

Appendix Attachment

1e

ATTACHMENT E

Concerns about Affirmation of an Incongruent Gender in a Child or Adolescent

Quentin L. Van Meter, M.D.

May 17, 2022

Qualifications

I received my B.A. in Science at the College of William and Mary and my M.D. from the Medical College of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University. I am currently a pediatric endocrinologist in private practice in Atlanta, Georgia. I am the President of Van Meter Pediatric Endocrinology, P.C. I am on the clinical faculties of Emory University School of Medicine and Morehouse College of Medicine, in the role of adjunct Associate Professor of Pediatrics. I am board certified in Pediatrics and Pediatric Endocrinology. I have been licensed to practice medicine in Georgia since 1991. I have been previously licensed to practice medicine in California, Louisiana, and Maryland.

I did my Pediatric Endocrine fellowship at Johns Hopkins Hospital from 1978-1980. The faculty present at that time had carried on the tradition of excellence established by Lawson Wilkins, M.D. Because of the reputation of the endocrine program as a center for exceptional care for children with disorders of sexual differentiation, I had well-above average exposure to such patients. As a Pediatric Fellow, I was also exposed to adults with Gender Identity Disorder, then called Trans-Sexuality, and received training from John Money, Ph.D., in his Psycho-hormonal Division. Over the past 44 years, I have closely followed the topic of incongruent gender in children adolescents and adults, but I am focusing in this document on working with children and adolescents. To get a more solid understanding of how male and female human beings develop in utero, it is important to start at the point when a sperm meets an egg.

Differentiation in the Fetus

From the moment of conception, a fetus is determined to be either a male (XY), female (XX), or in rare cases, to have a combination of sex-determining chromosomes, many of which are not compatible with life, and some of which are the cause of identifiable clinical syndromes. The presence of a Y chromosome in the developing fetus directs the developing gonadal tissue to develop as a testicle. The absence of a functional Y chromosome allows the gonadal tissue to develop as an ovary. Under the influence of the mother's placental hormones, the testicle will produce testosterone which directs the genital tissue to form a penis and a scrotum. Simultaneously, the testicle produces anti-Müllerian Hormone (AMH) which regresses development of the tissue that would otherwise develop into the uterus, fallopian tubes, and upper third of the vagina. This combination of actions in early fetal development is responsible for what we subsequently see on fetal sonograms, and what we observe at birth as male or female genitalia. It is only when the genital structures are ambiguous in appearance that sex determination is withheld until a thorough expert team evaluation has occurred.

For reasons most often occurring as random events, there are malfunctions of the normal differentiation. These aberrations of normal development are responsible for what we classify as Disorders of Sexual Differentiation (DSD), and they represent a very small fraction of the human population. The incidence of such circumstances occurs in 1:4500 to 1:5500 births.¹ Sex is binary, male or female, and is determined by chromosomal complement and corresponding reproductive role. The exceedingly rare DSDs are all medically identifiable deviations from this sexual binary norm. The 2006 consensus statement of the Intersex Society of North America and the 2015 revision of the Statement do not endorse DSD as a third sex.² DSD outcomes range from appearance of female external genitalia in an XY male (complete androgen insensitivity syndrome) to appearance of male external genitalia in an XX female (severe congenital adrenal hyperplasia).

As one would expect, there are variations of the degree of hormonally driven changes that create ambiguous genital development that prevent assigning of a specific classification as either male or female at birth. DSD patients are not “transgender”; they have an objective, physical, medically verifiable, physiologic condition. Transgender people generally do not have intersex conditions or any other verifiable physical anomaly. People who identify as “feeling like the opposite sex” or “somewhere in between” do not comprise a third sex. They remain biological men or biological women.

In some DSDs there exist more than one set of chromosomes. When there is a divergence of the appearance of the external genitalia from the chromosomally determined sex due to the presence of both an ovarian and testicular cell lines in a patient simultaneously, the patient is classified as having ovo-testicular DSD (formerly termed a true hermaphrodite). When there is a disruption in the development of genital structures but there is solely testicular tissue present in the chromosomal male or solely ovarian tissue in the chromosomal female, the term 46 XY DSD or 46 XX DSD is used instead respectively (formerly termed male pseudohermaphrodite or female pseudohermaphrodite).

The decision to assign a sex of rearing is complex and is specific to the diagnosis. Patients with complete androgen insensitivity (CAIS) are XY DSD but are never reared as a male. Because testosterone never influences development, they become happy, functional female adults with infertility. Females with severe congenital adrenal hyperplasia (CAH) are XX DSD but are not reared as males despite the male appearance of the genitalia at birth. Although these girls may show a tendency for male play behaviors as children, they generally assume a female sexual identity. Therapeutic interventions in the DSD individuals from infancy onward are aimed at what function can be expected from their disordered sexual anatomy in terms of function and fertility. Most often, the chromosomal sex aligns with the sex of rearing.

Gender Identity

“Gender” is a term that refers to the psychological and cultural characteristics associated with biological sex. It is a psychological concept and sociological term, not a biological one. The term gender possessed solely a linguistic meaning prior to the 1950s. This changed when sexologists of the 1950s and 1960s co-opted the term to conceptualize cross-dressing and transsexualism in their psychological practice. “Gender identity” is a term coined by my former endocrine faculty member John Money in the 1970s and has come to refer to an individual’s mental and emotional sense of being male or female. The norm is for individuals to have a gender identity that aligns with one’s biological sex.

Gender discordance (formerly Gender Identity Disorder) is used to describe a psychological condition in which a person experiences marked incongruence between his experienced gender and the gender associated with his biological sex. He will often express the belief that he is the opposite sex. Up until 2010, gender discordance occurred in 0.001% of biological females and in 0.0033% of biological males.³ Exact numbers are hard to document since reporting is often anecdotal. Gender discordance is not considered a normal developmental variation.

“Gender Dysphoria” is a diagnostic term to describe the emotional distress caused by gender incongruity.⁴ John Money played a prominent role in the early development of gender theory and transgenderism. He understood gender to be “the social performance indicative of an internal sexed identity.”⁵ He joined the Johns Hopkins faculty in 1951 specifically to have access to children diagnosed with DSD, hoping to prove his theory that gender was arbitrary and fluid. Money experimented with DSD infants by assigning them to the opposite biological sex through surgical revision, counseling, and hormonal manipulation during puberty. His mode of operation was to have a theory and then experiment with patients to see how his theory worked.

Ethics in Clinical Research on Human Subjects

It is important to discuss the need for ethics to play a role in the design of clinical studies involving human patients. To have a hypothesis, as did John Money, is not at issue. However, to clearly elucidate the potential for harm and balance that knowledge with the potential benefits is key and essential. After the travesties of open-ended experimentation in the Nazi concentration camps, international guidelines were established to protect human subjects from just such experimentation.⁶ John Money ignored these guidelines as he assigned genders to infants and toddlers with ambiguous genitalia. There was no informed consent of the patients, who were infants and toddlers, and their parents were just told to follow the advice of Dr. Money and to trust that he had the correct information. There was no standardized protocol to follow, and no known outcome that could be guaranteed. This kind of endeavor did not anticipate or prevent adverse outcomes and was the antithesis of ethical science. Money never submitted his research proposals for review by an independent external review board. This left the patients unprotected and vulnerable to harm, and, indeed, in the case of the Reimer twins, to death due to drug addiction/overdose in one brother to and suicide in the other.⁷

Near the end of my fellowship training at Johns Hopkins, a male infant was sent to our clinic to assess the cause of his very small penis and testicles. My attending physician and I laid out a diagnostic work-up based on the known science which would help us understand whether the problem was due to a pituitary deficiency or an inability of tissue response to hormones. We purposely left John Money off the care "team," having some serious concerns about his tendency to dismiss science and to experiment. We sent the family home with their son and were quite surprised when the mother returned six weeks later with a baby wearing a pink dress and an eyelet bonnet. Without our knowledge, Dr. Money had intervened and told the family that our protocol was nonsense and the baby needed to be reared as female. On physical exam, there was clear evidence that not only was the baby able to produce testosterone, but his penis responded well, as expected, to the hormone production by his own body. The family was relieved but had not been spared suffering under the experimentation by Dr. Money. They had suffered deeply when they divulged to their extended family that their baby boy was actually a baby girl, and then they suffered even more when they recanted and resumed calling him a boy.

Because of his experience with infants, Money initially garnered support from endocrine colleagues and surgical colleagues, and Johns Hopkins became a renowned center for care of patients with DSD in the 1970s, receiving referrals from around the world. Follow-up studies on these infants later showed, however, that altering their natal sexual identity via social intervention could lead to severe psychological harm. Clinical case reports of children with DSD have revealed that gender identity is indeed not immune to environmental input.⁸

Meanwhile, Money had expanded into the field of adult patients with persistent gender identity disorder. This very small group of patients chose voluntarily, as adults, to enter a very precise protocol which began with living socially as the opposite sex for a year, eventually receiving hormonal therapy to change their physical appearance to some extent. The final step was surgical revision of the body structures that would otherwise be at odds with their desired gender identity. This small group of patients was followed for a number of years past their final surgical procedures and required continuous counseling. These patients expressed some degree of subjective satisfaction but showed no objective improvement in overall wellbeing.⁹ The legacy of John Money fell into disrepute and the transsexual treatment program at Johns Hopkins was closed in the 1980s based on the lack of evidence that this protocol produced an effective cure.

Etiology of Gender Disorders

Transgender affirming professionals claim transgender individuals have a "feminized brain" trapped in a male body at birth and vice versa based upon various brain studies. Diffusion-weighted MRI scans have demonstrated that the pubertal testosterone surge in boys increases white matter volume. A study by Rametti and colleagues found that the white matter microstructure of the brains of female-to-male (FtM) transsexual adults, who had not begun testosterone treatment, more closely resembled that of men than that of women.¹⁰ Other

diffusion-weighted MRI studies have concluded that the white matter microstructure in both FtM and male-to-female (MtF) transsexuals falls halfway between that of genetic females and males.¹¹ These studies, however, are of limited clinical significance due to the small number of subjects and failure to account for neuroplasticity.

Neuroplasticity is the well-established phenomenon in which long-term behavior alters brain microstructure. For example, the MRI scans of experienced cab drivers in London are distinctly different from those of non-cab drivers, and the changes noted are dependent on the years of experience.¹² There is no evidence that people are born with brain microstructures that are forever unalterable, but there is significant evidence that experience changes brain microstructure.^{13,14} Therefore, any transgender brain differences would more likely be the result of transgender behavior than its cause.

