Published in final edited form as:

J Psychiatr Res. 2020 November ; 130: 327–332. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.08.022.

Prevalence and Clinical Indices of Risk for Sexual and Gender Minority Youth in an Adolescent Inpatient Sample

Alexandra H. Bettis^{1,3}, Elizabeth C. Thompson^{1,3}, Taylor A. Burke^{1,3}, Jacqueline Nesi^{1,3}, Anastacia Kudinova^{1,2}, Jeffrey I. Hunt^{1,2}, Richard T. Liu^{1,2}, Jennifer C. Wolff^{1,2}

¹Alpert Medical School of Brown University

²Bradley Hospital

³Rhode Island Hospital

Abstract

Objective: Rates of self-injurious thoughts and behaviors have increased in adolescents over the past two decades. Sexual and gender minority (SGM) youth report elevated rates of self-injurious thoughts and behaviors compared to heterosexual and cisgender youth. Studies of factors influencing suicide risk in SGM youth remain limited, however, and have largely been conducted in community or epidemiological samples.

Method: The present study aimed to address these limitations by examining the prevalence and clinical characteristics of sexual and gender minority youth in a sample of 515 youth admitted to an adolescent inpatient unit. In addition, the present study aimed to compare rates of self-reported self-injurious thoughts and behaviors, adverse early childhood experiences, and rates of rehospitalization in sexual and gender minority compared to non-sexual and gender minority youth.

Results: Results show that nearly 40% of the sample identified as sexual and/or gender minority. Sexual minority youth reported higher rates of suicidal ideation ($t = -6.19, p < .001$), higher rates of prior suicidal behavior ($\chi^2 = 27.44, p < .001$) and non-suicidal self-injury ($\chi^2 = 48.09, p < .001$), and greater numbers of adverse childhood experiences ($t = -3.99, p < .001$); gender minority youth reported higher rates of suicidal ideation ($t = -3.91, p = .001$). There were no group differences for SGM youth in rates of rehospitalization in the 6-months following initial

Corresponding author: Please direct all correspondence to Alexandra H. Bettis at alexandra_bettis@brown.edu, 1011 Veterans Memorial Pkwy, East Providence, RI 02903.

Bettis: Conceptualization; Methodology & formal analysis; Writing – original draft/review & editing; Funding acquisition

Thompson: Conceptualization; Data curation; Writing – original draft/review & editing

Burke: Writing – original draft/review & editing

Nesi: Writing – original draft/review & editing; Funding acquisition

Liu: Conceptualization; Supervision; Writing –review & editing

Hunt: Project administration

Wolff: Conceptualization; Project administration; Supervision; Writing – review & editing

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Conflicts of interest: The authors have no disclosures or conflicts of interest to declare.

admission. These results held when controlling for sex assigned at birth and current depression status in multivariate analyses.

Conclusions: The study illuminates the importance of assessing SGM status in clinical care and highlights the need to evaluate sexual and gender minority specific risk factors for self-injurious thoughts and behaviors in youth.

Keywords

Suicide; self-injury; adolescent; sexual orientation; gender identity

Introduction

Suicide is the second leading cause of death among adolescents in the United States.¹ Furthermore, rates of emergency department visits for self-injurious thoughts and behaviors (SITBs) have doubled in the past decade,² and psychiatric hospitalizations are on the rise. Sexual and gender minority (SGM) youth experience elevated rates of SITBs compared to non-SGM individuals.^{3–6} Data from a 2017 CDC survey suggests that, in the prior 12 months, 23.0% of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth attempted suicide, compared with 5.4% of heterosexual youth.⁷ In addition, the 12-month prevalence of suicide attempts (SAs) was 34.6% among transgender youth, compared to 9.1% in cisgender females and 5.5% in cisgender males.⁷ Further, in a recent meta-analytic review, rates of non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) in SGM were significantly higher than non-SGM youth.⁸

Research also indicates that SGM individuals experience elevated rates of stigma, victimization, and social isolation, which likely contribute to increased rates of SITBs.^{9,10} For SGM youth already experiencing mental health symptoms, adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) may further exacerbate risk for SITBs. Studies of factors influencing suicide risk in SGM youth remain limited, however, and have largely been conducted in community or epidemiological samples.^{4,11} This is a notable limitation given that risk for SITBs is most elevated in psychiatric samples, and in light of emerging evidence that indices of suicide risk in community samples may not generalize well to clinically acute populations.¹² Thus, there is an urgent need to assess and evaluate indices of risk for clinical SGM populations.

