EXHIBIT A

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

NHS England

Clinical Policy:

Puberty suppressing hormones (PSH) for children and young people who have gender incongruence / gender dysphoria [1927]

Publication date: 12 March 2024

Commissioning position

Puberty suppressing hormones (PSH) are not available as a routine commissioning treatment option for treatment of children and young people who have gender incongruence / gender dysphoria.

Background

Gender incongruence / dysphoria is a condition where a person experiences discomfort or distress that is caused by a discrepancy between a person's gender identity[1] (how they see themselves regarding their gender) and that person's natal sex (and the associated gender role, and/or primary and secondary sex characteristics).

Diagnostic approaches have been described with reference to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders Version 5 published in 2013 (gender dysphoria); and the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems version 11 effective 2022 (gender incongruence).

The reason why some people experience gender incongruence is not fully understood and it is likely that the development of gender identity is multifactorial and influenced by both biological and social factors. Gender variant behaviours may start between ages 3 and 5 years, the same age at which most typically developing children begin showing gendered behaviours and interests (Fast et al, 2018). Gender atypical behaviour is common among young children and may be part of normal development (Young et al, 2019). Children who meet the criteria for gender incongruence / gender dysphoria may or may not continue to experience the conflict between their physical gender and the one with which they identify into adolescence and adulthood (Ristori et al, 2016).

[1] "Gender" refers to the roles, behaviours, activities, attributes and opportunities that any society considers appropriate for girls and boys, and women and men." [source: WHO website Health Topics: Gender, at https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender]

Gender incongruence / gender dysphoria can become more distressing in adolescence due to the pubertal development of secondary sex characteristics and increasing social divisions between genders. Some studies have found that young people with gender incongruence / gender dysphoria may present to gender identity development services with a range of associated difficulties (e.g. bullying, low mood / depression and self-harm and suicidality).

PSH competitively block puberty hormone receptors to prevent the spontaneous release of two puberty inducing hormones, Follicular Stimulating Hormone (FSH) and Luteinising Hormone (LH) from the pituitary gland. This arrests the progress of puberty, delaying the development of secondary sexual characteristics. In England, the puberty suppressor triptorelin (a synthetic decapeptide analogue of a natural puberty hormone, which has marketing authorisations for the treatment of prostate cancer, endometriosis and central precocious puberty) is one of the puberty suppressing hormones used for this purpose. The use of triptorelin for children and adolescents with gender incongruence is off-label.

In January 2020, a Policy Working Group (PWG) was established by NHS England to undertake a review of the published evidence. As part of this process, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) was commissioned to review the published evidence on Gonadotrophin Releasing Hormone Analogues (GnRHa). Nine observational studies were included in the evidence review (NICE 2020). Overall, there was no statistically significant difference in gender dysphoria, mental health, body image and psychosocial functioning in children and adolescents treated with GnRHa (2020). The quality of evidence for all these outcomes was assessed as very low certainty using modified GRADE. There remains limited short-term and long-term safety data for GnRHa. GnRHa may reduce the expected increase in lumbar or femoral bone density during puberty. A re-run of the search was undertaken by NHS England in April 2023 to capture literature published after the NICE evidence review in 2020. Nine further studies were identified.

Current treatments

Treatment of individuals with gender incongruence / gender dysphoria is recommended to be tailored to the specific needs of individual patients and aims to ameliorate the potentially negative impact of gender incongruence on general developmental processes, to support young people and their families in managing the uncertainties inherent in gender identity development and to provide ongoing opportunities for exploration of gender identity (Ristori et al, 2016).

The primary intervention focuses on psychosocial and psychological support; for some individuals, the use of PSH in adolescence to suppress puberty has previously been a treatment option though no NHS clinical commissioning policy has been in place; this may be followed later with gender-affirming hormones of the desired sex (NHS England, 2013). If individuals fulfil additional criteria, they may have various types of gender affirming surgery from the age of 18 years through adult Gender Dysphoria Clinics (NHS England, 2013).

What we have decided

NHS England has carefully considered the evidence review conducted by NICE (2020) and has identified and reviewed any further published evidence available to date.

We have concluded that there is not enough evidence to support the safety or clinical effectiveness of PSH to make the treatment routinely available at this time.

Links and updates to other policies

NHS England has no other policies relating to the sole use of PSH for the treatment of children and adolescents who have gender incongruence.

This document relates to the specialised service for Children and Young People with Gender Incongruence:

- Interim Service Specification for specialist gender incongruence services for children and young people

And to the following policy:

- Clinical commissioning policy for prescribing cross sex hormones

This document will be reviewed when information is received which indicates that the policy requires revision. If a review is needed due to a new evidence base then a new Preliminary Policy Proposal needs to be submitted by contacting england.CET@nhs.net.

Equality statement

Promoting equality and addressing health inequalities are at the heart of NHS England's values. Throughout the development of the policies and processes cited in this document, we have:

- Given due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity, and to foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic (as cited under the Equality Act 2010) and those who do not share it; and
- Given regard to the need to reduce inequalities between patients in access to, and outcomes from healthcare services and to ensure services are provided in an integrated way where this might reduce health inequalities.

Definitions

Gender incongruence	Gender incongruence is where a person experiences discomfort or distress because there is a mismatch between their experienced gender as compared with their assigned sex and its associated physical primary and secondary sex characteristics.

Puberty suppressing hormones	Synthetic (man-made) hormones that suppress the hormones naturally produced by the body and in doing so, suppress puberty, with the aim of reducing the level of puberty-related anxiety in an individual with gender incongruence.
GRADE	Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluations (GRADE) is a transparent framework for developing and presenting summaries of evidence and provides a systematic approach for making clinical practice recommendations.

References

World Health Organisation (2018) International Classification of Diseases 11. Available from https://icd.who.int/

Fast, A.A. and Olson, K.R. , Gender Development in Transgender Preschool Children. Child Dev, (2018).89: 620-637. doi:10.1111/cdev.1275

Ristori J, Steensma TD. Gender dysphoria in childhood. Int Rev Psychiatry. 2016;28(1):13-20. doi:10.3109/09540261.2015.1115754

Young, N., Jean, E., Citro, T. (2019). Acceptance, Understanding and the Moral Imperative of promoting social justice education in the schoolhouse. Delaware. Vernon Press p.40

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2020). Evidence Review: Gonadotrophin Releasing Hormone Analogues for Children and Adolescents with Gender Dysphoria. Available from: Nice Evidence Reviews – Cass Review.

EXHIBIT B

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Evidence review: Gonadotrophin releasing hormone analogues for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria

This document will help inform Dr Hilary Cass' independent review into gender identity services for children and young people. It was commissioned by NHS England and Improvement who commissioned the Cass review. It aims to assess the evidence for the clinical effectiveness, safety and cost-effectiveness of gonadotrophin releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues for children and adolescents aged 18 years or under with gender dysphoria.

The document was prepared by NICE in October 2020.

The content of this evidence review was up to date on 14 October 2020. See summaries of product characteristics (SPCs), British National Formulary (BNF) or the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) or NICE websites for up-to-date information.

Contents

1. Introduction

This review aims to assess the evidence for the clinical effectiveness, safety and cost-effectiveness of gonadotrophin releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues for children and adolescents aged 18 years or under with gender dysphoria. The review follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the criteria outlined in the PICO framework (see appendix A). This document will help inform Dr Hilary Cass' independent review into gender identity services for children and young people.

Gender dysphoria in children, also known as gender identity disorder or gender incongruence of childhood (World Health Organisation 2020), refers to discomfort or distress that is caused by a discrepancy between a person's gender identity (how they see themselves[1] regarding their gender) and that person's sex assigned at birth and the associated gender role, and/or primary and secondary sex characteristics (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 2013).

GnRH analogues suppress puberty by delaying the development of secondary sexual characteristics. The intention is to alleviate the distress associated with the development of secondary sex characteristics, thereby providing a time for on-going discussion and exploration of gender identity before deciding whether to take less reversible steps. In England, the GnRH analogue triptorelin (a synthetic decapeptide analogue of natural GnRH, which has marketing authorisations for the treatment of prostate cancer, endometriosis and precocious puberty [onset before 8 years in girls and 10 years in boys]) is used for this purpose. The use of triptorelin for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria is off-label.

For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria it is recommended that management plans are tailored to the needs of the individual, and aim to ameliorate the potentially negative impact of gender dysphoria on general developmental processes, support young people and their families in managing the uncertainties inherent in gender identity development and provide on-going opportunities for exploration of gender identity. The plans may also include psychological support and exploration and, for some individuals, the use of GnRH analogues in adolescence to suppress puberty; this may be followed later with gender-affirming hormones of the desired sex (NHS England 2013).

2. Executive summary of the review

Nine observational studies were included in the evidence review. Five studies were retrospective observational studies (Brik et al. 2020, Joseph et al. 2019, Khatchadourian et al. 2014, Klink et al. 2015, Vlot et al. 2017), 3 studies were prospective longitudinal observational studies (Costa et al. 2015, de Vries et al. 2011, Schagen et al. 2016) and 1 study was a cross-sectional study (Staphorsius et al. 2015). Two studies (Costa et al. 2015

[1] Gender refers to the roles, behaviours, activities, attributes and opportunities that any society considers appropriate for girls and boys, and women and men (World Health Organisation, Health Topics: Gender).

and Staphorsius et al. 2015) provided comparative evidence and the remaining 7 studies used within-person, before and after comparisons.

The terminology used in this topic area is continually evolving and is different depending on stakeholder perspectives. In this evidence review we have used the phrase 'people's assigned sex at birth' rather than natal or biological sex, gonadotrophin releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues rather than 'puberty blockers' and gender-affirming hormones rather than 'cross sex hormones'. The research studies included in this evidence review may use historical terms which are no longer considered appropriate.

In children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?

Critical outcomes

The critical outcomes for decision making are the impact on gender dysphoria, mental health and quality of life. The quality of evidence for these outcomes was assessed as very low certainty using modified GRADE.

Impact on gender dysphoria
The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that treatment with GnRH analogues before starting gender-affirming hormones does not affect gender dysphoria (measured using the Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale [UGDS]). The mean (±SD) gender dysphoria (UGDS) score was not statistically significantly different at baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 53.20 [±7.91] versus 53.9 [±17.42], p=0.333).

Impact on mental health
The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that treatment with GnRH analogues before starting gender-affirming hormones may reduce depression (measured using the Beck Depression Inventory-II [BDI-II]). The mean [±SD] BDI score was statistically significantly lower (improved) from baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 8.31 [±7.12] versus 4.95 [±6.72], p=0.004).

The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that treatment with GnRH analogues before starting gender-affirming hormones does not affect anger (measured using the Trait Anger Scale [TPI]). The mean [±SD] anger (TPI) score was not statistically significantly different at baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 18.29 [±5.54] versus 17.88 [±5.24], p=0.503).

The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that treatment with GnRH analogues before starting gender-affirming hormones does not affect anxiety (measured using the Trait Anxiety Scale [STAI]). The mean [±SD] anxiety (STAI) score was not statistically significantly different at baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 39.43 [±10.07] versus 37.95 [±9.38], p=0.276).

Impact on quality of life
No evidence was identified.

Important outcomes

The important outcomes for decision making are impact on body image, psychosocial impact, engagement with health care services, impact on extent of and satisfaction with surgery and stopping treatment. The quality of evidence for all these outcomes was assessed as very low certainty using modified GRADE.

Impact on body image
The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that treatment with GnRH analogues before starting gender-affirming hormones does not affect body image (measured using the Body Image Scale [BIS]). The mean [±SD] body image (BIS) scores were not statistically significantly different from baseline compared with follow-up for primary sexual characteristics (n=57, 4.10 [±0.56] versus 3.98 [±0.71], p=0.145), secondary sexual characteristics (n=57, 2.74 [±0.65] versus 2.82 [±0.68], p=0.569) or neutral body characteristics (n=57, 2.41 [±0.63] versus 2.47 [±0.56], p=0.620).

Psychosocial impact
The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that treatment with GnRH analogues before starting gender-affirming hormones may improve psychosocial impact over time (measured using the Children's Global Assessment Scale [CGAS]). The mean [±SD] CGAS score was statistically significantly higher (improved) from baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 70.24 [±10.12] versus 73.90 [±9.63], p=0.005).

This study also found that psychosocial functioning may improve over time (measured using the Child Behaviour Checklist [CBCL] and the self-administered Youth Self-Report [YSR]). The mean [±SD] CBCL scores were statistically significantly lower (improved) from baseline compared with follow-up for Total T score (n=54, 60.70 [±12.76] versus 54.46 [±11.23], p<0.001), internalising T score (n=54, 61.00 [±12.21] versus 52.17 [±9.81], p<0.001) and externalising T score (n=54, 58.04 [±12.99] versus 53.81 [±11.86], p=0.001). The mean [±SD] YSR scores were statistically significantly lower (improved) from baseline compared with follow-up for Total T score (n=54, 55.46 [±11.56] versus 50.00 [±10.56], p<0.001), internalising T score (n=54, 56.04 [±12.49] versus 49.78 [±11.63], p<0.001) and externalising T score (n=54, 53.30 [±11.87] versus 49.98 [±9.35], p=0.009). The proportion of adolescents scoring in the clinical range decreased from baseline to follow up on the CBCL total problem scale (44.4% versus 22.2%, p=0.001) and the internalising scale of the YSR (29.6% versus 11.1%, p=0.017).

The study by Costa et al. 2015 in 201 adolescents with gender dysphoria who had 6 months of psychological support followed by either GnRH analogues and continued psychological support or continued psychological support only, found that during treatment with GnRH analogues psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning may improve over time (measured using the CGAS). In the group receiving GnRH analogues, the mean [±SD] CGAS score was statistically significantly higher (improved) after 6 months (n=60, 64.70 [±13.34]) and 12 months (n=35, 67.40 [±13.39]) compared with baseline (n=101, 58.72 [±11.38], p=0.003 and p<0.001, respectively). However, there was no statistically significant difference in global functioning (CGAS scores) between the group receiving GnRH analogues plus psychological support and the group receiving psychological support only at any time point.

The study by Staphorsius et al. 2015 in 40 adolescents with gender dysphoria (20 of whom were receiving GnRH analogues) gave mean [±SD] CBCL scores for each group, but statistical analysis is unclear (transfemales receiving GnRH analogues 57.4 [±9.8], transfemales not receiving GnRH analogues 58.2 [±9.3], transmales receiving GnRH analogues 57.5 [±9.4], transmales not receiving GnRH analogues 63.9 [±10.5]).

Engagement with health care services
The study by Brik et al. 2018 in 143 children and adolescents with gender dysphoria receiving GnRH analogues found that 9 adolescents in the original sampling frame (9/214, 4.2%) were excluded from the study because they stopped attending appointments.

The study by Costa et al. 2015 in 201 adolescents with gender dysphoria who had 6 months of psychological support followed by either GnRH analogues and continued psychological support or continued psychological support only had a large loss to follow-up over time. The sample size at baseline and 6 months was 201, which dropped by 39.8% to 121 after 12 months and by 64.7% to 71 at 18 months follow-up. No explanation of the reasons for loss to follow-up are reported.

Impact on extent of and satisfaction with surgery
No evidence was identified.

Stopping treatment
The study by Brik et al. 2018 in 143 children and adolescents with gender dysphoria receiving GnRH analogues reported the reasons for stopping GnRH analogues. During the follow-up period 6.2% (9/143) of adolescents had stopped GnRH analogues after a median duration of 0.8 years (range 0.1 to 3.0). Five adolescents stopped treatment because they no longer wished to receive gender-affirming treatment for various reasons. In 4 adolescents (all transmales), GnRH analogues were stopped mainly because of adverse effects (such as mood and emotional lability), although they wanted to continue treatments for gender dysphoria.

The study by Khatchadourian et al. 2014 in 27 adolescents with gender dysphoria who started GnRH analogues reported the reasons for stopping them. Eleven out of 26 where data was available (42%) stopped GnRH analogues during follow up.

In children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the short-term and long-term safety of GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?

Evidence was available for bone density, cognitive development or functioning, and other safety outcomes. The quality of evidence for all these outcomes was assessed as very low certainty using modified GRADE.

Bone density
The study by Joseph et al. 2019 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that GnRH analogues may reduce the expected increase in lumbar or femoral bone density (measured with the z-score). However, the z-scores were largely within 1 standard deviation of normal,

and actual lumbar or femoral bone density values were not statistically significantly different between baseline and follow-up:

- The mean z-score [±SD] for lumbar bone mineral apparent density (BMAD) was statistically significantly lower at 1 year compared with baseline in transfemales (baseline 0.859 [±0.154], 1 year −0.228 [±1.027], p=0.000) and transmales (baseline −0.186 [±1.230], 1 year −0.541 [±1.396], p=0.006).
- The mean z-score [±SD] for lumbar BMAD was statistically significantly lower after receiving GnRH analogues for 2 years compared with baseline in transfemales (baseline 0.486 [±0.809], 2 years −0.279 [±0.930], p=0.000) and transmales (baseline −0.361 [±1.439], 2 years −0.913 [±1.318], p=0.001).
- The mean z-score [±SD] for femoral neck bone mineral density (BMD) was statistically significantly lower after receiving GnRH analogues for 2 years compared with baseline in transfemales (baseline 0.0450 [±0.781], 2 years −0.600 [±1.059], p=0.002) and transmales (baseline −1.075 [±1.145], 2 years −1.779 [±0.816], p=0.001).

The study by Klink et al. 2015 in 34 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that GnRH analogues may reduce the expected increase in lumbar (transmales only), but not femoral bone density. However, the z-scores are largely within 1 standard deviation of normal. Actual lumbar or femoral bone density values were not statistically significantly different between baseline and follow-up (apart from BMD measurements in transmales):

- The mean z-score [±SD] for lumbar BMAD was not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales, but was statistically significantly lower when starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (GnRH analogues 0.28 [±0.90], gender-affirming hormones −0.50 [±0.81], p=0.004).

The study by Vlot et al. 2017 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that GnRH analogues may reduce the expected increase in lumbar or femoral bone density. However, the z-scores were largely within 1 standard deviation of normal. Actual lumbar or femoral bone density values were not statistically significantly different between baseline and follow-up (apart from in transmales with a bone age ≥14 years). This study reported change in bone density from starting GnRH analogues to starting gender-affirming hormones by bone age:

- The median z-score [range] for lumbar BMAD in transfemales with a bone age of <15 years was statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormones than at starting GnRH analogues (GnRH analogues −0.20 [−1.82 to 1.18], gender-affirming hormones −1.52 [−2.36 to 0.42], p=0.001) but was not statistically significantly different in transfemales with a bone age ≥15 years.
- The median z-score [range] for lumbar BMAD in transmales with a bone age of <14 years was statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormones than at starting GnRH analogues (GnRH analogues −0.05 [−0.78 to 2.94], gender-affirming hormones −0.84 [−2.20 to 0.87], p=0.003) and in transmales with a bone age ≥14 years (GnRH analogues 0.27 [−1.60 to 1.80], gender-affirming hormones −0.29 [−2.28 to 0.90], p≤0.0001).

- The median z-score [range] for femoral neck BMAD in transfemales with a bone age of <15 years was not statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormones than at starting GnRH analogues (GnRH analogues −0.71 [−3.35 to 0.37], gender-affirming hormones −1.32 [−3.39 to 0.21], p≤0.1) or in transfemales with a bone age ≥15 years (GnRH analogues −0.44 [−1.37 to 0.93], gender-affirming hormones −0.36 [−1.50 to 0.46]).
- The z-score for femoral neck BMAD in transmales with a bone age of <14 years was not statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormones than at starting GnRH analogues (GnRH analogues −0.01 [−1.30 to 0.91], gender-affirming hormone −0.37 [−2.28 to 0.47]) but was statistically significantly lower in transmales with a bone age ≥14 years (GnRH analogues 0.27 [−1.39 to 1.32], gender-affirming hormones −0.27 [−1.91 to 1.29], p=0.002).

Cognitive development or functioning

The study by Staphorsius et al. 2015 in 40 adolescents with gender dysphoria (20 of whom were receiving GnRH analogues) measured cognitive development or functioning (using an IQ test, and reaction time and accuracy measured using the Tower of London task):

- The mean (±SD) IQ in transfemales receiving GnRH analogues was 94.0 (±10.3) and 109.4 (±21.2) in the control group. In transmales receiving GnRH analogues the mean (±SD) IQ was 95.8 (±15.6) and 98.5 (±15.9) in the control group.
- The mean (±SD) reaction time in transfemales receiving GnRH analogues was 10.9 (±4.1) and 9.9 (±3.1) in the control group. In transmales receiving GnRH analogue it was 9.9 (±3.1) and 10.0 (±2.0) in the control group.
- The mean (±SD) accuracy score in transfemales receiving GnRH analogues was 73.9 (±9.1) and 83.4 (±9.5) in the control group. In transmales receiving GnRH analogues it was 85.7 (±10.5) and 88.8 (±9.7) in the control group.

No statistical analyses or interpretation of the results was reported.

Other safety outcomes

The study by Schagen et al. 2016 in 116 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that GnRH analogues do not affect renal or liver function:

- There was no statistically significant difference between baseline and 1 year results for serum creatinine in transfemales, but there was a statistically significant decrease between baseline and 1 year in transmales (p=0.01).
- Glutamyl transferase, alanine aminotransferase (ALT), and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) levels did not significantly change from baseline to 12 months of treatment.

The study by Khatchadourian et al. 2014 in 27 adolescents with gender dysphoria who started GnRH analogues narratively reported adverse effects from GnRH analogues in 26 adolescents:

- 1 transmale developed sterile abscesses; they were switched from leuprolide acetate to triptorelin, and this was well tolerated
- 1 transmale developed leg pains and headaches, which eventually resolved
- 1 participant gained 19 kg within 9 months of starting GnRH analogues.

In children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the cost-effectiveness of GnRH analogues compared to one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?

No cost-effectiveness evidence was found for GnRH analogues in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria.

From the evidence selected, are there any subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria that may benefit from GnRH analogues more than the wider population of interest?

Some studies reported data separately for the following subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria: sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) and sex assigned at birth females (transmales). This included some direct comparisons of these subgroups, and differences were largely seen at baseline as well as follow up. No evidence was found for other specified subgroups.

Sex assigned at birth males (transfemales)
Impact on gender dysphoria
The study by Costa et al. 2015 in 201 adolescents with gender dysphoria who had 6 months of psychological support followed by either GnRH analogues and continued psychological support or continued psychological support only, found that gender dysphoria (measured using the UGDS) in sex assigned at birth males is lower than in sex assigned at birth females. Sex assigned at birth males had a statistically significantly lower (improved) mean [±SD] UGDS score of 51.6 [±9.7] compared with sex assigned at birth females (56.1 [±4.3], p<0.001), but it was not reported if this was at baseline or follow-up.

The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that gender dysphoria (measured using the UGDS) in sex assigned at birth males is lower than in sex assigned at birth females at baseline and follow up. The mean [±SD] UGDS score was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=not reported, mean UGDS score: 47.95 [±9.70] versus 56.57 [±3.89]) and follow up (n=not reported, 49.67 [±9.47] versus 56.62 [±4.00]); between sex difference p<0.001).

Impact on mental health
The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that the impact on mental health (depression, anger and anxiety) may be different in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females. Over time there was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for depression, but sex assigned at birth males had statistically significantly lower levels of anger and anxiety than sex assigned at birth females at baseline and follow up.

- The mean [±SD] depression (BDI-II) score was not statistically significantly different in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=not reported, mean BDI score [±SD]: 5.71 [±4.31] versus 10.34 [±8.24]) and follow-up (n=not reported, 3.50 [±4.58] versus 6.09 [±7.93]), between sex difference p=0.057
- The mean [±SD] anger (TPI) score was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=not reported, mean TPI score [±SD]: 5.22 [±2.76] versus 6.43 [±2.78]) and follow-

up (n=not reported, 5.00 [±3.07] versus 6.39 [±2.59]), between sex difference p=0.022

- The mean [±SD] anxiety (STAI) score was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=not reported, mean STAI score [±SD]: 4.33 [±2.68] versus 7.00 [±2.36]) and follow-up (n=not reported, 4.39 [±2.64] versus 6.17 [±2.69]), between sex difference p<0.001.

Impact on body image

The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that the impact on body image may be different in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females. Sex assigned at birth males are less dissatisfied with their primary and secondary sex characteristics than sex assigned at birth females at both baseline and follow up, but the satisfaction with neutral body characteristics is not different.

- The mean [±SD] BIS score for primary sex characteristics was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=not reported, mean BIS score [±SD]: 4.02 [±0.61] versus 4.16 [±0.52]) and follow up (n=not reported, 3.74 [±0.78] versus 4.17 [±0.58]) between sex difference p=0.047.
- The mean [±SD] BIS score for secondary sex was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=not reported, mean BIS score [±SD]: 2.66 [±0.50] versus 2.81 [±0.76]) and follow up (n=not reported, 2.39 [±0.69] versus 3.18 [±0.42]), between sex difference p=0.001.
- The mean [±SD] BIS score for neutral body characteristics was not statistically significantly different in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=not reported, 2.60 [±0.58] versus 2.24 [±0.62], between sex difference p=0.777).

Psychosocial impact

The study by Costa et al. 2015 in 201 adolescents with gender dysphoria who had 6 months of psychological support followed by either GnRH analogues and continued psychological support or continued psychological support only, found that sex assigned at birth males had statistically significant lower mean [±SD] CGAS scores at baseline compared with sex assigned at birth females (n=201, 55.4 [±12.7] versus 59.2 [±11.8], p=0.03), but no conclusions could be drawn.

The study by de Vries et al. 2011 in 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria found that psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning (CGAS) and psychosocial functioning (CBCL and YSR) may be different in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females, but no conclusions could be drawn.

- There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females (at baseline or follow up) for the CBCL Total T score, the CBCL internalising T score, the YSR Total T score or the YSR internalising T score.

- Sex assigned at birth males had statistically higher mean [±SD] CGAS scores compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=54, 73.10 [±8.44] versus 67.25 [±11.06]) and follow up (n=54, 77.33 [±8.69] versus 70.30 [±9.44]), between sex difference p=0.021.
- Sex assigned at birth males had statistically lower mean [±SD] CBCL externalising T scores compared with sex assigned at birth females at baseline (n=54, 54.71 [±12.91] versus 60.70 [±12.64]) and follow up (n=54, 48.75 [±10.22] versus 57.87 [±11.66]), between sex difference p=0.015.
- Sex assigned at birth males had statistically lower mean [±SD] YSR externalising T scores compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (n=54, 48.72 [±11.38] versus 57.24 [±10.59]) and follow up (n=54, 46.52 [±9.23] versus 52.97 [±8.51]), between sex difference p=0.004.

Bone density

The studies by Joseph et al. 2019, Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017 provided evidence on bone density in sex assigned at birth males (see above for details).

Cognitive development or functioning

The study by Staphorsius et al. 2015 provided evidence on cognitive development or functioning in sex assigned at birth males (see above for details).

Other safety outcomes

The study by Schagen et al. 2016 provided evidence on renal function in sex assigned at birth males (see above).

Sex assigned at birth females (transmales)

Impact on gender dysphoria

The studies by de Vries et al. 2011 and Costa et al. 2015 found that gender dysphoria (measured using the UGDS) in sex assigned at birth females is higher than in sex assigned at birth males at baseline and follow up (see above for details).

Impact on mental health

The study by de Vries et al. 2011 found that the impact on mental health (depression, anger and anxiety) may be different in sex assigned at birth females compared with sex assigned at birth males. Over time there was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth females and sex assigned at birth males for depression, but sex assigned at birth females had statistically significantly greater levels of anger and anxiety than sex assigned at birth males at both baseline and follow up (see above for details).

Impact on body image

The study by de Vries et al. 2011 found that the impact on body image may be different in sex assigned at birth females compared with sex assigned at birth males. Sex assigned at birth females are more dissatisfied with their primary and secondary sex characteristics than sex assigned at birth males at both baseline and follow up, but the satisfaction with neutral body characteristics is not different (see above for details).

Psychosocial impact

The studies by de Vries et al. 2011 and Costa et al. 2015 found that psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning (CGAS) and psychosocial functioning (CBCL and YSR) may be different in sex assigned at birth females compared with sex assigned at birth males, but no conclusions could be drawn (see above for details).

Bone density

The studies by Joseph et al. 2019, Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017 provided evidence on bone density in sex assigned at birth females (see above for details).

Cognitive development or functioning

The study by Staphorsius et al. 2015 provided evidence on cognitive development or functioning in sex assigned at birth females (see above for details).

Other safety outcomes

The study by Schagen et al. 2016 provided evidence on renal function in sex assigned at birth females (see above for details).

From the evidence selected:

(a) what are the criteria used by the research studies to define gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder and gender incongruence of childhood?

(b) what were the ages at which participants commenced treatment with GnRH analogues?

(c) what was the duration of treatment with GnRH analogues?

All studies that reported diagnostic criteria for gender dysphoria (6/9 studies) used the version of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) criteria that was in use at the time. In 5 studies (Costa et al. 2015, Klink et al. 2015, Schagen et al. 2016, Staphorsius et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017) the DSM-fourth edition, text revision (IV-TR) criteria were used. The study by Brik et al. 2020 used DSM-V criteria. It was not reported how gender dysphoria was defined in the remaining 3 studies.

The studies show variation in the age (11 to 18 years old) at which children and adolescents with gender dysphoria started GnRH analogues.

Most studies did not report the duration of treatment with GnRH analogues (Joseph et al. 2019, Khatchadourian et al. 2014, Vlot et al. 2017, Costa et al. 2015, de Vries et al. 2011, Schagen et al. 2016), but where this was reported (Brik et al. 2020, Klink et al. 2015, Staphorsius et al. 2015) there was a wide variation ranging from a few months to about 5 years.

Discussion

A key limitation to identifying the effectiveness and safety of GnRH analogues for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria is the lack of reliable comparative studies. The lack of clear, expected outcomes from treatment with a GnRH analogue (the purpose of which is to suppress secondary sexual characteristics which may cause distress from unwanted pubertal changes) also makes interpreting the evidence difficult.

The studies included in this evidence review are all small, uncontrolled observational studies, which are subject to bias and confounding, and all the results are of very low certainty using modified GRADE. They all reported physical and mental health comorbidities and concomitant treatments very poorly. All the studies are from a limited number of, mainly European, care facilities. They are described as either tertiary referral or expert services but the low number of services providing such care and publishing evidence may bias the results towards the outcomes in these services only and limit extrapolation.

Many of the studies did not report statistical significance or confidence intervals. Changes in outcome scores for clinical effectiveness and bone density were assessed with regards to statistical significance. However, there is relatively little interpretation of whether the changes in outcomes are clinically meaningful.

In the observational, retrospective studies providing evidence on bone density, participants acted as their own controls and change in bone density was determined between starting GnRH analogues and follow up. Observational studies such as these can only show an association with GnRH analogues and bone density; they cannot show that GnRH analogues caused any differences in bone density seen. Because there was no comparator group and participants acted as their own controls, it is not known whether the findings are associated with GnRH analogues or due to changes over time.

Conclusion

The results of the studies that reported impact on the critical outcomes of gender dysphoria and mental health (depression, anger and anxiety), and the important outcomes of body image and psychosocial impact (global and psychosocial functioning), in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria are of very low certainty using modified GRADE. They suggest little change with GnRH analogues from baseline to follow-up.

Studies that found differences in outcomes could represent changes that are either of questionable clinical value, or the studies themselves are not reliable and changes could be due to confounding, bias or chance. It is plausible, however, that a lack of difference in scores from baseline to follow-up is the effect of GnRH analogues in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, in whom the development of secondary sexual characteristics might be expected to be associated with an increased impact on gender dysphoria, depression, anxiety, anger and distress over time without treatment. The study by de Vries et al. 2011 reported statistically significant reductions in the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) and Youth Self-Report (YSR) scores from baseline to follow up, which include measures of distress. As the aim of GnRH analogues is to reduce distress caused by the development of secondary sexual characteristics, this may be an important finding. However, as the studies all lack appropriate controls who were not receiving GnRH analogues, any positive changes could be a regression to mean.

The results of the studies that reported bone density outcomes suggest that GnRH analogues may reduce the expected increase in bone density (which is expected during puberty). However, as the studies themselves are not reliable, the results could be due to confounding, bias or chance. While controlled trials may not be possible, comparative studies are needed to understand this association and whether the effects of GnRH analogues on bone density are seen after they are stopped. All the studies that reported safety outcomes provided very low certainty evidence.

No cost-effectiveness evidence was found to determine whether or not GnRH analogues are cost-effective for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria.

The results of the studies that reported outcomes for subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, suggest there may be differences between sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) and sex assigned at birth females (transmales).

3. Methodology

Review questions

The review question(s) for this evidence review are:

1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?
2. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the short-term and long-term safety of GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?
3. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the cost-effectiveness of GnRH analogues compared to one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?
4. From the evidence selected, are there any subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria that may derive more (or less) advantage from treatment with GnRH analogues than the wider population of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria?
5. From the evidence selected,
    a) what are the criteria used by the research studies to define gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder and gender incongruence of childhood?
    b) what were the ages at which participants commenced treatment with GnRH analogues?
    c) what was the duration of treatment with GnRH analogues?

See appendix A for the full review protocol.

Review process

The methodology to undertake this review is specified by NHS England in their ‘Guidance on conducting evidence reviews for Specialised Services Commissioning Products’ (2020).

The searches for evidence were informed by the PICO document and were conducted on 23 July 2020.

See appendix B for details of the search strategy.

Results from the literature searches were screened using their titles and abstracts for relevance against the criteria in the PICO framework. Full text references of potentially

relevant evidence were obtained and reviewed to determine whether they met the inclusion criteria for this evidence review.

See appendix C for evidence selection details and appendix D for the list of studies excluded from the review and the reasons for their exclusion.

Relevant details and outcomes were extracted from the included studies and were critically appraised using a checklist appropriate to the study design. See appendices E and F for individual study and checklist details.

The available evidence was assessed by outcome for certainty using modified GRADE. See appendix G for GRADE Profiles.

4. Summary of included studies

Nine observational studies were identified for inclusion. Five studies were retrospective observational studies (Brik et al. 2020, Joseph et al. 2019, Khatchadourian et al. 2014, Klink et al. 2015, Vlot et al. 2017), 3 studies were prospective longitudinal observational studies (Costa et al. 2015, de Vries et al. 2011, Schagen et al. 2016) and 1 study was a cross-sectional study (Staphorsius et al. 2015).

The terminology used in this topic area is continually evolving and is different depending on stakeholder perspectives. In this evidence review we have used the phrase 'people's assigned sex at birth' rather than natal or biological sex, gonadotrophin releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues rather than 'puberty blockers' and gender-affirming hormones rather than 'cross sex hormones'. The research studies included in this evidence review may use historical terms which are no longer considered appropriate.

Table 1 provides a summary of these included studies and full details are given in appendix E.

Table 1 Summary of included studies

Study	Population	Intervention and comparison	Outcomes reported
Brik et al. 2020 Retrospective observational single-centre study Netherlands	The study was conducted at the Curium-Leiden University Medical Centre gender clinic in Leiden, the Netherlands and involved adolescents with gender dysphoria. The sample size was 143 adolescents (median age at start of treatment was 15.0 years, range 11.1 to 18.6 years in transfemales; 16.1 years, range 10.1 to 17.9 years in transmales) from a sampling frame of 269 children and adolescents registered at the clinic between November 2010 and January 2018.	**Intervention** 143 children and adolescents receiving GnRH analogues (no specific treatment, dose, route or frequency of administration reported). The median duration was 2.1 years (range 1.6–2.8 years). **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** • Stopping treatment

Study	Population	Intervention and comparison	Outcomes reported
	Participants were included in the study if they were diagnosed with gender dysphoria according to the DSM-5 criteria, registered at the clinic, were prepubertal and within the appropriate age range, and had started GnRH analogues. No concomitant treatments were reported.		
Costa et al. 2015 Prospective longitudinal observational single centre cohort study United Kingdom	The study was conducted at the Gender Identity Development Service in London and involved adolescents with gender dysphoria. The sample size was 201 adolescents (mean [±SD] age 15.52±1.41 years, range 12 to 17 years) from a sampling frame of 436 consecutive adolescents referred to the service between 2010 and 2014. The mean [±SD] age at the start of GnRH analogues was 16.48 [±1.26] years, range 13 to 17 years. Participants were invited to participate following a 6-month diagnostic process using DSM-IV-TR criteria. No concomitant treatments were reported.	**Intervention** 101 adolescents assessed as being immediately eligible for GnRH analogues (no specific treatment, dose or route of administration reported) plus psychological support. The average duration of treatment was approximately 12 months (no exact figure given). **Comparison** 100 adolescents assessed as not immediately eligible for GnRH analogues (more time needed to make the decision to start GnRH analogues) who had psychological support only. None received GnRH analogues throughout the study.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** • Psychosocial impact
de Vries et al. 2011 Prospective longitudinal observational single centre before and after study Netherlands	The study was conducted at the Amsterdam gender identity clinic of the VU University Medical Centre and involved adolescents who were defined as “transsexual”. The sample size was 70 adolescents receiving GnRH analogues (mean age [±SD] at assessment 13.6±1.8 years) from a sampling frame of 196 consecutive adolescents referred to the service between 2000 and 2008. Participants were invited to participate if they subsequently started gender-affirming hormones between 2003 and 2009. No diagnostic criteria or concomitant treatments were reported.	**Intervention** 70 individuals assessed at baseline (T0) before the start of GnRH analogues (no specific treatment, dose or route of administration reported). **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** • Gender dysphoria • Mental health (depression, anger and anxiety) **Important outcomes** • Body image • Psychosocial impact

Study	Population	Intervention and comparison	Outcomes reported
Joseph et al. 2019 Retrospective longitudinal observational single centre study United Kingdom	This study was conducted at the Early intervention clinic at University College London Hospital (all participants had been seen at the Gender Identity Development Service in London) and involved adolescents with gender dysphoria. The sample size was 70 adolescents with gender dysphoria (no diagnostic criteria described) all offered GnRH analogues. The mean age at the start of treatment was 13.2 years (SD ±1.4) for transfemales and 12.6 years (SD ±1.0) for transmales. Details of the sampling frame were not reported. Further details of how the sample was drawn are not reported. No concomitant treatments were reported.	**Intervention** GnRH analogues. No specific treatment, duration, dose or route of administration reported. **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** • Safety: bone density
Khatchadourian et al. 2014 Retrospective observational chart review single centre study Canada	This study was conducted at the Endocrinology and Diabetes Unit at British Columbia Children's Hospital, Canada and involved youths with gender dysphoria. The sample size was 27 young people with gender dysphoria who started GnRH analogues (at mean age 14.7 [SD ±1.9] years) out of 84 young people seen at the unit between 1998 and 2011. Diagnostic criteria and concomitant treatments were not reported.	**Intervention** 84 young people with gender dysphoria. For GnRH analogues no specific treatment, duration, dose or route of administration reported. **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** • Stopping treatment • Safety: adverse effects
Klink et al. 2015 Retrospective longitudinal observational single centre study Netherlands	This study was conducted in the Netherlands at a tertiary referral centre. It is unclear which centre this was. The sample size was 34 adolescents (mean age 14.9 [SD ±1.9] years for transfemales and 15.0 [SD ±2.0] years for transmales at start of GnRH analogues). Details of the sampling frame are not reported. Participants were included if they met DSM-IV-TR criteria for gender identity disorder of adolescence and had been treated with GnRH analogues and gender-affirming hormones during their pubertal years. No concomitant treatments were reported.	**Intervention** The intervention was GnRH analogue monotherapy (triptorelin 3.75 mg subcutaneously every 4 weeks) followed by gender-affirming hormones with discontinuation of GnRH analogues after gonadectomy. Duration of GnRH analogues was 1.3 years (range 0.5 to 3.8 years) in transfemales and 1.5 years (0.25 to 5.2 years in transmales. **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** • Safety: bone density

Study	Population	Intervention and comparison	Outcomes reported
Schagen et al. 2016 Prospective longitudinal study Netherlands	This study was conducted at the Centre of Expertise on Gender Dysphoria at the VU University Medical Centre (Amsterdam, Netherlands) and involved adolescents with gender dysphoria. The sample size was 116 adolescents (median age [range] 13.6 years [11.6 to 17.9] in transfemales and 14.2 years [11.1 to 18.6] in transmales during first year of GnRH analogues) out of 128 adolescents who started GnRH analogues. Participants were included if they met DSM-IV-TR criteria for gender dysphoria, had lifelong extreme gender dysphoria, were psychologically stable and were living in a supportive environment. No concomitant treatments were reported.	**Intervention** The intervention was GnRH analogue monotherapy (triptorelin 3.75 mg at 0, 2 and 4 weeks followed by intramuscular injections every 4 weeks, for at least 3 months). **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** • Safety: liver and renal function.
Staphorsius et al. 2015 Cross-sectional (single time point) assessment single centre study Netherlands	This study was conducted at the VU University Medical Centre (Amsterdam, Netherlands) and involved adolescents with gender dysphoria. The sample size was 85, of whom 40 were adolescents with gender dysphoria (20 of whom were being treated with GnRH analogues) and 45 were controls without gender dysphoria (not further reported here). Mean (±SD) age 15.1 (±2.4) years in transfemales and 15.8 (±1.9) years in transmales. Details of the sampling frame are not reported. Participants were included if they were diagnosed with Gender Identity Disorder according to the DSM-IV-TR and at least 12 years old and Tanner stage of at least B2 or G2 to G3 with measurable oestradiol and testosterone levels in girls and boys, respectively. No concomitant treatments were reported.	**Intervention** The intervention was a GnRH analogue (triptorelin 3.75 mg every 4 weeks subcutaneously or intramuscularly). The mean duration of treatment was 1.6 years (SD ±1.0). **Comparison** Adolescents with gender dysphoria not treated with GnRH analogues.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** • Psychosocial impact • Safety: cognitive functioning
Vlot et al. 2017 Retrospective observational data analysis study Netherlands	This study was conducted at the VU University Medical Centre (Amsterdam, Netherlands) and involved adolescents with gender dysphoria. The sample size was 70 adolescents (median age [range] 15.1 years [11.7 to 18.6] for transmales and 13.5 years [11.5 to	**Intervention** The intervention was a GnRH analogue (triptorelin 3.75 mg every 4 weeks subcutaneously). **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** • No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes**

Study	Population	Intervention and comparison	Outcomes reported
	18.3] for transfemales at start of GnRH analogues). Details of the sampling frame are not reported. Participants were included if they had a diagnosis of gender dysphoria according to DSM-IV-TR criteria who were receiving GnRH analogues and then gender-affirming hormones. No concomitant treatments were reported.		• Safety: bone density
Abbreviations: DSM-IV-TR, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fourth edition, text revision; GnRH, Gonadotrophin releasing hormone; SD, Standard deviation.			

