

Table 1

Correlations between independent and dependent variables

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|-------|--------|-------|--------|------|
| <i>Independent variables</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Self-esteem | -- | | | | | | | |
| 2. Depressive symptoms | -.67 | -- | | | | | | |
| 3. General stress | -.42 | .49 | -- | | | | | |
| 4. SGM—positive feelings | .31 | -.24 | -.15 | -- | | | | |
| 5. SGM—access to resources | .14 | -.12 | -.04 | .22 | -- | | | |
| 6. SGM—future beliefs | .36 | -.23 | -.13 | .43 | .12 | -- | | |
| 7. SGM—openness | .31 | -.26 | -.19 | .41 | .34 | .28 | -- | |
| 8. SGM—stress of coming out | -.19 | .20 | .19 | -.29 | -.10 | -.11 | -.33 | -- |
| <i>Dependent variables</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Caloric restriction | -.25 | .30 | .17 | -.10 | -.05 | -.09 | -.08 | .09 |
| 10. Diet pills | -.07 | .12 | .07 | -.03 | -.03** | -.01† | -.03** | .04 |
| 11. Purge (Vomit) | -.15 | .21 | .11 | -.06 | -.04 | -.03* | -.05 | .07 |
| 12. Laxatives | -.07 | .09 | .05 | -.02* | -.03* | .004† | -.03** | .01† |
| 13. Binge eat | -.16 | .20 | .12 | -.07 | -.03** | -.04 | -.06 | .26 |

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$ unless otherwise indicated.

† $p > .05$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 2

Measurement of SGM-Specific Factors

Instructions: For each question below, indicate how you feel about each statement:

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|
| 1. Whenever I think a lot about being LGBTQ, I feel critical of myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Whenever I think a lot about being LGBTQ, I feel depressed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. I wish I were not LGBTQ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| | Definitely Yes | Somewhat Yes | Somewhat No | Definitely No |
| 4. Are you involved in events or organizations that promote the rights of LGBTQ individuals? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Do you have access to information about LGBTQ issues? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Do you have access to support groups for LGBTQ adolescents? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Are you able to see yourself in the future as a happy or successful LGBTQ adult? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Are you able to imagine yourself in the future in a committed romantic relationship? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Are you able to imagine yourself in the future as an LGBTQ parent? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Do you feel pride in being an LGBTQ person? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. As an LGBTQ person, are you able to be yourself in school? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. As an LGBTQ person, are you able to be yourself at home? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. As an LGBTQ person, are you able to be yourself in your neighborhood? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. As an LGBTQ person, are you able to be yourself with your friends? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. Do you accept your LGBTQ identity? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Scoring: Compute means of following items. RC = Reverse Coded.

- Positive feelings about being SGM: 1 (RC), 2 (RC) 3 (RC), 10, 15
- Access to SGM resources: 4, 5, 6
- Future Beliefs about Life as SGM: 7, 8, 9,
- Openness as SGM: 11, 12, 13, 14

Items represent adaptation of a prior scale measuring SGM adolescents' experiences, per recommendations from the Human Rights Campaign in collaboration with the research team. For reference, see:

- Austin, A., Craig, S. L., D'Souza, S., & McInroy, L. B. (2020). Suicidality among transgender youth: Elucidating the role of interpersonal risk factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520915554>
- Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., Hunter, J., Braun, L. (2006). Sexual identity development among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths: Consistency and change over time. *Journal of Sex Research*, 43(1), 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490609552298>

Table 3

Measurement of Stress of Coming Out

Instructions: For each event listed below, we would like you to rate how stressful the situation was for you. Using the numbers on the scale provided, tell us how stressful the event was.

| N/A Does not apply to me | 0 No stress | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 Extremely Stressful |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
|--------------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------|

1. When you *told* your parents for the first time that you were LGBT.
2. When you *told* your brothers or sisters for the first time that you were LGBT.
3. When your parents *found out* that you were LGBT without you telling them.
4. When your brothers or sisters *found out* that you were LGBT without you telling them.
5. When other people in your family *found out* that you were LGBT.
6. When your teacher *first found out* that you were LGBT.
7. When your classmates *first found out* that you were LGBT.
8. When your close friends *first found out* that you were LGBT.
9. When you *told* your close friends for the first time that you were LGBT.
10. When a friendship ended *due to your being LGBT*.

