Preferences for Daylight Saving Time meet fundamentals of human physiology

José María Martín-Olalla

Universidad de Sevilla,
Facultad de Física,
Departamento de Física de la Materia Condensada,
ES41012 Sevilla,
Spain[*]

Jorge Mira

Universidade de Santiago de Compostela,
Facultade de Física,
Departamento de Física Aplicada and iMATUS,
ES15782 Santiago de Compostela,
Spain[†]

(Dated: June 21, 2023)

We search for correlations in the preferences for seasonal time arrangements across different countries. With this purpose we analyze the public consultation on summertime arrangements (Daylight Saving Time) launched by the European Commission in 2018 (the largest sample size study of this kind, 4.55 million replies). We also analyze the starting point of human activity in Europe from the Harmonized European Time Use Survey, also the largest scale survey to assess the budget of time in modern societies.
We find that the shares of population willing to abolish the seasonal regulations of time increases with increasing latitudes and with earlier phases of human activity. Notably the phases are determined in relation to the winter sunrise, which drives the seasonal cycles of light and dark, and synchronizes human preferences. We provide a simple physiological rationale for this finding.

CONTENTS

1. Results 3
   1.1. How public consultation preferences associate with geographical predictors 3
   1.2. How the public consultation preferences associated with human activity related predictors 4

2. Discussion 4

3. Methods 7
   3.1. Daylight Saving Time and geography 7
   3.2. The 2018 public consultation on summertime arrangements 8
   3.3. Harmonized European Time Use Survey 8

4. Data availability 9

Acknowledgments 9

References 9

A. Tabular material 11

B. Additional figures 16

Daylight Saving Time (DST) or summertime arrangements is the practice by which many Extratropical (chiefly Western) societies bound to pre-set schedules have successfully regulated their starting times through seasons. The practice consists in a one-hour delay of clock time in autumn followed by a backward one-hour advance of clock time

[*] olalla@us.es; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3750-9113; https://ror.org/03yxnpp24
[†] jorge.mira@usc.es; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6024-6294; https://ror.org/030eybx10

Typeset by REVTEX

in spring. The shifts imperfectly follow the delay (autumn) and the advance (spring) of sunrise times. All else equal, it is equivalent to a seasonal regulation of the pre-set schedules so that the phase of human activity is bimodal: delayed in winter, advanced in summer.

DST regulations have been long time under public scrutiny(Monk and Folkard, 1976) in the fear of the acute impact that the stroke of one hour may bring in health and societal issues, specifically in traffic accidents(Coren, 1996; Fritz *et al.*, 2020) and myocardial infarctions(Janszky and Ljung, 2009; Manfredini *et al.*, 2018), and of the disruption of the seasonal adjustement(Kantermann *et al.*, 2007). Recently some research studies have put emphasis on the chronic circadian misalignment that the practice might bring(Johnson and Malow, 2022; Roenneberg *et al.*, 2019a) and have flagged the practice as "artificial". As a result of this, many physiologists and some medical societies have built a strong case against DST, whose only benefit would be tiny, unspecific energy savings(e Cruz *et al.*, 2019; Malow, 2022; Roenneberg *et al.*, 2019b; Watson, 2019).

In contrast, we must note that the practice aimed to solve a tricky social question which roots on human physiology and on environmental conditions. How can the modern appetence for regular schedules conciliate with the irregular distribution of sunrise times? In other words, which is the best hour of the day for a pre-set starting time in view of the span of sunrise times? How can pre-set starting times be best aligned to sunrise time from winter to summer?

In line with these questions we previously challenged this modern criticism of DST regulations and described the conditions upon which modern societies would find more benefits than inconveniences in practicing DST(Martín-Olalla, 2019a). In the Tropical range DST is seldom used because the low span of sunrise times through seasons makes it unnecessary. At very high latitudes, the span of sunrise times is increasingly large and DST is unable to align the start of human activity with a sunrise which may not even occur for long periods of time (midnight sun and polar night). At moderate latitudes DST efficiently binds the start of human activity with sunrise and may have helped to prevent the incorporation of human activity into the hours at which the winter dawn occurs(Martín-Olalla, 2022). We also noted that the main goal of the practice is never challenged by the circadian community(Martín-Olalla and Mira, 2023): eventually human activity at Extratropical latitudes is prone to delay in winter and to advance in summer.

The understanding of social preferences for seasonal DST and for permanent DST has also become recently a point of interest in this field. Surveys usually show a majority of respondents pro canceling the biannual change of clocks, which is celebrated by those who sponsor the abolishing of DST. But polls also show a majority pro setting DST permanently, in bold disagreement with the "science-informed" positions that favor permanent standard time(Antle *et al.*, 2022; Coogan *et al.*, 2022; Rubin, 2023).

This work aims to identify the best explanatory variable that predicts the preferences for cancelling of the biannual change of the clocks. We present a thorough analysis of the public consultation that the European Commission launched in 2018 on summertime arrangements, and whose results prompted the Commission to demand the cancelling of DST, without success. The analysis will cross-correlate the preferences for abolishing DST with latitude, and with the phase of human activity deduced from the Harmonized European Time Use Survey (HETUS)(Eurostat, 2010).

In the end, we show that the shares of population against DST regulations can be best explained by the shares of early risers (those who start their activity earlier than the winter sunrise time). Not surprisingly, it is the very same explanatory variable that gave rise to DST regulations in the early 20th century, whose primary goal was the alignment of work hours closer to sunrise(Harrison, 2013; Pollack, 1981; Willet, 1907). Therefore we highlight the role of human physiology and environmental conditions (latitude) in this issue, and challenge both the association of DST with longitude/time zones(Johnson and Malow, 2022; Roenneberg *et al.*, 2019b) and the public policies that look for one-size-fits-all solutions.

The 2018 public consultation was a self-reported study without sample design but with a large number of replies. The consultation asked a key question (question 2): the individual preference *to keep or to abolish the current arrangement?* [DST]. This question provides a feedback of the *statu quo* under which the respondent has been living in the recent past. Therefore is of great interest to understand how the population reacts to DST.

