

Hemorrhage Control and Resuscitative Strategies in Trauma Care

Ayotte Montoy *

Department of Surgery, Polokwane Provincial Hospital, Polokwane, South Africa

Correspondence to: Ayotte Montoy, Department of Surgery, Polokwane Provincial Hospital, Polokwane, South Africa **Email:** montoy.ayotte@polokwane.hospitals

Received: January 02, 2025; **Accepted:** January 23, 2025; **Published:** January 30, 2025

Citation: Montoy A (2025) Hemorrhage Control and Resuscitative Strategies in Trauma Care. J Emerg Trauma Care Vol.10 No.1: 216.

Introduction

Hemorrhage remains one of the leading causes of preventable death in trauma patients, particularly within the first few hours following injury. Rapid and effective control of bleeding is essential to survival, as massive blood loss can quickly progress to hypovolemic shock, coagulopathy and multiple organ failure. Advances in trauma care have emphasized the importance of early recognition, immediate intervention and integrated resuscitation strategies designed to stabilize patients before irreversible physiological decline occurs. From the battlefield to civilian emergency departments, innovations in hemorrhage control have transformed outcomes, reducing mortality rates and improving recovery in critically injured patients. Modern trauma systems prioritize hemorrhage management as a cornerstone of emergency care, recognizing that traditional resuscitation approaches are often insufficient in cases of severe blood loss. The development of new techniques, devices and protocols such as tourniquets, hemostatic dressings, balanced transfusion strategies and endovascular interventions has redefined standards of care. These strategies are further enhanced by multidisciplinary collaboration, integrating surgeons, emergency physicians, anesthesiologists and prehospital providers in coordinated efforts to control bleeding and restore perfusion. As research continues to refine best practices, hemorrhage control and resuscitative strategies remain at the forefront of trauma medicine, shaping the way clinicians save lives in high-stakes emergencies [1].

Description

The initial approach to hemorrhage control in trauma care involves immediate interventions that stop or reduce external bleeding at the scene of injury. Simple yet effective measures such as direct pressure, wound packing and tourniquet application remain the foundation of early hemorrhage management. Tourniquets, once controversial, are now widely recognized as life-saving tools when applied correctly, particularly in extremity trauma. Hemostatic dressings, impregnated with agents that accelerate clot formation, provide additional means of controlling bleeding in areas where tourniquets cannot be used. Prehospital providers are

trained to rapidly identify life-threatening hemorrhage and prioritize bleeding control as part of the “C” (catastrophic bleeding) step in modern trauma algorithms such as MARCH (Massive hemorrhage, Airway, Respiration, Circulation, Hypothermia). These interventions have been widely adopted not only in military combat settings but also in civilian emergency systems, where first responders and even laypersons are educated through initiatives like “Stop the Bleed” campaigns. By empowering both professionals and the public with tools and knowledge, early hemorrhage control can drastically improve survival before patients reach definitive care facilities [2].

In the hospital setting, surgical and endovascular techniques play a critical role in definitive hemorrhage control. Damage control surgery (DCS) emphasizes rapid interventions to stop bleeding and contamination, prioritizing patient survival over complete anatomical repair in the initial stages. Techniques such as laparotomy with packing, temporary vascular shunts and external fixation of fractures provide rapid stabilization while minimizing operating room time. Endovascular approaches, including angioembolization, have become increasingly important for managing internal bleeding in areas such as the pelvis, where traditional surgery may be less effective. These strategies highlight the importance of a tailored, patient-specific approach that considers injury pattern, hemodynamic status and resource availability. Advances in surgical and endovascular techniques continue to expand the options available to trauma teams, improving outcomes even in cases of severe internal hemorrhage [3].

Resuscitation strategies for hemorrhagic shock have shifted dramatically over the past two decades, moving away from traditional large-volume crystalloid infusion toward balanced, blood-product-based resuscitation. Excessive crystalloid use was found to contribute to dilutional coagulopathy, acidosis and hypothermia components of the lethal triad that worsen trauma outcomes. Modern Damage Control Resuscitation (DCR) emphasizes early and balanced transfusion of red blood cells, plasma and platelets, often in a 1:1:1 ratio, to mimic

whole blood and restore hemostatic function. Whole blood transfusion itself has reemerged as a viable and effective strategy, particularly in military and prehospital settings. Adjunctive therapies such as Tranexamic Acid (TXA), administered within hours of injury, have been shown to significantly reduce mortality by inhibiting fibrinolysis. These approaches collectively represent a paradigm shift toward hemostatic resuscitation, where the goal is not simply volume replacement but restoration of effective clotting and oxygen delivery [4,5].

Conclusion

Prehospital emergency care has advanced beyond basic transportation to encompass a sophisticated, technology-driven network of rapid response and medical intervention. Innovations in dispatch systems, transport modalities, telemedicine and data-driven analytics have collectively enhanced the speed, accuracy and quality of care provided outside hospital walls. These developments not only save lives in time-critical emergencies but also ensure equitable access to healthcare across diverse geographic and social contexts. As technology continues to evolve, future innovations will likely focus on greater integration, automation and precision in prehospital care, ultimately setting new benchmarks for rapid response and transport in the global healthcare landscape.

Acknowledgment

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Haagsma JA, Graetz N, Bolliger I, Naghavi M, Higashi H, et al. (2016). The global burden of injury: Incidence, mortality, disability-adjusted life years and time trends from the Global Burden of Disease study 2013. *Inj Prev* 22: 3-18.
2. Curry N, Hopewell S, Dorée C, Hyde C, Brohi K, et al. (2011). The acute management of trauma hemorrhage: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Crit Care* 15: R92.
3. Leighton JL, You D, Schneider P (2020). Limiting blood loss in orthopaedic trauma: Strategies and effects. *Injury* 51: S123-S127.
4. Knops SP, Van Lieshout EM, Spanjersberg WR, Patka P, Schipper IB (2011). Randomised clinical trial comparing pressure characteristics of pelvic circumferential compression devices in healthy volunteers. *Injury* 42: 1020-1026.
5. Pap R, McKeown R, Lockwood C, Stephenson M, Simpson P (2020). Pelvic circumferential compression devices for prehospital management of suspected pelvic fractures: A rapid review and evidence summary for quality indicator evaluation. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med* 28: 65.