Tröhler U (2010). The introduction of numerical methods to assess the effects of medical interventions during the 18th century: a brief history.

© Ulrich Tröhler, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (ISPM), University of Bern, Finkenhubelweg 11, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland, Email: utroehler@ispm.unibe.ch

Cite as:

Tröhler U (2010). The introduction of numerical methods to assess the effects of medical interventions during the 18th century: a brief history. JLL Bulletin: Commentaries on the history of treatment evaluation (www.jameslindlibrary.org). [Brief history]

Although numerical approaches were used by John Graunt to analyse patterns of mortality in 17th century London (Graunt 1662), it was not until the early 18th century that numbers began to be used to assess the effects of medical interventions (Nettleton 1722a,b,c; Nettleton 1722; Jurin 1723; Boylston 2010). This development occurred chiefly, but not exclusively, in Britain (Tröhler 1978; 1981; Lilienfeld 1982; Warner 1986; Tröhler 1988; Rosser Matthews 1995; Maehle 1999; Borsay 2000; Tröhler 2000; Tröhler and Prüll 2001; Rusnock 2002; 2003; 2005; Edwards 2007). In 1731, for example, Francis Clifton published a book entitled *Tabular observations recommended as the plainest and surest way of practising and improving physick* (Clifton 1731), followed by a work entitled *The state of physick, ancient and modern, briefly considered: with a plan for the improvement of it* (Clifton 1732). Clifton pointed out that, instead of assessing the worth of therapies by whether they accorded with theories, physicians needed to base their judgements about the effects of treatments on a sufficient number of their own (or otherwise testified) observations, organised in tables.

Clifton was followed later in the 18th century by others emphasising similar principles: for example, William Hillary's *Inquiry into the means of improving medical knowledge* (Hillary 1761); Thomas Percival's commentary on the 'dogmatist' and the 'empiricist' physician in his *Essays medical and experimental* (Percival 1767); John Gregory's *Observations on the duties and offices of a physician* (Gregory 1772); James Sims' *Discourse on the best method of prosecuting medical enquiries* (Sims 1774); a section in John Aiken's *Thoughts on hospitals* (Aiken 1777); Thomas Kirkland's *Inseparability of the different branches of medicine* (Kirkland 1783); an anonymous author's contribution to *Medical Observations and Inquiries* in 1784; Gilbert Blane's *Observations on the diseases incident to seamen* (Blane 1785); and George Fordyce's *An attempt to improve the evidence of medicine* (Fordyce 1793), which was published in the *Transactions of a Society for the Improvement of Medical and Chirurgical Knowledge.*

Of course, there is a difference between calls for numerical methods to be applied and actually applying them. However, the principles enunciated by Clifton and others were applied widely in civilian practice in Britain, as well as in the British armed forces.

The application of numerical approaches to documenting diseases and assessing medical interventions in 18th century Britain

The British medical literature contained many discussions of the need to document diseases and their treatments using numerical data derived from patients seen in civilian and military practice. Beginning in the 1720s, numerical methods were used to compare mortality after smallpox inoculation (variolation) with mortality after natural smallpox, in Britain, and in other parts of Europe, and in America (Rusnock 1996; 2002). Throughout the 18th century, writers prepared detailed numerical reports of their work and experience, and emphasised the need to use this type of information (see, for example, John Millar 1770, 1777, 1778-1779, 1798a, and 1798b; John Coakley Lettsom 1774 and 1775; John Clark 1780 and 1792; William Black 1782, 1788 and 1789; Edward Alanson 1782; Gilbert Blane 1785; William Withering 1785; William Falconer 1790; and John Rowley 1793). They insisted on the need not only for regularly kept summaries of patient records and for mass observation, but also for numerical analysis of these data. Other authors simply got on with doing it. While the first group clearly thought about what they were doing, the others may just have fallen in line with what was becoming the empirical tradition, or, later in the 18th century, may have used numerical data simply because, by then, this was "what was done". Numerical data were sometimes reported only in texts (see, for example, Lind 1753, 1762, 1763, and 1771; Faure 1759; Répertoire du register 1761; Bilguer 1764; James 1770; Home 1780; Alanson 1782; Withering 1785; and Haygarth 1800). From early in the 18th century, however, data were increasingly also being presented in tables, beginning with results of smallpox inoculation (Nettleton 1722, 1724; Jurin 1724; Scheuchzer 1729); The smallpox inoculation issue was probably the key to the use of what was later called the numerical method, i.e. counting and comparing, as this appealed not only in Britain but was also used on the continent and in America (Franklin 1759). In clinical medicine, the results of a new technique for amputating limbs were presented in tables (White 1770).

In his *Medical Memoirs of the General Dispensary* in London, John Coakley Lettsom (1774) published detailed information about his treatments in tables arranged by disease categories. John Millar (1777) did likewise with data from cases seen at the Westminster General Dispensary, as did John Clark (1780) after founding a dispensary in Newcastle–upon-Tyne. Clark's tables were further subdivided according to age, sex and the calendar month of the onset of the health problem. Alexander Gordon (1795) tabulated data gathered at the Aberdeen dispensary, modelling his reports on the tables of Lettsom and Millar.

