



Review Article

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF IMPORTANCE OF CARAKA SAMHITA IN MADHAV NIDANA WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO NIDANA STHANA

Roy Annesha^{1*}, Basumatary Khagen², Goswami Kanika³

¹PG Scholar, ²Professor & HOD, ³Assistant Professor, Department of Samhita and Siddhant, Government Ayurvedic College, Guwhati, Assam, India.

Article info

Article History:

Received: 25-04-2026

Accepted: 13-05-2026

Published: 07-06-2026

KEYWORDS:

Caraka Samhita,
Madhava Nidana,
Nidana Sthana,
Ayurvedic
diagnostics,
Comparative study,
Madhavakara.

ABSTRACT

Caraka Samhita is one of the most authoritative foundational texts of Ayurveda and presents a systematic understanding of disease through *Nidana*, *Purvarupa*, *Rupa*, *Upashaya*, *Samprapti*, and prognostic considerations. *Madhava Nidana*, a major text of the *Laghutrayi*, represents a later and more specialized development in Ayurvedic diagnostics and is especially valued for its disease-wise organization, clarity of symptomatology, and practical clinical orientation. The present study is a literary, analytical, and comparative review undertaken to critically analyze the importance of *Caraka Samhita in Madhava Nidana* with special reference to *Nidana Sthana*. The research was divided into three broad sections: comparative evaluation of the eight chapters of *Nidana Sthana in Caraka Samhita* and their corresponding descriptions in *Madhava Nidana*, study of diseases independently elaborated in *Madhava Nidana*, and comparative review of diseases discussed in both texts outside *Nidana Sthana*. The analysis shows that *Madhavakara* adopted the core conceptual framework of *Caraka Samhita*, especially the principles of *Nidana Panchaka*, *Dosha-dushya involvement*, *Samprapti vicara*, and prognostic assessment, and reorganized them into a concise, structured, and clinically oriented format. Strong similarities were found in *Nidana* (etiological factors), *Purvarupa* (prodromal symptoms), *Rupa* (clinical manifestations), and *Samprapti* (pathogenesis) across major diseases, while *Madhava Nidana* also demonstrated originality through disease-wise chapter arrangement and the inclusion of independent entities such as *Amavata*, *Amlapitta*, *Medoroga*, *Masurika*, *Slipada*, and *Asrigdara*. The study establishes that *Caraka Samhita* served as a major conceptual foundation for *Madhava Nidana*, while *Madhava Nidana* transformed that foundation into a more specialized and practically useful diagnostic text, thereby contributing significantly to the historical evolution of Ayurvedic *Roga nidana*. The aim of the study is to critically evaluate the significance and influence of *Caraka Samhita* on *Madhava Nidana* with special reference to the concepts presented in *Nidana Sthana*.

INTRODUCTION

Ayurveda is fundamentally concerned with the preservation of health and the management of disease, and in both these functions the science of diagnosis occupies a central place. The concept of *Nidana* is therefore indispensable because it enables the physician to identify the causes, early manifestations,

clinical features, progression, and prognosis of disease before choosing a line of treatment. Without a sound understanding of *Nidana*, treatment remains incomplete and may lack precision in practical application.

Among the classical Ayurvedic compendia, *Caraka Samhita* occupies a unique place as one of the most foundational texts of internal medicine and disease theory. Its *Nidana Sthana* is particularly significant because it explains disease causation and development not merely through outward manifestations but through a deeper conceptual framework involving *Dosha*, *Dushya*, *Srotas*, *Samprapti*, and the logic of disease evolution. In this way, *Caraka*

Access this article online	
Quick Response Code	https://doi.org/10.47070/ijapr.v14i6.4243
	Published by Mahadev Publications (Regd.) publication licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

Samhita provides the intellectual and theoretical basis of Ayurvedic *Roga vijñana*.

Madhava Nidana represents a later but highly influential milestone in the growth of Ayurvedic diagnostics. Unlike the broader classical Samhitas, it is devoted primarily to disease diagnosis and arranges disorders in a chapter-wise pattern that emphasizes clinical identification, differentiation, and concise presentation. The text is often appreciated as one of the clearest and most practically useful diagnostic treatises in Ayurvedic literature.

A careful comparative reading shows that Madhava Nidana did not arise in isolation. Many of its disease concepts, definitions, and diagnostic structures are rooted in the earlier formulations found in Caraka Samhita, especially in the conceptual material of *Nidana Sthana*. At the same time, Madhavakara did not merely repeat earlier teachings; he condensed, reorganized, and refined them in a way that enhanced their practical and pedagogic value.

