

# Sexual Minority Disparities in Health and Well-Being as a Consequence of the COVID-19 Pandemic Differ by Sexual Identity

Jessica N. Fish, PhD<sup>1,\*</sup> John Salerno, MPH<sup>2,‡</sup> Natasha D. Williams, MS<sup>1</sup> R. Gordon Rinderknecht, PhD<sup>3,†</sup>  
Kelsey J. Drotning, MA<sup>4</sup> Liana Sayer, PhD<sup>4</sup> and Long Doan, PhD<sup>4,#</sup>

## Abstract

**Purpose:** The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has accentuated long-standing population health disparities in the United States. We examined how the pandemic and its social consequences may differentially impact sexual minority adults, relative to heterosexual adults.

**Methods:** Data are from a U.S. national sample of adults ( $n = 2996$ ; 18.06%) collected from online panels from April to May 2020. We used eight indicators of well-being—mental health, physical health, quality of life, stress, loneliness, psychological distress, alcohol use, and fatigue—to assess the degree to which sexual identity subgroups (i.e., heterosexual, gay/lesbian, bisexual, and “other” sexual minority) varied in retrospective pre- and postpandemic onset indicators of well-being and whether groups varied in their rate of change from pre- and postpandemic onset.

**Results:** The results showed consistent patterns of decline in well-being across sexual identity subgroups, although changes in mental health, physical health, quality of life, stress, and psychological distress were more robust among sexual minority adults in general, relative to heterosexual adults. Adjusted multivariate models testing differences in change in retrospective pre- and postpandemic onset found that well-being among bisexual men and women was most negatively impacted by the pandemic.

**Conclusion:** The COVID-19 pandemic may have distinct health consequences for sexual minority adults in the United States. Our findings support and further legitimize calls for more comprehensive surveillance and cultural responsiveness in emergency preparedness as it relates to sexual minority people and the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Keywords:** coronavirus, COVID-19, health disparities, LGB, mental health, sexual minority

## Introduction

THE CORONAVIRUS DISEASE 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has impacted the lives of millions across the United States, including more than 27 million positive cases and 500,000 deaths.<sup>1</sup> Recent data also demonstrate that COVID-19 has led to a sequelae of factors impacting the mental health of the U.S. population,<sup>2–4</sup> including increased substance use, suicidal ideation, anxiety, and depression.<sup>5–7</sup> Emerging research shows the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on the health and mental health of racial and ethnic minority

populations, as well as other socially disadvantaged populations (e.g., rural and low socioeconomic status populations).<sup>5,8,9</sup> However, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on sexual minority (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, and other nonheterosexual) youth and adults has garnered much less public and empirical attention.<sup>10–13</sup>

Sexual orientation disparities in health and well-being are well established, including anxiety, depression, suicidality, substance use disorder, sleep, and chronic health conditions.<sup>14–19</sup> These disparities are empirically linked to experiences with minority stressors (e.g., stigma, discrimination,

Departments of <sup>1</sup>Family Science and <sup>2</sup>Behavioral and Community Health, School of Public Health, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, USA.

<sup>3</sup>Laboratory of Digital and Computational Demography, Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, Germany.

<sup>4</sup>Department of Sociology, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, USA.

\*ORCID ID (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9280-6156>).

†ORCID ID (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5917-406X>).

‡ORCID ID (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3454-7472>).

#ORCID ID (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9875-1037>).

and rejection).<sup>19–24</sup> Sexual minority populations also face a disproportionate burden of social inequalities, including poverty, unstable housing, unemployment, and lack of access to health insurance and health care.<sup>25–27</sup> Existing evidence suggests that sexual minority persons are facing increased social inequality during the COVID-19 pandemic, including food insecurity, job loss, and reduced wages, as well as elevated rates of depression, loneliness, and lack of social support.<sup>28–30</sup> Pandemic-related trauma may intersect with existing mental health, minority stress, and substance use challenges and dimensions of social inequality among sexual minority persons, compounding their risks for mental health burdens in the current context.<sup>31</sup>

The current study seeks to expand understanding of disproportionate health and well-being risks among sexual minority adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. We used data from a national sample of adults collected at the height of physical distancing orders in the United States to assess disparities in eight indicators of mental, behavioral, and physical health and well-being both before, and during the pandemic. We also tested whether the difference in indicators of well-being from pre- to postpandemic onset differed across groups defined by sexual identity. These findings extend current conceptual and empirical writings on the health vulnerabilities of sexual minority people during the COVID-19 pandemic in the hopes of supporting the need for urgent action on behalf of sexual minority populations.

## Methods

### Data source and sample

Data are from the baseline survey of the Assessing the Social Consequences of COVID-19 (ASCC) study ( $n=3108$ ). The ASCC is an ongoing multiwave U.S.-based survey and web-based 24-hour time diary study designed to assess the social consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. Data for this article were collected in April and May 2020 from Prolific Academic, an online labor market connecting workers with tasks, including scientific research. The survey collected a host of sociodemographic characteristics along with several measures of mental health, physical health, and other indicators of well-being.<sup>32</sup> Participants were prompted to report retrospective assessments of well-being directly before and then following the onset of the pandemic in the United States. Specifically, the pre-COVID-19 outbreak prompt stated “For these questions, we are interested in your life just prior to the outbreak of the novel coronavirus/COVID-19 in the United States. Please answer the following questions regarding your life immediately before this outbreak, prior to March 1, 2020.” Postpandemic onset questions were introduced with the prompt, “We are now interested in things as they are right now, after the novel coronavirus/COVID-19 outbreak in the United States around March 1, 2020.” All pre-COVID-19 questions were adapted to start with the phrase “Before the novel coronavirus/COVID-19...” The current analytic sample was limited to participants who responded to both pre- and post-COVID outbreak assessments of well-being and sexual orientation ( $n=2996$ ; 18.06% sexual minority). The current study was approved by the University of Maryland Institutional Review

Board and participants accessed the survey through a click-to-consent page. Sample demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1.

