

Effectiveness of an eHealth Intervention for Reducing Psychological Distress and Increasing COVID-19 Knowledge and Protective Behaviors among Ethnoracially Diverse Sexual and Gender Minority Adults: A Quasi-experimental Study (#SafeHandsSafeHearts)

Peter A. Newman, Ph.D.^{1*}, Venkatesan Chakrapani, M.D., Ph.D.²; Notisha Massaquoi, Ph.D.³, Charmaine C. Williams, Ph.D.¹, Wangari Tharao, Ph.D.⁴, Suchon Tepjan, M.P.H.⁵, Surachet Roungrakhon, M.Ed.⁶; Joelleann Forbes, M.S.W.⁴, Sarah Sebastian, M.S.W.^{1,4}, Pakorn Akkakanjanasupar, Ph.D.⁵, Muna Aden, M.P.H.⁴

¹ Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada

² Centre for Sexuality and Health Research and Policy, Chennai, India

³ Department of Health and Society, University of Toronto Scarborough, Scarborough, Ontario, Canada

⁴ Women's Health in Women's Hands Community Health Centre, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

⁵ VOICES-Thailand Foundation, Chiang Mai, Thailand

⁶ Faculty of Science and Technology, Rajamangala University of Technology, Phra Nakhon, Bangkok, Thailand

***Corresponding author:** Peter A. Newman, Ph.D., Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, 246 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S1V4; Tel: +1 416-946-8611; Fax: +1-416-978-7072; Email: p.newman@utoronto.ca

Running Title: An eHealth Intervention for Pandemic-related Psychological Distress among LGBTQ+ People

Clinical trial registration information: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04870723;

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04870723>

Abstract

Purpose: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other persons outside of heteronormative and cisgender identities (LGBTQ+) and ethnic/racial minority populations are at heightened vulnerability amid the Covid-19 pandemic. Systemic marginalization and resulting adverse social determinants of health contribute to health disparities among these populations that result in more severe consequences due to Covid-19 and the public health measures to control it. We developed and tested a tailored online intervention (#SafeHandsSafeHearts) to support ethnoracially diverse LGBTQ+ individuals in Toronto, Canada amid the pandemic.

Methods: We used a quasi-experimental pre-test post-test design to evaluate the effectiveness of a 3-session, peer-delivered eHealth intervention in reducing psychological distress and increasing Covid-19 knowledge and protective behaviors. Individuals ≥ 18 -years-old, resident in Toronto, and self-identified as sexual or gender minority were recruited online. Depressive and anxiety symptoms, Covid-19 knowledge and protective behaviors were assessed at baseline, 2-weeks postintervention, and 2-months follow-up. We used generalized estimating equations and zero-truncated Poisson models to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention on the four primary outcomes.

Results: From March to November 2021, 202 participants (median age, 27 years [Interquartile range: 23-32]) were enrolled in #SafeHandsSafeHearts. Over half (54%, n=110) identified as cisgender lesbian or bisexual women or women who have sex with women, 26.2% (n=53) cisgender gay or bisexual men or men who have sex with men, and 19.3% (n=39) transgender or nonbinary individuals. The majority (75.7%, n=143) were Black and other people of color. The intervention led to statistically significant reductions in the prevalence of clinically significant depressive and anxiety symptoms, and increases in Covid-

19 protective behaviors from baseline to postintervention.

Conclusion: We demonstrated the effectiveness of a brief, peer-delivered eHealth intervention for ethnoracially diverse LGBTQ+ communities in reducing psychological distress and increasing protective behaviors amid the Covid-19 pandemic. Implementation through community-based health services with trained peer educators supports feasibility, acceptability, and the importance of engaging ethnoracially diverse LGBTQ+ communities in pandemic response preparedness. This trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT04870723.

Keywords: Covid-19; pandemic; depression; anxiety; eHealth; motivational interviewing; psychoeducation; LGBT persons; sexual and gender minorities; ethnic and racial minorities; minority health

Introduction

Marginalization of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ) and other persons outside of heteronormative and cisgender identities (LGBTQ+), and ethnoracially diverse populations, exacerbates vulnerability to SARS-CoV2 transmission and serious Covid-19 outcomes. Adverse social determinants of health (SDOH) owing to systemic discrimination against LGBTQ+ [1-4], Black [5] and other racial/ethnic minority populations [6,7], and those with intersectional marginalized identities [2,3,8], contribute to health disparities and excess risk in the Covid-19 pandemic. Among LGBTQ+ people in Canada, precarious employment and financial insecurity [9,10], unstable housing [10], lack of LGBTQ+-competent healthcare [11]—even more so among racial and ethnic minorities, and women [12]—and pervasive stigma [1] increase risks for Covid-19 transmission, reduce access to care, and constrain the ability to adhere to public health-recommended nonpharmaceutical interventions, such as physical distancing, working from home, and Covid-19 testing.

Health and mental health disparities among LGBTQ+ and ethnoracially diverse people associated with social and structural vulnerabilities are likely to be exacerbated by the trauma and social isolation of the Covid-19 pandemic [1,3,13-16]. Evidence from Canada [17-19] as well as the U.S. [8,20] indicates not only increases in, but disproportionately higher rates of depression, anxiety, and loneliness among LGBTQ+ people compared to cisgender heterosexual individuals during the pandemic. Yet, despite documented health disparities and heightened vulnerability among LGBTQ+ and ethnoracially diverse populations, we are aware of no tailored, evidence-informed interventions to reduce the burden of Covid-19 among these communities.

We developed and tested #SafeHandsSafeHearts, a peer-delivered eHealth intervention, with the aim of providing psychosocial and behavioral support and education to

ethn racially diverse LGBTQ+ individuals during the Covid-19 pandemic. We also aimed to advance pandemic responses designed for ethn racially diverse LGBTQ+ populations.

Materials and Methods

This study was funded by the International Development Research Centre (109555) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (895-2019-1020). All study procedures were approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University of Toronto (protocol no. 39769) and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. The clinical trial was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04870723). Recruitment of participants for baseline, postintervention, and follow-up assessments lasted from March 1, 2021 to May 15, 2022. The study was registered prospectively as one site of an international randomized clinical trial with a crossover design; however, due to protracted delays in ethics approvals from the other two sites amid a public health emergency, we implemented the approved study at the Toronto site as a pilot using a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design. All enrollment criteria remained the same, and the intervention and assessments were conducted according to the registered protocol. The authors confirm that all ongoing and related trials for this intervention are registered. The supporting CONSORT checklist is available as supporting information; see S1 Checklist.

