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1) The definition of transgender is problematic: saying that gender differs from sex presumes that they should be related: this is a form of cisgenderism. Better to say 'gender different to that normatively expected on the basis of assigned sex'
2) Same with the definition of cisgender: saying that sex and gender 'align' is a form of cisgenderism
3) It isn't really true that trans focused research is new. What is new is affirming research
4) I wouldn't use the term gender incongruence without scare quotes
6) 'Preferred gender' is problematic - do we refer to cisgender people's 'preferred gender'?
8) Also in terms of research on violence, there is UK research, including on DV, which i think should be included in the section (ie violence isn't just institutional): Ellis, S. J., Bailey, L., & McNeil, J. (2016). Transphobic victimisation and perceptions of future risk: a large-scale study of the experiences of trans people in the UK. Psychology & Sexuality, 7(3), 211-224 and Rogers, M. (2017). Transphobic 'honour'-based abuse: A conceptual tool. Sociology, 51(2), 225-240. (plus multiple other papers by Rogers)
11) I would also acknowledge existing training that exists and is available so the reader knows where to turn. For example: https://aelp.smartsparrow.com/v/open/f3xc2ipc
12) Both transphobia and cisnormativity are used in the paper. The authors needs to be clear for the reader about the relationship between the two.
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