A Deep Learning Approach for Transgender and Gender Diverse Patient Identification in Electronic Health Records

Yining Hua, MS[1,2*]; Liqin Wang, PhD[1]; Vi Nguyen, BA[1]; Meghan Rieu-Werden, BS[3]; Alex McDowell, PhD, MPH, MSN, RN[4,5]; David W. Bates[1], MD, MSc; Dinah Foer, MD[1,6†]; Li Zhou, MD, PhD[1†]

[1]Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
[2]Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts
[3]Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts

yining_hua@hms.harvard.edu; {lwang; vnguyen31; dbates; dfoer; lzhou}@bwh.harvard.edu; {amcdowell4; mrieuwerden}@mgh.harvard.edu

ABSTRACT

Background: Although accurate identification of gender identity in the electronic health record (EHR) is crucial for providing equitable health care, particularly for transgender and gender diverse (TGD) populations, it remains a challenging task due to incomplete gender information in structured EHR fields.

Objective: To develop a deep learning classifier to accurately identify patient gender identity using patient-level EHR data, including free-text notes.

Methods: This study included adult patients in a large healthcare system in Boston, MA, between 4/1/2017 to 4/1/2022. To identify relevant information from massive clinical notes and to denoise, we compiled a list of gender-related keywords through expert curation, literature review, and expansion via a fine-tuned BioWordVec model. This keyword list was used to pre-screen potential TGD individuals and create two datasets for model training, testing, and validation. Dataset I was a balanced dataset that contained clinician-confirmed TGD patients and cases without keywords. Dataset II contained cases with keywords. The performance of the deep learning model was compared to traditional machine learning and rule-based algorithms.

Results: The final keyword list consists of 109 keywords, of which 58 (53.2%) were expanded by the BioWordVec model. Dataset I contained 3,150 patients (50% TGD) while Dataset II contained 200 patients (90% TGD). On Dataset I the deep learning model achieved a F1 score of 0.917, sensitivity of 0.854, and a precision of 0.980; and on Dataset II a F1 score of 0.969, sensitivity of 0.967, and precision of 0.972. The deep learning model significantly outperformed rule-based algorithms.

Conclusion: This is the first study to show that deep learning algorithms can accurately identify gender identity using EHR data. Future work should leverage and evaluate additional diverse data sources to generate more generalizable algorithms.

Keywords: Gender Identity; Transgender Persons; Sexual and Gender Minorities; Electronic Health Records; Machine Learning; Natural Language Processing.

* Corresponding author
† Co-senior authors

This work was supported by a research grant from CRICO, the medical malpractice insurance organization.
IRB approval status: Mass General Brigham IRB #2021P001964

Graphical abstract:



Abbreviations:

BERT: Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers
EHR: Electronic Health Records
MGB: Mass General Brigham
NLP: Natural Language Processing
TGD: Transgender and Gender Diverse
SVM: Support Vector Machine
TF-IDF: Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency

1. INTRODUCTION

The transgender and gender-diverse (TGD) population is growing, with estimates ranging from 0.5-4.5% among adults and 2.5-8.4% among children and adolescents [1,2]. TGD populations experience health inequities and barriers to care, and are underrepresented in research studies [3–5].

Accurate and complete sex and gender data in electronic health records (EHR) is broadly recognized as a prerequisite for improving patient safety and advancing health equity for TGD populations [6]. However, structured sex and gender information are commonly missing in EHR data, which impedes patient safety efforts and prevents high-quality TGD health research using EHR data [7–9]. Despite missingness in structured fields, detailed information about a patient's gender identity may be available in free-text notes. Therefore, there is an urgent need to develop effective and efficient methods to identify TGD individuals within the EHR system.

Prior studies on methods to identify TGD individuals in EHR clinician notes have relied on rule-based natural language processing (NLP) algorithms that utilize a narrow set of medical codes and gender-related keywords [10–15]. Although rule-based methods are generally easier to understand and implement quickly, they may have lower accuracy than more sophisticated approaches using technology like artificial intelligence due to the difficulty of identifying complex patterns in human languages [5,8]. Pure keyword-based searches may also miss important contextual information in clinical notes, leading to false negatives.

Deep learning techniques, which are among the most sophisticated types of artificial intelligence and involve the utilization of neural networks for the analysis of large datasets, have demonstrated significant potential in clinical information studies [16,17]. These techniques are capable of learning intricate patterns and relationships within data, surpassing traditional machine learning methods in various tasks [18–20]. Furthermore, deep learning-powered NLP uses text representations to harness the wealth of information in clinical notes, making it a popular choice in patient cohort identification in EHR systems [21,22]. However, deep learning models must often overcome limitations related to data noise (such as irrelevant or inconsistent data across a patient's EHR) and extensive annotation requirements [23–26]. Manual annotation to support sentence level prediction [27] addresses some of these challenges, but is inefficient, costly, and lacks scalability.

The objective of this study was to develop a robust deep learning-aided pipeline that leverages both structured EHR data and free-text notes for identifying TGD individuals. Through this automated approach, we aimed to reduce resource utilization, improve efficiency, and increase accuracy; the resulting applications may improve researchers' ability to identify samples of TGD individuals in EHR data.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Clinical Setting and Data Sources

This study was conducted at Mass General Brigham (MGB), a large healthcare delivery system in the Northeastern United States. The study population included patients aged ≥18 years with at least one encounter at the health system between April 1, 2017, and April 1, 2022. Patient EHR data were retrieved from MGB's two clinical databases: the Research Patient Data Registry (RPDR) and the Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW), which together encompass patient demographics, healthcare encounters, problem lists, billing and encounter diagnoses, procedures, and clinical notes. **A.1** details terminology used in this study. Patients who identified as "chose not to disclose" for gender identity or sex assigned at birth in the structured sex and gender demographic fields were excluded from the study for ethical considerations (**A.2)**.

2.2. Overview of the Workflow

Figure 1 illustrates the workflow for developing and evaluating a deep learning-aided pipeline for TGD patient identification, which consisted of three steps. First, we compiled a comprehensive list of TGD keywords from three sources (expert input, published literature, and a BioWordVec model) to extract relevant information from the EHR. Next, using the keywords, we created a "screening cohort" from MGB's EHR and split this cohort into potential non-TGD and TGD patients for model development and evaluation. For model development, we further created a balanced training dataset by leveraging an internally generated TGD patient cohort previously confirmed by clinicians. Finally, we trained a deep learning-based TGD classifier compared with several machine learning algorithms. We evaluated the effectiveness of each component of our pipeline.