James Currie (1797) tabulated data from patients admitted to the fever wards in the Liverpool Infirmary. Similar numerical analyses were published by other exponents of what has been called the late 18th century British "fever hospital movement", including John Haygarth (1784). Rice Charleton (1770) tabulated data by diagnosis when recording the progress of 1053 patients treated with the warm waters of Bath. Thomas Fowler (1785) used tabulated data to report the progress of 400 patients to whom he had administered tobacco, and others to whom he had administered arsenic for treating the ague (Fowler 1786). In 1795 a table of 78 cases backed up his conclusion that bleeding was only an auxiliary remedy in acute cases of rheumatism, and even less so in chronic cases (Fowler 1795).

In the Royal Navy, Robert Robertson (1777; 1783) and Gilbert Blane (1785; 1813) tabulated the diseases experienced by British sailors in Africa, the West Indies, North America and the English Channel, always indicating the number of deaths following given treatments, sometimes in comparative tables (Robertson 1777; 1783). John Clark (1780), when working as a naval surgeon for the East India Company, published very detailed tables of the diseases and fates of the sailors under his care.

In the Army, John Rollo (1780) may have been the first to use tables to give a detailed account of all the cases he had treated in a military hospital in Barbados. When he became chief of the Hospital of the Ordnance (artillery) at Woolwich, he published a hospital report based on the same principles (Rollo 1801). Thomas Dickson Reide's (1793) *View of the diseases of the Army* was full of tabular compilations and arithmetical calculations, as were James McGrigor's reports (1802; 1815).

Numerical data were quite often used to calculate simple ratios. For example, William Falconer (1790) compared the results of his practice in Bath with that of Rice Charleton (1770), published earlier, by calculating success:failure ratios. Some analyses were quite sophisticated. For example, John Haygarth, with the help “a mathematical friend”, calculated that if two people living together escaped continuous fever and/or smallpox, the probability that they had never been exposed to “an infectious quantity of the poison” was about 400 to 1; and if three persons in a family had escaped, this probability rose to above 8000 to 1 (Haygarth 1784). These probabilities “computed arithmetically by the doctrine of chances, according to the data” led him to advocate the immediate isolation of smallpox and fever patients in specific wards in Chester.

These and other hospital reports can be termed institutional investigations. They certainly had practical consequences. However, some writers also used institutional data explicitly to assess the effects of treatment.

Causal inferences about the effects of treatments based on numerical comparisons

Numerical data were used to make causal inferences about the effects of treatments from early in the 18th century. Discussions about variolation were informed by comparisons of mortality following variolation with mortality following naturally acquired smallpox (Nettleton 1722; Jurin 1724; Scheuchzer 1729). Some of the observers engaged in these discussions recognised that it was important to ensure that these comparisons were based on comparing like with like. For example, in challenging inferences about the effects of variolation, Isaac Massey, an apothecary at Christ’s Hospital, London, insisted that “to form a just Comparison… the Circumstances of the Patients, must and ought to be as near as may be on a Par” (Massey 1723).

Application of this principle in practice can be illustrated using William Cheselden’s observation that it was necessary to take the ages of patients into account when comparing case series reporting mortality associated with different methods of lithotomy. As early as 1740 he noted that "…what is of most consequence to be known is the ages of those who recovered, and those who died." (Cheselden 1740) He grouped 213 patients in 10-year age groups and reported the number of deaths for each group, thus showing the substantially lower mortality among children than in adults, as shown in the following table derived from Cheselden's text:

Age/Years	10 or under	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	Total
Operated	105	62	12	10	10	7	5	2	213
Died	3	4	3	2	2	4	1	1	20

In 1779, John Millar presented a tabulated account of “the comparative success of bleeding and cooling medicines, and of opium and the Peruvian bark” on “contagious fever” in Senegal. He insisted that “the stubborn evidence of arithmetical demonstration could not be shaken by argument”, and used a comparative table to show the supremacy of Peruvian bark (cinchona) over conventional bleeding and purging (Millar 1798a). Edward Alanson, a surgeon working in Liverpool, used ‘historical controls’ to assess the effects of using skin flaps to achieve primary closure of wounds after amputations (Alanson 1782). Robert Robertson compared Peruvian bark [cinchona], bleeding and antimonials in treating fevers (Robertson 1789), and John Ferriar tabulated a comparison of different treatments (mainly digitalis and cream of tartar [potassium bitartrate]) for different forms of dropsy (Ferriar 1792). John Clark (1792) used the surgeons’ day-books of the East India Company to compare the results of various treatments of ‘fevers’, as did John Millar (Millar 1778-1779).

