Selection and Performance of Sensory Panelists: A Comprehensive Review of Factors Influencing Sensory Evaluation Outcomes

Prachi[1], Neelesh Kumar Maurya [2]*

[1]B.Sc. Students, Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Allied Health Science, Sharda University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Allied Health Science, Sharda University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India.
*Corresponding author: Neelesh Kumar Maurya, Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Allied Health Science, Sharda University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Abstract

Sensory evaluation is a critical component in the development, refinement, and quality control of consumer products, particularly in food, beverage, cosmetics, and fragrance industries. This review provides a comprehensive exploration of sensory panelist selection criteria and the several factors that influence sensory measurements, aiming to enhance the reliability and validity of sensory data. Panelist selection involves assessing sensory acuity, availability, and reliability, and encompasses a diverse range of panel types, including trained, expert, and consumer panels. Ensuring panelist consistency and sensitivity is crucial for producing reliable results, with factors such as age, health, and cultural background playing a significant role in sensory perception. This review also examines psychological, physiological, and environmental influences on sensory measurements, highlighting the impact of expectations, prior experiences, fatigue, mood, and testing conditions like lighting, temperature, and humidity. Effective selection, training, and control over these variables are essential to achieving high-quality sensory evaluations. The findings underscore the importance of refining sensory evaluation protocols to minimize bias and enhance data accuracy, thereby supporting better-informed product development and consumer satisfaction strategies. Future research should focus on standardizing sensitivity assessment methods and developing strategies to reduce environmental impact on sensory measurements.

1. Introduction

Sensory Evaluation: Significance in Product Development and Quality Control

Sensory evaluation plays an indispensable role in the development and refinement of consumer products, particularly in the food, beverage, cosmetics, and fragrance industries. By assessing products based on sensory attributes such as taste, aroma, texture, and appearance, sensory evaluation bridges the gap between objective measurements and subjective human experiences, thus enabling producers to align their products closely with consumer expectations and preferences (Lawless & Heymann, 2010). The significance of sensory evaluation extends beyond product development and into areas such as quality control and marketing, where understanding sensory perceptions helps refine branding, enhance quality, and ensure customer satisfaction (Muñoz, 2018). For instance, sensory insights guide product reformulation and aid in benchmarking products against competitors, which can be especially critical in highly competitive sectors like food and beverages (Stone & Sidel, 2004).

With consumer demands continuously evolving, manufacturers are increasingly reliant on sensory data to fine-tune product characteristics that meet or exceed consumer expectations. Thus, sensory evaluation not only improves product quality and consistency but also fosters consumer loyalty. Accurate sensory data enables businesses to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their offerings, leading to better decision-making across various stages of product lifecycle management (Prescott, 2017).

Purpose of the Review

The effectiveness of sensory evaluation, however, is heavily contingent on the panelists involved in the process. Panelists, the human evaluators responsible for assessing sensory characteristics, are central to the reliability of sensory data. The accuracy of sensory evaluations relies on the ability of panelists to perceive and consistently evaluate specific sensory attributes. This review paper aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the selection criteria for sensory panelists and examine the psychological, physiological, and environmental factors that influence sensory measurements. By consolidating existing research, this review provides insights into the optimal selection and performance of sensory panelists, offering guidelines for researchers and practitioners in the design of robust sensory evaluation protocols.

Criteria for Selecting Sensory Panelists

Selecting appropriate sensory panelists is a foundational step in the sensory evaluation process. Panelists are chosen based on their acuity in perceiving sensory attributes, consistency, and availability. The sensory acuity of panelists ensures they can accurately distinguish product differences, while consistency in responses allows for repeatable, reliable measurements. Effective panelists should demonstrate a strong ability to focus, diligence, and resilience against biases that might arise from prior experiences or expectations (Meilgaard, Civille, & Carr, 2007, Luo et al., 2024). Additionally, availability and commitment to participate in repeated evaluation sessions are crucial to ensure continuity in testing, particularly in longitudinal studies or quality control contexts (Stone & Sidel, 2004).

Types of Sensory Panelists

Sensory evaluations typically involve three main types of panelists: trained panelists, expert panelists, and consumer panels, each bringing unique strengths to the evaluation process.

1. **Trained Panelists**: These individuals undergo rigorous training to recognize and accurately assess specific sensory attributes. Training involves honing the panelists' abilities to identify and describe attributes with precision, following standardized procedures and criteria (Lawless & Heymann, 2010). Trained panels are ideal for difference tests, where subtle distinctions between product samples are identified. For example, in the food industry, trained panelists can detect minor variations in flavor or texture, which can be instrumental in product reformulation efforts (Muñoz, 2018).

2. **Expert Panelists**: Unlike trained panelists, expert panelists possess specialized knowledge and experience in a particular sensory field, such as wine or coffee tasting. Experts contribute deep insights and nuanced feedback, which can be valuable in assessing premium or niche products. However, experts may also introduce subjective biases due to personal preferences or familiarity with the product category (Meilgaard et al., 2007).

3. **Consumer Panels**: Consumer panels consist of general consumers who represent the target demographic for the product. They provide insights into product acceptability and potential market performance. Although they may lack the technical vocabulary of trained or expert panelists, consumer panelists offer critical perspectives on product appeal, preferences, and purchase intentions (Prescott, 2017).

Factors Influencing Sensory Measurements

Psychological Factors

Psychological factors, including expectations, previous experiences, and cognitive biases, significantly influence sensory perceptions and panelist responses. Studies show that panelists' prior experiences with a brand or product can create anticipatory biases, altering their sensory evaluations (Deliza & MacFie, 1996). Cognitive biases, such as the halo effect—where a positive perception of one attribute enhances perception of others—can further impact objectivity in assessments. Understanding and managing these biases is critical for obtaining accurate and reliable data (King & Meiselman, 2010, Ni et al., 2024). Training panelists to approach evaluations with an unbiased mindset and implementing blind testing methods are common strategies to mitigate these psychological influences.

Physiological Factors

The physiological state of panelists can affect their sensory perceptions, making it a crucial consideration in panelist selection and management. Key physiological factors include age, fatigue, and mood.

1. **Age**: Sensory acuity, particularly in taste and smell, often declines with age, potentially affecting the ability of older panelists to perceive subtle differences in products (Murphy et al., 2002). Sensory evaluations that require a high degree of acuity may benefit from selecting younger or middle-aged panelists.

2. **Fatigue**: Physical or mental fatigue can dull sensory perception, compromising the reliability of evaluations. Fatigue is especially relevant in long or repetitive testing sessions, where panelists' responses may become less consistent over time (Stone & Sidel, 2004).

3. **Mood**: Emotional states, such as stress, happiness, or anxiety, can alter sensory sensitivity, impacting panelists' responses. Studies have found that positive emotions enhance sensory perceptions, whereas stress or anxiety can lead to decreased sensitivity (King & Meiselman, 2010).

Environmental Factors

External environmental factors, such as lighting, temperature, and humidity, can significantly impact sensory evaluations.

1. **Lighting**: Lighting conditions can alter visual assessments, influencing perceptions of color, size, and shape. Proper lighting control is essential, particularly when visual attributes are central to evaluation criteria (Meilgaard et al., 2007).

2. **Temperature**: Both the ambient temperature and the temperature of the product being evaluated can influence taste, smell, and texture perceptions. For instance, certain flavors are more pronounced at warmer temperatures, while cold temperatures may dull taste sensations (Lawless & Heymann, 2010).

3. **Humidity**: Humidity levels can impact olfactory and tactile sensations, affecting attributes like smell and texture. Controlling humidity in the testing environment can help maintain consistent sensory perceptions across panelists (Stone & Sidel, 2004).

The selection and performance of sensory panelists are pivotal to the reliability of sensory evaluations. By considering criteria such as sensory acuity, consistency, and availability, alongside managing psychological, physiological, and environmental factors, researchers and practitioners can design more effective and accurate sensory evaluation protocols. The insights gained from this review emphasize the need for comprehensive training programs, controlled testing environments, and diverse panel representation to enhance the quality and applicability of sensory data in product development.

2. Selection of Sensory Panelists

The selection of sensory panelists is critical to the success of sensory evaluations, influencing the accuracy, consistency, and relevance of results in product development and quality assessment. The evaluation of sensory attributes, such as taste, texture, aroma, and appearance, requires panelists who can reliably detect, recognize, and quantify these attributes. Selecting panelists who meet specific criteria ensures that results reflect true product qualities and consumer acceptability (Lawless & Heymann, 2010). This section discusses the criteria for selecting panelists, the distinct types of panelists used in sensory studies, the importance of panelist consistency and sensitivity, and the factors that impact their performance.

2.1 Criteria for Selecting Sensory Panelists

Sensory panelists play a pivotal role in evaluating sensory attributes by translating objective characteristics into human perceptual terms. Sensory evaluation relies heavily on human senses, making panelists essential in determining product qualities and identifying any inconsistencies that could affect consumer acceptance (Meilgaard, Civille, & Carr, 2007).

Key Selection Criteria:

1. **Acuity in Sensory Perception**: Panelists should possess acute sensory perception, allowing them to detect subtle differences in sensory characteristics, which is critical for precise assessments (Lawless & Heymann, 2010).

2. **Availability and Reliability**: Consistent availability is important for longitudinal studies and repeatability. Reliable attendance also ensures data continuity and integrity (Muñoz, 2018).

3. **Ability to Follow Instructions**: Panelists must be able to follow instructions closely to minimize variability in sensory ratings and improve data reliability (Stone & Sidel, 2004).

4. **Lack of Bias**: Selection criteria include screening for panelists without strong biases toward or against certain products, as these biases can skew results (Drake, 2007).

The selection of effective panelists, therefore, is foundational to sensory evaluation, directly impacting the quality of data collected.

2.2 Types of Panelists

Distinct types of panelists serve distinct purposes in sensory evaluations, depending on the study's goals, the complexity of the attributes being evaluated, and the type of product involved. The three primary types of sensory panelists are **trained panelists**, **expert panelists**, and **consumer panelists**.

Trained Panelists:
Trained panelists receive systematic training to identify and describe specific sensory attributes with accuracy and consistency. According to Lawless and Heymann (2010), trained panels are essential for evaluations that require detailed, objective data, such as product formulation adjustments and quality control. Training enables panelists to develop a shared understanding of the attributes under assessment, reducing inter-individual variability and increasing the reliability of evaluations.

Expert Panelists:
Expert panelists possess extensive knowledge or experience in a specific sensory field. They are often used in highly specialized evaluations, such as wine or coffee tasting, where their expertise provides valuable insight into subtle characteristics that might be challenging for untrained individuals to detect (Prescott, 2017). While expert panelists bring a depth of knowledge, their evaluations can sometimes lack the general consumer perspective, potentially limiting the applicability of their feedback to the broader market (Stone & Sidel, 2004).

Consumer Panels:
Consumer panels are composed of individuals from the target market, providing feedback that reflects real-world consumer preferences. This type of panel is crucial in consumer acceptance studies, which aim to predict market success based on consumer reactions to sensory attributes (Meiselman, 2013). While consumer panels lack the technical vocabulary of trained or expert panels, they offer insights into product appeal, acceptance, and purchasing intent, making them essential for market-oriented product development (Muñoz, 2018).

Each panelist type contributes unique insights, and the selection of panelist type depends on the objectives of the sensory study. For example, while trained panels are optimal for quality control, consumer panels are indispensable for understanding market preferences.

2.3 Importance of Panelist Consistency and Sensitivity

Consistency
Consistency in panelist responses is critical to generating reliable, reproducible sensory data. Inconsistencies among panelists, whether due to personal biases, fatigue, or external factors, can lead to variability in sensory ratings, undermining the accuracy of results (Lawless & Heymann, 2010). By using calibrated scales and frequent training sessions, trained panels can maintain consistent evaluation standards across multiple sessions.

Sensitivity
Sensitivity refers to a panelist's ability to detect subtle differences in sensory attributes, a principal factor for accurate sensory evaluations. High sensitivity allows panelists to perceive minor changes in flavor, aroma, or texture, which may be relevant to product quality or formulation (Meilgaard et al., 2007). Panelists with high sensory acuity improve the detection of small variations that may affect product quality or consumer acceptance.

Sensory sensitivity and consistency are vital for precise, actionable data, making them essential considerations when selecting and training panelists. High sensitivity is particularly important in product testing where minute attribute differences can affect consumer satisfaction and market acceptance.

2.4 Factors Affecting Panelist Performance

The effectiveness of sensory evaluations can be compromised by several factors related to panelists' age, health, and cultural background, each influencing perception in distinct ways.

Age

As individuals age, their sensory capabilities often decline, particularly in taste and smell. Research indicates that the sensitivity to certain flavors, such as sweetness and bitterness, decreases with age, impacting older panelists' ability to evaluate products accurately (Murphy et al., 2002). This age-related sensory decline necessitates age-diverse panels or targeted training to ensure that product evaluations reflect accurate sensory perceptions across demographics (Delwiche, 2004).

Health

Health conditions such as allergies, sensory impairments, and illnesses can affect sensory acuity, limiting panelists' ability to perform consistently (Murray & Delahunty, 2000). For instance, anosmia, or the loss of smell, may severely impair a panelist's ability to evaluate aroma-based products accurately. Screening for health issues that affect sensory performance ensures that panelists are physically capable of participating in evaluations effectively (Muñoz, 2018).

Cultural Background

Cultural differences play a significant role in shaping sensory perception and preferences. Diverse cultures may have varying tolerance levels for certain flavors or textures, impacting panelists' feedback (Prescott, 2017). Including culturally diverse panelists can help capture a broad spectrum of consumer responses, especially for products intended for global markets. Cultural background influences flavor perception, meaning culturally diverse panels provide more comprehensive, inclusive data.

The selection and performance of sensory panelists play a critical role in achieving accurate and meaningful sensory evaluation outcomes. Selecting panelists with keen sensory acuity, consistent availability, and an absence of biases is essential to obtaining reliable results. Each type of panelist, whether trained, expert, or consumer, offers unique insights valuable to the sensory evaluation process. Additionally, ensuring panelist consistency and sensitivity, alongside considering factors such as age, health, and cultural background, can significantly enhance the accuracy and reliability of sensory evaluations. Future research should focus on developing standardized methods for panelist selection and training, along with strategies to mitigate the influence of personal and environmental factors on sensory performance. The effective selection and training of sensory panelists not only enhances the quality of sensory data but also supports product development processes that are aligned with consumer preferences and expectations.

3. Factors Influencing Sensory Measurements

Sensory evaluation is a complex process influenced by multiple factors, particularly those related to psychological, physiological, and environmental elements. Understanding these influences is crucial for obtaining accurate sensory data, as each factor can significantly impact panelist responses, thus shaping the sensory profile of a product (Lawless & Heymann, 2010). This section reviews these factors, emphasizing the role of psychological expectations, physiological conditions, and environmental settings in shaping sensory measurements.

3.1 Psychological Factors

Psychological factors play a vital role in sensory evaluation by affecting how panelists perceive and interpret sensory attributes. **Expectations** are one of the most influential psychological elements. Research demonstrates that a panelist's prior knowledge or assumptions about a product can influence their sensory experiences, often resulting in biased evaluations (Cardello & Sawyer, 1992). For instance, labeling a product as "premium" can lead to more favorable sensory ratings, regardless of the product's actual quality (Deliza & MacFie, 1996).

Previous experiences also shape sensory evaluations, as familiarity with certain flavors or textures can affect perception. For example, individuals who have frequently consumed a specific type of cheese may rate similar cheeses more favorably due to taste familiarity, creating a positive bias (Meiselman, 2013). Cognitive biases, such as the **halo effect**, where a specific product attribute (e.g., color or aroma) positively or negatively influences other perceived attributes, are also prevalent. These biases can lead to skewed data, particularly if panelists are aware of a brand or have pre-existing opinions about a product category (King et al., 2010).

In sensory evaluation, understanding these psychological factors is critical for designing protocols that minimize their impact. Methods such as blinding samples, masking brand names, and using neutral descriptions can help mitigate expectation biases.

Incorporating these strategies ensures that panelists' evaluations are based on sensory properties alone, enhancing the validity of sensory data.

3.2 Physiological Factors

Physiological factors, including age, fatigue, and mood, are important in sensory evaluation, as they affect the physical mechanisms underlying taste, smell, and other sensory perceptions.

Age is a well-documented factor in sensory decline. Research indicates that taste and smell abilities tend to decrease with age, impacting the intensity and accuracy of sensory perception (Murphy et al., 2002). This decline can make older adults less sensitive to certain flavors, such as sweet or salty tastes, and olfactory cues. Consequently, age-related changes in sensory abilities must be accounted for in panelist selection, particularly when testing products intended for a broad demographic (Mojet et al., 2003).

Fatigue both physical and mental—also significantly impacts sensory evaluations. Long or repetitive testing sessions can lead to panelist fatigue, reducing diligence and increasing the risk of errors in evaluation (Stone & Sidel, 2004). Physical fatigue affects the senses directly by reducing sensitivity, while mental fatigue can decrease cognitive focus, making it more difficult to accurately assess subtle sensory differences (King & Meiselman, 2010). For optimal sensory outcomes, it is essential to structure sessions to minimize fatigue by incorporating breaks or limiting the number of samples per session.

Mood is another crucial factor influencing sensory perception. Emotional states such as stress, anxiety, or happiness can alter sensory sensitivity and bias evaluation outcomes. Studies suggest that positive emotions may enhance sensory perceptions, leading to more favorable evaluations, while negative emotions can dampen sensory experiences, resulting in less favorable evaluations (King & Meiselman, 2010). Managing panelists' emotional states through a relaxed testing environment or pre-evaluation protocols can help reduce mood-related biases.

3.3 Environmental Factors

Environmental factors, such as lighting, temperature, and humidity, can alter sensory experiences, making the control of these conditions a key aspect of accurate sensory evaluations (Li et al., 2024).

Lighting is critical in sensory testing, especially for visual assessments. Research shows that the intensity and quality of lighting can affect how colors and textures are perceived, potentially impacting panelists' evaluations (Meilgaard et al., 2007). Bright lighting, for example, may exaggerate colors, while dim lighting may make it difficult to distinguish subtle visual details. Ensuring consistent, neutral lighting across evaluations is necessary for accurate visual assessments.

Temperature both testing room and the product significantly influences sensory perceptions, particularly for taste and aroma. Studies indicate that warmer temperatures often intensify flavors and aromas, while cooler temperatures may dull these sensory attributes (Baryłko-Pikielna et al., 2014). Therefore, controlling temperature within the testing environment is essential to prevent external variations from affecting sensory outcomes.

Humidity also impacts sensory evaluations, particularly for food products where moisture plays a role in texture and aroma. High humidity levels can alter the perceived freshness or crispness of certain products, such as snacks or baked goods, while low humidity can dry out samples, affecting their flavor and texture (Lawless & Heymann, 2010). Controlling ambient humidity helps maintain sample integrity and ensures consistent evaluations.

4. Discussion

The factors influencing sensory measurements are multifaceted, involving psychological, physiological, and environmental elements. Each of these factors significantly affects panelists' perceptions, highlighting the importance of carefully controlled testing environments and well-considered panelist selection criteria. The psychological aspect underscores the need for blinding techniques and strategies to minimize expectation bias, ensuring that sensory evaluations reflect actual product characteristics rather than preconceived notions (Cardello & Sawyer, 1992). For physiological factors, structuring tests to account for age differences

and managing fatigue through structured sessions and breaks are essential for reliable results. Similarly, addressing mood variability by creating a neutral testing environment can help minimize emotional influence on sensory responses (King & Meiselman, 2010). Environmental control is equally critical. Standardizing lighting, maintaining appropriate temperature, and controlling humidity can reduce variability and ensure consistency across evaluations. These controlled conditions enhance the accuracy of sensory data, making the results more reflective of the product's true sensory profile (Meilgaard et al., 2007). In comparing different panelist types, trained and expert panelists offer consistency, with reduced variability in responses. However, consumer panels provide valuable insights into broader preferences, albeit with higher variability due to lack of training. This distinction emphasizes the importance of selecting panelists based on the evaluation's objectives. For instance, product development might benefit from trained or expert panels, while consumer panels may be more appropriate for acceptability testing (Stone & Sidel, 2004).

Table: one. Factors Influencing Sensory Evaluation Outcomes

Study	Objective	Key Findings	Factor(s) Explored
Lowe & Perry (2020)	Examine environmental impact on sensory evaluations	Highlighted need for controlled lighting and temperature to reduce sensory variability	Environmental
Chen, Schifferstein, & Fenko (2021)	Branding's effect on sensory perception	Branding influences consumer perception, often subconsciously	Psychological
Hirsch & Li (2023)	Impact of product branding on taste perception	Branding significantly alters sensory evaluations, emphasizing importance of blind testing	Psychological
King & Meiselman (2010)	Consumer emotions associated with foods	Emotional states (stress, happiness) affect sensory sensitivity and response variability	Psychological
Taylor & Roberts (2022)	Aging and sensory decline	Age impacts olfactory and taste sensitivity; recommends age-based panel selection criteria	Physiological
Murphy et al. (2022)	Age-related olfactory impairment	Older adults show reduced sensitivity to certain flavors, impacting sensory evaluations	Physiological
Schmitt, Yoon, & Spence (2020)	Cross-cultural sensory expectations	Culture influences sensory perception; different panelist backgrounds provide comprehensive data	Cultural
Wang, Liu, & Chen (2021)	Environmental variables in sensory testing	Controlled lighting, temperature, and humidity reduce response variability in sensory tests	Environmental
Stone & Sidel (2004)	Sensory evaluation practices	Standardized sensory practices enhance panel consistency and reliability	Methodological
Baryłko-Pikielna et al. (2014)	Temperature's role in food texture and taste	Warmer temperatures intensify flavors, while cooler ones reduce sensitivity	Environmental
Cardello & Sawyer (1992)	Consumer expectations' effect on food acceptability	Anticipated product qualities bias sensory perception, especially in labeled samples	Psychological
Deliza & MacFie (1996)	External cues on sensory expectations	Labels and cues create anticipatory biases, affecting sensory evaluations	Psychological
Meiselman (2013)	Context's impact on consumer food choice	Environment affects sensory experience; structured settings lead to more consistent data	Environmental
Mojet et al. (2003)	Age impact on sensory intensity	Age influences taste and smell acuity; older adults require adjustments in evaluation settings	Physiological

Prescott (2017)	Cultural influence on flavor perception	Diverse cultural backgrounds provide broader insight, important in global product testing	Cultural

5. Conclusion

The review of factors influencing sensory evaluation outcomes underscores the intricate nature of human sensory perception and the multifaceted challenges inherent in obtaining reliable data. Sensory evaluation, while invaluable for product development and quality control, is affected by numerous variables that can impact the accuracy and consistency of results. Achieving reliable data requires an approach that prioritizes rigorous selection and training of panelists, ensuring that those selected possess the necessary acuity, consistency, and ability to follow standardized procedures. Proper training helps panelists identify sensory attributes with precision and interpret them accurately, thereby reducing inter-panelist variability. Furthermore, the control of environmental factors such as lighting, temperature, and humidity is critical to creating standardized testing conditions that minimize the influence of external variables on panelist perceptions. Environmental variability can unintentionally alter sensory experiences, leading to biased results. Structured environmental controls help to neutralize these potential influences, fostering a testing environment that yields data that is not only accurate but also reproducible across sessions. Future research should address the need for standardized evaluation methods that can reliably measure panelist sensitivity, particularly as it pertains to age, fatigue, and mood—all of which play significant roles in sensory perception. By developing and implementing these standardized methods, researchers can better assess individual panelist capabilities and create tailored approaches to panel selection and management. Additionally, advancing strategies to mitigate the effects of environmental factors will be vital for further improving sensory testing conditions. Enhancements in panelist selection protocols, training methods, and environmental controls will significantly bolster the reliability of sensory evaluations. These improvements will allow companies to make more informed decisions, refine their products more effectively, and maintain consistent quality, all while ensuring alignment with consumer expectations.

References

1. Baryłko-Pikielna, N., et al. (2014). Temperature and texture in sensory perception of food. *Journal of Food Science*, *79*(4), 717-723.
2. Cardello, A. V., & Sawyer, F. M. (1992). Effects of disconfirmed consumer expectations on food acceptability. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, *7*(4), 253-277.
3. Chen, L., Schifferstein, H. N. J., & Fenko, A. (2021). Exploring the effects of branding on consumer sensory perception. *Food Quality and Preference*, *93*, 104270.
4. Deliza, R., & MacFie, H. J. (1996). The generation of sensory expectation by external cues and its effect on sensory perception and hedonic ratings: A review. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, *11*(2), 103-128.
5. Delwiche, J. F. (2004). The impact of perceptual interactions on perceived flavor. *Food Quality and Preference*, *15*(2), 137-146.
6. Drake, M. A. (2007). Invited review: Sensory analysis of dairy foods. *Journal of Dairy Science*, *90*(11), 4925-4937.
7. Hirsch, J., & Li, W. (2023). Impact of product branding on consumer taste perception. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, *38*(1), e12851.
8. King, S. C., & Meiselman, H. L. (2010). Development of a method to measure consumer emotions associated with foods. *Food Quality and Preference*, *21*(2), 168-177.
9. Lawless, H. T., & Heymann, H. (2010). *Sensory Evaluation of Food: Principles and Practices*. New York: Springer.
10. Li, K., & Liu, M. (2024). Combined influence of multi-sensory comfort in winter open spaces and its association with environmental factors: Wuhan as a case study. *Building and Environment*, *248*, 111037.
11. Lowe, B., & Perry, R. (2020). Sensory panel testing in new product development: Addressing environmental and psychological influences. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, *33*, 108-114.
12. Meilgaard, M., Civille, G. V., & Carr, B. T. (2007). *Sensory Evaluation Techniques* (4th ed.). CRC Press.
13. Meiselman, H. L. (2013). The future in sensory/consumer research: Evolving to a better science. *Food Quality and Preference*, *27*(2), 208-214.
14. Mojet, J., et al. (2003). Taste perception with age: Generic or specific losses in supra-threshold intensities of five taste qualities? *Chemical Senses*, *28*(5), 397-413.
15. Muñoz, A. M. (2018). Profiling sensory panelists to improve sensory testing results. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, *22*, 80-85.

16. Murphy, C., Schubert, C. R., Cruickshanks, K. J., Klein, B. E., Klein, R., & Nondahl, D. M. (2002). Prevalence of olfactory impairment in older adults. *JAMA*, *288*(18), 2307-2312.

17. Murray, J. M., & Delahunty, C. M. (2000). Mapping consumer preference for the sensory and packaging attributes of cheddar cheese. *Food Quality and Preference*, *11*(5), 419-435.

18. Prescott, J. (2017). Multisensory processes in flavour perception and their influence on food choice. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, *15*, 13-18.

19. Schmitt, M., Yoon, J., & Spence, C. (2020). Consumer expectations and sensory perceptions of food products: A cross-cultural analysis. *Food Quality and Preference*, *86*, 104002.

20. Stone, H., & Sidel, J. L. (2004). *Sensory Evaluation Practices* (3rd ed.). Elsevier.

21. Taylor, K. D., & Roberts, J. M. (2022). Age and sensory decline: Enhancing panelist selection criteria. *Food Research International*, *160*, 111708.

22. Wang, H., Liu, X., & Chen, X. (2021). Impact of environmental variables on sensory perceptions in controlled testing environments. *Food Science and Technology*, *135*, 109902.