Main Manuscript for:

The Influence of Light Pollution and Light-at-Night on the Circadian Clock

Authors

Dennis Khodasevich[1], Susan Tsui[1], Darwin Keung[1], Debra J. Skene[2], and Micaela E. Martinez[1*]

Affiliations

1. Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, USA
*correspondence: mem2353@cumc.columbia.edu
2. Chronobiology, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, UK. *corresponding author

Classification

Biological Sciences – Environmental Sciences

Keywords

Light pollution, light at night, circadian rhythm, built environment

This PDF File includes:

Main Text
Figures 1 to 4

Abstract

Humans have largely supplanted natural light cycles with a variety of artificial light sources and schedules misaligned with day-night cycles. Circadian disruption has been linked to a number of disease processes, but the extent of circadian disruption among the population is unknown. We measured light exposure and wrist temperature among residents of New York City for a full week during each of the four seasons, as well as light illuminance in nearby outdoor locations. Daily light exposure was significantly lower for individuals, compared to outdoor light sensors, for all four seasons. There was also little seasonal variation in the realized photoperiod experienced by individuals, with the only significant difference between winter and summer. We tested the hypothesis that differential light exposure impacts circadian rhythms, detected via the wrist temperature rhythm. To determine the influence of light exposure on circadian rhythms, we modeled the impact of morning, afternoon, and nighttime light exposure on the midline-estimating statistic of rhythm (MESOR). We found that morning light exposure and nighttime light exposure had a significant but opposing impact on MESOR timing. Our results demonstrate that nighttime light can shift/alter circadian rhythms to delay the morning transition from nighttime to daytime physiology, while morning light can lead to earlier onset. Our results demonstrate that circadian shifts and disruptions may be a more regular occurrence in the general population than is currently recognized. Due to the impact of circadian rhythms on health, this is convincing evidence that real-world monitoring of light exposure and circadian rhythms could lead to new advances in personalized medicine.

Significance Statement

Disruption of circadian rhythms has been linked to various diseases, but the prevalence of circadian disruption among the general population is unknown. Light plays a pivotal role in entraining circadian rhythms. Humans have largely supplanted natural light cycles with a variety of artificial light sources and by spending large amounts of time indoors. We have shown that individuals experience a pronounced disconnect from natural light cycles. This disconnect includes low daytime light exposure, high levels of light-at-night, and minimal seasonal variation in light exposure. We identified measurable changes in wrist temperature rhythms as a function of differential light exposure during the morning and nighttime hours. Our findings suggest that circadian shifts, and even disruption, may be common in the general population.

Introduction

Circadian rhythms underlie many foundational biological processes across all corners of life, ranging from prokaryotes to humans [1]. Life evolved under predictable day-night cycles. Structuring certain biological processes into 24-hour cycles allowed organisms to maximize their fitness by syncing their internal biology with the external environment [2]. In mammals, nearly all aspects of physiology operate under some level of circadian control, resulting in orchestration of physiological conditions to appropriately match 24-hour cycles in the environment [3]. Well documented circadian rhythms in mammals include: direct trafficking of various immune cells among the blood and organs [4], generating daily variation in gene transcription [5], controlling rhythms in the rate of protein translation [6], and altering functional responses to infection/vaccination [7,8]. Similarly, rhythms in melatonin, DNA damage, lipid peroxidation, and protein oxidation suggest there is circadian control involved in the response to oxidative stresses [9].

In addition to circadian rhythms, mammals display endogenous seasonal (i.e. circannual) rhythms in physiology [10]. Unlike the master circadian clock of mammals, which has been extensively studied, the circannual clock has yet to be revealed in great detail. Though its molecular architecture is unknown, the circannual clock of many mammal and bird species entrains to photoperiod (day length) [11] and regulates changes in immunity and health [12]. The working conceptual model for seasonal rhythm generation is that the circadian clock, which entrains itself to light, is modified seasonally as the duration of daylight changes with the seasons. Seasonal modulation of circadian rhythms could thus generate circannual rhythms [11,13].

