



 Dryelle Oliveira Dias Le o<sup>1</sup>

 Muriel Bauermann Gubert<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade de Bras lia,  
Faculdade de Ci ncias da Sa de,  
Departamento de Nutri o,  
N cleo de Estudos  
Epidemiol gicos em Sa de e  
Nutri o. Bras lia, Distrito Federal,  
Brasil.

#### Correspondence

Dryelle Oliveira Dias Le o  
[dryelle.oliveiradl@gmail.com](mailto:dryelle.oliveiradl@gmail.com)

Article comes from part of the  
master's thesis in Human  
nutrition, from the Universidade  
de Bras lia, from Dryelle Oliveira  
Dias Le o, not yet published, with  
probable defense date for 2020..

## We need to talk about so-called growing up milks

### *Precisamos conversar sobre os chamados compostos l cteos*

#### Abstract

Industry is constantly looking to innovate and launch new products to attract consumers. In this context, growing up milk was launched. This product with a mixture of at least 51% milk base (milk or dairy products) with other food products, which according to the manufacturers is aimed at children from one years old to pre-school age. There are 13 different types of these mixtures on the Brazilian market. Similar packaging can confuse caregivers, who may believe these compounds are substitutes, equivalents, or follow-up to infant formulas at a reduced cost. They are often promoted commercially with giveaways and discounts on multiple purchases or combos and are heavily promoted on social media. Their labels advertise that they contain essential oils, fiber, immunonutrients, vitamins, and minerals, which may lead consumers to think that the product alone provides everything the child needs for this age, despite being an ultra-processed product, not recommended for consumption by this child. As they are new products in the market, they still are still not regulated by the Brazilian Standard for Commercialization of Food for Infants and Children in Early Childhood, Nipples, Pacifiers, and Feeding Bottles, today Law No. 11,265/2006 and Decree No. 9,579/2018. The suggestion is that these mixtures should be included in the legislation, with marketing controlled

within the scope of the law, as well as the creation of rules to restrict the abusive advertising of these and other products for children between one and three years old.

**Keywords:** Breast-Milk Substitutes. Food Industry. Breastfeeding

### **Resumo**

A indústria busca constantemente inovar e lançar no mercado novos produtos que atraiam o consumidor. Nesse contexto, foi lançado o composto lácteo, um produto com a mistura de pelo menos 51% de base láctea (leite ou derivados) com outros produtos alimentícios que, segundo os próprios fabricantes, é voltado para crianças de um ano até a idade pré-escolar. Existem no mercado brasileiro 13 tipos diferentes de compostos lácteos. A semelhança entre as embalagens pode causar confusão na compra por parte dos cuidadores, que podem achar que esses compostos são substitutos, equivalentes ou seguimento das fórmulas infantis, a um custo reduzido. Eles costumam ser promovidos comercialmente com brindes e descontos em compras múltiplas ou combos, além de serem intensamente promovidos em mídias sociais. Os rótulos deles valorizam o fato de conterem óleos essenciais, fibras, imunonutrientes, vitaminas e minerais, o que pode induzir o consumidor a pensar que o produto fornece, sozinho, tudo que a criança precisa nesta faixa etária, apesar de ser um produto ultraprocessado, não recomendado para o consumo dessa criança. Por serem produtos novos no mercado, ainda não se enquadram na Norma Brasileira de Comercialização de Alimentos para Lactentes e Crianças de Primeira Infância, Bicos, Chupetas e Mamadeiras, hoje Lei nº 11.265/2006 e Decreto nº 9.579/2018. Sugere-se a inclusão do composto na legislação, com a comercialização controlada no escopo da lei, bem como a criação de normas para restringir a publicidade abusiva deste e outros produtos para crianças entre um e três anos de idade

**Palavras-chave:** Substitutos do Leite Materno. Indústria Alimentícia. Aleitamento Materno.

## CONTEXT

The 1970s were a milestone in relation to breastfeeding worldwide. Around this time science became interested in the declining rate of breastfeeding and the increasing sale of infant formula worldwide. Mike Muller's book<sup>1</sup> ignited the issue, accusing the formula industry of introducing its products into poor countries and encouraging artificial feeding at the expense of breastfeeding, without concern for the consequences of misuse or inappropriate use of these compounds.

At first, breastmilk substitutes were promoted by highlighting their resemblance to human milk. However, around 1950, advertisements began to introduce infant formulas as substitutes and with nutrient supply that surpassed breast milk in quality.<sup>2</sup> Unregulated marketing, coupled with the significant changes in society at the time - such as the growing urbanization and the entrance of women into the workforce - provided the perfect setting for the promotion of what industry claimed to be the symbol of female liberation.

