

Excerpts from document at

<https://tavistockandportman.nhs.uk/documents/142/board-papers-2015-06.pdf>

Annotations by Michael Biggs, to accompany blogpost at

<https://www.transgendertrend.com/tavistock-experiment-puberty-blockers/>

Board of Directors Part One

Agenda and papers

of a meeting to be held in public

2.00pm–4.40pm

Tuesday 23rd June 2015

Board Room,
Tavistock Centre,
120 Belsize Lane,
London, NW3 5BA

Board of Directors : June 2015

Item : 9

Title : Service Line Report: Gender Identity Development Service (GIDS)

Purpose:

This paper is written to provide the Board of Directors with assurance of achievements and progress towards meeting Service and Trust-wide objectives by the Gender Identity Development Service

This report has been reviewed by the following Committees:

- Management Committee, 11th June 2015

This report focuses on the following areas:

- Quality
- Patient / User Experience
- Risk
- Finance
- Communications

For : Discussion

From : Dr Polly Carmichael, Director GIDS

- 9.4 One important piece of research we have conducted is an evaluation of physical intervention in the early stage of puberty. This study monitored the outcomes of using the hypothalamic blocker in a carefully selected group of younger adolescents. Preliminary findings for the study are presented in appendix 7.
- 9.5 We regularly write for professional journals and books – publications in the last year are presented in appendix 8. Members of the team regularly attend and present at National and International Conferences. A number of papers were selected for presentation at the 2014 World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH) Biannual Conference and the new established European equivalent (EPATH) in March 2015.
- 9.6 We hold regular monthly research meetings where all members of the team can contribute to audit and research planning.
- 9.7 The GIDS are committed to collaborating with European colleagues to increase the evidence base around gender dysphoria and appropriate treatment. For example, there is an audit of general psychological wellbeing in progress in collaboration with the Dutch Gender Clinic.
- 9.8 We regularly provide opportunities for research for post-graduate students undertaking further professional training(s).

10. Staffing and HR issues

- 10.1 The current establishment of the GIDS is described in the Executive Summary (see 1.1). With the increased income this year, we plan to recruit 4.0 WTE of new clinical staff and increase existing staff sessions by 1.1 WTE. In addition, we plan to use underspend from vacant posts to fund locum posts to help meet the demands of high referral rates.
- 10.2 The number of staff required and structure of the team is carefully planned to take into account the increase in referrals year on year and the level of complexity of referrals to the service. It is essential to maintain an adequate number of senior staff, both to appropriately manage complexity and support junior staff. We have

**Reports results of 44 kids given GnRHa for a year.
When this study was completed, 50 kids had been given GnRHa.**

**Appendix 7
Preliminary Results from the Early Intervention Research**

Results Early Intervention Research N=44

T0: Baseline (After Second / third appointment at the GIDS)

T1: 1 year on puberty suppression

Demographics:

No significant differences between natal boys and natal girls found in

1) Age referred to clinic 2) age starting puberty suppression, or 3) Time between start of puberty suppression (GnRHa) and cross sex hormones (CSH)

Table 1: General characteristics

	All participants N = 44	Natal boys N = 24	Natal girls N = 20	t or χ^2	df	p
Age (in years) referred to Research Project						
M (SD)	12.63 (.97)	12.45 (.83)	12.85 (1.09)	-1.35	42	0.196
Age start GnRHa						
M (SD)	13.16 (1.06)	13.13 (.99)	13.20 (1.15)	-0.232	42	0.676
Time (in years) between start GnRHa and CSH						
M (SD)	1.61 (.53)	1.56 (.56)	1.65 (.54)	-0.314	12	0.918

SRS: Autism questionnaire

No significant changes in Autistic traits in the participants between T0 and T1 on total T score and in SRS ranges.

Table; ASD traits measured by the SRS-2

	T0 (M,SD)	T1 (M,SD)	t / Z score	p
SRS total T score	62.31 (16.41)	62.66 (16.41)	-0.185	0.854
SRS Ranges %				
normal	53.30	41.40	-1.414	0.157
mid to moderate	30.00	37.90		
severe	16.70	20.70		

**Half the kids are outside
the norm for Autism Spectrum Disorder**

After a year on GnRHa, girls showed more behavioral and emotional problems (Child Behavior Checklist); p-value = .03. NEGATIVE OUTCOME

Psychological Functioning

Natal girls showed a significant increase in behavioural and emotional problems over time on mean *T*-scores of the internalizing scale on the CBCL (parent report), meaning: Natal girls showed **more internalizing** problems at T1 (1 year on puberty suppression) compared to T0 (before puberty suppression). However, according to the YSR (youth self-report) natal girls showed no significant changes in their internalising problems between T0 and T1.