The present study therefore examines the relationship between these two major texts with special reference to Nidana Sthana. Its purpose is to identify continuity, adaptation, originality, and development in Ayurvedic diagnostics and to clarify how the theoretical foundation laid by Caraka Samhita was transformed into the structured nosological framework seen in Madhava Nidana.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present work is a literary, analytical, and comparative study based mainly on classical Ayurvedic literature. The principal sources were Caraka Samhita, especially Nidana Sthana, and Madhava Nidana with relevant traditional commentaries such as Madhukosa. Supporting material was drawn from commentarial literature, allied Ayurvedic compendia, review studies, and related thesis dealing with *Nidana* theory, *Roga vijñana*, and the development of Ayurvedic diagnostics.

For convenience of analysis, the study was divided into three parts. The first part examined the eight chapters of Nidana Sthana in Caraka Samhita and compared them with corresponding descriptions in Madhava Nidana, with attention to *Nidana Panchaka* and disease-specific features. The second part focused on diseases independently elaborated in Madhava Nidana, including *Amavata*, *Masurika*, *Romantika*, *Medoroga*, *Slipada*, *Parinama Shula*, *Annadrava Shula*, *Amlapitta*, and *Asrigdara*. The third part compared diseases discussed in both texts outside the *Nidana Sthana* section, such as *Krimi*, *Rajayakshma*, *Vatavyadhi*, *Hridroga*, *Mutrakriccha*, *Mutraghata*, *Ashmari*, *Udara*, *Sotha*, *Grahani*, *Pandu*, *Kasa*, *Shwasa*, *Hikka*, *Chhardi*, *Trishna*, *Bhagandara*, and *Visarpa*.

Data relating to causative factors, prodromal features, symptomatology, pathogenesis, classification, prognosis, and complications were collected from the

concerned passages and interpreted comparatively. Commentaries were consulted where necessary for conceptual clarification, particularly in relation to technical terminology, disease classification, and the broader diagnostic implications of the texts.

Historical background of Nidana

The study traces the roots of diagnostic thinking in Ayurveda to the Vedic period, particularly to Atharvaveda, where early references to diseases such as *Jwara*, *Kustha*, *Apasmara*, and *Yakshma* appear along with rudimentary notions of causation, symptoms, and remedial measures^[2]. Although these references do not constitute a full diagnostic science, they represent the earliest conceptual background from which later Ayurvedic *Nidana* evolved.

In the post-Vedic and classical periods, these scattered ideas became more structured. The study notes defines that the conceptual maturation of *Nidana* took place gradually through the Samhita period, especially in Caraka Samhita and Susruta Samhita, where disease causation, premonitory signs, symptom complexes, complications, and pathogenesis were described in more systematic form. Within this development, Caraka Samhita played a crucial role by providing the broad theoretical structure of *Nidana Panchaka* and related diagnostic logic.

Madhava Nidana represents a later culmination of this process. The study describes it as a specialized diagnostic text that systematized and refined earlier frameworks into a more concise and clinically accessible form, thereby making it especially important in the historical evolution of Ayurvedic diagnostics.

Conceptual importance of Caraka Samhita

Caraka Samhita is of central importance because it presents diagnosis as an integrated intellectual process rather than a mere listing of symptoms. Its discussion of *Hetu*, *Purvarupa*, *Rupa*, *Upashaya*, and *Samprapti* forms the theoretical basis of *Nidana Panchaka*, and the study specifically notes that this framework is extensively discussed in *Nidana Sthana*. These concepts are not only diagnostic tools but also guide prognosis and treatment planning.

Another important feature of Caraka Samhita is its emphasis on *Dosha-dushya* interaction, disease evolution, and the underlying mechanisms of pathology. This deeper theoretical orientation explains why Caraka is often broader and more analytical than later diagnostic texts. General importance of Madhava Nidana is presented as one of the most important texts devoted specifically to diagnosis. Its major strength lies in chapter-wise organization, compact presentation, and the practical arrangement of disease entities in a way that is highly useful for clinicians and students. The text translates broad earlier doctrines into an efficient diagnostic manual without abandoning

the conceptual basis inherited from the classical Samhitas.

There are several merits of Madhava Nidana, including its subject-wise arrangement, concise style, incorporation of authoritative earlier teachings, and the independent elaboration of diseases that were either scattered or less clearly defined in previous texts. These features show that the text has both derivative and original dimensions. It is rooted in earlier authorities but also contributes significantly to the refinement and expansion of Ayurvedic nosology.

