A systematic review of the factors associated with suicide attempts among sexual-minority adolescents

Xavier Wang^{1,2}, MPH, MSc, Quan Gan³, MSc, Junwen Zhou⁴, PhD, MSc, Mireille Cosquer^{1,2}, MSc, Bruno Falissard³, MD, PhD, Emmanuelle Corruble^{1,5}, MD, PhD, Catherine Jousselme^{1,2}, MD, PhD, Florence Gressier^{1,5}, MD, PhD

*Florence Gressier and Catherine Jousselme are co-last authors.

1. INSERM UMR 1178, CESP, Faculté de Médecine Paris-Sud, Université Paris-Saclay, Le Kremlin Bicêtre, France
2. Centre Hospitalier Fondation Vallée, Gentilly, France
3. INSERM UMR1018, CESP, Department of Biostatistics, Hôpital Paul Brousse, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris Saclay, Villejuif, France
4. Department of Public health, Université Aix-Marseille, Marseille, France
5. Department of Psychiatry, Bicêtre University Hospital, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris Saclay, Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France.

Abstract

Introduction: Suicide attempt is a worldwide major public health problem, that accounts for 1.4% of all deaths worldwide. Recent literature reported higher risk of suicide attempt among adolescents associated with sexual minority status but few systematic reviews focused on the risk and protective factors. For that reason, it seems necessary to examine risk and protective factors of attempted suicide in sexual minority adolescents.

Methods: We conducted a systematic review of published studies on factors associated with suicide attempts in LGBT adolescents. 4 databases up to December 2020 were searched to find relevant studies.

Results: In addition to the factors usually found in general population (gender, ethnic minorities, childhood trauma, psychiatric symptoms, addictive behaviors), some factors have been independently associated with suicide attempt in LGBT population: early coming out, not acceptable by families, not satisfied with LGBT friendship, too few number of friends, physical abuse, sexual abuse and bullying. The protective factors of suicide attempt reported in LGBT population were feeling safety at school, teacher support, anti-bullying policy, and other adult's support.

Conclusion: Effective preventive measures for suicide attempt among LGBT youth need to be developed and implemented. The impact of interventions targeting teacher responses to LGBT stigma, discussion of LGBT issues in class and reactions of family and friends to the coming out of LGBT youth should be further investigated.

Key words: LGBT, sexual minority, adolescent, suicide attempt, risk and protective factors

Background

Mental health conditions account for 16% of the global burden of disease and injury in people aged 10-19 years and suicide is the fourth leading cause of death in 15-19-year-olds (World Health Organisation, 2020). Among all the mental health problems in adolescents, suicide attempt is a worldwide major public health problem, that accounts for 1.4% of all deaths worldwide (Smith et al., 2020). In the United States, it has become the second leading cause of death among youth aged 10-24 since 2011, which caused the loss of 6000 lives a year in the year's 2011 to 2019 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019). In addition, the situation of suicide attempt among adolescents associated with sexual minority status is more severe (Greteman, 2015; Meyer, 2003; Ueno, 2005; Williams et al., 2021). Lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) adolescents are 2 to 8 times more likely to have attempted suicide compared to their heterosexual peers (Firdion & Beck, 2015; Huang et al., 2018; Needham & Austin, 2010; Seil, Desai, & Smith, 2014; Williams et al., 2021). Some studies in the United States showed that adolescents between 15-19 years of age with a homosexual attraction experience more SA than their heterosexual peers (Seil et al., 2014; Teasdale & Bradley-Engen, 2010). In Europe, a study in Iceland looked at the problem of the risk of SA among LGB adolescents between 15 and 16 years old. It reported that the risk of SA was 4 to 6 times higher in LGB than in heterosexual adolescents (Arnarsson, Sveinbjornsdottir, Thorsteinsson, & Bjarnason, 2015).

Due to the growing frequency for suicide attempt during the last decades, adolescents are the main target population of prevention policies to reduce suicide and the identification of suicide risk factors is crucial. Many studies have reported factors including mood disorders (depression and anxiety), substance abuse and prior suicide attempts are strongly related with youth suicides (Pelkonen & Marttunen, 2003; Swee, Shochet, Cockshaw, & Hides, 2020). Anxiety and feelings of pressure linked in large part to fear of the judgment of others, often refrain LGB adolescents from sharing their sexual orientations, which seems to push them more frequently than their heterosexual peers to have suicide attempts (Hatzenbuehler, 2011; Liu & Mustanski, 2012). Factors related to family adversity, social exclusion and poor school performance also contribute to the risk of suicide (Hernández-Bello, Hueso-Montoro, Gómez-Urquiza, & Cogollo-Milanés, 2020; Pelkonen & Marttunen, 2003). Numbers of risks have made adolescents vulnerable to negative results, but protective factors have facilitated a resilient response, so both protective and risk factors should be considered in terms of factors that may link to suicide attempts among adolescents (Joiner et al., 2009). According to the protective environments, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (Hong, Espelage, & Kral, 2011) has divided the protective factors of suicide into several systems levels (micro, meso, exo, macro and chrono). Because different environments will act on different factors which will produce different effects. Moreover, as a sexual minority group, due to their sexual orientation, LGBTs may even experience more negative factors than heterosexual people, leading to a further increase in suicide risk (Williams et al., 2021). One study in UK revealed that psychological factors may account for the association between LGB status and suicide attempt (Taylor, Dhingra, Dickson, & McDermott, 2020). During the last decades, different experts have reported systematic review of prevalence rather than risk or protective factors for suicide attempts in LGBT adolescents (Miranda-Mendizábal et al., 2017; Pelkonen & Marttunen, 2003; Williams et al., 2021). Considering the significant risk of suicide among LGB youth, it seems essential to identify the risk and protective factors.

