

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

³ *Mushfiqul Anwar Siraj^{1,*}, Rafael Robert Lazar^{2, 3,*}, Juliëtte van Duijnhoven^{4, 5}, Luc*
⁴ *Schlanger^{5, 6}, Shamsul Haque¹, Vineetha Kalavally⁷, Céline Vetter^{8, 9}, Gena Glickman¹⁰,*
⁵ *Karin Smolders^{5,6}, & Manuel Spitschan^{11, 12, 13}*

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, Intelligent Lighting Institute, Eindhoven,
¹⁵ Netherlands

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

¹⁸ ⁷ Monash University, Department of Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering,
¹⁹ Selangor, Malaysia

²⁰ ⁸ University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Integrative Physiology, Boulder, USA

²¹ ⁹ XIMES GmbH, Vienna, Austria

²² ¹⁰ Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Department of Psychiatry,
²³ Bethesda, USA

²⁴ ¹¹ Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics, Tübingen, Germany

²⁵ ¹² Technical University of Munich, Department of Sport and Health Sciences (TUM SG),
²⁶ Munich, Germany

²⁷ ¹³ University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology, Oxford, United Kingdom

²⁸ * Joint first author

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

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

50

Abstract

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

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

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

74 **Keywords:** light exposure, light-related behaviours, non-visual effects of light,
75 psychometrics

76

Word count: X

77 *Light Exposure Behavior Assessment (LEBA): Development of a novel instrument to*
78 *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

87 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 behavioural component of light exposure were found (see Table ??). 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 – comprising all authors of the present manuscript – generated and collected preliminary item ideas. Special attention was paid to design items circumscribed to assess light exposure *behaviour* as opposed to subjective measurements of the light environment (Dianat, Sedghi, Bagherzade, Jafarabadi, & Stedmon, 2013; Eklund & Boyce, 1996)) and semi-quantitative assessments of light sources' illuminance (Bajaj, Rosner, Lockley, &

99 Schernhammer, 2011) in order to maintain content validity. In a collective effort the
100 generated items were then peer-reviewed, amended, unified, and complemented with a
101 suitable response scale (5-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 “Never/Does not apply/I
102 don’t know” to 5 “Always”). This process was finalized when all experts were in
103 agreement, resulting in 48 items to implement in the data collection.

104 **Survey characteristics**

105 Data was collected in a quantitative cross-sectional approach via a fully
106 anonymous online survey hosted on REDCap (Harris et al., 2019, 2009) by way of the
107 University of Basel sciCORE. Participants were recruited via the website of a Comic
108 co-released with the survey(Weinzaepflen & Spitschan, 2021), social media (i.e.,
109 LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook), mailing lists, word of mouth, the investigators’ personal
110 contacts, and supported by distribution of the survey link via f.lux (F.lux Software LLC,
111 2021). Completing the online survey took approx. 15 to 20 minutes and was not
112 compensated. The first page of the survey comprised a participant information sheet,
113 where participants’ informed consent to participate was obtained before any of the
114 questions were displayed. Underaged participants (<18 years) were urged to obtain
115 assent from their parents/legal guardians, before filling in the survey. Information on the
116 first page included the objectives of the study, inclusion criteria, estimated duration, the
117 use, storage and sharing of the data, compensation (none), and information about the
118 type of questions in the survey. Moreover, participants needed to confirm that they were
119 participating the survey for the first time. To ensure high data quality, five attention check
120 items were included in the survey (e.g., “We want to make sure you are paying attention.
121 What is 4+5?”). The data analysed in this study was collected between 17 May 2021 and
122 3 September 2021. Questions incorporating retrospective recall were all aligned to the
123 period of “past four weeks,” matching the presented LEBA instrument.

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

assessed other variables and items which were not included in the present analysis. This comprised various sleep-related measures, i.e., sleep disturbances and sleep-related impairment (adult and pediatric versions) (Bevans et al., 2019; Daniel J. Buysse et al., 2010; Forrest et al., 2018; Harb, 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 (MCTQ version for adults and adolescents Roenneberg, Wirz-Justice, & Merrow, 2003) plus sleep environment (Olivier et al., 2016). Furthermore, we included a light sensitivity questionnaire (photophobia vs. photophilia) (Wu & Hallett, 2017) and self-reported pubertal stage assessment (Petersen, Crockett, Richards, & Boxer, 1988) for participants younger than 18 years of age. Moreover, we incorporated custom items on meal timing and caffeine consumption in the “workday vs. free day” structure of the MCTQ sleep-wake regulation. Example items are: “On workdays I usually have my first meal at :” “On free days I usually have my last meal at :” and “On workdays I usually drink my first caffeinated drink at :”

Finally, we assessed age, sex, gender identity, occupational status, COVID-19 related occupational setting, time zone/country of residence and native language as single-item demographic variables. The demographic characteristics of our sample are given in Table ??.

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

151 adequacy, normality assumptions, quality of correlation matrix, were assessed. Our data
152 violated both the univariate and multivariate normality assumptions. Due to these
153 violations and the ordinal nature of our response data, we used polychoric correlation
154 matrix (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018) for the EFA. We employed principal axis (PA) as factor
155 extraction method with varimax rotation. PA is robust to the normality assumption
156 violations (Watkins, 2020). The obtained latent structure was confirmed by another factor
157 extraction method: “the minimum residuals extraction” as well. We used a combination
158 of factor identification method including scree plot (Cattell, 1966), Horn’s parallel analysis
159 (Horn, 1965), minimum average partials method (Velicer, 1976), and hull method
160 (Lorenzo-Seva, Timmerman, & Kiers, 2011) to identify factor numbers. Additionally, to
161 determine the simple structure, we followed the guidelines recommended by
162 psychometricians: (i) no factors with fewer than three items (ii) no factors with a factor
163 loading <0.3 (iii) no items with cross-loading greater than .3 across factors (Bandalos &
164 Finney, 2018). We confirmed the latent structure obtained in the EFA by conducting a
165 categorical “Confirmatory Factor Analysis” (CFA) using “robust weighted least square
166 estimator” (WLSMV). We estiabished the measurement invariance of our tool across the
167 native and non-native English speakers using structural equation model framework. To
168 assess the possible semantic overlap of our tool with the existing tools, we sought to
169 “Semantic Scale Network” (Rosenbusch, Wanders, & Pit, 2020).To assess the possible
170 semantic overlap of our tool with the existing tools, we sought to “Semantic Scale
171 Network” (Rosenbusch et al., 2020). Lastly, we sought “Item Response Theory” (IRT)
172 based analysis on developing a short form of LEBA. We also conducted psychometric
173 analysis on non-merged response options data (Supp. Table A9) and rejected the latent
174 structure obtained as the factors were less interpretable.

175 **Ethical approval**

176 By reason of using fully anonymous online survey data, the present research
177 project does not fall under the scope of the Human Research Act, making an
178 authorisation from the ethics committee redundant. Nevertheless, the cantonal ethics
179 commission (Ethikkommission Nordwest- und Zentralschweiz, EKNZ) reviewed our
180 proposition (project ID Req-2021-00488) and issued an official clarification of
181 responsibility (full document see Suppl. X in appendix).

182 **Data Availability**

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

188 **Results**

189 **Participants**

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

trustworthiness of the result. Our sample size exceeds these requirements: Anonymous responses from a total of $n = 690$ participants were included in the analysis of the current study, split into samples for exploratory (EFA: $n = 428$) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA: $n = 262$). The EFA sample included participants filling out the questionnaire from 17 May 2021 to XX XXX 2021, whereas participants who filled out the questionnaire from YY YYY 2021 to 3 September 2021 were included in the CFA analysis. Participants indicated filling out the online survey from a diverse range of geographic locations. The ten most common country and time zone combinations included:

- 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%)

For a complete list of geographic locations, see Suppl. Table ??.

Age among all participants ranged from 11 years to 84 years [EFA: $\min = 11$, $\max = 84$; CFA: $\min = 12$, $\max = 74$], with an overall mean of ~ 33 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 [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 $q \geq 0.2$).

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

250 nature of the response data polychoric correlations over Pearson's correlations was
251 chosen (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018). The corrected item-total correlation ranges between
252 .03 -.48. However, no item was discarded based on descriptive statistics or item analysis.

253 **Exploratory Factor Analysis**

254 Sampling adequacy was checked using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures of
255 sampling adequacy (Kaiser, 1974) . The overall KMO vale for 48 items was 0.63 which
256 was above the cutoff value (.50) indicating a mediocre sample (Hutcheson, 1999).

257 Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954), χ^2 (1128) = 5042.86, p < .001 indicated the
258 correlations between items are adequate for the EFA. However only 4.96% of the
259 inter-item correlation coefficients were greater than .30. The absolute value of inter-item
260 correlation ranged between .00 to .91. Figure 2 depicts the correlation matrix.