Comparative discussion of major diseases

Jwara

The study identifies *Jwara* as a major example of the relation between the two texts. Both Caraka Samhita and Madhava Nidana accept *Jwara* as a *Tridoshaja* disorder and connect it with *Dosha* aggravation and disease evolution from internal imbalance. However, their styles differ in emphasis. Caraka Samhita explains *Jwara* with strong attention to pathophysiology, especially *Ama*, *Srotorodha*, and the involvement of *Rasa* and *Swedavaha srotas* in the disturbance of heat regulation^[3]. Madhava Nidana, by contrast, presents a more clinically differentiated classification, including clearer delineation of *Dwandvaja* and *Sannipataja* forms and a sharper emphasis on clinically recognizable signs.^[4] This concludes that Caraka provides the foundational pathogenetic explanation, while Madhava develops that basis into a more diagnostic and practically useful framework.

Raktapitta

The analysis of *Raktapitta* shows a similar pattern. Essential aspects such as *Pitta-rakta* involvement, causative factors, classification, and prognosis in Madhava Nidana are described as conceptually dependent on earlier Samhita literature, especially Caraka^[5]. Yet Madhava Nidana presents them in a more compact and clinically oriented style, emphasizing recognition of symptom patterns and diagnostic interpretation over extensive therapeutic discussion^[6].

This comparison indicates that Caraka Samhita acted as the primary conceptual source, while Madhava Nidana systematically condensed and organized the same material for easier practical application.

Gulma

The chapter on *Gulma* in Madhava Nidana also reflects clear influence from Caraka Samhita. This notes continuity in causative factors, *Vata* predominance, classification, symptomatology, and prognostic orientation. Caraka offers elaborate *samprapti* and broader therapeutic discussion^[7],

whereas Madhava emphasizes systematized diagnostic features.^[8]

The importance of this shift lies in the transition from etiopathological exposition toward compact clinical recognition. Madhava Nidana preserves the substance of the disease concept but rearranges it for diagnostic clarity.

Prameha

The study of *Prameha* clearly shows the adaptive method of *Madhavakara*. Madhava Nidana preserves the core concepts of *Dosha* involvement, etiological factors, classification into 20 types, and general understanding of *Samprapti* already developed in Caraka Samhita. At the same time, this notes that Madhava presents the disease in a more concise way, especially through organized descriptions of urine characteristics, disease types, and symptom-based distinctions.

Caraka Samhita provides a broader understanding of pathology, *Dosha*-specific causes, prognosis, and systemic involvement.^[9] Madhava Nidana gives greater emphasis to clinical recognition and differential diagnosis, which made the disease easier to grasp in practical settings^[10]. This is one of the strongest examples of Madhava Nidana as a refined diagnostic adaptation of Caraka's broader exposition.

Kustha

The *Kustha* chapter similarly illustrates continuity with modification. The study shows that Madhava Nidana retains the broad classical classification of *Mahakustha* and *Kshudrakustha* and accepts the *Tridoshic* and multi-*Dhatu* involvement already elaborated in Caraka Samhita. However, the emphasis shifts toward clearer diagnostic recognition, concise symptom arrangement, and prognosis.

Caraka Samhita discusses etiology, pathology, prognosis, and treatment in greater breadth^[11]. Madhava Nidana, while preserving doctrine, is more symptom-oriented and clinically direct. The thesis therefore interprets the *Kustha* chapter as evidence that Madhava Nidana simplified and systematized earlier Ayurvedic knowledge for bedside use without severing its roots in Caraka Samhita.^[12]

Sosha and Rajyakshma

The study notes that diseases involving depletion and chronicity, such as *Sosha* or *Rajyakshma*, are discussed more comprehensively in Caraka Samhita with strong emphasis on pathogenesis, *Dhatu* depletion, and management principles.^[13] Madhava Nidana selectively extracts clinically significant material and arranges it in a more structured sequence for diagnosis^[14]. This again demonstrates dependence on Caraka for conceptual depth and reliance on Madhava for concise diagnostic utility.

Unmada

Unmada is one of the most important comparative topics because it shows the psychosomatic richness of Caraka Samhita. Caraka defines *Unmada* broadly as derangement of mind, intellect, consciousness, memory, conduct, behavior, and activity, and gives detailed attention to psychological factors such as *Rajas* and *Tamas* as well as prognostic and therapeutic aspects [15]. Madhava Nidana accepts the *Doshic* and *Manovaha srotas* basis of the disorder but presents the material in a shorter and more clinically direct style [16].