Although the daily and seasonal light cycles that life evolved under continue to exist, humans have largely supplanted these natural light cycles with increased time spent indoors and new light cycles built around a variety of artificial light sources. Indoor lighting places humans in an illuminance setting that would not be experienced in nature. Similarly, outdoor lighting and light spilling from buildings causes brightness many times above the lux of moonlight within urban areas and in the skies, termed light pollution or light-at-night (LAN). Unlike other exposures, LAN does not cause direct toxicity to the body, and instead causes perturbations to the circadian system with downstream physiological consequences [14]. The evolved use of light for rhythm entrainment can have pathological consequences in the presence of artificial light, such as elevated breast cancer risk due to light pollution and light at night [15]. A growing body of evidence suggests that chronic circadian disruption can contribute to the development of various diseases, including asthma, cancer, metabolic syndrome, and cardiovascular disease [16,17,18].

People live with their own unique realized light cycles, made up of a combination of natural sunlight, ambient light pollution, and indoor artificial lighting. The extent to which daily variations in realized light cycles disrupt circadian physiology is poorly understood. In this study

we set out to characterize the realized light cycles (RLC) of people in their normal environments, compared to outdoor light cycles, and identify any associations between variations in light exposure and variations in circadian physiology. Body temperature is under circadian control and has been used for many decades to monitor the circadian clock [19]. Due to the ease of measuring body temperature using wearable devices, we used wrist temperature as a non-invasive readout of the circadian system [20]. Our overall aim was to test three hypotheses. First, *people dim out their days* by spending time indoors and *light up their nights* using artificial light. Second, we hypothesize people experience relatively uniform light exposure throughout the year instead of the natural seasonal light cycle (i.e., seasonal changes in photoperiod). Lastly, differential light exposure experienced during a normal routine can lead to shifts in circadian physiology, which could have downstream implications for health and disease.

Results

Light Exposure Around the Clock & Through the Seasons

Time series of light measured from our outdoor sensors was highly regular, relative to individual exposure, and tightly linked to local sunrise and sunset times (Figure 1a-b). There were few nonzero lux readings occurring outdoors after sunset, despite the relatively high amount of light pollution expected in NYC, our primary sample site. Due to the tight link with sunrise/sunset, seasonal changes in photoperiod were clearly observable from the outdoor sensors (Figure 1a). In contrast to outdoor light, individual light cycles exhibit a high degree of variation within and between individuals. Study participant light exposure did not closely align with sunrise and sunset times (Figure 1b). In particular, participants experienced high levels of nighttime light exposure. Relative to outdoor light, individual light exposure time series featured a high number of days with low levels of light exposure. For instance, compared to a shaded outdoor area, which regularly reached maximum daily lux values of 10^3-10^5 lux, individual light exposure rarely exceeded 10^3 lux and daily patterns were highly erratic (Figure 1b). Lastly, many individuals exhibited low levels of light exposure throughout most of their observation weeks, with one or two days of high intensity light exposure more closely resembling outdoor light readings.

As for seasonal light exposure, individuals had relatively similar total daily light exposure from season-to-season, and the amount of light experienced was lower relative to outdoor light for all four seasons (Figure 2a). Differences in daily light exposure measurements (the area under the curve of the $\log_{10}$lux time series) are highlighted in Figure 2 and Table S1. Total daily outdoor light exhibited a seasonal pattern with light highest in the summer and lowest in the winter measured by outdoor sensors. Importantly, however, total daily light exposure experienced by study participants exhibited no discernible seasonal pattern (Figure 2a; Table

S1). However, when looking at daytime light exposure, individuals exhibit a highly dampened seasonal pattern that follows the same trend as the outdoor sensors (Figure 2c). As for nighttime light, most individuals experienced some nighttime light, even though little-to-no nighttime light was detected from the outdoor sensors (Figure 2b). Thus, we infer that nighttime light exposure came from the use of indoor artificial lighting as opposed to outdoor light pollution exposure. When we partitioned the 24-hour cycle into late night, evening, morning, and afternoon we found that individuals experienced the most variation in light exposure late night (relative standard error, RSE = 11.83). While the most consistent light exposure was in the afternoon (RSE = 2.06).

The Effect of Light-at-Night and Morning Light on Circadian Physiology

Individuals exhibited a large degree of variation in daily wrist temperature but followed the same general trend of reaching a maximum wrist temperature in the late night/early morning and falling to a minimum wrist temperature in the afternoon (Figure 1c). From this we infer that the nighttime physiological state consists of warm peripheral temperature and the daytime state consists of cool peripheral temperature. The transition from nighttime to daytime physiology tended to occur in the hours around sunrise, with seasonal variation in how closely aligned the transition was to sunrise (Figure 1c). The transition to nighttime physiology was not clearly aligned with sunset and this transition time tended to be noisier among individuals and between seasons (Figure 1c).

The cluster analysis identified significant clusters shared among the light exposure and wrist temperature matrices (Figure 3a). The two most frequent and biologically relevant clusters were high temperature/low light and low temperature/high light. High wrist temperature and low light was indicative of nighttime physiology, while low temperature and high light exposure was indicative of daytime physiology. The transition from nighttime physiology to daytime physiology typically occurred between 6 and 8 AM. While the transition from daytime physiology to nighttime physiology was more variable. The most common times for daily maximum temperature were 12- 1 AM (Figure 3b). Individual daily temperature trends were relatively noisy due to periods with missing data and the presence of high frequency variation in temperature within the overall 24-hour trend. Aggregating the data across individuals revealed a 24-hour wrist temperature cycle with nighttime peaks and daytime troughs (Figure 3c).

The morning MESOR, which we define as the time point between peak nighttime body temperature and trough daytime body temperature, was used as a biological readout of the circadian phase. We used this readout specifically because it has the potential to be influenced by both nighttime light, that can disrupt the circadian clock, and daytime light, that entrains the clock. Furthermore, based on our cluster analysis, the morning MESOR coincides with the transition from nighttime physiology to daytime physiology (Fig 3a). The mean morning MESOR

was at 8:40 AM with a large standard deviation of approximately 2.8 hours. Our linear mixed model tested the effect of nighttime, morning, and afternoon light on MESOR timing. There was a significant effect of nighttime light which caused the MESOR to occur later, as well as a significant effect of morning light, which shifted the MESOR (Fig. 4a). Afternoon light had no effect (Table S2). Baseline MESOR timing varied substantially among participants, ranging from 7:00AM to 11:30AM. The effect size of morning and nighttime light exposure was similar in magnitude (morning effect estimate of -3.95e-03, SE: 9.16e-04; nighttime effect estimate of 2.76e-03, SE: 1.14e-03), suggesting they have equal but opposing effects on when the body transitions from nighttime to daytime physiology.

There are multiple ways in which circadian rhythms can be modulated to generate the observed shift in MESOR timing found by our model. One potential method is through an overall phase shift, in which the entire daily wrist temperature cycle is moved earlier or later due to the timing of light exposure. Specifically, morning light exposure may shift the entire temperature rhythm, generating an earlier morning MESOR (Fig. 4b), while nighttime light exposure shifts the MESOR later (Fig. 4c). Another potential process is through an alteration of the cycle/rhythm shape, in which the normal daily wrist temperature rhythm is temporarily distorted by light exposure. For instance, morning light exposure may lead to a faster decline in wrist temperature (Fig. 4d), as opposed to a phase shift. Similarly, nighttime light may lead to a delayed rise in wrist temperature and/or other distortions of the rhythm (Fig. 4e).

Discussion

This study characterized daily and seasonal light exposure and wrist temperature cycles in people living within their normal environment. Individual light exposure was significantly less than outdoor light across all four seasons. Low overall light exposure resulted from the use of artificial light during the day and what we assume to be little time spent outdoors, especially on weekdays. Artificial light was also used at night, and this resulted in higher light exposure at night, relative to outdoor conditions. Individuals exhibited a wide range of light-at-night exposure, ranging from undetectable levels to those similar to daytime. Some individuals were so depauperate in daytime light, and enriched in nighttime light, that half of their total daily light exposure occurred at night. Due to our sensor's inability to register light intensity values below 10 lux, we were unable to measure the effect of low intensity light-at-night and light pollution. Our evaluation of light exposure, and how it is partitioned among daytime and nighttime hours, supported our hypothesis that by using artificial light, individuals living in urban environments dim out their days and light up their nights.

The results from our seasonal analysis lead us to conclude that there is minimal seasonal variation in the realized photoperiod experienced by individuals. We had hypothesized that people experience uniform light exposure throughout the year. We did, however, see some variation in light exposure, with a significant difference between summer and winter. The

summer-winter difference in light exposure was one-fifth the magnitude of the same seasonal difference in the outdoor light sensors. The participants in our study live in New York City, which has a built environment that is heavily influenced by artificial light. We cannot extrapolate our seasonal results to all urban environments, because some cities may be less dependent on artificial light, facilitating more naturalistic seasonal cycles in light exposure. Furthermore, depending on economic/occupational and behavioral characteristics of a population, individuals living in other urban environments may have seasonal light exposure vastly different from that in New York City. Seasonal biology in humans is not well-understood, therefore, it is unknown whether the disconnect from natural light cycles we observed will have an impact on physiology and health.

Most importantly, this study revealed that differential light exposure, within the range seen in everyday life, can lead to shifts in circadian physiology, even in the general population. We identified alterations in circadian physiology in response to differential light exposure. Increased nighttime light shifted the morning MESOR later, while morning light shifted it earlier. There have been numerous elegant lab experiments demonstrating that drastic changes in light exposure (i.e., mimicking night shift and/or jet lag) can lead to circadian disruption. To our knowledge, ours is one of the first studies to show there is an effect of differential light exposure on circadian rhythms in day-to-day life. It is important to note that individuals in our study kept relatively typical daily schedules, similar to that of a 9 AM-5 PM worker. Our results suggest, if we were to survey light exposure and circadian rhythms for a broader swath of the population, we may expect to find that circadian disruption is a more regular occurrence than has been recognized.

The large degree of variability in light exposure among individuals living in a single geographic area, highlights the importance of personal light monitoring, as opposed to outdoor sensors and satellite data. Although light-at-night studies are highly represented in the chronobiology literature, we found that individuals experienced a high degree of variability in light exposure, not only at night, but across all hours of the day. This variability in light exposure may have broader implications for the generalizability of chronobiology studies conducted under strict experimental conditions. With the emerging focus on personalized medicine and the use of wearable devices to study behavior and health, we believe that the study of light exposure and circadian rhythms in real-time opens up new opportunities for individuals to harness their clock to improve health and wellbeing.

Materials/Methods

Recruitment/Data collection:

This study was conducted under Columbia University IRB (Protocol Number AAAR7297 M00Y03). We recruited 24 participants, one child age 6 yrs. and 23 adults, for this study in summer 2018. Participants were recruited via flyers placed in Upper Manhattan, New York City (NYC) and Princeton, NJ, representing high light pollution and low light pollution regions, respectively. Inclusion into the study required the participants to state that they keep a relatively consistent 8-9 hour daily sleep schedule and did not identify as night owls. The majority of participants were from NYC (n = 19), with the mean age of adult participants being 32.2 years. We aimed to have a representative sample of individuals living in Northern Manhattan; 70% of the participants identified as women, 20% of the participants identified as Hispanic/Latino, 20% identified as Asian, 20% identified as Black/African American, 30% identified as White, and 4% identified as Other.

Participants were given light illuminance sensors (HOBO® UA-002-08 Pendant Temperature/Light Data Logger) and wrist temperature sensors (iButton® temperature loggers DS1922L/DS1922T). The light sensors had a lower limit of detection of 10 lux, which limited detection of low-intensity light exposure recorded. Refer to the supplemental information for a photo of the sensors. Each participant wore their sensors simultaneously for a full week during each of the four seasonal sampling sessions. The seasonal sampling sessions were held during weeks surrounding summer solstice 2018, autumn equinox 2018, winter solstice 2018, and spring equinox 2019. Loss of light/temperature sensors during observation periods and dropout between seasons lowered the effective sample size to 18 in the Summer, 16 in the Fall, 15 in the Winter, and 12 in the Spring.

Light Exposure Characterization:

Light exposure was measured in 5-minute intervals for each week-long seasonal sampling session. While outdoor light intensity was measured in 3-minute intervals over a two-week period each season. We aligned outdoor sampling sessions with the timing of participant sampling. HOBO sensors were hung approx. 1.5 meters above ground facing north, typically on trees (refer to Supplemental Information for an image of the setup). At each outdoor sample location, one sensor was hung in a shaded location and another was hung in a well-lit location. Light illuminance, measured in lux, was $\log_{10}$ transformed for analyses. We analyzed data starting at 5 PM on the first day of sampling. Individual time series were categorized into observation days beginning at 5 PM and ending at 4:55 PM the following calendar day. Observation days were used when analyzing data over 24-hour periods. We created heatmaps to visualize changes in light illuminance over time, with each row containing each sequential light reading from within one observation day. Rows were organized to group together sequential observation days from the same light sensor within the same season.

We quantified light exposure as the area under the curve (AUC) for the $\log_{10}$lux time series using the trapezoidal rule. To study the seasonal variation in light exposure we measured (i) total daily light exposure, (ii) nighttime light exposure (i.e., sunset to 4 AM), and (iii) daytime light exposure (i.e., 4 AM to sunset) for each observation day. We calculated this for both the participant data and the outdoor data for comparison. Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test was used to compare means across seasons. To determine the effect of differential light exposure on circadian physiology, standardized nighttime (9 PM-2 AM) and morning (4 AM-11:59 AM) AUC was calculated for individual participants on each observation day. This was used as inputs for the linear mixed model described below. In order to quantify variability in light exposure at different times of day, the AUC was lastly calculated for four fixed-duration temporal windows: morning (5 AM – 11 AM), afternoon (11 AM – 5 PM), evening (5 PM – 11 PM), and late night (11 PM – 5 AM). The relative standard error of the AUC was calculated for each temporal window.

Temperature Characterization:

Wrist temperature was also taken in 5-minute intervals. Temperature readings outside of the normal biological range (< 29.5°C or > 38.5°C) were replaced with NAs, as we assumed these readings occurred when participants removed their device. To visualize global patterns in the relationship between light exposure and wrist temperature, time series matrices of light and temperature were identically gridded and treated as spatially-organized grids. Using these spatially-organized grids, we ran a Bivariate Local Moran's I using queen contiguity and 8 orders of contiguity. The Moran's I allowed us to identify significant clusters shared among the light and temperature matrices. Knowing that body temperature follows a periodic rhythm [20] with a period of approximately 24 hours, a periodic wave function was fit to each observation day of temperature readings by running a linear regression model with $\cos(2*\text{pi}*\text{Time}/24)$ and $\sin(2 * \text{pi} * \text{Time}/24)$ as predictor variables and temperature as the response variable. Wavelet analyses of the data revealed that many observation days did not exhibit a significant periodic signal. We therefore applied a goodness-of-fit measure to periodic wave function and only worked with those observation days where the average difference between predicted and observed wrist temperature was less than 1.11°C.

The fitted periodic wave functions were used to predict the timing of the MESOR (midline estimating statistic of rhythm) occurring between the peak and the trough following the daily maximum temperature within each observation day. A linear mixed model was then run with MESOR timing as the outcome, nighttime, morning, and afternoon light exposure as fixed effects, and individual participant number as the random effect (variable slope). The R package lme4 was used to fit the linear mixed model [21]. Accompanying p-values for the linear mixed model were calculated via Satterthwaite's degrees of freedom method, using the R package lmerTest [22]. Additionally, multicollinearity among the input variables was tested for

by calculating the variance inflation factor using the vif function from the R package usdm [23]. All data analysis was done in R version 3.6.2 [24]. Figures were generated using the R packages ggplot2 [25] and plotly [26].

References

1. W. L. Koukkari, R. B. Sothern, Introducing Biological Rhythms: A Primer on the Temporal Organization of Life, with Implications for Health, Society, Reproduction, and the Natural Environment (Springer Netherlands, 2006) https:/doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4701-5 (September 11, 2020).
2. S. Yerushalmi, R. M., Green, Evidence for the adaptive significance of circadian rhythms. *Ecol Lett*. 12(9):970-981 (2009).
3. J. Mermet, J. Yeung, F. Naef, Systems Chronobiology: Global Analysis of Gene Regulation in a 24-Hour Periodic World. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol 9, a028720 (2017).
4. C. Scheiermann, Y. Kunisaki, P. S. Frenette, Circadian control of the immune system. Nature Reviews Immunology 13, 190–198 (2013).
5. M. Keller, et al., A circadian clock in macrophages controls inflammatory immune responses. PNAS 106, 21407–21412 (2009).
6. J. S. Takahashi, Transcriptional architecture of the mammalian circadian clock. Nature Reviews Genetics 18, 164–179 (2017).
7. M. M. Bellet, et al., Circadian clock regulates the host response to Salmonella. PNAS 110, 9897–9902 (2013).
8. L. L. Tsoumtsa, C. Torre, E. Ghigo, Circadian Control of Antibacterial Immunity: Findings from Animal Models. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 6 (2016).
9. M. Wilking, M. Ndiaye, H. Mukhtar, N. Ahmad, Circadian Rhythm Connections to Oxidative Stress: Implications for Human Health. Antioxidants & Redox Signaling 19, 192–208 (2013).
10. E. Gwinner, Circannual Rhythms: Endogenous Annual Clocks in the Organization of Seasonal Processes (Springer-Verlag, 1986) https:/doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-82870-6 (September 11, 2020).
11. G. A. Lincoln, I. J. Clarke, R. A. Hut, D. G. Hazlerigg, Characterizing a Mammalian Circannual Pacemaker. Science 314, 1941–1944 (2006).
12. M. Martinez-Bakker, B. Helm, The influence of biological rhythms on host-parasite interactions. Trends Ecol. Evol. (Amst.) 30, 314–326 (2015).
13. H. T. VanderLeest, et al., Seasonal encoding by the circadian pacemaker of the SCN. Curr. Biol. 17, 468–473 (2007).
14. Y. Cho, et al., Effects of artificial light at night on human health: A literature review of observational and experimental studies applied to exposure assessment. Chronobiology International 32, 1294–1310 (2015).
15. P. James, et al., Outdoor Light at Night and Breast Cancer Incidence in the Nurses' Health Study II. Environmental Health Perspectives 125, 087010.

16. S. K. Davies, J. E. Ang, V. L. Revell, B. Holmes, A. Mann, F. P. Robertson, et al, Effect of sleep deprivation on the human metabolome. Proc Natl Acad Sci 2014;111:10761–6 (2014).
17. R. J. Martin, S. Banks-Schlegel, Chronobiology of asthma. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 158:1002–7 (1998).
18. J. A. Evans, A. J. Davidson, Health consequences of circadian disruption in humans and animal models. Prog Mol Biol Transl Sci. (2013).
19. J. Morf, U. Schibler, Body temperature cycles: gatekeepers of circadian clocks. *Cell Cycle*. 12(4):539-540. (2013).
20. J. A. Sarabia, M. A. Rol, P. Mendiola, J. A. Madrid, Circadian rhythm of wrist temperature in normal-living subjects A candidate of new index of the circadian system. *Physiol Behav*. 95(4):570-580 (2008).
21. Douglas Bates, Martin Maechler, Ben Bolker, Steve Walker (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software, 67(1), 1-48.
22. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB (2017). “lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models.” Journal of Statistical Software, *82*(13), 1-26.
23. Naimi B, Hamm Na, Groen TA, Skidmore AK, Toxopeus AG (2014). “Where is positional uncertainty a problem for species distribution modelling.” Ecography, *37*, 191-203.
24. R Core Team (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria
25. H. Wickham. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New York, 2016.
26. C. Sievert. Interactive Web-Based Data Visualization with R, plotly, and shiny. Chapman and Hall/CRC Florida, 2020.

Figures



Figure 1: Time series data from light and temperature sensors. *Daily light exposure time series across all four seasons with mean monthly sunrise and sunset times shown in blue from (a) outdoor sensors and (b) individual light exposure. Individual data consists of lux readings taken at 5-minute intervals over 7 days from study participants. Outdoor data consists of lux readings taken at 3-minute intervals over 9 days from 2 sensors located in upper Manhattan. One sensor was in a shaded location and one sensor was located in a well-lit area on the Columbia University campus. (c) Daily wrist temperature time series across all four seasons with approximate sunrise and sunset times shown in yellow. Temperatures outside of realistic human wrist temperature range (< 29.5°C or > 38.5°C) are shown as white spaces.*



***Figure 2**: **Daily light exposure across seasons for individual (Ind.) and outdoor (Out.) sensors**. (a) Total daily light exposure. (b) Nighttime (Sunset - 4am) light exposure. (c) Daytime light exposure (4am - Sunset).*



Figure 3: Wrist temperature trend characterization*. (a) Local bivariate Moran's I cluster analysis of individual light exposure and wrist temperature trend data. (b) Relative frequency of daily maximum temperature timing, based on hourly averages. (c) All wrist temperature data shown as a highly transparent scatterplot, with season-specific trend lines formed from a generalized additive model.*



Figure 4: Effect of light exposure on wrist temperature*. (a) Projected change in MESOR timing at different levels of nighttime and morning light exposure, based on data outputs from the mixed model. (b-e) Proposed explanations for the effects of light exposure on wrist temperature rhythms. Normal temperature rhythms are shown in black. Shifted/altered temperature rhythms are shown in orange for the morning light and blue for the nighttime light.*