

# Baby Box Distributions: Public Health Benefit or Concern?

Wendy Middlemiss, PhD<sup>1</sup> ; Naomi C. Brownstein, PhD<sup>2</sup>;  
Miranda Leddy, MS<sup>1</sup>; Scott Nelson, BA<sup>3</sup>; Srikant Manchiraju, PhD<sup>4</sup>;  
and Joseph G. Grzywacz, PhD<sup>5</sup>

## Keywords

SIDS, infant mortality, health disparities, maternal and child health, morbidity and mortality trends, pediatrics

An increasing number of countries, including Canada, the United Kingdom, and South Asia, are distributing baby boxes (ie, cardboard boxes for infants to sleep in during naps and at nighttime that are patterned from a baby box distributed in Finland) as part of initiatives to reduce the incidence of sleep-related infant death.<sup>1,2</sup> Beginning in 2017, distribution initiatives in the United States included statewide and citywide efforts. Continuing initiatives in 4 states (Alabama, New Jersey, Ohio, and Texas) plan the distribution of 705 000 baby boxes.<sup>2</sup> Some communities are distributing baby boxes to mothers of infants at risk for sudden unexplained infant death syndrome; others are distributing baby boxes to all new mothers.<sup>3,4</sup>

Reducing the high number of sleep-related infant deaths in the United States (3700 deaths in 2015, or approximately 90 deaths per 100 000 live births)<sup>5</sup> is the primary motivation for distributing baby boxes.<sup>6</sup> However, empirical evidence documenting the effectiveness of a cardboard baby box either as a safe sleep space or a means of decreasing sleep-related infant deaths is absent from the literature.<sup>7,8</sup> This absence of scientific evidence of the safety and effectiveness of the baby box for reducing sleep-related infant deaths raises 2 questions: “What is driving distribution?” and “What are the potential concerns?”

## Current Use and Concerns

A common justification for distributing cardboard baby boxes is an inaccurate interpretation that baby box distribution in Finland drove changes in rates of infant deaths during sleep.<sup>7</sup> It is accurate that the Social Insurance Institution of Finland, Kela, distributed baby boxes beginning in the 1930s.<sup>9</sup> Distribution was part of a health initiative focused on reducing rates of sudden infant death syndrome and increasing birth rates in Finland by increasing the number of women seeking prenatal care.<sup>9,10</sup> Receiving a baby box required engagement in a specified number of prenatal visits.<sup>10</sup> The incentive for completing prenatal care was receipt of the baby box, which was filled with baby-related

materials. A spokesperson for Kela indicated that this health care initiative, which aimed to increase prenatal care and included antipoverty actions, drove improvements in infants’ outcomes.<sup>10</sup> The importance of emphasizing antipoverty programs and new directions for health policy, rather than a reliance on baby box distribution, is evident globally in both research and public health campaigns.<sup>2,11</sup>

## Safety of Use

Cardboard baby boxes do not meet the definition of a bassinet or crib. Thus, baby boxes are not subject to standard US safety certifications (eg, certification by the Consumer Product Safety Commission). Part of certification is the reporting of adverse events with certified products. Because accidents or deaths related to use of the cardboard baby box would not be reported through this central resource, it would be difficult for families or agencies to monitor the safety of using cardboard baby boxes for infant sleep.<sup>12</sup>

The safety of the baby box for infant sleep raises other pressing concerns, particularly concerns related to the ventilation of baby boxes, the box as an impediment to breastfeeding, the integrity of cardboard as an infant sleep space, baby box placement, and the likelihood that baby boxes will be used for infant sleep. No scientific studies address

<sup>1</sup> Department of Educational Psychology, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Behavioral Sciences and Social Medicine, College of Medicine, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

<sup>3</sup> College of Medicine, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

<sup>4</sup> Department of Retail Merchandising and Product Development, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Family and Child Sciences, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Wendy Middlemiss, PhD, University of North Texas, Department of Educational Psychology, 1155 Union Circle #11335, Denton, TX 76203, USA. Email: wendy.middlemiss@unt.edu

these issues.<sup>1,6</sup> We address these concerns and related potential risks.

