1	Time spent in outdoor light is associated with increased blood
2	pressure, higher hypertension risk, and lower hypotension risk
3	Sicheng Li <sup>1</sup> , Liyong Lu <sup>2,3</sup> , Wenpan Xian <sup>4</sup> , Jiawei Li <sup>5</sup> , Shuaiming Xu <sup>5</sup> , Jiajin Chen <sup>1</sup> , Yan
4	Wang <sup>1</sup>
5	
6	<sup>1</sup> Xiamen Cardiovascular Hospital of Xiamen University, School of Medicine, Xiamen
7	University, Xiamen, Fujian, China
8	<sup>2</sup> Center for Health Management and Policy Research, School of Public Health,
9	Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China
10	<sup>3</sup> NHC Key Lab of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University),
11	Jinan, Shandong, China
12	<sup>4</sup> West China Hospital of Stomatology, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610041, China
13	<sup>5</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Health Statistics, West China School of Public
14	Health / West China Fourth Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China
15	
16	S. Li, L. Lu, and W. Xian contributed equally
17	Correspondence:
18	Sicheng Li, Xiamen Cardiovascular Hospital of Xiamen University, School of
19	Medicine, Xiamen University, No. 2999 Jinshan Road, Xiamen, 361006, Fujian,
20	China. E-mail: lisicheng1027@foxmail.com
21	Yan Wang, Xiamen Cardiovascular Hospital of Xiamen University, School of
22	Medicine, Xiamen University, No. 2999 Jinshan Road, Xiamen, 363001, Fujian,
23	China. E-mail: wy@medmail.com.cn
24	

#### 25 Abstract

Objective: Light exposure is considered to be associated with reduced blood pressure
(BP). However, longitudinal epidemiological studies concerning the light–BP
association with large samples are still limited.

29 **Methods:** This cohort study enrolled over 300,000 participants from the UK Biobank. 30 Information on time spent in outdoor light during typical summer or winter days was 31 obtained through questionnaires. Cases of hypertension and hypotension were 32 identified using the 10th edition of International Classification of Diseases codes. Cox proportional hazard regression models were employed to estimate the light-BP 33 34 associations, restricted cubic splines were utilized to detect potential nonlinear 35 associations, subgroup analyses were conducted to identify effect modifiers, and causal mediation analyses were performed to explore potential mechanisms. 36

**Results:** Using summer light exposure as an illustration, after a median follow-up of 37 38 13.4 years, each additional hour of summer light exposure was associated with an 39 increased risk of hypertension (hazard ratio [HR] 1.011, 95% confidence interval [CI] 40 1.006–1.017, P-nonlinear=0.803) and a decreased risk of hypotension (0.988, 0.977– 41 0.998, P-nonlinear=0.109). The light-BP association is stronger in females (P=0.022), 42 those with short sleep duration (P=0.049), and those with high genetic risk of 43 hypertension (P < 0.001). Potential mechanisms included increasing biological age 44 (proportion mediated, 24.1%, P<0.001), neutrophil count (5.4%, P<0.001), BMI (32.0%, 45 *P*<0.001), etc.

46 Conclusions: Contrary to previous findings, our study revealed a positive association
47 between light exposure and BP. Potential mechanisms include inflammation, aging,
48 and behavioral lifestyle changes. Further epidemiological and experimental
49 investigations are warranted to validate these novel findings.

50

### 51 1. Introduction

52 Hypertension is the most important modifiable risk factor for global morbidity 53 and mortality, correlating with an increased risk of cardiovascular diseases<sup>1</sup>. 54 According to WHO reports, the number of hypertensive individuals reached 1.3 55 billion in 2019, doubling from 650 million in 1990, with approximately 33% of 56 individuals aged 30-79 years suffering from hypertension, leading to a significant disease burden<sup>2</sup>. Hypotension, as another type of blood pressure (BP) abnormality, 57 58 also poses significant health risks that cannot be ignored. For example, orthostatic hypotension has a prevalence ranging from 6% to  $35\%^3$  and is significantly associated 59 with increased risks of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, heart failure, and 60 61 stroke<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, understanding the risk factors related to BP abnormalities is 62 crucial.

63 As a common environmental factor, light exposure is considered to be associated 64 with BP. For example, a cross-sectional study involving 5,069 adults nationwide in 65 Chile found that increased geographic latitude was associated with decreased light intensity and increased systolic blood pressure (SBP)<sup>5</sup>. Another cross-sectional study 66 67 involving 342,457 dialysis patients in the US found that ultraviolet was negatively associated with SBP<sup>6</sup>. The mechanism underlying this association may be that light 68 exposure promotes vitamin D synthesis<sup>7</sup> and facilitates the release of nitric oxide in 69 70 the skin into the bloodstream<sup>8</sup>. However, current epidemiological studies have 71 typically employed cross-sectional study designs, which cannot ensure the temporality 72 of exposure and outcome, resulting in relatively low evidence strength, and have not 73 further explored susceptible populations and potential mechanisms of the light-BP 74 association at the population level.

To address the above gap, this study aims to systematically explore the associations of light exposure with BP, hypertension, and hypotension, identify effect modifiers, and explore potential mechanisms of association based on the baseline survey, repeat survey, and follow-up data from the UK Biobank. Based on existing

results, we hypothesize that light exposure is associated with lower BP, lower risk of

80 hypertension, and higher risk of hypotension.

#### 81 **2. Methods**

#### 82 **2.1 Study population**

83 This study is based on the UK Biobank (www.ukbiobank.ac.uk), a cohort study described in detail previously<sup>9</sup>. In brief, the baseline survey included over 500,000 84 85 participants from 37 to 73 from 2006 to 2010, collecting their demographic characteristics, behavioral lifestyle factors, disease history, family history, physical 86 measurements, and biochemical examinations, followed by three repeated surveys 87 88 including 2012-2013, 2014+, and 2019+. The UK Biobank study has approval from 89 the North West Multi-center Research Ethics Committee, and all participants provided written informed consent for the study<sup>10,11</sup>. 90

91 This study included 502,178 participants from UK Biobank. We excluded 92 participants with light exposure time larger than the typical day length in the UK during summer (16h, n=252) and winter (8h, n=5,318)<sup>12</sup>, and participants with 93 extreme light exposure time (larger than the mean plus twice the standard deviation) 94 during summer (n=14,600) and winter (n=24,947)<sup>13</sup>. For hypertension and 95 96 hypotension outcomes (categorical variables), we separately excluded participants 97 who had the disease before the baseline survey. For the BP outcome (continuous 98 variable), we excluded participants with both hypertension and hypotension before the 99 baseline survey. The design and analysis flowchart of this study is shown in **Figure 1**.

100

#### 2.2 Measurement of light exposure

Participants reported their daily outdoor hours for summer (Field 1050) and winter (Field 1060), including integers or specific values indicating "Do not know", "Prefer not to answer" or "Less than an hour a day". The first two specified values are treated as missing data, while the latter is reassigned for half an hour. Additionally, the average daily light exposure was calculated as the mean of summer and winter light,

106 representing the yearly average light exposure.

#### 107 **2.3 Measurement of outcome**

108 For BP-associated outcomes in the baseline or repeated survey, the Omron 705 109 IT electronic BP monitor (df-4079 and df-4080) was used to collect two measures. A 110 manual sphygmometer (df-93 and df-94) was used if the standard automated device could not be employed<sup>14</sup>. We calculated pulse pressure (PP) and mean arterial 111 112 pressure (MAP) based on systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure 113 (DBP), i.e., PP=SBP-DBP, and MAP=(SBP+ $2 \times DBP$ ) ÷ 3. The baseline SBP, DBP, 114 PP, and MAP were included as outcomes (Figure 1, Phase 2) in the cross-sectional 115 design. Considering the repeated surveys, cumulative BP (cBP, including cSBP, cDBP, 116 cPP, and cMAP) was calculated as the area under the curve of BP (mmHg) versus time (years)<sup>15</sup>. BP trajectory was identified according to the trends of BP utilizing the 117 latent growth model. Analyses involving cBP and BP trajectory (Figure 1, Phase 3) 118 119 included participants with BP data in the baseline and the first two repeat surveys to 120 ensure a relatively sufficient sample size. More details of cBP calculation and BP 121 trajectory identification are shown in Text S1 and Figure S1.