Furthermore, the adolescents showed no significant changes in behavioural functioning over time measured by the parent report (CBCL), the self-report (YSR) and clinician report (CGAS) (see Table 2).

Table 2: Psychological functioning of adolescents with GD before (T0) and while on puberty suppression (T1)

	T0			T1			T0 - T1 significance		Between-sex significance			
	All (N=30)	Natal boys (N=14)	Natal girls (N=16)	All (N=30)	Natal boys (N=14)	Natal girls (N=16)	<i>F</i> (<i>df</i> , <i>errdf</i>)	ρ	Natal boys		Natal girls	
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)			<i>F</i> (<i>df</i> , <i>errdf</i>)	ρ	<i>F</i> (<i>df</i> , <i>errdf</i>)	ρ
CBCL												
<i>Total T-score</i>	61.40 (10.84)	59.93 (12.99)	62.69 (8.77)	61.77 (10.27)	58.43 (11.88)	64.69 (7.87)	0.063 (1, 29)	0.804	0.334 (1,13)	0.573	1.733 (1,15)	0.208
<i>Externalizing T-score</i>	56.23 (12.29)	54.79 (13.85)	57.50 (11.04)	54.87 (11.69)	54.36 (13.72)	55.31 (10.02)	.800 (1, 29)	0.378	0.027 (1,13)	0.872	1.502 (1,15)	0.239
<i>Internalizing T-score</i>	60.57 (10.60)	59.43 (12.26)	61.56 (9.22)	62.93 (10.11)	59.29 (10.32)	66.13 (9.05)	1.703 (1, 29)	0.202	0.002 (1,13)	0.965	5.756 (1,15)	.030 *
YSR												
<i>Total T-score</i>	56.68 (9.75)	57.62 (11.59)	55.87 (8.17)	59.60 (11.77)	59.54 (14.12)	59.67 (9.80)	1.87 (1, 27)	0.183	0.295 (1,12)	0.597	2.035 (1,14)	0.176
<i>Externalizing T-score</i>	52.60 (10.60)	52.54 (11.98)	52.67 (9.70)	53.00 (11.82)	54.69 (13.84)	51.53 (10.02)	.040 (1, 27)	0.843	0.543 (1,12)	0.475	0.181 (1,14)	0.677
<i>Internalizing T-score</i>	55.68 (9.83)	57.54 (10.92)	54.07 (8.84)	60.50 (12.95)	60.38 (14.59)	60.60 (11.89)	3.70 (1, 27)	0.065	0.489 (1,12)	0.498	4.33 (1,14)	0.056
CGAS												
<i>Global functioning</i>	62.18 (2.04)	64.85 (11.43)	59.87 (10.01)	64.79 (1.72)	67.08 (10.95)	62.80 (6.89)	1.533 (1,27)	0.226	- 0.792 (1, 12)	0.444	- 0.925 (1,14)	0.371

M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation; CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; YSR = Youth Self Report; CGAS = Children's Global Assessment Scale.

* Significant difference in mean between T0 and T1, $\rho < .05$

Clinical Range scores psychological functioning (measured by CBCL and YSR)

This table shows the percentages of adolescents scoring in the Normal, Borderline or Clinical range measured by the YSR (self-report) and CBCL (psychological functioning reported by their parents).

The percentage of adolescents scoring in the Clinical Range significantly decreased between T0 and T1, on the CBCL internalizing scale, meaning: according to their parents, the young people experience **less** internalizing behavioural problems following 1 year on puberty suppression treatment.

No significant changes were found between sexes (natal males & natal females).

