Miscellaneous.

Brief Observations on Some Conditions in Women that are of Much Concern to the Practitioner.—J. RIDGLY SIMMS, A.M., M.D., Racine, Wisconsin.

The conditions of which I wish to speak are dysmenorrhea, and the state following miscarriage or abortion, in which there are retained portions of the placenta and membranes that require removal or expulsion.

For lack of space, I shall devote myself, in the present paper, chiefly to dysmenorrhea, and will dismiss the condition following abortion with a few remarks, which may as well precede the other part of my article. I reserve for a future communication the detailed discussion of this important and interesting clinical condition.

The effects of retained placental or fetal tissue in a partially successful miscarriage or abortion consist in hemorrhages, purulent discharge, enlargement of the uterus, subinvolution, metritis, endometritis and sepsis. The indications in these cases are, therefore, the thorough emptying of the uterus and the rendering of the womb-cavity aseptic.

In ordinary cases this must be done by surgical interference, including curetting and the removal of all decomposing and diseased tissue, followed by the application of antiseptics to the endometrium. There is a class of cases, however, in which, for one reason or another, curettage is refused by the patient, and in which it is incumbent upon the physician to give what relief he can by medical means. In such cases I have prescribed Ergoapiol (Smith), a combination of the active principles of ergot (ergotine) parsley (apiol) and certain other emmenagogues and uterine tonics. In one case of this kind which came under my observation some months ago, I used Ergoapiol (Smith) with such marked success, that I learned since then to rely upon this preparation in removing the retained fragments from the uterus, emptying the organ and reducing it to its normal size and functions. The remedy in question has proved so trustworthy in my hands in these cases, that when it disappoints, which it rarely does, I look about to ascertain wherein I myself have erred.

A discussion of the causes of dysmenorrhea would lead us too far in the present brief clinical paper, and it will suffice if I assume that the reader is acquainted sufficiently with this part of the subject to follow me in the remainder of the article. The clinical diagnosis of dysmenorrhea is in itself easy enough, while the diagnosis of the cause is not always so simple. In the cases presented here I paid especial attention to the causation of the menstrual pain, as I believe that in this manner I