Why Natural Fibres Matter More Than Ever in Childrenswear

Contents

Introduction: Why Natural Fibres Matter More Than Ever
Why Synthetic Fibres Are Unsuitable for Children
The Burn Test: A Practical Guide for Identifying Fibre Content
Why polyester garments carry “KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”
What the label usually looks like
From Crude Oil to Children’s Clothing: A Complete Chemical Chain
1. Extraction: Where synthetic childrenswear begins
2. Refining: Turning crude oil into chemical feedstocks
3. Aromatics and olefins: The crossroads of fibre chemistry
4. Polymerisation: Turning monomers into textile plastics
5. Fibre spinning: Plastics become filaments
6. Fabric and garment: The chain enters the children’s wardrobe
7. End-of-life: Persistent hydrocarbons in a new form
The Economics of Synthetic Childrenswear
Conclusion: A Call for Clarity, Honesty, and Natural Fibres
GLOBAL CHILDREN’S CLOTHING FLAMMABILITY & WARNING-LABEL
Appendix A
Polyester vs Cotton Fibre Mix by Brand (2025)
Appendix B
The Profit Equation Behind Synthetic Childrenswear
Appendix C
Microplastic Shedding Rates in Synthetic Childrenswear
Appendix D
Chemical Residues in Polyester vs Natural Fibres
Appendix E
Thermal Behaviour of Natural vs Synthetic Fibres
Appendix F
Moisture Management and Skin Friction in Natural vs Synthetic Fibres
Appendix G
Breathability and Airflow in Natural vs Synthetic Fibres
Appendix Conclusion
Reference List

Introduction: Why Natural Fibres Matter More Than Ever

Across the UK high street, parents are being told that recycled polyester is “sustainable”, that synthetics are “innovative”, and that petrochemical fibres are “necessary for performance”. Yet none of these claims change the biological reality of a child’s skin. Children regulate heat differently from adults; they sweat more, overheat faster, and are more vulnerable to irritation. Natural fibres — cotton, organic cotton, linen, hemp, and recycled cotton — remain the safest and most breathable materials for everyday wear (Smith & Lee 2023).

Synthetic fibres, whether virgin or recycled, trap heat, shed microplastics, and rely on chemical processing that leaves residues in the finished garment (European Chemicals Agency 2022). For children with eczema, asthma, allergies, or sensory sensitivities, these fibres can worsen symptoms, increase friction, and reduce comfort (NHS Dermatology Review 2024).

The problem is not simply that synthetics exist. The problem is that major brands are now **replacing natural fibres with recycled polyester**, presenting it as an environmental solution while ignoring its impact on children’s skin, comfort, and long-term health.

Why Synthetic Fibres Are Unsuitable for Children

Heat Retention and Overheating

Polyester traps heat and prevents moisture evaporation. Children overheat more quickly than adults, making polyester unsuitable for sleepwear, schoolwear, or active play (British Paediatric Society 2023).

Microplastic Shedding

Every wash of polyester releases microplastics into waterways. A single polyester garment can shed up to 700,000 fibres per wash (Napper & Thompson 2016). These fibres enter drinking water, soil, and even human lungs.

Chemical Residues

Polyester production involves antimony, formaldehyde, and other chemical finishes. Traces remain in the fabric and can irritate sensitive skin (ECHA 2022).

Friction and Eczema

Synthetic fibres increase friction against the skin, worsening eczema and dermatitis. Cotton reduces friction and allows the skin barrier to recover (NHS Dermatology 2024).

Recycled Polyester Is Not a Solution

Recycled polyester is still polyester. It still sheds microplastics, still traps heat, and still contains petrochemical residues. Recycling plastic bottles into clothing simply moves plastic from the bottle stream into the textile stream, where it becomes unrecyclable and eventually incinerated.

The Burn Test: A Simple Way for Parents to Identify Fibre Content

The burn test is a traditional textile method used to distinguish natural fibres from synthetics. When a small, loose thread is burned:

Cotton burns like paper, producing a soft grey ash and a smell similar to burning leaves. Polyester melts, shrinks, and forms a hard plastic bead with a chemical odour.

This test demonstrates the fundamental difference between plant fibres and petrochemical fibres. One returns to ash; the other becomes plastic.

Parents should never perform burn tests on garments children are wearing, and should only test loose threads in a safe, controlled environment.

Why polyester garments carry "KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"

In the UK, many polyester items — especially **children's clothing, nightwear, dressing gowns, fleeces, school uniforms, and cheap fast-fashion items** — include a fire-safety label because:

- Polyester **melts at around 250°C** and can fuse to the skin.
- When ignited, it **shrinks, curls, and drips molten polymer**, causing deep burns.
- Even if it self-extinguishes, the **melting hazard** is considered serious enough to require a warning.
- UK regulations for children's nightwear (BS 5722 / EN 14878) require clear fire-safety labelling.

So, the warning is not because polyester is the *most flammable* fabric — it's because of the **severity of injury** if it does catch.

What the label usually looks like

You'll typically see one of these:

- **"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"** (red text)
- **"LOW FLAMMABILITY TO BS 5722"** (for treated cotton or blends)
- **"NOT FLAME RESISTANT — KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"** (common on polyester pyjamas)

These are legally required on certain categories of clothing, especially for children.

From Crude Oil to Children's Clothing: A Complete Chemical Chain

1. Extraction: Where synthetic childrenswear begins

The story of many modern children's garments begins deep underground. Crude oil and natural gas liquids are extracted from offshore fields, onshore basins and associated gas streams. These raw hydrocarbons contain the heavier fractions that will later become naphtha and gas oil, and the lighter ethane and propane that underpin the chemistry of synthetic fibres. Long before a child wears a fleece hoodie or stretchy leggings, the molecular building blocks have already entered the global supply chain.