### **Ventilation**

The height of the sides of the most commonly distributed cardboard baby boxes is approximately 10 inches.<sup>13</sup> This height and the impermeability of cardboard raise concerns about the quality of air available to infants.<sup>1,6</sup> It is not known whether ventilation is sufficient to avoid infants' rebreathing of expired breath. One concern is that rebreathing expired air can result in potentially higher concentrations of carbon dioxide in the baby box, which can pose an increased risk of sleep-related death.<sup>6,14</sup> A second concern related to ventilation is whether poor ventilation places infants at risk of overheating. Empirical evidence associates overheating with an increased risk of infant suffocation during sleep.<sup>1</sup> Without empirical evidence of safety, adequate ventilation remains a concern. Of note, an empirical study found that in-bed bassinets, which are smaller than baby boxes, have lower sides, have mesh or aerated walls, provide adequate ventilation, and maintain infants' oxygen saturation and thermal environment during sleep.<sup>15,16</sup>

### **Impediment to Breastfeeding**

The height of the cardboard box walls<sup>13</sup> and the impermeability of the cardboard sides raise concerns about mothers' breastfeeding.<sup>6,14</sup> Unlike other in-bed devices, which have lower and often softer sides (ie, approximately 6 inches),<sup>17,18</sup> baby boxes prohibit mothers from easily breastfeeding their infant.<sup>15</sup> Breastfeeding is an important protective factor against infant death during sleep. Thus, balancing the use of baby boxes with the risk of reducing the likelihood of breastfeeding is a concern.

### **Cardboard Integrity**

No empirical studies have examined the probability of keeping the cardboard base of the baby box dry and sanitary.<sup>19</sup> Common occurrences during infant sleep (eg, spitting up, loose diapers) make it unlikely that the cardboard base will remain dry. This potential for the cardboard to become wet leads to concerns about whether a cardboard baby box can maintain its structural integrity and, if so, for how long and under what conditions.<sup>1,6</sup> Because one purported benefit of a cardboard baby box is its portability, the structural integrity of the base is a safety consideration. Portability contributes to decisions to distribute cardboard baby boxes to families in need of a sleep space rather than a certified, structurally sound space, such as a self-standing portable crib.<sup>20</sup>

### **Placement**

An additional safety concern is where parents can place a baby box when it contains the infant (either sleeping or otherwise). The most commonly distributed cardboard baby

boxes are generally larger (eg, approximately 27 inches long and 17 inches wide)<sup>13</sup> than other in-bed sleep bassinets such as the SwaddleMe By Your Side sleeper (Summer, Woonsocket, RI) or the Pepi-Pod (Pepi-Pod, Christchurch, New Zealand; eg, approximately 16 inches long and 13 inches wide).<sup>17,18</sup> The size of the cardboard baby box raises concerns about where caregivers can place the baby box for infant sleep.<sup>1</sup> It is unclear where the box should be placed if it is too large to fit in an adult bed. Placing a baby box on a dresser or table raises potential hazards, including the box tipping over or falling. Placing a baby box on the floor introduces risk from pets, other children, or falling objects.<sup>6</sup> Thus, one concern is how various-sized boxes can be used safely.

### **Likelihood of Use**

Baby box distribution initiatives often focus on lower-income and non-Hispanic black mothers because non-Hispanic black infants are more likely to experience a sleep-related death than non-Hispanic white or Hispanic infants.<sup>21</sup> As such, one concern is whether women from this target population view baby boxes as useful or attractive for infant care. If baby boxes are not seen as useful or attractive as a sleep space for infants, the effectiveness of cardboard baby boxes to reduce the risk of sleep-related infant death will be compromised.<sup>22</sup> To our knowledge, the question of parents' perceptions of the baby box and use has been examined in only 1 empirical qualitative study.<sup>23</sup> In that study, women described the usefulness of baby boxes in relation to the affordability of the baby box for those who could not afford a crib. Attractiveness was described as the baby box being decorative or portable.

