

# Sex Trouble: Common pitfalls in incorporating sex/gender in medical machine learning and how to avoid them

Kendra Albert\*<sup>1</sup> and Maggie Delano\*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA, USA

<sup>2</sup>Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, USA

\* = Both authors contributed equally to this work.

## ABSTRACT

False assumptions about sex and gender are deeply embedded in the medical system, including that they are binary, static, and concordant. Machine learning researchers must understand the nature of these assumptions in order to avoid perpetuating them. In this perspectives piece, we identify three common mistakes that researchers make when dealing with sex/gender data: “sex confusion”, the failure to identify what sex in a dataset does or doesn’t mean; “sex obsession”, the belief that sex, specifically sex assigned at birth, is the relevant variable for most applications; and “sex/gender slippage”, the conflation of sex and gender even in contexts where only one or the other is known. We then discuss how these pitfalls show up in machine learning studies based on electronic health record data, which is commonly used for everything from retrospective analysis of patient outcomes to the development of algorithms to predict risk and administer care. Finally, we offer a series of recommendations about how machine learning researchers can produce both research and algorithms that more carefully engage with questions of sex/gender, better serving all patients, including transgender people.

Keywords: sex, gender, sex/gender, machine learning, healthcare, transgender, intersex, non-binary, electronic health records

## 1 THE BIGGER PICTURE

In recent years, there has been an increasing emphasis on the generation and sharing of datasets for machine learning research. When used for healthcare applications, these datasets often include demographic variables such as sex/gender, age, and race/ethnicity. However, these datasets often ignore the complexities of sex/gender and race/ethnicity, especially when using data from electronic health records. This can lead to worse health outcomes for anyone who does not fit the “norm,” especially transgender and non-white people. In this perspective piece, we review how assumptions around sex and gender have been embedded in medicine, and discuss how those assumptions influence machine learning research. We highlight both pitfalls and opportunities for machine learning researchers to better incorporate sex and gender data as appropriate.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

It is perhaps a cliché at this point to point out that like many industries, healthcare has become increasingly data-heavy and dependent. Many actors within health systems see great opportunity in both data gathered explicitly for research as well as the exhaust produced by everyday interactions between patients and doctors (Ghassemi, Marzyeh et al., 2019). Machine learning is one of the ways in which these data can be transformed - into algorithms that identify tumors (Chen et al., 2022), predict HIV risk (Marcus et al., 2019), or even warn when a patient in surgery might need an adjustment to their anesthesia (Lundberg et al., 2018).

As data becomes the scaffolding upon which new edifices are built, analyzing its own foundation is even more important. In this perspective, we look at one very particular aspect of medical data -

the contingent and complicated relationship of variables like sex, gender, and sex/gender to the truth of bodies and identities. We explore how an insufficiently critical eye towards these complex variables can end up reifying the primacy of “sex assigned at birth”, a concept that has never done a particularly good job of capturing medically relevant information. We use examples of machine learning in healthcare, with a focus on electronic health records, to illustrate some common problems in analysis of sex/gender, and provide recommendations of how to use these variables in ways that support nuanced, meaningful findings that properly analyze sex/gender.

Our message is a hopeful one - there are a variety of tools available to machine learning researchers and medical researchers to avoid the mistakes of the past, especially as more nuanced gender information is incorporated into standard electronic health records systems. But these tools require an understanding of what sex/gender are, and what they are not.

### **3 WHAT’S WRONG WITH SEX/GENDER IN MEDICINE?**

Sex and gender are terms that refer to a variety of aspects of a person’s physiology, how they see themselves, and how they interact with others and their environment. Sex typically refers to a person’s gonads, anatomy, chromosomes, and hormone levels (Ainsworth, 2015; Davis and Preves, 2017). Gender meanwhile typically refers to a person’s gender identity (how they see themselves or experience their own gender), but also involves other factors such as how a person is perceived by others or experiences differential treatment related to their perceived gender (Shattuck-Heidorn and Richardson, 2019; Raparelli et al., 2021; Johnson et al., 2007). While it is often assumed that sex and gender are distinct, with sex being “in the body” and gender being “in the mind,” the two are actually deeply entwined (Springer et al., 2012). We will frequently use the term sex/gender to refer to the entwinement of these phenomena. Components of sex/gender and how a person interacts and is treated in a social world have deep impacts on their health and wellbeing (Stardust et al., 2017; Tadiri et al., 2021; Knight, 2021; Connelly et al., 2021). Additionally, although a full treatment is outside the scope of this work, gender is also deeply entwined with race, with race mediating how people experience their own genders and how others gender them (Ziyad, 2017; Jones and Shorter-Gooden, 2009).

#### **3.1 Sex/gender as binary, static, concordant**

Historically, sex/gender has been assumed to be binary, static, and concordant (Ainsworth, 2015; Davis and Preves, 2017; Fausto-Sterling, 2000). Binary means that there were two options for a person’s sex (male and female), and two options for a person’s gender (man or woman). Once assigned male or female at birth, typically by examining a newborn’s external genitalia, a person is presumed to be male or female for their entire life (static). Anyone assigned male at birth is also presumed to be a man, and anyone assigned female at birth is presumed to be a woman (concordant).

In practice, sex and gender are not binary, static over time, or necessarily perfectly aligned. There are people who have chromosomal, gonadal, anatomical, and/or secondary sex characteristics that do not align with the defaults for male or female sex. Some people with such characteristics may use the term intersex for themselves, but some do not. Estimates suggest intersex people make up between 1.7 and 4 percent of the population (though an exact number is difficult to quantify, see Jones (2018)). Similarly, there are people with genders other than man or woman (e.g. non-binary, genderqueer, genderfluid), and some people have no gender (agender). Some people’s gender changes over short or long periods of time. A person’s sex and gender also need not be aligned; transgender people are assigned a sex at birth that does not align with their gender identity.

Despite these complexities, the false assumptions of binary, static, and concordant sex/gender are deeply ingrained in our medical system (Tannenbaum et al., 2019; Richardson, 2022; Schiebinger, 2021). This negatively impacts not just those with minority sex/gender, but also fails to serve anyone who doesn’t exactly fit the average (which is almost everyone in some way or another).

Trouble with sex/gender has historically manifested in clinical care and research in three main ways: 1) ignoring complexities entirely and treating everyone the same, 2) excluding people from minority groups or comparing minority groups to a “default” (cisgender white men), or 3) presuming and essentializing differences that lead to stereotypes and discrimination against minority groups (Garcia-Sifuentes and Maney, 2021; Richardson, 2022). In recent years, funding agencies such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in the United States have attempted to address scenarios 1) and 2) by requiring the inclusion of women and racial minorities in clinical trials (National Institutes of Health, 2001,

**Table 1.** Definitions of sex, gender, and sex/gender related terms used in electronic health records. For other definitions of terms used in this paper, see Table 2.

