

for a child to miss school. In addition, “no-nit” policies have not been proven to be effective in reducing transmission and are not recommended ([American Academy of Pediatrics, 2009](#)).

Apply the Evidence: Nursing Implications

A “no-nit” policy inflates the risks associated with lice infestations, increases the probability of overusing pediculicides, and may hinder academic performance by excluding children from school. Several practice implications can be derived from the studies:

1. School nurses should receive training and a microscope or magnifying glass to help them identify head lice correctly.
2. A diagnosis of head lice should be based on observation of live lice rather than dead eggs, dandruff, or other suspicious material in a child's hair.
3. A “no-nit” policy should be invoked only as a last resort.
4. Repeated failure of parents to rid a child's hair of nits is not a sound basis for suspecting neglect or abuse or instituting legal action against the parents.

References

- American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Infectious Diseases, Pickering LK. 2009 *red book: report of the Committee on Infectious Diseases*. ed 28. The Academy: Elk Grove Village, IL; 2009.
- Devore CD, Schutze GE. Head Lice, clinical report: guidance for the clinician in rendering pediatric care. *Pediatrics*. 2015;135(5):e1355–e1365.
- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2008;336(7650):924–926.
- Pollack RJ, Kiszewski AE, Spielman A. Overdiagnosis and consequent management of head louse infestations in North America. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2000;19(8):689–693.
- Williams LK, Reichert A, MacKenzie WR, et al. Lice, nits, and school policy. *Pediatrics*. 2001;107(5):1011–1015.