

1 **How does the weekend catch-up sleep ratio affect the health and**  
2 **lifestyle of Korean adults? An age- and gender- matched study.**

3 **In-Whi Hwang<sup>¶</sup>, Soo-Ji Hwang<sup>¶</sup>, Jun-Hao Shen<sup>¶</sup>, Jisu Kim<sup>2, &</sup>, and Jung-Min Lee<sup>3,4,\*</sup>**

4

5

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Sports Medicine and Science, Graduate School of Physical Education, Kyung Hee  
8 University, Yongin-si 17014, Gyeonggi-do, Korea; <sup>2</sup> Department of Kinesiology and Health Science,  
9 Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, 23284, United States of America; <sup>3</sup> Sports Science  
10 Research Center, Global Campus, Kyung Hee University, Yongin-si, Gyeonggi-do, Korea; <sup>4</sup> Department of  
11 Physical Education, Kyung Hee University, Yongin-si, Gyeonggi-do, Korea;

12

13 \* Corresponding author

14 E-mail: [jungminlee@khu.ac.kr](mailto:jungminlee@khu.ac.kr)

15

16

17 <sup>¶</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work

18 <sup>&</sup>These authors also contributed equally to this work.

19

## 20 Abstract

21 The purpose of this study was to investigate the association between various levels of physical activity,  
22 self-perception, cardiometabolic risk factors, and weekend catch-up sleep ratio (CSR). Using raw data from  
23 the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2018 – 2021, all participants were divided into  
24 three groups ( $< 1.0$ ,  $1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$ , or  $\geq 1.5$ ) by CSR, which is the value calculated by dividing weekend  
25 sleep time by weekday sleep time. After matching age and gender, 2,484 Korean adults were selected as study  
26 participants. Descriptive statistics, chi-square test, ANOVA, and multinomial logistic regression analysis were  
27 performed to analyze the data. The results showed a significant association between weekend CSR and  
28 socioeconomic status, physical activity, self-perception levels, and cardiometabolic risk factors. Specifically,  
29 compared to the reference group ( $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$ ), those with a  $\text{CSR} < 1$  were 2.42 times more likely to live  
30 in a single-family house (OR = 2.42, 95% CI = 1.77 – 3.32) and 1.71 times more likely to engage in vigorous  
31 physical activity meeting WHO guidelines (OR = 1.71, 95% CI = 1.20 – 2.46). They were also 1.33 times  
32 more likely to perceive themselves as 'obese' (OR = 1.33, 95% CI = 1.00 – 1.76). Conversely, those in the CSR  
33  $\geq 1.5$  group were 3.93 times more likely to be 'pink-collar' workers (OR = 3.93, 95% CI = 2.70 – 5.71), 1.72  
34 times more likely to perceive their stress levels as 'quite' (OR = 1.72, 95% CI = 1.20 – 2.47), and 1.87 times  
35 more likely to have diabetes (OR = 1.87, 95% CI = 0.97 – 3.60). Alterations in CSR could indicate changes in  
36 physical activity levels, sedentary behavior duration, and other health indicators, ultimately influencing overall  
37 well-being. Therefore, a comprehensive healthcare approach incorporating CSR considerations is increasingly  
38 essential.

39

## 40 Introduction

41 The global prevalence of sleep disorders and sleep deprivation has been steadily increasing, with  
42 factors such as modern lifestyle, work culture, and increased screen time contributing to this concerning trend  
43 (1-3). South Korea is no exception, experiencing a growing number of individuals reporting sleep deprivation  
44 (4). The concept of catch-up sleep, which refers to the compensatory sleep obtained during weekends or days

45 off, has emerged as a typical response to sleep debt accumulated during weekdays due to demanding work or  
46 social obligations (5). This phenomenon is prevalent among Koreans, as they grapple with long working hours,  
47 high-stress lifestyles, and societal expectations that often lead to sleep deprivation and irregular sleep patterns  
48 (6-8).

49 Previous studies revealed that physical activity (PA) is essential to maintaining overall health and  
50 well-being (9, 10). Regular engagement in PA can improve cardiovascular health, reduce the risk of developing  
51 chronic diseases, enhance mental health, and promote better sleep quality (11-14). As the general awareness  
52 of the importance of regular participation in PA, it is crucial to understand the factors that may influence an  
53 individual's level of PA, such as sleep deprivation (15, 16). However, there is insufficient research to confirm  
54 how the weekend catch-up sleep ratio (CSR) impacts PA levels among Korean adults.

55 Sedentary behavior (SB), defined by extended periods of inactivity or sitting, has become increasingly  
56 prevalent in modern society, contributing to various health problems such as sleep deprivation, obesity, type 2  
57 diabetes, and cardiometabolic diseases (17-20). SB is becoming a significant contributor to mortality,  
58 particularly with the rise of sedentary occupations and technology-driven lifestyles (21). Despite achieving  
59 sufficient levels of PA, the continuous link between SB and the onset and progression of chronic conditions  
60 has been confirmed by a study by Biswas and colleagues, who demonstrated that extended periods of inactivity  
61 are independently associated with negative health outcomes, irrespective of PA levels (22). This changing  
62 paradigm of modern lifestyles has increased in SB time, characterized by prolonged inactivity and irregular  
63 sleep patterns (23).

64 Our mental health, deeply influenced by stress and subjective perception, significantly impacts sleep  
65 quality (24, 25). The persistent demands of daily life often generate considerable stress, which can precipitate  
66 mental health disorders like anxiety and depression (26). Simultaneously, subjective perception of body shape  
67 influenced by societal standards can contribute to mental health problems, potentially leading to disorders such  
68 as body dysmorphia or eating disorders (27). Additionally, a negative self-evaluation of health, such as an  
69 exaggerated belief in personal physical decline or illness, can increase stress levels, induce anxiety, and disrupt  
70 normal sleep, contributing to an unstable CSR (28, 29). Therefore, effective personal management strategies  
71 are crucial to address the relationship between mental health and sleep patterns influenced by these factors.

72 Cardiometabolic risk factors (CRF), such as obesity, hypertension, dyslipidemia, and insulin  
73 resistance, have been associated with sleep deprivation in numerous studies (30-32). This connection involves

74 hormonal imbalances, impaired glucose metabolism, and increased inflammation (33, 34). Sleep deprivation  
75 can exacerbate existing cardiometabolic issues and potentially lead to new health problems (35). Besides  
76 directly impacting physical health, poor sleep also profoundly affects mental health (36). It can lead to elevated  
77 stress and anxiety levels, further complicating the management of cardiometabolic health (37). Thus,  
78 understanding and addressing sleep deprivation is crucial for cardiometabolic health and overall well-being  
79 (38).

80 Previous research has primarily focused on the association between sleep deprivation and various  
81 health-related variables. However, these studies have not extensively explored the specific role of CSR in PA,  
82 SB, mental health, and CRF among Korean adults. The proposed research aims to address this gap by  
83 examining the impact of CSR on these health-related factors. This research will provide a more comprehensive  
84 understanding of the complex associations between CSR and health-related factors and identify potential  
85 confounding factors such as socioeconomic status and lifestyle habits. Ultimately, the findings from this study  
86 will contribute valuable insights that can inform the development of tailored interventions and public health  
87 strategies for the Korean adult population.

88

## 89 **Methods**

### 90 *Study participants*

91 This cross-sectional study used data from the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination  
92 Survey (KNHANES) during 2018 – 2021. The KNHANES is a comprehensive national survey implemented  
93 across South Korea. Its primary objective is to consistently accumulate data annually encompassing various  
94 elements, encompassing sociodemographic indicators, economic status, and health-related characteristics and  
95 behaviors across all age demographics. Since 2007, this body of data has undergone review and received an  
96 annual endorsement by the Research Ethics Review Committee from the Korea Centers for Disease Control  
97 and Prevention Agency (KDCA). The KNHANES data is an open-access resource for scholars, enabling  
98 further exploratory analysis and research in numerous fields.

99 The KNHANES for 2018 – 2021 was conducted with 30,551 respondents. However, 5,616  
100 individuals under 20 years were excluded from the data to align with the research parameters. In addition,  
101 participants who did not respond to the critical variables under examination were also eliminated from

102 consideration. The remaining participants were classified into three distinct groups according to their CSR  
103 (CSR < 1, 1 ≤ CSR < 1.5, 1.5 ≤ CSR). These groups contained 1,112, 18,743, and 1,233 participants,  
104 respectively. Then, we matched participants based on age and gender, using the group with a CSR < 1 as the  
105 reference group. As a result of this stringent selection process, a balanced cohort of 828 participants from each  
106 group was extracted, resulting in a total study sample of 2,848 individuals.

107

## 108 ***Group***

109 The group was divided by considering the catch-up sleep ratio.

110

$$111 \quad \textit{Weekend catch up sleep ratio} = \frac{\textit{Average hours of sleep per day on weekends}}{\textit{Average hours of sleep per day on weekdays}}$$

112

113 Using this formula, we classified the participants into three distinct groups according to their CSR  
114 (CSR < 1, 1 ≤ CSR < 1.5, 1.5 ≤ CSR). For instance, if participants sleep the same amount of time on weekdays  
115 and weekends, they are classified into a 1 ≤ CSR < 1.5 group. If a participant sleeps for 6 hours on weekdays  
116 and catches up by sleeping for 10 hours on weekends, their CSR is 1.5 or greater, placing them in the group  
117 with a 1.5 ≤ CSR group. Conversely, if participants sleep less on weekdays than on weekends, they belong to  
118 the CSR < 1 group.

