Gender Incongruence as a Distinct Clinical Construct: Restoring Differential Diagnosis in Gender-Related Care

Prepared by Tracy C. Coyle

Contents

Preface 3

Executive Summary 4

1. Purpose and Scope 6

2. Current Diagnostic Frameworks and Their Limits 7

3. The Clinical Consequences of Heterogeneity Collapse 8

4. Reframing Dysphoria: From Diagnosis to Response State 10

5. Gender Incongruence as a Distinct Clinical Construct 11

6. Developmentally Distinct Criteria: Children, Adolescents, and Adults 12

7. Explicit Exclusions and the Restoration of Differential Diagnosis 13

8. Differential Diagnosis in Practice 14

- Trauma-Related Self-Alienation 15
- Affective and Self-Concept Disturbance 15
- Neurodevelopmental Rigidity 15
- Body Dysmorphic Disorder 16
- Psychotic and Dissociative States 16
- Developmental Exploration and Socially Mediated Distress 16

9. From Pathway Authorization to Mechanism-Aligned Sequencing 17

10. Professional and Ethical Implications 18

11. Implementation Pathway for Professional Societies 20

12. Conclusion 21

Appendix A: Proposed Diagnostic Criteria 22

- Gender Incongruence — Adolescents and Adults 22
- Gender Incongruence — Children 23

Appendix B: Research and Validation Agenda 25

Appendix C: Summary for Professional Bodies 26

Preface

This paper is written from within the ethical commitments that have shaped contemporary transgender health: the depathologization of identity, the protection of gender diversity, and the preservation of access to care. It does not seek to reverse those gains. Instead, it addresses an unintended clinical consequence of symptom-based diagnostic models: the collapse of heterogeneous pathways into a single category in which distress or experienced incongruence functions as the diagnosis itself. The framework proposed here distinguishes gender dysphoria as a response state from gender incongruence as a specific clinical construct, not to restrict care, but to align it with mechanism. Exclusion redirects rather than denies. Identity is neither necessary nor sufficient for diagnosis. Gender nonconformity is explicitly protected as normal human variation. The aim is to preserve affirmation while restoring differential reasoning, so that gender-related suffering is met not only with compassion, but with understanding.

Executive Summary

Over the past decade, diagnostic frameworks in both the DSM and ICD have undergone deliberate reform in response to ethical concerns regarding stigma, access to care, and the pathologization of identity. These reforms have succeeded in important respects. They have decoupled gender variance from mental disorder status and preserved pathways to care for individuals experiencing gender-related distress.

They have also produced an unintended clinical consequence: the collapse of heterogeneous phenomena into a single diagnostic container defined by presenting states rather than underlying mechanisms. In DSM-5, distress becomes the diagnosis ("gender dysphoria"). In ICD-11, experienced incongruence becomes the diagnosis ("gender incongruence"), explicitly detached from psychopathology. Despite differences in placement and language, both systems converge on a post-nosological model in which symptoms substitute for conditions.

Under this model, diverse pathways—trauma-related self-alienation, affective and self-concept disturbance, neurodevelopmental rigidity, body dysmorphic disorder, psychotic and dissociative states, developmental exploration, socially mediated distress, and a smaller cohort characterized by a stable self–body mismatch—are treated as manifestations of a single clinical entity. Differential diagnosis is structurally disincentivized. The same surface presentation increasingly authorizes the same clinical pathway.

This white paper proposes a corrective framework that preserves the ethical aims of recent reforms while restoring psychiatry's core function: discrimination among causes. It advances three central propositions:

1. **Gender dysphoria is a response state, not a diagnosis.**
   Distress related to gender is clinically significant and deserving of care, but it is non-specific in origin. Like pain or fever, it signals the presence of a problem without specifying its nature.

2. **Gender incongruence is a distinct clinical construct.**
   It is defined as a persistent, internally anchored perception that one's sexed body is incongruent with one's experienced self, in the absence of disorders of sex development and not better explained by alternative mechanisms. It is neither an identity nor a mental disorder.

3. **Diagnosis must be anchored in mechanism, not appearance.**
   Explicit exclusions and developmentally sensitive criteria restore differential diagnosis across childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. Distress and impairment remain clinically central, retained as specifiers rather than gatekeepers.

This framework does not deny access to care. It redirects it. Individuals whose suffering arises from trauma, mood disorder, neurodevelopmental rigidity, social conflict, or other pathways receive care aligned with those mechanisms. Individuals who meet criteria for a stable self–body mismatch are identified as such and may proceed along gender-affirming pathways designed for that condition.

