

Journal Pre-proof

Family Building and Pregnancy Experiences of Cisgender Sexual Minority Women



Diana M. TORDOFF PhD, MPH , Heidi MOSESON PhD, MPH ,
Sachiko RAGOSTA , Jen HASTINGS MD ,
Annesa FLENTJE PhD , Matthew R. CAPRIOTTI PhD ,
Micah E. LUBENSKY PhD , Mitchell R. LUNN MD, MAS ,
Juno OBEDIN-MALIVER MD, MPH, MAS

PII: S2666-5778(23)00140-5
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xagr.2023.100298>
Reference: XAGR 100298

To appear in: *AJOG Global Reports*

Received date: 5 December 2023
Accepted date: 10 December 2023

Please cite this article as: Diana M. TORDOFF PhD, MPH , Heidi MOSESON PhD, MPH , Sachiko RAGOSTA , Jen HASTINGS MD , Annesa FLENTJE PhD , Matthew R. CAPRIOTTI PhD , Micah E. LUBENSKY PhD , Mitchell R. LUNN MD, MAS , Juno OBEDIN-MALIVER MD, MPH, MAS , Family Building and Pregnancy Experiences of Cisgender Sexual Minority Women, *AJOG Global Reports* (2023), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xagr.2023.100298>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2023 Published by Elsevier Inc.
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Title: Family Building and Pregnancy Experiences of Cisgender Sexual Minority Women

Authors: Diana M. TORDOFF, PhD, MPH¹, Heidi MOSESON, PhD, MPH², Sachiko RAGOSTA², Jen HASTINGS, MD³, Annesa FLENTJE, PhD³, Matthew R. CAPRIOTTI, PhD⁴, Micah E. LUBENSKY, PhD³, Mitchell R. LUNN, MD, MAS¹, Juno OBEDIN-MALIVER, MD, MPH, MAS¹

¹Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, CA, USA

²Ibis Reproductive Health, Oakland, CA, USA

³University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

⁴Department of Psychology, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA, USA

Declarations of Interest: Dr. Obedin-Maliver received consultation fees from Ibis Reproductive Health, Hims Inc., Folx Health Inc., and Sage Therapeutics on topics unrelated to this work. Dr. Lunn received consultation fees from Hims Inc., Folx Health Inc., and Otsuka Pharmaceutical Development and Commercialization, Inc. on topics unrelated to this work.

Funding: This study was funded by a grant from the Society of Family Planning to HM (SFPRF12-II1) as well as intramural funding from Stanford Departments of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Medicine. Dr. Obedin-Maliver's and Lunn's time were partially supported by the following grants (on topics unrelated to this work) during the conduct of this study by the National Institutes of Health (R21MD015878, R01CA237670, R01DA052016, OT2OD025276). Dr. Moseson's and Mx. Ragosta's time was also partially supported by a grant (on topics unrelated to this work) during the conduct of this study by the National Institutes of Health (R21CA256759). AF was supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (K24DA057874, K23DA039800). Research reported in this article was partially funded through a Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (www.pcori.org; PPRN-1501-26848) to MRL. The statements in this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, its Board of Governors or Methodology Committee, The Society for Family Planning, or the National Institutes of Health.

Consent: All study participants provided informed consent prior to answering surveys.

Meetings: Findings will be presented as a poster at the FIGO World Congress of Gynecology and Obstetrics in Paris, France, on October 9-12, 2023.

Corresponding authors: Diana M. Tordoff, PhD, MPH; Stanford University School of Medicine;
dtordoff@stanford.edu

Word and Item Count: 374/500 words in abstract, 3000/3000 words in manuscript, 4 tables/figures, 38 references

Tweetable Statement: In a study of 1,369 cisgender sexual minority women in the US, 18% were parents and primarily built their families through pregnancy, and 24% had future pregnancy intentions.

Short Title: Family Building and Pregnancy among Sexual Minority Women

AJOG at a Glance:

- **Why was this study conducted?** Although 1 in 5 cisgender women have a sexual minority identity (*e.g.*, bisexual, lesbian, queer), there are limited data on the family building and pregnancy experiences of sexual minority cisgender women.
- **Key findings.** In a national study of 1,369 cisgender sexual minority women, 18% were parents and primarily built their families through pregnancy. There were important differences in family building methods used by sexual orientation; for example, bisexual women were most likely to use sexual activity with a partner while lesbian and queer women were more likely to use donor sperm.
- **What does this add to what is known?** Our findings add nuance to prior studies and highlight that a quarter of sexual minority cisgender women had future pregnancy desires.

ABSTRACT

Background: Although 10-20% of cisgender women age 18-40 have a sexual minority identity (*e.g.*, bisexual, lesbian, queer), there is limited research on the family building and pregnancy experiences of sexual minority cisgender women. Improving our understanding of the family building and pregnancy experiences of cisgender sexual minority women is critical for improving the perinatal health of this population.

Objectives: To compare the mode of family building, past pregnancy experiences, and future pregnancy intentions among cisgender sexual minority women by sexual orientation.

Study Design: Observational study using cross-sectional data collected in 2019 from a national sample of 1,369 cisgender sexual minority women aged 18-45.

Results: Most participants ($n=794$, 58%) endorsed multiple sexual orientations, most commonly queer ($n=641$, 47%), lesbian ($n=640$, 47%), and/or bisexual ($n=583$, 43%). There were 243 (18%) cisgender sexual minority women who were parents. Pregnancy was used by 74% ($n=181/243$) of women to build their families. Among participants who used pregnancy, 60% ($n=108/181$) became pregnant through sexual activity with another parent of the child, while 27% ($n=64/243$) of women used donor sperm. An additional 10% ($n=24$) became parents through second-parent adoption, 10% ($n=25$) through adoption, and 14% ($n=35$) through step-parenting. Bisexual women more often used sexual activity to become parents ($n=61/100$, 61%) compared to queer ($n=40/89$, 45%) and lesbian women ($n=40/130$, 31%). In contrast, lesbian ($n=50/130$, 39%) and queer ($n=25/89$, 27%) women more often used donor sperm to become parents compared to bisexual women ($n=11/100$, 11%). Among the 266 (19%) cisgender sexual minority women who had ever been pregnant there were 545 pregnancies (mean=2.05 pregnancies per woman). Among those pregnancies, 59% ($n=327$) resulted in live birth, 23% ($n=126$) in miscarriage, 15% ($n=83$) in abortion, and 2% ($n=9$) in ectopic pregnancy. A quarter of women had future pregnancy intentions, with no

differences by sexual orientation. Overall, few participants (16%) reported that all of their healthcare providers were aware of their sexual orientation.

Conclusions: Cisgender sexual minority women primarily built their families through pregnancy and a quarter have future pregnancy desires. In addition, there were important differences in family building methods used by sexual orientation. Providers should be aware of the pregnancy and family-building patterns, plans, and needs of cisgender sexual minority women.

KEY WORDS: Sexual minority women; lesbian; bisexual women; family building; pregnancy; parenthood

Journal Pre-proof

INTRODUCTION

Although 10-20% of cisgender women age 18-40 have a sexual minority identity (e.g., bisexual, lesbian, queer)¹⁻³ there is limited research on the family building and pregnancy experiences of cisgender sexual minority women (CSMW). Most literature to date has focused on family building experiences of lesbian or same-sex couples with less attention to the experiences of bisexual, pansexual, and queer cisgender women.^{4,5} To our knowledge, only two prior studies have broadly described the modes of family building among CSMW: The LGBTQ Family Building Project⁶ and The National LGBTQ+ Women's Community Survey.^{12,13} These studies found that many women (53-78%) used pregnancy (carried by themselves or their partner) to become parents, but other means including adoption and step-parenting were used.

CSMW experience significant barriers to achieving desired pregnancies, including difficulty accessing general sexual and reproductive health care, difficulty accessing medically assisted reproduction (e.g., intrauterine insemination [IUI], *in vitro* fertilization [IVF]), and financial barriers.^{9,10} At the same time bisexual women are more likely than heterosexual women to experience pregnancy over their lifetime^{11,12} including unintended pregnancies.^{13,14} CSMW's sexual and reproductive healthcare experiences are frequently characterized by discrimination, erasure, and feeling their like identities and experiences are invisible due to heteronormative assumptions and lack of LGBTQ+ competency.^{9,10,15-17}

Improving our understanding of the family building and pregnancy experiences of CSMW is critical for improving the whole family and perinatal health experiences of this population. Emerging data suggest CSMW experience significant disparities in fertility and pregnancy outcomes, including higher rates of miscarriage, stillbirth, preterm birth, and severe maternal morbidity.¹⁸⁻²⁰ These inequities can be attributed to minority stress as well as substantial structural barriers to sexual and reproductive health services for CSMW.^{9,21-24} For example, pregnant CSMW report decreased healthcare access, poorer mental health, higher number of chronic health conditions, and substance use compared to pregnant heterosexual women.²⁵

The present study aimed to address these gaps by describing the family building and pregnancy experiences of CSMW using data from a large national community-engaged study on the sexual and reproductive health of sexual and gender minority adults in the United States.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Study population, design, and data collection

We conducted an, online, cross-sectional survey on sexual and reproductive health designed for sexual and gender minority (SGM) participants. Survey development and content are described in detail elsewhere.²⁶ Participants were recruited from two populations: (1) the general public (recruited *via* social media, community-based organizations, e-mail distribution lists, in-person community events, and a standalone study website) and (2) The Population Research in Identity and Disparities for Equality (PRIDE) Study. The PRIDE Study is an online national prospective cohort study of sexual and gender minority adults. The PRIDE Study's community-engaged research approach, demographics, and methods have been described elsewhere.^{27,28} The survey was administered through Qualtrics (Provo, UT) from May-September 2019. Respondents who initiated the survey were entered into a raffle to win one of 67 \$50 electronic gift cards.

Participants were eligible to complete the study if they were assigned female or intersex at birth; identified as transgender, nonbinary, gender diverse, or as a cisgender sexual minority woman (e.g., lesbian, bisexual, gay); resided in the United States or its Territories; and could read and understand English. Participants recruited from the general public were eligible if they were 15-45 years old, while participants recruited from The PRIDE Study were 18-45 years old. The present analysis is restricted to cisgender women participants who did not endorse any transgender or gender diverse identities. Nearly all CSMW participants (n=1,366, 99.8%) were recruited through The PRIDE Study. Prior analyses have presented findings for transgender participants.²⁹⁻³¹

Measures

To identify cisgender women, we categorized participants based on their responses to two questions about their (1) current gender identity (using a select all that apply format that allowed for additional write-in response) and (2) sex assigned at birth. Additional sociodemographic variables included sexual orientation, age, racial/ethnic identity, relationship status, marital status, annual household income, health insurance coverage, and US Census region. We also asked participants what proportion of their healthcare providers are aware of their sexual orientation (modified from the Nebraska Outness Scale).³²

Parent participants were asked about the methods they used to become a parent for each child using a select-all-that-apply multiple-choice question with the following options: sexual activity with another parent of the child, carried pregnancy and was egg source, carried pregnancy but was not egg source, provided egg that a partner carried, surrogacy, second parent adoption of partner's biological child, adoption, step-parent, foster parent, used anonymous donor sperm, used known donor sperm, used an egg donor. Second-parent adoption describes the process in which parents who did not birth a child and/or who are not biologically related to a child can adopt a child without terminating the first legal parent's rights.

For pregnancy-related outcomes, we asked participants how many times they had been pregnant and collected detailed information on the outcomes of each pregnancy. Participants' future pregnancy intentions were based on responses to a modified version of the Pregnancy Attitudes Timing and How (PATH) questions.³³

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize sociodemographic characteristics for the overall sample as well as by parental status and pregnancy history. We calculated frequencies for mode of family building, prior pregnancies, and future pregnancy intentions overall and by sexual orientation and racial/ethnic identity. Notably, most participants selected more than one sexual orientation. Therefore, we chose to conduct our analysis using overlapping, rather than mutually exclusive groups, to represent our

participants most accurately. As a result of using overlapping categories, we were unable to conduct statistical tests for differences between groups defined by sexual orientation. Due to very small sample sizes for racial/ethnic minority parents (n=22) and participants with a prior pregnancy (n=26), results stratified by race/ethnicity are presented in the supplement. All analyses were conducted in Stata 15.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

Ethics

This study received ethical approval from the Institutional Review Boards of Stanford University, University of California, San Francisco, and WCG. In addition, The PRIDE Study Research Advisory Committee and The PRIDE Study Participant Advisory Committee (pridestudy.org) reviewed and approved the study. We obtained informed consent from all survey respondents.

