

1 More spice, less salt: how capsaicin affects liking for and perceived saltiness of foods in people with
2 smell loss.

3

4 Stephanie R. Hunter^{1*}, Candelaria Beatty¹, Pamela H. Dalton¹

5

6 ¹Monell Chemical Senses Center, Philadelphia, PA

7

8 *Corresponding Author:

9 Stephanie Hunter

10 3500 Market Street

11 Philadelphia, PA 19104

12 shunter@monell.org

13 Abstract

14 People who lose their sense of smell self-report consuming more salt to compensate for a lack of
15 flavor and enhance eating enjoyment. However, this can contribute to excess sodium intake and a
16 poor diet. Capsaicin may help increase salt taste intensity and eating enjoyment in this population,
17 but this has not been studied. The purpose of this study was to determine 1) whether salt intake in
18 those with smell loss differs from population averages, 2) whether capsaicin increases flavor and salt
19 taste intensity, and 3) if adding spice to foods increases food liking in individuals with smell loss.
20 Participants 18-65 years old with confirmed partial or total smell loss for at least 12 weeks completed
21 two sets of replicate test sessions (four total). In two sessions participants rated overall flavor
22 intensity, taste qualities' intensities, spicy intensity, and liking for model tomato soups with low or
23 regular sodium content and three levels of capsaicin (none, low, or moderate). In the other two
24 sessions, participants rated the same sensory attributes for model food samples with three levels of
25 added spice (none, low, or moderate). 24-hour urine samples were also collected to determine
26 sodium intake. Results indicate that although sodium intake is higher than recommended in those
27 with smell loss (2893 ± 258 mg/day), they do not consume more sodium than population averages.
28 Adding low and moderate amounts of capsaicin to a model tomato soup increased the intensity of
29 overall flavor and saltiness compared to a model tomato soup without capsaicin. However, the effect
30 of capsaicin on liking differed by food type. In conclusion, the addition of capsaicin can improve flavor,
31 salt taste intensity, and eating enjoyment in people with smell loss.

32
33 Keywords (limit 6): anosmia, hyposmia, salt, chemesthesis, sensory nutrition, olfaction

34
35
36
37
38 Abbreviations: gLMS = general labeled magnitude scale, LHS = labeled hedonic scale

39 **1. Introduction**

40 Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is estimated that about 20% of the population suffered from
41 long-term smell disorders¹⁻⁴. Since the COVID-19 pandemic began, in which smell loss is a cardinal
42 symptom⁵, millions more people have lost their sense of smell long-term^{6,7}. Smell disorders are more
43 prevalent now than ever before, and more people than ever will suffer from their negative effects on
44 physical and mental health.

45 Food odors contribute to flavor and a pleasurable eating experience^{8,9}. One of the primary
46 complaints in people who lose their sense of smell is the lack of flavor perception and reduced eating
47 enjoyment^{10,11}, which negatively affects their quality of life^{12,13}. People with smell loss often report
48 compensatory strategies in attempts to regain flavor and increase palatability of foods. One of these
49 compensatory strategies is adding more salt to foods. Those with smell loss self-report being more
50 frequent salt consumers^{11,14} and preferring salty foods after losing their sense of smell¹⁰. However, if
51 this is maintained with long-term smell loss, this could lead to excess sodium intake. Another
52 compensatory strategy that people with smell loss often report is adding hot sauce or spiciness to
53 foods, which increases the chemesthetic aspect of flavor^{10,11,15,16}. For example, one person with
54 smell loss stated that "...I opted for more spicy food... stuff with a lot more heat in it just to taste
55 something"¹⁵. Thus, this may be a useful strategy to improve flavor and palatability, but this has not
56 been tested.

57 Sodium intake is already too high throughout the population. The World Health Organization
58 recommends consuming 5 grams of sodium per day, but the average intake is 9-12 grams per day¹⁷.
59 In the United States, the dietary guidelines recommend consuming less than 2300 mg of sodium per
60 day¹⁸, however the average sodium intake is 3,361 mg/day¹⁹. Many health organizations have goals
61 to reduce sodium intake^{18,20-22}. If those with long-term smell loss are consuming even more sodium
62 after losing their sense of smell, this could exacerbate the problem that already exists, and hinder
63 population wide efforts to reduce sodium intake. Compensatory strategies that improve flavor, but do
64 not negatively affect health should be encouraged in those with smell loss²³.

65 Previous studies have found that capsaicin can increase salt taste intensity in people with a
66 normal sense of smell. In one study, normosmic individuals reported that 4.4 g/L solutions of salt
67 tastes saltier with 0.1 or 0.3 mg/L added capsaicin compared to when no capsaicin is added²⁴. Others
68 have found that 3200 mg/L of capsaicin increased salt taste intensity of a 0.98 g/L salt water solution
69 by 51% compared to the salt water solution with no capsaicin added²⁵. Observational studies also
70 report that participants with a high spice preference had lower salt intakes and blood pressure than
71 individuals who disliked spicy food²⁶. Given that individuals with smell loss self-report adding spicy
72 ingredients onto foods to regain some flavor, adding a small amount of capsaicin to foods may be a
73 well-adhered to strategy to improve flavor and food liking while avoiding excessive salt intake in these
74 individuals. However, this strategy has not been tested in individuals with smell loss.

75 The purpose of this study was to 1) establish current sodium intake and eating behavior
76 changes in those with smell loss - we hypothesized that there will be differences in eating behavior
77 after smell loss and that current sodium intake will be high compared to recommended levels; 2)
78 determine if capsaicin increases salt taste sensitivity in individuals with smell loss - we hypothesized
79 that the addition of capsaicin to an NaCl solution will increase salt taste sensitivity; and 3) quantify
80 liking of a meal with and without capsaicin in individuals with smell loss - we hypothesized that adding
81 capsaicin to a food in those with smell loss will increase liking compared to the same food without
82 capsaicin.

84 **2. Methods**

85 *2.1 Participants*

86 Participants were recruited from the greater Philadelphia, PA area from October 2021 to
87 September 2022. Eligibility criteria included men and women 18 - 65 years old with acquired anosmia
88 or hyposmia for at least 12 weeks. Smell loss was confirmed using the NIH Toolbox Odor
89 Identification Test²⁷ and a SCENTinelTM test²⁸. Those who answered 6 or less questions correctly on
90 the NIH Toolbox Odor Identification Test and/or rated the odor intensity on the SCENTinelTM test \leq

91 50 (out of 100) were included in this study. Those who had congenital anosmia were excluded from
92 this study due to potential differences in eating behaviors from those with acquired smell disorders²⁹.

93 33 participants were included in this study (Table 1). Results from the NIH Toolbox Odor
94 Identification Test indicated that 10 had anosmia, and 23 had hyposmia. Furthermore, 11 of those
95 with hyposmia also self-reported that they experienced parosmia. 88% of participants were female,
96 85% were white, and the average age was 47 ± 11 years old. The average smell loss duration was 3
97 ± 5 years, from a variety of etiologies, including COVID-19, surgery, traumatic brain injury, and
98 unknown reasons.

99

100 Table 1. Demographics.

Characteristic	Participants
n	33
Age; (mean \pm SE)	47 ± 11
Sex; n (%)	29 (88%) Female 4 (12%) Male
Race; n (%)	28 (85%) White 3 (9%) Black 2 (6%) Mixed Race
Objective Smell Disorder; n (%)	10 (30%) with Anosmia 23 (70%) with Hyposmia
Length of Smell Disorder; (mean \pm SD)	3 ± 5 years
Frequency of Spicy Food Consumption; n (%)	2 (6%) never or less than 1 time per month 1 (3%) 1 time per month 9 (27%) 2 - 3 times per month 2 (6%) 1 time per week 10 (30%) 2 - 3 times per week 3 (9%) 4 - 6 times per week 1 (3%) 1 time per day 5 (15%) Unknown or not reported

101

102

103

2.2 Design

This was a within-subjects study. Participants came to the Monell Chemical Senses Center for four, 1-hour test sessions, which consisted of two replicate test sessions: two in which they completed sensory evaluations of model tomato soups, and two in which they completed sensory evaluations of two other model foods (pasta and chocolate). Order of the sessions was counterbalanced across participants, such that about half were randomly assigned to sensory evaluations of model tomato soups first, and model foods second, and others were randomly assigned to sensory evaluations of model foods first, and model soups second.

2.3 Procedure

This research was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board (protocol #849791). All participants provided written informed consent prior to taking part in this study.

Participants arrived fasted for at least one hour prior to each test session. For one of the replicate test sessions, participants first completed scale training. Participants were then provided with 12, 30-mL samples of tomato soup. In a random order, participants swished the sample around their mouth, and swallowed the sample. They then made intensity and liking ratings on the sample. Participants waited for two minutes in between samples, cleansed their palate with a cracker (Nabisco Saltine Cracker, Unsalted Tops), rinsed their mouth with whole milk³⁰ (SKU 8826700874, Foodhold USA, LLC), and expectorated the milk. For the other replicate test sessions, participants first completed scale training. Next, participants were provided with six, 30-g samples of pasta, followed by six, 15 g samples of chocolate. For each food, participants tasted the sample, swallowed it, and then made intensity and liking ratings. Participants waited 2 minutes in between samples, cleansed their palate with a cracker (Nabisco Saltine Cracker, Unsalted Tops), rinsed their mouth with whole milk (Foodhold USA, LLC), and expectorated the milk. At the end of the first test session, participants completed a questionnaire to determine how their eating behaviors differ from before

versus after losing their sense of smell, adapted from Aschenbrenner et al¹⁰. They were also provided with supplies to collect their urine for a 24-hour period.

2.4 Stimulus Materials

Tomato soup samples were prepared using commercially available Regular Sodium (Imagine Foods Creamy Tomato Soup; 670 mg Sodium) and Reduced Sodium (Imagine Foods Light in Sodium Garden Tomato Soup; 280 mg Sodium) soup. Based on methods from Narakuwa et al²⁴, 0, 0.0003, or 0.0006 g of capsaicin was added per liter of soup, and from now on will be referred to as none, low, or moderate amounts of capsaicin, respectively. Samples were coded with three digit numbers, and there were different codes for replicates. Participants were provided each sample in a random order, and in duplicate, such that they sampled 12 tomato soup samples during the respective test session. Soups were served at 150°F and kept hot using a water bath.

Pasta and chocolate samples were used to simulate a more meal-like experience. Pasta samples were prepared according to the Sambal butter noodles recipe from the Taste & Flavour Cookbook by Ryan Riley and Kimberley Duke, which was created specifically for individuals who lost their sense of smell because of COVID-19³¹. Specifically, 260 g of pasta (Light 'n Fluffy extra wide egg noodles, SKU 3340061280) was cooked for 6 minutes, and then strained. Seventy-five grams of unsalted butter (SKU 8826707471, Foodhold USA, LLC) was added to the pasta, along with 2 tablespoons of dried basil (SKU 8826701570, Ahold USA, Inc.), 100 g of parmesan cheese (SKU 8826716875, Ahold USA, Inc.), ¼ teaspoon of salt, and ¼ teaspoon of pepper, and mixed well so that each noodle had an even coating of ingredients. One-hundred grams of the pasta was divided into three different bowls. One bowl had no sambal oelek (Huy Fong Foods, Irwindale, CA) added (no spice), one had ¼ teaspoon of sambal oelek added and mixed well (low spice) and had ½ teaspoon of sambal oelek added and mixed well (moderate spice). Thirty grams of each pasta was served to participants in duplicate in clear, plastic souffle cups, coded with a three-digit number. Replicates were coded with different three-digit numbers. Chocolate was prepared by melting 73 g of chocolate

156 (Hershey's Milk Chocolate Baking Chips) in a double broiler until it reached 110-115°F, removing it
157 from heat and cooling to 95-100°F, then adding in an additional 36 g of chocolate, and stirring until
158 melted. Then, either 0g, 0.17g, or 0.33g of cayenne pepper was added and mixed thoroughly. The
159 chocolate was poured into a mold and cooled completely. Fifteen grams of each chocolate was
160 served to participants in duplicate in clear, plastic souffle cups, coded with a three-digit number.

161 162 *2.5 Scale Training*

163 At the beginning of each test session, participants were trained to use the general labeled magnitude
164 scale (gLMS)³² and the labeled hedonic scale (LHS)³³ using standard instructions, then practiced
165 each scale by rating the intensity or liking of imagined sensations. The gLMS is a vertical scale with
166 intensity descriptors of “barely detectable”, “weak”, “moderate”, “strong”, “very strong”, and “strongest
167 imaginable sensation of any kind”, with the spacing of the descriptors on the scale determined
168 empirically to be proportional to the strength of the sensation. The LHS is a vertical scale with liking
169 descriptors of “most disliked sensation imaginable”, “dislike extremely”, “dislike very much”, “dislike
170 moderately”, “dislike slightly”, “neutral”, “like slightly”, “like moderately”, “like very much”, “like
171 extremely”, and “most liked sensation imaginable”.

172 173 *2.6 Ratings of intensity and liking*

174 For each sample, participants rated the intensity of flavor, taste qualities (sweet, sour, salty, bitter,
175 and umami), and spiciness using a gLMS, and how much they liked the sample using a LHS, in that
176 order. Umami was described to participants as how savory the sample was. While we were
177 specifically interested in salt taste intensity, we assessed all taste qualities to prevent a dumping
178 effect³⁴.

179 180 *2.7 Dietary Behaviors Questionnaire*

181 Changes in dietary behaviors before and after smell loss were assessed using the Dietary Behaviors
182 Questionnaires, as done in Aschenbrenner et al 2008¹⁰. This is a 41-item questionnaire with
183 questions about taste preferences, body weight changes, social eating behaviors, and whether
184 different foods and nutrients are consumed more, less, or no change now compared to before losing
185 their sense of smell. Two questions to determine changes in salt intake (“Do you use more or less salt
186 now?”) and spicy intake (“Do you eat more or less spicy foods now?”) were added to the survey.

188 *2.8 24-hour urine collection*

189 Participants were provided with supplies to collect their urine for a 24-hour period after the first test
190 session. Participants were instructed to void their first urine upon waking up, and then to collect all
191 urine including the final specimen voided at the end of the 24-hour collection period. 24-hour urine
192 volume was recorded, and a 10-mL aliquot was sent to LabCorp to assess sodium content.

194 *2.9 Data Analysis*

195 The sample size calculation for this study was based on a power analysis that indicated a
196 sample of 30 participants would be sufficient to detect a moderate effect size of 0.35 with 95% power
197 for detecting differences in rated salt taste intensity. The α level was set at 0.05 for all analyses. To
198 account for potential dropouts, our goal was to recruit 35 participants, but due to time constraints, we
199 stopped data collection after we reached 33 participants. Not all participants completed all study
200 sessions, and the sample size included in each analysis is described below. Data are reported as
201 means and standard errors unless otherwise stated.

202 All 33 participants completed the Dietary Behaviors Questionnaire. The Dietary Behaviors
203 Questionnaire was analyzed using chi-square tests, Kruskal-Wallis tests, and t-tests where
204 appropriate. 24-hour urine was compared to population averages using t-test, and compared across
205 objective smell disorder groups using one-way ANOVA. Urine volumes less than 500 mL were
206 considered incomplete and were excluded from the analysis^{35–37}. One participant had a 24-hour urine

207 volume less than 500 mL. Twenty-five participants had complete 24-hour urine samples and were
208 included in the analysis.

209 We performed a test-retest analysis on all ratings for replicate samples within and between
210 sessions. The test-retest reliability ranged from 0.16 – 0.7, and all ratings were significantly correlated
211 within and between sessions (see Supplementary Tables 2-5). Thus, we averaged ratings across
212 replicate samples using arithmetic means for the analyses. Linear mixed models were used to
213 determine the effect of sodium (regular or reduced), capsaicin (none, low, moderate), and
214 sodium*capsaicin [for soup samples; n=29], or food (pasta or chocolate), spice (none, low, or
215 moderate), and food*spice [for food samples; n=31] on total flavor, taste qualities, and spiciness
216 intensities, and liking. Sodium and capsaicin, and food and spice levels were fixed effects, and
217 participants were treated as random effects. Age, sex (male, female, other, prefer not to answer),
218 frequency of spice consumption, length of smell disorder, and objective smell disorders were included
219 in the models as covariates. When the main or interaction effects were significant, pairwise
220 comparisons were conducted with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Variables that were
221 not Normally distributed were log transformed to ameliorate a positive skew³² or had outliers
222 removed. We failed to asked participants about gender identity, which limits the generalizability of our
223 research.


224 The procedures, hypotheses, and pre-analysis plan were pre-registered and data are publicly
225 available in the Open Science Framework Repository³⁸.

227 **3. Results**

228 *3.1 Changes in dietary behaviors*

229 Significantly more participants prefer salty foods after compared to before losing their sense of smell
230 ($X^2=6.3$, $df=1$, $p=0.01$; figure 1c), and significantly fewer participants prefer fatty foods after compared
231 to before losing their sense of smell ($X^2=4.5$, $df=1$, $p=0.03$; figure 1e), but there were no differences in
232 preferences for sweet ($X^2=2.3$, $df=1$, $p=0.13$; figure 1a), sour ($X^2=1.3$, $df=1$, $p=0.3$; figure 1b), bitter

233 ($X^2=0.5$, $df=1$, $p=0.5$; figure 1d), or spicy tastes ($X^2=0.6$, $df=1$, $p=0.5$; figure 1f). Forty-eight percent of
234 participants indicated that they gained weight, while 30% indicated that they lost weight since the
235 onset of their smell disorder. Seventy percent of participants indicated that they use more herbs and
236 spices, and 58% of participants report eating more spicy foods today compared to before losing their
237 smell, while 63% of participants reported eating more salt now compared to before their smell loss
238 (Table 2). Responses to all questions can be found in Table 2. There were no differences between
239 smell disorders for any questions.



240

241 **Figure 1. Changes in taste preferences before and after smell loss.** Black represents those who
242 prefer that taste, gray represents those who do not prefer that taste. $n=33$.

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

Table 2. Changes in dietary behaviors questionnaire. n=33.

Question	More, n (%)	Less, n (%)	No Change, n (%)
Do you eat more or less now?	10 (30)	12 (36)	11 (33)
Do you eat on a more or less regular schedule?	4 (12)	14 (42)	15 (45)
Do you use more or less spices today?	23 (70)	7 (21)	3 (9)
Do you invite people for dinner more or less frequently?	1 (3)	19 (58)	13 (39)
Are you looking more or forward to dinner invitations?	2 (6)	18 (55)	13 (39)
Do you need more or less time to eat a meal?	3 (9)	7 (21)	23 (70)
Do you go out to eat to a restaurant more or less frequently?	1 (3)	19 (58)	13 (39)
Do you eat more or less meals a day now?	1 (3)	17 (52)	15 (45)
Do you eat more or less in between meals now?	8 (24)	12 (36)	13 (39)
Do you spend more or less money on food now?	11 (33)	10 (30)	12 (36)
Do you pay more or less attention to low caloric nutrition?	3 (9)	11 (33)	19 (58)
Do you eat more or less cake today?	7 (21)	17 (52)	9 (27)
Do you pay more or less attention to healthy nutrition now?	7 (21)	12 (36)	14 (42)
Do you eat more or less sweets today?	12 (36)	18 (55)	2 (9)
Do you eat more or less yogurt/milk products now?	12 (36)	9 (27)	12 (36)
Do you eat more or less cheese now?	12 (36)	9 (27)	12 (36)
Do you eat more or less fruits now?	12 (36)	13 (39)	8 (24)
Do you eat more or less vegetables and salad now?	9 (27)	17 (52)	7 (21)
Do you eat more or less spicy foods now?	19 (58)	5 (15)	9 (27)
Do you eat more or less low-fat food now?	4 (12)	7 (21)	22 (67)
Do you eat more or less high-fat food now?	12 (36)	7 (21)	14 (42)
Do you use more or less artificial sweeteners now?	4 (12)	10 (30)	19 (58)
Do you use more or less sugar now?	6 (18)	12 (36)	15 (45)
Do you use more or less salt now?	21 (63)	4 (12)	8 (24)
Do you drink more or less coffee or tea today?	11 (33)	6 (18)	16 (48)
Do you drink more or less alcoholic beverages today?	2 (6)	15 (45)	16 (48)
Do you drink more or less sweet drinks today?	7 (21)	17 (52)	9 (27)
Is your daily intake of liquids higher or lower today?	12 (36)	4 (12)	17 (52)

254

255 *3.2 24-hour urinary sodium*

256 The average sodium intake in all participants was 2992 ± 279 mg/day (n=25). Since men and women
 257 have different levels of sodium intake, and there were only four males in this study, we only analyzed


258 sodium intake in women. The average sodium intake for women included in this study was $2893 \pm$
259 258 mg/day ($n=22$). This is not significantly different compared to previous population estimates in
260 women (3039 ± 99 mg/day; $t=0.3$, $df=426$, $p=0.3$), however, it is still higher than the recommended
261 levels of sodium intake per day in the United States (2300 mg/day). Average sodium intake was not
262 significantly different between smell disorders (supplementary table 1; F -value= 0.7 , $df=2$, $p=0.5$).

264 *3.3 Moderate amounts of capsaicin increased salt taste intensity in model tomato soup samples*

265 There was a significant effect of capsaicin ($F_{2,568}=165$, $p<0.001$), where participants rated the soups
266 with low ($p<0.001$) and moderate ($p<0.001$) amounts of capsaicin spicier than the soups with no
267 capsaicin, and the soups with moderate amounts of capsaicin were rated as spicier than the soups
268 with low amounts of capsaicin ($p<0.001$), indicating that participants could perceive the three different
269 capsaicin levels, which was expected (Figure 2a). There was also an effect of objective disorder
270 ($F_{1,19}=8.4$, $p=0.009$), where those with anosmia (30.6 ± 2.1) rated the soups twice as spicy as
271 participants with hyposmia (14.5 ± 1.1).

272 There was a significant effect of sodium concentration on taste quality intensities, such that the
273 regular sodium soup was rated more sweet ($F_{1,626}=6.4$, $p=0.01$; Figure 2c), more salty ($F_{1,570}=32.1$,
274 $p<0.001$; Figure 2e), less bitter ($F_{1,570}=13.3$, $p<0.001$; Figure 2f), and more umami ($F_{1,570}=35.1$,
275 $p<0.001$; Figure 2g) than the reduced sodium soup. There was also a significant effect of capsaicin
276 level on umami ($F_{2,570}=5.6$, $p=0.004$), sweet ($F_{2,626}=3.3$, $p=0.04$), bitter ($F_{2,570}=5.4$, $p=0.005$), and salt
277 ($F_{2,570}=5.5$, $p=0.004$) taste intensities, such that the soups with moderate amounts of capsaicin were
278 more umami (Figure 2g; $p<0.001$), less sweet ($p=0.02$, Figure 2c) and more bitter (Figure 2f; $p<0.001$)
279 than soups with no capsaicin added. Soups with moderate ($p<0.001$) and low ($p=0.02$) capsaicin
280 were also more salty than soups with no capsaicin (Figure 2e). There were no significant effects of
281 sodium level or capsaicin levels on sour intensity ratings ($F_{2,570}=1.1$, $p=0.3$; Figure 2d). There was
282 also a significant sodium ($F_{1,570}=14.4$, $p<0.001$) and capsaicin ($F_{2,570}=27.3$, $p<0.001$) effect on flavor
283 intensity, where regular sodium soups were rated more flavorful than the reduced sodium soups

284 (p<0.001), and soups with moderate (p<0.001) and low (p<0.001) amounts of capsaicin were more
285 flavorful than soups with no capsaicin added, and soups with moderate (p<0.001) capsaicin added
286 were more flavorful than soups with low capsaicin added (Figure 2b). Regular sodium soups were
287 liked more than the reduced sodium soups ($F_{1, 569}=35.5$, p<0.001), but there was no effect of
288 capsaicin level on liking ($F_{2,568}=1.8$, p=0.1; Figure 2h). Thus, adding moderate amounts of capsaicin
289 made the soups more flavorful, salty, bitter, and umami, and less sweet, compared to the soup when
290 no capsaicin was added, but this did not translate to the soups being more liked.



291

292

293

Figure 2. Intensity ratings for a) spice, b) flavor, c) sweet, d) sour, e) salt, f) bitter, g) umami, and h) liking ratings for soups with two sodium concentrations and three capsaicin

294 **concentrations.** Pink bar = no capsaicin, green bar = low capsaicin, blue bar = moderate capsaicin.

295 n=29.

296 297 *3.4 Adding spice to model foods increased liking in a food-specific manner*

298 There was a significant food*spice level interaction effect on spice intensity ($F_{2, 603}=5.3, p=0.005$),
299 where both pasta and chocolate food samples with low ($p<0.001$ for both) and moderate ($p<0.001$ for
300 both) amounts of spice were rated more spicy than the pasta and chocolate with no spice added, and
301 the pasta and chocolate samples with moderate ($p<0.001$ for both) amounts of spice added were
302 rated more spicy than pasta and chocolate samples with low amounts of spice added, respectively.
303 Thus, participants were able to perceive differences between the three spice levels (Figure 3a).

304 There was a significant food*spice level interaction effect on total flavor intensity ($F_{2,581}=14.1,$
305 $p<0.001$; Figure 3b), where pasta samples with low ($p<0.001$) and moderate ($p<0.001$) amounts of
306 spice were more flavorful than pasta samples when no spice was added, and pasta samples with
307 moderate ($p<0.001$) amounts of spice were more flavorful than pasta samples with low amounts of
308 spice added. Chocolate samples with moderate amounts of spice were rated more flavorful than
309 chocolate samples with no spice added ($p=0.01$; Figure 3b). Pasta samples were rated less sweet
310 ($F_{1, 604}=1520.1, p<0.001$; Figure 3c), more sour ($F_{1, 526}=20.5, p<0.001$; Figure 3d), more salty
311 ($F_{1,604}=184.3, p<0.001$; Figure 3e), less bitter ($F_{1,603}=34.2, p<0.001$; Figure 3f), and more umami
312 ($F_{1,604}=75.6, p<0.001$; Figure 3g) than chocolate samples. There was a significant effect of spice level
313 on sour ratings ($F_{2, 524}=4.9, p=0.008$), where food samples with moderate amounts of spice were
314 rated more sour ($p=0.004$; Figure 3d) than food samples with no spice, but there was no significant
315 interaction between food type and spice level ($F_{2, 524}=0.06, p=0.9$). There were also significant effects
316 of spice level on salt ($F_{2,603}=6.4, p=0.002$), bitter ($F_{2,602}=10.4, p<0.001$), and umami ($F_{2, 603}=12.2,$
317 $p<0.001$) ratings, where food samples with low and moderate amounts of spice added were rated
318 more salty ($p=0.04$ and $p<0.001$, respectively; Figure 3e), bitter ($p=0.01$ and $p<0.001$, respectively;
319 Figure 3f) and umami ($p=0.02$ and $p<0.001$, respectively; Figure 3g) than food samples with no spice,

320 and moderate amounts of spice added were rated more umami than food samples with low spice
321 ($p=0.04$), but there was no significant interaction between food type and spice level. Finally, pasta
322 samples were liked more than chocolate samples ($F_{1,538}=5.8$, $p=0.02$; Figure 3h) and there was a
323 significant food*spice level interaction effect ($F_{2,530}=6.3$, $p=0.002$), where adding a moderate amount
324 of spice to pasta samples increased liking compared to pasta samples with no spice added ($p<0.001$).
325 Furthermore, younger participants ($F_{1,22}=4.9$, $p=0.04$), men ($F_{1,24}=5.0$, $p=0.04$), and those with
326 anosmia ($F_{1,21}=6.0$, $p=0.02$) had higher liking ratings compared to older participants, females, and
327 those with hyposmia.




Figure 3. Intensity ratings for a) spice, b) flavor, c) sweet, d) sour, e) salt, f) bitter, g) umami, and h) liking ratings for food samples (pasta and chocolate) with three spice levels added.

Pink bar = no spice, green bar = low spice, blue bar = moderate spice. Data are means \pm SE. n=31.

4. Discussion

Flavor perception and food liking are negatively affected when someone loses their smell, leading to compensatory behaviors, such as increased salt use. The purpose of this study was to establish sodium intake and eating behavior changes in those with smell loss, quantify liking of a meal with and without capsaicin in individuals with smell loss, and determine whether adding capsaicin increases salt taste intensity in individuals with smell loss.

The majority of participants self-reported that they consumed more herbs and spices (70%), spicy foods (58%) and salt (63%) after losing their sense of smell. Participants also preferred salty tastes more after losing their sense of smell. These results are consistent with other studies and anecdotal reports of participants altering their diets to compensate for the lack of flavor, specifically by adding in tastes (like salt)^{11,14} and enhancing the chemesthetic aspect of flavor (spices)^{10,11,15,16}, and preferring salty foods¹⁰. Preferring sweet tastes is also frequently reported in those with smell loss¹¹, but there were no significant differences in reported preference for sweet tastes before and after smell loss in this study, and the majority of our participants indicated no change in their sugar consumption, or reported consuming less sugar after smell loss.

Despite participants self-reporting a higher salt intake and salt taste preferences, sodium intake measured by 24-hour urine was not significantly higher compared to population averages. However, these results should be interpreted with caution, since we do not know what their sodium intake was before losing their sense of smell and therefore do not know if, or in which direction, it changed. If the majority of salt added to the diet is from discretionary sources, which would provide the most direct taste, there would likely only be a small effect on sodium intake³⁹. Excess sodium intake in the population is largely driven by consumption of processed foods, which have a high

355 sodium content, but do not necessarily taste salty³⁹. Future studies should assess which food sources
356 are contributing the most sodium to the diet in people with smell loss.

357 Pasta samples were liked more with moderate amounts of spice added, but liking of tomato
358 soup or chocolate did not change with the addition of spiciness. People who like spicy foods may also
359 be more receptive to the samples with moderate spice added, but there was no effect of spice intake
360 frequency on results in this study. Pasta samples may have been the only food that increased in liking
361 because adding spice to pasta is more common than tomato soup or chocolate, which may have
362 been more of a novel flavor. Previous studies report that individuals with smell loss are less attracted
363 to novel foods than people with a normal sense of smell⁴⁰, thus our participants may have been more
364 wary of these samples. Exposure to novel foods multiple times may be needed to see increases in
365 liking in individuals with smell loss. Furthermore, several of our participants indicated that they have
366 parosmia, and may dislike all foods, even if a palatable taste is added. Nevertheless, our results still
367 provide evidence that adding low and moderate amounts of spiciness to food may help increase how
368 much a food is liked, which can promote intake of that food. Future studies should assess whether
369 this can be used as a strategy to improve diet quality by increasing vegetable intake in individuals
370 with smell loss, which is lower than the population with a normal sense of smell⁴¹, and whether these
371 sensory strategies work in some people more than others.

372 Participants reported that soup samples with low to moderate amounts of capsaicin were more
373 salty compared to soup samples without capsaicin added. Our results support a growing body of
374 evidence that capsaicin increases salt taste intensity, particularly at low to moderate concentrations of
375 salt^{24,25,42-45}. This suggests that capsaicin may be particularly beneficial in increasing perceived
376 saltiness of reduced sodium food products, which could aid in their acceptance. However, the salt
377 taste enhancement was weak in our study, and cross-modal interactions between taste, smell, and
378 chemesthesis may be necessary to see a stronger enhancement of salt taste^{25,42}. It is noteworthy that
379 other studies have been conducted in Asian countries, where spice consumption is high. To our
380 knowledge, this is the first study that has been done in a US sample, and in those with smell loss.

381 While the mechanism for the enhancement of salt taste by capsaicin is unknown, it could be that a
382 TRPV1 (the receptor for capsaicin) variant plays a role in salt taste detection^{46,47}.

383 While there is growing evidence supporting capsaicin increasing salt taste intensity, whether
384 this actually helps reduce salt intake over time has not been tested. Previous studies have modeled
385 sodium reduction with salt taste intensity enhancement, and have found that a 51% enhancement in
386 salt taste intensity would result in about a 10% reduction in sodium²⁵. Another study found that
387 sodium reduction was dependent on the sensitivity of participants to salt, but that 0.41 g/L Sichuan
388 pepper oleoresin (which includes trigeminal and odor component) could increase salt taste intensity
389 and reduce sodium at levels upwards of 3.93 points on a gLMS and 39%, respectively, for the semi-
390 sensitive group, and 3.27 points on a gLMS and 39%, respectively, for the hypersensitive group⁴².

391 Despite many studies reporting that capsaicin increases salt taste intensity, other studies have
392 found that capsaicin reduces salt taste intensities^{48,49}. However, the reduction in taste intensity occurs
393 when the burning sensation is particularly high, either from high levels of capsaicin used or in
394 infrequent spice consumers who are more sensitive to the burn. Thus, there is a cutoff where
395 capsaicin either enhances tastes or diminishes tastes. To use capsaicin as a flavor enhancement
396 strategy, low to moderate levels should be used.

397 One limitation of this study is the lack of a normosmic control group. However, the purpose of
398 this study was specifically to determine if capsaicin increases food liking and salt taste intensity in
399 those with smell loss. Nonetheless, a normosmic control would help to understand if the salt taste
400 enhancement is of the same magnitude in those with smell loss, and could have given a better
401 comparison for sodium intake. Another limitation is that we were not able to collect 24-hour urine
402 sodium intake from all participants due to travel issues and unwillingness to collect the sample,
403 resulting in a sample size of only 22 female participants. Furthermore, we did not measure creatinine
404 to assess completeness of the sample, therefore we do not know the accuracy of the sodium intake
405 measures. However, only participants who had urine volumes greater than 500 mL were included,

406 which has been used in previous studies as a guide to determine whether a sample is complete or
407 not³⁵.

408 This is one of the first studies to assess a sensory strategy to improve food liking in a way that
409 promotes diet quality in people with smell loss. There is a need for more sensory nutrition research in
410 this growing population with smell loss; they are a growing population which suffers from lack of food
411 enjoyment, and is at risk for worse diet quality, a higher BMI and waist circumference, and more
412 chronic diseases than those with a normal sense of smell⁴¹. More sensory nutrition research is
413 needed into this growing population with smell loss in order to improve diet quality, eating enjoyment,
414 and health, which will likely result in improvements to their quality of life²³.

416 **5. Conclusions**

417 People who lose their sense of smell struggle with reduced flavor perception and eating enjoyment,
418 resulting in compensatory strategies that can have a negative effect on health if maintained long-
419 term. In this study, we found that participants with smell loss reported consuming more herbs and
420 spices, salt, and spicy foods. They also consume more sodium than is recommended in the United
421 States, but not more than population averages with normosmia. Capsaicin increases total flavor and
422 salt taste intensity in people with smell loss. Adding spice to foods can help increase food liking, but
423 this is dependent on the food to which the spice is added. Thus, adding spice to foods is a useful
424 strategy to help improve food liking, and flavor and salt taste intensity. Future studies should assess
425 whether this strategy can be used to reduce sodium intake and improve diet quality.

427 **6. Acknowledgements**

428 This work would not be possible without people who are willing to participate in the research. We are
429 grateful to all participants in this study, as well as the AbScent and STANA communities for allowing
430 us to recruit from their communities.

432 **7. Author Contributions**

433 SRH: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, visualization, supervision,
434 project administration, funding acquisition, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing. CB:
435 investigation, writing – review & editing. PHD: conceptualization, methodology, supervision, writing –
436 review & editing.

437 **8. Funding Source**

438 This work was funded by the AbScent Research Grant. SH was supported by NIH U01 (DC019578 to
439 PHD) and T32 (DC000014) funding during this work. The funding sources had no role in the study
440 design, analysis, or interpretation of the data.
441

442 **9. Declaration of Interests**

443 The authors declare no competing interests.
444
445
446

References

1. Rawal, S., Hoffman, H. J., Bainbridge, K. E., Huedo-Medina, T. B. & Duffy, V. B. Prevalence and Risk Factors of Self-Reported Smell and Taste Alterations: Results from the 2011-2012 US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *Chem Senses* **41**, 69–76 (2016).
2. Mullol, J. *et al.* Furthering the understanding of olfaction, prevalence of loss of smell and risk factors: a population-based survey (OLFACAT study). *BMJ Open* **2**, (2012).
3. Nordin, S., Brämerson, A. & Bende, M. Prevalence of self-reported poor odor detection sensitivity: the Skövde population-based study. *Acta Otolaryngol* **124**, 1171–1173 (2004).
4. Landis, B. N., Konnerth, C. G. & Hummel, T. A study on the frequency of olfactory dysfunction. *Laryngoscope* **114**, 1764–1769 (2004).
5. Gerkin, R. C. *et al.* Recent Smell Loss Is the Best Predictor of COVID-19 Among Individuals With Recent Respiratory Symptoms. *Chem Senses* **46**, (2021).
6. Chiesa-Estomba, C. M. *et al.* Patterns of smell recovery in 751 patients affected by the COVID-19 outbreak. *Eur J Neurol* **27**, 2318–2321 (2020).
7. Moein, S. T., Hashemian, S. M., Tabarsi, P. & Doty, R. L. Prevalence and reversibility of smell dysfunction measured psychophysically in a cohort of COVID-19 patients. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol* **10**, 1127–1135 (2020).
8. Reed, D. R. *et al.* NIH Workshop Report: sensory nutrition and disease. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* **113**, 232–245 (2021).
9. International Food Information Council. 2020 Food & Health Survey. (2020).
10. Aschenbrenner, K. *et al.* The influence of olfactory loss on dietary behaviors. *Laryngoscope* **118**, 135–144 (2008).
11. Merkonidis, C. *et al.* Characteristics of chemosensory disorders—results from a survey. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology* **272**, 1403–1416 (2015).
12. Miwa, T. *et al.* Impact of olfactory impairment on quality of life and disability. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* **127**, 497–503 (2001).

- 473 13. O'Donoghue, A. *et al.* Taste and smell abnormalities in advanced cancer: Negative impact on
474 subjective food intake. *Nutrition in Clinical Practice* **n/a**, (2023).
- 475 14. Henkin, R. I. Effects of smell loss (hyposmia) on salt usage. *Nutrition* **30**, 690–695 (2014).
- 476 15. Turner, L. & Rogers, P. J. Varied Effects of COVID-19 Chemosensory Loss and Distortion on
477 Appetite: Implications for Understanding Motives for Eating and Drinking. *Foods* **11**, 607 (2022).
- 478 16. Mattes, R. D. *et al.* Dietary evaluation of patients with smell and/or taste disorders. *Am J Clin Nutr*
479 **51**, 233–240 (1990).
- 480 17. *Guideline: Sodium intake for adults and children.*
481 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241504836> (2012).
- 482 18. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Dietary*
483 *Guidelines for Americans, 2020-2025.* (2020).
- 484 19. Wallace, T. C., Cowan, A. E. & Bailey, R. L. Current Sodium Intakes in the United States and the
485 Modelling of Glutamate's Incorporation into Select Savory Products. *Nutrients* **11**, 2691 (2019).
- 486 20. Lloyd-Jones, D. M. *et al.* Defining and Setting National Goals for Cardiovascular Health Promotion
487 and Disease Reduction. *Circulation* **121**, 586–613 (2010).
- 488 21. World Health Organization(Who). *Guideline.* (World Health Organization, 2016).
- 489 22. Voluntary Sodium Reduction Goals: Target Mean and Upper Bound Concentrations for Sodium in
490 Commercially Processed, Packaged, and Prepared Foods: Guidance for Industry. (2021).
- 491 23. Hunter, S. R. & Dalton, P. H. The need for sensory nutrition research in individuals with smell loss.
492 *Clinical Nutrition Open Science* (2022) doi:10.1016/j.nutos.2022.11.002.
- 493 24. NARUKAWA, M., SASAKI, S. & WATANABE, T. Effect of Capsaicin on Salt Taste Sensitivity in
494 Humans. *Food Science and Technology Research* **17**, 167–170 (2011).
- 495 25. Wang, Y. *et al.* Cross-modal effect of capsaicin and pepper oleoresin on the enhancement of
496 saltiness perception in a NaCl model solution. *Food Quality and Preference* **98**, 104542 (2022).
- 497 26. Li Qiang *et al.* Enjoyment of Spicy Flavor Enhances Central Salty-Taste Perception and Reduces
498 Salt Intake and Blood Pressure. *Hypertension* **70**, 1291–1299 (2017).

- 499 27. Dalton, P. *et al.* Olfactory assessment using the NIH Toolbox. *Neurology* **80**, S32–S36 (2013).
- 500 28. Hunter, S. R. *et al.* Proof-of-concept: SCENTinel 1.1 rapidly discriminates COVID-19-related
501 olfactory disorders. *Chem Senses* **48**, bjad002 (2023).
- 502 29. Boesveldt, S. & Parma, V. The importance of the olfactory system in human well-being, through
503 nutrition and social behavior. *Cell and Tissue Research* **383**, 559–567 (2021).
- 504 30. Fibrianto, K., Nurdiani, K., Puanda, N. & Wulandari, E. The influence of solid and liquid palate
505 cleansers toward the neutralization effectiveness of chili's spicy sensation. *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth
506 Environ. Sci.* **260**, (2019).
- 507 31. Riley, R. & Duke, K. *Taste & Flavour*.
- 508 32. Green, B. G. *et al.* Evaluating the 'Labeled Magnitude Scale' for Measuring Sensations of Taste
509 and Smell. *Chemical Senses* **21**, 323–334 (1996).
- 510 33. Lim, J., Wood, A. & Green, B. G. Derivation and evaluation of a labeled hedonic scale. *Chem
511 Senses* **34**, 739–751 (2009).
- 512 34. Clark, C. C. & Lawless, H. T. Limiting response alternatives in time-intensity scaling: an
513 examination of the halo-dumping effect. *Chemical Senses* **19**, 583–594 (1994).
- 514 35. Ma, Y. *et al.* 24-Hour Urinary Sodium and Potassium Excretion and Cardiovascular Risk. *N Engl J
515 Med* **386**, 252–263 (2022).
- 516 36. Thout, S. R. *et al.* Rationale, design, and baseline characteristics of the Salt Substitute in India
517 Study (SSiIS): The protocol for a double-blinded, randomized-controlled trial. *J Clin Hypertens
518 (Greenwich)* **22**, 1504–1512 (2020).
- 519 37. Peng, Y. *et al.* A New Approach Is Needed to Evaluate 24-Hour Urinary Sodium Excretion Using
520 Spot Urines: A Validation Study in a Chinese Child Population. *Journal of the American Heart
521 Association* **9**, e014575 (2020).
- 522 38. Hunter, S. Understanding the Role of Capsaicin in Food Liking and Salt Preference in Individuals
523 with Smell Loss. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/WP4GM> (2022).

- 524 39. Harnack, L. J. *et al.* Sources of Sodium in US Adults From 3 Geographic Regions. *Circulation*
525 **135**, 1775–1783 (2017).
- 526 40. Manesse, C. *et al.* Dysosmia-Associated Changes in Eating Behavior. *Chemosensory Perception*
527 **10**, 104–113 (2017).
- 528 41. Rawal, S. *et al.* Self-Reported Olfactory Dysfunction and Diet Quality: Findings from the 2011-
529 2014 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *Nutrients* **13**, 4561 (2021).
- 530 42. Zhang, Q.-B. *et al.* The enhancement of the perception of saltiness by Sichuan pepper oleoresin
531 in a NaCl model solution. *Food Research International* **136**, 109581 (2020).
- 532 43. Zhang, L.-L. *et al.* Determination of Recognition Threshold and Just Noticeable Difference in the
533 Sensory Perception of Pungency of *Zanthoxylum bungeanum*. *International Journal of Food*
534 *Properties* **19**, 1044–1052 (2016).
- 535 44. Zhang, L.-L. *et al.* The effect of the pungent sensation elicited by Sichuan pepper oleoresin on the
536 sensory perception of saltiness throughout younger and older age groups. *Food Quality and*
537 *Preference* **86**, 103987 (2020).
- 538 45. Han, P., Müller, L. & Hummel, T. Peri-threshold Trigeminal Stimulation with Capsaicin Increases
539 Taste Sensitivity in Humans. *Chemosensory Perception* **15**, 1–7 (2022).
- 540 46. Lyall, V. *et al.* The mammalian amiloride-insensitive non-specific salt taste receptor is a vanilloid
541 receptor-1 variant. *J Physiol* **558**, 147–159 (2004).
- 542 47. Ishimaru, Y. & Matsunami, H. Transient receptor potential (TRP) channels and taste sensation. *J*
543 *Dent Res* **88**, 212–218 (2009).
- 544 48. Green, B. G. & Hayes, J. E. Capsaicin as a probe of the relationship between bitter taste and
545 chemesthesis. *Physiology & Behavior* **79**, 811–821 (2003).
- 546 49. Simons, C. T., Boucher, Y. & Carstens, E. Suppression of central taste transmission by oral
547 capsaicin. *J Neurosci* **23**, 978–985 (2003).
- 548
- 549

Supplementary Information

Supplementary Table 1. 24-hour urine sodium results in female participants only.

Group	n	24-hour Urinary Sodium Excretion (mg)	F-value (p-value)
Overall	22	2893 ± 258	0.67 (p=0.526)
Anosmia	5	2336 ± 337	
Hyposmia	8	3043 ± 517	
Hyposmia + Parosmia	9	3067 ± 399	

Data are means ± SE.

Supplementary Table 2. Within-session test-retest reliability for model soup samples.

Quality	First Sample	Second Sample	R	p-value
Flavor	37.4 ± 0.8	43.0 ± 1.1	0.39	<0.001
Sweet	18.6 ± 0.6	20.8 ± 0.7	0.59	<0.001
Sour	13.9 ± 0.5	18.3 ± 0.7	0.45	<0.001
Salty (overall)	16.0 ± 0.5	16.0 ± 0.5	0.29	<0.001
Reduced sodium samples only	13.3 ± 0.8	13.6 ± 0.8	0.29	<0.001
Regular sodium samples only	20.1 ± 1.6	17.4 ± 1.3	0.28	0.003
Bitter	12.5 ± 0.6	15.4 ± 0.6	0.35	<0.001
Umami	27.2 ± 0.7	29.3 ± 0.8	0.43	<0.001
Spice (overall)	17.5 ± 0.8	23.1 ± 1.0	0.23	<0.001
Samples with no capsaicin only	4.9 ± 0.8	7.0 ± 0.9	0.62	<0.001
Samples with low capsaicin only	11.9 ± 1.3	18.6 ± 2.3	0.40	<0.001
Samples with moderate capsaicin only	35.6 ± 3.1	43.8 ± 3.5	0.49	<0.001
Liking	77.9 ± 0.7	76.6 ± 0.7	0.43	<0.001

Note that the p-value indicates a significant correlation between the two samples.

559

Supplementary Table 3. Between-session test-retest reliability for model soup samples.

Quality	First Session	Second Session	R	p-value
Flavor	38.3 ± 0.5	41.4 ± 0.5	0.46	<0.001
Sweet	17.8 ± 0.3	19.6 ± 0.3	0.58	<0.001
Sour	14.8 ± 0.3	17.7 ± 0.3	0.44	<0.001
Salty (overall)	15.4 ± 0.2	17.6 ± 0.3	0.35	<0.001
Reduced sodium samples only	13.2 ± 0.4	14.4 ± 0.5	0.42	<0.001
Regular sodium samples only	18.1 ± 0.7	21.7 ± 0.8	0.39	<0.001
Bitter	13.1 ± 0.3	12.8 ± 0.2	0.35	<0.001
Umami	26.9 ± 0.4	28.8 ± 0.4	0.48	<0.001
Spice (overall)	19.8 ± 0.4	19.2 ± 0.4	0.27	<0.001
Samples with no capsaicin only	6.0 ± 0.4	5.1 ± 0.4	0.70	<0.001
Samples with low capsaicin only	14.7 ± 1.0	18.2 ± 1.0	0.51	<0.001
Samples with moderate capsaicin only	38.7 ± 1.7	34.3 ± 1.4	0.51	<0.001
Liking	76.7 ± 0.4	78.5 ± 0.3	0.52	<0.001

560

Note that the p-value indicates a significant correlation between the two sessions.

561

562

Supplementary Table 4. Within-session test-retest reliability for model food samples.

Quality	First Sample	Second Sample	R	p-value
Flavor	35.8 ± 0.8	37.1 ± 0.8	0.47	<0.001
Sweet	25.9 ± 1.0	24.6 ± 0.9	0.23	<0.001
Sour	6.0 ± 0.3	5.6 ± 0.3	0.42	<0.001
Salty	14.6 ± 0.5	13.1 ± 0.4	0.34	<0.001
Bitter	11.3 ± 0.5	13.3 ± 0.5	0.42	<0.001
Umami	21.1 ± 0.7	21.1 ± 0.6	0.46	<0.001
Spice	22.9 ± 0.8	23.3 ± 0.8	0.16	<0.001
Samples with no spice only	3.9 ± 0.3	5.6 ± 0.4	0.40	<0.001
Samples with low spice only	21.5 ± 1.1	23.7 ± 1.0	0.19	<0.001
Samples with moderate spice only	46.3 ± 1.5	46.7 ± 1.4	0.46	<0.001
Liking	83.1 ± 0.7	80.8 ± 0.6	0.39	<0.001

563

Note that the p-value indicates a significant correlation between the two samples.

564

565

Supplementary Table 5. Between-session test-retest reliability for model food samples.

Quality	First Sample	Second Sample	R	p-value
Flavor	37.1 ± 0.5	38.4 ± 0.4	0.45	<0.001
Sweet	25.6 ± 0.5	24.3 ± 0.5	0.24	<0.001
Sour	6.1 ± 0.2	6.9 ± 0.2	0.46	<0.001
Salty	13.6 ± 0.3	14.7 ± 0.3	0.3	<0.001
Bitter	13.2 ± 0.3	13.4 ± 0.3	0.46	<0.001
Umami	22.6 ± 0.4	23.7 ± 0.4	0.46	<0.001
Spice	23.9 ± 0.5	25.4 ± 0.4	0.17	<0.001
Samples with no spice only	3.6 ± 0.5	4.2 ± 0.6	0.45	<0.001
Samples with low spice only	22.4 ± 2.2	19.6 ± 1.9	0.21	0.015
Samples with moderate spice only	42.7 ± 2.7	46.0 ± 2.7	0.42	<0.001
Liking	81.0 ± 0.3	81.1 ± 0.3	0.32	<0.001

566

Note that the p-value indicates a significant correlation between the two sessions.