



LJMU Research Online

Hagan, R, Pawling, R, McGlone, F and Walker, SC

No evidence for goal priming or sensory specific satiety effects following exposure to ambient food odours

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/24606/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Hagan, R, Pawling, R, McGlone, F and Walker, SC (2024) No evidence for goal priming or sensory specific satiety effects following exposure to ambient food odours. *Appetite*. ISSN 0195-6663

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.


For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

Journal Pre-proof

No evidence for goal priming or sensory specific satiety effects following exposure to ambient food odours.

Rachel Hagan, Ralph Pawling, Francis. McGlone, Susannah C. Walker



PII: S0195-6663(24)00534-8

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2024.107730>

Reference: APPET 107730

To appear in: *Appetite*

Received Date: 15 February 2024

Revised Date: 21 October 2024

Accepted Date: 23 October 2024

Please cite this article as: Hagan R., Pawling R., McGlone F. & Walker S.C., No evidence for goal priming or sensory specific satiety effects following exposure to ambient food odours., *Appetite*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2024.107730>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2024 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

1 **No evidence for goal priming or sensory specific satiety**
2 **effects following exposure to ambient food odours.**

3
4 Rachel Hagan^{a*}, Ralph Pawling^a, Francis. McGlone^{a,b} & Susannah C. Walker^a

5
6 ^a Research Centre for Brain & Behaviour,

7 School of Psychology

8 Faculty of Health

9 Liverpool John Moores University,

10 Liverpool

11 UK

12
13 ^b School of Science

14 Department of Neuroscience and Biomedical Engineering

15 Aalto University

16 Finland

17
18 Emails: r.hagan@ljmu.ac.uk; r.pawling@ljmu.ac.uk; francis.l.mcglone@gmail.com;

19 s.c.walker@ljmu.ac.uk

20 Tel: +44 (0) 151 904 6309

21
22 *Corresponding Author

Abstract

Sensory-specific satiety describes a decline in hedonic value of the taste of a food as it is consumed, relative to a non-consumed food – the pudding tummy phenomenon. Incentive motivation towards consumed foods has also been shown to decline. Several studies report that brief exposure to food odours can also produce a sensory-specific satiety effect, in the absence of consumption, selectively reducing hedonic ratings and subsequent high calorie food choices. Yet, other studies report goal-priming effects of ambient odours, in which brief implicit exposure increases the hedonic value of odour congruent food options. The present study aimed to determine whether exposure to ambient food odours would enhance or reduce incentive motivation for associated foods. Participants completed either an ambient odour (N=38) or food consumption (N=40) task. In both, participants were randomly assigned to an indulgent (*chocolate*) or non-indulgent (*orange*) food group and completed two blocks of a cross-modality matching grip-force task. One block was completed immediately before, the other immediately after, odour exposure/food consumption. A grip-force transducer measured effort exerted “to win” briefly presented (33 or 200ms) visual images of these foods, relative to control stimuli. In both studies, participants exerted greater effort to win the food items than control images. While neither satiety nor priming effect were found following ambient odour exposure, a classic sensory-specific satiety effect was found in the food consumption study. That is, force exerted for chocolate images declined significantly following chocolate consumption, in the absence of any decline in motivation for orange stimuli. While differences in odour exposure findings could be explained by factors such as concentration, timing, and nature of exposure, questions remain about the robustness of previously reported odour induced satiety and priming effects.

Keywords: Odour Priming; Sensory-Specific Satiety; Incentive Motivation; Food Consumption; Grip Force

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Sensory-specific satiety refers to the reduced pleasantness of a food as it is eaten, relative to
3 other uneaten foods which possess different sensory qualities (Andersen, Byrne & Wang, 2023;
4 Abeywickrema, Oey & Peng, 2022; Rolls, Rolls, Rowe, & Sweeney, 1981). This phenomenon
5 is thought to promote both the termination of an eating episode and the tendency to resume
6 eating when different foods become available (Abeywickrema, Oey & Peng, 2022). For
7 example, rats display reduced hedonic taste reactivity to foods after being pre-fed congruent
8 diets (Myers, 2016; Reichelt, Morris, & Westbrook, 2014; Berridge, 1991), while humans
9 consistently report reduced hedonic pleasure from, and demonstrate reduced selection of,
10 consumed relative to unconsumed foods (Rolls et al 1981; Hethrington et al 1996; Rolls &
11 Rolls, 1997; Hendricks et al., 2019).

12 The term olfactory-specific satiety (OSS) was coined to describe the observation that the
13 perceived pleasantness of the odour of foods eaten to satiety declines relative to the odours of
14 other non-consumed foods (Rolls & Rolls 1987). This reduction in hedonic ratings has been
15 replicated with both ortho and retronasal exposure to food odour (Stafford 2016; Fernandez
16 2013; Abeywickrema et al 2022). Neurally, OSS is reflected as reduced odour evoked
17 responses in the orbitofrontal cortex, which in motivational terms is encoding the current value
18 of the associated food (Gottfried et al 2003). Intriguingly, Rolls & Rolls (1997) also observed
19 partial OSS following five minutes of chewing but not ingesting a food. Subsequently
20 Fernandez et al (2013) have reported that retronasal exposure to a food associated odour while
21 eating reduced the perceived pleasantness of the flavour of other foods containing that aroma
22 when encountered later in the meal. Such findings have sparked interest in the potential of food
23 odour exposure to modify food selection and consumption, and several studies have reported
24 that non-conscious exposure to ambient odours associated with high calorie, indulgent foods
25 can induce OSS effects, driving people to make more low calorie, healthy food choices (Biswas
26 & Szocs 2019; Chae et al 2023). However, such reports stand in direct contrast to findings from
27 a wide range of studies where exposure to ambient odours induce goal-priming effects, with
28 brief implicit exposure leading to an increase in selection of odour congruent food options
29 (Smeets & Dijksterhuis 2014; Gaillet et al 2013; Proserpio et al, 2019; Gaillet-Torrent et al,
30 2014).

31 Such mixed findings on the motivational effects of food odours may be explained by
32 methodological variations in the nature and duration of odour exposure. For example, explicit
33 retronasal exposure for five minutes has been shown to induce satiety effects (Rolls & Rolls,

1 1997), while explicit orthonasal exposure for ten and twenty minutes resulted in increased
2 appetite for odour congruent foods (Jansen et al., 2003; Ramaekers 2013). Consistently, non-
3 conscious exposure to ambient odours for ten to twenty minutes has been reported to prime
4 congruent food choice (Proserpio et al, 2019; Gaillet-Torrent et al, 2014; Gaillet et al, 2013),
5 and enhance both appetite ratings (Ramaekers et al, 2014) and food cue reactivity (Mas et al,
6 2020). While, in contrast, Biswas and Szocs (2019) reported priming effects after only thirty
7 seconds of implicit exposure to an ambient food odour, with exposure of two minutes or more
8 reducing selection of odour congruent foods. Meanwhile, Morquecho-Campos (2021) did not
9 find any effect on appetite, preference, or intake after implicit exposure of three minutes. Taken
10 together, reports that extended exposure to ambient food odours primes non congruent food
11 choices (Biswas & Szocs 2019; Chae et al 2023) stand in contrast to the majority of the extant
12 literature.

13 The incentive salience theory of motivation distinguishes neurally and psychologically
14 between the motivational drive to obtain a reward (wanting) and the hedonic pleasure derived
15 from its consumption (liking) (Robinson & Berridge 2003). Operationally, liking is measured
16 as an explicit affective response to reward during, or immediately after, consumption while
17 wanting is measured as motivation to obtain a future reward and can be either implicit or
18 explicit (Berridge 1989; Pool et al., 2016). Results from both animal and human studies
19 demonstrate that sensory specific satiety effects are apparent, not just in affective measures of
20 food liking (Berridge 1991; Rolls et al 1981) but also in motivational assessments of food
21 wanting, manifested as a selective decrease in drive to obtain a consumed food (Balleine &
22 Dickinson 1998; Havermans 2009; Saelens & Epstein 1996; Ziauddeen et al 2014). In animals,
23 wanting is typically measured in instrumental behavioural tasks such as progressive ratio-
24 schedules, where motivation is assessed as the amount of effort expended to obtain food
25 (Zepeda-Ruiz et al, 2020; Velazquez-Sanchez et al, 2015; Kendig et al, 2013). In equivalent
26 tasks, human participants are asked to perform actions such as pressing a response key
27 (Temple, 2016; Rogers & Hardman, 2015) or squeezing a grip-force dynamometer (Ziauddeen
28 et al., 2014). Here, the goal is to assess the value of the food at the moment of the response.
29 For example, Ziauddeen et al (2014) found that participants exerted less effort to win a visually
30 cued food after they had consumed it to satiety, while there was no change in effort exerted to
31 obtain a food that hadn't been consumed. This sensory-specific decrease in incentive
32 motivation was apparent whether the food images were presented at a conscious or non-

1 conscious level, suggesting that modulations of effort for the consumed food occurred outside
2 conscious awareness.

3 According to incentive salience theory, at any given time, motivational drive (wanting) is
4 determined by a combination of both internal and external factors, specifically an organism's
5 internal physiological state (e.g. how hungry they are) and the presence of external stimuli
6 encountered in the environment that are associated with reward (e.g. sight or smell of food)
7 (Berridge 1989; Pool et al., 2016). Thus, it would be predicted that encountering a food odour
8 when hungry would result in a greater drive to obtain an associated food item than when the
9 same odour was encountered when satiated. To our knowledge, behavioural measures of
10 wanting, have not so far been used to test the effects of ambient odour exposure on incentive
11 motivation for associated foods. Thus, to further explore the psychological mechanisms
12 underlying previously reported priming and satiety effects, the current study used grip force
13 (Ziauddeen et al 2014; Ziauddeen et al 2012) to investigate the effect of implicit, ambient odour
14 exposure on appetitive motivation. In addition, to confirm the sensitivity of this task to changes
15 in motivation, a classic sensory specific satiety consumption study was conducted using an
16 identical procedure and the same foods.

17 In-line with incentive models of motivation, consistent with previous reports of implicit odour
18 priming (Proserpio et al 2019; Gaillet-Torrent et al., 2014), and in contrast to the OSS effects
19 reported by Biswas & Szocs (2019), it is hypothesised that a non-conscious, five-minute
20 exposure to an ambient food odour will result in a priming effect, with participants displaying
21 selective enhancement of motivation for congruent food images following odour exposure. In
22 contrast, it is hypothesised, consistent with previous studies (e.g Ziauddeen et al 2014), food
23 consumption will result in a satiety effect, with participants showing a selective decrease in
24 exerted effort for consumed but not unconsumed foods. In addition, participants will be asked
25 to make an unobserved explicit food selection at the end of the study. It is hypothesised that,
26 while odour exposure will increase selection of the primed over the non-primed food, food
27 consumption will increase selection of the non-consumed food.

28

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants

Odour Exposure study: 38 participants, aged 18-60 years old (24 female) were quasi-randomly assigned to either Orange (N=18, Mean age = 32.95, SD = 12.79) or Chocolate (N=20, Mean age = 30.90, SD = 12.89) odour exposure groups. Age was not reported by one participant in the Orange group.

Food Consumption study: 40 participants, aged 18-60 years old (24 female), were quasi-randomly assigned to either Orange (N=19, Mean age = 24.89, SD = 6.64) or Chocolate (N=21, Mean age = 24.33, SD = 7.55) food consumption groups.

In both studies, participants were assigned to groups alternately.

Participants were recruited from the staff and student population at Liverpool John Moores University and from the wider public using the university's Psychology Research Participant Panel. Participants were excluded from taking part if they had any respiratory problems, food intolerances or allergies. The experimental protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee at Liverpool John Moores University (19/NSP/062). Participants received a £10 shopping voucher to thank them for their time. Participants were recruited for the odour exposure study between October 2019 and January 2021, with testing periods intermittently interrupted due to COVID-19 restrictions. Participants for the Food Consumption study were recruited between June 2021 and May 2022.

2.2 Materials

2.2.1 Odour Stimuli

In line with a previous laboratory-based study reporting satiety effects of ambient food odour exposure (Biswas & Szocs 2019), one indulgent (high-calorie) and one non-indulgent (low-calorie) food associated odour was selected for the study. The final selection of Double Chocolate and Seville Orange aroma oils (*AromaPrime.com*) was based on pilot testing (n=13) which confirmed, during explicit exposure (odour presented on filter papers in glass jars), that

1 both odours were identifiable and did not differ significantly in terms of ratings of perceived
2 pleasantness, intensity, familiarity, or edibility.

3

4 2.2.2 Odour Pilot

5 Diffusion times were based on pilot testing, which determined that both odours were
6 recognisable when attention was directed towards them, but the intensity was not so strong as
7 to capture attention upon entering the room. N=19 faculty members at LJMU (11 Male) were
8 asked (one-by-one) to enter each of the four rooms in any order they wished. One room
9 contained the Seville Orange Odour, one room contained the Double Chocolate Odour, and
10 two rooms were used as controls and contained no odour. Participants were asked whether they
11 were able to identify the odour and to rate the intensity on 12cm Visual analogue Scales (VAS).

12 For detection and concentration of the Seville Orange Odour, 100% of participants were able
13 to detect an odour in the room, with 52.6% correctly identifying the odour as being either
14 Orange or Citrus, with a mean intensity of 7.97 (SD=2.59). For the Double Chocolate Odour,
15 84.2% (n=16) of participants were able to detect an odour in the room, with 62.5% being able
16 to correctly identify the odour as being either 'Chocolate' or 'Cocoa', with a mean intensity of
17 7.38 (SD=3.53).

18 2.2.3 Odour Dispenser

19 During the main testing sessions, twenty minutes prior to the participant entering the odour
20 exposure room, 200 μ l (4 drops from a Pasteur pipette) of the aroma oil were pipetted onto
21 individual quarters of filter paper (GE Healthcare Whatman TM 55mm diameter, Fisher
22 Scientific), placed into the top of a mini scent diffuser (AromaPrime.com) and dispersed for 60
23 seconds. The diffuser was then removed from the room.

24

25 2.2.4 Visual Images

26 Task Images were sourced from non-copyright online sources and prepared using Adobe
27 Photoshop. They were formatted to 500 x 500 pixels and had the same luminance and opacity,
28 with all edges being blurred to reduce any sharp contrast between the stimuli image and the
29 masked background. In line with the task design used in Ziauddeen et al, (2012) study, in order
30 to minimise direct motor specification effects different images were used for the long (200 ms)
31 and short (33 ms) presentation trials (see Figure 1A). All test images were randomly scrambled
32 using MATLAB. A random combination of pixels from each image were then merged using

1 MATLAB, in order to create ten composite mask images (see Figure 1B). These were then
2 randomly selected across all trials for both the pre and post-stimuli mask.

3

4 *Figure 1 (A) Visual Stimuli used in the Grip-Force Task; two images were used for each*
5 *category (Chocolate, Orange, Control). The top three images were presented for the Long-*
6 *duration trials (200msec) and bottom three images were used for the Short-duration trials (33*
7 *msec). (B) An exemplar of one of the mask images used.*

8

9 **2.3 Measures**

10 2.3.1 Food Preference Questionnaire

11 Prior to attending the laboratory, participants completed a Food Preference questionnaire
12 presented online via Qualtrics survey software (Qualtrics.com). This asked whether they
13 followed a particular diet (e.g. vegetarian/vegan), their snack preferences (e.g. for sweet or
14 savoury foods), general eating habits and any food intolerances/allergies. Information gathered
15 from this questionnaire was used to ensure participants were eligible to take part in the study
16 and able to consume the foods being presented. These data were not used in any subsequent
17 analysis.

18

19 2.3.2 Grip-Force Task

20 Experiment generator software E-prime 3.0 (v3.0.3.80) was used to create the task (modified
21 from Ziauddeen et al, 2012). All images were presented on a 19-inch monitor (resolution:
22 1280 × 1024; refresh rate: 60Hz). The monitor was set up to be approximately 50cm from the
23 participants and at eye level. A pre-calibrated strain gauge-based isometric dynamometer with
24 a linear response in the 0 to 800 Newton (N) range (MLT004/ST Grip Force Transducer,
25 ADInstruments, Dunedin, New Zealand) and accuracy of $\pm 5\%$ of reading was used to measure
26 hand-grip force at a sampling rate of 1000 Hz.

27

28 Prior to starting the task, all participants provided a measure of their maximum grip-force by
29 applying as much effort as possible onto the transducer three times. The Maximum of these
30 three trials was then taken as the participant's Maximal Volitional Contraction (MVC)
31 (Ziauddeen, 2014). Whilst the response screen was only visible for 1000ms during each trial,
32 to ensure the full responses were captured, exerted effort was measured for a total of 4500ms,
33 which was then binned into 100ms intervals. Thus, providing a total of 45 data-points per trial.

34

1 The trial design is shown in Figure 2. Each trial consisted of a fixation cross which was
2 presented for 200ms, followed by a mask screen presented for 200ms, a stimuli screen
3 depicting either chocolate cake (indulgent), an orange (non-indulgent) or a teapot (control
4 stimuli), was presented for either 33ms (short-presentation) or 200ms (long-presentation). A
5 second mask screen was then presented for either 300ms (short-presentation) or 100ms (long-
6 presentation), followed by a response screen, which cued participants to respond with the grip-
7 force transducer. Lastly, a fluid level screen was presented for 3000ms, the purpose of this was
8 to provide visual feedback that a response has been recorded, however, participants were made
9 aware that the visual guides were not always accurate and should only be taken as an estimate
10 of the exerted force. This fluid level was in-fact set at three randomised levels and was not
11 directly associated with the participant's exerted effort. The purpose of the different timings of
12 the second mask screen was to ensure the total trial time was consistent across long and short
13 presentation trials (4700ms).

14

15 Participants first completed 6 practice trials, followed by two identical test blocks. Each block
16 comprised 13 long-presentation and 13 short-presentation trials per stimuli (78 trials per block).
17 Within each block, stimuli were presented in a randomised order for each participant. The
18 images used during the practice trials were the same as those used during the main task.
19 Participants were instructed *“In order to win the food items, you need to squeeze the handgrip
20 in line with how much you want each item – so, the more you want the reward shown, the
21 harder you squeeze”*.

22

23 *Figure 2: Task Diagram showing order and duration of screens presented during each*
24 *short-presentation (SP) and long-presentation (LP) trial. On each trial participants were*
25 *presented with a fixation cross, followed by a mask, a stimulus was then displayed for*
26 *either 33 or 200 msec, followed by a second mask, a response screen then cued the*
27 *participant to respond on the grip-force transducer. Finally, a fluid level screen provided*
28 *visual feedback to the participant that a response had been recorded.*

29

30 2.3.3 Odour Exposure

31 In the odour study, between blocks one and two of the grip force task, participants were taken
32 to the test room where the odour had been diffused. Participants were not told about the odour.
33 They spent five minutes there completing a reading comprehension task (taken from

1 Ngllife.com) which consisted of a ~500-word piece of text and 8 multiple-choice questions
2 related to the text. The piece was chosen as it was affectively neutral and contained no food
3 related content. Data from this task was not intended for analysis and was merely used as a
4 distractor during odour exposure.

5

6 2.3.4 Food Consumption

7 In the Food study, between blocks one and two of the grip force task, participants were taken
8 to a room where fixed portions of either ten fresh satsumas (ASDA Grower's Selection) or ten
9 chocolate cake slices (Mr Kipling Chocolate Slice) were available. Participants were instructed
10 “*Please consume as much food as you wish during this five-minute period. Please do not leave*
11 *the room until instructed to do so by the researcher*”. Participants were unaware that portion
12 size was recorded before and after consumption. The researcher recorded food intake by
13 counting the number of missing items from the plate. In cases where a participant was part way
14 through consuming an item of food when the researcher returned, they were allowed to finish
15 it before returning to the grip-force testing room.

16

17 2.3.5 Forced Choice Discrimination Task

18 This task measured participant awareness of the images used in the Grip-Force task and
19 comprised 30, 33ms masked presentations in a randomised order. The images used in this task
20 were the same six images used in the main task, the presentation timings were the same as
21 those used for the short-presentation trials in the main task. During each trial, participants were
22 presented with a mask screen, followed by a stimulus screen and then a second mask screen.
23 They were then shown a response screen which consisted of two images; the image just
24 presented for that trial and a second randomly selected image. Using keys Z and M on the
25 keyboard, they were required to indicate which of the two images was the one just presented.
26 Position (left or right) of the correct image on this screen was counterbalanced across trials.

27

28 2.3.6 Food Choice

29 At the end of the experiment, participants were asked to select a food item: either a fresh orange
30 (ASDA Grower's Selection Satsumas) or a chocolate cake slice (Mr Kipling Chocolate Slice -
31 Individually wrapped), which they were able to take away with them. Since prior research has
32 found that participants are more likely to change their eating behaviour if they believe their
33 food intake is being monitored, (Robinson et al, 2014), the food selection was completed in
34 another room, out of sight of the experimenter. Participants were directed to the food choice

1 room upon completion of the other tasks. Two dishes, one containing oranges and the other
2 chocolate slices were available. All food selections were recorded after the participant had left
3 the laboratory.

4 5 **2.4 Procedure**

6 Prospective participants for both studies were informed they were investigating motivation for
7 food related images and food choices. Once a participant agreed to take part in the study, an e-
8 mail containing a link to the Food Preference Questionnaire was forwarded for completion
9 prior to attending the laboratory. On the scheduled test day, participants were asked not to eat
10 or drink anything, apart from water, for at least 3hrs prior to arriving, and to refrain from
11 smoking for 1hr prior to testing. Upon entering the laboratory, participants were asked to place
12 their personal belongings, including their mobile phone, to one side They were then provided
13 with a paper version of the information sheet and instructed to read it carefully prior to being
14 verbally briefed and offered the opportunity to ask any questions. Once the participant was
15 happy with the instructions, they were asked to sign a consent form. Participants then provided
16 a measure of their MVC using the grip-force transducer, before completing the practice trials
17 on the task. Once the participant was happy, they continued to complete block-one of the grip-
18 force task.

19
20 Following completion of the first block, participants in the odour study were told that they were
21 required to take a five-minute break in another room where they completed the reading
22 comprehension task. The room had previously been diffused with either the Chocolate or
23 Orange odour without the participant's knowledge, with separate rooms being used for each
24 odour. For those in the Food study, participants spent five-minutes in another room where they
25 consumed either oranges or chocolate cake.

26
27 On returning to the test room, all participants completed block-two of the grip-force task
28 followed by the Forced Choice Discrimination Task. Upon completion of the experimental
29 tasks, participants in the odour study were asked if they had noticed anything unusual about
30 the room during the task blocks, providing them an opportunity to report any perception of the
31 odour. Additionally, in both the odour and food studies, participants were asked if they
32 understood the aims of the study prior to the food choice task, however, no further information
33 was provided at this point. Participants were then informed that they could collect a food item
34 from the next room if they wished. Following this, participants were presented with a debrief

1 sheet and were fully debriefed on the true aims of the study and the reasons for not disclosing
2 the odour exposure beforehand.

3

4 **2.5 Data Analysis**

5 A power analysis was conducted using G-Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007).
6 Using the ANOVA: Repeated Measures, within-between interaction option with two groups
7 and two measurements, a sample of 38 was required to detect a small-medium effect size ($f =$
8 $.25$) with 85% power and an alpha level of 0.05.

9

10 Prior to analysis, data from 3 participants was removed. One participant in the odour study
11 wore a face mask throughout testing. One participant in the satiety study did not eat any food
12 between grip force blocks, (whilst all other participant consumed between 1-4 food items. 1-2
13 by the Orange food group and 2-4 by the Chocolate food group), and another acknowledged
14 during debrief that they exerted more force for the teapots than the foods during both blocks,
15 as they wanted a cup of tea (this was confirmed by inspection of their data). Thus, in the odour
16 study 37 participants were included in the analysis, 18 in the orange and 19 in the chocolate
17 group. In the food consumption study 38 participants were included in the analysis, 18 in the
18 orange and 20 in the chocolate group. It was found that there was a significant difference in
19 age between those in the Odour Exposure study and those in the Food Consumption study ($t(73)$
20 $= 20.38$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .65$), however, while previous research has shown that sensory
21 perception, including olfactory and gustatory responses, can decline with age these effects are
22 typically more pronounced, in elderly populations (Doty et al., 1984). and here participants in
23 both studies were primarily young adults. Since our participant groups are all within a range
24 where sensory functions are generally stable, it is unlikely that the differences in mean age
25 would lead to significant variations in how participants responded to the odour or food stimuli.

26

27 Grip-Force data were exported from LabChart to Microsoft Excel. Data from the Forced
28 Choice Discrimination Task were exported using E-DataAid. All data was transferred to SPSS
29 (IBM Corp. Released 2013. IBM SPSS Statistics for Mac, Version 23.0) for analyses. Upon
30 checking each participant's data, it was clear that a number of participants did not exert any
31 effort on some trials. However, due to the instructions given to the participant, this was
32 expected, and no data were removed as a result. Following this, it was evident that, on some
33 trials, where a participant had either not exerted any grip or failed to respond during the

1 measurement period, the transducer recorded negative values, possibly due to the absence of
2 force or a decrease in force from a previous state. Such negative values, resulting from non-
3 responses, can distort the dataset. Therefore, a constant of 10 Newtons was added to all data
4 points, which meant any previously negative values became positive. The same transformation
5 was applied to the Maximal Volitional Contraction (MVC) values.

6
7 To calculate each participant's MVC, the maximum force recorded during each 4500ms
8 sampling period was extracted, and the maximum of these values over the three trials taken as
9 their MVC.

10
11 For both studies, a mixed ANOVA with pairwise comparisons was conducted, with Block
12 (One, Two), Image (Control, Chocolate, Orange) and Duration (Long, Short) as within subject
13 factors and Group (Chocolate, Orange) as a between participant factors. Following the methods
14 of Ziauddeen et al, (2011), all grip-force scores were then normalised based on each
15 participant's MVC. The force exerted during the response period was measured as a percentage
16 of the difference between the baseline and the MVC: $(\text{trial value}/\text{MVC value}) * 100$.

17
18 Secondly, in both studies, to compare effort exerted for food stimuli, before and after odour
19 exposure/food consumption, the second stage of the analysis focused on exerted effort for the
20 food items only. Thus, again following the methods of Ziauddeen et al (2011), the normalised
21 scores obtained in the first analysis were standardised by subtracting category specific control
22 trial responses from category specific food trial responses (e.g. 'Block1_Control_Short, was
23 subtracted from Block1_Chocolate_Short). A mixed ANOVA was then conducted with Block
24 (One, Two), Image (Chocolate, Orange) and Duration (Long, Short) as within participant
25 factors and Group (Chocolate, Orange) as a between participant factor.

26
27 The Forced Discrimination data was analysed using a Chi-Square test, between Image
28 Condition and Response Accuracy.

29
30 To compare the proportions of 'Orange' food choices versus 'Chocolate' food choices, data
31 were analysed using binomial logistic regression on the proportion of participants in each group
32 selecting an orange.

- 1 All data fulfilled the assumptions for parametric analysis and there was homogeneity of
- 2 variances for all conditions, as assessed by Levene's test. In cases where data did not meet the
- 3 assumptions of sphericity, greenhouse geisser correction was applied.

Journal Pre-proof

3. Results

3.1 Exerted Effort: Main effect of Image type

Initial analyses were conducted to determine whether exerted effort varied based on the presumed motivational value of the depicted food items. Specifically, we assessed how motivation influenced effort for food images, irrespective of the block (pre- or post-intervention) and presentation duration.

In the Odour study, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Image on exerted effort ($F(2, 74) = 12.26, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .25$). As shown in Figure 3A, participants applied significantly less force on Control trials compared to either Chocolate ($p < .001$) or Orange trials ($p < .01$). Effort did not significantly differ between Orange and Chocolate trials ($p = .06$).

Similarly, in the Food study, there was also a significant main effect of Image ($F(2, 72) = 13.72, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .28$). As shown in Figure 3B, participants applied significantly less force on Control trials compared to either Chocolate ($p < .001$) or Orange trials ($p < .001$). Effort did not differ significantly between Orange and Chocolate trials ($p = .41$).

Thus, in both studies, participants exerted significantly more effort to “win” the food items than the control stimuli.

*Figure 3: Mean Grip-Force applied for each image type during the Odour Study (A) and the Food Study (B). Exerted effort was significantly greater for food images compared to control images in both studies. *** denotes sig level $< .001$, ** denotes sig level $< .01$. Error bars indicate 95% CI.*

3.2 Exerted Effort –Main effects of Block and Duration

In the Odour study, there were significant main effects of Block ($F(1, 36) = 4.39, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .11$) and Duration ($F(1, 36) = 13.58, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .27$) reflecting the fact participants exerted greater force in block-one compared to block-two, and for long compared to short duration images. There was no interaction between Block and Image ($F(2, 74) = .39, p = .68, \eta_p^2 = .01$), however, there was a significant interaction between Image and Duration ($F(2, 72) = 6.17, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .14$), which reflects the fact duration only had an effect on force exerted for

1 Chocolate ($p<.01$) and Orange Images ($p<.01$), effort for Control Images did not differ across
 2 long and short duration trials ($p=.73$). See Figure 4A.

3

4 For the Food study, there was again, a significant main effect of Block ($F(1, 36) = 17.37$,
 5 $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.33$) and Duration ($F(1, 36) = 5.97$, $p<.05$, $\eta_p^2=.14$) reflecting the fact participants
 6 exerted greater force in block-one compared to block-two, and for long compared to short
 7 duration images. In addition, there was a significant Block x Image interaction ($F(2,72)=3.83$,
 8 $p=.03$, $\eta_p^2=.10$), reflecting a significant decrease in effort for chocolate images ($p<.001$) but
 9 not orange images ($p=.15$) or control images ($p=.26$), from block-one to block-two (Figure 4B).
 10 In this study, the interaction between Image and Duration was not significant ($F(2, 72) = 1.58$,
 11 $p=.21$, $\eta_p^2=.04$).

12

13 *Figure 4: Mean Grip-Force applied for each condition during the Odour Study (A) and the*
 14 *Food Study (B). Red bars represent Mean Grip-Force for Short Duration trials (33 msec) and*
 15 *blue bars represent Mean Grip-Force for Long Duration trials (200 msec). Block One is shown*
 16 *on the left of each figure and Block Two is shown on the right. In both studies there was a*
 17 *significant main effect of block and duration, with greater effort exerted in block one than block*
 18 *2 and to long than short duration images. Error bars indicate 95% CI.*

19

20 **3.3 Effect of Food / Odour Exposure on exerted effort.**

21 To determine whether there was any change in exerted effort for Food Images following Odour
 22 Exposure or Food Consumption, mixed ANOVAs were conducted using standardised scores
 23 of effort exerted for food images minus effort exerted for control images, thus accounting for
 24 the general decrease in effort observed in block 2 compared to block 1. Here, within participant
 25 factors were Block (Block 1 & 2) Image (Chocolate, Orange) and Duration (Long, Short) and
 26 the between participant factor was Group (Orange, Chocolate).

27

28 For the Odour Study, there was no main effect of Group ($F(1, 35)=2.34$, $p=.14$, $\eta_p^2=.06$) or
 29 Block ($F(1, 36)=.01$, $p=.94$, $\eta_p^2=.00$). There was, however, a significant main effect of Image
 30 ($F(1, 36)=5.78$, $p=.001$, $\eta_p^2=.14$). As shown in Figure 5A, participants applied greater force for
 31 Chocolate compared to Orange images. There was also a significant effect of Duration ($F(1,$

1 36)=13.81, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.28$), with greater force applied for Long compared to Short-Duration
 2 images. Contrary to the initial hypothesis, that odour exposure would influence effort for
 3 incongruent food images, there were no interaction effects with respect of the Groups ($p>.05$),
 4 indicating that exerted effort for chocolate/orange images, did not differ between Groups
 5 following Odour Exposure.

6 For the Food Study, there was no main effect of Group ($F(1, 35)=2.34$, $p=.14$, $\eta_p^2=.06$), Block
 7 ($F(1, 35)=2.75$, $p=.11$, $\eta_p^2=.07$) or Image ($F(1, 35)=2.33$, $p=.14$, $\eta_p^2=.06$). However, there was
 8 a significant three-way interaction between Group, Block and Image ($F(1,35)=7.47$, $p=.01$,
 9 $\eta_p^2=.18$). In support of the hypothesis, the chocolate group displayed a significant decrease in
 10 force applied for chocolate images from block one to block two ($p=.001$), in the absence of any
 11 decrease in effort exerted for orange images ($p=.31$), indicative of a sensory specific satiety
 12 effect (Figure 5B). The orange group showed no change in exerted effort from block-one to
 13 block-two for either Orange ($p=.32$) or Chocolate ($p=.27$) images.

14

15 *Figure 5: Standardised Grip-Force applied for each condition for (A) the Odour Study and (B)*
 16 *the Food study. Red bars represent Mean Grip-Force for block-one trials and blue bars*
 17 *represent Mean Grip-Force for block-two trials. Exerted effort did not change from block one*
 18 *to block 2 in the odour study. However, in the Food Study, the chocolate group showed a*
 19 *selective decrease in effort exerted to chocolate images from block one to block 2, in the*
 20 *absence of any change in effort exerted towards orange images. The orange group showed no*
 21 *change in effort across blocks to either image type. ** denotes sig level $<.01$. Error bars*
 22 *indicate 95% CI.*

23

24 **3.4 Forced-Choice Discrimination**

25 To determine whether images presented at the short-duration were at a subliminal level, a Chi-
 26 Squared test was conducted between Image Condition and Response Accuracy for both the
 27 Odour Study and the Food Study. For the Odour Study, the association between Image
 28 Condition and Response Accuracy was not significant, $\chi^2(2) = 4.31$, $p=.12$. Images were
 29 correctly identified 95.9% of the time (Control images 95.7%, Chocolate images 97.6%,
 30 Orange images 94.6% accuracy). Similarly, for the Food study, the association between Image
 31 Condition and Response Accuracy was not significant, $\chi^2(2) = 3.96$, $p=.14$. Overall, images

1 were correctly identified 96.1% of the time (Control images 95.9%, Chocolate images 97.6%,
2 Orange images with 94.7).

3 **3.5 Food Choice**

4 In determining whether there was an effect of Odour Exposure or Food Consumption on food
5 choice, data were analysed separately for the Odour Study and the Food Study. For the Odour
6 study, it was found that overall, 41.2% of participants chose Orange as their gift, whilst 58.8%
7 chose Chocolate as their gift. Contrary to the hypothesis, there was no significant effect of
8 Group on these selections (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 2.26, p=0.13$). For the Food Study, 59.5% of
9 participants chose Orange as their gift, whilst 40.5% chose chocolate as their gift. In line with
10 the hypothesis, there was a significant effect of Group on these selections (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 14.90,$
11 $p<.001$), with 85% of participants in the Chocolate group, choosing Orange as their gift and
12 70.6% of participants in the Orange group, choosing Chocolate as their gift, indicative of a
13 satiety effect (Figure 6).

14

15 *Figure 6: Food selections for the Odour Study (left) and Food (right) study. Red bars represent*
16 *Orange food selection and blue bars represent Chocolate food selection. As shown on the right,*
17 *in the Food Study, there was a significant association between Food group and Food selection,*
18 *in that, those in the Chocolate Group tended to choose Orange as their gift, whilst those in the*
19 *Orange Group, tended to choose Chocolate as their gift. *** denotes sig level $<.001$.*

20

4. Discussion

The aim of this study was to determine whether implicit exposure to ambient food odours influenced motivation for congruent foods, using grip-force as a measure of incentive motivation. While no significant satiety or priming effect was found following ambient odour exposure, a classic sensory specific satiety effect was observed in the food consumption experiment. That is, grip-force exerted for chocolate images declined significantly following chocolate consumption, in the absence of any decline in that exerted for orange images. Behaviourally, while odour exposure also had no impact on explicit food selection, a satiety effect was seen following food consumption, with most participants selecting the food item they hadn't consumed.

The lack of any effect of ambient odour exposure on motivation for congruent foods contrasts with previous reports of both odour priming and olfactory-specific satiety (OSS) (eg Gaillet et al 2013; Biswas & Szocs 2019). In terms of odour priming, while non-conscious, ambient odour exposure lasting between 10 to 20 minutes has been reported to influence food choice (Proserpio et al., 2019; Gaillet et al., 2013), explicit exposure for ten minutes has been reported to enhance appetite ratings (Jansen et al., 2003; Ramaekers, 2013), and increase food cue reactivity (Mas et al., 2020). While the short ambient odour exposure duration of just 5 minutes in the present study could potentially explain the null result, several recent studies have suggested that ambient odours can induce priming effects after exposure of just one minute or less (Chae et al, 2023; Biswas & Szocs; 2019), while satiety effects on food selection have been reported following two minutes (Biswas & Szocs; 2019) and five minutes or more of implicit ambient odour exposure, in both laboratory and real-world settings (Chae et al, 2023). However, our findings align with other research indicating that moderate durations of implicit ambient odour exposure may not produce changes in reported food preferences or selection (Morquecho-Campos, 2021). Taken together, while explicit odour exposure paradigms using retronasal exposure of up to five minutes, appear to reliably induce OSS effects (Fernandez et al 2014; Rolls & Rolls 1997), explicit orthonasal exposure for ten to twenty minutes appears to enhance appetite for odour-congruent foods (Jansen et al., 2003; Ramaekers, 2013). In contrast, findings regarding the effects of non-conscious ambient odour exposure on both goal priming and satiety appear to be more equivocal, underscoring the need for further research.

Previous studies exploring the effects of odour exposure on eating behaviour have utilised a range of outcome measures, including consumption behaviours, food choices, and subjective

1 rating scales (Chae et al., 2023; Morquecho-Campos, 2021; Biswas & Szocs, 2019; Proserpio
2 et al., 2019; Ramaekers et al., 2014; Gaillet et al., 2013; O'Doherty et al., 2000; Rolls & Rolls,
3 1997). In contrast, the present study used an objective measure of incentive motivation (Pool
4 et al, 2016; Berridge & Robinson, 1998) which has been established to be sensitive to the
5 detection of classic sensory-specific satiety effects (Arumae, 2019, Ziauddeen et al, 2012), as
6 shown again here in the food consumption study. Whilst similar satiety effects were not evident
7 following odour exposure, consistent with previous literature (Ziauddeen et al., 2012), fasted
8 participants in both of the present studies did display a greater level of motivation, indexed by
9 greater expended grip-force, when they were presented with food images, compared to control
10 images, and toward long-duration compared to short-duration food images. Thus, participants
11 did modulate the grip-force applied depending on the motivational salience of the visual cue
12 presented.

13
14 The fact that, in the consumption study, grip-force was only affected by chocolate and not by
15 orange consumption likely reflects the smaller number of calories consumed in this condition.
16 Participants in the chocolate condition consumed an average of 274kcal, whereas those in the
17 orange condition consumed an average of only 53.44kcal per person. In addition to the calorific
18 differences, two foods consumed in equal amounts may have distinct effects on satiety if their
19 macronutrient compositions differ, with high-protein, high-fibre and high-fat foods delivering
20 greater satiety effects than energy matched foods with lower levels of protein, fibre, and fat
21 (Astbury et al., 2010, Bertenshaw et al, 2009; Buckland et al., 2015). The decision to use non-
22 macronutrient matched food options was based on the primary goal of partially replicating and
23 extending the work of Biswas & Szocs, (2019), that directly compared indulgent (high calorie)
24 and non-indulgent (low-calorie) items. This contrasts with classic sensory-specific satiety
25 studies which typically use two high-calorie foods such as full-fat chocolate milk (Pirc, Cad,
26 Jager & Smeets, 2019), pizzas and cheesecake (Ziauddeen et al., 2012).

27 In contrast to previous grip-force studies which have reported visual stimulus presentations
28 times of 50ms or less as subliminal (Ziauddeen et al, 2012; Pessiglione et al, 2006), participants
29 in the present study were able to accurately identify all test stimuli when presented for 33ms in
30 a forced-choice discrimination task. This is consistent with the wider visual processing
31 literature which indicates that for stimuli to be considered subliminal, presentation times should
32 not exceed 16.66ms (Ionescu, 2016; Potter, Wyble & Haggmann, 2013). This perceptual
33 threshold however can be dependent on a number of factors, such as the type (picture/texture)

1 and direction (forward/backward/sandwich) of masking technique used (Wernicke & Mattler,
2 2019; Potter, Wyble & Haggmann, 2013), as well as the temporal delay (Nakamura &
3 Murakami, 2021; Harris et al, 2011; Bacon-Mace et al, 2005) and contrast (Wernicke &
4 Mattler, 2019; Harris et al, 2011; Haynes & Rees, 2005) between stimulus and mask. In the
5 present study we replicated the stimulus presentation, masking timings and techniques
6 previously reported by Ziauddeen et al (2012) whose participants performed at chance level on
7 the forced choice discrimination test of awareness. Differences in monitor refresh rates and
8 visual stimuli used could potentially explain this difference. While monitors with a refresh rate
9 of 60Hz, as used here, have been used for subliminal stimulus presentation, a higher refresh
10 rate and shorter presentation time may have been necessary with the present stimuli
11 (Baumgarten et al 2017).

12 While the primary outcome measure was incentive motivation, to be consistent with previous
13 odour priming studies, we also included a secondary food choice measure. In line with the grip
14 force findings, whilst odour exposure did not influence subsequent food reward choice, food
15 consumption did induce a satiety effect, in that participants were more likely to choose a food
16 item different to the item they had consumed during the task. The lack of effect of ambient
17 odour on food selection in the present study contrasts with previous research reporting that
18 implicit odour exposure influences food choice and intake (Chambaron et al., 2015, Gaillet et
19 al., 2013, Gaillet-Torrent et al., 2014, Proserpio et al., 2017). The method of food choice in the
20 current study was two-alternative forced-choice while previous studies have used buffets
21 (Morquecho-Campos et al, 2021), menus (Proserpio et al, 2017, Proserpio et al, 2019), as well
22 as supermarket and cafeteria settings (Biswas & Szocs, 2019), where participants have a wider
23 range of items to choose from. Forced-choice procedures are thought to offer insight into the
24 immediate motivation behind selecting a specific food product over others (Finlayson, King,
25 & Blundell, 2008), whereas selections from a wider array of choices may more strongly reflect
26 dietary habits and goals (Appelhans et al, 2017). One possible explanation for the lack of effect
27 of odour priming on food selection in the present study is timing. Here, approximately 30
28 minutes elapsed between odour exposure and food-choice selection, whilst participants in other
29 studies selected food options either during or immediately following odour exposure (Proserpio
30 et al, 2019; Biswas & Szocs, 2019; Gaillet et al, 2013). Also, though participants were
31 instructed not to consume food for three hours prior to attending the testing session, and we
32 verbally confirmed their adherence to this rule, no measurements of subjective hunger were
33 taken during the study. Given physiological state is a significant determinant of expended

1 motivational effort (Pirc et al, 2019) and food selection (Koster, 2009), this should be addressed
2 in future priming studies. However, the fact participants in both studies exerted greater effort
3 for food stimuli compared to control stimuli during block one indicates that lack of
4 motivational drive does not underlie our failure to observe an odour priming effect.

5 One of the biggest challenges in olfactory priming studies is control of stimulus concentration
6 (Smeets & Dijksterhuis, 2014). For priming effects to occur the intensity of the odour should
7 not be high enough to be consciously perceived, though not so low that it cannot be detected at
8 all (Loersch and Payne 2011; Morquecho-Campos et al, 2021). Whilst some studies do attempt
9 to quantify the intensity of the odour e.g., below 50 on a 0-100 VAS (Morquecho-Campos et
10 al, 2021; Proserpio et al, 2019), others merely state that intensity was low (Chae et al, 2023;
11 Mas et al., 2019; Gaillet-Torrent et al, 2014; Gaillet et al, 2013; Coelho et al, 2009). In
12 preparation for the present study, two pilot tests were conducted. The protocol used resulted in
13 intensity ratings of approximately 7.68, on a 0-10 VAS, when dispersed in the test rooms, while
14 odours were not reliably detected when attention was not directed towards them. In the study
15 itself, only two participants reported noticing an odour prior to debriefing. Taken together, it
16 seems unlikely our stimuli were too low in intensity to have a priming effect or so high that the
17 aims of the study were obvious to participants. Future, cross-laboratory collaborations that
18 determine best practice guidelines for odour dispersal, quantification and reporting would be
19 beneficial to the field. For example, room size, air temperature as well as air flow and air
20 exchange rates will impact odour concentration making precise replication of protocols
21 challenging.

22
23 The present study does come with limitations, for example, the decision to expose participants
24 to the ambient odour for a duration of five minutes was based on varying effects reported in
25 previous studies, in which five minutes of retronasal exposure induces satiety effects (Rolls &
26 Rolls, 1997), while ten to twenty minutes of orthonasal exposure increases appetite (Jansen et
27 al., 2003; Ramaekers, 2013) and primes food choices (Proserpio et al., 2019; Gaillet-Torrent et
28 al., 2014). Biswas and Szocs (2019) found priming effects with thirty seconds but reduced food
29 selection with two minutes, whereas Morquecho-Campos (2021) saw no effects with three
30 minutes. Thus, our study explored an intermediate five-minute exposure duration that has
31 revealed both priming and satiety effects (Biswas & Szocs, 2019; Rolls & Rolls, 1997). Due to
32 the null findings following odour exposure, future research should look incorporate both long
33 and short exposure times in order to determine any differing effects. The use of indulgent

1 (Chocolate) and non-indulgent (Orange) odours were again, chosen for replication of Biswas
2 and Szocs (2019), with the specific matching of odours to images, replicating the methods of
3 Ziauddeen et al., (2012), where foods consumed matched those used within the grip-force task.
4 Much previous research (Mas et al, 2020; Proserpio et al, 2019; Chambaron (2015); Gaillet-
5 Torrent et al, 2014; Ramaekers et al, 2014; Zoon et al, 2016), though not all (Chae et al, 2023;
6 Coelho et al, 2009), has opted for food categories matched for nutritional content (high/low
7 energy) or food groups (sweet/savoury), as opposed to odours being directly congruent to
8 images. In order to try and replicate previous priming effects, odours and images could be
9 separated into these categories (for example, multiple savoury food images could be used
10 alongside a savoury odour) in order to determine the impact of (sweet/savoury) odours on
11 motivation for congruent foods. While the present study was powered to detect small-medium
12 effects with 85% power, it could be that it was underpowered to detect what are likely to be
13 small effects of odour exposure on incentive motivation. Therefore, future studies should utilise
14 larger samples.

15 In conclusion, this study successfully replicated previous reports of sensory specific satiety
16 effects on incentive motivation as measured using grip-force. These effects were accompanied
17 by changes in food selection behaviour. In contrast, there was no effect of ambient odour
18 exposure on incentive motivation nor on food selection. This contrasts with previous reports
19 of odour priming following ambient odour exposure (Morquecho-Campos, 2021; Proserpio et
20 al., 2019; Gaillet-Torrent et al., 2014) and recent reports of sensory specific satiety effects on
21 food selection, in both real world and laboratory settings (Biswas & Szocs, 2019). Further
22 research is needed to determine whether stimulus level factors, such as timing, intensity or
23 character of the food odours differentially affect behaviour (Abeywickrema, Oey, Peng, 2022;
24 Smeets & Dijksterhuis, 2014). However, inconsistent findings, along with other null effects
25 (Morquecho-Campos, 2021; Zoon et al, 2016) highlight issues of reproducibility of the odour
26 priming literature (Cesario, 2014) and reinforce the need for detailed methodological reporting
27 and replication.

28

1 Funding

2 This work was supported by a Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council/Glaxo
3 Smith Kline industrial CASE studentship awarded to RH.

5 Contributions

6 **Rachel Hagan:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Data
7 Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Visualization. **Ralph Pawling:** Methodology, Data
8 Curation, Writing - Reviewing and Editing, Supervision. **Francis McGlone:** Writing -
9 Reviewing and Editing, Funding acquisition. **Susannah Walker:** Conceptualization,
10 Methodology, Writing - Reviewing and Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

12 Conflict of interest

13 RH.'s PhD studentship was partly funded by GlaxoSmithKline (G.S.K). G.S.K had no role in
14 the design, analysis, or decision to publish this study.

15

- 1 Abeywickrema, S., Oey, I. and Peng, M. (2022) ‘Sensory specific satiety or appetite?
2 investigating effects of retronasally-introduced aroma and taste cues on subsequent real-
3 life snack intake’, *Food Quality and Preference*, 100, p. 104612.
4 doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2022.104612.
- 5 Andersen, T., Byrne, D.V. and Wang, Q.J. (2023) ‘Imagined eating – an investigation of
6 priming and sensory-specific satiety’, *Appetite*, 182, p. 106421.
7 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2022.106421.
- 8 Appelhans, B.M. et al. (2017) ‘To what extent do food purchases reflect shoppers’ diet quality
9 and nutrient intake?’, *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*,
10 14(1). doi:10.1186/s12966-017-0502-2.
- 11 Arumäe, K., Kreegipuu, K. and Vainik, U. (2019) ‘Assessing the overlap between three
12 measures of food reward’, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00883.
- 13 Bacon-Macé, N. et al. (2005) ‘The time course of visual processing: Backward masking and
14 natural scene categorisation’, *Vision Research*, 45(11), pp. 1459–1469.
15 doi:10.1016/j.visres.2005.01.004.
- 16 Balleine, B. W., & Dickinson, A. (1998). Goal-directed instrumental action: Contingency and
17 incentive learning and their cortical substrates. *Neuropharmacology*, 37(4–5), 407–419.
18 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3908\(98\)00033-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3908(98)00033-1)
- 19 Baumgarten, T.J. et al. (2017) ‘Subliminal stimuli modulate somatosensory perception
20 rhythmically and provide evidence for discrete perception’, *Scientific Reports*, 7(1).
21 doi:10.1038/srep43937.
- 22 Berridge, K.C. (1991) ‘Modulation of taste affect by hunger, caloric satiety, and sensory-
23 specific satiety in the rat’, *Appetite*, 16(2), pp. 103–120. doi:10.1016/0195-
24 6663(91)90036-r.
- 25 Berridge, K. C., Venier, I. L., & Robinson, T. E. (1989). Taste reactivity analysis of 6-
26 hydroxydopamine-induced aphagia: implications for arousal and anhedonia hypotheses
27 of dopamine function. *Behavioral neuroscience*, 103(1), 36–45.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1037//0735-7044.103.1.36>

- 1 Biswas, D. and Szocs, C. (2019) ‘The smell of healthy choices: Cross-modal sensory
2 compensation effects of ambient scent on food purchases’, *Journal of Marketing*
3 *Research*, 56(1), pp. 123–141. doi:10.1177/0022243718820585.
- 4 Chae, B. et al. (2023) ‘The lasting smell of temptation: Counteractive effects of indulgent food
5 scents’, *Journal of Business Research*, 155, p. 113437.
6 doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113437.
- 7 Coelho, J.S. et al. (2009) ‘Wake up and smell the cookies. effects of olfactory food-cue
8 exposure in restrained and unrestrained eaters’, *Appetite*, 52(2), pp. 517–520.
9 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2008.10.008.
- 10 Doty, R. L., Shaman, P., Kimmelman, C. P., & Dann, M. S. (1984). University of Pennsylvania
11 Smell Identification Test: A rapid quantitative olfactory function test for the clinic. *The*
12 *Laryngoscope*, 94(2), 176–178. <https://doi.org/10.1288/00005537-198402000-00004>
- 13 Fernandez, P., Bensafi, M., Rouby, C., & Giboreau, A. (2013). Does olfactory specific satiety
14 take place in a natural setting?. *Appetite*, 60(1), 1–4.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2012.10.006>
- 16 Finlayson, G., King, N., & Blundell, J. (2008). The role of implicit wanting in relation to
17 explicit liking and wanting for food: Implications for appetite control. *Appetite*, 50(1),
18 120–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2007.06.007>
- 19 Gaillet, M. et al. (2013) ‘Priming effects of an olfactory food cue on subsequent food-related
20 behaviour’, *Food Quality and Preference*, 30(2), pp. 274–281.
21 doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2013.06.008.
- 22 Gaillet-Torrent, M. et al. (2014) ‘Impact of a non-attentively perceived odour on subsequent
23 food choices’, *Appetite*, 76, pp. 17–22. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2014.01.009.
- 24 Gottfried, J., O’Doherty, J., & Dolan, R. (2003). Encoding Predictive Reward Value in Human
25 Amygdala and Orbitofrontal Cortex. *Science* 301,1104-1107.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1087919>
- 27 Harris, J.A., Wu, C.-T. and Woldorff, M.G. (2011) ‘Sandwich masking eliminates both visual
28 awareness of faces and face-specific brain activity through a feedforward mechanism’,
29 *Journal of Vision*, 11(7), pp. 3–3. doi:10.1167/11.7.3.