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

266 With the initial 48 items we conducted three rounds of EFA and gradually discarded
267 problematic items. (cross-loading items and poor factor loading (<.30) items). Finally, a
268 five-factor EFA solution with 25 items was accepted with low RMSR = 0.08 (Brown,
269 2015), all factor-loading higher than .30 and no cross-loading greater than .30. We
270 further confirmed this five-factor latent structure by another EFA using varimax rotation
271 with a minimum residual extraction method (Sup.Table A7). Table 4 displays the
272 factor-loading (structural coefficients) and communality of the items. The absolute value
273 of the factor-loading ranged from .49 to .99 indicating strong coefficients. The
274 commonalities ranged between .11 to .99. Figure 4(A) depicts the obtained five factor

275 structure. However, the histogram of the absolute values of non-redundant
276 residual-correlations (Figure 4(B)) showed 26% correlations were greater than the
277 absolute value of .05, indicating a possible under-factoring. (Desjardins & Bulut, 2018).
278 Subsequently, we fitted a six-factor solution. However, a factor emerged with only two
279 salient variables, thus disqualifying the six-factor solution (Sup.Table A8). Internal
280 consistency reliability coefficient Cronbach's alpha assumes all the factor-loadings of the
281 items under a factor are equal (Graham, 2006; Novick & Lewis, 1967) which is not the
282 case in our sample. Additionally Cronbach's alpha coefficient has a tendency to deflate
283 the estimates for Likert type data as the calculation is based on pearson-correlation
284 matrix which requires that response data should be in continuous of nature (Gadermann,
285 Guhn, & Zumbo, 2012; Zumbo, Gadermann, & Zeisser, 2007). Subsequently to get
286 better estimates of reliability we reported ordinal alpha which used polychoric-correlation
287 matrix and assumed that the responses data were ordered in nature instead of
288 continuous (Zumbo et al., 2007). Ordinal alpha coefficient value ranges from 0 to 1 and
289 higher value represents better reliability. In the five-factor solution, the first factor
290 contained three items and explained 10.25% of the total variance with a internal reliability
291 coefficient ordinal $\alpha = .94$. All the items in this factor stemmed from the individual's
292 preference to use blue light filters in different light environments. The second factor
293 contained six items and explained 9.93% of the total variance with a internal reliability
294 coefficient ordinal $\alpha = .76$. Items under this factor commonly investigated an individual's
295 hours spent outdoor. The third factor contained five items and explained 8.83% of the
296 total variance. Items under this factor dealt with the specific behaviors pertaining to using
297 phone and smart-watch in bed. The internal consistency reliability coefficient was,
298 ordinal $\alpha = .75$. The fourth factor contained five items and explained 8.44% of the total
299 variance with an internal consistency coefficient, ordinal $\alpha = .72$. These five items
300 investigated the behaviors related to individual's light exposure before bedtime. Lastly,
301 the fifth factor contained six items and explained 6.14% of the total variance. This factor

302 captured individual's morning and daytime light exposure related behavior. The internal
303 consistency reliability was, ordinal $\alpha = .62$. It is essential to attain a balance between
304 psychometric properties and interpretability of the common themes when exploring the
305 latent structure. As all of the emerged factors are highly interpretable and relevant
306 towards our aim to capture light exposure related behavior, regardless of the apparent
307 low reliability of the fifth factor, we retain all the five-factors with 23 items for our
308 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Two items showed negative factor-loading (items 44
309 and 21). Upon inspection, it was understood that these items are negatively correlated to
310 the common theme, and thus in the CFA analysis, we reversed the response code for
311 these two items. Figure ?? depicts the data distribution and endorsement pattern for the
312 included items in our LEBA tool for both the EFA and CFA sample.

313 **Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

314 We conducted categorical confirmatory factor analysis with robust weighted least
315 square (WLSMV) estimator since our response data was of ordinary nature (Desjardins
316 & Bulut, 2018). Several indices are suggested to measure model fit which can be
317 categorized as absolute, comparative and parsimony fit indices (Brown, 2015). Absolute
318 fit assess the model fit at an absolute level using indices including χ^2 test statistics and
319 the standardized root mean square (SRMR). Parsimony fit indices including the root
320 mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) considers the number of free parameters
321 in the model to assesses the parsimony of the model. Comparative fit indices evaluate
322 the fit of the specified model solution in relation to a more restricted baseline model
323 restricting all covariances among the indicators as zero. Comparative fit index (CFI) and
324 the Tucker Lewis index (TLI) are such two comparative fit indices. Commonly used
325 Model fit guidelines (Hu & Bentle, 1999; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004) includes (i)
326 Reporting of χ^2 test statistics (A non-significant test statistics is required to reflect model
327 fit) (ii) CFI and TLI (CFI/TLI close to .95 or above/ranging between 90-95 and above) (iii)

RMSEA (close to .06 or below), (iv) SRMR (close to .08 or below) to estimate the model fit. Table 5 summarizes the fit indices of our fitted model. Our fitted model failed to attain an absolute fit estimated by the χ^2 test. However, the χ^2 test is sensitive to sample size and not recommended to be used as the sole index of absolute model fit (Brown, 2015). Another absolute fit index we obtained in our analysis was SRMR which does not work well with categorical data (C. Yu, 2002). We judged the model fit based on the comparative fit indices: CFI, TLI and parsimony fit index:RMSEA. 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 colored 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 best fit (CFI = .95; TLI = .95); RMSEA = .06[.05-.06, 90% CI]) and SRMR value (SRMR = .11) was also close to the suggestions of Hu and Bentle (1999). Internal consistency ordinal α for the five factors of LEBA were .96, .83, .70, .69, .52 respectively. We also estimated the internal consistency reliability of the total scale using Mcdonald's ω_t coefficient which is a better reliability estimate for multidimensional constructs (Dunn, Baguley, & Brunsden, 2014; Sijtsma, 2009). McDonald's ω_t coefficient for the total scale was .68. Figure 7 depicts the obtained CFA structure.

354 **Measurement Invariance**

355 Measurement invariance (MI) evaluates whether a construct has the psychometric
356 equivalence and same meaning across groups or measurement occasions (Kline, 2015;
357 Putnick & Bornstein, 2016). We used structural equation modeling framework to assess
358 the measurement invariance of our developed tool across two groups: native English
359 speakers(n= 129) and non-native English speakers (n = 133). For a detailed description
360 these two groups please see Sup. Table ???. Our measurement invariance testing
361 involved successively comparing the nested models: configural, metric, scalar, and
362 residual invariance models with each others (Widaman & Reise, 1997). Among these
363 nested models configural model is the first and least restrictive model. The configural
364 model assumes that the number of factors and item number under each factor will be
365 equal across two groups. The metric invariance model assumes configural invariance of
366 the fitted model and requires the factor-loadings of the items across the two groups to be
367 equal. Having the factor-loadings equal across groups indicates each item contributes to
368 the measured construct equivalently. Scalar invariance assumes the metric invariance of
369 the fitted model demands the item intercepts to be equivalent across groups. This equity
370 of item intercepts indicates the equivalence of response scale across the groups, i.e.,
371 persons with the same level of the underlying construct will score the same across the
372 groups. The residual invariance model assumes metric invariance for the fitted model
373 and adds the assumption of equality in error variances and covariances across the
374 groups. This model is the highest level of MI and assures the equivalence of precision of
375 items across the groups in measuring the underlying constructs. The invariance model fit
376 of our tool was assessed using the fit indices including χ^2 test, CFI and TLI (close to .95
377 or above), RMSEA (close to .06 or below) (Hu & Bentle, 1999). We excluded SRMR
378 from our consideration as it does not behave optimally for categorical variables (C. Yu,
379 2002). Table 6 summarized the fit indices. The comparison among different
380 measurement invariance models was made using the χ^2 difference test ($\Delta\chi^2$) to

381 assess whether our obtained latent structure of “LEBA” attained the highest level of the
382 MI. A non-significant $\Delta\chi^2$ test between two MI models fit indicates mode fit does not
383 significantly decrease for the superior model (Dimitrov, 2010) thus allowing the superior
384 level of invariance model to be accepted. We started our analysis by comparing the
385 model fit of the least restrictive model:configural model to metric MI model and continued
386 successive comparisons. Table 6 indicates that our fitted model had acceptable fit
387 indices for all of the fitted MI models. The model fit did not significantly decrease across
388 the nested models up to the scalar MI model. The chi-square value difference between
389 the scalar and residual model is zero, indicating model fit remained the same for both:
390 scalar and residual MI model, indicating the acceptability of the residual MI model.

391 **Semantic Analysis**

392 To find out if our developed tool (23 items) is overlapping with existing instruments,
393 we subjected the items of LEBA to the “Semantic Scale Network”(SSN) analysis
394 (Rosenbusch et al., 2020). The SSN detects semantically related scales and provides
395 cosine similarity index ranging between -.66 to 1 (Rosenbusch et al., 2020). Pair of
396 scales with a cosine similarity index value of 1 indicates they are perfectly semantically
397 similar scales indicating redundancy. LEBA appeared most strongly related to scales
398 about sleep: “Sleep Disturbance Scale For Children” (Bruni et al., 1996) and
399 “WHO-Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI): Insomnia”(WHO, 1990).The
400 cosine similarities lie between .47 to .51. Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (Flesch, 1948)
401 analysis on the the 23 items of our scale indicated required educational grade level was
402 3.33 and with a age above 8.33.

