



REVIEW ARTICLE

A Critical Review on Methodological Assessment of Ama: Challenges and Barriers

Rajasree G K¹, Pradeep K²

¹Final year PG Scholar, Department of Kriyasareera, Government Ayurveda College, Kannur

²Associate Professor, Department of Kriyasareera, Government Ayurveda College, Kannur

*Email: rajasreegk95@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 05 January 2026

Accepted: 23 February 2026

Available online

Version 1.0 : 31 March 2026

Keywords

Ama, *Ayurveda*, diagnostic challenges, methodological assessment, standardization.

Additional information

Peer review: Publisher thanks Sectional Editor and the other anonymous reviewers for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Reprints & permissions information is available at <https://keralajournalofayurveda.org/index.php/kja/open-access-policy>

Publisher's Note: All Kerala Govt. Ayurveda College Teacher's Association remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright: © The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

CITE THIS ARTICLE

Rajasree GK, Pradeep K. A Critical Review on Methodological Assessment of Ama:



Challenges and Barriers. Kerala Journal of Ayurveda. 2026;5(1):23-27. <https://doi.org/10.55718/kja.548>

Abstract

Ama is a central concept in Ayurvedic pathology, regarded as the toxic residue of impaired digestion and metabolic dysfunction. Despite its foundational role in the genesis of various disorders, the assessment of *Ama* remains largely subjective, with limited standardized diagnostic protocols available. This review aims to critically examine the existing methodologies for the assessment of *Ama* and identify the inherent challenges and barriers in both classical and contemporary frameworks. A narrative review was conducted by analysing classical Ayurvedic texts, including *Charaka Samhita*, *Ashtanga Hridaya*, and *Madhava Nidana*, alongside recent research articles from PubMed, AYUSH portals, and peer-reviewed Ayurvedic journals. The focus was on diagnostic indicators, clinical tools, and assessment models used to identify *Ama*, and their alignment with scientific methods. Findings reveal a lack of uniform criteria for *Ama* assessment across classical references. Contemporary studies attempt to correlate Ayurvedic symptoms with biochemical and inflammatory markers, but validation remains limited. The primary challenges include variability in the interpretation of signs and symptoms, the absence of objective biomarkers, and inadequate research models to evaluate *Ama* quantitatively. Additionally, clinical assessment heavily depends on practitioner experience, introducing significant inter-observer variability. These challenges highlight the need for standardized diagnostic frameworks and objective clinical markers. Integration of systems biology approaches and empirical tools is emerging as a promising direction to understand *Ama* as a multidimensional and clinically relevant construct.

Introduction

Diagnosis, the meticulous and multifaceted process of identifying and determining the underlying cause of a patient's symptoms, conditions, or diseases. It is a foundational principle of medicine that relies on a combination of clinical expertise, advanced technology, and effective communication⁽¹⁾. Despite being grounded in scientific knowledge, the diagnostic process remains susceptible to various challenges and constraints, particularly when complex factors such as individual clinician variability, population characteristics, disease prevalence, and resource availability come into play. In Ayurveda, diagnostic reasoning is rooted in a distinct epistemological framework encompassing *Pramana*, *Trividha Pariksha* and *Rogi - Roga Pariksha*,

collectively guiding a comprehensive and individualized evaluation of health and disease. Embracing patient-centric philosophy, Ayurveda's diagnostic approach uniquely integrates the assessment of both subjective and objective parameters, considering the intricate dynamics between the individual, their disease, and their overall well-being. The *Dosha*-based approach of Ayurvedic medicine allows for effective treatment outcomes in clinical practice, the lack of standardized and scientifically validated diagnostic tools poses a significant challenge for reproducibility in research, highlighting the need for rigorous diagnostic methodologies in Ayurvedic clinical trials.

At the core of Ayurveda's integrative framework, the concept of *Ama* plays a important role in explaining the interplay between gastrointestinal dysfunction, psychosomatic imbalance, and the pathogenesis of various disorders(2). Although *Ama* is classically defined as a pathological byproduct arising from impaired Agni(3), its clinical identification remains challenging due to the absence of uniform diagnostic parameters. The transformation of *Ama* into *Amavisha* and its involvement in *Doshā-Duṣya*(4) interactions further complicate assessment, as these processes manifest heterogeneously across individuals. While the descriptions of *Sama* and *Nirama* states offer useful clinical indicators, their interpretation is largely subjective, relying heavily on practitioner experience and textual discretion. These inconsistencies highlight the critical need for standardization; however, such standardization is difficult to achieve because existing diagnostic criteria lack operational clarity, measurable biomarkers, and validated assessment tools capable of ensuring reproducibility across clinical and research settings.

