WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
Coden USA: WJPRAP Impact Factor 8.63
Volume 15, Issue 8, 814-824. Review Article ISSN 2277–7105

ROLE OF DIFFERENTIAL DIAGNOSIS IN CLINICAL PRACTICE

Dr. Bhoomi Gumber[1*], Prof (Dr). Ruby Rani Agarwal[2]

[1]PG Scholar, Roga Nidan Evam Vikriti Vigyan, Rishikul Campus, Haridwar, Uttarakhand Ayurved University.

[2]HOD, Roga Nidan Evam Vikriti Vigyan, Rishikul Campus, Haridwar, Uttarakhand Ayurved University.

Article Received on 24 March 2026,
Article Revised on 13 April 2026,
Article Published on 16 April 2026,

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19593913

***Corresponding Author**

Dr. Bhoomi Gumber

PG Scholar, Roga Nidan Evam Vikriti Vigyan, Rishikul Campus, Haridwar, Uttarakhand Ayurved University.

How to cite this Article: Dr. Bhoomi Gumber[1*], Prof (Dr). Ruby Rani Agarwal[2]. (2026). Role of Differential Diagnosis In Clinical Practice. World Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, 15(8), 814–824.

ABSTRACT

Differential diagnosis plays a vital role in accurate disease identification and effective treatment planning. In *Ayurveda*, this concept is reflected in *Sapekṣa Nidāna*, which emphasizes the comparative evaluation of diseases with similar manifestations to arrive at a precise diagnosis. Classical Ayurvedic texts describe systematic diagnostic approaches such as *Nidana Panchaka* and various *Pareeksha* methods, which help physicians analyze diseases through their etiology, prodromal features, clinical manifestations, therapeutic responses and pathogenesis. In the present study, the utility of differential diagnosis is illustrated through selected examples where diseases are differentiated on the basis of *Nidana*, *Purvarupa*, *Rupa*, *Upshaya–Anupshaya*, and *Samprapti*. This approach highlights the analytical and scientific nature of *Ayurvedic* diagnostic principles and emphasizes their importance in achieving accurate diagnosis and individualized management in clinical practice.

KEYWORDS:- Differential diagnosis, Sapeksha Nidana, Nidana Panchaka, Pareeksha.

INTRODUCTION

Diagnosis is a fundamental component of medical practice, guiding appropriate treatment and patient management. Many diseases present with overlapping signs and symptoms, making accurate diagnosis challenging. To address this complexity, clinicians use the concept of

differential diagnosis, a systematic process of distinguishing one disease from other conditions that present with similar clinical features.

Accurate diagnosis is the cornerstone of effective medical practice and is essential for proper treatment and patient care. This process of identifying and evaluating multiple possible causes for a patient's clinical presentation is known as differential diagnosis. It involves formulating a list of suspected diseases and systematically narrowing down the possibilities through clinical reasoning, experience and appropriate investigations. The process requires physicians to consider both common and uncommon conditions, since failure to include a potential diagnosis in the initial list may lead to missed or delayed diagnosis.

In *Ayurveda*, the concept of ***Sapeksha Nidana*** reflects an approach similar to differential diagnosis. *Sapeksha Nidana* refers to the comparative evaluation of diseases that exhibit similar signs and symptoms, in order to distinguish one disease from another.

Classical *Ayurvedic* texts emphasize that when multiple diseases are present with comparable clinical manifestations, the physician must carefully analyze factors such as *Nidana* (etiology), *Rupa* (clinical features), *Dosha* involvement and *Samprapti* (pathogenesis) to arrive at the correct diagnosis. Thus, *Sapeksha Nidana* represents a systematic method of distinguishing diseases based on their subtle differences, which closely parallels the modern concept of differential diagnosis. This highlights the analytical and scientific nature of *Ayurvedic* diagnostic principles.

In order to establish an accurate differential diagnosis, it is essential that both the patient and the disease are examined thoroughly. In modern clinical practice this involves careful history taking, physical examination and appropriate investigations. Similarly, the classical science of *Ayurveda* provides a well-structured framework for understanding and differentiating diseases through systematic examination.