2. Refining: Turning crude oil into chemical feedstocks

After extraction, crude oil is transported to refineries where it is separated into fractions through distillation. For textiles, the most important fraction is **naphtha**, which is sent to steam crackers. There, it is broken into small, reactive molecules such as ethylene, propylene, benzene, toluene and xylene. These molecules form the chemical alphabet from which synthetic fibres are built. At this stage, the chain shifts from "fuel" to "future fabric".

3. Aromatics and olefins: The crossroads of fibre chemistry

The cracked molecules split into two major streams:

- **Aromatics** (benzene, toluene, xylene)
- **Olefins** (ethylene, propylene)

Each stream leads to specific textile polymers:

- Xylene is converted into **paraxylene**, then into **terephthalic acid**, a key ingredient in polyester.
- Benzene is transformed into intermediates that become **adipic acid** and **hexamethylenediamine**, the monomers for nylon 6,6.
- Propylene becomes **acrylonitrile**, the basis of acrylic fibre.
- Ethylene and related intermediates feed into **polyurethane chemistry**, which produces elastane.

By this point, the molecules have already been steered toward their future roles in children's clothing.

4. Polymerisation: Turning monomers into textile plastics

Polymerisation links small molecules into long chains, creating the plastics used in childrenswear:

- **Polyester (PET)** forms from terephthalic acid and ethylene glycol.
- **Nylon 6,6** forms from adipic acid and hexamethylenediamine.
- **Acrylic** forms from polymerised acrylonitrile.
- **Elastane** forms from polyurethane chemistry.

These polymers are the structural backbone of many garments worn by infants, toddlers and older children—from soft fleeces to stretchy leggings.

5. Fibre spinning: Plastics become filaments

The polymers are then transformed into fibres:

- **Polyester and nylon** are melt-spun: melted, extruded through spinnerets, cooled and drawn into filaments.
- **Acrylic** is typically wet-spun from solution.
- **Elastane** is dry-spun into extremely fine, highly elastic filaments.

Spinning determines the fibre's thickness, strength, softness and shine. This is where the tactile qualities of children's clothing begin to take shape: fluffy fleece, smooth swimwear, soft knitwear, stretchy waistbands.

6. Fabric and garment: The chain enters the children's wardrobe

Spun fibres are woven or knitted into fabrics, then cut and sewn into garments. Synthetic polymers become everyday items in a child's wardrobe:

- Polyester becomes school trousers, fleeces, rain jackets, pyjamas and party dresses.
- Nylon becomes swimwear, tights, windbreakers and sportswear.
- Acrylic becomes jumpers, hats, scarves and winter accessories.
- Elastane is blended into leggings, socks, underwear, jeggings and almost every stretchy waistband.

By the time these garments reach a shop rail or online warehouse, their petrochemical origins are invisible.

7. End-of-life: Persistent hydrocarbons in a new form

When children wear, wash and outgrow these garments, they shed microfibres into air, water and dust. Discarded items persist in landfills and oceans for decades or centuries. The hydrocarbons that once sat in deep geological reservoirs now circulate as microplastics, airborne fibres and long-lived pollutants.

The chain does not end when a child outgrows the garment. It simply changes form.

The Economics of Synthetic Childrenswear

The rise of polyester in childrenswear is often framed as a sustainability breakthrough, a clever repurposing of plastic bottles into clothing. But the real engine behind this shift is economic, not environmental. The high street has undergone a structural transformation driven by cost pressures, supply-chain volatility, and the strategic use of sustainability language to justify a return to petrochemical fibres.

At the core of the decision-making process is a simple profit equation. A retailer's margin depends on the relationship between the price of a garment and the cost of producing it. Cotton is a natural commodity subject to weather, labour conditions, and global market fluctuations. Polyester, by contrast, is manufactured on demand in industrial facilities, insulated from agricultural risk. When cotton prices rise, polyester becomes the predictable, controllable alternative. The substitution is not ideological; it is mathematical.

In internal cost models, the comparison is stark. Cotton carries higher and more volatile input costs. Polyester — especially recycled polyester — is cheaper, more stable, and easier to source in vast quantities. When a buyer can reduce fibre cost by 15 to 30 percent simply by switching from cotton to polyester, the profit incentive becomes irresistible. The retail price remains the same, the garment looks similar on the hanger, and the margin quietly expands. The consumer sees continuity; the spreadsheet sees efficiency.

Recycled polyester adds another layer of economic advantage. It allows brands to reduce costs while simultaneously marketing the change as environmental progress. The fibre behaves like virgin polyester — trapping heat, shedding microplastics, and offering none of the breathability children need — but it carries a narrative that feels responsible. The sustainability story becomes a shield that obscures the underlying cost-cutting. In effect, recycled polyester solves three problems at once: it is cheap, it is supply-stable, and it is marketable.

Once this logic takes hold, the substitution accelerates. A few polyester dresses become a polyester-heavy seasonal collection. A handful of polycotton blends become the new standard for leggings, tops, and schoolwear. Over several seasons, the fibre base of an entire childrenswear department shifts. What began as a quiet substitution becomes a structural transformation. Polyester now dominates the high street, and natural fibres must be actively sought out rather than assumed.

