1 *Light Exposure Behavior Assessment (LEBA)*: Development of a novel instrument to

2 capture light exposure-related behaviours

3 Mushfiqul Anwar Siraji[1, *], Rafael Robert Lazar[2, 3, *], Juliëtte van Duijnhoven[4], Luc

4 Schlangen[5], Shamsul Haque[1], Vineetha Kalavally[6], Céline Vetter[7, 8], Gena Glickman[9],

5 Karin Smolders[10], & Manuel Spitschan[11, 2, 3]

6 [1] Monash University, Department of Psychology, Jeffrey Cheah School of Medicine and

7 Health Sciences, Malaysia

8 [2] Psychiatric Hospital of the University of Basel (UPK), Centre for Chronobiology, Basel,

9 Switzerland

10 [3] University of Basel, Transfaculty Research Platform Molecular and Cognitive

11 Neurosciences, Basel, Switzerland

12 [4] Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of the Built Environment, Building

13 Lighting, Eindhoven, Netherlands

14 [5] Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of Industrial Engineering and

15 Innovation Sciences, Intelligent Lighting Institute, Eindhoven, Netherlands

16 [6] Monash University, Department of Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering,

17 Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

18 [7] University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Integrative Physiology, Boulder, USA

19 [8] Ximes GmbH, Frankfurt, Germany

20 [9] Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Department of Psychiatry,

21   Bethesda, USA

22   [10] Eindhoven University of Technology, Human-Technology Interaction Group,

23   Eindhoven, Netherlands

24   [11] University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology, Oxford, UK

25   * Joint first author

Author Note

Abstract

⁴³ One or two sentences providing a **basic introduction** to the field, comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline.

⁴⁶ Two to three sentences of **more detailed background**, comprehensible to scientists in related disciplines.

⁴⁸ One sentence clearly stating the **general problem** being addressed by this particular study.

⁵⁰ One sentence summarizing the main result (with the words "**here we show**" or their equivalent).

⁵² Two or three sentences explaining what the **main result** reveals in direct comparison to what was thought to be the case previously, or how the main result adds to previous knowledge.

⁵⁵ One or two sentences to put the results into a more **general context**.

⁵⁶ Two or three sentences to provide a **broader perspective**, readily comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline.

⁵⁸ *Keywords:* keywords

⁵⁹ Word count: X

Light Exposure Behavior Assessment (LEBA): Development of a novel instrument to capture light exposure-related behaviours

Introduction

- Light exposure is important

- Light exposure Behavior is important

- Table: Overview Existing Related Scales: items in total / items on light exposure (behaviour)

- Existing Scales: Review them in text

- None of these do light exposure behavior.

Methods

Ethical approval

The cantonal ethics commission (Ethikkommission Nordwest- und Zentralschweiz, project ID Req-2021-00488) reviewed this project and issued an official clarification of responsibility (full document see Suppl. Fig X in appendix) stating: "The research project does not fall under the scope of the Human Research Act, because your project is using only anonymised data. An authorisation from the ethics committee is therefore not required and the EKNZ is not responsible for its review."

Data Availability

- What data will be available

- Where this data will be available

- under which licence

- who to contact

82 **Survey characteristics**

83   Data was collected in a quantitative cross-sectional approach via a fully anonymous

84 online survey hosted on REDCap (Harris et al., 2019, 2009) by way of the University of

85 Basel sciCORE. Participants were recruited via the website of a Comic co-released with

86 the survey(Weinzaepflen & Spitschan, 2021) , social media (i.e., LinkedIn, Twitter,

87 Facebook), mailing lists, word of mouth, the investigators' personal contacts, and

88 supported by distribution of the survey link via f.lux software (F.lux Software LLC, 2021).

89   Completing the online survey took approx. 15 to 20 minutes and was not

90 compensated. The first page of the survey comprised a participant information sheet,

91 where participants' informed consent to participate was obtained before any of the

92 questions were displayed. Underaged participants (<18 years) were urged to obtain

93 assent from their parents/legal guardians, before filling in the survey. Information on the

94 first page included the objectives of the study, inclusion criteria, estimated duration, the

95 use, storage and sharing of the data, compensation (none), and information about the

96 type of questions in the survey. Moreover, participants needed to confirm that they were

97 participating the survey for the first time. To ensure high data quality, five attention check

98 items were included in the survey (e.g., "We want to make sure you are paying attention.

99 What is 4+5?"). The data analysed in this study was collected between 17.05.2021 and

100 03.09.2021. Questions incorporating retrospective recall were all aligned to the period of

101 "past four weeks," matching the presented LEBA instrument.

102   In addition to the LEBA questionnaire, which is subject of the current study, the

103 following variables and items were assessed but not included in the analysis:

104 • Sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairment (adult and pediatric versions)

105   (Bevans et al., 2019; Daniel J. Buysse et al., 2010; Forrest et al., 2018; Harb,

106   Hidalgo, & Martau, 2015; L. Yu et al., 2011)

- Sleep duration, timing, and latency, chronotype, social jetlag, time in bed, work/sleep schedule and outdoor light exposure duration (version for adults and adolescents) (Roenneberg, Wirz-Justice, & Merrow, 2003)
- Sleep environment (Olivier et al., 2016)
- Meal timing & caffeine consumption [custom items]
- Light sensitivity (photophobia vs. photophilia) (Wu & Hallett, 2017)
- Self-reported pubertal stage (only if younger than 18 years old) (Petersen, Crockett, Richards, & Boxer, 1988)

Furthermore, the following 1-item demographic variables were assessed:

- Age
- Sex
- Gender identity
- Occupational Status
- COVID-19 related Occupational setting during the past four weeks
- Time zone & country of residence
- English as native language

Participants

Table 1 summarizes the survey participants' demographic characteristics. Only participants completing the full LEBA questionnaire were included, thus there are no missing values in the item analyses. XX participants were excluded from analysis due to not passing at least one of the "attention check" items. For exploring initial factor structure (EFA) , a sample of 250-300 is recommended (Comrey & Lee, 1992; Schönbrodt & Perugini, 2013). For estimating the sample size for the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) we followed the N:q rule (Bentler & Chou, 1987; Jackson, 2003; Kline, 2015; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006), where ten participants per parameter is required

132 to earn trustworthiness of the result. Our sample size exceeds these requirements:

133 Anonymous responses from a total of n = 690 participants were included in the analysis

134 of the current study, split into samples for exploratory (EFA: n = 428) and confirmatory

135 factor analysis (CFA: n = 262). The EFA sample included participants filling out the

136 questionnaire from 17.05.2021 to XX.XX.XXXX , whereas participants who filled out the

137 questionnaire from YY.YY.YYYY to 03.09.2021 were included in the CFA analysis.

138 Participants indicated filling out the online survey from a diverse range of geographic

139 locations. The ten most common country + timezone combinations included:

140 • United States - America/New_York (UTC -04:00): 63 (9.1%)

141 • United Kingdom - Europe/London (UTC): 57 (8.3%)

142 • Germany - Europe/Berlin (UTC +01:00): 53 (7.7%)

143 • India - Asia/Kolkata (UTC +05:30): 38 (5.5%)

144 • United States - America/Los_Angeles (UTC -07:00): 37 (5.4%)

145 • United States - America/Chicago (UTC -05:00): 30 (4.3%)

146 • France - Europe/Paris (UTC +01:00): 22 (3.2%)

147 • Switzerland - Europe/Zurich (UTC +01:00): 21 (3.0%)

148 • Brazil - America/Sao_Paulo (UTC -03:00): 19 (2.8%)

149 • Netherlands - Europe/Amsterdam (UTC +01:00): 19 (2.8%)

150   For a complete list of geographic locations, see Suppl. Table X in the appendix.

151   Age among all participants ranged from 11 years to 84 years [EFA: min = 11, max =

152 84; CFA: min = 12, max = 74], with an overall mean of ~ 33 years of age [Overall: M =

153 32.95, SD = 14.57; EFA: M = 32.99, SD = 15.11; CFA: M = 32.89, SD = 13.66]. In total

154 325 (47%) of the participants indicated female sex [EFA: 189 (44%); CFA: 136 (52%)],

155 351 (51%) indicated male [EFA: 230 (54%); CFA: 121 (46%)] and 14 (2.0%) indicated

156 other sex [EFA: 9 (2.1%), CFA: 5 (1.9%)]. Overall, 49 (7.2%) [EFA: 33 (7.8%); CFA: 16

157 (6.2%)] participants indicated a gender-variant identity. In a "Yes/No" question regarding

native language, 320 (46%) of respondents [EFA: 191 (45%); CFA: 129 (49%)] indicated

to be native English speakers. For their "Occupational Status," more than half of the

overall sample reported that they currently work [Overall: 396 (57%); EFA: 235 (55%);

CFA: 161 (61%)], whereas 174 (25%) [EFA: 122 (29%); CFA: 52 (20%)] reported that

they go to school and 120 (17%) [EFA: 71 (17%); CFA: 49 (19%)] responded that they do

"Neither." With respect to the COVID-19 pandemic we asked participants to indicate their

occupational setting during the last four weeks: In the overall sample 303 (44%) [EFA:

194 (45%); CFA: 109 (42%)] of the participants indicated that they were in a home office/

home schooling setting, while 109 (16%) overall [EFA: 68 (16%) ; CFA: 41 (16%)]

reported face-to-face work/schooling. Lastly, 147 (21%) overall [EFA: 94 (22%) ; CFA: 53

(20%)] reported a combination of home- and face-to-face work/schooling, whereas 131

(19%) overall [EFA: 72 (17%); CFA: 59 (23%)] filled in the "Neither (no work or school, or

on vacation)" response option. We tested all demographic variables in Table 1 for

significant group differences between the EFA and CFA sample, applying Wilcoxon rank

sum test for the continuous variable "Age" and Pearson's χ^2 test for all other categorical

variables via the gtsummary R package's "add_p" function (Sjoberg et al., 2021a) . The

p-values were corrected for multiple testing applying false discovery rate (FDR) via the

"add_q" function of the same package. After p-value (FDR) correction for multiple testing,

none of the demographic variables were significantly different between the EFA sample

and the CFA sample (all q-values $q \square 0.2$.

Item Generation

To ensure construct adequacy we thoroughly assessed the current status of

literature and identified a variety of light exposure related scales. However, no scales

specifically measuring the behavioral component of light exposure were found (cf. Table

1). Consequentially we pursued to introduce a new openly available scale to address

this research gap. For this purpose an expert researcher panel from the fields of

chronobiology, light research, neuroscience and psychology (including seven of the authors, see authors roles) generated and collected preliminary item ideas. Special attention was paid to design items circumscribed to assess light exposure *behavior* as opposed to subjective measurements of the light environment (cf.(Eklund & Boyce, 1996) & (Dianat, Sedghi, Bagherzade, Jafarabadi, & Stedmon, 2013)) and semi-quantitive assesments of light sources' illuminance (cf. (Bajaj, Rosner, Lockley, & Schernhammer, 2011)) in order to maintain content validity. In a collective effort the generated items were then peer-reviewed, amended, unified, and complemented with a suitable response scale (5 point Likert-scale ranging from 1 "Never/Does not apply/I don't know" to 5 "Always"). This process was finalized when all experts were in agreement, resulting in 48 items to implement in the data collection.

Analytic Strategies

Figure 1 summarizes the steps of our psychometric analysis. In our analysis we used R (version 4.1.0), with several R packages. Initially, our tool had six point Likert type response format (0:Does not apply/I don't know; 1:Never, 2:Rarely; 3:Sometimes; 4:Often; 5:Always). Our purpose was to capture light exposure related behavior and these two response options: "Does not apply/I don't know" and "Never" were providing similar information. As such we decided to collapse them into one, making it a 5 point Likert type response format. Necessary assumptions of EFA, including sample adequacy, normality assumptions, quality of correlation matrix, were assessed. Our data violated both the univariate and multivariate normality assumptions. Due to these violations and the ordinal nature of our response data, we used polychoric correlation matrix (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018) for the EFA. We employed principal axis (PA) as factor extraction method with varimax rotation. PA is robust to the normality assumption violations (Watkins, 2020). The obtained latent structure was confirmed by another factor extraction method: "the minimum residuals extraction" as well. We used a combination

of factor identification method including scree plot (Cattell, 1966), Horn's parallel analysis

(Horn, 1965), minimum average partials method (Velicer, 1976), and hull method

(Lorenzo-Seva, Timmerman, & Kiers, 2011) to identify factor numbers. Additionally, to

determine the simple structure, we followed the guidelines recommended by

psychometricians: (i) no factors with fewer than three items (ii) no factors with a factor

loading <0.3 (iii) no items with cross-loading greater than .3 across factors (Bandalos &

Finney, 2018). We confirmed the latent structure obtained in the EFA by conducting a

categorical "Confirmatory Factor Analysis" (CFA) using "robust weighted least square

estimator" (WLSMV). We estiablished the measurement invariance of our tool across the

native and non-native English speakers using structural equation model framework. To

assess the possible semantic overlap of our tool with the existing tools, we sought to

"Semantic Scale Network" (Rosenbusch, Wanders, & Pit, 2020). Lastly, we sought "Item

Response Theory" (IRT) based analysis on developing a short form of LEBA. We also

conducted psychometric analysis on non-merged response options data (Supp. Table

??) and rejected the latent structure obtained as the factors were less interpretable.