The clinical stakes of this shift are already visible. The original Dutch protocol—the empirical foundation of pediatric medical transition—was built on a narrowly defined cohort characterized by early-onset, persistent gender incongruence and relative psychological stability. As diagnostic frameworks broadened and symptom-based classification replaced phenotype-sensitive selection, treated populations diversified and outcomes became more variable. This pattern is not mysterious. It reflects the consequences of pathway authorization in the absence of etiological discrimination.

Professional societies occupy a pivotal position in this landscape. They shape clinical standards, training, and practice norms. They can act without waiting for DSM or ICD revision cycles. By adopting a mechanism-sensitive model that distinguishes symptom from condition, societies can:

- Preserve depathologization while restoring diagnostic integrity
- Protect gender nonconformity as normal human variation
- Prevent category error in clinical pathways
- Improve alignment between presentation, diagnosis, and treatment
- Support ethically grounded, developmentally literate care

This white paper presents a complete clinical framework: conceptual definition, diagnostic criteria for children, adolescents, and adults, explicit exclusions, differential diagnosis guidance, treatment sequencing logic, and an implementation pathway for professional bodies.

What is proposed is not restriction, but restoration: of diagnostic meaning, of differential reasoning, and of medicine’s obligation to understand before it acts.

1. Purpose and Scope

This white paper is addressed to professional societies whose guidance shapes everyday clinical practice in psychiatry, pediatrics, psychology, adolescent medicine, and related fields. Its purpose is to propose a clinically coherent, ethically grounded framework for the assessment and treatment of gender-related presentations—one that preserves the achievements of recent diagnostic reforms while restoring medicine's core obligation to discriminate among causes.

The proposal does **not** seek to:

- Re-pathologize gender diversity
- Reintroduce identity as a psychiatric diagnosis
- Restrict access to care
- Replace or pre-empt the authority of DSM or ICD revision bodies

Instead, it seeks to provide professional societies with a mechanism-sensitive clinical model that can be implemented through practice guidelines, training standards, and consensus statements, independent of formal diagnostic revision cycles.

DSM and ICD function as classification systems. Professional societies function as *translators* of classification into care. They determine how diagnoses are interpreted, how clinicians are trained, how pathways are sequenced, and how ethical principles are operationalized. When classification systems adopt intentionally broad constructs for policy reasons—as DSM-5 and ICD-11 have done—professional societies become the primary site where clinical meaning is either restored or relinquished.

The framework presented here offers societies a way to:

- Retain depathologization and stigma reduction
- Preserve access to care
- Protect normative variation
- Restore differential diagnosis
- Align intervention with mechanism rather than appearance

It provides a complete clinical architecture: conceptual foundations, diagnostic criteria for children, adolescents, and adults, explicit exclusions, differential diagnosis guidance, treatment sequencing logic, and an implementation pathway.

The scope of this paper is therefore clinical and professional rather than purely nosological. It does not ask DSM or ICD to act. It asks professional bodies to lead: to articulate a model of care that distinguishes symptom from condition, restores diagnostic reasoning, and ensures that gender-related suffering is met with understanding rather than default.

---

2. Current Diagnostic Frameworks and Their Limits

Over the past decade, both DSM-5 and ICD-11 have undergone deliberate reform in the classification of gender-related conditions. These reforms were motivated by ethical imperatives: to reduce stigma, avoid pathologizing identity, and preserve access to care. In DSM-5, “gender identity disorder” was replaced with “gender dysphoria,” shifting the object of diagnosis from identity to distress. In ICD-11, “gender incongruence” was relocated from the chapter on mental disorders to sexual health, explicitly decoupling the construct from psychopathology.

On the surface, these changes appear divergent. In practice, they converge on a shared diagnostic philosophy. Both systems define the condition by a *presenting state* rather than by an underlying mechanism. In DSM-5, distress becomes the diagnosis. In ICD-11, experienced incongruence becomes the diagnosis. In both, the internal logic is the same: the subjective state itself is treated as the clinical entity.

This convergence is intentional. It reflects a post-nosological settlement in which classification is oriented toward ethical and policy goals rather than etiological discrimination. Heterogeneous phenomena are collapsed into a single diagnostic container so that services may be accessed without adjudicating cause. The system does not ask *what kind of condition this is*; it asks only whether a person experiences distress or incongruence of sufficient persistence to warrant recognition.

The clinical consequences of this shift are structural rather than incidental. When symptoms become diagnoses, differential inquiry is truncated. Distress is no longer a signal that initiates evaluation; it becomes the endpoint. Incongruence is no longer a

phenomenon to be explained; it is a state to be confirmed. The clinician's role shifts from differential diagnosis to pathway authorization.

This is not the result of individual error. It is the predictable outcome of a framework in which the category itself carries the clinical arc. Once a person is recognized as having "gender dysphoria" or "gender incongruence," the logic of care is pre-shaped. Affirmation, social transition, and consideration of medical intervention follow not because clinicians are careless, but because the diagnosis itself implies a singular condition with a singular trajectory.

The ethical achievements of this model are real. It has reduced overt stigma, removed identity from the domain of mental disorder, and preserved access to care. Its clinical cost is equally real. Diverse pathways—trauma-related self-alienation, affective and self-concept disturbance, neurodevelopmental rigidity, body dysmorphic disorder, psychotic and dissociative states, developmental exploration, socially mediated distress, and a smaller cohort characterized by a stable self–body mismatch—are treated as manifestations of a single condition.

Heterogeneity is not merely acknowledged; it is rendered clinically inert. The system can describe comorbidity, but it cannot discriminate among causes. Surface similarity substitutes for diagnosis. The same presentation increasingly authorizes the same pathway.

This white paper does not reject the ethical aims of DSM-5 and ICD-11. It seeks to complete their unfinished clinical work. Depathologization need not entail diagnostic abdication. A classification system can reduce stigma while still asking what kind of condition it is treating. Professional societies are uniquely positioned to restore this function—by reintroducing mechanism-sensitive reasoning within a non-pathologizing frame.

The sections that follow articulate such a framework.

---

3. The Clinical Consequences of Heterogeneity Collapse

When heterogeneous phenomena are subsumed under a single diagnostic heading, classification ceases to guide care. It authorizes it. The result is not merely conceptual imprecision; it is a structural alteration of clinical reasoning.

Under symptom-based models, gender-related distress or experienced incongruence functions as a terminal category. The clinician's task becomes confirmatory rather than discriminative. Assessment is oriented toward establishing presence and persistence, not toward determining mechanism. Differential diagnosis—historically the core of psychiatric practice—becomes optional, and in practice is often deferred.

This shift has several predictable effects:

1. **Diagnostic Flattening**
   Presentations that differ in origin, course, and prognosis are treated as variants of a single condition. Trauma-related alienation from the body, affective collapse of self-concept, neurodevelopmental rigidity, body dysmorphic preoccupation, psychotic or dissociative states, developmental exploration, and socially mediated distress converge at the level of appearance. Each may involve discomfort with sexed embodiment or a desire for change. Yet each arises from a different mechanism and calls for a different first-line intervention.

2. **Pathway Defaulting**
   When the category itself implies a trajectory, recognition becomes authorization. The same surface presentation increasingly leads to the same sequence of care. This is not the result of ideological zeal; it is the ordinary operation of a system in which diagnosis and pathway are coupled.

3. **Developmental Distortion**
   In children and adolescents, where self-concept, language, and identity are in flux and presentation is mediated through parents, schools, and peers, symptom-based classification amplifies ambiguity. Gender nonconformity, transient exploration, and socially mediated distress can be reinterpreted as evidence of a single underlying condition. The absence of explicit exclusions converts developmental variation into diagnostic signal.

4. **Outcome Variability**
   As treated populations broaden, outcomes diversify. This pattern has been widely observed in pediatric gender services: shifts in age at presentation, sex ratio, comorbidity profiles, and persistence rates. Variability is not evidence of failure; it is evidence of heterogeneity. A model that cannot discriminate among pathways cannot account for it.

These effects are structural. They do not reflect the intentions or competence of clinicians. They reflect the logic of a system in which symptoms substitute for conditions.

The purpose of classification is not merely to justify services. It is to organize understanding. When classification relinquishes that function, medicine becomes reactive rather than investigative. Care becomes palliative rather than explanatory. The question is no longer "What kind of condition is present?" but "Does this presentation meet threshold?"

A clinically viable framework must restore the ability to distinguish among causes while preserving ethical commitments. That restoration begins by reestablishing the distinction between *response* and *condition*.

---

4. Reframing Dysphoria: From Diagnosis to Response State

In the current diagnostic landscape, "gender dysphoria" functions as both symptom and diagnosis. Distress becomes the disease. This conflation obscures the clinical task: to determine what kind of condition is generating the distress.