Furthermore, infants' brains are imprinted prenatally by their own endogenous sex hormones, which are secreted from their gonads beginning at approximately eight weeks' gestation.^{15,16,17} There are no published studies documenting MRI-verified differences in the brains of gender-disordered children or adolescents. The DSD guidelines also specifically state that current MRI technology cannot be used to identify those patients who should be raised as males or raised as females.¹⁸ Behavior geneticists have known for decades that while genes and hormones influence behavior, they do not hard-wire a person to think, feel, or behave in a particular way. The science of epigenetics has established that genes are not analogous to rigid "blueprints" for behavior. Rather, humans "develop traits through the dynamic process of gene-environment interaction. ... [genes alone] don't determine who we are."¹⁹

Regarding transgenderism, twin studies of adults prove definitively that prenatal genetic and hormone influence is minimal. The largest twin study of transgender adults found that only 20 percent of identical twins were both transgender-identified.²⁰ Since identical twins contain 100 percent of the same DNA from conception and develop in exactly the same prenatal environment exposed to the same prenatal hormones, if genes and/or prenatal hormones contributed to a significant degree to transgenderism, the concordance rates would be close to 100 percent. Instead, 80 percent of identical twin pairs were discordant. This difference would indicate that at least 80 percent of what contributes to transgenderism as an adult in one co-twin consists of one or more non-shared post-natal experiences including but not limited to non-shared family experiences. These findings also mean that persistent GD is due predominately to the impact of nonshared environmental influences. These studies provide compelling evidence that discordant gender is not hard-wired genetically.

Gender Dysphoria vs. Gender Identity Disorder

Up until the recent revision of the DSM-IV criteria, the American Psychological Association (APA) held that Gender Identity Disorder (GID) was the mental disorder described as a discordance between the natal sex and the gender identity of the patient. Dr. Kenneth Zucker, who is a highly respected clinician and researcher from Toronto, carried on evaluation and

treatment of GID patients for forty years. His works, widely published, found that the vast majority of boys and girls with GID identify with their biological sex by the time they emerge from puberty to adulthood, through either watchful waiting or family and individual counseling.²¹ His results were mirrored in studies from Europe.^{22,23}

When the DSM-V revision of the diagnosis of GID was proposed by the APA committee responsible for revision, Dr. Zucker strongly opposed the change to the term Gender Dysphoria, which purposefully removed gender discordance as a mental disorder apart from the presence of significant emotional distress. With this revision, Gender Dysphoria describes the mental anguish which is experienced by the gender discordant patient. The theory that societal rejection is the root cause of Gender Dysphoria was validly questioned by a study from Sweden which showed that the dysphoria was not eliminated by hormones and sex reassignment surgery even with widespread societal acceptance.²⁴

Treatment of Gender Dysphoria

The treatment of children and adolescents with gender discordance and accompanying gender dysphoria should include an in-depth evaluation of the child and family dynamics. This evaluation provides a basis on which to proceed with psychologic therapy. The entire biologic and social family should be involved in psychological therapy designed to assist the patient, if at all possible, to align gender identity with natal sex. Psychological support by competent counselors with an intent of resolving the gender conflict should be provided as long as the patient continues to suffer emotionally. Given the high degree of eventual desistance of gender discordance/dysphoria by the end of puberty, it would be ethical and logical to counsel the patient and family to rear the child in conformity with natal sex.

There should be no interruption of natural puberty. Natural pubertal maturation in accordance with one's natal sex is not a disease. It is designed to carry malleable, immature children forward to be healthy adults capable of conceiving their own progeny by providing either a sperm or an egg. Puberty affects physical changes, some of them painful, unique to the natal sex to reflect the laws of nature. Interruption of puberty has been reserved for children who begin puberty at an age much younger than normal in an effort to preserve final height potential and avoid the social consequences of precocious maturation.²⁵

There are a number of physical changes that are a consequence of normally timed puberty that could be classified as disadvantageous: changes in body proportions can alter success with dance and gymnastics; acne can be severe and disfiguring; a boy soprano can suddenly hardly carry a tune. It has not been the ethical standard of care to stop puberty so that these changes can be circumvented. Erikson described the stage of adolescence as "Identity versus Role Confusion" during which the teen works at developing a sense of self by testing roles then integrating them into a single identity.²⁶ This process is often unpleasant regardless of the presence or absence of gender identity conflicts. The major benefit of enduring puberty in a GD patient is that it provides a strong likelihood of alignment of his gender identity with his

natal sex. There is no doubt that these patients need compassionate care to get them through their innate pubertal changes.

The light at the end of the tunnel is the proven scientific evidence that 80%- 95% of pre-pubertal children with GD will come to identify with their biological sex by late adolescence. Some will require lifelong supportive counseling while others will not.²⁷ Intervention at a young age with gonadotropin releasing hormone analogs (often referred to as puberty blockers) to either stop puberty early on or prevent it from starting before it naturally occurs is suggested by guidelines developed by WPATH without scientific basis. These guidelines are essentially nothing more than an open-ended experiment in the manner of John Money. They represent the ideas of their authors with clear admission that there is no long-term evidence that harm will exceed benefits as these patients grow to old age. There is evidence that bone mineral density is irreversibly decreased if puberty blockers are used during the years of adolescence.²⁸ To treat puberty as a pathologic state of health that should be avoided by using puberty blockers (GnRH analogs) is to interrupt a major necessary physiologic transformation at a critical age when such changes can effectively happen. We have definite evidence of the need for estrogen in females to store calcium in their skeleton in their teen years. That physiologic event can't be put off successfully to a later date. It is very difficult to imagine ethical controlled clinical trials that could elucidate the effects of delaying puberty until the age of consent.

The use of cross-sex hormones during this same time frame has no basis of safety and efficacy. The use of such treatment in adults raises scientifically valid concerns that were amply expressed in the 2009 Endocrine Society Guidelines on Transgender treatment. The next step in WPATH-recommended intervention is to use cross-sex hormone therapy during the time when the patient would naturally be experiencing endogenous pubertal changes. This too is not based on scientifically proven theories. The use of cross-sex hormones can cause permanent infertility.²⁹

The final recommended step is so-called "sex reassignment surgery," which can include surgical removal of the breasts in natal females, or removal of the penis and scrotum in natal males. Each of these steps has adverse outcomes, some reversible and others not. Mastectomies leave scars, and there is great difficulty in creating a functional vaginal-like orifice, and certainly no success in creating an innervated erectile penis where none existed previously. Sex reassignment surgery is, by nature, permanent.

Recurrent Themes that Are Repeatedly Published

Puberty blockers are stated to be completely reversible in their effects on the adolescent who has entered puberty based on clinical studies in young children with precocious puberty who have been treated with these drugs. This is comparing apples to oranges. Precocious puberty, by definition, is defined as puberty which starts before the 8th birthday for a female child or the before the 9th birthday in a male child. The end of treatment is carefully timed so that resumption of puberty occurs at the average age for females (10.5 years) and males (11.5

years). This allows the necessary functions of puberty to prepare the body for reproduction and affects the bones, gonads, and brain, among other body systems. On the other hand, blocking puberty at the age of normal puberty prevents the needed accretion of calcium into the skeleton and prevents the maturation of the gonads. There is no long-term data that compares bone, gonad, and brain health in pubertal-aged patients who have had puberty interrupted and those who have not, as was noted as a concern in the Endocrine Society Guidelines. There are no such ongoing studies completed that guarantee the full reversibility of blocking puberty in this age group, but there is evidence that normal bone density can't be fully reestablished. Without any verifiable safety data, using the puberty blockers for interrupting normal puberty is not a sanctionable off-label use of these drugs and is therefore to be considered uncontrolled, non-consentable experimentation on children.

Advocates for the social, medical and surgical affirmation of gender incongruent children insist that they are only following established standards of care. There are no standards of care for transgender health. Standards of care established by broad consensus are reached by inclusion of the whole spectrum of opinions, clinical experience and published science in the formation thereof. The guidelines published by WPATH³⁰, the Endocrine Society,^{29,31} the American Academy of Pediatrics³², and the Pediatric Endocrine Society³³ are solely the opinions of like-minded practitioners who excluded any contrary opinion. The Endocrine Society Guidelines, as mentioned before, clearly stated that they are not to be considered standards of care. Before true consensus-driven standards of care are established for the treatment of transgender patients of all ages, following the current guidelines is risky experimentation in a manner reminiscent of John Money's tactics.

What We Do Know and Do Not Know

We do know that social affirmation of an incongruent gender tears the fabric of the patient's life into pieces- pitting family members against each other, ruining child friendships and it introduces the child to a fantasy world, much of it on the internet. Kenneth Zucker aptly documented the detrimental effects of such affirmation and the immense amount of work it takes to undo these effects when the child does come to realize they can't change their sex and wants to go back to identifying with their sex³⁴. We do not know that social affirmation does anything other than push the child away from the proven, 80-90% effective, so-called watch-and wait treatment option. Embarrassingly unscientific short term convenience sample studies purport to show that all gender incongruent children who are socially affirmed have improved mental health and are therefore better off than those children who are not allowed to socially transition.³⁵

We do know that blocking puberty during the age when puberty naturally happens lessens accretion of calcium into the skeleton and that this can't be regained by allowing puberty to resume or by using cross sex hormones. We do know that the ovary and testicle cease to mature with treatment. What we do not know is whether allowing puberty to resume will allow the ovary and testicle to fully mature and have full function in terms of fertility. We do

not know if brain development that is halted with puberty blockers can return to full function once puberty is allowed to resume.

We do know that elevated levels of testosterone in females and of estrogen in males create significant medical morbidity. This knowledge comes from the evaluation and treatment of naturally occurring disease states in children and adults. Treatment of these conditions is aimed at returning hormone levels to normal, thereby avoiding cancers, heart disease, and stroke. We do not know that elevating testosterone in females and estrogen in males to levels ten-fold higher than these known disease states is safe, but common sense would say it can't possibly be safe.

The Myth of Increased Suicide

The affirmation advocates repeatedly refer to the established increased risk of suicide if any of the affirmation strategies are not followed to completion. They point to their own published studies touting dramatic improvement in mental health status of patients who are affirmed in all three ways, but they cite data from convenience sampling, which never should be used to prove anything other than association, at best. Such studies can never prove causation. There are only two total population studies in the peer-reviewed medical literature.^{24,36,37} They show that when every recorded case in the population of Sweden was analyzed, neither medical affirmation nor medical affirmation followed by surgical affirmation improved the mental health of the patients in the long run.

What of the Nearly Logarithmic Increase in Incidence of Gender Incongruence?

