



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Heritability of sleep quality in a middle-aged twin sample from Spain

Juan J. Madrid-Valero^{1,2,*}, Juan F. Sánchez-Romera^{1,2}, Alice M. Gregory³, José M. Martínez-Selva^{1,2} and Juan R. Ordoñana^{1,2,*†}

¹Department of Human Anatomy and Psychobiology, University of Murcia, Spain, ²Murcia Institute of Biomedical Research, IMIB-Arrixaca, Spain and ³Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

*Corresponding authors. Juan R. Ordoñana, Faculty of Psychology, University of Murcia, Campus de Espinardo 30100 Murcia, Spain.

Email: ordonana@um.es; Juan J. Madrid-Valero, Faculty of Psychology, University of Murcia, Campus de Espinardo 30100 Murcia, Spain.

Email: juanjose.madrid1@um.es.

†Work Performed: University of Murcia, Spain.

Abstract

Study Objectives: Sleep quality is associated with health throughout the life span, which is particularly salient in middle-age and older adulthood. Sleep quality appears to be influenced by both genetic and environmental factors. However, there is still limited information about genetic influences on sleep quality in middle-aged adults, and particularly in those from certain geographical locations. We estimated the magnitude of genetic and environmental influences on sleep quality in a representative sample of middle-aged Spanish twins.

Methods: The sample comprised 2150 individuals born between 1939 and 1966, who participate in the Murcia Twin Registry. To estimate the heritability of sleep quality variables, we performed univariate analyses for the global score on the Pittsburgh sleep quality index and for each of its components.

Results: We found moderate but significant heritability (34%) for sleep quality. The genetic variance of the components of the Pittsburgh index ranged from 30 to 45 per cent, except for sleep efficiency for which no genetic influence could be detected. In summary, there was a moderate genetic influence on most dimensions of sleep quality in a sample of adult male and female twins. Shared environment influences were not found.

Conclusions: This study adds new information regarding the underlying determinants of sleep quality by providing heritability estimates in a middle-aged population-based representative sample from a geographical location that has not been included in studies of this type previously. This could provide a reference point for future research regarding sleep research in middle-age.

Statement of Significance

Twin studies indicate that both genetic and environmental factors are important in explaining individual differences in sleep quality. However, heritability is a population statistic, meaning that the magnitude of genetic influences may vary depending on the specific population under investigation. There is a paucity of information focusing on middle-aged twins, and those from Southern Europe (where cultural habits concerning sleep differ from those in countries typically focused on in twin studies). This study examines the role of genetic and environmental influences in sleep quality in a sample of middle-aged Spanish twins of both sexes, thus, allowing for sex comparison and providing estimates for an age period when poor sleep quality is common. We found no evidence of sex differences and report similar estimates to those found when focusing on samples from other locations.

Key Words: adult; dizygotic; heritability; monozygotic; sleep duration; sleep quality; twins

Submitted: 27 February, 2018; Revised: 7 May, 2018

© Sleep Research Society 2018. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Sleep Research Society. All rights reserved. For permissions, please e-mail journals.permissions@oup.com.

Introduction

Sleep quality is a concept that incorporates different aspects of our sleep, including total sleep time, sleep latency, sleep efficiency, or sleep disturbances [1]. It is well known that poor sleep quality is associated with general health and wellbeing [2]. Sleeping poorly has been associated with a wide array of problems including psychological disorders, chronic pain, and higher Body Mass Index (BMI) [3–6]. Sleep quality often worsens with age [7] and shows a gender disequilibrium. Thus, middle-aged women when compared with men have a higher predisposition to suffer sleep problems like insomnia [8] and poorer sleep quality [8, 9]. Moreover, age contributes progressively to poorer sleep quality in men and women [7, 9]. Altogether, middle-age adulthood seems to be a sensitive period in which to develop sleep problems for both women and men.

Sleep parameters are influenced by both genetic and environmental factors [10, 11]. There is a wealth of literature on twin studies estimating genetic and environmental influences on sleep. However, most of it focuses on sleep duration, which is just one of the components of sleep quality, and heritability estimates of sleep duration between 0.17 and 0.63 have been reported [11–17]. These estimates, however, have been inconsistent. Thus, Butkovic et al. [16] reported a heritability of 0.63 in a sample of young adults, whereas Barclay et al. [18] did not find genetic influence for sleep duration in those aged 18–27 years.

Other aspects of sleep have also been investigated using twin studies. For example, heritability estimates have been reported between 0.29 and 0.38 for sleepiness, 0.39 for daytime sleep duration (i.e. siesta), and 0.22 for bedtime [12, 15, 19].

A similar picture appears related to insomnia, the most common sleep disorder with a prevalence between 6 and 33 per cent depending on the criterion used [20–23]. Heritability values for insomnia vary from 0.14 to 0.55 [10, 24–26].

All of the aforementioned papers focus on a specific aspect of sleep. On the other hand, sleep quality, as a global index, encompasses different aspects of sleep providing a more complete and valid image of the subjective experience of sleep. Such an index has also been studied from a quantitative genetics perspective. For example, a pioneering study by Partinen and colleagues [13] found a heritability for sleep quality of 0.44. In another study, using a large sample of twins measured at two different time points, reported heritabilities were 0.33 and 0.39 for men and 0.53 and 0.39 for women [2]. Similarly, Heath et al. [27] found a heritability of 0.33. A limitation of all of these studies is that they used a very simple measure (i.e. one question) to assess sleep quality. More recent studies have used psychometrically adequate measures, like the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI), and have reported a heritability of 0.43 in young adults [28] or 0.34 in middle-aged males [17], with a wide variation between specific components of the PSQI questionnaire in both studies. For example, Barclay et al. [18] did not find genetic influences on sleep duration, whereas Genderson et al. [17] reported a heritability of 0.29. Such discrepancies reinforce the need to consider specific features of the population under investigation, such as age and sex, and cultural environment as well, when we are estimating the heritability of sleep quality and its components.

To the best of our knowledge, no study to date has analyzed the genetic architecture of the PSQI index and its components in a sample including middle-aged women. Given that they

seem to be a group at risk of poor sleep quality, this information has the potential to be of great value. It allows a better understanding of the genetic underpinnings of sleep difficulties and increases knowledge about possible age and gender effects on the heritability of sleep quality. Additionally, heritability is a population statistic.

Therefore, it seemed important to analyze data from a southern European country where several social characteristics and cultural habits differ from those of previously reported twin samples. In particular, the use of Central European Time in Spain, means that sunset is at a later hour than would be expected according to its geographical location, the practice of daytime naps or siestas, late bedtimes, commercial opening hours, and prime time television hours create a specific milieu in Spain which could influence the relative impact of genetic and environmental underpinnings of sleep. We conducted a classical twin study of the PSQI index and its components in a population-based sample of middle-aged Spanish twins of both sexes.

Methods

Participants

The sample comprised 2150 participants from a population-based registry in the Region of Murcia, South East of Spain (Murcia Twin Registry, MTR). Description about MTR, recruitment procedures, and data collection is provided elsewhere [29, 30]. There were 975 males (45.3%) and 1175 females (54.7%). The sample comprised twins that were 32.7% monozygotic (MZ), 31% same-sex dizygotic (DZ-SS), and 31.7% opposite sex dizygotic (DZ-OS). Mean age was 53.7 ($SD = 7.4$; Range: 41–73) (Table 1). Altogether the sample is representative of the general population in the region [30].

The MTR protocols and instruments, as well as the data collection procedures and the analysis derivatives thereof, have been approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Murcia and meet the legal requirements of confidentiality and protection of personal data. Participants provided written informed consent when interviewed in person or oral consent when a telephone interview was used.

Measures

Zygoty assessment

Twin zygoty was assessed by DNA in 338 pairs of twins. When this was not possible, a 12-item questionnaire focusing on the degree of similarity and mistaken identity between twins was used. This questionnaire-based zygoty corresponds well to zygoty as determined by DNA testing with an agreement in nearly 96 per cent of the cases [29].

Sleep quality

Sleep quality was measured through the Spanish version of the PSQI. The PSQI is a widely used self-report questionnaire, comprising seven subscales: (1) subjective sleep quality, (2) sleep latency, (3) sleep duration, (4) habitual sleep efficiency, (5) sleep disturbances, (6) use of sleeping medication, and (7) daytime dysfunction [31]. The components scores range from 0 to

Table 1. Study sample characteristics

	Male	Female	MZ	DZ	Total sample
N (%)	975 (45.3%)	1175 (54.7 %)	704(32.7%)	1446(67.2%)	2150(100%)
Age mean (SD)	53.76 (7.20)	53.62 (7.49)	52.12 (6.96)	54.45 (7.43)	53.69 (7.36)
Mean Global PSQI (SD)	4.37 (3.57)	5.74 (4.15)	5.22 (3.93)	5.09 (3.98)	5.14 (3.96)
N (%) poor sleep quality (PSQI \geq 5)	254 (30.1%)	481 (44.6%)	255 (39.1%)	480 (37.8%)	735 (38.2%)
Subjective sleep quality (SD)*	0.92 (0.69)	1.15 (0.75)	1.06 (0.74)	1.04 (0.73)	1.04 (0.73)
Sleep latency (SD)*	0.75 (1.11)	1.10 (1.19)	0.90 (1.13)	0.96 (1.18)	0.94 (1.17)
Sleep duration (SD)*	0.93 (1.01)	0.89 (1.01)	0.89 (0.98)	0.92 (1.03)	0.91 (1.01)
Habitual sleep efficiency (SD)*	0.61 (0.97)	0.73 (1.07)	0.66 (1.01)	0.68 (1.03)	0.68 (1.03)
Sleep disturbances (SD)*	0.75 (0.55)	0.97 (0.59)	0.89 (0.60)	0.86 (0.58)	0.87 (0.58)
Use of sleeping medication (SD)*	0.26 (0.81)	0.68 (1.22)	0.50 (1.09)	0.48 (1.07)	0.49 (1.08)
Daytime dysfunction (SD)*	0.27 (0.72)	0.31 (0.73)	0.32 (0.74)	0.28 (0.72)	0.29 (0.73)
Mean Sleep Hours (SD)	6.42 (1.37)	6.43 (1.41)	6.44 (1.36)	6.42 (1.40)	6.43 (1.39)

DZ = dizygotic twins; MZ = monozygotic twins; SD = standard deviation; PSQI = Pittsburgh sleep quality index.

*Subscales range from 0 to 3.

3 (where a higher score represents poorer sleep quality). These seven partial scores add up to a global index ranging from 0 to 21. The questionnaire has been validated in its Spanish version [32] and has also shown adequate reliability and validity [33]. In the current sample, Cronbach's alpha for the global score was 0.73. Additionally, the questionnaire allows for an estimation of average sleep hours during the last month based on self-report of usual time to go to bed and awakening.

Data analysis

The global PSQI score was log-transformed because of positive skewness (0.92 before and -0.34 after log transformation) and treated as a continuous variable in the analyses. Since scores of the PSQI components range from 0 to 3, they were treated as ordinal variables.

Data from the MZ and DZ twin pairs were analyzed using structural equation modeling, with the Open MX software package in R [34], to estimate the contribution of genetic and environmental factors to phenotypic variability. The ordinal variables were analyzed using a liability threshold model. To apply variance component genetic models to categorical twin data, it is assumed that the categories reflect an imprecise measurement of an underlying normal distribution of liability, which would have one or more thresholds to discriminate between the categories [35]. This liability may be influenced by genetic and environmental factors and is normally distributed with a mean value of zero and a variance of one. Twins' similarity can be estimated by the correlation for the liability scale, called a polychoric correlation.

Assumptions of the twin design (i.e. equal variances and means for MZ and DZ twins as well as for cotwins) and possible age effects were tested by comparing twin models to saturated models. Next, we tested whether MZ twin intrapair correlations were higher than DZ twin correlations for each of the phenotypes, which would suggest a genetic influence on individual differences for such trait. Genetic influences found in the measured parameters were estimated by fitting genetic structural equation models in which the observed phenotypic variance is decomposed into genetic and environmental components [36]. Observed MZ and DZ twin correlations generally show a combination of additive (A; i.e. summed allelic effects across multiple genes) and nonadditive (D; i.e. genetic dominance, possibly including epistasis) genetic factors, as well as shared (C; i.e.

environmental influences that act so as to make family members more alike) and individual (E; i.e. environmental influences that make those within a family less alike, including measurement error) environmental factors. It is not possible to estimate C and D simultaneously, because C and D are negatively correlated and the choice of modeling C or D depends on the pattern of MZ and DZ correlations; usually C is estimated if the DZ twin correlation is greater than half of the MZ twin correlation, and D is estimated if the DZ twin correlation is less than half of the MZ correlation [37, 38].

Structural equation modeling determines the combination that best matches the observed data [39]. We fitted both ACE and ADE models to the data. Since the goodness-of-fit of a model is distributed as a chi-square (χ^2), by testing the change in chi-square ($\Delta\chi^2$) against the change in degrees of freedom (Δdf), we can test whether dropping or equating specific model parameters significantly worsens the model fit and following the principle of parsimony, select the simplest model among those that are not statistically different. The best-fitting model was chosen in each case by deducting the residual deviance of the compared models and by comparing Akaike's information criterion (AIC).

In addition, as a checking analysis, possible sex differences in the distribution of variance were explored through the comparison of the magnitude of the DZ-SS and DZ-OS twin pair correlations. Higher DZ-SS correlations than DZ-OS correlations would suggest that different genes or shared environmental factors could influence individual differences in the trait [40]. A saturated model was used to estimate means and variances (for men and women separately) as well as five twin correlations (MZm and DZm for males; MZf and DZf for females; and DZ-OS for opposite-sex pairs) for the PSQI global score. The subsequent models tested were 1-variances; 2-correlations of DZm and DZf pairs; and 3-correlations of DZ-SS and DZ-OS pairs, and were constrained to be equal. If the constraints in the nested models do not cause a significant deterioration in model fit, correlation difference is nonsignificant and no suggestion of sex differences in the genetic or common-environment architecture is implied.

Results

Mean PSQI index was 5.14 (SD = 3.96). Females reported greater sleep problems than males (\bar{X} = 5.74 (SD = 4.15) and \bar{X} = 4.37 (SD = 3.57), respectively). This pattern was similar for all the

components of the questionnaire except for average sleep hours, where the mean scores were almost identical, 6.43 ($SD = 1.41$) for women and 6.42 ($SD = 1.37$) for men.

Testing for sex differences

Correlations for the global PSQI score in the different zygosity groups were, as expected, higher for MZ twins than for DZ twins ($r_{MZM} = 0.28$, 95% CI 0.08, 0.46; $r_{MZF} = 0.39$, 95% CI 0.26, 0.50; $r_{DZM} = 0.09$, 95% CI 0.0, 0.26; $r_{DZF} = 0.21$, 95% CI 0.06, 0.36; $r_{DZ-os} = 0.07$, 95% CI 0.0, 0.22). No suggestion of sex differences was found since correlations for male, female, and opposite-sex DZ pairs could be equated without significant deterioration of fit ($p > 0.05$). Consequently, we proceeded with the univariate analyses taking the complete sample as a whole.

Heritability PSQI global score and its components

The univariate analysis for the global PSQI score showed an important contribution of genetic factors and nonshared environmental effects. When we compared the ADE model versus more restricted models, an AE model was selected as the best fitting model. Estimated parameters were 0.34 for genetic influences and 0.66 for nonshared environmental influences (Table 2).

Regarding the PSQI components, all correlations ranged from 0.17 to 0.47 for MZ and 0.0 to 0.26 for DZ twins (Table 3). Six of the seven components showed an important genetic influence, regardless of whether an ACE or ADE model was fitted according to the correlations structure. AE models showed the best fit for subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, sleep duration, sleep disturbances, and use of sleeping medication, with estimates of heritability ranging from 0.30 to 0.40 (Table 2). However, nested models showed a significantly worse fit in the case of daytime dysfunction, probably due to the low frequency of problems in this dimension. Additionally, the best fitting model for sleep efficiency was a CE model, where E represented an important percentage of variance (0.80).

Sensitivity analyses were conducted, whereby we fitted models for raw data rather than for the ordinal PSQI scales for those dimensions in which quantitative data were available (i.e. duration, latency, and efficiency). So, for example, for sleep efficiency scores, we focused on scores which could theoretically range from 0 to 100 (rather than the scaled scores of 0–3). Heritability estimates obtained from the raw data were similar to those of the scales, albeit of a lesser magnitude, in two of these dimensions. Thus, heritability lowered from 0.30 to 0.25 (duration) and from 0.20 to 0.16 (efficiency). For latency, the best fitting model changed to a CE model in this case.

Discussion

The objective of this study was to analyze the relative genetic and environmental contributions to sleep quality and its components, in a sample of middle-aged twins. We focused on both sexes from a geographical location (Southern Europe) which has not been explored previously. We expected to shed light on the genetic architecture of sleep quality during a time of life when sleep can deteriorate and within a specific environment with distinct cultural habits regarding sleep.

We first showed that DZ correlations from same-sex and opposite-sex pairs were not significantly different, suggesting that the same genes related to sleep quality seem to be operating in middle-aged men and women. In our sample, the heritability of sleep quality was estimated at 0.34. This result is consistent with previous studies with more limited samples. For example, Genderson et al. [17] found exactly the same heritability estimate, although their sample comprised only male adult twins (mean age = 55.4). Heritability estimates appear to be roughly similar regardless of age or measurement method, as other studies have reported values ranging from 0.33 to 0.53 [2, 13, 27, 28]. Interestingly, our estimate is at the lower end of the range meaning that the largest part of the variance is due to unique environmental factors. Although, in this study, we partitioned genetic and environmental influences (as is standard in twin analyses) in reality, there was likely gene-environment interplay, whereby exposure or sensitivity to the environment is based in part on genetic propensities. Middle-age men and women can have specific age-related circumstances that produce difficulties and interruptions of sleep. For instance, among those in our current sample reporting sleep disturbances, men usually mentioned shift working (32.6%) or the emergence of age-related diseases (e.g. respiratory or prostatic) (26.8%) as sleep disrupters. In turn, women mentioned partner snoring/noises (7.4%) or a care-giver role (children or elder people) (13.6%) as important sources of sleep disturbance. Moreover, worries or anxiety was present in 46.3 per cent of those females, but only in 16.3 per cent of males. There are other age-related factors that could affect sleep differently between sexes. Menopause has been repeatedly mentioned in the literature as related to sleep disruption [41]; however, not all work supports this, and a previous analysis with the current sample showed that age, and not menopausal status, was associated with a decline in sleep quality [9]. In spite of all this, we have not been able to detect significant sex-related differences in common environmental factors, which is likely due to lack of power in our sample for this analysis. Larger samples and longitudinal studies are needed to better determine the age and other covariate effects, if any, on the heritability of sleep quality.

Genetic influences on the PSQI components were also analyzed. The genetic variance estimates of six of the seven PSQI components in our study ranged from 0.30 to 0.45. These results are also consistent with findings of other studies that reported heritability for PSQI components ranging from 0.21 to 0.47 [18] and from 0.23 to 0.34 [17]. In contrast, we did not find genetic influences for sleep efficiency, whereas a heritability of 0.30 and 0.34, respectively, was estimated in the above-cited studies. Sample differences or power issues might be behind this discrepancy and these results need to be replicated before we can be confident that environmental influences are key in explaining sleep efficiency in this age group and cultural context. An additional difference relates to “use of sleeping medication,” which fitted an AE model in our sample, whilst a CE model fitted best in the study of Genderson et al. [17]. A possible explanation for this discrepancy could be the sex of the sample, for ours includes males and females, and the prevalence for using sleeping medication was higher in women (24.9%) than men (9.4%). Again, replication is necessary before strong conclusions should be drawn about this point.

Our estimates are, in general, consistent with those in the literature, despite the differences in the sleep-related social

Table 2. Proportion of variance explained by genetic and environmental influences with 95% CI, extracted from univariate analyses

	Model	A (95% CI)	C (95% CI)	D (95% CI)	E (95% CI)	df	-2LL	AIC	DiffLL	Diffdf	P
Global PSQI	ADE	0.14 (0,0.41)		0.23 (0,0.46)	0.63 (0.54,0.74)	1917	5361.20	1527.20			
	AE	0.34 (0.24,0.43)		–	0.66 (0.57,0.76)	1918	5362.36	1526.36	1.16	1	0.28
	E	–	–	–	1 (1,1)	1919	5404.92	1566.93	43.72	2	<0.001
Subjective sleep quality	ADE	0.09 (0.01,0.39)		0.25 (0.13,0.45)	0.66 (0.56,0.78)	2110	4488.33	268.34			
	AE	0.31 (0.20,0.41)		–	0.69 (0.59,0.80)	2111	4489.52	267.52	1.18	1	0.28
	E	–	–	–	1 (1-1)	2112	4519.78	295.78	31.45	2	<0.001
Sleep latency	ACE	0.27 (0,0.47)	0.08 (0,0.31)		0.65 (0.53,0.80)	2060	4772.63	652.63			
	AE	0.37 (0.25,0.48)	–	–	0.63 (0.52,0.75)	2061	4773.01	651.01	0.38	1	0.54
	CE	–	0.25 (0.17,0.34)		0.75 (0.66–0.83)	2061	4774.84	652.84	2.21	1	0.14
Sleep duration	ACE	0.19 (0,0.40)	0.08 (0.02,0.27)		0.73 (0.60,0.86)	2079	5140.87	982.87			
	AE	0.30 (0.19,0.40)	–	–	0.70 (0.60,0.81)	2080	5141.3	981.33	0.47	1	0.49
	CE	–	0.21 (0.13,0.28)		0.79 (0.72,0.87)	2080	5142.14	982.14	1.27	1	0.26
Habitual sleep efficiency	ACE	0 (0,0)	0.20 (0,0.29)		0.80 (0.67,0.89)	2020	4173.85	133.85			
	AE	0.26 (0.13,0.38)	–	–	0.74 (0.62,0.87)	2021	4177.15	135.15	3.30	1	0.07
	CE	–	0.20 (0.11,0.29)		0.80 (0.71,0.89)	2021	4173.85	131.85	0	1	1
Sleep disturbances	ACE	0.21 (0,0.48)	0.15 (0,0.36)		0.64 (0.52,0.77)	2085	3443.20	–726.80			
	AE	0.40 (0.29,0.50)	–	–	0.60 (0.50,0.71)	2086	3444.56	–727.44	1.36	1	0.24
	CE	–	0.30 (0.29,0.38)		0.70 (0.62,0.71)	2086	3444.76	–727.24	1.57	1	0.21
Use of sleeping medication	ACE	0 (0,0)		0.46 (0.12,0.62)	0.54 (0.38,0.74)	2128	2323.67	–1932.33			
	AE	0.39 (0.21,0.55)	–	–	0.61 (0.45,0.79)	2129	2326.05	–1931.95	2.38	1	0.12
	E	–	–	–	1 (1,1)	2130	2343.35	–1916.65	19.68	2	<0.001
Daytime dysfunction	ADE	0 (0,0)	–	0.45 (0.07–0.61)	0.55 (0.39,0.72)	2120	2658.44	–1581.56			
	AE	0.37 (0.20,0.53)	–	–	0.63 (0.47,0.80)	2121	2663.19	–1578.81	4.75	1	0.03
	E	–	–	–	1 (1,1)	2122	2681.86	–1562.14	23.42	2	<0.001

A = additive genetic influences; AIC = Akaike information criterion; C = common environmental influences; CI = confidence interval; D = nonadditive genetic influences; df = degrees of freedom; E = unique environmental influences; P = significance value of the likelihood ratio chi-square test; PSQI = Pittsburgh sleep quality index. The bold text identifies the best fitting model.

Table 3. Cross twin correlations for the different dimensions of the PSQI questionnaire

	rMZ (CI:95%)	rDZ (CI:95%)
Global PSQI	0.35 (0.25,0.45)	0.13 (0.04,0.23)
Subjective sleep quality	0.35 (0.22,0.46)	0.11 (0.01,0.21)
Sleep latency	0.33 (0.19,0.46)	0.22 (0.11,0.32)
Sleep duration	0.26 (0.12,0.38)	0.18 (0.09,0.28)
Habitual sleep efficiency	0.17 (0.01,0.33)	0.22 (0.11,0.33)
Sleep disturbances	0.38 (0.24,0.50)	0.26 (0.15,0.36)
Use of sleeping medication	0.47 (0.27,0.64)	0.08 (–0.09,0.25)
Daytime dysfunction	0.47 (0.30,0.62)	–0.01(–0.17,0.17)

PSQI = Pittsburgh sleep quality index; DZ = dizygotic twins; MZ = monozygotic twins.

and cultural habits in Spain in comparison to countries from Northern Europe and North America, where most of the previously reported samples come from. Spain uses Central European Time, which involves a delayed schedule (due to later sunset) when compared with what might be expected based on geographical location. This results in a delay in commercial hours, with closing times of malls usually later than 21:00, late evening meals, and with a TV prime time between 21:00 and 00:00. It has been suggested that societal factors may trump biological cues around the end of the day resulting in a late bedtime [42], and, in fact, in a Spanish sample, heritability has been reported to be higher for traits earlier on in the day than for those later on in the day [15]. All in all, these factors result in a late bedtime in Spain when compared with other countries which predicts shorter sleep duration [42]. Indeed, our sample reported an average night-time sleep duration of

6.43 hr, which is shorter than that noted in other samples of European origin [43, 44], but largely consistent with the results of the Spanish National Health Survey (2011–2012) of ≈7.15 hr (which included time spent sleeping during the day), for same age subsamples [45]. Short night-time sleep duration has also been related to the practice of midday naps, which might be a method to compensate for insufficient sleep at night. However, this compensatory hypothesis appears too simple to explain this phenomenon as both homeostatic pressure and circadian rhythmicity are important in understanding night-time and nap sleep architecture [46]. Actually, siesta is less common in Spain than is sometimes assumed to be the case (about 40%–60% of the Spanish population never takes siesta) [47, 48]. Furthermore, siesta has been found to be more frequent among people sleeping 7–8 hr at night than among those sleeping <5 hr [48]. It has been suggested that siesta might be associated with some of the parameters of sleep quality (e.g. daytime sleepiness), but not others (e.g. sleep duration) [49, 50]. Moreover, a recent twin study in a subsample of the Spanish twins participating in the MTR found a 45 per cent heritability for siesta even after controlling for night-time sleep duration [15]. The results of the current study might imply that all of these variations between countries/samples regarding duration and timing of sleep do not have a strong impact on the genetic architecture of sleep quality. However, the complexity of the factors involved means that further research is required to elucidate possible interactions between genetic influences and the social environment.

These results provide valuable information about the etiological influences on overall sleep quality and its components and highlight the need for multivariate and longitudinal studies

to characterize the changing relative impact of genetics and the environment on the experience of sleep. This might be particularly useful when focusing on global sleep quality, which is a broader measure of sleep that just sleep duration and may be better able to capture certain associations [51].

Additionally, quantitative genetic twin studies can guide future genetic molecular studies to identify specific genes [52]. Molecular studies have already shown that sleep is genetically related to depression, schizophrenia, and other health variables [53–56]. Future research in this area will be informative regarding more precise diagnostic and treatment alternatives and there has already been a pilot/feasibility study conducted with the aim of understanding more about genetic and environmental predictors of outcome to treatment aimed at reducing insomnia symptoms [57].

This study has several strengths. For example, our sample is quite large, representative of the general population in the region [30] and comprises middle-aged males and females. The inclusion of females of this age is critical because they usually have poorer sleep quality when compared with males or to participants of other age groups. Despite strengths, there are also limitations. Besides the classical assumptions (e.g. equal environment) required for the twin method, there are other issues that advise for caution in interpreting our results. For example, conclusions are limited by the use of self-report measures of sleep. Objective measures such as polysomnography or actigraphy would provide valuable additional information. However, the PSQI questionnaire has repeatedly shown adequate psychometric properties and sleep quality is a subjective phenotype with specific interest per se. Moreover, a large proportion of twins were classified as MZ/DZ based on responses to a questionnaire rather than using a DNA test. This could have resulted in misclassification in certain cases. However, our questionnaire has been validated with data from our own sample showing a high agreement with genetic screening [29]. Therefore, the possible impact of this limitation for our results is considered negligible.

In summary, this study adds to the literature by providing heritability estimates of sleep quality in middle-aged participants of both sexes. Its results point to the need for longitudinal studies to provide information about the changes in sleep patterns and the genetic contribution to such variation. Future research may focus on gene x environment studies in order to understand the interplay between genes and the environment in bringing about poor sleep quality. Finally, molecular and bivariate genetic studies between sleep and other relevant variables may contribute to our understanding of the important relations between sleep disruption and health.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the participants in the Murcia Twin Registry.

Funding

The Murcia Twin Registry is funded by the Fundación Séneca, Regional Agency for Science and Technology of the Murcia Region (Projects 15302/PHCS/10 and 19479/PI/14) and the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (PSI2009-11560 and PSI2014-56680-R). J.J.M.-V. is supported by predoctoral scholarship (19814/FPI/15) of the Fundación Séneca.

Notes

Conflict of interest statement. The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. Alice M. Gregory is writing a book (Nodding Off) to be published by Bloomsbury Sigma (June, 2018). She has provided advice for a freely available website (www.babysleep.com) which provides tips to help with sleep in babies and young children. This website is partially sponsored by Johnson and Johnson, but they do not have any influence over the content and do not advertise on it. Alice Gregory also contributes to BBC Science Focus magazine. Her current work (although not related to that presented here) is sponsored by the Dowager Countess Eleanor Peel Trust.

References

1. Krystal AD, et al. Measuring sleep quality. *Sleep Med.* 2008;9(Suppl 1):S10–S17.
2. Paunio T, et al. Longitudinal study on poor sleep and life dissatisfaction in a nationwide cohort of twins. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2009;169(2):206–213.
3. Royuela A, et al. Calidad de sueño en pacientes ansiosos y depresivos. *Psiquiatría Biológica.* 1997; 4(6):225–230.
4. Rahe C, et al. Associations between poor sleep quality and different measures of obesity. *Sleep Med.* 2015;16(10):1225–1228.
5. Alsaadi SM, et al. Erratum to: prevalence of sleep disturbance in patients with low back pain. *Eur Spine J.* 2012;21(3):554–560.
6. Pinheiro MB, et al. Genetic and environmental contributions to sleep quality and low back pain: a population-based twin study. *Psychosom Med.* 2018;80(3):263–270. doi:10.1097/PSY.0000000000000548.
7. Ohayon MM, et al. Meta-analysis of quantitative sleep parameters from childhood to old age in healthy individuals: developing normative sleep values across the human lifespan. *Sleep.* 2004;27(7):1255–1273.
8. Zhang B, et al. Sex differences in insomnia: a meta-analysis. *Sleep.* 2006;29(1):85–93.
9. Madrid-Valero JJ, et al. Age and gender effects on the prevalence of poor sleep quality in the adult population. *Gac Sanit.* 2017;31(1):18–22.
10. Hublin C, et al. Heritability and mortality risk of insomnia-related symptoms: a genetic epidemiologic study in a population-based twin cohort. *Sleep.* 2011;34(7):957–964.
11. Hublin C, et al. Genetic factors in evolution of sleep length—a longitudinal twin study in Finnish adults. *J Sleep Res.* 2013;22(5):513–518.
12. Gottlieb DJ, et al. Genome-wide association of sleep and circadian phenotypes. *BMC Med Genet.* 2007;8(Suppl 1):S9.
13. Partinen M, et al. Genetic and environmental determination of human sleep. *Sleep.* 1983;6(3):179–185.
14. Watson NE, et al. A twin study of sleep duration and body mass index. *J Clin Sleep Med.* 2010;6(1):11–17.
15. Lopez-Minguez J, et al. Heritability of siesta and night-time sleep as continuously assessed by a circadian-related integrated measure. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7(1):12340.
16. Butkovic A, et al. Sleep duration and personality in Croatian twins. *J Sleep Res.* 2014;23(2):153–158.
17. Genderson MR, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on sleep quality in middle-aged men: a twin study. *J Sleep Res.* 2013;22(5):519–526.

18. Barclay NL, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on different components of the Pittsburgh sleep quality index and their overlap. *Sleep*. 2010;**33**(5):659–668.
19. Watson NF, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on insomnia, daytime sleepiness, and obesity in twins. *Sleep*. 2006;**29**(5):645–649.
20. Benbir G, et al. Prevalence of insomnia and its clinical correlates in a general population in Turkey. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2015;**69**(9):543–552.
21. Morin CM, et al. Prevalence of insomnia and its treatment in Canada. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2011;**56**(9):540–548.
22. Uhlig BL, et al. Prevalence and associated factors of DSM-V insomnia in Norway: the nord-Trøndelag health study (HUNT 3). *Sleep Med*. 2014;**15**(6):708–713.
23. Ohayon MM. Epidemiology of insomnia: what we know and what we still need to learn. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2002;**6**(2):97–111.
24. Barclay NL, et al. The heritability of insomnia progression during childhood/adolescence: results from a longitudinal twin study. *Sleep*. 2015;**38**(1):109–118.
25. Drake CL, et al. Sleep reactivity and insomnia: genetic and environmental influences. *Sleep*. 2011;**34**(9):1179–1188.
26. Gregory AM, et al. A longitudinal twin and sibling study of associations between insomnia and depression symptoms in young adults. *Sleep*. 2016;**39**(11):1985–1992.
27. Heath AC, et al. Evidence for genetic influences on sleep disturbance and sleep pattern in twins. *Sleep*. 1990;**13**(4):318–335.
28. Barclay NL, et al. Diurnal preference and sleep quality: same genes? A study of young adult twins. *Chronobiol Int*. 2010;**27**(2):278–296.
29. Ordoñana JR, et al. The Murcia twin registry: a population-based registry of adult multiples in Spain. *Twin Res Hum Genet*. 2013;**16**(1):302–306.
30. Ordoñana JR, et al. [The Murcia twin registry. A resource for research on health-related behaviour]. *Gac Sanit*. 2018;**32**(1):92–95.
31. Buysse DJ, et al. The Pittsburgh sleep quality index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res*. 1989;**28**(2):193–213.
32. Royuela A, et al. Propiedades clinimétricas de la versión castellana del cuestionario de Pittsburgh. *Vigilia-Sueño*. 1997;**9**(2):81–94.
33. Carpenter JS, et al. Psychometric evaluation of the Pittsburgh sleep quality index. *J Psychosom Res*. 1998;**45**(1):5–13.
34. Boker S, et al. OpenMx: an open source extended structural equation modeling framework. *Psychometrika*. 2011;**76**(2):306–317.
35. Rijdsdijk FV, et al. Analytic approaches to twin data using structural equation models. *Brief Bioinform*. 2002;**3**(2):119–133.
36. Falconer DS, et al. *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics*. Harlow, Essex, UK: Longmans Green; 1996.
37. Verweij KJ, et al. Estimating heritability from twin studies. *Methods Mol Biol*. 2012;**850**:151–170.
38. Neale MC, et al. *Methodology for Genetic studies of Twins and Families*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 1992.
39. Posthuma D, et al. Theory and practice in quantitative genetics. *Twin Res*. 2003;**6**(5):361–376.
40. Vink JM, et al. Sex differences in genetic architecture of complex phenotypes? *PLoS One*. 2012;**7**(12):e47371.
41. Xu M, et al. Comparison of subjective and objective sleep quality in menopausal and non-menopausal women with insomnia. *Sleep Med*. 2011;**12**(1):65–69.
42. Walch OJ, et al. A global quantification of “normal” sleep schedules using smartphone data. *Sci Adv*. 2016;**2**(5):e1501705.
43. Allebrandt KV, et al. A K(ATP) channel gene effect on sleep duration: from genome-wide association studies to function in *Drosophila*. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2013;**18**(1):122–132.
44. Gottlieb DJ, et al. Novel loci associated with usual sleep duration: the CHARGE consortium genome-Wide association study. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2015;**20**(10):1232–1239.
45. Instituto Nacional de Estadística. *Encuesta Nacional de Salud 2011–2012*. Madrid: Metodología. INE; 2012.
46. Mantua J, et al. Exploring the nap paradox: are mid-day sleep bouts a friend or foe? *Sleep Med*. 2017;**37**:88–97.
47. Fundación de Educación Para la Salud. Primer estudio sobre salud y descanso. 2009. <https://www.fundadeps.org/recursos/documentos/45/estudio-salud-descanso.ppt> Accessed April 25, 2018.
48. Sayón-Orea C, et al. Association between sleeping hours and siesta and the risk of obesity: the SUN mediterranean cohort. *Obes Facts*. 2013;**6**(4):337–347.
49. Valencia-Flores M, et al. The siesta culture concept is not supported by the sleep habits of urban Mexican students. *J Sleep Res*. 1998;**7**(1):21–29.
50. Paraskakis E, et al. Siesta and sleep patterns in a sample of adolescents in Greece. *Pediatr Int*. 2008;**50**(5):690–693.
51. Jarrin DC, et al. Beyond sleep duration: distinct sleep dimensions are associated with obesity in children and adolescents. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2013;**37**(4):552–558.
52. Barclay NL, et al. Quantitative genetic research on sleep: a review of normal sleep, sleep disturbances and associated emotional, behavioural, and health-related difficulties. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2013;**17**(1):29–40.
53. Lane JM, et al. Genome-wide association analysis identifies novel loci for chronotype in 100,420 individuals from the UK Biobank. *Nat Commun*. 2016;**7**:10889.
54. Parsons MJ, et al. Replication of genome-wide association studies (GWAS) loci for sleep in the British G1219 cohort. *Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet*. 2013;**162B**(5):431–438.
55. Hammerschlag AR, et al. Genome-wide association analysis of insomnia complaints identifies risk genes and genetic overlap with psychiatric and metabolic traits. *Nat Genet*. 2017;**49**(11):1584–1592.
56. Lane JM, et al. Genome-wide association analyses of sleep disturbance traits identify new loci and highlight shared genetics with neuropsychiatric and metabolic traits. *Nat Genet*. 2017;**49**(2):274–281.
57. Denis D, et al. Sleep Treatment Outcome Predictors (STOP) pilot study: a protocol for a randomised controlled trial examining predictors of change of insomnia symptoms and associated traits following cognitive-behavioural therapy for insomnia in an unselected sample. *BMJ Open*. 2017;**7**(11):e017177.