Background

A clear conceptual distinction exists between diagnostic criteria and diagnostic tools, a distinction that is crucial in the context of *Ama* assessment. Diagnostic criteria define the characteristic features necessary for identifying a condition, whereas diagnostic tools provide a structured and systematic method for eliciting, measuring, and interpreting these features in clinical practice. In Ayurveda, the classical description of *Ama Lakṣhaṇa* such as *srotorodha*, *balabramsā*, *gaurava*, *anila mudatha*, *alasya*, *apakthi*, *nishteeva*, *malasanga*, *aruchi*, and *klama* (5) presents significant practical challenges for clinicians. Two key issues emphasize these challenges. First, operationalizing conceptually ambiguous terms like *srotorodha* requires the development of precise, context-sensitive questions capable of reliably capturing patient-reported experiences. Second, the symptomatic overlap between *Ama* and other pathological states necessitates a systematic, algorithmic approach to differentiate *Ama* from comorbid or mimicking conditions with sufficient diagnostic certainty.

These limitations highlight the importance of developing a comprehensive diagnostic tool for *Ama*. This review evaluates the

methodological landscape of *Ama* assessment across classical descriptions and contemporary tool development. Using criteria such as conceptual clarity, feasibility, methodological rigor, and evidence support, it identifies the key gaps hindering the development of standardized and validated diagnostic tools.

Methodology

This study is a narrative review aimed at critically examining the methodological approaches used in the assessment of *Ama*. A comprehensive literature search was conducted using PubMed, Google Scholar, and the AYUSH Research Portal. The search strategy incorporated combinations of the following keywords: *Ama*, *Ayurveda*, *Ama* assessment, diagnostic tools, method development, psychometric validation and Ayurvedic diagnostics. Boolean operators (AND/OR) were used to refine the search.

The search included articles published with no time restrictions, and studies were eligible if they addressed: (1) conceptual discussions on *Ama*, (2) clinical or experimental research related to *Ama*, or (3) efforts toward developing or validating diagnostic tools. Exclusion criteria included papers lacking methodological relevance or duplicate content across sources.

Classical Ayurvedic texts were selected based on their canonical importance, including the *Brhatrayi* and *Laghutrayi*. Relevant chapters were systematically reviewed to extract descriptions of *Ama Lakṣhaṇa*, classification, and diagnostic parameters. Contemporary studies were categorized into conceptual analyses, clinical investigations, and tool-development studies. Findings from each group were synthesized through qualitative thematic analysis to identify methodological gaps, diagnostic challenges, and opportunities for standardization.

Results

Ama and its pivotal role in disease manifestation

The identification of *Ama*, a pathological entity arising from impaired digestion and metabolic dysfunction, constitutes a critical diagnostic milestone in Ayurvedic clinical practice. Through the judicious application of classical diagnostic modalities, including *Nādi Nirṇaya*, *Jihva Nireekṣhaṇa*, and *Darsana*, practitioners can accurately detect the presence of *Ama*. The manifestation of characteristic symptoms such as *Srotorodha*, *Balabhramsā*, *Gaurava*, and various digestive disturbances necessitates prompt recognition and intervention. Early detection enables practitioners to devise targeted therapeutic strategies that restore physiological balance and promote optimal health outcomes.

On this conceptual basis, classical texts also specify characteristic symptom patterns that support the systematic recognition of *Ama*.

Recognition of *Ama* Through Classical Symptomatology

Srotorodha, recognized as a key pathological concept in *Ayurveda*, denotes the obstruction of the body's *srotas* (physiological channels) and is regarded as an early indicator of *Ama* accumulation. Such blockages disrupt the normal flow of biological substances, leading to systemic imbalances and a range of clinical manifestations that vary according to the specific *srotas* involved and the dominant *doṣha*. For example, gastrointestinal obstructions may present as bloating, constipation, and sluggish bowel movements. In *Kapha*-predominant individuals(6), signs such as peripheral or abdominal edema are common. In *Vata*-related obstructions often result in musculoskeletal stiffness or pain. Other early signs of *Ama* include *Balabhramsa* (loss of strength), where individuals experience profound fatigue even with minimal exertion, and *Gaurava*, characterized by a heavy, burdened sensation throughout the body. These symptoms reflect impaired metabolism and energy stagnation, commonly exacerbated after meals or physical activity.