Results

Item Analysis

Table 3 summarizes the univariate descriptive statistics for the 48 items. Some of

the items were skewed with high Kurtosis values. Our data violated both univariate

normality (Shapiro-Wilk statistics; (Shapiro & Wilk, 1965)) and multivariate normality

assumptions [Marida's test;(Mardia, 1970)]. Multivariate skew was = 583.80 (p <0.001)

and multivariate kurtosis was = 2,749.15 (p <0.001). Due to these violations and ordinal

nature of the response data polychoric correlations over Pearson's correlations was

chosen (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018). The corrected item-total correlation ranges between

.03 -.48. However, no item was discarded based on descriptive statistics or item analysis.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Sampling adequacy was checked using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures of sampling adequacy (Kaiser, 1974) . The overall KMO vale for 48 items was 0.63 which was above the cutoff value (.50) indicating a mediocre sample (Hutcheson, 1999). Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954), χ^2 (1128) = 5042.86, p < .001 indicated the correlations between items are adequate for the EFA. However only 4.96% of the inter-item correlation coefficients were greater than .30. The absolute value of inter-item correlation ranged between .00 to .91. Figure 2 depicts the correlation matrix.

Scree plot (Figure 3) suggested a six-factor solution. Horn's parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) with 500 iterations also indicated a six-factor solution. However, the minimum average partial (MAP) method (Velicer, 1976) and Hull method (Lorenzo-Seva et al., 2011) suggested a five-factor solution. As a result, we tested both five-factor and six-factor solutions.

With the initial 48 items we conducted three rounds of EFA and gradually discarded problematic items. (cross-loading items and poor factor loading (<.30) items). Finally, a five-factor EFA solution with 25 items was accepted with low RMSR = 0.08 (Brown, 2015), all factor-loading higher than .30 and no cross-loading greater than .30. We further confirmed this five-factor latent structure by another EFA using varimax rotation with a minimum residual extraction method (Table ??). Table 4 displays the factor-loading (structural coefficients) and communality of the items. The absolute value of the factor-loading ranged from .49 to .99 indicating strong coefficients. The commonalities ranged between .11 to .99. Figure 4 depicts the obtained five-five factor structure. However, the histogram of the absolute values of non-redundant residual-correlations (Figure 5) showed 26% correlations were greater than the absolute value of .05,

indicating a possible under-factoring. (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018). Subsequently, we fitted a six-factor solution. However, a factor emerged with only one salient variable loading in the six-factor solution, thus disqualifying the six-factor solution (Table ??). Internal consistency reliability coefficient Cronbach's alpha assumes all the factor-loadings of the items under a factor are equal (Graham, 2006; Novick & Lewis, 1967) which is not the case in our sample. Additionally Cronbach's alpha coefficient has a tendency to deflate the estimates for Likert type data as the calculation is based on pearson-correlation matrix which requires that response data should be in continuous of nature (Gadermann, Guhn, & Zumbo, 2012; Zumbo, Gadermann, & Zeisser, 2007). Subsequently to get better estimates of reliability we reported ordinal alpha which used polychoric-correlation matrix and assumed that the responses data were ordered in nature instead of continuous (Zumbo et al., 2007). Ordinal alpha coefficient value ranges from 0 to 1 and higher value represents better reliability. In the five-factor solution, the first factor contained three items and explained 10.25% of the total variance with a internal reliability coefficient ordinal α = .94. All the items in this factor stemmed from the individual's preference to use blue light filters in different light environments. The second factor contained six items and explained 9.93% of the total variance with a internal reliability coefficient ordinal α = .76. Items under this factor commonly investigated an individual's hours spent outdoor. The third factor contained five items and explained 8.83% of the total variance. Items under this factor dealt with the specific behaviors pertaining to using phone and smart-watch in bed. The internal consistency reliability coefficient was, ordinal α = .75. The fourth factor contained five items and explained 8.44% of the total variance with an internal consistency coefficient, ordinal α = .72. These five items investigated the behaviors related to individual's light exposure before bedtime. Lastly, the fifth factor contained six items and explained 6.14% of the total variance. This factor captured individual's morning and daytime light exposure related behavior. The internal consistency reliability was, ordinal α = .62 . It is essential to attain a balance between

287 psychometric properties and interpretability of the common themes when exploring the

288 latent structure. As all of the emerged factors are highly interpretable and relevant

289 towards our aim to capture light exposure related behavior, regardless of the apparent

290 low reliability of the fifth factor, we retain all the five-factors with 23 items for our

291 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Two items showed negative factor-loading (items 44

292 and 21). Upon inspection, it was understood that these items are negatively correlated to

293 the common theme, and thus in the CFA analysis, we reversed the response code for

294 these two items. Figure 6 depicts the data distribution and endorsement pattern for the

295 included items in our LEBA tool for both the EFA and CFA sample.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

297   We conducted categorical confirmatory factor analysis with robust weighted least

298 square (WLSMV) estimator since our response data was of ordinary nature (Desjardins

299 & Bulut, 2018). Several indices are suggested to measure model fit which can be

300 categorized as absolute, comparative and parsimony fit indices (Brown, 2015). Absolute

301 fit assess the model fit at an absolute level using indices including χ^2 test statistics and

302 the standardized root mean square (SRMR). Parsimony fit indices including the root

303 mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) considers the number of free parameters

304 in the model to assesses the parsimony of the model. Comparative fit indices evaluate

305 the fit of the specified model solution in relation to a more restricted baseline model

306 restricting all covariances among the indicators as zero. Comparative fit index (CFI) and

307 the Tucker Lewis index (TLI) are such two comparative fit indices. Commonly used

308 Model fit guidelines (Hu & Bentle, 1999; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004) includes (i)

309 Reporting of χ^2 test statistics (A non-significant test statistics is required to reflect model

310 fit) (ii) CFI and TLI (CFI/TLI close to .95 or above/ranging between 90-95 and above) (iii)

311 RMSEA (close to .06 or below), (iv) SRMR (close to .08 or below) to estimate the model

312 fit. Table 5 summarizes the fit indices of our fitted model. Our fitted model failed to attain

313 an absolute fit estimated by the χ^2 test. However, the χ^2 test is sensitive to sample size

314 and not recommended to be used as the sole index of absolute model fit (Brown, 2015).

315 Another absolute fit index we obtained in our analysis was SRMR which does not work

316 well with categorical data (C. Yu, 2002). We judged the model fit based on the

317 comparative fit indices: CFI, TLI and parsimony fit index:RMSEA. Our fitted model

318 attained acceptable fit (CFI =.94; TLI = .93); RMSEA = .06,[.05-.07, 90% CI]) with two

319 imposed equity constrain on item pairs 32-33 [I dim my mobile phone screen within 1

320 hour before attempting to fall asleep.;I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before

321 attempting to fall asleep.] and 16-17 [I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted

322 glasses indoors during the day.;I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted

323 glasses outdoors during the day.]. Items pair 32-33 stemed from the preference of

324 dimming electric device's brightness before bed time and items pair 16 and 19 stemed

325 from the preference of using blue filtering or colored glasses during the daytime.

326 Nevertheless, SRMR value was higher than the guideline (SRMR = .12). Further by

327 allowing one pair of items (30-41) [I look at my smartwatch within 1 hour before

328 attempting to fall asleep.;I look at my smartwatch when I wake up at night.] to covary

329 their error variance and discarding two item (item 37 & 26) for very low r-square value,

330 our model attained best fit (CFI =.97; TLI = .96); RMSEA = .05[.04-.06, 90% CI]) and

331 SRMR value (SRMR = .09) was also close to the suggestions of Hu and Bentle (1999).

332 Internal consistency ordinal α for the five factors of LEBA were .96, .83, .70, .69, .52

333 respectively. We also estimated the internal consistency reliability of the total scale using

334 Mcdonald's ω (total) coefficient which is a better reliability estimate for multidimensional

335 constructs (Dunn, Baguley, & Brunsden, 2014; Sijtsma, 2009). McDonald's ω(total)

336 coefficient for the total scale was .73. Figure 7 depicts the obtained CFA structure.

Measurement Invariance

Measurement invariance (MI) evaluates whether a construct has the psychometric equivalence and same meaning across groups or measurement occasions (Kline, 2015; Putnick & Bornstein, 2016). We used structural equation modeling framework to assess the measurement invariance of our developed tool across two groups: **native English speakers** and **non-native English speakers**. Our measurement invariance testing involved successively comparing the nested models: configural, metric, scalar, and residual invariance models with each others (Widaman & Reise, 1997). Among these nested models configural model is the first and least restrictive model. The configural model assumes that the number of factors and item number under each factor will be equal across two groups. The metric invariance model assumes configural invariance of the fitted model and requires the factor-loadings of the items across the two groups to be equal. Having the factor-loadings equal across groups indicates each item contributes to the measured construct equivalently. Scalar invariance assumes the metric invariance of the fitted model demands the item intercepts to be equivalent across groups. This equity of item intercepts indicates the equivalence of response scale across the groups, i.e., persons with the same level of the underlying construct will score the same across the groups. The residual invariance model assumes metric invariance for the fitted model and adds the assumption of equality in error variances and covariances across the groups. This model is the highest level of MI and assures the equivalence of precision of items across the groups in measuring the underlying constructs. The invariance model fit of our tool was assessed using the fit indices including χ^2 test, CFI and TLI (close to .95 or above), RMSEA (close to .06 or below) (Hu & Bentle, 1999). We excluded SRMR from our consideration as it does not behave optimally for categorical variables (C. Yu, 2002). Table 6 summarized the fit indices. The comparison among different measurement invariance models was made using the χ^2 difference test ($\Delta\chi^2$) to assess whether our obtained latent structure of "LEBA" attained the highest level of the

364   MI. A non-significant $\Delta \chi^2$ test between two MI models fit indicates mode fit does not

365   significantly decrease for the superior model (Dimitrov, 2010) thus allowing the superior

366   level of invariance model to be accepted. We started our analysis by comparing the

367   model fit of the least restrictive model:configural model to metric MI model and continued

368   successive comparisons. Table 6 indicates that our fitted model had acceptable fit

369   indices for all of the fitted MI models. The model fit did not significantly decrease across

370   the nested models up to the scalar MI model. The chi-square value difference between

371   the scalar and residual model is zero, indicating model fit remained the same for both:

372   scalar and residual MI model, indicating the acceptability of the residual MI model.

Semantic Analysis

374   To find out if our developed tool is overlapping with existing instruments, we

375   subjected the items of LEBA to the "Semantic Scale Network"(SSN) analysis

376   (Rosenbusch et al., 2020). The SSN detects semantically related scales and provides

377   cosine similarity index ranging between -.66 to 1 (Rosenbusch et al., 2020). Pair of

378   scales with a cosine similarity index value of 1 indicates they are perfectly semantically

379   similar scales indicating redundancy. LEBA appeared most strongly related to scales

380   about sleep: "Sleep Disturbance Scale For Children" (Bruni et al., 1996) and

381   "WHO-Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI): Insomnia"(WHO, 1990).The

382   cosine similarities lie between .47 to .51. Two factors of our LEBA tool: "Using phone and

383   smart-watch in bed" and "Using light before bedtime" dealt with light exposure related

384   behavior pertaining to sleep quality. As such the similarity index obtained is expected.

Developing Short form of LEBA

386   We sought the item response theory (IRT) to develop the short form of LEBA. IRT

387   the conventional classical test theory-based analysis by gathering information on item

388   quality by indices like item difficulty,item discrimination, and item information(Baker,

2017). IRT judges the item's quality on item information in relation to participants' latent

trait level (θ). We gathered evidence on item quality by fitting each factor of LEBA with

the graded response model (Samejima, Liden, & Hambleton, 1997) to the combined EFA

and CFA sample (n =690). Item discrimination indicates the pattern of variation in the

categorical responses with the changes in latent trait level (θ), and item information

curve (IIC) indicates the amount of information an item carries along the latent trait

continuum. Here, we reported the item discrimination parameter and only discarded the

items with relatively flat item information curve (information <.2) to develop the short form

of LEBA. Baker (2017) categorized the item discrimination in as none = 0; very low =0.01

to 0.34; low = 0.35 to 0.64; moderate = 0.65 to 1.34 ; high = 1.35 to 1.69; very high >1.70.

Table 7 summarizes the IRT parameters of our tool. Item discrimination parameters of

our tool fell in very high (10 items), high (4 items), moderate (4 items), and low (5 items)

categorizes indicating a good range of discrimination along the latent trait level (θ).

Examination of the item information curve 8 indicated 6 items (1, 25, 9, 38, 30, & 41) had

relatively flat information curves thus discarded creating a short form of LEBA with 5

factors and 17 items.

Test information curve (TIC) (Figure 9) indicate the amount of information an the

full-scale carry along the latent trait continuum. As we treated each factor of short-LEBA

as an unidmensional construct we obtain 5 TICs (Figure 9). These information curves

indicated except the first and fifth factors, the other three factor's TICs are roughly

centered on the center of the trait continuum (θ).The first and fifth factor had a peak to

the right side of the center of latent trait.Thus we conferred the LEBA tool estimated the

light exposure related behavior with precision near the center of trait continuum for 2nd,

3rd and 4th factors and near the right side of the center of trait continuum for 1st and 5th

factors (Baker, 2017).

Table 8 summarizes the item fit indexes of the items. All the items fitted well to the

respective models as assessed by RMSEA value obtained from Signed-χ^2 index

implementation. All of the items had RMSEA value $\leq$.06 indicating adequate fit. Figure

10 depicts the person fit of out fitted models. Person fit indicates the validity and

meaningfulness of the fitted model at the participants latent trait level (Desjardins &

Bulut, 2018). We estimated the person fit statistics using standardized fit index Zh

statistics (Drasgow, Levine, & Williams, 1985). Zh < -2 should be considered as a misfit.

Fig indicates that Zh is larger than -2 for most participants, suggesting a good fit of the

selected IRT models.

Overall we concluded that IRT analysis indicated short form of LEBA is a

psychometrically sound measure. Item fit indexes and person fit index for all five fitted

model were acceptable. Items had diverse slope parameters indicating a good range of

discrimination- the ability to differentiate respondents with different levels of the light

exposure related behavior. All-in-all we can recommend the short form of LEBA to be

used to capture light exposure related behavior.

```
##                  b1           b2           b3           b4
## item16   0.7807957   0.90332137   1.0596322   1.3981805
## item36   0.9388451   1.07739859   1.2341076   1.4015546
## item17   0.9699978   1.10851664   1.3823259   1.6231702
## item11  -0.7993727   0.63107568   1.5504129   2.3232025
## item10  -1.3086787  -0.11480621   0.8379381   2.0962871
## item12  -0.6724163   0.43631801   1.2693775   2.1055080
## item7   -0.5125608   0.72582270   1.6472296   3.0034725
## Ritem8  -2.2395064  -0.49235265   0.6231859   1.9061062
## item27  -1.9125260  -1.21138648  -0.7397590   0.3076421
## item3   -1.2185275  -0.76238958  -0.1999601   0.6540466
## item40  -0.5026451   0.45325963   1.3021130   2.2029669
## item32  -1.0375439  -0.78527701  -0.4205447   0.1598258
```

```
## item35 -1.1021938 -0.99327791 -0.7569304 -0.4062170

## item33 -0.6630993 -0.47607705 -0.2395981  0.1319339

## item46  0.6628837  0.87739111  1.3558587  2.1245599

## item45  0.2974122  0.55477156  1.1686994  1.9062468

## item25 -1.4452560 -0.04033735  1.9939122  4.4623458
```

Discussion

References

448

449 Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Prepare reproducible APA journal articles*

450   *with R Markdown.* Retrieved from https://github.com/crsh/papaja

451 Bajaj, A., Rosner, B., Lockley, S. W., & Schernhammer, E. S. (2011). Validation of

452   a light questionnaire with real-life photopic illuminance measurements: The

453   harvard light exposure assessment questionnaire. *Cancer Epidemiology and*

454   *Prevention Biomarkers*, *20*(7), 1341–1349.

455 Baker, F. B. (2017). *The Basics of Item Response Theory Using R* (1st ed. 2017.).

456   Springer.

457 Bandalos, D. L., & Finney, S. J. (2018). Factor analysis: Exploratory and

458   confirmatory. In *The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the social*

459   *sciences* (pp. 98–122). Routledge.

460 Barnier, J., Briatte, F., & Larmarange, J. (2020). *Questionr: Functions to make*

461   *surveys processing easier.* Retrieved from

462   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=questionr

463 Barth, M. (2021). *tinylabels: Lightweight variable labels.* Retrieved from

464   https://github.com/mariusbarth/tinylabels

465 Bartlett, M. (1954). A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various Chi-square

466   Approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B,*

467   *Methodological*, *16*(2), 296–298.

468 Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C.-P. (1987). Practical Issues in Structural Modeling.

469   *Sociological Methods & Research*, *16*(1), 78–117.

470   https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124187016001004

471 Bevans, K. B., Meltzer, L. J., La Motte, A. de, Kratchman, A., Viél, D., & Forrest, C.

472   B. (2019). Qualitative development and content validation of the PROMIS

473   pediatric sleep health items. *Behavioral Sleep Medicine*, *17*(5), 657–671.

474   https://doi.org/10.1080/15402002.2018.1461102

Bossini, L., Valdagno, M., Padula, L., De Capua, A., Pacchierotti, C., &
    Castrogiovanni, P. (2006). Sensibilità alla luce e psicopatologia: Validazione
    del questionario per la valutazione della fotosensibilità (QVF). *Med
    Psicosomatica*, *51*, 167–176.

Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed.).
    New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press.

Bruni, O., Ottaviano, S., Guidetti, V., Romoli, M., Innocenzi, M., Cortesi, F., &
    Giannotti, F. (1996). The sleep disturbance scale for children (SDSC)
    construct ion and validation of an instrument to evaluate sleep disturbances in
    childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Sleep Research*, *5*(4), 251–261.

Bryer, J., & Speerschneider, K. (2016). *Likert: Analysis and visualization likert
    items*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=likert

Buchanan, E. M., Gillenwaters, A., Scofield, J. E., & Valentine, K. D. (2019).
    *MOTE: Measure of the Effect: Package to assist in effect size calculations and
    their confidence intervals*. Retrieved from http://github.com/doomlab/MOTE

Buysse, Daniel J., Reynolds III, C. F., Monk, T. H., Berman, S. R., & Kupfer, D. J.
    (1989). The pittsburgh sleep quality index: A new instrument for psychiatric
    practice and research. *Psychiatry Research*, *28*(2), 193–213.

Buysse, Daniel J., Yu, L., Moul, D. E., Germain, A., Stover, A., Dodds, N. E., …
    Pilkonis, P. A. (2010). Development and validation of patient-reported outcome
    measures for sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairments. *Sleep*, *33*(6),
    781–792. https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/33.6.781

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Test For The Number Of Factors. *Multivariate
    Behavioral Research*, *1*(2), 245–276.
    https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10

Chalmers, R. P. (2012). mirt: A multidimensional item response theory package
    for the R environment. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(6), 1–29.

https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i06

Chang, W., Cheng, J., Allaire, J., Sievert, C., Schloerke, B., Xie, Y., … Borges, B. (2021). *Shiny: Web application framework for r*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shiny

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis, 2nd ed*. Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Conigrave, J. (2020). *Corx: Create and format correlation matrices*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=corx

Dahl, D. B., Scott, D., Roosen, C., Magnusson, A., & Swinton, J. (2019). *Xtable: Export tables to LaTeX or HTML*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=xtable

Desjardins, C., & Bulut, O. (2018). *Handbook of Educational Measurement and Psychometrics Using R*. https://doi.org/10.1201/b20498

Dianat, I., Sedghi, A., Bagherzade, J., Jafarabadi, M. A., & Stedmon, A. W. (2013). Objective and subjective assessments of lighting in a hospital setting: Implications for health, safety and performance. *Ergonomics*, *56*(10), 1535–1545.

Dimitrov, D. M. (2010). Testing for factorial invariance in the context of construct validation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, *43*(2), 121–149.

Dinno, A. (2018). *Paran: Horn's test of principal components/factors*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=paran

Drasgow, F., Levine, M. V., & Williams, E. A. (1985). Appropriateness measurement with polychotomous item response models and standardized indices. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *38*(1), 67–86.

Dunn, T. J., Baguley, T., & Brunsden, V. (2014). From alpha to omega: A practical

529   solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British*

530   *Journal of Psychology*, *105*(3), 399–412.

531   Eklund, N., & Boyce, P. (1996). The development of a reliable, valid, and simple

532   office lighting survey. *Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society*, *25*(2),

533   25–40.

534   Epskamp, S. (2019). *semPlot: Path diagrams and visual analysis of various SEM*

535   *packages' output*. Retrieved from

536   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semPlot

537   Epskamp, S., Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., Schmittmann, V. D., & Borsboom,

538   D. (2012). qgraph: Network visualizations of relationships in psychometric

539   data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(4), 1–18.

540   F.lux Software LLC. (2021). F.lux (Version 4.120). Retrieved from

541   https://justgetflux.com/

542   Forrest, C. B., Meltzer, L. J., Marcus, C. L., La Motte, A. de, Kratchman, A.,

543   Buysse, D. J., … Bevans, K. B. (2018). Development and validation of the

544   PROMIS pediatric sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairment item banks.

545   *Sleep*, *41*(6). https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/zsy054

546   Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R companion to applied regression* (Third).

547   Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. Retrieved from

548   https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/

549   Fox, J., Weisberg, S., & Price, B. (2020). *carData: Companion to applied*

550   *regression data sets*. Retrieved from

551   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=carData

552   Gadermann, A. M., Guhn, M., & Zumbo, B. D. (2012). Estimating ordinal reliability

553   for likert-type and ordinal item response data: A conceptual, empirical, and

554   practical guide. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *17*(1), 3.

555   Graham, J. M. (2006). Congeneric and (essentially) tau-equivalent estimates of

score reliability: What they are and how to use them. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *66*(6), 930–944.

Harb, F., Hidalgo, M. P., & Martau, B. (2015). Lack of exposure to natural light in the workspace is associated with physiological, sleep and depressive symptoms. *Chronobiology International*, *32*(3), 368–375. https://doi.org/10.3109/07420528.2014.982757

Harrell Jr, F. E., Charles Dupont, with contributions from, & others., many. (2021). *Hmisc: Harrell miscellaneous*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc

Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Minor, B. L., Elliott, V., Fernandez, M., O'Neal, L., … others. (2019). The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, *95*, 103208.

Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J., Gonzalez, N., & Conde, J. G. (2009). Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, *42*(2), 377–381.

Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr

Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *30*(2), 179–185. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289447

Horne, J. A., & Östberg, O. (1976). A self-assessment questionnaire to determine morningness-eveningness in human circadian rhythms. *International Journal of Chronobiology*.

Hu, L., & Bentle, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Hutcheson, G. D. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist : Introductory statistics using generalized linear models*. London : SAGE.

Iannone, R. (2016). *DiagrammeRsvg: Export DiagrammeR graphviz graphs as SVG*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DiagrammeRsvg

Iannone, R. (2021). *DiagrammeR: Graph/network visualization*. Retrieved from https://github.com/rich-iannone/DiagrammeR

Irribarra, D. T., & Freund, R. (2014). *Wright map: IRT item-person map with ConQuest integration*. Retrieved from http://github.com/david-ti/wrightmap

Jackson, D. L. (2003). Revisiting Sample Size and Number of Parameter Estimates: Some Support for the N:q Hypothesis. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *10*(1), 128–141. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1001_6

Johnson, P., & Kite, B. (2020). *semTable: Structural equation modeling tables*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTable

Johnson, P., Kite, B., & Redmon, C. (2020). *Kutils: Project management tools*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kutils

Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., & Rosseel, Y. (2021). `semTools`: *Useful tools for structural equation modeling*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*(1), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02291575

Kassambara, A. (2019). *Ggcorrplot: Visualization of a correlation matrix using 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggcorrplot

Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. The Guilford Press.

Kowarik, A., & Templ, M. (2016). Imputation with the R package VIM. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *74*(7), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v074.i07

Lishinski, A. (2021). *lavaanPlot: Path diagrams for 'lavaan' models via*

'DiagrammeR'. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lavaanPlot

Lorenzo-Seva, U., Timmerman, M., & Kiers, H. (2011). The Hull Method for Selecting the Number of Common Factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *46*, 340–364. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2011.564527

Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M. S., Patil, I., & Lüdecke, D. (2020). Methods and algorithms for correlation analysis in r. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *5*(51), 2306. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.02306

Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika*, *57*(3), 519–530. https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/57.3.519

Mock, T. (2021). *gtExtras: A collection of helper functions for the gt package*. Retrieved from https://github.com/jthomasmock/gtExtras

Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble

Navarro-Gonzalez, D., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2021). *EFA.MRFA: Dimensionality assessment using minimum rank factor analysis*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=EFA.MRFA

Neuwirth, E. (2014). *RColorBrewer: ColorBrewer palettes*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RColorBrewer

Novick, M. R., & Lewis, C. (1967). Coefficient alpha and the reliability of composite measurements. *Psychometrika*, *32*(1), 1–13.

Olivier, K., Gallagher, R. A., Killgore, W. D. S., Carrazco, N., Alfonso-Miller, P., … Grandner, M. A. (2016). Development and initial validation of the assessment of sleep environment: A novel inventory for describing and quantifying the impact of environmental factors on sleep. *Sleep*, *39*(Abstract Supplement: A367).

Ooms, J. (2021a). *Magick: Advanced graphics and image-processing in r*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=magick

Ooms, J. (2021b). *Rsvg: Render SVG images into PDF, PNG, PostScript, or bitmap arrays*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rsvg

Peters, G.-J. (2021). *Ufs: Quantitative analysis made accessible*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ufs

Petersen, A. C., Crockett, L., Richards, M., & Boxer, A. (1988). A self-report measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *17*(2), 117–133. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537962

Pornprasertmanit, S., Miller, P., Schoemann, A., & Jorgensen, T. D. (2021). *Simsem: SIMulated structural equation modeling*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=simsem

Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Measurement invariance conventions and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. *Developmental Review*, *41*, 71–90.

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Revelle, W. (2021). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych

Roenneberg, T., Wirz-Justice, A., & Merrow, M. (2003). Life between clocks: Daily temporal patterns of human chronotypes. *Journal of Biological Rhythms*, *18*(1), 80–90.

Rosenbusch, H., Wanders, F., & Pit, I. L. (2020). The semantic scale network: An online tool to detect semantic overlap of psychological scales and prevent scale redundancies. *Psychological Methods*, *25*(3), 380.

Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(2), 1–36. Retrieved from https://www.jstatsoft.org/v48/i02/

Ryu, C. (2021). *Dlookr: Tools for data diagnosis, exploration, transformation*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dlookr

Samejima, F., Liden, W. van der, & Hambleton, R. (1997). Handbook of modern item response theory. New York, NY: Springer.

Sarkar, D. (2008). *Lattice: Multivariate data visualization with r*. New York: Springer. Retrieved from http://lmdvr.r-forge.r-project.org

Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations stabilize? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(5), 609–612. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.05.009

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. psychology press.

Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika*, *52*(3-4), 591–611. https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/52.3-4.591

Sijtsma, K. (2009). On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of cronbach's alpha. *Psychometrika*, *74*(1), 107.

Siraji, M. A. (2021). *Tabledown: A companion pack for the book "basic & advanced psychometrics in r"*. Retrieved from https://github.com/masiraji/tabledown

Sjoberg, D. D., Curry, M., Hannum, M., Larmarange, J., Whiting, K., & Zabor, E. C. (2021b). *Gtsummary: Presentation-ready data summary and analytic result tables*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gtsummary

Sjoberg, D. D., Curry, M., Hannum, M., Larmarange, J., Whiting, K., & Zabor, E. C. (2021a). *Gtsummary: Presentation-ready data summary and analytic result*

tables. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gtsummary

Stauffer, R., Mayr, G. J., Dabernig, M., & Zeileis, A. (2009). Somewhere over the rainbow: How to make effective use of colors in meteorological visualizations. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *96*(2), 203–216. https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00155.1

Terry M. Therneau, & Patricia M. Grambsch. (2000). *Modeling survival data: Extending the Cox model*. New York: Springer.

Ushey, K., McPherson, J., Cheng, J., Atkins, A., & Allaire, J. (2021). *Packrat: A dependency management system for projects and their r package dependencies*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=packrat

van Lissa, C. J. (2021). *tidySEM: Tidy structural equation modeling*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidySEM

Velicer, W. (1976). Determining the Number of Components from the Matrix of Partial Correlations. *Psychometrika*, *41*, 321–327. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02293557

Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern applied statistics with s* (Fourth). New York: Springer. Retrieved from https://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/pub/MASS4/

Verriotto, J. D., Gonzalez, A., Aguilar, M. C., Parel, J.-M. A., Feuer, W. J., Smith, A. R., & Lam, B. L. (2017). New methods for quantification of visual photosensitivity threshold and symptoms. *Translational Vision Science & Technology*, *6*(4), 18–18.

Watkins, M. (2020). *A Step-by-Step Guide to Exploratory Factor Analysis with R and RStudio*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003120001

Weinzaepflen, C., & Spitschan, M. (2021). Enlighten your clock: How your body tells time. Open Science Framework. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/ZQXVH

WHO. (1990). Composite international diagnostic interview.

Wickham, H. (2011). The split-apply-combine strategy for data analysis. *Journal*

718   *of Statistical Software*, *40*(1), 1–29. Retrieved from

719   http://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i01/

720   Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag

721   New York. Retrieved from https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

722   Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string*

723   *operations*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr

724   Wickham, H. (2021a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables*

725   *(factors)*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats

726   Wickham, H. (2021b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from

727   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr

728   Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., …

729   Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source*

730   *Software*, *4*(43), 1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

731   Wickham, H., & Bryan, J. (2019). *Readxl: Read excel files*. Retrieved from

732   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readxl

733   Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of*

734   *data manipulation*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr

735   Wickham, H., & Hester, J. (2021). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*. Retrieved

736   from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr

737   Widaman, K. F., & Reise, S. P. (1997). Exploring the measurement invariance of

738   psychological instruments: Applications in the substance use domain.

739   Wilke, C. O. (2020). *Cowplot: Streamlined plot theme and plot annotations for*

740   *'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=cowplot

741   Winston Chang. (2014). *Extrafont: Tools for using fonts*. Retrieved from

742   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=extrafont

743   Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale Development Research: A

744   Content Analysis and Recommendations for Best Practices. *The Counseling*

Psychologist, *34*(6), 806–838. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127

Wu, Y., & Hallett, M. (2017). Photophobia in neurologic disorders. *Translational Neurodegeneration*, *6*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40035-017-0095-3

Xie, Y., Wu, X., Tao, S., Wan, Y., & Tao, F. (2021). Development and validation of the self-rating of biological rhythm disorder for chinese adolescents. *Chronobiology International*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/07420528.2021.1989450

Yu, C. (2002). *Evaluating cutoff criteria of model fit indices for latent variable models with binary and continuous outcomes* (Thesis). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Yu, L., Buysse, D. J., Germain, A., Moul, D. E., Stover, A., Dodds, N. E., … Pilkonis, P. A. (2011). Development of short forms from the PROMIS™ sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairment item banks. *Behavioral Sleep Medicine*, *10*(1), 6–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/15402002.2012.636266

Yuan, K.-H., & Zhang, Z. (2020). *Rsem: Robust structural equation modeling with missing data and auxiliary variables*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rsem

Zeileis, A., & Croissant, Y. (2010). Extended model formulas in R: Multiple parts and multiple responses. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *34*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v034.i01

Zeileis, A., Fisher, J. C., Hornik, K., Ihaka, R., McWhite, C. D., Murrell, P., … Wilke, C. O. (2020). colorspace: A toolbox for manipulating and assessing colors and palettes. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *96*(1), 1–49. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v096.i01

Zeileis, A., Hornik, K., & Murrell, P. (2009). Escaping RGBland: Selecting colors for statistical graphics. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, *53*(9), 3259–3270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2008.11.033

772   Zhang, Z., & Yuan, K.-H. (2020). *Coefficientalpha: Robust coefficient alpha and*

773   *omega with missing and non-normal data*. Retrieved from

774   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=coefficientalpha

775   Zhu, H. (2021). *kableExtra: Construct complex table with 'kable' and pipe syntax*.

776   Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra

777   Zumbo, B. D., Gadermann, A. M., & Zeisser, C. (2007). Ordinal versions of

778   coefficients alpha and theta for likert rating scales. *Journal of Modern Applied*

779   *Statistical Methods*, *6*(1), 4.

Table 1

Releated Scales

Name	Author	Description	Relevant Items	Scale type	Validity evidences
Visual Light Sensitivity Questionnaire-8	Verriotto et al., 2017	Eight-question survey to assess the presence and severity of photosen-sitivity symptoms	None	5-point Likert scale	Not available
Office Light Survey	Eklundet al., 1996	30 items survey to assess electrical lighting en-vironment in office	Item 29	Mixed response format	Not available

Table 1

Releated Scales (continued)

Name	Author	Description	Relevant Items	Scale type	Validity evidences
Harvard Light Exposure Assessment Questionnaire	Bajaj et al., 2011	1 item semi-quantitative light questionnaire	None	Semi-quantitative	Correlation with physical measuremernt
Hospital Lighting Survey	Dianat et el., 2013	23 items questionnaire to assess light environment in a hospital	Item 16,17	5-point Likert scale	Face and Content validity
Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire	Horne et al., 1976	19 items questionnaire to understand your body clock	item 1,2,8,13,14	Mixed response format	Correlation the oral temperature

Table 1

Releated Scales (continued)

Name	Author	Description	Relevant Items	Scale type	Validity evidences
Munich Chrono-type Question-naire (MCTQ)	Roenneberg et al., 2003	17 items question-naire to under-stand individuals phase of entrain-ment	Time spect outdoors	Mixed response format	Correlation with sleep-logs, actimetry, and physi-ological parame-ters
Sleep Practices and Attitudes Question-naire (SPAQ)	Olivier et.al., 2016	16 Factor question-naire measuring practice, behavior and attitude related sleep	Subscale 8&9	5-point Likert scale	Face and Construct validity

Table 1

Releated Scales (continued)

Name	Author	Description	Relevant Items	Scale type	Validity evidences
The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI)	Buysse et al., 1989	9 items inventory to measure sleep quality and sleeping pattern	item 1-4	Mixed response format	Correlation with clinical measure-ments
Self-Rating of Biological Rhythm Disorder for Disorder for Adoles-cents (SBRDA)	Xie et al., 2021	29 Items question-naire assessing four di-mensions of biological rhythm disorder in adoles-cents	Item 3,6,22-25 and 29	5-point Likert scale	Construct validity

Table 1

Releated Scales (continued)

Name	Author	Description	Relevant Items	Scale type	Validity evidences
Photosensitivity Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ)	Bossini et al.,2006	16 dichotomous (yes/no) items questionnaire to assess "photophobia" and "photophilia"	All items	Binary response option	Not available

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Overall, N = 690	1. EFA Sample, N = 428	2. CFA Sample, N = 262	p-value	q-value
Age	32.95 (14.57)	32.99 (15.11)	32.89 (13.66)	0.5	0.5
Sex				0.14	0.4
Female	325 (47%)	189 (44%)	136 (52%)		
Male	351 (51%)	230 (54%)	121 (46%)		
Other	14 (2.0%)	9 (2.1%)	5 (1.9%)		
Gender-Variant Identity	49 (7.2%)	33 (7.8%)	16 (6.2%)	0.4	0.5
Native English Speaker	320 (46%)	191 (45%)	129 (49%)	0.2	0.5
Occupational Status				0.040	0.2
Work	396 (57%)	235 (55%)	161 (61%)		
School	174 (25%)	122 (29%)	52 (20%)		
Neither	120 (17%)	71 (17%)	49 (19%)		
Occupational setting				0.3	0.5
Home office/Home schooling	303 (44%)	194 (45%)	109 (42%)		
Face-to-face work/Face-to-face schooling	109 (16%)	68 (16%)	41 (16%)		
Combination of home- and face-to-face- work/schooling	147 (21%)	94 (22%)	53 (20%)		
Neither (no work or school, or in vacation)	131 (19%)	72 (17%)	59 (23%)		

[1] Mean (SD); n (%)

[2] False discovery rate correction for multiple testing

[3] Wilcoxon rank sum test

[4] Pearson's Chi-squared test

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Statistics	Item-Total Correlation
Item1	2.27	1.39	0.74	-0.81	0.81*	0.19
Item2	2.87	1.59	0.08	-1.60	0.83*	0.28
Item3	3.36	1.38	-0.48	-1.03	0.87*	0.23
Item4	1.47	1.18	2.38	4.00	0.43*	0.24
Item5	4.01	1.40	-1.22	0.07	0.70*	0.17
Item6	2.79	1.55	0.19	-1.48	0.85*	0.13
Item7	2.26	1.25	0.70	-0.60	0.85*	0.32
Item8	2.97	1.20	-0.06	-0.94	0.91*	0.25
Item9	2.94	1.03	-0.12	-0.40	0.91*	0.08
Item10	2.74	1.04	0.09	-0.74	0.91*	0.42
Item11	2.18	0.90	0.60	0.12	0.86*	0.41
Item12	2.36	1.22	0.59	-0.62	0.87*	0.48
Item13	2.73	1.46	0.20	-1.36	0.87*	0.25
Item14	2.14	1.31	0.77	-0.78	0.80*	0.28
Item15	3.26	1.09	-0.26	-0.45	0.91*	0.03
Item16	1.56	1.23	2.00	2.45	0.50*	0.28
Item17	1.54	1.21	2.07	2.75	0.49*	0.21
Item18	1.12	0.49	5.02	27.80	0.25*	0.18
Item19	1.05	0.36	7.23	52.98	0.13*	0.17
Item20	1.04	0.33	8.99	85.28	0.10*	0.16
Item21	1.14	0.59	4.79	24.05	0.25*	0.21
Item22	3.57	1.07	-0.65	-0.17	0.88*	0.20
Item23	2.56	1.27	0.33	-1.00	0.89*	0.08

Table 3 continued

	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Statistics	Item-Total Correlation
Item24	4.14	0.99	-1.23	1.14	0.79*	0.22
Item25	2.59	1.41	0.27	-1.27	0.86*	0.15
Item26	2.25	1.27	0.69	-0.64	0.84*	0.08
Item27	3.80	1.29	-0.87	-0.42	0.82*	0.17
Item28	3.76	1.14	-0.68	-0.45	0.86*	0.18
Item29	2.44	1.31	0.38	-1.14	0.86*	0.13
Item30	1.48	1.11	2.18	3.35	0.48*	0.13
Item31	3.00	1.62	-0.08	-1.61	0.83*	0.39
Item32	3.55	1.65	-0.60	-1.34	0.76*	0.33
Item33	3.62	1.64	-0.68	-1.25	0.74*	0.37
Item34	3.42	1.83	-0.45	-1.69	0.69*	0.20
Item35	3.86	1.67	-0.99	-0.85	0.65*	0.20
Item36	1.54	1.25	2.13	2.86	0.46*	0.35
Item37	1.33	0.91	3.03	8.43	0.41*	0.09
Item38	4.30	1.08	-1.79	2.53	0.67*	0.32
Item39	1.96	0.98	1.02	0.69	0.82*	0.07
Item40	2.16	1.19	0.71	-0.54	0.84*	0.25
Item41	1.31	0.81	2.75	6.92	0.43*	0.14
Item42	3.93	1.48	-1.06	-0.44	0.71*	0.15
Item43	1.64	1.18	1.79	2.02	0.60*	0.22
Item44	3.51	1.30	-0.70	-0.59	0.85*	0.40
Item45	2.22	1.48	0.71	-1.02	0.76*	0.29
Item46	1.76	1.23	1.35	0.44	0.66*	0.39
Item47	2.11	1.17	0.77	-0.39	0.83*	0.37

Table 3 continued

	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Statistics	Item-Total Correlation
Item48	2.60	1.25	0.29	-0.86	0.89*	0.36

Note. *p<.001

Table 4

Factor loadings and communality of the retained items

item	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA5	Communality	Uniqueness
item16	0.99					0.993	0.007
item36	0.94					0.899	0.101
item17	0.8					0.658	0.342
item11		0.79				0.642	0.358
item10		0.76				0.592	0.408
item12		0.65				0.465	0.535
item7		0.5				0.267	0.733
item8		-0.49				0.252	0.748
item9		0.32				0.113	0.887
item27			0.8			0.658	0.342
item3			0.8			0.682	0.318
item40			0.65			0.464	0.536
item30			0.45			0.353	0.647
item41			0.36			0.329	0.671
item33				0.74		0.555	0.445
item32				0.73		0.624	0.376
item35				0.66		0.454	0.546
item37				-0.39		0.174	0.826
item38				0.38		0.178	0.822
item46					0.6	0.422	0.578
item45					0.59	0.374	0.626
item25					0.41	0.193	0.807
item4					0.41	0.219	0.781
item1					0.4	0.17	0.83
item26					0.35	0.165	0.835
% of Variance	0.1	0.1	0.09	0.08	0.06		

Note. Only loading higher than .30 is reported

Table 5

Fit indices of CFA

Model	Chi-Squre	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% Lower CI	RMSEA 90% Upper CI	SRMR
Five factor model:25	448.51	222.00	.94	0.93	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.12
Five factor model:23	346.59	221.00	.97	0.96	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.09

Note. df: Degrees of Freedom; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker Lewis Index;RMSEA:Root Mean Square Error of

Approximation; CI: Confidence Interval; SRMR: Standardized Root Mean Square

Table 6

Invariance Analysis

	Chi-Square	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% Lower CI	RMSEA 90% Upper	Chi-Square Difference	df difference*	p
Configural	632.20	442.00	0.95	0.94	0.06	0.05	0.07	-	-	-
Metric	644.58	458.00	0.95	0.95	0.06	0.05	0.07	18.019a	16	0.323
Scalar	714.19	522.00	0.95	0.95	0.05	0.04	0.06	67.961b	64	0.344
Residual	714.19	522.00	0.95	0.95	0.05	0.04	0.06	0c	0	NA

Note. a = Metric vs Configural; b = Scalar vs Metric; c = Residual vs Scalar; d = Structural vs Residual;* = df of model comparison

Table 7

IRT Item parameters for the LEBA Scale

	a	b1	b2	b3	b4
item16	28.13	0.78	0.90	1.06	1.40
item36	4.49	0.94	1.08	1.23	1.40
item17	2.81	0.97	1.11	1.38	1.62
item11	3.27	-0.79	0.65	1.54	2.31
item10	3.07	-1.27	-0.09	0.82	2.00
item12	1.72	-0.67	0.44	1.28	2.11
item7	1.09	-0.50	0.73	1.63	2.97
Ritem8	1.19	-2.26	-0.48	0.64	1.91
item9	0.91	-2.63	-0.96	1.11	3.49
item27	2.21	-1.88	-1.19	-0.73	0.30
item3	3.03	-1.24	-0.77	-0.20	0.66
item40	1.55	-0.51	0.46	1.32	2.22
item30	0.49	3.27	3.74	4.64	6.52
item41	0.51	3.87	4.78	6.39	8.91
item32	1.62	-1.03	-0.78	-0.42	0.16
item35	1.37	-1.09	-0.98	-0.75	-0.40
item38	0.40	-7.48	-5.56	-4.23	-0.90
item33	12.31	-0.66	-0.48	-0.24	0.13
item46	2.22	0.68	0.89	1.38	2.17
item45	1.51	0.30	0.55	1.17	1.91
item25	0.52	-1.37	-0.04	1.89	4.22
item4	0.84	2.44	2.80	3.18	3.67
item1	0.39	-0.91	1.52	3.25	5.53

Note. a = item discrimination parameter; b(1-4)
= response category difficulty parameter

Table 8

Item fit statistics for the fitted models

| Item	Signed Chi-square	df	RMSEA	p
item16	2.02	6.00	0.00	0.92
item36	39.07	13.00	0.05	0.00
item17	25.58	13.00	0.04	0.02
item11	24.42	21.00	0.02	0.27
item10	37.39	25.00	0.03	0.05
item12	36.60	34.00	0.01	0.35
item7	47.23	40.00	0.02	0.20
Ritem8	81.87	36.00	0.04	0.00
item27	16.41	11.00	0.03	0.13
item3	15.09	11.00	0.02	0.18
item40	9.92	9.00	0.01	0.36
item32	41.33	15.00	0.05	0.00
item35	41.71	14.00	0.05	0.00
item33	46.89	14.00	0.06	0.00
item46	19.00	15.00	0.02	0.21
item45	15.05	15.00	0.00	0.45
item25	31.60	15.00	0.04	0.01

*Figure 1*. Development of long and short form of LEBA

*Figure 2.* Correlation plot of the items

Figure 3. Factor Identification (A) Parallel analysis (B) Scree Plot (C) Hull Method

Figure 4. Five Factor Solution

Figure 5. Histogram of residuals: five-factor solution

LEBA
Summary Descriptives of CFA and EFA Sample (N =690)

LEBA Items	n	Mean	Median	SD	Histogram[1]	Density[2]	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
EFA (n = 428)											
item01	428	2.3	2.0	1.4			42.29% (181)	22.20% (95)	12.62% (54)	12.38% (53)	10.51% (45)
item03	428	3.4	4.0	1.4			15.89% (68)	11.45% (49)	17.29% (74)	31.07% (133)	24.30% (104)
item04	428	1.5	1.0	1.2			84.11% (360)	3.50% (15)	2.10% (9)	2.10% (9)	8.18% (35)
item07	428	2.3	2.0	1.2			35.98% (154)	27.80% (119)	17.29% (74)	12.38% (53)	6.54% (28)
item08	428	3.0	3.0	1.2			13.79% (59)	22.20% (95)	27.80% (119)	25.93% (111)	10.28% (44)
item09	428	2.9	3.0	1.0			10.28% (44)	19.63% (84)	41.82% (179)	22.43% (96)	5.84% (25)
item10	428	2.7	3.0	1.0			11.92% (51)	31.31% (134)	31.31% (134)	21.96% (94)	3.50% (15)
item11	428	2.2	2.0	0.9			22.43% (96)	46.26% (198)	23.13% (99)	7.01% (30)	1.17% (5)
item12	428	2.4	2.0	1.2			29.91% (128)	29.67% (127)	21.50% (92)	12.15% (52)	6.78% (29)
item16	428	1.6	1.0	1.2			79.67% (341)	4.21% (18)	3.97% (17)	4.67% (20)	7.48% (32)
item17	428	1.5	1.0	1.2			80.61% (345)	3.27% (14)	5.14% (22)	3.27% (14)	7.71% (33)
item25	428	2.6	3.0	1.4			34.35% (147)	13.79% (59)	22.20% (95)	17.99% (77)	11.68% (50)
item26	428	3.7	4.0	1.3			38.32% (164)	23.36% (100)	20.09% (86)	10.98% (47)	7.24% (31)
item27	428	3.8	4.0	1.3			8.41% (36)	11.21% (48)	11.21% (48)	30.37% (130)	38.79% (166)
item30	428	1.5	1.0	1.1			81.78% (350)	3.27% (14)	4.91% (21)	5.37% (23)	4.67% (20)
item32	428	3.6	4.0	1.6			23.13% (99)	7.01% (30)	8.18% (35)	14.95% (64)	46.73% (200)
item33	428	3.6	4.0	1.6			21.96% (94)	7.01% (30)	7.24% (31)	14.49% (62)	49.30% (211)
item35	428	3.9	5.0	1.7			22.90% (98)	1.87% (8)	3.74% (16)	9.35% (40)	62.15% (266)
item36	428	1.5	1.0	1.3			82.24% (352)	3.04% (13)	3.04% (13)	2.34% (10)	9.35% (40)
item37	428	2.3	2.0	1.3			38.32% (164)	23.36% (100)	20.09% (86)	10.98% (47)	7.24% (31)
item38	428	4.3	5.0	1.1			5.37% (23)	3.50% (15)	5.37% (23)	27.57% (118)	58.18% (249)
item40	428	2.2	2.0	1.2			39.49% (169)	25.00% (107)	19.63% (84)	11.45% (49)	4.44% (19)
item41	428	1.3	1.0	0.8			85.05% (364)	4.67% (20)	6.07% (26)	3.04% (13)	1.17% (5)
item45	428	2.2	1.0	1.5			53.04% (227)	7.01% (30)	16.36% (70)	11.92% (51)	11.68% (50)
item46	428	1.8	1.0	1.2			67.06% (287)	7.71% (33)	11.68% (50)	8.88% (38)	4.67% (20)
CFA (n =262)											
item01	262	2.3	2.0	1.4			40.46% (106)	22.52% (59)	14.50% (38)	10.69% (28)	11.83% (31)
item03	262	3.7	4.0	1.3			11.83% (31)	7.25% (19)	17.56% (46)	28.24% (74)	35.11% (92)
item04	262	1.3	1.0	0.8			89.31% (234)	2.29% (6)	3.44% (9)	3.05% (8)	1.91% (5)
item07	262	2.1	2.0	1.2			43.13% (113)	23.66% (62)	14.50% (38)	14.12% (37)	4.58% (12)
item08	262	3.0	3.0	1.2			14.12% (37)	22.90% (60)	20.99% (55)	32.06% (84)	9.92% (26)
item09	262	2.9	3.0	1.1			12.98% (34)	22.14% (58)	34.35% (90)	26.34% (69)	4.20% (11)
item10	262	2.6	3.0	1.1			17.56% (46)	29.39% (77)	29.01% (76)	21.37% (56)	2.67% (7)
item11	262	2.1	2.0	0.9			25.95% (68)	46.56% (122)	20.23% (53)	5.34% (14)	1.91% (5)
item12	262	2.3	2.0	1.2			32.06% (84)	30.92% (81)	19.08% (50)	11.45% (30)	6.49% (17)
item16	262	1.6	1.0	1.3			78.24% (205)	3.44% (9)	4.20% (11)	5.73% (15)	8.40% (22)
item17	262	1.6	1.0	1.2			80.15% (210)	3.44% (9)	5.34% (14)	2.67% (7)	8.40% (22)
item25	262	2.5	2.0	1.4			32.82% (86)	18.32% (48)	21.76% (57)	16.79% (44)	10.31% (27)
item27	262	4.0	4.0	1.2			6.11% (16)	7.25% (19)	8.02% (21)	33.59% (88)	45.04% (118)
item30	262	1.4	1.0	1.1			83.59% (219)	2.67% (7)	4.20% (11)	6.11% (16)	3.44% (9)
item32	262	3.4	4.0	1.7			25.95% (68)	4.20% (11)	11.45% (30)	16.79% (44)	41.60% (109)
item33	262	3.1	3.0	1.7			32.44% (85)	6.11% (16)	11.83% (31)	14.12% (37)	35.50% (93)
item35	262	3.6	5.0	1.8			27.48% (72)	2.67% (7)	7.25% (19)	6.49% (17)	56.11% (147)
item36	262	1.6	1.0	1.3			80.53% (211)	3.44% (9)	3.05% (8)	3.44% (9)	9.54% (25)
item38	262	4.3	5.0	1.1			4.20% (11)	7.63% (20)	6.49% (17)	21.37% (56)	60.31% (158)
item40	262	2.5	2.0	1.3			30.92% (81)	27.10% (71)	18.70% (49)	12.21% (32)	11.07% (29)
item41	262	1.2	1.0	0.7			90.08% (236)	3.82% (10)	2.29% (6)	2.67% (7)	1.15% (3)
item45	262	2.0	1.0	1.4			64.12% (168)	5.34% (14)	9.54% (25)	11.83% (31)	9.16% (24)
item46	262	1.6	1.0	1.2			75.57% (198)	2.67% (7)	8.02% (21)	9.54% (25)	4.20% (11)

[1] **Histogram**
[2] **Density**

Figure 6. Summary Descriptives of CFA and EFA Sample

Figure 7. Five Factor CFA Model of LEBA

Figure 8. Item information curves (a) Wearing blue light filters (b) Spending time outdoors

(c) Using phone and smartwatchin bed (d) Using light before bedtime (e) Using light in the

morning andduring daytime

Figure 9. Test information curves (a) Wearing blue light filters (b) Spending time outdoors (c) Using phone and smartwatchin bed (d) Using light before bedtime (e) Using light in the morning andduring daytime

Figure 10. Person fit of the five fitted IRT models (a) Wearing blue light filters (b) Spending time outdoors (c) Using phone and smartwatchin bed (d) Using light before bedtime (e) Using light in the morning andduring daytime

Figure 11. Person Item Map (a) Wearing blue light filters (b) Spending time outdoors (c) Using phone and smartwatchin bed (d) Using light before bedtime (e) Using light in the morning andduring daytime

Appendix A

SA: Confirming the five factor solution obtained using minimum residual extraction method

Table A1

Factor loadings and communality of the retained items(Minmum Residual)

item	MR1	MR2	MR3	MR4	MR5	Communality	Uniqueness
item16	1					0.996	0.004
item36	0.94					0.897	0.103
item17	0.8					0.658	0.342
item11		0.79				0.642	0.358
item10		0.76				0.592	0.408
item12		0.65				0.465	0.535
item7		0.5				0.267	0.733
item8		-0.49				0.252	0.748
item9		0.32				0.113	0.887
item27			0.8			0.659	0.341
item3			0.8			0.683	0.317
item40			0.65			0.464	0.536
item30			0.45			0.353	0.647
item41			0.36			0.329	0.671
item33				0.74		0.555	0.445
item32				0.73		0.623	0.377
item35				0.66		0.455	0.545
item37				-0.39		0.175	0.825
item38				0.38		0.178	0.822
item46					0.6	0.422	0.578
item45					0.59	0.374	0.626

Table A1 continued

item	MR1	MR2	MR3	MR4	MR5	Communality	Uniqueness
item25					0.41	0.193	0.807
item4					0.41	0.219	0.781
item1					0.4	0.17	0.83
item26					0.35	0.165	0.835
% of Variance	0.1	0.1	0.09	0.08	0.06		

Note. Only loading higher than .30 is reported

Appendix B

SA: Factor analysis with six factors

Table B1

Factor loadings and communality of the retained items(six factor)

item	PA1	PA4	PA2	PA3	PA5	PA6	Communality	Uniqueness
item19	1.78						3.318	-2.318
item5							0.11	0.89
item16		1					1.004	-0.004
item36		0.91					0.86	0.14
item17		0.81					0.691	0.309
item11			0.83				0.71	0.29
item10			0.79				0.638	0.362
item12			0.63				0.465	0.535
item8			-0.5				0.269	0.731
item7			0.47				0.268	0.732
item9			0.32				0.163	0.837
item33				0.83			0.698	0.302
item32				0.75			0.666	0.334
item35				0.64			0.446	0.554
item31				0.48			0.331	0.669
item38				0.39			0.191	0.809
item37				-0.35			0.153	0.847
item3					0.85		0.748	0.252
item27					0.8		0.644	0.356
item40					0.68		0.507	0.493
item46						0.6	0.431	0.569

Table B1 continued

item	PA1	PA4	PA2	PA3	PA5	PA6	Communality	Uniqueness
item45						0.56	0.341	0.659
item4						0.43	0.265	0.735
item25						0.4	0.178	0.822
item1						0.36	0.142	0.858
item26						0.36	0.173	0.827
item13							0.087	0.913
item29							0.108	0.892
% of Variance	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.06		

Note. Only loading higher than .30 is reported

781

Appendix C

SA: Factor Analysis with Unmerged Response Option

Table **??** summarizes the univariate descriptive statistics for the 48 items with un-merged options. Some of the items were skewed with high Kurtosis values. Our data violated both univariate normality (Shapiro-Wilk statistics) and multivariate normality assumptions [Marida's test]. Multivariate skew was = 494.70 (p <0.001) and multivariate kurtosis was = 2,705.00 (p <0.001). Due to these violations and ordinal nature of the response data polychoric correlations over Pearson's correlations was chosen. Sampling adequacy was checked using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures of sampling adequacy. The overall KMO vale for 48 items was 0.65 which was above the cutoff value (.50) indicating a mediocre sample. Bartlett's test of sphericity, χ^2 (1128) = 5515.20, p < .001 indicated the correlations between items are adequate for the EFA. However only 4.34% of the inter-item correlation coefficients were greater than .30. The absolute value of inter-item correlation ranged between .00 to .96.Figure **??** depicts the correlation matrix. For un-merged response option Horn's parallel analysis with 500 iterations indicated a five-factor solution. However, Scree plot and the MAP method suggested 6-factor solution. five-factor solution . As a result, we tested both five-factor and six-factor solutions. The six factor solution yielded a factor with only two salient loading (Table **??**. Thus we reject the six factor solution. The five factor solution retained 24 items (Table **??**). However the factors are less interpretable in terms of common theme. Thus we reject the five factor solution.

Table C1

Descriptive Statistics for Unmerged response options

	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Statistics	Item-Total Correlation
Item1	2.16	1.51	0.49	-0.86	0.90*	.21

Table C1 continued

	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Statistics	Item-Total Correlation
Item2	2.76	1.75	-0.10	-1.42	0.88*	.20
Item3	3.34	1.43	-0.58	-0.77	0.88*	.18
Item4	1.30	1.31	1.93	2.92	0.62*	.32
Item5	3.95	1.56	-1.42	0.75	0.70*	.19
Item6	2.70	1.66	0.02	-1.33	0.90*	.18
Item7	2.23	1.28	0.60	-0.59	0.89*	.18
Item8	2.95	1.24	-0.19	-0.70	0.93*	-.07
Item9	2.92	1.09	-0.37	0.11	0.91*	.14
Item10	2.73	1.07	-0.03	-0.52	0.92*	.27
Item11	2.17	0.93	0.44	0.20	0.89*	.25
Item12	2.34	1.26	0.46	-0.58	0.91*	.24
Item13	2.71	1.49	0.14	-1.29	0.89*	.28
Item14	2.11	1.34	0.68	-0.78	0.84*	.24
Item15	3.26	1.11	-0.34	-0.21	0.91*	.11
Item16	1.46	1.31	1.71	1.90	0.65*	.33
Item17	1.43	1.30	1.76	2.12	0.64*	.30
Item18	0.92	0.67	2.00	9.41	0.62*	.32
Item19	0.85	0.56	1.71	10.74	0.55*	.34
Item20	0.83	0.54	1.76	13.92	0.53*	.31
Item21	0.94	0.75	2.46	10.66	0.58*	.27
Item22	3.57	1.08	-0.72	0.08	0.88*	.19
Item23	2.53	1.31	0.22	-0.91	0.92*	.11
Item24	4.13	1.01	-1.39	2.01	0.78*	.19
Item25	2.57	1.43	0.22	-1.23	0.88*	.17

Table C1 continued

	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Statistics	Item-Total Correlation
Item26	2.23	1.30	0.59	-0.63	0.88*	.16
Item27	3.78	1.34	-1.01	0.08	0.82*	.18
Item28	3.75	1.16	-0.78	-0.10	0.86*	.01
Item29	2.38	1.40	0.20	-1.04	0.92*	.11
Item30	0.94	1.42	1.66	1.69	0.68*	.24
Item31	2.91	1.76	-0.24	-1.41	0.87*	.45
Item32	3.49	1.76	-0.71	-1.06	0.78*	.43
Item33	3.56	1.75	-0.79	-0.95	0.77*	.32
Item34	3.30	2.00	-0.54	-1.50	0.74*	.34
Item35	3.80	1.79	-1.07	-0.59	0.67*	.24
Item36	1.36	1.38	1.75	2.05	0.65*	.38
Item37	1.30	0.94	2.79	7.65	0.48*	-.01
Item38	4.27	1.18	-2.07	4.01	0.65*	.23
Item39	1.94	1.01	0.85	0.61	0.86*	.05
Item40	2.13	1.24	0.56	-0.54	0.89*	.16
Item41	0.87	1.08	1.68	2.74	0.73*	.21
Item42	3.90	1.55	-1.15	-0.12	0.72*	.17
Item43	1.59	1.23	1.59	1.70	0.69*	.22
Item44	3.46	1.41	-0.92	-0.01	0.86*	.38
Item45	2.04	1.66	0.46	-1.12	0.87*	.29
Item46	1.57	1.40	0.97	-0.07	0.82*	.38
Item47	2.07	1.23	0.59	-0.42	0.89*	.34
Item48	2.57	1.30	0.14	-0.74	0.93*	.31

Note. *p<.001

801

Figure C1. Factor Identification (A) Parallel analysis (B) Scree Plot [Unmerged response options]

Table C2

Factor loadings and communality of the retained items in five factor solution [Unmerged Responses]

item	PA1	PA2	PA5	PA3	PA4	Communality	Uniqueness
item19	0.99					1.007	-0.007
item20	0.91					0.874	0.126
item18	0.82					0.711	0.289

Table C2 continued

item	PA1	PA2	PA5	PA3	PA4	Communality	Uniqueness
item21	0.8					0.683	0.317
item4	0.47					0.25	0.75
item11		0.83				0.687	0.313
item10		0.81				0.67	0.33
item12		0.56				0.371	0.629
item8		-0.44				0.206	0.794
item7		0.42				0.226	0.774
item9		0.33				0.115	0.885
item16			0.95			0.946	0.054
item17			0.74			0.595	0.405
item36	0.3		0.73			0.653	0.347
item3				0.85		0.746	0.254
item27				0.78		0.624	0.376
item40				0.71		0.512	0.488
item35					0.58	0.351	0.649
item48					0.57	0.354	0.646
item33					0.55	0.32	0.68
item47					0.52	0.294	0.706
item44					0.45	0.216	0.784
item31					0.41	0.206	0.794
item38					0.33	0.129	0.871
% of Variance	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08		

Note. Only loading higher than .30 is reported

Table C3

Factor loadings and communality of the retained items in six factor solution [Unmerged Responses]

item	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA6	PA5	Communality	Uniqueness
item19	0.98						0.995	0.005
item20	0.92						0.904	0.096
item21	0.79						0.666	0.334
item4	0.49						0.296	0.704
item43	0.32					0.31	0.282	0.718
item10		0.81					0.67	0.33
item11		0.81					0.668	0.332
item12		0.58					0.408	0.592
item8		-0.45					0.218	0.782
item7		0.42					0.229	0.771
item9		0.33					0.115	0.885
item3			0.85				0.731	0.269
item27			0.77				0.606	0.394
item40			0.72				0.533	0.467
item35				0.64			0.426	0.574
item33				0.62			0.413	0.587
item48				0.52			0.305	0.695
item47				0.48			0.259	0.741
item31				0.39			0.206	0.794
item38				0.32			0.18	0.82
item17					0.85		0.786	0.214

Table C3 continued

item	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA6	PA5	Communality	Uniqueness
item16					0.78		0.681	0.319
item13						0.57	0.336	0.664
item14						0.5	0.356	0.644
item15						0.48	0.277	0.723
item42						0.37	0.168	0.832
item26							0.064	0.936
% of Variance	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05		

Note. Only loading higher than .30 is reported

Appendix D

Items Retained in the Five Factor Solution [Unmerged Responses]

Five Factor Solution [Unmerged Responses] (24 Items)

F1

I use light therapy applying a blue light box.

I use light therapy applying a light visor.

I use light therapy applying a white light box.

I use light therapy applying another form of light device.

I use an alarm with a dawn simulation light.

F2

I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.

I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.

I spend as much time outside as possible.

I spend 30 minutes or less per day (in total) outside.

I go for a walk or exercise outside within 2 hours after waking up.

I spend between 30 minutes and 1 hour per day (in total) outside.

F3

I look at my mobile phone screen immediately after waking up.

I use my mobile phone within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.

I check my phone when I wake up at night.

F4

I use a blue-filter app on my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.

I seek out knowledge on how to improve my light exposure.

I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.

I discuss the effects of light on my body with other people.

Five Factor Solution [Unmerged Responses] (24 Items)

I modify my light environment to match my current needs.

I dim my room light within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.

I use as little light as possible when I get up during the night.

F5

I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses indoors during the day.

I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses outdoors during the day.

I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses within 1 hour before

attempting to fall asleep.

Appendix E

Geographic Locations of Survey Participants

Table E1

Geographical Location

	N = 690
__Time zone - Country__	
United States - America/New_York (UTC -04:00)	63 (9.1%)
United Kingdom - Europe/London (UTC)	57 (8.3%)
Germany - Europe/Berlin (UTC +01:00)	53 (7.7%)
India - Asia/Kolkata (UTC +05:30)	38 (5.5%)
United States - America/Los_Angeles (UTC -07:00)	37 (5.4%)
United States - America/Chicago (UTC -05:00)	30 (4.3%)
France - Europe/Paris (UTC +01:00)	22 (3.2%)
Switzerland - Europe/Zurich (UTC +01:00)	21 (3.0%)
Brazil - America/Sao_Paulo (UTC -03:00)	19 (2.8%)
Netherlands - Europe/Amsterdam (UTC +01:00)	19 (2.8%)
Canada - America/Toronto (UTC -04:00)	16 (2.3%)
Poland - Europe/Warsaw (UTC +01:00)	15 (2.2%)
Canada - America/Edmonton (UTC -06:00)	14 (2.0%)
Finland - Europe/Helsinki (UTC +02:00)	9 (1.3%)
Indonesia - Asia/Jakarta (UTC +07:00)	9 (1.3%)
Italy - Europe/Rome (UTC +01:00)	9 (1.3%)
Chile - America/Santiago (UTC -03:00)	8 (1.2%)
Russian Federation - Europe/Moscow (UTC +03:00)	8 (1.2%)
China - Asia/Shanghai (UTC +08:00)	7 (1.0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Malaysia - Asia/Kuala_Lumpur (UTC +08:00)	7 (1.0%)
Spain - Europe/Madrid (UTC +01:00)	7 (1.0%)
United States - America/Phoenix (UTC -07:00)	7 (1.0%)
Canada - America/Vancouver (UTC -07:00)	6 (0.9%)
New Zealand - Pacific/Auckland (UTC +13:00)	6 (0.9%)
Philippines - Asia/Manila (UTC +08:00)	6 (0.9%)
Turkey - Europe/Istanbul (UTC +03:00)	6 (0.9%)
United States - America/Denver (UTC -06:00)	6 (0.9%)
United States - America/Detroit (UTC -04:00)	6 (0.9%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Buenos_Aires (UTC -03:00)	5 (0.7%)
Australia - Australia/Melbourne (UTC +11:00)	5 (0.7%)
Ireland - Europe/Dublin (UTC)	5 (0.7%)
Lithuania - Europe/Vilnius (UTC +02:00)	5 (0.7%)
South Africa - Africa/Johannesburg (UTC +02:00)	5 (0.7%)
Australia - Australia/Brisbane (UTC +10:00)	4 (0.6%)
Belgium - Europe/Brussels (UTC +01:00)	4 (0.6%)
Israel - Asia/Jerusalem (UTC +02:00)	4 (0.6%)
Sweden - Europe/Stockholm (UTC +01:00)	4 (0.6%)
United States - America/Boise (UTC -06:00)	4 (0.6%)
Czech Republic - Europe/Prague (UTC +01:00)	3 (0.4%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Denmark - Europe/Copenhagen (UTC +01:00)	3 (0.4%)
Germany - Europe/Busingen (UTC +01:00)	3 (0.4%)
Greece - Europe/Athens (UTC +02:00)	3 (0.4%)
Iran	3 (0.4%)
Japan - Asia/Tokyo (UTC +09:00)	3 (0.4%)
Norway - Europe/Oslo (UTC +01:00)	3 (0.4%)
Romania - Europe/Bucharest (UTC +02:00)	3 (0.4%)
Serbia - Europe/Belgrade (UTC +01:00)	3 (0.4%)
Slovenia - Europe/Ljubljana (UTC +01:00)	3 (0.4%)
Taiwan	3 (0.4%)
United States - America/Anchorage (UTC -08:00)	3 (0.4%)
United States - America/Indiana/Indianapolis (UTC -04:00)	3 (0.4%)
United States - America/Kentucky/Louisville (UTC -04:00)	3 (0.4%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Cordoba (UTC -03:00)	2 (0.3%)
Australia - Australia/Adelaide (UTC +10:30)	2 (0.3%)
Australia - Australia/Perth (UTC +08:00)	2 (0.3%)
Australia - Australia/Sydney (UTC +11:00)	2 (0.3%)
Brazil - America/Araguaina (UTC -03:00)	2 (0.3%)
Brazil - America/Bahia (UTC -03:00)	2 (0.3%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Canada - America/Moncton (UTC -03:00)	2 (0.3%)
Colombia - America/Bogota (UTC -05:00)	2 (0.3%)
Costa Rica - America/Costa_Rica (UTC -06:00)	2 (0.3%)
Croatia - Europe/Zagreb (UTC +01:00)	2 (0.3%)
Ecuador - America/Guayaquil (UTC -05:00)	2 (0.3%)
Estonia - Europe/Tallinn (UTC +02:00)	2 (0.3%)
Hong Kong - Asia/Hong_Kong (UTC +08:00)	2 (0.3%)
Hungary - Europe/Budapest (UTC +01:00)	2 (0.3%)
Jordan - Asia/Amman (UTC +03:00)	2 (0.3%)
Latvia - Europe/Riga (UTC +02:00)	2 (0.3%)
Malaysia - Asia/Kuching (UTC +08:00)	2 (0.3%)
Mexico - America/Mexico_City (UTC -06:00)	2 (0.3%)
Nepal - Asia/Kathmandu (UTC +05:45)	2 (0.3%)
Portugal - Europe/Lisbon (UTC)	2 (0.3%)
Slovakia - Europe/Bratislava (UTC +01:00)	2 (0.3%)
Spain - Africa/Ceuta (UTC +01:00)	2 (0.3%)
Sudan - Africa/Khartoum (UTC +02:00)	2 (0.3%)
United States - America/Adak (UTC -09:00)	2 (0.3%)
United States - Pacific/Honolulu (UTC -10:00)	2 (0.3%)
Viet Nam - Asia/Ho_Chi_Minh (UTC +07:00),British - America/Tortola (UTC -04:00)	2 (0.3%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Albania - Europe/Tirane (UTC +01:00)	1 (0.1%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Jujuy (UTC -03:00)	1 (0.1%)
Australia - Antarctica/Macquarie (UTC +11:00)	1 (0.1%)
Australia - Australia/Darwin (UTC +09:30)	1 (0.1%)
Austria - Europe/Vienna (UTC +01:00)	1 (0.1%)
Bangladesh - Asia/Dhaka (UTC +06:00)	1 (0.1%)
Brazil - America/Cuiaba (UTC -04:00)	1 (0.1%)
Brazil - America/Fortaleza (UTC -03:00)	1 (0.1%)
Bulgaria - Europe/Sofia (UTC +02:00)	1 (0.1%)
Cameroon - Africa/Douala (UTC +01:00)	1 (0.1%)
Canada - America/Blanc-Sablon (UTC -04:00)	1 (0.1%)
Canada - America/Halifax (UTC -03:00)	1 (0.1%)
Canada - America/Resolute (UTC -05:00)	1 (0.1%)
Cayman Islands - America/Cayman (UTC -05:00)	1 (0.1%)
Chile - Pacific/Easter (UTC -05:00)	1 (0.1%)
Cyprus - Asia/Famagusta (UTC +02:00)	1 (0.1%)
Guatemala - America/Guatemala (UTC -06:00)	1 (0.1%)
Korea,Republic of - Asia/Seoul (UTC +09:00)	1 (0.1%)
Macedonia	1 (0.1%)
Martinique - America/Martinique (UTC -04:00)	1 (0.1%)
Mexico - America/Monterrey (UTC -06:00)	1 (0.1%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Mongolia - Asia/Ulaanbaatar (UTC +08:00)	1 (0.1%)
Myanmar - Asia/Yangon (UTC +06:30)	1 (0.1%)
New Zealand - Pacific/Chatham (UTC +13:45)	1 (0.1%)
Nigeria - Africa/Lagos (UTC +01:00)	1 (0.1%)
Pakistan - Asia/Karachi (UTC +05:00)	1 (0.1%)
Panama - America/Panama (UTC -05:00)	1 (0.1%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Barnaul (UTC +07:00)	1 (0.1%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Novosibirsk (UTC +07:00)	1 (0.1%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Tomsk (UTC +07:00)	1 (0.1%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Vladivostok (UTC +10:00)	1 (0.1%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Yekaterinburg (UTC +05:00)	1 (0.1%)
Saudi Arabia - Asia/Riyadh (UTC +03:00)	1 (0.1%)
Singapore - Asia/Singapore (UTC +08:00)	1 (0.1%)
Spain - Atlantic/Canary (UTC)	1 (0.1%)
Tanzania	1 (0.1%)
Ukraine - Europe/Kiev (UTC +02:00)	1 (0.1%)
United States - America/Indiana/Tell_City (UTC -05:00)	1 (0.1%)
United States - America/North_Dakota/Center (UTC -05:00)	1 (0.1%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
United States - America/North_Dakota/New_Salem (UTC -05:00)	1 (0.1%)
Aland Islands - Europe/Mariehamn (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Afghanistan - Asia/Kabul (UTC +04:30)	0 (0%)
Algeria - Africa/Algiers (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
American Samoa - Pacific/Pago_Pago (UTC -11:00)	0 (0%)
Andorra - Europe/Andorra (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Angola - Africa/Luanda (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Anguilla - America/Anguilla (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Casey (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Davis (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/DumontDUrville (UTC +10:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Mawson (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/McMurdo (UTC +13:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Palmer (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Rothera (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Syowa (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Troll (UTC)	0 (0%)
Antarctica - Antarctica/Vostok (UTC +06:00)	0 (0%)
Antigua and Barbuda - America/Antigua (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Argentina - America/Argentina/Catamarca (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/La_Rioja (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Mendoza (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Rio_Gallegos (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Salta (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/San_Juan (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/San_Luis (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Tucuman (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Argentina - America/Argentina/Ushuaia (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Armenia - Asia/Yerevan (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Aruba - America/Aruba (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Australia - Australia/Broken_Hill (UTC +10:30)	0 (0%)
Australia - Australia/Currie (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Australia - Australia/Eucla (UTC +08:45)	0 (0%)
Australia - Australia/Hobart (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Australia - Australia/Lindeman (UTC +10:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Australia - Australia/Lord_Howe (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Azerbaijan - Asia/Baku (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Bahamas - America/Nassau (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Bahrain - Asia/Bahrain (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Barbados - America/Barbados (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Belarus - Europe/Minsk (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Belize - America/Belize (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Benin - Africa/Porto-Novo (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Bermuda - Atlantic/Bermuda (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Bhutan - Asia/Thimphu (UTC +06:00),Plurinational State of - America/La_Paz (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Bolivia,Sint Eustatius and Saba - America/Kralendijk (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Bonaire	0 (0%)
Bosnia and Herzegovina - Europe/Sarajevo (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Botswana - Africa/Gaborone (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Belem (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Boa_Vista (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Campo_Grande (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Eirunepe (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Brazil - America/Maceio (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Manaus (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Noronha (UTC -02:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Porto_Velho (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Recife (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Rio_Branco (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Brazil - America/Santarem (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
British Indian Ocean Territory - Indian/Chagos (UTC +06:00)	0 (0%)
Brunei Darussalam - Asia/Brunei (UTC +08:00)	0 (0%)
Burkina Faso - Africa/Ouagadougou (UTC)	0 (0%)
Burundi - Africa/Bujumbura (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Cambodia - Asia/Phnom_Penh (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Atikokan (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Cambridge_Bay (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Creston (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Dawson (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Dawson_Creek (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Fort_Nelson (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Glace_Bay (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Goose_Bay (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Canada - America/Inuvik (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Iqaluit (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Nipigon (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Pangnirtung (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Rainy_River (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Rankin_Inlet (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Regina (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/St_Johns (UTC -02:30)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Swift_Current (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Thunder_Bay (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Whitehorse (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Winnipeg (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Canada - America/Yellowknife (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Cape Verde - Atlantic/Cape_Verde (UTC -01:00)	0 (0%)
Central African Republic - Africa/Bangui (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Chad - Africa/Ndjamena (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Chile - America/Punta_Arenas (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
China - Asia/Urumqi (UTC +06:00)	0 (0%)
Christmas Island - Indian/Christmas (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Cocos (Keeling) Islands - Indian/Cocos (UTC +06:30)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Comoros - Indian/Comoro (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Congo - Africa/Brazzaville (UTC +01:00),the Democratic Republic of the - Africa/Kinshasa (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Congo,the Democratic Republic of the - Africa/Lubumbashi (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Congo	0 (0%)
Cook Islands - Pacific/Rarotonga (UTC -10:00)	0 (0%)
Cuba - America/Havana (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Curaçao - America/Curacao (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Cyprus - Asia/Nicosia (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Côte dIvoire - Africa/Abidjan (UTC)	0 (0%)
Djibouti - Africa/Djibouti (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Dominica - America/Dominica (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Dominican Republic - America/Santo_Domingo (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Ecuador - Pacific/Galapagos (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Egypt - Africa/Cairo (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
El Salvador - America/El_Salvador (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Equatorial Guinea - Africa/Malabo (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Eritrea - Africa/Asmara (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Ethiopia - Africa/Addis_Ababa (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Falkland Islands (Malvinas) - Atlantic/Stanley (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Faroe Islands - Atlantic/Faroe (UTC)	0 (0%)
Fiji - Pacific/Fiji (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
French Guiana - America/Cayenne (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
French Polynesia - Pacific/Gambier (UTC -09:00)	0 (0%)
French Polynesia - Pacific/Marquesas (UTC -09:30)	0 (0%)
French Polynesia - Pacific/Tahiti (UTC -10:00)	0 (0%)
French Southern Territories - Indian/Kerguelen (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Gabon - Africa/Libreville (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Gambia - Africa/Banjul (UTC)	0 (0%)
Georgia - Asia/Tbilisi (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Ghana - Africa/Accra (UTC)	0 (0%)
Gibraltar - Europe/Gibraltar (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Greenland - America/Danmarkshavn (UTC)	0 (0%)
Greenland - America/Nuuk (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Greenland - America/Scoresbysund (UTC -01:00)	0 (0%)
Greenland - America/Thule (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Grenada - America/Grenada (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Guadeloupe - America/Guadeloupe (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Guam - Pacific/Guam (UTC +10:00)	0 (0%)
Guernsey - Europe/Guernsey (UTC)	0 (0%)
Guinea - Africa/Conakry (UTC)	0 (0%)
Guinea-Bissau - Africa/Bissau (UTC)	0 (0%)
Guyana - America/Guyana (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Haiti - America/Port-au-Prince (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Holy See (Vatican City State) - Europe/Vatican (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Honduras - America/Tegucigalpa (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Iceland - Atlantic/Reykjavik (UTC)	0 (0%)
Indonesia - Asia/Jayapura (UTC +09:00)	0 (0%)
Indonesia - Asia/Makassar (UTC +08:00)	0 (0%)
Indonesia - Asia/Pontianak (UTC +07:00),Islamic Republic of - Asia/Tehran (UTC +03:30)	0 (0%)
Iraq - Asia/Baghdad (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Isle of Man - Europe/Isle_of_Man (UTC)	0 (0%)
Jamaica - America/Jamaica (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Jersey - Europe/Jersey (UTC)	0 (0%)
Kazakhstan - Asia/Almaty (UTC +06:00)	0 (0%)
Kazakhstan - Asia/Aqtau (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Kazakhstan - Asia/Aqtobe (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Kazakhstan - Asia/Atyrau (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Kazakhstan - Asia/Oral (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Kazakhstan - Asia/Qostanay (UTC +06:00)	0 (0%)
Kazakhstan - Asia/Qyzylorda (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Kenya - Africa/Nairobi (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Kiribati - Pacific/Enderbury (UTC +13:00)	0 (0%)
Kiribati - Pacific/Kiritimati (UTC +14:00)	0 (0%)
Kiribati - Pacific/Tarawa (UTC +12:00),Democratic Peoples Republic of - Asia/Pyongyang (UTC +09:00)	0 (0%)
Korea	0 (0%)
Kuwait - Asia/Kuwait (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Kyrgyzstan - Asia/Bishkek (UTC +06:00)	0 (0%)
Lao Peoples Democratic Republic - Asia/Vientiane (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Lebanon - Asia/Beirut (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Lesotho - Africa/Maseru (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Liberia - Africa/Monrovia (UTC)	0 (0%)
Libya - Africa/Tripoli (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Liechtenstein - Europe/Vaduz (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Luxembourg - Europe/Luxembourg (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Macao - Asia/Macau (UTC +08:00),the Former Yugoslav Republic of - Europe/Skopje (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Madagascar - Indian/Antananarivo (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Malawi - Africa/Blantyre (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Maldives - Indian/Maldives (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Mali - Africa/Bamako (UTC)	0 (0%)
Malta - Europe/Malta (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Marshall Islands - Pacific/Kwajalein (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Marshall Islands - Pacific/Majuro (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Mauritania - Africa/Nouakchott (UTC)	0 (0%)
Mauritius - Indian/Mauritius (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Mayotte - Indian/Mayotte (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Bahia_Banderas (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Cancun (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Chihuahua (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Hermosillo (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Matamoros (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Mazatlan (UTC -07:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Merida (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Mexico - America/Ojinaga (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Mexico - America/Tijuana (UTC -07:00),Federated States of - Pacific/Chuuk (UTC +10:00)	0 (0%)
Micronesia,Federated States of - Pacific/Kosrae (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Micronesia,Federated States of - Pacific/Pohnpei (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Micronesia,Republic of - Europe/Chisinau (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Moldova	0 (0%)
Monaco - Europe/Monaco (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Mongolia - Asia/Choibalsan (UTC +08:00)	0 (0%)
Mongolia - Asia/Hovd (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Montenegro - Europe/Podgorica (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Montserrat - America/Montserrat (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Morocco - Africa/Casablanca (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Mozambique - Africa/Maputo (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Namibia - Africa/Windhoek (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Nauru - Pacific/Nauru (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
New Caledonia - Pacific/Noumea (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Nicaragua - America/Managua (UTC -06:00)	0 (0%)
Niger - Africa/Niamey (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Niue - Pacific/Niue (UTC -11:00)	0 (0%)
Norfolk Island - Pacific/Norfolk (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Northern Mariana Islands - Pacific/Saipan (UTC +10:00)	0 (0%)
Oman - Asia/Muscat (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Palau - Pacific/Palau (UTC +09:00),State of - Asia/Gaza (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Palestine,State of - Asia/Hebron (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Palestine	0 (0%)
Papua New Guinea - Pacific/Bougainville (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Papua New Guinea - Pacific/Port_Moresby (UTC +10:00)	0 (0%)
Paraguay - America/Asuncion (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Peru - America/Lima (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
Pitcairn - Pacific/Pitcairn (UTC -08:00)	0 (0%)
Portugal - Atlantic/Azores (UTC -01:00)	0 (0%)
Portugal - Atlantic/Madeira (UTC)	0 (0%)
Puerto Rico - America/Puerto_Rico (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Qatar - Asia/Qatar (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Anadyr (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Chita (UTC +09:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Russian Federation - Asia/Irkutsk (UTC +08:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Kamchatka (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Khandyga (UTC +09:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Krasnoyarsk (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Magadan (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Novokuznetsk (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Omsk (UTC +06:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Sakhalin (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Srednekolymsk (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Ust-Nera (UTC +10:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Asia/Yakutsk (UTC +09:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Europe/Astrakhan (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Europe/Kaliningrad (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Europe/Kirov (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Europe/Samara (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Europe/Saratov (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Russian Federation - Europe/Ulyanovsk (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Russian Federation - Europe/Volgograd (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Rwanda - Africa/Kigali (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Réunion - Indian/Reunion (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Saint Barthélemy - America/St_Barthelemy (UTC -04:00),Ascension and Tristan da Cunha - Atlantic/St_Helena (UTC)	0 (0%)
Saint Helena	0 (0%)
Saint Kitts and Nevis - America/St_Kitts (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Saint Lucia - America/St_Lucia (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Saint Martin (French part) - America/Marigot (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Saint Pierre and Miquelon - America/Miquelon (UTC -02:00)	0 (0%)
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines - America/St_Vincent (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Samoa - Pacific/Apia (UTC +14:00)	0 (0%)
San Marino - Europe/San_Marino (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Sao Tome and Principe - Africa/Sao_Tome (UTC)	0 (0%)
Senegal - Africa/Dakar (UTC)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Seychelles - Indian/Mahe (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
Sierra Leone - Africa/Freetown (UTC)	0 (0%)
Sint Maarten (Dutch part) - America/Lower_Princes (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Solomon Islands - Pacific/Guadalcanal (UTC +11:00)	0 (0%)
Somalia - Africa/Mogadishu (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands - Atlantic/South_Georgia (UTC -02:00)	0 (0%)
South Sudan - Africa/Juba (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Sri Lanka - Asia/Colombo (UTC +05:30)	0 (0%)
Suriname - America/Paramaribo (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Svalbard and Jan Mayen - Arctic/Longyearbyen (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Swaziland - Africa/Mbabane (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Syrian Arab Republic - Asia/Damascus (UTC +03:00),Province of China - Asia/Taipei (UTC +08:00)	0 (0%)
Tajikistan - Asia/Dushanbe (UTC +05:00),United Republic of - Africa/Dar_es_Salaam (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Thailand - Asia/Bangkok (UTC +07:00)	0 (0%)
Timor-Leste - Asia/Dili (UTC +09:00)	0 (0%)
Togo - Africa/Lome (UTC)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Tokelau - Pacific/Fakaofo (UTC +13:00)	0 (0%)
Tonga - Pacific/Tongatapu (UTC +13:00)	0 (0%)
Trinidad and Tobago - America/Port_of_Spain (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Tunisia - Africa/Tunis (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Turkmenistan - Asia/Ashgabat (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Turks and Caicos Islands - America/Grand_Turk (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Tuvalu - Pacific/Funafuti (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Uganda - Africa/Kampala (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Ukraine - Europe/Simferopol (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Ukraine - Europe/Uzhgorod (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Ukraine - Europe/Zaporozhye (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
United Arab Emirates - Asia/Dubai (UTC +04:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Indiana/Knox (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Indiana/Marengo (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Indiana/Petersburg (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Indiana/Vevay (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Indiana/Vincennes (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
United States - America/Indiana/Winamac (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Juneau (UTC -08:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Kentucky/Monticello (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Menominee (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Metlakatla (UTC -08:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Nome (UTC -08:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/North_Dakota/Beulah (UTC -05:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Sitka (UTC -08:00)	0 (0%)
United States - America/Yakutat (UTC -08:00)	0 (0%)
United States Minor Outlying Islands - Pacific/Midway (UTC -11:00)	0 (0%)
United States Minor Outlying Islands - Pacific/Wake (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Uruguay - America/Montevideo (UTC -03:00)	0 (0%)
Uzbekistan - Asia/Samarkand (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Uzbekistan - Asia/Tashkent (UTC +05:00)	0 (0%)
Vanuatu - Pacific/Efate (UTC +11:00),Bolivarian Republic of - America/Caracas (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Venezuela	0 (0%)

Table E1

Geographical Location (continued)

	N = 690
Virgin Islands,U.S. - America/St_Thomas (UTC -04:00)	0 (0%)
Virgin Islands	0 (0%)
Wallis and Futuna - Pacific/Wallis (UTC +12:00)	0 (0%)
Western Sahara - Africa/El_Aaiun (UTC +01:00)	0 (0%)
Yemen - Asia/Aden (UTC +03:00)	0 (0%)
Zambia - Africa/Lusaka (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)
Zimbabwe - Africa/Harare (UTC +02:00)	0 (0%)

Appendix F

804 **Disclaimer**: This is a non-public version of LEBA (dated December 15, 2021) and still a

805 work in progress. Please do not distribute!

806   LEBA captures light exposure-related behaviours on a 5 point Likert type scale

807 ranging from 1 to 5 (Never/Does not apply/I don't know = 1; Rarely = 2; Sometimes = 3;

808 Often = 4; Always = 5). The score of each factor is calculated by the summation of

809 scores of items belonging to the corresponding factor. The following instruction is given

810 before displaying the items: "Please indicate how often you performed the following

811 behaviours in the past 4 weeks."

Appendix G

LEBA Long Form (23 Items)

	Items	Never/Does not apply/I don't know	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses indoors during the day.					
2	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses outdoors during the day.					
3	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
4	I spend 30 minutes or less per day (in total) outside.					

	Items	Never/Does not apply/I don't know	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
5	I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
6	I spend between 30 minutes and 1 hour per day (in total) outside.					
7	I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
8	I spend as much time outside as possible.					
9	I go for a walk or exercise outside within 2 hours after waking up.					
10	I use my mobile phone within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					

	Items	Never/Does not apply/I don't know	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
11	I look at my mobile phone screen immediately after waking up.					
12	I check my phone when I wake up at night.					
13	I look at my smartwatch within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
14	I look at my smartwatch when I wake up at night.					
15	I dim my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
16	I use a blue-filter app on my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					

	Items	Never/Does not apply/I don't know	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
17	I use as little light as possible when I get up during the night.					
18	I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
19	I use tunable lights to create a healthy light environment.					
20	I use LEDs to create a healthy light environment.					
21	I use a desk lamp when I do focused work.					
22	I use an alarm with a dawn simulation light.					
23	I turn on the lights immediately after waking up.					

812 Latent Structure, Reliability and Structural Validity

813 The long form of LEBA consists 23 items with five factors.

Factor names	Items	Reliability Coefficients: ordinal alpha
F1: Wearing blue light filters	1-3	.96
F2: Spending time outdoors	4-9 (Item 4 is reversed)	.83
F3: Using phone and smartwatch in bed	10-14	.70
F4: Using light before bedtime	15-18	.69
F5: Using light in the morning and during daytime	19-23	.52
McDonald's Omega coefficient for the total scale		.73(Total scale)

814 LEBA -long form showed satisfactory structural validity (CFI =.97; TLI = .96; RMSEA = .05[.04-.06, 90% CI]; SRMR =

815 .09).

816 **How to cite:**

Appendix H

LEBA Short Form (17 Items)

	Short Form (17 Items)	Never/Does not apply/I don't know	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
01	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses indoors during the day.					
02	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses outdoors during the day.					
03	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
04	I spend 30 minutes or less per day (in total) outside.					

	Short Form (17 Items)	Never/Does not apply/I don't know	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
05	I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
06	I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
07	I spend as much time outside as possible.					
08	I go for a walk or exercise outside within 2 hours after waking up.					
09	I use my mobile phone within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
10	I look at my mobile phone screen immediately after waking up.					
11	I check my phone when I wake up at night.					

	Short Form (17 Items)	Never/Does not apply/I don't know	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
12	I dim my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
13	I use a blue-filter app on my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
14	I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
15	I use tunable lights to create a healthy light environment.					
16	I use LEDs to create a healthy light environment.					
17	I use an alarm with a dawn simulation light.					

Latent Structure, Reliability and Structural Validity

The short form of LEBA consists 23 items with five factors.

Factor names	Items
F1: Wearing blue light filters	1-3
F2: Spending time outdoors	4-8 (Item 4 is reversed)
F3: Using phone and smart-watch in bed	9-11
F4: Using light before bedtime	12-14
F5: Using light in the morning and during daytime	15-17

How to cite: