

1 Title: Does living close to petrochemical complex increase the
2 adverse psychological effects of COVID-19 lockdown?

3

4 Paloma Vicens^{1,2}, Luis Heredia^{1,2}, Edgar Bustamante³, Yolanda Pérez³, José L. Domingo²,
5 Margarita Torrente^{1,2,*}

6

7 ¹ Department of Psychology, CRAMC (Research Center for Behavior Assessment), Universitat
8 Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain.

9 ² Laboratory of Toxicology and Environmental Health, TECNATOX, School of Medicine,
10 Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain.

11 ³ Department of Geography, GRATET, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Vila-seca, Spain.

12

13

14 * Corresponding author. E-mail: margarita.torrente@urv.cat (MT)

15

16 **Author Contributions**

17 Conceptualization: Paloma Vicens, Luis Heredia, José L. Domingo, Margarita Torrente

18 Funding Acquisition: José L. Domingo

19 Data Curation and Formal Analysis: Paloma Vicens, Luis Heredia, Edgar Bustamante, Yolanda
20 Pérez, Margarita Torrente

21 Methodology: Paloma Vicens, Luis Heredia, Margarita Torrente

22 Writing-original draft: Paloma Vicens, Luis Heredia

23 Writing- review and editing: Paloma Vicens, Luis Heredia, Yolanda Pérez, José L. Domingo,
24 Margarita Torrente

25

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 The petrochemical industry has made possible the economic development of many local
29 communities, increasing the employment opportunities and generating a complex network of

30 secondary industries closely related to those. However, it is known that petrochemical
31 industries emit air pollutants, which are related to different negative effects on mental health.
32 In addition, many people around the world are being exposed to highly stressful situations
33 derived from the COVID-19 pandemic and the lockdown adopted by the national and regional
34 governments. The present study was aimed at analysing the possible differential effects on
35 different psychological outcomes (stress, anxiety, depression and emotional regulation
36 strategies) derived from the COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent lockdown in individuals
37 living near an important petrochemical complex and subjects living in other areas, non-
38 exposed to the characteristic environmental pollutants emitted by this kind of complexes. The
39 sample was composed by 1607 subjects which respond a questionnaire developed *ad hoc*
40 about the confinement conditions, the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), the Hospital Anxiety and
41 Depression Scale (HADS), the Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS) and the Emotional Regulation
42 Questionnaire (ERQ). The results indicated that people living closer to petrochemical
43 complexes reported greater risk perception. However, no significant relationships between
44 psychological variables and proximity to the focus were detected when compared people living
45 near to or far away from a chemical/petrochemical complex. Regarding the adverse
46 psychological effects of the first lockdown due to COVID-19 on the general population in
47 Catalonia, we can conclude that the lockdown conditions included in this survey were mainly
48 related to changes in the impulsivity levels of participants. However, we can also suggest that
49 the economic effects are going to be harder than those initially detected in this study. More
50 studies are necessary to corroborate our results.

51 Keywords: perceived stress; impulsivity; anxiety; depression; emotion; petrochemical complex;

52

53 **INTRODUCTION**

54 In the past 200 years, the world has experienced a rapid and continued industrialization
55 process. Among the industrial sectors, petroleum-related activities have constituted the core
56 of this industrial development. Nowadays, there are many petrochemical complexes located
57 around the world. The petrochemical industry has made possible the economic development
58 of many local communities, increasing the employment opportunities and generating a
59 complex network of secondary industries closely related to those [1]. However, living near to
60 these industrial complexes means also concerns. In this sense, it is known that petrochemical
61 industries emit air pollutants, which are related to different negative effects on human health
62 [2]. Specifically, some studies have shown that compounds as sulphur dioxide (SO₂), particulate
63 matter (PM), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs)
64 are frequently found in the ambient air around petrochemical complexes [3-5]. At the same
65 time, a number of studies have related human exposure to these compounds with an increase
66 in cancer mortality, acute lower respiratory infections, asthma and cardiovascular diseases [6-
67 8]. Moreover, living in the surroundings of petrochemical complexes has been also related to
68 increases in the occurrence of hypothyroidism [9] and pre-term births [10].

69 On the other hand, mental health of people living in the surroundings of petrochemical
70 complexes can be also affected because some of the pollutants emitted (e.g., PM and NO₂) by
71 these facilities are linked oxidative stress and inflammatory processes in the brain [11, 12].
72 Zhang, Wang [13] assessed the neuropsychological function in a group of petrochemical
73 workers and a group of office personnel of the same facility, showing a decreased learning and
74 working memory in petrochemical workers in comparison to the office personnel group. This
75 decreased working memory function has also been observed in children depending on the
76 distance between their habitual place of residence and the location of the petrochemical
77 complexes [14].

78 Another variable involved in the possible psychological effects derived from living around
79 areas exposed to this kind of environmental contaminants is the subjective risk perception.
80 Some authors have argued that subjective risk perception of environmental threats leads to
81 chronic stress because of the fear to potential health problems, the uncertainty of the threat,
82 as well as the lack of control [15]. However, previous studies have reported incongruent
83 results regarding to people's stress levels living near petrochemical industries. Thus, while
84 some researchers have reported increased stress levels in exposed areas [16, 17], other
85 investigators did not observe significant differences [18]. Axelsson, Stockfelt [19], evaluated
86 annoyance and worry in individuals living in the vicinity of this kind of complexes (< 3 km –
87 exposed group)) and subjects residing in a control area (> 24 km – non-exposed group). The
88 results showed that number of subjects frequently worried about the health effects of
89 industrial air pollution were more than twice in the exposed group than in the non-exposed
90 group. Similarly, the number of subjects worried about accidents in industrial activities were
91 three times higher in people living in the exposed area than in the non-exposed area.

92 Considering that living around industrial facilities could be a health risk factor, this population
93 would be considered vulnerable to unexpected stressful situations since they have higher basal
94 levels of stress and worry (Axelsson, 2013).

95 Nowadays, many people around the world are being exposed to highly stressful
96 situations derived from the COVID-19 pandemic and the lockdown adopted by the national
97 and regional governments. Recently, Brooks, Webster [20] have reviewed studies focused on
98 mental health consequences in previous Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), H1N1
99 influenza and Ebola outbreaks. It was concluded that the most frequently psychological
100 outcomes in quarantined people were acute stress disorders, trauma-related mental health
101 disorders, and depressive symptoms, being the most reported emotional states fear,
102 nervousness, sadness and guilt. These authors also concluded that being a woman, working in

103 health services, losing economic income, and being quarantined for more than 10 days, were
104 factors associated to poorer mental health [20]. Thus, the scientific community is making a
105 great effort to understand the psychological consequences related with the COVID-19
106 pandemic. In a recent study by Odriozola-González, Planchuelo-Gómez [21], a group of 2530
107 university members were examined for anxiety, depression and stress through an online
108 survey during the high lockdown period in Spain. The percentage of responses reporting
109 moderate to extremely several scores in the variables assessed was 21.34% for anxiety, 34.19%
110 for depression, and 28.14% for stress. Using a different methodology, Li, Wang [22] assessed a
111 sample of 17865 Weibo (a Chinese social network of microblogging) users through a learning
112 machine algorithm, and the number of positive and negative words found in their messages.
113 Results showed an increase in the number of words related to negative emotions (anxiety,
114 depression and indignation), while positive emotions were reduced. It has been suggested that
115 in stressful situations the subject's capability to manage their emotions could constitute an
116 essential way to mitigate the downstream of negative consequences in the quarantine period
117 [23]. However, currently there is a scarce of knowledge about the lockdown effects in the
118 COVID-19 outbreak.

119 Taking into account the above, the present study was aimed at analyzing the possible
120 differential effects on different psychological outcomes (stress, anxiety, depression and
121 emotional regulation strategies) derived from the COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent
122 lockdown in individuals living near an important petrochemical complex and subjects living in
123 other areas, non-exposed to the characteristic environmental pollutants emitted by this kind
124 of complexes. The main hypothesis of the study was that people living near the petrochemical
125 complex should show a higher psychological impact during the lockdown than those living in
126 non-exposed areas. In order to assess this aim, the following specific objectives were
127 established:

- 128 1. To explore any relationship to COVID risk perception and lockdown variables.
- 129 2. To assess the risk perception related to live in the vicinity of a chemical/petrochemical
130 complex.
- 131 3. To evaluate the relationship between the distance to a chemical/petrochemical
132 complex and psychological variables such as perceived stress, impulsivity, anxiety and
133 depression symptomatology, and emotional regulation.
- 134 4. Refer whether psychological variables were affected by confinement conditions.
- 135 5. To appraise which variables (closeness to petrochemical/chemical complex, COVID-19
136 and lockdown conditions) are influencing the psychological state.

