

April 28, 2022

## **Executive Summary and Table of Contents**

### **Biased Science: The Texas and Alabama Measures Criminalizing Medical Treatment for Transgender Children and Adolescents Rely on Inaccurate and Misleading Scientific Claims**

Susan D. Boulware, M.D., Associate Professor of Clinical Pediatrics (Endocrinology), Yale School of Medicine; Director Clinical Operations, Section of Pediatric Endocrinology; Medical Director, Yale Pediatric Gender Program

Rebecca Kamody, PhD (Clinical Psychology), Assistant Professor, Yale School of Medicine: Child Study Center, Pediatrics, and Psychiatry

Laura Kuper PhD (Psychology), ABPP, Assistant Professor in Psychiatry, University of Texas Southwestern; Child & Adolescent Psychologist, Children’s Medical Center Dallas

Meredithe McNamara, M.D., M.S., FAAP, Assistant Professor of Pediatrics (Adolescent Medicine), Yale School of Medicine

Christy Olezeski, PhD (Clinical Psychology), Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Yale Child Study Center and Pediatrics, Yale School of Medicine; Director, Yale Pediatric Gender Program

Nathalie Szilagyi, M.D., Instructor, Yale Child Study Center, Yale Pediatric Gender Program; Director, Greenwich Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Greenwich Center for Gender & Sexuality

Anne Alstott, J.D., Jacquin D. Bierman Professor, Yale Law School; Professor, Yale Child Study Center\*

## **Introduction and Summary**

On February 18, 2022, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton issued an interpretation of Texas state law (the “AG Opinion”), taking the position that certain medical procedures constitute child abuse as defined in the Texas Family Code.<sup>1</sup> Texas Governor Greg Abbott cited the AG Opinion as authority for his February 22, 2022 directive requiring the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services to “conduct a prompt and thorough investigation of any reported instances of these abusive procedures” (the “Governor’s Directive”).<sup>2</sup>

---

\* We would like to thank Dr. Sundes Kazmir, M.D., FAAP, who provided helpful information on medical research on child abuse investigations. Calleigh Higgins, Christina Lepore, and Henry Robinson provided excellent research assistance.

<sup>1</sup> Tex. Op. Att’y. Gen. No. KP-0401 (Feb. 18, 2022) (hereinafter, “AG Opinion”).

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Greg Abbott, Governor of Texas, to Jaime Masters, Commissioner, Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, Feb. 22, 2022, at <https://gov.texas.gov/uploads/files/press/O-MastersJaime202202221358.pdf>

On April 7, 2022, Governor Kay Ivey of Alabama signed S.B. 184 (the “Alabama Law”), which imposes felony penalties on anyone providing certain medical care to any child, adolescent, or young adult under age 19.<sup>3</sup>

We are a group of six scientists and one law professor. Among the scientists, three of us are M.D.s., three are PhD’s, and all treat transgender children and adolescents in daily clinical practice. We all hold academic appointments at major medical schools, including the University of Texas Southwestern and Yale University. In this report, we examine in depth the scientific claims made in the AG Opinion and the text of the Alabama Law about medical care for transgender children and adolescents. Note that, although we reject the AG’s assertion that gender-affirming care constitutes child abuse and we oppose the Alabama Law’s criminalization of such care, we do not address, in this report, the legal validity of either.<sup>4</sup> In accordance with our expertise, our focus is on the science.

After examining the AG Opinion and the findings of “fact” in the Alabama Law in detail, we conclude that their medical claims are not grounded in reputable science and are full of errors of omission and inclusion. These errors, taken together, thoroughly discredit the AG Opinion’s claim that standard medical care for transgender children and adolescents constitutes child abuse. The Alabama Law contains similar assertions of scientific fact, and these too are riddled with errors, calling into question the scientific foundations of the law.

In this report, we focus closely on the AG Opinion, because it contains a full explanation of its reasoning, while the Alabama law presents a list of purported scientific findings without argument or citation. We note, throughout, when the purported findings in the Alabama law echo the claims made in the AG Opinion.

The Texas Attorney General either misunderstands or deliberately misstates medical protocols and scientific evidence. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law make exaggerated and unsupported claims about the course of treatment for gender dysphoria, specifically claiming that standard medical care for pediatric patients includes surgery on genitals and reproductive organs. In fact, the authoritative protocols for medical care for transgender children and adolescents, which define what we term “gender-affirming care,” specifically state that individuals must be over the age of majority before they can undergo such surgery. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law also ignore the mainstream scientific evidence showing the significant benefits of gender-affirming care and exaggerate potential risks.

These are not close calls or areas of reasonable disagreement. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law’s findings ignore established medical authorities and repeat discredited, outdated, and poor-quality information. The AG Opinion also mischaracterizes reputable

---

<sup>3</sup> Vulnerable Child Compassion and Protection Act, 2022 Ala. Laws 289 (hereinafter, “Alabama Law”).

