AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

MEDICAL GASLIGHTING: WHY FEMALE PATIENTS DIE YOUNGER

Md Shamshad
Medical Student, Samarkand state medical university, Uzbekistan,mshamshad4616@gmail.com
Sujaat ali
Medical Student, Samarkand state medical university, Uzbekistan
Sujaatali9639@gmail.com
S. dK.Jannathul firoze
Medical Student, Samarkand state medical university,Uzbekistan,jannathulfirdoze388@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20176231

Abstract

Medical gaslighting—the systematic dismissal, minimization, or psychologization of women's physical symptoms within healthcare settings—represents one of the most insidious forms of gender inequality in modern medicine. While women globally demonstrate a survival advantage over men in overall life expectancy, this metric masks a devastating paradox: women spend significantly more years living with chronic illness, disability, and undiagnosed disease. This narrative review examines the empirical evidence linking gender bias in clinical diagnosis and treatment to delayed care, misdiagnosis, and excess mortality among female patients. Drawing upon recent survey data, peer-reviewed literature, and epidemiological analyses, we demonstrate that women face disproportionate rates of diagnostic delay across more than 700 pathologies, experience longer wait times for pain management, and receive less aggressive intervention for cardiovascular events. The article traces the historical roots of medical gaslighting from the legacy of "hysteria" to contemporary clinical practice, analyzes the mortality implications of delayed diagnosis in cardiology, autoimmune disease, and chronic pain, and examines how the underrepresentation of women in medical research perpetuates these disparities. We argue that medical gaslighting is not merely a communication failure but a structural determinant of premature mortality. The review concludes with evidence-based recommendations for systemic reform, including sex-specific diagnostic protocols, implicit bias training, and mandatory sex-disaggregated outcome reporting. Addressing these inequities is essential not only for ethical clinical practice but for reducing preventable deaths among female patients worldwide.

Keywords:

Medical gaslighting, gender bias, diagnostic delay, female mortality, healthcare disparities, Yentl syndrome, cardiovascular disease, endometriosis, chronic pain, clinical trials

Introduction

In the spring of 2024, Rylie Toomey, a young woman experiencing severe abdominal pain, drove herself to her local emergency department seeking answers. Imaging was performed, yet clinicians dismissed her symptoms as constipation and sent her home. This scenario repeated over several months until she returned screaming in agony, at which point advanced imaging revealed perforated bowel and metastatic colon cancer—an outcome that months of dismissal had rendered irreversible. Toomey's story is not an anomaly. It is emblematic of a systemic crisis

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

in which women's pain, symptoms, and bodily knowledge are routinely invalidated by the very institutions sworn to heal them.

The term "medical gaslighting" has entered popular discourse to describe this phenomenon: the process by which healthcare providers dismiss, minimize, or attribute physical symptoms to psychological causes, leaving patients doubting their own perceptions and delaying critical care. While the concept resonates with millions of women, its consequences extend far beyond psychological distress. Emerging evidence suggests that gender bias in medicine is literally shortening women's lives—or, more precisely, depriving them of the healthy life years that their longer overall survival might otherwise suggest.

The statistics are staggering. A 2022 Kaiser Family Foundation survey found that 29% of women aged 18–64 reported having their concerns dismissed by a doctor, compared to 21% of men. Fifteen percent of women said a provider did not believe they were telling the truth, and 38% experienced at least one negative interaction during healthcare visits. More recent surveys suggest the problem is worsening: a 2025 study of 900 women aged 25–34 found that 93% reported feeling dismissed when seeking medical help, with over 40% visiting multiple providers before receiving a diagnosis.

These dismissals are not merely hurtful; they are deadly. Women are approximately 66% more likely to receive a medical misdiagnosis than men. They wait an average of 65 minutes for analgesia in emergency settings compared to 49 minutes for men presenting with similar acute pain. For conditions ranging from cardiovascular disease to autoimmune disorders, women face diagnostic delays that allow disease to progress from treatable to life-threatening. The result is what researchers have termed the "male-female health-survival paradox": women live longer than men, yet spend those additional years burdened by chronic disease, disability, and the long-term sequelae of missed diagnoses.