### Measures

Self-reported mental health, physical health, and quality of life were each assessed using a single item adapted from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s “Healthy Days Measure.”<sup>33,34</sup> Participants were asked to rate their “mental health, including your mood and your ability to think,” “physical health,” and their “quality of life” with response options of excellent = 5, very good = 4, good = 3, fair = 2, and poor = 1.

Participant stress was assessed with the question, “On a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being no stress and 10 being the worst stress possible, what number best describes your level of stress.”

Psychological distress was assessed using the Kessler 6,<sup>35</sup> which assesses the presence of depression and anxiety symptoms (e.g., feeling “hopeless,” “restless or fidgety,” “worthless”) from none of the time = 1 to all of the time = 5. Items were summed and averaged (pre- and post-alpha = 0.91).

Loneliness was assessed using four items from the UCLA Loneliness Scale,<sup>36</sup> which captures feelings of loneliness and social isolation (e.g., How often do you feel that no one really knows you well? and How often do you feel you can find companionship when you want it?). Response options range from never = 1 to often = 4. Scores were summed and averaged (alpha pre = 0.77, post = 0.75).

Alcohol use was assessed with two items. First, participants were asked to report how many days in a 7-day period they consumed alcohol (range: 0–7 days); followed by a question asking, “On the days you consumed alcohol, how many drinks did you have on average?” (range: 0–10 drinks). Scores were multiplied to assess average weekly alcohol consumption before and following the COVID-19 outbreak (range: 0–70).<sup>37</sup>

Participants were asked to report on their fatigue; “how would you rate your fatigue on average?” (none = 1, mild = 2, moderate = 3, and severe = 4).

Sexual identity was assessed by asking participants, “Do you think of yourself as,” with response options of, “lesbian or gay,” “bisexual,” “straight, that is, not lesbian or gay,” and “a sexual orientation not listed here.”

Multivariate models were adjusted for gender (man [reference (ref)], woman; in nongender-stratified models), race/ethnicity (White [ref], Black or African American, Latino/a/x, Asian American, and Multiracial/Multiethnic/Other), age, income (<\$10,000, \$10,000–\$14,999, \$15,000–\$24,999, \$25,000–\$34,999, \$35,000–\$49,999, \$50,000–\$74,999, and ≥\$75,000), region (Northeast, South, Midwest, and West), relationship status (married [ref], partnered [non-married], or single), and parental status (no [ref], yes).

### Analytic approach

We started by providing sample demographic characteristic information, stratified by sexual identity. Next, we assessed sexual identity differences in each of the eight well-being indicators both pre- and postpandemic onset. We then estimated paired-sample *t*-tests to assess change between pre- and postassessments of well-being across sexual identity

TABLE 1. SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS: ASSESSING THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF COVID-19 (N=2996)

	Total sample %/M (SD)	Heterosexual (n=2455) %/M (SD)	Lesbian/gay (n=111) %/M (SD)	Bisexual (n=347) %/M (SD)	Other (n=83) %/M (SD)	$\chi^2/F$	p
Gender						<b>70.61</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Man	42.26	45.54	40.54	23.05	27.71		
Woman	57.74	54.46	59.46	76.95	72.29		
Race/ethnicity						<b>39.24</b>	<b>0.001</b>
White	64.49	64.93	62.16	64.84	60.24		
Latina/o/x	6.58	6.80	6.31	5.48	4.82		
Black or African American	7.08	6.97	11.71	6.05	8.43		
Asian American	11.95	12.83	7.21	7.20	12.05		
Multiracial, Multiethnic, or Other	9.71	8.47	12.61	16.43	14.45		
Region						<b>17.59</b>	<b>0.040</b>
Northeast	24.83	24.15	25.23	28.24	30.12		
Midwest	21.73	22.08	18.92	21.33	16.87		
South	35.18	34.95	45.05	31.70	43.37		
West	18.26	18.82	10.81	18.73	9.64		
Children						<b>72.74</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Yes	30.14	33.44	9.91	17.29	13.25		
No	69.86	66.56	90.09	82.71	86.75		
Relationship status						<b>66.77</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Single	39.85	28.82	45.95	42.94	49.40		
Partnered	27.74	25.66	35.14	38.33	34.94		
Married	32.41	35.52	18.92	18.73	15.66		
Household income						<b>58.54</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<10,000	7.41	11.28	5.75	11.54	6.59		
10,000–14,999	6.48	5.93	3.51	3.85	3.91		
15,000–24,999	7.41	12.17	7.85	11.54	8.43		
25,000–34,999	11.11	13.65	9.01	11.54	9.69		
35,000–49,999	14.81	11.87	11.66	12.82	11.83		
50,000–74,999	24.07	16.02	22.36	14.10	21.48		
75,000+	28.70	29.08	39.85	34.62	38.07		
Age	32.20 (11.52)	33.03 (11.85)	30.69 (10.69)	27.96 (8.39)	27.66 (8.77)	<b>25.37</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>

Statistically significant associations at  $p<0.05$  are bolded.

subgroups. Finally, to test sexual identity differences in rate of change, we regressed post-COVID well-being scores on sexual identity, adjusting for pre-COVID scores and other sociodemographic covariates. Multiple imputation was used ( $m=50$ ) to address missing data (<2% across variables) in multivariate models. All data management and analyses were conducted in Stata 15.1.<sup>38</sup>

## Results

### Sexual identity differences in well-being pre- and postpandemic onset

Sexual identity disparities in well-being pre- and postpandemic onset are presented in Table 2. Due to space limitations, we focus on gender-stratified models. Gay men, when compared to heterosexual men, showed poorer mental health, physical health, and quality of life before the start of the pandemic, and poorer mental health postpandemic onset. Relative to heterosexual men, bisexual men reported poorer mental and physical health, and more stress, loneliness, psychological distress, and fatigue before and after the pandemic started. Before the start of the pan-

demic, “other” sexual minority men reported poorer mental and physical health, and greater psychological distress and fatigue; however, only differences in physical health and psychological distress remained significant at postpandemic onset.

