IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Precision Insights in *Agadatantra*: Molecular Mechanisms, Individual Differences and Computational Frontiers

Prof. Naresh Jain,[1*] Vd Disha Kirtibhai Chatbhar,[2] Dr. Vijay Jatoliya,[3] Dr. Kriti Rai,[4]

[1*]Prof. and HOD, PG department of Kriya Sharir, Sheth J.P. Govt Ayurveda College, Bhavnagar, Gujarat.

[2]PhD Scholar, Dept. of Agad Tantra, Institute of Teaching and Research in Ayurveda, Jamnagar, Gujarat.

[3]PhD Scholar, Dept. of RS&BK, Institute of Teaching and Research in Ayurveda, Jamnagar, Gujarat.

[4]MS Scholar, Dept. of Shalyatantra, Institute of Teaching and Research in Ayurveda, Jamnagar, Gujarat.

ABSTRACT

Background: Agadatantra, the Ayurvedic science of toxicology, systematically classifies poisons (Visha) of plant, animal, and mineral origin and details their clinical presentation and management. Contemporary advances in molecular biology, genetics, and computational sciences offer tools to examine these classical principles through modern mechanistic frameworks. **Objectives:** This chapter aims to (i) delineate molecular mechanisms underlying the toxicity of plant- and animal-derived poisons; (ii) examine how genetic variability and pharmacogenomics shape individual toxic responses; (iii) contextualize the cellular and genetic impact of environmental pollutants within the Ayurvedic concept of Janpadodhvamsa; and (iv) evaluate the contribution of bioinformatics and computational modeling to toxin characterization, predictive toxicology, and personalized therapy. **Methods:** A narrative review approach was adopted, synthesizing evidence from classical Ayurvedic texts alongside contemporary literature in molecular toxicology, pharmacogenomics, and computational biology. **Results and Discussion:** Plant- and animal-derived toxins disturb cellular homeostasis through oxidative stress, receptor modulation, enzymatic inhibition, and apoptotic pathways processes mirrored in Ayurvedic symptomatology. Genetic polymorphisms in detoxification enzymes validate Prakriti-based susceptibility. Environmental toxins cause DNA damage and immune dysregulation consistent with *Janpadodhvamsa*. Computational tools such as molecular docking, pathway mapping, network pharmacology, and omics integration extend the investigative scope of Agadatantra. **Conclusion:** Integrating traditional Ayurvedic toxicology with molecular and computational sciences yields a holistic, evidence-enriched paradigm for advancing toxicology research, validating classical concepts, and guiding precision antidote development.

Keywords: *Sthavara Visha, Jangama Visha,* molecular toxicology, pharmacogenomics, *Janpadodhvamsa*, bioinformatics, personalized toxicology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Agadatantra classically designated *Vishachikitsa* is the Ayurvedic discipline devoted to the study, prevention, and clinical management of poisons (Visha). Its scope extends beyond antidote administration to encompass a structured taxonomy of toxic agents drawn from animal, plant, mineral, and synthetic sources (Shastri, 2015). Foundational texts including the Charaka Samhita, Sushruta Samhita, and Ashtanga Hridaya document the symptomatology, progression, and systemic consequences of diverse poisons descriptions that resonate with what modern science now attributes to cellular and molecular disruption (Sharma & Dash, 2018).

Therapeutic approaches in Agadatantra spanning *Samshodhana* (elimination), *Shamana* (pacification), and supportive care are individualized according to the patient's Prakriti (constitution), age, and Bala (strength), reflecting an early recognition of inter-individual variability in toxic susceptibility (Tripathi, 2017). In contemporary populations, escalating exposure to pharmaceuticals, industrial chemicals, pesticides, and heavy metals makes the integration of classical principles with modern molecular toxicology both timely and necessary (Casarett & Klaassen, 2019).

This chapter explores three converging domains: the molecular and cellular mechanisms of toxicity, the determinants of individual variability spanning Prakriti and pharmacogenomics, and the potential of computational and Ayur-genomic models to predict, characterize, and mitigate toxic effects.

2. AYURVEDIC PERSPECTIVE ON TOXICITY

2.1 Classification of Visha

Ayurveda perceives Visha as any substance whose inherent properties oppose the sustenance of life. Classical texts ascribe to it qualities such as *Laghu* (penetrating lightness), *Teekshna* (sharp rapidity of spread), *Ashukari* (swift onset of effects), Viryavati (intense potency), and *Vyavayi* (systemic dispersion prior to digestion) attributes that collectively distinguish poisons from ordinary pathogenic factors (Shastri, 2015).

Five categories of Visha are recognized: Sthavara Visha (plant-derived, e.g., *Vatsanabha*/Aconitum ferox); *Jangama Visha* (animal-derived venoms, including snake and scorpion); *Kritrima Visha* (synthetic or artificially produced toxins); *Garavisha* (substances that become harmful only in combination, analogous to drug–food interactions); and Dushi Visha (latent, slowly accumulating toxins that manifest under precipitating conditions such as weakened immunity or seasonal stress) (Tripathi, 2017). This taxonomy shows considerable conceptual alignment with modern divisions into natural toxins, environmental pollutants, pharmaceuticals, and synthetic chemicals (Casarett & Klaassen, 2019).

2.2 Pathogenesis and Clinical Manifestations

In Ayurveda, poisoning is uniquely characterized by the simultaneous derangement of all three Doshas (Vata, Pitta, Kapha), producing a breadth and severity of pathology that exceeds that of ordinary disease (Shastri, 2015). Toxins progress sequentially through the Dhatus: initial involvement of Rasa dhatu (plasma) causes systemic malaise; infiltration of *Rakta* (blood) produces hemorrhagic and cutaneous features; deeper involvement of *Mamsa, Meda, Asthi* and *Majja dhatus* results in myopathy, metabolic disruption, skeletal damage, and neurotoxic signs; and, at its most severe, Shukra dhatu involvement causes

reproductive failure (Tripathi, 2017). This tissue-level progression is functionally comparable to organotropism and target-organ specificity in modern toxicology.

Disruption of Agni (metabolic fire) results in accumulation of Ama (toxic metabolic by-products), paralleling enzyme inhibition in biotransformation pathways such as the cytochrome P450 system (Patwardhan et al., 2015). Depletion of Ojas (vital essence governing immunity) mirrors the immunosuppression and antioxidant exhaustion observed in modern toxicological models (Casarett & Klaassen, 2019).

2.3 Therapeutic Framework

Agadatantra employs a four-stage management strategy. *Samshodhana* (elimination) uses Vamana (emesis), *Virechana* (purgation), *Raktamokshana* (bloodletting), and nasal therapies to expel toxins, analogous to gastric lavage, activated charcoal administration, and extracorporeal purification in modern medicine (Patwardhan et al., 2015). Shamana (pacification) relies on antidotal herbs including *Haridra* (Curcuma longa), *Guduchi* (Tinospora cordifolia), and *Triphala* which possess documented antioxidant, hepatoprotective, and immunomodulatory properties (Jaiswal & Williams, 2016). *Bahirparimarjana* (external therapy) encompasses localized wound treatments and fomentation to limit systemic absorption. *Rasayana* (rejuvenation) with formulations such as *Amalaki Rasayana* and *Chyawanprash* restores Ojas and systemic resilience following acute management (Patwardhan et al., 2015).

Preventive measures including *Ritucharya* (seasonal regimens), *Ahara-Vihara* (dietary and lifestyle discipline), and avoidance of *Viruddha Ahara* (incompatible food combinations) constitute an early form of preventive toxicology, with direct parallels in modern risk mitigation strategies (Sharma & Dash, 2018).

3. MODERN MOLECULAR TOXICOLOGY

Molecular toxicology investigates how toxic agents interact with cellular biomolecules to disrupt normal physiology. Key mechanisms include:

3.1 Protein Modification and Enzyme Inhibition

Electrophilic toxins form covalent adducts with proteins, as exemplified by acetaminophen metabolites causing hepatocellular injury (Jaeschke et al., 2012). Reactive oxygen species (ROS) oxidize amino acid residues, destabilizing protein structure (Halliwell & Gutteridge, 2015). Heavy metals such as mercury and cadmium induce endoplasmic reticulum stress through misfolded protein accumulation. Organophosphate compounds irreversibly inhibit acetylcholinesterase, precipitating neuromuscular dysfunction (Lotti, 2001). These molecular events correspond to *Dhatu dushti* the Ayurvedic concept of structural and functional derangement of tissues.

Detoxification enzymes are equally susceptible. Cytochrome P450 isoforms (CYP450)—central to Phase I xenobiotic metabolism—are frequently inhibited or induced by drugs and environmental chemicals (Guengerich, 2019). Saturation of Phase II conjugation pathways, as occurs in paracetamol overdose, diverts metabolism toward hepatotoxic quinone-imine intermediates, mirroring *Agnimandya* (metabolic fire impairment) and consequent Ama accumulation in Ayurvedic pathophysiology.

3.2 Receptor-Mediated Disruption and DNA Damage

Toxins may act as agonists or antagonists at cellular receptors: nicotine overstimulates nicotinic acetylcholine receptors, while bisphenol A (BPA) mimics estrogen at estrogen receptors, disrupting reproductive and developmental regulation (Diamanti-Kandarakis et al., 2009). Tetrodotoxin blocks voltage-gated sodium channels, silencing neuronal signaling. At the genetic level, benzo[a]pyrene metabolites form DNA adducts that trigger mutations (Phillips, 2005), while ionizing radiation and ROS generate strand breaks. Epigenetic alterations including altered DNA methylation, histone modification, and non-coding RNA expression induced by arsenic and cadmium can persist across generations (Reichard & Puga, 2010). These mechanisms correspond to Beeja dosha (genetic seed defects) and Ojas depletion in Ayurvedic thought.

3.3 Oxidative Stress, Mitochondrial Dysfunction, and Cell Death

Many toxins exert harm primarily through ROS generation, leading to lipid peroxidation, protein oxidation, and DNA mutagenesis. When cellular antioxidant defences glutathione, catalase, superoxide dismutase are overwhelmed, frank toxicity results (Halliwell & Gutteridge, 2015). Mitochondria are preferential targets: agents such as cyanide, rotenone, and antimycin arrest the electron transport chain, while mitochondrial permeability transition leads to organelle swelling and programmed cell death (Galluzzi et al., 2018). The resultant apoptosis, necrosis, or excessive autophagy reflects the Ayurvedic spectrum from gradual Dhatu degeneration to acute systemic collapse.

Immunotoxic effects T-cell suppression by dioxins, autoantibody induction by mercury, anaphylaxis by penicillin—parallel the loss of Ojas and heightened susceptibility to external insults described in Ayurvedic texts (Dietert & Piepenbrink, 2006).

4. INDIVIDUAL VARIABILITY IN TOXIC RESPONSE

4.1 Ayurvedic Determinants: Prakriti, Satmya, and Ojas

Ayurveda attributed differential toxic susceptibility to constitutional types (Prakriti) determined at conception. Vata-dominant individuals are predisposed to neurotoxic manifestations and rapid drug effects; Pitta-dominant individuals exhibit heightened susceptibility to hepatotoxic and inflammatory insults; Kapha-dominant individuals tend toward slower toxic accumulation and prolonged clearance (Jaiswal & Williams, 2016). *Satmya* (acquired adaptability) denotes physiological tolerance developed through repeated exposure—conceptually equivalent to pharmacological habituation. Strong Ojas confers resilience against toxic challenges, whereas depletion corresponds to immunocompromise and depleted antioxidant reserves (Tripathi, 2017).

4.2 Molecular Determinants: Pharmacogenomics and Epigenetics

Modern toxicology identifies genetic polymorphisms as the primary molecular basis of inter-individual variability. CYP2D6 polymorphisms create poor metabolizers who accumulate drugs to toxic concentrations, and ultra-rapid metabolizers who generate reactive intermediates in excess (Guengerich, 2019). Variants in Phase II enzymes—glutathione-S-transferases (GST) and N-acetyltransferase 2 (NAT2)—diminish conjugative detoxification capacity; NAT2 slow acetylators carry elevated risk of drug-induced hepatotoxicity (Hein, 2002). Transporter polymorphisms, particularly in ABCB1 (P-glycoprotein), modulate efflux of xenobiotics and thereby alter tissue-level exposure.

Epigenetic mechanisms explain why genetically similar individuals may diverge in long-term toxic outcomes. Arsenic exposure induces hypermethylation of tumor suppressor genes; cadmium impairs

chromatin remodelling and DNA repair; microRNAs modulate detoxification gene expression in an exposure-dependent manner (Reichard & Puga, 2010). The gut microbiome constitutes an additional determinant: microbial enzymes can both activate pro-carcinogens and degrade toxins, while dysbiosis elevates systemic toxicant absorption (Claus et al., 2016).

4.3 Ayurgenomics: Bridging Constitution and Genetics

Ayurgenomics seeks to validate Prakriti classifications through molecular profiling. Genomic studies have demonstrated that Pitta individuals exhibit elevated expression of pro-inflammatory cytokines; Vata types show greater variability in neuro-signaling genes; and *Kapha* types are enriched for genes associated with anabolism and slower metabolic clearance (Prasher et al., 2008). Functional correspondences can be drawn as follows: Prakriti maps to genetic polymorphism profiles; *Satmya* to acquired pharmacological tolerance; Ojas to immunocompetence and antioxidant reserves; and Dushi Visha to chronic low-dose bioaccumulation. Combining Prakriti assessment with pharmacogenomic data—for example, identifying Pitta-dominant individuals who are also CYP2C9 poor metabolizers—has practical potential for predicting susceptibility to drug-induced hepatotoxicity and tailoring preventive interventions.

5. COMPUTATIONAL AND SYSTEMS BIOLOGY APPROACHES

5.1 QSAR Modeling and Molecular Docking

Quantitative Structure–Activity Relationship (QSAR) modelling establishes mathematical relationships between chemical structure and toxicological activity, enabling prediction of mutagenicity, carcinogenicity, hepatotoxicity, and endocrine-disrupting potential prior to experimental testing (Cherkasov et al., 2014). QSAR has proved especially effective for screening pesticide and industrial chemical libraries and could be applied to evaluate alkaloid content and safety of purified Ayurvedic formulations such as *Shodhita Vatsanabha*. Molecular docking simulates how bioactive compounds bind to target proteins; organophosphate–acetylcholinesterase interactions and curcumin–NF-κB binding have been characterized by this approach (Gupta et al., 2013). Docking-based validation of traditional antidotal herbs against venom enzymes offers a computationally efficient pathway to support clinical studies.

5.2 Systems Biology, Omics Integration, and AI

Network toxicology and systems biology map the multi-target disruptions induced by toxins across signaling, metabolic, and immune pathways. Benzene, for example, simultaneously perturbs hematopoietic, oxidative stress, and immune networks consistent with the Ayurvedic principle that potent Visha deranges multiple Doshas and Dhatus simultaneously (Zhou et al., 2019). Multi-omics integration combining genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics provides a systems-level portrait of toxic responses that bridges classical and modern paradigms; arsenic-induced mitochondrial dysfunction and epigenetic dysregulation have been delineated through such approaches (Rusyn & Daston, 2010).

Artificial intelligence and machine learning analyze large toxicogenomic and pharmacovigilance datasets to forecast adverse outcomes including drug-induced liver injury and cardiotoxicity (Xu et al., 2015). When applied to Ayurgenomics, AI-driven models can integrate Prakriti phenotyping with genomic and environmental exposure data to generate individualized toxic risk profiles, substantially expanding the translational utility of classical Ayurvedic constitutional assessment (Topol, 2019).

6. TRANSLATIONAL POTENTIAL OF AGADATANTRA

Ayurveda contributes preventive and holistic strategies that complement mechanistic molecular approaches. Ritucharya (seasonal dietary and behavioral adaptation), avoidance of Viruddha Ahara, and Rasayana therapies with herbs such as Guduchi and Amalaki collectively support metabolic efficiency, antioxidant reserves, and immune competence—providing a traditional blueprint for reducing toxic burden (Patwardhan et al., 2015). The concept of Agni has functional equivalence with the cytochrome P450 enzyme network governing xenobiotic clearance; Ojas parallels immune surveillance and stress-response pathways; and Dushi Visha mirrors the epidemiological phenomenon of chronic low-dose bioaccumulation.

Translational applications with near-term feasibility include: molecular docking of classical snakebite antidotes against venom phospholipases and proteases; validation of Triphala's heavy metal chelation capacity using in vitro and in silico assays; multi-omics characterization of informed screening protocols that complement pharmacogenomic testing in adverse drug reaction prevention. Policy frameworks integrating Ayurvedic preventive principles into toxicological risk management could strengthen public health responses to industrial and environmental chemical exposures.

7. CONCLUSION

Agadatantra articulates a comprehensive and internally consistent framework for toxicology grounded in Dosha, Dhatu, Agni, Ojas, and Prakriti. These classical constructs find meaningful correspondence with the molecular mechanisms of modern toxicology: protein modification, enzyme inhibition, receptor disruption, epigenetic alteration, and immune modulation. Pharmacogenomic and Ayurgenomic research validates the constitutional basis of individual toxic susceptibility, while computational tools—QSAR, molecular docking, systems biology, and AI—provide mechanistic depth and predictive capacity that extend the reach of traditional knowledge.

Sustained progress requires collaborative models uniting Ayurvedic scholars, molecular toxicologists, and computational biologists; systematic experimental validation of classical antidotes and detoxification procedures; and expansion of Ayurgenomic databases linking constitutional phenotypes with molecular profiles. Pursued rigorously, this integrative agenda can position Agadatantra as a meaningful contributor to twenty-first-century precision toxicology, informing safer drug design, personalized risk assessment, and preventive strategies for the management of toxic exposures.

REFERENCES

1. Casarett, L. J., & Klaassen, C. D. (2019). *Casarett & Doull's toxicology: The basic science of poisons* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
2. Sharma, R. K., & Dash, B. (2018). *Charaka Samhita: Text with English translation*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.
3. Shastri, A. (2015). *Sushruta Samhita: With Ayurveda Tatva Sandipika Hindi commentary*. Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan.
4. Tripathi, R. (2017). *Astanga Hridaya: With Nirmala Hindi commentary*. Chaukhambha Sanskrit Pratishthan.
5. Patwardhan, B., Bodeker, G., & Vaidya, A. D. B. (2015). Ayurveda and traditional Chinese medicine: A comparative overview. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine, 2015*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/658625

6. Eaton, D. L., & Gilbert, S. G. (2013). Principles of toxicology. In C. D. Klaassen (Ed.), *Casarett & Doull's toxicology* (8th ed., pp. 13–48). McGraw-Hill Education.
7. Jaiswal, Y. S., & Williams, L. L. (2016). A glimpse of Ayurveda – The forgotten history and principles of Indian traditional medicine. *Journal of Traditional and Complementary Medicine, 7*(1), 50–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcme.2016.02.002
8. Cherkasov, A., Muratov, E. N., Fourches, D., Varnek, A., Baskin, I. I., Cronin, M., Dearden, J., Gramatica, P., Martin, Y. C., Todeschini, R., Consonni, V., Kuz'min, V. E., Cramer, R., Benigni, R., Yang, C., Rathman, J., Terfloth, L., Gasteiger, J., Richard, A., & Tropsha, A. (2014). QSAR modeling: Where have you been? Where are you going to? *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 57*(12), 4977–5010. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm4004285
9. Claus, S. P., Guillou, H., & Ellero-Simatos, S. (2016). The gut microbiota: A major player in the toxicity of environmental pollutants? *NPJ Biofilms and Microbiomes, 2*, 16003. https://doi.org/10.1038/npjbiofilms.2016.3
10. Diamanti-Kandarakis, E., Bourguignon, J. P., Giudice, L. C., Hauser, R., Prins, G. S., Soto, A. M., Zoeller, R. T., & Gore, A. C. (2009). Endocrine-disrupting chemicals: An Endocrine Society scientific statement. *Endocrine Reviews, 30*(4), 293–342. https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2009-0002
11. Dietert, R. R., & Piepenbrink, M. S. (2006). Perinatal immunotoxicity: Why adult exposure assessment fails to predict risk. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 114*(4), 477–483. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.8651
12. Galluzzi, L., Bravo-San Pedro, J. M., Vitale, I., Aaronson, S. A., Abrams, J. M., Adam, D., Alnemri, E. S., Altucci, L., Andrews, D., Annicchiarico-Petruzzelli, M., Baehrecke, E. H., Bazan, N. G., Bertrand, M. J. M., Bianchi, K., Blagosklonny, M. V., Blomgren, K., Borner, C., Bredesen, D. E., Brenner, C., … Kroemer, G. (2018). Essential versus accessory aspects of cell death: Recommendations of the NCCD 2015. *Cell Death and Differentiation, 25*(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1038/cdd.2017.131
13. Guengerich, F. P. (2019). Cytochrome P450 research and the development of precision medicine. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 18*(12), 891–911. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-019-0032-5
14. Gupta, S. C., Patchva, S., Koh, W., & Aggarwal, B. B. (2013). Discovery of curcumin, a component of golden spice, and its miraculous biological activities. *Clinical and Experimental Pharmacology and Physiology, 39*(3), 283–299. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1681.2011.05648.x
15. Halliwell, B., & Gutteridge, J. M. C. (2015). *Free radicals in biology and medicine* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
16. Hartung, T. (2009). Toxicology for the twenty-first century. *Nature, 460*(7252), 208–212. https://doi.org/10.1038/460208a
17. Hein, D. W. (2002). Molecular genetics and function of NAT1 and NAT2: Role in aromatic amine metabolism and carcinogenesis. *Mutation Research/Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis, 506–507*, 65–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0027-5107(02)00153-7
18. Jaeschke, H., McGill, M. R., & Ramachandran, A. (2012). Oxidant stress, mitochondria, and cell death mechanisms in drug-induced liver injury: Lessons learned from acetaminophen hepatotoxicity. *Drug Metabolism Reviews, 44*(1), 88–106. https://doi.org/10.3109/03602532.2011.602688
19. Lotti, M. (2001). Clinical toxicology of anticholinesterase agents in humans. In R. C. Gupta (Ed.), *Toxicology of organophosphate and carbamate compounds* (pp. 104–110). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012088523-7/50009-2
20. Phillips, D. H. (2005). DNA adducts as markers of exposure and risk. *Mutation Research/Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis, 577*(1–2), 284–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mrfmmm.2005.03.017

21. Prasher, B., Negi, S., Aggarwal, S., Mandal, A. K., Sethi, T. P., Deshmukh, S. R., Purohit, S. G., Sengupta, S., Khanna, S., & Mohanty, D. (2008). Whole genome expression and biochemical correlates of extreme constitutional types defined in Ayurveda. *Journal of Translational Medicine, 6*(1), 48. https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5876-6-48
22. Reichard, J. F., & Puga, A. (2010). Effects of arsenic exposure on DNA methylation and epigenetic gene regulation. *Epigenomics, 2*(1), 87–104. https://doi.org/10.2217/epi.09.45
23. Rusyn, I., & Daston, G. P. (2010). Computational toxicology: Risk assessment for the 21st century. *Toxicological Sciences, 113*(2), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfp456
24. Topol, E. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nature Medicine, 25*(1), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7
25. Xu, Y., Dai, Z., Chen, F., Gao, S., Pei, J., & Lai, L. (2015). Deep learning for drug-induced liver injury. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling, 55*(10), 2085–2093. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.5b00238
26. Zhou, W., Wang, Y., Lu, A., & Zhang, G. (2019). Systems biology of toxicity and traditional Chinese medicine: Translation from high-throughput data to in silico prediction and clinical application. *Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 202*, 107–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pharmthera.2019.06.007