Acharayas have described methods such as ***Trividha Roga Vishesh Vigyan***, ***Shadvidha Roga Pareeksha***, ***Ashthavidha Pareeksha, Dashvidha Pareeksha, Shat Kriya Kala*** which guide physicians in the detailed assessment of disease.

Trividha Roga Vishesh Vigyan

!"ि◌वधं खलु रोगfवशेषfव2◌ानं भfवत; त7यथा-आ;तोपदेशः, ?@यAम्, अनुमानं चे◌ि◌त| (Ch.Vi.

4/3)

The concept of [1]*Trividha Roga Vishesh Vigyan* emphasizes three fundamental means of gaining knowledge about disease: ***Aptopdesha*** (authoritative testimony from classical texts and experienced teachers), ***Pratyaksha*** *(*direct observation or clinical examination), and ***Anumana*** (logical inference based on observed findings). Through these methods, the physician gathers reliable information regarding the disease's condition.

Shadvidha Roga Pareeksha

ष ििFवधो िह रोगाणां िव2ानोपायः, त7यथा-पिाचभः J◌े"◌ाििKदभः ?Lनेन चेिित।

(Su.Su. 10/4)

The concept of [2]*Shadvidha Roga Pareeksha* states that the knowledge of disease is obtained through six methods: observation through the five sense organs(*Shrotra*, *Sparsha*, *Chakshu*, *Rasana*, *Ghrana*) and questioning of the patient (*Prashna*). This approach emphasizes comprehensive clinical examination and patient interrogation for proper understanding and diagnosis of disease, as mentioned in the *Sushruta Samhita*. Through careful observation and patient interrogation, the physician gathers detailed clinical information, which helps in distinguishing between diseases with similar manifestation. Thus, this classical diagnostic approach closely parallels the modern concept of differential diagnosis, where systematic evaluation of signs, symptoms and patient history aids in identifying the correct disease.

Ashthvidha Pareeksha

रोगाN◌ाOत शरPरQय QथानाOयRटौ परPAयेत्। नाड़ी मू"ं मलं िजYवा शZद Qपशर् [गाकृ िित।।

(Yogaratnakar)

[3]*Ashtavidha Pareeksha* provides eight parameters for patient examination: *Nadi* (Pulse), *Mutra* (Urine), *Mala* (Stool), *Jihva* (Tongue), *Shabda* (Speech/voice), *Sparsha* (Touch/temperature), *Drik* (Eyes), *Akruti* (Body build). These parameters help assess *Dosha* predominance and systemic involvement, which is crucial for differentiating diseases.

Dashvidha Pareeksha**:** **तस्मादातुरं परीक्षेत प्रकृ िततश्च, िवकृ िततश्च सारतश्च, संहननतश्च, प्रमाणतश्च, सात्म्यतश्च, सत्त्वतश्च, आहारिशक्ततश्च, व्यायामिशक्ततश्च, वयस्तश्चेित, बलप्रमािणवशेषग्रहणहेतोः** ।। (Ch.Vi. 8/94)

[4]*Dashavidha Pareeksha* is an important diagnostic method described in Ayurveda for a

comprehensive evaluation of the patient. It includes ten parameters: *Prakriti* (constitution), *Vikriti* (morbid state), *Sara* (tissue excellence), *Samhanana* (compactness of body), *Pramana* (body measurements), *Satmya* (adaptability), *Satva* (psychological strength), *Ahara Shakti* (digestive capacity), *Vyayama Shakti* (exercise tolerance) and *Vaya* (age). Among its components, *Vikriti* holds particular importance in the context of differential diagnosis because it evaluates the pathological state or deviation from normal physiology, thereby focusing on the *Roga*(disease process) rather than solely on the *Rogi*(patient). By analyzing the nature and variations of *Vikriti*, the physician can differentiate between diseases with similar clinical presentations and arrive at a more precise diagnosis.