### **Soliciting Caregivers' Perceptions**

To explore the question of use more directly, we invited caregivers to rate their perceptions of the attractiveness (ie, comfortable or uncomfortable) and usefulness (ie, worthless or valuable) of the baby box. We solicited feedback by using the online crowdsourcing survey tool MTurk,<sup>24</sup> a data collection platform that has been deemed a reliable source for data collection.<sup>25</sup> We collected data in December 2016, as part of a broader project that had received institutional review board approval at the University of North Texas. In total, 550 survey respondents (125 men, 425 women) were requested through MTurk. Potential participants responded to qualifying questions to determine their eligibility for the study (eg, "Has a baby entered your life in the last 5 months or will a baby enter your life in the next 5 months? If yes, will you take a caregiving role?"). We considered data to be usable if a respondent had a valid US internet protocol address, spent a nonzero amount of time on the survey, and answered at least 1 of the first set of questions about perceived safety. Of 1615 total responses, 750 respondents met the eligibility criteria, 549 of whom provided usable data. Of eligible responses

with usable data, 8 pairs of responses had the same internet protocol address, either the sole complete response was used, or one of the responses was selected at random. The final sample contained 541 eligible respondents.

### Usefulness and Attractiveness

The 541 caregivers who met the inclusion criteria and had usable data rated their perception of the attractiveness and usefulness of the baby box on a scale from 1 (low attractiveness or usefulness) to 100 (high attractiveness or usefulness). Caregivers rated a total of 10 items: 5 measuring the intensity of attraction and 5 measuring the intensity of usefulness. Ratings were based on images of the baby box; 1 image featured a baby and 1 image did not feature a baby. We tabulated descriptive statistics on ratings for the entire sample and by ethnicity, and we examined perceptions of caregivers by whether or not they received public assistance. These ratings can be viewed from the perspective of the expectancy-value theory of planned behavior (ie, considering caregivers' expectancy of a positive outcome with use of the baby box and the value of that outcome).<sup>26</sup>

Caregivers' ratings provided little support for the likelihood of using the baby box. If caregivers' ratings from 1-100 were put in terms of an academic grade, wherein  $\geq 90.0$  was considered an "A," 80.0-89.9 was considered a "B," and so on, the baby box typically earned a "D" (60.0-69.9) or "F" ( $< 60.0$ ). For non-Hispanic black caregivers who received public assistance—a common target for safe infant sleep services—mean ratings of usefulness were  $< 60.0$ . Non-Hispanic black caregivers gave a mean rating of 49 (median, 47) for the usefulness statement, "In my home, this [baby box] would be [responses ranging from worthless to useful]"; a mean rating of 58 (median, 55) for the safety statement, "This [baby box] seems [responses ranging from dangerous to safe]"; and a mean rating of 52 (median, 41) for the attractiveness statement, "Using this [baby box] would be [responses ranging from uncomfortable to comfortable]."

Non-Hispanic white caregivers gave slightly higher ratings for the 3 statements. Non-Hispanic white caregivers gave a mean rating of 61 (median, 65) for the usefulness statement, a mean rating of 59 (median, 59) for the safety statement, and a mean rating of 60 (median, 67) for the attractiveness statement. Thus, the ratings for the 3 statements fell into the "F" range among non-Hispanic black caregivers and the "D" to "F" range among non-Hispanic white caregivers.

These perceptions may preclude caregivers' use of cardboard baby boxes, suggesting that community-wide initiatives, such as those undertaken in the United States and globally, are unlikely to yield their intended result. These findings force the question, "Will caregivers use something that is not perceived as valuable?" The results of this preliminary study suggest that caregivers may not perceive the cardboard baby box as a useful, safe, or attractive sleep space. Results from further exploration of whether

cardboard baby boxes may be useful for caregivers whose infants are at risk of sleep-related death may help inform successful intervention and prevention initiatives. Thus, definitive empirical peer-reviewed research on both attitudes and outcomes is needed.