RESULTS

Participants characteristics

There were 1,369 CSMW participants with a median age of 29.7 (IQR 24.4-37.6 years; Table 1). Many participants (n=794, 58%) endorsed more than one sexual orientation, most commonly queer (n=641, 47%), lesbian (n=640, 47%), and/or bisexual (n=583, 43%). Overlap between sexual orientations are presented in Supplemental Table 1. Few participants *exclusively* endorsed an asexual (n=31), gay (n=8), pansexual (n=31), same-gender loving (n=1), or a straight (n=1) identity. Most participants (n=1,201, 88%) were White. In addition, 15 (1%) were American Indian or Alaska Native, 57 (4%) were Asian, 40 (3%) were Black or African American, 65 (5%) were Hispanic or Latinx, 16 (1%) were Middle Eastern or North African, and 6 (<1%) were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.

Eighteen percent of participants were parents and 19% had ever been pregnant. Parents were more likely to be in a relationship, living with a partner, legally married, and had higher household incomes compared to non-parents. Similar patterns were observed for participants who had ever been pregnant versus never pregnant. Overall, few participants (16%) reported that *all* their healthcare providers were

aware of their sexual orientation. Parents (28% v. 15%, $p < 0.001$) and participants who had ever been pregnant (23% v. 14%, $p = 0.014$) were more likely to be out to their providers.

Family Building Experiences

There were 243 (18%) CSMW who were parents, lesbian women were most likely to be parents (20%), followed by bisexual (17%), pansexual (17%), queer (13%), gay (12%), and asexual women (5%).

Three-quarters (74%, $n = 181/243$) of women used pregnancy to build their families for one or more of their children (*e.g.*, sexual activity with another parent of the child and/or carrying a pregnancy as the egg source or not as the egg source). The most common modes of family building were carrying a pregnancy (49%) and sexual activity with another parent of the child (44%; Table 2). Notably, these categories are not mutually exclusive, and 41% ($n = 46/113$) of women who reported carrying a pregnancy as the egg source also reported using sexual activity as a mode of family building.

Additionally, 14% were step-parents, 10% of parents underwent second-parent adoption their partner's child, 10% adopted, and 4% were foster parents. A quarter of parents used donor sperm, and anonymous donor sperm was more common than known donor sperm (21% v. 5% of parents). Few participants carried a pregnancy for which they were not the egg source ($n = 6$, 3%, also referred to as reciprocal IVF in which the index participant was pregnant) or used donor eggs ($n = 1$, <1%). No participants provided an egg that a partner carried (also referred to as reciprocal IVF in which the index participant was the egg source) or used surrogacy.

Bisexual and pansexual women were more likely to have become pregnant *via* sexual activity (61%) compared to queer (45%), lesbian (31%), and gay (31%) women. In contrast, lesbian, gay, and queer women were more likely to use donor sperm (39%, 31%, and 27%, respectively) compared to pansexual (16%) and bisexual women (11%).

Prior Pregnancy Experiences

There were 266 (19%) CSMW who had ever been pregnant (Table 3). Forty-four percent (n=117, 44%) of participants had only one pregnancy. Pansexual, bisexual, and lesbian women were most likely to have ever been pregnant (23%, 21%, and 20% respectively), followed by queer (17%), gay (11%), and asexual women (7%).

Among the 558 pregnancies reported by participants, 59% resulted in live birth, 23% in miscarriage, 15% in abortion, and 2% in ectopic pregnancy (Table 4). Of the live births, 28% were by cesarean. One participant reported having a stillbirth. There were no differences in these pregnancy outcomes by sexual orientation.

Future Pregnancy Intentions

A quarter (24%) of CSMW had future pregnancy intentions (Table 3). Among those who would like to be pregnant at some point, 20% indicated a desire to become pregnant within the next year, an additional 32% said they would like to become pregnant in the next 5 years, and an additional 31% in the next 5-10 years. There were no differences in future pregnancy intentions by sexual orientation.

COMMENT

Our findings demonstrate that CSMW primarily build their families through pregnancy, and many have future pregnancy intentions. There are differences in family building methods use by sexual orientation. Although sexual activity was the most common method for family building among bisexual women, lesbian and queer women were more likely to use donor sperm, second parent adoption, adoption, and foster parenting to build their families. Most pregnancies resulted in live birth, although miscarriage (23%) and abortion (15%) were also common outcomes. Although we do not have a comparator group, the rates of miscarriage and abortion are similar to what is observed in the overall US population.^{34,35}

We observed that 18% of CSMW were parents, a prevalence that is similar to what was previously reported by the *Generations Study*, a national probability sample of sexual minority adults in the US, which

found that 23% of CSMW were parents.³⁶ Our findings also add nuance to prior studies which have broadly documented the family building and pregnancy experiences of CSMW. For example, Goldberg found that 73% of CSMW self-reported using donor insemination, 21% adoption or fostering, 4% penis-vagina sex, and 5% step-parenting to build their families.⁶ In our study, sexual activity was significantly more common as a mode of family building (reported by 49%) and may reflect differences in study populations. Notably, Goldberg's study primarily included CSMW in same-sex partnerships, and is less representative of the overall population of CSMW. Data from the National LGBTQ+ Women's Community Survey^{12,13} similarly found that many CSMW became parents through pregnancy, with significant differences by self-reported gender expression. Women who were femme or on the feminine spectrum were most likely to have given birth (52%) compared to women who were butch or on the masculine spectrum (30%), although a similar proportion of women reported becoming parents by their partner giving birth (19% of femme and 23% of butch women). Butch women were more likely than femme women to use non-pregnancy methods (*e.g.*, adoption, step-parenting) to become parents. Collectively, this small but growing body of research highlights heterogeneity in experiences of family building among CSMW.