Data collection in this regard is subject to estimates based on surveys, which can easily alter the numbers upward or downward, depending on who designed the survey and to whom it was presented. Fear, self-loathing or suicide will necessarily lower the numbers of survey participants whose lives are made miserable by the choice to affirm an incongruent gender. Instant gratification, payback to strict parents, and current celebrity will draw survey participants to express euphoric satisfaction with their decision to affirm their incongruent gender, especially when the surveys are circulated by trans-activist organizations, such as the Trevor Project. What had been in 2010 a nearly invisible fraction of adults who admitted to living with an incongruent gender has exponentially increased in frequency to as many as one out of five students in a suburban Pittsburgh school district in 2021. After I completed my fellowship at Johns Hopkins in 1980, it was not until 1993 that a biologic male presented to my private practice office with a desire to be treated with estrogen to feminize his body so that he could appear to be a female and identify as such. There was nothing in published medical literature that I could find to guide my treatment options. I canvassed my broad contact pediatric endocrinology network across the United States, and nobody had heard of such a clinical case, and none had any suggestions about what I should do. In the ensuing 19 years, the number of transgender treatment centers have burgeoned from zero to several hundred between university-based centers and Planned Parenthood. Minority stress theory is frequently used to cover this explosion in numbers, but that is utterly impossible. What does

explain this increase is online recruiting and grooming of vulnerable children and adolescents by a generously funded political movement aimed at dissolving the reality and birthright of biologic sex. This will not end well. By the time a plethora of legal action against those who promoted and engineered the social, medical, and surgical affirmation of incongruent gender knocks down this house of cards, millions of children and adolescents will have been medically, surgically, and mentally maimed as well sterilized.

Endnotes

¹ Lee PA et al, Global Disorders of Sex Development Update since 2006: Perceptions, Approach and Care, 2016 *Horm Res Paediatr*.

² Lee PA et al, Consensus Statement on Management of Intersex Disorders, *Pediatrics* 2006; 118 e488-e500.

³ Seaborg E, About Face, *Endocrine News* 2014 (May) 16-19.

⁴ American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed; 2013:451-459.

⁵ Jeffreys, S. *Gender Hurts: A feminist analysis of the politics of transgenderism*. Routledge. 2014 (p. 27).

⁶ Annas GJ and Grodin MA, Reflections on the 70th Anniversary of the Nuremberg Doctor's Trial, *AM J Pub Health* 2018;108:10-12

⁷ <https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bs-xpm-2000-02-10-0002100278-story.html>

⁸ Whitehead, N. *My Genes Made Me Do It*. Chapter 5.

⁹ Meyer J.K. and Reter D. Sex Reassignment Follow-up. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 36:1010-1015, 1979.

¹⁰ Rametti G, Carrillo B, Gomez-Gil E, et al. White matter microstructure in female to male transsexuals before cross-sex hormonal treatment. A diffusion tensor imaging study. *J Psychiatr Res* 2011; 45:199-204.

¹¹ Kranz GS, Hahn A, Kaufmann U, et al. White matter microstructure in transsexuals and controls.

¹² Maguire EA et al, Navigation-related structural change in the hippocampi of taxi drivers, *PNAS* 2000; 97:4398- 4403.

¹³ Gu J, Kanai R. What contributes to individual differences in brain structure? *Front Hum Neurosci* 2014; 8:262.

¹⁴ Sale A, Berardi N, Maffei L, Environment and Brain Plasticity: Towards an Endogenous Pharmacotherapy, *Physiol Rev* 2014; 94: 189 –234.

¹⁵ Reyes FI, Winter JS, Faiman C. Studies on human sexual development fetal gonadal and adrenal sex steroids. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 1973; 37(1):74-78.

¹⁶ Lombardo M. Fetal testosterone influences sexually dimorphic gray matter in the human brain. *J Neurosci* 2012; 32:674-680.

¹⁷ Campano A. [ed]. Geneva Foundation for Medical Education and Research. *Human Sexual Differentiation*; 2016. Available at ww.gfmer.ch/Books/Reproductive_health/Human_sexual_differentiation.html. Accessed May 11, 2016.

-
- ¹⁸ Lee PA et al, Consensus Statement on Management of Intersex Disorders, *Pediatrics* 2006; 118 e488-e500.
- ¹⁹ Shenk, D. *The Genius in All of Us: Why everything you've been told about genetics, talent, and IQ is wrong.* (2010) New York, NY: Doubleday; p. 18.
- ²⁰ Diamond, M. "Transsexuality Among Twins: identity concordance, transition, rearing, and orientation." *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 14(1), 24-38.
- ²¹ Zucker KJ, Gender Identity Disorder, in Rutter M, Taylor EA, editors. *Child and Adolescent psychiatry*, 4th ed, Malden Mass: Blackwell, 2006: 737-753.
- ²² Wallien MS, Cohen-Kettenis PT. Psychosexual outcome of gender-dysphoric children. *J AM Academy Child Adolescent Psychiatry* 2008; 47:1413-1423.
- ²³ Schechner T. Gender Identity Disorder: A Literature Review from a Developmental Perspective. *Isr J Psychiatry Related Sci* 2010; 47:42-48.
- ²⁴ Dhejne C, et al. Long-term Follow-up of transsexual Persons Undergoing Sex Reassignment Surgery: Cohort Study in Sweden *PLoS One* February 2011 Vol 6 Issue 2, e16885.
- ²⁵ Carel JC, Eugster EA, Rogol A, et al. Consensus statement on the use of gonadotropin-releasing hormone analogs in children. *Pediatrics*. 2009 Apr. 123(4):e752-62.
- ²⁶ Erikson EH (1993). *Childhood and society*. WW Norton & Company.
- ²⁷ Zucker KJ, Gender Identity Disorder, in Rutter M, Taylor EA, editors. *Child and Adolescent psychiatry*, 4th ed, Malden Mass: Blackwell, 2006: 737-753.
- ²⁸ *J Clin Endo Metab* 2008; 93:190-195.
- ²⁹ Hembree WC et al. Endocrine Treatment of Transsexual Persons: and Endocrine Society Clinical Practice Guideline, *J Clin Endo Metab* 2009; 94:3132-3154.
- ³⁰ Coleman E, Bockting W, Botzer M et al. Standards of Care for the Health of Transsexual, Transgender, and Gender-Non-conforming People, version 7, *International Journal of Transgenderism* 2012;13(4): 165-232
- ³¹ Wylie W et al. "Endocrine Treatment of Gender-dysphoric/Gender-incongruent Persons: An Endocrine Society Clinical Practice Guideline, *JCEM* 2017; 102:3869-3903
- ³² Rafferty J, Ensuring Comprehensive Care and Support for Transgender and Gender-Diverse Children and Adolescents, *Pediatrics*, 2018;142:e20182162
- ³³ Lopez X et al. Pediatric Endocrine Society Transgender Health Special Interest Group statement on gender-affirmative approach to care the Pediatric Endocrine Society, 2017 *Curr Opin Pediatr*;29:475-480.
- ³⁴ Zucker K. J. (2019), Debate: Different strokes for different folks. *Child Adolesc Ment Health*. doi:[10.1111/camh.12330](https://doi.org/10.1111/camh.12330)
- ³⁵ Olson KR et al, Mental Health of Transgender Children Who are Supported in Their Identities, *Pediatrics* 2016;137 e20153223

³⁶ Branstrom R Pachankis JE Reduction in mental health treatment utilization among transgender individuals after gender-affirming surgeries: a total population study, *Am J Psychiatry* 2020; 177:727-734

³⁷ Bränström R and Pachankis JE. Toward Rigorous Methodologies for Strengthening Causal Inference in the Association Between Gender-Affirming Care and Transgender Individuals' Mental Health: Response to Letters. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 2020 177:8, 769-772 doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20050599.

Appendix Attachment

1f

ATTACHMENT F

Florida Medicaid Project: Surgical Procedures and Gender Dysphoria

Patrick Lappert, M.D.

May 17, 2022

Florida Medicaid Project: Surgical Procedures and Gender Dysphoria

Patrick Lappert, M.D.

Overview

The “Gender Affirmation” care model for children who suffer from gender identity issues is experimental in nature because it is based in low to very low-quality scientific evidence. There is no body of quality scientific evidence to support the hypothesis that gender dysphoria with its associated problems of self-harm and suicide, is improved long-term by gender affirmation surgical procedures.

The best evidence available today demonstrates that transgender is not a single condition that can be explained by any single factor. There are vast differences in age of presentation, predominant sex, persistence into adulthood, and resolution during adolescent development. Moreover, there are numerous and common co-morbid conditions such as autism-spectrum disorder, major anxiety disorders, and clinical depression that severely affect any sense of certainty about the true cause of the child’s dysphoria, as well as their capacity to understand and give assent to irreversible medical and surgical procedures that lead to permanent sterility, sexual impotence, and a lifetime of medical problems associated with affirmation care.

The process of obtaining medical informed consent as part of gender affirming surgery is morally indefensible, and likely legally indefensible as well. Parents of suffering children are led by medical professionals to believe that there is only one valid option of care (affirmation medicine and surgery), utterly concealing the historic reality that greater than 92% of children desist in their cross-sex self-identification when treated using the “watchful waiting” therapeutic strategy. Parents are told that if they do not consent to affirmation care, there is a high likelihood that their child will die from suicide. This is not informed consent, but rather consent under duress.

Gender identity is being presented as a fixed and unchanging, biologically determined, personal characteristic. It is not. The medical literature has consistently shown over many years that the vast majority of children with cross-sex gender identity resolve the issue during adolescence and adopt a gender identity that is congruent with their biological sex.

Because surgeons who perform gender affirmation surgeries have no diagnostic test to predict who among the self-identified transgender minors would have persisted in their cross-sex self-identification into adulthood, and who among those children would have desisted, they have no way to know, in any particular case if the irreversible surgery is being performed on a person who would have continued to self-identify in the cross-sex persona into adulthood. Given the historically well-known desistance rate, it is possible that as many as 90% of children are undergoing surgery based upon an incorrect diagnosis.

“Gender Affirming” breast surgery for self-identifying transgender minors is not medically and ethically equivalent to similar procedures performed for objectively identifiable medical conditions. Transgender breast surgery is always cosmetic (aesthetic) in nature because the indication is a hoped-for improvement in the interior emotional life of the patient. Transgender surgery is not based in any medical diagnosis and does not seek to restore any form or function that may have been lost due to trauma, disease, or developmental accident. It begins with normal structures and changes their appearance in order to achieve a subjective improvement and is therefore cosmetic surgery.

Because gender affirming surgery is cosmetic (aesthetic) in nature, such surgeries must never be offered if they are known to predictably produce an irreversible loss of function. To knowingly sacrifice a human capacity (breast feeding, capacity for sexual intimacy, fertility) in the pursuit of a cosmetic result in a minor who is incapable of giving informed consent, is morally indefensible. The hoped-for subjective improvement that is sought in transgender surgery is a short-lived improvement and is only supported by low to very low-quality scientific evidence. Long term longitudinal cohort studies that are based in level III evidence show that affirmation surgical care is of no benefit in reducing self-harm including suicide.

