

1 **Main Manuscript for:**
2 Characterizing the Modern Light Environment
3 and its Influence on Circadian Rhythms
4

5 **Authors**
6 Dennis Khodasevich¹, Susan Tsui¹, Darwin Keung¹, Debra J. Skene²,
7 Victoria Revell², and Micaela E. Martinez^{1*}
8

9 **Affiliations**

- 10 1. Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, USA
11 *correspondence: mem2353@cumc.columbia.edu
12 2. Chronobiology, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, UK.
13
14
15

16 **Keywords**

17 Light at night, circadian rhythms, seasonal rhythms, built environment
18
19
20
21

22 **This PDF File includes:**

- 23 Main Text
24 Figures 1 to 3
25 Table 1

26 Abstract

27 Humans have largely supplanted natural light cycles with a variety of artificial light
28 sources and schedules misaligned with day-night cycles. Circadian disruption has been linked to
29 a number of disease processes, but the extent of circadian disruption among the population is
30 unknown. We measured light exposure and wrist temperature among residents of an urban
31 area for a full week during each of the four seasons, as well as light illuminance in nearby
32 outdoor locations. Daily light exposure was significantly lower for individuals, compared to
33 outdoor light sensors, for all four seasons. There was also little seasonal variation in the realized
34 photoperiod experienced by individuals, with the only significant difference between winter
35 and summer. We tested the hypothesis that differential light exposure impacts circadian phase
36 timing, detected via the wrist temperature rhythm. To determine the influence of light
37 exposure on circadian rhythms, we modeled the impact of morning, afternoon, and nighttime
38 light exposure on the timing of the midline-estimating statistic of rhythm (MESOR). We found
39 that morning light exposure and nighttime light exposure had a significant but opposing impact
40 on MESOR timing. Our results demonstrate that nighttime light can shift/alter circadian
41 rhythms to delay the morning transition from nighttime to daytime physiology, while morning
42 light can lead to earlier onset. Our results demonstrate that circadian shifts and disruptions may
43 be a more regular occurrence in the general population than is currently recognized.

44 Significance Statement

45 Disruption of circadian rhythms has been linked to various diseases, but the prevalence
46 of circadian disruption among the general population is unknown. Light plays a pivotal role in
47 entraining circadian rhythms to the 24-hour day. Humans have largely supplanted natural light
48 cycles with electrical lighting and through time spent indoors. We have shown that individuals
49 experience a disconnect from natural light cycles, with low daytime light exposure, high levels
50 of light-at-night, and minimal seasonal variation in light exposure. We identified measurable
51 changes in the timing of wrist temperature rhythms as a function of differential light exposure
52 during the morning and nighttime hours. Our findings suggest that circadian shifts, and
53 potentially disruption, may be common in the general population.

54
55

56 Introduction

57 Circadian rhythms underlie many foundational biological processes across all corners of
58 life, ranging from prokaryotes to humans [1]. Life evolved under predictable day-night cycles.
59 Structuring certain biological processes into 24-hour cycles allowed organisms to maximize
60 their fitness by synchronizing their internal biology with the external environment [2]. In
61 mammals, nearly all aspects of physiology operate under some level of circadian control,
62 resulting in orchestration of physiological conditions to appropriately match 24-hour cycles in
63 the environment [3]. Well-documented circadian rhythms in mammals include: direct
64 trafficking of various immune cells among the blood and organs [4], generating daily variation in
65 gene transcription [5], controlling rhythms in the rate of protein translation [6], and altering
66 functional responses to infection/vaccination [7,8]. Similarly, rhythms in melatonin, DNA
67 damage, lipid peroxidation, and protein oxidation suggest there is circadian control involved in
68 the response to oxidative stresses [9].

69 In addition to circadian rhythms, mammals display endogenous seasonal (i.e. circannual)
70 rhythms in physiology [10]. Unlike the master circadian clock of mammals, located in the
71 hypothalamic suprachiasmatic nuclei, which has been extensively studied, the circannual clock
72 has yet to be revealed in great detail. Though its molecular architecture is unknown, the
73 circannual clock of many mammal and bird species entrains to photoperiod (day length) [11]
74 and may regulate changes in immunity and health [12]. The working conceptual model for
75 seasonal rhythm generation is that the master circadian clock, which entrains itself to light, is
76 modified seasonally as the duration of daylight changes with the seasons. Seasonal modulation
77 of circadian rhythms could thus generate circannual rhythms [11,13].

78 Although the daily and seasonal light cycles that life evolved under continue to exist,
79 humans have largely supplanted these natural light cycles with increased time spent indoors
80 and new light cycles built around a variety of electrical light sources. Indoor lighting places
81 humans in an illuminance setting that would not be experienced in nature. Electrical light
82 experienced after sunset, termed light-at-night (LAN), can introduce high levels of light
83 exposure at times that would normally be characterized by exceedingly low light exposure due
84 to the lack of direct sunlight. Similarly, outdoor lighting and light spilling from buildings causes
85 brightness many times above the lux of moonlight within urban areas and in the skies, termed
86 light pollution. Unlike other exposures, LAN does not cause direct toxicity to the body, but
87 instead causes perturbations to the circadian system with downstream physiological
88 consequences [14]. The evolved use of light for rhythm entrainment can have pathological
89 consequences in the presence of artificial light, such as elevated breast cancer risk due to light
90 pollution and light at night [15]. A growing body of evidence suggests that chronic circadian
91 disruption can contribute to the development of various diseases, including asthma, cancer,
92 metabolic syndrome, and cardiovascular disease [16,17,18].

93 People live with their own unique realized light cycles, made up of a combination of
94 natural sunlight, ambient light pollution, and indoor artificial lighting. The extent to which daily
95 variations in realized light cycles disrupt circadian physiology in the real-world is poorly
96 understood. In this study we set out to characterize the realized light cycles (RLC) of people in
97 their normal environments, compared to outdoor light cycles, and identify any associations
98 between variations in light exposure and variations in circadian physiology. Body temperature is
99 under circadian control and has been used for many decades to monitor the circadian clock
100 [19]. Due to the ease of measuring body temperature using wearable devices, we used wrist
101 temperature as a non-invasive readout of the circadian system [20]. Our overall aim was to test
102 three hypotheses. First, *people dim out their days* through time spent indoors and *light up their*
103 *nights* through the use of electric light. Second, we hypothesize people experience relatively
104 uniform light exposure throughout the year instead of the natural seasonal light cycle. Lastly,
105 differential light exposure experienced during a normal routine can lead to shifts in circadian
106 physiology, as detected in changes to the timing of wrist temperature rhythms.

107 Results

108 Light Exposure Around the Clock & Through the Seasons

109 Time series of light measured from our outdoor sensors was highly regular, relative to
110 individual exposure, and tightly linked to local sunrise and sunset times (Figure 1a-b). There
111 were minimal nonzero lux readings occurring outdoors after sunset, despite the relatively high
112 amount of light pollution expected in New York City, our primary sample site. Given the lower
113 limit of detection of the light sensors, the illuminance of the outdoor light pollution in the study
114 area measured less than 10 lux. Due to the tight link with sunrise/sunset, seasonal changes in
115 photoperiod were clearly observable from the outdoor sensors (Figure 1a). In contrast to
116 outdoor light, individual light cycles exhibit a high degree of variation within and between
117 individuals. Study participant light exposure did not closely align with sunrise and sunset times
118 (Figure 1b). In particular, participants experienced high levels of nighttime light exposure and a
119 high degree of variability in the degree of nighttime light exposure. Relative to outdoor light,
120 individual light exposure time series featured a high number of days with low levels of light
121 exposure. For instance, compared to a shaded outdoor area, which regularly reached maximum
122 daily lux values of 10^3 - 10^5 lux, individual light exposure rarely exceeded 10^3 lux and daily
123 patterns were highly erratic (Figure 1b). Lastly, many individuals exhibited low levels of light
124 exposure throughout most of their observation weeks, with one or two days of high intensity
125 light exposure more closely resembling outdoor light readings, typically occurring on weekends.

126 As for seasonal light exposure, individuals had relatively similar total daily light exposure
127 from season-to-season, and the amount of light experienced was lower relative to outdoor light
128 for all four seasons (Figure 1c). Differences in total daily light exposure measurements (the area

129 under the curve of the \log_{10} lux time series) are highlighted in Table S1. Total daily outdoor light
130 exhibited a seasonal pattern with light highest in the summer and lowest in the winter
131 measured by outdoor sensors. However, total daily light exposure experienced by study
132 participants exhibited no discernible seasonal pattern (Figure 1c; Table S1). As for nighttime
133 light, most individuals experienced some nighttime light, even though little-to-no nighttime
134 light was detected from the outdoor sensors (Figure 1d). Thus, we infer that nighttime light
135 exposure came from the use of indoor lighting as opposed to outdoor light pollution exposure.
136 When we partitioned the 24-hour cycle into morning, afternoon, evening, and late night we
137 found that individuals experienced the most variation in light exposure late night (relative
138 standard error, RSE = 11.83), while the most consistent light exposure was in the afternoon
139 (RSE = 2.06).

140

141 **The Effect of Light-at-Night and Morning Light on Circadian Physiology**

142 Individuals exhibited a large degree of variation in daily wrist temperature but followed
143 the same general trend of reaching a maximum wrist temperature in the late night/early
144 morning and falling to a minimum wrist temperature in the afternoon (Figure 2a). From this we
145 infer that the nighttime physiological state consists of warm peripheral temperature and the
146 daytime state consists of cool peripheral temperature. The transition from nighttime to
147 daytime physiology tended to occur in the hours around sunrise, with seasonal variation in how
148 closely aligned the transition was to sunrise (Figure 2a). The transition to nighttime physiology
149 was not clearly aligned with sunset and this transition time tended to be noisier among
150 individuals and between seasons (Figure 2a). Individual daily temperature trends were
151 relatively noisy due to periods with missing data and the presence of high frequency variation
152 in temperature within the overall 24-hour trend. The most common times for daily maximum
153 temperature were 00:00 and 01:00 (Figure 2b).

154 The cluster analysis identified significant clusters shared among the light exposure and
155 wrist temperature matrices (Figure 2c). The two most frequent and biologically relevant
156 clusters were low light/high wrist temperature clusters and high light/low wrist temperature
157 clusters. Low light exposure and high wrist temperature was indicative of nighttime physiology,
158 while high light exposure and low wrist temperature was indicative of daytime physiology. The
159 transition from nighttime physiology to daytime physiology typically occurred between 06:00
160 and 08:00, while the transition from daytime physiology to nighttime physiology was more
161 variable.

162 The timing of the morning MESOR, which we define as the time point between peak
163 nighttime wrist temperature and trough daytime wrist temperature, was used as a biological
164 readout of the circadian phase. We used this readout specifically because it has the potential to
165 be influenced by both nighttime light and daytime light. Furthermore, based on our cluster
166 analysis, the morning MESOR coincides with the transition from nighttime physiology to

167 daytime physiology (Figure 2c). The mean timing of the morning MESOR was at 08:40 with a
168 large standard deviation of approximately 2.8 hours. Our linear mixed model tested the effect
169 of nighttime, morning, and afternoon light on MESOR timing. There was a significant effect of
170 nighttime light which caused the MESOR to occur later, as well as a significant effect of morning
171 light, which shifted the MESOR later, as well as no significant effect of afternoon light (Table 1).
172 Baseline MESOR timing varied substantially among participants, ranging from 07:00 to 11:30.
173 The effect size of morning and nighttime light exposure were relatively similar in magnitude,
174 suggesting they may have equal but opposing effects on when the body transitions from
175 nighttime to daytime physiology.

176 Overall, more morning light and less nighttime light exposure was associated with
177 earlier MESOR timing, while less morning light and more nighttime light exposure was
178 associated with later MESOR timing (Figure 3). There are multiple ways in which circadian
179 rhythms can be modulated to generate the observed shift in MESOR timing found by our
180 model. One potential method is through an overall phase shift, in which the entire daily wrist
181 temperature cycle is moved earlier or later due to the timing of light exposure. Specifically,
182 morning light exposure may shift the entire temperature rhythm, generating an earlier morning
183 MESOR timing (Figure S4a), while nighttime light exposure shifts the MESOR timing later (Figure
184 S4b). Another potential process is through an alteration of the cycle/rhythm shape, in which the
185 normal daily wrist temperature rhythm is temporarily distorted by light exposure. For instance,
186 morning light exposure may lead to a faster decline in wrist temperature (Figure S4c), as
187 opposed to a phase shift. Similarly, nighttime light may lead to a delayed rise in wrist
188 temperature and/or other distortions of the rhythm (Figure S4d).

189

190 Discussion

191 This study characterized daily and seasonal light exposure and wrist temperature cycles
192 in people living within their normal environment. Individual light exposure was significantly less
193 than outdoor light across all four seasons. Low overall light exposure resulted from the use of
194 artificial light during the day and what we assume to be little time spent outdoors, especially on
195 weekdays. Electric light was also used at night, and this resulted in higher light exposure at
196 night, relative to outdoor conditions. Individuals exhibited a wide range of light-at-night
197 exposure, ranging from undetectable levels to those similar to daytime. Some individuals were
198 so depauperate in daytime light, and enriched in nighttime light, that half of their total daily
199 light exposure occurred at night. Due to our sensor's inability to register light intensity values
200 below 10 lux, we were unable to measure the effect of low intensity light-at-night and outdoor
201 light pollution. Our evaluation of light exposure, and how it is partitioned among daytime and
202 nighttime hours, supported our hypothesis that individuals living in urban environments dim
203 out their days and light up their nights.

204 The results from our seasonal analysis lead us to conclude that there is minimal seasonal
205 variation in the realized photoperiod experienced by individuals. We had hypothesized that
206 people experience uniform light exposure throughout the year. We did, however, see some
207 variation in light exposure, with a significant difference between summer and winter. However,
208 this summer-winter difference in realized light exposure was one-fifth the magnitude of the
209 same seasonal difference in the outdoor light sensors. The participants in our study live in
210 relatively urban areas within a built environment that is heavily influenced by electric light. We
211 cannot extrapolate our seasonal results to all urban environments, because some cities may be
212 less dependent on electric light, facilitating more naturalistic seasonal cycles in light exposure.
213 Furthermore, depending on economic/occupational and behavioral characteristics of a
214 population, individuals living in other urban environments may have seasonal light exposure
215 vastly different from that in New York City. Seasonal biology in humans is not well-understood,
216 therefore, it is unknown whether the disconnect from natural light cycles we observed will have
217 an impact on physiology and health.

218 Most importantly, this study revealed that differential light exposure, within the range
219 seen in everyday life, can lead to regular shifts in circadian physiology within the general
220 population. We identified alterations in circadian physiology in response to differential light
221 exposure. Increased nighttime light shifted the morning MESOR timing later, while morning
222 light shifted it earlier. There have been numerous elegant lab experiments demonstrating that
223 drastic changes in light exposure (i.e., mimicking night shift and/or jet lag) can lead to circadian
224 disruption [19]. To our knowledge, ours is one of the first studies to show there is an effect of
225 differential light exposure on circadian rhythms in day-to-day life. It is important to note that
226 individuals in our study kept relatively typical daily schedules, similar to that of a typical 9 AM-5
227 PM worker. Our results suggest, if we were to survey light exposure and circadian rhythms in a
228 broader swath of the population, we may expect to find that circadian disruption is a more
229 regular occurrence than has been recognized.

230 The large degree of variability in light exposure among individuals living in a similar
231 geographic area, highlights the importance of personal light monitoring, as opposed to outdoor
232 sensors and satellite data. Although light-at-night studies are highly represented in the
233 chronobiology literature, we found that individuals experienced a high degree of variability in
234 light exposure, not only at night, but across all hours of the day. This variability in light exposure
235 may have broader implications for the generalizability of chronobiology studies conducted
236 under strict experimental conditions. With the emerging focus on personalized medicine and
237 the use of wearable devices to study behavior and health, we believe that the study of light
238 exposure and circadian rhythms in real-time opens up new opportunities for individuals to
239 harness their clock to improve health and wellbeing.

240

241 Materials/Methods

242 **Recruitment/Data collection:**

243 This study was conducted under Columbia University IRB (Protocol Number AAAR7297
244 M00Y03). We recruited 23 adult participants for this study in summer 2018. Participants were
245 recruited via flyers placed in Upper Manhattan, New York City (NYC) and Princeton, NJ.
246 Inclusion into the study required the participants to state that they keep a relatively consistent
247 8-9 hour daily sleep schedule and did not identify as night owls. The majority of participants
248 were from NYC (n = 19), with the mean age of participants being 32.2 years (sd = 8.33 years).
249 We aimed to have a representative sample of individuals living in Northern Manhattan; 70% of
250 the participants identified as women, 22% of the participants identified as Hispanic/Latino, 22%
251 identified as Asian, 22% identified as Black/African American, 30% identified as White, and 4%
252 identified as Other.

253 Participants were given light illuminance sensors (HOBO® UA-002-08 Pendant
254 Temperature/Light Data Logger) and wrist temperature sensors (iButton® temperature loggers
255 DS1922L/DS1922T). The light sensors had a lower limit of detection of 10 lux, which limited
256 detection of low-intensity light exposure recorded. Refer to the supplemental information for a
257 photo of the sensors. Each participant wore their sensors simultaneously for a full week during
258 each of the four seasonal sampling sessions. The seasonal sampling sessions were held during
259 weeks surrounding summer solstice 2018, autumn equinox 2018, winter solstice 2018, and
260 spring equinox 2019. Loss of light/temperature sensors during observation periods and dropout
261 between seasons lowered the effective sample size to 18 in the Summer, 16 in the Fall, 15 in
262 the Winter, and 12 in the Spring.

263

264 **Light Exposure Characterization:**

265 Light exposure was measured in 5-minute intervals for each week-long seasonal
266 sampling session, while outdoor light intensity was measured in 3-minute intervals over a two-
267 week period each season. We aligned outdoor sampling sessions to match the timing of
268 participant sampling. HOBO sensors were hung approx. 1.5 meters above ground facing north,
269 typically on trees (refer to Supplemental Information for an image of the setup). At each
270 outdoor sample location, one sensor was hung in a shaded location and another was hung in a
271 well-lit location. Light illuminance, measured in lux, was \log_{10} transformed for analyses. We
272 analyzed data starting at 17:00 on the first day of sampling. Individual time series were
273 categorized into observation days beginning at 17:00 and ending at 16:55 the following
274 calendar day. Observation days were used when analyzing data over 24-hour periods. We
275 created heatmaps to visualize changes in light illuminance over time, with each row containing
276 each sequential light reading from within one observation day. Rows were organized to group
277 together sequential observation days from the same light sensor within the same season.

278 We quantified light exposure as the area under the curve (AUC) for the \log_{10} lux time
279 series using the trapezoidal rule. All AUC measurements are expressed with the unit \log_{10} lux-
280 minutes. To study the seasonal variation in light exposure we measured (i) total daily light
281 exposure, (ii) nighttime light exposure (i.e., sunset to 04:00), and (iii) daytime light exposure
282 (i.e., 04:00 to approximate hour of sunset) for each observation day. We calculated this for
283 both the participant data and the outdoor data for comparison. Tukey's Honest Significant
284 Difference test was used to compare means across seasons. To determine the effect of
285 differential light exposure on circadian physiology, standardized nighttime (21:00 – 02:00) and
286 morning (04:00 - 11:59) AUC was calculated for individual participants on each observation day.
287 This was used as inputs for the linear mixed model described below. In order to quantify
288 variability in light exposure at different times of day, the AUC was lastly calculated for four
289 fixed-duration temporal windows: morning (05:00 – 11:00), afternoon (11:00 – 17:00), evening
290 (17:00 – 23:00), and late night (23:00 – 05:00). The relative standard error of the AUC was
291 calculated for each temporal window.

292

293 **Temperature Characterization:**

294 Wrist temperature was also measured in 5-minute intervals, synchronized with the light
295 exposure measurements. Temperature readings outside of the normal biological range (<
296 29.5°C or > 38.5°C) were replaced with NAs, as we assumed these readings occurred when
297 participants removed their device. To visualize global patterns in the relationship between light
298 exposure and wrist temperature, time series matrices of light and temperature were identically
299 gridded and treated as spatially-organized grids. Using these spatially-organized grids, we ran a
300 Bivariate Local Moran's I using queen contiguity and 8 orders of contiguity. The Moran's I
301 allowed us to identify significant clusters shared among the light and temperature
302 matrices. Knowing that body temperature follows a periodic rhythm [20] with a period of
303 approximately 24 hours, a periodic wave function was fit to each observation day of
304 temperature readings by running a linear regression model with $\cos(2\pi \cdot \text{Time}/24)$ and $\sin(2\pi \cdot \text{Time}/24)$
305 as predictor variables and temperature as the response variable. We then
306 applied a goodness-of-fit measure to the periodic wave functions and only worked with those
307 observation days where the average difference between predicted and observed wrist
308 temperature was less than 1.11°C.

309 The fitted periodic wave functions were used to predict the timing of the MESOR
310 (midline estimating statistic of rhythm) occurring between the peak and the trough following
311 the daily maximum temperature within each observation day. A linear mixed model was then
312 run with MESOR timing as the outcome, nighttime, morning, and afternoon light exposure as
313 fixed effects, and individual participant number as the random effect (variable slope). The R
314 package lme4 was used to fit the linear mixed model [21]. Accompanying p-values for the linear
315 mixed model were calculated via Satterthwaite's degrees of freedom method, using the R

316 package lmerTest [22]. Additionally, multicollinearity among the input variables was tested for
317 by calculating the variance inflation factor using the vif function from the R package usdm [23].
318 All data analysis was done in R version 3.6.2 [24]. Figures were generated using the R packages
319 ggplot2 [25] and plotly [26].

320

321 Acknowledgements

322 Our research was funded by a pilot award from the NIEHS p30 Center (ES009089).

References

1. Koukkari WL, Sothorn RB, *Introducing Biological Rhythms: A Primer on the Temporal Organization of Life, with Implications for Health, Society, Reproduction, and the Natural Environment*. Springer Netherlands, 2006 doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-4701-5.
2. Yerushalmi S, Green RM. Evidence for the adaptive significance of circadian rhythms. *Ecology Letters* 2009;12:970–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01343.x>.
3. Mermet J, Yeung J, Naef F. *Systems Chronobiology: Global Analysis of Gene Regulation in a 24-Hour Periodic World*. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* 2016;9:a028720. <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a028720>.
4. Scheiermann C, Kunisaki Y, Frenette PS. Circadian control of the immune system. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2013;13:190–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nri3386>.
5. Keller M, Mazuch J, Abraham U, Eom GD, Herzog ED, Volk H-D, et al. A circadian clock in macrophages controls inflammatory immune responses. *PNAS* 2009;106:21407–12. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0906361106>.
6. Takahashi JS. Transcriptional architecture of the mammalian circadian clock. *Nat Rev Genet* 2016;18:164–79. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2016.150>.
7. Bellet MM, Deriu E, Liu JZ, Grimaldi B, Blaschitz C, Zeller M, et al. Circadian clock regulates the host response to Salmonella. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2013;110:9897–902. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1120636110>.
8. Tsoumtsa LL, Torre C, Ghigo E. Circadian Control of Antibacterial Immunity: Findings from Animal Models. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2016;6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2016.00054>.
9. Wilking M, Ndiaye M, Mukhtar H, Ahmad N. Circadian Rhythm Connections to Oxidative Stress: Implications for Human Health. *Antioxidants & Redox Signaling* 2013;19:192–208. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2012.4889>.
10. Gwinner E. *Circannual Rhythms*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 1986. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-82870-6>.
11. Lincoln GA, Clarke IJ, Hut RA, Hazlerigg DG. Characterizing a Mammalian Circannual Pacemaker. *Science* 2006;314:1941–4. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1132009>.
12. Martinez-Bakker M, Helm B. The influence of biological rhythms on host–parasite interactions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 2015;30:314–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.012>.

13. VanderLeest HT, Houben T, Michel S, Deboer T, Albus H, Vansteensel MJ, et al. Seasonal Encoding by the Circadian Pacemaker of the SCN. *Current Biology* 2007;17:468–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.01.048>.
14. Cho Y, Ryu S-H, Lee BR, Kim KH, Lee E, Choi J. Effects of artificial light at night on human health: A literature review of observational and experimental studies applied to exposure assessment. *Chronobiology International* 2015;32:1294–310. <https://doi.org/10.3109/07420528.2015.1073158>.
15. James P, Bertrand KA, Hart JE, Schernhammer ES, Tamimi RM, Laden F. Outdoor Light at Night and Breast Cancer Incidence in the Nurses' Health Study II. *Environ Health Perspect* 2017;125:087010. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp935>.
16. Skene DJ, Skorniyakov E, Chowdhury NR, Gajula RP, Middleton B, Satterfield BC, et al. Separation of circadian- and behavior-driven metabolite rhythms in humans provides a window on peripheral oscillators and metabolism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2018;115:7825–30. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1801183115>.
17. Martin RJ, Banks-Schlegel S. Chronobiology of Asthma. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1998;158:1002–7. <https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.158.3.9712132>.
18. Daugaard S, Garde AH, Bonde JPE, Christoffersen J, Hansen ÅM, Markvart J, et al. Night work, light exposure and melatonin on work days and days off. *Chronobiology International* 2017;34:942–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07420528.2017.1327867>.
19. Khalsa SBS, Jewett ME, Duffy JF, Czeisler CA. The Timing of the Human Circadian Clock Is Accurately Represented by the Core Body Temperature Rhythm following Phase Shifts to a Three-Cycle Light Stimulus Near the Critical Zone. *J Biol Rhythms* 2000;15:524–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074873040001500609>.
20. Sarabia JA, Rol MA, Mendiola P, Madrid JA. Circadian rhythm of wrist temperature in normal-living subjects. *Physiology & Behavior* 2008;95:570–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2008.08.005>.
21. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J Stat Soft* 2015;67. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.
22. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *J Stat Soft* 2017;82. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>.
23. Naimi B, Hamm NAS, Groen TA, Skidmore AK, Toxopeus AG. Where is positional uncertainty a problem for species distribution modelling? *Ecography* 2013;37:191–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2013.00205.x>.
24. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2019. <http://www.R-project.org/>.
25. Wickham H. *ggplot2*. Springer New York; 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-98141-3>.
26. Sievert C. Interactive Web-Based Data Visualization with R, plotly, and shiny. Chapman and Hall/CRC Florida, 2020. Available from: <https://plotly-r.com>

Figures




Figure 1: Light Data Characterization. Daily light exposure time series across all four seasons with approximate sunrise and sunset times shown in blue from (a) outdoor sensors and (b) individual light exposure. Each row contains a full 24-hour period of readings from a single light sensor, with rows grouped together by light sensor and by season. Individual data consists of lux readings taken at 5-minute intervals over up to 7 days from study participants. Outdoor data consists of lux readings taken at 3-minute intervals over 9 days from sensors located in upper Manhattan. (c) Total daily light exposure, measured as the area-under-the-curve for the $\log_{10}\text{lux}$ timeseries, comparisons of individual participant data (Ind.) and outdoor data (Out.) across the four seasons. (d) Nighttime light exposure (Sunset – 04:00) comparisons of individual participant data (Ind.) and outdoor data (Out.) across the four seasons.




Figure 2: Wrist Temperature Characterization. (a) Daily wrist temperature time series across all four seasons with approximate sunrise and sunset times shown in yellow. Each row contains a full 24-hour period of readings from a single individual, with rows grouped together by individual and by season. Individual data consists of lux readings taken at 5-minute intervals over up to 7 days from study participants. Times with wrist temperatures outside of the range of normal human wrist temperature ($< 29.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ or $> 38.5^{\circ}\text{C}$) appear as white cells. (b) Relative frequency of daily maximum temperature timing, based on hourly averages. (c) Local bivariate Moran's I cluster analysis of individual light exposure and wrist temperature trend data. Significant clusters are shown in their corresponding colors, with non-significant areas shown in white.

| Variable | Estimate | Std. Error | df | t-value | Pr(> t) |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|----------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 1.65E+01 | 6.09E-01 | 1.08E+02 | 27.06 | 2.00E-16 |
| Morning Light | -4.00E-03 | 9.18E-04 | 2.59E+02 | -4.36 | 1.92E-05 |
| Nighttime Light | 2.80E-03 | 1.15E-03 | 2.48E+02 | 2.44 | 0.0155 |
| Afternoon Light | 8.28E-04 | 8.67E-04 | 2.62E+02 | 0.96 | 0.3401 |

Table 1: Fixed Effects Outputs from the Linear Mixed Model. Linear mixed model fit by REML, t-tests use Satterthwaite's method. Accompanying p-values for the fixed effects are under the "Pr(>|t|)" column. Random effects allow for y-intercept to vary between individuals. All input variables had a variance inflation factor below 1.47, suggesting no multicollinearity among the variables.




Figure 3: Conceptual Explanation of the effect of light exposure on MESOR timing. Projected change in MESOR timing at different levels of nighttime and morning light exposure, based on data outputs from the mixed model. Distance between parallel lines reflects difference in baseline MESOR timing intercept between individual participants.