



Review Article

YOGA TANTRAYUKTI AS A STRUCTURAL PRECURSOR TO IMRAD: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SNEHADHYAYA OF CHARAKA SAMHITA SUTRASTHANA

Ankit Patil^{1*}, Bhoomika Naval¹, Vidyadhish Kashikar², Shailza Bhatnagar³

*1PG Scholar, ²Senior Assistant Professor, ³Professor Department of Samhita Evam Maulik Siddhanta, National Institute of Ayurveda (De-novo), Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

Article info

Article History:

Received: 28-06-2026

Accepted: 26-07-2026

Published: 10-09-2026

KEYWORDS:

Yoga Tantrayukti,
IMRAD format,
Ayurveda research,
Scientific writing,
Charaka samhita,
Snehadhyaya.

ABSTRACT

Ayurveda possesses a sophisticated tradition of scientific documentation embedded within its classical texts. Among the thirty-six *Tantrayukti*, *Yoga Tantrayukti*, which governs the logical and sequential arrangement of subject matter, holds particular relevance for research communication. Modern scientific writing universally follows the IMRAD format (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion). However, a structural disconnect is often perceived between classical Ayurvedic scholarly tools and contemporary academic publishing requirements. **Methods:** A conceptual-analytical approach was employed using primary sources including the *Charakasamhita* with their classical commentaries, along with peer-reviewed Ayurvedic articles and literature on the IMRAD framework. The *Snehadhyaya* of *Charakasamhita Sutrasthana* was selected for analysis. **Results:** A prominent structural alignment was identified between *Yoga Tantrayukti* and the IMRAD format which mirror an Introduction, Methods; verses 57-59 reflect Results; and verses 96-97 demonstrate discussion. **Discussion:** The findings suggest that *Yoga Tantrayukti* conceptually anticipates the IMRAD structure, providing a systematic mapping of its sub-functions to each IMRAD component and an original methodological contribution to *Samhita Siddhanta*.

INTRODUCTION

The architectural design of ancient Ayurvedic texts is exceptionally advanced, featuring a built-in logical framework that secures its scientific integrity and clinical applicability across eras. This is exemplified in the *Charakasamhita*, where *Charaka* utilized thirty-six distinct *Tantrayukti*, a set of systematic methodological apparatuses functioning much like modern research tools to guide textual composition and clinical execution.^[1]

The word *Tantrayukti* derives from *Tantra* (a scientific treatise or discipline) and *Yukti* (a method or technique). Together, these serve as systematic methodological devices that eliminate ambiguity, illuminate the true meaning of a text, and ensure its

correct composition and comprehension for both scholars and practitioners alike.

Among these thirty-six tools, *Yoga Tantrayukti* holds special significance for research communication. As described by *Chakrapanidatta* in his commentary *Ayurvedadipika*, *Yoga* is the *Tantrayukti* by which scattered or separately mentioned words or statements are syntactically and logically combined to derive a unified meaning.^[2]

In the contemporary scientific world, the gold standard for research writing is the IMRAD format (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion). Emerging as the dominant framework in biomedical publishing during the 1940s and later formally standardized by the American National Standards Institute in 1972, IMRAD is now the universally accepted structure for original research in global scientific journals.

Despite ongoing efforts to integrate Ayurvedic research into mainstream indexed journals, scholars frequently encounter difficulty in structuring their articles to meet international standards. This challenge

Access this article online

Quick Response Code



<https://doi.org/10.47070/ayushdhara.v13i4.2846>

Published by Mahadev Publications (Regd.)
publication licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0
International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

largely stems from a perceived disconnect between the scholarly tools inherent to the Ayurvedic tradition and the structural demands of modern academic publishing.

The present paper proposes that *Yoga Tantrayukti* is not merely an ancient interpretive tool, but a framework that actually anticipates and mirrors the modern IMRAD structure. By establishing this conceptual bridge, the present study aims to enable postgraduate scholars and researchers in Ayurveda to approach scientific writing not as an imposed format, but as a natural extension of their own classical heritage.

While previous scholars have briefly noted a general correspondence between *Yoga Tantrayukti* and the IMRAD pattern, this connection has historically been mentioned.^[3,4] To the best of the author's knowledge, no prior published work has performed a comprehensive, point-by-point structural to each distinct section of a modern manuscript.