Anilamudhata, indicating *vata* obstruction, is characterised by hard stools, incomplete evacuation, and abdominal discomfort. *Alasya* denotes a sense of lethargy and lack of motivation, not attributable to physical or mental exertion, often coexisting with *Apakti*, impaired digestion, manifesting as early satiety, nausea, reflux, or bowel irregularities. *Malasanga* denotes impaired elimination of body wastes, including constipation, urinary retention, foul-smelling excretions, and reduced sweating, all suggestive of *Ama* accumulation within excretory channels. *Aruchi*, or tastelessness, shoots from disturbed *Agni* and reflects both physiological and psychological factors such as poor diet and emotional stress. *Klama*, a deeper expression of fatigue, reveals the depletion of vital energy and manifests as chronic tiredness, low concentration, and emotional disturbance. *Pureesha Pareeksha*, a critical diagnostic method for identifying *Ama*, involves examining stool characteristics, such as sinking or floating in water(7). *Suddha Udgara*, or clear belching, is a vital indicator of proper digestion and a crucial diagnostic tool for detecting the presence of *Ama*(8). However, despite the utility of these symptom-based indicators, multiple challenges emerge when attempting to apply them reliably in clinical practice.

Limitations and Complexities in the Symptom-Based Diagnosis of *Ama*

The current diagnostic landscape in *Ayurveda* is troubled with challenges in detecting *Ama*, particularly in its promising stages. The reliance on practitioner expertise and intuition introduces a degree of subjectivity, rendering diagnosis susceptible to variability and inconsistency. The subtle, nonspecific symptoms characteristic of early-stage *Ama* often masquerade as other conditions, complicating accurate diagnosis. Furthermore, the insidious,

gradual accumulation of *Ama* can evade detection, leading to improper diagnoses and delayed intervention. The absence of standardized, objective diagnostic tools, compounded by the confounding effects of modern medical interventions, severely hampers the timely identification of *Ama*, undermining effective management and treatment.

The recognition of *Ama* through classical symptomatology presents several diagnostic challenges, largely due to the subjective nature and variability of its manifestations. Symptoms associated with *Srotorodha*, such as bloating, discomfort, or fatigue, can differ significantly from one individual to another, and may be subtle or absent in the early stages. Furthermore, *Ama* may accumulate in diverse forms and locations within the body, complicating efforts to pinpoint the specific site or extent of channel obstruction. Assessing *Balabhramsa*, a hallmark symptom characterized by fatigue and weakness poses additional difficulty, as these indicators are inherently subjective and frequently overlap with conditions such as depression, anemia, and chronic fatigue syndrome. This overlap often blurs diagnostic clarity, making it difficult to attribute the symptoms solely to *Ama*.

Evaluating digestive strength and related symptoms, such as *Apakti*, requires a delicate approach, as a one-time assessment may not accurately reflect an individual's true digestive capacity. Digestive performance fluctuates with numerous factors, including emotional stress, mental state, sleep quality, physical activity, and environmental influences. These variables can temporarily affect digestion, leading to misinterpretation of the symptom severity. Diagnostic assessment like *Pureesha Pariksha*, which examine stool characteristics (e.g., sinking or floating), are valuable in assessing *Ama* but rely heavily on accurate patient self-observation, which is often inconsistent. Similarly, evaluating *Suddha Udgara* (clear and proper belching) is complicated by patients' lack of awareness or misunderstanding of the symptom. Some may misinterpret normal belching as pathological or fail to notice it altogether, resulting in inaccurate reporting and diminished diagnostic precision. The fluctuating nature of digestive strength (*Agnibala*), heavily modulated by stress, environment, circadian rhythm, and diet, further blurs the clinical picture.

Despite these limitations, symptoms like *Suddha Udgara* remain essential indicators in *Ama* evaluation and cannot be excluded from diagnostic criteria without compromising clinical reliability. A single-point assessment may not reliably capture chronic or intermittent digestive inefficiency associated with *Ama* formation. In light of these challenges, there is an urgent need to develop and validate objective assessment instruments grounded in classical symptomatology but refined through psychometric testing.

Challenges in Standardizing and Validating Diagnostic Criteria for *Ama*

Developing a strong questionnaire to assess the complex concept of *Ama* is only the first hurdle. Validation of such a questionnaire poses significant challenges, even with a well-structured questionnaire. The symptom terminology related to *Ama* is often used synonymously across various sections of the Ayurvedic *Samhithas*, leading to interpretative variations. While classical texts provide rich descriptions, the operational definitions of these symptoms may differ among practitioners, shaped by their individual clinical experiences and diagnostic perspectives. This variability presents significant challenges in the development of a standardized diagnostic tool for *Ama*. Furthermore, issues such as appropriate word sequencing, accurate translation, and consistent back-translation become critical, as subtle meanings can easily be lost or misinterpreted during this process. Such linguistic and contextual complexities must be carefully addressed to ensure the reliability and validity of any assessment instrument designed for *Ama* evaluation.

Challenges in Evaluating Reliability

One major obstacle arises during test–retest reliability assessment, where a two-week interval between evaluations may lead to inconsistencies. If patients undergo treatment or self-management during this period, their *Ama* condition may improve, resulting in variations in scoring. Such changes can compromise the reliability of the questionnaire. Clinical recovery during the interval may further contribute to discrepancies in results, thereby undermining the overall reliability and validity of the tool.

Discussion and Conclusion

This review demonstrates that the methodological foundation for assessing *Ama* remains underdeveloped, largely due to reliance on subjective interpretations drawn from classical descriptions. Although these descriptions provide conceptual richness, their qualitative nature limits reproducibility, leading to substantial inter-practitioner variability. Existing attempts to develop assessment tools or correlate *Ama* with biochemical or physiological markers are fragmented, lack methodological uniformity, and often fall short of rigorous validation. As a result, no standardized or widely accepted diagnostic instrument for *Ama* currently exists.

Advancing the methodological landscape of *Ama* assessment will require a shift toward greater precision and empirical rigor. Operational definitions of classical terminologies must be clearly articulated, and item generation for diagnostic tools should follow systematic procedures such as structured text analysis and expert consensus. Future studies should be designed with adequate sample sizes, transparent methodologies, and appropriate psychometric testing to establish reliability and validity.

Strengthening these methodological domains is essential for transforming *Ama* from a conceptually described entity into a clinically measurable construct. Such progress will enhance diagnostic consistency, support higher-quality clinical research, and contribute to the broader integration of Ayurvedic diagnostic frameworks within contemporary evidence-based practice.

References

1. Edavalath M, Bharathan BP. Methodology for developing and evaluating diagnostic tools in Ayurveda – A review. *Journal of Ayurveda and Integrative Medicine*. Elsevier B.V.; 2021. p. 389–97. doi:10.1016/j.jaim.2021.01.009
2. Sreekumar T. *Aṣṭāṅga Hṛdaya of Vāgbhaṭa*. Vol. 1. Thaikattussery, Thrissur, Kerala: Vaidyaratnam Ayurveda College Publications; 2018. 420 p.
3. T. Sreekumar. *Aṣṭāṅga Hṛdaya of Vāgbhaṭa*. Vol. 1. Thaikattussery, Thrissur, Kerala: Vaidyaratnam Ayurveda College Publications; 2021. 419 p.
4. T. Sreekumar. *Aṣṭāṅga Hṛdaya of Vāgbhaṭa*. Vol. 1. Thaikattussery, Thrissur, Kerala: Vaidyaratnam Ayurveda College Publications; 2021. 420–423 p.
5. T. Sreekumar. *Aṣṭāṅga Hṛdaya*. Thaikattussery, Thrissur, Kerala: Vaidyaratnam Ayurveda College Publications; 2021. 418–419 p.
6. Dr. T. Sreekumar. *Aṣṭāṅga Hṛdaya*. Vol. 1. Thrissur, Kerala: Vaidyaratnam Ayurveda College Publications; 2021.
7. susrutha, Nibandhasangraha Commentary by Dalhanacharya. *Sushruta Samhita, Uttarantra*, Chapter 40, verse 17,. Vaidya Yadavji Trikamaji Acharya, editor. Vol. 3. varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia; 2014. 698 p.
8. Yogaratnakara. *Yogaratanakara*. Prof. K. R. Rama Chandra Reddy, editor. varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia; 2005.

§§§