This notes that Madhava emphasizes classification and observable manifestations, whereas Caraka gives a wider psychosomatic interpretation and more elaborate therapeutic orientation. This comparison is significant because it shows that Madhava's condensation does not replace Caraka's depth; rather, it depends on it while adapting it for practical diagnosis.

Apasmara

The study presents *Apasmara* as another strong example of *Madhavakara's* method. Caraka Samhita explains the disease as involving disturbance of memory, consciousness, and intellectual functions together with *Dosha* imbalance and mental factors such as *Rajas* and *Tamas*. [17] Madhava Nidana arranges the same principles in a more clinically recognizable form, highlighting sudden unconsciousness, abnormal movements, frothing, post-episode confusion, and *Dosha*-specific manifestations with greater clarity [18].

The study concludes that Caraka provides the conceptual and psychological basis of the disease, while Madhava Nidana sharpens its differential diagnostic value through concise organization and symptom-based clarity.

Independent contributions of Madhava Nidana

One of the major strengths of the study is its analysis of diseases independently elaborated in Madhava Nidana. These sections show that Madhava Nidana was not merely a digest of earlier texts but also a creative expansion of the diagnostic tradition. The independent or more developed discussion of diseases such as *Amavata*, *Amlapitta*, *Medoroga*, *Masurika*, *Romantika*, *Slipada*, *Parinama Shula*, *Annadrava Shula*, and *Asrigdara* demonstrates the text's originality and practical orientation.

Amavata is especially important because it is treated as an independent disease entity with detailed *Nidana*, *Purvarupa*, *Rupa*, and *Samprapti*. The study notes that earlier classics contain scattered references to *Ama* and *Vata* involvement, but *Madhavakara* systematized these factors into a distinct disease concept, revealing diagnostic maturity and clinical insight [19].

Amlapitta is another important example. While earlier texts contain references to *Pittaja* digestive disturbances, Madhava Nidana organizes the disease more clearly and even differentiates *Urdhvaga* and *Adhoga* types, indicating a refined attempt at classifying functional digestive disorders according to direction and manifestation [20].

Masurika and *Romantika* show the expanding awareness of epidemic and eruptive conditions. The study explains that these disorders are either minimally described or not systematically classified in earlier Brihatrayi texts, but *Madhavakara* provides separate symptom-oriented descriptions, demonstrating observational skill and growing nosological sophistication [21].

Medoroga, *Slipada*, and *Asrigdara* similarly reflect a more specialized diagnostic tendency. Their independent elaboration indicates a shift from theoretical understanding of *Doshic* or *dhatu* derangement toward disease-oriented clinical identity. In this sense, Madhava Nidana extends the tradition of Caraka rather than merely summarizing it [22].

Diseases outside Nidana Sthana

The study also compares diseases discussed in both texts outside the *Nidana Sthana* of Caraka Samhita. These include *Krimi*, *Rajayakshma*, *Vatavyadhi*, *Urustambha*, *Hridroga*, *Mutrakriccha*, *Mutraghata*, *Ashmari*, *Udara*, *Sotha*, *Grahani*, *Atisara*, *Pandu*, *Kasa*, *Shwasa*, *Hikka*, *Chhardi*, *Trishna*, *Bhagandara*, and *Visarpa*.

The general pattern identified is highly significant. Caraka Samhita typically discusses these diseases within a broad therapeutic and pathophysiological framework, emphasizing why they arise, how *Dosha* and *Dushya* interact, and what principles govern their management. Madhava Nidana reorganizes many of the same diseases into separate chapters with concise outlines of *Nidana*, *Purvarupa*, *Rupa*, and at times prognosis, thereby making them easier to classify, study, and diagnose in practice.

This contrast supports one of the central conclusions of the thesis: Caraka Samhita serves as the conceptual foundation of Ayurvedic *Roga vijnana*, whereas Madhava Nidana serves as a later diagnostic consolidation that transforms principle-based knowledge into disease-wise nosology.

Role of commentaries and later interpretation

The study repeatedly notes that commentaries play an important role in clarifying the relation between the two texts. In the case of Caraka Samhita, Chakrapani and other interpreters help elucidate the logical and philosophical structure of diagnosis, especially in relation to *Hetu*, *Samprapti*, and technical terms. In the case of Madhava Nidana, *Madhukosa* is described as especially valuable because it explains

technical terms, reconciles differences, and preserves interpretive traditions around the text.

