Investigating the causal interplay between sleep traits and risk of acute myocardial infarction: a Mendelian randomization study

Nikhil Arora[1,2], Laxmi Bhatta[1,3], Eivind Schjelderup Skarpsno[4,5], Håvard Dalen[6,7,8], Bjørn Olav Åsvold[1,9,10], Ben Michael Brumpton[1,9,11], Rebecca Claire Richmond[2,12], Linn Beate Strand[4]*

[1]K.G. Jebsen Center for Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; [2]Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom; [3]Institute for Molecular Bioscience, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; [4]Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; [5]Department of Neurology and Clinical Neurophysiology, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim, Norway; [6]Department of Circulation and Medical Imaging, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; [7]Department of Medicine, Levanger Hospital, Nord-Trøndelag Hospital Trust, Levanger, Norway; [8]Clinic of Cardiology, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim, Norway; [9]HUNT Research Centre, Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Levanger, Norway; [10]Department of Endocrinology, Clinic of Medicine, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim, Norway; [11]Department of Medicine, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim, Norway; and [12]MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom.

* Corresponding author: e-mail: nikhil.arora@ntnu.no, or docnikhilarora@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Few studies have investigated the joint effects of sleep traits on the risk of acute myocardial infarction (AMI). No studies have used factorial Mendelian randomization (MR) which may reduce confounding, reverse causation and measurement error. Thus, it is prudent to study joint effects using robust methods to propose sleep-targeted interventions which lower the risk of AMI.

Methods: The causal interplay between combinations of two sleep traits (including insomnia symptoms, sleep duration or chronotype) on the risk of AMI was investigated using factorial MR. Genetic risk scores for each sleep trait were dichotomized at their median in UK Biobank (UKBB) and the second survey of the Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT2). A combination of two sleep traits constituting 4 groups were analysed to estimate the risk of AMI in each group using a 2x2 factorial MR design.

Results: In UKBB, participants with high genetic risk for both insomnia symptoms and short sleep had the highest risk of AMI (HR 1.10; 95% CI 1.03, 1.18), although there was no evidence of any relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI 0.03; 95% CI -0.07, 0.12). These estimates were less precise in HUNT2 (HR 1.02; 95% CI 0.93, 1.13), possibly due to weak instruments. Participants with high genetic risk for both a morning chronotype and insomnia symptoms (HR 1.09; 95% CI 1.03, 1.17); and a morning chronotype and short sleep (HR 1.11; 95% CI 1.04, 1.19) had the highest risk of AMI in UKBB, although there was no evidence of any relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI 0.03; 95% CI -0.06, 0.12; and RERI 0.05; 95% CI -0.05, 0.14, respectively). Chronotype was not available in HUNT2.

Conclusions: All combinations of sleep traits increased the risk of AMI except those with long sleep, but the risk from these combinations did not exceed the additive risk from the individual sleep traits.

Keywords: Insomnia, Sleep duration, Chronotype, Myocardial infarction, Mendelian randomization.

Background

Poor sleep is a major public health problem that has emerged as being associated with several health conditions [1, 2], including those related to cardiovascular health such as hypertension [2, 3], obesity [2, 4], and dyslipidaemia [5]. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) account for a large part of global morbidity, and are the leading cause of death [6]. Since sleep problems can be managed through cognitive-behavioural therapy and medication [7], understanding how sleep impacts cardiovascular health can have important implications for interventions that aim to target sleep with an objective to lower the risk of CVDs.

Sleep is a complex and multifaceted biological phenomenon which comprises several traits [8]. Previous observational studies have mainly focused on individual sleep traits as separate risk factors for CVDs [9–13]. Insomnia symptoms, short or long sleep duration, and evening chronotype have been identified as individual risk factors for acute myocardial infarction (AMI) [9, 10, 12, 13]. A few studies have investigated the joint effects of sleep traits and have found evidence that some of these sleep traits interact to increase the risk of cardiovascular outcomes [9, 14, 15]. For instance, insomnia with short sleep considered the most biologically severe sleep disorder phenotype [16], has been found to be associated with increased cardiometabolic risk [14, 17, 18]. In our recent study, we observed that those reporting two sleep traits (including insomnia symptoms, short sleep, long sleep and evening chronotype) had a higher incidence of AMI than those reporting only one sleep trait. Any relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI) was only observed among those reporting insomnia symptoms and long sleep duration [9]. However, all evidence on the joint effects of sleep traits on the risk of AMI is based on conventional observational studies, predisposing findings to biases due to residual confounding, reverse causation and measurement error [19].

Mendelian randomization (MR) uses genetic variants as instruments that are robustly associated with a modifiable risk factor to investigate the causal effect on an outcome [20]. MR exploits the fact that genetic variants are randomly assigned to individuals and fixed at conception, making it less susceptible to the

biases observed in conventional observational studies. Recent MR studies have evaluated individual effects of sleep traits on CVDs [12, 21–26], providing evidence of an adverse effect of insomnia symptoms on prevalent coronary artery disease (CAD) [21, 22, 25, 26] and AMI [24], and a protective effect per hour increase in sleep duration and an adverse effect of short sleep on CAD [23] and AMI [12, 23]. MR investigations exploring the joint effects of sleep traits on risk of AMI could provide more robust evidence on the risk of AMI from experiencing two sleep traits simultaneously.

In this study, we used one-sample and factorial MR to investigate the causal effects of individual sleep traits (insomnia symptoms, sleep duration and chronotype) and their joint effects on incident AMI, in two large longitudinal studies (UK Biobank (UKBB) and the second survey of the Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT2)).

Methods

Study participants

UK Biobank

Out of 9.2 million eligible adults (ranging between 40 and 70 years) in the UK who were invited to participate, more than 500 000 participated in the study during March 2006 – July 2010 (5.5% response rate). The participants visited one of the 22 study assessment centres located throughout England, Scotland and Wales, where they signed an electronic consent and completed a touchscreen questionnaire along with a brief computer-assisted interview. They provided detailed information about their lifestyle, physical measures and had blood, urine and saliva samples collected and stored for future analysis, as described elsewhere [27]. The UKBB received approval from the National Health Service (NHS) Research Ethics Service (reference number 11/NW/0382) and the database was created in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

HUNT study

All inhabitants aged 20 years or older in the Nord-Trøndelag region of Norway, were invited to participate in a four-phase population-based health survey (the HUNT study), first in 1984-86 (HUNT1), then in 1995-97 (HUNT2) and 2006-08 (HUNT3), and last in 2017-19 (HUNT4). This study is based on data from HUNT2, where 93 898 individuals were invited and 65 228 (69.5%) participated [28]. The invitation letter was sent by mail along with a self-administered questionnaire. The participants attended examination stations where clinical examination was performed, and blood samples were drawn by trained personnel. Detailed information regarding HUNT2 study has been published elsewhere [29]. The HUNT Study was approved by the Data Inspectorate of Norway and recommended by the Regional Committee for Ethics in Medical Research (REK; reference number 152/95/AH/JGE). Additionally, the ethical clearance for conducting this study was obtained from the Regional Committee for Ethics in Medical Research (REK nord; reference number 2020/47206).

Sleep traits

Insomnia symptoms

In both UKBB and HUNT2, insomnia symptoms were defined as two night-time insomnia symptoms (i.e., difficulty falling asleep, difficulty maintaining sleep or waking up too early) without information about daytime impairment. Thus our definition for insomnia symptoms did not include all components used in the frameworks for diagnosing insomnia [30].

In UKBB, participants were asked: “Do you have trouble falling asleep at night or do you wake up in the middle of the night?” with response options “Never/rarely”, “Sometimes”, “Usually” or “Prefer not to answer”. Participants were classified as having insomnia symptoms if they answered “Usually”; otherwise as having no insomnia symptoms.

In HUNT2, insomnia symptoms were assessed by the following two questions: “Have you had difficulty falling asleep in the last month?”, and “During the last month, have you woken too early and not been able to get back to sleep?” with response options “Never”, “Sometimes”, “Often” or “Almost every night”. Participants who responded “Often” or “Almost every night” to at least one of these questions were classified as having insomnia symptoms. For participants in HUNT2 who answered only one of these insomnia symptom questions, we did the following: (1) if they answered “Often” or “Almost every night” to one of the questions, but did not answer the other, they were classified as having insomnia symptoms, and (2) if they answered “Never” or “Sometimes” to one of the questions, but did not answer the other, they were excluded to avoid possible misclassification.

Sleep duration

Sleep duration was assessed by the questions: “About how many hours sleep do you get in every 24 hours? (please include naps)” and “How many hours do you usually spend lying down (i.e. sleeping and/or napping) during a 24-hour period?” in UKBB and HUNT2, respectively. The answers could only contain integer values. Any influence of poor health on implausible short or long sleep durations was avoided by excluding extreme responses of less than 3 hours or more than 18 hours. Binary variables for short sleep (≤6 hours vs. 7-8 hours) and long sleep (≥ 9 hours vs. 7-8 hours) were also constructed. Sleep duration was not reported in HUNT1, HUNT3, and HUNT4.

Chronotype

Chronotype (morning or evening chronotype) in UKBB was assessed by the question: “Do you consider yourself to be?” with response options “Definitely a ‘morning’ person”, “More a ‘morning’ than ‘evening’ person”, “More an ‘evening’ than a ‘morning’ person”, “Definitely an ‘evening’ person”, “Do not know”, or “Prefer not to answer”. Participants were classified as having a morning chronotype if they reported “Definitely a ‘morning’ person” or “More a ‘morning’ than ‘evening’ person”, and as having an evening

chronotype if they reported “More an ‘evening’ than a ‘morning’ person” or “Definitely an ‘evening’ person”. Other responses were coded as missing. Chronotype was not reported in any survey of the HUNT Study.

Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

In UKBB, participants were followed through record linkage to the Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) for England, Scottish Morbidity Record (SMR) and Patient Episode Database for Wales (PEDW) where health-related outcomes had been defined by International Classification of Diseases (ICD)-9 and ICD-10 codes (Field IDs: 41270, 41271, 41280 and 41281). Also, mortality records were obtained from the National Health Service (NHS) Digital for participants in England and Wales, and from the NHS Central Register (part of the National Records of Scotland) for participants in Scotland where cause of death had been defined by ICD-10 codes (Field IDs: 40001 and 40000).

In HUNT2, participants were followed via linkage to the medical records from the three hospitals (St. Olavs Hospital, Levanger Hospital and Namsos Hospital) of the Nord-Trøndelag region where health-related outcomes had been defined by ICD-9 and ICD-10 codes. Mortality records were identified by a linkage to the National Cause of Death Registry where cause of death had been defined by ICD-10 codes.

Any hospitalization or death due to AMI were identified using ICD-9 code 410, and ICD-10 codes I21 and I22. Each participant was followed until either first diagnosis/death due to AMI, death due to other cause, loss to follow-up, or end of follow-up (March 23, 2021 for UKBB and Dec. 31, 2020 for HUNT2). Incident cases were defined as the first occurrence of either hospitalization or death due to AMI during follow-up. Participants with any previous AMI episode(s) before their date of participation in the study regarded as prevalent cases, were excluded in the study.

Covariates

Several factors to be potential confounders of the exposure-outcome relation were considered. The covariates selected a priori were age, gender, marital status (married, unmarried or separated/divorced/widowed), frequency of alcohol intake (never, monthly, weekly, or daily), smoking history (never, ex-smoker or current smoker), body mass index (BMI), level of physical activity (inactive/low, moderate, or high), Townsend deprivation index (TDI; for UKBB only), education attainment (≤10 years, 11-13 years, or ≥14 years), shift work (yes or no), employment status (employed or not employed), systolic blood pressure, blood cholesterol levels, blood glucose levels, depression (yes or no in UKBB; and Hospital Anxiety and Depression Score (HADS) – Depression scores in HUNT2), anxiety (yes or no in UKBB; and HADS – Anxiety scores in HUNT2), use of sleep medication (yes or no) and chronic illness (yes or no). The details on how covariates were handled are described in the supplementary material.

Genetic variants

In UKBB, participants were genotyped using either one of the UK BiLEVE or the UK Biobank Axiom genotyping chips. The genetic variants used were extracted genotypes from the UK Biobank imputation dataset (imputed to the UK10K plus 1000 Genomes phase 3 and Haplotype Reference Consortium reference panels), that were quality controlled by exclusion of samples with third degree or close relatives, sex mismatch, those identified to be outliers of heterozygosity and of non-European descent [31, 32]. In HUNT, participants were genotyped with one of three different Illumina HumanCoreExome genotyping chips (HumanCoreExome 12 v.1.0, HumanCoreExome 12 v.1.1, and UM HUNT Biobank v.1.0), where genotypes from different chips were quality controlled separately and reduced to a common set of variants. The quality control measures used were similar to UKBB [33].

A total of 248 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were identified as robustly associated with insomnia symptoms [34], 78 SNPs associated with 24-hour sleep duration [35], and 351 SNPs associated with morning preference chronotype [36], at a genome-wide significance level ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) from three large genome-wide association studies (GWASs). In addition, 27 and 8 SNPs were identified to associate with short and long sleep duration, respectively [35]. The detailed information about discovery GWASs from where genetic instruments were identified were listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of genome-wide significant genetic instruments of sleep traits in the discovery genome-wide association studies.

Sleep traits	**Discovery GWAS**	**PMID**	**N**	**Cohorts used by the discovery GWAS**		**No. of SNPs identified**
				UKBB	**23andMe**	
Insomnia symptoms	Jansen et al., 2019 [34]	30804565	1 331 010	109 402 cases and 277 131 controls	288 557 cases and 655 920 controls	248
24-hour sleep duration (h)	Dashti et al., 2019 [35]	30846698	446 118	N.A.	Not included	78
Short sleep (≤6 h vs. 7-8 h)	Dashti et al., 2019 [35]	30846698	411 934	106 192 cases and 305 742 controls	Not included	27
Long sleep (≥9 h vs. 7-8 h)	Dashti et al., 2019 [35]	30846698	339 926	34 184 cases and 305 742 controls	Not included	8
Chronotype (morning preference)*	Jones et al., 2019 [36]	30696823	651 295	252 287 cases and 150 908 controls	120 478 cases and 127 622 controls	351

GWAS indicated genome-wide association studies; N, sample size; SNPs, single nucleotide polymorphisms; UKBB, UK Biobank; and N.A., Not applicable.
* In the discovery GWAS of chronotype, the chronotype increasing allele is morning preference.

Statistical analysis

Genetic risk score (GRS) for each sleep trait were created as an instrument that could overcome the weak effect of most SNPs on their corresponding sleep trait [37]. Weighted GRS (wGRS) were calculated as the sum of the participants' sleep trait increasing alleles (morning preference alleles for chronotype), weighted by the variant effect sizes from the external GWAS. wGRS were incorporated for our main analysis in HUNT2 only, whereas in UKBB, we used unweighted GRS (uwGRS) calculated as sum of the sleep trait increasing alleles. Since all included discovery GWASs used the UKBB cohort, the use of internal weights to calculate wGRS is not recommended [37].

Instrument strength was assessed by regressing each sleep trait on their respective GRS and reporting R^2 and F-statistics. The causal effects of individual sleep traits (insomnia symptoms, 24-hour sleep duration, short sleep, long sleep and chronotype) on the risk of incident AMI were tested using a one-sample MR analysis. A factorial MR analysis was used to investigate the joint causal effects of any two sleep traits (i.e., insomnia symptoms and short sleep, or insomnia symptoms and long sleep, or insomnia symptoms and chronotype, or short sleep and chronotype, or long sleep and chronotype) on the risk of incident AMI. All analyses were conducted using R version 3.6.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

One-sample MR analysis

One-sample MR analysis was performed for each sleep trait using individual-level data separately in UKBB and HUNT2. A two-stage least-squares (TSLS) regression estimator method was used to calculate average causal hazard ratios (HRs). The first stage involved regression of each sleep trait (linear regression for 24-hour sleep duration, and logistic regression for other sleep traits) on their GRS, and the second stage consisted of a Cox regression of AMI status on the fitted values from the first stage regression, with adjustment for age at recruitment, gender, assessment centre (in UKBB), genetic principal components (40 in UKBB and 20 in HUNT2), and genotyping chip in both stages. As recommended for MR analysis with a binary outcome [38], the first stage regression was restricted to participants who did not experience AMI. To obtain corrected standard errors, a bootstrapping method was applied with 2000 iterations in UKBB and 5000 iterations in HUNT2 [38]. The causal estimates for insomnia symptoms, short sleep, long sleep and chronotype were scaled to represent the risk increase in AMI per doubling in the odds of these exposures, by multiplying the obtained β values by 0.693 as previously described [39]. The causal estimate for 24-hour sleep duration represents the risk increase in AMI per additional hour of sleep.

