

<sup>1</sup> *Light Exposure Behavior Assessment (LEBA): Development of a novel instrument to capture light exposure-related behaviours*

<sup>3</sup> **Mushfiqul Anwar Siraj<sup>1,\*</sup>, Rafael Robert Lazar<sup>2, 3,\*</sup>, Juliëtte van Duijnhoven<sup>4, 5</sup>, Luc**  
<sup>4</sup> **Schlängen<sup>5, 6</sup>, Shamsul Haque<sup>1</sup>, Vineetha Kalavally<sup>7</sup>, Céline Vetter<sup>8, 9</sup>, Gena**  
<sup>5</sup> **Glickman<sup>10</sup>, Karin Smolders<sup>5, 6</sup>, & Manuel Spitschan<sup>11, 12, 13</sup>**

<sup>6</sup> <sup>1</sup> Monash University, Department of Psychology, Jeffrey Cheah School of Medicine and  
<sup>7</sup> Health Sciences, Malaysia

<sup>8</sup> <sup>2</sup> Psychiatric Hospital of the University of Basel (UPK), Centre for Chronobiology, Basel,  
<sup>9</sup> Switzerland

<sup>10</sup> <sup>3</sup> University of Basel, Transfaculty Research Platform Molecular and Cognitive  
<sup>11</sup> Neurosciences, Basel, Switzerland

<sup>12</sup> <sup>4</sup> Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of the Built Environment, Building  
<sup>13</sup> Lighting, Eindhoven, Netherlands

<sup>14</sup> <sup>5</sup> Eindhoven University of Technology, Intelligent Lighting Institute, Eindhoven,  
<sup>15</sup> Netherlands

<sup>16</sup> <sup>6</sup> Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of Industrial Engineering and  
<sup>17</sup> Innovation Sciences, Human-Technology Interaction, Eindhoven, Netherlands

<sup>18</sup> <sup>7</sup> Monash University, Department of Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering,  
<sup>19</sup> Selangor, Malaysia

<sup>20</sup> <sup>8</sup> University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Integrative Physiology, Boulder, USA

<sup>21</sup> <sup>9</sup> XIMES GmbH, Vienna, Austria

<sup>22</sup> <sup>10</sup> Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Department of Psychiatry,  
<sup>23</sup> Bethesda, USA

<sup>24</sup> <sup>11</sup> Translational Sensory & Circadian Neuroscience, Max Planck Institute for Biological  
<sup>25</sup> Cybernetics, Tübingen, Germany

<sup>26</sup> <sup>12</sup> TUM Department of Sport and Health Sciences (TUM SG), Technical University of  
<sup>27</sup> Munich, Munich, Germany

<sup>28</sup> <sup>13</sup> University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology, Oxford, United Kingdom  
<sup>29</sup> \* Joint first author

31        This research is supported by funding from the Wellcome Trust (204686/Z/16/Z),  
32    the European Training Network LIGHTCAP (project number 860613) under the Marie  
33    Skłodowska-Curie actions framework H2020-MSCA-ITN-2019, the BioClock project  
34    (number 1292.19.077) of the research program Dutch Research Agenda: Onderzoek op  
35    Routes door Consortia (NWA-ORC) which is (partly) financed by the Dutch Research  
36    Council (NWO), and the European Union and the nationals contributing in the context of  
37    the ECSEL Joint Undertaking programme (2021-2024) under the grant #101007319.

38        The authors made the following contributions. Mushfiqul Anwar Siraji: Formal  
39    Analysis, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing;; Rafael Robert  
40    Lazar: Data curation, Investigation, Project administration, Visualization, Writing –  
41    original draft, Writing – review & editing;; Juliëtte van Duijnhoven: Conceptualization,  
42    Methodology, Investigation, Writing – review & editing; Luc Schlangen:  
43    Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – review & editing; Shamsul  
44    Haque: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing; Vineetha Kalavally:  
45    Supervision, Writing – review & editing; Céline Vetter: Conceptualization, Writing –  
46    review & editing; Gena Glickman: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review &  
47    editing; Karin Smolders: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing;  
48    Manuel Spitschan: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Project  
49    administration, Visualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review &  
50    editing.

51

## Abstract

52 Light exposure is an important driver of health and well-being. Many aspects of light  
53 exposure are modulated by our behaviour. How these light-related behaviours can be  
54 shaped to optimise personal light exposure is currently unknown. Here, we present a  
55 novel, self-reported and psychometrically validated instrument to capture light  
56 exposure-related behaviour, the Light Exposure Behavior Assessment (LEBA).

57 An expert panel prepared the initial 48 item pool spanning different light exposure  
58 related behaviors. Responses, consisting rating the frequency of engaging in the  
59 per-item behavior on a 5-point Likert type scale were collected in an online survey  
60 yielding responses from a geographically unconstrained sample (690 completed  
61 responses, 74 countries, 28 time zones). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on an initial  
62 subset of our sample ( $n=428$ ) rendered a five-factor solution with 25 items (Wearing blue  
63 light filters, spending time outdoors, using phone and smart-watch in bed, using light  
64 before bedtime, using light in the morning and during daytime). In a confirmatory factor  
65 analysis (CFA) performed on an independent subset of participants ( $n=262$ ), we  
66 removed two further items to attain the best fit for the five-factor solution ( $CFI=0.97$ ,  
67  $TLI=0.96$ ,  $RMSEA=0.05$ ,  $SRMR=0.09$ ). The internal consistency reliability coefficient for  
68 the total instrument was, McDonald's Omega(total)=0.73. Measurement model  
69 invariance analysis between native and non-native English speakers showed our model  
70 attained the highest level of invariance (residual invariance;  $CFI=0.95$ ,  $TLI =0.95$ ,  
71  $RMSEA=0.05$ ). Lastly, a short form of LEBA ( $n=18$ ) was developed using Item Response  
72 Theory on the complete sample ( $n=690$ ).

73 The psychometric properties of the LEBA instrument indicate the usability to  
74 measure the light exposure-related behaviours across a variety of settings and may offer  
75 a scalable solution to characterise light exposure-related behaviours in remote samples.  
76 The LEBA instrument will be available under the open-access CC-BY-NC-ND license.

<sup>77</sup> *Keywords:* light exposure, light-related behaviours, non-visual effects of light,

<sup>78</sup> psychometrics

<sup>79</sup> 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 Behaviour is important
  - Supplementary Table S1 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

90 Data Collection

A quantitative cross-sectional fully anonymous online survey was conducted via REDCap (Harris et al., 2019, 2009) by way of the University of Basel sciCORE. Participants were recruited via the website (<https://enlightenyourclock.org/participate-in-research>) of the science-communication comic-book “Enlighten your clock” co-released with the survey (Weinzaepflen & Spitschan, 2021), social media (i.e., LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook), mailing lists, word of mouth, the investigators’ personal contacts, and supported by distribution of the survey link via f.lux (F.lux Software LLC, 2021). The landing page of the online survey had the explanatory statements where we mentioned participation was voluntary and that respondents could withdraw from participation anytime without being penalized. At the beginning of the survey, for the adult participants (>18 years) consent was recorded digitally. Underaged participants (<18 years) were urged to obtain assent from their

103 parents/legal guardians. The entire survey was estimated to take <30 minutes.  
104 Participants were not compensated. As a part of the demographic information  
105 participants provided information regarding age, sex, gender identity, occupational  
106 status, COVID-19 related occupational setting, time zone/country of residence and  
107 native language. The demographic characteristics of our sample are given in Table  
108 ???. To ensure high data quality, five attention check items were included in the survey  
109 (e.g., “We want to make sure you are paying attention. What is 4+5?”). Participants were  
110 asked to confirm that they were participating the survey for the first time. Questions  
111 incorporating retrospective recall were all aligned to the period of “past four weeks.”

