ORIGINAL ARTICLE



Binge Drinking and Depression Symptoms as Risk Factors for Teen Dating Violence Among Sexual Minority Youth

Taylor Thaxton 1,2 • Angela-Maithy Nguyen • Ndola Prata 3

Accepted: 22 May 2023 © The Author(s) 2023

Abstract

Purpose Given sexual minority youth (SMY) are disproportionately impacted by teen dating violence (TDV), this study assessed binge drinking and depression symptoms as possible risk factors contributing to this disparity.

Methods Cross-sectional survey data collected from a nationally representative sample of SMY high school students in the United States in 2017 and 2019 through the national Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS) (n=3,424) was used to create 3 logistic regression models. The models estimated the associations between the exposures, binge drinking and depression symptoms, and TDV, including physical TDV, sexual TDV, or both. Additionally, we hypothesized that these associations would be stronger in SMY than heterosexual youth. Therefore, we expanded the study population to include SMY and heterosexual youth (n=22,798) and tested for interaction.

Results Both binge drinking (adjusted odds ratio [aOR]: 2.6, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.8–3.8) and symptoms of depression (aOR: 2.7, 95% CI: 1.8–4.02) were positively associated with TDV among SMY. Additionally, binge drinking was associated with a significantly greater risk of victimization for SMY (aOR = 2.7, 95% CI 1.9–3.9) than heterosexual youth (aOR = 1.5, 95% CI 1.2–2.0).

Conclusions Our results suggest that while both exposures are associated with an increased risk of both physical and sexual TDV, binge drinking may contribute to the disparate rates of dating violence impacting SMY.

Keywords Teen Dating Violence · Sexual Minority Youth · Binge Drinking · Depression

Introduction

Teen dating violence (TDV) is a prevalent public health concern that impacts the wellbeing of millions of youth in America, particularly sexual minority youth (lesbian, gay,

☐ Taylor Thaxton tthaxton@mednet.ucla.edu

Angela-Maithy Nguyen angela_nguyen@berkeley.edu

Ndola Prata ndola@berkeley.edu

Published online: 05 June 2023

- David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, United States
- School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, United States
- ³ Bixby Center for Population Health and Sustainability, School of Public Health, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, United States

bisexual, transgender, and queer [LGBTQ]) (National Center for Injury Prevention & Control, 2022). TDV can consist of multiple behaviors including physical or sexual abuse, stalking, psychological aggression, and/or coercive control between romantic partners. Among high school students in the US who have dated, over 20% of female and 10% of male students report experiencing some form of TDV (Vagi et al., 2015). Additionally, most of these students report multiple incidents of violence, suggesting these experiences are not isolated events. A growing body of literature has identified several individual risk factors for TDV victimization, among those, alcohol use and depressive symptoms are commonly indicated in many studies (Glass et al., 2003; Edwards et al., 2021; Parker & Bradshaw, 2015; Temple & Freeman, 2011; Helweg-Larsen et al., 2008; Brooks-Russell et al., 2013; Cascardi, 2016).

Sexual minority youth consistently report higher rates of TDV than their heterosexual peers (Basile et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2014; Dank et al., 2014; Whitton et al., 2019). Bisexual youth and youth who report sexual contact with more



than one gender have demonstrated even greater vulnerability when compared to other SMY (Martin-Storey, 2015; Rostad et al., 2020). However, it is not clear what specific exposures contribute to the increased risk of victimization among SMY (Waterman et al., 2019; Parker & Bradshaw, 2015; Lehrer et al., 2006; Glass et al., 2003). Recent data has shown that the number of adolescents who self-identify as a sexual minority nearly doubled, from 7.3% to 2009 to 14.3% in 2017, further emphasizing the importance of targeted research and interventions for this population (Raifman et al., 2020).

Because adolescence is a critical period of development, experiencing interpersonal violence during this time can have a lasting effect on overall development and health that will continue into adulthood (Blakemore & Mills, 2014; Silverman, 2001). In addition to injuries sustained due to the abuse, survivors of TDV are at increased risk for mental health concerns including anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation (Banyard & Cross, 2008; Callahan et al., 2003; Coker et al., 2000; Exner-Cortens et al., 2013; Tharp et al., 2017). TDV is also associated with increased risky health behaviors that can cause harm both in adolescence and beyond, such as substance use and high-risk sexual behavior (Silverman, 2001; Vagi et al., 2015). Additionally, as an adverse childhood experience (ACE), TDV predisposes survivors to an increased burden of chronic disease, such as hypotension or diabetes, at an earlier onset (Danese et al., 2009; Sonu et al., 2019).

Minority Stress Theory has been widely used to contextualize the many health disparities affecting sexual minorities, including the high rates of intimate partner violence. This theory suggests that as a marginalized group, SMY experience increased internal and external stressors related to their sexual identity (Bränström et al., 2016; McCabe et al., 2010; Meyer, 2003). In addition, systemic disenfranchisement of marginalized populations limits access to resources and support that can help moderate the effects of these stressors (Meyer et al., 2008). Internal stressors, such as identity conflict, and external stressors, such as homophobia, contribute to the adversity burden SMY must grapple with. Increased adversity burden is tied to increased harmful health behaviors, such as binge drinking and mental health concerns (Baams et al., 2015, 2018; Bränström et al., 2016; McCabe et al., 2010). Sexual minorities consistently report more frequent and heavier alcohol use than heterosexual youth (Talley et al., 2014). Additionally, sexual minorities report significantly higher rates of poor mental health outcomes, including depression.

and more than half of SMY who report wanting mental health services say they have not been able to access care (Steele et al., 2017; The Trevor Project National Survey Results 2021, 2021). A 2020 survey-based study by Edwards

et al. (2020) found that sexual minority girls in grades 7–10 reported higher rates of sexual victimization than their heterosexual peers, and that binge drinking and depression fully mediated the relationship between sexual minority identity and victimization (Edwards et al., 2020). Further exploration into the role of binge drinking and depressive symptoms in TDV occurring among SMY could allow for improved prevention measures and health outcomes.

The relationship between TDV and both alcohol use and depressive symptoms is widely acknowledged. A 2015 study found that recent alcohol use is associated with an increased risk of experiencing physical and verbal TDV among high school students, with frequent use of alcohol increasing the odds of experiencing both forms of TDV (Parker et al., 2016). Additionally, the relationship between intimate partner violence and alcohol appears to remain consistent over time. A study examined the longitudinal association between alcohol and dating violence among female high school students. The results indicated that the co-occurrence of alcohol use and dating violence persisted over the course of three years (Choi et al., 2017). While it has been well established that experiencing intimate partner violence at any age can increase the risk for depression or depression symptoms, there is also evidence that this relationship is bidirectional (Brooks-Russell et al., 2013; Collibee et al., 2021). A 2021 study demonstrated that the severity of depression symptoms is positively associated with risk of physical dating violence among adolescent girls and that differences in symptom severity mediated the effectiveness of violence prevention programing (Collibee et al., 2021). The positive association between drinking and intimate partner violence, as well as depressive symptoms and intimate partner violence is significant for both men and women in heterosexual relationships (Anderson, 2002).

Similar associations have been observed in adult sexual minority populations, suggesting binge drinking and psychological or emotional distress are associated with an increased risk of experiencing IPV (Goldberg & Meyer, 2013; Lewis et al., 2015). A 2015 study demonstrated that emotional distress, including negative affect, brooding, and depression, was positively associated with bidirectional IPV among lesbians between the ages 18–35 (Lewis et al., 2015). Furthermore, participants who experienced emotional distress were more likely to use alcohol as a coping mechanism and report risky alcohol use, a behavior that was identified as a risk factor for bidirectional IPV (Lewis et al., 2015). A 2017 by Lewis et al. proposed a novel model demonstrating links between sexual minority discrimination, alcohol use, and IPV among partnered lesbian women (Lewis et al., 2017).

