International Journal of Traditional and Integrative Health Sciences
An Official Publication of Susruta Academic Publishing House
Peer Reviewed | Volume 1, Issue 2 (2026) | ISSN: [to be assigned] | DOI: [to be assigned]

EDITORIAL

Urological Health in Ayurveda: Traditional Understanding, Clinical Relevance, and Future Research Priorities

Neeraj Kumar
PG Department of Shalya Tantra, Post Graduate Institute of Ayurved,
Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan Rajasthan Ayurved University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

Urinary disorders occupy an unglamorous but consequential corner of clinical medicine. Lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) affect a large proportion of ageing men and shape daily quality of life; urolithiasis recurs in a substantial share of those affected and consumes considerable surgical and economic resources; recurrent urinary tract infection is complicated by rising antimicrobial resistance; and chronic kidney disease imposes a growing burden on health systems worldwide.[1,2,3] Against this background, the sustained interest of systems of traditional medicine in urinary function deserves attention rather than dismissal. Ayurveda, whose classical texts devote whole chapters to disorders of micturition, stone formation, and abnormal urine, offers a coherent diagnostic vocabulary and a layered therapeutic repertoire. The argument of this editorial is straightforward: classical Ayurvedic knowledge may furnish valuable perspectives for contemporary urological research, but responsible clinical integration depends on diagnostic clarity, rigorous evidence, and an uncompromising concern for patient safety

The Classical Framework

Ayurveda conceptualizes the urinary tract through *Mutravaha Srotas* (the channels that carry urine), whose roots are traditionally located in the kidneys and bladder. Pathology of these channels is elaborated in two principal clinical categories. *Mutraghata* (obstructive or suppressive disorders of urine flow) is described in *Charaka Samhita, Siddhi Sthana* 9, as a set of eight distinct patterns marked by retention, dribbling, strangury, or absent and excessive flow.[4] *Mutrakrichra* (difficult or painful micturition), treated in *Charaka Samhita, Chikitsa Sthana* 26, is distinguished from Mutraghata by the primacy of pain with voiding.[5] *Sushruta Samhita, Nidana Sthana* 3, provides the most detailed classical account of *Ashmari* (urinary calculi), attributing stone formation to aggravated kapha mixing with urine in the bladder and classifying stones by dominant qualities, with characteristic symptom clusters for renal, vesical, and urethral sites.[6]

Two features of this framework remain intellectually interesting. The first is the close attention to symptom phenomenology: classical authors separated painful voiding from obstructed voiding, and gradated urinary complaints by timing, stream, and associated suffering, anticipating in rudimentary form the symptom-based reasoning that underlies modern LUTS classification.[1] The second is the practical linkage of diagnosis with regimen, including fluid management, dietary correction, and procedural interventions described for calculi. What the classical framework cannot do, however, is map neatly onto modern diagnoses. *Mutraghata* aggregates conditions as diverse as urethral stricture, prostatic obstruction, and neurogenic bladder; *Prameha* (a group of disorders of abnormal urine, often linked with glycosuria) is not diabetes mellitus tout court. Historically informed reading is possible; diagnostic equivalence without justification is not.

Where Ayurveda Meets Contemporary Urology

The most plausible contribution of Ayurvedic perspectives lies in supportive, patient-centred care rather than disease modification. For LUTS attributed to benign prostatic hyperplasia, contemporary guidelines stress shared decision-making, watchful waiting for mildly symptomatic men, and lifestyle counselling on fluid and caffeine intake, physical activity, and bladder habits.[1,2] Ayurvedic practice already operates comfortably in this space: dietary regulation, daily routine, and structured herbal prescribing fit naturally alongside conservative management, provided that objective assessment is not neglected. Any patient presenting with

retention, gross haematuria, recurrent infection with systemic features, or deteriorating renal function requires prompt conventional evaluation, including urinalysis, renal function testing, ultrasonography with post-void residual measurement, and, where indicated, uroflowmetry and endoscopic assessment. Ayurvedic management should complement, never delay, established medical or surgical treatment.[1,3]

For urolithiasis, classical claims about stone dissolution and expulsion have prompted genuine research interest in plants such as *Varuna (Crataeva nurvala)* and *Gokshura (Tribulus terrestris)*. The honest reading of the literature is that preclinical signals exist but clinical validation remains thin, and guideline-endorsed management, including active stone prevention and surgical intervention where appropriate, should not be displaced.[3] For chronic kidney disease and recurrent urinary symptoms, the role of Ayurvedic care is currently best framed as adjunctive: symptom support, quality of life, and adherence to dietary advice, with renal parameters monitored by conventional laboratory methods. Distinguishing between symptom management and cure is not a rhetorical concession; it is the condition on which interdisciplinary trust depends.