This article examines the mechanisms, manifestations, and mortality implications of medical gaslighting. We trace how historical biases embedded in medical education and research continue to shape clinical decision-making, explore the specific disease contexts where gender bias proves most lethal, and argue that addressing these disparities requires fundamental restructuring of how medicine understands, researches, and treats the female body.

The Anatomy of Medical Gaslighting

Medical gaslighting operates through several interconnected mechanisms that collectively diminish the credibility of female patients and delay appropriate care. Understanding these mechanisms is essential for recognizing how individual clinical encounters translate into population-level mortality disparities.

The Legacy of Hysteria and Psychologization

The roots of medical gaslighting extend deep into medical history. For centuries, women's symptoms were attributed to "hysteria"—a diagnosis derived from the Greek word for uterus that pathologized the female body itself. While the terminology has evolved, the underlying impulse persists. Today, women presenting with complex or multisystem symptoms are frequently diagnosed with anxiety, depression, or somatic symptom disorders before organic causes are excluded.

This psychologization disproportionately affects young women. Research indicates that the threshold for assigning "functional," "somatic," or "medically unexplained" labels is significantly lower for female patients than for males presenting with identical complaints. Chronic pelvic pain, abdominal discomfort, and musculoskeletal complaints may be attributed to stress or irritable bowel syndrome without systematic evaluation for endometriosis, inflammatory bowel disease, or other organic pathologies. Once a psychosomatic narrative is established in a patient's

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

chart, subsequent clinicians often interpret new symptoms through this lens, creating a cascade of diagnostic neglect.

The Credibility Deficit

Women's reports of pain are systematically downplayed across clinical contexts. Experimental and clinical studies demonstrate that women's pain is more likely to be considered exaggerated or emotionally driven compared to men's reports of similar intensity. This credibility deficit manifests in tangible treatment differences: women receive less effective pain relief, fewer opioids, more sedatives and antidepressants, and more frequent referrals to psychiatry rather than thorough diagnostic workups.

The consequences of this credibility gap are particularly acute for women of color and those from marginalized communities. Black women report higher rates of having their truthfulness questioned by providers, and intersectional biases compound the dismissive treatment experienced by women with disabilities, low incomes, or limited English proficiency. The result is a tiered system of medical credibility in which white men's symptoms are treated as objective facts while women's symptoms are treated as subjective interpretations requiring verification.

Diagnostic Criteria Built on Male Bodies

Perhaps the most fundamental driver of medical gaslighting is the historical construction of medical knowledge around male physiology. For decades, medical research excluded women—particularly those of childbearing age—from clinical trials, ostensibly to protect them from potential harm. The result is a body of medical evidence derived predominantly from male animals, male cells, and male patients, which is then generalized to female bodies that differ in metabolism, symptom presentation, and disease trajectory.

Cardiovascular disease provides the most lethal example. The classic "Hollywood heart attack"—crushing chest pain radiating down the left arm—represents the male pattern of acute coronary syndrome. Women, particularly young women, more commonly present with dyspnea, fatigue, nausea, jaw pain, and abdominal discomfort. Because these symptoms do not match male-centric diagnostic criteria, women are less likely to receive timely electrocardiography, biomarker testing, or cardiology consultation. They are more likely to be discharged from emergency departments while actively experiencing myocardial infarction—a phenomenon so well-documented that cardiologists have named it the "Yentl syndrome," after the protagonist who had to disguise herself as a man to be taken seriously.

The Data: Quantifying the Crisis

The disparities in medical treatment between men and women are not anecdotal; they are measurable, reproducible, and statistically significant across virtually every domain of healthcare. The following tables synthesize key findings from recent peer-reviewed literature and large-scale surveys.

Table 1: Gender Disparities in Patient-Provider Interactions

Negative Experience	Women (%)	Men (%)	Source Year
Doctor dismissed concerns	29	21	2022
Provider did not believe patient	15	12	2022
Provider assumed something without asking	19	16	2022
Felt treated	17	6	2019

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

differently due to gender			
Any negative interaction	38	32	2022
Felt dismissed when seeking help	93	—	2025

Sources: Kaiser Family Foundation Women's Health Survey; FemTech World Survey

The data reveal a consistent pattern: women are significantly more likely to experience invalidating interactions across all measured categories. The 93% dismissal rate reported in the 2025 survey of young women represents a crisis of confidence in the medical system among the very demographic that will rely upon it for decades.

Table 2: Diagnostic Delay and Misdiagnosis by Condition

Condition	Women's Diagnostic Delay	Consequence
Endometriosis	9 years average (UK)	Chronic pain, infertility, organ damage
Heart attack	50% more likely misdiagnosed	Higher mortality, especially under age 50
Autoimmune disorders	2.5–4.5 years longer than men	Irreversible organ damage, disability
Cancer (overall)	2.5 years longer than men	Advanced staging, reduced survival
Diabetes	4.5 years longer than men	Complications, cardiovascular damage

Sources: Endometriosis UK; Cureus; Dr. Aliabadi; University of Alicante

These delays are not benign inconveniences. In inflammatory demyelinating conditions such as multiple sclerosis, early recognition and treatment are associated with improved neurological outcomes, while prolonged inflammatory activity increases the risk of permanent disability. In cardiovascular disease, every minute of delay in reperfusion therapy increases myocardial damage and mortality risk.

Table 3: Pain Management Disparities in Emergency Settings

Metric	Women	Men	Disparity
Average wait time for analgesia (acute pain)	65 minutes	49 minutes	+33% longer
Likelihood of receiving opioid analgesics	Lower	Higher	Significant
Likelihood of receiving sedatives/antidepressants	Higher	Lower	Significant
Representation in pain research	~20%	~80%	4:1 male bias

Sources: PMC Gendered Pain; Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

The underrepresentation of women in pain research creates a self-reinforcing cycle: because pain studies rely primarily on male subjects, clinical guidelines reflect male patterns of pain perception and response, leading to inadequate assessment and treatment of women's pain, which is then dismissed as atypical or exaggerated.

Case Studies in Systemic Failure

To understand how medical gaslighting translates into excess mortality, it is instructive to examine specific disease contexts where gender bias has been most thoroughly documented.

Cardiovascular Disease: The Yentl Syndrome

Cardiovascular disease has traditionally been conceptualized as a male condition, with classic teaching centered on middle-aged men presenting with exertional chest pain. This historical framing has contributed to systematic under-recognition of ischemic heart disease in women, with lethal consequences.

Young women with myocardial infarction face a twofold higher mortality rate compared to age-matched men—a disparity that widens as women age. More than half of women who present to hospitals with heart attacks report that their healthcare provider did not recognize their symptoms as cardiac-related, compared to less than 40% of men. Women are less likely to receive thrombolysis, angioplasty, or coronary artery bypass grafting, and when these interventions are provided, they occur after longer delays.

The symptom presentation in women is genuinely different. Women experiencing acute coronary syndromes more commonly report fatigue, nausea, jaw pain, back pain, and abdominal discomfort rather than classic chest pain. These "atypical" symptoms are not actually atypical for women; they are the typical female presentation of cardiac ischemia. However, because diagnostic algorithms and clinical instincts were developed using male cohorts, these presentations are misinterpreted as indigestion, anxiety, or musculoskeletal pain.

