Should We Keep Changing the Clock? Characterizing Causal Effects of Daylight Saving Time on Behavior and Physiology

Hayoung Jeong[1]*, Srikar Katta[2]*, Will Ke Wang[1], Alexander Volfovsky[2,3], Jessilyn Dunn[1,4,5]

** These authors contributed equally to this work*

[1] Department of Biomedical Engineering, Duke University, Durham, NC
[2] Department of Computer Science, Duke University, Durham, NC
[3] Department of Statistical Science, Duke University, Durham, NC
[4] Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University, Durham, NC
[5] Duke Clinical Research Institute, Durham, NC

Correspondence: Jessilyn Dunn, PhD

534 Research Dr, Room #448,
Durham, NC 27708

jessilyn.dunn@duke.edu,

+1 919 668 9798

Abstract

Daylight Saving Time (DST) remains contentious: some policymakers highlight behavioral benefits, while others emphasize health risks. Existing evidence relies largely on aggregated data and strict modeling assumptions, obscuring individual-level patterns and yielding associational rather than causal insights. We address these limitations using objective, longitudinal Fitbit measures from the NIH *All of Us* Research Program. Avoiding strict modeling assumptions, we employed a natural difference-in-differences design using Arizona (no DST) as a control against neighboring Mountain Time states (observing DST). Contrary to the common belief, DST transitions produced no net change in total daily steps. Instead, activity was reallocated to other times of day: fall transitions increased morning steps by 202 while reducing evening steps by 180; spring showed the opposite. Notably, activity reallocation patterns differed across data-driven activity phenotypes ("Morning-," "Neutral-," and "Evening Walker") and demographics (age, income, and sex). These disparities suggest that structural factors (e.g., rigid work schedules, perceived safety) may constrain the capacity to flexibly adapt to time shifts. Physiologically, resting heart rate showed subtle intraday shifts mirroring behavioral changes, though differences were clinically insignificant. Our study provides the first large-scale causal analysis of DST's influence using continuous wearables data, illustrating how observational data can generate real-world evidence to inform health-relevant policies.

Introduction

Daylight Saving Time (DST) was first implemented in 1918 as a means to conserve energy by aligning waking hours with daylight. Over a century later, DST remains practiced in over 70 countries, yet it has become increasingly controversial.

A growing consensus, including position statements by the American Academy of Sleep Medicine, advocates for abolishing seasonal time changes in favor of permanent standard time[1]. The misalignment between biological rhythms and external time cues from DST has been linked to sleep disruption, circadian misalignment, and increased risks of myocardial infarction, ischemic stroke, and mood disorders[2–5]. However, proponents argue that DST generates behavioral benefits, especially additional opportunities for outdoor physical activity by shifting evening light later. Based on common daily activity routines, this could amount to roughly 300 additional hours of outdoor leisure time each year for adults and about 200 for children[6]. Resolving the debate around DST requires reliable, causal evidence that can evaluate both the physiological and behavioral effects of DST.

Historical DST studies relied on large-scale administrative data sources, such as hospital admission registries, health insurance claims, traffic crash databases, or self-reported surveys like the American Time Use Survey (ATUS)[4,7–10]. (Extended Data Table 1). While these studies have established important associations at the population level, they lack continuous, individual-level measures of behavior and physiology necessary for health policy evaluation.

Recent studies have begun to leverage wearable devices to move beyond broad statistics and directly measure how DST affects daily routines at an individual level. For example, Heacock et al. found associations between DST transitions and significant shifts in sleep timing, consistency, and duration among wrist-worn fitness tracker users (N=24,000)[11]. Another study by Goodman et al. employed accelerometers (N=439) to demonstrate that longer daylight is associated with increased moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) in children living in Europe and Australia, whereas no consistent changes were observed in the US pediatric population[12]. Additional smaller-scale studies have used wearables to examine cardiovascular responses and light exposure changes during DST[13,14]. However, these efforts have largely remained descriptive and depend on strict modeling assumptions (e.g., no unobserved confounders); because they rely on simple before-and-after comparisons without robust control groups, rigorous causal claims cannot be made.

In this study, we address these gaps by taking advantage of the natural variation over time and geography in one of the largest continuous wearable datasets available, the *All of Us* Research Program[15,16], spanning diverse demographic groups across the US. Arizona, the only state in the contiguous US that does not observe DST, serves as a natural control group, enabling a comparison to neighboring DST-observing Mountain Time (MT) states (Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah). Compared to previous studies that relied on simple before-and-after comparisons[10–12], we employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) analysis that leverages this natural variation. Because DiD methods do not require adjusting for any individual-level confounders, our analysis

relies on weaker assumptions that enable more rigorous causal inference. We then stratify our analysis by physical activity phenotypes and demographics to reveal heterogeneous effects across the population, providing the first large-scale causal analysis of DST's influence on behavior and physiology from continuous wearable data.

Results

Cohort Description

The *All of Us* Research Program collected Fitbit data via two pathways: the Bring-Your-Own-Device (BYOD) program, in which participants shared retrospective Fitbit data, and the *All of Us* WEAR Program, which prospectively collected data beginning in March 2021 using study-provided devices. Our analytic cohort comprised 1,157 participants located in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah with valid intraday heart rate and step data for the two weeks surrounding each spring and fall DST transition during 2021-2023 (Extended Data Fig. 1)[17]. Of these, 66% (N=763) were enrolled through the BYOD program and 34% (N=394) through the All of Us WEAR program (Extended Data Table 2). Participants represented diverse demographic groups across the four states (Table 1).

Behavioral response to DST: changes in physical activity

Visual inspection of hourly steps in Arizona (DST non-observing) and the surrounding Mountain Time states (DST-observing; Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah) revealed shifts in activity around the spring and fall transitions whereas Arizona showed no consistent change (Extended Data Fig. 2). After the "spring forward" transition, people in the DST-observing states were slower to start their activity in the mornings, particularly on Sunday (i.e., the morning of DST), and showed more activity in the late afternoon and evenings during the following days (Fig. 1A). In contrast, the "fall back" transition produced an opposite pattern: activity shifted earlier, with increased morning movement and reduced late-day steps in the DST-observing states (Fig. 1B).

Our DiD analysis corroborated these qualitative patterns and revealed contrasting effects between fall and spring DST transitions on intraday activity. Throughout, we report the results of a t-test on the estimated treatment coefficient from the DiD regression (see Methods section for more details), with standard errors clustered at the subject-level. DST transitions did not change total daily activity levels but rather restructured *when* people were active. Total daily steps did not differ significantly after either of the transitions (spring: $\beta = 31.9$, CI = [-214, 277], $p = 0.799$, t-test; fall: $\beta = -9.5$, CI = [-308, 289], $p = 0.950$, t-test). Yet, both transitions produced significant changes in activity distribution across the day, with opposing directional effects that mirror the shift in daylight availability. In spring, when sunset is delayed by an hour, evening activity slightly increases by 90 steps (CI = [14, 167], $p = 0.021$) (Fig. 1C) while morning activity showed a non-significant reduction ($\beta = -66$, CI = [-156, 24], $p = 0.148$). In fall, when sunrise is earlier, morning steps increased by 202 steps (CI = [78, 326], $p = 0.001$), roughly equating to about one

and a half city blocks, while evening steps declined by 180 steps (CI = [-263, -97], $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 1D). This significant reciprocal change observed in the fall suggests that people respond to DST transitions by reallocating their activity timings (i.e., earlier movement) rather than by changing their overall activity level.

To explore whether these temporal shifts varied by individual's preferred activity timing, we stratified participants into Morning, Neutral, and Evening Walkers based on their typical distribution of steps during the six weeks preceding each transition (see Methods). We hypothesized that daylight shifts that align with a person's preferred activity time would amplify activity levels. In particular, we expected this amplification for Evening Walkers in the spring since existing literature suggests evening hours represent a flexible, opportunistic window for leisure[18].

The hypothesis held true for Morning Walkers in the fall (Fig. 2). When daylight moved earlier, they actively capitalized on the change, significantly increasing their morning activity ($\beta = 636$, CI = [146, 1126], $p = 0.011$) while reallocating some movement away from the evening ($\beta = -144$, CI = [-267,-21], $p = 0.022$). Evening Walkers also showed a slight increase in their morning steps ($\beta = 88$, CI = [3, 173], $p = 0.043$) but no significant changes in the evening steps ($\beta = -234$, CI = [-479, 12], $p = 0.062$), suggesting that they followed their habitual routines even as daylight decreased in the evening.

Interestingly, the reciprocal during the spring did not hold true for the Evening Walkers (i.e., they did not increase their evening steps), revealing an asymmetry in behavioral response in Morning vs Evening Walkers. We expected that the "spring forward" change, by providing more evening daylight, would create an opportunity for more physical activity in Evening Walkers. Despite the daylight now being better aligned with their typical active times, Evening Walkers did not show a significant increase in evening steps ($\beta = 39.3$, CI= [-166, 245], $p = 0.708$). Morning Walkers also largely maintained their routines (morning steps: $\beta = 55.1$, CI = [-250, 361], $p = 0.723$), rather than reducing their activity from less daylight.

Neutral Walkers, who lack a strong temporal preference, simply reallocated their activity without a large amplification of either morning or evening activity. In fall, Neutral Walkers had a slight decrease in evening activity ($\beta = -169$, CI= [-272, -65], $p = 0.001$) with a non-significant increase in morning steps ($\beta = 120$, CI = [-40, 280], $p = 0.142$), behaving more like Morning Walkers. In the spring, neutral walkers took fewer steps in the darker morning ($\beta = -119.8$, CI = [-239, -0.2], $p=0.05$) and compensated with an almost identical increase in the lighter evening ($\beta = 118$, CI= [22, 213], $p = 0.016$), behaving more like Evening Walkers.

We also observed that the ability to reallocate intraday activity following the DST transition varied by age, household income, and sex (Extended Data Fig. 3). During the fall transition, adults aged 65 and older increased their morning steps ($\beta = 281$, CI = [80, 483], $p = 0.006$) while reducing their evening steps ($\beta = 227$, CI = [-341, -113], $p < 0.001$) (Extended Data Fig. 3A). In contrast, younger adults (18-45) exhibited no significant changes in either morning ($\beta = 209$, CI = [-58, 476], $p = 0.124$) or evening steps ($\beta = -90$, CI = [-286, 105], $p = 0.365$). This

divergence may suggest that older adults are more flexible in adapting their daily schedules and more apt to follow daylight availability. Younger adults, by contrast, may be more constrained by fixed social schedules that limit temporal adjustments in their activity. This pattern is also directly reflective of the underlying distribution of activity timing preferences. The 65+ age group contains a substantially higher proportion of habitual Morning Walkers (36% vs. 8-18% in younger adults), which is also consistent with documented age-related shifts toward morning chronotypes[19]. As established in our primary analysis, individuals with pre-existing morning activity patterns capitalize on additional morning daylight, while those without such patterns show no to little increase in morning steps (Fig. 2).

Evening steps declined universally across income groups during fall (low-income: $\beta = -207$, CI = [-353.2, -61.4], $p = 0.005$; middle-income: $\beta = -202$, CI = [-369, -34], $p = 0.018$; high-income: $\beta = -153$, CI = [-287, -19], $p = 0.025$) (Extended Data Fig. 3B). However, only the lowest income bracket (≤ $50,000) compensated this decline in evening activity with increased morning steps ($\beta = 335$, CI = [100, 570], $p = 0.005$), whereas middle- and high-income groups showed no changes in morning activity (middle: $\beta = 237$, CI = [-2, 476], $p = 0.052$; high: $\beta = 60$, CI = [-128, 249], $p = 0.532$). The distribution of Morning vs Evening Walkers was similar across income groups, suggesting that income level does not play a role in activity phenotype. Instead, the morning increase among lower-income adults may reflect greater schedule flexibility—encompassing retirees or those with flexible work schedules (e.g., part-time, self-employed, gig, and/or mainly outdoor workers)—who continue their pre-DST behavior or reallocate activity toward daylight. By contrast, higher-income individuals may experience stronger occupational timing constraints, limiting their capacity to adjust morning behavior despite additional daylight or personal preference.

The spring transition, which shifts daylight toward evening hours, revealed an interesting difference by sex (Extended Data Fig. 3C). Females increased evening steps ($\beta = 158$, CI = [62, 253], $p = 0.001$), whereas males showed no significant change ($\beta = -61$, CI = [-185, 64], $p = 0.339$). Females may benefit from extended evening light induced by spring DST, reducing pre-existing barriers to evening activity (e.g., perceived outdoor safety)[20].

Physiological response to DST: changes in average resting heart rate

Across both DST transitions, changes in average resting heart rate (RHR) were small (ranging from -2 to +2 beats per minute (bpm)), differences which are unlikely to be clinically meaningful (Extended Data Fig. 4). In fall, RHR during the evening declined by 0.8 bpm ($\beta = -0.8$, CI = [-1.4, -0.2], $p = 0.014$) while morning RHR rose slightly ($\beta = 1.3$, CI = [0.7, 2.0], $p < 0.001$). In spring, RHR declined in the morning ($\beta = -1.0$, CI = [-1.6, -0.5], $p < 0.001$) without any changes in the evening RHR ($\beta = 0.4$, CI = [-0.1, 1.0], $p = 0.127$). We found no significant differences in daily average RHR during either seasonal transition (spring: $\beta = 0.0$, CI = [-0.3, 0.4], $p = 0.763$; fall: $\beta = -0.1$, CI = [-0.5, 0.3], $p = 0.621$).

Discussion

We used intraday Fitbit data from over 1,000 participants in the *All of Us* Research Program to investigate the behavioral and physiological effects of DST policy. Our DiD analysis reveals that while DST transitions influence *when* people are active, they do not significantly alter how much they are active. Our primary finding refutes the common argument that increased evening light due to DST creates more activity[6]. We found no significant net gain or loss in total daily steps following either the spring or fall transitions, aligning with prior findings from association studies[10,12]. The one-hour shift in daylight instead triggered a significant temporal reallocation of physical activity (Fig. 1). This was most evident in the "fall back" transition, which prompted a clear reciprocal shift, with a 202-step increase in the morning and a 180-step decrease in the evening (Fig. 1D).

These results also question the assumption that evening light is the most effective lever for increasing activity. We tested the intuitive hypothesis that physical activity rises when daylight coincides with preferred activity timing (Fig. 2). Specifically, we expected Evening Walkers to increase their activity in the spring, when daylight extends later into the evening, which is often assumed to represent flexible, discretionary time[10]. However, Evening Walkers did not increase their activity in the spring, even when the new daylight more closely aligned with their typical activity time. In addition, although we found Neutral walkers shifting their activity to the evening in Spring, total activity volume remained unchanged.

Demographic stratification further reinforced that no subgroup achieves a net gain in total steps (Extended Data Fig. 3). However, the pattern of reallocation varied by age, annual household income, and sex, suggesting distinct behavioral (e.g., rigid work hours) and structural considerations (e.g., perceived safety). Older adults, females, and lower-income individuals exhibited significant increases in morning steps and a decrease in evening steps following the fall transition. On the other hand, following the spring, females and ages 45-65 showed greater evening activity, whereas males primarily reduced morning movement. Yet, in all cases, these gains were offset by compensatory reductions at other times of day, resulting in a net-zero change in total activity volume

Such behavioral flexibility may represent a double-edged adaptation. On one hand, the behavioral flexibility to “capitalize on the light” (e.g., Morning Walkers) could be seen as a successful realignment to the solar environment. On the other hand, the very capacity to flexibly shift behavior may signal a greater underlying asynchrony between biological and social time. For individuals whose activity patterns are tightly coupled to solar cues (e.g., older adults), the one-hour advancement of the social clock can be especially disruptive, producing greater social jetlag (i.e., the misalignment of biological and social time)[21]. Then, the groups that appear most flexible in our demographic analysis may be the ones experiencing the greatest circadian disruptions.

Just as with physical activity, we found no net change in daily average RHR (Extended Data Fig. 4). However, we observed a similar pattern of intraday changes as physical activity. In fall,

for instance, RHR rose slightly in the morning while declining in the evening. Although these acute changes were too small to be clinically meaningful, they demonstrate that the body's rhythms are being subtly perturbed alongside behavioral shifts. In this analysis, we observed the immediate effects of DST transitions using a two-week observation window. Future studies can collect higher-resolution data to detect the more subtle physiological changes (e.g., heart rate variability) indicative of the circadian misalignments.

From a methodological standpoint, our approach utilizing large-scale wearable data establishes stronger causal evidence than prior observational research. While previous studies have examined DST effects, they have largely relied on either cross-sectional comparisons (which fail to account for baseline population differences) or simple pre-post analyses (which left open the possibility that observed changes reflected seasonal trends rather than DST itself)[10,12]. We employed a DiD approach that addresses these limitations and isolated the causal effect from concurrent seasonal confounders. In this framework, causal identification does not require explicit modeling of time-varying covariates as long as Arizona and its DST-observing neighbors would have experienced similar activity trajectories in the absence of DST transitions (i.e., parallel-trends assumption). We reduced the likelihood of violating this assumption by focusing on neighboring Mountain Time states that share similar geography, latitude, and time zone, and thus experience nearly identical daylight patterns (Fig. 1). Weather conditions in this region also evolve in close synchrony—spring warming, fall cooling, and precipitation trends are highly aligned across Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. Because the DiD design is robust to individual-level confounding, our specification accounts for time-invariant climatic and behavioral differences. Moreover, given the shared seasonal conditions across these states, our model also absorbs region-wide weather shocks. Consequently, only idiosyncratic, state-specific anomalies coinciding precisely with the DST transition could bias our estimates, and–to our knowledge–no such shocks occurred during the study period.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. Our sample skews toward female and higher socioeconomic demographics who likely have greater flexibility for physical activity (Table 1), suggesting our estimates may not represent the general US population[22–24]. In addition, sleep outcomes were not evaluated due to Fitbit's unreliable sleep tracking[25], especially during DST transitions, as reported by many Fitbit users. Given these data quality concerns and the absence of validated correction algorithms, we excluded sleep analyses to ensure methodological rigor, though future work could incorporate algorithmic calibration to enable more reliable sleep assessment. Our estimation of the behavioral effects through predefined time windows (e.g., morning, evening) may not fully capture the temporal shifts in physical activity; alternative approaches using hourly bins or rolling activity windows could provide finer resolution.

Our study leveraged large-scale wearable data from the *All of Us* Research Program to evaluate the behavioral effects of DST transitions in the United States. Contrary to the common assumption that DST would promote physical activity through added evening light, we found no evidence that DST amplifies total physical activity. Instead, DST primarily reallocated when

people were active, producing reciprocal shifts between morning and evening hours. We also found that the ability to adapt to this shift is not uniform across the population. As policymakers continue to debate the future of DST, such findings should be interpreted cautiously and within context.

Methods

Data from the *All of Us* Research Program

We used the demographic and Fitbit data from the NIH's *All of Us* Research Program[16]. Our analysis used the most up-to-date Controlled Tier dataset version 8 (C2024Q3R5), which includes non-date-shifted intraday Fitbit data (through October 1, 2023) and the first three digits of participant ZIP codes.

From a total of 59,018 participants who shared any Fitbit data, we identified 53,812 individuals who contributed intraday heart rate data (Extended Data Fig. 1). Of these, 51,364 participants also had both state and ZIP codes. After excluding individuals with discrepancies in their geolocation information, we retained 4,375 participants across Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, or Utah. To focus on the immediate effects of DST, we included participants with valid data on any day during the first week of spring or fall DST transition for years 2021, 2022, and 2023. After applying our inclusion criteria, our cohort included 1,531 unique individuals with both intraday HR and steps data (Extended Data Fig. 1). Year-by-year transition breakdown is shown in Extended Data Table 2.

Data Processing

To address missingness from inconsistent device wear, we defined "valid days" using sensitivity thresholds ranging from 0% to 100% daily wear or wear during specific time windows (e.g., morning and evening) (Extended Data Fig. 5A). Wear time was calculated as the sum of all minute-level HR data available for each person per day; wear threshold was defined as the proportion of observed wear time over the potentially observable data. For example, the potentially observable data for a full day is 1440 minutes (60 min/hour * 24 hour/day). We required participants' average wear time for each DST period to meet wear-time thresholds (75%) to enable within-person temporal comparisons of the specific time window. We additionally performed sensitivity analysis with different wear threshold choices (ranging from 75% to 95%), illustrating the robustness of our analysis to this hyperparameter (Extended Data Fig. 5B & 5C).

To reduce the influence of extreme activity values, we excluded person-days with step counts exceeding the 99.9th percentile within each time window (morning, evening, night, or full day). Fewer than 20 participants were removed following this criterion. From 1,531 unique participants, our final analytic cohort included 1,157 participants (Extended Data Fig. 1). We

summarize the demographics of the full analytic cohort residing in the four states and who had valid data in any of the four DST transitions (Table 1). Of note, some individuals contributed data to multiple transitions, while others participated in only one.

Feature Extraction

Behavioral features were derived from step data, calculated as total steps per day and across specific time windows. We chose resting heart rate (RHR) as the physiological feature of interest to minimize confounding influences from physical activity. RHR was calculated as the average heart rate during restful periods (steps = 0). We examined average RHR across the full day and within time-specific windows.

Activity Phenotypes

We estimated the effect of DST on individuals with different activity patterns by defining activity phenotypes based on step count data collected during the six weeks preceding the transition. Participants were classified as Morning, Evening, or Neutral Walkers using a rule-based approach. For each day within this period, we compared the number of steps taken in the morning versus the evening. Days with more morning steps were assigned a score of +1, days with more evening steps were assigned -1, and days with no clear preference were assigned 0. Each participant's mean daily score over the final six days before DST represented their time-of-day tendency. Participants with average scores > 0.5 were classified as Morning Walkers, those with scores < –0.5 as Evening Walkers, and those between –0.5 and 0.5 as neutral walkers. This classification required participants to have at least one day of both morning and evening step counts with ≥75% wear level. The distribution of Morning, Evening, and Neutral Walkers is illustrated in Extended Data Fig. 6.

Difference-in-Difference (DiD)

Our analysis leverages state-level differences in DST observance. Specifically, because Arizona (with the exception of the Navajo Nation) does not participate in the time change, its residents are not exposed to DST changes[10]. We leveraged this natural variation over time and across states to conduct a difference-in-difference (DiD) analysis using Arizona residents as our "control" group.

The DiD analysis is robust to time-invariant omitted variables that are not accounted for in other DST studies, such as Goodman et al.'s accelerometer-based observational analyses in children that attribute higher MVPA to longer evening daylight in Europe and Australia without a geographic counterfactual control, and Ferguson et al.'s within-person pre/post wearable study in adults that detects only small shifts (e.g., +8 min/day sedentary after DST ends) but lacks a no-DST control to separate seasonal effects[12,26]. Furthermore, while Zick employed a similar geographic comparison using Arizona, pre-DST baseline data was absent in their approach[10].

We assessed the pre-treatment trends by plotting the average hourly step counts during the week before and after the DST transition, separated by day of the week and control vs intervention (Fig. 1A & 1B). The pre-DST patterns (grey) for Arizona and the Mountain Time states follow highly similar shapes and magnitudes, indicating parallel pre-transition trends in activity.

Our DiD analysis controls for day-of-week and yearly behavioral differences[27]. The regression function is:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha Treat_i + \beta I(Time_t \geq EventTime) + \tau Treat_i \cdot I(Time_t \geq EventTime) + \phi_y + \phi_d + \epsilon_{it}$$

where Y_{it} measures the outcome for person i at time t, $Treat_t$ is a binary indicator for whether person i is in a region of DST exposure, $I(Time_t \geq EventTime)$ indicates whether the corresponding time period is before or after the time change, ϕ_y is a matrix of year-level fixed effects, ϕ_d is a matrix of day-of-week fixed effects, and ϵ_{it} is random and clustered by subject. Throughout the paper, we report the estimated treatment coefficient from the DiD regression along with the p-value from the t-test.

We estimate the effect of DST on the mean RHR or total step counts in three time-windows: (1) morning (6-9AM), (2) evening (5-7PM), and (3) full day (24 hours) (Fig. 1 and Extended Data Fig. 4). In addition, we performed our analysis with different wear-threshold choices, ranging from 75% to 95% illustrating the robustness of our analysis to this hyperparameter (Extended Data Fig. 5).

We fit separate DiD regressions for fall and spring DST changes and time window (morning and evening). Analyses are conducted using the statsmodels package in Python.

Heterogeneous effects of DST

We examined heterogeneity in DST effects by activity phenotype (Fig. 2) and by demographics, including income level, biological sex, and age group (Extended Data Fig. 3). We estimated separate DiD regressions for each combination of subgroup and time period. Only individuals with non-missing demographic information were included in the subgroup analyses.

Data availability

To ensure participant privacy, data used for this study is available to approved researchers following registration, completion of ethics training, and attestation of a data use agreement through the *All of Us* Research Workbench platform, which can be accessed via https://workbench.researchallofus.org/login.

Acknowledgements

This project is supported by NSF CAREER Award (#2339669). H.J. is supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute F31 Fellowship (F31HL179990-0); S.K is supported by the Apple Scholar in AI/ML Fellowship. We gratefully acknowledge *All of Us* participants for their contributions, without whom this research would not have been possible. We thank the NIH's *All of Us* Research Program for making available the participant data and the cohort examined in this study. This work was reviewed and submitted to the Machine Learning for Health (ML4H) 2025 Findings Track (non-archival), and we gratefully acknowledge the constructive feedback provided by four anonymous reviewers. We also thank Sarah Jiang for her contributions to the initial literature review during the early stages of this work.

Author contributions

H.J. and K.W. conceived the initial idea for the study. H.J., S.K., and K.W. developed the research framework, and J.D. supervised the project. K.W. performed the literature review, and H.J. curated the data for analysis. S.K. conducted the formal analysis under the supervision of A.V. The results were interpreted collaboratively by all authors. H.J., S.K., and K.W. drafted the initial manuscript. All authors contributed to data interpretation, critically revised the manuscript, and approved the final version for submission.

Competing Interests

J.D. sits on the Google Consumer Health Advisory Board and is a consultant to Samsung Research America. All other authors declare no competing interests.

Materials & Correspondence

Correspondence to Jessilyn Dunn (jessilyn.dunn@duke.edu)

References

1. Owen, Z. *et al.* Lingering impacts on sleep following the Daylight Savings Time transition in the Project Baseline Health Study. *Sleep Sci. Pract.* **6**, 13 (2022).

2. Rishi, M. A. *et al.* Daylight saving time: an American Academy of Sleep Medicine position statement. *J. Clin. Sleep Med. JCSM Off. Publ. Am. Acad. Sleep Med.* **16**, 1781–1784 (2020).

3. Chudow, J. J. *et al.* Changes in atrial fibrillation admissions following daylight saving time transitions. *Sleep Med.* **69**, 155–158 (2020).

4. Janszky, I. & Ljung, R. Shifts to and from Daylight Saving Time and Incidence of Myocardial Infarction. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **359**, 1966–1968 (2008).

5. Sipilä, J. O. T., Ruuskanen, J. O., Rautava, P. & Kytö, V. Changes in ischemic stroke occurrence following daylight saving time transitions. *Sleep Med.* **27–28**, 20–24 (2016).

6. Hillman, M. More daylight, better health: why we shouldn't be putting the clocks back this weekend. *BMJ* **341**, (2010).

7. Sandhu, A., Seth, M. & Gurm, H. S. Daylight savings time and myocardial infarction. *Open Heart* **1**, e000019 (2014).

8. Fritz, J., VoPham, T., Wright, K. P. & Vetter, C. A Chronobiological Evaluation of the Acute Effects of Daylight Saving Time on Traffic Accident Risk. *Curr. Biol.* **30**, 729-735.e2 (2020).

9. Zhang, H., Dahlén, T., Khan, A., Edgren, G. & Rzhetsky, A. Measurable health effects associated with the daylight saving time shift. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **16**, e1007927 (2020).

10. Zick, C. D. Does Daylight Savings Time Encourage Physical Activity? *J. Phys. Act. Health* **11**, 1057–1060 (2014).

11. Heacock, R. M. *et al.* Sleep and Alcohol Use Patterns During Federal Holidays and Daylight Saving Time Transitions in the United States. *Front. Physiol.* **13**, 884154 (2022).

12. Goodman, A., Page, A. S., Cooper, A. R., & International Children's Accelerometry Database (ICAD) Collaborators. Daylight saving time as a potential public health intervention: an observational study of evening daylight and objectively-measured physical activity among 23,000 children from 9 countries. *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.* **11**, 84 (2014).

13. Óskarsdóttir, M. *et al.* Importance of Getting Enough Sleep and Daily Activity Data to Assess Variability: Longitudinal Observational Study. *JMIR Form. Res.* **6**, e31807 (2022).

14. Phase Response Curve to Light under Ambulatory Conditions: A Pilot Study for Potential Application to Daylight Saving Time Transitions. https://www.mdpi.com/2079-7737/11/11/1584.

429 15. Ramirez, A. H. *et al.* The All of Us Research Program: Data quality, utility, and diversity.
430 *Patterns* **3**, 100570 (2022).

431 16. All of Us Research Program Investigators *et al.* The 'All of Us' Research Program. *N.*
432 *Engl. J. Med.* **381**, 668–676 (2019).

433 17. Considerations while using Fitbit Data in the All of Us Research Program: Tutorial. *JMIR*
434 *Preprints* https://preprints.jmir.org/preprint/45103.

435 18. Goodman, A., Page, A. S. & Cooper, A. R. Daylight saving time as a potential public
436 health intervention: an observational study of evening daylight and objectively-measured
437 physical activity among 23,000 children from 9 countries. *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.* **11**,
438 84 (2014).

439 19. Sleep-wake disturbances and sleep disorders in patients with dementia - UpToDate.
440 https://www.uptodate.com/contents/sleep-wake-disturbances-and-sleep-disorders-in-
441 patients-with-dementia.

442 20. Bennett, G. G. et al. Safe To Walk? Neighborhood Safety and Physical Activity Among
443 Public Housing Residents. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0040306
444 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040306.

445 21. Wittmann, M., Dinich, J., Merrow, M. & Roenneberg, T. Social Jetlag: Misalignment of
446 Biological and Social Time. *Chronobiol. Int.* **23**, 497–509 (2006).

447 22. Shuval, K., Li, Q., Gabriel, K. P. & Tchernis, R. Income, physical activity, sedentary
448 behavior, and the 'weekend warrior' among U.S. adults. *Prev. Med.* **103**, 91–97 (2017).

449 23. Jiménez-Zazo, F. *et al.* Differences among Sociodemographic Variables, Physical
450 Fitness Levels, and Body Composition with Adherence to Regular Physical Activity in Older
451 Adults from the EXERNET Multicenter Study. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health* **19**, 3853
452 (2022).

453 24. Cho, P. J. *et al.* Demographic Imbalances Resulting From the Bring-Your-Own-Device
454 Study Design. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth 2022104e29510 Httpsmhealthjmirorg20224e29510*
455 https://doi.org/10.2196/29510 (2022) doi:10.2196/29510.

456 25. Master, H. *et al.* Capturing Real-World Habitual Sleep Patterns With a Novel User-
457 Centric Algorithm to Preprocess Fitbit Data in the All of Us Research Program:
458 Retrospective Observational Longitudinal Study. *J Med Internet Res 202527e71718*
459 *Httpswwwjmirorg20251e71718* https://doi.org/10.2196/71718 (2025) doi:10.2196/71718.

460 26. Ferguson, T. *et al.* The Annual Rhythms in Sleep, Sedentary Behavior, and Physical
461 Activity of Australian Adults: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Ann. Behav. Med.* **58**, 286–295
462 (2024).

463 27. Card, D. & Krueger, A. *Minimum Wages and Employment: A Case Study of the Fast*
464 *Food Industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania*. w4509
465 http://www.nber.org/papers/w4509.pdf (1993) doi:10.3386/w4509.

466 **Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of participants in the final analytic cohort.
467

	Subgroup	Count (%)
Overall	Total N	1157
Age	18-44	268 (23.2%)
	45-64	406 (35.1%)
	≥ 65	483 (41.7%)
Biological Sex	Female	790 (68.3%)
	Male*	350-375 (30.3-32.4%)
	Unknown*	≤ 20 (≤ 1.7%)
Race	Asian*	≤ 20 (≤ 1.7%)
	Black or African American	26 (2.2%)
	White	986 (85.2%)
	Other	41 (3.5%)
	Unknown*	80-90 (6.9-7.8%)
Ethnicity	Hispanic or Latino	123 (10.6%)
	Not Hispanic or Latino	1013 (87.6%)
	Other/Unknown	21 (1.8%)
Annual Household Income	<50k	348 (30.1%)
	50-100k	372 (32.2%)
	>100k	377 (32.6%)
	Unknown	60 (5.2%)

468
469

470 **Counts below 20 are suppressed, and additional cells are obscured as needed to prevent back-*
471 *calculation, complying with the All of Us Data and Statistics Dissemination Policy.*

Figure 1. Behavioral effects of Daylight Saving Time (DST) transitions. (A-B). Average hourly step counts on the Sunday before and after the **(A)** Spring transitions in 2022 (N=812) and 2023 (N=1,072) and **(B)** Fall transitions in 2021 (N=820) and 2022 (N=837), combined. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals. The near-parallel pre-transition trajectories across groups support the parallel trends assumption underlying the difference-in-differences (DiD) analysis. **(C–D)** Population-level DiD estimates for the effect of DST transitions on step counts across time-of-day periods (morning, evening, and full day) for **(C)** Fall transitions in 2021 and 2022 and **(D)** Spring transitions in 2022 and 2023. Points represent DiD coefficients, and error bars denote 95% confidence intervals. Effects that are not statistically significant ($p \geq 0.05$) are displayed in grey.



Figure 2. Heterogeneity in behavioral responses to Daylight Saving Time (DST) by physical activity phenotype. Effects stratified by activity phenotype (Morning, Evening, and Neutral Walkers) based on pre-DST activity timing classifications. Points represent difference-in-differences coefficients, and error bars denote 95% confidence intervals. Effects that were not statistically significant ($p \geq 0.05$) are displayed with reduced opacity.