

In all, nine cases have been treated, and in all the results were good.

For the treatment of the class of cases described, naphthalin is certainly superior to iodoform. Both agents appear to act equally well up to the time that the tissues become antiseptic, but afterwards their action is different. Iodoform, after this stage in the treatment is reached, appears frequently to do more harm than good; it makes the granulations flabby. Naphthalin, on the other hand, on account of its stimulating properties, promotes the healing of antiseptic wounds.

If, in the treatment of an ulcer, all that is required is an antiseptic action, then both agents act equally well; but if, in addition to an antiseptic action, a slightly stimulating one is required, which is frequently the case in ulcers in broken-down people, then naphthalin is to be preferred.

Naphthalin possesses another important advantage over iodoform, in its being a much cheaper agent.

Compared with carbolic acid, it is just as powerful, and probably less irritating. It is free from grave untoward effects. It, however, in common with iodoform, possesses the great disadvantage of being insoluble in water, and therefore useless for spray and irrigation purposes.