




# Questioning the ethics of international research on formula milk supplementation in low-income African countries: response

Tanya Doherty <sup>1,2,3</sup> Ingunn Marie S Engebretsen <sup>4</sup> Thorkild Tylleskär,<sup>4,5</sup> Kathy Burgoine <sup>6</sup> Anne Baerug,<sup>7</sup> Raul Mercer,<sup>8</sup> Phillip Baker,<sup>9</sup> David Clark,<sup>10</sup> Catherine Jane Pereira-Kotze <sup>2</sup>, Max Kroon<sup>3,11</sup>

**To cite:** Doherty T, Engebretsen IMS, Tylleskär T, *et al.* Questioning the ethics of international research on formula milk supplementation in low-income African countries: response. *BMJ Global Health* 2022;**7**:e010227. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2022-010227

Received 22 July 2022  
Accepted 28 July 2022

We thank Nankabirwa and colleagues for their response<sup>1</sup> to our commentary.<sup>2</sup> We concur that well-supported early, exclusive breast feeding (EBF) has important health benefits for infants. We also agree that strategies to prevent infant growth impairment are urgently needed. However, we are concerned that supplementing all low birthweight newborns with commercial milk formula, during the first 30 days, is ill considered as a possible solution and has potential for harm in these two countries where 40% of families lack access to basic drinking water services. Introducing commercial milk formula in the first 3 days, when frequent breast feeding is so critical to establish lactation and breast feeding, may also have a negative impact on these processes.

We fully share the trial authors' wish to help infants who fail to thrive while breast feeding and we applaud sincere efforts in this respect. We agree that there are situations where breast feeding is not adequate or indeed not possible. However, the trial was not designed to assess the need for an update to the WHO (2009) acceptable medical reasons for use of breast milk substitutes.<sup>3</sup> The current WHO recommendation regarding the duration of EBF was based on a systematic review<sup>4</sup> which concluded that: 'neither the trials nor the observational studies suggest that infants who continue to be exclusively breastfed for 6 months show deficits in weight or length gain, although larger sample sizes would be required to rule out modest differences in risk of undernutrition'. A 2012 update of this review concluded that: 'Although infants should still be managed individually so that insufficient growth or other adverse outcomes are not ignored and appropriate

## SUMMARY BOX

- ⇒ Well-supported early, exclusive breast feeding has important health benefits for infants.
- ⇒ We argue that supplementation with commercial milk formula, during the first 30 days, is ill considered as a possible intervention for small and at-risk newborns and has potential for harm within the research settings.
- ⇒ Interventions to address infant growth impairment must be sustainable, scalable and not increase harm.

interventions are provided, the available evidence demonstrates no apparent risks in recommending, as a general policy, EBF for the first 6 months of life in both developing and developed country settings'.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, a rationale for the WHO multicentre growth reference study<sup>6</sup> was that formula-fed infants grow on a different and higher trajectory than breastfed infants.<sup>7</sup>

There is overwhelming evidence that EBF for 6 months prevents morbidity and mortality, particularly in the first months of life when infants are at highest risk of infection-related mortality.<sup>8-9</sup> Early supplementation with commercial milk formula increases infection risk and alters the gut microbiota.<sup>10</sup> There is extensive evidence from the HIV epidemic that introduction of commercial milk formula increases infant morbidity and mortality.<sup>11</sup> In a study undertaken in Uganda,<sup>12</sup> the mortality risk among formula-fed infants was sixfold higher at 12 months of age. The formula was provided free of charge with good training and supervision by the health system.

Early supplementation of low birthweight newborns with commercial milk formula is not a sustainable or safe public health



▶ <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-009181>

▶ <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-010118>



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

### Correspondence to

Professor Tanya Doherty;  
tanya.doherty@mrc.ac.za

intervention. We agree with Nankabirwa and colleagues that all who care for small and at-risk infants need to join together to improve infant nutrition, growth, health and survival. We argue that any proposed interventions must be sustainable, scalable and not increase harm. We believe early supplementation of low birthweight newborns with expensive human milk oligosaccharide-enhanced commercial milk formula is not a scalable, sustainable or safe public health intervention.

All of the authors of the commentary are researchers or health professionals with considerable experience in low/middle-income countries. We respect institutional review boards and in no way intend to impugn their integrity. According to Nankabirwa and colleagues, the ethical committees who approved and monitored the PRIMES trial were highly engaged and active in evaluating the study and modifying its design to ensure appropriateness for local context. Making public these deliberations would help us understand their decisions.

#### Author affiliations

<sup>1</sup>Health Systems Research Unit, South African Medical Research Council, Tygerberg, South Africa

<sup>2</sup>School of Public Health, University of the Western Cape Faculty of Community and Health Sciences, Cape Town, South Africa

<sup>3</sup>Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, University of Cape Town Faculty of Health Sciences, Observatory, South Africa

<sup>4</sup>Centre for International Health, Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

<sup>5</sup>Centre for Intervention Science in Maternal and Child Health, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

<sup>6</sup>Neonatal Unit, Mbale Regional Referral Hospital, Mbale, Uganda

<sup>7</sup>Unit on Breastfeeding, Division for Health Services, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

<sup>8</sup>Program of Social Sciences and Health, Latin American School of Social Sciences (FLACSO), Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>9</sup>Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria, Australia

<sup>10</sup>Giovine-Clark Consultancy, Independent, New York, New York, USA

<sup>11</sup>Neonatal Service, Mowbray Maternity Hospital, Mowbray, South Africa

**Twitter** Ingunn Marie S Engebretsen @ingunnengebret1 and Phillip Baker @philbakernz

**Contributors** TD and IMSE coordinated the conceptualisation and writing of the original draft of the commentary, and this was reviewed by all 10 coauthors.

**Funding** TD is supported by the South African Medical Research Council.

**Competing interests** None declared.

**Patient consent for publication** Not required.

**Provenance and peer review** Commissioned; internally peer reviewed.

**Data availability statement** There are no data in this work.

**Open access** This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

#### ORCID iDs

Tanya Doherty <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1592-0080>

Ingunn Marie S Engebretsen <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5852-3611>

Kathy Burgoine <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7975-745X>

Catherine Jane Pereira-Kotze <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3061-6511>

#### REFERENCES

- 1 Nankabirwa V, Flaherman VJ, Co R, *et al*. Early infant growth impairment in the setting of frequent exclusive breast feeding: considering therapeutic options. *BMJ Glob Health* 2022.
- 2 Doherty T, Engebretsen IMS, Tylleskär T, *et al*. Questioning the ethics of international research on formula milk supplementation in low-income African countries. *BMJ Glob Health* 2022;7:e009181.
- 3 WHO, UNICEF. *Acceptable medical reasons for use of breast-milk substitutes*. Geneva: WHO, 2009.
- 4 Kramer MS, Kakuma R. Optimal duration of exclusive breastfeeding. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2002;CD003517.
- 5 Kramer MS, Kakuma R. Optimal duration of exclusive breastfeeding. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012;8:CD003517.
- 6 de Onis M, Onyango A, Borghi E. *WHO child growth standards length/height-for-age, weight-for-age, weight-for-length, weight-for-height and body mass index-for-age methods and development*. Geneva: Department of Nutrition for Health and Development, World Health Organization, 2006.
- 7 Garza C, de Onis M. Rationale for developing a new international growth reference. *Food Nutr Bull* 2004;25:S5–13.
- 8 Bahl R, Frost C, Kirkwood BR, *et al*. Infant feeding patterns and risks of death and hospitalization in the first half of infancy: multicentre cohort study. *Bull World Health Organ* 2005;83:418–26.
- 9 Sankar MJ, Sinha B, Chowdhury R, *et al*. Optimal breastfeeding practices and infant and child mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Paediatr* 2015;104:3–13.
- 10 Pärnänen KMM, Hultman J, Markkanen M, *et al*. Early-life formula feeding is associated with infant gut microbiota alterations and an increased antibiotic resistance load. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2022;115:407–21.
- 11 World Health Organisation and UNICEF. *Guideline: updates on HIV and infant feeding*. Geneva: WHO, 2016.
- 12 Kagaayi J, Gray RH, Brahmabhatt H, *et al*. Survival of infants born to HIV-positive mothers, by feeding modality, in Rakai, Uganda. *PLoS One* 2008;3:e3877.