Table 2a: Clinical Range scores from the CBCL and YSR

	T0			T1			T0 - T1 significance	
	Normal Range	Borderline Range	Clinical Range	Normal Range	Borderline Range	Clinical Range	Z-score	p
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
CBCL								
<i>Total Problem score</i>	46.70	13.30	40.00	33.30	13.30	53.30	-1.661	0.097
<i>Externalizing Problem score</i>	60.00	16.70	23.30	70.00	6.70	23.30	-0.64	0.522
<i>Internalizing Problem score</i>	50.00	13.30	36.70	33.30	3.30	63.30	-2.183	.029 *
YSR								
<i>Total Problem score</i>	60.00	6.70	33.30	50.00	14.30	35.70	-0.0589	0.55
<i>Externalizing Problem score</i>	70.00	16.70	13.30	71.40	10.70	17.90	0	1
<i>Internalizing Problem score</i>	63.30	16.70	20.00	46.40	14.30	39.30	-0.1942	0.052

**Text states that kids after year on GnRHa experience less internalizing problems (Child Behavior Checklist), but this contradicts previous page and contradicts table 2a—which show statistically significant increase in proportion in the ‘clinical range’ (from 37% to 63%).
OUTCOME UNCLEAR**

Self-harm

Looking at two self-harm items measured by the YSR, a significant **increase** was found in the first item “I deliberately try to hurt or kill self”. Adolescents had the option to score these items as: not true, sometimes true, often true. More adolescents tend to score this item in the “sometimes true - range” at T1 compared to T0, especially natal girls.

Table 4: Self harm items 18 and 91 from the Youth Self Report using Wilcoxon Test

	T0			T1			T0 - T1 significance		Between-sex significance			
	All N=30	Natal boys N=14	Natal girls N=16	All N=30	Natal boys N=14	Natal girls N=16	Z	ρ	Natal boys		Natal girls	
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)			Z	ρ	Z	ρ
Self harm items YSR:												
<i>I deliberately try to hurt or kill myself</i>	.13 (.15)	.14 (.36)	.13 (.34)	.39 (.56)	.23 (.44)	.50 (.63)	-2.111	0.035 *	0.447	6.55	-2.449	0.014 *
<i>I think about killing myself</i>	.30 (.53)	.21 (.43)	.38 (.62)	.57 (.73)	.43 (.65)	.69 (.79)	-1.734	0.083	-1.134	0.257	-1.311	0.19

* Significant difference in mean between T0 and T1, ρ < .05

This Table shows the percentages of the scores given in T0 and T1.

Table 3: Self-harm reported by adolescents at T0 and T1

	T0	T1
I deliberately try to hurt or kill myself		
not true	71.80%	67.90%
sometimes	18.90%	32.10%
often true	10.00%	0%
I think about killing myself		
not true	65.90%	58.60%
sometimes	29.60%	31.00%
often true	4.50%	10.30%

According to text and table 4, after a year on GnRHa, kids were more likely to report deliberately trying to hurt or kill themselves (Youth Self Report); p-value = .01. This is hard to square, however, with the figures in table 3. NEGATIVE (?) OUTCOME



Gender Dysphoria & Body Image

No significant changes in gender dysphoria emerged, measured by UGDS, GII and RCGI. This suggests that the suppression of puberty does not impact positively on the experience of gender dysphoria. It will be interesting to see if the introduction of cross sex hormone produces different results.

For body image however, significant differences were found looking at both sexes separately between T0 and T1 (see Table 5). Natal boys were less dissatisfied with their primary sex characteristics after being on the blockers for 1 year ($F(1,12)=4.857, \rho < .05$), whereas natal girls appeared to be more dissatisfied with their secondary ($F(1,15)=5.509, \rho < .05$) and neutral sex characteristics ($F(1,15)=7.79, \rho < .05$).

Page 54 of 106

Table 5: Gender Dysphoria and Body Image of adolescents before (T0) and 1 year on puberty suppression (T1)