Lesbian/gay women did not differ from heterosexual women on any indicators of well-being, neither at pre- nor post-COVID-19 onset. Compared to heterosexual women, bisexual women reported poorer pre- and postpandemic onset mental health, physical health, and quality of life, as well as greater stress, loneliness, psychological distress, and fatigue. “Other” sexual minority women, relative to heterosexual women, had poorer physical health and quality of life before the pandemic. Postpandemic onset, they also experienced poorer mental health, physical health, quality of life, and greater psychological distress.

We also conducted several additional adjusted regression models to test the difference between gay/lesbian and bisexual subgroups. Among men, bisexual men had higher psychological distress than gay men both pre- and postpandemic onset. Among women, bisexual women had poorer mental and physical health and greater loneliness and psychological

TABLE 2. SEXUAL IDENTITY DIFFERENCES IN INDICATORS OF WELL-BEING PRE- AND POSTPANDEMIC ONSET

	All				Men				Women			
	Pre-		Post-		Pre-		Post-		Pre-		Post-	
	b	p	b	p	b	p	b	p	b	p	b	p
<b>Mental health</b>												
Lesbian/gay	-0.09	0.359	<b>-0.21</b>	<b>0.047</b>	<b>-0.43</b>	<b>0.006</b>	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>0.029</b>	0.15	0.242	-0.08	0.557
Bisexual	<b>-0.42</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.41	-0.410	<b>-0.39</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>-0.46</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.41</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.38</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Other	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>0.002</b>	-0.32	-0.320	<b>-0.70</b>	<b>0.002</b>	-0.19	0.395	-0.20	0.131	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>0.015</b>
<b>Physical health</b>												
Lesbian/gay	-0.09	0.320	-0.13	0.175	<b>-0.29</b>	<b>0.046</b>	-0.26	0.097	0.06	0.650	-0.03	0.813
Bisexual	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.32	-0.320	<b>-0.35</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>0.032</b>	<b>-0.27</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Other	<b>-0.45</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.48	-0.480	<b>-0.60</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>-0.46</b>	<b>0.032</b>	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>0.003</b>	<b>-0.48</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Quality of life</b>												
Lesbian/gay	<b>-0.23</b>	<b>0.006</b>	-0.17	0.055	<b>-0.33</b>	<b>0.013</b>	-0.24	0.096	-0.16	0.140	-0.10	0.371
Bisexual	<b>-0.29</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.34	-0.340	-0.16	0.102	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>-0.33</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Other	<b>-0.27</b>	<b>0.006</b>	-0.30	-0.300	-0.30	0.071	-0.07	0.704	<b>-0.20</b>	<b>0.046</b>	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>0.003</b>
<b>Stress</b>												
Lesbian/gay	0.21	0.321	0.40	0.091	0.48	0.142	0.32	0.383	0.00	0.990	0.41	0.181
Bisexual	<b>0.56</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.72	0.720	<b>0.88</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.002</b>
Other	0.10	0.669	0.15	0.150	0.70	0.135	0.25	0.621	-0.20	0.460	0.03	0.933
<b>Loneliness</b>												
Lesbian/gay	-0.02	0.798	-0.04	0.504	0.03	0.776	0.03	0.788	-0.06	0.508	-0.10	0.241
Bisexual	<b>0.22</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.23	0.230	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Other	0.11	0.148	0.11	0.110	0.10	0.651	0.14	0.323	0.10	0.177	0.09	0.332
<b>Psychological distress</b>												
Lesbian/gay	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.034</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.018</b>	0.24	0.062	0.24	0.098	0.12	0.265	0.18	0.132
Bisexual	<b>0.47</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.55	0.550	<b>0.60</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Other	<b>0.38</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.40	0.400	<b>0.70</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.042</b>	0.20	0.056	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.006</b>
<b>Alcohol use</b>												
Lesbian/gay	-0.47	0.469	-0.15	0.844	-0.94	0.461	-0.54	0.703	-0.27	0.681	0.07	0.932
Bisexual	0.56	0.158	0.70	0.700	-0.33	0.733	0.88	0.412	0.64	0.079	0.49	0.297
Other	-0.68	0.370	-0.77	-0.770	-2.00	0.248	-2.67	0.172	-0.40	0.536	-0.21	0.819
<b>Fatigue</b>												
Lesbian/gay	0.06	0.423	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.027</b>	0.12	0.257	0.12	0.289	0.01	0.925	0.19	0.064
Bisexual	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.001</b>	0.29	0.290	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.038</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Other	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.006</b>	0.21	0.210	<b>0.50</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.31	0.053	0.10	0.405	0.17	0.116

All models adjusted for age, race/ethnicity, income, relationship status, parental status, and region. Heterosexual was the referent category for all models. Statistically significant associations at  $p < 0.05$  are bolded.

distress than lesbian/gay women both pre- and postpandemic onset; bisexual women also had lower postpandemic onset quality of life.

#### *Changes in self-reported well-being pre-/postpandemic onset*

Changes in pre-/postpandemic onset scores of health and well-being across sexual identity subgroups are presented in Table 3. Again, we focus on gender-stratified results. Heterosexual men showed significant declines in mental and physical health as well as quality of life and increases in stress, loneliness, psychological distress, and fatigue. Comparatively, gay men experienced decreased physical health and quality of life, and bisexual men had significant reductions in mental health and quality of life, and higher stress, loneliness, psychological distress, alcohol use, and fatigue. With one exception (i.e., physical health), the degree of pre- and postpandemic onset change ( $\Delta M$ ) was largest among bisexual men. “Other” sexual minority men showed no pre-/postpandemic onset change across all indicators.