***Figure 1**. Transgender and gender diverse identification algorithm pipeline*



2.3. TGD Keyword Identification

Developing keyword lists is a crucial step when building input corpora for deep learning models from patient-level EHR data. As the length of the input increases, so does the computation time and data noise. In our case, we selected the BERT architecture, which presents a maximum sequence length limitation of 512 tokens. To ensure that the most significant information is retained within this limit and with minimal noise, a list of keywords was compiled to pre-screen patient data.

To meet our objective of minimizing false negatives and maximizing prediction model accuracy, developed a comprehensive keyword list to pre-screen potential TGD individuals using three sources in sequence: expert input, published literature, and a BioWordVec model

finetuned on a self-narrative corpus. Initially, a group of clinicians experienced in transgender healthcare created a list of keywords. We then identified additional keywords from relevant articles on this subject [10–12,14]. The expert-curated list and literature-reported list were then merged to form a base list, which was subsequently edited to eliminate duplicates, acronyms, and words that may introduce false positives, such as *MTF* (which is frequently used to refer to military treatment facility), *identifies as* (often followed by religious beliefs), *body dysmorphia* and *bisexual* (which are not closely related to TGD and may introduce bias), etc. In some cases, related keywords were grouped together (e.g., *transvestic disorder*, *transvestic fetish*, and *transvestite* were grouped under *transvest*), while others were not if they were not closely related to TGD or had high rates of false positives (e.g., *gender identity disorder* and *gender identity issue* were not combined with *gender identity*). Some of the keywords reflect stigmatizing terminology that was previously used to describe identities and behaviors in the TGD population, including ICD codes that have since been replaced with updated terms.

We then employed word embedding techniques to expand the base list. We used BioWordVec [28], a pre-trained word embedding model designed specifically for biomedical NLP tasks. This model used neural networks to analyze word associations in the training data and assigned each word a vector representation. For the TGD identification task, we fine-tuned the BioWordVec on a corpus of transgender-related texts [29] to create a new word embedding model. The transgender corpus contained self-narratives collected from the *asktransgender* subreddit channel. To the best of our knowledge, it is the most extensive public corpus on transgender-related topics. We then removed stop words (defined as words that carry little or no information in a language), generated unigrams, bigrams, and trigrams from the remaining text, added a new vocabulary to the BioWordVec model's dictionary, and trained the model with three epochs.

Using the fine-tuned BioWordVec model, we extended the base list by identifying the top 30 similar phrases for each keyword in the list. Each of these phrases was manually reviewed, and those were removed if they were stop words (e.g., *hello*, *sis*), directly unrelated to TGD (e.g., *depression*, *anxiety*), or likely to produce false positives in keyword matching. Since the BioWordVec model was fine-tuned on a social media corpus, we further filtered it by matching the keywords against the set of clinician-verified clinical notes from TGD patients to ensure that the expanded list of keywords was relevant to our clinical context. Any keywords not appearing in notes were removed from the list.

To make the keyword list usable without deep learning models, we divided it into a main list and a complementary list. The main list's keywords are directly TGD-related, while the complementary list contains phrases that frequently appear with TGD terms in our dataset but are less directly related to TGD, such as procedures that non-TGD patients can receive (e.g., breast augmentation, voice modification, etc.). While we separated them for the readers, we used both lists in our pipeline because it includes a BERT model, which makes predictions based on contextual information. We recommend not using the complementary list without a contextual model to avoid algorithm bias.

2.4. Data Preparation

2.4.1. ***Creation of development and validation datasets***

The study population comprised three groups: the cohort of clinician-confirmed TGD patients seen at the health system, potential TGD patients, and potential non-TGD patients. The latter two were selected based on the presence of TGD-related keywords in diagnoses, procedures, and notes, as well as any indication of diverse gender identity in the gender identity fields. The clinician-confirmed TGD group and the potential non-TGD group were used to create a balanced dataset for model development and evaluation, as described below. The potential TGD group was used for further evaluation of the model.

To develop and evaluate the TGD classifier, we created two datasets: Dataset I for model development, and Dataset II for further testing the model's performance on keyword-preselected patients.

Dataset I consisted of the clinician-confirmed TGD patients as positive cases, as well as an equal number of potential non-TGD patients as negative cases. Those negative cases were randomly sampled by year among all potential non-TGD patients. We conducted a manual chart review, detailed below, on 150 randomly selected non-TGD cases and found that 146 (97.3%) were confirmed to be non-TGD patients; the remaining four patients did not have sufficient records for assessment.

Dataset II consists of a randomly selected sample of 200 potential TGD patients and was used to evaluate the ability of the trained model to predict gender identity on the remainder of the dataset.

2.4.2. Chart review

A manual chart review was conducted to provide gold-standard labels of gender identity (TGD or non-TGD). The review was performed by two authors (Y.H. and V.N.) and consisted of examining demographic fields, progress notes, diagnoses and procedures, and problem lists related to gender within the EHR to determine TGD labels. Any discrepancies between the two reviewers were adjudicated by a third reviewer (D.F.). The purpose of the manual chart review was to provide accurate labels for use in training and evaluating the TGD classifier.

2.4.3. Generating corpora

We extracted structured and unstructured EHR data for individual patients and converted it into a free-text format suitable for use with deep learning algorithms. However, the BERT model has a limited processing capacity, typically processing up to 512 tokens. As patient notes often exceed this limit, we employed several strategies commonly seen in various text pre-processing tasks [27,30] to shorten note length. In detail, we extracted sentences containing at least one keyword, removed duplicate sentences, and concatenated the remaining sentences in their original order. Then, regular expressions were used to remove unrelated information such as dates, times, patient identifiers, zip codes, numbers with more than three digits, parentheses and their contents, and known health system locations, such as hospital names and locations. If the notes were still longer than 400 words, we segmented the text into sentences and selected as many sentences as possible in their original order within 400 words. This process allowed us to classify the gender identity of patients based on their EHR data using the BERT model.

To incorporate structured EHR data (such as the sex and gender demographic fields, diagnoses, and procedures) into the deep learning pipeline for TGD identification, we converted the structured data into free text. This was done by inserting the names and values of the data into template sentences and then concatenating the resulting text with the processed notes. For example, the template sentences for diagnoses and procedures could be in the following format:

1. The patient was diagnosed with: DIAGNOSIS1, DIAGNOSIS2, …, DIAGNOSISn.
2. The patient received: PROCEDURE1, PROCEDURE2, …, PROCEDUREm.

