1	Supplementary Information
2	"The gut microbiota-bile acid axis links the positive association between chronic
4	insomnia and cardiometabolic diseases"
5	
6	This supplementary file contains the following:
7	Supplementary Methods:
8	Method S1 Fecal microbial DNA extraction and 16S rRNA gene sequencing in the
9	Guangzhou Nutrition and Health Study
10	Method S2 16S rRNA gene sequencing bioinformatics in the Guangzhou Nutrition
11	and Health Study
12	Method S3 Targeted fecal bile acid profiling in the Guangzhou Nutrition and Health
13	Study
14	Supplementary Tables:
15	Supplementary Table 1 Gut microbiota features of chronic insomnia with three
16	different models
17	Supplementary Table 2 The stratification analysis of the chronic insomnia-gut
18	microbiota association by age or sex
19	Supplementary Table 3 The association of chronic insomnia symptom score with
20	Ruminococcaceae UCG-002 and Ruminococcaceae UCG-003 in the Guangdong Gut
21	Microbiome Project
22	Supplementary Table 4 Sensitivity analysis for the association of chronic insomnia
23	with bile acids by adding dietary cholesterol intake and fiber intake as additional
24	covariates
25	Supplementary Table 5 The association of chronic insomnia with short-chain fatty
26	acids, aromatic amino acids and their derivatives
27	Supplementary Table 6 The stratification analysis of the gut microbiota-CMD
28	association by age or sex

29	Supplementary Table 7 Sensitivity analysis of the mediation effect of bile acids in
30	the association of chronic insomnia-related gut microbiota with CMD risk.
31	Supplementary Table 8 The association of tea consumption with chronic insomnia
32	
33	
34	Supplementary Figures:
35	Supplementary Fig. 1 The association of chronic insomnia with Shannon index,
36	Chao 1 index, ACE index and Simpson index among four groups. n = 1,809. a.

37 Shannon index for chronic insomnia. **b**, Chao 1 index for chronic insomnia. **c**. ACE

38 index for chronic insomnia. **d**, Simpson index for chronic insomnia. Multivariable

39 linear regression was used to estimate the difference in Shannon index, Chao 1 index,

40 ACE index and Simpson index among four groups with three different statistical

41 models (Methods). Box plots indicate median and interquartile range (IQR). The

42 upper and lower whiskers indicate 1.5 times the IQR from above the upper quartile

and below the lower quartile. Value with symbol is significantly different (model 1:

44 * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001; model 2: *p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001;

45 model 3: p < 0.05, p < 0.01, p < 0.01). All statistical tests were two-sided.

46 Source data are provided as a Source Data file.

47

Supplementary Fig. 2 The association of chronic insomnia with Shannon index, 48 49 Chao 1 index, ACE index and Simpson index in the discovery cohort comparing 50 **Chronic insomnia group and Long-term healthy group.** n = 1,809. a. Shannon index for chronic insomnia. b, Chao 1 index for chronic insomnia. c. ACE index for 51 chronic insomnia. d, Simpson index for chronic insomnia. Multivariable linear 52 regression was used to estimate the difference in Shannon index, Chao 1 index, ACE 53 index and Simpson index comparing chronic insomnia group and Long-term healthy 54 group using three different statistical models (Methods). Box plots indicate median 55 and interquartile range (IQR). The upper and lower whiskers indicate 1.5 times the 56 57 IQR from above the upper quartile and below the lower quartile. Value with symbol is significantly different (model 1: *p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001; model 2: *p < 58

59 $0.05, {}^{++}p < 0.01, {}^{+++}p < 0.001; \text{ model } 3: {}^{\#}p < 0.05, {}^{\#\#}p < 0.01, {}^{\#\#\#}p < 0.001). \text{ All}$ 60 statistical tests were two-sided. Source data are provided as a Source Data file. 61

Supplementary Fig. 3 The association of chronic insomnia with Shannon index, 62 Chao 1 index, ACE index and Simpson index in the validation cohort comparing 63 **Chronic insomnia group and Non-chronic insomnia group.** n = 6,122. **a**. Shannon 64 index for chronic insomnia. b, Chao 1 index for chronic insomnia. c. ACE index for 65 chronic insomnia. d, Simpson index for chronic insomnia. Multivariable linear 66 regression was used to estimate the difference in Shannon index, Chao 1 index, ACE 67 index and Simpson index comparing Chronic insomnia group and Non-chronic 68 insomnia group, adjusted for age, sex, BMI, smoking status, alcohol status, education, 69 70 dietary intake of vegetables, fruits, and red and processed meat. Box plots indicate median and interquartile range (IQR). The upper and lower whiskers indicate 1.5 71 times the IQR from above the upper quartile and below the lower quartile. Value with 72 asterisk is significantly different (*p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001). All statistical 73 74 tests were two-sided. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.