Evidence and Its Limits

Published clinical research on Ayurvedic interventions for urological disorders is limited but not absent. Patankar and colleagues conducted a 28-week, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group study of a standardised polyherbal formulation in patients with asymptomatic renal calculi, reporting favourable changes in stone status and safety with limitations typical of the field.[7] Smaller, largely uncontrolled studies of formulations for *Mutraghata* managed as benign prostatic hyperplasia and for *Mutrashmari* have reported symptomatic improvement, but their designs preclude confident inference.[8] Methodological weaknesses recur across this literature: small samples, absent or weak control groups, short follow-up, non-standardised formulations, heterogeneous diagnostic criteria, subjective outcome measures, and inadequate adverse-event monitoring. A further, frequently understated, safety concern is product quality: Saper and colleagues found detectable lead, mercury, or arsenic in approximately one fifth of internet-purchased Ayurvedic medicines of both Indian and US manufacture.[9] Until manufacturing quality and safety surveillance are demonstrably robust, claims of general efficacy and safety for Ayurvedic treatment of urinary disorders cannot be sustained. Traditional use documents plausibility; it does not establish efficacy.

A Research Agenda

A credible research programme is identifiable and need not be extravagant. First, diagnostic criteria for Ayurvedic urological research should be standardized and explicitly linked to modern phenotyping, building on national initiatives such as the NAMASTE portal, which codes Ayurvedic morbidities against WHO ICD terminology.[10] Second, classical categories such as *Mutraghata* should be treated as hypotheses about symptom clusters, interpreted carefully rather than assumed equivalent to benign prostatic hyperplasia. Third, adequately powered randomized controlled trials with standardized, quality-assessed formulations are required, with trial designs that permit safety reporting. Fourth, outcome measurement should combine validated patient-reported instruments, such as the International Prostate Symptom Score, with objective parameters including uroflowmetry, post-void residual urine, stone recurrence on imaging, and serum creatinine or estimated glomerular filtration rate; subjective improvement alone is an insufficient endpoint. [1,2] Fifth, long-term follow-up and pharmacovigilance must become routine. None of this is achievable without interdisciplinary collaboration between Ayurvedic clinicians, urologists, nephrologists, and trialists, and without care models that specify when each system's expertise should lead.

Concluding Perspective

Ayurveda's classical account of urinary health is neither a museum piece nor a ready-made alternative to urology. Its enduring strengths are a phenomenologically rich diagnostic language, an integrated view of diet, regimen, and therapy, and a therapeutic inventory that has barely been tested to modern standards. Its future relevance to urological care will be decided not by assertion but by evidence: well-designed trials, standardized medicines, honest safety monitoring, and collaboration conducted on terms both systems can respect. For clinicians, the practical message is one of disciplined integration, in which diagnostic clarity and patient safety define the boundary of Ayurvedic supportive care while rigorous research determines how far that boundary can, justifiably, expand.

Reference

1. Gravas S, Cornu JN, Gacci M, et al. EAU Guidelines on Management of Non-neurogenic Male Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms. European Association of Urology. Available

from: https://uroweb.org/guidelines/management-of-non-neurogenic-male-luts
2. Sandhu JS, Ackerman AL, Breyer BN, et al. Management of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Attributed to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: AUA Guideline Amendment 2023. J Urol. 2024. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000003698
3. Skolarikos A, Neisius A, Somani BK, et al. European Association of Urology Guidelines on Urolithiasis. European Association of Urology. Available from: https://uroweb.org/guidelines/urolithiasis
4. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita, Siddhi Sthana 9 (Trimarmiya Siddhi: Mutraghata). Chaukhambha Bharati Academy; Varanasi.
5. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita, Chikitsa Sthana 26 (Trimarmiya Chikitsa: Mutrakrichra). Chaukhambha Bharati Academy; Varanasi.
6. Sushruta. Sushruta Samhita, Nidana Sthana 3 (Ashmari Nidana). Chaukhambha; Varanasi.
7. Patankar SB, Mujumdar AM, Bernard F, et al. Safety and efficacy of an herbal formulation in patients with renal calculi - A 28 week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel group study. J Ayurveda Integr Med. 2019;10(4):257-62. doi:10.1016/j.jaim.2017.09.004. PMID: 30709687.
8. Patel JKK, Dudhamal TS, Gupta SK, Mahanta V. Efficacy of Kanchanara Guggulu and Matra Basti of Dhanyaka Gokshura Ghrita in Mutraghata (benign prostatic hyperplasia). Ayu. 2015;36(1):138-44. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4784122/
9. Saper RB, Phillips RS, Sehgal A, et al. Lead, mercury, and arsenic in US- and Indian-manufactured Ayurvedic medicines sold via the Internet. JAMA. 2008;300(8):915-23. doi:10.1001/jama.300.8.915. PMID: 18728265.
10. Thrigulla SR, Srikanth N, Khanduri S, et al. Initiatives: National Ayush Morbidity and Standardized Terminologies Electronic (NAMASTE) Portal. J Ayurveda Integr Med. 2023;14(3):100734. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10410508/

CITE THIS ARTICLE

Vancouver: Kumar N, Urological Health in Ayurveda: Traditional Understanding, Clinical Relevance, and Future Research Priorities. Int J Tradit Integr Health Sci. 2026;1(2): [1-3]