

1 The Correlation Between Brain Performance Capacity and COVID-19: A Cross-
2 sectional Survey and Canonical Correlation Analysis

3 Y Liu ^a, X Chen ^b, JS Xian ^c, R Wang ^c, K Ma ^c, K Xu ^d, X Yang ^c, FL Wang ^c, N Mu ^c, S Wang ^c, Y
4 Lai ^c, T Li ^a, CY Yang ^c, YL Quan ^c, H Feng ^{c*}, LH Wang ^{a*}, TN Chen ^{c, d*}

5 ^a Army Medical University, Southwest Hospital, Administrative Office, Chongqing, 400038, China.

6 ^b Chongqing Medical University, University Town Hospital, Pediatrics Department, Chongqing
7 400031, China

8 ^c Army Medical University, Southwest Hospital, Neurosurgery Department, Chongqing 400038, China

9 ^d Army Medical University, Southwest Hospital, Army Aviation Medicine Teaching and Research
10 Office, Chongqing, 400038, China.

11

12 **ABSTRACT**

13 **Objective:** To generate a concept of brain performance capacity (BPC) with sleep, fatigue and mental
14 workload as evaluation indicators and to analyze the correlation between BPC and the impact of COVID-
15 19.

16 **Methods:** A cluster sampling method was adopted to randomly select 259 civil air crew members. The
17 measurements of sleep quality, fatigue and mental workload (MWL) were assessed using the Pittsburgh
18 Sleep Quality Index (PSQI), Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI-20) and NASA Task Load Index.
19 The impact of COVID-19 included 7 dimensions scored on a Likert scale. Canonical correlation analysis
20 (CCA) was conducted to examine the relationship between BPC and COVID-19.

21 **Results:** A total of 259 air crew members participated in the survey. Participants' average PSQI score
22 was 7.826 (SD = 3.796), with 49.8% reporting incidents of insomnia, mostly of a minor degree.
23 Participants' MFI was an average 56.112 (SD = 10.040), with 100% reporting some incidence of fatigue,
24 mainly severe. The weighted mental workload (MWL) score was an average of 43.084 (SD = 17.543),
25 with reports of mostly a mid-level degree. There was a significant relationship between BPC and
26 COVID-19, with a canonical correlation coefficient of 0.507 ($P=0.000$), an eigenvalue of 0.364 and a
27 contribution rate of 69.1%. All components of the BPC variable set: PSQI, MFI and MWL contributed
28 greatly to BPC, with absolute canonical loadings of 0.790, 0.606 and 0.667, respectively; the same was
29 true for the COVID-19 variable set, with absolute canonical loadings ranging from 0.608 to 0.951.

30 **Conclusion:** Multiple indicators to measure BPC and the interrelationship of BPC and COVID-19 should
31 be used in future research to gain a comprehensive understanding of anti-epidemic measures to ensure
32 victory in the battle against the spread of the disease.

33 **Keywords:** COVID-19, mental health, brain performance capacity, flight crews

34 INTRODUCTION

35 Brain performance capacity, a complex concept, is associated with memory, cognitive capacities,
36 attention, and work efficiency. This has been tested by research and resulted in much evidence. As early
37 as 1975, Kahn, R L(1) held the idea that impaired memory and depression were the products of poor
38 brain performance. L. Nyberg also argued that brain maintenance constituted the primary determinant of
39 successful memory aging (2). In modern society, it is vital for optimal performance to enhance or
40 preserve the cognitive performance of personnel working in stressful, demanding and/or high-tempo
41 environments (3). Furthermore, the ability to focus attention on tasks may contribute to peak brain
42 performance and high-level work efficiency. A. Yamashita found that individuals with attention-
43 deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) spent more time and energy maintaining optimal and effective
44 performance behavior during tasks that required sustained attention (4).

45 It is well known that in some professional contexts, such as aviation, where staying in good physical
46 condition is requisite, there are additional traits, such as BPC, that are important factors for success.
47 However, how can this aspect be valued? We have a remarkably poor understanding of what the direct
48 indicator might be in measuring BPC.

49 However, there are some factors, such as sleep, fatigue-free state, and appropriate level of mental
50 workload, which are thought to be related to performance; vigilant attention and long memory are also
51 traits that may indirectly boost peak brain performance. Much evidence suggests that the right number
52 of hours and quality of sleep improves working memory (5), vigilant attention (6), concentration (7), but
53 fatigue and high-level mental workload impair them (8-13). Taking flight crews as an example, members
54 and particularly pilots, are submitted to high, exigent work demands and must manage multiple tasks at
55 the same time. In addition, they are continuously exposed to stimuli that compete for their attention and

56 ability to manage their resources to make the right decisions. These task-oriented responsibilities are
57 further complicated by complex flying factors, such as long trips and varying shift flights.

58 It was reported that the majority of accidents, 60%~90%, are attributed to “human error” (14-16)
59 and occur when flight crews are subjected to a high and intensive mental workload level (17). Thus, BPC
60 is a prerequisite to ensure flight safety. The COVID-19 pandemic has had a huge impact on people’s
61 lives, the economy, physical-mental health, and BPC, since the outbreak began in 2020. Because of the
62 instability and resurgence of the disease, it will continue to have a negative impact for some time even
63 though we have entered a new period known as the normalized era of COVID-19. Like the general
64 population, aviation crews have been exposed to high-risk environments COVID-19 environments for a
65 long time. Thus, this study aimed to assess the impact in the following ways: 1) update information about
66 the sleep quality, fatigue and mental workload of commercial flight crews in the normalized era of
67 COVID-19 in China, and 2) generate a dependent variable cluster named BPC with indicators such as
68 sleep quality, fatigue and mental workload and to explore the relationship between BPC and the impact
69 of COVID-19 in this new era.

70 **METHODS**

71 *2.1 Participants and study design*

72 This was a cluster sampling and cross-sectional study. The recommended minimum sample size
73 was 200, which was 10 times the number of MFI-20 for a maximum number of entries in this study (18).
74 Estimating a 20% invalid survey response rate, the expected sample was at least 240. The final sample
75 was 259.

76 *Questionnaire Star* was used to collect sociodemographic data and key targets (sleep, fatigue and
77 mental workload) from 25 November to 2 December 2021. Inclusion criteria: a. volunteer to participate

78 in this survey, b. have the ability to use basic modern information technology, such as WeChat or
79 computers. Exclusion criteria: a. not full-attended during the investigation request period due to any
80 reasons, b. have physical and mental illness. The eligible participants were asked to answer all the
81 questions about sleep, fatigue and mental workload in the previous month. Subjects logged on to
82 Questionnaire Star via WeChat with a smartphone or computer. Individuals completing the survey
83 received a red envelope with a random amount of money as compensation from *Questionnaire Star*.

84 Demographics including gender, age, BMI, position, and social jet lag, were collected. Respondents
85 were also asked about the severity of the impact of COVID-19 on them and scored their responses on a
86 Likert scale (1= never, 5 = extremely serious). This scale included seven dimensions: fear of self-
87 infection (C1); fear of ineffective prevention and control (C2); physical unwellness caused by regular
88 nucleic acid testing (C3); increased workload of personal protective equipment (C4); sleep quality (C5);
89 mental fatigue (C6); and physical fatigue (C7).

90 *2.2 Scales to measure indicators of BPC*

91 2.2.1 Fatigue Assessment

92 A multidimensional fatigue inventory (MFI-20) was conducted to evaluate the fatigue of
93 commercial pilots. The scale was created by Ellen Smets and colleagues (19) in 1995 and has been
94 translated into various languages by other researchers worldwide. The 20-item scale was designed to
95 evaluate five dimensions of fatigue: general fatigue, physical fatigue, reduced activity, reduced
96 motivation and mental fatigue. Twenty questions were rated on a 5-point scale (“yes, that is true” to “no,
97 that is not true”). The higher the total score was, the greater the fatigue. The total MFI scores range from
98 0 to 100 and are interpreted as no fatigue (0-20), minor fatigue (21-39), serious fatigue (40-59), severe
99 fatigue (60-79) and extremely severe fatigue (80-100). This scale has been verified by Chinese scholars

100 and can be used to test the fatigue of Chinese pilots (20).

101 2.2.2 Sleep Assessment

102 The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) was used to assess the sleep quality of the participants.

103 This mature scale, widely used to evaluate sleep quality, has 7 items: sleep latency, sleep duration, sleep

104 quality, habitual efficiency, sleep disturbance, use of sleeping medications and daytime dysfunction²¹.

105 Total PSQI scores range from 0 to 21, and 8 points or more is regarded as a sleep disorder, 8-10 points

106 as a minor sleep disorder, 11-15 points as a serious sleep disorder, and 16 points or more as a severe

107 sleep disorder (22). The higher the score was, the worse the sleep quality.

108 2.2.3 Mental Workload Assessment

109 NASA Task Load Index (NASA TLX) (23) was utilized to measure the mental workload of the

110 participants. It is a tool for measuring and conducting a subjective mental workload (MWL) assessment.

111 It allows the subject to determine the MWL of a participant while they are performing a task. It rates

112 performance across six dimensions to determine an overall workload rating. The six dimensions are as

113 follows:

114 (1). Mental demand: How much thinking, deciding, or calculating was required to perform the task?

115 (2). Physical demand: How much physical activity and intensity was required to complete the task?

116 (3). Temporal demand: What kind of time pressure was involved in completing the task?

117 (4). Effort: How hard does the participant have to work to maintain his or her level of performance?

118 (5). Performance: How successful was the individual in completing the task?

119 (6). Frustration level: How insecure and discouraged or secure and content did the participant feel

120 during the task?

121 Each subscale is presented to the participants either during or after the experimental trial. They are

122 asked to rate their score on an interval scale ranging from low (1) to high (100). The TLX also employs
123 a paired comparisons procedure. This involves presenting 15 pairwise combinations to the participants
124 and asking them to select the scale from each pair that has the most effect on the workload during the
125 task under analysis. This procedure accounts for two potential sources of between-rater variability:
126 differences in workload definition between the raters and differences in the sources or workload between
127 the tasks. The total MWL score is 0-100 points. The higher the scores, the higher the mental workload.
128 In this study, we used the weighted workload score. This scale has been verified by Chinese scholars and
129 can be used to test the mental workload of Chinese pilots.

130 *2.3 Statistical analyses*

131 The statistical analyses were carried out by IBM SPSS Statistics 26.0. All answer sheets were error-
132 checked by the study team. The QQ chart and Bonferroni test were used to check the former's normality
133 and homogeneity of the variance. Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA), a multivariate analysis of the
134 association between sets of multiple independent and dependent variables, was administered to explore
135 the relationship between BPC and the impact of COVID-19. Each set can be named. The canonical
136 correlation coefficient (R_c) maximizes the correlation between the canonical variate obtained by
137 synthesizing multiple independent and dependent variables. In this study, we constructed an independent
138 variable set named *COVID-19* that affected the dependent variable set: sleep quality, fatigue state and
139 mental workload, which was named *brain performance capacity (BPC)*. The relationships between the
140 2 sets of variables were interpreted using canonical loadings to determine how much each variable
141 contributed to its own set and using canonical cross-loadings to determine how much each variable
142 contributed to the other set. The significance level (p) of the correlation was set at 0.05, and a
143 loading >0.30 was regarded as an important contribution.

144 RESULTS

145 3.1 Participant

146 In total, 259 flight crew members participated, and the number of valid responses was 100% without any
147 missing data. Overall, 51.7% of the flight crew members ($n = 134$) were male, and 48.3% were female
148 ($n=125$). The age of the participants ranged from 17 to 55 years, with an average of 28.204 ± 6.728 . The
149 weighted NASA-TLX scores ranged from 0 to 100, and the mean score was 43.084 ± 17.543 . The PSQI
150 scores ranged from 0~22 with a mean score of 7.826 ± 3.796 , and the MFI score ranged from 22 to 77
151 with a mean score of 56.112 ± 10.040 . The insomnia incidence of the participants was 49.8%, mainly
152 minor insomnia (30.2%), followed by serious (15.8%) and severe insomnia (1.9%), with a significant
153 difference among the insomnia degrees ($X^2=134.745$, $P=0.000$). The fatigue incidence was 100%, mainly
154 severe fatigue (47.9%), followed by serious (42.1%) and minor fatigue (10%), with significant difference
155 among them ($X^2=64.548$, $P=0.000$). The distribution of civil aviation crew BPCs is detailed in Table 1.

156 3.2 CCA of BPC and COVID-19

157 3.2.1 Spearman's Correlation

158 Table 2 shows the correlation coefficient matrix among the three components of BPC scales and the
159 seven domains of COVID-19 impact on the civil aviation crews. Except for C4 and MFI, the correlation
160 coefficients among the components were significant, from the lowest absolute value of 0.140 ($P<0.05$)
161 to the largest absolute value of 0.896 ($P < 0.01$).

162 3.2.2 Canonical Correlation

163 The CCA was performed between BPC variables and COVID-19 variables, and the outcome
164 contained 3 pairs of canonical variables. The correlation coefficient of the first pair of canonical variates
165 was statistically significant ($P=0.000 < 0.05$), with the correlation coefficient having a value of 0.517,

166 an eigenvalue of 0.364, and a contribution rate of 69.1%. Thus, only the first pair of canonical variables
167 was analyzed further (Table 3).

168 According to Table 4, which shows the standardized canonical correlation coefficients, a set of
169 linear combinations within a group of typical variables can be obtained:

$$170 \text{ BPC} = -0.485 * \text{MWL} - 0.610 * \text{PSQI} - 0.312 * \text{MFI}$$

$$171 \text{ COVID-19} = 0.088 * \text{C1} - 0.114 * \text{C2} - 0.511 * \text{C3} + 0.464 * \text{C4} - 0.872 * \text{C5} + 0.086 * \text{C6} - 0.132 * \text{C7}$$

172 The proportion variance explained by the BPC set was 48.3%, and that explained by the COVID-
173 19 set was 58%.

174 Fig 1 shows the canonical loadings of the BPC set and the COVID-19 set. All MWL, PSQI and MFI
175 contribute greatly to BPC, with an absolute value of the lowest canonical loading coefficient of 0.606.
176 All components of COVID-19 contribute greatly to COVID-19, with absolute values of canonical
177 loading coefficients from 0.608 to 0.951. This indicates that the indicators MWL, PSQI and MFI could
178 well inflect the BPC. Similarly, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 and C7 present the impacts of COVID-19 on
179 civil aviation crews.

180 **DISCUSSION**

181 This study updated the data on civil aviation crews regarding sleep quality, fatigue and mental
182 workload in the new stage of normalized epidemic era of COVID-19 in China. The insomnia incidence
183 was 49.8%, and gender, position and driving experience had no significant impact. There was a high
184 level of fatigue, with a 100% incidence reported by participants, which was much higher than that
185 reported by US army aviators (24). Men were more tired than women. The MWL was reported to be
186 mid-level, with a weighted score of 43.084 ± 17.543 . Furthermore, the older the age and the higher the
187 BMI were, the worse the sleep, the more fatigued and the higher the mental workload level.

188 It also first reported here that a comprehensive evaluation of BPC can be made through the
189 assessment index cluster we built. Many studies have reported the effects of sleep quality, fatigue and
190 mental workload on individuals' memory, attention, reaction, and mental health, which could directly or
191 indirectly respond to brain performance. *Yamashita, A* hold the idea (25) that individuals with attention-
192 deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) have unstable and unreliable behaviors related to the state of their
193 brains, whereas those without ADHD have an optimal brain state that guides their more stable and
194 reliable behavior. The brain has plasticity. L. L. Beason-Held (26) tested the hypotheses that stable task
195 performance could be supported by stable brain performance or that stable performance could be
196 maintained by changing brain functions if the change was a compensatory reorganization of function.
197 We also found that sleep quality, fatigue and mental workload responded well to BPC. Each indicator
198 contributed greatly to BPC, as there were strong loadings of MWL (loading=-0.677), PSQI (loading=-
199 0.790), and MFI (loading=-0.606). As concluded by *Walker, Matthew P, et al.*, the brain under sleep
200 deprivation exhibits inattention, decreased working memory, and insufficient motivation to learn (27).
201 We also found that the higher the MWL level was, the lower the BPC; the worse the sleep quality was,
202 the lower the BPC; and the more fatigued an individual was, the lower his or her BPC. These findings
203 may provide new perspectives on how to evaluate BPC.

204 Additionally, this study highlighted the impact of COVID-19 on civil flight crews. The COVID-19
205 pandemic has had a profound impact on the aviation industry, leading to job loss, furlough, disruption of
206 careers and training trajectories and uncertainties, even leading to self-harm among airline employees
207 (28). In addition, there is evidence that COVID-19 induces fears, including fear of infection and fear of
208 passing the infection to others due to ineffective prevention and control measures from the government.
209 Due to the vagaries of the epidemic, people receive nucleic acid tests (NATs) on a fixed schedule or and

210 at any time during the period of normalized control of the epidemic in China. Special occupations in the
211 airlines and health care require not only masks but also personal protective equipment such as gloves,
212 gowns and hats, which is bound to increase the workload of these employees. COVID-19 causes sleep
213 problems such as difficulties initiating and maintaining sleep (29) and fatigue, including mental fatigue
214 and physical fatigue (30). With the statistical analysis of canonical loadings of the COVID-19 set, we
215 also found that the fear of infection(C1), fear of ineffective prevention and control(C2), physical
216 unwellness caused by NAT(C3), increased workload of personal protective equipment(C4), sleep
217 quality(C5), mental fatigue(C6) and physical fatigue(C7) all contributed greatly to the impact of COVID-
218 19, with a loading of -0.608, -0.689, -0.774, -0.617, -0.951, -0.818 and -0.813, respectively. The more
219 severe the impact of COVID-19 was, the worse the BPC.

220 We also explored the relationship between BPC and the impact of COVID-19 with CCA. We found
221 that a moderate positive correlation existed between BPC and the impact of COVID-19, with a
222 correlation of 0.517. The correlation indicated that the more severe the impact of COVID-19 was on civil
223 aviation crews, the stronger the BPC. However, the pandemic has been in a normalized control period in
224 China. As of 24:00 on November 25, 2021, there had been 860 confirmed cases (including 8 severe
225 cases), 93,087 cured and discharged cases, 4,636 deaths, 98,583 confirmed cases and 4 suspected cases;
226 a total of 1,315,485 close contacts had been traced, and 28,342 close contacts were still under medical
227 observation, according to a report from the National Health Commission of the People's Republic of
228 China (31). COVID-19 was still a predictor of BPC. This finding may suggest that there is a long way to
229 go in the fight against COVID-19, and the negative influences should not be underestimated. There are
230 some valid concerns about how to boost the BPC to respond to the impact of COVID-19 on individuals.

231 This study has limitations that need to be considered. First, this was a cross-sectional study, so it

232 cannot provide a cause-and-effect relationship. Because BPC is dynamic, more rigorous study designs,
233 such as cohort studies, should be conducted in the future. Second, although sleep, fatigue and mental
234 workload were successfully used as evaluation indicators of BPC, the assessment tools in this study were
235 mainly scales that are subjective. Therefore, more evaluation indicators of BPC should be explored and
236 combined with objective evaluation indicators.

237 **CONCLUSION**

238 BPC could be assessed by sleep quality, fatigue and mental workload. In the normalized epidemic
239 era of COVID-19 in China, the pandemic can positively affect the level of brain performance of
240 commercial flight crews. Considerations including multiple indicators to measure BPC and the
241 relationship between BPC and COVID-19 should be considered in future research to gain a
242 comprehensive view of anti-epidemic measures as soon as possible.

243 **Acknowledgements**

244 **Ethical approval and consent to participate**

245 Guided by the 2000 Declaration of Helsinki for ethical standards, the protocol was approved by the
246 Ethics Committee of the First Affiliated Hospital of Army Medical University, PLA (Ref: KY2021047).
247 Informed consent was obtained from the participants prior to their participation. There, they were able
248 to read a 2-page informed consent form. After reading the consent, they could decide whether to take
249 part in this survey. Those who agreed to participate in the study were required to electronically sign the
250 consent form and then to complete the questionnaire; otherwise, the Questionnaire Star would end the
251 interview directly.

252 **Funding**

253 This study was supported by Chongqing Municipal Education Commission titled *Research on the*

254 *Construction of Intelligent Supervision System of Mental Workload and Its Key Technologies*
255 *(CYS21523).*

256 **Competing interesting**

257 The authors declare that they have no competing interests. All authors have read the manuscript and
258 agreed to publish.

259 **Clinical Trial Registry**

260 This study is registered in the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry, number ChiCTR2100053133.

261 **Authors' contributions**

262 HF, TNC and LHW conceived, designed, and supervised the study; YL, XC, YL, NM, KX collected
263 the data; YL, JSX, FLW and TL finalized the analysis, designed the study and interpreted the findings;
264 YL and XC drafted the manuscript; YLQ, SW, RW and CYY interpreted the findings and helped revise
265 drafts of the manuscript. all authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript, and agree
266 with the order of presentation of the authors.

267 **References**

- 268 1. Kahn RL, Zarit SH, Hilbert NM, Niederehe G. Memory complaint and impairment in the
269 aged. The effect of depression and altered brain function. Archives of general psychiatry.
270 1975;32(12):1569-73.
- 271 2. Nyberg L, Lovden M, Riklund K, Lindenberger U, Backman L. Memory aging and brain
272 maintenance. Trends Cogn Sci. 2012;16(5):292-305.
- 273 3. Tooley KL. Effects of the Human Gut Microbiota on Cognitive Performance, Brain
274 Structure and Function: A Narrative Review. Nutrients. 2020;12(10):17.
- 275 4. Yamashita A, Rothlein D, Kucyi A, Valera EM, Esterman M. Brain state-based detection of

- 276 attentional fluctuations and their modulation. *Neuroimage*. 2021;236.
- 277 5. Goldi M, Rasch B. Effects of targeted memory reactivation during sleep at home depend on
278 sleep disturbances and habituation. *Npj Science of Learning*. 2019;4(1).
- 279 6. Mao TX, Dinges D, Deng Y, Zhao K, Yang ZJ, Lei H, et al. Impaired Vigilant Attention
280 Partly Accounts for Inhibition Control Deficits After Total Sleep Deprivation and Partial
281 Sleep Restriction. *Nature and Science of Sleep*. 2021;13:1545-60.
- 282 7. Hudson AN, Van Dongen HPA, Honn KA. Sleep deprivation, vigilant attention, and brain
283 function: a review. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2020;45(1):21-30.
- 284 8. Hoskens MCJ, Uiga L, Cooke A, Capio CM, Masters RSW. The effects of fatigued working
285 memory functions on hypothesis testing during acquisition of a motor skill. *Journal of*
286 *experimental psychology General*. 2021.
- 287 9. Jain S, Nataraja NP. The Effect of Fatigue on Working Memory and Auditory Perceptual
288 Abilities in Trained Musicians. *American Journal of Audiology*. 2019;28(2):483-94.
- 289 10. Wang H, Liu X, Li J, Xu T, Bezerianos A, Sun Y, et al. Driving Fatigue Recognition With
290 Functional Connectivity Based on Phase Synchronization. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive*
291 *and Developmental Systems*. 2021;13(3):668-78.
- 292 11. Riley EA, Owora A, McCleary J, Anderson A. Sleepiness, Exertion Fatigue, Arousal, and
293 Vigilant Attention in Persons With Chronic Aphasia. *American Journal of Speech-Language*
294 *Pathology*. 2019;28(4):1491-508.
- 295 12. Xing X, Zhong B, Luo H, Rose T, Li J, Antwi-Afari MF. Effects of physical fatigue on the
296 induction of mental fatigue of construction workers: A pilot study based on a
297 neurophysiological approach. *Automation in Construction*. 2020;120.

- 298 13. Wang H, Liu X, Hu H, Wan F, Li T, Gao L, et al. Dynamic Reorganization of Functional
299 Connectivity Unmasks Fatigue Related Performance Declines in Simulated Driving. *Ieee*
300 *Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*. 2020;28(8):1790-9.
- 301 14. Park S-J, Jeon E-C. A Study on the Safety and Management Plan of Aviation Maintenance
302 due to Human Error. *Journal of the Korean Society of Manufacturing Process Engineers*.
303 2020;19(10):68-73.
- 304 15. Lyu T, Song W, Du K. Human Factors Analysis of Air Traffic Safety Based on HFACS-BN
305 Model. *Applied Sciences-Basel*. 2019;9(23).
- 306 16. Budde D, Hinkelbein J, Boyd DD. Analysis of Air Taxi Accidents (20042018) and
307 Associated Human Factors by Aircraft Performance Class. *Aerospace medicine and human*
308 *performance*. 2021;92(5):294-302.
- 309 17. Christopher D. Wickens WSH, Justin G. Hollands, Simon Banbury. *Engineering Psychology*
310 *and Human Performance*. 5th Edition ed. New York: Routledge; 2021.
- 311 18. Chenfeng. *Medical Multivariate Statistics*: China Statistics Press; 2019.
- 312 19. Smets EM, Garssen B, Bonke B, De Haes JC. The Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI)
313 psychometric qualities of an instrument to assess fatigue. *J Psychosom Res*. 1995;39(3):315-
314 25.
- 315 20. Lin R, Yan C, Rui J. The reliability and validity of the Chinese version of the
316 Multidimensional Fatigue Scale for pilots. *Chin J Convalescent Med* 2016;25:332-4.(In
317 Chinese)
- 318 21. Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF, 3rd, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburgh Sleep
319 Quality Index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res*.

- 320 1989;28(2):193-213.
- 321 22. Jixian L, Maoqin T, Lei H, et al. Reliability and validity of the Pittsburgh sleep quality index.
322 Shandong Mental Health Center, Jinan 1996:103-7.(In Chinese)
- 323 23. Hart SG, Staveland LE. Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of
324 Empirical and Theoretical Research. In: Hancock PA, Meshkati N, editors. Advances in
325 Psychology. 52: North-Holland; 1988. p. 139-83.
- 326 24. Kelley AM, Feltman KA, Curry IP. A Survey of Fatigue in Army Aviators. *Aerosp Med*
327 *Hum Perform.* 2018;89(5):464-8.
- 328 25. Yamashita A, Rothlein D, Kucyi A, Valera EM, Esterman M. Brain state-based detection of
329 attentional fluctuations and their modulation. *Neuroimage.* 2021;236:118072.
- 330 26. Beason-Held LL, Kraut MA, Resnick SM. Longitudinal changes in aging brain function.
331 *Neurobiol Aging.* 2008;29(4):483-96.
- 332 27. Krause AJ, Simon EB, Mander BA, Greer SM, Saletin JM, Goldstein-Piekariski AN, et al.
333 The sleep-deprived human brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2017;18(7):404-18.
- 334 28. Vuorio A, Bor R. Self-Harm in Aviation Medicine-A Complex Challenge During a
335 Pandemic. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9:5.
- 336 29. Becker SP, Dvorsky MR, Breaux R, Cusick CN, Taylor KP, Langberg JM. Prospective
337 examination of adolescent sleep patterns and behaviors before and during COVID-19. *Sleep.*
338 2021;44(8):11.
- 339 30. Elanwar R, Hussein M, Magdy R, Eid RA, Yassien A, Abdelsattar AS, et al. Physical and
340 Mental Fatigue in Subjects Recovered from COVID-19 Infection: A Case-Control Study.
341 *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment.* 2021;17:2063-71.

342 31. China NHCotPsRo. The Latest Situation of the COVID-19 as of 24:00 on November 25 ,

343 2021. National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China2021.

344

345

346 **Tables**

347 **Table 1** Distribution of Civil Aviation Crews' BPC (n=259)

Item		PSQI (Mean ± SD)	MFI (Mean ± SD)	MWL (Mean ± SD)
gender	Male(n=134)	8.08±4.04	53.99±11.04	44.06±18.65
	Female(n=125)	7.55±3.50	58.39±8.30	42.04±16.28
	t value	1.13	-3.65	0.93
	P value	0.26	0.00	0.35
age/y	28.20±2.73	20.38±7.35	-27.91±12.3	-14.8±18.75
	t value	44.63	36.52	-12.77
	P value	0.00	0.00	0.00
BMI	21.11±3.89	13.28±5.42	-35±11.17	-21.9±17.93
	t value	39.42	-50.43	-19.73
	P value	0.00	0.00	0.00
position	pilots(n=78)	7.60±4.08	54.06±11.7	44.18±18.18
	flight attendant(n=138)	7.96±3.87	56.96±9.1	42.88±16.73
	security(n=43)	7.79±3.00	57.09±9.31	41.75±19.17
	F value	0.23	2.35	0.28
	P value	0.80	0.10	0.75
driving experience/y	≥5(n=187)	7.58±3.41	56.33±10.22	42.29±17.32
	>5(n=72)	8.47±4.60	55.56±9.61	45.14±18.06
	t value	-1.50	0.56	-1.17
	P value	0.14	0.58	0.24

348 **Table 2** Spearman's Correlation between BPC and COVID-19

	MWL	PSQI	MFI	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7
MWL	1	.171**	.203**	.167**	.236**	.229**	.210**	.345**	.327**	.285**
PSQI	.171**	1	.190**	.255**	.320**	.355**	.296**	.393**	.329**	.354**
MFI	.203**	.190**	1	.149*	.140*	.140*	0.078	.272**	.187**	.198**
C1	.167**	.255**	.149*	1	.797**	.668**	.749**	.674**	.692**	.662**
C2	.236**	.320**	.140*	.797**	1	.660**	.752**	.737**	.743**	.716**
C3	.229**	.355**	.140*	.668**	.660**	1	.817**	.692**	.648**	.644**
C4	.210**	.296**	0.078	.749**	.752**	.817**	1	.698**	.721**	.703**
C5	.345**	.393**	.272**	.674**	.737**	.692**	.698**	1	.896**	.850**
C6	.327**	.329**	.187**	.692**	.743**	.648**	.721**	.896**	1	.867**
C7	.285**	.354**	.198**	.662**	.716**	.644**	.703**	.850**	.867**	1

349 **Note:** **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05

350 level (2-tailed).

351 Abbreviations: MWL=mental workload; PSQI= Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; MFI= Multidimensional
 352 Fatigue Inventory ; C1=self-fear of infection; C2=fear of ineffective prevention and control; C3=physical
 353 unwellness caused by regular nucleic and testing; C4=increased workload of personal protective
 354 equipment; C5=sleep quality; C6=mental fatigue; C7=physical fatigue.

355

356 Table 3 Results of CCA between BPC and COVID-19

	Correlation	Eigenvalue	Wilks Statistic	<i>F</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>P</i>
1	0.517	0.364	0.691	4.681	21.000	0.000
2	0.206	0.044	0.943	1.247	12.000	0.247
3	0.124	0.016	0.985	0.789	5.000	0.558

357

358 Table 4 Standardized Canonical Correlation Coefficients of BPC set and COVID-19 set

Variable set	Variable	Standardized Canonical Correlation Coefficients	Proportion Variance of Explained
BPC	MWL	-0.485	0.483
	PSQI	-0.610	
	MFI	-0.312	
COVID-19	C1	0.088	0.580
	C2	-0.114	
	C3	-0.511	
	C4	0.464	
	C5	-0.872	
	C6	0.086	
	C7	-0.132	

359 Abbreviations: BPC=brain performance capacity; MWL=mental workload; PSQI= Pittsburgh Sleep
 360 Quality Index; MFI= Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory; C1=self-fear of infection; C2=fear of
 361 ineffective prevention and control; C3=physical unwellness caused by regular nucleic and testing;
 362 C4=increased workload of personal protective equipment; C5=sleep quality; C6=mental fatigue;

363 C7=physical fatigue.

364

365 **Figure Caption**

366 Figure 1: CCA of BPC and COVID-19


367 Abbreviations: CCA=canonical correlation analysis; BPC=brain performance capacity; MWL=mental

368 workload; PSQI= Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; MFI= Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory; C1=self-

369 fear of infection; C2=fear of ineffective prevention and control; C3=physical unwellness caused by

370 regular nucleic acid testing; C4=increased workload of personal protective equipment; C5=sleep quality;

371 C6=mental fatigue; C7=physical fatigue.



Figure