The consequences of these anti-breastfeeding investments soon appeared. Childhood illnesses increased, mainly due to poor sanitary conditions in the preparation of formulas, which became vehicles of contamination and provided less than recommended nutrients, due to dilution errors,<sup>2</sup> in addition to the formulas themselves being unregulated at that time. Children using the formulas also had developmental delay due to the low essential fatty acid content of these products and their propensity for chronic non-communicable diseases due to their high energy density.<sup>3</sup>

To control the use and marketing of these products, as well as to promote and protect breastfeeding (BF), the World Health Organization (WHO) - together with academia, non-governmental organizations, governments of various countries, and civil society. - created in 1981 the International Code for the Marketing of Human Milk Substitutes.<sup>4</sup>

In Brazil, the Code was first published as a Resolution by the National Health Council (CNS) in 1988, revised in 1992, called the Brazilian Standard for the Commercialization of Infant Food (NBCAL). NBCAL, after several reformulations, was transformed into Law No. 11,265/2006, and regulated by Decree No. 8,552/2015, replaced by Decree No. 9,579/2018.<sup>5-7</sup>

Brazilian legislation on infant formulas and food products for children up to three years old, including nipples, bottles and pacifiers, is now one of the most comprehensive legal instruments in protecting breastfeeding, as it encompasses most of the items established by the WHO code.<sup>8</sup> However, despite the collective efforts of lawmakers and civil society to advocate for breastfeeding, loopholes in the law still allow industry to develop strategies to promote their

products, including confusing visual labeling, loyalty merchandising and rewards programs, or the development of new products that take advantage of legislative loopholes.

In this context, the so-called growing up milks (GUM) was regulated by the Brazilian Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply (MAPA) in 2007. GUM is defined as “a powdered product resulting from the mixture of dairy ingredients – milk and/or dairy product(s) or food substance(s) - with other ingredients such as vegetable oils and sugar, along with chemical additives, such as flavorings, preservatives, flavor enhancers, among others, and dairy components must represent at least 51% of the total ingredients.”<sup>9</sup> Today, in Brazil, 13 types of growing up milks are marketed by three Different brands.

A GUM does not fit, a priori, by its composition, into any of the product categories covered by the scope of the legislation on milk, infant formula, follow-up, diet therapy, cereals, etc.<sup>5-7</sup>

According to the website of one of the companies offering GUM for sale, the “main difference between milk powder and milk mixture is that the latter includes the possibility of adding important nutrients for healthy development in childhood, such as vitamins, minerals, fiber in adequate quantities, and DHA (docosahexaenoic acid).”<sup>10</sup> This “growing up milk” is offered as the food that will provide the necessary nutrients, especially vitamins and minerals, for this phase of life.

In other countries, it is usually sold as fortified milk, not growing up milk,<sup>11</sup> but it has a long list of ingredients and is not nominally characterized in legislation, similar to Brazil. Few studies have found the need for this product,<sup>12-14</sup> because there are already other products that may meet requirements in special cases, such as malnutrition and innate errors of metabolism. The point is that there is no international legal definition to regulate GUM.

The composition of these products often includes vegetable oils, sugar, and food additives in the list of ingredients. According to the new classification, these products are ultra-processed.<sup>15,16</sup> However, this information is not known to the consumer, which can be induced to consume this product by ingenious and misleading marketing techniques,<sup>17</sup> in which product advertising omits product information that would influence customer decision making, as detailed below. In this reflection, we will focus on two aspects of marketing GUM: label design and product advertising strategies on social networks, television media, and manufacturers' websites, in light of the proposals by McDaniel and Gates.<sup>18</sup>

In the case of product label design, words such as “Premium”, “Supreme”, and similar are used to reinforce the idea that the product has a special composition and favors more adequate growth compared to milk powder. The most common nutritional claims are the presence of DHA,

a source of minerals, rich in vitamins, zero added sugars, and adding fiber to aid bowel function. Just as important as nutrition claims is the label design of these products. GUM packages display the same colors, font and lettering, text distribution, and prominent elements as products for children under one year old (infant and follow-on formulas) of the same brand (Figure 1).

**Figure 1.** Examples comparing labels on growing up milk with those on infant formula. Source: Internet stock photography images.



These characteristics, reinforced by marketing strategies, imply that milk mixture provides continuity in infant feeding after infant formulas and follow-up formulas, which along with the attractive price compared to infant formulas, can encourage the caregiver to purchase them. This can occur through relationship marketing, characterized by a focus on long-term business relationship, with the objective of building customer loyalty to the brand. In this type of marketing, a company needs to offer what the customer is looking for: meeting their needs with access to the best product at the lowest possible price, so that the customer will believe that it is the best for them.<sup>19</sup>

Another a risk is that caregivers will confuse GUM with infant formula, making an unequal replacement. Under no circumstances should GUM be offered to children under one year of age, as they are formulated for the nutritional needs of older children and are not a complete diet, but just as “supplement”.

The nutritional claims on the labels value the addition of vegetable or fish oils, fiber, immunonutrients, vitamins and minerals. The promise is that these elements will ensure proper nutrition, motor and bone growth and development, strength, and intelligence. By advertising that growing up milk is almost magical, they imply that it provides all that the child needs.