Scoring: Compute mean of all items, excluding “N/A”

Scenarios have been used previously in research with SM adolescents. They were used in the current study per recommendations from the Human Rights Campaign, in collaboration with the research team. For reference:

- Rosario, M., Rotheram-Borus, M. J., & Reid, H. (1996). Gay-related stress and its correlates among gay and bisexual male adolescents of predominantly Black and Hispanic background. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 24(2), 136–159. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6629\(199604\)24:2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6629(199604)24:2)

Table 4

Interaction between General Psychological Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Caloric Restriction

| Model Set 4 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 4a. Caloric Restriction | | | | | |
| Self-esteem*GM Identity | 0.44 | 1.56 | 1.07 | 2.27 | .020 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.16 | 3.19 | 2.65 | 3.84 | < .001 |
| General stress | 0.06 | 1.06 | 1.00 | 1.13 | .046 |
| 4b. Caloric Restriction | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.08 | 0.43 | 0.34 | 0.53 | < .001 |
| Depressive symptoms*GM Identity | -0.38 | 0.68 | 0.51 | 0.92 | .013 |
| General stress | 0.06 | 1.06 | 1.00 | 1.13 | .044 |
| 4c. Caloric Restriction | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.84 | 0.43 | 0.35 | 0.54 | < .001 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.16 | 3.19 | 2.65 | 3.84 | < .001 |
| General stress*GM Identity | -0.15 | 0.86 | 0.78 | 0.96 | .009 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 5

Interaction between General Psychological Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Diet Pill Use

| Model Set 4 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 4d. Diet Pills | | | | | |
| Self-esteem*GM Identity | -0.09 | 0.91 | 0.49 | 1.71 | .770 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.25 | 3.49 | 2.47 | 4.93 | < .001 |
| General stress | 0.10 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 1.23 | .095 |
| 4e. Diet Pills | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | 0.08 | 1.08 | 0.74 | 1.58 | .688 |
| Depressive symptoms*GM Identity | -0.09 | 0.91 | 0.53 | 1.56 | .747 |
| General stress | 0.10 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 1.23 | .094 |
| 4f. Diet Pills | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | 0.08 | 1.08 | 0.74 | 1.57 | .697 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.26 | 3.52 | 2.49 | 4.97 | < .001 |
| General stress*GM Identity | -0.10 | 0.91 | 0.74 | 1.11 | .348 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 6

Interaction between General Psychological Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Purging (Vomiting)

| Model Set 4 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 4g. Purge (Vomit) | | | | | |
| Self-esteem*GM Identity | 0.08 | 1.08 | 0.67 | 1.74 | .744 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.40 | 4.07 | 3.17 | 5.23 | < .001 |
| General stress | 0.04 | 1.04 | 0.96 | 1.13 | .313 |
| 4h. Purge (Vomit) | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.41 | 0.67 | 0.50 | 0.88 | .004 |
| Depressive symptoms*GM Identity | -0.14 | 0.87 | 0.58 | 1.29 | .487 |
| General stress | 0.04 | 1.04 | 0.96 | 1.13 | .313 |
| 4i. Purge (Vomit) | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.41 | 0.66 | 0.50 | 0.88 | .004 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.41 | 4.10 | 3.20 | 5.27 | < .001 |
| General stress*GM Identity | -0.12 | 0.89 | 0.77 | 1.02 | .098 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 7

Interaction between General Psychological Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Laxative Use

| Model Set 4 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 4j. Laxatives | | | | | |
| Self-esteem*GM Identity | -0.52 | 0.59 | 0.25 | 1.40 | .231 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.09 | 2.99 | 1.88 | 4.73 | < .001 |
| General stress | 0.03 | 1.04 | 0.89 | 1.20 | .648 |
| 4k. Laxatives | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.38 | 0.68 | 0.40 | 1.15 | .152 |
| Depressive symptoms*GM Identity | -0.35 | 0.71 | 0.33 | 1.47 | .361 |
| General stress | 0.04 | 1.04 | 0.89 | 1.20 | .642 |
| 4l. Laxatives | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.37 | 0.69 | 0.41 | 1.16 | .164 |
| Depressive symptoms | 1.11 | 3.03 | 1.91 | 4.80 | < .001 |
| General stress*GM Identity | 0.03 | 1.03 | 0.79 | 1.34 | .830 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 8