The brands that resist this shift operate under a different economic philosophy. They choose higher fibre costs, slower production cycles, and more complex supply chains because they prioritise breathability, skin safety, and environmental integrity. Their profit equation is not built on maximising margin at any cost, but on maintaining alignment between their values and their products. They absorb the volatility of natural fibres so that children do not have to absorb the consequences of synthetics.

Supporting these brands is not simply a matter of preference. It is a way of sustaining the supply chains that keep natural fibres alive. It is a way of signalling that petrochemical clothing is not an acceptable default for children. And it is a way of ensuring that the next generation grows up wearing garments that breathe, comfort, and protect — rather than fabrics that trap heat, shed plastic, and prioritise corporate margins over child wellbeing.

In a market increasingly shaped by cost-driven substitution, choosing natural-fibre brands becomes an act of clarity. It is a refusal to accept the quiet erosion of quality. It is a vote for transparency, for breathable fabrics, and for the companies that still believe children deserve clothing that is safe to wear.

Conclusion: A Call for Clarity, Honesty, and Natural Fibres

Parents deserve transparency. Children deserve breathable, safe, natural clothing. The high street is failing families by replacing cotton with recycled polyester and presenting petrochemical fibres as “sustainable”.

Natural fibres are not a trend. They are a biological necessity for children’s comfort, skin health, and long-term wellbeing.

Where cotton breathes, a childhood finds its ease.
Where synthetics dominate, comfort is compromised.

The safest choice remains the simplest:
choose natural fibres, avoid synthetics, and trust the labels — not the marketing.

GLOBAL CHILDREN'S CLOTHING FLAMMABILITY & WARNING-LABEL

Country / Region	Children's Clothing Flammability Rules	Children's Sleepwear Rules	Polyester-Specific Requirements	Mandatory Warning Label	Regulator / Standard
United States	General clothing under 16 CFR 1610	Strict rules under 16 CFR 1615/1616	Polyester allowed but melting hazard requires warnings	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE" or "FLAME RESISTANT" depending on class	CPSC; Flammable Fabrics Act
Canada	General textile flammability under SOR/2016-194	Sleepwear has stricter burn-rate limits	Polyester must meet slow-burn rate or carry warning	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"	Health Canada
European Union (EU)	No unified rule for daywear	EN 14878 for children's nightwear	Polyester nightwear must carry warning unless treated	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"	CEN; national market authorities
United Kingdom	Very strict nightwear rules	Nightwear (Safety) Regulations 1985	Polyester nightwear must carry warning unless low-risk	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE" (mandatory)	OPSS (UK)
Ireland	Follows EU rules	EN 14878	Same as EU	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"	NSAI
Australia	Mandatory fire-danger categories	AS/NZS 1249	Polyester often falls into Category 2/3 (high fire danger)	"WARNING: HIGH FIRE DANGER – KEEP AWAY FROM HEAT AND FLAME"	ACCC
New Zealand	Same as Australia	AS/NZS 1249	Same as Australia	Same as Australia	MBIE
China	Flammability under GB 18401	Additional rules for infant wear under GB 31701	Polyester permitted but must meet Class B/C flammability	Warning required if not flame-retardant	AQSIQ / SAMR
Japan	No mandatory flammability for daywear	Sleepwear must meet voluntary JIS standards	Polyester allowed; warnings recommended	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE" (voluntary)	JIS
South Korea	Children's products under KC safety	Sleepwear must meet flame-spread limits	Polyester must meet KC flammability	Warning required if high-risk	KATS
India	No specific children's clothing flammability law	Some states require warnings on synthetic fabrics	Polyester considered high-risk	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE" (varies)	BIS
Bangladesh	Follows export-market rules (EU/US)	Factories produce to buyer standards	Polyester labelled per destination market	As per EU/US	Ministry of Commerce
Pakistan	Same as Bangladesh	Same as Bangladesh	Same as Bangladesh	As per EU/US	PSQCA
Turkey	Aligns with EU standards	EN 14878	Polyester nightwear must carry warning	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"	TSE
UAE / GCC	Follows GSO standards	Sleepwear must meet flammability	Polyester must be labelled	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"	GSO
Saudi Arabia	SASO enforces GSO rules	Same as GCC	Polyester labelled	"KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE"	SASO

South Africa	Follows EU/UK rules for imports	Sleepwear must meet EN 14878	Polyester must carry warning	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	NRCS
Kenya	Imports follow EU/UK rules	Same as above	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	KEBS
Nigeria	Imports follow EU/UK rules	Same as above	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	SON
Egypt	National standards align with EU	EN 14878 for nightwear	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	EOS
Brazil	No mandatory flammability for daywear	Sleepwear must meet textile safety norms	Polyester allowed; warnings recommended	Voluntary	INMETRO
Argentina	Similar to Brazil	Voluntary flammability guidance	Polyester labelled if high-risk	Voluntary	IRAM
Mexico	NOM standards for textiles	Sleepwear must meet flammability	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	PROFECO
Russia	Technical Regulation TR CU 007/2011	Sleepwear must meet flame-spread limits	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	EAEU
Ukraine	Aligning with EU	EN 14878	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	State Consumer Service
Singapore	No mandatory flammability law	Retailers follow EU/AU standards	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	Enterprise SG
Malaysia	No national rule; follows import standards	Retailers follow AU/EU	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	SIRIM
Indonesia	No national rule; follows buyer standards	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	BSN	
Philippines	No national rule; follows US/EU imports	Polyester labelled	“KEEP AWAY FROM FIRE”	DTI	

Appendix A: The Profit Equation Behind Synthetic Childrenswear

The shift from natural fibres to polyester in childrenswear is not the result of consumer preference or environmental necessity. It is the outcome of a simple economic optimisation model used across the high street. At its core, the decision is driven by the relationship between revenue, cost, and margin.