Term	Definition	Source
Sex	Sex refers to a person’s status as male, female, or intersex based on biologic and physiologic characteristics. Sexes are usually assigned at birth based on simple visual inspection of the genitals of a newborn baby.	Lau et al. (2020); Goldman et al. (2020)
Sex assigned at birth (SAAB)	Sex assigned at birth, usually based on simple examination of the genitals of a newborn baby.	Lau et al. (2020); Goldman et al. (2020)
Legal Sex	Sex as defined by legal documents, such as birth certificate, passport, driver’s license, or health care card. Many transgender people may have different legal sexes across contexts.	Lau et al. (2020)
Gender	Gender can refer to personal and/or interpersonal components, including gender identity (man, woman, non-binary, agender, genderfluid), and also gender roles and stereotypes. Gender is often assumed to be binary, static, and concordant with sex (i.e. a baby assigned male at birth is and will always be a man, a baby assigned female at birth is and will always be a woman).	Present work
Administrative gender	A term used in most existing electronic health record systems that refers to either one’s sex or gender recorded and used for administrative purposes, such as billing. Also known in as legal gender in some EHR systems.	Lau et al. (2020)
Sex/gender	A term used in place of sex to emphasize the entanglement of sex and gender.	Springer et al. (2012)

2017) and analyzing sex and/or gender as a dependent variable in biological studies (National Institutes of Health, 2015; Government of Canada, 2018). However, with their emphasis specifically on “women,” “female health” and “sex differences”, these interventions actually reinforce a binary, static, and concordant framing of sex/gender, often excluding intersex, transgender, and non-binary people. A lack of consideration of differences in sex/gender leads to lack of knowledge about the experiences of and appropriate treatment for sex/gender minorities, and incorrect, denied, or delayed treatment (Knight, 2021; Stroumsa et al., 2019; Spade, 2003; Today, 2019; Rosendale et al., 2018; Goldstein et al., 2017; Mays et al., 2018).

### **3.2 Problems with Sex as Ground Truth: Sex Obsession, Sex Confusion, and Sex/Gender Slippage**

In recent years, there has been a laudable effort to improve the experience of LGBTQIA+ patients through the addition of gender-related fields to EHR systems (Lau et al., 2020; Keuroghlian, 2021; Thompson et al., 2021). While the introduction of gender identity and other fields in EHR such as pronouns and preferred names can help facilitate a more welcoming environment for trans, non-binary, and gender non-conforming people, the addition of these fields has been mostly limited to patient-facing care. In many cases, “sex” is still assumed to be the “ground truth,” both by doctors and by researchers. We call this assumption “sex obsession”—the idea that fundamentally, sex, usually sex assigned at birth, corresponds to some particular fact about the bodies of people with that designation, and is thus the most relevant factor to analyze when attempting to produce generalizable knowledge.

Sex obsession often manifests as studies that are purportedly about gender heavily leaning on sex assigned at birth. For example, Pelletire et al. created a composite gender score in order to evaluate its association with risk factors in patients with premature acute coronary syndrome (Pelletier et al., 2015). However, they used sex as a dependent variable when creating their gender index, which assumes everyone in the cohort is cisgender and endosex (i.e. not intersex). As the results from the authors themselves show, there is a wide variety of “gender” scores for “male” and “female” participants. Additionally, characterizing gender on a one-dimensional scale from masculine to feminine ignores the complexities of gendered experience.

Sex obsession leads to what we call “sex confusion”—a failure to actually develop an understanding of what sex means in a particular dataset or context. The meanings of sex and gender in any previously gathered dataset are context-dependent and will change over time. For example, EHR systems have begun to distinguish between gender identity (how a person experiences their own gender and identifies), administrative gender (the sex/gender used for administrative purposes such as billing), and sex assigned at birth (the sex assigned based on examination of a newborn’s genitalia)(Lau et al., 2020; Deutsch et al., 2014). However, when only a “sex” field is available, as has been historically the case in EHR data, that field could actually correspond to any one of these three things. Prior to the introduction of gender identity fields within medical records, many transgender people may have changed their demographic sex information in order to increase their chances of being treated respectfully by medical doctors. Some may still be forced to do so in order to get access to particular forms of care or legal tools (Currah and Moore, 2008). As an example of how this plays out, that means that the demographics of what a particular sex marker at a particular hospital means may end up depending on what the local rules are for name changes, and be subject to shifts as those rules are modified. The advent of “gender identity” as a separate field in EHRs may minimize some of the pressure to change administrative gender, but this does not mean that the “sex” field is now clean and easy to interpret, as sex assigned at birth has always been in itself socially constructed and contingent (Davis and Preves, 2017; Fausto-Sterling, 2000).

Sex obsession and sex confusion can lead to situations where false assumptions are made based on a patient’s sex marker, particularly that all people with those designations have a particular body part, secondary sex characteristic, or hormone level (Alpert et al., 2021). It is very common for clinicians and researchers to assume that an “M” in the demographics section means not just a penis, but testosterone levels in a particular range, higher muscle mass, or a particular pelvic build. These assumptions do not hold up particularly well in practice, and not just for transgender and gender non-conforming people. As an example, post-menopausal cisgender women have decreased levels of estrogen as compared to pre-menopausal cisgender women (Helen Buckler, 2005). Although both groups may show up with an “F” as their sex marker in a medical record, and indeed, have had genital erectile tissue under a certain size at birth, the assumption individuals belonging to both groups would have similar expected estrogen

**Table 2.** Definitions of sex, gender, and sex/gender related terms used to characterize the use of sex/gender in medical machine learning and possible improvements. For other definitions of terms used in this paper, see Table 1.

Term	Definition	Source
Sex/gender slippage	The free substitution of sex for gender and gender for sex, and the presumed equivalence of sex and gender.	Albert and Delano (2021)
Sex essentialism	An approach to research that “perpetuate(s) a view of sex differences as principally biological and not also cultural, leading to a potentially dangerously inaccurate understanding of the causes of sex disparities.”	Richardson (2022); Epstein (2009)
Sex contextualism	An approach to research that “recognizes the pluralism and context-specificity of operationalizations of ‘sex’ across experimental laboratory research”	Richardson (2022)
Sex confusion	A characterization of the uncertainty of the accuracy of the “sex” field in an EHR system, which could represent SAAB, legal sex, administrative gender and/or gender identity.	Present work
Sex obsession	The prioritization of the binary M/F sex variable over the gender variable or other sex/gender related variables in clinical and machine learning research.	Present work
Organ/Anatomic Inventory	An accurate record of what organs a patient may or may not have	Lau et al. (2020); Rosendale et al. (2018); Deutsch et al. (2013)
phenotyping	The identification of particular patients who might have certain “characteristics of interest.”	Banda et al. (2018)
data richness	Richness moves beyond the binary presence or absence of a condition to timing, degree, severity, cause, and relationship to factors like behavior, etc.	Hripcsak and Albers (2018)

levels would be incorrect.