Problems with Informed Consent

The protection of children in situations requiring informed consent is a crucial problem that the state has a historic and abiding interest in. In the particular situation of self-identified transgender children, it becomes a most significant problem, given that they are being submitted for permanently life-altering interventions. In my opinion as a plastic and reconstructive surgeon, the life-altering nature of hormonal and surgical interventions needs to be addressed from the moment of the child’s entry into the gender-transition system, given the fact that the overwhelming majority of children who first begin puberty blockade, go onto the physically altering and permanent changes produced by cross sex hormones, and many ultimately also pursue surgery, as is attested to by multiple papers, the content of which is examined below. Informed consent has several requirements that need to be met if such consent is to be deemed valid. These requirements include a thorough discussion of the details of the proposed procedure including risks, known complications, and some measure of the likelihood of a favorable outcome. The discussion must include alternative treatments, and their risks, known complications and their likelihood of a favorable outcome. In the case of the interventions associated with gender-transition medicine and surgery, the favorable outcomes should be evident over the lifetime of the patient, given that they are permanently sacrificing structures and capacities (breasts and breast-feeding, or genitals and fertility).

Because the commonly cited medical literature used in support of these surgeries is of low to very low quality, it must be recognized that such surgeries must be considered experimental in nature given the unknown long-term effects of treatment, and the vast uncertainty in the patient selection and diagnostic processes. Yet the experts who provide opinion in support of these surgeries speak with absolute certainty of their efficacy, and the absence of any alternative treatment. Considering these factors severally and together it becomes difficult to imagine a

more flawed consent process. It also becomes understandable how parents can be drawn into uninformed participation given the simultaneous presentation of dire consequences if gender dysphoria is left untreated, and the insistence that affirmation care including surgery is the only way to bring lasting happiness to the child.

Chest Masculinization” in Natal Females is Not Ethically Equivalent to Mastectomies for Breast Cancer

When mastectomy is performed for the management of breast cancer, or to mitigate the proven risk of developing breast cancer in women, it is done on the basis of objective diagnoses either by pathological examination of biopsy tissue, or as in the case of prophylactic mastectomy, on the basis of genetic analysis that shows known markers of increased risk of developing breast cancer. These tests (microscopic examination of tissue specimens, detection of cell surface markers with proven association with malignancy, and genetic screening of at-risk patients) have known positive predictive value for the diagnosis of breast cancer, and these tests have known error rates that can be used when obtaining informed consent for mastectomy. The validity of these tests has been proven using scientific methodologies that produce high quality evidence in longitudinal population studies with control populations, and very long follow up. As the result, when a woman gives consent for mastectomy to control or prevent the potentially lethal disease, it is with a clear and proven evaluation of the risks and benefits that consent is obtained. Mastectomy is being performed based upon an objective diagnosis of a potentially lethal condition, and the surgical procedure has proven benefit in management of that condition.

In stark contrast, this is not the case when mastectomy is performed to “masculinize” the chest of girls and women who self-identify as transgender or who self-report symptoms of dysphoria. In the self-identified transgender adolescent, breasts are being removed on the basis of a diagnosis that is made by the patient since there are no tests with known error rates that can be used to predict who will benefit from this disfiguring and irreversible surgery. The claim is made that chest masculinization has proven benefit in reducing dysphoria and the associated risk of suicide. But published studies that make this claim of benefit offer evidence that is low to very low quality, typically small case collections with self-selection bias, very short follow up, and no case controls.

The best data presently available on the long-term effects of medical and surgical transitioning are long-term, longitudinal, population-based studies. For example, Dehjne, et al., examined the putative long-term benefit of full transitioning (including hormonal and surgical treatments) found in the Swedish medical database. (See Long-Term Follow-Up of Transsexual Persons Undergoing Sex Reassignment Surgery: Cohort Study in Sweden; Cecilia Dhejne, Paul Lichtenstein, Marcus Boman, Anna L. V. Johansson, Niklas Långström, Mikael Landén; PLOSOne February 22, 2011 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016885>). That database includes all persons in the Swedish medical system, from pre-natal to death. It reports all episodes of care and all demographic information in a uniform vocabulary. Furthermore, Sweden has been on the forefront of “gender affirmation” long before the American medical

system seriously considered its claims. Because of the nature of Sweden's database, it is possible to study a cohort of patients that very closely matches the inquiry group with regards to age, sex, economic status, etc. It is possible to ask with great precision such questions as, "What is the likelihood that a fully transitioned transgender male will be hospitalized for psychiatric illness when compared to the age/sex matched control group?" Even more, one could urgently ask, "What is the relative risk of suicide in transgender persons, when compared to age/sex matched controls?"

Why are such longitudinal, population-based studies superior to the case-collection/case series methodology? Because confounding variables such as age, sex, and self-selection biases are removed. In the flawed case-collection methodology, the reported cases are typically only those who return for follow up. You have no way of knowing if the patient had a good outcome or didn't return for follow up because they were in a psychiatric hospital, were incarcerated, or committed suicide. In the Swedish longitudinal study, the suicide is in the same database, as are the other issues of hospitalization, incarceration, and addiction treatment, among other rates of comorbidity. Thus the longitudinal population study can give us what is called a "hazard ratio" for a particular study population (patients who have completed transgender transition in this case).

What this Swedish study shows us that the risk of completed suicide in all transgender persons is 19.1 times higher than in the control cohort. If you look only at patients who have transitioned — patients after "treatment" — from female to "male presentation," the risk of completed suicide is 40 times higher than in the general population. (Note: this finding is consistent with the historic Bränström 10-year follow up study, which found no benefits to "transitioning treatments" but did note an increased risk of serious suicide attempts and anxiety disorders AFTER "treatment.") (Correction to Bränström and Pachankis, *Am J Psychiatry* 177:8, August 2020; see detailed citations in the "Notes" section of this report below).

Another cautionary note was added to the literature by the reputed Cochrane Review, a UK based international association of researchers who examine the quality of scientific evidence used in medical decision making. The Cochrane Review recently published findings concerning the medical evidence used to support the decision to give young women cross sex hormones as part of the transition process. The authors summarize the world literature review thus: "We found insufficient evidence to determine the efficacy or safety of hormonal treatment approaches for transgender women in transition. This lack of studies shows a gap between current clinical practice and clinical research." (Does hormone therapy help transgender women undergoing gender reassignment to transition? See, Haupt C, Henke M, Kutschmar A, Hauser B, Baldinger S, Saenz SR, Schreiber G., *Cochrane Review*, 28 Nov 2020).

Similar issues of very poor, low quality scientific support for chest masculinization surgery can be seen in a recent article by Tolstrup et al. published in the journal *Aesthetic Plastic Surgery* (See Anders Tolstrup, Dennis Zetner, Jacob Rosenberg, *Outcome Measures in Gender-Confirming Chest Surgery: A Systematic Scoping Review*, *Aesthetic Plast Surg* 2020 Feb;44(1):219-228. doi: 10.1007/s00266-019-01523-1. Epub 2019 Oct 29). The article reports a

comprehensive review of the world literature concerning the efficacy of “gender confirming” chest surgery in transgender patients. The authors found 849 articles on the subject, published in peer reviewed medical journals. Of these 849 articles, only 47 could be included in the review. This means that only 5.5% of all the published, peer-reviewed transgender surgery articles demonstrated even rudimentary scientific rigor. Of those 47 articles, the authors report that only 29 of the articles addressed mental health outcomes (3.4% of all the articles). What is startling is that the mental health outcomes were judged only on the basis of uncorroborated, untested, and unassessed patient subjective reporting with descriptors that varied so widely from article to article that results could not even be compared. The authors summarize by saying, “Evaluation of outcomes in gender-confirming chest surgery showed large variations in reporting, and further streamlining of reporting is therefore required to be able to compare surgical outcomes between studies.” None of these negligent articles even bothered to examine rates of psychiatric hospitalization, substance abuse, self-harm behaviors, and suicide. This tells us that the main reason for performing these surgeries (psychological distress and suicide risk) isn’t even evaluated with regard to efficacy.

An example of an article with very low-quality data, reckless (now banned practices), and methodology, published in a “leading journal,” and promoted as evidence for the efficacy of “chest masculinization” surgery makes this fact very clear. The lead author (Olson-Kennedy, a leading national advocate for the transgender treatment enterprise) is a board-certified pediatrician who leads the gender clinic for the Los Angeles Children’s Hospital. The article appeared in 2018 (See J. Olson-Kennedy, J. Warus, MD1, et al., Chest Reconstruction and Chest Dysphoria in Transmasculine Minors and Young Adults; Comparisons of Nonsurgical and Postsurgical Cohorts., *JAMA Pediatr.* 2018;172(5):431-436. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2017.5440. In their summary of findings, the authors reported that “chest dysphoria” is common among “trans males” (natal females seeking to present as males) and claimed that dysphoria is “decreased by surgery.” They claim that regret for surgery is “rare.” The article reports breast removal surgery on at least one girl aged 13 years. (Note that this reckless, experimental practice has now apparently been abandoned as unethical/experimentation on children by England, Sweden, and Finland. The average age of patients in the study was 19. Children were entered into the study through recruitment from among patients visiting the clinic and by telephone over a six-month period. The authors found that, of the patients recruited from among visitors to the clinic (convenience sampling), there was an over-representation of non-operated patients, so the authors were forced to reach out to all the post-surgical patients by phone. Twenty-six percent of the clinic’s post-surgical patients could not be reached for various reasons including no working phone, or failure to respond to multiple messages. The 26% drop-out rate is never even questioned by these authors. Were surgical patients lost to follow up because of dissatisfaction, psychiatric hospitalization, or suicide? This problem is called “self-selection bias,” and it is evidence of careless study design. Of the remaining 74% of patients, only 72% completed the survey. This is a second example of self-selection bias. Why would some post-surgical patients who had been successfully contacted, not complete the survey? The authors — demonstrating multiple levels of confirmation bias — do not even ask such essential questions. (See detailed citations in the “Notes” section of this report below).

In the study, dysphoria was evaluated using what the author called “a novel measure,” which amounted to a series of subjective questions about happiness that was in part designed by the adolescent test subjects themselves. Essentially, the methodology used an entirely unvalidated (“junk science”) test instrument, with no known error rates and no proven predictive power. Furthermore, the post-surgical patients were administered the survey at widely varying time intervals post-surgery. The longest interval between surgery and the satisfaction survey was 5 years, but children less than a year post-surgery were included in this obviously flawed sample, and yet the authors claim evidence of “negligible regret.” This is a remarkable, misleading, and deceptive claim given that long-term, longitudinal population studies show that there is a dramatic rise in post-surgical problems such as depression, hospitalization, substance abuse, and suicide beginning at around seven years post-surgery (Ibid). Surely the authors are familiar with the world literature on transgender outcomes?