### Public Health Implications

Without solid empirical accounts of the safety and use of the baby box, broad dissemination of the baby box to help reduce rates of sleep-related infant deaths in the United States is premature. Furthermore, the potential effect of the baby box on parents' engagement in various protective factors, such as breastfeeding, warrants further investigation. Research is needed to examine the baby box's safety and its potential to reduce infants' risk of sleep-related deaths.<sup>27</sup>

Despite the lack of empirical support for the safe use of baby boxes, caregivers are unlikely to question the safety of the baby box as a tool to protect infants during sleep. Caregivers will likely presume that a health product distributed through recognized health organizations is an assurance of product safety. Currently, however, no evidence supports the safety of the baby box, the likelihood that the baby box will positively affect parenting practices, or the creation of safe sleep spaces. Furthermore, the safety of the baby box as a sleep space for infants continues to be questioned by sleep experts. As outlined here, these concerns cross issues of safety and use. For example, one concern is about whether the baby box, which is purported to be a means to reduce infant risk of sleep-related deaths, would actually be used.<sup>1,6</sup> Another concern is whether the cardboard baby box promotes important protective factors for infants during sleep, such as breastfeeding.<sup>6</sup> Other concerns include whether the baby box is practical as a sleep space, whether ventilation is adequate, and whether the cardboard construction is durable enough.<sup>19,27</sup>

Until these concerns are resolved through rigorous research and evaluation, decisions by US public health departments to distribute baby boxes may be premature and should be carefully considered. Attention to factors empirically related to sleep-related infant death may be an important focus in reducing infant risk.<sup>28</sup>


### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### ORCID iD

Wendy Middlemiss  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0807-1922>