When using sex as a demographic variable in a research study, researchers sometimes assume that sex in EHR systems not only corresponds to a set of chromosomes, anatomy, hormone levels, etc. but also to gender, leading to sex/gender slippage. This is made worse by the fact that datastores themselves confuse sex characteristics and gender in their database definitions, as Kronk et al. point out Kronk et al. (2021). It is thus unsurprising that researchers lack clarity on whether they are talking about sex or gender. For example, in Feller et al., the authors switch back and forth between describing the information retrieved from the EHR system as gender and sex (Feller et al., 2018). Such slippage can also occur in analysis. For example, in Ancochea et al., researchers gathered sex data from EHRs, and then, when attempting to explain their results, discuss disproportionate childcare obligations on women (Ancochea et al., 2021). This dynamic is typical across the literature we reviewed. Sex may be used because of presumptions around its accuracy (or frankly, the fact that the field is almost always filled out) but researchers postulate gendered explanations for their results. It is not wrong to turn to an analysis of gender for biomedical phenomena, as gender is lived in the body, having impacts on health. But “sex” demographic data in medical records may not, in many cases, correspond to a patient’s experience of gender.

### 3.3 Sex/Gender in Machine Learning Research

The issues laid out with sex variables above have profound implications for all data analysis done at scale in medicine, including analysis that uses machine learning. Machine learning researchers often pick up from where healthcare and society have “left off”, encoding these biases and then introducing their own. This means that ML cannot easily divorce itself from the assumptions made in this previous stage, especially when relying on EHR or existing datasets. An individual researcher might be able to

make careful decisions about how to understand sex/gender within the context of their work, knowing which characteristics are key to the questions they are asking. EHR or other standardized data, on the other hand, is one-size-fits-no-one. Researchers using EHR data cannot go back and ask each clinician how the “sex” field was populated, and due to variable adoption of more inclusive EHR practices, may not even be aware of when or how sex and gender identity were considered separately. But because sex variables are almost universally filled out within EHR systems, they can seem appealing for ML purposes (Kho et al., 2011). Notably, none of the papers using machine learning on EHR data that we could find discussed how sex data was gathered or what it meant, and only a handful even identified that sex was a binary variable.

### **3.3.1 Diving Deeper into EHR Data Concerns**

EHR data has been used by machine learning researchers in a variety of contexts, including for retrospective analysis to better understand health phenomena (Wanyan et al., 2021), to identify patients for potential treatments or interventions (Krakower et al., 2016), and/or to guide clinical care in real time (Lundberg et al., 2018). In this section, we discuss common pitfalls around sex/gender when performing machine learning on EHR data.

Sex/gender slippage and sex confusion were common across papers we studied. For example, Walsh et al. use EHR data to analyze suicide risk, incorporating “gender” data from EHRs because “demographics such as age and gender are known risk factors for suicidal behavior” (Walsh et al., 2017). In the study, “gender” was found to be a significant factor in prediction of suicide attempts. Given that that paper was published in 2017 and Vanderbilt Medical system did not start collecting specific gender identity data until that year (Ding et al., 2020), it seems difficult to imagine that gender information was actually used. This paper, like many, demonstrates a sex/gender slippage of the type described in our previous work Albert and Delano (2021). Such a slippage here is especially notable because gender identity and gendered experiences likely do matter for suicidality, as transgender and gender-nonconforming people have significantly higher risk of suicide. Slippages between sex, gender, and sex/gender, and a failure to understand the underlying actual data may lead to inaccurate conclusions about suicide attempts as a gendered phenomenon, and may specifically fail to recognize patterns around transgender suicidality.

Strikingly, studies that particularly focus on gender can exhibit similar issues. As discussed briefly above, Ancochea et al. used the unstructured free text of EHRs from a hospital system in Spain to look at differences in management and treatment for COVID-19 (Ancochea et al., 2021). The research seems to use sex information from the demographic field of the EHR system to determine sex/gender. (We say seems to because the exact method they used for determining sex/gender is not clear from the methodology.) However, the results and discussion theorizes a number of different potential explanations for differences between male and female patients. Some, as discussed above, vary based on gender (e.g. women being more likely to have primary care giving responsibilities), and some vary based on things like ovarian hormones. A more robust analysis of what the “sex” variable means in this context could allow for a more detailed analysis of how these variables interact with the population in question.

Studies like these can serve as building blocks, potentially resulting in a failure to produce effective knowledge translating to other contexts. Within medicine, machine learning has long been used for “phenotyping” - that is, the identification of particular patients who might have certain “characteristics of interest” (Banda et al., 2018). Such algorithms can be used for recruitment of patients for clinical trials, cohort or case control studies on already existing data, or even clinical decision support. Although phenotyping is similar in some ways to exploratory analyses of the type discussed above, the excitement about using phenotyping algorithms in shaping subsequent care means that potential failures to account for sex/gender complications could result in people being left out of both research *and* potentially helpful medical care. Although most phenotyping that uses machine learning currently only uses sex/gender to balance populations, phenotypes specific to demographics are likely on the horizon, as such phenotypes have already been developed using non-ML methods (Chen et al., 2015; Estiri et al., 2021).

The slippage and confusion are most concerning in circumstances where machine learning is used to directly guide clinical care. For example, Lundberg et al. use explainable ML models to predict the prevention of hypoxaemia during surgery, allowing for anesthesiologists to adjust administration of anesthesia accordingly (Lundberg et al., 2018). In general, explainable models that have been thoroughly vetted and reviewed by working clinicians, like the one produced by Lundberg et al., reduce some of the risks that can be involved in black box models where sex/gender may end up playing a significant role as a feature without the knowledge of researchers, doctors, or patients. However, even these very well-

documented models use sex/gender from EHRs as an input, without fully analyzing what that variable might mean. And, to the extent that such models might also use real-time test or device data to guide interventions, sex/gender may matter because some tests use sex/gender offsets or sex/gender-based reference intervals (Goldstein et al., 2017). If the model is built such that the EHR “sex” field is the relevant one for determining such thresholds/offsets, it could be wrong for whole subsections of the population without any clinician being the wiser.

