Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: same genes?

A study of young adult twins

Nicola L. Barclay*, Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London,
UK

Thalia C. Eley, King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, University of London,
UK

Daniel J. Buysse, School of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, USA

Simon N. Archer, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, UK

Alice M. Gregory, Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

Running head title: Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

For submission to: Chronobiology International

*Corresponding author: Nicola L. Barclay, Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths,
University of London, Lewisham Way, New Cross, London, SE14 6NW;
email: ps701nh@gold.ac.uk, tel: +44 (0)20 8465 7768

Declaration of interests: The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Sources of support: Waves 1-3 of the G1219 study were supported by grants from the
W T Grant Foundation, the University of London Central Research fund, and a
Medical Research Council Training Fellowship and Career Development Award to
Thalia C Eley. Wave 4 of the G1219 study was supported by grants from the
Economic and Social Research Council (RES-000-22-2206) and the Institute of Social
Psychiatry to Alice M. Gregory who is currently supported by a Leverhulme Research
Fellowship. Nicola L. Barclay is supported by an ESRC studentship.

Abstract

The aims of this study were to examine 1) genetic and environmental influences on diurnal preference and sleep quality; 2) the association between these phenotypes; 3) the genetic and environmental influences on this association; and 4) the magnitude of overlap between these influences. Using a classic twin design, data on diurnal preference (measured by the 'Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire') and sleep quality (measured by the 'Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index') were collected from 420 monozygotic twins, 773 dizygotic twins and 329 siblings (mode age = 20 years, range = 18-27 years) from a population-based twin registry across the UK. Univariate analyses indicated that dominance genetic influence accounted for 52% and non-shared environment 48% of variance in diurnal preference. For sleep quality, additive genetic influence explained 43% and non-shared environment 57% of the variance. The bivariate analysis indicated a significant association between greater eveningness preference and poorer sleep quality ($r = .27$). There was substantial overlap in the additive genetic influences on both phenotypes ($r_A = .57$) and overlap in the dominance genetic influences common to both phenotypes was almost absolute ($r_D = .99$). Overlap in non-shared environment was much smaller ($r_E = .02$). Additive genetic influence accounted for 2% of the association; dominance genetic influence accounted for 94%; and non-shared environmental influences accounted for the remaining 4%. The substantial overlap in genetic influence between these phenotypes indicates that similar genes are important for diurnal preference and sleep quality. Therefore, those genes already known to influence one phenotype may be possible candidates to explore with regards to the other phenotype.

Keywords: Circadian, diurnal preference, eveningness, genetics, morningness, sleep

Introduction

The regulation of sleep-wake behaviour is considered to be the product of two processes: the endogenous control of circadian rhythmicity and homeostatic regulation (Borbely, 1982; Borbely & Achermann, 1999; Daan et al., 1984; Dijk & Lockley, 2002). The endogenous period of the circadian pacemaker is tightly constrained between individuals, however, circadian preferences and the entrainment of sleep-wakefulness to circadian rhythms show greater inter-individual variability (Kerkhof, 1985). Knowledge regarding individual differences in circadian timing may be important for organising our daily lives, in terms of timing work and social commitments, and in terms of maintaining sleep hygiene and quality by ensuring that we sleep at times in accordance with our biological ‘clock’. It is known that differences in the phase position of this biological ‘clock’, and thus the timing of an individual’s preferred sleep-wake cycle is, to some extent, under genetic control (Archer et al., 2003). Furthermore, research has indicated that diurnal preference – the self-report analogue of circadian rhythm phase – is also heritable (Drennan et al., 1992; Hur et al., 1998; Koskenvuo et al., 2007; Vink et al., 2001). The morningness-eveningness disposition represents extremes in diurnal preference. Morning-types are so-called ‘larks’, who find it easy to arise in the morning, function best at this time, and fall asleep easily during early evening. Evening-types, on the other hand, so-called ‘owls’, find it hard to get up early, are at their peak during late evening, and go to bed late, often in the early hours of the morning. Advanced and Delayed Sleep Phase Disorders (ASPD and DSPD, respectively) represent extremes of morning and evening-type orientations (American Academy of Sleep Medicine, 2005), and are characterized by difficulty maintaining socially-normal sleep-wake hours even in the face of adverse social and occupational consequences.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

These two chronotypes have received much attention over the last decade, with researchers investigating not only the heritability of the morningness-eveningness disposition but also the molecular genetic basis for its occurrence (Archer et al., 2003; Archer et al., 2008; Carpen et al., 2005; Carpen et al., 2006; Dijk & Lockley, 2002; Katzenberg et al., 1998; Lee et al., 2007); and the personality dimensions correlated with these chronotypes (Larsen, 1985; Randler, 2008a; Tonetti et al., 2009). For instance, evening-types, compared to other chronotypes, have more irregular lifestyle habits (Monk et al., 2004); are more prone to substance abuse (Giannotti et al., 2002); have more psychological and emotional problems (Giannotti et al., 2002); lower self control and elevated levels of procrastination (Digdon & Howell, 2008); and hold dysfunctional beliefs about sleep (Ong et al., 2007). Some of these difficulties have previously been associated with poor sleep quality (for example, dysfunctional beliefs about sleep: Edinger et al., 2001; Gregory & O'Connor, 2002; Gregory et al., 2006b; and anxiety and depression: Gregory et al., submitted). Thus, it is possible that since both diurnal preference and sleep quality have similar correlates, there may be more explicit links between them.

Perhaps more direct evidence for the associations between diurnal preference and sleep quality comes from noting that evening-types suffer from greater daytime sleepiness and dysfunction (Vardar et al., 2008), experience poorer sleep than morning-types (Megdal & Schernhammer, 2007; Ong et al., 2007; Shiihara et al., 1998; Vardar et al., 2008), and display other forms of sleep deficit, such as irregular sleep/wake habits (Talliard et al., 1999). Furthermore, a relationship has been reported between the timing of an individual's biological clock and some types of chronic insomnia (Lack & Wright, 2007). When sleep is attempted at a time incongruent to one's biological clock, difficulties such as decreased total sleep time, impaired

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

daytime functioning, cognitive impairment, fatigue, difficulty falling asleep, early morning awakenings and chronic insomnia may arise - which may be seen not only in ASPD and DSPD, but also in conditions such as Shift Work Sleep Disorder (American Academy of Sleep Medicine, 2005). While there appears to be an association between diurnal preference and sleep quality, what is currently unclear is what accounts for this association. Like diurnal preference, sleep quality is influenced by genes (Gregory & Franken, in press) and one possibility is that shared genes are important in accounting for the association between these phenotypes.

Examining the extent to which genetic and environmental influences account for this association may be useful in understanding why differences between chronotypes may be associated with sleep problems. Finding genetic/ environmental overlap in the genes/ environments influencing diurnal preference and sleep quality would suggest that once we have found genetic/ environmental influences associated with one phenotype, the same genes/ environments may be worth exploring as to their role in other phenotypes with which it is associated.

Using a sample of 1,556 twin and non-twin siblings, aged between 18 and 27 years, the present study aimed to 1) estimate the extent to which genes and environments influence both diurnal preference and sleep quality, separately; 2) examine the phenotypic overlap between diurnal preference and sleep quality; 3) address the extent to which genetic and environmental contributions overlap for diurnal preference and sleep quality; and 4) estimate the magnitude of genetic and environmental influences on the association between diurnal preference and sleep quality.

Methods

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval for different stages of this study has been provided by the Research Ethics Committees of the Institute of Psychiatry, South London and Maudsley NHS Trust, and Goldsmiths, University of London. The experimental protocol conforms to international ethical standards as outlined by Portaluppi et al. (2008).

Participants

The present analyses focus on wave 4 of the G1219 and G1219Twins longitudinal studies. G1219 initially comprised adolescent offspring of adults from a large-scale population-based study (GENESiS: Sham et al., 2000). The G1219Twins are a random selection of live twin births born between 1985 and 1988 identified by the UK Office of National Statistics. Health Authorities and General Practitioners then contacted families (Eley et al., 2004). At wave 1 of data collection (which took place between 1999 and 2002), 3,640 respondents aged between 12 and 19 years participated in the study. Informed consent was obtained from parents/ guardians of all adolescents under 16 years, and from the adolescents themselves when over 16. At Wave 2, data were available from 2,646 individuals (73% of the original sample at Wave 1), whilst corresponding figures for Wave 3 were 1,777 adolescents (49% of the original sample at Wave 1).

At wave 4 (which took place in 2007 and is the focus of this current report), we traced participants who had taken part in wave 2/ wave 3 primarily by using websites dedicated to providing information (e.g. phone numbers and postal addresses) about members of the population. We successfully traced 2,550 individuals and sent them a questionnaire booklet. Three reminders were then sent (a duplicate

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

questionnaire was sent out with the last reminder in case the former had been misplaced). Participants were also emailed and telephoned in order to see whether they planned to take part. A total of 1,556 individuals were included in the wave 4 dataset (61% of those targeted; 74% of those participating at wave 3).

Zygoty was established through a questionnaire measure completed by mothers at waves 2 and 3, assessing physical similarity between twins (Cohen et al., 1975). When zygoty was only available on one or other wave, this rating was used. If there was disagreement between zygoty ratings at the two waves, DNA was obtained (N = 26 pairs) before final classifications were made.

At wave 4, on which the present study is focused, 61.5% of the sample was female and the mode age was 20 years (range 18-27 years). Following the study design the majority of participants were close in age (90% of participants were aged 18-22 years), but the inclusion of siblings inevitably created some age-spread. At wave 4 the 1,556 individuals came from 896 families: 75 MZ male (65 complete) pairs, 76 DZ male (53 complete) pairs, 155 MZ female (125 complete) pairs, 138 DZ female (111 complete) pairs, 232 DZ opposite sex (163 complete) pairs, 44 male-male sibling (28 complete) pairs, 68 female-female sibling (44 complete) pairs, 89 opposite sex sibling (56 complete) pairs. Sibling type was uncertain for a remaining 19 (15 complete) pairs.

In the whole G1219 sample, levels of parental education were somewhat higher (39% educated to A-level or above) than in a large nationally represented sample of parents (Meltzer et al., 2000), where 32% were educated to A-level or above. G1219 parents were also somewhat more likely to own their own houses (82%) than in the nationally representative sample (68%). To reduce the impact of any initial response bias associated with educational level, the sample was re-

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

weighted to match the distribution of educational qualifications in a nationally representative sample of parents (Meltzer et al. 2000). For more detailed information regarding weighting and attrition, please see a previous report from this study (Gregory et al., submitted).

Measures

Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire

The Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire (MEQ: Horne & Östberg, 1976) is amongst the most widely used measures for assessing diurnal preference, and was adopted for use in this study. The MEQ is a 19-item self report questionnaire which assesses individual preference in the timing of daytime activities, sleeping habits, hours of peak performance, and times of ‘feeling best’ and maximum alertness. Participants are required to respond mostly by indicating which statement out of 4 best describes them. For example, for the question, “Assuming adequate environmental conditions, how easy do you find getting up in the morning?”, responses range from “Not at all easy”, “Not very easy”, “Fairly easy”, to “Very easy”. Other questions require participants to indicate during which hours they feel, for example, most tired and in need of sleep, or at what time they feel that they reach their peak. Individual items are rated on either a 4- or 5-point scale and the responses used to give a total score on the morningness-eveningness dimension ranging from 16-86. Higher scores indicate greater ‘morningness’ and lower scores indicate greater ‘eveningness’. However, for the present analyses the total MEQ scale was reversed so that a higher score indicated greater eveningness. This procedure was employed so that we could decompose a positive correlation for ease of interpretation for the reader.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

In order to determine whether diurnal preference was associated with actual behaviour, scores on the MEQ were examined in relation to reported bed times and arising times (these measures were taken from the PSQI, described below, and are typically used to calculate sleep duration). There was a significant association between diurnal preference (MEQ total score) and actual bedtimes, ($r = .50, p < .01$), indicating that greater eveningness preference was associated with going to bed later, and that greater morningness preference was associated with going to bed earlier. There was also a significant association between diurnal preference and getting up time ($r = .42, p < .01$) indicating that greater eveningness was associated with later getting up time, and greater morningness with earlier getting up time. We note that actual bedtimes and getting up times may be influenced by many factors other than diurnal preference, such as school and work obligations (hence why a perfect correlation was not expected).

Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index

Sleep disturbance over the past month was assessed using the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI: Buysse et al. 1989), which is a widely-used questionnaire measure containing 19 items. Items include both open-ended questions (e.g. “During the past month, when have you usually gone to bed at night?”) and fixed-choice questions (“During the past month, how would you rate your sleep quality overall? ‘Very good; Fairly good; Fairly bad or Very bad’”). A global score of overall sleep quality is derived from the sum of individual items, with scores ranging from 0 to 21. Higher scores indicate poorer sleep quality. The PSQI global score has demonstrated good psychometric properties, with both internal consistency and test-retest reliability in the .8 range (Backhaus et al., 2002; Buysse et al., 1989). The PSQI has also been shown to correspond to other self-report measures of sleep (e.g. Backhaus et al.,

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

2002).

Statistical Analyses

Data Preparation

Skew was not considered problematic for MEQ or PSQI (MEQ skew = $-.17$, [SE = $.09$]; PSQI skew = $.98$, [SE = $.09$]) and so the variables were not transformed for this purpose. Prior to analyses, data were regressed on age and sex, as is standard in twin modelling (McGue & Bouchard, 1984). Furthermore, outliers of 3 or more standard deviations above and below the mean were omitted from scales, since extreme scores can significantly influence results (in total, 38 cases were excluded for this reason). All analyses focus on the transformed variables (except for descriptive statistics). Of note, analyses were also re-run on raw (untransformed) data and without excluding outliers, without notable differences in results (unreported).

Genetic Analyses

Analyses were carried out using the statistical package Mx (Neale, 1997), a widely used programme for analysing genetically sensitive data, using the method of maximum likelihood estimation. Twin studies compare the similarity within monozygotic (MZ) twin pairs to the similarity within dizygotic (DZ) twin pairs to estimate genetic influences on traits. Since MZ twins share 100% of their genes whilst DZ twins share on average half of their segregating genes, this information can be used to estimate the relative contribution of 4 sources of variance impacting on a phenotype: additive genetic influences (A) (where alleles at a locus ‘add up’ to influence behaviour); dominance genetic effects (D) (where genes don’t simply “add up”, but the influence of one allele affects the other at a locus to influence behaviour); shared environmental influences (C) (those environmental influences that act to make twins similar); and non-shared environmental influences, (E) (those environmental

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

influences acting to make twins within a pair different. This source of variance also incorporates error). Of note, it is not possible to model both dominance genetic effects and shared environmental effects simultaneously. This is because C and D predict different MZ and DZ twin correlation ratios, and the effect of both is confounded if examined together (Neale & Cardon, 1992). Thus, these effects are examined in separate models (i.e. either an ACE or ADE model) as appropriate. If the correlation between MZ pairs is greater than that of DZ/sibling pairs, genetic influence may be important for that phenotype. If, however, the MZ twin pair correlation is more than twice that of the DZ twin/sibling pairs, dominance genetic influence may be playing a role.

Model Fitting

The fit statistic provided by Mx for raw data modelling is -2LL (minus twice the log likelihood of the observations). Saturated models, which estimate the maximum number of parameters required to describe the variance-covariance matrix and means of observed variables and thus provide a perfect fit to the data, are first fitted to the data. The -2LL of a saturated model is then subtracted from the -2LL of the genetic model. The -2LL value in itself provides no information of fit, however the difference between -2LL for the saturated and genetic models is distributed as chi-square, and so provides a relative fit of the data. A non-significant difference in fit between the genetic and saturated models indicates that the genetic model does not fit the data less well than a saturated model and therefore provides a good description of the data. An additional measure of fit is provided by Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) (calculated as $\Delta\chi^2 - 2 \times \Delta df$), which accounts for the number of parameters being estimated and the goodness-of-fit. A good fit is indicated by lower, negative values of AIC (Neale et al., 1989). Likelihood based 95% confidence intervals (CIs)

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

on the parameter estimates were obtained in order to determine their precision. Sub-models, in which certain parameters (e.g. C) are dropped in order to test their significance, can also be tested and compared against full models. However, full models are reported here for all analyses in order to provide the reader with maximum information.

Sex Effects

Model fitting allows the investigation of various types of sex differences. The present study investigated, 1) quantitative sex differences – the extent to which the magnitude of genetic and environmental influences differed between males and females; 2) qualitative sex differences – the extent to which the genetic and environmental influences affecting males were the same as those affecting females; and 3) scalar sex differences – whether male and female scores differed in variance. Sex differences were also equated in all models in order to determine whether doing so would result in a significant decrement in fit compared to models incorporating sex differences. The best-fitting models (i.e. the most parsimonious, and that which did not result in a significantly worse fit compared to the saturated model) were selected for interpretation.

Univariate analyses

Twin correlations suggested dominance genetic effects on diurnal preference (i.e. the MZ twin correlation was more than twice that of DZ twin and sibling correlations). As such, univariate models assessing the relative contribution of A, D, and E to diurnal preference were tested in addition to ACE models. For sleep quality, only the models assessing the relative contribution of A, C and E were examined as dominance was not suggested by the twin correlations.

Bivariate correlated factors model

A bivariate correlated factors model, which allows the influences of one phenotype to correlate with the other, was tested. The influence of A, D, C and E on the phenotypic correlation was estimated by Mx in two separate models – one examining A, C, and E, and the other examining A, D, and E. For an example of an ADE model, see **Figure 1**. The bivariate additive genetic correlations (rA), dominance genetic correlations (rD), shared environmental correlations (rC), and non-shared environmental correlations (rE), demonstrate the extent to which these sources overlap within the phenotypic correlation. The proportions to which A, D and E accounted for the phenotypic correlation can be calculated as $\sqrt{A}$ for MEQ $\times rA \times \sqrt{A}$ for PSQI / phenotypic correlation; $\sqrt{D}$ for MEQ $\times rD \times \sqrt{D}$ for PSQI / phenotypic correlation; and $\sqrt{E}$ for MEQ $\times rE \times \sqrt{E}$ for PSQI / phenotypic correlation.

[Insert Figure I here]

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of scores on the MEQ and PSQI, split by sex and zygosity. There were significant sex differences in diurnal preference (fit of model incorporating sex differences compared to fully unconstrained model: $\Delta\chi^2 = 31.47$, $\Delta df = 16$, $p < .01$), with males reporting slightly greater eveningness. As sex differences were important for this phenotype, sex was considered in the genetic analyses presented below. There were no significant sex differences for sleep quality (fit of model incorporating sex differences compared to fully unconstrained model: $\Delta\chi^2 = 16.71$, $\Delta df = 14$, $p = .27$).

[Insert Table I here]

Univariate Correlations

Univariate twin correlations for MZ, DZ twins and siblings (e.g. the correlation in MEQ score for twin 1 and twin 2) are presented in **Table 2**. For MEQ, MZ correlations were more than twice that of both DZ twins and siblings, suggesting dominance genetic effects on this phenotype. As such, dominance effects with regards to this phenotype were explored. Sibling correlations were greater than DZ twin pairs, but confidence intervals on the phenotypic correlations for both DZ twin pairs and siblings overlapped so were not significantly different.

For PSQI, MZ twin correlations were greater than DZ and sibling correlations, suggesting additive genetic influence on sleep quality. For both diurnal preference and sleep quality, MZ correlations were less than unity, suggesting that non-shared environmental factors may be important.

[Insert Table II here]

Univariate Genetic Models

None of the genetic models fit the data significantly worse than saturated models, and so provide a good fit to the data. For diurnal preference an ADE model, which allowed for scalar sex differences, provided the best fit to the data (ADE scalar sex difference model fit compared to saturated model: $\Delta\chi^2 = 17.31$, $\Delta df = 20$, $p = .63$, $AIC = -22.69$). Male variance was 9% greater than the female variance. Additive genetic influence on this phenotype was estimated at 0% (95% Confidence Intervals [CI], .00-.29); dominance genetic effects at 52% (95% CI, .20-.61); and non-shared environmental influences at 48% (95% CI, .39-.59).

For sleep quality, the best-fitting model was an ACE model that equated sex differences (ACE fit compared to saturated model: $\Delta\chi^2 = 16.64$, $\Delta df = 21$, $p = .73$, $AIC = -25.36$). Additive genetic influence on this phenotype was estimated at 43%

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

(95% CI, .12-.52); shared environmental influence at 0% (95% CI, .00-.21); and non-shared environmental influences at 57% (95% CI, .48-.71).

Bivariate Correlations

There was a significant phenotypic correlation between diurnal preference and sleep quality ($r = .27$, 95% CI, .21-.32) suggesting that greater eveningness preference is associated with poorer sleep quality (and conversely that greater morningness preference is associated with better sleep quality). Cross-twin cross-trait correlations (e.g. the correlation between diurnal preference in twin 1 and sleep quality in twin 2) are presented in **Table 2**. Greater MZ versus DZ correlations indicated that genes influenced the association between phenotypes. The MZ cross-twin cross-trait correlation for the association between phenotypes, being more than double that of the DZ and sibling correlations implies that dominance genetic influences may be important for the association.

Bivariate Genetic Model

Since the cross-twin cross-trait correlations gave some indication that dominance genetic influences may be important for the association between diurnal preference and sleep quality, an ADE bivariate correlated factors model was tested and compared against an ACE model. An ADE model in which sex differences were equated provided the best fit to the data compared to the ACE model and models in which sex differences were free to vary (ADE bivariate model fit compared to saturated model: $\Delta\chi^2 = 66.09$, $\Delta df = 71$, $p = .64$, AIC = -75.91). The bivariate additive genetic correlation between phenotypes ($r_A = .57$, 95% CI, -.99-.99) indicated that there was substantial overlap in the genes influencing diurnal preference and sleep quality. The overlap in the dominance genetic influences, however was very high ($r_D = .99$, 95% CI, -.99-.99) indicating that dominance genetic influences impacting on

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

diurnal preference may be almost entirely shared with those impacting on sleep quality. There was negligible overlap in the non-shared environmental influences for these phenotypes ($rE = .02$, 95% CI, $-.11-.16$). The proportion of the phenotypic correlation accounted for by additive genetic, dominance genetic, and non-shared environmental influences was also estimated in this model. Overall, additive genetic influence accounted for 2% (95% CI, $-.52-.85$) of the phenotypic association between diurnal preference and sleep quality; dominance genetic influence accounted for 94% (95% CI, $.02-1.57$); and non-shared environmental influence accounted for the remaining 4% (95% CI, $-.22-.31$) of the covariance.

Discussion

The first aim of the present study was to estimate the extent to which genes and environments influence diurnal preference and sleep quality. For diurnal preference, additive genetic influence accounted for 0%, dominance genetic influence 52% and non-shared environmental influences 48%. For sleep quality, additive genetic influence accounted for 43%, shared environmental influences 0% and non-shared environmental influences 57%. The second aim was to examine the phenotypic association between diurnal preference and sleep quality and it was found that eveningness was associated with poorer sleep quality ($r = .27$). Thirdly, we aimed to address the extent to which genetic and environmental contributions overlap for diurnal preference and sleep quality. There was 57% overlap in the additive genetic influences common to both phenotypes, and overlap in the dominance genetic influences were 99% indicating that almost exactly the same genes may be responsible for the co-occurrence between traits. Overlap in the non-shared environmental influences common to both phenotypes, however, was much smaller,

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

being only 2%. The fourth aim was to estimate the extent to which genetic and environmental influences contribute to the association between diurnal preference and sleep quality. Overall, additive genetic influences accounted for 2% of the association between diurnal preference and sleep quality, dominance genetic influences accounted for 94%, and non-shared environmental influences accounted for the remaining 4%. Further discussion of the main results and limitations of this study are presented below.

Univariate analyses

Univariate estimates, firstly on diurnal preference, indicate that dominance genetic influences - where alleles at a given locus interact to influence behaviour - account for over half of the variability in the phenotype. This is somewhat consistent with other studies of the broad-sense heritability (including both additive and dominance genetic effects) of diurnal-type, where genes were found to account for around 50% of the total variability in the phenotype (Hur et al., 1998; Hur, 2007; Koskenvuo et al., 2007; Vink et al., 2001). Also in accordance with all other reports the remaining source of variance in diurnal preference was accounted for by non-shared environmental factors. One could postulate that such environmental factors influencing diurnal preference may be work and social commitments, since the time that one goes to bed may be influenced by external factors. These external pressures may thus influence the development of a preference for timing activities and sleep patterns in accordance with them.

With regards to sleep quality, the present results are almost identical to those reported by Partinen and colleagues (1983) and similar to others (Heath et al., 1990), with additive genetic influence accounting for 43% of variance in this phenotype. Like diurnal preference, the remaining source of variance was accounted for by non-

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

shared environment (like the majority of studies reported here, shared-environmental influences were absent for these phenotypes). Possible non-shared environmental factors influencing sleep quality can be gleaned from previous research which has suggested that this may be affected by life events including relationship issues (Ohayon, 1996), family conflict (Gregory et al., 2006a), unemployment (Virtanen et al., 2008), or ill health (Walder et al., 2007), for example.

Sex differences

Like previous research, females were significantly more morning-oriented than males (Vink et al., 2001), yet also consistent with twin research there were no significant differences in the magnitude of genetic/ environmental effects on this sex difference (Koskenvuo et al., 2007). However, the present findings did note scalar sex differences, (i.e. male's scores varied to a greater extent than did female's), indicating that diurnal preference may be a more variable trait for males than females.

With regards to symptoms of sleep disturbances, no sex differences were found for prevalence and estimates of heritability. This is contrary to both clinical and epidemiological studies which suggest that females experience greater sleep disturbance than males (Ohayon, 2002), and also a recent twin study in which sleep quality for females was more heritable than for males (Paunio et al., 2009). As such, further studies investigating sex differences for sleep quality are essential in both clinical and non-clinical populations in order to determine whether males and females do differ with regards to the magnitude of genetic and environmental influences on this phenotype.

Bivariate analyses

The current analyses demonstrate that a preference for eveningness is associated with poor sleep quality, which is consistent with previous suggestions

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

(Koskenvuo et al., 2007; Megdal & Schernhammer, 2007; Shiihara et al., 1998; Vardar et al., 2008). This finding may be related to intrinsic properties of the circadian system. It has been suggested that the phase position of the endogenous circadian oscillator of evening-types is delayed compared to that of morning-types (Kerkhof & Van Dongen, 1996), and evidence has demonstrated that the core body temperature minimum in evening-types occurs much later in the night-time period than morning-types (Baehr et al., 2000). As such, evening-types sleep on an earlier part of their temperature cycle, and their temperature nadir occurs closer to waking compared to morning-types, i.e., the phase angle between sleep and wake-time is smaller in evening types (Baehr et al., 2000; Waterhouse et al., 2001). Since alertness is lowest near the temperature minimum and evening-types awaken closer to the time of this nadir, this may account for their feeling less alert upon awakening. It is also possible that evening-types' difficulty awakening leads them to infer that they have slept poorly. Of course, it is also possible that evening-types actually sleep shorter overall, given a preference for later self-selected bedtimes in combination with earlier than desired wake-times constrained by school or occupational demands (of note, there was a small but significant association between diurnal preference and sleep duration [$r = .08, p < .05$] indicating that evening-types slept for a shorter duration than morning-types).

With this in mind, one may infer that circadian rhythm disorders, such as DSPD (characterized by extreme eveningness), may also encompass poor sleep quality. Although diagnostic criteria for DSPD describe normal sleep quality and duration when individuals are allowed to choose their sleep schedule (American Academy of Sleep Medicine, 2005), truly *ad lib* sleep schedules are difficult to attain in the real world. Thus, even though the present analysis represents individuals in the

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

full range of circadian preference rather than the extremes (as represented by DSPS), an evening-type diurnal preference was associated with poor sleep quality. Empirical research examining sleep quality in individuals with ASPD and DSPD would be beneficial to refine existing diagnostic criteria and our understanding of sleep quality-diurnality associations.

Genetic influence on the association between diurnal preference and sleep quality

A novel finding presented here is that the association between phenotypes is almost entirely explained by genetic influences, and there is substantial overlap in the genes influencing both phenotypes. This suggests that the genes associated with greater evening preference are also associated with increased sleep disturbance. This is informative for future research into diurnal preference and sleep quality since it suggests that genes already known to be associated with one phenotype should be considered as possible candidates for exploration with regards to the other. For example, extensive research has indicated that polymorphisms of the *CLOCK* gene, 3111 T/C allele influence eveningness and sleep timing (Katzenberg et al., 1998); and *PER1*, *PER2* and *PER3*, extreme circadian preference (Archer et al., 2003; Carpen et al., 2005; Carpen et al., 2006). Both the *CLOCK* 3111 T/C (Serretti et al., 2003) and serotonin 5HTTLPR (Brummett et al., 2007) polymorphisms have been related to sleep quality. In the search for genes common to both phenotypes, it has been found that homozygosity for 5-repeat allele in the *PER3* variable number tandem repeat polymorphism is associated with both morning preference (Archer et al., 2003; Ellis et al., 2009; Jones et al., 2007) and increased sleep pressure (i.e. shorter sleep latency, more theta and alpha activity in wake and REM sleep, more slow wave activity in non-REM sleep, and more slow wave sleep (Viola et al., 2007), which is broadly

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

associated with good sleep quality. This suggests that it may be beneficial to investigate the role of genes associated with one phenotype in relation to the other.

Environmental influence on the association between diurnal preference and sleep quality

Environmental influences accounted for only a small proportion of the association between phenotypes and overlap between environmental influences was also small. This again demonstrates the importance of genetic factors in explaining reasons behind the association between diurnal preference and sleep quality in the normal range.

Limitations

There are four main limitations to this research. First regards the use of self-report measures to determine both diurnal preference and sleep quality. However, the MEQ and PSQI are widely used, and good psychometric properties of both measures have been well established (for example, MEQ: Anderson et al., 1991; Chelminski et al., 1997; Smith et al., 1989); (PSQI: Backhaus et al., 2002; Buysse et al., 1989). Furthermore, the large sample size required to perform a genetic decomposition of a phenotype limits the ability to obtain polysomnographic measures of these constructs and would be too costly and time-consuming (Gregory et al., 2006c). Simple techniques for evaluating circadian phase and sleep, such as wrist actigraphy and simplified ambulatory EEG monitors, may be useful additions to behavioural genetic studies in the future.

The second limitation regards the age range used in the present analysis. Previous research has suggested that diurnal preference, and the influence of specific genes on this phenotype, changes with age (Carrier et al., 1999; Jones et al., 2007; Talliard et al., 1999; Vink et al., 2001), and so this would be useful to be investigated

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

in relation to sleep quality. However, since our participants were all young adults, we were unable to investigate this important issue.

Third regards the generalisability of the results. Since heritability is a population statistic, the results may only be applicable to the population under study. Indeed one study found evidence that different climates throughout the world influence differences in chronotypes (Randler, 2008b). As such, replications in different populations would be necessary before we can confidently extrapolate our findings.

The final limitation regards power. Although we found strong overlap in the additive genetic and dominance genetic influences accounting for the association between phenotypes, confidence intervals for some parameters were wide and often spanned zero. This is common in twin research and largely reflects our sample size and consequent power limitations. Although our sample size was relatively large, this finding highlights the need for replications in much larger twin populations before our conclusions can be confidently drawn.

Conclusion

A preference for eveningness is associated with poor sleep quality and this association is largely under genetic control. Those genes influencing diurnal preference are substantially shared with those influencing sleep quality. Further exploration of specific genotypes and environmental factors influencing this association will aid in the progression to understanding the complexities of sleep and the circadian system.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Acknowledgements

We thank the families for their participation as well as numerous staff and students from the Social Genetic Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, London and Goldsmiths, University of London.

References

- American Academy of Sleep Medicine. (2005). The International Classification of Sleep Disorders, Second Edition (ICSD-2): Diagnostic and coding manual. Westchester, Illinois: American Academy of Sleep Medicine.
- Anderson MJ, Petros TV, Beckwith BE, Mitchell WW, & Fritz S. (1991). Individual differences in the effect of time of day on long-term memory access. *Am. J. Psychol.* 104:241-255.
- Archer SN, Robilliard DL, Skene DJ, Smits M, Williams A, Arendt J, & von Schantz M. (2003). A length polymorphism in the circadian clock gene *Per3* is linked to delayed sleep phase syndrome and extreme diurnal preference. *Sleep* 26:413-415.
- Archer SN, Viola AU, Kyriakopoulou V, von Schantz M, & Dijk DJ. (2008). Inter-individual differences in habitual sleep timing and entrained phase of endogenous circadian rhythms of *BMAL1*, *PER2* and *PER3* mRNA in human leukocytes. *Sleep* 31:608-617.
- Backhaus J, Junghanns K, Broocks A, Riemann D, & Hohagen F. (2002). Test-retest reliability and validity of the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index in primary insomnia. *J. Psychosom. Res.* 53:737-740.
- Baehr EK, Revelle W, & Eastman CI. (2000). Individual differences in the phase and amplitude of the human circadian temperature rhythm: with an emphasis on morningness-eveningness. *J. Sleep. Res.* 9:117-127.
- Borbely AA. (1982). A two-process model of sleep regulation. *Hum. Neurobiol.* 1:195-204.
- Borbely AA, & Achermann P. (1999). Sleep homeostasis and models of sleep regulation. *J. Biol. Rhythms* 14:557-568.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

- Brummett BH, Krystal AD, Ashley-Koch A, Kuhn CM, Zuchner S, Siegler IC, Barefoot JC, Ballard EL, Gwyther LP, & Williams RB. (2007). Sleep quality varies as a function of 5-HTTLPR genotype and stress. *Psychosom. Med.* 69:621-624.
- Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF, Monk TH, Berman SR, & Kupfer DJ. (1989). The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index: A new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res.* 28:192-213.
- Carpen JD, Archer SN, Skene DJ, Smits M, & von Schantz M. (2005). A single-nucleotide polymorphism in the 5'-untranslated region of the hPER2 gene is associated with diurnal preference. *J. Sleep. Res.* 14:293-297.
- Carpen JD, von Schantz M, Smits M, Skene DJ, & Archer SN. (2006). A silent polymorphism in the PER1 gene associates with extreme diurnal preference in humans. *J. Hum. Genet.* 51:1122-1125.
- Carrier J, Monk TH, Reynolds CF, Buysse DJ, & Kupfer DJ. (1999). Are age differences in sleep due to phase differences in the output of the circadian timing system? *Chronobiol. Int.* 16:79-91.
- Chelminski I, Ferraro FR, Pertros T, & Plaud JJ. (1997). Horne and Ostberg Questionnaire: a score distribution in a large sample of young adults. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 23:647-652.
- Cohen DJ, Dibble E, Grawe JM, & Pollin W. (1975). Reliably separating identical from fraternal twins. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 32:1371-1375.
- Daan S, Beersma DGM, & Borbely AA. (1984). The timing of human sleep: Recovery process gated by a circadian pacemaker. *Am. J. Physiol.* 246:R161-R178.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Digdon N, & Howell A. (2008). College students who have an eveningness preference report lower self-control and greater procrastination. *Chronobiol. Int.* 25:1029-1046.

Dijk D, & Lockley SW. (2002). Functional genomics of sleep and circadian rhythm invited review: Integration of human sleep-wake regulation and circadian rhythmicity. *J. Appl. Physiol.* 92:852-862.

Drennan SJ, Kripke DF, Kelsoe J, & Gillin JC. (1992). Morningness/eveningness is heritable. *Abstr. Soc. Neurosci.* 196.

Edinger JD, Wohlgemuth WK, Radtke RA, Marsh GR, & Quillian RE. (2001). Does cognitive-behavioral insomnia therapy alter dysfunctional beliefs about sleep? *Sleep* 24:591-599.

Eley TC, Liang HL, Plomin R, Sham P, Sterne A, Williamson R, & Purcell S. (2004). Parental familial vulnerability, family environment, and their interactions as predictors of depressive symptoms in adolescents. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 43:298-306.

Ellis J, von Schantz M, Jones KHS, & Archer SN. (2009). Association between specific diurnal preference questionnaire items and PER3 VNTR genotype. *Chronobiol. Int.* 26:464-473.

Giannotti F, Cortesi F, Sebastiani T, & Ottaviano S. (2002). Circadian preference, sleep and daytime behaviour in adolescence. *J. Sleep. Res.* 11:191-199.

Gregory AM, & O'Connor TG. (2002). Sleep problems in childhood: A longitudinal study of developmental change and association with behavioral problems. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 41:964-971.

Gregory AM, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, & Poulton R. (2006a). Family conflict in childhood: A predictor of later insomnia. *Sleep* 29:1063-1067.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

- Gregory AM, Rijdsdijk FV, Dahl RE, McGuffin P, & Eley TC. (2006b). Associations between sleep problems, anxiety, and depression in twins at 8 years of age. *Pediatrics* 118:1124-1132.
- Gregory AM, Rijdsdijk FV, & Eley TC. (2006c). A twin-study of sleep difficulties in school-aged children. *Child Dev.* 77:1668-1679.
- Gregory AM, & Franken P. (in press). Genetic approaches to the problem of sleep. In M. Francos (Ed.). *Current advances in sleep biology: Mechanisms and Function*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Gregory AM, Buysse DJ, Willis TA, Rijdsdijk FV, Maughan B, Messer J, Rowe R, Cartwright S, Barclay NL, & Eley TC. (submitted). Associations between sleep quality and anxiety and depression symptoms in a sample of young adult twins and siblings.
- Heath AC, Kendler KS, Eaves LJ, & Martin NG. (1990). Evidence for genetic influences on sleep disturbance and sleep pattern in twins. *Sleep* 13:318-335.
- Horne JA, & Östberg O. (1976). A self-assessment questionnaire to determine morningness-eveningness in human circadian rhythms. *Int. J. Chronobiol.* 4:97-110.
- Hur Y, Bouchard TJ, & Lykken DT. (1998). Genetic and environmental influence on morningness-eveningness. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 25:917-925.
- Hur Y. (2007). Stability of genetic influence on morningness–eveningness: a cross-sectional examination of South Korean twins from preadolescence to young adulthood. *J. Sleep. Res.* 16:17-23.
- Jones KHS, Ellis J, Von Schantz M, Skene DJ, Dijk DJ, & Archer SN. (2007). Age-related change in the association between a polymorphism in the PER3 gene and preferred timing of sleep and waking activities. *J. Sleep. Res.* 16:12-16.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Katzenberg D, Young T, Finn L, Lin L, King DP, Takahashi JS, & Mignot E. (1998).

A CLOCK polymorphism associated with human diurnal preference. *Sleep* 21:569-576.

Kerkhof GA. (1985). Inter-individual differences in the human circadian system: A review. *Biol. Psychol.* 20:83-112.

Kerkhof GA, & Van Dongen HPA. (1996). Morning-type and evening-type individuals differ in the phase position of their endogenous circadian oscillator. *Neurosci. Lett.* 218:153-156.

Koskenvuo M, Hublin C, Partinen M, Heikkila K, & Kaprio J. (2007). Heritability of diurnal type: a nationwide study of 8753 adult twin pairs. *J. Sleep. Res.* 16:156-162.

Lack LC, & Wright HR. (2007). Treating chronobiological components of chronic insomnia. *Sleep Med.* 8:637-644.

Larsen RJ. (1985). Individual differences in circadian activity and rhythm and personality. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 6:305-311.

Lee HJ, Paik JW, Kang SG, Lim SW, & Kim L. (2007). Allelic variants interaction of clock gene and g-protein beta 3 subunit gene with diurnal preference. *Chronobiol. Int.* 24:589-597.

McGue M, & Bouchard TJ. (1984). Adjustment of twin data for the effects of age and sex. *Behav. Genet.* 14:325-343.

Megdal SP, & Schernhammer ES. (2007). Correlates for poor sleepers in a Los Angeles high school. *Sleep Med.* 9:60-63.

Meltzer H, Gatward R, Goodman R, & Ford T. (2000). Mental health of children and adolescents in Great Britain. London: The Stationery Office.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

- Monk TH, Buysse DJ, Potts JM, DeGrazia JM, & Kupfer DJ. (2004). Morningness-eveningness and lifestyle regularity. *Chronobiol. Int.* 21:435-443.
- Neale MC, Heath AC, Hewitt JK, Eaves LJ, & Fulker DW. (1989). Fitting genetic models with LISREL: hypothesis testing. *Behav. Genet.* 19:37-49.
- Neale MC, & Cardon LR. (1992). *Methodology for genetic studies in twins and families*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Neale MC. (1997). *Mx: Statistical Modeling*. (4th ed.). Box 126 MCV, Richmond, VA 23298: Department of Psychiatry.
- Ohayon M. (1996). Epidemiological study on insomnia in the general population. *Sleep* 19:S7-S15.
- Ohayon M. (2002). Epidemiology of insomnia: what we know and what we still need to learn. *Sleep Med. Rev.* 165:35-41.
- Ong JC, Huang JS, Kuo TF, & Manber R. (2007). Characteristics of insomniacs with self-reported morning and evening chronotypes. *J. Clin. Sleep Med.* 3:289-294.
- Paunio T, Korhonen T, Hublin C, Partinen M, Kivimaki M, Koskenvuo M, & Kaprio J. (2009). Longitudinal study on poor sleep and life dissatisfaction in a nationwide cohort of twins. *Am J Epidemiol* 169:206-213.
- Portaluppi F, Touitou Y, & Smolensky M. (2008). Ethical and methodological standards for laboratory and medical biological rhythm research. *Chronobiol. Int.* 25:999-1016.
- Randler C. (2008a). Morningness-eveningness, sleep-wake variables and big five personality factors. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 45:191-196.
- Randler C. (2008b). Morningness-eveningness comparison in adolescents from different countries around the world. *Chronobiol. Int.* 25:1017-1028.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

- Serretti A, Benedetti F, Mandelli L, Lorenzi C, Pirovano A, Colombo C, & Smeraldi E. (2003). Genetic dissection of psychopathological symptoms: Insomnia in mood disorders and CLOCK gene polymorphism. *Am. J. Med. Genet. B Neuropsychiatr. Genet.* 121B:35-38.
- Sham P, Sterne A, Purcell S, Cherny SS, Webster M, Rijdsdijk FV, Asherson P, Ball D, Craig I, Eley TC, Goldberg D, Gray J, Mann A, Owen M, & Plomin R. (2000). GENESiS: Creating a composite index of the vulnerability to anxiety and depression in a community-based sample of siblings. *Twin Res.* 3:316-322.
- Shiihara Y, Nakajima M, Miyazaki Y, Nakamiya T, Miyamoto M, Takahasi S, & Kodama M. (1998). Evaluation of sleep using ambulatory skin potential recording: Differences between morning and evening type. *Psychiatry Clin. Neurosci.* 52:167-168.
- Smith CS, Reilly C, & Midkiff K. (1989). Evaluation of three circadian rhythm questionnaires with suggestions for an improved measure of morningness. *J. Appl. Physiol.* 74:728-738.
- Talliard J, Philip P, & Bioulac B. (1999). Morningness/eveningness and the need for sleep. *J. Sleep. Res.* 8:291-295.
- Tonetti L, Fabbri M, & Natale V. (2009). Relationship between circadian typology and big five personality domains. *Chronobiol. Int.* 26:337-347.
- Vardar E, Vardar SA, Molla T, Kaynak C, & Ersoz E. (2008). Psychological symptoms and sleep quality in young subjects with different circadian preferences. *Biol. Rhythm. Res.* 39:493-500.
- Vink JM, Groot AS, Kerkhof GA, & Boomsma DI. (2001). Genetic analysis of morningness and eveningness. *Chronobiol. Int.* 18:809-822.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Viola AU, Archer SN, James LM, Groeger JA, Lo JCY, Skene DJ, von Schantz M, & Dijk DJ. (2007). PER3 polymorphism predicts sleep structure and waking performance. *Curr. Biol.* 17:613-618.

Virtanen P, Vahtera J, Broms U, Sillanmaeki L, Kivimaeki M, & Koskenvuo M. (2008). Employment trajectory as determinant of change in health-related lifestyle: the prospective HeSSup study. *Eur. J. Public Health* 18:504-508.

Walder B, Haase U, & Rundshagen I. (2007). Sleep disturbances in critically ill patients. *Anaesthesist* 56:7-17.

Waterhouse J, Folkard S, Van Dongen H, Minors D, Owens D, Kerkhof G, Weinert D, Nevill A, Macdonald I, Sytnik N, & Tucker P. (2001). Temperature profiles, and the effect of sleep on them, in relation to morningness-eveningness in healthy female subjects. *Chronobiol. Int.* 18:227-247.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Figure 1. Bivariate Correlated Factors Model.

Note. A = Additive genetic influence; D = Dominance genetic influence; E = Non-shared environmental influence; rA = Bivariate additive genetic correlation; rD = Bivariate dominance genetic correlation; rE = Bivariate non-shared environmental correlation.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Table 1: Descriptive statistics. Means (SD) of scores on the Morningness and Eveningness Questionnaire (MEQ) and the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI)

	Males	Females	MZ	DZ	Sibs
MEQ	54.88 (8.38)*	52.42 (7.78)*	51.77 (7.67)	54.10 (8.20)	53.64 (8.20)
PSQI	5.58 (3.00)	5.72 (3.01)	5.45 (2.86)	5.74 (3.10)	5.70 (2.93)

Note: MZ = monozygotic twins; DZ = dizygotic twins. Means and standard deviations of raw (untransformed) data. Note that the MEQ variable has been reversed so that higher scores indicate greater eveningness. Sex differences for means were tested, * $p < .01$. All analyses were run in Mx incorporating a weight to account for initial participation bias and attrition.

Diurnal preference and sleep quality: Same genes?

Table 2: Phenotypic correlations for Monozygotic twins (MZ), Dizygotic twins (DZ) and siblings (Sibs) (95% Confidence Intervals)

	MEQ-MEQ	PSQI-PSQI	MEQ-PSQI
Within Twins	/	/	.27 (.22 - .32)
Cross Twins			
MZ	.50 (.39 - .60)	.42 (.29 - .53)	.25 (.16 - .33)
DZ	.10 (-.01 - .20)	.25 (.14 - .35)	.04 (-.04 - .12)
Sibs	.17 (-.01 - .34)	.11 (-.08 - .30)	.08 (-.06 - .20)

Note: All analyses are run on transformed (i.e. age and sex regressed) data and include a weight variable to account for initial selection bias and attrition. The model was constrained where appropriate. For example, the twin correlations are constrained so that those of the randomly selected twin 1's are the same as the randomly selected twin 2's.