

## Online supplement

Title: Life under Covid-19 for LGBT+ people in the UK: Systematic review of UK research on the impact of COVID-19 on sexual and gender minority populations

Authors Victoria J McGowan, Hayley J Lowther, Catherine Meads

### Contents:

Online Supplement Table W1. Search terms

Online Supplement Table W2. List of excluded studies and reasons for exclusion

Online Supplement Table W3. Quality checklist results (using Joanna Briggs Institute checklist for cross-sectional studies)

Online Supplement Table W4. Results from Kneale & Becares Queerantime Study

Online Supplement Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram

Online Supplement Table W1. Database searches

Database (platform)	Date	Search terms
Cinahl Plus (EBSCO)	2019 - 26th Nov 2020	homosexuality or gay or lesbian or bisexual or queer or transgender AND covid-19 or coronavirus or 2019-ncov or sars-cov-2 or cov-19
Cochrane Central (Cochrane Library)	2020 - 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2020	covid or coronavirus in Title Abstract Keyword AND "sexual orientation" or "gender identity" or lesbian or bisexual or gay or transgender or "sexual minority" in Title Abstract Keyword
Core collection (Web of Science)	1970 - 10 <sup>th</sup> Dec 2020	(sexual orientation) or (gender identity) or lgbt or lgb or lesbian or bisexual or gay AND covid or coronavirus
Embase (Ovid)	1974 - 2020 November 25	1 homosexuality.mp. or homosexuality/ (25311) 2 homosexual.mp. (17847) 3 sexual orientation/ or gender identity/ (21917) 4 lesbian.mp. or homosexual female/ (8526) 5 bisexual.mp. or bisexuality/ (12325) 6 transsexualism/ or gender dysphoria/ (5637) 7 transgender/ or transgender.mp. (10197) 8 queer.mp. (1524) 9 pansexual.mp. (67) 10 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 (67482) 11 Coronavirinae/ or covid.mp. (69060) 12 10 and 11 (66)
Medline (Ovid)	1946 - November 25, 2020	1 homosexuality.mp. or homosexuality/ (31121) 2 homosexual.mp. (9492) 3 sexual orientation/ or gender identity/ (73957) 4 lesbian.mp. or homosexual female/ (6343) 5 bisexual.mp. or bisexuality/ (10306) 6 transsexualism/ or gender dysphoria/ (4209) 7 transgender/ or transgender.mp. (7406) 8 queer.mp. (1399) 9 pansexual.mp. (56) 10 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 (109868) 11 Coronavirinae/ or covid.mp. (75174) 12 10 and 11 (99)
Scopus (Scopus platform)	2020 - 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2020	covid or coronavirus AND "sexual orientation" or "gender identity" or lesbian or bisexual or gay or transgender or "sexual minority"

Online Supplement Table W2. Excluded studies and reasons for exclusion

No	Reference	Reason
1	Gahan L, Almack K. Experiences of and responses to disempowerment, violence, and injustice within the relational lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer people. JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY 2020. DOI: 10.1177/1440783320958812 Early Access Date: OCT 2020	Editorial
2	Rosa WE, Shook A, Acquaviva KD. LGBTQ+ Inclusive Palliative Care in the Context of COVID-19: Pragmatic Recommendations for Clinicians. Journal of Pain and Symptom Management 2020;60:e44ee47	Not UK-based
3	COVID-19 & Older LGBT+ people, see <a href="https://covid19olderlgbt.wordpress.com/">https://covid19olderlgbt.wordpress.com/</a>	Study ongoing
4	Galop, see <a href="http://www.galop.org.uk/a-new-survey-to-better-understand-how-covid-19-lockdown-restrictions-impacted-relationships/">http://www.galop.org.uk/a-new-survey-to-better-understand-how-covid-19-lockdown-restrictions-impacted-relationships/</a>	Study ongoing
5	NatCen, see <a href="https://natcen.ac.uk/news-media/press-releases/2020/december/natcen-to-investigate-impacts-of-covid-19-on-uk-lgbtplus-communities/">https://natcen.ac.uk/news-media/press-releases/2020/december/natcen-to-investigate-impacts-of-covid-19-on-uk-lgbtplus-communities/</a>	Study ongoing
6	Queer Voices Heard, see <a href="https://www.gaytimes.co.uk/life/57-of-lgbtq-people-think-their-lives-will-be-worse-off-in-six-months-due-to-coronavirus/">https://www.gaytimes.co.uk/life/57-of-lgbtq-people-think-their-lives-will-be-worse-off-in-six-months-due-to-coronavirus/</a>	Insufficient results, no numbers of participants given