Among women, changes in pre-/postpandemic onset scores were fairly uniform. Heterosexual, lesbian/gay, bisexual, and “other” sexual minority women showed significant declines in mental health, physical health, and quality of life, along with statistical increases in stress, psychological distress, and fatigue. Heterosexual and bisexual women experienced increased loneliness; heterosexual and lesbian/gay women showed increased alcohol use. There were no clear sexual identity patterns of pre- and postpandemic onset change ( $\Delta M$ ) among women.

Unadjusted and adjusted multivariate models testing sexual identity differences in the pre- and postpandemic onset changes in indicators of well-being are presented in Table 4. Focusing on gender-stratified models, the unadjusted results suggest that when compared to heterosexual men, gay and bisexual men report greater decreases in mental health, physical health, and quality of life as well as greater increases in psychological distress; bisexual men also showed greater increases in stress, loneliness, and fatigue. “Other” sexual minority men showed greater decreases in physical health and larger increases in psychological distress.

TABLE 3. PAIRED SAMPLE *T*-TEST OF PRE- AND POSTPANDEMIC ONSET DIFFERENCES IN INDICATORS OF WELL-BEING BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

	All				Men				Women				
	<i>M<sub>pre</sub></i>	<i>M<sub>post</sub></i>	$\Delta M$	<i>t</i>	<i>M<sub>pre</sub></i>	<i>M<sub>post</sub></i>	$\Delta M$	<i>t</i>	<i>M<sub>pre</sub></i>	<i>M<sub>post</sub></i>	$\Delta M$	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Mental health</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>-19.52</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-11.79</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>-0.41</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>3.18</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>-0.49</b>	<b>-5.00</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>-0.27</b>	<b>-1.77</b>	<b>0.083</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>-0.64</b>
Bisexual	<b>2.79</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>-6.78</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>-0.38</b>	<b>-3.65</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>-0.41</b>
Other	<b>2.84</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>-3.31</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.426</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>-0.57</b>
<b>Physical health</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>-0.23</b>	<b>-14.76</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>-11.05</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>-0.21</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>3.21</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-4.13</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>-0.24</b>	<b>-2.12</b>	<b>0.040</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>-0.33</b>
Bisexual	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-6.46</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>-0.17</b>	<b>-1.98</b>	<b>0.052</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>-0.34</b>
Other	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>-0.31</b>	<b>-3.09</b>	<b>0.003</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>-0.09</b>	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>0.724</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>-0.40</b>
<b>Quality of life</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>-0.41</b>	<b>-24.47</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>-13.97</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>-0.47</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>3.18</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>-4.88</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>-0.31</b>	<b>-2.10</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>-0.45</b>
Bisexual	<b>3.11</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>-0.54</b>	<b>-11.57</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>-0.45</b>	<b>-4.97</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>-0.57</b>
Other	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>-0.52</b>	<b>-5.78</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>-0.09</b>	<b>-0.44</b>	<b>0.665</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>-0.68</b>
<b>Stress</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>4.21</b>	<b>5.01</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>18.61</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>12.05</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>5.31</b>	<b>0.91</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>4.58</b>	<b>5.52</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>5.04</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>1.86</b>	<b>0.070</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>5.85</b>	<b>1.20</b>
Bisexual	<b>5.11</b>	<b>6.06</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>7.83</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.98</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>5.14</b>	<b>6.08</b>	<b>0.94</b>
Other	<b>4.65</b>	<b>5.46</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.74</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.388</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>5.63</b>	<b>1.02</b>
<b>Loneliness</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>2.21</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>11.01</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.24</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>6.82</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>0.13</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>2.24</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>0.120</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.396</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>0.09</b>
Bisexual	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>0.010</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>0.12</b>
Other	<b>2.39</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>0.061</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>0.10</b>
<b>Psychological distress</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>1.94</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>20.57</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>1.94</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>11.11</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>1.94</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>0.33</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>0.056</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>0.38</b>
Bisexual	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>9.29</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>0.41</b>
Other	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>-0.07</b>	<b>-0.89</b>	<b>0.385</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>0.47</b>
<b>Alcohol use</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>3.64</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>4.94</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>0.298</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>0.66</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>1.89</b>	<b>0.061</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.425</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>0.82</b>
Bisexual	<b>3.67</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>0.081</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>5.64</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>0.31</b>
Other	<b>2.35</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.594</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.29</b>	<b>0.776</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>0.52</b>
<b>Fatigue</b>													
Heterosexual	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>7.75</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>0.13</b>
Lesbian/gay	<b>2.30</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>0.204</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>0.32</b>
Bisexual	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>6.54</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>0.28</b>
Other	<b>2.49</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>0.153</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>-0.13</b>	<b>-0.90</b>	<b>0.377</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>0.23</b>

Statistically significant associations at  $p < 0.05$  are bolded. $M_{pre}$  = mean prepanemic onset. $M_{post}$  = mean postpanemic onset.