112 We conducted two rounds of data collections. At first we collected data from  
113 428 participants In the second round we collected data from another 262 participants  
114 making a total sample of 690.

115 The data analysed in this study was collected between 17 May 2021 and 3  
116 September 2021.

### 117 Analytic Strategy

118 Figure 1 summarizes the steps of our psychometric analysis. In our analysis we  
119 used R (version 4.1.0) (R Core Team, 2021). In the item generation and selection phase  
120 we had developed a item pool of 48 items with six-point Likert type response format  
121 (0-Does not apply/I don't know, 1-Never, 2-Rarely 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, 5-Always). Our  
122 purpose was to capture light exposure related behaviour. In that context, the first two  
123 response options: “Does not apply/I don't know” and “Never” were providing similar  
124 information. As such we collapsed them into one, making it a 5 point Likert type  
125 response format.

126 We conducted an initial item analysis and proceed to the exploratory factor analysis  
127 (EFA) with all 48 items using the data collected in our first round. (EFA sample; n=428).

Prior to the EFA, necessary assumptions, 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, in EFA we used polychoric correlation matrix and employed principal axis (PA) as factor extraction method with varimax rotation (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018; Watkins, 2020). We used a combination of factor identification method including Scree plot (Cattell, 1966), minimum average partials method (Velicer, 1976), and Hull method (Lorenzo-Seva, Timmerman, & Kiers, 2011) to identify factor numbers. To determine the latent structure, we followed the common guidelines : (i) no factors with fewer than three items (ii) no factors with a factor loading  $<0.3$  (iii) no items with cross-loading  $> .3$  across factors (Bandalos & Finney, 2018). We also conducted a EFA on non-merged response options data (**Supplementary File 3**)

For reliability estimation we used internal consistency reliability coefficient ordinal  $\alpha$ . Though Cronbach's alpha coefficient is widely used for estimating internal consistency, it has a tendency to deflate the estimates for Likert-type data since the calculation is based on Pearson-correlation matrix which requires response data to be continuous in nature (Gadermann, Guhn, & Zumbo, 2012; Zumbo, Gadermann, & Zeisser, 2007). Subsequently to get better estimates of reliability we reported ordinal alpha for each factors using polychoric-correlation matrix (Zumbo et al., 2007). We also estimated the internal consistency reliability of the total scale using McDonald's  $\omega_t$  coefficient which is a better reliability estimate for multidimensional constructs (Dunn, Baguley, & Brunsden, 2014; Sijtsma, 2009). Both ordinal alpha and McDonald's  $\omega_t$  coefficient value range from 0 to 1 and higher value represents better reliability.

To validate the latent structure obtained in EFA, We conducted a categorical confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with weighted least square with mean and variance adjusted (WLSMV) estimator (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018) on the data collected in our second round of data collection (CFA sample; n=262). We assessed the model fit using

common model fit guidelines: (i)  $\chi^2$  test statistics: a non-significant test statistics is required to accept the model (ii) comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker Lewis index (TLI): close to .95 or above/ between 90-95 and above (iii) root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA): close to .06 or below, (iv) Standardized root mean square (SRMR): close to .08 or below (Hu & Bentle, 1999; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). However, the  $\chi^2$  test is sensitive to sample size (Brown, 2015) and SRMR does not work well with ordinal data (Yu, 2002) As such, we judged the model fit using CFI, TLI, SRMR and RMSEA.

We assessed the measurement invariance (MI) of our construct between native English speakers (n=129) and non native English speakers (n=133) among the CFA sample (n=262). MI evaluates whether a construct has the psychometric equivalence and same meaning across groups (Kline, 2015; Putnick & Bornstein, 2016). We used structural equation modelling framework to assess the measurement invariance. We successively compared four nested models: configural, metric, scalar, and residual models using the  $\chi^2$  difference test ( $\Delta\chi^2$ ). Among MI models, configural model is the least restrictive model and residual model is the most restrictive model. A non-significant  $\Delta\chi^2$  test between two nested measurement invariance models indicates mode fit does not significantly decrease for the superior model (Dimitrov, 2010) thus allowing the superior invariance model to be accepted. (Widaman & Reise, 1997).

We also analysed possible semantic overlap of our developed tool using “Semantic Scale Network” (SSN) engine (Rosenbusch, Wanders, & Pit, 2020). The SSN detects semantically related scales and provides cosine similarity index ranging between -.66 to 1 (Rosenbusch et al., 2020). Pair of scales with a cosine similarity index value of 1 indicates they are perfectly semantically similar scales indicating redundancy. Additionally, to identify the educational grade level required to understand the items in our tool we subjected the tool to Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (Flesch, 1948)

181 Lastly, we sought Item Response Theory (IRT) based analysis on developing a  
182 short form of LEBA. We fitted each factor of LEBA using the graded response model  
183 (Samejima, Liden, & Hambleton, 1997) to the combined EFA and CFA sample (n =690).  
184 IRT assesses the item quality by estimating item discrimination, item difficulty, item  
185 information, and test information (Baker, 2017). Item discrimination indicates the pattern  
186 of variation in the categorical responses with the changes in latent trait level ( $\theta$ ). Item  
187 information curve (IIC) indicates the amount of information an item carries along the  
188 latent trait continuum. Here, we reported the item discrimination parameter and  
189 categorize the items according to the suggestions of Baker (2017) : none = 0; very low  
190 =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  
191 >1.70. We discarded the items with relatively flat item information curve (information <.2)  
192 to develop the short form of LEBA. We also assessed the precision of the short LEBA  
193 using Test information curve (TIC). TIC indicates the amount of information an the  
194 full-scale carry along the latent trait continuum. Item fit and person fit of the fitted IRT  
195 models were also analyzed to gather more evidence on validity and meaningfulness of  
196 our Tool (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018). Item fit was evaluated using the RMSEA value  
197 obtained from Signed- $\chi^2$  index implementation, RMSEA value  $\leq .06$  was considered  
198 adequate item fit. Person fit was estimated using standardized fit index Zh statistics  
199 (Drasgow, Levine, & Williams, 1985). Zh < -2 was be considered as a misfit (Drasgow et  
200 al., 1985).

