Title: Association between indoor-outdoor green features and psychological health during the COVID-19 lockdown in Italy: A cross-sectional nationwide study

Authors: Giuseppina Spano[1,2,*] †, Marina D'Este[1]†, Vincenzo Giannico[1], Mario Elia[1], Rosalinda Cassibba[2], Raffaele Lafortezza[1,3] and Giovanni Sanesi[1]

[1]Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Via Amendola 165/A 70126 Bari, Italy

[2]Department of Education Science, Psychology, Communication Science, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Via Crisanzio 42 70122 Bari, Italy

[3]Department of Geography, The University of Hong Kong, Centennial Campus, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China

*Corresponding author:
Giuseppina Spano, PhD
Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
University of Bari Aldo Moro
Via Amendola 165/A 70126 Bari, ITALY
Email: giuseppina.spano@uniba.it

† Both authors contributed equally to this work.

Declaration of conflicting interests
The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Funding
This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgments
The authors wish to thank Yole DeBellis for support in revising the manuscript.

Title: Association between indoor-outdoor green features and psychological health during the COVID-19 lockdown in Italy: A cross-sectional nationwide study

Abstract

Exposure to public green spaces was shown to be associated with psychological and mental health. Nonetheless, evidence on the role of different green features within and/or surrounding the home environment when public green spaces are inaccessible or not usable is lacking. The overarching goal of this study is to shed light on the associations between the presence of greenness within the home and in the surrounding environment and the detrimental effects of quarantine on psychological health during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown in Italy. A cross-sectional nationwide study involving an online survey was conducted of an Italian population-based sample of 3886 respondents on the association of indoor and outdoor green features (i.e., presence of plant pots, sunlight, green view and accessibility of private green space and natural outdoor environment) with self-reported increases in anxiety, anger, fear, confusion, moodiness, boredom, irritability, recurrent thoughts and/or dreams, poor concentration and sleep disturbance during the COVID-19 lockdown. Single-exposure regression models were performed to estimate associations between single green features and each psychological health outcome adjusted for relevant covariates. In the adjusted models, the presence of plant pots at home was associated with a lower self-reported increase in anxiety, anger, fear, irritability, and sleep disturbance. A greater amount of sunlight in the home was associated with a lower increase in anger, fear, confusion, moodiness, boredom, irritability, poor concentration, and sleep disturbance. A greater amount of green view and access to private green spaces were both associated with a lower increase in each of the psychological health outcomes except for green view and recurrent thought and/or dreams. Natural outdoor environment was associated with anxiety, fear, boredom, irritability, and sleep disturbance. Insights on human–nature interaction in a post-corona society for a sustainable future are offered.

Keywords

Psychological health; home environment; private green space; COVID-19; indoor green features; green view.

1. Introduction

In late December 2019, a cluster of cases of respiratory diseases caused by a novel coronavirus termed severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) were reported in Wuhan, China (Chan et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020). Later, a similar disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 was officially named COVID-19 by the World Health Organization (WHO) (Gorbalenya et al., 2020). In mid-February, a new cluster of COVID-19 cases was detected in Northern Italy, which rapidly became one of the most strongly hit areas in Europe. The entire country was declared a COVID-19 risk area by the Italian government, which initially imposed a lockdown only in the most affected cities and surrounding localities (i.e., Lombardy region) but gradually extended restrictive measures to the entire country. Hence, on March 10, 2020, a national lockdown was declared and enforced. Italian citizens were not allowed to leave their homes, exception made for buying essential goods, special working demands and/or for urgent health reasons. Although such restrictive measures were necessary to contain the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic across the country, as suggested by major international public health agencies, an emerging body of scientific evidence highlights the detrimental effects of long-term quarantine on psychological health (Rajkumar 2020). Social distancing, self-isolation, and the associated stressors including fear, boredom and financial loss have produced long-lasting psychological effects, such as post-traumatic stress symptoms, confusion, anger, panic disorders, anxiety and depression (Brooks et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2020). In particular, prohibiting all outdoor activities and contact with green/open spaces is expected to jeopardize the psychological health outcomes of the quarantine period. In this regard, Wang et al. (2020a) have recently reported that preventing Chinese children from performing outdoor activities during home confinement may lead to physical and psychological disorders, including sleep disturbance, boredom, and anxiety. In a wide sample of Chinese college students, mild to severe levels of anxiety have been reported during the COVID-19 pandemic (Cao et al., 2020). Besides children, the elderly may also be affected by banned access to public green spaces and the possible limitation of performing exercise, which is a key protective factor for a considerable number of age-related physical and psychological issues, such as frailty and cognitive impairment (Spano et al., 2018; Jiménez-Pavón et al., 2020).

Although a large body of literature confirms the positive relationship between exposure to green spaces and psychological and mental health in diverse contexts (Lafortezza et al., 2009; Lee, & Maheswaran, 2011; Amoly et al., 2014; Dadvand et al., 2014; Carrus et al., 2015; Gascon et al., 2015; Scopelliti et al., 2016; Panno et al., 2017; Fischer et al., 2018; Spano et al., 2020a), there is still a lack of evidence of the role of indoor green features in terms of psychological benefits. In this direction, only a few attempts have been made to focus on specific aspects, such as indoor gardening (Tse, 2010), the effect of green view from a window mainly in work environments (Korpela et al.,

2015; Dreyer et al., 2018) and of residential attributes (i.e., crowding and distance) on family functioning (Thornock et al., 2019). To our knowledge, there is no specific evidence in the literature on the potential psychological impacts of exposure to different green features within and/or surrounding the home environment at a nationwide large scale when public green spaces are inaccessible or not usable as during a lockdown.

The overarching aim of the present study is to understand the association between the presence of green features within and surrounding the home environment and the self-reported psychological change during the COVID-19 lockdown. For this purpose, we conducted an investigation of the Italian population on the association of a number of indoor and outdoor features, i.e., presence of plant pots, sunlight, green view and accessibility of private green space and natural outdoor environment) with the self-reported change in anxiety, anger, fear, confusion, moodiness, boredom, irritability, recurrent thoughts and/or dreams, poor concentration and sleep disturbance during the COVID-19 lockdown.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Study population

Data collection was conducted on a large sample of community dwellers who spent the lockdown period in Italy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Community dwellers were recruited through a nonprobability sampling technique known as "snowball sampling", or "chain-referral sampling" (Mann, & Whitney, 1947), where participants are invited to recruit other potential participants. An online survey lasting approximately five minutes was uploaded to a survey administration app and made accessible through a link launched via e-mail and a free messaging platform from March 31, 2020 (three weeks after the start of the lockdown in Italy, i.e., March 10, 2020) to April 7, 2020.

Each potential participant was informed that participation in the study was on a voluntary basis, that the questionnaire was anonymous, and that the data would be processed in an aggregate manner in compliance with national and European data protection laws for scientific and statistical purposes (GDPR 2016/679). Proceeding with the compilation of the survey, they agreed to participate in the study. Four thousand fifty questionnaires were completed (i.e., Google forms). The selection of the final sample was carried out by applying the following inclusion criteria: (a) permanence on the Italian territory during the lockdown period, and (b) age equal to or greater than 14 years. The final sample consisted of 3886 participants. The number and distribution of completed questionnaires throughout the Italian peninsula are reported in Figure S1 (see Supplementary Materials). The most represented region was Apulia (~54% of completed questionnaires), followed by Piedmont (~10%) and Lombardy (~8%), whereas the least represented region was Aosta Valley with only 0.15% of completed questionnaires on the overall number.