TABLE 4. ADJUSTED REGRESSION MODELS TESTING CHANGE IN INDICATORS OF WELL-BEING BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

	Full sample				Men				Women			
	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	b	p	b	p	b	p	b	p	b	p	b	p
<b>Mental health</b>												
Lesbian/gay	<b>-0.32</b>	<b>0.002</b>	-0.15	0.074	<b>-0.46</b>	<b>0.006</b>	-0.06	0.608	-0.21	0.127	-0.16	0.150
Bisexual	<b>-0.63</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.16</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>-0.57</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.19</b>	<b>0.041</b>	<b>-0.58</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.15</b>	<b>0.014</b>
Other	<b>-0.53</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.10	0.277	-0.24	0.310	0.27	0.118	<b>-0.59</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.23	0.055
<b>Physical health</b>												
Lesbian/gay	-0.19	0.051	-0.07	0.353	<b>-0.33</b>	<b>0.034</b>	-0.04	0.715	-0.10	0.457	-0.07	0.470
Bisexual	<b>-0.41</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.11</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>-0.31</b>	<b>0.010</b>	0.00	0.975	<b>-0.43</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.15</b>	<b>0.004</b>
Other	<b>-0.56</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.16	0.057	<b>-0.48</b>	<b>0.027</b>	-0.01	0.971	<b>-0.58</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.22</b>	<b>0.028</b>
<b>Quality of life</b>												
Lesbian/gay	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>0.005</b>	-0.03	0.655	<b>-0.33</b>	<b>0.024</b>	-0.03	0.777	-0.20	0.086	-0.01	0.927
Bisexual	<b>-0.48</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.17</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.35</b>	<b>0.002</b>	-0.16	0.075	<b>-0.49</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.17</b>	<b>0.002</b>
Other	<b>-0.43</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.14	0.111	-0.13	0.514	0.13	0.415	<b>-0.52</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>-0.23</b>	<b>0.023</b>
<b>Stress</b>												
Lesbian/gay	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.029</b>	0.26	0.178	0.39	0.277	-0.04	0.889	0.55	0.076	0.40	0.129
Bisexual	<b>1.05</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.037</b>
Other	0.45	0.096	0.09	0.694	0.35	0.487	-0.25	0.505	0.33	0.304	0.14	0.610
<b>Loneliness</b>												
Lesbian/gay	0.01	0.873	-0.03	0.476	0.06	0.554	0.01	0.933	-0.02	0.802	-0.07	0.316
Bisexual	<b>0.29</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.011</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.032</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.05	0.152
Other	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.018</b>	0.03	0.564	0.13	0.369	0.09	0.327	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.024</b>	0.00	0.948
<b>Psychological distress</b>												
Lesbian/gay	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.001</b>	0.08	0.233	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.041</b>	0.03	0.761	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.017</b>	0.09	0.311
Bisexual	<b>0.71</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.001</b>
Other	<b>0.55</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.09	0.195	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.028</b>	-0.18	0.151	<b>0.56</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.047</b>
<b>Alcohol use</b>												
Lesbian/gay	-0.34	0.660	0.22	0.695	-0.54	0.701	0.15	0.888	-0.07	0.934	0.32	0.606
Bisexual	0.14	0.757	0.25	0.473	0.69	0.521	1.12	0.164	0.43	0.345	-0.09	0.801
Other	-1.46	0.102	-0.24	0.718	-2.55	0.194	-1.18	0.421	-0.66	0.465	0.18	0.779
<b>Fatigue</b>												
Lesbian/gay	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.038</b>	0.13	0.269	0.06	0.578	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.036</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.045</b>
Bisexual	<b>0.38</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Other	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.002</b>	0.10	0.204	0.29	0.065	0.02	0.900	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.045</b>	0.13	0.179

All models adjusted for age, race/ethnicity, income, relationship status, parental status, and region. Heterosexual was the referent category for all models. Statistically significant associations at  $p < 0.05$  are bolded.

When models were adjusted for sociodemographic characteristics, there were no longer statistical differences between gay men or “other” sexual minority men and heterosexual men, although differences between heterosexual and bisexual men remained with the exception of physical health and quality of life.

These patterns across unadjusted and adjusted models were more varied among women. Unadjusted models showed that compared to heterosexual women, bisexual and “other” sexual minority women had greater decreases in mental health, physical health, and quality of life, alongside greater increases in loneliness, psychological distress, and fatigue. Bisexual women also reported greater increases in stress relative to heterosexual women, and gay/lesbian women had greater increases in psychological distress and fatigue. After adjusting for sociodemographic factors, bisexual women differed from heterosexual women across outcomes (with the exception of loneliness); “other” sexual minority women differed from heterosexual women on physical health, quality of life, and psychological distress.

## Discussion

Existing evidence and predictions about the negative mental health impacts associated with the COVID-19 pandemic align with past research findings on the psychological consequences of large-scale disasters.<sup>2,39</sup> Consistent with expectations and emerging data,<sup>2,12,40</sup> we observed near universal declines in health and well-being pre- and postpandemic onset. Still, our findings demonstrate the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on the health and well-being of sexual minority adults, particularly bisexual adults. Specifically, using a national sample, we noted substantial changes across several measures of well-being (e.g., mental health, physical health, quality of life, loneliness, and stress) for gay men, bisexual men and women, and “other” sexual minority women and that these changes were greater when compared to same-gender heterosexual adults. After adjusting for sociodemographic factors, bisexual adults reported the most consistent and robust changes across all indicators of mental health and well-being when compared to their heterosexual peers.

Consistent with previous work,<sup>14–19</sup> we observed sexual identity disparities across several indicators of well-being both pre- and postpandemic onset, although these differences were mostly observed between heterosexual and bisexual subgroups, even within nongender-stratified models. For example, bisexual men and women were more likely to report poorer mental health and physical health and greater stress, loneliness, psychological distress, and fatigue both before and after the onset of the pandemic. These findings are consistent with the current literature documenting sexual identity-related health disparities: research often finds that bisexual populations show greater disparities in mental health and substance use relative to their gay/lesbian peers.<sup>41</sup> These findings support previous work that documents distinct health risk for bisexual people, relative to heterosexual and monosexual gay/lesbian peers.<sup>42,43</sup> These differences in health risk among sexual minority subpopulations are often attributed to the distinct forms of stigma for bisexual people (e.g., biphobia, denying that bisexuality exists), and also a lack of LGBT community support, which has been shown to be a protective factor for well-being among sexual minority adults.<sup>43</sup>

As expected, pre- and postpandemic onset declines in mental health, physical health, and quality of life, along with increased stress, loneliness, psychological distress, and fatigue, were robust and consistent across heterosexual and sexual minority subgroups, with some variation. Again, bisexual men and women showed the greatest change across indicators and were the only sexual minority subgroup to consistently show significant pre-/postpandemic onset differences after adjusting for sociodemographic characteristics. Thus, not only did we observe that these sexual identity disparities were present for bisexual men and women, but the degree to which their mental health and other indicators of well-being changed from pre- to postpandemic onset appeared to be uniquely strong relative to their heterosexual, and to a lesser extent their gay and lesbian, peers. Although other sexual minority subgroups showed evidence of greater change relative to heterosexual respondents in *t*-test and unadjusted models (e.g., gay men with mental health, physical health, and quality of life; “other” sexual minority women with quality of life and psychological distress), bisexual men and women were the most consistent sexual minority subgroup to show statistically different change scores from heterosexual men and women, respectively, after adjusting for sociodemographic and economic characteristics.

The attenuation of these differences for gay/lesbian and “other” sexual minority subgroups in adjusted models suggests that there may be other factors that help to mitigate the social and psychological impacts of the pandemic. For example, bisexual participants in our sample were younger than both heterosexual and lesbian/gay participants, and also more likely to be in lower income brackets than gay/lesbian and “other” sexual minority subgroups. These distinctions in economic resources are consistent with previous research highlighting that bisexual men and women tend to experience more economic precarity than their monosexual heterosexual and gay/lesbian peers.<sup>27</sup> Although we adjusted for age and income in our models, it may be that there are other related factors (e.g., job security, health insurance access) that may uniquely compound the stress of the pandemic for this population.

Surprisingly, despite well-documented risk for excessive alcohol use and abuse among sexual minority populations,<sup>23,44,45</sup> we did not observe sexual identity differences in alcohol use, nor differential rates of change in alcohol use between heterosexual and sexual minority subgroups from pre- to postpandemic onset. These distinctions may reflect unique sampling differences, as many of these former studies have been based on probability samples.<sup>15,23</sup>

Overall, our findings echo Phillips II et al.’s recently provided “priorities for action” regarding the needs of sexual and gender minority people during the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>13</sup> Our findings further legitimize calls for more comprehensive and inclusive surveillance and cultural responsiveness in disaster response as it relates to sexual minority people and the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>10,12,13</sup> Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, mental health, health care, and public health systems were not prepared to address the unique health needs of this population.<sup>46–48</sup> There remain cultural deficits in the medical and mental health workforce when it comes to understanding and addressing the unique needs of sexual minority people. These deficits—which often manifest as stigma and microaggressions<sup>49–51</sup>—will only further exacerbate pandemic-related stressors for sexual minority people who seek professional help.

Outreach and education for medical and mental health providers, including information about the unique effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on sexual minority health, can reduce the harm done by medical and mental health institutions across the life course. Furthermore, public health surveillance systems have lagged in their inclusion of sexual orientation (and gender identity),<sup>10,52</sup> which further stymies efforts to understand, and more importantly address, the health needs of sexual minority and gender minority (e.g., transgender, gender diverse) populations, particularly in times of great need, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic. Collecting information about sexual orientation and gender identity will also allow researchers and policymakers to track potential improvements in health indicators as the United States begins to recover from the current health and financial crises. These calls for action reflect critical areas of research and practice to help address the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on sexual and gender minority populations and to identify the supports needed to help alleviate these disparities during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond.

### Limitations

We have several limitations to note. First, the data are from a nonprobability sample with relatively small numbers of sexual minority respondents. Representative data would likely reflect a more accurate picture of how COVID-19 is differentially impacting heterosexual and sexual minority communities. Our results invite more investigations on the social consequences of COVID-19 by sexual orientation. Second, our pre-COVID data are based on retrospective reporting and, therefore, likely provide conservative estimates. In the future, large population data sources that are collected annually (e.g., Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, National Survey on Drug Use and Health) will offer the opportunity to examine these effects with a natural experimental design—and with representative data.

Third, research on online-recruitment platforms such as MTurk and Prolific Academic yield quality data, but samples tend to be younger, better educated, and lower income than the general U.S. population.<sup>53,54</sup> Fourth, given our sample size, we were not able to further identify distinct experiences of the COVID-19 pandemic by other social identities and experiences (e.g., sexual minority status and race and ethnicity or socioeconomic status). Given growing research on how COVID-19 operates across axes of inequality,<sup>5,55</sup> there are likely distinct experiences and health vulnerabilities for those at the intersection of multiply marginalized social identities. Finally, given the data source, we were unable to assess why sexual minority adult health is more vulnerable to the stress of the COVID-19 pandemic. The minority stress framework<sup>20</sup> posits that disparate health outcomes for sexual minority people are the result of both elevated everyday stressors alongside minority specific stressors that arise from stigma. Ongoing data collection on the experiences of sexual minority people during the pandemic will be vital to helping us identify the mechanisms that contribute these distinct outcomes, and ultimately the policies and programs that are needed to address them.<sup>12,31</sup>

## Conclusion

Despite existent health and mental health disparities faced by sexual minority persons, the COVID-19 pandemic appears to have distinct ramifications for sexual minority adults in the United States. Our findings support and further legitimize calls for more comprehensive surveillance and cultural responsiveness, generally and in emergency preparedness, as it relates to sexual minority people, and for consideration of sexual minority populations in strategies to address the pandemic (e.g., vaccine uptake) and the related economic and social consequences that will likely persist in the years to follow. Finally, there is a salient need to improve cultural responsiveness, data collection, research practice, community outreach, and provider education to address existing health and mental health disparities among sexual minority populations.