Here, DIAGNOSIS and PROCEDURE are unique names of the diagnosis and procedure code, and n and m are the number of diagnoses and procedures, respectively.

Similarly, for we converted patient sex and gender demographic field information using the template sentence: “The patient’s sex at birth is SEX_AT_BIRTH; legal sex is LEGAL_SEX; gender identity is GENDER_IDENTITY”.

Our final corpus for the model consists of patient notes concatenated from sentences of individual patients in the following order: 1) diagnoses and procedures, 2) sex and gender demographics, and 3) extracted note sentences.

2.5. Classification Models

2.5.1. Deep learning-based classifier

To classify patients as transgender or cisgender, we built a linear classification model, in which we used Bio_ClinicalBERT [31], a variant of bidirectional encoder representations from transformers (BERT) [32] that has been further trained on extensive biomedical data, to encode the processed patient notes. We added a linear classifier after the ClinicalBERT embedding layers and froze all but the last layer to prevent overfitting. Then, we trained the model on a binary classification task of identifying transgender patients, utilizing binary cross-entropy loss.

Given the small size of our data sets, we froze all but the last three layers of the Bio_ClinicalBERT model before fine-tuning. We set the maximum length of tokens to 512, and both the training and validation batch sizes to 8. The model was trained using a learning rate of 3e-5 for four epochs, and its performance was evaluated every 100 training steps. Training and validation typically took 8 to 10 minutes on an NVIDIA Quadro p6000 GPU with 24 GB of memory.

2.5.2. Baselines

We conducted several experiments to evaluate the performance of our model by comparing it with several baseline approaches, including rule-based and statistical machine learning algorithms. While a few studies have reported the use of rule-based approaches in TGD identification, none of them, to the best of our knowledge, have used machine learning-based approaches. For the rule-based approaches, we used the best single- and combined-rule algorithm proposed by Guo et al [14].

We also tested traditional statistical machine learning methods. We transformed the text into n-grams (unigrams, bigrams, and trigrams) and used the term frequency-inverse document frequency (TF-IDF) [33,34], a widely adopted method to measure the relevance of n-grams to a document across a collection of documents, to encode the texts. We applied XGBoost, support vector machine (SVM), random forest, and logistic regression to classify the encoded texts using the Scikit-learn package. The parameters of the classic machine learning models were optimized using a grid search on the training set.

Additionally, to evaluate the performance of the keyword expansion module, we compared the pipeline's performance in two different settings: (1) using only the baseline keyword list (i.e., literature-reported keywords and expert-curated keywords), and 2) using the expanded keyword list, but without the classification module. We considered patients with any keyword matches in any data fields (e.g., notes, diagnosis, and procedures) as TGD.

2.5.4. Evaluation metrics and strategy

We used the F1 score, a metric that combines precision and recall, to evaluate the performance of our model. In addition to the F1 score, we also report the mean and standard deviation of sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), accuracy, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC), and area under the precision-recall curve (AUPRC), which were calculated based on five-fold cross-validation. This allowed us to assess the stability and robustness of our results and to determine the overall performance of the model.

To ensure the model could accurately predict the gender identity of patients with missing structured gender demographic information, we conducted a sub-analysis to assess the model’s performance on a subset of patients who had missing values in the gender fields in both the development and evaluation datasets. Only patients whose gender identity values were “unknown” were included in this sub-analysis. Patients with a “chose to not disclose” value were excluded, consistent with the main analysis.

We also conducted an error analysis on both datasets to gain a deeper understanding of where the model is likely to fail. Specifically, we aimed to identify the types of errors made by

the model as well as the characteristics of the patients for whom the model demonstrated poor performance.

3. RESULTS

3.1. TGD Keyword Identification

The expert-curated keyword list contained 27 keywords and the literature-reported keyword list contained 53 keywords (**table 1**). After merging the two lists and removing any misused keywords, there were 51 unique keywords. Following keyword expansion, the total number of keywords in the expanded list reached 364. Among these, 109 (29.9%) keywords—including 58 novel ones—were referenced at least once in the clinical notes of the study group, and thus were incorporated into our final expanded keyword list.

Table 1*. TGD-related Keyword lists*

Source		keywords
Keyword list I (clinician-curated)		*\bF to M\b, \bM to F\b, binary titles, bottom surgery, female to male, female to male, gender change, gender dysphori gender identity disorder, gender reassignment, gender surgery, gender transition, genderqueer, male to female, male-to-female, non binary, non-binary, nonbinary, sex change, sex reassignment, top surgery, trans female, trans male, trans-gender, transfeminine, transgender, transmasculine, transsexual*
Keyword list II (identified from the literature)	**Roblin et al. (2016)**	*Female-to-male, gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder, gender reassignment, male-to-female, sex reassignment, trans-gender, transsexual, transvest*
	Xie et al. (2021)	*Female to male, gender change, gender dysphoria, gender identity disorder, gender reassignment, gender transformation, male to female, sex change, sex reassignment, sex transformation, transgender, transition to female, transition to male, transsexual, transvest*
	Guo et al. (2021)	*\bF to M\b, \bgay\b , \bM to F\b, agender, ambiguous genitalia, assigned female, assigned gender, assigned male, assigned sex, bigender, binary titles, binary trans, biological female, biological male, biologically female, biologically male, birth sex, bottom surgery, breast augmentation, changed name, chest binding, cross dress, cross gender, cross sex, crossdress, dead name, deadname, demifemale, demimale, desired gender, female to male, female-to-male, male to female, male-to-female, trans-sexual, transsexual*
Keyword list III (combined from lists I and II, and expanded by BioWordVec-TGD)	**The main list**	*\bF to M\b, \bgay\b, \bM to F\b, agender, assigned female, assigned gender, assigned male, assigned sex, binary trans, biological female, biological male, biologically female, biologically male , birth sex, cross gender, cross sex, dead name, deadname, desired gender, female to male, female-to-male*, feminization*, feminizing hormone therapy*, feminizing vaginoplasty*, gender affirm*, gender assigned*, gender binary*, gender change, gender confirmation*, gender creative*, gender disorder*, gender dysphoria, gender fluid*, gender identity disorder, gender identity issues*, gender identity uncertain*, gender incongruence*, gender issues*, gender neutral*, gender non-conform*, gender nonconform*, gender presentation*, gender pronoun*, gender queer*, gender reassignment, gender surgery, gender transition, genderfluid*, genderqueer, hormonal transition*, intersex*, male to female, male-to-female*, masculinization*,*