In all but two Member States (Greece and Cyprus) the majority supported the abolish choice. The Commission committed to this result and demanded the abolition, without success. In sharp contrast, for our study the net balance of the two choices by Member State is irrelevant. Instead, we will analyse the distribution of the abolish choice according to latitude; and the distribution of the keep choice according to latitude. By separating either choice in our the analysis we are removing the bias that the lack of sample design introduced in the public consultation.

Three major strengths of the study must be highlighted: first, the large sample size of the public consulation. Second, the wide range of latitudes covered by the consultation —from 35° to 63° and beyond— which brings vividly different seasonal cycle of light and dark, under the same clock regulations. Third, the large number of countries involved —from 25 to 17, depending of the analysis— which brings the association between explanatory variables (latitude and the phase of human activity) and the outcome (preferences to abolish DST) statistically significant. Previous



FIG. 1 The association between the seasonal factor $F(\phi)$ and the shares of population willing to abolish DST as per the 2018 public consultation C. The outliers, Germany, Austria and Luxembourg, are not shown in the main picture. They can be identified in the inset. The solid line shows the point estimates of the prediction; the dashed lines bound the 95 % prediction interval. The regression is statistically significant ($p = 0.015$), see Table S1 in the Supplementary Material. Notice that the span of the predictor is larger than one hour: the standard unit of social time and the size of the stroke brought by DST of clocks. Labels show iso-3166 alpha-2 codes.

studies were limited to one country (Norway(Bjorvatn *et al.*, 2021)) and one province (Alberta, Canada(Antle *et al.*, 2022)) with a narrower range of latitude.

1. RESULTS

1.1. How public consultation preferences associate with geographical predictors

We first show the association between the results of the 2018 public consultation on DST (outcome) and the geographical predictors. On the first hand, we consider two outcomes: the shares of respondents willing to cancel DST, hereafter C, by Member State; and the shares of respondents willing to keep DST, hereafter K. On the other hand, we consider four predictors. First we test the longitude λ and the time offset, the distance from solar noon to clock midday. Neither of these two predictors sets seasonal variability (see Section 3.1) and therefore neither should set preferences for neither outcome.

Indeed, the null hypothesis "the shares of respondents pro canceling C or pro keeping K DST by Member State do not depend on the longitude or the time offset" sustained ($p = 0.188; p = 0.247; p = 0.689; p = 0.938$) at the standard level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$), see Table S1 and Figure S1 in the Supplementary Material.

We then considered the latitude ϕ as a predictor, and found that that the null hypothesis does not sustain ($p = 0.043; R^2 = 0.167; N = 25$) for the abolish outcome. The association brings larger shares of respondents willing to cancel DST with higher latitude. On the contrary, the null hypothesis sustains for the keep outcome ($p = 0.449$).

Finally, we test the seasonal factor $F(\phi)$ —which sets the seasonal differences in photoperiod, in sunset times and in sunrise times as a function of latitude, see Section 3.1— as a explanatory variable and found that the null hypothesis does not sustain ($p = 0.015$, $R^2 = 0.231, N = 25$). Preferences for canceling DST increased with earlier sunrise times and larger seasonal variability, in line with our previous expectations(Martín-Olalla, 2019a). On the contrary the null hypothesis sustained ($p = 0.666$) when the keep choice was tested against the seasonal factor. Figure 1 shows a scatter plot of C versus F.

Germany, Austria and Luxembourg met several standard criteria for outlier removal and were removed from these

associations. On the first hand, their shares were larger than $Q_3 + 1.5 \times (Q_3 - Q_1)$, where Q_1 and Q_3 are the low and high quartiles of the distribution of shares. On the second hand if the sample standard deviation σ and the sample mean μ are considered, German shares were located more than 3σ away from μ, thus qualifying as an outlier for the 3σ criterion. When the German shares where removed, the Austrian shares were also located more than 3σ away from the new sample mean. When the Austrian shares were removed, the Luxembergean shares met also the 3σ criterion. In the end, and relative to the rest of the field, the shares against DST in Austria, Germany and Luxembourg were located $9\sigma, 15\sigma$, and 5σ relative to the mean. Similar deviations were obtained for the bivariate analysis, see the inset in Figure 1.

For the keep choice Austria, Cyprus, Germany and Luxembourg qualified as outliers and were removed from the analysis. As a result of this, the sample size was 960 199 replies in 25 member states (against) and 174 489 replies in 24 member states (keep).

We bring the attention to the pivotal role played by physical geography and human geography in determining the statistical significance in the C vs $F(\phi)$ association. On the first hand, the predictor extends for two hours, larger than the size of the DST shift. On the other hand, the border effects across every Member State allow many isolated systems, which develop uses and costumes somehow homogeneous and somehow heterogeneous. This makes the breakdown of the results by Member States meaningful. We found remarkable that this set of social and environmental variables can be associated in a way which is related to physical phenomena.

1.2. How the public consultation preferences associated with human activity related predictors

To understand the interplay between the shares of population against DST C and the seasonal factor $F(\phi)$ and how this is related to human physiology we now analyze the association between C and the phase of human activity (see Section 3.3). The data set is here reduced to the $N = 17$ participants in HETUS that also participated in the 2018 public consultation and were not flagged as outliers. The number of replies in the $N = 17$ Member States adds up 813 564.

We did not find any statistically significant association between C and the phase of the sleep/wake cycle or the phase of the work cycle when they are measured by a distance to noon (either clock time or mean solar time). This is in line with our previous expectations because mean solar time is not impacted by seasons or latitude.

On the contrary, we did find a statistically significant association when the phase (midpoint) was measured relative to the winter sunrise time. For the association between the phase of the sleep and other personal care with C we found $p = 0.006; R^2 = 0.408; N = 17$, while for the phase of the labor cycle found $p < 0.001; R^2 = 0.553; N = 17$. Either of the two activities finds larger shares of population willing to cancel DST with earlier starting points, shown by the negative value of the bivariate slope; see Table S4 in Supplementary Material.

In line with the goals of DST, which aims to regulate starting times, we analyzed the association between C and morning time marks —sleep offset and work onset—. We found similar results (see Table S5 in Supplementary Material). Notably the consultation results correlate the more against morning time marks for both activities. The association between C and the time distance between work onset and the winter sunrise time finds $R^2 = 0.702$ and $p < 2 \times 10^{-5}$.

