Ethnic and sexual identities: inequalities in adolescent health and wellbeing in a national population-based study

Amal R. Khanolkar[1,2], David M. Frost[3], Evangeline Tabor[3], Victoria Redclift[3], Rebekah Amos[4], Praveetha Patalay[1,3]

1. MRC Unit for Lifelong Health & Ageing at UCL,

2. Department of Population Health Sciences, King' College London,

3. Social Research Institute, UCL Institute of Education

4. Department of Primary Care and Mental Health, University of Liverpool

Sexual and ethnic inequalities in adolescent health

Corresponding Author: Amal Khanolkar

a.khanolkar@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

Aims To examine inequalities related to dual sexual- and ethnic-identities in risk for health, wellbeing, and health-related behaviours in a nationally representative sample of adolescents.

Methods 9,789 adolescents (51% female) aged 17 years from the UK-wide Millennium Cohort Study, with data on self-identified sexual- and ethnic-identities. Adolescents were grouped into White-Heterosexual, White sexual minority (White-SM), ethnic minority (EM)-heterosexual, and ethnic- and sexual minority (EM-SM).

Mental health (e.g., self-reported psychological distress, doctor-diagnosed depression, attempted suicide, victimisation), general health (self-rated health, chronic illness, BMI) and a range of health-related behaviours (e.g., smoking, substance use) were assessed by questionnaires. Associations between dual identities and outcomes were analysed using logistic and linear regression (adjusted for sex and parental income).

Results Sexual minorities (White:18% and ethnic minority:3%) had increased odds for mental ill-health and attempted suicide, with higher odds in White-SM than EM-SM. Compared to White-heterosexuals, White-SM and EM-SM had higher odds for psychological distress (OR 3.47/2.24 for White-SM/EM-SM respectively), and emotional problems (OR 3.17/1.65). White-SM and EM-SM had higher odds for attempted suicide (OR 2.78/2.02), self-harm (OR 3.06/1.52), and poor sleep quality (OR 1.88/1.67). In contrast, White-Heterosexual and White-SM groups had similarly high proportions reporting risky behaviours except for drug use (OR 1.34) and risky sex (OR 1.40) more common in White-SM individuals. EM-Heterosexuals and EM-SM individuals had decreased odds for health-related behaviours.

Conclusions Sexual minorities (White and EM) had substantially worse mental health compared to their heterosexual peers. Adverse health-related behaviours were more common in White sexual minority individuals. Further investigation into potentially different mechanisms leading to adverse health in White-SM and EM-SM individuals is needed.

Introduction

Recent decades have witnessed sociocultural shifts in better understanding sexual identities along with greater social acceptance and political rights for sexual minorities in many countries[1]. Nonetheless, growing evidence shows adolescent and adult sexual minorities (e.g. lesbian, gay, bisexual) have substantially poorer mental health, higher levels of stress and increased risk of self-harm, adverse health-related behaviours (substance use, physical activity and risky sex), and attempted suicide compared to their heterosexual peers[1-7]. They are more likely to be bullied or harassed at schools and workplaces, face stigma and hide their sexual identities[1,8-10].

To date most studies on health in sexual minority individuals focused on mental health, wellbeing, and sexual health. They are mostly restricted to White individuals with the few studies on sexual and ethnic minorities (EM) originating in the US (often based on small study samples, non-probability samples, often without comparator groups, some with discordant results and a substantial number focusing on one ethnic/racial group in comparison to the majority White group)[2,11]. Additionally, most studies focus on adults with few studies specifically examining health and related issues in sexual minority adolescents in general, irrespective of ethnic origin[2]. This is despite adolescents coming out at earlier ages and increasing evidence for greater sexuality-based inequalities in adolescent health[2,12].

In the UK there is little knowledge on health and health-related behaviours in EM individuals who identify as sexual minority (i.e., dual minority identities) and in general how combined minority statuses can impact health leading to disparities that may track into adulthood. This critical gap in knowledge is striking despite the substantial evidence of poorer health in many EM[13-16]. One exception being better internalising mental health in millennial adolescent EM compared to White peers[17]. EM are more likely to face bullying, harassment, and racism because of their ethnic-origin and/or religion, regardless of their sexual identity[9,18,19]. Dual minority (based on ethnicity and sexuality) individuals may experience higher levels of stressors due to ethnic and cultural differences and expectations (for e.g. having to conform to ethnic-specific expectations regarding gender roles, inability to disclose sexual orientation with families)[20], and face higher levels of homophobic violence[21]. Higher levels of stress impact not only mental health but might lead to higher levels of risky and (mal)adaptive behaviours including coping mechanisms (positive and negative)[22]. Thus, EM could be at an even higher risk for mental ill-health, poor wellbeing, and risky behaviour due to the cumulative effects of two or more minority identities.

Adolescence is characterised by rapid biological changes and increased psychosocial awareness. It is a critical period of increasing self-awareness and social exploration when adolescents explore self-identities with specific groups (e.g. ethnicity, religious, sexual)[23]. Chronic physical and mental health conditions, and health-related behaviours (e.g., drug and alcohol use) in adolescence can have long-term consequences as they impact access to higher education, the labour market, effective and positive participation in society, and track across adulthood increasing risk for morbidity[24]. [25] Lastly, victimisation, stigmatisation and discrimination related to minority identities experienced in adolescence exacerbate poor health and wellbeing in vulnerable individuals with long-term consequences for health, social, and economic outcomes in later life[26,27].

This study examined dual sexual- and ethnic-identities in relation to health in a nationally representative population of adolescents aged 17 years. We investigated differences in mental health, general health, and health-related behaviours in EM adolescents who identify as sexual minority (dual minority) and in comparison, to their EM heterosexual and White-LGB and heterosexual peers.