ि◌नदानं पूव^_ पाि◌ण ^पा`युपशयQतथा । सं?◌ाि◌;तLचेि◌त ि◌व2◌ानं रोगाणां पIचधा Qमृतम।। (Ma.Ni. 1/4)

Furthermore, the examination of disease *(Roga Pareeksha)* in Ayurveda is elaborated through the principle of [5]***Nidana Panchaka***, which includes *Nidana* (etiological factors), *Purvarupa* (premonitory symptoms), *Rupa* (clinical manifestations), *Upashaya-Anupashaya* (therapeutic tests or factors that relieve/aggravate the condition) and *Samprapti* (pathogenesis).

By systematically evaluating these components, the physician can differentiate between diseases with similar manifestations and determine the underlying pathological process.

Shatkriya Kala

[6]*Shatkriya Kala* describes the six stages of disease development- *Sanchaya, Prakopa, Prasara, Sthanasamshraya, Vyakti and Bheda.* In differential diagnosis, it helps the physician identify the stage of disease progression and the involvement of *Dosha*. In the early stages (*Sanchaya, Prakopa, Prasara*), subtle *Dosha* disturbances appear before the disease manifests fully. During *Sthanasamshraya, Dosha* localize in specific tissues and produce *Purvarupa*, which helps indicate the probable disease and aids in early differentiation. In the later stages (*Vyakti* and *Bheda*) the disease becomes fully expressed with characteristic features, allowing clearer distinction between similar conditions.

Thus, *Shatkriya Kala* assists in differential diagnosis by explaining the stage, progression and pathogenesis of disease.

These classical concept, described in texts like the *Charaka Samhita*, *Sushruta Samhita* and

Madhav Nidana, reflects a systematic clinical reasoning process comparable to the modern concept of differential diagnosis. From modern point of view the four fundamental methods of clinical examination- **inspection, palpation, percussion and auscultation** are essential components in the process of differential diagnosis. Each method provides **distinct and complementary information** about the underlying pathology. Inspection offers initial visual clues, palpation helps assess the nature and localization of lesions, percussion differentiates between air, fluid, and solid structures, while auscultation reveals functional abnormalities through internal sounds. When used together, these techniques enable the physician to correlate symptoms with objective findings, thereby narrowing down multiple diagnostic possibilities. This systematic approach not only improves diagnostic accuracy but also reduces reliance on investigations alone. Thus, these clinical methods play a vital role in distinguishing diseases with overlapping presentations, reinforcing the scientific basis of differential diagnosis, an approach that closely parallels the comprehensive examination methods described in Ayurveda.

AIM

To critically evaluate the significance of differential diagnosis in clinical practice and to explore its parallelism with classical Ayurvedic diagnostic frameworks, thereby highlighting an integrative approach to clinical decision-making.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

This article is based on a conceptual and descriptive review of classical Ayurvedic literature. Relevant references related to differential diagnosis, *Nidana Panchaka* and diagnostic principles were collected from classical Ayurvedic texts such as *Charaka Samhita*, *Sushruta Samhita* and *Madhav Nidana*, along with relevant modern research articles.

For demonstrating the concept of differential diagnosis in *Ayurveda*, examples of diseases with similar clinical presentations were selected. The differentiation between these diseases was analyzed on the basis of the five components of *Nidana Panchaka*, namely:

- *Nidana* (etiological factors)
- *Purvarupa* (prodromal symptoms)
- *Rupa* (clinical manifestations)
- *Upashaya–Anupashaya* (relieving factors and aggravating factors)
- *Samprapti* (pathogenesis)

Pairs or groups of diseases having overlapping symptomatology were taken as examples, and their differentiation was explained through these parameters. For instance, two diseases were compared on the basis of *Nidana*, another set was differentiated through *Purvarupa*, while others were analyzed using *Upshaya-Anupshaya*, *Rupa* and *Samprapti*.

This approach helps illustrate how classical *Ayurvedic* diagnostic tools can be systematically applied to perform differential diagnosis, thereby highlighting the scientific and analytical nature of *Ayurvedic* clinical reasoning.

Additionally, examples based on inspection, palpation, percussion and auscultation were included to illustrate differential diagnosis from a modern clinical perspective.

Correlation of Modern Clinical Examination with Ayurvedic Pareeksha and Pramana.

Modern Method	Ayurvedic correlation (Pariksha)	Pramana involved	Explanation
Inspection	Darshana Pariksha	Pratyaksha Pramana (Chakshu-Indriya)	Visual examination of the body such as color, swelling, deformity corresponds to observation through eyes in Ayurveda
Palpation	Sparshana Pariksha	Pratyaksha Pramana (Sparsha-Indriya)	Assessment by touch (temperature, tenderness, consistency) aligns with tactile examination described in Ayurveda
Percussion	Sparshana Pariksha	Pratyaksha + Anumana Pramana	Though not directly described, interpretation of sound produced by tapping involves touch and inference about underlying structures
Auscultation	Shravana (Shabda Pariksha)	Pratyaksha Pramana (Shrotra- Indriya)	Listening to internal sounds (breath, heart) corresponds to auditory examination through ear.

The above correlation shows that all methods of clinical examination, whether modern (inspection, palpation, percussion, auscultation) or *Ayurvedic Pareeksha*, are all based on the principles of *Trividha Pareeksha*. The knowledge is derived from *Aaptopadesha*, the examination itself represents *Pratyaksha*, and the interpretation of findings involves *Anumana*, together forming the basis of clinical evaluation. Thus, it can be understood that every step of clinical evaluation inherently integrates these three *Pramana*. Whether in modern or Ayurvedic practice, the physician relies on textual knowledge, direct perception and logical inference simultaneously. This demonstrates that the *Ayurvedic* concept of *Trividha Pareeksha* is comprehensive in nature and is capable of encompassing all methods

of examination used in clinical practice, thereby reinforcing its relevance even in the context of modern differential diagnosis. Additionally, the concept of *Sat-Asat Pareeksha* described in Charaka Samhita emphasizes that for the proper understanding of any entity-whether living (*Sat*) or non-living (*Asat*) the application of *Trividha Pareeksha (Aaptopadesha, Pratyaksha* and *Anumana)* is essential. This further reinforces that all forms of knowledge acquisition and clinical evaluation, irrespective of the subject, ultimately depend upon these three fundamental means of examination.

Differential diagnosis on the basis of ***Nidana*** could be understood with the help of following instance: **Malaria** is caused by infection with Plasmodium species, which is transmitted to humans through the bite of an infected female Anopheles mosquito. The disease is therefore associated with exposure to mosquito breeding areas, stagnant water, and endemic regions. In contrast, **Typhoid fever** is caused by the bacterium Salmonella typhi and is primarily transmitted through contaminated food and water due to poor sanitation and hygiene. Although both diseases present with fever, chills, headache and generalized weakness, their *Nidana* differs significantly. Malaria is a vector-borne infection, whereas Typhoid is a food and water-borne infection. Therefore, identifying the etiological exposure history plays a crucial role in differentiating between these two febrile illnesses.

[7]हाि◌ेरbवणरं् c◌ि◌धरं च मू"ं ि◌वना ?मेहQय ि◌ह पूव^_ पैः। यो मू"येः ं न वदेत् ?मेहं रfतQय ि◌पeQय ि◌ह स

?कोपः।। (Ch.Chi. 6/54)

Differential diagnosis based ***Purvarupa*** can be understood with the help of the following instance: in conditions like ***Prameha*** and ***Raktapitta***, the presence or absence of specific prodromal features plays a crucial role. When symptoms such as *Haridra Varna* and *Rakta* in *Mutra* occur along with classical *Purvarupa* of *Prameha*, the condition is diagnosed as *Prameha*; however, in the absence of these prodromal features, it indicates aggravation of *Pitta* in *Rakta*, suggesting *Raktapitta*. Thus, careful evaluation of *Purvarupa* enables early differentiation between diseases with similar initial manifestations.

Rupa provide direct clues for distinguishing similar conditions. For instance, ***Atisara*** and ***Pravahika*** both involve increased bowel frequency, yet differ in presentation. *Atisara* shows profuse watery stools without significant straining, whereas *Pravahika* is characterized by

tenesmus with scanty stool mixed with mucus. Such differences in presentation help the physician clearly differentiate between the two.

The role of ***Upashaya–Anupashaya*** becomes important when symptoms overlap but response patterns differ. For example, both **GERD** and **angina pectoris** may present with chest discomfort; however, GERD symptoms improve with antacids or posture changes, while angina is relieved by rest or nitrates and remains unaffected by gastric interventions. Hence, observing relieving and aggravating factors become a valuable tool in differentiation.

A clear distinction between clinically overlapping conditions can be achieved by understanding their underlying mechanisms(***Samprapti***). For instance, **hyperthyroidism** and **anxiety disorder** may both present with palpitations, restlessness, sweating and weight loss, yet their origin differs significantly. Hyperthyroidism results from excess production of thyroid hormones, leading to a hypermetabolic state, whereas anxiety disorder arises due to neurochemical imbalance without any primary endocrine pathology. Thus, despite similar clinical features, analysis of the underlying pathophysiology enables accurate differentiation.

Modern point of view

Visual examination i.e. inspection often provides the first clue in differentiating diseases with similar presentations. For example, measles and chickenpox both present with fever and rash, yet their morphology and distribution differ. Measles shows a maculopapular rash spreading in a cephalocaudal pattern along with Koplik spots, whereas chickenpox presents with vesicular lesions in different stages, predominantly over the trunk. Hence, inspection alone can provide significant diagnostic distinction.

Assessment through touch helps in identifying the nature and localization of pathology. In cases like **appendicitis** and **renal colic**, both presenting with abdominal pain, **palpation** reveals key differences. Appendicitis shows localized tenderness at McBurney's point with guarding, while renal colic presents with radiating pain and minimal localized tenderness. This difference assists in distinguishing between localized inflammation and referred pain.

Evaluation by **percussion** aids in assessing the underlying physical characteristics of tissues. Conditions such as **pleural effusion** and **pneumothorax** may present with similar respiratory symptoms, yet percussion findings vary distinctly. Pleural effusion produces a dull note due to fluid accumulation, whereas pneumothorax results in a hyper-resonant note because of air

in the pleural space. Thus, percussion findings help differentiate between fluid-filled and air-filled conditions.

Listening to internal body sounds provides insight into functional abnormalities. For example, **bronchial asthma** and **pneumonia** may both present with cough and breathlessness, but **auscultation** reveals distinguishing features. Asthma is characterized by wheezing due to airway narrowing, while pneumonia presents with crepitations resulting from alveolar involvement. Therefore, auscultation helps identify the exact site and nature of pathology

DISCUSSION

The present study highlights that differential diagnosis is a systematic and analytical process that goes beyond mere identification of symptoms and requires a deeper understanding of disease mechanisms. The examples discussed demonstrate that diseases with similar clinical presentations can be effectively differentiated by evaluating parameters such as *Nidana, Purvarupa, Rupa, Upashaya– Anupashaya* and *Samprapti.* This reflects the multidimensional diagnostic approach described in *Ayurveda*, where emphasis is placed not only on clinical features but also on etiology, pathogenesis and disease progression.

Furthermore, the correlation between modern clinical examination methods and *Ayurvedic Pareeksha* reveals that both systems rely on systematic observation, examination, and interpretation. Techniques such as inspection, palpation, percussion and auscultation parallel the principles of *Darshana*, *Sparshana*, and *Shravana Pareeksha*, and are fundamentally based on the concepts of *Aaptopadesha*, *Pratyaksha* and *Anumana*. This demonstrates that classical Ayurvedic principles are comprehensive and capable of encompassing modern diagnostic approaches.

Overall, this integrative understanding enhances diagnostic accuracy, reduces the chances of misdiagnosis, and supports individualized patient management. It also highlights that Ayurvedic diagnostic principles are not only philosophical but deeply scientific and clinically applicable.

CONCLUSION

Differential diagnosis plays a crucial role in clinical practice as many diseases present with similar signs and symptoms, which may lead to diagnostic confusion. *Ayurveda* provides a

systematic and multidimensional diagnostic framework that allows the physician to distinguish between such conditions through careful analysis of *Nidana Panchaka and Pareeksha* methods.

This diagnostic approach highlights the analytical nature of *Ayurvedic* clinical reasoning, where diagnosis is not based solely on symptoms but on a comprehensive evaluation of etiology, progression and pathological processes. Such an approach ultimately leads to individualized diagnosis and appropriate treatment planning, which is a fundamental principle of *Ayurveda*.

Thus, differential diagnosis in *Ayurveda* serves not only to identify the correct disease entity but also to understand the stage, cause and mechanism of disease, thereby improving the accuracy of diagnosis and effectiveness of treatment.

REFERENCES

1. Charak Samhita Purwardh/I "Vidyotini" hindi Tika, By Pt. Kashinath Shastri & Dr. G.N. Chaturvedi, Vimana Sthana, Trividharogvisheshvigyaniyam Vimanam, published by Chaukhambha bharti Academy, Varanasi,Reprint in yr, 1998; Page no. 627
2. Sushrut Samhita Vol I "AyurvedaTattwasandipika" hindi commentary, By Kaviraj ambikadutta shastri, sutrasthan, Vishikhanupraveshniye Adhyay, published by Chaukhambha Sanskrit sansthan, Varanasi, 1997. Page No.42
3. Vaidya Lakshmipati Shastri, Hindi commentary, Yogaratnakar with vidyotini Hindi commentary, rasayanadhikara, verse no 1, Varanasi, chaukambha Sanskrit Sansthanhan, 1999.
4. Charak Samhita Purwardh/I "Vidyotini" hindi Tika, By Pt. Kashinath Shastri & Dr. G.N. Chaturvedi, Vimana Sthana, Rogbhishagjitiyam Vimanam, published by Chaukhambha bharti Academy, Varanasi,Reprint in yr, 1998; Page no. 684.
5. Madhav Nidan puravardha "Madhukosh'' by Shri Vijayrakshit & Srikanthadutta commented by SriSudarshan Shastri & Prof. Y.N. upadhyaya, Panchnidana Lakshanam Adhyay, published by Chaukhambha Sanskrit Bhawan, Varanasi, reprint edn, 2004; Page No. 08.
6. Shushrut Samhita Vol I "AyurvedaTattwasandipika" hindi commentary, By Kaviraj ambikadutta shastri, sutrasthan, Vranaprashna Adhyay, published by Chaukhambha Sanskrit sansthan, Varanasi, 1997. Page No.110
7. Charak Samhita Uttarardh/II "Vidyotini" hindi Tika, By Pt. Kashinath Shastri & Dr. G.N.

Chaturvedi, Chikitsa Sthana, Prameha Chikitsa published by Chaukhambha bharti Academy, Varanasi,Reprint in yr, 1998;

8. Madhav Nidan Puravardha "Madhukosh'' by Shri Vijayrakshit & Srikanthadutta commented by SriSudarshan Shastri & Prof. Y.N. upadhyaya, Atisara Nidana Adhyay, published by Chaukhambha Sanskrit Bhawan, Varanasi, reprint edn, 2004; Page No. 161
9. Madhav Nidan Puravardha "Madhukosh'' by Shri Vijayrakshit & Srikanthadutta commented by SriSudarshan Shastri & Prof. Y.N. upadhyaya, Atisara Nidana Adhyay, published by Chaukhambha Sanskrit Bhawan, Varanasi, reprint edn, 2004; Page No. 175
10. Madhav Nidan Puravardha "Madhukosh'' by Shri Vijayrakshit & Srikanthadutta commented by SriSudarshan Shastri & Prof. Y.N. upadhyaya, Rajyakshma-Kshatksheena Nidana Adhyay, published by Chaukhambha Sanskrit Bhawan, Varanasi, reprint edn, 2004; Page No. 301.