ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Association Between Sleep Characteristics and Likelihood of Prodromal Parkinson's Disease: A Cross-Sectional Analysis in the HABIT Study

Cheng-Jie Mao (D^{1,*}, Hao Peng (D^{2,*}, Sheng Zhuang^{1,*}, Ying-Chun Zhang³, Wei-Ye Xie¹, Jia-Hui Yan¹, Hui-Hui Liu (D¹, Jing Chen¹, Jun-Yi Liu⁴, Jianan Zhang⁵, Hai Jiang⁵, Yonghong Zhang², Mingzhi Zhang (D², Chun-Feng Liu (D^{1,6})

¹Department of Neurology and Clinical Research Center of Neurological Disease, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, Suzhou, People's Republic of China; ²Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, MOE Key Laboratory of Geriatric Diseases and Immunology, Suzhou Medical College of Soochow University, Suzhou, People's Republic of China; ³Department of Ultrasound, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, Suzhou, People's Republic of China; ⁴Department of Neurology, The Fourth Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, Suzhou, People's Republic of China; ⁵Department of Chronic Disease, Taicang Center of Disease Prevention and Control, Suzhou, People's Republic of China; ⁶Institute of Neuroscience, Soochow University, Suzhou, People's Republic of China

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence: Chun-Feng Liu, Department of Neurology and Clinical Research Center of Neurological Disease, the Second Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, 1055 Sanxiang Road, Suzhou, 215004, People's Republic of China, Email liuchunfeng@suda.edu.cn; Mingzhi Zhang, Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Medical College of Soochow University, 199 Renai Road, Industrial Park, Suzhou, 215123, People's Republic of China, Email zhangmingzhi@suda.edu.cn

Background: Sleep is critical in health problems including Parkinson's disease (PD). This study examined the association between sleep characteristics and the likelihood of prodromal PD.

Methods: At baseline examination of the Heart and Brain Investigation in Taicang (HABIT) study, potential PD biomarkers were obtained for 8777 participants aged over 50 years, and the probability of prodromal PD was assessed based on the Chinese expert consensus and Movement Disorder Society (MDS) criteria. General and component sleep characteristics were evaluated by the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI). Median regression was applied to examine the association between sleep and the probability of prodromal PD, adjusting for age, sex, education level, physical activity, obesity, fast plasma glucose, lipids, and hypertension.

Results: Based on China criteria, a higher level of PSQI score was significantly associated with a higher probability of prodromal PD ($\beta = 0.02, 95\%$ CI: 0.01–0.03) and a higher risk of having an increased probability of prodromal PD (OR = 1.04, 95% CI: 1.02–1.05). Compared to participants with good quality sleep, those with poor quality sleep had a 0.07% increased probability of prodromal PD (95% CI: 0.01–0.13) and a 19% increased risk of having a high prodromal PD probability (95% CI: 1.04–1.20). Similar associations between sleep quality and the probability of prodromal PD were also observed using the MDS criteria. Subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, habitual sleep efficiency, daytime dysfunction, and use of sleep medications were also associated with the probability of prodromal PD.

Conclusion: Poor sleep quality was associated with a high probability of prodromal PD. Sleep may be helpful for understanding and intervention of prodromal PD.

Keywords: prodromal Parkinson's disease, sleep, Parkinson's disease

Introduction

Accumulating evidence reveals a crosstalk between sleep disturbance and the progression of neurodegenerative diseases including Alzheimer's disease (AD), Huntington's disease, and Parkinson's disease (PD).^{1–3} Lack of sleep, including shortened sleep duration and poor sleep quality, may promote the process of neurodegeneration,^{4,5} which may in turn deteriorate sleep disorders.^{3,6} Novel intervention aiming to restore sleep health is also promising for the therapeutic

1355

strategy of neurodegenerative diseases.⁷ Previous studies suggested that dysregulated sleep, eg, a short or prolonged sleep duration^{8–11} and poor sleep quality,^{11–13} were associated with incident PD. However, whether these modifiable sleep dysregulations were associated with the early stage of PD or the risk of PD remains unclear.

Prodromal PD, a stage where neurodegeneration has occurred but not fully met the classic clinical diagnosis, is becoming progressively popular owing to its significance of early PD diagnosis and a potential target for disease-preventing therapy.¹⁴ As proposed by the Movement Disorder Society (MDS), current sleep-related prodromal markers contributing to the positive likelihood ratio for PD risk were rapid eye movement sleep behavior disorder (RBD) and excessive daytime somnolence.^{15,16} However, subclinical sleep characteristics, eg sleep quality, sleep duration, and daytime dysfunction, which are often easily accessed in the general population, were rarely investigated in association with prodromal PD. Therefore, we used the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) to assess seven aspects of sleep characteristics and examined their associations, individually and jointly, with the likelihood of prodromal PD in more than five thousand community members.

Methods

Study Participants

The Heart And Brain Investigation in Taicang (HABIT) study is an ongoing prospective longitudinal study designed to search for new risk factors for cardiovascular disorders, neurodegenerative diseases, and biomarkers underlying their crosstaling effects. The protocol of the HABIT study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Ethics Committee of Soochow University (Approval No. ECSU-2019000119). All participants provided written informed consent. The study design and data collection have been detailed elsewhere.¹⁷ In brief, 10357 community members aged over 30 years were included in the HABIT from 24 randomly selected communities in Taicang City between 2019 and 2020. Considering that the neurodegenerative process is more common among middle-aged and elder individuals, we only included participants over 50 years old (n = 8777) in the current analysis. All of the included participants have not been diagnosed with PD or AD.

Assessment of Sleep Characteristics

We used the Chinese version of the PSQI to evaluate nighttime sleep quality in the last month. The PSQI questionnaire was also recommended for the assessment of overall sleep problems in individuals with PD. PSQI includes seven component scores including subjective quality of sleep, sleep duration, sleep latency, habitual sleep efficiency, sleep disturbance, use of sleep medication, and daytime dysfunction.¹⁸ Each item is scored from 0 to 3 points and then finally summed to provide the global PSQI score (range: 0-21 points). A higher score indicates poorer sleep quality and the cut-off score of 5 was regarded as screening for sleep disturbance.¹⁸ In the current study, a global PSQI score ≥ 5 was defined as poor and otherwise good sleep quality.

Collection of Risk Markers and Estimation of Prodromal PD

Prodromal PD was estimated according to the recommendations from the 2019 Chinese expert consensus¹⁹ and the 2016 MDS research criteria,¹⁵ respectively. The risk markers used included male gender, regular pesticide exposure, cigarette smoking, alcohol consumption, use of tea, RBD, constipation, depression, family history of PD, olfactory loss, and substantial nigra hyperechogenicity. The methods of collection of these markers have been detailed elsewhere¹⁷ and in the <u>Supplementary data</u>. Their corresponding likelihood ratios (LRs) are shown in <u>Supplementary Table S1</u>. The probability of prodromal PD was calculated for all participants using the following formula:

Probability of prodromal PD =
$$\frac{\text{prior probability}/(1 - \text{prior probability}) \times \text{pooled LR}}{1 + [\text{prior probability}/(1 - \text{prior probability}) \times \text{pooled LR}]} \times 100\%$$

The prior probability estimated according to 5-year age intervals was 0.4% from ages 50 to 54, 0.75% from ages 55 to 59, 1.25% from ages 60 to 64, 2.0% from ages 65 to 69, 2.5% from ages 70 to 74, 3.5% from ages 75 to 79, and 4.0% age 80 and over. Based on the relevant information of the risk markers and corresponding LRs listed in <u>Supplementary Table</u>

 $\underline{S1}$, the pooled LR is generated by multiplying all available LRs by one another. The probability of prodromal PD for an individual can be finally calculated from the pooled LR combined with the age-specific prior probability.

Measurement of Covariates

As detailed in the <u>Supplementary data</u>, education level, physical activity, body mass index (BMI), blood pressure (BP), fasting plasma glucose, total cholesterol, triglycerides, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) were obtained for all participants.

Statistical Analysis

There were very few participants who were likely to have prodromal PD, as indicated by the prevalence of 0.79% and 0.76% according to the criteria recommended by China and MDS, respectively. We, therefore, defined participants with a probability over the 75^{th} percentile as an increased probability of prodromal PD. The clinical characteristics of the study participants were presented in participants with and without an increased probability of prodromal PD, respectively. To examine the association between sleep quality and prodromal PD, we first constructed a median regression model in which the probability of prodromal PD was the dependent variable, sleep quality (continuous PSQI score or categorical as poor sleep quality) was the independent variable, adjusting for age, sex, education level, physical activity, BMI, fast plasma glucose, HDL-C, LDL-C, and hypertension. Then, a logistic regression model was similarly constructed to examine the association between sleep quality and the risk of an increased probability of prodromal PD. The associations of sleep characteristics assessed by the 7 components of PSQI with prodromal PD were similarly examined. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). A two-tailed *P* value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Sensitivity Analysis

To further examine whether social-demographic characteristics affect our results, the association between sleep quality and prodromal PD was also analyzed in subgroups by age (<55 or higher), sex, and education level. To eliminate the potential influence of sleep medications on the association between sleep quality and prodromal PD, participants who reported the use of sleep medications were excluded.

Results

Clinical Characteristics of Study Participants

A total of 8777 participants (median aged 59 years; 41.2% males) were included in the current analysis. Of them, 1905 individuals (21.7%) complained of poor quality sleep as defined by PSQI score \geq 5 points. Their clinical characteristics are shown in Table 1. Compared to participants without, those with an increased probability of prodromal PD were more likely to be males, older, less educated, and have a lower level of BMI and blood pressure (All *P* < 0.05). There were no statistically significant differences in other listed variables (All *P* > 0.05). Notably, poor sleep quality was more common in participants with an increased probability of prodromal PD than those without (*P* = 0.003).

Association Between Sleep Quality and Probability of Prodromal PD

According to the China criteria, a higher level of PSQI score was significantly associated with a higher probability of prodromal PD ($\beta = 0.02, 95\%$ CI: 0.01–0.03) and a higher risk of having an increased probability of prodromal PD (OR = 1.04, 95% CI: 1.02–1.05). Compared to participants with good quality sleep, those with poor quality sleep had a 0.07% increa

sed probability of prodromal PD (95% CI: 0.01–0.13) and a 19% increased risk of having an increased probability of prodromal PD (95% CI: 1.04–1.20). Similar associations between sleep quality and probability of prodromal PD were also observed using the MDS criteria (Table 2).

Association Between PSQI Components and Probability of Prodromal PD

In addition to sleep quality assessed by the PSQI score, the individual components of the PSQI were also associated with the probability of prodromal PD. As shown in Figure 1, subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, habitual sleep efficiency,

Characteristics	Probability based on China criteria		Probability based on MDS criteria			
	Low	High	P value	Low	High	P value
No. of participants	6579	2198	-	6583	2194	-
Sex, males (%)	2960 (45.0)	709 (32.3)	<0.001	2919 (44.3)	750 (34.2)	<0.001
Age, years	59 (54-64)	65 (62-67)	<0.001	59 (54-64)	65 (62-67)	<0.001
Education level, years	9 (6-9)	5 (2-7)	<0.001	9 (6-9)	5 (2-7)	<0.001
Cigarette smoking, n (%)						
Current smoking	1720 (26.1)	245 (11.2)	<0.001	1745 (26.5)	220 (10.0)	<0.001
Former smoking	377 (5.7)	170 (7.7)		392 (6.0)	155 (7.1)	
Never smoking	4482 (68.1)	1783 (81.1)		4446 (67.5)	1819 (82.9)	
Alcohol consumption, n (%)						
Current drinking	1171 (17.8)	218 (9.9)	<0.001	1134 (17.2)	255 (11.6)	<0.001
Former drinking	189 (17.8)	59 (2.7)		194 (3.0)	54 (2.5)	
Never drinking	5219(79.3)	1921 (87.4)		5255 (79.8)	1885 (85.9)	
Physical activity, MET-min/week	960 (0-4200)	960 (0-4480)	0.203	960 (0-4320)	720 (0-4320)	0.702
Body mass index, kg/m ²	23.9 (21.9-26.2)	23.7 (21.7-25.8)	0.005	23.9 (21.9-26.2)	23.8 (21.8,25.8)	0.037
Systolic BP, mmHg	129 (118-140)	130 (120-141)	0.137	129 (119-141)	130 (120-141)	0.208
Diastolic BP, mmHg	73 (67-79)	70 (65-76)	<0.001	73 (67-79)	71 (65-76)	<0.001
FPG, mmol/L	5.3 (5.0-5.9)	5.4 (5.0-5.9)	0.209	5.3 (5.0-5.8)	5.4 (5.0-5.9)	0.137
Triglycerides, mmol/L	1.4 (1.0-2.0)	1.4 (1.0-1.9)	0.146	1.4 (1.0-2.0)	1.3 (1.0-1.9)	0.243
Total cholesterol, mmol/L	5.3 (4.6-5.9)	5.2 (4.6-5.9)	0.456	5.3 (4.6-5.9)	5.2 (4.6-5.9)	0.514
LDL-cholesterol, mmol/L	3.3 (2.8-3.9)	3.3 (2.7-3.9)	0.225	3.3 (2.8-3.9)	3.3 (2.7-3.9)	0.330
HDL-cholesterol, mmol/L	1.4 (1.2-1.6)	1.4 (1.2-1.7)	<0.001	1.4 (1.2-1.6)	1.4 (1.2-1.7)	<0.001
PSQI Score, points	3 (2-5)	3 (2-6)	<0.001	3 (2-5)	3 (2-6)	<0.001
Poor quality sleep, n (%)	1415 (21.5)	560 (25.5)	<0.001	1417 (21.5)	558 (25.4)	0.001

Table I Clinical characteristics of study participants according to probability of prodromal PD

Notes: Results were presented with n (%) or median (interquartile range) as appropriate.

Abbreviations: BP: blood pressure; FPG: Fasting blood glucose; LDL: low-density lipoprotein; HDL: high-density lipoprotein; MET-min: metabolic equivalents minutes; PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; MDS: Movement Disorder Society; PD: Parkinson disease.

Sleep Quality	Recommended by China		Recommended by MDS		
	Probability,	Increased probability	Probability,	Increased probability	
	% (β (95% Cl))*	(OR (95% CI)) *	% (β (95% Cl)) *	(OR (95% CI)) *	
PSQI score	0.02 (0.01–0.03)	1.04 (1.02–1.05)	0.02 (0.01–0.03)	1.04 (1.02–1.06)	
Good quality	0.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	0.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	
Poor quality	0.07 (0.01–0.13)	1.19 (1.04–1.20)	0.07 (0.02–0.13)	1.21 (1.07–1.38)	

Table 2 Association Between Sleep Quality and Probability of Prodromal PD

Notes: *adjusting for age, sex, education level, physical activity, body mass index, fast plasma glucose, high- and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and hypertension.

Abbreviations: PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; MDS, Movement Disorder Society; PD, Parkinson's disease.

use of sleeping medications, and daytime dysfunction were significantly associated with a higher probability of prodromal PD calculated according to recommendations from either China or MDS (all P < 0.05). These components were also significantly associated with an increased risk of having a high probability of prodromal PD (all P < 0.05, Figure 2). Amongst these components, daytime dysfunction seemed to show a stronger association with prodromal PD probability, as suggested by the largest R² (Supplementary Table S2).

Results of Sensitivity Analysis

The subgroup analysis by sex, age, and education levels did not reveal a statistically significant group difference in the magnitude of the association between sleep quality and the probability of prodromal PD (<u>Supplementary Table S3</u>), suggesting that social-demographic characteristics may not affect our results. After excluding participants who reported the use of sleep medications, the association between the PSQI score and the probability of prodromal PD persisted

Pro records we way and the set of			Beta(95%CI)
order 0 control parky pool very pool 0 control parky pool very pool 0 control Siep Latency 0 control prime 0 control sever allicity very bool 0 control Siep Latency 0 control Moderate allicity very bool 0 control Siep Latency 0 control Moderate allicity very bool 0 control Siep Latency 0 control Moderate allicity very bool 0 control Siep Latency 0 control order 0 control control 0 control control <t< td=""><td>Subjective Sleep quality</td><td>Recommended by China</td><td></td></t<>	Subjective Sleep quality	Recommended by China	
Fairly good ver very good Fairly daar very good Very der very good Very der very good Auge	ordinal		0.062(0.030, 0.094)
Part have were differences of the were good were differences of the di	Fairly good vs Very good		0.047(0.002, 0.093)
Tay but in the year and the set of the year and the year of the year of the year and the year of the year of the year and the year of the y	Fairly bad vs Very good		0.087(0.004, 0.171)
Siep Litting 0.22(0.002, 0.049) Medianie difficulty is No difficulty 0.25(0.002, 0.049) Siep Duration 0.05(0.002, 0.049) Siep Distribution 0.05(0.002, 0.049) Construction 0.05(0.022, 0.050) Construction <td>Very bad vs Very good</td> <td>_</td> <td>0.400(0.000, 0.000)</td>	Very bad vs Very good	_	0.400(0.000, 0.000)
and the set of the set	Sleep Latency		
han attractive to antrady devere difficulty who attractive devere difficulty who difficulty devere diffic	orinal		0.026(0.002, 0.049)
Severe dificulty is No dificulty Siep Duration ordinal	Mild difficulty vs No difficulty		0.024(-0.022, 0.070)
Selep Duration admail	Severe difficulty vs No difficulty		0.093(-0.034, 0.219)
Siep Duration ordinal			
6.77	Sleep Duration		0.007/ 0.001 0.000
Image: Solution of the set	>7 vs 6~6 9 hours		-0.007(-0.034, 0.020)
c 5 is 3 - 6 - 8 hours 0.030(0.247, 0.307) Habitual Sleep Efficiency one and the stress of the st	5~6 vs >6~6.9 hours		0.040(-0.022, 0.102)
Habital Sleep Efficiency difference in the save is a vession of the sa	< 5 vs >6~6.9 hours	-	0.030(-0.247, 0.307)
Index 0.004-002, 0.038) 157-94% vs > 26% -0.044-002, 0.038) 157-94% vs > 26% -0.074-002, 0.038) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.038) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.038) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.038) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.038) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.038) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.038) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.024-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.049) 158-01 0.014-002, 0.028, 0.039, 0.028, 0.039, 0.028, 0.039, 0.028, 0.039, 0.028, 0.039, 0.028, 0.030, 0.048, 0.044, 0.020, 0.048, 0.044, 0.020, 0.048, 0.044, 0.020, 0.048, 0.044, 0.020, 0.048,	Habitual Sleep Efficiency		
T3-54% way-55% -0.044(-0.16, 0.015) Siep Disturbances onal 0.019(-0.021, 0.060) Oute or more a week va none 0.019(-0.021, 0.060) Daytine Dystancian 0.019(-0.021, 0.060) Daytine Dystancian 0.011(-0.037, 0.227) Use of Sieping Medication orinal 0.011(-0.037, 0.227) Daytine Dystancian 0.244(-0.048, 0.058) Daytine Dystancian 0.244(-0.048, 0.058) Daytine Dystancian 0.244(-0.048, 0.058) Three or more lines a week va none 0.244(-0.048, 0.058) Daytine Dystancian 0.244(-0.048, 0.058) Three or more lines a week va none 0.244(-0.038, 0.288) Daytine Dystancian 0.244(-0.038, 0.288) Three or more lines a week va Nover 0.244(-0.038, 0.288) For Probility of Proformal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjectic Subjecti	orinal	•	0.004(-0.027, 0.036)
d5-3f% ws-35% c5% ws-35% Siep Disturbances constant Less than once a week vs none Once or more a w	75~84% vs >85%	× - *	-0.044(-0.108, 0.019)
 c 65% vs -85% c 25% vs -85% c 275(0060, 0.490) <lic 0.490)<="" 275(0060,="" li=""> <lic 0.490)<="" 275(0060,="" li=""> <</lic></lic>	65~74% vs >85%		-0.073(-0.147, 0.001)
Sleep Disturbances orinal Less than once a week vis none Once or more a week vis none 0019(-0.021, 0.060) -0.099(-0.068, 0.050) 0.011(0.037, 0.257) Use of Sleeping Medication orinal Less than once a week vis none 0.24(0.043, 0.355) 0.24(0.253, 0.460) Daytime Dysfunction orinal Less than once a week vis none 0.24(0.023, 0.257) Doytime Dysfunction orinal Less than once a week vis Never Once or twice a week vis Never 0.167(0.025, 0.230) For Probility of Prodromal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Sileep quality per origonial moresade week vis Never 0.167(0.025, 0.230) For Probility of Prodromal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Sileep quality per origonial moresade week vis Never 0.427(0.151, 0.703) For Probility of Prodromal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Sileep Quality per origonial moresade vis y bad vis Very good 0.059(0.029, 0.69) Sileep Latency per origonial increased hild difficulty vis No difficulty seven difficulty vis No difficul	< 65% vs >85%	·-■	0.275(0.060, 0.490)
binal Less than once a week vs none Otigeo drave with vs none Otigeo drave drave drave with vs none Otigeo drave d	Sleep Disturbances		
Less than once a week vs none Once or more survex vs none Once or more survex vs none Once or more survex vs Never Once or twice a week vs none Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once	orinal	•	0.019(-0.021, 0.060)
Unce of more a week vs none Uses than once a week vs Never Data of Sieep Disturbanes Per one point increased Noderate difficulty vs No difficulty Sieep Datation Per one point increased Unce of Sieep Disturbanes Per one point increased Unce of Sieep Disturbanes Per one point increased Unce of Sieep Disturbanes Unce of Sieep	Less than once a week vs none	±	-0.009(-0.068, 0.050)
Use of Sleeping Medication orinal control Less finan once a week vance 0.204(0.043, 0.365) 1.243(0.344, 2.142) 0.241(0.025, 0.360) 0.253(0.060, 1.227) Daytime Dysfunction orinal Conce or twice a week vance 0.107(0.055, 0.149) 0.107(0.055, 0.230) 0.107(0.055, 0.230) 0.107(0.055, 0.230) 0.107(0.055, 0.230) 0.107(0.055, 0.230) 0.107(0.055, 0.230) 0.107(0.025, 0.230) 0.107(0.025, 0.230) 0.107(0.025, 0.230) 0.107(0.025, 0.230) 0.107(0.025, 0.230) 0.004(0.002, 0.085) 0.004(0.002, 0.085) 0.004	Once or more a week vs hone		0.011(-0.037, 0.257)
orinal Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction orinal Less than once a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction orinal Less than once a week vs Never Diffeo Tore or twice a week vs Never Diffeo Tore o	Use of Sleeping Medication		
Less finance a week va Never One or twice a week va Never Daytime Dysfunction orinal Lass finances a week va Never Done or twice a week va Never Der one joint increased Der one joint increased Der one joint increased Des failty us No difficulty Step Duration Per one joint increased Des failty us No difficulty Step Duration Der one joint increased Done joint increased	orinal		0.204(0.043, 0.365)
Once or twice a week 0.241(0.253, 0.960) Daytime Dysfunction orinal Less than once a week vs Never 0.107(0.065, 0.149) Daytime Dysfunction orinal Less than once a week vs Never 0.107(0.065, 0.149) Three or more times a week vs Never 0.107(0.065, 0.236) For Probility of Protormal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Step quality per one point threesaid Silep Latency per one point threesaid 0.059(0.029, 0.059) Per ome point threesaid 0.047(0.067, 0.226) Mid difficulty vs No difficulty vs Vs vs Vsry good 0.0308(-0.023, 0.639) Silep Latency per one point threesaid 0.023(-0.01, 0.046) Mid difficulty vs No difficulty vs No difficulty vs No difficulty vs No difficulty vs	Less than once a week vs Never		1.243(0.344, 2.142)
The of Inde alles a week vs hole	Once or twice a week		0.241(-0.253, 0.960)
Daytime Dysfunction orinal Less than once a week vs Never Cheer or twice a week vs Never Cheer or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never For Probility of Prodormal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Sleep quality per one point increased Fairly bad vs Very good Sleep Latency per one point increased Sleep Latency per one point increased Sleep Duration per one point increased For Probability vs No difficulty Sleep Latency per one point increased Sleep Duration per one point increased For Sleep Quality Daytime Dysfunction Daytime Dysfunction Per one point increased Per one	Three of more times a week vs hone		0.303(-0.000, 1.227)
orinal Less han once a week vs Never 0.107(0.065, 0.149) Conce or twice a week vs Never 0.107(0.025, 0.238) Three or more times a week vs Never 0.427(0.151, 0.703) For Probility of Prodromal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Sleep quality per one point increased 0.059(0.029, 0.089) Faity good vs Very good 0.0427(0.151, 0.703) Faity good vs Very good 0.040(0.02, 0.85) Sleep Latency per one point increased 0.059(0.029, 0.089) Per one point increased 0.038(-0.023, 0.639) Sleep Latency per one point increased 0.038(-0.023, 0.639) Sleep Latency per one point increased 0.023(-0.01, 0.046) Mid difficulty vs No difficulty 0.038(-0.023, 0.105) Severe difficulty vs No difficulty 0.038(-0.023, 0.105) Sleep Duration per one point increased 0.011(-0.037, 0.140) >75-44% vs >65% 0.039(-0.024, 0.036) Sleep Disturbances per one point increased 0.011(-0.037, 0.140) Siep Disturbances 0.011(-0.037, 0.140) per one point increased 0.011(-0.037, 0.140) Siep Disturbances 0.011(-0.037, 0.140) per one point increased 0.011(-0.037, 0.140) Less than once a week vs none 0.038(-0.024, 0.038) Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased 0.011(-0.037, 0.140) p	Daytime Dysfunction		
Less man once a week vs Never Che or Nice a week vs Never For Probility of Prodromal PD (%). Recommended by MDS Subjective Sieep quality per one point increased Fairly bad vs Very good Sieep Latency per one point increased Mid difficulty vs No difficulty Siever difficulty vs No difficulty Per one point increased Siever difficulty vs No difficulty Per one point increased Habitual Sieep Efficiency per one point increased Habitual Sieve Siever Habitual Sieve Siever Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Siever our one increased Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Sieve Siever Difficulty Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Sieve Siever Habitual Sieve Siever Difficulty Sieve Siever Difficulty Siever Siever Habitual Siever Difficulty Siever Siever Difficulty Siever Siever Difficulty Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Siever Sieve	orinal		0.107(0.065, 0.149)
The or more times a week vs Never The or more times a week vs Never For Probility of Prodromal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Sleep quality per one point increased Pe	Once or twice a week vs Never		0.146(0.076, 0.216)
For Problity of Prodromal PD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Sleep quality Parting good very good Paithy good very good Paithy good very good Per one point increased Mid difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty Per one point increased Mid difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty Per one point increased Per one point increased Per one point increased Per one point increased Sidep Latency Per one point increased Less fiban once a week vs none Duster Dimetimes a week vs none Duster Dimetimes a week vs none Duster Dimetimes a week vs none Duster	Three or more times a week vs Never	·	0.427(0.151, 0.703)
FO From your for the final FD (%) Recommended by MDS Subjective Steep quality 0.059(0.024,0.089) Failty good Very good 0.044(0.002,0.085) Failty good Very good 0.038(-0.023,0.639) Sieep Latency 0.023(-0.001,0.046) per one point increased 0.023(-0.001,0.046) Mid difficulty vs No difficulty 0.038(-0.023,0.139) Sieep Latency 0.038(-0.023,0.105) per one point increased 0.044(0.002,0.086) Mid difficulty vs No difficulty 0.038(-0.026,0.205) Sieep Duration 0.044(0.002,0.086) per one point increased 0.044(0.002,0.086) > 54 vs >6-6.9 hours 0.044(0.002,0.086) Habitual Sieep Efficiency 0.001(-0.034,0.036) per one point increased 0.001(-0.034,0.036) 25 -744 vs >85% 0.001(-0.034,0.036) 25 -744 vs >85% 0.001(-0.034,0.036) 25 -744 vs >85% 0.018(-0.021,0.056) Less than once a week vs none 0.018(-0.021,0.056) Once or more times a week vs none 0.038(-0.021,0.056) Once or times a week vs none 0.038(-0.021,0.056) Daytime Dysfunction 0.037(-0.061,0.133)	For Probility of Prodremal DD (%)	Decommonded by MDS	
per one point increased Faity good vs Very good Painty good vs Very good Siep Latency per one point increased Difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty Per one point increased Siep Duration per one point increased Siep Duration per one point increased Siep Duration per one point increased Siep Duration per one point increased Siep Disturbances per one point increased Siep Disturbances per one point increased Disturbances per one point increased Disturbances Disturbances per one point increased Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances Disturbances D	Subjective Sleep quality	Recommended by MDS	
Fairly good vs Very good Fairly bad vs Very good Very bad vs Very good Very bad vs Very good Sleep Latency per one point increased Mid difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty Siep Duration per one point increased About Severe Shours 5 4 vs >6-6 Shours 6 4 0.002(.008) 1 4 4 0.000(.003(.008)) 1 4 4 0.000(.003(.008)) 1 4 4 0.001(-0.004(.002).008) 1 4 4 0.001(-0.007(.008)) 1 4 4 0.001(.0007(.008)) 1 4 4 0.001(.0007(.	per one point increased	•	0.059(0.029,0.089)
Fairly bad vs Very good Very bad vs Very good Very bad vs Very good Sieep Latency per one point increased Mild afficulty vs No afficulty Noderate afficiality vs No afficulty Severe afficiality vs No afficulty Per one point increased 5-6 vs 3-6-6 9 hours C 5 vs 3-6-6 9 hours C 5 vs 3-6-6 9 hours Sieep Disturbances per one point increased Per one point increased C 5 vs 3-6-6 9 hours C 2 vs 3-6-0 9 hours C 2	Fairly good vs Very good	-	0.044(0.002,0.085)
Sleep Latency per one point increased Mid difficulty vs No difficulty Moderate difficulty vs No difficulty so difficulty vs No d	Fairly bad vs Very good		0.106(0.023,0.189)
Sleep Latency per one point increased Mid difficulty vs No difficulty 0.023(-0.01,0.046) Mid difficulty vs No difficulty 0.038(-0.032,0.105) Severe difficulty vs No difficulty 0.038(-0.032,0.105) Sleep Duration per one point increased -0.011(-0.037,0.140) >7 vs 6-6.9 hours 0.034(-0.026,0.026) < 0.034(-0.026,0.026,0.026)	very bad vs very good		0.308(-0.023,0.639)
per one point increased Mild difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty Do 0.08(-0.028, 0.280) Severe difficulty vs No difficulty Do 0.08(-0.028, 0.280) Do 0.08(-0.028, 0.280) Do 0.08(-0.028, 0.280) Do 0.08(-0.028, 0.280) Do 0.08(-0.028, 0.280) Do 0.08(-0.048, 0.208) Device a week vs none Device a week vs Never Do cor twice a week vs Never Direct runce a week vs Never Direct runce a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never Device a week vs Never Direct runce a week	Sleep Latency		
Mid difficulty vs No difficulty 0.018(-0.026, 0.026) Severe difficulty vs No difficulty 0.038(-0.026, 0.205) Sleep Duration 0.038(-0.026, 0.205) per one point increased -0.011(-0.037, 0.140) 5-6 vs >6-6 9 hours 0.038(-0.026, 0.038) + 0.038(-0.026, 0.038) Fabitual Sleep Efficiency 0.034(-0.0140, 0.026, 0.038) per one point increased 0.034(-0.0140, 0.026, 0.038) 75-6 vs >6-6 9 hours 0.033(-0.026, 0.038) + 0.033(-0.026, 0.038) + 0.034(-0.0140, 0.026, 0.038) 5-74 % vs >85% 0.005(-0.114, 0.015) 55-74 % vs >85% - 55-74 % vs >85% - Sleep Disturbances - per one point increased - Less than once a week vs none - Once or more times a week vs none - Once or wice a week vs Never 0.184(0.051.0.317) Less than once a week vs Never 0.134(0.062,0.133) Once or twice a week vs Never - Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.186) Once or twice a week vs Never - Once or twice a week vs Never </td <td>per one point increased</td> <td>•</td> <td>0.023(-0.001,0.046)</td>	per one point increased	•	0.023(-0.001,0.046)
Sievere difficulty is No difficulty 0.089(-0.026, 0.205) Sievere difficulty is No difficulty 0.089(-0.026, 0.205) Sievere difficulty is No difficulty 0.044(0.002, 0.086) > 7 vs 6-8, 9 hours 0.044(0.002, 0.086) < 5 vs >6-6, 9 hours 0.036(-0.026, 0.036) < 5 vs >6-6, 9 hours 0.034(0.032, 0.086) < 5 vs >6-6, 9 hours 0.036(-0.026, 0.036) Habitual Siep Efficiency 0.063(-0.262, 0.388) Per one point increased 0.001(-0.034, 0.036) (Mild difficulty vs No difficulty	Ĩ.	0.016(-0.026,0.058)
Sleep Duration per one point increased 5-6 vs >6-6.9 hours 5-6 vs >6-6.9 hours 5-6 vs >6-6.9 hours 5-6 vs >6-6.9 hours 4 Habitual Sleep Efficiency per one point increased 75-84% vs >85% 5-74%	Severe difficulty vs No difficulty		0.036(-0.033,0.105)
Sleep Duration -0.011(-0.037, 0.140) per one point increased -0.039(-0.018, 0.096) 5-6 vs >6-6.9 hours 0.039(-0.018, 0.096) <			0.000(0.010,0.100)
per one point increased -0.011(-0.037,0.140) >7 vs 66-6 9 hours 0.044(0.002, 0.066) <-0.037(-0.039,0.018, 0.096)	Sleep Duration		
Prive 30-5 Hours 0.044(0.002, 0.086) S-6 vs >6-6.9 hours 0.034(-0.018, 0.096) + abitual Sleep Efficiency 0.001(-0.034, 0.036) per one point increased 0.001(-0.034, 0.036) 75~84% vs >85% -0.05(-0.114, 0.015) 65~74% vs >85% 0.018(-0.021, 0.096) 65~74% vs >85% 0.001(-0.034, 0.036) Sleep Disturbances 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) per one point increased 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) Less than once a week vs none 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) Use of Sleeping Medication 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) per one point increased 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) Use of Sleeping Medication 0.080(-0.048, 0.08) per one point increased 0.080(-0.048, 0.08) Use or Sleeping Medication 0.280(-0.287, 0.848) per one point increased 0.280(-0.287, 0.848) Daytime Dysfunction 0.097(0.061, 0.133) per one point increased 0.0134(0.082, 0.186) Less than once a week vs Never 0.134(0.082, 0.581) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082, 0.581) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082, 0.591) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,	per one point increased		-0.011(-0.037,0.140)
< 5 vs >6-6.9 hours Habitual Sleep Efficiency 0.063(-0.262, 0.388) per one point increased 0.001(-0.034, 0.036) 55-74% vs >85% -0.05(-0.114, 0.015) 65% vs >85% 0.201(-0.017, 0.417) Sleep Disturbances 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) per one point increased 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) Less than once a week vs none 0.080(-0.048, 0.208) Use of Sleeping Medication -0.05(-0.048, 0.0317) per one point increased 0.184(0.051, 0.317) Less than once a week vs none	5~6 vs >6~6.9 hours	.	0.039(-0.018 0.096)
Habitual Sleep Efficiency per one point increased 55~74% vs >85% 0.001(-0.034,0.036) -0.031(-0.094,0.032) 65~74% vs >85% -0.031(-0.047,0.056) 65% vs >85% -0.05(-0.114,0.015) Sleep Disturbances per one point increased 0.018(-0.021,0.056) Cost or more times a week vs none -0.012(-0.062,0.038) Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased -0.080(-0.048,0.208) Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased -0.184(0.051,0.317) Less than once a week vs Never 0.280(-0.287,0.848) Once or twice a week vs none	< 5 vs >6~6.9 hours		0.063(-0.262, 0.388)
natural Greep EnriceTrey per one point increased 75~84% vs >85% 0.001(-0.034,0.036) 65~74% vs >85% -0.05(-0.114,0.015) 65~74% vs >85% -0.05(-0.114,0.015) 65~74% vs >85% 0.001(-0.017,0.417) Sleep Disturbances per one point increased 0.018(-0.021,0.056) Less than once a week vs none -0.012(-0.062,0.038) Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased 0.080(-0.048,0.208) Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased 0.184(0.051,0.317) Less than once a week vs Never 0.134(0.062,0.038) Once or twice a week 0.280(-0.287,0.848) Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased 0.097(0.061,0.133) Less than once a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.186) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.591) Three or more times a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.591) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.591) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.591) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.591)	Habitual Sleen Efficiency		
75~84% vs >85% -0.031(-0.094, 0.032) 65~74% vs >85% -0.05(-0.114, 0.015) 65~74% vs >85% -0.05(-0.114, 0.015) 96 or one point increased 0.018(-0.021, 0.056) Less than once a week vs none -0.012(-0.062, 0.038) Use of Sleeping Medication -0.014(0.051, 0.317) per one point increased 0.080(-0.247, 0.848) Once or twice a week vs none	per one point increased	-	0,001(-0.034.0.036)
65~74% vs >85% <pre> 65~74% vs >85% </pre> -0.05(-0.114,0.015) -0.02(-0.017,0.417) Sleep Disturbances per one point increased Less than once a week vs none Once or more times a week vs none Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Daytime a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never	75~84% vs >85%	r a n	-0.031(-0.094,0.032)
< 65% vs >85% Sieep Disturbances per one point increased Less than once a week vs none Use of Sieeping Medication per one point increased Once or more times a week vs none Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased 0.039(-0.061,0.133) Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never 0.134(0.080,0.581) 12 0 15 25	65~74% vs >85%	· •	-0.05(-0.114,0.015)
Sleep Disturbances per one point increased Less than once a week vs none Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction Daytime Dysfunction Daytime Dysfunction Daytime Dysfunction Dayte Dysfunction Day	< 65% vs >85%	——	0.201(-0.017,0.417)
per one point increased 0.018(-0.021,0.056) Less than once a week vs none -0.012(-0.062,0.038) Once or more times a week vs none -0.012(-0.062,0.038) Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Date or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never Date or twice a we	Sleep Disturbances		
Less than once a week vs none Once or more times a week vs none Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Conce or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs none Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Date or more times a week vs Never Date or more times a week vs Never Date or twice a week vs	per one point increased	•	0.018(-0.021,0.056)
Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Conce or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Conce or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Conce or twice a week vs Never Conce or twice a	Less than once a week vs none	•	-0.012(-0.062,0.038)
Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs none Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never Date or twice a week vs Never Date of the or twice a week vs Never Date o	Once or more times a week vs none	1	0.080(-0.048,0.208)
per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs none Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never	Use of Sleeping Medication		
Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week Three or more times a week vs none Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Once or twice a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never	per one point increased	⊢∎→	0.184(0.051,0.317)
Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never	Less than once a week vs Never		1.118(0.199,2.036)
Daytime Dysfunction 0.097(0.061,0.133) per one point increased 0.097(0.061,0.133) Less than once a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.186) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.101(-0.007,0.209) Three or more times a week vs Never 0.34(0.089,0.591)	Unce or twice a week		0.280(-0.287,0.848)
Daytime Dysfunction 0.097(0.061,0.133) per one point increased 0.097(0.061,0.133) Less than once a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.186) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.101(-0.007,0.209) Three or more times a week vs Never 0.34(0.089,0.591)	These of more times a week is note	-	0.404(-0.110,1.003)
per one point increased 0.097(0.061).0.133) Less than once a week vs Never 0.134(0.082,0.186) Once or twice a week vs Never 0.101(-0.007, 0.209) Three or more times a week vs Never 0.34(0.089,0.591)	Daytime Dysfunction		
Once or twick is Never	per one point increased		0.097(0.061,0.133)
Three or more times a week vs Never 0.34(0.089,0.591)	Once or twice a week vs Never		0.104(0.002,0.100)
-12 0 15 25	Three or more times a week vs Never		0.34(0.089,0.591)
		-12 0 15	2.5

Figure 1 A forest plot presenting the associations between individual PSQI components and the probability of prodromal PD. Notes: βs and 95% Cls were generated by the median regression model after adjusting for age, sex, education level, physical activity, body mass index, fast plasma glucose, high- and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and hypertension. PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; MDS: Movement Disorder Society; PD: Parkinson's disease.

Beta's estimates

For Higher risk Prodromal PD Recommended by China		OR(95%CI)
Subjective Sleep quality per one point increased Fairly good vs Very good Fairly bad vs Very good Very bad vs Very good		1.164(1.080, 1.254) 1.135 (1.006, 1.280) 1.291(1.080, 1.543) 1.928(1.319, 2.817)
Sleep Latency per one point increased Mild difficulty vs No difficulty Moderate difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty		1.058(1.000, 1.120) 1.022(0.899, 1.161) 1.055 (0.880, 1.264) 1.245(1.023, 1.516)
Sleep Duration per one point increased >7 vs >6~6.9 hours 5~6 vs >6~6.9 hours <5 vs >6~6.9 hours		1.037(0.968, 1.111) 0.989(0.874, 1.121) 1.068(0.908,1.257) 1.140(0.743,1.749)
Habitual Sleep Efficiency per one point increased 75~84% vs >85% 65~74% vs >85% < 65% vs >85%		1.050(0.971, 1.135) 1.046(0.870, 1.258) 0.856(0.668, 1.098) 1.537(1.121, 2.107)
Sleep Disturbances per one point increased Less than once a week vs none Once or more a week vs none		1.005(0.890, 1.135) 0.969(0.836, 1.123) 1.025(0.773, 1.360)
Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week Three or more times a week vs none		1.241(1.107, 1.391) 2.254(1.326, 3.832) 1.208(0.698, 2.092) 1.881(1.281, 2.764)
Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never		1.245(1.158, 1.337) 1.414(1.225, 1.633) 1.55(1.258, 1.909) 1.64(1.192, 2.257)
For Higher risk Prodromal PD Recommended by MDS Subjective Sleep quality per one point increased Fairly good vs Very good Fairly bad vs Very good Very bad vs Very good		1.164(1.080, 1.254) 1.107(0.982, 1.249) 1.331(1.115, 1.588) 1.836(1.257, 2.681)
Sleep Latency per one point increased Mild difficulty vs No difficulty Moderate difficulty vs No difficulty Severe difficulty vs No difficulty		1.063(1.004, 1.126) 1.016(0.894, 1.154) 1.030(0.859, 1.235) 1.295(1.065, 1.574)
Sleep Duration per one point increased >7 vs >6~6.9 hours 5~6 vs >6~6.9 hours <5 vs >6~6.9 hours		1.023(0.955, 1.095) 1.026(0.906,1.162) 1.076(0.914, 1.266) 1.204(0.788, 1.840)
Habitual Sleep Efficiency per one point increased 75~84% vs >85% 65~74% vs >85% < 65% vs >85%		1.049(0.97, 1.133) 0.968(0.804, 1.166) 0.837(0.653, 1.072) 1.664(1.218, 2.274)
Sleep Disturbances per one point increased Less than once a week vs none Once or more a week vs none		1.035(0.917, 1.169) 0.991(0.855, 1.149) 1.100(0.831, 1.457)
Use of Sleeping Medication per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week Three or more times a week vs none		1.269(1.132, 1.422) 2.245(1.328, 3.795) 1.268(0.734, 2.189) 2.015(1.372, 2.958)
Daytime Dysfunction per one point increased Less than once a week vs Never Once or twice a week vs Never Three or more times a week vs Never		1.236(1.150, 1.328) 1.326(1.148, 1.531) 1.514(1.229, 1.865) 1.751(1.276, 2.401)
0.5	1 1.5 OR's estimates	4

Figure 2 A forest plot presenting the associations between individual PSQI components and an increased probability of prodromal PD. Notes: ORs and 95% CIs were generated by a logistic regression model after adjusting for age, sex, education level, physical activity, body mass index, fast plasma glucose, high- and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and hypertension. PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; MDS: Movement Disorder Society; PD: Parkinson's disease. (<u>Supplementary Table S4</u>). The association between sleep quality and prodromal PD observed in our study was unlikely to be driven by sleep medications. We additionally examined but failed to observe a significant association between sleep apnea and the probability of prodromal PD (all P > 0.05).

Discussion

In this community-based cohort study including more than 8000 Chinese adults aged over 50 years, we systemically examined the associations between sleep characteristics and probability of prodromal PD. We found that poor nighttime sleep quality was significantly associated with an increased probability of prodromal PD. Among the complicated aspects of sleep quality, subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, habitual sleep efficiency, daytime dysfunction, and use of sleep medications were also associated with the probability of prodromal PD. These associations were independent of age, sex, lifestyle, and metabolic factors. Sleep may participate in the development and progress of PD through mechanisms beyond these factors.

In line with our study, the association between sleep quality and probability of prodromal PD have also been observed by prior studies. For example, two cross-sectional studies reported a similar magnitude of the association between sleep quality and prodromal PD,^{11,13} using the same assessment of sleep quality with us. Another cross-sectional study including 269 elderly adults used actigraphy as a measurement of sleep quality and found that greater sleep fragmentation was associated with 1.43 times higher odds of substantial nigra neuron loss and 2.04 times higher odds of pathological PD diagnosis.¹² In addition to prodromal or clinical PD, a recent study including 536 Chinese adults free of PD reported significant linear associations of the PSOI score and its components with total CSF α -syn levels,¹³ suggesting that sleep quality was biologically linked to synucleinopathy. However, these studies were limited in sample size (n < 600) and did not consider environmental and lifestyle confounders of PD risk such as smoking, pesticide exposure, and exercise. In addition, the application of single biomarkers might not be able to capture the whole picture of prodromal PD diagnosis in its early stage.²⁰ In the Rotterdam Study including over 7,000 individuals with a mean follow-up of 8.4 years, Lysen et al found that individuals with baseline poor sleep quality, as was evaluated by PSQI in our study, were significantly associated with increased risk of parkinsonism and PD only in the first 2 years but not subsequent 6 years in the followup,¹¹ indicating the impaired sleep quality could be a prodromal characteristic of PD instead of its etiology. Considering that the outcome of our study was set for the early stage of disease progression, their findings were well in line with our results indicating that poor sleep quality was associated with higher odds of prodromal PD.

Concerning specific components of PSQI, we found consistent results showing that the use of sleeping medications and daytime dysfunction was related to 1.3–2.3 times higher odds of prodromal PD using two versions of criteria for prodromal PD. Chronic use of sleeping medication was suggestive of insomnia, which added a 1.37-fold risk of future PD regardless of common diseases and conditions.¹⁰ As for daytime dysfunction in PD, it is not restricted to daytime sleepiness but also involves factors including daytime fatigability, anxiety, and depression.²¹ Pal et al showed that daytime dysfunction was somehow more explained by reduced enthusiasm rather than EDS in the PD population and the component of the former score was more related to symptoms of depression.²¹ In line with the literature, depression is a known predictor of prodromal PD¹⁶ and is used to assess the probability of prodromal PD. These findings suggested a biological association between sleep quality and prodromal PD.

We also explored the sleep duration–PD relationship in our study. Previous studies on this topic generated inconsistent findings, ^{8–11,13,22} with some showing that prolonged sleep duration was related to higher PD risk, ^{8,9} while others reported that shorter sleep duration contributed to the development of PD.^{10,11} However, these studies varied in study design (cross-sectional^{13,22} or prospective^{8–11}), enrolled participants (general population or female cohort⁸), or PD ascertainment (clinical diagnosis, ^{9,11,22} ICD code¹⁰ or PD biomarker¹³). Moreover, none of these studies used prodromal PD as the outcome of interest. In an early study by Gao et al, a U-shaped association was first noted between nighttime sleep duration and established PD cases that were diagnosed before the sleep survey.²² Interestingly, the association disappeared for PD cases that were diagnosed \geq 3 years after the survey (defined as prediagnostic PD). Their results, to some extent, indicated that excessive or insufficient nighttime sleep duration could be symptoms after PD diagnosis but not an early feature in its prediagnostic stage. However, in the Rotterdam study, Lysen et al showed that baseline and worsening shorter sleep duration were significantly related to increased risk of parkinsonism and PD in the short run of their follow-up duration.¹¹ Similar to their results, our findings, though

not statistically significant, indeed showed that individuals with shorter sleep duration tend to have an 18%–26% higher odds of prodromal PD, in comparison to those with 6–6.9/h of sleep per night. This might be interpreted that insufficient sleep may potentially disturb the clearance of accumulated α -synuclein,²³ a vital component in PD pathology. Moreover, fragmentation and deprivation of sleep might accelerate brain oxidative stress involved in models of PD pathogenesis.²⁴ Because of measurement errors and recall bias for self-reported duration, subjective and quantitative tools with adjustments for other cofounders can be used in future research to confirm the relationship between sleep duration and PD development.

The strengths of our study include a comprehensive collection of known predictive markers, including lifestyle factors, probable RBD, sniff test for olfactory loss, transcranial sonography for SN hyperintensity, etc, to calculate the probability of prodromal PD on an individual level in a large-scale cohort. We applied two versions of criteria for prodromal PD to confirm the robustness and generalizability of our findings.^{15,19} To understand the influence of different aspects of sleep, we also evaluated both overall and separate PSQI components in association with prodromal PD probability and risk. Several limitations should be noticed. First, we were not able to investigate the temporal association between sleep and prodromal PD because the current study was cross-sectional. Second, misclassification may occur as the questionnaires for assessment of sleep and some other confounding variables were self-reported. Residual confounding may also exist as other sleep habits such as napping or sleepwalking, which were reported to increase PD risk, were not included in our study.^{25,26} Although tools such as polysomnography can provide more accurate results, these examinations may not be suitable for a large population-based epidemiological study. The association between sleep quality and prodromal PD is warranted to be validated by objective sleep measures in future studies. Third, the generalizability to other populations remains unclear as the current cohort was set in 24 communities in southern China. Fourth, although it is unclear about the mechanisms underlying the association between sleep quality and PD. proteostasis of some neurotoxic proteins may link sleep to prodromal PD. Impaired proteostasis and the resulting accumulation of misfolded and aggregation-prone neurotoxic proteins,²⁷ including α -syn in PD, are common pathomechanisms of PD and this protein has been associated with sleep quality.¹³ Whether sleep quality was associated with α -syn protein in our study population is unclear. Fifth, the findings of the existing studies to date suggest a bidirectional association between sleep quality and PD. Prospective longitudinal data are critical for deciphering the temporality and causality underneath the observed association between them. However, we do not have such data currently, but the HABIT study is designed as a prospective longitudinal study. Sixth, our study did not obtain some sleep habits such as napping and sleepwalking. Their potential contribution to prodromal PD or influence on the association between sleep quality and prodromal PD is not clear.

In conclusion, presence of poor sleep quality was associated with a high probability of prodromal PD. Given the commonality and significance of sleep disturbances in PD progression, attention to modifiable sleep habits may be helpful for understanding and intervention in prodromal PD. Strategies for improving sleep quality may be applicable to individuals at risk of PD. Prospective and trial studies are warranted to further test the role of sleep quality in the prevention and treatment of PD.

Acknowledgments

Cheng-Jie Mao, Hao Peng and Sheng Zhuang are co-first authors for this study. We gratefully acknowledge the continued cooperation and participation of the members of the HABIT study and their families. Without their contribution, this research would not have been possible.

Author Contributions

All authors made a significant contribution to the work reported, whether that is in the conception, study design, execution, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation, or in all these areas; took part in drafting, revising or critically reviewing the article; gave final approval of the version to be published; have agreed on the journal to which the article has been submitted; and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding

This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81903384 and 82271279), the Jiangsu Provincial Medical Key Discipline (ZDXK202217), Xiong An New Area Science and Technology Innovation Project (2023XAGG0073), Suzhou Key Laboratory (SZS2023015), Project of Jiangsu Provincial Health Commission

(M2022063), Suzhou Major Disease Multi-center Clinical Research Project (DZXYJ202303), the Suzhou Municipal Science and Technology Bureau (No. SKY2023041 and SKY2022048), and the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

References

- 1. Fifel K, Videnovic A. Circadian and sleep dysfunctions in neurodegenerative disorders-an update. *Front Neurosci.* 2020;14:627330. doi:10.3389/ fnins.2020.627330
- Bohnen NI, Hu MTM. Sleep disturbance as potential risk and progression factor for Parkinson's disease. J Parkinsons Dis. 2019;9(3):603–614. doi:10.3233/JPD-191627
- 3. Al-Qassabi A, Fereshtehnejad SM, Postuma RB. Sleep disturbances in the prodromal stage of Parkinson disease. *Curr Treat Options Neurol.* 2017;19(6):22. doi:10.1007/s11940-017-0458-1
- 4. Owen JE, Zhu Y, Fenik P, et al. Late-in-life neurodegeneration after chronic sleep loss in young adult mice. *Sleep.* 2021;44(8):zsab057. doi:10.1093/sleep/zsab057
- 5. Owen JE, Veasey SC. Impact of sleep disturbances on neurodegeneration: insight from studies in animal models. *Neurobiol Dis.* 2020;139:104820. doi:10.1016/j.nbd.2020.104820
- 6. Matsumoto S, Tsunematsu T. Association between sleep, alzheimer's, and Parkinson's disease. Biology. 2021;10(11). doi:10.3390/biology10111127
- Videnovic A, Klerman EB, Wang W, Marconi A, Kuhta T, Zee PC. Timed light therapy for sleep and daytime sleepiness associated with Parkinson disease: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Neurol. 2017;74(4):411–418. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2016.5192
- Beydoun HA, Naughton MJ, Beydoun MA, et al. Association of sleep disturbance with Parkinson disease: evidence from the women's health initiative. *Menopause*. 2022;29(3):255–263. doi:10.1097/GME.00000000001918
- 9. Chen H, Schernhammer E, Schwarzschild MA, Ascherio A. A prospective study of night shift work, sleep duration, and risk of Parkinson's disease. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2006;163(8):726–730. doi:10.1093/aje/kwj096
- 10. Hsiao YH, Chen YT, Tseng CM, et al. Sleep disorders and an increased risk of Parkinson's disease in individuals with non-apnea sleep disorders: a population-based cohort study. J Sleep Res. 2017;26(5):623–628. doi:10.1111/jsr.12545
- 11. Lysen TS, Darweesh SKL, Ikram MK, Luik AI, Ikram MA. Sleep and risk of parkinsonism and Parkinson's disease: a population-based study. *Brain*. 2019;142(7):2013–2022. doi:10.1093/brain/awz113
- Sohail S, Yu L, Schneider JA, Bennett DA, Buchman AS, Lim ASP. Sleep fragmentation and Parkinson's disease pathology in older adults without Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2017;32(12):1729–1737. doi:10.1002/mds.27200
- Wang XT, Liu FT, Bi YL, et al. Associations of sleep characteristics with alpha-synuclein in cerebrospinal fluid in older adults. Ann Clin Transl Neurol. 2020;7(10):2026–2034. doi:10.1002/acn3.51204
- 14. Schaeffer E, Toedt I, Kohler S, Rogge A, Berg D. Risk disclosure in prodromal Parkinson's Disease. *Mov Disord*. 2021;36(12):2833-2839. doi:10.1002/mds.28723
- Berg D, Postuma RB, Adler CH, et al. MDS research criteria for prodromal Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord. 2015;30(12):1600–1611. doi:10.1002/ mds.26431
- Heinzel S, Berg D, Gasser T, et al. Update of the MDS research criteria for prodromal Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord. 2019;34(10):1464–1470. doi:10.1002/mds.27802
- 17. Peng H, Mao C, Zhang J, et al. Cohort profile: heart and brain investigation in Taicang (HABIT) study. Int J Epidemiol. 2024;53(1):dyad192. doi:10.1093/ije/dyad192
- Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF 3rd, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburgh sleep quality index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res.* 1989;28(2):193–213. doi:10.1016/0165-1781(89)90047-4
- Chinese Medical Association SoN, Parkinson's Disease and Movement Disorders Study Group. Chinese expert consensus on research criteria for prodromal Parkinson's disease. *Chinese J Geriatrics*. 2019;38(9):7.
- 20. Postuma RB, Berg D. Prodromal Parkinson's disease: the decade past, the decade to come. Mov Disord. 2019;34(5):665-675. doi:10.1002/mds.27670
- 21. Pal PK, Thennarasu K, Fleming J, Schulzer M, Brown T, Calne SM. Nocturnal sleep disturbances and daytime dysfunction in patients with Parkinson's disease and in their caregivers. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2004;10(3):157–168. doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2003.11.002
- 22. Gao J, Huang X, Park Y, et al. Daytime napping, nighttime sleeping, and Parkinson disease. Am J Epidemiol. 2011;173(9):1032–1038. doi:10.1093/ aje/kwq478
- 23. Wang XT, Yu H, Liu FT, et al. Associations of sleep disorders with cerebrospinal fluid alpha-synuclein in prodromal and early Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol.* 2022;269(5):2469–2478. doi:10.1007/s00415-021-10812-2
- 24. Jenner P, Olanow CW. Oxidative stress and the pathogenesis of Parkinson's disease. *Neurology*. 1996;47(6 Suppl 3):S161–170. doi:10.1212/ WNL.47.6_Suppl_3.161S
- Leng Y, Goldman SM, Cawthon PM, Stone KL, Ancoli-Israel S, Yaffe K. Excessive daytime sleepiness, objective napping and 11-year risk of Parkinson's disease in older men. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2018;47(5):1679–1686. doi:10.1093/ije/dyy098
- 26. Zhang X, Molsberry SA, Pavlova M, Schwarzschild MA, Ascherio A, Gao X. Association of sleepwalking and REM sleep behavior disorder with Parkinson disease in men. JAMA Network Open. 2021;4(4):e215713. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.5713
- Prakash J, Chouhan S, Yadav SK, Westfall S, Rai SN, Singh SP. Withania somnifera alleviates parkinsonian phenotypes by inhibiting apoptotic pathways in dopaminergic neurons. *Neurochem Res.* 2014;39(12):2527–2536. doi:10.1007/s11064-014-1443-7

Nature and Science of Sleep

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

Nature and Science of Sleep is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal covering all aspects of sleep science and sleep medicine, including the neurophysiology and functions of sleep, the genetics of sleep, sleep and society, biological rhythms, dreaming, sleep disorders and therapy, and strategies to optimize healthy sleep. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: https://www.dovepress.com/nature-and-science-of-sleep-journal