In addition to these and other causal inferences about the effects of treatment comparisons based on retrospective analyses of numerical data, there are also examples based prospective experiments. James Lind’s account of his comparison of six treatments for scurvy is probably the best known of these (Lind 1753); less well known is Thomas Trotter’s demonstration that unripe guavas were more effective anti-scorbutics than ripe guavas (Trotter 1792). Some 18th century experiments were very sophisicated (Boylston 2008): William Watson used a beautifully designed prospective comparison to assess alternative ways of reducing the side effects associated with variolation (Watson 1768). Besides the smallpox work a trial of delayed versus immediate amputation (Faure 1759), and the refutation of mesmerism by Benjamin Franklin and the other members of a commission of the Académie Royale des Sciences in Paris (Commission Royale. Bailly A 1784) make clear that methodologically refined studies were also done prior to Louis in France. At the end of the century, again in England, John Haygarth conducted a single blind crossover trial on seven patients to assess whether Perkins’ metal ‘tractors’ had any more effect on symptoms than placebo tractors made of wood (Haygarth 1800). In prospective studies done during the Peninsular War, George Guthrie compared immediate versus delayed amputation of shattered limbs of wounded soldiers (Guthrie 1815), and Alexander Hamilton assessed the effects of bloodletting by alternating 366 sick soldiers to treatment with or without venesection (Hamilton 1816).

Were these numerical approaches recognised as important?

How were these numerical approaches to the assessment of medical interventions received in contemporary Britain? This question can be addressed by looking at the evidence presented during the first three decades of the 19th century. Some prominent contemporary British medical writers appear to have ignored these numerical approaches. For example, Tröhler (1978) was unable to find direct reference to numerical approaches in the lectures of Cullen or Gregory in Edinburgh, or those of John Hunter in London. Important figures of the London medical establishment around 1800, such as William Heberden and his son, though interested in vital statistics, did not mention or use numerical approaches when they wrote about treating diseases (Heberden 1772; 1802). On the other hand, the revival of bloodletting in the first decade of the 19th century was launched by a book in which the mortality of three regimens (no bleeding, moderate bleeding, and copious bleeding) were compared in the same disease in the same hospital (Sutton 1806). These analyses suggested that the more the lancet was used, the better were the results. As noted many years ago by Peter Niebyl (1977), this comparison was made “long before the famous work of Pierre Louis in France” (Niebyl 1977). The effectiveness of bloodletting was sustained, in the year after Sutton’s book, by another book written entirely without numerical data (Clutterbuck 1807), and in 1812 by one comparing mortalities (Mills 1813).

What did the medical journals of the time have to say about numerical assessments of medical interventions? The most important review journal of British medical literature was *Medical and Philosophical Commentaries* (published between 1774 and 1795, and then continued first as *Annals of Medicine* , then as the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* until 1855). It was published simultaneously in London, Edinburgh and Dublin, and had a wide circulation (Chalmers and Tröhler 2000; Chalmers et al. 2010). The journal published reviews of many of the books to which we have referred. John Clark’s books were included twice, the second time with some very flattering remarks (Medical and Philosophical Commentaries 1774; 1780). The journal reviewed favourably several works which had employed numerical approaches, although it made no specific remarks on methodology. These included, for example, Thomas Percival’s numerical analyses of mortality in and around Manchester, John Coakley Lettsom’s work at the Aldersgate Dispensary, and William Black’s work on smallpox. By contrast, Thomas Fowler’s and William Withering’s works were the subject of repeated methodological comments concerning the use of numbers. The review of Gilbert Blane’s *Observations* was seventy pages long, and commented very favourably on his methodological programme using mass observation

(Medical and Philosophical Commentaries 1788). Haygarth was praised for calculating the probability of the contagiousness of typhus (Annals of Medicine 1803).

From 1805, the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* began to publish critical book reviews, not mere analyses. One such review described James Currie's *Medical Reports* (which had made extensive use of numerical data) as "one of the most valuable [books] which has ever been published... the style and manner should be imitated" (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1805a). Haygarth's *Clinical Histories of Diseases* (Haygarth 1805) was seen as one of the all too rare examples of a doctor taking the trouble to record his observations and, having accumulated a sufficient number, to arrange and then reduce them to a tabular state, intelligible to others (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1805b). When reviewing William Black's Dissertation on insanity (Black 1810), the editor of the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* (1811a) emphasised the need to subject assessment of remedies and modes of cure and prevention to "arithmetical proof."

On the other hand, failure to provide numerical evidence sometimes prompted questions about the author's claims of therapeutic success stated only in "general and equivocal terms". For example, the reviewer of a book by Jackson (1808) observed:

> *we are altogether at a loss to discover the comparative advantages of the practice of his own hands...we doubt whether he has made the comparative experiment so often, as to ascertain the effect [of his method of cure] (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1809a).*

Another review journal - *The London Medical Review* - included an analysis of the third edition of Blane's *Observations on the diseases incident to seamen*. Blane's methods were seen as having set an example worthy of imitation, and its principles were again fully reprinted. The journal deemed John Rollo's account of the arrangements made for collecting patient data in the Artillery Hospital at Woolwich so valuable that it "might be read with advantage by all persons concerned in the establishment or regulation of an infirmary". It was fully reprinted, including the tabular hospital report (London Medical Review 1801).

In 1813, Thomas Mills had introduced copious bloodletting during a temporary appointment at the Dublin Fever Hospital. The statistics comparing his mortality rates with those of the regular physicians who had hardly used bloodletting were reprinted in the review of his *Essay on the utility of blood-letting in fever* (Mills 1813), and elicited the following comment:

> *presuming....these are candid and correct statements, we may deem them potent arguments in favour of the advantages of the anti-phlogistic [bloodletting and purging] treatment of fever.*

With this method, Mills was judged to have adduced "very strong proof" of the superiority of bloodletting (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1813). Guthrie's answer to the question of the timing of amputation, and the works of McGrigor and Blane drew forth similar praise (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1816).