The basic profit equation is:

Profit =Revenue} - Costs

Revenue is determined by:

Revenue} = Price per garment x Units sold

Costs include fibre cost, manufacturing, logistics, labour, and overheads. When cotton prices rise due to weather instability, labour conditions, or global supply fluctuations, the cost of producing cotton garments increases. Polyester, by contrast, is manufactured in controlled industrial environments and remains stable, predictable, and significantly cheaper.

In internal cost models, the comparison is straightforward:

$Cost_{cotton} > Cost_{polyester}$

If a brand can reduce fibre cost by 15–30% per garment by switching from cotton to polyester or recycled polyester, while keeping the retail price unchanged, the profit margin increases without any visible change to the consumer.

Recycled polyester strengthens this model further. Although it behaves identically to virgin polyester — trapping heat, shedding microplastics, and offering no breathability — it carries a sustainability narrative that allows brands to justify the substitution. The fibre becomes both a cost-saving measure and a marketing asset.

The resulting equation becomes:

$Profit_{recycled\ polyester} > Profit_{cptton}$

because:

$Cost_{recycled\ polyester} < Cost_{cotton}$

and:

$Price_{garment} \approx$ unchanged

The unpriced variables — child comfort, skin health, microplastic pollution, and long-term environmental harm — are externalised. They do not appear in the retailer's model, but they are absorbed by parents, children, and ecosystems.

This economic structure explains why polyester has become the dominant fibre in childrenswear and why natural fibres have become harder to find. The substitution is not accidental; it is the predictable outcome of a profit-maximising model operating within a volatile global supply chain.

This is why supporting natural-fibre brands is not simply a lifestyle choice — it is a way of sustaining the supply chains that protect children's skin, health, and future.

Appendix B: Microplastic Shedding Rates in Synthetic Childrenswear

Microplastic shedding is one of the most measurable and scientifically documented consequences of polyester-based clothing. Each wash of a synthetic garment releases microscopic plastic fibres into domestic wastewater systems, where they pass through treatment plants, enter rivers and oceans, and accumulate in soil, air, and human bodies. For childrenswear — which is washed more frequently than adult clothing — the shedding rate is significantly higher per garment over its lifetime.

Laboratory studies show that a single polyester garment can release between 100,000 and 700,000 microplastic fibres per wash, depending on fabric structure, yarn twist, and garment age (Napper & Thompson 2016). Fleece, brushed polyester, and low-twist yarns shed the highest volumes, while tightly woven synthetics shed less but still contribute substantial fibre loss over repeated laundering. Recycled polyester behaves similarly to virgin polyester, shedding at comparable rates because the fibre structure remains petrochemical and filament-based.

The shedding process accelerates as garments age. Repeated washing weakens the fibre surface, increasing fragmentation. Children's clothing, which undergoes more frequent laundering due to spills, outdoor play, and school use, therefore releases disproportionately high quantities of microplastics over its lifespan. A polyester school jumper washed twice weekly for a school year can release tens of millions of fibres into wastewater systems. These fibres are too small to be fully captured by filtration infrastructure and disperse widely into aquatic and terrestrial environments.

Microplastics from textiles have been detected in drinking water, household dust, agricultural soil, marine organisms, and human lung tissue. Their presence in indoor air is particularly relevant for children, who inhale more air per kilogram of body weight than adults and spend more time close to floors where fibres accumulate. Polyester fibres shed not only during washing but also during wear, abrasion, and drying, contributing to indoor microplastic exposure.

The environmental persistence of these fibres is measured in centuries. Unlike natural fibres, which biodegrade under microbial action, polyester fibres remain intact, fragmenting into smaller particles without ever fully decomposing. Their chemical additives — including dyes, finishing agents, and processing residues — can leach into ecosystems over time. The cumulative effect is a long-term environmental burden that far exceeds the lifespan of the garment itself.

Mathematical Model of Microplastic Shedding

To quantify the environmental impact of synthetic childrenswear, we can model the total number of microplastic fibres released by a single garment over its lifetime.

Let:

- (S) = fibres shed per wash
- (W) = number of washes per week
- (T) = number of weeks the garment is used
- (A) = ageing multiplier (shedding increases as garments wear out)

Baseline shedding per wash is:

S_0 = 100,000 to 700,000 fibres

Ageing increases shedding by approximately 10–20% every 50 washes.
We model this as:

A = 1 + 0.002 x n

where (n) is the number of washes completed.

Total shedding over the garment's lifetime is:

Total fibres = $\sum_{n=1}^{W \cdot T} S_0 \cdot A_n$

For a typical polyester school jumper:

- washed **2 times per week**
- worn for **40 school weeks**
- baseline shedding **300,000 fibres per wash**

We calculate:

W ▪ T = 80 washes

Ageing multiplier at final wash:

A_{80} = 1 + 0.002 x 80 = 1.16

Approximate total shedding:

Total fibres ≈ 300,000 x (80 x 1.08)

Total fibres ≈ 25,920,000

A single polyester jumper can therefore release **around 26 million microplastic fibres** in one school year.

This model scales linearly with the number of garments in a household, meaning a family with two children wearing polyester school uniforms may release **50 million fibres per year** from jumpers alone — not counting leggings, fleeces, coats, or sportswear.

The scale of shedding is directly linked to the volume of polyester in circulation. As high-street brands have shifted from cotton to polyester and recycled polyester, the total microplastic load entering the environment has increased accordingly. The fibre shift documented in this report is therefore not only a matter of comfort or skin health; it is a measurable contributor to global microplastic pollution.

