1

1 Using facial reaction analysis and machine learning to

2 objectively assess palatability of medicines in children

3 Facial reaction analysis and palatability of medicines in children

- 4 Rabia Aziza¹, Elisa Alessandrini², Clare Matthews¹, Sejal Ranmal², Ziyu Zhou², Elin Haf Davies¹, Catherine
- 5 Tuleu²
- ⁶ ¹Aparito Ltd, Wrexham, United Kingdom
- 7 ²University College London, School of Pharmacy, London, United Kingdom
- 8 *Corresponding author
- 9 E-mail: <u>elisa.alessandrini@ucl.ac.uk</u> (EA)
- 10 [¶]These authors contributed equally to this work.

12 Abstract

For orally administered drugs, palatability is key in ensuring patient acceptability and treatment compliance. Therefore, understanding children's taste sensitivity and preferences can support formulators in making paediatric medicines more acceptable. Presently, we explore if the application of computer-vision techniques to videos of children's reaction to gustatory taste strips can provide an objective assessment of palatability.

17 Primary school children tasted four different flavoured strips: no taste, bitter, sweet and sour. Data was collected at 18 home, under the supervision of a guardian, with responses recorded using the Aparito Atom5TM app and 19 smartphone camera. Participants scored each strip on a 5-point hedonic scale. Facial landmarks were identified in 20 the videos, and quantitative measures such as changes around the eyes, nose and mouth were extracted to train 21 models to classify strip taste and score. We received 197 videos and 256 self-reported scores from 64 participants. 22 The hedonic scale elicited expected results: children like sweetness, dislike bitterness and have varying opinions for 23 sourness. The findings revealed the complexity and variability of facial reactions and highlighted specific measures, 24 such as eyebrow and mouth corner elevations, as significant indicators of palatability. This study into children's 25 taste specificities can improve the measurement of paediatric medicine acceptability. An objective measure of how 26 children feel about the taste of medicines has great potential in helping find the most palatable formulation. 27 Moreover, collecting data in the home setting allows for natural behaviour, with minimal burden for participants.

Author summary

29 When formulating medicines for children, understanding the taste profile is crucial to ensure they are not 30 excessively unpleasant. In this study, we assessed if facial reactions in response to taste stimuli can be used to 31 easily measure children's feelings about the taste. We recorded videos of children trying different taste strips and 32 analysed their facial expressions in response to each taste. The strips had different flavours: bitter, sweet, sour, and 33 one with no taste. We also asked the children to rate each strip on scale of 1 to 5. We collected data from 64 34 children. The results confirmed that children generally like sweet tastes and do not like bitter ones. Their opinions 35 on sour taste varied. Moreover, we found that specific facial reactions, like changes in their eyebrows and mouth 36 corners were good indicators of taste preferences. The analysis of facial expressions can help formulators make 37 medicines for children taste better. By objectively measuring how children feel about the taste of medicines, we can 38 create more acceptable medicines for them. The collection of this data at home ensured children were in their 39 comfortable environment, making it easier for them to be part of the study.

41 Introduction

42 The concept of patient acceptability is gaining progressive relevance in the development of paediatric dosage forms.
43 Acceptability is defined as the overall ability of the patient and caregiver to use a medicinal product as intended or
44 authorised and it is determined by characteristics of the user (age, ability, disease type) and of a medicinal product
45 (e.g. palatability, swallowability, appearance) (1).

Thus, acceptability can have a significant impact on the patient's adherence and consequently on the safety and efficacy of a product. For this reason, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) has repeatedly emphasised the importance and incentive to assess the acceptability of formulations for paediatric use, including in its 2006 Reflection Paper (2) and 2014 guideline on pharmaceutical development of medicinal products for children, where it is stated that the evaluation of acceptability should be embedded in the development program and evaluated within the targeted population (1). Consequently, in recent years, there has been an increased emphasis on conducting studies examining factors affecting medicines acceptability in children.