Endometriosis and Chronic Pelvic Pain

Endometriosis affects approximately 10% of women in reproductive age, yet the average diagnostic delay in the United Kingdom currently stands at nine years—an increase from previous decades. Most women visit their general practitioner more than five times before receiving a diagnosis, and half seek care in emergency departments, often encountering dismissive attitudes.

The normalization of menstrual suffering plays a central role in this delay. In a UK survey of over 110,000 women, 50% felt their pain was disregarded or overlooked, frequently accompanied by the message that certain symptoms were simply natural aspects of womanhood that did not merit medical attention. Women reported being left unattended to bleed for hours after miscarriage and sent home with paracetamol, while others endured years of severe pain from endometriosis or fibroids only to be told their suffering was "all in their head."

The mortality implications of endometriosis extend beyond the condition itself. Chronic inflammation, delayed diagnosis, and inadequate pain management contribute to cardiovascular risk, mental health deterioration, and reduced life expectancy. The psychologization of endometriosis symptoms also delays recognition of related conditions, including ovarian cancer and adhesive disease.

Autoimmune Disorders: The Invisible Epidemic

Autoimmune diseases disproportionately affect women, with conditions such as systemic lupus erythematosus, rheumatoid arthritis, and thyroid autoimmune disorders showing female-to-male ratios ranging from 3:1 to 9:1. Despite this epidemiological reality, women with early autoimmune symptoms face prolonged diagnostic pathways marked by misinterpretation and psychologization.

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

Early symptoms—including fatigue, joint pain, rashes, and cognitive dysfunction—are frequently attributed to stress, depression, or hormonal fluctuations. Women with optic neuritis or sensory disturbances may be diagnosed with migraine or functional neurological disorders before receiving appropriate neuroimaging. The diagnostic delay is clinically significant: in systemic lupus, early intervention with immunosuppressive therapy can prevent irreversible renal damage and cardiovascular complications, yet the average time from symptom onset to diagnosis remains years.

The Pain Paradox

Chronic pain affects approximately 70% of women at some point in their lives, yet 80% of pain studies use male subjects. This research gap has tangible clinical consequences. Women reporting chronic pain are more likely to be prescribed sedatives, anxiolytics, and antidepressants rather than analgesics or disease-modifying treatments. They are more frequently referred to psychiatry and less frequently offered interventional pain procedures or specialist referral.

The gender bias in pain management reflects deeper cultural assumptions about women's pain tolerance and pain expression. Societal expectations regarding women's endurance of menstrual, obstetric, and domestic suffering create a framework in which women's pain is simultaneously expected and dismissed. When a woman reports pain that exceeds these normalized expectations, her report is often interpreted as hysteria or drug-seeking behavior rather than a legitimate medical complaint.

The Mortality Connection

The ultimate measure of medical gaslighting's harm lies not in survey percentages or wait times, but in deaths—premature, preventable, and disproportionately female.

The Health-Survival Paradox

Demographers have long documented the "male-female health-survival paradox": women live longer than men but spend those additional years in poorer health. While men's higher mortality is driven by acute, lethal conditions such as cardiovascular disease, accidents, and suicide, women's excess morbidity manifests as chronic, disabling conditions including autoimmune disease, chronic pain, and degenerative disorders.

Recent analyses of healthy life expectancy reveal the complexity beneath this paradox. While women in most developed countries show a 3–5 year advantage in disability-free life expectancy, this advantage is entirely attributable to lower mortality rates rather than better health. When chronic disease-free life expectancy is examined, women are actually disadvantaged in most countries, experiencing fewer years free from conditions such as arthritis, cancer, diabetes, and heart disease.

This paradox is not biologically inevitable; it is partially manufactured by a healthcare system that fails to diagnose and treat women's diseases in their early, curable stages. When women are dismissed for years with endometriosis, autoimmune disease, or atypical cardiac symptoms, their conditions progress to chronic, irreversible states that diminish both lifespan and healthspan.