<sup>4</sup> For legal analysis, see Plaintiffs’ Original Petition and Application for Temporary Restraining Order, Temporary Injunction, Permanent Injunction, and Request for Declaratory Relief, Doe v. Abbott, March 1, 2022, at <https://www.aclu.org/legal-document/doe-v-abbott-petition>.

sources and repeatedly cites a fringe group whose listed advisors have limited (or no) scientific and medical credentials and include well-known anti-trans activists.

The AG Opinion falsely implies that puberty blockers and hormones are administered to prepubertal children, when, in fact, the standard medical protocols recommend drug treatments only for adolescents (and not prepubertal children). For purposes of this report, we use the term “adolescent” to refer to a child under the age of majority in whom pubertal development has begun.

The AG Opinion also omits mention of the extensive safeguards established by the standard protocols to ensure that medication is needed and that adolescents and their parents give informed assent and consent, respectively, to treatment when it is determined to be essential care. There is no rush to treatment: the course of gender-affirming care is tailored to each individual, and standard protocols mandate a process of consultation involving an interdisciplinary team including mental health professionals, medical providers, and parents.

By omitting the evidence demonstrating the substantial benefits of treatment for gender dysphoria, and by focusing on invented and exaggerated harms, the AG Opinion and the Alabama Law portray a warped picture of the scientific evidence. Contrary to their claims, a solid body of reputable evidence shows that gender-affirming care can be lifesaving and significantly improves mental health and reduces suicide attempts. The standard medical protocols were crafted by bodies of international experts based on a solid scientific foundation and have been in use for decades. Thus, treating gender dysphoria is considered not only ethical but also the clinically and medically recommended standard of care. Indeed, it would be considered unethical to *withhold* medical care from patients with gender dysphoria, just as it would be unethical to withhold potentially lifesaving care for patients with any other serious medical condition.

The repeated errors and omissions in the AG Opinion are so consistent and so extensive that it is difficult to believe that the opinion represents a good-faith effort to draw legal conclusions based on the best scientific evidence. It seems apparent that the AG Opinion is, rather, motivated by bias and crafted to achieve a preordained goal: to deny gender-affirming care to transgender youth. The same is true of the scientific claims made in the Alabama Law.

Many reputable scientific and professional organizations have issued statements opposing the Texas action,<sup>5</sup> but to our knowledge, none have conducted the in-depth, point-by-point review that we provide here.

---

<sup>5</sup> See APA President Condemns Texas Governor’s Directive to Report Parents of Transgender Minors [Internet]. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association; 2022 Feb 24 [cited 2022 Apr 15]. Available from: <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2022/02/report-parents-transgender-children>; American Academy of Pediatrics, AAP, Texas Pediatric Society Oppose Actions in Texas Threatening Health of Transgender Youth [Internet]. Itasca (IL): American Academy of Pediatrics; 2022 Feb 24 [cited 2022 Apr 15]. Available from: <https://www.aap.org/en/news-room/news-releases/aap/2022/aap-texas-pediatric-society-oppose-actions-in-texas-threatening-health-of-transgender-youth/>; AACAP Statement Opposing Actions in Texas Threatening the Health, Mental Health and Well-Being of Transgender and Gender Diverse Youth and Their Families [Internet]. Washington, D.C.: American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry; 2022 March 1 [cited 2022 Apr 22].

Throughout this report, we use the highest-quality scientific evidence available. In this context, large-scale, randomized controlled trials would be inappropriate for ethical reasons: when medical care has been shown (by other methods) to reduce gender dysphoria and improve mental health, as is the case for gender-affirming care for individuals with gender dysphoria, it would be unethical to deny that care to a control group of patients. This is true in many areas of medicine. In such cases, physicians instead rely on studies using other scientific methods, and they judge the relative quality of evidence based on several factors, including whether the study is peer-reviewed, published in a high-impact journal, up to date, and conducted by reputable investigators.

In this report, we cite studies that are peer-reviewed, up to date, conducted by respected investigators, and published in high-impact journals that are widely read. This represents the highest-quality evidence available to physicians making treatment decisions in this context. By contrast, the AG Opinion relies on very poor-quality evidence. Only two of its sources are peer-reviewed scientific studies. Of these, one is badly out-of-date, and the other is cited for a proposition that is irrelevant to the treatment of transgender children and adolescents.<sup>6</sup>

To summarize, we find that:

**1. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law falsely claim that current medical standards authorize the surgical sterilization of transgender children and adolescents. In fact, present medical standards state that individuals must be the age of majority or older before undergoing surgery on genitals or reproductive organs.**

Current medical protocols do not allow for either surgery or drug therapy for prepubertal children and specifically state that genital surgery should not be carried out before patients reach the legal age of majority. The standards of care do permit the careful use of drug therapies for adolescents (but not prepubertal children) and caution that drug therapies should be undertaken only after a careful, staged process of psychological and

---

Available from:

[https://www.aacap.org/AACAP/zLatest\\_News/AACAP\\_Statement\\_Opposing\\_Actions\\_in\\_Texas.aspx](https://www.aacap.org/AACAP/zLatest_News/AACAP_Statement_Opposing_Actions_in_Texas.aspx).