119 According to prevailing health guidelines, the recommended sleep duration for adults typically falls  
120 within the range of 7 to 9 hours (39). However, it's been observed that Korean adults tend to sleep less, with  
121 their average sleep duration falling below 6.5 hours (40). This discrepancy can be primarily attributed to socio-  
122 cultural norms and professional obligations within South Korea, which may significantly influence sleep  
123 behaviors, often encouraging a tendency to compensate by sleeping longer on weekends. Considering these  
124 factors, a normative threshold has been proposed in which weekend sleep duration should not surpass 1.50  
125 times the corresponding weekday sleep duration to be deemed within acceptable bounds.

126

## 127 ***Measurement***

### 128 ***Anthropometric***

129 KNHANES gathers data on gender and age via self-reported surveys. This study's age variable was  
130 segmented into decade intervals ranging from the 20s to the 70s or above for further analysis. Anthropometric  
131 assessments were carried out by well-trained examiners adhering to standard protocols. The height (m<sup>2</sup>)  
132 measurement was performed using a stadiometer with participants standing erect, shoeless, and with heels,  
133 buttocks, and shoulders in contact with the apparatus. Body weight (kg) was measured using a digital scale,  
134 with participants dressed in light and barefooted attire. The waist circumference (WC, cm) was determined at  
135 the mid-point between the lower rib margin and the iliac crest using an inelastic measuring tape. Body Mass  
136 Index (BMI, kg/m<sup>2</sup>) was calculated as the weight divided by the square of the height, and participants were  
137 categorized as underweight, normal weight, overweight, or obese based on the World Health Organization  
138 (WHO) guidelines (World Health Organization).

139

### 140 ***Socioeconomic status***

141 The socioeconomic factors included type of residence: (1) single-family house, (2) apartment, (3)  
142 others, occupational status: (1) white-collar, (2) pink-collar, (3) blue-collar, (4) not classified, work schedule:  
143 (1) day, (2) night, (3) shift work (others), and household personal income quintile: (1) low, (2) lower middle,  
144 (3) middle, (4) upper middle, (5) high.

145

### 146 ***Lifestyle behaviors***

147 The lifestyle factors included drinking status and smoking status. For drinking status in the  
148 KNHANES, participants were classified as: (1) abstained in the last year, (2) less than once a month, (3) about  
149 once a month, (4) 2 – 4 times a month, (5) 2 – 3 times a week, (6) 4 or more times a week, but considering the  
150 number of people belonging to each variable, we divided it into (1) abstained in the last year, (2) once a month,  
151 (3) 2 – 4 times a month, (4) at least twice a week. Smoking status was categorized as (1) current smoker, (2)  
152 ex-smoker, (3) never smoked.

153

### 154 ***Health-related factors***

155           The health-related factors included in this study encompass moderate to vigorous physical activity  
156 (MVPA) participation time, the number of days walking per week, SB time, perceived self-body shape,  
157 perceived self-health status, perceived stress level, average daily sleep duration (weekday, weekend), and CRF.  
158 The time spent on MVPA was calculated using the following process, in line with the WHO's  
159 recommendations for PA (World Health Organization, 2022). Participants were asked about time on vigorous  
160 PA during their work or leisure, resulting in shortness of breath or a speedy heart rate. The daily hours and  
161 minutes spent on these activities were added and multiplied by the number of days a week. This resulted in the  
162 total weekly hours of vigorous PA. A similar process was used to calculate the time spent on moderate PA,  
163 including work, leisure activities, or moving from place to place that causes slight shortness of breath or a  
164 slightly rapid heart rate. According to WHO's recommendation, we separated the groups into (1) met and (2)  
165 not met for MVPA variables. Considering the distribution of participants, responses regarding the number of  
166 days walked per week have been categorized into (1) every day, (2) 4 – 6 days, (3) 1 – 3 days, and (4) not  
167 participating. For the analysis of SB time, we divided participants into groups based on the total daily duration  
168 of their SB time. We calculated the average daily sitting time in minutes for each participant and then  
169 categorized them into tertiles: (1) SB time < 420, (2) 420 ≤ SB time < 600, (3) 600 ≤ SB time. Sleep duration  
170 was assessed via a self-reported questionnaire, differentiating the average daily sleep duration (mins) into  
171 weekdays and weekends.

172           Cognition-related variables such as perceived self-body shape, perceived self-health status, and  
173 perceived stress level were classified through a self-report questionnaire given to the participants. The  
174 questions included 'What do you think of your current body shape?', 'How do you feel about your health in  
175 general?', and 'How much stress do you feel daily?'. Responses regarding body shape were categorized as (1)  
176 thin, (2) average, and (3) fat. Health status responses were classified as (1) good, (2) average, and (3) poor.  
177 Lastly, perceived stress levels were separated into (1) not at all, (2) a little, and (3) quite.

178           The researchers of the KNHANES study procured explicit written authorization from the participants  
179 after delivering a comprehensive explanation of the objectives and methodology of CRF, encompassing  
180 measurements for obesity, hypertension, fasting glucose, total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, triglycerides, and  
181 HbA1c. Participants were counseled to observe a minimum fasting period of 8 hours before the blood draw to  
182 ensure precise quantification of these health biomarkers. The resulting data were stratified into distinct

183 categories according to predefined criteria established by the WHO. Obesity; (1) underweight (BMI < 18.5  
184 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), (2) normal (18.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup> ≤ BMI < 23 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), (3) overweight (23 kg/m<sup>2</sup> ≤ BMI < 25 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), (4) obese  
185 (25 kg/m<sup>2</sup> ≤ BMI). Hypertension; (1) normal (systolic < 120 mmHg and diastolic < 80 mmHg), (2)  
186 prehypertension (systolic 120 – 139 mmHg or diastolic 80 – 89 mmHg), and (3) hypertension (systolic ≥ 140  
187 mmHg or diastolic ≥ 90 mmHg), Fasting glucose; (1) normal (70 – 99 mg/dL), (2) impaired fasting glucose  
188 (100 – 125 mg/dL), (3) diabetes (≥ 126 mg/dL), Total cholesterol; (1) normal (< 200 mg/dL), (2) borderline  
189 (200 – 239 mg/dL), and (3) hyperlipidemia (≥ 240 mg/dL), HDL cholesterol; (1) low (< 40 mg/dL), (2) normal  
190 (40 – 59 mg/dL), and (3) high (≥ 60 mg/dL), Triglycerides; (1) normal (< 150 mg/dL), (2) borderline (150 –  
191 199 mg/dL), and (3) high (≥ 200 mg/dL), HbA1c; (1) normal (< 5.7%), (2) borderline (5.7 – 6.4%), and (3)  
192 diabetes (≥ 6.5%).

193

## 194 ***Data Analysis***

195 All data processing and statistical analysis used SPSS 28.0 version (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).  
196 Descriptive statistics were conducted to summarize the participants' characteristics for the anthropometric  
197 variables (gender, age, height, weight, WC, and BMI). The chi-square analysis ( $\chi^2$  test) was used to compare  
198 the categorical data of general characteristics between the three groups. An analysis of variance (ANOVA)  
199 was conducted to analyze the mean difference of continuous variables (i.e., MVPA time, SB time, sleep  
200 duration, and work time) between the three groups. Following the ANOVA, a Bonferroni posthoc test was  
201 conducted to provide a more detailed analysis of the differences between the three groups. Moreover,  
202 multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to find out the associations between the factors and  
203 CSR. Results are presented as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI), and the statistical  
204 significance of all analyzes was set by  $p < 0.05$ .

205

## 206 **Results**

207 Table 1 presents the characteristics and anthropometric data of participants (n = 2,484) across three  
208 groups classified based on the CSR: CSR < 1 (n = 828), 1 ≤ CSR < 1.5 (n = 828), and 1.5 ≤ CSR (n = 828).



209 The distribution of age and gender was identical across all groups due to the matching procedure conducted in  
210 the study. Regarding anthropometrics, male and female participants within each group showed similar  
211 averages for their respective categories. For males, the average values of height, weight, WC, BMI, and CRF  
212 did not differ significantly between the groups. The same pattern was held for female participants' height.  
213 However, the CSR categories observed significant differences in female participants' weight, WC, BMI, and  
214 CRF. Specifically, for females in the CSR < 1 group, the average weight was  $60.5 \pm 11.2$  kg, significantly  
215 higher than those in the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group ( $57.6 \pm 9.1$  kg). The WC was also larger in the CSR < 1 group  
216 ( $78.9 \pm 10.6$  cm) compared to the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group ( $76.1 \pm 9.1$  cm). Similarly, the BMI was  $23.7 \pm$   
217  $4.1$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> in the CSR < 1 group, which was significantly higher than the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group ( $22.5 \pm 3.4$   
218 kg/m<sup>2</sup>). The fasting glucose levels in the CSR < 1 group ( $95.7 \pm 15.3$  mg/dL) were significantly lower than  
219 the  $1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$  group ( $96.6 \pm 18.0$  mg/dL). The HbA1c levels were marginally lower in the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} <$   
220  $1.5$  group ( $5.5 \pm 0.6\%$ ) compared to the  $1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$  group ( $5.6 \pm 0.6\%$ ). For the entire participant group  
221 (combined male and female), those in the CSR < 1 group had an average weight of  $66.5 \pm 13.4$  kg,  
222 significantly higher than the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group ( $64.8 \pm 13.9$  kg). The WC was also larger in the CSR <  
223 1 group ( $82.6 \pm 10.8$  cm) compared to the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group ( $80.9 \pm 10.8$  cm). The BMI was  $24.2 \pm$   
224  $3.8$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> in the CSR < 1 group, which was significantly higher than the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group ( $23.5 \pm 3.7$   
225 kg/m<sup>2</sup>). The HbA1c levels were marginally lower in the  $1 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group ( $5.6 \pm 0.7\%$ ) compared to  
226 the  $1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$  group ( $5.7 \pm 0.8\%$ ).