With the availability of more and more numerical data, numbers began to be pitted against numbers. Thus, for example, during the debates about bloodletting for the treatment of fever, statistics were widely used on both sides. Indeed, a writer in the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* in 1813, noted that, if one could assume the data to have been honestly assembled and presented by both sides, the only way out of the maze would be through "extensive comparative experiments" (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1813).

From about 1820, a few doctors reacted to such feelings of perplexity and to outspoken criticisms of numerical methods made by men who had never actually used them. For instance, in the debate about bloodletting, simple comparisons were now considered inadequate if they did not compare similar groups of patients (Bateman 1818). In 1820 Guthrie found it easy to defend his views against an influential civilian surgeon, John Bell, who "had no practice of his own and little opportunity of enquiry into that of others […and] reasoned from theory, probably on an individual case, and not from actual observation made on many" (Guthrie 1820).

Alexander Copland Hutchinson refined Guthrie's examination of the timing of amputations by sending a circular letter to the surgeons of all eleven ships engaged in the Battle of Algiers, in 1816. He required not only precise anatomical locations but precise timing of amputations and cure rates and summaries of the results a year later (Hutchinson 1817). Among others, Rutherford Alcock, a pupil of Guthrie, went on to criticize his teacher's recommendations. He asserted that comparisons of conservative with operative treatment were required which used more data and analyses that took account of a number of external circumstances. Alcock furnished these in a series of detailed statistical reports compiled from returns he had required as medical head of a British expeditionary force in the Carlist War in Spain (1835-1836), using the reporting approaches initiated decades earlier, by his chief, the still active James McGrigor (Alcock 1838, 1840, 1840-41).

It seems reasonable to conclude from the evidence presented so far that many British doctors around 1800 must have been aware of numerical approaches. As noted in the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* in 1809, it seemed to have become unacceptable to defend a treatment method as "generally successful without any discrimination of circumstances" (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1809b). This attitude was reflected in criticisms of a new edition of Ferriar's first three volumes of *Medical Histories* (Ferriar 1810) and a fourth volume (Ferriar 1813) for lacking the additional evidence that the first editions had seemed to promise (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1811b; 1814). That the principle of numerical approaches was accepted in some influential circles is further illustrated by the fact that complaints about the absence of accurate hospital record-keeping which Blane, Robertson and many others had made in the 18th century (see e.g. Marcet 1819; Phillips 1832) were endorsed by *The Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* in the 1810s and 1820s. This deplorable state of affairs was even noted by a Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons in 1818, the censure of which was published by the Journal (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1818). The *Lancet* also led a vigorous campaign for the publication of results as part of its original policy (see, for example, Wakley 1832-33; Sprigge 1897; Gibbon 1922).

In 1831, in the spirit of Clifton and those following him over the previous century, Tweedy John Todd, a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London, published a methodological book entitled *The book of analysis, or a new method of experience whereby the induction of the Novum Organon is made easy of application to medicine…*(Todd 1831). Two years later, William Poulteney Alison, a celebrated Edinburgh professor of medicine, published his *Dissertation on the state of medical science, from the termination of the 18th century to the present time* (Alison 1833). Alison noted the contributions of the numerical methods which were being used by his early 19th century contemporaries - mentioning Johnson (1813; 1827) and Hawkins (1829) in particular. However, he also pointed out that they were not the originators of a new method of enquiry; rather, they continued a long line of development of comparative numerical inquiries to assess therapy, to which Robertson, Percival, Clark, Blane and McGrigor had all contributed (Alison 1833). Furthermore, in the same sentence in which he mentioned the numerical nosography of Louis and others in France, he also noted earlier comparable work by John Cheyne (1817) in Dublin and Thomas Bateman (1818) in London (he might also have mentioned Haygarth's much praised *Clinical Histories of Diseases* in this context). Alison's and Hawkins'

overviews around 1830, as well as the specific reports of contemporary army, navy and civilian hospital doctors (Tröhler 1978), rather than being innovative, were the products of a steady development which had its roots in British military medicine and specific aspects of British hospital and dispensary medicine of the 18th century.

In summary, it had begun to be quite widely accepted among opinion-formers in British medicine that treatment claims should no longer be accepted on the basis of reports of single cases by medical 'authorities', as previously. A 'numerical culture' had become established during the 18th century in British medicine and surgery (Tröhler 2005). This process was nurtured by the specific intellectual climate of the Age of Enlightenment in Britain, which opened the door for the acceptance of meritocracy in medicine (Mathias 1979; Tröhler 2000). This new medical culture did not dominate the research activities of British doctors; it competed with normal and pathological anatomy, animal experimentation, clinical case studies. Yet, as far as the evaluation of therapies was concerned, there was now an expectation that treatment claims would be supported by numerical statements based on the results of numerous, comparative observations – an approach characterised by the term 'rational empiricism'. In the words of a contemporary, John Bostock, a well known physician, physiologist and medical historian wrote in 1833:

