1	Main Manuscript for:
2	Characterizing the Modern Light Environment
2	and its Influence on Circadian Bhythms
3	
4	A sh a
5	
6	Dennis Khodasevich ¹ , Susan Tsul ¹ , Darwin Keung ¹ , Debra J. Skene ² ,
7	Victoria Revell ² , 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	
27	This PDF File includes:
22 22	Main Toyt
23 24	
24 05	Figures 1 to 3
25	I add 1

26 Abstract

27 Humans have largely supplanted natural light cycles with a variety of artificial light sources and schedules misaligned with day-night cycles. Circadian disruption has been linked to 28 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 photoperiod experienced by individuals, with the only significant difference between winter 34 35 and summer. We tested the hypothesis that differential light exposure impacts circadian phase timing, detected via the wrist temperature rhythm. To determine the influence of light 36 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 on MESOR timing. Our results demonstrate that nighttime light can shift/alter circadian 40 rhythms to delay the morning transition from nighttime to daytime physiology, while morning 41 light can lead to earlier onset. Our results demonstrate that circadian shifts and disruptions may 42 43 be a more regular occurrence in the general population than is currently recognized. 44

45 Significance Statement

46 Disruption of circadian rhythms has been linked to various diseases, but the prevalence 47 of circadian disruption among the general population is unknown. Light plays a pivotal role in 48 entraining circadian rhythms to the 24-hour day. Humans have largely supplanted natural light cycles with electrical lighting and through time spent indoors. We have shown that individuals 49 50 experience a disconnect from natural light cycles, with low daytime light exposure, high levels of light-at-night, and minimal seasonal variation in light exposure. We identified measurable 51 52 changes in the timing of wrist temperature rhythms as a function of differential light exposure during the morning and nighttime hours. Our findings suggest that circadian shifts, and 53 54 potentially disruption, may be common in the general population. 55

56 Introduction

57 Circadian rhythms underlie many foundational biological processes across all corners of life, ranging from prokaryotes to humans [1]. Life evolved under predictable day-night cycles. 58 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 trafficking of various immune cells among the blood and organs [4], generating daily variation in 64 65 gene transcription [5], controlling rhythms in the rate of protein translation [6], and altering functional responses to infection/vaccination [7,8]. Similarly, rhythms in melatonin, DNA 66 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 modified seasonally as the duration of daylight changes with the seasons. Seasonal modulation 76 77 of circadian rhythms could thus generate circannual rhythms [11,13]. Although the daily and seasonal light cycles that life evolved under continue to exist. 78

humans have largely supplanted these natural light cycles with increased time spent indoors 79 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 brightness many times above the lux of moonlight within urban areas and in the skies, termed 85 light pollution. Unlike other exposures, LAN does not cause direct toxicity to the body, but 86 87 instead causes perturbations to the circadian system with downstream physiological consequences [14]. The evolved use of light for rhythm entrainment can have pathological 88 consequences in the presence of artificial light, such as elevated breast cancer risk due to light 89 pollution and light at night [15]. A growing body of evidence suggests that chronic circadian 90 91 disruption can contribute to the development of various diseases, including asthma, cancer, 92 metabolic syndrome, and cardiovascular disease [16,17,18].

People live with their own unique realized light cycles, made up of a combination of 93 natural sunlight, ambient light pollution, and indoor artificial lighting. The extent to which daily 94 variations in realized light cycles disrupt circadian physiology in the real-world is poorly 95 understood. In this study we set out to characterize the realized light cycles (RLC) of people in 96 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 three hypotheses. First, people dim out their days through time spent indoors and light up their 102 103 *nights* through the use of electric light. Second, we hypothesize people experience relatively uniform light exposure throughout the year instead of the natural seasonal light cycle. Lastly, 104 105 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

Time series of light measured from our outdoor sensors was highly regular, relative to 109 110 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 limit of detection of the light sensors, the illuminance of the outdoor light pollution in the study 113 area measured less than 10 lux. Due to the tight link with sunrise/sunset, seasonal changes in 114 photoperiod were clearly observable from the outdoor sensors (Figure 1a). In contrast to 115 outdoor light, individual light cycles exhibit a high degree of variation within and between 116 117 individuals. Study participant light exposure did not closely align with sunrise and sunset times (Figure 1b). In particular, participants experienced high levels of nighttime light exposure and a 118 119 high degree of variability in the degree of nighttime light exposure. Relative to outdoor light. individual light exposure time series featured a high number of days with low levels of light 120 exposure. For instance, compared to a shaded outdoor area, which regularly reached maximum 121 daily lux values of 10³-10⁵ lux, individual light exposure rarely exceeded 10³ lux and daily 122 patterns were highly erratic (Figure 1b). Lastly, many individuals exhibited low levels of light 123 exposure throughout most of their observation weeks, with one or two days of high intensity 124 light exposure more closely resembling outdoor light readings, typically occurring on weekends. 125 As for seasonal light exposure, individuals had relatively similar total daily light exposure 126 from season-to-season, and the amount of light experienced was lower relative to outdoor light 127 128 for all four seasons (Figure 1c). Differences in total daily light exposure measurements (the area

under the curve of the log₁₀lux 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
- standard error, RSE = 11.83), while the most consistent light exposure was in the afternoon
 (RSE = 2.06).
- 140

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

Individuals exhibited a large degree of variation in daily wrist temperature but followed 142 143 the same general trend of reaching a maximum wrist temperature in the late night/early morning and falling to a minimum wrist temperature in the afternoon (Figure 2a). From this we 144 infer that the nighttime physiological state consists of warm peripheral temperature and the 145 daytime state consists of cool peripheral temperature. The transition from nighttime to 146 daytime physiology tended to occur in the hours around sunrise, with seasonal variation in how 147 closely aligned the transition was to sunrise (Figure 2a). The transition to nighttime physiology 148 was not clearly aligned with sunset and this transition time tended to be noisier among 149 individuals and between seasons (Figure 2a). Individual daily temperature trends were 150 151 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).

The cluster analysis identified significant clusters shared among the light exposure and 154 155 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, while high light exposure and low wrist temperature was indicative of daytime physiology. The 158 159 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

daytime physiology (Figure 2c). The mean timing of the morning MESOR was at 08:40 with a 167 large standard deviation of approximately 2.8 hours. Our linear mixed model tested the effect 168 169 of nighttime, morning, and afternoon light on MESOR timing. There was a significant effect of nighttime light which caused the MESOR to occur later, as well as a significant effect of morning 170 light, which shifted the MESOR later, as well as no significant effect of afternoon light (Table 1). 171 Baseline MESOR timing varied substantially among participants, ranging from 07:00 to 11:30. 172 173 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 associated with later MESOR timing (Figure 3). There are multiple ways in which circadian 178 179 rhythms can be modulated to generate the observed shift in MESOR timing found by our model. One potential method is through an overall phase shift, in which the entire daily wrist 180 181 temperature cycle is moved earlier or later due to the timing of light exposure. Specifically, morning light exposure may shift the entire temperature rhythm, generating an earlier morning 182 MESOR timing (Figure S4a), while nighttime light exposure shifts the MESOR timing later (Figure 183 S4b). Another potential process is through an alteration of the cycle/rhythm shape, in which the 184 normal daily wrist temperature rhythm is temporarily distorted by light exposure. For instance, 185 morning light exposure may lead to a faster decline in wrist temperature (Figure S4c), as 186 opposed to a phase shift. Similarly, nighttime light may lead to a delayed rise in wrist 187 temperature and/or other distortions of the rhythm (Figure S4d). 188

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 than outdoor light across all four seasons. Low overall light exposure resulted from the use of 193 194 artificial light during the day and what we assume to be little time spent outdoors, especially on weekdays. Electric light was also used at night, and this resulted in higher light exposure at 195 196 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 so depauperate in daytime light, and enriched in nighttime light, that half of their total daily 198 light exposure occurred at night. Due to our sensor's inability to register light intensity values 199 below 10 lux, we were unable to measure the effect of low intensity light-at-night and outdoor 200 light pollution. Our evaluation of light exposure, and how it is partitioned among daytime and 201 202 nighttime hours, supported our hypothesis that individuals living in urban environments dim 203 out their days and light up their nights.

The results from our seasonal analysis lead us to conclude that there is minimal seasonal 204 variation in the realized photoperiod experienced by individuals. We had hypothesized that 205 206 people experience uniform light exposure throughout the year. We did, however, see some variation in light exposure, with a significant difference between summer and winter. However, 207 208 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. Furthermore, depending on economic/occupational and behavioral characteristics of a 213 214 population, individuals living in other urban environments may have seasonal light exposure vastly different from that in New York City. Seasonal biology in humans is not well-understood, 215 216 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 seen in everyday life, can lead to regular shifts in circadian physiology within the general 219 220 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 drastic changes in light exposure (i.e., mimicking night shift and/or jet lag) can lead to circadian 223 disruption [19]. To our knowledge, ours is one of the first studies to show there is an effect of 224 differential light exposure on circadian rhythms in day-to-day life. It is important to note that 225 226 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 the use of wearable devices to study behavior and health, we believe that the study of light 237 238 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. Inclusion into the study required the participants to state that they keep a relatively consistent 246 8-9 hour daily sleep schedule and did not identify as night owls. The majority of participants 247 were from NYC (n = 19), with the mean age of participants being 32.2 years (sd = 8.33 years). 248 249 We aimed to have a representative sample of individuals living in Northern Manhattan; 70% of the participants identified as women, 22% of the participants identified as Hispanic/Latino, 22% 250 251 identified as Asian, 22% identified as Black/African American, 30% identified as White, and 4% identified as Other. 252

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

263

264 Light Exposure Characterization:

Light exposure was measured in 5-minute intervals for each week-long seasonal 265 sampling session, while outdoor light intensity was measured in 3-minute intervals over a two-266 week period each season. We aligned outdoor sampling sessions to match the timing of 267 participant sampling. HOBO sensors were hung approx. 1.5 meters above ground facing north, 268 269 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 log₁₀ transformed for analyses. We analyzed data starting at 17:00 on the first day of sampling. Individual time series were 272 273 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 created heatmaps to visualize changes in light illuminance over time, with each row containing 275 276 each sequential light reading from within one observation day. Rows were organized to group together sequential observation days from the same light sensor within the same season. 277

We quantified light exposure as the area under the curve (AUC) for the log₁₀lux time 278 279 series using the trapezoidal rule. All AUC measurements are expressed with the unit log₁₀lux-280 minutes. To study the seasonal variation in light exposure we measured (i) total daily light exposure, (ii) nighttime light exposure (i.e., sunset to 04:00), and (iii) daytime light exposure 281 (i.e., 04:00 to approximate hour of sunset) for each observation day. We calculated this for 282 283 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 differential light exposure on circadian physiology, standardized nighttime (21:00 – 02:00) and 285 286 morning (04:00 - 11:59) AUC was calculated for individual participants on each observation day. This was used as inputs for the linear mixed model described below. In order to quantify 287 288 variability in light exposure at different times of day, the AUC was lastly calculated for four fixed-duration temporal windows: morning (05:00 - 11:00), afternoon (11:00 - 17:00), evening 289 290 (17:00 - 23:00), and late night (23:00 - 05:00). The relative standard error of the AUC was calculated for each temporal window. 291

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 (< 29.5°C or > 38.5°C) were replaced with NAs, as we assumed these readings occurred when 296 participants removed their device. To visualize global patterns in the relationship between light 297 298 exposure and wrist temperature, time series matrices of light and temperature were identically gridded and treated as spatially-organized grids. Using these spatially-organized grids, we ran a 299 300 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 approximately 24 hours, a periodic wave function was fit to each observation day of 303 304 temperature readings by running a linear regression model with $\cos(2*pi*Time/24)$ and $\sin(2*pi)$ 305 pi * Time/24) 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.

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

- 316 package ImerTest [22]. Additionally, multicollinearity among the input variables was tested for
- 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, Sothern 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, Skornyakov 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 ÄM, 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 normalliving 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 Usinglme4. J Stat Soft 2015;67. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

22. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. ImerTest 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 log₁₀lux 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.



Maximum Temperature Timing Frequency

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°C or > 38.5°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.