Pole selection in Polarized Sensory Positioning: Insights from the cognitive aspects behind the task

Gastón Ares[1]*, Lucía Antúnez[1], Denize Oliveira[2], Florencia Alcaire[1], Ana Giménez[1], Ingunn Berget[3], Tormod Næs[3], Paula Varela[3]

[1] Facultad de Química. Universidad de la República. Gral. Flores 2124. CP 11800. Montevideo, Uruguay.

[2] Instituto de Química, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Av. Athos da Silveira Ramos 149, Cidade Universitária 21949-909, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

[3]Nofima AS, P.O. Box 210, 1431 Ås, Norway

* Corresponding author: Gastón Ares. Telephone: +5982 9248003, Fax: +5982 9241906, E-mail: gares@fq.edu.uy

Abstract

Polarized Sensory Positioning (PSP) is a relatively new methodology for sensory characterization, based on the comparison of samples to reference samples, usually called poles. The key step in the implementation of this methodology is the selection of the poles. In this context, the aim of the present work was to gain insights on the strategies used by consumers to complete this task and to study the influence of the number and characteristics of the poles on results from PSP. Three consumer studies were carried out, on three product categories: chocolate-flavoured milks, vanilla milk desserts and orange-flavoured powdered drinks. In each study, three groups of consumers (n=40) evaluated samples using one of three sets of two or three poles. After the PSP task consumers indicated how they evaluated the degree of difference between the samples and the poles, and listed the sensory characteristics of the poles they took into account for the evaluation. Consumers tended to evaluate the degree of difference between the samples and each of the poles by evaluating the intensity of one or two main sensory characteristics. Sample configurations obtained using two and three poles did not largely differ, especially when the poles clearly represented the sensory characteristics responsible for the main differences among samples. This work demonstrates that it is possible to unfold a multidimensional sensory space with the use of just two well-selected poles, and that the number of poles should be selected considering the main sensory characteristics that discriminate among samples.

Keywords: *sensory characterization; PSP; reference-based methodologies; consumer*

1. Introduction

Polarized Sensory Positioning (PSP) is a reference-based methodology for sensory characterization with trained, semi-trained or untrained assessors (Varela & Ares, 2012). It is based on the comparison of samples with a set of fixed references, commonly referred to as poles (Teillet 2014). Comparison of samples with references allows comparing data collected in different sessions, which is the main advantage of the methodology. PSP is a good methodological choice for sensory characterization of sample sets that require multiple sessions to be evaluated due to their complexity or intense/persistent sensory characteristics (Ares & Varela, 2014). PSP was initially developed for sensory characterization of mineral waters, which can be regarded as challenging products due to the subtle differences usually found in their sensory profiles (Teillet, 2014). According to Teillet, Schlich, Urbano, Cordelle, & Guichard (2010) the best approach to evaluate the small differences that characterize samples of commercial mineral waters is comparison with references (Teillet, 2014). Initial explorations by Varela et al. (2014) with the use of a trained panel also suggested that PSP could be a good method when enhanced discrimination is sought.

The original application of PSP required assessors to quantify the overall degree of difference between each sample and each of the poles using unstructured scales, ranging from "exactly the same" to "totally different" (Teillet et al., 2010). No indication is given to assessors about the sensory attributes that should be considered in the evaluation of global similarities and differences between samples and the poles or their relative importance. PSP can be seen as a compromise between holistic methods, like projective mapping or sorting, and analytical methods, like flash profiling. In general, holistic methods can be regarded as more natural, less analytic and more representative of consumer evaluation of products than attribute-based methodologies (Ares & Varela, 2014). Thus, it could be expected that sensory characterizations obtained using PSP would better represent consumers' perceived similarities and differences among samples than those obtained using attribute-based techniques. The potential

disadvantage of PSP, as in any holistic methodology, is that assessors could use different criteria for sample evaluation, leading to more noisy data. However, heterogeneity could also be seen as an advantage as it allows considering different points of view, particularly when dealing with large groups of untrained assessors (Ares & Varela, 2014).

PSP has a great potential for sensory characterization with semi-trained or untrained assessors during new product development, due to its iterative nature (Costa & Jongen, 2006). In this process, prototypes are obtained in different moments in time and comparison of their sensory characteristics is usually necessary. PSP allows aggregating and comparing data collected in different sessions. However, published applications of PSP are limited to a few products, which include mineral water (Teillet et al., 2010), cosmetic creams (Chrea, Teillet, & Navarro, 2011), chocolate flavoured milk (Antúnez, Salvador, de Saldamando, Varela, Giménez, & Ares, 2015), cheese and meatballs (Varela, Svartebekk Myhrer, Næs, & Hersleth,2014), yogurt (Cadena et al., 2014), make-up foundations and orange flavoured powdered drinks (de Saldamando, Delgado, Herencia, Giménez, & Ares, 2013).

The selection of the poles is probably the most important step for the implementation of this methodology. In this sense, one of the first questions that arises when designing a PSP study is how many poles should be considered. Although it can be hypothesized that using more poles could enable to detect more detailed differences among samples, it should be taken into account that increasing the number of poles makes the task more difficult and tedious, increasing sensory fatigue and becoming more cognitively requiring.

