

I appreciate the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled, “Mental health, resilience, and well-being among sexual minority college students: A study framed by the minority stress and minority resilience models” submitted to *Social Sciences* for consideration in the special issue on *Foundational Social Science Research on LGBTQ+ Communities and Populations*. The focus on mental health among college students, especially once that is more comprehensive, is an important one and I appreciate the author(s) for engaging such a focus. Below, I offer some suggestions that I believe can help strengthen this work.

1. It could be helpful to add a discussion of proximal-distal stressors to the theoretical foundation section on the minority stress model of the manuscript and carry that across all sections of the manuscript including findings and their interpretation. How might this add some additional understanding and nuance.
2. I appreciate the section on the minority mental health paradox. I encourage the author(s) to also consider (a) how the very notion of mental health might be a Eurocentric and cis-heteronormative construct and how that might account for some of the findings and the paradox idea and (b) more critique of the idea that these groups can or should be compared. Both allow for a more critical review of the literature and the conceptual foundation of the current study.
3. I also appreciate the author’s section on the minority resilience model and bringing in a more strengths based approach. At the same time, it could be helpful for the authors to consider some of the current theorizing about the problem with using the concept of resilience- it assumes that is internal to the person which means it could a person’s resilience can be strengthened. This focus, however, completely makes invisible that the need for resilience is a systemic issue and puts the onus on the person to be resilient rather than the system to stop causing harm. If we want to move away from a deficit approach a more critical lens added to a strengths-based framing would be helpful to consider.
4. Some additional information about studies in the lit review would be helpful. For example, more information about samples, methods, theoretical framing, etc would be good to include so the reader has a sense of the strength of the extant literature. Some critique of comparative studies is important generally and since the current study is comparative it is important more specifically. In the lit review and/or methods a case needs to be made that the groups are comparable and that biases that can make their way into comparative studies were mitigated to the extent possible. Related, even using the term “non-heterosexual categories” centers heterosexuality. Additionally, a rationale is needed for treating the queer-identified sample as monolithic and putting them into a single group beyond sample size limitations- that is, maybe some should be deleted from the sample and not used or else the validity of the results is significantly lowered.
5. If some instructors provided extra credit and others didn’t how should we consider this inequity among the sample from an ethics perspective?
6. I suggest the authors redo table 1 so that one side presents variable information for the queer-identified (used as an umbrella term) sample and the other column provides it for heterosexually-identified sample.

7. I would alphabetize all variable responses rather than list them based on largest to smaller percent (e.g., race).
8. Which orientation were put into which groups and provide a rationale for this.
9. How were control variables determined?
10. Was gender assessed based on being cis and trans? Could there be some trans-identified respondents mixed across sexual orientation categories and how might this have an impact on the results in some significant ways?
11. Additional clarity about the sampling procedures is needed. The authors seems to imply only sociology and anthropology courses were sampled and in the next sentence is states gen ed courses that also included Intro to Soc and Ant specifically were sampled. A specific sampling approach is never named and I am sure it was convenience yet naming it is important as well as providing a rationale for why that was selected. How many courses received info and how many shared it with students and how many potential respondents were there, etc.
12. I would like a stronger link between the lit review and the operationalization of variables (e.g., inner peace, environmental mastery) especially hope this variables work with historically minoritized samples.
13. The analytic strategy does not include all analyses so additional context is needed for readers. Part of this should address sample size differences and how that was considered, where appropriate as well as how controls were used/entered. For example, table 3 makes it appear that results are from model 2 (model is spelled wrong in the table, I assume the word is supposed to be model) so my guess is the controls were entered in step 1 but it is not clear.
14. Although there is a significant difference in some of the means scores, they are higher for both groups and the narrative seems to focus on the queer group and the disparity between groups yet the heterosexual group is also really high, particularly for depression. It should be made clear when controls were used and not, specifically for the t-tests as the regression reports them. For example, how were the used for the t-tests since t-tests typically don't include controls directly. How were analyses for table 4 conducted? The treatment of gender is unclear and this relates to me earlier comments about how gender was conceptualized and measured.
15. I am not clear on if the SES related variables were intended to be controls or explanatory based on how they are discussed in the discussion section and prior sections.
16. Given the data came from 2022, it is important to contextualize the findings based on that. For example, we were just "coming out of" covid in many areas and there were significant general and unique stressors related to that which are never mentioned with the interpretation. I also believe it would strengthen the manuscript to discuss what the numbers actually mean more.

I wish the authors luck with their work and appreciate the much needed focus on mental health.