While alcohol use and mental health concerns, including depression, are consistently recognized as risk factors



for IPV, the mechanisms underlying these relationships are less easily identified. Alcohol intoxication can increase the risk of victimization due to an impaired ability to recognize or respond to environmental cues, such as escalating partner aggression (Eckhardt et al., 2015; Temple & Freeman, 2011). Similarly, symptoms of depression may impede a victim's ability to accurately assess their partner's abusive behavior and take steps to leave the relationship (Edwards et al., 2011; Gidycz et al., 2006). Additionally, both depression and alcohol use, particularly in an under-aged population, are associated with significant stigma which creates a barrier to care for both heterosexual and SMY. However, as a result of their sexual identity SMY may have less access to familial or community support to address these concerns, making them more vulnerable to experiencing abuse (Meyer et al., 2008).

The purpose of this study is to assess whether binge drinking and symptoms of depression are associated with TDV among SMY. Additionally, we will explore if these associations differ between sexual minority and heterosexual populations. By utilizing a nationally representative sample of high school students in the United States, we hope to fill some gaps in this body of literature, which primarily focuses on dating violence among college students and rarely assesses TDV among SMY. Additionally, much of the existing research uses any drinking behavior as a risk factor for TDV. By narrowing our focus to binge drinking, we will gain a better understanding of how this form of high-risk alcohol use is associated with abusive relationships within our study population. We hypothesized that (1) SMY who report binge drinking or symptoms of depression will have a higher likelihood of experiencing TDV and (2) that these associations will be stronger in SMY than heterosexual youth.

Methods

The current study utilizes data collected through the national Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS). The YRBSS is conducted by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) to assess key health behaviors among a nationally representative sample of 9th – 12th grade students in the US. YRBSS consists of a self-administered, 99 item questionnaire that is conducted every two years using a three-stage cluster sample design (Underwood et al., 2020). To adjust for nonresponse and oversampling of Black and Hispanic students, a weighting factor is applied to each sampled student (Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, 2020). The YRBSS allows respondents to identify their sexual identity as heterosexual, gay/lesbian, bisexual, or unsure. For the purposes of this study, SMY will refer to

those who identified as gay/lesbian, bisexual, or questioning in the survey; students who did not respond to this question were excluded.

We combined cross-sectional data collected from 2017 to 2019, resulting in a total sample size of 42,119 students (CDC, 2014). For the first stage of analysis, the primary study population only included SMY (n=6,340) who had dated in the last year (n=4,229), responded to at least one survey question assessing TDV (n=3,963), and responded to both survey questions assessing depression symptoms and binge drinking (n=3,424). For the comparison analysis, heterosexual youth who met the same inclusion criteria (n=20,255) were combined with the primary study population.

Measures

Independent Variables

Symptoms of Depression YRBSS assesses history of depression or depression symptoms through one binary yes/no variable: "During the past 12 months, did you ever feel so sad or hopeless almost every day for two weeks or more in a row that you stopped doing some usual activities?" Binge Drinking Current binge drinking behavior is determined through the question "During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have 4 or more drinks of alcohol in a row, that is, within a couple of hours (if you are female) or 5 or more drinks of alcohol in a row, that is, within a couple of hours (if you are male)?" Responses ranged from 0 to 20 or more days. For this study responses were collapsed to create a binary yes/no exposure variable.

Dependent Variables

Teen Dating Violence YRBSS contains two measures of TDV. The first question asks "During the past 12 months, how many times did someone you were dating or going out with force you to do sexual things that you did not want to do? (Count such things as kissing, touching, or being physically forced to have sexual intercourse.)" Responses for both questions ranged from 0 to 6 or more times or participants could indicate that they did not date anyone in the past year. Responses were collapsed to create a binary yes/ no exposure variable, excluding those who did not have a relationship in the past year.

The second question asks "During the past 12 months, how many times did someone you were dating or going out with physically hurt you on purpose? (Count such things as being hit, slammed into something, or injured with an object or weapon.)". Responses for both questions ranged from 0 to 6 or more times or participants could indicate that they



did not date anyone in the past year. Responses were collapsed to create a binary yes/no exposure variable, excluding those who did not have a relationship in the past year.

Additionally, responses to both questions were combined to create a binary yes/no exposure variable to measure any experience of TDV.

Covariates

Covariates were identified based on a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), a graphic description of the presupposed causal pathway of the questions of interest. Variables were selected a priori; these included sex, race/ethnicity, age, grade, history of drug use. Each variable was represented as a node within the DAG and connected within the pathway via arrows in order to identify potential confounding. Sex was a binary male/female variable. Race/ethnicity was created as a six-level categorical variable that included White, Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI)/ Native Hawaiian, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Hispanic/Latino, and Mixed. History of drug use was a binary variable created by combining responses from survey questions assessing any previous use of marijuana, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines, ecstasy, LSD, and any inhalants or injected illicit substances.

Statistical Analysis

We used descriptive analysis with weighted percentages to assess the prevalence of binge drinking, feeling sad/hopeless, and physical and sexual TDV (analyzed both separately and combined) among SMY, as well as the covariates.

We created three logistic regression models to estimate the crude and adjusted associations between binge drinking and TDV and feeling sad or hopeless and TDV. Multivariable analyses included both exposures in the same model and controlled for covariates that were selected a priori, except grade. Grade was not included to create a more parsimonious model, as it was not associated with the outcomes (p>0.1) and the removal did not change the main effect by >10%.

Using the SMY population, three models were created, one for each of the TDV outcomes (Any, Sexual, or Physical violence). Each model included both exposure variables (binge drinking and sad/hopeless). To assess differences in association between the two exposure variables and experiencing any form of TDV by sexual minority identity we also performed interaction analysis. Additionally, we hypothesized that the associations of binge drinking and feeling sad/hopeless might be stronger in sexual minority youth. Therefore, we expanded the study population to include all youth (SMY and heterosexual youth) and tested for interaction by

generating cross-product terms between each exposure and sexual minority status. The alpha for statistical significance was set at p < 0.05. All analyses were performed using Stata BE 17.0 (StataCorp. 2021).

Our study was exempt from full human subjects review by the University of California, Berkeley Center for the Protection of Human Subjects as the data used are deidentified and publicly available online.

Results

Table 1. presents the weighted percentages of sexual minority identity, feeling sad or hopeless, binge drinking behavior, any experience of dating violence, and associated covariates. Based on an analytical sample of 3,424 SM high school students, an estimated 21.9% of SMY in the United States have experienced TDV in the past year. A population estimate of 51% of these youth have experienced feeling sad or hopeless in the past year, 4.7% have engaged in binge drinking, and 14.4% experienced both exposures.

Table 2. presents the distribution of covariates by exposure. There were significant differences in the population estimate of feeling sad or hopeless in the past year by sexual minority identity, sex, race/ethnicity, and history of drug use. Female SMY (70.9%) reported a higher population estimate for feeling sad or hopeless than males (47.4%). Among racial/ethnic groups, Mixed SMY had the highest report of feeling sad or hopeless (77.0%), followed by Hispanic/Latino (66.3%), White (69.4%), AAPI/Native Hawaiian (67.4%), Black/African American (44.9%), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (30.6%).

There were significant differences in the population estimate of binge drinking in the past 30 days by age, race, and history of drug use. Among racial/ethnic groups, American Indian/Alaskan Native SMY had the highest population estimate for binge drinking (21.9%), followed by White (21.5%), Hispanic/Latino (19.9%), Mixed (15.0%), AAPI/Native Hawaiian (17.7%), and Black/African American (10.3%).