		masculinizing hormone therapy, misgender*, non binary, non-binary, nonbinary, null gender*, reassignment surgery*, sex change, sex reassignment, they/them*, theythem*, trans female, trans male, trans men*, trans people*, trans women*, trans-gender, transfeminine, transgender, transgender surgery*, transhealth*, transition to female, transition to male, transmasculine, transmen*, transsexual, transvest, transwomen**
	The complementary list	*ambiguous genitalia, augmentation mammoplasty*, bottom surgery, breast augmentation, changed name, chest binding, cross dress, crossdress, facial feminization*, gender expression*, gender unknown*, hysterectomy*, metoidioplasty*, orchiectomy*, permanent hair removal*, original birth*, preferred pronoun*, questioning gender*, sex unknown*, two spirit*, tomboy*, top surgery, unknown gender*, unknown sex*, vaginectomy*, vaginoplasty*, vocal feminization*, voice modification**

Abbreviations: F to M, female to male; M to F. male to female.
* Expanded keywords from BioWordVec-TGD.
\b represents a leading/trailing whitespace.
Authors note: As detailed in the methods, this list was compiled to include terminology that would maximally capture data from the sources used. As a result, this this list contains terminology that is stigmatizing and outdated.

3.2. Dataset Characteristics

Dataset I contained 3,150 patients, of whom 1575 (50%) were clinician-confirmed TGD patients. Dataset II contained 200 patients, of which 180 (90%) were TGD patients. **Table 2** displays the key characteristics of the datasets as well as the TGD and non-TGD patients in each dataset. TGD keywords were more frequently identified in clinical notes than in the diagnosis field, while the procedure field had the lowest frequency. For example, TGD keywords were mentioned in 89.02% of the TGD patients' notes in Dataset I and 95.56% of the TGD patients' notes in Dataset II. In contrast, in Dataset I, keywords were only mentioned in 60.76% and 26.8% of the TGD patients' diagnoses and procedures, respectively. Similarly, in Dataset II, only 103 (57.22%) TGD patients had keywords in their diagnosis fields, and 10 (5.56%) in procedure fields. Out of 200 randomly selected patients with keyword matches, 20 were found to be non-TGD. Among these false positives, 3 (15%) had procedure matches, and 17 (85%) had note matches. We identified high missingness in the structured gender demographic fields: in Dataset I, 1247 (39.59%) patients had missing gender identity values, and in Dataset II, 99 (49.5%) patients had missing values.

***Table 2**. Summary of two datasets for model development and evaluation*

	Dataset I (N = 3150)		**Dataset II (N = 200)**	
	Clinician-confirmed TGD patients (N=1575) n (%)	**Non-TGD patients filtered by keyword search (N=1575) n (%)**	**TGD patients by chart review (N=180) n (%)**	**Non-TGD patients by chart review (N=20) n (%)**
Age, mean (SD) year	35.94 (16.04)	60.92 (18.0)	34.52 (15.48)	57.85 (20.27)
Race, n (%)				
Asian	77 (4.89)	37 (2.35)	8 (4.44)	1 (5.0)
Black	116 (7.37)	84 (5.33)	12 (6.67)	2 (10.0)
More than one race	50 (2.54)	6 (0.38)	6 (3.33)	0 (0.0)

Other	177 (11.24)	116 (7.37)	24 (13.33)	2 (10.0)
White	1155 (73.33)	1332 (84.57)	130 (72.22)	15 (75.0)
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	22 (1.40)	41 (2.60)	9 (5.0)	1 (5.0)
Non-Hispanic	1351 (85.78)	1321 (83.87)	146 (81.11)	15 (75.0)
Other	415 (12.83)	213 (13.52)	25 (13.89)	4 (20.0)
Patients with keywords, n (%)				
Diagnoses	957 (60.76)	0	103 (57.22)	0
Procedures	422 (26.8)	0	10 (5.56)	3 (15.0)
Clinical notes	1402 (89.02)	0	172 (95.56)	17 (85.0)
Patients with missing gender fields, n (%)	884 (56.13)	691 (43.87%)	84 (46.67)	15 (75.0)

3.3. Model Performances on Dataset I

Table 3 shows the performance of our models on dataset I. *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* achieved an F1 score of 0.917, a sensitivity of 0.854, and a precision of 0.980, which significantly outperformed the rule-based baseline algorithms. Compared to other machine learning algorithms, *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* achieved slightly better performance, with an AUROC of 0.913 (95% CI, 0.891, 0.935) and an AUPRC of 0.956 (95% CI, 0.941, 0.970).

The augmented match algorithm, which relies on a single rule based on the presence or absence of any keywords, achieved an F1 score of 0.857 and a sensitivity of 0.883, outperforming previously published best-combined rules approach in [14].

Finally, traditional machine learning classifiers on TF-IDF encoded text features had comparable performance to *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD*, with only a 0.2 to 0.3 sacrifice in F1.

Table 4 presents the algorithms' performance on the subset of patients from Dataset I with missing structured gender field values. *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* remained the best-performing model, achieving the highest F1 score of 0.923, the highest sensitivity of 0.906 and AUROC of 0.940. *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* significantly outperformed the rule-based algorithms in terms of F1 score, sensitivity, specificity, precision, NPV, and accuracy. *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* slightly outperformed machine learning models in all the metrics except specificity and precision. The rule-based baseline models all showed a decrease in performance compared to the performance in the entire Dataset I. In contrast, the machine learning and deep learning models showed a slight improvement in performance.