The usual number of poles that has been used in PSP studies is three (Teillet, 2014). This number has been recommended, assuming that most information about the sensory characteristics of samples would be represented in a two-dimensional space, and considering that three poles would be needed to stabilize that space. According to this criterion, if more than two dimensions are expected to be necessary to represent the

similarities and differences among samples, the number of poles should be augmented. However, Teillet et al. (2010) has reported that a three-dimensional space was defined using a PSP task with three poles. This result suggests that the number of poles necessary for defining a sensory space would depend on the number of *sensory dimensions* responsible for the main similarities and differences among samples, rather than on the *spatial dimensions*. It could be hypothesized then, that if samples differ in two main sensory dimensions only two poles could be enough as long as they are adequately represented by the selected poles.

Therefore, how to select the poles is a relevant question that still needs to be answered. Published studies have selected poles that represent the main sensory characteristics responsible for the expected similarities and differences among samples. For example, according to Teillet et al. (2010) degree of mineralization was considered the main determinant of the sensory characteristics of mineral water. Waters with low mineralization are characterized by their metallic and bitter taste, waters with medium mineral content show neutral and fresh taste, while high mineralization provides salty taste. For this reason, the authors selected three poles with different degrees of mineralization (low, intermediate and high). Other research has shown that small changes in the set of poles do not lead to relevant changes in sample configurations, as long as the poles represent the main sensory characteristics responsible for similarities and differences among samples (de Saldamando et al., 2013, Teillet, 2014).

Understanding the cognitive strategies used by assessors to estimate the degree of difference between the samples and the poles could also contribute to generate recommendations on how to select the poles. That is, if assessors evaluate the differences thinking of one or two main sensory attributes, or if on the other hand, they assess the samples from a more holistic point of view. Those two cognitive paths could potentially require different points of reference or poles.

The present work aims at contributing to the development of best practices for the selection of poles for PSP studies. The following research questions were formulated:

How does the number of poles affect sample configurations obtained using PSP? Do the sensory characteristics of the poles influence the number of poles needed in a PSP task? How do assessors evaluate the degree of difference between the samples and the poles? Results are expected to provide insights on how many poles are necessary for PSP studies and how these poles should be selected.

2. Materials and Methods

Across three consumer studies, the influence of the number and characteristics of poles on results from PSP was studied using a between-subjects experimental design. In each study three groups of consumers used PSP for characterizing a sample set using different number of poles: one of the groups used 3 poles and the other two groups used 2 different sets of 2 poles. The rational of pole selection is explained in section 2.3. Consumers were asked to complete two open-ended questions about their strategy for evaluating the degree of difference between the samples and the poles, and which sensory characteristics of the poles they took into account.

2.1. Consumers

One hundred and twenty consumers participated in each of the three studies, i.e. different consumers participated in each study. All of them were recruited from the consumer database of the Food Science and Technology Department of Universidad de la República (Uruguay), based on their consumption of the target product and their availability to participate. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 49 and were 60% female. They signed an informed consent form and received a small gift for their participation.

2.2. Samples

Three product categories were considered: chocolate-flavoured milk, vanilla milk desserts and orange-flavoured powdered drinks.

154

155 ***Study 1***

156 Eight samples of chocolate flavoured milk were formulated in Study 1, varying the
157 concentration of alkaline cocoa powder and sugar. Sample formulation, presented in
158 Table 1, was determined by pilot testing with trained assessors in order to have samples
159 with noticeable differences in two main sensory characteristics, sweetness and
160 chocolate flavour. The rest of the formulation consisted of 0.08% carrageenan (Ticaloid®
161 780 Stabilizer, TIC GUMS, Philadelphia, USA) and pasteurized whole milk (up to 100%).
162 Samples were prepared using a Thermomix TM 31 (Vorwerk Mexico S. de R.L. de C.V.,
163 Mexico D.F. Mexico). The solid ingredients were mixed with the milk, previously heated
164 to 70°C for 3 min. The dispersion was mixed for 1 min under gentle agitation (100 rpm),
165 heated to 70 °C for 4 min and cooled to 20 °C. Then, samples were placed in glass
166 containers, closed, and maintained under refrigeration temperature (4 °C ± 1°C). They
167 were removed from the refrigerator as needed immediately prior to sensory evaluation,
168 and dispensed into plastic serving cups.

169

170 Insert Table 1 around here

171

172 ***Study 2***

173 Eight milk desserts were formulated by varying the concentration of modified
174 starch (Purity HPC, National Starch and Chemical Company; Bridgewater, NJ, USA) and
175 sugar. Sample formulations (Table 2) were selected based on previous studies to get a
176 set of milk desserts with noticeable different sensory characteristics. Samples contained
177 12% powdered skimmed milk (Conaprole, Uruguay), 0.4% vanilla flavouring (0.4%),
178 0.1% sodium tripolyphosphate, 0.025% sucralose (0.025%), 0.02% carrageenan (TIC
179 PRETESTED® Colloid 710 H, TIC GUMS, Philadelphia, USA), 0.0025% egg yellow
180 colouring, and water (up to 100%). Samples were prepared using a Thermomix TM 31
181 (Vorwerk Mexico S. de R.L. de C.V., México D.F., México). The solid ingredients were

mixed with the water and heated to 90ºC for 5 minutes. Then, the colorant and vanilla flavour were added and the dispersion was mixed again for 1 minute under gentle agitation (100 rpm). The desserts were placed in glass containers and then stored refrigerated (4-7 ºC) for 24 h, prior to their evaluation.

