

# No Evidence of Purported Lunar Effect on Hospital Admission Rates or Birth Rates

Jean-Luc Margot

**Background:** Studies indicate that a fraction of nursing professionals believe in a “lunar effect”—a purported correlation between the phases of the Earth’s moon and human affairs, such as birth rates, blood loss, or fertility.

**Purpose:** This article addresses some of the methodological errors and cognitive biases that can explain the human tendency of perceiving a lunar effect where there is none.

**Approach:** This article reviews basic standards of evidence and, using an example from the published literature, illustrates how disregarding these standards can lead to erroneous conclusions.

**Findings:** Román, Soriano, Fuentes, Gálvez, and Fernández (2004) suggested that the number of hospital admissions related to gastrointestinal bleeding was somehow influenced by the phases of the Earth’s moon. Specifically, the authors claimed that the rate of hospital admissions to their bleeding unit is higher during the full moon than at other times. Their report contains a number of methodological and statistical flaws that invalidate their conclusions. Reanalysis of their data with proper procedures shows no evidence that the full moon influences the rate of hospital admissions, a result that is consistent with numerous peer-reviewed studies and meta-analyses. A review of the literature shows that birth rates are also uncorrelated to lunar phases.

**Conclusions:** Data collection and analysis shortcomings, as well as powerful cognitive biases, can lead to erroneous conclusions about the purported lunar effect on human affairs. Adherence to basic standards of evidence can help assess the validity of questionable beliefs.

**Key Words:** bias • hemorrhage • lunar cycle • Moon • parturition • patient admission • Poisson distribution

*Nursing Research, May/June 2015, Vol 64, No 3, 168–176*

Numerous studies have shown the absence of a lunar influence on human affairs, including automobile accidents, hospital admissions, surgery outcomes, cancer survival rates, menstruation, births, birth complications, depression, absenteeism, violent behavior, suicides, and homicides (see Foster & Roenneberg, 2008, for a recent review). Meta-analyses of dozens of studies spanning decades show that there is no foundation for the belief in a lunar effect (Byrnes & Kelly, 1992; Martens, Kelly, & Saklofske, 1988; Martin, Kelly, & Saklofske, 1992; Rotton & Kelly, 1985). Yet, some professionals who work in emergency rooms or maternity wards continue to believe that the number of hospital admissions or human births is larger during the full moon than at other times. In

some cases, the tiniest deviations from randomness are used in an attempt to justify these beliefs.

To properly establish a correlation between the phases of the Moon and human affairs, one must adhere to a few basic standards of evidence. First, data collection procedures must be sound. For instance, the assignment of time tags to specific events must be precise; otherwise, an unnecessary source of error is introduced in the data. Because the lunar cycle varies in duration, a reasonable metric might be the time interval in minutes between the event under consideration and the previous or next full moon—with a transition from positive to negative values at new moon. Examples of problems related to improper time tags are reviewed in the sections on calendar, binning, and timescale issues. Second, periodicities or trends present in the data, but unrelated to the Moon, must be properly considered and controlled for; otherwise, a genuine variability may masquerade as a lunar cycle variability. Examples of mistaken attributions are discussed in the section on confounding issues. Third, rigorous statistical tests must be employed to ensure that the variability cannot be explained by chance alone,

Jean-Luc Margot, PhD, is Professor, Department of Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Los Angeles.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 License, where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially.

DOI: 10.1097/NNR.0000000000000086

and these calculations must be performed with a suitably high level of confidence; otherwise, one might “detect” an effect that is not present. The impact of flawed procedures and low confidence levels are discussed in the section on improper statistical treatment. Fourth, if a departure from expectations based on chance is detected, care must be taken to verify that this departure is truly associated with the Moon. If statistically significant deviations were to occur at random times during the lunar cycle, for instance, the Moon would have to be exonerated. The consequences of omitting this important verification step are reviewed in the section on incomplete statistical treatment. Finally, the claim of a lunar effect would have to satisfy the additional requirements of reproducibility and predictability. Similar studies by independent teams at different hospitals would have to produce similar results, and predictions based on the claimed effect would have to be tested and validated by additional data.

### *Studies that have claimed the existence of a lunar effect universally fail to meet the reproducibility and predictability requirements.*

They also often fail to meet some of the other basic standards of evidence discussed above (Kelly, Rotton, & Culver, 1996; Rotton & Kelly, 1985). An instructive example of these shortcomings is provided by the study of Román, Soriano, Fuentes, Gálvez, and Fernández (2004). This article examines their study in some detail and also describes some of the cognitive biases that lead to questionable beliefs.

## FLAWED DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

### Data

The number of hospital admissions throughout the lunar cycle, as described by Román et al. (2004), is shown in Table 1. The data set covers a 738-day period between January 1, 1996, and January 7, 1998. The authors reported a total of 447 hospital admissions—26 of which are listed as coinciding with one of 25 “full moon days.” They described the mean number of admissions per day as 1.04 ( $SD = 0.93$ ) and 0.59 ( $SD = 0.78$ ) for “full moon” and “non-full moon” days, respectively.

### Definitions of Full Moon and Lunar Cycle

A full moon occurs when the excess of the Moon’s apparent geocentric ecliptic longitude over the Sun’s apparent geocentric ecliptic longitude is  $180^\circ$  (Urban & Seidelmann, 2012). Because the orbital velocities of the Earth and the Moon are not constant,

**TABLE 1. Number of Hospital Admissions**

Day <sup>a</sup>	Admissions <sup>b</sup>
1	16
2	21
3	13
4	13
5	7
6	12
7	13
8	16
9	24
10	8
11	14
12	23
13	23
14	15
15	14
16	12
17	8
18	16
19	16
20	9
21	16
22	17
23	18
24	20
25	10
26	16
27	23
28	8
29	26

Note. From Román et al. (2004). <sup>a</sup>“Days of the lunar cycle.” <sup>b</sup>Number of admissions reported for those days. No data were reported for Day 30.

the time interval between successive instances of the full moon is not constant. Over the duration of the Román et al. (2004) study, this interval reached a minimum of 29.28 days and a maximum of 29.80 days. Currently, the average length of the cycle of lunar phases is roughly 29.53 days.

### Calendar Issues

The methodology described in Román et al. (2004) is as follows: “We determined the total number of admissions on each calendar day during the period studied and then distributed this number according to the corresponding day of the lunar month. . . . A full moon day was considered to be the day when the moon appears completely illuminated (100% of the moon disc).” Because there is no additional specification of the calendar that was used, one must assume that the authors used the civil calendar in force at their hospital in Barcelona, Spain. Spain has had and continues to have a complicated history of political decrees enforcing time zone changes between Coordinated Universal Time (UTC), UTC+1, and UTC+2. These decrees appear to accommodate daylight savings time as well as other time-variable preferences. Because the timing of the full moon

samples the entire 24-hour calendar day, the same hospital admissions could be assigned to what the authors describe as a “full moon day” or a “non-full moon day,” depending on the legislation in place at the time. Therefore, the methodology of Román et al. (2004) introduces an unnecessary source of error that can contribute to bias, variance, or both. As constructed, their data set is ill-suited to study the possibility of lunar effects and is better suited to study the possibility of cyclic effects modulated by the vagaries of legislated time zone changes—which are obviously not natural phenomena.

### Binning Issues

A more serious problem with the methodology of Román et al. (2004) has to do with the assignment of hospital admissions to 1 of 29 days, with Day 29 considered the “full moon day.” Román et al. (2004) used the following prescription to bin their data: “A full moon day was considered to be the day when the moon appears completely illuminated (100% of the moon disc). We considered this day to be the 29th day of the lunar calendar.” Because the length of the lunar cycle is not equal to 29 days, the assignment of hospital admissions to 1 of 29 days is problematic. Specifically, the authors reported studying 25 “complete cycles” of 29 days each (a total of  $25 \times 29$  days = 725 days), which does not match the 738 days spanned by the 25 lunar cycles that occurred during their study period. On 13 different occasions, the authors associated the full moon with the 29th day of their “lunar calendar”—even though the full moon actually coincided with the 30th day of that calendar. To illustrate, 30 days separate the full moon on January 5, 1996, from that on February 4, 1996, yet, both were labeled “Day 29” in the Román et al. (2004) study. If hospital admissions on Days 29 and 30 were combined in a single bin, it would obviously lead to an artificial increase in the number of admissions reported for Days 29 (“full moon days”). If hospital admissions on Days 29 were not counted with those on Days 30, how were those admissions treated? The Román et al. (2004) paper remains silent on this issue, leaving the methodology poorly defined. In the best-case scenario, the Román et al. (2004) procedure biases the data. In the worst-case scenario, it leads to a completely artificial (roughly 50%) increase in the number of hospital admissions reported for “full moon days.”

### Timescale Issues

Román et al. (2004) did not state over what timescale the purported lunar effect is supposed to take place. If the timescale were less than 24 hours, then the analysis would be faulty because it makes no distinction between a full moon that occurs at 00:00:01 or a full moon that occurs at 23:59:59. In the first case, hospital admissions in the ~24 hours *following* the full moon would count toward “Day 29” admissions, whereas in the second case, admissions in the ~24 hours *preceding* the full moon would count toward “Day 29” admissions. This unnecessary source of error in calculating the time from full moon can

contribute to bias, variance, or both. If the timescale were more than 24 hours, the analysis would also be faulty because it fails to consider days adjacent to Day 29. For instance, a total of 50 hospital admissions were reported on the 3 days surrounding the full moon ( $29 \pm 1$ ). This amounts to an average admission rate of 0.65 admissions per day over the 738-day study period—which is statistically indistinguishable from the overall average admission rate of 0.61 admissions per day (447 admissions over 738 days).

### Confounding Issues

It has been well established that day-of-week variability can explain most or all of the variance in studies claiming a lunar effect. For instance, Templer, Veleber, and Brooner (1982) asserted that the number of traffic accidents was correlated to the phases of the Moon. However, Kelly and Rotton (1983) pointed out that the pattern was more likely due to an increase in vehicular accidents during weekends. Indeed, when Templer, Brooner, and Corgiat (1983) reanalyzed their data with controls for holidays, weekends, and months of the year, the hypothesis of a lunar effect was no longer tenable. What the authors had initially observed and incorrectly ascribed to a lunar influence was merely day-of-week variability. In the case of hospital admissions, it is not difficult to imagine that variations by day of week would occur. In their analysis, Román et al. (2004) did not account for variables, such as day of week, that likely explain most of the variance in their data, casting further doubt on the validity of their conclusions.

## FLAWED STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

### Improper Statistical Treatment

Román et al. (2004) indicated that they performed Mann-Whitney tests of their hypotheses. The hypotheses are not clearly stated, but it appears that the authors tried to establish that the rate of hospital admissions on “full moon days” was statistically different from that on “non-full moon days.” In certain situations, the Mann-Whitney test can be used to compare the equality of the means or medians of two independent groups—as long as the distributions are similar in dispersion and shape (Hollander & Wolfe, 1999). This test requires that the dependent variable be either continuous or ordinal, which is not the case for the number of hospital admissions per day because counts are discrete variables. It is possible that the data were rank-ordered, but the paper does not describe rank ordering, leaving the methodology poorly defined. In addition, Román et al. (2004) did not provide values of the Mann-Whitney  $U$  statistic, making validation of their results impossible. Furthermore, when the probability distributions of the two groups are not identical, the Mann-Whitney test cannot be used to compare the means or medians of the two groups. A difference in dispersion or shape invalidates the test (Hollander & Wolfe, 1999). As shown below in the section on variability in hospital

admission rates, the distributions of hospital admissions on “full moon” and “non-full moon” days in the Román et al. (2004) data set are not the same—perhaps as a result of the procedural flaws described above—such that any conclusion about the mean or median number of hospital admissions resulting from a Mann-Whitney test must be discarded.

Additional difficulties arise when attempting to make statistical inferences and choosing relatively low confidence levels. At a 95% confidence level, five studies out of a hundred will detect an effect that is not present (type I error). When making extraordinary claims, much higher confidence levels are warranted. In addition, studies affected by Type I errors tend to be overrepresented in the literature, because the studies that fail to show a connection are more likely to remain unpublished—a publication bias known colloquially as the file drawer effect (Easterbrook, Gopalan, Berlin, & Matthews, 1991).

### Incomplete Statistical Treatment

Román et al. (2004) asserted that “the number of [hospital] admissions ... nearly doubled on full moon days as compared to non-full moon days.” Because of improper statistical treatment, they did not correctly examine the statistical significance of this claim. Even if one were to disregard problems with the data collection and statistical treatment, the fact that the number of hospital admissions on Days 29 ( $M = 1.04$ ,  $SD = 0.93$  admissions per day) is larger than the number of admissions on other days ( $M = 0.59$ ,  $SD = 0.78$  admissions per day) does not demonstrate a causal relationship with the Moon. For instance, four separate days throughout the “lunar cycle” exhibit hospital admission rates nearly equal to the rate reported for “full moon days.” Days 9 registered 24 admissions over 25 days (0.96 admissions per day), and Days 12, 13, and 27 each registered 23 admissions over 25 days (0.92 admissions per day). The differences between the number of admissions per day on Days 9, 12, 13, 27, and 29 of the cycle are *not* statistically significant. Therefore, there is no evidence that “full moon days” are associated with an unusual rate of hospital admissions.

### FLAWED INTERPRETATION

The strength of lunar tides on blood was invoked as a possible explanation for the purported lunar effect (Román et al., 2004). This underscores misconceptions about tides. First, tides act on ordinary matter, whether liquid or solid. Second, the strength of tides is proportional to the mass of the tide-raising body and inversely proportional to the cube of the distance from the tide-raising body. Therefore, ordinary objects (cars, houses, hospitals, etc.) in the vicinity of a potential patient exert tides that are orders of magnitude stronger than those exerted by the Moon. In addition, the strongest lunar tides occur at both the new moon and the full moon (when the Sun, Earth, and Moon are roughly aligned), but an increase in hospital admissions at new moon was not observed—further invalidating the interpretation.

### VARIABILITY IN HOSPITAL ADMISSION RATES

The data set of Román et al. (2004) suffers from a number of problems that make it unsuitable for a rigorous examination of the impact of lunar phases on hospital admission rates. The statistical treatment is inadequate and does not support the claim of a lunar influence. Nevertheless, it may be possible to use the data to investigate the variability in hospital admission rates.

The number of hospital admissions in any given time interval can be modeled by a Poisson distribution with rate  $\lambda$  (admissions per day). For any two Poisson processes 1 and 2 with rates  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ , it is possible to test the hypothesis that one of the rates is larger than the other. The Poisson distributions representing hospital admissions over time intervals  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  expressed in days are given by  $X_1 \infty \text{Poisson}(t_1\lambda_1)$  and  $X_2 \infty \text{Poisson}(t_2\lambda_2)$ . Let us represent the observed values (number of admissions) by  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ , respectively, with  $k = k_1 + k_2$ .

