

**Working from home due to the COVID-19 pandemic abolished the sleep disturbance vulnerability of late chronotypes relieving their predisposition to depression**

Federico Salfi<sup>1</sup>, Aurora D'Atri<sup>1</sup>, Giulia Amicucci<sup>1,2</sup>, Lorenzo Viselli<sup>1</sup>, Maurizio Gorgoni<sup>2</sup>, Serena Scarpelli<sup>2</sup>, Valentina Alfonsi<sup>2</sup>, and Michele Ferrara<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biotechnological and Applied Clinical Sciences, University of L'Aquila, L'Aquila, Italy

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

\*Corresponding author

Prof. Michele Ferrara, Ph.D.

Department of Biotechnological and Applied Clinical Sciences

University of L'Aquila

Via Vetoio (Coppito 2)


67100 Coppito (AQ)

Italy

[michele.ferrara@univaq.it](mailto:michele.ferrara@univaq.it)

## Supplemental materials

Two additional moderation models were tested using model 1 of PROCESS macro (version 3.5) for SPSS (version 22.0).<sup>40</sup> We assumed that working modality (office working, remote working) moderated the effect of chronotype on bedtime and get-up time (Figure S1). Both the models included the covariance of age and gender.




**Figure S1.** The two additional moderation models tested (M4, M5). Chronotype is hypothesized to predict bedtime and get-up time, while the working modality (office working, remote working) moderated this relationship.

*Abbreviations:* MEQr, Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire-reduced version.

The regressions on bedtime and get-up time were significant (Model 4:  $R^2 = .247$ ,  $F = 56.852$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Model 5:  $R^2 = .274$ ,  $F = 65.685$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The covariate effect of “gender” emerged significant for the bedtime variable ( $B = 14.51$  min,  $t = 2.630$ ,  $p = .009$ ), indicating that female respondents went to bed earlier. Age was a significant predictor of get-up time ( $B = -1.58$  min,  $t = -8.509$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that older age was associated with earlier get-up time.

The conditional direct effects at both values of the moderator (office working, remote working) were significant in both the models. In particular, MEQr score predicted significantly bedtime (office working:  $B = -9.80$  min,  $t = -10.029$ ,  $p < .001$ ; remote working:  $B = -7.92$  min,  $t = -11.154$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and get-up time (office working:  $B = -8.50$  min,  $t = -9.317$ ,  $p < .001$ ; remote working:  $B = -6.05$  min,  $t = -9.221$ ,  $p < .001$ ), confirming the tendency to delayed sleep time of evening-type people in both the working modality conditions. The “working modality” moderator was significant in both the models (M4:  $B = 51.55$  min,  $t = 2.682$ ,  $p = .008$ ; M5:  $B = 69.27$  min,  $t = 3.874$ ,  $p = .001$ ), showing that people working from home went to bed and got-up later. Finally, the significant interaction between “working modality” and MEQr score

was limited to the get-up time variable (M4:  $B = -1.87$  min,  $t = -1.564$ ,  $p = .118$ ; M5:  $B = -2.30$  min,  $t = -2.130$ ,  $p = .033$ ), highlighting that the relationship between chronotype and rising time was stronger in those who worked from home than in the office working condition (Figure S2).



**Figure S2.** Simple slope analysis of the interaction between MEQr scores and working modality [office working (blue line), remote working (green line)] on get-up time (hh:mm). Gray bands identify chronotypes according to the validated cut-off scores.

*Abbreviations:* ET, evening type; NT, neither type; MT, morning type; MEQr, Morningness-eveningness questionnaire-reduced version.