This commentarial tradition is important because it shows that the continuity between Caraka and Madhava was not only textual but also intellectual. Later scholars understood Madhava Nidana in relation to the classical framework inherited from Caraka and other authorities, which further confirms the thesis argument of deep interdependence.

DISCUSSION

The overall evidence of the study supports several major findings.

- Caraka Samhita, especially Nidana Sthana, provides the foundational conceptual structure of Ayurvedic diagnosis through Nidana Panchaka, *Dosha-dushya* interaction, *Samprapti*, and prognostic thought.
- Madhava Nidana adopts much of this conceptual material but reorganizes it into a concise, systematic, and disease-wise form that is highly suitable for diagnosis and teaching.
- In major diseases such as *Jwara*, *Raktapitta*, *Gulma*, *Prameha*, *Kustha*, *Unmada*, and *Apasmara*, strong continuity exists between the two texts, though the balance between theory and clinical arrangement differs.
- Madhava Nidana also contributes original value through chapter organization, disease classification, and the independent elaboration of disorders such as *Amavata*, *Amlapitta*, *Masurika*, *Medoroga*, *Slipada*, and *Asrigdara*.
- The evolution from Caraka Samhita to Madhava Nidana reflects a broader historical transition in Ayurveda from principle-based disease explanation to more refined and practically oriented nosology.

CONCLUSION

The present study confirms that Caraka Samhita, particularly Nidana Sthana, occupies a foundational position in the development of Ayurvedic diagnostic literature. It provides the central conceptual apparatus of disease causation, prodromal signs, symptomatology, pathogenesis, and prognosis that later texts inherited, interpreted, and refined.

A comparative analysis demonstrates that Madhava Nidana is not merely a repetition of Caraka Samhita, but a later and more specialized development of the same diagnostic tradition. Madhavakara adopted the essential concepts of earlier Samhita literature and transformed them into a concise, organized, and clinically practical disease-wise format. This reorganization reflects editorial judgment, practical insight, and diagnostic maturation rather than mechanical compilation.

The relationship between Caraka Samhita and Madhava Nidana is therefore best understood as one of continuity with refinement. Caraka Samhita served as

the philosophical and theoretical source, while Madhava Nidana systematized and expanded that source into a clearer diagnostic manual suited to later clinical and pedagogical needs. In this sense, the historical significance of Madhava Nidana lies not only in preserving earlier knowledge but also in converting it into a more sharply structured and clinically useful expression of Ayurvedic *Roga nidana*.

REFERENCES

1. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021.
2. Macdonell AA, Keith AB. Vedic Index of Names and Subjects. Hindi translation by Ramkumar Rai. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan; 2014.
3. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 1, p.641.
4. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 2, p.81.
5. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 2, p.679.
6. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 9.
7. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 3.
8. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 28.
9. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 4.
10. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan

- Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 33.
11. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 5.
 12. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 49.
 13. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 6.
 14. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 10.
 15. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 7.
 16. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 20.
 17. Agnivesha. Charaka Samhita. Ayurved Deepika commentary by Chakrapanidatta. Edited by Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. 6th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2024. Nidansthana, Chapter 8.
 18. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 21.
 19. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 25.
 20. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 51.
 21. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 54.
 22. Madhavakara. Madhava Nidana (Roga Viniscaya). With Madhukosa commentary of Vijayarakshita and Srikanthadatta. Edited by Yadunandan Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha prakashan; 2021. Chapter 34, 39, 61.

Cite this article as:

Roy Annesha, Basumatary Khagen, Goswami Kanika. Critical Analysis of Importance of Caraka Samhita in Madhav Nidana with special reference to Nidana Sthana. International Journal of Ayurveda and Pharma Research. 2026;14(6):402-407.

<https://doi.org/10.47070/ijapr.v14i6.4243>

Source of support: Nil, Conflict of interest: None Declared

***Address for correspondence**

Dr. Roy Annesha

PG Scholar

Department of Samhita and Siddhant,
Government Ayurvedic College,
Guwhati.

Email: annesharoy97@gmail.com

Disclaimer: IJAPR is solely owned by Mahadev Publications - dedicated to publish quality research, while every effort has been taken to verify the accuracy of the content published in our Journal. IJAPR cannot accept any responsibility or liability for the articles content which are published. The views expressed in articles by our contributing authors are not necessarily those of IJAPR editor or editorial board members.