122 Participants with PB ≥130/80 mmHg and <90/60 mmHg were diagnosed with 123 newly developed hypertension and hypotension (Figure 1, Phase 2), respectively, 124 during the baseline survey. The diagnosis of hypertension and hypotension (Figure 1, 125 Phase 4) during follow-up utilized the 10th edition of International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) codes, with the first occurrence recorded in the UK Biobank. 126 127 Hypertension was identified by ICD-10 codes I10, I11, I12, I13, and I15, while 128 hypotension was identified by code I95. Follow-up concluded at the earliest of the first disease occurrence, death, loss to follow-up, or the end of the follow-up period. 129 130 The follow-up period was determined as the difference between the baseline survey 131 date and the end of follow-up.

#### 132 2.4 Covariates

133 We incorporated three sets of variables as covariates: demographic 134 characteristics, behavioral lifestyle, and family history. Demographic characteristics 135 encompassed age (continuous), gender (female, male), education (with or without a college or university degree), employment status (employed, unemployed), skin 136 colour (black, brown, dark olive, fair, light olive, very fair), Townsend Deprivation 137 138 Index (TDI, continuous), and location (22 assessment centers). Behavioral lifestyle 139 variables included body mass index (BMI, continuous), metabolic equivalent of task 140 (MET, continuous), sleep duration (continuous), healthy diet index (HDI, continuous), smoking status (never, previous, current), drinking status (never, special occasions 141 only, one to three times a month, once or twice a week, three or four times a week, 142 143 daily or almost daily), sun protection (do not go out in sunshine, never/rarely, sometimes, always, most of the time), and vitamin D supplementation (yes, no). The 144 HDI was derived from participants' intake of vegetables, fruits, fish, processed meat, 145 and non-processed red meat, with each item scored as 1 for healthy and 0 for 146 unhealthy, yielding an HDI range of 0 to 5, consistent with prior studies<sup>16,17</sup>. Family 147 history was identified according to family history of father, mother, and siblings, 148 149 including hypertension, diabetes, stroke, and heart disease.

150 A simplified directed acyclic graph (without considering associations within 151 covariates) was used to depict the relationships among the exposure, covariates, and 152 outcome (Figure S2). Demographic characteristics were included as confounders 153 because they were simultaneously associated with light exposure and BP. All these behavioral lifestyle and family history factors were associated with BP. As MET<sup>18</sup>, 154  $BMI^{19}$ , and sleep duration<sup>12</sup> were associated with light exposure, they were included 155 156 as potential mediators, and the remaining behavioral lifestyle and family history 157 factors were included as effect modifiers.

6

#### 158 **2.5 Statistical analyses**

#### 159 2.5.1 Cross-sectional analyses

In the cross-sectional design, linear regression models were used to estimate the associations ( $\beta$ s) of light exposure with BP, and logistic regression models were used to estimate the associations (odds ratios, ORs) of light exposure with hypertension and hypotension. For each analysis, four models were considered: Model 1, the crude model, where no covariate was included; Model 2, including demographic characteristics; Model 3, further including behavioral lifestyle factors; Model 4, further including family history factors.

#### 167 **2.5.2 Longitudinal analyses (repeated survey)**

168 In the longitudinal design, linear regression models were used to investigate the associations (\$\beta\$s) of light and four cBPs (including cDBP, cSBP, cPP, and cMAP). 169 170 Compared to the cross-sectional design using BP as the outcome, the advantage of 171 using cBP here is the reduced risk of reverse causality and consideration of BP 172 dynamics, albeit with the disadvantage of a relatively smaller sample size. After the 173 trajectories for the four types of BP (DBP, SBP, PP, and MAP) were successfully 174 clustered, multinomial logistic regression models were used to assess the associations 175 (ORs) between light exposure and the derived BP trajectories. All these models 176 included the same covariates in the above Model 4. More details are shown in Text 177 **S1**.

#### 178 **2.5.3 Longitudinal analyses (follow-up period)**

In the longitudinal design, Cox proportional hazard regression models were used to estimate the associations (hazard ratio, HRs) of light exposure with hypertension and hypotension (time-to-event outcome). Restricted cubic spline (RCS) was used to evaluate the nonlinear exposure–response relationships. Based on the RCS results, continuous variables were transformed into categorical variables to refit the Cox model. Sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of results included: 1)

185 utilizing multiple imputation techniques (Text S3) to address missing data; 2) 186 excluding participants developing hypertension or hypotension within two years after 187 the baseline survey to reduce the risk of causal inversion; 3) replacing the existing 188 hypertension outcomes with primary hypertension (I10); 4) further adjusting fine particulate matter as it may reduce light exposure through physical obstruction<sup>13</sup> and 189 are associated with BP<sup>20</sup>, potentially acting as a confounder; 5) further adjusting noise 190 and greenspace exposure as light exposure might lead to an increase in these 191 exposures associated with  $BP^{21}$ , potentially acting as mediators; 6) further adjusting 192 193 disease such as hearing difficulty and fracture as they might reduce light exposure by spending less time outside and may be associated with BP<sup>13,22,23</sup>, potentially acting as 194 195 confounders.

196 To identify susceptible populations, we conducted subgroup analyses by adding 197 interaction terms in the Cox models. Potential effect modifiers included: gender 198 (variables not explicitly annotated here are incorporated in a form consistent with the 199 covariate section), age at baseline ( $\geq 60$ , < 60), skin colour, location (England, Scotland, 200 Wales), sun protection, family history of hypertension, sleep duration (>9h, 7-9h, <7h), 201 HDI (divided into three equal parts according to quartiles, i.e., low, medium and high), 202 MET (same as HDI), polygenic score (PRS) for hypertension (divided into five equal 203 parts according to quartiles, with the highest group defined as high risk, the lowest 204 group defined as low risk, and the remaining three groups defined as intermediate 205 risk<sup>9</sup>).

Casual mediation analyses<sup>24</sup> were conducted to explore potential mechanisms in 206 207 the light-BP association (Text S2). The mediators predominantly consisted of 208 indicators related to aging, inflammation, lipids, general blood biochemical 209 parameters, and behavioral lifestyle factors. Aging indicators included biological age 210  $(BA)^{25}$ , calculated by regressing eight blood indicators on chronological age; 211 phenotypic age, derived by 9 aging-related variables; and telomere length. More 212 details of aging indicators calculation are shown in Text S3. Inflammation indicators 213 included C-reactive protein, white blood cell count, neutrophil count, platelet count,

214 lymphocyte immune-inflammation index count. systemic 215 (platelet×neutrophil÷lymphocyte), and bilirubin. Lipids included triglyceride, 216 cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein, low-density lipoprotein, apolipoprotein A, 217 apolipoprotein B, and lipoprotein A. General blood biochemical indicators included 218 calcium, vitamin D, creatinine, urea, glucose, alkaline phosphatase, albumin, 219 hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub>, Insulin-like growth factors-1, gamma-glutamyl transferase, aspartate 220 aminotransferase, and alanine aminotransferase. Behavioural lifestyle factors included 221 BMI, MET, HDI, and sleep duration.

Participants with missing exposure, outcome, or covariates were further excluded
in the main statistical analyses. All analyses were performed using R 4.3.1 software.
Two-sided P values ≤0.05 were considered to indicate statistical significance.

### 225 **3. Results**

226 The general characteristics of participants included in the Cox analysis, 227 categorized by hypertension and hypotension, are presented in Table 1. During a 228 median follow-up of 13.4 years (interquartile range, IQR, 12.4–14.2) and 13.6 years 229 (12.8–14.3), 61,530 (18.3%) participants and 18,596 (4.1%) participants developed 230 hypertension and hypotension, respectively. Statistical description for light exposure, 231 BP, and cBP is shown in Table S1. Taking the population under investigation for the 232 light–BP association as an example, the distribution of missing data is illustrated in 233 Figure S3. A comparison of baseline characteristics of the population before and after 234 participants with missing data were excluded is presented in Table S2. Statistically 235 significant changes in baseline characteristics indicate non-random patterns in missing 236 data.

237 **3.1 Cross-sectional analyses** 

The findings from cross-sectional analyses are presented in **Table 2**, indicating a significant association of light exposure with elevated BP and increased risk of hypertension, and an insignificant association between light exposure and decreased

risk of hypotension. Taking summer light as anexample, exposure to summer light exhibited associations with BP, with effect estimates ( $\beta$ s and 95% CIs) of 0.164 (0.126, 0.201) for SBP, 0.084 (0.063, 0.106) for DBP, 0.079 (0.052, 0.106) for PP, and 0.111 (0.086, 0.136) for MAP. Furthermore, summer light exposure demonstrated associations with hypertension and hypotension, with ORs and 95% CIs of 1.019 (1.014, 1.025) and 0.982 (0.958, 1.005), respectively.

#### 247 **3.2 Longitudinal analyses (repeated survey)**

248 Light exposure is not significantly associated with cBP. Specifically, exposure to 249 summer light exhibited insignificant associations with cBP, with effect estimates (Bs 250 and 95% CIs) of 1.344 (-4.208, 6.897) for cSBP, 0.929 (-2.172, 4.031) for cDBP, 251 0.415 (-2.290, 3.119) for cPP, and 1.068 (-2.814, 4.949) for cMAP. Based on the 252 combination of the Bayesian information criterion and the interpretability of the 253 trajectory models, the trajectories for four BPs were identified in three categories 254 (Table S3). The associations between light exposure and BP trajectories are shown in 255 Table S4. Significant associations of summer light and average light with DBP 256 trajectories were found. The increased probability of DBP being classified as an 257 upward-trending trajectory group was significantly associated with summer light (1.094, 1.019–1.176) and average light (1.141, 1.026–1.267). 258

#### 259 **3.3 Longitudinal analyses (follow-up period)**

260 The Cox models in this section all satisfied the proportional hazard assumption. 261 The associations of continuous light exposure with hypertension and hypotension are 262 shown in Table 3. For example, light exposure was associated with hypertension, with 263 effect estimates (HRs and 95% CIs) of 1.011 (1.006, 1.017) for summer light, 1.008 264 (0.997, 1.018) for winter light, and 1.015 (1.007, 1.024) for average light. The RCS 265 results are shown in Figure 2, where the associations were approximately linear (P-nonlinear >0.05) except for the winter light-hypotension association (P-nonlinear 266 267 <0.05). The associations of categorical light exposure with hypertension and 268 hypotension are shown in Table 3, suggesting similar results that much light exposure

may elevate the risk of hypertension and reduce the risk of hypotension. Consistent
results were observed for sensitivity analyses regarding the association direction,
magnitude, and statistical significance (Tables S5-S10).

272 The subgroup analysis results are presented in Figure 3. The main results are 273 summarised as follows. First, Women are sensitive to the BP-raising effects of light 274 exposure compared with men. For example, the summer light-hypertension 275 association is stronger (P=0.022) in females (1.018, 1.010–1.027) than in males 276 (1.006, 0.998–1.013); similarly, light exposure provides stronger (P=0.012) protection 277 against hypotension in females (0.974, 0.959-0.989) compared to males (0.998, 278 0.985-1.012). Second, longer sleep duration reduces the increased risk of 279 hypertension associated with light exposure and reinforces the benefits of light 280 exposure in lowering the risk of hypotension. For example, the hypertension risk due 281 to average light exposure is higher (P=0.049) in the group with short sleep duration 282 (1.020, 1.004-1.036) than in the group with long sleep duration (0.966, 0.917-1.017); 283 similarly, hypotension risk decrease due to average light exposure is stronger 284 (P < 0.001) in the group with long sleep duration (0.859, 0.798 - 0.924) than in the 285 group with short sleep duration (1.000, 0.973–1.029). Third, The genetic risk of 286 hypertension synergistically increases the elevated risk of hypertension due to light 287 exposure, while antagonizing the reduced risk of hypotension due to light exposure. 288 For example, the increased hypertension risk due to summer light is higher (P < 0.001) 289 in high PRS group (1.085, 1.077–1.092) than low PRS group (0.929, 0.921–0.937), 290 while the decreased hypotension risk due to summer light is higher (P=0.002) in low 291 PRS group (0.979, 0.965–0.993) than high PRS group (1.001, 0.987–1.015).

The mediation analyses results are demonstrated in **Figure 4**. In brief, significant mediators mainly concentrated on aging, inflammation, and behavioural lifestyle indicators. For example, summer light may increase the risk of hypertension by increasing biological age (proportion mediated, 24.1%, P<0.001), neutrophil count (5.4%, P<0.001), and BMI (32.0%, P<0.001). Summer light associated with reduced risk of hypotension may through increasing MET (39.3%, P=0.003).

#### 298 **4. Discussion**

299 This study represents a pioneering large-scale population-based longitudinal epidemiological investigation into the light-BP association. Utilizing data from the 300 301 UK Biobank encompassing over 300,000 individuals, we employed cross-sectional 302 and longitudinal research designs to comprehensively explore the associations of light 303 exposure with continuous BP, hypertension, and hypotension. Additionally, we 304 conducted an in-depth exploration of susceptible populations and potential underlying 305 mechanisms. Our findings indicate that 1) light exposure is associated with elevated 306 BP, increased risk of hypertension, and decreased risk of hypotension; 2) gender, 307 sleep duration, and genetic risk of hypertension may modify the light-BP association; 308 and 3) mechanisms such as aging, inflammation, and behavioral lifestyle alterations 309 may contribute to the light-BP association.

#### 310 **4.1 Comparison to other studies**

311 Existing epidemiological studies concerning light exposure and BP are limited. 312 A cross-sectional study involving 5,069 adults nationwide in Chile found that 313 increased geographic latitude was associated with decreased light intensity and 314 increased SBP<sup>5</sup>. Similarly, another cross-sectional study involving 342,457 dialysis 315 patients in the US found that ultraviolet A (UVA) and ultraviolet B (UVB) were negatively associated with SBP<sup>6</sup>. Additionally, a cross-sectional study involving 316 317 205,888 singleton pregnant women in the US found that higher solar radiation was associated with a lower risk of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy<sup>26</sup>. While these 318 319 studies suggest a negative relationship between light exposure and BP, contrasting 320 with our findings, differences in study populations may account for this disparity, as 321 our research targeted the general UK population. The strengths of the above studies 322 include the use of geographic coordinates to match participants' sunlight exposure, 323 ensuring higher accuracy, however without consideration of individual outdoor 324 duration. Our study benefits from a large sample size, self-reported individual outdoor 325 duration, a robust longitudinal design, and comprehensive statistical analyses.

326 Notably, light exposure is not a singular dimension but comprises complex patterns, including wavelength, intensity, exposure time, and duration<sup>27</sup>. Regarding 327 wavelength, Krause et al. found that UVB, with shorter wavelengths than UVA, is 328 associated with decreased BP, while UVA is not<sup>28</sup>. Concerning intensity, McFadden 329 et al. found a correlation between bedroom brightness and higher BMI in women<sup>29</sup>. In 330 terms of exposure time, Cheung et al. discovered that exposure to blue light in the 331 evening (rather than in the morning) is associated with higher glucose peaks<sup>30</sup>. As for 332 duration, Veleva et al. found that ultraviolet only has short-term effects on BP 333 334 reduction rather than long-term effects<sup>31</sup>. As a large-scale epidemiological study based on self-reported light exposure, this study accounted for long-term exposure to 335 336 light encompassing all wavelengths. However, considerations regarding intensity and 337 exposure time remain insufficient in this study.

#### 338 4.2 Potential mechanisms

339 The potential mechanisms underlying the light-BP association remain unclear. 340 Existing research supporting the notion that light reduces BP commonly posits that 341 light increases vitamin D synthesis, thereby conferring cardiovascular benefits<sup>7</sup>. However, the relationship between vitamin D and BP remains highly debated<sup>32,33</sup>. A 342 343 randomized clinical trial involving 119 individuals found that exposure to UVB radiation, which enhances vitamin D synthesis, did not reduce BP<sup>34</sup>. Apart from 344 345 vitamin D, other studies suggest that light exposure may facilitate the release of nitric oxide from the skin into the bloodstream, thus lowering  $BP^{8,35}$ . 346

Mediation analyses suggest that inflammation, aging, and BMI may be potential mediators in light-BP association. Ultraviolet may induce premature skin aging through pathways such as DNA damage, lipid peroxidation, mitochondrial damage, and activation of inflammatory signaling pathways<sup>36</sup>. Furthermore, studies have found that facial aging can predict the risk of cardiovascular disease<sup>37</sup>, possibly due to skin inflammation triggering systemic inflammation and its association with diseases<sup>38</sup>. Since inflammation is a component of aging<sup>39</sup>, facial aging may be related to systemic

aging<sup>40</sup>. Regarding lipid metabolism, Klinedinst et al. found that light exposure is 354 associated with decreased subcutaneous fat and increased visceral fat<sup>19</sup>. Pattinson et al. 355 found an association between light exposure and childhood obesity<sup>41</sup>. Similarly, cell 356 357 experiments have found that ultraviolet-induced adipokines may be associated with decreased subcutaneous fat, leading to disrupted adipose homeostasis and obesity<sup>42</sup>. 358 Animal experiments have also shown that UVB exposure increases food intake and 359 weight gain<sup>43</sup>. The above studies support the role of inflammatory, aging, and BMI in 360 361 the light-BP association.

#### 362 **4.3 Clinical implication**

363 Although the impact of light on BP is relatively modest, the potential risks of 364 hypertension stemming from light exposure cannot be disregarded, given the 365 widespread exposure of the populace to light. The prevalence of individuals exposed to summer light for more than one hour stood at 88.76%, correlating with an HR of 366 367 1.041 for hypertension. Consequently, the population attributable fraction amounted 368 to 3.52%, suggesting that a reduction in light exposure to one hour or less among the 369 whole population could alleviate the burden of hypertension by 3.52%. In line with 370 data from the WHO, the global hypertensive population numbered 1.3 billion in 2019. 371 Therefore, curtailing light exposure within one hour could potentially avert 372 approximately 45.76 million cases of hypertension. For susceptible populations, such 373 as females and those with a heightened genetic predisposition to hypertension, as well 374 as vulnerable populations such as outdoor workers exposed to elevated light levels, 375 mitigating light exposure, employing adequate sun protection, supplementing vitamin 376 D, and embracing healthy lifestyles (adequate sleep and low BMI) may prove 377 beneficial.

#### 378 **4.4 Limitations and strengths**

This study has several limitations. First, this study included self-reported light duration as exposure, which might involve recall bias and change over time, potentially leading to inaccurate effects estimations. In addition, we need more

382 information on light intensity and exposure time to portray light patterns accurately. 383 Second, since self-reported light exposure does not precisely measure individual 384 exposure to light, it may introduce environmental factors such as temperature, 385 humidity, noise, etc., which could affect BP. We controlled some of these factors in 386 our sensitivity analyses and roughly controlled for unmeasured environmental factors 387 by including the UKB assessment centers as a covariate. Third, considering the 388 variable availability and sample size, the covariates included in this study might be 389 insufficient. For example, outdoor physical activity is an unavailable confounder 390 simultaneously associated with light exposure and BP. However, MET was adjusted 391 as an alternative, and we conducted extensive sensitivity analyses regarding covariates and reached consistent conclusions. Fourth, even though this study 392 393 excluded participants with hypertension and hypotension before the baseline survey, 394 the risk of reverse causality still exists. Consequently, we conducted sensitivity 395 analyses by excluding participants who developed corresponding diseases within two 396 years after the baseline survey and arrived at consistent conclusions, alleviating our 397 concerns. Fifth, the analyses involving cBP and BP trajectory included a relatively 398 small sample size and a limited number of repeated measurements, which may lead to 399 insufficient statistical power. Particularly in trajectory analysis, where samples 400 classified into increasing or decreasing BP groups consist of only a few hundred 401 individuals, the issue of insufficient statistical power may be exacerbated. Finally, 402 missing data is prevalent in this study, which may affect the research findings. However, consistent conclusions were drawn through multiple imputation techniques 403 404 for missing data. Due to the presence of missing data, the study population is not 405 representative of the UKB population, and considering that the UKB itself may not be 406 representative of the entire population of the UK, caution is needed when 407 extrapolating the findings of this study to the whole UK population.

This study has several strengths. First, we mainly employed a longitudinal study
design, decreasing the risk of reverse causality and providing high evidence strength.
Moreover, all analyses except for repeated measurements included over 300,000

411 participants, ensuring sufficient statistical power. Second, comprehensive analyses 412 were conducted on BP, hypertension, hypotension, cBP, and BP trajectories. 413 Consistent results were obtained across these analyses, enhancing the conclusions' 414 credibility. Finally, numerous sensitivity analyses were conducted to ensure the 415 robustness of the results, susceptible subgroups were identified through subgroup 416 analyses, and potential mechanisms were explored through mediation analyses.

#### 417 **5. Conclusion**

In conclusion, this study found that light exposure was associated with increased BP, higher risk of hypertension, and lower risk of hypotension. The light–BP association is stronger among females and those with insufficient sleep or a higher genetic risk of hypertension. Potential mechanisms included inflammation, aging, and behavioral lifestyle changes. Subsequent epidemiological studies considering complex light patterns and in-depth experimental studies are needed to confirm the novel findings of this study.

#### 425 **Conflict of interest**

426 The authors declare no conflicts of interest that pertain to this work.

#### 427 **Data availability statement**

428 The UK Biobank data can be accessed through approved application429 (www.ukbiobank.ac.uk)

#### 430 Funding

431 This work was supported by Xiamen Science and Technology Project
432 (3502Z20224032, 3502Z20241002, 3502Z20209007).

#### 433 Acknowledgments

434 This study has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under

- 435 Application Number 134551. We express gratitude to all individuals contributed to
- 436 the acquisition and dissemination of the UK Biobank data, as well as the participants
- 437 involved in UK Biobank.

438

Oparil S, Acelajado MC, Bakris GL, et al. Hypertension. Nat Rev Dis Primers 2018; 4: 18014.

#### 439 **Reference**

1.

440

441 2. World Health Organization. Global report on hypertension: the race against a silent killer.; 442 2023. 443 Shibao C, Biaggioni I. Orthostatic hypotension and cardiovascular risk. Hypertension (Dallas, 3. 444 Tex: 1979) 2010; 56(6): 1042-4. 445 4. Ricci F, Fedorowski A, Radico F, et al. Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality related to 446 orthostatic hypotension: a meta-analysis of prospective observational studies. European heart 447 journal 2015; 36(25): 1609-17. 448 5. Cabrera SE, Mindell JS, Toledo M, Alvo M, Ferro CJ. Associations of Blood Pressure With 449 Geographical Latitude, Solar Radiation, and Ambient Temperature: Results From the Chilean 450 Health Survey, 2009-2010. American journal of epidemiology 2016; 183(11): 1071-3. 451 6. Weller RB, Wang Y, He J, et al. Does Incident Solar Ultraviolet Radiation Lower Blood 452 Pressure? J Am Heart Assoc 2020; 9(5): e013837. 453 7. Rostand SG. Ultraviolet light may contribute to geographic and racial blood pressure 454 differences. Hypertension (Dallas, Tex: 1979) 1997; 30(2 Pt 1): 150-6. 455 Opländer C, Volkmar CM, Paunel-Görgülü A, et al. Whole body UVA irradiation lowers 8. 456 systemic blood pressure by release of nitric oxide from intracutaneous photolabile nitric oxide 457 derivates. Circ Res 2009; 105(10): 1031-40. 458 9. Said MA, Verweij N, van der Harst P. Associations of Combined Genetic and Lifestyle Risks 459 With Incident Cardiovascular Disease and Diabetes in the UK Biobank Study. JAMA Cardiol 460 2018; 3(8): 693-702. 461 10. UK Biobank. UK Biobank research ethics approval. 462 https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/learn-more-about-uk-biobank/about-us/ethics (accessed 463 April 18 2024). 464 11. UK Biobank. Consent Form: UK **Biobank** 465 https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/media/t22hbo35/consent-form.pdf (accessed April 18 2024). 466 12. Burns AC, Saxena R, Vetter C, Phillips AJK, Lane JM, Cain SW. Time spent in outdoor light 467 is associated with mood, sleep, and circadian rhythm-related outcomes: A cross-sectional and 468 longitudinal study in over 400,000 UK Biobank participants. J Affect Disord 2021; 295: 469 347-52. 470 13. Ma LZ, Ma YH, Ou YN, et al. Time spent in outdoor light is associated with the risk of 471 dementia: a prospective cohort study of 362094 participants. BMC Med 2022; 20(1): 132. 472 14. Haas ME, Aragam KG, Emdin CA, et al. Genetic Association of Albuminuria with 473 Cardiometabolic Disease and Blood Pressure. Am J Hum Genet 2018; 103(4): 461-73. 474 15. Domanski MJ, Wu CO, Tian X, et al. Association of Incident Cardiovascular Disease With 475 Time Course and Cumulative Exposure to Multiple Risk Factors. J Am Coll Cardiol 2023; 476 **81**(12): 1151-61. 477 16. Wang M, Zhou T, Song Y, et al. Joint exposure to various ambient air pollutants and incident 478 heart failure: a prospective analysis in UK Biobank. European heart journal 2021; 42(16): 479 1582-91. 480 17. Xu H, Xu H, Wu J, et al. Ambient air pollution exposure, plasma metabolomic markers, and 481 risk of type 2 diabetes: A prospective cohort study. Journal of hazardous materials 2024; 463:

482		132844.
483	18.	Zheng C, Feng J, Huang W, Wong SH-S. Associations between weather conditions and
484		physical activity and sedentary time in children and adolescents: A systematic review and
485		meta-analysis. Health & Place 2021; 69: 102546.
486	19.	Klinedinst BS, Meier NF, Larsen B, et al. Walking in the Light: How History of Physical
487		Activity, Sunlight, and Vitamin D Account for Body Fat-A UK Biobank Study. Obesity (Silver
488		Spring) 2020; <b>28</b> (8): 1428-37.
489	20.	Chen H, Burnett RT, Kwong JC, et al. Spatial association between ambient fine particulate
490		matter and incident hypertension. <i>Circulation</i> 2014; <b>129</b> (5): 562-9.
491	21.	Dzhambov AM, Lercher P, Markevych I, Browning MHEM, Rüdisser J. Natural and built
492		environments and blood pressure of Alpine schoolchildren. Environ Res 2022; 204(Pt A):
493		111925.
494	22.	Babarinde JA, Adeyemo AA, Adeove AM. Hearing loss and hypertension: exploring the
495		linkage. The Egyptian Journal of Otolaryngology 2021; <b>37</b> (1): 98.
496	23.	Du X-P, Zheng M-L, Yang X-C, Zheng M-L. High blood pressure is associated with increased
497		risk of future fracture, but not vice versa. <i>Sci Rep</i> 2024; <b>14</b> (1): 8005.
498	24.	Imai K, Keele L, Tingley D. A general approach to causal mediation analysis. <i>Psychol</i>
499		Methods 2010: <b>15</b> (4): 309-34.
500	25.	Klemera P. Doubal S. A new approach to the concept and computation of biological age. Mech
501		Ageing Dev 2006; <b>127</b> (3): 240-8.
502	26.	Lu D. Li M. Gan Y. Yu G. Zhang O. Zhang J. Prenatal exposure to solar radiation and
503		hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. <i>BJOG</i> 2022; <b>129</b> (3): 393-401.
504	27.	Ishihara A, Courville AB, Chen KY. The Complex Effects of Light on Metabolism in Humans.
505		<i>Nutrients</i> 2023: <b>15</b> (6).
506	28.	Krause R, Bühring M, Hopfenmüller W, Holick MF, Sharma AM. Ultraviolet B and blood
507		pressure. Lancet 1998; <b>352</b> (9129): 709-10.
508	29.	McFadden E, Jones ME, Schoemaker MJ, Ashworth A, Swerdlow AJ. The Relationship
509		Between Obesity and Exposure to Light at Night: Cross-Sectional Analyses of Over 100,000
510		Women in the Breakthrough Generations Study. American journal of epidemiology 2014;
511		<b>180</b> (3): 245-50.
512	30.	Cheung IN, Zee PC, Shalman D, Malkani RG, Kang J, Reid KJ. Morning and Evening
513		Blue-Enriched Light Exposure Alters Metabolic Function in Normal Weight Adults. <i>PLoS One</i>
514		2016: <b>11</b> (5): e0155601.
515	31.	Veleva BI. Caliouw MAA. Muurman A. et al. The effect of ultraviolet irradiation compared to
516		oral vitamin D supplementation on blood pressure of nursing home residents with dementia.
517		BMC Geriatr 2021: <b>21</b> (1): 577.
518	32.	Beveridge LA, Struthers AD, Khan F, et al. Effect of Vitamin D Supplementation on Blood
519	52.	Pressure: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Incorporating Individual Patient Data.
520		IAMA Intern Med 2015: 175(5): 745-54
521	33	Al Mheid I Ouvvumi AA Vitamin D and Cardiovascular Disease: Controversy Unresolved
522	55.	Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2017: <b>70</b> (1)
523	34	Scragg R Wishart I Stewart A et al No effect of ultraviolet radiation on blood pressure and
524	51.	other cardiovascular risk factors <i>Journal of hypertension</i> 2011: <b>29</b> (9): 1749-56
525	35.	Liu D. Fernandez BO. Hamilton A. et al. UVA irradiation of human skin vasodilates arterial

526		vasculature and lowers blood pressure independently of nitric oxide synthase. J Invest
527		Dermatol 2014; <b>134</b> (7): 1839-46.
528	36.	Woodby B, Penta K, Pecorelli A, Lila MA, Valacchi G. Skin Health from the Inside Out.
529		Annual review of food science and technology 2020; 11: 235-54.
530	37.	Gunn DA, de Craen AJM, Dick JL, et al. Facial Appearance Reflects Human Familial
531		Longevity and Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Healthy Individuals. The Journals of
532		Gerontology: Series A 2013; 68(2): 145-52.
533	38.	Agrawal R, Hu A, Bollag WB. The Skin and Inflamm-Aging. Biology, 2023. (accessed.
534	39.	López-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G. Hallmarks of aging: An
535		expanding universe. Cell 2023; 186(2): 243-78.
536	40.	Franco AC, Aveleira C, Cavadas C. Skin senescence: mechanisms and impact on whole-body
537		aging. Trends Mol Med 2022; 28(2).
538	41.	Pattinson CL, Allan AC, Staton SL, Thorpe KJ, Smith SS. Environmental Light Exposure Is
539		Associated with Increased Body Mass in Children. PLoS One 2016; 11(1): e0143578.
540	42.	Kim EJ, Kim YK, Kim S, et al. Adipochemokines induced by ultraviolet irradiation contribute
541		to impaired fat metabolism in subcutaneous fat cells. Br J Dermatol 2018; 178(2): 492-501.
542	43.	Parikh S, Parikh R, Michael K, et al. Food-seeking behavior is triggered by skin ultraviolet
543		exposure in males. Nat Metab 2022; <b>4</b> (7): 883-900.
544		

	Hyj	pertension	Hypotension				
Characteristic	No	Yes	D *	No	Yes	D	
	N = 274,798, 81.7%	N = 61,530, 18.3%	₽ <sup>↓</sup>	N = 436,373, 95.9%	N = 18,596, 4.1%	ľ	
General CHARACTERISTICS							
Age	54.52 (8.07) †	58.87 (7.46)	< 0.001	56.25 (8.07)	60.97 (6.84)	< 0.001	
TDI	-1.48 (2.99)	-1.22 (3.12)	< 0.001	-1.37 (3.05)	-0.88 (3.29)	< 0.001	
Gender (Female)	167,945 (61.12%)	32,269 (52.44%)	< 0.001	249,464 (57.17%)	9,053 (48.68%)	< 0.001	
Work (Employed)	186,227 (68.16%)	31,417 (51.46%)	< 0.001	265,933 (61.30%)	7,126 (38.54%)	< 0.001	
Education (College or university degree)	104,125 (38.56%)	16,877 (28.23%)	< 0.001	148,753 (34.78%)	4,616 (25.46%)	< 0.001	
Location			< 0.001			< 0.001	
England	242,860 (88.38%)	55,902 (90.85%)		386,498 (88.57%)	17,107 (91.99%)		
Scotland	21,193 (7.71%)	3,065 (4.98%)		31,953 (7.32%)	806 (4.33%)		
Wales	10,745 (3.91%)	2,563 (4.17%)		17,922 (4.11%)	683 (3.67%)		
Skin colour			< 0.001			< 0.001	
Black	1,564 (0.58%) ‡	448 (0.74%)		3,160 (0.74%)	101 (0.56%)		
Brown	6,857 (2.53%)	1,938 (3.22%)		12,353 (2.88%)	486 (2.67%)		
Dark olive	4,543 (1.68%)	1,114 (1.85%)		7,485 (1.74%)	318 (1.75%)		
Fair	184,037 (67.96%)	41,271 (68.58%)		292,752 (68.16%)	12,737 (70.07%)		
Light olive	52,181 (19.27%)	10,692 (17.77%)		79,776 (18.57%)	2,998 (16.49%)		
Very fair	21,621 (7.98%)	4,713 (7.83%)		33,977 (7.91%)	1,537 (8.46%)		
LIGHT EXPOSURE							
Summer light	3.21 (1.80)	3.50 (1.88)	< 0.001	3.32 (1.84)	3.56 (1.91)	< 0.001	
Winter light	1.46 (0.98)	1.59 (1.05)	< 0.001	1.51 (1.01)	1.62 (1.07)	< 0.001	

# Table 1 The general characteristics of the study population

Average light	2.34 (1.24)	2.55 (1.30)	< 0.001	2.42 (1.27)	2.60 (1.31)	< 0.001
LIFESTYLE						
BMI	26.29 (4.25)	28.21 (4.85)	< 0.001	27.32 (4.78)	28.27 (5.44)	< 0.001
MET	2,504.98 (2,418.10)	2,479.94 (2,492.06)	< 0.001	2,461.22 (2,420.89)	2,346.12 (2,487.94)	< 0.001
Sleep duration	7.16 (1.03)	7.13 (1.17)	< 0.001	7.15 (1.09)	7.20 (1.34)	< 0.001
HEI	2.90 (1.28)	2.83 (1.29)	< 0.001	2.88 (1.28)	2.84 (1.28)	< 0.001
Smoking status			< 0.001			< 0.001
Never	160,881 (58.84%)	30,641 (50.25%)		242,967 (56.00%)	8,436 (45.76%)	
Previous	85,342 (31.21%)	22,881 (37.52%)		147,877 (34.08%)	7,492 (40.64%)	
Current	27,194 (9.95%)	7,456 (12.23%)		43,045 (9.92%)	2,507 (13.60%)	
Drinking status			< 0.001			< 0.001
Never	19,230 (7.02%)	5,534 (9.04%)		33,799 (7.77%)	2,194 (11.86%)	
Special occasions only	29,077 (10.61%)	7,750 (12.66%)		49,667 (11.42%)	2,626 (14.19%)	
One to three times a month	31,741 (11.58%)	6,665 (10.89%)		48,902 (11.24%)	1,966 (10.63%)	
Once or twice a week	73,059 (26.66%)	15,118 (24.71%)		112,144 (25.78%)	4,254 (22.99%)	
Three or four times a week	66,913 (24.42%)	13,065 (21.35%)		101,872 (23.42%)	3,606 (19.49%)	
Daily or almost daily	53,994 (19.70%)	13,061 (21.34%)		88,651 (20.38%)	3,855 (20.84%)	
Sun protection			< 0.001			< 0.001
Do not go out in sunshine	1,288 (0.47%)	498 (0.82%)		2,626 (0.61%)	211 (1.15%)	
Never/rarely	22,162 (8.16%)	6,760 (11.19%)		40,527 (9.40%)	2,557 (13.97%)	
Sometimes	87,413 (32.17%)	20,412 (33.80%)		141,864 (32.92%)	6,149 (33.59%)	
Always	57,714 (21.24%)	12,362 (20.47%)		89,641 (20.80%)	3,718 (20.31%)	
Most of the time	103,171 (37.97%)	20,353 (33.71%)		156,342 (36.27%)	5,670 (30.98%)	
Vitamin D supplement (Yes)	11,210 (4.13%)	2,521 (4.19%)	0.525	17,504 (4.07%)	816 (4.48%)	0.006
FAMILY HISTORY						
Family history of diabetes (Yes)	55,339 (20.49%)	13,889 (23.18%)	< 0.001	94,063 (22.02%)	4,054 (22.59%)	0.07

Family history of hypertension (Yes)	120,177 (44.36%)	27,977 (46.52%)	< 0.001	210,455 (49.05%)	8,303 (45.99%)	< 0.001
Family history of stroke (Yes)	64,435 (23.83%)	17,324 (28.88%)	< 0.001	114,087 (26.68%)	5,390 (29.96%)	< 0.001
Family history of heart disease (Yes)	108,471 (40.03%)	28,345 (47.06%)	< 0.001	186,948 (43.58%)	8,932 (49.33%)	< 0.001

\*: Pearson's Chi-squared test was used for categorical variables, and the Wilcoxon rank sum test was used for continuous variables.

**†:** Continuous variables are presented as mean (standard deviation), and discrete variables are presented as n (%).

**‡:** The total number of people here is less than 336,328, as no exclusions for missing data in this table.

Abbreviations: TDI: Townsend deprivation index; BMI: Body mass index; MET: Metabolic equivalent of task; HDI: Health diet index.

Evenoguno	Outcomo	Model 1 *	Model 2 †		Model 3 ‡		Model 4 §		
Exposure	Outcome	Beta/OR 95% CI	Р	Beta/OR 95% CI	Р	Beta/OR 95% CI	Р	Beta/OR 95% CI	Р
	SBP	1.031 (0.997, 1.064)	< 0.001	0.243 (0.210, 0.276)	< 0.001	0.164 (0.126, 0.202)	< 0.001	0.164 (0.126, 0.201)	< 0.001
	DBP	0.227 (0.208, 0.245)	< 0.001	0.091 (0.072, 0.111)	< 0.001	0.082 (0.060, 0.103)	< 0.001	0.084 (0.063, 0.106)	< 0.001
Summer	PP	0.804 (0.780, 0.828)	< 0.001	0.152 (0.128, 0.175)	< 0.001	0.082 (0.055, 0.109)	< 0.001	0.079 (0.052, 0.106)	< 0.001
light	MAP	0.495 (0.473, 0.517)	< 0.001	0.142 (0.119, 0.164)	< 0.001	0.109 (0.084, 0.134)	< 0.001	0.111 (0.086, 0.136)	< 0.001
	Hypertension	1.088 (1.083, 1.092) ¶	< 0.001	1.025 (1.020, 1.029)	< 0.001	1.019 (1.013, 1.024)	< 0.001	1.019 (1.014, 1.025)	< 0.001
	Hypotension	0.948 (0.930, 0.966) ¶	< 0.001	0.965 (0.946, 0.984)	< 0.001	0.977 (0.955, 1.001)	0.056	0.982 (0.958, 1.005)	0.125
	SBP	1.526 (1.464, 1.587)	< 0.001	0.199 (0.139, 0.259)	< 0.001	0.094 (0.025, 0.164)	0.008	0.101 (0.032, 0.171)	0.004
	DBP	0.323 (0.289, 0.357)	< 0.001	0.005 (-0.030, 0.040)	0.760	0.068 (0.029, 0.108)	0.001	0.077 (0.037, 0.117)	< 0.001
Winter	PP	1.203 (1.159, 1.247)	< 0.001	0.193 (0.151, 0.235)	< 0.001	0.026 (-0.024, 0.075)	0.307	0.024 (-0.025, 0.074)	0.337
light	MAP	0.724 (0.684, 0.764)	< 0.001	0.070 (0.030, 0.110)	0.001	0.077 (0.031, 0.123)	0.001	0.085 (0.039, 0.131)	< 0.001
	Hypertension	1.137 (1.129, 1.146)	< 0.001	1.019 (1.011, 1.027)	< 0.001	1.019 (1.009, 1.030)	< 0.001	1.021 (1.011, 1.032)	< 0.001
	Hypotension	0.928 (0.897, 0.961)	< 0.001	0.976 (0.941, 1.011)	0.177	0.976 (0.934, 1.019)	0.271	0.981 (0.939, 1.025)	0.393
	SBP	1.566 (1.517, 1.615)	< 0.001	0.325 (0.276, 0.373)	< 0.001	0.210 (0.154, 0.266)	< 0.001	0.212 (0.156, 0.268)	< 0.001
	DBP	0.339 (0.312, 0.367)	< 0.001	0.099 (0.070, 0.127)	< 0.001	0.112 (0.080, 0.143)	< 0.001	0.117 (0.085, 0.149)	< 0.001
Average	PP	1.226 (1.191, 1.261)	< 0.001	0.226 (0.192, 0.260)	< 0.001	0.099 (0.059, 0.138)	< 0.001	0.095 (0.055, 0.135)	< 0.001
light	MAP	0.748 (0.716, 0.780)	< 0.001	0.174 (0.141, 0.207)	< 0.001	0.145 (0.108, 0.182)	< 0.001	0.149 (0.112, 0.186)	< 0.001
	Hypertension	1.137 (1.130, 1.144)	< 0.001	1.032 (1.026, 1.039)	< 0.001	1.027 (1.019, 1.035)	< 0.001	1.028 (1.020, 1.037)	< 0.001
	Hypotension	0.923 (0.898, 0.949)	< 0.001	0.956 (0.928, 0.984)	0.002	0.969 (0.936, 1.003)	0.076	0.975 (0.941, 1.010)	0.164

# Table 2 Cross-sectional associations between light exposure and BP

\*: Linear or logistic model adjusted for no covariate.

**†:** Linear or logistic model adjusted for age, gender, education, TDI, employment status, location, and skin colour.

**‡:** Linear or logistic model additionally adjusted for BMI, MET, HDI, sleep duration, smoking status, drinking status, sun protection, and Vitamin D supplement.

**§:** Linear or logistic model additionally adjusted for family history of diabetes, hypertension, stroke, and heart disease.

**||:** Beta estimations here corresponded to continuous outcomes.

**¶:** OR estimations here corresponded to dichotomous outcomes.

Abbreviations:BP: Blood pressure; OR: Odds ratio; CI: Confidence interval; SBP: Systolic blood pressure; DBP: Diastolic blood pressure; PP: Pulse pressure; MAP: Mean arterial pressure; TDI: Townsend deprivation index; BMI: Body mass index; MET: Metabolic equivalent of task; HDI: Health diet index.

A	Exposure	Model 1 *		Model 2 †		Model 3 ‡		Model 4 §	
Associations	(Hours)	HR 95% CI	Р						
	Continuous	1.082 (1.077, 1.086)	< 0.001	1.002 (0.997, 1.007)	0.48	1.011 (1.005, 1.017)	< 0.001	1.011 (1.006, 1.017)	< 0.001
Summer light hungertongion	<=1	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
Summer light—hypertension	2—4	1.145 (1.116, 1.174)	< 0.001	0.962 (0.937, 0.987)	0.003	1.013 (0.983, 1.044)	0.396	1.017 (0.987, 1.049)	0.268
	>4	1.474 (1.434, 1.515)	< 0.001	0.985 (0.956, 1.014)	0.304	1.055 (1.019, 1.092)	0.003	1.061 (1.024, 1.099)	0.001
	Continuous	1.129 (1.120, 1.138)	< 0.001	0.986 (0.978, 0.995)	0.002	1.007 (0.997, 1.018)	0.164	1.008 (0.997, 1.018)	0.147
Winter light hypertension	1	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
winter ngnt—nypertension	<1	0.973 (0.951, 0.996)	0.021	1.068 (1.043, 1.094)	< 0.001	0.998 (0.971, 1.027)	0.911	0.999 (0.972, 1.028)	0.966
	>1	1.245 (1.222, 1.269)	< 0.001	0.998 (0.979, 1.017)	0.828	1.015 (0.993, 1.038)	0.182	1.018 (0.995, 1.041)	0.128
	Continuous	1.130 (1.123, 1.137)	< 0.001	0.998 (0.991, 1.005)	0.6	1.015 (1.006, 1.023)	0.001	1.015 (1.007, 1.024)	< 0.001
Average light hypertension	<=1	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
Average light—light tension	2—4	1.203 (1.174, 1.233)	< 0.001	0.966 (0.942, 0.990)	0.007	1.023 (0.994, 1.054)	0.123	1.029 (0.999, 1.059)	0.061
	>4	1.592 (1.539, 1.646)	< 0.001	0.976 (0.942, 1.011)	0.177	1.060 (1.017, 1.105)	0.003	1.057 (1.013, 1.103)	0.010
	Continuous	1.074 (1.065, 1.082)	< 0.001	0.973 (0.964, 0.981)	< 0.001	0.988 (0.978, 0.999)	0.025	0.988 (0.977, 0.998)	0.022
Summer light hypotonsion	4	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
Summer light—hypotension	<4	0.820 (0.787, 0.854)	< 0.001	1.065 (1.022, 1.110)	0.003	1.017 (0.969, 1.068)	0.489	1.019 (0.970, 1.071)	0.445
	>4	1.130 (1.081, 1.181)	< 0.001	0.988 (0.944, 1.034)	0.602	0.986 (0.935, 1.039)	0.591	0.989 (0.938, 1.043)	0.692
	Continuous	1.121 (1.105, 1.137)	< 0.001	0.954 (0.940, 0.969)	< 0.001	0.988 (0.970, 1.006)	0.196	0.987 (0.968, 1.005)	0.157
Winter light—hypotension	2	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
	<2	0.842 (0.813, 0.872)	< 0.001	1.078 (1.040, 1.118)	< 0.001	1.013 (0.971, 1.057)	0.554	1.013 (0.970, 1.057)	0.562

 Table 3 Longitudinal associations of continuous light exposure with hypertension and hypotension

	>2	1.169 (1.118, 1.222)	< 0.001	0.992 (0.948, 1.038)	0.737	1.007 (0.956, 1.062)	0.782	1.004 (0.951, 1.059)	0.887
	Continuous	1.121 (1.108, 1.134)	< 0.001	0.957 (0.945, 0.969)	< 0.001	0.984 (0.969, 0.999)	0.037	0.983 (0.968, 0.998)	0.029
Avorage light hypotonsion	3	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
Average light—hypotension	<3	0.831 (0.793, 0.872)	< 0.001	1.078 (1.027, 1.313)	0.002	1.006 (0.952, 1.063)	0.841	1.005 (0.950, 1.063)	0.87
	>3	1.160 (1.102, 1.220)	< 0.001	1.004 (0.954, 1.058)	0.872	0.988 (0.931, 1.048)	0.695	0.990 (0.932, 1.051)	0.738

\*: Linear or logistic model adjusted for no covariate.

**†:** Linear or logistic model adjusted for age, gender, education, TDI, employment status, location, and skin colour.

**‡:** Linear or logistic model additionally adjusted for BMI, MET, HDI, sleep duration, smoking status, drinking status, sun protection, and Vitamin D supplement.

**§:** Linear or logistic model additionally adjusted for family history of diabetes, hypertension, stroke, and heart disease.

Abbreviations: HR: Hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval; TDI: Townsend deprivation index; BMI: Body mass index; MET: Metabolic equivalent of task; HDI: Health diet index.



## Figure 1 Flow chart of this study

Abbreviations: BP: Blood pressure; cBP: Cumulative blood pressure.



Figure 2 The exposure-response associations of light with

## hypertension and hypotension

All the models adjusted for age, gender, education, TDI, employment status, location, skin colour, BMI, MET, HDI, sleep duration, smoking status, drinking status, sun protection, Vitamin D supplement, and family history of diabetes, hypertension, stroke, and heart disease.

The P-nonlinear from left to right from top to bottom are 0.803, 0.385, 0.471, 0.109, <0.001, and 0.207, respectively.

Abbreviations: HR: hazard ratio; TDI: Townsend deprivation index; BMI: Body mass index; MET: Metabolic equivalent of task; HDI: Health diet index.

Subgroup	Summer-HE	P-int	Winter-HE	P-int	Total-HE	P-int	Summer-HO	P-int	Winter-HO	P-int	Total-HO	P-int
Gender	:		1		1		1		1		:	
Female	141	Ref	)ei	Ref	н	Ref	Hel	Ref	HH	Ref	H	Ref
Male		0.022	141	0.012	t	0.006	141	0.012	H <del>a</del> -I	0.001	H <del>F</del> I	0.002
Skin colour												
Black		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	< •   	*Ref	<	Ref
Brown	Hett	0.955	r+-	0.854	H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-H-	0.887		0.931		0.492		0.719
Dark olive	H-H-H	0.655	H-H-H	0.870	H-H-H	0.684		0.721		0.639	H-+++	0.909
Fair	7	0.441	1	0.751		0.495	H)	0.718	H <del>aj</del>	0.722	iej	0.630
Light olive	ei I	0.453		0.767	(e)	0.499	Hett	0.746	H+H	0.647	Heli	0.623
Very fair	Here .	0.519	H	0.604	1 <del>40 1</del>	0.491	1 <b>1</b>	0.902		0.700	H-++	0.743
Vitamin D supplement												
No		Ref		Ref		Ref	M	Ref	fei I	Ref	e  	Ref
Yes	H#4	0.066		0.881	H	0.164		0.443		0.720	<b>H</b>	0.584
Sun protection												
Always		Ref	HH	Ref	fet .	Ref	нн	Ref	H	Ref	Here	Ref
Most of the time	Ē	0.664	1	0.999	H	0.840	HeH	0.043	Hell	0.108	HeH	0.044
Never/rarely	Hel	0.736	Her	0.894	101	0.702	Hell	0.313		0.011	HH	0.088
Sometimes	E .	0.697	=  	0.883		0.910	H#1	0.014		0.017	H#1	0.010
Family history for hypertension												
No		Ref	<b>m</b> )	Ref		Ref	Hel	Ref	Hel	Ref	-	Ref
Yes		0.500	Hel	0.775		0.499	Hel	0.876	Heri	0.573	Hel	0.788
Location												
England		Ref	H.	Ref		Ref	iei	Ref	Hel	Ref		Ref
Scotland	Hel 	0.130		0.418	141	0.138	H	0.119	<b>⊨</b> •1	0.040		0.057
Wales	He-I	0.961		0.796	He-I	0.986	H	0.959	► • - • - • - • - • - • - • - • - • · • ·	0.854	⊢•⊢1 ¦	0.999
Age												
Older		Ref	Let .	Ref		Ref	iei	Ref	141	Ref	Pel	Ref
Younger	H	0.002	i Heri	0.058		0.003	Hel	0.020		0.395		0.049
Sleep duration												
Long	HeH L	Ref		Ref	H++-1	Ref	H	Ref		Ref		Ref
Moderate		0.132		0.061		0.066	10	0.003	Hel	0.001	Hel	0.000
Short	<b></b>	0.101	1	0.046	per .	0.049	H	0.001		0.001		0.000
HDI												
1		Ref	1	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	rep.	Ref
2	E	0.586		0.599		0.575		0.683		0.081	Hell	0.688
3	(#1	0.755	1	0.732	191	0.717	Heh.	0.571		0.073		0.287
MET	L											
1		Ref		Ref		Ref	1	Ref		Ref	1	Ref
2		0.576	i i	0.090		0.290	101	0.219	1	0.228	141	0.194
3		0.437	1	0.155		0.206	H#I	0.146		0.437	++1	0.158
PRS for hypertension							-1-					
High		Ref	1 101	Ref		Ref	1	Ref		Ref	1	Ref
Intermediate	. [	0.000	-	0.000		0.000		0.003		0.085	0	0.012
Low		0.000		0.000		0.000	ted <sup>1</sup>	0.002		0.061	1 and	0.008
	0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1	

## Figure 3 Potential effect modifiers in the associations of light and BP

All the models adjusted for age, gender, education, TDI, employment status, location, skin colour, BMI, MET, HDI, sleep duration, smoking status, drinking status, sun protection, Vitamin D supplement, and family history of diabetes, hypertension, stroke, and heart disease.

The effect estimates given in the figure are HRs and 95% CIs.

Abbreviations: HE: Hypertension; HO: Hypotension; *P*-int: *P* for interaction; Ref: Reference; HDI: Health diet index; MET: Metabolic equivalent of task; BP: Blood pressure; TDI: Townsend deprivation index; BMI: Body mass index; HR: Hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval.



## Figure 4 Potential mediators in the associations of light and BP

Both the exposure-mediator and exposure-mediator-outcome models adjusted for age, gender, education, TDI, employment status, location, skin colour, BMI, MET, HDI, sleep duration, smoking status, drinking status, sun protection, Vitamin D supplement, and family history of diabetes, hypertension, stroke, and heart disease.

Gray indicates the absence of a mediating effect (total effect and indirect effect are reversed), red indicates a mediating effect by elevating the mediator variable, blue indicates a mediating effect by lowering the mediator variable, and the darker the color, the higher the proportion mediated.

Abbreviations: HDI: Health diet index; MET: Metabolic equivalent of task; BMI: Body mass index; VD: Vitamin D; GLU: Glucose; ALP: Alkaline phosphatase; ALB: Albumin; HBA<sub>1c</sub>: Hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub>; IGF1: Insulin-like growth factors-1; GGT: Gamma-glutamyl transferase; AST: Aspartate aminotransferase; ALT: Alanine aminotransferase; HDL: High-density lipoprotein; LDL:

Low-density lipoprotein; APO B: Apolipoprotein B; APO A: Apolipoprotein A; WBC: White blood cell; CRP: C-reactive protein; SII: Systemic immune-inflammation index; BA: biological age; TDI: Townsend deprivation index;  $\star: 0.01 < P < 0.05; \star \star: 0.001 < P < 0.01; \star \star \star: P < 0.001$ 





Subgroup	Summer-HE	P-int	Winter-HE	P-int	Total-HE	P-int	Summer-HO	P-int	Winter-HO	P-int	Total-HO	P-int
Gender	1				1				1		1	
Female	14	Ref	lei	Ref	н	Ref	ы	Ref	Hert	Ref	Hel	Ref
Male	t i	0.022	-	0.012		0.006	141	0.012	Heri	0.001	++	0.002
Skin colour												
Black	<b>⊢</b> • <mark>⊢</mark> •	Ref	<b>⊢</b>	Ref		Ref	<b>⊢</b>	Ref	< •	*Ref	<	Ref
Brown	Hell	0.955	F F F	0.854	H	0.887	H-a-H	0.931	H-1	0.492	F a f	0.719
Dark olive	H+H	0.655	H-	0.870	H-H-H	0.684	⊢ d i	0.721	(	0.639		0.909
Fair	H	0.441	-	0.751	H	0.495	Iel	0.718	Hel	0.722	He)	0.630
Light olive	e	0.453	H+H	0.767	e	0.499	Hell	0.746	H H	0.647	Heli	0.623
Very fair	Hen	0.519	H <del>a</del> -1	0.604	He I	0.491	H-B-H	0.902	H	0.700	Heil I	0.743
Vitamin D supplement												
No	н	Ref		Ref	μ.	Ref	Iel	Ref	Hel	Ref		Ref
Yes	HeH	0.066		0.881	H	0.164	Fett	0.443	H + + +	0.720	He H	0.584
Sun protection												
Always		Ref	Her	Ref		Ref	Heri	Ref	Hen	Ref	Hert	Ref
Most of the time	-	0.664	Hel	0.999		0.840	HeH	0.043	Hell	0.108	нен	0.044
Never/rarely	lei	0.736	Hert	0.894	<b>I</b> II	0.702	HeH	0.313	H-H	0.011	Her	0.088
Sometimes		0.697	Hell	0.883	-	0.910	Hel	0.014	H <del>i</del> I	0.017	Here i	0.010
Family history for hypertension												
No	1001	Ref	101	Ref	Η.	Ref	Iei	Ref	H	Ref	н	Ref
Yes	H	0.500	Heri I	0.775	H	0.499	Iel	0.876	Here	0.573	Hel	0.788
Location												
England	M	Ref	•	Ref	in in	Ref	IN	Ref	1 mil	Ref	iei	Ref
Scotland	Heil	0.130	F.	0.418	Hini H	0.138	<b>⊢</b>	0.119	i <b>_</b> ●1	0.040	<b>H</b>	0.057
Wales	Hell	0.961		0.796	He-I	0.986		0.959		0.854	<b>—</b> •	0.999
Age												
Older	H	Ref		Ref		Ref	Iei	Ref	Heil	Ref		Ref
Younger	H	0.002	iei	0.058	H	0.003	Hel	0.020	H#-1	0.395	He-I	0.049
Sleep duration												
Long	1-ei-1	Ref	⊢•-i	Ref	H-e-it	Ref		Ref	< i	Ref	<b>~~</b> 1	Ref
Moderate		0.132		0.061	<b>H</b>	0.066		0.003	Her	0.001		0.000
Short	jei	0.101	he-l	0.046	jei I	0.049	H <del>4</del> 1	0.001	1++-1	0.001	He-I	0.000
HDI												
1	-	Ref	i <del>p</del> i	Ref		Ref	lei	Ref	HeH	Ref	Hel	Ref
2		0.586	lei	0.599	H	0.575	iei	0.683	Hen	0.081	H <del>o</del> l	0.688
3	lei	0.755	H#H	0.732	iei I	0.717	-e-¦l	0.571	F=-1	0.073	1	0.287
MET												
1	101	Ref		Ref	iei I	Ref	H <del>P</del> I	Ref	Hart	Ref	HPI	Ref
2		0.576	H <b>PH</b> I	0.090		0.290	H <del>o</del> l	0.219	Heit .	0.228	H <del>el</del>	0.194
3	-	0.437	H <del>r</del> i	0.155		0.206	Hel	0.146	Hei	0.437	101	0.158
PRS for hypertension												
High		Ref		Ref		Ref	191 1	Ref	F#1	Ref	141	Ref
Intermediate		0.000		0.000		0.000	iei I	0.003	H=1	0.085	Her.	0.012
Low		0.000		0.000		0.000	1 <del>101</del>	0.002	•••	_0.061		0.008
	0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1		0.9 1 1.1	



proportion 0.4 0.2 0.0