The null and alternate hypotheses are

$$H_0: \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \leq 1 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_a: \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} > 1. \quad (1)$$

Przyborowski and Wilenski (1940) gave us a formalism for testing the null hypothesis. It relies on the conditional distribution  $X_1$  given  $X_1 + X_2 = k$ . This distribution is binomial with  $k$  trials and a probability of success  $p = t_1/(t_1 + t_2)$  for equal rates. One can reject the null hypothesis  $H_0$  whenever

$$P(X_1 \geq k_1 | k; p) = \sum_{i=k_1}^k \binom{k}{i} p^i (1-p)^{k-i} \leq \alpha, \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a given significance level. Using the 0.05 significance level chosen by Román et al. (2004) and recalling that  $t_1 + t_2 = 738$  days, one can show that the hypothesis must be rejected for any day of their calendar that accumulated 23 or more hospital admissions, and this conclusion is unchanged if one assumes  $t_1 + t_2 = 725$  days instead. There are five such instances. With  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda_{\bar{i}}$  representing the admission rate on days  $i$  and on all other days, respectively, one finds

$$\frac{\lambda_9}{\lambda_{\bar{9}}} > 1, \frac{\lambda_{12}}{\lambda_{\bar{12}}} > 1, \frac{\lambda_{13}}{\lambda_{\bar{13}}} > 1, \frac{\lambda_{27}}{\lambda_{\bar{27}}} > 1, \frac{\lambda_{29}}{\lambda_{\bar{29}}} > 1. \quad (3)$$

Because the apparent increase in rates is observed on 5 out of 29 days—four of which are not “full moon days”—it is unjustifiable to ascribe the increase to the full moon. The logical conclusion that can be drawn from these data is that hospital admission rates on some days are higher than those on other days.

One can ask whether the variations recorded by Román et al. (2004) could have been observed under the hypothesis of a constant rate of hospital admissions. Specifically, if the process of admissions on days  $i$  is represented by  $X_i \infty$

Poisson( $t_i\lambda_i$ ), the relevant hypothesis to test is  $H_0: \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \dots = \lambda_{29}$ . The test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{29} \frac{[k_i - (k/t)]^2}{(k/t)}, \quad (4)$$

where the observed values are represented by  $k_i$ ,  $\sum k_i = k$ , and  $\sum t_i = t$ . One can reject the null hypothesis  $H_0$  whenever  $P_\chi(\chi^2; \nu) \leq \alpha$ , where  $P_\chi(\chi^2; \nu)$  is the integral probability of exceeding  $\chi^2$  and  $\nu = 28$  is the number of degrees of freedom. With  $\alpha = .05$  and the data of Román et al. (2004), the null hypothesis is rejected—which could be due to the biases introduced by their binning procedure, by confounding effects such as day of week, by clerical or other errors, or by a combination of these factors.

To conclude, although the data of Román et al. (2004) exhibit variations that appear to deviate from a Poisson process with a constant rate, there is no support for the idea that the full moon is associated with the variations. This conclusion is consistent with the fact that there is no known plausible lunar-related mechanism that could explain such variations.

## ANALOGY WITH BIRTH RATES

Anecdotal evidence suggests that many nurses and midwives believe that deliveries are more abundant during the full moon (e.g., Schaffir, 2006). This belief is inconsistent with the data. The landmark study was conducted at the University of California, Los Angeles. Records of 11,961 live births and 8,142 natural births (not induced by drugs or Cesarean section), over a 4-year period (1974–1978) at the University of California, Los Angeles hospital, did not correlate in any way with the cycle of lunar phases (Abell & Greenspan, 1979). The study benefited from an interdisciplinary collaboration between Abell, an astronomer, and Greenspan, a physician. This interdisciplinary model is likely to reduce the number of problems that plague studies purporting to show a lunar effect. A decade later, an extensive review of 21 studies from seven different countries showed that most studies reported no relationship between birth rate and lunar phase, and that the positive studies were inconsistent with each other (Martens et al., 1988). A review of six additional studies from five different countries showed no evidence of a relationship between birth rate and lunar phase (Kelly & Martens, 1994). Additional investigations have been published since then. An analysis of 3,706 spontaneous births (excluding births resulting from induced labor) in New York in 1994 showed no correlation with lunar phase (Joshi, Bharadwaj, Gallousis, & Matthews, 1998). The distribution of 167,956 spontaneous vaginal deliveries—at 37–40 weeks gestation, in Phoenix—between 1995 and 2000 showed no relationship with lunar phase (Morton-Pradhan, Bay, & Coonrod, 2005). Analysis of 564,039 births in a 4-year period (1997–2001) in North Carolina showed no predictable influence of the lunar cycle on deliveries or complications (Arliss, Kaplan, & Galvin,

2005). A review of 6,725 deliveries in a 6-year period (2000–2006) in Hannover, Germany, revealed no significant correlation of birth rate to lunar phase (Staboulidou, Soergel, Vaske, & Hillemanns, 2008). Because the absence of a correlation has been reported so widely, one may wonder why the belief in a lunar effect has persisted in the medical and nursing communities.

## COGNITIVE BIASES

Gilovich (1993) provided a lucid and compelling explanation of several cognitive biases that affect the emergence of questionable beliefs. First, we are not very good at recognizing random data and tend to see patterns, clusters, and order even where these don't exist. Second, we are prone to ignore data that contradict our beliefs and to give undue weight to confirmatory information (i.e., data that support preestablished beliefs). Third, we tend to overestimate the fraction of people who share our beliefs, which reinforces preexisting beliefs. Gilovich (1993) emphasized that many of our questionable beliefs have purely cognitive origins and derive primarily from the “misapplication or overutilization of generally valid and effective strategies for knowing.” Questionable beliefs, he stated, are not the products of irrationality, but rather of flawed rationality.

Kelly et al. (1996) classified some of the cognitive biases under three categories: *selective perception* (we are more likely to notice events that support our beliefs than those that do not), *selective recall* (we are more likely to recall positive instances and forget negative ones), and *selective exposure* (we are more likely to associate with people or news sources that promote our beliefs). All of these effects are much more complex and interesting than the gravitational force exerted by an ordinary natural satellite. Research efforts devoted to understanding these cognitive biases are far more likely to yield productive results than another study of the imagined influence of the Moon on human affairs.

Schaffir (2006) indicated that the proportion of people who believe in a lunar effect is much higher among nurses than among the general population. If selective exposure plays an important role, this trend is unlikely to subside until nursing and medical professionals acquaint themselves with the fascinating cognitive biases that shape our questionable beliefs.

## Conclusion

This article examined the claim that hospital admission rates or birth rates are correlated with the phases of the Moon. When one adheres to basic standards of evidence, no such correlation is found. The article described how a number of data collection and analysis shortcomings can lead to erroneous conclusions and how powerful cognitive biases can lead to questionable beliefs.

Accepted for publication September 8, 2014.

The author has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Corresponding author: Jean-Luc Margot, PhD, Department of Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Los Angeles, 595 Charles E. Young Dr. East, Los Angeles, CA 90095 (e-mail: jlm@astro.ucla.edu).

## REFERENCES

- Abell, G. O., & Greenspan, B. (1979). Human births and the phase of the moon [Letter]. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *300*, 96.
- Arliss, J. M., Kaplan, E. N., & Galvin, S. L. (2005). The effect of the lunar cycle on frequency of births and birth complications. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, *192*, 1462-1464. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2004.12.034
- Byrnes, G., & Kelly, I. W. (1992). Crisis calls and lunar cycles: A twenty-year review. *Psychological Reports*, *71*, 779-785. doi:10.2466/pr0.1992.71.3.779
- Easterbrook, P. J., Gopalan, R., Berlin, J. A., & Matthews, D. R. (1991). Publication bias in clinical research. *The Lancet*, *337*, 867-872. doi:10.1016/0140-6736(91)90201-Y
- Foster, R. G., & Roenneberg, T. (2008). Human responses to the geophysical daily, annual and lunar cycles. *Current Biology*, *18*, R784-R794. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2008.07.003
- Gilovich, T. (1993). *How we know what isn't so: The fallibility of human reason in everyday life*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Hollander, M., & Wolfe, D. A. (1999). *Nonparametric statistical methods* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Joshi, R., Bharadwaj, A., Gallousis, S., & Matthews, R. (1998). Labor ward workload waxes and wanes with the lunar cycle, myth or reality? *Primary Care Update for OB/GYNs*, *5*, 184. doi:10.1016/S1068-607X(98)00100-0
- Kelly, I. W., & Martens, R. (1994). Geophysical variables and behavior: LXXVIII. Lunar phase and birthrate: An update. *Psychological Reports*, *75*, 507-511. doi:10.2466/pr0.1994.75.1.507
- Kelly, I. W., & Rotton, J. (1983). Geophysical variables and behavior: XIII. Comment on "Lunar Phase and Accident Injuries": The dark side of the moon and lunar research. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *57*, 919-921. doi:10.2466/pms.1983.57.3.919
- Kelly, I. W., Rotton, J., & Culver, R. (1996). The moon was full and nothing happened. A review of studies on the moon and human behavior and belief. In J. Nickell, B. Karr, & T. Genoni (Eds.), *The outer edge: Classic investigations of the paranormal* (pp. 17-34). Amherst, NY: Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP).
- Martens, R., Kelly, I. W., & Saklofske, D. H. (1988). Lunar phase and birthrate: A 50-year critical review. *Psychological Reports*, *63*, 923-934. doi:10.2466/pr0.1988.63.3.923
- Martin, S. J., Kelly, I. W., & Saklofske, D. H. (1992). Suicide and lunar cycles: A critical review over 28 years. *Psychological Reports*, *71*, 787-795. doi:10.2466/pr0.1992.71.3.787
- Morton-Pradhan, S., Bay, R. C., & Coonrod, D. V. (2005). Birth rate and its correlation with the lunar cycle and specific atmospheric conditions. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, *192*, 1970-1973. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2005.02.066
- Przyborowski, J., & Wilenski, H. (1940). Homogeneity of results in testing samples from Poisson series: With an application to testing clover seed for dodder. *Biometrika*, *31*, 313-323.
- Román, E. M., Soriano, G., Fuentes, M., Gálvez, M. L., & Fernández, C. (2004). The influence of the full moon on the number of admissions related to gastrointestinal bleeding. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, *10*, 292-296. doi:10.1111/j.1440-172x.2004.00492.x
- Rotton, J., & Kelly, I. W. (1985). Much ado about the full moon: A meta-analysis of lunar-lunacy research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*, 286-306. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.286
- Schaffir, J. (2006). Birth rate and its correlation with the lunar cycle and specific atmospheric conditions. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, *195*, 878. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2005.11.047
- Staboulidou, I., Soergel, P., Vaske, B., & Hillemanns, P. (2008). The influence of lunar cycle on frequency of birth, birth complications, neonatal outcome and the gender: A retrospective analysis. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*, *87*, 875-879. doi:10.1080/00016340802233090
- Templer, D. I., Brooner, R. K., & Corgiat, M. D. (1983). Geophysical variables and behavior: XIV. Lunar phase and crime: Fact or artifact. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *57*, 993-994. doi:10.2466/pms.1983.57.3.993
- Templer, D. I., Veleber, D. M., & Brooner, R. K. (1982). Geophysical variables and behavior: VI. Lunar phase and accident injuries: A difference between night and day. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *55*, 280-282. doi:10.2466/pms.1982.55.1.280
- Urban, S. E., & Seidelmann, P. K. (Eds.). (2012). *Explanatory supplement to the astronomical almanac* (3rd ed.). Mill Valley, CA: University Science Books.

# Full Moon and Gastrointestinal Bleeding

## Response to Margot (2015)

OPEN

Eva Román ▼ Ignasi J. Gich ▼ German Soriano

We read with interest the article of Margot (2015) about our paper published 10 years ago (Román, Soriano, Fuentes, Gálvez, & Fernández, 2004), and we wish to comment on some points.

First, our study arose simply from a perception among nurses and physicians at our Gastrointestinal Bleeding Unit

that the number of admissions was higher on days with a full moon. When we designed the study in 1995, we found only one article, a paper by Pérez-Cuadrado, Montero, and Bello (1986), addressing the issue and describing a higher number of admissions because of gastrointestinal bleeding in full moon. The aim of our study was therefore very simple: to determine

whether the number of admissions to our bleeding unit was higher on full moon days than on non-full moon days. From the 738 days of the period studied (25 lunar cycles), there were 25 full moon days and 713 non-full moon days. We found the mean number of admissions on full moon days ( $M = 1.04$ ,  $SD = 0.93$ ) was higher than the mean on non-full moon days ( $M = 0.59$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ,  $p = .007$ , using Mann-Whitney test). Margot states “Román et al. suggested that the number of hospital admissions related to gastrointestinal bleeding was somehow influenced by the phases of the Earth’s moon.” This is not exact. Our conclusion in the abstract reads as follows: “The results of this study suggest an increase in the number of admissions related to gastrointestinal hemorrhage in our bleeding unit during the full moon, especially in men and in patients experiencing variceal hemorrhage. However, the wide variation in the number of admissions throughout the lunar cycle could limit interpretation of the results. Therefore, further studies are needed to clarify the possible influence of the moon on gastrointestinal hemorrhage.”

Second, Margot considers the number of days included in the study is not clear and criticizes our “assignment of hospital admissions to one of the 29 days” of the lunar cycle. We will try to clarify these aspects. The study period included 25 complete lunar cycles (a total of 738 days). Full moon days were the days so-named on the local lunar calendar, and non-full moon days were the remaining days. Therefore, there was a total of 25 full moon days (considered day number 29 of the lunar cycle in our study), and the remaining 713 days were non-full moon days. As Margot states, the lunar cycle has a variable duration with a mean of 29.53 days and some cycles of 30 instead of 29 days. During the study period, 13 cycles had 30 days, and these 13 “extra” days explain the difference between the 25 cycles  $\times$  29 days = 725 days and the 738 days finally included in the study. There were no admissions on these 13 “extra” non-full moon days. Moreover, in no case were the admissions of two consecutive days assigned to one full-moon day, as Margot suggests. We omitted day 30 in the figure, showing the cumulative total number of admissions per day of the lunar cycle to avoid confusion, because there were only 13 Day 30s, compared to 25 days in each of the remaining days, 1 to 29. This design was chosen to express the results in a way as close as possible to clinical practice, but we acknowledge

that it could make analysis of the data difficult if someone wanted to compare each day of the lunar cycle. We emphasize, however, that our aim was not to do this but to compare number of admissions on full moon days with all the non-full moon days, and we consider that this analysis was performed reliably. We disagree about the long series of shortcomings that Margot suggests and consider our data were correctly managed for the purpose of the article.

The third issue refers to our statistical analysis. We used the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test instead of Student’s  $t$  test because of the nonnormal distribution of the data as evaluated by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Margot states the use of Mann-Whitney test was incorrect, because the dependent variable (number of admissions per day) was not continuous or ordinal. Indeed, it was not continuous, but it was ordinal. Moreover, rank ordering was performed automatically by the SPSS program, and the mean rank was 470.04 in full moon days and 365.95 in non-full moon days. These data were not provided in our article because they are not usually specified in clinical research and are not easy to understand. We consider Margot’s statement that “when the probability distributions of the two groups are not identical, the Mann-Whitney test cannot be used” is too restrictive and not shared by other authors (Conover, 1980). Moreover, Levene’s test did not detect significant differences in the variances of the number of admissions between the full moon and non-full moon days. We also conducted other statistical evaluations, such as the Student’s  $t$  test, regression analyses, and the median test, and the differences between the two groups were also statistically significant in all of them. Margot’s analysis using a Poisson process can be an interesting method to explore variability in the number of admissions along the lunar cycle, but we emphasize again that this was not the objective of our study.

Fourth, Margot states that the day of the week is a confounding factor not accounted for in our study that could explain the differences observed between full moon days and non-full moon days. As commented by Margot, in studies analyzing traffic accidents, “what the authors had initially observed and incorrectly ascribed to a lunar influence was merely day-of-week variability.” However, we consider that, if an increase in traffic accidents during the weekends could have been expected, there is no apparent reason to explain a possible relationship between the day of the week and the number of admissions because of an event such as gastrointestinal bleeding. Moreover, we have reanalyzed our data, and we did not find significant differences in the number of admissions between the different days of the week.

Fifth, Margot argues against our speculation concerning the possible effect of the full moon on splanchnic hemodynamics. We wish to emphasize that this was only speculation and was presented as such in the Discussion. Margot also writes that the absence of an increase in hospital admissions at new

**Eva Román, PhD, RN**, is Professor, University School of Nursing EUI-Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.

**Ignasi J. Gich, MD, PhD**, is Senior Statistician, Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Public Health, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Institut de Recerca-IB-Sant Pau, Spain.

**German Soriano, MD, PhD**, is Consultant, Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 License, where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially.

DOI: 10.1097/NNR.000000000000087

moon further invalidates this interpretation. However, we ourselves made the same comment in our article. We underscore the descriptive nature of our study. We did not state that a higher number of admissions on the days with a full moon was a consequence of a moon effect. Furthermore, this higher number of admissions does not mean that patients bled more frequently on full moon days, as the time between the first symptom of bleeding and the hospital admission is highly variable, as reported in other articles from our bleeding unit (Villanueva et al., 2006) and from other groups (Ingrand et al., 2006). Moreover, we did not pretend at any time to determine the mechanisms by which the moon could have affected the number of admissions for gastrointestinal bleeding.

Sixth, the author points out the need for “reproducibility and predictability” of studies evaluating the lunar effects. We, of course, agree on this point, but we have only found two other studies evaluating the possible relationship between full moon and gastrointestinal bleeding, and their findings were contradictory (Pérez-Cuadrado et al., 1986; Tahri, Amouri, Fekih, El-Euch, & Krichen, 2003). Margot reviews a high number of studies demonstrating the absence of a correlation with lunar phases in a different setting, in relation to birth rates. However, although it seems clear that deliveries show no relationship with lunar phases, this does not necessarily mean that the full moon does not have any relationship with any other physiological or pathological situations, such as gastrointestinal bleeding.

Finally, we agree with Margot regarding the value of interdisciplinary approaches, to investigate not only possible effects of the lunar cycle but also in any area of research in health sciences. However, if our objective is to contribute to improvements in the healthcare of our patients, it is essential that the clinical environment in which a hypothesis is set and the

exact question that clinical researchers pretend to answer are carefully taken into account.

Accepted for publication January 19, 2015.

The authors thank Carolyn Newey for revising the English.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

Corresponding author: Eva Román, PhD, RN, University School of Nursing EUI-Sant Pau, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Mas Casanovas 90, 08041 Barcelona, Spain (e-mail: eroman@santpau.cat).

## REFERENCES

- Conover, W. J. (1980). *Practical nonparametric statistics* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Ingrand, P., Gournay, J., Bernard, P., Oberti, F., Bernard-Chabert, B., & Pauwels, A. The Club Francophone pour l'Étude de l'Hypertension Portale. (2006). Management of digestive bleeding related to portal hypertension in cirrhotic patients: A French multicenter cross-sectional practice survey. *World Journal of Gastroenterology*, *12*, 7810-7814.
- Margot, J.-L. (2015). No evidence of purported lunar effect on hospital admission rates or birth rates. *Nursing Research*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1097/NNR.0000000000000086
- Pérez-Cuadrado, E., Montero, J., & Bello, G. (1986). Hemorragia digestiva alta: El efecto lumínico y gravitacional de la luna [Upper gastrointestinal bleeding: The effect of lighting and gravity of the moon]. *Revista de Sanidad Militar*, *44*, 276-278.
- Román, E. M., Soriano, G., Fuentes, M., Gálvez, M. L., & Fernández, C. (2004). The influence of the full moon on the number of admissions related to gastrointestinal bleeding. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, *10*, 292-296. doi:10.1111/j.1440-172x.2004.00492.x
- Tahri, N., Amouri, A., Fekih, H., El-Euch, F., & Krichen, M. S. (2003). Conditions météorologiques et ruptures de varices œsophagiennes [Meteorologic conditions and esophageal varices rupture]. *Annales de Médecine Interne*, *154*, 509-514.
- Villanueva, C., Piqueras, M., Aracil, C., Gómez, C., López-Balaguer, J. M., Gonzalez, B., & Balanzó, J. (2006). A randomized controlled trial comparing ligation and sclerotherapy as emergency endoscopic treatment added to somatostatin in acute variceal bleeding. *Journal of Hepatology*, *45*, 560-567. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2006.05.016

# Rejoinder to Román, Gich, and Soriano (2015)

Jean-Luc Margot, PhD

OPEN

It is good to see that Román, Gich, and Soriano (2015) appear to distance themselves from the suggestion that the Moon can somehow influence the rate of hospital admissions at their bleeding unit. The title and body of the article by Román, Soriano, Fuentes, Gálvez, and Fernández (2004; “The influence of the full moon on the number of admissions related to gastrointestinal bleeding”) clearly implied a causal relationship. Their description of a specific mechanism implicating the Moon as the causal agent, no matter how speculative, reinforced the allegation that the Moon had some influence on the number of hospital admissions.

As the authors' data show, the Moon is innocent. Greater-than-expected admission rates are observed on Days 9, 12, 13, 27,

and 29 of the “lunar cycle” (Román et al.'s [2004] definition), but only one of these days is associated with the full moon. Establishing an association with the full moon would require, at the very least, a demonstration that the number of hospital admissions near full moon differs from the number of admissions in equivalent time intervals at other times during the lunar cycle. One cannot simply ignore, as Román et al. (2004) have done, admission rates on certain days of the lunar cycle.

Regarding the third item in Román et al.'s (2015) rebuttal, I wish to emphasize that I am not responsible for the statement that a difference in dispersion or shape of two distributions invalidates the statistical test known as Mann-Whitney. This fact was established by statisticians (Hollander & Wolfe, 1999).



Statisticians also generally agree that one should not trust results of statistical tests when test assumptions are violated.

The authors' attempt to clarify the assignment of hospital admissions to so-called "full moon days" and "non-full moon days" confirms that their procedure introduced a bias. Although they acknowledge that there were 13 instances in which the full moon fell on Day 30 of the calendar, they still insist on labeling Day 29 as the "full moon day."

Remarkably, the authors write in their rebuttal that "there were no admissions on these 13 extra non-full moon days." Let us examine the probability of such an event. There were 447 hospital admissions in the 738-day study, corresponding to an average rate of admissions of 0.61 per day. The probability that there was no hospital admission on the first Day-30 instance is given by the Poisson distribution, specifically  $\exp(-.61) = .55$ . The probability that there was no hospital admission on any of the 13 Day-30 instances, as Román et al. (2015) claim, is  $\exp(-.61 \times 13) = .00038$ , or 1 chance in 2628. In other words, if one conducted 2628 studies similar to that of Román et al. (2004), only one of these studies would yield such an exceptional outcome. Are we expected to believe that their study happens to be the one study among 2628 that fortuitously escaped the annoying consequences of the fact that the duration of the lunar cycle is variable? There is a 0.038% chance that their statement is true and a 99.962% chance that a more mundane explanation is true. Could it be that the authors selected *a posteriori* which day they would label "Day 30" (presumably a day with no hospital admissions), thereby hopelessly biasing the data by shifting the number of hospital admissions around on 13 separate occasions? Could it be that another day of the lunar cycle would have garnered the largest number of admissions with the proper accounting?

This supposition, as well as other claims in their article, must regrettably remain unconfirmed because the raw data are not available. In this context, the authors' call for additional studies is not warranted. The data as presented are sufficient to refute the hypothesis. With proper analysis of the raw data,

one would most likely be in a position to exonerate the Moon with a higher level of confidence.

Because I am not a health professional, I am not in a position to directly improve healthcare, and I am genuinely grateful to all those who devote their careers to the health professions. I trust that it is possible to improve healthcare while remaining committed to evidence-based reasoning. I understand that some health professionals are under the impression that the Moon influences hospital admission rates or birth rates. However, careful examination of the data reveals that these beliefs are unfounded. For a lucid and compelling explanation of the cognitive biases that shape our questionable beliefs, see Gilovich (1993).

---

**Jean-Luc Margot, PhD**, is Professor, Department of Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Los Angeles.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

Corresponding author: Jean-Luc Margot, PhD, Department of Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Los Angeles, 595 Charles E. Young Dr. East, Los Angeles, CA 90095 (e-mail: jlm@astro.ucla.edu).

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 License, where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially.

DOI: 10.1097/NNR.0000000000000090

## REFERENCES

- Gilovich, T. (1993). *How we know what isn't so: The fallibility of human reason in everyday life*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Hollander, M., & Wolfe, D. A. (1999). *Nonparametric statistical methods* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Román, E., Gitch, I., & Soriano, G. (2015). Full moon and gastrointestinal bleeding. Response to Margot (2015). *Nursing Research*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1097/NNR.0000000000000087
- Román, E. M., Soriano, G., Fuentes, M., Gálvez, M. L., & Fernández, C. (2004). The influence of the full moon on the number of admissions related to gastrointestinal bleeding. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 10, 292–296. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-172x.2004.00492.x

## REGISTER YOUR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OR META-ANALYSIS

Prospective registration of systematic reviews and meta-analysis reports is **recommended**. The recommendation does not apply to integrative Biology Reviews. Registration sites for systematic review and meta-analysis are:

### PROSPERO

[www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero](http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero)

### Cochrane Collaboration

<http://www.cochrane.org/cochrane-reviews/registering-titles>

Include the registry and trial number in the letter to the editor uploaded with your original submission. For questions, please contact Dr. Susan J. Henly, [henly003@umn.edu](mailto:henly003@umn.edu).