**The usefulness of a quantitative olfactory test for the detection of COVID-19.**
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**Abstract**

**Background**: During the COVID-19 pandemic, olfactory dysfunction (anosmia or hyposmia) has been reported by many patients and recognized as a prevalent and early symptom of infection. This finding has been associated with viral-induced olfactory neuron dysfunction rather than the nasal congestion typically found in cold- or flu-like states. In literature, the prevalence of anosmia varies from 15% to 85%, and the studies, in general, were based on the subjective evaluation of patients’ self-reports of loss of smell (yes or no question). In the present study, we quantitatively evaluated olfactory dysfunction and the prevalence of fever in symptomatic patients suspected of having COVID-19 using a scratch-and-sniff olfactory test and infrared temperature testing with RT-PCR as the gold-standard comparator method to diagnose COVID-19 infection.

**Methods**: Outpatients had their forehead temperature checked with an infrared non-contact thermometer (temperature guns). After that, they received two olfactory smell identification test (SIT) cards (u-Smell-it™; CT, USA) that each had 5 scent windows and were asked to scratch with a pencil and sniff each of the 10 small circles containing the microencapsulated fragrances and mark the best option on a response card. Nasopharyngeal swabs were then collected for Reverse Transcriptase-Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) to determine if the patients were positive or negative for COVID-19 infection. We considered the number of ‘hits’ (correct answers) ≤ 5 as positive for loss of smell (LOS) in the olfactory test; ≥ 6 hits was considered negative for LOS (i.e. normal olfactory function). All data were analyzed using Excel and Matlab software.

**Results:** In the present study, 165 patients were eligible for the olfactory test and nasopharyngeal swab collection RT-PCR. Five patients were excluded because of inconclusive PCR results (n=2) and missing data (n=3). A total of 160 patients completed all the protocols. The RT-PCR positivity rate for COVID-19 was 27.5% (n=44), and PCR+ patients scored significantly worse in the olfactory test (5.5±3.5) compared to RT-PCR- patients (8.2±1.8, p<0.001). 0/44 PCR+ patients presented with a fever (≥37.8ºC). In contrast an olfactory SIT had a specificity of 94.8% (95% CI, 89.1 – 98.1), sensitivity of 47.7% (95% CI, 32.7 – 63.3), accuracy of 0.82 (95% CI, 0.75 – 0.87), positive predictive value of 77.8% (95% CI, 59.6 – 88.8), negative predictive value of 82.7% (85% CI, 78.7 – 86.7), and odds ratio of 16.7.

**Conclusion:** Our results suggest that temperature checking failed to detect COVID-19 infection, while an olfactory test may be useful to help identify COVID-19 infection in symptomatic patients.

**Introduction**

Supplemental Figure 1. Example of a scratch-and-sniff (u-Smell-it™) olfactory test.



Supplemental Figure 2. Example of a response card to the olfactory test.



Supplemental Table 1. Scent options and the right response for all cards used in this study.