For orally administered drugs, palatability is key in determining patient acceptability and treatment compliance (1). Palatability is defined as the overall appreciation of a medicinal product in relation to its smell, taste, aftertaste and texture (i.e. feeling in the mouth) (1). Specifically, taste is frequently reported to be a common reason for noncompliance among children (3). Thus, regulatory agencies strongly encourage the inclusion of acceptability testing, including palatability assessment, as part of the product development and clinical program in the target patient population (3).

59 Several methodologies for palatability assessment in children are available, and they have been largely reviewed 60 (3–7). These methodologies should be age-appropriate and depending on the age of the child may involve 61 collecting data from patients and/or caregivers (4). The selection of the appropriate taste assessment methodology is 62 determined by the cognitive capacity of the child, and until now, there is no methodology validated for accuracy 63 and reliability with any particular age group (3,6), although the facial hedonic scale is considered the gold standard 64 for drug palatability testing in children (8). However, this scale cannot be used in very young children or in those 65 with communication issues, cognitive impairments, and/or developmental delay.

The EMA reflection paper defines four key criteria for palatability assessment in children: 1) the test should be short, 2) the test has to be intrinsically motivating and "fun" to do, 3) the procedure should be as easy as possible, 4) the number of variants to be tested should be limited to a maximum of four. However, the reflection paper does not aim to provide any scientific, technical, or regulatory guidance (2). This suggests the opportunity for the development of more objective quantitative technological advancements such as the use of high throughput systems

[https://www.opertechbio.com/technology], facial electromyography (9), electrogustometry (10), or facial
recognition technology (8,11) in palatability assessment (3).

73 Observation of children's facial expressions after a taste stimulus to assess taste reactivity, is not new. Some of the 74 earliest investigations on taste in children consisted of videotaping infants and then characterising their oromotor 75 reflexes when taste stimuli were placed on the tongue or in the oral cavity (12-15). In 1988, Oster and Rosenstein 76 (15) developed a method for describing orofacial responses by using the Ekman and Friesen's (16) anatomically 77 based Facial Action Coding System (FACS). FACS virtually decomposes any facial expression into its constituent 78 action units (AUs). Video records are analysed in slow motion to quantify the actual number of affective reactions 79 infants express to a taste stimulus, as a measure of valence and intensity (7,17). The advantage of using this method 80 is that it can be used in non-verbal children such as infants. However, the analysis of video images requires trained 81 individuals to establish reliability across scores and it can be subjective (18). Moreover, this method is time-82 consuming and costly (7).

A large number of studies have focused their attention on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, i.e. facial emotion recognition technologies, to assess food and drinks preferences and consumer acceptance (19–25) with promising results. However, only recently, the use of these technologies has caught the attention of researchers in the assessment of taste responses to medicinal products.

Kearns et al. (26) undertook a prospective, pilot study to assess the feasibility of using facial recognition technology to assess drug palatability in 10 children aged between 7 to 17 years. Although the qualitative assessment of the facial recognition data demonstrated the ability to discriminate between bitter and sweet tastants, their facial recognition software (Noldus FaceReader® 7) and approach showed some limitations in discriminating taste profiles and highlighted that further refinement was required before this methodology can be applied more widely (8). The Noldus FaceReader® 7 software measures the intensities of a predefined set of emotions e.g., happy, angry, disgusted etc., on a frame-by-frame basis.

Similarly, Peng et al.(27), used the same software to compare the palatability of two preparations of carbocysteine among healthy children aged 2-12 years. The palatability assessed by emotional valences was performed using a facial action coding system by FaceReaderTM, which reflected the quantification of emotions; a positive value represents a positive emotion, and a negative value represents a negative emotion (27).

98 Presently, we refine the work of Kearn's group (26), to explore if the application of computer-vision techniques to 99 videos of primary school children's reaction to gustatory taste strips can provide an objective assessment of 100 palatability. Our methodology uses pose estimation for facial recognition analysis, which allows access to the raw 101 movements of facial features, rather than through the lens of emotional reactions. Finally, our study was conducted

102 in a domiciliary setting to allow for natural behaviour, with minimal burden for participants.

Materials and Methods

104 **Participants**

105 Participants were children aged between 4 to 11 years old recruited from a primary school in London, United

106 Kingdom, and their adult caregiver. Prior to the study, all participants received an information sheet with the study

107 details. Participants and their caregivers had to sign informed consent and assent forms respectively if they were

108 willing to participate in the study. The study was approved by the UCL research ethics committee (REC) 4612/029.

109 As this was an exploratory study, no formal requirements were put on sample size. All pupils at a school of 840

110 were invited to join the study.

111 Study Design and Procedures

112 This study was a single blind taste assessment, conducted in a home environment. After consent, all participants 113 were provided with a study pack for the taste evaluation to be completed at home. The pack contained the study 114 instructions, four taste strips and information about how to download the Aparito app (Atom 5^{TM}) on their 115 smartphone. Atom5TM is a secure, encrypted and password protected platform (ISO 13845, ISO 27001, Cyber 116 Essential Plus, CREST tested and ePrivacyApp awarded by ePrivacyseal GmbH) for remote monitoring of a wide 117 range of adult and paediatric disease areas, designed to collect digital endpoint data. Commercially available 118 Burghart (or ODOFIN) taste strips (MediSense, Groningen, The Netherlands) were used in this study. The taste 119 strips are made of filter paper impregnated with different solutions containing substances found in food and drinks. 120 They are used in clinical and research contexts as a validated procedure to investigate taste ability/gustatory 121 sensitivity in both children and adults (28). One of the strips was blank with no tastant, one strip was bitter (0.006 122 g/mL of quinine hydrochloride), one was sweet (0.4 g/mL of sucrose), and one sour (0.3 g/mL of citric acid). Each 123 taste strip was individually repackaged into coloured Mylar foil bags for blinding purposes: blank in a white 124 coloured foil bag, bitter in yellow, sweet in green and sour in purple.

After receiving the study pack, participants were asked to input their age and sex on the app. Then, instructions guided the participants through each step of the study. Children were instructed to place one strip on the middle of their tongue, close their mouth and test the sample for 10 seconds before removing the strip. The adult caregiver used their smartphone video to record the facial reaction of the child as they tasted the strip. After removing each strip, the children were asked to rate the sample on a 5-point hedonic smiley face scale, where 1 corresponded to a

130 sad face, indicative of dislike and 5 to a happy face indicating the liking of the taste of the strip, Fig 1. Finally,

131 children were invited to provide their feedback about the tasting experience through an open response question.



133

132

Fig 1. A 5-point hedonic smiley face scale that was used in the study.

Instructions indicated to test the blank control strip first so that participants could practise the correct use of the strip, the video recording, and how to record their responses in the app. The other three taste strips were tested in three different sequences as indicated by the foil bag colour (sweet, sour, bitter - sour, bitter, sweet - bitter, sweet, sour) and children were randomly assigned to one of the three sequences by the app. To avoid any anticipation and bias in their responses, participants were blinded to the taste of the strip they were tasting and were instructed to taste each strip sequentially from each coloured foil bag. Children were invited to take some water to help remove any residual taste between each sample.

All data recorded within the app was transferred onto the Atom5 TM software platform and stored securely on
Microsoft Azure. All data were collected and stored in accordance with the Data Protection Legislation 2018 and
General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 2018.

144 Statistical Analysis

For each taste strip, the rank rating of the hedonic scale was analysed to see if any difference could be appraised between different age groups, sex, and order of strip testing. Also, differences in rank rating between different tastes were assessed. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for the analysis and the IBM® SPSS Statistics software platform (IBM Corp. Released 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 28.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp) was used with the limit of statistical significance set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

150 Machine Learning for Pose Estimation

151 **Pose Estimation Framework**

152 We used a CNN (Convolutional Neural Network) based, open-source ML (Machine Learning) framework,

153 Medianine (29) Medianine is a nercention nineline builder that offers different nose estimation components

7

- 154 including face detection, face mesh, hands, body, and object tracking. In this study, we used the face mesh
- 155 component to estimate 368 3D face landmarks per frame.

156 Data Pre-processing

157 The video data were filtered on two levels: frame level and facial landmark level.

158 First, we identified which frames to include in the analysis. We defined the tasting task as the sequence of frames

159 per video from when the taste strip was inserted in the subject's mouth, until just before the action of removing said

160 strip. The cleaning process included going through the videos and manually identifying the beginning and end times

161 of the tasting task. Importantly, we noticed that some subjects reacted after the taste strip was removed from the

- 162 mouth. Therefore, we also identified a post-tasting section that started from the moment after the strip was removed
- 163 from the mouth, until the end of the video or until the subject was distracted by something else (e.g., if the child
- starts talking to someone else in the room or turns away and moves out of the frame).
- 165 Secondly, we identified 53 facial landmarks to be included in the analysis out of the 368 landmarks extracted by
- 166 Mediapipe, which allows for the outlining of the main visible facial features, Fig 2.



- 167
- 168 Fig 2. Landmarks identified to be included in the analysis (red) plotted against all landmarks estimated by
- 169 Mediapipe (grey).

170 Facial Feature Aggregation

- 171 The extracted landmarks were aggregated into six measures inspired from Novotny et al., 2022 (30):
- Eyebrow elevation: left and right variants of the distance between the median of the eyebrow landmarks
 and the nose tip landmark.

8

174	٠	Eyebrow tilt: left and right variants of the angle between the fitted line to the five eyebrow landmarks and
175		the line connecting the inner corners of the eyes.

- Eyebrow shape: left and right variants of the angle between the lines connecting the middle eyebrow
 landmark with the left and right endpoints of the eyebrow.
- Palpebral aperture: left and right variants of the surface delimiting the eye area.
- Lip elevation: upper and lower variants of the distance between the middle lip landmark and the nose tip.
- Mouth corner: left and right variants of the distance between the mouth corner landmark and the nose tip.
- 181 All distance measures were rescaled by a reference measure to account for the variations in the landmarks'
- 182 coordinates caused by something other than the facial reaction. These other variations were caused by the subject's
- 183 face changing position or angle during the video, e.g., head rotation, head movement closer or farther from the
- 184 camera, the camera's angle moving during the test, etc. The reference measure chosen was the distance between the
- 185 right inner corner of the eye and the tip of the nose.

186 **Results**

187 Data Description and Participants' Demographics

A total of 250 participants agreed to take part in the study and received a study pack at home. Of these, 40 participants completed all the hedonic ratings and video recordings, and 24 participants completed all the hedonic scales but did not record one or more videos. Thus, the data analysis was performed with data from 64 participants; Table 1 reports the number of hedonic scales and videos recorded per taste strip.

192 Table 1. Total number of hedonic scale ratings and videos analysed per each taste.

Taste of the strip	No. of hedonic scales	No. of videos
Neutral	64	51
Sour	64	46
Sweet	64	54
Bitter	64	46
Total	256	197

193 Children in the study were aged between 5 to 11 years, with a median age of 8.5 years (SD 1.46), Table 2, and there

194 were slightly more females (n=36) than males (n=28).

Table 2. Age distribution of the children participating in the study.

Age (years)	Frequency (%)
5	1 (2%)
6	3 (5%)
7	10 (16%)
8	18 (28%)
9	13 (20%)
10	11 (17%)
11	8 (13%)

196 Hedonic Scale Results

197 The ratings of the hedonic scale for each taste strip were analysed by gender, age, and randomisation order of the 198 strips to assess if any difference between groups existed. The analysis by gender showed that there were no 199 significant differences between boys and girls in terms of hedonic responses to the taste of each strip ($\chi^2(2) = 0.46$, 200 p = 0.50 for the blank (control) strip, $\chi^2(2) = 1.50$, p = 0.23 for the sour strip, $\chi^2(2) = 2.32$, p = 0.13 for the sweet 201 strip, and $\chi^2(2) = 2.30$, p = 0.13 for the bitter strip). Different ages also showed similar ranking scores for each taste 202 strip $(\chi^2(2) = 2.04, p = 0.92)$ for the control strip, $\chi^2(2) = 4.19, p = 0.65$ for the sour strip, $\chi^2(2) = 3.92, p = 0.69$ for 203 the sweet strip, $\chi^2(2) = 1.99$, p =0.92 for the bitter strip). Similarly, changing the order of how the taste strips were 204 assessed did not alter the rating of each taste strip ($\chi 2(2) = 0.64$, p = 0.73 for the sour strip, $\chi 2(2) = 0.41$, p = 0.82 for 205 the sweet strip, $\chi 2(2) = 0.80$, p =0.67 for the bitter strip). 206 Instead, a statistically significant difference in ratings emerged across the different tastes ($\chi^2(2)$ = 124.62, and p= 207 0.001), with the following predominant scores observed for each taste strip: 3 for the blank control strip, 1 for the

bitter strip, 5 for the sweet strip, and various scores for the sour strip. These results indicate that the hedonic scale

209 elicited expected results: children like sweetness, dislike bitterness and have varying opinions for sourness, Fig 3.

10



210

211 Fig 3. Participants' hedonic scale rating for each taste strip, where 1 corresponds to not liking the taste (sad

212 face), and 5 corresponds to liking the taste of the strip (happy face).

213 Facial Measures

- 214 Facial landmark coordinates were extracted for each frame captured during or after the tasting task. A total of
- 215 97.4% of frames (accounting for 95561 total frames) were successfully processed using the Mediapipe framework.
- 216 Failures to process some frames were due to subjects turning away from the camera or covering their face. Fig 4
- 217 shows the distribution of processed frames during and after the tasting.



- Fig 4. Number of frames processed with Mediapipe per taste and section: during the tasting (SI) and post
 tasting (SII).
- Using the extracted coordinates, we computed the facial measures (described in section 2.4.3). A sample data of two subjects (four videos per subject: one for each taste) is depicted in Fig 5 as a 5-frame moving average of three
- - -



224

Fig 5. Sample of rescaled measures (left eyebrow elevation, lower lip elevation, right palpebral aperture) of two subjects, representing the variation of the measures over time per tasting (including both during and post tasting sections).

We then calculated the standard deviation of the rescaled measures for all subjects, including all their videos that passed quality checks. We plotted this, grouped per taste and hedonic score, in Figs 6 and 7.





Fig 6. Box plots of the standard deviation of the rescaled measures, grouped by taste.

232



Fig 7. Box plots of the standard deviation of the rescaled measures, grouped by hedonic scores.

- 235 Moreover, we ran an analysis that determines which facial measure(s) were most predictive of palatability. We used
- an Extra-trees classifier to rank the importance of each measure. The "Right eyebrow elevation" measure was found
- to be the most important, followed by the "Left eyebrow elevation" and the "Left/Right" mouth corner", Fig 8.



Fig 8. Ranking of the importance of the facial measures using an Extra-Trees classifier.

241

238

242 **Discussion**

243 The present study sought to investigate facial reactions to different tastes in children, with the aim of identifying

244 key indicators of palatability perceptions.

Two previous studies have assessed the use of facial recognition technology to evaluate palatability in the context of medicinal products in children (26,27). However, the main differences of our study compared to the previous studies are as follows. Firstly, our study was conducted in a domiciliary setting rather than in a standardised laboratory environment. If, on the one side, this meant reduced video quality and compliance with the instructions, on the other side, our study showed that it is feasible with the advantage of posing a minimal burden for

- 250 participants.
- 251 Secondly, the methodology applied in our study differed from that of Kearn's and Peng's study (26,27). We applied
- 252 nose estimation for facial reaction analysis assessing the raw movements of facial features, rather than classifying

14

stimuli without the need to translate them into emotions which can be biased by aspects other than the taste.

Finally, taste strips were used instead of liquids to measure the palatability. The advantage of using taste strips rather than solutions is that the latter pose inherent quality and safety related challenges to taste testing, given their bulkiness and thus difficulty of storage and transport, as well as their swallowing risk, particularly if used by children (31).

- 259 This study showed that taste strips were easy to use and results from the hedonic scale showed that expected results
- 260 were elicited: children like sweetness, dislike bitterness and have varying opinions for sourcess. Previous studies
- 261 have reported that children's liking of sweet and dislike of bitter reflect their basic biology (32). The appreciation
- 262 for sourness seems to be influenced by children's food habits and there are various experiential factors that can
- 263 influence flavour preferences during childhood (33,34).
- 264 In the 197 videos available, the relative proportions of frames per taste were as follows: 28.29% control, 26.15%
- sweet, 24.40% sour, and 21.16% bitter. The lower value for bitter was due to less adherence to the 10 seconds
 minimal duration of the video.
- This well-balanced distribution of processed frames across the different tastes enabled a comprehensive evaluationof facial reactions.
- 269 Overall, our findings demonstrate a clear signal of a reaction to taste, but also highlight the complexity and 270 variability of facial reactions in response to different tastes.
- For instance, Figure 5 illustrates how the bitter taste resulted in a higher lower lip elevation, while the sweet taste elicited a higher left eyebrow in both subjects. However, these signals were not consistent across all measures and subjects, indicating the complex nature of taste perception.
- Our study considered a range of measures, and we found that right eyebrow elevation, left eyebrow elevation, and left mouth corner were the three most significant indicators of children's palatability perceptions, ranked in decreasing order of importance. Furthermore, we observed that some measures, such as lower lip elevation, showed a decreasing signal as the hedonic score increased, and that most measures exhibited symmetry between their left and right variants.
- 279 The results from the hedonic scale ratings support this methodology as the current gold standard for use with this
- age and ability group. However, further insight may be possible by analysing the facial reactions in relation to the
- 281 hedonic ratings, for example, considering separately the reactions of those who liked and disliked the sour taste.
- 282 One limitation of this study is that the sample size obtained was smaller than what initially expected, although
- 283 slightly larger than that of Kearn's and Peng's (26,27). This can partly be explained by the fact that the study

15

- required proactive commitment from the caregiver's side and the fact that several parents were not willing to provide videorecords of the face of their children, although clear explanation about privacy and data confidentiality were provided in the Information Sheet.
- 287 A second limitation of this study was that only selected facial expression was considered. To generalise the
- 288 findings, larger sample size and more diverse facial expression should be examined in future studies.
- 289 The results of this study provide new insights into the dynamics of facial expressions in response to taste stimuli.
- 290 The study generated meaningful results, despite the relative lack of consistency and standardisation inherent in data
- 291 gathered from a home setting, supporting the potential use of a decentralised approach.

292 **Conclusion**

293 Our study provides valuable insights into the complex nature of taste perception in children and their potential 294 application to drug delivery by improving the acceptance of orally administered medications in children. Further 295 investigations could be conducted to explore other non-verbal cues to provide a more comprehensive understanding 296 of the factors that influence taste perception in children. For instance, voice patterns may reveal vocal cues that 297 indicate preferences or aversions. Besides that, body movement and hand gesture analysis can also offer valuable 298 information on the emotional and cognitive responses to taste stimuli. These findings may be used to develop 299 interventions that enhance the understanding and acceptability of medications in children, ultimately to improve 300 their overall health outcomes.

16

302 Acknowledgments

- 303 The authors gratefully thank all the children and caregivers who took part in this study. Our work would not have
- 304 been possible without their help.

306 **References**

- 307 1. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Guideline on Pharmaceutical Development of Medicines
- 308 for Paediatric Use (EMA/CHMP/QWP/805880/2012 Rev. 2) [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2020 Dec
- 309 12]. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-
- 310 pharmaceutical-development-medicines-paediatric-use_en.pdf
- 311 2. European Medicines Agency (EMA) Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP).
- 312 Reflection Paper: Formulations of Choice for the Paediatric Population [Internet]. 2006 [cited
- 313 2023 May 19]. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-
- 314 guideline/reflection-paper-formulations-choice-paediatric-population_en.pdf
- 315 3. Ternik R, Liu F, Bartlett JA, Khong YM, Thiam Tan DC, Dixit T, et al. Assessment of
- 316 swallowability and palatability of oral dosage forms in children: Report from an M-CERSI
- 317 pediatric formulation workshop. Int J Pharm [Internet]. 2018 Feb;536(2):570–81. Available from:
- 318 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0378517317308062
- 319 4. Kozarewicz P. Regulatory perspectives on acceptability testing of dosage forms in children. Int J
- 320 Pharm [Internet]. 2014 Aug;469(2):245–8. Available from:
- 321 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0378517314002129
- 322 5. Davies EH, Tuleu C. Medicines for Children: A Matter of Taste. J Pediatr. 2008 Nov;153(5):599604.e2.
- 3246.Forestell CA, Mennella JA. The Ontogeny of Taste Perception and Preference Throughout
- 325 Childhood. In: Handbook of Olfaction and Gustation. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons,
- 326 Inc; 2015. p. 795–828.
- 327 7. Mennella JA, Spector AC, Reed DR, Coldwell SE. The bad taste of medicines: overview of basic
- 328 research on bitter taste. Clin Ther [Internet]. 2013 Aug;35(8):1225–46. Available from:
- 329 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23886820
- 330 8. Abdel-Rahman SM, Bai S, Porter-Gill PA, Goode GA, Kearns GL. A Pilot Comparison of High-
- 331 Versus Low-Tech Palatability Assessment Tools in Young Children. Pediatric Drugs [Internet].
- 332 2021 Jan 25;23(1):95–104. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40272-020-00430-2
- 333 9. Armstrong JE, Hutchinson I, Laing DG, Jinks AL. Facial Electromyography: Responses of

		18
334		Children to Odor and Taste Stimuli. Chem Senses. 2007 May 17;32(6):611-21.
335	10.	Shin IH, Park DC, Kwon C, Yeo SG. Changes in Taste Function Related to Obesity and Chronic
336		Otitis Media With Effusion. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2011 Mar 21;137(3):242.
337	11.	Sikka K, Ahmed AA, Diaz D, Goodwin MS, Craig KD, Bartlett MS, et al. Automated
338		Assessment of Children's Postoperative Pain Using Computer Vision. Pediatrics [Internet]. 2015
339		Jul 1;136(1):e124–31. Available from:
340		https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/136/1/e124/28842/Automated-Assessment-of-
341		Children-s-Postoperative
342	12.	Steiner JE. Facial Expressions Of The Neonate Infant Indicating The Hedonics Of Food-Related
343		Chemical Stimuli. In: Weiffenbach JM, editor. Taste and development: The genesis of sweet
344		preference [Internet]. 1977. p. 173-8. Available from:
345		https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=it&lr=&id=P0JCgGAlwLkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA173&ots=KS2
346		zTMxJ6D&sig=DD8HbsP0gcD4tkxYeHaj10-dl6A&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
347	13.	Steiner JE, Glaser D, Hawilo ME, Berridge KC. Comparative expression of hedonic impact:
348		affective reactions to taste by human infants and other primates. Neurosci Biobehav Rev
349		[Internet]. 2001 Jan;25(1):53-74. Available from:
350		https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0149763400000518
351	14.	Forestell CA, Mennella JA. Early Determinants of Fruit and Vegetable Acceptance. Pediatrics.
352		2007 Dec 1;120(6):1247–54.
353	15.	Rosenstein D, Oster H. Differential Facial Responses to Four Basic Tastes in Newborns. Child
354		Dev [Internet]. 1988 Dec;59(6):1555. Available from:
355		https://www.jstor.org/stable/1130670?origin=crossref
356	16.	Ekman P, Wallace V. F. Facial action coding system. Environmental Psychology & Nonverbal
357		Behavior. 1978;
358	17.	Mennella JA, Forestell CA, Morgan LK, Beauchamp GK. Early milk feeding influences taste
359		acceptance and liking during infancy. Am J Clin Nutr. 2009 Sep 1;90(3):780S-788S.
360	18.	Forestell CA, Mennella JA. More than just a pretty face. The relationship between infant's
361		temperament, food acceptance, and mothers' perceptions of their enjoyment of food. Appetite.
362		2012 Jun;58(3):1136–42.

19

- 36319.Yamamoto T, Mizuta H, Ueji K. Analysis of facial expressions in response to basic taste stimuli
- 364 using artificial intelligence to predict perceived hedonic ratings. Li Z, editor. PLoS One [Internet].
- 365 2021 May 4;16(5):e0250928. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250928
- 20. Danner L, Sidorkina L, Joechl M, Duerrschmid K. Make a face! Implicit and explicit
- 367 measurement of facial expressions elicited by orange juices using face reading technology. Food
- 368 Qual Prefer [Internet]. 2014 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Oct 19];32:167–72. Available from:
- 369 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329313000086
- 21. Dibeklio 🗆 lu H, Gevers T. Automatic Estimation of Taste Liking through Facial Expression
- 371 Dynamics. IEEE Trans Affect Comput. 2020;11(1):151–63.
- 22. Zeinstra GG, Koelen MA, Colindres D, Kok FJ, de Graaf C. Facial expressions in school-aged
- 373 children are a good indicator of 'dislikes', but not of 'likes.' Food Qual Prefer [Internet]. 2009
- 374 Dec;20(8):620–4. Available from:
- 375 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329309001098
- 23. Zhi R, Cao L, Cao G. Asians' Facial Responsiveness to Basic Tastes by Automated Facial

377 Expression Analysis System. J Food Sci. 2017 Mar;82(3):794–806.

- Zhi R, Hu X, Wang C, Liu S. Development of a direct mapping model between hedonic rating
 and facial responses by dynamic facial expression representation. Food Research International.
- 380 2020 Nov;137:109411.
- Samant SS, Chapko MJ, Seo HS. Predicting consumer liking and preference based on emotional
 responses and sensory perception: A study with basic taste solutions. Food Research

383 International. 2017 Oct;100:325–34.

26. Kearns GL, Bai S, Porter-gill PA, Goode GA, Farrar HC, Children A, et al. Use of facial

- 385 recognition technology to assess drug palatability in pediatric patients: a pilot study. Journal of
- 386 Applied Biopharmaceutics and Pharmacokinetics [Internet]. 2019;(7):37–49. Available from:
- 387 https://www.scientificarray.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/JABPV7A5-Kearns.pdf
- 27. Peng Y, Zhang H, Gao L, Wang X, Peng X. Palatability Assessment of Carbocysteine Oral
- 389 Solution Strawberry Taste Versus Carbocysteine Oral Solution Mint Taste: A Blinded
- 390 Randomized Study. Front Pharmacol [Internet]. 2022 Feb 28;13. Available from:
- 391 https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2022.822086/full

392	28.	Mueller C, Kallert S,	Renner B, Stiassny K,	Temmel AFP	, Hummel T, et al.	Quantitative
-----	-----	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------	--------------------	--------------

- assessment of gustatory function in a clinical context using impregnated "taste strips". Rhinology.
 2003;44(1):2–6.
- 395 29. Lugaresi C, Tang J, Nash H, McClanahan C, Uboweja E, Hays M, et al. MediaPipe: A
- 396 Framework for Building Perception Pipelines. 2019 Jun 14;
- 397 30. Novotny M, Tykalova T, Ruzickova H, Ruzicka E, Dusek P, Rusz J. Automated video-based
- 398 assessment of facial bradykinesia in de-novo Parkinson's disease. NPJ Digit Med [Internet]. 2022
- Jul 18;5(1):98. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41746-022-00642-5
- 400 31. Georgopoulos D, Keeley A, Tuleu C. Assessing the feasibility of using "taste-strips" for
- 401 bitterness taste panels. In: Formulating Better Medicines for Children [Internet]. Malmo; 2019
- 402 [cited 2023 May 16]. Available from:
- 403 https://www.ucl.ac.uk/pharmacy/sites/pharmacy/files/eupfi_taste-strips_poster.pdf
- 404 32. Mennella JA, Bobowski NK. The sweetness and bitterness of childhood: Insights from basic
- 405 research on taste preferences. Physiol Behav [Internet]. 2015 Dec;152:502–7. Available from:
- 406 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S003193841500298X
- 407 33. Liem DG. Heightened Sour Preferences During Childhood. Chem Senses [Internet]. 2003 Feb
- 408 1;28(2):173–80. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/chemse/article-
- 409 lookup/doi/10.1093/chemse/28.2.173
- 410 34. Liem DG, Mennella JA. Sweet and sour preferences during childhood: Role of early experiences.
- 411 Dev Psychobiol [Internet]. 2002 Dec;41(4):388–95. Available from:
- 412 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/dev.10067
- 413
- 414