Other available data on modes of family building focus on same-sex couples rather than self-reported sexual orientation. Using birth-certificate data for women in same-sex partnerships, Downing *et al.* found that three quarters (73%) of couples had used any fertility treatments—most commonly IVF (34%) and intracervical insemination (22%)—and 60% used anonymous donor sperm. Data from the US Census also found that same-sex couples are less likely to have biological children compared to opposite-sex couples (52% vs. 84%) and were more likely to adopt (17% vs. 2%).³⁷ Data on same-sex partnerships highlight the critical role that dyad structure may play in mode of family building options. In the absence of the comprehensive collection of sexual orientation and gender identity data on national surveys, administrative data on same-sex couples is an important step towards documenting the reproductive health needs of SGM populations. However, this approach excludes bisexual, pansexual, and queer women

who are partnered with cisgender and transgender men, a population that is under-researched. Furthermore, a focus on same-sex couples, though important, precludes examination of individuals who are not currently or may never have been in a dyad or who are in relationships with more than one person, as over 10% of our sample of parents were. Examinations of various family structures in family building is needed.

Clinical Implications

The number of pregnancies to CSMW is anticipated to increase as younger generations are more likely to identify as sexual minorities (19.7% of Generation Z, compared to 11.2% of Millennials and 3.3% of Generation X)² and are twice as likely to desire children through sexual activity and medically assisted reproduction compared to older cohorts.³⁸ Access to and general use of medically assisted reproduction is also expected to grow. Therefore, it is critical that providers are aware of the reproductive healthcare needs of CSMW.

Notably, few participants in our study reported that all their healthcare providers were aware of their sexual minority identity. Providers should avoid making assumptions about the sexual orientation of their patients, especially when providing sexual and reproductive health services and counseling. Prior research has emphasized the centrality of patient-provider communication and experiences of erasure for CSMW and their experiences of autonomy, empowerment, and agency in healthcare settings throughout their family building and pregnancy journeys.^{9,24}

A quarter of the women in our sample had future pregnancy intentions, and this did not differ by sexual orientation. Sexual minority identity can have a strong impact on individual pregnancy intentions. Prior qualitative research demonstrates that many CSMW view pregnancy as inaccessible and that heteronormative narratives of motherhood, pregnancy, and family planning impact whether women thought of pregnancy as an option for them.³⁹ Therefore, providers should avoid assumptions about

patients' pregnancy desires based on their sexual orientation, gender presentation, or family composition, and they assist all sexual minority patients in family building and reproductive health options.

Lastly, provider familiarity with the variety of modes used for family building is critical for supporting CSMW. There are well-documented gaps in information on fertility and family building available to sexual minority women.^{24,40} Informational barriers can create uncertainty, confusion, dissatisfaction, isolation, and decreased engagement with healthcare services.²⁴ In addition, different pathways to pregnancy and parenthood can significantly impact physical and mental health due to systemic and structural barriers experienced by SGM couples. Although operational definitions are changing and building a family is considered a basic human right,^{41,42} until very recently infertility was defined based on a period of unprotected (assumed) penis-in-vagina sex, leaving many sexual minority women with systematically limited access to fertility services.⁴³ Utilization of fertility services and donor gametes can create significant financial, legal, and socio-emotional stress for cisgender sexual minority women and are associated with complicated perinatal outcomes such as multiple gestation. Few insurance companies cover fertility services for sexual and gender minority individuals, and in many cases, certain modes of family building such as traditional IVF, reciprocal IVF, and surrogacy are inaccessible due to financial barriers. Notably, few women in our study used reciprocal IVF and none used surrogacy. Additional barriers include the limited availability of provider and clinics that are LGBTQ+ inclusive and knowledgeable, parenthood designation laws that require second-parent adoption for non-gestational parents to be legally recognized as a parent, as well as unnecessary, expensive assessments and clinic procedures that disproportionately impact SGM couples (such as required psychological assessment and sperm quarantine when using known donor). Provider awareness of these specific challenges can improve their ability to support patients.

Strengths and Limitations

Our study had several strengths, including community engagement, the use of a questionnaire developed specifically for SGM populations, and a large geographically diverse national sample. Compared

to a national probability sample of CSMW, our study was representative of the overall population of CSMW in the US with respect of age, sexual orientation, and US region.³⁶ To our knowledge, it is the first study to comprehensively assess modes of family building, pregnancy experiences, and intentions among cisgender women who self-identify as asexual, queer, and pansexual, since most prior studies rely on lesbian and bisexual sexual orientation categories only. In addition, our large sample size enabled us to provide more descriptive information than previously available.

Our findings should be interpreted considering several limitations. This study was a cross-sectional convenience sample. Although our sample was representative in term of age, sexual orientation, and geography, our study sample was under representative of Black and Latina CSMW.³⁶ Thus, we were limited in our ability to assess differences by race and ethnicity. Prior research suggests there are large differences in receipt of sexual healthcare,^{44,45} access to assisted reproduction¹⁰, and pregnancy outcomes^{18,46,47} among Black and Latina/Latinx CSMW. Intersectional approaches to understanding differences in family building and pregnancy experiences among racial and ethnic minority CSMW is a critical area for future research.

We did not assess the gender(s) of participants partners at the time of family building. The observed differences in modes of family building likely reflect differences in the gender(s) of participants' partners and co-parents, for example, cisgender women in partnerships with people who produce sperm have different family building options available to them compared to cisgender women in partnership with other cisgender women, transgender men, and gender-diverse people assigned female at birth. We also did not explicitly ask about assisted reproduction methods (*e.g.*, IUI or IVF) or experiences accessing fertility services.

Conclusions

CSMW primarily build their families through pregnancy, and many have future pregnancy desires. There are important differences in family building methods used by bisexual, lesbian, and queer women.

Since as many as 1 in 5 cisgender women aged 18-40 are sexual minorities, it is critical that clinicians be aware of the pregnancy and family-building patterns, plans, and needs of CSMW, including fertility planning, assisted reproduction, contraception, and abortion.

Journal Pre-proof

REFERENCES

1. Solazzo AL, Tabaac AR, Agénor M, Austin SB, Charlton BM. Sexual orientation inequalities during provider-patient interactions in provider encouragement of sexual and reproductive health care. *Prev Med.* 2019;126:105787. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.105787
2. Jones J. U.S. LGBT Identification Steady at 7.2%. Gallup. Published February 22, 2023. Accessed August 4, 2023. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/470708/lgbt-identification-steady.aspx>
3. Flores AR, Conron KJ. *Adult LGBT Population in the United States*. The Williams Institute Accessed December 1, 2023. <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/adult-lgbt-pop-us/>
4. Oj C, Mc J, J N, C B. Utilization of fertility treatment and reproductive choices by lesbian couples. *Fertility and sterility.* 2016;106(7). doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2016.08.050
5. Downing JM. Pathways to pregnancy for sexual minority women in same-sex marriages. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2019;221(3):281-282. doi:10.1016/J.AJOG.2019.04.019
6. Goldberg AE. *LGBTQ Family Building: A Guide for Prospective Parents*. American Psychological Association; 2022:x, 295. doi:10.1037/0000291-000
7. Sewell AA, Sutherland C. Data Portal of the National LGBTQ+ Women's Community Survey. Published online June 12, 2023. www.lgbtqwomensurvey.org/dataportal
8. Wilson B. Bridging Research and Policy to Improve Reproductive Health for Sexual and Gender Minority Communities. In: ; 2023.
9. Soled KRS, Niles PM, Mantell E, Dansky M, Bockting W, George M. Childbearing at the margins: A systematic metasynthesis of sexual and gender diverse childbearing experiences. *Birth.* Published online October 5, 2022. doi:10.1111/birt.12678
10. Blanchfield BV, Patterson CJ. Racial and sexual minority women's receipt of medical assistance to become pregnant. *Health Psychol.* 2015;34(6):571-579. doi:10.1037/hea0000124
11. Charlton BM, Everett BG, Light A, et al. Sexual Orientation Differences in Pregnancy and Abortion Across the Lifecourse. *Womens Health Issues.* 2020;30(2):65-72. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2019.10.007
12. Hodson K, Meads C, Bewley S. Lesbian and bisexual women's likelihood of becoming pregnant: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJOG.* 2017;124(3):393-402. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.14449
13. Everett BG, McCabe KF, Hughes TL. Sexual orientation disparities in mistimed and unwanted pregnancy among adult women. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health.* 2017;49(3):157-165. doi:10.1363/psrh.12032
14. Hartnett CS, Lindley LL, Walsemann KM. Congruence across Sexual Orientation Dimensions and Risk for Unintended Pregnancy among Adult U.S. Women. *Womens Health Issues.* 2017;27(2):145-151.e2. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2016.10.010
15. Klittmark S, Malmquist A, Karlsson G, Ulfsdotter A, Grundström H, Nieminen K. When complications arise during birth: LBTQ people's experiences of care. *Midwifery.* 2023;121:103649. doi:10.1016/j.midw.2023.103649

16. Wingo E, Ingraham N, Roberts SCM. Reproductive Health Care Priorities and Barriers to Effective Care for LGBTQ People Assigned Female at Birth: A Qualitative Study. *Womens Health Issues*. 2018;28(4):350-357. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2018.03.002
17. Malmquist A, Wikström J, Jonsson L, Nieminen K. How norms concerning maternity, femininity and cisgender increase stress among lesbians, bisexual women and transgender people with a fear of childbirth. *Midwifery*. 2021;93:102888. doi:10.1016/j.midw.2020.102888
18. Barcelona V, Jenkins V, Britton LE, Everett BG. Adverse pregnancy and birth outcomes in sexual minority women from the National Survey of Family Growth. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2022;22(1):923. doi:10.1186/s12884-022-05271-0
19. Everett BG, Kominiarek MA, Mollborn S, Adkins DE, Hughes TL. Sexual Orientation Disparities in Pregnancy and Infant Outcomes. *Matern Child Health J*. 2019;23(1):72-81. doi:10.1007/s10995-018-2595-x
20. Leonard SA, Berrahou I, Zhang A, Monseur B, Main EK, Obedin-Maliver J. Sexual and/or gender minority disparities in obstetrical and birth outcomes. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2022;226(6):846.e1-846.e14. doi:10.1016/J.AJOG.2022.02.041
21. Altman MR, Cragg K, van Winkle T, et al. Birth includes us: Development of a community-led survey to capture experiences of pregnancy care among LGBTQ2S+ families. *Birth*. Published online January 10, 2023. doi:10.1111/birt.12704
22. Everett BG, Limburg A, McKetta S, Hatzenbuehler ML. State-Level Regulations Regarding the Protection of Sexual Minorities and Birth Outcomes: Results From a Population-Based Cohort Study. *Psychosom Med*. 2022;84(6):658-668. doi:10.1097/PSY.0000000000001092
23. Everett BG, Limburg A, Homan P, Philbin MM. Structural Heteropatriarchy and Birth Outcomes in the United States. *Demography*. 2022;59(1):89-110. doi:10.1215/00703370-9606030
24. Permezel J, Arnold ASC, Thomas J, et al. Experiences in the delivery of preconception and pregnancy care for LGBTIQ+ people: A systematic review and thematic synthesis of patient and healthcare provider perspectives. *Midwifery*. 2023;123:103712. doi:10.1016/j.midw.2023.103712
25. Gonzales G, Quinones N, Attanasio L. Health and Access to Care among Reproductive-Age Women by Sexual Orientation and Pregnancy Status. *Womens Health Issues*. 2019;29(1):8-16. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2018.10.006
26. Moseson H, Lunn MR, Katz A, et al. Development of an affirming and customizable electronic survey of sexual and reproductive health experiences for transgender and gender nonbinary people. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(5):e0232154. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0232154
27. Lunn MR, Capriotti MR, Flentje A, et al. Using mobile technology to engage sexual and gender minorities in clinical research. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(5):e0216282. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0216282
28. Lunn MR, Lubensky M, Hunt C, et al. A digital health research platform for community engagement, recruitment, and retention of sexual and gender minority adults in a national longitudinal cohort study--The PRIDE Study. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2019;26(8-9):737-748. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocz082

29. Moseson H, Fix L, Ragosta S, et al. Abortion experiences and preferences of transgender, nonbinary, and gender-expansive people in the United States. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2021;224(4):376.e1-376.e11. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.09.035
30. Moseson H, Fix L, Gerdtz C, et al. Abortion attempts without clinical supervision among transgender, nonbinary and gender-expansive people in the United States. *BMJ Sex Reprod Health*. Published online March 4, 2021:bmjsrh-2020-200966. doi:10.1136/bmjsrh-2020-200966
31. Moseson H, Fix L, Hastings J, et al. Pregnancy intentions and outcomes among transgender, nonbinary, and gender-expansive people assigned female or intersex at birth in the United States: Results from a national, quantitative survey. *Int J Transgend Health*. 2021;22(1-2):30-41. doi:10.1080/26895269.2020.1841058
32. Meidlinger P, Hope D. Differentiating Disclosure and Concealment in Measurement of Outness for Sexual Minorities: The Nebraska Outness Scale. *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*. Published online December 1, 2014. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub/874>
33. Callegari LS, Aiken ARA, Dehlendorf C, Cason P, Borrero S. Addressing potential pitfalls of reproductive life planning with patient-centered counseling. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2017;216(2):129-134. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.10.004
34. Rossen LM, Ahrens KA, Branum AM. Trends in Risk of Pregnancy Loss Among US Women, 1990–2011. *Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology*. 2018;32(1):19–29. doi:10.1111/ppe.12417
35. Jones RK, Witwer E, Jerman J. Abortion Incidence and Service Availability in the United States, 2017. Published online September 18, 2019. doi:10.1363/2019.30760
36. Meyer IH, Wilson BDM, O’neill K. *LGBTQ People in the US: Select Findings from the Generations and TransPop Studies*. The Williams Institute; 2021. doi:10.1007/s10508-019-01485-0
37. Walker L, Taylor D. *Same-Sex Couple Households: 2019*. American Community Survey Briefs. US Census Bureau; 2021. <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2021/acs/acsbr-005.pdf>
38. Family Equality Council. LGBTQ Family Building Survey. Published 2019. Accessed December 6, 2022. <https://www.familyequality.org/fbs>
39. Carpenter E, Everett BG, Greene MZ, Haider S, Hendrick CE, Higgins JA. Pregnancy (im)possibilities: identifying factors that influence sexual minority women’s pregnancy desires. *Soc Work Health Care*. 2020;59(3):180-198. doi:10.1080/00981389.2020.1737304
40. Topper PS, Bauermeister JA, Golinkoff J. Fertility health information seeking among sexual minority women. *Fertil Steril*. 2022;117(2):399-407. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2021.09.023
41. Disparities in access to effective treatment for infertility in the United States: an Ethics Committee opinion. *Fertility and Sterility*. 2021;116(1):54-63. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2021.02.019
42. Zegers-Hochschild F, Adamson GD, Dyer S, et al. The International Glossary on Infertility and Fertility Care, 2017. *Fertility and Sterility*. 2017;108(3):393-406. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2017.06.005

43. Kawwass JF, Penzias AS, Adashi EY. Fertility—a human right worthy of mandated insurance coverage: the evolution, limitations, and future of access to care. *Fertility and Sterility*. 2021;115(1):29-42. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2020.09.155
44. Pérez AE, Agénor M. Racial/Ethnic and Sexual Orientation Identity Differences in the Receipt of a Sexual History Assessment from a Health Care Provider among Women in the United States. *Womens Health Issues*. 2022;32(2):156-164. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2021.11.005
45. Agénor M, Pérez AE, Wilhoit A, et al. Contraceptive Care Disparities Among Sexual Orientation Identity and Racial/Ethnic Subgroups of U.S. Women: A National Probability Sample Study. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2021;30(10):1406-1415. doi:10.1089/jwh.2020.8992
46. Everett BG, Mollborn S, Jenkins V, Limburg A, Diamond LM. Racial/Ethnic Differences in Unwanted Pregnancy: Moderation by Sexual Orientation. *J Marriage Fam*. 2020;82(4):1234-1249. doi:10.1111/jomf.12656
47. Everett BG, Limburg A, Charlton BM, Downing JM, Matthews PA. Sexual Identity and Birth Outcomes: A Focus on the Moderating Role of Race-ethnicity. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2021;62(2):183-201. doi:10.1177/0022146521997811

TABLES & FIGURES

Table 1. Characteristics of Cisgender Sexual Minority Women, Stratified by Parent Status and Pregnancy History

	Is a Parent			p	Ever Pregnant		p
	Overall n (%)	Yes n (%)	No n (%)		Yes n (%)	No n (%)	
N	1369 (100)	243 (17.8)	1063 (77.8)		266 (19.4)	1101 (80.4)	
Median age in years, IQR	29.7 (24-38)	40.1 (36-48)	27.6 (24-34)	<0.001	39.9 (35-48)	27.6 (24-34)	<0.001
Race and Ethnicity¹							
American Indian or Alaska Native	15 (1.1)	2 (0.8)	13 (1.2)	0.595	1 (0.4)	14 (1.3)	0.202
Asian	57 (4.2)	4 (1.6)	53 (5)	0.021	2 (0.8)	55 (5.1)	0.002
Black or African American	40 (2.9)	7 (2.9)	33 (3.1)	0.849	8 (3)	32 (2.9)	0.96
Hispanic or Latinx	65 (4.7)	6 (2.5)	58 (5.5)	0.051	13 (4.9)	52 (4.8)	0.948
Middle Eastern or North African	16 (1.2)	3 (1.2)	13 (1.2)	0.992	2 (0.8)	14 (1.3)	0.467
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	6 (0.4)	0 (0)	6 (0.6)	0.24	0 (0)	6 (0.6)	0.224
White	1201 (87.7)	229 (93.9)	970 (91.2)	0.171	235 (88.3)	964 (88.8)	0.816
Other/unknown	29 (2.1)	5 (2)	24 (2.3)	0.843	8 (3)	21 (1.9)	0.28
None of these	122 (8.9)	17 (7)	105 (9.9)	0.255	17 (6.4)	105 (9.7)	0.004
Missing	67 (4.9)	4 (1.7)	63 (5.9)	--	13 (4.9)	54 (4.9)	--
Sexual Orientation¹							
Asexual	111 (8.1)	5 (2)	106 (10)	<0.001	8 (3)	103 (9.5)	0.001
Gay	227 (16.6)	26 (10.7)	189 (17.8)	0.007	25 (9.4)	198 (18.2)	<0.001