The current study had two primary aims. First, we aimed to describe prevalence statistics and clinical characteristics of a sample of adolescents hospitalized on a psychiatric inpatient unit, with a focus on youth identifying as SGM. We provide prevalence statistics, diagnostic information, and symptom measures of SITBs and ACEs in SGM youth. We examined rates of suicidal behavior (i.e. history of SA), and SI and NSSI, which are important clinical phenomena both independently and as indicators of risk for suicidal behavior. Second, we aimed to examine differences between SGM and non-SGM youth on these clinical indicators of risk and re-hospitalization in the 6-months postdischarge. Despite all youth in the sample experiencing elevated psychiatric problems, we hypothesized that SGM youth will report higher levels of SITBs near the time of hospitalization. In addition, we hypothesized that SGM youth will report higher levels of ACEs, and that SGM youth will have higher rates of re-hospitalization in the 6-months following initial hospitalization.

Methods

Participants.

The current sample included 515 youth who completed an admission assessment on an adolescent psychiatric inpatient unit in the northeastern United States between December 2017 and February 2019. Youth were admitted if they were determined to be an imminent danger to themselves or others. The modal length of stay on the unit was nine days. Youth ranged from 11 to 18 years old ($M = 14.65$; $SD = 1.84$) and were largely non-Hispanic (75%). The majority of the sample was white (66.5%); 11.4% of the sample identified as Black, 1.6% as Asian, 0.2% as American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.2% as Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 18.4% as other, 1.0% as unknown, and 0.6% declined to state.

Procedure.

Data were collected as a part of an intake assessment battery including self-reported demographic data, sexual orientation, gender identity, early adversity, and SITBs, and interviewer-rated diagnostic information. Electronic medical records were reviewed six months post-discharge to identify psychiatric rehospitalizations within that time-period. This study was approved by the IRB at the institution in which this research was conducted.

Measures.

Sexual orientation.

Sexual orientation was assessed using a single item, “Do you consider your sexual orientation to be...” Response options included: heterosexual, gay/lesbian/homosexual, bisexual, not sure, other, or decline to state.

Gender identity.

Gender identity was assessed using a single item, “What is your gender?” Response options included: male, female, transgender (male to female), transgender (female to male), transgender (do not identify as male/female), not sure, other, or decline to state.

Current DSM IV Diagnoses.

Psychiatric diagnoses were assessed using the *Children’s Interview for Psychiatric Syndromes* (ChIPS)¹³ a structured interview to determine DSM diagnoses for youth ages 6 to 18. The ChIPS modules included attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, conduct disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, major depressive disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, and social anxiety disorder. A mental health provider on the inpatient unit administered all interviews to youth at the time of their admission.

Adverse Childhood Experiences.

Exposure to early adverse experiences was assessed using the *Adverse Childhood Experiences* (ACES)¹⁴, a 10-item questionnaire that assesses exposure to stressful or traumatic events in childhood. The total number of adverse events endorsed (range from 0 to

10) was calculated and used in analyses. The ACEs questionnaire demonstrates good test-retest reliability and has been used in several studies examining mental health across the lifespan.^{15–17}

Suicidal ideation.

Suicidal ideation was assessed by the *Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire – Jr. (SIQ-Jr.)*¹⁸. The SIQ-JR is a 15-item self-report measure of frequency and severity of suicidal ideation in the past month. The measure demonstrates good test-retest reliability, internal consistency, and validity in adolescents.^{18,19} The total score was used in analyses, and the measure demonstrated excellent reliability ($\alpha = .96$).