> *rational empiricism... has produced a most beneficial influence on the general state of medical practice. If it has, on some occasions, produced fluctuation of opinion, and in others indecision of inertness, it has tended to sweep away much error, and to purify the science from many of the antiquated doctrines and practices that still maintain their ground among our continental brethren (Bostock 1833).*

In contrast to the evidence of national acceptance of numerical methods in Britain early in the 19th century, numerical analyses published in Paris by Pierre-Charles-Alexandre Louis (1835), which called into question the value of bloodletting, caused controversy that lasted for several decades (Delaunay 1953; Müllener 1966; Bariéty 1972; Piquemal 1974; Murphy 1981; Wootton 2006). Among others, Louis was criticised by his mathematically inclined contemporary, Jules Gavarret, who pointed out that the size of Louis samples had been too small to be reliable (Gavarret 1840), a problem that had been recognised twenty years earlier by British authors discussing paradoxical statistics in the bloodletting controversy around 1810 (Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal 1813). The controversies in France must have played a useful role in prompting reflection on causal inferences in medicine, at least in Paris. There were lively academic discussions in the 1830s and again at the end 1840s, both in the Académie Royale de Médecine and the Académie Royale des Sciences (Murphy 1981). Later in the 19th century the discussions in Paris ended with the compromise that 'medical statistics' needed to be distinguished from 'the numerical method': while the former was applicable, even indispensable, to epidemiological studies, the latter procedure was rarely convincing in the clinical evaluation of therapies, mostly "because therapeutics was so much in need of appropriate remedies" (Murphy 1981). Although interest in the methodology of treatment evaluation never actually died out (see 19th century entries in www.jameslindlibrary.org), it was no longer in the forefront of discussions after 1850.

Acknowledgements
We are grateful to Linda Bryder, Harry Marks, Iain Milne, Alfredo Morabia, and Jan Vandenbroucke for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper.

References

Aiken J (1777). Thoughts on hospitals. London: Johnson.

Alanson EA (1782). Practical observations on amputation, and the after-treatment. 2nd edn. London: Joseph Johnson.

Alcock R (1838). Notes on the medical history and statistics of the British Legion in Spain; comprising the results of gun-shot wounds, in relation to important questions in surgery. London: Churchill, p 60, 62, 70.

Alcock R (1840). Observations on injuries of joints and their treatment. Medico- chirurgical Transactions 23: 243-322.

Alcock R (1840-41). Lectures on amputations and on the nature, progress and termination of the injuries. Lancet 1:105-111 and passim up to 2:849—858.

Alison WP (1833). Dissertation on the state of medical science, from the termination of the 18th century to the present time. In: Forbes et al, eds. The Cyclopaedia of Practical Medicine. Vol 1. London: Sherwood et al. :lxxiii-cx.

Annals of Medicine (1803). Lustrum 2:51-78.

Anonymous (1784). Medical Observations and Inquiries 1784;6:400.

Bariéty M (1972). Louis et la méthode numérique. Clio Medica 7: 177-183.

Bateman T (1818). A succinct account of the contagious fever of this country. London: Longman, p 78-79, 80-1, 85, and 119.

Bilguer JU (1764). A dissertation on the inutility of the amputation of limbs. London: Baldwin.

Black W (1782). An historical sketch of medicine and surgery from their origin to the present time. London: J Johnson.

Black W (1788). A comparative view of the mortality of the human species at all ages. London: Dilly.

Black W (1789). An arithmetical and medical analysis of the diseases and mortality of the human species. London: J Johnson.

Black W (1810). A dissertation on insanity; illustrated with tables and extracted from between two and three thousand cases in Bedlam. London: for the author.

Blane G (1785). Observations on the diseases incident to seamen. London: Cooper.

Blane G (1813). Observations on the comparative prevalence, mortality, & treatment of different diseases.... Medico-chirurgical Transactions, Vol 4, p 89-141, London.

Borsay A (2000). An example of political arithmetic: the evaluation of spa therapy at the Georgian Bath Infirmary, 1742-1830. Medical History 44:149-172.

Bostock J (1833). History of medicine. In: Forbes et al, eds. The cyclopaedia of practical medicine. Vol 1. Sherwood et al.: London, p i-lxxii (see p lxix).

Boylston AW (2008). Did clinical science begin in 1767?. The James Lind Library (www.jameslindlibrary.org).

Boylston AW (2010). Thomas Nettleton and the dawn of quantitative assessments of the effects of medical interventions. The James Lind Library (www.jameslindlibrary.org).

Chalmers I, Tröhler U (2000). Helping physicians to keep abreast of the medical literature: 'Medical and Philosophical Commentaries', 1773-1795. Annals of Internal Medicine 133:238-243.

Chalmers I, Tröhler U, Chalmers J (2010). Andrew Duncan's publications and his relations with his publishers. In: Chalmers J (ed.). Andrew Duncan Senior, Physician of the Enlightenment. Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland Publishing, p 36-55.

Charleton R (1770). An inquiry into the efficacy of warm bathing in palsies. Oxford: Clarendon.

Cheselden W (1740). The anatomy of the human body. 5th edition. London: William Bowyer.