Bisexual	583 (42.6)	100 (41)	465 (43.7)	0.439	123 (46.2)	457 (42.1)	0.224
Lesbian	640 (46.7)	130 (53.3)	481 (45.2)	0.023	129 (48.5)	506 (46.6)	0.586
Pansexual	253 (18.5)	44 (18)	199 (18.7)	0.808	60 (22.6)	193 (17.8)	0.074
Queer	641 (46.8)	89 (36.5)	529 (49.7)	<0.001	108 (40.6)	526 (48.5)	0.021
Same-gender loving	99 (7.2)	14 (5.7)	81 (7.6)	0.309	17 (6.4)	82 (7.6)	0.513
Straight	5 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	4 (0.4)	0.938	1 (0.4)	4 (0.4)	0.986
Questioning	37 (2.7)	1 (0.4)	34 (3.2)	0.015	3 (1.1)	33 (3)	0.082
Another sexual orientation not listed	51 (3.7)	6 (2.5)	44 (4.1)	0.218	7 (2.6)	44 (4.1)	0.275
Relationship Status							
Not in a relationship	408 (29.8)	25 (10.2)	382 (35.9)	<0.001	40 (15)	367 (33.8)	<0.001
In a relationship with one person, not living with partner	233 (17)	11 (4.5)	222 (20.9)	<0.001	12 (4.5)	220 (20.3)	<0.001
In a relationship with one person, living with partner	579 (42.3)	179 (73.4)	398 (37.4)	<0.001	172 (64.7)	407 (37.5)	<0.001
In a relationship with more than one person, not living with partner(s)	28 (2)	7 (2.9)	21 (2)	0.384	8 (3)	20 (1.8)	0.232
In a relationship with more than one person, living with partner(s)	47 (3.4)	18 (7.4)	29 (2.7)	<0.001	21 (7.9)	26 (2.4)	<0.001
Another type of relationship	25 (1.8)	3 (1.2)	22 (2.1)	0.388	3 (1.1)	22 (2)	0.329
Missing	62 (4.5)	2 (0.2)	60 (5.6)	--	13 (4.9)	49 (4.5)	--
Legal Marital Status				<0.001			<0.001
Single, never married	771 (56.3)	20 (8.2)	751 (70.6)		47 (17.7)	722 (66.5)	
Married	396 (28.9)	168 (68.9)	226 (21.2)		150 (56.4)	246 (22.7)	
Legally recognized civil union	3 (0.2)	2 (0.8)	1 (0.1)		3 (1.1)	0 (0)	
Registered domestic partnership	9 (0.7)	2 (0.8)	7 (0.7)		1 (0.4)	8 (0.7)	
Separated	20 (1.5)	13 (5.3)	7 (0.7)		12 (4.5)	8 (0.7)	
Divorced	78 (5.7)	33 (13.5)	45 (4.2)		35 (13.2)	43 (4)	
Widowed	4 (0.3)	1 (0.4)	3 (0.3)		1 (0.4)	3 (0.3)	
Not listed	16 (1.2)	4 (1.6)	12 (1.1)		4 (1.5)	23 (2.1)	
Missing	61 (4.5)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.1)		13 (4.9)	32 (2.9)	
Annual Household Income				<0.001			<0.001
<\$15,000	51 (3.7)	6 (2.5)	45 (4.2)		8 (3)	43 (4)	
\$15-30,000	90 (6.6)	12 (4.9)	78 (7.3)		14 (5.3)	76 (7)	
\$30-50,000	190 (13.9)	19 (7.8)	171 (16.1)		23 (8.6)	167 (15.4)	
\$50-75,000	210 (15.3)	29 (11.9)	181 (17)		32 (12)	178 (16.4)	
\$75-100,000	125 (9.1)	39 (16)	86 (8.1)		39 (14.7)	86 (7.9)	
\$100-150,000	182 (13.3)	54 (22.1)	128 (12)		47 (17.7)	135 (12.4)	
>\$150,000	184 (13.4)	60 (24.6)	124 (11.7)		58 (21.8)	126 (11.6)	
Missing	337 (24.6)	25 (10.3)	251 (23.6)		45 (16.9)	274 (25.3)	
Health Insurance Coverage				0.662			0.515
Yes	1242 (90.7)	228 (93.4)	1012 (95.1)		238 (89.5)	1003 (92.4)	

No	53 (3.9)	12 (4.9)	41 (3.9)	13 (4.9)	39 (3.6)
Don't Know	8 (0.6)	2 (0.8)	6 (0.6)	1 (0.4)	7 (0.6)
Missing	66 (4.8)	2 (0.8)	5 (0.5)	14 (5.3)	36 (3.3)
Percent of Health Care Providers aware of Sexual Orientation			<0.001		0.014
0%	240 (17.5)	38 (15.6)	199 (18.7)	49 (18.4)	190 (17.5)
10-50%	499 (36.4)	62 (25.4)	433 (40.7)	76 (28.6)	423 (39)
60-90%	296 (21.6)	65 (26.6)	226 (21.2)	61 (22.9)	235 (21.7)
100%	224 (16.4)	68 (27.9)	154 (14.5)	62 (23.3)	162 (14.9)
Don't know	64 (4.7)	64 (26.2)	64 (6)	12 (4.5)	51 (4.7)
Missing	46 (3.4)	46 (18.9)	46 (4.3)	6 (2.3)	24 (2.2)
US Census Region			0.037		0.015
Midwest	263 (19.2)	44 (18)	219 (20.6)	45 (16.9)	218 (20.1)
Northeast	263 (19.2)	37 (15.2)	225 (21.1)	41 (15.4)	221 (20.4)
South	307 (22.4)	56 (23)	250 (23.5)	59 (22.2)	248 (22.9)
West	368 (26.9)	84 (34.4)	284 (26.7)	92 (34.6)	275 (25.3)
Missing	168 (12.3)	23 (9.4)	86 (8.1)	29 (10.9)	123 (11.3)

¹Participants could select more than one response, therefore percentages sum to greater than 100%

Journal Pre-proof

Table 2 Family Building Experiences among Cisgender Sexual Minority Women, Overall and by Sexual Orientation