Other commercial promotion strategies involve giving away gifts and toys, discounted pricing on the purchase of larger cans, and even subscription to child-friendly cartoon channels. The strategies also include compound buying clubs on manufacturers' websites; social media promotion, paid sponsorship of maternity blogs and digital influencers, and celebrity product promotion. Manufacturers' websites feature question and answer sections, often signed by healthcare professionals, justifying and emphasizing the advantages of additives.<sup>10</sup>

This is why we need to talk about these growing up milk. Regulation of this type of product is urgent. As in the past, civil society, health professionals, and governmental and non-governmental bodies must join forces and work together to update the current legislation, so that the marketing and advertising of the so-called GUMs fall under the same strict rules for other early childhood products. The specific inclusion of these products in the scope of Decree No. 9,579/2018,<sup>7</sup> is necessary, placing them as their own category, and in view of the potential damage from their misuse, at least hold GUM to the same restrictions on commercial promotion as the follow-up and early childhood formulas. Our children must be protected, and this cannot wait.

## REFERENCES

1. Muller M. *The Baby Killer: A War on Want Investigation into the Promotion and Sale of Powdered Baby Milks in the Third World*. London: War on Want; 1974.
2. Amorim STSP. Alimentação infantil e o marketing da indústria de alimentos, Brasil, 1960-1988. *História: questões & debates* 2005; 42:95-111.
3. Rea MF. Substitutos do leite materno: passado e presente. *Rev. Saúde Pública* 1990; 24(3): 241-249.
4. WHO/UNICEF. International code of marketing breast-milk substitutes. *WHO Chron* 1981;35:112-17.
5. Brasil. Lei nº 11.265. Regulamenta a comercialização de alimentos para lactentes e crianças de primeira infância e também a de produtos de puericultura correlatos. *Diário Oficial da União*. 4 de janeiro de 2006.

6. Brasil. Decreto 8552. Regulamenta a Lei nº 11.265, de 3 de janeiro de 2006, que dispõe sobre a comercialização de alimentos para lactentes e crianças de primeira infância e de produtos de puericultura correlatos. Diário Oficial da União. 3 de janeiro de 2006.
7. Brasil. Decreto nº 9.579. Consolida atos normativos editados pelo Poder Executivo federal que dispõem sobre a temática do lactente, da criança e do adolescente e do aprendiz, e sobre o Conselho Nacional dos Direitos da Criança e do Adolescente, o Fundo Nacional para a Criança e o Adolescente e os programas federais da criança e do adolescente, e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial da União. 22 de novembro de 2018.
8. Araújo MFM, Otto. AFN, Schmitz, BAS. Primeira avaliação do cumprimento dos "Dez Passos para o Sucesso do Aleitamento Materno" nos Hospitais Amigos da Criança do Brasil. Rev. Bras. Saude Mater. Infant. 2003; 3(4):411-419.
9. Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento (Brasil). Instrução Normativa nº 28. 12 de junho de 2007. Diário Oficial da União 12 de junho de 2007.
10. Nestlé Baby&Me [homepage na internet]. Composto lácteo, perguntas e respostas; 2019.
11. Przyrembel H, Agostoni B. Growing up milk: a necessity or marketing? In: Szajewska H, Shamir R (eds): Evidence-based research in pediatric nutrition. World Rev Nutr Diet. 108:49-55, 2013.
12. Wall, CR., Hill, RJ., Lovell, AL., Matsuyama, M., Milne, T., Grant, CC. Davies, PSW. A multicenter, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial to evaluate the effect of consuming Growing Up Milk "Lite" on body composition in children aged 12-23 mo. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2019; 109(3):576-585.
13. Lovell, A. L., Milne, T., Jiang, Y., Chen, R. X., Grant, C. C., & Wall, C. R. Evaluation of the Effect of a Growing up Milk Lite vs. Cow's Milk on Diet Quality and Dietary Intakes in Early Childhood: The Growing up Milk Lite (GUMLi) Randomised Controlled Trial. *Nutrients* 2019;11(1), 203.
14. Chatchatee P, Lee WS, Carrilho E, et al. Effects of growing up milk supplemented with prebiotics and LCPUFAs on infections in young children. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 2014;58(4):428-437.
15. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde (MS). Guia Alimentar para a População Brasileira. Brasília: MS; 2014.
16. Ludwig, D. Technology, diet, and the burden of chronic disease. *JAMA* 2011;305:1352-1353.
17. Brasil. Lei nº. 8078, de 11 de setembro de 1990. Código de Defesa do Consumidor. Diário Oficial da União 12 set 1990;128(176 supl):1.
18. McDaniel, C.; Gates, R. Pesquisa de Marketing, 5 ed. São Paulo: Elsevier Academic; 2003.
19. Berry, L. L. Relationship marketing of service perspectives from 1983 and 2000. *Journal of Relationship Marketing* 2002;1(1):59-77.

**Contributors**

Leão DOD participated in the conception and design; literature review, data collection, analysis and interpretation of data; review and approval of the final version of the article. Gubert MB participated in the conception and design; data analysis and interpretation; review and approval of the final version of the article.

Conflict of interest: the authors declare no conflict of interest.

---

Received: July 5, 2018

Reviewed: August 19, 2018

Accepted: September 2, 16, 2018