1	Title
2	WHAT ABOUT USING SNIFFIN' STICKS 12 SCREENING TEST TO IDENTIFY POST-COVID-19
3	OLFACTORY DISORDERS?
4	
5	Authors
6	Clair Vandersteen ¹ , Magali Payne ^{2,3} , Louise-Émilie Dumas ⁴ , Alexandra Plonka ^{2,5} , Grégoire
7	D'Andrea ¹ , David Chirio ⁶ , Élisa Demonchy ⁶ , Karine Risso ⁶ , Florence Askenazy-Gittard ⁴ , Nicolas
8	Guevara ¹ , Laurent Castillo ¹ , Valeria Manera ^{2,3} , Auriane Gros ^{2,3}
9	
10	Affiliation
10 11	Affiliation ¹ Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université
10 11 12	Affiliation ¹ Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France
10 11 12 13	Affiliation ¹ Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France ² Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, laboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique du
10 11 12 13 14	Affiliation Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France 2Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, laboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique du Cerveau et du Mouvement, Nice, France
10 11 12 13 14 15	AffiliationInstitut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, UniversitéCôte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France2Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, laboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique duCerveau et du Mouvement, Nice, France3Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'Orthophonie de Nice, UFR Médecine, Nice, France.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Affiliation ¹ Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France ² Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, laboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique du Cerveau et du Mouvement, Nice, France ³ Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'Orthophonie de Nice, UFR Médecine, Nice, France. ⁴ Hôpitaux Pédiatriques de Nice CHU-LENVAL, 57 Avenue de la Californie, 06200, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Affiliation ¹ Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France ² Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, Iaboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique du Cerveau et du Mouvement, Nice, France ³ Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'Orthophonie de Nice, UFR Médecine, Nice, France. ⁴ Hôpitaux Pédiatriques de Nice CHU-LENVAL, 57 Avenue de la Californie, 06200, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Affiliation Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Universitá Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France 2Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, Iaboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique du Cerveau et du Mouvement, Nice, France 3Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'Orthophonie de Nice, UFR Médecine, Nice, France. Hôpitaux Pédiatriques de Nice CHU-LENVAL, 57 Avenue de la Californie, 06200, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France Institut NeuroMod, INRIA Centre de recherche Sophia Antipolis, 2004 Route des Lucioles, 06902, Université Côte d'Azur,
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	AffiliationInstitut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, UniversitéCôte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France'Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, laboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique duCerveau et du Mouvement, Nice, France'Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'Orthophonie de Nice, UFR Médecine, Nice, France.'Hôpitaux Pédiatriques de Nice CHU-LENVAL, 57 Avenue de la Californie, 06200, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université'Gôte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France'Institut NeuroMod, INRIA Centre de recherche Sophia Antipolis, 2004 Route des Lucioles, 06902, Université Côte d'Azur,Sophia Antipolis, Alpes-Maritimes, France
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Affiliation Institut Universitaire de la Face et du Cou, 31 Avenue de Valombrose, 06100, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France 2Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, Iaboratoire CoBTeK, Service Clinique Gériatrique du Cerveau et du Mouvement, Nice, France 3Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'Orthophonie de Nice, UFR Médecine, Nice, France. 4Hôpitaux Pédiatriques de Nice CHU-LENVAL, 57 Avenue de la Californie, 06200, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, Alpes-Maritimes, France ¹ Institut NeuroMod, INRIA Centre de recherche Sophia Antipolis, 2004 Route des Lucioles, 06902, Université Côte d'Azur, Sophia Antipolis, Alpes-Maritimes, France ⁶ Département de médecine infectiologique, hôpital de l'archet, 151 route de Saint-Antoine, 06200, Centre Hospitalier

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 ABSTRACT

24

25 Background: Olfactory impairment is a major sequela of SARS-CoV-2 infection and has a 26 negative impact on daily life quality. Olfactory loss can be assessed in many ways but seems 27 to be little realized in a daily clinical practice. The sniffin Sticks test – 12 items (SST-12) can be 28 used in quick olfactory disorders screening. Its use in a post-covid19 situation was the main 29 objective of this work. 30 Methodology: Consecutive patients consulting to the ENT department with post-Covid-19 31 olfactory loss were included. The clinical examination included an analog scale for the self-32 assessment of olfactory recovery (VAS), self-reported salt and sugar intake, a nasofibroscopy, 33 the complete Sniffin' Stick Test (SST) and the SST-12. 34 **Results**: Among the 54 patients included, based on the SST-12, 14,8% (n=8) of the patients 35 could be classified as normosmic (SST-12≥11), 48,1% (n=26) as hyposmic (6< SST-12<10) and 37% (n=20) as functional anosmic (SST-12 \leq 6). We report excellent and significant correlations 36 37 between SST-12 and SST or VAS assessments. Salt and Sugar increased intake seems significantly related to SST-12 results. 38 Conclusions: SST-12 is a reliable way to screen post-COVID-19 olfactory disorders could be 39 40 used in a daily clinical practice and might be used to prevent bad diet habits and so cardiovascular risk. 41 42

- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46

47 INTRODUCTION

48

The onset of a sudden partial (hyposmia) or total (anosmia) loss of smell is now 49 50 recognized as highly predictive of SARS-COV-2 infection⁽¹⁾. Anosmia can be the only COVID-19 symptom in 11 to 26% of cases⁽²⁻⁴⁾. The long-term anosmia can cause an alteration in the 51 quality of life⁽⁵⁾ and psychiatric disorders such as depression^(6,7), anxiety, anorexia⁽⁸⁾ and its 52 nutritional consequences⁽⁹⁾, social interaction disorders^(10,11) and cognitive impairment^(10,12,13). 53 So, the diagnosis of olfactory disorders and their management is essential especially as 6⁽¹⁴⁾ 54 55 and 12⁽¹⁶⁾ months after the COVID-19 infection, respectively 60% and 30% of patients retain an olfactory complaint and require attention. Moreover, even if sweet, salty, sour and bitter 56 tastes improved from 60% (acute COVID-19) to 97.2% (6 months) of patients⁽¹⁴⁾, salt and sugar 57 intake increase concerned near 30% of post-COVID-19 patients⁽¹⁵⁾, especially young women. 58 59 These findings should require patient's education to prevent cardiovascular risk.

Although there are different ways to assess a patient's ortho and retro-olfaction ^(17,18), 60 61 only 50% of ENTs assess the olfactory disorders on an anamnesis, and 10% assess through psychophysical tests ⁽¹⁹⁾. Olfaction is most often evaluated by subjective self / hetero 62 63 questionnaires with a significant variability of the results and a probable underestimation,^(19,20) given the poorer olfactory perception before 20 years and after 50 64 ^(21,22). Complete psychophysical olfactory tests, with assessment of odor threshold, odor 65 discrimination and odor identification, are the gold standard ⁽¹⁹⁾ and allow to specify the 66 olfactory disorder ⁽²³⁾. The most used in Europe is the Sniffin 'stick test[®] (SST)^(19,21,24-26) that 67 include an odor Threshold detection (T), an odor Discrimination (D) and an odor Identification 68 (I) tests. However, these psychophysical tests are expensive and take a long time (between 30 69 and 60 minutes))^(17,18), thus making their daily clinical use difficult. It therefore seems 70

- 71 important to look for other olfactory tests that are faster (≤5 minutes) and accessible to
- 72 specialists, but also to general practitioners.
- The Sniffin 'Sticks Test 12 items (SST-12) is an olfactory screening test in the form of
 a 4-minute identification test allowing, according to its authors, to detect anosmia and
 hyposmia with comparable measurement reliability other similar scent screening tests ^(27,28).
 It can also be used laterally (one nostril tested independently of the other).
 Seeing that it has been demonstrated that identification disorders are predominant in
 post COVIDs ⁽⁵⁾, the objective of this study was to assess the value of SST-12 in the detection
- and characterization of a persistent post-COVID-19 olfactory disorder.

80 MATERIAL AND METHODS

81

82 Population

83 The study was approved by the institutional review board of the Nice University Hospital (CNIL number: 412). This study is part of a large work registered under a 84 85 ClinicalTrials.gov number (ID: NCT04799977). Since March 2020, we retroprospectively 86 recruited at ENT department of Nice University Hospital all patients infected by COVID-19 with 87 persistent olfactory disorders from two to nine months. Patients where self-referred or referred by colleagues, general practitioners or advised by the infectiology department that 88 89 managed all COVID-19 declared patients (city guidelines). Patients had either an olfactory 90 complaint for over 6 weeks and a molecular-proven SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis or a CT-proven SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis secondarily confirmed by serology. We retrospectively extracted 91 92 patients' demographic data, and clinical characteristics including nasofibroscopy, visual 93 analogue scale (VAS) for the subjective assessment of olfactory recovery (ranging from 0% to 94 100%), subjective taste impairment, over intake of salt and sugar, and SST^(26,29,30) total and 95 subdomains results which were systematically assessed. SST-12 results were extrapolated from SST results. 96

97

98 Sniffin' sticks test 12 items

Olfaction diseases SST-12 test has been validated in 2001 by Hummel et al.⁽³¹⁾. This 4
min screening psychophysical test is an odor identification test based on 12 from the 16 odors
being sniffed during the identification subdomain part of the original SST.

The original SST identification odors set include peppermint, orange, fish, leather, rose,
 cloves, coffee, pineapple, licorice, anise, lemon, banana, cinnamon, apple, turpentine and

104 garlic. During the identification SST test, subjects were blindfolded. Sixteen odorant sticks 105 were presented once, separated by an interval of at least 20 seconds to prevent olfactory 106 desensitization. Each stick presentation was accompanied by a written list containing the 107 correct odorant and 3 semantic distractors. Retrospectively, results from all odors set but 108 apple, turpentine, garlic and anise were summed up to the SST-12 global score, as previously described⁽³¹⁾. We defined a normosmia (SST-12≥11), an hyposmia (10>SST-12>6) or an 109 110 anosmia (SST-12≤6) based on normative values assessed from more than 1200 patients assessed with SST and olfactive evoked potential for anosmic and hyposmic ones⁽³¹⁾. Apple, 111 112 turpentine and garlic have been removed from the SST-12 because identified by less than 55% of its normosmic validation cohort⁽³¹⁾. Anise was removed too because of being too similar to 113 114 liquorice. With a reproducibility kappa coefficient of 0,77, the diagnosis agreement can be 115 considered as "good" (Altman, 1991). Although olfactory abilities decreased at extreme ages, 116 SST-12 can be used before the age of 10 and after the age of 80.

117

118 Statistical Analysis

119 Data are presented as mean (SD) for quantitative variables and as frequency and 120 percentage for qualitative variables. The degree of accordance between the SST and the SST-121 12 in patients' categorization was calculated using Cohen's Kappa coefficient. Sensitivity and 122 specificity of the SST-12 compared to the SST in classifying patients as anosmic, was also 123 reported. To verify whether patients that increased their consumption of salt and sugar had 124 lower SST and SST-12 scores compared to those who did not, we employed Mann-Whitney U 125 tests. Chi2 tests were employed to explore links between self-reported taste disorders and 126 the presence of an increased salt and sugar consumption. To investigate correlations between 127 subjective reports (VAS), and odor identification disorders (based on the SST and SST-12) we

- 128 performed bivariate correlation analyses. As data were not normally distributed (as suggested
- 129 by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test), non-parametric Spearman's correlations were employed.

130

132 Table 1 - Demographic and clinical characteristics. SD=standard deviation; CT=computerized

133 tomography; PCR=polymerase chain reaction

134

		n	%
135	Total	54	100
136	COVID ₁₉ testing		
407	Molecular PCR test	46	85.2
137	Chest CT	11	20.4
138	Serology (antibody test)	16	29.6
139	COVID-19 dedicated treatment		
	Oral corticosteroids	6	11.1
140	Nasal corticosteroids	4	7.4
141	Inhaled corticosteroids	2	3.7
140	Azithromycin alone	7	13.0
142	Hydroxychloroquine alone	1	1.9
143	Azithromycin + Hydroxychloroquine	3	5.5
144	Amoxicillin alone	1	1.9
	Amoxicillin + Azithromycin	2	3.7
145	Others (vitamins, zinc)	5	93
146		5	5.5
147			
148		mean	SD
149			
150	VAS (subjective % of olfactory recovery)	33.9	25.6
151	Sniffin' Sticks test – scores		
153	Threshold detection	4.7	4.0
154	Discrimination	10.2	21
155	Discrimination	10.5	5.1
156	Identification	9.4	3.9
157	Taste disorders	49	90.7
159	Retro-olfaction alone	35	64.8
160		42	22.2
161	Retro-olfaction + taste	12	22.2
162	Taste alone	1	1.8
163			
164			
165			

166

Table 2 – Categorization of subjects based on the Sniffin' Sticks Test scores (SST), Sniffin' Sticks

170 Test 12 items scores (SST12) and inter-test reliability (Kappa)

N-54	Normosmic	Hyposmic	Anosmic
N=54	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
SST	13(24,1)	29(53,7)	12(22,2)
SST-12	8(14,8)	26(48.1)	20(37,0)
Correct Categorization	4(7,4)	17(31,5)	12(22,2)
False positive	0(0)	9(16,7)	8(14,8)
False negative	4(7,4)	0(0)	0(0)
Cohen's Kappa	0,242	0,224	0,654

Table 3 - Sensitivity and specificity of the different cut-off scores of the SST-12 compared to

186 the SST in classifying patients as anosmic

107			
187	SST-12 score	Sensitivity	Specificity
188	0	1,000	0,00
189	1	1,000	0,17
100	2	1,000	0,25
190	3	0,98	0,33
191	4	0,93	0,42
192	5	0,88	0,75
	6	0,81	1,00
193	7	0,69	1,00
194	8	0,55	1,00
195	9	0,38	1,00
	10	0,19	1,00
196	11	0,07	1,00
197	12	0,00	1,00
198			

- 203 Figure 1. Correlations between a) SST-12 and SST identification score, b) percentage of
- subjective olfactory recovery (VAS) and SST, and c) percentage of subjective olfactory



205 recovery (VAS) and SST-12

207 **RESULTS**

208

209 Demographic and clinical features

Fifty-four patients consulting the ENT department of Nice University Hospitals (CHU) for olfactory complaints after a COVID-19 infection were included in the study. The demographic and clinical features are reported in Table 1. 57% of patients were female (n=31), with a mean age of 39.9±13,9 years. They were seen after 5.4±3,1 months after the COVID-19 infection. 17 patients (31.5%) received a COVID-19 related treatment.

215

216 Retrospective olfactory and taste complains screening results

217 Descriptive analyses for the loss of smell and taste are reported in Table 2. The day of 218 consultation, patients reported to have recovered only 33.9±25.6% of their olfaction (ranging 219 from 0% to 90%). 90.7% of the patients (n=49) reported taste disorders, including retro-220 olfaction (food flavors) alone (64.8%, n=35), retro-olfaction associated to taste (22.2%, n=12; 221 16.7% concerning sweet and salty, 11.1% concerning sour and bitter), or taste alone (1.8%, 222 n=1 concerning sweet and salty). 45.5% of patients (20 out of the 44 who responded to the 223 question) reported that they increased their consummation of salt, and 20.5% (9 out of 44) 224 that they increased their consummation of sugar.

Categorization of patients based on the results of the olfactory tests is presented in Table 2. The global results (TDI) of the Sniffin' Sticks Test (SST) suggested that 24,1% (n=13) of the patients could be classified as normosmic (TDI \geq 30.75), 53,7% (n=29) as hyposmic (16.25 \leq TDI \leq 30.5) and 22,2% (n=12) as functional anosmic (TDI \leq 16). Based on the SST-12, 14,8% (n=8) of the patients could be classified as normosmic (SST-12 \geq 11), 48,1% (n=26) as hyposmic (6< SST-12<10) and 37% (n=20) as functional anosmic (SST-12 \leq 6). Interestingly,

231 patients that increased their consummation of salt showed lower SST (U=112.5, p=0.003) and 232 SST-12 (U=121, p=0.005) scored compared to the patients that did not increase salt usage 233 $(20.0\pm8.8 \text{ vs. } 27.9\pm7.7, \text{ and } 5.7\pm3.5 \text{ vs. } 8.5\pm2.2, \text{ respectively})$. The same result was found for 234 patients who increased their consummation of sugar, that showed lower SST (U=73.5, 235 p=0.014) and SST-12 (U=62, p=0.005) scored compared to the other patients (26.2±8.0 vs. 236 17.1±8.4, and 4.6±2.9 vs. 6.9±2.9, respectively). The self-reported presence of taste disorders 237 did not show any significant link with the presence of an increased consummation of salt (Chi²=0.74, p=389) or sugar (Chi²=1.13, p=287). 238

239 Taking SST as the gold standard, on 54 patients, 61% (n=33) were classified in the same 240 category by the SST-12 patients. SST-12 misdiagnosed 4 patients as normosmic (7.4%), 8 as 241 anosmic (14.8%), and 9 as hyposmic (16.7%). Importantly, all the patients that were diagnosed as anosmic by the SST were also detected by the SST-12. Accordingly, Cohen's Kappa 242 243 coefficient revealed a week agreement between the two tests in classifying patients as 244 normosmic (Kappa= 0.24) and hyposmic (Kappa=0.22), but a strong agreement in classifying 245 patients as anosmic (Kappa=0.65). The sensitivity and specificity of the SST-12, compared to 246 the SST score, is reported in Table 3 and suggests that a score of 6 is the cut-off that maximize 247 the combination between specificity (100%) and sensitivity (81%) in detecting anosmic 248 patients. The presence of taste disorders did not affect the type of errors of the SST-12 249 compared to the SST.

250

251 Correlations between self-reported olfactory recovery, SST and SST-12 score

VAS scores were 45±24% (range 5%-70%), 38±25% (range 1%-90%), and 13±16% (range
0%-50%) for respectively normosmic, hyposmic and anosmic patients, based on the SST. Based
on the SST-12, VAS scores were 52±26%, 42±22%, and 16±19% for respectively normosmic,

255	hyposmic and anosmic patients. An almost perfect correlation between scores at the SST and
256	SST-12 was found (rho $_{(52)}$ =0.98, p<0.001), confirming that the SST-12 can assess odor
257	identification as well as the SST. Correlations between subjective reports (VAS) and the SST
258	and SST-12 scores suggested a significant, positive correlation between percentage of
259	subjective olfactory recovery (VAS) and the identifications scores for both the SST
260	(rho ₍₅₂₎ =0.47, p< 0.001) and the SST-12 scores (rho ₍₅₂₎ =0.49, p< 0.001), testifying that the two
261	scales were equally correlated to self-reported disorders. These results are reported in Figure
262	1.

263

265 **DISCUSSION**

This is the first study that evaluates quantitatively the efficiency of the SST-12 to screen for post-COVID-19 olfactory disorders, and specially to identify post COVID-19 anosmics patients.

269 Screening for olfactory disorders is important because, in addition to allowing to set 270 up appropriate care for patients, it helps prevent the occurrence of consequences of long-271 term anosmia like an alteration in the quality of life⁽⁵⁾, psychiatric disorders such as depression^(6,7), anxiety, anorexia⁽⁸⁾ and its nutritional consequences⁽⁹⁾, social interaction 272 273 disorders^(10,11) or cognitive impairment^(10,12,13). Although a subjective olfactory complaint (80% 274 anosmia, 20% hyposmia) is now a very frequent symptom of a COVID-19 infection ⁽²⁾ affecting 275 70 to 85% of patients ^(32,33), only 21% of clinicians use psychophysical olfactory tests to characterize this olfactory complaint ⁽²⁰⁾. Odor disorder is also the only symptom in 16-20% of 276 cases ^(3,34). 277

Post-COVID-19 olfactory disorders show unique psychophysical characteristics in the long term. In a population of 34 patients deprived of their olfaction for about 6 months after COVID-19 and presenting a persistent odor complaint (VAS), we previously highlighted a significantly predominant impairment of odor identification⁽⁵⁾, characteristic of central olfactory impairment ⁽²³⁾. This impairment worsened with the duration of olfactory deprivation and significantly impacted the quality of life.

The present study shows the reliability of SST-12 in screening for post-COVID-19 olfactory disorders, and in particular anosmia. Among SST-12 diagnostic errors, only 7% (n = 4) of hyposmic patients would have been considered normosmic by the gold standard (SST). The other differences in scores between the SST-12 and the SST do not modify the purpose of the screening, which is to perform or have performed complete olfactory tests in the event of

289 an abnormality detected. In this way, all but 4 patients (92%) would have been correctly 290 screened using the SST-12. All the anosmics patients at the SST were correctly screened by the 291 SST-12 as evidenced by the "good" correlation coefficient (0,61≤Kappa≤0,80 - Altman 1991). 292 Other screening test do exist. The Q-stick test^(35,36) is another olfactory screening test validated 293 on 196 people from the SST. It allows, after the age of 12, to assess the identification of three 294 smells (coffee, cloves and rose) contained again in olfactory markers. On the other hand, its 295 reliability coefficient is less good than the SST-12 (Kappa between 0.2 and 0.33 at most)⁽³⁶⁾. Also, it does not detect 8% of anosmics according to its authors⁽³⁶⁾. Others are more used in 296 297 Asia or the American continent (Cross Cultural Smell Identification Test (CC-SIT)⁽²⁷⁾, Q-SIT⁽²⁸⁾) but they are based on single-use "scratch and sniff". Others are less used⁽¹⁷⁾ (Kremer olfactory 298 Test, Le Nez du Vin, Smell Diskettes). They require additional specific equipment (Jet Stream 299 300 Olfactometer) or have been validated outside of Europe (different scents) or on small cohorts, 301 and never in the context of COVID-19.

The total SST-12, as SST, was significantly correlated (p < 0.001) with odor complaint 302 303 (VAS - figure 1) which reflects persistent post-COVID-19 olfactory impairment, i.e. 304 identification disorder ⁽⁵⁾. Unlike the SST, the SST-12 only assesses the identification of odors 305 and thus seems more suited to detect an identification disorder than the SST, which adds to 306 the identification score, a score for discrimination and perception of the odor threshold. As we have shown in previous studies ⁽⁵⁾, the SST interpretation can conclude to a global 307 normosmia when one of its subdomains is altered. The SST should therefore not be used as a 308 gold standard in the post-COVID-19 odor evaluation given that some patients, early⁽³⁷⁾ and at 309 310 a distance⁽⁵⁾ from SARS-COV-2 infection, may be incorrectly classified as normosmic on SST despite odor loss⁽⁵⁾. In this study we found that olfactory complain (VAS) was significantly 311 312 linked to an SST or SST12 impairment, justifying the no need to a psychophysical screening

313 test to take social distancing and barrier measures in case of acute olfactory disorders in 314 COVID-19 pandemic times. Even if SST-12 has been recently evaluated in a single-use "filter 315 paper" manner⁽³⁸⁾, 7% of hyposmic patients could be missed with such a test. This is especially 316 true since such a screening test poses a contamination risk to the examiner. However, at a 317 distance from acute infection, SST-12 could be helpful to screen post COVID-19 olfactory 318 disorders. In case of a complaining person, as our results suggest, a complete psychophysical 319 olfactory test might be directly performed as an olfactory complain is highly correlated with 320 an impaired SST and SST-12. But in case of a non-complaining, or olfactory impairment 321 unaware, post-COVID-19 patient, SST-12 could avoid negative consequences of unknown olfactory disorders, especially quality of life^(5,39–41) and metabolic impairments. Indeed, 45,5 322 323 and 20,5% (n=44) of post COVID-19 patients increased respectively their daily diet salt and 324 sugar intake. As previously published, salt and sugar intake increase concerned near 30% of 325 COVID-19 patients⁽¹⁵⁾, especially young women. Our results suggest that theses bad diet habits 326 could concerned in fact olfactory impaired post-COVID-19 patients, specifically anosmics ones 327 (SST-12≤6) being deprived of their original food tastes and trying to enhance it whatever the 328 way. Interestingly, there is no significant relation, otherwise only with the SST-12 score, 329 between the risk of bad diet habits and subjective olfactory complain, underlining the benefits 330 of using SST-12. The sugar intake is also concerned as COVID-19 could basically raise blood glucose and HbA1c levels⁽⁴²⁾ which has to be monitored after hospital discharge. It's a major 331 public health concern as post-COVID-19 olfaction disorders recovery time is still uncertain and 332 333 long term salt and sugar intake could increase respectively blood pressure⁽⁴³⁾ and type 2 334 diabetes⁽⁴⁴⁾ onset and so, cardiovascular risk. In case of SST-12 screened anosmia, a not to 335 change daily use of salt and sugar advice must be added to the patient consultation.

336	Despite these interesting results, this study suffers from some limitations. The main
337	limitation concerns the small cohort of 54 patients, with no follow up reported, who
338	spontaneously consulted our university hospital, which represents the risk of a recruitment
339	bias. The small sample size may have contributed to a limited strength of correlations (rho(32)
340	MAX = 0,49), and therefore our results cannot be directly generalized to all patients with a
341	post-covid olfactory disorder and could be verified in a larger prospective cohort study.
342	

343 CONCLUSION

- 344 The SST 12 is an olfactory psychophysical test suitable for screening an olfactory sequelae post
- 345 COVID-19. It makes it possible to highlight the subjective complaint of patients on the odor's
- identification. Its use in the context of screening for a long olfactory covid could be used for
- 347 the implementation of personalized management of olfactory disorders and the prevention
- of psychological and metabolic consequences adding to the impairment of quality of life.

349

350

352 REFERENCES

- 353 1. Gerkin RC, Ohla K, Veldhuizen MG, et al. Recent Smell Loss Is the Best Predictor of
- 354 COVID-19 Among Individuals With Recent Respiratory Symptoms. Chem Senses.
- 355 2021;46(December 2020):1–12.
- 356 2. Gane SB, Kelly C, Hopkins C. Isolated Sudden Onset Anosmia in COVID-19 Infection. A
- 357 Novel Syndrome? Rhinol J. 2020;58(3):299–301.
- 358 3. Carrillo-Larco RM, Altez-Fernandez C. Anosmia and dysgeusia in COVID-19: A
- 359 systematic review. Wellcome Open Res. 2020;5:94.
- 360 4. Kanjanaumporn J, Aeumjaturapat S, Snidvongs K, Seresirikachorn K, Chusakul S. Smell
- 361 and taste dysfunction in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection: A review of
- 362 epidemiology, pathogenesis, prognosis, and treatment options. Asian Pacific J Allergy
- 363 Immunol. 2020;69–77.
- 364 5. Vandersteen C, Payne M, Dumas L-E, et al. Persistent olfactory complaints after
- 365 COVID-19: a new interpretation of the psychophysical olfactory scores. Rhinol Online.
- 366 2021;4(14):66–72.
- 367 6. Hur K, Choi JS, Zheng M, Shen J, Wrobel B. Association of alterations in smell and taste
 368 with depression in older adults. Laryngoscope Investig Otolaryngol. 2018;3(2):94–9.
- 369 7. Kohli P, Soler ZM, Nguyen SA, Muus JS, Schlosser RJ. The Association Between
- 370 Olfaction and Depression: A Systematic Review. Chem Senses. 2016;41(6):479–86.
- 8. Croy I, Nordin S, Hummel T. Olfactory disorders and quality of life-an updated review.
- 372 Chem Senses. 2014;39(3):185–94.
- 9. Nordin S. Sensory perception of food and ageing. In: Food for the Ageing Population.
- 374 Elsevier; 2009. p. 73–94.
- 375 10. Valsamidis K, Printza A, Constantinidis J, Triaridis S. The Impact of Olfactory

- 376 Dysfunction on the Psychological Status and Quality of Life of Patients with Nasal
- 377 Obstruction and Septal Deviation. Int Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 2020;24(02):e237–46.
- 378 11. Schablitzky S, Pause BM. Sadness might isolate you in a non-smelling world: olfactory
- 379 perception and depression. Front Psychol. 2014;5(FEB).
- 380 12. Nordin S, Brämerson A. Complaints of olfactory disorders: epidemiology, assessment
- and clinical implications. Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol. 2008;8(1):10–5.
- 382 13. Ahmedy F, Mazlan M, Danaee M, Abu Bakar MZ. Post-traumatic brain injury olfactory
- 383 dysfunction: factors influencing quality of life. Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngology.
- 384 2020;277(5):1343–51.
- Hopkins C, Surda P, Vaira LA, et al. Six month follow-up of self-reported loss of smell
 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Rhinol J. 2020;(11):0–0.
- 387 15. Rolland B, Haesebaert F, Zante E, Benyamina A, Haesebaert J, Franck N. Global
- 388 Changes and Factors of Increase in Caloric/Salty Food Intake, Screen Use, and
- 389 Substance Use During the Early COVID-19 Containment Phase in the General
- 390 Population in France: Survey Study. JMIR Public Heal Surveill. 2020;6(3):e19630.
- 391 16. Boscolo P, Francesco R, Jerry G, et al. Self reported smell and taste recovery in
- 392 coronavirus disease 2019 patients : a one year prospective study. Eur Arch Oto-
- 393 Rhino-Laryngology. 2021;(0123456789).
- 394 17. Doty RL. Office Procedures for Quantitative Assessment of Olfactory Function. Am J
 395 Rhinol. 2007;21(4):460–73.
- 396 18. Su B, Bleier B, Wei Y, Wu D. Clinical Implications of Psychophysical Olfactory Testing:
- 397 Assessment, Diagnosis, and Treatment Outcome. Front Neurosci. 2021;15(March):1–
- 398

12.

399 19. Hummel T, Whitcroft KL, Andrews P, et al. Position paper on olfactory dysfunction.

- 400 Rhinol J. 2017;54(26):1–30.
- 401 20. Agyeman AA, Chin KL, Landersdorfer CB, Liew D, Ofori-Asenso R. Smell and Taste
- 402 Dysfunction in Patients With COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Mayo
- 403 Clin Proc. 2020;95(8):1621–31.
- 404 21. Oleszkiewicz A, Schriever VA, Croy I, Hähner A, Hummel T. Updated Sniffin' Sticks
- 405 normative data based on an extended sample of 9139 subjects. Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-
- 406 Laryngology. 2019;276(3):719–28.
- 407 22. Sorokowska A, Schriever VA, Gudziol V, et al. Changes of olfactory abilities in relation
- 408 to age: odor identification in more than 1400 people aged 4 to 80 years. Eur Arch Oto-
- 409 Rhino-Laryngology. 2015;272(8):1937–44.
- 410 23. Whitcroft KL, Cuevas M, Haehner A, Hummel T. Patterns of olfactory impairment
- 411 reflect underlying disease etiology. Laryngoscope. 2017;127(2):291–5.
- 412 24. Gudziol V, Lötsch J, Hähner A, Zahnert T, Hummel T. Clinical significance of results

413 from olfactory testing. Laryngoscope. 2006;116(10):1858–63.

- 414 25. Steinbach S, Hummel T, Böhner C, et al. Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment of
- 415 Taste and Smell Changes in Patients Undergoing Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer or
- 416 Gynecologic Malignancies. J Clin Oncol. 2009;27(11):1899–905.
- 417 26. Hummel T, Sekinger B, Wolf SR, Pauli E, Kobal G. 'Sniffin' Sticks': Olfactory
- 418 Performance Assessed by the Combined Testing of Odour Identification, Odor
- 419 Discrimination and Olfactory Threshold. Chem Senses. 1997;22(1):39–52.
- 420 27. Doty RL, Marcus A, William Lee W. Development of the 12-Item Cross-Cultural Smell
- 421 Identification Test(CC-SIT). Laryngoscope. 1996;106(3):353–6.
- 422 28. Jackman AH, Doty RL. Utility of a Three-Item Smell Identification Test in Detecting
- 423 Olfactory Dysfunction. Laryngoscope. 2005;115(12):2209–12.

- 424 29. Allis TJ, Leopold DA. Smell and Taste Disorders. Facial Plast Surg Clin North Am.
- 425 2012;20(1):93–111.
- 426 30. Rumeau C, Nguyen DT, Jankowski R. Comment tester l'olfaction avec le Sniffin' Sticks
- 427 test[®]. Ann françaises d'Oto-rhino-laryngologie Pathol Cervico-faciale.
- 428 2016;133(3):183–6.
- 429 31. Hummel T, Rosenheim K, Konnerth C-G, Kobal G. Screening of Olfactory Function with
- 430 a Four-Minute Odor Identification Test: Reliability, Normative Data, and Investigations
- 431 in Patients with Olfactory Loss. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol. 2001;110(10):976–81.
- 432 32. Lechien JR, Chiesa-Estomba CM, Place S, et al. Clinical and epidemiological
- 433 characteristics of 1420 European patients with mild-to-moderate coronavirus disease
- 434 2019. J Intern Med. 2020;288(3):335–44.
- 435 33. Lechien JR, Cabaraux P, Chiesa-Estomba CM, et al. Objective olfactory evaluation of
- 436 self-reported loss of smell in a case series of 86 COVID-19 patients. Head Neck.
- 437 2020;42(7):1583–90.
- 438 34. Lechien JR, Hopkins C, Saussez S. Sniffing out the evidence; It's now time for public
- 439 health bodies recognize the link between COVID-19 and smell and taste disturbance.
- 440 Rhinol J. 2020;10(7):0–0.
- 441 35. Hummel T, Pfetzing U, Lötsch J. A short olfactory test based on the identification of
 442 three odors. J Neurol. 2010;257(8):1316–21.
- 443 36. Sorokowska A, Oleszkiewicz A, Minovi A, Konnerth CG, Hummel T. Fast Screening of
- 444 Olfactory Function Using the Q-Sticks Test. ORL. 2019;81(5–6):245–51.
- 445 37. Lechien JR, Cabaraux P, Chiesa-Estomba CM, et al. Psychophysical Olfactory Tests and
- 446 Detection of COVID-19 in Patients With Sudden Onset Olfactory Dysfunction: A
- 447 Prospective Study. Ear, Nose Throat J. 2020;99(9):579–83.

- 448 38. Wirkner K, Hinz A, Loeffler M, Engel C. Sniffin' Sticks Screening 12 test: Presentation of
- d49 odours on filter paper improves the recognition rate. Rhinol J. 2021;0–0.
- 450 39. Liu DT, Besser G, Prem B, et al. Self-perceived Taste and Flavor Perception:
- 451 Associations With Quality of Life in Patients With Olfactory Loss. Otolaryngol Neck
- 452 Surg. 2020;019459982096524.
- 453 40. Elkholi SMA, Abdelwahab MK, Abdelhafeez M. Impact of the smell loss on the quality
- 454 of life and adopted coping strategies in COVID-19 patients. Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-
- 455 Laryngology. 2021;(0123456789).
- 456 41. Coelho DH, Reiter ER, Budd SG, Shin Y, Kons ZA, Costanzo RM. Quality of life and
- 457 safety impact of COVID-19 associated smell and taste disturbances. Am J Otolaryngol.
- 458 2021;42(4):103001.
- 459 42. Chen J, Wu C, Wang X, Yu J, Sun Z. The Impact of COVID-19 on Blood Glucose: A
- 460 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne).
- 461 2020;11(October):1–8.
- 462 43. Graudal NA, Hubeck-Graudal T, Jurgens G. Effects of low sodium diet versus high
- 463 sodium diet on blood pressure, renin, aldosterone, catecholamines, cholesterol, and
- 464 triglyceride. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;2017(4).
- 465 44. Lean MEJ, Te Morenga L. Sugar and type 2 diabetes. Br Med Bull. 2016;120(1):43–53.