Among microaggressions identified by SPs (Fig. 3), misgendering was the most common, especially after the interview. 77% (n=20) of facilitators had received training on transgender patient care prior to the case. Most students felt "well" or "very well-prepared" to care for gender-diverse patients after the case (Fig. 4).

**Results**

**Student Feedback (n=70)**
- 79% (n=55) of medical students responded to the post-case survey; 69% interviewed the SP.
- 91% rated transgender/nonbinary patient care as "important" or "very important" (Fig. 2) and 98% believed the case was a plausible scenario.
- Most students felt "well" or "very well-prepared" to care for gender-diverse patients after the case (Fig. 4).

**Facilitator Feedback (n=30)**
- 77% (n=20) of facilitators had received training on transgender patient care prior to the case.
- 92% believed that the case should be used in future interviewing courses, but 97% rated transgender/nonbinary patient care as "not at all important" or "not important" to medical school training (Fig. 2).

**Student Feedback (n=70)**
- 91% of interviewers successfully obtained a gender history; 71% assessed the patient's personal transition choices (e.g. surgery).
- 93% of interviewers believed that the case was a plausible scenario.
- 79% of students observed that the case effectively prepared them to care for gender-diverse patients.

**SP Feedback (n=30)**
- 93% of interviewers successfully obtained a gender history; 71% assessed the patient's personal transition choices (e.g. surgery).
- Assumptions made about the patient's gender affirming therapy (39%) and transition choices (20%) were common.

**Conclusion**

Students and faculty believed the case effectively prepared students to care for gender-diverse patients, but misgendering and other microaggressions reported by SPs demonstrate the need for continued innovation in teaching gender-diverse patient care.