75

Supplementary Fig. 4 Sensitivity analysis for the association between chronic insomnia and gut microbial features in the Guangdong Gut Microbiome Project.

78 For the Guangdong Gut Microbiome Project (GGMP), we did not include income in

79 the statistical models due to large amount of missing values (income data were

80 available among 3774 out of 6122 participants). A sensitivity analysis using

81 multivariable linear regression (β coefficient) with further adjustment for income was

82 used to examine the robustness of the associations between chronic insomnia and gut

- 83 microbial features. Values presented are beta coefficients (95% confidence intervals).
- 84 Value with asterisk is significantly different (*p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001).
- 85 Error bars are beta coefficient with 95% confidence intervals. The

86 Benjamini-Hochberg method was used to control false discovery rate (FDR) due to

- 87 multiple testing. All statistical tests were two-sided. Source data are provided as a
- 88 Source Data file.

90 Supplementary Fig. 5 The potential bile acid features of chronic insomnia.

91	Orthogonal partial least squares discrimination analysis (OPLS-DA) was used to
92	identify potential bile acids associated with chronic insomnia comparing Chronic
93	insomnia group with Long-term healthy group. The x axis shows the variable
94	important in projection (VIP) values and the y axis indicates the partial correlation
95	coefficient values. Points are coloured based on the significance of the obtained
96	associations (green indicates positive associations with VIP >1 and $ p (corr) > 0.3$,
97	pink indicates negative associations with VIP >1 and $ p (corr) > 0.3$). All statistical
98	tests were two-sided. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.
99	

Supplementary Fig. 6 Sensitivity analysis for the association between chronic
 insomnia-related microbial features and cardiometabolic diseases in the

insomma-related merobial reatures and cardiometabolic diseases in the

102 **Guangdong Gut Microbiome Project.** In the Guangdong Gut Microbiome Project

(GGMP), income data were available among 3774 out of 6122 participants. A 103 104 sensitivity analysis using Multivariable logistic regression (odds ratio) with further adjustment for income was used to estimate the association of the chronic insomnia 105 inverse-related microbial features Ruminococcaceae UCG-002 and Ruminococcaceae 106 UCG-003 with different cardiometabolic diseases (CMD) in the discovery and 107 108 validation cohorts, respectively (Methods). The effect estimates from the discovery 109 and validation cohorts were pooled using random effects meta-analysis for each of the above analyses. Values presented are odds ratio (95% confidence intervals) with 110 corresponding *p*-values. Value with asterisk is significantly different (*p < 0.05, ** *p* 111 < 0.01, ***p < 0.001). The Benjamini-Hochberg method was used to control FDR due 112 to multiple testing. All statistical tests were two-sided. Source data are provided as a 113 Source Data file. 114

- 115
- 116 Supplementary Fig. 7 Prospective association of dietary factors with the

117 identified microbial feature Ruminococcaceae UCG-003 linking chronic insomnia

118 and cardiometabolic diseases. Prospective association of dietary factors with the

- 119 identified microbial feature Ruminococcaceae UCG-003 linking chronic insomnia and
- 120 cardiometabolic diseases (CMD) in the GMHS. Multivariable linear regression was
- 121 used to determine the prospective association of dietary factors with
- 122 Ruminococcaceae UCG-003, adjusting for age, sex, BMI, smoking status, alcohol
- 123 status, physical activity, education, income, dietary intake of vegetables/fruits/red and
- 124 processed meat/fish/dairy products/coffee/tea) (mutual adjustment for each other) and
- 125 total energy intake. The analyses were conducted among the GNHS participants
- 126 without chronic insomnia or CMD at baseline. Values presented are beta coefficients
- 127 (95% confidence intervals) with corresponding p-values. Value with asterisk is
- 128 significantly different (*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001). The
- 129 Benjamini-Hochberg method was used to control FDR due to multiple testing. All
- 130 statistical tests were two-sided. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.

131 Supplemental Methods

Method S1 Fecal microbial DNA extraction and 16S rRNA gene sequencing in the Guangzhou Nutrition and Health Study

Fecal microbial DNA was extracted from each sample using the QIAamp® DNA 134 Stool Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) following the manufacturer's instruction. 135 DNA concentration and purity were monitored on 1% agarose gels. According to the 136 concentration, DNA was diluted to 1 ng/ μ L using sterile water. The 16S rRNA gene 137 138 amplification procedure was divided into two PCR steps, in the first PCR reaction, the V3-V4 hypervariable region of the 16S rRNA gene was amplified from genomic DNA 139 using primers 341F(CCTACGGGNGGCWGCAG) and 805R(GACTACHVGGGTAT 140 CTAATCC). Amplification was performed in 96-well microtiter plates with a reaction 141 142 mixture consisting of 1X KAPA HiFi Hot start Ready Mix, 0.1µM primer 341 F, 0.1 µM primer 805 R, and 12.5 ng template DNA, giving a total volume of 50 µL per 143 sample. Reactions were run in a T100 PCR thermocycle (BIO-RAD) according to the 144 following cycling program: 3 min of denaturation at 94 °C, followed by 18 cycles of 145 30 s at 94 °C (denaturing), 30 s at 55 °C (annealing), and 30 s at 72 °C (elongation), 146 with a final extension at 72 °C for 5 min. Subsequently, the amplified products were 147 checked by 2% agarose gel electrophoresis and ethidium bromide staining. Amplicons 148 were quantified using the Qubit quantification system (Thermo Scientific, Wilmington, 149 DE, US) following the manufacturers' instructions. Sequencing primers and adaptors 150 were added to the amplicon products in the second PCR step as follows 2 µL of the 151 152 diluted amplicons were mixed with a reaction solution consisting of 1×KAPA HiFi Hotstart ReadyMix, 0.5µM fusion forward and 0.5µM fusion reverse primer, 30 ng 153 154 Meta-gDNA(total volume 50 µL). The PCR was run according to the cycling program above except with cycling number of 12. The amplification products were purified 155 with Agencourt AMPure XP Beads (Beckman Coulter Genomics, MA, USA) 156 according to the manufacturer's instructions and quantified as described above. 157 Equimolar amounts of the amplification products were pooled together in a single 158 159 tube. The concentration of the pooled libraries was determined by the Qubit quantification system. Amplicon sequencing was performed on the Illuimina MiSeq 160

161	System (Illumina Inc., CA, USA). The MiSeq Reagent Kits v2 (Illumina Inc.) was
162	used. Automated cluster generation and 2×250 bp paired-end sequencing with
163	dual-index reads were performed.
164	
165	Method S2 16S rRNA gene sequencing bioinformatics in the Guangzhou
166	Nutrition and Health Study
167	Fastq-files were demultiplexed by the MiSeq Controller Software (Bcl2fastq version
168	2.20, Illumina Inc.). The sequences were trimmed for amplification primers, diversity
169	spacers, and sequencing adapters, merge-paired and quality filtered by Quantitative
170	Insights into Microbial Ecology (QIIME) software version 2-2020.2. DADA2 was
171	used for amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) clustering equaling 100% ¹ . A
172	representative sequence was picked for each ASV and the Sliva reference database
173	version 138 was used to annotate taxonomic information. α -diversity (Observed
174	species, Shannon index, Chao1 index) and β -diversity (Bray-Curtis distance)
175	measures were calculated based on the genus-level counts. The genus-level absolute
176	abundance table was extracted from the pipeline and converted to relative abundances
177	by normalizing for analyzing the composition of gut microbiota by QIIME2.
178	
179	Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) based on genus-level Bray-Curtis distance and
180	permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) were performed to
181	compare the dissimilarity of global microbiota composition. MaAsLin is a
182	multivariate statistical framework that identifies associations between continuous and
183	discrete clinical metadata and microbial community abundances. Microbiome-based
184	biomarker discovery was performed with MaAsLin using the online galaxy server
185	(https://huttenhower.sph.harvard.edu/galaxy/). Briefly, the percentage of each genus
186	was arcsin-square-root-transformed. For each correlation between metadata (as
187	predictors) and transformed genus abundances (as response variables), we adjusted
188	potential confounders using the three different statistical models (q value (false
189	discovery rate adjusted p value) ≤ 0.25 was considered statistically significant).
190	Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, BMI, smoking status, alcohol status, physical

191activity, education, income and total energy intake at baseline. Model 2 was further192adjusted for hypertension, hyperlipidaemia, metabolic syndrome (MetS), type 2193diabetes (T2D), coronary heart disease (CHD), stroke and medication for T2D. Model1943 was further adjusted for vegetables, fruits, red and processed meat, fish, dairy195products, coffee and tea. To further reduce the computational load, the genera that196were present in < 10% of the population were excluded. The Benjamini-Hochberg</td>197method was used to adjust *p* values for multiple hypotheses.

198

Method S3 Targeted fecal bile acid profiling in the Guangzhou Nutrition and Health Study

201 Targeted bile acid profiling of fecal samples (n=954) was performed by

202 Metabo-Profile (Shanghai, China). The order of all test samples is randomly selected

203 before the preparation. 10 mg lyophilized feces were homogenized with $25\mu L$ water

and extracted with 185µL cold ACN-Methanol (8/2, v/v). After centrifugation, 30 µL

supernatant was used to derivatization with 20 µL freshly prepared derivative reagents

on a Biomek 4000 workstation (Biomek 4000, Beckman Coulter, Inc., Brea,

207 California, USA), followed by mixing with internal standards. Subsequently, the

208 derivatized samples and serial dilutions of derivatized stock standards were randomly

analyzed and quantitated by an ultra-performance liquid chromatography coupled to

210 tandem mass spectrometry (UPLC-MS/MS) system (ACQUITY UPLC-Xevo TQ-S,

211 Waters Corp., Milford, MA, USA). 41 of bile acid standard substances were obtained

212 from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA), Steraloids Inc. (Newport, RI, USA) and

213 TRC Chemicals (Toronto, ON, Canada). Three types of quality control samples i.e.,

test mixtures, internal standards, and pooled biological samples are routinely used in

215 metabolomics platform. The derivatized pooled quality control samples were injected

216 every 14 test samples. Raw data generated by UPLC-MS/MS were processed using

217 the QuanMET software (v2.0, Metabo-Profile, Shanghai, China) to perform peak

218 integration, calibration, and quantification for each bile acid.

220 Supplementary Tables

221 Supplementary Table 1 Gut microbiota features of chronic insomnia with three

222 different models*

Genus	Coefficient	Correlation direction	q value	Phylum	Family
Model 1					
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002	-0.077	Negative	0.112	Firmicutes	Ruminococcaceae
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003	-0.050	Negative	0.112	Firmicutes	Ruminococcaceae
Model 2					
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002	-0.077	Negative	0.140	Firmicutes	Ruminococcaceae
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003	-0.052	Negative	0.130	Firmicutes	Ruminococcaceae
Model 3					
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002	-0.073	Negative	0.191	Firmicutes	Ruminococcaceae
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003	-0.049	Negative	0.223	Firmicutes	Ruminococcaceae

*The gut microbiota biomarkers were determined by MaAsLin adjusted by three different models.

224 Model 1 was adjusted for age, sex, BMI, smoking status, alcohol status, physical activity, education,

225 income and total energy intake at baseline. Model 2 was further adjusted for hypertension,

226 hyperlipidaemia, metabolic syndrome (MetS), type 2 diabetes (T2D), coronary heart disease (CHD),

stroke and medication for T2D. Model 3 was further adjusted for vegetables, fruits, red and processed

228 meat, fish, dairy products, coffee and tea. q value < 0.25 was considered statistically significant.

229 Supplementary Table 2 The stratification analysis of the chronic insomnia-gut

230 microbiota association by age or sex*

Cohorts	Beta coefficient	95%CI	<i>p</i> value	$p_{\text{interaction}}$ value
Age stratification				
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002				0.447
High age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 856$)	-0.25	[-0.44, -0.05]	0.012	
Validation cohort (n = 3024)	-0.10	[-0.17, -0.03]	0.008	
Meta-analysis (n = 3880)	-0.15	[-0.28, -0.01]	0.032	
Low age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 863$)	-0.14	[-0.31, 0.04]	0.120	
Validation cohort (n = 3098)	-0.07	[-0.14, -0.01]	0.047	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	-0.08	[-0.15, -0.02]	0.015	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003				0.562
High age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 856$)	-0.19	[-0.35, -0.04]	0.017	
Validation cohort ($n = 3024$)	-0.10	[-0.17, -0.04]	0.008	
Meta-analysis (n = 3880)	-0.12	[-0.19, -0.05]	0.001	
Low age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 863$)	-0.12	[-0.26, 0.02]	0.092	
Validation cohort (n = 3098)	-0.06	[-0.14, 0.01]	0.078	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	-0.08	[-0.14, -0.01]	0.019	
Sex stratification				
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002				0.127
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	-0.21	[-0.50, 0.08]	0.155	
Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	-0.07	[-0.15, 0.01]	0.063	

Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	-0.08	[-0.16, -0.01]	0.031	
women				
Discovery cohort (n = 1148)	-0.19	[-0.33, -0.04]	0.013	
Validation cohort (n = 3399)	-0.11	[-0.17, -0.04]	0.003	
Meta-analysis (n = 4547)	-0.12	[-0.18, -0.06]	< 0.001	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003				0.904
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	-0.23	[-0.46, -0.01]	0.040	
Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	-0.04	[-0.12, 0.03]	0.289	
Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	-0.11	[-0.29, 0.07]	0.240	
women				
Discovery cohort ($n = 1148$)	-0.14	[-0.26, -0.02]	0.024	
Validation cohort (n = 3399)	-0.11	[-0.18, -0.04]	0.001	
Meta-analysis ($n = 4547$)	-0.12	[-0.18, -0.06]	< 0.001	

231 * Multivariable linear regression (Beta coefficient) was used to estimate the association of chronic

232 insomnia with Ruminococcaceae UCG-002 and Ruminococcaceae UCG-003. Median of age was used

as the cutoff in the age stratification. All statistical tests were two-sided.

234 Supplementary Table 3 The association of chronic insomnia symptom score with

235 Ruminococcaceae UCG-002 and Ruminococcaceae UCG-003 in the Guangdong Gut

236 Microbiome Project*

Species	Beta coefficient	95%CI	<i>p</i> value
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002	-0.04	[-0.06, -0.02]	< 0.001
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003	-0.04	[-0.07, -0.01]	0.002

*Multivariable linear regression (Beta coefficient) was used to estimate the association of chronic

238 insomnia symptom score with the gut microbial biomarkers of chronic insomnia, adjusted for the same

239 covariates. All statistical tests were two-sided.

240 Supplementary Table 4 Sensitivity analysis for the association of chronic insomnia

241 with bile acids by adding dietary cholesterol intake and fiber intake as additional

242 covariates*

Bile acids	Beta coefficient	95%CI	<i>p</i> value
Muro cholic acid	0.21	[0.04, 0.38]	0.049
Nor cholic acid	0.21	[0.04, 0.37]	0.042
Isolithocholic acid	-0.26	[-0.43, -0.09]	0.030
Lithocholic acid	-0.21	[-0.38, -0.04]	0.035
Ursodeoxycholic acid	-0.22	[-0.39, -0.05]	0.049

243 *Multivariable linear regression (Beta coefficient) was used to estimate the association of chronic

244 insomnia with bile acids, adjusted for dietary cholesterol intake and fiber intake as additional covariates

245 in the above model 3. The Benjamini-Hochberg method was used to control false discovery rate (FDR)

246 for multiple testing. All statistical tests were two-sided.

Microbial metabolites	Beta coefficient	95%CI	<i>p</i> value
Short chain fatty acids			
Acetic acid	0.01	[-0.03, 0.04]	0.899
Propionic acid	0.01	[-0.04, 0.05]	0.978
Butyric acid	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.04]	0.909
Isobutyric acid	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.02]	0.079
Valeric acid	-0.04	[-0.13, 0.04]	0.649
Isovaleric acid	-0.03	[-0.10, 0.04]	0.595
Isocaproic acid	-0.06	[-0.18, 0.06]	0.787
Caproic acid	-0.12	[-0.25, 0.01]	0.547
Aromatic amino acids and their derivativ	ves		
L-tyrosine	0.01	[-0.04, 0.05]	0.799
4-hydroxyphenylpyruvic acid	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	0.816
4-hydroxyphenylacetic acid	0.05	[-0.04, 0.15]	0.549
4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid	-0.01	[-0.10, 0.10]	0.965
4-hydroxybenzoic acid	0.07	[-0.02, 0.16]	0.534
Hippuric acid	0.14	[-0.04, 0.32]	0.502
Ortho-hydroxyphenylacetic acid	-0.04	[-0.14, 0.05]	0.662
L-phenylalanine	0.01	[-0.04, 0.05]	0.803
Phenylpyruvic acid	-0.05	[-0.14, 0.04]	0.761
Phenyllactic acid	-0.08	[-0.16, 0.01]	0.781
Phenylacetic acid	-0.05	[-0.14, 0.04]	0.541
2-phenylpropionate	-0.16	[-0.36, 0.03]	0.781
L-tryptophan	0.02	[-0.03, 0.06]	0.762
3-indolepropionic acid	0.10	[-0.27, 0.07]	0.634

247	Supplementary	Table 5	The	association	of	chronic	insomnia	with	short-chain	fatty

248 acids, aromatic amino acids and their derivatives*

	Indoleacetic acid	-0.03	[-0.12, 0.07]	0.735		
249	*Multivariable linear regression (Beta c	oefficient) was used to e	estimate the association of	of chronic		
250	0 insomnia with short-chain fatty acids, aromatic amino acids and their derivatives, adjusted for same					

- 251 covariates as above model 3. The Benjamini-Hochberg method was used to control false discovery rate
- 252 (FDR) for multiple testing. All statistical tests were two-sided.

Cohorts	Odds ratio (OR)	95%CI	<i>p</i> value	$p_{\text{interaction}}$ value
Age stratification				
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002-Dys	lipidaemia			0.270
High age group				
Discovery cohort (n = 856)	0.88	[0.77, 1.02]	0.083	
Validation cohort (n = 3024)	0.90	[0.84, 0.97]	0.005	
Meta-analysis (n = 3880)	0.90	[0.84, 0.96]	0.001	
Low age group				
Discovery cohort (n = 863)	0.85	[0.73, 0.99]	0.036	
Validation cohort (n = 3098)	0.99	[0.92, 1.06]	0.717	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	0.93	[0.73, 1.07]	0.314	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002-T2D)			0.489
High age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 856$)	0.82	[0.68, 0.99]	0.039	
Validation cohort (n = 3024)	0.84	[0.76, 0.94]	0.003	
Meta-analysis (n = 3880)	0.84	[0.76, 0.92]	< 0.001	
Low age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 863$)	0.70	[0.52, 0.91]	0.011	
Validation cohort (n = 3098)	1.02	[0.87, 1.20]	0.792	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	0.86	[0.59, 1.25]	0.426	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002-Met	S			0.713
High age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 856$)	0.70	[0.58, 0.84]	< 0.001	
Validation cohort ($n = 3024$)	0.90	[0.83, 0.98]	0.017	
Meta-analysis ($n = 3880$)	0.81	[0.63, 1.03]	0.089	

253 Supplementary Table 6 The stratification analysis of the gut microbiota-CMD

association by age or sex*

Low age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 863$)	0.84	[0.69, 1.01]	0.072	
Validation cohort (n = 3098)	0.85	[0.77, 0.95]	0.003	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	0.85	[0.78, 0.93]	< 0.001	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003-Dyslipi	daemia			0.511
High age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 856$)	0.91	[0.79, 1.04]	0.173	
Validation cohort (n = 3024)	0.89	[0.83, 0.95]	0.001	
Meta-analysis (n = 3880)	0.89	[0.84, 0.95]	< 0.001	
Low age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 863$)	0.84	[0.72, 0.98]	0.028	
Validation cohort (n = 3098)	0.88	[0.82, 0.95]	< 0.001	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	0.87	[0.82, 0.93]	< 0.001	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003-T2D				0.834
High age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 856$)	0.92	[0.77, 1.09]	0.367	
Validation cohort (n = 3024)	0.85	[0.76, 0.96]	0.007	
Meta-analysis (n = 3880)	0.87	[0.79, 0.96]	0.006	
Low age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 863$)	0.71	[0.52, 0.94]	0.026	
Validation cohort (n = 3098)	0.95	[0.80, 1.12]	0.555	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	0.85	[0.64, 1.12]	0.239	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003-MetS				0.631
High age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 856$)	0.70	[0.57, 0.84]	< 0.001	
Validation cohort (n = 3024)	0.88	[0.81, 0.96]	0.003	
Meta-analysis (n = 3880)	0.80	[0.64, 0.99]	0.047	

Low age group				
Discovery cohort ($n = 863$)	0.86	[0.70, 1.05]	0.148	
Validation cohort ($n = 3098$)	0.81	[0.73, 0.90]	< 0.001	
Meta-analysis (n = 3961)	0.82	[0.75, 0.90]	< 0.001	
Sex stratification				
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002-Dyslipida	nemia			0.003
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	0.82	[0.68, 0.98]	0.033	
Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	0.88	[0.81, 0.95]	< 0.001	
Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	0.87	[0.81, 0.93]	< 0.001	
women				
Discovery cohort ($n = 1148$)	0.80	[0.68, 1.02]	0.109	
Validation cohort ($n = 3399$)	0.99	[0.93, 1.07]	0.892	
Meta-analysis ($n = 4547$)	0.96	[0.88, 1.05]	0.394	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002-T2D				0.158
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	0.90	[0.71, 1.13]	0.377	
Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	0.93	[0.82, 1.06]	0.287	
Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	0.92	[0.82, 1.04]	0.173	
women				
Discovery cohort ($n = 1148$)	0.70	[0.57, 0.86]	< 0.001	
Validation cohort ($n = 3399$)	0.85	[0.75, 0.97]	0.014	
Meta-analysis ($n = 4547$)	0.79	[0.66, 0.95]	0.011	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002-MetS				0.082
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	0.75	[0.60, 0.93]	0.009	

Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	0.84	[0.76, 0.92]	<0.001	
Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	0.82	[0.76, 0.90]	< 0.001	
women				
Discovery cohort ($n = 1148$)	0.77	[0.65, 0.90]	0.002	
Validation cohort (n = 3399)	0.77	[0.65, 0.90]	0.080	
Meta-analysis ($n = 4547$)	0.85	[0.71, 1.02]	0.075	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003-Dyslipi	daemia			0.120
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	0.75	[0.61, 0.91]	0.004	
Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	0.85	[0.79, 0.92]	< 0.001	
Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	0.82	[0.74, 0.92]	< 0.001	
women				
Discovery cohort (n = 1148)	0.96	[0.85, 1.08]	0.464	
Validation cohort ($n = 3399$)	0.92	[0.84, 1.01]	0.016	
Meta-analysis (n = 4547)	0.93	[0.87, 0.99]	0.014	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003-T2D				0.222
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	0.96	[0.75, 1.20]	0.719	
Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	0.92	[0.80, 1.05]	0.202	
Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	0.93	[0.82, 1.04]	0.199	
women				
Discovery cohort ($n = 1148$)	0.80	[0.65, 0.98]	0.036	
Validation cohort ($n = 3399$)	0.85	[0.75, 0.97]	0.019	
Meta-analysis (n = 4547)	0.84	[0.75, 0.94]	0.002	
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003-MetS				0.367
men				
Discovery cohort ($n = 571$)	0.81	[0.64, 1.00]	0.064	

Validation cohort ($n = 2723$)	0.80	[0.73, 0.88]	<0.001	
Meta-analysis (n = 3294)	0.80	[0.74, 0.88]	< 0.001	
women				
Discovery cohort ($n = 1148$)	0.76	[0.63, 0.89]	< 0.001	
Validation cohort ($n = 3399$)	0.90	[0.82, 0.99]	0.030	
Meta-analysis ($n = 4547$)	0.84	[0.71, 0.99]	0.041	

255 *Multivariable logistic regression (Odds ratio) was used to estimate the association of

256 Ruminococcaceae UCG-002 and Ruminococcaceae UCG-003 with cardiometabolic disease (CMD)

risk. Median of age was used as the cutoff in the age stratification. All statistical tests were two-sided.

258 T2D: type 2 diabetes; MetS: metabolic syndrome.

259 Supplementary Table 7 Sensitivity analysis of the mediation effect of bile acids in

Sensitivity results		Outcomes
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002		
		MetS
For MCA:	Rho at which $ACME = 0$	0.100
For NorCA:	Rho at which $ACME = 0$	0.130
		T2D
For IsoLCA:	Rho at which $ACME = 0$	-0.120
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003		
		MetS
For MCA:	Rho at which $ACME = 0$	0.130
For NorCA:	Rho at which ACME = 0	0.145
		T2D
For IsoLCA:	Rho at which $ACME = 0$	-0.145

260 the association of chronic insomnia-related gut microbiota with CMD risk*

*The sensitivity analysis of mediation was performed using the R package "medsens" with default
parameters. The Rho from the R package "medsens" is interpreted as a Pearson correlation. For
example, a Rho of 0.10 is often regarded as a weak association, which implies that it would take some
set of unmeasured confounders of the mediator and outcome to induce a relatively weak correlation
between the mediator and the outcome for the observed mediated effect to equal zero. MCA: Muro
cholic acid; NorCA: nor cholic acid; IsoLCA: isolithocholic acid; CMD: cardiometabolic disease;
MetS: metabolic syndrome; T2D: type 2 diabetes; ACME: average causal mediated effect.

					_
	Cohorts	Odds ratio (OR)	95%CI	<i>p</i> value	
-	Discovery cohort	0.85	[0.60, 1.19]	0.334	
	Validation cohort	0.64	[0.49, 0.83]	< 0.001	
	Meta-analysis	0.72	[0.55, 0.95]	0.020	

268 Supplementary Table 8 The association of tea consumption with chronic insomnia*

269 *Multivariable logistic regression (Odds ratio) was used to estimate the association of tea consumption

270 with chronic insomnia, adjusted for the potential covariates. The Benjamini-Hochberg method was

271 used to control false discovery rate (FDR) for multiple testing. All statistical tests were two-sided.

Supplementary Figures

- Supplementary Fig. 1 The association of chronic insomnia with Shannon index,
- Chao 1 index, ACE index and Simpson index among four groups.





a-diversity for chronic insomnia



- 277 Supplementary Fig. 2 The association of chronic insomnia with Shannon index,
- 278 Chao 1 index, ACE index and Simpson index in the discovery cohort comparing
- 279 Chronic insomnia group and Long-term healthy group.
- 280





b α-diversity for chronic insomnia Model 1 p = 0.038 * Model 3 p = 0.046 # 4 2 2



- 282 Supplementary Fig. 3 The association of chronic insomnia with Shannon index,
- 283 Chao 1 index, ACE index and Simpson index in the validation cohort comparing
- 284 Chronic insomnia group and Non-chronic insomnia group.
- 285









- 287 Supplementary Fig. 4 Sensitivity analysis for the association between chronic
- 288 insomnia and gut microbial features in the Guangdong Gut Microbiome Project.
- 289

Sensitivity analysis for gut microbiota biomarkers of chronic insomnia in the GGMP

β coefficient

<	Negative	Positive	-		
Validation cohort GGMP n = 3774				β 95% CI	p value
Ruminococcaceae UCG-002		- 1		-0.07 [-0.14, -0.01]	0.035 *
Ruminococcaceae UCG-003		_		-0.09 [-0.14, -0.03]	0.006 **
	-0.4 -0.2	0.0	0.2		





- 294 **Supplementary Fig. 6** Sensitivity analysis for the association between chronic
- 295 insomnia-related microbial features and cardiometabolic diseases in the Guangdong
- 296 Gut Microbiome Project.
- 297

Discovery cohort	0.76 [0.66,0.86]	0.87 [0.79,0.97]	0.78 [0.67,0.91]	0.92 [0.82,1.03]	0.93 [0.81,1.08]	1.12 [0.85, 1.45]
	<i>p</i> < 0.001 * * *	p = 0.016 *	p = 0.005 **	p = 0.210	p = 0.445	p = 0.401
Validation cohort	0.87 [0.80,0.94]	0.93 [0.87,0.99]	0.88 [0.78,0.99]	0.96 [0.89,1.03]	0.87 [0.79,0.96]	1.02 [0.79,1.27]
	p = 0.004 **	p = 0.043 *	p = 0.043 *	p = 0.309	p = 0.012 *	p = 0.988
Meta-analysis	0.82 [0.72,0.93]	0.91 [0.86,0.96]	0.84 [0.75,0.93]	0.95 [0.89,1.01]	0.89 [0.82,0.96]	1.05 [0.88,1.26]
	p = 0.003 **	p < 0.001 ***	p = 0.002 **	p = 0.079	p = 0.004 ***	p = 0.568
	MetS	Dyslipidaemia	T2D	Hypertension	CHD	Stroke

Ruminococcaceae UCG-002

Ruminococcaceae UCG-003

Discovery cohort	0.77 [0.67,0.88]	0.89 [0.81,0.99]	0.87 [0.74,1.01]	0.95 [0.84,1.06]	0.96 [0.83,1.11]	0.99 [0.74,1.29]
	p = 0.001 **	p = 0.073	p = 0.135	p = 0.519	p = 0.709	p = 0.951
Validation cohort	0.85 [0.78,0.92]	0.91 [0.85,0.97]	0.88 [0.78,0.99]	0.99 [0.92,1.07]	0.93 [0.85,1.03]	1.12 [0.89,1.41]
	<i>p</i> < 0.001 ***	p = 0.014 *	p = 0.079	p = 0.836	p = 0.248	p = 0.385
Meta-analysis	0.82 [0.76,0.89]	0.91 [0.86,0.96]	0.87 [0.79,0.96]	0.98 [0.92,1.04]	0.94 [0.87,1.02]	1.07 [0.89,1.27]
	p < 0.001 ***	<i>p</i> < 0.001 ***	p = 0.006 **	p = 0.489	p = 0.148	p = 0.469
	MetS	Dyslipidaemia	T2D	Hypertension	CHD	Stroke



- 299 Supplementary Fig. 7 Prospective association of dietary factors with the identified
- 300 microbial feature Ruminococcaceae UCG-003 linking chronic insomnia and
- 301 cardiometabolic diseases.
- 302



Reference

305	1.	Bolyen E, et al. Reproducible, interactive, scalable and extensible microbiome data science
306		using QIIME 2. Nat Biotechnol 37, 852-857 (2019).