Table 3. presents the distribution of covariates by TDV outcomes. There were significant differences in the population estimates of Any Dating Violence between sexual minority identities. Gay/Lesbian SMY had the lowest estimates of Any TDV at 14.8%, bisexual SMY had the highest at 24.4%, followed by questioning SMY at 19.9%. Female SMY and those with a history of drug use also demonstrated significantly higher population estimates of TDV than their respective counterparts.

The only significant difference in the population estimates of Physical Dating Violence is between those who



Table 1 Weighted percentages of selected characteristics among Sexual Minority Youth (SMY) in the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS) from 2017 and 2019. n = 3,424

	N	Weighted
		%
Sexual Minority Identity		
Gay/Lesbian	584	16.01%
Bisexual	2,089	62.07%
Questioning	751	21.92%
Sad/Hopeless + Binge Drinking		
Neither	1,021	29.93%
Sad/Hopeless Only	1,765	50.98%
Binge Drinking Only	184	4.66%
Sad/Hopeless and Binge Drinking	454	14.43%
Any Dating Violence (Sexual or Physical)		
No	2,676	78.09%
Yes	748	21.91%
Sex		
Male	752	23.66%
Female	2,602	76.34%
Age		
14 and younger	428	11.68%
15	807	23.22%
16	917	26.46%
17	806	24.11%
18 and older	446	14.53%
Grade		
9th	844	23.62%
10th	950	27.10%
11th	816	25.12%
12th	772	24.16%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	1,500	51.24%
AAPI/Native Hawaiian	103	2.82%
Black/African American	625	14.05%
American Indian/Alaska Native	33	0.49%
Hispanic/Latino	825	25.07%
Mixed	245	6.32%
Age of Alcohol Initiation		
Never	1,024	31.93%
10 and younger	467	13.52%
11–12 yrs	330	9.21%
13–14 yrs	714	21.46%
15–16 yrs	641	19.93%
17 yrs and older	111	3.95%
History of Drug Use		
No	1,589	44.80%
Yes	1,821	55.20%

have a history of drug use (18.4%) and those who do not (6.1%).

Significant differences in the population estimates of sexual dating violence are present between sexual minority identities. Bisexual SMY had the highest at 17.8%, followed by questioning SMY at 14.1%, and gay/lesbian SMY at 7.5%. Female SMY had significantly higher estimates of

sexual dating violence (16.9%) when compared to males (9.59%). There were also significant differences between SMY with and without a history of drug use.

Table 4. presents results of multivariate logistic regression analyses conducted in the subpopulation of SMY for the three TDV outcomes (any TDV, physical TDV, and sexual TDV) in relation to either feeling sad/hopeless or binge drinking. Feeling sad/hopeless was significantly associated with any TDV (adjusted odd ratio [aOR]=2.7, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.8–4.02), physical TDV (aOR=2.6, CI 1.6–4.2), and sexual TDV (aOR=2.7, CI 1.6–4.8). Binge drinking was also significantly associated with any TDV (aOR=2.6, CI 1.8–3.8), physical TDV (aOR=3.4, CI 2.2–5.2), and sexual TDV (aOR=2.2, CI 1.4–3.3).

To better assess the differences between sexual minority identities we tested for effect modification for both exposures in relation to experiencing any form of TDV. Youth who identified as questioning and engaged in binge drinking were at significantly greater risk (Interaction P-value=<0.001, aOR=2.8, 95% CI 1.8-4.5) when compared to their gay/lesbian (aOR=1.6, 95% CI 0.92-2.7) and bisexual peers (aOR=1.1, 95% CI 0.83-1.5). A significant interaction was also seen when looking at the association between feeling sad/hopeless and experiencing TDV. Bisexual youth with these depression symptoms were at significantly lower risk of victimization (Interaction P-value=<0.001, aOR=0.61, 95% CI 0.46-0.8) when compared to gay/lesbian youth (aOR=0.78, 95% CI 0.44-1.4) and questioning youth (aOR=1.27, 95% CI 0.79-2.0).

Table 5. presents the results from the two interaction analyses used to determine if differences existed in the two exposure and outcome relationships in SMY and their heterosexual peers. Both feeling sad/hopeless and binge drinking were associated with increased risk of experiencing TDV for both SMY and heterosexual youth. However, no effect modification was found when comparing the association between feeling sad/hopeless and experiencing any TDV. A significant interaction was seen when comparing the associations between binge drinking and experiencing any TDV among SMY and heterosexual youth (Interaction P-value = < 0.01). Binge drinking was associated with a significantly greater risk of victimization for SMY (aOR = 2.7, 95% CI 1.9–3.9) than heterosexual youth (aOR = 1.5, 95% CI 1.2–2.0).

Discussion

We found that, in a nationally representative sample of high school students, both binge drinking and feeling sad/hopeless are strongly associated with physical and sexual TDV among SMY. Furthermore, binge drinking is associated



 Table 2
 Selected characteristics by exposure to feeling sad/hopeless or binge drinking among SMY in the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS) from 2017 and 2019. n = 3,424

	No		Yes		F Test	P-value
	N	Weighted %	N	Weighted %	_	
Sad/Hopeless						
Sexual Minority Identity					9.0589	< 0.001
Gay/Lesbian	239	39.97%	345	60.03%		
Bisexual	631	29.76%	1458	70.24%		
Questioning	335	44.34%	416	55.66%		
Sex					61.8562	< 0.001
Male	386	52.61%	366	47.39%		
Female	794	29.14%	1808	70.86%		
Age					0.6579	0.61
14 and younger	151	33.49%	277	66.51%		
15	275	35.01%	532	64.99%		
16	298	31.74%	619	68.26%		
17	283	34.86%	523	65.14%		
18 and older	191	39.17%	255	60.83%		
Race/Ethnicity					10.4961	< 0.001
White	448	30.61%	1052	69.39%		
AAPI/ Native Hawaiian	34	32.56%	69	67.44%		
Black/African American	332	55.13%	293	44.87%		
American Indian/ Alaska Native	17	69.39%	16	30.61%		
Hispanic/Latino	266	33.75%	559	66.25%		
Mixed	65	23.00%	180	77.00%		
History of Drug Use					38.8309	< 0.001
No	675	43.28%	923	56.72%		
Yes	528	27.57%	1293	72.43%		
Binge Drinking						
Sexual Minority Identity					0.2907	0.75
Gay/Lesbian	462	80.60%	122	19.40%		
Bisexual	1698	80.41%	391	19.59%		
Questioning	626	82.56%	125	17.44%		
Sex					1.0838	0.3
Male	625	83.63%	127	16.37%		
Female	2,118	80.33%	484	19.67%		
Age					5.299	< 0.001
14 and younger	340	82.35%	88	17.65%		
15	705	89.03%	102	10.97%		
16	763	82.38%	154	17.62%		
17	627	76.85%	179	23.15%		
18 and older	338	71.24%	108	28.76%		
Race/Ethnicity					2.3703	0.046
White	1193	78.54%	307	21.46%		
AAPI/ Native Hawaiian	88	82.32%	15	17.68%		
Black/African American	551	89.74%	74	10.26%		
American Indian/Alaska Native	27	78.09%	6	21.91%		
Hispanic/Latino	654	80.12%	171	19.88%		
Mixed	208	85.05%	37	14.95%		
History of Drug Use					155.517	< 0.001
No	1517	96.38%	81	3.62%		
Yes	1264	68.33%	557	31.67%		



Table 3 Covariate by TDV outcomes among SMY in the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS) from 2017 and 2019. n=3,424

No Weighted % No				
Name fine fronce N Weighted % N Auting fine fronce 471 85.19% 113 sexual 1613 75.55% 476 sexual 1613 75.55% 476 sexual 1613 75.55% 476 sexual 1613 75.55% 476 sexual 611 81.75% 141 male 611 81.75% 141 male 77.45% 201 202 and younger 664 77.45% 201 604 77.45% 201 202 ack Mire 83.40% 15 202 ack Mire 83.42% 103 202 spanic/Latin 62 77.43% 12 spanic/Latin 62 77.43% 10 spanic/Latin 87.50% 12 22 spanic/Latin 133 70.51% 22 spanic/Latin 133 70.51% 22 spanic/Latin	Yes	H _	F Test	P-value
butting fiolence 471 85.19% 113 butting fiolence 471 85.19% 113 sexual 1613 75.55% 476 asexual 1613 75.55% 476 asexual 611 81.75% 159 asexual 611 81.75% 159 and younger 327 75.93% 101 and older 653 83.40% 574 ind older 664 74.05% 202 604 74.05% 201 604 74.05% 84 Elhnicity 1167 77.43% 333 API Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 84 ack Africian American 520 83.40% 105 ack Africian American 87.40% 17.74% 62 yor Drug Use 133 77.53% 198 samic and Jounger 134 87.25% 22.7 sand younger 624 628 87.16% 94		Weighted %		
M Minority Identity 471 83.19% 113 v/L-sebian 1613 75.55% 476 assexual 592 80.11% 153 asstroning 611 81.73% 476 and electroning 611 81.73% 141 and younger 623 77.45% 574 and younger 633 77.45% 574 inde 77.45% 101 77.44% 201 inde 77.44% 201 84 Individed 77.44% 104 77.44% 201 Individed 83.45% 105 84 77.44% 202 Individed 83.45% 105 84				
yyLeshiam 471 85.19% 113 sexual 471 85.19% 113 sexual 592 80.11% 159 and better 611 81.75% 141 male 611 81.75% 141 and younger 623 82.40% 154 604 77.48% 202 ine 77.74% 202 and older 604 74.09% 84 Ethnicity 77.74% 202 hie 77.74% 202 API/ Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 84 API/ Stitle Hawaiian 520 77.50% 84 API/ Native Hawaiian 520 77.40% 202 API/ Native Hawaiian 520 77.40% 202 API/ Native Hawaiian 520 77.53% 84 API/ Native Hawaiian 520 77.75% 62 API/ Native Hawaiian 48 88.01% 77.53% 198 Api Minoriy Identity <td></td> <td>4</td> <td>4.9845</td> <td>< 0.01</td>		4	4.9845	< 0.01
sexual 1613 75.55% 476 restioning 592 80.11% 159 ale 611 81.75% 476 and younger 653 83.40% 154 and younger 653 83.40% 154 and older 663 77.45% 201 604 74.09% 201 604 74.09% 201 604 74.09% 201 604 74.09% 201 604 74.09% 201 605 77.43% 153 biffe 77.43% 153 biff 77.43% 153 biffe 77		14.81%		
septioning 592 80.11% 159 ale 611 81.75% 151 and younger 5028 77.45% 574 and younger 653 83.40% 574 ind dorn 716 77.74% 201 604 74.09% 202 ind older 362 79.50% 84 Ethnicity 77.74% 201 hine 77.74% 202 API, Naive Hawaiian 91 87.40% 202 API, Naive Hawaiian 183.39% 72.77% 62 API, Naive Hawaiian 1303 70.51% 51 API, Naive Hawaiian 137 70.51% 52 <		24.45%		
and younger 2028 77.45% 574 and younger 327 75.93% 101 and younger 653 83.40% 202 716 77.74% 201 716 77.74% 201 604 74.09% 84 Pithelicity April 1167 77.43% 333 API Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 105 arekl-African American 520 78.33% 105 arekl-African American 520 78.33% 105 arekl-African American 627 77.53% 198 spanic Latino 627 77.53% 198 arekl-African American 1371 87.52% 227 by of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 284 Al Minority Identity African 488 88.01% 94 sexual 488 88.01% 86.29% 284 aretioning 70 624 0.8524 127 and younger 360 0.8512 65 and younger 360 0.8512 66 and older 37.8 0.840% 64 and older 37.8 0.8408 64		19.89%		
ale 611 81.75% 141 male 2028 77.45% 141 male 5228 77.55.93% 101 523 83.40% 154 524 77.74% 201 663 83.40% 154 664 74.09% 201 77.74% 201 664 74.09% 201 77.74% 201 664 74.09% 201 84.40% 142 84.40% 142 84.40% 162 84.40% 162 85.20% 83.42% 105 86.20% 162 87.52% 162 87.52% 162 88.01% 88.01% 162 88.01% 88.01% 162 88.01% 1799 86.29% 123 88.01% 1799 86.29% 123 ale 624 0.88524 123 and younger 1668 87.16% 168 88.01% 1688 1688 1688 88.01% 1688 1688 88.01% 1688 1688 88.01% 1688 1688 88.01% 1688 1688 88.01%		2	2.0544	0.16
male 2028 77.45% 574 and younger 653 83.40% 101 ind dounger 716 77.74% 101 ind older 70.40% 202 ind older 77.74% 201 birtheity 1167 77.74% 202 birtheity 1167 77.40% 202 APIV Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 202 APIV Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 202 APIV Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 105 necican Indian American 520 83.42% 105 nerican Indian American 520 87.40% 10 sexual contract 183 77.53% 19 syl Chug Use 137 87.52% 227 syl Chug Use 133 70.51% 227 and Minority Identity 488 88.01% 94 sexual 1779 86.20% 284 and younger 707 0.9026 96		18.25%		
and younger 633 8340% 101 653 8340% 154 716 77.74% 201 604 74.09% 202 Ethnicity 604 77.74% 202 Ethnicity 77.74% 202 Ethnicity 77.74% 202 Ethnicity 77.74% 202 83.42% 84.20% 84 84.40% 202 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 83.42% 105 84.83% 227 85.22% 227 86.22% 227 86.29% 284 88.01% 88.01% 94 88.01% 88.01% 94 88.01% 88.01% 123 and younger 624 0.8524 123 and younger 707 0.8657 134 ead older 378 0.8424 141 83.53 0.8424 141 84.80% 10.8657 144 85.00% 10.8657 144 86.50% 10.8667		22.55%		
and younger 523 75.93% 101 553 83.40% 154 716 77.74% 201 604 74.00% 201 604 74.00% 201 604 74.00% 201 604 74.00% 201 804 74.00% 84 804 84 804 87.40% 112 805 83.20% 105 805 84.89% 1123 806 85.20% 105 807 80.8524 113 808 80.10% 105 808 80.10		1	1.9694	0.10
653 83.40% 154 716 77.74% 201 604 74.09% 202 Ethnicity 1167 74.09% 202 Intensity 1167 77.43% 84 API/ Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 84 API/ Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 84 API/ Native Hawaiian 520 83.42% 105 API/ Native Hawaiian 26 77.43% 105 API/ Native Hawaiian 26 78.42% 105 API/ Native Hawaiian 26 78.32% 105 API/ Native Hawaiian 183 72.77% 62 spanic/Latino 183 72.77% 62 syl Ching Use 1759 87.52% 227 syl Ching Use 1779 87.52% 227 sxual 1779 86.20% 284 nextioning 618 84.80% 123 and younger 70 0.9026 64 swall </td <td></td> <td>24.07%</td> <td></td> <td></td>		24.07%		
716 77.74% 201 604 74.09% 202 604 74.09% 202 Ethnicity 1167 77.43% 201 hite 1167 77.43% 333 APV Native Hawaiian 21 87.40% 12 APV Native Hawaiian 20 83.42% 105 nerican Indian/ Alaska Native 26 78.33% 105 ixed 78.33% 175 108 ixed 183 72.77% 62 ixed 183 72.77% 62 ixed 183 70.51% 518 cal Dating Fiolence 1303 70.51% 518 assual 1488 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 624 0.8524 123 and younger 70 0.9056 96 65 0.8424 141		16.60%		
fund older 604 74.09% 202 Ethnicity 1167 79.50% 84 Ethnicity 1167 77.43% 333 hite 1167 77.43% 133 API/ Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 12 API/ Native Hawaiian 520 83.42% 105 nerican Indian/ Alaska Native 26 78.33% 7 nerican Indian/ Alaska Native 62 78.33% 7 ry of Drug Use 183 72.77% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 227 scal Dating Violence 1371 87.52% 227 s.stad 1303 70.51% 518 cal Dating Violence 48 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 asexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 707 0.9026 96 saxual 141 665		22.26%		
Ethmicity 1167 79.50% 84 Ethmicity 1167 77.43% 333 hite 1167 77.43% 333 APIV Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 12 APIV Native Hawaiian 26 78.33% 105 APIV Native Hawaiian 26 78.33% 105 Incrican Indian/Alaska Native 627 77.53% 108 propring Indian/Alaska Native 627 77.53% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 62 cot Dating Violence 1371 87.52% 227 cot Dating Violence 488 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 624 0.8687 141 and older 780 0.8687 141 665 0.8424 64		25.91%		
Ethnicity 1167 77.43% 333 hite 77.43% 333 API/ Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 12 ack/African American 250 83.42% 105 ack/African American 26 78.33% 7 ack/African American 26 77.53% 198 sixed 77.53% 198 198 vised 1371 87.52% 227 sixed 1371 87.52% 227 sixed 1371 87.52% 227 sixed 1371 87.52% 227 sixed 1378 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 618 84.89% 123 actioning 618 84.89% 123 and younger 624 0.8524 123 and younger 707 0.9026 96 sexual 65 0.8424 141 sexual		20.50%		
hite 1167 77.43% 333 API/ Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 12 ack/African American 520 83.42% 105 merican Indian/ Alaska Native 26 78.33% 105 merican Indian/ Alaska Native 26 78.33% 108 sixed 183 72.77% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 62 s.s 1371 87.52% 227 s.s 1303 70.51% 518 cal Dating Violence 11799 86.29% 284 al Minority Identity 86.29% 284 actual 618 84.89% 127 actual 618 84.89% 127 actioning 618 87.16% 94 sexual 624 0.8524 123 and younger 707 0.9026 96 and younger 65 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64		1	1.3653	0.24
APV Native Hawaiian 91 87.40% 12 ack/African American 520 83.42% 105 nerican Indian/ Alaska Native 26 78.33% 7 ixed 77.53% 198 7 ixed 183 72.77% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 227 ss 1303 70.51% 518 cal Dating Violence 488 88.01% 94 swull 1799 86.29% 284 awyLesbian 1799 86.29% 284 acal Dating Violence 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 618 87.16% 352 and younger 624 0.9026 96 rand older 770 0.9026 96 rand older 780 0.8408 64		22.57%		
ack/African American 520 83.42% 105 merican Indian/ Alaska Native 26 78.33% 7 ispanic/Latino 627 77.53% 198 ixed 183 72.77% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 62 s.s 1371 87.52% 227 s.s cal Dating Violence 133 70.51% 518 al Minority Identity 488 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 624 0.8524 123 and younger 360 0.8524 123 and older 707 0.9026 96 665 0.8424 141 134 665 0.8408 64		12.60%		
merican Indian/ Alaska Native 26 78.3% 7 ispanic/Latino 627 77.53% 198 ixed 183 72.77% 198 ixed 1371 87.52% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 227 s.s 1303 70.51% 518 s.s 1303 70.51% 518 al Minority Identity 488 88.01% 94 sexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 360 0.8512 65 and younger 707 0.9026 96 665 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64		16.58%		
spanic/Latino 627 77.53% 198 ixed 183 72.77% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 227 s. 1303 70.51% 227 s. 1303 70.51% 518 cal Dating Violence 488 88.01% 94 al Minority Identity 488 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 ale 624 0.8524 123 and be 2243 87.16% 96 and younger 707 0.9026 96 370 0.8687 134 465 0.8408 64		21.67%		
ixed 183 72.77% 62 ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 227 ss 1303 70.51% 227 ss 1303 70.51% 518 scal Dating Violence 88.01% 94 al Minority Identity 488 88.01% 94 sexual 618 84.89% 284 uestioning 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 360 0.8512 65 imad older 780 0.8687 134 i and older 378 0.8408 64		22.47%		
ry of Drug Use 1371 87.52% 227 ss 1303 70.51% 518 scal Dating Violence Il Minority Identity A88 88.01% 94 sexual ay/Lesbian 488 88.01% 94 sexual lestioning 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 360 0.8512 65 i and younger 707 0.9026 96 i and older 378 0.8408 64		27.23%		
5 1371 87.52% 227 5s 1303 70.51% 518 5 cal Dating Violence 488 88.01% 94 at Minority Identity 488 88.01% 94 asylLesbian 1799 86.29% 284 asextual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 ale 6243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 and younger 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 i and older 378 0.8408 64		S	50.5408	< 0.001
ss cal Dating Violence al Minority Identity Ayl Lesbian sexual 488 88.01% 94 sexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and younger 360 0.8512 65 and older 378 0.8408 1134 and older 665 0.8408 64		12.48%		
cal Dating Violence 94 ay/Lesbian 488 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 ale 2243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 and younger 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 i and older 378 0.8408 64		29.49%		
In Minority Identity 488 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 sexual 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and ele 2243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 and younger 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64				
ay/Lesbian 488 88.01% 94 sexual 1799 86.29% 284 uestioning 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 and ele 2243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 and younger 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64			0.5348	0.58
sexual 1799 86.29% 284 uestioning 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 amale 2243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64		11.99%		
uestioning 618 84.89% 127 ale 624 0.8524 123 emale 2243 87.16% 352 e and younger 360 0.8512 65 f 707 0.9026 96 f 780 0.8687 134 f 665 0.8424 141 i and older 378 0.8408 64		13.71%		
atle 624 0.8524 123 male 2243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64		15.11%		
ale 624 0.8524 123 Finale 2243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64		0	0.6276	0.43
male 2243 87.16% 352 and younger 360 0.8512 65 107 0.9026 96 128 0.8687 134 134 665 0.8424 141 134 64 64		0.1476		
and younger 360 0.8512 65 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 and older 378 0.8408 64		0.1284		
tger 360 0.8512 65 707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 r 378 0.8408 64		1	1.5786	0.18
707 0.9026 96 780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 r 378 0.8408 64		0.1488		
780 0.8687 134 665 0.8424 141 r 378 0.8408 64		0.0974		
r 665 0.8424 141 0.8408 64		0.1313		
r 378 0.8408 64		0.1576		
		0.1592		
Race/Ethnicity		0	0.3444	98.0