**Table 1.** Characteristics and anthropometrics for participants in three groups (n = 2,484)

Variables		CSR < 1 (n = 828)		1 ≤ CSR < 1.5 (n = 828)		1.5 ≤ CSR (n = 828)		
		No. (%)	Mean ± SD	No. (%)	Mean ± SD	No. (%)	Mean ± SD	
<b>Gender</b>	Male	364 (44)		364 (44)		364 (44)		
	Female	464 (56)		464 (56)		464 (56)		
<b>Anthropometrics</b>	Age (yr)		44.0 ± 14.4		44.0 ± 14.4		44.0 ± 14.4	
	Height (cm)		172.7 ± 6.6		172.9 ± 7.0		172.1 ± 6.3	
	Weight (kg)		74.2 ± 11.9		73.9 ± 13.5		74.3 ± 12.4	
	Waist circumference (cm)		87.3 ± 9.0		87.1 ± 9.7		87.9 ± 9.8	
	BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )		24.8 ± 3.4		24.6 ± 3.6		25.0 ± 3.7	
	Male	Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	364 (44)	120.1 ± 15.2	364 (44)	118.0 ± 13.9	364 (44)	118.4 ± 13.4
		Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)		78.8 ± 11.2		79.3 ± 9.9		79.0 ± 9.1
		Fasting Glucose (mg/dL)		102.3 ± 21.2		101.8 ± 22.3		102.7 ± 26.5
		Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)		196.71 ± 37.9		193.2 ± 36.3		196.7 ± 37.2
		HDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)		48.2 ± 12.2		47.6 ± 11.0		48.5 ± 10.5
		Triglyceride (mmHg)		162.4 ± 126.6		156.5 ± 113.4		147.0 ± 112.1
		HbA1c (%)		5.7 ± 0.8		5.7 ± 0.8		5.8 ± 0.9
	Female	Age (yr)		43.0 ± 14.3		43.0 ± 14.3		43.0 ± 14.3
		Height (cm)		159.7 ± 6.0		159.9 ± 6.1		159.6 ± 6.1
Weight (kg) *†			60.5 ± 11.2		57.6 ± 9.1		59.6 ± 11.0	
Waist circumference (cm) *†		464 (56)	78.9 ± 10.6	464 (56)	76.1 ± 9.1	464 (56)	78.4 ± 10.8	
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) *†			23.7 ± 4.1		22.5 ± 3.4		23.4 ± 4.0	
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)			113.3 ± 15.5		112.1 ± 16.3		112.5 ± 14.5	
	Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)		73.4 ± 9.9		74.5 ± 10.0		73.9 ± 8.8	

	Fasting Glucose (mg/dL) †		95.7 ± 15.3		93.55 ± 14.4		96.6 ± 18.0
	Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)		193.6 ± 35.9		194.6 ± 34.5		196.0 ± 35.9
	HDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)		56.1 ± 13.0		57.3 ± 13.2		57.4 ± 12.4
	Triglyceride (mmHg)		109.3 ± 111.1		101.7 ± 62.4		103.7 ± 65.1
	HbA1c (%) †		5.6 ± 0.6		5.5 ± 0.6		5.6 ± 0.6
	Age (yr)		43.4 ± 14.3		43.4 ± 14.3		43.4 ± 14.3
	Height (cm)		165.4 ± 9.0		165.6 ± 9.2		165.1 ± 8.8
	Weight (kg) *		66.5 ± 13.4		64.8 ± 13.9		66.1 ± 13.7
	Waist circumference (cm) **		82.6 ± 10.8		80.9 ± 10.8		82.6 ± 11.4
	BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) **		24.2 ± 3.8		23.5 ± 3.7		24.1 ± 4.0
Total	Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	828 (100)	116.3 ± 15.7	828 (100)	114.7 ± 15.5	828 (100)	115.1 ± 14.3
	Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)		75.8 ± 10.8		76.6 ± 10.2		76.1 ± 9.3
	Fasting Glucose (mg/dL)		98.6 ± 18.4		97.2 ± 18.8		99.3 ± 22.3
	Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)		194.9 ± 36.8		194.0 ± 35.3		196.3 ± 36.4
	HDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)		52.7 ± 13.2		53.1 ± 13.2		53.5 ± 12.4
	Triglyceride (mmHg)		132.65 ± 121.0		125.8 ± 92.5		122.7 ± 91.4
	HbA1c (%) †		5.6 ± 0.7		5.6 ± 0.7		5.7 ± 0.8

228 Note. Depending on the group, the values of gender and age were expressed as frequency (*n*) and percentage (%), and the values of anthropometrics were presented as the mean ± SD. SD:  
229 standard deviation. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated by dividing the weight (kg) by the square of the height (m<sup>2</sup>).

230 \* Significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) between  $CSR < 1$  and  $1 \leq CSR < 1.5$ , † significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) between  $1 \leq CSR < 1.5$  and  $1.5 \leq CSR$ .

231 Table 2 shows the distribution of various demographic and health characteristics across three groups.  
 232 There was a significant difference between the three CSR groups regarding their residence type ( $X^2 = 32.70$ ,  
 233  $p < 0.001$ ). The majority of each group lived in apartments, but there was a slightly higher proportion of  
 234 individuals living in single-family houses in the  $CSR < 1$  group and a larger proportion living in "other" types  
 235 of residence in the  $1 \leq CSR < 1.5$  group. For the occupational status, the CSR groups significantly differed in  
 236 their occupational status ( $X^2 = 83.74$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The  $CSR < 1$  group had a higher proportion of white-collar  
 237 workers, while the  $1 \leq CSR < 1.5$  and  $1.5 \leq CSR$  groups had a higher proportion of pink and blue-collar  
 238 workers. The work schedule showed a significant difference ( $X^2 = 9.87$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), with day work being the  
 239 most common in all groups. Income quintiles also differed significantly ( $X^2 = 31.26$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), with lower  
 240 income quintiles more common in the  $CSR < 1$  and  $1.5 \leq CSR$  groups, while the  $1 \leq CSR < 1.5$  group had  
 241 more high-income individuals. However, drinking and smoking statuses showed no significant differences  
 242 between groups. Meeting guidelines for moderate PA showed a significant difference ( $X^2 = 6.35$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) but  
 243 not for vigorous PA. The number of walking days per week ( $X^2 = 35.87$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and SB time ( $X^2 = 47.54$ ,  
 244  $p < 0.001$ ) significantly varied across the groups. Self-perceived body shape, health status, and stress levels  
 245 categories also significantly differed between CSR groups. Among CRF, only fasting glucose and HDL  
 246 cholesterol levels showed significant differences between the groups. In contrast, others, such as BMI,  
 247 hypertension, total cholesterol, triglycerides, and HbA1c levels, showed no significant differences.

248 **Table 2.** Result of chi-square analysis examining differences in general characteristics across three groups ( $n = 2,484$ )

Variables		CSR < 1 (%)	1 ≤ CSR < 1.5 (%)	1.5 ≤ CSR (%)	X <sup>2</sup>
<b>Type of Residence</b>	Single-family house	241 (29.1)	168 (20.3)	219 (26.4)	32.70 ***
	Apartment	473 (57.1)	471 (56.9)	466 (56.3)	
	Others	114 (13.8)	189 (22.8)	143 (17.3)	
<b>Occupational Status</b>	White	306 (37.0)	391 (47.2)	383 (46.3)	83.74 ***
	Pink	85 (10.3)	70 (8.5)	69 (8.3)	
	Blue	197 (23.8)	113 (13.6)	227 (27.4)	
	Not classified	240 (29.0)	254 (30.7)	149 (18.0)	
<b>Work Schedule</b>	Day	542 (65.5)	545 (65.8)	574 (69.3)	9.87 *
	Night	98 (11.8)	79 (9.5)	97 (11.7)	
	Shiftwork (or others)	188 (22.7)	204 (24.6)	157 (19.0)	
<b>Income Quintile (Individual)</b>	Low	157 (19.0)	157 (19.0)	121 (14.6)	31.26 ***
	Lower middle	176 (21.3)	152 (18.4)	161 (19.4)	
	Middle	168 (20.3)	139 (16.8)	177 (21.4)	
	Upper middle	176 (21.3)	156 (18.8)	192 (23.2)	
	High	151 (18.8)	224 (27.1)	177 (21.4)	
<b>Drinking Status</b>	Abstained in the last year	174 (21.0)	152 (18.4)	170 (20.5)	7.96

	Once a month	200 (24.2)	188 (22.7)	169 (20.4)	
	2 – 4 times a month	206 (24.9)	229 (27.7)	208 (25.1)	
	At least twice a week	248 (30.0)	259 (31.3)	281 (33.9)	
<b>Smoking Status</b>	Current smoker	163 (19.7)	194 (23.4)	186 (22.5)	4.39
	Ex-smoker	171 (20.7)	172 (20.8)	178 (21.5)	
	Never smoked	494 (59.7)	462 (56.0)	464 (55.8)	
<b>Moderate PA</b>	Met	359 (43.4)	408 (49.3)	371 (44.8)	6.35 *
	Not met	469 (56.6)	420 (50.7)	457 (55.2)	
<b>Vigorous PA</b>	Met	85 (10.3)	68 (8.2)	74 (8.9)	2.16
	Not met	743 (89.7)	760 (91.8)	754 (91.1)	
<b>Walking Days (wk)</b>	Not participating	132 (15.9)	95 (11.5)	145 (17.5)	35.87 ***
	1 – 3 days	255 (30.8)	203 (24.5)	230 (27.8)	
	4 – 6 days	230 (27.8)	237 (28.6)	242 (29.2)	
	Everyday	211 (25.5)	293 (35.4)	211 (25.5)	
<b>SB time (min)</b>	< 420	324 (39.1)	239 (28.9)	228 (27.5)	47.54 ***
	420 ≤ Time < 600	200 (24.2)	213 (25.7)	170 (20.5)	
	600 ≤	304 (36.7)	376 (45.4)	430 (51.9)	
<b>Self-perceived Body Shape</b>	Thin	107 (12.9)	116 (14.0)	102 (12.3)	12.86 *
	Normal	295 (35.6)	352 (42.5)	309 (37.3)	
	Obese	426 (51.4)	360 (43.5)	417 (50.4)	
<b>Self-perceived Health Status</b>	Good	256 (30.9)	297 (35.9)	253 (30.6)	10.61 *
	Average	427 (51.6)	423 (51.1)	438 (52.9)	
	Bad	145 (17.5)	108 (13.0)	137 (16.5)	
<b>Self-perceived Stress Level</b>	Not at all	115 (13.9)	107 (12.9)	83 (10.0)	24.74 ***
	A little	451 (54.5)	490 (59.2)	426 (51.4)	
	Quite	262 (31.6)	231 (27.9)	319 (38.5)	
<b>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	Underweight	30 (3.6)	48 (5.8)	39 (4.7)	15.22 *
	Normal	306 (37.0)	350 (42.3)	301 (36.4)	
	Overweight	185 (22.3)	178 (21.5)	194 (23.4)	
	Obese	307 (37.1)	252 (30.4)	294 (35.5)	
<b>Hypertension (mmHg)</b>	Normal	525 (63.4)	556 (67.1)	545 (65.8)	5.77
	Prehypertension	229 (27.7)	208 (25.1)	230 (27.8)	
	Hypertension	74 (8.9)	64 (7.7)	53 (6.4)	
<b>Fasting Glucose (mg/dL)</b>	Normal	558 (67.4)	611 (73.8)	559 (67.5)	11.73 *
	Impaired glucose	221 (26.7)	170 (20.5)	221 (26.7)	
	Diabetes	49 (5.9)	47 (5.7)	48 (5.8)	
<b>Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)</b>	Normal	486 (58.7)	490 (59.2)	461 (55.7)	3.81
	Borderline	248 (30.0)	258 (31.2)	276 (33.3)	
	Hyperlipidemia	94 (11.4)	80 (9.7)	91 (11.0)	
<b>HDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)</b>	Low	126 (15.2)	121 (14.6)	87 (10.5)	10.75 *
	Normal	478 (57.7)	470 (56.8)	514 (62.1)	
	High	224 (27.1)	237 (28.6)	227 (27.4)	
<b>Triglyceride (mmHg)</b>	Normal	593 (71.6)	612 (73.9)	632 (76.3)	4.84
	Borderline	115 (13.9)	104 (12.6)	97 (11.7)	
	Danger	120 (14.5)	112 (13.5)	99 (12.0)	
<b>HbA1c (%)</b>	Normal	609 (73.6)	643 (77.7)	601 (72.6)	6.63
	Borderline	154 (18.6)	130 (15.7)	155 (18.7)	
	Diabetes	65 (7.9)	55 (6.6)	72 (8.7)	

Note. The values are presented as n (%). \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , PA: Physical Activity, SB: Sedentary Behavior

250 Table 3 presents the results of an ANOVA analysis for different variables across three groups.  
 251 Firstly, for moderate PA, no significant difference was observed ( $p = 0.91$ ), with mean values of  $191.3$   
 252  $\pm 293.2$ ,  $187.6 \pm 238.0$ , and  $193.2 \pm 288.7$  for the  $CSR < 1.0$ ,  $1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$ , and  $1.5 \leq CSR$  groups  
 253 respectively. However, vigorous PA displayed a significant mean difference between  $CSR < 1.0$  ( $30.6$   
 254  $\pm 133.6$ ) and the  $1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$  ( $17.4 \pm 63.8$ ) groups ( $p = 0.04$ ). SB time revealed significant mean  
 255 differences between all groups ( $p < 0.001$ ):  $CSR < 1.0$  ( $482.1 \pm 209.9$ ),  $1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$  ( $520.6 \pm$   
 256  $202.9$ ), and  $1.5 \leq CSR$  ( $555.8 \pm 227.7$ ). Both sleep duration on weekdays and weekends demonstrated  
 257 significant mean differences among all groups ( $p < 0.001$ ), with respective values for  $CSR < 1.0$  of  
 258  $458.9 \pm 75.8$  (weekday) and  $388.5 \pm 81.0$  (weekend), for  $1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$  of  $422.0 \pm 70.4$  (weekday)  
 259 and  $466.5 \pm 82.5$  (weekend), and for  $1.5 \leq CSR$  of  $327.3 \pm 68.1$  (weekday) and  $562.2 \pm 107.3$   
 260 (weekend). Weekly Sleep Duration also exhibited significant mean differences ( $p < 0.001$ ) between  
 261  $CSR < 1.0$  ( $423.7 \pm 75.1$ ) and both  $1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$  ( $444.2 \pm 72.3$ ) and  $1.5 \leq CSR$  ( $444.7 \pm 81.2$ ), but  
 262 not between  $1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$  and  $1.5 \leq CSR$ . Lastly, worktime showed significant mean differences  
 263 among all groups ( $p < 0.001$ ):  $CSR < 1.0$  ( $1833.1 \pm 1204.2$ ),  $1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$  ( $1858.7 \pm 1260.7$ ), and  
 264  $1.5 \leq CSR$  ( $2270.9 \pm 1157.7$ ).  
 265

**Table 3.** Comparative ANOVA analysis of health-related factors across CSR groups (n = 2,484)

Variables		Groups	Mean $\pm$ SD	p-value	95% Confidence Intervals
MVPA	Moderate Intensity	$CSR < 1.0$	$191.3 \pm 293.2$	0.91	171.3 – 211.3
		$1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$	$187.6 \pm 238.0$		171.3 – 203.8
		$1.5 \leq CSR$	$193.2 \pm 288.7$		173.5 – 212.9
	Vigorous Intensity	$CSR < 1.0$	$30.6 \pm 133.6$	0.04*	21.5 – 39.7 <sup>†</sup>
		$1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$	$17.4 \pm 63.8$		13.1 – 21.8 <sup>†</sup>
		$1.5 \leq CSR$	$27.9 \pm 120.6$		19.7 – 36.2
SB time	$CSR < 1.0$	$482.1 \pm 209.9$	$< 0.001^{* \dagger \wedge}$	467.8 – 496.4	
	$1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$	$520.6 \pm 202.9$		506.8 – 534.5	
	$1.5 \leq CSR$	$555.8 \pm 227.7$		540.3 – 571.3	
Sleep Duration	Weekdays	$CSR < 1.0$	$458.9 \pm 75.8$	$< 0.001^{* \dagger \wedge}$	453.7 – 464.1
		$1.0 \leq CSR < 1.5$	$422.0 \pm 70.4$		417.2 – 426.8

	$1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$	$327.3 \pm 68.1$		$322.7 - 331.9$
	$\text{CSR} < 1.0$	$388.5 \pm 81.0$	$< 0.001^{* \dagger \wedge}$	$383.0 - 394.1$
Weekends	$1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$	$466.5 \pm 82.5$		$460.9 - 472.1$
	$1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$	$562.2 \pm 107.3$		$554.9 - 569.5$
	$\text{CSR} < 1.0$	$423.7 \pm 75.1$	$< 0.001^{* \wedge}$	$418.6 - 428.8$
Weekly	$1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$	$444.2 \pm 72.3$		$439.3 - 449.2$
	$1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$	$444.7 \pm 81.2$		$439.2 - 450.3$
	$\text{CSR} < 1.0$	$1833.1 \pm 1204.2$	$< 0.001^{\dagger \wedge}$	$1751.0 - 1915.3$
<b>Worktime</b>	$1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$	$1858.7 \pm 1260.7$		$1772.7 - 1944.7$
	$1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$	$2270.9 \pm 1157.7$		$2191.9 - 2349.8$

266 Note.  $n = 828$  for all groups, MVPA: Moderate to Vigorous Physical Activity, SB: Sedentary Behavior, SD: Standard  
 267 Deviation; \* Significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) between  $\text{CSR} < 1.0$  and  $1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$ , † Significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ )  
 268 between  $1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.50$  and  $1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$ , ^ Significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) between  $\text{CSR} < 1.0$  and  $1.5 \leq \text{CSR}$ .  
 269