5. Results

In children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?

Outcome	Evidence statement
Clinical Effectiveness	
Critical outcomes	
Impact on gender dysphoria **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is a critical outcome because gender dysphoria in children and adolescents is associated with significant distress and problems with functioning. One uncontrolled, prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence relating to the impact on gender dysphoria in adolescents, measured using the Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale (UGDS). The UGDS is a validated screening tool for both adolescents and adults to assess gender dysphoria. It consists of 12 items, to be answered on a 1- to 5-point scale, resulting in a sum score between 12 and 60. The higher the UGDS score the greater the gender dysphoria. The study measured the impact on gender dysphoria at 2 time points: • before starting a GnRH analogue (mean [±SD] age: 14.75 [±1.92] years), and • shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones (mean [±SD] age: 16.64 [±1.90] years). The mean (±SD) UGDS score was not statistically significantly different at baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 53.20 [±7.91] versus 53.9 [±17.42], p=0.333) **(VERY LOW)**. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that treatment with GnRH analogues, before starting gender-affirming hormones, does not affect gender dysphoria.**

Impact on mental health: depression **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is a critical outcome because self-harm and thoughts of suicide have the potential to result in significant physical harm and, for completed suicides, the death of the young person. One uncontrolled, prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence relating to the impact on depression in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria. Depression was measured using the Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II). The BDI-II is a valid, reliable, and widely used tool for assessing depressive symptoms. There are no specific scores to categorise depression severity, but it is suggested that 0 to 13 is minimal symptoms, 14 to 19 is mild depression, 20 to 28 is moderate depression, and severe depression is 29 to 63. The study provided evidence for depression measured at 2 time points: • before starting a GnRH analogue (mean [±SD] age: 14.75 [±1.92] years), and • shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones (mean [±SD] age: 16.64 [±1.90] years). The mean (±SD) depression (BDI) score was statistically significantly lower (improved) from baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 8.31 [±7.12] versus 4.95 [±6.72], p=0.004) **(VERY LOW)**. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that treatment with GnRH analogues, before starting gender-affirming hormones, may reduce depression.**
Impact on mental health: anger **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is a critical outcome because self-harm and thoughts of suicide have the potential to result in significant physical harm and, for completed suicides, the death of the young person. One uncontrolled, prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence relating to the impact on anger in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria. Anger was measured using the Trait Anger Scale of the State-Trait Personality Inventory (TPI). This is a validated 20-item inventory tool which measures the intensity of anger as the disposition to experience angry feelings as a personality trait. Higher scores indicate greater anger. The study provided evidence for anger measured at 2 time points: • before starting a GnRH analogue (mean [±SD] age: 14.75 [±1.92] years), and • shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones (mean [±SD] age: 16.64 [±1.90] years). The mean (±SD) anger (TPI) score was not statistically significantly different at baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 18.29 [±5.54] versus 17.88 [±5.24], p=0.503) **(VERY LOW)**. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that treatment with GnRH analogues, before starting gender-affirming hormones, does not affect anger.**
Impact on mental health: anxiety	This is a critical outcome because self-harm and thoughts of suicide have the potential to result in significant physical harm and, for completed suicides, the death of the young person.

Certainty of evidence: very low	One uncontrolled, prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence relating to the impact on anxiety in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria. Anxiety was measured using the Trait Anxiety Scale of the State-Trait Personality Inventory (STAI). This is a validated and commonly used measure of trait and state anxiety. It has 20 items and can be used in clinical settings to diagnose anxiety and to distinguish it from depressive illness. Higher scores indicate greater anxiety. The study provided evidence for anxiety at 2 time points: • before starting a GnRH analogue (mean [±SD] age: 14.75 [±1.92] years), and • shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones (mean [±SD] age: 16.64 [±1.90] years). The mean (±SD) anxiety (STAI) score was not statistically significantly different at baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 39.43 [±10.07] versus 37.95 [±9.38], p=0.276) (**VERY LOW)**. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that treatment with GnRH analogues, before starting gender-affirming hormones, does not affect levels of anxiety.**
Quality of life	This is a critical outcome because gender dysphoria in children and adolescents may be associated with a significant reduction in health-related quality of life. No evidence was identified.
Important outcomes	
Impact on body image **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because some children and adolescents with gender dysphoria may want to take steps to suppress features of their physical appearance associated with their sex assigned at birth or accentuate physical features of their desired gender. One uncontrolled, prospective observational longitudinal study provided evidence relating to the impact on body image (de Vries et al. 2011). Body image was measured using the Body Image Scale (BIS) which is a validated 30-item scale covering 3 aspects: primary, secondary and neutral body characteristics. Higher scores represent a higher degree of body dissatisfaction. The study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence for body image measured at 2 time points: • before starting a GnRH analogue (mean [±SD] age: 14.75 [±1.92] years), and • shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones (mean [±SD] age: 16.64 [±1.90] years). The mean (±SD) body image (BIS) scores for were not statistically significantly different from baseline compared with follow-up for: • primary sexual characteristics (n=57, 4.10 [±0.56] versus 3.98 [±0.71], p=0.145) • secondary sexual characteristics (n=57, 2.74 [±0.65] versus 2.82 [±0.68], p=0.569)

	• neutral body characteristics (n=57, 2.41 [±0.63] versus 2.47 [±0.56], p=0.620) **(VERY LOW)**. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that treatment with GnRH analogues, before starting gender affirming hormones, does not affect body image.**
Psychosocial impact: global functioning **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because gender dysphoria in children and adolescents is associated with internalising and externalising behaviours, and emotional and behavioural problems which may impact on social and occupational functioning. One uncontrolled, observational, prospective cohort study (de Vries et al 2011) and one prospective cross-sectional cohort study (Costa et al. 2015) provided evidence relating to psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning. Global functioning was measured using the Children's Global Assessment Scale (CGAS). The CGAS tool is a validated measure of global functioning on a single rating scale from 1 to 100. Lower scores indicate poorer functioning. One study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence for global functioning (CGAS) at 2 time points: • before starting a GnRH analogue (mean [±SD] age: 14.75 [±1.92] years), and • shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones (mean [±SD] age: 16.64 [±1.90] years). The mean (±SD) CGAS score was statistically significantly higher (improved) from baseline compared with follow-up (n=41, 70.24 [±10.12] versus 73.90 [±9.63], p=0.005) **(VERY LOW)**. One study (Costa et al. 2015) in adolescents with gender dysphoria who had 6 months of psychological support followed by either GnRH analogues and continued psychological support (the immediately eligible group) or continued psychological support only (the delayed eligible group who did not receive GnRH analogues) provided evidence for global functioning (CGAS) measured at 4 time points: • at baseline (T0) in both groups, • after 6 months of psychological support in both groups (T1), • after 6 months of GnRH analogues and 12 months of psychological support in the immediately eligible group and 12 months of psychological support only in the delayed eligible group (T2), and • after 18 months of psychological support and 12 months of GnRH analogues in the immediately eligible group and after 18 months of psychological support only in the delayed eligible group (T3). The mean [±SD] CGAS score was statistically significantly higher (improved) for all adolescents (including those not receiving GnRH analogues) at T1, T2 or T3 compared with baseline (T0). For the immediately eligible group (who received GnRH analogues) versus the delayed eligible group (who did not receive GnRH analogues) there were no statistically significant differences in CGAS

	scores between the 2 groups at baseline T0 (n=201, p=0.23), T1 (n=201, p=0.73), T2 (n=121, p=0.49) or T3 (n=71, p=0.14) time points. For the immediately eligible group (who received GnRH analogues), the mean (±SD) CGAS score was not statistically significantly different at: • T1 compared with T0 • T2 compared with T1 • T3 compared with T2. The mean (±SD) CGAS score was statistically significantly higher (improved) at: • T2 compared with T0 (n=60, 64.70 [±13.34] versus n=101, 58.72 [±11.38], p=0.003) • T3 compared with T0 (n=35, 67.40 [±13.39] versus n=101, 58.72 [±11.38], p<0.001) • T3 compared with T1 (n=35, 67.40 [±13.93] versus n=101, 60.89 [±12.17], p<0.001) **(VERY LOW)**. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that during treatment with GnRH analogues, global functioning may improve over time. However, there was no statistically significant difference in global functioning between GnRH analogues plus psychological support compared with psychological support only at any time point.**
Psychosocial impact: psychosocial functioning **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because gender dysphoria in children and adolescents is associated with internalising and externalising behaviours, and emotional and behavioural problems which may impact on social and occupational functioning. Two studies provided evidence for this outcome. One uncontrolled, observational, prospective cohort study (de Vries et al, 2011) and 1 cross-sectional observational study (Staphorsius et al. 2015) assessed psychosocial functioning using the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) and the self-administered Youth Self-Report (YSR). The CBCL is a checklist parents complete to detect emotional and behavioural problems in children and adolescents. YSR is similar but is self-completed by the child or adolescent. The scales consist of a Total problems score, which is the sum of the scores of all the problem items. An internalising problem scale sums the anxious/depressed, withdrawn-depressed, and somatic complaints scores while the externalising problem scale combines rule-breaking and aggressive behaviour. The standard scores are scaled so that 50 is average for the child or adolescent's age and gender, with a SD of 10 points. Higher scores indicate greater problems, with a T-score above 63 considered to be in the clinical range. One study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence for psychosocial functioning (CBCL and YSR scores) at 2 time points: • before starting a GnRH analogue (mean [±SD] age: 14.75 [±1.92] years), and • shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones (mean [±SD] age: 16.64 [±1.90] years).

	At follow up, the mean (±SD) CBCL scores were statistically significantly lower (improved) compared with baseline for: • Total T score (n=54, 60.70 [±12.76] versus 54.46 [±11.23], p<0.001 • Internalising T score (n=54, 61.00 [±12.21] versus 52.17 [±9.81], p<0.001) • Externalising T score (n=54, 58.04 [±12.99] versus 53.81 [±11.86], p=0.001). At follow up, the mean (±SD) YSR scores were statistically significantly lower (improved) compared with baseline for: • Total T score (n=54, 55.46 [±11.56] versus 50.00 [±10.56], p<0.001) • Internalising T score (n=54, 56.04 [±12.49] versus 49.78 [±11.63], p<0.001) • Externalising T score (n=54, 53.30 [±11.87] versus 49.98 [±9.35], p=0.009). The proportion of adolescents scoring in the clinical range decreased from baseline to follow up on the CBCL total problem scale (44.4% versus 22.2%, p=0.001) and the internalising scale of the YSR (29.6% versus 11.1%, p=0.017) **(VERY LOW)**. One study (Staphorsius et al. 2015) assessed CBCL in a cohort of adolescents with gender dysphoria (transfemale: n=18, mean [±SD] age 15.1 [±2.4] years and transmale: n=22, mean [±SD] age 15.8 [±1.9] years) either receiving GnRH analogues (transfemale, n=8 and transmale, n=12), or not receiving GnRH analogues (transfemale, n=10 and transmale, n=10). The mean (±SD) CBCL scores for each group were (statistical analysis unclear): • transfemales (total) 57.8 [±9.2] • transfemales receiving GnRH analogues 57.4 [±9.8] • transfemales not receiving GnRH analogues 58.2 [±9.3] • transmales (total) 60.4 [±10.2] • transmales receiving GnRH analogues 57.5 [±9.4] • transmales not receiving GnRH analogues 63.9 [±10.5] **(VERY LOW)**. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that during treatment with GnRH analogues psychosocial functioning may improve, with the proportion of adolescents in the clinical range for some CBCL and YSR scores decreasing over time.**
Engagement with health care services **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because patient engagement with health care services will impact on their clinical outcomes. Two uncontrolled observational cohort studies provided evidence relating to loss to follow up, which could be a marker of engagement with health care services (Brik et al. 2018 and Costa et al. 2015). In one retrospective study (Brik et al. 2018), 9 adolescents (9/214, 4.2%) who had stopped attending appointments were excluded from the study between November 2010 and July 2019 **(VERY LOW)**.

	One prospective study (Costa et al. 2015) had evidence for a large loss to follow-up over time. The sample size at baseline (T0) and 6 months (T1) was 201, which dropped by 39.8% to 121 after 12 months (T2) and by 64.7% to 71 at 18 months follow-up (T3). No explanation of the reasons for loss to follow-up are reported **(VERY LOW)**. Due to their design there was no reported loss to follow-up in the other 3 effectiveness studies (de Vries et al 2011; Khatchadourian et al. 2014; Staphorsius et al. 2015). **These studies provide very low certainty evidence about loss to follow up, which could be a marker of engagement with health care services, during treatment with GnRH analogues. Due to the large variation in rates between studies no conclusions could be drawn.**
Impact on extent of and satisfaction with surgery	This is an important outcome because some children and adolescents with gender dysphoria may proceed to transitioning surgery. No evidence was identified.
Stopping treatment **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because there is uncertainty about the short- and long-term safety and adverse effects of GnRH analogues in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria. Two uncontrolled, retrospective, observational cohort studies provided evidence relating to stopping GnRH analogues. One study had complete reporting of the cohort (Brik et al. 2018), the other (Khatchadourian et al. 2014) had incomplete reporting of its cohort, particularly for transfemales where outcomes for only 4/11 were reported. Brik et al. 2018 narratively reported the reasons for stopping GnRH analogues in a cohort of 143 adolescents (38 transfemales and 105 transmales). Median age at the start of GnRH analogues was 15.0 years (range, 11.1–18.6 years) in transfemales and 16.1 years (range, 10.1–17.9 years) in transmales. Of these adolescents, 125 (87%, 36 transfemales, 89 transmales) subsequently started gender-affirming hormones after 1.0 (0.5–3.8) and 0.8 (0.3–3.7) years of GnRH analogues. At the time of data collection, the median duration of GnRH analogue use was 2.1 years (1.6–2.8). During the follow-up period 6.3% (9/143) of adolescents had discontinued GnRH analogues after a median duration of 0.8 years (range 0.1 to 3.0). The percentages and reasons for stopping were: • 2.8% (4/143) stopped GnRH analogues although they wanted to continue endocrine treatments for gender dysphoria: ○ 1 transmale stopped due to increase in mood problems, suicidal thoughts and confusion attributed to GnRH analogues ○ 1 transmale had hot flushes, increased migraines, fear of injections, stress at school and unrelated medical issues, and temporarily stopped treatment (after 4 months) and restarted 5 months later. ○ 1 transmale had mood swings 4 months after starting GnRH analogues. After 2.2 years had unexplained severe nausea and rapid weight loss and discontinued GnRH analogues after 2.4 years

	○ 1 transmale stopped GnRH analogues because of inability to regularly collect medication and attend appointments for injections. • 3.5% (5/143) stopped treatment because they no longer wished to receive gender-affirming treatment for various reasons **(VERY LOW)**. Khatchadourian et al. 2014 narratively reported the reasons for stopping GnRH analogues in a cohort of 26 adolescents (15 transmales and 11 transfemales), 42% (11/26) discontinued GnRH analogues during follow-up between 1998 and 2011. Of 15 transmales receiving GnRH analogues, 14 received testosterone during the observation period, of which: • 7 continued GnRH analogues after starting testosterone • 7 stopped GnRH analogues after a median of 3.0 years (range 0.2 to 9.2 years), of which: ○ 5 stopped after hysterectomy and salpingo-oophorectomy ○ 1 stopped after 2.2 years (transitioned to gender-affirming hormones) ○ 1 stopped after <2 months due to mood and emotional lability **(VERY LOW)**. Of 11 transfemales receiving GnRH analogues, 5 received oestrogen during the observation period, of which: • 4 continued GnRH analogues after starting oestrogen • 1 stopped GnRH analogues when taking oestrogen (no reason reported) **(VERY LOW)**. Of the remaining 6 transfemales taking GnRH analogues: • 1 stopped GnRH analogues after a few months due to emotional lability • 1 stopped GnRH analogues before taking oestrogen (the following year delayed due to heavy smoking) • 1 stopped GnRH analogues after 13 months due not to pursuing transition **(VERY LOW)**. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence for the number of adolescents who stop GnRH analogues and the reasons for this.**

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; SD, standard deviation.

In children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the short-term and long-term safety of GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?

Outcome	Evidence statement
Safety	
Change in bone density: lumbar	This is an important outcome because puberty is an important time for bone development and puberty suppression may affect bone development, as shown by changes in lumbar bone density.

Certainty of evidence: very low	Three uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence relating to the effect of GnRH analogues on bone density (based on lumbar BMAD) between starting with a GnRH analogue and at 1 and 2 year intervals (Joseph et al. 2019), and between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones (Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017). All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. BMAD is a size adjusted value of BMD incorporating body size measurements using UK norms in growing adolescents. It was reported as g/cm^3 and as z-scores. Z-scores report how many standard deviations from the mean a measurement sits. A z-score of 0 is equal to the mean, a z-score of −1 is equal to 1 standard deviation below the mean, and a z-score of +1 is equal to 1 standard deviation above the mean. One retrospective observational study (Joseph et al. 2019, n=70) provided non-comparative evidence on change in lumbar BMAD increase using z-scores. • The z-score for lumbar BMAD was statistically significantly lower at 2 years compared with baseline in transfemales (z-score [±SD]: baseline 0.486 [0.809], 2 years −0.279 [0.930], p=0.000) and transmales (baseline −0.361 [1.439], 2 years −0.913 [1.318], p=0.001) **(VERY LOW)**. • The z-score for lumbar BMAD was statistically significantly lower at 1 year compared with baseline in transfemales (baseline 0.859 [0.154], 1 year −0.228 [1.027], p=0.000) and transmales (baseline −0.186 [1.230], 1 year −0.541 [1.396], p=0.006) **(VERY LOW)**. • Actual lumbar BMAD values in g/cm^3 were not statistically significantly different between baseline and 1 or 2 years in transfemales or transmales **(VERY LOW)**. Two retrospective observational studies (Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017, n=104 in total) provided non-comparative evidence on change in lumbar BMAD between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones. All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. In Klink et al. 2015 the z-score for lumbar BMAD was not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales but was statistically significantly lower when starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (z-score mean [±SD]: GnRH analogue 0.28 [±0.90], gender-affirming hormone −0.50 [±0.81], p=0.004). Actual lumbar BMAD values in g/cm^3 were not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales or transmales **(VERY LOW)**. Vlot et al. 2017 reported change from starting GnRH analogues to starting gender-affirming hormones in lumbar BMAD by bone age. • The z-score for lumbar BMAD in transfemales with a bone age of <15 years was statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormone treatment than at starting GnRH

	analogues (z-score median [range]: GnRH analogue −0.20 [−1.82 to 1.18], gender-affirming hormone −1.52 [−2.36 to 0.42], p=0.001) but was not statistically significantly different in transfemales with a bone age ≥15 years **(VERY LOW)**. • The z-score for lumbar BMAD in transmales with a bone age of <14 years was statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormone treatment than at starting GnRH analogues (z-score median [range]: GnRH analogue −0.05 [−0.78 to 2.94], gender-affirming hormone −0.84 [−2.20 to 0.87], p=0.003) and in transmales with a bone age ≥14 years (GnRH analogue 0.27 [−1.60 to 1.80], gender-affirming hormone −0.29 [−2.28 to 0.90], p≤0.0001) **(VERY LOW)**. • Actual lumbar BMAD values in g/cm^3 were not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales or transmales with young or old bone age **(VERY LOW)**. Two uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence for the effect of GnRH analogues on bone density (based on lumbar BMD) between starting GnRH analogues and either at 1 or 2 year intervals (Joseph et al. 2019), or starting gender-affirming hormones (Klink et al. 2015). All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. One retrospective observational study (Joseph et al. 2019, n=70) provided non-comparative evidence on change in lumbar BMD increase using z-scores. • The z-score for lumbar BMD was statistically significantly lower at 2 years compared with baseline in transfemales (z-score mean [±SD]: baseline 0.130 [0.972], 2 years −0.890 [±1.075], p=0.000) and transmales (baseline −0.715 [±1.406], 2 years −2.000 [1.384], p=0.000) **(VERY LOW)**. • The z-score for lumbar BMD was statistically significantly lower at 1 year compared with baseline in transfemales (z-score mean [±SD]: baseline −0.016 [±1.106], 1 year −0.461 [±1.121], p=0.003) and transmales (baseline −0.395 [±1.428], 1 year −1.276 [±1.410], p=0.000) **(VERY LOW)**. • With the exception of transmales, where lumbar BMD in kg/m^2 increased between baseline and 1 year (mean [±SD]: baseline 0.694 [±0.149], 1 year 0.718 [±0.124], p=0.006), actual lumbar BMD values were not statistically significantly different between baseline and 1 or 2 years in transfemales or between 0 and 2 years in transmales **(VERY LOW)**. One retrospective observational study (Klink et al. 2015, n=34) provided non-comparative evidence on change in lumbar BMD between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones. • The z-score for lumbar BMD was not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogue and starting gender-affirming hormone treatment in transfemales, but was statistically significantly lower when starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (z-score mean [±SD]: GnRH analogue 0.17 [±1.18], gender-affirming hormone −0.72 [±0.99], p<0.001) **(VERY LOW)**.

	• Actual lumbar BMD in g/cm^2 was not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales but was statistically significantly lower when starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (mean [±SD]: GnRH analogues 0.95 [±0.12], gender-affirming hormones 0.91 [±0.10], p=0.006) **(VERY LOW)**. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues reduce the expected increase in lumbar bone density (BMAD or BMD) compared with baseline (although some findings were not statistically significant). These studies also show that GnRH analogues do not statistically significantly decrease actual lumbar bone density (BMAD or BMD).**
Change in bone density: femoral **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because puberty is an important time for bone development and puberty suppression may affect bone development, as shown by changes in femoral bone density. Two uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence relating to the effect of GnRH analogues on bone density (based on femoral BMAD) between starting treatment with a GnRH analogue and starting gender-affirming hormones (Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017). All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. One retrospective observational study (Klink et al. 2015, n=34) provided non-comparative evidence on change in femoral area BMAD between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones. All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales. • The z-score for femoral area BMAD was not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales or transmales **(VERY LOW)**. • Actual femoral area BMAD values were not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales or transfemales **(VERY LOW)**. One retrospective observational study (Vlot et al. 2017, n=70) provided non-comparative evidence on change in femoral neck (hip) BMAD between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones. All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. • The z-score for femoral neck BMAD in transfemales with a bone age of <15 years was not statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormones than at starting GnRH analogues (z-score median [range]: GnRH analogue −0.71 [−3.35 to 0.37], gender-affirming hormone −1.32 [−3.39 to 0.21], p≤0.1) or in transfemales with a bone age ≥15 years (GnRH analogue −0.44 [−1.37 to 0.93], gender-affirming hormone −0.36 [−1.50 to 0.46]) **(VERY LOW)**. • The z-score for femoral neck BMAD in transmales with a bone age of <14 years was not statistically significantly lower at starting gender-affirming hormones than at starting GnRH analogues (z-score median [range]: GnRH analogue −0.01

	[−1.30 to 0.91], gender-affirming hormone −0.37 [−2.28 to 0.47]) but was statistically significantly lower in transmales with a bone age ≥14 years (GnRH analogue 0.27 [−1.39 to 1.32], gender-affirming hormone −0.27 [−1.91 to 1.29], p=0.002) **(VERY LOW)**. • Actual femoral neck BMAD values were not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales or in transmales with a young bone age, but were statistically significantly lower in transmales with a bone age ≥14 years (GnRH analogue 0.33 [0.25 to 0.39), gender-affirming hormone 0.30 [0.23 to 0.41], p≤0.01) **(VERY LOW)**. Two uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence for the effect of GnRH analogues on bone density (based on femoral BMD) between starting GnRH analogues and either at 1 or 2 year intervals (Joseph et al. 2019), or starting gender-affirming hormones (Klink et al. 2015). All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. One retrospective observational study (Joseph et al. 2019, n=70) provided non-comparative evidence on change in femoral neck BMD increase using z-scores. All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales. • The z-score for femoral neck BMD was statistically significantly lower at 2 years compared with baseline in transfemales (z-score mean [±SD]: baseline 0.0450 [±0.781], 2 years −0.600 [±1.059], p=0.002) and transmales (baseline −1.075 [±1.145], 2 years −1.779 [±0.816], p=0.001) **(VERY LOW)**. • The z-score for femoral neck BMD was statistically significantly lower at 1 year compared with baseline in transfemales (z-score mean [±SD]: baseline 0.157 [±0.905], 1 year −0.340 [±0.816], p=0.002) and transmales (baseline −0.863 [±1.215], 1 year −1.440 [±1.075], p=0.000) **(VERY LOW)**. • Actual femoral neck BMD values in kg/m^2 were not statistically significantly different between baseline and 1 or 2 years in transmales or transfemales **(VERY LOW)**. One retrospective observational study (Klink et al. 2015, n=34) provided non-comparative evidence on change in femoral area BMD between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones. All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales. • The z-score for femoral area BMD was not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales, but was statistically significantly lower in transmales (z-score mean [±SD]: GnRH analogue 0.36 [±0.88], gender-affirming hormone −0.35 [±0.79], p=0.001) **(VERY LOW)**. • Actual femoral area BMD values were not statistically significantly different between starting GnRH analogues and starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales, but were statistically significantly lower in transmales (mean [±SD] GnRH analogue 0.92 [±0.10], gender-affirming hormone 0.88 [±0.09], p=0.005) **(VERY LOW)**.

	These studies provide very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues may reduce the expected increase in femoral bone density (femoral neck or area BMAD or BMD) compared with baseline (although some findings were not statistically significant). These studies also show that GnRH analogues do not statistically significantly decrease actual femoral bone density (femoral area BMAD or femoral neck BMD), apart from actual femoral area BMD in transmales.
Cognitive development or functioning **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because puberty is an important time for cognitive development and puberty suppression may affect cognitive development or functioning. One cross-sectional observational study (Staphorsius et al. 2015, n=70) provided comparative evidence on cognitive development or functioning in adolescents with gender dysphoria on GnRH analogues compared with adolescents with gender dysphoria not on GnRH analogues. Cognitive functioning was measured using an IQ test. Reaction time (in seconds) and accuracy (percentage of correct trials) were measured using the Tower of London (ToL) task. All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. No statistical analyses or interpretation of the results in these groups were reported: • IQ in transfemales (mean [±SD] GnRH analogue 94.0 [±10.3], control 109.4 [±21.2]). IQ transmales (GnRH analogue 95.8 [±15.6], control 98.5 [±15.9]. • Reaction time in transfemales (mean [±SD] GnRH analogue 10.9 [±4.1], control: 9.9 [±3.1]). Reaction time transmales (GnRH analogue 9.9 [±3.1], control 10.0 [±2.0]). • Accuracy score in transfemales (GnRH analogue 73.9 [±9.1], control 83.4 [±9.5]. Accuracy score in transmales (GnRH analogue 85.7 [±10.5], control 88.8 [±9.7]. **This study provides very low certainty evidence (with no statistical analysis) on the effects of GnRH analogues on cognitive development or functioning. No conclusions could be drawn.**
Other safety outcomes: kidney function **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because if renal damage (raised serum creatinine is a marker of this) is suspected, GnRH analogues may need to be stopped. One prospective observational study (Schagen et al. 2016, n=116) provided non-comparative evidence on change in serum creatinine between starting GnRH analogues and at 1 year. All outcomes were reported separately for transfemales and transmales; also see subgroups table below. • There was no statistically significant difference between baseline and 1 year for serum creatinine in transfemales (mean [±SD] baseline 70 [±12], 1 year 66 [±13], p=0.20). • There was a statistically significant decrease between baseline and 1 year for serum creatinine in transmales (baseline 73 [±8], 1 year 68 [±13], p=0.01). **This study provides very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues do not affect renal function.**

Other safety outcomes: liver function **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because if treatment-induced liver injury (raised liver enzymes are a marker of this) is suspected, GnRH analogues may need to be stopped. One prospective observational study (Schagen et al. 2016, n=116) provided non-comparative evidence on elevated liver enzymes between starting GnRH analogues and during use. No comparative values or statistical analyses were reported. • Glutamyl transferase was not elevated at baseline or during use in any person. • Mild elevations of AST and ALT above the reference range were present at baseline but were not more prevalent during use than at baseline. • Glutamyl transferase, AST, and ALT levels did not significantly change from baseline to 12 months of use. **This study provides very low certainty evidence (with no statistical analysis) that GnRH analogues do not affect liver function.**
Other safety outcomes: adverse effects **Certainty of evidence: very low**	This is an important outcome because if there are adverse effects, GnRH analogues may need to be stopped. One uncontrolled, retrospective, observational cohort study (Khatchadourian et al. 2014) provided evidence relating to adverse effects from GnRH analogues. It had incomplete reporting of its cohort, particularly for transfemales where outcomes for only 4/11 were reported. Khatchadourian et al. 2014 reported adverse effects in a cohort of 26 adolescents (15 transmales and 11 transfemales) receiving GnRH analogues. Of these: • 1 transmale developed sterile abscesses; they were switched from leuprolide acetate to triptorelin, and this was well tolerated. • 1 transmale developed leg pains and headaches, which eventually resolved • 1 participant gained 19 kg within 9 months of starting GnRH analogues. **This study provides very low certainty evidence about potential adverse effects of GnRH analogues. No conclusions could be drawn.**

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; BMAD, bone mineral apparent density; BMD, bone mineral density; GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; IQ, intelligence quotient; NS, not significant; SD, standard deviation.

In children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the cost-effectiveness of GnRH analogues compared to one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?

Outcome	Evidence statement
Cost-effectiveness	No studies were identified to assess the cost-effectiveness of GnRH analogues for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria.

From the evidence selected, are there any subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria that may benefit from GnRH analogues more than the wider population of interest?

Subgroup	Evidence statement
Sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) **Certainty of evidence: Very low**	Some studies reported data separately for sex assigned at birth males (transfemales). This included some direct comparisons with sex assigned at birth females (transmales). **Impact on gender dysphoria** One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence for gender dysphoria in sex assigned at birth males. See the clinical effectiveness results table above for a full description of the study. The mean (±SD) UGDS score was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (T0) (n=not reported, mean UGDS score [±SD]: 47.95 [±9.70] versus 56.57 [±3.89]) and T1 (n=not reported, 49.67 [±9.47] versus 56.62 [±4.00]); between sex difference p<0.001 **(VERY LOW)**. One further prospective observational longitudinal study (Costa et al. 2015) provided evidence for the impact on gender dysphoria in sex assigned at birth males. See the clinical effectiveness results table above for a full description of the study. Sex assigned at birth males had a statistically significantly lower (improved) mean (±SD) UGDS score of 51.6 [±9.7] compared with sex assigned at birth females (56.1 [±4.3], p<0.001). However, it was not reported if this was baseline or follow-up **(VERY LOW)**. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales), gender dysphoria is lower than in sex assigned at birth females (transmales).** **Impact on mental health** One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence for the impact on mental health (depression, anger and anxiety) in sex assigned at birth males. See the clinical effectiveness results table above for a full description of the study. • The mean (±SD) depression (BDI-II) score was not statistically significantly different in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (T0) (n=not reported, mean BDI score [±SD]: 5.71 [±4.31] versus 10.34 [±8.24]) and T1 (n=not reported, 3.50 [±4.58] versus 6.09 [±7.93]), between sex difference p=0.057 • The mean (±SD) anger (TPI) score was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (T0) (n=not reported, mean TPI score [±SD]: 5.22 [±2.76] versus 6.43 [±2.78]) and T1 (n=not reported, 5.00 [±3.07] versus 6.39 [±2.59]), between sex difference p=0.022 • The mean (±SD) anxiety (STAI) score was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males

compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (T0) (n=not reported, mean STAI score [±SD]: 4.33 [±2.68] versus 7.00 [±2.36]) and T1 (n=not reported, 4.39 [±2.64] versus 6.17 [±2.69]), between sex difference p<0.001 **(VERY LOW)**.

This study provides very low certainty evidence that the impact on mental health (depression, anger and anxiety) may be different in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) compared with sex assigned at birth females (transmales). Over time there was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for depression. However, sex assigned at birth males had statistically significantly lower levels of anger and anxiety than sex assigned at birth females at both baseline and follow up.

Impact on body image

One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence relating to the impact on body image in sex assigned at birth males.

- The mean (±SD) BIS score for primary sex characteristics was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (T0) (n=not reported, mean BIS score [±SD]: 4.02 [±0.61] versus 4.16 [±0.52]) and T1 (n=not reported, 3.74 [±0.78] versus 4.17 [±0.58]), between sex difference p=0.047
- The mean (±SD) BIS score for secondary sex was statistically significantly lower (improved) in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (T0) (n=not reported, mean BIS score [±SD]: 2.66 [±0.50] versus 2.81 [±0.76]) and T1 (n=not reported, 2.39 [±0.69] versus 3.18 [±0.42]), between sex difference p=0.001
- The mean (±SD) BIS score for neutral body characteristics was not statistically significantly different in sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females at both baseline (T0) (n=not reported, mean BIS score [±SD]: 2.60 [±0.58] versus 2.24 [±0.62]) and T1 (n=not reported, 2.32 [±0.59] versus 2.61 [±0.50]), between sex difference p=0.777 **(VERY LOW)**.

This study provides very low certainty evidence that the impact on body image may be different in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) compared with sex assigned at birth females (transmales). Sex assigned at birth males are less dissatisfied with their primary and secondary sex characteristics than sex assigned at birth females at both baseline and follow up, but the satisfaction with neutral body characteristics is not different.

Psychosocial impact

One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence for psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning (CGAS) and psychosocial functioning (CBCL and YSR) in sex assigned at birth males.

- Sex assigned at birth males had statistically higher mean (±SD) CGAS scores compared with sex assigned at birth

	females at both baseline (T0) (n=54, 73.10 [±8.44] versus 67.25 [±11.06]) and T1 (n=54, 77.33 [±8.69] versus 70.30 [±9.44]), between sex difference p=0.021 • There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for the CBCL Total T score at T0 or T1 (n=54, p=0.110) • There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for the CBCL internalising T score at T0 or T1 (n=54, p=0.286) • Sex assigned at birth males had statistically lower mean (±SD) CBCL externalising T scores compared with sex assigned at birth females at both T0 (n=54, 54.71 [±12.91] versus 60.70 [±12.64]) and T1 (n=54, 48.75 [±10.22] versus 57.87 [±11.66]), between sex difference p=0.015 • There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for the YSR Total T score at T0 or T1 (n=54, p=0.164) • There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for the YSR internalising T score at T0 or T1 (n=54, p=0.825) • Sex assigned at birth males had statistically lower mean (±SD) YSR externalising T scores compared with sex assigned at birth females at both T0 (n=54, 48.72 [±11.38] versus 57.24 [±10.59]) and T1 (n=54, 46.52 [±9.23] versus 52.97 [±8.51]), between sex difference p=0.004 **(VERY LOW)**. One uncontrolled, observational, prospective cohort study (Costa et al. 2015) provided evidence for psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning (CGAS) in sex assigned at birth males. • Sex assigned at birth males had statistically significant lower mean (±SD CGAS scores at baseline) compared with sex assigned at birth females (n=201, 55.4 [±12.7] versus 59.2 [±11.8], p=0.03) **(VERY LOW)**. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that psychosocial impact may be different in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) compared with sex assigned at birth females (transmales). However, no conclusions could be drawn.** **Change in bone density: lumbar** Three uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence relating to the effect of GnRH analogues on lumbar bone density in sex assigned at birth males (Joseph et al. 2019, Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017). See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues reduce the expected increase in lumbar bone density (BMAD or BMD) in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales; although some findings were not statistically significant). These studies also show that GnRH analogues do not statistically significantly decrease actual lumbar bone density (BMAD or BMD) in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales).** **Change in bone density: femoral**

	Three uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence for the effect of GnRH analogues on femoral bone density in sex assigned at birth males (Joseph et al. 2019, Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017). See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues may reduce the expected increase in femoral bone density (femoral neck or area BMAD or BMD) in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales; although some findings were not statistically significant). These studies also show that GnRH analogues do not statistically significantly decrease actual femoral bone density (femoral area BMAD or femoral neck BMD) in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales).** **Cognitive development or functioning** One cross-sectional observational study (Staphorsius et al. 2015) provided comparative evidence on cognitive development or functioning in sex assigned at birth males. See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **This study provides very low certainty evidence (with no statistical analysis) on the effects of GnRH analogues on cognitive development or functioning in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales). No conclusions could be drawn.** **Other safety outcomes: kidney function** One prospective observational study (Schagen et al. 2016) provided non-comparative evidence on change in serum creatinine in sex assigned at birth males. See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues do not affect renal function in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales).**
Sex assigned at birth females (transmales) **Certainty of evidence: Very low**	Some studies reported data separately for sex assigned at birth females (transmales). This included some direct comparisons with sex assigned at birth males (transfemales). **Impact on gender dysphoria** One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) and one prospective observational longitudinal study (Costa et al. 2015) provided evidence for gender dysphoria in sex assigned at birth females. See the sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) row above for a full description of the results. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that in sex assigned at birth females (transmales), gender dysphoria is higher than in sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) at both baseline and follow up.** **Impact on mental health** One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence relating to the impact on mental health (depression, anger and anxiety) in sex assigned at birth

	females. See the sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) row above for a full description of the results. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that the impact on mental health (depression, anger and anxiety) may be different in sex assigned at birth females (transmales) compared with sex assigned at birth males (transfemales). Over time there was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth females and sex assigned at birth males for depression. However, sex assigned at birth females had statistically significantly greater levels of anger and anxiety than sex assigned at birth males at baseline and follow up.** **Impact on body image** One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence relating to the impact on body image in sex assigned at birth females. See the sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) row above for a full description of the results. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that the impact on body image may be different in sex assigned at birth females (transmales) compared with sex assigned at birth males (transfemales). Sex assigned at birth females are more dissatisfied with their primary and secondary sex characteristics than sex assigned at birth males at both baseline and follow up, but the satisfaction with neutral body characteristics is not different.** **Psychosocial impact** One uncontrolled prospective observational longitudinal study (de Vries et al. 2011) provided evidence for psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning (CGAS) and psychosocial functioning (CBCL and YSR) in sex assigned at birth females. One uncontrolled, observational, prospective cohort study (Costa et al. 2015) provided evidence for psychosocial impact in terms of global functioning (CGAS) in sex assigned at birth females. See the sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) row above for a full description of the results. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that psychosocial impact may be different in sex assigned at birth females (transmales) compared with sex assigned at birth males (transfemales). However, no conclusions could be drawn.** **Change in bone density: lumbar** Three uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence relating to the effect of GnRH analogues on lumbar bone density in sex assigned at birth females (Joseph et al. 2019, Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017). See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues reduce the expected increase in lumbar bone density (BMAD or BMD) in sex assigned at birth females (transmales; although some findings were not statistically significant). These studies also show that GnRH analogues do not statistically**

	significantly decrease actual lumbar bone density (BMAD or BMD) in sex assigned at birth females (transmales). **Change in bone density: femoral** Three uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence relating to the effect of GnRH analogues on femoral bone density in sex assigned at birth females (Joseph et al. 2019, Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017). See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **These studies provide very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues may reduce the expected increase in femoral bone density (femoral neck or area BMAD or BMD) in sex assigned at birth females (transmales; although some findings were not statistically significant). These studies also show that GnRH analogues do not statistically significantly decrease actual femoral bone density (femoral area BMAD or femoral neck BMD) in sex assigned at birth females (transmales), apart from actual femoral area.** **Cognitive development or functioning** One cross-sectional observational study (Staphorsius et al. 2015) provided comparative evidence on cognitive development or functioning in sex assigned at birth females. See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **This study provides very low certainty evidence (with no statistical analysis) on the effects of GnRH analogues on cognitive development or functioning in sex assigned at birth females (transmales). No conclusions could be drawn.** **Other safety outcomes: kidney function** One prospective observational study (Schagen et al. 2016) provided non-comparative evidence on change in serum creatinine in sex assigned at birth females (transmales). See the safety results table above for a full description of the results. **This study provides very low certainty evidence that GnRH analogues do not affect renal function in sex assigned at birth females (transmales).**
Duration of gender dysphoria	No evidence was identified.
Age at onset of gender dysphoria	No evidence was identified.
Age at which GnRH analogue started	No evidence was identified.
Age at onset of puberty	No evidence was identified.
Tanner stage at which GnRH analogue started	No evidence was identified.
Diagnosis of autistic spectrum disorder	No evidence was identified.

Diagnosis of mental health condition	No evidence was identified.

Abbreviations: BDI-II**,** Beck Depression Inventory-II; BIS, Body Image Scale; CBCL, Child Behaviour Checklist; CGAS, Children's Global Assessment Scale; SD, standard deviation; STAI, Trait Anxiety Scale of the State-Trait Personality Inventory; TPI, Trait Anger Scale of the State-Trait Personality Inventory; UGDS, Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale; YSR, Youth Self-Report

From the evidence selected,

(a) what are the criteria used by the research studies to define gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder and gender incongruence of childhood?

(b) what were the ages at which participants commenced treatment with GnRH analogues?

(c) what was the duration of treatment with GnRH analogues?

<table>
<tr><th>Outcome</th><th>Evidence statement</th></tr>
<tr><td>Diagnostic criteria</td><td>In 5 studies (Costa et al. 2015, Klink et al. 2015, Schagen et al. 2016, Staphorsius et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017) the DSM-IV-TR criteria of gender identity disorder was used.

The study by Brik et al. 2020 used DSM-V criteria. The DSM-V has one overarching definition of gender dysphoria with separate specific criteria for children and for adolescents and adults. The general definition describes a conflict associated with significant distress and/or problems functioning associated with this conflict between the way they feel and the way they think of themselves which must have lasted at least 6 months.

It was not reported how gender dysphoria was defined in the remaining 3 studies (VERY LOW).