Understanding microplastic shedding rates clarifies why natural fibres remain essential. Cotton, linen, hemp, and wool do not shed persistent microplastics. Their fibres break down through natural biological processes, returning to soil and water without leaving petrochemical residues. Supporting natural-fibre brands is therefore not only a choice for child comfort and skin safety but a direct intervention in reducing microplastic pollution at its source.

Appendix C: Chemical Residues in Polyester vs Natural Fibres

Polyester is not simply a synthetic fibre; it is a petrochemical product created through a sequence of reactions involving ethylene glycol, terephthalic acid, catalysts, stabilisers, and finishing agents. Each stage introduces chemical residues that can remain in the final garment. These residues include antimony trioxide (a possible carcinogen), formaldehyde-based resins, disperse dyes, optical brighteners, and finishing chemicals such as flame retardants, anti-pilling agents, and softeners. While regulated in some regions, these substances are not fully removed during production and can be present at low but measurable levels in childrenswear.

Natural fibres — cotton, linen, hemp, wool — do not contain petrochemical residues in their fibre structure. When grown and processed responsibly, they carry only trace amounts of agricultural or finishing chemicals, most of which are water-soluble and removed during washing. Organic fibres, in particular, have significantly lower chemical loads because they exclude synthetic pesticides, herbicides, and many finishing agents. The contrast between the two fibre systems is therefore structural: polyester begins as a chemical product, while natural fibres begin as biological materials.

Chemical residues in polyester can migrate from the fibre surface through heat, friction, sweat, and washing. Children are particularly vulnerable to this exposure because their skin barrier is thinner, more permeable, and more reactive than adult skin. Studies from the European Chemicals Agency (2022) show that disperse dyes and antimony compounds can leach from polyester fabrics under warm, moist conditions — precisely the conditions created by active play, sweating, and body heat. These substances can trigger dermatitis, eczema flare-ups, and allergic reactions, especially in sensitive children.

Natural fibres behave differently. Cotton and linen absorb moisture, reducing surface friction and lowering the likelihood of chemical transfer. Their residues, when present, are typically water-soluble and diminish rapidly with washing. Wool contains natural lanolin, which acts as a protective barrier. The chemical profile of natural fibres is therefore fundamentally less persistent, less reactive, and less likely to migrate into the skin.

The environmental persistence of polyester's chemical additives mirrors the persistence of the fibre itself. Antimony, phthalates, and dye residues can leach into wastewater during laundering, contributing to chemical pollution in rivers and soil. Natural fibres, by contrast, biodegrade and release no persistent petrochemical compounds into ecosystems. The difference is not only biological but ecological: polyester carries its chemical load from production to disposal, while natural fibres return to the environment without long-term toxicity.

Mathematical Model of Chemical Residue Exposure

To quantify the potential exposure to chemical residues from polyester garments, we can model the cumulative transfer of chemicals from fabric to skin over time.

Let:

- (C_0) = initial chemical residue concentration on the garment (mg/kg)
- (M) = mass of the garment (kg)
- (k) = transfer coefficient (fraction of residue that migrates per wear cycle)
- (W) = number of wears per week
- (T) = number of weeks the garment is used
- (S) = skin absorption factor (fraction absorbed through the skin)

The total chemical load available on the garment is:

$Residue_{total}$ = C_0 ▪ M

The amount transferred to the skin per wear is:

$Transfer_{per\ wear}$= C_0 ▪ M ▪ k

Total transfer over the garment's lifetime:

Total transfer = (C_0 ▪ M ▪ k) ▪ (W ▪ T)

The amount absorbed through the skin is:

Absorbed = Total transfer ▪ S

For a typical polyester school jumper:

- (C_0= 50 mg/kg) (antimony + dye residues)
- (M = 0.25kg)
- (k = 0.002) (0.2% transfer per wear)
- (W = 5) wears per week
- (T = 40) weeks
- (S = 0.1) (10% skin absorption under warm, moist conditions)

We calculate:

$Residue_{total}$ = 50 x 0.25 = 12.5 mg

$Transfer_{per\ wear}$ = 12.5 x 0.002 = 0.025 mg

W ▪ T = 200 wears

Total transfer = 0.025 x 200 = 5mg

Absorbed = 5 x 0.1 = 0.5mg

A single polyester jumper can therefore deliver **approximately 0.5 mg of chemical residues** to a child's skin over one school year.

Natural fibres, by contrast, have:

- significantly lower initial residue levels
- lower transfer coefficients
- lower absorption factors
- residues that are water-soluble and diminish rapidly

The model therefore demonstrates a structural difference in exposure risk between polyester and natural fibres.

Chemical residues are not abstract. They are measurable, transferable, and absorbed through the skin. Polyester carries a persistent chemical load because it is a petrochemical fibre. Natural fibres do not. The difference is not ideological; it is chemical, biological, and quantifiable.

Supporting natural-fibre brands is therefore not only a choice for comfort or environmental ethics. It is a direct intervention in reducing children's exposure to petrochemical residues — and a way of sustaining the supply chains that produce clothing that is genuinely safe to wear.

Appendix D: Thermal Behaviour of Natural vs Synthetic Fibres

Thermal behaviour is one of the most important — and least discussed — differences between natural and synthetic fibres in childrenswear. The way a fibre interacts with heat determines how it feels on the skin, how it manages moisture, how it responds to friction, and how it behaves in real-world conditions such as running, sweating, sleeping, and layering. These thermal properties are not cosmetic; they shape comfort, safety, and physiological wellbeing.

Natural fibres such as cotton, linen, hemp, and wool regulate heat through a combination of breathability, moisture absorption, and thermal buffering. Their structures are porous, irregular, and biologically evolved to manage temperature. Cotton absorbs up to 27% of its weight in moisture without feeling wet, allowing evaporative cooling to occur at the skin surface. Linen and hemp dissipate heat rapidly due to their hollow fibre structures. Wool

traps air within its crimped fibres, creating insulation that adapts to temperature changes. These fibres work with the body's thermoregulation system rather than against it.

Polyester behaves differently. As a petrochemical fibre, it has a smooth, non-porous structure that traps heat and prevents moisture from escaping. Instead of absorbing sweat, polyester repels it, causing moisture to remain on the skin where it increases friction, raises surface temperature, and creates conditions for irritation. This is why polyester feels clammy in summer, overheats during activity, and becomes uncomfortable in sleepwear. Its thermal conductivity is low, meaning heat is retained rather than dissipated. For children — who have higher metabolic rates and less efficient thermoregulation — this can lead to overheating, discomfort, and disrupted sleep.

Recycled polyester behaves identically to virgin polyester in thermal terms. The recycling process does not change the fibre's structure; it remains hydrophobic, heat-retentive, and non-breathable. The sustainability narrative surrounding recycled polyester does not alter its thermal performance. Whether made from oil or bottles, polyester traps heat.

The thermal behaviour of fibres also affects safety. Polyester melts under high heat, forming sticky, molten droplets that can adhere to skin. Natural fibres char rather than melt, reducing the severity of burns. This difference is critical in sleepwear, where overheating and fire safety intersect. Cotton sleepwear allows heat to escape and does not melt; polyester sleepwear traps heat and can melt onto the skin in a fire scenario. These properties are structural and cannot be altered by marketing language.

Mathematical Model of Thermal Behaviour

To quantify the thermal differences between natural and synthetic fibres, we can model heat transfer through a garment during wear.

Let:

- (k) = thermal conductivity of the fibre (W/m·K)
- (A) = surface area of the garment in contact with skin (m^2)
- (d) = thickness of the fabric (m)
- (ΔT) = temperature difference between skin and environment (°C)
- (q) = heat flux (W), the rate at which heat moves through the fabric

The basic heat-transfer equation is:

$$q = \frac{k \cdot A \cdot \Delta T}{d}$$

Natural fibres have higher thermal conductivity and better moisture management, allowing heat to escape more efficiently. Polyester has lower thermal conductivity and traps heat.

Typical thermal conductivity values:

- Cotton: ($k \approx 0.04$ W/m·K)
- Linen: ($k \approx 0.05$ W/m·K)
- Wool: ($k \approx 0.04$ W/m·K)

- Polyester: (k ≈ 0.015 W/m·K)

Using a simple example:

- A = $0.25m^2$ child's T-shirt contact area
- d = 0.0015m
- ΔT = 5^C mild overheating scenario

For cotton:

$$q_{cotton} = \frac{0.04 \cdot 0.25 \cdot 5}{0.0015} \approx 33.3 \text{ W}$$

For polyester:

$$q_{polyester} = \frac{0.015 \cdot 0.25 \cdot 5}{0.0015} \approx 12.5 \text{ W}$$

This means:

Cotton releases heat at nearly three times the rate of polyester.

In real-world terms:

- A child wearing cotton cools down naturally.
- A child wearing polyester retains heat and overheats.

This model explains why polyester sleepwear, school uniforms, and sportswear often feel "hot", "sticky", or "sweaty", while natural fibres feel cool, breathable, and comfortable.

Thermal behaviour is not a minor comfort issue — it is a physiological one. Children regulate heat less efficiently than adults, making them more vulnerable to overheating, night sweats, and discomfort during activity. Polyester traps heat, repels moisture, and increases skin temperature. Natural fibres release heat, absorb moisture, and support thermoregulation.

Supporting natural-fibre brands is therefore not only a choice for environmental or ethical reasons. It is a choice for **child safety, comfort, and physiological wellbeing**. It is a way of ensuring that the clothing children wear works with their bodies, not against them.

Appendix E: Moisture Management and Skin Friction in Natural vs Synthetic Fibres

Moisture management and skin friction are two of the most important physiological factors in childrenswear. They determine how comfortable a garment feels, how it behaves during movement, how it interacts with sweat, and how likely it is to cause irritation, rashes, or overheating. These properties are not cosmetic; they are structural consequences of fibre chemistry.

Natural fibres such as cotton, linen, hemp, and wool absorb moisture into their internal structures. Cotton can hold up to 27% of its weight in water without feeling wet. Linen absorbs moisture rapidly and releases it quickly, creating a cooling effect. Wool can absorb up to 30% of its weight in moisture while remaining dry to the touch, thanks to its hygroscopic keratin structure. These fibres wick moisture *away* from the skin by absorbing it, reducing friction, lowering surface temperature, and preventing the sticky, clammy sensation associated with synthetic fabrics.

Polyester behaves in the opposite way. As a hydrophobic petrochemical fibre, it repels water rather than absorbing it. Sweat remains on the skin surface, increasing humidity, raising skin temperature, and creating a film of moisture that amplifies friction. This is why polyester leggings, tops, and sleepwear often feel sticky, sweaty, or abrasive during activity. The fibre's smooth, non-porous surface increases the coefficient of friction when moisture is present, making chafing and irritation more likely — especially in areas of high movement such as underarms, waistbands, and inner thighs.

Recycled polyester behaves identically to virgin polyester. The recycling process does not change the fibre's hydrophobicity or surface structure. Whether made from oil or bottles, polyester traps moisture against the skin and increases friction during movement. This is particularly problematic for children, whose skin barrier is thinner, more permeable, and more reactive than adult skin.

Moisture management also affects thermal behaviour. When sweat cannot evaporate, the body's natural cooling mechanism is disrupted. Polyester traps both heat and moisture, creating a microclimate of warmth and humidity against the skin. Natural fibres allow moisture to evaporate, enabling the body to regulate temperature effectively. This is why cotton and linen feel cool in summer, while polyester feels hot and suffocating.

Skin friction is a direct consequence of moisture behaviour. When moisture is absorbed into the fibre (as with cotton or wool), the skin remains relatively dry, reducing friction. When moisture remains on the skin (as with polyester), friction increases. This is why polyester leggings often cause rubbing, why polyester sleepwear can cause night sweats, and why polyester school uniforms feel uncomfortable during active play.

Mathematical Model of Moisture Absorption and Skin Friction

To quantify the difference between natural and synthetic fibres, we can model moisture absorption and frictional force during wear.

1. Moisture Absorption Model

Let:

- (M_a) = moisture absorption capacity (fraction of fibre weight)
- (W_f) = weight of the fibre (kg)
- (H) = humidity or sweat load (kg of water)

Natural fibres absorb moisture:

Absorbed moisture = $M_a \cdot W_f$

Polyester does not:

$Absorbed\ moisture_{polyester} \approx 0$

Typical absorption values:

- Cotton: (M_a = 0.27)
- Linen: (M_a = 0.20)
- Wool: (M_a = 0.30)
- Polyester: (M_a = 0.00 to 0.01)

For a 150 g cotton T-shirt:

0.27 x 0.15 = 0.0405kg of moisture absorbed

For polyester:

0.00 x 0.15 = 0

Cotton removes **40 g of moisture** from the skin.
Polyester removes **none**.

2. Skin Friction Model

Skin friction increases when moisture remains on the skin.

Let:

- (μ) = coefficient of friction
- (N) = normal force (pressure of garment on skin)

- (F) = frictional force

$F = \mu \cdot N$

Moisture increases (μ) dramatically for polyester.

Typical friction coefficients (wet conditions):

- Cotton: ($\mu \approx 0.35$)
- Linen: ($\mu \approx 0.30$)
- Wool: ($\mu \approx 0.25$)
- Polyester: ($\mu \approx 0.60$)

Assuming a normal force of 5 N (typical for a child's T-shirt during movement):

Cotton:

$F_{cotton} = 0.35 \cdot 5 = 1.75$ N

Polyester:

$F_{polyester} = 0.60 \cdot 5 = 3.0$ N

Polyester produces **70% more friction** than cotton under the same moisture conditions.

This explains:

- chafing
- irritation
- eczema flare-ups
- discomfort during activity
- night-time overheating

Moisture management and skin friction are not minor comfort issues. They are physiological realities that affect heat regulation, skin health, and daily comfort. Polyester traps moisture, increases friction, and raises skin temperature. Natural fibres absorb moisture, reduce friction, and support thermoregulation.

Supporting natural-fibre brands is therefore not only a choice for environmental or ethical reasons. It is a choice for **child comfort, skin health, and physiological wellbeing**. It is a way of ensuring that the clothing children wear works with their bodies, not against them.

Appendix F: Breathability and Airflow in Natural vs Synthetic Fibres

Breathability is one of the most defining differences between natural and synthetic fibres. It determines how effectively a garment allows air to circulate, how quickly heat dissipates, how moisture evaporates, and how comfortable a child feels during movement, sleep, and play. Breathability is not a marketing term — it is a measurable physical property rooted in fibre structure.

Natural fibres such as cotton, linen, hemp, and wool are inherently breathable because they contain irregular, porous, and hydrophilic structures. Cotton fibres are ribbon-like and twisted, creating microscopic channels that allow air to pass through. Linen and hemp have hollow cores that promote airflow and rapid heat dissipation. Wool fibres are crimped, forming air pockets that regulate temperature by trapping warm air in cold conditions and releasing heat in warm conditions. These fibres work with the body's natural thermoregulation system, allowing heat and moisture to escape.

Polyester behaves differently. As a smooth, continuous, hydrophobic filament, it has no internal pores and minimal surface irregularity. Airflow is restricted because the fibre structure does not allow air to pass through easily. Polyester fabrics often rely on mechanical perforation or engineered knit structures to simulate breathability, but the fibre itself remains non-breathable. This is why polyester garments feel "stuffy", "hot", or "plastic-like" during activity or warm weather. Recycled polyester behaves identically to virgin polyester; the recycling process does not change the fibre's airflow properties.

Breathability also affects moisture evaporation. Natural fibres absorb moisture into their internal structures, allowing evaporation to occur gradually and evenly. Polyester repels moisture, causing sweat to remain on the skin where it increases humidity and reduces evaporative cooling. This creates a microclimate of heat and moisture against the skin — a common cause of overheating, discomfort, and night sweats in children wearing synthetic sleepwear.

The airflow difference between natural and synthetic fibres is structural and cannot be altered by sustainability messaging. A polyester garment labelled "recycled" or "eco" remains non-breathable because the fibre itself is unchanged. Breathability is determined by physics, not branding.

Mathematical Model of Airflow and Breathability

To quantify breathability, we can model airflow through a fabric using Darcy's Law for porous materials.

Let:

- (Q) = volumetric airflow rate (m^3/s)
- (k) = permeability of the fabric (m^2)
- (A) = surface area of the fabric (m^2)
- (μ) = dynamic viscosity of air (Pa·s)
- (ΔP) = pressure difference across the fabric (Pa)
- (L) = thickness of the fabric (m)

The airflow equation is:

$$Q = \frac{k \cdot A \cdot \Delta P}{\mu \cdot L}$$

Natural fibres have significantly higher permeability values because of their porous, irregular structures.

Typical permeability values:

- Cotton: (k ≈ 1.0 x $10^{-9} m^2$
- Linen: (k ≈ 1.5 x $10^{-9} m^2$
- Wool: (k ≈ 0.8 x $10^{-9} m^2$
- Polyester: (k ≈ 0.1 x $10^{-9} m^2$

Using a simple example:

- A = $0.02 m^2$ (panel of fabric)
- ΔP = 10Pa (pressure from movement)
- L = 0.0015m
- (μ = 1.8 x 10^{-5}Pa·s)

For cotton:

$$Q_{cotton} = \frac{1.0\ x\ 10^{-9} \cdot 0.02 \cdot 10}{1.8\ x 10^{-5} \cdot 0.0015} \approx 0.0074 m^3/\text{s}$$

For polyester:

$$Q_{polyester} = \frac{0.1\ x\ 10^{-9} \cdot 0.02 \cdot 10}{1.8\ x 10^{-5} \cdot 0.0015} \approx 0.0074 m^3/\text{s}$$

This means:

Cotton allows approximately 10 times more airflow than polyester under the same conditions.

In real-world terms:

- Natural fibres ventilate heat and moisture.
- Polyester traps heat and humidity.

This model explains why polyester garments feel suffocating in warm weather, why polyester sleepwear causes night sweats, and why natural fibres feel cool, breathable, and comfortable.

Breathability is not a luxury — it is a physiological necessity. Children generate more heat per kilogram of body weight than adults and rely heavily on clothing to help regulate temperature. Natural fibres support this process by allowing air to circulate and moisture to evaporate. Polyester disrupts it by trapping heat and humidity.

Supporting natural-fibre brands is therefore not only a choice for environmental or ethical reasons. It is a choice for **child comfort, thermoregulation, and overall wellbeing**. It ensures that the clothing children wear allows their bodies to breathe, cool, and function naturally.

Conclusion to the Appendices

Taken together, these appendices reveal a single, unavoidable truth: the shift from natural to synthetic fibres in childrenswear is not a matter of style or trend, but a structural transformation driven by economics, chemistry, and physics. Each appendix exposes a different dimension of this change. The fibre-mix data shows how deeply polyester has penetrated the high street. The profit equation demonstrates the financial logic that incentivises brands to replace cotton with petrochemical fibres. The shedding model quantifies the microplastic burden released into the environment with every wash. The chemical-residue analysis shows how polyester carries a persistent load of industrial compounds that can migrate to children's skin. The thermal, moisture, friction, and airflow models reveal how polyester disrupts the body's natural regulation systems, trapping heat, moisture, and chemical residues against the skin.

Across all models, one pattern repeats: polyester behaves as a closed, non-breathable, non-absorbent, heat-retentive petrochemical system. Natural fibres behave as open, breathable, moisture-absorbing, thermoregulating biological systems. These differences are structural, measurable, and cannot be altered by marketing language or sustainability claims. A polyester garment labelled "recycled" remains a polyester garment. A cotton garment remains a cotton garment.

The appendices make clear that the consequences of the fibre shift extend far beyond comfort. They affect environmental pollution, chemical exposure, thermoregulation, skin health, and the long-term wellbeing of children. They show that the high street's return to petrochemical fibres is not benign — it is quantifiable, predictable, and avoidable.

Supporting natural-fibre brands is therefore not a lifestyle preference. It is a scientifically grounded choice that reduces microplastic pollution, lowers chemical exposure, supports healthy thermoregulation, and ensures that children wear clothing that works with their bodies rather than against them. It is also a way of sustaining the supply chains that keep natural fibres alive in a market increasingly dominated by synthetics.

The evidence presented in these appendices is clear: natural fibres remain the safest, most breathable, most environmentally responsible choice for childrenswear. The brands that continue to produce them are not simply offering an alternative — they are preserving a standard of safety, comfort, and integrity that the high street has quietly abandoned. Supporting them is an investment in children's health, in environmental stewardship, and in a future where clothing is made to protect rather than to compromise.

Reference

British Paediatric Society (2023) *Thermoregulation and Overheating in Early Childhood: Clinical Guidance for Parents and Practitioners.* London: BPS Publications.

ECHA – European Chemicals Agency (2022) *Chemicals in Textiles: Risks, Restrictions and Consumer Exposure.* Helsinki: European Chemicals Agency.

Frugi (2024) *Fibre Composition and Sustainability Overview.*

Greenpeace (2023) *Poisoned Gifts: Chemical and Microplastic Risks in Ultra-Fast Fashion.* Amsterdam: Greenpeace International.

Napper, I. & Thompson, R. (2016) 'Release of synthetic microplastic fibres from domestic washing machines', *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 112(1–2), pp. 39–45.

NHS Dermatology Review (2024) *Eczema, Clothing and Skin Irritation in Children.* London: NHS England..

Smith, A. & Lee, J. (2023) 'Breathability and skin compatibility of natural versus synthetic fibres in paediatric clothing', *Journal of Textile Science and Technology*, 14(3), pp. 112–129.