Insert Table 2 around here

Study 3

Six samples of commercial orange-flavoured powdered drinks (samples A to F) were used in Study 3. All samples were available in the Uruguayan market and were purchased from local supermarkets in Montevideo (Uruguay). Two of the samples were selected as poles in the evaluation: pole P1 (sample E) and pole P2 (sample F). Pole P3 corresponded to a commercial sample that was not included in the sample set which according to previous studies, had similar sensory characteristics to sample B (Ares, de Saldamando, Vidal, Antúnez, Giménez, & Varela, 2013). Samples were prepared following the recommendations provided by the manufacturer on the package. The powders were diluted in tap water and stored at 10°C until they were served to consumers in plastic containers, within 4 hours.

2.3. Experimental design

In each study consumers were randomly assigned to three groups (n=40), each of which evaluated samples using a different set of poles.

One of the groups evaluated samples using Set 1, which was composed of three poles (P1, P2, P3). The poles were selected to represent the main sensory characteristics responsible for the similarities and differences among samples. The other two groups evaluated the samples using sets of two poles.

In Studies 1 and 2 pole selection was based on sample formulation. The three poles included in Set 1 (P1, P2 and P3) corresponded to extreme points of the

experimental design (Figure 1). Set 2 comprised poles with the highest and lowest concentration of the two formulation variables, i.e. Poles P1 and P3. Finally, the third set included poles P1' and P2', which were formulated using the highest concentration of one of the variables and intermediate concentration of the other variable (Figure 1).

Meanwhile, pole selection in Study 3 was based on results from previous studies (Ares et al., 2013). Each of the three poles included in Set 1 represented one of the sensory characteristics responsible for the main differences among samples: sourness, sweetness and total flavour intensity. Sets 2 and 3 were created by selecting two of the poles included in Set 1. Poles P2 and P3 were considered in Set 2, whereas Poles P1 and P2 were included in Set 3.

A summary of the characteristics of the three sets of poles is shown in Table 3.

Insert Figure 1 around here

Insert Table 3 around here

2.4. Data collection

The procedure for data collection was identical in the three studies. Consumers received the three poles and the evaluated samples. The poles were coded as R1, R2 and R2, whereas samples were coded with three-digit random numbers. Some of the poles were evaluated as blind coded samples in the three studies, as detailed in Sections 2.2 and 2.3. The order in which participants received samples differed among participants, following a design balanced for order and carry-over effects (Williams' Latin Square).

Consumers were asked to try the poles and to remember their sensory characteristics. Then, they had to taste the samples and to rate the overall difference between each sample and each one of the poles using an unstructured scale anchored from "exactly the same" to "totally different ". The poles were available for re-tasting

during the whole evaluation. Consumers were told that they had to complete the task according to their own criteria, taking into account that there were no right or wrong answers. Still mineral water was available for mouth rinsing between samples.

After finishing the task consumers answered the following open-ended questions: "How did you evaluate the degree of difference between samples and the poles?" and "What sensory characteristics of each of the poles did you take into account in the evaluation?".

Testing took place in a sensory laboratory in standard sensory booths designed in accordance with ISO 8589 (ISO, 2007), under artificial daylight and temperature control (22ºC). Data collection was carried out using *Compusense-at-hand* (Compusense Inc., Guelph, Canada).

2.5. Data analysis

Data from PSP were analysed using Multiple factor Analysis (MFA), considering data from each consumer as a separate group of variables. This approach preserves individual data and compensates for individual differences when scoring global differences between samples and poles (Teillet, 2014). Confidence ellipses were calculated using parametric bootstrapping (Dehlholm, Brockhoff, & Bredie, 2012).

The RV coefficient (Robert & Escoufier, 1976) was used to evaluate the agreement of sample configurations obtained from groups of consumers using different sets of poles. The significance of the RV coefficient was tested using a permutation test (Josse, Pagès, & Husson, 2008).

All statistical analyses were performed in R language (R Core Team, 2013) using FactoMineR (Lê, Josse, & Husson, 2008).

3. Results

3.1. Sample configurations

3.1. Study 1: Chocolate flavoured milks

When the set of three poles (Set 1) was considered in the PSP task the percentage of variance explained by the first and second dimensions of the MFA was 63.8%. As expected, samples were positioned in the bi-dimensional space according to their sugar and cacao concentration. The first dimension of the MFA was positively correlated with sugar content. Samples with the lowest sugar content (C and E) were located at negative values of the first dimension, while samples formulated with the highest sugar content (B and F) were located at the highest positive values of Dimension 1 (Figure 2a). Cacao content was correlated with both the first and second dimensions. Samples formulated with the highest cacao concentration (B and D) were located at positive values of the first and second dimensions, samples with the lowest cacao concentration (A and C) tended to be located at the opposite side of the sensory space, whereas samples with intermediate cacao concentration (E and F) were located between the other two groups. No overlapping in the confidence ellipses was observed, suggesting that the methodology significantly discriminated all samples.

Insert Figure 2 around here

When one of the poles was not included in the PSP task and consumers used only two poles (Set 2, poles P1 and P2) sample configurations were similar (Figure 2b). The percentage of explained variance and conclusions regarding similarities did not largely differ. The RV between samples configurations obtained using Set 1 and Set 2 was significant and close to 0.85 (Table 4). However, some differences between the configurations were identified. When consumers used Set 1, the first dimension of the MFA was spanned by samples B and C (Figure 2a), whereas when Set 2 was considered these samples spanned the second dimension of the MFA (Figure 2b). Also, some

differences in the relative distance between pair of samples were identified, such as between samples C and E and between samples D and E.

When consumers used Set 3, which also included 2 poles (c.f. Table 3), sample configurations were less similar (Figure 2c). Although samples were distributed along the first dimension according to their sugar content, the influence of cacao content was not very clear. Sample D was separated from the rest of the samples, which could be explained by its high cacao content. However, samples B and F were located very close to each other, as were samples C and E, even though they differed in their cacao content (c.f. Table 1 and Figure 2c). Despite these differences, the RV coefficient between sample configurations obtained using Set 1 and Set 3 was high (Table 4), which can be explained by the similarity between sample configurations in the first dimension of the MFA.

Insert Table 4 around here

3.2. Study 2: Milk desserts

When consumers completed the PSP task using three poles (Set 1), samples were distributed along the first dimension of the MFA according to their starch concentration. The thicker samples (B and D) were located at positive values of the first dimension, whereas samples A and F, formulated with the lowest starch concentration were located at negative values of Dimension 1 (Figure 3). Sugar concentration was correlated to the second dimension. Samples formulated with low and intermediate sugar concentration (A, B, C and D) tended to be located at positive values of the second dimensions, whereas samples E and F (with the lowest sugar concentration) were located at negative values of the second dimension.

When consumers used Set 2 (which included poles P1 and P2), sample configuration was almost identical to the one obtained using Set 1 (c.f. Figures 3a and 3b), as denoted by the high RV coefficient (RV= 0.986, Table 4).

The sample configuration obtained using Set 3 showed some differences as compared to the configuration obtained with the other two set of poles (Figure 3). This can be visualized by comparing the RV coefficient between sample configurations obtained using the different set of poles (Table 4). In this study, sample discrimination was affected by changing the set of poles. When consumers used Set 3 samples A and F were located almost in the same place of the bi-dimensional space, while samples B and D were significantly discriminated. However, when Set 1 and Set 2 were considered the opposite trend was observed: the confidence ellipses of samples A and F did not overlap, whereas samples B and D were not significantly discriminated.

Insert Figure 3 around here

3.3. Study 3: Powdered orange juices

Four dimensions were necessary to explain the main sensory characteristics responsible for the similarities and differences among the orange-flavoured powdered drink samples considered in Study 3 (Figure 4). When consumers used three poles (Set 1) in the PSP task, three main groups of samples were identified in the first and second dimensions of the MFA (Figure 4a): sample E, a group composed of samples A, F and D, and another group composed of samples B and C. When the third and fourth dimensions of the MFA were considered sample D was located in a distinct position and samples B and C were significantly discriminated.

The sample configuration obtained using Set 2 (two poles) was almost identical to the one obtained using Set 1 in the four dimensions of the MFA (c.f. Figure 4a and b), showing RV coefficients higher than 0.96 (Table 4).

When Set 3 was considered sample configurations were less similar (Figure 4c, Table 4). Sample D was discriminated from samples A and F in the first two dimensions of the sensory space. Besides, consumers were not able to significantly discriminate between samples B and C in the first four dimensions of the MFA, whereas samples A

and F were located in clearly different positions in the third and fourth dimensions of the MFA (Figure 4c).

Insert Figure 4 around here

3.2. Open-ended questions

When consumers were asked about the cognitive strategies they used for evaluating the degree of difference between the samples and the poles, they referred to the evaluation of specific sensory characteristics. They stated that they first tasted the poles and tried to associate each of them with one or two sensory characteristics. Then, when they tasted the samples they evaluated the intensity of those sensory characteristics to evaluate the degree of difference between samples and the poles. Exemplar quotes of consumers' responses are included below:

> *"I tasted samples A2 and B2 and assigned characteristics to each of them. Then, I tried each of the samples looking for those characteristics"*
>
> *"I associated sample A2 with sweetness and sample B2 with bitterness. Then, I tried samples and evaluated those two characteristics to rate their similarity with samples A2 and B2"*
>
> *"I evaluated sweetness, sourness and total flavour intensity, which were the main characteristics of the three poles"*

These results suggest that consumers tend to evaluate the degree of difference between a sample and a pole as the intensity of a sensory characteristic or a group of similar characteristics. This was confirmed by consumers' responses to the open-ended question about the characteristics they took into account for evaluating the degree of difference between samples and each of the poles. As shown in Table 5, in Study 1 consumers mainly referred to sweetness, bitterness and chocolate flavour as the main sensory characteristics that were considered for estimating the degree of difference

between the samples and the poles. As expected, pole P1 was associated with sweetness, while pole P3 was mainly associated with bitterness and chocolate flavour. Pole P2 showed intermediate sensory characteristics, in agreement with its formulation (Table 1). Consumers stated that they took into account both chocolate flavour and sweetness for estimating the degree of difference between this pole and the samples. Pole P2' was expected to represent bitterness and chocolate flavour, as it was formulated with the maximum cacao concentration. It is interesting to note that the frequency of mention of the term bitter was lower than that of pole P3, which could be explained considering the difference in sugar concentration of both samples (Table 1). Consumers also mentioned other sensory characteristics such as rough, smooth, strong flavour or mild flavour to describe the poles. However, the frequency of mention of these characteristics was lower than 20%.

In Study 2 results were similar. Consumers mainly took into account thickness and sweetness for estimating the degree of difference between the samples and the poles (Table 5).

In Study 3 the three poles considered in Set 1 represented three different sensory characteristics. Pole P1 was associated with sweetness and orange flavour, pole P2 with sourness and pole P3 with low total flavour intensity, being described as diluted (Table 5).

Insert Table 5 around here

4. Discussion

Selection of poles is a key step for the implementation of Polarized Sensory Positioning (PSP). Therefore, recommendations on how to select the poles are necessary for practitioners. The present work addressed this topic by studying how consumers evaluated the degree of differences between the poles and the samples, and

406 by studying how sample configurations were affected by the number and characteristics
407 of the poles.
408
409 **4.1. Sensory characteristics of the poles**
410 When completing PSP tasks consumers reported that they tried to identify the
411 most relevant sensory characteristics that differentiated the poles. Then, they associated
412 one or two sensory characteristics with each of the poles and evaluated the degree of
413 difference between samples and each of the poles by measuring the intensity of those
414 sensory characteristics. Therefore, degree of difference ratings are expected to be
415 strongly correlated with the intensity of specific sensory characteristics. These results
416 have several implications for the selection of the poles.
417 The poles should be perceivable different as they determine consumers'
418 strategies for completing the PSP task. Consumers should be able to clearly identify
419 differences among the poles and to associate these differences with specific sensory
420 characteristics, which is the second implication of the cognitive strategy used by
421 consumers for estimating the degree of difference between the poles and the samples.
422 It is advisable that the poles clearly represent specific sensory characteristics. Sample
423 discrimination in PSP tasks is expected to increase if consumers are able to easily
424 identify the sensory characteristics that drive differences among the poles and to
425 associate a few characteristics with each of the poles.
426
427 **4.2. Degree of difference among the poles**
428 Studies 1 and 2 provided insight on the influence of the degree of difference
429 among the poles on sample discrimination in PSP tasks. In both studies samples mainly
430 differed in two sensory characteristics: sweetness and chocolate flavour/bitterness in
431 Study 1, and sweetness and thickness in Study 2. The poles in Set 2 were selected
432 based on their formulation to have high intensity of one sensory characteristic and low
433 intensity of the other (c.f. Tables 1 and 2). Meanwhile, the poles in Set 3 were selected

to have high intensity of one sensory characteristic and intermediate intensity of the other. Therefore, the degree of difference between the poles in Set 2 was larger than the difference among the poles in Set 3. When consumers used Set 2 to complete the PSP task the position of samples along the first and second dimension of the MFA was clearly explained by their formulation (Figures 1 and 2). On the other hand, when consumers evaluated samples using Set 3, samples were not clearly sorted in the first two dimensions of the MFA according to their formulation. It can be hypothesized that when each pole is strongly associated with one sensory characteristic consumers are able to focus on that characteristic and more accurately evaluate the degree of difference between the samples and the poles.

4.3. Number of poles in PSP tasks

Another implication of how consumers complete the PSP task is related to the number of poles needed to obtain a bi-dimensional configuration. Difference ratings seem to be related to the intensity of specific sensory characteristics. Therefore, two poles can accurately represent a sensory space defined by two main groups of sensory characteristics. Samples would be located in the bi-dimensional space according to the intensity of those two groups of characteristics, measured as the degree of difference between samples and each of the poles. This was clearly observed in Studies 1 and 2. Removing one of the poles from Set 1 did not have a large effect on sample configurations, and therefore results obtained using two of the poles (Set 2) were largely similar (c.f. Figures 1 and 2, Table 4). Also the percentage of explained variance did not largely vary when PSP was performed using 2 or 3 poles (Figures 1 and 2). In these studies pole P2 did not seem to add relevant information about similarities and differences among samples as it had intermediate sensory characteristics from poles P1 and P3 (c.f. Tables 1 and 2). However, some differences in the conclusions regarding similarities and differences among samples were identified, which suggests that the influence of the number of poles on results from PSP deserves further exploration.

462 Furthermore, an important point that should be taken into account is that the influence of
463 the number of poles on results from PSP is expected to strongly depend on the sample
464 set, as well as on the sensory characteristics of the poles.
465 Study 3 provided further insight on the influence of the number of poles in PSP
466 studies. When consumers used three poles four dimensions were necessary to fully
467 visualize differences among samples, particularly for differentiating samples B and C and
468 samples A and D (Figure 3a). Consumers referred to three main sensory characteristics
469 as responsible for the differences between samples and the poles: sweetness, sourness
470 and total flavour intensity (Table 5). However, it is important to note total flavour intensity
471 can be considered as sweetness and sourness intensity. Sample configurations
472 obtained with three poles (Set 1) and one of the subsets of two poles (Set 2) were almost
473 identical, as shown in Figures 3 (a) and (b). It is interesting to note that the sample
474 configurations obtained with 2 and 3 poles were similar in both the first two and the first
475 four dimensions of the MFA (Table 4). This suggests that using two poles enabled to
476 obtain a four-dimensional sensory space, which could be explained considering that
477 consumers' heterogeneity was preserved by MFA. Some consumers might have taken
478 into account different sensory characteristic for estimating the degree of difference
479 between samples and the poles and their perception was kept in higher dimensions of
480 the MFA. For example, in Study 3 some consumers referred to orange/citrus flavour
481 when asked about the sensory characteristics of the poles they relied on for estimating
482 degree of difference, although the majority of the consumers referred to the *attributes*
483 *sweet, sour* and *diluted* (Table 5). Similarly, in Study 1 the main sensory characteristics
484 that characterized the poles were sweetness, bitterness and chocolate flavour. However,
485 some consumers referred to roughness and total flavour intensity for describing the
486 sensory characteristics of the poles.
487
488 **4.4. Influence of the number of poles on sample discrimination in PSP tasks**