From the evidence selected, all studies that reported diagnostic criteria for gender dysphoria (6/9 studies) used the DSM criteria in use at the time the study was conducted.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age when GnRH analogues started</td><td>8/9 studies reported the age at which participants started GnRH analogues, either as the mean age (with SD) or median age (with the range):

<table>
<tr><th>Study</th><th>Mean age (±SD)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Costa et al. 2015</td><td>16.5 years (±1.3)</td></tr>
<tr><td>de Vries et al. 2011</td><td>13.6 years (±1.8)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Joseph et al. 2019</td><td>13.2 years (±1.4) in transfemales
12.6 years (±1.0) in transmales</td></tr>
<tr><td>Khatchadourian et al. 2014</td><td>14.7 years (±1.9)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Klink et al. 2015</td><td>14.9 years (±1.9) in transfemales
15.0 years (±2.0) in transmales</td></tr>
</table>
<table>
<tr><th>Study</th><th>Median age (range)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Brik et al. 2020</td><td>15.5 years (11.1–18.6) in transfemales
16.1 years (10.1–17.9) in transmales</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

	Schagen et al. 2016	13.6 years (11.6–17.9) in transfemales 14.2 years (11.1–18.6) in transmales
	Vlot et al. 2017	13.5 years (11.5–18.3) in transfemales 15.1 years (11.7–18.6) in transmales
	Age at the start of GnRH analogues was not reported in Staphorsius et al. 2015, but participants were required to be at least 12 years **(VERY LOW)**. **The evidence included showed wide variation in the age (11 to 18 years old) at which children and adolescents with gender dysphoria started GnRH analogues.**	
Duration of treatment	The duration of treatment with GnRH analogues was reported in 3/9 studies. The median duration was: • 2.1 years (range 1.6–2.8) in Brik et al. 2020. • 1.3 years (range 0.5–3.8) in transfemales and 1.5 years (range 0.25–5.2) in transmales in Klink et al. 2015. In Staphorsius et al. 2015, the mean duration was 1.6 years (SD ±1.0). In de Vries et al. 2011, the mean duration of time between starting GnRH analogues and gender-affirming hormones was 1.88 years (SD ±1.05). **The evidence included showed wide variation in the duration of treatment with GnRH analogues, but most studies did not report this information. Treatment duration ranged from a few months up to about 5 years.**	

Abbreviations: DSM, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders criteria; SD, standard deviation.

6. Discussion

A key limitation to identifying the effectiveness and safety of GnRH analogues for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria is the lack of reliable comparative studies. The lack of clear, expected outcomes from treatment with a GnRH analogue (the purpose of which is to suppress secondary sexual characteristics which may cause distress from unwanted pubertal changes) also makes interpreting the evidence difficult. The size of the population with gender dysphoria means conducting a prospective trial may be unrealistic, at least on a single centre basis. There may also be ethical issues with a 'no treatment arm' in comparative trials of GnRH analogues, where there may be poor mental health outcomes if treatment is withheld. However, the use of an active comparator such as close psychological support may reduce ethical concerns in future trials.

The studies included in this evidence review are all small, uncontrolled observational studies, which are subject to bias and confounding, and are of very low certainty as assessed using modified GRADE. All the included studies reported physical and mental health comorbidities and concomitant treatments very poorly. For example, very little data are reported on how many children and adolescents needed additional mental health support, and for what reasons, or whether additional interventions, and what form and duration (for example drug treatment or counselling) that took. This is a possible confounder for the treatment outcomes in the studies because changes in critical and important

outcomes may be attributable to external care rather than the psychological support or GnRH analogues used in the studies.

The studies that reported diagnostic criteria for gender dysphoria (6/9 studies) used the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) criteria in use at the time the study was conducted (either DSM-IV-TR or DSM-V). The definition was unclear in the remaining studies. There was wide variation in the ages at which participants started a GnRH analogue, typically ranging from about 11 to 18 years. Similarly, there was a wide variation in the duration of use, but few studies reported this.

Changes in outcome scores for clinical effectiveness were assessed for statistical significance in the 3 studies reporting these outcomes (Costa et al. 2015; de Vries et al. 2011; Staphorsius et al. 2015). However, there is relatively little interpretation of whether the changes in outcome scores seen in these studies are clinically meaningful.

For some outcomes there was no statistically significant difference from before starting GnRH analogues until just before starting gender-affirming hormones. These were the Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale (UGDS) (which was assessed in 1 study de Vries et al. 2011), the Trait Anger (TPI) and Trait Anxiety (STAI) Scales (which were assessed in 1 study de Vries et al. 2011), and Body Image Scale (BIS) which was assessed in 1 study (de Vries et al. 2011).

The Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II) was used in 1 study (de Vries et al. 2011) to assess change in depression from before starting GnRH analogues to just before starting gender-affirming hormones. The result is statistically significant, with the mean (±SD) BDI-II score decreasing from 8.31 (±7.12) at baseline to 4.95 (±6.27) at follow up (p=0.004). However, both scores fall into the minimal range using the general guidelines for interpretation of BDI-II (0 to 13 minimal, 14 to 19 mild depression, 20 to 28 moderate depression and 29 to 63 severe depression), suggesting that while statistically significant, it is unclear if this is a clinically meaningful change.

Psychosocial outcomes were assessed in 3 studies (Costa et al. 2015; de Vries et al. 2011; Staphorsius et al. 2015) using the Children's Global Assessment Scale (CGAS) and Child Behavior Checklist/Youth Self-Report (CBCL/YSR). The CGAS score was assessed in 2 studies (Costa et al. 2015; de Vries et al. 2011). In de Vries et al. 2011 the mean (±SD) CGAS score statistically significantly increased over time from 70.24 [±10.12] at baseline to 73.90 [±9.63] at follow up. CGAS scores are clinically categorised into 10 categories (10 to 1, 20 to 11 and so on until 100 to 91) and both scores reported were in a single category (71 to 80, no more than slight impairment) suggesting that while statistically significant, it is unclear if this is a clinically meaningful change. The Costa et al. 2015 study does highlight a larger change in CGAS scores from baseline to follow-up (mean [±SD] 58.72 [±11.38] compared with 67.40 [±13.39]), but whether this is clinically meaningful is unclear. The average score moved from the clinical category of 60 to 51 (variable functioning with sporadic difficulties) at baseline to 70 to 61 (some difficulty in a single area, but generally functioning pretty well) at follow up, but the large standard deviations suggest clinically significant overlaps between the scores from baseline to follow-up.

Psychosocial functioning using the CBCL/YSR was assessed in 2 studies (de Vries et al. 2011; Staphorsius et al. 2015). In de Vries et al. 2011 there was a statistically significant reduction in both CBCL and YSR scores from before starting GnRH analogues to just before

starting gender-affirming hormones. The study interpreted the CBCL/YSR with a proportion of adolescents who scored in the clinical range (a T-score above 63), which allows changes in clinically meaningful scores to be assessed, and proportions of adolescents in the clinical range for some CBCL and YSR scores decreased over time. One cross-sectional study (Staphorsius et al. 2015) assessed CBCL scores only, but it was unclear if this was the Total T score, or whether subscales of internalising or externalising scores were also assessed, and whether the results were statistically significant.

The 2 prospective observational studies (Costa et al. 2015; de Vries et al. 2011) are confounded by a number of common factors. Firstly, the single assessment of scores at baseline means it is unclear if scores were stable, already improving or declining before starting treatment. Secondly, in an uncontrolled study any changes in scores from baseline to follow-up could be attributed to a regression-to-mean, for example getting older has been positively associated with maturity and wellbeing. The studies use mean and standard deviations in the descriptive statistics and analyses; however, they do not report testing the normality of data which would support the use of parametric measures. The study by de Vries et al. 2011 used general linear models (regression) to examine between and within group variances (changes in outcomes). In using such models, the data is assumed to be balanced (measured at regular intervals and without missing data), but the large ranges in ages at which participants were assessed and started on various interventions suggests that ascertainment of outcome was unlikely to be regular and missing data was likely. Missing data was handled through listwise deletion (omits those cases with the missing data and analyses the remaining data) which is acceptable if data loss is completely random but for some outcomes where there was incomplete data for individual items this was not random (items were introduced by the authors after the first eligible adolescents had started GnRH analogues). The study provided no detail on whether these assumptions for the modeling were met, they also provided no adequate assessment of whether any regression diagnostics (analysis that seek to assess the validity of a model) or model fit (how much of the variance in outcome is explained by the between and within group variance) were undertaken.

The 2 retrospective observational studies (Brik et al. 2020; Khatchadourian et al. 2014) both only report absolute numbers for each trajectory along with reasons for stopping GnRH analogues. It is difficult to assess outcomes from such single centre studies because there is little comparative data for outcomes from other such services. A lack of any critical or other important outcomes also means the success of the treatment across all the participants is difficult to judge.

Three uncontrolled, observational, retrospective studies provided evidence relating to the effect of GnRH analogues on bone density (Joseph et al. 2019; Klink et al. 2015; Vlot et al. 2017). In all 3 studies, the participants acted as their own controls and change in bone density was determined between starting GnRH analogues and either after 1 and 2 year follow-up timepoints (Joseph et al. 2019) or when gender-affirming hormones were started (Klink et al. 2015 and Vlot et al. 2017). Observational studies such as these can only show an association with GnRH analogues and bone density; they cannot show that GnRH analogues caused any differences in bone density seen. Because there was no comparator group and participants acted as their own controls, it is unclear whether the findings are associated with GnRH analogues or due to changes over time. The authors reported z-scores which allows for comparison with the expected increase in bone density in the

general population. However, because no concomitant treatments or comorbidities were reported it is possible that the findings may not be because of GnRH analogues and there is another way in which the study population differs from the general population.

All the studies are from a limited number of, mainly European, care facilities. They are described as either tertiary referral or expert services but the low number of services providing such care and publishing evidence may bias the results towards the outcomes in these services only and limit extrapolation.

The first study (Brik et al. 2020) was an uncontrolled, retrospective, observational study that assessed the outcome trajectories of adolescents receiving GnRH analogues for gender dysphoria. This study followed-up 143 individuals who had received GnRH analogues (38 transfemales and 105 transmales) using clinical records to show outcomes for up to 9 years (continuing use of GnRH analogues, reasons for stopping GnRH analogues and onward care such as gender-affirming hormone use). The methods and results are well reported, but no analysis of data was undertaken. The views of adolescents and their parents are particularly difficult to interpret because no data on how many responded to each question and in what ways are reported.

The second study (Costa et al. 2015) was an uncontrolled, prospective observational study which assessed global functioning in adolescents with gender dysphoria using CGAS every 6 months, including during the first 6 months where statistically significant improvements were seen without GnRH analogues. The study is confounded by significant unexplained loss to follow-up (64.7%: from n=201 adolescents to n=71 after 18 months). Missing data for those lost to follow-up maybe more than sufficient to change the direction of effects seen in the study if the reasons for loss to follow-up are systematic (such as deriving little or no benefit from treatment). The study uses clustered data in its analysis, a single outcome (CGAS) measured in clusters (at different visits), and the analysis does not take account of the correlation of scores (data at different time points are not independent) as a significant change in scores early in the study means the successive changes measured against baseline were also significant. The study relies on multiple (>20) pairwise independent *t*-tests to examine change in CGAS between the 4 time points, increasing the possibility of type-I error (a false positive which occurs when a researcher incorrectly rejects a true null hypothesis) because the more tests performed the more likely a statistically significant result will be observed by chance alone.

The Costa et al. 2015 study compares immediately eligible and delayed eligible cohorts, however, it is highly likely that they are non-comparable groups because the immediately eligible group were those able to start GnRH analogues straight away whilst those in the delayed eligible group were either not ready to make a decision about starting treatment (no age comparison was made between the 2 groups so it is unclear if they were a younger cohort than the immediately eligible group) or had comorbid mental health or psychological difficulties. The authors report that those with concomitant problems (such as mental health problems, substantial problems with peers, or conflicts with parents or siblings) were referred to local mental health services but no details are provided.

The third study (de Vries et al. 2011) was an uncontrolled, prospective observational study which assessed gender dysphoria and psychological functioning before and after puberty suppression in adolescents with gender dysphoria. Although the study mentions the DSM-IV-TR there is no explicit discussion of this, or any other criteria, being used as the

diagnostic criteria for study entry. There are no details reported for how the outcomes in the study were assessed, and by whom. The length of follow-up for the outcomes in the model are questionable in relation to whether there was sufficient time for GnRH analogues to have a measurable effect. The time points used are start of GnRH analogues and start of gender-affirming hormones. Overall, the mean time between starting GnRH analogues and gender-affirming hormones was 1.88 (±1.05) years, but the range is as low as just 5 months between the 2 time points, which may be insufficient for any difference in outcome to have occurred in some individuals.

The fourth study (Joseph et al. 2019) was a retrospective, longitudinal observational single centre study which assessed bone mineral density in adolescents with gender dysphoria in the UK. For inclusion in the study, participants had to have been assessed by the Gender Identity Development Service multi-disciplinary psychosocial health team for at least 4 assessments over a minimum of 6 months. No other diagnostic criteria, such as the DSM-IV-TR, are discussed. Bone density was assessed using dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DAXA) scan of the lumbar spine (L1-L4) and the femoral neck at baseline (n=70), 1 year (n=70) and 2 years after starting GnRH analogues (n=39). The results suggest a possible association between GnRH analogues and bone mineral apparent density. However, the evidence is of poor quality, and the results could be due to bias or chance. No concomitant treatments or comorbidities were reported.

The fifth study (Khatchadourian et al. 2014) was an uncontrolled retrospective observational study which describes patient characteristics at presentation, treatment, and response to treatment in 84 adolescents with gender dysphoria, of whom 27 received GnRH analogues. The study used clinical records to show outcomes for up to 13 years (continuing use of GnRH analogues, reasons for stopping GnRH analogues and onward care such as gender-affirming hormone use). The methods are well reported but the results for those taking GnRH analogues are poorly and incompletely reported, particularly for transfemales, and no analysis of data was undertaken. It is difficult to assess the results for stopping GnRH analogues due to incomplete reporting of this outcome.

The sixth study (Klink et al. 2015) was a retrospective longitudinal observational single centre study which assessed bone mineral density in adolescents with gender dysphoria, diagnosed with the DSM-IV-TR criteria. Bone density was assessed when starting GnRH analogues and then when starting gender-affirming hormones. Results are reported for transmales and transfemales separately and no results for the whole cohort are given. Statistical analyses were reported for all outcomes of interest but, because there was no comparator group and participants acted as their own controls, it is not known whether the findings are associated with GnRH analogues or due to changes over time. The authors reported z-scores which allows for comparison with the expected increase in bone density in the general population. However, because no concomitant treatments or comorbidities were reported it is possible that the findings may not be because of GnRH analogues and there is another way in which the study population differs from the general population.

The seventh study (Schagen et al. 2016) was a prospective observational study of 116 adolescents which provided very low certainty non-comparative evidence on change in serum creatinine between starting GnRH analogues and 1 year, and liver function during treatment. Statistical analyses were reported for changes in serum creatinine but not for liver function. Because there was no comparator group and participants acted as their own

controls, it is not known whether the findings are associated with GnRH analogues or due to changes over time, or concomitant treatments.

The eighth study (Staphorsius et al. 2015) was a cross-sectional study of 85 adolescents, 40 with gender dysphoria (of whom 20 were receiving GnRH analogues) and 45 matched controls (not further reported in this evidence review). The study includes 1 outcome of interest for clinical effectiveness (CBCL) and 1 outcome of interest for safety (cognitive development or functioning). The mean (±SD) CBCL, IQ test, reaction time and accuracy scores were given for each group, but the statistical analysis is unclear. It is not reported what analysis was used or which of the groups were compared, therefore it is difficult to interpret the results.

The ninth study (Vlot et al. 2017) was a retrospective observational study which assessed bone mineral apparent density in adolescents with DSM-IV-TR gender dysphoria. Measurements were taken at the start of GnRH analogues and at the start of gender-affirming hormones. Results are reported for young bone age and old bone age in transmales and transfemales separately, and no results for the whole cohort are given. Statistical analyses were reported for all outcomes of interest but, because there was no comparator group and participants acted as their own controls, it is not known whether the findings are associated with GnRH analogues or due to changes over time. The authors reported z-scores which allows for comparison with the expected increase in bone density in the general population. However, because no concomitant treatments or comorbidities were reported it is possible that the findings may not be because of GnRH analogues and there is another way in which the study population differs from the general population.

7. Conclusion

The results of the studies that reported impact on the critical outcomes of gender dysphoria and mental health (depression, anger and anxiety), and the important outcomes of body image and psychosocial impact (global and psychosocial functioning) in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria are of very low certainty using modified GRADE. They suggest little change with GnRH analogues from baseline to follow-up.

Studies that found differences in outcomes could represent changes that are either of questionable clinical value, or the studies themselves are not reliable and changes could be due to confounding, bias or chance. It is plausible, however, that a lack of difference in scores from baseline to follow-up is the effect of GnRH analogues in children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, in whom the development of secondary sexual characteristics might be expected to be associated with an increased impact on gender dysphoria, depression, anxiety, anger and distress over time without treatment. One study reported statistically significant reductions in the Child Behaviour Checklist/Youth Self-Report (CBCL/YSR) scores from baseline to follow up, and given that the purpose of GnRH analogues is to reduce distress caused by the development of secondary sexual characteristics and the CBCL/YSR in part measures distress, this could be an important finding. However, as the studies all lack reasonable controls not receiving GnRH analogues, the natural history of the outcomes measured in the studies is not known and any positive changes could be a regression to mean.

The results of the studies that reported bone density outcomes suggest that GnRH analogues may reduce the increase in bone density which is expected during puberty. However, as the studies themselves are not reliable, the results could be due to confounding, bias or chance. While controlled trials may not be possible, comparative studies are needed to understand this association and whether the effects of GnRH analogues on bone density are seen after treatment is stopped. All the studies that reported safety outcomes provided very low certainty evidence.

No cost-effectiveness evidence was found to determine whether or not GnRH analogues are cost-effective for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria.

The results of the studies that reported outcomes for subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, suggest there may be differences between sex assigned at birth males (transfemales) and sex assigned at birth females (transmales).

Appendix A PICO document

The review questions for this evidence review are:

1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?
2. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the short-term and long-term safety of GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?
3. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the cost-effectiveness of GnRH analogues compared to one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention?
4. From the evidence selected, are there any subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria that may derive more (or less) advantage from treatment with GnRH analogues than the wider population of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria?
5. From the evidence selected,
   a) what are the criteria used by the research studies to define gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder and gender incongruence of childhood?
   b) what were the ages at which participants commenced treatment with GnRH analogues?
   c) what was the duration of treatment with GnRH analogues?

PICO table

P – Population and Indication	Children and adolescents aged 18 years or less who have gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder or gender incongruence of childhood as defined by study: The following subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder or gender incongruence of childhood need to be considered: • Sex assigned at birth males. • Sex assigned at birth females. • The duration of gender dysphoria: less than 6 months, 6-24 months, and more than 24 months. • The age of onset of gender dysphoria. • The age at which treatment was initiated. • The age of onset of puberty. • Tanner stage at which treatment was initiated. • Children and adolescents with gender dysphoria who have a pre-existing diagnosis of autistic spectrum disorder. • Children and adolescents with gender dysphoria who had a significant mental health symptom load at diagnosis including anxiety, depression (with or without a history of self-harm and suicidality), suicide attempts, psychosis, personality disorder, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and eating disorders.
I – Intervention	Any GnRH analogue including: triptorelin*; buserelin; histrelin; goserelin (Zoladex); leuprorelin/leuprolide (Prostap); nafarelin.

	* Triptorelin (brand names Gonapeptyl and Decapeptyl) are used in Leeds Hospital, England. The search should include brand names as well as generic names.
C – Comparator(s)	One or a combination of: • Psychological support. • Social transitioning to the gender with which the individual identifies. • No intervention.
O – Outcomes	There are no known minimal clinically important differences and there are no preferred timepoints for the outcome measures selected. **All outcomes should be stratified by:** • The age at which treatment with GnRH analogues was initiated. • The length of treatment with GnRH analogues where possible. **A: Clinical Effectiveness** *Critical to decision making* • **Impact on Gender Dysphoria** This outcome is critical because gender dysphoria in adolescents and children is associated with significant distress and problems functioning. Impact on gender dysphoria may be measured by the Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale. Other measures as reported in studies may be used as an alternative to the stated measure. • **Impact on mental health** Examples of mental health problems include self-harm, thoughts of suicide, suicide attempts, eating disorders, depression/low mood and anxiety. These outcomes are critical because self-harm and thoughts of suicide have the potential to result in significant physical harm and for completed suicides the death of the young person. Disordered eating habits may cause significant morbidity in young people. Depression and anxiety are also critical outcomes because they may impact on social, occupational, or other areas of functioning of children and adolescents. The Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Assessment (CAPA) may be used to measure depression and anxiety. The impact on self-harm and suicidality (ideation and behaviour) may be measured using the Suicide Ideation Questionnaire Junior. Other measures may be used as an alternative to the stated measures. • **Impact on Quality of Life** This outcome is critical because gender dysphoria in children and adolescents may be associated with a significant reduction in health-related quality of life. Quality of Life may be measured by the KINDL questionnaire, Kidscreen 52. Other measures as reported in studies may be used as an alternative to the stated measure. *Important to decision making* • **Impact on body Image** This outcome is important because some transgender young people may desire to take steps to suppress features of their physical appearance associated with their sex assigned at birth or accentuate physical features of their desired gender. The Body Image Scale could be used as a measure. Other measures

	as reported in studies may also be used as an alternative to the stated measure. • **Psychosocial Impact** Examples of psychosocial impact are: coping mechanisms which may impact on substance misuse; family relationships; peer relationships. This outcome is important because gender dysphoria in adolescents and children is associated with internalising and externalising behaviours and emotional and behavioural problems which may impact on social and occupational functioning. The child behavioural check list (CBCL) may be used to measure the impact on psychosocial functioning. Other measures as reported in studies may be used as an alternative to the stated measure. • **Engagement with health care services** This outcome is important because patient engagement with healthcare services will impact on their clinical outcomes. Engagement with health care services may be measured using the Youth Health Care measure-satisfaction, utilization, and needs (YHC-SUN) questionnaire. Loss to follow up should also be ascertained as part of this outcome. Alternative measures to the YHC-SUN questionnaire may be used as reported in studies. • **Transitioning surgery – Impact on extent of and satisfaction with surgery** This outcome is important because some children and adolescents with gender dysphoria may proceed to transitioning surgery. Stated measures of the extent of transitioning surgery and satisfaction with surgery in studies may be reported. • **Stopping treatment** The proportion of patients who stop treatment with GnRH analogues and the reasons why. This outcome is important to patients because there is uncertainty about the short- and long-term safety and adverse effects of GnRH analogues in children and adolescents being treated for gender dysphoria. **B: Safety** • Short and long-term safety and adverse effects of taking GnRH analogues are important because GnRH analogues are not licensed for the treatment of adolescents and children with gender dysphoria. Aspects to be reported on should include: o Impact of the drug use such as its impact on bone density, arterial hypertension, cognitive development/functioning o Impact of withdrawing the drug such as, slipped upper femoral epiphysis, reversibility on the reproductive system, and any others as reported. **C: Cost effectiveness** Cost effectiveness studies should be reported.
Inclusion criteria	
Study design	Systematic reviews, randomised controlled trials, controlled clinical trials, cohort studies. If no higher level quality evidence is found, case series can be considered.

Language	English only
Patients	Human studies only
Age	18 years or less
Date limits	2000-2020
Exclusion criteria	
Publication type	Conference abstracts, non-systematic reviews, narrative reviews, commentaries, letters, editorials, guidelines and pre-publication prints
Study design	Case reports, resource utilisation studies

Appendix B Search strategy

Medline, Embase, the Cochrane Library, HTA and APA PsycInfo were searched on 23 July 2020, limiting the search to papers published in English language in the last 20 years. Conference abstracts and letters were excluded.

Database: Medline
Platform: Ovid
Version: Ovid MEDLINE(R) <1946 to July 21, 2020>
Search date: 23/7/2020
Number of results retrieved: 144
Search strategy:

1 Gender Dysphoria/ (485)
2 Gender Identity/ (18452)
3 "Sexual and Gender Disorders"/ (75)
4 Transsexualism/ (3758)
5 Transgender Persons/ (3143)
6 Health Services for Transgender Persons/ (136)
7 exp Sex Reassignment Procedures/ (836)
8 (gender* adj3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongruen* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*)).tw. (7435)
9 (transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*).tw. (12678)
10 (trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*).tw. (102343)
11 ((sex or gender*) adj3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*)).tw. (6974)
12 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m).tw. (114841)
13 or/1-12 (252702)
14 exp Infant/ or Infant Health/ or Infant Welfare/ (1137479)
15 (prematur* or pre-matur* or preterm* or pre-term* or infan* or newborn* or new-born* or perinat* or peri-nat* or neonat* or neo-nat* or baby* or babies or toddler*).ti,ab,in,jn. (852400)
16 exp Child/ or exp Child Behavior/ or Child Health/ or Child Welfare/ (1913257)

17 Minors/ (2574)
18 (child* or minor or minors or boy* or girl* or kid or kids or young*).ti,ab,in,jn. (2361686)
19 exp pediatrics/ (58118)
20 (pediatric* or paediatric* or peadiatric*).ti,ab,in,jn. (836269)
21 Adolescent/ or Adolescent Behavior/ or Adolescent Health/ (2024207)
22 Puberty/ (13278)
23 (adolescen* or pubescen* or prepubescen* or pre-pubescen* or pubert* or prepubert* or pre-pubert* or teen* or preteen* or pre-teen* or juvenil* or youth* or under*age*).ti,ab,in,jn. (424246)
24 Schools/ (38104)
25 Child Day Care Centers/ or exp Nurseries/ or Schools, Nursery/ (7199)
26 (pre-school* or preschool* or kindergar* or daycare or day-care or nurser* or school* or pupil* or student*).ti,ab,jn. (468992)
27 (("eight" or "nine" or "ten" or "eleven" or "twelve" or "thirteen" or "fourteen" or "fifteen" or "sixteen" or "seventeen" or "eighteen" or "nineteen") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (89353)
28 (("8" or "9" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "15" or "16" or "17" or "18" or "19") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (887838)
29 or/14-28 (5534171)
30 13 and 29 (79263)
31 (transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*).tw. (7)
32 30 or 31 (79263)
33 Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone/ (27588)
34 (pubert* adj3 block*).ti,ab. (78)
35 ((gonadotrophin or gonadotropin) and releasing).ti,ab. (17299)
36 (GnRH adj2 analog*).ti,ab. (2541)
37 GnRH*.ti,ab. (20991)
38 "GnRH agonist*".ti,ab. (4040)
39 Triptorelin Pamoate/ (1906)
40 triptorelin.ti,ab. (677)
41 arvekap.ti,ab. (1)
42 ("AY 25650" or AY25650).ti,ab. (1)
43 ("BIM 21003" or BIM21003).ti,ab. (0)
44 ("BN 52014" or BN52014).ti,ab. (0)
45 ("CL 118532" or CL118532).ti,ab. (0)
46 Debio.ti,ab. (83)
47 diphereline.ti,ab. (17)
48 moapar.ti,ab. (0)
49 pamorelin.ti,ab. (0)
50 trelstar.ti,ab. (3)
51 triptodur.ti,ab. (1)
52 ("WY 42422" or WY42422).ti,ab. (0)
53 ("WY 42462" or WY42462).ti,ab. (0)
54 gonapeptyl.ti,ab. (0)
55 decapeptyl.ti,ab. (210)
56 salvacyl.ti,ab. (0)
57 Buserelin/ (2119)
58 buserelin.ti,ab. (1304)

59 bigonist.ti,ab. (0)
60 ("hoe 766" or hoe-766 or hoe766).ti,ab. (69)
61 profact.ti,ab. (2)
62 receptal.ti,ab. (30)
63 suprecur.ti,ab. (4)
64 suprefact.ti,ab. (22)
65 tiloryth.ti,ab. (0)
66 histrelin.ti,ab. (55)
67 "LHRH-hydrogel implant".ti,ab. (1)
68 ("RL 0903" or RL0903).ti,ab. (1)
69 ("SPD 424" or SPD424).ti,ab. (1)
70 goserelin.ti,ab. (875)
71 Goserelin/ (1612)
72 ("ici 118630" or ici118630).ti,ab. (51)
73 ("ZD-9393" or ZD9393).ti,ab. (0)
74 zoladex.ti,ab. (379)
75 leuprorelin.ti,ab. (413)
76 carcinil.ti,ab. (0)
77 enanton*.ti,ab. (23)
78 ginecrin.ti,ab. (0)
79 leuplin.ti,ab. (13)
80 Leuprolide/ (2900)
81 leuprolide.ti,ab. (1743)
82 lucrin.ti,ab. (11)
83 lupron.ti,ab. (162)
84 provren.ti,ab. (0)
85 procrin.ti,ab. (3)
86 ("tap 144" or tap144).ti,ab. (40)
87 (a-43818 or a43818).ti,ab. (3)
88 Trenantone.ti,ab. (1)
89 staladex.ti,ab. (0)
90 prostap.ti,ab. (6)
91 Nafarelin/ (327)
92 nafarelin.ti,ab. (251)
93 ("76932-56-4" or "76932564").ti,ab. (0)
94 ("76932-60-0" or "76932600").ti,ab. (0)
95 ("86220-42-0" or "86220420").ti,ab. (0)
96 ("rs 94991 298" or rs94991298).ti,ab. (0)
97 synarel.ti,ab. (12)
98 deslorelin.ti,ab. (263)
99 gonadorelin.ti,ab. (201)
100 ("33515-09-2" or "33515092").ti,ab. (0)
101 ("51952-41-1" or "51952411").ti,ab. (0)
102 ("52699-48-6" or "52699486").ti,ab. (0)
103 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (463)
104 cetrotide.ti,ab. (41)
105 ("NS 75A" or NS75A).ti,ab. (0)
106 ("NS 75B" or NS75B).ti,ab. (0)

107 ("SB 075" or SB075).ti,ab. (0)
108 ("SB 75" or SB75).ti,ab. (63)
109 gonadoliberin.ti,ab. (143)
110 kryptocur.ti,ab. (6)
111 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (463)
112 cetrotide.ti,ab. (41)
113 antagon.ti,ab. (17)
114 ganirelix.ti,ab. (138)
115 ("ORG 37462" or ORG37462).ti,ab. (3)
116 orgalutran.ti,ab. (20)
117 ("RS 26306" or RS26306).ti,ab. (5)
118 ("AY 24031" or AY24031).ti,ab. (0)
119 factrel.ti,ab. (11)
120 fertagyl.ti,ab. (11)
121 lutrelef.ti,ab. (5)
122 lutrepulse.ti,ab. (3)
123 relefact.ti,ab. (10)
124 fertiral.ti,ab. (0)
125 (hoe471 or "hoe 471").ti,ab. (6)
126 relisorm.ti,ab. (4)
127 cystorelin.ti,ab. (18)
128 dirigestran.ti,ab. (5)
129 or/33-128 (42216)
130 32 and 129 (416)
131 limit 130 to english language (393)
132 limit 131 to (letter or historical article or comment or editorial or news or case reports) (36)
133 131 not 132 (357)
134 animals/ not humans/ (4686361)
135 133 not 134 (181)
136 limit 135 to yr="2000 -Current" (144)

Database: Medline in-process
Platform: Ovid
Version: Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations <1946 to July 21, 2020>
Search date: 23/7/2020
Number of results retrieved:
Search strategy: 42

1 Gender Dysphoria/ (0)
2 Gender Identity/ (0)
3 "Sexual and Gender Disorders"/ (0)
4 Transsexualism/ (0)
5 Transgender Persons/ (0)
6 Health Services for Transgender Persons/ (0)
7 exp Sex Reassignment Procedures/ (0)

8 (gender* adj3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongruen* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*)).tw. (1645)
9 (transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*).tw. (2333)
10 (trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*).tw. (20884)
11 ((sex or gender*) adj3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*)).tw. (968)
12 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m).tw. (15513)
13 or/1-12 (39905)
14 exp Infant/ or Infant Health/ or Infant Welfare/ (0)
15 (prematur* or pre-matur* or preterm* or pre-term* or infan* or newborn* or new-born* or perinat* or peri-nat* or neonat* or neo-nat* or baby* or babies or toddler*).ti,ab,in,jn. (80723)
16 exp Child/ or exp Child Behavior/ or Child Health/ or Child Welfare/ (0)
17 Minors/ (0)
18 (child* or minor or minors or boy* or girl* or kid or kids or young*).ti,ab,in,jn. (321871)
19 exp pediatrics/ (0)
20 (pediatric* or paediatric* or peadiatric*).ti,ab,in,jn. (119783)
21 Adolescent/ or Adolescent Behavior/ or Adolescent Health/ (0)
22 Puberty/ (0)
23 (adolescen* or pubescen* or prepubescen* or pre-pubescen* or pubert* or prepubert* or pre-pubert* or teen* or preteen* or pre-teen* or juvenil* or youth* or under*age*).ti,ab,in,jn. (60264)
24 Schools/ (0)
25 Child Day Care Centers/ or exp Nurseries/ or Schools, Nursery/ (0)
26 (pre-school* or preschool* or kindergar* or daycare or day-care or nurser* or school* or pupil* or student*).ti,ab,jn. (69233)
27 (("eight" or "nine" or "ten" or "eleven" or "twelve" or "thirteen" or "fourteen" or "fifteen" or "sixteen" or "seventeen" or "eighteen" or "nineteen") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (10319)
28 (("8" or "9" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "15" or "16" or "17" or "18" or "19") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (112800)
29 or/14-28 (525529)
30 13 and 29 (9196)
31 (transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*).tw. (3)
32 30 or 31 (9197)
33 Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone/ (0)
34 (pubert* adj3 block*).ti,ab. (19)
35 ((gonadotrophin or gonadotropin) and releasing).ti,ab. (1425)
36 (GnRH adj2 analog*).ti,ab. (183)
37 GnRH*.ti,ab. (1695)
38 "GnRH agonist*".ti,ab. (379)
39 Triptorelin Pamoate/ (0)
40 triptorelin.ti,ab. (72)
41 arvekap.ti,ab. (0)
42 ("AY 25650" or AY25650).ti,ab. (0)
43 ("BIM 21003" or BIM21003).ti,ab. (0)
44 ("BN 52014" or BN52014).ti,ab. (0)
45 ("CL 118532" or CL118532).ti,ab. (0)

46 Debio.ti,ab. (11)
47 diphereline.ti,ab. (6)
48 moapar.ti,ab. (0)
49 pamorelin.ti,ab. (0)
50 trelstar.ti,ab. (0)
51 triptodur.ti,ab. (0)
52 ("WY 42422" or WY42422).ti,ab. (0)
53 ("WY 42462" or WY42462).ti,ab. (0)
54 gonapeptyl.ti,ab. (0)
55 decapeptyl.ti,ab. (8)
56 salvacyl.ti,ab. (0)
57 Buserelin/ (0)
58 buserelin.ti,ab. (59)
59 bigonist.ti,ab. (0)
60 ("hoe 766" or hoe-766 or hoe766).ti,ab. (3)
61 profact.ti,ab. (0)
62 receptal.ti,ab. (0)
63 suprecur.ti,ab. (1)
64 suprefact.ti,ab. (2)
65 tiloryth.ti,ab. (0)
66 histrelin.ti,ab. (9)
67 "LHRH-hydrogel implant".ti,ab. (0)
68 ("RL 0903" or RL0903).ti,ab. (0)
69 ("SPD 424" or SPD424).ti,ab. (0)
70 goserelin.ti,ab. (68)
71 Goserelin/ (0)
72 ("ici 118630" or ici118630).ti,ab. (0)
73 ("ZD-9393" or ZD9393).ti,ab. (0)
74 zoladex.ti,ab. (6)
75 leuprorelin.ti,ab. (47)
76 carcinil.ti,ab. (0)
77 enanton*.ti,ab. (1)
78 ginecrin.ti,ab. (0)
79 leuplin.ti,ab. (1)
80 Leuprolide/ (0)
81 leuprolide.ti,ab. (121)
82 lucrin.ti,ab. (4)
83 lupron.ti,ab. (10)
84 provren.ti,ab. (0)
85 procrin.ti,ab. (0)
86 ("tap 144" or tap144).ti,ab. (0)
87 (a-43818 or a43818).ti,ab. (0)
88 Trenantone.ti,ab. (1)
89 staladex.ti,ab. (0)
90 prostap.ti,ab. (0)
91 Nafarelin/ (0)
92 nafarelin.ti,ab. (5)
93 ("76932-56-4" or "76932564").ti,ab. (0)

94 ("76932-60-0" or "76932600").ti,ab. (0)
95 ("86220-42-0" or "86220420").ti,ab. (0)
96 ("rs 94991 298" or rs94991298).ti,ab. (0)
97 synarel.ti,ab. (0)
98 deslorelin.ti,ab. (14)
99 gonadorelin.ti,ab. (13)
100 ("33515-09-2" or "33515092").ti,ab. (0)
101 ("51952-41-1" or "51952411").ti,ab. (0)
102 ("52699-48-6" or "52699486").ti,ab. (0)
103 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (31)
104 cetrotide.ti,ab. (5)
105 ("NS 75A" or NS75A).ti,ab. (0)
106 ("NS 75B" or NS75B).ti,ab. (0)
107 ("SB 075" or SB075).ti,ab. (0)
108 ("SB 75" or SB75).ti,ab. (2)
109 gonadoliberin.ti,ab. (4)
110 kryptocur.ti,ab. (1)
111 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (31)
112 cetrotide.ti,ab. (5)
113 antagon.ti,ab. (0)
114 ganirelix.ti,ab. (8)
115 ("ORG 37462" or ORG37462).ti,ab. (0)
116 orgalutran.ti,ab. (3)
117 ("RS 26306" or RS26306).ti,ab. (0)
118 ("AY 24031" or AY24031).ti,ab. (0)
119 factrel.ti,ab. (2)
120 fertagyl.ti,ab. (1)
121 lutrelef.ti,ab. (0)
122 lutrepulse.ti,ab. (0)
123 relefact.ti,ab. (0)
124 fertiral.ti,ab. (0)
125 (hoe471 or "hoe 471").ti,ab. (0)
126 relisorm.ti,ab. (0)
127 cystorelin.ti,ab. (1)
128 dirigestran.ti,ab. (0)
129 or/33-128 (2332)
130 32 and 129 (45)
131 limit 130 to english language (45)
132 limit 131 to yr="2000 -Current" (42)

Database: Medline epubs ahead of print
Platform: Ovid
Version: Ovid MEDLINE(R) Epub Ahead of Print <July 21, 2020>
Search date: 23/7/2020
Number of results retrieved: 8
Search strategy:

1 Gender Dysphoria/ (0)

2 Gender Identity/ (0)
3 "Sexual and Gender Disorders"/ (0)
4 Transsexualism/ (0)
5 Transgender Persons/ (0)
6 Health Services for Transgender Persons/ (0)
7 exp Sex Reassignment Procedures/ (0)
8 (gender* adj3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongruen* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*)).tw. (486)
9 (transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*).tw. (640)
10 (trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*).tw. (1505)
11 ((sex or gender*) adj3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*)).tw. (178)
12 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m).tw. (2480)
13 or/1-12 (4929)
14 exp Infant/ or Infant Health/ or Infant Welfare/ (0)
15 (prematur* or pre-matur* or preterm* or pre-term* or infan* or newborn* or new-born* or perinat* or peri-nat* or neonat* or neo-nat* or baby* or babies or toddler*).ti,ab,in,jn. (15496)
16 exp Child/ or exp Child Behavior/ or Child Health/ or Child Welfare/ (0)
17 Minors/ (0)
18 (child* or minor or minors or boy* or girl* or kid or kids or young*).ti,ab,in,jn. (53563)
19 exp pediatrics/ (0)
20 (pediatric* or paediatric* or peadiatric*).ti,ab,in,jn. (22796)
21 Adolescent/ or Adolescent Behavior/ or Adolescent Health/ (0)
22 Puberty/ (0)
23 (adolescen* or pubescen* or prepubescen* or pre-pubescen* or pubert* or prepubert* or pre-pubert* or teen* or preteen* or pre-teen* or juvenil* or youth* or under*age*).ti,ab,in,jn. (13087)
24 Schools/ (0)
25 Child Day Care Centers/ or exp Nurseries/ or Schools, Nursery/ (0)
26 (pre-school* or preschool* or kindergar* or daycare or day-care or nurser* or school* or pupil* or student*).ti,ab,jn. (12443)
27 (("eight" or "nine" or "ten" or "eleven" or "twelve" or "thirteen" or "fourteen" or "fifteen" or "sixteen" or "seventeen" or "eighteen" or "nineteen") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (1416)
28 (("8" or "9" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "15" or "16" or "17" or "18" or "19") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (20166)
29 or/14-28 (88366)
30 13 and 29 (1638)
31 (transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*).tw. (1)
32 30 or 31 (1638)
33 Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone/ (0)
34 (pubert* adj3 block*).ti,ab. (2)
35 ((gonadotrophin or gonadotropin) and releasing).ti,ab. (176)
36 (GnRH adj2 analog*).ti,ab. (30)
37 GnRH*.ti,ab. (223)
38 "GnRH agonist*".ti,ab. (49)
39 Triptorelin Pamoate/ (0)

40 triptorelin.ti,ab. (12)
41 arvekap.ti,ab. (0)
42 ("AY 25650" or AY25650).ti,ab. (0)
43 ("BIM 21003" or BIM21003).ti,ab. (0)
44 ("BN 52014" or BN52014).ti,ab. (0)
45 ("CL 118532" or CL118532).ti,ab. (0)
46 Debio.ti,ab. (2)
47 diphereline.ti,ab. (1)
48 moapar.ti,ab. (0)
49 pamorelin.ti,ab. (0)
50 trelstar.ti,ab. (0)
51 triptodur.ti,ab. (0)
52 ("WY 42422" or WY42422).ti,ab. (0)
53 ("WY 42462" or WY42462).ti,ab. (0)
54 gonapeptyl.ti,ab. (0)
55 decapeptyl.ti,ab. (0)
56 salvacyl.ti,ab. (0)
57 Buserelin/ (0)
58 buserelin.ti,ab. (7)
59 bigonist.ti,ab. (0)
60 ("hoe 766" or hoe-766 or hoe766).ti,ab. (0)
61 profact.ti,ab. (0)
62 receptal.ti,ab. (0)
63 suprecur.ti,ab. (0)
64 suprefact.ti,ab. (1)
65 tiloryth.ti,ab. (0)
66 histrelin.ti,ab. (2)
67 "LHRH-hydrogel implant".ti,ab. (0)
68 ("RL 0903" or RL0903).ti,ab. (0)
69 ("SPD 424" or SPD424).ti,ab. (0)
70 goserelin.ti,ab. (11)
71 Goserelin/ (0)
72 ("ici 118630" or ici118630).ti,ab. (0)
73 ("ZD-9393" or ZD9393).ti,ab. (0)
74 zoladex.ti,ab. (1)
75 leuprorelin.ti,ab. (13)
76 carcinil.ti,ab. (0)
77 enanton*.ti,ab. (1)
78 ginecrin.ti,ab. (0)
79 leuplin.ti,ab. (0)
80 Leuprolide/ (0)
81 leuprolide.ti,ab. (22)
82 lucrin.ti,ab. (0)
83 lupron.ti,ab. (2)
84 provren.ti,ab. (0)
85 procrin.ti,ab. (0)
86 ("tap 144" or tap144).ti,ab. (1)
87 (a-43818 or a43818).ti,ab. (0)

