

Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity

Male-Partnered Sexual Minority Women: Sexual Identity Disclosure to Health Care Providers During the Perinatal Period

Abbie E. Goldberg, Lori E. Ross, Melissa H. Manley, and Jonathan J. Mohr

Online First Publication, January 9, 2017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000215>

CITATION

Goldberg, A. E., Ross, L. E., Manley, M. H., & Mohr, J. J. (2017, January 9). Male-Partnered Sexual Minority Women: Sexual Identity Disclosure to Health Care Providers During the Perinatal Period. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000215>

Male-Partnered Sexual Minority Women: Sexual Identity Disclosure to Health Care Providers During the Perinatal Period

Abbie E. Goldberg
Clark University

Lori E. Ross
University of Toronto

Melissa H. Manley
Clark University

Jonathan J. Mohr
University of Maryland

Male-partnered sexual minority women (SMW) have received little research attention, although they represent a large proportion of SMW, particularly child-bearing SMW. Male-partnered SMW are less “out” than female-partnered SMW and will likely be “read” as heterosexual by perinatal providers. Given this, and evidence that pregnant women have unique mental health care needs, the current study focuses on male-partnered SMW ($n = 28$) during the perinatal period, recruited from Toronto, Canada and Massachusetts, United States, in an effort to understand disclosure and concealment processes in general and specifically to perinatal health-care providers. Women generally reported that they did not disclose (but made no effort to conceal) their sexual identities and histories in new or unfamiliar relationships, largely because the topic rarely came up, although some women highlighted bisexual invisibility and fear of biphobia as reasons for nondisclosure. Despite overall positive experiences with perinatal providers, less than one quarter of the sample ($n = 6$) had disclosed their sexual identities and histories to them. Most women felt that this information was generally not relevant to their health care, and particularly their reproductive/obstetric care, although some believed that disclosure would be appropriate under conditions of sexual health risk ($n = 8$). Others noted that although they did not feel the need to disclose, they did prefer an lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ)-affirming provider ($n = 7$). Findings provide insight into male-partnered SMW’s views and patterns of disclosure during the perinatal period and have implications for providers, organizations, and scholars who interface with SMW.

Public Significance Statement

Pregnant sexual minority women with male partners are often assumed to be heterosexual, raising questions about whether and when these women disclose their sexual minority status in the perinatal context. This qualitative study of 28 women found that most participants did not share their sexual identity or sexual histories with their perinatal health care providers because this information was perceived as not relevant to their care, although some women nevertheless valued having LGBTQ friendly providers.

Keywords: bisexual, disclosure, health-care provider, perinatal, sexual minority

Disclosing one’s sexual identity or sexual history to health-care providers can be stressful for sexual minorities because of fears of discrimination and limited access to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ)-competent providers and services (Koh, Kang, & Usherwood, 2014; Quinn et al., 2015). LGBQ people may experience anxiety related to sexual identity disclosure in health-care

settings in that they weigh the potential costs of disclosing (vulnerability to mistreatment; denial of care) with the potential benefits (forming a good relationship with a provider; receiving a thorough health evaluation and appropriate services; Sherman, Kauth, Shipherd, & Street, 2014).

Following the lead of Schrimshaw, Siegel, Downing, and Parsons (2013), we differentiate nondisclosure (not sharing one’s sexual identity) from concealment (efforts to hide it), which have different meanings and implications for psychosocial functioning (Jackson & Mohr, 2016; Schrimshaw et al., 2013). Among behaviorally bisexual men, greater concealment of same-sex sexual behavior has been linked to poorer mental health whereas nondisclosure per se was unrelated to well-being (Schrimshaw et al., 2013). In addition, in a sample of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) persons, concealment of sexual orientation was linked to difficulties with mental health and minority stress, but nondisclosure

Abbie E. Goldberg, Department of Psychology, Clark University; Lori E. Ross, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto; Melissa H. Manley, Department of Psychology, Clark University; Jonathan J. Mohr, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Abbie E. Goldberg, Department of Psychology, Clark University, 950 Main Street, Worcester, MA 01610. E-mail: agoldberg@clarku.edu

predicted positive views of one's sexual orientation (Jackson & Mohr, 2016). Despite such findings, most studies have examined disclosure only, and underlying this work is often the suggestion that disclosure is inherently positive and nondisclosure is inherently negative. The "disclosure imperative" suggests that everyone should be "out," ignoring the potential risks of disclosure and the fact that for individuals who are single or partnered with someone of a different gender, disclosure of a nonheterosexual identity may feel irrelevant or uncomfortable (McLean, 2007).

This study focuses on the disclosure practices and beliefs of sexual minority women (SMW) partnered with men (i.e., women who identify as nonheterosexual or have sexual histories involving women, who have sometimes been referred to as "behaviorally bisexual") during the perinatal period. Bisexual women show elevated risk for difficulties in the domains of mental health (Ross, Siegel, Dobinson, Epstein, & Steele, 2012), behavioral health (e.g., substance abuse; Emory et al., 2016), and physical health (e.g., sexually transmitted infections [STIs]; Bostwick, Hughes, & Everett, 2015). Of note is that we could identify only one study that distinguished between male- and female-partnered bisexual women in examining these health disparities. Dyar, Feinstein, and London (2014) found that bisexual women with different-sex partners had higher depression levels than bisexual women with same-sex partners, a difference that was explained by the greater levels of binegative exclusion and rejection by lesbians/gay men that were experienced by bisexual women with different-sex partners. The health disparities that have been associated with bisexuality may have severe consequences in the perinatal period in that perinatal depression, substance use, and untreated STIs pose threats to maternal and child health (Burnett, Loucks, & Lindsay, 2015; Yedid Sion, Harlev, Weintraub, Sergienko, & Sheiner, 2016). Health disparities have been attributed to bisexual women's unique exposure to bisexual stigma (e.g., stereotypes about bisexual people; Bostwick, 2012) and bisexual invisibility (e.g., being "read" as heterosexual or lesbian; Ross et al., 2012); however, little work has examined how stigma and invisibility are experienced in the perinatal period (Ross et al., 2012).

Given the health disparities associated with bisexuality and the consequences of health problems for maternal and child well-being, together with the limited existing research on health among childbearing bisexual women, this population requires further study. Existing literature indicates a strong possibility that pregnant sexual minority women who are partnered with men will not disclose their sexual identities or histories to providers, and it suggests potential health implications of nondisclosure. As such, it is important to understand male-partnered SMW's disclosure to and experiences with providers during the perinatal period. Women are especially likely to interface with the health-care system during pregnancy and postpartum (Loureiro et al., 2009), but they are also vulnerable to unmet health-care needs (Megnin-Viggars, Symington, Howard, & Pilling, 2015). Within supportive environments, patient disclosure of sexual history/identity could be beneficial—for example, by enabling a holistic picture of patients' sexual history, romantic lives, and sexual identity and informing appropriate testing (e.g., for STIs) and related interventions. Disclosure may also enhance rapport with providers, thus facilitating appropriate psychosocial assessment and care (Austin, 2004). However, it also possible that women may perceive disclosure as unnecessary in the perinatal health-care setting, as important only under

certain conditions, or as dangerous; in turn, they may be motivated to conceal aspects of their sexual identity or history.

Sexual Identity Disclosure Among SMW

Within the larger category of SMW, bisexual women tend to be less "out" than lesbians (Colledge, Hickson, Reid, & Weatherburn, 2015; Dyar, Feinstein, & London, 2015). Bisexual women may not disclose their sexual orientation because of fears of encountering biphobia (Eady, Dobinson, & Ross, 2011; Ross et al., 2012) and discrimination (Koh et al., 2014; Sherman et al., 2014). They may also choose not to disclose as a result of lower salience and centrality of their sexual identity (Dyar et al., 2015), which may be especially relevant if they have a different-gender partner (Mohr, Jackson, & Sheets, 2016; Schrimshaw et al., 2013). Bisexual identities are typically invisible because sexual identity is often presumed according to one's partner's gender, whereby male-partnered women are assumed to be heterosexual and female-partnered women are assumed to be lesbian. As a result, some women who self-identify as bisexual may present themselves as heterosexual or lesbian (Mohr et al., 2016), in part because correction of outsiders' presumptions is experienced as burdensome. Perceptions of irrelevance may also drive nondisclosure of sexual identity for bisexual people. Research on bisexual women (Wandrey, Mosack, & Moore, 2015) and men (Schrimshaw, Downing, Cohn, & Siegel, 2014) suggests that believing that others have no reason to know often underlies nondisclosure of sexual identity and behaviors.

Bisexual women are less likely than lesbians to disclose their sexual orientation/history to health-care providers specifically (Mor et al., 2015; Quinn et al., 2015), with Durso and Meyer (2013) reporting nondisclosure rates of 32.6% and 12.9%, respectively, to general medical providers. Providers are likely to avoid asking patients about sexual orientation/history for a range of reasons (e.g., to avoid offending heterosexual patients, or to conceal lack of competence), thus placing the responsibility for disclosure solely on SMW women (McNair, Hegarty, & Taft, 2012). In this way, nondisclosure may reflect bisexual invisibility (Ross et al., 2012). Nondisclosure to providers may also reflect the belief that one's sexual identity/history is not relevant in a particular health-care setting (Wandrey et al., 2015)—a belief that is likely to be especially common among people whose relationships conform to heteronormative expectations, such as male-partnered SMW (Schrimshaw et al., 2014). Such individuals may feel that the default care provided in the context of heteronormative expectations is sufficient for their needs; thus, they do not feel the same necessity to disclose as those for whom this default care is not relevant or sufficient.

Significantly, women who do not disclose their sexual identity/history to providers are not necessarily seeking to conceal it (Jackson & Mohr, 2016), and, by extension, the threat of negative consequences of nondisclosure (e.g., poor rapport, inadequate service use) would appear to be low. In contrast, some women may feel that it is important for providers to know about their sexual histories but do not feel comfortable sharing; others may actively conceal this information (e.g., because they worry about judgment of sexual practices; McNair et al., 2012). In these contexts, nondisclosure could constitute a barrier to rapport-building and health-care use.

Thus, SMW who are partnered with men may be especially unlikely to disclose their sexual orientation/history to providers, who generally presume heterosexuality and seem unlikely to ask about patients' sexual orientation (McNair et al., 2012). This may be particularly true during the perinatal period, in light of heteronormative assumptions surrounding pregnancy, partnership, and child-rearing (Ross & Goldberg, 2016), such that women who are visibly pregnant and possibly present with their male partner may often be presumed heterosexual. Little research has examined bisexual (or male-partnered SM) women's disclosure experiences with providers in the perinatal period, with one exception. In a study of bisexual women who were trying to conceive, were pregnant, or were new parents, Ross and colleagues (2012) noted briefly that women who were partnered with men were less likely to have disclosed their sexual orientation to family, friends, and health providers relative to other women in the sample. Some women described conflicting feelings about ways in which their heterosexual privilege (i.e., the social benefits of being partnered with a man) had contributed to invisibility of their bisexual identity—an experience that troubled them in that it isolated them from a potential source of community. In an analysis of quantitative data from the same study, Steele, Ross, Epstein, Strike, and Goldfinger (2008) found that women who had conceived with a man were more likely to report an unmet need for mental health services than SMW who conceived via other means. Thus, the limited data suggest that bisexual women partnered with men may experience invisibility and possibly unmet health-care needs in the perinatal period.

The Current Study

There is a lack of research on male-partnered SMW's health-care experiences, and during the perinatal period specifically, although there is some suggestion that perinatal health-care providers (e.g., midwives, OB/GYNs¹) may tend to "read" male-partnered SMW as heterosexual (in terms of identity and behavior), and women themselves may not disclose their sexual identities or histories. Given that the perinatal period is a time of elevated invisibility of sexual minority identity and increased health service use for male-partnered SMW, it offers an ideal context in which to examine women's choices and feelings about disclosure to providers. Such work is particularly important in that male-partnered SMW, by virtue of their sexual relationships with men, likely make up a large proportion of SMW, and specifically childbearing SMW (Moegelin, Nilsson, & Helström, 2010), as evidenced by the fact that bisexual women are more likely to have children than lesbians (Goldberg, Gartrell, & Gates, 2014).

This study explored male-partnered SMW's views of and experiences with disclosure to health-care providers during the perinatal period. We provide data on their sexual identities (e.g., preferred labels) and perspectives on disclosure in general (i.e., with people that they do not know well) before presenting data on their choices and feelings about disclosure in relation to providers. Of interest is the extent to which these women engage in active disclosure (i.e., volunteering the information), passive disclosure (responding to a provider's inquiries), nondisclosure, or concealment (McNair et al., 2012). Also of interest are their feelings about and reasons for (non)disclosure and their perceptions of the consequences of (non)disclosure on the effectiveness of their care. We

place these disclosure-related concerns in the context of their broader relationships with providers by providing data on their experiences more generally with prenatal care.

Method

Participants

Included in the study are data from 28 SMW partnered with men who were interviewed during the perinatal period. In our pilot work (Flanders, Gibson, Goldberg, & Ross, 2015), we found that sexual behavior in interaction with partner gender was significantly associated with women's mental health. As such, we used a broad definition of "sexual minority" in this study that was based on not only self-identity but also sexual history (i.e., having had at least one female partner in the past 5 years). A description of the sample appears in Table 1. Twenty-four of the women were pregnant at the time of the interview; in 4 cases, women were interviewed 1–2 weeks after the birth of their baby. Most women were first-time parents, White, and had at least a bachelor's degree. Women were between 22 and 44 years ($M = 31.39$, $SD = 4.97$) of age. Approximately half were employed full time; the remainder were working part time, were students, or were not employed. Approximately half of the sample reported one to two sexual partners in the past 5 years, and approximately half reported three or more partners during that time period. Most women reported that their sexual relationships during the past 5 years were either with men and women about equally or mostly with men. Regarding the length of their current relationships, most reported a relationship duration of more than 2 years.

Analysis and interpretation of the open-ended data indicated that most women ($n = 20$) identified as bisexual (although a few of them stated that they sometimes identified as queer, depending on the context); two identified as primarily heterosexual but open to future relationships with women; and one each identified as queer, bicurious, bi/pansexual, heterosexual, heteroflexible, and unlabeled. Two thirds ($n = 19$) described at least one serious or long-term sexual and romantic relationships with women. The remainder ($n = 9$) described primarily sexual encounters with women.

Procedures

The current study was approved by the human subjects committees at [Clark University and the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health]. Women were recruited through consecutive sampling from selected midwifery clinics and OB/GYNs (including hospital-based and stand-alone practices) during presentation for prenatal care in and around the city of Toronto, Canada and cities and towns in Western and Central Massachusetts, United States (Worcester, Northampton, Holyoke, Greenfield, and Westfield). A multiregion, multisite design was necessary because perinatal SMW are a relatively small population. The two specific regions were chosen because of the high density of SMW in these areas.

¹ A doctor who deals with the birth of children and with diseases that affect the female reproductive system. OB is an abbreviation for obstetrics or for an obstetrician, a physician who delivers babies. GYN is an abbreviation for gynecology or for a gynecologist.

Table 1
Selected Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 28)

Demographic variable	<i>n</i> (%)
First-time parents	18 (64.3)
Race	
White	23 (82.1)
Of color ^a	5 (17.9)
Education	
High school or less	4 (14.3)
Some college or technical certificate	3 (10.7)
Associate or bachelor's degree	10 (35.7)
Higher degree	11 (39.3)
Employment	
Full time	15 (53.6)
Other	13 (46.4)
Household income	
<\$30,000	8 (28.6)
\$30,000–59,999	5 (17.8)
\$60,000–99,999	7 (25.0)
≥\$100,000	8 (28.6)
Number of past partners (in past 5 years)	
1	6 (21.4)
2	7 (25.0)
≥3	15 (53.6)
Gender of past partners	
Mostly women	2 (7.1)
Women and men equally	8 (28.6)
Mostly men	11 (39.3)
Exclusively men	7 (25.0)
Marital status	
Married	18 (64.3)
Unmarried ^b	10 (35.7)
Relationship duration of current relationship	
<2 years	8 (28)
2–10 years	14 (50)
>10 years	6 (21)
Consensual nonmonogamy	
Yes ^c	9 (32.1)
No	19 (67.9)
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Age, years	31.39 (4.97)

^a This category includes four Latina participants and one East-Indian/South-Asian participant. ^b One participant was engaged to her partner. ^c Classification of consensual nonmonogamy (including threesomes, swinging, open relationships, and polyamory) was based upon our interpretation of participants' interview data.

Within these regions, recruitment sites ($n = 11$) were located in various different geographic locations, rural and urban, serving low-, middle-, and high-income women. Women attending a prenatal care visit at 25–32 weeks gestation were asked to complete a brief questionnaire including (a) sexual orientation, (b) gender of sexual partners in the past 5 years, and (c) current partner status. This prescreen enabled us to obtain a systematic sample of “invisible sexual minority women”: women who were currently partnered with a man but reported having had a least one female sexual partner in the past 5 years and/or identified with a nonheterosexual identification (e.g., bisexual, queer). To be eligible for participation, all women also had to be pregnant, at least 18 years old, and fluently speak English.

Potentially eligible participants were contacted by research staff to be invited to participate in an Internet-based survey. Of the eligible consecutively recruited participants who were contacted

(75% of attempted contacts), 89% ($n = 31$) consented. Of these 31 women, 29 consented to also participate in in-depth prenatal interviews. One of these women was partnered with a transgender woman. We included her in the original sample given our interest in her experience as an “invisible” sexual minority. Given that she was not male partnered, we did not include her in the current study. Thus, we only include data from the 28 male-partnered women in this analysis.

Most women were interviewed prenatally; in four cases, women were interviewed 1–2 weeks after delivery either because of early delivery of the baby or scheduling difficulties. Most interviews took place in person; five were telephone interviews. Interviews were conducted by one of the two principal investigators of the study or trained graduate or postgraduate students. Interviewers were diverse in terms of age, sexual orientation, and parental status. The interviews ranged in length from 1 to 2 h and were mostly conducted at the participants' homes, although some women preferred the interview to be conducted at the investigator's office or a restaurant.

Interviews followed a semistructured interview guide that probed areas such as feelings about the pregnancy/parenting; support/nonsupport from partner, family, friends, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) community, and health-care workers; and sexual history. Relevant to this particular study were questions that addressed how women saw their sexual identities and histories as impacting their experience of pregnancy, their openness about their sexual identities/histories, their experiences seeking out and interacting with health-care providers during pregnancy, whether providers were aware of their sexual history or identity, and the perceived importance of sharing this information.

Data Analysis

Participants responses were transcribed and examined using thematic analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The thematic analysis focused on women's descriptions of their sexual identities and histories, their general openness and patterns of disclosure, and their experiences with health-care providers. The analysis was informed by the literatures on bisexual and nonmonosexual identities, health-care experiences of sexual minorities, and concealment and disclosure.

To develop themes, the first author, a professor of psychology, initiated the coding process with open coding. She engaged in line-by-line analysis to generate initial theoretical categories (Charmaz, 2006). For example, she generated the initial codes “does/does not disclose sexual history to providers” to describe women's general stance on disclosure. As she moved to focused coding, she refined these codes; for example, “discloses to providers” was replaced by two codes: (a) “discloses in response to explicit questioning about sexual identity (passive)” and (b) “discloses spontaneously (active).” Furthermore, she developed sub-codes to denote reasons for and conditions of nondisclosure (e.g., perceptions of irrelevance). These focused codes, which are more conceptual and selective, became the basis for the “themes” developed in the analysis (Patton, 2002).

The third author, a doctoral student in psychology and a graduate research assistant on the project, coded a select number of transcripts (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2013) to serve as an outside perspective on the emerging categories and to provide a

reliability check. This coder independently coded the data. Subsequently, the two coders examined their level of agreement upon codes. Inter-coder agreement ranged from 85% to 94% (number of agreements/number of agreements + disagreements), indicating good reliability. Coding disagreements were discussed; these discussions led to a minor refinement of the scheme. The final scheme was established once both coders had verified agreement among all of the independently coded data.

Results

To provide context for the findings regarding women's disclosure to providers, we first discuss the degree to which they tended to share information about their sexual histories and identities in new or relatively unfamiliar relationships in general. Then we briefly discuss their experiences with providers, which provides context for talking about their disclosure practices and explanations for these practices in the perinatal health-care setting (see Table 2 for key themes).

Approaches to and Perspectives on Disclosure in Everyday Life

All 28 women asserted that their male partners (all of who reportedly identified as heterosexual) were aware of their sexual identities and histories. However, in general, women reported that

they did not tend to disclose information about their sexual identities and histories to people outside of their friend/family network, although notably, not a single woman said that they specifically sought to conceal this information, and some ($n = 8$) specifically noted that they did not attempt to hide it. Brigitte,² a bisexual woman, reflected, "I guess it's on a need-to-know basis. Right, like I wouldn't say that I hide it, but I don't go around and talk to people about what I do for sex" [*laugh*]. Meredith, also bisexual, asserted,

For women like me, [with a husband], nobody knows that you're bi unless you tell them. I'm not gonna like, meet someone and be like '... and I'm bisexual.' But I'm definitely not one of those people that make a point to hide.

In explaining their general lack of disclosure, most women ($n = 20$) noted that this information did not organically or regularly "come up in daily conversation." Common statements were "it's typically not relevant" and "it doesn't come up." Maxine, a bisexual woman, stated, "As normal parts of conversation . . . it's not like things come up where I feel like I need to catalogue my sexual history with someone." Sharon, also bisexual, said, "By and large it doesn't come up because talking about sexuality or relationships beyond day to day gripes about living with your husband or wife—they're not conversations that typically come up." In turn, women generally did not "avoid telling people" but also did not "go out of [their] way" to make the information known.

Although this lack of disclosure was largely discussed in terms of the fact that the topic "rarely came up," some of the women ($n = 8$) directly or indirectly hinted at bisexual invisibility as a reason for the absence of situations or conversations during which it would seem natural to "come out" about their sexual identities or histories. They noted that they were consistently "read" as heterosexual because of their relational configuration and gender presentation (i.e., feminine): "I'm a fairly feminine woman and he's a fairly masculine guy so that doesn't challenge people's notions of us being straight" (Sheila, bisexual). Carrie, a bisexual woman, shared, "There's not this need to come out about it, which is why I think so many bisexual people are closeted. If I'm in a heterosexual relationship . . . [it's like], why do I need to be out? . . . It's easy to get by being a bisexual person and not having to be out about it, 'cause I'm with a man."

"Passing" as heterosexual meant that women had access to heterosexual privilege, which they did not necessarily want: "I do struggle a little bit with . . . some guilt around my ability to . . . fluidly move into places of privilege" (Stacy, bisexual). However, to correct assumptions of heterosexuality could potentially "create an awkward situation; I don't like to offend people." On the other hand, a few women who acknowledged that people generally assumed that they were heterosexual noted a lack of discomfort with these assumptions: "It doesn't weigh on me."

In addition to highlighting the role of bisexual invisibility in nondisclosure, a few women ($n = 3$) acknowledged that concerns about biphobia also affected their lack of disclosure. Carrie, bisexual, stated: "There's a lot of taboos that go along with being bisexual, so it's not something that I think I'm that out about. I feel like it makes people uncomfortable, and they somehow associate it

Table 2

Key Themes Regarding Disclosure of Sexual Identity/History and Provider Experiences

Major codes and subcodes	<i>n</i>
Reasons for nondisclosure ^a	
Lack of relevance	20
Bisexual invisibility	8
Concerns about biphobia	3
Stigmas around nonmonogamy	3
Types of health-care providers	
Midwives (alone or with OB/GYNs)	22
OB/GYNs only	6
Benefits of midwives as providers ^a	
Holistic and natural approach	13
Responsive and hands-on	9
Respectful and nondogmatic style	4
Less heteronormative stance	2
Reasons for switching providers ($n = 7$) ^a	
Continuity/intimacy of care	4
Provider philosophy	4
Accessibility	2
Disclosure to health-care providers	
Disclosed in response to direct provider inquiry	1
Disclosed in response to indirect inquiry	2
Initiated disclosure (provider did not ask)	3
Did not disclose	22
Perceptions of importance of disclosure to providers	
Not relevant, in general	12
Relevant under conditions of potential sexual risk	8
Not relevant, but prefer an LGBTQ-affirming provider	7
Important for providers to ask	1

Note. LGBTQ = lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer; OB = obstetrician; GNY = gynecologist;

^a Categories are not mutually exclusive (respondents sometimes cited multiple factors).

² All names are pseudonyms.

with being kinky or dirty.” Alicia, also bisexual, was aware that some people think that bisexual

means that you need to be with a man *and* a woman, or that monogamy will be hard for you or that you’re somehow confused or something . . . so [bisexual] is not an easy label because of the baggage that comes with it, [and] people’s misconceptions.

In turn, she felt that it was easier “not to talk about it.” A few women ($n = 3$) who were in open relationships described feeling that the stigma surrounding nonmonogamy were even greater than the stigma surrounding bisexuality. In turn, concerns about encountering discrimination based on their nonmonogamous identities prevented them from disclosing about their sexual identities because it seemed impossible to be open about one without being open about the other. Stacy, bisexual, explained:

I actually think it’s way more easier to be in a same-sex relationships and [be open about] that with straight colleagues than it is to explain about polyamory or talk about having more than one partner, or bringing those partners to events. So I actually found that at my last job, even though I would say close to half the staff was in same sex relationships, that I never talked about my dating life. And that was really more about the poly stuff.

General Experiences With Perinatal Health-Care Providers

Before describing women’s experiences of disclosure with perinatal providers, it is necessary to contextualize these data by briefly describing their general experiences with providers. As described in the section that follows, despite their positive experiences with providers, women were unlikely to disclose their sexual identities regardless of provider type.

Most women ($n = 15$) were cared for only by midwives, of which seven reported being seen by more than one midwife. Seven women were seen at practices (hospital and community-based) with OB/GYNs and midwives, of which four reported being seen by more than one midwife. Finally, six women reported being cared for only by OB/GYNs. Given that most of the women saw midwives, it is not surprising that women frequently highlighted the positive qualities of midwives, often contrasting them with “traditional” providers (e.g., OB/GYNs). One perceived advantage of midwives was their tendency to embrace *holistic and natural approaches* to pregnancy and birth, whereby they minimized the need for interventions, especially during birth; promoted natural childbirth and home birth; and were generally “attuned” to not only women’s physical experience of pregnancy and birth but their emotional experience of it ($n = 13$). Another theme was the perception of midwives as more *available, responsive, and hands-on* ($n = 9$), whereby they booked “longer appointment times” and spent time “creating good rapport.” A *respectful, collaborative, and “nondogmatic” style* was named by a few women as typical of midwives ($n = 4$), such that discussions regarding their care and birth plan were a “conversation, [not] an instruction.” Two women perceived a *less heteronormative stance* and greater openness to queerness as more likely among midwives (i.e., it was consistent with their “philosophy”). Terry, bisexual, chose a midwife because she “[wanted] somebody who wouldn’t make assumptions of who I’ve had sex with in my life or who I want to have sex with or how I have sex actually.”

Some women ($n = 7$) described having switched providers during the prenatal period. Women’s reasons for changing providers centered on *continuity and intimacy of care* (e.g., they wanted to see the same provider at every appointment; $n = 4$), *philosophy* (i.e., they wanted a provider who shared their views on vaccinations, breastfeeding, and natural childbirth; $n = 4$), and *accessibility* (i.e., they wanted a provider that was closer to where they lived; $n = 2$).

Disclosure to Perinatal Health-Care Providers

Only one woman, Stacy, reported that she had been asked about her sexual history and/or identity—either in person or via paperwork—by a health-care provider during the prenatal period. Stacy said that she “ticked” a box on the paperwork to indicate that she was bisexual/queer; however, despite this, and the fact that she was “there with [her] male partner,” her midwife had not followed up on or initiated a conversation about this information. In two cases, women disclosed in response to a related but not direct question about sexual history by their providers. Terry, bisexual, tried to recall exactly how the conversation had unfolded:

I feel like [provider] does know. I felt like one of the questions that she had to ask, health-wise, was about that and I think one of them was like, you know, how long has it been since you had sex, and . . . I said “We’ve been monogamous; but I had sex with men and women before that” or something.

Finally, three women said that despite no direct or indirect inquiry regarding their sexual history or identity, they had indeed volunteered this information to their providers. Of note, all three recalled that their providers seemed to have taken the information in stride and had had little reaction. For example, Liza noted that her midwife “seem[ed] fine,” in response to her disclosure that she was bisexual and had a history of relationships with both men and women.

In contrast to these exceptions, most women ($n = 22$) noted that their providers had “assumed that they were straight” and/or had not inquired about any alternative identifications or a sexual history with women; in turn, they had not disclosed their sexual history or identity. Arielle, who was bisexual, said,

They didn’t ask on any forms that I can remember. . . . Providers or nurses or whatever, they assume that I’m married to a man. I know that based on their language . . . you know, “What does your husband do?” when I’ve never said I have a husband.

Sophie, who was pansexual, said that in the health-care setting, she typically encountered “the usual assumption of, you know, they see me with my fiancé . . . and think, oh, hetero couple . . . I feel like, you know, the appearance is, guy, girl, baby . . . clearly they did something to [get pregnant].”

Many participants ($n = 12$) explicitly described feeling that it was not important or relevant to disclose their sexual history or identity to their perinatal providers. They stated unequivocally that their sexual history had not only not come up, but also, they did not see it as relevant to disclose, although three provided the caveat that they felt that it was important to disclose to providers “on the behavioral health side of things” (i.e., therapists). Greta, who was bisexual, stated, “It never came up and did not feel particularly

relevant to the current situation [pregnancy]. . . . We're just sort of dealing with *this* right now."

Several of these women ($n = 4$) explicitly noted that although they did not see how it was relevant, they would share the information if asked. Rose, who was bisexual, said, "If they needed to know for any reason, I wouldn't have any problem telling them. I [just] don't really offer stuff out of the way to people." Thus, at least some of these women did not perceive themselves as hiding their sexual history or identity; rather, they described themselves as open to providing the information if and when they were asked (despite not seeing it as relevant).

In some cases ($n = 8$), women noted that although they had not disclosed because it had not come up, they did believe that such information could be relevant under certain circumstances—namely those involving sexual risk, such as if they were seeking testing or treatment for STIs and/or if they were in an open relationship and having sex outside of their relationship with their primary male partner, such that they "may have been exposed to such and such a thing." Iris, bisexual, remarked, "It's interesting [that they never asked], because I feel like there's aspects of your sexual history that kind of come up in, you know, midwifery care, gynecological care."

Other women ($n = 7$) shared the perspective that although they did not feel compelled to disclose their sexual identities or histories to providers—and, likewise, it was not essential that providers inquire about it—they did prefer to see providers who were queer affirming, and who did not make assumptions about their sexual orientation. They asserted that if they had a provider who was homophobic or biphobic, they "would not feel comfortable with that." Keira, bisexual, said, "If one of my providers said something to me that I thought was discriminatory towards gay people or something, I would be really offended and wouldn't want to see them again."

A few of these women ($n = 3$) explicitly noted that their providers had offered indications that they were queer affirming, which put them at ease and perhaps made it seem less important to disclose (i.e., to figure out a provider's attitudes). Patty, who did not identify with any label, was aware that her OB/GYN was gay, had children, and served "many gay couples." Knowing these details made Patty feel like, "as a human being, she has a slightly different perspective. And I value that, that she has a different viewpoint. To me, she's an awesome, awesome doctor." Maxine, bisexual, described how the midwifery clinic she attended had

posters up [of] different queer families, [like], "we're against discrimination in medical settings" and . . . like, "we support [all families]." It's just very open and out. So I didn't feel like I was on high alert . . . and just with my midwife, she was just so . . . open minded and just very relaxed that I didn't feel like I needed to push anything. Honestly, if I felt like a midwife was . . . not like that, I would probably request that I change midwives. Having prejudice or biases against queer people is like, totally unacceptable to me.

In contrast to these women, one woman, Rayna, who was bisexual, said that she would not switch providers if she suspected that they were homophobic or biphobic, noting further that "I probably wouldn't say anything [about my sexual identity] just because I wouldn't want them to discriminate against me afterwards because of it . . . I would probably just keep my mouth shut."

Only one woman had strong feelings about the desirability of having perinatal providers ask explicitly about sexual identity/history. Sophie, who was pansexual, felt that "knowing that information will definitely help a medical professional connect. . . . You want to make a connection with your patient. I as the patient . . . would want someone to actually care enough to [ask]." She went on to say that she would probably prefer a provider that was LGBTQ-savvy, because "they may have a little bit better of an understanding . . . [of what] makes [me] unique."

Discussion

This study explored how male-partnered SMW, who represent a large proportion of childbearing SMW, experience disclosure of their sexual identities and histories to perinatal providers. Because the perinatal period is a time of heightened invisibility of sexual minority identity and increased health service use (between 80% and 95% of American and Canadian women receive prenatal care; Child Trends, 2015; Public Health Agency of Canada, 2009), it offers an ideal context in which to explore women's choices and feelings about disclosure to providers.

Dominant discourses about sexual minority identity have historically positioned sexual identity disclosure as "good" (because it is seen as facilitating or reflecting healthy sexual identity development) whereas nondisclosure is positioned as "bad" (McLean, 2007). As such, there is a "disclosure imperative" attached to living as LGB. However, as McLean (2007) argues, for bisexual people, perhaps especially those in different-gender relationships, coming out to others may be experienced as more complicated or less necessary (e.g., due to bisexual invisibility and stigma), thus challenging the notion of the disclosure imperative. Likewise, research suggests that bisexual individuals often explain nondisclosure of their sexual identity or behaviors by stating that others have no reason to know or the topic is too personal (Schrimshaw et al., 2014; Wandrey et al., 2015), highlighting how the perceived costs of disclosure may seem to outweigh the benefits.

The narratives of the participants extend and nuance such findings. When discussing disclosure to individuals that they did not know well, they tended to state that they did not perceive it as relevant—although some also invoked bisexual invisibility as contributing to their nondisclosure, as well as concerns about stigma related to their bisexual and/or nonmonogamous identities (McLean, 2007). Likewise, with regard to perinatal providers, most women did not disclose their sexual identities/histories, typically because they did not see it as relevant, although some women indicated that it would be important under certain specific circumstances, such as if they were concerned about their sexual health, which echoes some prior work demonstrating that LGB individuals are more likely to disclose their sexual orientation to their physician if they have discussed sex or sexual health of any kind (Meckler, Elliott, Kanouse, Beals, & Schuster, 2006). Such nondisclosure is notable in light of women's generally positive experiences with providers. That these male-partnered SMW were unlikely to openly or voluntarily share their sexual identities/histories did not, in most cases, seem to stem from fear of marginalization. Instead, nondisclosure resulted from low perceived salience or relevance, and, perhaps, uncertainty about how to raise the issue amid bisexual invisibility and lack of invitation to provide the information.

Indeed, some women said that they would be open to providing this information if directly asked; that is, they were open to passive disclosure but did not see the need for active disclosure (McNair et al., 2012). In the presence of a neutral/positive provider-patient relationship, questions about sexual history or identity (e.g., in person or via paperwork) could perhaps be experienced as indicating openness to nonheterosexual behaviors and identities, which could foster greater openness on behalf of women and a more positive relationship between women and providers.

At the same time, some participants expressed their relative preference to have an LGBTQ-savvy or affirming provider, and a few said that they would switch providers if they seemed to be homophobic or biphobic. These findings echo those of Quinn et al. (2015), who found that LGB respondents tended to feel more trust toward a health-care setting that had the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) logo (i.e., a symbol of equality) than one that did not, although bisexual men and women were less likely to notice the symbol than lesbians. Thus, although a queer-affirming atmosphere was named as desirable by some women, it may not be as salient for them as it might be for female-partnered pregnant women. However, explicit indications of acceptance of bisexuality may be particularly important to some women who have sexual histories with women. Several women did note that their providers had assumed they were heterosexual, and some articulated an attunement to bisexual stigma (Bostwick, 2012), which may have contributed to their general reluctance to share information about their sexual history with their perinatal providers.

Given women's elevated risk for mental health challenges during the perinatal period, it is important for women to establish good relationships with providers, who can serve as sources of support and resources should women encounter emotional challenges in the postpartum period. Significantly, women generally described positive relationships with providers, with many noting the benefits of specifically seeing midwives. It is possible that these relationships could be further enhanced by explicit environmental cues that communicate inclusion and acceptance of diverse families, relationships, and sexualities. This was, after all, identified as more important by some women than explicitly asking about sexual history/identity. In the presence of such cues, women might perhaps feel more comfortable about mentioning their sexual history and/or may feel encouraged to talk about this topic if and when it feels relevant to do so (Koh et al., 2014).

Given that women generally indicated that they did not try to conceal their sexual histories, interventions that focus on disclosure to providers may be misplaced in light of work suggesting that it is concealment (which may be motivated by internalized homophobia) that has the most negative effects on well-being (Dyar et al., 2015; Jackson & Mohr, 2016). However, efforts to facilitate disclosure (e.g., via affirming environmental cues) may be beneficial in that providers are better equipped to offer appropriate referrals if they know patients' sexual histories. Indeed, if a provider knows that her patient identifies as bisexual, then she can refer her to a biaffirmative therapist for the treatment of postpartum depression or recommend a bi-inclusive support group for new parents.

Recommendations

On the basis of our findings, it seems important that providers—particularly those of perinatal care—avoid assuming that their patients are heterosexual on the basis of current male partnership. Explicit awareness of the tendency to assume a heteronormative lens may encourage providers to approach their patients with greater openness and sensitivity (e.g., in terms of their language and assessment tools). By working to acknowledge their own heteronormative value systems, and how these may frame their assumptions and interactions, providers can become more skilled in their approach to LGBTQ patients.

Insomuch as some women indicated that they would disclose if they felt that they were in a “safe space” and/or if they were asked, providers should seek to communicate an LGBTQ-affirming stance and to consider whether to ask about patient sexual identity and history. Providers can communicate affirmation of diverse sexual identities, families, and relationships via visual cues, medical forms, and resource lists (e.g., that contain LGBTQ community resources). Ensuring that these lists are made available to all patients is important, given the potential invisibility of patients' sexual identities. Providers should develop relationships with community LGBTQ organizations to ensure that their resource recommendations are well informed, and to highlight their own investment in providing sensitive perinatal care to members of the LGBTQ community.

In considering questions for medical forms, providers who choose to assess aspects of patient sexuality should be aware that sexual history, sexual identity, and partner gender represent different components of sexuality and should evaluate whether it makes sense to ask about any or all of these; in turn, they should not request data about one component and use it to make conclusions about others (Bauer & Brennan, 2013). In talking with patients (e.g., about sexual identity), providers should use their language, and, if in doubt, ask what terms they prefer. Providers should also respond nonjudgmentally to patients' language choices and to disclosures of sexual histories and behaviors more generally (Eady et al., 2011).

In sum, providers' ability to communicate awareness of sexual orientation diversity in a nonprejudicial manner may enhance LGBTQ patients' comfort and willingness to disclose details of their sexual history, possibly facilitating improved care and better health outcomes. Although it ultimately appears important for providers to anticipate and accept sexual diversity among patients, it is also necessary that providers understand that “when it comes to issues of disclosing sexual orientation, this may or may not be uppermost in the patient's mind” (Seeman, 2015, p. 312). As we saw in our findings, given that the meaning and salience of sexual history may vary significantly, it necessary that providers avoid making assumptions about meaning and salience on the basis of one piece of data (e.g., a client has a prior history of same-sex relationships).

Limitations and Conclusions

Although our sampling technique has many strengths, including identifying women who are less identified with or “out” about their sexual minority status, we may have underrepresented SMW who underutilize health care by virtue of drawing on women who were being seen by perinatal providers. Research suggests that racial mi-

norities are disproportionately represented among women who do not seek prenatal care; reasons for not seeking prenatal care often include substance abuse and financial problems (Child Trends, 2015; Friedman, Heneghan, & Rosenthal, 2009). Thus, women who do not seek prenatal care and are also sexual minorities may possess multiple risk factors that could impact their transition to parenthood. In addition, the geographic regions from which we drew participants likely had implications for their disclosure experiences. The experiences of pregnant SMW partnered with men might be very different in politically conservative and religious regions. In addition, although there was variability within the sample with regard to educational and financial status, most women were college educated, which inevitably had implications for their constructions of their sexual identity, health-care choices, and decision-making regarding disclosure. Our findings may not generalize to women of diverse backgrounds. Finally, we cannot generalize these findings to nonpregnant male-partnered SMW, nor to this population's disclosure experiences with other types of health providers. Indeed, the literature is consistent in showing that individuals' reasons for disclosure and nondisclosure of their sexual histories/identities vary considerably across different types of "targets" (Schrimshaw et al., 2013). As such, reasons for and rates of (non)disclosure to midwives or OB/GYNs may be different from those in relation to mental health or infectious disease providers, for example.

A strength of our study is that it reveals the diversity of sexual orientations and identities within the larger category of SMW partnered with men. However, the variability of our sample is also a limitation inasmuch as a sizable minority of women endorsed self-identifications other than bisexual, including, most notably, heterosexual. For example, had we gathered data from a larger number of heterosexual-identified women with a recent history of sexual relationships with women, it may have been possible to explore in greater depth how experiences of disclosure vary according to self-identification. Future work should seek to explore how sexual identification and its salience shape disclosure for diverse SMW, particularly those who are pregnant and on the cusp of entering "parenthood culture," which is largely heteronormative (Goldberg et al., 2014). In addition, we also only interviewed SMW partnered with men; we did not include nonmonosexual (e.g., bisexual) women partnered with women. Thus, we do not know how our participants' disclosure experiences may compare to those of women who have a history of relationships with men but are partnered with women and thus presumed lesbian by their health-care providers.

Despite these limitations, our study makes a contribution to the literature by expanding our understanding of how male-partnered SMW think about and navigate disclosure in the health-care setting and specifically during the perinatal period. The diversity in these women's identities and perspectives highlights the unique concerns and considerations of a group that is often invisible in society, in health care, and in research. Future work should aim to build on these findings to probe even more deeply into the lived experiences of male-partnered SMW as they navigate partnership and parenthood.

References

- Austin, M. P. (2004). Antenatal screening and early intervention for "perinatal" distress, depression and anxiety: Where to from here? *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 7, 1–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00737-003-0034-4>
- Bauer, G., & Brennan, D. (2013). The problem with "behavioral bisexuality": Assessing sexual orientation in survey research. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 13, 148–165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2013.782260>
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Bostwick, W. (2012). Assessing bisexual stigma and mental health status: A brief report. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 12, 214–222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2012.674860>
- Bostwick, W. B., Hughes, T. L., & Everett, B. (2015). Health behavior, status, and outcomes among a community-based sample of lesbian and bisexual women. *LGBT Health*, 2, 121–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2014.0074>
- Burnett, E., Loucks, T. L., & Lindsay, M. (2015). Perinatal outcomes in HIV positive pregnant women with concomitant sexually transmitted infections. *Infectious Diseases in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 2015, Article ID: 508482. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2015/508482>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Child Trends. (2015). *Late or no prenatal care*. Retrieved from <http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=late-or-no-prenatal-care>
- Colledge, L., Hickson, F., Reid, D., & Weatherburn, P. (2015). Poorer mental health in UK bisexual women than lesbians: Evidence from the UK 2007 Stonewall Women's Health Survey. *Journal of Public Health*, 37, 427–437. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdu105>
- Durso, L. E., & Meyer, I. H. (2013). Patterns and predictors of disclosure of sexual orientation to healthcare providers among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC*, 10, 35–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13178-012-0105-2>
- Dyar, C., Feinstein, B. A., & London, B. (2014). Dimensions of sexual identity and minority stress among bisexual women: The role of partner gender. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1, 441–451. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000063>
- Dyar, C., Feinstein, B., & London, B. (2015). Mediators of differences between lesbians and bisexual women in sexual identity and minority stress. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 2, 43–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000090>
- Eady, A., Dobinson, C., & Ross, L. E. (2011). Bisexual people's experiences with mental health services: A qualitative investigation. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 47, 378–389. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10597-010-9329-x>
- Emory, K., Kim, Y., Buchting, F., Vera, L., Huang, J., & Emery, S. L. (2016). Intragroup variance in lesbian, gay, and bisexual tobacco use behaviors: Evidence that subgroups matter, notably bisexual women. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, 18, 1494–1501. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntv208>
- Flanders, C., Gibson, M., Goldberg, A. E., & Ross, L. E. (2015). Postpartum depression among visible and invisible sexual minority women: A pilot study. *Archives of Women's Health*, 19, 299–305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00737-015-0566-4>
- Friedman, S. H., Heneghan, A., & Rosenthal, M. (2009). Characteristics of women who do not seek prenatal care and implications for prevention. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing: Clinical Scholarship for the Care of Women, Childbearing Families, & Newborns*, 38, 174–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6909.2009.01004.x>
- Goldberg, A. E., Gartrell, N., & Gates, G. (2014). *Research report on LGB-parent families* (pp. 1–35). Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law.
- Jackson, S. D., & Mohr, J. J. (2016). Conceptualizing the closet: Differentiating stigma concealment and nondisclosure processes. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 3, 80–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000147>
- Koh, C. S., Kang, M., & Usherwood, T. (2014). 'I demand to be treated as the person I am': Experiences of accessing primary health care for

- Australian adults who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or queer. *Sexual Health*, 11, 258–264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/SH14007>
- Loureiro, M. I., Goes, A. R., Paim da Câmara, G., Gonçalves-Pereira, M., Maia, T., & Saboga Nunes, L. (2009). Priorities for mental health promotion during pregnancy and infancy in primary health care. *Global Health Promotion*, 16, 29–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1757975908100748>
- McLean, K. (2007). Hiding in the closet? Bisexuals, coming out and the disclosure imperative. *Journal of Sociology*, 43, 151–166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1440783307076893>
- McNair, R. P., Hegarty, K., & Taft, A. (2012). From silence to sensitivity: A new Identity Disclosure model to facilitate disclosure for same-sex attracted women in general practice consultations. *Social Science & Medicine*, 75, 208–216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.02.037>
- Meckler, G. D., Elliott, M. N., Kanouse, D. E., Beals, K. P., & Schuster, M. A. (2006). Nondisclosure of sexual orientation to a physician among a sample of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 160, 1248–1254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.160.12.1248>
- Megnín-Viggars, O., Symington, I., Howard, L. M., & Pilling, S. (2015). Experience of care for mental health problems in the antenatal or postnatal period for women in the UK: A systematic review and meta-synthesis of qualitative research. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 18, 745–759. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00737-015-0548-6>
- Miles, M., Huberman, M., & Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moegelin, L., Nilsson, B., & Helström, L. (2010). Reproductive health in lesbian and bisexual women in Sweden. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*, 89, 205–209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/00016340903490263>
- Mohr, J. J., Jackson, S. D., & Sheets, R. L. (2016). Sexual orientation self-presentation among bisexual-identified women and men: Patterns and predictors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0808-1>
- Mor, Z., Eick, U., Wagner Kolasko, G., Zviely-Efrat, I., Makadon, H., & Davidovitch, N. (2015). Health status, behavior, and care of lesbian and bisexual women in Israel. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 12, 1249–1256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jsm.12850>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Public Health Agency of Canada. (2009). *What mothers say: The Canadian Maternity Experiences Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/rhs-ssg/survey-enquete/mes-eem-1-eng.php>
- Quinn, G., Sutton, S., Winfield, B., Breen, S., Canales, J., Shetty, G., . . . Schabath, M. (2015). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning (LGBTQ) perceptions and health care experiences. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 27, 246–261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10538720.2015.1022273>
- Ross, L., & Goldberg, A. E. (2016). Perinatal experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. In A. Wenzel & S. Stuart (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of perinatal psychology* (pp. 618–631). New York, NY: Oxford.
- Ross, L. E., Siegel, A., Dobinson, R., Epstein, R., & Steele, L. (2012). “I don’t want to turn totally invisible”: Mental health, stressors, and supports among bisexual women during the perinatal period. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 8, 137–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2012.660791>
- Schrimshaw, E. W., Downing, M. J., Jr., Cohn, D. J., & Siegel, K. (2014). Conceptions of privacy and the non-disclosure of same-sex behaviour by behaviourally-bisexual men in heterosexual relationships. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 16, 351–365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2014.887779>
- Schrimshaw, E. W., Siegel, K., Downing, M. J., Jr., & Parsons, J. T. (2013). Disclosure and concealment of sexual orientation and the mental health of non-gay-identified, behaviorally bisexual men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 81, 141–153. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031272>
- Seeman, M. V. (2015). Sexual minority women in treatment for serious mental illness: A literature review. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 19, 303–319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2015.1026016>
- Sherman, M. D., Kauth, M. R., Shipherd, J. C., & Street, R. L., Jr. (2014). Communication between VA providers and sexual and gender minority veterans: A pilot study. *Psychological Services*, 11, 235–242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035840>
- Steele, L. S., Ross, L. E., Epstein, R., Strike, C., & Goldfinger, C. (2008). Correlates of mental health service use among lesbian, gay, and bisexual mothers and prospective mothers. *Women & Health*, 47, 95–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03630240802134225>
- Wandrey, R., Mosack, K., & Moore, E. (2015). Coming out to family and friends as bisexually identified young adult women: A discussion of homophobia, biphobia, and heteronormativity. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 15, 204–229. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2015.1018657>
- Yedid Sion, M., Harlev, A., Weintraub, A. Y., Sergienko, R., & Sheiner, E. (2016). Is antenatal depression associated with adverse obstetric and perinatal outcomes? *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine*, 29, 863–867. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/14767058.2015.1023708>

Received August 19, 2016

Revision received November 15, 2016

Accepted November 17, 2016 ■