Interaction between General Psychological Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Binge Eating

| Model Set 4 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 4m. Binge Eating | | | | | |
| Self-esteem*GM Identity | -0.18 | 0.83 | 0.64 | 1.08 | .162 |
| Depressive symptoms | 0.65 | 1.92 | 1.67 | 2.20 | < .001 |
| General stress | 0.06 | 1.06 | 1.01 | 1.11 | .015 |
| 4n. Binge Eating | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.28 | 0.76 | 0.64 | 0.89 | < .001 |
| Depressive symptoms*GM Identity | 0.14 | 1.15 | 0.93 | 1.42 | .202 |
| General stress | 0.06 | 1.06 | 1.01 | 1.11 | .015 |
| 4o. Binge Eating | | | | | |
| Self-esteem | -0.29 | 0.75 | 0.64 | 0.88 | < .001 |
| Depressive symptoms | 0.65 | 1.92 | 1.67 | 2.21 | < .001 |
| General stress*GM Identity | -0.01 | 0.99 | 0.91 | 1.07 | .734 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 9

Interaction between SGM-Specific Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Caloric Restriction

| Model Set 5 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 5a. Caloric Restriction | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings*GM Identity | 0.23 | 1.26 | 0.96 | 1.64 | .092 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.01 | 0.88 | 0.78 | 0.99 | .035 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | -0.15 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.98 | .028 |
| SGM Openness | -0.21 | 0.81 | 0.71 | 0.93 | .003 |
| 5b. Caloric Restriction | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.35 | 0.70 | 0.60 | 0.82 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources*GM Identity | -0.15 | 0.86 | 0.69 | 1.08 | .189 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | -0.15 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.98 | .028 |
| SGM Openness | -0.20 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.94 | .004 |
| 5c. Caloric Restriction | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.36 | 0.70 | 0.60 | 0.81 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.13 | 0.90 | 0.78 | 0.99 | .035 |
| SGM Future Beliefs*GM Identity | 0.19 | 1.20 | 0.95 | 1.54 | .131 |
| SGM Openness | -0.20 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.94 | .004 |
| 5d. Caloric Restriction | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.36 | 0.70 | 0.60 | 0.82 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.12 | 0.88 | 0.78 | 0.99 | .039 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | -0.15 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.98 | .027 |
| SGM Openness*GM Identity | 0.04 | 1.04 | 0.82 | 1.33 | .729 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 10

Interaction between SGM-Specific Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Diet Pill Use

| Model Set 5 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 5e. Diet Pills | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings*GM Identity | -0.05 | 0.95 | 0.56 | 1.60 | .847 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.27 | 0.76 | 0.61 | 0.96 | .023 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.18 | 1.19 | 0.90 | 1.57 | .211 |
| SGM Openness | -0.22 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 1.05 | .114 |
| 5f. Diet Pills | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.27 | 0.76 | 0.56 | 1.04 | .082 |
| SGM Access to Resources*GM Identity | -0.10 | 0.90 | 0.58 | 1.39 | .650 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.18 | 1.19 | 0.91 | 1.57 | .208 |
| SGM Openness | -0.22 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 1.05 | .108 |
| 5g. Diet Pills | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.27 | 1.35 | 0.56 | 1.04 | .088 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.27 | 0.77 | 0.61 | 0.97 | .024 |
| SGM Future Beliefs*GM Identity | -0.28 | 0.75 | 0.46 | 1.23 | .256 |
| SGM Openness | -0.22 | 0.81 | 0.62 | 1.06 | .120 |
| 5h. Diet Pills | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.29 | 0.75 | 0.55 | 1.02 | .065 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.27 | 0.77 | 0.61 | 0.97 | .025 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.18 | 1.20 | 0.91 | 1.58 | .206 |
| SGM Openness*GM Identity | 0.29 | 1.34 | 0.84 | 2.17 | .225 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 11

