Supplementary Table 1. Psychosocial concerns and quality of life among sexual minority patients vs non-SGM patients.

Variable	SM patients <sup>a</sup> (n=1,356)	Non- SGM patients (n=50,116)	<i>p</i> -value
Psychosocial concerns	(11 1,000)	(11 00,110)	p varae
Have a family member or friend who can help	during my illness a	nd treatment	.001
(n, %)	<i>8 1</i>		
Yes	1,297 (95.6%)	48,782 (97.3%)	
No	59 (4.4%)		
No response	0 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	
1.0 10500000	0 (0.073)	10 (0.075)	
Living alone (n, %)			<.001
Yes	259 (19.1%)	6,921 (13.8%)	
No	` ,	43,185 (86.2%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	
1 to responde	0 (0.070)	10 (0.070)	
Considering having a child/children in the futi	ure (n, %)		.000
Yes	116 (8,6%)	2,313 (4.6%)	
No	· · · · /	46,258 (92.3%)	
Not sure	86 (6.3%)	1,539 (3.1%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	
1.1. 2.2. r	( ( ( ) ( ) ( )	( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( (	
Would like to discuss fertility-related issues wi	ith a specialist (n. %	)	.000
Yes	64 (4.7%)	1,258 (2.5%)	
No	` ,	47,309 (94.4%)	
Not sure	•	1,543 (3.1%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	
1.1. 2.2. r	( ( ( ) ( ) ( )	( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( ( (	
Have concerns that may interfere with my abil	lity to seek care at M	Ioffitt (n, %)	.000
Yes	291 (21.5%)	8,355 (16.7%)	
No		41,755 (83.3%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	
1.6 1666 6166	0 (0.070)	0 (0.075)	
Quality of life			
ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %)			.088
Fully active	750 (55.3%)	28,015 (55.9%)	
Restricted in physically strenuous activity bu	` ,	, (,	
ambulatory and able to carry out work of a		14,452 (28.8%)	
light or sedentary nature	( · - · )	, - (,-,)	
Ambulatory and capable of all self-care but		4 0 0 5 (0 5 5 )	
unable to carry out any work activities	161 (11.9%)	4,903 (9.8%)	
Capable of only limited self-care	56 (4.1%)	2,494 (5.0%)	
Completely disabled	6 (0.4%)	252 (0.5%)	
Completely disabled	0 (0.7/0)	232 (0.370)	
SF-12 (M, SD)			
MCS-12 <sup>¶</sup>	46.5 (10.9)	49.5 (10.3)	<.001
Vitality <sup>¶</sup>	44.1 (28.8)	47.8 (29.0)	<.001
Social functioning <sup>¶</sup>	65.0 (32.6)	71.2 (31.9)	<.001
Social functioning	03.0 (32.0)	11.2 (31.7)	<b>\.</b> 001

Role-emotional <sup>¶</sup>	70.4 (40.6)	77.0 (37.7)	<.001	
Mental health¶	62.3 (22.8)	68.0 (22.2)	<.001	
•				
PCS-12 <sup>¶</sup>	42.6 (12.8)	42.3 (12.8)	.344	
Physical functioning <sup>¶</sup>	65.0 (37.4)	63.3 (38.0)	.094	
Role-physical¶	52.1 (46.9)	52.9 (47.5)	.522	
Bodily pain <sup>¶</sup>	65.5 (33.2)	68.8 (32.4)	<.001	
General health¶	55.4 (27.1)	57.1 (27.5)	.026	

Note. <sup>a</sup> Excludes Straight or Heterosexual, Transgender Female or Trans Woman, Transgender Male or Trans Man, and Genderqueer (Nonbinary) or Additional gender category (open-ended response). ¶ Statistically significant difference between SGM and non-SGM patients when controlling for age, ethnicity, and race, as compared to the non-SGM individuals.

Variable	Bisexual patients (n=262)	Lesbian/Gay/Homosexual patients (n=1,087)	<i>p</i> -value
Psychosocial concerns	(H-202)	(11–1,007)	<i>p</i> -value
Have a family member or friend who can h	aln during my i	llnoss and treatment	.028
(n, %)	icip during my i	micss and treatment	.020
Yes	244 (93.1%)	1,046 (96.2%)	
No	18 (6.9%)	41 (3.8%)	
140	10 (0.770)	41 (3.070)	
Living alone (n, %)			.472
Yes	46 (17.6%)	212 (19.5%)	,2
No	216 (82.4%)	875 (80.5%)	
110	210 (02.170)	0,2 (00.2,0)	
Considering having a child/children in the	future (n. %)		.000
Yes	47 (17.9%)	67 (6.2%)	
No	186 (71.0%)	961 (88.4%)	
Not sure	29 (11.1%)	59 (5.4%)	
	- ()	(0)	
Would like to discuss fertility-related issue	s with a speciali	st (n, %)	.000
Yes	23 (8.8%)	37 (3.4%)	
No	208 (79.4%)	1,004 (92.4%)	
Not sure	31 (11.8%)	46 (4.2%)	
Have concerns that may interfere with my	-		.022
Yes	70 (26.7%)	220 (20.2%)	
No	192 (73.3%)	867 (79.8%)	
Quality of life			
ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %)			.921
Fully active	142 (54.2%)	599 (55.1%)	
Restricted in physically strenuous			
activity but ambulatory and able to	90 (20 50/)	207 (20 20/)	
carry out work of a light or sedentary	80 (30.5%)	306 (28.2%)	
nature			
Ambulatory and capable of all self-care			
but unable to carry out any work	30 (11.5%)	130 (12.0%)	
activities			
Capable of only limited self-care	9 (3.4%)	47 (4.3%)	
Completely disabled	1 (0.4%)	5 (0.5%)	
SF-12 (M, SD)			
MCS-12¶	42.4 (11.5)	47.5 (10.5)	<.001
Vitality <sup>¶</sup>	37.1 (27.6)	45.8 (28.8)	<.001
Social functioning <sup>¶</sup>	55.1 (32.3)	67.3 (32.2)	<.001
Role-emotional¶	58.2 (43.3)	73.4 (39.2)	<.001
Mental health <sup>¶</sup>	56.3 (23.3)	63.9 (22.4)	<.001
PCS-12	42.1 (12.7)	42.7 (12.8)	.520
1 00-12	72.1 (12.7)	<b>T2.</b> / (12.0)	.520

Physical functioning <sup>¶</sup>	63.2 (37.4)	65.3 (37.4)	.414
Role-physical <sup>¶</sup>	46.0 (46.5)	53.3 (47.0)	.024
Bodily pain	62.1 (32.6)	66.2 (33.3)	.077
General health	53.1 (27.1)	56.1 (27.0)	.116

Note. ¶ Statistically significant difference between SGM and non-SGM patients when controlling for age, ethnicity, and race, as compared to the non-SGM individuals.

Supplementary Table 3. Psychosocial concerns and quality of life among Bisexual vs Non-SGM patients.

Variable	Bisexual patients	Non-SGM patients	n wala
Variable  Psychosocial concerns	(n=262)	(n=50,116)	<i>p</i> -value
Psychosocial concerns  Have a family member or friend who can help du	ring my illness er	nd traatmont	.000
(n, %)	ring my miness ar	nu treatment	.000
Yes	244 (93.1%)	19 792 (07 20/)	
No	` ,	48,782 (97.3%)	
	` /	1,324 (2.6%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	
Living alone (n, %)			.210
Yes	46 (17.6%)	6,921 (13.8%)	
No	216 (82.4%)		
No response	0 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	
Considering having a child/children in the future	(n %)		.000
Yes	47 (17.9%)	2,313 (4.6%)	.000
No	186 (71.0%)		
Not sure	29 (11.1%)	1,539 (3.1%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	
No response	0 (0.070)	0 (0.070)	
Would like to discuss fertility-related issues with	a specialist (n, %	)	.000
Yes	23 (8.8%)	1,258 (2.5%)	
No	208 (79.4%)	47,309 (94.4%)	
Not sure	31 (11.8%)	1,543 (3.1%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	
Have concerns that may interfere with my ability	to seek care at N	Ioffitt (n. %)	.000
Yes	70 (26.7%)	8,355 (16.7%)	7000
No	\	41,755 (83.3%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	
Quality of life			
ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %)			.652
Fully active	142 (54.2%)	28,015 (55.9%)	
Restricted in physically strenuous activity but	,	. ,	
ambulatory and able to carry out work of a	80 (30.5%)	14,452 (28.8%)	
light or sedentary nature	,	. , ,	
Ambulatory and capable of all self-care but	20 (11 50/)	4 002 (0 00/)	
unable to carry out any work activities	30 (11.5%)	4,903 (9.8%)	
Capable of only limited self-care	9 (3.4%)	2,494 (5.0%)	
Completely disabled	1 (0.4%)	252 (0.5%)	
1 🗸	,	( - )	
SF-12 (M, SD)			
MCS-12¶	42.4 (11.5)	49.5 (10.3)	<.001
MCS-12¶ Vitality¶	37.1 (27.6)	47.8 (29.0)	<.001
MCS-12¶		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Mental health¶	56.3 (23.3)	68.0 (22.2)	<.001	
PCS-12¶	42.1 (12.7)	42.3 (12.8)	.809	
Physical functioning <sup>¶</sup>	63.2 (37.4)	63.3 (38.0)	.970	
Role-physical¶	46.0 (46.5)	52.9 (47.5)	.019	
Bodily pain¶	62.1 (32.6)	68.8 (32.4)	.001	
General health¶	53.1 (27.1)	57.1 (27.5)	.019	