404 **Developing Short form of LEBA**

405 We sought the Item Response Theory (IRT) to develop the short form of LEBA. IRT
406 the conventional classical test theory-based analysis by gathering information on item
407 quality by indices like item difficulty, item discrimination, and item information (Baker,
408 2017). Item is judged based on item information in relation to participants' latent trait
409 level (θ). We fitted each factor of LEBA with the graded response model (Samejima,
410 Liden, & Hambleton, 1997) to the combined EFA and CFA sample (n =690). Item
411 discrimination indicates the pattern of variation in the categorical responses with the
412 changes in latent trait level (θ), and item information curve (IIC) indicates the amount of
413 information an item carries along the latent trait continuum. Here, we reported the item
414 discrimination parameter and only discarded the items with relatively flat item information
415 curve (information <.2) to develop the short form of LEBA. Baker (2017) categorized the
416 item discrimination in as none = 0; very low =0.01 to 0.34; low = 0.35 to 0.64; moderate =
417 0.65 to 1.34 ; high = 1.35 to 1.69; very high >1.70. Table 7 summarizes the IRT
418 parameters of our tool. Item discrimination parameters of our tool fell in very high (10
419 items), high (4 items), moderate (4 items), and low (5 items) categorizes indicating a
420 good range of discrimination along the latent trait level (θ). Examination of the item
421 information curve (Sup.fig A2-A5) indicated 5 items (1, 25, 38, 30, & 41) had relatively
422 flat information curves ($I(\theta) < .20$) thus discarded creating a short form of LEBA with 5
423 factors and 18 items.

424 Test information curve (TIC) (Figure 8) indicate the amount of information an the
425 full-scale carry along the latent trait continuum. As we treated each factor of short-LEBA
426 as an unidimensional construct we obtain 5 TICs (Figure 8). These information curves
427 indicated except the first and fifth factors, the other three factor's TICs are roughly
428 centered on the center of the trait continuum (θ).The first and fifth factor had a peak to
429 the right side of the center of latent trait.Thus we conferred the LEBA tool estimated the

430 light exposure related behavior with precision near the center of trait continuum for 2nd,
431 3rd and 4th factors and near the right side of the center of trait continuum for 1st and 5th
432 factors (Baker, 2017).

433 Table 8 summarizes the item fit indexes of the items. All the items fitted well to the
434 respective models as assessed by RMSEA value obtained from Signed- χ^2 index
435 implementation. All of the items had RMSEA value $\leq .06$ indicating adequate fit.
436 Sup. Figure A6 depicts the person fit of out fitted models. Person fit indicates the validity
437 and meaningfulness of the fitted model at the participants latent trait level (Desjardins &
438 Bulut, 2018). We estimated the person fit statistics using standardized fit index Zh
439 statistics (Drasgow, Levine, & Williams, 1985). Zh < -2 should be considered as a misfit.
440 Fig indicates that Zh is larger than -2 for most participants, suggesting a good fit of the
441 selected IRT models.

442 Discussion

443 We developed a self-reported tool to capture different light exposure related
444 behavior and evaluated its psychometric properties using classical test theory and Item
445 Response Theory based analysis.

446 48 items were generated by an expert panel and administered to a large sample (n
447 = 428 to explore the latent structure. Exploratory Factor Analysis revealed a five factor
448 solution with 25 items. ("Wearing blue light filters," "Spending time outdoors," "Using
449 phone and smart-watch in bed," "Using light before bedtime," and "Using light in the
450 morning and during daytime"). The internal consistency reliability coefficient ordinal
451 alpha ranged between .62-.94. As all the retained factors were meaningful and
452 contributed essentially towards our aim we retained all five factors.

453 A CFA on a separate sample (($n = 262$ gave a five-factor solution (CFI = .95; TLI =
454 .95); RMSEA = .06[.05-.06, 90% CI]) and SRMR = .11) after discarding two item. The

455 internal consistency McDonald's ω_t of the five factors were satisfactory (.96, .83, .70,
456 .69, .52) Internal consistency reliability of the total scale (23 items) was also satisfactory,
457 McDonald's $\omega_t = .68$. In the same sample, our measurement invariance analysis
458 revealed that the latent structure attained the residual measurement invariance across
459 subgroups: male and female (CFI: .98, TLI: .98, SRMR: .98).

460 The "Semantic Scale Network"(SSN) analysis (Rosenbusch et al., 2020) on the
461 retained 23 items showed "LEBA" was related to "Sleep Disturbance Scale For Children"
462 (SDSC) (Bruni et al., 1996) and "WHO-Composite International Diagnostic Interview
463 (CIDI): Insomnia"(WHO, 1990). Upon inspecting the item contents we found items under
464 "Using phone and smart-watch in bed" and "Using light before bedtime" have semantic
465 overlap with the items of SDSC ans CIDI. Items in those two scales were looking into
466 behaviors related to sleep. As such the similarity index obtained is expected.
467 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (Flesch, 1948) analysis on the the 23 items of our scale
468 indicated required educational grade level was 3.33 and with a age above 8.33.

469 Lastly, we developed a short-LEBA (n=23) using IRT analysis. We fitted a graded
470 response model model to the combined EFA and CFA sample (n =690). We discarded 5
471 items with relatively flat item information curve [$I(\theta) < .20$]. IRT analysis indicated short
472 form of LEBA is a psychometrically sound measure. Item fit indexes and person fit index
473 for all five fitted model were acceptable. Items had diverse slope parameters indicating a
474 good range of discrimination- the ability to differentiate respondents with different levels
475 of the light exposure related behavior. Test information curve also indicated a good
476 coverage of underlying trait continuum with precision.

477 Conclusion

478 "The Light exposure behavior assessment"(LEBA) gave a five solution with 25
479 items in an EFA. A CFA with this 25-item scale again offered a five-factor solution, but

480 this time two more item was discarded. The 23-item “LEBA” was found reliable and valid.
481 A short-form of LEBA was developed using IRT analysis. IRT analysis gave a 18-item
482 scale with a good range of coverage across the underlying trait continuum. All-in-all, we
483 can recommend both forms to be used to capture individual’s light exposure related
484 behavior

References

- Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Prepare reproducible APA journal articles with R Markdown*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- Bajaj, A., Rosner, B., Lockley, S. W., & Schernhammer, E. S. (2011). Validation of a light questionnaire with real-life photopic illuminance measurements: The harvard light exposure assessment questionnaire. *Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers*, 20(7), 1341–1349.
- Baker, F. B. (2017). *The Basics of Item Response Theory Using R* (1st ed. 2017.). Springer.
- Bandalos, D. L., & Finney, S. J. (2018). Factor analysis: Exploratory and confirmatory. In *The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the social sciences* (pp. 98–122). Routledge.
- Barnier, J., Briatte, F., & Larmarange, J. (2020). *Questionr: Functions to make surveys processing easier*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=questionr>
- Barth, M. (2021). *tinylabes: Lightweight variable labels*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/mariusbarth/tinylabes>
- Bartlett, M. (1954). A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various Chi-square Approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Methodological*, 16(2), 296–298.
- Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C.-P. (1987). Practical Issues in Structural Modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 16(1), 78–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124187016001004>
- Bevans, K. B., Meltzer, L. J., La Motte, A. de, Kratchman, A., Viél, D., & Forrest, C. B. (2019). Qualitative development and content validation of the PROMIS pediatric sleep health items. *Behavioral Sleep Medicine*, 17(5), 657–671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15402002.2018.1461102>

- 512 Bossini, L., Valdagno, M., Padula, L., De Capua, A., Pacchierotti, C., &
513 Castrogiovanni, P. (2006). Sensibilità alla luce e psicopatologia: Validazione
514 del questionario per la valutazione della fotosensibilità (QVF). *Med
515 Psicosomatica*, 51, 167–176.
- 516 Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed.).
517 New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press.
- 518 Bruni, O., Ottaviano, S., Guidetti, V., Romoli, M., Innocenzi, M., Cortesi, F., &
519 Giannotti, F. (1996). The sleep disturbance scale for children (SDSC)
520 construct ion and validation of an instrument to evaluate sleep disturbances in
521 childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 5(4), 251–261.
- 522 Bryer, J., & Speerschneider, K. (2016). *Likert: Analysis and visualization likert
523 items*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=likert>
- 524 Buchanan, E. M., Gillenwaters, A., Scofield, J. E., & Valentine, K. D. (2019).
525 *MOTE: Measure of the Effect: Package to assist in effect size calculations and
526 their confidence intervals*. Retrieved from <http://github.com/doomlab/MOTE>
- 527 Buysse, Daniel J., Reynolds III, C. F., Monk, T. H., Berman, S. R., & Kupfer, D. J.
528 (1989). The pittsburgh sleep quality index: A new instrument for psychiatric
529 practice and research. *Psychiatry Research*, 28(2), 193–213.
- 530 Buysse, Daniel J., Yu, L., Moul, D. E., Germain, A., Stover, A., Dodds, N. E., ...
531 Pilkonis, P. A. (2010). Development and validation of patient-reported outcome
532 measures for sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairments. *Sleep*, 33(6),
533 781–792. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/33.6.781>
- 534 Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Test For The Number Of Factors. *Multivariate
535 Behavioral Research*, 1(2), 245–276.
536 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10
- 537 Chalmers, R. P. (2012). mirt: A multidimensional item response theory package
538 for the R environment. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(6), 1–29.

- 539 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i06>
- 540 Chang, W., Cheng, J., Allaire, J., Sievert, C., Schloerke, B., Xie, Y., ... Borges, B.
- 541 (2021). *Shiny: Web application framework for r*. Retrieved from
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shiny>
- 542 Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis, 2nd ed.*
- 543 Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 544 Conigrave, J. (2020). *Coxr: Create and format correlation matrices*. Retrieved
from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=coxr>
- 545 Dahl, D. B., Scott, D., Roosen, C., Magnusson, A., & Swinton, J. (2019). *Xtable:*
- 546 *Export tables to LaTeX or HTML*. Retrieved from
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=xtable>
- 547 Desjardins, C., & Bulut, O. (2018). *Handbook of Educational Measurement and*
- 548 *Psychometrics Using R*. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b20498>
- 549 Dianat, I., Sedghi, A., Bagherzade, J., Jafarabadi, M. A., & Stedmon, A. W. (2013).
- 550 Objective and subjective assessments of lighting in a hospital setting:
551 Implications for health, safety and performance. *Ergonomics*, 56(10),
552 1535–1545.
- 553 Dimitrov, D. M. (2010). Testing for factorial invariance in the context of construct
554 validation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*,
- 555 43(2), 121–149.
- 556 Dinno, A. (2018). *Paran: Horn's test of principal components/factors*. Retrieved
557 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=paran>
- 558 Drasgow, F., Levine, M. V., & Williams, E. A. (1985). Appropriateness
559 measurement with polytomous item response models and standardized
560 indices. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 38(1),
561 67–86.
- 562 Dunn, T. J., Baguley, T., & Brunsden, V. (2014). From alpha to omega: A practical
563

- 566 solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British*
567 *Journal of Psychology*, 105(3), 399–412.
- 568 Eklund, N., & Boyce, P. (1996). The development of a reliable, valid, and simple
569 office lighting survey. *Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society*, 25(2),
570 25–40.
- 571 Epskamp, S. (2019). *semPlot: Path diagrams and visual analysis of various SEM*
572 *packages' output*. Retrieved from
573 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semPlot>
- 574 Epskamp, S., Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., Schmittmann, V. D., & Borsboom,
575 D. (2012). qgraph: Network visualizations of relationships in psychometric
576 data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(4), 1–18.
- 577 Flesch, R. (1948). A new readability yardstick. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
578 32(3), 221.
- 579 F.lux Software LLC. (2021). F.lux (Version 4.120). Retrieved from
580 <https://justgetflux.com/>
- 581 Forrest, C. B., Meltzer, L. J., Marcus, C. L., La Motte, A. de, Kratchman, A.,
582 Buysse, D. J., ... Bevans, K. B. (2018). Development and validation of the
583 PROMIS pediatric sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairment item banks.
584 *Sleep*, 41(6). <https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/zsy054>
- 585 Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R companion to applied regression* (Third).
586 Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. Retrieved from
587 <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/>
- 588 Fox, J., Weisberg, S., & Price, B. (2020). *carData: Companion to applied*
589 *regression data sets*. Retrieved from
590 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=carData>
- 591 Gadermann, A. M., Guhn, M., & Zumbo, B. D. (2012). Estimating ordinal reliability
592 for likert-type and ordinal item response data: A conceptual, empirical, and

- practical guide. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 17(1), 3.
- 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., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*

- 620 *Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- 622 Hugh-Jones, D. (2021). *Huxtable: Easily create and style tables for LaTeX, HTML*
623 *and other formats*. Retrieved from
624 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=huxtable>
- 625 Hutcheson, G. D. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist : Introductory statistics*
626 *using generalized linear models*. London : SAGE.
- 627 Iannone, R. (2016). *DiagrammeRsvg: Export DiagrammeR graphviz graphs as*
628 *SVG*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DiagrammeRsvg>
- 629 Iannone, R. (2021). *DiagrammeR: Graph/network visualization*. Retrieved from
630 <https://github.com/rich-iannone/DiagrammeR>
- 631 Irribarra, D. T., & Freund, R. (2014). *Wright map: IRT item-person map with*
632 *ConQuest integration*. Retrieved from <http://github.com/david-ti/wrightmap>
- 633 Jackson, D. L. (2003). Revisiting Sample Size and Number of Parameter
634 Estimates: Some Support for the N:q Hypothesis. *Structural Equation*
635 *Modeling*, 10(1), 128–141. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1001_6
- 636 Johnson, P., & Kite, B. (2020). *semTable: Structural equation modeling tables*.
637 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTable>
- 638 Johnson, P., Kite, B., & Redmon, C. (2020). *Kutils: Project management tools*.
639 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kutils>
- 640 Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., & Rosseel, Y. (2021).
641 *semTools: Useful tools for structural equation modeling*. Retrieved from
642 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools>
- 643 Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36.
644 <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02291575>
- 645 Kassambara, A. (2019). *Ggcorrplot: Visualization of a correlation matrix using*
646 *'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggcorrplot>

- 647 Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. The
648 Guilford Press.
- 649 Kowarik, A., & Templ, M. (2016). Imputation with the R package VIM. *Journal of*
650 *Statistical Software*, 74(7), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v074.i07>
- 651 Lishinski, A. (2021). *lavaanPlot: Path diagrams for 'lavaan' models via*
652 *'DiagrammeR'*. Retrieved from
653 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lavaanPlot>
- 654 Lorenzo-Seva, U., Timmerman, M., & Kiers, H. (2011). The Hull Method for
655 Selecting the Number of Common Factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*,
656 46, 340–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2011.564527>
- 657 Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M. S., Patil, I., & Lüdecke, D. (2020). Methods and
658 algorithms for correlation analysis in r. *Journal of Open Source Software*,
659 5(51), 2306. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.02306>
- 660 Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with
661 applications. *Biometrika*, 57(3), 519–530.
662 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/57.3.519>
- 663 Michalke, M. (2020a). *koRpus.lang.en: Language support for 'koRpus' package:*
664 *english*. Retrieved from <https://reaktanz.de/?c=hacking&s=koRpus>
- 665 Michalke, M. (2020b). *Sylly: Hyphenation and syllable counting for text analysis*.
666 Retrieved from <https://reaktanz.de/?c=hacking&s=sylly>
- 667 Michalke, M. (2021). *koRpus: Text analysis with emphasis on POS tagging,*
668 *readability, and lexical diversity*. Retrieved from
669 <https://reaktanz.de/?c=hacking&s=koRpus>
- 670 Mock, T. (2021). *gtExtras: A collection of helper functions for the gt package*.
671 Retrieved from <https://github.com/jthomasmock/gtExtras>
- 672 Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames*. Retrieved from
673 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble>

- 674 Navarro-Gonzalez, D., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2021). *EFA.MRFA: Dimensionality*
675 *assessment using minimum rank factor analysis*. Retrieved from
676 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=EFA.MRFA>
- 677 Neuwirth, E. (2014). *RColorBrewer: ColorBrewer palettes*. Retrieved from
678 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RColorBrewer>
- 679 Novick, M. R., & Lewis, C. (1967). Coefficient alpha and the reliability of
680 composite measurements. *Psychometrika*, 32(1), 1–13.
- 681 Olivier, K., Gallagher, R. A., Killgore, W. D. S., Carrazco, N., Alfonso-Miller, P., ...
682 Grandner, M. A. (2016). Development and initial validation of the assessment
683 of sleep environment: A novel inventory for describing and quantifying the
684 impact of environmental factors on sleep. *Sleep*, 39(Abstract Supplement:
685 A367).
- 686 Ooms, J. (2021a). *Magick: Advanced graphics and image-processing in r*.
687 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=magick>
- 688 Ooms, J. (2021b). *Rsvg: Render SVG images into PDF, PNG, PostScript, or*
689 *bitmap arrays*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rsvg>
- 690 Peters, G.-J. (2021). *Ufs: Quantitative analysis made accessible*. Retrieved from
691 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ufs>
- 692 Petersen, A. C., Crockett, L., Richards, M., & Boxer, A. (1988). A self-report
693 measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. *Journal of*
694 *Youth and Adolescence*, 17(2), 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537962>
- 695 Pornprasertmanit, S., Miller, P., Schoemann, A., & Jorgensen, T. D. (2021).
696 *Simsem: SIMulated structural equation modeling*. Retrieved from
697 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=simsem>
- 698 Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Measurement invariance conventions
699 and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological
700 research. *Developmental Review*, 41, 71–90.

- 701 R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*.
702 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from
703 <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 704 Revelle, W. (2021). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and*
705 *personality research*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. Retrieved
706 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- 707 Roenneberg, T., Wirz-Justice, A., & Merrow, M. (2003). Life between clocks: Daily
708 temporal patterns of human chronotypes. *Journal of Biological Rhythms*,
709 18(1), 80–90.
- 710 Rosenbusch, H., Wanders, F., & Pit, I. L. (2020). The semantic scale network: An
711 online tool to detect semantic overlap of psychological scales and prevent
712 scale redundancies. *Psychological Methods*, 25(3), 380.
- 713 Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling.
714 *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36. Retrieved from
715 <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v48/i02/>
- 716 Ryu, C. (2021). *Dlookr: Tools for data diagnosis, exploration, transformation*.
717 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dlookr>
- 718 Samejima, F., Liden, W. van der, & Hambleton, R. (1997). Handbook of modern
719 item response theory. New York, NY: Springer.
- 720 Sarkar, D. (2008). *Lattice: Multivariate data visualization with r*. New York:
721 Springer. Retrieved from <http://lmdvr.r-forge.r-project.org>
- 722 Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations
723 stabilize? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(5), 609–612.
724 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.05.009>
- 725 Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural*
726 *equation modeling*. psychology press.
- 727 Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality

- 728 (complete samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3-4), 591–611.
- 729 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/52.3-4.591>
- 730 Sharpsteen, C., & Bracken, C. (2020). *tikzDevice: R graphics output in LaTeX*
- 731 *format*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tikzDevice>
- 732 Sijtsma, K. (2009). On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of
- 733 cronbach's alpha. *Psychometrika*, 74(1), 107.
- 734 Siraji, M. A. (2021). *Tabledown: A companion pack for the book "basic &*
- 735 *advanced psychometrics in r"*. Retrieved from
- 736 <https://github.com/masiraji/tabledown>
- 737 Sjoberg, D. D., Curry, M., Hannum, M., Larmarange, J., Whiting, K., & Zabor, E. C.
- 738 (2021b). *Gtsummary: Presentation-ready data summary and analytic result*
- 739 *tables*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gtsummary>
- 740 Sjoberg, D. D., Curry, M., Hannum, M., Larmarange, J., Whiting, K., & Zabor, E. C.
- 741 (2021a). *Gtsummary: Presentation-ready data summary and analytic result*
- 742 *tables*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gtsummary>
- 743 Stauffer, R., Mayr, G. J., Dabernig, M., & Zeileis, A. (2009). Somewhere over the
- 744 rainbow: How to make effective use of colors in meteorological visualizations.
- 745 *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 96(2), 203–216.
- 746 <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00155.1>
- 747 Terry M. Therneau, & Patricia M. Grambsch. (2000). *Modeling survival data:*
- 748 *Extending the Cox model*. New York: Springer.
- 749 Urbanek, S. (2013). *Png: Read and write PNG images*. Retrieved from
- 750 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=png>
- 751 Urbanek, S. (2021). *Jpeg: Read and write JPEG images*. Retrieved from
- 752 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=jpeg>
- 753 Ushey, K., McPherson, J., Cheng, J., Atkins, A., & Allaire, J. (2021). *Packrat: A*
- 754 *dependency management system for projects and their r package*

- 755 dependencies. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=packrat>
- 756 van Lissa, C. J. (2021). *tidySEM: Tidy structural equation modeling*. Retrieved
- 757 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidySEM>
- 758 Velicer, W. (1976). Determining the Number of Components from the Matrix of
- 759 Partial Correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41, 321–327.
- 760 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02293557>
- 761 Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern applied statistics with s* (Fourth).
- 762 New York: Springer. Retrieved from <https://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/pub/MASS4/>
- 763 Verriotto, J. D., Gonzalez, A., Aguilar, M. C., Parel, J.-M. A., Feuer, W. J., Smith,
- 764 A. R., & Lam, B. L. (2017). New methods for quantification of visual
- 765 photosensitivity threshold and symptoms. *Translational Vision Science &*
- 766 *Technology*, 6(4), 18–18.
- 767 Watkins, M. (2020). *A Step-by-Step Guide to Exploratory Factor Analysis with R*
- 768 *and RStudio*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003120001>
- 769 Weinzaepflen, C., & Spitschan, M. (2021). Enlighten your clock: How your body
- 770 tells time. Open Science Framework. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/ZQXVH>
- 771 WHO. (1990). Composite international diagnostic interview.
- 772 Wickham, H. (2007). Reshaping data with the reshape package. *Journal of*
- 773 *Statistical Software*, 21(12). Retrieved from
- 774 <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v21/i12/paper>
- 775 Wickham, H. (2011). The split-apply-combine strategy for data analysis. *Journal*
- 776 *of Statistical Software*, 40(1), 1–29. Retrieved from
- 777 <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i01/>
- 778 Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag
- 779 New York. Retrieved from <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- 780 Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string*
- 781 *operations*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>

- 782 Wickham, H. (2021a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables*
783 (*factors*). Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats>
- 784 Wickham, H. (2021b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from
785 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>
- 786 Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., ...
787 Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(43), 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- 788 Wickham, H., & Bryan, J. (2019). *Readxl: Read excel files*. Retrieved from
789 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readxl>
- 790 Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of*
791 *data manipulation*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>
- 792 Wickham, H., & Hester, J. (2021). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*. Retrieved
793 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>
- 794 Widaman, K. F., & Reise, S. P. (1997). Exploring the measurement invariance of
795 psychological instruments: Applications in the substance use domain.
- 796 Wilke, C. O. (2020). *Cowplot: Streamlined plot theme and plot annotations for*
797 *'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=cowplot>
- 798 Winston Chang. (2014). *Extrafont: Tools for using fonts*. Retrieved from
799 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=extrafont>
- 800 Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale Development Research: A
801 Content Analysis and Recommendations for Best Practices. *The Counseling*
802 *Psychologist*, 34(6), 806–838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127>
- 803 Wu, Y., & Hallett, M. (2017). Photophobia in neurologic disorders. *Translational*
804 *Neurodegeneration*, 6(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40035-017-0095-3>
- 805 Xie, Yihui. (2015). *Dynamic documents with R and knitr* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton,
806 Florida: Chapman; Hall/CRC. Retrieved from <https://yihui.org/knitr/>
- 807 Xie, Yang, Wu, X., Tao, S., Wan, Y., & Tao, F. (2021). Development and validation
808

- 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>
- Zhang, Z., & Yuan, K.-H. (2020). *Coefficientalpha: Robust coefficient alpha and omega with missing and non-normal data*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=coefficientalpha>
- Zhu, H. (2021). *kableExtra: Construct complex table with 'kable' and pipe syntax*.

836 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra>
837 Zumbo, B. D., Gadermann, A. M., & Zeisser, C. (2007). Ordinal versions of
838 coefficients alpha and theta for likert rating scales. *Journal of Modern Applied
839 Statistical Methods*, 6(1), 4.

Table 1

List of instruments measuring related constructs to LEBA

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 photosensitivity symptoms	None	5-point Likert scale	Not available
Office Light Survey	Eklundet al., 1996	30 items survey to assess electrical lighting environment in office	Item 29	Mixed response format	Not available
Harvard Exposure Assessment Questionnaire	Bajaj et al., 2011	1 item semi-quantitative questionnaire	None light	Semi-quantitative	Correlation with physical measurement
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 with oral temperature

Table 1 continued

Name	Author	Description	Relevant Items	Scale type	Validity evidences
Munich Chrono-type Questionnaire (MCTQ)	Roenneberg et al., 2003	17 items questionnaire to understand individuals phase of entrainment	Time spent outdoors	Mixed response format	Correlation with sleep-logs, actimetry, and physiological parameters
Sleep Practices and Attitudes Questionnaire (SPAQ)	Olivier et.al., 2016	16 Factor questionnaire measuring practice, behavior and attitude related sleep	Subscale 8&9	5-point Likert scale	Face and Construct validity
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 measurements
Self-Rating of Biological Rhythm Disorder for Adolescents (SBRDA)	Xie et al., 2021	29 Items questionnaire assessing four dimensions of biological rhythm disorder in adolescents	Item 3,6,22-25 and 29	5-point Likert scale	Construct validity
Photosensitivity Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ)	Bossini et al.,2006	16 dichotomous 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 testing³ Wilcoxon rank sum test⁴ Pearson's Chi-squared test

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics

Item	Stem	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	SW Statistics	Item-total corelation
item01	I turn on the lights immediately after waking up.	2.27	1.39	0.74	-0.81	0.81*	0.19
item02	I open the curtains or blinds immediately after waking up.	2.87	1.59	0.08	-1.60	0.83*	0.28
item03	I look at my mobile phone screen immediately after waking up.	3.36	1.38	-0.48	-1.03	0.87*	0.23
item04	I use an alarm with a dawn simulation light.	1.47	1.18	2.38	4.00	0.43*	0.24
item05	I have breakfast within 3 meters from a window.	4.01	1.40	-1.22	0.07	0.70*	0.17
item06	I have breakfast in a brightly lit room (illuminated by electric light).	2.79	1.55	0.19	-1.48	0.85*	0.13
item07	I go for a walk or exercise outside within 2 hours after waking up.	2.26	1.25	0.70	-0.60	0.85*	0.32
item08	I spend 30 minutes or less per day (in total) outside.	2.97	1.20	-0.06	-0.94	0.91*	0.25
item09	I spend between 30 minutes and 1 hour per day (in total) outside.	2.94	1.03	-0.12	-0.40	0.91*	0.08
item10	I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.	2.74	1.04	0.09	-0.74	0.91*	0.42
item11	I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.	2.18	0.90	0.60	0.12	0.86*	0.41
item12	I spend as much time outside as possible.	2.36	1.22	0.59	-0.62	0.87*	0.48
item13	I use sunglasses when I go outside in bright daylight.	2.73	1.46	0.20	-1.36	0.87*	0.25
item14	I wear a visor or cap when I go outside in bright daylight.	2.14	1.31	0.77	-0.78	0.80*	0.28
item15	I seek shade when I am outside in bright daylight.	3.26	1.09	-0.26	-0.45	0.91*	0.03
item16	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses indoors during the day.	1.56	1.23	2.00	2.45	0.50*	0.28
item17	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses outdoors during the day.	1.54	1.21	2.07	2.75	0.49*	0.21
item18	I use light therapy applying a white light box.	1.12	0.49	5.02	27.80	0.25*	0.18

Table 3 continued

Item	Stem	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	SW Statistics	Item-total corelation
item19	I use light therapy applying a blue light box.	1.05	0.36	7.23	52.98	0.13*	0.17
item20	I use light therapy applying a light visor.	1.04	0.33	8.99	85.28	0.10*	0.16
item21	I use light therapy applying another form of light device.	1.14	0.59	4.79	24.05	0.25*	0.21
item22	I spend most of my daytime in a brightly lit environment.	3.57	1.07	-0.65	-0.17	0.88*	0.20
item23	I close the curtains or blinds during the day if the light from outside is bright.	2.56	1.27	0.33	-1.00	0.89*	0.08
item24	I spend most of my indoor time within 3 meters from a window.	4.14	0.99	-1.23	1.14	0.79*	0.22
item25	I use a desk lamp when I do focused work.	2.59	1.41	0.27	-1.27	0.86*	0.15
item26	I turn on my ceiling room light when it is light outside.	2.25	1.27	0.69	-0.64	0.84*	0.08
item27	I use my mobile phone within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.80	1.29	-0.87	-0.42	0.82*	0.17
item28	I use my computer/laptop/tablet within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.76	1.14	-0.68	-0.45	0.86*	0.18
item29	I watch television within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	2.44	1.31	0.38	-1.14	0.86*	0.13
item30	I look at my smartwatch within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	1.48	1.11	2.18	3.35	0.48*	0.13
item31	I dim my room light within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.00	1.62	-0.08	-1.61	0.83*	0.39
item32	I dim my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.55	1.65	-0.60	-1.34	0.76*	0.33

Table 3 continued

Item	Stem	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	SW Statistics	Item-total corelation
item33	I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.62	1.64	-0.68	-1.25	0.74*	0.37
item34	I use a blue-filter app on my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.42	1.83	-0.45	-1.69	0.69*	0.20
item35	I use a blue-filter app on my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	3.86	1.67	-0.99	-0.85	0.65*	0.20
item36	I wear blue-filtering, orange-tinted, and/or red-tinted glasses within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.	1.54	1.25	2.13	2.86	0.46*	0.35
item37	I purposely leave a light on in my sleep environment while sleeping.	1.33	0.91	3.03	8.43	0.41*	0.09
item38	I use as little light as possible when I get up during the night.	4.30	1.08	-1.79	2.53	0.67*	0.32
item39	I turn on the lights when I get up during the night.	1.96	0.98	1.02	0.69	0.82*	0.07
item40	I check my phone when I wake up at night.	2.16	1.19	0.71	-0.54	0.84*	0.25
item41	I look at my smartwatch when I wake up at night.	1.31	0.81	2.75	6.92	0.43*	0.14
item42	I close curtains or blinds to prevent light from entering the bedroom if I want to sleep.	3.93	1.48	-1.06	-0.44	0.71*	0.15
item43	I use a sleep mask that covers my eyes.	1.64	1.18	1.79	2.02	0.60*	0.22
item44	I modify my light environment to match my current needs.	3.51	1.30	-0.70	-0.59	0.85*	0.40
item45	I use LEDs to create a healthy light environment.	2.22	1.48	0.71	-1.02	0.76*	0.29
item46	I use tunable lights to create a healthy light environment.	1.76	1.23	1.35	0.44	0.66*	0.39

Table 3 continued

Item	Stem	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	SW Statistics	Item-total corelation
item47	I discuss the effects of light on my body with other people.	2.11	1.17	0.77	-0.39	0.83*	0.37
item48	I seek out knowledge on how to improve my light exposure.	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
item07		0.5				0.267	0.733
item08		-0.49				0.252	0.748
item09		0.32				0.113	0.887
item27			0.8			0.658	0.342
item03			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
item04					0.41	0.219	0.781
item01					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

Confirmatory Factor Analysis model fit indices of the two model: five factor model with 25 items and five factor model with 23 items. The second model attained the best fit.

Model	Chi-Square	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	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 6

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

	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

*Items discrimination and response category
difficulty thresholds of 23 items in LEBA (n =690)*

	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
item07	1.09	-0.50	0.73	1.63	2.97
Ritem08	1.19	-2.26	-0.48	0.64	1.91
item09	0.91	-2.63	-0.96	1.11	3.49
item27	2.21	-1.88	-1.19	-0.73	0.30
item03	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
item04	0.84	2.44	2.80	3.18	3.67
item01	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 discrimination, response category difficulty thresholds and fit statistics of the 18 items in short LEBA (n=690)

Items	a	b1	b2	b3	b4	Signed Chi-square	df	RMSEA	p
item16	28.13	0.78	0.90	1.06	1.40	2.02	6.00	0.00	0.92
item36	4.49	0.94	1.08	1.23	1.40	39.07	13.00	0.05	0.00
item17	2.81	0.97	1.11	1.38	1.62	25.58	13.00	0.04	0.02
item11	3.27	-0.79	0.65	1.54	2.31	55.03	27.00	0.04	0.00
item10	3.07	-1.27	-0.09	0.82	2.00	53.19	30.00	0.03	0.01
item12	1.72	-0.67	0.44	1.28	2.11	34.39	42.00	0.00	0.79
item07	1.09	-0.50	0.73	1.63	2.97	67.45	46.00	0.03	0.02
Ritem08	1.19	-2.26	-0.48	0.64	1.91	140.90	46.00	0.05	0.00
item09	0.91	-2.63	-0.96	1.11	3.49	131.19	45.00	0.05	0.00
item27	2.12	-1.91	-1.21	-0.74	0.31	16.41	11.00	0.03	0.13
item03	3.24	-1.22	-0.76	-0.20	0.65	15.09	11.00	0.02	0.18
item40	1.57	-0.50	0.45	1.30	2.20	9.92	9.00	0.01	0.36
item32	1.60	-1.04	-0.79	-0.42	0.16	41.33	15.00	0.05	0.00
item35	1.34	-1.10	-0.99	-0.76	-0.41	41.71	14.00	0.05	0.00
item33	15.66	-0.66	-0.48	-0.24	0.13	46.89	14.00	0.06	0.00
item46	2.34	0.66	0.88	1.36	2.12	19.00	15.00	0.02	0.21
item45	1.51	0.30	0.55	1.17	1.91	15.05	15.00	0.00	0.45
item25	0.49	-1.45	-0.04	1.99	4.46	31.60	15.00	0.04	0.01

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




Figure 1. Development of long and short form of LEBA




Figure 2. Inter item polychoric correlation coefficients for the 48 items. 4.9 % inter-item correlation coefficients were higher than .30




Figure 3. Factor Identification Methods (A) Parallel analysis indicated the optimal number of factors were six. (B) Scree plot suggested six factors. (C) Hull method indicated 5 factors were required to balance the model fit and number of parameters.



A

Figure 4. (A) Five Factor Solution obtained in Exploratory Factor Analysis (B) Histogram of nonredundant residula correlations

LEBA

Summary Descriptives EFA Sample (n =428)

Items	Summary Statistics				Histogram ¹	Density ²	Response Pattern				
	n	Mean	Median	SD			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
LEBA Items											
F1:Wearing blue light filters											
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)
item36	428	1.5	1.0	1.3			82.24% (352)	3.04% (13)	3.04% (13)	2.34% (10)	9.35% (40)
F2:Spending time outdoors											
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)
F3:Using phone and smart-watch in bed											
item03	428	3.4	4.0	1.4			15.89% (68)	11.45% (49)	17.29% (74)	31.07% (133)	24.30% (104)
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)
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)
F4:Using light before bedtime											
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)
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)
F5:Using light in the morning and during daytime											
item01	428	2.3	2.0	1.4			42.29% (181)	22.20% (95)	12.62% (54)	12.38% (53)	10.51% (45)
item04	428	1.5	1.0	1.2			84.11% (360)	3.50% (15)	2.10% (9)	2.10% (9)	8.18% (35)
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)
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)

¹Histogram²Density

Figure 5. Summary Descriptives EFA Sample

LEBA

Summary Descriptives CFA Sample (Nn=262)

Items	Summary Statistics				Graphics		Response Pattern					
	LEBA Items	n	Mean	Median	SD	Histogram ¹	Density ²	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
F1:Wearing blue light filters												
item16	262	1.6	1.0	1.3	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	1.2			80.15% (210)	3.44% (9)	5.34% (14)	2.67% (7)	8.40% (22)
item36	262	1.6	1.0	1.3	1.3			80.53% (211)	3.44% (9)	3.05% (8)	3.44% (9)	9.54% (25)
F2:Spending time outdoors												
item07	262	2.1	2.0	1.2	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	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	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	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	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	1.2			32.06% (84)	30.92% (81)	19.08% (50)	11.45% (30)	6.49% (17)
F3:Using phone and smart-watch in bed												
item03	262	3.7	4.0	1.3	1.3			11.83% (31)	7.25% (19)	17.56% (46)	28.24% (74)	35.11% (92)
item27	262	4.0	4.0	1.2	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	1.1			83.59% (219)	2.67% (7)	4.20% (11)	6.11% (16)	3.44% (9)
item40	262	2.5	2.0	1.3	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	0.7			90.08% (236)	3.82% (10)	2.29% (6)	2.67% (7)	1.15% (3)
F4:Using light before bedtime												
item32	262	3.4	4.0	1.7	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	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	1.8			27.48% (72)	2.67% (7)	7.25% (19)	6.49% (17)	56.11% (147)
item38	262	4.3	5.0	1.1	1.1			4.20% (11)	7.63% (20)	6.49% (17)	21.37% (56)	60.31% (158)
F5:Using light in the morning and during daytime												
item01	262	2.3	2.0	1.4	1.4			40.46% (106)	22.52% (59)	14.50% (38)	10.69% (28)	11.83% (31)
item04	262	1.3	1.0	0.8	0.8			89.31% (234)	2.29% (6)	3.44% (9)	3.05% (8)	1.91% (5)
item25	262	2.5	2.0	1.4	1.4			32.82% (86)	18.32% (48)	21.76% (57)	16.79% (44)	10.31% (27)
item45	262	2.0	1.0	1.4	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	1.2			75.57% (198)	2.67% (7)	8.02% (21)	9.54% (25)	4.20% (11)

¹ Histogram² Density

Figure 6. Summary Descriptives of CFA Sample




Figure 7. 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 8. 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

Appendix

840 **Disclaimer:** This is a non-public version of LEBA (dated January 15, 2022) and still a
841 work in progress. Please do not distribute!

842 LEBA captures light exposure-related behaviours on a 5 point Likert type scale
843 ranging from 1 to 5 (Never = 1; Rarely = 2; Sometimes = 3; Often = 4; Always = 5). The
844 score of each factor is calculated by the summation of scores of items belonging to the
845 corresponding factor.

846 **Instruction:**

847 "Please indicate how often you performed the following behaviours in the **past 4**
848 **weeks.**"

Table A1

LEBA Long Form (23 Items)

Items	Never	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.					
05. I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
06. I spend between 30 minutes and 1 hour per day (in total) outside.					
07.I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
08.I spend as much time outside as possible.					
09.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.					
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.					
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.					

Table A1 continued

Items	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
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.					

Table A2

LEBA Long Form (23 Items):Latent Structure and Reliability

Factor names	Items	Reliability Coefficients
F1: Wearing blue light filters	01-03	0.96
F2: Spending time outdoors	4-9 (Item 4 is reversed)	0.83
F3: Using phone and smartwatch in bed	10-14	0.7
F4: Using light before bedtime	15-18	0.69
F5: Using light in the morning and during daytime	19-23	0.52
McDonald's Omega coefficient for the total scale		0.73

Table A3

LEBA Short Form (18 Items)

Items	Never	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.					
05. I spend between 1 and 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
06. I spend between 30 minutes and 1 hour per day (in total) outside.					
07.I spend more than 3 hours per day (in total) outside.					
08.I spend as much time outside as possible.					
09.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.					
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 dim my mobile phone screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
14.I use a blue-filter app on my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
15. I dim my computer screen within 1 hour before attempting to fall asleep.					
16. I use tunable lights to create a healthy light environment.					
17. I use LEDs to create a healthy light environment.					
18. I use an alarm with a dawn simulation light.					

Table A4

LEBA Short Form (18 Items): Latent Structure

Factor names	Items	Reliability Coefficients
F1: Wearing blue light filters	01-03	0.96
F2: Spending time outdoors	4-9 (Item 4 is reversed)	0.83
F3: Using phone and smartwatch in bed	10-14	0.7
F4: Using light before bedtime	15-18	0.69
F5: Using light in the morning and during daytime	19-23	0.52
McDonald's Omega coefficient for the total scale		0.73

Table A5

Minimum Average Partial (MAP) method of factor number determination. MAP Statistics is the lowest in the 5th row indicating five factors are required.

MAP Statistics	dof	chisq	fit	RMSEA	BIC	eChisq	SRMR
.01125	1,080.00	4,344.31	0.18	0.08	-2,199.54	8,678.73	0.09
.01062	1,033.00	3,735.35	0.30	0.08	-2,523.72	6,414.94	0.08
.01077	987.00	3,065.44	0.38	0.07	-2,914.91	5,022.94	0.07
.01042	942.00	2,661.78	0.45	0.07	-3,045.92	3,969.03	0.06
.00938	898.00	2,237.56	0.51	0.06	-3,203.53	2,971.15	0.06
.00943	855.00	2,040.02	0.56	0.06	-3,140.53	2,441.92	0.05
.00973	813.00	1,861.69	0.59	0.05	-3,064.37	2,063.72	0.05
.00999	772.00	1,620.64	0.62	0.05	-3,057.00	1,707.87	0.04

Table A6

Demographic Characteristics: Native English Speakers

Variable	Overall, N = 262	Yes, N = 129	No, N = 133	p-value	q-value
Age	32.89 (13.66)	34.08 (15.32)	31.74 (11.77)	0.5	0.6
Sex				0.002	0.009
Female	136 (52%)	80 (62%)	56 (42%)		
Male	121 (46%)	48 (37%)	73 (55%)		
Other	5 (1.9%)	1 (0.8%)	4 (3.0%)		
Occupational Status				0.7	0.7
Work	161 (61%)	76 (59%)	85 (64%)		
School	52 (20%)	27 (21%)	25 (19%)		
Neither	49 (19%)	26 (20%)	23 (17%)		
Occupational setting				0.4	0.6
Home office/Home schooling	109 (42%)	50 (39%)	59 (44%)		
Face-to-face work/Face-to-face schooling	41 (16%)	22 (17%)	19 (14%)		
Combination of home- and face-to-face- work/schooling	53 (20%)	23 (18%)	30 (23%)		
Neither (no work or school, or in vacation)	59 (23%)	34 (26%)	25 (19%)		

¹ Mean (SD); n (%)² False discovery rate correction for multiple testing³ Wilcoxon rank sum test⁴ Fisher's exact test⁵ Pearson's Chi-squared test

Table A7

Factor loadings and communality of the retained items (Minimum 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
item07		0.5				0.267	0.733
item08		-0.49				0.252	0.748
item09		0.32				0.113	0.887
item27			0.8			0.659	0.341
item03			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
item25					0.41	0.193	0.807
item04					0.41	0.219	0.781
item01					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 A8

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

item	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA5	PA6	Communality	Uniqueness
item16	0.99						0.987	0.013
item36	0.94						0.896	0.104
item17	0.8						0.674	0.326
item11		0.82					0.698	0.302
item10		0.81					0.656	0.344
item12		0.64					0.467	0.533
item08		-0.48					0.254	0.746
item07		0.47					0.257	0.743
item09		0.33					0.122	0.878
item33			0.97				0.978	0.022
item32			0.77				0.69	0.31
item35			0.54		0.3	0.408	0.592	
item31			0.49				0.332	0.668
item03				0.84			0.728	0.272
item27				0.81			0.666	0.334
item40				0.69			0.535	0.465
item46					0.65	0.525	0.475	
item45					0.57	0.355	0.645	
item04					0.48	0.332	0.668	
item25					0.4	0.238	0.762	
item01					0.35	0.134	0.866	
item26					0.35	0.161	0.839	
item37						-0.8	0.682	0.318
item38						0.39	0.245	0.755
% of Variance	0.11	0.1	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.05		

Table A8 continued

item	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA5	PA6	Communality	Uniqueness
------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------------	------------

Note. Only loading higher than .30 is reported; Sixth factor has only two salient loadings

850

Table A9

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
item21	0.8					0.683	0.317
item04	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
item08		-0.44				0.206	0.794
item07		0.42				0.226	0.774
item09		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
item03				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

Table A9 continued

item	PA1	PA2	PA5	PA3	PA4	Communality	Uniqueness
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

851

Table A10

*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
item04	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
item08		-0.45					0.218	0.782
item07		0.42					0.229	0.771
item09		0.33					0.115	0.885
item03			0.85				0.731	0.269
item27			0.77				0.606	0.394
item40			0.72				0.533	0.467

Table A10 continued

item	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA6	PA5	Communality	Uniqueness
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
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

852

Table A11

Geographical Location of the participants (n =690)

Timezone	Number of Participants
Africa/Ceuta (UTC +01:00)	2.00
Africa/Douala (UTC +01:00)	1.00
Africa/Johannesburg (UTC +02:00)	5.00
Africa/Khartoum (UTC +02:00)	2.00
Africa/Lagos (UTC +01:00)	1.00
America/Adak (UTC -09:00)	2.00
America/Anchorage (UTC -08:00)	3.00

Table A11 continued

Timezone	Number of Participants
America/Araguaina (UTC -03:00)	2.00
America/Argentina/Buenos_Aires (UTC -03:00)	5.00
America/Argentina/Cordoba (UTC -03:00)	2.00
America/Argentina/Jujuy (UTC -03:00)	1.00
America/Bahia (UTC -03:00)	2.00
America/Blanc-Sablon (UTC -04:00)	1.00
America/Bogota (UTC -05:00)	2.00
America/Boise (UTC -06:00)	4.00
America/Cayman (UTC -05:00)	1.00
America/Chicago (UTC -05:00)	30.00
America/Costa_Rica (UTC -06:00)	2.00
America/Cuiaba (UTC -04:00)	1.00
America/Denver (UTC -06:00)	6.00
America/Detroit (UTC -04:00)	6.00
America/Edmonton (UTC -06:00)	14.00
America/Fortaleza (UTC -03:00)	1.00
America/Guatemala (UTC -06:00)	1.00
America/Guayaquil (UTC -05:00)	2.00
America/Halifax (UTC -03:00)	1.00
America/Indiana/Indianapolis (UTC -04:00)	3.00
America/Indiana/Tell_City (UTC -05:00)	1.00
America/Kentucky/Louisville (UTC -04:00)	3.00
America/Los_Angeles (UTC -07:00)	37.00
America/Martinique (UTC -04:00)	1.00
America/Mexico_City (UTC -06:00)	2.00
America/Moncton (UTC -03:00)	2.00
America/Monterrey (UTC -06:00)	1.00
America/New_York (UTC -04:00)	63.00
America/North_Dakota/Center (UTC -05:00)	1.00

Table A11 continued

Timezone	Number of Participants
America/North_Dakota/New_Salem (UTC -05:00)	1.00
America/Panama (UTC -05:00)	1.00
America/Phoenix (UTC -07:00)	7.00
America/Resolute (UTC -05:00)	1.00
America/Santiago (UTC -03:00)	8.00
America/Sao_Paulo (UTC -03:00)	19.00
America/Toronto (UTC -04:00)	16.00
America/Vancouver (UTC -07:00)	6.00
Antarctica/Macquarie (UTC +11:00)	1.00
Asia /Taipei City (UTC +08:00)	3.00
Asia/Amman (UTC +03:00)	2.00
Asia/Barnaul (UTC +07:00)	1.00
Asia/Dhaka (UTC +06:00)	1.00
Asia/Famagusta (UTC +02:00)	1.00
Asia/Ho_Chi_Minh (UTC +07:00),British - America/Tortola (UTC -04:00)	2.00
Asia/Hong_Kong (UTC +08:00)	2.00
Asia/Jakarta (UTC +07:00)	9.00
Asia/Jerusalem (UTC +02:00)	4.00
Asia/Karachi (UTC +05:00)	1.00
Asia/Kathmandu (UTC +05:45)	2.00
Asia/Kolkata (UTC +05:30)	38.00
Asia/Kuala_Lumpur (UTC +08:00)	7.00
Asia/Kuching (UTC +08:00)	2.00
Asia/Manila (UTC +08:00)	6.00
Asia/Novosibirsk (UTC +07:00)	1.00
Asia/Riyadh (UTC +03:00)	1.00
Asia/Seoul (UTC +09:00)	1.00
Asia/Shanghai (UTC +08:00)	7.00
Asia/Singapore (UTC +08:00)	1.00

Table A11 continued

Timezone	Number of Participants
Asia/Tokyo (UTC +09:00)	3.00
Asia/Tomsk (UTC +07:00)	1.00
Asia/Ulaanbaatar (UTC +08:00)	1.00
Asia/Vladivostok (UTC +10:00)	1.00
Asia/Yangon (UTC +06:30)	1.00
Asia/Yekaterinburg (UTC +05:00)	1.00
Atlantic/Canary (UTC)	1.00
Australia/Adelaide (UTC +10:30)	2.00
Australia/Brisbane (UTC +10:00)	4.00
Australia/Darwin (UTC +09:30)	1.00
Australia/Melbourne (UTC +11:00)	5.00
Australia/Perth (UTC +08:00)	2.00
Australia/Sydney (UTC +11:00)	2.00
East Africa/Dodoma (UTC +03:00)	1.00
Europe/Amsterdam (UTC +01:00)	19.00
Europe/Athens (UTC +02:00)	3.00
Europe/Belgrade (UTC +01:00)	3.00
Europe/Berlin (UTC +01:00)	53.00
Europe/Bratislava (UTC +01:00)	2.00
Europe/Brussels (UTC +01:00)	4.00
Europe/Bucharest (UTC +02:00)	3.00
Europe/Budapest (UTC +01:00)	2.00
Europe/Busingen (UTC +01:00)	3.00
Europe/Copenhagen (UTC +01:00)	3.00
Europe/Dublin (UTC)	5.00
Europe/Helsinki (UTC +02:00)	9.00
Europe/Istanbul (UTC +03:00)	6.00
Europe/Kiev (UTC +02:00)	1.00
Europe/Lisbon (UTC)	2.00

Table A11 continued

Timezone	Number of Participants
Europe/Ljubljana (UTC +01:00)	3.00
Europe/London (UTC)	57.00
Europe/Madrid (UTC +01:00)	7.00
Europe/Moscow (UTC +03:00)	8.00
Europe/Oslo (UTC +01:00)	3.00
Europe/Paris (UTC +01:00)	22.00
Europe/Prague (UTC +01:00)	3.00
Europe/Riga (UTC +02:00)	2.00
Europe/Rome (UTC +01:00)	9.00
Europe/Sofia (UTC +02:00)	1.00
Europe/Stockholm (UTC +01:00)	4.00
Europe/Tallinn (UTC +02:00)	2.00
Europe/Tirane (UTC +01:00)	1.00
Europe/Vienna (UTC +01:00)	1.00
Europe/Vilnius (UTC +02:00)	5.00
Europe/Warsaw (UTC +01:00)	15.00
Europe/Zagreb (UTC +01:00)	2.00
Europe/Zurich (UTC +01:00)	21.00
European /Skopje (UTC +01:00)	1.00
Iran /Tehran (UTC +0:30)	3.00
Pacific/Auckland (UTC +13:00)	6.00
Pacific/Chatham (UTC +13:45)	1.00
Pacific/Easter (UTC -05:00)	1.00
Pacific/Honolulu (UTC -10:00)	2.00

Table A12

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.
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.




Figure A1. Item information curve of LEBA F1. Item 16 carried highest information among the three items




Figure A2. Item information curve of LEBA F2. All items carried information across the latent trait continuum. Item 09 carried the lowest information however its information peak was higher than .20.




Figure A3. Item information curve of LEBA F3. Item 30 and 41 had relatively flat information curve with a peak lower than .20




Figure A4. Item information curve of LEBA F4. Item 38 had relatively flat information curve with a peak lower than .20




Figure A5. Item information curve of LEBA F5. Three items: 25, 04, 01 carried low information. However Item 04 had a bump at the right side of the center with a curve peak higher than .20. Item 01 and 25 had relatively flat information curve with a peak lower than .20




Figure A6. Person fit of the five fitted IRT models (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