Self-injurious behavior.

History of suicide attempts and non-suicidal self-injury was assessed via items from the *Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors Interview (SITBI)*²⁰, which captures the frequency and characteristics of a range of SITBs. Questions were asked via self-report through a computerized survey. Three items from the SITBI were used in analyses. Respondents were asked to indicate lifetime history (presence/absence) of NSSI, as well as the prior 12 month frequency of NSSI. Items included: (1) “Have you ever in your life done anything to purposefully hurt yourself without trying to die (for example, cutting or burning your skin)?” (yes/no), and (2) “About how many days in the past 12 months have you purposely hurt yourself without trying to die?” (0 days, 1–4 days, 5+days). A single item, (3) “Have you ever made an actual suicide attempt, where you were trying to kill yourself, even just a little?” was used to determine lifetime history (presence/absence) of SA. The measure has strong inter-rater and test-retest reliability, and good validity.²⁰

Psychiatric inpatient readmission.

The presence or absence (yes/no) of rehospitalization on the psychiatric inpatient unit over the 6-months following data collection was assessed via electronic medical record review.

Data analytic plan.

First, to characterize the clinical characteristics of SGM compared to non-SGM youth, we examined rates of DSM-5 diagnoses and mean scores on symptom measures. Second, to characterize demographic differences, we compared groups on sex assigned at birth, ethnicity, and race. Third, to examine whether SGM youth experience higher levels of clinical distress, we compared groups on measures of SITBs and ACEs. Lastly, we compared hospital readmission rates in the 6-months following the initial data collection period. T-tests were used to compare groups on continuous variables, and chi square tests were used to compare groups on dichotomous measures. Finally, linear and logistic regression analyses were conducted to examine whether sexual minority status was a significant predictor of clinical risk indices when accounting for sex assigned at birth and current depression.

We collapsed youth across sexual minority (SM) and non-SM categories, and across gender minority (GM) and non-GM categories. For SM, we included youth who identified as gay/lesbian/homosexual, bisexual, or other. For non-SM, we included youth who identified as

heterosexual. For GM analyses, we included youth who identified as transgender or other, and for non-GM, we included youth who identified as male or female. Sensitivity analyses revealed no change in the pattern of results when including youth who selected 'unsure' or 'decline to state' response options for sexual orientation and/or gender identity; therefore, results below do not include these youth.

Results

Descriptive statistics.

Approximately half of the sample self-identified as heterosexual (51.7%; $n = 266$), and approximately one-third of the sample identified as a SM (24.3% identified as bisexual, $n = 125$; 7.4% identified as gay/lesbian/homosexual, $n = 38$; 2.9% identified as other, $n = 15$). The remainder of youth identified as unsure ($n = 55$; 10.7%) or declined to state ($n = 16$; 3.1%). A smaller proportion of youth identified as a GM in this sample. The majority of youth self-identified as female (57.5%; $n = 296$) or male (34.4%; $n = 177$). In contrast, 27 youth (5.2%) identified as transgender and 4 youth (0.8%) identified as other. The remainder of youth identified as unsure ($n = 7$; 1.4%) or declined to state ($n = 4$; 0.8%). Of SM youth, 20/178 (11.2%) identified as GM (transgender or other), and of GM youth, 20/31 youth (64.5%) identified as SM (bisexual, gay/lesbian/homosexual, or other).

In comparing rates of diagnoses between SM and non-SM youth, SM youth reported significantly higher rates of depression (79.8% SM vs. 62.2% non-SM), generalized anxiety disorder (57.7% vs. 34.5%), social anxiety disorder (22.6% vs. 14.3%), and post-traumatic stress disorder (31.5% vs. 19.0%). Groups did not differ on rates of any other diagnostic category. A similar pattern emerged for GM and non-GM youth. GM youth reported significantly higher rates of major depressive disorder (83.3% GM vs. 69.0% non-GM) and social phobia (30% vs. 17.3%). There were no differences between GM and non-GM youth on any other diagnostic category. In Table 1 and 2, we present findings comparing SGM youth and non-SGM youth on demographic variables. Both SM and GM youth were more likely to indicate their sex assigned at birth was female, compared to non-SM and non-GM youth. No other demographic differences were found.