Note. ¶ Statistically significant difference between SGM and non-SGM patients when controlling for age, ethnicity, and race, as compared to the non-SGM individuals.

Supplementary Table 4. T-Test results: Age difference within total and subsamples. (Total N=51,503; SGM N=1,387; Non-SGM=50,116)

Group	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not sure (3)	<i>p</i> -value
				(Comparison pair: 1-2; 1-3; 2-3)
Considering having	a child/children in	the future (M, S	5D)	
Total Sample	30.4 (8.3)	62.9 (12.6)	38.1 (12.4)	<.001, <.001, <.001
SGM	28.0 (6.3)	57.1 (13.4)	32.4 (11.1)	<.001, <.01, <.001
Non-SGM	30.6 (8.4)	63.1 (12.5)	38.5 (12.4)	<.001, <.001, <.001
Would like to discus	s fertility-related is	ssues with a spe	cialist (M, SD)	
Total Sample	34.6 (11.4)	62.0 (13.6)	39.3 (14.8)	<.001, <.001, <.001
SGM	30.6 (8.5)	55.4 (14.7)	32.7 (12.9)	<.001, .256, <.001
Non-SGM	34.8 (11.5)	62.2 (13.5)	39.6 (14.8)	<.001, <.001, <.001

Supplementary Table 5. Comparison of the demographics in the US, catchment area and the study sample.

	United States N=327,167,439	Catchment Area N=6,145,524	Study Sample: SGM N=1,387	Study Sample: Non-SGM N=50,116
Race				
Asian American or Pacific Islander/ American Indian <sup>a</sup>	5.8%	2.6%	1.7%	1.9%
Black/African American	12.7%	10.6%	4.4%	5.1%
Non-Hispanic White	60.2%	67.4%	74.5%	76.4%
Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latinx	18.3%	17.7%	11.7%	8.5%
Age				
10-19 Years <sup>b</sup>	13.1%	10.9%	0.9%	0.4%
20-64 Years	_c	54.7%	72.7%	52.8%
65 Years +	16.0%	24.1%	26.3%	46.8%
Gender				
Female	50.8%	51.3%	41.6%	40.7%
LGBT <sup>d</sup>	7.2%	4.1%	2.7%	-

Note. <sup>a</sup> USA/Catchment area includes Asian American or Pacific Islander whereas the study sample includes Asian American or American Indian. <sup>b</sup> USA/Catchment area includes individuals 10-19 years whereas the study sample includes 18-19 years. <sup>c</sup> Data unavailable. <sup>d</sup> USA is based on the Gallup results in 2023. <sup>3</sup> USA/Catchment area includes LGBT. Catchment area includes LGBT in Tampa Bay (4 counties) only. The study sample includes LGBT+.

