

CrossRef DOI of original article:

Mexican Screening Test for Olfactory Dysfunction using Essential Oils

Mandujano-González Alberto

Received: 1 January 1970 Accepted: 1 January 1970 Published: 1 January 1970

Abstract

Introduction: Olfaction is important for us to relate to the environment. Approximately 25

Index terms— olfactory disorders, olfactory loss, screening, diagnosis.

Olfactory disorders are classified into qualitative problems (dysosmias, i.e., altered olfactory perception) and quantitative problems (where the intensity of olfactory perception is affected and includes hyposmia and anosmia) 2 .

Of people over 40 years of age, 25% have some olfactory disorder, which increases with age, reaching a prevalence of 40-62% in people over 80 years of age 3,4. The causes of these conditions are: nasosinusal alterations, post-infectious olfactory dysfunction, presbysmia, post-traumatic, secondary to medication, chronic smoking and alcoholism, neurodegenerative diseases, metabolic and genetic diseases 5,6 .

The presence of olfactory alterations has an impact on the quality of life of sufferers, generating depression, social isolation, feelings of vulnerability, self-esteem problems and causing insecurity, since up to 60% of those affected report difficulty in noticing a gas leak or the presence of smoke. Eating habits, personal hygiene and sexual performance are affected 7,8,9. Olfactory impairment is a predictor of mortality, since subjects > 60 years of age with anosmia are 3 times more likely to die at 5 years than normosmic patients 10 .

Existing tests for screening for hyposmia are variable, including pens such as the Sniffin Sticks (SS) test 11,12 , booklets such as the University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test (UPSIT) or disks that give off scents 13,14 . They are expensive, not very accessible in Mexico and require training to perform them. These tests have been standardized in populations culturally very different from the Mexican population, so the type of aromas 15,16,17 their familiarity and therefore their identification are different in Mexico. This makes it difficult to detect patients and to know the prevalence of hyposmia in our population.

So far no studies have been conducted on the usefulness of using commercial essential oils in the detection of hyposmia, which are readily available, inexpensive, and easy and quick to use.

In Mexico there is no standardized test for the screening of olfactory alterations, so this work proposes the development and validation of a test of essential oils for this purpose.

1 Introduction

he ability to smell allows us to enjoy food, relate to others and even protect ourselves from danger. Moreover, because of its connections with the limbic system, it allows us to evoke intense emotions and memories 1 .

T II.

2 Materials and Methods

A descriptive study was carried out, in which two groups were created, one with subjective hyposmia of different etiologies and another age and gender matched control group made up of healthy people who denied symptomatic hyposmia.

The patients were recruited at the National Rehabilitation Institute-LGII within the period June 2021-March 2022.

The case group included subjects older than 18 years with hyposmia caused by nasal conditions: attic septal deviation, acute sinusitis, chronic sinusitis with and without polyps, nasal tumors, upper airway infections including COVID 19 corroborated by PCR, Parkinson's disease.

45 All subjects underwent nasal endoscopy to corroborate the presence of nasal conditions. Subjects with active
46 smoking and those with a history of nose and sinus surgery were excluded.

47 The following scales were applied to each case with olfactory alterations: Sinonasal Outcome 22 (SNOT 22)
48 22,23 and Questionnaire of Olfactory Disorders-Negative Statements (QOD NS), 22,23 and an endoscopic
49 scale was used to evaluate the state of the olfactory cleft: The olfactory cleft endoscopy scale (OCES). 24 To
50 evaluate the olfactory function, the University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test (UPSIT) and the Sniffin
51 Sticks test, the identification subset with 16 aromas, were applied. In this same consultation, the test with
52 essential oils was applied to each participant. The order of the olfactory evaluation was as follows: UPSIT,
53 essential oil test, Sniffin Sticks.

54 Between each test a 5-minute break was taken to prevent olfactory memory from influencing the results and
55 to allow for mental relaxation of the participants.

56 In a previous investigation, this test of commercial essential oils was standardized 25 . This test consists briefly
57 in the use of 5 aromas: lemon, chocolate, cinnamon, coffee, mint and a control with no odor (Image 1).

58 The interpretation of this test will be only if the patient correctly or incorrectly identified each aroma, therefore
59 it fluctuates between 0-5, if the subject obtains 0=anosmia, 1,2,3= hyposmia and 4,5 points= normosmia (Image
60 2). (Image 2).

61 The statistical package Prisma was used. Statistical significance was considered with a $p < 0.05$.

62 For olfactory function, each participant obtained three scores derived from the tests used: number of essential
63 oils correctly identified, score on the University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test and score on the Sniffin
64 Sticks test and also obtained an olfactory diagnosis from each test: Normosmia, hyposmia or anosmia.

65 Fisher's exact test was used to compare the numbers of anosmic, hyposmic and normosmic subjects with scores
66 of 0-5 correctly identified oils, these results were compared with the UPSIT and Sniffin Sticks scores.

67 Sensitivity and specificity of test results were determined by performing 2 x 2 contingency tables.

68 3 III.

69 4 Results

70 A total of 33 subjects were analyzed, 17 in the case group and 16 in the control group. The case group consisted
71 of 7 women and 10 men, the age range was 18-82 years with a mean age of 41 years. The control group consisted
72 of 7 women and 9 men, the age range was 18-81 years with a mean age of 46 years.

73 Regarding the cause of hyposmia in the case group, 2 had no identifiable cause, 5 were due to COVID 19, 3
74 due to nasosinus conditions, 4 due to Parkinson's disease and 3 due to cranioencephalic trauma.

75 The presence of nasal alterations, tumors or infectious diseases was ruled out in all the controls by nasal
76 endoscopy. The mean score on the endoscopic evaluation scale of the olfactory sulcus "OCES", in the cases, was
77 1.1 points in the right nostril and 1.2 in the left nostril.

78 Regarding quality of life, in the group of cases, the range of scores was 8-33 points, with a mean of 25, which
79 in percentage of affection of 1-100 translates into 14%-57.8%.

80 For the Sniffin Sticks test the scores were 1 -15 in the case group and for the controls 11-15.

81 In the UPSIT test the score in the case group was 9-29 and in the controls from 25 to 40. With this test in
82 the group of cases all had some degree of hyposmia and in the group of controls 4 had mild microsmia, 2 with
83 moderate and 1 with severe, the subjects with mild and moderate microsmia had no alterations in the other two
84 tests and the one with severe hyposmia was normal in the Sniffin Sticks test and with hyposmia in the essential
85 oils test.

86 For the essential oils test, a score of 4 and 5 points was taken as normal, hyposmia 1-3 and anosmia 0. An
87 additional point was added to be taken into account in the final score; for each aroma, the intensity with which
88 each aroma was perceived was questioned and if the subject did not perceive an aroma or if 3 of the aromas were
89 perceived with slight intensity, one point was subtracted from the total number of correctly identified aromas
90 (this variant was called modified oils test in the analysis).

91 Table ?? shows the olfactory results obtained with the different tests, sensitivity, specificity, positive and
92 negative predictive value and confidence interval calculated with Fisher's test.

93 5 IV.

94 6 Discussion

95 The screening test for olfactory disorders with essential oils proved to be an option with acceptable sensitivity
96 and specificity. Figures ranging from 0.88-0.93 and 0.41-0.77 respectively.

97 In 2018 in Barcelona Campabadal et al. determined the sensitivity and specificity of the UPSIT test Spanish
98 version in a population with Parkinson's disease: 97 subjects, and healthy controls: 65 and determined that the
99 sensitivity was 81.4% and specificity 100% with a cut-off point ? 25 points. 26 Hummel and his team in 1997
100 created the Sniffin Sticks test, applied it to a group of 104 healthy subjects (52 women, 52 men, mean age 49.5
101 years, range 18-84 years) and compared it to an established measure of olfactory performance; the Connecticut
102 Clinical Chemosensory Research Center Test, CCCRC 27 . The use of the different subsets separately has been
103 found to have a sensitivity and specificity of 84%. 28 Sorokowska et al. in 2019 conducted a multicenter study

104 in Germany with 333 subjects with olfactory disturbances of different etiologies, aged 12-88 years. In whom they
105 evaluated the clinical utility of employing a test created by the researchers "Q-Sticks test", a test composed of
106 the aromas of clove, coffee and roses. Their test obtained a sensitivity of 91.8% and a specificity of 92% 29 .

107 A retrospective study was carried out in Germany in 2016 with 613 subjects with an age range of 18-96 years,
108 they included subjects with olfactory disturbances (464) of different etiologies and controls (149), to whom they
109 applied the Sniffin Sticks olfactory identification subset containing 16 scents. All participants underwent nasal
110 endoscopy and medical history. They created a score for each aroma based on the following division: % of
111 subjects with normosmia who correctly identified it between % of subjects with identifiable cause of hyposmia
112 who correctly identified it and called it "odor specificity score", then using a calculated ABC analysis which is
113 a classification method used in economics, which allows identifying items that have an important impact on an
114 overall value they selected 3 aromas. Cinnamon, fish and banana were correctly identified by the largest number
115 of normosmic subjects, with this battery of tests they obtained a sensitivity of 80.4%, specificity of 84.3% and a
116 negative predictive value of 91.3% 30 .

117 It is important to mention that, during the analysis of the test results, we noticed the differences between
118 the tests at the time of interpreting their results, i.e., the UPSIT test graduates the level of hyposmia into
119 mild microsmia, moderate or severe hyposmia, while the Sniffin Sticks and the essential oils test only identifies
120 normosmia, hyposmia or anosmia. Because of these differences, subjects who obtained normosmia in the last two
121 tests, but mild microsmia in the UPSIT test were considered to have normosmia, thus obtaining different figures
122 for sensitivity, specificity, negative predictive value and positive predictive value.

123 In addition, when taking into account the intensity of aroma perception in the oil test; "modified oil test"
124 increased all the parameters analyzed.

125 The essential oil screening test we propose is an effective method, easily accessible, cost-effective and quick
126 to apply. With respect to its sensitivity and specificity, it is very similar to that shown by other tests, thus
127 determining its non-inferiority.

128 The great limitation of this study is the low number of samples; however, due to the favorable behavior of the
129 data, it can be inferred that by increasing the number of subjects, similar results will be obtained.

130 V.

131 7 Conclusion

132 This is a first step in the detection of olfactory disorders in Mexico; however, future research is needed to extend
133 the level of diagnosis, in order to obtain a test with which to follow up patients or even determine the efficacy of
134 certain treatments.

- 135 [JAMA] , 10.1001/JAMA.288.18.2307. <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMA.288.18.2307> JAMA 288 (18) p.
136 .
- 137 [] , 10.1016/0031-9384(84)90269-5.
- 138 [Otolaryngology and Surgery] , -Head Otolaryngology , Neck Surgery . 10.1067/MHN.2002.121022. <https://doi.org/10.1067/MHN.2002.121022> Official Journal of American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head
139 and Neck Surgery 126 (1) p. .
- 141 [Pinto et al. ()] , J M Pinto , K E Wroblewski , D W Kern , L P Schumm , M K McClintock . 2014.
- 142 [Yanagimachi et al. ()] , M Yanagimachi , I Takahashi , F Bernier , K Takahashi , S Kurauchi , Y Mikuniya , A
143 Sasaki , T Komine , A Matsubara , S Nakaji . 2017.
- 144 [Yáñez et al. ()] *A B C Prueba corta de olfato a utilizarse como una prueba de diagnóstico confiable*, C Yáñez ,
145 N Mora , B Nurko . 2004. 49 p. .
- 146 [Frasnelli and Hummel ()] ‘Affiliated with the German Society for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology -Head and
147 Neck Surgery’. J Frasnelli , T Hummel . 10.1007/S00405-004-0796-Y. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/S00405-004-0796-Y)
148 [S00405-004-0796-Y](https://doi.org/10.1007/S00405-004-0796-Y) *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology : Official Journal of the European*
149 *Federation of Oto-Rhino-Laryngological Societies* 2005. 262 (3) p. . (Olfactory dysfunction and daily life)
- 150 [Alzheimer’s Dementia Cognitive Neurology] ‘Alzheimer’s’. 10.15761/ADCN.1000117. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.15761/ADCN.1000117)
151 [10.15761/ADCN.1000117](https://doi.org/10.15761/ADCN.1000117) *Dementia & Cognitive Neurology* (3) p. 1.
- 152 [Boesveldt et al. ()] ‘Anosmia-A Clinical Review’. S Boesveldt , E M Postma , D Boak , A Welge-Luessen
153 , V Schöpf , J D Mainland , J Martens , J Ngai , V B Duffy . 10.1093/CHEMSE/BJX025. <https://doi.org/10.1093/CHEMSE/BJX025>
154 *Chemical Senses* 2017. 42 (7) p. .
- 155 [Hummel and Welge-Lüessen ()] ‘Assessment of Olfactory Function’. T Hummel , A Welge-Lüessen .
156 10.1159/000093752. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000093752> *Taste and Smell*, 2006. 63 p. . (1st ed.)
- 157 [Hopkins et al. ()] ‘Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the sino-nasal outcome test (SNOT-22) for
158 Spanish-speaking patients’. C Hopkins , S Gillett , R Slack , V J Lund , J P. ; G Browne , P Reyes
159 , R Del Castillo , C Fragola , A Royuela . 10.1111/J.1749-4486.2009.01995.X21.delosSantos. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00405-014-3437-0>
160 *Clinical Otolaryngology : Official Journal of ENT-UK ;*
161 *Official Journal of Netherlands Society for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology & Cervico-Facial Surgery* 2009. 2015.
162 34 (5) p. . (Affiliated with the German Society for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology -Head and Neck Surgery)
- 163 [Doty et al. ()] ‘Development of the University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test: a standardized
164 microencapsulated test of olfactory function’. R L Doty , P Shaman , M Dann . *Physiology & Behavior*
165 1984. 32 (3) p. .
- 166 [Campabadal et al. ()] ‘Diagnostic Accuracy, Item Analysis and Age Effects of the UPSIT Spanish Version
167 in Parkinson’s Disease’. A Campabadal , B Segura , H C Baggio , A Abos , C Uribe , A I Garcia-
168 Diaz , M J Marti , F Valldeoriola , Y Compta , N Bargallo , C Junque . 10.1093/ARCLIN/ACY053.
169 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ARCLIN/ACY053> *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology : The Official Journal*
170 *of the National Academy of Neuropsychologists* 2019. 34 (4) p. .
- 171 [Lötsch et al. ()] ‘Different odor tests contribute differently to the evaluation of olfactory loss’. J Lötsch , H
172 Reichmann , T Hummel . 10.1093/CHEMSE/BJM058. <https://doi.org/10.1093/CHEMSE/BJM058>
173 *Chemical Senses* 2008. 33 (1) p. .
- 174 [Taniyama-López et al. ()] *Estandarización de una prueba de tamizaje de alteraciones del olfato con aceites*
175 *esenciales Standardization of a screening test of olfactory alterations with essential oils*, Natsuko Taniyama-
176 López , O Carrillo-Mora , P , Selene Escobar-Barríos , M Hernández-Rosales , P Mandujano-González ,
177 A Ofelia Natsuko Taniyama López , C . 10.24245/aorl.v67i1.7502. [https://doi.org/10.24245/aorl.](https://doi.org/10.24245/aorl.v67i1.7502)
178 [v67i1.7502](https://doi.org/10.24245/aorl.v67i1.7502) 2022.
- 179 [Sorokowska et al. ()] ‘Fast screening of olfactory function using the q-sticks test’. A Sorokowska , A Oleszkiewicz
180 , A Minovi , C G Konnerth , T Hummel . 10.1159/000500559. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000500559>
181 *ORL* 2019. 81 (5-6) p. .
- 182 [Lötsch et al. ()] ‘How many and which odor identification items are needed to establish normal olfactory
183 function?’. J Lötsch , A Ultsch , T Hummel . 10.1093/chemse/bjw006. [https://doi.org/10.1093/](https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjw006)
184 [chemse/bjw006](https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjw006) *Chemical Senses* 2016. 41 (4) p. .
- 185 [Lötsch et al. ()] ‘How many and which odor identification items are needed to establish normal olfactory
186 function?’. J Lötsch , A Ultsch , T Hummel . 10.1093/chemse/bjw006. [https://doi.org/10.1093/](https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjw006)
187 [chemse/bjw006](https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjw006) *Chemical Senses* 2016a. 41 (4) p. .
- 188 [Rumeau et al. ()] *How to assess olfactory performance with the Sniffin’ Sticks test(®)*, C Rumeau , D T Nguyen
189 , R Jankowski . 10.1016/J.ANORL.2015.08.004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ANORL.2015.08.004>
190 2016. 133 p. . (European Annals of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Diseases)

7 CONCLUSION

191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241

- [Miwa et al. ()] *Impact of olfactory impairment on quality of life and disability. Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, T Miwa , M Furukawa , T Tsuchatani , R M Costanzo , L J Dinardo , E R Reiter . 10.1001/ARCHOTOL.127.5.497. <https://doi.org/10.1001/ARCHOTOL.127.5.497> 2001. 127 p. .
- [Imam et al. ()] ‘Is SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) postviral olfactory dysfunction (PVOD) different from other PVOD?’. S A Imam , W P Lao , P Reddy , S A Nguyen , R J Schlosser . 10.1016/J.WJORL.2020.05.004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WJORL.2020.05.004> *World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology -Head and Neck Surgery* 2020. (6) p. . (Suppl 1)
- [Murphy et al. ()] C Murphy , C R Schubert , K J Cruickshanks , B E K Klein , R Klein , D M Nondahl . *Prevalence of olfactory impairment in older adults*, 2002.
- [Croy et al. ()] ‘Olfactory disorders and quality of life—an updated review’. I Croy , S Nordin , T Hummel . 10.1093/CHEMSE/BJT072. <https://doi.org/10.1093/CHEMSE/BJT072> *Chemical Senses* 2014. 39 (3) p. .
- [Hummel and Nordin ()] ‘Olfactory disorders and their consequences for quality of life’. T Hummel , S Nordin . 10.1080/00016480410022787. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016480410022787> *Acta Oto-Laryngologica* 2005. 125 (2) p. .
- [Hummel and Nordin ()] ‘Olfactory disorders and their consequences for quality of life’. T Hummel , S Nordin . 10.1080/00016480410022787. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016480410022787> *Acta Oto-Laryngologica* 2005. 125 (2) p. .
- [Olfactory Dysfunction Predicts 5-Year Mortality in Older Adults PLOS ONE] ‘Olfactory Dysfunction Predicts 5-Year Mortality in Older Adults’. 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0107541. <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0107541> *PLOS ONE* 9 (10) .
- [Olfactory function evaluation in a 1102 communitydwelling 20-90-year old Japanese population in relation with age, sex and men] *Olfactory function evaluation in a 1102 communitydwelling 20-90-year old Japanese population in relation with age, sex and mental decline*,
- [Liu et al. ()] *Prevalence and risk factors of taste and smell impairment in a nationwide representative sample of the US population: a cross-sectional study. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey*, G Liu , G Zong , R L Doty , Q Sun . 10.1136/bmjopen-2016. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016> 2013. 2013-2014.
- [Liu et al. ()] *Prevalence and risk factors of taste and smell impairment in a nationwide representative sample of the US population: a cross-sectional study. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey*, G Liu , G Zong , R L Doty , Q Sun . 10.1136/bmjopen-2016. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016> 2013. 2013-2014.
- [Piccirillo et al. ()] *Psychometric and clinimetric validity of the 20-Item Sino-Nasal Outcome Test*, J F Piccirillo , M G Merritt , M L Richards . 2002. (SNOT-20)
- [Devere ()] ‘Selected Topics in Outpatient Neurology’. R Devere . 10.1212/CON.0000000000000463. <https://doi.org/10.1212/CON.0000000000000463> *Continuum* 2017. 23 (2) p. . (Disorders of Taste and Smell)
- [Hummel et al. ()] ‘Sniffin” sticks’: olfactory performance assessed by the combined testing of odor identification, odor discrimination and olfactory threshold’. T Hummel , B Sekinger , S R Wolf , E Pauli , G Kobal . 10.1093/CHEMSE/22.1.39. <https://doi.org/10.1093/CHEMSE/22.1.39> *Chemical Senses* 1997. 22 (1) p. .
- [Schlosser et al. ()] ‘The Olfactory Cleft Endoscopy Scale: a multi-institutional validation study in chronic rhinosinusitis’. R J Schlosser , T L Smith , J C Mace , J A Alt , D M Beswick , J L Mattos , V Ramakrishnan , C Massey , Z M Soler . 10.4193/RHIN20.307. <https://doi.org/10.4193/RHIN20.307> *Rhinology* 2021. 59 (2) p. .
- [Doty ()] *The Smell identification test™ administration manual 3rd Ed*, R L Doty . 1995. University of Pennsylvania
- [Mattos et al. ()] ‘Understanding the relationship between olfactory-specific quality of life, objective olfactory loss, and patient factors in chronic rhinosinusitis’. J L Mattos , R J Schlosser , K A Storck , Z M Soler . 10.1002/alr.21940. <https://doi.org/10.1002/alr.21940> *International Forum of Allergy and Rhinology* 2017. 7 (7) p. .