A multicentric, randomized, controlled phase III study of centhaquine (Lyfaquin®) as a resuscitative agent in hypovolemic shock patients

Authors: Anil Gulati, Rajat Choudhuri, Ajay Gupta, Saurabh Singh, S. K. Noushad Ali, Gursaran Kaur Sidhu, Parvez David Haque, Prashant Rahate, Aditya R Bothra, G P Singh, Sanjeev Maheshwari, Deepak Jeswani, Sameer Haveri, Apurva Agarwal, and Nilesh Radheshyam Agrawal

Abstract:

Centhaquine is a novel, first-in-class resuscitative agent for the treatment of hypovolemic shock. Efficacy of centhaquine for the treatment of hypovolemic shock as an adjuvant to standard of care (SOC) was evaluated in a prospective, multi-center, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled Phase 3 study. Key inclusion criteria were; systolic blood pressure of ≤90 mm Hg, blood lactate levels of ≥2 mmol/L and patients receiving SOC in a hospital or ICU setting. Patients were randomized in a 2:1 ratio either to the centhaquine group receiving centhaquine dose of 0.01 mg/kg by IV infusion along with SOC or to the control group receiving SOC plus saline. Primary endpoints of the study were change in systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP), change in blood lactate levels and change in base deficit. Mortality through day 28 was the key secondary endpoint. A total of 197 patients were screened, of which 105 patients met the eligibility criteria and were included in the study. Out of 105 patients, 71 patients were randomized to centhaquine group and 34 patients to control group. Demographics and baseline characteristics of patients in both groups was comparable. Hemoglobin level was 9.38 ± 0.71 g/dL and 8.73 ± 0.55 g/dL in control and centhaquine groups, respectively at the time of inclusion in the study. At 24 hours of resuscitation, SBP of more than 110 mmHg was in 59.38% patients of control and 81.82% patients of centhaquine group (P=0.00842). Similarly, at

24 hours of resuscitation, DBP of more than 70 mmHg was in 50.00% patients in control group and 78.46% patients in centhaquine group (P=0.002175). The number of patients with blood lactate levels of 1.5 mmol/L or less were 46.88% in the group with standard treatment compared to 69.35% in centhaquine group (P=0.0168). The number of patients with base-deficit of less than minus 2 were 46.88% in standard treatment group compared to 68.25% in those receiving centhaquine (P=0.0217). Centhaquine treatment significantly reduced 28-day all-cause mortality. In the control group, the mortality rate was 11.76% compared to 2.94% in the centhaquine group (odds ratio: 4.4; 95% CI 0.9651 to 23.74 and P=0.037). No drug related adverse event was reported. Centhaquine (Lyfaquin®) is a highly efficacious resuscitative agent for the treatment of hypovolemic shock as an adjuvant to SOC.

INTRODUCTION

Hypovolemic shock is a life-threatening condition of inadequate tissue blood perfusion and oxygenation due to a decrease in circulating vascular blood volume (Kobayashi et al., 2012). An annual incidence of hypovolemic shock in the United States is about 1.5 million and number of deaths due to hemorrhagic shock total 61,000 in the United States and about 1.9 million worldwide (Cannon, 2018). Main features of hypovolemic shock include hypotension, increased blood lactate levels and base deficit. Hypovolemia decreases cardiac pre-load to a critical level ensuing a dramatic drop in cardiac output that results in low tissue blood perfusion, ultimately leading to multiple organ dysfunction and death. Urgent management is needed to prevent multi-organ failure and death. Patients in intensive care units (ICUs) across the world are treated with fluid therapy to restore blood volume and tissue blood perfusion (Perel et al., 2013). Although the goal is to increase the intravascular circulating volume, however, fluid tends to move out into the extravascular space. An ideal resuscitation fluid should be able to rapidly and effectively increase intravascular volume (Kobayashi et al., 2012). Damage control resuscitation was developed to restore intravascular volume, prevent dilutional coagulopathy and preserve tissue oxygenation (Holcomb et al., 2015). An ideal transfusion to whole blood is use of blood products in a balanced ratio of 1:1:1 for units of plasma to platelets to red blood cells (Holcomb et al., 2007) and this remains an area of active research with strong evidence for use of 1:1:1 ratio (Nederpelt et al., 2020). When volume resuscitation alone fails vasopressors are administered (Havel et al., 2011). The most common vasopressor used is norepinephrine, distantly followed by phenylephrine, epinephrine, and dopamine. Catecholamine infusion enhances cardiac contractility as well as vascular tone including arteriolar, venous and renovascular beds and thus influences overall arterial, venous, and capillary pressures and blood flow (Al-Hesayen and

Parker, 2008). The most common adverse effects of vasopressors as a class include arrhythmias, fluid extravasation, and ischemia (Abid et al., 2000;Aoki et al., 2018). Current standard of care (SOC) is not adequate and is based on resuscitative agents developed more than 5 decades ago and no new agent has been developed to treat this life-threatening condition. There has been a vigorous debate about optimal methods of resuscitation (Santry and Alam, 2010) and clearly there is a need for novel resuscitative agents.

Over five decades numerous attempts have been made to develop an effective resuscitative agent without success. Agents that could decrease metabolic activity to reduce oxygen demand were studied. Histone deacetylase inhibitors such as valproic acid and suberoylanilide hydroxamic acid (Causey et al., 2013;Georgoff et al., 2018), hydrogen sulfide and its donor sodium sulfide (Ganster et al., 2010;Xu et al., 2015), mitochondria targeted hydrogen sulfide donor AP39 (Wepler et al., 2019), formulation consisting of d-beta-hydroxybutyrate and melatonin (Thakral et al., 2018) and other hibernation based approaches have been tried (Wolf et al., 2018) but none has shown any promise clinically. Hemoglobin-based blood substitutes were prepared as resuscitative agents. Diaspirin crosslinked hemoglobin found effective in animal models of hemorrhagic shock (Gulati et al., 1997;Gulati and Sen, 1998), failed in phase III clinical trial (Sloan et al., 1999;Sloan et al., 2010). Polymerized hemoglobin effective in experimental models (Gould et al., 1997;Williams et al., 2020), were not successful clinically (Levy et al., 2002;Moore et al., 2009;Vincent et al., 2015) and were dropped from further development. Numerous other approaches to develop hemoglobin based resuscitative agent were made but none has been successful (Spahn and Kocian, 2005).

Centhaquine is a novel, first-in-class resuscitative agent for the treatment of hypovolemic shock. It acts on α_{2B} adrenergic receptors to produce venous constriction and increase venous return to

the heart, resulting in an increase in cardiac output and improved tissue perfusion. Centhaquine also acts on central α_{2A} adrenergic receptors to reduce sympathetic drive and decrease systemic vascular resistance contributing to an improved tissue blood perfusion (Gulati et al., 2020b). Mechanism of action of centhaquine makes it an ideal candidate for the treatment of patients with hypovolemic shock. Enhancing tissue blood perfusion is a significant advantage in reducing the volume of resuscitation and preventing extravasation of fluid and adverse effect of lung edema. Centhaquine does not act on beta-adrenergic receptors, and therefore the risk of arrhythmias is mitigated. Safety and efficacy of centhaquine was evaluated extensively in preclinical models (Gulati et al., 2012;Gulati et al., 2013b;Lavhale et al., 2013;Papapanagiotou et al., 2016;Kontouli et al., 2019), healthy volunteers ((Goyal et al., 2015;Gulati et al., 2016) and in patients. Centhaquine was found to be efficacious in a phase 2 study with significant improvement in blood lactate levels, base deficit and blood pressure (Gulati et al., 2020a). Based on these highly encouraging data, a phase 3 study was undertaken, the results of which are described here.

METHODS

Trial Design: This was a prospective, multi-center, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blinded phase 3 clinical study of centhaquine in patients with hypovolemic shock receiving the best SOC (NCT04045327; Clinical Trials Registry, India CTRI/2019/01/017196). Because centhaquine was found to be efficacious in a phase 2 study with statistically significant improvements in blood lactate levels ($p=0.0012$), base deficit ($p= <0.0001$) and blood pressure ($p=<0.0001$) and a trend towards reduced mortality, in consultation and agreement with the regulatory authorities, patients were randomized in a 2:1 ratio either to the centhaquine group receiving centhaquine dose of 0.01 mg/kg by IV infusion along with SOC or to the control group

receiving SOC plus saline. The duration of study for an individual patient was 28 days, which included two study visits: visit 1 on day 1 included screening/randomization/baseline/treatment visit and visit 2 at the end of study (day 28 + 7).

The study was conducted in compliance with ICH-GCP Guidelines, the Helsinki Declaration, and local regulatory requirement. The study protocol (PMZ-2010/CT-3.1/2018) was approved by the Drug Controller General of India (DCGI) and Institutional Ethics Committee. A Data and Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) was convened and its responsibilities were determined before the initiation of the study. The members included a biostatistician and senior practicing physicians with extensive experience in critical care medicine. The DSMB had access to SAEs as well as any other AEs that the investigator or the medical monitor deemed important. At pre-determined intervals, the DSMB reviewed the study data on safety and critical efficacy endpoints. They were able to recommend changes to the study design or to request suspension of the study if there were any safety concerns.

Patients were screened for study eligibility based on the following criteria: 1) patients aged 18 years or older; 2) systolic blood pressure of ≤90 mm Hg; 3) blood lactate levels of ≥2 mmol/L that are indicative of hypovolemic shock; 4) patients receiving SOC in a hospital or ICU setting. SOC generally included endotracheal intubation, fluid resuscitation and vasopressors according to the treatment guidelines in the local hospital setting. Female patients with known pregnancy and patients who were participating in other clinical trials were excluded from the study. Patients with pre-existing systemic diseases such as cancer, chronic kidney failure, liver failure, decompensated heart failure or AIDS were also excluded.

The patients randomized in this study, were in a state of severe life-threatening shock. Those patients who were not fit to give consent themselves at the time of initiation of treatment,

informed consent was taken from their legally authorized representative (LAR). The patient/LAR was informed by a doctor both in writing and orally about all aspects of the study relevant to taking a decision on whether to participate or not. The informed consent form included all the elements required as per the ICH-GCP recommendations and schedule Y. Informed consent form in English and other regional languages were approved by respective Ethics Committee and DCGI. The entire consenting process was recorded through an audio-video recording, labeled and stored at the site in a secured place. To ensure medical confidentiality and data protection, the signed informed consent forms were stored in the investigator's study file according to the requirements.

At baseline a variety of demographic data (age, gender captured including, weight, height), chest X-ray, ECG, vital signs were recorded. Baseline blood test tests included CBC, blood lactate, base deficit, serum chemistry, liver function tests and kidney function tests. Patient’s physical examination was done, information about their medical history, concomitant illness, concomitant medications were recorded. In addition, patient’s initial Glasgow coma scale (GCS) and Adult Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) scores was recorded.

Treatment Regimen: The study drug (1.0 mg of centhaquine citrate in a 10 mL vial) was manufactured by Pharmazz Inc at Gufic Biosciences Ltd and supplied to the investigators at the participating sites. Patients who met the eligibility criteria were randomized 2:1 to centhaquine group or control group, respectively. Throughout the study all patients in both groups received the best SOC for hypovolemic shock according to local institutional standard practice, including fluid resuscitation with crystalloids/colloids, blood products and vasopressors such as norepinephrine. Centhaquine or normal saline was administered intravenously after randomization to hypovolemic shock patients with systolic arterial blood pressure (SBP) ≤ 90

mmHg at presentation and continued receiving standard treatment for hypovolemic shock. In centhaquine group, centhaquine was administered at a dose of 0.01 mg/kg body weight as an intravenous infusion over 1 hour in 100 mL normal saline. The next dose of centhaquine was administered if systolic blood pressure fell below or remained below 90 mmHg, but not before 4 hours of previous dose and total number of doses did not exceed three per day. Centhaquine administration if needed was continued for two days post randomization. A minimum 1 dose and a maximum of 6 doses of centhaquine were administered within first 48 hours post randomization. In control group, single dose of equal volume of normal saline was administered as intravenous infusion over 1 hour in 100 mL of normal saline post randomization.

Safety Evaluation: All patients who received treatment were included in safety analysis. Safety was assessed during treatment period and during follow-up period post-treatment based on adverse events, physical examination, vital signs (pulse rate, heart rate, systolic and diastolic blood pressure, body temperature, and respiratory rate), ECG; and clinical laboratory parameters as per protocol. A variety of biochemical tests, serum chemistry tests, hematological variables, coagulation variables, urine output, organ function tests such as kidney function and liver function. Adverse events that occurred or worsened during treatment or post-treatment were recorded. All AEs were coded by systems organ class and preferred term using the latest version of MedRA. All patients were followed up for safety assessment till the end of study on day 28.

Efficacy Assessments: The primary objectives of this study were to determine: 1) change in systolic blood pressure and diastolic blood pressure, 2) change in blood lactate levels and 3) change in base-deficit. For all these endpoints, changes were Mean through 48 hours [Time frame: first 48 hours]. Key secondary objectives of the study included proportion of patients with all-cause mortality and safety and tolerability of centhaquine.

Sample Size and Statistical Analysis: Sample size for this study was calculated based on the results of our phase 2 trial (CTRI/2017/03/008184, NCT04056065). In the phase 2 study, systolic blood pressure in the centhaquine group was 7.19% higher than the control group, at 48 hours (25.39% increase from the baseline in control group compared to 39.51% increase from the baseline in the centhaquine group). The statistical power of the study was 80%. Because centhaquine was found to be efficacious in a phase 2 study with statistically significant improvements in blood lactate levels (p=0.0012), base deficit (p= <0.0001) and blood pressure (p=<0.0001) and a trend towards reduced mortality, in consultation and agreement with the regulatory authorities, patients were randomized in a 2:1 ratio either to the centhaquine group (SOC + centhaquine) or to the control group (SOC + saline) in the phase 3 study. The power was set to 90% (beta, 0.1), enrollment ratio of 2:1, and the level of significance (alpha) used was 0.05. To achieve this, we estimated that a sample size of a minimum 69 patients (46 in centhaquine group and 23 in normal saline group) was enough to achieve a power of 90%, when the level of significance alpha was 0.05. To increase the power of the study (>90%, beta, 0.05) approximately 84 patients (56 in centhaquine group and 28 in control group) were required to be enrolled. Considering discontinuation rate of approximately 20%, it was decided to enroll a total of 105 patients (70 in centhaquine group and 35 in control group) in this study. The results of the trial are presented as mean ± SEM. The significance of differences was estimated by Tukey's multiple comparisons test, Chi-square test and Unpaired t test with Welch's correction. A P value of less than 0.05 was considered significant. The continuous variables between the groups were compared by using Unpaired t-test. Demographic variables and patient characteristics were summarized descriptively by treatment assignments. Demographic variables include age, weight, height, and body mass index. Variables that are measured on a continuous scale, such as the age

of the patient at the time of enrolment, the number of non-missing observations (n), mean and SEM were tabulated by treatment assignments. The Unpaired t-test was used to compare the discrete variables between the groups at baseline and at follow-ups. All available data was used in the analyses. Each group was summarized individually. Data not available was assessed as "missing values" and the observed population only were evaluated. The statistical analysis was processed with GraphPad Prism 8.1.1 (GraphPad, San Diego, CA).

Blinding/unblinding Procedures and Randomization Process: In this double-blind study, the patient and all relevant personnel involved with the conduct and interpretation of the study (including investigator, investigational site personnel, and the sponsor or designee's staff) were blinded to the identity of the study drug (centhaquine/normal saline) assigned and the randomization codes. The biostatistician/unblinded pharmacist was independent of study team. The pharmacist was unblinded of the randomization to ensure double blinding of the study. The pharmacist has signed the undertaking of not disclosing the study treatments to study team. Dispensing activity was monitored by an unblinded monitor independent of monitoring team. Final randomization list was kept strictly confidential and accessible only to authorized persons per sponsor until the completion of the study. Block randomization was used for patient randomization into the 2 treatment groups. The randomization list was prepared by statistician using a validated computer program, statistical analysis system SPSS. An IWRS method containing randomization codes was used to randomize/unblind the eligible patient to the treatment groups. Emergency unblinding through IWRS was available. As per the study protocol, the investigator or his/her designee was permitted to unblind the code when medically needed, without identifying other patient's treatment. For those patents, where unblinding was done, the date, time and the reason for emergency unblinding was recorded in patient's medical

record. Any AE or SAE that required unblinding the treatment was recorded and reported as specified in the protocol. Treatment unblinding was not done for any of the patients enrolled in this study.

RESULTS

Patient Enrollment and Demographics

This study was conducted in 14 Emergency Room/Intensive Care Units across India (Table 1). Patients with hypovolemic shock due to blood loss or fluid loss with systolic blood pressure ≤ 90 mmHg and lactate level indicative (≥2 mmol/L) of shock at presentation and who continued receiving standard shock treatment were enrolled in the study. A total of 197 patients were assessed for eligibility, out of which 105 patients were enrolled in the study and 92 patients did not meet the eligibility criteria and were excluded. Out of 105 patients 71 were randomized in centhaquine group and 34 in control group. In centhaquine group 1 patient withdrew consent and 2 patients were excluded by the investigator (one patient was diagnosed with fulminant tuberculosis and another patient was diagnosed with refractory septic shock). A total of 34 patients (22 male and 12 female) in control and 68 patients (41 male and 27 female) in centhaquine group completed the study (Figure 1). In both treatment groups, patients were provided the best SOC. Both treatment groups were well matched in terms of demographics and baseline characteristics (Table 2). Majority of patients were below 65 years of age and there were more males in the study than females in both groups. Total number of patients with hemorrhagic shock were 45 in centhaquine group and 20 in the control group. Similarly, patients with hypovolemic shock due to fluid loss were 23 in the centhaquine group and 14 in the control group. In general, majority of the patients included were hypovolemic patients due to hemorrhagic shock. The number of doses of study drug administered in control group averaged

1.47 per patient and in centhaquine group it was 1.27 per patient. Comparison of hemoglobin and hematocrit levels (P=0.0998 and P=0.1036 between control and centhaquine, respectively) between the groups suggest that the blood loss was similar in control and centhaquine groups. Similarly, total amount of fluids infused, total amount of blood products infused and urine output during the first 48 hours was similar in both groups suggesting that the fluid loss and subsequent fluid resuscitation was comparable in both groups. A total dose of vasopressors administered in the control group (9.062 mg) appeared to be higher compared to the centhaquine group (2.663 mg), however this difference (difference between means of control and centhaquine 6.399 ± 5.450, 95% CI 17.46-4.66, P=0.1241) was not statistically significant. Percent time patient spent in the intensive care unit during their stay in the hospital was similar in both the groups 46.56 ± 8.14 in control vs 46.85 ± 5.81 in centhaquine.

Centhaquine Improves Systemic Hemodynamics

Centhaquine increased both systolic and diastolic blood pressure and reduced blood lactate levels and base deficit and the improvements in all these endpoints were statistically significant. Thus, centhaquine met all the primary endpoints of the study (Table 3). At 30 hours of resuscitation blood pressure in centhaquine group was significantly higher compared to control group, a difference between means of control and centhaquine in systolic blood pressure was 6.203 ± 2.331 mmHg, 95% CI 1.566 to 10.840, P=0.0047 and in diastolic blood pressure was 2.750 ± 1.675 mmHg, 95% CI -0.586 to 6.068, P=0.0524. Systolic blood pressure increased following resuscitation in both control and centhaquine groups, however, significantly greater number of patients treated with centhaquine had higher systolic blood pressure compared to control group. At 12 hours of resuscitation, systolic blood pressure of more than 90 mmHg was recorded in 87.50% patients in control and 96.97% patients in centhaquine group (P=0.03335). At 24 hours

of resuscitation, systolic blood pressure of more than 110 mmHg was in 59.38% patients of control and 81.82% patients of centhaquine group (P=0.00842) (Figure 2 (upper panel)). At 48 hours of resuscitation, systolic blood pressure of more than 120 mmHg was recorded in 46.88% of control and 54.55% of centhaquine group, although this difference was not statistically significant at 48 hours (P= 0.238) (Figure 2 (upper panel)). Similarly, diastolic blood pressure increased above 65 mmHg in both groups however, significantly higher number of patients treated with centhaquine had diastolic blood pressure greater than control group. At 12 hours of resuscitation, diastolic blood pressure of more than 65 mmHg was in 62.50% patients in control and 75.76% patients in centhaquine group (P=0.0865). At 24 hours of resuscitation diastolic blood pressure of more than 70 mmHg was in 50.00% patients in control group and 78.46% patients in centhaquine group (P=0.002175). At 48 hours of resuscitation, diastolic blood pressure of more than 80 mmHg was in 31.25% patients in control group and 49.23% patients in centhaquine group (P=0.0464) (Figure 2 (lower panel)). An increase in pulse pressure was noted in patients treated with centhaquine compared to control. The difference between means ± SEM at 0 vs 48 hours was 11.41 ± 1.572 mmHg in control compared to 14.76 ± 1.743 mmHg in the centhaquine group. Pulse pressure at 30 hours of resuscitation was also found to be significantly higher (P=0.04196; 95% CI -0.4721 to 7.378) in centhaquine group compared to control. Similarly, a decrease in heart rate was noted in control and centhaquine patients. Difference between means ± SEM at 0 vs 48 hours was 35.78 ± 3.576 beats/min in control group compared to 25.52 ± 3.063 beats/min in centhaquine group.

Centhaquine Decreases Blood Lactate Levels

As expected the blood lactate levels in these hypovolemic shock patients were high on day 1, ranging from 2.04 to 11.90 mmol/L. Mean value ± SEM of blood lactate levels on day 1 in the

centhaquine group was 4.50 ± 0.29 mmol/L. Treatment with centhaquine led to a significant decrease in blood lactate levels as evidenced by blood lactate levels on day 3 that ranged from 0.6 to 4.82 mmol/L. Except for one out of 68 patients, every patient treated with centhaquine had lower levels of blood lactate on day 3 compared to day 1. In that patient, blood lactate levels were 2.69 and 4.82 mmol/L on day 1 and day 3 respectively. This patient was the only outlier where there was no decrease in blood lactate levels upon treatment with centhaquine. Mean value ± SEM of blood lactate levels on day 3 in the centhaquine group was 1.43± 0.09. In the control group two out of 34 patients had lower levels of blood lactate on day 3 compared to day 1. One patient had blood lactate levels of 4.80 and 5.30 mmol/L on day 1 and day 3, respectively and the other patient had blood lactate levels of 2.12 and 2.48 mmol/L on day 1 and day 3, respectively. In control group, mean value ± SEM of blood lactate levels were 4.13 ± 0.40 and 1.91 ± 0.26 mml/L on day 1 and day 3 respectively. Blood lactate levels at day 3 of resuscitation were found to be significantly lower in centhaquine group compared to control group receiving standard treatment (P=0.046; 95% CI -1.048 to 0.08253). The number of patients with blood lactate levels of 1.5 mmol or less were 46.88% in the control group compared to 69.35% in centhaquine group (P=0.0168) (Figure 3).

Centhaquine Improves Base Deficit

Base deficit ranged from -1.60 to -21.8 in patients from the centhaquine group on day 1. Only 4 out of 68 patients (5.88%) treated with centhaquine had lower base deficit on day 3 compared to day 1. Mean value ± SEM of base deficit was -7.35 ± 0.57 on day 1 and -1.90 ± 0.50 on day 3 in centhaquine group. In the control group 7 out 34 patients (20.59%) had lower base deficit on day 3 compared to day 1. Mean value ± SEM of base deficit was -6.85 ± 1.07 on day 1 and -3.33 ± 0.92 on day 3 in control group. Base-deficit improved in patients treated with centhaquine by

1.430 ± 1.047 mmol/L compared to control patients receiving standard treatment (P=0.0889). The number of patients with base-deficit of less than minus 2 were 46.88% in standard treatment group compared to 68.25% in those receiving centhaquine (P=0.0217) (Figure 4).

Centhaquine Decreases Mortality

Centhaquine treatment led to decreased 28-day all-cause mortality in hypovolemic shock patients that was statistically significant. In the control arm, 28-day all-cause mortality was 11.76% compared to 2.94% in centhaquine arm (odds ratio: 4.40; P=0.0371; 95% CI 0.9651-23.74) (Figure 5).

Centhaquine is Safe and Well Tolerated

Adverse events of any grade were reported in 3 patients in the centhaquine group. Two patients had elevated levels of serum creatinine (moderate severity) and one patient had vomiting (mild severity). None of these AEs were related to drug treatment. A total of six serious adverse events (deaths) were reported in the study, 4 deaths in the control group and 2 deaths in centhaquine group. No other serious adverse events were reported in the study. None of these SAEs were related to drug treatment (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

Treatment of blood loss resulting in hemorrhagic shock has been guided by traditional practices and not on randomized clinical trials conducted in multiple centers. Over five decades numerous attempts have been made to develop an effective resuscitative agent without success. Several agents that could decrease metabolic activity to reduce oxygen demand were studied, (Causey et al., 2013;Satterly et al., 2015;Georgoff et al., 2018) however, this hibernation-based approach has not shown any promise clinically. Hemoglobin-based blood substitutes were prepared as

resuscitative agents (Gulati and Rebello, 1994;Gulati et al., 1997;Spahn and Kocian, 2005;Sloan et al., 2010;Vincent et al., 2015), but none has been clinically successful to get market authorization. In the past 10 years a decrease in use of crystalloids and an increase in use of blood products in ratios that depict blood transfusion has been observed to improve outcome (Langan et al., 2014;Holcomb et al., 2015). However, fluids and vasopressors are still recognized as essential part of resuscitation and are associated with undesired effects fluid responsiveness, extravasation of fluids and cardiac complications (Abid et al., 2000;Kobayashi et al., 2012;Aoki et al., 2018). There is a need for the development of novel resuscitative agents that either work as single agent or assist in improving the outcome of existing therapeutics.

Centhaquine is a resuscitative agent acting as an α-adrenergic receptor agonist. It acts on venous α_{2B} adrenergic receptors to produce constriction and increase venous return to the heart, resulting in an increase in cardiac output and tissue perfusion. It also acts on central α_{2A} adrenergic receptors to reduce sympathetic drive and decrease systemic vascular resistance leading to improved tissue blood perfusion (Gulati et al., 2012). The resuscitative effect of centhaquine is completely blocked by α2 adrenergic receptor antagonists, yohimbine or atipamezole. Centhaquine does not act on beta-adrenergic receptors, therefore the risk of arrhythmias is mitigated. We have received approval of the International Nonproprietary Name (INN) of previously used names (centhaquin, PMZ-2010) as centhaquine (Organization, 2019).

In hypovolemic conditions, there is a drop in cardiac pre-load to a critical level resulting in a dramatic drop in cardiac output that in turn results in low tissue and organ perfusion, ultimately leading to multiple organ dysfunction and death. Clinical outcome of patients is predominantly monitored using biomarkers, blood pressure and blood lactate levels. Vasopressors tend to increase blood pressure by causing arterial vasoconstriction and increasing heart rate. An

increase in heart rate will augment cardiac output. However, the force or rate of contraction cannot explain large increases in cardiac output (Berlin and Bakker, 2014). About two-third of blood volume is stored in the venous system serving as a reservoir that is adjustable (Jansen et al., 2010). An increase in venous return from systemic veins into the right atrium will lead to a significant increase in cardiac output by Frank-Starling mechanism resulting in increased arterial blood pressure and tissue perfusion. Based on the mechanism of action, centhaquine increases venous return to the heart, increases cardiac output and tissue perfusion, making it an ideal candidate for use as a resuscitative agent in the treatment of patients with hypovolemic patients.

In pre-clinical models centhaquine significantly decreased blood lactate, and increased mean arterial pressure, pulse pressure and cardiac output. It was also found to decrease mortality and increase the survival time of hemorrhaged rats compared to Ringer's lactate, hypertonic saline or blood (Gulati et al., 2012;Gulati et al., 2013b;Lavhale et al., 2013;Papapanagiotou et al., 2016;Kontouli et al., 2019). Similarly, centhaquine improved survival rates in rabbit and swine models of hemorrhagic shock that closely mimic the human condition (Gulati et al., 2013a;Papapanagiotou et al., 2016;Kontouli et al., 2019). Based on this encouraging preclinical data, further clinical development of centhaquine was undertaken. Safety and efficacy of centhaquine was evaluated in healthy volunteers and hypovolemic shock patients in phase 1 (NCT02408731) and phase 2 studies respectively. In the phase 2 study (NCT04056065), centhaquine demonstrated significant efficacy in the improvement of key clinical features.

Hallmark features of hypovolemic patients are hypotension, increased blood lactate levels and increased base deficit. Reduction in blood pressure and increase in blood lactate are the main biomarkers that are used in identifying the risk and progress of clinical outcome in hypovolemic shock patients. Under conditions of shock, inadequate blood flow to the tissues, results in an

increase in blood lactate levels. High blood lactate levels and an increase in base deficit in patients are suggestive of poor outcomes and high mortality rates (Guyette et al., 2011). Early lactate clearance has been associated with decrease in mortality, shorter ICU length of stay and duration of mechanical ventilation (Pan et al., 2019). Results of this phase 3 study (NCT04045327) have confirmed previously observed efficacy in preclinical studies and in patients with hypovolemic shock (Gulati et al., 2012;Gulati et al., 2013b;Lavhale et al., 2013;Papapanagiotou et al., 2016;Kontouli et al., 2019;Gulati et al., 2020b). In the present study, centhaquine was found to be highly efficacious with statistically significant improvements in blood lactate levels (p=0.0168), base deficit (p= 0.0217) and blood pressure (p=0.002). Since time is of the essence in hypovolemic shock patients, it was observed that as early as 12 hours of resuscitation blood pressure was significantly improved compared to control suggesting faster recovery towards normalization of blood pressure with centhaquine. More importantly, treatment with centhaquine resulted in reduced 28-day all-cause mortality (odds ratio: 4.4; 95% CI 0.9651 to 23.74 and P=0.037). To our knowledge this is the only study that has demonstrated a statistically significant survival advantage. Centhaquine was found to be safe and well tolerated with no drug related adverse events. Based on the data from this study, centhaquine obtained Marketing Authorization from the regulatory authorities in India for the treatment of hypovolemic shock patients in May 2020.

Effect of centhaquine on systemic hemodynamics of patients with hypovolemic shock will depend on the fluid status at the time of its administration. A limitation of this study is that we have not examined the effect centhaquine on volume status of patients with hypovolemic shock. Centhaquine was administered in a total volume of 100 mL over 60 minutes, this is not likely to cause any volume overload. Moreover, the total volume of fluids administered in control and

centhaquine groups in the first 48 hours was similar (P=0.464). Blood products administered in the first 48 hours of resuscitation were also similar in control and centhaquine groups (P=0.371). Moreover, urine output in the first 48 hours was also not different (P=0.273) in control and centhaquine groups. Another limitation of this study is that although it is a multi-center study, it was conducted exclusively in patients from India. We recognize that the demographics and SOC for the treatment of hypovolemic shock across the world varies significantly and that the efficacy of centhaquine needs to be established in population across the world.

Conclusion: Centhaquine (Lyfaquin®) is a highly efficacious resuscitative agent for the treatment of hypovolemic shock as an adjuvant to SOC.

Acknowledgements: The present study was funded by Pharmazz, Inc. Toxicological study of centhaquine in dog was supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number R43HL137469. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Author Affiliations: Anil Gulati, Pharmazz, Inc. and Midwestern Univ, Willowbrook, IL; Rajat Choudhuri, Inst of Postgraduate Medical Education & Res/SSKM Hosp, Kolkata, India; Ajay Gupta, Chiranjeev Medical Ctr, Jhansi, India; Saurabh Singh, Inst of Medical Sciences, Banaras Hindu Univ, Varanasi, India; S. K. Noushad Ali, ACSR Government Medical Coll & Hosp, Nellore, India; Gursaran Kaur Sidhu, Sidhu Hosp Pvt. Ltd., Ludhiana, India; Parvez David Haque, Christian Medical Coll & Hosp, Ludhiana, India; Prashant Rahate, Seven Star Hosp, Nagpur, India; Aditya R. Bothra, Rahate Surgical Hosp & ICU, Nagpur, India; G.P. Singh, King George's Medical Univ, Lucknow, India; Sanjeev Maheshwari, Jawahar Lal Nehru Medical Coll & Attached Hosp, Ajmer, India; Deepak Jeswani, Criticare Hosp & Res Inst, Nagpur, India; Sameer Haveri, KLE's Dr. Prabhakar Kore Hosp & Medical Res Ctr, Belgaum, India; Apurva Agarwal, GSVM Medical Coll, Kanpur, India; Nilesh Radheshyam Agrawal, New Era Hosp & Res Inst, Nagpur, India

Table 1: List of hospitals

S. No.	Study Site	Site Initiation	Assessed Patient	Enrolled Patients
1	Institute of Post Graduate Medical Education and Research and SSKM Hospital, Kolkata, West Bengal	31st January 2019	36	25
2	King George's Medical University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh	26th March 2019	09	04
3	Institute of Medical Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh	12th April 2019	21	11
4	Seven Star Hospital, Nagpur, Maharashtra	18th April 2019	13	06
5	Rahate Surgical Hospital, Nagpur, Maharashtra	19th April 2019	13	05
6	New Era Hospital, Nagpur, Maharashtra	20th April 2019	01	01
7	Sidhu Hospital, Doraha, Ludhiana, Punjab	2nd May 2019	32	9
8	Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi Memorial Medical College, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh	21st May 2019	04	02
9	KLE's Dr. Prabhakar Kore Hospital and Medical Research Centre, Belgaum, Karnataka	22nd May 2019	09	02
10	Criticare Hospital and Research Institute, Nagpur, Maharashtra	18th June 2019	08	02
11	Christian Medical College & Hospital, Ludhiana, Punjab	19th June 2019	08	06
12	Jawahar Lal Nehru Medical College, Ajmer, Rajasthan	2nd July 2019	08	02
13	ACSR Government Medical College & Hospital, Nellore, Andhra Pradesh	4th July 2019	14	10
14	Chiranjeev Medical Centre, Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh	9th August 2019	21	20
		Total	**197**	**105**

Table 2: Patient's Demographics (Mean ± SEM)

Group	Gender	Age (Years)	Body Weight (Kg)	Height (Cm)	BMI (Kg/m^2)
Standard Treatment + Saline (N=34)	(22M/12F)	36.44±2.78	56.74±1.62	162.35±1.60	21.56±0.59
Standard Treatment + PMZ-2010 (N=68)	(41M/27F)	42.78±2.31	58.90±1.37	161.31±1.46	22.72±0.51

Table 3: Efficacy endpoints

Endpoint	**Centhaquine % of Patients**	**Placebo % of Patients**	**P Value**	**Hazard Ratio (95% CI)**
Primary Efficacy Endpoints				
Systolic Blood Pressure >110 mmHg @ 24 hr	81.82	59.38	0.0084	3.079
Diastolic Blood Pressure >70 mmHg @ 24 hr	78.46	50.00	0.0022	3.643
Blood Lactate Levels ≤ 1.5 mmol/L	69.35	46.88	0.0168	0.3899
Base Deficit < -2	68.25	46.88	0.0217	0.4104
Key Secondary Efficacy Endpoint				
Mortality	11.76	2.94	0.037	4.4 (0.9651-23.74)

Table 4: Centhaquine is Safe and Well Tolerated

Event	Centhaquine (N=71)	Placebo (N=34)
Adverse Events of any grade		
Increase in blood Creatinine	2 (2.8%)	0 (0%)
Vomiting	1 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
Serious Adverse Events		
Deaths	2 (2.8%)	4 (11.76%)



Figure 1: Patient enrollment



Figure 2: Centhaquine Increases Systolic and Diastolic Blood Pressure



Figure 3: Centhaquine Decreases Blood Lactate Levels





Difference between means ± SEM	1.430 ± 1.047
95% confidence interval	-0.6713 to 3.532
P value	0.0889
Welch-corrected t, df	t=1.367, df=50.28

Figure 4: Centhaquine Decreases Base Deficit



Chi-square, df	3.188, 1
Odds ratio	4.400
P value	0.0371
Percentage Control (mortality)	11.76%
Percentage Centhaquine (mortality)	2.94%

Figure 5: Centhaquine Reduces Mortality

REFERENCES

Abid, O., Akca, S., Haji-Michael, P., and Vincent, J.L. (2000). Strong vasopressor support may be futile in the intensive care unit patient with multiple organ failure. *Crit Care Med* 28**,** 947-949.

Al-Hesayen, A., and Parker, J.D. (2008). The effects of dobutamine on renal sympathetic activity in human heart failure. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol* 51**,** 434-436.

Aoki, M., Abe, T., Saitoh, D., Hagiwara, S., and Oshima, K. (2018). Use of Vasopressor Increases the Risk of Mortality in Traumatic Hemorrhagic Shock: A Nationwide Cohort Study in Japan. *Crit Care Med* 46**,** e1145-e1151.

Berlin, D.A., and Bakker, J. (2014). Understanding venous return. *Intensive Care Med* 40**,** 1564-1566.

Cannon, J.W. (2018). Hemorrhagic Shock. *N Engl J Med* 378**,** 370-379.

Causey, M.W., Miller, S., Hoffer, Z., Hempel, J., Stallings, J.D., Jin, G., Alam, H., and Martin, M. (2013). Beneficial effects of histone deacetylase inhibition with severe hemorrhage and ischemia-reperfusion injury. *J Surg Res* 184**,** 533-540.

Ganster, F., Burban, M., De La Bourdonnaye, M., Fizanne, L., Douay, O., Loufrani, L., Mercat, A., Cales, P., Radermacher, P., Henrion, D., Asfar, P., and Meziani, F. (2010). Effects of hydrogen sulfide on hemodynamics, inflammatory response and oxidative stress during resuscitated hemorrhagic shock in rats. *Crit Care* 14**,** R165.

Georgoff, P.E., Nikolian, V.C., Higgins, G., Chtraklin, K., Eidy, H., Ghandour, M.H., Williams, A., Athey, B., and Alam, H.B. (2018). Valproic acid induces prosurvival transcriptomic changes in swine subjected to traumatic injury and hemorrhagic shock. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 84**,** 642-649.

Gould, S.A., Moore, E.E., Moore, F.A., Haenel, J.B., Burch, J.M., Sehgal, H., Sehgal, L., Dewoskin, R., and Moss, G.S. (1997). Clinical utility of human polymerized hemoglobin as a blood substitute after acute trauma and urgent surgery. *J Trauma* 43**,** 325-331; discussion 331-322.

Goyal, A.O., Lavhale, M.S., and Gulati, A. (2015). Safety and Efficacy of Centhaquin as a Novel Resuscitative Agent for Hypovolemic Shock. *Circulation* 132 (Suppl 3)**,** A17521-A17521.

Gulati, A., Goyal, A.O., Lavhale, M.S., Gulati, S., and Scheetz, M. (2016). Human Pharmacokinetics of Centhaquin Citrate, a Novel Resuscitative Agent. *Circulation* 134 (Suppl 1)**,** A16607-A16607.

Gulati, A., Jain, D., Agrawal, N., Rahate, P., Das, S., Chowdhuri, R., Prabhu, M., Haveri, S., Dhibar, D., and Lavhale, M. (2020a). A phase II multicentric randomized controlled study of centhaquine in hemorrhagic shock patients. *Critical Care Medicine* 48**,** 840.

Gulati, A., Lavhale, M., Giri, R., Andurkar, S., and Xanthos, T. (2020b). Centhaquine citrate. Alpha2B-Adrenoceptor ligand, Resuscitative agent for hypovolemic shock. *Drugs Fut* 45**,** 153-163.

Gulati, A., Lavhale, M.S., Garcia, D.J., and Havalad, S. (2012). Centhaquin improves resuscitative effect of hypertonic saline in hemorrhaged rats. *J Surg Res* 178**,** 415-423.

Gulati, A., Mulloy, N., Zhang, Z., and Pais, G. (2013a). Resuscitative efficacy of centhaquin in a rabbit model of uncontrolled hemorrhagic shock. *Critical Care Medicine* 41.

Gulati, A., and Rebello, S. (1994). Diaspirin cross-linked hemoglobin (DCLHB): involvement of adrenergic mechanisms in the pressor effect. *Artif Cells Blood Substit Immobil Biotechnol* 22**,** 603-612.

Gulati, A., and Sen, A.P. (1998). Dose-dependent effect of diaspirin cross-linked hemoglobin on regional blood circulation of severely hemorrhaged rats. *Shock* 9**,** 65-73.

Gulati, A., Sen, A.P., Sharma, A.C., and Singh, G. (1997). Role of ET and NO in resuscitative effect of diaspirin cross-linked hemoglobin after hemorrhage in rat. *Am J Physiol* 273**,** H827-836.

Gulati, A., Zhang, Z., Murphy, A., and Lavhale, M.S. (2013b). Efficacy of centhaquin as a small volume resuscitative agent in severely hemorrhaged rats. *Am J Emerg Med* 31**,** 1315-1321.

Guyette, F., Suffoletto, B., Castillo, J.L., Quintero, J., Callaway, C., and Puyana, J.C. (2011). Prehospital serum lactate as a predictor of outcomes in trauma patients: a retrospective observational study. *J Trauma* 70**,** 782-786.

Havel, C., Arrich, J., Losert, H., Gamper, G., Mullner, M., and Herkner, H. (2011). Vasopressors for hypotensive shock. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, CD003709.

Holcomb, J.B., Jenkins, D., Rhee, P., Johannigman, J., Mahoney, P., Mehta, S., Cox, E.D., Gehrke, M.J., Beilman, G.J., Schreiber, M., Flaherty, S.F., Grathwohl, K.W., Spinella, P.C., Perkins, J.G., Beekley, A.C., Mcmullin, N.R., Park, M.S., Gonzalez, E.A., Wade, C.E., Dubick, M.A., Schwab, C.W., Moore, F.A., Champion, H.R., Hoyt, D.B., and Hess, J.R. (2007). Damage control resuscitation: directly addressing the early coagulopathy of trauma. *J Trauma* 62, 307-310.

Holcomb, J.B., Tilley, B.C., Baraniuk, S., Fox, E.E., Wade, C.E., Podbielski, J.M., Del Junco, D.J., Brasel, K.J., Bulger, E.M., Callcut, R.A., Cohen, M.J., Cotton, B.A., Fabian, T.C., Inaba, K., Kerby, J.D., Muskat, P., O'keeffe, T., Rizoli, S., Robinson, B.R., Scalea, T.M., Schreiber, M.A., Stein, D.M., Weinberg, J.A., Callum, J.L., Hess, J.R., Matijevic, N., Miller, C.N., Pittet, J.F., Hoyt, D.B., Pearson, G.D., Leroux, B., Van Belle, G., and Group, P.S. (2015). Transfusion of plasma, platelets, and red blood cells in a 1:1:1 vs a 1:1:2 ratio and mortality in patients with severe trauma: the PROPPR randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 313, 471-482.

Jansen, J.R., Maas, J.J., and Pinsky, M.R. (2010). Bedside assessment of mean systemic filling pressure. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 16, 231-236.

Kobayashi, L., Costantini, T.W., and Coimbra, R. (2012). Hypovolemic shock resuscitation. *Surg Clin North Am* 92, 1403-1423.

Kontouli, Z., Staikou, C., Iacovidou, N., Mamais, I., Kouskouni, E., Papalois, A., Papapanagiotou, P., Gulati, A., Chalkias, A., and Xanthos, T. (2019). Resuscitation with centhaquin and 6% hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4 improves survival in a swine model of hemorrhagic shock: a randomized experimental study. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 45, 1077-1085.

Langan, N.R., Eckert, M., and Martin, M.J. (2014). Changing patterns of in-hospital deaths following implementation of damage control resuscitation practices in US forward military treatment facilities. *JAMA Surg* 149, 904-912.

Lavhale, M.S., Havalad, S., and Gulati, A. (2013). Resuscitative effect of centhaquin after hemorrhagic shock in rats. *J Surg Res* 179, 115-124.

Levy, J.H., Goodnough, L.T., Greilich, P.E., Parr, G.V., Stewart, R.W., Gratz, I., Wahr, J., Williams, J., Comunale, M.E., Doblar, D., Silvay, G., Cohen, M., Jahr, J.S., and Vlahakes, G.J. (2002). Polymerized bovine hemoglobin solution as a replacement for allogeneic red blood cell transfusion after cardiac surgery: results of a randomized, double-blind trial. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 124, 35-42.

Moore, E.E., Moore, F.A., Fabian, T.C., Bernard, A.C., Fulda, G.J., Hoyt, D.B., Duane, T.M., Weireter, L.J., Jr., Gomez, G.A., Cipolle, M.D., Rodman, G.H., Jr., Malangoni, M.A., Hides, G.A., Omert, L.A., Gould, S.A., and Polyheme Study, G. (2009). Human polymerized hemoglobin for the treatment of hemorrhagic shock when blood is unavailable: the USA multicenter trial. *J Am Coll Surg* 208, 1-13.

Nederpelt, C.J., El Hechi, M.W., Kongkaewpaisan, N., Kokoroskos, N., Mendoza, A.E., Saillant, N.N., Fagenholz, P.J., King, D.R., Velmahos, G.C., and Kaafarani, H.M. (2020). Fresh Frozen Plasma-to-Packed Red Blood Cell Ratio and Mortality in Traumatic Hemorrhage: Nationwide Analysis of 4,427 Patients. *J Am Coll Surg* 230, 893-901.

Organization, W.H. (2019). International nonproprietary names for pharmaceutical substances (INN): proposed INN: list 121. *WHO Drug Information* 33, 233-392.

Pan, J., Peng, M., Liao, C., Hu, X., Wang, A., and Li, X. (2019). Relative efficacy and safety of early lactate clearance-guided therapy resuscitation in patients with sepsis: A meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 98, e14453.

Papapanagiotou, P., Xanthos, T., Gulati, A., Chalkias, A., Papalois, A., Kontouli, Z., Alegakis, A., and Iacovidou, N. (2016). Centhaquin improves survival in a swine model of hemorrhagic shock. *J Surg Res* 200**,** 227-235.

Perel, P., Roberts, I., and Ker, K. (2013). Colloids versus crystalloids for fluid resuscitation in critically ill patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev***,** CD000567.

Santry, H.P., and Alam, H.B. (2010). Fluid resuscitation: past, present, and the future. *Shock* 33**,** 229-241.

Satterly, S.A., Salgar, S., Hoffer, Z., Hempel, J., Dehart, M.J., Wingerd, M., Raywin, H., Stallings, J.D., and Martin, M. (2015). Hydrogen sulfide improves resuscitation via non-hibernatory mechanisms in a porcine shock model. *J Surg Res* 199**,** 197-210.

Sloan, E.P., Koenigsberg, M., Gens, D., Cipolle, M., Runge, J., Mallory, M.N., and Rodman, G., Jr. (1999). Diaspirin cross-linked hemoglobin (DCLHb) in the treatment of severe traumatic hemorrhagic shock: a randomized controlled efficacy trial. *JAMA* 282**,** 1857-1864.

Sloan, E.P., Koenigsberg, M.D., Philbin, N.B., Gao, W., Group, D.C.T.H.S.S., and European, H.I. (2010). Diaspirin cross-linked hemoglobin infusion did not influence base deficit and lactic acid levels in two clinical trials of traumatic hemorrhagic shock patient resuscitation. *J Trauma* 68**,** 1158-1171.

Spahn, D.R., and Kocian, R. (2005). Artificial O2 carriers: status in 2005. *Curr Pharm Des* 11**,** 4099-4114.

Thakral, S., Wolf, A., Beilman, G.J., and Suryanarayanan, R. (2018). Development and in vivo evaluation of a novel lyophilized formulation for the treatment of hemorrhagic shock. *Int J Pharm* 537**,** 162-171.

Vincent, J.L., Privalle, C.T., Singer, M., Lorente, J.A., Boehm, E., Meier-Hellmann, A., Darius, H., Ferrer, R., Sirvent, J.M., Marx, G., and Deangelo, J. (2015). Multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled phase III study of pyridoxalated hemoglobin polyoxyethylene in distributive shock (PHOENIX). *Crit Care Med* 43**,** 57-64.

Wepler, M., Merz, T., Wachter, U., Vogt, J., Calzia, E., Scheuerle, A., Moller, P., Groger, M., Kress, S., Fink, M., Lukaschewski, B., Rumm, G., Stahl, B., Georgieff, M., Huber-Lang, M., Torregrossa, R., Whiteman, M., Mccook, O., Radermacher, P., and Hartmann, C. (2019). The Mitochondria-Targeted H2S-Donor AP39 in a Murine Model of Combined Hemorrhagic Shock and Blunt Chest Trauma. *Shock* 52**,** 230-239.

Williams, A.T., Lucas, A., Muller, C.R., Munoz, C., Bolden-Rush, C., Palmer, A.F., and Cabrales, P. (2020). Resuscitation from Hemorrhagic Shock With Fresh and Stored Blood and Polymerized Hemoglobin. *Shock*.

Wolf, A., Lusczek, E.R., and Beilman, G.J. (2018). Hibernation-Based Approaches in the Treatment of Hemorrhagic Shock. *Shock* 50**,** 14-23.

Xu, Y., Dai, X., Zhu, D., Xu, X., Gao, C., and Wu, C. (2015). An exogenous hydrogen sulphide donor, NaHS, inhibits the apoptosis signaling pathway to exert cardio-protective effects in a rat hemorrhagic shock model. *Int J Clin Exp Pathol* 8**,** 6245-6254.