Online Supplement Table W3. Quality checklist results (using Joanna Briggs Institute checklist for cross-sectional studies)

Source organisation/ team (date)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Generalisability	Overall appraisal
Barnardo's Sept 2020	U	N	U	U	N	N	Y	Y	Reasonably good fit, consistent with Outlife survey results	Insufficient details in report to know how study done, small trans group - trans men's and women's results all put together
Birmingham LGBT (Sept 2020)	Y	N	U	U	N	N	Y	Y	Reasonably good fit, consistent with the other non-comparative surveys	Part of a broader project commissioned by the Public Health Division of Birmingham City Council – unclear where these results are
Healthwatch Together (June/July 2020)	Y	N	U	U	N	N	Y	N	Reasonably good fit, consistent with the other non-comparative surveys	Comparator includes small LGBT group within it, with the LGBT group also written up separately
Houghton and Tasker (Aug 2020)	N	N	U	U	N	N	Y	Y	Reasonably good fit, consistent with the other non-comparative surveys	Preliminary results only, no comparator, demographics covers most PROGRESS+ Factors
Kneale & Becares (Aug 2020)	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Reasonably good fit, consistent with the other non-comparative surveys	Detailed methods section, preliminary results only, no comparator, no demographics to assess variation within/between LGBT+ (ie intersectional approaches).
Lancashire LGBT (July 2020)	U	N	U	U	N	N	Y	Y	Reasonably good fit, consistent with the other non-comparative surveys	Insufficient details in report to know how study done, no comparator, no demographics
LGBT Foundation (May 2020)	U	N	U	U	N	N	U	Y	Reasonably good fit, consistent with the other non-comparative surveys	Insufficient details in report to know how study done, no comparator, some demographics – no SES indicators.
LGBT South West, Intercom Trust (July 2020)	N	N	U	U	N	N	U	Y	Reasonably good fit, consistent with the other non-comparative surveys	No methods section, no comparator, , no demographics beyond sexual orientation and gender identity.
Live Through This (Aug 2020)	Y	N	U	U	N	N	Y	Y	Reasonably good fit, but this is the only work of its kind in this population group	Insufficient details in report to know how study done, interesting limitations section – acknowledges intersectional effects, no comparator, some demographics – no SES indicators.

Opening Doors London (Nov 2020)	Y	N	U	U	N	N	U	Y	Better than most, as telephone used for non-digitally competent members of community	Insufficient details in report to know how study done, no comparator
Outlife (June 2020)	N	N	U	U	N	N	Y	Y	Reasonably good fit, but this is the only work of its kind in this population group	Largest survey, small heterosexual comparator group, very detailed results given, no methods or demographics.
<p>Questions: 1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?, 2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?, 3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?, 4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?, 5. Were confounding factors identified?, 6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?, 7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?, 8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?</p> <p>Generalisability – summary of: Can the results be applied to the local population? Do the results of this study fit with other available evidence? What are the implications of this study for practice?</p>										

Online Supplement Table W4. Results from Kneale &amp; Becares Queerantime Study

Outcome	Metric	Total	Cis female Gay/Lesbian	Cis female bisexual/ other/ don't know/ prefer not to say	Cis male Gay	Cis male bisexual/ other/don't know/ prefer not to say	Trans-gender and Gender Diverse
Perceived Stress Scale (4-items)	Mean (SD)	7.7 (3.2)	6.4 (3.2)	8.3 (3.1)	7.0 (3.0)	9.0 (3.4)	9.0 (3.0)
Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (10-items)	Mean (SD)	14.2 (6.9)	12.0 (6.6)	15.0 (5.9)	12.7 (7.2)	16.1 (7.5)	17.1 (6.6)
Evidence of depressive symptomology ( $\geq 10$ )	Percentage	71.9	63.4	81.7	61.3	84.6	83.6
Harassment or inappropriate incidents reported	Percentage	16.7	19.7	13.3	7.5	15.4	28.8
Change in perceived social status - negative	Percentage	27.6	25.3	26.7	23.7	23.1	37.0
Change in perceived social status - positive	Percentage	25.4	22.5	30.0	24.7	15.4	27.4

Online Supplement **Figure 1**. PRISMA flow diagram