Methods

Study design and participants

This cross-sectional study uses data from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS), a nationally representative birth cohort following children born Sept 2000-Jan 2002[28]. A national sample of 19,517 children from across the UK were recruited to MCS and followed-up over seven sweeps (ages 9 months, 3, 5, 7, 11, 14 and 17 years). This study includes N=10,757 children from the age 17 sweep (from 10,625 families or 73.6% of the eligible sample at this sweep) and took place between January 2018-May 2019. MCS was oversampled to have higher proportions of ethnic minorities and socioeconomically disadvantaged families (with appropriate sample weighting ensuring national representativeness). Attrition at the age 17 sweep was predicted by single-parent families, lower-income occupation and lower educational level, black ethnicity, and male sex.

Ethics approval for the MCS study was obtained from the National Research Ethics Service Committee London— Central (reference 13/LO/1786). All data are anonymised and available to researchers via the UK Data Service. Cohort members ≥16 years provided verbal consent to take part in the overall assessment, and each survey element.

Ethnic and sexual identity

Participants were asked '*Which of the following options best describes how you currently think of yourself*' and could choose from eight options (Supplemental Table 1). Based on responses, participants were categorised into 1. Completely heterosexual and 2. Sexual minority (mainly heterosexual/straight, bisexual, mainly gay/lesbian and completely gay/lesbian).

Further categorising sexual minorities into separate groups (gays, lesbians, and bisexuals) was restricted by the small numbers of individuals identifying as ethnic- and sexual-minority. However, previous research suggests that mainly heterosexuals report health differences due to similar reasons as sexual minority groups indicating that they can be combined for analysis[29].

As an alternative sexual identity variable, participants were also categorised into 1. Completely heterosexual, 2. Mainly heterosexual and 3. Exclusively sexual minority (bisexual, mainly gay/lesbian and completely gay/lesbian)

Parent/guardian reported participant's ethnicity at age 3 (original categories in Supplemental Table 1). Information from subsequent ages was used to replace any missing ethnicity at age 3. For analysis, subjects were grouped into one of two ethnic groups, creating a binary variable: 1.White and 2.Ethnic minority (which included Mixed, South Asian, Black and 'other'). The 'other' group included participants from Asia (excluding South Asia), the Middle East and South America. The Mixed ethnic group included any combination of mixed-ethnic backgrounds.

Ethnicity and sexuality indicator (study exposure)

The exposure of interest was created by combining the binary sexual and ethnic identity variables resulting in one dual identity variable with the categories: 1. White heterosexual, 2. EM and heterosexual [EM-heterosexual], 3. White and sexual minority [White-SM] and 4. EM and sexual minority [EM-SM]. This approach allows us to estimate risk in all three categories of sexuality- and ethnic-identities compared to the White Heterosexual group.

As a sensitivity analysis with the 3-category coding of sexual-identity, we created a second sexuality and ethnicity indicator which included individuals who self-identified as 'mainly heterosexual' in a separate category: 1. White heterosexual, 2. EM and heterosexual, 3. White and mainly heterosexual, 4. White and sexual minority [White-SM] and 5. EM and mainly heterosexual and 6. EM and sexual minority [EM-SM]. This was done to examine whether the mainly heterosexual group differed from the totally heterosexual and exclusively sexual-minority (lesbians, gays, and bisexual) groups.

Outcomes of interest

Mental & general health

Health indicators and health-related behaviours were obtained from questionnaires answered by adolescents. Mental health indicators included the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale for nonspecific psychological distress, and the self-report Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ-S) which assesses behavioural markers of mental health difficulties in young people [3031]. The SDQ-S comprises five subscales assessing conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, emotional problems (depression and anxiety), peer problems and prosocial behaviour. For both Kessler and each subscale of the SDQ-S, scores were summed to create overall scores. Each of the total scores were also categorised into binary variables based on recommended cut-off points to indicate individuals with and without diffculties[32].

Other mental health indicators included doctor diagnosed depression, self-harm (actions like burning, bruising/pinching, taking an overdose of tablets and pulling out hair), attempted suicide and self-esteem (assessed via the 5-item shortened version of the Rosenberg self-esteem scale)[33].

Mental wellbeing was assessed using the shortened Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS) which provides a single summary score indicating overall wellbeing[34].

General health indicators included self-assessed general health, chronic physical or mental health conditions in the preceding 12 months, quality of sleep and Body Mass Index (BMI, continuous, and categorised into normal vs obesity [including overweight] using the International Obesity Task Force age- and sex-specific cut-offs for 2-18 year-olds[35].

Social adversity was assessed by experiences of victimisation (i.e. experiences of verbal, physical, sexual assault and/or harassment in the past 12 months).

Health-related behaviours

These were coded as binary indicators (never tried/experienced/none vs. yes) and included smoking habits (ever smokers, and current smokers), alcohol consumption, frequency of alcohol consumption in previous 12 months, frequency of binge drinking in previous 4 weeks, any drug use, and specifically cannabis use, and frequency of cannabis use in the previous year. Sexual behaviour was assessed by sexual activity (ever had intercourse) and risky sex (did not use any contraception). We also examined frequency of physical activity in the previous week (none vs. any). Antisocial behaviour was assessed by one or more of the following acts in the previous 12 months: Pushed or shoved/hit/slapped/punched someone, hit someone with or used a weapon, stolen something from someone, harassed someone via mobile phone/email, sent pictures or spread rumours about someone and made unwelcome sexual approaches/sexually assaulted someone.

The original questions, complete component items of each scale, all health, and health-related indicators, and how they were categorised are explained in detail in Supplemental Methods and listed in Supplemental Table 3.

Other Covariates

Parental income was used as an indicator of socioeconomic position. Household income (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development UK) was categorised into equalised quintiles (where quintiles 1 and 5 represent the lowest and highest income quintiles respectively). Sex was based on sex at birth.

Statistical analysis

Associations between the dual sexual-ethnic identity indicator and outcomes of interest were analysed using multivariable linear and logistic regression modelling (for continuous and binary outcomes respectively). To account for the stratified cluster design of the MCS and attrition over time, all regression analyses were weighted with non-response weights from the birth sweep (using the Stata '*svy*' command for survey data).

All models were adjusted for sex and parental income. Odds ratios from logistic regression models were plotted for visualisation.

Sensitivity analysis – The above regression models were run with the sexual- and ethnicity-indicator which includes the 'mainly heterosexual' group as a separate category.

All analyses were conducted in Stata V16 (StataCorp LP, College Station, Texas).

Results

White-SM and EM-SM groups reported similarly higher proportions of mental ill-health (32%) based on the K6 psychological distress scale, and more than twice as high as heterosexual peers (Table 1). Based on the SDQ, 40% of White-SM and 32% of EM-SM individuals reported symptoms of psychological distress, substantially higher than White-heterosexuals (18.5%) and EM-heterosexuals (12.4%). Both sexual minorities had greater numbers of individuals with hyperactivity and peer problems. Compared to the EM-SM group, the White-SM group were more likely to report doctor diagnosed depression (21.3 vs. 13.1%), self-harm (47.1 vs. 39.9%), mental or physical health conditions (26.3 vs. 20.1%), and attempted suicide (15.6 vs. 12.6%) and victimisation (58.8 vs. 52.2%). EM-SM individuals were more likely to report feeling negative about their weight (63.2 vs. 52%) compared to White-SM individuals.

Irrespective of sexuality, EM individuals had lower levels of adverse health-related behaviours compared to White individuals (Table 1). However, EM-SM individuals had higher rates of adverse health-related behaviour compared to the EM-heterosexual individuals (for e.g., more likely to have tried alcohol (59.3 vs 30.2%), experienced binge drinking (47.3 vs. 38.1%), ever drug use (25.1 vs.16.2%), and risky sex (56.1 vs 41.9%)).

Table 2A and Figure 1 display results from multivariable logistic regression models. Both sexual minorities had consistently higher odds for mental ill-health compared to White-heterosexuals. However, White-SM individuals had higher odds than EM-SM individuals (for example, psychological distress: OR 3.47 [2.73-4.42] vs 2.24 [1.35-3.70], self-harm: 3.06 [2.41,3.89] vs 1.52 [0.98-2.37] and attempted suicide, OR 2.78 [2.10-3.68] vs 2.02[1.10-3.71] for White-SM vs EM-SM groups respectively). Only White-SM individuals had higher risks for hyperactivity (OR 1.52 [1.22-1.90), doctor diagnosed depression (OR 2.56 [1.85-3.53]), poor general health (OR 1.94 [1.42-2.64]) and mental/physical health conditions (OR 2.24 [1.71-2.94]). Higher odds for prosocial behaviour (OR 2.50, 1.35-4.65) was observed in the EM-SM group only.

Compared to White-heterosexuals, White-SM (Table 3, -1.82, [-2.30,-1.33]) and EM-SM (-1.19, [-1.93,-0.44]) groups had worse mental wellbeing.

EM-heterosexuals had consistently and significantly lower odds for all mental ill-health and general health indicators compared to the White-Heterosexuals.

Table 2B and Figure 2 display results from multivariable logistic regression models on health-related behaviours. In general, EM individuals were significantly less likely to report adverse health-related behaviours (ever smoking: OR 0.21/0.63, alcohol consumption: OR 0.10/0.25, and ever binge drinking: OR 0.26/0.61 for heterosexual/sexual minority groups respectively) compared to White-heterosexuals individuals. They were also less likely to have ever had sex. In contrast, EM-SM individuals had higher odds for anti-social behaviour (OR 1.86 [1.21-2.83]). There were no differences in health-related behaviours between White-heterosexuals and White-SM individuals apart from higher odds for drug use (OR 1.45, 1.18-1.78) and risky sex (OR 1.40, 1.03-1.90) in the latter. Compared to the White-heterosexuals, the other three groups had higher odds for attempting weight control.

When examining the mainly heterosexual group separately, the exclusively sexual minority and mainly heterosexual individuals had substantially higher risk for mental ill-health and poor health, but with a gradient that was more consistent and pronounced in White individuals (for example, OR 2.50 and 4.82 for psychological distress, 2.05 and 5.0 for emotional problems, 1.43 and 4.11 for diagnosed depression, 1.61 and 4.25 for attempted suicide in mainly heterosexuals and sexual minorities respectively, and compared to White-heterosexuals individuals, Supplemental Table 4A and Figure 1).

This gradient was less evident in EM; the EM-mainly heterosexual group was similar to the EM-Heterosexual group and did not have increased odds for adverse health. However, risk effects for all mental and general health outcomes were substantially larger in effect size in exclusively sexual minority individuals regardless of ethnic origin, when they were analysed as a separate category (Supplemental Table 4A). Similarly, the

White mainly-heterosexual and EM-mainly heterosexual groups were similar to their heterosexual counterparts in health-related behaviours (Supplemental Table 4B).

Discussion

We report the first population-based estimates for health and health-related behaviours related to ethnic- and sexual-identities in a nationally representative sample of adolescents in the UK, revealing: 1. Substantially higher risk for mental ill-health (consistent with several indicators) in sexual minority individuals, regardless of ethnic origin. 2. Adverse health-related behaviours were more commonly reported by White sexual minority individuals and were less likely to be reported by EM individuals (regardless of sexuality). 3. Among White individuals, those who identified as mainly heterosexual had higher odds for mental ill-health and poor general health that was intermediate between heterosexuals and exclusively sexual minorities. This gradient was less evident in mainly heterosexual who are EM. 4. When exclusively sexual minority individuals were examined as a separate group, odds for mental ill-health, and poor general health were greater, and more so in White individuals.

Strengths include a large sample size drawn from a nationally representative birth cohort oversampled for EM, and results should be generalizable to the UK population. The study benefits from a wide range of health outcomes, especially multiple and diverse health and wellbeing indicators, and health-related behaviours examined in the same sample. The consistent associations between sexual minority identity and multiple measures of mental health reduces risk of chance findings. Further this study examines risk in EM heterosexuals providing an essential comparator group often overlooked in similar studies[2]. While all individuals had data on ethnicity, 9% were missing data on sexual identity but proportions missing this information were the same between ethnic groups (9.7% in White and 9.1% in EM). Despite a large sample, only 253 (3%) individuals identified as being ethnic- and sexual minority (dual minority) which precluded analysing differences in health by sex and using more specific ethnic- (e.g. South Asian, Black and mixed-ethnicity) and sexual minority identities (gay, lesbian and bisexual). Lastly, this study could not examine sexual minority-specific issues such as age at 'coming-out', rejection sensitivity (being rejected by family/close friends), internalised stigma, gender-role strain and perceived burdensomeness which are strongly linked to mental health and wellbeing and are known to differ between ethnic groups[2,36].

To our knowledge, this is the first UK study to examine associations between dual ethnic- and sexual-identities and diverse health and health-related behaviours in a probability sample. A substantially lower proportion of EM identified as sexual minority (4.6%) and mainly heterosexual (8.9%) compared to White individuals (10.2% and 11.6% respectively). This is comparable with UK national data, and a US study on adolescents, that found EM were more likely to report their sexuality as 'Other'/'Don't know'/'refused to answer' and/or 'unsure'[37,38]. Previous UK studies that examined sexual identity and health focused on mental health and health behaviours excluding ethnic differences[39,40]. Most studies that examined associations between ethnic- and sexual minority identities and health, have largely focused on adults and are not comparable, as late adolescence is a unique life stage of identity development[2]. These studies largely originate from the US which has a different distribution of EM compared to the UK. Nonetheless, our results are consistent with elevated rates of emotional distress, mood and anxiety disorders, self-harm, and attempted suicide in studies on sexual minority young adults[2,41]. In this sample, White-SM individuals had on average higher risk for mental ill-health, self-harm, and attempted suicide compared to EM-SM individuals but as 95% CIs overlapped, we cannot be certain about differences in risks between the two groups. The lower risk for doctor diagnosed depression in EM groups is consistent with literature suggesting they are less likely to seek clinical support[42].

Studies on ethnic differences in health-related behaviours among sexual minority youth have mostly focused on smoking, alcohol, and drug use, with contradictory findings. EM adolescents in the UK, are less likely to smoke[43], drink, and use drugs compared to their White and mixed-ethnicity peers (though Black adolescents reported higher levels of substance use)[44]. Ethnic- and sexual-differences in health-related behaviours in UK adolescents were unknown and reported for the first time here. Our findings are intriguing; ethnic- and

exclusively sexual minority individuals were less likely to drink but were more likely to use drugs (especially cannabis) compared to their heterosexual peers. This suggests that EM-SM individuals are to some extent protected by the general lower prevalence of adverse health-related behaviours in EM youth. However, they report some adverse health-related behaviours which are known coping-mechanisms in sexual minority youth. Studies (including a systematic review) indicate that mainly heterosexuals experience an intermediate risk for adverse health (between that observed for completely heterosexuals and bisexuals)[29]. This suggests that mainly heterosexuals are a distinct group experiencing worse health outcomes, probably due to experiences of minority stress and non-heterosexual lifestyle, suggesting that they should be studied as a distinct group where possible[29,45].

The minority stress theory is the most cited explanation and considered the foundational framework to explain minority health disparities in both ethnic and sexual minorities[6]. The theory predicates that minorities experience acute and long-term chronic stressors due to social stigma attached to their identities (including racism, victimisation, bullying, unconscious bias, and other forms of discrimination), which are in addition to regular day-to-day stressors experienced by all people. Excess exposure to these forms of minority stress manifest in poorer mental and physical health. This compromised mental health is one of the main predictors of adverse health-related behaviours which further effect health in minority individuals[46]. Ethnic and sexual minority individuals balance multiple identities (such as gender and/or faith and religious identities) which can further exacerbate stigmatisation and stress associated with having one minority identity[47]. Additionally, EM individuals encounter a different set of expectations compared to their White peers, including educational, family and community expectations that can be difficult to navigate especially during adolescence and early adulthood. EM-SM individuals face discrimination within LGBTQ+ social contexts adding to feelings of isolation and not being accepted[48,49]. Our results suggest it is not the simple accumulation of minority identities that confers increased probability of adverse outcomes, but rather incidents of adversity (or lack of) reflecting a complex interplay of protective and detrimental cultural and interpersonal factors.

White-SM and EM-SM individuals experience more frequent and severe victimization, prejudice, and discrimination at individual and institutional levels increasing their risk for poor health. But the mechanisms and pathways for adverse health in the two groups potentially occur in different ways, for instance EM-specific and sexual minority specific pathways, and unpacking these differences will be important to elucidate mechanisms to reduce health disparities, and potentially design public health interventions accordingly.

The UK's social and policy contexts are increasingly shifting toward acceptance and equality for sexual minorities, yet the current generations of adolescents continue to experience health inequalities[45]. More effective public health efforts are needed to address continued social stigma and provide access to affirmative care and health promoting resources. Given the complex differences identified at the combination of sexual and ethnic minority identities, public health initiatives are likely to be most effective if differentially designed and targeted with the specific needs of EM communities in mind.

Future studies examining health in diverse sexual and ethnic identity groups should analyse protective factors in addition to risk factors. It will be informative to examine how adverse health and health-related behaviours change over time i.e. from adolescence to adulthood and beyond. However, this requires adequately powered longitudinal data including collecting detailed information related to experiences of sexual and ethnic minorities specific to sexual minorities.