To our knowledge, none of the key features in Lundberg rely on backend sex/gender offsets. However, it is only the interpretability of their algorithm that allows us to analyze it. To the extent that machine learning systems may at some point be used to produce so called “dimensionless parameters” (Gan et al., 1997; Albert and Delano, 2021), the failure to specify how questions of sex/gender might affect these numbers could have deleterious effects on transgender patients. The failure to allow for data richness can be offset somewhat in an individual patient relationship, where a doctor may be able to look beyond whatever the demographics say. But ML-developed algorithms are the opposite of that. In short, the closer that machine learning based on EHR data gets to prescribing clinical care without allowing for a care team to determine whether the assumptions made as part of algorithmic development are correct for the patient, the more significant the risks are to individual patients who may “deviate” from the expectations of the people who built the systems.

### **3.3.2 Case Study: HIV and PrEP**

The risks of “sex obsession” are especially significant in settings where sex, gender and sex/gender are known to play a significant role in outcomes, such as when transgender and gender non-conforming people are overrepresented in the populations studied. For example, a number of studies have used machine learning (or electronic risk scoring) to determine when a patient should be offered pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), medicine that can reduce the risk of HIV infection see (Krakower et al., 2016; Marcus et al., 2019; Feller et al., 2018; Ridgway et al., 2018)). HIV is often transmitted through sexual activity, and it’s hard to imagine an area of human behavior where questions of sex/gender play a larger role. It might be tempting to reduce risk variance in HIV transmission to either sex assigned at birth or genitals, but such a framing is inaccurate. A 2017 discussion paper from Here for Health in Australia highlights a number of potential differences in how transgender people might experience risk related to HIV transmission compared with cisgender people. Potential differences include the differential proprieties of cis women’s vaginas and transfeminine people’s neo-vaginas and potential effects of testosterone on genital lubrication for transmasculine people with vaginas (Stardust et al., 2017). And of course, sex practices themselves are highly gendered.

Many studies that attempt to do predictive modeling in this space, which can be used to determine when it might be appropriate to do a follow up call for HIV risk or PrEP counseling, rely on EHR sex data. For example, Ridgway et al. say in their abstract that their risk model incorporates gender, but the EHR data is “sex” (Ridgway et al., 2018).<sup>1</sup> Likewise, ML studies relied on “sex” data (Feller et al., 2018; Marcus et al., 2019). Marcus et al. also used EHR sex as an input variable, with male sex being one of the six features that they defined as most predictive. The algorithm produced could not identify cases amongst “females” - presumably meaning people with the EHR sex “F.” How that corresponds to any particular set of body parts or experiences is unclear, as the paper goes on to discuss how transgender women might be best characterized by a prediction model for females. Of course, transgender women are women, but not all transgender women may have their sex marked as F within an EHR system. Marcus et al. also note that they could not “assess sensitivity by gender identity” because there were too few incident diagnoses among transgender patients (Marcus et al., 2019). The most charitable read is that this means that there were too few diagnoses for people who had the “gender identity” field filled out in their EHR, but the language also seems to unfortunately imply cisgender people do not have gender identities.

Notably, there are better models. Krakower et al., the earliest work that suggests using ML to predict HIV risk and guide PrEP distribution, does not use a binary sex variable, likely because the data used was from Fenway Health, an organization specializing in LGBTQ healthcare. However, it is unclear which features are most predictive of HIV risk of the 168 variables extracted from the EHR, so it is difficult to draw any conclusions about how sex/gender was accounted for in the results (Krakower et al., 2016).

---

<sup>1</sup>This distinction is especially interesting because a table of people who received an electronic alert based on the output of the algorithm they developed includes not just “male” and “female” as sexes, but also a lone “transgender female.”

### 3.3.3 Other Issues Related to Sex/Gender

In this analysis of sex confusion within machine learning, we focus on the ways in which EHR “sex” fields can generate false assumptions and how researchers focus on “sex” to the exclusion of other relevant variables. We observe that sex confusion is more common than sex obsession, in part because there is such a lack of clarity on what researchers think the variable they are studying is. But of course, there are other issues present. Transgender and gender non-conforming people, due to stigma, the casual transphobia of the medical field, and lack of access to resources that might result in being unable to seek care in a country with uneven access to medicine, are likely underrepresented in any data set that relies on historical medical data (Ding et al., 2020; Hines et al., 2019). Additionally, many studies rely on natural language processing tools to handle unstructured data present within notes. This creates additional difficulties, as the notes field within EHRs often contains the musings of healthcare professionals on questions of sex/gender. They also may use keywords that assume particular relationships of sex/gender and behavior, for example, the use of “homosexual” in the context of HIV risk. Such issues are harder to identify but vital to eliminate if ML-based knowledge production becomes more normalized.

None of this analysis focuses on the way that particular models or studies might over or underrepresent sex/gender as a causal variable. Frankly, at this point, such analysis is not possible because the current failures are too significant. The historical failure of EHR systems to account for sex/gender in nuanced ways, the sex/gender slippage in medical literature, and the ways in which the base assumption that the complexity of sex/gender differences can be eliminated by looking at sex all make drawing conclusions about bias within models nigh on impossible.

## 4 RECOMMENDATIONS

While assumptions about sex/gender are deeply embedded in the medical system, we believe that there are concrete steps machine learning researchers can take to better incorporate sex/gender in their work. In this section, we provide recommendations related to increasing “data richness” (Hripcsak and Albers, 2018) and on avoiding common methodological pitfalls.

### 4.1 Focus on data richness

Our most important recommendation is to, whenever possible, not treat sex/gender as a stable, coherent category. Focus instead of increasing the “richness” of representations (Hripcsak and Albers, 2018). This includes:

- Differentiating between sex assigned at birth and current sex in the EHR system
- Considering the presence/absence of particular organs using an organ/anatomic inventory Lau et al. (2020); Rosendale et al. (2018); Deutsch et al. (2013)
- Considering variables besides binary sex/gender, including hormone status, gender identity, etc.

In order to focus on data richness, it is important to triage an analysis based on the clinical implications of the work, and work with clinicians, data experts and patients. For studies with a lot of different variables, triage your emphasis based on how the models will be used. We divide this into three main categories:

1. purely retrospective study not used for clinical decision making
2. used in routine clinical decision making, but adjusted as needed by clinician
3. ML or other algorithm acts as final decision maker without intervention from clinicians

Scenarios with higher category numbers have the most direct clinical impact and should be evaluated the most rigorously. Researchers should test their models for differential performance whenever possible. It is worth noting that unlike in many ML implementations outside of healthcare (Kourou et al., 2015), it does not appear that medical researchers are suggesting using live data produced by machine learning in the context of direct clinical care. Given the current state of machine learning knowledge and risk management, this is fortunate. However, to the extent that this changes, careful handling of sex/gender data is vital. This is especially true for algorithms that do not produce interpretable results or worse,

result in dimensionless parameters that can create special risks for populations that do not conform to the assumptions of their creators. Our findings serve to reinforce the need for interpretability and clarity around feature significance in machine learning in the medical context.