201 **Ethical approval**

202 By reason of using fully anonymous online survey data, the present research  
203 project does not fall under the scope of the Human Research Act, making an  
204 authorisation from the ethics committee redundant. Nevertheless, the cantonal ethics  
205 commission (Ethikkommission Nordwest- und Zentralschweiz, EKNZ) reviewed our  
206 proposition (project ID Req-2021-00488) and issued an official clarification of

207 responsibility.

208 **Data Availability**

209 The present article is a fully reproducible open-access “R Markdown” document. All  
210 code and data underlying this article – along with two versions of the LEBA questionnaire  
211 (full and short) and online survey implementation templates on common survey platforms  
212 – will be available under open-access licence (CC-BY-NC-ND) on a public GitHub  
213 repository.

214 **Results**

215 **Initial development of items**

216 After reviewing the literature, we identified several light exposure related scale.  
217 However, no scales specifically measuring the behavioural component of light exposure  
218 were found (**Supplementary Table 1**). As such, all authors in collaboration of an expert  
219 panel developed a comprehensive item pool of 48 items. The expert panel composed of  
220 all authors and researchers from the fields of chronobiology, light research, neuroscience  
221 and psychology. The 48 items were then judged based on their relevance and  
222 representativeness of the construct “Light Exposure Related Behaviour” by the expert  
223 panel. The panel members independently judged each of the items in terms of their  
224 relevance and representativeness and suggested required modification, if there is any.  
225 The author team acknowledged the suggestions and amended the items as required  
226 thus creating a 48-item scale.

227 **Large-scale survey of instruments**

228 **Participants.** Table 1 summarizes the survey participants’ demographic  
229 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 EFA, a sample of 250-300 is recommended (Comrey & Lee, 1992; Schönbrodt & Perugini, 2013). To assess sampling adequacy for CFA, we followed the N:q rule (Bentler & Chou, 1987; Jackson, 2003; Kline, 2015; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006), where ten participants per item is required to earn trustworthiness of the result. Both our EFA and CFA sample size exceeded these requirements. We collected data from 74 countries (28 time zones). Participants reported a diverse range of geographic location. Participants indicated filling out the online survey from a diverse range of geographic locations. For a complete list of geographic locations, see Suppl. Table ??.

Participants in our survey aged between 11 to 84 years [EFA sample: *min* = 11, *max* = 84; CFA sample: *min* = 12, *max* = 74], with an overall mean of ~ 32.95 years of age [Overall: *M* = 32.95, *SD* = 14.57; EFA: *M* = 32.99, *SD* = 15.11; CFA: *M* = 32.89, *SD* = 13.66]. In total 325 (47%) of the participants indicated female sex [EFA: 189 (44%); CFA: 136 (52%)], 351 (51%) indicated male [EFA: 230 (54%); CFA: 121 (46%)] and 14 (2.0%) indicated other sex [EFA: 9 (2.1%), CFA: 5 (1.9%)]. Overall, 49 (7.2%) [EFA: 33 (7.8%); CFA: 16 (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

257 [EFA: 94 (22%) ; CFA: 53 (20%)] reported a combination of home- and face-to-face  
258 work/schooling, whereas 131 (19%) overall [EFA: 72 (17%); CFA: 59 (23%)] filled in the  
259 "Neither (no work or school, or on vacation)" response option.

260       **Descriptive Statistics.** Figure 2 and Figure 3 summarize the response pattern of  
261 our total sample ( $n = 690$ ) for all 48 items. Most of the items were skewed and violated  
262 normality assumption.

263       **Item Analysis.** Supplementary Fig1 summarizes the univariate descriptive  
264 statistics for the 48 items among EFA sample ( $n = 428$ ). Our data violated both univariate  
265 normality (Shapiro & Wilk, 1965) and multivariate normality assumptions (Mardia, 1970).  
266 Multivariate skew was 583.80 ( $p < 0.001$ ) and multivariate kurtosis was 2,749.15 ( $p$   
267  $< 0.001$ ). Due to these violations and ordinal nature of the response data polychoric  
268 correlations over Pearson's correlations was chosen (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018). The  
269 corrected item-total correlation ranges between .03 -.48. However, no item was  
270 discarded based on descriptive statistics or item analysis.

271       **Exploratory Factor Analysis.** Sampling adequacy was checked using  
272 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures of sampling adequacy using the EFA sample ( $n$   
273  $= 428$ ) (Kaiser, 1974). The overall KMO value for 48 items was 0.63 which was above the  
274 cutoff value (.50) indicating adequate sample size (Hutcheson, 1999). Bartlett's test of  
275 sphericity (Bartlett, 1954),  $\chi^2 (1128) = 5042.86$ ,  $p < .001$  indicated the correlations  
276 between items are adequate for conducting the EFA. However only 4.96% of the  
277 inter-item correlation coefficients were greater than |.30|. The inter-item correlation  
278 coefficients ranged between -.44 to .91. Figure @ref(fig:efa-plot-print A) depicts the  
279 correlation matrix.

280       Scree plot (Figure 4 B) suggested a six-factor solution. However, the minimum  
281 average partial (MAP) (Velicer, 1976) method (Supplementary Table 2) and Hull method  
282 (Lorenzo-Seva et al., 2011) (Figure 4 D) suggested a five-factor solution. As a result, we

283 tested both five-factor and six-factor solutions.

284 With the initial 48 items we conducted three rounds of EFA and gradually discarded  
285 problematic items. (cross-loading items and poor factor loading (<.30) items). Finally, a  
286 five-factor EFA solution with 25 items was accepted with all factor-loading higher than  
287 .30 and no cross-loading greater than .30. We further confirmed this five-factor latent  
288 structure by another EFA using varimax rotation with a minimum residual extraction  
289 method (**Supplementary Table 3**). Table 2 displays the factor-loading (structural  
290 coefficients) and communality of the items. The absolute value of the factor-loading  
291 ranged from .49 to .99 indicating strong coefficients. The communalities ranged between  
292 .11 to .99. However, the histogram of the absolute values of non-redundant  
293 residual-correlations (Figure 4(D)) showed 26% correlations were greater than the  
294 absolute value of .05, indicating a possible under-factoring. (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018).  
295 Subsequently, we fitted a six-factor solution. However, a factor emerged with only two  
296 salient variables, thus disqualifying the six-factor solution (**Supplementary Table 4**).

297 In the five-factor solution, the first factor contained three items and explained  
298 10.25% of the total variance with an internal reliability coefficient ordinal  $\alpha = .94$ . All the  
299 items in this factor stemmed from the individual's preference of using blue light filters in  
300 different light environments. The second factor contained six items and explained 9.93%  
301 of the total variance with an internal reliability coefficient ordinal  $\alpha = .76$ . Items under this  
302 factor investigated individuals' hours spent outdoor. The third factor contained five items  
303 and explained 8.83% of the total variance. Items under this factor dealt with the specific  
304 behaviours pertaining to using phone and smart-watch in bed. The internal consistency  
305 reliability coefficient was, ordinal  $\alpha = .75$ . The fourth factor contained five items and  
306 explained 8.44% of the total variance with an internal consistency coefficient, ordinal  $\alpha =$   
307 .72. These five items investigated the behaviours related to individual's light exposure  
308 before bedtime. Lastly, the fifth factor contained six items and explained 6.14% of the  
309 total variance. This factor captured individual's morning and daytime light exposure

related behaviour. The internal consistency reliability was, ordinal  $\alpha = .62$ . It is essential to attain a balance between psychometric properties and interpretability of the common themes when exploring the latent structure. As all of the emerged factors are highly interpretable and relevant towards our aim to capture light exposure related behaviour, regardless of the apparent low reliability of the fifth factor, we retain all the five-factors with 23 items for our confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Two items showed negative factor-loading (items 44 and 21). Upon inspection, it was understood that these items are negatively correlated to the respective common theme, and thus in the CFA analysis, we reverse coded these two items.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis.** Table 3 summarizes the CFA fit indices of our fitted model. Our fitted model attained acceptable fit ( $CFI = .94$ ;  $TLI = .93$ );  $RMSEA = .06$ , [.05-.07, 90% CI]) with two imposed equity constrain on item pairs 32-33 [I dim my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.; I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.] and 16-17 [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.]. Items pair 32-33 stemmed from the preference of dimming electric device's brightness before bed time and items pair 16 and 19 stemmed from the preference of using blue filtering or coloured glasses during the daytime. Nevertheless, SRMR value was higher than the guideline ( $SRMR = .12$ ). Further by allowing one pair of items (30-41) [I look at my smartwatch within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.; I look at my smartwatch when I wake up at night.] to covary their error variance and discarding two item (item 37 & 26) for very low r-square value, our model attained the best fit ( $CFI = .95$ ;  $TLI = .95$ );  $RMSEA = .06$ , [.05-.06, 90% CI]). Internal consistency ordinal  $\alpha$  for the five factors of LEBA were .96, .83, .70, .69, .52 respectively. Internal consistency McDonald's  $\omega_t$  coefficient for the total scale was .68. Figure 5 depicts the obtained CFA structure. Supplementary Figure 2 depicts the data distribution and endorsement pattern of the retained 23 items in our

337 CFA sample.

338       **Measurement Invariance.** In our CFA sample we had 129 native English speakers  
339 and 133 non-native English speakers (For a detailed description these two groups see  
340 Sup. Table ?? ). Table 4 indicates our fitted model had acceptable fit indices for all of the  
341 fitted MI models. The model fit did not significantly decrease across the nested models  
342 indicating the acceptability of the highest measurement invariance model : residual  
343 model.

344       **Semantic Analysis.** “Semantic Scale Network”(SSN) analysis (Rosenbusch et al.,  
345 2020) indicated that LEBA (23 items) appeared most strongly related to scales about  
346 sleep: “Sleep Disturbance Scale For Children” (Bruni et al., 1996) and “WHO-Composite  
347 International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI): Insomnia”(WHO, 1990). The cosine similarities  
348 lie between .47 to .51. Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (Flesch, 1948) analysis on the the 23  
349 items of our scale indicated required educational grade level was 3.33 and with a age  
350 above 8.33.

351       **Developing Short form of LEBA.** We fitted each factor of LEBA with the graded  
352 response model (Samejima et al., 1997) to the combined EFA and CFA sample (n =690).  
353 Item discrimination parameters of our tool fell in very high (10 items), high (4 items),  
354 moderate (4 items), and low ( 5 items) categorizes indicating a good range of  
355 discrimination along the latent trait level ( $\theta$ ) (**Supplementary Table 5**). Examination of the  
356 item information curve (**Supplementary Figure 3**) indicated five items (1, 25, 38, 30, & 41)  
357 had relatively flat information curves ( $I(\theta) < .20$ ). We discarded those items which yielded  
358 a short form of LEBA with 5 factors and 18 items.

359       We treated each factor of short-LEBA as an unidimensional construct and obtain 5  
360 TICs (Figure 6). These information curves indicated except the first and fifth factors, the  
361 other three factor's TICs are roughly centred on the centre of the trait continuum ( $\theta$ ).The  
362 first and fifth factor had a peak to the right side of the centre of latent trait.Thus we

363 conferred the LEBA tool estimated the light exposure related behaviour with precision  
364 near the centre of trait continuum for 2nd, 3rd and 4th factors and near the right side of  
365 the centre of trait continuum for 1st and 5th factors (Baker, 2017).

366       Supplementary Table 6 summarizes the item fit indexes of the 18 items. All of the  
367       items had RMSEA value  $\leq .06$  indicating adequate fit of the items to the fitted IRT model.  
368       Supplementary Figure 4 depicts the person fit Z<sub>h</sub> statistics histogram of out fitted  
369       models. Z<sub>h</sub> statistics are larger than -2 for most participants, suggesting a good person  
370       fit of the selected IRT models.

371 Discussion

Though there are lots of validated tool to measure light exposure, they don't tell us much about the behavioural aspects pertaining to the light exposure. At present there is a dearth of validated tool to measure light exposure related behaviours. In that vein we have developed a subjective self-reported tool that can capture light exposure related behaviour in different dimensions.

377 Authors along with an expert panel generated 48 items and evaluated their quality  
378 and relevance and made necessary amendments. A large scale geographically  
379 unconstrained quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted yielding responses  
380 from large sample (n=428 to explore the latent structure. Exploratory factor analysis  
381 revealed a five factor solution with 25 items. (“Wearing blue light filters,” “Spending time  
382 outdoors,” “Using phone and smart-watch in bed,” “Using light before bedtime,” and  
383 “Using light in the morning and during daytime”). The internal consistency reliability  
384 coefficient ordinal alpha ranged between .62.94. As all the retained factors were  
385 meaningful and contributed essentially towards our aim we retained all five factors.

LEBA can be used to profile individuals based on their light exposure related behaviours, which can facilitate the development process of individual interventions to

388 promote health. All the five factors of LEBA may identify ‘problematic’ behaviours that  
389 are opposed to good light hygiene.

390 **Conclusion**

391 We developed a novel self-reported subjective tool-“Light exposure behaviour  
392 assessment”(LEBA) to capture light exposure related behaviour. We developed 48  
393 items, judged the relevance and content of the items and conducted a large scale  
394 geographically unrestricted cross-sectional survey. Our EFA gave a five solution with 25  
395 items. A CFA with this 25-item scale again offered a five-factor solution, but this time two  
396 more item was discarded. The 23-item “LEBA” was found reliable (internal consistency)  
397 and valid (structural validity). A short-form of LEBA was developed using IRT analysis.  
398 IRT analysis gave a 18-item scale with a good coverage across the underlying trait  
399 continuum. Hence, we could recommend that LEBA can be used to measure different  
400 aspects of light exposure related behaviour.