Objective

Our aim is to systematically review the literature on the risk and protective factors of suicide attempt in sexual minority adolescents.

Method

Eligibility Criteria

Inclusion criteria

- a) The target population is sexual minority teenagers with definition of sexual orientation (gay, lesbian, homosexual, bisexual) and/or reported levels of same sexual attraction or behavior;
- b) The age includes 13-20 years' old (World Health Organisation, 2020)
- c) With clearly identified suicide attempt as outcome;
- d) With definite risk or protective factors of suicide attempt in the result
- e) all types of studies: cross-sectional studies, cohort studies and case-control studies.
- f) No language limitation.

Information sources and Search

Two authors (X.W and Q.G) searched four databases (PubMed, Web of science, Cochrane library and PsycInfo) for articles published until 31 December 2020 using the search strategy "suicide" and "adolescent" or "youth" or "young people" or "teenager" and "LGB" or "gay" or "lesbian" or "homosexual" or "sexual minority" or "sexual orientation". The disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Study selection

From 422 articles identified, 60 duplicates were removed. After screening the titles and abstracts, 281 were excluded for the following reasons: 125 did not concern suicide attempt; 86 did not describe any risk or protective factor of suicide attempt; 47 did not include the participants aged 13-20 years old; 17 were based on a population not including sexual minorities; 6 only concerned transgender population. After reviewing the full text papers, 69 were excluded for the following reasons: 50 did not describe any risk or protective factor of suicide attempt; 10 were based on second analysis of published articles; 6 did not include the youth participants; 2 did not concern suicide attempt; 1 only concerned transgender population. Finally, 12 articles met the inclusion criteria (Flow chart 1).

Data collection process

The titles and abstracts were screened independently by two authors (X.W. and Q.G.). After selecting the efficient articles, they have been downloaded and read. One author (X.W) extracted the data and entered in the forms. Two authors (C.P and Q.G.) examined and verified the information entered was properly.

The following information was extracted in table 1: Author, publication year, country, target population, age range, study design, total sample size, sexual minority sample size, definition and proportion of suicide attempt, quality assessment.

Data synthesis

We extracted odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals of risk and protective factors from the results of multiple logistic regressions that focused on LGBT participants in 12 articles. We also divided all influencing factors into three categories according to the environmental contexts: personal environment (demographic, traumatic state, health condition, consumption of substances, psychiatric disorder, personal life), intimate environment (family/adult support, friendship) and public environment (school, internet, society).

The following information was extracted in table 2: Year of study, name of investigation, confirmed risk or protective factors with odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals, non-significant risk or protective factors with odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals, adjustment variables and conclusion.

Quality assessment of the studies

The Newcastle-Ottawa scale (Stang, 2010) was used to evaluate the quality of include studies. This scale is widely used as evaluation tool of observational studies and longitudinal studies (Moskalewicz & Oremus, 2020). It has three categories including eight entries with a full score of 10. We classify 8-10 points as high quality, 5-7 points as medium quality, less than 5 points as low quality (Appendices).

Result

Study characteristics

Of the 12 articles included, 10 studies were identified as high quality, 1 was moderate quality and only 1 was low quality. All but one was cross-sectional studies. 9 studies were based in the US, 2 in the United Kingdom, 1 in Belgium.

Population

6 studies involved the subjects aged between 12 and 18 years old, 2 until 20 years, 2 until 25 years, and 2 studies involved people aged until 30 years. All studies included at least two genders. 5 were on LGBT only. 7 took into account both sexual minority and heterosexual.

Definition of sexuality

Of 12 studies, 8 studies used one question to define sexual orientation, of which 4 studies originated from the same project YRBS (Youth Risk Behavior Survey) in U.S., but focused on different regions or years. The question they used was “Which of the following best describes you?” The answers included: heterosexual (straight); gay or lesbian; bisexual; not sure. 2 studies used sex behavior by asking the question “With whom have you had sexual contact?” Response options included no one, female(s), male(s), both female(s) and male(s). And 2 studies did not mention the definition.

Definition of suicide attempts

6 studies collected the information of attempt suicide during last 12 months by the question “During the past 12 months, how many times did you actually attempt suicide?” In 5 studies, participants described whether they ever had attempted suicide in their life. 1 study collected the data of both whole life and last year.

Associated factors

Personal environment

Considering personal environment, we analyzed risk factors associated with suicide attempt in adolescents and also risk factors more specifically related to sexuality.

Demographic

We categorized 5 elements (gender, race, age, rurality, parental education) in demographic category. Gender and race were considered as definite risk factors in sexual minority adolescents. Age, rurality and parental

education were analyzed only in one study reporting no difference (Toomey, Syvertsen, & Flores, 2019). For gender, 4 studies reported that girls were more likely to commit suicide than boys (Hatzenbuehler & Keyes, 2013; McDermott, Hughes, & Rawlings, 2018; Rimes et al., 2019; Toomey et al., 2019). Three studies adjusted their results for gender (Taliaferro, et al., 2017; Duong et al., 2014; Goodenow et al., 2006). For ethnicity, one study has revealed that non-white participants had higher risk of suicide attempt than white participants (Hatzenbuehler & Keyes, 2013). And study of Toomey implied that the Hispanic youth had higher risk than other ethnicities (Toomey et al., 2019).

Substances Consumption

Only two studies interested in substance abuse (Rimes et al., 2019; Turpin, Rosario, & Dyer, 2020). The consumption of substance was considered as a risk factor in the study of Turpin who reported the number of substances used (0-7) was identified the strongest associations with suicide attempt (Turpin et al., 2020). The study of Rimes revealed the same result that weekly drug use increased the risk of suicide attempt in LGBT youth (Rimes et al., 2019).

Psychiatric disorder

Depression or anxiety was evaluated in three studies reporting higher risks of suicide attempt (Mustanski & Liu, 2013; Rimes et al., 2019; Taliaferro & Muehlenkamp, 2017). Hopelessness was studied and found as risk factor in three studies (Toomey et al., 2019; Mustanski and Liu, 2013. Heeringen et al., 2000). Moreover, not talking about feelings and emotions (McDermott et al., 2018) and feeling unsafe (Toomey et al., 2019) were also reported as risk factors. Furthermore, a suicide attempt in someone close was found to be a risk factor (van Heeringen, Vincke, & van Heeringen, 2000).

Traumatic state

Physical abuse and sexual abuse were also identified as risk factors (McDermott et al., 2018; Rimes et al., 2019). And childhood abuse or violence from someone close was also associated with suicide attempt (Rimes et al., 2019).

Personal Life

Few studies interested in personal sexual life include age of thought LGBT, coming out and experience. The adolescents coming out before 16 years of age were more likely to commit suicide than others (Rimes et al., 2019) while another study revealed no association between LGBT identity affirmation and suicide behavior (Busby et al., 2020). Whereas self-identified as LGBT before the age of 10 was reported no association with suicide attempt (Rimes et al., 2019), and the age of being attracted to the same sex was not associated with suicide behavior (Mustanski & Liu, 2013).

Intimate environment

Family/adult support

Only 3 studies were interested in family/adult support but providing inconsistent results. Goodenow found that an adult (teacher) support was associated with a protective effect against suicide attempts (Goodenow, Szalacha, & Westheimer, 2006). However, Mustanski did not report such association (Mustanski & Liu, 2013). Rimes has focused in 4 elements of support (family support, open family communication, parent involvement in school and other adult relationships), unfortunately, none of these showed significance in multiple regression model (Rimes et al., 2019). In addition, not feeling accepted where one lives, doubled the risk of suicide attempts (Rimes et al., 2019).

Friend

Friend relationship and support were analyzed in 4 studies. Van Heeringen found that if the relationships of LGB peers around them are not satisfactory, the suicide attempt of homosexual adolescents will be greatly increased (van Heeringen et al., 2000). Too few friends (less than 5 friends) can also increase the risk of suicide attempt (Rimes et al., 2019). However, two studies reported no associations with a negative reaction of a friend or most friends have the same sexual orientation (Rimes et al., 2019) as well as friend caring (Taliaferro & Muehlenkamp, 2017). Social connectedness was a protective factor to prevent the suicide attempt (Busby et al., 2020). The

protective policy of peer-tutoring program didn't show any significance in Goodenow's study (Goodenow et al., 2006).

Public environment

School

School environment was analyzed in 6 studies. Two studies reported the importance of school safety: From Taliaferro's study, perceived safety at school was considered as a protective factor protected against a suicide attempt of gay/lesbian youth (Taliaferro & Muehlenkamp, 2017) and feeling unsafe at school in Toomey's study showed a risk of suicide attempt (Toomey et al., 2019). Whereas the studies of Duong and Rimes did not find any association with school connection and a caring school climate (Duong & Bradshaw, 2014; Rimes et al., 2019). According to school victimization, Goodenow reported an association of suicide attempt with school victimization (Goodenow et al., 2006). However, Taliaferro reported no association with violence victim at school (Taliaferro & Muehlenkamp, 2017). Other elements of school lessons referring negatively to LGBT issues and school staff not consistently speaking up against LGBT prejudice were reported as no significance (Rimes et al., 2019).

Internet

Cyber bullying is also considered a strong risk factor of suicide attempt in sexual minority youth. The study of Duong and Bradshaw divided bullying into school bullying and cyber bullying, while suffering from both types of bullying at the same time has the highest risks (Duong & Bradshaw, 2014). However, another study didn't find association between electronic bullying and suicide attempt, it only reported the significance of traditional bullying or both traditional and electronic bullying (Humphries, Li, Smith, Bridge, & Zhu, 2021).

Society

Among all the risk factors, bullying is always considered to be the most important factor (Hatzenbuehler & Keyes, 2013). The bullying that targets sexual orientation was also thought to be a risk factor, one study (Hatzenbuehler & Keyes, 2013) found that the homosexual population had higher risks of being bullied than the bisexual population. Rimes also reported that LGBT victimization crime was as risk factor of suicide attempt (Rimes

et al., 2019). However, experience of abuse related to sexual orientation was not associated in one study (McDermott et al., 2018). Therefore, regarding the protective factors, the most important is the anti-bullying policy. One study (Hatzenbuehler & Keyes, 2013) found “this policy was associated with reduced risk for suicide attempts among lesbian and gay youths”, another study (Goodenow et al., 2006) revealed that “anti-bullying policy significantly predicted a lower probability of single or multiple suicide attempts” in LGBT adolescents.

Discussion

Majority of studies and meta-analyses have focused on the prevalence of suicide attempt rather than investigating risk factors (di Giacomo, Krausz, Colmegna, Aspesi, & Clerici, 2018; Miranda-Mendizábal et al., 2017). Another precedent review focused on investigating risk factors in sexual minorities population rather than adolescents (Yıldız, 2018). The current systematic review analyzed in detail the LGBT youth suicide risk factor and gave specific classifications.

Personal environment

From the prospective of cognitive molding, risk or protective factors may have a corresponding continuity, from adolescence to adulthood. Corresponding literatures also corroborate such a proposition (Oi & Wilkinson, 2018). According to the cumulative disadvantage perspective, constant exposure to risk, like victimization and marginalization, could be classified as personal environment and public environment that may lead to an increase in the likelihood of a given outcome (Dannefer, 2003). But there are also some reports in the literature that under the implementation of protective policies, significant results were found in the pattern of declining depressive symptoms among LGBT population (Cardom, Rostosky, & Danner, 2013; Everett, 2015).

In addition, ethnic minorities also showed a higher risk of suicide attempt than Caucasian ethnicities (Hatzenbuehler & Keyes, 2013; Toomey et al., 2019), which also implies that ethnic minorities that living in Western countries were in a more vulnerable situation in terms of their sexual orientations. Many factors associated with sexuality have also been studied: Coming out during adolescence at an early age (before 16 years old) is considered to be a risk factor (Rimes et al., 2019), which may generate more family rejections and school bullying (Annor et al.,

2018; Humphries et al., 2021; Needham & Austin, 2010; Ryan, Huebner, Diaz, & Sanchez, 2009). And the result will lead to more LGBT victimization in school and emotional or physical blames by family members. This also suggests that coming out before maturity may hinder the determination of sexual orientation, especially in the dual hostile environment with a lack of family support and anti-LGBT attitudes. It was consistent with another study reporting that sexual orientation identity affirmation is no longer a risk factor for suicide attempt in college students over 18 years old (Busby et al., 2020). From this study, we got that after the formation of sexual orientation with the completion of puberty, LGBT young people can face their identity and orientation more calmly.

Interpersonal environment

Relevant literature still showed that relationship discrimination and low-quality intimate relationships, either family relationships, or friendships, are major risk factors for the adult LGBT community (Yıldız, 2018). On the basis of odds ratios, LGBT young adults who reported higher levels of family rejection during adolescence were 8.4 times more likely to report having attempted suicide (Ryan et al., 2009). The family support is considered to be one of the most important direct environments for the growth of adolescents. Some studies have shown that parental support is more important than peer support (Mustanski & Liu, 2013; Rimes et al., 2019). Therefore, the acceptance of parents to receive education on minority sexual orientations should also be the core of policy formulation.

According to LGBT victimization, sexual minorities will feel tremendous pressure due to this stigma. When the pressure is not adjusted in time, it will be transformed into suicidal behaviors or other mental illness behavioral characteristics. This makes LGBT victimization one of the biggest risk factors for suicide. And the biggest factor that causes LGBT victimization is bullying that almost all articles mentioned, whether it is school bullying, internet bullying or sexually-oriented bullying. Humphries's research revealed that the students who experienced both traditional bullying and electronic bullying had higher prevalence of suicide attempt than those who experienced only one form, but the interactions for both forms showed no association, which suggest that these two forms of bullying were not synergistic in the risk of suicidality (Humphries et al., 2021). However, another study by Duong showed that both school bullying and cyber bullying were significant respectively, and suffering both together further increase the probability of suicide among LGBT teenagers. However, they also found that with the support of

teachers, the association between bullying and suicide disappeared. Goodenow also reported the same conclusion that teacher support is a protective factor to prevent suicide behavior (Goodenow et al., 2006).

The safety environment of school has appeared in many studies as a strong protective factor (Duong & Bradshaw, 2014; Rimes et al., 2019; Taliaferro & Muehlenkamp, 2017). School as the first environment in which students live except for the family is very critical. If a student cannot perceive a sense of security, sympathetic and approachable in school, they will be reluctant to speak out even if they are seriously bullied (McDermott et al., 2018). If they have been in such a harsh environment for a long time, they will want to resort to substance use, dropping out or even suicide attempt to escape (Goodenow et al., 2006). These conclusions all verify the stress-buffering theory (Cohen & Wills, 1985) and point to the importance of school and teacher support in suicide prevention. Ongoing professional development and in-service training for teachers should address this issue.

