INTABIOTECH

Shatavari (Asparagus racemosus) in Women's Health

Clinical Evidence Across the Female Life Course, Extract-Specific Standardization, Safety, and the EU–US Regulatory Divide

A Critical Translational Review

TRADITION → CONTROLLED HUMAN EVIDENCE → EXTRACT BRIDGING → REGULATORY TRANSLATION

Central conclusion

Shatavari has moved beyond a purely traditional-use botanical. The most credible contemporary signal is for menopause-related symptom and quality-of-life support, with increasingly persuasive lactation data and promising sexual-wellness evidence. However, the current literature does not justify treating Shatavari as a universal "hormone-balancing" agent, and clinical findings cannot be transferred automatically between chemically different extracts or between EU and US claim environments.

Prepared by: José M. López, BSc, MD, PhD, LLD (C) · INTABIOTECH · Technical & Scientific Affairs

Regulatory assessment current to: 8 September 2026

Document type: Critical translational review

Highlights

- The human evidence base has expanded rapidly since 2024 and now includes multiple randomized controlled trials in menopause/perimenopause, lactation, sexual wellness, PCOS, and postmenopausal muscle function.
- Menopause-related symptom burden and quality of life currently represent the strongest and most commercially mature evidence domain; a 2026 two-site RCT with 150 randomized women is the largest monotherapy trial identified in this review.
- “Hormone balance” is not an adequate scientific summary of the data. Endocrine biomarkers change in some trials but remain unchanged in others despite clinical benefit. A context-dependent endocrine/neuroendocrine response model is more defensible.
- Evidence is extract-specific. Natural Shatavarin IV content can vary markedly between root populations, and modern trials use materially different extraction ratios and saponin/Shatavarin IV specifications; milligram dose alone is not a valid bridge.
- EU and US commercialization pathways diverge sharply: clinical substantiation does not itself authorize a botanical health claim in the EU, whereas US structure/function claims may be used without FDA pre-approval if they are properly substantiated, non-disease, notified, and accompanied by the statutory disclaimer.

Structured Abstract

Background. Shatavari, the Ayurvedic root drug derived from Asparagus racemosus Willd., has a long ethnomedical association with female reproductive health, lactation, sexual vitality, and restoration across the female life course. Until recently, the evidence base was dominated by traditional use, preclinical pharmacology, and small human studies. A rapid expansion of randomized clinical research between 2024 and 2026 materially changes the strength—and the complexity—of the evidence.

Objective. To critically appraise human clinical evidence for Shatavari in menopause/perimenopause, lactation, female sexual wellness, PCOS/reproductive health, and postmenopausal musculoskeletal function; to assess mechanistic plausibility, extract standardization, safety and evidence integrity; and to translate the findings into a comparative European Union–United States regulatory framework.

Approach. This is a critical translational narrative review. Human randomized trials and clinically relevant controlled studies were prioritized, with special attention to product identity, extraction characteristics, dose, endpoints, duration, sponsorship, trial registration, and independence of replication. Regulatory conclusions prioritize primary sources from the European Union, Court of Justice of the European Union, US Food and Drug Administration, and US Federal Trade Commission. Literature and regulatory status were reviewed through 8 September 2026.

Results. The most consistent clinical signal concerns menopausal symptoms and menopause-specific quality of life, supported by several randomized trials using different standardized extracts. Lactation is supported by an older prolactin-based RCT and a newer 120-participant postpartum trial demonstrating earlier breast fullness and higher expressed milk volume at 72 hours. Sexual-wellness data are positive but require independent replication and registry clarification. PCOS trials show potentially relevant ovarian-morphology and stress effects but inconsistent endocrine changes and should not be interpreted as proof of disease treatment. Across indications, biomarker patterns are heterogeneous. This argues against a universal “hormone-balancing” mechanism and favors context-dependent endocrine and neuroendocrine modulation. Several evidence-integrity issues—possible overlapping publications, sponsor dependence, and registry-publication discrepancies—reduce the apparent independence of the literature.

Conclusions. Shatavari should be considered an emerging, clinically investigated women’s-health botanical rather than a universally validated endocrine therapy. The most defensible development strategy is indication-specific and extract-specific. This review proposes the Clinical–Extract–Regulatory Translation (CERT) framework and an Endocrine Context Response Model to prevent over-extrapolation from traditional use, product-name similarity, biomarker changes, or jurisdictionally inapplicable claims.

Keywords: *Asparagus racemosus; Shatavari; Shatavarin IV; shatavarins; steroidal saponins; menopause; perimenopause; lactation; galactagogue; female sexual function; PCOS; women’s health; phytoestrogens; dietary supplements; botanical health claims; European Union; United States*.

Graphical Abstract — Translational Logic

IDENTITY	EXTRACT	CONTEXT	EVIDENCE	CLAIM
1. BOTANICAL IDENTITY A. racemosus root Authentication + contaminants	2. EXTRACT DEFINITION Solvent · DER · Shatavarin IV · total shatavarins · fingerprint	3. FEMALE LIFE STAGE Reproductive · postpartum · peri/postmenopause	4. CLINICAL ENDPOINT Symptoms · QoL · lactation · sexual function · ovarian outcomes	5. JURISDICTION EU claim authorization/transitions vs US structure/function

Translation rule

Tradition generates hypotheses; randomized trials test defined preparations in defined populations; chemical bridging determines whether those trials apply to a commercial ingredient; and jurisdiction-specific law determines what may be communicated to consumers.

1. Scope, Terminology and Evidence-Appraisal Method

The commercial narrative around Shatavari is evolving rapidly. A few years ago, a statement that clinical data "validate centuries of traditional use" would have been difficult to defend beyond lactation and small exploratory studies. By September 2026, that statement has become directionally more credible, but only if it is narrowed. Contemporary trials corroborate selected traditional applications; they do not validate the entire Ayurvedic materia medica, and they do not establish equivalence among all Shatavari powders, extracts, ratios, saponin profiles or branded preparations.

Accordingly, this review distinguishes four questions that are often conflated in commercial documents: (1) Is there human evidence for a benefit domain? (2) Is that evidence reproducible and independent? (3) Is the commercial extract sufficiently comparable to the tested extract for scientific bridging? and (4) Is the intended communication legally permissible in the target jurisdiction? A positive answer to one question does not imply a positive answer to the others.

This review is not presented as a PRISMA-compliant systematic review and does not calculate a pooled effect size. The literature is currently too heterogeneous in extract chemistry, dose, reproductive stage, outcome instruments and reporting quality for a simple quantitative synthesis to be more informative than a rigorous translational appraisal. Priority was therefore given to randomized controlled human trials, objective or validated outcomes, adequate duration, product characterization, trial registration, independence of replication, and consistency with the totality of evidence.

A pragmatic interpretive weight—exploratory, low-to-moderate, moderate, or moderate-plus—is used in selected tables. This is not a formal GRADE assessment. It is a translational judgement intended to prevent a common nutraceutical error: treating the number of positive papers as equivalent to independent confirmatory evidence.

Evidence density is not evidence independence

Multiple publications generated by the same proprietary extract, sponsor ecosystem, protocol family, or potentially overlapping registry record increase the volume of literature but not necessarily the independence of confirmation. For claim substantiation, replication by genuinely independent investigators and chemically matched materials deserves materially greater weight than paper count alone.

2. Botanical Identity, Traditional Rationale and Phytochemistry

Shatavari is the Ayurvedic name most commonly applied to the tuberous roots of Asparagus racemosus Willd. (family Asparagaceae). It is botanically distinct from the common culinary asparagus, Asparagus officinalis. In Ayurvedic practice it has long been classified among restorative or Rasayana botanicals and has been used in female reproductive health, postpartum recovery and lactation. Traditional use is scientifically valuable as a source of hypotheses and exposure history, but it cannot substitute for modern compositional characterization, controlled efficacy studies, or product-specific safety evidence.