88 Trenantone.ti,ab. (0)
89 staladex.ti,ab. (0)
90 prostap.ti,ab. (0)
91 Nafarelin/ (0)
92 nafarelin.ti,ab. (4)
93 ("76932-56-4" or "76932564").ti,ab. (0)
94 ("76932-60-0" or "76932600").ti,ab. (0)
95 ("86220-42-0" or "86220420").ti,ab. (0)
96 ("rs 94991 298" or rs94991298).ti,ab. (0)
97 synarel.ti,ab. (0)
98 deslorelin.ti,ab. (3)
99 gonadorelin.ti,ab. (3)
100 ("33515-09-2" or "33515092").ti,ab. (0)
101 ("51952-41-1" or "51952411").ti,ab. (0)
102 ("52699-48-6" or "52699486").ti,ab. (0)
103 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (6)
104 cetrotide.ti,ab. (2)
105 ("NS 75A" or NS75A).ti,ab. (0)
106 ("NS 75B" or NS75B).ti,ab. (0)
107 ("SB 075" or SB075).ti,ab. (0)
108 ("SB 75" or SB75).ti,ab. (0)
109 gonadoliberin.ti,ab. (0)
110 kryptocur.ti,ab. (0)
111 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (6)
112 cetrotide.ti,ab. (2)
113 antagon.ti,ab. (1)
114 ganirelix.ti,ab. (1)
115 ("ORG 37462" or ORG37462).ti,ab. (0)
116 orgalutran.ti,ab. (0)
117 ("RS 26306" or RS26306).ti,ab. (0)
118 ("AY 24031" or AY24031).ti,ab. (0)
119 factrel.ti,ab. (0)
120 fertagyl.ti,ab. (0)
121 lutrelef.ti,ab. (0)
122 lutrepulse.ti,ab. (0)
123 relefact.ti,ab. (0)
124 fertiral.ti,ab. (0)
125 (hoe471 or "hoe 471").ti,ab. (0)
126 relisorm.ti,ab. (0)
127 cystorelin.ti,ab. (0)
128 dirigestran.ti,ab. (0)
129 or/33-128 (310)
130 32 and 129 (8)
131 limit 130 to english language (8)
132 limit 131 to yr="2000 -Current" (8)

Database: Medline daily update
Platform: Ovid

Version: Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily Update <July 21, 2020>
Search date: 23/7/2020
Number of results retrieved: 1
Search strategy

1 Gender Dysphoria/ (4)
2 Gender Identity/ (38)
3 "Sexual and Gender Disorders"/ (0)
4 Transsexualism/ (2)
5 Transgender Persons/ (26)
6 Health Services for Transgender Persons/ (1)
7 exp Sex Reassignment Procedures/ (3)
8 (gender* adj3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongruen* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*)).tw. (24)
9 (transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*).tw. (39)
10 (trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*).tw. (87)
11 ((sex or gender*) adj3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*)).tw. (15)
12 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m).tw. (181)
13 or/1-12 (358)
14 exp Infant/ or Infant Health/ or Infant Welfare/ (932)
15 (prematur* or pre-matur* or preterm* or pre-term* or infan* or newborn* or new-born* or perinat* or peri-nat* or neonat* or neo-nat* or baby* or babies or toddler*).ti,ab,in,jn. (981)
16 exp Child/ or exp Child Behavior/ or Child Health/ or Child Welfare/ (1756)
17 Minors/ (3)
18 (child* or minor or minors or boy* or girl* or kid or kids or young*).ti,ab,in,jn. (3672)
19 exp pediatrics/ (75)
20 (pediatric* or paediatric* or peadiatric*).ti,ab,in,jn. (1658)
21 Adolescent/ or Adolescent Behavior/ or Adolescent Health/ (2006)
22 Puberty/ (8)
23 (adolescen* or pubescen* or prepubescen* or pre-pubescen* or pubert* or prepubert* or pre-pubert* or teen* or preteen* or pre-teen* or juvenil* or youth* or under*age*).ti,ab,in,jn. (732)
24 Schools/ (56)
25 Child Day Care Centers/ or exp Nurseries/ or Schools, Nursery/ (5)
26 (pre-school* or preschool* or kindergar* or daycare or day-care or nurser* or school* or pupil* or student*).ti,ab,jn. (622)
27 (("eight" or "nine" or "ten" or "eleven" or "twelve" or "thirteen" or "fourteen" or "fifteen" or "sixteen" or "seventeen" or "eighteen" or "nineteen") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (98)
28 (("8" or "9" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "15" or "16" or "17" or "18" or "19") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (1301)
29 or/14-28 (6705)
30 13 and 29 (130)
31 (transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*).tw. (0)
32 30 or 31 (130)
33 Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone/ (11)

34 (pubert* adj3 block*).ti,ab. (0)
35 ((gonadotrophin or gonadotropin) and releasing).ti,ab. (10)
36 (GnRH adj2 analog*).ti,ab. (2)
37 GnRH*.ti,ab. (14)
38 "GnRH agonist*".ti,ab. (4)
39 Triptorelin Pamoate/ (1)
40 triptorelin.ti,ab. (1)
41 arvekap.ti,ab. (0)
42 ("AY 25650" or AY25650).ti,ab. (0)
43 ("BIM 21003" or BIM21003).ti,ab. (0)
44 ("BN 52014" or BN52014).ti,ab. (0)
45 ("CL 118532" or CL118532).ti,ab. (0)
46 Debio.ti,ab. (1)
47 diphereline.ti,ab. (0)
48 moapar.ti,ab. (0)
49 pamorelin.ti,ab. (0)
50 trelstar.ti,ab. (0)
51 triptodur.ti,ab. (0)
52 ("WY 42422" or WY42422).ti,ab. (0)
53 ("WY 42462" or WY42462).ti,ab. (0)
54 gonapeptyl.ti,ab. (0)
55 decapeptyl.ti,ab. (0)
56 salvacyl.ti,ab. (0)
57 Buserelin/ (0)
58 buserelin.ti,ab. (0)
59 bigonist.ti,ab. (0)
60 ("hoe 766" or hoe-766 or hoe766).ti,ab. (0)
61 profact.ti,ab. (0)
62 receptal.ti,ab. (0)
63 suprecur.ti,ab. (0)
64 suprefact.ti,ab. (0)
65 tiloryth.ti,ab. (0)
66 histrelin.ti,ab. (0)
67 "LHRH-hydrogel implant".ti,ab. (0)
68 ("RL 0903" or RL0903).ti,ab. (0)
69 ("SPD 424" or SPD424).ti,ab. (0)
70 goserelin.ti,ab. (1)
71 Goserelin/ (2)
72 ("ici 118630" or ici118630).ti,ab. (0)
73 ("ZD-9393" or ZD9393).ti,ab. (0)
74 zoladex.ti,ab. (0)
75 leuprorelin.ti,ab. (0)
76 carcinil.ti,ab. (0)
77 enanton*.ti,ab. (0)
78 ginecrin.ti,ab. (0)
79 leuplin.ti,ab. (0)
80 Leuprolide/ (0)
81 leuprolide.ti,ab. (0)

82 lucrin.ti,ab. (0)
83 lupron.ti,ab. (0)
84 provren.ti,ab. (0)
85 procrin.ti,ab. (0)
86 ("tap 144" or tap144).ti,ab. (0)
87 (a-43818 or a43818).ti,ab. (0)
88 Trenantone.ti,ab. (0)
89 staladex.ti,ab. (0)
90 prostap.ti,ab. (0)
91 Nafarelin/ (0)
92 nafarelin.ti,ab. (0)
93 ("76932-56-4" or "76932564").ti,ab. (0)
94 ("76932-60-0" or "76932600").ti,ab. (0)
95 ("86220-42-0" or "86220420").ti,ab. (0)
96 ("rs 94991 298" or rs94991298).ti,ab. (0)
97 synarel.ti,ab. (0)
98 deslorelin.ti,ab. (0)
99 gonadorelin.ti,ab. (0)
100 ("33515-09-2" or "33515092").ti,ab. (0)
101 ("51952-41-1" or "51952411").ti,ab. (0)
102 ("52699-48-6" or "52699486").ti,ab. (0)
103 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (0)
104 cetrotide.ti,ab. (0)
105 ("NS 75A" or NS75A).ti,ab. (0)
106 ("NS 75B" or NS75B).ti,ab. (0)
107 ("SB 075" or SB075).ti,ab. (0)
108 ("SB 75" or SB75).ti,ab. (0)
109 gonadoliberin.ti,ab. (0)
110 kryptocur.ti,ab. (0)
111 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (0)
112 cetrotide.ti,ab. (0)
113 antagon.ti,ab. (0)
114 ganirelix.ti,ab. (0)
115 ("ORG 37462" or ORG37462).ti,ab. (0)
116 orgalutran.ti,ab. (0)
117 ("RS 26306" or RS26306).ti,ab. (0)
118 ("AY 24031" or AY24031).ti,ab. (0)
119 factrel.ti,ab. (0)
120 fertagyl.ti,ab. (0)
121 lutrelef.ti,ab. (0)
122 lutrepulse.ti,ab. (0)
123 relefact.ti,ab. (0)
124 fertiral.ti,ab. (0)
125 (hoe471 or "hoe 471").ti,ab. (0)
126 relisorm.ti,ab. (0)
127 cystorelin.ti,ab. (0)
128 dirigestran.ti,ab. (0)
129 or/33-128 (23)

130 32 and 129 (1)
131 limit 130 to english language (1)
132 limit 131 to yr="2000 -Current" (1)

Database: Embase
Platform: Ovid
Version: Embase <1974 to 2020 July 22>
Search date: 23/7/2020
Number of results retrieved: 367
Search strategy:

1 exp Gender Dysphoria/ (5399)
2 Gender Identity/ (16820)
3 "Sexual and Gender Disorders"/ (24689)
4 Transsexualism/ (3869)
5 exp Transgender/ (6597)
6 Health Services for Transgender Persons/ (158848)
7 exp Sex Reassignment Procedures/ or sex transformation/ (3058)
8 (gender* adj3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongru* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*)).tw. (13005)
9 (transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*).tw. (22509)
10 (trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*).tw. (154446)
11 ((sex or gender*) adj3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*)).tw. (10327)
12 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m).tw. (200166)
13 or/1-12 (582812)
14 exp juvenile/ or Child Behavior/ or Child Welfare/ or Child Health/ or infant welfare/ or "minor (person)"/ or elementary student/ (3437324)
15 (prematur* or pre-matur* or preterm* or pre-term* or infan* or newborn* or new-born* or perinat* or peri-nat* or neonat* or neo-nat* or baby* or babies or toddler*).ti,ab,in,jn. (1186161)
16 (child* or minor or minors or boy* or girl* or kid or kids or young*).ti,ab,in,jn. (3586795)
17 exp pediatrics/ (106214)
18 (pediatric* or paediatric* or peadiatric*).ti,ab,in,jn. (1491597)
19 exp adolescence/ or exp adolescent behavior/ or adolescent health/ or high school student/ or middle school student/ (105108)
20 (adolescen* or pubescen* or prepubescen* or pre-pubescen* or pubert* or prepubert* or pre-pubert* or teen* or preteen* or pre-teen* or juvenil* or youth* or under*age*).ti,ab,in,jn. (641660)
21 school/ or high school/ or kindergarten/ or middle school/ or primary school/ or nursery school/ or day care/ (103791)
22 (pre-school* or preschool* or kindergar* or daycare or day-care or nurser* or school* or pupil* or student*).ti,ab,jn. (687437)
23 (("eight" or "nine" or "ten" or "eleven" or "twelve" or "thirteen" or "fourteen" or "fifteen" or "sixteen" or "seventeen" or "eighteen" or "nineteen") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (138908)
24 (("8" or "9" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "15" or "16" or "17" or "18" or "19") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (1562903)

25 or/14-24 (7130881)
26 13 and 25 (182161)
27 (transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*).tw. (17)
28 26 or 27 (182161)
29 gonadorelin/ (37580)
30 (pubert* adj3 block*).ti,ab. (142)
31 ((gonadotrophin or gonadotropin) and releasing).ti,ab. (21450)
32 (GnRH adj2 analog*).ti,ab. (4013)
33 GnRH*.ti,ab. (29862)
34 "GnRH agonist*".ti,ab. (6719)
35 exp gonadorelin agonist/ or gonadorelin derivative/ or gonadorelin acetate/ (23304)
36 Triptorelin/ (5427)
37 triptorelin.ti,ab. (1182)
38 arvekap.ti,ab. (3)
39 ("AY 25650" or AY25650).ti,ab. (1)
40 ("BIM 21003" or BIM21003).ti,ab. (0)
41 ("BN 52014" or BN52014).ti,ab. (0)
42 ("CL 118532" or CL118532).ti,ab. (0)
43 Debio.ti,ab. (185)
44 diphereline.ti,ab. (51)
45 moapar.ti,ab. (0)
46 pamorelin.ti,ab. (0)
47 trelstar.ti,ab. (5)
48 triptodur.ti,ab. (1)
49 ("WY 42422" or WY42422).ti,ab. (0)
50 ("WY 42462" or WY42462).ti,ab. (0)
51 gonapeptyl.ti,ab. (10)
52 decapeptyl.ti,ab. (307)
53 salvacyl.ti,ab. (1)
54 buserelin acetate/ or buserelin/ (5164)
55 buserelin.ti,ab. (1604)
56 bigonist.ti,ab. (1)
57 ("hoe 766" or hoe-766 or hoe766).ti,ab. (89)
58 profact.ti,ab. (4)
59 receptal.ti,ab. (37)
60 suprecur.ti,ab. (8)
61 suprefact.ti,ab. (30)
62 tiloryth.ti,ab. (0)
63 histrelin/ (446)
64 histrelin.ti,ab. (107)
65 "LHRH-hydrogel implant".ti,ab. (1)
66 ("RL 0903" or RL0903).ti,ab. (1)
67 ("SPD 424" or SPD424).ti,ab. (1)
68 goserelin.ti,ab. (1487)
69 Goserelin/ (7128)
70 ("ici 118630" or ici118630).ti,ab. (49)
71 ("ZD-9393" or ZD9393).ti,ab. (0)

72 zoladex.ti,ab. (501)
73 leuprorelin/ (11312)
74 leuprorelin.ti,ab. (727)
75 carcinil.ti,ab. (0)
76 enanton*.ti,ab. (38)
77 ginecrin.ti,ab. (1)
78 leuplin.ti,ab. (26)
79 leuprolide.ti,ab. (2788)
80 lucrin.ti,ab. (47)
81 lupron.ti,ab. (361)
82 provren.ti,ab. (0)
83 procrin.ti,ab. (11)
84 ("tap 144" or tap144).ti,ab. (63)
85 (a-43818 or a43818).ti,ab. (3)
86 Trenantone.ti,ab. (7)
87 staladex.ti,ab. (0)
88 prostap.ti,ab. (11)
89 nafarelin acetate/ or nafarelin/ (1441)
90 nafarelin.ti,ab. (324)
91 ("76932-56-4" or "76932564").ti,ab. (0)
92 ("76932-60-0" or "76932600").ti,ab. (0)
93 ("86220-42-0" or "86220420").ti,ab. (0)
94 ("rs 94991 298" or rs94991298).ti,ab. (0)
95 synarel.ti,ab. (28)
96 deslorelin/ (452)
97 deslorelin.ti,ab. (324)
98 gonadorelin.ti,ab. (338)
99 ("33515-09-2" or "33515092").ti,ab. (0)
100 ("51952-41-1" or "51952411").ti,ab. (0)
101 ("52699-48-6" or "52699486").ti,ab. (0)
102 cetrorelix/ (2278)
103 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (717)
104 cetrotide.ti,ab. (113)
105 ("NS 75A" or NS75A).ti,ab. (0)
106 ("NS 75B" or NS75B).ti,ab. (0)
107 ("SB 075" or SB075).ti,ab. (1)
108 ("SB 75" or SB75).ti,ab. (76)
109 gonadoliberin.ti,ab. (152)
110 kryptocur.ti,ab. (6)
111 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (717)
112 cetrotide.ti,ab. (113)
113 antagon.ti,ab. (32)
114 ganirelix/ (1284)
115 ganirelix.ti,ab. (293)
116 ("ORG 37462" or ORG37462).ti,ab. (4)
117 orgalutran/ (1284)
118 orgalutran.ti,ab. (68)
119 ("RS 26306" or RS26306).ti,ab. (6)

120 ("AY 24031" or AY24031).ti,ab. (0)
121 factrel.ti,ab. (14)
122 fertagyl.ti,ab. (20)
123 lutrelef.ti,ab. (7)
124 lutrepulse.ti,ab. (6)
125 relefact.ti,ab. (10)
126 fertiral.ti,ab. (0)
127 (hoe471 or "hoe 471").ti,ab. (4)
128 relisorm.ti,ab. (6)
129 cystorelin.ti,ab. (26)
130 dirigestran.ti,ab. (5)
131 or/29-130 (80790)
132 28 and 131 (988)
133 limit 132 to english language (940)
134 133 not (letter or editorial).pt. (924)
135 134 not (conference abstract or conference paper or conference proceeding or "conference review").pt. (683)
136 nonhuman/ not (human/ and nonhuman/) (4649157)
137 135 not 136 (506)
138 limit 137 to yr="2000 -Current" (420)
139 elsevier.cr. (25912990)
140 138 and 139 (372)
141 remove duplicates from 140 (367)

Database: Cochrane Library – incorporating Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR); CENTRAL
Platform: Wiley
Version:
CDSR – Issue 7 of 12, July 2020
CENTRAL – Issue 7 of 12, July 2020
Search date: 23/7/2020
Number of results retrieved: CDSR – 1; CENTRAL - 8.

#1 [mh ^"Gender Dysphoria"] 3
#2 [mh ^"gender identity"] 227
#3 [mh ^"sexual and gender disorders"] 2
#4 [mh ^transsexualism] 27
#5 [mh ^"transgender persons"] 36
#6 [mh ^"health services for transgender persons"] 0
#7 [mh "sex reassignment procedures"] 4
#8 (gender* NEAR/3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongruen* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*)):ti,ab 308
#9 (transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*):ti,ab 929
#10 (trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*):ti,ab 3915
#11 ((sex or gender*) NEAR/3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*)):ti,ab 493
#12 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m):ti,ab 489

#13 {or #1-#12} 6142
#14 [mh infant] or [mh ^"infant health"] or [mh ^"infant welfare"] 27769
#15 (prematur* or pre-matur* or preterm* or pre-term* or infan* or newborn* or new-born* or perinat* or peri-nat* or neonat* or neo-nat* or baby* or babies or toddler*):ti,ab 69476
#16 [mh child] or [mh "child behavior"] or [mh ^"child health"] or [mh ^"child welfare"] 42703
#17 [mh ^minors] 8
#18 (child* or minor or minors or boy* or girl* or kid or kids or young*):ti,ab 175826
#19 [mh pediatrics]661
#20 (pediatric* or paediatric* or peadiatric*):ti,ab 30663
#21 [mh ^adolescent] or [mh ^"adolescent behavior"] or [mh ^"adolescent health"] 102154
#22 [mh ^puberty] 295
#23 (adolescen* or pubescen* or prepubescen* or pre-pubescen* or pubert* or prepubert* or pre-pubert* or teen* or preteen* or pre-teen* or juvenil* or youth* or under*age*):ti,ab 34139
#24 [mh ^schools] 1914
#25 [mh ^"Child Day Care Centers"] or [mh nurseries] or [mh ^"schools, nursery"] 277
#26 (pre-school* or preschool* or kindergar* or daycare or day-care or nurser* or school* or pupil* or student*):ti,ab 54723
#27 (("eight" or "nine" or "ten" or "eleven" or "twelve" or "thirteen" or "fourteen" or "fifteen" or "sixteen" or "seventeen" or "eighteen" or "nineteen") NEAR/2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)):ti,ab 6710
#28 (("8" or "9" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "15" or "16" or "17" or "18" or "19") NEAR/2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)):ti,ab 196881
#29 {or #14-#28} 469351
#30 #13 and #29 2146
#31 (transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*):ti,ab 0
#32 #30 or #31 2146
#33 [mh ^"Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone"] 1311
#34 (pubert* NEAR/3 block*):ti,ab 1
#35 ((gonadotrophin or gonadotropin) and releasing):ti,ab 2095
#36 (GnRH NEAR/2 analog*):ti,ab 493
#37 GnRH*:ti,ab 3764
#38 "GnRH agonist*":ti,ab 1399
#39 [mh ^"Triptorelin Pamoate"] 451
#40 triptorelin:ti,ab 451
#41 arvekap:ti,ab 4
#42 ("AY 25650" or AY25650):ti,ab 0
#43 ("BIM 21003" or BIM21003):ti,ab 0
#44 ("BN 52014" or BN52014):ti,ab 0
#45 ("CL 118532" or CL118532):ti,ab 0
#46 Debio:ti,ab 301
#47 diphereline:ti,ab 25
#48 moapar:ti,ab 0
#49 pamorelin:ti,ab 5
#50 trelstar:ti,ab 3

#51 triptodur:ti,ab 0
#52 ("WY 42422" or WY42422):ti,ab 0
#53 ("WY 42462" or WY42462):ti,ab 0
#54 gonapeptyl:ti,ab 11
#55 decapeptyl:ti,ab 135
#56 salvacyl:ti,ab 0
#57 [mh ^Buserelin] 290
#58 Buserelin:ti,ab 339
#59 bigonist:ti,ab 0
#60 ("hoe 766" or hoe-766 or hoe766):ti,ab 11
#61 profact:ti,ab 1
#62 receptal:ti,ab 4
#63 suprecur:ti,ab 0
#64 suprefact:ti,ab 28
#65 tiloryth:ti,ab 0
#66 histrelin:ti,ab 5
#67 "LHRH-hydrogel implant":ti,ab 0
#68 ("RL 0903" or RL0903):ti,ab 0
#69 ("SPD 424" or SPD424):ti,ab 0
#70 goserelin:ti,ab 761
#71 [mh ^goserelin] 568
#72 ("ici 118630" or ici118630):ti,ab 7
#73 ("ZD-9393" or ZD9393):ti,ab 1
#74 zoladex:ti,ab 318
#75 leuprorelin:ti,ab 248
#76 carcinil:ti,ab 0
#77 enanton*:ti,ab 21
#78 ginecrin:ti,ab 1
#79 leuplin:ti,ab 7
#80 [mh ^Leuprolide] 686
#81 leuprolide:ti,ab 696
#82 lucrin:ti,ab 21
#83 lupron:ti,ab 77
#84 provren:ti,ab 0
#85 procrin:ti,ab 2
#86 ("tap 144" or tap144):ti,ab 24
#87 (a-43818 or a43818):ti,ab 0
#88 Trenantone:ti,ab 3
#89 staladex:ti,ab 0
#90 prostap:ti,ab 9
#91 [mh ^Nafarelin] 77
#92 nafarelin:ti,ab 114
#93 ("76932-56-4" or "76932564"):ti,ab 0
#94 ("76932-60-0" or "76932600"):ti,ab 2
#95 ("86220-42-0" or "86220420"):ti,ab 0
#96 ("rs 94991 298" or rs94991298):ti,a ɔ 0
#97 synarel:ti,ab 10
#98 deslorelin:ti,ab 16

#99 gonadorelin:ti,ab 11
#100 ("33515-09-2" or "33515092"):ti,ab 0
#101 ("51952-41-1" or "51952411"):ti,ab 0
#102 ("52699-48-6" or "52699486"):ti,ab 0
#103 cetrorelix:ti,ab 221
#104 cetrotide:ti,ab 111
#105 ("NS 75A" or NS75A):ti,ab 0
#106 ("NS 75B" or NS75B):ti,ab 0
#107 ("SB 075" or SB075):ti,ab 0
#108 ("SB 75" or SB75):ti,ab 10
#109 gonadoliberin:ti,ab 5
#110 kryptocur:ti,ab 0
#111 cetrorelix:ti,ab 221
#112 cetrotide:ti,ab 111
#113 antagon:ti,ab 12
#114 ganirelix:ti,ab 142
#115 ("ORG 37462" or ORG37462):ti,ab 4
#116 orgalutran:ti,ab 45
#117 ("RS 26306" or RS26306):ti,ab 0
#118 ("AY 24031" or AY24031):ti,ab 0
#119 factrel:ti,ab 1
#120 fertagyl:ti,ab 0
#121 lutrelef:ti,ab 0
#122 lutrepulse:ti,ab 1
#123 relefact:ti,ab 1
#124 fertiral:ti,ab 0
#125 (hoe471 or "hoe 471"):ti,ab 3
#126 relisorm:ti,ab 0
#127 cystorelin:ti,ab 0
#128 dirigestran:ti,ab 0
#129 {or #33-#128} 6844
#130 #32 and #129 27
#131 #130 with Cochrane Library publication date Between Jan 2000 and Jul 2020, in Cochrane Reviews 1
#132 #130 27
#133 "conference":pt or (clinicaltrials or trialsearch):so 492465
#134 #132 not #133 9
#135 #134 with Publication Year from 2000 to 2020, in Trials 8

Database: HTA
Platform: CRD
Version: HTA
Search date: 23/7/2020
Number of results retrieved: 26
Search strategy:

1 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Gender Dysphoria EXPLODE ALL TREES 0
2 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Gender Identity EXPLODE ALL TREES 14

3 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Sexual and Gender Disorders EXPLODE ALL TREES 2

4 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Transsexualism EXPLODE ALL TREES 12
5 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Transgender Persons EXPLODE ALL TREES 3
6 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Health Services for Transgender Persons EXPLODE ALL TREES 0
7 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Sex Reassignment Procedures EXPLODE ALL TREES 1

8 ((gender* adj3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongruen* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*))) 28
9 ((transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*)) 76
10 ((trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*)) 83
11 (((sex or gender*) adj3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*))) 24
12 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m) 86
13 ((transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*)) 0
14 #1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13 262
15 (#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13) IN HTA 30

*26 results are from 200 onwards. Downloaded as a set to sift for drug terms rather than continuing with search strategy.

Database: APA PsycInfo
Search date: July 2020 (Week 2)
Search Strategy:
---
1 Gender Dysphoria/ (936)
2 Gender Identity/ (8648)
3 Transsexualism/ (2825)
4 Transgender/ (5257)
5 exp Gender Reassignment/ (568)
6 (gender* adj3 (dysphori* or affirm* or incongruen* or identi* or disorder* or confus* or minorit* or queer*)).tw. (15471)
7 (transgend* or transex* or transsex* or transfem* or transwom* or transma* or transmen* or transperson* or transpeopl*).tw. (13028)
8 (trans or crossgender* or cross-gender* or crossex* or cross-sex* or genderqueer*).tw. (7679)
9 ((sex or gender*) adj3 (reassign* or chang* or transform* or transition*)).tw. (5796)
10 (male-to-female or m2f or female-to-male or f2m).tw. (63688)
11 or/1-10 (99560)
12 exp Infant Development/ (21841)
13 (prematur* or pre-matur* or preterm* or pre-term* or infan* or newborn* or new-born* or perinat* or peri-nat* or neonat* or neo-nat* or baby* or babies or toddler*).ti,ab,in,jn. (150219)

14 Child Characteristics/ or exp Child Behavior/ or Child Psychology/ or exp Child Welfare/ or Child Psychiatry/ (23423)
15 (child* or minor or minors or boy* or girl* or kid or kids or young*).ti,ab,in,jn. (984230)
16 (pediatric* or paediatric* or peadiatric*).ti,ab,in,jn. (78962)
17 Adolescent Psychiatry/ or Adolescent Behavior/ or Adolescent Development/ or Adolescent Psychology/ or Adolescent Characteristics/ or Adolescent Health/ (62142)
18 Puberty/ (2753)
19 (adolescen* or pubescen* or prepubescen* or pre-pubescen* or pubert* or prepubert* or pre-pubert* or teen* or preteen* or pre-teen* or juvenil* or youth* or under*age*).ti,ab,in,jn. (347604)
20 Schools/ or exp elementary school students/ or high school students/ or junior high school students/ or middle school students/ (113053)
21 Child Day Care/ or Nursery Schools/ (2836)
22 (pre-school* or preschool* or kindergar* or daycare or day-care or nurser* or school* or pupil* or student*).ti,ab,jn. (772814)
23 (("eight" or "nine" or "ten" or "eleven" or "twelve" or "thirteen" or "fourteen" or "fifteen" or "sixteen" or "seventeen" or "eighteen" or "nineteen") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (21475)
24 (("8" or "9" or "10" or "11" or "12" or "13" or "14" or "15" or "16" or "17" or "18" or "19") adj2 (year or years or age or ages or aged)).ti,ab. (285697)
25 or/12-24 (1772959)
26 11 and 25 (49612)
27 (transchild* or transyouth* or transteen* or transadoles* or transgirl* or transboy*).tw. (14)
28 26 or 27 (49613)
29 exp Gonadotropic Hormones/ (4226)
30 (pubert* adj3 block*).ti,ab. (29)
31 ((gonadotrophin or gonadotropin) and releasing).ti,ab. (1060)
32 (GnRH adj2 analog*).ti,ab. (49)
33 GnRH*.ti,ab. (998)
34 "GnRH agonist*".ti,ab. (72)
35 triptorelin.ti,ab. (25)
36 arvekap.ti,ab. (0)
37 ("AY 25650" or AY25650).ti,ab. (0)
38 ("BIM 21003" or BIM21003).ti,ab. (0)
39 ("BN 52014" or BN52014).ti,ab. (0)
40 ("CL 118532" or CL118532).ti,ab. (0)
41 Debio.ti,ab. (7)
42 diphereline.ti,ab. (0)
43 moapar.ti,ab. (0)
44 pamorelin.ti,ab. (0)
45 trelstar.ti,ab. (0)
46 triptodur.ti,ab. (0)
47 ("WY 42422" or WY42422).ti,ab. (0)
48 ("WY 42462" or WY42462).ti,ab. (0)
49 gonapeptyl.ti,ab. (0)
50 decapeptyl.ti,ab. (3)
51 salvacyl.ti,ab. (1)

52 buserelin.ti,ab. (6)
53 bigonist.ti,ab. (0)
54 ("hoe 766" or hoe-766 or hoe766).ti,ab. (0)
55 profact.ti,ab. (0)
56 receptal.ti,ab. (0)
57 suprecur.ti,ab. (0)
58 suprefact.ti,ab. (0)
59 tiloryth.ti,ab. (0)
60 histrelin.ti,ab. (1)
61 "LHRH-hydrogel implant".ti,ab. (0)
62 ("RL 0903" or RL0903).ti,ab. (0)
63 ("SPD 424" or SPD424).ti,ab. (0)
64 goserelin.ti,ab. (30)
65 ("ici 118630" or ici118630).ti,ab. (0)
66 ("ZD-9393" or ZD9393).ti,ab. (0)
67 zoladex.ti,ab. (3)
68 leuprorelin.ti,ab. (12)
69 carcinil.ti,ab. (0)
70 enanton*.ti,ab. (1)
71 ginecrin.ti,ab. (0)
72 leuplin.ti,ab. (0)
73 leuprolide.ti,ab. (79)
74 lucrin.ti,ab. (1)
75 lupron.ti,ab. (18)
76 provren.ti,ab. (0)
77 procrin.ti,ab. (0)
78 ("tap 144" or tap144).ti,ab. (1)
79 (a-43818 or a43818).ti,ab. (0)
80 Trenantone.ti,ab. (0)
81 staladex.ti,ab. (0)
82 prostap.ti,ab. (0)
83 nafarelin.ti,ab. (1)
84 ("76932-56-4" or "76932564").ti,ab. (0)
85 ("76932-60-0" or "76932600").ti,ab. (0)
86 ("86220-42-0" or "86220420").ti,ab. (0)
87 ("rs 94991 298" or rs94991298).ti,ab. (0)
88 synarel.ti,ab. (0)
89 deslorelin.ti,ab. (8)
90 gonadorelin.ti,ab. (3)
91 ("33515-09-2" or "33515092").ti,ab. (0)
92 ("51952-41-1" or "51952411").ti,ab. (0)
93 ("52699-48-6" or "52699486").ti,ab. (0)
94 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (9)
95 cetrotide.ti,ab. (0)
96 ("NS 75A" or NS75A).ti,ab. (0)
97 ("NS 75B" or NS75B).ti,ab. (0)
98 ("SB 075" or SB075).ti,ab. (0)
99 ("SB 75" or SB75).ti,ab. (1)

100 gonadoliberin.ti,ab. (1)
101 kryptocur.ti,ab. (0)
102 cetrorelix.ti,ab. (9)
103 cetrotide.ti,ab. (0)
104 antagon.ti,ab. (0)
105 ganirelix.ti,ab. (0)
106 ("ORG 37462" or ORG37462).ti,ab. (0)
107 orgalutran.ti,ab. (0)
108 ("RS 26306" or RS26306).ti,ab. (0)
109 ("AY 24031" or AY24031).ti,ab. (0)
110 factrel.ti,ab. (0)
111 fertagyl.ti,ab. (0)
112 lutrelef.ti,ab. (0)
113 lutrepulse.ti,ab. (0)
114 relefact.ti,ab. (0)
115 fertiral.ti,ab. (0)
116 (hoe471 or "hoe 471").ti,ab. (0)
117 relisorm.ti,ab. (0)
118 cystorelin.ti,ab. (0)
119 dirigestran.ti,ab. (0)
120 or/29-119 (4869)
121 28 and 120 (130)
122 limit 121 to english language (120)
123 limit 122 to yr="2000 -Current" (93)

Appendix C Evidence selection

The literature searches identified 525 references. These were screened using their titles and abstracts and 25 references were obtained and assessed for relevance. Of these, 9 references are included in the evidence review. The remaining 16 references were excluded and are listed in appendix D.

Figure 1 – Study selection flow diagram



References submitted with Preliminary Policy Proposal

There is no preliminary policy proposal for this policy.

Appendix D Excluded studies table

Study reference	Reason for exclusion
Achille, C., Taggart, T., Eaton, N.R. et al. (2020) Longitudinal impact of gender-affirming endocrine intervention on the mental health and well-being of transgender youths: Preliminary results. International Journal of Pediatric Endocrinology 2020(1): 8	Intervention – data for GnRH analogues not reported separately from other interventions
Bechard, Melanie, Vanderlaan, Doug P, Wood, Hayley et al. (2017) Psychosocial and Psychological Vulnerability in Adolescents with Gender Dysphoria: A "Proof of Principle" Study. Journal of sex & marital therapy 43(7): 678-688	Population – no GnRH analogues at time of study
Chew, Denise, Anderson, Jemma, Williams, Katrina et al. (2018) Hormonal Treatment in Young People With Gender Dysphoria: A Systematic Review. Pediatrics 141(4)	All primary studies included apart from 1 conference abstract
de Vries, Annelou L C, McGuire, Jenifer K et al. (2014) Young adult psychological outcome after puberty suppression and gender reassignment. Pediatrics 134(4): 696-704	Population – relevant population included in de Vries et al. 2011
Ghelani, Rahul, Lim, Cheryl, Brain, Caroline et al. (2020) Sudden sex hormone withdrawal and the effects on body composition in late pubertal adolescents with gender dysphoria. Journal of pediatric endocrinology & metabolism: JPEM 33(1): 107-112	Outcomes – not in the PICO

Study reference	Reason for exclusion
Giovanardi, G, Morales, P, Mirabella, M et al. (2019) Transition memories: experiences of trans adult women with hormone therapy and their beliefs on the usage of hormone blockers to suppress puberty. Journal of endocrinological investigation 42(10): 1231-1240	Population – adults only
Hewitt, Jacqueline K, Paul, Campbell, Kasiannan, Porpavai et al. (2012) Hormone treatment of gender identity disorder in a cohort of children and adolescents. The Medical journal of Australia 196(9): 578-81	Outcomes – no data reported for relevant outcomes
Jensen, R.K., Jensen, J.K., Simons, L.K. et al. (2019) Effect of Concurrent Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone Agonist Treatment on Dose and Side Effects of Gender-Affirming Hormone Therapy in Adolescent Transgender Patients. Transgender Health 4(1): 300-303	Outcomes – not in the PICO
Klaver, Maartje, de Mutsert, Renee, Wiepjes, Chantal M et al. (2018) Early Hormonal Treatment Affects Body Composition and Body Shape in Young Transgender Adolescents. The journal of sexual medicine 15(2): 251-260	Outcomes – not in the PICO
Klaver, Maartje, de Mutsert, Renee van der Loos, Maria A T C et al. (2020) Hormonal Treatment and Cardiovascular Risk Profile in Transgender Adolescents. Pediatrics 145(3)	Outcomes – not in the PICO
Lopez, Carla Marisa, Solomon, Daniel, Boulware, Susan D et al. (2018) Trends in the use of puberty blockers among transgender children in the United States. Journal of pediatric endocrinology & metabolism : JPEM 31(6): 665-670	Outcomes – not in the PICO
Schagen, Sebastian E E, Lustenhouwer, Paul, Cohen-Kettenis, Peggy T et al. (2018) Changes in Adrenal Androgens During Puberty Suppression and Gender-Affirming Hormone Treatment in Adolescents With Gender Dysphoria. The journal of sexual medicine 15(9): 1357-1363	Outcomes – not in the PICO
Swendiman, Robert A, Vogiatzi, Maria G, Alter, Craig A et al. (2019) Histrelin implantation in the pediatric population: A 10-year institutional experience. Journal of pediatric surgery 54(7): 1457-1461	Population – less than 10% of participants had gender dysphoria; data not reported separately
Turban, Jack L, King, Dana, Carswell, Jeremi M et al. (2020) Pubertal Suppression for Transgender Youth and Risk of Suicidal Ideation. Pediatrics 145(2)	Intervention – data for GnRH analogues not reported separately from other interventions
Vrouenraets, Lieke Josephina Jeanne Johanna, Fredriks, A Miranda, Hannema, Sabine E et al. (2016) Perceptions of Sex, Gender, and Puberty Suppression: A Qualitative Analysis of Transgender Youth. Archives of sexual behavior 45(7): 1697-703	Outcomes – not in the PICO
Zucker, Kenneth J, Bradley, Susan J, Owen-Anderson, Allison et al. (2010) Puberty-blocking hormonal therapy for adolescents with gender identity disorder: A descriptive clinical study. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health 15(1): 58-82	Intervention – data for GnRH analogues not reported separately from other interventions

Appendix E Evidence tables

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Brik T, Vrouenraets L, de Vries M, et al. (2020) Trajectories of adolescents treated with gonadotropin-releasing hormone analogues for gender dysphoria. Archives of Sexual Behaviour https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01660-8 Netherlands Retrospective observational single-centre study To document trajectories after the initiation of GnRH analogue and explore reasons for extended use and discontinuation of GnRH analogues. Includes participants seen between November 2010 and January 1, 2018.	Inclusion criteria were adolescents with gender dysphoria, according to the DSM-5 criteria, seen at the single centre and treated with GnRH analogues between November 2010 and January 1, 2018. The study excluded adolescents without a diagnosis of gender dysphoria, those who had coexisting problems that interfered with the diagnostic process and/or might interfere with successful treatment (not further defined), those adolescents not wanting hormones, those with ongoing diagnostic evaluation and those who did not attend appointments. The sample consisted of 143 adolescents meeting the inclusion/exclusion criteria, 38 transfemales, 105 transmales, with median ages of 15.0 years (range 11.1 to 18.6 years) and 16.1 years (range 10.1 to 17.9	The study only reports that GnRH analogues were given, no specific drug, dose, route, or frequency of administration are reported. No comparator cohort was used in the study. Follow-up was at (up to) 9 years (last follow-up July 2019).	**Critical outcomes** No critical outcomes assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Psychosocial impact*** Not assessed. ***Engagement with health care services*** Not formally assessed but the study reported that out of 214 age and developmentally appropriate adolescents for potential inclusion in the study, 9 were excluded as they stopped attending appointments (4.2%). ***Stopping treatment*** Of the 143 adolescents, 9 (6.2%, 1 transfemale and 8 transmales) stopped taking GnRH analogues after a median duration of 0.8 years (range 0.1 to 3.0). Four adolescents (2.8%) discontinued GnRH analogues although they wanted to continue endocrine treatments for gender dysphoria: • 1 transmale stopped due to increase in mood problems, suicidal thoughts and confusion attributed to GnRH analogues (later had gender-affirming hormones at an adult gender clinic)[1] • 1 transmale experienced hot flushes, increased migraines, had a fear of injections, stress at school and unrelated medical issues, and temporarily discontinued treatment (after 4 months)[2]	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa tool for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. somewhat representative 2. no-non exposed cohort 3. secure record 4. yes **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. no comparator **Domain 3: Outcome** 1. record linkage 2. yes 3. complete follow-up **Overall quality is assessed as poor.** Other comments: Physical and psychological comorbidity was poorly reported, concomitant use of other medicines was not reported. Source of funding: not reported.