Conclusion

Sexual minority adolescents (White and EM) have substantially higher levels of mental ill-health and poorer general health compared to heterosexuals. Adverse health-related behaviours were more common among White sexual minorities compared to EM-SM individuals. Adolescents identifying as mainly-heterosexual had poorer health in between those exclusively heterosexual and exclusively sexual minority. This highlights

need for robust investigation into mechanisms leading to adverse health in sexual minorities. Additionally, these mechanisms potentially vary between ethnic groups. Further research will benefit from both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

References

1. The Health of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People: Building a Foundation for Better Understanding. Washington, DC:: IOM (Institute of Medicine), 2011.
2. Toomey RB, Huynh VW, Jones SK, Lee S, Revels-Macalinao M. Sexual minority youth of color: A content analysis and critical review of the literature. *J Gay Lesbian Ment Health* 2017; **21**(1): 3-31.
3. Scheer JR, Harney P, Esposito J, Woulfe JM. Self-Reported Mental and Physical Health Symptoms and Potentially Traumatic Events Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Individuals: The Role of Shame. *Psychol Violence* 2020; **10**(2): 131-42.
4. Blosnich JR, Andersen JP. Thursday's child: the role of adverse childhood experiences in explaining mental health disparities among lesbian, gay, and bisexual U.S. adults. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2015; **50**(2): 335-8.
5. Moagi MM, van Der Wath AE, Jiyane PM, Rikhotso RS. Mental health challenges of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people: An integrated literature review. *Health SA* 2021; **26**: 1487.
6. Meyer IH. Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychol Bull* 2003; **129**(5): 674-97.
7. Irish M, Solmi F, Mars B, et al. Depression and self-harm from adolescence to young adulthood in sexual minorities compared with heterosexuals in the UK: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2019; **3**(2): 91-8.
8. Mitchell M, Gray G, Green K, Beninge K. What works in tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic (HBT) bullying among school-age children and young people?: NatCen Social Research, 2014.
9. Russell ST, Sinclair KO, Poteat VP, Koenig BW. Adolescent health and harassment based on discriminatory bias. *Am J Public Health* 2012; **102**(3): 493-5.
10. Hatzenbuehler ML, Bellatorre A, Lee Y, Finch BK, Muennig P, Fiscella K. Structural stigma and all-cause mortality in sexual minority populations. *Soc Sci Med* 2014; **103**: 33-41.
11. Russell ST, Fish JN. Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Youth. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol* 2016; **12**: 465-87.
12. Saewyc EM. Research on Adolescent Sexual Orientation: Development, Health Disparities, Stigma and Resilience. *J Res Adolesc* 2011; **21**(1): 256-72.
13. Bhopal RS, Gruer L, Cezard G, et al. Mortality, ethnicity, and country of birth on a national scale, 2001-2013: A retrospective cohort (Scottish Health and Ethnicity Linkage Study). *PLoS Med* 2018; **15**(3): e1002515.
14. Watkinson RE, Sutton M, Turner AJ. Ethnic inequalities in health-related quality of life among older adults in England: secondary analysis of a national cross-sectional survey. *Lancet Public Health* 2021; **6**(3): e145-e54.
15. Khanolkar AR, Amin R, Taylor-Robinson D, Viner RM, Warner J, Stephenson T. Inequalities in glycemic control in childhood onset type 2 diabetes in England and Wales-A national population-based longitudinal study. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2019; **20**(7): 821-31.
16. Local action on health inequalities Understanding and reducing ethnic inequalities in health: Public Health England, 2018.
17. Digital N. Mental Health of Children and Young People in England

2018.
18. Vitoroulis I, Vaillancourt T. Meta-analytic results of ethnic group differences in peer victimization. *Aggress Behav* 2015; **41**(2): 149-70.
19. Quine L. Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: staff questionnaire survey. *BMJ* 1999; **318**(7178): 228-32.
20. Bhugra D. Coming out by south Asian gay men in the United Kingdom. *Arch Sex Behav* 1997; **26**(5): 547-57.
21. Galop. The Low Down: Black lesbians, gay men and bisexual people talk about their experiences and needs, 2001.
22. Jackson JS, Knight KM, Rafferty JA. Race and unhealthy behaviors: chronic stress, the HPA axis, and physical and mental health disparities over the life course. *Am J Public Health* 2010; **100**(5): 933-9.