Having deceptively or negligently promised in the introduction to their paper that “chest dysphoria” is reduced by surgery, at the conclusion the authors confessed to the fact that the study design and execution produced very low-quality data that is not useful for patient selection, or prediction of outcomes. They even confessed that the study does not address the efficacy of surgery in improving outcomes regarding the single most compelling reason for performing the operation: mitigation of depression and suicide. The authors write, “An additional limitation of the study was the small sample size. The nonsurgical cohort was a convenience sample, recruited from those with appointments during the data collection period. There could be unknown imbalances between the nonsurgical and postsurgical cohorts that could have confounded the study findings.”

Finally, the authors did not even bother to validate their “Chest Dysphoria Scale.” Such a “made-up” scale is unlikely to accurately represent distress or correlate with properly validated measures of quality of life, depression, anxiety, or functioning. Their own analysis at the conclusion of the paper directly contradicts the deceptive claim made in their introduction.

This is the kind of “junk science” that is used to support transgender medicine and surgery. The paper is only a few years old. It was written by board certified physicians who practice in one of the nation’s largest pediatric gender clinics and was published in a peer-reviewed medical journal. It is essentially useless in making any clinical decisions regarding who should be offered surgery, what is the likelihood they will benefit from it, and what is the likelihood they will regret their decision. Most importantly, it does not even measure the effect of therapy on suicide risk. The very morbidity (the risk of suicide) that they claim is improved by surgery is not even measured in their low-quality study.

Because of the very low-quality scientific support for mastectomy in the management of gender dysphoria, valid consent would demand that these procedures be described as experimental, would need the approval of ethics panels to monitor human experimentation, and would require the use of valid controls found in long-term, longitudinal population-based study models. These are the kinds of patient protections now endorsed in England, Sweden and Finland but still

ignored in the US environment where proper scientific critiques of such studies can get faculty “cancelled.”

Even though the transgender treatment industry has been performing these surgeries for over 50 years, gender treatment centers continue to publish the same low quality, methodologically defective studies based upon collected cases that are degraded in value by self-selection bias, confirmation bias, and short-term follow-up, while continuing to deceptively claim that such defective research provides a sufficient scientific basis for performing irreversible, disfiguring, and ultimately sterilizing hormonal treatments and surgeries on children.

“Chest Masculinization” in Natal Females is Not Ethically Equivalent to Gynecomastectomy

Gynecomastectomy is the surgical treatment of gynecomastia, a fairly common condition in which males develop female-type breast gland tissue. Proponents of “masculinization” mastectomy in natal females erroneously equate the ethics of removing healthy breast tissue from gender dysphoric children with the removal of abnormal breast tissue in men (gynecomastia). In the case of gynecomastectomy in male patients, the operation is performed to remove the objectively diagnosed presence of female type glandular breast tissue present in a male patient. Physical examination demonstrates the presence of a dense retro-areolar mass which is tender and sometimes disfiguring. Pathological examination of the removed tissue will demonstrate the presence of female-type fibroglandular tissue in a male patient. This is an objectively abnormal condition. It should further be noted that the absence of such abnormal, female-type fibroglandular tissue in the submitted surgical specimen places the chest recontouring in the category of cosmetic surgery and is therefore not typically paid for by third-party payors.

A comprehensive literature review on the subject of gynecomastectomy and suicidal behavior conducted by Sollie in 2018 (Management of gynecomastia—changes in psychological aspects after surgery—a systematic review: *Gland Surg.* 2018 Aug; 7(Suppl 1): S70–76.doi: 10.21037/g.s.2018.03.09) did not produce a single paper claiming improvement in suicide rate in patients who underwent this surgery. There were many reports concerning improvement in the pain that men with this objective condition suffer with. The remainder of the reported data was in the category of subjective “satisfaction survey”. This tells us that the author did not distinguish between medically indicated and aesthetic surgeries. Nonetheless, no claim is made of decreased suicide rates in a suicidal population of male patients. This is because any male patient seeking removal of abnormal, female-type, breast tissue who reported suicidal ideation would be considered incompetent to give consent and would require a psychiatric evaluation and treatment to manage suicidal thinking before being considered for surgery. This kind of decision in favor of psychiatric support does not appear to be at work in the transgender affirmation world. There, and there alone, is suicidal thinking considered a qualification for a surgery.

“Chest Masculinization” in Natal Females is Not Ethically Equivalent to Breast Reduction

It should be obvious that “Chest Masculinization” surgery in natal females is not ethically equivalent to breast reduction surgery in non-transgender females. In the case of breast reduction for females with excessively large breasts (macromastia, or gigantomastia), the operation is performed to relieve a debilitating orthopedic complaint of neck, back, and shoulder pain associated with the postural/mechanical effects of the weight of the breasts. These patients experience significant activity restriction and chronic pain that is not relieved by medical management or physical therapy. Furthermore, there is voluminous actuarial data, based upon many years of longitudinal population-based study by medical insurance agencies that is used to predict who will benefit from surgery, and who will not. These physical, objective tests, based upon the actual measurement of the breasts, and the patient’s overall body habitus, have known error rates that can be used to predict the likelihood that a breast reduction will relieve the orthopedic complaints of neck, back, and shoulder pain (Accuracy of Predicted Resection Weights in Breast Reduction Surgery, Theodore A. Kung, MD, Raouf Ahmed, MBBS¹ Christine O. Kang, MPH,¹ Paul S. Cederna, MD, and Jeffrey H. Kozlow, MD; *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2018 Jun; 6(6): e1830.

Based upon that, adequate pre-operative consent can be obtained. The supporting data is based in very high-quality methodology. There is no quality research data, no pre-operative test or study, and no known error rates that can be used to predict the likelihood that any child suffering from gender dysphoria will benefit from the experimental procedures of mastectomy and chest “masculinization.” As noted above, because of the very low quality data, transgender chest masculinization is at best experimental and at worst, should be viewed as a form of medical child abuse — it is important to note that Finland, Sweden, and the UK apparently now all agree with this analysis, as they have all retreated from such reckless surgical procedures for (See detailed citations in the “Notes” section of this report below).

It is crucial to remember that “chest masculinization-affirmation surgery” of healthy breast tissue results in a complete loss of function, that this loss is two-fold (breast feeding and erotic sensibility), and the cause of the loss is two-fold (gland removal and severing of the intercostal nerve). (See *Breast Reduction with Use of the Free Nipple Graft Technique*; Stephen R. Colen, MD; *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, (Breast Reduction with Use of the Free Nipple Graft Technique; Stephen R. Colen, MD; *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, Volume 21, Issue 3, May 2001, Pages 261–271, <https://doi.org/10.1067/maj.2001.116439>).

If a patient who undergoes “chest masculinization” should regret the surgery, they do have the option of breast reconstruction. However, all that will be produced is a counterfeit of a breast. The patient will have lost the function of breast feeding. Additionally, the most commonly performed “masculinization” surgery involves the removal of the nipples, and subsequent re-

attachment in the form of a nipple graft. Those nipples will have lost their native nerve connections that provoke erotic sensibility. All that can be hoped for is the eventual random ingrowth of local skin sensation, but there will never be erotic sensation because the particular branch of the fourth intercostal nerve which communicates with particular centers in the brain responsible for oxytocin release and erotic provocation will have been permanently severed. This means that breast function has been completely and irreversibly sacrificed for the sake of producing a cosmetic result (a masculine appearing chest). This is the exact opposite of the goals of any reconstructive surgery. It must therefore be understood that “chest masculinization” is a cosmetic procedure that has violated the most essential principle of cosmetic surgery: never sacrifice function for the sake of a cosmetic result.

Erroneous use of the word “Reconstructive” to describe Gender Affirmation Surgeries

The transgender treatment enterprise uses the word “reconstructive” to characterize a group of surgical treatments that seek to alter the sexed appearance of the person. It is important to understand that these procedures, because of the indications for surgery, the motivations for surgery, and the outcomes of surgery, are not reconstructive, but are to be properly understood to be cosmetic in nature.

Reconstructive surgeries are procedures that seek to establish or restore structures and their functioning that have been lost due to trauma, disease, in-utero developmental abnormalities, or surgical treatment for disease. Such reconstructive surgeries must begin with the objective characterization of the defect, including abnormalities of form, and associated loss of function. This process of defining the defect begins with a thorough understanding of normal human form and function and seeks to select, develop, and execute procedures that will restore both. In some cases function may be emphasized more than form, as when the mangled hand of a man is reconstructed. In other cases, reconstruction of form is all that is possible because as yet there are no techniques to restore function. An example of this is seen in the reconstruction of a woman’s breast following cancer care. All that can be offered is the appearance of a breast; she will never be able to feed an infant through the reconstructed part.

This is to be contrasted with cosmetic, or aesthetic surgery in which the appearance of a structure is modified in order to produce a subjective (aesthetic) result for the patient. No functional restoration is addressed because no functional or structural loss exists. The object of the surgery is aesthetic. There is no lost form or function that needs to be reconstructed. It is aesthetic surgery because the motivation is aesthetic (subjective feelings about appearance). Further evidence for this is the fact that nearly the entirety of the outcome studies cited in support of these surgeries use subjective questionnaires which the patient fills out. The questions used are typical of those used to evaluate any aesthetic surgery. They are called “satisfaction surveys”. Such surveys are prone to suffer from self-selection bias, confirmation bias, and high drop-out rates.

One of the key problems that the transgender treatment enterprise faces on a daily basis is the issue of third-party payment for services. No health insurance provider, including federal and state agencies will pay for cosmetic surgery. For this reason, it is necessary, in order for the business model to succeed, that providers characterize their services as reconstructive. This is doubly difficult given the intense political pressure that has been exerted upon the medical community to “de-pathologize” the condition of transgender. This is seen in the abandoning of the diagnostic nomenclature of “body dysmorphic disorder”, and “gender identity disorder” in favor of the more recent DSM manual using the term “gender dysphoria”. This leads transgender treatment providers into the difficult situation of claiming that transgender is not a pathology, while at the same time insisting that the services are medically necessary and describing the procedures as reconstructive without characterizing any physical/ functional defect.

As we consider the specific “gender affirming” surgical procedures we will see that comparison to medically indicated surgeries on both men and women actually serves to reinforce the evidence that these surgeries are essentially and fundamentally cosmetic.

Masculinizing and Feminizing Chest Surgeries are Not “Medically Necessary”

Supporters of “transitioning” treatments justify surgical treatment based upon “medical necessity.” They claim that gender dysphoria can lead to debilitating anxiety and depression, as well as serious incidents of self-harm, including self-mutilation, suicide attempts, and suicide. Yet with only a single exception, in the studies they cite no measures are made of the effects of surgery on what is claimed to constitute the “medical necessity” for these procedures. In contrast, the Branstrom study¹ documented no reliable benefits for transgender surgery/hormonal treatments and no reduction in suicide and even an increase in serious suicide attempts requiring hospitalization in patients receiving surgery. These recent, long-term, published, peer reviewed, credible research findings are quite contrary to the claims of supporters of “transitioning treatments” — as are the National Science Reviews in this area from England-NICE, Sweden, and Finland. (See detailed citations in the Notes section in this declaration).