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
	years), respectively at commencement of GnRH analogues. Of the 143 adolescents in the study, 125 (87%, 36 transfemales and 89 transmales) subsequently started treatment with gender-affirming hormones after median 1.0 (range 0.5 to 3.8) years and 0.8 (0.3 to 3.7) years, respectively. Median age at the start of gender-affirming hormones was 16.2 years (range 14.5 to 18.6 years) in transfemales and 17.1 years (range 14.9 to 18.8 years) in transmales. Five adolescents who used GnRH analogues had not started gender-affirming hormones at the time of data collection as they were not yet eligible for this treatment due to age. At the time of data collection, they had used GnRH analogues for a median duration of 2.1 years (range 1.6 to 2.8). Tanner stage was not reported. Six adolescents had been referred to a gender clinic elsewhere for further		• 1 transmale experienced mood swings 4 months after commencing GnRH analogues. After 2.2 years he developed unexplained severe nausea and rapid weight loss and due to his general condition discontinued GnRH analogues after 2.4 years[3] • 1 transmale stopped GnRH analogues as his parents were unable to regularly collect medication from the pharmacy and take him to appointments for the injections[4] Five adolescents (3.5%) stopped treatment as they no longer wished to continue with gender-affirming treatment. • 1 adolescent had been very distressed about breast development at the start of GnRH analogues and later thought that she might want to live as a woman without breasts. She did not want to live as a boy and discontinued GnRH analogues, although dreaded breast development and menstruation. • 1 adolescent experienced concurrent psychosocial problems interfering with the exploration of gender identity and did not currently want treatment.[5] • 1 adolescent felt more in between male and female and therefore did not want to continue with GnRH analogues.[6] • 1 adolescent made a social transition while using GnRH analogues and shortly after decided to discontinue treatment.[7]	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
	treatment, including 1 who had prolonged use.		• 1 adolescent discontinued after using GnRH analogues as the treatment allowed them to feel who they were.[8]	

[1] The adolescent later indicated "I was already fully matured when I started GnRH analogues, menstruations were already suppressed by contraceptives. For me, it had no added value" (transmale, age 19 years).
[2] The adolescent restarted endocrine treatment (testosterone) 5 months later.
[3] The adolescent recovered over the next 2 years and subsequently started lynestrenol and testosterone treatment.
[4] The adolescent subsequently started lynestrenol to suppress menses, he was not yet eligible for testosterone treatment.
[5] The adolescent later reflected that "The decision to stop GnRH analogues to my mind was made by the gender team, because they did not think gender dysphoria was the right diagnosis. I do still feel like a man, but for me it is okay to be just me instead of a he or a she, so for now I do not want any further treatment" (adolescent assigned female sex at birth, age 16 years).
[6] The adolescent stated "At the moment, I feel more like 'I am' instead of 'I am a woman' or 'I am a man'" (adolescent assigned female sex at birth, age 16 years).
[7] The adolescent stated that "he had fallen in love with a girl and had never had such feelings, which made him question his gender identity. At subsequent visits, he indicated that he was happy living as a man.
[8] The adolescent stated "After using GnRH analogues for the first time, I could feel who I was without the female hormones, this gave me peace of mind to think about my future. It was an inner feeling that said I am a woman" (adolescent assigned female sex at birth, age 18 years).

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Costa R, Dunsford M, Skagerberg E, et al. (2015) Psychological support, puberty suppression, and psychosocial functioning in adolescents with gender dysphoria. Journal of Sexual Medicine 12(11):2206-14. United Kingdom Prospective longitudinal observational single centre cohort study Includes participants referred to the service between 2010 and 2014.	Adolescents with gender dysphoria who completed a 6-month diagnostic process using DSM-IV-TR criteria for gender dysphoria (comprising the gender dysphoria assessment and psychological interventions) either immediately eligible for treatment with GnRH analogues or delayed eligible for treatment with GnRH analogues (received psychological support without any physical intervention). No exclusion criteria were reported. The sample consisted of 201 adolescents (sex assigned at birth male to female ratio 1:1.6) mean (±SD) age 15.52±1.41 years) from a sampling frame of	**Intervention** 101 individuals were assessed as being immediately eligible for use of GnRH analogues (no specific treatment, dose or route, or frequency of administration reported but all received psychological support). **Comparison** The analyses were between the immediately eligible and delayed eligible (n=100) adolescents,	**Critical outcomes** ***Impact on gender dysphoria*** The Utrecht gender dysphoria scale (UGDS) was used to assess adolescents' gender dysphoria related discomfort. The Cronbach's alpha (α) for the study was reported as 0.76 to 0.88, suggesting good internal consistency. UGDS was only reported once, for 160 adolescents (50 sex assigned at birth males and 110 sex assigned at birth females). The assessment time point is not reported (baseline or follow-up) and the comparison for gender related discomfort was between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females. Sex assigned at birth males had a mean (±SD) UGDS score of 51.6 [±9.7] versus sex assigned at birth females score of 56.1 [±4.3], *t*-test 4.07; p<0.001.	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa tool for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. somewhat representative 2. drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort. 3. secure record 4. no **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. partial comparator **Domain 3: Outcome** 1. independent assessment (unclear if blinded) 2. yes 3. incomplete follow-up **Overall quality is assessed as poor.**

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
	436 consecutive adolescents referred to the service between 2010 and 2014. The mean (±SD) age (n=201) at the start of GnRH analogues was 16.48 [±1.26], range 13 to 17 years. The interval from the start of the diagnostic procedure to the start of puberty suppression took approximately 1.5 years [±0.63] from baseline. None of the delayed eligible individuals received puberty suppression at the time of this study. Tanner stage was not reported.	Baseline assessment (following diagnostic procedure) was followed by follow-up at 6 months from baseline (T1), 12 months from baseline (T2) and 18 months from baseline (T3).	***Impact on mental health*** Not assessed. ***Impact on quality of life*** Not assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Psychosocial impact*** The Children's Global Assessment Scale (CGAS) was used to assess adolescents' psychosocial functioning. The CGAS was administered by psychologists, psychotherapists, and psychiatrists (intra-class correlation assessment was 0.76 ≤ Cronbach's α ≤0.94). At baseline, CGAS scores were not associated with any demographic variable, in both sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females (all p>0.1). In comparison with sex assigned at birth females, sex assigned at birth males had statistically significantly lower mean (±SD) baseline CGAS scores (55.4 [±12.7] versus 59.2 [11.8]; *t*-test 2.15; p=0.03). There was no statistically significant difference in mean (±SD) CGAS scores at baseline (T0) between immediately eligible adolescents and delayed eligible adolescents (n=201, 58.72 [±11.38] versus 56.63 [±13.14]; *t*-test 1.21; p=0.23). **Immediately eligible compared with delayed eligible participants** At follow-up, there was no statistically significant difference in mean (±SD) CGAS scores at any follow-up time point (T1, T2 or T3) between immediately	Other comments: Physical and psychological comorbidity was poorly reported, concomitant use of other medicines was not reported. Large unexplained loss to follow-up (64.7%) at T3. Source of funding: not reported.

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			eligible adolescents and delayed eligible adolescents: • T1, n=201, 60.89 [±12.17] versus 60.29 [±12.81]; *t*-test 0.34; p=0.73 • T2, n=121, 64.70 [±13.34] versus 62.97 [±14.10]; *t*-test 0.69; p=0.49 • T3, n=71, 67.40 [±13.93] versus 62.53 [±13.54]; *t*-test 1.49; p=0.14. **All participants** There was a statistically significant increase in mean (±SD) CGAS scores at any follow-up time point (T1, T2 or T3) compared with baseline (T0) for the all adolescents group: • T0 (n=201) versus T1 (n=201), 57.73 [±12.27] versus 60.68 [±12.47]; *t*-test 4.87; p<0.001 • T0 (n=201) versus T2 (n=121), 57.73 [±12.27] versus 63.31 [±14.41]; *t*-test 3.70; p<0.001 • T0 (n=201) versus T3 (n=71), 57.73 [±12.27] versus 64.93 [±13.85]; *t*-test 4.11; p<0.001 There was a statistically significant increase in mean (±SD) CGAS scores when comparing the follow-up period T1 to T3 but not for the periods T1 to T2 and T2 to T3, for all adolescents: • T1 (n=201) versus T2 (n=121), 60.68 [±12.47] versus 63.31 [±14.41]; *t*-test 1.73; p<0.08 • T1 (n=201) versus T3 (n=71), 60.68 [±12.47] versus 64.93 [±13.85], *t*-test 2.40; p<0.02 • T2 (n=121) versus T3 (n=71), 63.31 [±14.41] versus 64.93 [±13.85], *t*-test 0.76; p=0.45 There were no statistically significant differences in CGAS scores between sex assigned at birth males and sex	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			assigned at birth females with gender dysphoria in all the follow-up evaluations (all p>0.1). Delayed eligible and immediately eligible adolescents with gender dysphoria were not statistically significantly different for demographic variables (all p>0.1). **Immediately eligible participants** There was a statistically significant increase in mean (±SD) CGAS scores at follow-up times T2 and T3 compared with baseline (T0) but not for T0 versus T1, for the immediately eligible adolescents: • T0 (n=101) versus T1 (n=101), 58.72 [±11.38] versus 60.89 [±12.17]; *t*-test 1.31; p=0.19 • T0 (n=101) versus T2 (n=60), 58.72 [±11.38] versus 64.70 [±13.34]; *t*-test 3.02; p=0.003 • T0 (n=101) versus T3 (n=35), 58.72 [±11.38] versus 67.40 [±13.93]; *t*-test 3.66; p<0.001 There was a statistically significant increase in mean (±SD) CGAS scores when comparing the follow-up period T1 to T3 with each other but not for the periods T1 to T2 and T2 to T3, for the immediately eligible adolescents: • T1 (n=101) versus T2 (n=60), 60.89 [±12.17] versus 64.70 [±13.34]; *t*-test 1.85; p=0.07 • T1 (n=101) versus T3 (n=35), 60.89 [±12.17] versus 67.40 [±13.93], *t*-test 2.63; p<0.001 • T2 (n=60) versus T3 (n=35), 64.70 [±13.34] versus 67.40 [±13.93], *t*-test 0.94; p=0.35 The immediately eligible adolescents had a CGAS score which was not	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			statistically significantly different compared to the sample of children/ adolescents without observed psychological /psychiatric symptoms after 12 months of puberty suppression (T3, *t*=0.01, *p*=0.99).	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
de Vries A, Steensma T, Doreleijers T, et al. (2011) Puberty suppression in adolescents with gender identity disorder: a prospective follow-up study. The Journal of Sexual Medicine 8 (8):2276-83. Netherlands Prospective longitudinal observational single centre before and after study.	The sample size was 70 adolescents receiving GnRH analogues (mean age [±SD] at assessment 13.6±1.8 years) from a sampling frame of 196 consecutive adolescents referred to the service between 2000 and 2008. Inclusion criteria were if they subsequently started gender-affirming hormones between 2003 and 2009 (mean [±SD] age at start of GnRH analogues was 14.75 [±1.92] years)[1]. No specific exclusion criteria were described. No diagnostic criteria or concomitant treatments were reported. Tanner stage of the included adolescents was not reported.	**Intervention** 70 adolescents were assessed at baseline (T0) before the start of GnRH analogues (no specific treatment, dose or route of administration reported). **Comparison** The same 70 adolescents were assessed again at follow-up (T1), shortly before starting gender-affirming hormones. Not all adolescents completed all assessments for all items[2].	**Critical outcomes** ***Impact on gender dysphoria*** Impact on gender dysphoria was assessed using the Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale (UGDS). • There was no statistically significant difference in UGDS scores between T0 and T1 (n=41). There was a statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females, with sex assigned at birth females reporting more gender dysphoria, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 15.98 (1,39), p<0.001. ***Impact on mental health*** Depressive symptoms were assessed using the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II). • There was a statistically significant reduction in BDI score between T0 and T1, n=41, 8.31 [±7.12] versus 4.95 [±6.72], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 9.28 (1,39), p=0.004. • There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 3.85 (1,39), p=0.057.	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa tool for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. somewhat representative of children and adolescents who have gender dysphoria 2. no non-exposed cohort 3. no description 4. no **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. study controls for age, age at start of treatment, IQ, and parental factors **Domain 3: Outcome** 1. no description 2. no/unclear 3. complete **Overall quality is assessed as poor**. Other comments: Physical and psychological comorbidity was not reported, concomitant use of other medicines was not reported. Source of funding: This study was supported by a personal

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			Anger and anxiety were assessed using Trait Anger and Anxiety (TPI and STAI, respectively) Scales of the State-Trait Personality Inventory. • There was no statistically significant difference in anger (TPI) scale scores between T0 and T1 (n=41). There was a statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females, with sex assigned at birth females reporting increased anger compared with sex assigned at birth males, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 5.70 (1,39), p=0.022. • Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference in anxiety (STAI) scale scores between T0 and T1 (n=41). There was a statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females, with sex assigned at birth females reporting increased anxiety compared with sex assigned at birth males, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 16.07 (1,39), p<0.001. ***Impact on quality of life*** Not assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Impact on body image*** Impact on body image was assessed using the Body Image Scale to measure body satisfaction (BIS). There was no statistically significant difference between T0 and T1 for any of the 3 BIS scores (primary sex characteristics, secondary sex characteristics or neutral characteristics,	grant awarded to the first author by the Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development.

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			n=57). There were statistically significant differences between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females, with sex assigned at birth females reporting more dissatisfaction, for: • primary sexual characteristics, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 4.11 (1,55), p=0.047. • secondary sexual characteristics, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 11.57 (1,55), p=0.001. But no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females was found for neutral characteristics. However, there was a significant interaction effect between sex assigned at birth sex and the changes of gender dysphoria between T0 and T1; sex assigned at birth females became more dissatisfied with their secondary sex characteristics compared with sex assigned at birth males, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 14.59 (1,55), p<0.001) and neutral characteristics, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 15.26 (1,55), p<0.001). ***Psychosocial impact*** Psychosocial impact was assessed using both the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) and the Youth Self-Report (YSR) to parents and adolescents, respectively. The Children's Global Assessment Scale was also reported. There was a statistically significant decrease in mean (±SD) total, internalising, and externalising[3] parental CBCL scores between T0 and T1[4] for all adolescents (n=54): • Total score (T0 – T1) 60.70 [±12.76] versus 54.46 [±11.23], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 26.17 (1,52), p<0.001.	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			• Internalising score (T0 – T1) 61.00 [±12.21] versus 54.56 [±10.22], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 22.93 (1,52), p<0.001. • Externalising score (T0 – T1) 58.04 [±12.99] versus 53.81 [±11.86], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 12.04 (1,52), p=0.001. There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for total and internalising CBCL score but there was a significant difference for the externalising score: • Externalising score, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 6.29 (1,52), p=0.015. There was a statistically significant decrease in mean (±SD) total, internalising, and externalising[3] YSR scores between T0 and T1 for all adolescents (n=54): • Total score (T0 – T1) 55.46 [±11.56] versus 50.00 [±10.56], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 16.24 (1,52), p<0.001. • Internalising score (T0 – T1) 56.04 [±12.49] versus 49.78 [±11.63], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 15.05 (1,52), p<0.001. • Externalising score (T0 – T1) 53.30 [±11.87] versus 49.98 [±9.35], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 7.26 (1,52), p=0.009. There was no statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for total and internalising YSR score but there was a significant difference for the externalising score: • Externalising score, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 9.14 (1,52), p=0.004. There was a statistically significant increase in CGAS mean (±SD) score between T0 and T1 (n=41), 70.24 [±10.12] versus 73.90 [±9.63], *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 8.76	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			(1,39), p=0.005. There was a statistically significant difference between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females, with sex assigned at birth females reporting lower score for global functioning compared with sex assigned at birth males, *F* (*df, errdf*), *P*: 5.77 (1,52), p=0.021. The proportion of adolescents scoring in the clinical range significantly decreased between T0 and T1, on the CBCL total problem scale (44.4% versus 22.2%, X^2[1] = 6.00, p=0.001), and the internalising scale (29.6% versus 11.1%, X^2[1] = 5.71, p=0.017) of the YSR.	

[1] There were statistically significant mean age [±SD] differences between sex assigned at birth males and sex assigned at birth females for age at assessment (13.14 [±1.55] versus 14.10 [±1.99] years, p=0.028), age at start of GnRH analogues (14.25 [±1.79] versus 15.21 [±1.95] years, p=0.036) and age at the start of gender-affirming hormones (16.24 [±1.21] versus 16.99 [±1.09] years, p=0.008). No statistically significant differences were seen for other baseline characteristics, time between GnRH analogue and gender-affirming hormones, full scale IQ, parental marital status, education, and sexual attraction to own, other or both sexes.
[2] Independent t-tests between mean scores on the CBCL, YSR, BDI, TPI, STAI, CGAS, UGS, and BIS of adolescents who completed both assessments and mean scores of adolescents who completed only one of the assessments revealed no significant differences on all used measures, at neither T0 or at T1.
[3] The CBCL/YSR has 2 components: Internalising score which sums the anxious/depressed, withdrawn-depressed, and somatic complaints scores; externalising score which sums rule-breaking and aggressive behaviour. The total problems score is the sum of the scores of all the problem items. The YSR is a child self-report version of the CBCL.
[4] A repeated measures ANOVA (analysis of variance) was used.

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Joseph T, Ting J, Butler G. (2019) The effect of GnRH analogue treatment on bone mineral density in young adolescents with gender dysphoria: findings from a large national cohort. Journal of pediatric endocrinology & metabolism 32(10): 1077-1081 United Kingdom	Adolescents (12 to 14 years) with gender dysphoria (no diagnostic criteria described), n=70, including 31 transfemales and 39 transmales. All had been seen and assessed by a Gender Identity Development Service multi-disciplinary psychosocial health team for at least 4 assessments over a minimum of 6 months. All participants had entered puberty	Treatment with a GnRH analogue for at least 1 year or ongoing until they reached 16 years. No specific treatment, dose or route of administration reported. No concomitant treatments were reported.	**Critical outcomes** No critical outcomes assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Bone density: lumbar[1]*** **Lumbar spine bone mineral apparent density (BMAD)[2] 0 to 1 year** Transfemales (mean [±SD]): 0.235 (0.030) g/cm3 at baseline, 0.233 g/cm3 (0.029) at 1 year (p=0.459); z-score 0.859 (0.154) at baseline, −0.228 (1.027) at 1 year (p=0.000) Transmales (mean [±SD]):	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment checklist for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. Somewhat representative of children and adolescents who have gender dysphoria 2. Not applicable 3. Via routine clinical records 4. No

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Retrospective longitudinal observational single centre study To investigate whether there is any significant loss of bone mineral density (BMD) and bone mineral apparent density (BMAD) for up to 3 years of GnRH analogues. To investigate whether there was a significant drop after 1 year of treatment following abrupt withdrawal. 2011 to 2016	and all but 2 of the transmales were postmenarchal. 57% of the transfemales were in early puberty (G2–3 and testicular volume >4 mL) and 43% were in late puberty (G4–5). Details of the sampling frame were not reported. Further details of how the sample was drawn are not reported.	No comparator.	0.196 (0.035) g/cm3 at baseline, 0.201 (0.033) g/cm3 at 1 year (p=0.074); z-score −0.186 (1.230) at baseline, −0.541 (1.396) at 1 year (p=0.006) **Lumbar spine BMAD 0 to 2 years** Transfemales (mean [±SD]): 0.240 (0.027) g/cm3 at baseline, 0.240 (0.030) g/cm3 at 2 years (p=0.865); z-score 0.486 (0.809) at baseline, −0.279 (0.930) at 2 years (p=0.000) Transmales (mean [±SD]): 0.195 (0.058) g/cm3 at baseline, 0.198 (0.055) at 2 years (p=0.433); z-score −0.361 (1.439) at baseline, −0.913 (1.318) at 2 years (p=0.001) **Lumbar spine bone mineral density (BMD) 0 to 1 year** Transfemales (mean [±SD]): 0.860 (0.154) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.859 (0.129) kg/m2 at 1 year (p=0.962); z-score −0.016 (1.106) at baseline, −0.461 (1.121) at 1 year (p=0.003) Transmales (mean [±SD]): 0.694 (0.149) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.718 (0.124) kg/m2 at 1 year (p=0.006); z-score −0.395 (1.428) at baseline, −1.276 (1.410) at 1 year (p=0.000) **Lumbar spine BMD 0 to 2 years** Transfemales (mean [±SD]): 0.867 (0.141) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.878 (0.130) kg/m2 at 2 years (p=0.395); z-score 0.130 (0.972) at baseline, −0.890 (1.075) at 2 years (p=0.000) Transmales (mean [±SD]): 0.695 (0.220) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.731 (0.209) kg/m2 at 2 years (p=0.058); z-score −0.715 (1.406) at baseline, −2.000 (1.384) at 2 years (p=0.000) ***Bone density: femoral***	**Domain 2: Comparability** 1. No control group **Domain 3: Outcome** 1. Via routine clinical records 2. Yes 3. No statement **Overall quality is assessed as poor**. Other comments: although the evidence is of poor quality, the results suggest a possible association between GnRH analogues and BMAD. However, the results are not reliable and could be due to bias or chance. Further details of how the sample was drawn are not reported. No concomitant treatments were reported. Source of funding: None disclosed

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			Femoral neck (hip) BMD 0 to 1 year Transfemales (mean [±SD]): 0.894 (0.118) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.905 (0.104) kg/m2 at 1 year (p=0.571); z-score 0.157 (0.905) at baseline, −0.340 (0.816) at 1 year (p=0.002) Transmales (mean [±SD]): 0.772 (0.137) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.785 (0.120) kg/m2 at 1 year (p=0.797); z-score −0.863 (1.215) at baseline, −1.440 (1.075) at 1 year (p=0.000) **Femoral neck (hip) BMD 0 to 2 years** Transfemales (mean [±SD]): 0.920 (0.116) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.910 (0.125) kg/m2 at 2 years (p=0.402); z-score 0.450 (0.781) at baseline, −0.600 (1.059) at 2 years (p=0.002) Transmales (mean [±SD]): 0.766 (0.215) kg/m2 at baseline, 0.773 (0.197) at 2 years (p=0.604); z-score −1.075 (1.145) at baseline, −1.779 (0.816) at 2 years (p=0.001)	

[1] Lumbar spine (L1-L4) BMD was measured by yearly dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) scans at baseline (n=70), 1 year (n=70), and 2 years (n=31).
[2] BMAD is a size adjusted value of BMD incorporating body size measurements using UK norms in growing adolescents. Reported as g/cm3 and z-scores. Hip BMAD z-scores were not calculated as there were no available reference ranges.

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Khatchadourian K, Shazhan A, Metzger D. (2014) Clinical management of youth with gender dysphoria in Vancouver. The Journal of Pediatrics 164 (4): 906-11. Canada Retrospective observational chart review single centre study	27 young people with gender dysphoria who started GnRH analogues (at mean age [±SD] 14.7±1.9 years) out of 84 young people seen at the unit between 1998 and 2011. Note: the transmale and transfemale subgroups reported in the paper is discrepant, 15 transmales and 11 transfemales (n=26) reported in the outcomes section rather than the n=27	**Intervention** 84 young people with gender dysphoria were included. For GnRH analogues no specific treatment, dose or route of administration reported. **Comparison** No comparator.	**Critical Outcomes** No critical outcomes assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Stopping treatment*** The authors report that of 15 transmales taking GnRH analogues: • 14 transitioned to testosterone treatment during the observation period • 7 continued taking GnRH analogues after starting testosterone	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa tool for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. not reported 2. no non-exposed cohort 3. secure record 4. no **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. not applicable **Domain 3: Outcome**

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding

	stated in the paper; complete outcome reporting is also incomplete for the transfemale group.
	Inclusion criteria were at least Tanner stage 2 pubertal development, previous assessment by a mental health professional and a confirmed diagnosis of gender dysphoria (diagnostic criteria not specified). No exclusion criteria are specified.
			• 7 discontinued GnRH analogues after a median of 3.0 years (range 0.2 to 9.2 years), of which:
			  ○ 5 discontinued after hysterectomy and salpingo-oophorectomy
			  ○ 1 discontinued after 2.2 years (transitioned to gender-affirming hormone)
			  ○ 1 discontinued after <2 months due to mood and emotional lability
			The authors report that of 11 transfemales taking GnRH analogues:
			• 5 received oestrogen treatment during the observation period
			• 4 continued taking GnRH analogues during oestrogen treatment
			• 1 discontinued GnRH analogues during oestrogen treatment (no reason reported)
			• 1 stopped GnRH analogues after a few months due to emotional lability
			• 1 stopped GnRH analogues before oestrogen treatment (the following year delayed due to heavy smoking)
			• 1 discontinued GnRH analogues after 13 months due to choosing not to pursue transition
			
			Safety
			Of the 27 patients treated with GnRH analogues:
			• 1 transmale participant developed sterile abscesses; they were switched from leuprolide acetate to triptorelin, and this was well tolerated.
			• 1 transmale participant developed leg pains and headaches on GnRH analogues, which eventually resolved without treatment.
				1. record linkage
				2. yes
				3. in complete missing data
				
				Overall quality is assessed as poor.
				
				Other comments: mental health comorbidity was reported for all participants but not for the GnRH analogue cohort separately. Concomitant use of other medicines was not reported.
				
				Source of funding: No source of funding identified.

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			• 1 participant gained 19 kg within 9 months of initiating GnRH analogues, although their body mass index was >85 percentile before GnRH analogues.	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Klink D, Caris M, Heijboer A et al. (2015) Bone mass in young adulthood following gonadotropin-releasing hormone analog treatment and cross-sex hormone treatment in adolescents with gender dysphoria. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 100(2): e270-5 Netherlands Retrospective longitudinal observational single centre study To assess BMD development during GnRH analogues and at age 22 years in adolescents with gender dysphoria who started treatment for gender dysphoria during adolescence. 1998 to 2012	34 adolescents (mean age ±SD 14.9±1.9 for transfemales and 15.0±2.0 for transmales at start of GnRH analogues). Participants were included if they met DSM-IV-TR criteria for gender identity disorder of adolescence and had been treated with GnRH analogues and gender-affirming hormones during their pubertal years. No concomitant treatments were reported.	The intervention was GnRH analogue monotherapy (triptorelin pamoate 3.75 mg subcutaneously every 4 weeks) followed by gender-affirming hormones from 16 years with discontinuation of GnRH analogue after gonadectomy. Median duration of GnRH analogue monotherapy in transfemales was 1.3 years (range, 0.5 to 3.8 years), and in transmales was 1.5 years (range, 0.25 to 5.2 years).	**Critical outcomes** No critical outcomes assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Bone density: lumbar*** **Lumbar spine bone mineral apparent density (BMAD)[1]** Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.6±1.4) in transfemales (mean [±SD]): GnRH analogue: 0.22 (0.03) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.22 (0.02) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.44 (1.10), gender-affirming hormones: −0.90 (0.80) (p=NS) Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales (mean [±SD]: GnRH analogue: 0.25 (0.03) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.24 (0.02) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: 0.28 (0.90), gender-affirming hormones: −0.50 (0.81) (p=0.004) **Lumbar spine bone mineral density (BMD)[1]** Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment checklist for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. somewhat representative of children and adolescents who have gender dysphoria 2. not applicable 3. via routine clinical records 4. no **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. no control group **Domain 3: Outcome** 1. via routine clinical records 2. yes 3. follow-up rate variable across timepoints and no description of those lost **Overall quality is assessed as poor**. Other comments: Within person comparison. Small numbers of participants in each subgroup. No concomitant treatments or comorbidities were reported. Source of funding: None disclosed

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			16.6±1.4) in transfemales (mean [±SD]): GnRH analogue: 0.84 (0.13) g/m2, gender-affirming hormones: 0.84 (0.11) g/m2 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.77 (0.89), gender-affirming hormones: −1.01 (0.98) (NS) Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales (mean [±SD]): GnRH analogue: 0.95 (0.12) g/m2, gender-affirming hormones: 0.91 (0.10) g/m2 (p=0.006); z-score GnRH analogue: 0.17 (1.18), gender-affirming hormones: −0.72 (0.99) (p<0.001) ***Bone density; femoral*** **Femoral area BMAD[1]** Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.6±1.4) in transfemales (mean [±SD]), GnRH analogue: 0.28 (0.04) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.26 (0.04) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.93 (1.22), gender-affirming hormones: −1.57 (1.74) (p=NS) Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales (mean [±SD]), GnRH analogue: 0.32 (0.04) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.31 (0.04) (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: 0.01 (0.70), gender-affirming hormones: −0.28 (0.74) (NS)	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			Femoral area BMD[1] Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.6±1.4) in transfemales (mean [±SD]), GnRH analogue: 0.88 (0.12) g/m2, gender-affirming hormones: 0.87 (0.08) (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.66 (0.77), gender-affirming hormones: −0.95 (0.63) (NS) Change from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales (mean [±SD]), GnRH analogue: 0.92 (0.10) g/m2, gender-affirming hormones: 0.88 (0.09) (p=0.005); z-score GnRH analogue: 0.36 (0.88), gender-affirming hormones: −0.35 (0.79) (p=0.001)	

[1] BMD and BMAD of the lumbar spine and femoral region (nondominant side) measured by DXA scans at start of GnRH analogues, (n=32), start of gender-affirming hormones (n=34), and at 22 years (n=34).

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Schagen SEE, Cohen-Kettenis PT, Delemarre-van de Waal HA et al. (2016) Efficacy and Safety of Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone Agonist Treatment to Suppress Puberty in Gender Dysphoric Adolescents. The journal of sexual medicine 13(7): 1125-32	Adolescents with gender dysphoria (n=116), median age (range) 13.6 years (11.6 to 17.9) in transfemales and 14.2 years (11.1 to 18.6) in transmales during first year of GnRH analogues. Participants were included if they met DSM-IV-TR criteria for gender dysphoria, had lifelong extreme gender dysphoria, were psychologically stable and were living in a supportive environment. No concomitant treatments were	GnRH analogue monotherapy (triptorelin pamoate 3.75 mg at 0, 2 and 4 weeks followed by injections every 4 weeks, route of administration not described) for at least 3 months.	**Critical outcomes** No critical outcomes assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Other safety outcomes: liver function*** Glutamyl transferase was not elevated at baseline or during treatment in any subject. Mild elevations of aspartate aminotransferase (AST) and alanine aminotransferase (ALT) above the reference range were present at baseline but were not more prevalent during treatment than at baseline. Glutamyl transferase, AST, and ALT	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment checklist for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. somewhat representative of children and adolescents who have gender dysphoria 2. not applicable 3. via routine clinical records 4. no **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. no control group

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Netherlands Prospective longitudinal study To describe the changes in Tanner stage, testicular volume, gonadotropins, and sex steroids during GnRH analogues of adolescents with gender dysphoria to evaluate the efficacy. To report on liver enzymes, renal function and changes in body composition. 1998 to 2009	reported.		levels did not significantly change from baseline to 12 months of treatment. No values or statistical analyses were reported. ***Other safety outcomes: kidney function*** **Change in serum creatinine between 0 and 1 year** Transfemales (mean [±SD]): 70 (12) micromol/l at baseline, 66 (13) micromol/l at 1 year (p=0.20) Transmales (mean [±SD]): 73 (8) micromol/l at baseline, 68 (13) micromol/l at 1 year (p=0.01)	**Domain 3: Outcome** 1. via routine clinical records 2. yes 3. no statement **Overall quality is assessed as poor**. Other comments: Within person comparison. No concomitant treatments or comorbidities were reported. Source of funding: Ferring pharmaceuticals (triptorelin manufacturer)

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Staphorsius A, Baudewijntje P, Kreukels P, et al. (2015) Puberty suppression and executive functioning: an fMRI-study in adolescents with gender dysphoria. Psychoneuroendocrinology 565:190-9. Netherlands Cross-sectional (single time point) assessment single centre study	The inclusion criteria were diagnosed with Gender Identity Disorder according to the DSM-IV-TR and at least 12 years old and Tanner stage of at least B2 or G2 to G3 with measurable oestradiol and testosterone levels in girls and boys, respectively. For all group's exclusion criteria were an insufficient command of the Dutch language (how assessed not reported), unadjusted endocrine disorders, neurological or psychiatric disorders that could lead to deviant test results (details not reported) use	**Intervention** GnRH analogues (triptorelin pamoate 3.75 mg every 4 weeks subcutaneously or intramuscularly). **Comparison** The comparison was between adolescents with gender dysphoria receiving GnRH analogues and those without GnRH	**Critical Outcomes** No critical outcomes assessed. **Important outcomes** ***Psychosocial impact*** The Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) was used to assess psychosocial impact. The CBCL was administered once during the study. The reported outcomes for each group were (n, mean [±SD]): • Transfemales (all, n=18) 57.8 [±9.2] • Transfemales on GnRH analogues (n=8) 57.4 [±9.8] • Transfemales without GnRH analogues (n=10) 58.2 [±9.3]	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa tool for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection domain** 1. somewhat representative of children and adolescents who have gender dysphoria 2. drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort 3. via routine clinical records 4. no **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. study controls for age and diagnosis

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
	of psychotropic medication, and contraindications for an MRI scan. Additionally, adolescents receiving puberty delaying medication or any form of hormones besides oral contraceptives were excluded as controls. The sample size was 85 of whom 41 were adolescents (the numbers are discrepant with the number for whom outcomes are reported n=40) with gender dysphoria (20 of whom were being treated with GnRH analogues); 24 girls and 21 boys without gender dysphoria acted as controls (not further reported here). Details of the sampling frame are not reported. The ages at which GnRH analogues were started was not reported. The mean duration of treatment was 1.6 years (SD 1.0) Mean (±SD) Tanner stage for each group was reported: • Transfemales 3.9 [±1.1] • Transfemales on GnRH analogues 4.1 [±1.0] • Transfemales without GnRH analogues 3.8 [±1.1] • Transmales 4.5 [±0.9] • Transmales on GnRH analogues 4.1 [±1.1] Transmales without GnRH analogues 4.9 [±0.3]	analogues.	• Transmales (all, n=22) 60.4 [±10.2] • Transmales on GnRH analogues (n=12) 57.5 [±9.4] • Transmales without GnRH analogues (n=10) 63.9 [±10.5] The analysis of the CBCL data is not discussed, and statistical analysis is unclear. ***Cognitive development or functioning*** **IQ[1]** • Transfemales (mean [±SD]) on GnRH analogues: 94.0 (10.3) • Transfemales (mean [±SD]) without GnRH analogues: 109.4 (21.2) • Transmales (mean [±SD]) on GnRH analogues: 95.8 (15.6) • Transmales (mean [±SD]) without GnRH analogues: 98.5 (15.9) **Reaction time[2]** • Transfemales (mean [±SD]) on GnRH analogues: 10.9 (4.1) • Transfemales (mean [±SD]) without GnRH analogues: 9.9 (3.1) • Transmales (mean [±SD]) on GnRH analogues: 9.9 (3.1) • Transmales (mean [±SD]) without GnRH analogues: 10.0 (2.0) **Accuracy[3]** • Transfemales (mean [±SD]) on GnRH analogues: 73.9 (9.1) • Transfemales (mean [±SD]) without GnRH analogues: 83.4 (9.5) • Transmales (mean [±SD]) on GnRH analogues: 85.7 (10.5) • Transmales (mean [±SD]) without	**Domain 3: Outcome** 1. via clinical assessment 2. yes 3. unclear **Overall quality is assessed as poor.** Other comments: Physical and psychological comorbidity was not reported, concomitant use of other medicines was not reported. Source of funding: This work was supported by an educational grant from the pharmaceutical firm Ferring BV, and by a VICI grant (453-08-003) from the Dutch Science Foundation. The authors state that funding sources did not play a role in any component of this study.

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			GnRH analogues: 88.8 (9.7)	

[1] Estimated with 4 subscales (arithmetic, vocabulary, picture arrangement, and block design) of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, third edition (WISC-III®, Wechsler 1991) or the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, third edition (WAIS-III®, Wechsler 1997), depending on the participant's age.
[2] Reaction time in seconds in the Tower of London task
[3] Percentage of correct trials in the Tower of London task

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
Vlot, Mariska C, Klink, Daniel T, den Heijer, Martin et al. (2017) Effect of pubertal suppression and cross-sex hormone therapy on bone turnover markers and bone mineral apparent density (BMAD) in transgender adolescents. Bone 95: 11-19 Netherlands Retrospective observational data analysis study To investigate the course of 3 bone turnover markers in relation to bonemineral density, in adolescents with gender dysphoria during GnRH analogue and gender-affirming hormones. 2001 to 2011	Adolescents with gender dysphoria, n=70. Median age (range) 15.1 years (11.7 to 18.6) for transmales and 13.5 years (11.5 to 18.3) for transfemales at start of GnRH analogues. Participants were included if they had a diagnosis of gender dysphoria according to DSM-IV-TR criteria who were treated with GnRH analogues and then gender-affirming hormones. No concomitant treatments were reported. The study categorised participants into a young and old pubertal group, based on their bone age. The young transmales had a bone age of <14 years and the old transmales had a bone age of ≥14 years. The young transfemales group had a bone age of <15 years and the old transfemales group ≥15 years.	GnRH analogues (triptorelin pamoate 3.75 mg every 4 weeks subcutaneously).	**Critical outcomes** No critical outcomes reported **Important outcomes** ***Bone density: lumbar*** **Lumbar spine bone mineral apparent density (BMAD)** Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales (bone age of <15 years; median [range]), GnRH analogue: 0.21 (0.17 to 0.25) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.20 (0.18 to 0.24) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.20 (−1.82 to 1.18), gender-affirming hormones: −1.52 (−2.36 to 0.42) (p=0.001) Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales (bone age of ≥15; median [range]), GnRH analogue: 0.22 (0.18 to 0.25) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.22 (0.19 to 0.24) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −1.18 (−1.78 to 1.09), gender-affirming hormones: −1.15 (−2.21 to 0.08) (p≤0.1) Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of <15 years; median [range]), GnRH analogue: 0.23 (0.20 to 0.29) g/cm3, gender-affirming	This study was appraised using the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment checklist for cohort studies. **Domain 1: Selection** 1. Somewhat representative of children and adolescents who have gender dysphoria 2. Not applicable 3. Via routine clinical records 4. No **Domain 2: Comparability** 1. No control group **Domain 3: Outcome** 1. Via routine clinical records 2. Yes 3. Follow-up rate variable across outcomes and no description of those lost **Overall quality is assessed as poor**. Other comments: Within person comparison. No concomitant treatments were reported. Source of funding: grant from Abbott diagnostics

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			hormones: 0.23 (0.19 to 0.28) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.05 (−0.78 to 2.94), gender-affirming hormones: −0.84 (−2.20 to 0.87) (p=0.003) Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of ≥15; median [range]), GnRH analogue: 0.26 (0.21 to 0.29) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.24 (0.20 to 0.28) g/cm3 (p≤0.01); z-score GnRH analogue: 0.27 (−1.60 to 1.80), gender-affirming hormones: −0.29 (−2.28 to 0.90) (p≤ 0.0001) ***Bone density; femoral*** **Femoral neck BMAD** Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales (bone age of <15 years; median [range]), GnRH analogue: 0.29 (0.20 to 0.33) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.27 (0.20 to 0.33) g/cm3 (p≤0.1); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.71 (−3.35 to 0.37), gender-affirming hormones: −1.32 (−3.39 to 0.21) (p≤0.1) Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales (bone age of ≥15; median [range]), GnRH analogue: 0.30 (0.26 to 0.36) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.30 (0.26 to 0.34) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.44 (−1.37 to 0.93), gender-affirming hormones: −0.36 (−1.50 to 0.46) (NS) Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of <15 years; median [range]),	

Study details	Population	Interventions	Study outcomes	Appraisal and Funding
			GnRH analogue: 0.31 (0.26 to 0.36) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.30 (0.22 to 0.35) g/cm3 (NS); z-score GnRH analogue: −0.01 (−1.30 to 0.91), gender-affirming hormones: −0.37 (−2.28 to 0.47) (NS) Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of ≥15; median [range]), GnRH analogue: 0.33 (0.25 to 0.39) g/cm3, gender-affirming hormones: 0.30 (0.23 to 0.41) g/cm3 (p≤0.01); z-score GnRH analogue: 0.27 (−1.39 to 1.32), gender-affirming hormones: −0.27 (−1.91 to 1.29) (p=0.002)	

Appendix F Quality appraisal checklists

Newcastle-Ottawa tool for cohort studies

Question	
Domain: Selection	
1. Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Truly representative of the average [describe] in the community Somewhat representative of the average [describe] in the community Selected group of users e.g. nurses, volunteers No description of the derivation of the cohort
2. Selection of the non-exposed cohort	Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort Drawn from a different source No description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort
3. Ascertainment of exposure	Secure record (e.g. surgical records) Structured interview Written self-report No description
4. Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Yes / No
Domain: Comparability	
1. Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Study controls for [select most important factor] Study controls for any additional factor [this criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor]
Domain: Outcome	
1. Assessment of outcome	Independent blind assessment Record linkage Self-report No description
2. Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	Yes [select and adequate follow up period for outcome of interest] No
3. Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	Complete follow up (all subjects accounted for) Subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias (small number lost to follow up [select an adequate %] follow up or description provided of those lost) Follow up rate [select an adequate %] and no description of those lost No statement

Appendix G Grade profiles

Table 2: Question 1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – gender dysphoria

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Impact on gender dysphoria									
Mean±SD Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale[1] (version(s) not reported), time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (before gender-affirming hormones, higher scores indicate more gender dysphoria)									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=41	None	Baseline: 53.20±7.91 GnRH analogue: 53.9±17.42 *P*=0.333	Critical	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; *P*, P-value; SD, Standard deviation.

1 The UGDS is a validated screening tool for both adolescents and adults to assess gender dysphoria. It consists of 12 items, to be answered on a 1- to 5-point scale, resulting in a sum score between 12 and 60. The higher the UGDS score the greater the gender dysphoria.
2 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by de Vries et al. (2011) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).

Table 3: Question 1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – mental health

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Impact on mental health									

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Mean±SD Beck Depression Inventory-II, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones). (Lower scores indicate benefit)									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=41	None	Baseline: 8.31±7.12 GnRH analogue: 4.95±6.72 *P*=0.004	Critical	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Trait Anger (TPI), time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit)									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=41	None	Baseline: 18.29±5.54 GnRH analogue: 17.88±5.24 *P*=0.503	Critical	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Trait Anxiety (STAI), time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit)									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=41	None	Baseline: 39.43±10.07 GnRH analogue: 37.95±9.38 *P*=0.276	Critical	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; *P*, P-value; SD, Standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by de Vries et al. (2011) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).

Table 4: Question 1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – body image

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Impact on body image									
Mean±SD Body Image Scale (primary sexual characteristics), time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit)									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=57	None	Baseline: 4.10±0.56 GnRH analogue: 3.98±0.71 *P*=0.145	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Body Image Scale (secondary sexual characteristics), time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit)									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=57	None	Baseline: 2.74±0.65 GnRH analogue: 2.82±0.68 *P*=0.569	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Body Image Scale (neutral characteristics), time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit)									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=57	None	Baseline: 2.41±0.63 GnRH analogue: 2.47±0.56 *P*=0.620	Important	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; *P*, P-value; SD, Standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by de Vries et al. (2011) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).