In Study 3 when consumers used one of the sets of two poles (Set 3) sample configurations slightly differed from the one obtained using three poles (Set 1), as shown in Figures 4(a) and 4(c). When P1 and P2 were considered in the task, Sample D, which had intermediate sensory characteristics from the two poles was discriminated from samples A and F in the first dimension of the MFA (Figure 4c). However, these samples were only discriminated in the third and fourth dimensions (Figures 4a and 4b) when consumers used three poles (Set 1, Figure 4a) or when they used two poles that did not include a sweet sample (Set 2, Figure 4b) (cf. Tables 3 and 5). This suggests that discrimination according to sweetness and sourness was achieved considering two poles, which differed in these specific characteristics.

On the contrary, sample discrimination of diluted samples (B and C) was reduced when a pole representing this sensory characteristic was not included (Set 3). This result indicates that PSP can discriminate samples characterized by sensory attributes that are not represented by the poles, in agreement with results reported by Teillet et al. (2010). These authors reported that a water sample containing chlorine was identified in a PSP study performed using poles that did not represent this sensory attribute. However, it should be taken into account that discriminating ability might be compromised for samples with sensory characteristic that are not well-represented by the poles, as shown in Study 3 for samples B and C. In this sense, it is important to stress that sample discrimination did not seem to be affected by removing the pole that represented sweetness in Set 2, probably due to the fact that only one sample was clearly associated with this characteristic (sample E).

4.5. General recommendations, limitations and suggestions for further research

In the light of the obtained results, poles should reflect the main sensory dimensions as represented by the main specific sensory attributes, rather than just expanding the map dimensionality to cover a determined number of factors. This work demonstrates that it is possible to unfold a multidimensional sensory space with the use

517 of two well selected poles. However, care must be taken, as the characteristics of the
518 poles should really reflect the main characteristics that are drivers of the sensory space
519 to being able to obtain reliable results with only two poles. It is also very important to
520 think about the particular objectives of each product characterization study when
521 deciding how to select the poles. In this regard, one can imagine situations in which some
522 sensory dimensions could be more interesting than others (not necessarily the main
523 sensory dimensions), so alternative poles could be selected to get increased
524 discrimination in those specific dimensions, or cases in which some attributes could be
525 of interest in order to have a good discrimination. More research would be needed to
526 generate recommendations on these aspects.

527 Further than this, more research would be needed to being able to generalize,
528 but also better understand the limitations of the findings of this work, for example when
529 more complex samples are under study. Sample complexity could be an issue when
530 deciding the number of poles. If multiple texture and flavour characteristics were involved
531 in sample description, or when it is not so easy to explicitly identify main sensory
532 attributes, it would be very likely that the use of two poles would not be enough for
533 characterizing the whole sensory space. Another point to consider in further research
534 should be the degree of difference of the sample set to be characterized, it could be
535 expected that when working with narrower sensory spaces, the use of a low number of
536 poles could be problematic, as assessors might struggle to associate poles and samples
537 with specific sensory attributes or group of attributes.

538 Finally, it is important to take into account that although the approaches used for
539 comparing results obtained using different set of poles relied on commonly used
540 statistical techniques they do not allow to conclude if sample configurations are identical.
541 In this sense, the development of statistical methods to compare sample configurations
542 seems necessary to study the effect of how variation in the implementation of sensory
543 methods affect the results and to compare different methodological approaches. In this
544 sense, it is worth highlighting that concerns about the limitations of the RV coefficient for

545 comparing sample configurations have recently been raised by different authors (El
546 Ghaziri & Qannari, 2015; Josse & Holmes, 2014; Tomic, Berget & Næs, 2015; Tomic,
547 Forde, Delahunty, & Næs, 2013).
548
549 **5. Conclusions**
550 Results from the present work allowed a better understanding of pole selection in
551 PSP Polarized Sensory Positioning studies. As general recommendation, poles should
552 clearly represent the groups of main sensory characteristics responsible for the expected
553 differences among samples. It is advisable to select poles that are perceived as clearly
554 different and that each of the poles clearly represents one or two sensory characteristics.
555 The number of poles in a PSP task should be related to the number of groups of
556 main sensory characteristics that are expected to discriminate among samples and not
557 necessarily to the dimensions necessary to represent samples in a low-dimensional
558 space obtained from factorial techniques such as PCA, GPA or MFA. For example, two
559 well selected poles could potentially represent a bi-dimensional sensory space, instead
560 of the three poles that would be necessary to represent that space from a geometrical
561 point of view. Using two instead of three poles might make the task easier for untrained
562 assessors, and reduce sensory and cognitive fatigue, but care should be taken when
563 selecting those two poles. PSP seems to be able to identify samples showing sensory
564 characteristics not represented by the poles. However, it should be taken into account
565 that the ability of the task to differentiate among these samples could be expected to be
566 low. The present study did not aim to recommend the use of only two poles in PSP
567 studies, but rather to highlight the potential of unfolding sensory dimensions based on
568 the diversity of consumers' perceptions.
569 Further research exploring the influence of the number and characteristics of the
570 poles in studies involving more complex samples would be needed to better understand
571 the implication of the potential unfolding (or not) of the sensory space. Also, the influence

572 of the number of poles on the quality of sensory spaces constructed by aggregating PSP
573 data collected in different sessions and/or with different panels deserves consideration.
574
575
576 **Acknowledgments**
577 The authors are indebted to Comisión Sectorial de Investigación Científica
578 (Universidad de la República, Uruguay) and to CAPES-Brasil for financial support.
579 Authors also are grateful for financial support from the Norwegian Foundation for
580 Research Levy on Agricultural Products through the research program “Sensory
581 strategies and consumer insight for healthy and palatable food” and to FFL and the
582 Research Council of Norway through the RapidCheck project.
583
584
585 **References**
586 Antúnez, A., Salvador, A., de Saldamando, L., Varela, P., Giménez, A., & Ares, G
587 (2015). Evaluation of data aggregation in Polarized Sensory Positioning. *Journal of*
588 *Sensory Studies*, 30, 46-55.
589 Ares, G., de Saldamando, L., Vidal, L., Antúnez, L., Giménez, A. & Varela, P. (2013).
590 Polarized Projective Mapping: Comparison with Polarized Sensory Positioning
591 approaches. *Food Quality and Preference*, 28, 510–518.
592 Ares, G., & Varela, P. (2014). Comparison of Novel Methodologies for Sensory
593 Characterization. In P. Varela & G. Ares (Eds.), *Novel Techniques in Sensory*
594 *Characterization and Consumer Profiling* (pp. 365–389). Boca Raton: CRC Press.
595 Cadena,R.S., Caimi, D., Jaunarena, I., Lorenzo, I., Vidal, L., Ares, G., Deliza, R.,
596 Giménez, A. (2014). Comparison of rapid sensory characterization methodologies
597 for the development of functional yogurts. *Food Research International,* 64, 446-
598 455.

599 Chrea, C., Teillet, E., & Navarro, S. (2011). Application of the polarized sensory
600 positioning in the cosmetic area. In *9th Pangborn Sensory Science Symposium*, 4–
601 8 September, 2011, Toronto, Canada.
602 de Saldamando, L., Delgado, J., Herencia, P., Giménez, A., & Ares, G. (2013). Polarized
603 sensory positioning: Do conclusions depend on the poles? *Food Quality and*
604 *Preference,* 29, 25–32.
605 Costa, A.I.A., & Jongen, W.M.F. (2006). New insights into consumer-led food product
606 development. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 17, 457-465.
607 Dehlholm, C., Brockhoff, P. B., & Bredie, W. L. P. (2012). Confidence ellipses: A variation
608 based on parametric bootstrapping applicable on multiple factor analysis results for
609 rapid graphical evaluation. *Food Quality and Preference*, 26, 278–280.
610 El Ghaziri, A., & Qannari, E.M. (2015). Measures of association between two datasets:
611 Application to sensory data. *Food Quality and Preference,* 40, 116-124.
612 Josse, J., & Holmes, S. (2014). *Measures of dependence between random vectors and*
613 *tests of independence. Literature review.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Library.
614 Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1307.7383v3.pdf. Accessed November 22nd, 2014.
615 Josse, J., Pagés, J., & Husson, F. (2008). Testing the significance of the RV coefficient.
616 *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis,* 53, 82–91.
617 Lê, S., Josse, J., & Husson, F. (2008). FactoMineR: An R package for multivariate
618 analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software,* 25(1), 1–18.
619 R Core Team (2013). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna:
620 R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
621 Robert, P., & Escoufier, Y. (1976). A unifying tool for linear multivariate statistical
622 methods: The RV coefficient. *Applied Statistics,* 25, 257–265.
623 Teillet, E. (2014). Polarized sensory positioning methodologies. In P. Varela & G. Ares
624 (Eds.), *Novel techniques in sensory characterization and consumer profiling,* pp.
625 255-270. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

626 Teillet, E., Schlich, P., Urbano, C., Cordelle, S., & Guichard, E. (2010). Sensory
627 methodologies and the taste of water. *Food Quality and Preference*, 21, 967–976.
628 Tomic, O., Berget, I., Næs, T. (2015). A comparison of generalised procrustes analysis
629 and multiple factor analysis for projective mapping data. *Food Quality and*
630 *Preference,* 43, 34-46.
631 Tomic, O., Forde, C., Delahunty, C., Næs, T. (2013). Performance indices in descriptive
632 sensory analysis – A complimentary screening tool for assessor and panel
633 performance. *Food Quality and Preference*, 28, 122-133.
634 Varela, P., & Ares, G (2012). Sensory profiling, the blurred line between sensory and
635 consumer science. A review of novel methods for product characterization. *Food*
636 *Research International*, 48, 893–908.
637 Varela, P., Svartebekk Myhrer, K., Næs, T., & Hersleth, M. (2014). The best of both
638 worlds: Rapidity and enhanced discrimination with a trained panel. Exploration of
639 global and partial PSP with a descriptive step. In *6th European Conference on*
640 *Sensory and Consumer Research*, 7-10 September 2014, Copenhaguen, Denmark.

641 **Figure captions**

642

643 **Figure 1.** Graphical representation of the formulation of samples and poles in Study 1
644 (a) and Study 2 (b).

645

646 **Figure 2.** Sample configurations of chocolate flavoured milks in the first two dimensions
647 of Multiple Factor Analysis performed on data from Polarized Sensory Positioning with
648 different sets of poles: (a) Set 1, three poles (P1, P2 and P3), (b) Set 2, two poles (P1
649 and P3), (c) Set 3, two poles (P1' and P2').

650

651 **Figure 3.** Sample configurations of vanilla milk desserts in the first two dimensions of
652 Multiple Factor Analysis performed on data from Polarized Sensory Positioning with
653 different sets of poles: (a) Set 1, three poles (P1, P2 and P3), (b) Set 2, two poles (P1
654 and P3), (c) Set 3, two poles (P1' and P2').

655

656 **Figure 4** Sample configurations of orange flavoured powdered drinks in the first four
657 dimensions of Multiple Factor Analysis performed on data from Polarized Sensory
658 Positioning with different sets of poles: (a) Set 1, three poles (P1, P2 and P3), (b) Set 2,
659 two poles (P1 and P3), (c) Set 3, two poles (P1 and P2).

660 **Tables**

661

662 **Table 1.** Formulation of the chocolate flavoured milks used in Study 1. Samples P1, P2,

663 P3, P1' and P2' correspond to poles in the Polarized Sensory Positioning task.

664

Sample	Sugar (%)	Cacao (%)
A	7.0	1.5
B, P2	9.0	3.5
C	5.0	1.5
D, P2'	7.0	3.5
E	5.0	2.5
F, P1'	9.0	2.5
P1	9.0	1.5
P3	5.0	3.5

665

666

667 **Table 2.** Formulation of the milk desserts used in Study 2. Samples P1, P2, P3, P1' and
668 P2' correspond to poles in the Polarized Sensory Positioning task.
669

Sample	Sugar (%)	Starch (%)
A	6.0	3.4
B, P2	8.0	5.0
C, P2'	8.0	4.2
D, P1'	6.0	5.0
E	4.0	4.2
F	4.0	3.4
P1	4.0	5.0
P3	8.0	3.4

670
671

672 **Table 3.** Description of the three sets of poles used in the three Polarized Sensory
673 Positioning studies.
674

Study	Set of poles	Pole P1	Pole P2	Pole P3	Pole P1'	Pole P2'
	1	x	x	X		
1	2	x		X		
	3				x	x
	1	x	x	X		
2	2	x		X		
	3				x	x
	1	x	x	X		
3	2		x	x		
	3	x	x			

675

676 **Table 4.** RV coefficients and p-value (between brackets) between sample configurations
677 obtained using Polarized Sensory Positioning with different set of poles in the three
678 consumer studies**.**
679

Study ID	Dimensions of the MFA	RV coefficient		
		Set 1 (P1, P2 and P3) and Set 2 (P1 and P3)	**Set 1 (P1, P2 and P3) and Set 3 (P1' and P2')**	**Set 2 (P1 and P3) and Set 3 (P1' and P2')**
1	1 and 2	0.865 (0.009)	0.850 (0.011)	0.774 (0.020)
2	1 and 2	0.986 (<0.001)	0.742 (0.030)	0.721 (0.025)
3	1 and 2	0.943 (0.004)	0.897 (0.007)	0.763 (0.023)
	1, 2, 3 and 4	0.968 (0.003)	0.870 (0.022)	0.829 (0.037)

680
681

682 **Table 5.** Frequency of mention of the main characteristics consumers stated to consider
683 when estimating the degree of difference between the samples and the poles in the three
684 studies.
685

Study	Set 1	Set 2	Set 3
1	*Pole P1* Sweet 88% *Pole P2* Sweet 50% Chocolate 60% *Pole P3* Bitter 65% Chocolate 30%	*Pole P1* Sweet 90% *Pole P3* Bitter 78% Chocolate 48% Not sweet 23%	*Pole P1'* Sweet 93% *Pole P2'* Bitter 43% Chocolate 53% Not sweet 43%
2	*Pole P1* Thick 58% Not very sweet 50% *Pole P2* Thick 73% Sweet 63% *Pole P3* Liquid 95% Sweet 43%	*Pole P1* Thick 88% Not very sweet 50% *Pole P3* Liquid 88% Sweet 83%	*Pole P1'* Thick 63% Sweet 50% *Pole P2'* Sweet 70% Liquid 55%
3	*Pole P1* Sweet 70% Orange flavour 23% *Pole P2* Sour 73% Not sweet 25% *Pole P3* Diluted 63% Sweet 38%	*Pole P2* Sour 75% Not sweet 38% *Pole P3* Diluted 73% Sweet 38%	*Pole P1* Sweet 83% *Pole P2* Sour 78%

686 Note: For simplicity, only the most frequently mentioned characteristics are included.