## **4.2 Avoid Methodological Pitfalls**

As we've discussed throughout this paper, sex/gender data need to be interpreted carefully. When starting a research study, look to previous research (if it exists) about the possible roles of sex/gender (Tannenbaum et al., 2019; Lacasse et al., 2020). Do not assume sex/gender is relevant, but similarly, do not assume that it is not (Richardson, 2022). This can be a challenge, but "threading the needle" is important to better understanding the role of sex/gender in any particular study. We've observed four major methodological pitfalls to avoid: 1) not working with data experts, 2) not describing how sex/gender data were collected, 3) incorporating gender in a way that does not consider the complexities of sex/gender, and 4) misrepresenting sex/gender differences.

### **4.2.1 Work With Data Experts**

Researchers should always work with clinicians and data experts to avoid the pitfalls around data bias or data being used in unintuitive ways. It is especially important to find a clinician who has worked with these data specifically, as it might not always be clear how something is actually used in clinical practice. EHR data can be used for multiple or unintuitive purposes, such as the preferred name field, which is sometimes also used to store information like pronouns or phone numbers. Also consider working directly with patients when feasible.

### **4.2.2 Clearly Describe How Sex/Gender Data Were Collected and Used**

One of the biggest challenges in evaluating research papers and their use of sex/gender is that in the vast majority of cases papers do not even disclose how sex/gender data were collected. It is assumed to be so obvious and clear as to not be stated explicitly. However, as we've discussed above, how sex/gender data are collected has impacts on their accuracy. When conducting a research study, state clearly where the sex/gender variables used in your study came from, and how they were collected. If the variables available shifted over the course of the time that data was gathered, as if a gender identity field was added to an EHR system, include details about when and how the change occurred and how your analysis accounts for these changes. For example, if using the "sex" field from a patient's medical record, discuss who populated that field and how it is being used in the research. If there is information you do not know, state this clearly as a limitation of the study and discuss potential impacts on the results.

### **4.2.3 Incorporate Gender Carefully**

Researchers of gender and health typically break gender down into four dimensions, including gender identity, relations, roles, and institutionalized gender (Johnson et al., 2007; Tadiri et al., 2021). Different components and variables related to gender will be relevant depending on the research context. It is also important not to conflate sex and gender, or assume that sex is a "ground truth" where as gender is in people's heads. This oversimplifies the relationship between sex and gender and erases transgender, non-binary, intersex, and gender non-conforming people.

Steps to incorporate gender into an analysis include: 1) identifying potentially relevant gender-related variables, 2) defining measured outcomes, and 3) selecting gender-related variables from an existing EHR or dataset or developing a protocol to collect new data. When incorporating gender, consider its multi-dimensional nature and which variables might be relevant for the research context. This can be challenging as there may be many different variables to consider. One way to simplify the analysis is to reduce multiple gender-related variables into a composite score by summing or averaging (Tadiri et al., 2021). However, given the number of variables, it can be difficult to determine how to weigh them relative to one another. Methods such as exploratory factor analysis or principle component analysis could be used to reduce the number of variables and/or construct the appropriate composite score. If conducting a statistical analysis using a gender-related variable, consider also how gender might impact a measured outcome. For example, gender could act as a main effect, directly impacting an outcome, or it could act as an interaction term (e.g., with sex). One challenge might be the lack of availability of gender related-variables in the EHR or data set. One approach to mitigate this would be to incorporate other available indexes. However, these indices may have assumptions about sex/gender that diminish their utility, such as excluding the experiences of transgender, non-binary, and intersex people.

#### **4.2.4 Conduct Statistical Tests Appropriately**

When considering the possible influence of sex/gender in research, it is important to conduct the appropriate statistical tests to ensure sex/gender differences are not misreported. A recent study from Garcia-Sifuentes and Maney examined the reporting of sex differences in over 100 articles in the biological sciences and found that while sex differences are increasingly reported, statistical evidence for those claims were missing or based on incorrect statistical methods (Garcia-Sifuentes and Maney, 2021). There were two pitfalls the authors identified: failing to test for an interaction effect, and pooling without looking for differences. When looking at the effect of a “treatment” or intervention, an effect in one sex but not another was frequently reported as a “sex difference.” However, this does not imply the presence of a sex difference. Instead, one must test for the interaction between sex and the treatment. The other pitfall was pooling based on sex/gender without testing first whether there are statistically and clinically significant differences between groups, or pooling even when differences had been clearly established. Similar issues could be possible in some machine learning contexts, for example those that involve evaluating the impact of some sort of treatment or intervention (Ridgway et al., 2018), or deciding whether to include sex/gender related variables as parameters when training a model. Our review of the machine learning literature has found that a binary measure of sex/gender is often included without subsequent evaluation of its influence on the results.

## **5 CONCLUSION**

Machine learning plays an increasingly important role in modern healthcare. Machine learning researchers need to learn about how important demographic variables such as sex and gender are used in medical data sets, especially electronic health records (EHR). In this paper, we provide an overview of historical assumptions about sex and gender in medicine. We highlight that sex and gender have been viewed as binary, static, and concordant, with sex and gender frequently used interchangeably (sex/gender slippage). Ignoring the complexities of sex, gender and the entwinement of them (i.e. sex/gender) can lead to significant “sex confusion” when attempting to use these data. Researchers must be careful not to continue to reify sex-assigned-at-birth as “ground truth” over other variables (sex obsession). The failure to think about what sex is and does makes it difficult to apply algorithms in any case where an individual person might deviate from dimorphic norms, whether that person is transgender, intersex, has undergone surgery or treatment to remove sex organs, or just doesn’t quite conform to the normal curves (no pun intended). With the advent of gender identity being added to EHRs, data richness and literature that describes how to avoid common methodological pitfalls when it comes to sex/gender provide promising tools for machine learning researchers to move forward.

Many of the problems we have described are not unique to the phenomenon of sex/gender (Paullada et al., 2021). However, because of the historical beliefs about sex and what we have termed sex obsession, even researchers who are relatively savvy and thoughtful about the origins of their data and its (dis)contents, to borrow the phrasing of Paullada et al., can make the mistake of thinking that “sex” is one of the things in a dataset that doesn’t need further explanation or unpacking. Make no mistake. Despite its position in the demographics section, sex is more like “family history” than it is like “age.” The same can, to some extent, be said for race and ethnicity (Lett et al., 2022).