Study Design and Setting

We used a quasi-experimental, single group pretest-posttest design to assess the effectiveness of the #SafeHandsSafeHearts eHealth intervention. The study was wholly developed and conducted online due to rolling lockdowns in Toronto and the contiguous

urban region from March 2020 to June 2021 [21]. The Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA; pop. estimate, 7.3 million) is comprised of the largest and ethnoracially diverse cities by population in Ontario, including Toronto, Halton, Peel, York, and Durham. We used a World Health Organization-recommended approach [22] with community engagement in intervention development, co-governance, and capacity-building of community-based organizations (CBOs). Given the disproportionate impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on physical and mental health among LGBTQ+ and ethnoracial minority populations [3,13,14,20], and as a community-based intervention, we used a single group design rather than randomization to a control or waitlist group during a public health emergency.

Sample Size

The sample size was calculated based on power (80%) to detect significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$ for 95% confidence interval, two-tailed test) in 4 primary outcomes: increases in Covid-19 knowledge and Covid-19-protective behavior scores; and decreases in the proportion of participants with pandemic-related depressive and anxiety symptoms. We assumed a small to medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.3$) on knowledge and behavior, and 20% reduction in the proportion of participants with depression or anxiety. Required sample sizes estimated using Stata-16 and G*Power 3.1 ranged from 90–92 to detect significant differences between pre-intervention and postintervention timepoints. Assuming 10% attrition and adding a design/clustering effect of 1.5, the target sample size was increased to 239.

Procedures

We developed a customized online dashboard AND database to support study coordination, including tracking of participant recruitment, screening, enrollment, counselor

assignment, and eHealth sessions. Participants were recruited online via listservs and social media accounts of CBOs and health centers serving ethnoracially diverse LGBTQ+ communities, LGBTQ+ e-groups, and a study website. We distributed e-flyers and messages with a focus on groups and organizations serving ethnoracial minority LGBTQ+ populations.

Eligibility criteria were (1) age ≥ 18 years; (2) self-identify as cisgender lesbian or bisexual woman or woman who has sex with women (LBWSW); cisgender gay or bisexual man or man who have sex with men (GBMSM); or transgender or non-binary individuals (TNB); (3) resident in the GTHA for ≥ 6 months; (4) able to understand and willing to provide informed consent; and (5) able to understand English.

Peer counselors were recruited among the focal study populations and those with experience working with LGBTQ+ and ethnoracially diverse communities from social service organizations and social work training programs. Peer counselors received a 3-day, manualized online training, including small-group discussions, role-plays, mock counseling sessions, and feedback, delivered by study coordinators and health and mental health professionals, as well as a subsequent booster session. The training covered Covid-19, public health-recommended nonpharmaceutical interventions, pandemic-related distress (i.e., anxiety, depression, social isolation), motivational interviewing (MI)-based counseling, psychoeducation, and research ethics. Biweekly clinical group supervision was conducted throughout the intervention, along with two Covid-19 updates provided by Toronto Public Health medical staff.

Intervention

#SafeHandsSafeHearts builds on evidence-informed interventions that have used MI [23,24] and psychoeducation [25] to increase health knowledge, health behaviors, and reduce psychological distress [26-28]. Both MI and psychoeducation lend themselves to culturally

appropriate, nonjudgmental, non-stigmatizing and strengths-based approaches to self-evaluation, emotional support, and behavior change [29,30], and have demonstrated effectiveness with LGBTQ+ and racial/ethnic minority populations [30-32].

The intervention content was organized into 3 sessions (see S2 Appendix). The first session focused on building rapport, goal-identification (i.e., participant's goals for change), and psychoeducation (i.e., selecting 1 or 2 new things to observe/try out and discuss next session), with additional content focused on knowledge about Covid-19 transmission, symptoms, testing, and treatment. Session 2 content focused on understanding and practicing Covid-19 protective behaviors (i.e., improving self-efficacy), risk reduction, psychoeducation, and problem-solving (i.e., reviewing the “new things” experience, reinforcing successes, normalizing setbacks). Session 3 focused on understanding psychosocial issues, promoting awareness of community resources, and improving mental health (i.e., mental health and social support assessment and strengthening, expanding support for change—tools, relationships, services), and maintaining change (i.e., relapse prevention).

The intervention was delivered online (via mobile phone, tablet, laptop, or PC) in 3-weekly 60-minute modules. Counselors were given flexibility to address pressing needs raised by participants at the beginning of each session. A referral list was provided to all counselors, including locally available and free or low-cost concrete services (e.g., food banks, housing), health services, and mental health hotlines, including LGBTQ+- and ethnoracially-competent organizations. Counselors documented referrals made in each session and followed up with participants in subsequent sessions. Participants were provided with a \$30 honorarium after each online session, and after postintervention and follow-up survey completion.

Measures

Participants completed surveys at baseline, 2-weeks postintervention after their final eHealth session, and 2-month follow-up.

Primary outcomes

Depression symptoms in the past 2 weeks were measured using the Patient Health Questionnaire-2 (PHQ-2) [33]. Anxiety symptoms in the past 2 weeks were measured using the Generalized Anxiety Disorder-2 scale (GAD-2) [34]. Each 2-item scale was scored from 0–3 (range, 0–6), with a score of ≥ 3 indicative of screening cut-points for clinically significant depression or anxiety [35].

Covid-19 knowledge was assessed using a 7-item index (score range, 2–7) developed by the research team, based on U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) guidelines [36,37] and published research [38,39]. Public health-recommended Covid-19 protective behaviors (handwashing, mask-wearing, physical distancing) were assessed using a 9-item index (score range, 1–18) developed by the research team based on WHO and U.S. CDC guidelines [36,37].

Covariates

Demographic variables included age, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, city of residence, country of birth, education, and employment status. We assessed loneliness/social isolation (UCLA Loneliness Scale) [40]; Covid-19 stress (Covid-19 danger and Covid-19 traumatic stress subscales) [41]; resilience (Resilience to Traumatic Experience scale) [42]; vaccine conspiracy beliefs [43-45]; and Covid-19 vaccination status.

Acceptability of the Intervention

After each eHealth session, participants were sent an online link to a confidential 4-item evaluation to indicate their satisfaction with the session and session length, the extent to which it was helpful in improving their emotional wellness or mental health and their Covid-19-related knowledge and skills.

Statistical Analyses

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize sociodemographic and related characteristics: frequencies and percentages for categorical variables and means and standard deviations for continuous variables. We used population-averaged Poisson models (generalized estimating equations or GEE) [46] to estimate dichotomous outcomes (i.e., depression, anxiety), and zero-truncated Poisson models [47] to estimate count outcomes (i.e., Covid-19 knowledge, Covid-19 protective behaviors). Incidence rate ratios (IRR) were calculated based on pair-wise comparisons to estimate between group differences on primary outcomes at baseline, postintervention, and 2-month follow-up. Clustering of observations at the participant level were taken into account by specifying the clustering variable (participant ID) in the GEE models and by using robust standard errors in the truncated Poisson models [48]. We conducted an intention-to-treat analysis, in that all participants were included irrespective of their session attendance or completion of questionnaires. A complete-case analysis is generally not recommended due to loss of sample size and potential bias in the results [49]. Models were adjusted for demographic factors such as age, employment status, sexual/gender identity subgroup, education, and race/ethnicity. Two-sided p-values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed using Stata/SE 16.1 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX).

Results

Enrollment and Intervention Exposure

Among individuals initially screened online (n = 229), 27 (11.8%) were ineligible; of these, n = 18 did not meet residency requirements and n = 9 did not meet sexuality/gender criteria. Among enrolled participants (n = 202), the majority (54.5%; n = 110) completed 3 sessions, 5 (2.5%) completed 2 sessions, 8 (4.0%) 1 session, and 79 (39.1%) no sessions. Fifty-four percent (n = 109) completed the postintervention survey, and 48% (n = 96) completed the follow-up survey (see Fig 1).

Fig 1. CONSORT diagram of participant flow in one-group quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design (#SafeHandsSafeHearts)

Figure legend: GTHA, Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area; LGBTQ+, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other persons outside of heteronormative and cisgender identities

Participant Characteristics

In total, 202 participants (median age, 27 years [IQR: 23-32]) were enrolled in the #SafeHandsSafeHearts trial. The majority (54%, n = 110) identified as cisgender LBWSW, nearly one-fifth (19.3%, n = 39) TNB, and one-quarter (26.2%, n = 53) cisgender GBMSM. Nearly one-third of participants (30.7%, n = 62) identified as African/Caribbean/Black, 30.2% (n = 61) South/East/Southeast Asian, 24.3% (n = 49) White, 8.9% (n = 18) Latinx/Hispanic, and 5.9% (n = 12) multiracial. Over two-thirds (67.3%, n = 136) had college-degree education and one-half (50.0%, n = 101) were unemployed. Table 1 shows participant demographic characteristics.

Table 1. Baseline demographic characteristics (N = 202)

Characteristic	n (%)
Race/ethnicity	
African/Caribbean/Black	62 (30.7)
South/East/Southeast Asian	61 (30.2)
Latinx/Hispanic	18 (8.9)
White	49 (24.3)
Multiracial	12 (5.9)
Gender	
Cisgender lesbian, bisexual, WSW	110 (54.5)
Cisgender gay, bisexual, MSM	53 (26.2)
Transgender or non-binary	39 (19.3)
Education	
None/Elementary school	6 (3.0)
High school	60 (29.7)
≥ College/University	136 (67.3)
Employment	
Full-time	47 (23.3)
Part-time	54 (26.7)
Unemployed	101 (50.0)
Health Insurance	
Insured	164 (81.2)
Uninsured	38 (18.8)

MSM, men who have sex with men; WSW, women who have sex with women

Psychological Distress, Covid-19 Knowledge and Protective Behaviors

The baseline prevalence of depressive symptoms was 53.6% (95% CI 48.0%–59.3%), and of anxiety symptoms was 63.5% (95% CI 57.5%–69.5%). The mean score on Covid-19 knowledge at baseline was 6.73 (95% CI 6.66–6.80) and on protective behaviors was 14.75 (95% CI 14.27–15.23) (see Table 2).

Table 2. Effect of the intervention on primary outcomes: Predicted probabilities (%) or scores, and pairwise comparisons of change in % or score at 3 timepoints

Outcomes	Scores or %'s at 3 timepoints (95% CI)			Pairwise comparisons IRR (95% CI)		
	<i>Baseline (T0)</i>	<i>Post-intervention (T1)</i>	<i>Follow-up (T2)</i>	T0 to T1	T0 to T2	T1 to T2
Depressive symptoms (%)	53.6% (48.0, 59.3)	40.0% (32.4, 47.7)	49.1% (39.2, 58.9)	0.746** ^a (0.612 - 0.911)	0.915 (0.737 - 1.135)	1.225 (0.951 - 1.579)
Anxiety symptoms (%)	63.5% (57.5, 69.5)	52.9% (44.5, 61.3)	48.4% (38.8, 58.0)	0.834* (0.710 - 0.979)	0.763* (0.615 - 0.945)	0.915 (0.732 - 1.144)
Covid-19 knowledge score (2–7)	6.73 (6.66, 6.80)	6.68 (6.57, 6.80)	6.67 (6.52, 6.82)	0.992 (0.973 - 1.013)	0.991 (0.967 - 1.016)	0.998 (0.970 - 1.027)
Covid-19 protective behaviors score (1–18)	14.75 (14.27, 15.23)	15.48 (15.02, 15.94)	16.02 (15.55, 16.49)	1.049* ^b (1.002 - 1.099)	1.086*** (1.036 - 1.138)	1.035 (0.994 - 1.078)

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001,

^a IRRs can be interpreted as relative differences; an IRR of 0.746 signifies a 25.4% decrease in the prevalence of depression from baseline (T0) to postintervention (T1) (i.e., $0.746 - 1 = -.254$ or -25.4%)