## References

1. Blair PS, Pease A, Bates F, et al. Concerns about the promotion of a cardboard baby box as a place for infants to sleep. *BMJ*. 2018;363:k4243. doi:10.1136/bmj.k4243
2. Barford V. Why babies all over the world are now sleeping in boxes. *BBC News Magazine*. April 4, 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-35834370>. Accessed July 7, 2018.
3. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Frequently asked questions (FAQs) about SIDS and safe infant sleep. Is a baby-sized cardboard box a safe alternative infant sleep surface? <https://www1.nichd.nih.gov/sts/about/pages/faq.aspx>. Accessed September 7, 2018.
4. Peachman RR. Put your baby in a box? Experts advise caution. *The New York Times*. May 24, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/24/well/family/put-your-baby-in-a-box-experts-advise-caution.html>. Accessed January 31, 2019.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Sudden unexpected infant death and sudden infant death syndrome: data and statistics. <https://www.cdc.gov/sids/data.htm>. Accessed July 7, 2018.
6. Bartick M, Tomori C, Ball HL. Babies in boxes and the missing links on safe sleep: human evolution and cultural revolution. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2018;14(2):e12544. doi:10.1111/mcn.12544
7. Askew G, Ahmad-Baker A. Safe sleeping for babies: opinion letter to the editor. *The New York Times*. June 9, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/09/opinion/safe-sleeping-for-babies.html>. Accessed January 31, 2019.
8. Chandler MA. Baby boxes proposed in D.C. as wave of states look to Finland to prevent infant deaths. *The Washington Post*. July 27, 2017. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/social-issues/baby-boxes-proposed-in-dc-as-wave-of-states-look-to-finland-to-prevent-infant-deaths/2017/07/27/05b0d128-6ca0-11e7-9c15-177740635e83\\_story.html?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.fd65c7300a42](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/social-issues/baby-boxes-proposed-in-dc-as-wave-of-states-look-to-finland-to-prevent-infant-deaths/2017/07/27/05b0d128-6ca0-11e7-9c15-177740635e83_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.fd65c7300a42). Accessed January 31, 2019.
9. Kela. Home and family. Benefits for families with children and housing benefits. [http://www.kela.fi/documents/10180/1978560/2015\\_Home\\_family.pdf/86f57786-9efc-4341-9dc9-37cd95b2b2d3](http://www.kela.fi/documents/10180/1978560/2015_Home_family.pdf/86f57786-9efc-4341-9dc9-37cd95b2b2d3). Published 2015. Accessed November 11, 2017.
10. Hakulinen T, Gissler M. Finland's low infant mortality has multiple contributing factors. THL-Blogi. <https://blogi.thl.fi/finlands-low-infant-mortality-has-multiple-contributing-factors>. Published 2017. Accessed March 19, 2019.
11. Barfield W, D'Angelo D, Moon R, Lu M, Wong B, Iskander J. CDC grand rounds: public health approaches to reducing U.S. infant mortality. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2013;62(31):625-628.
12. US Consumer Product Safety Commission. CPSC statement on cardboard baby boxes. <https://cpsc.gov/vi-VN/CPSC-State-ment-on-Cardboard-Baby-Boxes>. Accessed January 31, 2019.
13. Finnish Baby Box. How big is the box? <https://help.finnishbabybox.com/article/6-how-big-is-the-box>. Published 2016. Accessed January 31, 2019.
14. Tipene-Leach D, Baddock SA, Williams SM, et al. The Pepi-Pod study: overnight video, oximetry and thermal environment while using an in-bed sleep device for sudden unexpected death in infancy prevention. *J Paediatr Child Health*. 2018;54(6):638-646. doi:10.1111/jpc.13845
15. Baddock SA, Tipene-Leach D, Williams SM, et al. Wahakura versus bassinet for safe infant sleep: a randomized trial. *Pediatrics*. 2017;139(2):e20160162. doi:10.1542/peds.2016-0162
16. Baddock SA, Tipene-Leach D, Williams SM, et al. Physiological stability in an indigenous sleep device: a randomised controlled trial. *Arch Dis Child*. 2018;103(4):377-382. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2017-313512
17. Pepi-Pod. New pod. [http://www.changeforourchildren.nz/pepi\\_pod\\_programme/windows\\_upgrade](http://www.changeforourchildren.nz/pepi_pod_programme/windows_upgrade). Accessed March 20, 2019.
18. Summer. Swaddle Me By Your Side Sleeper. <https://www.summerinfant.com/sleepers-bassinets/swaddleme-by-your-side-sleeper>. Accessed March 20, 2019.
19. Baby Bargains. Baby box review: unsanitary, unsafe, uncertified. <http://www.babybargains.com/baby-box-review-unsanitary-unsafe-uncertified/>. Updated January 23, 2019. Accessed July 7, 2018.
20. Cribs for Kids. Our story. <https://cribsforkids.org/our-story>. Accessed September 15, 2018.
21. Parks SE, Erck Lambert AB, Shapiro-Mendoza CK. Racial and ethnic trends in sudden unexpected infant deaths: United States, 1995-2013. *Pediatrics*. 2017;139(6):e20163844. doi:10.1542/peds.2016-3844
22. Ahlers-Schmidt CR, Schunn C, Redmond ML, et al. Qualitative assessment of pregnant women's perceptions of infant sleep boxes. *Glob Pediatr Health*. 2017;4:233. doi:10.1177/2333794X17744948
23. Batra R, Ahtola OT. Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian sources of consumer attitudes. *Marketing Letters*. 1991;2(2):159-170.
24. Buhrmeste M, Kwang T, Gosling SD. Amazon's Mechanical Turk: a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? In: Kazdin AE, ed. *Methodological Issues and Strategies in Clinical Research*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2016:133-139.
25. Bartneck C, Duenser A, Moltchanova E, Zawieska K. Comparing the similarity of responses received from studies in Amazon's Mechanical Turk to studies conducted online and with direct recruitment. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0121595. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0121595
26. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Org Behav Hum Decision Processes*. 1991;50(2):179-211.
27. Cribs for Kids. Is the baby box safe? Crib for Kids statement on the baby box. <https://cribsforkids.org/is-the-baby-box-safe>. Accessed March 20, 2019.
28. McIntosh C, Trenholme A, Stewart J, Vogel A. Evaluation of a sudden unexpected death in infancy intervention programme aimed at improving parental awareness of risk factors and protective infant care practices. *J Paediatr Child Health*. 2018;54(4):377-382. doi:10.1111/jpc.13772