The study procedure was designed in accordance with the ethical standards of the Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Department of Education Science, Psychology, Communication Science, University of Bari A. Moro.

2.2. Measures

The online questionnaire was developed by the authors and consisted of three sections. The first section included questions concerning sociodemographic characteristics, covariates, and potential confounding variables. The subsequent two sections dealt with items related to the variables of interest for our study.

2.2.1. Sociodemographic characteristics and potential confounding variables

The first section of the questionnaire was composed of 8 items investigating sociodemographic characteristics, i.e., age, gender, level of education, current place of residence, and other information regarding potential covariates or confounding variables such as current working mode (e.g., smart working), presence of other people living in the home, presence of pets, and estimated decrease in income due to the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown.

2.2.2. Psychological outcomes

The second section of the questionnaire was composed of 10 items. Each participant was asked to evaluate feelings related to their psychological state in the preceding weeks, considering March 10, 2020 as the first day of the lockdown across the country. The choice of outcomes to be assessed was mainly based on the evidence reported in a recent review of the negative psychological effects of quarantine (Brooks et al., 2020). Due to the absence of a baseline, participants were asked to evaluate the negative change (increase) in levels of anxiety, anger, fear, confusion, moodiness, boredom, irritability, recurrent thoughts and/or dreams, poor concentration and sleep disturbance compared to the period before the lockdown ("I feel more anxious than before"). A 5-point Likert scale was used ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Completely agree" where the first level indicated no change and the last indicated a marked worsening in the referred outcome.

2.2.3. Indoor-outdoor green features

In the third and last section of the questionnaire, 5 items were used to address indoor and outdoor green features. The participants were asked to provide information on: (a) the presence of plant pots (yes/no); (b) the self-reported presence of sunlight in the home using a 3-point Likert scale, i.e., "not at all or not very bright" = 0, "medium bright" = 1 and " quite or very bright " = 2; (c) the amount of

green view from the home environment using a 5-point Likert scale from the lowest, or none, to the highest amount of green view ("no green space or no windows" = 0, "a little bit of the view" = 1, "some of the view but without trees" = 2, "some of the view with trees" = 3, "most of the view" = 4, "all of the view" = 5); (d) accessibility to private green spaces from the lowest to the highest amount of private green space ("no access" = 0; "terrace with presence of green" = 1, "courtyard with presence of green" = 2, "garden" = 3, "more than one access" = 4, "countryside or mountains" = 5; and (e) type of road where the house was located as a proxy for natural outdoor environment ("main or secondary extra-urban road" = 0, "urban or neighborhood street" = 1, "seafront" = 2, "limited traffic area such as pedestrian street" = 3, "internal or private road" = 4, "road with trees or greenery" = 5, and "country or mountain road" = 6). All items related to the home environment in which each participant was spending the lockdown or quarantine period.

2.3. Statistical analysis

2.3.1. Descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlations

Descriptive statistics were calculated to explore the characteristics and distributions of sociodemographic data and psychological health outcomes considered in the survey. Pearson's correlation coefficients were performed to examine the strength of the relations both among indoor-outdoor green features and among psychological health outcomes.

2.3.2. Regression analysis

Single-exposure regression models were used to estimate the associations between indoor-outdoor green features as explanatory variables and psychological health outcomes. For each psychological health outcome (i.e., increase in anxiety, anger, fear, confusion, moodiness, boredom, irritability, recurrent thoughts and/or dreams, poor concentration and sleep disturbance) we built a single-exposure regression model considering each green feature (i.e., presence of plant pots, sunlight, green view, accessibility of private green space and natural outdoor environment). All models were adjusted for age (continuum variable), gender identity (male, female and other), education level, working mode during the lockdown period, and estimated decrease in income due to lockdown measures. In addition, the presence of other people (yes/no) and presence of pets (yes/no) during the lockdown were used as covariates, since it has been shown that social presence at home and human–animal interactions impact overall physical and psychological well-being (Chou et al., 2006; Beetz et al., 2012; Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). Beta coefficients were considered a quantitative measure of the associations between green-related variables as proxies of green features and psychological outcomes.

A sensitivity analysis was performed to test the robustness of the significant associations between green features and psychological health outcomes by additionally adjusting the single-

exposure regression models for a potential confounding variable, i.e., confirmed COVID-19 cases per regional population. The total number of people who tested positive (confirmed cases) for COVID-19 on March 30, 2020, the day before the survey launch, was provided as official and public data from the Ministry of Health (http://opendatadpc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/b0c68bce2cce478eaac82fe38d4138b1; accessed March 30, 2020). The latest available data on the total number of regional populations from existing databases were updated to 2019 (http://dati.istat.it/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DCIS_POPRES1; accessed May 19, 2020). Aosta Valley recorded the highest number of positive cases in relation to the total number of inhabitants, followed by the regions of Lombardy and Emilia-Romagna (see Supplementary Material, Figure S2).

The lm() function from the R 'stats' package (Wilkinson, & Rogers, 1973; Chambers, & Hastie, 1992) was used to perform all the analyses; statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

2.3.3. Effect modification by the Current Working Mode

The sample of participants was selected according to current working mode (CWM) and divided into two groups: smart workers and non-smart workers. The sub-sample for this analysis was composed of a total of 2729 participants, including 2059 smart workers and 670 non-smart workers. The last group was comprised of those who reported going to work as usual and those in partial smart working mode. In relation to each psychological health outcome, interaction analysis was tested between CWM and green view, and CWM and access to private green space.

3. Results

3.1. Sample characteristics

In the total sample of survey participants, the average age was 41.9 years (standard deviation: 15.2, range: 14-93); almost 62% was composed of women and about 38% of men. Twelve respondents, or 0.31% of the total, declared that they did not feel they belonged to either of the two genders previously mentioned. The most represented level of education in the total sample was high school, while the least represented was primary school; this is probably attributable to the lower threshold relating to 14 years of age. More than half of the respondents continued to work from home (i.e., in smart working mode). More than 90% of respondents were spending the lockdown in the company of other people, and about two thirds benefitted from the company of at least one pet. More than half of the respondents foresaw that their financial income would decrease due to the COVID-19 pandemic (for percentages see Table 1). Detailed descriptive statistics of the study participants (N = 3886) and the prevalence of each psychological health outcome are reported in Table 1. The distribution of the sample participants' answers on indoor-outdoor green features are reported in Table 2.

3.2. Correlations among green features and among psychological health outcomes

Person's correlations among indoor-outdoor green features and among psychological health outcomes are shown in Table 3. Green features were positively associated amongst each other. The strongest, though low-moderate, correlation was between green view and private green spaces, i.e., r = 0.50. This is not surprising given the probability that individuals with an available private green space easily observe it from their home window(s). The poorest correlation, i.e., r = 0.08, was observed between sunlight in the home and general outdoor naturalness. Most of the correlation coefficients among outcomes were low-to-moderately associated with each other, while negligible positive correlations (r = 0.13) were found between recurrent thoughts/dreams and boredom and irritability, respectively.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the study participants and prevalence of psychological health outcomes.

	N = 3886 (%)	Anxiety M ± SD	Anger M ± SD	Fear M ± SD	Confusion M ± SD	Moodiness M ± SD	Boredom M ± SD	Irritability M ± SD	Recurrent thoughts/dreams M ± SD	Poor concentration M ± SD	Sleep disturbance M ± SD
Age-groups											
14-29	1039 (26.74)	3.0 ± 1.2	2.4 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.3	3.1 ± 1.3	3.4 ± 1.4	3.0 ± 1.4	2.1 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.5
30-44	1111 (28.59)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.3 ± 1.3	3.1 ± 1.2	2.7 ± 1.3	3.1 ± 1.2	2.7 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.4
45-59	1186 (30.52)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.0 ± 1.2	3.0 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.4	2.3 ± 1.2	2.4 ± 1,4	2.6 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.4
60-74	520 (13.38)	2.8 ± 1.3	1.6 ± 0.9	2.7 ± 1.3	2.2 ± 1.2	2.3 ± 1.2	2.4 ± 1.4	2.0 ± 1.1	2.1 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.3
≥75	30 (0.77)	2.8 ± 1.5	1.8 ± 1.2	3.0 ± 1.5	2.3 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.5	3.0 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.3	1.9 ± 1.2	2.1 ± 1.3	2.1 ± 1.3
Gender											
Male	1482 (38.14)	2.8 ± 1.2	1.9 ± 1.1	2.6 ± 1.2	2.4 ± 1.2	2.5 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.4	2.4 ± 1.3	2.1 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.4
Female	2392 (61.55)	3.2 ± 1.2	2.2 ± 1.3	3.2 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.5	2.6 ± 1.4	2.4 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.9
Other	12 (0.31)	3.1 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.5	2.8 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.5	3.0 ± 1.5	2.8 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.5	2.0 ± 1.5	3.6 ± 1.6	2.8 ± 1.6
Education level											
Primary school	7 (0.18)	4.3 ± 1.0	2.7 ± 1.7	3.7 ± 1.7	3.4 ± 2.0	3.4 ± 2.0	4.1 ± 1.5	3.1 ± 1.5	2.1 ± 2.0	2.1 ± 1.7	2.6 ± 1.8
Middle school	287 (7.39)	3.0 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.4	3.2 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.5	2.2 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.5	2.6 ± 1.5
High school	1522 (39.17)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.1 ± 1.2	2.9 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4	2.2 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.5
University	1438 (37)	3.0 ± 1.2	2.1 ± 1.2	3.0 ± 1.2	2.7 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.4	2.4 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4
Post-university	632 (16.26)	3.0 ± 1.3	2.1 ± 1.2	2.9 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.4	2.4 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4
Working mode											
Smart working	2059 (52.99)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.9 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.2	2.7 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4
Working normally	361 (9.29)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.0 ± 1.1	3.0 ± 1.2	2.7 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.5	2.5 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.4	2.4 ± 2.4	2.5 ± 1.4
Partial smart working	309 (7.95)	3.0 ± 1.2	1.9 ± 1.1	2.9 ± 1.1	2.5 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.2	2.6 ± 1.3	2.2 ± 1.2	2.2 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.4
Suspended job	689 (17.73)	3.2 ± 1.3	2.1 ± 1.2	3.0 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.3	3.1 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.5
Lost job	81 (2.08)	3.4 ± 1.2	2.4 ± 1.4	3.1 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.4	3.5 ± 1.4	2.9 ± 1.4	2.4 ± 1.4	3.0 ± 1.4	3.0 ± 1.5
Not classifiable*	387 (9.96)	2.9 ± 1.3	1.9 ± 1.2	2.8 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.4	2.2 ± 1.3	2.0 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.4
Presence of other people											
Yes	3350 (91.35)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.2 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.5
No	336 (8.65)	2.9 ± 1.3	1.8 ± 1.1	2.9 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.4	2.9 ± 1.4	2.2 ± 1.3	2.2 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.5
Presence of pets											
Yes	1398 (64.02)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.1 ± 1.2	2.9 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.4	2.5 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4
No	2488 (35.98)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.1 ± 1.2	2.9 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.4	2.5 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.5
Decrease in income											
Yes	2128 (54.76)	3.2 ± 1.2	2.2 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.4	2.8 ± 1.5
No	1434 (36.90)	2.9 ± 1.2	1.9 ± 1.1	2.8 ± 1.2	2.5 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.4	2.3 ± 1.3	2.2 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.4	2.4 ± 1.4
Rather not say	324 (54.76)	3.1 ± 1.2	2.3 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.3	2.8 ± 1.3	2.9 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 1.3	2.3 ± 1.3	2.7 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 1.4

*Includes retirees and the unemployed since before the lockdown. M ± SD = mean plus or minus standard deviation.

Table 2. Distribution of the sample participants' answers for indoor-outdoor green features.

	N = 3886 (%)
Do you have plants at home?	
Yes	3228 (83.07)
No	658 (16.93)
How do you evaluate the presence of daylight at home?	
Not at all or not very bright	139 (3.58)
Medium bright	1072 (27.59)
Quite or very bright	2675 (68.84)
From the room you are in, how much green can you see from the window? Indicates the amount of green view?	
No green space or no windows	452 (11.63)
A little bit of the view	1140 (29.34)
Some of the view but without trees	312 (8.03)
Some of the view with trees	1213 (31.21)
Most of the view	611 (15.72)
All of the view	158 (4.07)
During this period do you have access to private green spaces?	
No access	1641 (42.23)
Yes, to a terrace with presence of green	561 (14.44)
Yes, to a courtyard with presence of green	528 (13.59)
Yes, to a garden	697 (17.94)
I have more than one access	126 (3.24)
Yes, I am in the countryside or mountains	333 (8.57)
What type of road is the house where you are spending this period?	
Main or secondary extra-urban road	455 (11.71)
Urban or neighborhood street	2641 (67.96)
Seafront	9 (0.23)
Limited traffic area (e.g., old town, pedestrian street)	72 (1.85)
Internal or private road	124 (3.19)
Road with trees or greenery	286 (7.36)
Country or mountain road	299 (7.69)

Table 3. Pearson's correlations among indoor-outdoor green features and among psychological health outcomes.

	Sunlight	Green view	Private green spaces	General outdoor naturalness
Presence of plant pots	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.05
Sunlight		0.23	0.11	0.08
Green view			0.50	0.27
Private green spaces				0.32

	Anger	Fear	Confusion	Moodiness	Boredom	Irritability	Recurrent thoughts/ dreams	Poor concentration	Sleep disturbance
Anxiety	0.40	0.68	0.54	0.52	0.23	0.41	0.40	0.38	0.44
Anger		0.37	0.41	0.57	0.30	0.74	0.23	0.34	0.34
Fear			0.56	0.47	0.20	0.36	0.45	0.37	0.40
Confusion				0.58	0.31	0.46	0.35	0.48	0.40
Moodiness					0.41	0.68	0.32	0.50	0.46
Boredom						0.45	0.13	0.31	0.27
Irritability							0.13	0.32	0.27
Recurrent thoughts/dreams								0.39	0.40
Poor concentration									0.49

All correlations are significant for $p < 0.001$.

3.3. Single-exposure regression analysis

The presence of plant pots at home was significantly associated with a lower self-reported increase in anxiety, anger, fear, moodiness, boredom, irritability, and sleep disturbance. In the adjusted model, we observed that psychological health outcomes such as anger, fear, irritability, and sleep disturbance maintain a significant association with the presence of plant pots in the home (Table 4). A higher level of sunlight in the home was significantly associated with a lower increase in anger, fear, confusion, moodiness, boredom, irritability, poor concentration, and sleep disturbance. The significant associations were also consistent in the adjusted model (Table 4). The amount of green view from home windows was significantly associated with all outcomes evaluated, both in the unadjusted and adjusted models. A greater presence of green view from the window was associated with a lower increase in each of the psychological health outcomes (Table 4). Consistently, a greater availability of access to private green spaces was significantly associated with a lower increase in all the psychological health outcomes (Table 5). Lastly, living on a road with higher levels of greenness, that we considered as a proxy of natural outdoor environment, was significantly associated with a lower increase in all the health outcomes; in the adjusted model, this association remained valid for anxiety, fear, boredom, irritability, recurrent thoughts and/or dreams, and sleep disturbance (Table 5).

3.4. Sensitivity analysis

Single-exposure regression models were further adjusted for number of confirmed COVID-19 cases per regional population. Significant associations between indoor-outdoor green features and psychological health outcomes remained robust. After the adjustment, presence of plant pots, anxiety and sleep disturbance resulted as being significantly associated. A slight decrease was found in the significance of the effect of sunlight on anger (from $p < 0.01$ to $p < 0.05$) and green view on poor concentration (from $p < 0.001$ to $p < 0.01$). Green view and natural outdoor environment were no longer significantly associated with recurrent thoughts and/or dreams in the adjusted model for the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases per regional population and the other aforementioned covariates (Tables S1 and S2 in Supplementary Materials).

3.5. Effect modification by the Current Working Mode

For green view, the interaction with CWM (smart workers vs non-smart workers) was statistically significant on boredom ($p = 0.02$), recurrent thoughts and/or dreams ($p = 0.04$) and irritability ($p = 0.02$). By stratifying this result for CWM, we found that in the group of non-smart workers the association between the amount of green view and each of the aforementioned outcomes was stronger

than for smart workers. For access to private green space, no interaction term with CWM was significant for any of the psychological health outcome variables.

Table 4. Results of unadjusted and adjusted single-exposure regression models of the associations between indoor green features and psychological health outcomes.

Outcome	Plant pots				Sunlight				Green view			
	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F
Anxiety												
Unadjusted	-0.09* (-0.17 -0.006)	0.001	0.0009	4.456*	-0.02 (-0.05 -0.009)	0.0005	0.0002	2	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.004	0.003	13.86***
Adjusted	-0.08 (-0.16 0.03)	0.05	0.04	11.04***	-0.02 (-0.05 -0.01)	0.05	0.04	10.92***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.05	0.04	11.43***
Anger												
Unadjusted	-0.12** (-0.20 -0.03)	0.002	0.002	7.71**	-0.07*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.004	0.004	16.68***	-0.10*** (-0.13 -0.07)	0.01	0.01	42.04***
Adjusted	-0.08* (-0.17 -0.0006)	0.07	0.07	17.64***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.07	0.07	17.98***	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.08	0.07	18.71***
Fear												
Unadjusted	-0.10* (-0.18 -0.01)	0.001	0.001	5.27*	-0.03* (-0.06 -0.0005)	0.001	0.0007	3.97*	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.005	0.005	19.93***
Adjusted	-0.10* (-0.18 -0.02)	0.06	0.06	15.25***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.007)	0.06	0.06	15.26***	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.07	0.06	16.13***
Confusion												
Unadjusted	-0.05 (-0.14 0.03)	0.0004	0.0001	1.502	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.005	0.005	20.64***	-0.10*** (-0.13 -0.07)	0.01	0.01	37.21***
Adjusted	-0.02 (-0.10 0.06)	0.05	0.05	12.29***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.05	0.05	13.17***	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.04)	0.06	0.05	13.65***
Moodiness												
Unadjusted	-0.10* (-0.18 -0.01)	0.001	0.001	5.07	-0.09*** (-0.12 -0.06)	0.008	0.008	32.71***	-0.11***(-0.14 -0.08)	0.01	0.01	50.57***
Adjusted	-0.05 (-0.12 0.04)	0.07	0.06	16.61***	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.07	0.07	17.8***	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.05)	0.07	0.07	18.23***
Boredom												
Unadjusted	-0.16*** (-0.24 -0.08)	0.004	0.004	14.82***	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.005	0.005	19.7***	-0.11*** (-0.14 -0.08)	0.01	0.01	48.55***
Adjusted	-0.07 (-0.15 0.01)	0.11	0.11	29.01***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.007)	0.11	0.11	29.22***	-0.07*** (-0.09 -0.04)	0.12	0.11	30.06***
Irritability												
Unadjusted	-0.15*** (-0.24 -0.07)	0.003	0.003	12.9***	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.005	0.005	20.28***	-0.10*** (-0.13 -0.06)	0.009	0.009	36.14***
Adjusted	-0.10* (-0.18 -0.02)	0.09	0.09	22.45***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.09	0.08	22.71***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.09	0.09	22.92***
Recurrent thoughts/dreams												
Unadjusted	0.01 (-0.07 -0.09)	0.000013	-0.0002	0.05	-0.01 (-0.04 -0.02)	0.0002	0.00009	0.62	-0.03* (-0.06 -0.002)	0.001	0.0008	4.27*
Adjusted	-0.005 (-0.09 0.08)	0.03	0.03	7.19***	-0.02 (-0.05 0.01)	0.03	0.03	7.264***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.005)	0.03	0.03	7.49***
Poor concentration												
Unadjusted	-0.03 (-0.11 -0.06)	0.0001	-0.0002	0.39	-0.07*** (-0.11 -0.04)	0.006	0.005	21.65***	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.05)	0.007	0.006	26.39***
Adjusted	0.01 (-0.07 -0.09)	0.06	0.05	13.33***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.02)	0.06	0.05	14.11***	-0.05*** (-0.09 -0.02)	0.06	0.05	14***
Sleep disturbance												
Unadjusted	-0.14** (-0.22 -0.05)	0.003	0.002	10.12**	-0.09*** (-0.13 -0.06)	0.009	0.009	34.91***	-0.10*** (-0.13 -0.07)	0.01	0.01	41.84***
Adjusted	-0.10* (-0.19 -0.02)	0.04	0.04	10.58***	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.05)	0.05	0.05	11.91***	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.05)	0.05	0.05	11.86***

Regressions are adjusted for age, gender, education level, current working mode, presence of other people, presence of pets, and estimated decrease in income. R^2= R-Squared; AR^2=Adjusted R-Squared. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

Table 5. Results of adjusted and unadjusted single-exposure regression models of the associations between outdoor green features and psychological health outcomes.

Outcome	Private green spaces				General outdoor naturalness			
	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F
Anxiety								
Unadjusted	-0.09*** (-0.13 -0.06)	0.01	0.01	35.11***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.008)	0.002	0.001	5.923*
Adjusted	-0.09*** (-0.11 -0.05)	0.05	0.05	12.59***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.005)	0.05	0.04	11.14***
Anger								
Unadjusted	-0.08*** (-0.12 -0.05)	0.007	0.007	27.55***	-0.04** (-0.07 -0.01)	0.002	0.002	7.12**
Adjusted	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.07	0.07	18.41***	-0.03 (-0.06 -0.0004)	0.07	0.07	17.63***
Fear								
Unadjusted	-0.10*** (-0.13 -0.07)	0.01	0.01	38.41***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.008)	0.002	0.001	5.946*
Adjusted	-0.09*** (-0.12 -0.06)	0.07	0.06	16.84***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.007)	0.06	0.06	15.27***
Confusion								
Unadjusted	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.03)	0.004	0.004	16.44***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.008)	0.002	0.001	6.149*
Adjusted	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.05	0.05	12.8***	-0.03 (-0.06 0.0009)	0.05	0.05	12.5***
Moodiness								
Unadjusted	-0.09*** (-0.12 -0.06)	0.009	0.008	31.83***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.009)	0.002	0.001	6.536*
Adjusted	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.07	0.07	17.78***	-0.03 (-0.06 0.002)	0.07	0.06	16.75***
Boredom								
Unadjusted	-0.11*** (-0.14 -0.08)	0.01	0.01	49.08***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.003	0.003	13.23***
Adjusted	-0.09*** (-0.12 -0.06)	0.12	0.12	30.94***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.008)	0.11	0.11	29.25***
Irritability								
Unadjusted	-0.09*** (-0.12 -0.06)	0.009	0.009	34.83***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.003	0.003	13.05***
Adjusted	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.09	0.09	23.39***	-0.04** (-0.07 -0.01)	0.09	0.09	22.58***
Recurrent thoughts/dreams								
Unadjusted	-0.05*** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.003	0.003	10.88***	-0.03* (-0.06 -0.002)	0.001	0.0009	4.343*
Adjusted	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.03	0.03	7.79***	-0.03* (-0.07 -0.002)	0.03	0.03	7.46***
Poor concentration								
Unadjusted	-0.05*** (-0.09 -0.02)	0.003	0.003	11.67	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.007)	0.001	0.001	5.78*
Adjusted	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.005)	0.06	0.05	13.66***	-0.03 (-0.06 -0.0005)	0.06	0.05	13.56***
Sleep disturbance								
Unadjusted	-0.10*** (-0.13 -0.06)	0.009	0.009	36.3***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.02)	0.003	0.003	12.23***
Adjusted	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.05)	0.05	0.04	11.72***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.01)	0.05	0.04	10.8***

Regressions are adjusted for age, gender, education level, current working mode, presence of other people, presence of pets, and estimated decrease in income. R^2= R-Squared; AR^2=Adjusted R-Squared. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

4. Discussion

To our knowledge, this study represents the first attempt in the field of scientific research on the health effects of epidemics on man to investigate the associations between exposure and access to green features within and surrounding the home environment and specific psychological health outcomes in a context where accessibility to public green spaces is banned. In fact, home confinement caused by the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown allowed us to study the effect of visual exposure to greenness and access to private green spaces when the use of public green spaces was not permitted.

Our results showed distinct associations with respect to the indoor and outdoor green features of the living environment and the assessed psychological health outcomes. We found that the presence of indoor plant pots was associated with a lower increase in anger, fear, irritability, and sleep disturbance during the lockdown. These results are of considerable importance for the extension of previous literature on health conditions in the living environment, such as the home and workplace. For example, the presence of plants in working environments seems to reduce perceived stress and, in general, to promote positive emotions and reduce negative feelings (Han, & Ruan, 2019). Interestingly, our results are inconsistent with those reporting associations between presence of indoor plants and lower level of anxiety (Hassan et al., 2018; Toyoda et al., 2020). However, these studies have focused on structured horticultural activities, and access to other forms of greenness was not prohibited. Therefore, a synergistic effect of the two conditions can be assumed, whilst our study considered the psychological benefits of the presence of indoor plants during a state of home confinement. It would be worthwhile to investigate the psychological benefits of the presence of plants in the home by involving different contexts and groups of individuals. From a therapeutic point of view, it would be interesting to learn which individuals spent most of their time indoors, such as the elderly in nursing homes (Tse, 2010).

Natural sunlight in the home was associated with a lower increase in many psychological health outcomes, such as anger, fear, confusion, moodiness, boredom, irritability, poor concentration, and sleep disturbance. These findings are consistent with those related to the reduction of sleep disturbance, depression, and agitation in groups of people who have poor self-regulation of circadian rhythms (Hanford, & Figueiro, 2013). Exposure to sunlight regulates changes in the release of serotonin in the brain, which is commonly known to affect mood and sleep quality (Lansdowne, & Provost, 1998; Lambert et al., 2002). Likewise, our results are in line with the evidence reporting improvement in mood level in

individuals who spend a lot of time indoors after a brief 30-minute exposure to natural light (Kaida et al., 2007).

We found associations between green view and the entire range of psychological health outcomes evaluated. The evidence made available points out that green view provides layered benefits for individuals who are unable to freely move outside. For example, it was found that showing wall-size photographic images of natural landscapes to a sample of prisoners produced a calming and restorative effect (Moran, 2019). Furthermore, viewing nature from a window is particularly important for maintaining a healthy psychological state in healthcare environments where interactions with the outdoors can be limited (Raanaas et al., 2012). The three green variables discussed so far constitute indoor features that could act as important protective factors for psychological well-being, hence it would be profitable to consider them as fundamental elements in the interior design of workplaces and homes (Gray, & Birrell, 2014; Ebrahimpour et al., 2018).

Regarding outdoor green features, accessibility to private green spaces was strongly associated with all the psychological health outcomes considered, while the natural outdoor environment was found to be moderately associated with only a minor increase in anxiety, fear, boredom, irritability, recurrent thoughts and/or dreams, and sleep disturbance. Evidence of the effects of outdoor green spaces on psychological and mental health is inconsistent. While numerous studies have reported positive associations between access to private green space and psychological and mental health (Wu et al., 2015; Cox et al., 2017; Korpela et al., 2017; Richardson et al., 2017; Dadvand et al., 2019; Kruize et al., 2020) and an inverse association between surrounding greenness and depression (Banay et al., 2019), others have found poor evidence on the effect of access to green spaces on mental health in adults and children (Gascon et al., 2015). Still others have reported a stronger association for surrounding greenness than for access to green spaces with mental health (Triguero-Mas et al., 2015). These inconsistencies may reflect the fact that access to green spaces and surrounding/neighborhood greenness has been evaluated using a number of different tools, methods, contexts, and sample groups. However, few available studies have investigated the association between the aforementioned outdoor green variables and well-being when visiting public residential green spaces is not allowed. A recent measure of street view exposure of visible green space called "Green View Index" may assist in overcoming this gap. The tool accurately reproduces the human perception of greenness at street scale and could be useful for evaluating the effect of visual perception of surrounding greenness on health and well-being. (Larkin, & Hystad, 2019).

The observed associations between indoor-outdoor green features and psychological health outcomes did not remarkably change by adjusting for number of confirmed COVID-19 cases per regional population. This result is not surprising as the restrictive measures of the lockdown have been extended at national level. Therefore, the individuals' perception of limitations and the behavioral adjustment of daily life involved the entire Italian population, regardless of the epidemiological specificities at the regional level. The only notable change observed was that green view and natural outdoor environment were no longer significantly associated with recurrent epidemic-related thoughts and/or dreams. This supports recent findings that living in an area highly exposed to COVID-19 infection can arouse traumatic experiences leading to the development of event-related recurrent and intrusive thoughts and dreams (Wang al., 2020b).

Our preliminary results discussed so far highlight the differentiated effects of indoor and outdoor green features on different psychological health outcomes and suggest the potential role of green features in preventing the deterioration of specific aspects of psychological health. This provides preliminary insight into the possible differentiation of nature-based interventions and therapies fostering well-being.

The interaction of current working mode and green view significantly affected boredom, recurrent thoughts and/or dreams, and irritability. This represents a further potential insight on the established essential role of smart working in workers' health and quality of life during the COVID-19 containment period (Zhang et al., 2020). Besides the aforementioned importance of being surrounded by nature-based elements and having access to greenness near the workplace (Marquet et al., 2020), it is worth promoting the use of nature-based elements also inside the home environment to promote the well-being of all users. Our results show that the associations between green view and the above-mentioned psychological health outcomes are stronger in non-smart workers than in smart workers demonstrating that exposure to green features at home can play a key role in perceived health and well-being, regardless of the presence of green features in the workplace.

Altogether, our findings, combined with those on the significant role of interaction of the working mode for smart workers and non-smart workers, allow to apply the results of our study to broader contexts. The importance of a home environment that predisposes contact with green elements can constitute a protective factor for psychological health not only in individuals forced to spend much time indoors, such as the elderly in their own home or in nursing homes, but also in adults who lead an active lifestyle, i.e., non-smart workers. In addition, our findings offer interesting insights to further explore the tendency of people to

develop a pro-environmental behavior in household settings and the underlying drivers to this preference (Miao, & Wei, 2013).

5. Strengths and limitations of the study

The study presents several innovative concepts insofar as it represents the first attempt to explore the potential effect of specific indoor private green features in the decline of perceived psychological health during confinement. Several studies have investigated and confirmed the great value of public green during the COVID-19 pandemic (e.g., Ugolini et al., 2020; Venter et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2020). Only one study (Amerio et al., 2020) attempted to investigate the role of the housing-built environment on mental health during the COVID-19 lockdown, albeit on a large sample of university students. Thus far, no attempts have been made to systematically explore the effect of green features (within and surrounding the home environment) on the psychological health of the general population.

Despite the sound evidence provided herein to support our study hypotheses, we realize that a number of limitations exist. The sample of survey participants is not uniformly distributed geographically and balanced by demographic variables and, therefore, may not be representative of the entire Italian population. Moreover, we are aware of the potential effect of self-selection of the sample, since people who are less prone to use smartphones or e-mail are less likely to respond to an online survey. In addition, the cross-sectional research design does not provide baseline measures on psychological health outcomes; for this reason, we advise caution when discussing the associations between variables rather than a causal relationship.

Although the retrieval of self-reported data via a web-based survey was functional in reducing acquisition times and reaching all Italian regions, the survey was not composed of internationally validated measuring instruments for investigating psychological health outcomes, but rather of single items on the self-reported change in psychological state. We cannot rule out that a certain amount of awareness of one's emotional state is required to provide such a reliable estimate.

Most of these limitations are the consequence of the exceptional nature of the situation under consideration. Numerous studies have used online data collection tools to investigate the psychological effects of quarantine through cross-sectional analyses. For example, Burhamah et al. (2020) report the bias resulting from a cross-sectional study with a non-representative sample and suggest further follow-up studies. Khan et al. (2020) recognize a further bias in addition to those mentioned, namely that internet access would exclude the less wealthy

segment of the population. We also point out the exclusion of the elderly who, being a less computerized population group than others, are more difficult to reach (e.g., in our case, participants 75 years of age and older did not reach 1% of the total sample interviewed). Confinement and restrictions have made field data very difficult to collect, thus web-based data collection has become a valid alternative. However, web-based surveys must be self-reported and brief; thus, for our study and others (e.g., Ara et al., 2020) questionnaire items were created to satisfy this specific purpose.

The information on green features was also self-reported. This method of data collection is in line with a recent study from Ugolini et al. (2020) who investigated the perception of urban green spaces and the social isolation effects of not using them during lockdown. The study, through web-based data collection on an international scale, provided useful insights on the need for confined residents to benefit from green spaces, which confirms the results of our study. Lastly, in our study the availability of private green spaces was investigated in terms of amount and not of usage. Mediation variables could intervene, such as physical activity carried out in private green spaces that would lead to relevant mental health benefits (Dadvand et al., 2016). Likewise, we did not consider the potential mediating effect of gardening activities in private green spaces, which has been proven to generate benefits on health and well-being (Clatworthy et al., 2013; Spano et al., 2020b; Yeo et al., 2020). Further studies addressing these matters are strongly recommended.

6. Conclusions

Increasing urbanization, travel mobility and climate change issues will likely lead to new epidemics that will require a rearrangement of our daily lifestyle. The current lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic represents an interesting opportunity to reflect on new perspectives for the agenda of environmental psychology research. It is necessary to reconsider the management and planning of key green elements within the home environment as a substitute for public green space and an aid to promote health and well-being once the restrictive measures of social distancing will no longer be essential. Further studies are recommended to replicate our findings in other contexts, evaluating other possible green elements in and surrounding the home environment. In addition, evaluating the long-term effects of the presence of these elements on psychological health through longitudinal studies is strongly endorsed.

References

Amerio, A., Brambilla, A., Morganti, A., Aguglia, A., Bianchi, D., Santi, F., ... & Serafini, G. (2020). Covid-19 lockdown: Housing built environment's effects on mental health. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(16), 5973.

Amoly, E., Dadvand, P., Forns, J., López-Vicente, M., Basagaña, X., Julvez, J., ... & Sunyer, J. (2014). Green and blue spaces and behavioral development in Barcelona schoolchildren: the BREATHE project. *Environmental health perspectives*, *122*(12), 1351-1358.

Ara, T., Rahman, M., Hossain, M., & Ahmed, A. (2020). Identifying the Associated Risk Factors of Sleep Disturbance During the COVID-19 Lockdown in Bangladesh: A Web-Based Survey. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *11*, 966.

Banay, R. F., James, P., Hart, J. E., Kubzansky, L. D., Spiegelman, D., Okereke, O. I., ... & Laden, F. (2019). Greenness and depression incidence among older women. *Environmental health perspectives*, *127*(2), 027001.

Beetz, A., Uvnäs-Moberg, K., Julius, H., & Kotrschal, K. (2012). Psychosocial and psychophysiological effects of human-animal interactions: the possible role of oxytocin. *Frontiers in psychology*, *3*, 234.

Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*.

Burhamah, W., AlKhayyat, A., Oroszlányová, M., AlKenane, A., Almansouri, A., Behbehani, M., ... & AlSuwaidan, M. (2020). The psychological burden of the COVID-19 pandemic and associated lockdown measures: experience from 4000 participants. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *277*, 977-985.

Cao, W., Fang, Z., Hou, G., Han, M., Xu, X., Dong, J., & Zheng, J. (2020). The psychological impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry research*, 112934.

Carrus, G., Scopelliti, M., Lafortezza, R., Colangelo, G., Ferrini, F., Salbitano, F., ... & Sanesi, G. (2015). Go greener, feel better? The positive effects of biodiversity on the well-being of individuals visiting urban and peri-urban green areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *134*, 221-228.

Chambers, J. M., & Hastie, T. J. (1992). Linear models. Chapter 4 of statistical models in S. *Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole*.

Chan, J. F. W., Yuan, S., Kok, K. H., To, K. K. W., Chu, H., Yang, J., ... & Tsoi, H. W. (2020). A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *The Lancet*, *395*(10223), 514-523.

Chou, K. L., Ho, A. H. Y., & Chi, I. (2006). Living alone and depression in Chinese older adults. *Aging and Mental Health*, *10*(6), 583-591.

Clatworthy, J., Hinds, J., & Camic, P. M. (2013). Gardening as a mental health intervention: a review. *Mental Health Review Journal*, *18*(4), 214-225.

Cox, D. T., Shanahan, D. F., Hudson, H. L., Fuller, R. A., Anderson, K., Hancock, S., & Gaston, K. J. (2017). Doses of nearby nature simultaneously associated with multiple health benefits. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *14*(2), 172.

Dadvand, P., Bartoll, X., Basagaña, X., Dalmau-Bueno, A., Martinez, D., Ambros, A., ... & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2016). Green spaces and general health: roles of mental health status, social support, and physical activity. *Environment international*, *91*, 161-167.

Dadvand, P., Hariri, S., Abbasi, B., Heshmat, R., Qorbani, M., Motlagh, M. E., ... & Kelishadi, R. (2019). Use of green spaces, self-satisfaction and social contacts in adolescents: a population-based CASPIAN-V study. *Environmental research*, *168*, 171-177.

Dadvand, P., Villanueva, C. M., Font-Ribera, L., Martinez, D., Basagaña, X., Belmonte, J., ... & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2014). Risks and benefits of green spaces for children: a cross-sectional study of associations with sedentary behavior, obesity, asthma, and allergy. *Environmental health perspectives*, *122*(12), 1329-1335.

Dreyer, B. C., Coulombe, S., Whitney, S., Riemer, M., & Labbé, D. (2018). Beyond exposure to outdoor nature: Exploration of the benefits of a green building's indoor environment on wellbeing. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*, 1583.

Ebrahimpour, R., Payedar Ardakani, P., & Tohidi Moghadam, M. (2018). The Role of Lighting, Window Views and Indoor Plants on Stress Reduction of Offices' Staffs by Psychophysics method. *Iran Occupational Health*, *14*(6), 135-147.

Fischer, L. K., Honold, J., Cvejić, R., Delshammar, T., Hilbert, S., Lafortezza, R., ... & Kowarik, I. (2018). Beyond green: Broad support for biodiversity in multicultural European cities. *Global environmental change*, *49*, 35-45.

Gascon, M., Triguero-Mas, M., Martínez, D., Dadvand, P., Forns, J., Plasència, A., & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2015). Mental health benefits of long-term exposure to

residential green and blue spaces: a systematic review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *12*(4), 4354-4379.

Gorbalenya, A., Baker, S., Baric, R., de Groot, R., Drosten, C., Gulyaeva, A., ... & Penzar, D. (2020). Coronaviridae Study Group of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. The species severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: classifying 2019-nCoV and naming it SARS-CoV-2. *Nature microbiology*, *2020*, 03-04.

Gray, T., & Birrell, C. (2014). Are biophilic-designed site office buildings linked to health benefits and high performing occupants?. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *11*(12), 12204-12222.

Han, K. T., & Ruan, L. W. (2019). Effects of Indoor Plants on Self-Reported Perceptions: A Systemic Review. *Sustainability*, *11*(16), 4506.

Hanford, N., & Figueiro, M. (2013). Light therapy and Alzheimer's disease and related dementia: past, present, and future. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *33*(4), 913-922.

Hassan, A., Qibing, C., Tao, J., Bing-Yang, L., Nian, L., Li, S., ... & Tahir, M. S. (2018). Effects of plant activity on mental stress in young adults. *HortScience*, *53*(1), 104-109.

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on psychological science*, *10*(2), 227-237.

Huang, C., Wang, Y., Li, X., Ren, L., Zhao, J., Hu, Y., ... & Cheng, Z. (2020). Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The lancet*, *395*(10223), 497-506.

Jiménez-Pavón, D., Carbonell-Baeza, A., & Lavie, C. J. (2020). Physical exercise as therapy to fight against the mental and physical consequences of COVID-19 quarantine: Special focus in older people. *Progress in cardiovascular diseases*, *63*(3), 386–388.

Kaida, K., Takahashi, M., & Otsuka, Y. (2007). A short nap and natural bright light exposure improve positive mood status. *Industrial health*, *45*(2), 301-308.

Khan, A. H., Sultana, M. S., Hossain, S., Hasan, M. T., Ahmed, H. U., & Sikder, M. T. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health & wellbeing among home-quarantined Bangladeshi students: A cross-sectional pilot study.

Korpela, K., De Bloom, J., & Kinnunen, U. (2015). From restorative environments to restoration in work. *Intelligent Buildings International*, *7*(4), 215-223.

Korpela, K., Nummi, T., Lipiäinen, L., De Bloom, J., Sianoja, M., Pasanen, T., & Kinnunen, U. (2017). Nature exposure predicts well-being trajectory groups among employees across two years. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *52*, 81-91.

Kruize, H., van Kamp, I., van den Berg, M., van Kempen, E., Wendel-Vos, W., Ruijsbroek, A., ... & Ellis, N. (2020). Exploring mechanisms underlying the relationship between the natural outdoor environment and health and well-being–Results from the PHENOTYPE project. *Environment international*, *134*, 105173.

Lafortezza, R., Carrus, G., Sanesi, G., & Davies, C. (2009). Benefits and well-being perceived by people visiting green spaces in periods of heat stress. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, *8*(2), 97-108.

Lambert, G. W., Reid, C., Kaye, D. M., Jennings, G. L., & Esler, M. D. (2002). Effect of sunlight and season on serotonin turnover in the brain. *The Lancet*, *360*(9348), 1840-1842.

Lansdowne, A. T., & Provost, S. C. (1998). Vitamin D3 enhances mood in healthy subjects during winter. *Psychopharmacology*, *135*(4), 319-323.

Larkin, A., & Hystad, P. (2019). Evaluating street view exposure measures of visible green space for health research. *Journal of exposure science & environmental epidemiology*, *29*(4), 447-456.

Lee, A. C., & Maheswaran, R. (2011). The health benefits of urban green spaces: a review of the evidence. *Journal of public health*, *33*(2), 212-222.

Mann, H. B., & Whitney, D. R. (1947). On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 50-60.

Marquet, O., Floyd, M. F., James, P., Glanz, K., Jennings, V., Jankowska, M. M., ... & Hipp, J. A. (2020). Associations between worksite walkability, greenness, and physical activity around work. *Environment and Behavior*, *52*(2), 139-163.

Miao, L., & Wei, W. (2013). Consumers' pro-environmental behavior and the underlying motivations: A comparison between household and hotel settings. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *32*, 102-112.

Moran, D. (2019). Back to nature? Attention restoration theory and the restorative effects of nature contact in prison. *Health & Place*, *57*, 35-43.

Panno, A., Carrus, G., Lafortezza, R., Mariani, L., & Sanesi, G. (2017). Nature-based solutions to promote human resilience and wellbeing in cities during increasingly hot summers. *Environmental research*, *159*, 249-256.

Qiu, J., Shen, B., Zhao, M., Wang, Z., Xie, B., & Xu, Y. (2020). A nationwide survey of psychological distress among Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: implications and policy recommendations. *General psychiatry*, *33*(2).

Raanaas, R. K., Patil, G. G., & Hartig, T. (2012). Health benefits of a view of nature through the window: a quasi-experimental study of patients in a residential rehabilitation center. *Clinical rehabilitation*, *26*(1), 21-32.

Rajkumar, R. P. (2020). COVID-19 and mental health: A review of the existing literature. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, 102066.

Richardson, E. A., Pearce, J., Shortt, N. K., & Mitchell, R. (2017). The role of public and private natural space in children's social, emotional and behavioural development in Scotland: A longitudinal study. *Environmental research*, *158*, 729-736.

Scopelliti, M., Carrus, G., Adinolfi, C., Suarez, G., Colangelo, G., Lafortezza, R., ... & Sanesi, G. (2016). Staying in touch with nature and well-being in different income groups: The experience of urban parks in Bogotá. *Landscape and urban planning*, *148*, 139-148.

Spano, G., Caffò, A. O., & Bosco, A. (2018). Cognitive functioning, subjective memory complaints and risky behaviour predict minor home injuries in elderly. *Aging clinical and experimental research*, *30*(8), 985-991.

Spano, G., D'Este, M., Giannico, V., Carrus, G., Elia, M., Lafortezza, R., ... & Sanesi, G. (2020b). Are Community Gardening and Horticultural Interventions Beneficial for Psychosocial Well-Being? A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(10), 3584.

Spano, G., Giannico, V., Elia, M., Bosco, A., Lafortezza, R., & Sanesi, G. (2020a). Human health–environment interaction science: An emerging research paradigm. *Science of The Total Environment*, *704*, 135358.

Thornock, C. M., Nelson, L. J., Porter, C. L., & Evans-Stout, C. A. (2019). There's no place like home: The associations between residential attributes and family functioning. *Journal of environmental psychology*, *64*, 39-47.

Toyoda, M., Yokota, Y., Barnes, M., & Kaneko, M. (2020). Potential of a Small Indoor Plant on the Desk for Reducing Office Workers' Stress. *HortTechnology*, *30*(1), 55-63.

Triguero-Mas, M., Dadvand, P., Cirach, M., Martínez, D., Medina, A., Mompart, A., ... & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2015). Natural outdoor environments and mental and physical health: relationships and mechanisms. *Environment international*, *77*, 35-41.

Tse, M. M. Y. (2010). Therapeutic effects of an indoor gardening programme for older people living in nursing homes. *Journal of clinical nursing*, *19*(7- 8), 949-958.

Ugolini, F., Massetti, L., Calaza-Martínez, P., Cariñanos, P., Dobbs, C., Ostoic, S. K., ... & Simoneti, M. (2020). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the use and perceptions of

urban green space: an international exploratory study. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 126888.

Venter, Z., Barton, D., Gundersen, V., Figari, H., & Nowell, M. (2020). Urban nature in a time of crisis: recreational use of green space increases during the COVID-19 outbreak in Oslo, Norway. *Environmental Research Letters*.

Wang, G., Zhang, Y., Zhao, J., Zhang, J., & Jiang, F. (2020a). Mitigate the effects of home confinement on children during the COVID-19 outbreak. *The Lancet*, *395*(10228), 945-947.

Wang, H., Xia, Q., Xiong, Z., Li, Z., Xiang, W., Yuan, Y., ... & Li, Z. (2020b). The psychological distress and coping styles in the early stages of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic in the general mainland Chinese population: A web-based survey. *Plos one*, *15*(5), e0233410.

Wilkinson, G. N., & Rogers, C. E. (1973). Symbolic description of factorial models for analysis of variance. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, *22*(3), 392-399.

Wu, Y. T., Prina, A. M., Jones, A., Matthews, F. E., Brayne, C., & CFAS, M. (2015). Older people, the natural environment and common mental disorders: cross-sectional results from the Cognitive Function and Ageing Study. *BMJ open*, *5*(9), e007936.

Xie, J., Luo, S., Furuya, K., & Sun, D. (2020). Urban Parks as Green Buffers During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Sustainability*, *12*(17), 6751.

Yeo, N. L., Elliott, L. R., Bethel, A., White, M. P., Dean, S. G., & Garside, R. (2020). Indoor nature interventions for health and wellbeing of older adults in residential settings: A systematic review. *The Gerontologist*, *60*(3), e184-e199.

Zhang, S. X., Wang, Y., Rauch, A., & Wei, F. (2020). Unprecedented disruption of lives and work: Health, distress and life satisfaction of working adults in China one month into the COVID-19 outbreak. *Psychiatry research*, 112958.

Supplementary materials

Figure S1. Number and distribution of completed questionnaires throughout the Italian peninsula. A bigger and darker circle indicates a higher number of completed questionnaires.



Figure S2. Total number of people that tested positive for COVID-19, i.e., the number of confirmed cases on the total number of inhabitants per region.



Table S1. Results of single-exposure regression models of the associations between indoor green features and psychological health outcomes adjusted for number of confirmed COVID-19 cases per regional population and previously tested covariates (i.e., age, gender, education level, current working mode, presence of other people, presence of pets, and estimated decrease in income).

Outcome	Plant pots				Sunlight				Green view			
	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F
Anxiety	-0.09* (-0.17 - 0.001)	0.05	0.04	10.7***	-0.02 (-0.05 0.01)	0.05	0.04	10.57***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.05	0.04	10.98***
Anger	-0.09* (-0.17 - 0.004)	0.07	0.07	16.84***	-0.05* (-0.08 -0.02)	0.07	0.07	17.16***	-0.07*** (-0.10 0.10)	0.08	0.07	17.75***
Fear	-0.11* (-0.19 -0.03)	0.07	0.06	15.26***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.008)	0.07	0.06	15.23***	-0.06*** (-0.1 -0.03)	0.07	0.06	15.85***
Confusion	-0.02 (-0.11 0.06)	0.05	0.05	11.76***	-0.06*** (-0.1 -0.03)	0.06	0.05	12.61***	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.06	0.05	12.96***
Moodiness	-0.05 (-0.13 0.03)	0.07	0.06	15.86***	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.07	0.07	17***	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.05)	0.07	0.07	17.29***
Boredom	-0.07 (-0.16 0.06)	0.12	0.11	28.34***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.008)	0.12	0.11	28.52***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.12	0.12	29.1***
Irritability	-0.10* (-0.18 -0.02)	0.09	0.09	21.29***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.09	0.09	21.53***	-0.06*** (-0.18 -0.02)	0.09	0.09	21.67***
Recurrent thoughts/dreams	-0.01 (-0.1 0.07)	0.03	0.03	7.75***	-0.02 (-0.05 0.01)	0.04	0.03	7.83***	-0.03 (-0.06 0.002)	0.04	0.03	7.94***
Poor concentration	0.003 (-0.08 0.09)	0.06	0.05	12.99***	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.06	0.06	13.75***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.02)	0.06	0.05	13.54***
Sleep disturbance	-0.11** (-0.20 - 0.03)	0.05	0.04	11.13***	-0.08*** (-0.12 -0.05)	0.05	0.05	12.38***	-0.08*** (-0.11 -0.04)	0.05	0.05	12.04***

R^2= R-Squared; AR^2=Adjusted R-Squared. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

Table S2. Results of single-exposure regression models of the associations between outdoor green features and psychological health outcomes adjusted for number of confirmed COVID-19 cases per regional population and previously tested covariates (i.e., age, gender, education level, current working mode, presence of other people, presence of pets, and estimated decrease in income).

Outcome	Private green spaces				General outdoor naturalness			
	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F	β (95% CI)	R^2	AR^2	F
Anxiety	-0.08*** (-0.12 -0.05)	0.05	0.05	12.04***	-0.03* (-0.07 -0.004)	0.05	0.04	10.74***
Anger	-0.06*** (-0.09 -0.03)	0.08	0.07	17.48***	-0.03 (-0.06 0.002)	0.07	0.07	16.8***
Fear	-0.08*** (-0.12 -0.05)	0.07	0.07	16.5***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.005)	0.07	0.06	15.17***
Confusion	-0.04** (-0.08 -0.01)	0.05	0.05	12.2***	-0.03 (-0.06 0.002)	0.05	0.05	11.94***
Moodiness	-0.07*** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.07	0.07	16.89***	-0.03 (-0.04 -0.06)	0.07	0.06	15.97***
Boredom	-0.08*** (-0.02 -0.05)	0.12	0.12	29.9***	-0.04* (-0.07 -0.005)	0.12	0.11	28.47***
Irritability	-0.07*** (-0.09 -0.02)	0.09	0.09	22.12***	-0.04** (-0.10 -0.04)	0.09	0.09	21.38***
Recurrent thoughts/dreams	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.01)	0.04	0.03	8.19***	-0.03 (-0.06 -0.001)	0.04	0.03	7.96***
Poor concentration	-0.03* (-0.07 -0.002)	0.06	0.05	13.24***	-0.03 (-0.06 0.003)	0.06	0.05	13.18***
Sleep disturbance	-0.07*** (-0.11 -0.04)	0.05	0.05	11.94***	-0.05** (-0.08 -0.01)	0.05	0.05	11.2***

R^2= R-Squared; AR^2=Adjusted R-Squared. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

Declaration of interests

☒ The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: