

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**

26 **Objective:** Light exposure is considered to be associated with reduced blood pressure  
27 (BP). However, longitudinal epidemiological studies concerning the light–BP  
28 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  
33 proportional hazard regression models were employed to estimate the light–BP  
34 associations, restricted cubic splines were utilized to detect potential nonlinear  
35 associations, subgroup analyses were conducted to identify effect modifiers, and  
36 causal mediation analyses were performed to explore potential mechanisms.

37 **Results:** Using summer light exposure as an illustration, after a median follow-up of  
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  
57 disease burden<sup>2</sup>. Hypotension, as another type of blood pressure (BP) abnormality,  
58 also poses significant health risks that cannot be ignored. For example, orthostatic  
59 hypotension has a prevalence ranging from 6% to 35%<sup>3</sup> and is significantly associated  
60 with increased risks of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, heart failure, and  
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  
66 intensity and increased systolic blood pressure (SBP)<sup>5</sup>. Another cross-sectional study  
67 involving 342,457 dialysis patients in the US found that ultraviolet was negatively  
68 associated with SBP<sup>6</sup>. The mechanism underlying this association may be that light  
69 exposure promotes vitamin D synthesis<sup>7</sup> and facilitates the release of nitric oxide in  
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.

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

79 studies, 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](http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk)), a cohort study  
84 described in detail previously<sup>9</sup>. In brief, the baseline survey included over 500,000  
85 participants from 37 to 73 from 2006 to 2010, collecting their demographic  
86 characteristics, behavioral lifestyle factors, disease history, family history, physical  
87 measurements, and biochemical examinations, followed by three repeated surveys  
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  
90 written informed consent for the study<sup>10,11</sup>.

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  
93 during summer (16h, n=252) and winter (8h, n=5,318)<sup>12</sup>, and participants with  
94 extreme light exposure time (larger than the mean plus twice the standard deviation )  
95 during summer (n=14,600) and winter (n=24,947)<sup>13</sup>. For hypertension and  
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**

101 Participants reported their daily outdoor hours for summer (Field 1050) and  
102 winter (Field 1060), including integers or specific values indicating “Do not know”,  
103 “Prefer not to answer” or “Less than an hour a day”. The first two specified values are  
104 treated as missing data, while the latter is reassigned for half an hour. Additionally, the  
105 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  
111 could not be employed<sup>14</sup>. We calculated pulse pressure (PP) and mean arterial  
112 pressure (MAP) based on systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure  
113 (DBP), i.e.,  $PP = SBP - DBP$ , and  $MAP = (SBP + 2 \times DBP) \div 3$ . 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  
117 time (years)<sup>15</sup>. BP trajectory was identified according to the trends of BP utilizing the  
118 latent growth model. Analyses involving cBP and BP trajectory (**Figure 1, Phase 3**)  
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  $\geq 130/80$  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  
126 Diseases (ICD-10) codes, with the first occurrence recorded in the UK Biobank.  
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  
129 first disease occurrence, death, loss to follow-up, or the end of the follow-up period.  
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  
136 college or university degree), employment status (employed, unemployed), skin  
137 colour (black, brown, dark olive, fair, light olive, very fair), Townsend Deprivation  
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),  
141 smoking status (never, previous, current), drinking status (never, special occasions  
142 only, one to three times a month, once or twice a week, three or four times a week,  
143 daily or almost daily), sun protection (do not go out in sunshine, never/rarely,  
144 sometimes, always, most of the time), and vitamin D supplementation (yes, no). The  
145 HDI was derived from participants' intake of vegetables, fruits, fish, processed meat,  
146 and non-processed red meat, with each item scored as 1 for healthy and 0 for  
147 unhealthy, yielding an HDI range of 0 to 5, consistent with prior studies<sup>16,17</sup>. Family  
148 history was identified according to family history of father, mother, and siblings,  
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  
154 behavioral lifestyle and family history factors were associated with BP. As MET<sup>18</sup>,  
155 BMI<sup>19</sup>, and sleep duration<sup>12</sup> were associated with light exposure, they were included  
156 as potential mediators, and the remaining behavioral lifestyle and family history  
157 factors were included as effect modifiers.

## 158 **2.5 Statistical analyses**

### 159 **2.5.1 Cross-sectional analyses**

160 In the cross-sectional design, linear regression models were used to estimate the  
161 associations ( $\beta$ s) of light exposure with BP, and logistic regression models were used  
162 to estimate the associations (odds ratios, ORs) of light exposure with hypertension  
163 and hypotension. For each analysis, four models were considered: Model 1, the crude  
164 model, where no covariate was included; Model 2, including demographic  
165 characteristics; Model 3, further including behavioral lifestyle factors; Model 4,  
166 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  
169 associations ( $\beta$ s) of light and four cBPs (including cDBP, cSBP, cPP, and cMAP).  
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)**

179 In the longitudinal design, Cox proportional hazard regression models were used  
180 to estimate the associations (hazard ratio, HRs) of light exposure with hypertension  
181 and hypotension (time-to-event outcome). Restricted cubic spline (RCS) was used to  
182 evaluate the nonlinear exposure–response relationships. Based on the RCS results,  
183 continuous variables were transformed into categorical variables to refit the Cox  
184 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  
189 particulate matter as it may reduce light exposure through physical obstruction<sup>13</sup> and  
190 are associated with BP<sup>20</sup>, potentially acting as a confounder; 5) further adjusting noise  
191 and greenspace exposure as light exposure might lead to an increase in these  
192 exposures associated with BP<sup>21</sup>, potentially acting as mediators; 6) further adjusting  
193 disease such as hearing difficulty and fracture as they might reduce light exposure by  
194 spending less time outside and may be associated with BP<sup>13,22,23</sup>, potentially acting as  
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 ( $> 9$ h, 7-9h,  $< 7$ h),  
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>).

206 Casual mediation analyses<sup>24</sup> were conducted to explore potential mechanisms in  
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)<sup>25</sup>, 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 count, systemic immune-inflammation index  
215 (platelet $\times$ neutrophil $\div$ 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.

222 Participants with missing exposure, outcome, or covariates were further excluded  
223 in the main statistical analyses. All analyses were performed using R 4.3.1 software.  
224 Two-sided P values  $\leq 0.05$  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**

238 The findings from cross-sectional analyses are presented in [Table 2](#), indicating a  
239 significant association of light exposure with elevated BP and increased risk of  
240 hypertension, and an insignificant association between light exposure and decreased

241 risk of hypotension. Taking summer light as an example, exposure to summer light  
242 exhibited associations with BP, with effect estimates ( $\beta$ s and 95% CIs) of 0.164 (0.126,  
243 0.201) for SBP, 0.084 (0.063, 0.106) for DBP, 0.079 (0.052, 0.106) for PP, and 0.111  
244 (0.086, 0.136) for MAP. Furthermore, summer light exposure demonstrated  
245 associations with hypertension and hypotension, with ORs and 95% CIs of 1.019  
246 (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 ( $\beta$ s  
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  
258 (1.094, 1.019–1.176) and average light (1.141, 1.026–1.267).

### 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  
266 ( $P$ -nonlinear  $>0.05$ ) except for the winter light–hypotension association ( $P$ -nonlinear  
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

269 may elevate the risk of hypertension and reduce the risk of hypotension. Consistent  
270 results were observed for sensitivity analyses regarding the association direction,  
271 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).

292 The mediation analyses results are demonstrated in **Figure 4**. In brief, significant  
293 mediators mainly concentrated on aging, inflammation, and behavioural lifestyle  
294 indicators. For example, summer light may increase the risk of hypertension by  
295 increasing biological age (proportion mediated, 24.1%,  $P<0.001$ ), neutrophil count  
296 (5.4%,  $P<0.001$ ), and BMI (32.0%,  $P<0.001$ ). Summer light associated with reduced  
297 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  
300 epidemiological investigation into the light–BP association. Utilizing data from the  
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  
316 negatively associated with SBP<sup>6</sup>. Additionally, a cross-sectional study involving  
317 205,888 singleton pregnant women in the US found that higher solar radiation was  
318 associated with a lower risk of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy<sup>26</sup>. While these  
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  
327 patterns, including wavelength, intensity, exposure time, and duration<sup>27</sup>. Regarding  
328 wavelength, Krause et al. found that UVB, with shorter wavelengths than UVA, is  
329 associated with decreased BP, while UVA is not<sup>28</sup>. Concerning intensity, McFadden  
330 et al. found a correlation between bedroom brightness and higher BMI in women<sup>29</sup>. In  
331 terms of exposure time, Cheung et al. discovered that exposure to blue light in the  
332 evening (rather than in the morning) is associated with higher glucose peaks<sup>30</sup>. As for  
333 duration, Veleva et al. found that ultraviolet only has short-term effects on BP  
334 reduction rather than long-term effects<sup>31</sup>. As a large-scale epidemiological study  
335 based on self-reported light exposure, this study accounted for long-term exposure to  
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>.  
342 However, the relationship between vitamin D and BP remains highly debated<sup>32,33</sup>. A  
343 randomized clinical trial involving 119 individuals found that exposure to UVB  
344 radiation, which enhances vitamin D synthesis, did not reduce BP<sup>34</sup>. Apart from  
345 vitamin D, other studies suggest that light exposure may facilitate the release of nitric  
346 oxide from the skin into the bloodstream, thus lowering BP<sup>8,35</sup>.

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

354 aging<sup>40</sup>. Regarding lipid metabolism, Klinedinst et al. found that light exposure is  
355 associated with decreased subcutaneous fat and increased visceral fat<sup>19</sup>. Pattinson et al.  
356 found an association between light exposure and childhood obesity<sup>41</sup>. Similarly, cell  
357 experiments have found that ultraviolet-induced adipokines may be associated with  
358 decreased subcutaneous fat, leading to disrupted adipose homeostasis and obesity<sup>42</sup>.  
359 Animal experiments have also shown that UVB exposure increases food intake and  
360 weight gain<sup>43</sup>. The above studies support the role of inflammatory, aging, and BMI in  
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  
366 to summer light for more than one hour stood at 88.76%, correlating with an HR of  
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**

379 This study has several limitations. First, this study included self-reported light  
380 duration as exposure, which might involve recall bias and change over time,  
381 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  
392 covariates and reached consistent conclusions. Fourth, even though this study  
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.  
403 However, consistent conclusions were drawn through multiple imputation techniques  
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.

408 This study has several strengths. First, we mainly employed a longitudinal study  
409 design, decreasing the risk of reverse causality and providing high evidence strength.  
410 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**

418 In conclusion, this study found that light exposure was associated with increased  
419 BP, higher risk of hypertension, and lower risk of hypotension. The light–BP  
420 association is stronger among females and those with insufficient sleep or a higher  
421 genetic risk of hypertension. Potential mechanisms included inflammation, aging, and  
422 behavioral lifestyle changes. Subsequent epidemiological studies considering complex  
423 light patterns and in-depth experimental studies are needed to confirm the novel  
424 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 application  
429 ([www.ukbiobank.ac.uk](http://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

## 439 Reference

- 440 1. Oparil S, Acelajado MC, Bakris GL, et al. Hypertension. *Nat Rev Dis Primers* 2018; **4**: 18014.
- 441 2. World Health Organization. Global report on hypertension: the race against a silent killer;  
442 2023.
- 443 3. Shibao C, Biaggioni I. Orthostatic hypotension and cardiovascular risk. *Hypertension (Dallas,*  
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 8. Opländer C, Volkmar CM, Paunel-Görgülü A, et al. Whole body UVA irradiation lowers  
456 systemic blood pressure by release of nitric oxide from intracutaneous photolabile nitric oxide  
457 derivatives. *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; **28**(8): 1428-37.
- 489 20. Chen H, Burnett RT, Kwong JC, et al. Spatial association between ambient fine particulate  
490 matter and incident hypertension. *Circulation* 2014; **129**(5): 562-9.
- 491 21. Dzhambov AM, Lercher P, Markevych I, Browning MHEM, Rüdiger 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, Adeoye AM. Hearing loss and hypertension: exploring the  
495 linkage. *The Egyptian Journal of Otolaryngology* 2021; **37**(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. *Sci Rep* 2024; **14**(1): 8005.
- 498 24. Imai K, Keele L, Tingley D. A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychol  
499 Methods* 2010; **15**(4): 309-34.
- 500 25. Klemm P, Doubal S. A new approach to the concept and computation of biological age. *Mech  
501 Ageing Dev* 2006; **127**(3): 240-8.
- 502 26. Lu D, Li M, Gan Y, Yu G, Zhang Q, Zhang J. Prenatal exposure to solar radiation and  
503 hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *BJOG* 2022; **129**(3): 393-401.
- 504 27. Ishihara A, Courville AB, Chen KY. The Complex Effects of Light on Metabolism in Humans.  
505 *Nutrients* 2023; **15**(6).
- 506 28. Krause R, Bühring M, Hopfenmüller W, Holick MF, Sharma AM. Ultraviolet B and blood  
507 pressure. *Lancet* 1998; **352**(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 **180**(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. *PLoS One*  
514 2016; **11**(5): e0155601.
- 515 31. Veleva BI, Caljouw 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; **21**(1): 577.
- 518 32. Beveridge LA, Struthers AD, Khan F, et al. Effect of Vitamin D Supplementation on Blood  
519 Pressure: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Incorporating Individual Patient Data.  
520 *JAMA Intern Med* 2015; **175**(5): 745-54.
- 521 33. Al Mheid I, Quyyumi AA. Vitamin D and Cardiovascular Disease: Controversy Unresolved.  
522 *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2017; **70**(1).
- 523 34. Scragg R, Wishart J, Stewart A, et al. No effect of ultraviolet radiation on blood pressure and  
524 other cardiovascular risk factors. *Journal of hypertension* 2011; **29**(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; **134**(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; **4**(7): 883-900.
- 544

**Table 1 The general characteristics of the study population**

Characteristic	Hypertension			Hypotension		
	No N = 274,798, 81.7%	Yes N = 61,530, 18.3%	<i>P</i> *	No N = 436,373, 95.9%	Yes N = 18,596, 4.1%	<i>P</i>
<b>General CHARACTERISTICS</b>						
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%)	
<b>LIGHT EXPOSURE</b>						
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

Average light	2.34 (1.24)	2.55 (1.30)	<0.001	2.42 (1.27)	2.60 (1.31)	<0.001
<b>LIFESTYLE</b>						
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
<b>FAMILY HISTORY</b>						
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.

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

Exposure	Outcome	Model 1 *		Model 2 †		Model 3 ‡		Model 4 §	
		Beta/OR 95% CI	P	Beta/OR 95% CI	P	Beta/OR 95% CI	P	Beta/OR 95% CI	P
Summer light	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
	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
	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
Winter light	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
	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
	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
Average light	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
	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
	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



\*: 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.

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

Associations	Exposure (Hours)	Model 1 *		Model 2 †		Model 3 ‡		Model 4 §		
		HR	95% CI	P	HR	95% CI	P	HR	95% CI	P
<b>Summer light—hypertension</b>	<b>Continuous</b>	1.082	(1.077, 1.086)	<0.001	1.002	(0.997, 1.007)	0.48	1.011	(1.005, 1.017)	<0.001
	<b>&lt;=1</b>	Ref			Ref			Ref		
	<b>2—4</b>	1.145	(1.116, 1.174)	<0.001	0.962	(0.937, 0.987)	0.003	1.013	(0.983, 1.044)	0.396
	<b>&gt;4</b>	1.474	(1.434, 1.515)	<0.001	0.985	(0.956, 1.014)	0.304	1.055	(1.019, 1.092)	0.003
<b>Winter light—hypertension</b>	<b>Continuous</b>	1.129	(1.120, 1.138)	<0.001	0.986	(0.978, 0.995)	0.002	1.007	(0.997, 1.018)	0.164
	<b>1</b>	Ref			Ref			Ref		
	<b>&lt;1</b>	0.973	(0.951, 0.996)	0.021	1.068	(1.043, 1.094)	<0.001	0.998	(0.971, 1.027)	0.911
	<b>&gt;1</b>	1.245	(1.222, 1.269)	<0.001	0.998	(0.979, 1.017)	0.828	1.015	(0.993, 1.038)	0.182
<b>Average light—hypertension</b>	<b>Continuous</b>	1.130	(1.123, 1.137)	<0.001	0.998	(0.991, 1.005)	0.6	1.015	(1.006, 1.023)	0.001
	<b>&lt;=1</b>	Ref			Ref			Ref		
	<b>2—4</b>	1.203	(1.174, 1.233)	<0.001	0.966	(0.942, 0.990)	0.007	1.023	(0.994, 1.054)	0.123
	<b>&gt;4</b>	1.592	(1.539, 1.646)	<0.001	0.976	(0.942, 1.011)	0.177	1.060	(1.017, 1.105)	0.003
<b>Summer light—hypotension</b>	<b>Continuous</b>	1.074	(1.065, 1.082)	<0.001	0.973	(0.964, 0.981)	<0.001	0.988	(0.978, 0.999)	0.025
	<b>4</b>	Ref			Ref			Ref		
	<b>&lt;4</b>	0.820	(0.787, 0.854)	<0.001	1.065	(1.022, 1.110)	0.003	1.017	(0.969, 1.068)	0.489
	<b>&gt;4</b>	1.130	(1.081, 1.181)	<0.001	0.988	(0.944, 1.034)	0.602	0.986	(0.935, 1.039)	0.591
<b>Winter light—hypotension</b>	<b>Continuous</b>	1.121	(1.105, 1.137)	<0.001	0.954	(0.940, 0.969)	<0.001	0.988	(0.970, 1.006)	0.196
	<b>2</b>	Ref			Ref			Ref		
	<b>&lt;2</b>	0.842	(0.813, 0.872)	<0.001	1.078	(1.040, 1.118)	<0.001	1.013	(0.971, 1.057)	0.554

	>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
	<b>Continuous</b>	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
<b>Average light—hypotension</b>	<b>3</b>	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
	<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.



**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; ★:  $0.01 < P < 0.05$ ; ★★:  $0.001 < P < 0.01$ ; ★★★:  $P < 0.001$







Subgroup	Summer-HE	<i>P-int</i>	Winter-HE	<i>P-int</i>	Total-HE	<i>P-int</i>	Summer-HO	<i>P-int</i>	Winter-HO	<i>P-int</i>	Total-HO	<i>P-int</i>
<b>Gender</b>												
Female		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Male		0.022		0.012		0.006		0.012		0.001		0.002
<b>Skin colour</b>												
Black		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Brown		0.955		0.854		0.887		0.931		0.492		0.719
Dark olive		0.655		0.870		0.684		0.721		0.639		0.909
Fair		0.441		0.751		0.495		0.718		0.722		0.630
Light olive		0.453		0.767		0.499		0.746		0.647		0.623
Very fair		0.519		0.604		0.491		0.902		0.700		0.743
<b>Vitamin D supplement</b>												
No		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Yes		0.066		0.881		0.164		0.443		0.720		0.584
<b>Sun protection</b>												
Always		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Most of the time		0.664		0.999		0.840		0.043		0.108		0.044
Never/rarely		0.736		0.894		0.702		0.313		0.011		0.088
Sometimes		0.697		0.883		0.910		0.014		0.017		0.010
<b>Family history for hypertension</b>												
No		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Yes		0.500		0.775		0.499		0.876		0.573		0.788
<b>Location</b>												
England		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Scotland		0.130		0.418		0.138		0.119		0.040		0.057
Wales		0.961		0.796		0.986		0.959		0.854		0.999
<b>Age</b>												
Older		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Younger		0.002		0.058		0.003		0.020		0.395		0.049
<b>Sleep duration</b>												
Long		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Moderate		0.132		0.061		0.066		0.003		0.001		0.000
Short		0.101		0.046		0.049		0.001		0.001		0.000
<b>HDI</b>												
1		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
2		0.586		0.599		0.575		0.683		0.081		0.688
3		0.755		0.732		0.717		0.571		0.073		0.287
<b>MET</b>												
1		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
2		0.576		0.090		0.290		0.219		0.228		0.194
3		0.437		0.155		0.206		0.146		0.437		0.158
<b>PRS for hypertension</b>												
High		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref
Intermediate		0.000		0.000		0.000		0.003		0.085		0.012
Low		0.000		0.000		0.000		0.002		0.061		0.008