Scientific rigor would demand an examination of objective outcomes such as: rates of substance abuse, psychiatric hospitalization, self-harm, or suicide, and how they were changed by surgery. One paper does ask these crucial questions concerning efficacy in a very comprehensive, long term, longitudinal population cohort study which actually shows the opposite of what experts claim for these patient outcomes. When followed beyond eight years post operatively, this paper shows that patients receiving these treatments have the same alarmingly high rates of hospitalization, substance abuse, self-harm, and completed suicide as persons who have had no medical or surgical intervention.

¹Correction of a key study: No evidence of “gender-affirming” surgeries improving mental health. Home. (2020, August 30). Retrieved May 17, 2022, from https://segm.org/ajp_correction_2020

In summary, on the issue of the efficacy of these surgeries, the scientific support is very weak, while the scientific evidence rejecting the hypothesis of efficacy is remarkably strong (See Long-Term Follow-Up of Transsexual Persons Undergoing Sex Reassignment Surgery: Cohort Study in Sweden; Cecilia Dhejne, Paul Lichtenstein, Marcus Boman, Anna L. V. Johansson, Niklas Långström, Mikael Landén; PLOS One February 22, 2011 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016885>).

The surgical removal of the breasts, and the re-contouring of the chest through liposuction is a common procedure for women who seek to present as men. These operations are performed in both men and women, for a variety of reasons. They are generally very safe, and typically performed in the outpatient setting. It is important to understand that the only way of distinguishing cosmetic breast surgery from “medically necessary” surgery is based upon the diagnosis of underlying pathology. For example, breast reduction may be cosmetic, or it may be medically indicated. In both cases, the patient presents with a complaint that her breasts are too big. The distinction between cosmetic breast reduction and medically indicated breast reduction is based upon the presenting symptoms of orthopedic problems when working, such as chronic neck back and shoulder pain caused by the weight of the breasts. But even then, the weight of the removed tissue is factored into the objective verification that the surgery was “medically necessary.” There is a vast body of medical and actuarial data that demonstrates the relationship between the weight of the breast tissue removed and the probability that back pain will be cured by performing a breast reduction.

The same issues are at stake in breast enhancement for men seeking to present as women. Cross-sex hormones will have caused varying degrees of gynecomastia (breast enlargement in men). Surgical enhancement procedures are exactly the same in both men and women.

Medically necessary surgery in women is based upon the diagnosis of an objective medical condition, such as Poland’s syndrome (congenital absence of a breast), surgical absence of the breast following cancer care. In men, the objective diagnosis of gynecomastia might warrant surgery based upon medical necessity, but it would be the removal of tissue that has objective pathological features (breast gland proliferation in a man). A rare diagnosis of breast cancer in a man might warrant chest wall reconstruction after cancer care. On the other hand, cosmetic surgery of the breast is entirely about the subjective feelings of the patient, and that is all that we find in the case of the self-identified transgender patient.

In the case of transgender chest surgery, the diagnosis is based on the patient’s subjective report of dysphoria, but the medical necessity is based on the expectation that surgery will relieve the patient of the risk of, among other things, major depression, self-harm behaviors, and suicide. None among the many papers typically cited by supporters of “transitioning treatments” address themselves to the question of medical necessity for either masculinizing surgery, or feminizing surgery. They only address technical issues, management of complications, and subjective outcomes that employ precisely the same language that is used to assess every

other cosmetic surgery of the breast. Such papers often begin with standard language about the suffering of self-identified transgender adolescents, and their risk of self-harm. They will claim that the reported surgeries somehow reduce the risk of suicide, or the frequency or severity of self-harm, but they never report actual results of improvement in the risk of suicide, or substance abuse, or cutting, or sexual risk taking. The claim of benefit is unsupported in the scientific literature.

In summary, the medical necessity of transgender chest surgery is not supported by scientific evidence and appears to be firmly in the category of cosmetic surgery. What is more, the surgeries when performed on natal females causes a life-long loss of function, placing those surgeries in the category of malpractice. No other cosmetic procedure is expected to produce major functional loss. Such a result would only be the result of a complication, or other surgical misadventure. To actually have a 100% certainty of loss when surgical consent is being obtained constitutes a complete neglect of one of the foundational principles in plastic surgery: Never sacrifice function for the sake of a cosmetic result.

About the Author

Education and Training: I received my Bachelor of Arts in Biological Sciences at the University of California, Santa Barbara, 1979. There I was engaged in research in cell membrane physiology with Dr. Philip C. Laris, studying stoichiometry of the sodium: potassium ATPase pump. I received my M.D., Doctor of Medicine degree at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, 1983 at Bethesda, Md. I served my General Surgery Residency at the Naval Hospital Oakland/UC Davis East Bay Consortium, 1987-1991 and served as Chief Resident, Department of Surgery, Naval Hospital Oakland, 1990-1991. I also served a Plastic Surgery Residency at the University of Tennessee-Memphis, 1992-1994. My professional background, experience, and publications are described in more detail in my curriculum vitae, which is attached as Exhibit A to this declaration.

Board Certifications in Medicine: I have been Board Certified in Surgery (American Board of Surgery, 1992), in Plastic Surgery (American Board of Plastic Surgery, 1997; American Board of Plastic Surgery, 2008).

Medical Staff Appointments: I served as the Staff General Surgeon at the Naval Hospital Oakland, CA 1991-1992 and as Associate Professor of Surgery, UC Davis-East Bay, 1991-1992. I also served as a Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeon, Naval Medical Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, 1994-2002 and as Chairman, Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Naval Hospital Portsmouth, Virginia, 1996-2002. I later served as Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, 1995-2002 and as Founding Director, Pediatric Cleft Palate and Craniofacial Deformities Clinic, Naval Hospital Portsmouth, Virginia, 1996-2002 also as the Founding Director, Wound Care Center, Naval Hospital Portsmouth, Virginia, 1995-2002. I have also served as a Staff Plastic Surgeon in Nebraska and Alabama.

U.S. Surgeon General Service: I served as a Specialty Leader, Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Office of the Surgeon General-USN, 1997-2002.

Faculty Appointments: I served as Teaching Faculty at Eastern Virginia Medical School, Division of Plastic Surgery, 1995-2002. I also served on the teaching faculty of the Via College of Osteopathic Medicine, 2017-2020.

Military Service: I served as an Aviation Officer Candidate, Naval Aviation Schools Command, NAS Pensacola, 1978 and was Commissioned an Ensign, MC, USNR 1979 and Commissioned as a Lieutenant, MC, USN 1983. I served as a Designated Naval Flight Surgeon, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute, 1985, and I was Assigned Marine Fighter/Attack Squadron-451, serving as Flight Surgeon, and serving as Radar Intercept Officer in the Marine F4S Phantom, accumulating 235 flight hours, and trained for qualification as an Air Combat Tactics Instructor. I was deployed to the Western Pacific as UDP forward deployed fighter squadron in Korea, Japan, and the Philippines. I served in the US Navy for 24 years, and I served in the USMC for 3 years. I retired with the rank of Captain, USN in 2002.

Publications - Peer Reviewed Medical Journals: Lappert PW. Peritoneal Fluid in Human Acute Pancreatitis. *Surgery*. 1987 Sep; 102(3):553-4; Toth B, Lappert P. Modified Skin Incisions for Mastectomy: The Need for Plastic Surgical Input in Preoperative Planning. *J Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*. 1991; 87 (6): 1048-53; Lappert P. Patch Esophagoplasty. *J Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*. 1993; 91 (5): 967-8; Smoot E C III, Bowen D G, Lappert P, Ruiz J A. Delayed development of an ectopic frontal sinus mucocele after pediatric cranial trauma. *J Craniofacial Surg*. 1995;6(4):327–331; Lappert PW. Scarless Fetal Skin Repair: “Unborn Patients” and “Fetal Material”. *J Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*. 1996 Nov; 98(6): 1125; Lappert PW, Lee JW. Treatment of an isolated outer table frontal sinus fracture using endoscopic reduction and fixation. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* 1998; 102(5): 1642-5.

Publications - Medical Textbooks: *Wound Management in the Military*. Lappert PW, Weiss DD, Eriksson E. *Plastic Surgery: Indications, Operations, and Outcomes*, Vol. 1; 53-63. Mosby. St. Louis, MO 2000.

Operations and Clinical Experience: Consultations and Discussions: As a physician and surgeon, I have treated many thousands of patients in 7 states and 4 foreign nations. My practice has included Primary Care, Family Medicine, Aerospace Medicine, General Surgery, Reconstructive Surgery for combat injured, cancer reconstructive surgeries including extensive experience with microvascular surgery, Pediatric Congenital Deformity, and the care of chronic wounds. I have practiced in rural medicine, urban trauma centers, military field hospitals, university teaching hospitals, and as a solo private practitioner. In my private practice I have had occasion to treat many self-identified transgender patients for skin pathologies related to their use of high dose sex steroids, laser therapies for management of facial hair both in transitioners and detransitioners. I have performed breast reversal surgeries for detransitioning patients. My practice is rated as “LGBTQ friendly” on social media. I have consulted with families with children who are experiencing gender discordance. I have given many presentations to professional meetings of educators and counselors on the subject of transgender, and the present state of the science and treatment. I have discussed the scientific issues relevant to the case with many physicians and experts over a number of years and also discussed related issues with parents and others.

Appendix Attachment

1g

ATTACHMENT G

Florida Medicaid Project: Treatment for Transgender Children

Medical Experimentation without Informed Consent:

An Ethicist's View of Transgender Treatment for Children

G. Kevin Donovan, MD, MA
5-12-2022

Florida Medicaid Project: Treatment for Transgender Children

Medical Experimentation without Informed Consent: An Ethicist's View of Transgender Treatment for Children

I. The Issue

Growing controversy attends the diagnosis and treatment of individuals identifying as transgender, particularly those who are still children or adolescents. As was recently pointed out, leading medical, mental health, and public health organizations support understanding gender-diverse youth and providing gender-affirming medical (hormonal) and other(surgical) care as the standard of care, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, American Psychological Association, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Society for Adolescent Health and Medicine, and the American Medical Association. Major nursing organizations—the American Nurses Association and the American Academy of Nursing— have made statements that young people's access to inclusive, safe, and competent health care is a human rights issue. (Wolfe, I., & Goepferd, A. "Child Abuse in Texas." *The Hastings Center*. 14 Mar. 2022) However, this widespread support is not going unchallenged, even by those who have been providing medical interventions for these children and adolescents.

Recently, questions have arisen about the appropriateness of both the diagnosis, and the safety and efficacy of these interventions that have been strongly encouraged up until now. Currently, less than half of state Medicaid programs provide gender affirming care. (Mallory, C., & Tentindo, W. "Medicaid coverage of gender-affirming care." Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. Oct 2019). The Florida Surgeon General has said that minors should not undergo gender transition procedures, puberty blockers and hormone treatments. "[Florida Department of Health Releases Guidance on Treatment of Gender Dysphoria for Children and Adolescents.](#)" 20220420-Gender-Dysphoria-Press-Release | Florida Department of Health.) In Texas, the state attorney general issued a decision that gender-affirming medical treatments such as puberty-suppressing hormones fall under the definition of child abuse in Texas state law. In fact, 34 states have introduced legislation to limit hormonal and surgical interventions for such transgender patients. This aligns with similar reassessments and limitations in the United Kingdom, Sweden, Finland, and France. A new position statement from the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists (RANZCP) stresses the importance of a mental health evaluation for people with gender dysphoria — in particular for children and adolescents — before any firm decisions are made on whether to prescribe hormonal treatments to transition or to perform surgeries, often referred to as "gender-affirming care." "There is a paucity of quality evidence on the outcomes of those presenting with gender dysphoria. In particular, there is a need for better evidence in relation to outcomes for children and young people," the guidance states.

Given the legitimate concerns about the diagnosis, treatment, and the paucity of supportive, scientific studies in regard to the interventions being offered to minors who identify as transgender, I will offer a view of these from the perspective of an ethicist and pediatrician. This will be done in the face of strong and sometimes heated opposition to any variance from the currently prevailing recommendations. Each category of currently recommended or potential treatments will be briefly considered within this framework. The evidence base for these will be reviewed, and an overall argument made that such interventions must be considered as medical experimentation, subject to the requirements of research in childhood with informed consent. Finally, I will conclude with an examination of the fundamental flaw of the transgender project in childhood, and how it is leading to inevitable and controversial challenges.

In order to do this, we must review the ethical requirements for medical research in childhood and the elements of **informed consent**. Because of numerous abuses in the past, a strong system of regulations and oversight has been developed for the protection of human subjects in the United States. This began with the Belmont Report: (<https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html>) The report not only described the ethical principles listed below, but led to guidelines for research protections that are now codified in Federal regulations (Code of Federal Regulations, or ‘CFR’) and monitored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). These led to the establishment of IRBs (Institutional Review Boards) which are responsible for the protection of human subjects in federally funded research—IRBs are the Federally mandated committees that review research activities for the protection of human subjects. The Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) provides leadership in the protection of the rights, welfare, and wellbeing of subjects involved in research conducted or supported by the DHHS. The OHRP helps ensure this by providing clarification and guidance, developing educational programs and materials, maintaining regulatory oversight, and providing advice on ethical and regulatory issues in biomedical and social-behavioral research. These measures have laid the ground rules for human research, in adults and children including the need for informed consent.

Although adults may be included in research, this should only be done with *fully informed consent*, and the requirements will differ for children and other vulnerable subjects. The bedrock of these protections lies in obtaining the informed consent from the participant. Informed consent to medical treatment and research involvement is fundamental to both ethics and law. The process requires that a *fully autonomous patient* have the ability to *understand relevant medical information* about the proposed interventions, including the *risks, benefits if any, and alternatives* (including doing nothing/non-participation), and consent *voluntarily* without *coercion*. This is rooted in respect for the **ethical principles of autonomy, beneficence, and justice**.

Autonomy is derived from respect for persons, which requires that we not only respect those who are fully autonomous but protect those individuals that are not fully autonomous. Vulnerable subjects such as children cannot legally or ethically participate in the consent process due to their age and maturity level. The rules for their involvement are set out by the Code of Federal Regulations (46 CFR 401-409). While consent cannot be given for another person, parents or guardians can give “permission” and children can give assent to the extent that they are able. The process of obtaining assent should be appropriate to the age, maturity, and psychological development of the child. The consent process must contain three ethically required components: *information, comprehension, and voluntariness*. Deficiencies in any of these categories would invalidate the process. The main contention here is that deficiencies in *all* these categories can be found in the current approach to minors who identify as transgender, and current attempts at treatment should not proceed as they are now practiced.

Beneficence is reflected in the complementary expressions of (1) do no harm and (2) maximize possible benefits and minimize possible harms. An assessment of risks and benefits will depend heavily on the delivery of accurate and complete information as described above. An assessment of risk will include both the probability and the severity of envisioned harms, both physical and psychological.

Finally, **justice** requires fairness in distribution of risks and benefits. It suggests that not only should like cases be treated alike, but different approaches are appropriate for different circumstances. This is highly relevant in the selection process for those being subjected to the various interventions while still minors.

Thus the process of informed consent must proceed with a correct diagnosis, the nature and purpose of recommended interventions, the known burdens and benefits of all options, including doing nothing or forgoing the intervention. While not able to do an exhaustive review of these elements as they apply to the main treatment approaches recommended for transgender minors, we can briefly examine each category to assess for obvious deficiencies. The issue of deficient information will be significant in each category, and questions of comprehension and voluntariness will be addressed at the end.

II. The Interventions

Surgery

A variety of surgeries have been performed on transgender adults. These range from removal of both breasts (bilateral mastectomy) and associated chest reconstruction, nipple repositioning, dermal implant and tattooing, to gender surgery for trans men which includes construction of a penis (phalloplasty or metoidioplasty), construction of a scrotum (scrotoplasty) and testicular implants, or a penile implant. Removal of the womb (hysterectomy) and the ovaries and fallopian tubes (salpingo-oophorectomy) may also be considered. Surgery for trans women includes removal of the testes (orchidectomy), removal of the penis (penectomy), construction of a vagina (vaginoplasty), construction of a vulva (vulvoplasty), construction of a clitoris (clitoroplasty), as well as breast implants for trans women, facial feminisation surgery and hair transplants. Certainly there are multiple known risks to this long list of surgeries. These used to be described as “sex-change” operations: they are now termed “gender affirming surgeries.” The semantic shift is important, as we will see.

Most, but not all, practitioners would delay undertaking these permanent alterations in minor children and adolescents. This may be as much for legal reasons as for medical considerations. However, the lack of sexual maturity in younger patients, especially if previously delayed by puberty blocking agents, makes the sparse tissue more difficult to work with and outcomes less favorable, with problems such as wound rupture more likely. These are not challenges that are routinely described to minors at the beginning of their treatment progression with puberty blocking agents or hormones. This deficit of information would be a major failing.

Hormonal Treatment

Treatment with cross-sex hormones is a mainstay of gender affirming care. These result in the changes in body habitus, facies, voice tone, and hair development that transgender patients seek. They are described as “gender affirming”, “life-saving” and “a human right” by their proponents. They have been prescribed by Planned Parenthood clinics and others after a first visit for gender dysphoria (<https://www.plannedparenthood.org/planned-parenthood-greater-texas/patient-resources/transgender-healthcare>). Surely no one would argue that such a precipitous practice has been accompanied by a full psychological evaluation, or disclosure of medical risks. Chief among these is the fact that the resulting bodily changes will not disappear, even if the initial desire for them changes. And this change is no unlikely development – upwards of 80% of minors who identify as transgender will reverse this identity by the time they reach their mid-20’s if left untreated, and revert to their previous identification, albeit possibly with a same-sex attraction. It is more than simply changes in one’s body that are at risk; sex hormones have an important and lasting effect on brain development and adolescent psychology. To not fully appreciate this fact, or to not have it delineated in the first place, is an egregious failure of informed consent.

Puberty Blockers

Perhaps the greatest failure of informed consent, and non-disclosure of human experimentation outcomes, is found in the supposedly benign use of puberty blocking agents in minors. They are routinely and widely prescribed with the thought that this will “buy time” for those questioning their gender as minors. Children and their supportive parents are assured that they are a benign intervention whose effects are easily reversible, just in case the child decides not to transition. Some potential effect on the development of bone density may be mentioned. The extent of this danger is just now being appreciated, with severe and disabling osteoporosis described in at least one child in Sweden. This led to new guidelines for gender-affirming care issued in February by the National Board of Health and Welfare. It stated that, based on current knowledge: “the risks of puberty suppressing treatment with GnRH-analogues and gender-affirming hormonal treatment currently outweigh the possible benefits, and that the treatments should be offered only in exceptional cases.” However, the effect of puberty blocking agents (started in early adolescent development) on long-term sexual function seems to be largely unstudied. Current guidelines recommend starting puberty blockers at the earliest stage of sexual maturation in children (Tanner two). These will not only prevent the enlargement of penile tissue, it will desensitize the orgasmic potential for tissues later exposed to cross-sex hormones. Simply put, transgender adults treated in early adolescence with puberty blockers may never experience orgasm. When children with gender dysphoria are given these powerful hormones (around age 11) they are too young to appreciate the implications of what will happen.

It is not simply a matter of chronology. As children mature into adolescents and adults, their brains are also being formed and reformed under the influence of sex hormones. There is evidence for structural changes, and these are likely to be demonstrated in cognitive and behavioral changes. In fact, the development of the adolescent brain and the maturation of its rational and executive functions does not typically complete until one’s early 20s. Although the deleterious effects on sexual development and function in adulthood from puberty blockers may be predicted, no one is entirely certain of the effects on other critical areas such as brain development and bone density. Carefully constructed and monitored studies have not been done. *Until they are, these off-label treatments with puberty blockers and cross sex hormones can only be considered experimental.* Experimental interventions should be done as carefully as any other research, and fully informed consent is the only ethical way to enter into such studies. Clearly, this is not the current practice.

III. The Fundamental Flaw

There appears to have been a headlong rush in the past decade towards the process of gender affirming care described above. After close scrutiny, it can only be seen as off label experimentation, despite the fact that informed consent practices do not conform to this reality. Given this, we must ask ourselves: how can experienced and ethical physicians so mislead others or be so misled themselves? In 2013, the American Psychiatric Association published their update of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, the DSM-5. In it the diagnosis of “gender identity disorder” was replaced with “gender dysphoria.” This was done to “avoid stigma and ensure clinical care for individuals who see and feel themselves to be a different gender” other than the one to which they were born. The APA stated that “it is important to note the gender nonconformity is not in itself a mental disorder. The critical element of gender dysphoria is the presence of clinically significant distress associated with the condition.” Dysphoria is a state of uneasiness, unhappiness, or dissatisfaction. With this change in terminology there was also a shift from seeking or correcting the underlying cause of the dysphoria, and a focus on transitioning to the preferred gender.

This revision has probably done more harm than good by accepting a self-diagnosis characterized by the belief that the patient (or their essence) is “trapped in the wrong body.” This concept relies on the Cartesian duality, a body-self dichotomy. It reverts to the fallacious “ghost in the machine” concept. In reality, we cannot be trapped in the wrong body; we **are** our bodies, which are an integral and inseparable part of ourselves. To assert that there is a female self inside a male body (or the reverse), is to fail to achieve a full understanding that we are embodied persons, unified body and mind, if you will. A generation ago, sex and gender were taken to be synonyms for the same phenomena. Even now, a transgender female, no matter how much or how long of a hormonal therapeutic regimen they undergo, is still genetically male. Ignoring this fact has led to a contradiction, where sympathetic practitioners recommend “holistic care” while insisting on a fragmented concept of the self. This approach has been warmly embraced, even insisted upon, by many practitioners while viewed as nonsensical and even ludicrous by many laypersons.

Inevitably this has led to added difficulties. Even young patients are encouraged to begin puberty blockers and then hormones based on a self-diagnosis. Self-diagnosing psychiatric conditions is always fraught with the possibility of error. In this case, there can be no confirmatory lab tests, radiologic exams, or genetic findings. Moreover, the dysphoria can only be diagnosed and opened to treatment if it is causing significant trauma to the individual. The clinically significant distress manifests itself in underlying psychiatric diagnoses such as depression and suicidality. It is argued that embarking on affirmative treatment as early as possible is urgently needed to prevent further psychiatric complications, a contested assertion. Studies have shown that adult transgender persons continue to have evidence of depression and suicidality following treatment. The rate of suicide among post-operative transgender adults in a study from Sweden found an incidence 20 times greater than that of the general population. Such treatment may not be urgently needed to protect adolescents; it may not even be effective protection for their adult counterparts.

The claim of urgency coupled with an impulse toward nonjudgmental empathy for the disturbed patients has led to a frantic insistence on a single approach that may seem almost cult like in its insularity and opposition to outside challenges. Both parents (Trinko, K. (Nov. 19, 2018 “What It’s Like to Lose Your Children to the ‘Transgender Cult,’ From a Mom Who Knows.” *The Daily Signal*, 30 Oct. 2019) and teachers (Manning, M. for The Mail on Sunday, “Whistleblower Teacher Makes Shocking Claim That ‘Most Are Autistic.’” *Daily Mail Online*, Associated Newspapers, 19 Nov. 2018, <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-6401593/Whistleblower-teacher-makes-shocking-claim-autistic.html>.) report that their children or students are being wrongly encouraged at school to think of themselves as transgender. Sometimes this is the result of overenthusiastic acceptance or “love bombing”. Sometimes it appears to influence the susceptible, as in autistic children. Sometimes transgender counseling is taking place even without the parents’ knowledge, and this troubling approach has been supported in the literature with statements that adolescents should be legally empowered to obtain puberty-blocking without parental consent (Priest, M. Transgender Children and the Right to Transition: Medical Ethics When Parents Mean Well but Cause Harm. *Am J Bioeth.* 2019 Feb;19(2):45-59).

Inevitably, this has resulted in complications and conflicts. The media have been replete with reports of such things as contested accessibility of transgender females to such things as domestic abuse shelters, female prisons, and female sports competitions. Similar issues regarding bathroom accessibility in schools recently came to a boil in Virginia, when it came to light that a sexual assault by a self-described trans- female (with a penis) was repeated in another school after the perpetrator was transferred. (Poff, J. “Loudoun superintendent failed to inform state of school sexual assault.” *Washington Examiner*, 4 May 2022.) These issues are far from any resolution by debate, discussion, or legislation. In fact, both sides of the debate have doubled down with insistence that the opposing viewpoint must not only be rejected but considered unethical and made illegal.

Some disturbing trends have developed resulting not only from this dichotomy of opinion about the proper treatment approach, but ultimately based in the acceptance of the mind-body dichotomy. There has been a change in the diagnosed population. As Abigail Schrier pointed out:

For the nearly 100-year diagnostic history of gender dysphoria, it overwhelmingly afflicted boys and men, and it began in early childhood (ages two to four). According to the DSM-V, the latest edition of the historical rate of incidence was 0.01 percent of males (roughly one in 10,000).

For decades, psychologists treated it with “watchful waiting” — that is, a method of psychotherapy that seeks to understand the source of a child’s gender dysphoria, lessen its intensity, and ultimately help a child grow more comfortable in her own body. Now such an approach is disdained by the term “conversion therapy”, and labelled as unethical, and even made illegal.

She continues:

Since nearly seven in 10 children initially diagnosed with gender dysphoria eventually outgrew it, the conventional wisdom held that, with a little patience, most kids would come to accept their bodies. The underlying assumption was children didn’t always know best. But in the last decade, watchful waiting has been supplanted by “affirmative care,” which assumes children do know what’s best. Affirmative care proponents urge doctors to corroborate their patients’ belief that they are trapped in the wrong body. The family is pressured to help the child transition to a new gender identity — sometimes having been told by doctors or activists that, if they don’t, their child may eventually commit suicide. From there, pressures build on parents to begin concrete medical steps to help children on their path to transitioning to the “right” body. That includes puberty blockers as a preliminary step. Typically, cross-sex hormones follow and then, if desired, gender surgery. (Shrier, A. “Top Trans Doctors Blow the Whistle on ‘Sloppy’ Care.” Emmaus Road Ministries, 5 Oct. 2021)

These pressures apply not only to parents, but to the children themselves because of the strong emphasis on affirmative support for anyone declaring themselves transgender. As one mother described: “A lot of these kids have concurrent mental health issues, and they find a place to fit in because as soon as you say that you’re trans, you get love-bombed,” she reflects. “You get love-bombed online, you get love-bombed on at school ... As soon as you say you’re trans, you turn into a star. And kids are thirsty for that kind of affirmation.” (Trinko, 2019)

Two phenomena may be associated with this. Strong affirmation for the diagnosis and hormonal treatment may be altering the natural course of the phenomenon in childhood. It may not only be easier to identify as transgender in today’s environment; it may be more difficult to turn ones back on the diagnosis. This may help explain a recent report that found that an average of 5 years after their initial social transition, 7.3% of youth had retransitioned (changed gender identity) at least once. At the end of this period, most youth identified as binary transgender youth (94%), including 1.3% who retransitioned to another identity before returning to their binary transgender identity. 2.5% of youth identified as cisgender and 3.5% as nonbinary. Later cisgender identities were more common amongst youth whose initial social transition occurred before age 6 years; the retransition often occurred before age 10. Unlike previous studies of transgender youth, males were not predominant, but were outnumbered by 2 to 1. Moreover, this is a direct contradiction of previous data showing a high rate of reversion towards a sex/gender coherence in children as they mature. (Olson, Kristina R., Durwood, Lily, Horton, Rachel, Gallagher, Natalie M., & Devor, Aaron; Gender Identity 5 Years

After Social Transition. *Pediatrics* 2022; 10.1542/peds.2021-056082) We must ask if this represents a shift towards being trapped in a wrong diagnosis, rather than a child being trapped in a wrong body.

In fact, there has been another shift. Unlike in the past, we now see increased numbers of females identifying as transgender, and later in their adolescence. Sometimes this occurs in large cohorts within a single school or peer group, a phenomenon labelled “rapid onset gender dysphoria.” Both these phenomena call into question the underlying cause for the concept of gender dysphoria. Rather than approaching it as an accurate self-diagnosis that must be affirmed and treated to change the outward sexual appearance, isn’t there a better model? We may be making a fundamental mistake in approaching transgender phenomena, not as a disease or disorder, but at most a dysphoria that is a cause for affirmation. This contrasts with our approach to similar conditions claiming a mind-body divergence, such as anorexia nervosa or body integrity identity disorder. The former is familiar to most Americans. The latter is a rare mental disorder characterized by a desire to have a physical disability, claiming discomfort with being able-bodied and often resulting in a request for amputation of the body part that makes them uncomfortable. People with this condition may refer to themselves as “trans abled.”

In all three of these conditions there is a claim for a mismatch between one’s mental bodily image and physical body. All tend to find an onset in prepubescence and are frequently associated with other mental disturbances. “Affirmative care” is the only recommended standard for transgender patients. It is horribly disturbing to contemplate amputation of a healthy limb because of a mental disorder (although this has been done). No one would seriously consider surgery to limit caloric intake or weight gain for a patient with anorexia nervosa, in order to support and affirm her distorted body image. Nevertheless, sex change operations have been recast as “gender affirming surgeries”. The change in language reflects the change in attitude that distorts the approach to treatment for a psychiatric, not medical/surgical, disorder.

Finally, what are we to make of this situation, as a medical profession, and as a society? This question cannot be answered until both the affected people and profession can overcome our collective hubris. It is not enough to admit we don’t know all the answers. We must see that we are not yet certain of all the questions that must be answered. In such a situation, competing interests must not pretend to take the moral high ground when no one can be certain where it will be located. First and foremost, we must back off from our current approaches until questions can be answered with proper studies, done with sufficient patients, and sufficient controls, over a sufficient period of time. Any insistence on a single course of therapy without this information could prove to be the same type of morally unacceptable interventions that caused formal research protections to be created in the first place.

In the meantime, we must adopt a more respectful tone with those whom we disagree. As John Milton said, “Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making.” Most important of all, in order to protect the current and future well-being of these affected children, we must rely on the ancient principal of medical ethics “In the first place, do no harm.” Until we can demonstrate the efficacy and safety of any proposed treatment or intervention, its usage must properly be considered a medical experimentation and require fully informed consent. Anything less is a betrayal of both our principles and our progeny.

About the author: Dr. Donovan’s observations flow from his professional experience. He has been a Board-certified pediatrician for over 40 years, as an academic physician who rose to Vice-chair of the Department of Pediatrics and ultimately interim Chair at the University of Oklahoma in Tulsa. His professional role and interests expanded in the 1990’s after he took a sabbatical in medical ethics at

Georgetown University under the world-famous Dr. Edmund Pellegrino, a founding father of modern bioethics. He subsequently went on to earn a master's degree in Bioethics and founded the first bioethics center in his home university, where he was responsible for ethics training and education for students and physicians. He also served as clinical ethics consultant for three teaching hospitals. He was chair of the Section on Bioethics for the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) for three years and then their first liaison member of the AAP Committee on Bioethics. He has also served as the chair for a hospital Institutional Review Board for 17 years. Finally, he was asked to become Director for the Center for Clinical Bioethics at Georgetown University School of Medicine, where he served from 2012-2020. His duties included teaching, consultation, publishing papers and speaking on bioethics extensively at the local, national, and international level on four continents. He has been interviewed and quoted on National Broadcasting Company (NBC), National Public Radio (NPR), Eternal Word Television Network (EWTN), and Al Jazeera, as well as the New York Times and the Washington Post, among others. He was awarded the Humanism in Medicine award from the Gold Foundation, which recognizes physicians to have successfully integrated humanism into the delivery of care to their patients and families. He has also offered formal testimony on bioethical issues before state legislatures and the U.S. Congress.