

Clinical Nutrition Open Science


Assessing the Impact of Olfactory Dysfunction on Eating Behavior: A Systematic Scoping Review and Call for Standardized Assessments

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	NUTOS-D-24-00024
Article Type:	NUTOS_SI Altered taste
Section/Category:	Other
Keywords:	smell loss; food enjoyment; food liking; appetite; food neophobia; eating behavior measures
Corresponding Author:	Parvaneh Parvin, phd Wageningen University & Research Wageningen, NETHERLANDS
First Author:	Parvaneh Parvin, phd
Order of Authors:	Parvaneh Parvin, phd Sanne Boesveldt, PhD Elbrich Postma
Abstract:	<p>Olfaction plays a priming role in both the anticipation and consumption phases of eating behavior. Olfactory dysfunction can therefore lead to changes in various aspects of eating behavior, such as food choice, appetite, and food intake. In light of the increasing prevalence of persistent olfactory dysfunction among patients affected by Covid-19, providing proper care and dietary advice to individuals with olfactory dysfunction is imperative. Therefore, this scoping review seeks to gain a better understanding of the impact of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior. Following the PRISMA guidelines, 49 papers were included, the outcomes were presented by dividing them into two categories: 1) anticipatory eating behavior, including (anticipatory) food liking, appetite and craving, food preferences, food neophobia, and cooking habits; and 2) consummatory behavior, including, food intake, consumption frequency, adherence to dietary guidelines, (experienced) food liking, food enjoyment, and eating habits. Our results show that in the anticipatory phase of eating behavior, food liking, and, food preferences, and in the consummatory phase, food enjoyment is most affected in people who experienced a sudden change in olfactory function rather than a gradual decline. Moreover, changes in food flavor perception due to olfactory dysfunction, result in a shift of food preferences towards more taste-based preferences, such as salty or savory (i.e., umami) foods. Subsequently, changes in preferences can affect food intake and adherence to dietary guidelines, but only to a limited extent. Appetite is more likely to be low in individuals with short-term olfactory dysfunction compared to those with long-term changes. Generally, eating behavior is more impacted in individuals with a distorted sense of smell than in those with smell loss, and the effect becomes more pronounced over time. Due to the heterogeneity of methods used to measure different aspects of eating behavior, this review stresses the importance of more research on olfaction and eating behavior using standardized and validated assessments. Such research is essential to better understand the effects of olfactory dysfunction on each aspect of eating behavior and provide effective interventions.</p>
Suggested Reviewers:	Mei Peng Lecturer in Food Science (Sensory Science), University of Otago Department of Food Science mei.peng@otago.ac.nz Alexander Fjaeldstad medicdkmail@gmail.com Agnes Giboreau agnes.giboreau@institutpaulbocuse.com
Opposed Reviewers:	

Highlights:

- Food liking, preferences, and enjoyment are the most affected by olfactory dysfunction
- Impact on eating behavior is more pronounced in qualitative vs. quantitative smell loss
- Effects of olfactory dysfunction vary by duration and nature (qualitative vs. quantitative)
- Standardized, validated methods are needed to assess eating behavior in future studies
- There is a crucial need for effective interventions to enhance the eating experience



1 **Assessing the Impact of Olfactory Dysfunction on Eating Behavior: A Systematic**

2 **Scoping Review and Call for Standardized Assessments**

3
4
5
6
7
8 Parvaneh Parvin¹, Sanne Boesveldt¹, Elbrich M. Postma^{1,2}

9
10
11 1. Wageningen University, Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Stippeneng 4, 6708 WE,
12
13 Wageningen, Netherlands

14
15
16 2. Smell and Taste Center, Hospital Gelderse Vallei, Ede, Netherlands

17
18
19 8 Corresponding author: Parvaneh Parvin, PhD (parvaneh.parvin@wur.nl)

20 21 22 9 23 24 10 **Abstract**

25
26 11 Olfaction plays a priming role in both the anticipation and consumption phases of eating behavior.
27
28 12 Olfactory dysfunction can therefore lead to changes in various aspects of eating behavior, such as food
29
30 choice, appetite, and food intake. In light of the increasing prevalence of persistent olfactory
31
32 13 dysfunction among patients affected by Covid-19, providing proper care and dietary advice to
33
34 14 individuals with olfactory dysfunction is imperative. Therefore, this scoping review seeks to gain a
35
36 15 better understanding of the impact of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior. Following the PRISMA
37
38 16 guidelines, 49 papers were included, the outcomes were presented by dividing them into two
39
40 17 categories: 1) anticipatory eating behavior, including (anticipatory) food liking, appetite and craving,
41
42 18 food preferences, food neophobia, and cooking habits; and 2) consummatory behavior, including, food
43
44 19 intake, consumption frequency, adherence to dietary guidelines, (experienced) food liking, food
45
46 20 enjoyment, and eating habits. Our results show that in the anticipatory phase of eating behavior, food
47
48 21 liking and, food preferences and in the consummatory phase, food enjoyment is most affected in
49
50 22 people who experienced a sudden change in olfactory function rather than a gradual decline.
51
52 23 Moreover, changes in food flavor perception due to olfactory dysfunction, result in a shift of food
53
54 24 preferences towards more taste-based preferences, such as salty or savory (i.e., umami) foods.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

26 Subsequently, changes in preferences can affect food intake and adherence to dietary guidelines, but
27 only to a limited extent. Appetite is more likely to be low in individuals with short-term olfactory
28 dysfunction compared to those with long-term changes. Generally, eating behavior is more impacted
29 in individuals with a distorted sense of smell than in those with smell loss, and the effect becomes
30 more pronounced over time. Due to the heterogeneity of methods used to measure different aspects
31 of eating behavior, this review stresses the importance of more research on olfaction and eating
32 behavior using standardized and validated assessments. Such research is essential to better
33 understand the effects of olfactory dysfunction on each aspect of eating behavior and provide effective
34 interventions.

36 **Keywords:** smell loss, food enjoyment, food liking, appetite, food neophobia, cooking habits,
37 systematic scoping review, eating behavior measures

51 Introduction

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 Olfaction is a crucial sense that plays a pivotal role in several essential functions in our daily lives. It
53 assists in social communication, facilitates avoidance of environmental hazards, and contributes to
54 eating behavior, such as the enjoyment of food (Aschenbrenner et al., 2008). Olfactory dysfunction
55 has been linked to various disturbances in the three aforementioned areas, incorporating social issues
56 related to hygiene and altered sexual behaviors (Blomkvist & Hofer, 2021), difficulty detecting
57 hazardous smells or food, and reduced food enjoyment (Stevenson, 2009). These deficits can have a
58 profound impact on an individual's quality of life (Boesveldt et al., 2017), including eating behavior, as
59 olfaction is closely related to our sense of taste and is a significant factor in our perception of flavors.

60 Olfactory dysfunction refers to a decreased ability or distorted ability to smell during sniffing
61 (orthonasal olfaction) or eating and drinking (retronasal olfaction). It is typically divided into two
62 categories: quantitative and qualitative dysfunction. Quantitative dysfunction can be divided into
63 anosmia, a complete loss of sense of smell, and hyposmia, a reduced sense of smell. On the other
64 hand, qualitative dysfunction is defined as a change in the quality of perceived odors and comprises
65 parosmia, a distorted sense of smell, and phantosmia, odor hallucinations. The major difference
66 between these two qualitative disorders is that these distorted olfactory sensations are experienced
67 in the presence or absence of an odor, respectively (Desai & Oppenheimer, 2021), (Leopold, 2002).

68 It has been estimated that between 3-20% of the general population experiences either
69 qualitative or quantitative olfactory dysfunctions (Boesveldt et al., 2017), (B. N. Landis & Hummel,
70 2006). Up to 1% of those individuals may have a congenital form, such as Kallmann's syndrome or
71 isolated congenital anosmia (Temmel et al., 2002). Other causes for olfactory dysfunction include (1)
72 head trauma, (2) other viral infections such as influenza (Soler et al., 2020), (3) nasal causes such as
73 sinusitis or polyposis nasi, (4) aging and (5) age-related neurological illnesses such as Parkinson's and
74 Alzheimer's disease (Hummel et al., n.d.). Recently, COVID-19 has been linked to persistent loss and
75 alteration of smell, leading to an increase in the number of individuals experiencing olfactory
76 dysfunction (Soler et al., 2020), (Boscolo-Rizzo et al., 2020), (Hopkins & Kelly, 2021).

77 To measure olfactory dysfunction, both subjective and objective measures can be used.
1
2 78 Subjective measures of smell are typically questionnaires that ask individuals to rate their level of
3
4 79 olfactory ability and can be completed in a person's own home or online. Objective measures, on the
5
6
7 80 other hand, are mostly carried out under the supervision of a researcher or healthcare provider and
8
9 81 typically consist of psychophysical tests developed to measure and quantify human responses to
10
11 82 physical stimuli (Hannum et al., 2020), like the Sniffin' Sticks test (Oleszkiewicz et al., 2019) or the UPSIT
12
13 83 (Doty et al., 1984). These tests can assess distinct aspects of olfactory function, such as the ability to
14
15 84 detect, identify or discriminate odors.
16
17

18 85 Eating behavior is a multifaceted process that is influenced by physiological, psychological, and
19
20 86 behavioral factors elicited by the sensory and nutritional properties of foods (Blundell et al., 2010).
21
22 87 This multifaceted process can be divided broadly into two distinct phases: *anticipatory* and
23
24 88 *consummatory phases of eating behavior*. In the anticipatory phase, which encompasses the pre-
25
26 89 ingestive aspect of eating, the body prepares for eating by secreting hormones that increase hunger
27
28 90 and stimulate the digestive system. In this phase, sensory cues, such as (oronasal) ambient food
29
30 91 odors, can have a substantial influence on appetite, cravings, food preferences, and influence decisions
31
32 92 regarding food choice and consequently the food consumption (Ramaekers et al., 2016). Additionally,
33
34 93 food liking, but also food neophobia, the reluctance or fear of trying new or unfamiliar foods, shapes
35
36 94 individuals' food choices and preferences. The anticipatory phase also comprises cooking habits,
37
38 95 including food preparation. Upon transitioning to the consummatory phase of eating behavior, the
39
40 96 focus shifts to the actual consumption (ingestive) process. In this phase, retronasal odor, but also taste,
41
42 97 and texture play a crucial role in overall flavor perception and determining the amount and type of
43
44 98 food that is consumed. These factors contribute to food intake behavior including nutritional intake,
45
46 99 consumption frequency, and adherence to dietary guidelines. Moreover, the pleasure derived from
47
48 100 consumed food during the consummatory phase is paramount, as it influences individuals' perception
49
50 101 of the meal and subsequent dietary choices. Long-term eating habits, such as behaviors and routines
51
52 102 individuals have when it comes to consuming food and the social aspects of eating, also play a crucial
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

103 role in shaping individuals' overall consumption patterns, and meal planning (Aschenbrenner et al.,
1
2 104 2008).

3
4 105 When measuring eating behavior, the choice of techniques employed depends on the research
5
6
7 106 purpose, study design, and the specific aspect of eating behavior being evaluated, such as food
8
9 107 preference or food intake. These methods range from simple visual analog ratings of liking or appetite
10
11 108 to more elaborate questionnaires or (behavioral) tasks to assess preferences, to food frequency
12
13 109 questionnaires and food intake diaries (Dovey, 2011). Additionally, researchers must choose between
14
15 110 laboratory-based studies and free-living studies to measure eating behavior, which often leads to a
16
17 111 focus on specific subsets of eating behavior aspects.
18
19
20

21 112 While the importance of olfaction in eating behavior is well-established, the impact of
22
23 113 olfactory dysfunction on distinct aspects of eating behavior is not yet fully understood. Thus, this
24
25 114 scoping review sought to identify and summarize evidence on the impact of olfactory dysfunction on
26
27 115 distinct aspects of eating behavior as alluded to above. By examining the effects of olfactory
28
29 116 dysfunction on these various facets of eating behavior, this review aims to provide a comprehensive
30
31 117 understanding of how olfactory impairment impacts individuals' overall eating behavior.
32
33
34

35 118

36
37 119

38
39
40 120

41
42
43 121

44
45
46 122

47
48 123

49
50
51 124

52
53
54 125

55

56
57 126

2. Materials and Methods

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

127 **2.1 Literature search strategy**

1
2 128 The literature search and screening were performed following the Preferred Reporting Items for
3
4 129 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines (PRISMA) (Moher et al., n.d.), as shown in Figure 1.
5
6
7 130 The search covered papers on human studies published between the earliest record and July 2022.
8
9 131 This search was executed on the Scopus, Ovid MEDLINE, PubMed, and PsycINFO databases, chosen for
10
11 132 their relevance and comprehensive coverage in the field. The general search strategy involved
12
13 133 searching for title, abstract, and keywords (or headwords on the PsycINFO database). The specific
14
15 134 combinations of keywords used are detailed in Table 1, while database-specific search strategies can
16
17 135 be found in Appendix 1. Results from each database are tabulated in Table 2.a. Additionally, a manual
18
19 136 search in the reference list of the articles included was performed to identify further eligible studies.
20
21 137 It's worth noting that we expanded our search criteria later in the process, as detailed in sections 2.1.1
22
23 138 and 2.2.1. The result of the additional search is presented in Table 2.b.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **2.1.1 Extended Literature Search**

32
33 141 At the outset of our scoping review, we conducted an initial search focusing on particular aspects of
34
35 142 eating behavior. These aspects were chosen due to their well-established status as domains of eating
36
37 143 behavior extensively explored in the literature. However, as we reviewed the final selection of papers,
38
39 144 it became evident that additional terms, such as food liking, (food wanting), and food neophobia, were
40
41 145 identified as significant factors that had not been initially included in our categorization. We
42
43 146 acknowledged the significance of these factors, particularly concerning olfactory dysfunction and its
44
45 147 impact on eating behavior. As a result, we broadened our search strategy to include these new terms
46
47 148 in our scoping review, using the same conditions as mentioned in Section 2.1.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **2.2 Study selection process**

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

152 In the initial search, in total, 1062 results (see Table 2.a) were identified both using search strategies
1 (N=1060) and through reference lists (N=2). After removing 404 duplicate records, the remaining 658
2 153 articles were assessed for eligibility by two independent reviewers (PP and EP) based on title and
3 154 abstract. First, a selection of 40 articles was screened by both reviewers, and Cohen's kappa was
4 155 calculated. The inter-rater agreement for the exclusion of articles was high (K = 0.93; almost perfect
5 156 agreement above 0.80 (J. R. Landis & Koch, 1977)). Next, both reviewers screened titles and abstracts
6 157 of all 658 articles, using the following exclusion criteria: animal studies; no eating behavior; no
7 158 olfactory dysfunction; case study; no original research article; not related to the research question (i.e.,
8 159 the effect of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior). We excluded studies on eating disorders as
9 160 'not related to the research question', as our primary focus was to investigate healthy eating behavior.
10 161 Therefore, studies that specifically examined disordered eating patterns or individuals with diagnosed
11 162 eating disorders were not included. See Table 3.a, for a list of excluded articles.
12 163

164 As the last step, both reviewers performed full-text screening for all articles that passed the
165 abstract screening. In total, 108 full texts were reviewed, using the same exclusion criteria as used
166 during the title and abstract screening, with 'no English full text available' added as an additional
167 criterion. After review, 61 articles were excluded, resulting in 47 full-text articles for quality assessment
168 and data extraction.

170 **2.3 Additional literature search**

171 In total, 118 articles were found, of which 44 new articles were identified after the removal of the
172 duplicate articles from our previous search. The articles underwent the procedures outlined in Section
173 2.2. Following the title and abstract screening, 3 papers advanced to full-text screening and were
174 included in the final selection for quality assessment and data extraction. See Table 3.b for a list of
175 excluded articles.

177 **2.4 Quality assessment and data extraction**

178 Quality assessment was done using the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-
1
2 179 Sectional Studies from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (*Study Quality Assessment Tools* |
3
4 180 *NHLBI, NIH*, n.d.). This tool contained 14 questions on the paper's quality that were answered for all
5
6
7 181 included full texts using Yes, No, Cannot Determine, Not Applicable, or Not Reported (see Table A2.1
8
9 182 in Appendix 2).

10
11 183 Based on the established criteria, all papers were categorized as either Good, Fair, or Poor. Out of 47,
12
13
14 184 30 papers received a 'Good' rating, 17 were rated as 'Fair', and none were deemed 'Poor'. As a result,
15
16 185 no papers were excluded based on the Quality Assessment. Papers sourced from the additional search
17
18
19 186 were also subjected to a quality assessment: one paper was rated 'Good', another as 'Fair', and the
20
21 187 third as 'Poor'. Consequently, the latter was excluded from the selection. A detailed breakdown of the
22
23 188 ratings, organized by the etiology of olfactory dysfunction, can be found in Table A2.2, Appendix 2.
24
25
26 189 This process culminated in a final selection of 49 papers for the comprehensive review.

27
28 190 For the final selection of papers, all available data were obtained regarding the first author's
29
30
31 191 name, year of publication, study design (e.g., cross-sectional or longitudinal), demographics of the
32
33 192 participants (i.e., sample size, mean age \pm SD/SEM, age range, gender, and characteristics of the study
34
35 193 groups), type of olfactory function measures utilized (e.g., identification, discrimination, threshold,
36
37
38 194 detection, self-report), eating behavior measures employed, and primary findings. Appendix 3 includes
39
40 195 a full overview of the methods used to measure olfactory function.

41
42 196

43 44 45 197 **2.5 Presentation of results**

46
47 198 The primary findings were organized into two categories, based on the literature search findings: the
48
49
50 199 anticipatory phase of eating behavior, which includes food neophobia, (anticipatory) food liking, food
51
52 200 preferences, appetite and craving, and cooking habits; and the consummatory phase of eating
53
54 201 behavior, which encompasses food intake, consumption frequency, adherence to dietary guidelines,
55
56
57 202 (experienced) food liking, food enjoyment, and eating habits (see Table 4 and Table 5 for details). In
58
59 203 the manuscript's result section, within each section, findings are presented according to the underlying

60
61
62
63
64
65

204 cause of olfactory dysfunction in the study population (i.e., general olfactory dysfunction, older adults,
1
2 205 cancer patients, and other underlying diseases). This categorization allowed for a comprehensive
3
4 206 examination of olfactory dysfunction across different patient populations and conditions.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3. Results: the impact of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior

3.1 Study characteristics and design

The characteristics of the 49 studies included in the review are summarized in Table 3 to Table 6. The studies were conducted in multiple countries, including South Korea, The Netherlands, Germany, Italy, France, the USA, and Australia. Most studies were cross-sectional (N=44). Only Gopinath et al. (Gopinath et al., 2016), De Vries et al. (de Vries et al., 2019), (de Vries et al., 2018) and Postma et al. (Postma, Kok, et al., 2020) applied a longitudinal study design; Essed et al. (Essed et al., 2009) used a single-blind, within-subjects, cross-over design. Sample sizes varied between 15 cancer patients (de Vries et al., 2019) and 24,490 participants from a population-based study in Korea (Kong et al., 2016). Overall, study participants, including control groups, were divided into five populations: 16 studies included individuals with general olfactory dysfunction (quantitative as well as qualitative; N=3,175); 11 studies included older adults (N=3,071); 10 studies included cancer patients (N=933); and 8 studies included individuals with various underlying disorders causing the olfactory dysfunction (e.g., Covid-19 (Coelho et al., 2021),(Lechien et al., 2020); CHARGE¹ syndrome (Chalouhi et al., 2005); or diabetes (Rasmussen et al., 2018), N=4,394). Additionally, there were 4 population-based studies (N=37,369).

3.2 Anticipatory phase of eating behavior

This category includes food neophobia, food preferences, (anticipatory) food liking, appetite and craving, and cooking habits. To explore these aspects more precisely and consistently, the following terminology will be employed in this context. *Food neophobia* is the reluctance to try new or unfamiliar foods (Pelchat, 2000). The evaluative attitudes that people express toward foods are referred to as *food preferences* (Styles, 2003); these are based on a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic factors, including personal preferences, cultural influences, nutritional concerns, and health status (Féart et al., 2013).

¹ CHARGE is an abbreviation for several of the features common in the disorder: coloboma, heart defects, atresia choanae, growth retardation, genital abnormalities, and ear abnormalities.

230 (*Anticipatory*) food liking refers to the anticipated pleasure (hedonic pleasure) derived from the food
1
2 231 or its sensory properties (Finlayson et al., 2012); this is one of the key drivers of food consumption
3
4 232 (Wanich et al., 2018). *Appetite* is defined as a person's desire to search for, select, and consume foods
5
6
7 233 in general (De Graaf et al., 2004). On the other hand, a food *craving* is an intense urge to consume a
8
9 234 specific food (Weingarten & Elston, 1990), (Hill et al., 1991). Cooking habits refer to the individual's
10
11 235 practices and routines related to food preparation and cooking. In the context of this study, it includes
12
13 236 aspects such as cooking for oneself and any difficulties or changes in cooking behavior due to the
14
15 237 condition of olfactory dysfunction. Table 4 shows the articles that were included for the anticipatory
16
17
18 238 phase of eating behavior per category.
19
20

21 239

240 **3.2.1 Food neophobia**

241 The general population (Manesse et al., 2017) as well as older adults (Manesse et al., 2021) with
27
28 242 olfactory dysfunction are more neophobic than healthy controls. In contrast, this was not the case for
29
30 243 younger participants (Manesse et al., 2021). In addition, older adults with OD were equally willing to
31
32 244 try new foods compared to healthy older adults and healthy young people. However, older adults with
33
34 245 OD were significantly more willing to try foods with an unpleasant odor than young adults, likely
35
36 246 because they were unable to detect unpleasant aspects of food odor (Pelchat, 2000). Lastly, there was
37
38 247 no correlation between olfactory function and food neophobia score in children with and without
39
40 248 Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (Stankovic et al., 2021).
41
42

43
44 249 To summarize, we found contrasting results on the effect of olfactory dysfunction on food
45
46 250 neophobia. As food neophobia is a personality trait and depends on factors such as age (Demattè et
47
48 251 al., 2013), genetics (Knaapila et al., 2007), and sensory properties of food, such as texture and visual
49
50 252 cues, the large variation in food neophobia among the population may account for these contrasting
51
52 253 results.
53
54

55 254

56 255

60
61
62
63
64
65

256 3.2.2 Food preferences

1
2 257 There was no significant difference in food preferences (i.e., preferences for macronutrients (Postma,
3
4 258 De Graaf, et al., 2020); vegetables, fruits, meat, fish, starchy foods, and dairy products (Manesse et al.,
5
6
7 259 2017)) between participants who lost their sense of smell during life and healthy controls (Manesse et
8
9 260 al., 2017), (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020). However, individuals with acquired (i.e., quantitative and
10
11 261 qualitative) olfactory dysfunction experienced a shift in preference from sweet, sour, bitter, and fatty
12
13 262 tastes to a preference for salty and spicy tastes (Aschenbrenner et al., 2008). Moreover, etiology
14
15 263 affected preference for foods high in fat, and preference for sweet foods differed between individuals
16
17 264 with OD and controls (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020). Individuals with congenital OD were found to be
18
19 265 more taste-oriented when eating compared to those with acquired smell loss (Postma, De Graaf, et
20
21 266 al., 2020).

22
23
24
25
26 267 In older adults, lower olfactory function was associated with a change in sweet and salt
27
28 268 preferences (Kim et al., 2003) and in older females, to lower preference for food with a sour or bitter
29
30 269 taste or pungent taste (Duffy et al., 1995). In contrast, neither colorectal cancer patients (Postma, Kok,
31
32 270 et al., 2020) nor patients with advanced esophagogastric cancer (de Vries et al., 2019) showed a
33
34 271 correlation between olfactory dysfunction and food preferences. On the other hand, bariatric surgery
35
36 272 patients who exhibited olfactory dysfunction were found to have a reduced preference for cheese
37
38 273 (Guyot et al., 2021).

39
40
41
42 274 Overall, olfactory dysfunction leads to changes in food preferences, likely to compensate for
43
44 275 the changed flavor perception. This is most prominently seen in individuals with congenital anosmia,
45
46 276 who are more taste (sweet)- or nutrient (fat) oriented than individuals with acquired OD or individuals
47
48 277 with a normal sense of smell (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020). However, congenital anosmia does not
49
50 278 produce noticeably abnormal food preferences (DOTY, 1977). The exact mechanism of the effect of
51
52 279 OD on flavor perception and subsequent food preferences needs further investigation. There are
53
54 280 contrasting results on the effect of OD itself on taste ability (Stinton et al., 2010), (B. N. Landis et al.,
55
56 281 2010), but olfactory and taste dysfunction are often seen in combination, for example in Covid-19
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

282 patients (Boscolo-Rizzo et al., 2022) or cancer patients (Spotten et al., 2017). Lastly, individuals with
283 OD have been found to have a reduced sensitivity to the spiciness of the food, as those with anosmia
284 showed reduced oral irritation in response to chili powder (Han et al., 2021) and a decreased sensitivity
285 towards trigeminal stimuli (Hummel et al., 1996), (Frasnelli et al., 2010). This reduced sensitivity may
286 also contribute to the changes in flavor perception (during the consumption phase) that drive future
287 food preferences in these individuals.

288

289 **3.2.3 Food (anticipatory) liking**

290 The effect of olfactory dysfunction on the liking of food can differ across cultures. A study conducted
291 in the United States indicated that individuals with OD had a lower overall liking for food stimuli than
292 healthy controls, whereas no significant difference was found between groups in a German population
293 (Pellegrino et al., 2020). Also, the nature of the OD affects food liking. In individuals with smell loss and
294 distorted smell changes in food liking were particularly pronounced in individuals within the latter
295 group with sweets and meat being the most disliked food categories (Mattes et al., 1990). In addition,
296 it was observed that food aversions were more frequent among individuals experiencing a distorted
297 sense of smell and those with multiple diagnoses (e.g., hyposmia and phantosmia) (Mattes & Cowart,
298 1994).

299 Olfactory dysfunction can affect food liking in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy.
300 Among women with breast cancer, a lower self-reported sense of smell was correlated with a lower
301 liking of low-energy and sweet products (de Vries et al., 2018). However, in colorectal cancer patients,
302 olfactory (dys)function was not correlated with food liking (Postma, Kok, et al., 2020). Moreover, in
303 individuals with smell loss and distorted sense of smell following a Covid-19 infection, food liking was
304 significantly lower compared to controls (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022).

305 Overall, most studies show that olfactory dysfunction affects anticipatory food liking. Its effect
306 depends on the nature of OD. Furthermore, external factors such as culture (Pellegrino et al., 2020),
307 or treatment in cancer patients (Boltong & Keast, 2012), can also impact the liking of food.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3.2.4 Appetite and Craving

In individuals with OD, the prevalence of decreased appetite ranges from 22-48% (Mattes & Cowart, 1994), (Nordin et al., 2011), (Ferris & Duffy, 1989). Changes were not dependent on age or extent of the dysfunction, and individuals with long-lasting OD (more than three years) did not perceive a change in appetite (Ferris & Duffy, 1989). Moreover, changes in appetite were more common in individuals with a distorted sense of smell (37%) than in individuals with smell loss (22%) (Mattes et al., 1990). Similarly, more individuals with smell distortion (25%) than with smell loss (19%) reported the development of food cravings (Mattes et al., 1990).

Studies in older adults show mixed findings regarding the relation between olfactory function and appetite. While some studies found no impact of olfactory function on appetite (Arganini & Sinesio, 2015), (Fluitman et al., 2021), (Fluitman et al., 2019), one study among Korean elderly women showed that between 51% and 62% of the participants reported a decreased appetite (Kim et al., 2003). Additionally, olfactory function did not affect the desire for plain soup versus flavor-enhanced soup in older adults (Essed et al., 2009).

Among advanced cancer patients, 27% reported diminished appetite due to their smell alterations (Omlin et al., 2013), while. However, another study showed no significant effect of smell alterations on appetite in patients undergoing chemotherapy (Drareni et al., n.d.).

Among Covid-19 patients with OD, 55% reported a reduced appetite (Coelho et al., 2021). However, reduction in appetite was lower in those with anosmia than in those with hyposmia and without OD (Lechien et al., 2020). In chronic hemodialysis patients there were more changes in smell in patients with a poor appetite compared to those with a good appetite (Bossola et al., 2011). Among children with CHARGE syndrome, no relation between olfactory deficits and the severity of feeding disorders (including poor appetite as part of abnormal feeding behavior) was found (Chalouhi et al., 2005).

The results of these studies suggest that the nature of olfactory dysfunction (qualitative vs quantitative) and its duration can lead to differences in appetite. For instance, it is more likely to

334 experience a decrease in appetite in individuals with short-term olfactory dysfunction, while those
1
2 335 with long-term olfactory dysfunction may develop coping strategies (Croy et al., 2014). This is reflected
3
4 336 in a higher quality of life in individuals with long-term dysfunction (Shu et al., 2011). Furthermore,
5
6
7 337 while more research is needed, it can be speculated that qualitative olfactory disorders, which typically
8
9 338 have more significant effects on eating behavior, may lead to food craving.

10
11 339

14 340 **3.2.5 Cooking habits**

16 341 Comparison of individuals with OD to healthy controls revealed no differences in cooking habits, i.e.,
17
18 342 cooking for oneself and eating prepared meals (Manesse et al., 2017). However, another study found
19
20
21 343 that among individuals with smell loss, difficulty in cooking was the most common interference (Nordin
22
23 344 et al., 2011). Additionally, individuals with OD after a Covid-19 infection had lower scores on skills and
24
25
26 345 self-efficacy, and attitude related to cooking compared to healthy controls (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022).
27
28 346 However, individuals' age and etiology of the OD (i.e., Covid-19 vs non-Covid-19 (long duration)) have
29
30
31 347 no effect (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022).

33 348 Generally, individuals experiencing OD face challenges while cooking, including a lack of
34
35 349 comfort and inspiration in the kitchen and difficulty in preparing new dishes. Individuals with distorted
36
37
38 350 sense of smell have more challenges with respect to individuals with smell loss, such as a reduced
39
40 351 confidence in the ability to deal with unexpected results, and a wish for more time for planning meals.

41
42 352

45 353 **3.3 Consummatory phase of eating behavior**

47 354 Within the consummatory phase, we defined the following categories: nutritional intake, adherence
48
49
50 355 to dietary guidelines, consumption frequency, (experienced) food liking, food enjoyment, and finally
51
52 356 eating habits. *Nutritional intake* is the sum of foods and beverages consumed by a person, including
53
54
55 357 carbohydrates, proteins, fats, vitamins, and minerals (Khalid et al., 2014). *Adherence to dietary*
56
57 358 *guidelines* is defined as following the recommendations for daily nutrient intake as set by national or
58
59 359 international health organizations (Van Lee et al., 2012). *Consumption frequency* refers to how often
60
61
62
63
64
65

360 food is consumed during a specified time (Tarasuk & Brooker, 1997). We defined the *experienced food*
1
2 361 *liking* as individuals' actual liking and sensory satisfaction with the taste, flavor, and texture of the food
3
4 362 during consumption. *Food enjoyment* is the overall satisfaction and pleasure derived from consuming
5
6
7 363 food (Styles, 2003) including feelings of pleasure, satisfaction, and well-being during the meal. And last
8
9 364 but not least, *eating habits* refer to the behaviors and routines individuals have when it comes to
10
11 365 consuming food, and the social aspects of eating, such as eating alone or with others (Jastran et al.,
12
13 366 2009).

16 367 Table 5 shows the articles that were included for the anticipatory phase per category.
17
18
19 368

21 369 **3.3.1 Nutritional intake**

23 370 Most studies demonstrated an effect of olfactory dysfunction on food intake among the general
24
25 371 population. In particular, 29% of individuals reported having reduced their intake since the onset of
26
27 372 their OD (Aschenbrenner et al., 2008). Furthermore, individuals reporting intake changes consumed
28
29 373 fewer nutrients (Mattes et al., 1990). Notably, a higher proportion (18.6%) reported decreased
30
31 374 consumption compared to those increasing intake (7.3%) (Merkonidis et al., 2015). In South Korean
32
33 375 adults, olfactory dysfunction was associated with lower fat intake (Kong et al., 2016). Moreover, age
34
35 376 and gender were identified as factors that can influence the effect of OD on food intake, as young
36
37 377 males with olfactory dysfunction were found to consume less protein compared to their healthy
38
39 378 counterparts (Kong et al., 2016). Also, significantly lower consumption of carbohydrates, dietary fiber,
40
41 379 and total sugars was observed in individuals with OD with multiple diagnoses compared to healthy
42
43 380 controls. However, no marked deficiencies or clinically relevant excesses were found (Mattes & Cowart,
44
45 381 1994).

52 382 In contrast, other studies revealed that 62% of the individuals with OD did not exhibit any
53
54 383 changes in food intake (Ferris & Duffy, 1989). In addition, no significant difference in nutritional status
55
56 384 was observed between individuals with anosmia and healthy controls (Ferris et al., 1985) nor was an
57
58 385 association found between olfactory impairment and the consumption rate of vegetables or fruit
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

386 (Schubert et al., 2012). Moreover, no association between a Western-style diet (i.e., high in sugar, salt,
1
2 387 and fat) and OD was identified among the study's population. However, for the separate subgroups
3
4 388 for etiology, various associations were observed between olfactory function and consumption of a
5
6
7 389 Western-style diet (Stevenson et al., 2020).
8

9 390 Most studies reported increased usage of condiments (Manesse et al., 2017) and additional
10
11 391 foods among individuals with OD: 15% up to 57% reported altered use of spices (Aschenbrenner et al.,
12
13 392 2008), (Merkonidis et al., 2015). Individuals with hyposmia reported an average increase of 2.8 times
14
15
16 393 in the use of salt when compared with before their smell loss (Henkin, 2014). However, another study
17
18 394 found no association between the frequency of adding sugar or salt to food and olfactory function
19
20
21 395 (Schubert et al., 2012). Furthermore, a slightly higher rate of change in the use of spices was observed
22
23 396 among individuals with a distorted sense of smell (43%) compared to those with smell loss (40%)
24
25
26 397 (Mattes et al., 1990).
27

28 398 Older adults with olfactory dysfunction have been observed to experience changes in their
29
30 399 nutritional intake. Studies among elderly women revealed that lower olfactory perception was
31
32 400 associated with a higher intake of sweets and a lower intake of low-fat milk products, leading to a
33
34
35 401 nutrient intake profile pointing towards a higher risk for cardiac disease (Duffy et al., 1995) and
36
37 402 negatively correlated with the consumption of meats, eggs, cereals, and caloric intake, as well as intake
38
39
40 403 of protein, fat, carbohydrates, and minerals (Kim et al., 2003). Older adults with OD were found to
41
42 404 choose different snacks than their unimpaired peers (Kremer et al., 2014) and to consume significantly
43
44
45 405 less protein and alcohol, and more carbohydrates than their normosmic counterparts, though their
46
47 406 total energy intake was similar (Fluitman et al., 2021). Additionally, older adults with OD tended to
48
49
50 407 consume more dairy products and meat, and fewer vegetables than younger participants (Manesse et
51
52 408 al., 2021), and used more spices to enhance appetite and food intake (Kim et al., 2003). Notably,
53
54 409 olfactory function did not affect the intake of plain soup versus flavor-enhanced soup (Essed et al.,
55
56
57 410 2009).
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 412 Among advanced cancer patients, chemosensory alterations were found to have a negative
3
4 413 impact on energy and macronutrient intake, including protein (Brisbois et al., 2011) and fat (Hutton et
5
6 414 al., 2007), with 27% of these patients reporting reduced intake (Omlin et al., 2013). Furthermore, lung
7
8 415 cancer patients with smell and taste alterations reported significantly lower food intake than those
9
10 416 without such alterations (Belqaid et al., 2014). Additionally, diabetic patients with OD had a decreased
11
12 417 daily caloric, carbohydrate, sodium, and fat intake when compared with those without OD. In the same
13
14 418 study, controls with OD also had a lower daily caloric intake and lower fat intake compared to the
15
16 control group without OD (Rasmussen et al., 2018).

17
18
19 419 To summarize, the literature shows that, regardless of etiology, olfactory dysfunction can lead
20
21 420 to a decrease in food intake, potentially resulting in inadequate nutrient intake and deficiencies.
22
23 421 Individuals with distorted olfactory function reported avoiding eating because food had an unpleasant
24
25 422 flavor, while those with only smell loss reported reduced pleasure as the reason for avoiding eating
26
27 423 (Mattes et al., 1990). The effects of olfactory dysfunction do not seem to lead to marked deficiencies
28
29 424 in the general population, probably because individuals compensate for the effect of OD by the
30
31 425 increased use of condiments and additional foods. However, OD may put older adults at risk of
32
33 426 inadequate food consumption, including a decrease in intake and less healthy dietary patterns.
34
35 427 Contrary to the findings of Essed et al. (Essed et al., 2009), the study by Mathey et al. revealed that
36
37 428 flavor enhancement can improve dietary intake in older adults (Mathey, Siebelink, et al., 2001). This
38
39 429 indicates that other factors may also influence nutritional intake, as Essed et al. administered the
40
41 430 products in a laboratory setting, while Mathey et al. provided meals during lunch at nursing homes.
42
43
44
45
46

47 431

48 49 432 **3.3.2 Adherence to dietary guidelines**

50
51
52 433 Individuals with OD had a lower diet quality than healthy individuals, consuming more foods with
53
54 434 higher energy density, such as saturated fats and added sugars, as well as having a lower consumption
55
56 435 of vegetables (Rawal et al., 2021). In contrast, another study showed that there was no difference in
57
58
59 436 *total* adherence to dietary guidelines between individuals with OD and healthy controls. However,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 437 individuals did have significantly lower adherence to the guidelines for dietary fiber, trans fatty acids,
3 438 and alcohol, and a better adherence to salt (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020). Furthermore, adequate
4 439 adherence to dietary recommendations was reported, except for a low intake of vitamin B6 and zinc
5 440 in individuals with OD (Ferris & Duffy, 1989).
6
7

8
9 441 Older adults with olfactory dysfunction showed a poorer adherence to dietary guidelines
10
11 442 compared to those without OD (Gopinath et al., 2016), (Fluitman et al., 2021). The self-reported poor
12
13 443 smell was associated with lower scores on dietary quality indexes (Fluitman et al., 2021) and female
14
15 444 individuals with moderate or severe OD had significantly lower adherence to dietary guidelines than
16
17 445 those without OD five years later (Gopinath et al., 2016).
18
19
20

21 446 Overall, these results show that individuals with OD have lower adherence to (components of)
22
23 447 dietary guidelines, leading to a less healthy diet. Factors that influence adherence include etiology
24
25 448 (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020), duration (Gopinath et al., 2016), (Ferris & Duffy, 1989) and severity
26
27 449 (Ferris & Duffy, 1989) of OD, and age and gender (Gopinath et al., 2016), (Ferris & Duffy, 1989), (Rawal
28
29 450 et al., 2021). Therefore, tailored advice for people with olfactory dysfunction, taking factors like the
30
31 451 age of the individuals and duration of the OD into account, is necessary to improve adherence to
32
33 452 dietary guidelines. Such advice can be derived from more generic strategies employed by individuals
34
35 453 with OD, such as focusing on food texture or the visual aspects of food (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022)
36
37 454 (Ferris & Duffy, 1989).
38
39
40
41
42

43 455

44 456 **3.3.3 Consumption frequency**

45
46
47 457 Olfactory dysfunction does not necessarily lead to changes in eating frequency among individuals with
48
49 458 acquired olfactory dysfunction, as it was not associated with the number of meals per day nor with the
50
51 459 average time spent per meal (Han et al., 2018). Moreover, there was no difference in eating frequency
52
53 460 among older adults with olfactory dysfunction when compared to older adults with a normal sense of
54
55 461 smell, while those with OD did consume less varied meals (Kremer et al., 2014). Moreover, alcohol
56
57 462 consumption was less frequent in individuals with OD than in healthy controls (Han et al., 2018). Other
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 464 research showed that up to 77% of individuals with OD reported alterations in their eating patterns,
3
4 465 mostly changes in eating frequency, with the highest incidence seen in those with multiple diagnoses
5
6 466 (e.g., combining hyposmia and phantosmia) (Mattes & Cowart, 1994). Additionally, intake frequency
7
8 467 was lower in individuals with a distorted sense of smell compared to those with just smell loss or
9
10 468 healthy controls (Mattes et al., 1990), while among individuals with OD after aCovid-19 infection no
11
12 469 changes in frequency of intake were found (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022).
13
14 470 Concluding, these findings indicate that changes in eating frequency are related to the nature of
15
16 471 olfactory dysfunction (i.e., quantitative or qualitative), with a lower consumption frequency observed
17
18 472 in those with a distorted sense of smell. This is further supported by evidence from recent work among
19
20 473 individuals with a distorted sense of smell after a Covid-19 infection, who indicated that distorted food
21
22 474 odors were also mostly perceived as unpleasant (Parker et al., 2022).
23
24
25
26
27

28 475 **3.3.4 Experienced liking**

29
30 476 The hedonic value of food typically decreases during consumption; however, in individuals with
31
32 477 congenital olfactory dysfunction, this decline in pleasantness was lower than in healthy controls
33
34 478 (Novakova et al., 2012). In older adults with OD, variations in the concentration of tea and coffee did
35
36 479 not affect the pleasantness of these drinks (Seo & Hummel, 2009). While older adults with and without
37
38 480 OD increased food liking in response to multi-sensory enrichment in warm meals (i.e., visual and flavor
39
40 481 enrichment in mashed potato) (Kremer et al., 2014), no effects on food liking were observed for flavor
41
42 482 and texture enhancement in older adults with OD (Essed et al., 2009), (Kremer et al., 2007). However,
43
44 483 changes in the texture affected food pleasantness more in older adults with low olfactory ability
45
46 484 compared to older adults with a medium or high olfactory ability (Kremer et al., 2007).
47
48
49
50
51

52 485 Overall, most studies show that olfactory dysfunction affects food liking. However, it can be
53
54 486 assumed a gradual decline of olfactory function, which is common in older adults, has a minor effect
55
56 487 on the liking of food, while a sudden change in olfactory function is likely to have a greater effect. This
57
58 488 is supported by the finding that olfactory function is not associated with nutritional status (Toussaint
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

489 et al., 2015) or total energy intake (Duffy et al., 1995). Thus, further research should consider other
1
2 490 factors that may affect the liking of food in individuals with olfactory dysfunction, such as the
3
4 491 heterogeneity of olfactory dysfunction among older adults (Essed et al., 2009).
5
6

7 492

9 493 **3.3.5 Food enjoyment**

10
11 494 Food enjoyment, and eating-related quality of life, were found to be positively associated with
12
13
14 495 olfactory function (Manesse et al., 2017), (Manesse et al., 2021), (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020),
15
16 496 (Nordin et al., 2011), (Ferris et al., 1985), (Rowan et al., 2019), (Schubert et al., 2012). While individuals
17
18
19 497 with acquired olfactory dysfunction had significantly lower food enjoyment compared to healthy
20
21 498 controls, those with life-long olfactory dysfunction did not (Ferris et al., 1985). Reduced food
22
23 499 enjoyment was also observed in 87% of the individuals in a cohort of Covid-19 patients with olfactory
24
25 500 dysfunction (Coelho et al., 2021).

26
27
28 501 While one study found that decreased food enjoyment declined with the duration of OD (Mattes &
29
30 502 Cowart, 1994), another study found no effect of duration (Merkonidis et al., 2015). Individuals with
31
32
33 503 multiple diagnoses related to smell (e.g., hyposmia and phantosmia) (Mattes & Cowart, 1994) and
34
35 504 patients with qualitative disorders (Mattes et al., 1990), (Philpott & Boak, 2014) reported decreased
36
37
38 505 enjoyment of food more often compared to those solely suffering from smell loss. The difference
39
40 506 between individuals with qualitative and quantitative disorders was most pronounced in those with
41
42 507 long-term (> 1 year) problems (Mattes et al., 1990). Additionally, olfactory dysfunction was identified
43
44
45 508 to reduce the enjoyment of food in younger cohorts (Ferris & Duffy, 1989), (Merkonidis et al., 2015),
46
47 509 regardless of gender or severity of the disorder (Ferris & Duffy, 1989).

48
49 510 The results obtained for older adults were inconsistent. In one study, over 70% of the participants
50
51
52 511 responded that food enjoyment had diminished to some extent or significantly since the emergence
53
54 512 of their OD (Ferris & Duffy, 1989), while another study found that only 18% of the individuals reported
55
56
57 513 a decrease in eating pleasure (Arganini & Sinesio, 2015). The decrease in food enjoyment did, however,
58
59 514 diminish as OD duration increased (Ferris & Duffy, 1989). In addition, food enjoyment was lower in
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 515 patients with advanced cancer who had severe chemosensory complaints compared to those with less
2 516 severe complaints (Hutton et al., 2007).
3

4 517 Together, these results indicate that OD leads to a decline in food enjoyment, in which young
5
6 518 individuals are more affected than older adults. The decline in food enjoyment seems to become less
7
8
9 519 pronounced over time, likely due to the development of coping mechanisms (Ferris & Duffy, 1989).
10

11 520 Moreover, the nature of olfactory dysfunction is an important factor in food enjoyment. In individuals
12
13 521 with a distorted sense of smell, food enjoyment is more severely impacted, possibly because
14
15
16 522 qualitative olfactory dysfunction likely has a greater impact on flavor perception than quantitative
17
18 523 olfactory dysfunction. This was further corroborated by recent studies on parosmia in patients after
19
20
21 524 Covid-19 infections (Parker et al., 2022), (Watson et al., 2021). Moreover, the importance of flavor
22
23 525 perception in food enjoyment is supported by the finding of Liu et al. (Liu et al., 2021), who found that
24
25 526 food enjoyment was more strongly associated with self-perceived taste and flavor than with smell
26
27 527 perception. Also, this is further evidenced by the fact that individuals with lifelong olfactory
28
29
30 528 dysfunction did not show reduced food enjoyment (Ferris et al., 1985). These individuals were never
31
32 529 able to perceive the flavor of food fully. This suggests that alternative strategies to enhance the
33
34 530 enjoyment of the flavor of food, either through coping strategies (e.g., focusing on other sensory
35
36 531 aspects of the food) or by innovative food products (e.g., new food designs), are important to increase
37
38
39 532 overall food enjoyment in patients with olfactory dysfunction.
40
41

42 533

43 44 534 **3.3.6 Eating habits**

45
46 535 Comparison of individuals with OD to healthy controls revealed no differences in eating habits, such
47
48 536 as emptying a food plate although full (Han et al., 2018). However, another study found that 67% of
49
50 537 the individuals reported changes in eating habits (Ferris & Duffy, 1989), mostly by younger females or
51
52 538 older adults with shorter OD duration. OD negatively affected socially related eating habits, such as
53
54
55 539 going out for dinner (Aschenbrenner et al., 2008), (Lechien et al., 2020), (Philpott & Boak, 2014), (Rowan
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 540 et al., 2019). Individuals reported employing coping strategies, including emphasizing the social
3
4 541 aspects of the meal (Ferris & Duffy, 1989), to cope with their altered flavor perception.
5
6 542 Concluding, these findings suggest that individuals with OD experience the most difficulty with social
7
8 543 activities related to eating, impacting their quality of life (Temmel et al., 2002), (Philpott & Boak, 2014).
9
10 544 To cope with the altered perception of flavor, individuals can use a variety of strategies, such as eating
11
12 545 with family and friends, altering the quality of spices to stimulate the trigeminal sensation, and
13
14 546 focusing on the texture, temperature, and visual presentation of the food. These coping strategies
15
16 547 could contribute to a better quality of life, as they might improve social interactions during eating.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

548 **4. Discussion and conclusion**

1
2
3 549 This systematic scoping review with its primary objective of exploring the range and nature of studies
4
5 550 investigating the effect of olfactory dysfunction on distinct aspects of eating behavior reveals a crucial
6
7 551 need for standardized assessments in this research area. So far, the exact relationship between
8
9
10 552 olfactory dysfunction and eating behavior has been poorly understood. This may partly be attributed
11
12 553 to the complexity of olfactory dysfunction, which can affect eating behavior in multiple ways, as well
13
14 554 as a lack of harmonized assessment methods for the distinct aspects of eating behavior. Our analysis
15
16
17 555 of existing literature indicates that this variability can range from self-reported questionnaires to more
18
19 556 objective measures like psychophysical tests. Such divergence makes it challenging to draw definitive
20
21
22 557 conclusions or compare results across studies. For example, while some studies used validated tools
23
24 558 like food frequency questionnaires, others relied on less standardized methods. This inconsistency
25
26 559 highlights the urgent need for standardized, validated tools in this research area.
27
28

29 560
30

31 561 In discussing the impact of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior, we note that the
32
33 562 heterogeneity in study populations and methodologies leads to diverse findings. However, it can be
34
35
36 563 concluded that there are implications for individuals experiencing olfactory dysfunction, of which
37
38 564 decreased food enjoyment is the most outstanding. Moreover, our results show that in the
39
40
41 565 anticipatory phase of eating behavior, food preferences and food liking are most affected in people
42
43 566 who experienced a sudden change in olfactory function rather than a gradual decline, probably as the
44
45 567 latter group adapts to their decreased olfactory function over time. Moreover, changes in odor
46
47
48 568 perception due to olfactory dysfunction alters the perception of food flavors, resulting in a shift of food
49
50 569 preferences towards more taste-based preferences, like salty or savory (i.e., umami). Appetite is more
51
52
53 570 likely to be low in individuals with short-term olfactory dysfunction compared to those with long-term
54
55 571 changes. This is because individuals with long-term olfactory dysfunction may habituate to their
56
57 572 altered sense of smell. Moreover, individuals with olfactory dysfunction associate cooking with a lack
58
59
60 573 of comfort and inspiration and an inability to make new foods successfully.
61
62
63
64
65

574 Subsequently, changes in preferences in the anticipatory phase can affect food intake and
1
2 575 adherence to dietary guidelines in the consummatory phase. This is likely only to a limited extent
3
4 576 because food intake is not only regulated by sensory perception but also by other factors, including
5
6
7 577 hunger state and eating habits (Bilman et al., 2017). Additionally, eating behavior is more impacted in
8
9 578 individuals with a distorted sense of smell than in those with smell loss; this effect is more pronounced
10
11 579 over time (Mattes et al., 1990). Moreover, food enjoyment is most affected in people who experienced
12
13 580 a sudden change in olfactory function rather than a gradual decline.
14
15

16 581
17
18
19 582 The findings of this review reveal that specific characteristics of olfactory dysfunction influence
20
21 583 its impact on eating behavior. For instance, the *duration* and *nature* of dysfunction (sudden versus
22
23 584 gradual onset, total loss versus distortion of smell) significantly influence eating behavior. However,
24
25 585 the lack of standardized measures makes it difficult to systematically compare these impacts or to
26
27 586 understand the complex interplay of factors influencing eating behavior in individuals with olfactory
28
29 587 dysfunction. The current result shows that in individuals with a distorted sense of smell, pleasantness,
30
31 588 food enjoyment, appetite, consumption frequency, and cooking habits (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022) are
32
33 589 more affected than in individuals with smell loss. This is attributed to the fact that individuals with a
34
35 590 distorted sense of smell perceive food odors differently, and in most cases as unpleasant, rather than
36
37 591 simply experiencing them as less intense or non-existent (Watson et al., 2021). Moreover, associating
38
39 592 an unpleasant smell (e.g., garbage) with a food item (e.g., coffee) creates an unpleasant sensory
40
41 593 experience that can disrupt expectations and create a sense of unease or discomfort. This will make it
42
43 594 difficult to enjoy the food and will lead to a lack of appetite. Additionally, the presence of a strong,
44
45 595 unpleasant smell can be a distraction and make it difficult to focus on the taste of the food itself. A
46
47 596 distorted sense of smell has been linked to a lower overall quality of life (Pellegrino et al., 2021), which
48
49 597 is also reflected in eating behavior, including but not limited to decreased enjoyment of food and a
50
51 598 decreased consumption frequency.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

599 However, the *duration* of olfactory dysfunction emerges as a central determinant. For
1
2 600 instance, as time progresses, individuals with a distorted sense of smell experience a more pronounced
3
4 601 effect on their eating behavior compared to those with a complete loss of smell (Mattes et al., 1990).
5
6
7 602 Appetite and food enjoyment are low in individuals with short-term olfactory dysfunction, while in
8
9 603 individuals who experience long-term OD, the reduction in food enjoyment will diminish over time.
10
11 604 Most likely, this is because they develop coping strategies to deal with their olfactory loss or adapt to
12
13
14 605 it. However, it is noteworthy that such coping strategies, such as focusing on the texture, temperature,
15
16 606 and visual presentation of the food, are not only adopted by individuals living with long-term olfactory
17
18 607 dysfunction (Croy et al., 2014) but also by those with short-term changes, for instance, patients
19
20
21 608 undergoing chemotherapy (Bernhardson et al., 2012).

22
23 609
24
25
26 610 In most studies with a heterogeneous population, the effect of *etiology* of olfactory
27
28 611 dysfunction on eating behavior was not investigated, mostly because subgroups were too small to
29
30 612 compare. Further research involving large-scale studies with diverse etiologies might provide a more
31
32
33 613 comprehensive insight into the effect of the etiology of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior.
34
35 614 However, the effect of duration of olfactory dysfunction might overrule the effect of etiology. This is
36
37
38 615 supported by the evidence shown for the differential impact of acquired versus congenital olfactory
39
40 616 dysfunction on eating behavior. Individuals with congenital (i.e., lifelong) anosmia tend to focus more
41
42 617 on basic tastes during eating (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020), do not show lower food enjoyment, and
43
44
45 618 experience less decline in pleasantness during consumption (i.e., experienced liking) compared to
46
47 619 those with acquired dysfunction (Ferris et al., 1985) and healthy controls (Novakova et al., 2012). As
48
49 620 individuals with congenital OD were never able to fully perceive the flavor of food, they may have
50
51
52 621 developed coping strategies (Bojanowski et al., 2013) and do not know what they are missing;
53
54 622 however, they do report difficulties related to their dysfunction, such as an inability to identify spoiled
55
56 623 food (Croy et al., 2014). Moreover, it can be debated if it is the etiology of olfactory dysfunction that
57
58
59 624 affects eating behavior. For example, in cancer patients who experience olfactory dysfunction, the
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

625 disease itself could also influence their eating behavior. However, in most studies, a control group was
626 included, either consisting of patients with no olfactory dysfunction or healthy controls with a normal
627 sense of smell, which increases the likelihood that the effects on eating behavior in these individuals
628 are caused by the olfactory dysfunction itself. However, in future research, this should be a point of
629 attention, and control groups should therefore be carefully chosen.

630
631 In the studies included in this review, a wide range of approaches were employed to assess
632 various aspects of eating behavior. Standardized measures, such as food frequency questionnaires and
633 dietary recalls, are routinely utilized and validated methods for assessing dietary intake. However, as
634 these can also be laborious and time-consuming, in some studies, other measures were used as proxies
635 to measure these aspects of eating behavior. Most of the measures employed in studies were based
636 on surveys, including just a few validated instruments, such as the Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders
637 (Langstaff et al., 2019) and the Macronutrient and Taste Preference Ranking Task (de Bruijn et al.,
638 2017). Yet, most studies relied on self-developed questionnaires, also because of the unavailability of
639 validated instruments suitable to assess the eating behavior in question. For example, Rowan et al
640 (Rowan et al., 2019) utilized quality-of-life eating-related questions due to the absence of a validated
641 instrument to measure individuals' food enjoyment.

642 The evaluation of appetite in the context of olfactory dysfunction was addressed in several
643 studies, with some utilizing a single question to assess this aspect of eating behavior. For instance,
644 Fluitman et al. (Fluitman et al., 2019) applied the following question to evaluate appetite: *"In the past*
645 *week, I did not feel like eating, my appetite was poor"*. It can be debated whether a single question
646 may be sufficiently sensitive to accurately detect changes in appetite, particularly when comparing it
647 to the situation before the onset of olfactory dysfunction. In addition, some studies employed lab-
648 based settings to measure eating behavior, such as having individuals rate their food desire and liking.
649 These results may not be directly applicable to real-world situations. Hence, it is complex to compare

650 results from various studies due to the use of different methods to assess the same eating behavior
1
2 651 aspect such as appetite.
3

4 652 Therefore, we suggest developing standardized questionnaires to measure various aspects of
5
6
7 653 eating behavior in individuals with olfactory dysfunction during both anticipatory and consummatory
8
9 654 phases of eating behavior. To measure food intake and adherence to the dietary guidelines, already
10
11 655 existing methods, such as food frequency questionnaires (Vijay et al., 2020), or digital dietary
12
13 656 assessment tools such as Traqq (Lucassen et al., 2023) can be applied. To assess food liking, appetite,
14
15
16 657 and food preferences, questionnaires need to be standardized and validated. These can then serve as
17
18
19 658 the foundation for future research and, if needed, be extended with additional questions to meet the
20
21 659 objectives of specific studies, while still allowing for the comparison of results across studies.
22
23 660 Moreover, these questionnaires can include measures that are not included in the current research,
24
25
26 661 such as eating rate.
27

28 662
29
30 663 Additionally, articles included in this review demonstrate a wide range of methodologies
31
32
33 664 employed to measure olfactory function. While some studies incorporated psychophysical tests to
34
35 665 objectively diagnose olfactory dysfunction, most studies relied on subjective measures, such as self-
36
37
38 666 reported olfactory function through questionnaires (e.g., AHSP: Appetite, Hunger, and Sensory
39
40 667 Perception (Mathey, De Jong, et al., 2001)) and self-report ratings, or incorporated one or more
41
42 668 questions on olfactory function into an existing questionnaire. Utilizing objective testing when
43
44
45 669 investigating the effect of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior will improve the accuracy of the
46
47 670 prevalence of smell loss, as already has been demonstrated in Covid-19 patients with olfactory
48
49 671 dysfunction (Hannum et al., 2020). The emergence of low-cost, at-home tests for olfactory function
50
51
52 672 during the Covid-19 pandemic, such as the SCENTinel (Hunter et al., 2023), further increases the
53
54 673 feasibility of objective testing in studies conducted in a home setting. While at-home tests serve as
55
56
57 674 valuable initial screening tools, more comprehensive insights into olfactory function often require a
58
59 675 well-established and validated method such as Sniffin Sticks that offers standardized and quantitative
60
61
62
63
64
65

676 assessment across various olfactory dimensions. Researchers seeking an overview of olfactory
1
2 677 assessment methods can refer to the comprehensive work of Parma et al., (Parma & Boesveldt, 2022).

3
4 678

5
6
7 679 Furthermore, the current body of research largely overlooks the long-term adaptations and
8
9 680 coping strategies of individuals with olfactory dysfunction. While some studies hint at these aspects, a
10
11 681 standardized approach to measure and evaluate these adaptations is missing. Individuals facing
12
13 682 olfactory dysfunction often employ creative strategies to address the impact on their eating behavior.
14
15 683 For instance, they may enhanced the flavor through the increased use of spices and condiments, while
16
17 684 also focusing on other sensory attributes, like temperature and texture (Aschenbrenner et al., 2008),
18
19 685 (Ferris & Duffy, 1989), which can be applied in both the anticipatory and consummatory phase. These
20
21 686 coping mechanisms play a pivotal role in the eating behavior of people with olfactory dysfunction since
22
23 687 eating pleasure is associated with positive health outcomes (Bédard et al., 2021). Therefore, future
24
25 688 research is needed to investigate how people with olfactory dysfunction can modify their diets to make
26
27 689 eating enjoyable and palatable, despite their olfactory dysfunction. Most changes in the eating
28
29 690 behavior of these individuals are related to changes in flavor perception, as smell is a major contributor
30
31 691 to flavor. However, taste and trigeminal senses can also be affected in individuals with olfactory
32
33 692 dysfunction. Here lay opportunities for multidisciplinary research, including chefs and food designers,
34
35 693 to explore the potential of alternative strategies (e.g., through texture and taste) that people with
36
37 694 olfactory dysfunction can apply to have a joyful food experience. Furthermore, research could explore
38
39 695 how those with olfactory dysfunction can adjust the way they prepare, cook, and serve meals to
40
41 696 enhance other senses, such as sound and touch. This can provide valuable input for promoting healthy
42
43 697 eating practices, addressing dietary challenges, and improving overall well-being. Finally, research
44
45 698 could study how people with olfactory dysfunction can use technology, such as virtual reality (Li &
46
47 699 Bailenson, 2017), to enhance the overall experience of eating.

50
51
52 700
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


701 The systematic scoping review underscores the intricate relationship between olfactory
1
2 702 dysfunction and its profound influence on eating behavior, especially in the domains of food liking,
3
4 703 preferences, and enjoyment. Qualitative smell loss emerges as a significant factor, with the duration
5
6
7 704 and nature of the dysfunction further shaping its impact. There is a pressing need for further
8
9 705 investigations using standardized and validated assessment tools to delve deeper into these findings.
10
11 706 Significantly, this research also emphasizes the importance of crafting effective interventions to enrich
12
13 707 the eating experience for those affected. By addressing and understanding these connections, we pave
14
15 708 the way for enhanced interventions and the promotion of healthier eating habits in individuals with
16
17
18 709 olfactory dysfunction.
19

20
21 710

22
23 711 **Declaration of interests**

24
25
26 712 This research was funded by an Aspasia grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research,
27
28 713 awarded to SB. If there are other authors, they declare that they have no known competing financial
29
30 714 interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this
31
32
33 715 paper.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65



716
717
718

Figure 1. Flow chart showing the results of the literature search on studies investigating the effect of olfactory dysfunction on eating behavior.




Figure 2: Distribution of populations across studies (Number of Studies by Category with Participant Counts)

Table 1. Main keywords for olfactory dysfunction and eating behavior used for the literature search

Keywords	Strings and combinations of keywords
Olfactory Dysfunction	((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odor) W/5 (disorder OR loss OR dysfunction OR changes OR deficit OR impairment OR decrease OR alter*)) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY ((anosmia OR hyposmia OR parosmia)) AND
Eating behavior	appetite OR diet* OR food OR eating OR feed*) W/5 (habit OR intake OR pattern OR preference OR pleasantness OR liking OR wanting OR neophobia OR choice OR enjoyment OR perception OR behavi* OR pleasure OR quality OR consumption)

Table 2.a. Search results per database for the initial literature search

Database	Original # of Items found	# of deleted duplicates	# of unique items found
Medline®	237	22	215
PubMed	265	98	167
PsycINFO®	95	5	90
Scopus	463	147	316
Manual search	2	0	2
Check for external duplicates (all databases in one)	0	132	-132
Total	1062	404	658

726

727 **Table 2.b.** Search results per database for the additional literature search

Database	Original # of Items found	# of deleted duplicates	# of unique items found
Medline®	19	14	5
PubMed	18	15	3
PsycINFO®	14	13	1
Scopus	67	32	35
Total	118	74	44

728

729 **Table 3.a.** Results from the title and abstract screening for the initial search

Exclusion criteria	Number of papers excluded
Animal study	17
No eating behavior	97
No olfactory dysfunction	193
No original research article	176
Not related to the research question	35
case study	22
duplicated	7
Total number of papers excluded	547

730

731 **Table 3.b.** Results from the title and abstract screening for additional search

Exclusion criteria	Number of papers excluded
Animal study	6
No eating behavior	2
No olfactory dysfunction	3
No original research article	5
Not related to the research question	24
Not available in English	1
Total number of papers excluded	41

732

733

734

735

736

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 4. Included articles for the anticipatory phase of eating behavior per category (food neophobia, food liking, food preferences, and appetite and craving)

Anticipatory phase of eating behavior					
	Participants		Measurement methods		
Authors	Sample	Age: mean ± SD (age range); Gender: F /M	Olfactory dysfunction	Eating behavior	Result
Food neophobia					
(Manesse et al., 2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> French individuals (N=3685) Older adults (N=202) (subgroup) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (4-89); 2085F/600M (60-89); 117F/85M 	Identification Self-report	Food neophobia questionnaire	Older adults with olfactory dysfunction had a higher level of food neophobia; this was not the case for younger participants with and without OD.
(Manesse et al., 2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=39) CG (N=40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55.72 ± 2.08*; 22F/18M 56.82 ± 1.84*; 22F/18M 	Identification Self-report	Food questionnaire	Individuals with OD were more neophobic than control participants.
(Pelchat, 2000)	Community-dwelling adults; Experiment 1 (N=51) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young adults with NOR (N=16) Older adults with NOR (N=15) Older adults with OD (N=20) Experiment 2 (sauce could not be smelled) (N=54): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOR Young (N=15) NOR Older adults NOR (N=15) Older adults with OD (N=15) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (18-25) Older adults (62-85); 31F/20M <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young (19-34) Older adults: (64-85); 28F/17M 	Threshold	Four food stimuli, rated on familiarity, willingness to taste, and pleasantness of the food's odor	No significant effect of olfactory dysfunction on willingness to try new food in older adults compared to healthy older adults and healthy young people in both experiments; older adults with OD were significantly more willing to try the unpleasant-smelling foods than the young adults.
(Stankovic et al., 2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children with ADHD (N=36) Children without ADHD (N=36) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14 (13-16); 7F/29M 15 (13-16); 18F/18M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Food Neophobia Test Tool	No correlation between olfactory function and FNNT-score in either group.
Anticipatory food liking					
(de Vries et al., 2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women with breast cancer (N=28) CG (N=28) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 51.0 ± 1.1 51.8 ± 7.6 	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	Macronutrient and Taste Preference Ranking Task	A higher rating of subjective smell function was correlated with a higher liking of low-energy and sweet products.
(Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022)	Normosmic controls (N=166) Individuals with OD (N=522) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Olfactory loss (N=271) Parosmia (N=251) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 47 (37-58); 111F/55M 47 (34-58); 417F/105M 	Self-report	Questionnaire on liking of basic tastants and food items	Liking scores of food items were lower in participants with olfactory dysfunction compared with normosmic controls.
(Mattes et al., 1990)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals with a distorted sense of smell (N=60) Individuals with just smell loss (N=58) CG (N=40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.3 ± 16.4; 31F/29M 50.0 ± 15.2; 28F/30M 51.7 ± 17.8; 30F/10M 	Identification; threshold; Self-report	Dietary behavior questionnaire	Changes in food liking were more prominent in individuals with a distorted sense of smell than only smell loss; the most avoided

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

					foods in individuals with distortion were sweets and meat.
(Mattes & Cowart, 1994)	Individuals with OD (N=389): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No diagnosis (N=48); HYP (N=64); ANS (N=106); DYS (N=30); PH (N=31); Multi-OD (N=31) • CG (N=79) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50.5 ± 15.7 (15-93); 168F/142M • 48.8 ± 18.8 (20-83); 37F/42M 	Identification; detection Self-report	Questionnaire on dietary habits	Food dislike was most common in individuals with dysosmia, phantogeusia, and multiple disorders.
(Pellegrino et al., 2020)	Anosmic individuals and healthy controls (N=174) USA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANS (N = 22) • CG (N = 65) Germany <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANS (N = 22) • CG (N = 65) 	USA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55.7 ± 12.5 (36–76); 12F/10M • 34.7 ± 12.2 (21–63); 42F/23M Germany <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55.2 ± 16.4 (18.–82); 19F/12M • 36.5 ± 16.9 (20.0–81.0); 39F/17M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Food preference ratings for a 15 foods; preference for certain components in foods	Individuals with OD from the USA had a lower overall liking for food stimuli compared to healthy controls, while no such difference was found in the German population.
(Postma, Kok, et al., 2020)	Colorectal cancer patients; Longitudinal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients undergoing chemotherapy (N=15) • CG (N=20) Cross-sectional: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 (N=20); • T2 (N=20); • T3 (N=20) 	Longitudinal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66 ± 7.7; 2F/13M • 67 ± 8.8; 6F/14M Cross-sectional: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1:63 ± 9.1; 10F/10M • T2:65 ± 8.9; 7F/13M • T3:66 ± 4.7; 7F/13M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	Macronutrient and Taste Preference Ranking Task	No correlation between olfactory function and liking of macronutrients or taste qualities in all groups.
(Seo & Hummel, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young adults with normal olfactory function (N=30) • Older adults with normal olfactory (N=30) • Older adults with OD (N=30) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22.6 ± 2.9 (18-30), 30F • 66.4 ± 3.7 (60-75), 30F • 67.8 ± 4.4 (62-79), 30F 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Rating of the pleasantness of green tea and brewed coffee (both in 3 concentrations)	Variations in the concentration of tea and coffee did not affect the pleasantness of these drinks in older adults with OD.
Food preferences					
(Aschenbrenner et al., 2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals with OD (N=176) • NOR (N=12); • HYP (N=75); • ANS (N=89) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 57.4 ± 14.1; 114F/86M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Questionnaire providing a dietary alterations score (DAS).	After the onset of smell loss, there is a change in taste preferences towards more salty and spicy food. There was no significant difference between the three diagnostic groups.
(de Vries et al., 2019)	Advanced oesophagogastric cancer patients (N=15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 61 ± 9.3; 14F/1M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Macronutrient and Taste Preference Ranking Task	No correlation between olfactory function and food preferences.
(Duffy et al., 1995)	Elderly women with high personal functioning (N=80)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 76±6 (65-93) 	Identification; detection	Survey on food behavior; food preference for 87 foods on a five-point hedonic scale,	The lower olfactory perception was associated with lower preference for foods with a sour/bitter taste or pungency.
(Guyot et al., 2021)	Patients undergoing bariatric surgery (N=220)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (19 – 68); 197F/23M 	Self-report	Self-designed questionnaire on food preferences	Lower preference for cheese among patients with olfactory dysfunction.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Kim et al., 2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Korean elderly females (N=41) ● Young female adults (N=41) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 73.0 ± 1.1 ● 24.4±0.2 	Detection; threshold	Self-reported changes in dietary habits	Older adults with higher smell thresholds showed changes in sweet and salt preferences with age.
(Manesse et al., 2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=39) ● CG (N=40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 55.72 ± 2.08*; 22F/18M ● 56.82 ± 1.84*; 22F/18M 	Identification Self-report	Food questionnaire	No significant consequences of dysosmia were found for most aspects of food preferences.
(Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=71) ● CG (N=738) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 58 ± 12 (22–82); 52F/19M ● 55 ± 15 (19–84); 456F/282M 	Self-report	Macronutrient and Taste Preference Ranking Task	Patients with congenital smell loss are more taste (sweet)- or nutrient (fat) oriented.
(Postma, Kok, et al., 2020)	Colorectal cancer patients; Longitudinal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Patients undergoing chemotherapy (N=15) ● CG (N=20) Cross-sectional: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● T1 (N=20); ● T2 (N=20); ● T3 (N=20) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 66 ± 7.7; 2F/13M ● 67 ± 8.8; 6F/14M ● 1:63 ± 9.1; 10F/10M ● 2:65 ± 8.9; 7F/13M ● 3:66 ± 4.7; 7F/13M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	Macronutrient and Taste Preference Ranking Task	Food preferences were not correlated to olfactory function.
Appetite and craving					
(Bossola et al., 2011)	Chronic hemodialysis patients (N=110)	● 64.6 ± 14.8; 40F/70M	Self-report	Hemodialysis Study Appetite questionnaire	Changes in smell were significantly higher in patients with a poor/very poor appetite compared to patients with a good/very good appetite.
(Chalouhi et al., 2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Children with CHARGE syndrome (N=14) ● CG (N=25) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (6-18 years); 8F/6M ● (6-13 years);14 F/11M 	Identification; threshold	Questionnaire on child eating difficulty	No relation between olfactory deficits and the severity of feeding disorders (including poor appetite).
(Coelho et al., 2021)	Patients with a COVID-19 infection reported change in sense of smell (N=332)	● 41.57 ±13.72; 258 F/ 63M	Self-report	Questions regarding quality of life	55% of the patients reported a reduced appetite.
(Drareni et al., 2021)	Cancer patients receiving chemotherapy (N=89)	● 66 ± 11.7; 52F/37M	Self-report	Questionnaire on food behavior	No significant effect of chemosensory profile on self-reported appetite.
(Essed et al., 2009)	Older adults with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Normal olfactory + normal gustatory function (N=25), ● Normal olfactory + low gustatory function (N=23), ● Low olfactory + normal gustatory function (N=34), ● Low olfactory + low gustatory function (N=38) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 73 ± 6; 19F/6M ● 70 ± 7; 19F/4M ● 73 ± 6; 23F/11M ● 72 ± 5; 21F/17M 	Identification; detection	Rating desire for soup on a 10-point scale	No effect of flavor enhancement on the desire for soup in any of the groups.
(Arganini & Sinesio, 2015)	Independently living Italian older adults (N=99)	● (65-101 years); 66F/33M	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	Questionnaire on diminished eating pleasure and appetite	Chemosensory impairment does not diminish appetite in independently living older adults.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Ferris & Duffy, 1989)	Individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=227) ● Young (N=104) ● Older adults (N=123)	● (25-45); 50F/54M ● (>= 60 years); 61F/62M	Identification; detection	Nutritional evaluation based on diet history, food-intake analysis, and weight record	66% of individuals with OD reported no change in appetite. Change in appetite was not dependent on age or duration of the OD. Those with a duration of OD > 3 years did not perceive a change in appetite.
(Fluitman et al., 2019)	Community-dwelling Dutch older adults (N=673)	● (57.8±63.1); 345F/328 M	Identification	Question from the Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale: "In the past week, I did not feel like eating, my appetite was poor."	No association between olfactory function and appetite.
(Fluitman et al., 2021)	Community-dwelling Dutch older adults (N=359) ● Hyp (N = 66) ● Nor (N = 292)	● (69–77 years); 150F/209M ● 75(71–81); 22F/40M; ● 72 (69–77);123F/169M	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	8-item Council of Nutrition Appetite Questionnaire	No association between olfactory function and appetite.
(Kim et al., 2003)	● Korean elderly females (N=41) ● Young female adults (N=41)	● 73.0 ± 1.1 ● 24.4 ± 0.2	Detection; threshold	Self-reported changes in dietary habits	51% of the older adults reported a decreased appetite.
(Lechien et al., 2020)	Mild-to-moderate Covid-19 patients (N=417)	● 36.9 ± 11.4 (19–77); 263F/154M	Identification	The short version of the Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders-Negative Statements	Patients with anosmia had significantly more loss of appetite than patients with hyposmia or patients with no OD.
(Mattes & Cowart, 1994)	Individuals with a chemosensory disorder (N=389) ● No-Diagnosis (N=48); ● HYP (N=64); ● ANS (N=106); ● DYS (N=30); ● PH (N=31); ● Multi-OD (N=31); CG (N=79)	● 50.5±15.7; 168F/142M ● 28F/20M ● 32F/32M ● 55F/51M ● 20F/10M ● 21F/10M ● 12F/19M ● 48.8 ± 18.8 (20-83); 37F/42M	Identification; detection Self-report	Questionnaire on dietary habits	22% up to 48% of the individuals reported a decrease in appetite after the onset of OD.
(Mattes et al., 1990)	● Individuals with a distorted sense of smell (N=60) ● Individuals with smell loss (N=58) ● CG (N=40)	● 54.3 ± 16.4; 31F/29M ● 50.0 ± 15.2; 28F/30M ● 51.7 ± 17.8; 30F/10M	Identification; threshold Self-report	Dietary behavior questionnaire	37% of the individuals with a distorted sense of smell reported a decrease in appetite, compared to 22% of individuals with just smell loss.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Nordin et al., 2011)	individuals with smell loss and with nasal polyposis and asthma (N=50) ● HYP (N=16) ● ANS (N= 34)	● 50.5 ± 13.1; 21F/29M	Threshold	Questions about consequences of smell loss, QoL, psychological well-being and distress, and coping strategies	27% of patients reported worsened appetite.
(Omlin et al., 2013)	● Advanced cancer patients (N=52) ● CG (N=52)	● 63 (25-86); 21F/31M ● 64 (26-81); 21F/31M	Self-report	NIS checklist (nutrition impact symptoms)	27% of the patients reported taste and smell alterations reducing their appetite.
Cooking habits					
(Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022)	Normosmic controls (N=166) Patients with OD (N=522) ● ANS (N=271) ● PAR (N=251)	● 47 (37–58); 11F/55M ● 47 (34–58); 41F/105M	Self-report	Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale	Total CAFPAS score was significantly different between normosmic participants and participants with olfactory dysfunction. However, age and etiology of OD had no effect. Significant differences in cooking habits were found between individuals with smell loss and distorted sense of smell.
(Manesse et al., 2017)	● Individuals with OD (N=39) ● CG (N=40)	● 55.72 ± 2.08*; 22F/18M ● 56.82 ± 1.84*; 22F/18M	Identification; Self-report	Food questionnaire	No differences in cooking habits between groups.
(Nordin et al., 2011)	Individuals with smell loss, nasal polyposis and asthma (N=50) ● HYP (N=16) ● ANS (N= 34)	● (50.5 ± 13.1); 21F/29M	Threshold	Questionnaire on consequences of smell loss	Difficulty in cooking was the most common interference.
(Rowan et al., 2019)	● Patients with chronic rhinosinusitis (N=70)	● (52.2±17.1); 32F/38M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Factor 2 of Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders Negative Statements	Patients with a lower threshold score had a higher chance of impaired eating-related QoL.

F (Female); M (Male); ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder), ANS (Anosmia); CG (Control Group); CAFPAS (Cooking and Food Provisioning Action Scale); CHARGE (coloboma, heart defects, atresia choanae);

DYS (Dysosmia); GD (Gustatory dysfunction);HYP (Hyposmia); Multi-OD (Multiple diagnoses for olfactory dysfunction); NOR (Normosmia); OD (Olfactory dysfunction); PAR (Parosmia); PH (Phantosmia); QoL (Quality of Life); SD (Standard Deviation); SEM (Standard Error of Mean),

* Reported with SEM instead of SD

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 5. Included articles for the consummatory phase of eating behavior per category: nutritional intake, adherence to dietary guidelines, consumption frequency, experienced liking, food enjoyment, and eating habits

Consummatory phase of eating behavior					
Authors	Participants		Measurement methods		Result
	Sample	Age: mean ± SD (age range); Gender: F/M	Olfactory dysfunction	Eating behavior	
Nutritional intake					
(Aschenbrenner et al., 2008)	Individuals with OD (N=176) ● NOR (N=12); ● HYP (N=75); ● ANS (N=89)	● 57.4 ± 14.1; 114F/86M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Specifically designed questionnaire providing a dietary alterations score	29% of all individuals with OD reported that they eat less since the onset of olfactory dysfunction.
(Belqaid et al., 2014)	Patients under investigation for suspected LC (N=215) ● LC=117 ● CG=98	● 68 ± 9; 63 F /54 M ● 66 ± 10; 43F/ 55M	Self-report	Patient-Generated Subjective Global Assessment	Olfactory dysfunction decreases food intake in cancer patients.
(Brisbois et al., 2011)	● Adult advanced cancer patients (N=192)	● 64.3 ± 12.4; 95F/97M	Self-report	Three-day dietary record	Chemosensory alterations were associated with decreased caloric and protein intakes.
(Duffy et al., 1995)	● Elderly women with high personal functioning (N=80)	● 76±6 (65-93 years);	Identification; detection	Food frequency questionnaire, 24-h food records (N=5)	The lower olfactory perception was associated with a higher intake of sweets and a lower intake of low-fat milk products.
(Essed et al., 2009)	Older adults with: ● Normal olfactory + normal gustatory function (N=25), ● Normal olfactory + low gustatory function (N=23), ● Low olfactory + normal gustatory function (N=34) ● Low olfactory + low gustatory function (N=38)	● 73 ± 6; 19F/6M ● 70 ± 7; 19F/4M ● 73 ± 6; 23F/11M ● 72 ± 5; 21F/17M	Identification; detection	Soup intake	No significant difference in intake between the plain soup and the flavor-enhanced soup in any of the groups.
(Ferris et al., 1985)	● Lifelong ANS (N=9) ● Mid-ANS (N=22) ● Onset ANS (N=22) ● CG= (N=33)	● 41.7 ±17.2;3F/6M ● 51.6 ± 13.41;3F/9M ● 50.2 ±17.5;11F/11M ● 49.9 ±16.2;17F/16M	Identification; threshold	Nutrition interview; 24-hour recall, the two-day record of food intake	No differences were found in the nutrient intake between people with OD and the control group.
(Ferris & Duffy, 1989)	Individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=227) ● Young (N=104) ● Older adults (N=123)	● (25-45); 50F/54M ● (>= 60) 61F/62M	Identification; detection	Nutritional evaluation based on diet history, food-intake analysis, and weight record	62% reported no change in food intake.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Fluitman et al., 2021)	Community-dwelling Dutch older adults (N=359) ● HYP (N = 66); ● NOR (N = 292)	● (69–77);150F/209M ● 75(71–81); 22F/40M; ● 72(69–7);123F/169M	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	Food frequency questionnaire	People with hyposmia and those with a normal sense of smell had similar total energy intake. Individuals with hyposmia consumed significantly less protein and alcohol and more carbohydrates
(Henkin, 2014)	● Individuals with HYP (N=56) ● CG (N=27)	● (46 ± 2); 33F/23M ● 28 ± 2 (19-56); 22F/5M	threshold; rating	Questions on salt usage	In individuals with hyposmia, most of them estimated their salt usage increased on average 2.8 times compared to before their hyposmia onset.
(Hutton et al., 2007)	● Advanced cancer patients (N=66)	● 65.4±12.4; 36F/30M	Self-report	Three-day dietary records;	Smell complaint scores were inversely related to energy intake and affected the macronutrient composition of the diet (lesser proportion of fat).
(Kim et al., 2003)	● Korean elderly females (N=41) ● Young female adults (N=41)	● 73.0 ± 1.1 ● 24.4±0.2	detection; threshold	Food interview; 24 hr-recall	Higher smell threshold results in lowering consumption of meats, eggs, and cereals and lowering calories, protein, fat, carbohydrate, and minerals.
(Kong et al., 2016)	South Korean adults ● OD (N=1,332) ● CG (N=23,158)	● 14,663F/9,827M ● mean age=54.7 ● mean age=45.9	Self-report	24-hour recall	Olfactory dysfunction was associated with reduced fat intake for the whole group and showed differential effects depending on age and gender.
(Manesse et al., 2017)	● Individuals with Dysosmic (N=39) ● CG (N=40)	● 55.72 ± 2.08*; 22F/18M ● 56.82 ± 1.84*; 22F/18M	Identification; Self-report	Food questionnaire	Individual with OD Increased use of condiments (sugar, mayonnaise, sour cream) for flavor enhancement
(Manesse et al., 2021)	● French individuals (N=3685) ● Older adults (N=202) (subgroup)	● (4 -89); 2085F/600M ● (60-89); 117F/85M	Identification; Self-report	Food questionnaire	Olfactory dysfunction led to greater consumption of dairy products and meat and lower consumption of vegetables in older adults but did not affect food intake in younger participants.
(Mattes et al., 1990)	● Individuals with a distorted sense of smell (N=60) ● Individuals with smell loss (N=58) ● CG (N=40)	● 54.3 ± 16.4;31F/29M ● 50.0 ± 15.2; 28F/30M ● 51.7 ± 17.8; 30F/10M	Identification; detection; Self-report	Food frequency questionnaire; 24-h recall; 2-d food record	Both individuals with a distorted sense of smell and those with just smell loss reported changes in intake (i.e., decreased or increased); Those who reported changes indeed consumed less nutrients.
(Mattes & Cowart, 1994)	Patients with a chemosensory disorder (N=389) ● No-Diagnosis (N=48); ● HYP (N=64); ● ANS (N=106); ● DYS (N=30); ● PH (N=31); ● Multi-OD (N=31); ● CG (N=79)	● 50.5±15.7; 168F/142M ● 28F/20M ● 32F/32M ● 55F/51M ● 20F/10M ● 21F/10M ● 12F/19M ● 48.8 ± 18.8 (20-83); 37F/42M	Identification; detection; Self-report	3-day food record;	There were significant differences in intake of carbohydrates, dietary fiber, and total sugars between patient groups and healthy controls. Increased use of sugar and salt was reported by 39-57% of the patients.
(Merkonidis et al., 2015)	Individuals with chemosensory disorders (N=269)	● M (52.3 ± 12.3) ● F (50.6 ±12.3), ● 149 F/116M ● Gender N/A (N=4)	Self-report	The questionnaire comprises six sections: eating with a smell and taste disorder	More patients reported eating less (18.6%) than eating more (7.3%).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Omlin et al., 2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advanced cancer patients (N=52) CG (N=52) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 63 (25-86); 21F/31M 64 (26-81); 21F/31M 	Self-report	NIS checklist (nutrition impact symptoms)	27% of the patients reported taste and smell alterations reducing their oral intake.
(Rasmussen et al., 2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients with diabetes (N=428) CG (N=2776) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 62.2 (11.2); 193F/235M 58.1 (12.2); 231F/197M 	Identification	Dietary Interview	Patients with OD had a lower daily caloric intake and a lower intake of carbohydrates and sodium. Controls with OD also had a lower daily caloric and fat intake compared to controls without OD.
(Rowan et al., 2019)	Patients with chronic rhinosinusitis (N=70)	52.2 ± 17.1; 32F/38M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders Negative Statements	Patients with a lower threshold score had a higher chance of impaired eating-related QoL.
(Schubert et al., 2012)	Participants in the Beaver Dam Offspring Study (N=2838)	49(21-84); 1545F/1293 M	Identification	Dietary choices were assessed by 4 questions.	Overall, olfactory impairment was not linked to the quantity of fruit or vegetable servings or how often salt or sugar was added to food.
(Stevenson et al., 2020)	Individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=222) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congenital (N=10) Idiopathic (N=66) Post-infection (N=63) Sino-nasal disease (N=34) Trauma (N=33) Miscellaneous (N= 17) 	55.6 ± 16.5; 127F/95M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	The 26-item German version of the DFS (dietary fat and sugar scale) to assess intake of discretionary processed foods—a Western-style diet (rich in sugar, salt, and saturated fat)	The etiology-based approach revealed both positive and negative associations between olfactory performance and consumption of a WSD.
Adherence to dietary guidelines					
(Ferris & Duffy, 1989)	Individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=227) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young (N=104); Elderly (N=123) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (25-45) ;50F/54M (>=60); 61F/62M 	Detection; Identification	Nutritional evaluation based on diet history, food-intake analysis, and weight record	Individuals with OD demonstrated a low intake of vitamin B6 and zinc intake was affected by age, gender, severity, and duration of the dysfunction.
(Fluitman et al., 2021)	Community-dwelling Dutch older adults (N=359) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HYP (N = 66); NOR (N = 292) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 69-77 years; 150F/209M 75(71-81); 22F/40M 72 (69-77); 123F/169M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	Food frequency questionnaire	Hyposmics had worse scores for the AHEI and tended to have worse adherence to the MDS.
(Gopinath et al., 2016)	Blue Mountains Eye Study participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Older adults with OD (N=89) Older adults without OD (CG) (N = 468) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70.7 ± 6.5; 305F/252M 74.0 (6.7); 34F/55M 70.0 (6.3); 371/197M 	Identification	Validated semiquantitative, food frequency questionnaire used to calculate adherence to dietary guidelines and total dietary score	Older adults showed a poorer adherence to dietary guidelines when they experienced olfactory dysfunction.
(Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals with olfactory loss (N=105) CG (N=738) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 58 ± 12 (22-82); 77F/28M 55 ± 15 (19-84); 457F/281M 	Self-report	Adherence to Dutch Dietary Guidelines	Individuals with OD had lower adherence to the dietary guidelines for fiber, trans fatty acids, and alcohol.
(Rawal et al., 2021)	Older adults from the NHANES survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OD (N=1399) CG (N=4957) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 58.6 ± 0.4 (SEM) 57.7 ± 0.2 (SEM)* 	Self-report	24h dietary recall, used to calculate the Healthy Eating Index score	Individuals with OD have a lower diet quality and consume more foods with higher energy density, and have lower consumption of vegetables.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Consumption frequency					
(Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022)	individuals with OD (N=522) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Olfactory loss (N=271) ● Parosmia (N=251) ● Normosmic controls (N=166) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 47 (34–58); 417F/105M ● 47 (37–58); 111F/55M 	Self-report	Questionnaire on frequency of intake of basic tastants and food items	The difference in frequency of intake was not significant between individuals with OD and the normosmic controls.
(Han et al., 2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individuals with OD (N=60) ● CG (N=60) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 59.8 ± 12.4; 43F/17M ● 58.4 ± 14.6; 38F/22M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Self-designed questionnaire for Dietary evaluation	Olfactory dysfunction was not associated with changes in the number of meals per day compared to healthy controls. Individuals with OD consumed alcohol less frequently than healthy controls.
(Kremer et al., 2014)	Dutch older adults with and without olfactory impairment (N=321) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NOR (N=213) ● HYP (N=108) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 66.2(5.5);124F/89M ● 68.3(6.7);47F/61M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	An extensive questionnaire containing various questions on eating behavior	No difference in eating frequency was observed between olfactory-impaired and unimpaired people.
(Mattes et al., 1990)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individuals with a distorted sense of smell (N=60) ● Individuals with smell loss (N=58) ● CG (N=40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 54.3 ± 16.4; 31F/29M ● 50.0 ± 15.2; 28F/30M ● 51.7 ± 17.8; 30F/10M 	Identification; threshold; Self-report	Food frequency questionnaire, 24-h recall, and 2-d food record	Intake frequency was lower in individuals with a distorted sense of smell compared to those with just smell loss or healthy controls.
(Mattes & Cowart, 1994)	Individuals with OD (N=389) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No-Diagnosis (N=48); ● HYP (N=64); ● ANS (N=106); ● DYS (N=30); ● PH (N=31); ● Multi-OD (N=31); ● CG (N=79) 	50.5±15.7; 168F/142M <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 28F/20M ● 32F/32M ● 55F/51M ● 20F/10M ● 21F/10M ● 12F/19M ● 48.8 ± 18.8; 37F/42M 	Identification Self-report	Questionnaire on dietary habits	46% up to 77% of the Individuals with OD reported alterations in their eating patterns, mostly changes in eating frequency.
Experienced Liking					
(Essed et al., 2009)	Older adults with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Normal olfactory + normal gustatory function (N=25) ● Normal olfactory + low gustatory function (N=23) ● Low olfactory + normal gustatory function (N=34) ● Low olfactory + low gustatory function (N=38) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 73 ± 6; 19F/6M ● 70 ± 7; 19F/4M ● 73 ± 6; 23F/11M ● 72 ± 5; 21F/17M 	Identification; detection	Rating liking of soup on a 10-point scale	No effect of flavor enhancement on liking of soup in any of the groups.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Kremer et al., 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Older adults (N=52) Young CG (N=55) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 71.3 (61–86); 36F/16M 22.7 (18–35); 31F/24M 	Identification; detection	Liking of custard desserts and tomato drinks after applying flavor enhancement, textural change, and/or irritant addition	Multi-sensory enhancement did not affect increasing food liking in older adults with OD.
(Kremer et al., 2014)	<p>Dutch young and older people with and without olfactory impairment (N=122)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young consumers (N=38) HYP old (N=43) NOR old (N=41) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (32.3 ± 8.9); 22F/16M (68.5 ± 5.9); 18F/25M (65.1 ± 5.2); 28F/13M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Food liking was assessed on a 100 mm horizontal visual analog scale	Older adults with and without OD increased food liking in multi-sensory enrichment in warm meal components.
(Novakova et al., 2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals with congenital anosmia (N=15) CG (N=15) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.0 ± 9.9 (20-42); 3F/2M 27.8 ± 5.2 (21-39); 2F/3M 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Rating the pleasantness of a stimulus (banana) during consumption on a 21-point scale	In individuals with congenital anosmia, the decline in pleasantness during consumption was lower than in healthy controls.
(Seo & Hummel, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young adults with normal olfactory function (N=30) Older adults with normal olfactory (N=30) Older adults with OD (N=30) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22.6 ± 2.9 (18-30), 30F 66.4 ± 3.7 (60-75), 30F 67.8 ± 4.4 (62-79), 30F 	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Rating of the pleasantness of green tea and brewed coffee (both in 3 concentrations)	Variations in the concentration of tea and coffee did not affect the pleasantness of these drinks in older adults with OD.
Food enjoyment					
(Arganini & Sinesio, 2015)	Independently living Italian older adults (N=99)	(65 -101); 66F/33M	Identification; discrimination; threshold Self-report	Questionnaire on diminished eating pleasure and appetite	Chemosensory impairment does not diminish eating pleasure in independently living older adults.
(Coelho et al., 2021)	Patients with a COVID-19 infection reported change in sense of smell (N=332)	41.57 ±13.72; 258F/63 M	Self-report	Questions regarding the quality of life (QOL) and safety concerns	Reduced enjoyment of food was the most common complaint (87%).
(Ferris et al., 1985)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lifelong ANS (N=9); Midterm-ANS (N=22); Onset ANS (N=22); CG (N=33) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 41.7 ±17.2;3F/6M 51.6± 13.41;3/9 50.2 ±17.5;11/11 49.9 ±16.2;17/16 	Identification; threshold	Score enjoyment between 1-5	The recent-onset and mid-term anosmics had experienced significantly lower food enjoyment compared to healthy controls, whereas individuals with life-long olfactory dysfunction did not.
(Ferris & Duffy, 1989)	<p>Individuals with olfactory dysfunction (N=227)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young (N=104); Older adults (N=123) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (25-45);50F/54M (>=60);61F/62M 	Identification; detection	Nutritional evaluation based on diet history, food-intake analysis	In the total sample, food enjoyment was very great (27%) or somewhat (42%) decreased regardless of gender or severity of smell disorder. Among older adults, food enjoyment was only diminished if the duration of OD was < 3 years.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Hutton et al., 2007)	Advanced cancer patients (N=66)	● 65.4±12.4; 36F/30M	Self-report	Three-day dietary records	Food enjoyment was lower among individuals with severe chemosensory complaints vs. patients with mild or moderate OD.
(Liu et al., 2021)	Individuals with smell loss (N=133) ● HYP (N=61) ● ANS (N=72)	● 55.9 +- 16.3; 81F/52M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	19-item Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders	Self-perceived senses of taste and flavor are more dominantly associated with food enjoyment, in contrast to the patient-perceived sense of smell.
(Manesse et al., 2017)	● Individuals with DYS (N=39) ● CG (N=40)	● 55.72 ± 2.08*; 22F/18M ● 56.82 ± 1.84*; 22F/18M	Identification; Self-report	Food questionnaire	Food enjoyment was lower in individuals with quantitative smell disorder
(Manesse et al., 2021)	French individuals from the general population (N=3685)	(4 -89); 2085 F/600 M	Identification Self-report	Food neophobia questionnaire	Better smell function was associated with greater food enjoyment.
(Mattes et al., 1990)	Individuals with a distorted sense of smell (N=60) ● Patients with smell loss (N=58) ● CG (N=40)	● 54.3 ± 16.4; 31F/29M ● 50.0 ± 15.2; 28F/30M ● 51.7 ± 17.8; 30F/10M	Identification; detection Self-report	Dietary behavior questionnaire	Decreased food enjoyment was higher in individuals with distorted smell than in those with smell loss.
(Mattes & Cowart, 1994)	Individuals with OD (N=389) ● No diagnosis (N=48); ● HYP (N=64); ● ANS (N=106); ● DYS (N=30); ● PH (N=31); ● Multi-OD (N=31) CG (N=79)	50.5 ± 15.7 (15-93);168F/142M ● 28F/20M ● 32F/32M ● 55F/51M ● 20F/10M ● 21F/10M ● 12F/19M 48.8 ± 18.8 (20-83); 37F/42M	Identification; detection Self-report	Questionnaire on dietary habits	Most individuals reported decreased food enjoyment; this was highest among people with multiple diagnoses and lowest in those with anosmia. Food enjoyment declined with the duration of OD.
(Merkonidis et al., 2015)	Individuals with chemosensory disorders (N=269)	● M (52.3 ± 12.3) ● F (50.6 ±12.3), ● 149 F/116M ● Gender N/A (N=4)	Self-report	The questionnaire comprises six sections: eating with a smell and taste disorder	The decreased pleasure from eating was the most common complaint. Duration of OD does not affect the declined pleasure.
(Nordin et al., 2011)	Individuals with smell loss and with nasal polyposis and asthma (N=50) ● HYP (N=16) ● ANS (N= 34)	● 50.5 ± 13.1; 21F/29M	Threshold	Questions about consequences of smell loss; Quality of life questionnaire	68% of participants had a diminished food enjoyment.
(Philpott & Boak, 2014)	Members of the patient support organization Fifth Sense (N=496)	● 55 (8–95); 318F/178M	Self-report	The survey included questions on the quality of life, depression, and anxiety, impact, and allowed free text entries	People with qualitative disorders have less enjoyment of food in terms of flavor perception, eat unhealthily, and eat less.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020)	Individuals with olfactory loss (N=105)	● 58±13 (14–87); 73F/32M	Self-report	Questions on food enjoyment	People with OD enjoy eating food less than they did before the onset of their smell loss.
(Rowan et al., 2019)	Patients with chronic rhinosinusitis (N=70)	● (52.2 ±17.1); 32F/38M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Factor 2 of Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders Negative Statements	Of the potential effects of their decreased olfaction on QoL, the enjoyment of food and eating was missed the most.
(Schubert et al., 2012)	Participants in the Beaver Dam Offspring Study (N=2838)	● (21–84, mean 49); 1545F/1293 M	Identification	Two questions on the impact of olfactory impairment on food enjoyment	Participants with olfactory impairment were less likely to report that food tasted as good as it used to, or that they experienced food flavors the same.
Eating habits					
(Aschenbrenner et al., 2008)	Individuals with OD (N=176) ● NOR (N=12); ● HYP (N=75); ● ANS (N=89)	● (57.4±14.1); 114F/86M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Specifically designed questionnaire providing a dietary alterations score.	Olfactory dysfunction negatively affects social food-related activities
(Philpott & Boak, 2014)	● Members of the patient support organization, Fifth Sense (N=496)	● 55 (8–95); 318F/178M	Self-report	Survey including questions on the quality of life; depression and anxiety; impact; free text entries	Patients reported avoidance of birthdays, family events, dinner parties, and eating out.
(Ferris & Duffy, 1989)	Individuals with OD(N=227) ● Young (N=104) ● Elderly (N=123)	● (25-45 years); 50F/54M ● (>=60 years); 61F/62M	Identification; detection	Nutritional evaluation based on diet history, food-intake analysis, and weight record	67% of the individuals reported changes in eating habits. The severity of smell loss has no effect.
(Han et al., 2018)	● Individuals with OD (N=60) ● CG (N=60)	● 59.8± 2.4; 43F/17M 58.4 ± 14.6; 38F/22M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Self-designed questionnaire	No effect of OD on eating habits.
(Lechien et al., 2020)	● Mild-to-moderate Covid-19 patients (N=417)	● (36.9±1.4); 263F/154M	Self-report	The short version of the Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders-Negative Statements	Patients with anosmia ate out significantly less than patients with hyposmia or patients with no OD.
(Rowan et al., 2019)	● Patients with chronic rhinosinusitis (N=70)	● (52.2±17.1); 32F/38M	Identification; discrimination; threshold	Factor 2 of Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders Negative Statements	Patients with a lower threshold score had a higher chance of impaired eating-related QoL.

F (Female); M (Male); ANS (Anosmia), CG (Control Group); DYS (Dysosmia); GD (Gustatory dysfunction);HYP (Hyposmia);LG (Lung Cancer); MDS (Mediterranean Diet Score); Multi-OD (Multiple diagnoses for olfactory dysfunction); NOR (Normosmia); OD (Olfactory dysfunction); PAR (Parosmia); PH (Phantosmia); QoL (Quality of Life), SD (Standard Deviation); SD (Standard Deviation); SEM (Standard Error of Mean); WSD (Western Style Diet).

* Reported with SEM instead of SD

References

- 1
2
3 Arganini, C., & Sinesio, F. (2015). Chemosensory impairment does not diminish eating pleasure and
4 appetite in independently living older adults. *Maturitas*, *82*(2), 241–244.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2015.07.015>
6
- 7 Aschenbrenner, K., Hummel, C., Teszmer, K., Krone, F., Ishimaru, T., Seo, H.-S., & Hummel, T. (2008).
8 The influence of olfactory loss on dietary behaviors. *The Laryngoscope*, *118*(1), 135–144.
9 <https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med7&NEWS=N&AN=17975508>
10
- 11 Bédard, A., Lamarche, P. O., Grégoire, L. M., Trudel-Guy, C., Provencher, V., Desroches, S., & Lemieux,
12 S. (2021). Can eating pleasure be a lever for healthy eating? A systematic scoping review of eating
13 pleasure and its links with dietary behaviors and health. *PLoS ONE*, *15*(12 December).
14 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244292>
15
- 16 Belqaid, K., Orrevall, Y., McGreevy, J., Månsson-Brahme, E., Wismer, W., Tishelman, C., & Bernhardson,
17 B. M. (2014). Self-reported taste and smell alterations in patients under investigation for lung
18 cancer. *Acta Oncologica*, *53*(10), 1405–1412. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0284186X.2014.895035>
19
- 20 Bernhardson, B. M., Olson, K., Baracos, V. E., & Wismer, W. V. (2012). Reframing eating during
21 chemotherapy in cancer patients with chemosensory alterations. *European Journal of Oncology*
22 *Nursing*, *16*(5), 483–490. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2011.11.004>
23
- 24 Bilman, E., van Kleef, E., & van Trijp, H. (2017). External cues challenging the internal appetite control
25 system—Overview and practical implications. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*,
26 *57*(13). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2015.1073140>
27
- 28 Blomkvist, A., & Hofer, M. (2021). Olfactory Impairment and Close Social Relationships. A Narrative
29 Review. *Chemical Senses*, *46*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjab037>
30
- 31 Blundell, J., De Graaf, C., Hulshof, T., Jebb, S., Livingstone, B., Lluch, A., Mela, D., Salah, S., Schuring,
32 E., Van Der Knaap, H., & Westerterp, M. (2010). Appetite control: Methodological aspects of the
33 evaluation of foods. In *Obesity Reviews* (Vol. 11, Issue 3). [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2010.00714.x)
34 [789X.2010.00714.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2010.00714.x)
35
- 36 Boesveldt, S., Postma, E. M., Boak, D., Welge-Luessen, A., Schopf, V., Mainland, J. D., Martens, J., Ngai,
37 J., & Duffy, V. B. (2017). Anosmia—A Clinical Review. *Chemical Senses*, *42*(7), 513–523.
38 <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjx025>
39
- 40 Bojanowski, V., Hummel, T., & Croy, I. (2013). [Isolated congenital anosmia—clinical and daily life
41 aspects of a life without a sense of smell]. In *Laryngo- rhino- otologie* (Vol. 92, Issue 1).
42
- 43 Boltong, A., & Keast, R. (2012). The influence of chemotherapy on taste perception and food hedonics: A
44 systematic review. In *Cancer Treatment Reviews* (Vol. 38, Issue 2).
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctrv.2011.04.008>
46
- 47 Boscolo-Rizzo, P., Borsetto, D., Fabbris, C., Spinato, G., Frezza, D., Menegaldo, A., Mularoni, F.,
48 Gaudio, P., Cazzador, D., Marciani, S., Frascioni, S., Ferraro, M., Berro, C., Varago, C., Nicolai, P.,
49 Tirelli, G., Da Mosto, M. C., Obholzer, R., Rigoli, R., ... Hopkins, C. (2020). Evolution of Altered
50 Sense of Smell or Taste in Patients with Mildly Symptomatic COVID-19. *JAMA Otolaryngology -*
51 *Head and Neck Surgery*, *146*(8). <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2020.1379>
52
- 53 Boscolo-Rizzo, P., Polesel, J., & Vaira, L. A. (2022). Smell and taste dysfunction after covid-19. In *The*
54 *BMJ*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.o1653>
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Bossola, M., Luciani, G., Rosa, F., & Tazza, L. (2011). Appetite and Gastrointestinal Symptoms in Chronic
2 Hemodialysis Patients. *Journal of Renal Nutrition*, 21(6). <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jrn.2010.09.003>
- 3 Brisbois, T. D., De Kock, I. H., Watanabe, S. M., Baracos, V. E., & Wismer, W. V. (2011).
4 Characterization of chemosensory alterations in advanced cancer reveals specific chemosensory
5 phenotypes impacting dietary intake and quality of life. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*,
6 41(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2010.06.022>
- 7
8 Chalouhi, C., Faulcon, P., Le Bihan, C., Hertz-Pannier, L., Bonfils, P., & Abadie, V. (2005). Olfactory
9 evaluation in children: Application to the CHARGE syndrome. *Pediatrics*, 116(1), e81–e88.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2004-1970>
- 11
12 Coelho, D. H., Reiter, E. R., Budd, S. G., Shin, Y., Kons, Z. A., & Costanzo, R. M. (2021). Quality of life
13 and safety impact of COVID-19 associated smell and taste disturbances. *American Journal of*
14 *Otolaryngology*, 42(4), 103001. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjoto.2021.103001>
- 15
16 Croy, I., Nordin, S., & Hummel, T. (2014). Olfactory disorders and quality of life—An updated review.
17 *Chemical Senses*, 39(3), 185–194. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjt072>
- 18
19 de Bruijn, S. E. M., de Vries, Y. C., de Graaf, C., Boesveldt, S., & Jager, G. (2017). The reliability and
20 validity of the Macronutrient and Taste Preference Ranking Task: A new method to measure food
21 preferences. *Food Quality and Preference*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2016.11.003>
- 22
23 De Graaf, C., Blom, W. A. M., Smeets, P. A. M., Stafleu, A., & Hendriks, H. F. J. (2004). Biomarkers of
24 satiation and satiety. In *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* (Vol. 79, Issue 6).
25 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/79.6.946>
- 26
27 de Vries, Y. C., Boesveldt, S., Kampman, E., de Graaf, C., Winkels, R. M., & van Laarhoven, H. W. M.
28 (2019). Low reported taste function is associated with low preference for high protein products in
29 advanced oesophagogastric cancer patients undergoing palliative chemotherapy. *Clinical Nutrition*,
30 38(1), 472–475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2017.12.001>
- 31
32 de Vries, Y. C., Winkels, R. M., van den Berg, M. M. G. A., de Graaf, C., Kelfkens, C. S., de Kruif, J. T. C.
33 M., Göker, E., Grosfeld, S., Sommeijer, D. W., van Laarhoven, H. W. M., Kampman, E., &
34 Boesveldt, S. (2018). Altered food preferences and chemosensory perception during chemotherapy
35 in breast cancer patients: A longitudinal comparison with healthy controls. *Food Quality and*
36 *Preference*, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2017.09.003>
- 37
38 Demattè, M. L., Endrizzi, I., Biasioli, F., Corollaro, M. L., Pojer, N., Zampini, M., Aprea, E., & Gasperi, F.
39 (2013). Food neophobia and its relation with olfactory ability in common odour identification.
40 *Appetite*, 68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2013.04.021>
- 41
42 Desai, M., & Oppenheimer, J. (2021). The Importance of Considering Olfactory Dysfunction During the
43 COVID-19 Pandemic and in Clinical Practice. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology. In*
44 *Practice*, 9(1), 7–12. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2020.10.036>
- 45
46 DOTY, R. L. (1977). Food Preference Ratings of Congenitally Anosmic Humans. In *The Chemical Senses*
47 *and Nutrition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-397850-9.50022-1>
- 48
49 Doty, R. L., Shaman, P., Kimmelman, C. P., & Dann, M. S. (1984). University of pennsylvania smell
50 identification test: A rapid quantitative olfactory function test for the clinic. *Laryngoscope*, 94(2).
51 <https://doi.org/10.1288/00005537-198402000-00004>
- 52
53 Dovey, T. M., C. I. M. V. K. A. E. H. and C. M. (2011). Measures, measures everywhere, but which one
54 should I use? *The Feeding News*, 1–13.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Drareni, K., Bensafi, M., Giboreau, & A., & Dougkas, & A. (n.d.). *Chemotherapy-induced taste and smell*
2 *changes influence food perception in cancer patients*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-020-05717-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-020-05717-1)
3 [1/Published](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-020-05717-1)
- 4 Drareni, K., Bensafi, M., Giboreau, A., & Dougkas, A. (2021). Chemotherapy-induced taste and smell
5 changes influence food perception in cancer patients. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, 29(4).
6 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-020-05717-1>
7
- 8 Duffy, V. B., Backstrand, J. R., & Ferris, A. M. (1995). Olfactory dysfunction and related nutritional risk in
9 free-living, elderly women. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 95(8), 876–879.
10 <https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med3&NEWS=N&AN=7636078>
11
- 12 Essed, N. H., Kleikers, S., Van Staveren, W. A., Kok, F. J., & De Graaf, C. (2009). No effect on intake and
13 liking of soup enhanced with mono-sodium glutamate and celery powder among elderly people with
14 olfactory and/or gustatory loss. *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition*, 60(SUPPL. 5),
15 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637480802710216>
16
17
- 18 Féart, C., Samieri, C., Allès, B., & Barberger-Gateau, P. (2013). Potential benefits of adherence to the
19 Mediterranean diet on cognitive health. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 72(1).
20 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665112002959>
21
- 22 Ferris, A. M., & Duffy, V. B. (1989). Effect of olfactory deficits on nutritional status: Does age predict
23 persons at risk? In C. Murphy, W. S. Cain, & D. M. Hegsted (Eds.), *Nutrition and the chemical*
24 *senses in aging: Recent advances and current research needs*. (Vol. 561, pp. 113–123). New York
25 Academy of Sciences. [https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=1989-](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=1989-98090-010&site=ehost-live)
26 [98090-010&site=ehost-live](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=1989-98090-010&site=ehost-live)
27
28
- 29 Ferris, A. M., Schlitzer, J. L., Schierberl, M. J., Catalanotto, F. A., Gent, J., Peterson, M. G., Bartoshuk, L.
30 M., Cain, W. S., Goodspeed, R. B., Leonard, G., & Donaldson, J. O. (1985). Anosmia and nutritional
31 status. *Nutrition Research*, 5(2), 149–156. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5317\(85\)80030-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5317(85)80030-0)
32
- 33 Finlayson, G., Dalton, M., & Blundell, J. E. (2012). Liking versus wanting food in human appetite:
34 Relation to craving, overconsumption, and “food addiction.” In *Food and addiction: A*
35 *comprehensive handbook*.
36
37
- 38 Fjaeldstad, A. W., & Smith, B. (2022). The Effects of Olfactory Loss and Parosmia on Food and Cooking
39 Habits, Sensory Awareness, and Quality of Life—A Possible Avenue for Regaining Enjoyment of
40 Food. *Foods*, 11(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods11121686>
41
- 42 Fluitman, K. S., Hesp, A. C., Kaihatu, R. F., Nieuwdorp, M., Keijser, B. J. F., Ijzerman, R. G., & Visser, M.
43 (2021). Poor Taste and Smell Are Associated with Poor Appetite, Macronutrient Intake, and Dietary
44 Quality but Not with Undernutrition in Older Adults. *Journal of Nutrition*, 151(3), 605–614.
45 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxaa400>
46
- 47 Fluitman, K. S., Nadar, H. J., Roos, D. S., Berendse, H. W., Keijser, B. J. F., Nieuwdorp, M., Ijzerman, R.
48 G., & Visser, M. (2019). The Association of Olfactory Function with BMI, Appetite, and Prospective
49 Weight Change in Dutch Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *Journal of Nutrition, Health and Aging*,
50 23(8), 746–752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-019-1241-7>
51
52
- 53 Frasnelli, J., Schuster, B., & Hummel, T. (2010). Olfactory dysfunction affects thresholds to trigeminal
54 chemosensory sensations. *Neuroscience Letters*, 468(3).
55 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2009.11.008>
56
- 57 Gopinath, B., Russell, J., Sue, C. M., Flood, V. M., Burlutsky, G., & Mitchell, P. (2016). Olfactory
58 impairment in older adults is associated with poorer diet quality over 5 years. *European Journal of*
59 *Nutrition*, 55(3), 1081–1087. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00394-015-0921-2>
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Guyot, E., Dougkas, A., Robert, M., Nazare, J. A., Iceta, S., & Disse, E. (2021). Food Preferences and
2 Their Perceived Changes Before and After Bariatric Surgery: a Cross-sectional Study. *Obesity*
3 *Surgery*, 31(7), 3075–3082. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-021-05342-9>
- 4 Han, P., Georgi, M., Cuevas, M., Haehner, A., Gudziol, V., & Hummel, T. (2018). Decreased
5 electrogustometric taste sensitivity in patients with acquired olfactory dysfunction. *Rhinology*,
6 56(2). <https://doi.org/10.4193/Rhin17.186>
- 7
8 Han, P., Seo, H. S., Klockow, M., Yan, X., Hähner, A., & Hummel, T. (2021). Oral irritation in patients
9 with chemosensory dysfunction. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, 36(4), 490–496.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ffj.3660>
- 11
12 Hannum, M. E., Ramirez, V. A., Lipson, S. J., Herriman, R. D., Toskala, A. K., Lin, C., Joseph, P. V., &
13 Reed, D. R. (2020). Objective sensory testing methods reveal a higher prevalence of olfactory loss
14 in COVID-19-positive patients compared to subjective methods: A systematic review and meta-
15 analysis. *Chemical Senses*, 45(9). <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjaa064>
- 16
17
18 Henkin, R. I. (2014). Effects of smell loss (hyposmia) on salt usage. *Nutrition*, 30(6), 690–695.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2013.11.003>
- 20
21 Hill, A. J., Weaver, C. F. L., & Blundell, J. E. (1991). Food craving, dietary restraint and mood. *Appetite*,
22 17(3), 187–197. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0195-6663\(91\)90021-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0195-6663(91)90021-J)
- 23
24 Hopkins, C., & Kelly, C. (2021). Prevalence and persistence of smell and taste dysfunction in COVID-19;
25 how should dental practices apply diagnostic criteria? *BDJ In Practice*, 34(2).
26 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41404-021-0652-4>
- 27
28 Hummel, T., Barz, S., Lötsch, J., Roscher, S., Kettenmann, B., & Kobal, G. (1996). Loss of olfactory
29 function leads to a decrease of trigeminal sensitivity. *Chemical Senses*, 21(1).
30 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/21.1.75>
- 31
32 Hummel, T., Landis, B. N., & Hüttenbrink, K.-B. (n.d.). *Smell and taste disorders*.
33 www.awmf.org/leitlinien/detail/ll/017-050.html
- 34
35 Hunter, S. R., Hannum, M. E., Pellegrino, R., O’Leary, M. A., Rawson, N. E., Reed, D. R., Dalton, P. H., &
36 Parma, V. (2023). Proof-of-concept: SCENTinel 1.1 rapidly discriminates COVID-19-related
37 olfactory disorders. *Chemical Senses*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjad002>
- 38
39
40 Hutton, J. L., Baracos, V. E., & Wismer, W. V. (2007). Chemosensory Dysfunction Is a Primary Factor in
41 the Evolution of Declining Nutritional Status and Quality of Life in Patients With Advanced Cancer.
42 *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 33(2), 156–165.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2006.07.017>
- 44
45
46 Jastran, M. M., Bisogni, C. A., Sobal, J., Blake, C., & Devine, C. M. (2009). Eating routines. Embedded,
47 value based, modifiable, and reflective. *Appetite*, 52(1).
48 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.09.003>
- 49
50 Khalid, M., Sc Mahnaz, M., Khan, N., Kausar, N., Yousaf, K., & Khalid, S. (2014). Actual Intake Verses
51 Recommended Intake Amongst Female Adolescent. In *European Scientific Journal* (Vol. 10, Issue
52 36).
- 53
54
55 Kim, W. Y., Hur, M., Cho, M. S., & Lee, H. S. (2003). Effect of olfactory function on nutritional status of
56 Korean elderly women. *Nutrition Research*, 23(6), 723–734. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5317\(03\)00031-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5317(03)00031-9)
- 57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Knaapila, A., Tuorila, H., Silventoinen, K., Keskitalo, K., Kallela, M., Wessman, M., Peltonen, L., Cherkas,
2 L. F., Spector, T. D., & Perola, M. (2007). Food neophobia shows heritable variation in humans.
3 *Physiology and Behavior*, 91(5). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2007.03.019>
- 4 Kong, I. G., Kim, S. Y., Kim, M.-S., Park, B., Kim, J.-H., & Choi, H. G. (2016). Olfactory Dysfunction Is
5 Associated with the Intake of Macronutrients in Korean Adults. *PloS One*, 11(10), e0164495.
6 <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0164495>
- 7
8 Kremer, S., Bult, J. H. F., Mojet, J., & Kroeze, J. H. A. (2007). Compensation for age-associated
9 chemosensory losses and its effect on the pleasantness of a custard dessert and a tomato drink.
10 *Appetite*, 48(1), 96–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2006.08.001>
- 11
12 Kremer, S., Holthuysen, N., & Boesveldt, S. (2014). The influence of olfactory impairment in vital,
13 independently living older persons on their eating behaviour and food liking. *Food Quality and*
14 *Preference*, 38, 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2014.05.012>
- 15
16 Landis, B. N., & Hummel, T. (2006). New evidence for high occurrence of olfactory dysfunctions within
17 the population [6]. In *American Journal of Medicine* (Vol. 119, Issue 1).
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.07.039>
- 19
20 Landis, B. N., Scheibe, M., Weber, C., Berger, R., Brämerson, A., Bende, M., Nordin, S., & Hummel, T.
21 (2010). Chemosensory interaction: Acquired olfactory impairment is associated with decreased
22 taste function. *Journal of Neurology*, 257(8). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-010-5513-8>
- 23
24 Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). An Application of Hierarchical Kappa-type Statistics in the
25 Assessment of Majority Agreement among Multiple Observers. *Biometrics*, 33(2).
26 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529786>
- 27
28
29 Langstaff, L., Pradhan, N., Clark, A., Boak, D., Salam, M., Hummel, T., & Philpott, C. M. (2019).
30 Validation of the olfactory disorders questionnaire for English-speaking patients with olfactory
31 disorders. *Clinical Otolaryngology*, 44(5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/coa.13351>
- 32
33
34 Lechien, J. R., Chiesa-Estomba, C. M., De Siati, D. R., Horoi, M., Le Bon, S. D., Rodriguez, A.,
35 Dequanter, D., Blecic, S., El Afia, F., Distinguin, L., Chekkoury-Idrissi, Y., Hans, S., Delgado, I. L.,
36 Calvo-Henriquez, C., Lavigne, P., Falanga, C., Barillari, M. R., Cammaroto, G., Khalife, M., ...
37 Saussez, S. (2020). Olfactory and gustatory dysfunctions as a clinical presentation of mild-to-
38 moderate forms of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19): a multicenter European study. *European*
39 *Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology : Official Journal of the European Federation of Oto-Rhino-*
40 *Laryngological Societies (EUFOS) : Affiliated with the German Society for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology -*
41 *Head and Neck Surgery*, 277(8), 2251–2261. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-020-05965-1>
- 42
43
44 Leopold, D. (2002). Distortion of olfactory perception: Diagnosis and treatment. *Chemical Senses*, 27(7).
45 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/27.7.611>
- 46
47
48 Li, B. J., & Bailenson, J. N. (2017). Exploring the influence of haptic and olfactory cues of a virtual donut
49 on satiation and eating behavior. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 26(3).
50 https://doi.org/10.1162/PRES_a_00300
- 51
52 Liu, D. T., Besser, G., Prem, B., Sharma, G., Speth, M. M., Sedaghat, A. R., & Mueller, C. A. (2021).
53 Self-perceived Taste and Flavor Perception: Associations With Quality of Life in Patients With
54 Olfactory Loss. *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (United States)*, 164(6), 1330–1336.
55 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599820965242>
- 56
57
58 Lucassen, D. A., Brouwer-Brolsma, E. M., Boshuizen, H. C., Mars, M., de Vogel-Van den Bosch, J., &
59 Feskens, E. J. (2023). Validation of the smartphone-based dietary assessment tool “Traqq” for
60 assessing actual dietary intake by repeated 2-h recalls in adults: comparison with 24-h recalls and
61
62
63
64
65

urinary biomarkers. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 117(6), 1278–1287.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcnut.2023.04.008>

Manesse, C., Ferdenzi, C., Mantel, M., Sabri, M., Bessy, M., Fournel, A., Faure, F., Bellil, D., Landis, B. M., Hugentobler, M., Giboreau, A., Rouby, C., & Bensafi, M. (2021). The prevalence of olfactory deficits and their effects on eating behavior from childhood to old age: A large-scale study in the French population. *Food Quality and Preference*, 93.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2021.104273>

Manesse, C., Ferdenzi, C., Sabri, M., Bessy, M., Rouby, C., Faure, F., Bellil, D., Jomain, S., Landis, B. N., Hugentobler, M., Cuevas, M., Hummel, T., & Bensafi, M. (2017). Dysosmia-Associated Changes in Eating Behavior. *Chemosensory Perception*, 10(4), 104–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12078-017-9237-3>

Mathey, M. F. A. M., De Jong, N., De Groot, C. P. G. M., De Graaf, C., & Van Staveren, W. A. (2001). Assessing appetite in dutch elderly with the appetite, hunger and sensory perception (AHSP) questionnaire. *Journal of Nutrition, Health and Aging*, 5(1).

Mathey, M. F. A. M., Siebelink, E., De Graaf, C., & Van Staveren, W. A. (2001). Flavor enhancement of food improves dietary intake and nutritional status of elderly nursing home residents. *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 56(4), M200–M205.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/56.4.M200>

Mattes, R. D., & Cowart, B. J. (1994). Dietary assessment of patients with chemosensory disorders. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 94(1), 50–56.
<https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med3&NEWS=N&AN=8270755>

Mattes, R. D., Cowart, B. J., Shiavo, M. A., Arnold, C., Garrison, B., Kare, M. R., & Lowry, L. D. (1990). Dietary evaluation of patients with smell and/or taste disorders. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 51(2), 233–240. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/51.2.233>

Merkonidis, C., Grosse, F., Ninh, T., Hummel, C., Haehner, A., & Hummel, T. (2015). Characteristics of chemosensory disorders--results from a survey. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology : Official Journal of the European Federation of Oto-Rhino-Laryngological Societies (EUFOS) : Affiliated with the German Society for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, 272(6), 1403–1416. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00405-014-3210-4>

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (n.d.). *Guidelines and Guidance Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement*.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>

Nordin, S., Hedén Blomqvist, E., Olsson, P., Stjärne, P., & Ehnhage, A. (2011). Effects of smell loss on daily life and adopted coping strategies in patients with nasal polyposis with asthma. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 131(8), 826–832. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00016489.2010.539625>

Novakova, L., Bojanowski, V., Havlíček, J., & Croy, I. (2012). Differential patterns of food appreciation during consumption of a simple food in congenitally anosmic individuals: An explorative study. *PLoS ONE*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0033921>

Oleszkiewicz, A., Schriever, V. A., Croy, I., Hähner, A., & Hummel, T. (2019). Updated Sniffin' Sticks normative data based on an extended sample of 9139 subjects. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*, 276(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-018-5248-1>

Omlin, A., Blum, D., Wierecky, J., Haile, S. R., Ottery, F. D., & Strasser, F. (2013). Nutrition impact symptoms in advanced cancer patients: Frequency and specific interventions, a case-control study.

1 *Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle*, 4(1), 55–61. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s13539-012-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13539-012-0099-x)
2 0099-x

3 Parker, J. K., Methven, L., Pellegrino, R., Smith, B. C., Gane, S., & Kelly, C. E. (2022). Emerging Pattern
4 of Post-COVID-19 Parosmia and Its Effect on Food Perception. *Foods*, 11(7).
5 <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods11070967>

6
7 Parma, V., & Boesveldt, S. (2022). Measurement of olfaction: Screening and assessment. In *Sensory*
8 *Science and Chronic Diseases: Clinical Implications and Disease Management* (pp. 45–63). Springer
9 International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86282-4_3

10
11 Pelchat, M. L. (2000). You can teach an old dog new tricks: Olfaction and responses to novel foods by
12 the elderly. *Appetite*, 35(2), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1006/appe.2000.0348>

13
14 Pellegrino, R., Hummel, T., Emrich, R., Chandra, R., Turner, J., Trone, T., Dorminy, C., & Luckett, C. R.
15 (2020). Cultural determinants of food attitudes in anosmic patients. *Appetite*, 147, 104563.
16 <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.104563>

17
18 Pellegrino, R., Mainland, J. D., Kelly, C. E., Parker, J. K., & Hummel, T. (2021). Prevalence and correlates
19 of parosmia and phantosmia among smell disorders. *Chemical Senses*, 46.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjab046>

21
22 Philpott, C. M., & Boak, D. (2014). The impact of olfactory disorders in the United Kingdom. *Chemical*
23 *Senses*, 39(8), 711–718. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bju043>

24
25 Postma, E. M., De Graaf, C., & Boesveldt, S. (2020). Food preferences and intake in a population of
26 Dutch individuals with self-reported smell loss: An online survey. *Food Quality and Preference*, 79.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2019.103771>

28
29 Postma, E. M., Kok, D. E., de Graaf, C., Kampman, E., & Boesveldt, S. (2020). Chemosensory perception
30 and food preferences in colorectal cancer patients undergoing adjuvant chemotherapy. *Clinical*
31 *Nutrition ESPEN*, 40, 242–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnesp.2020.09.012>

32
33 Ramaekers, M. G., Luning, P. A., Lakemond, C. M. M., Van Boekel, M. A. J. S., Gort, G., & Boesveldt, S.
34 (2016). Food preference and appetite after switching between sweet and savoury odours in women.
35 *PloS One*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0146652>

36
37 Rasmussen, V. F., Vestergaard, E. T., Hejlesen, O., Andersson, C. U. N., & Cichosz, S. L. (2018).
38 Prevalence of taste and smell impairment in adults with diabetes: A cross-sectional analysis of data
39 from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *Primary Care Diabetes*,
40 12(5), 453–459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcd.2018.05.006>

41
42 Rawal, S., Duffy, V. B., Berube, L., Hayes, J. E., Kant, A. K., Li, C. M., Graubard, B. I., & Hoffman, H. J.
43 (2021). Self-reported olfactory dysfunction and diet quality: Findings from the 2011–2014 national
44 health and nutrition examination survey (nhanes). *Nutrients*, 13(12).
45 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13124561>

46
47 Rowan, N. R., Soler, Z. M., Storck, K. A., Othieno, F., Ganjaei, K. G., Smith, T. L., & Schlosser, R. J.
48 (2019). Impaired eating-related quality of life in chronic rhinosinusitis. *International Forum of*
49 *Allergy and Rhinology*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/alr.22242>

50
51 Schubert, C. R., Cruickshanks, K. J., Fischer, M. E., Huang, G. H., Klein, B. E. K., Klein, R., Pankow, J. S.,
52 & Nondahl, D. M. (2012). Olfactory impairment in an adult population: The beaver dam offspring
53 study. *Chemical Senses*, 37(4), 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjr102>

54
55 Seo, H. S., & Hummel, T. (2009). Effects of olfactory dysfunction on sensory evaluation and preparation
56 of foods. *Appetite*, 53(3), 314–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2009.07.010>

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Shu, C. H., Lee, P. L., Lan, M. Y., & Lee, Y. L. (2011). Factors affecting the impact of olfactory loss on the
2 quality of life and emotional coping ability. *Rhinology*, 49(3). <https://doi.org/10.4193/Rhino10.130>
- 3 Soler, Z. M., Patel, Z. M., Turner, J. H., & Holbrook, E. H. (2020). A primer on viral-associated olfactory
4 loss in the era of COVID-19. In *International Forum of Allergy and Rhinology* (Vol. 10, Issue 7).
5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/alr.22578>
- 6
7 Spotten, L. E., Corish, C. A., Lorton, C. M., Ui Dhuibhir, P. M., O'Donoghue, N. C., O'Connor, B., & Walsh,
8 T. D. (2017). Subjective and objective taste and smell changes in cancer. *Annals of Oncology* :
9 *Official Journal of the European Society for Medical Oncology*, 28(5), 969–984.
10 <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdx018>
- 11
12 Stankovic, J., Hove Thomsen, P., & Ovesen, T. (2021). Food preferences, food neophobia and
13 chemosensation among adolescents with ADHD. *Acta Paediatr*, 110(7), 2187–2199.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1111/apa.15790>
- 15
16 Stevenson, R. J. (2009). An initial evaluation of the functions of human olfaction. *Chemical Senses*,
17 35(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjp083>
- 18
19 Stevenson, R. J., Mahmut, M. K., Horstmann, A., & Hummel, T. (2020). The aetiology of olfactory
20 dysfunction and its relationship to diet quality. *Brain Sciences*, 10(11), 1–10.
21 <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci10110769>
- 22
23 Stinton, N., Atif, M. A., Barkat, N., & Doty, R. L. (2010). Influence of smell loss on taste function.
24 *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 124(2). <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018766>
- 25
26 *Study Quality Assessment Tools | NHLBI, NIH*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 21, 2023, from
27 <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>
- 28
29 Styles, B. T. (2003). Encyclopedia of Food Sciences and Nutrition. *Encyclopedia of Food Sciences and*
30 *Nutrition*.
- 31
32 Tarasuk, V. S., & Brooker, A. S. (1997). Interpreting epidemiologic studies of diet-disease relationships.
33 *Journal of Nutrition*, 127(9). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/127.9.1847>
- 34
35 Temmel, A. F. P., Quint, C., Schickinger-Fischer, B., Klimek, L., Stoller, E., & Hummel, T. (2002).
36 Characteristics of olfactory disorders in relation to major causes of olfactory loss. *Archives of*
37 *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, 128(6). <https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.128.6.635>
- 38
39 Toussaint, N., de Roon, M., van Campen, J. P. C. M., Kremer, S., & Boesveldt, S. (2015). Loss of
40 olfactory function and nutritional status in vital older adults and geriatric patients. *Chemical*
41 *Senses*, 40(3). <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bju113>
- 42
43 Vad Andersen, B., & Hyldig, G. (2015). Food satisfaction: Integrating feelings before, during and after
44 food intake. *Food Quality and Preference*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2015.03.004>
- 45
46 Van Lee, L., Geelen, A., Van Huysduynen, E., De Vries, J. H. M., Vant Veer, P., & Feskens, E. J. M.
47 (2012). The dutch healthy diet index (DHD-index): An instrument to measure adherence to the
48 Dutch guidelines for a healthy diet. *Nutrition Journal*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-11-49>
- 49
50 Vijay, A., Mohan, L., Taylor, M. A., Grove, J. I., Valdes, A. M., Aithal, G. P., & Shenoy, K. T. (2020). The
51 evaluation and use of a food frequency questionnaire among the population in Trivandrum, south
52 Kerala, India. *Nutrients*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12020383>
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Wanich, U., Sayompark, D., Riddell, L., Cicerale, S., Liem, D. G., Mohebbi, M., Macfarlane, S., & Keast,
2 R. (2018). Assessing food liking: Comparison of food liking questionnaires and direct food tasting in
3 two cultures. *Nutrients*, *10*(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10121957>

4 Watson, D. L. B., Campbell, M., Hopkins, C., Smith, B., Kelly, C., & Deary, V. (2021). Altered smell and
5 taste: Anosmia, parosmia and the impact of long Covid-19. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(9 September).
6 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256998>

7
8 Weingarten, H. P., & Elston, D. (1990). The phenomenology of food cravings. *Appetite*, *15*(3).
9 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0195-6663\(90\)90023-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0195-6663(90)90023-2)

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Appendix 1: Search strategies for the databases**
7
8
9

10 **Ovid MEDLINE**

11
12
13 **(Query for initial search)**

14
15 ((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour) adj5 (disorder OR loss OR deficit OR dysfunction
16 OR changes OR impairment OR decrease OR alter*).ti,ab,au) OR (anosmia OR hyposmia OR
17 parosmia) AND (appetite OR diet* OR food OR eating OR feed*) adj5 (habit OR intake OR
18 pattern OR preference OR choice OR enjoyment OR perception OR behavi* OR pleasure OR
19 quality OR consumption).ti,ab,au
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **(Query for additional search)**

28
29 ((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour) adj5 (disorder OR loss OR deficit OR dysfunction
30 OR changes OR impairment OR decrease OR alter*).ti,ab,au) OR (anosmia OR hyposmia OR
31 parosmia) AND (diet* OR food OR eating OR feed*) adj5 (pleasantness OR liking OR wanting OR
32 neophobia).ti,ab,au
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **PsycInfo**

42
43
44 **(Query for initial search)**

45
46 AB ((appetite OR diet* OR food OR eating OR feed*) N5 (habit OR intake OR pattern OR preference
47 OR choice OR enjoyment OR perception OR behavi* OR pleasure OR quality OR consumption)) AND
48 (AB ((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour) N5 (deficit OR disorder OR loss OR dysfunction
49 OR changes OR impairment OR decrease)) OR AB (anosmia OR hyposmia OR parosmia))
50
51 TI ((appetite OR diet* OR food OR eating OR feed*) N5 (habit OR intake OR pattern OR preference
52 OR choice OR enjoyment OR perception OR behavi* OR pleasure OR quality OR consumption)) AND
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (TI ((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour) N5 (deficit OR disorder OR loss OR dysfunction
2 OR changes OR impairment OR decrease)) OR TI (anosmia OR hyposmia OR parosmia))

3
4 **(Query for additional search)**

5
6 AB ((diet* OR food OR eating OR feed*) N5 (pleasantness OR liking OR wanting Or neophobia)) AND

7
8 (AB ((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour) N5 (deficit OR disorder OR loss OR dysfunction
9 OR changes OR impairment OR decrease)) OR AB (anosmia OR hyposmia OR parosmia))

10
11 TI ((diet* OR food OR eating OR feed*) N5 (pleasantness OR liking OR wanting Or neophobia)) AND

12
13 (TI ((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour) N5 (deficit OR disorder OR loss OR dysfunction
14 OR changes OR impairment OR decrease)) OR TI (anosmia OR hyposmia OR parosmia))

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 **Pubmed**

24
25 **(Query for initial search)**

26
27 ("feeding behaviour"[MeSH Terms] OR eating behav*[Text Word] OR food enjoyment [text word] OR
28 appetite[text word] OR food consumption OR food intake) AND (("smell"[MeSH] OR olfact*[Text Word]
29 OR chemosensory[Text Word] OR odour[text word]) AND ("physiopathology"[Subheading] OR
30 dysfunction[Text Word] OR deficit[Text Word]) OR ("Anosmia"[Mesh] OR parosmia[Text word]))

31
32
33
34
35
36
37 **(Query for additional search)**

38
39 ("food neophobia" [Text Word] OR "food pleasantness" [Text Word] OR "food wanting" [Text Word]
40 OR "food liking" [Text Word]) AND (("smell"[MeSH] OR olfact*[Text Word] OR chemosensory[Text
41 Word] OR odour[text word]) AND ("physiopathology"[Subheading] OR dysfunction[Text Word] OR
42 deficit[Text Word]) OR ("Anosmia"[Mesh] OR parosmia[Text word]))

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 **Scopus**

52 **(Query for initial search)**

53
54 (TITLE-ABS-KEY ((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour) W/5 (disorder OR loss OR
55 dysfunction OR changes OR deficit OR impairment OR decrease OR alter*)) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY ((

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

anosmia OR ypos a OR parosmia)) AND T LE-A -KEY ((appetite OR diet* OR food OR eating OR
feed*) W/5 habit OR intake OR pattern OR preference OR choice OR enjoyment OR perception OR
beha* OR pleasure OR quality OR consumption))

(Query for additional search)

(TITLE-ABS-KEY((olfact* OR smell OR chemosensory OR odour W/5 disorder OR loss OR dysfunction
OR changes OR deficit OR impairment OR decrease OR alter*) OR (anosmia OR hyposmia OR parosmia
)) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY((diet* OR food OR eating OR feed* W/5 lik* OR want* OR pleasantness OR
neophobia)))

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Appendix 2: Quality assessment

Table A2.1 Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies

Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies	
1	Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?
2	Was the study population clearly specified and defined?
3	Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?
4	Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?
5	Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?
6	For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?
7	Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?
8	For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?
9	Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
10	Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?
11	Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
12	Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?

13	Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?
14	Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?

Table A2.2. Rating of the manuscripts

Group	Good	Fair	Poor
Older adults	10	1	1
Cancer patients	6	4	0
Underlying disorders	4	4	0
General olfactory dysfunction	8	8	0
Population-based studies	3	1	0
Total	31	18	1

Appendix 3: Detailed overview of olfactory function measures

Table A3.1 Overview of olfactory function measurements used in the articles included in the review

Olfactory outcome measurement	Articles	Category
Objective Measures		
Sniffin' Sticks	(Aschenbrenner et al., 2008), (Hannum et al., 2020), (de Vries et al., 2019), (de Vries et al., 2018), (Postma, Kok, et al., 2020), (Vad Andersen & Hyldig, 2015), (Pellegrino et al., 2020), (Demattè et al., 2013), (Knaapila et al., 2007), (DOTY, 1977), (Mattes et al., 1990), (Kremer et al., 2007), (Bossola et al., 2011), (Schubert et al., 2012), (Belqaid et al., 2014)	Identification; discrimination; threshold
Odour identification task (OIT)	(Manesse et al., 2021), (Stankovic et al., 2021), (Guyot et al., 2021), (B. N. Landis et al., 2010), (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022)	Identification
San Diego Odour Identification Test (SDOIT)	(Gopinath et al., 2016), (Schubert et al., 2012)	Identification
Smell Identification Test (SIT)	(Manesse et al., 2017)	Identification
University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test (UPSIT)	(Shu et al., 2011)	Identification
Scratch-and-sniff (UPSIT)	(Stinton et al., 2010)	Identification
Smell component of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)	(Drareni et al., 2021)	Identification
4-Item NHANES Pocket Smell Test (PST)	(Rasmussen et al., 2018)	Identification

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

European Test of Olfactory Capabilities (ETOC)	(Essed et al., 2009), (Postma, De Graaf, et al., 2020)	Detection; identification
Odour detection threshold (ODT)	(Manesse et al., 2021), (Stankovic et al., 2021), (Guyot et al., 2021), (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022), (Boltong & Keast, 2012), (Brisbois et al., 2011)	Detection
French Bioalfa olfactory test (olfactory threshold and odor identification)	(Chalouhi et al., 2005)	Identification; threshold
Butanol threshold test (BTT)	(Ferris et al., 1985)	Identification; threshold
Connecticut Chemosensory Clinical Research Center olfactory test (CCCRC-OT)	(Nordin et al., 2011)	Threshold
Subjective Measures		
Self-Reported Olfactory Loss (self-reported OL)	(Hannum et al., 2020), (Postma, Kok, et al., 2020), [30], (Manesse et al., 2021), (Stankovic et al., 2021), (Stinton et al., 2010), (Spotten et al., 2017), (Han et al., 2021), (Frasnelli et al., 2010), (Novakova et al., 2012), (Pellegrino et al., 2020), (Mattes et al., 1990), (Mattes & Cowart, 1994), , (Bossola et al., 2011), (Ferris et al., 1985), (Hutton et al., 2007), (Van Lee et al., 2012), (Tarasuk & Brooker, 1997), (Henkin, 2014)	Self-report

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Ratings of odour intensity, pleasantness, familiarity, irritation, and edibility (O_IPFIE)	(Spotten et al., 2017)	
Individual self-reported smell perception scores (VAS)	(de Vries et al., 2018), (Fjaeldstad & Smith, 2022)	
Taste and Smell Survey (TSS)	(Brisbois et al., 2011), (Belqaid et al., 2014)	
CITAS scale (Chemotherapy-induced Taste Alterations)	(Drareni et al., 2021)	

Declaration of interests

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

The author is an Editorial Board Member/Editor-in-Chief/Associate Editor/Guest Editor for *[Journal name]* and was not involved in the editorial review or the decision to publish this article.

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

This research was funded by an Aspasia grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, awarded to SB. If there are other authors, declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Credit Author statement:

Conceptualization: PP, SB, EP; Data curation: PP, EP; Formal Analysis: PP, EP; Funding acquisition: SB; Investigation: PP, EP; Methodology: PP, SB, EP; Project administration: PP; Resources: PP, EP; Software: PP, EP; Supervision: SB; Validation: PP, SB, EP; Visualization: PP, EP; Writing - original draft: PP, EP; Writing - review & editing: PP, SB, EP