	Sexual Orientation								
	Overall	Asexual	Gay	Bisexual	Lesbian	Pansexual	Queer	Same-gender loving	Questioning
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
N	1369	111	227	583	640	253	641	99	37
Is a Parent	243 (17.8)	5 (4.5)	26 (11.5)	100 (17.2)	130 (20.3)	44 (17.4)	89 (13.9)	14 (14.0)	1 (2.7)
Mode(s) of Family Building Ever Used									
Sexual activity with another parent of the child*	108 (44.4)	5 (100.0)	8 (30.8)	61 (61.0)	40 (30.8)	27 (61.4)	40 (44.9)	5 (35.7)	1 (100)
Carried pregnancy and was egg source*	113 (46.5)	2 (40.0)	7 (26.9)	48 (48.0)	55 (42.3)	25 (56.8)	46 (51.7)	6 (42.9)	0 (0)
Carried pregnancy but was not egg source*	6 (2.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (3.1)	0 (0)	3 (3.4)	1 (7.1)	0 (0)
Provided egg that a partner carried*	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Surrogacy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Second parent adoption of partner's biological child	24 (9.9)	0 (0)	6 (23.1)	4 (4)	18 (13.8)	2 (4.5)	10 (11.2)	2 (14.3)	0 (0)
Adoption	25 (10.3)	0 (0)	5 (19.2)	3 (3)	22 (16.9)	0 (0)	5 (5.6)	2 (14.3)	0 (0)
Step-parent	35 (14.4)	0 (0)	4 (15.4)	15 (15)	20 (15.4)	5 (11.4)	9 (10.1)	1 (7.1)	0 (0)
Foster parent	9 (3.7)	0 (0)	1 (3.8)		4 (3.1)	3 (6.8)	6 (6.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Ever used gamete donors				5 (5)					
Anonymous donor sperm	52 (21.4)	0 (0)	6 (23.1)	9 (9.0)	39 (30.0)	5 (11.4)	20 (22.5)	4 (28.6)	0 (0)
Known donor sperm	13 (5.3)	0 (0)	2 (7.7)	2 (2.0)	11 (8.5)	2 (4.5)	4 (4.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Egg donor	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0.8)	0 (0)	1 (1.1)	1 (7.1)	0 (0)

There were 6 (2.5%) participants who were parents were missing data on mode of family building. Participants can select more than one sexual orientation, and therefore may appear in multiple columns.

*These four family building methods involve pregnancy of the study participant or their partner. "Carried a pregnancy but was not the egg source" and "provided egg that a partner carried" are both responses that refer to reciprocal IVF.

Table 3 Pregnancy History and Future Pregnancy Intentions among Cisgender Sexual Minority Women, Overall and by Sexual Orientation

	Sexual Orientation								
	Overall	Asexual	Gay	Bisexual	Lesbian	Pansexual	Queer	Same-gender loving	Questioning
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
N	1369	111	227	583	640	253	641	99	37
Ever pregnant	266 (19.4)	8 (7.2)	25 (11.0)	123 (21.1)	129 (20.2)	60 (23.7)	108 (16.8)	17 (17.2)	3 (8.1)
Currently pregnant	8 (0.6)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.4)	5 (0.9)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.8)	5 (0.8)	1 (1.0)	0 (0)
Number of pregnancies									
0	1085 (79.3)	103 (92.8)	198 (87.2)	457 (78.4)	506 (79.1)	193 (76.3)	526 (82.1)	82 (82.8)	33 (89.2)
1	117 (8.5)	4 (3.6)	14 (6.2)	50 (8.6)	58 (9.1)	28 (11.1)	58 (9.0)	7 (7.1)	1 (2.7)
2	70 (5.1)	4 (3.6)	5 (2.2)	31 (5.3)	34 (5.3)	13 (5.1)	22 (3.4)	3 (3.0)	0 (0)
3	45 (3.3)	0 (0)	5 (2.2)	23 (3.9)	23 (3.6)	12 (4.7)	15 (2.3)	5 (5.1)	2 (5.4)
4+	34 (2.5)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	19 (3.3)	14 (2.2)	7 (2.8)	13 (2.0)	2 (2.0)	0 (0)
Future Pregnancy Intentions									
Would like to be pregnant at some point	325 (23.7)	24 (21.6)	56 (24.7)	162 (27.8)	137 (21.4)	68 (26.9)	164 (25.6)	19 (19.2)	9 (24.3)
Within next year ¹	64 (19.7)	1 (4.2)	12 (21.4)	31 (19.1)	26 (19.0)	18 (26.5)	36 (22.0)	3 (15.8)	0 (0)
Within next 5 years ¹	104 (32.0)	7 (29.2)	20 (35.7)	49 (30.2)	51 (37.2)	22 (32.4)	46 (28.0)	2 (10.5)	1 (11.1)
Within 6-10 years ¹	100 (30.8)	11 (45.8)	18 (32.1)	50 (30.9)	42 (30.7)	15 (22.1)	44 (26.8)	11 (57.9)	5 (55.6)
More than 10 years ¹	7 (2.2)	1 (4.2)	0 (0)	3 (1.9)	3 (2.2)	3 (4.4)	5 (3.0)	1 (5.3)	1 (11.1)

Participants can select more than one sexual orientation, and therefore may appear in multiple columns.

¹Percentage out of the total number of participants who indicated they “would like to be pregnant at some point.”

Table 4. Prior Pregnancy Outcomes among Cisgender Sexual Minority Women, Overall and by Sexual Orientation

	Sexual Orientation								
	Overall	Asexual	Gay	Bisexual	Lesbian	Pansexual	Queer	Same-gender loving	Questioning
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
N pregnancies	558 (100.0)	12 (2.2)	44 (7.9)	272 (48.7)	263 (47.1)	123 (22)	215 (38.5)	38 (6.8)	7 (1.3)
Pregnancy Outcomes									
Still pregnant	8 (1.4)	1 (8.3)	1 (2.3)	5 (1.8)	2 (0.8)	2 (1.6)	5 (2.3)	1 (2.6)	0 (0)
Miscarriage	126 (22.6)	1 (8.3)	11 (25.0)	68 (25.0)	56 (21.3)	34 (27.6)	62 (28.8)	9 (23.7)	1 (14.3)
Ectopic pregnancy	9 (1.6)	0 (0)	1 (2.3)	5 (1.8)	6 (2.3)	1 (0.8)	3 (1.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Abortion	83 (14.9)	3 (25.0)	9 (20.5)	39 (14.3)	46 (17.5)	16 (13.0)	28 (13.0)	7 (18.4)	3 (42.9)
Stillbirth	1 (0.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Live birth	327 (58.6)	7 (58.3)	22 (50.0)	155 (57.0)	148 (56.3)	70 (56.9)	117 (54.4)	21 (55.3)	3 (42.9)
Cesarean birth ¹	91 (27.8)	1 (14.3)	4 (18.2)	34 (21.9)	42 (28.4)	21 (30.3)	39 (33.3)	3 (14.3)	0 (0)
Missing	4 (0.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (1.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Participants can select more than one sexual orientation, and therefore may appear in multiple columns.

¹Percentage out of the total number of live births