Figure 2 shows in four panels the association between morning timemarks (left) and midpoints (right) with the shares of population willing to cancel DST as per the public consultation. The top two panels refer to the sleep and other cares activity: sleep offset (left) and sleep midpoint (right). The bottom two panels refer to work onset (left) and work midpoint (right). The solid line shows the regression and the dashed lines bound the 95 % prediction interval associated with the regression.

2. DISCUSSION

Our analysis of the 2018 public consultation shows that the best predictor for the shares of population willing to cancel DST is the shares of early risers —here defined as persons that start their duties earlier than the winter sunrise—. The more shares of early risers in the general population, the more shares of persons against DST in the general population: $R^2 = 0.7; p = 2 \times 10^{-5}$ in a sample of $N = 17$ EU Member States.

In other words, the best quantity that explains the discomfort with DST and, also the relief that the biannual change brings, is the distance between the starting point of the activity and the winter sunrise. This result roots in human physiology and in the aims and goals of DST, which addressed the discomfort that starting times aligned with



FIG. 2 Scatter plots of the shares of population willing to abolish DST as per the 2018 European Commission public consultation (outcome) vs four predictors related to human activity as per HETUS. The left column shows morning time marks: sleep and other personal care offset (top) and work onset (bottom). The right column shows noon time marks: sleep and other personal cares midpoint (top), work midpoint (bottom). Time marks are given as a distance to the winter sunrise. Circles refer to round 2 (year 2010) of HETUS, and squares to round 1 (year 2000). The null hypothesis "the predictor does not explain the outcome" does not sustain at the standard level of significance for every test, see Table S5 in Supplementary Material. Solid line shows the results of the linear regression; dashed lines bound the 95 % prediction interval of the regression. Table S2 lists the data values that generated this plot.

the winter sunrise brought during the summer season(Harrison, 2013; Martín-Olalla, 2019a,b; Pollack, 1981; Willet, 1907).

The early risers find challenging dark conditions in the winter morning. They may find challenging dark conditions after DST spring forward shift, depending on the transition date. Finally, they also find challenging bright conditions during the summer evening, which jeopardizes their bedtimes. All these bring the discomfort with the practice. We must note that this interplay is irrespective of latitude because everywhere winter sunrise time and summer sunset time are separated by twelve hours (eleven "clock" hours if DST applies). Increasing latitude simply promotes larger shares of early risers as a result of increasingly delayed winter sunrise times. On the contrary, the late risers —those persons with start times in line with the winter sunrise— seldom find these issues and show little discomfort with the practice.

Our finding is a paradoxical result for the current science-informed scenario described by the circadian community. It is showing that in order to build up shares of population against the annoying DST regulations, it is needed to build up shares of early risers. That is, population living with annoying start times earlier than the winter sunrise. The circadian golden standard of year-round pre-set schedules with start times aligned with the winter sunrise seems to be unstable in some societies. Indeed, this golden standard must have been present at the beginning of the 20th century, but it was soon deprecated in United Kingdom, urban areas of United States, Ireland and Portugal, giving birth to the biannual changing of the clocks. Eventually by advancing clocks in spring and delaying it back in autumn, these societies prevented the growing use of artificial light from incorporating more human activity into the earlier hours of the winter morning(Martín-Olalla, 2022). Therefore the biannual clock change kept the number or early risers at bay

and the shares population against the regulations did not grow either. In the end the setting sustained in time.

Our results challenge the frequent argument within the circadian community that the seasonal clock regulations bring a circadian misalignment during the DST period because the social clock is "artificially" out of sync with the sun clock(Johnson and Malow, 2022; Malow, 2022, 2023; Roenneberg *et al.*, 2019a). The misunderstanding here comes from the fact that the misalignment is associated with clock time and with mean solar time (noon). However, human preferences and practical decisions are connected with sunrise, and therefore with latitude and seasons(Martín-Olalla, 2018). As long as the clock regulations do not bring the starting points ahead of the sunrise and the bedtimes ahead of the sunset, the alleged misalignment is irrelevant for practical decisions and, very likely, a matter of personal preferences.[1] We have previously noted that for this to occur transition dates must be properly chosen.(Martín-Olalla, 2020; Martín-Olalla and Mira, 2023)

If DST brought a circadian misalignment due to the misalignment between the social clock and the sun clock, then the shares of population against DST in the public consultation and the latitude should not correlate because the stroke of one hour does not depend on the latitude. In reverse, the existence of a statistically significant correlation between the latitude and the shares of population against DST suggests that the stroke of one hour is not playing a leading role in bringing up the discomfort with the practice. In contrast, our results suggest that the alleged misalignment is mainly perceived by the early risers, but not by the late risers. The latter group would find themselves comfortable with the current setting; and might find themselves misaligned should the clocks be not advanced in spring. This would explain why many polls display larger preferences for permanent DST, a choice that bothers the circadian community(Antle *et al.*, 2022; Coogan *et al.*, 2022). More than expressing a science-informed preference for this setting, they might be just spontaneously expressing their accordance with their current way of life in summer.

We did not find a statistically significant correlation between the shares of population willing to keep DST and the latitude or the seasonal factor. We suggest that the public consultation targeted specifically the group of population against DST. This group had a stimulus to show up and have their say: their own discomfort with the current regulation. They expected to alter the *statu quo*. We hypothesize that the stimulus was related to human physiology and correlated with the aims of the clock regulations. On the contrary the stimulus was lacking for the group of population pro DST.

More succinctly our results suggest that the real shares of population against DST by Member States and the shares of population against DST by Member State that showed up in the public consultation scale through a roughly similar scaling factor.

We exclude from this suggestion Austria, Germany and Luxembourg where a clear, distinct, unidentified cause brought larger shares of population to show up at the public consultation. As a plausible hypothesis we put forward the following argument. In order to show up at the public consultation the general population first needed to know about it. That role was brought by public advertisment launched by the European Commission and, above all, by the impact of the consultation in mass media. We note that Austria and Germany are the two only member states where the German language is the official language; while in Luxembourg, the German language is spoken by significant shares for the population. It might have been the case that German language media put more attention on the public consultation than elsewhere. Larger shares of audiences brought larger shares of respondents compared with other Member States.

Because the shares of population pro DST did not show up consistently in the 2018 public consultation our methodology cannot assess whether above some circle of latitude the majority is against the current regulations. Nonetheless, the findings of this manuscript, supported by such large scale samples, have a substantial impact in the current wave of discussion around summertime arrangements and, specifically, challenges the one-size-fits-all solutions that usually show up.

As an example, we put forward the past preference of the European Commission: either every Member State must practice summertime arrangements (the *statu quo* now implemented through Directive 2000/48/EC) or they all must abandon the practice. We emphasize that the ex-post impact assessment on the time arrangements in the European Union briefly addresses this issue in Section 2.3.3, but only from a pure geographical point of view(Parliament *et al.*, 2017). The final report of the technical assistance with the 2018 public consultation(Commission *et al.*, 2019) considered in the Appendix A3 "Analysis by latitude" three latitudinal clusters —above the 53rd parallel (7 countries), below the 46th parallel (9), and the intermediate range (12)—. Surprisingly no conclusions, evidences or lack of evidences follow the grouping analysis, probably due to the poor methodology.

In sharp contrast, our methodology did find a significant stratification of preferences with latitude and with the phase of the human activity. Therefore we understand that a science evidence-based policy should allow Member

[1] Eventually, beyond the Polar Circle and during the Polar night or during the midnight sun period, few can be said about the alignment of the phase of human activity in terms of clock time.

States to opt-out from the current setting, and should implement binding transition dates only for those Member States who wanted to continue the seasonal practice.

In contrast to the European Union, the contiguous USA happen to experience more similar seasonal cycles of day and light, with perhaps the exception of Florida, close to the Tropic of Cancer. We do not know of a public consultation in USA similar to the public consultation launched by the European Commission. Yet, Martín-Olalla (2018) places the US starting point of human activity in line with the winter sunrise, as in United Kingdom or Italy. Therefore we would expect the general population would not strongly oppose DST in USA. This is also in line with the long standing record of the practice (some one hundred years in the US urban areas). On the contrary, we place the Russian starting point of human activity in line with the Scandinavian and Baltic starting points using data from Borisenkov *et al.* (2017), who report school starting times. As a result, year-round DST failed to sustain in Russia after 2015, when year-round standard time was adopted. While this choice was celebrated by the circadian community we bring the attention to the fact that this is a consequence of having previously advanced the starting point of human activity, due to the challenges associated with the shortening of the winter photoperiod, and may not necessarily apply elsewhere.

The bi-annual change of the clocks is abrupt, annoying and hazardous, but societies seldom practice them for the fun of it, or only for economic reasons. They happen to manifest a simple, physiological adaptation to seasons once pre-set schedules were established and when the environment demands it. This happens within a range of intermediate latitudes where $F(\phi)$ ranges from 1 h and 2 h (30° to 50° in latitude) so that DST effectively binds the starting point of human activity to the sunrise (see the annotated box in Supplementary Material, Figure S2).

3. METHODS

3.1. Daylight Saving Time and geography

DST transitions are usually associated to the longitude λ and the time zone offset Z.(Johnson and Malow, 2022; Roenneberg *et al.*, 2019a) After all, time zone designation is the modern way by which we express the reference of time. However, longitude and time zone offset only set the difference between noon and midday $Z - \lambda/\Omega$, where $\Omega = 15\,^\circ\,\mathrm{h}^{-1} = 0.262\,\mathrm{rad\,h}^{-1}$ is Earth's angular rotation speed. With noon occurring every 24 h day after day, irrespective of season they play no role in this issue.

However, the human response to, and the human preferences for, these arrangements must depend chiefly on the latitude ϕ because this is the one and only factor that sets the seasonal variability of sunrise times through the seasonal factor:

$$F(\phi) = \frac{\pi/2 - \cos^{-1}(\tan\phi\tan\varepsilon)}{\Omega}, \tag{1}$$

where $\varepsilon = 23.5°$ is Earth's axial tilt. Figure S2 in the Supplementary Material shows a scatter plot of $F(\phi)$. Notice that $F(\phi)$ is a time magnitude, defined so that $6\,\mathrm{h} \pm F(\phi)$ is the winter (plus) and summer (minus) sunrise mean solar time. Likewise sunset times go as $18\,\mathrm{h} \mp F(\phi)$; and the photoperiod, as $12\,\mathrm{h} \mp 2F(\phi)$(Martín-Olalla, 2018). During one year the sunrise times and the sunset times span $2F(\phi)$ and the photoperiod $4F(\phi)$ around the Equatorial values.

With $F(\phi)$ a small and slow varying function at low latitudes (see Figure S2 in Supplementary Material) the annoying stroke of one-hour finds little support in the Tropic. Likewise with $F(\phi)$ high and steepest it would find little support in the Polar region, because the varying seasons brings a span of sunrise time much larger than one hour. At intermediate latitudes the annoying stroke is balanced with better alignment of starting times with sunrise time, smaller exposition to the damaging central hours of the day during the summer season and with an improvement on the leisure time during this season(Martín-Olalla, 2019a).

Little is known on how latitude impacts the public preferences for the practice, save for the obvious fact that the practice is seldom used at the Tropics. The European Union is an adequate environment to test this idea because the supranational ensemble extends from 35° (Cyprus) to the Polar Circle (Finland and Sweden), which sets vividly different seasonal cycles of light and dark: sunrise time can span as few as less than three hours (Cyprus) to more than seven hours (Finland).

Table S2 in the Supplementary Material lists European Union Member States and United Kingdom in increasing values of latitude. Figure S3 in Supplementary Material shows an Albers projection of Europe and visualizes longitude and latitude. Geographical data were retrieved from the GeoNames database.

3.2. The 2018 public consultation on summertime arrangements

From 4 July 2018 to 16 August 2018 the European Commission launched a web-based public consultation on summertime arrangements in their *Have your say* portal. The final report counts $N = 4\,540\,554$ million replies to the consultation from citizens in the then 28 Member States(Commission *et al.*, 2019). A clear majority, 84 % of respondents, demanded the cancel of DST. A fortnight after the consultation ended, the Juncker Commission launched the proposal to cancel of DST. However Member States could not agree on which time should survive, a most complicated decision to which the consultation gave no clear preference: 56 % of respondents preferred summer time, 32 %, winter time.

Public consultations are not surveys due to the lack of sample extraction design. The European Commission acknowledges that the consultation on time arrangements had "a self-selection bias of the respondents towards the views of those who choose[d] to respond to the consultation"[2].

However in our methodology we performed different analysis for the two main groups of population: those against DST, and those pro DST. In that case the selection bias of the sample is unimportant.

We took the data from Table 8 in the final report, which lists the absolute numbers of answers by citizens to Question 2 in the consultation: *to keep or abolish the current arrangement?*. We also retrieved the population numbers P for 2018 by Member State from the Eurostat database (`demo_pjanind.tsv`). By scaling with the population numbers we produced the shares of population against the current arrangement C by Member State and the shares of population in favor of the current regulations K.

The total number of citizens against DST that showed up in the public consultation were 3 802 007, only 738 547 showed up to keep the regulations. After removing the outliers (see Section 1.1) are removed the totals are 960 199 citizens in 25 countries and 174 849 in 24 countries.

We emphasize that the replies to the target question express a feedback to the current *statu quo*, under which most of the respondents have been living during long time. We do not analyze the preferences for which clock should survive (Question 3). Replies to this question express, for the majority of the population, preferences for hypothetical, unknown scenarios. These personal preferences may or may not sustain in time if they materialize.

Table S3 lists the population numbers and the replies to question 2 in the Member States that took part in the consultation.

3.3. Harmonized European Time Use Survey

In addition to the geographical variables, the outcome will be tested against the phase of human cycles. For this purpose we will retrieve the daily rhythms available at HETUS(Eurostat, 2010), a collection of large scale time use surveys which were carried out in two rounds (2000 and 2010). Of the 25 Member States with meaningful C, 17 of them have reported time use statistics to Eurostat and will be tested here.

We focus on the two activities of interest in connection to the seasonal regulations of time: sleep and other personal care (code `ACOA`) and work as a primary and secondary activity, including the transfer from home to work, (code `AC1_2_TR`). The first activity largely reproduces the sleep/wake cycle in the participant state, with a minor contribution of other personal care (washing, clothing and the like). The second activity refers to the labor cycle. Both activities are linked one way or the other to the cycle of light and dark with which time regulations are associated.

HETUS reports the participation rate in an activity by time of the day in 144 distinct, 10-minute time slots. The sum of all participation rates is the fraction of time spent in the activity. An assessment of the phase of daily rhythm is provided by the midpoint (centroid) of the activity: the time slot when half the daily time spent has been consumed and half remains. For this purpose the daily rhythm is started when the participation rate is minimal: 4am (work) and 7pm (sleep and other personal cares).

We also assessed the starting point of work (or work onset) and the end point of the sleep and other personal cares (or sleep offset) by scaling the daily rhythm with the daily maximum participation rate and retrieving the time slot when the scaled participation rate is larger than one half (work) or smaller than one half (sleep).

Time slots in HETUS are given as a local time: a time relative to the local noon or the local midnight. For the purpose of comparison we will consider the mean solar time of the time mark and its distance to the winter sunrise. To obtain this metrics we will make use of longitude (mean solar time), and longitude and latitude (distance

[2] In "Public Consultation On EU Summertime Arrangements Report of Results" a working documment by the Commission Staff accompanying the document "Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council discontinuing seasonal changes of time and repealing Directive 2000/84/EC", document number 52018SC0406, `https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52018SC0406`

to the winter sunrise). The second metric (mean solar times) is the standard way in which the phase of circadian phenomena is measured. The third metric is specifically associated with ambient-light conditions and seasons, since they refer to the most challenging day of the year: that with the latest sunrise time and shortest photoperiod. We have previously shown that the winter sunrise time is a synchronizer for the human activity after analyzing time use surveys(Martín-Olalla, 2018, 2019c)

In addition to the concerns and limitations that the study design of the public consulation presents for our analysis we will also mention a further limitation. The two activities here analyzed refer to distinct population structures. The work activity is filled only by the fraction of survey respondents that do work, while the sleep and other cares activity is filled by every individual taken part in the survey. In contrast, it is not possible to extract the responses given by employees only in the 2018 public consultation.

4. DATA AVAILABILITY

Results from the public consultation are publicly available in tabular format(Commission *et al.*, 2019). We only made use of the column "Abolishing the switching for all EU-MS Citizens" in Table 8, Section B.1.2, page 41. We discarded the 8758 replies not assigned to any Member State.

HETUS data are publicly available at Eurostat(Eurostat, 2010) for all Member States that participated in the survey except Sweden. We took Sweden results from Martín-Olalla (2018). In the HETUS database we took the participation rate in the main activity (wide groups) by sex and time of the day, file `tus_00startime`.

European population numbers for 2018 were extracted from Eurostat's Demography, population stock and balance database: population (national level), population on 1 January by age and sex, file `demo_pjan`.

Geographical coordinates (latitude, longitude and time zone offset) were extracted from `GeoNames` database (`https://www.geonames.org/`). We retrieved the file `cities1000.txt`, cities above 1000 inhabitants, and produced population median values of latitude and longitude for every country in the public consultation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Along this manuscript United Kingdom is sometimes listed as a EU Member State since it participated as such in the public consultation of 2018 and in HETUS rounds. United Kingdom ceased to be a EU Member State on February 1, 2020. Removing the British results from the field does not alter the findings of our study in a substantial way.

REFERENCES

Antle, Michael C, Mahtab Moshirpour, Patricia R Blakely, Katelyn Horsley, Colin J Charlton, and Victor Hu (2022), "Longitudinal location influences preference for daylight saving time." Journal of biological rhythms **37**, 343–348.

Bjorvatn, Bjørn, Ståle Pallesen, Ingvild W. Saxvig, and Siri Waage (2021), "Daylight saving time preferences in norway: Do individual chronotype and home address' latitude and longitude matter?" Chronobiology International , 1–11.

Borisenkov, Mikhail F, Tatyana A. Tserne, Alexander S. Panev, Ekaterina S. Kuznetsova, Natalia B. Petrova, Vladimir D. Timonin, Sergey N. Kolomeichuk, Irina A. Vinogradova, Maria S. Kovyazina, Nikita A. Khokhlov, Anna L. Kosova, and Olga N. Kasyanova (2017), "Seven-year survey of sleep timing in russian children and adolescents: chronic 1-h forward transition of social clock is associated with increased social jetlag and winter pattern of mood seasonality," Chronobiology International **48**, 3–12.

Commission, European, Directorate-General for Mobility, and Transport (2019), *Technical assistance with the public consultation on EU summertime arrangements: final report* (Publications Office).

Coogan, Andrew N, Shannon Richardson, and Sudha Raman (2022), "A data-informed perspective on public preferences for retaining or abolishing biannual clock changes," Journal of Biological Rhythms **37**, 351–357.

Coren, Stanley (1996), "Daylight savings time and traffic accidents," New England Journal of Medicine **334**, 924–925.

e Cruz, M Meira, M. Miyazawa, R. Manfredini, D. Cardinali, J. A. Madrid, R. Reiter, J. F. Araujo, R. Agostinho, and D. Acuña-Castroviejo (2019), "Impact of daylight saving time on circadian timing system: An expert statement," European Journal of Internal Medicine **60**, 1–3.

Eurostat, (2010), "Harmonised european time use surveys (hetus). rounds 1 and 2," .

Fritz, Josef, Trang VoPham, Kenneth P. Wright, and Céline Vetter (2020), "A chronobiological evaluation of the acute effects of daylight saving time on traffic accident risk," Current Biology **30**, 729–735.

Harrison, Yvonne (2013), "The impact of daylight saving time on sleep and related behaviours," Sleep Medicine Reviews **17**, 285–292.

Janszky, Imre, and Rickard Ljung (2009), "Shifts to and from daylight saving time and incidence of myocardial infarction," New England Journal of Medicine **359**, 1966–1968.

Johnson, Karin G, and Beth A. Malow (2022), "Daylight saving time: Neurological and neuropsychological implications," Current Sleep Medicine Reports **8**, 86–96.

Kantermann, Thomas, Myriam Juda, Martha Merrow, and Till Roenneberg (2007), "The human circadian clock's seasonal adjustment is disrupted by daylight saving time," Current Biology **17**, 1996–2000.

Malow, Beth A (2022), "It is time to abolish the clock change and adopt permanent standard time in the united states: a sleep research society position statement," Sleep **45**, 10.1093/sleep/zsac236.

Malow, Beth A (2023), "Author's response to "it is time to understand daylight saving time"," Sleep **46**, zsac323.

Manfredini, R, F Fabbian, A De Giorgi, B Zucchi, R Cappadona, F Signani, N Katsiki, and D P Mikhailidis (2018), "Daylight saving time and myocardial infarction: should we be worried? a review of the evidence." European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences **22**, 750–755.

Martín-Olalla, José María (2018), "Latitudinal trends in human primary activities: characterizing the winter day as a synchronizer," Scientific Reports **8**, 5350.

Martín-Olalla, José María (2019a), "Comment to "impact of daylight saving time on circadian timing system: An expert statement"," European Journal of Internal Medicine **62C**, e18–e19.

Martín-Olalla, José María (2019b), "The long term impact of daylight saving time regulations in daily life at several circles of latitude," Scientific Reports **9**, 18466.

Martín-Olalla, José María (2019c), "Seasonal synchronization of sleep timing in industrial and pre-industrial societies," Scientific Reports **9**, 6772.

Martín-Olalla, José María (2020), "Traffic accident increase attributed to daylight saving time doubled after energy policy act," Current Biology **30**, R298–R300.

Martín-Olalla, José María (2022), "A chronobiological evaluation of the risks of canceling daylight saving time," Chronobiology International **39**, 1–4.

Martín-Olalla, José María, and Jorge Mira (2023), "It is time to understand daylight saving time," Sleep **46**, zsac309–2.

Monk, Timothy H, and Simon Folkard (1976), "Adjusting to the changes to and from daylight saving time," Nature **261**, 688–689.

Parliament, European, Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services, and Irmgard Anglmayer (2017), *EU summer-time arrangements under Directive 2000/84/EC Study* (European Parliament).

Pollack, Oliver (1981), "The daylight savings time movement," History Today **31**.

Roenneberg, Till, Eva C. Winnebeck, and Elizabeth B. Klerman (2019a), "Daylight saving time and artificial time zones – a battle between biological and social times," Frontiers in Physiology **10**, 944.

Roenneberg, Till, Anna Wirz-Justice, Debra J. Skene, Sonia Ancoli-Israel, Kenneth P. Wright, Derk-Jan Dijk, Phyllis Zee, Michael R. Gorman, Eva C. Winnebeck, and Elizabeth B. Klerman (2019b), "Why should we abolish daylight saving time?" Journal of Biological Rhythms **34**, 227–230.

Rubin, Rita (2023), "Groundswell grows for permanent daylight saving time, but medical societies overwhelmingly support year-round standard time," JAMA 10.1001/JAMA.2023.0159.

Watson, Nathaniel F (2019), "Time to show leadership on the daylight saving time debate." Journal of clinical sleep medicine : JCSM : official publication of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine **15**, 815–817.

Willet, William (1907), *The waste of daylight*.

Supplementary Material A: Tabular material

The section is intended to be included in a dedicated Supplementary Material file if the manuscript is published. It can be tailored to comply with the journal's Guidelines.

	Outcome	**Pearson-R^2**	$p-$value	**Slope** [95 % **CI**]	**Unbiased SE**	**Outliers**
Non-seasonal predictors						
Longitude, λ	Absolish C	0.074	0.188		0.231	AT DE LU
	Keep K	0.060	0.247		0.048	AT CY DE LU
Time offset, $Z - \lambda/\Omega$	Absolish C	0.007	0.689		0.240	AT DE LU
	Keep K	0.000	0.938		0.049	AT CY DE LU
Seasonal predictors						
Latitude, ϕ	Absolish C	0.167	0.043	$0.013[0.000, 0.026]$	0.219	AT DE LU
	Keep K	0.026	0.449		0.049	AT CY DE LU
Seasonal factor, $F(\phi)$	Absolish C	0.231	0.015	$0.182[0.039, 0.326]$	0.211	AT DE LU
	Keep K	0.009	0.666		0.049	AT CY DE LU

TABLE S1 The association between the geographical data (predictors) and the shares of population willing to abolish or willing to keep the current time arrangements as per the 2018 public consultation launched by the European Commission (outcome). The null hypothesis fails to sustain for seasonal predictors and the abolish choice (see Figure 1 in the main text) and sustains for non-seasonal predictors (see Figure S1 in the Supplementary Material) and for the keep choice . The unbiased standard error (SE) is given in basis points. The slopes are given in basis points per degree (latitude) and basis points per hour (seasonal factor). The positive value shows larger shares of population willing to abolish the current time regulations with higher latitude and higher seasonal variability. The sample size was 960 199 replies to the public consultation from 25 member states for the abolish choice, and 174 489 replies from 24 member states for the keep choice.

Country		**Latitude** ϕ	**Longitude** λ	**Time offset** $Z - \lambda/\Omega$	**Seasonal factor**, F
CY	Cyprus	35.0°	33.4°	−0.22 h	1.18 h
MT	Malta	35.9°	14.5°	0.04 h	1.22 h
GR	Greece	38.0°	23.7°	0.42 h	1.33 h
PT	Portugal	39.2°	−8.7°	0.58 h	1.39 h
ES	Spain	40.3°	−3.6°	1.20 h	1.45 h
BG	Bulgaria	42.7°	24.8°	0.35 h	1.58 h
IT	Italy	43.5°	12.3°	0.18 h	1.63 h
HR	Croatia	45.5°	16.1°	−0.07 h	1.75 h
RO	Romania	45.6°	25.8°	0.28 h	1.76 h
SI	Slovenia	46.1°	14.5°	0.03 h	1.79 h
HU	Hungary	47.5°	19.0°	−0.27 h	1.89 h
FR	France	48.0°	2.4°	0.84 h	1.92 h
AT	Austria	48.1°	15.5°	−0.03 h	1.93 h
SK	Slovakia	48.7°	18.7°	−0.25 h	1.98 h
LU	Luxembourg	49.6°	6.1°	0.59 h	2.05 h
CZ	Czech Republic	49.9°	15.2°	−0.01 h	2.07 h
BE	Belgium	50.9°	4.4°	0.71 h	2.15 h
DE	Germany	51.0°	9.2°	0.38 h	2.17 h
PL	Poland	51.8°	19.2°	−0.28 h	2.23 h
GB	United Kingdom	52.1°	−1.4°	0.09 h	2.26 h
NL	Netherlands	52.1°	5.1°	0.66 h	2.26 h
IE	Ireland	53.3°	−6.3°	0.42 h	2.38 h
LT	Lithuania	54.9°	23.9°	0.41 h	2.55 h
DK	Denmark	55.7°	11.8°	0.22 h	2.64 h
LV	Latvia	56.9°	24.1°	0.39 h	2.80 h
SE	Sweden	59.2°	16.2°	−0.08 h	3.13 h
EE	Estonia	59.4°	24.8°	0.35 h	3.15 h
FI	Finland	61.2°	24.9°	0.34 h	3.48 h

TABLE S2 The European Union Member States at the time of the 2018 public consultation with geographical coordinates: latitude ϕ, longitude λ, time offset —the difference between noon and midday, $Z - \lambda/\Omega$, where Z is the time zone offset and Ω is Earth's rotation speed— and the seasonall factor $F(\phi)$, see Equation (1).

Country		Population P	Q2 Abolish		Q2 Keep	
			Absolute	Shares C	Absolute	Shares K
CY	Cyprus	864 236	3557	0.412 %	3951	0.457 %
MT	Malta	475 701	625	0.131 %	537	0.113 %
GR	Greece	10 741 165	15 829	0.147 %	20 443	0.190 %
PT	Portugal	10 291 027	29 045	0.282 %	5223	0.051 %
ES	Spain	46 658 447	81 961	0.176 %	5971	0.013 %
BG	Bulgaria	7 050 034	11 008	0.156 %	2123	0.030 %
IT	Italy	60 483 973	15 464	0.026 %	7976	0.013 %
HR	Croatia	4 105 493	19 493	0.475 %	2284	0.056 %
RO	Romania	19 533 481	5827	0.030 %	1663	0.009 %
SI	Slovenia	2 066 880	13 177	0.638 %	1911	0.092 %
HU	Hungary	9 778 371	18 203	0.186 %	1952	0.020 %
FR	France	67 026 224	328 124	0.490 %	64 497	0.096 %
AT	Austria	8 822 267	200 160	2.269 %	58 530	0.663 %
SK	Slovakia	5 443 120	26 435	0.486 %	6447	0.118 %
LU	Luxembourg	602 005	8337	1.385 %	2196	0.365 %
CZ	Czech Republic	10 610 055	52 233	0.492 %	10 391	0.098 %
BE	Belgium	11 398 589	52 267	0.459 %	10 143	0.089 %
DE	Germany	82 792 351	2 633 311	3.181 %	502 972	0.608 %
PL	Poland	37 976 687	121 668	0.320 %	6306	0.017 %
GB	United Kingdom	66 273 576	9582	0.014 %	2117	0.003 %
NL	Netherlands	17 181 084	21 851	0.127 %	5948	0.035 %
IE	Ireland	4 830 392	10 205	0.211 %	1436	0.030 %
LT	Lithuania	2 808 901	8744	0.311 %	833	0.030 %
DK	Denmark	5 781 190	5042	0.087 %	1196	0.021 %
LV	Latvia	1 934 379	6448	0.333 %	1146	0.059 %
SE	Sweden	10 120 242	42 562	0.421 %	5815	0.057 %
EE	Estonia	1 319 133	10 561	0.801 %	1868	0.142 %
FI	Finland	5 513 130	50 288	0.912 %	2672	0.048 %

TABLE S3 The results to question 2 in the 2018 public consultation launched by the European Commission. Member States are listed in increasing values of latitude. Each answer to the question is given in absolute numbers and in shares of the country population.