A particularly compelling demonstration of this alignment is found within the *Snehadhyaya*, of the *Charakasamhita*. This chapter serves as a remarkable case study, as its internal architecture mirrors the IMRAD structure with striking fidelity. In it, *Agnivesha* presents a precise series of questions to his preceptor *Atreya Punarvasu* before any answer is given. These questions systematically address the origin and classification of *Sneha* (unctuous substances), their individual properties, the correct timing and adjuvants, the mode of administration and *Pravicharana* (vehicles of administration), the appropriate dosage, condition-specific indications, duration of therapy, signs of adequate and inadequate oleation, and the management of complications.^[5] This structured questioning establishes the background, rationale, and objectives of the entire chapter functioning precisely as the Introduction section of a modern research article, which must state the context, identify gaps, and frame the study's aims before any elaboration proceeds.

METHOD

The present research was conducted as a conceptual-analytical literary review. The investigation relied on a structured examination of both classical texts and contemporary academic literature. No database search with PRISMA methodology was applicable, as the study is textual and conceptual in nature; however, the literature consulted is systematically described below.

Primary Classical Sources

The foundational texts of Ayurveda formed the primary basis of this study:

1. *Charaka samhita, Sushruta samhita*,^[6] *Ashtanga hridaya*.^[7]
2. *Charaka samhita, Sutrasthana*, Chapter 13- the *Snehadhyaya* analyzed as a dedicated case study throughout the present paper.

Secondary Sources

Peer-reviewed research papers focusing on *Tantrayukti*, published in Ayurvedic journals between 2016 and 2024, were reviewed. Standard academic references detailing modern scientific writing protocols and the IMRAD framework were also consulted. Published literature regarding *Tantraguna* provided broader contextual comparison of classical Ayurvedic manuscript norms.^[8]

Background

Tantrayukti serves as Ayurveda's indigenous methodology for the composition and interpretation of scientific texts.^[9] The application of *Tantrayukti* fulfils the following classical purposes:

1. *Asadvadi Pratishedha* (refutation of erroneous arguments): Refuting illogical or scientifically unsound propositions.
2. *Svavakya Siddhi* (establishment of one's own proposition): Substantiating one's own argument through logical reasoning.
3. *Artha Prasadhana* (clarification of meaning): Accurately interpreting meanings that are *Vyakta* (explicitly stated), *Anukta* (implied but not directly stated), *Lina* (embedded within the text), *Anirmala* (obscure or ambiguous), or *Leshokta* (briefly or partially mentioned).

These classical objectives mirror the foundational goals of modern research publishing: to present knowledge with clarity and accuracy, thereby enabling peer review, reproducibility, and intellectual critique.

Yoga Tantrayukti and its Scope

Yoga Tantrayukti is applied under the following conditions: when diverse components of a subject must be organized into a logical, purposeful sequence; when the arrangement of data whether clinical, literary, or experimental must guide the reader progressively from initial context to a clear conclusion; and when sentences and sections within a manuscript must follow an order that builds the reader's understanding incrementally.

When documenting clinical cases or research within the *Samhita*, *Yoga Tantrayukti* dictates the flow of information: beginning with patient history, moving through pathogenesis, and concluding with the treatment protocol. This classical sequence closely parallels the modern flow from Introduction (problem context) to Methods (protocol) and Results (outcomes).

The IMRAD Format -Origin and Purpose

IMRAD (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) is the universally adopted organizational

structure for original research articles. Each section serves a distinct communicative purpose, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Purpose of IMRAD

IMRAD Section	Core Question Answered	Communicative Purpose
Introduction	Why was this study done?	Establishes context, identifies research gap and states objective
Methods	How was the study done?	Describes study design and procedure for replicability
Results	What was found?	Presents data objectively without interpretation
Discussion	What do the findings mean?	Interprets results and draws logical conclusions

Yoga Tantrayukti and the Introduction Section

The Introduction section within the IMRAD framework serves three primary purposes: providing background context, identifying the existing knowledge gap, and explicitly stating the study's aim or hypothesis.

Through the lens of *Yoga Tantrayukti*, the concepts of *Adhikarana* (subject matter or research area) and *Prayojana* (purpose or aim) although categorized as independent *Tantrayukti* function as the foundational, opening placement of content that establishes this necessary context, closely paralleling the modern Introduction. The principle begins with a broader context before narrowing to a specific aim mirrors classical rhetorical techniques found in the *Samhita*, where a *Sthana* invariably opens with an *Uddesha* (brief statement of the theme) before proceeding to detailed elaboration known as *Nirdesha* (detailed explanation).