Table 3 (continued)

	No		Yes		F Test	P-value
	Z	Weighted %	z	Weighted %		
White	1673	87.71%	253	12.29%		
AAPI/ Native Hawaiian	122	91.27%	6	8.73%		
Black/African American	714	89.32%	106	10.68%		
American Indian/ Alaska Native	40	83.64%	&	16.36%		
Hispanic/Latino	805	87.10%	138	12.90%		
Mixed	241	86.24%	43	13.76%		
History of Drug Use					47.8688	< 0.001
No	1953	93.88%	156	6.12%		
Yes	1725	81.64%	432	18.36%		
Sexual Dating Violence						
Sexual Minority Identity					7.2774	< 0.01
Gay/Lesbian	455	92.54%	48	7.46%		
Bisexual	1505	82.23%	276	17.77%		
Questioning	533	85.92%	92	14.08%		
Sex					7.7816	< 0.01
Male	591	90.41%	59	%65.6		
Female	1866	83.10%	343	16.90%		
Age					1.1055	0.35
14 and younger	283	82.69%	58	17.31%		
15	564	88.72%	82	11.28%		
16	689	82.82%	124	17.18%		
17	290	82.84%	106	17.16%		
18 and older	352	86.98%	44	13.02%		
Race/Ethnicity					2.2477	90.0
White	1125	84.04%	199	15.96%		
AAPI/ Native Hawaiian	71	86.81%	10	13.19%		
Black/African American	477	92.60%	34	7.40%		
American Indian/ Alaska Native	23	91.66%	2	8.34%		
Hispanic/Latino	296	82.83%	126	17.17%		
Mixed	150	78.61%	39	21.39%		
History of Drug Use					39.092	< 0.001
No	1245	91.21%	137	8.79%		
Yes	1247	79.26%	277	20.74%		



95% CI) (1.4, 3.3)(1.6, 4.8)Table 4 Association of Feeling Sad/Hopeless or Binge Drinking with TDV among SMY in the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS) from 2017 and 2019. n=3,424 Model 3: Sexual Dating Violence 2.2 (2.1, 4.5)(2.0, 5.9)(95% CI) RefOR Ref 3.1 95% CI) (2.2, 5.2)(1.6, 4.2)Model 2: Physical Dating Violence 3.4 (95% CI) (3.2, 7.0) $(1.5, ^{2}$ Ref 4.7 Ref 2.5 OR (1.8, 4.02)(95% CI) (1.8, 3.8)Model 1: Any Dating Violence OR (95% CI) aOF 2.6 (2.6, 5.2)(1.9, 4.5)Ref Binge Drinking Sad/Hopeless Yes

All adjusted models included: sad/hopeless, binge drinking, sexual minority identity, sex, age, race/ethnicity, and history of drug use. **P < 0.01. ***P < 0.001. Abbreviations: TDV = Teen Dating Violence SMY = Sexual Minority Youth

Table 5 Sexual Identity as an Effect Modifier in Relationship Between Feeling Sad/Hopeless or Binge Drinking and TDV in the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey (YRBSS) from 2017 and 2019. n=22 798

11 - 22,770					
	Sexua Mino		Heterosexual		Inter- action
	aOR	(95% CI)	aOR	(95% CI)	P-value
Any TDV					
Sad/Hopeless	2.7	(1.8– 4.0)	3.4	(2.7– 4.3)	0.29
Binge Drinking	2.7	(1.9– 3.9)	1.5	(1.2– 2.0)	< 0.01

Separate models were created for Feeling Sad/Hopeless and Binge Drinking. Both models controlled for sex, age, race/ethnicity, and history of drug use. Abbreviations: TDV=Teen Dating Violence

with a greater risk of victimization for SMY than heterosexual youth. However, SMY should not be viewed monolithically as risk varied by sexual minority identity. Previous research on TDV has primarily centered heterosexual youth, with less of a focus on the specific risk factors affecting SMY. To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine how depressive symptoms and binge drinking are associated with both physical and sexual TDV among SMY in a nationally representative sample of high school students and to compare these relationships with heterosexual youth.

It is not surprising that binge drinking was significantly associated with all three categories of TDV considering the robust body of literature that supports the hypothesis that substance use increases the risk of dating violence victimization. There are several theories as to why alcohol use leads to victimization; one explanation is that the physiological effects of heavy alcohol use make youth more vulnerable to abuse (Temple & Freeman, 2011). Binge drinking has been linked to impaired cognition and emotional dysregulation; experiencing this could make it more difficult for SMY to navigate high-risk situations that result in TDV (Briones & Woods, 2013; Stephens & Duka, 2008). Additionally, it is possible that binge drinking reported by TDV survivors is indicative of the perpetrator's risky drinking behavior (Bartel et al., 2020). Numerous studies have found an association between substance use and dating violence perpetration (Haynie et al., 2013; Shorey et al., 2011; Temple et al., 2013).

Minority stress theory offers some context as to why binge drinking would differentially impact SMY. In addition to the common stressors associated with adolescence, SMY must manage the adversity burden associated with their marginalized status, often with less access to the resources or safety net that could mitigate the consequences of risky drinking behaviors (Lewis et al., 2015; Meyer et al., 2008; The Trevor Project National Survey Results 2021, 2021). In addition to formal forms of intervention, social support,



particularly from family members, can reduce the harm caused by alcohol misuse (Villar et al., 2022). Social support is thought to improve health outcomes by providing a buffer that allows the supported individual to more effectively assess and respond to stressful situations (Pauley & Hesse, 2009; Villar et al., 2022). A perceived lack of social support and belonging is commonly noted to be a concern for SMY, and is associated with poorer wellbeing, including an increased risk of victimization (Button et al., 2012; Perales & Campbell, 2020). While both heterosexual and sexual minority youths may be participating in similar binge drinking behaviors, SMY may be less insulated from the associated harms than their heterosexual peers.

Similar to substance use, it is possible that poor mental health increases vulnerability to dating violence by compromising SMY's perceived agency to leave a perpetrator (Foshee, 2004; Roberts et al., 2003; Vézina & Hébert, 2007). Youth who have experienced depression or psychological distress are less likely to recognize their own vulnerability, "red flags" in their relationship, or alternative partners (Edwards et al., 2011; Gidycz et al., 2006). As a result, depressed youth are more likely to begin and stay in an abusive relationship. Furthermore, symptoms of depression can be perceived by perpetrators as signs of vulnerability, leading them to preferentially pursue relationships with these youth (Tran et al., 2012).

It is less clear, however, why symptoms of depression, unlike binge drinking, were not associated with an increased risk of TDV among SMY when compared to heterosexual peers. While SMY have higher rates of depression symptoms, this did not correlate with a significantly stronger association with TDV for SMY. It is possible that the broad description of "feeling sad or hopeless" fails to capture the specific dimensions of depression that differentially impact SMY and their relationships. Particularly, as this is a binary variable, it may not accurately represent differences in the severity of symptoms. Because the survey asks participants to consider their emotional state over the past 12 months, recall bias may have impacted the validity of the data. Additionally, it is also possible that the mechanisms underlying the strong association between depression symptoms and TDV do not operate differently between the two populations, and this could be a reason we do not see a difference in association between SMY and their heterosexual peers.

While these findings offer new insights, some limitations should be considered. First, the use of cross-sectional data does not allow for the assessment of temporal relationships. We cannot be certain that the sequential categorization of depressive symptoms and binge drinking as exposures that lead to TDV is accurate. Both symptoms of depression and binge drinking could result from the trauma of experiencing TDV. In addition, the YRBSS only asks about sex,

not gender. This limitation, as well as the limited sexual identity categories (heterosexual, gay/lesbian, bisexual, or questioning) fail to capture the full spectrum of gender and sexuality, possibly causing some participants to skip the questions or choose an option that does not accurately represent their identity. Additionally, due to the sensitive nature of these survey items it is likely that some participants did not feel comfortable responding and we are missing data that reflects their experiences. Furthermore, in an effort to avoid arbitrarily combining racial and ethnic groups there are some small cell sizes. Finally, we were not able to assess or control for characteristics of socioeconomic status based on the available items included in the YRBSS.

Despite these limitations, our study has several strengths. The large sample size taken from a nationally representative population suggests greater generalizability of the results. Additionally, unlike many other studies that assess the role of general alcohol usage in experiences of TDV, our research was able to isolate binge drinking specifically. We were also able to analyze two separate forms of TDV, physical violence and sexual violence. Finally, this study helps to address the lack of research into the specific risk factors that affect SMY to better understand why this population is disproportionately impacted by TDV.

This study indicates that both feeling sad/hopeless and binge drinking puts SMY at higher risk for both physical and sexual TDV. Furthermore, binge drinking is associated with greater risk of TDV in SMY than heterosexual youth who engage in the same behavior. Our research suggests that interventions targeting depression and binge drinking may reduce rates of TDV. These findings highlight the need for programming tailored to the specific needs of SMY. Future research should utilize longitudinal methodologies to determine the temporal relationship between symptoms of depression, binge drinking, and TDV. Additionally, this methodology may allow for a better understanding of the mechanisms that underlie the associations described in our findings; particularly, the differential impact of binge drinking on SMY health and wellbeing.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted



use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

- Anderson, K. L. (2002). Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate Partner Violence and Well-Being.Journal of Marriage and Family,64(4),851–863.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00851.x
- Baams, L., Grossman, A. H., & Russell, S. T. (2015). Minority stress and mechanisms of risk for depression and suicidal ideation among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth.Developmental Psychology,51(5),688–696.https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038994
- Baams, L., Dubas, J. S., Russell, S. T., Buikema, R. L., & van Aken, M. A. G. (2018). Minority stress, perceived burdensomeness, and depressive symptoms among sexual minority youth. Journal of Adolescence,66,9–18.https://doi.org/10.1016/j. adolescence.2018.03.015
- Banyard, V. L., & Cross, C. (2008). Consequences of Teen dating violence. Violence Against Women, 14(9), 998–1013. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208322058
- Bartel, S. J., Sherry, S. B., Smith, M. M., Glowacka, M., Speth, T. A., & Stewart, S. H. (2020). Social influences on binge drinking in emerging adults: Which social network members matter most?Substance Abuse,41(4),480–484.https://doi.org/10.1080/08897077.2019.1709604
- Basile, K. C., Clayton, H. B., DeGue, S., Gilford, J. W., Vagi, K. J., Suarez, N. A., Zwald, M. L., & Lowry, R. (2020). InterpersonalViolenceVictimizationAmongHighSchoolStudents—Yout hRiskBehaviorSurvey,UnitedStates,2019. MMWR Supplements, 69(1), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.su6901a4.
- Blakemore, S. J., & Mills, K. L. (2014). Is adolescence a sensitive period for Sociocultural Processing?Annual Review of Psychology,65(1),187–207.https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115202
- Bränström, R., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Pachankis, J. E., & Link, B. G. (2016). Sexual orientation disparities in Preventable Disease: A fundamental cause perspective. American Journal of Public Health, 106(6), 1109–1115. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303051
- Briones, T. L., & Woods, J. (2013). Chronic binge-like alcohol consumption in adolescence causes depression-like symptoms possibly mediated by the effects of BDNF on neurogenesis.Neuroscience,254,324–334.https://doi.org/10.1016/j. neuroscience.2013.09.031
- Brooks-Russell, A., Foshee, V. A., & Ennett, S. T. (2013). Predictors of latent trajectory classes of physical dating violence victimization. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42(4), 566–580. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10964-012-9876-2
- Button, D. M., O'Connell, D. J., & Gealt, R. (2012). Sexual minority youth victimization and social support: The intersection of sexuality, gender, race, and victimization. Journal of homosexuality, 59(1), 18–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.614903
- Callahan, M. R., Tolman, R. M., & Saunders, D. G. (2003). Adolescent dating violence victimization and Psychological Well-Being. Journal of Adolescent Research, 18(6),664–681. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558403254784
- Cascardi, M. (2016). From violence in the home to physical dating violence victimization: The mediating role of psychological distress in a prospective study of female adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45(4), 777–792. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0434-1

- Choi, H. J., Elmquist, J., Shorey, R. C., Rothman, E. F., Stuart, G. L., & Temple, J. R. (2017). Stability of alcohol use and teen dating violence for female youth: A latent transition analysis.Drug and Alcohol Review,36(1),80–87.https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.12462
- Coker, A. L., McKeown, R. E., Sanderson, M., Davis, K. E., Valois, R. F., & Huebner, E. S. (2000). Severe dating violence and quality of life among South Carolina high school students. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 19(4),220–227. https://doi. org/10.1016/S0749-3797(00)00227-0
- Collibee, C., Rizzo, C. J., Kemp, K., Hood, E., Doucette, H., Gittins Stone, D. I., & DeJesus, B. (2021). Depressive symptoms moderate dating violence Prevention Outcomes among adolescent girls. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36(5–6), NP3061–NP3079.https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518770189
- Danese, A., Moffitt, T. E., Harrington, H., Milne, B. J., Polanczyk, G., Pariante, C. M., Poulton, R., & Caspi, A. (2009). Adverse child-hood experiences and adult risk factors for age-related disease. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine,163(12).https://doi.org/10.1001/archpediatrics.2009.214
- Dank, M., Lachman, P., Zweig, J. M., & Yahner, J. (2014). Dating violence experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth.Journal of Youth and Adolescence,43(5),846–857.https:// doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9975-8
- Eckhardt, C. I., Parrott, D. J., & Sprunger, J. G. (2015). Mechanisms of Alcohol-Facilitated intimate Partner violence. Violence Against Women,21(8),939–957.https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215589376
- Edwards, K. M., Gidycz, C. A., & Murphy, M. J. (2011). College Women's Stay/Leave decisions in Abusive Dating Relationships: A prospective analysis of an expanded investment model. Journal of Interpersonal Violence,26(7),1446–1462.https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510369131
- Edwards, K. M., Waterman, E. A., & Banyard, V. L. (2020). Do depression and binge drinking explain the increased risk of sexual violence among sexual minority Middle and High School Girls? Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 088626052093850. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520938506
- Edwards, K. M., Wheeler, L. A., Rizzo, A., & Banyard, V. L. (2021). Testing an Integrated Model of Alcohol norms and availability, binge drinking, and Teen dating violence. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 53(1), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2020. 1810833
- Exner-Cortens, D., Eckenrode, J., & Rothman, E. (2013). Longitudinal Associations between Teen dating violence victimization and adverse Health Outcomes.Pediatrics,131(1),71–78.https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-1029
- FOSHEE, V. (2004). Longitudinal predictors of serious physical and sexual dating violence victimization during adolescence.Preventive Medicine,39(5),1007–1016.https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ypmed.2004.04.014
- Gidycz, C. A., McNamara, J. R., & Edwards, K. M. (2006). Women's risk perception and sexual victimization: A review of the literature. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11(5),441–456. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.avb.2006.01.004
- Glass, N., Fredland, N., Campbell, J., Yonas, M., Sharps, P., & Kub, J. (2003). Adolescent dating violence: Prevalence, risk factors, Health Outcomes, and implications for clinical practice. Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic & Neonatal Nursing, 32(2), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0884217503252033
- Goldberg, N. G., & Meyer, I. H. (2013). Sexual orientation disparities in history of intimate Partner violence: Results from the California health interview survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(5), 1109–1118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512459384.
- Haynie, D. L., Farhat, T., Brooks-Russell, A., Wang, J., Barbieri,
 B., Iannotti, R. J.DatingViolencePerpetrationandVictimizat
 ion, & Among, U. S. (2013). Prevalence, Patterns, and Assoc