^b This signifies a 4.9% increase in the mean score of Covid-19 protective behaviors from baseline to postintervention ($1.049 - 1 = .049$ or 4.9%)
CI, confidence interval; IRR, incidence rate ratio

Effect of the Intervention on Depression

The intervention led to statistically significant reductions in the prevalence of depressive symptoms by one-fourth (25.4%) from baseline to postintervention (IRR = 0.746; 95% CI 0.612–0.911, $p < .01$) (Table 2). Those who were employed reported significantly lower risk (IRR = 0.74; 95% CI .60–.90, $p < .05$) of depressive symptoms (Table 3). Higher scores on Covid-19 stress (IRR = 1.25; 95% CI, 1.13–1.39, $p < .001$) and loneliness (IRR = 1.24; 95% CI 1.16–1.32, $p < .001$) were associated with significantly greater risks of depressive symptoms (Table 2). Higher scores on resilience to traumatic stress were associated with a small but significantly lower risk of depressive symptoms (IRR = 0.97; 95% CI .94–.99, $p < .001$). Overall reduction in the prevalence of depression from baseline to 2-month follow-up was not statistically significant, nor was the difference between postintervention and follow-up prevalence of depressive symptoms statistically significant, suggesting that the effect of the intervention on depression was not retained.

Table 3. Predictors of depressive and anxiety symptoms among LGBTQ+ individuals in Toronto (n = 202)

Variables	Depression			Anxiety		
	IRR	SE	95% CI	IRR	SE	95% CI
Time (Ref. Baseline)						
Postintervention	0.75**	0.08	0.61 - 0.91	0.83*	0.07	0.71 - 0.98
Follow-up	0.91	0.10	0.74 - 1.13	0.76*	0.08	0.62 - 0.94
Age	0.99	0.00	0.98 - 1.00	1.00	0.00	0.99 - 1.01
Employed (Yes)	0.74**	0.07	0.61 - 0.90	0.84*	0.07	0.70 - 0.99
Identity (Ref. GBMSM)						
LBWSW	1.23	0.17	0.93 - 1.62	1.29*	0.16	1.01 - 1.66
TNB	1.14	0.18	0.84 - 1.55	1.21	0.18	0.91 - 1.62
Education: College (Ref. Up to higher secondary)	1.00	0.10	0.83 - 1.21	1.04	0.10	0.86 - 1.25
Covid-19 stress score	1.25***	0.07	1.13 - 1.39	1.29***	0.07	1.16 - 1.43
Loneliness score	1.24***	0.04	1.16 - 1.32	1.14***	0.03	1.08 - 1.21
Resilience to traumatic experience score	0.97**	0.01	0.94 - 0.99	1.00	0.01	0.98 - 1.02
Race (Ref. White)						
African/Caribbean/Black	1.20	0.15	0.94 - 1.52	0.90	0.10	0.72 - 1.13
South/East/SE Asian	0.89	0.12	0.69 - 1.16	0.91	0.10	0.72 - 1.14
Latinx/Hispanic	1.11	0.27	0.69 - 1.79	1.18	0.21	0.84 - 1.66
Multiracial	1.16	0.16	0.89 - 1.51	1.17	0.19	0.85 - 1.61
Constant	0.15***	0.06	0.07 - 0.33	0.13***	0.05	0.07 - 0.26

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

SE, standard error

GBMSM, gay, bisexual and men who have sex with men; LBWSW, lesbian, bisexual women who have sex with women; SE Asian, Southeast Asian; TNB, transgender or non-binary individuals

Effect of the Intervention on Anxiety

The intervention led to statistically significant reductions in anxiety symptoms, with the prevalence reduced by 16.6% from baseline to postintervention (IRR = 0.834; 95% CI 0.710–0.970, p<.05) (Table 2). The prevalence of anxiety symptoms at 2-month follow-up was also significantly different from baseline (23.7% reduction: IRR = 0.763; 95% CI 0.615–0.945, p<.05), with no significant difference from postintervention to follow-up (IRR = 0.915; 95% CI 0.732–1.144, p = .65); this suggests that the effect of the intervention on reducing anxiety was retained over time (Table 2). Those who were employed had a significantly lower risk (IRR = 0.84; 95% CI, .70–.99, p<.05) of anxiety symptoms (Table 3).

Higher scores on Covid-19 stress (IRR = 1.29; 95% CI 1.16–1.43, $p < .001$) and higher scores on loneliness (IRR = 1.14; 95% CI 1.08–1.21, $p < .001$) were each associated with significantly greater risk of anxiety symptoms.

Effect of the Intervention on Covid-19 Knowledge

There was no statistically significant increase in Covid-19 knowledge scores over time (Table 2). Higher scores on vaccine conspiracy beliefs (IRR = 0.994; 95% CI, 0.990–0.998, $p < .05$) were inversely associated with Covid-19 knowledge scores over time (Table 4). Higher Covid-19 stress scores were positively associated with Covid-19 knowledge (IRR = 1.02; 95% CI, 1.005–1.04, $p < .05$) over time.

Table 4. Predictors of Covid-19 knowledge and protective behavior scores in Toronto (n = 202)

Variables	Covid-19 Knowledge Score			Covid-19 Behavior Score		
	IRR	SE	95% CI	IRR	SE	95% CI
Time (Ref. Baseline)						
Postintervention	0.99	0.01	0.97 - 1.01	1.05*	0.02	1.00 - 1.10
Follow-up	0.99	0.01	0.97 - 1.02	1.09***	0.03	1.04 - 1.14
Age	1.00	0.00	1.00 - 1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00 - 1.00
Employed (Yes)	0.99	0.01	0.97 - 1.01	1.03	0.02	0.99 - 1.07
Identity (Ref. GBMSM)						
LBWSW	1.00	0.01	0.98 - 1.02	1.03	0.03	0.98 - 1.09
TNB	1.01	0.01	0.98 - 1.03	1.02	0.04	0.95 - 1.10
Education: College (Ref. up to higher secondary)	1.02*	0.01	1.00 - 1.04	0.97	0.02	0.93 - 1.02
Vaccine conspiracy beliefs score	0.99**	0.00	0.990 - 0.998	1.00	0.00	0.99 - 1.00
Covid-19 stress score	1.02*	0.01	1.005 - 1.04	1.03*	0.01	1.00 - 1.05
Covid-19 knowledge score				1.06***	0.02	1.03 - 1.10
Vaccinated with ≥1 dose (Yes)				0.93*	0.03	0.89 - 0.99
Race (Ref. White)						
African/Caribbean/Black	1.02	0.01	1.00 - 1.05	1.06*	0.03	1.00 - 1.12
South/East/SE Asian	1.02*	0.01	1.00 - 1.05	1.05*	0.03	1.00 - 1.11
Latinx/Hispanic	1.04**	0.02	1.01 - 1.07	1.02	0.05	0.93 - 1.13
Multiracial	0.99	0.03	0.95 - 1.04	1.08*	0.04	1.02 - 1.15
Vaccinated with ≥1 dose (Yes)	1.01	0.01	0.98 - 1.03			
Constant	6.58***	0.17	6.25 - 6.92	9.01***	1.27	6.84 - 11.87

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Effect of the Intervention on Covid-19 Protective Behaviors

The intervention led to a statistically significant increase in Covid-19 protective behavior scores over time, from baseline to postintervention (4.9% increase: IRR = 1.049; 95% CI 1.002–1.099, p<.05), and from baseline to 2-month follow-up (8.6% increase: IRR = 1.086; 95% CI 1.036–1.138, p<.001) (Table 2). There was no significant change in Covid-19 protective behavior scores from postintervention to 2-month follow-up (IRR = 1.035; 95% CI 0.994–1.078, p=.06), suggesting that the effect of the intervention was retained. Those who reported Covid-19 vaccination (one or two doses) showed small but statistically significantly

differences in lower scores on Covid-19 protective behaviors (IRR = 0.93; 95% CI 0.89–0.99, $p < .05$) over time (Table 4).

Acceptability of the Intervention

Evaluation forms were submitted online by 72% of those who engaged in intervention counselling sessions. Overall, participants indicated feeling “very satisfied” in 84% (141/168) of sessions evaluated and “very satisfied” with the duration of the session in 79% (133/168) of sessions evaluated. In 86% (145/168) of sessions evaluated, participants indicated they were “very helpful” in “improving your emotional wellness or mental health.”

Discussion

This study provides evidence of the effectiveness of a novel community-based, peer-delivered eHealth intervention (#SafeHandsSafeHearts) in reducing psychological distress and increasing Covid-19 protective behaviors among ethnographically diverse LGBTQ+ individuals. Despite the largescale failure of public health systems to systematically report sexual orientation and gender identity information in relation to Covid-19 [50], increasing evidence indicates the disproportionate impact of Covid-19 and pandemic-related public health responses on health and mental health outcomes among LGBTQ+ people in Canada [17], the US [51,52], and Western Europe [53]. To that end, this is the first intervention of which we are aware to demonstrate effectiveness in mitigating pandemic-related psychosocial and behavioral risks among LGBTQ+ people.

Importantly, even among research and interventions designed to support broader LGBTQ+ health, there is substantially lesser focus on individuals who occupy intersectional marginalized identities on the basis of sexual and gender minority and ethnoracial minority status, such as LGBTQ+ Black, Latinx, other people of color, and women [12,14,50]. Our

successful enrollment of a sample of LGBTQ+ people, a majority of whom were Black and other people of color, is both notable and apropos of the increased risk of Covid-19 infection and worse outcomes among these populations [8]. The successful implementation of #SafeHandsSafeHearts during a global public health emergency, with extensive rolling lockdowns and stay-at-home orders in the GTHA [21], further supports the feasibility and ecological validity of the intervention.

As hypothesized, the intervention led to a significant reduction in the prevalence of symptoms indicative of clinically significant depression and anxiety from baseline to postintervention. The high baseline prevalence of depressive and anxiety symptoms itself exemplifies the extreme pandemic-related distress among ethnographically diverse LGBTQ+ individuals, many of whom were enrolled before Covid-19 vaccination was available to them, beginning in June 2021 [54].

The significant effects of the intervention in reducing the prevalence of depression and anxiety support the success of the MI-based and psychoeducational approach, as well as the eHealth modality. The decidedly nonjudgmental stance of MI may be especially appropriate in working with sexual and gender minority and ethnic minority communities, more so amid a pandemic. These communities may experience ambivalence or alienation in the context of historically justified medical mistrust [55,56], moreover, in response to public health interventions that were not designed with community input nor with their communities in mind [57]. The use of eHealth, as well as telehealth and other online modalities with low barriers to access, also may be particularly important for LGBTQ+, ethnographic minority, and other marginalized populations during a pandemic; closures of familiar community-based services may reduce rather than increase access to culturally competent health and mental health services despite their heightened vulnerability [53].

Despite the postintervention reductions in depression and anxiety, the increase in

depressive symptomology from post-intervention to 2-month follow up suggests that future research using an RCT design should assess the intervention using biweekly versus weekly sessions, more than 3 sessions, and/or the use of eHealth booster sessions [58] to determine if any of these may support retention of reductions in depression over time. The retention of intervention effects in reducing anxiety at 2-months post-intervention during an ongoing pandemic suggests the potential for more sustained impact on depression.

We also identified statistically significant associations between secondary measures of loneliness and Covid-19 stress, respectively, and depression and anxiety outcomes. The intervention may have helped to abate these risk factors, potentially reflecting benefits of a peer-based approach in providing psychosocial support for marginalized communities in the context of systemic stigma and discrimination [59]. LGBTQ+ individuals may be particularly vulnerable to psychological distress during lockdowns as a result of different family configurations than heterosexual individuals on whom public health responses are normed, and the closure of community spaces that provide LGBTQ+-affirmative and culturally competent support [60,61].

Notably, employment exerted significant protective effects against both depression and anxiety; this corroborates pathways through which economic marginalization contributes to vulnerability in a pandemic [18,50]. The extensive job loss reported among our sample is substantiated by Toronto government data indicating 50% higher rates of pandemic-related unemployment among Black and Asian versus other ethnoracial groups [62], as well as studies demonstrating vulnerability and stress associated with pandemic-related job loss among LGBTQ+ individuals in Canada [18] and the U.S. [20,50]. Structural interventions to promote job security and retention among ethnoracial and sexual and gender minorities, communities disproportionately represented in service industries [3], including provision of paid sick leave [63] and broader employment antidiscrimination measures, may exert

substantial salubrious effects on mental health in a public health emergency.

Our findings also identify relatively high adherence to public health-recommended protective behaviors at baseline, including physical distancing and mask-wearing, as well as handwashing. The intervention had a small but sustained positive effect on protective behaviors, with increases retained at 2-month follow-up. The uniformly high Covid-19 knowledge demonstrated at baseline may be attributable to daily public health messaging about Covid-19 delivered through multiple channels in the Toronto area; this may have impeded our ability to detect improvements in Covid-19 knowledge over time.

Strengths and Limitations

Study results should be understood in the context of limitations. First, the quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design precludes the ability to determine causal associations; however, the temporality of the intervention, and use of pretest, posttest, and follow-up surveys, support the impact of the intervention on the outcomes assessed and account for possible decay in intervention effects over time [64]. Second, self-reporting of depression and anxiety symptoms, and use of a brief assessment instrument, might result in bias; however, we implemented widely used screening tools with established validity and reliability [35].

Third, while over 60% of individuals who screened into the study completed 1 or more—89% of these, all 3—counseling sessions, session nonattendance may reflect the challenges of participation and retention during a pandemic. We anticipated constraints to engaging in online counseling owing to lack of privacy, and not having a personal mobile device or broadband internet access. To that end, we made arrangements with local CBOs to provide free PC/internet access on site; however, ongoing lockdowns and concerns about infection may have precluded their utilization. Nevertheless, even with the inclusion of participants who did not attend one or more sessions in our analyses, we identified

intervention effectiveness on three of four primary outcomes. Fourth, lack of retention of significant reductions in depression, similarly identified in other brief MI-based interventions [32], suggests the need to test #SafeHandsSafeHearts with additional eHealth sessions over a longer duration. Finally, study results may not be generalizable to all ethnographically diverse LGBTQ+ people in Toronto or elsewhere. However, we designed eligibility criteria to include a broad range of self-identifications among sexual and gender minorities (i.e., not only self-identified gay or lesbian or trans individuals) and we were successful in recruitment of a racially and ethnographically diverse LGBTQ+ sample during a pandemic.

Conclusion

We demonstrated the preliminary effectiveness of an innovative, brief eHealth intervention in reducing psychological distress and increasing protective behaviors among ethnographically diverse LGBTQ+ individuals during the Covid-19 pandemic. The successful implementation of #SafeHandsSafeHearts through partnership and strengthening of community-based health services, and by trained peer counselors with ongoing clinical supervision, most of whom mirrored the sample demographics, supports feasibility and the need for further evaluation of the #SafeHandsSafeHearts model. Overall, this study also affirms the critical importance of meaningful engagement of ethnographically diverse LGBTQ+ communities in pandemic preparedness, and public health intervention design and implementation.

Authorship Confirmation/Contribution Statement

P.A.N.: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing, funding acquisition. V.C.: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, writing—review and editing. N.M.: methodology, supervision. C.C.W.: conceptualization, methodology. W.T.: resources, supervision. S.T.: project administration. S.R.: software, data curation. J.F.: supervision. S.S.: project administration. P.A.: data curation. M.A.: supervision, project administration. All authors reviewed and approved the final article before submission.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge our lead community partner, Women’s Health in Women’s Hands Community Health Centre, for their collaboration in implementing the study. We also thank our dedicated online peer counsellors and study staff: Chantel Aboagye-Mensah, Celeste Bilbao, Rachel Cheung, Denise Frans, Manvinder Gill, Rae Paul, Ali Pearson, Monte-Angel Richardson, Jora Shacter, Jena Taylor-Hunter, Monica Vu, Alisha Williams, and Alexandra Wright.

Conflict of Interest

I have read the journal’s policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: PAN reports serving as an Academic Editor for PLOS One. All other authors reported no conflicts of interest.

Funding Information

This study was supported by the International Development Research Centre (109555) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (895-2019-1020).

References

1. Jaffray B. Experiences of violent Victimization and Unwanted Sexual Behaviours among Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and other Sexual Minority People, and the Transgender Population, in Canada, 2018. Statistics Canada; September 9, 2020. Available from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2020001/article/00009-eng.pdf> [Last accessed: October 6, 2022].
2. Krause K. Implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on LGBTQ communities. *J Public Health Manag Pract.* 2021;27(Suppl 1):S69-71. doi: 10.1097/PHH.0000000000001273
3. Salerno JP, Williams ND, Gattamorta KA. LGBTQ populations: Psychologically vulnerable communities in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychol Trauma.* 2020;12(S1):S239-42. doi: 10.1037/tra0000837
4. Sanchez TH, Zlotorzynska M, Rai M, Baral SD. Characterizing the impact of COVID-19 on men who have sex with men across the United States in April, 2020. *AIDS Behav.* 2020;24(7):2024-2032. doi: 10.1007/s10461-020-02894-2
5. Yancy CW. COVID-19 and African Americans. *JAMA.* 2020;323(19):1891-2; doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.6548
6. Lundberg, DJ, Cho A, Raquib R, Nsoesie EO, Wrigley-Field E, Stokes AC. Geographic and temporal patterns in Covid-19 mortality by race and ethnicity in the United States from March 2020 to February 2022. medRxiv [Preprint]. July 21, 2022. doi: 10.1101/2022.07.20.22277872
7. Wrigley-Field E. US racial inequality may be as deadly as COVID-19. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2020;117(36):21854-6. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2014750117
8. Heslin KC, Hall JE. Sexual orientation disparities in risk factors for adverse COVID-19–related outcomes, by race/ethnicity — Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, United States, 2017–2019. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70:149-54. doi:

10.15585/mmwr.mm7005a1

9. Egale. National Survey Results: The Impact of COVID-19 on the 2SLGBTQI Community. Egale; April 6, 2020. Available from: <https://egale.ca/awareness/covid19-impact-report/> [Last accessed: October 6, 2022].
10. Propkopenko E, Kevins C. Vulnerabilities related to COVID-19 among LGBTQ2+ Canadians. Statistics Canada; December 15, 2020. Available from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/45-28-0001/2020001/article/00075-eng.pdf> [Last accessed: October 6, 2022].
11. McKenzie C, Mulé NJ, Khan M. Where Is LGBTQ+ in Ontario's health care policies and programs? *Sex Res Social Policy*. 2022;19(2):610-21. doi: 10.1007/s13178-021-00577-8
12. Higgins R, Hansen B, Jackson BE, Shaw A, Lachowsky NJ. Programs and interventions promoting health equity in LGBTQ2+ populations in Canada through action on social determinants of health. *Health Promot Chronic Dis Prev Can*. 2021;41(12):431-5. doi: 10.24095/hpcdp.41.12.04
13. Abramovich A, Pang N, Moss A. Experiences of family violence among 2SLGBTQ+ youth at risk of, and experiencing, homelessness before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Gay Lesbian Ment Health*. 2022;26(3):265-88. doi: 10.1080/19359705.2022.2076759
14. Drabble LA., Eliason MJ. Introduction to special issue: Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on LGBTQ+ health and well-being. *J Homosex*. 2021;68;(4):545-59. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2020.1868182
15. Riggle EDB, Drabble LA, Bochicchio LA, Wootton AR, Veldhuis CB, Munroe C, et al. Experiences of the COVID-19 pandemic among African American, Latinx, and White sexual minority women: A descriptive phenomenological study. *Psychol Sex Orientat*

- Gend Divers. 2021;8(2):145-58. doi: 10.1037/sgd0000510
16. Galea S, Merchant RM, Lurie N. The mental health consequences of COVID-19 and physical distancing: The need for prevention and early intervention. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020;180(6):817-8. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1562
 17. Jacmin-Park S, Rossi M, Dumont L, Lupien SJ, Juster R-P. Mental health and social support of sexual and gender diverse people from Québec, Canada during the COVID-19 crisis. *LGBT Health.* 2022;9(3):151-60. doi: 10.1089/lgbt.2021.0255
 18. Jenkins EK, McAuliffe C, Hirani S, Richardson C, Thomson KC, McGuinness L, et al. A portrait of the early and differential mental health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada: Findings from the first wave of a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. *Prev Med.* 2021;145:106333. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106333
 19. Slemmon A, Richardson C, Goodyear T, Salway T, Gadermann A, Oliffe JL, et al. Widening mental health and substance use inequities among sexual and gender minority populations: Findings from a repeated cross-sectional monitoring survey during the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada. *Psychiatry Res.* 2022;307:114327. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2021.114327
 20. Akre E-R, Anderson A, Stojanovski K, Chung KW, VanKim NA, Chae DH. Depression, anxiety, and alcohol use among LGBTQ+ people during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Am J Pub Health.* 2021;111(9):1610-9. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2021.306394
 21. Canadian Press. City of Toronto Declares End of COVID-19 Emergency Order. *CBC News*; May 9, 2022. Available from: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/toronto-emergency-order-covid-1.6446969> [last accessed: October 6, 2022].
 22. World Health Organization (WHO). *Community Engagement: A Health Promotion Guide for Universal Health Coverage in the Hands of the People*. WHO; October 5, 2020. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240010529> [Last

- accessed: October 6, 2022].
23. Miller W, Rollnick S. *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing People for Change* (2nd edition). Guilford Press: New York; 2002.
 24. Miller WR, Rollnick S. Meeting in the middle: Motivational interviewing and self-determination theory. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2012;9:25. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-9-25
 25. Lukens EP, McFarlane WR. Psychoeducation as evidence-based practice: Considerations for practice, research, and policy. *Brief Treat Crisis Interv*. 2004;4(3):205-225. doi: 10.1093/brief-treatment/mhh019
 26. Donker T, Griffiths KM, Cuijpers P, Christensen H. Psychoeducation for depression, anxiety and psychological distress: A meta-analysis. *BMC Med*. 2009;16(7):79. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-7-79
 27. Frost H, Campbell P, Maxwell M, O'Carroll RE, Dombrowski SU, Williams B, et al. Effectiveness of motivational interviewing on adult behaviour change in health and social care settings: A systematic review of reviews. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(10):e0204890. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0204890
 28. Smedslund G, Berg RC, Hammerstrøm KT, Steiro A, Leiknes KA, Dahl HM, et al. Motivational interviewing for substance abuse. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011;2011(5): CD008063. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD008063.pub2
 29. Markland D, Ryan RM, Tobin VJ, Rollnick S. Motivational interviewing and self-determination theory. *J Soc Clin Psychol*. 2005;24(6):811-31. doi: 10.1521/jscp.2005.24.6.811
 30. Naar-King S, Parsons J, Johnson A. Motivational interviewing targeting risk reduction for people with HIV: A systematic review. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2012;9(4):335-43;.doi: 10.1007/s11904-012-0132-x

31. Carrico AW, Zepf R, Meanley S, Batchelder A, Stall R. When the party is over: A systematic review of behavioral interventions for substance-using men who have sex with men. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;73(3):299-306. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0000000000001102
32. Lundahl BW, Kunz C, Brownell C, Tollefson D, Burke BL. A meta-analysis of motivational interviewing: Twenty-five years of empirical studies. *Res Soc Work Pract*. 2010;20(2):137-60. doi: 10.1177/1049731509347850
33. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The Patient Health Questionnaire-2: Validity of a two-item depression screener. *Med Care*. 2003;41(11):1284-92. doi: 10.1097/01.MLR.0000093487.78664.3C
34. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Monahan PO, Löwe B. Anxiety disorders in primary care: Prevalence, impairment, comorbidity, and detection. *Ann Intern Med*. 2007;146(5):317-25. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-146-5-200703060-00004
35. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Löwe B. The patient health questionnaire somatic, anxiety, and depressive symptom scales: A systematic review. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2010;32(4):345-59. doi: 10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2010.03.006
36. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). COVID-19 Coronavirus Disease: Share Facts, not Fear. New Mexico Department of Health; March 16, 2020. Available from: <https://cv.nmhealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/share-facts-about-COVID-19-NMDOH.pdf> [Last accessed: October 6, 2022].
37. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). How to Protect Yourself and Others. National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD), Division of Viral Diseases; August 11, 2022. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html> [Last accessed: October 6, 2022].

38. Al-Hanawi MK, Angawi K, Alshareef N, Qattan AMN, Helmy HZ, Abudawood Y, et al. Knowledge, attitude and practice toward COVID-19 among the public in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional study. *Front Public Health*. 2020;8:217. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00217
39. Azlan AA, Hamzah MR, Sern TJ, Ayub SH, Mohamad E. Public knowledge, attitudes and practices towards COVID-19: A cross-sectional study in Malaysia. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(5):e0233668. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0233668
40. Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkley LC, Cacioppo JT. A short scale for measuring loneliness in large surveys: Results from two population-based studies. *Res Aging*. 2004;26(6):655-72. doi : 10.1177/0164027504268574
41. Taylor S, Landry CA, Paluszek MM, Fergus TA, McKay D, Asmundson GJG. Development and initial validation of the COVID Stress Scales. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2020;72:102232. doi: 10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102232
42. Johnson DC, Polusny MA, Erbes CR, King D, King L, Litz BT, et al. Development and initial validation of the Response to Stressful Experiences Scale. *Mil Med*. 2011;176(2):161-169. doi: 10.7205/milmed-d-10-00258
43. Allington D, Duffy B, Wessely S, Dhavan N, Rubin J. Health-protective behaviour, social media usage and conspiracy belief during the COVID-19 public health emergency. *Psychol Med* 2021;51(10):1763-9. doi: 10.1017/S003329172000224X
44. Georgiou N, Delfabbro P, Balzan R. COVID-19-related conspiracy beliefs and their relationship with perceived stress and pre-existing conspiracy beliefs. *Pers Individ Dif*. 2020;166:110201. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110201
45. Shapiro GK, Holding A, Perez S, Amsel R, Rosberger Z. Validation of the vaccine conspiracy beliefs scale. *Papillomavirus Res*. 2016;2:167-72. doi: 10.1016/j.pvr.2016.09.001

46. Twisk, JWR. Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis for Epidemiology: A Practical Guide. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; 2015.
47. Cameron AC, Trivedi PK. Regression Analysis of Count Data (2ed.). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; 2013.
48. Rabe-Hesketh S, Skrondal A. Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling using Stata–Vol. 2, Categorical Responses, Counts, and Survival. Stata Press: College Station, Texas; 2022.
49. Salim A, Mackinnon A, Christensen H, Griffiths K. Comparison of data analysis strategies for intent-to-treat analysis in pre-test-post-test designs with substantial dropout rates. *Psychiatry Res* 2008;160(3):335-45. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2007.08.005
50. Sell RL, Krims El. Structural transphobia, homophobia, and biphobia in public health practice: The example of COVID-19 surveillance. *Am J Public Health*. 2021; 111(9):1620-6. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2021.306277
51. Fish JN, Salerno J, Williams ND, Rinderknecht RG, Drotning KJ, Sayer L, et al. Sexual minority disparities in health and well-being as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic differ by sexual identity. *LGBT Health*. 2021;8(4):263-72. doi: 10.1089/lgbt.2020.0489
52. Peterson ZD, Vaughan EL, Carver DN. Sexual identity and psychological reactions to COVID-19. *Traumatol*. 2021;27(1):6-13. doi: 10.1037/trm0000283
53. Buspavanich P, Lech S, Lerner E, Fischer M, Berger M, Vilsmaier T, et al. Well-being during COVID-19 pandemic: A comparison of individuals with minoritized sexual and gender identities and cis-heterosexual individuals. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(6):e0252356. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0252356
54. CBC News. Ontario to Expand COVID-19 Vaccine Eligibility to all Adults by End of May. CBC, April 29, 2021. Available from:

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/covid-19-ontario-april-29-vaccine-modelling-1.6006880> [Last accessed: October 18, 2022].

55. Jaiswal J, Halkitis PN. Towards a more inclusive and dynamic understanding of medical mistrust informed by science. *Behav Med*. 2019;45(2):79-85. doi: 10.1080/08964289.2019.1619511
56. Newman PA, Reid L, Tepjan S, Fantus S, Allan K, Nyoni T, et al. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among marginalized populations in the U.S. and Canada: Protocol for a scoping review. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(3):e0266120. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0266120
57. Newman PA, Guta A. How to have sex in an epidemic redux: Reinforcing HIV prevention in the COVID-19 pandemic. *AIDS Behav* 2020;4:2260-4. doi: 10.1007/s10461-020-02940-z
58. Schueller SM, Glover AC, Rufa AK, Dowdle CL, Gross GD, Karnik NS, et al. A mobile phone-based intervention to improve mental health among homeless young adults: Pilot feasibility trial. *JMIR mHealth uHealth*. 2019;7(7):e12347. doi: 10.2196/12347
59. Sokol R, Fisher E. Peer support for the hardly reached: A systematic review. *Am J Public Health* 2016;106(7):e1-8. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2016.303180
60. Anderson AR, Knee E. Queer isolation or queering isolation? Reflecting upon the ramifications of COVID-19 on the future of queer leisure space. *Leis Sci*. 2021;43(1-2):118-24. doi: 10.1080/01490400.2020.1773992
61. Brennan DJ, Card KG, Collicot D, Jollimore J, Lachowsky NJ. How might social distancing impact gay, bisexual, queer, trans and two-spirit men in Canada? *AIDS Behav*. 2020;24(9):2480-2. doi: 10.1007/s10461-020-02891-5
62. City Planning Division, City of Toronto. Toronto Employment Survey 2020. Toronto; April 21, 2021. Available from: <https://www.toronto.ca/wp->

[content/uploads/2021/05/9829-Toronto-Employment-Survey-2020-Bulletin.pdf](#) [Last accessed: October 13, 2022].

63. Thompson A, Stall NM, Born KB, Gibson JL, Allen U, Hopkins J, et al. Benefits of paid sick leave during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Science Briefs of the Ontario COVID-19 Science Advisory Table*. 2021;2:25;1-13; doi: 10.47326/ocsat.2021.02.25.1.0
64. Stratton, S. Quasi-experimental design (pre-rest and post-test studies) in prehospital and disaster research. *Prehosp Disaster Med*. 2019;34(6):573-4; doi: 10.1017/S1049023X19005053




Fig 1 CONSORT flow diagram