## Disclaimers

Any interpretations and opinions expressed herein are solely those of the authors and may not reflect those of the National Science Foundation, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or the National Institutes of Health.

## Authors' Contributions

J.N.F. conceptualized the study, conducted data analysis, and drafted the first iteration of the article. Both J.S. and N.D.W. contributed original writing and offered revisions to the original article. L.D., L.S., R.G.R., K.J.D., and J.N.F. were responsible for the original conceptualization of and data collection for Assessing the Social Consequences of COVID-19 (ASCC). L.D., L.S., R.G.R., and K.J.D. offered extensive feedback on the conceptualization of the current study and on the original draft of the article.

## Author Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

## Funding Information

This article is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. SES-2029963 and from the University of Maryland Vice President for Research. We gratefully acknowledge support from the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development grant P2CHD041041, Maryland Population Research Center. This work was also supported by the University of Maryland Prevention Research Center cooperative agreement #U48DP006382 from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

## References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: United States COVID-19 Cases and Deaths by State. Updated February 23, 2021. Available at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/us-cases-deaths.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/us-cases-deaths.html) Accessed February 24, 2021.
2. Amsalem D, Dixon LB, Neria Y: The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak and mental health: Current risks and recommended actions. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2021; 78:9–10.
3. Galea S, Merchant RM, Lurie N: The mental health consequences of COVID-19 and physical distancing: The need for prevention and early intervention. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020;180:817–818.
4. Golberstein E, Wen H, Miller BF: Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and mental health for children and adolescents. *JAMA Pediatr* 2020;174:819–820.
5. Czeisler MÉ, Lane RI, Petrosky E, et al.: Mental health, substance use, and suicidal ideation during the COVID-19 pandemic—United States, June 24–30, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:1049–1057.
6. Chodkiewicz J, Talarowska M, Miniszewska J, et al.: Alcohol consumption reported during the COVID-19 pandemic: The initial stage. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17: 4677.
7. Vindegaard N, Benros ME: COVID-19 pandemic and mental health consequences: Systematic review of the current evidence. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;89:531–542.
8. van Dorn A, Cooney RE, Sabin ML: COVID-19 exacerbating inequalities in the US. *Lancet* 2020;395:1243–1244.
9. Webb Hooper M, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ: COVID-19 and racial/ethnic disparities. *JAMA* 2020;323:2466–2467.
10. Cahill S, Grasso C, Keuroghlian A, et al.: Sexual and gender minority health in the COVID-19 pandemic: Why data collection and combatting discrimination matter now more than ever. *Am J Public Health* 2020;110:1360–1361.
11. Fish JN, McInroy LB, Paceley MS, et al.: “I’m kinda stuck at home with unsupportive parents right now”: LGBTQ youths’ experiences with COVID-19 and the importance of online support. *J Adolesc Health* 2020;67:450–452.
12. Salerno JP, Williams ND, Gattamorta KA: LGBTQ populations: Psychologically vulnerable communities in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychol Trauma* 2020;12:S239–S242.
13. Phillips II G, Felt D, Ruprecht MM, et al.: Addressing the disproportionate impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on sexual and gender minority populations in the United States: Actions toward equity. *LGBT Health* 2020;7:279–282.
14. Plöderl M, Tremblay P: Mental health of sexual minorities. A systematic review. *Int Rev Psychiatry* 2015;27: 367–385.

15. McCabe SE, Hughes TL, Bostwick WB, et al.: Sexual orientation, substance use behaviors and substance dependence in the United States. *Addiction* 2009;104:1333–1345.

16. Bostwick WB, Boyd CJ, Hughes TL, McCabe SE: Dimensions of sexual orientation and the prevalence of mood and anxiety disorders in the United States. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100:468–475.

17. Patterson CJ, Potter EC: Sexual orientation and sleep difficulties: A review of research. *Sleep Health* 2019;5:227–235.

18. Fish JN, Baams L, McGuire JK: Sexual and gender minority mental health among children and youth. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Sexual and Gender Minority Mental Health*. Edited by Rothblum ED. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2020, pp 229–244.

19. Lick DJ, Durso LE, Johnson KL: Minority stress and physical health among sexual minorities. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2013;8:521–548.

20. Meyer IH: Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychol Bull* 2003;129:674–697.

21. McCabe SE, Bostwick WB, Hughes TL, et al.: The relationship between discrimination and substance use disorders among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100:1946–1952.

22. Dürrbaum T, Sattler FA: Minority stress and mental health in lesbian, gay male, and bisexual youths: A meta-analysis. *J LGBT Youth* 2020;17:298–314.

23. Fish JN, Exten C: Sexual orientation differences in alcohol use disorder across the adult life course. *Am J Prev Med* 2020;59:428–436.

24. Fish JN, Rice CE, Lanza ST, Russell ST: Is young adulthood a critical period for suicidal behavior among sexual minorities? Results from a US national sample. *Prev Sci* 2019;20:353–365.

25. Whittington C, Hadfield K, Calderón C: The Lives & Livelihoods of Many in the LGBTQ Community are at Risk Amidst COVID-19 Crisis. Washington, DC: Human Rights Campaign Foundation, 2020. Available at [https://assets2.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/COVID19-IssueBrief-032020-FINAL.pdf?\\_ga=2.204695312.1245769386.1587933081-33985213.1582646637&\\_gac=1](https://assets2.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/COVID19-IssueBrief-032020-FINAL.pdf?_ga=2.204695312.1245769386.1587933081-33985213.1582646637&_gac=1) Accessed December 12, 2020.

26. Charlton BM, Gordon AR, Reisner SL, et al.: Sexual orientation-related disparities in employment, health insurance, healthcare access and health-related quality of life: A cohort study of US male and female adolescents and young adults. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e020418.

27. Badgett MVL, Choi SK, Wilson BDM: LGBT Poverty in the United States: A Study of Differences between Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Groups. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute, 2019. Available at <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/National-LGBT-Poverty-Oct-2019.pdf> Accessed December 12, 2020.

28. McKay T, Henne J, Gonzales G, et al.: The Impact of COVID-19 on LGBTQ Americans. Vanderbilt University and the Henne Group. 2020. Available at [https://www.affenashville.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Brief\\_COVID\\_LGBTQ\\_Americans.pdf](https://www.affenashville.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Brief_COVID_LGBTQ_Americans.pdf) Accessed December 12, 2020.

29. Flentje A, Obedin-Maliver J, Lubensky ME: Depression and anxiety changes among sexual and gender minority people coinciding with onset of COVID-19 pandemic. *J Gen Intern Med* 2020;35:2788–2790.

30. Salerno JP, Pease M, Devadas J, et al.: COVID-19-Related Stress Among LGBTQ+ University Students: Results of a U.S. National Survey. College Park, MD: University of Maryland Prevention Research Center, 2020. Available at [https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/26375/LGBTQ\\_COVID\\_Report\\_09032020.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y](https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/26375/LGBTQ_COVID_Report_09032020.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y) Accessed February 14, 2021.

31. Salerno JP, Devadas J, Pease M, et al.: Sexual and gender minority stress amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Implications for LGBTQ young persons' mental health and wellbeing. *Public Health Rep* 2020;135:721–727.

32. Feller SC, Castillo EG, Greenberg JM, et al.: Emotional well-being and public health: Proposal for a model national initiative. *Public Health Rep* 2018;133:136–141.

33. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: CDC HRQOL-14 “Healthy Days Measure”: Healthy days core module. 2018. Available at [www.cdc.gov/hrqol/hrqol14\\_measure.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/hrqol14_measure.htm) Accessed August 25, 2020.

34. Moriarty DG, Zack MM, Kobau R: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Healthy Days Measures—Population tracking of perceived physical and mental health over time. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2003;1:37.

35. Furukawa TA, Kessler RC, Slade T, Andrews G: The performance of the K6 and K10 screening scales for psychological distress in the Australian National Survey of Mental Health and Well-Being. *Psychol Med* 2003;33:357–362.

36. Russell D, Peplau LA, Cutrona CE: The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1980;39:472–480.

37. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism: Drinking Levels Defined: 2011. Available at <https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/alcohol-health/overview-alcohol-consumption/moderate-binge-drinking> Accessed August 25, 2020.

38. StataCorp: Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC, 2017.

39. Goldmann E, Galea S: Mental health consequences of disasters. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2014;35:169–183.

40. Choi KR, Heilemann MV, Fauer A, Mead M: A second pandemic: Mental health spillover from the novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *J Am Psychiatr Nurses Assoc* 2020;26:340–343.

41. Bostwick WB, Harrison EA: Bisexual mental health. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Sexual and Gender Minority Mental Health*. Edited by Rothblum ED. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2020, pp 269–281.

42. Bostwick WB, Dodge B: Introduction to the special section on bisexual health: Can you see us now? *Arch Sex Behav* 2019;48:79–87.

43. Feinstein BA, Dyar C: Bisexuality, minority stress, and health. *Curr Sex Health Rep* 2017;9:42–49.

44. Hughes TL, Wilsnack SC, Kantor LW: The influence of gender and sexual orientation on alcohol use and alcohol-related problems. *Alcohol Res* 2016;38:121–132.

45. Talley AE, Gilbert PA, Mitchell J, et al.: Addressing gaps on risk and resilience factors for alcohol use outcomes in sexual and gender minority populations. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2016;35:484–493.

46. McCann E, Brown M: Education and practice developments: Addressing the psychosocial concerns and support needs of LGBT+ people. *Nurse Educ Today* 2019;82:15–20.

47. National LGBT Health Education Center, A Program of The Fenway Institute. Providing Inclusive Services and Care for LGBT People: A Guide for Health Care Staff. Boston, MA: National LGBT Health Education Center, The Fenway Institute. 2016. Available at <https://www.lgbtqiaphilanthropy.org/wp-content/uploads/Providing-Inclusive-Services-and-Care-for-LGBT-People.pdf> Accessed August 25, 2020.

48. Williams ND, Fish JN: LGBT-specific mental health and substance abuse treatment in the United States. *Health Serv Rev* 2020;55:932–943.

49. Dean MA, Victor E, Guidry-Grimes L: Inhospitable healthcare spaces: Why diversity training on LGBTQIA issues is not enough. *J Bioeth Inq* 2016;13:557–570.

50. Martos AJ, Wilson PA, Gordon AR, et al.: “Like finding a unicorn”: Healthcare preferences among lesbian, gay, and bisexual people in the United States. *Soc Sci Med* 2018; 208:126–133.

51. Israel T, Gorcheva R, Burnes TR, et al.: Helpful and unhelpful therapy experiences of LGBT clients. *Psychother Res* 2008;18:294–305.

52. Cahill SR, Makadon HJ: If they don’t count us, we don’t count: Trump administration rolls back sexual orientation and gender identity data collection. *LGBT Health* 2017;4: 171–173.

53. McCredie MN, Morey LC: Who are the Turkers? A characterization of MTurk workers using the personality assessment inventory. *Assessment* 2019;26:759–766.

54. Peer E, Brandimarte L, Samat S, Acquisti A: Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2017;70:153–163.

55. Moore JT, Ricaldi JN, Rose CE, et al.: Disparities in incidence of COVID-19 among underrepresented racial/ethnic groups in counties identified as hotspots during June 5–18, 2020—22 States, February–June 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:1122–1126.

Address correspondence to:

*Jessica N. Fish, PhD*

*Department of Family Science*

*School of Public Health*

*University of Maryland*

*1142 Valley Drive*

*College Park, MD 20742*

*USA*

*E-mail:* jnfish@umd.edu