See also Letter from James L. Madara, CEO and Executive Vice President of the American Medical Association, to Bill McBride, Executive Director of the National Governors Association, April 26, 2021 (opposing legislation in Arkansas and other states that would deny gender-affirming care), at <https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-states-stop-interfering-health-care-transgender-children>; Clarke M, Farnan A, Barba A, Giovanni K, Brymer M, Julian J. Gender-Affirming Care Is Trauma-Informed Care [Internet]. Los Angeles (CA) and Durham (NC): National Child Traumatic Stress Network; 2022 [cited 2022 Apr 15]. Available from:

<https://www.nctsn.org/sites/default/files/resources/fact-sheet/gender-affirming-care-is-trauma-informed-care.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> One study is Dhejne C, Lichtenstein P, Boman M, Johansson AL, Langstrom N, Landen M. Long-term follow-up of transsexual persons undergoing sex reassignment surgery: cohort study in Sweden. *PLoS One* 2011 Feb 22;6(2):e16885. We discuss in Section 2 why Dhejne et al. is out of date and unresponsive of the AG's claims. The AG Opinion also cites one study for the proposition that "hysterectomy, oophorectomy, and orchiectomy result in permanent sterility." The cited study is Cheng PJ, Pastuszak AW, Myers JB, Goodwin IA, Hotaling JM. Fertility concerns of the transgender patient. *Transl Androl Urol*. 2019 Jun;8(3):209-218. As we explain in Section 1, current medical protocols do not authorize surgery on genitals or reproductive organs for anyone under the age of majority, and so the reference is irrelevant to the treatment of minors.

medical counseling. The AG Opinion's and Alabama Law's lists of "sex change procedures" and the claims that doctors are routinely sterilizing children and teenagers do not reflect current medical practice.

**2. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law ignore the substantial benefits of medical care for transgender children and adolescents, care which has consistently been shown to reduce gender dysphoria and improve mental health. The best scientific evidence shows that gender dysphoria is real, that untreated gender dysphoria leads predictably to serious, negative medical consequences, and that gender-affirming care significantly improves mental health outcomes, including reducing rates of suicide.**

The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law omit any discussion of the demonstrated benefits of gender-affirming care as recognized by established medical science. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law also greatly exaggerate the percentage of adolescents whose diagnosed gender dysphoria dissipates without gender-affirming care. And the AG Opinion repeats discredited evidence claiming that there is a wave of so-called "rapid-onset" gender dysphoria among U.S. adolescents.

**3. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law greatly exaggerate the risks of gender-affirming drug therapy.**

The AG Opinion exhibits a poor understanding of medicine and consistently misstates medical protocols and scientific evidence. Contrary to the AG Opinion's statements, gender-affirming drug therapy (including puberty blockers and hormonal treatments) is safe and effective and has been approved by the major medical authorities. Puberty blockers are fully reversible; when discontinued, puberty begins, and fertility develops normally.

Gender-affirming hormone treatments can reduce fertility to some degree while ongoing, but the evidence suggests that these effects are reversible when hormone therapy is discontinued. Standard medical protocols manage these risks in the way any medical risks should be managed: by weighing the benefits of treatment against potential harms and by a careful and individualized process of consultation and consent. Indeed, the informed consent procedures for gender-affirming drug treatment are at least as rigorous as the consent required for any other drug treatment.

## Table of Contents

<b>Section 1. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law falsely claim that current medical standards authorize the surgical sterilization of transgender children and adolescents. In fact, present medical standards state that individuals must be the age of majority or older before undergoing surgery on genitals or reproductive organs. ....</b>	<b>7</b>
a. The medical standards of care for transgender children specifically state that individuals must be the age of majority or older before undergoing surgery on genitals or reproductive organs.....	8
b. The standards of care do not recommend drug treatments (puberty blockers or hormones) for prepubertal children. ....	9
c. Present standards of care recommend drug treatments for adolescents (youth who have developed pubertal changes) only for those with puberty-induced worsening gender dysphoria and only after a careful protocol that begins with psychological and medical counseling to ensure valid consent. ....	9
<b>Section 2. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law ignore the substantial benefits of medical care for transgender children and adolescents, care which has consistently been shown to reduce gender dysphoria and improve mental health. The best scientific evidence shows that gender dysphoria is real, that untreated gender dysphoria leads predictably to serious, negative medical consequences, and that gender-affirming care significantly improves mental health outcomes, including reducing rates of suicide. ....</b>	<b>11</b>
a. Gender dysphoria is real, and untreated gender dysphoria is harmful. ....	12
b. Gender-affirming care has measurable and significant benefits. ....	13
c. The AG Opinion repeats discredited and unreliable evidence on “desistance” and “rapid-onset gender dysphoria.” ....	17
<b>Section 3. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law greatly exaggerate the risks of gender-affirming drug therapy.....</b>	<b>21</b>
a. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law greatly overstate the risks of puberty-blocking medication and incorrectly state that it results in sterilization.....	21
b. The AG Opinion and the Alabama Law exaggerate the fertility risks of gender-affirming hormonal treatment. ....	25
<b>Appendix A: Additional Information on Biased Sources of Information in the AG Opinion .....</b>	<b>28</b>