

Table S4-1. Level of correct actual knowledge on general characteristics and hazards of plastics, microplastics, and nanoplastics, stratified by risk perception groups. Mean value and standard deviation of scores values from -1 (min correctness) to +1 (max correctness).

	Group 1 (29)	Group 3 (20)	Group 4 (178)	Sign. ^a	Sign. ^b	(η_H^2) Effect size ^c
P1 - Plastics, overall characteristics	0.66±0.28	0.63±0.29	0.61±0.26	n.s.	-	0.006
P2 - Plastics, advantages	0.61±0.28	0.53±0.47	0.57±0.35	n.s.	-	0.001
P3 - Plastics, disadvantages	0.49±0.35	0.30±0.42	0.49±0.32	n.s.	G3 vs G4 (p<0.05)	0.014
P4 - Plastics, pittogrammes	0.38±0.41	0.15±0.43	0.34±0.42	n.s.	G1 vs G3 (p<0.05) G3 vs G4 (p<0.05)	0.021
MN1 - MPs/NPs, definition and sources	0.53±0.38	0.56±0.39	0.59±0.32	n.s.	-	0.002
MN2 - MPs/NPs, contaminated environmental matrices	0.66±0.40	0.56±0.35	0.68±0.30	n.s.	-	0.009
MN3 - MPs/NPs, contaminated foods	0.36±0.43	0.44±0.48	0.52±0.39	n.s.	G1 vs G4 (p<0.05)	0.017
MN4 - MPs/NPs, human exposure and general toxicity	0.56±0.29	0.53±0.39	0.68±0.30	p<0.05	G1 vs G4 (p<0.05) G3 vs G4 (p<0.05)	0.028
MN5 - MPs toxicity for organs and body systems	0.41±0.27	0.35±0.29	0.43±0.28	n.s.	-	0.006
MN6 - NPs toxicity for organs and body systems	0.31±0.28	0.46±0.32	0.44±0.29	n.s.	G1 vs G3 (p<0.05) G1 vs G4 (p<0.05)	0.021
MN7 - MPs/NPs, risk of carcinogenicity	-0.31±0.59	-0.69±0.63	-0.44±0.64	n.s.	G1 vs G3 (p<0.05) G3 vs G4 (p<0.05)	0.023

^a Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test (comparison of three or more independent groups)

^b Dunn test with Benjamini-Hochberg's correction (non-parametric post-hoc test for pairwise comparison)

^c Eta squared effect size (η_H^2) on Kruskal-Wallis test:

≥0.01 small

≥0.06 medium

≥0.14 large

Table S4-2. Use of different source to learn about health and environmental risks: % proportion of interviewed using 'often' each source stratified by risk perception groups.

	Group 1 (29)	Group 3 (178)	Group 4 (20)	Sign.^a	Effect size^b
TV	24.1%	60.0%	40.9%	p<0.05	0.169
Radio	10.3%	53.3%	15.0%	p<0.001	0.274
Social network	67.9%	78.9%	69.1%	n.s.	0.063
Websites	75.9%	70.0%	69.8%	n.s.	0.045
Newspapers	3.4%	52.6%	26.8%	p<0.01	0.264
Specialized journals	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	n.s.	0.053
Books	24.1%	33.3%	23.4%	n.s.	0.065
Seminars	24.1%	22.2%	11.9%	n.s.	0.137
People	31.0%	50.0%	32.5%	n.s.	0.106

^a Significant at Fisher's exact test

^b Cramer's V effect size:

≥0.10 small

≥0.30 medium

≥0.50 large

Table S4-3. Possible public strategy or technology solutions regarding plastic that the governments should adopt: % proportion of interviewed approved each solution ('YES' response option) stratified by risk perception groups.

	Group 1 (29)	Group 3 (178)	Group 4 (20)	Sign.^a	Effect size^b
Solution 1 - Use alternative materials instead of plastic whenever possible	85.7%	80.0%	98.9%	p<0.001	0.315
Solution 2 - Make plastic products lighter to reduce their overall quantity	71.4%	85.0%	77.1%	n.s.	0.074
Solution 3 - Use biodegradable plastic	85.2%	80.0%	86.9%	n.s.	0.058
Solution 4 - Promote separate collection and recycling of plastic	85.7%	90.0%	97.2%	p<0.05	0.189
Solution 5 - Encourage technologies for remediation of natural environments	100.0%	85.0%	96.0%	n.s.	0.172
Solution 6 - Offer free reusable bags	71.4%	75.0%	73.9%	n.s.	0.020
Solution 7 - Ban the sale of plastic bags	67.9%	85.0%	79.4%	n.s.	0.105
Solution 8 - Educate the people	92.9%	90.0%	98.9%	p<0.05	0.187
Solution 9 - Improve water purification technology	89.3%	85.0%	90.8%	n.s.	0.056

^a Significant at Fisher's exact test

^b Cramer's V effect size:

≥0.10 small

≥0.30 medium

≥0.50 large