Interaction between SGM-Specific Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Purging (Vomiting)

| Model Set 5 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 5i. Purge (Vomit) | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings*GM Identity | 0.20 | 1.22 | 0.85 | 1.74 | .282 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.19 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 0.97 | .021 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.09 | 1.09 | 0.91 | 1.32 | .344 |
| SGM Openness | -0.24 | 0.78 | 0.65 | 0.95 | .011 |
| 5j. Purge (Vomit) | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.37 | 0.69 | 0.56 | 0.85 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources*GM Identity | 0.04 | 1.04 | 0.77 | 1.41 | .776 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.09 | 1.09 | 0.91 | 1.31 | .353 |
| SGM Openness | -0.23 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.95 | .014 |
| 5k. Purge (Vomit) | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.37 | 0.69 | 0.56 | 0.85 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.19 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 0.97 | .020 |
| SGM Future Beliefs*GM Identity | 0.15 | 1.17 | 0.84 | 1.64 | .368 |
| SGM Openness | -0.24 | 0.79 | 0.65 | 0.95 | .013 |
| 5l. Purge (Vomit) | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.36 | 0.70 | 0.56 | 0.86 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.19 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 0.97 | .021 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.09 | 1.09 | 0.91 | 1.31 | .359 |
| SGM Openness*GM Identity | -0.18 | 0.83 | 0.60 | 1.15 | .269 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 12

Interaction between SGM-Specific Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Laxative Use

| Model Set 5 <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 5m. Laxatives | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings*GM Identity | -0.51 | 0.60 | 0.29 | 1.21 | .159 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.28 | 0.76 | 0.56 | 1.03 | .077 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.36 | 1.43 | 0.98 | 2.09 | .063 |
| SGM Openness | -0.32 | 0.72 | 0.50 | 1.04 | .079 |
| 5n. Laxatives | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.27 | .763 | 0.50 | 1.15 | .199 |
| SGM Access to Resources*GM Identity | 0.26 | 1.292 | 0.73 | 2.29 | .379 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.36 | 1.433 | 0.98 | 2.10 | .064 |
| SGM Openness | -0.34 | 0.712 | 0.50 | 1.02 | .064 |
| 5o. Laxatives | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.26 | 0.77 | 0.51 | 1.17 | .226 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.28 | 0.76 | 0.56 | 1.03 | .077 |
| SGM Future Beliefs*GM Identity | -0.44 | 0.64 | 0.32 | 1.26 | .198 |
| SGM Openness | -0.33 | 0.72 | 0.50 | 1.03 | .069 |
| 5p. Laxatives | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.26 | 0.77 | 0.51 | 1.16 | .216 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.28 | 0.75 | 0.56 | 1.03 | .072 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | 0.36 | 1.44 | 0.98 | 2.10 | .063 |
| SGM Openness*GM Identity | -0.08 | 0.93 | 0.49 | 1.75 | .810 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.

Table 13

Interaction between SGM-Specific Factors and Gender Minority Identity on Clinical Threshold Binge Eating

| Model Set 5 | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|----------|
| <i>n</i> = 8814 | | | | | |
| Outcome | b | OR | 95% CI OR | | <i>p</i> |
| | | | CI LL | CI UL | |
| 5q. Binge Eat | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings*GM Identity | 0.10 | 1.10 | 0.88 | 1.37 | .398 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.07 | 0.93 | 0.85 | 1.03 | .155 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | -0.05 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 1.06 | .384 |
| SGM Openness | -0.14 | 0.87 | 0.77 | 0.97 | .012 |
| 5r. Binge Eat | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.26 | 0.77 | 0.68 | 0.87 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources*GM Identity | -0.10 | 0.90 | 0.76 | 1.08 | .276 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | -0.05 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 1.06 | .398 |
| SGM Openness | -0.14 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.97 | .014 |
| 5s. Binge Eat | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.26 | 0.77 | 0.675 | 0.87 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.07 | 0.93 | 0.85 | 1.03 | .167 |
| SGM Future Beliefs*GM Identity | -0.08 | 0.93 | 0.76 | 1.13 | .451 |
| SGM Openness | -0.14 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.97 | .015 |
| 5t. Binge Eat | | | | | |
| SGM Positive Feelings | -0.26 | 0.77 | 0.68 | 0.87 | < .001 |
| SGM Access to Resources | -0.07 | 0.93 | 0.85 | 1.03 | .155 |
| SGM Future Beliefs | -0.05 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 1.06 | .376 |
| SGM Openness*GM Identity | -0.09 | 0.92 | 0.75 | 1.12 | .395 |

Note. Gender Identity was analyzed using a dummy code (1 = cisgender sexual minority; 0 = gender minority of any sexual identity). Sensitivity analyses revealed an identical pattern of results when excluding gender minority participants who identified as heterosexual.