The Physician Mortality Puzzle

Perhaps the most striking evidence that medical gaslighting reflects systemic rather than individual bias comes from recent mortality data on women physicians. Despite the general population pattern in which women live approximately five years longer than men, women physicians show no mortality advantage over their male colleagues. In fact, Black women physicians experience the highest mortality rates among all doctors.

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

This finding is remarkable because women physicians share with their male colleagues the same education, income, and access to healthcare—factors that typically explain mortality differences. The loss of women's usual longevity advantage within medicine suggests that the stresses, biases, and structural inequities of the medical profession uniquely harm women. Women physicians report higher rates of burnout, take on greater home responsibilities, experience more sexual harassment, receive lower compensation, and are more likely to work part-time or leave medicine entirely. The implication is clear: when women enter a system built on male norms, even their biological survival advantage can be erased.

Excess Mortality by Condition

The mortality toll of gender bias is condition-specific but follows consistent patterns. In cardiovascular disease, women under 50 who experience myocardial infarction have twice the mortality of age-matched men—a disparity attributed primarily to delayed recognition and treatment. In stroke, women are less likely to receive thrombolysis and more likely to be discharged to institutional care rather than home. In cancer, the 2.5-year diagnostic delay for women means more advanced staging at diagnosis and reduced five-year survival rates.

The COVID-19 pandemic illuminated these disparities in stark relief. Women were more likely to experience long COVID symptoms, yet also more likely to have those symptoms dismissed or attributed to anxiety. The dismissal of women's post-viral symptoms delayed access to multidisciplinary care and rehabilitation, contributing to prolonged disability.

Why the System Fails

Understanding the mechanisms of medical gaslighting requires examining the structural foundations that perpetuate it.

The Research Gap

Historically, women were excluded from clinical trials based on concerns about fertility and pregnancy, and because researchers believed that fluctuating hormones introduced unacceptable variability. The consequence is that much of pharmacology, surgery, and diagnostic medicine was developed using male bodies as the default human template. Even when both sexes are included in studies, only 42% of meta-analyses actually analyze data separately by sex.

This research gap means that drug dosages, surgical techniques, and diagnostic thresholds may be inappropriate for female physiology. Women taking cardiovascular medication are 2–2.5 times more likely to suffer adverse drug reactions than men on equivalent doses, yet dosing guidelines rarely account for sex differences in metabolism and body composition.

Medical Education and Implicit Bias

Medical curricula have historically taught that male and female physiology differ only in reproductive organs. This assumption—now known to be profoundly inaccurate—means that generations of physicians were trained to recognize disease patterns as they present in men, while considering female presentations "atypical" or "unusual."

Implicit bias testing reveals that healthcare providers, like the general population, hold unconscious associations linking men with objective reasoning and women with emotional instability. These biases influence clinical decision-making even when providers consciously endorse egalitarian values. When a woman presents with chest pain, the clinician's automatic associations may trigger questions about stress or anxiety before triggering cardiac workups.

The "Good Patient" Trap

Socialization pressures also contribute to medical gaslighting. Women are often socialized to be accommodating, uncomplaining, and deferential to authority—qualities that are rewarded in many social contexts but dangerous in medical encounters. Women who advocate forcefully for themselves may be labeled difficult, demanding, or hysterical, while women who remain

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

polite and stoic may have their symptoms minimized. This double bind means that regardless of how women present their symptoms, they face heightened risk of dismissal.

Conclusion

Medical gaslighting is not a collection of isolated incidents or insensitive physicians. It is a structural feature of healthcare systems built upon male bodies, male symptoms, and male norms. The data are unambiguous: women are dismissed more frequently, diagnosed later, treated less aggressively, and prescribed less effectively than men across virtually every domain of medicine. These disparities are measurable in years of diagnostic delay, in rates of irreversible organ damage, and ultimately in lives lost.

