Gender—or do we mean sex?

The use of language when dealing with gender and sex is important: the choice ranges from deliberately political and incendiary, to confusing despite the best of intentions.

The most recent issue of the BJGP illustrates this amply. I was excited to see an issue devoted to 'Gender', as an associate in training (AiT) feeling the absence of education in gender medicine. It became increasingly clear that much of the issue was about sex-based topics—important and interesting, but conflated with a more nebulous (and largely undefined) concept of 'gender'.

Kath Checkland describes the author of Hags, highlighting the dangers to women of current attempts to downgrade the importance of biological sex, which is especially pertinent to the paper by Jefferson et al. Here, the authors relied on self-identification (as well as other clues such as name) when it came to documenting uncertain gender, which they then appear to equate to sex. The distinction between sex and self-identified gender is of course vital to drawing any conclusions about discrimination; biology and gender incongruence may impact this, but for entirely different reasons.

The linguistic confusion continues in the 'gender' space. Brown et al specifically acknowledge difficulties with conducting research because of coding complications and state the 'intention to balance inclusivity and specificity', even if they slip from 'transmasculine' and 'transfeminine', to 'transgender men' in the discussion — are such men in the former or latter category?

The difficulties with language are not specific to general practice, or to this journal. The laudable aim to make research because of coding complications and state the 'intention to balance inclusivity and specificity', even if they slip from 'transmasculine' and 'transfeminine', to 'transgender men' in the discussion — are such men in the former or latter category?
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A system to enable the early detection of new side effects of recently marketed drugs

The system would work as follows: when a patient taking a recently marketed drug develops a symptom, the symptom is entered on the computer in the usual way. If the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) has already received a report/reports of the same symptom experienced by a patient taking the newly marketed drug, an alert would appear on the screen saying ‘this is a suspected side effect of the newly marketed drug A. Please click on the link to report this suspected side effect to the MHRA.’

The MHRA would simultaneously extract from the patient’s record their current medication and other relevant patient data, all in an anonymised form. This way, new and possibly dangerous side effects of recently marketed drugs could be detected at an early stage.

To my knowledge, such a system does not currently exist. If this facility was rolled out worldwide, even earlier detection of new side effects of recently marketed drugs could be achieved.
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Correction

Mapping GPs’ motivation—it’s not all about the money: a nationwide cross-sectional survey study from Denmark. Yordanov D, Osholm AS, Gyrd-Hansen D, Pedersen LB. Br J Gen Pract 2023; DOI: https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGP2023.0563. The title of this article has been revised and in Figure 2, the bar charts for Class 5 have been corrected so they are no longer floating above the x axis.
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