

Correlations in sleeping patterns and circadian preference between spouses

Rebecca C Richmond*^{1,2}, Laurence J Howe^{1,2}, Karl Heilbron³, Samuel Jones⁴, Junxi Liu^{1,2}, 23andMe Research Team³, Xin Wang³, Michael N Weedon⁵, Martin K Rutter^{6,7}, Deborah A Lawlor^{1,2,8}, George Davey Smith^{1,2,8}, Céline Vetter⁹

1. Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK
2. Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Barley House, Oakfield Grove, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK
3. 23andMe, Inc., 223 N Mathilda Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA, 94086, USA
4. Institute for Molecular Medicine FIMM, HiLIFE, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
5. Genetics of Complex Traits, University of Exeter Medical School, Exeter, UK
6. Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes & Gastroenterology, School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
7. Diabetes, Endocrinology and Metabolism Centre, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, UK
8. National Institute of Health Research Biomedical Research Centre, University of Bristol, UK
9. Circadian and Sleep Epidemiology Laboratory, Department of Integrative Physiology, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA

Abstract

Spouses may affect each other's sleeping behaviour. In 47,420 spouse-pairs from the UK Biobank, we found a weak positive phenotypic correlation between spouses for self-reported sleep duration ($r=0.11$; 95% CI=0.10, 0.12) and a weak inverse correlation for chronotype (diurnal preference) ($r=-0.11$; -0.12, -0.10), which replicated in up to 127,035 23andMe spouse-pairs. Using accelerometer data on 3,454 UK Biobank spouse-pairs, the correlation for derived sleep duration was similar to self-report ($r=0.12$; 0.09, 0.15). Timing of diurnal activity was positively correlated ($r=0.24$; 0.21, 0.27) in contrast to the inverse correlation for chronotype. In Mendelian randomization analysis, positive effects of sleep duration (mean difference=0.13; 0.04, 0.23 SD per SD) and diurnal activity (0.49; 0.03, 0.94) were observed, as were inverse effects of chronotype (-0.15; -0.26, -0.04) and snoring (-0.15; -0.27, -0.04). Findings support the notion that an individual's sleep may impact that of their partner, with implications for sleep health.

1 Introduction

2 Insufficient and disturbed sleep are pervasive features of society, with more than a quarter of US adults
3 reporting sleeping six or fewer hours per night (1), and over a third of adults reporting insomnia (2). In
4 addition to insomnia and short sleep duration, symptoms of sleep disturbance include long sleep
5 duration, difficulty waking up in the morning and daytime sleepiness (3).

6
7 Sleep patterns vary across the life course (3), are affected by ageing processes (4) and have been
8 associated with demographic and socio-economic characteristics (e.g. marital status, employment and
9 parenthood) (1). Men and women exhibit differences in sleep-wake patterns which vary with age (3).
10 For example, on average, men have a more pronounced later chronotype (evening preference) than
11 women, especially in early adulthood, but this observed difference diminishes over time (5).

12
13 Sleep problems have been strongly associated with occupational accidents (6) and loss of productivity
14 (7), as well as elevated risk of cardiovascular disease (8), metabolic disease (9, 10), depression (11) and
15 some forms of cancer (12). The discordance in sleep patterns between cohabiting couples could
16 exacerbate sleep problems which may have social, psychological, and physical health implications (13).

17
18 Spousal concordance is well established in humans for several characteristics (14), including
19 cardiometabolic health (15), smoking (15), alcohol consumption (16), educational level (17), language
20 and culture (18). Spouses tend to be positively correlated for most measures phenotypes, and this may
21 represent positive assortative mating or social homogamy (whereby individuals select phenotypically
22 similar partners), interactions after partnership (where an individual's behaviour influences that of their
23 spouse) which may result in convergence over time, or confounding by shared environmental factors
24 (19). It is plausible that sleep traits between spouses may also be influenced by these processes.

25
26 In a study of 46 couples, actigraphy-assessed sleep movements were more frequent when couples were
27 sleeping together versus when sleeping apart (6% vs 5.5% probability of movement onset per hour
28 asleep), and yet subjective sleep was generally reported to be worse when sleeping apart (44% reported
29 sleeping better with their partner present vs. 22% when their partner was away) (20). The same study
30 found that females reported being disturbed more often by their partner than was the case for males
31 (9% vs. 6%). Another study of 36 couples evaluated the interdependence of sleeping patterns based on
32 several actigraphy-assessed measures and found strong correlations in bed time (intraclass correlation

33 (ICC) = 0.42;p<0.01), sleep latency (ICC=0.25,p<0.001), light/dark ratio (ICC=0.28,p<0.001) and wake
34 bouts (ICC=0.42;p<0.001) between couples (21).

35
36 Previous studies using actigraphy measures to investigate spousal sleeping patterns have been limited in
37 terms of sample size. While larger studies have investigated self-reported sleep traits among spouses
38 (22, 23), they may suffer from bias due to individuals' perception and recall of sleeping patterns, which
39 may differ between men and women. Previous observational studies investigating both self-reported
40 and objectively-assessed sleeping patterns between spouses may also be biased by confounding (i.e. by
41 shared socioeconomic and lifestyle factors) and it can be difficult to determine the directionality in
42 correlated sleep patterns between spouses (i.e. the extent to which one spouse influences the sleep
43 patterns of the other, and vice versa).

44
45 Mendelian randomization (MR) is a method that uses genetic variants to evaluate causality between two
46 traits by minimizing risk of confounding and reverse causation (24-26). While it is typically used to
47 investigate effects of traits within the same individual, it may be extended to investigate the effect of
48 one individual on another (27). This builds on the concept of "social" or "indirect" genetic effects (28-
49 31), where the genotype of an individual influences the phenotype of an individual's contacts (spouses,
50 parents or friends). Evidence for indirect genetic effects between couples across a range of socio-
51 economic, lifestyle and behavioural phenotypes has been recently identified in large-scale population
52 datasets (32, 33). One study used genetic data from cohabiting spouses in UK Biobank to investigate the
53 possible causes of spousal similarity for alcohol behaviour (34). A similar approach can be used to
54 investigate spousal correlation in sleep behaviour.

55
56 Accelerometer-based assessment of sleep patterns, which have been demonstrated to be correlated
57 with gold-standard polysomnography data (35), are now available in much larger studies such as the UK
58 Biobank (36). The UK Biobank also has data on self-reported sleep traits, as well as genetic data, and
59 contains ~50,000 cohabiting spouses (34).

60
61 In this study, we aimed to investigate similarities in sleeping patterns between spouses in UK Biobank
62 and 23andMe, Inc. (n=174,455 spouse-pairs). If similarities in sleeping patterns and circadian preference
63 are observed, this may represent assortative mating by sleep traits, sleep interactions after partnership
64 (where an individual's sleep pattern influences that of their spouse's) or confounding by shared

65 environmental factors (**Figure 1**). To minimize risk of confounding, we performed MR using genetic
66 variants associated with the nine sleep traits to estimate the effect of an individual's sleep patterns on
67 those of their spouse. To determine whether any effects represent assortative mating, we also
68 investigated genetic concordance for sleep traits between spouses, which would imply that an effect
69 exists prior to pairing (since genotypes cannot be modified). Finally, we conducted sensitivity analyses to
70 evaluate potential bias in the MR analysis.

71

72 Results

73

74 Sleep characteristics between spouse-pairs

75 *UK Biobank*

76 Of the 47,549 derived spouse-pairs in the UK Biobank, 47,420 (99.7%) had reported information about
77 their sleep in a touchscreen questionnaire completed at baseline and 3,454 pairs (7.3%) had valid data
78 from a triaxial accelerometer device (Axivity AX3) worn for a continuous period of up to 7 days between
79 2.8 and 8.7 years after study baseline, from which several sleep measures were derived (**Supplementary**
80 **Figure 1, Box 1**).

81

82 The mean age of female and male spouses at baseline was 56.8 (SD 7.3) and 58.5 (7.3) years,
83 respectively. Reported sleep duration was similar between both females and males (mean (SD): 7.3 (1.1)
84 and 7.2 (1.0) hours). Males were slightly more likely to report no chronotype preference (12.8% males
85 vs. 8.4% females) and to report an extreme evening preference (7.0% males vs 6.4% females), while
86 females were slightly more likely to report an extreme morning preference (23.9% females vs 22.6%
87 males). Male spouses found waking up in the morning easier, with 40.2% finding it very easy compared
88 with 27.4% women. Female spouses reported more frequent insomnia symptoms, with 82.5% reporting
89 to sometimes or usually have symptoms, compared with 69.6% of males. Males were more likely to say
90 that their spouse complained about their snoring (53.6% vs 30.2%) (**Table 1**).

91

92 Of those spouse-pairs who participated in the accelerometer assessment, the mean age of females and
93 males was 63.1 (SD 6.9) and 64.8 (7.0) years when worn. Estimated nocturnal sleep duration was similar
94 between male and female spouses (7.5 (0.8) and 7.3 (0.9) hours) and was consistent with the self-
95 reported estimates. Timing of the least active 5 hours the day (L5-timing) was equivalent between males
96 and females, with the mean midpoint estimated as 3.18am (SD 1.0). Despite reporting more frequent

97 insomnia and difficulty getting up in the mornings at baseline, females who wore the accelerometer had
98 more efficient sleep (0.78 (0.06) vs 0.75 (0.07) with fewer sleep episodes (16.9 (3.5) vs 17.6 (3.8)) than
99 their male spouses (**Table 1**).

100

101 The UK Biobank spouse-pairs were slightly older (mean age 57.6 years (7.4)) than the remainder of the
102 UK Biobank cohort (56.3 years (8.2)), had a lower Townsend deprivation index (TDI) (mean -2.2 (2.5) vs. -
103 1.1 (3.2)), were less likely to be current smokers (7.1% vs. 11.4%) and more likely to abstain from alcohol
104 (22.3% vs 19.9%). However, they were less likely to be employed (54.3% vs 58.3%) and to have a
105 university degree (31.6% vs 33.0%) (**Supplementary Table 1**). Those individuals in spouse-pairs who
106 participated in the accelerometer assessment had a lower TDI (mean -2.4 (2.3) vs -2.1 (2.5)) and were
107 more likely to be employed (56.3%) and to have a university degree (41.3%) than those spouse-pairs
108 who did not participate (53.8% and 29.0%). They also had a lower body mass index (BMI), were less
109 likely to be current smokers (4.8% vs. 7.7%) and more likely to abstain from alcohol (24.0% vs 21.9%)
110 (**Supplementary Table 2**).

111

112 72.4% of the UK Biobank participants with genetic data reported living with a spouse. They were less
113 likely to report having an extreme evening preference (7.2%) compared with those living with someone
114 other than a spouse (9.9%) or living alone (10.7%); found it less difficult waking up in the morning (3.2%
115 vs 6.0% and 5.6%) and experienced less frequent insomnia symptoms (27.1% vs 29.3% and 31.7%). They
116 were more likely to report snoring (40.3% vs 28.9% and 27.1%), which is likely an artefact of how this
117 question was asked: "Does your partner or a close relative or friend complain about your snoring?".

118 Both self-reported and accelerometer-derived sleep duration were similar between the household
119 categories, as was accelerometer-derived diurnal activity (L5-timing), nocturnal sleep episodes and sleep
120 efficiency. Findings were similar when stratified by sex, except for snoring behaviour which was
121 reported at a similar prevalence among women in the different household categories (**Supplementary**
122 **Table 3**). Sleep traits among participants who also had a spouse in the UK Biobank cohort (UK Biobank
123 spouse-pairs) were generally similar to those who reported living with a spouse not in UK Biobank
124 (**Supplementary Table 1**).

125

126 *23andMe*

127 The mean age of female and male spouses in 23andMe was 62.5 (SD 11.5) and 64.5 (11.7), respectively.

128 Reported sleep duration was similar between both females and males, but less than that reported in UK

129 Biobank (mean (SD): 5.9 (1.2) and 5.9 (1.1) hours). Unlike in UK Biobank, males in 23andMe were less
130 likely to report having an evening preference than their spouses (34.5% vs 41.7%), Female spouses were
131 more likely to report having been diagnosed or treated with insomnia (20.0% vs 11.9%). Male spouses
132 were more likely to report that they snored (56.7% vs 37.2%) (**Supplementary Table 4**).

133

134 Spousal phenotypic correlation for sleep traits

135 *UK Biobank*

136 Self-reported and accelerometer-derived sleep traits were correlated between spouse-pairs, except for
137 insomnia and snoring. Weak positive correlations were found for L5-timing ($r=0.24$; 95%CI=0.21, 0.27),
138 self-reported and accelerometer-derived sleep duration ($r=0.11$; 0.10, 0.12 and $r=0.12$; 0.09, 0.15,
139 respectively), sleep efficiency ($r=0.07$; 0.04, 0.10), number of sleep episodes ($r=0.08$; 0.05, 0.11) and
140 ease of waking ($r=0.04$; 0.04, 0.05). An inverse correlation was observed for chronotype ($r=-0.11$; -0.12, -
141 0.10) (**Figure 2**). Phenotypic correlations were generally smaller in magnitude than other
142 sociodemographic and lifestyle factors considered, which were all positive correlated between spouses
143 ($r=0.13$ to 0.47) (**Figure 2**). Corresponding risk and mean differences obtained from multivariable (MV)
144 regression were very similar to the phenotypic correlations (as expected given that MV regression of SD
145 on SD \sim partial correlation) (**Table 2**). Weak cross-trait correlations were also evident between the
146 spouses, with the largest positive correlation between snoring and insomnia ($r=0.10$; 0.09, 0.11) and the
147 largest inverse correlation between L5-timing (later diurnal activity) and chronotype (morning
148 preference) ($r=-0.07$; -0.09, -0.05) (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

149

150 *23andMe*

151 Self-reported sleep traits were also correlated between spouse-pairs in 23andMe (**Supplementary Table**
152 **3**). Similar to UK Biobank, sleep duration was positively correlated between spouses ($r=0.12$; 0.09, 0.15)
153 while chronotype was inversely correlated ($r=-0.13$; -0.14, -0.12) (**Figure 2**). Weak positive correlations
154 were also observed for insomnia ($r=0.07$; 0.06, 0.07) and snoring ($r=0.05$; 0.03, 0.07), which were larger
155 in magnitude than in UK Biobank (**Figure 3**). Again, weak cross-trait correlations were observed between
156 spouses, with the largest positive correlation between insomnia and snoring ($r=0.07$; 0.05, 0.09), and the
157 largest inverse correlation between sleep duration and snoring ($r=-0.06$; -0.10, -0.02) (**Supplementary**
158 **Figure 3**).

159

160 Mendelian Randomization analysis

161 In the UK Biobank, genetic risk scores (GRS) for each of the self-reported and accelerometer-derived
162 sleep traits were generated based on single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) surpassing genome-wide
163 significance ($p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) in previous genome-wide association studies (GWAS) (see **Methods**). Details of
164 the number of SNPs contributing to the GRS and the variation explained in the sleep traits by the GRS in
165 female and male spouses are shown in **Table 3**. The GRS explained between 0.1 and 1.4% of the variance
166 in the respective sleep traits, conferring adequate genetic instrument strength for the self-reported
167 sleep traits (F-statistics 132-604), although the variance explained differed between males and female
168 spouses for the accelerometer-derived sleep traits and there was an indication of weak instruments
169 ($F < 10$) for sleep efficiency and L5-timing in females (F-statistics 4.8 and 8.5, respectively).

170
171 MR effect estimates from two-stage least squares (2SLS) analysis were largely consistent with those
172 from MV regression (**Table 2**), with the exception of snoring, where MR estimated a larger inverse effect
173 between spouses (risk difference = -0.15; -0.27, -0.04; p-value for difference from MV estimate = 0.017).
174 We observed that participants' chronotype was more likely to induce the opposite chronotype in their
175 spouse (mean difference = -0.15; -0.26, -0.04 SD per SD). Longer sleep duration of one spouse was
176 positively related to sleep duration in the other (0.13; 0.04, 0.23 SD per SD). From the accelerometer
177 assessment, activity timing was positively related between spouses in MR analysis (mean difference:
178 0.49; 0.03, 0.94 SD per SD) and there were consistent estimates for the effect of sleep duration, albeit
179 with wider confidence intervals than the self-reported equivalent (0.13; -0.12, 0.39 SD per SD).

180
181 When the impact of male spouses' sleep was separated from female spouses' sleep, effect estimates
182 were similar for the majority of sleep traits, with a few exceptions. Males' chronotype had a stronger
183 inverse effect on the chronotype of female spouses, while females' ease of waking had a stronger
184 inverse effect on ease of waking of male spouses (**Supplementary Figure 4**).

185
186 In addition to investigating causal estimates for one given sleep trait between spouses, we also
187 examined cross-trait effects using MR (**Supplementary Figure 5**). The directions of association between
188 the spousal sleep traits were relatively consistent with those observed from the spousal phenotypic
189 correlations (**Supplementary Figure 2**). The strongest cross-traits effects were seen for the diurnal
190 preference traits (ease of waking and chronotype), where easier waking was inversely related to
191 spouses' report of morning preference (mean difference = -0.15; 0.25, -0.06 SD per SD) and reciprocally,

192 morning preference was inversely related to spouses' ease of waking (mean difference = -0.08; 0.14, -
193 0.01 SD per SD). However, the opposite direction of effect was observed for diurnal preference on
194 spouses' diurnal activity, where later L5-timing was inversely related to spouses' ease of waking (mean
195 difference = -0.30; 0.60, 0.00 SD per SD). Insomnia was also found to have a causal positive effect on
196 spouses' reported snoring (mean difference = 0.10; 0.04, 0.16 SD per SD), but not vice versa (risk
197 difference = -0.02; -0.05, 0.01). This implies that an individual with insomnia is more likely to report their
198 spouses' snoring.

199

200 Genetic risk score correlation

201 There was limited evidence for genotypic correlations between the sleep traits as determined based on
202 correlations of the GRS (based on $p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) between spouses) ($-0.007 \leq r \leq 0.010$). (**Supplementary**
203 **Figure 6**). Cross-trait correlations between the GRS were also less evident ($-0.009 \leq r \leq 0.006$).
204 Findings were similar when using a series of additional GRS derived from SNPs selected at a lower p-
205 value threshold from the GWAS for each sleep trait ($p < 5 \times 10^{-7}$, $p < 5 \times 10^{-6}$ and $p < 5 \times 10^{-5}$) (**Supplementary**
206 **Figure 7**). The only trait demonstrating consistent (but weak) evidence of correlation between the
207 spouses was for insomnia ($0.009 \leq r \leq 0.014$).

208

209 Difference in effects by age, time of wear and birth location

210 For those sleep traits where we found evidence suggestive of effects between spouses, we investigated
211 whether the effects were modified by age, birth location and time of wear characteristics. Effect
212 modification by age was assessed as a proxy for relationship length, whereby evidence of stronger
213 effects with longer relationships could provide more evidence for convergence in behaviours after
214 partnership. We assessed whether effects varied by birth location of the spouses to evaluate potential
215 confounding by population structure (i.e. where spouses originating from similar areas may be more
216 similar to each other than those born further apart). Finally, given variation in the dates when the
217 accelerometer was worn by UK Biobank participants, we also investigated whether spousal effects for
218 the accelerometer-derived traits varied by differences in season and date of wear between the spouses.

219

220 Analysis stratified by age and birth location revealed limited evidence for heterogeneity in effects
221 estimates for chronotype ($I^2 = 0\%$, $P_{Het} \geq 0.45$). Moderate heterogeneity by mean age was observed for
222 sleep duration ($I^2 = 62\%$, $P_{Het} = 0.07$) with larger effects at older ages (mean differences = -0.02; -0.18, 0.13
223 SD per SD for 40-54 years; 0.17; 0.05, 0.39 SD per SD for 55-61 years; 0.22; 0.07, 0.36 SD per SD for 62-

224 70 years). There was also moderate heterogeneity by age difference for snoring ($I^2=61\%$, $PHet=0.07$) but
225 no linear trend was observed. Analysis stratified by age, birth location and time/season of wear for the
226 accelerometer assessment revealed limited evidence for heterogeneity in effect estimates for L5-timing
227 ($I^2\leq 23\%$, $PHet\geq 0.26$) (**Supplementary Figure 8**).

228

229 Robustness of MR analyses: Horizontal pleiotropy

230 For those sleep traits where there was an indicated effect between spouses, we found little evidence for
231 horizontal pleiotropy based on: i) a Sargan test which evaluates between-SNP heterogeneity in the
232 causal estimates (**Supplementary Table 6**) and ii) an MR-Egger intercept test which tests for directional
233 pleiotropy (**Supplementary Table 6**). We also evaluated effect estimates using methods which can
234 account for pleiotropy in this setting (37). Effect estimates were largely consistent in direction with
235 those obtained from both MV and 2SLS analysis, although with wider confidence intervals for the MR-
236 Egger and Least Absolute Deviation (LAD) approaches, which crossed the null (**Figure 4, Supplementary**
237 **Table 7**). However, mean F-statistics and I^2 values for the individual SNP-exposure estimates used in
238 these analyses were found to be small, indicating presence of weak genetic instruments
239 (**Supplementary Table 6**). Together, findings suggest that our main results are likely robust to horizontal
240 pleiotropy, although the presence of weak instruments indicates that this sensitivity analysis should be
241 interpreted with caution.

242

243 Robustness of MR analyses: Winner's curse

244 We derived GRS comprising a subset of SNPs used in the main analysis which replicated in independent
245 datasets in order to evaluate potential Winner's curse. This could be present due to overlap between
246 the sleep GWAS and spouse-pair sample, leading to an overestimation of the individual SNP effects on
247 the exposure. Effect estimates for chronotype and sleep duration using replicated SNPs were largely
248 consistent with those from the main analysis (**Supplementary Table 8**). For insomnia, the effect
249 estimates obtained based on SNPs which replicated in 23andMe were more consistent with a positive
250 effect between spouses (0.173; -0.025, 0.371), with estimates in the opposite direction to those
251 obtained in the main analysis from UK Biobank (-0.046, -0.151, 0.058) (**Supplementary Table 8**). We also
252 re-estimated effects for insomnia using SNPs identified in a meta-analysis of UK Biobank and 23andMe
253 (38). Estimates were also in the opposite direction to the main analysis although still consistent with the
254 null (0.076, -0.025, 0.177) (**Supplementary Table 9**)

255

256 Discussion

257 Using a sample of spouse-pairs within the UK Biobank study, we investigated the correlation in sleep
258 patterns and circadian preference between spouses using data on both self-reported and
259 accelerometer-derived sleep traits. We found evidence for weak positive phenotypic correlations
260 between spouses for sleep duration, ease of waking, timing of diurnal activity and number of nocturnal
261 sleep episodes as well as a weak inverse correlation between spouses for reported chronotype (diurnal
262 preference). Findings of a positive correlation for sleep duration and inverse correlation for chronotype
263 were replicated in 23andMe. Several cross-trait correlations were also observed between spouses.
264 Individuals who reported having insomnia were more likely to report snoring by their spouse in both UK
265 Biobank and 23andMe. Additionally, morning preference in the index individual was associated with
266 later activity timing of their spouse in UK Biobank. In MR analyses, positive effects of sleep duration and
267 activity timing were found between spouses as well as inverse effects of chronotype and snoring on the
268 same traits in their partners. We were unable to determine whether males or females had more bearing
269 on their spouse's sleep patterns, and no large differences in effects were found by age, birth location,
270 and timing of the accelerometer assessment. This was except for sleep duration, where larger positive
271 effects were observed at older ages, suggesting a convergence in sleep duration between spouses over
272 time. GRS correlations in the sleep traits were weaker than phenotypic correlations between spouses,
273 providing some evidence against assortative mating (whereby individuals select phenotypically similar
274 partners).

275
276 In line with our findings, Randler and Kretz found correlations in several sleep-wake variables between
277 spouses (39). However, in contrast to the moderate positive relationship in chronotype observed in that
278 small study ($r=0.40$, $n=84$ couples), weak inverse effects for chronotype were found between spouses in
279 the UK Biobank and 23andMe ($r=-0.11$ and -0.13 , respectively), which was supported by MR analysis.
280 The inverse correlation is unexpected, especially given the positive correlation between accelerometer-
281 assessed L5-timing. This suggests a separation of subjective chronotype, reflective of diurnal preference,
282 from actual objective sleep timing. Inverse correlations also go against the plethora of evidence
283 indicating wide-spread similarities (rather than differences) of spouses for many phenotypes (**Figure 2**)
284 (33). However, it should be emphasised that the inverse correlation observed for chronotype was
285 relatively weak in both studies.

286

287 Similar to our findings, the previous study did not find a correlation between length of relationship
288 (proxied in our study by mean age of couples) and dissimilarity in morning-evening preference (39). They
289 interpreted this as suggesting initial assortment by chronotype, whereas the lack of GRS correlation
290 ($r=0.001$) and discordance in chronotype between spouses does not provide the same evidence for
291 assortative mating in UK Biobank and 23andMe. Additionally, our findings suggest that activity timing, as
292 proxied by accelerometer-assessed L5-timing in UK Biobank, converges between spouses and so may
293 deviate from reported diurnal preference after partnership.

294
295 The literature regarding insomnia between spouses is less consistent, with some studies reporting a
296 protective effect on insomnia symptoms of being in a partnership (3) and others showing more frequent
297 wake transmissions among partners of individuals with insomnia (40). Another study found that while
298 actigraphy-assessed sleep movements were greater when couples were sleeping together, subjective
299 sleep was generally reported to be worse when sleeping apart (20). We did not find a strong correlation
300 of insomnia symptoms between spouses, assessed based on self-report as well as accelerometer
301 measures of sleep efficiency and number of nocturnal sleep episodes. However, we did find some
302 evidence for an effect of sleep duration between spouses.

303
304 We also observed an inverse relationship between spouses' reported snoring, and a positive relationship
305 between snoring and insomnia in the spouse. Spouses of snorers have been found to more frequently
306 report sleeping problems including insomnia (23). However, the results of the MR analysis suggested
307 that this association may reflect a positive effect of an index individual's reported insomnia on snoring in
308 their spouse, rather than spouse's snoring inducing insomnia. This may be explained by the fact that
309 reported snoring is captured via the spouse of the snorer in the UK Biobank question, "Does your
310 partner or a close relative or friend complain about your snoring", and so if an individual experiences
311 insomnia symptoms, they may be more likely to notice and report snoring in their spouse.

312
313 Most of the studies which have investigated sleep correlations between spouses have done so in small,
314 cross-sectional settings, typically with fewer than a hundred couples (20, 21, 39, 40). The present study
315 uses data on 47,420 determined spouse-pairs within the UK Biobank to evaluate correlation in sleep
316 traits between spouses, with replication in 23andMe ($n \leq 127,035$ spouse-pairs), as well as the use of
317 genetic analysis to evaluate causal effects underlying spousal correlation in sleep traits. Furthermore,
318 the availability of accelerometer data on ~3,500 couples in UK Biobank has enabled a comparison of

319 both subjective reported sleep traits and objective sleep measures between spouses. Unlike findings
320 from a previous study which used a similar genetic approach in the UK Biobank to infer assortative
321 mating on both height and alcohol consumption (34), our finding of low GRS correlation between sleep
322 traits suggest that correlation for sleep traits did not exist prior to cohabitation but that spouses may
323 influence each other's sleep patterns after partnership.

324
325 The current study suffers from some limitations with respect to both the phenotypic measures and
326 genetic analysis which require discussion. We were unable to directly obtain information on spouses
327 within UK Biobank and instead spouses were inferred based on several criteria, including marital status
328 and location. Other studies have used similar methods to determine spouses and the validity of the
329 derived spouse-pair sample has been previously verified (34). In 23andMe, a different method was used
330 to infer spouse-pairs, based on genetic trios to obtain mother-father pairs. However, we could not
331 determine whether the 23andMe 'parents' were separated and not living together. We also did not
332 have information on whether couples in the UK Biobank or 23andMe shared a bed, and so we are
333 unable to determine the extent to which the effects observed are directly attributed to bed sharing
334 rather than cohabitation. Although the availability of accelerometer measures enabled an objective
335 assessment of sleep patterns between a large sample of spouses in the UK Biobank, individuals did not
336 wear an accelerometer at the same time as the self-reported assessment, with a median time difference
337 of 6 years between assessments for the spouses. Additionally, spouse-pairs wore the accelerometer 7
338 months apart on average, with only 4% of individuals wearing an accelerometer at the same time as
339 their spouse. While the results of our analysis suggest potential interactions after partnership which may
340 result in convergence of sleep traits over time, we were unable to investigate this longitudinally, which
341 would require repeat assessments of sleep traits. While we investigated effect modification by age, this
342 is a crude proxy measure for relationship length.