The mortality implications of medical gaslighting challenge the simplistic narrative that women's longer life expectancy represents healthcare success. Women live longer than men not because medicine serves them well, but because biology grants them a baseline survival advantage that medical systems then erode through neglect. The years that women gain are too often years of chronic pain, untreated autoimmune inflammation, and the slow progression of cancers that were identified too late. The health-survival paradox is not a mystery to be solved; it is an injustice to be remedied.

Addressing this crisis requires multifaceted intervention. Medical education must incorporate sex- and gender-specific symptomatology as core curriculum, not elective specialty knowledge. Clinical trials must mandate sex-disaggregated analysis and achieve equitable female representation. Diagnostic algorithms must be revised to recognize female-typical presentations of common diseases as equally valid to male-typical patterns. Healthcare systems must implement audit-and-feedback mechanisms that track diagnostic intervals, investigation rates, and treatment outcomes by sex, identifying services where women are systematically under-investigated.

Most fundamentally, medicine must abandon the default male model and embrace what researchers call "sex- and gender-based medicine"—an approach that recognizes biological sex and social gender as critical variables in every aspect of health and disease. Until this transformation occurs, women will continue to die younger than they should—not from the diseases themselves, but from a system that refuses to believe them until it is too late.

The path forward is clear. The only question is whether healthcare systems possess the will to walk it.

References

1. Kaiser Family Foundation. Women's Experiences with Provider Communication and Interactions in Health Care Settings: Findings from the 2022 KFF Women's Health Survey. February 2023.
2. FemTech World. "93% of women feel dismissed when seeking medical help, new survey reveals." March 2025.
3. Endo Excision for All. "Why Women Are Dismissed in Healthcare." August 2025.
4. Psychology Today. "She's Not Imagining It: The Continuing Medical Dismissal of Women." July 2025.
5. PMC. "Gendered pain: a call for recognition and health equity." March 2024.
6. Endometriosis UK. Diagnostic Delay Survey. March 2024.
7. PMC. "Gender Bias and Diagnostic Delays in Young Women." 2025.
8. Frontiers in Health Services. "Medical gaslighting: navigating patient-clinician mistrust in healthcare." 2025.

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 6. No 05. MAY ,2026

9. Duke Health. "Recognizing, Addressing Unintended Gender Bias in Patient Care." January 2020.
10. University of Alicante. Perspectiva de género en medicina (Gender perspective in medicine). Dr. Antoni Esteve Foundation.
11. PMC. "Sex Inequalities in Medical Research: A Systematic Scoping Review of the Literature."
12. PMC. "The Yentl Syndrome: A Case Report."
13. PMC. "Coronary artery disease in women: From the yentl syndrome to contemporary treatment."
14. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. "Patient-physician gender concordance and increased mortality among female heart attack patients." 2018.
15. AAMC. "Women tend to live longer than men. But not in medicine." July 2025.
16. TIME Magazine. "Women Live Longer Than Men—But Not in Medicine." March 2025.
17. PMC. "Gender gaps in healthy life expectancy as indicators of health inequality."
18. PMC. "The Gender Gap in Life Expectancy in the United States and Deaths of Despair: Trends from 1979 to 2022."
19. OECD. Gender Equality in a Changing World. September 2025.
20. Sacred Heart University. "Gender Bias in Healthcare: The Role of Nurses." January 2025.
21. Dr. Aliabadi. "Gender Bias in Healthcare: Do Women Receive Worse Care?" April 2026.
22. Northwell Health. "Gaslighting in women's health: when doctors dismiss symptoms."
23. Circulation. "Sex Differences in the Presentation and Perception of Symptoms Among Young Patients With Myocardial Infarction." February 2018.
24. Translational Gastroenterology and Hepatology. "We didn't start the fire...or did we?—a narrative review of medical gaslighting and introduction to medical invalidation." 2024.
25. JAMA Network Open. "Experiences of care and gaslighting in patients with vulvovaginal disorders." 2025.

Word count: Approximately 4,050 words