The root contains a complex mixture of steroidal saponins conventionally grouped as shatavarins, alongside flavonoids, phenolic constituents and other specialized metabolites. Shatavarin IV is frequently used as an

analytical marker and has attracted substantial mechanistic interest, but the biological effect of a full-spectrum root extract should not be reduced to a single compound without comparative pharmacological evidence. Recent reviews emphasize Shatavarin IV while simultaneously illustrating the broader chemical diversity of Asparagus saponins [1,2].

Authentication matters. Earlier phytochemical literature occasionally attributed compounds to A. racemosus that were later questioned when authentic reference material and molecular/chemical authentication were applied. Kumeta and colleagues, for example, found that asparagamine A—previously reported in Shatavari—was absent from authentic A. racemosus material, supporting the possibility of historical misidentification [3]. This is more than a taxonomic curiosity: it demonstrates why modern clinical-grade botanical development requires authenticated source material and not merely a vernacular plant name.

2.1 Natural variability is clinically relevant

A key constraint on species-wide extrapolation is natural chemical variability. An HPTLC survey of 103 root samples from eastern India reported Shatavarin IV concentrations spanning approximately 0.01% to 0.40%—roughly a forty-fold range [4]. Cultivar, geography, soil, harvest stage, processing, storage and extraction can all alter the final chemical profile. Concentrated extracts can amplify those differences further.

For this reason, a label statement such as “500 mg Shatavari” is pharmacognostically incomplete. The same mass may represent crude root powder, a low-ratio aqueous extract, a 13:1 concentrated extract, a preparation standardized to 5% total shatavarins, or a product standardized around Shatavarin IV. These materials are not automatically interchangeable.

3. From Plant Name to Clinical-Grade Ingredient: Standardization, Authentication and Quality

The contemporary Shatavari clinical literature makes one principle unavoidable: evidence should follow the chemically characterized preparation before it follows the species name. Recent trials have used products standardized to total shatavarins, products specifying Shatavarin IV, aqueous extracts, hydroalcoholic extracts, high herb-to-extract ratios, and more traditional formulations. Apparent dose ranges—from approximately 100 mg/day to 1,000 mg/day—are therefore not interpretable without the extraction and marker context.

A defensible clinical-grade specification should, at minimum, define botanical identity and plant part; geographic/cultivation traceability; extraction solvent(s); drug/extract or herb/extract ratio; a chromatographic fingerprint; a quantitative marker or marker panel (for example Shatavarin IV and, where validated, total shatavarins); moisture and microbiological limits; residual solvents where relevant; pesticide residues; elemental impurities; mycotoxins where applicable; adulteration controls; and stability of both fingerprint and marker content through shelf life.

Quality controls are not theoretical. In January 2025, a US recall was initiated for a Shatavari powder because of potential elevated lead contamination [5]. Such events reinforce a broader regulatory point: traditional use and clinical efficacy do not compensate for inadequate contaminant control. In a women’s-health ingredient—particularly one marketed around pregnancy, postpartum or long-term use—elemental impurity specifications and batch-level verification should be treated as core product-development requirements rather than commodity checks.

Proposed clinical-bridging specification

Botanical identity → plant part → extraction solvent(s) → DER/herb-extract ratio → chromatographic fingerprint → Shatavarin IV → total shatavarin profile (if methodologically robust) → contaminant panel → microbiological quality → batch-to-batch equivalence → shelf-life stability. Only after this chain is established should efficacy studies generated with a reference extract be used to substantiate a commercial material.

4. Human Clinical Evidence: Overview

The clinical landscape has changed substantially since 2024. Multiple randomized trials now exist across menopause/perimenopause, postpartum lactation, sexual wellness, PCOS and postmenopausal muscle

function. The signal is encouraging, but the literature is not homogeneous and should not be summarized by counting statistically significant outcomes.

The most mature domain is menopause/perimenopause, where several placebo-controlled trials using different standardized extracts report improvements in symptom scales or menopause-specific quality of life. Lactation provides a particularly strong bridge from traditional use to a direct functional endpoint, because the newest trial assessed expressed milk volume rather than relying solely on prolactin. Sexual wellness is promising but less replicated. PCOS remains a research indication: two recent trials differ materially in endocrine and ultrasound outcomes, and any disease-treatment claim would be inappropriate for a conventional food supplement/dietary supplement. Muscle-function evidence is exploratory.

Table 1. Critical appraisal of representative human Shatavari trials

Domain / study	Population	Intervention	Duration	Key findings	Integrity / limitations	Interpretive weight
Menopause — Gudise et al., 2024 [6]	n=70; 40–65 y; pre/postmenopausal symptoms	Aspurūs; 500 mg/day; full-spectrum root extract; 5% total shatavarins (HPTLC)	8 wk	Improved hot flashes, night sweats, insomnia, anxiety, nervousness, vaginal dryness, libido and Utian QoL vs placebo; no significant AEs	Small-to-moderate sample; proprietary extract; early modern RCT; clinically relevant symptom outcomes	Moderate
Postmenopause — Pingali et al., 2025 [7]	Postmenopausal women 40–55 y; six-arm RCT	Standardized aqueous Shatavari 250 or 500 mg/day; comparator Ashwagandha doses, combination, placebo	24 wk	Dose-related MENQOL and reflection-index improvements; changes in bone-turnover, inflammatory and oxidative-stress biomarkers	Longer duration; many arms and biomarkers; multiple-testing complexity; extract differs from later high-saponin products	Moderate
Perimenopause — Yadav et al., JANA 2025 [8]	n=50; 40–50 y	CL22205; 200 mg/day	120 d	MRS, vasomotor and menstrual outcomes improved; large FSH/LH/AMH changes reported	Chemiloids-funded; same CTRI record appears in a second 2025 paper with different product code/dose/sample size — possible overlap; do not double-count pending clarification	Low–moderate until registry/publication relationship clarified
Perimenopause — Yadav et al., FFHD 2025 [9]	n=75 reported; early perimenopause	CL22209; 50 or 100 mg/day	120 d	Dose-related symptom and endocrine changes reported	Same authors/site and same CTRI/2023/10/058694 as [8], but different sample size/product code/dose; potential duplicate/overlapping publication	Treat as same evidence family, not independent replication
Menopause — Mahajan et al., 2025 [10]	n=80 randomized; 40–65 y	SRI-81; 300 mg/day; 13:1; >10% total shatavarins	8 wk	MRS, hot flashes, stress and mood/fatigue outcomes improved; selected endocrine changes reported	Ixoreal material; modest duration; multiple outcomes; useful product characterization	Moderate
Menopause — Ademola et al., 2025 [11]	Paper reports n=135; 3 arms	Shatavari 300 mg/day; Shatavari + Ashwagandha; placebo; high-shatavarin extract	8 wk	Shatavari improved MRS/stress; combination generally broader	ClinicalTrials.gov record associated with protocol currently displays a materially smaller enrollment than article report; needs reconciliation; product supplied by commercial partner	Low–moderate pending registry clarification
Postpartum lactation — Ajgaonkar et al., 2025 [12]	120 enrolled; 113 completed; term postpartum women	Shatavari root extract 300 mg twice daily	72 h	Earlier breast fullness; higher expressed milk volume at 72 h; greater maternal satisfaction; no AEs	Strong direct functional endpoint but very short exposure; does not establish long-term breastfeeding or infant safety	Moderate for early postpartum lactogenesis
PCOS — Kondamudi et al., 2025 [13]	n=60; 20–35 y; Rotterdam criteria	CL22209; 100 mg/day; ≥15% total shatavarins	84 d	Ovarian volume, cyst size and follicle number improved; menstrual/metabolic/endocrine exploratory effects	Disease population; proprietary extract; replication needed; not appropriate basis for consumer disease claims	Low–moderate research signal
Menopause — Swaroop & Swaroop, 2026 [14]	60 completed; 40–55 y	SheVari4; 100 mg/day; hydroalcoholic root extract; 5% Shatavarin IV	8 wk	Large MRS reduction reported by weeks 4 and 8	Funded/analysed/written by product-owner employees; strong sponsor dependence; public registry planned enrollment appears larger than publication	Low–moderate despite positive effect size
Sexual wellness — Ademola et al., 2026 [15]	Article reports n=135; 3 arms	Shatavari 300 mg/day; Shatavari + Ashwagandha; placebo	8 wk	Shatavari improved total FSFI and satisfaction; combination improved more FSFI domains; mild events	ClinicalTrials.gov record for stated protocol currently lists lower actual enrollment than article; independent replication absent	Low–moderate pending clarification
PCOS — Mhatre et al., 2026 [16]	n=70 randomized; 66 completed; 20–40 y	Shatavari 300 mg/day; 13:1; >10% total shatavarins	12 wk	Follicle count decreased; endometrial thickness and stress improved; ovarian volume and serum hormones not significantly different vs placebo	Important partial replication that weakens broad endocrine claims; disease indication; modest sample	Moderate as corrective/replication evidence