Cheyne J (1817). Report of the Hardwicke Fever Hospital, for the year ending on the 31st March 1817. Dublin Hospital Reports 1:1-116.

Clark J (1780). Observations on fevers, especially of the continued type. London: T Cadell.

Clark J (1792). Observations on the diseases which prevail in long voyages to hot countries. London: J Murray.

Clifton F (1731). Tabular observations recommended as the plainest and surest way of practising and improving physick. London: Brindley.

Clifton F (1732). The state of physick, ancient and modern, briefly considered: with a plan for the improvement of it. London printed by W Bowyer, for John Nourse without Temple-Bar, 1732.

Clutterbuck H (1807). An inquiry into the seat and nature of fever. London: Boosey.

Commission Royale. Bailly A (1784). Rapport des commissaires chargés par le Roi, de l'examen du magnétisme animale. Imprimé par ordre du Roi. Paris: A Paris, de L'Imprimerie Royale.

Currie W (1797). Medical reports of the effects of water: cold and warm as a remedy in fever and febrile diseases. Vol. 1. Liverpool and London: M'Creery & Cadell.

Delaunay P (1953). Les doctrines médicales au début du XIX siècle – Louis et la méthode numérique. In: Underwood EA, ed. Science, medicine and history. Essays in the evolution of scientific thought and medical practice. London etc: Oxford University Press, vol 2, p 321-330.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1805a);1:67-72.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1805b);1:479-480.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1809a);5:119.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1809b);5:123.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1811a);7:220.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1811b);7:226-231.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1813);9:458-459.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1814);10:240-244.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1816);12:222, 233-240.

Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal (1818);14:530-531, 534.

Edwards M (2007). Control and the therapeutic trial. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Falconer W (1790). A practical dissertation on the medicinal effects of the Bath waters. London and Bath: Robinson & Crutwell.

Faure [?] (1759). Recueil des pièces qui ont concouru pour le prix de L'Académie Royale de Chirurgie. Vol 8. Paris, PA Le Prieur.

Ferriar J (1792). Medical histories and reflections. Vol 1. London: Cadell and Davies.

Ferriar J (1810). Preface. Medical histories and reflexions, Vol.1. 1st edition. London: Cadell and Davies. p xvii-xviii.

Ferriar J (1813). Medical histories and reflections. Vol. 4. London: Cadell and Davies.

Fordyce G (1793). An attempt to improve the evidence of medicine. Transactions of a society for the Improvement of medical and chirurgical knowledge. London: J Johnson.

Fowler T (1785). Medical reports of the effects of tobacco in the cure of dropsies and dysuries… London: J Johnson.

Fowler T (1786). Medical reports of the effects of arsenic in the cure of agues, remittent fevers, and periodic headaches. London: Johnson.

Fowler T (1795). Medical reports of the effects of blood-letting, sudorifics, and blistering in the cure of the acute and chronic rheumatism. London: Johnson.

Franklin B (1759). Some account on the success of inoculation for the small-pox in England and America. London: W Strahan.

Gavarret LDJ (1840). Principes généraux de statistique médicale: ou dèveloppement des règles qui doivent provider à son emploi. Paris: Bechet Jeune & Labé.

Gibbon J (1922). London surgery in the early part of the nineteenth century. Annals of Medical History 4: 80-85.

Gordon A (1795). A treatise on the puerperal fever of Aberdeen. In: Churchill F, ed (1849). Essays on the puerperal fever and other diseases selected from the writings of British authors previous to the close of the eighteenth century. London: Sydenham Society, pp 445-500.

Graunt J (1662). Natural and political observations made upon the Bills of Mortality. London: John Martin.

Gregory J (1772). Lectures on the duties and qualifications of a physician. London: Strahan and Cadell.

Guthrie GJ (1815). A treatise on gun-shot wounds. London: Burgess and Hill.

Guthrie GJ (1820). Observations on gun-shot wounds and on injuries of the nerves. London: Burgess and Hill, p 81-83.

Hamilton AL (1816). Dissertatio medica inauguralis de synocho castrensi (Inaugural medical dissertation on camp fever). Edinburgh: J Ballantyne.

Hawkins FB (1829). The elements of medical statistics. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown & Green.

Haygarth J (1784). An inquiry on how to prevent the small-pox. Chester and London: Monk and Johnson.

Haygarth J (1800). Of the imagination, as a cause and as a cure of disorders of the body: exemplified by fictitious tractors, and epidemical convulsions. Bath: R. Crutwell.

Haygarth J (1805). A clinical history of diseases I. A clinical history of the acute rheumatism, or rheumatic fever. II. A clinical history of the nodosity of the joints. London: Cadell and Davies.

Heberden W [Father] (1772). On a disorder of the breast. Medical Transactions of the Royal College of Physicians of London 2:59-67.

Heberden W [Father] (1802). Commentaries on the history and cure of diseases. London: Payne.

Hillary W (1761). An inquiry into the means of improving medical knowledge. London: Hitch and Hawes.

Home F (1780). Clinical experiments, histories and dissections. Edinburgh: Creech; London: Murray.