23. Quintana SM, Aboud FE, Chao RK, et al. Race, ethnicity, and culture in child development: contemporary research and future directions. *Child Dev* 2006; **77**(5): 1129-41.
24. Jacob CM, Baird J, Barker M, Cooper C, Hanson M. The importance of a life-course approach to health: Chronic disease risk from preconception through adolescence and adulthood - White paper, 2017.
25. Disease GBD, Injury I, Prevalence C. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet* 2017; **390**(10100): 1211-59.
26. Evans-Lacko S, Takizawa R, Brimblecombe N, et al. Childhood bullying victimization is associated with use of mental health services over five decades: a longitudinal nationally representative cohort study. *Psychol Med* 2017; **47**(1): 127-35.
27. Toomey RB, Ryan C, Diaz RM, Russell ST. High School Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs) and Young Adult Well-Being: An Examination of GSA Presence, Participation, and Perceived Effectiveness. *Appl Dev Sci* 2011; **15**(4): 175-85.
28. Connelly R, Platt L. Cohort profile: UK Millennium Cohort Study (MCS). *Int J Epidemiol* 2014; **43**(6): 1719-25.
29. Vrangalova Z, Savin-Williams RC. Psychological and physical health of mostly heterosexuals: a systematic review. *J Sex Res* 2014; **51**(4): 410-45.
30. Kessler RC, Green JG, Gruber MJ, et al. Screening for serious mental illness in the general population with the K6 screening scale: results from the WHO World Mental Health (WMH) survey initiative. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* 2010; **19 Suppl 1**: 4-22.
31. Goodman R, Meltzer H, Bailey V. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a pilot study on the validity of the self-report version. *Int Rev Psychiatry* 2003; **15**(1-2): 173-7.
32. Scoring the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire for age 4-17, 2014.
33. Rosenberg M. Society and the adolescent self-image: Princeton University Press; 1965.
34. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2007; **5**: 63.
35. Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, Dietz WH. Establishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. *BMJ* 2000; **320**(7244): 1240-3.
36. Pachankis JE, Goldfried MR, Ramrattan ME. Extension of the rejection sensitivity construct to the interpersonal functioning of gay men. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2008; **76**(2): 306-17.
37. Booker CL, Rieger G, Unger JB. Sexual orientation health inequality: Evidence from Understanding Society, the UK Longitudinal Household Study. *Prev Med* 2017; **101**: 126-32.
38. Mustanski B, Birkett M, Greene GJ, Rosario M, Bostwick W, Everett BG. The association between sexual orientation identity and behavior across race/ethnicity, sex, and age in a probability sample of high school students. *Am J Public Health* 2014; **104**(2): 237-44.
39. Amos R, Manalastas EJ, White R, Bos H, Patalay P. Mental health, social adversity, and health-related outcomes in sexual minority adolescents: a contemporary national cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2020; **4**(1): 36-45.
40. Jones A, Robinson E, Oginni O, Rahman Q, Rimes KA. Anxiety disorders, gender nonconformity, bullying and self-esteem in sexual minority adolescents: prospective birth cohort study. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2017; **58**(11): 1201-9.
41. Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, Beautrais AL. Is sexual orientation related to mental health problems and suicidality in young people? *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1999; **56**(10): 876-80.
42. Edbrooke-Childs J, Patalay P. Ethnic Differences in Referral Routes to Youth Mental Health Services. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2019; **58**(3): 368-75 e1.
43. Cigarette smoking among 15 year olds - Official Statistics, 2017.
44. Rodham K, Hawton K, Evans E, Weatherall R. Ethnic and gender differences in drinking, smoking and drug taking among adolescents in England: a self-report school-based survey of 15 and 16 year olds. *J Adolesc* 2005; **28**(1): 63-73.
45. Meyer IH. The Elusive Promise of LGBT Equality. *Am J Public Health* 2016; **106**(8): 1356-8.
46. Bontempo DE, D'Augelli AR. Effects of at-school victimization and sexual orientation on lesbian, gay, or bisexual youths' health risk behavior. *J Adolesc Health* 2002; **30**(5): 364-74.
47. Khan M, Ilcisin M, Saxton K. Multifactorial discrimination as a fundamental cause of mental health inequities. *Int J Equity Health* 2017; **16**(1): 43.

48. Ibanez GE, Van Oss Marin B, Flores SA, Millett G, Diaz RM. General and gay-related racism experienced by Latino gay men. *Cultur Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol* 2009; **15**(3): 215-22.
49. Teunis N. Sexual objectification and the construction of whiteness in the gay male community. *Cult Health Sex* 2007; **9**(3): 263-75.

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of 9,789 young individuals by ethnic and sexual identities that attended the age 17 assessment of the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS). Values are means (SD) or N (%)

Characteristics (total N)	Total N for each outcome	White Heterosexual 6,193 (63)	White Sexual Minority 1,727 (18)	Ethnic minority Heterosexual 1,616 (17)	Ethnic & Sexual Minority 253 (3)	Overall sample 9,789	Test for difference[1]
Mental & general health							
Psychological Distress[2]	9,780	6.6 (4.6)	10.1 (5.1)	6.1 (4.5)	10.1 (4.6)	7.2 (4.9)	<0.001
High levels		743 (12.0)	563 (32.6)	166 (10.3)	82 (32.4)	1,544 (15.9)	<0.001
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ-S)							
Conduct problems	9,547	1.6 (1.5)	1.8 (1.7)	1.7 (1.5)	1.9 (1.5)	1.7 (1.5)	<0.001
High levels		300 (4.9)	116 (6.9)	82 (5.2)	13(5.2)	511 (5.4)	<0.05
Hyperactivity/inattention	9,547	3.9 (2.3)	4.5 (2.4)	3.4 (2.1)	4.4 (2.2)	3.9 (2.3)	<0.001
High levels		862 (14.3)	344 (20.6)	126 (7.9)	43 (17.3)	1,375 (14.4)	<0.001
Emotional problems (depression and anxiety)	9,547	3.2 (2.3)	4.8 (2.5)	2.7 (2.2)	4.5 (2.3)	3.5 (2.4)	<0.001
High levels		1,116 (18.5)	674 (40.3)	197 (12.4)	79 (31.9)	2,066 (21.6)	<0.001
Peer problems	9,547	2.0 (1.7)	2.7 (1.8)	1.9 (1.5)	2.8 (1.8)	2.1 (1.7)	<0.001
High levels		1,047 (17.3)	505 (30.2)	232 (14.7)	74 (29.8)	1,858 (19.5)	<0.001
Prosocial behaviour	9,552	7.9 (1.7)	7.9 (1.8)	8.0 (1.7)	7.7 (1.8)	7.9 (1.7)	<0.001
High levels		648 (10.7)	178 (10.6)	170 (10.7)	37 (14.9)	1,033 (10.8)	>0.05
Doctor-diagnosed depression	9,775	534 (8.6)	367 (21.3)	57 (3.5)	33 (13.1)	991 (10.1)	<0.001
Self-harm[3] Yes	9,539	1,097 (18.2)	788 (47.1)	199 (12.6)	99 (39.9)	2,183 (22.8)	<0.001
Attempted suicide	9,534	349 (5.8)	259 (15.6)	56 (3.5)	31 (12.6)	695 (7.3)	<0.001
Victimisation[4] Yes	9,780	2,769 (44.8)	1,015 (58.8)	502 (31.1)	132 (52.2)	4,418 (45.2)	<0.001
Self-esteem[5]	9,781	4.8 (3.1)	6.1 (3.3)	4.3 (3.1)	5.9 (3.1)	4.9 (3.2)	<0.001
Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing[6]	9,735	22.8 (4.1)	21.1 (3.7)	23.1 (4.2)	20.8 (3.5)	22.5 (4.1)	<0.001
General health rating Fair/poor	9,555	336 (5.6)	183 (11)	115 (7.3)	27 (10.9)	661 (7)	<0.001
Mental/physical health condition in previous year Yes	9,555	922 (15.3)	440 (26.3)	176 (11.1)	50 (20.1)	1,588 (16.6)	<0.001
Quality of sleep Fairly bad/very bad	6,302	1,115 (28.1)	513 (40.5)	264 (29.3)	71 (41.3)	1,963 (31.2)	<0.001
BMI (kg/m^2)	9,093	23.1 (4.5)	23.5 (4.9)	23.4 (4.9)	23.8 (5.7)	23.3 (4.7)	<0.05
Overweight/obesity	9,076	1,595 (27.7)	508 (32.3)	494 (32.9)	75 (31.4)	2,672 (29.4)	<0.001
Weight perception Underweight or slightly/very overweight	6,439	1,702 (42.1)	669 (52.0)	471 (50.5)	110 (63.2)	2,952 (45.9)	<0.001
Health behaviours							
Smoking Ever	9,751	2,932 (47.5)	915 (53.1)	342 (21.3)	82 (32.7)	4,271 (43.8)	<0.001
Current	9,751	768 (12.4)	250 (14.5)	65 (4.1)	17 (6.8)	1,100 (11.3)	<0.001
Alcohol							
Ever consumed	9,783	5,517 (89.1)	1,578 (91.4)	487 (30.2)	150 (59.3)	7,732 (79.1)	<0.001