	T0			T1			T0 - T1 significance		Between-sex significance			
	All (N=30)	Natal boys (N=14)	Natal girls (N=16)	All (N=30)	Natal boys (N=14)	Natal girls (N=16)	<i>F</i> (df, errdf)	ρ	Natal boys		Natal girls	
	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>M</i> (SD)			<i>F</i> (df, errdf)	ρ	<i>F</i> (df, errdf)	ρ
UGDS	4.77 (.24)	4.81 (.26)	4.74 (.22)	4.73 (.36)	4.76 (.39)	4.71 (.33)	.215 (1,29)	0.647	.159 (1,13)	0.697	.061 (1,15)	0.808
GII	2.03 (.27)	2.09 (.30)	1.98 (.24)	1.95 (.22)	2.05 (.16)	1.87 (.23)	1.740 (1,27)	0.198	.124 (1,13)	0.731	2.331 (1,14)	0.149
RCGI	2.02 (.43)	1.72 (.29)	2.26 (.38)	1.93 (.41)	1.67 (.29)	2.13 (.38)	1.860 (1,26)	0.184	0.17 (1,11)	0.688	2.703	0.122
Body Image Scale												
<i>primary characteristics</i>	4.49 (.47)	4.55 (.42)	4.44 (.51)	4.36 (.50)	4.17 (.51)	4.51 (.45)	1.445 (1,28)	0.239	4.857 (1,12)	0.048 *	0.387 (1,15)	0.543
<i>secondary characteristics</i>	2.96 (.70)	2.84 (.73)	3.06 (.69)	3.07 (.77)	2.53 (.76)	3.52 (.43)	.365 (1,28)	0.551	0.88 (1,12)	0.367	5.509 (1,15)	0.033 *
<i>neutral characteristics</i>	2.44 (.74)	2.71 (.65)	2.22 (.75)	2.70 (.68)	2.54 (.85)	2.82 (.50)	2.176 (1,28)	0.151	0.521 (1,12)	0.484	7.79 (1,15)	0.014 *

M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation; UGDS = "Utrecht Gender Dysphoria Scale" with Range 0-5; GII = "Gender Identity Interview" RCGI = "Recalled Childhood Gender Identity"

Body Image Scale is a 5-point scale coded with 1 = very satisfied to 5 = very dissatisfied with body part

* Significant difference in mean between T0 and T1, $\rho < .05$

After a year on GnRHa, boys were less dissatisfied with one aspect of their body (Body Image Scale); p-value = .05.
Girls were more dissatisfied with their two aspects of their body; p-values = .03 and .01.
ONE POSITIVE OUTCOME, TWO NEGATIVE OUTCOMES

Health and Well-being measured by the Kidscreen

The Kidscreen measures 10 dimensions of children’s health and well-being, reported by parents and reported by the young person. Overall, no significant changes occurred in Health Related Quality of Life, except for one dimension completed by parents, which showed a significant **decrease** in Physical well-being of their child.

Table 6: Quality of Life measure for adolescents with GD before (T0) and while on puberty suppression (T1) according to the KIDSCREEN

	T0			T1			T0 - T1 significance		Between-sex significance			
	All (N=30)	Natal boys (N=14)	Natal girls (N=16)	All (N=30)	Natal boys (N=14)	Natal girls (N=16)	F (df, errdf)	ρ	Natal boys		Natal girls	
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)			F (df, errdf)	ρ	F (df, errdf)	ρ
Kidscreen T-Values by Parents												
Physical Well-being	47.06 (11.37)	51.34 (12.07)	43.33 (9.57)	41.08 (11.44)	46.19 (5.08)	36.60 (13.60)	7.634 (1,29)	0.01 *	3.45 (1,13)	0.086	4.064 (1,15)	0.062
Psychological Well-being	40.64 (8.76)	40.82 (10.01)	40.48 (7.84)	40.01 (12.68)	45.19 (11.79)	35.48 (11.97)	.061 (1,29)	0.807	1.385 (1,13)	0.26	2.438 (1,15)	0.139
Moods and Emotions	43.49 (10.55)	42.37 (11.05)	44.47 (10.36)	42.50 (13.50)	47.71 (11.53)	37.95 (13.78)	.167 (1,29)	0.686	3.398 (1,13)	0.088	4.102 (1,15)	0.061
Self-Perception	35.46 (5.60)	33.93 (6.76)	36.79 (3.99)	33.78 (8.22)	33.84 (6.94)	33.73 (9.42)	.913 (1,29)	0.347	.001 (1,13)	0.971	1.600 (1,15)	0.225
Autonomy	47.54 (9.90)	48.75 (10.45)	46.48 (9.60)	46.56 (9.89)	48.62 (6.16)	44.77 (12.21)	.133 (1,29)	0.718	.002 (1,13)	0.97	.167 (1,15)	0.686
Parent Relation and Home Life	49.90 (10.88)	48.07 (8.95)	51.50 (12.40)	46.50 (12.21)	48.50 (12.22)	44.76 (12.34)	2.731 (1,29)	0.109	.044 (1,13)	0.838	4.307 (1,15)	0.056
Financial Resources	50.11 (9.64)	50.79 (9.51)	49.48 (10.06)	52.57 (12.60)	54.18 (11.65)	51.07 (13.67)	2.515 (1,28)	0.124	3.041 (1,13)	0.105	.426 (1,15)	0.525
Social Support and Peers	40.07 (10.57)	42.56 (7.76)	37.88 (12.36)	39.45 (14.11)	41.99 (12.28)	37.23 (15.58)	.061 (1,29)	0.807	0.025 (1,13)	0.876	.033 (1,15)	0.857
School Environment	45.91 (10.64)	47.66(7.75)	44.01 (13.24)	45.48 (12.09)	45.57 (10.23)	45.37 (14.37)	.030 (1,22)	0.864	0.939 (1,11)	0.353	.082 (1,10)	0.78
Social Acceptance and Bullying	37.77 (15.21)	31.88 (16.99)	42.93 (11.69)	35.67 (13.72)	33.55 (12.88)	37.53 (14.57)	.460 (1,29)	0.503	.131 (1,13)	0.723	1.705 (1,15)	0.211
Kidscreen T-Values by Adolescents												
Physical Well-being	43.61 (10.75)	44.84 (12.35)	42.63 (9.55)	40.66 (11.21)	45.05 (11.29)	37.09 (10.12)	1.260 (1,28)	0.271	.002 (1,12)	0.962	2.978 (1,15)	0.105
Psychological Well-being	43.63 (13.81)	41.46 (13.70)	45.39 (14.09)	40.26 (14.58)	43.02 (14.07)	38.01 (15.05)	1.128 (1,28)	0.297	.113 (1,12)	0.743	3.095 (1,15)	0.099
Moods and Emotions	44.26 (15.25)	42.45 (15.24)	45.83 (15.61)	40.91 (14.16)	42.37 (15.00)	39.64 (13.79)	1.005 (1,27)	0.325	.000 (1,12)	0.989	2.202 (1,14)	0.16
Self-Perception	34.30 (7.95)	34.58 (8.51)	34.07 (7.74)	36.15 (10.51)	36.53 (9.70)	35.83 (11.44)	.842 (1,28)	0.367	.442 (1,12)	0.519	.383 (1,15)	0.545
Autonomy	45.61 (10.66)	45.05 (9.28)	46.07 (11.95)	44.31 (13.31)	46.44 (12.46)	42.58 (14.12)	.261 (1,28)	0.614	.161 (1,12)	0.695	.907 (1,15)	0.356
Parent Relation and Home Life	51.27 (13.28)	49.41 (13.26)	52.78 (13.53)	49.27 (12.28)	51.04 (11.76)	47.83 (12.89)	.754 (1,28)	0.393	.280 (1,12)	0.606	2.347 (1,15)	0.146
Financial Resources	49.37 (11.16)	48.66 (9.16)	49.98 (12.94)	51.12 (11.69)	50.43 (12.30)	51.71 (11.53)	.493 (1,27)	0.489	.160 (1,12)	0.696	.387 (1,14)	0.544
Social Support and Peers	50.01 (10.00)	49.60 (12.24)	50.37 (8.02)	45.30 (15.32)	47.39 (16.57)	43.49 (14.47)	1.561 (1,27)	0.222	.121 (1,12)	0.734	2.307 (1,14)	0.151
School Environment	46.16 (15.26)	43.69 (13.52)	48.27 (15.04)	44.64 (15.73)	46.24 (13.49)	43.28 (17.81)	.192 (1,25)	0.665	.222 (1,11)	0.647	1.286 (1,13)	0.277
Social Acceptance and Bullying	40.97 (15.59)	33.87 (15.05)	46.29 (14.18)	41.79 (17.05)	40.34 (16.52)	42.88 (17.89)	.048 (1,27)	0.829	1.077 (1,11)	0.322	.559 (1,15)	0.466

Kidscreen items use 5-point Likert-type scales to assess either the frequency (never-seldomo-sometimes-often-always) of certain behaviors/feelings or intensity of an attitude (not at all-slightly-moderately-very-extremely)

T-values with a mean of 50 and a SD of 1; higher scores indicate better HRQoL and well-being.

* Significant difference in mean between T0 and T1, $p < .05$

After a year on GnRHa, parents reported that their kids had lower physical well-being (Kidscreen); p-value = .01. NEGATIVE OUTCOME