Choice of feeding preparations for the newborn

Sir,

As a paediatric dietitian I read with interest Dr Bamford's comments on the choice of feeding preparations for the newborn. The choice of a modified baby milk is, as he points out, virtually an impossible choice as all comply with the guidelines of the Department of Health and Social Security.

In my view the solution is for a shared contract. An agreement could be made with the baby food manufacturers to supply their appropriate baby milk formulas at an acceptable set price to maternity units, children’s hospitals, and paediatric units. (Such a contract has been accepted unofficially in the past and is likely to be formally accepted if supported by paediatricians.) This would do away with ‘doubtful incentives’ and might encourage the baby food manufacturers, who no longer have to compete for business, to donate a portion of their shared profits to paediatric research!

If breast feeding, for whatever reason, is not undertaken then the choice of baby milk, from the low solute range, should be made by the mother, particularly if she is distressed at being unable to breast feed. There is a clear variation in cost, which is of major importance for many families. If determined mothers are forced to feed their infants on a product they may, on discharge from hospital, change the formula, which could unsettle the infant.

We must be open minded and supply a choice of formulas that meet the requirements of young infants. More importantly, we must show we are unbiased. Supplying only one brand of baby milk formula is misleading as it implies to the general public that a particular health authority considers this product to be the best infant formula available. That the decision has been made only for financial reasons is not obvious and it allows the selected food manufacturer to use the contract award for sales promotion.

The undesirability of relying on one baby milk formula was emphasised recently when one powder was condemned as a suspected source of salmonella and immediately withdrawn. Had the ready to feed milk been affected, units solely using the brand in question would not have been able to offer an alternative. The fact that the incident happened in the Christmas period intensified the problem.

Expert opinion on the finer differences in baby milk formulas is available from paediatric dietitians, who are always pleased to advise.

Christine Clothier
Royal Liverpool Children’s Hospital,
Alder Hey,
Liverpool L12 2AP

Sir,

The seductive blandishments of the milk food industry described by Dr Bamford¹ have been avoided in at least one hospital for six years. Here, midwives and doctors recite ‘all baby milks approved by the Department of Health and Social Security are suitable. If you have a particular milk which you wish to use, we will try to provide it during your baby’s stay in hospital.’ A recent and unexpected bonus was the absence of organisational problems when Osterfeed was suddenly withdrawn.

Product endorsement by hospitals is actively sought by infant food manufacturers, and perhaps to a greater degree than many paediatricians are aware. The ready to feed
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bottled milk is almost universally used in National Health Service (NHS) hospitals. The cost per unit is approximately double that charged to the hospitals, a striking example of philanthropy! The actual cost to the hospital of a single supplier or multiple suppliers is marginal when one considers the high rate of breast feeding and early discharge home that is now widely practised. In the long term it is theoretically possible that by chasing the lowest price one could end up in a monopoly situation with the price being dictated to the NHS and the general public.

My personal moment of enlightenment came when a regional sales manager asked what substantial piece of equipment or research project could be funded when he learnt that his company’s monopoly was to be ended.

To be consistent, should we not give equally careful consideration to the distribution of ‘bounty bags’ and free ‘baby’s progress’ wall charts, which are bordered by unsolicited advertisements. Here again our professional silence surely implies endorsement.

ALEX HABEL
West Middlesex University Hospital,
Isetworth,
Middlesex TW7 6AF
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Turner’s syndrome

Sir,

I am very sorry to see the article entitled ‘Turner syndrome’ in the March journal—not because of its content, which was excellent as would be expected in an article by Charles Brook; it was the lack of the apostrophe ‘s’ that disturbed me. I have of course been aware for some time that a number of American journals have dropped this recently but I am sorry to see that you have joined them. I am afraid I fail to see how a group of journal editors can take a unilateral decision to change the English language and I fail to see any logic whatever in trying to abolish the apostrophe ‘s’. To talk of Turner’s syndrome or Cushing’s syndrome without it is difficult and sounds extremely ugly. It doesn’t even save on space or printing ink as it is necessary to refer to ‘the Turner syndrome’ from time to time.

I do wish you would change your mind and reintroduce the apostrophe ‘s’.
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Treatment of asthma with beclomethasone

Sir,

I am sorry that credit is not given where it is due. The first paper on the use of beclomethasone for treating asthma in children was written in 1973 in Derby by Dr Morrow Brown and his colleague. This was published a year before the article by Godfrey and Kornig, which is given as the first reference in a recent paper by Storr, Lenney, and Lenney on nebulised beclomethasone.

I think we should recognise that Dr Morrow Brown was the first person to publish on the use of steroid aerosols for childhood asthma and not ignore this work.
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