Mean levels of SI, NSSI, and exposure to ACEs are presented in Table 1 and 2. Overall, SGM youth reported clinically elevated mean levels of SI (scores > 30) at initial hospitalization, as well as high rates of NSSI and SAs prior to initial hospitalization. SGM youth also reported high mean levels of early adversity experiences.

Comparisons between groups.

Independent samples t-tests comparing SM and non-SM youth on SI, past year NSSI frequency, and early adversity exposure are reported in Table 1.1. Results highlight significant differences between groups, such that youth who identify as a SM report greater exposure to early adversity and higher levels of SI, but not higher NSSI frequency, at their index admission. Effect sizes for these group differences were small to medium. Chi square tests comparing SM and non-SM youth on history of NSSI and SA (Table 1.2) indicate that

SM youth are significantly more likely to report a history of both NSSI and SA compared to non-SM youth.

Due to the small number of GM identified youth in this sample ($n = 31$), analyses comparing GM and non-GM youth on the clinical outcomes of interest are considered preliminary. Independent samples t-tests comparing GM and non-GM youth on recent SI, past year NSSI frequency, and early adversity exposure are reported in Table 2.1. Results highlight significant differences between groups, such that youth who identify as a GM report elevated SI at the time of hospitalization. Chi square tests comparing GM and non-GM youth on history of NSSI and SA (Table 2.2) indicate no significant differences between groups.

Finally, we compared SM and non-SM youth on rates of rehospitalization 6-months following initial data collection. Of youth who were re-hospitalized at least once in the 6-months following the initial data collection period ($n = 50$), 19/142 (13.4%) identified as SM and 31/224 (13.8%) as non-SM. Chi square analyses indicate there were no significant differences between groups ($\chi^2 = .016$; $p = .901$). The number of GM youth re-hospitalized in this time period was too small to conduct meaningful comparison between GM ($n = 2$) and non-GM ($n = 59$) youth. Post-hoc Benjamini-Hochberg tests indicated all bivariate results held after adjusting for multiple comparisons.

Multivariate analyses.

To test whether our findings were maintained when we statistically adjusted for relevant demographic and clinical characteristics (i.e., SM status, sex assigned at birth, and current depression status), linear regressions were conducted for continuous outcomes identified as significant in group comparisons between SM and non-SM youth. Notably, SM status remained a significant predictor of SI severity ($F(3,341) = 75.75$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .40$) and frequency of ACEs ($F(3,108) = 4.23$, $p = .007$, $R^2 = .11$) when SM status, sex assigned at birth, and current depression status were included in the model as independent variables. Logistic regressions were conducted for dichotomous outcomes identified as significant in group comparisons. Similarly, SM status remained a significant predictor of NSSI ($\chi^2(3) = 60.27$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .18$) and SA history ($\chi^2(3) = 85.85$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .25$) when SM status, sex assigned at birth, and current depression status were entered into the model. Depression was also a significant predictor in both models.

Discussion

The current study's aims were two-fold: to characterize the prevalence and clinical characteristics of SGM identification among psychiatrically hospitalized adolescents and to assess the relation between SGM status and clinical indicators of risk. We found that approximately 40% of psychiatrically hospitalized adolescents identify as SGM. Among these hospitalized adolescents, SGM youth evidenced significantly higher levels of risk, as compared to heterosexual and cisgender youth. Overall, SGM youth showed greater rates of SITBs, including higher severity of SI and greater likelihood of prior suicidal and non-suicidal self-injurious behavior, which is consistent with previous literature.^{21,22} The current findings were maintained in multivariate analyses that included relevant participant characteristics, including SM status, sex assigned at birth, and current depression status, in

the models. Results extend prior research to psychiatrically acute youth, showing that even among high clinical severity teens, SGM status is associated with greater SITB risk.^{9,23}

Consistent with prior research, we also found higher rates of childhood adversity among SGM youth, including developmental risk factors such as childhood abuse, neglect, and victimization. These ACEs likely contribute to health disparities later in life.^{24–27} Future research examining ACEs specific to SGM youth will be important to inform intervention for these high-risk youth. Additionally, the minority stress model provides a framework for explaining elevated risk for suicidality and related mental health outcomes in SM individuals and has been extended to examine minority stress processes in GM individuals.^{9,28} This model can be used to inform future research examining minority-specific stressors that may further account for increased risk for SITB in acute SGM adolescent populations.

Our findings indicate that, although SGM youth report greater clinical indicators of risk, including elevated rates of mental health diagnoses (e.g., depression, anxiety) relative to their psychiatrically hospitalized counterparts, they are not at a greater risk for rehospitalization. It is possible that, despite higher scores on risk indices at the time of initial hospitalization, SGM youth benefit from this contact with the mental healthcare system to the extent that the rates of rehospitalization do not exceed those of their non-SGM counterparts. Notably, however, our measure of rehospitalization was based on electronic medical record review, which was limited to the adolescent psychiatric units that share the same electronic medical record system. As a result, we were unable to account for rehospitalizations that occurred outside this hospital system. Therefore, limitations in our measure of rehospitalization may account for this unexpected finding. Further, because a small proportion of the sample was re-hospitalized during this six-month period, we may have been limited in our ability to detect differences between these groups. As a result, the present findings should be considered preliminary, and future research in a larger sample over a longer follow-up period with a more complete rehospitalization record should be conducted.

Limitations.

Despite notable study strengths, limitations should also be considered. First, apart from the clinical diagnostic interview, this study relied on adolescent self-report measures. Although obtaining caregiver perspectives is important, adolescents are the most accurate reporters of their gender identity and sexual orientation, and they are often the most accurate reporters of their own internalized states.²⁹ Second, in future research, it will be important to include a broader range of response options for inquiring about sexual orientation, including assessing both attraction and behavior. Third, we only assessed SGM status and clinical symptoms at their initial hospital admission; as a result, the degree to which SGM status is associated with SITBs over time could not be explored. Such work is needed in future research to disambiguate concomitants from risk factors for SITBs. The study design also prohibited consideration of the long-term stability of SGM identities and exploration of different stages of SGM identity development, factors that have been shown to impact mental health and SITB risk.^{30,31} Fourth, item-level data were not available for the ACEs measure to examine whether specific adverse events were driving the observed differences between SGM youth

and non-SGM youth. Fifth, the low number of GM youth reduced our ability to detect differences between groups on proposed clinical outcomes. Fifth, some interviewers may have been aware of adolescents' SGM status prior to conducting diagnostic interviews, which could bias these results. Finally, the sample size in this study restricted our ability to compare subgroups of SGM youth. Given evidence that certain subgroups may be at higher risk for SITBs³², further exploration of sexual and gender identity group differences is warranted. Research with much larger samples of SGM youth will allow for more nuanced investigation into differences in risk between SGM identities.

Clinical implications.

Given the high proportion of psychiatrically hospitalized youth identifying as SGM, and its association with greater risk for SITBs, it is clinically indicated to assess gender and sexual identity in a thorough and nuanced way, in accordance with guidelines for best practices, and to do so on a continual basis, as identification may change with time.³³ It is essential that all healthcare providers receive training in best practices with SGM youth and families. Additionally, it is critically important for research to examine whether evidence-based interventions to reduce SITB risk employed during hospitalization (e.g., safety planning³⁴) and post-discharge (e.g., dialectical behavior therapy³⁵) work effectively for this population, or if SGM-specific modifications are needed. In order to appropriately tailor treatments to maximize effectiveness, it will be imperative for future research to assess the mechanisms underlying elevated SITB risk among psychiatrically hospitalized SGM youth.

Conclusion.

In summary, even among clinically high-risk youth, SGM youth are at elevated risk for poor clinical outcomes and indices of risk, including SITBs and ACEs. Findings from the current study have direct clinical implications for assessment and clinical training, and results also highlight important directions for future research, including the need to test the effectiveness of evidence-based interventions in adolescent SGM samples.

Acknowledgments

Funding: This work was supported by the National Institutes of Mental Health [T32 MH019927], and in part by grant PDF-010517 from the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (PI: Nesi). NIMH and AFSP had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; and preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of NIMH or AFSP.

References

1. Heron M Deaths: Final data for 2016 (National Vital Statistics Reports; CDC). Natl Vital Stat Reports. 2018;67:1–76. https://www.cdc.gov/%0Ahttps://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr67/nvsr67_05.pdf.
2. Plemmons G, Hall M, Douplik S, Gay J, Brown C, Browning W, Casey R, Freundlich K, Johnson D, Lind C, Rehm K, Thomas S, Williams D. Hospitalization for suicide ideation or attempt: 2008–2015. *Pediatrics*. 2018;141.
3. Marshal MP, Dermody SS, Cheong JW, Burton CM, Friedman MS, Aranda F, Hughes TL. Trajectories of Depressive Symptoms and Suicidality Among Heterosexual and Sexual Minority Youth. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2013;42:1243–1256. [PubMed: 23784511]

4. Marshal MP, Dietz LJ, Friedman MS, Stall R, Smith HA, McGinley J, Thoma BC, Murray PJ, D'Augelli AR, Brent DA. Suicidality and depression disparities between sexual minority and heterosexual youth: A meta-analytic review. *J Adolesc Heal.* 2011;49:115–123.
5. Testa RJ, Sciacca LM, Wang F, Hendricks ML, Goldblum P, Bradford J, Bongar B. Effects of violence on transgender people. *Prof Psychol Res Pract.* 2012;43:452–459.
6. Testa RJ, Michaels MS, Bliss W, Rogers ML, Balsam KF, Joiner T. Suicidal Ideation in Transgender People: Gender Minority Stress and Interpersonal Theory Factors. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 2017;126:125–136. [PubMed: 27831708]
7. Kann L, McManus T, Harris AW, Shanklin S, Flint HK, Queen B, Lowry R, Chyen D, Whittle L, Thornton J, Lim C, Bradford D, Yamakawa Y, Leon M, Brener N, Ethier KA. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance - United States, 2017. Vol 67; 2018 <http://ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cin20&AN=2011717026&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
8. Liu RT, Sheehan AE, Walsh RF, Sanzari CM, Cheek SM, Hernandez EM. Prevalence and correlates of non-suicidal self-injury among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2019;74:101783. [PubMed: 31734440]
9. 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. [PubMed: 12956539]
10. Baams L, Grossman AH, Russell ST. Minority stress and mechanisms of risk for depression and suicidal ideation among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Dev Psychol.* 2015;51:688–696. [PubMed: 25751098]
11. Peters JR, Mereish EH, Krek MA, Chuong A, Ranney ML, Solomon J, Spirito A, Yen S. Sexual orientation differences in non-suicidal self-injury, suicidality, and psychosocial factors among an inpatient psychiatric sample of adolescents. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;284:112664. [PubMed: 31732188]
12. Yen S, Weinstock LM, Andover MS, Sheets ES, Selby EA, Spirito A. Prospective predictors of adolescent suicidality: 6-month post-hospitalization follow-up. *Psychol Med.* 2013;43:983–993. [PubMed: 22932393]
13. Weller EB, Weller RA, Fristad MA, Rooney MT, Schecter J. Children's interview for psychiatric syndromes (ChIPS). *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2000;39.
14. Anda RF, Butchart A, Felitti VJ, Brown DW. Building a framework for global surveillance of the public health implications of adverse childhood experiences. *Am J Prev Med.* 2010;39:93–98. [PubMed: 20547282]
15. Chapman D, Anda R, Felitti V, Dube S, Edwards V, Whitfield C. Adverse childhood experiences and the risk of depressive disorders in adulthood. *J Affect Disord.* 2004;82:217–225. [PubMed: 15488250]
16. Dube S, Williamson D, Thompson T, Felitti V, Anda R. Assessing the reliability of retrospective reports of adverse childhood experiences among adult HMO members attending a primary care clinicexternal icon. *Child Abus Negl.* 2004;28:729–737.
17. Dube S, Anda R, Felitti V, Chapman D, Williamson D, Giles W. Childhood abuse, household dysfunction and the risk of attempted suicide throughout the life span: Findings from Adverse Childhood Experiences Study. *JAMA.* 2001;286:3089–3096. [PubMed: 11754674]
18. Reynolds WM, Mazza JJ. Assessment of suicidal ideation in inner-city children and young adolescents: Reliability and validity of the Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire-JR. *Sch Psychol Rev.* 1999;28:17–30.
19. Hill K, Van Eck K, Goklish N, Larzelere-Hinton F, Cwik M. Factor structure and validity of the SIQ-JR in a southwest American Indian tribe. *Psychol Serv.* 2020;17:207–216. [PubMed: 30475042]
20. Nock MK, Holmberg EB, Photos VI, Michel BD. The Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors Interview: Development, reliability, and validity in an adolescent sample. *Psychol Assess.* 2007;19:309–317. [PubMed: 17845122]
21. Smithee LC, Sumner BW, Bean RA. Non-suicidal self-injury among sexual minority youth: An etiological and treatment overview. *Child Youth Serv Rev.* 2019;96:212–219.

22. Liu RT. Temporal Trends in the Prevalence of Nonsuicidal Self-injury Among Sexual Minority and Heterosexual Youth From 2005 Through 2017. *JAMA Pediatr.* 6 2019.
23. McLemore K A Minority Stress Perspective on Transgender Individuals' Experiences With Misgendering. *Stigma Heal.* 2016;2.
24. Austin A, Herrick H, Proescholdbell S. Adverse Childhood Experiences Related to Poor Adult Health Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Individuals. *Am J Public Health.* 2016;106:314–320. [PubMed: 26691127]
25. Rothman EF, Exner D, Baughman AL. The prevalence of sexual assault against people who identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in the United States: a systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse.* 2011;12:55–66. [PubMed: 21247983]
26. Friedman MS, Marshal MP, Guadamuz TE, Wei C, Wong CF, Saewyc E, Stall R. A meta-analysis of disparities in childhood sexual abuse, parental physical abuse, and peer victimization among sexual minority and sexual nonminority individuals. *Am J Public Health.* 2011;101:1481–1494. [PubMed: 21680921]
27. Andersen JP, Blosnich J. Disparities in adverse childhood experiences among sexual minority and heterosexual adults: results from a multi-state probability-based sample. *PLoS One.* 2013;8:e54691. [PubMed: 23372755]
28. Testa RJ, Habarth J, Peta J, Balsam K, Bockting W. Development of the Gender Minority Stress and Resilience Measure. *Psychol Sex Orientat Gend Divers.* 2015;2:65–77.
29. Sourander A, Helstelä L, Helenius H. Parent-adolescent agreement on emotional and behavioral problems. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 1999;34:657–663. [PubMed: 10703276]
30. Pachankis JE. The scientific pursuit of sexual and gender minority mental health treatments: Toward evidence-based affirmative practice. *Am Psychol.* 2018;73:1207. [PubMed: 30525805]
31. D'Augelli A, Hersberger S, Pilkington N. Suicidality patterns and sexual orientation-related factors among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths. *Suicide Life Threat Behav.* 2001;31:250–264. [PubMed: 11577911]
32. Mustanski BS, Garofalo R, Emerson EM. Mental health disorders, psychological distress, and suicidality in a diverse sample of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youths. *Am J Public Health.* 2010;100:2426–2432. [PubMed: 20966378]
33. Hu Y, Xu Y, Tornello SL. Stability of self-reported same-sex and both-sex attraction from adolescence to young adulthood. *Arch Sex Behav.* 2016;45:651–659. [PubMed: 26048483]
34. Stanley B, Brown GK. Safety Planning Intervention: A Brief Intervention to Mitigate Suicide Risk. *Cogn Behav Pract.* 2012;19:256–264.
35. Mehlum L, Ramberg M, Tormoen AJ, Haga E, Diep LM, Stanley BH, Groholt B. Dialectical behavior therapy compared with enhanced usual care for adolescents with repeated suicidal and self-harming behavior: outcomes over a one-year follow-up. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2016;54:295–300.