Table 5: Question 1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – psychosocial impact

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Psychosocial impact									
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, at baseline, higher scores indicate benefit)									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	n=101 58.72 [±11.38]	n=100 56.63 [±13.14]	*P*=0.23	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, at 6 months[2] (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	n=101 60.89 [±12.17]	n=100 60.29 [±12.81]	*P*=0.73	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, at 12 months[3] (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	n=60 64.70 [±13.34]	n=61 62.97 [±14.10]	*P*=0.49	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, at 18 months[4] (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	n=35 67.40 [±13.93]	n=36 62.53 [±13.54]	*P*=0.14	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, participants at 6 months compared to baseline (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=101 N=101	None	Baseline: 58.72±11.38 6 months: 60.89±12.17 *P*=0.19	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, participants at 12 months compared to baseline (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=101 N=60	None	Baseline: 58.72±11.38 12 months: 64.70±13.34 *P*=0.003	Important	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, participants at 18 months compared to baseline (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=101 N=35	None	Baseline: 58.72±11.38 18 months: 67.40±13.93 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, participants at 12 months compared to 6 months (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=101 N=60	None	6 months: 60.89±12.17 12 months: 64.70±13.34 *P*=0.07	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, participants at 18 months compared to 6 months (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=101 N=35	None	6 months: 60.89±12.17 18 months: 67.40±13.93 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, participants at 18 months compared to 12 months (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=60 N=35	None	12 months: 64.70±13.34 18 months: 67.40±13.93 *P*=0.35	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, in all participants (including those not treated with GnRH analogues) at 6 months[2] compared to baseline (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=201	None	Baseline: 57.73±12.27 6 months: 60.68±12.47 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, in all participants (including those not treated with GnRH analogues) at 12 months[3] compared to baseline (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=201 N=121	None	Baseline: 57.73±12.27 12 months: 63.31±14.41 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Mean±SD Children's Global Assessment Scale score, in all participants (including those not treated with GnRH analogues) at 18 months[4] compared to baseline (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=201 N=71	None	Baseline: 57.73±12.27 18 months: 64.93±13.85 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Children's Global Assessment Scale score, in all participants (including those not treated with GnRH analogues) at 12 months compared to 6 months (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=201 N=121	None	6 months: 60.68±12.47 12 months: 63.31±14.41 *P*<0.08	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Children's Global Assessment Scale score, in all participants (including those not treated with GnRH analogues) at 18 months compared to 6 months (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=201 N=71	None	6 months: 60.68±12.47 18 months: 64.93±13.85 *P*<0.02	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Children's Global Assessment Scale score, in all participants (including those not treated with GnRH analogues) at 18 months compared to 12 months (higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	N=121 N=71	None	12 months: 63.31±14.41 18 months: 64.93±13.85 *P*<0.45	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Children's Global Assessment Scale score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, higher scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=41	None	Baseline: 70.24±10.12 GnRH analogue: 73.90±9.63 *P*=0.005	Important	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Mean±SD Child Behaviour Checklist (total T) score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 60.70±12.76 GnRH analogue: 54.46±11.23 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Child Behaviour Checklist (internalising T) score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 61.00±12.21 GnRH analogue: 52.1±9.81 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Child Behaviour Checklist (externalising T) score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 58.04±12.99 GnRH analogue: 53.81±11.86 *P*=0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Proportion of adolescents scoring in the clinical range Child Behaviour Checklist total problem scale, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 44.4% GnRH analogue: 22,2% *P*=0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Youth Self-Report (total T) score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormone, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 55.46±11.56 GnRH analogue: 50.00±10.56 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Mean±SD Youth Self-Report (internalising T) score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 56.04±12.49 GnRH analogue: 49.78±11.63 *P*<0.001	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Youth Self-Report (externalising T) score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 53.30±11.87 GnRH analogue: 49.98±9.35 *P*=0.009	Important	VERY LOW
Proportion of adolescents scoring in the clinical range Youth Self-Report (internalising T) score, time point at baseline (before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones, lower scores indicate benefit).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[5]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=54	None	Baseline: 29.6% GnRH analogue: 11.1% *P*=0.017	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Child Behaviour Checklist score, transfemales (lower scores indicate benefit									
1 cross-sectional study Staphorsius et al 2015	Serious limitations[6]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=8	N=10	GnRH analogue: 57.4 [±9.8] No GnRH analogue: 58.2 [±9.3]	Important	VERY LOW
Mean±SD Child Behaviour Checklist score, transmales (lower scores indicate benefit)									
1 cross-sectional study Staphorsius et al 2015	Serious limitations[6]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=12	N=10	GnRH analogues: 57.5 [±9.4] No GnRH analogue: 63.9 [±10.5]	Important	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; *P*, P-value; SD, Standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Costa et al. (2015) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).

2 6 months from baseline (after 6 months of psychological support – both groups).
3 12 months from baseline (delayed eligible gender dysphoria [GD] adolescents, after 12 months of psychological support; immediately eligible GD adolescents, after 12 months of psychological support + 6 months of puberty suppression).
4 18 months from baseline (delayed eligible gender dysphoria [GD] adolescents, after 12 months of psychological support; immediately eligible GD adolescents, after 12 months of psychological support + 6 months of puberty suppression).
5 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by de Vries et al. (2011) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).
6 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Staphorsius et al. (2015) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no randomisation).

Table 6: Question 1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – engagement with healthcare services

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	**Risk of bias**	**Indirectness**	**Inconsistency**	**Imprecision**	**Intervention**	**Comparator**	**Result**		
Engagement with healthcare services									
Number (proportion) failing to engage with health care services (did not attend clinic), at (up to) 9 years follow-up									
1 cohort study Brik et al 2018	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	9/214 (4.2%)	None	9 adolescents out of 214 failed to attend clinic and were excluded from the study (4.2%)	Important	VERY LOW
Loss to follow-up									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	201	None	The sample size at baseline and 6 months was 201, which dropped by 39.8% to 121 after 12 months and by 64.7% to 71 at 18 months follow-up. No explanation of the reasons for loss to follow-up are reported.	Important	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Brik et al. (2018) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).
2 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Costa et al. (2015) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).

Table 7: Question 1. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the clinical effectiveness of treatment with GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – stopping treatment

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Stopping treatment									
Number (proportion) stopping GnRH analogues, at (up to) 9 years follow-up									
1 cohort study Brik et al 2018	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	9/143 (6.2%)	None	9/143 adolescents stopped GnRH analogues (6.2%)[2]	Important	VERY LOW
Number (proportion) stopping from GnRH analogues, at (up to) 13 years follow-up									
1 cohort study Khatchadourian et al 2014	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	11/27 (42%)	None	11/26 stopped GnRH analogues (42%)[4]	Important	VERY LOW
Number (proportion) stopping GnRH analogues but who wished to continue endocrine treatment, at (up to) 9 years follow-up									
1 cohort study Brik et al 2018	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	4/143 (2.8%)	None	4/143 adolescents stopped GnRH analogues but wished to continue treatment (2.8%)	Important	VERY LOW
Number (proportion) stopping GnRH analogues who no longer wished gender-affirming treatment, at (up to) 9 years follow-up									
1 cohort study Brik et al 2018	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	5/143 (3.5%)	None	5/143 adolescents stopped GnRH analogues and no longer wished to continue gender-affirming treatment (3.5%)	Important	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Brik et al. (2018) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).

2 Median duration of 0.8 years (range 0.1 to 3.0). Five adolescents stopped treatment because they no longer wished to receive gender-affirming treatment for various reasons. In 4 adolescents (all transmales), although they wanted to continue treatments for gender dysphoria, GnRH analogues were stopped mainly because of adverse effects (such as mood and emotional lability).
3 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Khatchadourian et al. (2014) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding, no control group and high number of participants lost to follow-up).
4 Because of transitioning to gender-affirming hormones or gender-affirming surgery, adverse effects (such as mood and emotional lability) or no longer wishing to pursue transition.

Table 8. Question 2. For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the short-term and long-term safety of GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – bone density

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Bone density: change in lumbar BMAD									
Change in lumbar spine BMAD from baseline to 1 year in transfemales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=31	None	Mean (SD), g/cm^3 Baseline: 0.235 (0.030) 1 year: 0.233 (0.029) p=0.459 z-score Baseline: 0.859 (0.154) 1 year: −0.228 (1.027) p=0.000	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar spine BMAD from baseline to 1 year in transmales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=39	None	Mean (SD), g/cm^3 Baseline: 0.196 (0.035) 1 year: 0.201 (0.033) p=0.074 z-score Baseline: −0.186 (1.230) 1 year: −0.541 (1.396) p=0.006	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Change in lumbar spine BMAD from baseline to 2 years in transfemales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=10	None	Mean (SD), g/cm^3 Baseline: 0.240 (0.027) 2 years: 0.240 (0.030) p=0.865 z-score Baseline: 0.486 (0.809) 2 years: −0.279 (0.930) p=0.000	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar spine BMAD from baseline to 2 years in transmales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=21	None	Mean (SD), g/cm^3 Baseline: 0.195 (0.058) 2 years: 0.198 (0.055) p=0.433 z-score Baseline: −0.361 (1.439) 2 years: −0.913 (1.318) p=0.001	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar BMAD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.6±1.4) in transfemales									
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=11 N=12	None	Mean (SD), g/cm^3 GnRH analogue: 0.22 (0.03) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.22 (0.02) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.44 (1.10) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.90 (0.80) p-value: NS	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar BMAD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales									

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=18	None	Mean (SD), g/cm^3 GnRH analogue: 0.25 (0.03) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.24 (0.02) NS z-score GnRH analogue: 0.28 (0.90) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.50 (0.81) p-value: 0.004	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar BMAD from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales (bone age of <15 years)									
1 observational study Vlot et al. 2017	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=15	None	Median (range), g/cm^3 GnRH analogue: 0.21 (0.17 to 0.25) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.20 (0.18 to 0.24) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.20 (−1.82 to 1.18) Gender-affirming hormones: −1.52 (−2.36 to 0.42) p-value: <0.01	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar BMAD from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales (bone age of ≥15)									
1 observational study Vlot et al. 2017	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=5	None	Median (range), g/cm^3 GnRH analogue: 0.22 (0.18 to 0.25) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.22 (0.19 to 0.24) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −1.18 (−1.78 to 1.09)	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
							Gender-affirming hormones: −1.15 (−2.21 to 0.08) p-value: p≤0.1		
Change in lumbar BMAD from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of <14 years)									
1 observational study Vlot et al. 2017	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=11	None	Median (range), g/cm^3 GnRH analogue: 0.23 (0.20 to 0.29) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.23 (0.19 to 0.28) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.05 (−0.78 to 2.94) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.84 (−2.20 to 0.87) p-value: ≤0.01	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar BMAD from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of ≥14)									
1 observational study Vlot et al. 2017	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=23	None	Median (range), g/cm3 GnRH analogue: 0.26 (0.21 to 0.29) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.24 (0.20 to 0.28) p≤0.01 z-score GnRH analogue: 0.27 (−1.60 to 1.80) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.29 (−2.28 to 0.90) p-value: p ≤ 0.01)	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Bone density: change in lumbar BMD									
Change in lumbar spine BMD from baseline to 1 year in transfemales									

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=31	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.860 (0.154) 1 year: 0.859 (0.129) p=0.962 z-score Baseline: −0.016 (1.106) 1 year: −0.461 (1.121) p=0.003	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar spine BMD from baseline to 1 year in transmales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=39	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.694 (0.149) 1 year: 0.718 (0.124) p=0.006 z-score Baseline: −0.395 (1.428) 1 year: −1.276 (1.410) p=0.000	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar spine BMD from baseline to 2 years in transfemales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=10	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.867 (0.141) 2 years: 0.878 (0.130) p=0.395 z-score Baseline: 0.130 (0.972) 2 years: −0.890 (1.075) p=0.000	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar spine BMD from baseline to 2 years in transmales									
1 observational study	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=21	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.695 (0.220) 2 years: 0.731 (0.209) p=0.058	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Joseph et al. (2019)							z-score Baseline: −0.715 (1.406) 2 years: −2.000 (1.384) p=0.000		
Change in lumbar BMD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.6±1.4) in transfemales									
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=12 N=11	None	Mean (SD), g/m2 GnRH analogue: 0.84 (0.13) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.84 (0.11) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.77 (0.89) Gender-affirming hormones: −1.01 (0.98) NS	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in lumbar BMD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales									
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=18	None	Mean (SD), g/m2 GnRH analogue: 0.95 (0.12) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.91 (0.10) p-value: 0.006 z-score GnRH analogue: 0.17 (1.18) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.72 (0.99) p-value: <0.001	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Bone density: change in femoral neck (hip) BMD									
Change in femoral neck BMD from baseline to 1 year in transfemales									
1 observational study	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=31	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.894 (0.118) 1 year: 0.905 (0.104) p=0.571	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Joseph et al. (2019)							z-score Baseline: 0.157 (0.905) 1 year: −0.340 (0.816) p=0.002		
Change from baseline to 1 year in femoral neck BMD in transmales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=39	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.772 (0.137) 1 year: 0.785 (0.120) p=0.797 z-score Baseline: −0.863 (1.215) 1 year: −1.440 (1.075) p=0.000	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change from baseline to 2 years in femoral neck BMD in transfemales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=10	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.920 (0.116) 2 years: 0.910 (0.125) p=0.402 z-score Baseline: 0.450 (0.781) 2 years: −0.600 (1.059) p=0.002	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change from baseline to 2 years in femoral neck BMD in transmales									
1 observational study Joseph et al. (2019)	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=21	None	Mean (SD), kg/m2 Baseline: 0.766 (0.215) 2 years: 0.773 (0.197) p=0.604 z-score Baseline: −1.075 (1.145) 2 years: −1.779 (0.816) p=0.001	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Bone density: change in femoral neck (hip) BMAD									
Change from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in femoral neck BMAD in transfemales (bone age of <15 years)									
1 observational study Vlot et al. 2017	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=16	None	Median (range), g/cm3 GnRH analogue: 0.29 (0.20 to 0.33) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.27 (0.20 to 0.33) p≤0.1 z-score GnRH analogue: −0.71 (−3.35 to 0.37) Gender-affirming hormones: −1.32 (−3.39 to 0.21) p≤0.1	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in femoral neck BMAD from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transfemales (bone age of ≥15)									
1 observational study Vlot et al. 2017	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=6	None	Median (range), g/cm3 GnRH analogue: 0.30 (0.26 to 0.36) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.30 (0.26 to 0.34) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.44 (−1.37 to 0.93) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.36 (−1.50 to 0.46) NS	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in femoral neck BMAD from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of <14 years)									
1 observational study	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=10	None	Median (range), g/cm3 GnRH analogue: 0.31 (0.26 to 0.36) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.30 (0.22 to 0.35)	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Vlot et al. 2017							NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.01 (−1.30 to 0.91) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.37 (−2.28 to 0.47) NS		
Change in femoral neck BMAD from starting GnRH analogue to starting gender-affirming hormones in transmales (bone age of ≥14)									
1 observational study Vlot et al. 2017	Serious limitations[3]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=23	None	Median (range), g/cm3 GnRH analogue: 0.33 (0.25 to 0.39) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.30 (0.23 to 0.41) p-value: ≤0.01 z-score GnRH analogue: 0.27 (−1.39 to 1.32) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.27 (−1.91 to 1.29) p-value: ≤0.01	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Bone density: change in femoral area BMD									
Change in femoral BMD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.6±1.4) in transfemales									
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=14 N=6	None	Mean (SD), g/m2 GnRH analogue: 0.88 (0.12) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.87 (0.08) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.66 (0.77) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.95 (0.63) NS	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Change in femoral BMD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales									
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=18 N=13	None	Mean (SD), g/m2 GnRH analogue: 0.92 (0.10) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.88 (0.09) p-value: 0.005 z-score GnRH analogue: 0.36 (0.88) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.35 (0.79) p-value: 0.001	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Bone density: change in femoral area BMAD									
Change in femoral BMAD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 14.9±1.9) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.6±1.4) in transfemales									
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=12 N=10	None	Mean (SD), g/cm3 GnRH analogue: 0.28 (0.04) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.26 (0.04) NS z-score GnRH analogue: −0.93 (1.22) Gender-affirming hormones: −1.57 (1.74) p-value: NS	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in femoral BMAD from starting GnRH analogue (mean age 15.0±2.0) to starting gender-affirming hormones (mean age 16.4±2.3) in transmales									
1 observational study Klink et al. 2015	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=18 N=18	None	Mean (SD), g/cm3 GnRH analogue: 0.32 (0.04) Gender-affirming hormones: 0.31 (0.04) NS z-score	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
							GnRH analogue: 0.01 (0.70) Gender-affirming hormones: −0.28 (0.74) NS		

Abbreviations: BMAD, bone mineral apparent density; BMD, bone mineral density; GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; NS, not significant; SD, standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Joseph et al. (2019) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).
2 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Klink et al. (2015) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding, no randomisation, no control group and high number of participants lost to follow-up).
3 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Vlot et al. (2017) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control).

Table 9 Question 2: For children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the short-term and long-term safety of GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – cognitive development or functioning

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Cognitive development or functioning (1 cross-sectional study)									
IQ (4 subscales: arithmetic, vocabulary, picture arrangement, and block design) at a single time point between GnRH analogue treated and untreated transfemales									
1 Cross-sectional study Staphorsius et al. 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=8 Mean (SD) 94.0 (10.3)	N=10 Mean (SD) 109.4 (21.2)	NR	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
IQ (4 subscales: arithmetic, vocabulary, picture arrangement, and block design) at a single time point between GnRH analogue treated and untreated transmales									

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
1 Cross-sectional study Staphorsius et al. 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=12 Mean (SD) 95.8 (15.6)	N=10 Mean (SD) 98.5 (15.9)	NR	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Reaction time at a single time point between GnRH analogue treated and untreated transfemales									
1 Cross-sectional study Staphorsius et al. 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=8 Mean (SD) 10.9 (4.1)	N=10 Mean (SD) 9.9 (3.1)	NR	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Reaction time at a single time point between GnRH analogue treated and untreated transmales									
1 Cross-sectional study Staphorsius et al. 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=12 Mean (SD) 9.9 (3.1)	N=10 Mean (SD) 10.0 (2.0)	NR	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Accuracy at a single time point between GnRH analogue treated and untreated transfemales									
1 cohort study Staphorsius et al. 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=8 Mean (SD) 73.9 (9.1)	N=10 Mean (SD) 83.4 (9.5)	NR	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Accuracy at a single time point between GnRH analogue treated and untreated transmales									
1 cohort study Staphorsius et al. 2015	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=12 Mean (SD) 85.7 (10.5)	N=10 Mean (SD) 88.8 (9.7)	NR	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; NR, not reported; *P*, P-value; SD, Standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Staphorsius et al. (2015) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no randomisation).

Table 10: Question 2: In children and adolescents with gender dysphoria, what is the short-term and long-term safety of GnRH analogues compared with one or a combination of psychological support, social transitioning to the desired gender or no intervention? – other safety outcomes

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
Other safety outcomes: change in serum creatinine									
Change in serum creatinine (micromol/l) between baseline and 1 year in transfemales									
1 observational study Schagen et al. 2016	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=28	None	Mean (SD) Baseline: 70 (12) 1 year: 66 (13) p-value: 0.20	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Change in serum creatinine (µmol/l) between baseline and 1 year in transmales									
1 observational study Schagen et al. 2016	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	N=29	None	Mean (SD) Baseline: 73 (8) 1 year: 68 (13) p-value: 0.01	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW
Other safety outcomes: liver enzymes									
Presence of elevated liver enzymes (AST, ALT, and glutamyl transferase) between baseline and during treatment									
1 observational study Schagen et al. 2016	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	39	None	Glutamyl transferase was not elevated at baseline or during treatment in any subject. Mild elevations of AST and ALT above the reference range were present at baseline but were not more prevalent during treatment than at baseline.	IMPORTANT	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients% (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Intervention	Comparator	Result		
							Glutamyl transferase, AST, and ALT levels did not significantly change from baseline to 12 months of treatment.		
Other safety outcomes: adverse effects									
Proportion of patients reporting adverse effects									
1 cohort study Khatchadourian et al 2014	Serious limitations[2]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable[2]	27	None	3/27 adolescents[3]	Important	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; P, P-value; SD, standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Schagen et al. (2016) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control).

2 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by Khatchadourian et al. (2014) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding, no control group and high number of participants lost to follow-up).

3 1 transmale developed sterile abscesses; they were switched from leuprolide acetate to triptorelin, and this was well tolerated. 1 transmale developed leg pains and headaches, which eventually resolved without treatment. 1 participant gained 19 kg within 9 months of initiating GnRH analogues.

Table 11: Question 4. From the evidence selected, are there any subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria that may derive more (or less) advantage from treatment with GnRH analogues than the wider population of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria? – critical outcomes

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
Subgroups: sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females									

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
Impact on gender dysphoria									
Mean [±SD] Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale (version(s) not reported), time point at baseline (before GnRHa) versus follow-up (just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[2] score at T0 47.95 [±9.70] score at T1 49.67 [±9.47]	n-NR[2] score at T0 56.57 [±3.89] score at T1 56.62 [±4.0]	*F*-ratio 15.98 (*df, errdf*: 1,39), *P*<0.001	Critical	VERY LOW
Impact on mental health									
Mean [±SD] Beck Depression Inventory-II, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[2] score at T0 5.71 [±4.31] score at T1 3.50 [±4.58]	n-NR[2] score at T0 10.34 [±8.24] score at T1 6.09 [±7.93]	*F*-ratio 3.85 (*df, errdf*: 1,39), *P*=0.057	Critical	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Trait Anger (TPI), time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[2] score at T0 5.22 [±2.76] score at T1 5.00 [±3.07]	n-NR[2] score at T0 6.43 [±2.78] score at T1 6.39 [±2.59]	*F*-ratio 5.70 (*df, errdf*: 1,39), *P*=0.022	Critical	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
Mean [±SD] Trait Anxiety (STAI), time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[2] score at T0 4.33 [±2.68] score at T1 4.39 [±2.64]	n-NR[2] score at T0 7.00 [±2.36] score at T1 6.17 [±2.69]	*F*-ratio 16.07 (*df, errdf*: 1,39), *P*<0.001	Critical	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; NR, not reported; *P*, P-value; SD, Standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by de Vries et al. (2011) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).
2 The overall sample size completing the outcome at both time points was 41.

Table 11: Question: 4. From the evidence selected, are there any subgroups of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria that may derive more (or less) advantage from treatment with GnRH analogues than the wider population of children and adolescents with gender dysphoria? – important outcomes

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
Subgroups: sex assigned at birth males compared with sex assigned at birth females									
Impact on body image									
Mean [±SD] Body Image Scale (primary sexual characteristics), time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[2] score at T0 4.02 [±0.16] score at T1 3.74 [±0.78]	n-NR[2] score at T0 4.16 [±0.52] score at T1 4.17 [±0.58]	*F*-ratio 4.11 (*df, errdf*: 1,55), *P*=0.047	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Body Image Scale (secondary sexual characteristics), time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[2] score at T0 2.66 [±0.50] score at T1 2.39 [±0.69]	n-NR[2] score at T0 2.81 [±0.76] score at T1 3.18 [±0.42]	*F*-ratio 11.57 (*df, errdf*: 1,55), *P*=0.001[3]	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Body Image Scale (neutral characteristics), time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[2] score at T0 2.60 [±0.58] score at T1 2.32 [±0.59]	n-NR[2] score at T0 2.24 [±0.62] score at T1 2.61 [±0.50]	*F*-ratio 0.081 (*df, errdf*: 1,55), *P*=0.777[3]	Important	VERY LOW
Psychosocial impact									
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, at baseline.									
1 cohort study Costa et al 2015	Serious limitations[4]	No serious indirectness	No serious inconsistency	Not calculable	n=not reported	n=not reported	*t*-test 2.15; *P*=0.03[5]	Important	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
					55.4 [±12.7]	59.2 [±11.8]			
Mean [±SD] Children's Global Assessment Scale score, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[6] score at T0 73.10 [±8.84] score at T1 77.33 [±8.69]	n-NR[6] score at T0 67.25 [±11.06] score at T1 70.30 [±9.44]	*F*-ratio 5.77 (*df, errdf*: 1,39), *P*=0.021	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Child Behaviour Checklist (total T) score, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[7] score at T0 59.42 [±11.78] score at T1 50.38 [±10.57]	n-NR[7] score at T0 61.73 [±13.60] score at T1 57.73 [±10.82]	*F*-ratio 2.64 (*df, errdf*: 1,52), *P=0.110*	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Child Behaviour Checklist (internalising T) score, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[7] score at T0 60.00 [±9.51] score at T1 52.17 [±9.81]	n-NR[7] score at T0 61.80 [±14.12] score at T1 56.30 [±10.33]	*F*-ratio 1.16 (*df, errdf*: 1,52), *P*=0.286	Important	VERY LOW

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
Mean [±SD] Child Behaviour Checklist (externalising T) score, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[7] score at T0 54.71 [±12.91] score at T1 48.75 [±10.22]	n-NR[7] score at T0 60.70 [±12.64] score at T1 57.87 [±11.66]	*F*-ratio 6.29 (*df, errdf*: 1,52), *P*=0.015	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Youth Self-Report (total T) score, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[7] score at T0 53.56 [±12.26] score at T1 47.84 [±10.86]	n-NR[7] score at T0 57.10 [±10.87] score at T1 51.86 [±10.11]	*F*-ratio 1.99 (*df, errdf*: 1,52), *P*=0.164	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Youth Self-Report (internalising T) score, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRH analogues) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[7] score at T0 55.88 [±11.81] score at T1 49.24 [±12.24]	n-NR[7] score at T0 56.17 [±13.25] score at T1 50.24 [±11.28]	*F*-ratio 0.049 (*df, errdf*: 1,52), *P*=0.825	Important	VERY LOW
Mean [±SD] Youth Self-Report (externalising T) score, time point at baseline (T0 before GnRHa) versus follow-up (T1 just before gender-affirming hormones).									

QUALITY					Summary of findings			IMPORTANCE	CERTAINTY
					No of events/No of patients (n/N%)		Effect		
Study	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Sex assigned at birth males	Sex assigned at birth females	Result		
1 cohort study de Vries et al 2011	Serious limitations[1]	No serious indirectness	Not applicable	Not calculable	n-NR[7] score at T0 48.72 [±11.83] score at T1 46.52 [±9.23]	n-NR[7] score at T0 57.24 [±10.59] score at T1 52.97 [±8.51]	*F*-ratio 9.14 (*df, errdf*: 1,52), *P*=0.004	Important	VERY LOW

Abbreviations: GnRH, gonadotrophin releasing hormone; NR, not reported; *P*, P-value; SD, Standard deviation.

1 Downgraded 1 level - the cohort study by de Vries et al. (2011) was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality overall; lack of blinding and no control group).

2 The overall sample size completing the outcome at both time points was 57.

3 There was a significant interaction effect between sex assigned at birth and BDI between T0 and T1; sex assigned at birth females became more dissatisfied with their secondary F (df, errdf), P: 14.59 (1,55), P<0.001) and neutral F (df, errdf), P: 15.26 (1,55), P<0.001) sex characteristics compared with sex assigned at birth males.

4 Serious limitations – the cohort study by Costa et al. 2015 was assessed as at high risk of bias (poor quality).

5 At baseline, CGAS scores were not associated with any demographic variable, in both sex assigned at birth males and females. There were no statistically significant differences in CGAS scores between gender dysphoric sex assigned at birth males and females in all follow-up evaluations (P>0.1; full data not reported).

6 The overall sample size completing the outcome at both time points was 41

7 The overall sample size completing the outcome at both time points was 54.

Glossary

Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II)	The BDI-II is a tool for assessing depressive symptoms. There are no specific scores to categorise depression severity, but it is suggested that 0 to 13 is minimal symptoms, 14 to 19 is mild depression, 20 to 28 is moderate depression, and severe depression is 29 to 63.
Body Image Scale (BIS)	The BIS is used to measure body satisfaction. The scale consists of 30 body features, which the person rates on a 5-point scale. Each of the 30 items falls into one of 3 basic groups based on its relative importance as a gender-defining body feature: primary sex characteristics, secondary sex characteristics, and neutral body characteristics. A higher score indicates more dissatisfaction.
Bone mineral apparent density (BMAD)	BMAD is a size adjusted value of bone mineral density (BMD) incorporating body size measurements using UK norms in growing adolescents.
Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL)	CBCL is a checklist parents complete to detect emotional and behavioural problems in children and adolescents.
Children's Global Assessment Scale (CGAS)	The CGAS tool is a validated measure of global functioning on a single rating scale from 1 to 100. Lower scores indicate poorer functioning.
Gender	The roles, behaviours, activities, attributes, and opportunities that any society considers appropriate for girls and boys, and women and men.
Gender dysphoria	Discomfort or distress that is caused by a discrepancy between a person's gender identity (how they see themselves regarding their gender) and that person's sex assigned at birth (and the associated gender role, and/or primary and secondary sex characteristics).
Gonadotrophin releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues	GnRH analogues competitively block GnRH receptors to prevent the spontaneous release of 2 gonadotropin hormones, Follicular Stimulating Hormone (FSH) and Luteinising Hormone (LH) from the pituitary gland. The reduction in FSH and LH secretion reduces oestradiol secretion from the ovaries in those whose sex assigned at birth was female and testosterone secretion from the testes in those whose sex assigned at birth was male.
Sex assigned at birth	Sex assigned at birth (male or female) is a biological term and is based on genes and how external and internal sex and reproductive organs work and respond to hormones. Sex is the label that is recorded when a baby's birth is registered.
Tanner stage	Tanner staging is a scale of physical development.
Trait Anger Spielberger scales of the State-Trait Personality Inventory (TPI)	The TPI is a validated 20-item inventory tool which measures the intensity of anger as the disposition to experience angry feelings as a personality trait. Higher scores indicate greater anger.
Transgender (including transmale and transfemale)	Transgender is a term for someone whose gender identity is not congruent with their birth-registered sex. A transmale is a person who identifies as male and a transfemale is a person who identifies as female.

Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale (UGDS)	The UGDS is a validated screening tool for both adolescents and adults to assess gender dysphoria. It consists of 12 items, to be answered on a 1- to 5-point scale, resulting in a sum score between 12 and 60. The higher the UGDS score the greater the impact on gender dysphoria.
Youth Self-Report (YSR)	The self-administered YSR is a checklist to detect emotional and behavioural problems in children and adolescents. It is self-completed by the child or adolescent. The scales consist of a Total problems score, which is the sum of the scores of all the problem items. An internalising problem scale sums the anxious/depressed, withdrawn-depressed, and somatic complaints scores while the externalising problem scale combines rule-breaking and aggressive behaviour.

References

Included studies

- Brik T, Vrouenraets L, de Vries M et al. (2020). Trajectories of Adolescents Treated with Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone Analogues for Gender Dysphoria. Archives of Sexual Behaviour. [Accessed 6 August 2020]
- Costa R, Dunsford M, Skagerberg E et al. (2015) Psychological Support, Puberty Suppression, and Psychosocial Functioning in Adolescents with Gender Dysphoria. Journal of Sexual Medicine. [online] Volume 12(11), Pages 2206-2214. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/jsm.13034 [Accessed 7 August 2020]
- de Vries A, Steensma T, Doreleijers T et al. (2011) Puberty Suppression in Adolescents with Gender Identity Disorder: A Prospective Follow-Up Study. The Journal of Sexual Medicine Volume 8, Issue 8, August, Pages 2276-2283. [Accessed 11 August 2020].
- Joseph T, Ting J, Butler G (2019) The effect of GnRH analogue treatment on bone mineral density in young adolescents with gender dysphoria: findings from a large national cohort. Journal of pediatric endocrinology & metabolism 32(10): 1077-1081
- Khatchadourian K, Shazhan A, Metzger D. (2014) Clinical Management of Youth with Gender Dysphoria in Vancouver. The Journal of Pediatrics. Volume 164, Issue 4, April, Pages 906-911. [Accessed 14 August 2020]
- Klink D, Caris M, Heijboer A et al. (2015) Bone mass in young adulthood following gonadotropin-releasing hormone analog treatment and cross-sex hormone treatment in adolescents with gender dysphoria. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 100(2): e270-5
- Schagen SEE, Cohen-Kettenis PT, Delemarre-van de Waal HA et al. (2016) Efficacy and Safety of Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone Agonist Treatment to Suppress Puberty in Gender Dysphoric Adolescents. The journal of sexual medicine 13(7): 1125-32
- Staphorsius A, Baudewijntje P, Kreukels P, et al. (2015) Puberty suppression and executive functioning: An fMRI-study in adolescents with gender dysphoria. Psychoneuroendocrinology Volume 565. Pages 190-199. [Accessed 10 August 2020]

- Vlot, Mariska C, Klink, Daniel T, den Heijer, Martin et al. (2017) Effect of pubertal suppression and cross-sex hormone therapy on bone turnover markers and bone mineral apparent density (BMAD) in transgender adolescents. Bone 95: 11-19

Other references

- World Health Organisation (2018) International Classification of Diseases 11. Available from https://icd.who.int/ [online; accessed 20 August 2020]
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) (5th ed). Washington, DC and London: American Psychiatric Publishing. pp.451-460. [accessed 20 August 2020]
- NHS England (2013). NHS Standard contract for gender identity development service for children and adolescents [accessed 20 August 2020]

Copyright

EXHIBIT C

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

NHS ENGLAND SPECIALISED SERVICES

CLINICAL PANEL REPORT

Date: 17 May 2023

Intervention: Gonadotrophin releasing hormone analogues

Indication: treatment of children and adolescents who have gender incongruence

URN: 1927

Gateway: 2, Round 1

Programme: Gender

CRG: Gender Dysphoria Services

Information provided to the Panel

Rapid Policy Statement Proposition

Evidence Review completed by NICE

Literature Surveillance

Equalities and Health Inequalities (EHIA) Assessment

This interim Policy Statement Proposition recommends that this treatment is not routinely commissioned for children and young people CYP) with gender incongruence and should only be accessed through a research setting. Panel members were informed about the independent Cass Review that has been commissioned by NHS England to make recommendations on how to improve services for CYP experiencing gender incongruence. There is a research programme as part of this review where healthcare data is being collected, and a systematic review is being undertaken as part of the Cass Review and will inform the Review's recommendations. The final Cass Review recommendations are anticipated later in 2023.

NICE previously completed an evidence review on this subject in 2020 which included nine observational studies. The quality of evidence for the identified critical outcomes for decision making – gender dysphoria, mental health – was assessed at the time as very low certainty. There was no statistically significant difference in measurements compared with baseline. No evidence was found for quality of life. The quality of evidence reported for important outcomes was also assessed as very low certainty. Surveillance of published literature, using the original PICO and bibliographic search strategies, has been undertaken to identify any relevant studies published since the NICE 2020 review. This assessment was presented to Panel members.

Clinical Panel considered the interim proposition and supporting evidence.

Panel members considered the issue where a child may have transitioned at a very early age, and the distress being caused should puberty progress rapidly during the wait for any research findings to be available. Panel members considered a requirement for consideration for 'exceptional' circumstances for access to puberty suppressants and possible options around this. Three possible options were considered:

1. Continuation of a policy working group to consider scenarios and make recommendations to Clinical Panel for policy revision

2. Formation of a national prior approval multi-disciplinary team to make assessments
3. Access enabled using the planned criteria for the clinical trial up to the point of it opening

Members debated each and it was proposed a 4th option could be included which was a combination of options 2 and 3. Members voted, and the outcome was: Option 2 received 4 votes in favour and Option 4 received 6 votes in favour.

EHIA – no amendments requested.

Recommendation

Clinical Panel agreed with the interim proposition and recommends this proceeds as a not for routine commissioning proposition.

Why the panel made these recommendations

Clinical Panel members considered the very low certainty quality of evidence and the work currently underway through the independent Cass Review. Any future position would need to be informed by final recommendations of that review.

Documentation amendments required

- Inclusion of 'exceptional' circumstances for access to puberty suppressants in the interim with option 4 as the recommended option for operationalising

---

Declarations of Interest of Panel Members: One declaration of interest received.

Panel Chair: Anthony Kessel, Clinical Director, Clinical Policy Team, Specialised Services

Post Panel note:

Following the Clinical Panel meeting the title of the Interim Policy Statement Proposition has been changed to *Puberty suppressing hormones (PSH) for the purpose of puberty suppression of children and adolescents who have gender incongruence.*

Clinical Panel discussion – 19th July 2023

Following agreement to proceed at the May Clinical Panel meeting, the Interim Policy Statement Proposition was published for two weeks of stakeholder testing. In response, 8 stakeholders highlighted that there were 19 identifiable and unique study references that may not have been previously considered in the evidence review or recent literature surveillance report. Full text copies of all 19 were obtained and reviewed for relevance as outlined in the Public Health report presented to Clinical Panel. An explanation of the process undertaken to assess these 19 papers was shared with Panel members. Of the 19 studies, one study was highlighted to have been identified but excluded from the original evidence review. Panel members heard that this study did meet the PICO details and search methodology. Although the study's positive but very low certainty findings add information for an important (not critical) outcome for which evidence was not previously available, on assessment, the findings were not considered to materially impact on the conclusion of the review or the interim policy proposition.

Outcome: Panel members agreed that an appropriate process had been followed. The one identified paper was appropriately reviewed, and Panel agreed that it did not affect the recommended commissioning position.

Clinical Panel discussion – January 2024

The Interim Policy Statement Proposition was recently published for public consultation, which concluded 1st November 2023. 251 unique references for evidence were suggested during public consultation. A Public Health Report was presented to Clinical Panel members and the process followed for the consideration of each reference was explained. Duplicate articles were identified and excluded. 246 unique references were checked for relevance against the search strategy and PICO used for the original evidence review completed by NICE and literature surveillance report, and against the references detailed in the evidence review, the literature surveillance report and the stakeholder testing Public Health Evidence Report. Most references did not meet the PICO criteria. Some evidence had previously been considered. 22 full text articles were reviewed in depth. Three met the PICO and were identified as not being included in any previous evidence reviews. These were carefully reviewed and It was determined that these didn't materially affect the proposition as written.

It was highlighted to Panel members that three unique references were links to websites pages from which specific information could not be determined but were not peer reviewed and published articles, so didn't impact on the position.

Outcome: All Panel members present agreed with the position as presented and that there was no impact on the proposition as currently stated.

EXHIBIT D

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Classification: Official

NHS England

Consultation report for the clinical policy on puberty suppressing hormones for children and adolescents who have gender incongruence / gender dysphoria

Publication reference: PRNxxx

Contents

Background

In September 2020, NHS England commissioned an independent and wide-ranging expert review of gender identity services for children and young people. The Independent Review, which will conclude by April 2024, is being led by Dr Hilary Cass, past president of the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. It was established in response to a complex and diverse range of issues including:

1. **A significant and sharp rise in referrals**
   In 2021/22 there were over 5,000 referrals into the Gender Identity Development Service (GIDS) run by the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust. This compares to just under 250 referrals in 2011/12.

2. **Marked changes in the types of patients being referred which are not well understood**
   There has been a dramatic change in the case-mix of referrals from predominantly natal males to predominantly natal females presenting with gender incongruence in early teen years. Additionally, a significant number of children are also presenting with neurodiversity and other mental health needs and risky behaviours which requires careful consideration and needs to be better understood.

3. **Scarce and inconclusive international evidence to support clinical decision making**
   This has led to a lack of clinical consensus and polarised opinion on what the best model of care for children and young people experiencing gender incongruence should be; and a lack of evidence to support families in making informed decisions about interventions that may have life-long consequences including Puberty Suppressing Hormones.

In February 2022, the Independent Review published an interim report which set out initial findings and advice. The report emphasised the need to move away from the current model of a sole provider and to establish regional services that work to a new clinical model that can better meet the holistic needs of a vulnerable group of children and young people. The report began to describe the need for these new services to work as networked centres that connected with other local services including children and young people's mental health services and primary care to support all of a patient's clinical needs.

The Independent Review's interim report also came to the following conclusions about the evidence relating to clinical approaches for children and young people with gender incongruence or gender dysphoria:

- The evidence is inconclusive both nationally and internationally
- Aspects of the available literature are open to interpretation in multiple ways, and there is a risk that some authors interpret their data from a particular ideological and/or theoretical standpoint
- Internationally as well as nationally, longer-term follow-up data on children and young people who have been seen by gender identity services is limited, including for those who have received endocrine interventions
- While there has been research on the short-term mental health outcomes and physical side effects of Puberty Suppressing Hormones for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, there is very limited research on the sexual, cognitive or broader developmental outcomes

In July 2022, the Independent Review offered further advice on the core components of the new clinical model. Dr Cass emphasised the importance of embedding research into the clinical practice of the new services given the substantial gaps that exist in the evidence base. The Review advised NHS England to give rapid consideration as to how it could establish '*the necessary research infrastructure to prospectively enrol young people being considered for hormone treatment into a formal research protocol with adequate follow up into adulthood, with a more immediate focus on the questions regarding puberty blockers'*.

You can read the advice in full here.

In response to this advice, NHS England announced plans to remove the use of Puberty Supressing Hormones as a routine treatment on the NHS pathway of care for gender incongruence / dysphoria due to significant uncertainties around risks, benefits and outcomes.

NHS England also described proposals to put in place a programme of work that would establish a clinical research framework that may provide access to Puberty Suppressing Hormones to some children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, subject to the usual approvals.

How we consulted

The proposed clinical commissioning policy initially went out for two weeks of targeted stakeholder testing between 8 – 25th June 2023, supported by a draft Equality and Health Inequalities Impact Assessment (EHIA) and the report of the review of evidence on gonadotrophin releasing hormone analogues for children and adolescents with gender dysphoria undertaken by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Comments were received from 23 individuals and organisations. NHS England did not make any changes to the proposed clinical commissioning policy as an outcome of stakeholder engagement but did make some changes to the draft EHIA.

A public consultation on the proposed clinical commissioning policy ran for 90 days on the NHS England consultation website from 3 August to 1 November 2023. The length of the consultation was determined through the recommendation of an independent Patient and Public Voice Assurance Group for Specialised Services. Alongside the proposed policy NHS England published various documents including the amended EHIA, a report on the outcome of the stakeholder testing process, and documents that described the evidence. The process of consultation generated 5,183 responses. NHS England thanks all those individuals and organisations who submitted responses.

NHS England has commissioned TONIC - an independent organisation specialising in public consultation, social research and evaluation - to conduct the analysis on all responses and report back on these findings. Their detailed analysis of the responses can be found here [link].

NHS England's responses to consultation, and consideration of the evidence

NHS England has carefully considered the independent report on the analysis of consultation responses.

The majority of respondents felt that additional evidence needed to be taken into account when developing the proposals (72%) and believed that the EHIA had failed to reflect the potential impact that might arise as a result of adoption of the proposal (82%).

Appendix A - NHS England's responses to the consultation submissions.

Appendix B - a summary of how NHS England sought to identify, and consider, other relevant evidence throughout the process of policy development.

Appendix C - detailed summary review of the evidence that was identified by respondents to consultation.

Appendix D – detailed summary review of the relevant evidence relied upon by the World Professional Association for Transgender Health.

What has NHS England decided?

