ATTACHMENT F

Florida Medicaid Project: Surgical Procedures and Gender Dysphoria

Patrick Lappert, M.D.

May 17, 2022

Florida Medicaid Project: Surgical Procedures and Gender Dysphoria

Patrick Lappert, M.D.

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Problems with Informed Consent

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Chest Masculinization" in Natal Females is Not Ethically Equivalent to Gynecomastectomy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Erroneous use of the word "Reconstructive" to describe Gender Affirmation Surgeries

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

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

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

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

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

Masculinizing and Feminizing Chest Surgeries are Not "Medically Necessary"

Supporters of "transitioning" treatments justify surgical treatment based upon "medical necessity." They claim that gender dysphoria can lead to debilitating anxiety and depression, as well as serious incidents of self-harm, including self-mutilation, suicide attempts, and suicide. Yet with only a single exception, in the studies they cite no measures are made of the effects of surgery on what is claimed to constitute the "medical necessity" for these procedures.
In contrast, the Branstrom study[1] documented no reliable benefits for transgender surgery/hormonal treatments and no reduction in suicide and even an increase in serious suicide attempts requiring hospitalization in patients receiving surgery. These recent, long-term, published, peer reviewed, credible research findings are quite contrary to the claims of supporters of "transitioning treatments" — as are the National Science Reviews in this area from England-NICE, Sweden, and Finland. (See detailed citations in the Notes section in this declaration).

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

About the Author

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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