Country	Round	Sleep and other personal cares				Work			
		offset		midpoint		onset		midpoint	
		Local time	Distance to winter sunrise	Local time	Distance to winter sunrise	Local time	Distance to winter sunrise	Local time	Distance to winter sunrise
GR Greece	2	07:40h	+00:00h	04:10h	−03:29h	08:00h	+00:20h	12:40h	+05:00h
ES Spain	2	08:20h	−00:13h	04:20h	−04:13h	08:20h	−00:13h	13:00h	+04:26h
BG Bulgaria	1	07:10h	−00:39h	03:20h	−04:29h	08:00h	+00:10h	13:00h	+05:10h
IT Italy	2	07:30h	−00:12h	03:30h	−04:12h	08:00h	+00:17h	12:20h	+04:37h
RO Romania	2	07:20h	−00:35h	03:10h	−04:45h	08:00h	+00:04h	12:10h	+04:14h
SI Slovenia	1	06:50h	−00:52h	02:50h	−04:52h	07:00h	−00:42h	12:00h	+04:17h
HU Hungary	2	07:00h	−00:30h	02:50h	−04:40h	07:40h	+00:09h	12:00h	+04:29h
FR France	2	07:50h	−00:48h	03:40h	−04:58h	08:00h	−00:38h	13:20h	+04:41h
LU Luxembourg	2	07:40h	−00:51h	03:40h	−04:51h	08:00h	−00:31h	12:50h	+04:18h
BE Belgium	2	07:50h	−00:54h	03:40h	−05:04h	08:20h	−00:24h	12:50h	+04:05h
DE Germany	2	07:30h	−00:55h	03:20h	−05:05h	07:50h	−00:35h	12:10h	+03:44h
PL Poland	2	07:20h	−00:29h	03:00h	−04:49h	07:20h	−00:29h	12:20h	+04:30h
GB United Kingdom	2	07:50h	−00:23h	03:30h	−04:43h	08:30h	+00:16h	13:00h	+04:46h
NL Netherlands	2	08:00h	−00:47h	03:50h	−04:57h	08:20h	−00:27h	13:00h	+04:12h
LT Lithuania	1	07:00h	−01:48h	02:50h	−05:58h	07:40h	−01:08h	12:50h	+04:01h
LV Latvia	1	07:20h	−01:41h	03:10h	−05:51h	08:00h	−01:01h	13:20h	+04:18h
SE Sweden	1	07:30h	−01:21h	03:20h	−05:31h	07:50h	−01:01h	12:40h	+03:48h
EE Estonia	2	07:50h	−01:28h	03:40h	−05:38h	08:00h	−01:18h	12:50h	+03:31h
FI Finland	2	07:40h	−01:55h	03:30h	−06:05h	08:00h	−01:35h	12:30h	+02:54h

TABLE S4 The time marks associated with the sleep and other personal cares and the work cycles as per HETUS. Countries are listed in increasing values of latitude. The third left-most column list the round of HETUS: round 1 was taken around 2000; round 2 around 2010. Round 3 is currently in progress.

Predictor	**Pearson-R^2**	$p-$value	**Slope**[95 % **CI**]	**Unbiased SE**
Sleep and other personal cares offset				
Time distance to local noon (local time)	0.000	0.956		0.275
Time distance to solar noon (solar time)	0.001	0.893		0.275
Time distance to winter sunrise	0.476	0.002	$-0.31[-0.49, -0.13]$	0.199
Work onset				
Time distance to local noon (local time)	0.097	0.222		0.262
Time distance to solar noon (solar time)	0.127	0.161		0.257
Time distance to winter sunrise	0.702	< 0.001	$-0.36[-0.49, -0.23]$	0.150
Sleep and other personal cares midpoint				
Time distance to local noon (local time)	0.008	0.729		0.274
Time distance to solar noon (solar time)	0.021	0.577		0.272
Time distance to winter sunrise	0.408	0.006	$-0.25[-0.41, -0.08]$	0.212
Work midpoint				
Time distance to local noon (local time)	0.000	0.962		0.275
Time distance to solar noon (solar time)	0.001	0.906		0.275
Time distance to winter sunrise	0.553	< 0.001	$-0.36[-0.54, -0.18]$	0.184

TABLE S5 The association between time marks of human activity —measured through three distinct metrics— (predictor, see Table S4) and the shares of population willing to cancel the time regulations as per the 2018 public consultation (outcome, see Table S3). Blue ink annotates $p-$values below the standard level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$), which occurs only when predictors are measured relative to the winter sunrise. The negative slope shows that earlier starting points relative to winter sunrise time predict larger shares supporting the abolition of the regulations. Slopes are given in basis points per hour. The unbiased standard error of the fit is given in basis points. The association considers 813 564 replies in $N = 17$ Member States.

Supplementary Material B: Additional figures

The section is intended to be included in a dedicated Supplementary Material file if the manuscript is published. It can be tailored to comply with the journal's Guidelines.



FIG. S1 The association between the time offset —difference between noon and midday— and the shares of population willing to cancel the regulations as per the 2018 public consultation C. Germany (3.18 %), Austria (2.27 %) and Luxembourg (1.38 %) are not shown in the picture. The solid line shows the point estimates of the prediction; the dashed lines bound the 95 % prediction interval. The regression is not statistically significant ($p = 0.696$), see Table S1 in the Supplementary Material, therefore the null hypothesis "shares do not depend on time offset" sustains at the standard level of significance. Labels show iso-3166 alpha-2 codes.



FIG. S2 The evolution of the seasonal factor F as a function of latitude ϕ. The seasonal factor is defined in Eq. (1) so that it equals to zero at the Equator. The seasonal factor gives the advance or delay of the sunrise and sunset times at the solstices relative to the Equatorial standard. The right axis shows the corresponding winter photoperiod (and the summer scotoperiod) $12\,\mathrm{h} - 2F(\phi)$. Data points annotate the Member States. The seasonal factor was modeled for a point-sized Sun and a refractionless atmosphere. The box expands from 30° to 50° and yields $F(\phi)$ from 1 h to 2 h. It is an educated guess for the utility range of seasonal regulations of time.



FIG. S3 An Albers projection of Europe with the countries participating in the 2018 European Commission public consultation on summertime arrangements (in shade and labeled). Dashed meridians annotate time meridians. Solid meridians annotate the bounduaries of the physical time zones. Circles of latitudes annotate straight values of $F(\phi)$, starting at $F = 1.5\,\mathrm{h}$ (southern most) and ending at $3.5\,\mathrm{h}$ (northern most) in steps of $0.5\,\mathrm{h}$. Color shades highlight time zones; from west to east, Western European Time ($Z = 0$), Central European Time ($Z = 1\,\mathrm{h}$) and Eastern European Time ($Z = 2\,\mathrm{h}$). Dots annotates the population median values of longitude and latitude listed in Table S2.