401 **Future Direction**

402 Since, LEBA is the first of its kind, estimating convergent validity with other  
403 subjective tool was not possible. One way to establish the convergent validity of LEBA is  
404 to administer this subjective tool along which some objective measurement tools  
405 (e.g. personalised light dosimeter). Though such objective tools do not directly capture  
406 light exposure related behaviour, potential insight can be drawn by understanding the  
407 behaviour pattern and light exposure. Also, light exposure related behaviours can be  
408 dependent upon the socio-economic status as behaviours can be modulated by  
409 available tools individual have on their disposal. Our analysis did not consider  
410 socio-economic status, as we didn’t measure it. Investigating the properties of LEBA  
411 while considering different socio-economic status would be a valuable addition.

## 412                   References

- 413                   Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*.  
414                   Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- 415                   Bajaj, A., Rosner, B., Lockley, S. W., & Schernhammer, E. S. (2011). Validation of  
416                   a light questionnaire with real-life photopic illuminance measurements: The  
417                   harvard light exposure assessment questionnaire. *Cancer Epidemiology and*  
418                   *Prevention Biomarkers*, 20(7), 1341–1349.
- 419                   Baker, F. B. (2017). *The Basics of Item Response Theory Using R* (1st ed. 2017.).  
420                   Springer.
- 421                   Bandalos, D. L., & Finney, S. J. (2018). Factor analysis: Exploratory and  
422                   confirmatory. In *The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the social*  
423                   *sciences* (pp. 98–122). Routledge.
- 424                   Bartlett, M. (1954). A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various Chi-square  
425                   Approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B,*  
426                   *Methodological*, 16(2), 296–298.
- 427                   Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C.-P. (1987). Practical Issues in Structural Modeling.  
428                   *Sociological Methods & Research*, 16(1), 78–117.  
429                   <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124187016001004>
- 430                   Bossini, L., Valdagno, M., Padula, L., De Capua, A., Pacchierotti, C., &  
431                   Castrogiovanni, P. (2006). Sensibilità alla luce e psicopatologia: Validazione  
432                   del questionario per la valutazione della fotosensibilità (QVF). *Med*  
433                   *Psicosomatica*, 51, 167–176.
- 434                   Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed.).  
435                   New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press.
- 436                   Bruni, O., Ottaviano, S., Guidetti, V., Romoli, M., Innocenzi, M., Cortesi, F., &  
437                   Giannotti, F. (1996). The sleep disturbance scale for children (SDSC)  
438                   construct ion and validation of an instrument to evaluate sleep disturbances in

- 439 childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 5(4), 251–261.
- 440 Bryer, J., & Speerschneider, K. (2016). *Likert: Analysis and visualization likert*  
441 *items*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=likert>
- 442 Buchanan, E. M., Gillenwaters, A., Scofield, J. E., & Valentine, K. D. (2019).  
443 *MOTE: Measure of the Effect: Package to assist in effect size calculations and*  
444 *their confidence intervals*. Retrieved from <http://github.com/doomlab/MOTE>
- 445 Buysse, D. J., Reynolds III, C. F., Monk, T. H., Berman, S. R., & Kupfer, D. J.  
446 (1989). The pittsburgh sleep quality index: A new instrument for psychiatric  
447 practice and research. *Psychiatry Research*, 28(2), 193–213.
- 448 Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Test For The Number Of Factors. *Multivariate*  
449 *Behavioral Research*, 1(2), 245–276.  
450 [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10)
- 451 Chalmers, R. P. (2012). mirt: A multidimensional item response theory package  
452 for the R environment. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(6), 1–29.  
453 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i06>
- 454 Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*, 2nd ed.  
455 Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 456 Dahl, D. B., Scott, D., Roosen, C., Magnusson, A., & Swinton, J. (2019). *Xtable:*  
457 *Export tables to LaTeX or HTML*. Retrieved from  
458 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=xtable>
- 459 Desjardins, C., & Bulut, O. (2018). *Handbook of Educational Measurement and*  
460 *Psychometrics Using R*. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b20498>
- 461 Dianat, I., Sedghi, A., Bagherzade, J., Jafarabadi, M. A., & Stedmon, A. W.  
462 (2013). Objective and subjective assessments of lighting in a hospital setting:  
463 Implications for health, safety and performance. *Ergonomics*, 56(10),  
464 1535–1545.
- 465 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 solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British Journal of Psychology*, 105(3), 399–412.
- Eklund, N., & Boyce, P. (1996). The development of a reliable, valid, and simple office lighting survey. *Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society*, 25(2), 25–40.
- Epskamp, S. (2019). *semPlot: Path diagrams and visual analysis of various SEM packages' output*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semPlot>
- Epskamp, S., Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., Schmittmann, V. D., & Borsboom, D. (2012). qgraph: Network visualizations of relationships in psychometric data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(4), 1–18.
- Flesch, R. (1948). A new readability yardstick. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 32(3), 221.
- F.lux Software LLC. (2021). F.lux (Version 4.120). Retrieved from <https://justgetflux.com/>
- Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R companion to applied regression* (Third). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. Retrieved from <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/>

- 493 Fox, J., Weisberg, S., & Price, B. (2022). *carData: Companion to applied*  
494 *regression data sets*. Retrieved from  
495 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=carData>
- 496 Gadermann, A. M., Guhn, M., & Zumbo, B. D. (2012). Estimating ordinal reliability  
497 for likert-type and ordinal item response data: A conceptual, empirical, and  
498 practical guide. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 17(1), 3.
- 499 Grandner, M. A., Jackson, N., Gooneratne, N. S., & Patel, N. P. (2014). The  
500 development of a questionnaire to assess sleep-related practices, beliefs, and  
501 attitudes. *Behavioral Sleep Medicine*, 12(2), 123–142.
- 502 Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Minor, B. L., Elliott, V., Fernandez, M., O'Neal, L., ...  
503 others. (2019). The REDCap consortium: Building an international community  
504 of software platform partners. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 95, 103208.
- 505 Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J., Gonzalez, N., & Conde, J. G.  
506 (2009). Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven  
507 methodology and workflow process for providing translational research  
508 informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 42(2), 377–381.
- 509 Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools*. Retrieved  
510 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr>
- 511 Horne, J. A., & Östberg, O. (1976). A self-assessment questionnaire to determine  
512 morningness-eveningness in human circadian rhythms. *International Journal  
513 of Chronobiology*.
- 514 Hu, L., & Bentle, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure  
515 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation  
516 Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- 518 Hutcheson, G. D. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist : Introductory statistics  
519 using generalized linear models*. London : SAGE.

- 520 Iannone, R., Cheng, J., & Schloerke, B. (2021). *Gt: Easily create*  
521 *presentation-ready display tables*. Retrieved from  
522 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gt>
- 523 Jackson, D. L. (2003). Revisiting Sample Size and Number of Parameter  
524 Estimates: Some Support for the N:q Hypothesis. *Structural Equation*  
525 *Modeling*, 10(1), 128–141. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1001\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1001_6)
- 526 Johnson, P., & Kite, B. (2020). *semTable: Structural equation modeling tables*.  
527 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTable>
- 528 Johnson, P., Kite, B., & Redmon, C. (2020). *Kutils: Project management tools*.  
529 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kutils>
- 530 Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., & Rosseel, Y. (2021).  
531 *semTools: Useful tools for structural equation modeling*. Retrieved from  
532 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools>
- 533 Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36.  
534 <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02291575>
- 535 Kassambara, A. (2019). *Ggcorrplot: Visualization of a correlation matrix using*  
536 *'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggcorrplot>
- 537 Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. The  
538 Guilford Press.
- 539 Kowarik, A., & Templ, M. (2016). Imputation with the R package VIM. *Journal of*  
540 *Statistical Software*, 74(7), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v074.i07>
- 541 Lorenzo-Seva, U., Timmerman, M., & Kiers, H. (2011). The Hull Method for  
542 Selecting the Number of Common Factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*,  
543 46, 340–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2011.564527>
- 544 Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with  
545 applications. *Biometrika*, 57(3), 519–530.  
546 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/57.3.519>

- 547 Michalke, M. (2020a). *koRpus.lang.en: Language support for 'koRpus' package: english*. Retrieved from <https://reaktanz.de/?c=hacking&s=koRpus>
- 548 Michalke, M. (2020b). *Sylly: Hyphenation and syllable counting for text analysis*.  
549 Retrieved from <https://reaktanz.de/?c=hacking&s=sylly>
- 550 Michalke, M. (2021). *koRpus: Text analysis with emphasis on POS tagging, readability, and lexical diversity*. Retrieved from  
551 <https://reaktanz.de/?c=hacking&s=koRpus>
- 552 Mock, T. (2022). *gtExtras: A collection of helper functions for the gt package*.  
553 Retrieved from <https://github.com/jthomasmock/gtExtras>
- 554 Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames*. Retrieved from  
555 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble>
- 556 Navarro-Gonzalez, D., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2021). *EFA.MRFA: Dimensionality  
557 assessment using minimum rank factor analysis*. Retrieved from  
558 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=EFA.MRFA>
- 559 Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Measurement invariance conventions  
560 and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological  
561 research. *Developmental Review*, 41, 71–90.
- 562 R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*.  
563 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from  
564 <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 565 Revelle, W. (2021). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and  
566 personality research*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. Retrieved  
567 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- 568 Roenneberg, T., Wirz-Justice, A., & Merrow, M. (2003). Life between clocks: Daily  
569 temporal patterns of human chronotypes. *Journal of Biological Rhythms*,  
570 18(1), 80–90.
- 571 Rosenbusch, H., Wanders, F., & Pit, I. L. (2020). The semantic scale network: An

- 574 online tool to detect semantic overlap of psychological scales and prevent  
575 scale redundancies. *Psychological Methods*, 25(3), 380.
- 576 Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling.  
577 *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36.  
578 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>
- 579 Ryu, C. (2021). *Dlookr: Tools for data diagnosis, exploration, transformation*.  
580 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dlookr>
- 581 Samejima, F., Liden, W. van der, & Hambleton, R. (1997). Handbook of modern  
582 item response theory. New York, NY: Springer.
- 583 Sarkar, D. (2008). *Lattice: Multivariate data visualization with r*. New York:  
584 Springer. Retrieved from <http://lmdvr.r-forge.r-project.org>
- 585 Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations  
586 stabilize? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(5), 609–612.  
587 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.05.009>
- 588 Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural  
589 equation modeling*. psychology press.
- 590 Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality  
591 (complete samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3-4), 591–611.  
592 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/52.3-4.591>
- 593 Sijtsma, K. (2009). On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of  
594 cronbach's alpha. *Psychometrika*, 74(1), 107.
- 595 Siraji, M. A. (2022). *Tabledown: A companion pack for the book "basic &  
596 advanced psychometrics in r"*. Retrieved from  
597 <https://github.com/masiraji/tabledown>
- 598 Sjoberg, D. D., Whiting, K., Curry, M., Lavery, J. A., & Larmarange, J. (2021).  
599 Reproducible summary tables with the gtsummary package. *The R Journal*,  
600 13, 570–580. <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2021-053>

- 601 Stauffer, R., Mayr, G. J., Dabernig, M., & Zeileis, A. (2009). Somewhere over the  
602 rainbow: How to make effective use of colors in meteorological visualizations.  
603 *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 96(2), 203–216.  
604 <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00155.1>
- 605 Velicer, W. (1976). Determining the Number of Components from the Matrix of  
606 Partial Correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41, 321–327.  
607 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02293557>
- 608 Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern applied statistics with s* (Fourth).  
609 New York: Springer. Retrieved from <https://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/pub/MASS4/>
- 610 Verriotto, J. D., Gonzalez, A., Aguilar, M. C., Parel, J.-M. A., Feuer, W. J., Smith,  
611 A. R., & Lam, B. L. (2017). New methods for quantification of visual  
612 photosensitivity threshold and symptoms. *Translational Vision Science &*  
613 *Technology*, 6(4), 18–18.
- 614 Watkins, M. (2020). *A Step-by-Step Guide to Exploratory Factor Analysis with R*  
615 and *RStudio*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003120001>
- 616 Weinzaepflen, C., & Spitschan, M. (2021). Enlighten your clock: How your body  
617 tells time. Open Science Framework. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/ZQXVH>
- 618 WHO. (1990). Composite international diagnostic interview.
- 619 Wickham, H. (2007). Reshaping data with the reshape package. *Journal of*  
620 *Statistical Software*, 21(12). Retrieved from  
621 <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v21/i12/paper>
- 622 Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag  
623 New York. Retrieved from <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- 624 Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string*  
625 *operations*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>
- 626 Wickham, H. (2021a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables*  
627 (*factors*). Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats>

- 628 Wickham, H. (2021b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from  
629 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>
- 630 Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., ...  
631 Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(43), 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- 632 Wickham, H., & Bryan, J. (2019). *Readxl: Read excel files*. Retrieved from  
633 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readxl>
- 634 Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2022). *Dplyr: A grammar of  
635 data manipulation*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>
- 636 Wickham, H., Hester, J., & Bryan, J. (2021). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*.  
637 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>
- 638 Widaman, K. F., & Reise, S. P. (1997). Exploring the measurement invariance of  
639 psychological instruments: Applications in the substance use domain.
- 640 Wilke, C. O. (2020). *Ggtext: Improved text rendering support for 'ggplot2'*.  
641 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggtext>
- 642 Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale Development Research: A  
643 Content Analysis and Recommendations for Best Practices. *The Counseling  
644 Psychologist*, 34(6), 806–838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127>
- 645 Xiao, N. (2018). *Ggsci: Scientific journal and sci-fi themed color palettes for  
646 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggsci>
- 647 Xie, Y., Wu, X., Tao, S., Wan, Y., & Tao, F. (2022). Development and validation of  
648 the self-rating of biological rhythm disorder for chinese adolescents.  
649 *Chronobiology International*, 1–7.
- 650 Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/07420528.2021.1989450>
- 651 Yu, C. (2002). *Evaluating cutoff criteria of model fit indices for latent variable  
652 models with binary and continuous outcomes* (Thesis). ProQuest  
653 Dissertations Publishing.

- 655 Zeileis, A., Fisher, J. C., Hornik, K., Ihaka, R., McWhite, C. D., Murrell, P., ...  
656  
657 Wilke, C. O. (2020). *colorspace*: A toolbox for manipulating and assessing  
658 colors and palettes. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 96(1), 1–49.  
<https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v096.i01>  
659 Zeileis, A., Hornik, K., & Murrell, P. (2009). Escaping RGBland: Selecting colors  
660 for statistical graphics. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(9),  
661 3259–3270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2008.11.033>  
662 Zhu, H. (2021). *kableExtra: Construct complex table with 'kable' and pipe syntax*.  
663 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra>  
664 Zumbo, B. D., Gadermann, A. M., & Zeisser, C. (2007). Ordinal versions of  
665 coefficients alpha and theta for likert rating scales. *Journal of Modern Applied  
666 Statistical Methods*, 6(1), 4.

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants (n=690)*

Variable	Overall, N = 690	1. EFA Sample, N = 428	2. CFA Sample, N = 262
Age	32.95 (14.57)	32.99 (15.11)	32.89 (13.66)
Sex			
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%)
Native English Speaker	320 (46%)	191 (45%)	129 (49%)
Occupational Status			
Work	396 (57%)	235 (55%)	161 (61%)
School	174 (25%)	122 (29%)	52 (20%)
Neither	120 (17%)	71 (17%)	49 (19%)
Occupational setting			
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%)

<sup>1</sup> Mean (SD); n (%)

Table 2

*Factor loadings and communality of the retained items in EFA using principal axis extraction method*

item	Stem	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA5	Communality
item16	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses indoors during the day.	0.99					0.993
item36	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	0.94					0.899
item17	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses outdoors during the day.	0.8					0.658
item11	I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.		0.79				0.642
item10	I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.		0.76				0.592
item12	I spend as much time outside as possible.		0.65				0.465
item07	I go for a walk or exercise outside within 2 hours after waking up.		0.5				0.267
item08	I spend 30 minutes or less per day (in total) outside.		-0.49				0.252
item09	I spend between 30 minutes and 1 hour per day (in total) outside.		0.32				0.113
item27	I use my mobile phone within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.		0.8				0.658
item03	I look at my mobile phone screen immediately after waking up.		0.8				0.682
item40	I check my phone when I wake up at night.		0.65				0.464
item30	I look at my smartwatch within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.		0.45				0.353
item41	I look at my smartwatch when I wake up at night.		0.36				0.329

Table 2 continued

item	Stem	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA5	Communality
item33	I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.				0.74		0.555
item32	I dim my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.				0.73		0.624
item35	I use a blue-filter app on my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.				0.66		0.454
item37	I purposely leave a light on in my sleep environment while sleeping.				-0.39		0.174
item38	I use as little light as possible when I get up during the night.				0.38		0.178
item46	I use tunable lights to create a healthy light environment.				0.6		0.422
item45	I use LEDs to create a healthy light environment.				0.59		0.374
item25	I use a desk lamp when I do focused work.				0.41		0.193
item04	I use an alarm with a dawn simulation light.				0.41		0.219
item01	I turn on the lights immediately after waking up.				0.4		0.17
item26	I turn on my ceiling room light when it is light outside.				0.35		0.165

*Note.* Only loading > .30 is reported

Table 3

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis model fit indices of the two model: (a) Model 1: five factor model with 25 items (b) Model 2: five factor model with 23 items. Model 2 attained the best fit.*

Model	$\chi^2$	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% Lower CI	RMSEA 90% Upper CI	SRMR
Model 1	448.51	222.00	.94	0.93	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.12
Model 2	415.45	231.00	.95	0.95	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.11

*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 4

*Measurment Invariance analysis on CFA sample (n=262) across native and non-native English speakers.*

	$\chi^2$	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% Lower CI	RMSEA 90% Upper	$\Delta \chi^2$	$\Delta df^*$	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.* 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; a = Metric vs Configural; b = Scalar vs Metric; c = Residual vs Scalar; d = Structural vs Residual; \* = df of model comparison




Figure 1. Flow chart of the LEBA (long and short form) development and evaluation.

## Summary Descriptives (n =690)

Items 01-24




Items	Item	Summary Statistics			Graphics		Response Pattern				
		Mean	Median	SD	Histogram	Density	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
●item01	I turn on the lights immediately after waking up.	2.3	2.0	1.4			41.59% (287)	22.32% (154)	13.33% (92)	11.74% (81)	11.01% (76)
●item02	I open the curtains or blinds immediately after waking up.	2.8	3.0	1.6			32.61% (225)	15.22% (105)	11.30% (78)	19.28% (133)	21.59% (149)
●item03	I look at my mobile phone screen immediately after waking up.	3.5	4.0	1.4			14.35% (99)	9.86% (68)	17.39% (120)	30.00% (207)	28.41% (196)
●item04	I use an alarm with a dawn simulation light.	1.4	1.0	1.1			86.09% (594)	3.04% (21)	2.61% (18)	2.46% (17)	5.80% (40)
●item05	I have breakfast within 3 meters from a window.	3.9	5.0	1.4			14.35% (99)	4.78% (33)	11.01% (76)	18.26% (126)	51.59% (356)
●item06	I have breakfast in a brightly lit room (illuminated by electric light).	2.7	3.0	1.5			33.19% (229)	15.36% (106)	16.38% (113)	16.09% (111)	18.99% (131)
●item07	I go for a walk or exercise outside within 2 hours after waking up.	2.2	2.0	1.2			38.70% (267)	26.23% (181)	16.23% (112)	13.04% (90)	5.80% (40)
●item08	I spend 30 minutes or less per day (in total) outside.	3.0	3.0	1.2			13.91% (96)	22.46% (155)	25.22% (174)	28.26% (195)	10.14% (70)
●item09	I spend between 30 minutes and 1 hour per day (in total) outside.	2.9	3.0	1.0			11.30% (78)	20.58% (142)	38.99% (269)	23.91% (165)	5.22% (36)
●item10	I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.	2.7	3.0	1.1			14.06% (97)	30.58% (211)	30.43% (210)	21.74% (150)	3.19% (22)
●item11	I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.	2.2	2.0	0.9			23.77% (164)	46.38% (320)	22.03% (152)	6.38% (44)	1.45% (10)
●item12	I spend as much time outside as possible.	2.3	2.0	1.2			30.72% (212)	30.14% (208)	20.58% (142)	11.88% (82)	6.67% (46)
●item13	I use sunglasses when I go outside in bright daylight.	2.7	3.0	1.5			30.14% (208)	17.54% (121)	17.83% (123)	18.70% (129)	15.80% (109)
●item14	I wear a visor or cap when I go outside in bright daylight.	2.1	2.0	1.3			47.54% (328)	18.84% (130)	12.90% (89)	15.22% (105)	5.51% (38)
●item15	I seek shade when I am outside in bright daylight.	3.3	3.0	1.1			7.97% (55)	13.91% (96)	35.36% (244)	27.97% (193)	14.78% (102)
●item16	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses indoors during the day.	1.6	1.0	1.3			79.13% (546)	3.91% (27)	4.06% (28)	5.07% (35)	7.83% (54)
●item17	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses outdoors during the day.	1.5	1.0	1.2			80.43% (555)	3.33% (23)	5.22% (36)	3.04% (21)	7.97% (55)
●item18	I use light therapy applying a white light box.	1.1	1.0	0.5			92.90% (641)	3.48% (24)	2.75% (19)	0.58% (4)	0.29% (2)
●item19	I use light therapy applying a blue light box.	1.0	1.0	0.3			97.68% (674)	0.87% (6)	0.72% (5)	0.72% (5)	0.00% (0)
●item20	I use light therapy applying a light visor.	1.0	1.0	0.3			98.70% (681)	0.14% (1)	0.58% (4)	0.43% (3)	0.14% (1)
●item21	I use light therapy applying another form of light device.	1.1	1.0	0.6			94.06% (649)	1.45% (10)	3.04% (21)	0.58% (4)	0.87% (6)
●item22	I spend most of my daytime in a brightly lit environment.	3.5	4.0	1.1			5.36% (37)	13.33% (92)	21.74% (150)	41.59% (287)	17.97% (124)
●item23	I close the curtains or blinds during the day if the light from outside is bright.	2.6	2.0	1.3			26.38% (182)	24.93% (172)	23.33% (161)	17.25% (119)	8.12% (56)
●item24	I spend most of my indoor time within 3 meters from a window.	4.1	4.0	1.0			2.90% (20)	5.65% (39)	11.45% (79)	37.83% (261)	42.17% (291)


Figure 2. Summary descriptives and response pattern

## Summary Descriptives (n =690)


Items 25-48

LEBA Items	Item Stem	Summary Statistics			Graphics		Response Pattern				
		Mean	Median	SD	Histogram	Density	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
●item25	I use a desk lamp when I do focused work.	2.6	3.0	1.4			33.77% (233)	15.51% (107)	22.03% (152)	17.54% (121)	11.16% (77)
●item26	I turn on my ceiling room light when it is light outside.	3.7	4.0	1.3			37.54% (259)	22.03% (152)	20.58% (142)	12.17% (84)	7.68% (53)
●item27	I use my mobile phone within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.9	4.0	1.3			7.54% (52)	9.71% (67)	10.00% (69)	31.59% (218)	41.16% (284)
●item28	I use my computer/laptop/tablet within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.7	4.0	1.2			5.07% (35)	13.19% (91)	17.39% (120)	35.36% (244)	28.99% (200)
●item29	I watch television within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	2.5	2.0	1.3			33.04% (228)	18.12% (125)	20.29% (140)	20.72% (143)	7.83% (54)
●item30	I look at my smartwatch within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	1.5	1.0	1.1			82.46% (569)	3.04% (21)	4.64% (32)	5.65% (39)	4.20% (29)
●item31	I dim my room light within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.0	3.0	1.6			31.30% (216)	10.43% (72)	12.03% (83)	20.14% (139)	26.09% (180)
●item32	I dim my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.5	4.0	1.6			24.20% (167)	5.94% (41)	9.42% (65)	15.65% (108)	44.78% (309)
●item33	I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.4	4.0	1.7			25.94% (179)	6.67% (46)	8.99% (62)	14.35% (99)	44.06% (304)
●item34	I use a blue-filter app on my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.4	5.0	1.8			34.06% (235)	2.90% (20)	4.20% (29)	7.83% (54)	51.01% (352)
●item35	I use a blue-filter app on my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.8	5.0	1.7			24.64% (170)	2.17% (15)	5.07% (35)	8.26% (57)	59.86% (413)
●item36	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	1.6	1.0	1.3			81.59% (563)	3.19% (22)	3.04% (21)	2.75% (19)	9.42% (65)
●item37	I purposely leave a light on in my sleep environment while sleeping.	2.3	2.0	1.3			37.54% (259)	22.03% (152)	20.58% (142)	12.17% (84)	7.68% (53)
●item38	I use as little light as possible when I get up during the night.	4.3	5.0	1.1			4.93% (34)	5.07% (35)	5.80% (40)	25.22% (174)	58.99% (407)
●item39	I turn on the lights when I get up during the night.	2.0	2.0	1.1			37.97% (262)	37.10% (256)	14.78% (102)	6.52% (45)	3.62% (25)
●item40	I check my phone when I wake up at night.	2.3	2.0	1.3			36.23% (250)	25.80% (178)	19.28% (133)	11.74% (81)	6.96% (48)
●item41	I look at my smartwatch when I wake up at night.	1.3	1.0	0.8			86.96% (600)	4.35% (30)	4.64% (32)	2.90% (20)	1.16% (8)
●item42	I close curtains or blinds to prevent light from entering the bedroom if I want to sleep.	4.0	5.0	1.4			13.62% (94)	5.07% (35)	8.41% (58)	15.51% (107)	57.39% (396)
●item43	I use a sleep mask that covers my eyes.	1.7	1.0	1.2			69.86% (482)	9.28% (64)	10.00% (69)	4.20% (29)	6.67% (46)
●item44	I modify my light environment to match my current needs.	3.4	4.0	1.3			14.49% (100)	7.68% (53)	20.29% (140)	34.93% (241)	22.61% (156)
●item45	I use LEDs to create a healthy light environment.	2.1	1.0	1.5			57.25% (395)	6.38% (44)	13.77% (95)	11.88% (82)	10.72% (74)
●item46	I use tunable lights to create a healthy light environment.	1.7	1.0	1.2			70.29% (485)	5.80% (40)	10.29% (71)	9.13% (63)	4.49% (31)
●item47	I discuss the effects of light on my body with other people.	2.1	2.0	1.2			40.43% (279)	24.06% (166)	21.30% (147)	9.57% (66)	4.64% (32)
●item48	I seek out knowledge on how to improve my light exposure.	2.5	2.0	1.3			26.81% (185)	23.33% (161)	28.12% (194)	12.46% (86)	9.28% (64)


Figure 3. Summary descriptives and response pattern



**Figure 4.** (A) Inter-item polychoric correlation coefficients for the 48 items. 4.9 % inter-item correlation coefficients were higher than  $|.30|$ . (B) Scree plot suggested six factors. (C) Hull method indicated 5 factors were required to balance the model fit and number of parameters. (D) Histogram of nonredundant residual correlations indicated 26% of inter-item correlations were higher than .05, hinting a possible under factoring.



**Figure 5.** Five factor model of LEBA obtained by confirmatory factor analysis. By allowing item pair 41 and 30 to covary their error variance our model attained the best fit.



**Figure 6.** Test information curves for the five factors of LEBA: (a) wearing blue light filters (b) spending time outdoors (c) using phone and smartwatch in bed (d) using light before bedtime (e) using light in the morning and during daytime. Along x-axis we plotted the underlying latent trait continuum for each factor. Along y-axis we plotted how much information a particular factor is carrying across its latent trait continuum