The nature of modern machine learning systems and the lack of interpretability to clinicians can make the dynamics described above even more concerning. As of yet, we have not seen machine learning systems deployed in medical settings that continuously train on patient data. But the machine learning and even basic algorithmic scoring systems that have been produced, especially those in areas like PrEP counseling or referrals, take “sex” at face value, resulting in less accurate and less than helpful results. It is vital that as machine learning researchers look to the low-hanging fruit of EHRs to make “meaningful use” of the data within, they pay full attention to the deep contextual knowledge required to interpret what might seem like the most straight-forward of variables.

## **6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors would like to thank David Arney, Heather Lane, and Jordan Nestor.

## **REFERENCES**

Ainsworth, C. (2015). Sex redefined. *Nature*, 518(7539):288–291.

- Albert, K. and Delano, M. (2021). This Whole Thing Smacks of Gender: Algorithmic Exclusion in Bioimpedance-based Body Composition Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '21, pages 342–352, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Alpert, A. B., Ruddick, R., and Manzano, C. (2021). Rethinking sex-assigned-at-birth questions. *BMJ*, page n1261.
- Ancochea, J., Izquierdo, J. L., and Soriano, J. B. (2021). Evidence of Gender Differences in the Diagnosis and Management of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients: An Analysis of Electronic Health Records Using Natural Language Processing and Machine Learning. *Journal of Women's Health*, 30(3):393–404.
- Banda, J. M., Seneviratne, M., Hernandez-Boussard, T., and Shah, N. H. (2018). Advances in Electronic Phenotyping: From Rule-Based Definitions to Machine Learning Models. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science*, 1(1):53–68.
- Chen, L., Qi, H., Lu, D., Zhai, J., Cai, K., Wang, L., Liang, G., and Zhang, Z. (2022). Machine vision-assisted identification of the lung adenocarcinoma category and high-risk tumor area based on CT images. *Patterns*, page 100464.
- Chen, Y., Ghosh, J., Bejan, C. A., Gunter, C. A., Gupta, S., Kho, A., Liebovitz, D., Sun, J., Denny, J., and Malin, B. (2015). Building bridges across electronic health record systems through inferred phenotypic topics. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 55:82–93.
- Connelly, P. J., Azizi, Z., Alipour, P., Delles, C., Pilote, L., and Raparelli, V. (2021). The Importance of Gender to Understand Sex Differences in Cardiovascular Disease. *The Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, 37(5):699–710.
- Currah, P. and Moore, L. J. (2008). “We Won’t Know Who You Are”: Contesting Sex Designations in New York City Birth Certificates. *Hypatia*, 24(3):113–135.
- Davis, G. and Preves, S. (2017). Intersex and the Social Construction of Sex. *Contexts*, 16(1):80–80.
- Deutsch, M. B., Green, J., Keatley, J., Mayer, G., Hastings, J., Hall, A. M., Deutsch, M. B., Keatley, J., Green, J., Allison, R., Blumer, O., Brown, S., Cody, M. K., Fennie, K., Hall, A. M., Hastings, J., Mayer, G. S., Moscoe, G., St Claire, R., River Stone, M., Wilson, A., and Wolf-Gould, C. (2013). Electronic medical records and the transgender patient: Recommendations from the World Professional Association for Transgender Health EMR Working Group. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 20(4):700–703.
- Deutsch, M. B., Keatley, J., Sevelius, J., and Shade, S. B. (2014). Collection of Gender Identity Data Using Electronic Medical Records: Survey of Current End-user Practices. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 25(6):657–663.
- Ding, J. M., Ehrenfeld, J. M., Edmiston, E. K., Eckstrand, K., and Beach, L. B. (2020). A Model for Improving Health Care Quality for Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Patients. *Joint Commission journal on quality and patient safety*, 46(1):37–43.
- Epstein, S. (2009). *Inclusion: The Politics of Difference in Medical Research*. Chicago Studies in Practices of Meaning. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Estiri, H., Strasser, Z. H., Brat, G. A., Semenov, Y. R., The Consortium for Characterization of COVID-19 by EHR (4CE), Aaron, J. R., Agapito, G., Albayrak, A., Alessiani, M., Amendola, D. F., Anthony, L. L. L. J., Aronow, B. J., Ashraf, F., Atz, A., Avillach, P., Balshi, J., Beaulieu-Jones, B. K., Bell, D. S., Bellasi, A., Bellazzi, R., Benoit, V., Beraghi, M., Sobrino, J. L. B., Bernaux, M., Bey, R., Martínez, A. B., Boeker, M., Bonzel, C.-L., Booth, J., Bosari, S., Bourgeois, F. T., Bradford, R. L., Brat, G. A., Bréant, S., Brown, N. W., Bryant, W. A., Bucalo, M., Burgun, A., Cai, T., Cannataro, M., Carmona, A., Caucheteux, C., Champ, J., Chen, J., Chen, K., Chiovato, L., Chiudinelli, L., Cho, K., Cimino, J. J., Colicchio, T. K., Cormont, S., Cossin, S., Craig, J. B., Bermúdez, J. L. C., Rojo, J. C., Dagliati, A., Daniar, M., Daniel, C., Davoudi, A., Devkota, B., Dubiel, J., Esteve, L., Estiri, H., Fan, S., Follett, R. W., Gaiolla, P. S. A., Ganslandt, T., Barrio, N. G., Garmire, L. X., Gehlenborg, N., Geva, A., Gradinger, T., Gramfort, A., Griffier, R., Griffon, N., Grisel, O., Gutiérrez-Sacristán, A., Hanauer, D. A., Haverkamp, C., He, B., Henderson, D. W., Hilka, M., Holmes, J. H., Hong, C., Horki, P., Huling, K. M., Hutch, M. R., Issitt, R. W., Jannot, A. S., Jouhet, V., Keller, M. S., Kirchoff, K., Klann, J. G., Kohane, I. S., Krantz, I. D., Kraska, D., Krishnamurthy, A. K., L’Yi, S., Le, T. T., Leblanc, J., Leite, A. R. R., Lemaitre, G., Lenert, L., Leprovost, D., Liu, M., Loh, N. H. W., Lozano-Zahonero, S., Luo, Y., Lynch, K. E., Mahmood, S., Maidlow, S., Malovini, A., Mandl, K. D., Mao, C., Maram, A.,

- Martel, P., Masino, A. J., Mazzitelli, M., Mensch, A., Milano, M., Minicucci, M. F., Moal, B., Moore, J. H., Moraleda, C., Morris, J. S., Morris, M., Moshal, K. L., Mousavi, S., Mowery, D. L., Murad, D. A., Murphy, S. N., Naughton, T. P., Neuraz, A., Ngiem, K. Y., Norman, J. B., Obeid, J., Okoshi, M. P., Olson, K. L., Omenn, G. S., Orlova, N., Ostasiewski, B. D., Palmer, N. P., Paris, N., Patel, L. P., Jimenez, M. P., Pfaff, E. R., Pillion, D., Prokosch, H. U., Prudente, R. A., González, V. Q., Ramoni, R. B., Raskin, M., Rieg, S., Domínguez, G. R., Rojo, P., Sáez, C., Salamanca, E., Samayamuthu, M. J., Sandrin, A., Santos, J. C. C., Savino, M., Schriver, E. R., Schubert, P., Schuettler, J., Scudeller, L., Sebire, N. J., Balazote, P. S., Serre, P., Serret-Larmande, A., Shakeri, Z., Silvio, D., Sliz, P., Son, J., Sondag, C., South, A. M., Spiridou, A., Tan, A. L. M., Tan, B. W. Q., Tan, B. W. L., Tanni, S. E., Taylor, D. M., Terriza Torres, A. I., Tibollo, V., Tippmann, P., Torti, C., Trecarichi, E. M., Tseng, Y.-J., Vallejos, A. K., Varoquaux, G., Vella, M. E., Verdy, G., Vie, J.-J., Visweswaran, S., Vitacca, M., Waghlikar, K. B., Waitman, L. R., Wang, X., Wassermann, D., Weber, G. M., Xia, Z., Yehya, N., Yuan, W., Zambelli, A., Zhang, H. G., Zoeller, D., Zucco, C., Patel, C. J., and Murphy, S. N. (2021). Evolving phenotypes of non-hospitalized patients that indicate long COVID. *BMC Medicine*, 19(1):249.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000). *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. Basic Books, New York, NY, 1st edition.
- Feller, D. J., Zucker, J., Yin, M. T., Gordon, P., and Elhadad, N. (2018). Using Clinical Notes and Natural Language Processing for Automated HIV Risk Assessment. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes (1999)*, 77(2):160–166.
- Gan, T. J., Glass, P. S., Windsor, A., Payne, F., Rosow, C., Sebel, P., and Manberg, P. (1997). Bispectral index monitoring allows faster emergence and improved recovery from propofol, alfentanil, and nitrous oxide anesthesia. BIS Utility Study Group. *Anesthesiology*, 87(4):808–815.
- Garcia-Sifuentes, Y. and Maney, D. L. (2021). Reporting and misreporting of sex differences in the biological sciences. *eLife*, 10:e70817.
- Ghassemi, Marzyeh, Naumann, T., Schulam, P., Beam, A. L., Chen, I. Y., and Ranganath, R. (2019). A Review of Challenges and Opportunities in Machine Learning for Health. *arXiv:1806.00388 [cs, stat]*.
- Goldman, M., Butler-Foster, T., Lapierre, D., O'Brien, S. F., and Devor, A. (2020). Trans people and blood donation. *Transfusion*, 60(5):1084–1092.
- Goldstein, Z., Corneil, T. A., and Greene, D. N. (2017). When Gender Identity Doesn't Equal Sex Recorded at Birth: The Role of the Laboratory in Providing Effective Healthcare to the Transgender Community. *Clinical Chemistry*, 63(8):1342–1352.
- Government of Canada, C. I. o. H. R. (2018). How CIHR is supporting the integration of SGBA - CIHR. <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/50837.html>.
- Helen Buckler (2005). The menopause transition: Endocrine changes and clinical symptoms. *British Menopause Society Journal*, 11(2):61–65.
- Hines, D. D., Laury, E. R., and Habermann, B. (2019). They Just Don't Get Me: A Qualitative Analysis of Transgender Women's Health Care Experiences and Clinician Interactions. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 30(5):e82.
- Hripcsak, G. and Albers, D. J. (2018). High-fidelity phenotyping: Richness and freedom from bias. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 25(3):289–294.
- Johnson, J. L., Greaves, L., and Repta, R. (2007). Better science with sex and gender: A primer for health research. Technical report, Women's Health Research Network, Vancouver, Canada.
- Jones, M. C. and Shorter-Gooden, K. (2009). *Shifting: The Double Lives of Black Women in America*. Harper Collins.
- Jones, T. (2018). Intersex Studies: A Systematic Review of International Health Literature. *SAGE Open*, 8(2):2158244017745577.
- Keuroghlian, A. S. (2021). Electronic health records as an equity tool for LGBTQIA+ people. *Nature Medicine*, 27(12):2071–2073.
- Kho, A. N., Pacheco, J. A., Peissig, P. L., Rasmussen, L., Newton, K. M., Weston, N., Crane, P. K., Pathak, J., Chute, C. G., Bielinski, S. J., Kullo, I. J., Li, R., Manolio, T. A., Chisholm, R. L., and Denny, J. C. (2011). Electronic Medical Records for Genetic Research: Results of the eMERGE Consortium. *Science translational medicine*, 3(79):79re1.
- Knight, E. P. (2021). Gender and Cardiovascular Disease Risk: Beyond the Binary. *The Journal for*

- Nurse Practitioners*, 17(7):823–827.
- Kourou, K., Exarchos, T. P., Exarchos, K. P., Karamouzis, M. V., and Fotiadis, D. I. (2015). Machine learning applications in cancer prognosis and prediction. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, 13:8–17.
- Krakower, D., Gruber, S., Menchaca, J. T., Maro, J. C., Cocoros, N., Kruskal, B., Wilson, I. B., Mayer, K., and Klompas, M. (2016). Automated Identification of Potential Candidates for Human Immunodeficiency Virus Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Using Electronic Health Record Data. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*, 3(suppl.1):860.
- Kronk, C. A., Everhart, A. R., Ashley, F., Thompson, H. M., Schall, T. E., Goetz, T. G., Hiatt, L., Derrick, Z., Queen, R., Ram, A., Guthman, E. M., Danforth, O. M., Lett, E., Potter, E., Sun, S. D., Marshall, Z., and Karnoski, R. (2021). Transgender data collection in the electronic health record: Current concepts and issues. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, page ocab136.
- Lacasse, A., Pagé, M. G., Choinière, M., Dorais, M., Vissandjée, B., Nguefack, H. L. N., Katz, J., Samb, O. M., Vanasse, A., and TORSAGE Cohort Working Group (2020). Conducting gender-based analysis of existing databases when self-reported gender data are unavailable: The GENDER Index in a working population. *Canadian Journal of Public Health = Revue Canadienne De Sante Publique*, 111(2):155–168.
- Lau, F., Antonio, M., Davison, K., Queen, R., and Devor, A. (2020). A rapid review of gender, sex, and sexual orientation documentation in electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(11):1774–1783.
- Lett, E., Asabor, E., Beltrán, S., Michelle Cannon, A., and Arah, O. A. (2022). Conceptualizing, Contextualizing, and Operationalizing Race in Quantitative Health Sciences Research. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, page 2792.
- Lundberg, S. M., Nair, B., Vavilala, M. S., Horibe, M., Eisses, M. J., Adams, T., Liston, D. E., Low, D. K.-W., Newman, S.-F., Kim, J., and Lee, S.-I. (2018). Explainable machine-learning predictions for the prevention of hypoxaemia during surgery. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 2(10):749–760.
- Marcus, J. L., Hurley, L. B., Krakower, D. S., Alexeeff, S., Silverberg, M. J., and Volk, J. E. (2019). Use of electronic health record data and machine learning to identify candidates for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis: A modelling study. *The Lancet HIV*, 6(10):e688–e695.
- Mays, J. A., Greene, D. N., Metcalf, R. A., and Pagano, M. B. (2018). Transfusion support for transgender men of childbearing age. *Transfusion*, 58(3):823–825.
- National Institutes of Health (2001). NOT-OD-02-001: AMENDMENT: NIH POLICY AND GUIDELINES ON THE INCLUSION OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES AS SUBJECTS IN CLINICAL RESEARCH - OCTOBER, 2001. <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-02-001.html>.
- National Institutes of Health (2015). NOT-OD-15-102: Consideration of Sex as a Biological Variable in NIH-funded Research. <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not-od-15-102.html>.
- National Institutes of Health (2017). NOT-OD-18-014: Revision: NIH Policy and Guidelines on the Inclusion of Women and Minorities as Subjects in Clinical Research. <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-18-014.html>.
- Paullada, A., Raji, I. D., Bender, E. M., Denton, E., and Hanna, A. (2021). Data and its (dis)contents: A survey of dataset development and use in machine learning research. *Patterns*, 2(11).
- Pelletier, R., Ditto, B., and Pilote, L. (2015). A Composite Measure of Gender and Its Association With Risk Factors in Patients With Premature Acute Coronary Syndrome. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 77(5):517–526.
- Raparelli, V., Norris, C. M., Bender, U., Herrero, M. T., Kautzky-Willer, A., Kublickiene, K., Emam, K. E., and Pilote, L. (2021). Identification and inclusion of gender factors in retrospective cohort studies: The GOING-FWD framework. *BMJ Global Health*, 6(4):e005413.
- Richardson, S. S. (2022). Sex Contextualism. *Philosophy, Theory, and Practice in Biology*, 14(0).
- Ridgway, J. P., Almirol, E. A., Bender, A., Richardson, A., Schmitt, J., Friedman, E., Lancki, N., Leroux, I., Pieroni, N., Dehlin, J., and Schneider, J. A. (2018). Which Patients in the Emergency Department Should Receive Preexposure Prophylaxis? Implementation of a Predictive Analytics Approach. *AIDS patient care and STDs*, 32(5):202–207.
- Rosendale, N., Goldman, S., Ortiz, G. M., and Haber, L. A. (2018). Acute Clinical Care for Transgender Patients: A Review. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 178(11):1535.
- Schiebinger, L. (2021). Integrating Sex, Gender, and Intersectional Analysis into Bioengineering. *Cur-*

- rent *Opinion in Biomedical Engineering*, page 100347.
- Shattuck-Heidorn, H. and Richardson, S. S. (2019). Sex/Gender and the biosocial turn. *The Scholar and Feminist Online*, 15.
- Spade, D. (2003). Resisting Medicine/Remodeling Gender. *Berkeley Women's Law Journal*, 18:15–37.
- Springer, K. W., Mager Stellman, J., and Jordan-Young, R. M. (2012). Beyond a catalogue of differences: A theoretical frame and good practice guidelines for researching sex/gender in human health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(11):1817–1824.
- Stardust, Z., Cook, T., Hopkins, L., Gray, J., and Olsen, K. (2017). Effective and Meaningful Inclusion of Trans and Gender Diverse People in HIV Prevention. Sydney: ACON and PASH.tn.
- Stroumsa, D., Roberts, E. F., Kinnear, H., and Harris, L. H. (2019). The Power and Limits of Classification — A 32-Year-Old Man with Abdominal Pain. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 380(20):1885–1888.
- Tadiri, C. P., Raparelli, V., Abrahamowicz, M., Kautzy-Willer, A., Kublickiene, K., Herrero, M.-T., Norris, C. M., and Pilote, L. (2021). Methods for prospectively incorporating gender into health sciences research. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 129:191–197.
- Tannenbaum, C., Ellis, R. P., Eyssel, F., Zou, J., and Schiebinger, L. (2019). Sex and gender analysis improves science and engineering. *Nature*, 575(7781):137–146.
- Thompson, H. M., Kronk, C. A., Feasley, K., Pachwicewicz, P., and Karnik, N. S. (2021). Implementation of Gender Identity and Assigned Sex at Birth Data Collection in Electronic Health Records: Where Are We Now? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(12):6599.
- Today, C. (2019). Transgender adult reference intervals taking shape. <https://www.captodayonline.com/transgender-adult-reference-intervals-taking-shape/>.
- Walsh, C. G., Ribeiro, J. D., and Franklin, J. C. (2017). Predicting Risk of Suicide Attempts Over Time Through Machine Learning. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 5(3):457–469.
- Wanyan, T., Honarvar, H., Jaladanki, S. K., Zang, C., Naik, N., Somani, S., Freitas, J. K. D., Paranjpe, I., Vaid, A., Zhang, J., Miotto, R., Wang, Z., Nadkarni, G. N., Zitnik, M., Azad, A., Wang, F., Ding, Y., and Glicksberg, B. S. (2021). Contrastive learning improves critical event prediction in COVID-19 patients. *Patterns*, 2(12).
- Ziyad, H. (2017). My gender is Black.

## 7 BIOGRAPHIES

Maggie Delano is an Assistant Professor at Swarthmore College, where she teaches computer engineering and inclusive engineering design. Her research focuses on the development of a wearable monitoring system for patients with Congestive Heart Failure. She also writes about and researches better design, including the use of sex/gender in medicine and human subjects testing in machine learning. More details about Maggie can be found on her website: <https://www.maggiedelano.com/>

Kendra Albert is a public interest technology lawyer whose research interests include gender, machine learning, and power. They serve as a clinical instructor at the Cyberlaw Clinic at Harvard Law School, where they teach students to practice law by working with pro bono clients. Kendra also has taught classes on transgender rights in the Program on Studies of Women, Gender, and Sexuality at Harvard College and Harvard Law School. They serve on the board of the ACLU of Massachusetts and the Tor Project, and provide support as a legal advisor for Hacking // Hustling. More at <https://kendraalbert.com/>.