Table 1.

1 Chi square tests comparing sexual minority and non-sexual minority youth on demographic variables.					
	SM youth n (%)	non-SM youth n (%)	Chi²	<i>p</i>	Odds Ratio (CI)
Female sex at birth	158 (88.8%)	119 (44.4%)	88.09	< .001	9.76 (5.77 – 16.48)
Hispanic	42 (24.0%)	62 (23.7%)	.003	.953	1.01 (.65 – 1.59)
Non-white	55 (31.4%)	86 (32.9%)	.11	.739	.933 (.62 – 1.41)
2 Independent samples t-tests comparing sexual minority and non-sexual minority youth on symptom measures.					
	SM youth mean (SD)	non-SM youth mean (SD)	<i>t</i> (df)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
ACEs	7.17 (3.62)	4.79 (3.52)	−3.99 (142)	< .001	.69
SIQ-JR	44.03 (26.13)	27.95 (27.31)	−6.19 (442)	< .001	.60
NSSI 12 month frequency	1.35 (.72)	1.20 (.64)	−1.50 (204)	.135	.20
3 Chi square tests comparing sexual minority and non-sexual minority youth on SITBs.					
	SM youth n (%)	non-SM youth n (%)	Chi²	<i>p</i>	Odds Ratio (CI)
NSSI history	138 (77.5%)	123 (46.24%)	43.086	< .001	4.01 (2.62 – 6.15)
SA history	122 (78.5%)	115 (43.23%)	27.44	< .001	2.86 (1.92 – 4.26)

SM = Sexual minority; ACEs = Adverse Early Experiences questionnaire; SIQ = Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire; NSSI = Non-suicidal self-injury; SA = suicide attempt.

Table 2.

1 Chi square tests comparing gender minority and non-gender minority youth on demographic variables.					
	GM youth n (%)	non-GM youth n (%)	Chi²	<i>p</i>	Odds Ratio (CI)
Female sex at birth	27 (87.1%)	298 (63.0%)	7.38	.007	3.96 (1.36 – 11.52)
Hispanic	8 (25.8%)	108 (23.3%)	.104	.747	1.14 (.50 – 2.64)
Non-white	10 (32.3%)	120 (32.5%)	.001	.980	.99 (.45 – 2.16)
2 Independent samples t-tests comparing gender minority and non-gender minority youth on symptom measures.					
	GM youth mean (SD)	non-GM youth mean (SD)	<i>t</i> (df)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
ACEs	6.45 (3.23)	5.74 (3.73)	−0.61 (152)	.543	.20
SIQ-JR	53.32 (24.98)	33.59 (27.38)	−3.91 (502)	.001	.75
NSSI 12 month frequency	1.52 (.62)	1.23 (.69)	−1.72 (229)	.087	.44
3 Chi square tests comparing gender minority and non-gender minority youth on SITBs.					
	GM youth n (%)	non-GM youth n (%)	Chi²	<i>p</i>	Odds Ratio (CI)
NSSI history	22 (70.10%)	269 (56.87%)	2.37	.124	1.85 (.84 – 4.11)
SA history	17 (54.83%)	248 (52.43%)	.068	.795	1.02 (.53 – 2.86)

GM = Gender minority; ACEs = Adverse Early Experiences questionnaire; SIQ = Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire; NSSI = Non-suicidal self-injury; SA = suicide attempt.