

5-1-1939

## Secondary traumatic shock

Clarence A. Luckey  
*University of Nebraska Medical Center*

This manuscript is historical in nature and may not reflect current medical research and practice. Search [PubMed](#) for current research.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/mdtheses>



Part of the [Medical Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Luckey, Clarence A., "Secondary traumatic shock" (1939). *MD Theses*. 764.  
<https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/mdtheses/764>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Collections at DigitalCommons@UNMC. It has been accepted for inclusion in MD Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNMC. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@unmc.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@unmc.edu).

## Table of Contents

1. Introductory paragraph
2. Definition
  - a. Primary shock
  - b. Secondary shock
3. History--old ideas of shock
4. Theories of shock production
  - a. Capillary congestion
  - b. Acapnia
  - c. Inhibition
  - d. Fat embolism
  - e. Adrenal hyper and hypo function
  - f. Decreased alkali reserve
  - g. Exhaustion
  - h. Traumatic toxemia
  - i. Nervous
  - j. Plasma exudation
5. Possible mechanism
6. Pathology
7. Clinical picture
  - a. Symptomatology
  - b. Laboratory findings
  - c. When is patient in shock
  - d. Differential diagnosis--hemorrhage versus shock
8. Treatment
  - a. Preventative
    1. In accidents
    2. Preoperatively
    3. Anesthetic
  - b. Treatment of actual shock

## Introduction

From earliest times medical men noted a peculiar clinical picture following many surgical procedures or following some sudden and severe injuries. Many names were given to this condition. James Latta, in 1795, used the word "shock". Since then that term has been used and still is being used to designate the above noted condition.

In this paper the various views of shock will be considered from both angles. In this manner the reader should get a general idea as to what is being done, both experimentally and clinically, with secondary traumatic shock.

## Definition

Considerable dispute still reigns over the definition of shock. There seems to be a clinical syndrome which most workers agree to call shock, yet some differ in defining this condition. We must differentiate clearly between primary and secondary shock. Primary shock is defined by Holt (38) as a circulatory collapse due to inhibition of constrictor tone by influences operating throughout the nervous system. It is characterized by a rapid onset associated with a fall in blood pressure, but without a decrease in blood volume. For one to two hours the blood pressure may be too low to read.

"Psychogenic" shock (Phemister and Livingston 54) is the result of a psychic distress--a physical strain without associated tissue injury to any extent. This is characterized by a low blood pressure, slow pulse, shallow respirations, and fainting. As a result of the fainting the patient falls; the horizontal position restores the cerebral circulation and recovery is usually prompt. In cases where the patient is originally horizontal, no fainting results. The above stated workers (54) report a case of an operation of a chondroma of the phalanx. On the first operation

primary shock was experienced by the patient. During the second operation the blood pressure did not fall from the normal level, It is believed that the psychic factor is the cause but that the pain helps in the precipitation of the shock. Psychic shock is rarely, if ever, the cause of death in healthy individuals. Primary shock will not be discussed any more. It is mentioned merely to distinguish it from secondary shock.

In this paper we are concerned primarily with secondary shock which presents itself clinically by a low blood pressure, low basal metabolic rate, increased cardiac rate, and diminished renal excretion. Later, the coaguability and the oxygen of the blood are decreased, the blood chlorides fall below normal and the blood non-protein nitrogen increases. Clement (18).

A more complete picture of the clinical syndrome of secondary shock given by Makel (44) is increased pulse rate, low blood pressure, exposed parts pale, and a tinge of cyanosis, sweating, thirst, restlessness, and increased respiratory rate. In severe shock there may be air hunger owing to the clouding of the sensorium.

The above are really descriptions of the clinical state

and not definitions of the condition. McKesson, according to Perkins (53), defines shock as "a decompensation of the muscular elements of the cardiovascular system leading to malnutrition and exhaustion".

Moon (51) defines shock as "a circulatory deficiency, neither cardiac nor vaso-motor in origin, characterized by decreased blood volume, decreased cardiac output (reduced volume flow) and by increased concentration of the blood". This definition seems very satisfactory; it rules out all shock states which are cardiac or vaso-motor in origin. Immediately primary shock is ruled out and we are dealing with secondary shock.

## History

In Crile's book on Surgical Shock (20) he lists the following early workers connected with surgical shock: James Latta in 1795 was the first to use the word shock in the sense that it is now employed. In 1827 Travers described a certain form of shock as "prostration with excitement". In 1834 J. A. Delcasse thought that the effects of violence were transmitted chiefly through the osseous system whereby lining molecules were separated from each other and shock was produced. Erichsen, in 1864, explained shock in accidents due to the "sharp vibration that is transmitted through everything". Later came Vernevil who declared that shock is a series of phenomenon following trauma of tissue, characterized by a temporary depression of the functions of the parts injured and provoking changes anatomically comparable to those one observes normally in the stage of activity and of repose.

Parson and Phemister (52) report that Sir Ashley Cooper, Copland, Morris, and Hordon maintained that shock was due to general depression of the nervous system through gross mechanical insult. After Claude Bernard discovered the sympathetic control of the blood vessels in 1852,

Weir, Mitchell, Moorehead, and Keen, in 1865, decided that shock was a reflex motor paralysis. In 1870 Fisher noted that injury caused a reflex paralysis of vasomotor nerves with a fall in blood pressure and dilatation of the large veins of the visceral regions. Against this theory was Loven who, in 1866, discovered that stimulation of the central end of a cerebrospinal nerve caused elevation instead of depression of blood pressure.

Hefmeister, in 1885 (20), called attention to the great number of deaths from shock in abdominal operations. Malnutrition of the heart, fatty degeneration, general weakness, and loss of blood were mentioned as important causes. Agnew maintained that the determining cause of shock must reach that portion of the nervous system from which the heart and lungs receive their motor endowments.

With the above review of the older ideas of shock production we shall now consider the various theories of shock which have been worked on quite extensively in the past two or three decades.

### Theories of Shock Production

#### Theory of Capillary Congestion

The idea behind this theory is that the blood goes out into the capillary bed thus reducing the total circulat-



ing blood volume and resulting in a lowered blood pressure. Erlanger, Gesell, Gasser, and Elliott (25) produced shock by traumatization of the intestines, by injury of the adrenals, and by mechanical obstruction of large vessels. They noted a marked capillary distention; the venules of the intestinal villi were also distended with solid masses of red cells. This was back in 1917. Since that time much work has been done on other theories which will be mentioned later--theories which involve factors that should have been considered in the above experiment. They failed to take into consideration the possibilities of toxemia, exudation, and nervous impulses as causative factors. Even though there was capillary congestion we still do not know what causes it. No idea was advanced for the actual cause of capillary congestion.

#### Theory of Acapnia

Henderson (36) found that shock is associated with a decreased venous return of blood to the heart. This theory is an attempt to explain this decrease. Pain, sorrow, etc. cause excessive respiration which results in a reduction of the carbon dioxide content of the blood and a state of acapnia. The conditions leading to the shock state are hyperpnoea, acapnia, failure of

venopressor mechanism, venous anoxemia, tissue asphyxia, and acidosis and acute oligemia.

Very little supports this theory. There is the well-known fact (Larson 39) that the severely wounded often do not experience much pain, and the observation that patients in shock do not always have excessive breathing.

Treatment with carbon-dioxide has not been as successful as might be expected were the explanation correct.

Cannon and Bayliss (13) in 1919 were able to produce shock experimentally by trauma and the respiration was controlled artificially.

Henderson (36) observed the fall in blood pressure following over ventilation of the lungs in man, so-called acapnia shock. This state is approached in experimental animals after reflex hyperpnea from stimulation of sensory nerves under light anesthesia. It is antagonized by deepening the anesthesia. The fall in arterial pressure is due to arteriolar dilatation.

#### Theory of Inhibition

Meltzer (48) in 1908 noted that dissection of the skin

of the abdomen caused inhibition of peristalsis. He assumed that injury caused an inhibition of all functions of the body. But Cannon (15) in 1923 emphasized that the cessation of intestinal movements was not due to inhibition of activity in the central nervous system but rather to activity there. Meltzer thought that the action of depressor reflexes were responsible for the lowering of arterial pressure. Such depressors (Larson 39) play no part in secondary shock.

#### Theory of Fat Emboli

This idea (Larson 39) is based on the fact that shock from traumatization of an extremity is often more severe if bones are crushed, which presumably would favor the production of fat emboli. But this favors any other mechanism equally well, since broken bone fragments would obviously produce considerable laceration of tissue. The picture of fat embolism is usually that of pulmonary embolism, with raised venous pressure, and is obviously different from the picture of shock. Porter (55) injected fat in small quantities in the vertebral artery in dogs and obtained death from medullary embolism. But the fall in blood pressure is here due to arteriolar dilatation which is not present in secondary shock. Parsons and Phemister (52) conducted ten experiments

in regard to this theory. After trauma they found very little fat in the various organs and came to the conclusion that fat emboli is not a factor in shock production.

#### Theory of Adrenal Hypo and Hyper Function

Gley and Quinquand, two Frenchmen mentioned by Blalock in 1933 (7) found that the blood pressure does not go down until several hours after the removal of the adrenal glands. This evidence would disprove the idea of hypoactivity. Mann (46) found that the phenomenon of shock was not due to removal of the adrenal glands. Blalock and Johnson (10) found that hemorrhage or gross trauma causes at first a decrease in cardiac output which is later followed by a fall in blood pressure and that after adrenalectomy these changes appear in the reverse order.

The theory of overactivity (Blalock 11) is based upon the observation that there is an increased adrenal secretion as a result of severe pain or over exertion. Shock can be produced by the injection of large amounts of adrenalin. However, the amounts necessary is far greater than that evoked by reflex stimulation.

With the above facts at hand it appears that neither hypo nor hyper function of the adrenals can play a very large role in shock production.

#### Theory of Decreased Alkali Reserve

This idea has been practically dropped by present day workers. There is no direct evidence that supports this theory. Moon (51) concludes that all evidence supports the conclusion that the decrease in the reserve alkali of the blood in shock is the result of decreased oxidation due to circulatory deficiency. It is the effect and not the cause of the circulatory disturbance, and develops similarly whenever anoxemia is marked.

#### Exhaustion Theory

In 1914 Crile (21) was under the impression that the "motor mechanism, which through its phylogenetic association with injury to the individual, is responsible for the discharge of energy which is occasioned by the presence or thought of danger". When these discharges of energy are intense enough shock is produced. Shock is the result of the excessive conversion of potential into kinetic energy in response to adequate stimuli. The essential lesions of shock are in the cells of the brain, suprarenals, and liver, and are caused by the conversion

of potential energy into kinetic energy at the expense of certain chemical compounds stored in the cells of these organs. There is strong evidence that animals capable of being shocked are those whose self-preservation originally depended upon some form of motor activity. In each individual, Crile maintained, there is a limited amount of potential energy stored in the brain, suprarenals, liver and that the motor activity diminishes it. If the expenditure is due to traumatic or to psychic stimuli which lead to no obvious work performed, shock is produced. From experiments on dogs Crile concluded that ether anesthesia offers no protection to the brain cells against the effect of trauma and that the lipoid-solvent anesthesia probably breaks the arc which maintains consciousness beyond the brain cells somewhere in the efferent pathway. "The afferent pathway from the seat of injury unbroken the afferent stimuli reach and modify the brain cells readily as if no anesthesia had been given and it would seem that the brain cell changes must be due to the discharge of energy in a futile effort to escape from injury."

Ewing, in "The Nature of Shock", (27) showed that prolonged stimulation of the somatic nerves in mammals does

not bring on circulatory failure. Seelig and Lyon's (60) experimental results indicate that the symptom complex known as shock is not due primarily to vasomotor exhaustion.

Erlanger, Gesell and Gasser (26) have shown that in the early stages of shock, vasomotor tone is normal or increased. As the shock progresses and the blood pressure falls, the vessels lose some tone, but up to death will show some reactions. Cannon concludes that there is no true exhaustion of the vasomotor center.

The balance of power seems to be definitely against the idea of exhaustion. Present day workers have dropped the exhaustion idea.

#### Toxemia Theory

There is the popular belief that shock is due to a toxic substance liberated into the blood stream following trauma or some other exciting factor. The first evidence of a chemical substance producing shock was demonstrated in 1891 when Heidenhain (35) introduced peptone intravenously into animals and produced exhaustion, rapid pulse, and respiration, and low blood pressure.

Dale and Laidlaw (22) in 1910 introduced histamine intravenously and produced a similar but more shock-like effect through its vasodilatation action on the capillaries and arterioles.

During the World War, according to Cannon (17), both French and English reported that shock was associated with tissue injury and even here shock did not come on promptly but came only after delay.

Quenu (56) in 1918 showed that any means employed to delay or prevent absorption from the injured part delayed or prevented the development of shock.

McNee (42) showed that the application of a tourniquet to a badly smashed leg or amputation of the leg led to rapid and maintained improvement. Bayliss and Cannon (14), experimenting on dogs, showed that tissue damage led to a gradual drop in blood pressure, resulted in recovery of the patient when the injured region was isolated from the rest of the body, and resulted in failure of the blood pressure to fall as the vessels to the injured region were blocked so congestion developed.

Dale, Laidlaw, and Richards (23) have shown that hist-



amine occurs in tissue and when injected in minute amounts it reduces the amount of circulating blood and lowers the blood pressure. The effects in the above work of Bayliss and Cannon are believed to be analagous to the hypotensive effect in this experiment.

McIvar and Haggert (41) were able to induce shock in a second cat by crossed circulation from a cat in which tissues were damaged.

Sir Thomas Lewis (40), working on the skin, found that mechanical, electrical, photo, and chemical stimulation liberated a histamine-like substance which caused redness, edema, and sometimes bled formation. He believed that this vasodilator or substance was liberated by the irritated vascularized portion of the epithelium and that in extensive irritation of the skin, this vasodilator substance was poured into the blood stream and general circulatory changes resulted. When persons with urticaria factitia are treated by extensive stroking and combing the face becomes flushed, there is a general rise in skin temperature, and a small temporary fall in blood pressure. It is believed that deeper tissues would respond the same. This experiment indicated, in the opinion of the author, that circulatory fail-

ure in extensive injury results from liberation of a histamine-like substance to the general circulation. On the other hand considerable work has been done which does not support the traumatic toxemia theory.

Thorpe (65) found that skeletal muscle contains an exceedingly small amount of histamine. Smith (64) and Parsons and Phemister (52) were unable to determine any toxic substance. They attributed the low blood pressure to the extravasation into smashed tissue. Blalock, Beard, and Johnson (9) found the same to be true.

In 1930 Simonart (61) confirmed the onset of shock following muscle damage but inferred that the fall in pressure was caused by afferent impulses from the injured areas. He cut the afferent nerves and the fall in blood pressure did not occur. This finding supports the nerve impulse idea which will be discussed later.

Parsons and Phemister (52) hammered the lower extremity of thirty-five animals and found a lowered blood pressure, increased pulse rate, accelerated and shallow respiration. If these findings were due to a toxic substance massage of the traumatized limb might have forced out more toxic material and produced a still further lower-

ing of the blood pressure. This was not found to be true. The concentration of the blood was determined in these animals in search of evidence of traumatic toxemia. Blood counts were made from the ears. The red cells and hemoglobin were found to be reduced. At no time was there any evidence found of concentration of capillary blood. The blood from the traumatized limb was directed to the good limb and no vasodilatation and fall in general blood pressure was noted. After the limb was hammered and the blood pressure dropped, the limb was bled. Death was produced when only a small amount of blood was taken. When the low pressure was due to histamine injection much more blood could be taken before death resulted. These findings fail to demonstrate that either hemolyzed or extravasated blood returning to the circulation or a toxin is the explanation of the low blood pressure of the traumatized animal and favor hemorrhage as the cause.

To determine if a toxic substance could be found in devitalized muscle which gave rise to shock the right rectus muscle was implanted in other dogs and observed for three weeks. No signs of intoxication were noted at any time. Parsons and Plemister (52).

Parsons and Phemister (52) did some work on the chemical control of circulation and found that vasodilatation is not due to a histamine-like substance liberated from broken down cells. They came to this conclusion in the following manner. When histamine was injected there was a marked and prolonged fall in blood pressure whereas very large amounts of extensively hemolyzed or severely traumatized blood, when circulated through a peripheral artery, did not lower the blood pressure and when circulated through a vein an initial fall in blood pressure for only one or two minutes was noted.

When a constrictor is applied to a limb the vessels of the limb constrict, on release of the constrictor there is dilatation. Anrep (2) believed that the dilatation may be due to the metabolites formed in the tissues during the period of constriction. Parsons and Phemister (52) perfused blood taken during the stage of dilatation back into the recovered limb and were unable to demonstrate any vasodilatation. These findings would tend to rule out Anrep's idea of metabolites being the cause of the dilatation. It seems logical to believe that the vasodilatation following the constriction might cause a drop in the blood pressure. After release of constrictors which were applied to the thigh and arm for fifteen

minutes there was no change noted in the blood pressure. Experiments were also done on animals in which either the femoral artery or the aorta was tied off or obstructed for varying lengths of time. No change in blood pressure was noted on their release. Neither was there any vasodilatation noted on release.

Dragstedt and Mead (24) approached the toxemia theory from the pharmacological side. They anesthetized dogs with ether and sodium barbital, and recorded blood pressure, cannulated the thoracic duct for collection of lymph. Then they traumatized the intestines, limbs, or both and produced shock. Samples of blood and lymph were collected and tested on isolated strips of guinea pig or by intravenous injection into an etherized, atropinized cat and noting the effect on blood pressure. The blood was centrifuged before testing, the lymph was tested directly. Their methods will detect histamine in concentration around 1:250,000. Nine experiments were run and in no instance was there any indication of a physiological substance being present. Other workers who took the blood from a traumatized extremity during shock and injected it into a normal animal and failed to produce a depressor effect are Smith in 1930, Schneider in 1930, Holt and MacDonald in 1934, and

O'Shaughnessy and Slome in 1934-5.

Slome and O'Shaughnessy (62) in 1935 did a number of experiments and came to the conclusion that the amount of depressor substance which can be extracted from tissue subjected to trauma is insufficient to produce the phenomenon of shock. Complete occlusion of the venous return from the limb failed to produce shock, perfusion of the traumatized limb failed to produce any evidence of the presence in the traumatized area of a vasodilator substance. No depressor toxin could be demonstrated in the systemic circulation of shocked animals, and post mortem appearance in animals dead from shock differs from those seen after death from histamine poisoning. Therefore they concluded that the toxemic theory of shock can not be substantiated.

Rome and Wilson (57) demonstrated that the depressor effect of injection of extracts of traumatized tissue recorded by some investigators as evidence of the toxic theory are due to blood coagulation and to particles of fat and tissue in these extracts.

Larson (39) commenting on the work of Cannon and Bayliss, says that it is obvious that ligation of the entire

traumatized extremity will prevent local fluid loss, and this favors the local fluid loss theory as strongly as the toxemia theory.

The general survey seems to show that the toxic factor certainly is not the proven cause of shock. All attempts to isolate such a factor have been fruitless. With our present experimental knowledge of the subject we cannot say that shock is due to a toxic substance. More conclusive work will have to be done before we can get such a fixed idea.

#### Nervous Theory

Malcolm (45) noted that in shock the arteries were overcontracted and assumed that the lessened capacity forced plasma out of the vessels into the tissues, but he did not explain the primary constriction. Seelig and Lyon (60) also found this vasoconstriction. Several years later Erlanger (26) found a vaso-constriction in all the types of experimental shock he studied. He suggested that the causative factor was a reduced circulation through the action of painful stimuli, and of a certain amount of hemorrhage into the vasoconstrictor mechanism.

Freeman, according to Cannon (17), believes that not

only pain but also cold, emotional excitement, asphyxia, and hemorrhage have one physical action in common. They evoke higher activity of the sympatho-adrenal system and cause a pronounced vasoconstriction except in the heart and skeletal muscle. Cannon (13) showed that continued pain, prolonged exposure to cold, persistent fear and other great emotional excitement, and restlessness act favorable to the induction of shock. These all involve special action of the nervous system.

Cannon and Britton (16) used animals manifesting sham rage. Under brief ether anesthesia the cerebral cortex was swiftly destroyed. When the cat recovered from the anesthesia it displayed a supreme degree of sham rage. The sympatho-adrenal system is stimulated in this way. The blood from fifteen of these experimental animals was tested and showed a drop in blood volume of 22%.

Freeman, in some unpublished work quoted from Cannon (27), lowered the blood volume as much as 27% by injecting adrenalin for two hours at a physiological rate of output from the glands in response to painful stimuli. Ergotoxine blocks the vasoconstrictor effect of both adrenalin and sympathetic nerve impulses. After ergotoxine neither adrenalin or sham rage caused a decrease



in blood volume. Clawing, lashing of the tail were present to show that the cat was in the pseudoaffective state. The conclusion was therefore, justified that sympatho-adrenal stimulation was responsible for the phenomenon.

Another test of hyperactivity of the sympatho-adrenal system was done by Cannon (17). He completely sympathectomized the animals. The blood volume failed to fall. At the end of five hours the blood pressure was still at the original level. When the sympathico-adrenal was present the blood pressure fell to a shock level in two to three hours, as the blood volume decreased. Absence of a reduction in blood volume in completely sympathectomized animals manifesting sham rage indicates that toxic factors are not operating. It could not be explained by local loss of fluids into traumatized tissue because in the experiments with sham rage the trauma was in the cranial cavity where swelling of tissue is limited. Also the damage to the brain in sympathectomized animals was the same as that in normal animals, yet the blood volume was not reduced. Neither a toxic factor, therefore, nor hemorrhagic factor was present.

Hartman (34) and others say that the sympathetico-adrenal system also dilates the blood vessels of skeletal muscles. The capillary bed is thus increased by the opening of primarily closed channels. The redistribution of blood thus affected is associated with an outpouring of fluids through the capillary walls to spaces between the muscle fibers. Cannon (17). But it is also ordinarily associated with muscle activity which would force the blood into the lymphatics and back to the general circulation. In the early stage of shock the arterioles are relaxed which means greater filtration pressure in the recipient capillary bed. Thus fluid and blood goes to the peri-vascular intermuscular spaces. Injured men move little so the fluid remains in the injured area. Thus the blood volume might be reduced by greater filtration into the muscle where there is vasodilatation than in the skin and viscera where there is vasoconstriction. In the stage of shock when the blood volume is reduced the increased capacity of the dilated vascular area in muscles which remain idle might play a significant part in the diminished return of blood to the heart.

Parsons and Plemister (52) stimulated the sciatic and the anterior crural nerve by forceps and faradic current. At the beginning of stimulation there was a rise in blood

pressure due to the Loven reflex. The rise was sustained as long as the stimulus was actively applied. In no case did they find a fall in blood pressure.

In an attempt to determine the role of the nervous system in animals where circulatory failure was produced by traumatizing the limb experiments were performed in which the limb was denervated before trauma and in others the nerves were left intact. Where the nerves of the limb were intact, hammering resulted in a fall in blood pressure, the amount being directly dependent upon the amount of injury. Where the nerves were cut there was no drop in blood pressure.

Brain injury rarely brings on shock, while in cervical and thoracic cord injury there is an immediate fall in blood pressure due to paralysis of the sympathetic system with a resultant vasomotor dilatation. In operations of the abdomen the blood pressure fell as soon as the operation was started and stayed down until the end of the operation at which time it came up. This was noted while working on the stomach, gallbladder, and lower abdomen. This is believed to support the neurogenic theory. Phemister and Livingston (54).

Intraabdominal manipulations, especially of the intestines, are said to cause dilatation and accumulation of blood in the mesentery. Phemister and Livingston (54) did not find intestinal congestion at autopsy, and moreover, the reaction was also noted more often when working on the stomach and gall bladder when the bowels were not disturbed than when the intestines were worked on. They believed that the vagi, sympathetic, and the intercostal-abdominal nerves to the peritoneum and abdominal wall are the pathways of the impulses. They believe, but have not proven, that vagi stimulation carries impulses to the medullary center.

Fluid loss was measured by Slome and O'Shaughnessy (63) in the same manner as Blalock did and found it not enough to say that it is the sole factor determining the decline in blood pressure. There, arterial supply of the limb was occluded prior to trauma. Fluid could not be lost in this case, since the limb was occluded of its blood supply, it was both ischemic and anesthetic, so nervous factors could not operate. No shock was produced during the period of occlusion. When blood was supplied to the limb by cross circulation, shock was produced.

Simonart (61) demonstrated that if the nerve was sectioned before trauma there was no shock produced. Slome and O'Shaughnessy (63) confirmed this finding and also found that similar protection could be obtained by continuous spinal anesthesia. They concluded that local toxin production plays no role in these experiments. They also believed that traumatic shock is caused by the operation of two factors: fluid loss in the traumatized area and nerve impulses from that area.

Slome and O'Shaughnessy (63) amputated the traumatized limbs of shocked animals and in most cases got a marked improvement in the condition of the animal. This improvement may be due to either the cessation of fluid loss or to removal of the source of origin of the nerve impulses. Records were taken of action currents on the nerves of traumatized limbs and compared with records from the opposite untraumatized limbs. No abnormal impulses were recognized for three-fourths to one hour after traumatization. After this interval of time almost a continuous barrage of impulses rapidly developed. These were shown to be centripetal afferent impulses. The absence of impulses for a period accords with the gradual decline in blood pressure which sets in at this time. This seems to be quite confirmatory of the nervous

theory.

In 1930 Parsons and Phemister (52) decided that reflex vasomotor paralysis or exhaustion did not account for the circulatory failure since intensive stimulation of somatic nerves produced elevation instead of a fall in blood pressure and equal amounts of trauma to denervated and innervated extremities produced the same amount of fall in pressure in each.

This survey seems to indicate that nervous factors have something to do in shock production. Certainly with the strong experimental evidence in favor of this theory it cannot be passed over lightly. The survey seems to show that there is more experimental results in favor of this theory than there is against it.

#### Plasma Exudation

Considerable experimental work has been done to support the view that local fluid loss or plasma exudation may be the cause of secondary shock. In 1930 Blalock (7) concluded that the increased weight of a limb can account for the loss of the circulating blood volume. At this time he also transfused normal animals with blood from a shocked animal and was unable to establish a toxic factor. Blalock and Parsons and Phemister (52) traum-

atized one of the hind limbs of a number of dogs. They noted that there was considerable fluid loss in the groin so the legs were amputated higher than usual, bisected and each hind leg weighed. They found that there was sufficient loss of blood into the injured part to account for the decline in blood pressure. The degree of injury determined whether plasma or blood was lost into the damaged tissue and it was also demonstrated that even when it was mainly a plasma loss from which the circulation suffered it could not be sufficient to cause death. Later Blalock (8) manipulated the intestines of twelve dogs and determined the fluid loss as follows: the dogs were weighed before the experiment, and after the experiment the fluid was sponged out of the peritoneal cavity and the dog was again weighed; the difference in weight between the intestines of the traumatized dogs and those of a normal dog of the same size were determined. This gave the amount of fluid lost from the circulating blood. The average loss was 3.98% of the body weight. The blood pressure was also decreased and there was hemoconcentration. Beard and Blalock (4), by intestinal manipulation in dogs, produced extensive visceral weeping of the visceral peritoneal surfaces that is an important causative factor in the resultant shock-like syndrome. They found a reduction in blood pressure to a shock level with

concentration of the blood and an outpouring of fluid similar in chemical composition to blood plasma.

Wilson and Roome (67) constricted the hind limbs of various dogs for two to twenty hours. Two-thirds of them died at intervals of from five to fifty-two hours after release of the constrictor. After release of the constrictor the legs swelled. The fluid was analyzed and found similar to blood plasma; the extremity gained in weight. The animal could be saved by amputation and transfusion but not by transfusion alone or by amputation alone. They concluded that the fall in blood pressure and death was due chiefly to the withdrawal of water and plasma from the general circulation to produce local swelling of the limb.

Plasma-like fluid is lost in a variety of conditions including burns, freezing, bile peritonitis, pneumonia, acute peritonitis, intestinal manipulation, externally strangulated colostomy loops, tissue autolyses in vivo, mesenteric obstruction, and release of a constrictor. The type of trauma can be thermal, chemical, bacterial, mechanical manipulation, and capillary injury due to inadequate circulation. (Harkins and Harmon 29,30,32.) They report three cases of externally strangulated



colostomy loops, all of which showed an enormous amount of serosanguinous material taken up by the dressing which resembles blood plasma. These patients had a reduced blood pressure. The loops were decompressed, fluid was given and the blood pressure came up.

Harkins and Roome (31) believe that if a simple crushed hand can display an increase in volume of several hundred cubic centimeters it is easy to conceive that a more extensive body injury could easily produce a change of several times as much. They maintain that extensive hemorrhage has long been recognized as shock producing; concealed hemorrhage into body cavities and hollow organs has been recognized but not diagnosed, whole concealed hemorrhage into the tissue spaces has not been universally considered as an important clinical cause of secondary shock.

The extensive concealed hemorrhage and plasma exudation in clinical cases substantiates the experimental observations of others that such local loss of fluid from the circulating blood stream is a factor of importance in production of secondary surgical shock or traumatic shock.

In crossed circulation experiments conducted by Bell,

Clark, and Cuthbertson (5) a leg of a cat was traumatized and then the blood from this leg was transfused to a recipient animal. There was a marked fall in blood pressure in the donor resulting in death. The blood pressure of the recipient remained practically unaffected. They also determined local fluid loss by comparing both hind quarters in regard to weight difference following trauma to one limb, and concluded that local fluid loss is a contributory if not the main cause of fall in blood pressure. The induction of this state, they stated, appears to be dependent on the integrity of the nervous paths to the injured area. Moreover, the crossed circulation experiment does not support the traumatic toxemic theory.

Parsons and Phemister (52) traumatized one hind limb of experimental animals and weighed both quarters and found an average weight increase somewhat more than that of the blood which, if withdrawn of the same weight, will result in death. The limb was examined and found to contain much more hemorrhage than edema. They say that it is preferable to speak of hemorrhage rather than shock or shock due to hemorrhage where acute loss of blood in wounds, whether closed or open, is the cause of marked circulatory embarrassment or failure.

In 1931 Harris and Blalock (33) showed that shock is not

associated with a general increase in capillary permeability and a loss of fluid throughout the body.

A summary of the above experimental work points to the fact that local fluid loss certainly does play a major role in shock production. Some work does not, however, support this idea. With our present knowledge of shock it seems that local fluid loss and nervous impulses are two factors which do play major roles in shock production. At least these two ideas have considerable experimental work to back them up. However, we must bear in mind that a toxic factor may alter the permeability of the capillaries so that the blood plasma may get out of the circulatory system and produce the local loss.

#### Possible Mechanism

With the previous review of what has been done both experimentally and clinically to reach a possible answer as to what the actual cause of shock is, one can see that the answer is rather vague. Without an actual knowledge of the cause of shock we certainly cannot explain the mechanism behind its production. In review of the various theories we found that each theory had its own mechanism of shock production. In this paragraph we want to

discuss the mechanism behind shock production after the blood pressure has fallen.

Meek (47) states that Gesell has showed that shock is often produced when the blood volume is reduced from 7-17%. The flow of blood through an organ may be reduced as much as 60% by reduction of the blood volume by 10%. The decreased blood volume results in a lowered alkali reserve. This is not the cause of shock but a secondary feature. This is followed by acidosis. The decreased carbon dioxide of the blood interferes with the unloading of oxygen from the hemoglobin and reduces the tonus of both the respiratory and cardio-vascular centers. This means a vicious circle for the initial loss of effective blood volume is now augmented by stasis in the smaller blood vessels due to loss of central tonus, local peripheral dilatation from the accumulation of acids, and capillary transudation because of damage from the lack of oxygen. The acid salts resulting from the decreased oxygen aid in reducing the volume of the blood stream by the withdrawal of fluids to the acid-laden cells. The problem of lost blood thus involves a great deal more than that lost by mere hemorrhage or extravasation. The latter may even be almost entirely masked by the fixation of fluids in the tissue cells.

Moon (51) says that two major factors are operative in the development of shock:

1. Atony and dilatation of the capillaries and venules in extensive visceral areas is the first factor. This leads to reduced blood volume, and retards the circulation. The oxygen to the tissues is reduced in proportion to the decreased volume flow of blood.

2. The second factor is anoxia. The accumulation of wastes due to deficient oxygenation will, of itself, result in atony and dilatation of minute vessels.


Either of the two above factors operating will bring the other into action. Thus a vicious circle is set up as is shown by the following diagram of Moon's. The essential mechanism in which the circulation becomes deficient is a difference in the volume of blood and the volume-capacity of the vascular system. The mechanism of origin must then be sought in:

1. Those factors which reduce the volume of blood-hemorrhage, transudation, loss by perspiration, vomiting, and diarrhea.

2. Those factors which increase the volume-capacity of the circulatory system-dilatation of capillaries. The same factor that does this may increase

the capillary permeability.

These two factors usually work together.



The vicious circle and associated factors

Austin (3) classifies acute circulatory failure on what he calls a physiological basis. The classification is as follows:

1. Hematogenous type in which there is decreased blood volume, vasoconstriction, decreased cardiac output, decreased in blood pressure.

2. Neurogenic type in which there is an immediate vasodilatation depending on a diminished constrictor tone due to action through the nervous system.

3. Vasogenic type in which vasodilatation is induced by agents acting directly on the vessels.

4. Cardiogenic type in which the primary disturbance is in the heart; here a venous engorgment results. It is also possible to have a combination of these. This classification is of very little help in getting at the mechanism. True enough it tells us what produces the drop in the blood pressure. The fault is that it does not tell us what factor or factors start the various systems to work or what stops them from working.

Moon and Morgan (49) have done much work on shock cases, not all of which were cases of traumatic shock. Nevertheless, the findings are similar. Regarding the mechanism of death in intestinal obstruction they came to the following conclusions:

1. The physiological disturbances following intestinal obstruction are those usually seen in the shock syndrome.

2. Gross and microscopic visceral changes are identical with those which accompany shock produced by various means. They are distention and engorgement of capillaries and venules, edema and ecchymosis of the lungs and gastrointestinal mucosa and effusion into the serous cavities. Evidence of injury to the capillaries is seen in the capillary hemorrhages, the formation of edema fluid of high protein content and the rapidity with which colloidal dyes escape from the blood into the tissues.

3. The probable cause of the shock syndrome following intestinal obstruction is intoxication by histamine absorbed from the obstructed bowel. Any of the agents alone will produce the shock-like syndrome in animals.

4. Intestinal obstruction is one of the many conditions which will produce characteristically the shock syndrome.



### Pathology

As regards the pathology of shock little has been done. Moon and his associates are practically the only workers who have done anything in this line. Necropsy of shock cases showed the following findings. The superficial veins were collapsed and bloodless, the blood in the heart, large vessels and parenchyma of the organ was dark and cyanotic, there was ecchymosis and the blood and blood-tinged fluid in the cavities in severe cases. The bowels were atonic, relaxed and distended, mesenteric vessels were engorged. The mucosa was congested, edematous and frequently contained ecchymosis. The lungs were congested. Microscopically the capillaries were distended, the venules were engorged, hemorrhage from capillaries was numerous. The liver and kidneys were congested, the cells showed parenchymatous degeneration. The spleen usually had less blood than normal. The heart was a purplish cyanotic color, the venules and capillaries of the myocardium was engorged. Moon (49,51).

Referring to the above Moon says "these circulatory phenomena are the same in character as seen in early acute inflammation, and their mechanism or origin is similar. The results from systemic effects of various agents which cause dilatation and increase permeability

of the walls of the capillaries and venules. Such vascular changes result in the sequestration of blood in the minute vessels and the transudation of plasma, thereby producing edema, reducing the blood volume and increasing its concentration. This combination of results reduces both the effective and the total blood volume".

The Medical Research Council showed that circulatory failure is not due to cardiac or vasomotor inefficiency. The vasomotor mechanism is active and the peripheral arteries are not atonic but are maximally contracted. They thought that wound shock resulted from the absorption of injurious substances from the traumatized tissue. Moon's observation of necropsies supports this.

### Clinical Picture

#### Symptomatology

Without a thorough knowledge of what the shock syndrome presents clinically it would be practically impossible to say whether a patient is in shock or not.

Makel (44) describes the clinical pictures as follows: increased pulse rate, low blood pressure, exposed parts pale, and a tinge of cyanosis is often noted, sweating,

complaints of thirst, restlessness, and increased respiratory rate. Following injury a patient with a systolic blood pressure of one hundred should be considered as being in potential shock. When the systolic blood pressure goes below ninety mm. of mercury the patient is in actual shock and treatment should be instituted. A patient in shock may have a slow pulse (70-80), therefore the pulse rate should not mislead the examiner. The temperature as a rule is sub-normal. In severe shock there is often an early leucocytosis. It should be understood that the above symptoms are not present until several hours after injury or whatever the causative factor may be in the individual case. Besides the symptoms mentioned above Mahaffey (43) includes a rapid, thready pulse as a rule, respirations, besides being increased in rate are shallow, superficial, feeble, and irregular or gasping, and the exposed parts, besides being cold, are moist. The patient may be unconscious. If conscious he is dull, listless, and expressionless, and often displays muscular relaxation. The pupils are dilated and react slowly. There may be involuntary micturation.

### Laboratory Findings

Hemoconcentration has already been mentioned as a constant finding in shock. It is an early finding. Other laboratory findings include (Moon 50) a diminished renal excretion and a lowered basal metabolic rate. Later, the coagulability and oxygen of the blood are decreased, blood chlorides are below normal and the blood non-protein nitrogen and blood sugar are increased. It has been suggested that the diminished renal excretion is due to the lowered renal function incident to anoxemia or to hemoconcentration. Likewise, some workers feel that the high blood non-protein nitrogen may be due to decomposition of protein in the tissues. Early in shock the white cell count is low, later a moderate leucocytosis is present. As regards sodium-potassium level in shock, Bisgard (6) produced traumatic shock in dogs and came to the conclusion that there was no consistent alteration of serum sodium, or potassium. The same was found to be true of blood chlorides.

### When Is Patient In Shock?

Naturally there is no definite line between being in shock and not being in shock. Just as in any other abnormal condition of the body the symptoms vary with the individual. For that reason we cannot say that

below one particular blood pressure reading the patient is in a state of shock. However, Clement (18) divides surgical shock due to anesthesia into three degrees. He bases this classification on the degree of fall in blood pressure and increase in pulse rate. In the first degree are those cases with a fifteen per cent decrease in pulse rate without an increase in blood pressure or a ten per cent decrease in blood pressure without a decrease in pulse rate. When in second degree shock they have a twenty five per cent increase in pulse rate plus a ten to twenty five per cent increase in blood pressure. Those in third degree shock have a pulse rate of one hundred and ascending plus progressively falling blood pressures reaching eighty mm. mercury systolic or less and a pulse pressure of twenty mm. mercury or less and progressively diminishing. This is McKesson's shock index. The first and second degrees are not fatal. The third may be fatal.

Makel (44), as stated beforehand, declares a patient in potential shock when the systolic blood pressure gets down to one hundred mm. mercury. When the systolic blood pressure gets below ninety mm. mercury, the patient is in actual shock.

## Differential Diagnosis

Shock should not be confused with hemorrhage. In both the pulse and respirations are slow, the temperature subnormal, and the blood pressure diminished, but following hemorrhage the blood concentration is unchanged at first but soon is lowered as fluids are absorbed from the tissue into the blood. In hemorrhage there is no retention of nitrogen products, no hematuria, the coagulability of the blood is not affected characteristically, and there is no tendency to diarrhea and vomiting.

When fluids are supplied therapeutically they are retained. In shock the hemoconcentration is present before the circulatory inefficiency manifests itself. Fluid is not absorbed from the tissues and if injected passes out rapidly. The vomitus and excreta contain hemoglobin and albumin. At necropsy the viscera is congested and edematous and contains hemorrhage from the capillaries in shock, whereas in hemorrhage the tissues are pale, dry and anemic. In addition Mahaffey (43) mentions the fact that in hemorrhage there is impaired vision, restlessness, anxiety, thirst, nausea, and increased pulse rate, all of which appear slowly. In shock the symptoms appear rapidly.

## Treatment

### Prevention And Treatment

With the above knowledge we can direct treatment toward the possible causes. The actual cause is still in doubt, nevertheless we have numerous theories regarding cause. We can attempt to eliminate what we think are causative factors. It is far easier to prevent shock in most cases than it is to overcome it once it is present.

Shock frequently develops following accidents which do some bodily damage such as producing fractures or considerable soft tissue injury. Since fractures produce trauma all fractures should be splinted at the site of fracture. Exposure should be guarded against. The patient should be kept warm. Where there is excess pain morphine should be given hypodermically. Head injury should be put to bed, made comfortable, kept warm, and not disturbed by immediate X-ray. The same general plan should be followed in all accident cases--rest, eliminate pain, keep warm.(Perkins 53.)

In the operating room there are four contributing factors to the onset of shock: prolonged deep anesthesia, hemorrhage, manipulation of abdominal contents, and prolonged operating time. Preventative measures should therefore be directed toward eliminating the contributing factors

as much as possible. The lightest plane of anesthesia possible to work in should be maintained. Operating time should be cut down but efficiency should not be sacrificed for speed. The patient should be examined before operation and evaluated as to what his chances of surgical success are. During the operation the pulse pressure and pulse rate should be taken routinely. (Clement 18.)

If the patient has been dehydrated preoperatively because of vomiting, high fever, sweating, frequent enemata, the fluids should be replaced before the operation is started. Fluids should be given continuously during the operation. Before the operation is begun a needle should be put in the antecubital fossa or a canula inserted through a small longitudinal incision in the skin at the beginning of the great saphenous vein just above the medial malleolus of the ankle. Forty to sixty drops of five per cent glucose in normal saline per minute is recommended. When there has been much vomiting and chloride loss one and five tenths per cent saline is substituted for the nine tenths per cent. The dextrose is nutritive, anti-ketogenic, and stimulating. (Trimble 66.)

Coller (19) says that about one thousand cc of fluid is lost during an operation and the first four hours



after. Furthermore, the basic fluid requirement daily is about three thousand cc. Thus, to keep a balance, at least three thousand cc. are needed daily. The fear of embarrassing the heart by giving saline or glucose is unfounded. Infusions given at the rate of one thousand cc. per thirty minutes means only six minims passing through the ventricle at each systole. Therefore, it is difficult to conceive that the heart is being over burdened.

When the systolic blood pressure falls below ninety mm. mercury blood loss should be strictly guarded against since a very small loss may be serious here. In low or declining blood pressure gas-oxygen anesthesia should be given surgical cases rather than ether or chloroform. Deep ether anesthesia decreases the ability to withstand hemorrhage. In case of much blood loss spinal anesthesia should not be used. The vasodilatation will produce a further decline in pressure. (Blalock 11.)

Sir Stanton Hicks (37) lists the treatment and the prevention of shock under three headings:

1. Maintenance of the circulatory blood volume.
2. Avoidance of extra demands up on the circulation.

3. Mitigation or avoidance of any influences likely to stimulate the sympathetico-adrenal system or to undermine the metabolic resistance of the tissue cells.

Under the first heading we are concerned with dehydration and osmotic pressure of the plasma proteins. Most workers agree that five per cent dextrose in normal saline works well here. The only drawback to it is that it will not stay in the circulatory bed very long. Many agree that six per cent gum acacia in nine-tenths per cent saline is retained well, however, some feel that the acacia is kept in the system too long. Sarma (59) found that acacia leaves the blood stream in about six days, is detected in the urine immediately after injection, and may be found in the blood and urine as long as ten to fourteen days after administration. Basing his reasoning on these findings and on the fact that it has the same viscosity as whole blood and the same osmotic pressure as the plasma, Sarma feels that acacia solution is a desirable substance to use in the treatment of shock. All workers do not agree. Anderich and Gibson (1) showed large proportions of acacia deposited in the hepatic cells of the liver. Hall (28), experimenting on dogs, showed an impairment of liver function in carbohydrate and plasma protein metabolism.

Under the second heading are placed those measures taken to insure warmth and to prevent any movements either due to pain or apprehension of the subject yet unaware of the danger of his condition. Quietness is essential. It is necessary to bear in mind the effect of overheating because the increased flow of blood to the skin, brought about by the heat regulatory mechanism, may, in severe cases of depleted circulatory volume, further diminish the cardiac filling and lower the blood pressure. It is only necessary to prevent heat loss. Heat need not be applied. Under the third heading are included such influences as are known to predispose to shock. These are exposure to cold, starvation, and prolonged anesthesia.

If the early stage of shock is recognized and the diagnosis is certain, (Coller 19), morphine can be given as a preventative. It stops the movements due to pain which are likely to increase the loss of blood or plasma into the damaged area and to increase the demands upon the heart due to muscular response and emotional interference with the cardiac rate while it lessens the activity of the sympathetic system and consequent vasoconstriction. It depresses the respiratory center and therefore is dangerous. Later shock is developed and the respiratory center is depressed by anoxemia. Mahaffey (43) believes

in giving morphine in small doses to relieve pain, restlessness, nervousness, and to stimulate the heart.

Besides giving glucose intravenously he gives normal saline or five per cent glucose in saline per rectum. Hot tea and coffee are given if the patient can drink.

Small transfusions of three hundred to four hundred cc of blood is the method of choice of replacing fluids to raise blood pressure. Aside from morphine Mahaffey finds other drugs useful. Atropine is given for the moist skin.

Neo-synephrine hydrochloride given subcutaneously or intramuscularly has a more lasting effect in raising the blood pressure than has pituitrin, ephedrine or epinephrine.

A patient in shock should be handled very little. Shifting the circulating blood suddenly can so interfere with the venous return as to cause circulatory collapse. Hicks (37).

Bond and Wright (12) recommend using intravenous lyophile serum in the treatment of hemorrhage and traumatic shock. Blood is rapidly frozen and is rapidly dehydrated from the frozen state under a high vacuum. It is readily dissolved in water to make an isotonic or hypertonic solution. Because of its rapid solubility it is called "lyophile".

The immediate availability, its theoretical suitability, and its immediate action upon shocked animals suggests its use as a valuable treatment for clinical shock.

The anesthetic may be the causative factor. When the blood pressure and pulse indicate the approach of shock the anesthesia should be lightened. The Depression test should be applied. That is, the oxygen content of the mixture should be increased. A reversal of the systolic pressure upward indicates a positive test and means that the depression has been due, in part at least, to too deep anesthesia. No change in blood pressure would indicate that the depression is due to factors other than the anesthesia and would call for other measures in treatment. Clement (18).

In conclusion, we can attempt to prevent shock by:

1. Proper treatment of emergencies--avoidance of excessive trauma, pain, exposure.
2. Proper preoperative and postoperative care and avoidance of prolonged deep anesthesia, hemorrhage, excessive manipulation of abdominal contents, and prolonged operating time.
3. Recognizing circulatory deficiency before it is fully developed by hemoconcentration.

Once shock has developed the treatment is very similar to that mentioned above:

1. Morphine in small doses to relieve pain, restlessness, nervousness.
2. Keep the patient warm.
3. Supply intravenous to raise blood pressure.
4. Quiet is essential.
5. Drugs, other than morphine, are of little importance. Vasoconstricting drugs produce only a temporary rise in blood pressure.

## Bibliography

1. Andersch, M. & Gibson, R. B.: Studies on intravenous injections of colloids, J. Pharm. and Exper. Ther., 52:390-407, 1934.
2. Anrep, G.V.: Quoted by Starling in Principles of Human Physiology, London, J. and A. Churchill, 1926.
3. Austin, T. R.: A consideration of the mechanism and treatment of surgical shock, U.S. Navel Bull., 35:426-434, Oct. 1937.
4. Beard, J.W. and Blalock, A.: The composition of the fluid that escapes from the tissues after trauma to the intestines and after burns, Arch. Surg., 22:617-625, April 1931.
5. Bell, J.R., Clark, A.M. and Cuthbertson, D.P.: Experimental traumatic shock, J. Physiol., 92: 361-370, May 1938.
6. Bisgard, J.D.: Studies of sodium, potassium, and chlorides of blood serum in experimental traumatic shock, Surgery, 4:528-547, Oct. 1938.
7. Blalock, A.: Experimental shock--the cause of low blood pressure produced by muscle injury, Arch. Surg., 20:959-996, June 1930.
8. Blalock, A.: Trauma to the intestines; importance of local loss of fluid in production of low blood pressure, Arch. Surg., 22:314-324, Feb. 1931.
9. Blalock, A., Beard, J.W. and Johnson, G.S.: Experimental shock; its study of its production and treatment, J.A.M.A., 97:1794-1797, Dec. 1931.
10. Blalock, A. and Johnson, G.S.: Mechanism and treatment of experimental shock; shock following hemorrhage, Arch. Surg., 15:762-798, Nov. 1927.
11. Blalock, A.: A consideration of the causes and treatment of shock associated with injury

to tissue, Internat. Clin., 1:144-165,  
Mar. 1933.

12. Bond, D.D. and Wright, D.G.: Treatment of hemorrhage and traumatic shock by intravenous lyophilic serum, Ann. Surg., 107:500-510, April 1938.
13. Cannon, W.B. and Bayliss, W.M.: Rep. shock comm., Med. Research Council, 26:19-23, 1919. Quoted by Blalock (11).
14. Cannon, W.B. and Bayliss, W.M.: Rep. shock comm., Med. Research Council, 26:23-27, 1919. Quoted by Blalock (11).
15. Cannon, W.B.: Traumatic shock, New York, D.Appleton & Co., 1923.
16. Cannon, W.B. and Britton, S.W.: Ibid, 172:283, 1925. Quoted by Cannon (17).
17. Cannon, W.B.: A consideration of possible toxic and nervous factors in the production of traumatic shock, Ann. Surg., 100:704-713, Oct. 1934.
18. Clement, F.W.: Shock and some associated factors, Anesth. and Analg., 16:271-274, Sept.-Oct. 1937.
19. Collier, F.A.: The water requirements of surgical patients, Ann. Surg. 98:952-960, Nov. 1933.
20. Crile, G.W.: Surgical shock, Philadelphia, J.B.Lippincott Co., 1927.
21. Crile, G.W.: Anociassociation, London, W.B.Saunders Co., 1914.
22. Dale, H.H. and Laidlaw, P.P.: The physiological action of beta-aminazolylyl-ethylamine, J. Physiol., 41:318-344, 1910-1911.
23. Dale, H.H., Laidlaw, P.P. and Richards, A.N.: The action of histamine--its bearing on traumatic toxemia as a factor in shock, J. Physiol., 52:355-360, 1919.



24. Dragstedt, C.A. and Mead, F.B.: A pharmacological study of the toxemia theory of surgical shock, J.A.M.A., 108:95-96, Jan. 1937.
25. Erlanger, J., Gesell, R., Gasser, H.S., Elliott, B.L.: Surgical shock, J.A.M.A., 69:2089-2090, 1917.
26. Erlanger, J. and Gasser, H.S.: Studies in secondary traumatic shock, Am. J. Physiol. 49:90-115, July 1919.
27. Ewing, E.W.: The nature of shock, Ann. Surg., 59: 158-170, 1914.
28. Hall, W.N.: Effects of intravenous injections of acacia in certain functions of the liver, Proc. Soc. Exper. Biol. and Med., 38:46-48, Feb. 1938.
29. Harkins, H.N.: Shock due to freezing, Proc. Soc. Biol. and Med., 32:432-434, 1934. and Thermal injuries, J. Clin. Invest., 16: 213-221, Mar. 1937.
30. Harkins, H.N.: Surgical shock from burns, freezing and similar traumatic agents, Colo. Med., 33:871-876, Dec. 1936.
31. Harkins, H.N. and Roome, N.W.: Concealed hemorrhage into tissue and its relation to traumatic shock, Arch. Surg., 35:130-138, July 1937.
32. Harkins, H.N. and Harmon, P.H.: Plasma exudation, Ann. Surg., 106:1070-1081, Dec. 1937.
33. Harris, P.N. and Blalock, A.: Experimental shock; observations on the water content of the tissues of the body after trauma and after hemorrhage, Arch. Surg., 22:638-648, April 1931.
34. Hartman, F.A.: The differential effects of adrenin on splanchnic and peripheral arteries, Amer. J. Physiol., 38:438-455, Oct. 1915.
35. Heidenhan: Arch. f.d.ges. Physiol., 49:252-254, 1891. Quoted by Parsons and Phemister (52).

36. Henderson, Y.: Acapnia and shock, Am. J. Physiol., 21:128-132, 1908.
37. Hicks, S.: Physiology of acute circulatory failure due to hemorrhage and trauma, Australian and New Zealand J. of Surg., 7:99-110, Oct. 1937.
38. Holt, R.L.: Discussion on traumatic shock, Proc. Roy. Soc. Med., 28:1473-1496, Sept. 1935.
39. Larson, H.: Secondary vascular shock, Kentucky Med. J., 36:281-284, July 1938.
40. Lewis, Sir Thomas: The blood vessels of the human skin and their responses, London, Shaw and Sons, 1927.
41. McIvar, M.A. and Haggart, W.W.: Traumatic shock--some experimental work on crossed circulation, 36:542-546, 1923.
42. McNee, J.W., Sladden, A.F. and McCartney, J.E.: Rep. shock comm., Med. Research Comm., 26:33-35, 1919. Quoted by Gannon (17).
43. Mahaffey, H.K.: Symptoms and control of traumatic shock, Kentucky Med. Journal, 36:137-142, April 1938.
44. Makel, H.P.: Shock, Mil. Surgeon, 80:436-447, June 1937.
45. Malcolm, J.D.: The nature and treatment of surgical shock, Tr. M. Soc. London, 32:274-306, 1909.
46. Mann, F.C.: Shock during anesthesia, J.A.M.A., 69:371-373, 1917.
47. Moon, V.H. and Morgan, D.R.: Mechanism of death following obstruction, Arch. Surg., 32:776-788, May, 1936.
48. Meltzer, S.J.: The nature of shock, Arch. Int. Med., 1:571-588, 1908.
49. Moon, V.H.: Shock, its mechanism and pathology, Arch. Path., 24:642-663, Nov; 794-813, Dec. 1937.

50. Moon, V.H.: Shock--a definition and differentiation, Arch. Path., 22:325-335, Sept. 1936.
51. Moon, V.H.: Shock and related capillary phenomenon, New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1938.
52. Parsons, E. and Phemister, D.B.: Hemorrhage and shock in traumatized limb, Surg., Gynec. and Obst., 51:196-207, Sept. 1930.
53. Perkins, P.A.: Traumatic shock, Jour. Tenn. Med. Ass., 28:461\*464, Nov. 1935.
54. Phemister, D.B. and Livingston, H.: Primary shock, Ann. Surg., 100:714-727, Oct. 1934.
55. Porter, W.T.: Fat embolism a cause of shock, Boston Med. and Surg. Jour., 176:248-249, Feb. 1917.
56. Quenu, E.: Rev. de Chirur., 56:204-205, 1918. Quoted by Cannon (41).
57. Roome, N.W. and Wilson, H.: Experimental shock; effects of extracts from traumatized limbs on blood pressure, Arch. Surg., 31:361-370, Sept 1935.
58. Roome, N.W.: Unified theory of etiology of shock, Anesth. and Analg., 17:237-239. July-Aug. 1938.
59. Sarma, P.I.: Hypertonic solutions, S. Clin. North America, 16:281-286, Feb. 1936.
60. Seelig, M.G. and Lyon, E.P.: Further experimental data on vasomotor relation of shock, Surg., Gynec. and Obst., 11:146-150, 1910. Quoted by Cannon (17).
61. Simonart, A.: Arch. Internat. de Pharmacodyn et de Therap., 37:269-303, 1930. Quoted by Cannon (17).
62. Slome, D. and O'Shaughnessy, L.: Etiology of traumatic shock, Brit. J. Surg., 22:589-618, Jan. 1935.
63. Slome, D. and O'Shaughnessy, L.: The nervous factors in

traumatic shock, Brit. J. Surg., 25:900-909, April, 1938.

64. Smith, M.I.: Studies in experimental shock with special reference to its treatment, J. Pharmacol. and Exper. Therap., 32:465-508, April 1928.
65. Thorpe, W.V.: Vasodilator constituents of tissue extracts, Biochem. Jour., 22:94-101, 1928.
66. Trimble, I.D.: The prevention and treatment of surgical shock, So. Med. Jour., 30:876-880, Sept. 1937.
67. Wilson, H. and Roome, N.W.: The effects of constriction and release of an extremity, Arch. Surg., 32:334-345, Feb. 1936.