Screenshot of comment posted on: [http://www.nhs.uk/conditions/fabricated-or-induced-illness/Pages/Symptoms.aspx#comment94416](http://www.nhs.uk/conditions/fabricated-or-induced-illness/Pages/Symptoms.aspx#comment94416) and subsequently removed and the account blocked from further commenting. No explanation was received. As you can see from viewing the text, there was nothing that would have breached ordinary commenting guidelines (no libel, profanity, contraindicated or dangerous medical advice etc). The only possible explanation is that they know (and they do) that accusations of MSBP/FII are being falsely used, when parents seek either diagnosis or support (resources) for their children. The Government has known about this issue since at least 2004. So the NHS is hiding information on this from the public. Anything that does not toe their party line, or agree with their misleading portrayal, is stifled. Who says we are living in a democracy?

---

**JusticeSeeker said on 27 November 2015**

This is a dangerous premise. Whilst there are a rare few parents who cause or fabricate illness in their children, likely as a result of a mental ill-health problem, as a "condition" this is disputed to even exist by some experts.

Some listed as potentially FII (the former MSBP just rebranded as it was discredited) are behaviours that could be shown by any parent & that this premise IN NO WAY takes into account invisible disabilities, rare, unusual conditions, under-diagnosed conditions & professional incompetency in recognising those conditions or illnesses. Rather than explain it all myself, there are links here which discuss the great problems with this supposed "diagnosis":

Dr Sue Gerard, in her Moving on from Bowlby blog post "fabricated or induced illness" [https://movingonfrombowlby.wordpress.com/2013/02/18/fabricated-or-induced-illness/](https://movingonfrombowlby.wordpress.com/2013/02/18/fabricated-or-induced-illness/)

"I contacted one of the authors of the briefing for her comments. It was clear from her response that the remit of the [NSPCC] briefing and the limit on length made a complete analysis of FII impossible. In addition her area of expertise didn’t qualify her to comment on medical conditions that might be mistaken for FII and that the primary purpose of the briefing was to raise awareness of FII amongst health professionals. An analysis like the NSPCC one doesn’t provide an exhaustive overview of the FII research literature, obviously. However, this briefing is written for professionals and, because it’s endorsed by the NSPCC it is, worryingly, likely to be taken as authoritative despite its shortcomings."