The proposed framework reconceptualizes dysphoria as a **response state**—a clinically significant form of suffering that may arise from multiple underlying mechanisms. It is analogous to pain or fever: meaningful, urgent, and deserving of care, but non-specific in origin. Dysphoria may emerge from internal self–body incongruence, from social rejection, from trauma, from depression or anxiety, from neurodevelopmental rigidity, or from developmental identity exploration. Its presence signals that something is wrong; it does not, by itself, specify what that something is.

This distinction resolves a persistent ambiguity in both DSM-5 and ICD-11. When distress is treated as the diagnosis, inquiry ends where it should begin. The proposed framework restores the classical medical sequence:

presenting state → differential diagnosis → condition → treatment

Gender-related suffering becomes the beginning of evaluation rather than its endpoint.

Crucially, this shift does not minimize distress. It elevates it. By treating dysphoria as a signal rather than a verdict, the framework ensures that suffering is met with investigation rather than presumption. It allows clinicians to say: *this person is in pain; now we must determine why.*

Dysphoria remains clinically central. It guides urgency, informs impairment, and shapes the intensity of intervention. It is retained as a specifier rather than a gatekeeper. What changes is its role. It no longer substitutes for diagnosis.

This reframing clears conceptual space for a distinct construct—one that specifies a particular kind of condition rather than a general state of suffering. That construct is *gender incongruence*.

---

5. Gender Incongruence as a Distinct Clinical Construct

The proposed framework defines *gender incongruence* not as an identity, not as a social position, and not as a general experience of discomfort, but as a specific clinical phenomenon: a persistent, internally anchored perception that one's sexed body is incongruent with one's experienced self.

This construct is developed in three interlocking layers:

1. **Conceptual Core**
   Gender incongruence refers to an intrapersonal mismatch. It is not primarily about how one is perceived by others or constrained by roles. Individuals describe their understanding of self as accurate and their body as wrong. In the absence of disorders of sex development, the body is medically typical; it is the experienced self–body relationship that is incongruent.

2. **Operational Definition**
   The diagnostic anchor is a stable, self-referential conviction that one's sexed body is not congruent with one's experienced self. Supporting features—discomfort with sex characteristics, desire to alter or prevent their development, desire for other sex traits, and identification not reducible to roles or style—are subordinate to this core. They elaborate it; they do not replace it.

3. **Boundary Conditions**
   The construct is bounded by explicit exclusions. Gender incongruence is:

   - A *clinical condition*, not an identity and not a mental disorder
   - Independent of identity labels; adoption of a "transgender" identity is neither necessary nor sufficient

- Distinct from gender dysphoria, which is a response state
- Exclusive of gender nonconformity, which is normal human variation

Taken together, these layers define gender incongruence as:

A distinct clinical condition characterized by a persistent, internally anchored perception that one's sexed body is incongruent with one's experienced self, in the absence of disorders of sex development and not better explained by alternative psychological, developmental, or social mechanisms.

This definition restores ontological clarity without reintroducing pathology. It specifies *what kind of thing* is being diagnosed. It allows clinicians to distinguish between those whose distress arises from a stable self–body mismatch and those whose distress arises from other pathways that resemble it in form.

The construct is empirically falsifiable. If gender incongruence is a coherent clinical entity, it should demonstrate temporal stability, discriminant validity from trauma-related alienation, affective disturbance, and body dysmorphic disorder, and differential response to intervention. Failure on these dimensions would argue against its nosological independence. The proposal therefore invites scientific testing rather than foreclosing it.

---

6. Developmentally Distinct Criteria: Children, Adolescents, and Adults

Gender incongruence does not present identically across the lifespan. The proposed framework therefore provides separate criteria sets for children and for adolescents/adults—not to imply different conditions, but to reflect developmental realities in how the same core phenomenon is experienced, expressed, and detected.

In adults, access to the internal state is direct. The clinician can evaluate a stable, self-referential conviction of self–body mismatch through narrative coherence, temporal persistence, and reflective capacity. Adult criteria emphasize phenomenology: a persistent internal conviction supported by body-focused features and an identification not reducible to role preference or affiliation. The task is differential—distinguishing a stable self–body mismatch from trauma-related alienation, body dysmorphia, psychosis, or mood-state–dependent identity disturbance.

In children and younger adolescents, access is indirect and developmentally mediated. Minors do not self-refer. Presentation is filtered through parental awareness, school environments, and cultural expectations. Some children experience incongruence long before they possess language to articulate it; others become aware only when pubertal development renders the body salient. In supportive contexts, distress may be minimal; in restrictive ones, it may be acute. Parental concern alone does not constitute diagnosis.

For this reason, child and adolescent criteria are anchored in the same core feature—internal self–body incongruence—but allow it to be inferred through stable cross-context patterns and consistent self-statements. Play style, peer affiliation, and gender-nonconforming interests are explicitly excluded as sufficient evidence. They may coexist with incongruence; they do not define it.

Developmental timing further differentiates presentations. Puberty compresses timescales. Bodily change can rapidly intensify awareness of mismatch and amplify distress. A rigid, multi-year persistence requirement risks converting caution into neglect. The proposed duration threshold is therefore paired with phenomenological specificity: persistence across time and context, internal self-reference, and body-focused features. Safeguard lies not in elapsed time alone, but in the structure of the experience.

The result is a developmentally literate model. It prevents over-diagnosis based on nonconformity or parental anxiety, and under-recognition of genuine incongruence in minors who lack language or safety to articulate it. Across the lifespan, the clinician's task remains constant: determine whether a persistent, internally anchored self–body mismatch is present and not better explained by alternative mechanisms.

---

7. Explicit Exclusions and the Restoration of Differential Diagnosis

A diagnostic construct that does not discriminate among causes cannot guide care. The proposed framework therefore embeds exclusion as a core diagnostic function. Gender incongruence is not defined solely by what it resembles, but by what it is *not*. A diagnosis requires the presence of a persistent, internally anchored self–body mismatch *and* the absence of more plausible alternative explanations.

The presentation must not be better accounted for by:

- Gender nonconformity in interests, roles, or expression
- Distress arising solely from social rejection, role pressure, or cultural conflict
- Transient developmental exploration without persistence across time and context
- Body image dissatisfaction unrelated to sexed anatomy
- Psychotic, dissociative, or mood states in which incongruence is episodic or state-dependent
- Trauma-related self-alienation not specifically centered on sexed embodiment
- Global affective or self-concept disturbance in which gender becomes the organizing symbol for diffuse distress

These exclusions do not deny the reality or seriousness of these conditions. On the contrary, they insist that each deserves to be understood and treated on its own terms. Trauma requires trauma-focused care. Mood and anxiety disorders require psychiatric treatment. Neurodevelopmental rigidity requires developmental and cognitive support. Social conflict requires family, school, and community-level intervention. None of these are "less real" than gender incongruence; they are simply different.

Heterogeneity becomes a problem only when it is misrecognized as unity. A classification system that cannot distinguish among causes cannot guide treatment. It can only authorize pathways. The result is a default sequence in which surface similarity substitutes for diagnosis and intervention precedes understanding.

By reintroducing explicit exclusions, the proposed framework restores the clinician's responsibility to discriminate. It converts "gender-related distress" from a terminal category into a starting point for inquiry. Only those individuals whose presentation cannot be better explained by these alternative pathways—and who demonstrate a persistent, internally anchored self–body mismatch—meet criteria for gender incongruence.

Exclusion here does not deny care; it redirects it. Each alternative pathway remains clinically actionable and ethically urgent. What changes is not whether care is offered, but which form of care is offered first.

---

8. Differential Diagnosis in Practice

The clinical value of the proposed framework lies in its capacity to discriminate among presentations that converge at the level of appearance but diverge in mechanism. Under symptom-based models, gender-related distress functions as a terminal label. In contrast, this framework treats such distress as an entry point into differential diagnosis. The task is not to determine whether a person is suffering, but *why*.

Several pathways commonly converge under current diagnostic practice:

Trauma-Related Self-Alienation

Trauma can produce estrangement from the body and self that mimics gender incongruence without constituting it. Individuals with histories of abuse, neglect, or chronic invalidation may experience their bodies as foreign, unsafe, or "not mine." This alienation may become focused on sexed anatomy, especially when trauma is sexual in nature. The resulting distress can resemble incongruence in form—disgust toward body parts, desire for removal, fantasies of being "other"—but the mechanism is defensive rather than constitutive. The self is not experienced as belonging to another sex; it is experienced as fractured or endangered. Treatment priorities center on trauma integration and safety, not on altering the body.

Affective and Self-Concept Disturbance

In some adolescents and adults, gender-related distress arises within a broader collapse of self-coherence associated with major depression, severe anxiety, or emerging personality pathology. These individuals often experience pervasive uncertainty about identity, intense dissatisfaction with the body, and a desire for categorical transformation as a solution to diffuse psychic pain. Gender becomes the organizing symbol for a more global disturbance of self. The phenomenology may resemble incongruence, but the core experience is not a stable self–body mismatch. Identity claims may shift rapidly; distress waxes and wanes with mood. Treatment centers on affect regulation, identity integration, and stabilization.