- iationsWithHealthComplaintsandSubstanceUse. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53(2), 194–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.02.008
- Helweg-Larsen, M., Harding, H. G., & Kleinman, K. E. (2008). Risk perceptions of dating violence among College Women: The role of experience and depressive symptoms. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 27(6),600-620. https://doi.org/10.1521/ jscp.2008.27.6.600
- Lehrer, J. A., Buka, S., Gortmaker, S., & Shrier, L. A. (2006). Depressive symptomatology as a predictor of exposure to intimate Partner Violence among US female adolescents and young adults. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 160(3),270. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.160.3.270
- Lewis, R. J., Padilla, M. A., Milletich, R. J., Kelley, M. L., Winstead, B. A., Lau-Barraco, C., & Mason, T. B. (2015). Emotional distress, Alcohol Use, and Bidirectional Partner Violence among Lesbian Women. Violence Against Women, 21(8), 917–938. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215589375
- Lewis, R. J., Mason, T. B., Winstead, B. A., & Kelley, M. L. (2017). Empirical investigation of a model of sexual minority specific and general risk factors for intimate partner violence among lesbian women. Psychology of Violence, 7(1),110–119. https://doi. org/10.1037/vio0000036
- Luo, F., Stone, D. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). Physical dating violence victimization among sexual Minority Youth. American Journal of Public Health, 104(10), e66-e73. https://doi.org/10.2105/ AJPH.2014.302051
- Martin-Storey, A. (2015). Prevalence of dating violence among sexual minority youth: Variation across gender, sexual minority identity and gender of sexual partners. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 44(1), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10964-013-0089-0
- McCabe, S. E., Bostwick, W. B., Hughes, T. L., West, B. T., & Boyd, C. J. (2010). The relationship between discrimination and Substance Use Disorders among Lesbian, Gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. American Journal of Public Health, 100(10), 1946–1952. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.163147
- 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
- Meyer, I. H., Schwartz, S., & Frost, D. M. (2008). Social patterning of stress and coping: Does disadvantaged social statuses confer more stress and fewer coping resources? Social Science & Medicine, 67(3), 368–379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.012
- andNational Center for Injury Prevention, & Control, D. (2022). ofV.P.February28). Preventing Teen Dating Violence.
- Parker, E. M., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Teen dating violence victimization and patterns of Substance Use among High School Students. Journal of Adolescent Health, 57(4), 441–447. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.06.013
- Parker, E. M., Debnam, K., Pas, E. T., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2016). Exploring the Link between Alcohol and Marijuana Use and Teen dating violence victimization among High School Students.Health Education & Behavior,43(5),528–536.https://doi. org/10.1177/1090198115605308
- Pauley, P. M., & Hesse, C. (2009). TheEffectsofSocialSupport,D epression,andStressonDrinkingBehaviorsinaCollegeStudent Sample. Communication Studies, 60:5, 493–508, https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970903260335
- Perales, F., & Campbell, A. (2020). HealthDisparitiesBetweenSexualMinorityandDifferent-Sex-AttractedAdolescents:Quantifyingt heInterveningRoleofSocialSupportandSchoolBelonging. LGBT Health.146–154.https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2019.0285

- Raifman, J., Charlton, B. M., Arrington-Sanders, R., Chan, P. A., Rusley, J., Mayer, K. H., Stein, M. D., Austin, S. B., & McConnell, M. (2020). Sexual orientation and suicide attempt disparities among US adolescents: 2009–2017.Pediatrics,145(3).https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-1658
- Roberts, T. A., Klein, J. D., & Fisher, S. (2003). Longitudinal effect of intimate Partner abuse on high-risk behavior among adolescents. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 157(9),875.https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.157.9.875
- Rostad, W. L., Clayton, H. B., Estefan, L. F., & Johns, M. M. (2020). Substance use and disparities in Teen dating violence victimization by sexual identity among High School Students. Prevention Science,21(3),398–407.https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-019-01049-7
- Shorey, R. C., Stuart, G. L., & Cornelius, T. L. (2011). Dating violence and substance use in college students: A review of the literature. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16(6),541–550.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2011.08.003
- Silverman, J. G. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and Associated Substance Use, Unhealthy Weight Control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, and suicidality.JAMA,286(5),572.https:// doi.org/10.1001/jama.286.5.572
- Sonu, S., Post, S., & Feinglass, J. (2019). Adverse childhood experiences and the onset of chronic disease in young adulthood. Preventive Medicine,123,163–170.https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ypmed.2019.03.032
- Steele, L. S., Daley, A., Curling, D., Gibson, M. F., Green, D. C., Williams, C. C., & Ross, L. E. (2017). LGBT Identity, untreated Depression, and Unmet need for Mental Health Services by sexual minority women and trans-identified people. Journal of Women's Health, 26(2), 116–127. https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2015.5677
- Stephens, D. N., & Duka, T. (2008). Cognitive and emotional consequences of binge drinking: Role of amygdala and prefrontal cortex. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 363(1507), 3169–3179. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0097
- Talley, A. E., Hughes, T. L., Aranda, F., Birkett, M., & Marshal, M. P. (2014). Exploring alcohol-use behaviors among heterosexual and sexual minority adolescents: Intersections with sex, Age, and Race/Ethnicity. American Journal of Public Health, 104(2), 295–303. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301627
- Temple, J. R., & Freeman, D. H. (2011). Dating violence and substance use among ethnically diverse adolescents. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26(4), 701–718. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510365858
- Temple, J. R., Shorey, R. C., Fite, P., Stuart, G. L., & Le, V. D. (2013). Substance use as a longitudinal predictor of the perpetration of Teen dating violence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42(4), 596–606. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9877-1
- Tharp, A. T., McNaughtonReyes, H. L., Foshee, V., Swahn, M. H., Hall, J. E., & Logan, J. (2017). Examining the prevalence and predictors of Injury from adolescent dating violence. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 26(5), 445–461. https://doi. org/10.1080/10926771.2017.1287145
- Tran, C., Cole, D. A., & Weiss, B. (2012). Testing reciprocal longitudinal relations between peer victimization and depressive symptoms in Young Adolescents. Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 41(3), 353–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2012.662674
- Underwood, J. M., Brener, N., Thornton, J., Harris, W. A., Bryan, L. N., Shanklin, S. L., Deputy, N., Roberts, A. M., Queen, B., Chyen, D., Whittle, L., Lim, C., Yamakawa, Y., Leon-Nguyen, M., Kilmer, G., Smith-Grant, J., Demissie, Z., Jones, S. E., Clayton, H., & Dittus, P. (2020). OverviewandMethodsfortheYouth-RiskBehaviorSurveillanceSystem—UnitedStates,2019.MMWR



- Supplements, 69(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.su6901a1
- Vagi, K. J., O'Malley Olsen, E., Basile, K. C., & Vivolo-Kantor, A. M. (2015). Teen dating violence (physical and sexual) among US High School Students. JAMA Pediatrics, 169(5),474. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.3577
- Vézina, J., & Hébert, M. (2007). Risk factors for victimization in romantic Relationships of Young Women. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse,8(1),33-66.https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838006297029
- Villar, E., Martínez-López, Z., Mayo, M. E., Braña, T., Rodríguez, M., & Tinajero, C. (2022). A systematic review and narrative synthesis of the relationship between social support and binge drinking among adolescents and emerging adults. Youth,2(4),570–586. MDPI AG.https://doi.org/10.3390/youth2040041
- Waterman, E. A., Lee, K. D. M., & Edwards, K. M. (2019). Longitudinal Associations of binge drinking with interpersonal violence among adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48(7), 1342–1352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01035-w
- Whitton, S. W., Newcomb, M. E., Messinger, A. M., Byck, G., & Mustanski, B. (2019). A longitudinal study of

- IPV victimization among sexual Minority Youth.Journal of Interpersonal Violence,34(5),912–945.https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516646093
- CDC (2014). Combining YRBS Data Across Years and Sites.https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrbs/pdf/yrbs_combining_data.pdf.

The Trevor Project National Survey Results 2021. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System. (2020, October 27). CDC.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