Hutchinson A C (1817). Some further observations on the subject of the proper period for amputating in gun-shot wounds. London: Callow, p16.

Jackson R (1808). An exposition of the practice of affusing cold water on the surface of the body as a remedy for the cure of fever. Edinburgh: Martin.

James R (1770). A dissertation on fevers and inflammatory distempers. 7th edn. London: Newbery.

Johnson J (1813). The influence of tropical climates, more especially the climate of India, on European constitutions. London: Stockdale.

Johnson J (1827). The influence of tropical climates, more especially the climate of India, on European constitutions. 4th edn. London: Underwood.

Jurin J (1724). A letter to the learned Dr. Caleb Cotesworth, F. R. S. of the College of Physicians, London, and physician to St. Thomas's Hospital; containing a comparison between the danger of the natural small pox, and that given by inoculation. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London (1722 - 1723), 32:213-227.

Kirkland T (1783). An inquiry into the present state of medical surgery. London: Dodsley.

Lettsom JC (1774). Medical memoirs of the General Dispensary in London. London: for the Author.

Lettsom JC (1775). On the improvement of medicine in London on the basis of public good. London: Phillips.

Lilienfeld A (1982). Ceteris paribus: the evolution of the clinical trial. Bulletin of the History of Medicine 56:1-18.

Lind J (1753). A treatise of the scurvy. In three parts. Containing an inquiry into the nature, causes and cure, of that disease. Together with a critical and chronological view of what has been published on the subject. Edinburgh: Printed by Sands, Murray and Cochran for A Kincaid and A Donaldson.

Lind J (1762). An essay on the most effectual means of preserving the health of seamen, in the Royal Navy. London: D Wilson.

Lind J (1763). Two papers on fevers and infection. London: D Wilson.

Lind J (1771). An essay on diseases incidental to Europeans in hot climates with the method of preventing their fatal consequences 2nd edition: London Printed for T Becket and PA De Hondt.

London Medical Review 1801;6:283-294.

Louis P-C-A (1835). Recherches sur les effets de la saignée dans quelques maladies inflammatoires et sur l'action de l'émétique et des vésicatoires dans la pneumonie. Paris: Librairie de l'Académie royale de médecine.

Maehle H-A (1999). Drugs on trial. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Marcet A (1819). An essay on the chemical history and medical treatment of calculous disorders, 2nd ed. London: Longman et al., p 24-26, 27-47.

Marks H (1997). The progress of experiment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Massey I (1723). A short and plain account of inoculation. With some remarks on the main argument made use of to recommend that practice, by Mr.

Maitland and others. To which is added, a letter to the learned James Jurin, M.D.R.S. Secr. Col. Reg. Med. Lond. Soc. In answer to his letter to the learned Dr. Cotesworth, and his comparison between the mortality of natural and inoculated small pox. The second edition. London: W. Meadows.

Mathias P (1979). The transformation of England. Essays in the economic and social history of England in the 18th century. London: Methuen (reprinted in 2006 by Routledge).

McGrigor J (1802). Account of diseases of the 88th Regiment, during their passage to India, and at Bombay, from December 1798 till June 1800. Annals of Medicine, Lustrum 2, 1:353-369.

McGrigor J (1815). Sketch of the medical histories of the British Armies in the Peninsula of Spain and Portugal, during the late campaigns. Med.-chir. Trans. 6:381-489.

Medical and Philosophical Commentaries 1774;2:9-19.

Medical and Philosophical Commentaries 1780;7:177.

Medical and Philosophical Commentaries 1788;2:17-73.

Millar J (1770). Observations on the prevailing diseases in Great Britain. London: Cadell.

Millar J (1777). Observations on the practice of the medical department of the Westminster General Dispensary. London: by order of the Governors.

Millar J (1778-1779). Observations on the management of diseases in Army and Navy. London: for the author.

Millar J (1798a). Observations on the management of diseases in the Army and Navy in reply to Dr. Monroe. London: for the Author.

Millar J (1798b). Observations on the conduct of the war. An appeal to the people of Great Britain. London: for the author.

Mills T (1813). An essay on the utility of bloodletting in fever. Dublin : J. Barlow for Gilbert and Hodges, London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown.

Müllener ER (1966). Zur methodischen therapeutisch-klinischen Forschung der “Ecole de Paris” (1800-1850). Gesnerus 23: 122-131.

Murphy TD (1981). Medical knowledge and statistical methods in early nineteenth-century France. Medical History 25: 301-319, p 310-318.

Nettleton T (1722a). A letter from Dr. Nettleton, physician at Halifax in Yorkshire, to Dr. Whitaker concerning the inoculation of the small pox.. Phil. Trans. XXXII, 1722 No. 370. p 35-48. Also published as an Account of the success of inoculating the small-pox in a letter to Dr. William Whitaker. Printed by S. Palmer for J. Batley London.

Nettleton T (122b). A letter to James Jurin dated June 16, 1722. Published as part of a letter from Dr. Nettleton Physician, a letter from the same learned and ingenious gentleman concerning his further progress in inoculating the small pox. Philosophical Transactions, vol. XXXII, 1722 no.

370. p 49-52. Original in Royal Society Archives, Early Letters vol 1.

