

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 Aziza<sup>1¶</sup>, Elisa Alessandrini<sup>2¶\*</sup>, Clare Matthews<sup>1</sup>, Sejal Ranmal<sup>2</sup>, Ziyu Zhou<sup>2</sup>, Elin Haf Davies<sup>1</sup>, Catherine  
5 Tuleu<sup>2</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Aparito Ltd, Wrexham, United Kingdom

7 <sup>2</sup>University College London, School of Pharmacy, London, United Kingdom

8 \*Corresponding author

9 E-mail: [elisa.alessandrini@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:elisa.alessandrini@ucl.ac.uk) (EA)

10 <sup>¶</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

11

## 12 **Abstract**

13 For orally administered drugs, palatability is key in ensuring patient acceptability and treatment compliance.  
14 Therefore, understanding children's taste sensitivity and preferences can support formulators in making paediatric  
15 medicines more acceptable. Presently, we explore if the application of computer-vision techniques to videos of  
16 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 Atom5™ 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.

## 28 **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.

40

## 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).

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

53    For orally administered drugs, palatability is key in determining patient acceptability and treatment compliance (1).  
54    Palatability is defined as the overall appreciation of a medicinal product in relation to its smell, taste, aftertaste and  
55    texture (i.e. feeling in the mouth) (1). Specifically, taste is frequently reported to be a common reason for non-  
56    compliance among children (3). Thus, regulatory agencies strongly encourage the inclusion of acceptability testing,  
57    including palatability assessment, as part of the product development and clinical program in the target patient  
58    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.

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

71 [<https://www.opertechbio.com/technology>], facial electromyography (9), electrogustometry (10), or facial  
72 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).

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

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

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

98 Presently, we refine the work of Kearns'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.

## 103 **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 (Atom5<sup>TM</sup>) on their  
115 smartphone. Atom5<sup>TM</sup> 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.

125 After receiving the study pack, participants were asked to input their age and sex on the app. Then, instructions  
126 guided the participants through each step of the study. Children were instructed to place one strip on the middle of  
127 their tongue, close their mouth and test the sample for 10 seconds before removing the strip. The adult caregiver  
128 used their smartphone video to record the facial reaction of the child as they tasted the strip. After removing each  
129 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.



132

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

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

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

## 144 **Statistical Analysis**

145 For each taste strip, the rank rating of the hedonic scale was analysed to see if any difference could be appraised  
146 between different age groups, sex, and order of strip testing. Also, differences in rank rating between different  
147 tastes were assessed. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for the analysis and the IBM® SPSS Statistics software  
148 platform (IBM Corp. Released 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 28.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp)  
149 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 perception pipeline builder that offers different pose estimation components


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  
164 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):

- 172 • Eyebrow elevation: left and right variants of the distance between the median of the eyebrow landmarks  
173 and the nose tip landmark.

- 174       • 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.
- 176       • Eyebrow shape: left and right variants of the angle between the lines connecting the middle eyebrow  
177       landmark with the left and right endpoints of the eyebrow.
- 178       • Palpebral aperture: left and right variants of the surface delimiting the eye area.
- 179       • Lip elevation: upper and lower variants of the distance between the middle lip landmark and the nose tip.
- 180       • 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**

188 A total of 250 participants agreed to take part in the study and received a study pack at home. Of these, 40  
189 participants completed all the hedonic ratings and video recordings, and 24 participants completed all the hedonic  
190 scales but did not record one or more videos. Thus, the data analysis was performed with data from 64 participants;  
191 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.**

<b>Taste of the strip</b>	<b>No. of hedonic scales</b>	<b>No. of videos</b>
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).




195 **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  
208 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.




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.




218

219 **Fig 4. Number of frames processed with Mediapipe per taste and section: during the tasting (SI) and post**  
220 **tasting (SII).**

221 Using the extracted coordinates, we computed the facial measures (described in section 2.4.3). A sample data of  
222 two subjects (four videos per subject: one for each taste) is depicted in Fig 5 as a 5-frame moving average of three


...



224

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


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



230

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


232



233

234 **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  
236 an Extra-trees classifier to rank the importance of each measure. The "Right eyebrow elevation" measure was found  
237 to be the most important, followed by the "Left eyebrow elevation" and the "Left/Right" mouth corner", Fig 8.



238

239

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

240

241

## 242 Discussion

243

The present study sought to investigate facial reactions to different tastes in children, with the aim of identifying key indicators of palatability perceptions.

244

245

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 participants.

250

251

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

252

254 stimuli without the need to translate them into emotions which can be biased by aspects other than the taste.  
255 Finally, taste strips were used instead of liquids to measure the palatability. The advantage of using taste strips  
256 rather than solutions is that the latter pose inherent quality and safety related challenges to taste testing, given their  
257 bulkiness and thus difficulty of storage and transport, as well as their swallowing risk, particularly if used by  
258 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 sourness. 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%  
265 sweet, 24.40% sour, and 21.16% bitter. The lower value for bitter was due to less adherence to the 10 seconds  
266 minimal duration of the video.

267 This well-balanced distribution of processed frames across the different tastes enabled a comprehensive evaluation  
268 of 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.

271 For instance, Figure 5 illustrates how the bitter taste resulted in a higher lower lip elevation, while the sweet taste  
272 elicited a higher left eyebrow in both subjects. However, these signals were not consistent across all measures and  
273 subjects, indicating the complex nature of taste perception.

274 Our study considered a range of measures, and we found that right eyebrow elevation, left eyebrow elevation, and  
275 left mouth corner were the three most significant indicators of children's palatability perceptions, ranked in  
276 decreasing order of importance. Furthermore, we observed that some measures, such as lower lip elevation, showed  
277 a decreasing signal as the hedonic score increased, and that most measures exhibited symmetry between their left  
278 and right variants.

279 The results from the hedonic scale ratings support this methodology as the current gold standard for use with this  
280 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

284 required proactive commitment from the caregiver's side and the fact that several parents were not willing to  
285 provide videorecords of the face of their children, although clear explanation about privacy and data confidentiality  
286 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.

301

## 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.

305



## 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-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-pharmaceutical-development-medicines-paediatric-use_en.pdf)  
310 [pharmaceutical-development-medicines-paediatric-use\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-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-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/reflection-paper-formulations-choice-paediatric-population_en.pdf)  
314 [guideline/reflection-paper-formulations-choice-paediatric-population\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-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):599-  
323 604.e2.
- 324 6. 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


- 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-](https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/136/1/e124/28842/Automated-Assessment-of-Children-s-Postoperative)  
341 [Children-s-Postoperative](https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/136/1/e124/28842/Automated-Assessment-of-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](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=it&lr=&id=P0JCgGAlwLkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA173&ots=KS2zTMxJ6D&sig=DD8HbsP0gcD4tkxYeHaj10-dl6A&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)  
346 [zTMxJ6D&sig=DD8HbsP0gcD4tkxYeHaj10-dl6A&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=it&lr=&id=P0JCgGAlwLkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA173&ots=KS2zTMxJ6D&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.

- 363 19. 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>
- 366 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>
- 370 21. Dibeklioğlu H, Gevers T. Automatic Estimation of Taste Liking through Facial Expression  
371 Dynamics. IEEE Trans Affect Comput. 2020;11(1):151–63.
- 372 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>
- 376 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.
- 378 24. Zhi R, Hu X, Wang C, Liu S. Development of a direct mapping model between hedonic rating  
379 and facial responses by dynamic facial expression representation. Food Research International.  
380 2020 Nov;137:109411.
- 381 25. Samant SS, Chapko MJ, Seo HS. Predicting consumer liking and preference based on emotional  
382 responses and sensory perception: A study with basic taste solutions. Food Research  
383 International. 2017 Oct;100:325–34.
- 384 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>
- 388 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  
393 assessment of gustatory function in a clinical context using impregnated “taste strips”. *Rhinology*.  
394 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, Ruz J. Automated video-based  
398 assessment of facial bradykinesia in de-novo Parkinson’s disease. *NPJ Digit Med* [Internet]. 2022  
399 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](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-](https://academic.oup.com/chemse/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/chemse/28.2.173)  
409 [lookup/doi/10.1093/chemse/28.2.173](https://academic.oup.com/chemse/article-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







number of frames


1500  
1000  
500  
0

control

swell

boom

tidder





Left cyclotron closure - subject 1



Lower lip activation - subject 1



Right palatal aperture - subject 1



Left cyclotron closure - subject 2



Lower lip activation - subject 2



Right palatal aperture - subject 2



Left eye: area 17 evolution



Right eye: area 17 evolution



Apical lip: area 17 evolution



Lower lip: area 17 evolution



Left: mouth corner: area 17 evolution



Right: mouth corner: area 17 evolution



Left eye:base IOL



Right eye:base IOL



Left eye:base shape



Right eye:base shape



Left eye:total aperture



Right eye:total aperture



Left eye: normal evolution



Right eye: normal evolution



Apical lip: evolution



Lower lip: evolution



Left: mouth corner



Right: mouth corner



Left Eye: size 100



Right Eye: size 100



Left eye: curvature



Right eye: curvature



Left pupillary aperture



Right pupillary aperture