Supplementary Table 6. Psychosocial concerns and quality of life among those who were exposed to the Sexual Orientation (SO) question only. (N=14,741)

Variable	SGM patients (n=352)	Non-SGM (n=14,389)	<i>p</i> -value
Psychosocial concerns			•
Have a family member or friend who can he	elp during my illness and	treatment (n, %)	.021
Yes	335 (95.2%)	14027 (97.5%)	
No	17 (4.8%)	358 (2.5%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	
Living alone (n, %)			<.001
Yes	79 (22.4%)	1898 (13.2%)	<b>\.001</b>
No	` ,	` '	
	273 (77.6%)	12487 (86.8%)	
No response	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	
Considering having a child/children in the f	uture (n, %)		<.01
Yes	29 (8.2%)	669 (4.6%)	
No	308 (87.5%)	13268 (92.2%)	
Not sure	15 (4.3%)	452 (3.1%)	
Would like to discuss fertility-related issues	with a specialist		.020
(n, %)			
Yes	13 (3.7%)	415 (2.9%)	
No	319 (90.6%)	13517 (93.9%)	
	319 (90.6%) 20 (5.7%)	13517 (93.9%) 457 (3.2%)	
No Not sure	20 (5.7%)	457 (3.2%)	.042
No Not sure Have concerns that may interfere with my a	20 (5.7%) ability to seek care at Mo	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %)	.042
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%)	.042
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%)	457 (3.2%) <b>ffitt (n, %)</b> 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%)	.042
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%)	.042
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%)	457 (3.2%) <b>ffitt (n, %)</b> 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%)	457 (3.2%) <b>ffitt (n, %)</b> 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%)	.760
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life ECOG Performance Status Scale	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%)	457 (3.2%) <b>ffitt (n, %)</b> 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature Ambulatory and capable of all self-	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)  199 (56.5%)  96 (27.3%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%) 4059 (28.2%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature Ambulatory and capable of all self- care but unable to carry out any work activities	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)  199 (56.5%)  96 (27.3%)  41 (11.6%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)  4059 (28.2%)  1380 (9.6%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature Ambulatory and capable of all self- care but unable to carry out any work	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)  199 (56.5%)  96 (27.3%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%) 4059 (28.2%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature Ambulatory and capable of all self- care but unable to carry out any work activities Capable of only limited self-care Completely disabled	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)  199 (56.5%)  96 (27.3%)  41 (11.6%) 15 (4.3%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)  4059 (28.2%)  1380 (9.6%) 631 (4.4%)	
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature Ambulatory and capable of all self- care but unable to carry out any work activities Capable of only limited self-care Completely disabled  SF-12 (M, SD)	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)  199 (56.5%)  96 (27.3%)  41 (11.6%)  15 (4.3%) 1 (0.3%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)  4059 (28.2%)  1380 (9.6%) 631 (4.4%) 64 (0.4%)	.760
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature Ambulatory and capable of all self- care but unable to carry out any work activities Capable of only limited self-care Completely disabled  SF-12 (M, SD) MCS-12¶	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)  199 (56.5%)  96 (27.3%)  41 (11.6%)  15 (4.3%) 1 (0.3%)  47.2 (10.8)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)  4059 (28.2%)  1380 (9.6%) 631 (4.4%) 64 (0.4%)  49.5 (10.2)	.760 <.001
No Not sure  Have concerns that may interfere with my a Yes No No response  Quality of life  ECOG Performance Status Scale (n, %) Fully active Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature Ambulatory and capable of all self- care but unable to carry out any work activities Capable of only limited self-care Completely disabled  SF-12 (M, SD)	20 (5.7%)  ability to seek care at Mo 80 (22.7%) 272 (77.3%) 0 (0.0%)  199 (56.5%)  96 (27.3%)  41 (11.6%)  15 (4.3%) 1 (0.3%)	457 (3.2%)  ffitt (n, %) 2525 (17.5%) 11863 (82.4%) 1 (0.0%)  8255 (57.4%)  4059 (28.2%)  1380 (9.6%) 631 (4.4%) 64 (0.4%)	.760

Role-emotional Mental health <sup>¶</sup>	73.4 (39.9) 62.4 (22.5)	76.7 (37.8) 68.0 (22.0)	.104 <.001
PCS-12	42.7 (12.8)	42.7 (12.7)	.999
Physical functioning	66.5 (36.5)	64.4 (37.8)	.311
Role-physical¶	51.3 (46.4)	53.5 (47.4)	.386
Bodily pain <sup>¶</sup>	65.9 (32.7)	69.4 (32.2)	.043
General health	56.3 (26.6)	58.1 (27.4)	.235

Note. Statistically significant difference between SGM and non-SGM patients when controlling for age, ethnicity, and race, as compared to the non-SGM individuals.