As an outcome of public consultation NHS England has decided that:

- The NHS in England will not prescribe Puberty Suppressing Hormones to children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, from 1 April 2024
- As a change to the proposed policy, Puberty Suppressing Hormones will not be available through an 'exceptional circumstances' route. Some stakeholders, including the new providers of gender incongruence services for children and young people, were concerned at how such a pathway could operate appropriately, effectively and equitably and NHS England has agreed with that view. Instead, as with all specialised services, a patient's clinician can make an application under NHS England's Individual Funding Request process. Under this process, the clinician making the request would need to explain why the patient's clinical circumstances are exceptional and show all available clinical evidence for why they believe the patient would benefit more from the treatment than other patients with the same condition. They would also need to demonstrate why a treatment that is not routinely commissioned by the NHS is an appropriate treatment option.
- Various amendments should be made to the EHIA (detailed in Appendix A)

How did NHS England make this decision?

NHS England has followed its established method for forming a clinical commissioning policy:

- In January 2024 the NHS England Clinical Panel for Specialised Services considered a report prepared by a public health specialist that explained why respondents to consultation had not identified any new or alternative evidence that would cause NHS England not to adopt the proposed policy
- In March 2024 NHS England's Clinical Priorities Advisory Group, which has an independent chair, considered NHS England's report on the outcome of consultation and the supporting documents, such as the EHIA that had been amended in response to consultation submissions and evidence report, and the views of the National Programme Board for Gender Dysphoria Services about the process that had been followed to form the policy. The Clinical Priorities Advisory

Group agreed for NHS England to recommend that the proposed policy be put to the NHS England National Commissioning Group for Specialised Services for agreement

- In March 2024 NHS England's National Commissioning Group for Specialised Services agreed the recommendations

What happens next?

The Gender Identity Development Service at the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust closes on 31 March 2024. The new providers of Children and Young People's Gender Services will work to the new clinical commissioning policy from 1 April 2024.

Children and young people who are already receiving Puberty Suppressing Hormones through the NHS pathway, or who have been referred into an endocrine team commissioned by NHS England by 31 March 2024, will not be subject to the new policy. In these cases the relevant NHS paediatric endocrine team (at Leeds Teaching Hospital NHS Trust or University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust) will continue to hold clinical responsibility for these patients. The intervention will continue to be administered / be initiated for these patients because there is an expectation of continued treatment, if that is the informed choice of the young person / parents of a child under 16 years, subject to the outcome of usual clinical review of the individual's existing individual care plan jointly between the individual's Lead Clinician and the young person / parents of a child under 16 years.

Clinical Study

NHS England's adoption of the new clinical commissioning policy is not contingent on the establishment of a clinical study but work is well underway to develop the framework for study design. A National Research Oversight Board for Children and Young People's Gender Services was established in 2023, chaired by Professor Sir Simon Wessely, a Past President of the Royal College of Psychiatrists, and Royal Society of Medicine. The National Research Oversight board includes representation from the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, the National Institute for Health and Care Research, the Medical Research Council, other academic and clinical experts, and Dr Hilary Cass. In November 2023, Professor Emily Simonoff (Kings College London) was confirmed as the Chief Investigator who will lead on study design.

In order for the clinical study to become operational, it will need to pass the usual ethics and approvals process. The current planning assumption is that, should the approvals be granted, the study will begin to recruit eligible individuals in late 2024.

NHS England explained as part of the public consultation that unless and until a clinical study is established, no child or young person will have access to Puberty Suppressing Hormones for gender incongruence / dysphoria. The study design process will define access criteria into the study, which NHS England has said will initially be focused on children with early onset gender incongruence / dysphoria.

Appendix A: Responses to consultation submissions

Question 1: Has all the relevant evidence been taken into account?

Group A Respondents said…	NHS England response …
The experiences, views and outcomes of transgender people, patients, and their families had not been considered as evidence, as well as the views of experts in the field.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. The policy proposition has been formed following NHS England's established method for forming clinical commissioning policies. This method takes account of relevant, peer-reviewed, quality academic and clinical research – it does not take account of lived experiences.
The evidential review had not included enough studies and had strict inclusion criteria, which may have excluded other relevant, good quality studies.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).

Studies that rated PSH treatment positively had been ignored, possibly due to unfair bias.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).
There has not been an evidential review of the outcomes of transgender children and young people who had been denied PSH.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).
Guidance and advice from leading international bodies, such as World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH), had been ignored.	NHS England has undertaken a detailed summary review of the relevant evidence relied upon by the WPATH in support of its position about prescribing Puberty Suppressing Hormones, as set out in its Standards of Care v8 (2023). The report on the outcome of the evidence review is in Appendix D. The conclusion of the evidence review is that the WPATH standards of care do not identify evidence about the risks, benefits and

	outcomes of Puberty Suppressing Hormones, including safety outcomes, contrary to the findings of the NICE evidence review. Although not a factor in NHS England's decision-making process, many international health systems and medical bodies are now moving to restrict the use of Puberty Suppressing Hormones as a response to gender incongruence / dysphoria because of the limited evidence base, including Canada, Sweden, Finland and France. Reflecting this trend, in January 2024 the World Health Organisation concluded that it was unable to advance any recommendations or guidance about gender affirming interventions for children and young people because '*the evidence base for children and adolescents is limited and variable regarding the longer-term outcomes of gender affirming care for children and adolescents*".
Evidence that PSH are used safely for other conditions (such as precocious puberty and prostate cancer) was not included.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B). The EHIA that supported the process of public consultation identified children receiving PSH as a response to Central Precocious Puberty (CPP) as an

	appropriate comparator group, and it described that the aetiology and epidemiology of CPP and treatment aims are quite different to that of gender incongruence. The EHIA describes how the evidence base to support use of PSH as a response to CPP is well formed.
The statement that children and young people treated with PSH do not show a statistically significant difference in mental health and psychosocial functioning misunderstands the intended results of PSH treatment.	The difficulties about describing the aims and intended results of Puberty Suppressing Hormones were addressed by Dr Cass in her letter to NHS England of 19 July 2022, in which she advised that urgent consideration be given to the establishment of the necessary research infrastructure for children and young people considering hormone treatment. In responding to the point made during consultation, it is helpful to set out the advice in some detail: "*As already highlighted in my interim report, the most significant knowledge gaps are in relation to treatment with puberty blockers, and the lack of clarity about whether the rationale for prescription is as an initial part of a transition pathway or as a 'pause' to allow more time for decision making.* *For those who will go on to have a stable binary trans identity, the ability to pass in later life is paramount, and many will decide that the trade-offs of medical treatment are a price that is fully justified by the ability to live confidently and comfortably in their identified gender.* *The widely understood challenge is in determining when a point of certainty about gender identity is reached in an adolescent who is in a state of developmental maturation, identity development and flux. It is the latter option*

	regarding a 'pause' for decision making about which we have the least information. The rationale for use of puberty blockers at Tanner Stage 2 of development was based on data that demonstrated that children, particularly birth registered boys who had early gender incongruence, were unlikely to desist once they reached early puberty; this rationale does not necessarily apply to later presenting young people, including the predominant referral group of birth-registered girls. *We do not fully understand the role of adolescent sex hormones in driving the development of both sexuality and gender identity through the early teen years, so by extension we cannot be sure about the impact of stopping these hormone surges on psychosexual and gender maturation. We therefore have no way of knowing whether, rather than buying time to make a decision, puberty blockers may disrupt that decision-making process*".

Group B Respondents said…	**NHS England response …**
The review does not highlight harm caused by PSH or the importance of going through puberty.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant

	evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).
It omits animal studies that have concluded that PSH cause harm.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).
The review omits experiential evidence from de-transitioners.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. The policy proposition has been formed following NHS England's established method for forming clinical commissioning policies. This method takes account of relevant, peer-reviewed, quality academic and clinical research – it does not take account of lived experiences.
The review fails to use evidence that studies the causes of gender dysphoria.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has

	considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).
There was no review of evidence addressing psychological treatments of gender dysphoria.	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).

Respondents from both groups said…	**NHS England response …**
Respondents from both groups suggested that the evidence included in the review was unfit for purpose due to small sample sizes, a lack of randomised control trials, and poor quality or inconclusive results. Many respondents from both groups also submitted details of a number of articles, references, papers and studies they	The evidence review by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) follows the NHS England Specialised Commissioning process and template and is based on the outcomes and search criteria agreed by an expert working group that had an independent chair. NHS England has considered all of the additional evidence that has been proposed during the public consultation and has concluded that, while some new, relevant

felt should have been included in the evidence review.	evidence was identified by stakeholders, it did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (see Appendix B).

Question 2 – Does the equality and health inequality impact assessment (EHIA) reflect the potential impact that may arise as a result of the proposed changes?

Group A Respondents

Respondents said…	**NHS England response …**
The EHIA fails to address the impact on transgender children denied PSH treatment. It was noted by some that the equality and health inequality impact assessment had recognised the potential for harm by acknowledging that potential distress may be experienced and that there may be an increase in risk taking behaviour, however the level of acknowledgement was seen as insufficient, understating the seriousness of the issues, and	The EHIA reads: "*Potential consequences of the proposal may be an increase in the number of children and young people who seek GnRHa from unregulated sources; and some stakeholder groups have previously suggested that withholding GnRHa will lead to an increase in emotional and psychological distress, leading to risk-taking behaviour particularly amongst adolescents. Conversely, some stakeholder groups have suggested that GnRHa should be removed from the NHS pathway of care completely in the best interests of children and young people in view of the limited evidence around treatment aims, benefits, risks and outcomes*". NHS England has had to weigh a consideration of potential harms with potential benefits to individuals who may be impacted by the decision. It has made the proposal to remove PSH from the NHS pathway of care because of

appearing to mitigate that the risks of such harm was acceptable.	a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. It is therefore proposed that adoption of the policy would in itself be a risk mitigation measure. The EHIA describes that other forms of specialist clinical support will remain available through the NHS for this patient cohort; the proposed NHS England interim service specification for gender incongruence (June 2023) describes a multi-disciplinary approach to care that focuses on psychosocial and psychological approaches, and psychoeducation. NHS England strongly discourages the sourcing of any medication from unregulated providers and unregulated sources such as the internet – but the risk that some individuals may seek PSH from unregulated sources regardless, cannot be used to compel the NHS to continue to prescribe PSH, for which there is very limited evidence of safety.
Group A respondents also objected to the repeated statement that the potential impact on transgender children and young people would be alleviated by other modes of specialist clinical support being made available. They argued that the assessment should explicitly address the potential negative impact of withdrawing access to PSH treatment, regardless of alternative treatments, and felt that	The policy position has been proposed because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. It is therefore proposed that adoption of the policy would in itself be a risk mitigation measure. NHS England plans to establish around eight new providers of CYP Gender Services by 2026, thereby increasing the clinical workforce and clinical capacity to address the long waiting times. **The EHIA has been amended to**

the reference to other treatments ignored ongoing issues in being able to access healthcare in a timely fashion. Wait lists for such services were predicted to be inordinately lengthy, with backlogs meaning that some young patients would be unable to receive treatment for several years, and beyond the period that they needed it most.	**read that**: *As a risk mitigation measure, in April 2024 NHS England will have commissioned a rapid assessment service for every child or young person on the waiting list for CYP Gender Services, through local NHS children and young people's mental health services. This will be a directly commissioned service for this cohort over-and-above existing mental health provision.*
Respondents also noted that there was no mention of the potential impact on those who were currently receiving PSH treatment but who may be forced to stop treatment due to the proposed changes in the clinical policy. Respondents also wondered whether endocrinologists and other supervising clinicians would receive training in preparation for such scenarios.	The EHIA did address this, but for clarity the EHIA has **been amended** to read: "*For children and young people who, at the point the clinical commissioning policy takes effect on 1 April 2024:* • *have been referred into an endocrine clinic by the former NHS Gender Identity Development Service but have not yet been assessed by a consultant endocrinologist for suitability of PSH; or* • *are under the clinical care of an endocrine team at University College of London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust or Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust following a referral by the former NHS Gender Identity Development Service* *there is an expectation that GnRHa will continue to be administered / be initiated, if that is the informed choice of the young person / parents of a child*

	under 16 years, subject to the outcome of usual clinical review of the individual's existing individual care plan jointly between the individual's Lead Clinician and the young person / parents of a child under 16 years". NHS England's adoption of the proposal would not be intended to compel young people / parents of children under 16 years to choose to continue with GnRHa if, after a consideration of the issues raised by the adoption of the policy, they make a decision to cease the intervention. As part of the programme of work to oversee the decommissioning of the GIDS at Tavistock and the establishment of new services, NHS England has asked a Paediatric Endocrinology Working Group to develop a framework for obtaining informed consent from relevant young people / parents of children under 16 years, to ensure rigour and consistency of approach.
The requirement for taking part in a research trial is discriminatory. The terms 'early onset' and 'late onset' have not been defined.	The policy position has been proposed because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. The development of a research protocol is well underway and will be subject to the usual approvals through the National Institute for Health and Care Research, but NHS England's proposal to remove PSH from routine NHS prescribing protocols is not contingent upon the establishment of a clinical

	study. **The wording of the proposed policy has been amended** to provide greater clarity on this point. The consequence of a decision by NHS England, should it be made, that PSH are no longer routinely commissioned by the NHS as a response to gender incongruence / dysphoria will be that the PSH pathway will be closed, regardless of the outcome of a separate programme of work through the National Research Oversight Board to determine the feasibility of a clinical study. It will also be for the National Research Oversight Board to define access criteria into the study.
Protected characteristic: Gender Reassignment Group A respondents felt that the EHIA misinterpreted the breadth of the characteristic and discriminated against those who had socially transitioned but not medically transitioned. Respondents referenced the Equality Act 2010, which states that "a person has the protected characteristic of gender reassignment if the person is proposing to undergo, is undergoing, or has undergone a process (or part of a process) for the purpose of reassigning the person's sex by changing physiological or other attributes of sex". There	In response to submissions on this point, NHS England has correctly applied the law. In considering the application of Equality Act 2010, section 7, to this service, the High Court in R (AA) v NHS Commissioning Board (2023). found that not every child or young person referred to a specialised gender incongruence service will have the protected characteristic of gender reassignment. The Court held that children and young people who are referred to such a service do not – at the point of referral or while they remain on the waiting list - share the protected characteristic of 'gender reassignment' as a class or cohort of patients. The whole cohort of patients cannot be treated as "proposing to undergo" a process (or part of a process) for the "purpose of reassigning" their sex "by changing physiological or other attributes of sex" as a class. However, as the Court found and as NHS England accepts, many children and young people in this position will, individually, have the protected

is, therefore, no requirement for medical treatment to have taken place in order to be covered by the protected characteristic gender reassignment.	characteristic of gender re-assignment at this stage although determining that will involve a case-specific factual assessment. It is for this reason that NHS England has determined to treat all of the children and young people who will be impacted by the proposals as likely to share the protected characteristic of gender reassignment, and it has proceeded on that basis throughout the whole process of policy formation.
Protected characteristic: Disability Group A respondents felt that the EHIA had failed to recognise the potential for the interim clinical policy to discriminate against neurodivergent children and young people by unfairly excluding them from research and PSH treatment. There was no case, it was stated, to conclude that those with diagnoses and conditions such as autism, ADHD, learning difficulties, or low IQ would be unable to recognise their own gender identity and make their own decisions, or that they should be denied PSH treatment and steered into purely psychological treatments on the basis that they experienced psychological conditions in	The basis for this submission is not clear. Firstly, the policy position has been proposed because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. A policy *not* to prescribe PSH would apply to all individuals, regardless of disability or any other protected characteristic. Secondly, the consequence of a decision by NHS England, should it be made, that PSH are no longer routinely commissioned by the NHS as a response to gender incongruence / dysphoria will be that the PSH pathway will be closed, regardless of the outcome of a separate programme of work through the National Research Oversight Board to determine the feasibility of a clinical study. It will be for the National Research Oversight Board to define access criteria into any study in due course, but NHS England is unable to identify from the policy proposition or the EHIA why respondents to consultation would

conjunction with their sense of gender dysphoria.	conclude that individuals with this protected characteristic would be at risk of exclusion from such a study.
Protected characteristic: Age Some respondents felt that the EHIA had not sufficiently reflected on how the interim clinical policy could potentially discriminate against young people by negating their individual autonomy and making the assumption that they aren't capable of knowing themselves or their own minds.	The policy position has been proposed because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. NHS England is content that the EHIA accurately describes that the proposal is a reasonable, rational and clinically necessary response to the findings of NICE and the Cass Review that a key limitation to identifying the effectiveness and safety of PSH in regard to children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria is the lack of reliable comparative studies. In other words, the age of the individuals for whom risk and benefits cannot be defined because of the lack of evidence is in itself a contributory reason for taking steps to mitigate clinical risk and safety issues.
Protected characteristic: Age Issues of age were also linked to questions regarding the definitions of 'early onset' and 'late onset' gender dysphoria, and how some transgender youth may be discriminated against because their ages would be unreasonably linked to these so-called "arbitrary definitions"	The policy position has been proposed because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. The consequence of a decision by NHS England, should it be made, that PSH are no longer routinely commissioned by the NHS as a response to gender incongruence / dysphoria will be that the PSH pathway will be closed,

and that they would therefore be impacted by missing out on potentially beneficial treatment.	regardless of the outcome of a separate programme of work through the National Research Oversight Board to determine the feasibility of a clinical study. It will also be for the National Research Oversight Board to define access criteria into such a study.
Protected characteristic: Age Some respondents also felt that the EHIA should have mentioned Gillick competency, and how this is viewed and applied by NHS England with regard to transgender children and young people.	The policy position has been proposed because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. The consequence of a decision by NHS England, should it be made, that PSH are no longer routinely commissioned by the NHS as a response to gender incongruence / dysphoria will be that PSH are no longer routinely commissioned by the NHS, and this policy would apply to all children and young people on the gender incongruence pathway irrespective of whether they would be deemed Gillick competent.
Protected characteristic: Race Respondents pointed out that there were no mentions of how the protected characteristic of race would be impacted by the interim clinical policy, nor any mentions of plans for how these groups would be recognised and supported.	In response to this submission, NHS England has assured itself that the impact to individuals who share the protected characteristic of race and ethnicity is indeed addressed by the EHIA.
Protected characteristic: Pregnancy	In response to this submission, NHS England has assured itself that the EHIA states that NHS England is in receipt of no evidence to suggest otherwise and

Respondents pointed out that there were no mentions of how the protected characteristic of pregnancy would be impacted by the interim clinical policy, nor any mentions of plans for how these groups would be recognised and supported.	therefore is of the view that the proposed interim service specification does not have any significant impact on individuals who may share this protected characteristic.
Protected characteristic: Religion Respondents pointed out that there were no mentions of how the protected characteristic of religion would be impacted by the interim clinical policy, nor any mentions of plans for how these groups would be recognised and supported.	In response to this submission, NHS England has assured itself that the EHIA states that it has concluded that the proposal does not significantly impact individuals who share this protected characteristic.
Protected characteristic: Sex It was pointed out that the EHIA had not sufficiently reflected on how the denial of PSH treatment would differently and negatively impact biological males going through undesired puberty (for example, in the development of an Adam's apple, or the deepening of the voice).	**The EHIA has been amended to read that: "***Some respondents to public consultation pointed out that the EHIA had not sufficiently reflected on how the withdrawal of PSH from the NHS pathway of care would differently and negatively impact natal males going through undesired puberty, for example, in the development of an Adam's apple or the deepening of the voice. The policy position has been proposed because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes".*

	Other forms of specialist clinical support will remain available through the NHS for this patient cohort; the NHS England interim service specification for gender incongruence (June 2023) describes a multi-disciplinary approach to care that focuses on psychosocial and psychological approaches, and psychoeducation".
Other Groups Children and young people from low-income homes who would be discriminated against because they would not be able to utilise treatments from private clinics available to those from more affluent families.	Some respondents to consultation invited NHS England to accept that inequity may arise as a consequence of adoption of the policy in that lower-income families will be disadvantaged by not being able to afford to source Puberty Suppressing Hormones from private clinics. NHS England cannot share that view because it is not able to support the sourcing of PSH from any source outside of the NHS because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. Moreover, NHS England is not aware of any **regulated** source of Puberty Suppressing Hormones for children and young people with gender incongruence outside of the NHS, hence NHS England's position being the following, regardless of the socio-economic status of the individual child or young person (source: NHS England's Interim Service Specification for CYP Gender Services, 2023). *NHS England strongly discourages the sourcing of any medication from unregulated providers and unregulated sources such as the internet.*

	The EHIA has been amended to reflect the wording above.
Other Groups Children and young people who, having been denied PSH treatment through NHS England (or being unwilling to enrol in a research trial), would choose to access treatments from unregulated sources, with potentially negative consequences.	NHS England strongly discourages the sourcing of any medication from unregulated providers and unregulated sources such as the internet – but the risk that some individuals may seek PSH from unregulated sources regardless, cannot be used to compel the NHS to continue to prescribe PSH, for which there is not sufficient evidence relating to safety and clinical effectiveness.
Other Groups Those who either lived with unsupportive families or who lived outside the family home, who would find it more difficult to access services than those who had the support and encouragement of their adult carers.	It is not clear how this submission directly relates to the proposal that PSH will not be routinely commissioned by the NHS as a response to gender incongruence.
Other Groups Those who, for a variety of reasons, could be considered to have low health literacy	**The EHIA has been amended to read that: "***There is evidence that there are lower levels of health literacy in communities that are socially and economically disadvantaged. NHS England is of the view that the proposals do not discriminate against this group; and that the proposals will have a neutral impact on reducing health inequalities in accessing services or achieving outcomes for this group*".

Other Groups Homeless transgender youth, who were seen as particularly vulnerable, but who weren't addressed in the impact assessment.	**The EHIA has been amended to read that:** *The charity akt reports that 24% of homeless people identify as "LGBT" but we do not have specific data on the prevalence of children 16 years and under who are homeless and who present with gender incongruence. A decision that PSH will not be routinely commissioned by the NHS will not have any specific impact on this group. Separately, if a clinical study is determined to be feasible, it will be for the National Research Oversight Board to define access criteria into such a study and to consider the equalities implications of the access criteria.*

Group B Respondents

Respondents said…	**NHS England response …**
The EHIA does not assess the negative impact of using PSH.	That is not the purpose of the EHIA, which has considered the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal that PSH is *not* routinely available to children and young people. Separately, the NICE evidence review examined the evidence about outcomes, safety and effectiveness of GnRHa and the EHIA has referred to, and is informed by, NICE's conclusions about the limited evidence base.
The language used in the EHIA shows signs of pro-transgender ideology. Some Group B respondents also highlighted what they	NHS England is aware of the disagreements that inevitably manifest about the language used in literature relating to children and young people who present with issues of gender incongruence. NHS England will not be changing the

considered unscientific and ideological terms such as “sex assigned at birth”.	language used in the EHIA. In any event, the term “sex assigned at birth” was not used in the EHIA.
There is no assessment of how others are impacted by gender affirming treatments.	That is not the purpose of the EHIA, which has correctly considered the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal that PSH is *not* routinely available to children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria.
Protected characteristic: Sexual Orientation Most Group B respondents who provided an answer to this question believed that the EHIA had inadequately addressed the impact on the protected characteristic of sexual orientation, considering it a troubling and unusual oversight that NHS England had declared that it did not hold sexual orientation data for transgender children and young people. For many Group B respondents some of the primary causes of gender dysphoria among young people were likely to be internalised homophobic impulses and/or mistaken ideas regarding the expression of human sexuality and gender. Group B respondents tended to believe that a large proportion of gender dysphoric young people	NHS England, as a commissioning body, does not routinely collect any personal data on individuals who use NHS services; any consolidated data relating to patients that is held by NHS England is collected by the providers of healthcare services. Data on the sexual orientation of children and young people who have accessed the GIDS has not been provided to NHS England by the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust. The Trust’s website explains the challenges of collecting this data from children and **the EHIA has been amended to read:** *In our [Tavistock] most recent statistics (2015), of the young people seen in our service who were assigned male at birth and for whom we have data, around 30% were attracted to males, 30% to females, and 30% to both males and females (or other genders). The remaining approximately 10% of those for whom we have data described themselves as not being attracted to either males or females, or as asexual. For young people assigned female at birth for whom we have data: over half were attracted to females, a quarter were attracted to males, just under 20% were to*

would become healthy homosexual or bisexual adults if allowed to develop and evolve naturally, and that there was a significant body of evidence that supported this.	*both males and females (or other genders), and a small percentage described themselves as asexual or as not being attracted to either males or females".* The EHIA explains that The Cass Review has said that in forming further advice to NHS England it is considering further the complex interaction between sexuality and gender identity, and societal responses to both – the Review's Interim Report (2022) cited the example of "young lesbians who felt pressured to identify as transgender male, and conversely transgender males who felt pressured to come out as lesbian rather than transgender".
Protected Characteristic: Age In opposition to Group A respondents who promoted the application of Gillick competency and individual autonomy, Group B respondents tended to feel that children under the age of 16 were too young to be able to make such important decisions, and that decisions around PSH treatment and gender transition should be made by parents, carers, and experienced clinicians. If PSH were made available to children under 16, therefore, it was believed that the protected characteristic of age would be	The EHIA has correctly considered the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal that PSH is *not* routinely available to children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria.

negatively impacted and that this should have been more directly addressed in the EHIA.	
Protected Characteristic: Gender Reassignment Some Group B respondents believed that the EHIA had inaccurately described the protected characteristic of gender reassignment, stating that, in terms of statute law, expressing a wish to change sex did not qualify a child under 16 for the protected characteristic. Some Group B respondents also stated that the Equality Act 2010 does not define gender reassignment in relation to children in its main body, but rather only in explanatory notes, and that the Gender Recognition Act 2005 requires those who undergo gender reassignment to be 18 at minimum, and to have lived as the desired gender for two years.	In response to submissions on this point, NHS England has correctly applied the law. In considering the application of Equality Act 2010, section 7, to this service, the High Court in R (AA) v NHS Commissioning Board (2023). found that not every child or young person referred to a specialised gender incongruence service will have the protected characteristic of gender reassignment. The Court held that children and young people who are referred to such a service do not – at the point of referral or while they remain on the waiting list - share the protected characteristic of 'gender reassignment' as a class or cohort of patients. The whole cohort of patients cannot be treated as "proposing to undergo" a process (or part of a process) for the "purpose of reassigning" their sex "by changing physiological or other attributes of sex" as a class. However, as the Court found and as NHS England accepts, many children and young people in this position will, individually, have the protected characteristic of gender re-assignment at this stage although determining that will involve a case-specific factual assessment. It is for this reason that NHS England has determined to treat all of the children and young people who will be impacted by the proposals as likely to share the protected characteristic of gender reassignment, and it has proceeded on that basis throughout the whole process of policy formation.

Some respondents highlighted the claim made in the EHIA that "the majority of individuals who will be impacted by the proposals are likely to have the protected characteristic of gender reassignment" as incompatible with statute law, as outlined above, and as unsupported and unevidenced by objective data.	
Protected Characteristic: Gender Reassignment Some also stated that even if the protected characteristic of gender reassignment was correctly applied this should only ensure that such individuals weren't unfairly discriminated against, and not that they should be guaranteed treatment.	The EHIA has correctly considered the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal that PSH is not routinely available to children and young people.
Protected Characteristic: Disability Some Group B respondents believed that the protected characteristic of disability had not been fully reflected, particularly with regard to autistic children and young people who, it was felt, were more susceptible than non-autistic children to arrive at the mistaken conclusion that	This is outside the scope of the consultation. The approach for assessment and diagnosis of gender incongruence is set out in NHS England's published interim service specification for CYP Gender Services, which was agreed following a process of public consultation. The current EHIA has correctly considered the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal that PSH is not routinely available to children and young people.

they were transgender and to fix their intentions on transition. According to Group B respondents, such comorbidities and the increased difficulties and risks faced by neurodivergent children and young people should have been more adequately addressed. Some respondents believed that it is impossible for an autistic person to have a gender identity and, therefore, that they could not experience gender dysphoria. That the EHIA and, apparently, the medical profession has ignored this was seen as discriminatory and in urgent need of review.	
Protected Characteristic: Sex Some respondents felt that the negative impact on young females had not been adequately addressed, and that though the EHIA recognised that more females than males are presenting with gender dysphoria there was not enough acknowledgement of the disparity and potential inequality.	The EHIA has explained that the terms of reference for the Cass Review include "*exploration of the reasons for the increase in referrals and why the increase has disproportionately been of natal females, and the implications of these matters*". The EHIA also explains that further engagement is also planned by the National Research Oversight Board to identify the key evidence gaps for children and young people with later-onset gender dysphoria – recognising that there is even greater uncertainty in terms of the supporting clinical evidence base, less established clinical practice and less known about the natural history of gender dysphoria in this group. The

Some respondents also believed that further research into discovering why more females than males currently presented as gender dysphoric was urgently required in order to ensure that young females weren't advanced into treatment for the wrong reasons.	engagement will include an analysis of the impacts to individuals who may share this protected characteristic.
Other Groups: Young People in Care Some Group B respondents believed that the EHIA had not sufficiently addressed the evidence and research regarding gender dysphoric children and young people who had lived in care, which could lead to a disproportionately negative impact for this group. Respondents believed that the numbers of transgender youth who lived in care situations was unusually high, and that this therefore suggested that the causes of their gender dysphoria and desire to transition was more likely to be linked to issues such as trauma, unhealthy parental influences, unstable home situations, and other psychological and mental health conditions. More research and study for	The EHIA has recorded that there is an over-representation percentage wise of looked after children seen by services for children and young people with gender incongruence. This was noted by the Cass Review, which is due to deliver final advice early 2024. The EHIA has correctly considered the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal that PSH is not routinely available to children and young people. Further "research and study" is not needed on this group in order for NHS England to make a decision on the proposal.

this group was therefore urged before final decisions are reached.	

Summary of themes raised by all respondents

Respondents said…	**NHS England response …**
The potential impact cannot be reflected because the evidence used is inadequate. A significant number of respondents from both groups believed that it was not possible to accurately comment on the EHIA due to the assessment itself based on inadequate evidence and research. Respondents argued that the current state of research, particularly regarding the long-term effects of gender-affirming care (including PSH treatment) was insufficient and scientifically questionable. While some respondents asserted that it was unethical to subject children to drugs without a clear understanding of their safety and long-term	The EHIA has described the very limited evidence about PSH, including about the risks, benefits and long-term outcomes. Specifically, under the heading "*What key sources of evidence have informed your impact assessment and are there key gaps in the evidence*" the EHIA refers to the evidence review on GnRHa as a response to gender dysphoria by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence in 2020 and says: "*The evidence review confirms that there is limited evidence. Criteria for enrolment in the clinical study alongside the first study to which children and young people with early on-set gender dysphoria may enrol, further engagement is also planned by the Research Oversight Board to identify the key evidence gaps for children and young people with later-onset gender dysphoria – recognising that there is even greater uncertainty in terms of the supporting clinical evidence base, less established clinical practice and less known about the natural history of gender dysphoria in this group*". The EHIA has therefore correctly considered the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal that PSH is *not* routinely available to children and young people, using evidence where

effects, others argued that it was unethical to withdraw potentially life-saving treatment without conclusive proof that it causes harm. Likewise, in some cases the same studies were used by both groups to support their points of view (the Dutch Protocol, for example), highlighting that the evidence is inconclusive on which both the interim clinical policy and the equality and health inequality impact assessment were based. Both groups raised concerns regarding the limitations of existing research, selectivity issues, and short follow-up duration.	it exists, noting where there are gaps in evidence and describing plans to increase the evidence base.
The document and question are unclear	The EHIA is, necessarily, a detailed technical document that seeks to support decision makers, with reference to the Equality Act, by examining the implications and potential consequences of adoption of the proposal on individuals who may share a protected characteristic, and / or for whom otherwise adoption of the proposal may cause or exacerbate inequalities. NHS England will give consideration to how future EHIAs may be written in a form that is more accessible to a lay-person, and how questions about the content of EHIAs are worded.

Question 3 – Are there any changes or additions you think need to be made to this policy?

Group A Respondents

Respondents said…	NHS England response …
The requirement to participate in a research trial is unethical	The development of a research protocol is well underway and will be subject to the usual approvals through the National Institute for Health and Care Research, but NHS England's proposal to remove PSH from routine NHS prescribing protocols is not contingent upon the establishment of a clinical study. **The wording of the proposed policy has been amended** to provide greater clarity on this point. The consequence of a decision by NHS England, should it be made, that PSH are no longer routinely commissioned by the NHS as a response to gender incongruence will be that the PSH pathway will be closed, regardless of the outcome of a separate programme of work through the National Research Oversight Board to determine the feasibility of a clinical study. The EHIA explained that, were the study to gain the usual approvals, some young people would likely not be eligible for the study. Should the study not gain the usual approvals, no child or young person would be eligible for the study.
The terms 'early onset' and 'late onset' are not defined for the purpose of the clinical study.	This falls outside the scope of the consultation. The development of a research protocol is well underway and will be subject to the usual approvals through the National Institute for Health and Care Research, but NHS England's proposal to remove PSH from routine NHS prescribing protocols is not contingent upon the establishment of a clinical study. **The wording of the proposed policy has**

The research trial is poorly designed and will not provide the desired results.	**been amended** to provide greater clarity on this point. The feasibility of a clinical study, including definition of access into a clinical study, is being led by a National Research Oversight Board following usual design principles.
The policy does not address certain risks of harm it may cause to transgender youth. The risks of not using PSH should be addressed in the policy.	NHS England has had to weigh a consideration of potential harms with potential benefits to individuals who may be impacted by the decision. It has made the proposal to remove PSH from the NHS pathway of care because of a lack of sufficient evidence relating to the safety and clinical effectiveness of PSH for children and young people with gender incongruence / dysphoria, including about the benefits, risks and long-term outcomes. It is therefore proposed that adoption of the policy would in itself be a risk mitigation measure. The EHIA describes that other forms of specialist clinical support will remain available through the NHS for this patient cohort; the proposed NHS England interim service specification for gender incongruence (June 2023) describes a multi-disciplinary approach to care that focuses on psychosocial and psychological approaches, and psychoeducation.
The policy should be informed by the lived experiences of transgender people and experts.	The policy proposition has been formed following NHS England's established method for forming clinical commissioning policies. This method takes account of relevant, peer-reviewed, quality academic and clinical research – it does not take account of lived experiences. The report on the analysis of consultation responses records that respondents have referred to the process of stakeholder testing that NHS England undertook prior to public consultation. That process of stakeholder testing was open to all

	individuals and organisations who had previously registered as stakeholders. The stakeholder testing asked the same questions as those put to respondents to the subsequent public consultation – it did not seek to use lived experience to inform the development of the policy itself.
Transgender healthcare should be available everywhere, not only in specialist clinics	This falls outside the scope of the consultation.
The policy should remove harmful terminology that pathologises transgender people. Some respondents felt that the policy conspicuously avoided the use of terms such as 'transgender' and 'gender dysphoria' in favour of the clinical term 'gender incongruence.'	The clinical commissioning policy has to refer to a recognised diagnostic tool in order to describe those individuals who would fall within the scope of the clinical commissioning policy. The search criteria agreed by the Policy Working Group for the purpose of the NICE evidence review was: "*children and adolescents aged 18 years or less who have gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder or gender incongruence of childhood".* The NICE evidence review reported that all of the studies that reported diagnostic criteria for gender dysphoria used the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) criteria that was in use at the time (6/9 studies) and the other 3 studies did not report how gender dysphoria / gender incongruence / gender identity disorder was defined. The proposed policy published by NHS England for the purpose of public consultation used 'gender incongruence' as defined by the International Classification of Diseases v11, which is consistent with the diagnostic framework that is referenced in NHS England's interim service specification for the new

	Children and Young People's Gender Services (2023); and 'gender dysphoria' as defined by the DSM.
The policy should give evidence that psychological therapies alone are an effective treatment.	The EHIA described that other forms of specialist clinical support will remain available through the NHS for this patient cohort; the proposed NHS England interim service specification for gender incongruence (June 2023) describes a multi-disciplinary approach to care that focuses on psychoeducation, psychosocial and psychological approaches, and aims to reduce distress and promote wellbeing and functioning. However, both the interim advice from the Cass Review and NHS England's previous public consultation on the interim service specification have acknowledged the scarce and inconclusive evidence to support clinical decision making in regard to children and young people who present with gender incongruence or gender variance, including approaches for social transition and psychological therapies. The Cass Review will deliver final advice to NHS England, including on the evidence base to support clinical decision making, by March 2024 and this advice will inform the development of a substantive service specification for the new CYP Gender Services by NHS England in 2024.
The requirement for those currently using PSH to desist is misguided.	This is not what NHS England has proposed. The policy proposition and the EHIA **have been amended to make clearer that:** *"For children and young people who, at the point the clinical commissioning policy takes effect on 1 April 2024:*

	• *have been referred into an endocrine clinic by the former NHS Gender Identity Development Service but have not yet been assessed by a consultant endocrinologist for suitability of PSH; or* • *are under the clinical care of an endocrine team at University College of London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust or Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust following a referrals by the former NHS Gender Identity Development Service* *there is an expectation that GnRHa will continue to be administered / be initiated, if that is the informed choice of the young person / parents of a child under 16 years*[1]*, subject to the outcome of usual clinical review of the individual's existing individual care plan jointly between the individual's Lead Clinician and the young person / parents of a child under 16 years".* NHS England's adoption of the proposal would not be intended to compel young people / parents of children under 16 years to choose to continue with GnRHa if, after a consideration of the issues raised by the adoption of the policy, they make a decision to cease the intervention. As part of the programme of work to oversee the decommissioning of the GIDS at Tavistock and the establishment of

[1] NHS England's adoption of the proposal would not be intended to compel young people / parents of children under 16 years to choose to continue with GnRHa if, after a consideration of the issues raised by the adoption of the policy, they make a decision to cease the intervention.

	new services, NHS England has asked a Paediatric Endocrinology Working Group to develop a framework for obtaining informed consent from relevant young people / parents of children under 16 years, to ensure rigour and consistency of approach.

Group B Respondents

Respondents said…	**NHS England response …**
Need for consistency and clarity in the definition of 'gender incongruence' within the interim clinical policy, suggesting that the definition should align with the diagnostic framework of the interim service specification and adopt the ICD-11 definition. Current version refers to "gender incongruence / dysphoria".	The proposed policy refers to 'gender incongruence' as defined by the International Classification of Diseases v11, which is consistent with the diagnostic framework that is referenced in NHS England's interim service specification for the new Children and Young People's Gender Services; and 'gender dysphoria' as defined by DSM V.
The proposed research trial is unethical.	The development of a research protocol is well underway and will be subject to the usual approvals through the National Institute for Health and Care Research, but NHS England's proposal to remove PSH from routine NHS prescribing protocols is not contingent upon the establishment of a clinical study. **The wording of the proposed policy has been amended** to provide greater clarity on this point. The consequence of a decision by NHS England, should it be

	made, that PSH are no longer routinely commissioned by the NHS as a response to gender incongruence will be that the PSH pathway will be closed, regardless of the outcome of a separate programme of work through the National Research Oversight Board to determine the feasibility of a clinical study.
There should be no exceptional cases outside of the research trial.	**As a change to the proposed policy:** Puberty Suppressing Hormones will not be available through an 'exceptional circumstances' route; the providers of gender incongruence services for children and young people were concerned at how such a pathway could operate appropriately, effectively and equitably; instead, as with all specialised services, a patient's clinician can make an application under NHS England's Individual Funding Request process, if the clinician can demonstrate that there are no other patients with similar clinical circumstances who might benefit from the treatment in a similar way.
Safeguarding policies should be clearly set out and described in full.	Since 2020 NHS England has commissioned a Multi-Professional Review Group (MPRG) to review all proposed referrals made by the Tavistock GIDS of children under 16 years to an endocrine clinic. The purpose of the review is to ensure that proper process has been followed, including compliance with safeguarding approaches and consent requirements. From April 2024 the role of the MPRG will be subsumed by a new national Multi-Disciplinary Team, with an independent chair.
The policy should address how modern culture has influenced the rise of gender dysphoria.	This is outside the scope of the consultation. The approach for assessment and diagnosis of gender incongruence is set out in NHS England's published interim service specification for CYP Gender Services, which was agreed following a process of public consultation.

The policy should make support available for de-transitioners and those harmed by PSH	NHS England will await the final report from the Cass Review to determine how to take this forward; any such work would be undertaken outside of the work to agree the final version of the clinical commissioning policy.
The research trial should be a clinical trial of an Investigational Medicinal Product.	This falls outside the scope of the consultation. The feasibility of a clinical study, including definition of access into a clinical study, is being led by a National Research Oversight Board following usual design principles. The development of a research protocol is well underway and will be subject to the usual approvals through the National Institute for Health and Care Research, but NHS England's proposal to remove PSH from routine NHS prescribing protocols is not contingent upon the establishment of a clinical study. **The wording of the proposed policy has been amended** to provide greater clarity on this point.
Patients and their families should be educated on the risks of using PSH	The feasibility of a clinical study, including definition of access into a clinical study, is being led by a National Research Oversight Board following usual design principles. Should a clinical study be feasible and were the study to gain the usual approvals, children and young people taking part in the study, and their families, would be fully appraised of the available evidence around the risks, benefits and outcomes of PSH, including where the evidence is uncertain.
The language used in the policy should be scientifically and medically accurate.	The language that is used needs to be accessible to a lay-person. NHS England has reviewed the language used in the policy and has concluded that the content is accurate.

The policy should address private or overseas prescribers.	This is outside the scope of the consultation. The scope of the proposed clinical commissioning policy is the use of PSH by the NHS in England.
Research participants must be carefully screened.	The development of a research protocol is well underway and will be subject to the usual approvals through the National Institute for Health and Care Research. The feasibility of a clinical study, including definition of access into a clinical study, is being led by a National Research Oversight Board following usual design principles.

Summary of themes raised by all respondents

Respondents said…	**NHS England response …**
The policy should be closely reviewed and updated following the new research outcomes.	All NHS England clinical commissioning policies for specialised services are subject to regular planned review, and a review can take place before the planned review date if new evidence emerges. It is the intention that the future review of the PSH policy will be informed by the evidence that emerges from the proposed clinical study over time.
The general public should not be consulted on medical matters.	NHS England has a statutory duty to make arrangements to involve the public in commissioning services under section 13Q of the National Health Service Act 2006 (as amended by the Health and Social Care Act 2012). The section 13Q

	duty is aimed at ensuring that NHS England acts fairly in making plans, proposals and decisions in relation to the health services it commissions.
Concerns were raised about the lack of explicit details on whether psychological treatment would be inherently gender affirming. A lack of elucidation on how decisions will be made concerning individuals already undergoing treatment through alternative providers or routes.	This is outside the scope of consultation. The approach for delivery of services as a response to gender incongruence, including psychological approaches, is set out in NHS England's published interim service specification for CYP Gender Services, which was agreed following a process of public consultation. As part of the programme of work to oversee the decommissioning of the GIDS at Tavistock and the establishment of new services, NHS England has asked a Paediatric Endocrinology Working Group to establish a framework for obtaining informed consent from relevant young people / parents of children under 16 years, to ensure rigour and consistency of approach.
Ambiguity surrounding the criteria for determining "exceptional circumstances" within the context of the research trial was also flagged as an issue.	**As a change to the proposed policy:** Puberty Suppressing Hormones will not be available through an 'exceptional circumstances' route; the providers of gender incongruence services for children and young people were concerned at how such a pathway could operate appropriately, effectively and equitably; instead, as with all specialised services, a patient's clinician can make an application under NHS England's Individual Funding Request process, if the clinician can demonstrate that there are no other patients with similar clinical circumstances who might benefit from the treatment in a similar way. NHS England **has amended the EHIA accordingly.**

Need for a more transparent policy that avoids ambiguity and ensures that individuals, including those already in the treatment process, clearly understand what the policy means for them, how it will affect them, and where they stand.	NHS England will consider the broader communication approach around implementation of the clinical commissioning policy.

Appendix B

Summary of NHS England's Approach for Review of the Evidence

In 2020 NHS England commissioned a systematic evidence review from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)[2]. The search criteria that were used by NICE[3] were based on the PICO table agreed by an independent working group[4] of expert clinicians and academics chaired by Dr Hilary Cass. Nine observational studies were identified in the evidence review (date range 2011 to 2020): five studies were retrospective observational studies; three studies were prospective longitudinal observational studies; and one study was a cross-sectional study. Two studies provided comparative evidence and the remaining seven studies used within-person, before and after comparisons. NICE concluded that overall: there was no statistically significant difference in gender dysphoria, mental health, body image and psychosocial functioning in children and adolescents treated with GnRHa; the quality of evidence for all these outcomes was assessed as very low certainty using modified GRADE; there remains limited short-term and long-term safety data for GnRHa; and GnRHa may reduce the expected increase in lumbar or femoral bone density during puberty.

In April 2023 experts in public health and evidence review methods at NHS England re-ran the search (using the same bibliographic search strategies that were used by NICE) to determine if any new evidence had been published subsequent to the NICE search. In total, an initial 358 references were identified across all databases, and following a process of de-duplication, 256 unique references remained which were screened against the details in the PICO table used for the NICE evidence review using their titles and abstracts. The outcome was that 54 references[5] were identified for the purpose of full text assessment against the details in the PICO table.

Of the 54 full texts:

- 45 studies were not relevant
    - 3 studies are unobtainable in full text
    - 5 studies were already identified in the NICE evidence review
    - 37 studies were not relevant according to the PICO details
- 9 studies were relevant according to the PICO details:

Of the 9 studies that were relevant:

- 7 studies were unlikely to materially affect the conclusions of the NICE evidence review (date range of this evidence was 2020 to 2022)

[2] The NICE report on the review of the evidence was published in March 2021.
[3] The search criteria were published and made available to respondents to consultation: literature-surveillace-report-on-gnrh-analogues-for-children-and-adolescents-with-gender-dysphoria-may-2023.pdf (england.nhs.uk)
[4] The PICO table was published and made available to respondents to consultation: literature-surveillace-report-on-gnrh-analogues-for-children-and-adolescents-with-gender-dysphoria-may-2023.pdf (england.nhs.uk)
[5] The list of studies was published and made available to respondents to consultation: literature-surveillace-report-on-gnrh-analogues-for-children-and-adolescents-with-gender-dysphoria-may-2023.pdf (england.nhs.uk)

- 2 studies may materially have affected the conclusions of the NICE evidence review (the dates of these evidence were 2020 and 2023)

In May 2023 NHS England's Specialised Services Clinical Panel considered the refreshed review of the evidence, and it concluded that the new evidence did not materially affect the conclusions of the NICE review.

In June 2023 NHS England ran a process of stakeholder testing on the policy proposition and asked stakeholders if they could identify other material evidence that had not been identified by the 2020 NICE evidence review or the subsequent literature review in April 2023, which was shared with them. No relevant evidence was identified through the process of stakeholder testing.

In August 2023 NHS England ran a 12-week public consultation on the policy proposition. The consultation asked respondents if they could identify other material evidence that had not been identified by the 2020 NICE evidence review or the subsequent literature review in April 2023, which was published as part of the consultation material. The process of consultation generated 246 proposed search references, which were subsequently reviewed by a team of experts in public health and evidence review methods in NHS England for relevance against the search strategy and PICO used for the NICE evidence review and the 2023 literature review. Where necessary, references were obtained in full text. NHS England's consideration of this evidence in January 2024 is set out in Appendix C below.

❖ In summary, of these 246 references:

- 3 were general website pages from which specific information could not be determined
- 34 were evidence already identified as part of the NICE evidence review or literature surveillance report (the date range of this evidence was 2008 to 2023)
- 206 were new evidence identified by respondents that did not fall within the PICO and search methodology (the date range of this evidence was 1989 to 2023)
- 3 were new evidence identified by respondents that fell within PICO and search methodology but did not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review (the date range of these papers was 2020 to 2023)

No new evidence was identified by respondents that fell within the PICO and search methodology, and that would materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review.

Appendix C

Public Health Evidence Report Following Engagement Activity

This form is to be completed by the Policy Working Group's Public Health Lead if stakeholders identify potential new evidence during policy development engagement activities. The Public Health Lead will assess the evidence raised to against the Population, Intervention, Comparator and Outcome (PICO) criteria and will record the studies in the appropriate boxes in the '*Outcome for studies suggested during engagement activities*' section of this form. In cases where newly identified evidence has a material impact, please return the completed form to the Clinical Effectiveness Team (CET).

URN	1927
Policy title:	Draft Interim Clinical Policy: Puberty Suppressing Hormones
CRG:	Gender Dysphoria Clinical Programme
NPOC:	National Programme Board for Gender Dysphoria Services
Engagement activity	Public consultation
Date	5th January 2024

Description of comments during engagement (If studies have been suggested please provide a list of references)	251 URLs related to the public consultation questions: • Has all of the relevant evidence been taken into account? • Are there any changes or additions you think need to be made to this policy? Short references were allocated for the information to which each of the URLs linked. 10 URLs linked to 5 duplicate short references, leaving 246 unique short references suggested during consultation.
Action taken by Public Health lead	246 unique references were checked for relevance against the search strategy and PICO used for the evidence review and literature surveillance report and against the references detailed in the evidence review, the literature surveillance report the

	stakeholder testing Public Health Evidence Report. Where necessary, references were obtained in full text. 3 unique references were general website pages from which specific information could not be determined. 1. ONS data http://www.nomisweb.co.uk 2. St Louis https://www.stlouischildrens.org/conditions-treatments/transgender-center/puberty-blockers 3. UK Parliament Committees https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/7947/html/
Outcome for studies suggested during engagement activities	
1. Evidence already identified as part of the evidence review, literature surveillance report or stakeholder testing	1. Achille 2020 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13633-020-00078-2 2. Anacker 2020 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32919399 3. Angus 2020 https://doi.org/10.1111/cen.14329 4. Biggs 2023 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36120756/ 5. Boogers 2022 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35666195/ 6. Carmichael 2021 https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0243894 7. Chen 2021 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.07.033 8. Costa 2015 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26556015/ 9. de Vries 2011 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20646177/ 10. de Vries 2014 https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article-abstract/134/4/696/32932/Young-Adult-Psychological-Outcome-After-Puberty?autologincheck=redirected 11. Drummond 2008 https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2F0012-1649.44.1.34 12. Giovanardi 2019 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30953318/ 13. Graham 2023 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10063975/ 14. Hembree 2017 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28945902/ 15. Horton 2022 https://doi.org/10.1177/07435584221100591 16. Jensen 2019 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31663037/ 17. Joseph 2019 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31472062/ 18. Khatchadourian 2014 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24315505/ 19. Klink 2015 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25427144/ 20. Kremen 2021 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33883246/ 21. Lee 2020 https://doi.org/10.1210/jendso/bvaa065 22. Nos 2022 https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2798002 23. Panagiotakopoulos 2020 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41585-020-0372-2 24. Ramos 2020 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40618-020-01449-5 25. Rew 2021 https://doi.org/10.1111/camh.12437

	26. Schagen 2016 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27318023/ 27. Schagen 2020 https://academic.oup.com/jcem/article/105/12/e4252/5903559?login=false 28. Staphorsius 2015 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0306453015000943 29. Steensma 2013 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2013.02.020 30. Tordoff 2022 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8881768/ 31. Van der Loos 2023 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36763938/ 32. van der Miesen 2020 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2019.12.018 33. Wallien 2008 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18981931/ 34. Zucker 2010 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19359705.2011.530574
2.New evidence identified by stakeholders that does not fall within PICO and search methodology	1. AACAP 2020 https://www.aacap.org/AACAP/Families_and_Youth/Facts_for_Families/FFF-Guide/transgender-and-gender-diverse-youth-122.aspx 2. AACE 2022 https://pro.aace.com/recent-news-and-updates/aace-position-statement-transgender-and-gender-diverse-patients 3. AACPP 2019 https://www.aacap.org/AACAP/Latest_News/AACAP_Statement_Responding_to_Efforts-to_ban_Evidence-Based_Care_for_Transgender_and_Gender_Diverse.aspx 4. Abbruzzese 2023 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0092623X.2022.2150346 5. Abreu 2022 https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2021-67997-001?doi=1 6. Abreu 2022a https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2022-47098-001 7. ACC 2023 https://www.acc.org/About-ACC/Press-Releases/2023/02/22/20/29/Hormone-Therapy-for-Gender-Dysphoria-May-Raise-Cardiovascular-Risks 8. ACHA https://www.acha.org/ACHA/About/Position_Statements/ACHA/About/Position_Statements.aspx?hkey=ff979452-3284-4993-8cbc-bf4abaa8b430 9. ACNM https://www.midwife.org/acnm/files/acnmlibrarydata/uploadfilename/000000000326/ACNM--PS--Care%20for%20TGNB%20People-%20Final_1.pdf 10. ACOG 2021 https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/committee-opinion/articles/2021/03/health-care-for-transgender-and-gender-diverse-individuals

11. ACP 2023 https://www.acponline.org/advocacy/state-health-policy/attacks-on-gender-affirming-and-transgender-health-care
12. ACT 2021 https://health.act.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-11/Guidance%20to%20support%20gender%20affirming%20care%20for%20mental%20health%20FINAL_0.pdf
13. Alegria 2016 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27031444/
14. AMA 2019 https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-leading-medical-organizations-fight-transgender-americans
15. AMA 2021 https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-states-stop-interfering-health-care-transgender-children
16. ANA 2022 https://www.nursingworld.org/news/news-releases/2022-news-releases/american-nurses-association-opposes-restrictions-on-transgender-healthcare-and-criminalizing-gender-affirming-care/
17. Anacker 2021 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32919399/
18. APA 2018 https://www.psychiatry.org/getattachment/3d23f2f4-1497-4537-b4de-fe32fe8761bf/Position-Conversion-Therapy.pdf
19. APA 2021 https://www.psychiatry.org/newsroom/news-releases/frontline-physicians-oppose-legislation-that-interferes-in-or-criminalizes-patient-care
20. Arnold 2023 https://journals.lww.com/co-pediatrics/abstract/2023/08000/transgender_and_gender_diverse_youth__an_update_on.6.aspx
21. Arnoldussen 2022 https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2020.0494
22. Arnoldussen 2022a https://doi.org/10.1177/13591045221091652
23. Ashley 2023 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/26895269.2023.2218357
24. Ashley 2023a https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/2024-16010-001.html
25. AUA 2022 https://www.auanet.org/about-us/policy-and-position-statements/transgender-care
26. AusPath https://auspath.org.au/standards-of-care/
27. Azar 2019 https://www.aapa.org/download/50101/
28. Bailey 2003 https://www.amazon.com/Man-Would-Queen-Gender-Bending-Transsexualism/dp/0309084180
29. Bangalore Krishna 2019 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31319416/
30. Barnes 2023 https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-66842352
31. Barnes 2023a https://www.amazon.com/Time-Think-Collapse-Tavistocks-Children-ebook/dp/B0BCL1T2XN
32. Bauer 2022 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34793826/
33. Beers 2021 https://www.aap.org/en/news-room/news-releases/aap/2021/american-academy-of-pediatrics-speaks-out-against-bills-harming-transgender-youth/

34. Bhatt Murphy solicitors 2023 https://bhattmurphy.co.uk/files/SRN%20cases/Sophie%20Williams%20Press%20Release%2001.03.23.pdf
35. Bindmans 2023 https://www.bindmans.com/knowledge-hub/news/alice-litman-inquest-concludes/.
36. Blanchard 1989 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2673136/
37. Blanchard 2008 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5420507_Deconstructing_the_Feminine_Essence_Narrative
38. Boerner 2022 https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-the-science-on-gender-affirming-care-for-transgender-kids-really-shows/
39. Bradley 1990 www.researchgate.net/publication/20948042_Gender_Identity_Disorder_and_Psychosexual_Problems_in_Children_and_Adolescents
40. Bungener 2020 https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-1411
41. Bustos 2021 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8099405/
42. Carter 2021 https://www.amazon.com/TransNarratives-Scholarly-Creative-Transgender-Experience/dp/0889616221
43. Castagnaro 2023 https://www.gendergp.com/new-study-confirms-benefits-of-gender-affirming-healthcare/
44. Chen 2020 https://doi.org/10.1089/TRGH.2020.0006
45. Chen 2023 https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2206297
46. Chew 2018 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29514975/
47. Chronister 2021 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2021.07.026
48. Chudy 2023 https://www.thepinknews.com/2023/09/14/alice-litman-inquest-gender-clinic-waiting-times/
49. Clarke 2019 https://repository.tavistockandportman.ac.uk/1910/
50. Cohen-Kettenis 2008 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18564158/
51. Cohen-Kettenis 2011 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3114100/
52. Coleman 2022 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/26895269.2022.2100644
53. Coyne 2023 https://skepticalinquirer.org/2023/06/the-ideological-subversion-of-biology/
54. Curtis 2020 https://ajp.psychiatryonline.org/doi/full/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.19111131
55. Davey 2023 https://amp.theguardian.com/society/2023/sep/08/fast-access-to-hormone-therapy-in-transgender-adults-lifesaving-study-

finds?fbclid=IwAR2KKTLNKBi9s7rG4_9F307IeFo3sEzuXYt7ZF9a_C_FDCFEW0lHWi9JN-Q
56. de Vries 2012 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22455322/
57. de Vries 2020 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32958612/
58. Diaz 2023 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-023-02576-9
59. Do no harm 2023 https://donoharmmedicine.org/2023/06/14/do-no-harm-expert-testifies-at-congress/
60. Eckert 2021 https://sciencebasedmedicine.org/a-critical-look-at-the-nice-review/
61. Endocrine Society 2023 https://www.endocrine.org/news-and-advocacy/news-room/2023/ama-gender-affirming-care
62. Eriksen 2018 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6148624/
63. Eugster 2019 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6486823/
64. FDA 2022 https://www.fda.gov/media/159663/download
65. Fitzsimons 2019 https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/prominent-transgender-activist-harassed-anti-trans-feminists-video-shows-n966061
66. GenderGP 2021 https://www.gendergp.com/detransition-facts/
67. Genspect 2023 https://genspect.org/detrans-awareness-day-2023/
68. Giedd 2012 https://doi.org/10.1186/2042-6410-3-19
69. Gill-Petersen 2018 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Histories_of_the_Transgender_Child
70. Giordano 2020 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/26895269.2020.1747768
71. Giordano 2021 https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2020-106999
72. Giovanardi 2017 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32258611/
73. Gitay 2009 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19297634/
74. Glinteborg 2023 https://academic.oup.com/ejendo/article-abstract/189/3/336/7261571?redirectedFrom=fulltext
75. Godfrey 2023

https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2022.105987
76. Gonen 2023 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36598988/
77. Good Law Project 2023 https://goodlawproject.org/warm-and-kind-alice-let-down-by-unfit-for-purpose-transgender-healthcare-provision/
78. Gosling 2022 https://sex-matters.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Teenagers-medication-vs-placebo.pdf
79. GovScot 2017 https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/foi-eir-release/2020/01/foi-201900010673/documents/foi-201900010673---document-3---puberty-blockers-and-trans-yp---april-2017/foi-201900010673---document-3---puberty-blockers-and-trans-yp---april-2017/govscot%3Adocument/FOI-201900010673%2B-%2BDocument%2B3%2B-%2B%2BPuberty%2Bblockers%2Band%2BTrans%2BYP%2B-%2BApril%2B2017.pdf
80. Green 1987 https://www.amazon.com/Sissy-Boy-Syndrome-Development-Homosexuality/dp/0300036965
81. Green 2022 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34920935/
82. Growing up transgender 2020 https://growinguptransgender.com/2020/06/10/puberty-blockers-overview-of-the-research/
83. Gunlusoy 2017 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28188757/
84. Guss 2022 https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2798007
85. GWA 2019 https://www.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/U_Z/WA-Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender-Intersex-Health-Strategy-2019
86. Hammes 2023 https://www.wsj.com/articles/trans-gender-affirming-care-endocrine-society-evidence-fdb8562c
87. Haugh 2017 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27987429/
88. Hayes 2016 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S02775395153023 4X?via%3Dihub
89. Hayes 2017 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00044
90. Hayton 2022 https://debbiehayton.com/2022/05/16/my-autogynephilia-story/

91. Health Select Committee 2016 https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmhealth/300/30005.htm
92. Healthtalk.org https://healthtalk.org/Experiences-of-trans-and-gender-diverse-young-people/Trans-and-gender-diverse-young-peoples-experiences-of-puberty-and-puberty-blockers
93. HEIW https://heiw.nhs.wales/news/heiw-launches-new-gender-diversity-and-trans-health-training-modules/
94. Hembree 2013 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24468758/
95. Henderson 2022 https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2022.2205
96. Hodgkinson 1989 https://www.amazon.com/Michael-Nee-Laura-Worlds-Female/dp/0862878721
97. Horton 2022a https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/27703371.2022.2076002
98. Horton 2023 https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/02724316221107076
99. Hough 2017 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5140006/
100. Jewett 2017 https://www.statnews.com/2017/02/02/lupron-puberty-children-health-problems/
101. Joshua 2018 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COGNITION.2018.04.007
102. Jowett 2022 https://philpapers.org/rec/JOWCFM
103. Kallitsounaki 2022 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35596023/
104. Kaltiala 2023 https://www.thefp.com/p/gender-affirming-care-dangerous-finland-doctor
105. Kay 2023 https://nationalpost.com/opinion/breaking-the-ideological-logjam-over-transgender-youth-health
106. Keating 2006 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16983113/
107. KFF Health News 2017 https://kffhealthnews.org/news/women-fear-drug-they-used-to-halt-puberty-led-to-health-problems/
108. Klein 2018 https://www.aafp.org/pubs/afp/issues/2018/1201/p645.html
109. Kohls 2023 https://acamh.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jcpp.13717
110. Kozlowska 2021 https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/26344041211010777
111. Lancet 2021 https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642(21)00139-5/fulltext#figures
112. Littman https://littmanresearch.com/publications/

113. Littman 2022 https://www.jpeds.com/article/S0022-3476(22)00183-4/fulltext
114. Logic Study https://logicstudy.uk/about/
115. Mahfouda 2017 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28546095/
116. Malone 2021 https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642(21)00235-2/fulltext
117. McNamara 2023 https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article-abstract/152/3/e2022060943/193719/Combating-Scientific-Disinformation-on-Gender
118. McNeil 2012 https://www.scottishtrans.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/trans_mh_study.pdf
119. McPherson 2023 https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.05.30.23290763v3.full
120. Mehmood 2023 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK557435/
121. Meier 2018 https://www.amazon.com/Gender-Affirmative-Model-Interdisciplinary-Perspectives-ebook/dp/B07DKY7GFG
122. Meredith 2022 https://www.medscape.co.uk/viewarticle/1000-families-sue-tavistock-gender-service-2022a10021ac
123. Mul 2001 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11683207/
124. Mul 2008 https://doi.org/10.1530/EJE-08-0814
125. Murphy 2023 https://www.feministcurrent.com/2023/05/03/its-the-funding-stupid/
126. Mystic sisters 2022 https://mysticsisters.substack.com/p/esg-the-hidden-reason-why-so-many
127. NASW 2023 https://www.socialworkers.org/News/News-Releases/ID/2642/Gender-Affirming-Health-Care-Saves-Lives#:~:text=WASHINGTON%2C%20D.C.%20%E2%80%93%20The%20National%20Association,transgender%20and%20gender%20diverse%20(TGD)
128. NHS 2020 https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/gender-dysphoria/
129. NHS 2022 https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/early-or-delayed-puberty/
130. NICE 2012 https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg6/resources/how-nice-clinical-guidelines-are-developed-an-overview-for-stakeholders-the-public-and-the-nhs-pdf-3304422725317.
131. NICE 2020 https://cass.independent-review.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/20220726_Evidence-review_GnRH-analogues_For-upload_Final.pdf
132. Nuruddin 2013 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23266521/
133. Olsen 2014 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24972421/
134. Olson 2016 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26921285/

135. Olson 2022 https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/doi/10.1542/peds.2021-056082/186992/Gender-Identity-5-Years-After-Social-Transition
136. Our duty https://ourduty.group/education/lifecycle-of-transgender-ideation/
137. Padula 2016 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-015-3529-6
138. Panagiotakopoulos 2018 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11154-018-9457-0
139. Pang 2020 https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2768726
140. Pang 2022 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35365494/
141. PATHA https://patha.nz/Guidelines
142. Pelham 2023 https://www.cedars-sinai.org/blog/puberty-blockers-for-precocious-puberty.html#:~:text=While%20puberty%20blockers%20have%20been,past%20the%20age%20of%20puberty
143. People 2020 https://people.com/health/nearly-all-transgender-children-who-socially-transition-stay-with-that-gender-study-finds/
144. Pincus 2021 https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2021.105154
145. PR Newswire 2023 https://www.benzinga.com/pressreleases/23/05/n32319924/sex-reassignment-surgery-market-report-2023-availability-of-health-insurance-coverage-to-boost-gro
146. Priest 2019 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15265161.2018.1557276
147. r/trans 2023 www.reddit.com/r/detrans/
148. Rafferty 2018 https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/142/4/e20182162/37381/Ensuring-Comprehensive-Care-and-Support-for?autologincheck=redirected
149. RCGP 2019 https://www.rcgp.org.uk/representing-you/policy-areas/transgender-care
150. Reduxx 2021 https://reduxx.info/trans-health-authority-cites-castration-fetish-site-in-guidelines/
151. Rigg 2019 https://doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2019.1692751
152. Rigg 2020 https://spssi.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/josi.12364
153. Ristori 2023 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40618-023-02173-6

154. Roberts 2022 https://academic.oup.com/jcem/article/107/9/e3937/6572526?login=false
155. Rothman 2019 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6709704/
156. Russell 2018 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.02.003
157. Salas-Humara 2019 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cppeds.2019.100683
158. Sapir 2023 https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/science/articles/finland-youth-gender-medicine
159. Schiappa 2021 https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003250494
160. Schillace 2021 https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/
161. Schneider 2017 https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00528
162. Schneider 2017 https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00528
163. SEGM 2021 https://segm.org/the_effect_of_puberty_blockers_on_the_accrual_of_bone_mass
164. Sex matters 2023 https://sex-matters.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Social-transition-in-schools-is-not-possible.pdf
165. Shrier 2020 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irreversible_Damage
166. Singh 2021 https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.632784/full
167. Smith 2021 https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/population-care/what-know-about-gender-affirming-care-younger-patients
168. Smothers 2021 https://www.vice.com/en/article/epnzjk/no-one-had-a-problem-with-puberty-blockers-when-only-cis-kids-took-them
169. Stanford Medicine 2022 https://med.stanford.edu/news/all-news/2022/01/mental-health-hormone-treatment-transgender-people.html
170. Stanikova 2018 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2017.10.025
171. Stonewall 2018 https://www.stonewall.org.uk/lgbt-britain-trans-report
172. Stuebing 2002 https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3102/00028312039002469
173. Tavistock 2021

https://tavistockandportman.nhs.uk/news/early-intervention-study-shows-puberty-blockers-are-a-well-received-intervention-in-carefully-selected-patients/
174. The Gender Critical https://gcritical.org/introduction/
175. Threadreader https://threadreaderapp.com/thread/1536422533230206976.html
176. Tordoff 2023 https://doi.org/10.1089/trgh.2021.0116
177. Transgender Trend https://www.transgendertrend.com/the-suicide-myth/
178. Transgender Trend 2023 https://www.transgendertrend.com/nhs-interim-clinical-policy-public-consultation-submission-guide/
179. Transtransmedia 2023 https://www.bitchute.com/video/AEFZv6dqtERN/
180. Turban 2022 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8754307/
181. Turban 2022a https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/gender-dysphoria/what-is-gender-dysphoria
182. Turban 2022b https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/political-minds/202201/the-evidence-trans-youth-gender-affirming-medical-care
183. US Trans Survey 2015 https://www.ustranssurvey.org/reports
184. van de Grift 2017 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5580378/
185. Van Meter 2018 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uC0zn0D_MyM
186. Van Meter 2019 https://christianconcern.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/CC-Resource-Misc-Rowes-JR-Van-Meter-20210915.pdf
187. Vandermorris 2023 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37885600/
188. Vrouenraets 2016 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27251640/
189. Vrouenraets 2021 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36324881/
190. Walch 2021 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33326028/
191. Wall Street Journal 2023 https://www.wsj.com/articles/trans-gender-affirming-care-transition-hormone-surgery-evidence-c1961e27
192. Wanta 2019 https://doi.org/10.1089/trgh.2019.0029
193. Warner 2021 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8606364/
194. WHO https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender
195. Wiepjes 2018 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2018.01.016
196. Wikipedia 2 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bell_v_Tavistock

	197. Wojniusz 2013 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23477973/ 198. Wojniusz 2016 https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01053 199. Yanovski 2003 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12621135/ 200. You tube 1 https://youtu.be/52UNfgTJBL0 201. You tube 2 https://youtu.be/Azx8e5nmc9g 202. You tube 3 https://youtu.be/v1eWlshUzr8?si=eRZLOTTeFau2tr74 203. You tube 5 https://zero.sci-hub.st/4911/9dc0c58006960fe1220b267bafa48e53/olson2016.pdf#view=FitH 204. You tube 6 www.youtube.com/watch?v=6mtQ1geeD_c 205. You tube 7 www.youtube.com/watch?v=N7_5m-AUuj4 206. Zucker 2012 https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2012.653309
3.New evidence identified by stakeholders that falls within PICO and search methodology but does not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review	1. Lavender 2023 https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2022.0201 They report a retrospective observational analysis of patients who attended an endocrine clinic. All patients in this study had been treated with puberty suppression **and** gender-affirming hormone treatment, although results are presented separately for each stage of treatment and thus it is possible to determine outcomes for patients following puberty suppression only. Number of patients in this study is small, with considerable loss to follow up (ie 109 eligible participants but full results only available for 38). Comprehensive assessment at each stage using a range of questionnaires, completed by young people and caregivers. The use of puberty suppressants resulted in statistically significant improvements in the Child Behavior Checklist but no statistically significant differences in the Youth Self Report questionnaire or the Body Image Scale questionnaire or the Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale. Improvements were also noted

	in self harm and suicidality statements following treatment with puberty suppressants. 2. Ludvigsson 2023 https://doi.org/10.1111/apa.16791 This is a systematic review with relevant outcomes. All contributing studies were checked and have been previously identified or are not relevant to the PICO. Note also that the authors state "Evidence to assess the effects of hormone treatment on the above fields [psychosocial and mental health, cognition, body composition, and metabolic markers of hormone treatment in children with gender dysphoria] is insufficient." 3. Kuper 2020 https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-3006 In this study a total of 148 participants completed surveys assessing body dissatisfaction, depression and anxiety at initial presentation to their clinic and at follow-up after one year. Most patients in this study were treated with feminising or masculinising hormone therapy but a small number (25/148; 17%) were treated with puberty blocking drugs and the results for this group are reported separately. Note that 90% of all the patients in this study were at a late stage of puberty (Tanner Stage IV or V). There were modest improvements in body dissatisfaction, depressive symptoms and anxiety symptoms in the group of patients treated with puberty suppressants only.
4.New evidence identified by	None

stakeholders that falls within PICO and search methodology, that does materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review. Updated evidence review to be undertaken (to be agreed with CET)	

Appendix D

Public Health Evidence Report Following Engagement Activity

URN	1927
Policy title	Draft Interim Clinical Policy: Puberty suppressing hormones (PSH) for children and adolescents who have gender incongruence.
CRG	Gender Dysphoria Clinical Programme
NPOC	Not applicable
Engagement activity	Post public consultation
Date	26 February 2024

Description of comments during engagement (If studies have been suggested please provide a list of references)	A query was received regarding NHSE's consideration of the The World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH) Standards of Care (SOC) for the Health of Transsexual, Transgender, and Gender Nonconforming People, Version 8, during development of the draft Interim Clinical Policy: Puberty suppressing hormones (PSH) for children and adolescents who have gender incongruence.
Action taken by Public Health lead	The suggested references at stakeholder testing and public consultation during policy development and the responses to suggestions were checked for mention of the WPATH SOC Version 8. The WPATH SOC Version 8 was suggested at stakeholder testing and public consultation and a correct response was provided in both evidence reports noting that it does not fall within PICO and search methodology (because it is a guideline). To ensure comprehensive consideration of the WPATH SOC Version 8, the 200 citations within the relevant chapter, i.e. Chapter 12 Hormone Therapy, were further assessed and findings are described below.
Outcome for studies cited in Chapter 12 of WPATH SOC Vn 8	

Citation not identifiable	*Citation given in short form in Chapter 12 but full details not provided in WPATH SOC Vn8 reference list* 1. Baba, 2007 2. Finkelstein et al 1996 3. Lin et al 2021 4. Stuyver et al 2020 5. Tebbens at al 2021 6. Toorians et al 2013
Citation does not meet PICO criteria or search methodology of the NICE 2020 evidence review	*Published prior to the date limits of the literature search:* 1. Comite et al 1981 2. Laron et al 1981 3. van Kesteren et al 1997 *Published within the date limits of the literature search and either was not identified from the searches performed or was identified but sifted out because of not meeting the PICO criteria based on the title and abstract details:* 1. Adeleye et al, 2018 2. Allen et al, 2019 3. Alzahrani et al, 2019 4. Anai et al, 2001 5. Arcelus et al, 2016 6. Ashley, 2019e 7. Asscheman et al, 2013 8. Barrow & Apostle, 2018 9. Bauer et al, 2015 10. Becerra-Culqui et al, 2018 11. Beek, Kreukels et al 2015 12. Bertelloni et al, 1998 13. Bisson, 2018 14. Bockting et al, 2013 15. Borghei-Razavi, 2014 16. Bouman et al, 2016 17. Bouman et al, 2016 18. Bouman et al, 2017 19. Canonico et al, 2007 20. Carel et al, 2009 21. Klink, Caris et al, 2015 22. Carswell & Roberts, 2017 23. Chan et al 2018 24. Chen, Hidalgo et al, 2016 25. Cheng et al, 2019 26. Colebunders et al, 2017 27. Coleman et al, 2012 28. Colizzi et al, 2014 29. Coolhart et al, 2017 30. Costa et al, 2016 31. Davey et al, 2014

	32. Davis & Meier, 2014 33. De Roo et al, 2016 34. De Roo et al, 2017 35. Defreyne et al, 2018 36. Defreyne, Nota et al 2017 37. Dekker er al 2016 38. Delemarre-van de Waal & Cohen- Kettenis 2006 39. Deutsch, 2016a 40. Deutsch, Bhakri et al 2015 41. Djordjevic et al, 2008 42. Du Bois et al, 2018 43. Eisenberg et al 2017 44. Ethics committee of the American Society of Reproductive Medicine et al 2015 45. Finlayson et al 2016 46. Fisher, Castellini et al 2016 47. Fitzpatrick et al 2000 48. Frey et al 2016 49. Gaither et al 2018 50. Gava et al 2016 51. Gava et al 2018 52. Giltay & Gooren, 2000 53. Giltay et al, 2000 54. Goldstein et al 2019 55. Gomez-Gil et al, 2012 56. Gorin-Lazard et al 2012 57. Gorin-Lazard et al 2013 58. Gower, Rider, Brown et al 2018 59. Grossman & D'Augelli 2006 60. Grynberg et al 2010 61. Hembree et al 2009 62. Hendricks & Testa, 2012 63. Heylens, Elaut et al 2014 64. Horbach at al 2015 65. Irwig, 2017 66. Irwig, 2018 67. Iwamoto, Defreyne et al 2019 68. Iwamoto, T'Sjoen et al 2019 69. Jiang et al 2018 70. Jiang et al 2019 71. Kailas et al 2017 72. Keo-Meier & Ehrensaft, 2018 73. Keo-Meier & Fitzgerald, 2017 74. Keo-Meier et al 2015 75. Kerckhof et al 2019 76. Klink, Bokenkamp et al 2015 77. Kuper, Mathews et al, 2019 78. Kuper, Wright et al 2018 79. Levy et al 2003 80. Light et al 2014 81. Mamoojee et al 2017 82. Mancini et al 2018

	83. Manson, 2013 84. Maraka et al 2017 85. Marks et al 2019 86. Mattawanon et al 2018 87. Meier et al 2013 88. Merriggiola et al 2008 89. Meyer 2003 90. Millington et al 2019 91. Moody et al 2015 92. Murad et al 2010 93. Nash et al 2018 94. Newfield et al 2006 95. Neyman et al 2019 96. Nguyen et al 2018 97. Nobili et al 2018 98. Nota et al 2018 99. Nota et al 2019 100. O'Bryant et al, 2008 101. Olson-Kennedy, Garofalo et al 2019 102. Olson-kennedy, Rosenthal et al 2018 103. Ott et al 2010 104. Pelusi et al 2014 105. Pflum et al 2015 106. Pradhan & Gomez-Lobo, 2019 107. Pullen Sansfacon et al 2015 108. Rider, McMorris et al 2019 109. Rosen et al 2019 110. Rosenthal 2014 111. Rosenthal et al 2016 112. Rothernberg et al 2019 113. Rowniak et al 2019 114. Ryan 2009 115. Ryan et al 2010 116. Safer & Tangpricha 2019 117. Schagen et al 2016 118. Schechter & Safa, 2018 119. Schneider et al 2015 120. Schwartz et al 2019 121. Seal et al 2012 122. Shumer at al 2016 123. Silverberg et al 2017 124. Smith et al 2014 125. Smith et al 2018 126. Taliaferro et al 2019 127. Tangpricha & den Heijer 2017 128. Ter Wengel et al 2016 129. Tishelman & Neumann-Mascis, 2018 130. Tishelman et al 2015 131. Toorians et al 2003 132. T'Sjoen et al 2005 133. T'Sjoen et al 2019 134. van Caenegem, Verhaeghe et al 2013

	135. van Dijk et al 2019 136. Vinogradova et al 2019 137. Vlot et al 2017 138. Weinand & Safer 2015 139. White Hughto & Reisner, 2016 140. Wiepjes et al 2019 141. Wierckx et al 2013 142. Wierckx, Mueller et al, 2012 143. Wierckx, van Caenegem et al 2014 144. Wierckx, van de Peer et al, 2014 *145.* Witcomb et al 2018
Citation identified within the NICE 2020 evidence review	*Listed as an excluded study in the evidence review:* 1. de Vries et al, 2014 2. Klaver et al 2020 3. Turban, King et al 2020 *Included in the evidence review:* 1. de Vries, Steensma et al, 2011 2. Klink, Caris et al 2015
Citation identified as part of the literature surveillance report	*Identified from the literature search but sifted out because of not meeting the PICO criteria based on the title and abstract details:* 1. Angus et al, 2021 2. T'Sjoen et al 2020 *Identified from the literature search but did not meet the PICO criteria based on reading the full text:* 1. Millington et al 2020 2. Lee, Finlayson et al 2020 3. Rew et al 2020 *Identified from the literature search, did meet the PICO criteria but did not materially affect the conclusions of the NICE 2020 evidence review:* 1. Schagen et al, 2020
Citation identified as part of stakeholder testing	*Identified during stakeholder testing but did not meet the PICO criteria:* 1. Hembree et al 2017
Citation identified as part of public consultation	*Identified during public consultation but did not meet the PICO criteria or search methodology of the NICE 2020 evidence review:*

	1. Bangalore Krishna et al, 2019 2. Russell et al 2018 3. Wiepjes et al 2018
New citation that does not fall within the search methodology	*Not identified from the searches performed for the literature surveillance report, nor during stakeholder testing nor during public consultation:* 1. Aldridge et al, 2020 2. Antun et al, 2020 3. Chlebowski, 2020 4. De Blok et al, 2020 5. Defreyne, Elaut et al 2020 6. Eisenberg et al 2020 7. Gava et al 2020 8. Kuper et al 2020 9. Kvist et al 2020 10. Nobili et al 2020 11. Prince & Safer, 2020 12. Sofer et al, 2020 13. Taub et al 2020 14. Van de Grift et al 2020 15. Vereecke et al 2020 16. Wiepjes et al 2020 17. Wilson et al 2020 18. Yeung et al 2020 19. Banks et al, 2021 20. Braun et al, 2021 21. Chantrapanichkul et al, 2021 22. Dy et al 2021 23. Gezer et al 2021 24. Greenwald et al 2021 25. Irwig, 2021 26. Kozato et al 2021 27. Kuijpers et al 2021 28. Kyinn et al 2021 29. Rosenthal 2021 30. Safer, 2021 31. Weill et al 2021
New citation that falls within PICO and search methodology but does not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review	None

New citation that falls within PICO and search methodology, that does materially affect the conclusions of the NICE 2020 evidence review.	None
Updated evidence review to be undertaken (to be agreed with CET)	Not applicable

Completed by:	Dr Robert Wilson
Date:	26 February 2024

Peer reviewed and supported by:	Not applicable
Date:	Not applicable

Reference List

- Adeleye, A. J., Cedars, M. I., Smith, J., & Mok-Lin, E. (2019). Ovarian stimulation for fertility preservation or family building in a cohort of transgender men. Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics, 36(10), 2155–2161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-019-01558-y
- Aldridge, Z., Patel, S., Guo, B., Nixon, E., Bouman, W. P., Witcomb, G., & Arcelus, J. (2020). Long term effect of gender affirming hormone treatment on depression and anxiety symptoms in transgender people: A prospective cohort study, Andrology, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/ andr.12884.
- Allen, L. R., Watson, L. B., Egan, A. M., & Moser, C. N. (2019). Well-being and suicidality among transgender youth after gender-affirming hormones. Clinical Practice in Pediatric Psychology, 7(3), 302–311. https://doi. org/10.1037/cpp0000288.

- Alzahrani, T., Nguyen, T., Ryan, A., Dwairy, A., McCaffrey, J., Yunus, R., Forgione, J., Krepp, J., Nagy, C., Mazhari, R., & Reiner, J. (2019). Cardiovascular disease risk factors and myocardial infarction in the transgender population. Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes, 12(4), e005597. https:// doi.org/10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.005597
- Anai, T., Miyazaki, F., Tomiyasu, T., Matsuo, T. (2001). Risk of irregular menstrual cycles and low peak bone mass during early adulthood associated with age at menarche. Pediatrics International, 43(5), 483–488. https://doi. org/10.1046/j.1442-200x.2001.01442.x
- Angus, L. M., Nolan, B. J., Zajac, J. D., & Cheung, A. S. (2020). A systematic review of antiandrogens and feminization in transgender women. Clinical Endocrinology, 94(5), 743–752. https://doi.org/10.1111/cen.14329.
- Antun, A., Zhang, Q., Bhasin, S., Bradlyn, A., Flanders, W. D., Getahun, D., & Goodman, M. (2020). Longitudinal changes in hematologic parameters among transgender people receiving hormone therapy. Journal of the Endocrine Society, 4(11), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1210/ jendso/bvaa119
- Arcelus, J., Claes, L., Witcomb, G. L., Marshall, E., & Bouman, W. P. (2016). Risk factors for non-suicidal self-injury among trans youth. Journal of Sexual Medicine, 13(3), 402–412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2016.01.003.
- Ashley, F. (2019e). Thinking an ethics of gender exploration: Against delaying transition for transgender and gender creative youth. Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 24(2), 223–236. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359104519836462
- Asscheman, H., T'Sjoen, G., Lemaire, A., Mas, M., Meriggiola, M. C., Mueller, A., Kuhn, A., Dhejne, C., Morel-Journel, N., & Gooren, L. J. (2014). Venous thrombo-embolism as a complication of cross-sex hormone treatment of male-to-female transsexual subjects: A review. Andrologia, 46(7), 791–795. https://doi. org/10.1111/and.12150
- Bangalore Krishna, K., Fuqua, John S., Rogol, Alan D., Klein, Karen O., Popovic, J., Houk, Christopher P., Charmandari, E., & Lee, Peter A. (2019). Use of gonadotropin-releasing hormone analogs in children: Update by an international consortium. Hormone Research in Paediatrics, 91(6), 357–372. https://doi. org/10.1159/000501336.
- Banks, K., Kyinn, M., Leemaqz, S. Y., Sarkodie, E., Goldstein, D., & Irwig, M.S. (2021). Blood pressure fffects of gender-affirming hormone therapy in transgender and gender-diverse adults. Hypertension, 77(6), 2066–2074. https://doi.org/10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.120.16839
- Barrow, K., & Apostle, D. (2018). Addressing mental health conditions often experienced by transgender and gender expansive children. In C. E. Keo-Meier & D. E. Ehrensaft (Eds.), The gender affirmative model: An interdisciplinary approach to supporting transgender and gender expansive International Journal of Transgender Health S183 children. American Psychological Association. https:// www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1chrwv9
- Bauer, G. R., & Hammond, R. (2015). Toward a broader conceptualization of trans women's sexual health. The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 24(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjhs.24.1-CO1.
- Becerra-Culqui, T. A., Liu, Y., Nash, R., Cromwell, L., Flanders, W. D., Getahun, D., Giammattei, S. V., Hunkeler, E. M., Lash, T. L., Millman, A., Quinn, V. P., Robinson, B., Roblin, D., Sandberg, D. E., Silverberg, M. J., Tangpricha, V., & Goodman, M. (2018). Mental health of transgender and gender nonconforming youth compared with their peers. Pediatrics, 141(5), e20173845. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-3845.
- Beek, T. F., Kreukels, B. P. C., Cohen-Kettenis, P. T., & Steensma, T. D. (2015). Partial treatment requests and underlying motives of applicants for gender affirming interventions. The Journal of Sexual Medicine, 12(11), 2201–2205. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsm.13033.