Table 3*. Performance of TGD identification algorithms on Dataset I (development set)*

		F1	Sensitivity	Specificity	Precision	NPV	Accuracy	AUROC (95% CI)	AUPRC (95% CI)
Rule-based	Exact Match	0.586	0.980	0.962	0.730	0.728	0.796	N/A	N/A
	Augmented Match	0.857	0.883	0.882	0.858	0.869	0.870	N/A	N/A
	Guo et al. (single)[1*]	0.816	0.723	0.952	0.936	0.777	0.838	N/A	N/A
	Guo et al. (combined)[2*]	0.843	0.766	0.951	0.939	0.804	0.859	N/A	N/A
Machine Learning	Random Forest	0.892	0.832	0.976	0.972	0.860	0.904	0.904 (0.880, 0.926)	0.944 (0.926, 0959)

	Support Vector Machine	0.886	0.808	0.993	0.991	0.844	0.900	0.900 (0.876, 0.923)	0.947 (0.932, 0.961)
	Linear Regression	0.882	0.799	**0.994**	**0.991**	0.837	0.896	0.896 (0.872, 0.919)	0.946 (0.931, 0.959)
	XGBoost	0.892	0.828	0.978	0.975	0.858	0.903	0.903 (0.879, 0.926)	0.945 (0.927, 0.960)
Deep Learning	Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD	**0.917**	**0.854**	0.983	0.980	**0.865**	**0.912**	**0.913 (0.891, 0.935)**	**0.956 (0.941, 0.970)**

[1]Best single-rule algorithm was based on ≥2 diagnosis codes and ≥1 keyword(s)
[2]Best combined rule was either gender field indicates transgender or ≥1 diagnosis code(s) plus ≥1 TGD keyword(s)
*Codes and keywords can be found in the paper by Guo et al. [17].

Table 4*. Sub-analysis of patients with missing structured sex and gender demographics in Dataset I*

		F1	**Sensitivity**	**Specificity**	**Precision**	**NPV**	**Accuracy**	**AUROC (95% CI)**	**AUPRC (95% CI)**
Rule-based	Exact Match	0.254	0.983	0.852	0.770	0.391	0.777	N/A	N/A
	Augmented Match	0.658	0.908	0.756	0.860	0.703	0.833	N/A	N/A
	Guo et al. (single)	0.766	0.674	0.951	0.887	0.837	0.851	N/A	N/A
	Guo et al. (combined)	0.788	0.706	0.951	0.892	0.850	0.862	N/A	N/A
Machine Learning	Random Forest	0.901	0.837	0.957	0.977	0.728	0.874	0.897 (0.870, 0.923)	0.963 (0.949, 0.975)
	Support Vector Machine	0.900	0.827	**0.979**	**0.988**	0.721	0.874	0.903 (0.878, 0.926)	0.967 (0.956, 0.977)
	Linear Regression	0.889	0.811	0.971	0.984	0.701	0.861	0.891 (0.865, 0.916)	0.962 (0.950, 0.973)
	XGBoost	0.901	0.837	0.957	0.977	0.728	0.874	0.897 (0.870, 0.923)	0.963 (0.949, 0.975)
Deep Learning	Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD	**0.923**	**0.906**	0.975	0.940	**0.960**	**0.954**	**0.940 (0.912, 0.964)**	**0.937 (0.908, 0.961)**

[1]Best single-rule algorithm was based on ≥2 diagnosis codes and ≥1 keyword(s)
[2]Best combined rule was either gender field indicates transgender or ≥1 diagnosis code(s) plus ≥1 TGD keyword(s)

3.4. *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* on Dataset II

Table 5 shows *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD*'s performance on Dataset II, the patients randomly sampled from the potential TGD patient group (**Figure 1**). *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* had an F1 score of 0.977, with a higher sensitivity of 0.967 and a higher precision of 0.988 compared to its performance on Dataset I. The mode's specificity and NPV dropped to 0.80 and 0.75, respectively, indicating that it was better at identifying true positive cases than true negative cases.

In the sub-analysis set of patients missing structured gender demographics, the model experienced a 0.007 decrease in the F1 score. The NPV increased to 0.857, suggesting that among patients with missing structured gender demographic data, the model achieved better balance in predicting true positive and true negative cases.

***Table 5**. Performance of Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD on Dataset II.*

	F1	**Sensitivity**	**Specificity**	**Precision**	**NPV**	**Accuracy**	**AUROC (95% CI)**	**AUPRC (95% CI)**
All patients	0.977	0.967	0.900	0.988	0.750	0.960	0.858 (0.755, 0.954)	0.984 (0.970, 0.996)
Patients with missing structured sex and gender demographics	0.970	0.976	0.800	0.964	0.857	0.939	0.865 (0.770, 0.960)	0.988 (0.974, 1.000)

3.5. Error Analysis

A manual chart review of the false classifications by Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD on Datasets I and II was conducted to summarize the root causes behind the false positives and negatives (Figure 2).

For Dataset I, which consisted of five validations, 149 false negatives and 39 false positives were found. Most false negatives (91.95%, n=137) were attributed to an absence of sufficient information to conclusively determine a patient's gender identity. This issue primarily arose in cases where patients had not selected any notes and the available sex and gender demographics were insufficient for accurate identification. A further 12 patients (8.05%) were identified via the pronoun "*they/them*" but the model failed to predict their gender, likely due to an inadequate number of training samples containing these pronouns.

The false positives in Dataset I were mainly triggered by keywords found within a complementary list. Three instances highlighted the sole keyword “hysterectomy” and two instances presented the keyword “vaginectomy.” This suggests a misinterpretation by the model, inferring a likely TGD identity for patients who had undergone a hysterectomy or vaginectomy. This bias may be the result of insufficient negative training samples containing details about these procedures, causing the model to form an overgeneralized association between these procedures and TGD identities. Additional false positives were found with confusing or contradictory information. For example, three patients had gender identity listed as unknown in structured demographics but mentioned they were biologically female or make in notes; one instance contained contradictory information, with the sex assigned at birth recorded as “male,” while the patient note indicated “biologically female."

Dataset II yielded six false negatives and two false positives. All false negatives were related to evidence from pronouns: two instances were unable to correctly associate "preferred pronouns: they/them" with TGD individuals, three instances contained "preferred pronouns: she they," and one instance showed “preferred pronouns are: he/him, they/their”. Both false positives were associated with mentions of hysterectomy.

Figure 2. *Error analysis for false classification groups in Dataset I and II. Dataset I had 149 false negatives and 39 false positives. Dataset II had six false negatives and two false positives.*



4. DISCUSSION

In this study, we developed an accurate and efficient method for transgender and gender diverse identification in an EHR. In doing so, we were able to overcome some of the limitations of prior methods that relied on structured EHR data and rule-based algorithms. Overall, identification of this group has been a difficult problem which needs to be solved to deliver better care to these populations. We were able to develop multiple classification models, based on different machine learning-based NLP approaches, that leverage rich clinical data to achieve high performance.