137

138 METHODS

139 Area of study

140 Tarragona County (Catalonia, Spain) concentrates an important complex of industrial activity.
141 Since the 1960s, an increasing number of chemical and petrochemical companies, including a
142 big oil refinery, a chlor-alkali plant, various plastic manufacture chemical companies, as well as
143 a municipal solid waste incinerator and a hazardous waste incinerator have been settled down
144 in that area. This means the most important petrochemical complex of Southern Europe.

145

146 Experimental design

147 The study consisted in an *ex post facto* correlational and comparative design. The variables
148 assessed were the place of habitual residence and its proximity to the chemical/petrochemical
149 complex, risk perception about the petrochemical complex closeness and the COVID-19
150 pandemic spread, lockdown conditions, self-reported levels of stress, anxiety, depression,
151 impulsivity, as well as cognitive emotional regulation strategies used during the lockdown.

152 Based on previous literature data about adverse health effects related to living near
153 chemical/petrochemical complexes, participants were divided into two groups: living near (\leq
154 10 km) or far (> 10 km) the petrochemical complex [6, 24, 25]. An online survey (*Petrocovid*
155 *Survey* -PS- see Tables 1 and 2) was used to obtain the data. Voluntary participants were able
156 to complete the survey since April 22 to May 14, 2020. The evolution of the number of COVID-
157 19 cases in Spain, the different lockdown degrees applied along the health emergency, and the
158 assessment period of the current study are depicted in Fig 1. It can be seen that assessment
159 period was coincident with the initial phase of the de-escalation. Data were anonymously
160 stored in the computer server of the Psychology Department of the Universitat Rovira i Virgili
161 (Tarragona, Catalonia, Spain).

162

163 Fig 1. Total daily number of COVID-19 cases detected in Spain along the lockdown and
164 Petrocovid Survey (PS) assessment period.

165

166 To determine the distance between the habitual residence of the participants and the
167 emission sources of environmental pollutants from the petrochemical complex, the Province
168 of Tarragona and its bordering provinces were taken as a spatial reference (Castelló, Teruel,
169 Zaragoza, Lleida and Barcelona Provinces, Fig 2). This means that only those surveys of the
170 mentioned provinces have been considered.

171

172 Fig 2. Surveys locations and the straight-line distance to the nearest source of pollution.

173

174 Cartography was created using ArcGIS 10.2.3 software (Environmental Systems Research
175 Institute, Redlands, CA, USA), in a point vector format and using ETRS89 UTM 31N projection.

176 The postal code layer was generated using the municipal polygonal base from the Centro
177 Nacional de Información Geográfica (CNIG). In order to obtain the postal code point layer,
178 firstly, borders between adjacent municipalities with the coinciding postal code were removed
179 obtaining a single polygon for each postal code area. Secondly, the midpoint from each
180 polygon from that layer was generated. The pollutant emissions sources layer from
181 petrochemicals industries was created by digitizing the points appeared in the industrial estate
182 database from the Institut Cartogràfic i Geològic de Catalunya (ICGC).

183 In studies of these characteristics, it is usual to use the Euclidean distance to establish the
184 relationship between the focus of contamination and the reference locations (from habitual
185 homes or schools to major roadways, foundries, mineral storages o airports, for example) [26-
186 31]. Once the two point-type layers were obtained, the straight-line distance in meters
187 between the postal code (place of residence) and the nearest source of pollution was
188 calculated using the 'nearest' option. Figure 2 shows the 1607 surveys locations and the
189 straight-line distance to the nearest source of contamination.

190

191 Participants

192 The snow ball sampling strategy was used to recruit the participants disseminating a
193 computerized version of the PS in social networks and digital press. One-thousand six-hundred
194 fifty-five subjects answered the survey. Data were revised and five participants were
195 eliminated because they did not complete some questions of PS. Finally, the sample was
196 composed by 1607 subjects (1195 women with 39.43 ± 13.61 years of average age and 412
197 men with and average age of 44.02 ± 14.42 years). From those, 1097 lived within 10 km of the
198 petrochemical complex, while 510 resided farther than 10kms. Before completing the survey,
199 information about the objectives of the study was provided and an informed consent was
200 requested. The present study followed the ethical principles of the World Medical

201 Association's Declaration of Helsinki (revised in Tokyo in 2004). It was approved by the Ethics
202 Committee of Clinical Research of the Pere Virgili Health Research Institute (IISPV, Tarragona,
203 Catalonia, Spain) (reference number: 084/2020). All data were processed in accordance with
204 the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (2016/679).

205

206 Instruments

207 *Petrocovid Survey (PS)*: To assess the habitual place of residence and the lockdown conditions,
208 an online *ad hoc* survey was created. At the first section (Table 1), the subject was asked for
209 age, gender, place of residence during the lockdown, and habitual residence, including in both
210 cases the postal code. Subjects were also asked for the proximity of their habitual residences
211 to the petrochemical complex (Yes/No) and the subjective risk perception on this
212 emplacement (Low/Medium/High).

| Items | Response options |
|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Age: | In years |
| 2. Gender: | Male / Female |
| 3. Place of residence during the confinement: | Town or city name |
| Postal code: | |
| 4. Place of habitual residence: | Town or city name |
| Postal code: | |
| 5. Are your habitual residence near of some chemical or petrochemical complex? | Yes / No |
| 6. If so, Have you perceived the emplacement of residence as dangerous? | Low / Medium / High |

213 Table 1. Items included at the first section of Petrocovid Survey (PS).

214

215 The second section of the survey included data about lockdown conditions. These are
216 summarized in Table 2.

217 Table 2. Items included at the second section of Petrocovid Survey (PS).

| Items | Response options |
|---|---|
| 1. Have you been alone at home? | Yes / No |
| 2. If accompanied, with.. | |
| Minors in their care | Yes / No |
| People over 65 years | Yes / No |
| Dependant in their care | Yes / No |
| 3. Have you had the COVID-19? | Yes / No |
| 4. Are you part of the risk population? | Yes / No |
| 5. Has any of your family member or friends died? | Yes / No |
| 6. Have you lost your job during the confinement? | Yes / No |
| 7. Has your company requested an ERTE? | Yes / No |
| 8. Have you worked during confinement? | Yes / No |
| 9. Have you telecommuting? | Yes / No |
| 10. Have you left home to work? | Yes / No |
| If so, in which field? | Health service / Food Industry / Petrochemical / Others |
| 11. Regardless of whether you have gone to work or not, | |
| How often do you left home within a week? | Once a week / 2-4 times a week / More than 4 times a week |
| 12. Have you established routines during confinement? | Yes / No |
| 13. Have you perceived the COVID-19 as dangerous? | Low / Medium / High |

218

219

220 *Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)* [32]: This scale was designed to measure the degrees on which
 221 individuals appraise situations in their lives as stressful. It consists in 14 items rated on a 5-
 222 point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). The PSS scale has been adapted to
 223 the Spanish population by Remor [33] with a Cronbach's alpha of .82 and a test-retest
 224 reliability coefficient of .73

225 *Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS)* [34]: The HADS was originally developed to
 226 assess emotional distress (anxiety and depression) in samples of people suffering physical
 227 illness. However, the scale has been also used in healthy population [35]. It is composed by 14
 228 items with four response options (seven items for the anxiety subscale (HADA) and seven for
 229 the depression subscale (HADD)). The HADS has been validated for the Spanish population by

230 Terol, López-Roig [36] with a Cronbach's alpha of .77 for anxiety and .71 for depression
231 subscale. The test-retest reliability coefficient was .77 for HADA and .74 for HADD.

232 *Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS)* [37]: This scale measures three traits of impulsiveness (motor,
233 cognitive and non-planning impulsivity). It contains a total of 30 items, and the total level of
234 impulsiveness through a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never/almost never) to 4
235 (always/almost always). The BIS was validated in Spanish population obtaining a Cronbach's
236 alpha of 0.67 for motor impulsivity and 0.59 for both cognitive impulsivity and non-planning
237 [38].

238 *Emotional Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ)* [39]: The ERQ is composed by 10 items, 6 assessing
239 cognitive reappraisal and 4 assessing expressive suppression using a 7-point Likert scale (1 =
240 strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). The items include questions about regulation of both
241 positive and negative emotions. The questionnaire has been validated in Spanish population by
242 Cabello, Salguero [40], with a Cronbach's alpha and test-retest reliability of 0.75 and 0.66 for
243 suppression, and 0.79 and 0.64 for reappraisal.

244
245 Statistical analysis
246
247

248 Group proportions were calculated for categorical variables. To test for association, we
249 performed Chi squared or Fisher exact tests. The effect size was evaluated with the eta
250 squared (η^2) based on the H-statistic coefficient [41]. For the continuous variables, a Shapiro-
251 Wilk test was performed to assess normality. If the distribution of the punctuations were
252 normal, we reported averages and standard deviations and performed t-tests, otherwise we
253 reported median and interquartile range, employing Mann-Whitney U tests. The effect size
254 was evaluated with Cohen's d.

255 For the multivariable analysis, we carried out linear regressions for the continuous variables
256 and logistic regressions for the binomial. Model selection was performed using the Akaike's

257 Information Criterion (AIC) and an automatic stepwise strategy, with forward and backward
258 steps. The model with the lowest AIC was automatically selected. Probability levels below 0.05
259 ($p < 0.05$) were considered as statistically significant. Data were analyzed using the R statistical
260 software package, version 4.0.

261

262 RESULTS

263 Objective 1

264 For the question “Have you perceived the situation arising from COVID-19 as dangerous?”, we
265 obtained a frequency of 519 answering a lot, 881 answering quite/enough, and 207 answering
266 little or nothing, out of 1607.

267 In order to explore any potential relationship to COVID-19 risk perception and lockout
268 variables, Chi-square test was used. Statistical analysis did not show significant relationships
269 between the risk perception of COVID-19 and any other variables included in the second
270 section of the PetroCovid Survey (see Table 2).

271 Objective 2

272 It is important to notice that when the risk perception related to proximity to a
273 chemical/petrochemical complex was assessed, a significant relation was observed, being
274 those individuals living closer to the chemical/petrochemical industries the most worried. A
275 logarithm’s continuous variable of distance from home to the focus was used to calculate the
276 analyses [$K = 73.42$, $p < 0.001$, with a medium size effect ($\eta^2 = 0.061$)].

277

278 Objective 3

279 In order to assess the relationship between distance to the chemical/petrochemical complex
280 and psychological variables during the lockdown, a distance over 10 km as far away from the

281 chemical/petrochemical complex was considered as a criterion. Thus, our sample was divided
282 into two experimental groups: near (n= 583) and far (n= 1024). In relation to this, it is
283 interesting to notice that no differences on perceived stress, impulsivity, anxiety symptoms,
284 depression symptoms or emotional regulation were observed between the experimental
285 groups.

286

287 Objective 4

288 Considering the relation of the variables related to COVID-19 lockdown with psychological
289 variables, the results showed that **perceived stress** is affected by losing the job [$W= 95371$, $p <$
290 0.001 ; *Cohen's d* = 0.51 (medium)], while people working had less perceived stress [$W= 360551$,
291 $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d* = 0.37 (small)]. Interestingly, just going out influenced perceived stress [$K =$
292 10.125 ; $p = 0.006$; *Cohen's d* = 0.20 (small)]. Post-hoc Tukey test showed that people answering
293 going out 'quite' had less perceived stress that subjects answering going out 'little or nothing'
294 [$p = 0.004$, *Cohen's d* = 0.21 (small)] (see Table 3).

295

| Variable | Group | Mean | SD | SEM | n | p values |
|------------|-------------------|-------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Losing Job | no | 22.64 | 9.16 | 0.24 | 1423 | $p < 0.001$ |
| | yes | 27.39 | 9.86 | 0.73 | 184 | |
| Working | no | 25.37 | 10 | 0.41 | 599 | $p < 0.001$ |
| | yes | 21.88 | 8.71 | | 1008 | |
| Going out | Little or nothing | 23.6 | 9.52 | 0.29 | 1084 | $p = 0.006$ |
| | Quite | 21.61 | 8.67 | 0.5 | 300 | |
| | A lot | 23.28 | 9.31 | 0.62 | 223 | |

296 Table 3. Variables that were significant related to perceived stress

297 SD: Standard deviation, SEM: Standard error of mean

298

299 Regarding **impulsivity** measurements, subjects having minors in their care had lower total
300 score of impulsivities [($W= 290120$, $p < 0.001$)] with a *Cohen's d* = 0.27 (small)]. Moreover, the
301 results showed that these individuals had also lower motor [$W= 279422$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*=
302 0.20 (small)] and cognitive [$W= 304254$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*= 0.36 (small)] impulsivity. People
303 who had lost their jobs had a higher total impulsivity score [$W= 86807$, $p < 0.001$ *Cohen's d*=
304 0.35 (small)], as well as motor [$W= 89027$, $p < 0.001$ *Cohen's d*= -0.35 (small)] and cognitive
305 impulsivity [$W= 84418$, $p < 0.001$ *Cohen's d*= -0.38 (small)]. Another significant result was
306 observed for people not working. This group of population showed a higher total impulsivity
307 [$W= 309688$, $p < 0.001$ *Cohen's d*= 0.47 (small)] together with a higher motor [$W= 300880$, $p <$
308 0.001 ; *Cohen's d*= 0.40 (small)] and cognitive impulsivity [$W= 300269$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*=
309 0.40 (small)], as well as a higher lack of planification [$W= 294811$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*= 0.35
310 (small)]. Similar results were found for those not telecommuting, showing a higher lack of
311 planification [$W= 304419$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*= 0.28 (small)], as well as total impulsivity score
312 [$W= 307133$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*= 0.31 (small)] and motor impulsivity [$W= 305254$, $p < 0.001$;
313 *Cohen's d*= 0.30 (small)]. In turn, stablishing routines was associated with a lower total
314 impulsivity score [$K= 6.3493$, $p = 0.011$; *Cohen's d*= 0.33 (small)] together with a lower lack of
315 planification [$K= 4.1318$, $p= 0.041$; *Cohen's d*= 0.25 (small)] and motor impulsivity [$K= 7.4641$,
316 $p= 0.006$; *Cohen's d*= 0.33 (small)]. People going out to work showed a lower total impulsivity
317 [$W= 197106$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*= 0.20 (small)] together with a lower cognitive impulsivity
318 [$W= 204489$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*= 0.27 (small)]. Results are summarized in Tables 4a and 4b.
319

| Variable | | Group | Mean | SD | SEM | n | p values |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------------|
| Having minors in their care | Motor Impulsivity | No | 18.68 | 3.9 | 0.13 | 904 | p< 0.001 |
| | | Yes | 17.89 | 3.58 | 0.15 | 552 | |
| | Cognitive Impulsivity | No | 16.3 | 3.58 | 0.12 | 904 | |
| | | Yes | 15.04 | 3.33 | 0.14 | 552 | |
| | Total Impulsivity | No | 19.48 | 10.03 | 0.33 | 904 | |
| | | Yes | 16.81 | 9.5 | 0.4 | 552 | |
| Losing the job | Motor Impulsivity | No | 18.23 | 3.66 | 0.1 | 1294 | p< 0.001 |
| | | Yes | 19.55 | 4.64 | 0.36 | 162 | |
| | Cognitive Impulsivity | No | 15.67 | 3.44 | 0.1 | 1294 | |
| | | Yes | 17.02 | 4.06 | 0.32 | 162 | |
| | Total Impulsivity | No | 18.07 | 9.65 | 0.27 | 1294 | |
| | | Yes | 11.61 | 11.37 | 0.89 | 162 | |
| Not working | Lack of planification | No | 25.32 | 4.7 | 0.21 | 533 | p< 0.001 |
| | | Yes | 23.65 | 4.66 | 0.15 | 923 | |
| | Motor Impulsivity | No | 19.33 | 4.06 | 0.18 | 533 | |
| | | Yes | 17.83 | 3.53 | 0.12 | 923 | |
| | Cognitive Impulsivity | No | 16.72 | 3.72 | 0.16 | 533 | |
| | | Yes | 15.3 | 3.32 | 0.11 | 923 | |
| Total Impulsivity | No | 11.38 | 10.12 | 0.44 | 533 | | |
| | Yes | 16.78 | 9.4 | 0.31 | 923 | | |

320 Table 4a. Variables of the COVID confinement that were significantly related to impulsivity.

321 SD: Standard deviation, SEM: Standard error of mean

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

| Variable | Group | Mean | SD | SEM | n | p values | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------|-------|-------|------|----------|----------|
| Not telecommuting | Lack of planification | No | 25 | 4.88 | 0.19 | 645 | p< 0.001 |
| | | Yes | 23.68 | 4.58 | 0.16 | 811 | |
| | Motor impulsivity | No | 19.02 | 4.1 | 0.10 | 645 | |
| | | Yes | 17.87 | 3.46 | 0.12 | 811 | |
| | Total impulsivity | No | 60.19 | 10.55 | 0.42 | 645 | |
| | | Yes | 57.1 | 9.16 | 0.32 | 811 | |
| Going out to work | Cognitive impulsivity | No | 16.03 | 3.52 | 0.1 | 1151 | p< 0.001 |
| | | Yes | 15.05 | 3.49 | 0.1 | 1105 | |
| | Total impulsivity | No | 58.88 | 9.66 | 0.28 | 1151 | |
| | | Yes | 56.89 | 10.71 | 0.61 | 305 | |
| Stablishing routines | Lack of planification | No | 24.94 | 4.47 | 0.56 | 63 | p= 0.041 |
| | | Yes | 23.64 | 5.7 | 0.1 | 297 | |
| | Motor impulsivity | No | 19.19 | 3.79 | 0.18 | 63 | |
| | | Yes | 17.85 | 4.06 | 0.24 | 292 | |
| | Total impulsivity | No | 60.06 | 10.03 | 1.26 | 63 | |
| | | Yes | 56.57 | 10.55 | 0.57 | 297 | |

329 Table 4b. Variables of the COVID confinement that were significantly related to impulsivity.

330 SD: Standard deviation, SEM: Standard error of mean.

331

332 It is important to notice that *working at different sector* affects differently motor impulsivity (K
333 = 9.2715; $p = 0.009$). Tukey's test showed that working at health sector had a lower motor
334 impulsivity than food ($p = 0.015$) or petrochemical ($p = 0.044$) sectors, with a $\eta^2 = 0.00187$
335 (small) (see Figure 3).

336

337 Figure 3. Differences in motor impulsivity levels depending on working sectors.

338

339 Regarding **anxious and depressive symptomatology**, we observed that *having minors in their*

340 *care* increased anxious symptomatology [$W = 24534s8$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d* = 0.32 (small)],

341 while *having dependents* in charge decreased it ($W = 95597$, $p = 0.029$; *Cohen's d* = 0.20 (small)).

342 Moreover, *losing the job* decreased these symptoms $W= 146640$, $p < 0.001$; *Cohen's d*= 0.39
 343 (small). However, *stablishing routines* increased depressive symptoms [$W= 8886$, $p= 0.021$;
 344 *Cohen's d*= 0.32 (small)] (see Table 5).

345

346 Table 5. Variables of the lockdown that were significantly related to anxious and depressive
 347 symptomatology.

348

| Symptomatology | Variable | Group | Mean | SD | SEM | n | p values |
|----------------|----------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Anxious | Minors in their care | No | 11.06 | 2.52 | 0.18 | 191 | $p < 0.001$ |
| | | Yes | 11.83 | 2.28 | 0.17 | 186 | |
| | Dependents in charge | No | 11.46 | 2.4 | 0.06 | 1442 | $p = 0.029$ |
| | | Yes | 10.97 | 2.43 | 0.22 | 119 | |
| | Losing a job | No | 11.53 | 2.34 | 0.06 | 1384 | $p < 0.001$ |
| | | Yes | 10.58 | 2.73 | 0.2 | 177 | |
| Depressive | Routines | No | 8.96 | 2.42 | 0.29 | 70 | $p = 0.021$ |
| | | Yes | 9.56 | 1.72 | 0.1 | 307 | |

349

350 SD: Standard deviation, SEM: Standard error of mean

351

352 Finally, with respect to **emotional regulation**, housing with *people over 65* [$W= 85283$, $p <$
 353 0.001 ; *Cohen's d*= -0.24 (small)], as well as living with a *dependent or disabled people* [$W=$
 354 54803 , $p = 0.043$; *Cohen's d*= -0.23 (small)], increased suppression strategy. However,
 355 *stablishing routines* increased cognitive re-evaluations as an emotional strategy [$W= 6674$, $p =$
 356 0.017 ; *Cohen's d*= -0.21 (small)] (see Table 6).

357

358 Table 6. Variables of the lockdown that were significantly related to emotional regulation.

| Strategy | Variable | Group | Mean | SD | SEM | n | p values |
|---------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Suppression | People over 65 | No | 14.83 | 5.7 | 0.33 | 294 | $p < 0.001$ |
| | | Yes | 16.23 | 5.23 | 0.88 | 35 | |
| Suppression | Dependents in their care | No | 14.18 | 5.72 | 0.16 | 1247 | $p = 0.043$ |
| | | Yes | 15.5 | 5.7 | 0.57 | 100 | |
| Re-evaluation | Routines | No | 28.47 | 6.16 | 0.38 | 263 | $p = 0.017$ |
| | | Yes | 29.86 | 6.74 | 0.2 | 1084 | |

359

SD: Standard deviation, SEM: Standard error of mean

360

361 Objective 5

362 In order to assess which variables (closeness to the petrochemical complex, COVID-19 and
363 lockdown conditions) are influencing the psychological state, regression analyses were
364 conducted for each psychological outcome score, in which all pertinent variables were
365 included. The variance inflation factors (VIF) of all variables were calculated to evaluate co-
366 linearity problems. All VIFs indexes showed values under 5, indicating the absence of co-
367 linearity between the variables included in each model [42].

368

369 **Perceived Stress Scale (PSS):** The PSS total score is influenced by age ($\beta = -0.36, p < 0.001$); sex
370 (to be male), ($\beta = -0.18, p = 0.001$); or not answering about their perception on petrochemical
371 complex danger ($\beta = -0.13, p = 0.039$). PSS total score was also influenced by not living with
372 people older than 65 years old ($\beta = 0.19, p = 0.006$), losing their job ($\beta = 0.28, p < 0.001$), working
373 during the lockdown ($\beta = -0.24, p = 0.002$), perceiving COVID-19 situation as very dangerous ($\beta =$
374 $0.23, p < 0.001$), and perceiving it as nothing or few dangerous ($\beta = -0.42, p < 0.001$). All the
375 variables entered in the regression (significant and no significant) analysis explain 22% of the
376 PSS variance (r^2 adjusted = 0.22) (see Table 7).

377 Table 7. Regression analysis related to perceived stress.

| | | | TOTAL PSS |
|--|---------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| | | | 378 |
| Predictors | β | CI | p values |
| (Intercept ¹) | 0.06 | -0.06 – 0.17 | 0.321 ³⁷⁹ |
| Age | -0.36 | -0.40 – (-0.31) | <0.001 ³⁸¹ |
| Sex [Male] | -0.18 | -0.28 – (-0.08) | 0.001 ³⁸² |
| Distance to focus | 0.04 | -0.01 – 0.09 | 0.105 ³⁸³ |
| Danger perception [Non] | -0.07 | -0.19 – 0.04 | 0.205 ³⁸⁴ |
| Danger perception [A lot] | 0.11 | -0.05 – 0.26 | 0.170 ³⁸⁵ |
| Danger perception [No answer] | -0.13 | -0.26 – (-0.01) | 0.039 ³⁸⁶ |
| People older than 65 | 0.19 | 0.05 – 0.32 | 0.006 ³⁸⁷ |
| Dependent or disabled people | 0.15 | -0.02 – 0.32 | 0.077 ³⁸⁸ |
| Loosing the job | 0.28 | 0.13 – 0.42 | <0.001 ³⁸⁹ |
| Working | 0.24 | 0.39 – (0.09) | 0.002 ³⁹⁰ |
| Telecommuting | 0.13 | 0.01 – 0.26 | 0.063 ³⁹¹ |
| Going out to work | 0.12 | -0.01 0.26 | 0.070 ³⁹² |
| COVID-19 as dangerous [a lot] | 0.23 | 0.13 0.33 | <0.001 ³⁹³ |
| COVID-19 as dangerous [little or nothing] | -0.16 | -0.56 – (-0.74) | <0.001 ³⁹⁴ |
| Observations: 1611/ | | | 403 |
| R² / R² adjusted: 0.228 / 0.221 | | | 404 |

405
406

407 CI: Confidence interval.

408 ¹The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

409

410 **Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS):** Non-planning score of the BIS is influenced by sex (to be male)

411 (β : -0.12, p =0.040), to work during the lockdown (β = -0.30, p <0.001), stabilishing routines (β =

412 0.32, p <0.001), and perceiving COVID-19 situation as not or little dangerous (β = -0.16, p =

413 0.046). These variables (significant and non-significant) only explain near a 5% of the non-

414 planning score variance (r^2 adjusted = 0.049) (see Table 8).

415 Table 8. Regression analysis related to lack of planification in the BIS.

416

| LACK OF PLANIFICATION | | | | 417 |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|
| Predictors | β | CI | p values | |
| (Intercept¹) | 0.54 | 0.40 – 0.68 | <0.001 | 418 |
| Sex [Male] | 0.12 | 0.24 – (0.01) | 0.046 | 419 |
| Distance to focus | 0.04 | -0.01 – 0.09 | 0.143 | 420 |
| Risk Population | 0.10 | 0.23 – 0.03 | 0.135 | |
| Working | -0.30 | -0.41 – (-0.20) | <0.001 | 421 |
| Routines | -0.32 | -0.45 – (-0.19) | <0.001 | 422 |
| COVID-19 as dangerous [a lot] | -0.06 | -0.17 – 0.05 | 0.296 | 423 |
| COVID-19 as dangerous [little or nothing] | 0.16 | 0.31 – (0.00) | 0.046 | 424 |
| Observations: 1456 | | | | 425 |
| R² / R² adjusted: 0.053 / 0.049 | | | | 426 |

427 CI: Confidence interval.

428 ¹The **intercept** (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

429

430 Motor score of BIS is influenced by living with children ($\beta = -0.14$, $p = 0.011$), working during the
 431 lockout ($\beta = -0.29$, $p < 0.001$), working in the health sector ($\beta = -0.39$, $p = 0.019$), and establishing
 432 routines during the lockout ($\beta = -0.36$, $p < 0.001$). All variables (significant and non-significant)
 433 explain 7% of the motor score variance of the BIS (r^2 adjusted = 0.07) (see Table 9).

434 Table 9. Regression analysis related to motor impulsivity in the BIS.

435

436

437

438

439

| MOTOR IMPULSIVITY | | | 440 |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Predictors | β | CI | p values |
| (Intercept¹) | 0.70 | 0.39 – 1.02 | <0.001 |
| Age | -0.07 | -0.13 – (-0.02) | 0.006 |
| Sex [Male] | 0.10 | -0.02 – 0.22 | 0.088 |
| Minors in their care | -0.14 | -0.24 – (-0.03) | 0.011 |
| Losing the job | 0.14 | -0.03 – 0.31 | 0.115 |
| Working | -0.29 | -0.41 – (-0.17) | <0.001 |
| Sector [no answer] | -0.23 | -0.51 – 0.05 | 0.107 |
| Sector [petrochemical complex] | -0.12 | -0.42 – 0.18 | 0.424 |
| Sector [health] | -0.39 | -0.73 – (-0.06) | 0.019 |
| Routines | -0.36 | -0.49 – (-0.23) | <0.001 |
| Observations: 1456 | | | 448 |
| R² / R² adjusted: 0.079 / 0.073 | | | |

449 CI: Confidence interval.

450 ¹The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

451

452 Cognitive score is influenced by age ($\beta = -0.24, p < 0.001$), sex (to be a male) ($\beta = -0.19, p = 0.001$),
 453 living with children ($\beta = -0.24, p < 0.001$), working ($\beta = -0.27, p < 0.001$), telecommuting ($\beta = 0.13,$
 454 $p = 0.047$), and establishing routines during the lockout ($\beta = -0.23, p < 0.001$). These variables
 455 (significant and non-significant) explain 14% of the cognitive score variance (r^2 adjusted = 0.14)
 456 (see Table 10).

457

458 Table 10. Regression analysis related to cognitive impulsivity in the BIS.

459

460

461

| COGNITIVE IMPULSIVITY | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Predictors | β | CI | p values |
| (Intercept¹) | 0.40 | 0.26 – 0.54 | <0.001 |
| Age | 0.24 | 0.29 – (0.19) | <0.001 |
| Sex [Male] | -0.19 | -0.30 – (-0.07) | 0.001 |
| Distance to the petrochemical complex | 0.04 | -0.00 – 0.09 | 0.014 |
| Minors in their care | -0.24 | -0.34 – (-0.14) | <0.001 |
| Loosing the job | 0.13 | -0.03 – 0.29 | 0.1057 |
| Working | -0.27 | -0.41 – (-0.13) | <0.001 |
| Telecommuting | 0.13 | 0.00 – 0.26 | 0.047 |
| Routines | -0.23 | -0.36 – (-0.11) | <0.001 |
| Covid-19 as dangerous [a lot] | 0.10 | -0.01 – 0.20 | 0.075 |
| Covid-19 as dangerous b13 [little or nothing] | -0.12 | -0.27 – 0.02 | 0.099 |
| Observations: 1456 | | | |
| R² / R² adjusted: 0.17 / 0.111 | | | |

473 CI: Confidence interval.

474 ¹The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

475

476 BIS total score is influenced by age ($\beta = -0.12$, $p < 0.001$), distance of the residence to the
 477 petrochemical complex ($\beta = 0.07$, $p = 0.016$), having children ($\beta = -0.17$, $p = 0.001$), working during
 478 the lockout ($\beta = -0.33$, $p < 0.001$) and establishing routines during that period ($\beta = -0.37$,
 479 $p < 0.001$). All variables (significant and non-significant) explain near a 10% of the total score
 480 variance of the BIS scale (r^2 adjusted = 0.096) (see Table 11).

481

482

483

484 Table 11. Regression analysis related to total impulsivity in the BIS.

| TOTAL IMPULSIVITY | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Predictors | β | CI | p values |
| (Intercept¹) | 0.62 | 0.48 – 0.77 | <0.001 |
| Age | -0.12 | -0.17 – (-0.07) | <0.001 |
| Distance to the petrochemical complex | 0.07 | 0.01 – 0.13 | 0.016 |
| Danger perception [Non] | -0.09 | -0.22 – 0.03 | 0.150 |
| Danger perception [A lot] | 0.10 | -0.08 – 0.27 | 0.278 |
| Danger perception [No answer] | -0.11 | -0.25 – 0.03 | 0.110 |
| Minors in their care | -0.17 | -0.27 – (-0.07) | 0.001 |
| Working | -0.33 | -0.44 – (-0.23) | <0.001 |
| Routines | 0.31 | -0.50 – (-0.25) | <0.001 |
| Observations: 1456 | | | 493 |
| R² / R² adjusted: 0.101 / 0.096 | | | |

494 CI: Confidence interval.

495 ¹The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

496

497 **Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS):** The anxiety score of the HADS is influenced by
 498 age ($\beta= 0.21, p<0.001$), sex (to be male), ($\beta= 0.14, p=0.013$), living with children ($\beta= 0.17,$
 499 $p=0.008$), working during the lockdown ($\beta=0.18, p=0.001$), go out to work ($\beta= -0.16, p=0.011$),
 500 perceiving COVID-19 situation as a lot dangerous ($\beta= -0.33, p<0.001$), and perceiving it nothing
 501 or little dangerous ($\beta= 0.31, p<0.001$). All variables (significant and non-significant of table 8)
 502 explain near 14% of the anxiety score variance (r^2 adjusted = 0.137) (see Table 12).

503

504

505

506 Table 12. Regression analysis related to anxious symptomatology in the HADS.

| Predictors | ANXIOUS SYMPTOMS | | | 507 |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------|-----|
| | β | CI | p values | |
| (Intercept ⁴) | -0.08 | -0.21 0.04 | 0.195 | 508 |
| Age | 0.21 | 0.16 – 0.26 | <0.001 | 509 |
| Sex [Male] | 0.14 | 0.03 0.25 | 0.018 | |
| Distance to the petrochemical complex | -0.04 | -0.10 – 0.01 | 0.095 | 510 |
| Danger perception [Non] | 0.04 | -0.08 – 0.16 | 0.485 | 511 |
| Danger perception [A lot] | -0.16 | -0.33 – 0.00 | 0.056 | |
| Danger perception [No answer] | 0.10 | -0.03 – 0.24 | 0.127 | 512 |
| Minors in their care | 0.17 | 0.07 – 0.27 | 0.001 | |
| Dependent or disabled people | -0.15 | -0.34 – 0.01 | 0.073 | 513 |
| Risk populations | -0.10 | -0.23 – 0.02 | 0.104 | 514 |
| Losing the job | -0.21 | -0.37 – (-0.05) | 0.008 | |
| Working | 0.18 | 0.07 – 0.29 | 0.001 | 515 |
| Going out to work | -0.15 | -0.28 – (-0.04) | 0.011 | |
| Covid-19 as dangerous [A lot] | -0.33 | -0.43 – (-0.22) | <0.001 | 516 |
| Covid-19 as dangerous [Little or nothing] | 0.31 | 0.16 – 0.45 | <0.001 | 517 |
| Observations: 1561 | | | | |
| R ² / R ² adjusted: 0.145 / 0.137 | | | | 518 |

519 CI: Confidence interval.

520 ⁴The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

521

522 The Depression Score of the HADS is influenced by losing their jobs ($\beta= 0.23, p=0.006$) and
 523 establishing routines during the lockdown ($\beta= 0.28, p<0.001$). All variables (significant and non-
 524 significant) explain only 2% of the depression score variance (r^2 adjusted = 0.021) (see Table
 525 13).

526 Table 13. Regression analysis related to depressive symptomatology in the HADS.

527

528

529

| DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Predictors | β | CI | p values |
| (Intercept¹) | -0.33 | -0.47 – (-0.19) | <0.001 |
| Losing the Job | 0.23 | 0.07 – 0.40 | 0.006 |
| Working | 0.10 | -0.01 – 0.21 | 0.055 |
| Routines | 0.28 | 0.15 – 0.40 | <0.001 |
| Covid-19 as dangerous [a lot] | 0.11 | -0.00 – 0.21 | 0.057 |
| Covid-19 as dangerous [little or nothing] | -0.15 | -0.30 – 0.01 | 0.033 |
| Observations: 1561 | | | 530 |
| R² / R² adjusted: 0.025 / 0.021 | | | 531 |

532

533

534

536 CI: Confidence interval.

537 ¹The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

538

539 **Emotional Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ):** Expressive suppression score is influenced by sex
 540 (to be male), ($\beta= 0.48, p<0.001$), distance of the residence to the petrochemical complex ($\beta=$
 541 $0.06, p=0.026$), living with people older than 65 years ($\beta= 0.22, p=0.007$), and telecommute ($\beta=$
 542 $-0.19, p<0.001$). These variables (significant and non-significant) explain 6% of the expressive
 543 suppression score variance (r^2 adjusted = 0.062) (see Table 14).

544

545

546

547

548

549

550 Table 14. Regression analysis related to suppression strategy in the ERQ.

| Predictors | SUPPRESSION | | |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------|
| | β | CI | p values |
| (Intercept ¹) | -0.06 | -0.14 – 0.03 | 0.193 |
| Sex [Male] | 0.48 | 0.36 0.60 | <0.001 |
| Distance to the petrochemical complex | 0.06 | 0.01 – 0.12 | 0.026 |
| Older than 65 years | 0.22 | 0.06 – 0.39 | 0.007 |
| Dependent or disabled people | 0.17 | -0.04 – 0.38 | 0.107 |
| Telecommuting | -0.19 | -0.29 (-0.08) | <0.001 |
| Observations: 1347 | | | 557 |
| R ² / R ² adjusted: 0.065 / 0.062 | | | |

558 CI: Confidence interval.

559 ¹The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

560 Cognitive reappraisal score is influenced by age ($\beta= 0.06, p=0.029$) and by establishing routines
 561 during the lockdown ($\beta= 0.19, p=0.006$). All variables entered in the regression analysis
 562 (significant and non-significant) explain only 1% of the cognitive reappraisal score (r^2 adjusted
 563 = 0.014) (see Table 15).

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572 Table 15. Regression analysis related to re-evaluating strategy in the ERQ.

| REAPPRAISAL | | | |
|---|---------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Predictors | β | CI | p values |
| (Intercept ¹) | -0.18 | -0.31 – (-0.04) | 0.009 |
| Age | 0.06 | 0.01 – 0.12 | 0.025 ⁵ |
| Minors in their care | 0.08 | 0.03 – 0.19 | 0.151 ⁵⁷⁶ |
| Being sick with Covid-19 | -0.29 | -0.65 – 0.07 | 0.113 |
| Risk population | -0.11 | -0.25 – 0.03 | 0.135 ⁵⁷⁷ |
| Going out to work | 0.10 | 0.04 – 0.23 | 0.154 ⁵⁷⁸ |
| Routines | 0.19 | 0.06 – 0.32 | 0.008 |
| Observations: 1347 | | | 579 |
| R ² / R ² adjusted: 0.018 / 0.014 | | | 580 |

581 CI: Confidence interval.

582 ¹The intercept (or constant) is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0.

583

584 DISCUSSION

585 The main goal of this study was to analyze the effects on different psychological outcomes
 586 (stress, impulsivity, anxiety, depression and emotional regulation strategies) derived from the
 587 COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent lockdown in relation to live about a petrochemical
 588 complex. We hypothesized that subjects living near the complex would show higher levels of
 589 psychological impact during the lockout in comparison to individuals living far away from the
 590 focus of environmental pollution. The current results indicate that people living closer to
 591 petrochemical complexes report greater risk perception. However, in contrast to our
 592 hypothesis, no significant relationships between psychological variables and proximity to the
 593 focus were detected when compared people living near to or far away from a
 594 chemical/petrochemical complex.

595 However, it is worthy to note how different conditions during the lockdown affected some of
596 the psychological variables here studied. In this sense, the current data showed that people
597 working and quite going out had a lower perception of stress, whereas individuals who had
598 lost their jobs had a higher stress perception. Therefore, the economic impact of the COVID-
599 19 situation in the area under evaluation could have a deleterious effect on people's health
600 since stress is widely related to both physical and psychological diseases (even if such a
601 differentiation could be made) [43-46] Moreover, psychological distress is prevalent in
602 frequent users of primary health care and emergency departments and has a significant
603 association with frequent use [47]. It suggests that the increase of distress due to the COVID-
604 19 could considerably increase health expenses.

605 The results of the present study also revealed that having minors in their care and stablishing
606 routines reduces total score of impulsivity, together with an increase in planification. It
607 indicates that planification could be an important strategy in order to avoid impulsive
608 decisions and actions that are considered risky, maladaptive and symptomatic of such diverse
609 brain disorders, such as attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, drug addiction and affective
610 disorders (Dalley and Robbins, 2017). A recent study assessing the psychological effects of the
611 lockdown in a Spanish population suggested a relation between the establishment of routines
612 and the levels of resilience in the participants, suggesting a better adaptation to adversity [48].

613 Individuals losing their jobs increased total, motor and cognitive impulsivity, indicating that
614 they were trying to find a solution to the family's economic situation. We believe this is an
615 important characteristic since impulsivity is an important aspect of obsessive-compulsive
616 disorder (OCD), or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) [49-51]. We might also keep
617 in mind that poor executive function increases the likelihood that healthy young adults will
618 engage in risky and potentially dangerous acts (Reynolds et al 2019). Interestingly, although
619 disgracefully, we cannot elude that the pandemic will mean a trauma for children. It is

620 noteworthy that a history of childhood trauma in OCD patients has indirect effects on the
621 severity of OCD and depressive symptoms and is associated with more severe anxiety, higher
622 levels of impulsivity, higher prevalence of ADHD, and lower levels of education [52].

623 On the other hand, our data also show that subjects going out to work decreased both
624 cognitive and total impulsivity, since they had no added economic problems at that time.
625 However, it is important to consider that not working or telecommuting increased planification
626 and decrease impulsivity, which could be a good indicator of mental health.

627 Data regarding anxious and depressive symptomatology were highly surprising. Our results
628 indicated that losing the job reduced anxious symptomatology. Cognitive models of social
629 anxiety disorder (SAD) emphasize anticipatory processing as a prominent maintaining factor
630 occurring before social-evaluative events [53]. In addition, as suggested by Wong, McEvoy
631 [54], anticipatory processing reflected by General Repetitive Thinking factor had moderately
632 large associations with social anxiety and life interference. Considering the aforementioned
633 information, it could be suggested that what increased these symptoms could be the
634 anticipation, but not the fact of losing it.

635 Another surprising result was that having minors in their care increased anxious symptoms,
636 whereas living with dependent or disabled people decreased them. We think that this
637 apparently contradictory result could be related to two different facts: a) perhaps minors are
638 more demanding than dependent people, and b) perhaps dependent subjects are also risk
639 population and living with them -when all over risk population are getting sick or dying -
640 deeply inside, a relief. Interestingly, we also found that establishing routines during the
641 confinement increased depressive symptomatology. In relation to it, although some authors
642 have suggested that positivity is an important attitude of resilient people [55], and others
643 suggested a relation between resilience levels and the establishment of routines (Morales-
644 Vives, Dueñas [48]), the increase in depressive symptomatology should not be interpreted

645 negatively. Since our results are not related to the presence of depressive syndrome, but only
646 depressive symptomatology, the results might indicate an increase of consciousness of the
647 hard situation that we are living, suggesting also that a realistic perspective in life is associated
648 to resilience.

649 Emotional regulation strategies were also affected by some differential conditions. Living with
650 people over 65 years old and dependent people increases suppression, while establishing
651 routines increased re-evaluation strategies. People living with dependent and/or old people
652 tend to suppress emotions as a strategy of regulation. One explanation may be that they do not
653 want to show their real emotions in front of their relatives (old/dependent people). However,
654 establishing routines, which increases planning, could allow to re-evaluate the hard
655 situation that we were living and to focus on benefits more than on harms. It is important to
656 consider that avoidance strategies increase anticipatory anxiety [56], which could be a main
657 factor in the development and maintenance of anxiety disorders.

658 Regarding the regression models implemented, we cannot ignore that the variables used in the
659 present study only explain 22% of the variance in PSS, 10% in BIS, and just 2% in HADS and 1%
660 ERQ. These results mean that the items used in the current survey could not be the more
661 appropriate to detect changes in the psychological variables due to the lockdown situation
662 generated by the COVID-19. Moreover, statistical analysis did not show significant
663 relationships between the risk perception of COVID-19 and any other variables included in the
664 PetroCovid Survey.

665 In conclusion, the results of the present study indicated that living near a big petrochemical
666 complex did not add any adverse psychological influence on the first lockdown due to COVID-
667 19 on the general population in Catalonia. In turn, although we can conclude that the
668 lockdown conditions included in this survey were mainly related to changes in the impulsivity

669 levels of participants, we can also suggest that the economic effects are going to be harder
670 than those initially detected in this study.

671

672 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

673 Authors wish to thank Toni Masip and Montse Marquès by their technical support in the
674 development and dissemination of the Petrocovid Survey (PS).

675

676 REFERENCES

- 677 1. Burningham K, Thrush D. Pollution concerns in context: a comparison of local
678 perceptions of the risks associated with living close to a road and a chemical factory. *J Risk Res.*
679 2004; 7(2):213-32.
- 680 2. Broitman D, Portnov BA. Forecasting health effects potentially associated with the
681 relocation of a major air pollution source. *Environ Res.* 2020; 182:109088.
- 682 3. Nadal M, Mari M, Schuhmacher M, Domingo JL. Multi-compartmental environmental
683 surveillance of a petrochemical area: Levels of micropollutants. *Environ Int.* 2009; 35(2):227-
684 35.
- 685 4. Zheng H, Kong S, Yan Y, Chen N, Yao L, Liu X, et al. Compositions, sources and health
686 risks of ambient volatile organic compounds (VOCs) at a petrochemical industrial park along
687 the Yangtze River. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020; 703:135505.
- 688 5. Jephcote C, Mah A. Regional inequalities in benzene exposures across the European
689 petrochemical industry: A Bayesian multilevel modelling approach. *Environ Int.* 2019;
690 132:104812.

- 691 6. Domingo JL, Marquès M, Nadal M, Schuhmacher M. Health risks for the population
692 living near petrochemical industrial complexes. 1. Cancer risks: A review of the scientific
693 literature. *Environ Res.* 2020; 186:109495.
- 694 7. Bergmann S, Li B, Pilot E, Chen R, Wang B, Yang J. Effect modification of the short-term
695 effects of air pollution on morbidity by season: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci*
696 *Total Environ.* 2020; 716:136985.
- 697 8. Chen PC, Lai YM, Wang JD, Yang CY, Hwang JS, Kuo HW, et al. Adverse effect of air
698 pollution on respiratory health of primary school children in Taiwan. *Environ Health Perspect.*
699 1998; 106(6):331-5.
- 700 9. Zaccarelli-Marino MA, Alessi R, Balderi TZ, Martins MAG. Association between the
701 Occurrence of Primary Hypothyroidism and the Exposure of the Population Near to Industrial
702 Pollutants in São Paulo State, Brazil. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2019; 16(18):3464.
- 703 10. Yang CY, Cheng BH, Hsu TY, Chuang HY, Wu TN, Chen PC. Association between
704 petrochemical air pollution and adverse pregnancy outcomes in Taiwan. *Arch Environ Health.*
705 2002; 57(5):461-5.
- 706 11. Block ML, Elder A, Auten RL, Bilbo SD, Chen H, Chen JC, et al. The outdoor air pollution
707 and brain health workshop. *Neurotoxicology.* 2012; 33(5):972-84.
- 708 12. Calderón-Garcidueñas L, Torres-Jardón R, Kulesza RJ, Park SB, D'Angiulli A. Air pollution
709 and detrimental effects on children's brain. The need for a multidisciplinary approach to the
710 issue complexity and challenges. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2014; 8:613.
- 711 13. Zhang M, Wang Y, Wang Q, Yang D, Zhang J, Wang F, et al. Ethylbenzene-induced
712 hearing loss, neurobehavioral function, and neurotransmitter alterations in petrochemical
713 workers. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2013; 55(9):1001-6.
- 714 14. Aungudornpukdee P, Vichit-Vadakan N, Taneepanichskul S. Factors related to short-
715 term memory dysfunction in children residing near a Petrochemical Industrial Estate. *J Med*
716 *Assoc Thai.* 2010; 93(3):285-92.

- 717 15. Hallman WK, Wandersman A. Attribution of Responsibility and Individual and
718 Collective Coping with Environmental Threats. *J Soc Issues*. 1992; 48(4):101-18.
- 719 16. Peek MK, Cutchin MP, Freeman D, Stowe RP, Goodwin JS. Environmental hazards and
720 stress: evidence from the Texas City Stress and Health Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.
721 2009; 63(10):792-8.
- 722 17. Luginah IN, Taylor SM, Elliott SJ, Eyles JD. Community responses and coping strategies
723 in the vicinity of a petroleum refinery in Oakville, Ontario. *Health Place*. 2002; 8(3):177-90.
- 724 18. Burby RJ. Heavy Industry, People, and Planners: New Insights on an Old Issue. *J Plan*
725 *Educ Res*. 1999; 19(1):15-25.
- 726 19. Axelsson G, Stockfelt L, Andersson E, Gidlof-Gunnarsson A, Sallsten G, Barregard L.
727 Annoyance and worry in a petrochemical industrial area--prevalence, time trends and risk
728 indicators. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2013; 10(4):1418-38.
- 729 20. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The
730 psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The*
731 *Lancet*. 2020; 395(10227):912-20.
- 732 21. Odriozola-González P, Planchuelo-Gómez Á, Iruetia MJ, de Luis-García R. Psychological
733 effects of the COVID-19 outbreak and lockdown among students and workers of a Spanish
734 university. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020; 290:113108.
- 735 22. Li S, Wang Y, Xue J, Zhao N, Zhu T, Joer, health p. The impact of COVID-19 epidemic
736 declaration on psychological consequences: a study on active Weibo users. *Int J Environ Res*
737 *Public Health*. 2020; 17(6):2032.
- 738 23. Restubog SLD, Ocampo ACG, Wang L. Taking control amidst the chaos: Emotion
739 regulation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Vocat Behav*. 2020; 119:103440.
- 740 24. Chiang TY, Yuan TH, Shie RH, Chen CF, Chan CC. Increased incidence of allergic rhinitis,
741 bronchitis and asthma, in children living near a petrochemical complex with SO₂ pollution.
742 *Environ Int*. 2016; 96:1-7.


- 743 25. Marquès M, Domingo JL, Nadal M, Schuhmacher M. Health risks for the population
744 living near petrochemical industrial complexes. 2. Adverse health outcomes other than cancer.
745 Sci Total Environ. 2020; 730:139122.
- 746 26. Adamkiewicz G, Hsu HH, Vallarino J, Melly SJ, Spengler JD, Levy JI. Nitrogen dioxide
747 concentrations in neighborhoods adjacent to a commercial airport: a land use regression
748 modeling study. Environ Health. 2010; 9:73.
- 749 27. Hauptman M, Gaffin JM, Petty CR, Sheehan WJ, Lai PS, Coull B, et al. Proximity to
750 major roadways and asthma symptoms in the School Inner-City Asthma Study. J Allergy Clin
751 Immunol. 2020; 145(1):119-26.e4.
- 752 28. Lisboa L, Klarián J, Campos RT, Iglesias V. Proximity of residence to an old mineral
753 storage site in Chile and blood lead levels in children. Cad Saude Publica. 2016;
754 32(4):e00023515.
- 755 29. Thongtip S, Siviroj P, Deesomchok A, Wisetborisut A, Prapamontol T. Association of
756 health-related quality of life with residential distance from home stone-mortar factories in
757 Northern Thailand. EnvironmentAsia. 2019; 12:140-50.
- 758 30. Thongtip S, Siviroj P, Deesomchok A, Wisetborisut A, Prapamontol T. Crystalline Silica
759 Exposure and Air Quality Perception of Residents Living Around Home Stone Factories. Sains
760 Malaysiana. 2020; 49.
- 761 31. Verhaegh BPM, Bijmens EM, van den Heuvel TRA, Goudkade D, Zeegers MP, Nawrot TS,
762 et al. Ambient air quality as risk factor for microscopic colitis – A geographic information
763 system (GIS) study. Environ Res. 2019; 178:108710.
- 764 32. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A Global Measure of Perceived Stress. J Health Soc
765 Behav. 1983; 24(4):385-96.
- 766 33. Remor E. Psychometric properties of a European Spanish version of the Perceived
767 Stress Scale (PSS). Span J Psychol. 2006; 9(1):86-93.

- 768 34. Zigmund AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatr*
769 *Scand.* 1983; 67(6):361-70.
- 770 35. Brennan C, Worrall-Davies A, McMillan D, Gilbody S, House A. The Hospital Anxiety and
771 Depression Scale: A diagnostic meta-analysis of case-finding ability. *J Psychosom Res.* 2010;
772 69(4):371-8.
- 773 36. Terol M, López-Roig S, Rodríguez-Marín J, Martí-Aragón M, Pastor M, Reig M.
774 Propiedades psicométricas de la Escala Hospitalaria de Ansiedad y Depresión (HADS) en
775 población española. *Ansiedad y Estrés.* 2007; 13(2-3):163-76.
- 776 37. Barratt ES. Impulsiveness and anxiety: Information processing and
777 electroencephalograph topography. *J Res Pers.* 1987; 21(4):453-63.
- 778 38. Oquendo M, Baca-García E, Graver RL, Morales M, Montalvan V, Mann JJ. Spanish
779 adaptation of the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS-11). *Eur J Psychiatry.* 2001; 15:147-55.
- 780 39. Gross JJ, John OP. Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes:
781 Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2003; 85(2):348-62.
- 782 40. Cabello R, Salguero JM, Fernández-Berrocal P, Gross JJ. A Spanish Adaptation of the
783 Emotion Regulation Questionnaire. *Eur J Psychol Assess.* 2013; 29(4):234-40.
- 784 41. Pierce CA, Block RA, Aguinis H. Cautionary Note on Reporting Eta-Squared Values from
785 Multifactor ANOVA Designs. *Educ Psychol Meas.* 2004; 64(6):916-24.
- 786 42. Akinwande O, Dikko HG, Agboola S. Variance Inflation Factor: As a Condition for the
787 Inclusion of Suppressor Variable(s) in Regression Analysis. *Open J Stat.* 2015; 05:754-67.
- 788 43. Cohen S, Gianaros PJ, Manuck SB. A Stage Model of Stress and Disease. *Perspect*
789 *Psychol Sci.* 2016; 11(4):456-63.
- 790 44. McEwen BS, Akil H. Revisiting the Stress Concept: Implications for Affective Disorders. *J*
791 *Neurosci.* 2020; 40(1):12-21.
- 792 45. Yaribeygi H, Panahi Y, Sahraei H, Johnston TP, Sahebkar A. The impact of stress on
793 body function: A review. *Excli J.* 2017; 16:1057-72.

- 794 46. Peters A, McEwen BS, Friston K. Uncertainty and stress: Why it causes diseases and
795 how it is mastered by the brain. *Prog Neurobiol*. 2017; 156:164-88.
- 796 47. Margo-Dermer E, Dépelteau A, Girard A, Hudon C. Psychological distress in frequent
797 users of primary health care and emergency departments: a scoping review. *Public Health*.
798 2019; 172:1-7.
- 799 48. Morales-Vives F, Dueñas JM, Vigil-Colet A, Camarero-Figuerola M. Psychological
800 Variables Related to Adaptation to the COVID-19 Lockdown in Spain. *Front Psychol*. 2020;
801 11:565634.
- 802 49. Sahmelikoglu Onur O, Tabo A, Aydin E, Tuna O, Maner AF, Yildirim EA, et al.
803 Relationship between impulsivity and obsession types in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Int J*
804 *Psychiatry Clin Pract*. 2016; 20(4):218-23.
- 805 50. Frydman I, Mattos P, de Oliveira-Souza R, Yücel M, Chamberlain SR, Moll J, et al. Self-
806 reported and neurocognitive impulsivity in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Compr Psychiatry*.
807 2020; 97:152155.
- 808 51. Adler LA, Faraone SV, Spencer TJ, Berglund P, Alperin S, Kessler RC. The structure of
809 adult ADHD. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2017; 26(1).
- 810 52. Çoban A, Tan O. Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, Impulsivity, Anxiety, and
811 Depression Symptoms Mediating the Relationship Between Childhood Trauma and Symptoms
812 Severity of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Noro Psikiyatrs Ars*. 2020; 57(1):37.
- 813 53. Sluis RA, Boschen MJ, Neumann DL, Murphy K. Anticipatory processing in social
814 anxiety: Investigation using attentional control theory. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry*. 2017;
815 57:172-9.
- 816 54. Wong QJJ, McEvoy PM, Rapee RM. Repetitive Thinking in Social Anxiety Disorder: Are
817 Anticipatory Processing and Post-Event Processing Facets of an Underlying Unidimensional
818 Construct? *Behav Ther*. 2019; 50(3):571-81.

- 819 55. Shing EZ, Jayawickreme E, Waugh CE. Contextual Positive Coping as a Factor
820 Contributing to Resilience After Disasters. *J Clin Psychol.* 2016; 72(12):1287-306.
- 821 56. Auxéméry Y. Treatment of post-traumatic psychiatric disorders: A continuum of
822 immediate, post-immediate and follow-up care mediated by specific psychotherapeutic
823 principles. *Clinical experience in French-speaking countries. L'Encéphale.* 2018; 44(5):403-8.
- 824

Figure 1



A: Spanish government announce the national lockdown (medium lockdown).

B: Spanish government announce the lockdown of workers of all non essential services (high lockdown).

C: Some non essential workers can go back to the work (medium lockdown).

D: Start of the lockdown de-escalation.

Source: National Epidemiological Surveillance Network (RENAVE). Carlos III Health Institute (ISCIII). Spain.

Figure 2




Figure 3