The anti-bullying policy has been verified by multiple studies to be an effective preventive measure against suicide attempt (Goodenow, Szalacha, & Westheimer, 2006; Hatzenbuehler & Keyes, 2013). Hatzenbuehler and Keyes's research showed that the prevalence of suicide attempt among sexual minority students in schools that have successfully implemented this policy has dropped to 17%. Schools that have not implemented the policy have the suicide attempt rate of 31%. In addition, the research also revealed that the suicide rate of heterosexual teenagers will also be alleviated by implementing this policy. However, the policy has no significant effect on bisexual youth, indicating that the protective factors of homosexuality may be distinguished from those of bisexuality. The same policy cannot be extended to all sexual minorities.

Strength

At our knowledge, this review is the first to focus on risk and protective factors of suicide attempts in sexual minority youth. The main strength of this study is to summarize all associated factors on suicide attempt in LGBT adolescents and contextualized into 3 different categories, finally classified as risk factors and protective factors. In addition, this literature review study summarizes the risk and protective factors of suicide attempt in different countries and regions through different perspectives in epidemiology, sociology, cultural, and political beliefs across multiple disciplines. These findings can provide a strong theoretical basis for subsequent policy formulation and implementation. Risk factors associated with suicide attempt in sexual minority were summarized in gender, ethnic minorities, childhood trauma, psychiatric symptoms, and addictive behaviors. Considering the higher prevalence in

female, special attention is needed and different prevention strategies should be developed for gays and lesbians respectively.

Limitation

However, this review also has several limitations. The first is that the number of studies included is small. Although lots of studies have reported on the suicide of adolescents with sexual minorities, but most of them have focused on the prevalence of suicidality rather than influencing factors. Moreover, most studies were concentrated in North America, only a few have focused on Europe, no relevant research can be found in Asia or Africa. Furthermore, some studies researched the influencing factors but did not perform multiple logistic regressions, which resulted in that it is impossible to obtain important evidence support for risk or protective factors of suicide attempt. Lastly, different studies have different definitions of associated factors, and standards cannot be unified. In our review, we collected the identified risk or protective factors of suicide attempts from studies only focus on sexual minorities. A large part of published studies does not compare risk factors among sexual minorities and heterosexual participants but analyzed sexuality as specific risk factor. Therefore, only when the study clearly divided the study population according to sexual orientation into subgroups, we could specifically collect the significant risk factors from the sexual minority subgroups.

Conclusion

Whereas risk factors associated with suicide attempt in general population have been found (female, ethnic minorities, trauma, psychiatric and addiction dimension), more specific risk factors related to sexuality have to be searched considering intimate and public environment. bullying, early coming out, not acceptable by families, not satisfied with LGBT friendship, too few numbers of friends. The protective factors of suicide attempt in LGBT population were feeling safety at school, teacher support, anti-bullying policy, and other adult's support.

Although suicide risk assessment is particularly important with individuals experiencing mental illness, it should be aware that these factors according to LGBT youth are also independently associated with suicidality. Effective preventive measures for suicide attempt among LGBT youth need to be developed and implemented. Societal-level anti-stigma interventions may be required to reduce LGBT victimization. The impact of interventions

targeting teacher responses to LGBT stigma, discussion of LGBT issues in class and reactions of family and friends to the coming out of LGBT youth should be further investigated.

References

- Annor, F. B., Clayton, H. B., Gilbert, L. K., Ivey-Stephenson, A. Z., Irving, S. M., David-Ferdon, C., & Kann, L. K. (2018). Sexual Orientation Discordance and Nonfatal Suicidal Behaviors in U.S. High School Students. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 54(4), 530–538. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.01.013>
- Arnarsson, A., Sveinbjornsdottir, S., Thorsteinsson, E. B., & Bjarnason, T. (2015). Suicidal risk and sexual orientation in adolescence: A population-based study in Iceland. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 43(5), 497–505. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494815585402>
- Busby, D. R., Horwitz, A. G., Zheng, K., Eisenberg, D., Harper, G. W., Albucher, R. C., ... King, C. A. (2020). Suicide risk among gender and sexual minority college students: The roles of victimization, discrimination, connectedness, and identity affirmation. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 121, 182–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2019.11.013>
- Cardom, R., Rostosky, S., & Danner, F. (2013). Does « it get better » for depressed sexual minority youth in young adulthood? *The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, 53(5), 671–673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.07.023>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). *Web-based injury statistics query and reporting system (WISQARS) [WWW Document]*. Consulté à l'adresse <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/LeadingCauses.html>
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310–357.
- Dannefer, D. (2003). Cumulative advantage/disadvantage and the life course: cross-fertilizing age and social science theory. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 58(6), S327–337. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/58.6.s327>
- di Giacomo, E., Krausz, M., Colmegna, F., Aspesi, F., & Clerici, M. (2018). Estimating the Risk of Attempted Suicide Among Sexual Minority Youths: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 172(12), 1145. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2018.2731>
- Duong, J., & Bradshaw, C. (2014). Associations Between Bullying and Engaging in Aggressive and Suicidal Behaviors Among Sexual Minority Youth: The Moderating Role of Connectedness. *Journal of School Health*, 84(10), 636–645. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12196>
- Everett, B. (2015). Sexual Orientation Identity Change and Depressive Symptoms: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 56(1), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146514568349>
- Firdion, J.-M., & Beck, F. (2015). Les jeunes LGBT face au risque: suicide et pratiques addictives. *Archives de Pédiatrie*, 22(5), 124–125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0929-693X\(15\)30061-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0929-693X(15)30061-0)
- Goodenow, C., Szalacha, L., & Westheimer, K. (2006). School support groups, other school factors, and the safety of sexual minority adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(5), 573–589. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20173>

Greteman, A. J. (2015). *LGBTQ Youth and Education: Policies and Practices* by Chris Mayo. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 62(3), 427–431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.977125>

Hatzenbuehler, M. L. (2011). The social environment and suicide attempts in lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Pediatrics*, 127(5), 896–903. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2010-3020>

Hatzenbuehler, M. L., & Keyes, K. M. (2013). Inclusive Anti-bullying Policies and Reduced Risk of Suicide Attempts in Lesbian and Gay Youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53(1), S21–S26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.08.010>

Hernández-Bello, L., Hueso-Montoro, C., Gómez-Urquiza, J. L., & Cogollo-Milanés, Z. (2020). [Prevalence and associated factor for ideation and suicide attempt in adolescents: a systematic review.]. *Revista Espanola De Salud Publica*, 94.

Hong, J. S., Espelage, D. L., & Kral, M. J. (2011). Understanding suicide among sexual minority youth in America: An ecological systems analysis. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34(5), 885–894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.01.002>

Huang, Y., Li, P., Lai, Z., Jia, X., Xiao, D., Wang, T., ... Lu, C. (2018). Association between sexual minority status and suicidal behavior among Chinese adolescents: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 239, 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.07.004>

Humphries, K. D., Li, L., Smith, G. A., Bridge, J. A., & Zhu, M. (2021). Suicide Attempts in Association With Traditional and Electronic Bullying Among Heterosexual and Sexual Minority U.S. High School Students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.12.133>

Joiner, T. E., Van Orden, K. A., Witte, T. K., Selby, E. A., Ribeiro, J. D., Lewis, R., & Rudd, M. D. (2009). Main predictions of the interpersonal-psychological theory of suicidal behavior: empirical tests in two samples of young adults. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 118(3), 634–646. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016500>

Liu, R. T., & Mustanski, B. (2012). Suicidal ideation and self-harm in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42(3), 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.10.023>

McDermott, E., Hughes, E., & Rawlings, V. (2018). The social determinants of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth suicidality in England: a mixed methods study. *Journal of Public Health*, 40(3), e244–e251. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdx135>

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674–697. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>

Miranda-Mendizábal, A., Castellví, P., Parés-Badell, O., Almenara, J., Alonso, I., Blasco, M. J., ... Alonso, J. (2017). Sexual orientation and suicidal behaviour in adolescents and young adults: systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 211(2), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.116.196345>

Moskalewicz, A., & Oremus, M. (2020). No clear choice between Newcastle–Ottawa Scale and Appraisal Tool for Cross-Sectional Studies to assess methodological quality in cross-sectional studies of

- health-related quality of life and breast cancer. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 120, 94–103.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.12.013>
- Mustanski, B., & Liu, R. T. (2013). A Longitudinal Study of Predictors of Suicide Attempts Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(3), 437–448.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0013-9>
- Needham, B. L., & Austin, E. L. (2010). Sexual Orientation, Parental Support, and Health During the Transition to Young Adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(10), 1189–1198.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9533-6>
- Oi, K., & Wilkinson, L. (2018). Trajectories of Suicidal Ideation from Adolescence to Adulthood: Does the History of Same-Sex Experience Matter? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 47(8), 2375–2396.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1234-3>
- Pelkonen, M., & Marttunen, M. (2003). Child and Adolescent Suicide: Epidemiology, Risk Factors, and Approaches to Prevention. *Pediatric Drugs*, 5(4), 243–265.
<https://doi.org/10.2165/00128072-200305040-00004>
- Rimes, K. A., Shivakumar, S., Ussher, G., Baker, D., Rahman, Q., & West, E. (2019). Psychosocial Factors Associated With Suicide Attempts, Ideation, and Future Risk in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth: The Youth Chances Study. *Crisis*, 40(2), 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000527>
- Ryan, C., Huebner, D., Diaz, R. M., & Sanchez, J. (2009). Family Rejection as a Predictor of Negative Health Outcomes in White and Latino Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Young Adults. *PEDIATRICS*, 123(1), 346–352. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2007-3524>
- Seil, K. S., Desai, M. M., & Smith, M. V. (2014). Sexual Orientation, Adult Connectedness, Substance Use, and Mental Health Outcomes Among Adolescents: Findings From the 2009 New York City Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(10), 1950–1956.
<https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302050>
- Smith, L., Jackson, S. E., Vancampfort, D., Jacob, L., Firth, J., Grabovac, I., ... Koyanagi, A. (2020). Sexual behavior and suicide attempts among adolescents aged 12–15 years from 38 countries: A global perspective. *Psychiatry Research*, 287, 112564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2019.112564>
- Stang, A. (2010). Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 25(9), 603–605.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-010-9491-z>
- Swee, G., Shochet, I., Cockshaw, W., & Hides, L. (2020). Emotion Regulation as a Risk Factor for Suicide Ideation among Adolescents and Young Adults: The Mediating Role of Belongingness. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 49(11), 2265–2274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01301-2>
- Taliaferro, L. A., & Muehlenkamp, J. J. (2017). Nonsuicidal Self-Injury and Suicidality Among Sexual Minority Youth: Risk Factors and Protective Connectedness Factors. *Academic Pediatrics*, 17(7), 715–722.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2016.11.002>

Taylor, P. J., Dhingra, K., Dickson, J. M., & McDermott, E. (2020). Psychological Correlates of Self-Harm within Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual UK University Students. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 24(sup1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2018.1515136>

Teasdale, B., & Bradley-Engen, M. S. (2010). Adolescent same-sex attraction and mental health: the role of stress and support. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57(2), 287–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918360903489127>

Toomey, R. B., Syvertsen, A. K., & Flores, M. (2019). Are Developmental Assets Protective Against Suicidal Behavior? Differential Associations by Sexual Orientation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(4), 788–801. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0954-y>

Turpin, R. E., Rosario, A. D., & Dyer, T. V. (2020). Substance Use and Suicide Attempts Among Adolescent Males Who Are Members of a Sexual Minority: A Comparison of Synthesized Substance-Use Measures. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 189(9), 900–909. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwaa055>

Ueno, K. (2005). Sexual Orientation and Psychological Distress in Adolescence: Examining Interpersonal Stressors and Social Support Processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(3), 258–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250506800305>

van Heeringen, C., Vincke, J., & van Heeringen, C. (2000). Suicidal acts and ideation in homosexual and bisexual young people: a study of prevalence and risk factors. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 35(11), 494–499. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s001270050270>

Williams, A. J., Jones, C., Arcelus, J., Townsend, E., Lazaridou, A., & Michail, M. (2021). A systematic review and meta-analysis of victimisation and mental health prevalence among LGBTQ+ young people with experiences of self-harm and suicide. *PLOS ONE*, 16(1), e0245268. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245268>

World Health Organisation. (2020). *Adolescent health*. Consulté à l'adresse <https://www.who.int/westernpacific/health-topics/adolescent-health>

Yildiz, E. (2018). Suicide in sexual minority populations: A systematic review of evidence-based studies. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 32(4), 650–659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2018.03.003>

Flow chart 1

Table 1 Characteristics of included articles

Author	Country	Population	Age	Study design	Suicide attempt	Total sample size	LGB size (% girls)	Proportion of suicide attempts LGB	Quality of study
Humphries et al. 2020	US	A nationally representative sample of students in grades 9 th to 12 th enrolled in either public or private schools	14-18	cross-sectional	last 12 months	27706	2740	25.8%	9
Busby et al. 2020	US	868 students from four universities who completed an online screening survey	18-30	cross-sectional	lifetime	868	868 (63.6%)	23%	8
Turpin et al. 2020	US	all regular public and private schools with students in at least one of 9th to 12th grades in the 50 states and the District of Columbia	12-18	cross-sectional	last 12 months	876	876	29.5%	9
Toomey et al. 2019	US	a large sample of in-school US adolescents	11-19	cross-sectional	lifetime	116925	5598	37.7%	6
Rimes et al. 2019	UK	LGB young adults	16-25	cross-sectional	lifetime	3275	3275 (49.3%)	13.6%	9
McDermott et al. 2017	UK	community-based via LGBT organizations and social media (twitter, FB, Tumblr)	13-25	mixed study	lifetime	789	789 (42.6%)	17.6%	4
Taliaferro et al. 2017	US	population-based survey administered every 3 years to students in grades 5, 8, 9, and 11	14-17	cross-sectional	last 12 months	77758	2878	12.5% (Gay or les), 19.5% (Bisexual)	9
Duong et al. 2014	US	the 11,877 students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 from 105 NYC public high schools	14-18	cross-sectional	last 12 months	11877	951 (69.5%)	27.3%	9
Hatzenbuehler et al. 2013	US	random sampled from 11th grade school students	13-17	cross-sectional	last 12 months	31852	1413 (67.4%)	21% LG, 23% B	8
Mustanski et al. 2013	US	venue sampling (flyers in neighborhoods by LGBT youth 38%) and snowball sampling (incentivized recruitment of peers by existing participants 62%)	16-20	cross-sectional	whole life, last year	237	237 (52.3%)	31.6% (lifetime) 7.2% (last year)	10
Goodenow et al. 2006	US	a population-based survey of adolescents from 64 public high schools	14-18	cross-sectional	last 12 months	3607	202 (49%)	28.5%	10
Heerngen et al. 2000	Belgium	a general population sample of homosexual or bisexual young people and a control sample consisting of secondary and high school students	15-27	cross-sectional	lifetime	404	219 (37.4%)	17.2%	9

Table 2 information of risk and protective factors in LGB adolescents

Author	Year of study	Name of study	Confirmed risk or protective factors	Non-significant risk or protective factors	Adjustment	Conclusion
Humphries et al. 2020	2015-2017	YRBS	Traditional bullying only PR 1.49 (1.08-2.04) Traditional and electronic bullying PR 1.74 (1.35-2.24)	Electronic bullying only PR 1.43 (0.90-2.27)	gender, race, class grade, school grade, student feeling hopeless over the past 12 months, sleeping 8 or more hours on average per school night, being physically active 5 or more days on average per week, ever smoked cigarettes in their lifetime, ever drank alcohol in their lifetime, ever used marijuana in their lifetime ever tried hard drugs (cocaine, heroin, etc.), ever had sexual intercourse in their lifetime, and ever experienced forced sexual intercourse in their lifetime	Traditional and electronic bullying are not synergistic in the risk of attempting suicide, although each form increases that risk.
Busby et al. 2020	2017-2018	eBridge	Victimization OR 1.11 (1.05-0.18) Connectedness OR 0.87 (0.79-0.96)	Discrimination OR 1.01 (0.97-1.06) LGBTQ identity affirmation OR 1.05 (1.00-1.10)	age, gender, race, study-site, sexual orientation	Results suggest efforts to decrease victimization and discrimination and increase connectedness may decrease depressive morbidity and risks for self-harm among SGM college students
Turpin et al. 2020	2015-2017	YRBS	Any substance use PR 1.99 (1.37-2.89) No of substance use PR 3.35 (2.41-4.66)		race and depression	Substance use is an especially important focal point for targeted interventions reducing suicidality among Adolescent sexual minority males
Toomey et al. 2019	2012-2015	PSL-AB	Gender: female OR 1.56 (1.27-1.92) Race: Hispanic OR 1.35 (1.02-1.09) Feeling unsafe OR 1.11 (1.03-1.20) Hope OR 0.60 (0.53-0.69)	Age OR 1.00(0.95,1.05), parental education OR 1.00 (0.94,1.05) urban city vs rural small cities OR 0.93(0.74,1.16), Asian OR 0.85 (0.61,1.19) Black/ African American OR 1.07 (0.79,1.43)		Disparities in suicidal behavior by sexual orientation were largely unexplained by differential associations between developmental assets and suicidal behavior.
Rimes et al. 2019	2012-2013	YCS	Gender: female OR 1.51 (1.14-1.90) Fewer than 5 friends to count on OR 1.33 (1.02-1.72) Help-seeking for depression/anxiety OR 3.89 (2.97-5.07) Abuse or violence from someone close OR 1.72 (1.33-2.24) sexual abuse before 16 years OR 2.25 (1.63-3.09) weekly drug use OR 1.58 (1.07-2.33) Orientation Bisexual OR 1.50 (1.14-1.99) Not feeling accepted where living OR 1.93 (1.44-2.60) Came out before 16 years OR 1.53 (1.18-1.97) LGB victimization Crime OR 1.79 (1.36-2.37)	Thought LGB before 10 OR 1.24 (0.88–1.73) Bad reaction: friend OR 1.34 (0.93–1.93) 50%+ friends LGBT OR 1.20 (0.93–1.55) Staff not speaking up OR 1.32 (0.80–2.18) Lessons negative OR 1.16 (0.77–1.75) LGB Harassment OR 1.17 (0.74–1.85) Academic engagement OR 1.19 (1,1.4) Social emotional skills OR 1.26 (1.05,1.51) Planning, decision making skills OR 0.76 (0.63,0.91) Caring OR 0.87 (0.66,1.15) Social Justice OR 1.13 (0.84,1.53) Integrity OR 1.03 (0.88,1.21) Responsibility OR 1.02 (0.84,1.24) Boundaries Family OR 1.17 (0.15,9.19) School OR 0.88 (0.01,68.79) Neighborhood OR 0.94 (0.37,2.41) Family Support OR 0.69 (0.1,65) Open Family Communication OR 1.50 (0.1,66) Parent Involvement in School OR 0.93 (0.7,1.24) Other Adult Relationships OR 1.04 (0.5,2.18) Caring School Climate OR 1.30 (0.02,80.78) Community Values Youth OR 1.02 (0.03,36.85) Extracurricular Activity Participation Non-Sports OR 0.92 (0.31,2.72)		The findings are consistent with the suggestion that LGB stigma and discrimination contribute to LGB youth suicidality. LGB participants also shared risk factors with previous general population samples (e.g., previous depression/ anxiety, childhood sexual abuse).

[illegible]

Corresponding author

Xavier WANG, MPH, MSc

INSERM UMR 1178, CESP,

Centre Hospitalier Fondation Vallée,

ED3C, Université de Paris

7 rue Benserade, 94250 Gentilly, France

Tel +336 73 97 56 08;

Fax +331 45 21 28 64;

Email:

xu.wang@ch-fondationvallee.fr

ganquan1990@126.com

zhoujunwen936@gmail.com

mireille.cosquer@ch-fondationvallee.fr

bruno.falissard@gmail.com

emmanuelle.corruble@aphp.fr

catherine.jousselme@ch-fondationvallee.fr

florence.gressier@aphp.fr

Author's contributions statement

Xavier Wang- Conceptualization, Research implementation, Data extraction, Writing-original draft.

Quan Gan- Research implementation, Data extraction, Writing-Review and Editing.

Junwen Zhou- Methodology, Writing-Review and Editing.

Mireille Cosquer- Writing-Review and Editing.

Bruno Falissard- Methodology, Writing-Review and Editing.

Emmanuelle Corruble- Supervision, Writing-Review and Editing.

Catherine Jousset- Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Supervision.

Florence Gressier- Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing-Review and Editing.

All co-authors reviewed and approved the manuscript prior to submission

Acknowledgments

We sincerely thank Helene RAFFIN, Aminata ALI, Camile PREVOST for their helpful input on this article.
And we also thank David Gregory BARNS to provide proofreading for this study.

Author Disclosure Statement

The authors have no financial or proprietary interests in any material discussed in this article.

Sources of funding

This research did not receive any specific funding.