343
344 The use of MR allowed us to overcome problems of confounding and reverse causation has enabled an
345 assessment of the potentially causal relationship in sleep traits between spouses. While this offers
346 additional inference to phenotypic correlations, several other assumptions must be made in order for
347 the causal estimates to be valid (24-26). We have attempted to address and overcome most of these
348 assumptions, with assessments of instrument strength, population stratification, horizontal pleiotropy
349 and Winner's curse. Most robust inference can be made when the estimated effects are consistent in
350 sensitivity analyses which attempt to address these assumptions, which was the case for effects

351 observed in relation to chronotype, diurnal behaviour and sleep duration. While the genetic instruments
352 were found to be strongly related to the sleep traits, for some of the accelerometer-derived traits, F-
353 statistics were small which could indicate weak instrument bias. This was particularly the case for
354 accelerometer traits in females, suggesting that there may be some sex differences in the genetic
355 contribution to the sleep traits. While we used GRS derived from SNPs identified in GWAS of men and
356 women combined, GRS comprising SNPs could be generated from sex-specific GWAS which may serve as
357 stronger instruments. However, there would be a necessary trade-off with lower sample sizes for the
358 sex-specific rather than sex-combined GWAS, which may reduce statistical power. Furthermore, mean
359 F-statistics of the individual SNP effects used in the analyses accounting for pleiotropy were found to be
360 small. However, the effects using the inverse-variance weighted approach were very consistent with
361 those obtained using the stronger GRS instrument in 2SLS analysis, indicating that this bias is unlikely to
362 be a major contributing factor.

363
364 We found that the spouse-pairs in UK Biobank differed in several socio-demographic characteristics
365 from the remainder of the UK Biobank cohort (including those participants who reported living with a
366 spouse but whose spouse was not in the study). While these differences were marginal, they suggest
367 that the spouse-pairs, particularly those with accelerometer data, were healthier and more affluent
368 which may influence the generalisability of findings to the full cohort. The UK Biobank and 23andMe
369 spouse-pairs are also unlikely to be fully representative of the general population, being more highly
370 educated, more affluent and in better health on average (41). Additionally, the mean ages of the
371 spouses in both studies were 57 and 63 years old, and so the findings regarding the correlation in
372 sleeping patterns and circadian preferences between spouses may not necessarily extrapolate to
373 younger couples, particularly those with contrasting work schedules. Furthermore, factors influencing
374 selection into the UK Biobank and 23andMe (42), and spousal assortment on other traits (19), may bias
375 spousal comparisons in both observational and MR analysis. However, previous simulations have
376 suggested that this most likely results in bias towards the null, leading to an under-estimate of the true
377 effect.

378
379 Another selection factor which could have biased estimates in the present study is relationship
380 dissolution, whereby sleep concordance/discordance could influence the likelihood of remaining in a
381 relationship and of participating in the UK Biobank study together. The lack of evidence to suggest that
382 mean age of each spouse-pair (as a proxy for relationship length) was associated with sleep correlation

383 suggests that the effects observed are unlikely to be due to relationship dissolution. However, further
384 work is required to investigate whether similarities/dissimilarities in spousal sleep traits are predictive of
385 relationship dissolution (43).

386
387 Within two large population-based resources comprising a high proportion of spouse-pairs, we
388 established correlations between several sleep traits between spouses. Within the UK Biobank, we were
389 also able to evaluate accelerometer-based sleep assessment and used a genetic analysis to demonstrate
390 effects of an individuals' sleep traits on those of their spouse for chronotype, diurnal activity, sleep
391 duration and snoring. Weak cross-trait associations were also evident in the study. Our results suggest
392 that these effects may be due to interaction after partnership rather than confounding by social
393 homogamy or assortative mating. According to the US National Sleep Foundation, 61% of adults sleep in
394 a bed with a significant other and 77% of those who are married or co-habiting report that their partner
395 experienced sleep problems (44). Our findings indicate that this may have consequences for the sleep of
396 both spouses since sleep disruption has been implicated in a number of chronic diseases (8, 9, 11, 12).
397 However, the magnitude of sleep effects was small and whether this level of correlation between
398 spouses contributes towards disease risk, as indicated in (45), requires further investigation.

399

400 **Methods**

401 **UK Biobank**

402 The UK Biobank is a population-based cohort study consisting of >500,000 participants, aged between
403 40 and 70 years, who were recruited between 2006 and 2010 in the UK (46). At recruitment, the
404 participants gave informed consent to participate and be followed up. UK Biobank has received ethical
405 approval from the UK National Health Service's National Research Ethics Service (ref 11/ NW/0382).

406

407 *Genetic data*

408 The full data release in UK Biobank contains the cohort of successfully genotyped individuals (N =
409 488,377). A total of 49,979 individuals were genotyped using the UK BiLEVE array and 438,398 using the
410 UK Biobank axiom array. Pre-imputation quality control, phasing and imputation of the UK Biobank
411 genetic data have been described elsewhere (47). We restricted the dataset to a subset of 463,827
412 individuals of recent European descent with available genotype data, with individuals of non-European
413 descent removed based on a k-means cluster analysis on the first four genetic PCs (48).

414

415 *Household composition*

416 At baseline assessment, participants were asked to report the number of people living in their
417 household (including themselves). For those who reported more than one person, they were asked how
418 the other people were related to themselves, or whether they were unrelated. Using this information,
419 we determined three groups of participants: living with spouse, living with someone other than spouse,
420 living alone.

421

422 *Spouse-pair sub-sample*

423 Using the European sub-sample, spouse-pair information was determined using the same approach
424 described previously (34). In brief, household sharing information was used to extract pairs of
425 individuals who a) report living with their spouse, b) report the same length of time living in the house,
426 c) report the same number of occupants in the household, d) report the same number of vehicles, e)
427 report the same accommodation type and rental status, f) have identical home coordinates (to the
428 nearest 1km) and g) are registered to the same UK Biobank recruitment centre and h) both have
429 available genotype data. Exclusions were made if more than two individuals shared identical information
430 across all variables (and so spouses could not be clearly defined), if potential couples who were the
431 same sex (as our analysis was related to sex differences in sleep patterns and hence effects in
432 heterosexual couples), if couples reported the same age of death for both parents (suggesting they were
433 siblings rather than spouses), and if estimated genetic relatedness was deemed to be too high (identify-
434 by-descent (IBD) >0.1, suggesting siblings or parent-child pairs rather than spouses). The final sample
435 included 47,549 spouse-pairs.

436

437 *Sleep questionnaire measures*

438 At baseline assessment, participants were given a touchscreen questionnaire, which included questions
439 about sociodemographic status, lifestyle and environment, early life and family history, health and
440 medical history, and psychosocial factors. This included several questions related to sleep and circadian
441 traits (**Box 1**).

442

443 We assessed spousal correlations between 5 self-reported sleep traits: chronotype (morning/evening
444 preference), ease of waking up, insomnia symptoms, sleep duration and snoring. Chronotype was coded
445 into five categories (“Definitely an ‘evening’ person”, “More an ‘evening’ than a ‘morning’ person”, “Do
446 not know”, “More a ‘morning’ than ‘evening’ person”, “Definitely a ‘morning’ person”); ease of waking

447 was coded into four categories (“Not at all easy”, “Not very easy”, “Fairly easy”, “Very easy”); total 24-
448 hour sleep duration was reported in whole hours; insomnia symptoms frequency was coded into three
449 categories (“Never/rarely”, “Sometimes”, “Usually”) and snoring was coded as a binary variable (“No” or
450 “Yes”). Those who responded “Do not know” or “Prefer not to say” were treated as missing data for all
451 sleep traits, except for chronotype where “Do not know” was treated as an intermediate category. A
452 binary was also generated for chronotype (“Evening vs Morning person”), by combining definite and
453 intermediate categories, and excluding those who reported “Do not know”, as well as for insomnia, by
454 combining “Never/rarely” and “Sometimes”). This was done to aid comparison with findings from
455 23andMe.

456

457 *Accelerometer measures*

458 A triaxial accelerometer device (Axivity AX3) was worn between 2.8 and 8.7 years after study baseline by
459 103,711 individuals from the UK Biobank for a continuous period of up to 7 days. Details of data
460 collection and processing have been previously described (49). Measures of sleep quality, quantity and
461 timing have been derived by processing raw accelerometer data with use of the open-source R package
462 GGIR (50). More details on the accelerometer-based sleep measures derived in UK Biobank can be found
463 in (51). These have been returned to UK Biobank as part of data return 1862.

464

465 We investigated four continuous measures: mean L5 time (midpoint of least-active 5 hours), mean
466 number of nocturnal sleep episodes, mean daily sleep duration and mean sleep efficiency. The least-
467 active five hours (L5) of each day was derived using a five-hour period of minimum activity. This period
468 was estimated using a rolling average of the respective time window and defined as the number of
469 hours elapsed from the previous midnight. The sleep period time (SPT)-window was estimated using an
470 algorithm described in (52). The number of sleep episodes within the SPT-window was defined as the
471 number of sleep bouts separated by at least 5 minutes of wakefulness within the SPT-window. The
472 summed duration of all sleep episodes was used as an indicator of sleep duration within the SPT-
473 window. Sleep efficiency was calculated as sleep duration divided by SPT-window duration.

474

475 We excluded individuals flagged by UK Biobank as having data problems (field 90002), poor wear time
476 (field 90015), poor calibration (field 90016), or unable to calibrate activity data on the device worn itself
477 requiring the use of other data (field 90017). Individuals were also excluded if the number of data
478 recording errors (field 90182), interrupted recording periods (field 90180), or duration of interrupted

479 recoding periods (field 90181) was greater than the respective variable's 3rd quartile $+1.5 \times IQR$, as
480 previously reported (51).

481

482 *Covariates*

483 The age of the participants at the baseline assessment (when self-reported measures were obtained)
484 were derived based on date of birth and the date of attending the assessment centre. Age at
485 accelerometry assessment was estimated using date of birth and the date of the first recording day. Sex
486 was determined at recruitment and individuals with sex-mismatch (derived by comparing genetic sex
487 and reported sex) (n=378) or individuals with sex-chromosome aneuploidy (n=652) were excluded from
488 the analysis. Information on which of the 22 centres in Scotland, England and Wales where assessments
489 were undertaken was also obtained. Place of birth in the UK was ascertained from a verbal interview at
490 the assessment centre and UK Grid co-ordinates (north and east) were determined. Season when the
491 accelerometer was worn was also ascertained. For all genetic analysis, we also included genotyping chip
492 and the top 10 PCs derived from the genetic data as covariates.

493

494 *23andMe*

495 Individuals in the 23andMe dataset were customers of 23andMe, Inc., a personal genomics company.
496 Participants provided informed consent and participated in the research online, under a protocol
497 approved by the external AAHRPP-accredited IRB, Ethical & Independent Review Services (E&I Review).
498 Participants were included in the analysis on the basis of consent status as checked at the time data
499 analyses were initiated.

500

501 *Spouse-pair sub-sample*

502 Parent-offspring trios were identified from the 23andMe database using identity-by-descent (IBD)
503 information. Specifically, a segment-based approach was used to designate IBD1 and IBD2,
504 corresponding to regions that have the indicated number (one or two) of shared haplotypes between
505 two individuals. Every individual was considered as a potential child in a trio (called index individual),
506 and candidate parents were identified as those sharing at least 42.5% of their genome IBD1 and no
507 more than 10% of their genome IBD2 with the index individual. Genome-wide relatedness between
508 pairs of candidate parents was then computed to eliminate incorrect candidate pairs (for example,
509 where one candidate parent is a true parent of the index individual and the other candidate parent is a
510 child of the index individual) by requiring candidate parents to share no more than 20% of their genome

511 IBD1 with each other. Lastly, trios were checked for mendelian concordance on 100 random SNPs with
512 genotyping rate 99.9% and MAF>0.3, and were required to be concordant on at least 95 of the 100
513 tested SNPs.

514
515 From 771,487 parent-offspring trios in the 23andMe research cohort, children were removed to obtain
516 mother-father pairs. The trios were subsetted to 531,856 pairs, where both parents had complete data
517 for the sleep trait, age and sex, and were of predominantly European ancestry. A detailed description of
518 23andMe ancestry classifier can be found here (53, 54) where participants defined as predominantly
519 European ancestry were those who, after 23andMe ancestry composition, had a probability of European
520 + Middle Eastern ancestry > 0.97% or European ancestry > 0.90%.

521

522 *Sleep questionnaire measures*

523 As part of the personal genomics service, all customers are invited to participate in research, which
524 occurs predominantly through web-based research surveys. Participants are asked a number of
525 questions about their sleep habits.

526

527 We assessed spousal correlations between 4 self-reported sleep traits: chronotype (morning/evening
528 preference), insomnia symptoms, sleep duration and snoring. Research participants were asked, “Are
529 you naturally a night person or a morning person?”, with options “Night person”, “Morning person”,
530 “Neither”, “It depends” and “I’m not sure”. A binary variable was generated as “Morning person” vs
531 “Night person”, where “It depends” and “I’m not sure” were treated as missing data. Participants also
532 answered the question, “Have you ever been diagnosed with, or treated for, insomnia?” with options
533 “Yes”, “No”, and “I’m not sure”. A binary variable was generated as “Yes” vs “No”, where “I’m not sure”
534 was treated as missing data. Participants were next asked, “During the past month, how many hours of
535 actual sleep did you get at night? (This may be different than the number of hours you spend in bed.)”
536 Responses were integers, with extreme responses of less than 3 hours or more than 12 hours excluded.
537 Finally, participants responded to the question, “On most nights, do you snore”, with options “Yes”,
538 “No” and “I’m not sure”. A binary variable was generated as “Yes” vs “No”, where “I’m not sure” was
539 treated as missing data.

540

541 *Covariates*

542 Accompanying surveys provide self-reported data on covariates such as age and sex. Ancestry
543 composition was performed as previously reported (54). Inclusion was restricted to individuals of
544 predominantly European ancestry to minimize confounding by ancestry.

545

546 *Statistical analysis*

547

548 Phenotypic correlations in sleep traits between spouses were calculated in both UK Biobank and
549 23andMe, while the remainder of the analysis involved participants from UK Biobank only (MR and
550 Supplementary analysis).

551

552 *Spousal phenotypic correlation for sleep*

553 **UK Biobank**

554 To evaluate the phenotypic correlation of sleep traits, we compared self-reported sleep traits and
555 accelerometer measures between spouses. We estimated the spousal correlation for the 5 self-reported
556 sleep traits and 4 accelerometer-based sleep traits by assessing the correlation between the relevant
557 variable for an individual against the relevant variable for their spouse, using a Pearson correlation test
558 adjusting for age, spouse's age and recruitment centre. With one unique phenotype pairing within
559 couples (male sleep trait / female sleep trait), each individual in the dataset was included only once as
560 either the reference individual or their spouse. To contextualise the findings, we also calculated the
561 correlation between spouses for height (field 12144), body mass index (field 21001), smoking status
562 (field 20116), alcohol intake (field 1558), physical activity (field 894), employment status (field 6142) and
563 education level (field 6138), obtained at baseline assessment.

564

565 **23andMe**

566 To assess the spousal correlation for the 4 self-reported sleep traits, a regression of the sleep trait on
567 age was first performed and then the residuals extracted for each parent. A Pearson correlation test for
568 the age-corrected values was used to assess the correlation between the relevant variable for an
569 individual against the relevant variable for their spouse. With one unique phenotype pairing within
570 couples (male sleep trait / female sleep trait), each individual in the dataset was included only once as
571 either the reference individual or their spouse.

572

573 *Mendelian Randomization analysis*

574 We used MR to investigate evidence for an effect of an individuals' sleeping patterns on the sleeping
575 patterns of their spouse. This was done by generating a series of genetic risk scores (GRS) for the 5 self-
576 reported sleep traits (chronotype (morning/evening preference)(55), ease of waking up, insomnia
577 symptoms (56), sleep duration (57) and snoring (58)) and 4 accelerometer-derived sleep traits (mean L5
578 time, number of nocturnal sleep episodes, mean daily sleep duration and mean sleep efficiency (36)).
579 Scores were generated based on single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) surpassing genome-wide
580 significance ($p\text{-value} < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) in relation to the sleep traits in genome-wide association studies (GWAS)
581 ($n = 85,670 - 461,569$). SNP lists were obtained from the relevant GWAS summary statistics available at
582 http://www.kp4cd.org/dataset_downloads/sleep. These were pruned for linkage disequilibrium
583 ($r^2 = 0.001$) based on a European reference panel, using the `clump_data` function from the
584 "TwoSampleMR" package in R (version 3.5.1) (59). Detailed information of the genetic variants is given
585 in **Supplementary Table 10**.

586
587 The genetic variants were extracted from the UK Biobank genetic data and unweighted GRS were
588 generated as the total number of sleep trait-increasing alleles (morning preference alleles for
589 chronotype) present in the genotype of each participant. Two-stage least squares (2SLS) instrumental
590 variable analyses were performed between standardized sleep traits (all traits with mean 0 and SD 1)
591 with adjustment for age at assessment, assessment centre, genotyping chip and 10 genetic principal
592 components (PCs) to minimize confounding by population stratification. This was performed using each
593 GRS as an instrument for its respective sleep traits using the "ivreg2" command in Stata (version 15).

594
595 Standardized variables are presented in the table to allow for direct comparisons with the correlation
596 coefficients estimated for the phenotypic correlation. To enable this, ordinal variables were treated
597 continuously. We also performed MV regression using the same variables with adjustment for age at
598 assessment and assessment centre, and performed a z-test for difference with the 2SLS estimate to
599 determine the extent to which the effects estimated from MR were consistent with the observational
600 associations.

601
602 With two unique pairings between genotype and sleep trait in each couple (male spouse
603 genotype/female spouse sleep trait and the converse), each individual in the dataset was included twice
604 as both the reference individual and as the spouse. This analysis was performed by sex (i.e. male spouse

605 genotype/female spouse sleep trait and female spouse genotype/male spouse sleep trait) to evaluate
606 any differential effects between males and females on their spouses' sleep patterns and then combined
607 the estimates obtained using an inverse-variance weighted random effects meta-analysis.

608

609 Supplementary analysis

610

611 *Genetic risk score correlation*

612 We assessed the correlation between the sleep GRS across spouse-pairs, adjusting for age, spouse's age,
613 assessment centre, genotyping chip and top 10 PCs. With one unique genotype pairing within couples
614 (male spouse genotype/female spouse genotype), each individual in the dataset was included only once
615 as either the reference individual or their spouse. In sensitivity analysis, we also assess the spousal
616 correlation of three additional GRS for each sleep trait, derived using less stringent p-value thresholds
617 for selecting contributing SNPs ($p < 5 \times 10^{-7}$, $p < 5 \times 10^{-6}$ and $p < 5 \times 10^{-5}$).

618

619 *Difference in effects by age, time of wear and location*

620 Where a sleep trait was found to have an effect on the same sleep trait of the spouse, we investigated
621 the extent to which this estimate varied by mean age of the spouses, the difference in ages between the
622 spouses, the birth location of the spouses and, for any accelerometer measures, differences between
623 spouses in terms of the season of wear and the time difference in wear. We investigated whether
624 results differed by age, location, season and timing by repeating MR analyses in subgroups as follows:
625 (1) by thirds of the age distribution; (2) less or more than 100km from where their spouse was born (34);
626 (3) whether the season of wearing the accelerometer differed between spouses (yes or no); (4) by thirds
627 of the difference in accelerometer wear-time between spouses. We meta-analysed estimates assuming
628 a fixed effects model using the meta package in R (version 3.5.1) to obtain an I^2 value for heterogeneity.

629

630 *Assessing MR assumptions and evaluating bias*

631 MR analysis requires various assumptions to be satisfied in order for effects to be estimated: 1) that the
632 genetic instrument is robustly associated with the exposure (instrument strength); 2) that the genetic
633 instrument is independent of potential confounders of the exposure-outcome association (no
634 confounding) and 3) that the genetic instrument influences the outcome exclusively through its effect
635 on the exposure (no horizontal pleiotropy). Various steps were taken to assess these assumptions, as
636 outlined below.

637
638 Partial r^2 values and F-statistics from the first-stage regression between each GRS and the index
639 individuals' sleep traits were examined to check adequate instrument strength.
640
641 While genetic variants should not theoretically be related to potential confounding factors, concerns
642 about potential violation of this assumption relate to confounding by ancestry or population
643 stratification, including assortative mating effects. To address this, we adjusted for principal components
644 derived from the genetic data in the MR analysis in order to control for population structure. The
645 sensitivity analysis examining spousal correlation by geographic birth proximity was also used to
646 evaluate potential confounding by social homogamy. We also examined the influence of assortative
647 mating by evaluating GRS correlation of the sleep traits, as described above.
648
649 Horizontal pleiotropy, where genetic variants may influence the outcome of interest through pathways
650 other than via the exposure, is an important limitation in conventional MR analysis. However, in the
651 context of spousal effects, pleiotropy of the genetic variants is arguably less problematic since there are
652 unlikely to be biological mechanisms by which an individual's genotype could plausibly affect their
653 spouses' phenotypes other than via the observed phenotype. Nonetheless, there may be other (e.g.
654 social) mechanisms which give rise to pleiotropy of the variants, and so we have conducted sensitivity
655 analyses to evaluate this.
656
657 To assess bias due to horizontal pleiotropy, we first explored between-SNP heterogeneity using the
658 Sargan over-identification test. We also applied a method that estimates unbalanced horizontal
659 pleiotropy in a one-sample MR setting (37). This method provides causal estimates using methods which
660 have been adapted from the two-sample MR setting, including inverse-variance weighted (IVW) meta-
661 analysis (60), MR-Egger (61) and least absolute deviation (LAD) regression (similar to the weighted
662 median approach (62)). More details of these methods are described in (37).
663
664 Winner's curse can occur when the study in which the genetic variants were identified at genome-wide
665 significance ($p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) is the same as the one used to perform the MR analysis. Since the genetic
666 variants for the sleep traits were predominantly identified in UK Biobank, this may bias causal estimates
667 towards the null. To minimize the impact of Winner's curse, we used unweighted GRSs in the main MR
668 analysis, rather than those weighted by the effect estimates obtained in the GWAS. We also performed

669 MR using GRS comprising those genetic variants that replicated in independent datasets for chronotype
670 (55), insomnia (38) and sleep duration (57). Replication was determined based on genome-wide
671 significance in 23andMe for chronotype (n=248,100) and insomnia (n=944,477), and $p < 0.05$ in CHARGE
672 given the smaller sample size of this replication dataset (n=47,180). Information on the genetic variants
673 used are described in **Supplementary Table 11**.

674
675 For insomnia, the SNPs used to assess Winner's curse were determined from a different GWAS of
676 insomnia to that used in the main analysis (56) and comprised a meta-analysis of UK Biobank and
677 23andMe (38). In an additional sensitivity analysis, we performed MR analysis using a GRS derived from
678 a larger number of SNPs identified at genome-wide significance in the meta-analysis and compared
679 estimates. Information on the genetic variants used are described in **Supplementary Table 12**.

680
681

682 Acknowledgements and Funding

683

684 This research was conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under application number 16391. We thank
685 the participants and researchers from the UK Biobank who contributed or collected data. We would also
686 like to thank the research participants and employees of 23andMe for making this work possible. RCR,
687 LH, JL, DAL and GDS are members of the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol
688 funded by the Medical Research Council (MM_UU_00011/1 and MC_UU_00011/6). RCR is a de Pass VC
689 research fellow at the University of Bristol. DAL is a British Heart Foundation Chair (CH/F/20/90003)
690 and NIHR Senior Investigator (NF-0616-10102). This study was supported by the NIHR Biomedical
691 Research Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol.
692 The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the
693 National Health Service, National Institute for Health Research, or Department of Health and Social Care.
694 RCR is a de Pass Vice Chancellor's Research Fellow at the University of Bristol.

695

696 The following members of the 23andMe Research Team contributed to this study: Stella Aslibekyan,
697 Adam Auton, Elizabeth Babalola, Robert K. Bell, Jessica Bielenberg, Katarzyna Bryc, Emily Bullis, Daniella
698 Coker, Gabriel Cuellar Partida, Devika Dhamija, Sayantan Das, Sarah L. Elson, Teresa Filshtein, Kipper
699 Fletez-Brant, Pierre Fontanillas, Will Freyman, Pooja M. Gandhi, Karl Heilbron, Barry Hicks, David A.
700 Hinds, Ethan M. Jewett, Yunxuan Jiang, Katelyn Kukar, Keng-Han Lin, Maya Lowe, Jey C. McCreight,
701 Matthew H. McIntyre, Steven J. Micheletti, Meghan E. Moreno, Joanna L. Mountain, Priyanka
702 Nandakumar, Elizabeth S. Noblin, Jared O'Connell, Aaron A. Petrakovitz, G. David Poznik, Morgan
703 Schumacher, Anjali J. Shastri, Janie F. Shelton, Jingchunzi Shi, Suyash Shringarpure, Vinh Tran, Joyce Y.
704 Tung, Xin Wang, Wei Wang, Catherine H. Weldon, Peter Wilton, Alejandro Hernandez, Corinna Wong,
705 Christophe Toukam Tchakouté

706

707

708 Author contributions

709

710 RCR conceived the study and conducted the main analysis. KH conducted the replication analysis in
711 23andMe and JL assisted with sensitivity analyses. RCR and CV drafted the initial manuscript. All authors
712 assisted with interpretation, commented on drafts of the manuscript, and approved the final version.

713 RCR is the guarantor and attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others
714 meeting the criteria have been omitted.

715

716 Competing interests

717

718 KH, XW and the 23andMe Research Team are employees of 23andMe and own stock and/or stock
719 options in 23andMe.

720

721 Data sharing


722

723 Summary-level data for UK Biobank and 23andMe are fully disclosed in the manuscript. Individual-level
724 data are not publicly available due to participant confidentiality, and in accordance with the IRB-
725 approved protocol under which the study was conducted. For details on accessing these studies, please
726 contact access@ukbiobank.ac.uk and apply.research@23andme.com.

727

728 Figures

729 Figure 1: Scenarios for spousal concordance of sleep traits



730


731 a) Assortative mating - individuals are more likely to select a mate with similar sleeping behaviour

732 b) Partner interaction - after partnership, spouses influence each other's sleeping behaviour

733 c) Confounding – shared environmental factors influence sleeping behaviour of the spouses

734


735 Figure 2: Comparison of phenotypic correlations between spouses in UK Biobank



736


737 Acc_ = accelerometer-derived measure

738 Figure 3: Spousal phenotypic correlations between sleep traits in UK Biobank and 23andMe



739

740 Figure 4: Comparison of multivariable and Mendelian randomization estimates in UK Biobank
741 Estimates represent the mean difference in the spouse's sleep trait per SD increase in an individual's
742 own sleep trait, with the exception of snoring for which estimates represent risk difference.



743
744 MV = multivariable regression, 2SLS = two-stage least squares, IVW = inverse-variance weighted, MR-
745 Egger = MR-Egger approach, LAD = least absolute deviation

746

747 **Tables**

748

749 Table 1: Sleep traits among male and female spouses in UK Biobank

750

		Female spouses	Male spouses
<i>Self-reported traits</i>	N (spouse-pairs)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Age at baseline assessment	47,420	56.8 (7.3)	58.5 (7.3)
Sleep duration	47,169	7.3 (1.1)	7.2 (1.0)
		% (n)	% (n)
Chronotype	47,235		
Extreme evening preference		6.4 (3,003)	7.0 (3,291)
Intermediate evening preference		26.2 (12,360)	24.6 (11,629)
No preference		8.4 (3,980)	12.8 (6,047)
Intermediate morning preference		35.2 (16,609)	32.9 (15,558)
Extreme morning preference		23.9 (11,283)	22.6 (10,710)
Ease of waking up	47,325		
Not at all easy		4.2 (2,007)	1.9 (889)
Not very easy		15.7 (7,416)	9.3 (4,400)
Fairly easy		52.7 (24,930)	48.6 (23,010)
Very easy		27.4 (12,972)	40.2 (19,026)
Insomnia symptoms frequency	47,369		
Never/rarely		17.5 (8,291)	30.4 (14,393)
Sometimes		50.3 (23,828)	46.0 (21,789)
Usually		32.2 (15,250)	23.6 (11,187)
Snoring			
No	45,546	69.8 (31,785)	46.4 (21,135)
Yes		30.2 (13,761)	53.6 (24,411)
<i>Accelerometer-derived traits</i>		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Age at accelerometer assessment	3,454	63.1 (6.9)	64.8 (7.0)
L5-timing	3,454	27.3 (1.0)	27.3 (1.0)
Sleep duration	3,454	7.5 (0.8)	7.3 (0.9)
Nocturnal sleep episodes	3,454	16.9 (3.5)	17.6 (3.8)
Sleep efficiency	3,454	0.78 (0.06)	0.75 (0.07)

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760 Table 2: Multivariable regression and Mendelian randomization analysis to assess associations between
 761 sleep traits among UK Biobank spouse-pairs
 762

Sleep trait	N (pairs)	Risk/mean difference	Multivariable regression				Mendelian randomization (2SLS)					z-test for difference
			SE	CIL	CIU	P-value	Risk/mean difference	SE	CIL	CIU	P-value	
Self-reported												
Chronotype	47,235	-0.113	0.005	-0.122	-0.104	2.42E-135	-0.152	0.055	-0.26	-0.042	0.006	0.480
Ease of waking	47,325	0.015	0.005	0.005	0.023	2.00E-03	-0.039	0.079	-0.193	0.116	0.625	0.503
Sleep duration	47,050	0.111	0.005	0.102	0.120	7.97E-126	0.131	0.048	0.037	0.226	0.007	0.679
Insomnia	47,369	0.005	0.005	-0.004	0.014	0.304	-0.046	0.054	-0.151	0.058	0.386	0.347
Snoring	45,546	-0.008	0.004	-0.017	0.000	0.051	-0.154	0.061	-0.274	-0.035	0.011	0.017
Accelerometer-derived												
L5-timing	3,454	0.241	0.016	0.209	0.272	1.56E-50	0.486	0.232	0.032	0.939	0.036	0.292
Sleep duration	3,454	0.108	0.016	0.077	0.140	1.38E-11	0.132	0.131	-0.124	0.387	0.312	0.856
Sleep episodes	3,454	0.069	0.016	0.038	0.100	1.63E-05	-0.267	0.247	-0.751	0.217	0.28	0.175
Sleep efficiency	3,454	0.075	0.016	0.043	0.106	3.84E-06	0.024	0.138	-0.246	0.295	0.859	0.714

763
 764 Estimates represent the mean difference in the spouse's sleep trait per SD increase in an individual's
 765 own sleep trait, with the exception of snoring for which estimates represent risk difference.
 766 Multivariable regression was adjusted for age at assessment and assessment centre for both spouses.
 767 Mendelian randomization was adjusted for age at assessment, assessment centre, genotyping chip and
 768 10 genetic principal components (PCs) for both spouses. 2SLS = Two-stage least squares.
 769
 770
 771

772 Table 3: Genetic risk score (GRS) associations with sleep traits in UK Biobank
773

Trait	N (pairs)	N SNPs	Female spouses		Male spouses	
			Partial R ²	F-statistic	Partial R ²	F-statistic
<i>Self-report</i>						
Chronotype	47,235	156	0.013	604	0.012	548
Ease of waking up	47,325	79	0.006	273	0.006	278
Sleep duration	47,050	70	0.006	279	0.005	239
Insomnia symptoms	47,369	40	0.004	192	0.003	161
Snoring	45,546	38	0.003	142	0.003	132
<i>Accelerometer-derived</i>						
Least-active 5 hour timing	3,454	6	0.003	8.5	0.006	19.2
Sleep duration	3,454	11	0.005	17.2	0.014	48.3
Number of sleep episodes	3,454	22	0.014	47.2	0.010	33.2
Sleep efficiency	3,454	5	0.001	4.8	0.005	17.3

774
775 Estimates for variance explained are adjusted for age, assessment centre, genotyping chip and top 10
776 principal components
777
778

779 **Boxes**

780

781 **Box 1: Sleep trait glossary**

782

783 **UK Biobank self-reported measures**

784 *Chronotype (diurnal preference)* – Whether a person identifies as being a ‘morning person’ or an
785 ‘evening person’ (ordered categorical variable of “definitely a morning person”, “more of a morning
786 than an evening person”, “do not know”, more of an evening than a morning person”, and “definitely
787 an evening person”)

788

789 *Ease of waking* – Whether a person finds it easy to wake up in the morning (ordered categorical
790 variable of “not at all easy”, “not very easy”, “fairly easy”, “very easy”)

Sleep duration – Average number of hours slept in 24 hours, including naps (continuous variable, hours)

Insomnia symptoms – Person has trouble falling asleep at night or wakes up in the middle of the night (ordered categorical variable of “never/rarely”, “sometimes”, and “usually”)

Snoring – Whether a person reports that their partner or a close relative or friend complains about their snoring (binary variable of “yes” or “no”)

UK Biobank accelerometer measures

L5-timing (activity timing) – Timing of the least active 5 hours of the day (continuous variable of hours elapsed since previous midnight). L5-timing represents activity later in the day (i.e. inversely related to morning preference chronotype).

Sleep duration – Average number of hours of sleep per night (continuous variable, hours)

Number of sleep episodes – Average number of nocturnal sleep episodes separated by at least 5 minutes of wakefulness per night (continuous variable, number of episodes)

Sleep efficiency - Sleep duration divided by time in bed (equivalent to time in bed) (continuous variable, proportion)

791 References

- 792 1. Krueger PM, Friedman EM. Sleep duration in the United States: a cross-sectional
793 population-based study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2009;169(9):1052-63.
- 794 2. Calem M, Bisla J, Begum A, Dewey M, Bebbington PE, Brugha T, et al. Increased
795 prevalence of insomnia and changes in hypnotics use in England over 15 years: analysis of the
796 1993, 2000, and 2007 National Psychiatric Morbidity Surveys. *Sleep*. 2012;35(3):377-84.
- 797 3. Kocevskaja D, Lysen TS, Dotinga A, Koopman-Verhoeff ME, Luijk M, Antypa N, et al. Sleep
798 characteristics across the lifespan in 1.1 million people from the Netherlands, United Kingdom
799 and United States: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2020.
- 800 4. Van Someren EJ. Circadian rhythms and sleep in human aging. *Chronobiol Int*.
801 2000;17(3):233-43.
- 802 5. Fischer D, Lombardi DA, Marucci-Wellman H, Roenneberg T. Chronotypes in the US -
803 Influence of age and sex. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(6):e0178782.
- 804 6. Uehli K, Mehta AJ, Miedinger D, Hug K, Schindler C, Holsboer-Trachsler E, et al. Sleep
805 problems and work injuries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Med Rev*.
806 2014;18(1):61-73.
- 807 7. Hafner M, Stepanek M, Taylor J, Troxel WM, van Stolk C. Why Sleep Matters-The
808 Economic Costs of Insufficient Sleep: A Cross-Country Comparative Analysis. *Rand Health Q*.
809 2017;6(4):11.
- 810 8. Sofi F, Cesari F, Casini A, Macchi C, Abbate R, Gensini GF. Insomnia and risk of
811 cardiovascular disease: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2014;21(1):57-64.
- 812 9. Cappuccio FP, D'Elia L, Strazzullo P, Miller MA. Quantity and quality of sleep and
813 incidence of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care*.
814 2010;33(2):414-20.
- 815 10. Liu J, Richmond RC, Bowden J, Barry C, Dashti HS, Daghlas I, et al. Assessing the causal
816 role of sleep traits on glycated haemoglobin: a Mendelian randomization study. *Diabetes Care*.
817 2022;(in press).
- 818 11. Baglioni C, Battagliese G, Feige B, Spiegelhalder K, Nissen C, Voderholzer U, et al.
819 Insomnia as a predictor of depression: a meta-analytic evaluation of longitudinal
820 epidemiological studies. *J Affect Disord*. 2011;135(1-3):10-9.
- 821 12. Haus EL, Smolensky MH. Shift work and cancer risk: potential mechanistic roles of
822 circadian disruption, light at night, and sleep deprivation. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2013;17(4):273-84.
- 823 13. Richter K, Adam S, Geiss L, Peter L, Niklewski G. Two in a bed: The influence of couple
824 sleeping and chronotypes on relationship and sleep. An overview. *Chronobiol Int*.
825 2016;33(10):1464-72.
- 826 14. Luo S. Assortative mating and couple similarity: Patterns, mechanisms, and
827 consequences. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. 2017;11(8):e12337.
- 828 15. Di Castelnuovo A, Quacquarello G, Donati MB, de Gaetano G, Iacoviello L. Spousal
829 concordance for major coronary risk factors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J*
830 *Epidemiol*. 2009;169(1):1-8.
- 831 16. Grant JD, Heath AC, Buchholz KK, Madden PA, Agrawal A, Statham DJ, et al. Spousal
832 concordance for alcohol dependence: evidence for assortative mating or spousal interaction
833 effects? *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2007;31(5):717-28.

- 834 17. Eeckhaut MC, Stanfors MA. Educational assortative mating, gender equality, and income
835 differentiation across Europe: A simulation study. *Acta Sociologica*. 2021;64(1):48-69.
- 836 18. Nagoshi CT, Johnson RC, Danko GP. Assortative mating for cultural identification as
837 indicated by language use. *Behavior genetics*. 1990;20(1):23-31.
- 838 19. Howe LJ, Battram T, Morris TT, Hartwig FP, Hemani G, Davies NM, et al. Assortative
839 mating and within-spouse pair comparisons. *PLoS Genet*. 2021;17(11):e1009883.
- 840 20. Pankhurst FP, Horne JA. The influence of bed partners on movement during sleep.
841 *Sleep*. 1994;17(4):308-15.
- 842 21. Meadows R, Arber S, Venn S, Hislop J, Stanley N. Exploring the interdependence of
843 couples' rest-wake cycles: an actigraphic study. *Chronobiol Int*. 2009;26(1):80-92.
- 844 22. Arber S, Hislop J, Bote M, Meadows R. Gender Roles and Women's Sleep in Mid and
845 Later Life: A Quantitative Approach. *Sociological Research Online*. 2007;12(5):182-99.
- 846 23. Ulfberg J, Carter N, Talback M, Edling C. Adverse health effects among women living
847 with heavy snorers. *Health Care Women Int*. 2000;21(2):81-90.
- 848 24. Davey Smith G, Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal
849 inference in epidemiological studies. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2014;23(R1):R89-98.
- 850 25. Davies NM, Holmes MV, Davey Smith G. Reading Mendelian randomisation studies: a
851 guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians. *BMJ*. 2018;362:k601.
- 852 26. Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. 'Mendelian randomization': can genetic epidemiology
853 contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J Epidemiol*.
854 2003;32(1):1-22.
- 855 27. Davies NM, Howe LJ, Brumpton B, Havdahl A, Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Within family
856 Mendelian randomization studies. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2019;28(R2):R170-R9.
- 857 28. Baud A, Mulligan MK, Casale FP, Ingels JF, Bohl CJ, Callebert J, et al. Genetic Variation in
858 the Social Environment Contributes to Health and Disease. *PLoS Genet*. 2017;13(1):e1006498.
- 859 29. Domingue BW, Belsky DW, Fletcher JM, Conley D, Boardman JD, Harris KM. The social
860 genome of friends and schoolmates in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult
861 Health. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2018;115(4):702-7.
- 862 30. Kong A, Thorleifsson G, Frigge ML, Vilhjalmsdottir BJ, Young AI, Thorgeirsson TE, et al. The
863 nature of nurture: Effects of parental genotypes. *Science*. 2018;359(6374):424-8.
- 864 31. Young AI, Benonisdottir S, Przeworski M, Kong A. Deconstructing the sources of
865 genotype-phenotype associations in humans. *Science*. 2019;365(6460):1396-400.
- 866 32. Xia C, Canela-Xandri O, Rawlik K, Tenesa A. Evidence of horizontal indirect genetic
867 effects in humans. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2021;5(3):399-406.
- 868 33. Robinson MR, Kleinman A, Graff M, Vinkhuyzen AAE, Couper D, Miller MB, et al. Genetic
869 evidence of assortative mating in humans. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2017;1(1):0016.
- 870 34. Howe LJ, Lawson DJ, Davies NM, St Pourcain B, Lewis SJ, Davey Smith G, et al. Genetic
871 evidence for assortative mating on alcohol consumption in the UK Biobank. *Nat Commun*.
872 2019;10(1):5039.
- 873 35. van Hees VT, Sabia S, Jones SE, Wood AR, Anderson KN, Kivimaki M, et al. Estimating
874 sleep parameters using an accelerometer without sleep diary. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):12975.
- 875 36. Jones SE, van Hees VT, Mazzotti DR, Marques-Vidal P, Sabia S, van der Spek A, et al.
876 Genetic studies of accelerometer-based sleep measures yield new insights into human sleep
877 behaviour. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1):1585.

- 878 37. Barry C, Liu J, Richmond R, Rutter MK, Lawlor DA, Dudbridge F, et al. Exploiting collider
879 bias to apply two-sample summary data Mendelian randomization methods to one-sample
880 individual level data. medRxiv. 2020:2020.10.20.20216358.
- 881 38. Jansen PR, Watanabe K, Stringer S, Skene N, Bryois J, Hammerschlag AR, et al. Genome-
882 wide analysis of insomnia in 1,331,010 individuals identifies new risk loci and functional
883 pathways. Nat Genet. 2019;51(3):394-403.
- 884 39. Randler C, Kretz S. Assortative mating in morningness-eveningness. Int J Psychol.
885 2011;46(2):91-6.
- 886 40. Walters EM, Phillips AJK, Mellor A, Hamill K, Jenkins MM, Norton PJ, et al. Sleep and
887 wake are shared and transmitted between individuals with insomnia and their bed-sharing
888 partners. Sleep. 2020;43(1).
- 889 41. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, Doherty N, Adamska L, Sprosen T, et al. Comparison of
890 Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants With Those of
891 the General Population. Am J Epidemiol. 2017;186(9):1026-34.
- 892 42. Munafo MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Collider scope: when
893 selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. Int J Epidemiol.
894 2018;47(1):226-35.
- 895 43. Torvik FA, Gustavson K, Roysamb E, Tambs K. Health, health behaviors, and health
896 dissimilarities predict divorce: results from the HUNT study. BMC Psychol. 2015;3(1):13.
- 897 44. [https://www.sleepfoundation.org/sites/default/files/inline-](https://www.sleepfoundation.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/2005_summary_of_findings.pdf)
898 [files/2005_summary_of_findings.pdf](https://www.sleepfoundation.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/2005_summary_of_findings.pdf) 2005 [
- 899 45. Gunn HE, Buysse DJ, Matthews KA, Kline CE, Cribbet MR, Troxel WM. Sleep-Wake
900 Concordance in Couples Is Inversely Associated With Cardiovascular Disease Risk Markers.
901 Sleep. 2017;40(1).
- 902 46. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK biobank: an open
903 access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and
904 old age. PLoS Med. 2015;12(3):e1001779.
- 905 47. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK Biobank
906 resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018;562(7726):203-+.
- 907 48. Mitchell R, Hemani G, Dudding T, Corbin L, Harrison S, Paternoster L. UK Biobank
908 Genetic Data: MRC-IEU Quality Control, Version 2.
909 <https://doi.org/10.5555/brs10vaau5sxunp2cv8rcy88688v>. 2019.
- 910 49. Doherty A, Jackson D, Hammerla N, Plotz T, Olivier P, Granat MH, et al. Large Scale
911 Population Assessment of Physical Activity Using Wrist Worn Accelerometers: The UK Biobank
912 Study. Plos One. 2017;12(2).
- 913 50. van Hees VT, Sabia S, Anderson KN, Denton SJ, Oliver J, Catt M, et al. A Novel, Open
914 Access Method to Assess Sleep Duration Using a Wrist-Worn Accelerometer. Plos One.
915 2015;10(11).
- 916 51. Jones SE, van Hees VT, Mazzotti DR, Marques-Vidal P, Sabia S, van der Spek A, et al.
917 Genetic studies of accelerometer-based sleep measures in 85,670 individuals yield new insights
918 into human sleep behaviour. bioRxiv. 2018.
- 919 52. van Hees VT, Sabia S, Jones SE, Wood AR, Anderson KN, Kivimaki M, et al. Estimating
920 sleep parameters using an accelerometer without sleep diary. Sci Rep-Uk. 2018;8.
- 921 53. <https://www.23andme.com/ancestry-composition-guide/> [

- 922 54. Durand EY, Do CB, Mountain JL, Macpherson JM. Ancestry Composition: A Novel,
923 Efficient Pipeline for Ancestry Deconvolution. *bioRxiv*. 2014:010512.
- 924 55. Jones SE, Lane JM, Wood AR, van Hees VT, Tyrrell J, Beaumont RN, et al. Genome-wide
925 association analyses of chronotype in 697,828 individuals provides insights into circadian
926 rhythms. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1):343.
- 927 56. Lane JM, Jones SE, Dashti HS, Wood AR, Aragam KG, van Hees VT, et al. Biological and
928 clinical insights from genetics of insomnia symptoms. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(3):387-93.
- 929 57. Dashti HS, Jones SE, Wood AR, Lane JM, van Hees VT, Wang H, et al. Genome-wide
930 association study identifies genetic loci for self-reported habitual sleep duration supported by
931 accelerometer-derived estimates. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1):1100.
- 932 58. Campos AI, Garcia-Marin LM, Byrne EM, Martin NG, Cuellar-Partida G, Renteria ME.
933 Insights into the aetiology of snoring from observational and genetic investigations in the UK
934 Biobank. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11(1):817.
- 935 59. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, Wade KH, Haberland V, Baird D, et al. The MR-Base
936 platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. *Elife*. 2018;7.
- 937 60. Burgess S, Dudbridge F, Thompson SG. Combining information on multiple instrumental
938 variables in Mendelian randomization: comparison of allele score and summarized data
939 methods. *Stat Med*. 2016;35(11):1880-906.
- 940 61. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments:
941 effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015;44(2):512-
942 25.
- 943 62. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian
944 Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. *Genet
945 Epidemiol*. 2016;40(4):304-14.
946