Domain / study	Population	Intervention	Duration	Key findings	Integrity / limitations	Interpretive weight
Menopause — Chattopadhyay et al., 2026 [17]	60 completed; peri/postmenopausal women	SheVari4; 100 mg/day	8 wk	MENQOL and several endocrine measures improved	Distinct cohort from [14] but same proprietary extract and sponsor ecosystem; not fully independent replication	Moderate product-specific signal, lower independence
Perimenopause — Surampalli et al., 2026 [18]	n=150 ITT; 145 completed; 38–54 y; two Indian sites	Shatavari root extract 500 mg/day	12 wk	Marked improvements in multidomain symptom frequency/intensity, hot flushes and MENQOL; FSH/LH reduced; no AEs reported	Largest monotherapy RCT identified; same general proprietary platform family as earlier Aspurūs work may limit full independence; 12-week duration	Moderate-plus for symptom support
Postmenopausal muscle — O'Leary et al., 2021 [19]	n=20 postmenopausal women; mean age ~68.5 y	Shatavari 1,000 mg/day	6 wk	Small handgrip improvement; myosin-regulatory-light-chain and Akt signaling changes; no knee-extensor or bone-turnover benefit	Very small exploratory mechanistic study; not a basis for sarcopenia/bone claims	Exploratory
Lactation — Gupta & Shaw, 2011 [20]	n=60 lactating mothers	Shatavari research formulation	Study course per original protocol	Prolactin increased >3-fold vs control; secondary maternal/infant outcomes supportive	Older small trial; prolactin surrogate predominates; formulation comparability to modern extracts uncertain	Low–moderate historical corroboration

4.1 Evidence-integrity findings that materially alter the apparent literature

The rapid growth of the literature creates a temptation to count each paper as an independent RCT. That would overstate certainty. At least one pair of 2025 perimenopause publications appears to use the same CTRI registration number, the same investigators and the same ethics approval while reporting different product codes, doses and sample sizes [8,9]. Until the registry and authors clarify whether these are protocol amendments, subsets, supersets, or duplicated reporting, they should be treated as one evidence family rather than two independent replications.

A second issue is registry-publication concordance. The 2025 three-arm menopause paper and the 2026 sexual-wellness paper report 135 participants, yet the current ClinicalTrials.gov records associated with the stated protocols display materially smaller enrollment figures. A registry discrepancy does not prove invalid data: records can be amended late, split by site, or incompletely synchronized. Nevertheless, it is a reporting-quality signal that should lower confidence until reconciled.

Third, several positive trials concern branded or proprietary extracts and are funded, supplied, analysed, or otherwise linked to the ingredient owner. Industry funding is common and does not invalidate a trial. However, from an evidence-substantiation perspective, a positive sponsor-funded RCT followed by another trial within the same commercial ecosystem is not equivalent to independent replication by an unrelated academic group using a chemically bridged material.

The practical conclusion is that Shatavari now has more clinical evidence than it did even two years ago, but the independent evidence base is smaller than the raw publication count suggests. This distinction should be explicit in scientific dossiers, investor materials and claim-substantiation files.

Original appraisal principle — Evidence Density ≠ Evidence Independence
For botanicals, the unit of evidence should often be the trial family or extract platform, not the publication. A robust substantiation dossier should map publications to registry numbers, sites, sponsor relationships, extract lots and protocol families before assigning independent evidentiary weight.

5. Menopause and Perimenopause: The Strongest Current Clinical Opportunity

Menopause is the domain in which Shatavari has most clearly progressed from traditional reputation to a credible modern clinical signal. The 2024 Gudise trial randomized 70 symptomatic women and used a chemically standardized full-spectrum root extract (Aspurūs) delivering 500 mg/day and 5% total shatavarins. The active group improved across vasomotor, sleep, psychological, vaginal dryness, libido and Utian quality-of-life measures relative to placebo, without significant adverse events [6]. The breadth of the symptom signal was clinically interesting, although the trial remained modest in size and duration.

Pingali and colleagues extended the duration to 24 weeks and used two doses of standardized aqueous Shatavari extract in a six-arm design that also included Ashwagandha, combination and placebo arms. Dose-related improvements in MENQOL and vascular reflection index were accompanied by changes in bone-turnover, inflammatory and oxidative-stress markers [7]. This study is valuable because it demonstrates persistence beyond the typical eight-week botanical trial, but interpretation of the large biomarker panel requires caution with multiplicity and mechanistic overreach.

The 2025 perimenopause work by Yadav and colleagues is potentially important because it reports simultaneous symptom improvement and large changes in FSH, LH and AMH [8]. However, the apparent overlap with a second publication using the same registry number [9] means that these endocrine findings should not be treated as independently replicated. The magnitude of hormonal changes also increases the need for confirmatory studies with prospectively designated endocrine endpoints and transparent laboratory methods.

More recent high-shatavarin trials generally reinforce symptom benefit. Mahajan et al. used a 13:1 root extract standardized to more than 10% total shatavarins at 300 mg/day and reported improvements in MRS, hot flashes, perceived stress, mood and fatigue [10]. A separate three-arm study comparing Shatavari, Shatavari

plus Ashwagandha and placebo also reported symptom improvements, although registry-enrollment discrepancies warrant caution [11].

Two 2026 trials using SheVari4 at 100 mg/day reported substantial improvements in menopause-related symptom/QoL measures [14,17]. These studies demonstrate that a lower nominal milligram dose can be clinically active when the extract is concentrated and standardized, but they also illustrate the danger of treating dose in milligrams as a cross-product potency measure. Both studies concern the same proprietary extract and are not fully independent confirmations.

The largest monotherapy trial identified in this review was published online on 31 July 2026. Surampalli and colleagues randomized 150 perimenopausal women to 500 mg/day Shatavari root extract or placebo for 12 weeks at two Indian sites. The trial reported large between-group improvements in multidomain symptom frequency and intensity, hot-flush burden and MENQOL, along with reductions in FSH and LH and no reported adverse events [18]. This materially strengthens the menopause dossier. It remains important, however, to confirm the effect in geographically broader populations and through investigator groups independent from established proprietary extract platforms.

5.1 Clinical interpretation: symptoms are more reproducible than hormones

Across the menopause trials, improvement in patient-reported symptom burden is more consistent than endocrine normalization. That distinction is strategically important. A nutraceutical intended to support a normal physiological transition does not need to reproduce hormone-replacement therapy. Indeed, clinically meaningful improvements in vasomotor comfort, sleep, stress, vaginal comfort or quality of life without large systemic estrogenic effects could ultimately be an advantage, provided that the mechanism and long-term safety are understood.

At the current stage, the evidence can reasonably support the scientific conclusion that selected standardized Shatavari root extracts have an emerging-to-moderate evidence base for menopause-related symptom and quality-of-life support. It does not support the stronger conclusion that any Shatavari preparation corrects estrogen deficiency, normalizes the HPO axis, or provides a predictable hormone-replacement-like effect.

6. Lactation: The Clearest Bridge Between Traditional Use and a Direct Functional Endpoint

Lactation is one of the oldest and most persistent traditional uses of Shatavari. The 2011 randomized double-blind study by Gupta and Shaw evaluated 60 lactating mothers and reported a more than three-fold increase in prolactin in the research group compared with control, supported by infant-weight and maternal-satisfaction outcomes [20]. Although methodologically modest by contemporary standards, the study gave early human corroboration to the galactagogue tradition.

The 2025 randomized postpartum trial is substantially more informative because it assessed direct function. One hundred twenty women were enrolled, and participants received 300 mg of Shatavari root extract twice daily or placebo for 72 hours postpartum. The active group experienced earlier breast fullness and significantly greater expressed milk volume at 72 hours; maternal satisfaction was also higher, and no adverse events were reported [12]. This shifts the evidence from a largely endocrine-surrogate narrative toward a measurable lactation outcome.

However, the 72-hour design should not be extrapolated to long-term breastfeeding success. It does not establish exclusive breastfeeding rates at one, three or six months, maternal safety during prolonged use, transfer of Shatavari constituents into human milk, or long-term infant exposure. The LactMed monograph revised in July 2026 continues to emphasize that lactation data are limited and that clinically relevant constituent transfer and infant-safety information remain incomplete [21].

Lactation claim-risk asymmetry

The efficacy signal is stronger than the long-term safety dataset. That asymmetry matters: a postpartum galactagogue product may have a credible functional story, but the target population creates a higher safety burden because the commercial decision affects both mother and breastfed infant. Short-term absence of adverse events cannot be converted into a blanket statement of chronic infant safety.

7. Female Sexual Wellness

Female sexual function is multidimensional and should not be reduced to libido. Validated instruments such as the Female Sexual Function Index (FSFI) integrate desire, arousal, lubrication, orgasm, satisfaction and pain, while distress and mood measures provide additional context.

A 2026 prospective randomized, double-blind, three-arm trial compared standardized Shatavari, Shatavari plus Ashwagandha and placebo over eight weeks. The Shatavari-only arm improved total FSFI and satisfaction relative to placebo, while the combination produced broader improvements in arousal, lubrication, orgasm and total FSFI [15]. The data support a genuine research signal for sexual wellness, but the registry-enrollment discrepancy and absence of independent replication limit claim certainty.

Mechanistically, a sexual-wellness effect need not imply direct aphrodisiac action or systemic estrogen restoration. Improvements in sleep, stress, vasomotor symptoms, vaginal comfort and emotional well-being can secondarily improve sexual function. Future studies should therefore prespecify whether the target is direct sexual function, menopause-associated sexual symptoms, or global well-being and should model mediating variables rather than attributing all changes to a single endocrine pathway.

8. PCOS and Reproductive Endocrinology: Biologically Interesting, Commercially Premature

PCOS is an endocrine-metabolic disorder, not a normal physiological transition. That difference is decisive both clinically and regulatorily. The most appropriate role of Shatavari in this domain is currently research, not consumer-facing disease treatment.

A 2025 randomized trial of the proprietary extract CL22209 in 60 women with PCOS reported improvements in ovarian volume, cyst size and follicle number, together with exploratory menstrual, metabolic and endocrine changes [13]. The findings were sufficiently positive to justify replication, but they arose from a modest product-specific trial in a disease population.

The 2026 Frontiers trial provides exactly the kind of corrective evidence that a developing field needs. Seventy women were randomized and 66 completed 12 weeks of 300 mg/day Shatavari or placebo. Follicular count decreased, endometrial thickness increased and perceived stress improved, but the prespecified ovarian-volume outcome was not significantly different, and no significant between-group effects were observed for major serum hormone measures or BMI [16]. Rather than being a failed study, this trial narrows the plausible effect profile and directly challenges generic “hormone balancing” language.

The two PCOS trials together therefore support biological plausibility but not a stable therapeutic endocrine phenotype. Claims that Shatavari “treats PCOS”, “reverses PCOS”, “restores fertility in PCOS” or equivalent would exceed both the current evidence and the permitted positioning of a conventional food supplement or dietary supplement.

9. Postmenopausal Muscle Function: An Exploratory Healthy-Ageing Signal

O’Leary and colleagues randomized 20 postmenopausal women to 1,000 mg/day Shatavari or placebo for six weeks. Handgrip strength improved modestly, and muscle-biopsy analyses suggested changes in myosin regulatory light-chain phosphorylation and Akt signaling; knee-extensor strength and bone-turnover markers did not improve [19]. The study is too small to support sarcopenia, strength or bone claims, but it is conceptually important because it suggests that Shatavari’s biology may extend beyond reproductive hormones and may include tissue-level signaling relevant to healthy ageing.

10. Mechanistic Plausibility: Why “Hormone Balance” Is an Inadequate Scientific Model

The commercial phrase “hormone balance” is attractive because it compresses a complex physiology into a simple benefit. Scientifically, it is problematic. There is no single hormone concentration that represents a universal female optimum across the menstrual cycle, postpartum lactation, perimenopause and

postmenopause. FSH, LH, estradiol, progesterone, prolactin, AMH, testosterone, cortisol and thyroid hormones change according to life stage and physiological context.

Shatavari trials themselves demonstrate the problem. Some perimenopause studies report large changes in gonadotropins or AMH; some menopause studies report shifts in estradiol or cortisol; the postpartum evidence suggests a prolactin-related pathway; the 2026 PCOS trial showed ultrasound and stress improvements without significant between-group changes in the principal reproductive hormones [16]. If one ingredient can produce clinical benefit with divergent biomarker patterns, a fixed “normalization” mechanism is unlikely to be the most parsimonious explanation.

Steroidal saponins provide a plausible starting point. In vitro and in silico work has investigated interactions between A. racemosus constituents and estrogen receptor alpha [22], and a wider preclinical literature describes antioxidant, inflammatory, neuroendocrine and reproductive effects. These findings support mechanistic hypotheses; they do not prove that oral Shatavari produces clinically relevant estrogen-receptor agonism in women at commercial doses. Receptor docking, cell assays and rodent endocrine changes must not be presented as direct evidence of a human mechanism.

10.1 Proposed Endocrine Context Response Model

Original hypothesis

Phytochemical profile × baseline endocrine state × target-tissue responsiveness × neuroendocrine environment → observed clinical phenotype. Under this model, Shatavari does not “balance” hormones toward a universal set point. Instead, the same botanical matrix may interact differently with postpartum prolactin physiology, perimenopausal HPO-axis instability, postmenopausal estrogen deprivation, stress pathways or PCOS-related ovarian physiology. The model is testable and should be treated as a hypothesis, not an established mechanism.

This model makes specific research predictions. Biomarker effects should differ by reproductive stage; symptom improvement should sometimes occur without corresponding serum-hormone changes; chemical standardization should alter effect magnitude; and tissue or neuroendocrine markers may explain outcomes better than a single circulating hormone. Future trials can test these predictions prospectively.

11. Safety, Special Populations and Risk Management

Across recent short- and medium-duration RCTs, standardized Shatavari extracts have generally been well tolerated, with few serious safety signals and routine hepatic, renal or thyroid laboratory parameters remaining acceptable. This supports short-term tolerability in the populations actually studied. It does not establish unlimited chronic safety, safety of all extracts, or safety in excluded high-risk populations.

Pregnancy requires particular restraint. An older animal study using a methanolic A. racemosus root extract reported increased fetal resorption, growth restriction and developmental abnormalities in rats [23]. The exposure model, extract and dose prevent direct extrapolation to human pregnancy, and the study does not demonstrate human teratogenicity. Nevertheless, in the absence of reassuring pregnancy trials, it provides a rational basis for precaution rather than the assumption that a traditional “women’s herb” is automatically safe during pregnancy.

Breastfeeding presents a different balance because direct postpartum efficacy trials now exist. Yet increased milk output does not constitute a full neonatal safety assessment. Until human-milk pharmacokinetic data and longer infant follow-up are available, chronic use during lactation should be assessed product-specifically and conservatively [21].

Women with current or previous hormone-sensitive malignancy are another evidence gap. Proposed estrogen-sensitive mechanisms and common trial exclusion criteria justify caution, but the available evidence is insufficient either to prove increased recurrence risk or to establish safety. A medically supervised, individualized approach is more defensible than an absolute marketing reassurance.

Drug-interaction evidence is similarly incomplete. Preclinical enzyme or transporter signals should not be converted into definitive clinical interaction statements without human pharmacokinetic support. Risk management should instead emphasize medication review, pharmacovigilance and avoidance of unsupported interaction claims.

11.1 Quality-related safety is part of clinical safety

For botanical products, safety cannot be separated from manufacturing. Heavy metals, pesticides, microbiological contamination, adulteration, residual solvents and botanical misidentification can dominate the risk profile even when the authentic plant is well tolerated. The 2025 US lead-related recall is therefore relevant to clinical translation, not merely regulatory operations [5]. An evidence-based Shatavari platform should integrate efficacy standardization and contaminant control into a single specification strategy.

12. European Union Regulatory Framework

Regulatory assessment in this section is current to 8 September 2026 and is intended as scientific-regulatory analysis, not a substitute for product-specific legal advice or competent-authority consultation.

12.1 Ingredient status and Novel Food analysis

Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 uses significant human consumption in the Union before 15 May 1997 as the central historical threshold for Novel Food status [24]. The European Commission's Novel Food Catalogue is a non-binding, non-exhaustive orientation tool: food business operators remain responsible for demonstrating relevant history of consumption, Member States may apply additional restrictions, and a history limited to food supplements does not automatically authorize a materially different use in conventional foods.

The Commission Catalogue has historically recorded use of A. racemosus roots and conventional aqueous/hydroalcoholic root extracts in food supplements before the Novel Food cutoff. That should not be translated into the blanket statement "Shatavari is non-novel". A highly purified shatavarin fraction, a materially novel extraction process, a chemically altered preparation or use outside the established supplement context may require a separate Novel Food analysis. National botanical rules and medicinal-product classification must also be considered.

12.2 Health claims: evidence does not equal authorization

Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 provides the central EU framework for nutrition and health claims. In simplified terms, health claims are prohibited unless they comply with the Regulation and the applicable authorization/listing system [25]. Botanicals have remained unusually difficult because a large body of claims was left unevaluated or "on hold".

The legal position was sharpened by the Court of Justice of the European Union in Novel Nutriology, Case C-386/23, judgment of 30 April 2025. The Court held that advertising using health claims relating to botanical substances is, in principle, prohibited while the Commission has not completed its assessment and included the claims in authorized lists, unless the use of the relevant claim is already permitted under the applicable transitional regime [26,27]. This is the decisive reason why a new positive Shatavari RCT does not automatically create a legal right to make a corresponding EU consumer health claim.

General, non-specific references to health or well-being are not a workaround. Article 10(3) of Regulation 1924/2006 links such references to accompanying specific authorized health claims, and the CJEU decision expressly addressed the botanical context. Any reliance on a transitional botanical claim therefore requires claim-specific and market-specific legal verification rather than generic reference to an "on-hold list".

12.3 Disease and medicinal positioning

Directive 2002/46/EC prohibits food-supplement labeling, presentation and advertising from attributing to supplements the property of preventing, treating or curing human disease [28]. PCOS, infertility and diagnosed sexual dysfunction therefore create particularly high regulatory risk. Even where clinical research is legitimate, the corresponding consumer communication may cross into medicinal presentation. EU development teams must keep research indications, scientific publications and consumer claims conceptually separate.

13. United States Regulatory Framework

13.1 Structure/function claims

US dietary-supplement law provides materially greater flexibility than the EU botanical-claims environment. Under section 403(r)(6) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, a dietary supplement may bear certain

structure/function, general well-being and classical nutrient-deficiency statements without FDA pre-approval, provided the marketer has substantiation that the claim is truthful and not misleading, the claim does not diagnose, mitigate, treat, cure or prevent disease, the statutory disclaimer is displayed, and FDA is notified no later than 30 days after first marketing the product with the claim [29,30].

FDA guidance is particularly relevant to menopause. Menopause, aging and the menstrual cycle are natural life processes rather than diseases in themselves, although some conditions associated with them may be diseases depending on context [31]. This means that appropriately framed claims about supporting normal physiological function or mild changes associated with the menopausal transition may fall within structure/function territory. The word “support”, however, is not a safe harbor: the overall context determines whether the communication implies disease treatment.

13.2 FTC advertising substantiation

FDA labeling compliance is only one layer. The Federal Trade Commission regulates advertising and requires objective health claims to be truthful, non-misleading and supported by competent and reliable scientific evidence. FTC guidance emphasizes that randomized controlled human trials are generally the most reliable form of support, that clinically meaningful results matter, that replication by independent researchers adds substantial weight, and that the study product/population/outcome must match the advertised claim [32].

This is highly relevant to Shatavari because a company cannot simply cite a positive trial on a chemically different proprietary extract to support its own formulation. The FTC’s product-fit principle aligns closely with the extract-equivalence component of the CERT framework proposed in this review. Traditional-use claims are also not exempt from substantiation rules when they imply an objective efficacy benefit.

13.3 New Dietary Ingredient status

Ingredient status must be assessed independently from claim status. FDA defines a new dietary ingredient (NDI) as a dietary ingredient not marketed in a dietary supplement in the United States before 15 October 1994. Critically, FDA states that there is no authoritative complete list of pre-1994 dietary ingredients; manufacturers and distributors are responsible for determining and documenting status [33]. It is therefore unsafe to assert that every Shatavari extract is automatically “grandfathered”. A concentrated or materially altered extract requires product-specific NDI analysis.

Table 2. EU–US regulatory comparison for Shatavari

Issue	European Union	United States	Development consequence
Ingredient category	Food supplement botanical; botanical harmonization incomplete	Dietary ingredient in dietary supplement	Similar commercial form, materially different legal architecture
Historical ingredient threshold	Significant EU consumption before 15 May 1997 (Novel Food)	Marketed in a US dietary supplement before 15 Oct 1994 (NDI threshold)	Both require preparation-specific historical evidence; neither supports blanket status statements
Premarket authorization of benefit wording	Health-claim authorization/list framework; botanical claims heavily constrained	Structure/function claims not FDA pre-approved	Core strategic difference
Botanical “on-hold” claims	CJEU 2025: general prohibition pending completion, unless applicable transitional regime permits use	No analogous “on-hold” category	EU claim legality must be established claim by claim
Menopause as physiological state	Claim still subject to EU health-claims regime	FDA guidance recognizes menopause as a natural process, not itself disease	US offers more plausible structure/function route
“Supports menopausal comfort”	Cannot be assumed lawful solely because RCTs exist; verify authorized/transitional basis	Potential structure/function claim if truthful, substantiated and non-disease	Evidence and wording must match product
“Balances hormones”	Health claim; no automatic authorization; scientifically overbroad	Potentially structure/function in form, but scientific substantiation is inconsistent and context-sensitive	Not recommended as core claim in either market
“Supports normal female sexual function”	Health-claim restrictions apply	Potential structure/function claim with adequate substantiation	US more flexible; clinical replication still needed
“Supports breast-milk production”	Health claim; maternal/infant sensitivity and EU claim law both relevant	Potential structure/function claim in principle, but high substantiation and safety burden	Scientifically attractive, regulatory/safety-sensitive
“Treats PCOS / restores fertility in PCOS”	Disease/medicinal positioning; unsuitable for food supplement	Disease claim; drug territory	Do not use as supplement claim
Traditional-use communication	Does not bypass Regulation 1924/2006	Possible historical-use description if accurate and not misleading; implied efficacy still regulated	Tradition is context, not automatic claim substantiation
Advertising substantiation	EU food-information/claims rules + national enforcement	FTC competent-and-reliable-scientific-evidence standard	US requires claim/product/study fit; independent replication adds weight
Mandatory disclaimer	No DSHEA equivalent	Statutory FDA disclaimer required for 403(r)(6) claims	US-specific label requirement
Claim notification	No direct equivalent of 30-day FDA notice	FDA notification within 30 days after first marketing claim	US-specific operational requirement

14. Evidence-to-Claim Matrix: Scientific Readiness vs Regulatory Readiness

Benefit domain	Human evidence	Consistency	Extract transferability	EU claim feasibility	US claim potential	Current recommendation
Menopause symptom/QoL support	Moderate and growing	Moderately consistent	Medium unless chemically bridged	Low/restricted without specific legal basis	Moderate–high potential	Primary development opportunity
Vasomotor comfort	Moderate	Positive across several trials	Medium	Restricted	Potentially viable S/F	Strong US target; EU requires claim-specific route
"Hormone balance"	Mixed endocrine evidence	Low consistency	Low	Very low	Formally possible wording but weak substantiation	Avoid as central claim
Female sexual wellness	Preliminary–moderate	Positive but limited replication	Medium	Restricted	Moderate potential	Secondary development opportunity
Early postpartum milk production	Moderate for 72-h endpoint	Positive direct functional signal	Medium	Restricted/high sensitivity	Potential S/F with strong safety file	Attractive scientifically; cautious commercial execution
PCOS	Preliminary/mixed	Ovarian findings not fully consistent	Low	Disease/medicinal risk	Disease claim risk	Research only
Fertility enhancement	Insufficient	Low	Low	Very poor	High disease/reproductive risk	Do not claim
Postmenopausal muscle function	Exploratory	Unreplicated	Low	Low	Possible future S/F	Research opportunity
Bone health	Biomarker signals only	Insufficient	Low	Requires authorized claim pathway/nutrient basis	Preliminary	Not ready
Stress/resilience in menopause	Supporting secondary signal	Moderate	Medium	Botanical claim constraints	Potential S/F	Useful secondary US positioning if product-matched

15. The Clinical–Extract–Regulatory Translation (CERT) Framework

The central translational problem with botanicals is that efficacy, compositional identity and legal communication are frequently evaluated in separate organizational silos. The proposed CERT framework treats them as multiplicative rather than additive dimensions:

CERT equation

Clinical relevance × Extract comparability × Regulatory permissibility = commercially defensible evidence.

Clinical relevance: The target consumer must match the studied physiological state closely enough to justify extrapolation. Perimenopause, postmenopause, postpartum lactation and PCOS are not interchangeable "female hormonal" populations.

Extract comparability: The marketed material must be comparable to the tested material in botanical identity, plant part, extraction process, concentration ratio, marker profile, fingerprint and relevant quality attributes. Milligram equivalence is insufficient.

Regulatory permissibility: The intended communication must be lawful in the target jurisdiction. A scientifically substantiated benefit can still be unusable as an EU claim; a legally conceivable US structure/function phrase can still be misleading if the evidence does not support it.

The multiplicative concept is deliberate. If a commercial Shatavari extract is chemically dissimilar to the trial extract, the practical value of the RCT approaches zero for product-specific substantiation. Likewise, if the proposed claim is legally unavailable, excellent clinical data may remain valuable for R&D, professional education or future authorization strategy but not for immediate consumer labeling.

16. A Life-Stage Platform Model for Shatavari

The evidence suggests that Shatavari should not be commercialized conceptually as one ingredient with one universal female-health claim. A more defensible model is a life-stage platform in which the specification, dose, endpoints, safety file and communication change with physiological context.

Life stage	Potential role	Preferred endpoints	Product-development implication	Claim implication
Reproductive-age wellness	General resilience / research on sexual wellness	FSFI, distress, stress, sleep; avoid disease framing	Standardized extract with direct sexual-wellness evidence	US structure/function more feasible; EU constrained
Immediate postpartum	Early lactogenesis / milk output	Expressed milk volume, lactogenesis timing, infant outcomes	Extract chemically bridged to lactation RCT; stringent contaminants	High maternal/infant safety burden
Perimenopause	Vasomotor comfort, symptom burden, QoL	MRS/MENQOL, hot-flush diaries, sleep, sexual comfort	Extract bridged to menopause RCTs	Strongest near-term clinical opportunity
Postmenopause	QoL, healthy ageing, exploratory vascular/muscle endpoints	MENQOL, function, bone/vascular markers as secondary	Longer-duration safety and extract continuity	Avoid converting biomarkers into unvalidated disease-prevention claims
PCOS / infertility	Research only	Ultrasound, ovulation, metabolic/endocrine endpoints	Clinical-development material under controlled protocol	Do not consumer-market as disease treatment

17. Research Agenda: What Would Move Shatavari from “Emerging” to “Established”?

The next generation of trials should focus less on generating another small positive paper and more on replication quality. Priority actions are:

1. Conduct adequately powered, multicentre menopause trials with prespecified reproductive-stage criteria (for example STRAW+10 staging), validated primary outcomes, responder analyses and transparent intention-to-treat methods.
2. Use full extract characterization before enrollment: botanical authentication, DER, extraction solvent, HPLC/LC-MS fingerprint, Shatavarin IV and validated total-shatavarin method, contaminant profile and batch stability.
3. Replicate at least one leading extract-independent clinical finding through investigators and statisticians with no financial relationship to the ingredient owner.
4. Reconcile trial-registration and publication discrepancies and publish protocol amendments transparently. Registry consistency should become a quality criterion in botanical substantiation dossiers.
5. Design menopause studies to distinguish symptom improvement from endocrine modulation. Treat serum hormones as mechanistic/secondary endpoints unless a specific hormonal hypothesis is prospectively powered.
6. Extend lactation research beyond 72 hours to objective milk production, exclusive breastfeeding rates, duration of breastfeeding, infant growth, maternal outcomes, adverse events and characterization of relevant constituents in human milk.
7. Replicate sexual-wellness effects using FSFI with clinically meaningful responder thresholds, not only mean score changes, and model whether benefits are mediated by stress, sleep or menopausal symptom improvement.
8. Keep PCOS research clinically rigorous and separate from consumer marketing. Future trials should include ovulation, menstrual regularity, validated ultrasound criteria, insulin sensitivity and patient-relevant outcomes.
9. Build pharmacokinetic and interaction datasets for standardized extracts, including human exposure markers where technically feasible.

10. Create a cross-extract bridging program: compare leading clinical extracts by fingerprint and marker profile to determine whether efficacy is platform-specific or transferable within defined compositional boundaries.

18. Product-Development and Commercial Strategy Implications

The strongest near-term strategy is a menopause-oriented standardized Shatavari platform rather than a generic "hormone balance" product. The clinical dossier now contains enough randomized evidence to support serious R&D and, in the United States, potentially carefully worded structure/function positioning, provided that the commercial extract is chemically bridged to the supporting trials and the complete body of evidence is considered.

A lactation platform is scientifically attractive because it aligns traditional use with a direct human functional endpoint. It is also the area where a simplistic commercial approach would be most dangerous. Maternal/infant safety, contaminant specifications, duration of use and professional guidance require a higher standard than a conventional wellness supplement.

Sexual wellness may become an important differentiating domain, but current evidence is too dependent on a small number of recent studies to justify maximal claims. A single independent replication could materially increase commercial readiness.

PCOS should remain on the clinical-development side of the portfolio. The research may eventually reveal valuable mechanisms or subpopulations, but disease-level communication would create both scientific and regulatory vulnerability.

Finally, the ingredient should be branded and developed around measurable chemistry rather than around the botanical name alone. A proprietary Shatavari platform can legitimately differentiate itself only if its specification, batch consistency and clinical bridge are real. Trademarking a chemically undefined powder does not create scientific exclusivity.

Recommended positioning hierarchy

1) Menopause/perimenopause symptom and quality-of-life support — strongest current platform. 2) Lactation — clinically meaningful but safety-sensitive. 3) Female sexual wellness — promising second-wave opportunity. 4) Healthy-ageing/muscle — exploratory. 5) PCOS/fertility — research only. Across all levels, avoid universal "hormone balance" as the central scientific proposition.

19. Communication Examples: Scientifically Defensible vs Overstated

The examples below are not pre-cleared legal claims. They illustrate the difference between evidence-aware scientific language and wording that overstates the current data. EU use requires separate claim-specific legal analysis; US use requires product-specific substantiation and all applicable 403(r)(6)/FTC requirements.

Domain	Evidence-aware wording	Overstated wording	Why it matters
Menopause	"Standardized Shatavari extracts have been clinically investigated for menopause-related symptom burden and quality of life."	"Clinically proven to restore estrogen and normalize female hormones."	First reflects endpoints; second converts heterogeneous biomarkers into a universal mechanism.
Hormonal physiology	"Clinical studies suggest context-dependent effects on selected endocrine markers, but findings are not consistent across populations."	"Balances all female hormones naturally."	The latter is undefined, non-falsifiable and inconsistent with PCOS replication data.
Lactation	"A randomized postpartum trial reported earlier breast fullness and higher expressed milk volume at 72 hours with a defined Shatavari extract."	"Guaranteed to increase milk supply and proven safe for breastfeeding babies."	Efficacy is time-limited; infant long-term safety is not established.
Sexual wellness	"A recent randomized trial reported improvement in total FSFI and satisfaction with a standardized Shatavari extract."	"Treats female sexual dysfunction."	The latter is disease/therapeutic framing and exceeds replication strength.
PCOS	"Shatavari is under clinical investigation for ovarian and reproductive endpoints in PCOS."	"Treats PCOS and restores fertility."	Research finding ≠ consumer disease claim; endocrine results are inconsistent.

20. Limitations of the Current Evidence Base and of This Review

The principal limitation of the Shatavari evidence base is heterogeneity. Extracts differ in chemistry, daily dose, concentration ratio and marker standardization; populations range from early perimenopause to late postmenopause, immediate postpartum women and patients with PCOS; primary outcomes range from patient-reported scales to hormone concentrations and ultrasound findings. Direct pooling would obscure these differences.

Most trials are relatively small and short. The largest monotherapy trial identified includes 150 randomized women and lasts 12 weeks [18]; the longest modern menopause study identified lasts 24 weeks [7]. These durations are useful for symptom efficacy and short-term tolerability but insufficient for definitive long-term safety conclusions.

The literature also contains commercial sponsorship and reporting-integrity issues. These do not justify dismissing positive studies, but they reduce the weight assigned to nominally multiple confirmations when the same extract, sponsor ecosystem or protocol family is involved.

This review is a targeted critical narrative review rather than a formal systematic review. It prioritizes clinically and regulatorily material studies and primary regulatory sources through 8 September 2026 but does not claim exhaustive capture of every traditional, preclinical or non-randomized publication. Regulatory requirements may also change and must be rechecked before product launch.

21. Conclusions

Shatavari has reached an inflection point. It can no longer be described fairly as a women's-health botanical supported only by centuries of traditional use and animal pharmacology. A growing randomized human evidence base now exists, and the strongest contemporary signal concerns menopause-related symptoms and quality of life. Lactation has moved from a traditional galactagogue narrative to direct clinical evidence of early postpartum milk-volume effects. Sexual wellness is promising, and PCOS research provides biologically interesting but inconsistent endocrine findings.

The same evidence also argues against one of the industry's most common simplifications: "hormone balance". Shatavari does not produce a uniform endocrine pattern across physiological states. A context-dependent response model is more consistent with the observed data and is scientifically testable.

Equally important, Shatavari is not a single standardized pharmacological entity. Root chemistry can vary substantially, and clinical extracts differ in extraction ratio and marker profile. Scientific substantiation must therefore be extract-specific unless compositional bridging is demonstrated.

Finally, regulatory translation is jurisdiction-dependent. In the European Union, a positive RCT does not itself authorize a botanical health claim, and the 2025 CJEU Novel Nutriology judgment has reinforced the restrictive position for botanical claims outside valid transitional routes. In the United States, structure/function claims offer greater flexibility but remain subject to product-specific substantiation, the disease-claim boundary, the statutory disclaimer, FDA notification and FTC advertising standards.

The most accurate contemporary conclusion is therefore not that clinical science has validated every traditional use of Shatavari. Rather, modern research is beginning to corroborate several of its most important traditional applications while simultaneously redefining them in population-specific, extract-specific and regulation-specific terms. That transition—from ethnomedical reputation to disciplined translational platform—is what makes Shatavari one of the most strategically interesting emerging ingredients in women's health.

Final technical position

Shatavari is best developed as an extract-defined women's-health platform with menopause/perimenopause as the lead indication. "Hormone balance" should be replaced by precise endpoint-based language. Clinical evidence should be mapped to registry, sponsor and extract families before being counted as independent. EU and US communication strategies should be designed separately from the outset.

References

1. *Banerjee P, Das A, Kumar P, Chakraborty S, Jalan K. An Updated Insight on the Chemistry, Ethnobotany, and Health Benefits of Asparagus racemosus (Shatavari): With a Special Emphasis on Shatavarin IV. J Am Nutr Assoc. 2025;44(8):681–692. doi:10.1080/27697061.2025.2496945.*
2. *Kurmi A, et al. Modulation of Various Pharmacological Pathways by Asparagus Saponins: Special Emphasis on Shatavarin-IV. Chem Biodivers. 2026;23:e02360. doi:10.1002/cbdv.202502360.*
3. *Kumeta Y, Maruyama T, Wakana D, Kamakura H, Goda Y. Chemical and botanical authentication of commercial Shatavari materials. J Nat Med. 2013;67(1):168–173. doi:10.1007/s11418-012-0669-4. PMID:22529051.*
4. *Champati BB, Padhiari BM, Ray A, et al. Assessment of Variation in Shatavarin IV Content in Asparagus racemosus through HPTLC Analysis and Identification of Elite Germplasm from Eastern India. Pharmacogn Mag. 2022;18(80):836–843. doi:10.4103/pm.pm_51_22.*
5. *US Food and Drug Administration. New York Wholesale Group Announces Recall of Zaarah Herbals Shatavari Powder Because of Potential Elevated Lead Contamination. Recall notice, 27 January 2025. FDA website.*
6. *Gudise VS, Dasari MP, Kuricheti SSK. Efficacy and Safety of Shatavari Root Extract for the Management of Menopausal Symptoms: A Double-Blind, Multicenter, Randomized Controlled Trial. Cureus. 2024;16(4):e57879. doi:10.7759/cureus.57879. PMID:38725785.*
7. *Pingali U, Nutalapati C, Wang Y. Ashwagandha and Shatavari Extracts Dose-Dependently Reduce Menopause Symptoms, Vascular Dysfunction, and Bone Resorption in Postmenopausal Women: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study. J Menopausal Med. 2025;31(1):21–34. doi:10.6118/jmm.24025. PMID:40347163.*
8. *Yadav P, Yadav S, Vedururu SS, Kumari G. A Standardized Asparagus racemosus Root Extract Improves Hormonal Balance and Menstrual Health and Reduces Vasomotor Symptoms in Perimenopausal Women: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study. J Am Nutr Assoc. 2025;44(8):754–764. doi:10.1080/27697061.2025.2510474. Trial registration: CTRI/2023/10/058694.*
9. *Yadav P, et al. Randomized controlled study of standardized Asparagus racemosus root extract in early perimenopausal women. Funct Foods Health Dis. 2025;15(7):415–443. doi:10.31989/ffhd.v15i7.1684. Trial registration reported as CTRI/2023/10/058694.*
10. *Mahajan S, Avad P, Langade J. Standardized Asparagus racemosus root extract in menopausal women: randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical study. Int J Womens Health. 2025;17:4057–4073. doi:10.2147/IJWH.S544267. PMID:41209045.*
11. *Ademola J, Ajgaonkar A, Debnath T, Debnath K, Langade J. Efficacy and Safety of Shatavari Root Extract (Asparagus racemosus) for Menopausal Symptoms: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Three-Arm, Placebo-Controlled Study. Front Reprod Health. 2025;7:1654503. doi:10.3389/frph.2025.1654503.*
12. *Ajgaonkar A, Debnath T, Bhatnagar S, Debnath K, Langade J. Shatavari (Asparagus racemosus Willd) Root Extract for Postpartum Lactation: A Randomised, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2025;45(1):2564168. doi:10.1080/01443615.2025.2564168. PMID:41055223.*
13. *Kondamudi S, et al. CL22209, a Standardized Asparagus racemosus Root Extract, Demonstrates Improved Ovarian Morphology, Menstrual Regularity, and Metabolic Parameters in Women with Polycystic Ovary Syndrome in a Randomized, Controlled Trial. Food Nutr Res. 2025;69. doi:10.29219/fnr.v69.13244. PMID:41497317.*
14. *Swaroop A, Swaroop A. Asparagus racemosus Root Extract (SheVari4®) Alleviates Menopausal Symptoms in Pre-, Peri-, and Post-menopausal Healthy Women. Cureus. 2026;18(4):e106987. doi:10.7759/cureus.106987.*
15. *Ademola J, Mahajan S, Srivathsan M, Langade D. Effects of Shatavari (Asparagus racemosus) Root Extract on Sexual Wellness in Women: Findings from a Prospective, Randomized, Double-Blind, Three-Arm, Parallel-Group, Placebo-Controlled Study. Int J Womens Health. 2026;18:561213. doi:10.2147/IJWH.S561213. PMID:41710148.*
16. *Mhatre Y, Jadhav P, Malik A, Srivathsan M, Langade D. Efficacy and Safety of Shatavari Root Extract in Women with Polycystic Ovarian Syndrome: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial. Front Endocrinol. 2026;17:1769773. doi:10.3389/fendo.2026.1769773.*
17. *Chattopadhyay R, Karmakar S, Chakraborty TR, Bagchi M, Banik SP, Bagchi D. SheVari4®, a Proprietary Root Extract from Asparagus racemosus, Ameliorates Menopausal Health: Insights from a Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial. Food Nutr Res. 2026;70. doi:10.29219/fnr.v70.14275.*
18. *Surampalli G, Madhuchander S, Mudhigonda M. Efficacy and Safety of Shatavari Root Extract in Managing Peri-Menopausal Symptoms—A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo Controlled Clinical Trial. J Diet Suppl. 2026;23(4):490–518. Published online 31 July 2026. doi:10.1080/19390211.2026.2689348.*
19. *O'Leary MF, Jackman SR, Sabou VR, et al. Shatavari Supplementation in Postmenopausal Women Improves Handgrip Strength and Increases Vastus lateralis Myosin Regulatory Light Chain Phosphorylation but Does Not Alter Markers of Bone Turnover. Nutrients. 2021;13(12):4282. doi:10.3390/nu13124282. PMID:34959836.*
20. *Gupta M, Shaw B. A Double-Blind Randomized Clinical Trial for Evaluation of Galactogogue Activity of Asparagus racemosus Willd. Iran J Pharm Res. 2011;10(1):167–172. PMID:24363697; PMCID:PMC3869575.*
21. *National Library of Medicine. LactMed: Wild Asparagus. Drugs and Lactation Database (LactMed®). Last revision 15 July 2026. NCBI Bookshelf NBK501813.*
22. *Sharma R, Jaitak V. Asparagus racemosus (Shatavari) Targeting Estrogen Receptor α: An In-vitro and In-silico Mechanistic Study. Nat Prod Res. 2020;34:1571–1574. doi:10.1080/14786419.2018.1517123.*
23. *Pandey SK, Sahay A, Pandey RS, Tripathi YB. Teratogenicity of Asparagus racemosus Willd. root, a herbal medicine. Indian J Exp Biol. 2006. PMID:16872047.*

24. *European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 of 25 November 2015 on novel foods. Official Journal of the European Union.*
25. *European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods. Official Journal of the European Union.*
26. *Court of Justice of the European Union. Novel Nutriology GmbH v Verband Sozialer Wettbewerb eV. Case C-386/23. Judgment of 30 April 2025. ECLI:EU:C:2025:304.*
27. *Court of Justice of the European Union. Press Release No 57/25, 30 April 2025: Advertising using health claims relating to botanical substances is currently prohibited. Curia.*
28. *European Parliament and Council. Directive 2002/46/EC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to food supplements, as amended.*
29. *US Food and Drug Administration. Notifications for Structure/Function and Related Claims in Dietary Supplement Labeling. FDA website. Accessed 8 September 2026.*
30. *US Food and Drug Administration. Structure/Function Claims. FDA website. Accessed 8 September 2026.*
31. *US Food and Drug Administration. Small Entity Compliance Guide: Structure/Function Claims. Guidance on disease versus structure/function statements, including natural states such as menopause. FDA website.*
32. *Federal Trade Commission. Health Products Compliance Guidance. Washington, DC: FTC; 2022. Accessed 8 September 2026.*
33. *US Food and Drug Administration. New Dietary Ingredients in Dietary Supplements — Background for Industry. FDA website. Accessed 8 September 2026.*
34. *European Commission. Novel Food Catalogue. Non-binding orientation tool for Novel Food status. European Commission website. Accessed 8 September 2026.*
35. *European Commission / EFSA. EU Register and scientific evaluation framework for nutrition and health claims; botanical claims placed on hold. Accessed 8 September 2026.*

Regulatory and Scientific Use Note

This document is a scientific and regulatory analysis prepared from publicly available evidence and primary regulatory materials current to 8 September 2026. It is not medical advice, a product authorization, a legal opinion, or a guarantee that any specific commercial claim will be accepted by a competent authority. Product composition, dose, target population, labeling, advertising context, Member State rules, US ingredient status and subsequent regulatory developments must be assessed before commercialization.