Neurodevelopmental Rigidity

Some individuals with autism spectrum conditions exhibit concrete or rigid reasoning about categories, including gender. A child who reasons, "I like X, and X is for girls, therefore I am a girl," may present with conviction and distress when contradicted. The form resembles incongruence, but the driver is cognitive style rather than an internally anchored self–body mismatch. Longitudinal assessment, narrative depth, and body-focused phenomenology are essential. Intervention emphasizes cognitive flexibility, social understanding, and emotional regulation.

Body Dysmorphic Disorder

In body dysmorphic disorder, preoccupation is with a body part believed to be malformed or ugly. The goal is correction of defect. In gender incongruence, the problem is not defect but category: the body part is experienced as wrong *because it is sexed*. Distinguishing these requires careful phenomenology. “I hate my chest because it is deformed” is not equivalent to “I hate my chest because it makes me female.” When concerns are better explained by dysmorphia and are not organized around sexed identity, the diagnosis is not gender incongruence.

Psychotic and Dissociative States

In psychotic disorders, individuals may develop delusional beliefs about transformation, identity, or bodily change. In dissociative conditions, identity states may shift episodically. These experiences can include gendered content, but they fluctuate with illness state and lack the stable, self-referential continuity of gender incongruence. Assessment must evaluate temporal stability, coherence across mental states, and response to treatment of the primary disorder.

Developmental Exploration and Socially Mediated Distress

Adolescence is a period of identity experimentation. Many youths explore gendered aesthetics, names, pronouns, or social roles without a fixed internal self–body mismatch. Such exploration may be intense, particularly in peer-mediated environments. Similarly, a young person may be distressed because their temperament, interests, or relationships conflict with gendered expectations. The suffering is genuine, but the driver is external constraint rather than internal mismatch. Intervention targets family systems, school climate, and self-acceptance rather than the body.

Each of these pathways can produce discomfort with sexed embodiment or desire for change. Yet each differs in mechanism, prognosis, and optimal treatment. Without explicit differential rules, surface similarity substitutes for diagnosis. The proposed framework restores clinical discrimination, ensuring that only those presentations characterized by a persistent, internally anchored self–body mismatch—and not better explained by these alternatives—meet criteria for gender incongruence.

---

9. From Pathway Authorization to Mechanism-Aligned Sequencing

Diagnostic categories do more than name conditions; they shape clinical trajectories. Under symptom-based frameworks, gender-related distress or experienced incongruence functions as a sufficient endpoint. Once the label is applied, a familiar arc tends to follow: affirmation, social transition, and consideration of medical intervention. This is not a failure of individual clinicians. It is the structural consequence of a system in which diagnosis itself carries a pathway logic.

The proposed framework breaks that coupling. By separating presenting state from underlying condition, it reintroduces a staged clinical logic:

1. **Presenting state:** gender-related distress or concern.
2. **Differential phase:** determine whether a persistent, internally anchored self–body mismatch is present, or whether another mechanism better explains the presentation.
3. **Primary intervention:**
    - Trauma → trauma-focused treatment
    - Affective/self-concept disturbance → psychiatric stabilization and identity integration
    - Neurodevelopmental rigidity → developmental and cognitive support
    - Social conflict → family, school, and systemic intervention
    - Gender incongruence → consideration of gender-affirming pathways
4. **Secondary interventions:** address residual distress, comorbidity, and functional impairment.

This is not restriction; it is alignment. No one is denied care. Care is sequenced according to cause.

The empirical stakes of this shift are already visible in the history of pediatric gender medicine. The original Dutch protocol—the foundation for puberty suppression and subsequent medical transition—was built on a narrowly defined cohort: children with early-onset, persistent gender incongruence and otherwise relative psychological stability.

Within this constrained population, outcomes were largely positive. The protocol's success depended on phenomenological specificity and etiological coherence.

As diagnostic frameworks broadened, inclusion criteria loosened. Contemporary cohorts increasingly include adolescents with later-onset presentations, complex psychiatric comorbidities, trauma histories, neurodevelopmental differences, and socially mediated distress. These heterogeneous presentations are now classified under the same diagnostic umbrella. Outcome data in these expanded cohorts show greater variability, higher rates of persistent distress, and a growing incidence of regret and detransition. Whether these trends reflect changes in referral patterns, sociocultural context, clinical practice, or underlying epidemiology remains contested. What is not contested is that the treated population has diversified.