This study represents a significant advancement in the identification of TGD individuals in EHRs by pioneering the use of machine learning to aid the process. The robust deep learning-aided pipeline effectively outperforms the previously predominant methodologies which relied on rule-based algorithms and a limited set of gender-related keywords and medical codes. These conventional methodologies often were limited in accuracy and lacked the pattern recognition capabilities inherent in deep learning techniques. We specifically benchmarked our models against the work of Guo et al. [14], a previously published comprehensive TGD phenotyping and identification work. Our results indicate that our algorithms consistently outperform their best rule-based approaches, thereby demonstrating the tangible benefits of our deep learning application in TGD identification.

The research pipeline we constructed, which includes a broad keyword list and multiple machine learning models, made a substantial contribution to the superb performance of gender identity detection. Across all metrics—F1 scores, accuracy, sensitivity, precision, PPV, and NPV—our methods excelled in both datasets compared to rule-based baselines. Algorithm evaluation across two datasets and two sub-analyses on patients without explicit sex and gender demographics demonstrated the superior accuracy of our machine learning-based algorithms. Moreover, they proved to be less vulnerable to gaps in sex and gender demographics, demonstrating their robustness in the face of data scarcity. Notably, the pipeline proved to be feasible and stable in classifying patient gender at the patient level, which is widely recognized as the most challenging level for prediction. Moreover, it is adaptable to note-, section-, or sentence-level predictions, although these levels require more labeling work. In doing so, our work helps to overcome a major barrier to EHR-based tools for population-level research and patient-level care, particularly given the large missing data in structured sex and gender fields. Specifically, these models could provide more complete information for downstream tasks that already rely on the gender fields, such as laboratories, rooming modules, preventative screening, population health programs, risk calculators and other applications. Future studies may compare patient-oriented outcomes in these areas using these models compared to current methods.

In addition to the Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD model, our experiments indicated that random forest and XG-Boost, using TF-IDF encoded text features as input, also performed reasonably well on Dataset I and the sub-analysis. While BERT models are generally considered state-of-the-art for text classification tasks, they may not always be the most practical solution due to their high computational requirements and the need for large amounts of training data. In contrast, random forest and XG-Boost have lower computational resource requirements and faster computation speeds, which make them more suitable for classifying large numbers of patients in the EHR database. Depending on the specific needs and available resources, these traditional machine learning models could be a suitable alternative to BERT.

Our literature review of TGD identification enabled us to detect and correct several inaccuracies in previous conventions. We removed terms and acronyms that could result in erroneous diagnoses from the literature-reported list, such as "MTF (male to female)", "identifies as", "body dysmorphia", and "bisexual". In our examination, "MTF" is often used to denote Military Treatment Facilities in clinical notes, while "identifies as" is commonly linked to religious convictions, and the last two terms are not strongly associated with TGD. Additionally, we observed that acronyms are typically employed after the full term has been introduced. Finally, we partitioned our keyword list into a primary and supplementary list, acknowledging that the supplementary list may lead to a high rate of false positives and emphasizing the importance of sufficient training data to differentiate between complementary keywords and definite indications of TGD. Together, these efforts support portability and generalizability.

The generalizability of deep learning models is largely limited due to Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) restrictions on sharing labeled patient-level data. To overcome this limitation, our method incorporates a partially reusable component, specifically the keyword extension for data denoising, which can be applied across different institutions. Furthermore, the model-building process in our approach is designed to be straightforward, allowing for easy implementation and adaptation in various healthcare settings. Lastly, our approach can be applied to other case identification and phenotyping tasks using her data.

5. LIMITATIONS

Our study has several limitations that need to be acknowledged. Firstly, the BioWordVec model used to generate TGD keywords was primarily trained on PubMed data and social media posts. As a result, it might be biased towards these data sources and may not capture a complete set of keywords used in clinical notes. This limitation could have affected the model's ability to accurately identify and classify TGD-related content in clinical notes. Secondly, our study relied on training and test sets from a single institution, which lacks external validity. Future research could benefit from utilizing larger and more diverse datasets collected from multiple institutions to improve the model's performance and validate it across different healthcare settings. Thirdly, our positive and negative samples were heterogeneous, potentially limiting the diversity of the final training set. This lack of diversity may have hindered the model's ability to fully understand all the keywords and concepts related to TGD. Our error analysis revealed that Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD was often confused with *hysterectomy* and *they/them*. This confusion may be attributed to the lack of training samples with the *they/them* keyword for the model to effectively learn the relationship between these pronouns and TGD, and that we excluded any keyword matches in the negative cohort to reduce labeling work. Finally, some patients did not have information in their notes that matched TGD-related information. We attempted to identify potentially relevant information using the trained *Bio_ClinicalBERT_TGD* model and a simple clustering pipeline in a previous framework [35]. However, it did not improve classification performance; more specifically designed techniques such as iteratively the most informative instances through semi-supervised learning should be investigated in future work.

6. CONCLUSION

We utilized machine learning-based NLP techniques that include both clinical notes and structured EHR data to identify gender identity. Better approaches to doing this will be helpful in addressing the needs of gender diverse populations. Future work should focus on addressing improving performance by incorporating additional diverse and representative data sources, increasing training and test set sizes, and ensuring balanced sample distribution models that are generalizable and actionable for the clinical domain.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Credit authorship contribution statement:

Yining Hua: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Methodology, Implementation, Formal analysis. Writing - Original Draft & Editing. **Liqin Wang**: Methodology, Writing - Original Draft, Supervision. **Vi Nguyen**: Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Meghan Rieu-Werden**: Data curation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Alex McDowell**: Data curation, Writing-Review & Editing. **David W. Bates**: Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision. **Dinah Foer**: Conceptualization, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Project administration. Funding acquisition. **Li Zhou**: Resources, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data sets used for training and evaluation in this study are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author, pending the necessary institutional reviews and approvals.

REFERENCES

[1] H.P. Crissman, M.B. Berger, L.F. Graham, V.K. Dalton, Transgender Demographics: A Household Probability Sample of US Adults, 2014, Am. J. Public Health. 107 (2017) 213–215. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303571.

[2] Q. Zhang, M. Goodman, N. Adams, T. Corneil, L. Hashemi, B. Kreukels, J. Motmans, R. Snyder, E. Coleman, Epidemiological considerations in transgender health: A systematic review with focus on higher quality data, Int. J. Transgender Health. 21 (2020) 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/26895269.2020.1753136.

[3] J. Rafferty, Committee on psychosocial aspects of child and family health, committee on adolescence, section on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender health and wellness, Ensuring Comprehensive Care and Support for Transgender and Gender-Diverse Children and Adolescents, Pediatrics. 142 (2018) e20182162. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2018-2162.

[4] C. Moloney, M. Allen, D.G. Power, R. M. Bambury, D. O'Mahony, D.M. O'Donnell, S. O'Reilly, D.C. Collins, Assessing the Quality of Care Delivered to Transgender and Gender Diverse Patients with Cancer in Ireland: A Case Series, The Oncologist. 26 (2021) e603–e607. https://doi.org/10.1002/onco.13618.

[5] C.A. Kronk, A.R. Everhart, F. Ashley, H.M. Thompson, T.E. Schall, T.G. Goetz, L. Hiatt, Z. Derrick, R. Queen, A. Ram, E.M. Guthman, O.M. Danforth, E. Lett, E. Potter, S.D. Sun, Z. Marshall, R. Karnoski, Transgender data collection in the electronic health record: Current concepts and issues, J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc. 29 (2022) 271–284. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocab136.

[6] N. Bates, M. Chin, T. Becker, eds., Measuring Sex, Gender Identity, and Sexual Orientation, National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., 2022. https://doi.org/10.17226/26424.

[7] Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Health Issues and Research Gaps and Opportunities, The Health of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People: Building a Foundation for Better Understanding, National Academies Press (US), Washington (DC), 2011. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK64806/ (accessed March 28, 2022).

[8] D. Foer, D.M. Rubins, A. Almazan, K. Chan, D.W. Bates, O.-P.R. Hamnvik, Challenges with Accuracy of Gender Fields in Identifying Transgender Patients in Electronic Health Records, J. Gen. Intern. Med. 35 (2020) 3724–3725. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-05567-6.

[9] H.M. Thompson, Stakeholder Experiences With Gender Identity Data Capture in Electronic Health Records: Implementation Effectiveness and a Visibility Paradox, Health Educ. Behav. 48 (2021) 93–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198120963102.

[10] D. Roblin, J. Barzilay, D. Tolsma, B. Robinson, L. Schild, L. Cromwell, H. Braun, R. Nash, J. Gerth, E. Hunkeler, V.P. Quinn, V. Tangpricha, M. Goodman, A Novel Method for Estimating Transgender Status Using Electronic Medical Records, Ann. Epidemiol. 26 (2016) 198–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2016.01.004.

[11] V.P. Quinn, R. Nash, E. Hunkeler, R. Contreras, L. Cromwell, T.A. Becerra-Culqui, D. Getahun, S. Giammattei, T.L. Lash, A. Millman, B. Robinson, D. Roblin, M.J. Silverberg, J. Slovis, V. Tangpricha, D. Tolsma, C. Valentine, K. Ward, S. Winter, M. Goodman, Cohort profile: Study of Transition, Outcomes and Gender (STRONG) to assess health status of transgender people, BMJ Open. 7 (2017) e018121. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018121.

[12] F. Xie, D. Getahun, V.P. Quinn, T.M. Im, R. Contreras, M.J. Silverberg, T.C. Baird, R. Nash, L. Cromwell, D. Roblin, T. Hoffman, M. Goodman, An automated algorithm using free-text clinical notes to improve identification of transgender people, Inform. Health Soc. Care. 46 (2021) 18–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/17538157.2020.1828890.

[13] J.R. Blosnich, J. Cashy, A.J. Gordon, J.C. Shipherd, M.R. Kauth, G.R. Brown, M.J. Fine, Using clinician text notes in electronic medical record data to validate transgender-related diagnosis codes, J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc. JAMIA. 25 (2018) 905–908. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocy022.

[14] Y. Guo, X. He, T. Lyu, H. Zhang, Y. Wu, X. Yang, Z. Chen, M.J. Markham, F. Modave, M. Xie, W. Hogan, C.A. Harle, E.A. Shenkman, J. Bian, Developing and Validating a Computable Phenotype for the Identification of Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Individuals and Subgroups, AMIA Annu. Symp. Proc. AMIA Symp. 2020 (2020) 514–523.

[15] T.G. Beltran, E. Lett, T. Poteat, J. Hincapie-Castillo, The Use of Computational Phenotypes within Electronic Healthcare Data to Identify Transgender People in the United States: A Narrative Review, Authorea. (2023). https://doi.org/DOI: 10.22541/au.167886006.60405995/v1.

[16] B. Shickel, P.J. Tighe, A. Bihorac, P. Rashidi, Deep EHR: A Survey of Recent Advances in Deep Learning Techniques for Electronic Health Record (EHR) Analysis, IEEE J. Biomed. Health Inform. 22 (2018) 1589–1604. https://doi.org/10.1109/JBHI.2017.2767063.

[17] A. Esteva, A. Robicquet, B. Ramsundar, V. Kuleshov, M. DePristo, K. Chou, C. Cui, G. Corrado, S. Thrun, J. Dean, A guide to deep learning in healthcare, Nat. Med. 25 (2019) 24–29. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0316-z.

[18] D. Ravì, C. Wong, F. Deligianni, M. Berthelot, J. Andreu-Perez, B. Lo, G.-Z. Yang, Deep Learning for Health Informatics, IEEE J. Biomed. Health Inform. 21 (2017) 4–21. https://doi.org/10.1109/JBHI.2016.2636665.

[19] O. Faust, Y. Hagiwara, T.J. Hong, O.S. Lih, U.R. Acharya, Deep learning for healthcare applications based on physiological signals: A review, Comput. Methods Programs Biomed. 161 (2018) 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2018.04.005.

[20] V. Sorin, Y. Barash, E. Konen, E. Klang, Deep Learning for Natural Language Processing in Radiology—Fundamentals and a Systematic Review, J. Am. Coll. Radiol. 17 (2020) 639–648. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2019.12.026.

[21] Z. Zeng, Y. Deng, X. Li, T. Naumann, Y. Luo, Natural Language Processing for EHR-Based Computational Phenotyping, IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform. 16 (2019) 139–153. https://doi.org/10.1109/TCBB.2018.2849968.

[22] S. Wu, K. Roberts, S. Datta, J. Du, Z. Ji, Y. Si, S. Soni, Q. Wang, Q. Wei, Y. Xiang, B. Zhao, H. Xu, Deep learning in clinical natural language processing: a methodical review, J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc. 27 (2020) 457–470. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz200.

[23] C. Xiao, E. Choi, J. Sun, Opportunities and challenges in developing deep learning models using electronic health records data: a systematic review, J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc. 25 (2018) 1419–1428. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocy068.

[24] R. Miotto, F. Wang, S. Wang, X. Jiang, J.T. Dudley, Deep learning for healthcare: review, opportunities and challenges, Brief. Bioinform. 19 (2018) 1236–1246. https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbx044.

[25] J.R. Ayala Solares, F.E. Diletta Raimondi, Y. Zhu, F. Rahimian, D. Canoy, J. Tran, A.C. Pinho Gomes, A.H. Payberah, M. Zottoli, M. Nazarzadeh, N. Conrad, K. Rahimi, G. Salimi-Khorshidi, Deep learning for electronic health records: A comparative review of multiple deep neural architectures, J. Biomed. Inform. 101 (2020) 103337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103337.

[26] F. Xie, H. Yuan, Y. Ning, M.E.H. Ong, M. Feng, W. Hsu, B. Chakraborty, N. Liu, Deep learning for temporal data representation in electronic health records: A systematic review of challenges

and methodologies, J. Biomed. Inform. 126 (2022) 103980. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2021.103980.

[27] L. Wang, L. Sha, J.R. Lakin, J. Bynum, D.W. Bates, P. Hong, L. Zhou, Development and Validation of a Deep Learning Algorithm for Mortality Prediction in Selecting Patients With Dementia for Earlier Palliative Care Interventions, JAMA Netw. Open. 2 (2019) e196972. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.6972.

[28] Y. Zhang, Q. Chen, Z. Yang, H. Lin, Z. Lu, BioWordVec, improving biomedical word embeddings with subword information and MeSH, Sci. Data. 6 (2019) 52. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-019-0055-0.

[29] M. Tat, Trans-NLP-Project, (2022). https://github.com/mjtat/Trans-NLP-Project (accessed September 28, 2022).

[30] M. Li, Y. Hua, Y. Liao, L. Zhou, X. Li, L. Wang, J. Yang, Tracking the Impact of COVID-19 and Lockdown Policies on Public Mental Health Using Social Media: Infoveillance Study, J. Med. Internet Res. 24 (2022) e39676. https://doi.org/10.2196/39676.

[31] E. Alsentzer, J. Murphy, W. Boag, W.-H. Weng, D. Jindi, T. Naumann, M. McDermott, Publicly Available Clinical BERT Embeddings, in: Proc. 2nd Clin. Nat. Lang. Process. Workshop, Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, 2019: pp. 72–78. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-1909.

[32] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, K. Toutanova, BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding, ArXiv181004805 Cs. (2019). http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805 (accessed April 20, 2022).

[33] A. Berger, J. Lafferty, Information Retrieval as Statistical Translation, in: Proc. 1999 ACM SIGIR Conf. Res. Dev. Inf. Retr., 1999: pp. 222–229.

[34] R. Juan, Using TF-IDF to Determine Word Relevance in Document Queries, Proc. First Instr. Conf. Mach. Learn. 242 (2003). https://doi.org/10.22214/IJRASET.2021.33625.

[35] Y. Hua, H. Jiang, S. Lin, J. Yang, J.M. Plasek, D.W. Bates, L. Zhou, Using Twitter Data to Understand Public Perceptions of Approved versus Off-label Use for COVID-19-related Medications, J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc. (2022) ocac114. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocac114.

A. Appendices

A.1. Study terminology*

Transgender and Gender Diverse (TGD)

Persons who have a gender identity that differs from the sex that they were assigned at birth, including transgender and gender fluid. In this study, persons who are not sure about their gender identities are included in the term "gender non-binary," among TGD persons.

Sex and Gender Demographics Fields (Appendix B)

Refers to patient sex information and gender information. In the EHR system studied, sex and gender demographics fields consist of three subfields: (1) sex assigned at birth, (2) legal sex, and (3) gender identity. Sex at birth refers to the sex an individual was assigned at birth. Legal sex refers to the registered or administrative sex. Gender identity refers to an individual's recorded gender identity. Legal Sex is a required field for patient registration; the other two fields are optional and may be patient-, provider-, or administratively recorded. Field values for each term are detailed in Appendix A.

Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI)

An umbrella term that includes EHR-based demographic information related to sexual orientation as well as gender and sex demographics. Sexual orientation is not a required field and is not assumed to be correlated with sex and gender demographics. This study does not examine sexual orientation data.

*Terminology can be fluid and may vary across patients and change over time. This study used cross-sectional data and therefore reflects a single data point for each participant.

A.2. Sex and gender demographics fields in the EHR system

Gender (Legal Sex)	Female
	Male
	Unknown
	X (Non-Binary)*
Gender Identity	Chose not to disclose
	Female
	Male
	Non-binary*
	Other*
	Queer/Genderqueer*
	Questioning/Unsure*
	Transgender Female (Male-to-Female)*
	Transgender Male (Female-to-Male)*
	Unknown
Sex at Birth	Chose not to disclose
	Female
	Male
	Uncertain*
	Unknown

*Structured values considered as TGD, if available. Patient with a field value of "chose not to disclose" for gender identity or sex at birth were excluded from the study. "Unknown" was not considered a TGD indication because it does not contain determinant information. Terminology reflects the field options in the EHR at the time of data entry.


Development of the idenfication keyword list and classification model
Expert-curated & literature-derived keyword curation
Keyword expansion
Fine-tuned BioWordVec
Patient EHR data
Data Preparation
Dataset I
Dataset II
Model Development
Model Evalutation
Classification model
Potential application
Expanded keywords
Patient EHR data
Information extraction
Relevant notes & codes
Classification model
Prediction
Is the patient TGD? (Yes/No)


2. Cohort development
1. Keyword augmentation
Literature-reported keyword list
Expert-curated keyword list
TGD self-narrative corpus
BioWordVec
Keyword expansion & post-processing
Expanded keyword list
EHR Screening Cohort
Mention of keywords / gender indication?
Yes
No
Potential non-TGD patients
Potential TGD patients
Randomly sample by year & Chart review
Randomly sample by year
Clinician-confirmed TGD patients (n = 1575)
Non-TGD patients (n = 1575)
Dataset I (n = 3150)
Dataset II (n = 200)
Feature Engineering
Model Development
Model Evalutation
3. Patient Identification


Missing information
Keyword "oophorectomy"
Keyword "hysterectomy" and "oophorectomy"
Confusing or contradictory information
77.8%
12.5%
2.8%
6.8%


Keyword "thesythom"
Other mentions of premature
Keyword "hysterectomy"
50.0%