Yes							
Frequency in previous year ≥20 times	7,707	1,522 (27.7)	443 (28.1)	55 (11.3)	25 (16.7)	2,045 (26.5)	<0.001
Binge drinking, ever	7,716	3,740 (67.9)	1,082 (68.7)	184 (38.1)	71 (47.3)	5,077 (65.8)	<0.001
Frequency in previous year ≥10 times	5,065	786 (21.1)	215 (19.9)	23 (12.5)	11 (15.5)	1,035 (20.4)	<0.05
Drug use							
Any drug use, ever	9,774	1,831 (29.6)	688 (39.9)	261 (16.2)	63 (25.1)	2,843 (29.1)	<0.001
Cannabis use, ever	9,760	1,813 (29.4)	678 (39.4)	259 (16.1)	62 (25.0)	2,812 (28.8)	<0.001
Frequency of cannabis use, >10times	2,807	509 (28.1)	193 (28.5)	75 (29.1)	18 (29.1)	795 (28.3)	>0.05
Sexual activity							
Sexual intercourse, ever	9,715	2,848 (46.3)	748 (43.5)	231 (14.5)	57 (22.6)	3,884 (39.9)	<0.001
Risky sex	3,874	1,255 (44.2)	390 (52.1)	96 (41.9)	32 (56.1)	1,773 (45.8)	<0.001
Exercise in previous week Not at all	9,557	1,295 (21.4)	489 (29.2)	434 (27.4)	78 (31.3)	2,296 (24.1)	<0.001
Weight loss Lose/gain weight	6,437	2,338 (57.8)	819 (63.7)	638 (68.5)	119 (68.4)	3,914 (60.8)	<0.001
Anti-social behaviour[7]	9,784	1,580 (25.5)	470 (27.2)	407 (25.2)	82 (32.4)	2,539 (25.9)	<0.05

[1]One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for difference in means of outcome by categories of sexual-ethnicity indicator or Chi2 test for difference in proportions between categorical variables.
[2]Based on Kessler psychological distress 6-item scale [3]Defined as being insulted/physically abused/hit/harassed or assaulted in previous 12 months. [4]Includes cutting/stabbing, burning, bruising/pinching, taking an overdose of tablets, pulling hair or hurting oneself. [5]Rosenburg Self-esteem scale (5-item). [6]Warwick-Edinburgh mental wellbeing scale (7-item).
[7]Physical violence/Hit or used a weapon/Stolen something/Harassed/Sent pictures or spread rumours/sexual approach or assaulted someone.

Table 2A. Associations between ethnic and sexual identities and binary mental health, wellbeing, and general health outcomes in 9,789 young individuals aged 17 from the Millennium Cohort Study. Estimates are from multivariable logistic regression models (models adjusted for sex and parental income)

			Emotional & behavioural difficulties based on the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire													
Ethnic & sexual identity indicator	**Psychological distress (K-6)**		**Conduct disorders**		**Hyperactivity**		**Emotional problems**		**Peer problems**		**Prosocial behaviour**		**Doctor diagnosed depression**		**Self-harm**	
	OR	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**
White-Heterosexual	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
White-SM	**3.47**	**2.73,4.42**	1.22	0.84,1.79	**1.52**	**1.22,1.90**	**3.17**	**2.48,4.04**	**2.09**	**1.63,2.67**	1.12	0.88,1.41	**2.56**	**1.85,3.53**	**3.06**	**2.41,3.89**
EM-heterosexual	**0.49**	**0.36,0.67**	0.83	0.52,1.31	**0.51**	**0.37,0.70**	**0.57**	**0.41,0.79**	**0.56**	**0.40,0.78**	1.06	0.73,1.53	**0.24**	**0.16,0.37**	**0.51**	**0.36,0.72**
EM-SM	**2.24**	**1.35,3.70**	0.72	0.39,1.33	1.65	0.89,3.06	**1.65**	**1.13,2.40**	1.38	0.85,2.25	**2.50**	**1.35,4.65**	1.02	0.62,1.67	1.52	0.98,2.37
N	9769		9537		9537		9537		9537		9542		9764		9529	
Sexuality and ethnic identity indicator	**Attempted suicide**		**Victimisation**		**General health**		**Mental/ physical health**		**Sleep quality**		**Overweight/ obesity**		**Weight perception**			
	OR	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**		
White-Heterosexual	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref			
White-SM	**2.78**	**2.10,3.68**	**1.91**	**1.56,2.34**	**1.94**	**1.42,2.64**	**2.24**	**1.71,2.94**	**1.88**	**1.49,2.39**	**1.40**	**1.10,1.78**	**1.65**	**1.32,2.07**		
EM-heterosexual	**0.35**	**0.22,0.55**	**0.56**	**0.43,0.75**	0.91	0.62,1.31	**0.65**	**0.43,0.97**	1.00	0.72,1.40	1.07	0.86,1.32	1.04	0.78,1.40		
EM-SM	**2.02**	**1.10,3.71**	1.30	0.89,1.89	1.28	0.73,2.24	1.09	0.66,1.79	**1.67**	**1.01,2.76**	1.18	0.81,1.73	1.38	0.83,2.29		
N	9524		9769		9545		9545		6297		9066		6434			

Text in bold indicate 95% confidence intervals that do not include an OR=one. EM: Ethnic minority, SM: Sexual minority, K-6: Kessler-6 item scale for psychological distress

Table 2B. Associations between ethnic and sexual identities and health-related behaviours) behaviours in 9,789 young individuals aged 17 from the Millennium Cohort Study. Estimates are from multivariable logistic regression models (models adjusted for sex and parental income)

Ethnic & sexual identity indicator	Smoking, ever		Smoking, regular		Alcohol, ever		Alcohol frequency		Binge drinking, ever		Binge drinking, frequency		Drug use, ever	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
White-Heterosexual	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
White-SM	1.17	0.95,1.45	1.10	0.80,1.51	1.21	0.79,1.83	1.05	0.83,1.33	1.18	0.96,1.45	0.83	0.65,1.05	**1.45**	**1.18,1.78**
EM-heterosexual	**0.21**	**0.16,0.27**	**0.18**	**0.12,0.28**	**0.10**	**0.07,0.16**	**0.30**	**0.18,0.51**	**0.26**	**0.18,0.38**	0.70	0.31,1.59	**0.41**	**0.31,0.55**
EM-SM	**0.63**	**0.42,0.94**	0.69	0.31,1.53	**0.25**	**0.14,0.45**	**0.50**	**0.31,0.83**	0.61	0.37,1.01	0.51	0.24,1.11	1.14	0.73,1.77
N	9740		9740		9772		7703		7712		5064		9763	
	Cannabis use, ever		Cannabis, frequency		Sex, ever had		Risky sex		Exercise		Weight control		Anti-social behaviour	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
White-Heterosexual	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
White-SM	**1.45**	**1.18,1.78**	1.18	0.86,1.61	0.89	0.72,1.11	**1.40**	**1.03,1.90**	1.22	0.97,1.55	**1.30**	**1.01,1.68**	1.15	0.91,1.44
EM-heterosexual	**0.41**	**0.31,0.55**	1.40	0.81,2.42	**0.24**	**0.16,0.37**	0.96	0.57,1.60	0.96	0.73,1.26	**1.94**	**1.47,2.55**	0.96	0.69,1.33
EM-SM	1.16	0.74,1.81	**2.65**	**1.05,6.66**	**0.28**	**0.18,0.44**	1.19	0.59,2.41	1.4	0.94,2.08	1.49	0.93,2.39	**1.86**	**1.21,2.83**
N	9749		2805		9704		3873		9547		6432		9773	

Text in bold indicate 95% confidence intervals that do not include an OR=one. EM: Ethnic minority, SM: Sexual minority

Table 3. Associations between ethnic and sexual identities and health (continuous outcomes) in 9,789 young individuals aged 17 from the Millennium Cohort Study. Estimates are from multivariable linear regression models (models adjusted for sex and parental income)

			Emotional & behavioural difficulties based on the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire													
Ethnic & sexual identity indicator	**Psychological Distress (K-6)**		**Conduct problems**		**Hyperactivity**		**Emotional problems**		**Peer problems**		**Prosocial behaviour**		**Mental wellbeing (WEMWBS)**		**BMI (kg/m2)**	
	β	**95% CI**	**β**	**95% CI**	**β**	**95% CI**	**β**	**95% CI**	**β**	**95% CI**	**B**	**95% CI**	**β**	**95% CI**	**β**	**95% CI**
White-Heterosexual	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
White-SM	**3.58**	**3.00,4.15**	**0.15**	**0.02,0.29**	**0.69**	**0.50,0.87**	**1.43**	**1.18,1.68**	**0.69**	**0.48,0.91**	-0.06	-0.23,0.12	**-1.82**	**-2.30,-1.33**	0.36	-0.22,0.94
EM-heterosexual	**-1.15**	**-1.63,-0.67**	-0.13	-0.32,0.06	**-0.71**	**-0.95,-0.47**	**-0.54**	**-0.77,-0.31**	**-0.39**	**-0.56,-0.22**	0.18	-0.01,0.37	**0.90**	**0.43,1.38**	-0.24	-0.80,0.31
EM-SM	**2.73**	**1.89,3.56**	**0.29**	**0.06,0.53**	**0.69**	**0.30,1.09**	**0.64**	**0.12,1.17**	**0.48**	**0.15,0.81**	**-0.49**	**-0.84,-0.14**	**-1.19**	**-1.93,-0.44**	0.69	-0.42,1.80
N	**9769**		**9537**		**9537**		**9537**		**9537**		**9542**		**9724**		**9083**	

Text in bold indicate 95% confidence intervals that do not include zero. SM: Sexual minority, EM: Ethnic minority, K-6: Kessler-6 item scale for psychological distress, WEMWBS = Warwick Edinburgh mental wellbeing scale.

Figure 1. Risk for mental ill-health, wellbeing and general health based on dual ethnic- and sexual identities in 9,789 individuals aged 17 from the Millennium Cohort Study



*Components of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)

Figure 2. Risk for health-related behaviours based on dual ethnic- and sexual identities in 9,789 individuals aged 17 from the Millennium Cohort Study



Figure Legends: