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INTRODUCTION
• Poor sleep quality is a key determinant of sleep complaints but what makes a poor night’s sleep?
• Previous studies have used qualitative methods to uncover the subjective meaning of sleep quality. These methods have high face and ecological validity but are vulnerable to interpretation biases from both participants and researchers.
• Aim: To identify the important parameters of sleep quality using a quantitative choice-making approach.

METHOD
• Participants were 87 healthy adults: Good sleepers (scored ≥8 on the Insomnia Severity Index- ISI); Poor sleepers (scored ≤7 on the ISI).
• Participants were asked to choose which of two stories represented a “better” or “worse” night’s sleep (Figure 1). Stories could differ on any 17 parameters relating to what happened the day before, pre-sleep, during sleep, post-sleep, and the day after (parameters given in Figure 3).
• Their choices enabled us to estimate how much each parameter contributes to subjective sleep quality.
• Because the total number of possible stories exceeded 200 million (3 options^7 parameters * 5 options^3 parameters), we applied Markov Chain Monte Carlo with People (MCMCP) to sample the most relevant stories.
• Each participant completed 48 trials.

Analysis:
• Logistic regression models were fit to the choice data.
• The logistics regression parameters are interpretable as log odds ratios: they quantify how much more or less likely a participant would choose a story if a particular option is included.

RESULTS
1. Parameters
• Parameters that occurred pre-sleep, during sleep, post-sleep and the day after had a significant impact on the participants’ choices (indicated by * in Figure 3).
2. Parameters interactions
• Of the pairwise interactions between sleep and post-sleep/ next day parameters, only WASO and feeling refreshed had a significant impact (p<0.001). Either feeling refreshed or sleeping through the night meant good sleep quality, both were not necessary.

3. Interactions between parameters and type of sleepers
• There was no significant effect on the type of sleepers
4. Interactions between parameters and type of questions
• Only one significant interaction was found between type of questions and feeling refreshed (p=0.003). When it was a case of a worse night’s sleep, participants were less concerned about feeling unrefreshed than they were when judging a better night’s sleep.

Figure 3 Parameters of sleep quality

Table 1 Participant characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good sleeper N=43</th>
<th>Poor sleeper N=44</th>
<th>t(85)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (18-30 years)</td>
<td>22.5 (3.6)</td>
<td>22.5 (3.6)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia Severity Index</td>
<td>8 (5.3)</td>
<td>8 (5.3)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical sleep onset latency</td>
<td>4.57 (7.71)</td>
<td>4.57 (7.71)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical total sleep time</td>
<td>483 (78.7)</td>
<td>483 (78.7)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS
• The overall judgment of sleep quality appears to be determined by not only what happened during sleep, but also upon waking and performance during the day.
• Good and poor sleepers appear to be using the same parameters when they make judgment on their daily sleep quality.
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Figure 1 Example of a choice that was presented to a participant
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