- 1 Havermans, R. C., Janssen, T., Giesen, J. C. A. H., Roefs, A., & Jansen, A. (2009). Food liking,
2 food wanting, and sensory-specific satiety. *Appetite*, 52(1), 222–225.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.09.020>
- 4 Haynes, J.-D. and Rees, G. (2010) ‘Predicting the orientation of invisible stimuli from activity
5 in human primary visual cortex’, *Journal of Vision*, 5(8), pp. 221–221.
6 [doi:10.1167/5.8.221](https://doi.org/10.1167/5.8.221).
- 7 Hetherington, M. M., & Rolls, B. J. (1996). Sensory-specific satiety: Theoretical frameworks
8 and central characteristics. In E. D. Capaldi (Ed.), *Why we eat what we eat: The*
9 *psychology of eating* (pp. 267–290). American Psychological Association.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1037/10291-010>
- 11 Jansen, A. et al. (2003) ‘Overweight children overeat after exposure to food cues’, *Eating*
12 *Behaviors*, 4(2), pp. 197–209. [doi:10.1016/s1471-0153\(03\)00011-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1471-0153(03)00011-4).
- 13 Kendig, M.D. et al. (2013) ‘Chronic restricted access to 10% sucrose solution in adolescent
14 and young adult rats impairs spatial memory and alters sensitivity to outcome
15 devaluation’, *Physiology & Behavior*, 120, pp. 164–172.
16 [doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2013.08.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2013.08.012).
- 17 Köster, E.P. (2009) ‘Diversity in the determinants of food choice: A psychological
18 perspective’, *Food Quality and Preference*, 20(2), pp. 70–82.
19 [doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2007.11.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2007.11.002).
- 20 Loersch, C. and Payne, B.K. (2011) ‘The situated inference model’, *Perspectives on*
21 *Psychological Science*, 6(3), pp. 234–252. [doi:10.1177/1745691611406921](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611406921).
- 22 Mas, M. et al. (2020) ‘Implicit food odour priming effects on reactivity and inhibitory control
23 towards foods’, *PLOS ONE*, 15(6). [doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0228830](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228830).
- 24 Mela, D.J. (2006) ‘Eating for pleasure or just wanting to eat? reconsidering sensory hedonic
25 responses as a driver of obesity’, *Appetite*, 47(1), pp. 10–17.
26 [doi:10.1016/j.appet.2006.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2006.02.006).
- 27 Morquecho-Campos, P., de Graaf, K. and Boesveldt, S. (2021) ‘Olfactory priming for eating
28 behavior – the influence of non-conscious exposure to food odors on specific appetite,
29 food preferences and Intake’, *Food Quality and Preference*, 90, p. 104156.
30 [doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104156](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104156).

- 1 Myers, K.P. (2017) 'Sensory-specific satiety is intact in rats made obese on a high-fat high-
2 sugar choice diet', *Appetite*, 112, pp. 196–200. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2017.01.013.
- 3 Nakamura, T. and Murakami, I. (2021) 'Common-onset masking terminates the temporal
4 evolution of orientation repulsion', *Journal of Vision*, 21(8), p. 5. doi:10.1167/jov.21.8.5.
- 5 O'Doherty, J. et al. (2000) 'Sensory-specific satiety-related olfactory activation of the human
6 orbitofrontal cortex', *NeuroReport*, 11(2), pp. 399–403. doi:10.1097/00001756-
7 200002070-00035.
- 8 Pessiglione, M. et al. (2006) 'Dopamine-dependent prediction errors underpin reward-seeking
9 behaviour in humans', *Nature*, 442(7106), pp. 1042–1045. doi:10.1038/nature05051.
- 10 Pirc, M. et al. (2019) 'Grab to eat! eating motivation dynamics measured by effort exertion
11 depend on Hunger State', *Food Quality and Preference*, 78, p. 103741.
12 doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2019.103741.
- 13 Pool, E. et al. (2016) 'Measuring wanting and liking from animals to humans: A systematic
14 review', *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 63, pp. 124–142.
15 doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.01.006.
- 16 Potter, M.C. et al. (2013) 'Detecting meaning in RSVP at 13 ms per picture', *Attention,
17 Perception, Psychophysics*, 76(2), pp. 270–279. doi:10.3758/s13414-013-0605-z.
- 18 Proserpio, C. et al. (2019) 'Ambient odor exposure affects food intake and sensory specific
19 appetite in obese women', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00007.
- 20 Ramaekers, M.G. et al. (2013) 'Odors: Appetizing or satiating? development of appetite during
21 odor exposure over time', *International Journal of Obesity*, 38(5), pp. 650–656.
22 doi:10.1038/ijo.2013.143.
- 23 Reichelt, A.C., Morris, M.J. and Westbrook, R.F. (2014) 'Cafeteria diet impairs expression of
24 sensory-specific satiety and stimulus-outcome learning', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5.
25 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00852.
- 26 Robinson, E. et al. (2014) 'I'm watching you. awareness that food consumption is being
27 monitored is a demand characteristic in eating-behaviour experiments', *Appetite*, 83, pp.
28 19–25. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2014.07.029.

- 1 Robinson, T. E., & Berridge, K. C. (2003). Addiction. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 25–
2 53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145237>
- 3 Rogers, P.J. and Hardman, C.A. (2015) ‘Food reward. what it is and how to measure it’,
4 *Appetite*, 90, pp. 1–15. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2015.02.032.
- 5 Rolls, B. et al. (1981) ‘Sensory specific satiety in man’, *Physiology & Behavior*, 27(1), pp.
6 137–142. doi:10.1016/0031-9384(81)90310-3.
- 7 Rolls, E. T., Murzi, E., Yaxley, S., Thorpe, S. J., & Simpson, S. J. (1986). Sensory-specific
8 satiety: Food-specific reduction in responsiveness of ventral forebrain neurons after
9 feeding in the monkey. *Brain Research*, 368(1), 79–86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-8993(86)91044-9)
10 [8993\(86\)91044-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-8993(86)91044-9)
- 11 Rolls E. & Rolls, J. (1997) ‘Olfactory sensory-specific satiety in humans’, *Physiology &*
12 *Behavior*, 61(3), pp. 461–473. doi:10.1016/s0031-9384(96)00464-7.
- 13 Rolls, E., Rolls, B., & Rowe, E. (1983). Sensory-specific and motivation-specific satiety for
14 the sight and taste of food and water in man. *Physiology & Behavior*, 30(2), 185–192.
15 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384\(83\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9384(83)90003-3)
- 16 Saelens, B. E., & Epstein, L. H. (1996). Reinforcing value of food in obese and non-obese
17 women. *Appetite*, 27(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1006/appe.1996.0032>
- 18 Smeets, M.A. and Dijksterhuis, G.B. (2014) ‘Smelly primes – when olfactory primes do or do
19 not work’, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00096.
- 20 Stafford, L. D. (2016). Olfactory Specific Satiety depends on degree of association
21 between odour and food. *Appetite*, 98, 63-66.
- 22 Temple, J.L. (2016) ‘Behavioral sensitization of the reinforcing value of Food: What Food and
23 drugs have in common’, *Preventive Medicine*, 92, pp. 90–99.
24 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.06.022.
- 25 Velázquez-Sánchez, C. et al. (2015) ‘Seeking behavior, place conditioning, and resistance to
26 conditioned suppression of feeding in rats intermittently exposed to palatable food.’,
27 *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 129(2), pp. 219–224. doi:10.1037/bne0000042.
- 28 Wernicke, M. and Mattler, U. (2019) ‘Masking procedures can influence priming effects
29 besides their effects on conscious perception’, *Consciousness and Cognition*, 71, pp. 92–
30 108. doi:10.1016/j.concog.2019.03.009.


- 1 Zepeda-Ruiz, W.A. et al. (2022) 'Exposure to a hypercaloric diet produces long lasting changes
2 in motivation', *Behavioural Processes*, 202, p. 104737.
3 doi:10.1016/j.beproc.2022.104737.
- 4 Ziauddeen, H. et al. (2012) 'Food images engage subliminal motivation to seek food',
5 *International Journal of Obesity*, 36(9), pp. 1245–1247. doi:10.1038/ijo.2011.239.
- 6 Ziauddeen, H. et al. (2014) 'Studying food reward and motivation in humans', *Journal of*
7 *Visualized Experiments [Preprint]*, (85). doi:10.3791/51281-v.
- 8 Zoon, H.F.A. et al. (2016) 'Food odours direct specific appetite', *Appetite*, 101, p. 220.
9 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2016.02.061.

A

Chocolate




Orange



Control




Long




Short


B

Mask






A




B




A

Odour Study




B

Food Study




A

Odour Study




B

Food Study



A


Odour Study



B

Food Study

Group
■ Orange
■ Chocolate



1 Ethics Statement

2 The research was conducted following the ethical principles stated in the Declaration of
3 Helsinki. Participants gave informed consent before taking part and all data was collected
4 anonymously. The experimental protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee at Liverpool
5 John Moores University (19/NSP/062).

Journal Pre-proof

1 **Conflict of interest**

2 RH.'s PhD studentship was partly funded by GlaxoSmithKline (G.S.K). G.S.K had no role in the design,
3 analysis, or decision to publish this study.

4

Journal Pre-proof