Example: The Snehadhyaya- Structured questioning as Introduction

In the *Snehadhyaya*, at start of chapter *Agnivesha* poses seventeen precise questions to *Atreya* before any clinical answer is provided. These questions address the *Yoni* (origin or source) of *Sneha* (unctuous substances), their individual *Guna* (properties), the *Kala* (timing) and *Anupana* (adjuvants) of administration, the *Pravicharana* (vehicles of administration), the *Matra* (dose), condition-specific indications, duration of therapy, *Snigdha-Asnigdha-Atisigdha Lakshana* (signs of adequate, insufficient, and excessive oleation), and *Vyapad* (complications) with their *Siddhi* (management).^[10] This structured questioning does not constitute the answer; it establishes the entire research framework of the chapter. In terms of *Yoga Tantrayukti*, these verses represent the deliberate placement of *Uddesha* (thematic orientation) before *Nirdesha* (detailed elaboration) functioning precisely as the Introduction section of a modern research article by contextualizing the problem, identifying what is unknown, and framing the objectives before any elaboration begins.

Yoga Tantrayukti and the Methods Section

The Methods section demands a precise, logically ordered description of the research procedure to ensure that other investigators can replicate the study. It relies heavily on sequential clarity and is arguably the most structurally rigorous component of the IMRAD format.

Yoga Tantrayukti explicitly governs this proper sequential arrangement of procedural content.

Example: Methodological protocol for Snehana (oleation)

The procedural protocol for *Snehana* replicates the precise hallmark of a Methods section. The seasonal administration of each *Sneha* (unctuous substance): *Sarpi* (clarified butter or ghee) in *Sharada* (autumn), *Vasa* (animal fat) and *Majja* (bone marrow) in *Madhava* (spring or *Vaishakha* month), and *Taila* (oil) in *Pravrit* (monsoon), with the general rule that *Sneha* should not be consumed in periods of extreme heat or cold.^[11] This directly mirrors a Methods section specifying the conditions, timing, and parameters of an intervention. The enumeration of the twenty-four *Pravicharana* (vehicles of administration) from *Odana* (cooked rice) and *Vilepi* (thin gruel) to *Abhyanjana* (external oil application) and *Basti* (enema) each representing a distinct mode of drug delivery analogous to a Methods section specifying routes of administration.^[12] The detailed explanation of the three *Matra* (dose categories): *Pradhana* (large dose, requiring a full day and night for digestion), *Madhyama* (medium dose, requiring half a day), and *Hrasva* (small dose, requiring a quarter day) along with their specific clinical indications, tells precisely the kind of dose-specification required in a clinical trial Methods section.^[13] The instructions regarding each *Sneha* for its specific indication: *Sarpi* for *Vata-Pitta* predominant conditions, *Taila* for *Vata-Kapha* conditions and *Krura Koshttha* (hard bowel), *Vasa* for depleted semen, blood, *Kapha*, and *Meda* states and bone-joint disorders, and *Majja* for patients with *Diptagni* (intense digestive fire), *Snehasevin* (habitual intake of unctuous substances), *Vatarta* (suffering from *Vata*

disorders).^[14] Finally, the description of pre-procedure *Pathya* (dietary management), behavioral restrictions including abstinence, avoidance of exertion, wind, and loud speech, and post-procedure conduct constituting the complete surrounding protocol that modern Methods sections are required to report.^[15]

***Yoga Tantrayukti* and the Results (Thematic Presentation)**

The Results section of the IMRAD format demands the purely objective presentation of data findings reported without interpretation, without editorial commentary, and in a logical sequence that directly addresses each stated aim.

This requirement corresponds precisely to the sub-function of *Yoga Tantrayukti* which dictates that every piece of information must be placed exactly where it belongs. Classical Ayurvedic scholars were meticulous about anchoring observations in the correct *Sthana* of a *Samhita*. The misplacement of information was identified by commentators as a *Tantradosha* and was considered a direct violation of proper *Yoga*. This classical insistence on correct placement without intermixing sections perfectly anticipates the modern peer-review prohibition against inserting interpretive discussion into the Results section.

Example: Objective outcome criteria in the *Snehadhyaya* i.e., *Snigdha* (adequately oiled), *Asnigdha* (insufficiently oiled), and *Atisnigdha* (excessively oiled) *Lakshana* (signs)

Three distinct sets of clinical signs are enumerated without interpretive commentary precisely as a Results section must present findings. The *Asnigdha Lakshana* (signs of insufficient oleation) include hardened dry stool, obstruction in the movement of flatus, and dryness and roughness of the body.^[16] The *Snigdha Lakshana* (signs of adequate oleation) include *Anulomana* of *Vata* (proper downward movement of *Vata*), kindled *Agni* (proper digestive strength), *Snigdha* and *Asamhat Mala* (unctuous and loose stool), and *Mardava Ange* (softness of the body).^[17] The *Atisnigdha Lakshana* (signs of excessive oleation) include *Panduta* (pallor), *Gauravam* (heaviness), *Jadyam* (stiffness), *Purishyaavipakvata* (incomplete digestion of stool), *Tandra* (drowsiness), *Aruchi* (anorexia) and *Utklesha* (nausea).^[18] These three outcome categories map directly onto the Results section's function of reporting findings across three objective levels insufficient effect, adequate effect, and adverse effect without any therapeutic recommendation, which is appropriately reserved for a subsequent section.

***Yoga Tantrayukti* and the Discussion Correspondence**

The Discussion section synthesizes findings, compares them with existing literature, acknowledges study limitations, and draws final conclusions. As the most intellectually demanding section of the IMRAD framework, it requires the researcher to transition from specific data points (Results) back out to a broader contextual understanding. Within *Yoga Tantrayukti*, this corresponds directly to the principle of purposeful synthesis and conclusion through arrangement the foundational idea that the organization of content must culminate in a logically supported, meaningful conclusion. Furthermore, the classical concept of *Svavakya Siddhi* (establishing and defending one's own view through systematic argumentation) a core function facilitated by *Yoga Tantrayukti* is precisely what the modern Discussion section is designed to accomplish.

Example: Interpretation of why rapid or excessive oleation fails

This chapter provides one of Ayurveda's most sophisticated uses of *Nidarshana* as a tool of interpretive synthesis, functioning precisely as the Discussion section's role of explaining *why* the Results are what they are. After the objective findings of oleation physiology have been established, three consecutive analogies are employed to explain the mechanisms of *Sneha* (unctuous substance) absorption and the consequences of incorrect administration:

"*Grihnnatyambu yatha vastram prasaratyadhikam yatha. Yathagni jiryati snehasthatha sravati chadhikah. Yatha vaakledya mrritpindammasiktam tvaraya jalam. Sravati sramsate snehasthatha tvaritasevitah.*"^[19]

(Meaning: Just as a cloth absorbs water but allows excess to drip out; just as fire digests only what it can and the remainder flows out; and just as water poured hastily over a barely moistened lump of clay runs off without being absorbed so too does *Sneha* administered too rapidly fail to penetrate the tissues and is eliminated without therapeutic effect.)

These three analogies do not introduce new data. They interpret and explain the Results specifically the *Sneha Vyapad* (complications of oleation therapy).^[20] by contextualizing them within known physical and biological laws. This is the exact function of the Discussion section: to synthesize findings transforming raw observations into meaningful scientific conclusions. *Chakrapanidatta's* commentary on these verses further exemplifies this interpretive synthesis, explaining that rapid administration prevents proper *Dhatu Snehana* even when quantity appears sufficient analogous to a

Discussion section citing mechanistic evidence to explain unexpected results.

RESULTS

The conceptual-analytical review of classical Ayurvedic texts and the IMRAD format yielded four major thematic correspondences, summarized in Table 2.

The Introduction section of IMRAD was found to correspond to the placement subject matter and its purpose within *Yoga Tantrayukti*, wherein an opening statement precedes elaboration of that topic.

The Methods section was found to correspond to *Vakya Yojana* (sentence arrangement) and *Artha Yojana* (meaning arrangement) the sequential ordering of procedural content).^[21] This correspondence was substantiated by the prescribed sequencing of the comprehensive *Snehana* procedural

protocol identified across *Snehadhyaya*, including seasonal timing, vehicles of administration, dose categories, and condition-specific indications.

The objective reporting of *Shodhana Karma* outcomes, and the criterion-based *Snigdha-Asnigdha-Atisigdha Lakshana* (signs of adequate, insufficient, and excessive oleation) identified in *Snehadhyaya*.

The Discussion section was found to correspond to *Svavakya Siddhi* with the help of three-fold analogical reasoning cloth, fire, and wet clay identified in *Snehadhyaya*, explaining the mechanism underlying oleation failure.

Across all four sections, the *Snehadhyaya* demonstrated a complete, self-contained replication of the IMRAD structure within a single classical chapter, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: IMRAD and its corresponding Application

IMRAD section	Corresponding <i>Yoga Tantrayukti</i> function	<i>Snehadhyaya</i> application
Introduction	<i>Adhikarana</i> (subject area) and <i>Prayojana</i> (purpose); <i>Uddesha</i> (thematic opening) before <i>Nirdesha</i> (elaboration).	Structured questions establish research background, gap, and objectives.
Methods	<i>Vakya Yojana</i> (sentence arrangement) and <i>Artha Yojana</i> (meaning arrangement) sequential procedural arrangement.	Seasonal timing, vehicles, dose categories, indications, and protocols.
Results	Correct <i>Sthana</i> (section) placement; avoidance of <i>Tantradosha</i> (structural defect).	Objective criterion-based reporting of three outcome levels without interpretive commentary.
Discussion	<i>Svavakya Siddhi</i> (establishment of one's argument); <i>Nidarshana</i> (illustrative analogy), <i>Hetu</i> (evidence-based reasoning), <i>Arthapatti</i> (logical inference).	Three analogies explaining the mechanism of oleation failure.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this conceptual analysis reveal a profound alignment between the foundational principles of *Yoga Tantrayukti* and the modern IMRAD format. This correspondence is not coincidental; both systems emerged from the same fundamental necessity the need to communicate scientific knowledge clearly, sequentially, and convincingly so that a reader can understand, evaluate, and act upon the information presented. This ancient mandate is precisely the philosophical backbone of the IMRAD format, which was designed to mirror the scientific method moving logically from context (Introduction) to procedure (Methods), onto raw data (Results), and finally culminating in interpretation.

What makes this conceptual bridge particularly significant for Ayurvedic scholars is that it fundamentally reframes the IMRAD format. It is no longer an alien imposition from Western biomedical culture, but rather a contemporary instantiation of

principles already deeply encoded within the Ayurvedic scholarly tradition. An Ayurveda researcher who comprehends *Yoga Tantrayukti* already possesses the complete cognitive framework required to structure a modern research article.

It is further noteworthy that other *Tantrayukti* do not conflict with the IMRAD structure but actively support and enrich it. *Hetu* supports the Discussion section; *Nidarshana* can anchor an Introduction; *Uddesha* (brief context) and *Nirdesha* (elaborative description) work sequentially to structure Background and Objectives; *Yoga Tantrayukti* thus serves as the master, which integrates all these individual tools.

The dedicated case study of the *Snehadhyaya* further strengthens this argument. Rather than relying solely on scattered examples across different *Samhita* (classical treatises), the *Snehadhyaya* demonstrates that a single classical chapter composed independently

and completely replicates all four IMRAD components within its own internal structure, from the diagnostic-style questioning in its opening verses to the analogical reasoning in its closing verses. This finding suggests that the IMRAD logic was not merely an implicit by-product of *Yoga Tantrayukti*, but an actively practiced compositional discipline within individual chapters of the *Samhitas*.

While previous published literature has addressed the general utility of *Tantrayukti* in broader research methodology and classical text comprehension, no prior study has isolated *Yoga Tantrayukti* to specifically map its relationship to the IMRAD format, nor demonstrated this correspondence through a dedicated single-chapter case study. The present paper addresses this identified gap in the existing academic literature.

Limitations: The present study is conceptual and literary in nature; no clinical or experimental data were generated, and no systematic database search with defined inclusion-exclusion criteria was undertaken, as is appropriate for a textual-analytical review. The structural parallels identified are interpretive, based on the author's reading of classical texts and their commentaries, and therefore carry an inherent degree of subjectivity common to all literary-conceptual scholarship. Future studies may explore whether other individual *Tantrayukti* map to specific IMRAD sub-sections, whether this framework holds across other chapters of the *Samhitas* beyond the *Snehadhyaya*, or whether it can be operationalized as a formal structured writing guide for Ayurvedic postgraduate scholars and researchers.

CONCLUSION

The present study establishes that *Yoga Tantrayukti* as detailed in the *Charakasamhita Siddhithana* chapter 12 encapsulates the core methodology for the deliberate, sequential organization of scientific literature, sharing a deep structural and philosophical resonance with the contemporary IMRAD model universally mandated in modern scientific publishing.

Through this detailed mapping, the following structural parallels have been identified. The Introduction corresponds to the strategic placement of *Uddesha* and *Prayojana* (Aim) within *Yoga*, exemplified by *Agnivesha's* structured questioning in *Snehadhyaya*, which establish the research background and objectives before any elaboration begins. The Methods section is structurally analogous to the systematic arrangement of *Vakya Yojana* and *Artha Yojana*, demonstrated comprehensively through the seasonal timing, vehicles of administration, dose categories, and behavioral protocols described across *Snehadhyaya*.

The Results section embodies the rigorous requirement for accurate *Sthana* placement and avoidance of *Tantradosha*, demonstrated through the objective, criterion-based *Snigdha-Asnigdha-Atisigdha Lakshana* (signs of adequate, insufficient, and excessive oleation) of *Snehadhyaya*. The Discussion functions as *Svavakya Siddhi*, bolstered by *Hetu*, *Nidarshana*, and *Arthapatti*, most powerfully illustrated through the three consecutive analogies of cloth, fire, and wet clay of *Snehadhyaya*.

REFERENCES

1. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Siddhithana, Chapter 12, verses 41-44, p.736.
2. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Siddhithana, Chapter 12, verses 41-44, p.736.
3. Mohanty B, Kalokhe JA, Das SK. Application of Tantrayukti with special reference to Yoga Tantrayukti. Int J Curr Res. 2022; 14(12): 23000-23001.
4. Anil AD. Application of Tantrayukti (Means of Interpreting Science) in Research Methodology. J Res Trad Med. 2016; 2(3): 81-86. doi:10.21276/jrtm.2016/159
5. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 4-8, p.81.
6. Sushruta. Sushruta samhita with the Nibandhasangraha commentary of Dalhana. Acharya YT, editor. ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2024. Uttaratantra, Chapter 65, p. 814.
7. Vagbhata. Ashtanga hridaya with the Sarvanga sundara commentary of Arunadatta and Ayurveda rasayana commentary of Hemadri. Paradakara HSS, editor. ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2025 Uttarasthana, Chapter 40, verses 78-80, p.946.
8. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Vimanasthana Chapter 8, verses 3, p.261.

9. Sushruta, Sushruta samhita. With the Nibandha sangraha commentary of Dalhana. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2014. Uttaratanttra, Chapter 65, verses 5-6, p.815.
10. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 4-8, p.81.
11. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 18, p. 82.
12. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 23-26, p.82.
13. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 29-40, p.83-84.
14. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 41-50, p.84.
15. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 60-64, p.85.
16. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 57, p.85.
17. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 58, p.85.
18. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 59, p.85.
19. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 96-97, p.87.
20. Agnivesha. Charaka samhita. Revised by Charaka and Dridhabala. With the Ayurvedadipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Acharya YT, editor. Reprint ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2023. Sutrasthana Chapter 13, verses 70-76, p.85-86.
21. Sushruta. Sushruta samhita with the Nibandha sangraha commentary of Dalhana. Acharya YT, editor. ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan; 2024. Uttaratanttra, Chapter 65, verses 4, p.815.

Cite this article as:

Ankit Patil, Bhoomika Naval, Vidyadhish Kashikar, Shailza Bhatnagar. Yoga Tantrayukti as a Structural Precursor to IMRAD: A Conceptual Analysis with special reference to Snehadhyaya of Charakasamhita Sutrasthana. AYUSHDHARA, 2026;13(4):457-463.

<https://doi.org/10.47070/ayushdhara.v13i4.2846>

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

***Address for correspondence**

Dr. Patil Ankit

PG Scholar,

Department of Samhita Evam Maulik Siddhanta,

National Institute of Ayurveda (De-novo), Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Email: ankitpatil976@gmail.com

Disclaimer: AYUSHDHARA is solely owned by Mahadev Publications - A non-profit publications, dedicated to publish quality research, while every effort has been taken to verify the accuracy of the content published in our Journal. AYUSHDHARA 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 AYUSHDHARA editor or editorial board members.