Nettleton T (1722c). Part of a letter from Dr. Nettleton, physician at Halifax, to Dr. Jurin, R.S. Secr. Concerning the inoculation of the smallpox, and the mortality of that distemper in the natural way. Phil. Trans. Vol 32, no. 374, p 209-212.

Nettleton T (1724). Part of a letter from Dr. Nettleton, physician at Halifax, to Dr. Jurin, R. S. Sec concerning the inoculation of the small pox, and the mortality of that distemper in the natural way. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London (1722 - 1723), 32: 209-212.

Niebyl PC (1977). The English blood letting revolution, or modern medicine before 1850. Bulletin of the History of Medicine 51:464-483 (p 475).

Percival T (1767). Essays medical and experimental, 1st series. London: Johnson.

Phillips B (1832). A treatise on the urethra. London: Longman, p 226. See also review in The Lancet, 1840-41: ii, 342.

Piquemal J (1974). Succès et decadence de la méthode numérique en France à l'époque de Pierre-Charles-Alexandre Louis. Médecine de France no. 250, mars 1974, 11-22, 59-60.

Reide TD (1793). A view of the diseases of the Army in Great Britiain, America, the West Indies and on board of King's ships. London: Johnson.

Repertoire du Regi[s]tre CC (1761). Maladies Vénériennes, et la Chambre Noble. Geneva, Archives d'Etat de Genève, Arch. Hosp. Aa 104, 18 janvier, p 53, and 6 décembre, p 135-6.

Robertson R (1777). A physical journal kept on board His Majesty's Ship Rainbow. London: Dilly.

Robertson R (1783). Observations on the jail, hospital or ship fever. London: Murray.

Robertson R (1789). Observations on jail, hospital, or ship fever. London: for the Author.

Rollo J (1780). Observations on the diseases which appeared in the Army on St Lucia…, Barbados. Orderson for the author.

Rollo J (1801). A short account of the Royal Artillery Hospital at Woolwich. London: Mawman.

Rowley W (1793). The causes of a great number of deaths amongst adults and children. 2nd edn. London: Newbery.

Rusnock A (1996). The Correspondence of James Jurin (1684-1750) Physician and Secretary to the Royal Society. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V.

Rusnock A (2002). Vital accounts: quantifying health and population in eighteenth century England and France. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chaps. 2-4.

Scheuchzer JG (1729). An account of the success of inoculating the small-pox in Great Britain, for the years 1727 and 1728: With a comparison between the mortality of the natural small-pox, and the miscarriages in that practice; as also some general remarks on its progress and success, since its first introduction . . . London: J. Peele.

Sims J (1774). A discourse on the best method of prosecuting medical enquiries. London: Hart.

Sprigge SS (1897). The life and times of Thomas Wakley. London: Longmans, p 103-110.

Sutton T (1806). A practical account of a remittent fever frequently occurring among the troops in this climate. Canterbury: printed by J. Simmons, and sold by G. Robinson, London, p 16-17.

Todd TT (1831). The book of analysis or a new method of experience whereby the induction of the Novum Organon is made easy of application to medicine… London: Murray.

Tröhler U (1978). Quantification in British medicine and surgery 1750-1830, with special reference to its introduction into therapeutics. PhD Thesis, University of London.

Tröhler U (1981). Klinisch-numerische Forshung in der britischen Geburtshilfe 1750-1820. Gesnerus 39:69-80.

Tröhler U (1988). To improve the evidence of medicine: arithmetic observation in clinical medicine in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences 10, suppl.:31-40.

Tröhler U (2000). "To improve the evidence of medicine": The 18th century British origins of a critical approach." Edinburgh: Royal College of Physicians, 2000.

Tröhler U (2003). Zwischen Argument und Erfahrung: Die wissenschaftliche Begründung therapeutischer Entscheide im Laufe der Geschichte. In: Rusteholz P, Moser R, eds. Wege zu wissenschlaftlichen Wahrheiten: Vermutung-Behauptung Beweis. Bern-Berlin: P Lang, p 137-164.

Tröhler U (2005). Quantifying experience and beating biases: a new culture in 18th century British clinical medicine. In: Jorland G, Opinel A, Weisz G, eds. Body counts: medical quantification in historical and sociological perspectives. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, p 19-50.

Tröhler U, Prüll CR (2001). The rise of the modern hospital. In: Loudon I, ed. Western medicine. An illustrated history. Oxford: Oxford University Press, paperback edition 2001, p 160-175.

Trotter T (1792). Observations on the scurvy. London: Longman, p 137-138, 184.

Wakley T (1832-33). Commentary on “Clinical reports of the surgical practice of the Glasgow Royal Infirmary”. Lancet 1:16.

Warner JH (1986). The therapeutic perspective. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Watson W (1768). An account of a series of experiments, instituted with a view of ascertaining the most successful method of inoculating the smallpox. London: J Nourse.

White C (1770). Cases in surgery. London: Johnston, p vi, viii.

Withering W (1785). An account of the foxglove and some of its medical uses: with practical remarks on dropsy and other diseases. London: J and J Robinson.

Wootton D (2006). Bad medicine. Doctors doing harm since Hippocrates. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p 171, 174-175.