A model that does not discriminate among pathways cannot account for that diversification. What was once a treatment pathway for a specific phenotype has become a default response to a surface presentation. The proposed framework restores the original clinical logic without abandoning ethical commitments. Distress and impairment remain central and actionable, but they no longer substitute for diagnosis. Individuals whose primary difficulty lies in trauma, mood disorder, neurodevelopmental rigidity, or social conflict receive care directed at those mechanisms first. Individuals who meet criteria for a stable self–body mismatch—those who most closely resemble the original Dutch cohort—are identified as such, allowing medical transition to be considered in alignment with etiology rather than as a default response to distress.

Nosology changes outcomes by changing order. The question becomes not "Does this person experience gender-related distress?" but "What kind of condition is generating this distress, and what should be treated first?" This is not a political stance. It is the most traditional medical principle: intervene in accordance with cause.

---

10. Professional and Ethical Implications

The framework advanced here restores a foundational medical distinction: symptoms are signals, not diagnoses. By separating gender dysphoria from gender incongruence and anchoring diagnosis in a specific internal self–body mismatch, it reorients gender-related care from pathway authorization to etiological assessment. This shift preserves the ethical aims that motivated recent reforms—depathologization, stigma reduction, and access—while reestablishing diagnosis as discrimination among causes.

Reconceptualizing dysphoria as a response state returns it to its proper clinical role. Distress remains urgent and actionable, but it no longer substitutes for diagnosis. Gender-related suffering becomes the beginning of inquiry rather than its end. The clinician's task is restored: to determine what kind of condition is present and why this person is suffering in this way.

The operational definition of gender incongruence completes this shift. Diagnosis is anchored in a persistent, internally anchored self–body mismatch, supported by body-focused features and bounded by explicit exclusions. Identity labels, community affiliation, and expressive style are decoupled from classification. Gender nonconformity is explicitly protected as normal human variation. Distress and impairment are retained as specifiers, allowing clinicians to describe severity without erasing etiological differences.

This structure produces three practical consequences.

First, it re-centers differential diagnosis. Presentations that converge at the level of appearance—trauma-related self-alienation, affective/self-concept disturbance, neurodevelopmental rigidity, body dysmorphia, psychotic or dissociative states, developmental exploration, and socially mediated distress—are no longer presumed equivalent. Each pathway becomes visible as a distinct clinical problem with its own prognosis and optimal treatment.

Second, it restores coherent treatment sequencing. Care is no longer organized around a surface phenotype. Instead, intervention follows cause. Trauma is treated as trauma. Mood disturbance is stabilized as mood disturbance. Developmental rigidity is addressed developmentally. Social conflict is met systemically. Gender incongruence, when present, becomes one pathway among others—distinct, identifiable, and aligned with interventions designed for it. What changes is not whether care is offered, but what kind of care is offered first.

Third, it reconciles precision with access. The model does not gate care behind distress thresholds or identity claims. Individuals with gender-related suffering are not turned away; they are assessed. Distress remains clinically central. Impairment remains urgent. The difference is that suffering no longer collapses into a single diagnosis by default.

Ethically, this approach avoids both historical errors. It neither pathologizes identity nor abdicates diagnosis. It affirms that difference is not disease while insisting that disease must still be named. It recognizes that suffering is real without presuming that all suffering of similar form arises from the same cause.

In this way, the framework restores psychiatry's core obligation: to discriminate among causes so that intervention can be aligned with what is actually present. A symptom-centered model may justify services; it cannot substitute for diagnosis.

---

11. Implementation Pathway for Professional Societies

Professional societies occupy a pivotal position between classification systems and clinical practice. They translate diagnostic language into standards of care, training curricula, and ethical guidance. They can act without waiting for DSM or ICD revision cycles.

Implementation of this framework can proceed in four domains:

1. **Practice Guidance**
   Societies can issue clinical guidance distinguishing gender dysphoria as a response state from gender incongruence as a specific condition. Guidelines can require explicit differential assessment across the pathways outlined in this paper before pathway commitment.
2. **Training and Competency Standards**
   Residency programs, continuing education, and certification pathways can incorporate mechanism-sensitive assessment of gender-related presentations, emphasizing phenomenology, developmental context, and exclusionary reasoning.
3. **Clinical Pathway Design**
   Health systems can be encouraged to structure intake and triage around differential evaluation rather than pathway authorization. Multidisciplinary models can be aligned with sequencing rather than confirmation.
4. **Research Agenda**
   Societies can promote a validation program for the construct:
   - Longitudinal stability of internally anchored self–body mismatch
   - Discriminant validity from trauma, mood, and body dysmorphic presentations
   - Predictive validity for treatment response
   - Developmental trajectories across childhood and adolescence

None of these steps require changes to DSM or ICD. They restore clinical reasoning within existing systems.

---

12. Conclusion

Contemporary diagnostic frameworks define gender-related conditions by presenting states while remaining intentionally agnostic about underlying mechanisms. This shift was ethically motivated and has achieved important gains. It has also produced an unintended consequence: the collapse of heterogeneous phenomena into a single clinical category.

This white paper has argued that medicine cannot function on symptoms alone. Distress is not a disease. Incongruence is not an explanation. When symptoms substitute for conditions, differential diagnosis is foreclosed and care becomes default rather than deliberative.

The proposed framework restores the distinction between response and condition. Gender dysphoria becomes a signal rather than a verdict. Gender incongruence is defined as a distinct clinical construct: a persistent, internally anchored self–body mismatch, bounded by explicit exclusions and implemented through developmentally sensitive criteria.

This approach does not re-pathologize identity. It does not deny access. It preserves depathologization while restoring diagnostic integrity. It aligns intervention with mechanism and protects normative variation.

What is proposed is not restriction but restoration: of conceptual clarity, of differential reasoning, and of psychiatry's fundamental task—to determine what kind of condition is present so that care can be aligned with what is actually occurring.

Professional societies are uniquely positioned to lead this restoration. They can ensure that gender-related suffering is met not only with compassion, but with understanding.

Appendix A: Proposed Diagnostic Criteria

(Condensed for White Paper Use; full DSM-style text appended separately)

Gender Incongruence — Adolescents and Adults

A. A marked and persistent internal incongruence between the individual's experienced self and their sexed body, manifested by:

1. A stable, self-referential perception or conviction that one's sexed body is not congruent with one's experienced self; **and**
2. One or more of the following:
    - Persistent discomfort with primary or secondary sex characteristics because they are sexed
    - Persistent desire to alter, remove, or prevent development of sex characteristics
    - Persistent desire for the sex characteristics of another sex
    - An internally anchored identification not reducible to roles, interests, or social affiliation

B. The experience has been present for at least six months and is stable across time and context.

C. The presentation is not better explained by:

- Gender nonconformity
- Socially mediated distress alone
- Developmental exploration
- Trauma-related self-alienation
- Affective or self-concept disturbance
- Body dysmorphic disorder
- Psychotic or dissociative states

Specifiers:

- With clinically significant dysphoria
- With functional impairment
- With comorbid psychiatric conditions (specify)

Gender Incongruence — Children

A. Evidence of a persistent internal incongruence between the child's experienced self and sexed body, inferred from:

1. Consistent self-statements across time and context indicating that one's body is wrong in a sexed sense; **and**
2. One or more of the following:
    - Anticipatory distress regarding pubertal changes
    - Persistent discomfort with sexed anatomy
    - Persistent desire to have other-sex anatomy
    - Stable self-reference not reducible to play style or interests

B. Persistence across time and context for at least six months.

C. Not better explained by:

- Gender nonconformity
- Parental or social anxiety
- Developmental exploration
- Trauma-related alienation
- Neurodevelopmental rigidity
- Affective disturbance

Specifiers:

- With dysphoria
- With functional impairment
- With developmental or psychiatric comorbidity

Appendix B: Research and Validation Agenda

The proposed construct is empirically falsifiable and should be subjected to systematic validation. Professional societies can catalyze a coordinated research program addressing four domains:

1. **Temporal Stability**
    - Does internally anchored self–body incongruence show greater longitudinal stability than other sources of gender-related distress?
2. **Discriminant Validity**
    - Can structured phenomenological instruments reliably distinguish gender incongruence from:
        - Trauma-related self-alienation
        - Body dysmorphic disorder
        - Affective/self-concept disturbance
        - Neurodevelopmental rigidity
        - Psychotic/dissociative states
3. **Predictive Validity**
    - Does the construct predict differential response to intervention (psychotherapeutic, social, medical)?
4. **Developmental Trajectories**
    - How does internally anchored self–body incongruence present across childhood, adolescence, and adulthood?
    - What distinguishes early-onset, persistent forms from later-emerging or transient presentations?

Failure on these dimensions would argue against nosological independence. Success would justify clinical distinction.

Appendix C: Summary for Professional Bodies

Professional societies can adopt this framework without awaiting DSM or ICD revision by:

- Issuing guidance that distinguishes response state from condition
- Requiring explicit differential assessment in gender-related care
- Training clinicians in phenomenological and developmental evaluation
- Aligning care pathways with mechanism
- Supporting empirical validation

This is not a rejection of current systems. It is their clinical completion.