270 Table 4 shows the multinomial logistic regression results with  $1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  as the reference  
 271 group. For the ‘Type of Residence’, those residing in a ‘Single-family house’ were 2.42 times more  
 272 likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} < 1$  group (OR = 2.42, 95% CI = 1.77 – 3.32,  $p$ -value < 0.001) and 1.78 times  
 273 more likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.78, 95% CI = 1.3 – 2.43,  $p$ -value < 0.001). Similarly,  
 274 those living in an “Apartment” were 2.01 times more likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} < 1$  group (OR = 2.01, 95%  
 275 CI = 1.52 – 2.67,  $p$ -value < 0.001) and 1.48 times more likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.48,  
 276 95% CI = 1.13 – 1.95,  $p$ -value = 0.004). In the ‘Occupational Status’, compared to the ‘Not classified’  
 277 reference group, the “White” workers were 0.71 times less likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} < 1$  group (OR =  
 278 0.71, 95% CI = 0.52 – 0.97,  $p$ -value = 0.03) but 1.71 more likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} \geq 1.5$  group (OR =  
 279 1.71, 95% CI = 1.22 – 2.39,  $p$ -value = 0.002). The “Pink” workers were significantly more likely to be  
 280 in the  $\text{CSR} \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 3.93, 95% CI = 2.7 – 5.71,  $p$ -value < 0.001). The “Blue” workers showed  
 281 1.76 times more likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.76, 95% CI = 1.12 – 2.77,  $p$ -value = 0.01).  
 282 In the ‘Work Schedule’, people working in shiftwork or other work schedules were 0.8 times as likely  
 283 to be in the  $\text{CSR} < 1$  group (OR = 0.8, 95% CI = 0.58 – 1.09,  $p$ -value = 0.15). However, they were 1.13  
 284 times more likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.13, 95% CI = 0.82 – 1.57,  $p$ -value = 0.46).  
 285 Night shift workers were 1.27 times as likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} < 1$  group (OR = 1.27, 95% CI = 0.91 –  
 286 1.79,  $p$ -value = 0.16) and 1.29 times as likely to be in the  $\text{CSR} \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.29, 95% CI = 0.91  
 287 – 1.81,  $p$ -value = 0.15). For the ‘Income Quintile (individual)’, those in the “low” category were 0.86

288 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.86, 95% CI = 0.62 – 1.2,  $p$ -value = 0.37) and 0.63  
289 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 0.63, 95% CI = 0.45 – 0.89,  $p$ -value = 0.008). The  
290 ‘lower middle’, ‘upper middle’, and ‘high’ categories showed no statistically significant differences in  
291 the  $CSR < 1$  group. However, those in the “high” category were 0.71 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq$   
292 1.5 group (OR = 0.71, 95% CI = 0.52 – 0.98,  $p$ -value = 0.04). Regarding the ‘Drinking Status’, people  
293 who drank once a month were 0.63 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 0.63, 95% CI =  
294 0.46 – 0.89,  $p$ -value = 0.007). Those who drank 2 – 4 times a month were 0.75 times as likely to be in  
295 the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 0.75, 95% CI = 0.55 – 1.02,  $p$ -value = 0.07). In terms of ‘Smoking Status’,  
296 current smokers were 0.79 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.79, 95% CI = 0.61 –  
297 1.01,  $p$ -value = 0.06).

298 In terms of ‘Moderate PA’, individuals who met the WHO’s guidelines were 0.92 times as  
299 likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.92, 95% CI = 0.73 – 1.16,  $p$ -value = 0.5), and were 1.08  
300 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.08, 95% CI = 0.86 – 1.36,  $p$ -value = 0.52). For  
301 ‘Vigorous PA’, those who met the criteria were 1.71 times more likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR  
302 = 1.71, 95% CI = 1.2 – 2.46,  $p$ -value = 0.003). However, they were 1.34 times more likely to be in the  
303  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.34, 95% CI = 0.92 – 1.94,  $p$ -value = 0.12). For ‘Walking Days per week’,  
304 those who walked every day were less likely to either CSR group compared to those who didn't  
305 participate at all, being 0.58 times in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.58, 95% CI = 0.4 – 0.83,  $p$ -value =  
306 0.003) and 0.53 times in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 0.53, 95% CI = 0.37 – 0.75,  $p$ -value < 0.001).  
307 Those who walked 4 – 6 days per week were 0.76 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR =  
308 0.76, 95% CI = 0.53 – 1.08,  $p$ -value = 0.13) and 0.69 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR  
309 = 0.69, 95% CI = 0.49 – 0.98,  $p$ -value = 0.04). Those who walked 1 – 3 days per week were just as  
310 likely to be in either CSR group as non-participants. In terms of ‘SB Time’, those with a time between  
311 420 – 600 minutes were 0.72 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.72, 95% CI = 0.55 –  
312 0.95,  $p$ -value = 0.02) and were just as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 0.93, 95% CI = 0.7 –  
313 1.24,  $p$ -value = 0.62). Those with a time of 600 minutes or more were 0.66 times as likely to be in the  
314  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.66, 95% CI = 0.51 – 0.84,  $p$ -value = 0.001), and were 1.42 times as likely to  
315 be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.42, 95% CI = 1.11 – 1.82,  $p$ -value = 0.006).



316 For ‘Self-perceived Body Shape’, those who perceived themselves as thin were 1.3 times as  
317 likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 1.3, 95% CI = 0.92 – 1.85,  $p$ -value = 0.14) compared to those  
318 who perceived themselves as normal. Individuals who perceived themselves as obese were 1.33 times  
319 as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 1.33, 95% CI = 1 – 1.76,  $p$ -value = 0.048), and were 1.24  
320 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.24, 95% CI = 0.93 – 1.64,  $p$ -value = 0.14).  
321 Regarding ‘Self-perceived Health Status’, those who perceived their health as good were 0.93 times as  
322 likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.93, 95% CI = 0.74 – 1.17,  $p$ -value = 0.53), and were 0.91  
323 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 0.91, 95% CI = 0.72 – 1.15,  $p$ -value = 0.42). Those  
324 who perceived their health as bad were 1.2 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 1.2, 95%  
325 CI = 0.89 – 1.63,  $p$ -value = 0.22). In terms of ‘Self-perceived Stress Level’, those who felt a little  
326 stressed were 0.85 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.85, 95% CI = 0.62 – 1.16,  $p$ -  
327 value = 0.31). Those who felt quite stressed were 1.72 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR  
328 = 1.72, 95% CI = 1.2 – 2.47,  $p$ -value = 0.003).

329 Regarding ‘BMI’, individuals classified as underweight were 0.65 times as likely to be in the  
330  $CSR < 1$  group compared to normal-weight individuals (OR = 0.65, 95% CI = 0.38 – 1.11,  $p$ -value =  
331 0.11). Obese individuals were 1.18 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 1.18, 95% CI =  
332 0.84 – 1.67,  $p$ -value = 0.34) and 1.11 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.11, 95% CI  
333 = 0.78 – 1.57,  $p$ -value = 0.56). In terms of ‘Hypertension’, those with hypertension were similarly likely  
334 to be in the  $CSR < 1$  (OR = 0.91, 95% CI = 0.62 – 1.35,  $p$ -value = 0.65) and  $CSR \geq 1.5$  groups (OR =  
335 0.69, 95% CI = 0.45 – 1.04,  $p$ -value = 0.08). For ‘Fasting Glucose’, individuals with impaired glucose  
336 were 1.26 times as likely to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 1.26, 95% CI = 0.96 – 1.66,  $p$ -value = 0.09)  
337 and 1.31 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.31, 95% CI = 0.99 – 1.72,  $p$ -value =  
338 0.06). Regarding ‘Total Cholesterol’, individuals with borderline cholesterol were 0.85 times as likely  
339 to be in the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 0.85, 95% CI = 0.68 – 1.07,  $p$ -value = 0.17) and were similarly likely  
340 to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.05, 95% CI = 0.83 – 1.32,  $p$ -value = 0.69). Individuals with  
341 hyperlipidemia were 1.14 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.14, 95% CI = 0.80 –  
342 1.63,  $p$ -value = 0.48). For ‘HDL Cholesterol’, individuals with low HDL were 0.62 times as likely to  
343 be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 0.62, 95% CI = 0.44 – 0.88,  $p$ -value < 0.01). In terms of ‘Triglyceride

344 levels’, individuals with borderline levels were 0.77 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  groups (OR  
 345 = 0.77, 95% CI = 0.55 – 1.08,  $p$ -value = 0.13) compared to those with normal levels. Lastly, for ‘HbA1c  
 346 levels’, individuals with borderline levels were 1.12 times as likely to be in the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR  
 347 = 1.12, 95% CI = 0.83 – 1.51,  $p$ -value = 0.47). Those with diabetes were 1.22 times as likely to be in  
 348 the  $CSR < 1$  group (OR = 1.22, 95% CI = 0.63 – 2.36,  $p$ -value = 0.56) and 1.87 times as likely to be in  
 349 the  $CSR \geq 1.5$  group (OR = 1.87, 95% CI = 0.97 – 3.60,  $p$ -value = 0.06).

350 **Table 4.** Multinomial logistic regression results ( $n = 2,484$ )

Variables		CSR < 1				1.5 ≤ CSR			
		95% CI				95% CI			
		<i>p</i> -value	OR	Lower	Upper	<i>p</i> -value	OR	Lower	Upper
<b>Type of Residence</b>	Others		Ref.				Ref.		
	Single-family house	< 0.001	2.42***	1.77	3.32	< 0.001	1.78***	1.30	2.43
	Apartment	< 0.001	2.01***	1.52	2.67	0.004	1.48**	1.13	1.95
<b>Occupational Status</b>	Not classified		Ref.				Ref.		
	White	0.03	0.71*	0.52	0.97	0.002	1.71**	1.22	2.39
	Pink	0.06	1.42	0.99	2.02	< 0.001	3.93***	2.70	5.71
	Blue	0.89	0.97	0.63	1.48	0.01	1.76*	1.12	2.77
<b>Work Schedule</b>	Day		Ref.				Ref.		
	Shiftwork (or others)	0.15	0.80	0.58	1.09	0.46	1.13	0.82	1.57
	Night	0.16	1.27	0.91	1.79	0.15	1.29	0.91	1.81
<b>Income Quintile (Individual)</b>	Middle		Ref.				Ref.		
	Low	0.37	0.86	0.62	1.20	0.008	0.63**	0.45	0.89
	Lower middle	0.80	1.04	0.75	1.44	0.45	0.88	0.63	1.22
	Upper middle	0.85	1.03	0.75	1.43	0.93	1.02	0.74	1.40
	High	0.02	0.68*	0.49	0.94	0.04	0.71*	0.52	0.98
<b>Drinking Status</b>	Abstained in the last year		Ref.				Ref.		
	Once a month	0.30	0.84	0.61	1.17	0.007	0.63**	0.46	0.89
	2 – 4 times a month	0.26	0.84	0.62	1.14	0.07	0.75	0.55	1.02
	At least twice a week	0.4	0.88	0.66	1.18	0.51	0.91	0.67	1.21
<b>Smoking Status</b>	Never smoked		Ref.				Ref.		
	Current smoker	0.06	0.79	0.61	1.01	0.88	0.98	0.76	1.26
	Ex-smoker	0.69	0.95	0.73	1.23	0.78	1.04	0.80	1.34
<b>Moderate PA</b>	Not met		Ref.				Ref.		
	Met	0.50	0.92	0.73	1.16	0.52	1.08	0.86	1.36
<b>Vigorous PA</b>	Not met		Ref.				Ref.		
	Met	0.003	1.71**	1.20	2.46	0.12	1.34	0.92	1.94

	Not participating			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Walking Days (wk)</b>	1~3 days	0.92	1.02	0.73	1.42	0.26	0.82	0.59	1.15
	4~6 days	0.13	0.76	0.53	1.08	0.04	0.69*	0.49	0.98
	Everyday	0.003	0.58**	0.41	0.83	< 0.001	0.53***	0.37	0.75
	< 420			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>SB Time (min)</b>	420 ≤ Time < 600	0.02	0.72*	0.55	0.95	0.62	0.93	0.70	1.24
	600 ≤	0.001	0.66**	0.51	0.84	0.006	1.42**	1.11	1.82
	Normal			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Self-perceived Body Shape</b>	Thin	0.14	1.30	0.92	1.85	0.99	1.00	0.70	1.42
	Obese	0.048	1.33*	1.00	1.76	0.14	1.24	0.93	1.64
	Average			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Self-perceived Health Status</b>	Good	0.53	0.93	0.74	1.17	0.42	0.91	0.72	1.15
	Bad	0.22	1.21	0.89	1.63	0.65	1.07	0.79	1.46
	Not at all			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Self-perceived Stress Level</b>	A little	0.31	0.85	0.62	1.16	0.73	1.06	0.76	1.48
	Quite	0.78	1.05	0.74	1.48	0.003	1.72**	1.20	2.47
	Normal			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>BMI (kg/m2)</b>	Underweight	0.11	0.65	0.38	1.11	0.89	1.04	0.62	1.73
	Overweight	0.47	1.12	0.83	1.52	0.41	1.14	0.84	1.54
	Obese	0.34	1.18	0.84	1.67	0.56	1.11	0.78	1.57
	Normal			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Hypertension (mmHg)</b>	Prehypertension	0.57	0.93	0.73	1.19	0.81	0.97	0.76	1.24
	Hypertension	0.65	0.91	0.62	1.35	0.08	0.69	0.45	1.04
	Normal			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Fasting Glucose (mg/dL)</b>	Impaired glucose	0.09	1.26	0.96	1.66	0.06	1.31	0.99	1.72
	Diabetes	0.60	0.82	0.40	1.71	0.34	0.70	0.34	1.46
	Normal			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)</b>	Borderline	0.17	0.85	0.68	1.07	0.69	1.05	0.83	1.32
	Hyperlipidemia	0.70	1.07	0.75	1.53	0.48	1.14	0.80	1.63
	Desirable			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>HDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)</b>	Low	0.53	0.90	0.66	1.24	0.007	0.62**	0.44	0.88
	High	0.43	1.1	0.86	1.41	0.84	1.03	0.80	1.31
	Normal			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>Triglyceride (mmHg)</b>	Borderline	0.95	0.99	0.72	1.36	0.13	0.77	0.55	1.08
	Danger	0.80	1.05	0.74	1.48	0.37	0.85	0.59	1.21
	Normal			Ref.				Ref.	
<b>HbA1c (%)</b>	Borderline	0.86	0.97	0.72	1.31	0.47	1.12	0.83	1.51

---

Diabetes	0.56	1.22	0.63	2.36	0.06	1.87	0.97	3.60
----------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

---

351 Note. \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , S.E: Standard Error, OR: Odd Ratio, CI: Confidence Interval, PA: Physical Activity, SB: Sedentary  
352 Behavior, the reference group is the  $1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$  group.  
353

## 354 Discussion

355 Sleep disorders and sleep deprivation are becoming increasingly prevalent across the globe  
356 due to contemporary lifestyles. A common practice among Koreans is to catch-up sleep during  
357 weekends or days off to compensate for the sleep deficit accumulated over the work week. Such  
358 inconsistent sleep schedules and interruptions often lead to various health problems, ranging from  
359 decreased PA to increased mental health risks. These issues diminish an individual's quality of life and  
360 contribute to broader clinical and public health challenges. Therefore, we examined the association  
361 between CSR of adults and health risk factors. In the present study, we demonstrated that the gap in  
362 CSR had statistically significant associations with PA levels, SB time, mental health, and CRF.

363 Our study reveals distinct differences in the anthropometric measures of participants based on  
364 the CSR groups, emphasizing a gender-specific impact. Although male participants showed no  
365 significant difference across CSR groups, we observed a downward trend in weight, WC, and BMI as  
366 CSR increased in female participants. Despite having higher weight-related measures, females in the  
367  $\text{CSR} < 1$  group exhibited significantly lower fasting glucose levels, indicating potential complex  
368 metabolic interplays. A marginal difference in HbA1c levels among the entire participant group  
369 (combined male and female) suggests a possible relation between better glycemic control and lower  
370 CSR. These findings suggest that CSR patterns might affect anthropometric characteristics differently  
371 based on gender, indicating a need for further research to elucidate the underlying mechanisms.

372 The type of residence significantly influenced CSR status. People who tended to get more  
373 sleep during weekdays and those who slept heavily on weekends were more likely to live in single-  
374 family houses or apartments. This implies sleep patterns and behaviors may impact the type of residence.  
375 Regarding occupational status, those who slept more on weekdays than weekends were less likely to be

376 'White' workers, but those who slept more on weekends than weekdays were more likely to belong to  
377 this job category. In contrast, people with high CSR were significantly more likely to be 'Pink' and  
378 'Blue' workers. While the relation between low CSR group and work schedules was not clearly defined,  
379 those with high CSR group showed a slight tendency to belong to non-traditional schedules, such as  
380 shift work or night work. These results indicate that various occupational characteristics and work  
381 schedules can disrupt standard sleep patterns, suggesting that different work conditions could impact  
382 one's sleep. The relationship between participants' work time and CSR demonstrated significant  
383 variations across all groups, suggesting a correlation between longer work hours and increased CSR.  
384 This was especially evident in the group that sleeps more on weekends than on weekdays, where the  
385 correlation appeared more clearly. This aligns with Dahlgren and his colleagues (Dahlgren et al., 2006),  
386 which showed that individuals working long hours tend to sleep more on non-working days, likely to  
387 recover from sleep deprivation experienced during working days. CSR status also significantly  
388 influenced individuals' income, with the high CSR group less likely to belong to the lower- and higher-  
389 income individuals. This means that people with high CSR are more likely to have very little or very  
390 high income. Regarding lifestyle habits, the high CSR group was less likely to belong to less frequent  
391 drinkers. People with high CSR had lower rates of drinking. This suggests that weekday and weekend  
392 sleep patterns can affect drinking rates and that drinking habits effectively prevent excessive CSR.  
393 Meanwhile, participants who slept more during the weekdays than on weekends were less likely to  
394 belong to current smokers than those with  $1.0 \leq \text{CSR} < 1.5$ . This might indicate that less sleep time  
395 during the weekdays than weekends is associated with a healthier lifestyle, such as not smoking. But  
396 additional research would be required to investigate the potential causal relationships between sleep  
397 patterns and smoking habits.

398         The relationship between CSR and adherence to WHO's PA guidelines appears to differ based  
399 on the intensity of the activity. Individuals with a low CSR were less likely to meet the WHO's  
400 recommendations for moderate-intensity PA, while those with a high CSR were more likely to do so.

401 This suggests sleep behavior changes between weekdays and weekends may not substantially impact  
402 moderate PA. However, the low and high CSR groups were more likely to meet the WHO's  
403 recommendations regarding vigorous-intensity PA than those with a typical sleeping pattern. These  
404 findings suggest a complex interplay between sleep behaviors and PA levels. The observed  
405 discrepancies in adherence to WHO's PA guidelines among those with different CSR levels imply that  
406 sleep patterns may influence how individuals adjust their PA intensity. Interestingly, for 'Walking Days  
407 per week', our findings suggest an association between regular walking and a more consistent sleep  
408 pattern throughout the week. This could indicate that irregular sleep patterns, either sleeping more on  
409 weekdays or having large amounts of sleep on weekends (presumably to catch up on sleep debt accrued  
410 during the week), might be associated with lower levels of regular PA, such as walking. Furthermore,  
411 those who sleep more on weekdays might miss out on morning or daytime opportunities for walking  
412 due to their extended sleep schedule. Conversely, individuals sleeping heavily on weekends might use  
413 this time to recover from sleep debt accumulated over the week, limiting their time or energy for PA.  
414 In terms of 'SB Time', A lower CSR, typically observed in participants who slept more during the  
415 weekdays, was associated with reduced SB time, specifically in those spending between 420 – 600  
416 minutes or more than 600 minutes in SB. This suggests less sleep debt during weekdays may encourage  
417 a more active lifestyle with lower SB time. On the other hand, a higher CSR was more prevalent among  
418 participants with a daily SB time of 600 minutes or more. This suggests a lifestyle with more SB time  
419 might lead to greater sleep debt during the working week, necessitating more catch-up sleep and a  
420 higher CSR. These findings highlight the complex relationship between catch-up sleep needs and a  
421 sedentary lifestyle. We suggest mitigating sleep debt could be critical in reducing SB time.

422 In examining 'Self-perceived Body Shape', individuals who slept more during weekdays tend  
423 to identify as thin or obese. However, those who had more sleep time during weekends showed a  
424 specific tendency to perceive themselves as obese. The study indicates an association between sleeping  
425 more during weekdays, catching up on sleep excessively during weekends, and the self-perception of

426 being obese. Considering the relationship between self-perception of body shapes and mental health  
427 conditions, such as depression and anxiety, we suggest that sleep hygiene might directly connect to the  
428 mental health (Darimont et al., 2020). Participants tended to sleep more on weekdays, and those who  
429 tended to compensate by sleeping excessively on the weekend showed a slightly decreased possibility  
430 of perceiving their health as 'good'. These findings suggest a potential relationship between sleep  
431 patterns and self-perception of health. Specifically, deviations from an average sleep pattern appear to  
432 be associated with a less positive perception of one's health. These results emphasize the importance of  
433 maintaining a balanced and consistent sleep routine for overall health and well-being. Regarding stress  
434 levels, it was observed that participants who slept excessively on weekends compared to weekdays were  
435 slightly more likely to consider themselves a little stressed. However, there was a significant difference  
436 between the groups in answers to the questionnaire that felt that the stress level was 'quite'. This suggests  
437 a direct relationship between longer sleep duration on weekends and stress relief. However, the increase  
438 in feeling 'very' stressed out among these participants means there may be a tipping point where  
439 excessive sleep can lead to increased stress. Meanwhile, the pattern observed among people who sleep  
440 a lot on weekends may be due to a phenomenon known as 'social jet lag'. It refers to a discrepancy  
441 between an individual's biological clock and social schedule, often caused by sleeping late or staying  
442 up late on weekends. You may get more sleep, but it can disrupt your body's circadian rhythm,  
443 heightening stress.

444         Among the CRF, BMI shows a higher tendency towards obesity in individuals who slept more  
445 on weekdays and those who slept excessively on weekends than on weekdays. Individuals who slept  
446 more on weekdays were less likely to be underweight. This pattern may emphasize the complex  
447 interplay between obesity, lifestyle behaviors, and sleep duration. Consistent sleep patterns also help  
448 maintain the balance of the hunger and satiety-regulating hormones leptin and ghrelin, which can  
449 contribute to a healthier BMI (Taheri et al., 2004). Leptin signals the brain to suppress appetite, and  
450 ghrelin, which stimulates appetite, can be negatively impacted by irregular sleep (Van Cauter et al.,

2008). These findings underline the need to improve sleep quality and consistency. In addition, groups had similarly diverse differences in other variables related to CRF. First, in the case of low CSR compared to the group with regular sleep patterns, the possibility of belonging to prehypertension and hypertension was low, and the probability of belonging to impaired glucose with fasting glucose was high, but a lower propensity towards diabetes. Total cholesterol, triglyceride, and HbA1c were less likely to belong to the borderline, but conversely, hyperlipidemia, danger, and diabetes were high. Paradoxically, the likelihood of them having hyperlipidemia and diabetes was higher, and their overall health risk was also elevated. A noticeable difference appeared in the group with high CSR. While they showed a similar pattern as the low CSR group regarding hypertension, fasting glucose, and HDL cholesterol, the odds ratios were more pronounced. The highest odds ratio was found with HbA1c, indicating that those catch-up sleep excessively over weekends were about twice as likely to have diabetes as those with regular sleep patterns. Contrary to our expectations that irregular sleep patterns would result in negative CRF, our results indicated a decreased risk for cardiometabolic diseases relating to hypertension, fasting glucose, and triglycerides. This suggests that managing blood pressure and fasting blood sugar is multifactorial and not confined to sleep patterns. Hence, while sleep is a vital aspect of overall health, it forms only one facet of a comprehensive approach to maintaining a healthy body. This approach includes a balanced diet, regular physical activity, stress management, and avoiding harmful habits such as smoking and excessive alcohol consumption. Consequently, our study underscores the complexity of maintaining physical health and the significance of adopting a holistic perspective toward health and lifestyle.

This study revealed several positive strengths. First, the strength of this study is the matching of gender and age using a nationally representative data set. In addition, this is the first study to investigate the associations between CSR and various factors such as socioeconomic status, PA level, SB time, self-perception level, and cardiometabolic risk factors. As far as we know, no prior research has previously delved into such a diverse range of aspects concerning CSR. This positions our study at



476 the forefront of this area of research, shedding new light on the complex interconnections between  
477 lifestyle, health, and sleep habits. However, this study has a few limitations. The cross-sectional design  
478 of our study limits our ability to conclude the causality or long-term dynamics of these relationships.  
479 Additionally, the potential for bias due to the reliance on participants' self-reported data cannot be  
480 discounted. Therefore, we suggest that future studies should strive to expand upon these findings by  
481 delineating the causal links between CSR and the array of factors analyzed in this research. A transition  
482 to a longitudinal study design, alongside using objective sleep and physical activity measurements,  
483 could afford more profound and precise insights into these relationships. Importantly, subsequent  
484 investigations should strive to shed light on the specific mechanisms whereby these elements shape  
485 sleep behaviors and metabolic health. This could ultimately facilitate better health outcomes and  
486 improved quality of life for these individuals.

487

## 488 **Conclusion**

489 In conclusion, our research indicates that weekend CSR can provide significant insights into  
490 various health behaviors, lifestyle habits, and CRF. The modern lifestyle, heavily influenced by  
491 widespread technology use, can drastically alter our sleep patterns, substantially impacting our physical  
492 and mental health. Shifts in CSR could signal changes in PA levels, SB duration, and other health  
493 indicators, ultimately shaping overall well-being. Therefore, a comprehensive health management  
494 approach incorporating CSR considerations becomes increasingly essential. Government agencies,  
495 healthcare providers, and individuals should acknowledge the significance of sleep patterns on health  
496 and incorporate these insights when devising health promotion strategies. The differences among the  
497 groups observed in our study highlight the necessity for more detailed investigations into sleep patterns,  
498 enhancing our understanding of their impact on adult health. This knowledge can aid in creating more  
499 targeted and effective health interventions for individuals across different strata of society.

500

## 501 **Acknowledgments**

502           We want to thank for participants who took part in our experiments.

## 503 Reference

- 504 1. Khubchandani J, Price JH. Short sleep duration in working American adults, 2010–2018.  
505 *Journal of community health*. 2020;45:219-27.
- 506 2. Ford ES, Cunningham TJ, Croft JB. Trends in self-reported sleep duration among US adults  
507 from 1985 to 2012. *Sleep*. 2015;38(5):829-32.
- 508 3. Jonasdottir SS, Minor K, Lehmann S. Gender differences in nighttime sleep patterns and  
509 variability across the adult lifespan: a global-scale wearables study. *Sleep*. 2021;44(2):zsaa169.
- 510 4. Bae M-J, Song Y-M, Shin J-Y, Choi B-Y, Keum J-H, Lee E-A. The association between shift  
511 work and health behavior: findings from the Korean National Health and Nutrition  
512 Examination Survey. *Korean journal of family medicine*. 2017;38(2):86.
- 513 5. Kang S-G, Lee YJ, Kim SJ, Lim W, Lee H-J, Park Y-M, et al. Weekend catch-up sleep is  
514 independently associated with suicide attempts and self-injury in Korean adolescents.  
515 *Comprehensive psychiatry*. 2014;55(2):319-25.
- 516 6. Hwangbo Y, Kim W-J, Chu MK, Yun C-H, Yang KI. Association between weekend catch-up  
517 sleep duration and hypertension in Korean adults. *Sleep medicine*. 2013;14(6):549-54.
- 518 7. Oh YH, Kim H, Kong M, Oh B, Moon JH. Association between weekend catch-up sleep and  
519 health-related quality of life of Korean adults. *Medicine*. 2019;98(13).
- 520 8. Kim KM, Han SM, Min IK, Heo K, Kim W-J, Chu MK. Weekend catch-up sleep and  
521 depression: Results from a nationally representative sample in Korea. *Sleep Medicine*.  
522 2021;87:62-8.
- 523 9. Lane ND, Lin M, Mohammad M, Yang X, Lu H, Cardone G, et al. Bewell: Sensing sleep,  
524 physical activities and social interactions to promote wellbeing. *Mobile Networks and*  
525 *Applications*. 2014;19:345-59.
- 526 10. Silfee VJ, Houghton CF, Jake-Schoffman DE, Lopez-Cepero A, May CN, Sreedhara M, et al.  
527 Objective measurement of physical activity outcomes in lifestyle interventions among adults:  
528 A systematic review. *Preventive medicine reports*. 2018;11:74-80.
- 529 11. Atkinson G, Davenne D. Relationships between sleep, physical activity and human health.  
530 *Physiology & behavior*. 2007;90(2-3):229-35.
- 531 12. Foti KE, Eaton DK, Lowry R, McKnight-Ely LR. Sufficient sleep, physical activity, and  
532 sedentary behaviors. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2011;41(6):596-602.
- 533 13. Ghrouz AK, Noohu MM, Dilshad Manzar M, Warren Spence D, BaHammam AS, Pandi-  
534 Perumal SR. Physical activity and sleep quality in relation to mental health among college  
535 students. *Sleep and Breathing*. 2019;23:627-34.
- 536 14. Kredlow MA, Capozzoli MC, Hearon BA, Calkins AW, Otto MW. The effects of physical  
537 activity on sleep: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of behavioral medicine*. 2015;38:427-49.
- 538 15. Wang F, Boros S. The effect of physical activity on sleep quality: a systematic review.  
539 *European Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2021;23(1):11-8.
- 540 16. Arslan SS, Alemdaroğlu İ, Karaduman AA, Yilmaz ÖT. The effects of physical activity on  
541 sleep quality, job satisfaction, and quality of life in office workers. *Work*. 2019;63(1):3-7.
- 542 17. Henson J, Dunstan DW, Davies MJ, Yates T. Sedentary behaviour as a new behavioural target  
543 in the prevention and treatment of type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes/metabolism research and reviews*.  
544 2016;32:213-20.
- 545 18. Dempsey PC, Owen N, Biddle SJ, Dunstan DW. Managing sedentary behavior to reduce the  
546 risk of diabetes and cardiovascular disease. *Current diabetes reports*. 2014;14:1-11.
- 547 19. Saunders TJ, McIsaac T, Douillette K, Gaulton N, Hunter S, Rhodes RE, et al. Sedentary  
548 behaviour and health in adults: an overview of systematic reviews. *Applied Physiology,*  
549 *Nutrition, and Metabolism*. 2020;45(10):S197-S217.
- 550 20. Mansoubi M, Pearson N, Biddle SJ, Clemes S. The relationship between sedentary behaviour

- 551 and physical activity in adults: a systematic review. *Preventive medicine*. 2014;69:28-35.
- 552 21. Browne RAV, Farias-Junior LF, Freire YA, Schwade D, de Araújo Dantas de Macêdo G,  
553 Montenegro VB, et al. Sedentary occupation workers who meet the physical activity  
554 recommendations have a reduced risk for metabolic syndrome. *Journal of Occupational and*  
555 *Environmental Medicine*. 2017;59(11):1029-33.
- 556 22. Biswas A, Oh PI, Faulkner GE, Bajaj RR, Silver MA, Mitchell MS, et al. Sedentary time and  
557 its association with risk for disease incidence, mortality, and hospitalization in adults: a  
558 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2015;162(2):123-32.
- 559 23. Shochat T. Impact of lifestyle and technology developments on sleep. *Nature and science of*  
560 *sleep*. 2012:19-31.
- 561 24. Charles LE, Slaven JE, Mnatsakanova A, Ma C, Violanti JM, Fekedulegn D, et al. Association  
562 of perceived stress with sleep duration and sleep quality in police officers. *International journal*  
563 *of emergency mental health*. 2011;13(4):229.
- 564 25. Prather AA, Bogdan R, Hariri PAR. Impact of sleep quality on amygdala reactivity, negative  
565 affect, and perceived stress. *Psychosomatic medicine*. 2013;75(4):350.
- 566 26. Rao JV, Chandraiah K. Occupational stress, mental health and coping among information  
567 technology professionals. *Indian journal of occupational and environmental medicine*.  
568 2012;16(1):22.
- 569 27. Dalmases M, Benítez I, Sapiña-Beltran E, Garcia-Codina O, Medina-Bustos A, Escarrabill J,  
570 et al. Impact of sleep health on self-perceived health status. *Scientific reports*. 2019;9(1):7284.
- 571 28. Keyes CLM, Ryff CD. Subjective change and mental health: A self-concept theory. *Social*  
572 *psychology quarterly*. 2000:264-79.
- 573 29. Lin SH, Liao WC, Chen MY, Fan JY. The impact of shift work on nurses' job stress, sleep  
574 quality and self-perceived health status. *Journal of nursing management*. 2014;22(5):604-12.
- 575 30. Domínguez F, Fuster V, Fernández-Alvira JM, Fernández-Friera L, López-Melgar B, Blanco-  
576 Rojo R, et al. Association of sleep duration and quality with subclinical atherosclerosis. *Journal*  
577 *of the American College of Cardiology*. 2019;73(2):134-44.
- 578 31. Kim J, Cho S-J, Kim W-J, Yang KI, Yun C-H, Chu MK. Insufficient sleep is prevalent among  
579 migraineurs: a population-based study. *The journal of headache and pain*. 2017;18(1):1-8.
- 580 32. Knutson KL. Sleep duration and cardiometabolic risk: a review of the epidemiologic evidence.  
581 *Best practice & research Clinical endocrinology & metabolism*. 2010;24(5):731-43.
- 582 33. Tobaldini E, Fiorelli EM, Solbiati M, Costantino G, Nobili L, Montano N. Short sleep duration  
583 and cardiometabolic risk: from pathophysiology to clinical evidence. *Nature Reviews*  
584 *Cardiology*. 2019;16(4):213-24.
- 585 34. Hjorth MF, Chaput J-P, Damsgaard CT, Dalskov S-M, Andersen R, Astrup A, et al. Low  
586 physical activity level and short sleep duration are associated with an increased cardio-  
587 metabolic risk profile: a longitudinal study in 8-11 year old Danish children. *PloS one*.  
588 2014;9(8):e104677.
- 589 35. Freeman D, Sheaves B, Waite F, Harvey AG, Harrison PJ. Sleep disturbance and psychiatric  
590 disorders. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(7):628-37.
- 591 36. Anderson KN, Bradley AJ. Sleep disturbance in mental health problems and neurodegenerative  
592 disease. *Nature and science of sleep*. 2013:61-75.
- 593 37. Alvaro PK, Roberts RM, Harris JK. A systematic review assessing bidirectionality between  
594 sleep disturbances, anxiety, and depression. *Sleep*. 2013;36(7):1059-68.
- 595 38. Eslami AA, Rabiei L, Khayri F, Nooshabadi MRR, Masoudi R. Sleep quality and spiritual  
596 well-being in hemodialysis patients. *Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal*. 2014;16(7).
- 597 39. Hirshkowitz M, Whiton K, Albert SM, Alessi C, Bruni O, DonCarlos L, et al. National Sleep  
598 Foundation's sleep time duration recommendations: methodology and results summary. *Sleep*  
599 *health*. 2015;1(1):40-3.
- 600 40. Kim HJ, Oh SY, Joo JH, Choi D-W, Park E-C. The relationship between sleep duration and

- 601 perceived stress: findings from the 2017 Community Health Survey in Korea. *International*  
602 *journal of environmental research and public health*. 2019;16(17):3208.
- 603 41. World Health Organization. Obesity [Available from:  
604 [https://www.who.int/westernpacific/health-topics/obesity#tab=tab\\_1](https://www.who.int/westernpacific/health-topics/obesity#tab=tab_1).
- 605 42. World Health Organization. Physical activity 2022 [Available from:  
606 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/physical-activity>.
- 607 43. Dahlgren A, Kecklund G, Åkerstedt T. Overtime work and its effects on sleep, sleepiness,  
608 cortisol and blood pressure in an experimental field study. *Scandinavian journal of work,*  
609 *environment & health*. 2006;318-27.
- 610 44. Darimont T, Karavasiloglou N, Hysaj O, Richard A, Rohrmann S. Body weight and self-  
611 perception are associated with depression: Results from the National Health and Nutrition  
612 Examination Survey (NHANES) 2005–2016. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. 2020;274:929-  
613 34.
- 614 45. Taheri S, Lin L, Austin D, Young T, Mignot E. Short sleep duration is associated with reduced  
615 leptin, elevated ghrelin, and increased body mass index. *PLoS medicine*. 2004;1(3):e62.
- 616 46. Van Cauter E, Spiegel K, Tasali E, Leproult R. Metabolic consequences of sleep and sleep  
617 loss. *Sleep medicine*. 2008;9:S23-S8.

618