Factorial MR analysis

A 2x2 factorial MR was applied where each of the sleep traits (except 24-hour sleep duration) was dichotomized at their median GRS (uwGRS for UKBB and wGRS for HUNT2), with values equal to or below the median represented low genetic risk for the sleep trait, and values above the median represented high genetic risk for the sleep trait. Thus, for any combination of two sleep traits, participants were categorized into 4 groups according to their genetic predisposition. For instance, when combining insomnia symptoms and short sleep, participants were categorized into: *"Both GRS ≤ median"* (reference; representing low genetic risk for both insomnia symptoms and short sleep), *"Insomnia GRS > median"* (representing high genetic risk for insomnia symptoms only), *"Short sleep GRS > median*" (representing high genetic risk for short sleep only) and *"Both GRS > median"* (representing high genetic risk for both insomnia symptoms and short sleep). Cox regression was then used to investigate the association between these groups and incident AMI, with adjustment for age at recruitment, gender, assessment centre (in UKBB), genetic principal components (40 in UKBB and 20 in HUNT2), and genotyping chip. Furthermore, interaction between any two sleep traits on risk of AMI was assessed by calculating relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI) using the risk estimates obtained for each sleep trait combination when none of the HRs were less than 1 (i.e. preventive) [40, 41]. RERI equals 0 implies exact additivity (no interaction), RERI > 0 implies more than additivity (positive interaction or synergism), and RERI < 0 implies less than additivity (negative interaction or antagonism).

Sensitivity analyses

To check the proportionality of hazards, the Pearson's correlations were used to test Schoenfeld residuals from one-sample MR and 2x2 factorial MR Cox regression models for an association with follow-up time.

To check the robustness of the findings, the one-sample MR and 2x2 factorial MR analyses were repeated using uwGRS in HUNT2.

To assess the second MR assumption that the genetic instruments used are independent of confounders, associations of the GRS and potential confounders were investigated in UKBB and HUNT2. Furthermore, one-sample MR analysis adjusted for any potential confounders found strongly associated with the sleep trait GRS in two cohorts (beyond a Bonferroni significance threshold of $P < 5.88x10^{-4}$ in UKBB and $P < 7.81x10^{-4}$ in HUNT2) were performed.

To investigate potential directional pleiotropy, the causal estimates from the TSLS method were compared with estimates from MR-Egger regression, weighted median and weighted mode-based methods obtained using summary statistics in UKBB and HUNT2. Each of these methods make different assumptions about the genetic instruments used, where the MR-Egger regression method gives a valid causal estimate under the InSIDE (instrument strength independent of direct effect) assumption and its intercept allows the size of any unbalanced pleiotropic effect to be determined [42], weighted median method assumes at least 50% of genetic variants are valid [43], and weighted mode-based estimation method assumes a plurality of genetic variants are valid [44]. Thus, consistent estimates across these methods strengthens causal evidence. To further investigate pleiotropy due to insomnia symptoms' instruments, 57 SNPs found robustly associated with insomnia by Lane *et al.* [25] in an older GWAS on UKBB (n = 345 022 cases and 108 357 controls) representing crucial variants with larger effect sizes, were used in a post hoc one-sample MR Cox regression analysis using different methods.

To evaluate potential impact of winner's curse, one-sample MR analysis was repeated using genetic variants that replicated at a genome-wide significance level ($P < 5x10^{-8}$) in a large independent dataset for insomnia symptoms (23andMe, n = 944 477; see Additional file, Table G1) [34] and chronotype (23andMe, n = 240 098; see Additional file, Table G5) [36].

As an additional analysis, continuous factorial MR analysis using two GRS (for any combination of two sleep traits) as quantitative traits and their product term was applied, to avoid potential bias due to arbitrary

dichotomization and to maximize power [45]. Further, RERI was calculated as test of interaction using the risk estimates for the quantitative GRS and their product term for each sleep trait combination when none of the HRs were less than 1 (i.e. preventive) for AMI [40, 46].

Results

Among the 336 262 participants in UKBB who passed the genetic quality control and had information available on the sleep traits, 11 399 (3.4%) had ever received the diagnosis of AMI. Of these, 3 586 (1.1%) prevalent cases with AMI diagnosis were excluded, and 7 813 (2.3%) had their first AMI diagnosis during a mean (SD) follow-up of 11.7 (1.9) years (see Additional file, Figure S1). Among the 45 602 participants in HUNT2 who passed the genetic quality control and had information available for sleep traits of interest, 5 362 (11.7%) had ever received diagnosis of AMI. Of these, 874 (1.9%) prevalent cases with AMI diagnosis were excluded, and 4 488 (10.0%) had their first AMI diagnosis during a mean (SD) follow-up of 20.4 (6.9) years (see Additional file, Figure S1).

Table 2: Baseline characteristics of study participants who had an episode of acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and not had AMI during follow-up in UK Biobank and HUNT2.

	UK Biobank (N = 332 676)		**HUNT2 (N = 44 728)**	
	No AMI diagnosis	**AMI diagnosis**	**No AMI diagnosis**	**AMI diagnosis**
Total, % (n)	97.65 (324 863)	2.35 (7 813)	89.97 (40 240)	10.03 (4 488)
Variables, % (n)				
Male	44.03 (143 029)	70.24 (5 488)	43.87 (17 654)	61.27 (2 750)
Missing, % (n)	-	-	-	-
Married	74.19 (241 001)	72.60 (5 672)	61.67 (24 814)	69.43 (3 116)
Missing, % (n)	0.48 (1 561)	0.93 (73)	0.23 (91)	0.07 (3)
Weekly alcohol intake	50.55 (164 215)	47.43 (3 706)	22.59 (9 089)	18.72 (840)
Missing, % (n)	0.05 (161)	0.08 (6)	7.31 (2 943)	9.54 (428)
Current smokers	9.97 (32 392)	18.17 (1 420)	27.31 (10 991)	32.53 (1 460)
Missing, % (n)	0.29 (956)	0.37 (29)	1.52 (610)	1.96 (88)
Highly physically active	33.39 (108 475)	31.95 (2 496)	33.41 (13 443)	22.59 (1 041)
Missing, % (n)	17.69 (57 463)	19.12 (1 494)	7.33 (2 950)	14.84 (666)
Tertiary education	43.24 (140 458)	37.71 (2 946)	21.74 (8 747)	11.85 (532)
Missing, % (n)	0.74 (2 418)	1.15 (90)	3.16 (1 273)	7.20 (323)
Shift workers	5.17 (16 797)	5.30 (414)	15.91 (6 403)	9.05 (406)
Missing, % (n)	0.27 (888)	0.22 (17)	7.31 (2 940)	6.66 (299)
Employed	57.28 (186 073)	43.45 (3 395)	68.66 (27 627)	45.94 (2 062)
Missing, % (n)	0.24 (773)	0.18 (14)	0.95 (381)	0.62 (28)

Use of sleep medication(s)	0.97 (3 135)	1.37 (107)	6.10 (2 454)	10.90 (489)
Missing, % (n)	-	-	9.39 (3 778)	10.90 (489)
Suffering from depression	12.06 (39 190)	15.10 (1 180)	-	-
Missing, % (n)	-	-	-	-
Suffering from anxiety	6.63 (21 543)	10.11 (790)	-	-
Missing, % (n)	-	-	-	-
Suffering from chronic illness	30.84 (100 189)	47.13 (3 682)	30.27 (12 182)	48.84 (2 192)
Missing, % (n)	2.03 (6 600)	2.20 (172)	3.02 (1 215)	4.48 (201)
Variables, mean (SD)				
Age, *years*	56.82 (7.95)	60.36 (6.82)	47.71 (16.07)	61.12 (13.23)
Missing, % (n)	-	-	-	-
TDI	-1.60 (2.91)	-1.22 (3.12)	-	-
Missing, % (n)	0.12 (386)	0.12 (9)	-	-
BMI, *kg/m*^{2}	27.37 (4.75)	28.74 (4.80)	26.18 (4.04)	27.41 (4.03)
Missing, % (n)	0.31 (993)	0.41 (32)	0.46 (184)	0.87 (39)
SBP, *mmHg*	138.20 (18.59)	145.80 (19.18)	135.50 (20.44)	148.80 (22.56)
Missing, % (n)	0.09 (297)	0.06 (6)	0.11 (43)	0.13 (6)
Serum cholesterol, *mmol/L*	5.74 (1.13)	5.70 (1.28)	5.80 (1.23)	6.55 (1.21)
Missing, % (n)	4.56 (14 819)	4.62 (361)	0.11 (44)	0.11 (5)
Blood glucose, *mmol/L*	5.11 (1.17)	5.41 (1.86)	5.36 (1.36)	5.90 (1.96)
Missing, % (n)	12.73 (41 362)	12.39 (968)	0.15 (61)	0.20 (9)
HADS – D scores	-	-	3.31 (2.97)	4.01 (3.15)
Missing, % (n)	-	-	6.38 (2 569)	11.25 (505)
HADS – A scores	-	-	4.18 (3.25)	4.06 (3.37)
Missing, % (n)	-	-	13.01 (5 237)	22.08 (991)

AMI indicates acute myocardial infarction; SD, standard deviation; TDI, Townsend deprivation index; BMI, body mass index; SBP, systolic blood pressure; HADS – D scores, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Score – Depression scores; and HADS – A scores, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Score – Anxiety scores.

Table 2 represents the baseline characteristics of the study participants stratified by their AMI status in UKBB and HUNT2. Participants with an incidence of AMI during follow-up in the UKBB and HUNT2 were older and more likely to be males and current smokers. They were more likely to have used sleep medication(s), have a higher BMI, higher systolic blood pressure, higher blood glucose levels, and were suffering more from depression and chronic illness. They were also less likely to consume alcohol, be physically active, have a tertiary education and be employed compared to participants with no episodes of AMI. The HUNT2 participants with an AMI incidence during follow-up were more likely to have higher serum cholesterol levels, but less likely to be suffering from anxiety and working shifts in contrast to UKBB participants when compared to participants with no episode of AMI.

Among UKBB participants, the variance explained by the uwGRS in insomnia symptoms, 24-hour sleep duration (h), short sleep (≤6 h vs. 7-8 h), long sleep (≥9 h vs. 7-8 h) and morning chronotype were 0.41%, 0.59%, 0.18%, 0.11% and 1.54%, respectively, and corresponding F-statistics were 1370.92, 1962.0, 558.68, 285.42 and 5202.20 (see Additional file, Table S1). The variance explained by the wGRS among HUNT2 participants in insomnia symptoms, 24-hour sleep duration, short sleep and long sleep were 0.16%, 0.09%, 0.01% and 0.01%, respectively, and the corresponding F-statistics were 71.17, 38.94, 4.97 and 4.07 (see Additional file, Table S1).

Figure 1: One-sample Mendelian randomization Cox regression analysis for risk of incident acute myocardial infarction associated with sleep traits in UK Biobank and HUNT2.

Sleep traits	N (incident cases)	Hazard ratio (95% CI)
Insomnia symptoms (Yes vs. No)[#]		
UK Biobank[†]	332 676 (7 813)	1.18 (1.07, 1.31)
HUNT2[‡]	44 728 (4 488)	1.23 (1.00, 1.55)
24-hour sleep duration (h)		
UK Biobank[†]	332 676 (7 813)	0.97 (0.75, 1.29)
HUNT2[‡]	44 728 (4 488)	0.76 (0.31, 1.79)
Short sleep (≤6 h vs. 7-8 h)[#]		
UK Biobank[†]	307 135 (7 028)	1.14 (0.97, 1.32)
HUNT2[‡]	33 243 (3 058)	0.87 (0.15, 3.24)
Long sleep (≥9 h vs. 7-8 h)[#]		
UK Biobank[†]	253 811 (5 762)	0.83 (0.67, 0.99)
HUNT2[‡]	41 945 (4 209)	0.53 (0.01, 8.28)
Chronotype (morning preference)[#]		
UK Biobank[†]	332 676 (7 813)	1.06 (0.99, 1.11)



CI indicates confidence interval.
[†] Derived using unweighted genetic risk score for each sleep trait, with adjustment for age, gender, assessment centre, 40 genetic principal components, and genotyping chip.
[‡] Derived using weighted genetic risk score for each sleep trait, with adjustment for age, gender, 20 genetic principal components, and genotyping chip.
[#] Hazard ratio (95% CI) scaled to per doubling in odds of the sleep trait. Chronotype was missing in HUNT2.

Causal effects of individual sleep traits on the risk of AMI

There was evidence for an adverse causal effect on AMI risk per doubling in odds of insomnia symptoms in UKBB (HR 1.18; 95% CI 1.07, 1.31) and HUNT2 (HR 1.23; 95% CI 1.00, 1.55) (Figure 1). The estimates for 24-hour sleep duration suggested no causal effect on AMI per hour increase in sleep duration in UKBB

(HR 0.97; 95% CI 0.75, 1.29) and HUNT2 (HR 0.76; 95% CI 0.31, 1.79). The sleep duration findings were further investigated using genetic variants specifically associated with short and long sleep duration. There was weak evidence for an adverse causal effect on AMI per doubling in odds of short sleep in UKBB (HR 1.14; 95% CI 0.97, 1.32) but not in HUNT2 (HR 0.87; 95% CI 0.15, 3.24). However, there was evidence for a protective causal effect on AMI per doubling in odds of long sleep in UKBB (HR 0.83; 95% CI 0.67, 0.99), which was underpowered in HUNT2 (HR 0.53; 95% CI 0.01, 8.28). Also, there was some evidence for an adverse causal effect on AMI per doubling in odds of morning chronotype in UKBB (HR 1.06; 95% CI 0.99, 1.11) (Figure 1).

Joint causal effects of sleep traits on the risk of AMI

The distribution of the baseline characteristics across the factorial groups for any combinations of two sleep traits were equal (see Additional file, Table S2 – S8), which indicates random allocation of the study participants into approximately equal-sized groups based on their genetic risk for any combinations of two sleep traits.

In addition, UKBB participants with high genetic risk for insomnia symptoms and high genetic risk for a morning chronotype had slightly higher risk of AMI (HR 1.03; 95% CI 0.97, 1.10 and HR 1.03; 95% CI 0.97, 1.10, respectively) whereas participants with high genetic risk for both sleep traits had the highest risk (HR 1.09; 95% CI 1.03, 1.17) (Figure 2). There was no evidence of interaction (RERI 0.03; 95% CI -0.06, 0.12). Similarly, the UKBB participants with high genetic risk for short sleep and high genetic risk for a morning chronotype had slightly higher risk of AMI (HR 1.04; 95% CI 0.98, 1.12 and HR 1.02; 95% CI 0.96, 1.10, respectively), whereas participants with high genetic risk for both had the highest risk (HR 1.11; 95% CI 1.04, 1.19) (Figure 2), although again with no evidence of interaction (RERI 0.05; 95% CI -0.05, 0.14). The joint effects of long sleep and morning chronotype were imprecise and not conclusive (Figure 2).

Figure 2: 2x2 factorial Mendelian randomization Cox regression analysis assessing the joint effects of two sleep traits with risk of incident acute myocardial infarction in UK Biobank and HUNT2

	UK Biobank†		HUNT2†	
	N (incident cases)	Hazard ratio (95% CI)*	N (incident cases)	Hazard ratio (95% CI)*
Insomnia symptoms – Short sleep				
Both GRS ≤ median	81 895 (1 793)	1 [Reference]	8 925 (823)	1 [Reference]
Insomnia GRS > median	71 674 (1 599)	1.03 (0.96, 1.10)	7 697 (730)	1.08 (0.98, 1.20)
Short sleep GRS > median	71 673 (1 658)	1.05 (0.98, 1.12)	7 697 (684)	1.00 (0.90, 1.10)
Both GRS > median	81 893 (1 978)	1.10 (1.03, 1.18)	8 924 (821)	1.02 (0.93, 1.13)
Insomnia symptoms – Long sleep				
Both GRS ≤ median	73 306 (1 662)	1 [Reference]	10 242 (1 007)	1 [Reference]
Insomnia GRS > median	75 001 (1 803)	1.07 (1.00, 1.14)	10 731 (1 137)	1.07 (0.98, 1.16)
Long sleep GRS > median	53 600 (1 167)	0.97 (0.90, 1.04)	10 731 (1 038)	0.94 (0.87, 1.03)
Both GRS > median	51 904 (1 130)	0.96 (0.89, 1.04)	10 241 (1 027)	1.04 (0.95, 1.13)
Insomnia symptoms – Chronotype#				
Both GRS ≤ median	80 295 (1 825)	1 [Reference]		
Insomnia GRS > median	86 043 (1 992)	1.03 (0.97, 1.10)		
Chronotype GRS > median	86 043 (2 007)	1.03 (0.97, 1.10)		
Both GRS > median	80 295 (1 989)	1.09 (1.03, 1.17)		
Short sleep – Chronotype#				
Both GRS ≤ median	77 511 (1 688)	1 [Reference]		
Short sleep GRS > median	76 057 (1 741)	1.04 (0.98, 1.12)		
Chronotype GRS > median	76 058 (1 704)	1.02 (0.96, 1.10)		
Both GRS > median	77 509 (1 895)	1.11 (1.04, 1.19)		
Long sleep – Chronotype#				
Both GRS ≤ median	72 088 (1 662)	1 [Reference]		
Long sleep GRS > median	54 818 (1 198)	0.95 (0.88, 1.02)		
Chronotype GRS > median	76 219 (1 803)	1.03 (0.96, 1.10)		
Both GRS > median	50 686 (1 099)	0.94 (0.87, 1.02)		



CI indicates confidence interval; and GRS, genetic risk score.
For each sleep trait combination, both GRS ≤ median represents low genetic risk for both sleep traits in combination, sleep trait 1 GRS > median represents high genetic risk for sleep trait 1 only, sleep trait 2 GRS > median represents high genetic risk for sleep trait 2 only and both GRS > median represents high genetic risk for both sleep traits.
† Derived using unweighted genetic risk score for each sleep trait in UK Biobank, whereas using weighted genetic risk score for each sleep trait in HUNT2.
* Adjusted for age, gender, assessment centre (in UK Biobank), genetic principal components (40 in UK Biobank and 20 in HUNT2), and genotyping chip.
# Chronotype genetic risk score calculated using alleles for morning preference.

Sensitivity analysis

The proportionality of hazards assumption was met for the one-sample and the 2x2 factorial MR Cox regression analyses (see Additional file, Table S9 & S10).

The one-sample MR and 2x2 factorial MR estimates in HUNT2 using the uwGRS for the sleep traits remained unchanged (see Additional file, Table S11 & Figure S2).

After adjusting for multiple testing, several confounding factors were associated with the sleep trait uwGRS in UKBB, whereas only a few were associated with the sleep trait wGRS in HUNT2 (see Additional file, Table S12 & S13). When the one-sample MR analysis adjusting for these potential confounding factors was carried out, evidence of adverse causal effects of insomnia symptoms was slightly weaker and less precise in UKBB (HR 1.04; 95% CI 0.92, 1.17) and HUNT2 (HR 1.13; 95% CI 0.87, 1.47) (see Additional file, Table S14).

The causal estimates obtained using MR-Egger, weighted median- and weighted mode-based methods attenuated slightly and were less precise (see Additional file, Figure S3-S7, Table S15 & S16). The MR-Egger regression for insomnia symptoms in UKBB showed evidence of directional pleiotropy (HR 0.77; 95% CI 0.62, 0.95; and intercept 0.011; 95% CI 0.005, 0.017). Further, the post hoc one-sample MR analysis using insomnia symptoms variants from Lane *et al.* [25] gave similar estimates (see Additional file, Figure S8 and Table S17), where the MR-Egger regression showed evidence of directional pleiotropy in UKBB (HR 0.69; 95% CI 0.50, 0.96; and intercept 0.020; 95% CI 0.008, 0.032) and in HUNT2 (HR 0.97; 95% CI 0.78, 1.19; and intercept 0.009; 95% CI 0.001, 0.019).

The causal estimates were consistent when using GRS comprising 116 insomnia SNPs (one missing in HUNT imputed dataset) and 72 chronotype SNPs which replicated at genome-wide significance level ($P < 5x10^{-8}$) in the independent 23andMe dataset (see Additional file, Table S18 & S19).

The estimates from the continuous factorial MR analysis using sleep trait GRS as quantitative traits (per standard deviation increase) and their product term inferred similar effects (see Additional file, Figure S9). In UKBB, the GRS for insomnia symptoms and short sleep were independently linked to an increased risk of AMI (HR 1.03; 95% CI 1.01, 1.06 and HR 1.02; 95% CI 0.99, 1.04, respectively), with no evidence of interaction (RERI 0.02; 95% CI -0.01, 0.04). Similarly, the GRS for insomnia symptoms and morning chronotype were independently associated with an increased risk of AMI (HR 1.04; 95% CI 1.02, 1.06 and

HR 1.03; 95% CI 1.00, 1.05, respectively), though there was no evidence of interaction (RERI 0.02; 95% CI -0.01, 0.04). Also, the GRS for short sleep and morning chronotype were both independently linked to an increased risk of AMI (HR 1.02; 95% CI 1.00, 1.04 and HR 1.03; 95% CI 1.00, 1.05, respectively), however suggested no evidence of interaction (RERI 0.01; 95% CI -0.02, 0.03).

Discussion

Using individual-level data from the UKBB and HUNT2 cohorts, we performed one-sample and factorial MR analyses to investigate the causal effects of individual sleep traits (insomnia symptoms, sleep duration and morning chronotype) and their joint effects on the risk of AMI. We found evidence of an adverse causal effect of insomnia symptoms and a weak causal effect of short sleep on the risk of incident AMI, while long sleep had a protective effect. We found those with a high genetic risk for two sleep traits in combination (including insomnia symptoms, short sleep, and a morning chronotype) had the highest risk of AMI in UKBB. However, there was no evidence of any relative excess risk due to interaction, suggesting that the joint effects of these sleep traits are (log-) additive. Moreover, our results suggest a protective effect of genetically predisposed long sleep among those with high genetic risk for insomnia symptoms or a morning chronotype on incident AMI in UKBB. However, these results were not replicated in HUNT2, where the estimates were imprecise.

Comparison with other studies

Direct comparison of MR results with observational findings is limited given that inherited genetic variation influences sleep behaviours over the life course, whereas observational estimates represent sleep behaviours measured at one time-point. Additionally, caution should be made when comparing our findings with other studies, due to variation in the definitions used for sleep traits.

Causal effects of individual sleep traits on the risk of AMI

Nonetheless, our finding showing evidence of an adverse causal effect of insomnia symptoms and a weak adverse causal effect of short sleep on the risk of AMI is consistent with prior observational [9, 10, 12] and MR research [12, 23, 24]. Our finding yielding evidence of a protective causal effect of long sleep on the risk of AMI contradicts with prior observational studies [9, 12], but aligns with a weak concordant effect shown by another MR study [23]. Long sleep may be an indicator of poor health status, being closely associated with depression, poor sleep quality, sedentary lifestyles and underlying comorbid conditions [47, 48], and so residual confounding or reverse causation may have biased previous observational findings. Moreover, our finding suggesting a weak causal effect of morning chronotype on the risk of AMI is inconsistent with our prior study that identified evening chronotype as detrimental [9]. Thus, further studies are needed to confirm our finding on a possible relationship between morning chronotype and an increased risk of AMI.

Joint causal effects of sleep traits on the risk of AMI

Our finding that UKBB participants with high genetic risk for both insomnia symptoms and short sleep had the highest risk of AMI is consistent with evidence from our previous observational study where we found that insomnia symptoms and short sleep together increased the risk of AMI in UKBB more than the risk attributed to either insomnia symptoms or short sleep alone [9], and is supported by finding from another prospective study [14]. Moreover, our finding suggesting no interaction between insomnia symptoms and short sleep on risk of AMI is also in line with prior research [9, 14]. However, our finding of no positive interaction between insomnia symptoms and long sleep on the risk of AMI in UKBB contrasts with our previous observational study [9], where insomnia symptoms and long sleep together were found to increase the risk of AMI beyond their mere additive effects. This may be due to biases apparent in conventional observational studies, where poor health could be a confounder that would lead to false indications of harmful consequences of prolonged sleep. If anything, our finding is suggestive of a protective effect of genetic predisposition to long sleep among those with high genetic risk for insomnia symptoms on incident AMI in UKBB.

Our findings that UKBB participants with high genetic risk for both insomnia symptoms and a morning chronotype; and those with high genetic risk for both short sleep and a morning chronotype had the highest risk of AMI are in contrast with our observational study where we found evening chronotype to be more deleterious than morning chronotype in combination with insomnia symptoms or short sleep [9]. Although there was no interaction, these observed additive effects require further investigations. Our finding that UKBB participants with high genetic risk for both long sleep and a morning chronotype likely decreased the risk of AMI is incongruous to our previous observational study, where long sleep together with morning chronotype was associated with an increased risk [9]. Thus, our finding suggestive of a protective effect of genetic predisposition to long sleep among those with high genetic risk for a morning chronotype on incident AMI require further investigation.

Potential mechanisms

The underlying mechanisms by which insomnia symptoms or short sleep increase in the risk of AMI are multifactorial [49]. Insomnia and short sleep independently increase the risk of autonomic dysfunction, by increasing sympathetic tone (stress response) consequently accompanied by increased metabolic rate, increased heart rate and decreased heart rate variability [50–53]. Further, experimentally induced sleep restriction has been shown to cause hormonal imbalance which stimulate proinflammatory pathways [54], increase appetite [55, 56] and increase insulin resistance [57]. These autonomic and hormonal disturbances lead to hypertension [58, 59], diabetes [57], dyslipidaemia and obesity [55, 56], thus constituting a set of interrelated metabolic disorders that are pathophysiological in the development of cardiac dysfunction by accelerating endothelial dysfunction and atherosclerosis [60].

The underlying mechanism by which chronotype may influence AMI is not yet established. Studies have found evening chronotypes have more susceptibility for cardiometabolic risk behaviours and risk factors

[61–63]. On the contrary, our causal findings suggest having a morning chronotype may be detrimental for incident AMI compared to having an evening chronotype. Thus, pathways explaining this association may still be uncovered through further research.

Strengths and limitations

This MR study leverages genetic information to assess the causal relationships between sleep traits and AMI, reducing the potential biases due to residual confounding, reverse causation and measurement error in conventional observational studies [19]. Another strength is that we applied factorial MR to explore the causal interplay between sleep traits on the risk of AMI, where participants were grouped based on their genetic predisposition for multiple sleep traits [45]. Moreover, this study benefitted from the use of results from three large GWASs for insomnia symptoms [34], sleep duration [35] and chronotype [36], and used two large cohorts to replicate the findings.

Nonetheless, there are a number of limitations of this study. Factorial MR analysis is usually underpowered which may raise the concerns of false negative results [45]. However, this study included the UKBB cohort with 332 676 participants constituting the largest factorial MR study on sleep traits to date. The strong instrument strength observed in UKBB cohort partially overcomes concerns due to underpowered factorial MR findings [64]. Another limitation is that although factorial MR can identify whether two independent exposures interact and have a joint effect of public health importance [64], it assumes exposures remain stable throughout the life course. Thus, the magnitude of effects should be cautiously interpreted.

Also, the validity of MR findings can be weakened by pleiotropy [65]. We used several sensitivity analyses to investigate possible sources of bias in MR. We found that the genetic risk for insomnia symptoms was strongly associated with BMI, smoking status, depression, and education among other covariates [34], which may be indicative of confounding, mediation or horizontal pleiotropy. Further to this, our results remained consistent across various MR methods, except for insomnia symptoms which showed evidence

of an unbalanced pleiotropy in MR-Egger analysis. Additionally, previous studies have showed only mild attenuation of causal effects of insomnia symptoms on CAD risk when adjusted for BMI, smoking, depression and education using multivariable Mendelian randomization (MVMR) [21, 26]. Moreover, simulations have shown that MR-Egger may be unreliable when applied to a single dataset [66], and this is a limitation of our study.

The sleep traits were based on self-report. It remains unclear if self-reported sleep duration represents time in bed or actual sleep time. Also, the insomnia questions in UKBB or HUNT2 did not cover all aspects of insomnia (difficulty falling asleep, night awakenings, waking up early and daytime impairments) [67]. Chronotype in this study was assessed from a single question in UKBB, whereas validated instruments such as the Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire and the Munich Chronotype Questionnaire use diverse questions to better estimate chronotype [68, 69]. Moreover, the sleep traits we used are binary exposures (except for 24-hour sleep duration), which are likely coarsened approximations of the true latent exposure [70]. This opens up alternate pathways from the genetic instruments to the outcome, which may violate the exclusion restriction assumption, resulting in biased effect estimates [70]. In addition, causal estimates from MR of binary exposures on a binary outcome are difficult to interpret [71].

Due to the small sample size in HUNT2, we might have missed weak causal effects due to insufficient power. In addition, the genetic instrument explained little variance in short sleep and long sleep within HUNT2, implying possible weak instrument bias [72] and leading to wide CIs as shown in the bootstrap simulations [73]. Furthermore, SNPs for short and long sleep were not assessed for replication in other independent cohorts [35], meaning that the GRS used is not validated in any other population.

The inclusion of UKBB in all exposure GWASs could lead to winner's curse, that might bias the causal estimates in UKBB [74]. We therefore used unweighted GRS for our exposures in UKBB as recommended [37]. Also, we derived GRS for insomnia symptoms and chronotype composed of SNPs that replicated in

an independent study (23andMe) [34, 36], which showed similar estimates, indicating winner's curse is unlikely to have substantially biased effect estimates. However, we could not apply the same approach to explore the impact of winner's curse on the sleep duration due to the limited sample size of the replication datasets in those studies [35], meaning that genetic associations might be imprecise.

Finally, our findings rely on analyses in UKBB due to its large sample. However, the generalizability of these findings may be limited due to a selected sample (5.5% response rate) in the UKBB cohort, which can bias both observational and MR estimates [75, 76]. Selection bias may artificially induce associations between genetic variants and confounders leading to the instrumental variable becoming invalid [77]. This might partly explain differences in UKBB and HUNT2 estimates observed in this study, where HUNT2 sample (69.5% response rate) more closely represents target population. The difference in demographics of the two cohorts might also cause inconsistent estimates. Moreover, the inclusion of cohorts from the European ancestry may further restrict generalizability of our findings.

Conclusions

This study reveals that any two sleep traits in combination (including insomnia symptoms, short sleep, and a morning chronotype) had the highest risk of AMI. Although these combinations did not show any departure from additivity (i.e., no interaction), interventions targeting both insomnia symptoms and short sleep are recommended to reduce the risk of AMI. Since the role of chronotype in AMI risk is uncertain, more research is needed to determine individual or joint effects of chronotype on risk of AMI. Moreover, this study also suggests a potential protective effect of genetically predisposed long sleep among those predisposed to insomnia symptoms and a morning chronotype. Thus these findings have important implications for the development of clinical strategies aimed at mitigating the risk of AMI and enhancing cardiovascular well-being.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available online.

Declarations

Ethical approval and consent

UK Biobank received ethical approval from the National Health Service (NHS) Research Ethics Service (reference number 11/NW/0382). The HUNT Study was approved by the Data Inspectorate of Norway and recommended by the Regional Committee for Ethics in Medical Research (REK; reference number 152/95/AH/JGE). The ethical approval for conducting this study was also obtained from the Regional Committee for Ethics in Medical Research (REK nord; reference number 2020/47206).

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants of both the cohorts included in this study.

Availability of data and materials

The data supporting the findings are available in the supplementary material and upon request. The UK Biobank data is available to researchers, subject to successful registration and application process via their website (https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/). The data from the HUNT Study are available from the HUNT Research Centre but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. However, the data are available for export given approval of application to the HUNT Research Centre (http://www.ntnu.edu/hunt/data). The data on hospital records linkages to the HUNT Study participants are available from Nord-Trøndelag Hospital Trust and require permission. All other data used are publicly available and referenced according in the main text.

Competing interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest. The authors of this manuscript have certified that they comply with the principles of ethical publishing.

Funding

This study was made possible with the financial support from the National Association for Public Health in Norway (Nasjonalforeningen for folkehelsen; project number 19479), mobility grant funds from the Liaison Committee for Education, Research and Innovation in Central Norway (Helse Midt-Norge; 2023/34249) and top-up financing from the Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

N.A. interpreted and analysed the data, interpreted the findings, and wrote the paper; L.B.S., and R.C.R. had the original idea for this study, interpreted the data, and critically revised the paper; E.S.S., B.M.B., and B.O.Å. had the original idea for this study, and critically revised the paper; L.B. assisted with analysis, and critically revised the paper; and H.D. assisted with interpreting data on acute myocardial infarction from medical records assessed through hospitals in the Trøndelag County, and critically revised the paper.

Acknowledgements

This research has been conducted using data from UK Biobank, a major biomedical database (www.ukbiobank.ac.uk), under application number 40135.

The Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT) is a collaboration between HUNT Research Centre (Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)), Trøndelag County Council, Central Norway Regional Health Authority, and the Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

We want to thank clinicians and other employees at Nord-Trøndelag Hospital Trust for their support and for contributing to data collection in this research project.

References

1. Roth T. Insomnia: definition, prevalence, etiology, and consequences. J Clin Sleep Med. 2007;3 5 Suppl:S7–10.

2. St-Onge M-P, Grandner MA, Brown D, Conroy MB, Jean-Louis G, Coons M, et al. Sleep Duration and Quality: Impact on Lifestyle Behaviors and Cardiometabolic Health: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2016;134:e367–86.

3. Vgontzas AN, Liao D, Bixler EO, Chrousos GP, Vela-Bueno A. Insomnia with objective short sleep duration is associated with a high risk for hypertension. Sleep. 2009;32:491–7.

4. Cappuccio FP, Taggart FM, Kandala NB, Currie A, Peile E, Stranges S, et al. Meta-analysis of short sleep duration and obesity in children and adults. Sleep. 2008;31:619–26.

5. Wong PM, Hasler BP, Kamarck TW, Muldoon MF, Manuck SB. Social Jetlag, Chronotype, and Cardiometabolic Risk. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2015;100:4612–20.

6. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs). https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds). Accessed 27 Mar 2023.

7. Qaseem A, Kansagara D, Forciea MA, Cooke M, Denberg TD. Management of Chronic Insomnia Disorder in Adults: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians. Ann Intern Med. 2016;165:125–33.

8. Buysse DJ. Sleep Health: Can We Define It? Does It Matter? Sleep. 2014;37:9–17.

9. Arora N, Richmond RC, Brumpton BM, Åsvold BO, Dalen H, Skarpsno ES, et al. Self-reported insomnia symptoms, sleep duration, chronotype and the risk of acute myocardial infarction (AMI): a prospective study in the UK Biobank and the HUNT Study. Eur J Epidemiol. 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-023-00981-x.

10. Laugsand LE, Vatten LJ, Platou C, Janszky I. Insomnia and the Risk of Acute Myocardial Infarction. Circulation. 2011;124:2073–81.

11. Laugsand LE, Strand LB, Platou C, Vatten LJ, Janszky I. Insomnia and the risk of incident heart failure: a population study. European Heart Journal. 2014;35:1382–93.

12. Daghlas I, Dashti HS, Lane J, Aragam KG, Rutter MK, Saxena R, et al. Sleep Duration and Myocardial Infarction. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019;74:1304–14.

13. Fan Y, Wu Y, Peng Y, Zhao B, Yang J, Bai L, et al. Sleeping Late Increases the Risk of Myocardial Infarction in the Middle-Aged and Older Populations. Frontiers in Cardiovascular Medicine. 2021;8.

14. Bertisch SM, Pollock BD, Mittleman MA, Buysse DJ, Bazzano LA, Gottlieb DJ, et al. Insomnia with objective short sleep duration and risk of incident cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality: Sleep Heart Health Study. Sleep. 2018;41.

15. Sands-Lincoln M, Loucks EB, Lu B, Carskadon MA, Sharkey K, Stefanick ML, et al. Sleep Duration, Insomnia, and Coronary Heart Disease Among Postmenopausal Women in the Women's Health Initiative. J Womens Health (Larchmt). 2013;22:477–86.

16. Vgontzas AN, Fernandez-Mendoza J, Liao D, Bixler EO. Insomnia with objective short sleep duration: The most biologically severe phenotype of the disorder. Sleep Medicine Reviews. 2013;17:241–54.

17. Fernandez-Mendoza J, Vgontzas AN, Liao D, Shaffer ML, Vela-Bueno A, Basta M, et al. Insomnia With Objective Short Sleep Duration and Incident Hypertension. Hypertension. 2012;60:929–35.

18. Fernandez-Mendoza J. The insomnia with short sleep duration phenotype: an update on it's importance for health and prevention. Current Opinion in Psychiatry. 2017;30:56–63.

19. Davies NM, Holmes MV, Smith GD. Reading Mendelian randomisation studies: a guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians. BMJ. 2018;362:k601.

20. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Mendelian Randomization: Methods for Causal Inference Using Genetic Variants. 2nd edition. New York: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2021.

21. Larsson SC, Markus HS. Genetic Liability to Insomnia and Cardiovascular Disease Risk. Circulation. 2019;140:796–8.

22. Liu X, Li C, Sun X, Yu Y, Si S, Hou L, et al. Genetically Predicted Insomnia in Relation to 14 Cardiovascular Conditions and 17 Cardiometabolic Risk Factors: A Mendelian Randomization Study. J Am Heart Assoc. 2021;10:e020187.

23. Ai S, Zhang J, Zhao G, Wang N, Li G, So H-C, et al. Causal associations of short and long sleep durations with 12 cardiovascular diseases: linear and nonlinear Mendelian randomization analyses in UK Biobank. European Heart Journal. 2021;42:3349–57.

24. Yang Y, Fan J, Shi X, Wang Y, Yang C, Lian J, et al. Causal associations between sleep traits and four cardiac diseases: a Mendelian randomization study. ESC Heart Failure. 2022;9:3160–6.

25. Lane JM, Jones SE, Dashti HS, Wood AR, Aragam KG, van Hees VT, et al. Biological and clinical insights from genetics of insomnia symptoms. Nat Genet. 2019;51:387–93.

26. Yuan S, Mason AM, Burgess S, Larsson SC. Genetic liability to insomnia in relation to cardiovascular diseases: a Mendelian randomisation study. Eur J Epidemiol. 2021;36:393–400.

27. UK Biobank: Protocol for a large-scale prospective epidemiological resource. 2006. https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/learn-more-about-uk-biobank/about-us. Accessed 25 Oct 2021.

28. Åsvold BO, Langhammer A, Rehn TA, Kjelvik G, Grøntvedt TV, Sørgjerd EP, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The HUNT Study, Norway. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2022;:dyac095.

29. Holmen J, Midthjell K, Krüger Ø, Langhammer A, Holmen TL, Bratberg GH, et al. The Nord-Trøndelag Health Study 1995–97 (HUNT 2): objectives, contents, methods and participation. Norsk epidemiologi. 2003;13:19–32.

30. Riemann D, Baglioni C, Bassetti C, Bjorvatn B, Dolenc Groselj L, Ellis JG, et al. European guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of insomnia. Journal of Sleep Research. 2017;26:675–700.

31. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018;562:203–9.

32. Mitchell RE, Hemani G, Dudding T, Corbin L, Harrison S, Paternoster L. UK Biobank Genetic Data: MRC-IEU Quality Control, version 2. 2017. https://data.bris.ac.uk/data/dataset/1ovaau5sxunp2cv8rcy88688v.

33. Brumpton BM, Graham S, Surakka I, Skogholt AH, Løset M, Fritsche LG, et al. The HUNT study: A population-based cohort for genetic research. Cell Genomics. 2022;2:100193.

34. Jansen PR, Watanabe K, Stringer S, Skene N, Bryois J, Hammerschlag AR, et al. Genome-wide analysis of insomnia in 1,331,010 individuals identifies new risk loci and functional pathways. Nat Genet. 2019;51:394–403.

35. Dashti HS, Jones SE, Wood AR, Lane JM, van Hees VT, Wang H, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies genetic loci for self-reported habitual sleep duration supported by accelerometer-derived estimates. Nat Commun. 2019;10:1100.

36. Jones SE, Lane JM, Wood AR, van Hees VT, Tyrrell J, Beaumont RN, et al. Genome-wide association analyses of chronotype in 697,828 individuals provides insights into circadian rhythms. Nat Commun. 2019;10:343.

37. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Use of allele scores as instrumental variables for Mendelian randomization. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2013;42:1134–44.

38. Burgess S, Small DS, Thompson SG. A review of instrumental variable estimators for Mendelian randomization. Stat Methods Med Res. 2017;26:2333–55.

39. Burgess S, Labrecque JA. Mendelian randomization with a binary exposure variable: interpretation and presentation of causal estimates. Eur J Epidemiol. 2018;33:947–52.

40. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S. Confidence Interval Estimation of Interaction. Epidemiology. 1992;3:452.

41. Knol MJ, VanderWeele TJ, Groenwold RHH, Klungel OH, Rovers MM, Grobbee DE. Estimating measures of interaction on an additive scale for preventive exposures. Eur J Epidemiol. 2011;26:433–8.

42. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2015;44:512–25.

43. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. Genet Epidemiol. 2016;40:304–14.

44. Hartwig FP, Davey Smith G, Bowden J. Robust inference in summary data Mendelian randomization via the zero modal pleiotropy assumption. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2017;46:1985–98.

45. Rees JMB, Foley CN, Burgess S. Factorial Mendelian randomization: using genetic variants to assess interactions. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2020;49:1147–58.

46. Knol MJ, van der Tweel I, Grobbee DE, Numans ME, Geerlings MI. Estimating interaction on an additive scale between continuous determinants in a logistic regression model. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2007;36:1111–8.

47. Grandner MA, Drummond SPA. Who Are the Long Sleepers? Towards an Understanding of the Mortality Relationship. Sleep Med Rev. 2007;11:341–60.

48. Stamatakis KA, Punjabi NM. Long sleep duration: A risk to health or a marker of risk? Sleep medicine reviews. 2007;11:337.

49. Hsieh CG, Martin JL. Short Sleep, Insomnia, and Cardiovascular Disease. Curr Sleep Med Rep. 2019;5:234–42.

50. D'Aurea C, Poyares D, Piovezan RD, Passos GS, Tufik S, Mello MT de. Objective short sleep duration is associated with the activity of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis in insomnia. Arq Neuro-Psiquiatr. 2015;73:516–9.

51. Grimaldi D, Carter JR, Van Cauter E, Leproult R. Adverse Impact of Sleep Restriction and Circadian Misalignment on Autonomic Function in Healthy Young Adults. Hypertension. 2016;68:243–50.

52. Castro-Diehl C, Diez Roux AV, Redline S, Seeman T, McKinley P, Sloan R, et al. Sleep Duration and Quality in Relation to Autonomic Nervous System Measures: The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA). Sleep. 2016;39:1927–40.

53. Jarrin DC, Ivers H, Lamy M, Chen IY, Harvey AG, Morin CM. Cardiovascular autonomic dysfunction in insomnia patients with objective short sleep duration. Journal of Sleep Research. 2018;27:e12663.

54. Vgontzas AN, Zoumakis E, Bixler EO, Lin H-M, Follett H, Kales A, et al. Adverse effects of modest sleep restriction on sleepiness, performance, and inflammatory cytokines. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2004;89:2119–26.

55. Kjeldsen JS, Hjorth MF, Andersen R, Michaelsen KF, Tetens I, Astrup A, et al. Short sleep duration and large variability in sleep duration are independently associated with dietary risk factors for obesity in Danish school children. Int J Obes (Lond). 2014;38:32–9.

56. Broussard JL, Kilkus JM, Delebecque F, Abraham V, Day A, Whitmore HR, et al. Elevated ghrelin predicts food intake during experimental sleep restriction. Obesity (Silver Spring). 2016;24:132–8.

57. Broussard JL, Ehrmann DA, Van Cauter E, Tasali E, Brady MJ. Impaired insulin signaling in human adipocytes after experimental sleep restriction: a randomized, crossover study. Ann Intern Med. 2012;157:549–57.

58. Lanfranchi PA, Pennestri M-H, Fradette L, Dumont M, Morin CM, Montplaisir J. Nighttime blood pressure in normotensive subjects with chronic insomnia: implications for cardiovascular risk. Sleep. 2009;32:760–6.

59. Fernandez-Mendoza J, He F, Vgontzas AN, Liao D, Bixler EO. Objective short sleep duration modifies the relationship between hypertension and all-cause mortality. J Hypertens. 2017;35:830–6.

60. Palombo C, Kozakova M. Arterial stiffness, atherosclerosis and cardiovascular risk: Pathophysiologic mechanisms and emerging clinical indications. Vascular Pharmacology. 2016;77:1–7.

61. Makarem N, Paul J, Giardina E-GV, Liao M, Aggarwal B. Evening chronotype is associated with poor cardiovascular health and adverse health behaviors in a diverse population of women. Chronobiology International. 2020;37:673–85.

62. Maukonen M, Kanerva N, Partonen T, Kronholm E, Konttinen H, Wennman H, et al. The associations between chronotype, a healthy diet and obesity. Chronobiology International. 2016;33:972–81.

63. Merikanto I, Lahti T, Puolijoki H, Vanhala M, Peltonen M, Laatikainen T, et al. Associations of chronotype and sleep with cardiovascular diseases and type 2 diabetes. Chronobiol Int. 2013;30:470–7.

64. North T-L, Davies NM, Harrison S, Carter AR, Hemani G, Sanderson E, et al. Using Genetic Instruments to Estimate Interactions in Mendelian Randomization Studies. Epidemiology. 2019;30:e33–5.

65. Davey Smith G, Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal inference in epidemiological studies. Human Molecular Genetics. 2014;23:R89–98.

66. Minelli C, Del Greco M. F, van der Plaat DA, Bowden J, Sheehan NA, Thompson J. The use of two-sample methods for Mendelian randomization analyses on single large datasets. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2021;50:1651–9.

67. Littner M, Hirshkowitz M, Kramer M, Kapen S, Anderson WM, Bailey D, et al. Practice parameters for using polysomnography to evaluate insomnia: an update. Sleep. 2003;26:754–60.

68. Horne JA, Ostberg O. A self-assessment questionnaire to determine morningness-eveningness in human circadian rhythms. Int J Chronobiol. 1976;4:97–110.

69. Roenneberg T, Wirz-Justice A, Merrow M. Life between clocks: daily temporal patterns of human chronotypes. J Biol Rhythms. 2003;18:80–90.

70. Tudball MJ, Bowden J, Hughes RA, Ly A, Munafò MR, Tilling K, et al. Mendelian randomisation with coarsened exposures. Genetic Epidemiology. 2021;45:338–50.

71. Palmer TM, Sterne JAC, Harbord RM, Lawlor DA, Sheehan NA, Meng S, et al. Instrumental Variable Estimation of Causal Risk Ratios and Causal Odds Ratios in Mendelian Randomization Analyses. American Journal of Epidemiology. 2011;173:1392–403.

72. Burgess S, Thompson SG, CRP CHD Genetics Collaboration. Avoiding bias from weak instruments in Mendelian randomization studies. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2011;40:755–64.

73. Moreira MJ, Porter JR, Suarez GA. Bootstrap validity for the score test when instruments may be weak. Journal of Econometrics. 2009;149:52–64.

74. Burgess S, Davies NM, Thompson SG. Bias due to participant overlap in two-sample Mendelian randomization. Genetic Epidemiology. 2016;40:597–608.

75. Hernán MA, Hernández-Díaz S, Robins JM. A Structural Approach to Selection Bias. Epidemiology. 2004;15:615.

76. Canan C, Lesko C, Lau B. Instrumental Variable Analyses and Selection Bias. Epidemiology. 2017;28:396.

77. Gkatzionis A, Burgess S. Contextualizing selection bias in Mendelian randomization: how bad is it likely to be? International Journal of Epidemiology. 2019;48:691–701.