

1 Molecular Mechanism of Parosmia

2

3 Jane K. Parker¹, Christine E. Kelly², Simon B. Gane³

4

5

6 ¹Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, UK

7 ²AbScent, 14 London Road, Andover, Hampshire, UK

8 ³Royal National Ear, Nose and Throat and Eastman Dental Hospitals, University College London

9 Hospital, UK.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 *Corresponding author:* S. Gane, Royal National Ear, Nose and Throat and Eastman Dental Hospitals,

21 University College London Hospital, UK. E-mail: simongane@nhs.net

22

23 **Abstract**

24 The molecular stimuli that trigger a parosmic response have been identified. Parosmia is a debilitating
25 disease in which familiar smells become distorted and unpleasant. Often a result of post infectious
26 smell loss, incidences are increasing as the number of COVID-19 cases escalates worldwide. Little is
27 understood of its pathophysiology, but the prevailing hypothesis for the underlying mechanism is a
28 mis-wiring of olfactory sensory neurons. We identified 15 different molecular triggers in coffee using
29 GC-Olfactometry as a relatively rapid screening tool for assessment of both quantitative olfactory loss
30 and parosmia. This provides evidence for peripheral causation, but places constraints on the mis-
31 wiring theory.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 **Keywords:** coffee, Covid-19, GC-olfactometry, mis-wiring, olfactory disorder, parosmia,

42

43 **Introduction**

44 Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, olfactory dysfunction was largely unrecognised, and often
45 underestimated by health care professionals. Since the spread of severe acute respiratory syndrome
46 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), and the realisation that 50-65% of cases result in the loss of sense of
47 smell (anosmia)¹, there is a greater awareness of the debilitating effect of olfactory disorders².

48 Typically, in cases of COVID-19, normal olfactory function returns within a few weeks, but one study
49 estimates 12% of all cases results in long term smell dysfunction³. With >100 million cases reported
50 worldwide⁴ this is a significant problem facing the global population today.

51 Parosmia often occurs in the early stages of recovery from anosmia, typically 2-3 months after onset¹,
52 particularly in those whose anosmia was either acquired post-infection or post-traumatic brain injury⁵.

53 Parosmia is a qualitative olfactory disorder in which familiar everyday smells become unpleasant and
54 altered, to the extent that they become almost unrecognisable. These olfactory distortions are
55 perceived in the presence of a stimulus. distinguishing it from phantosmia, where similar distortions
56 are perceived in the absence of a stimulus. Those severely affected by parosmia find their quality of
57 life deteriorates as everyday activities such as showering, oral care, eating and social interactions
58 become a challenge. They report being distressed, scared and anxious about their future⁶ and, with
59 many food aromas being intolerable, they start to reject food, leading to altered diets⁷, significant
60 changes in weight, a decline in mental health and, in the most severe cases, to clinical depression⁸⁻⁹.

61 The aim of this work was to gain insight into the mechanisms involved in parosmia. In 2013, coffee
62 and chocolate were found to elicit distorted olfactory experiences in parosmia¹⁰ and more recently,
63 coffee, meat, onion, garlic, egg, mint/toothpaste were identified in a thematic analysis of group posts
64 on social media⁶. These foods contain aroma compounds with some of the lowest odour-thresholds
65 known, and we suggest that these compounds may be involved in triggering olfactory distortions. Our
66 original hypothesis was based on the mechanisms underlying parosmia being at least partly related to
67 widespread loss of olfactory neurons (OSN). We proposed that as OSNs regenerate from basal stem
68 cells, selective detection of just the pungent highly odour-active compounds might result in a distorted

69 perception of certain foods and beverages. Whether this would be sufficient to cause the strong sense
70 of disgust often reported with parosmia, was not clear. For those with a normal sense of smell, the
71 perception of these potent molecules is moderated by tens of other less odour-active aroma
72 compounds, acting synergistically to produce the desirable balanced characteristic aroma of coffee as
73 we know it.

74 Our approach is novel in that we use GC-Olfactometry (GC-O) to determine which of the aroma
75 compounds present in the headspace of coffee are responsible for the distortions and the sense of
76 disgust experienced by parosmic participants. Gas chromatography separates the hundreds of volatile
77 components present in the headspace which, when coupled to an odour-port, allows subjects to sniff
78 and assess each component as it elutes from the column, thereby allowing us to screen multiple aroma
79 compounds in a short time.

80 **Results and Observations**

81 **Participants.** Table 1 shows demographic data for all participants (N = 45) with full details provided
82 in Supplementary Table S1. All participants were non-smokers and self-reported that they could taste
83 the difference between salt and sugar. Aetiology of parosmia was post infection for 29/30 those with
84 parosmia, with one case of traumatic brain injury. Pre-COVID-19 parosmic and non-parosmic
85 individuals were age matched with mean ages of 56 and 49 y respectively and no significant
86 difference between the two groups ($p=0.12$), whereas post-COVID-19 participants were significantly
87 younger (mean age 37 y) than their pre-COVID-19 counterparts or the non-parosmic group ($p<0.000$,
88 $p=0.008$ respectively).

89 **Olfactory Function.** Bilateral olfactory function was assessed using the complete validated
90 orthonasal psychophysical Sniffin' Sticks test (Burghart, Wedel, Germany)¹¹ based on the threshold of
91 phenylethyl alcohol (T), discrimination (D) and identification (I) tests which gives a TDI score (0-48).
92 TDI scores were significantly lower in pre- and post-COVID-19 participants (mean 27 and 28
93 respectively) compared to the non-parosmics group (mean 37) (ANOVA, $p<0.0001$ for both groups)
94 but there was no significant difference between pre- and post-COVID-19 parosmic individuals

95 (p=0.71). The TDI scores of the combined parosmic groups ranged from anosmic to normosmic (10-
96 38). Ten of this group were classified as normosmic on raw TDI score, increasing to 17 (more than
97 half of the group) when age adjustment was applied¹². On the contrary, three parosmic participants
98 scoring <16 were classified as functionally anosmic. We demonstrate here that although on average
99 most parosmic participants had a low olfactory function, parosmia also occurs in those with a normal
100 olfactory function.

101 **Gas Chromatography-Olfactometry.** The number of aromas detected by GC-O by non-parosmic
102 participants was significantly higher than for pre- or post-COVID-19 parosmic participants
103 (p<0.0001) (means 37, 19 and 19 respectively). This parameter correlated well with the TDI score
104 (R²=0.65, Fig. 1A). However, the mean number of molecular triggers detected by parosmic
105 participants was only 6.4 (range 0-13) indicating that on average parosmic participants detected twice
106 as many “normal” aroma molecules compared to trigger molecules. This has never been demonstrated
107 before and shows that, in those presenting with parosmia, some OSNs are functioning normally and it
108 is only specific OSNs (or combinations of them) which trigger the altered perception of food and the
109 sense of disgust. There was no strong correlation between the number of molecular triggers reported
110 and TDI score (R²=0.16, Fig. 1B) suggesting that although quantitative and qualitative olfactory
111 disorders may occur together, their mechanism may be quite different.

112 **Molecular triggers.** Molecular triggers identified in coffee headspace by >2 parosmic participants are
113 shown in Table 2. The most frequently reported trigger (21/30) is 2-furanmethanethiol. It imparts a
114 roasted coffee-like odour and has a particularly low odour threshold in water of 0.004 ug/kg¹³.

115 Whereas the non-parosmic participants used a range of food related terms to describe it (including
116 “coffee”, “roasty”, “popcorn”, “smoky”), it was commonly described by parosmic participants as
117 “new coffee” (relating to the altered smell of coffee since onset of parosmia), or with words
118 describing its hedonic quality (“disgusting”, “repulsive” and “dirty”). All non-parosmic participants
119 except one non-coffee drinker detected this compound. Five parosmic participants with low TDI
120 scores did not detect this compound but, when assessing a 100-fold more concentrated coffee extract
121 by GC-O, described it as a trigger. Four parosmic participants described it in the same way as non-

122 parosmic participants (“biscuit”, “toasty” or “roasty”) indicating that it is not universally parosmic,
123 but certainly an important and frequent molecular trigger of parosmia. The isomeric, and equally
124 potent 2-methyl-3-furanthiol (threshold 0.0004 ug/kg in water¹⁴) and its corresponding methyl
125 disulfide were also detected, but reported less frequently as triggers. They are character impact
126 compounds in meat, and we confirmed in four parosmic participants who assessed grilled chicken by
127 GC-O that these compounds also triggered parosmia in meat.

128 2-Ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine was the second most frequent trigger in coffee (14/30 times), described
129 with a variety of food terms by non-parosmic participants, but by “new coffee”, “unpleasant” and
130 “distorted” by parosmic participants. Other trisubstituted pyrazines (2,3-diethyl-5-methylpyrazine, 2-
131 ethyl-3,5-dimethylpyrazine and trimethylpyrazine) were common triggers. These pyrazines are highly
132 odour-active compounds in roasted, fried and baked goods, and we confirmed by GC-O that these
133 compounds also triggered parosmia in cocoa (N=4), grilled chicken (N=4) and peanut butter [N=3]. 2-
134 Ethyl-3-methoxypyrazine, 2-isobutyl-3-methoxypyrazine and 2-isopropyl-3-methoxypyrazine were
135 common triggers in coffee, and we confirmed that these also contributed to the parosmic character of
136 bell peppers (N=5), where they are character impact compounds.

137 The furanthiols, disulfides and the pyrazines which represent 9 of the 10 most frequently reported
138 trigger molecules, are interesting as they are all potent heterocyclic molecules containing an exposed
139 heteroatom with relatively good Lewis base properties.

140 Another important trigger, 3-methyl-2-butene-1-thiol, with a pungent weedy character and low
141 threshold (0.0002 ug/L), was reported as a trigger 9/30 times. Although not heterocyclic, it contains
142 the same α,β -unsaturated thiol moiety as 2-furanmethanethiol. The thiol ester, 3-mercapto-3-
143 methylbutyl formate, is one of the most potent aroma compounds in coffee¹⁵ and was the most
144 frequently detected by parosmic participants (15/30), but only reported 6 times as a trigger.

145 Although thiols and disulfides seem to be effective triggers for parosmia, there are two notable
146 exceptions. Methanethiol (odour threshold 0.02 ug/L¹⁶), which was detected by some non-parosmic
147 participants, was not detected by any of the parosmic participants, even in 100-fold concentrated

148 coffee. Likewise, dimethyl trisulfide (0.01 ug/L^{13}) is an exceptionally potent compound detected by
149 12/15 non-parosmic participants but only by 4 parosmic participants, and only once reported as a
150 trigger.

151 Furthermore, a handful of compounds were occasionally detected by but never reported as triggers.
152 (*E*)- β -Damascenone, a key odour-active compounds in coffee with a low odour threshold (0.01
153 ug/kg^{13}), was detected by 6 parosmic participants and always described as jammy and fruity.
154 Likewise, 4-ethylguaiacol was detected by 7 parosmic participants and always described as spicy,
155 sweet and smoky, but never parosmic.

156 **Cluster analysis.** Agglomerative hierarchical cluster analysis was carried out on the combined
157 intensity data from all parosmic participants of all potential triggers reported >3 times. It showed four
158 significant clusters of compounds (Fig. 2). A structure activity pattern starts to emerge, suggesting, for
159 example, that some participants might perceive thiols more intensely and others may perceive
160 pyrazines more intensely. When the same analysis was carried out using the data from the non-
161 parosmics, the same clusters did not emerge, but N was small, and we cannot draw any conclusions
162 from this. It is likely that in the general population, there are significant differences in the relative
163 perception of these compounds.

164 **Correlation between ligand structure and odour receptor (OR)?** Identifying a small number of
165 common molecular triggers for parosmia raised the obvious question of an olfactory receptor
166 similarity. To determine whether the clusters are associated with any of the known ligand odour
167 receptor pairs, we searched the ODORactor database¹⁷. We found no obvious segregation of triggers
168 by olfactory receptor (Fig. 3). Most of the triggers activated (with $> 50\%$ probability) either OR1G1
169 or OR52D1. We then compared molecules never reported as triggers such as disubstituted pyrazines,
170 indole, skatole, cresol and found these to activate the same ORs, making it unlikely that these
171 olfactory receptors are the source of the parosmic signal. OR1G1 is known to be very broadly tuned
172 and bind odorants of different chemical classes¹⁸. However, only a fraction of the known olfactory
173 receptors have been deorphaned, and further identification of ligand-OR pairs is required.

174 **Faecal odours.** Parosmic participants often comment that the smell of faeces is never as unpleasant as
175 before, often smelling like other parosmic food, or even more pleasant and biscuity⁶, presenting the
176 interesting corollary that foods smell of faeces yet faeces smell of food. One normosmic and two
177 parosmic researchers carried out GC-O on a 50% faecal slurry in water. Whilst the normosmic scored
178 the intensity of the volatiles normally associated with faeces (indole, skatole and p-cresol¹⁹) as close
179 to strongest imaginable, the parosmic researchers were unaware of these foul smells, rather reporting
180 many of the potent triggers already mentioned in coffee. This provides a neat explanation as to why
181 the changes in valence for faecal samples is reversed. In the absence of signals from the usual faecal
182 compounds, parosmic participants detect other potent volatiles in the sample, normally masked by the
183 faecal compounds for normosmics, which may elicit any number of odour percepts depending on the
184 sensitivity of the parosmic to the other compounds present.

185 **Participant observations.**

- 186 i. A case of parosmia not preceded by anosmia: One participant identified 45 aromas, of which
187 just 2 were triggers. The more intense one was 2-ethyl-3,5-dimethylpyrazine and the second a
188 mild and unidentified compound. They had a TDI score of 37, had tested positive for COVID-
189 19 antibodies but reported no loss of sense of smell. This is an unusual case where parosmia
190 was not preceded by anosmia.
- 191 ii. A case of parosmia improving with no concomitant increase in olfactory function: After 4
192 months one participant showed no improvement in threshold score, a decrease in the number
193 of GC-O aromas detected (22 to 16), and a 5-fold decrease in intensity scores (750 to 147) yet
194 reported an improvement in parosmia. Further work on the temporal aspect of parosmia is in
195 progress.
- 196 iii. A case of excellent recovery from parosmia with significant improvement of olfactory
197 function: After several years, one participant reported a “new normal” olfactory function,
198 scoring 35 on the TDI test. This indicates regrowth of a broad range of healthy OSNs, yet two
199 of the 52 aromas detected were still identified as triggers of parosmia: 2-methyl-3-furanthiol
200 and one unidentified compound.

- 201 iv. A case of a functional anosmia with parosmia: At the other extreme one participant was
202 within 3 months of onset and had a low TDI score (15) indicating functional anosmia. Only
203 five aromas were detected, all scored as barely detectable, and only one, 2-furanmethanethiol,
204 had parosmic character. Further investigations showed their parosmia was triggered more by
205 different compounds present in onion and garlic.
- 206 v. A case of two distinct parosmic characters: one participant reported several distinct parosmic
207 smells. One, which was described as plastic, chemical and burning rubber, was associated
208 with sulfur compounds from Cluster A, and a second, described as sickly sweet, smoky and
209 woody, was associated with pyrazines. Further investigation showed that onion and garlic
210 gave a third parosmic character. These groupings are consistent with HCA clusters and a sub-
211 theme emerging from the “AbScent Parosmia and Phantosmia Support” group on Facebook⁶.
- 212 vi. A case of sulfur triggers only: one participant attended just 4 weeks after onset of parosmia
213 and was our most “fresh” parosmic. Their reactions at the GC-O were quite extreme when a
214 trigger was encountered, with three thiols scoring 90-100 on the intensity scale. With a TDI
215 score of 27, 20 GC-aromas were detected but only five of these were triggers, either thiols or
216 disulfides. Pyrazines were detected but not reported as triggers. This is counter to any
217 hypothesis which suggests that in the early days of parosmia, all (or many) compounds are
218 triggers.
- 219 vii. A case of parosmia resulting from post-traumatic brain injury who reported the same
220 molecular triggers as the post infectious participants. This participant found meat a far worse
221 trigger than coffee, and this is reflected in detection of the meaty thiol rather than the coffee
222 thiol.
- 223 *viii. 3.5 Concentration of stimulus*
- 224 One participant assessed three different concentrations of coffee, spanning a factor of 10000.
225 At the regular concentration, 11 aromas were detected, of which 5 were triggers. When the
226 stimuli were diluted by 100, only 2 compounds were detected (barely detectable) but they still
227 had the same character as in the regular coffee extract— one was still parosmic and the other

228 was not. Dilution of the stimulus did not reverse the distortion, and this is backed up by many
229 who still report parosmia character for weak and barely detectable aromas. When the stimuli
230 were concentrated, those that were undistorted remained undistorted and there was no
231 evidence that concentration of the stimuli could create more distortions. This is backed up by
232 other participants reporting strong but undistorted aromas. On concentration, new aromas
233 both distorted (4) and non-distorted (5) were detected as their concentrations became
234 suprathreshold. Thus, for this parosmic, the concentration of the stimulus did not seem to
235 change its character or determine its valence, which is often the case for perception of highly
236 potent odorants, particularly sulfur compounds which on dilution can change from pungent to
237 a pleasant fruity character.

238 **Summary.** In summary, we have identified for the first time specific molecules which trigger
239 parosmia. These experiments demonstrate that there is a common set of molecular triggers responsible
240 for distortions and sense of disgust in coffee, and they also trigger parosmia in other chemically
241 related foods. However, not all molecules in this set are triggers in all parosmic participants. These
242 molecules tend to be potent, have very low detection thresholds and in isolation are neither distorted
243 nor unpleasant for non-parosmic participants. However, odour activity is not the defining factor since
244 (*E*)- β -damascenone has an exceptionally low odour threshold, is one of the more potent compounds in
245 coffee²⁰, and was always perceived as jammy and fruity by those parosmic participants who detected
246 it. Most of the trigger molecules found in coffee belong to one of four distinct groups: thiols,
247 pyrazines, disulfides, methoxypyrazines but there are no known odour receptors which are specific for
248 the described trigger molecules. In addition, individual case studies suggest that parosmia symptoms
249 are independent of olfactory function and parosmia may occur in patients with objectively normal
250 olfactory function. Parosmic odour quality is not necessarily related to odour concentration. Recovery
251 from parosmia can be associated with either improvement or stasis of olfactory function. As we stated
252 in our hypothesis, in those with poor olfactory function, parosmia may be enhanced by a lack of
253 contribution from other more desirable and less potent aroma compounds, but we found that the
254 molecular triggers alone are the key drivers of parosmia and individually responsible for the

255 perception of disgust. This explains why those with normal olfactory function, who also perceive the
256 more desirable less potent aroma compounds, still experience parosmia.

257 **Discussion**

258 Little is known about the pathophysiology of parosmia. Like the aetiologies of smell loss, both central
259 and peripheral mechanisms have been proposed²¹ and can broadly be thought of as the central theory,
260 the ephaptic theory and the mis-wiring theory. Although there is now some doubt about the role of the
261 bulb in olfactory identification²², these theories take the standard model of glomerular activation
262 pattern within the olfactory bulb as the motif of recognition within the CNS.

263 The central theory is based on the changes occurring in the integrative centres in the brain. A decrease
264 in olfactory bulb volume^{23, 24} and a significant loss of grey matter volume²⁵ has been demonstrated in
265 parosmic participants. Further evidence of central mechanisms has been published recently showing
266 different fMRI activation patterns in parosmic participants compared to hyposmics²⁶. Increased
267 activation in the thalamus and the putamen was observed in the parosmic participants, the latter being
268 of relevance since it is connected to the olfactory cortical networks and has been associated with the
269 perception of disgust. Also, stronger activation was observed in the ventral striatum which is
270 associated with odour valence. Whilst there is good evidence in humans for the central theory of
271 parosmia, a purely central causation seems unlikely based on our evidence that parosmia is triggered
272 by a group of highly specific molecules at the periphery.

273 The “mis-wiring” theory posits aberrant targeting of OSN to the glomerulus during regeneration from
274 insult. This has been observed in mice with impaired olfactory function induced by ciliopathies²⁷⁻²⁸,
275 physical lesioning²⁹⁻³⁰, and induced chemical degeneration³¹ but not yet in humans. However, it has
276 been adopted as the likely mechanism for the perception of distorted olfactory percepts in parosmia. It
277 is further suggested that the change in hedonic valence is due to broad activation of the olfactory bulb
278 sending a disordered and unmoderated array of signals to the central neural processing system which
279 invokes a strong sense of disgust. Our data neither support nor refute the mis-wiring hypothesis, but
280 certainly place constraints on it. We have demonstrated the requirement to account for the non-

281 stochastic nature of the OSNs involved in any proposed mis-wiring theory. Whilst mis-wiring is
282 attributed to a loss of axonal pathfinding mechanisms²⁷, in light of our results, this theory needs to
283 explain why some OSNs are relaying the “correct” undistorted signal, whereas others are not, even
284 early in the patient’s recovery.

285 The ephaptic theory summarised by Hawkes³² suggests that demyelination of the OSNs allow the
286 activation of other, non-stimulated OSNs adjacent to the activated OSN by current flow in the
287 extracellular fluid: “a form of short circuiting”. This too would result in a broader activation of the
288 olfactory bulb and must be able to account for the non-random nature of the OSNs involved.

289 Of course, these theories are not mutually exclusive. Alterations in innervation of the glomeruli, or
290 ephaptic activation of afferent nerves, and therefore the whole bulb, would result in the alteration of
291 downstream central processing. The plasticity of this part of the pathway is much more limited. The
292 “wiring” of the brain in recognising and acting on certain patterns of activation within the bulb
293 remains after the peripheral insult. Therefore, a broader activation of the glomeruli would activate
294 more odour object patterns within the cortex.

295 These hypotheses have to explain four characteristics: that parosmia arises almost uniquely in settings
296 of widespread synchronous neuronal destruction either post infection or post traumatic brain injury, is
297 triggered by one of a number of common odorants, is of novel odour character, and that this character
298 is almost always unpleasant. Whereas the mis-wiring theory is consistent with the first, and the central
299 theory may explain the novel odour character and the change in valence, it remains for us to
300 determine why only a few potent molecules elicit such a strong parosmic response.

301 These trigger molecules share the trait of having an extremely low threshold in human olfaction, so
302 they are detectable in very low concentrations. Such low olfactory thresholds may be attributed to a
303 higher binding affinity for their respective olfactory receptors (ORs), but there are other possible
304 explanations: higher rate of expression of specific ORs on the OSN cell surface, stronger activation of
305 OSN depolarisation by the OR due to reduced habituation at the receptor or cellular levels,
306 overrepresentation of that OSN within the mucosal OSN population, zonal expression (not

307 demonstrated in humans) resulting in improved access to the nasal airstream, glomerular level or
308 higher configurations resulting in greater salience of the glomerular activation, or the odorant could
309 activate more than one olfactory receptor and the combined activation is summed as a lower
310 detectable threshold within the bulb.

311 The common molecular structures, low odour thresholds and physiochemical grouping of the
312 molecular triggers of parosmia strongly suggest that this is an olfactory receptor-level phenomenon,
313 although we are unable to identify any specific olfactory receptors responsible from publicly available
314 databases. The fact that some parosmic participants only report distortion with some of the groups
315 suggests that there may be up to four separate olfactory receptors involved, or more when we consider
316 other food and household items that elicit distortions. So why then these groups of OSNs? Several
317 mechanisms could account for the role of specific receptors and their neurons.

318 1. These OSNs are regenerating because they are selectively damaged by the insult and others are
319 preserved. This may account for the presence of parosmia in objectively normosmic volunteers, but it
320 is unlikely that the insult from brain injury and viral infection would lead to the same preferential
321 damage to particular OSNs.

322 2. The specific OR is predominant within the regenerating OSN population for one of two reasons. In
323 one scenario, instead of a purely stochastic OR selection process in the olfactory mucosa, these
324 “parosmic ORs” are preferentially selected for expression in OSNs either normally or just in the post-
325 insult olfactory mucosa, thus increasing the number of these neurons in the olfactory mucosa as a
326 whole. Alternatively, there is evidence in mice that activated OSNs have a longer lifespan³³. Because
327 of their ease of activation, these OSNs tend to survive longer and therefore make up a greater
328 proportion of the overall OSN population.

329 3. The specific OR are not over-represented but merely more easily activated, so although many
330 OSNs regenerate and aberrantly innervate the glomeruli, since only a few afferent neurons pass to
331 each individual glomerulus, these few molecules are powerful enough to activate many glomeruli
332 simultaneously at physiological odorant concentrations.

333 4. Since axon guidance is at least partially OR-dependant³⁴ these specific OR-expressing OSNs could
334 be more likely to demonstrate aberrant targeting of glomeruli in an as-yet unknown way.

335 5. It is possible that parosmia does not arise from the activation of the glomeruli per se, but the
336 disruption of the network of interneurons, mitral, glial and tufted cells which is thought to act as a
337 habituation and modulatory network in the bulb. Disruption of input innervation and sporadic re-
338 innervation could cause feedback loops to interfere with the previous web of inhibition and promotion
339 of signal at this level and this disordered activation is experienced as unpleasant.

340 Parosmia is a tetrapartite symptom: it is a triggered, short lived, altered smell sensation which almost
341 universally elicits the basic emotion of disgust. Our finding that this is reliably triggered by a common
342 group of low threshold odorants advances our understanding of this debilitating condition and
343 constrains the pathophysiological hypothesis space.

344 That there are reliable molecular triggers of parosmia point to an olfactory receptor level pathology
345 which agrees with the fact that the sensation is triggered by smells and follows the usual pattern of
346 habituation and attenuation expected in an otherwise intact olfactory system. The selective
347 regeneration of only a few OSNs also explains how the odour percept is altered (if the central dogma
348 of glomerular activation patterns within the olfactory bulb is accepted). If only some of these
349 glomeruli are activated out of the previous broader activation pattern recognised as coffee, this will be
350 perceived as a novel smell.

351 What this does not explain is the presumably hypothalamic disgust response to this particular altered
352 odour. The miswiring hypothesis posits that broader, unregulated patterns of glomerular activation are
353 de novo perceived as unpleasant and disgusting, but this has not been demonstrated. Certainly, in the
354 normal nose, novel smell percepts are not usually automatically disgusting, so the mere novelty of the
355 percept is unlikely to be enough to explain this.

356 In this paper we identify the first common molecular triggers of human parosmia, characterised by
357 their physiochemical properties and sharing a low odour threshold for humans. We demonstrate that
358 parosmia is an olfactory dysfunction only partially correlated with olfactory loss, and provide

359 evidence to support its arising in the periphery of the olfactory system. This information is vital to the
360 understanding of the pathophysiology of this increasingly widespread condition and will be important
361 in guiding further research and future therapies.

362 **Acknowledgements**

363 The authors would like to acknowledge all those who participated in this study, Aidan Kirkwood for
364 assistance with the participants, Peter Jackson for his assistance in sourcing and handling the faecal
365 sample, and Professor Barry Smith for useful discussion and review of the manuscript.

366 **Authorship contribution**

367 JP contributed to conception, acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data, manuscript draft and
368 review; CK contributed to conception, participant management, data acquisition and review; SG
369 contributed to conception, interpretation of data, manuscript draft and review (SG).

370 **Conflict of interest**

371 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

372

373 **Methods**

374 **Participants.** This study (No 22/19) was approved by the University of Reading Research Ethics
375 Committee. All parosmic participants were recruited via Facebook support groups or local ENT
376 consultants, and non-parosmic participants from within the Department of Food and Nutritional
377 Sciences or through private Facebook pages. The initial study was carried out with pre-COVID-19
378 parosmic participants (N=15) and non-parosmic participants (N=15) between October 2019 and
379 March 2020. This was supplemented with post-COVID-19 parosmic participants (N=15) between
380 July and September 2020. All volunteers completed a screening questionnaire (Supplementary Table
381 S2) before attending a study day in the Olfaction Laboratory at the University of Reading. Selection
382 was based on the participants listing coffee as a key trigger, and answering “often” at least once to
383 two key questions which discriminate most efficiently between parosmic participants and those with
384 quantitative olfactory disorders³⁵:

- 385 1) Are odours that are pleasant to others, unpleasant to you? Never/rarely/often/always
- 386 2) Is the taste of food different to what you expect? Never/rarely/often/always

387 **Olfactory function.** The bilateral olfactory function of all participants was assessed at the beginning
388 of the day using the well-established and validated orthonasal psychophysical Sniffin’ Sticks test
389 (Burghart, Wedel, Germany)¹¹. Involving threshold (T), discrimination (D) and identification (I) tests,
390 the resulting TDI score ranges from 0 to 48 with those scoring >30.3 classified as normosmic.

391 **Materials.** Nescafé Original instant coffee sachets (Nestlé UK Ltd., York, UK) were used in this
392 study. One box of instant Nescafé sachets (use by date August 2021) was purchased in September
393 2019 for use with the subjects between October 2019 and March 2020. A second box (use by date Oct
394 2022) was purchased in October 2020 to cross check the stability of the sachets over one year. Cocoa
395 powder (Bournville, Cadbury, Bourneville, UK), skinless chicken breast fillet, smooth peanut butter
396 (Tesco, Cheshunt, UK) and red bell peppers were purchased from a local supermarket. Faecal samples
397 were kindly prepared under Class 2 conditions by members of the food and microbial science group at
398 the University of Reading. The suppliers of all aroma standards are given in Table 2. Food safe high-

399 grade mineral oil was purchased from Brandon Bespoke (Rochdale, UK), propylene glycol from
400 Sigma (Poole, UK) and absorbent 3M PowerSorb P-110 paper from Merck (Gillingham, UK).

401 A faecal sample was collected from a healthy donor who had not consumed antibiotics within the
402 previous six months. For transportation to the laboratory the sample was held under anaerobic
403 conditions, using an Oxoid Anaerogen sachet (Oxoid, Hampshire, UK), for up to two hours before
404 being frozen at -20 °C.

405 **Extraction of coffee aroma.** Fresh deionised water from a MilliQ system at 18.2 MΩ/cm resistivity
406 was boiled in a kettle and 300 mL was added to the contents of the sachet (2.15 ± 0.05 g) in a 500 mL
407 Duran bottle. The bottle was sealed, stirred for 2 min and an aliquot (3.0 ± 0.05 g) was transferred into
408 vial. More concentrated extracts (contents of 1 sachet in 3 g boiling water) were also prepared for expert
409 GC-O analysis and a detailed GC-MS analysis to aid identification of compounds. The vial was
410 equilibrated at 55 °C for 20 min and a preconditioned triple phase solid phase microextraction (SPME)
411 fibre (50/30 µm divinylbenzene/carboxen on polydimethylsiloxane (Supelco, Poole, UK)) was exposed
412 to the headspace at 55 °C for 20 min prior to analysis by GC-O.

413 **Gas Chromatography-Olfactometry (GC-O).** After extraction, the SPME device was inserted into
414 the injection port of an HP7890 GC from Agilent Technologies (Santa Clara, CA, USA) coupled to a
415 Series II ODO 2 GC-O system (SGE, Ringwood, Victoria, Australia). The SPME fibre was desorbed
416 in a split/splitless injection port held at 280 °C. The columns employed were either an Agilent HP-5
417 MSUi capillary (30 m, 0.25 mm i.d., 1.0 µm df) non-polar column or a Stabilwax[®]-DA (30 m,
418 0.25 mm i.d., 0.25 µm df) polar column (Restek, Bellefonte, PA, USA). The temperature gradients
419 were set as follows: 40 °C for 2 min, then a rise of 5 °C/min up to 200 °C and 15 °C/min from 200 °C
420 to 300 °C (or 250 °C for the polar column), and the final temperature held for a further 19 min.
421 Helium was used as carrier gas (2 mL/min). At the end of the column, the flow was split 1:1 between
422 a flame ionisation detector (kept at 250 °C) and a sniffing port using 2 untreated silica-fused
423 capillaries of the same dimensions (1 m, 0.32 mm i.d.). The flow to the odour-port was diluted with a
424 moist make up gas.

425 **Procedure at the odour-port.** Subjects were familiarised with the instrument, instructed to breathe
426 normally during the run, and advised that they could stop at any time, particularly if they felt dizzy or
427 light-headed. As the aromas eluted from the column, 3 bits of information were requested from the
428 subjects: an odour description, an odour intensity and an indication of whether the odour elicited a
429 parosmic response. Since the description and identification of aromas in the absence of any other cues
430 is difficult, all participants were presented with a flavour wheel (Supplementary Figure S1) before
431 they started which they could use as a reference during the GC-O run. It had been developed by 2
432 experts who sniffed samples of the same coffee (both at regular strength and concentrated) by GC-O.
433 The words were categorised into food and non-food, and colour coded for quick reference. This was
434 of more use to non-parosmic participants, as parosmic participants found it hard to describe many of
435 the aromas, even with the help of the flavour wheel. Many resorted to using the terms “new coffee”,
436 “that parosmia smell”, “trigger number 1” or “trigger number 2”. As each aroma eluted, parosmic
437 participants were prompted to highlight anything that had a parosmic character or trigger. Intensity
438 was scored on a 158 mm horizontal general labelled magnitude scale (gLMS) with anchors at “barely
439 detectable”, “weak”, “medium”, “strong”, “very strong” and “strongest imaginable” corresponding to
440 intensity scores of 1.4, 6, 17, 35, 51 and 100 respectively (et al. 2004). This was chosen over the more
441 common visual analogue scale to allow for instances where parosmic participants, in particular,
442 wanted to extend upwards the range of scores. It is a logarithmic scale which better relates the
443 psychophysics of perception to the concentration of the stimulus (Stevens’s Law). Time of elution
444 was recorded manually by the researcher. All subjects carried out the GC-O of coffee twice, once
445 before lunch and once after a 45 min lunch break. During the second run, the focus was on refining
446 the descriptors as well as obtaining a duplicate intensity rating. During the first run, the subjects
447 recorded the descriptors in their own words, prompted only by the flavour wheel, whereas during the
448 second run, there was more discussion between the researcher and the subject, to verify the odour
449 character and identity of the compound eluting.

450 **Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS).** An extract from a coffee prepared with one
451 sachet in 3 mL of boiling water was extracted as above and analysed by GC-MS to aid identification

452 of aroma compounds detected by GC-O and confirm their presence in the coffee extract. A7890A Gas
453 Chromatograph coupled to a 5975C series GC/MSD from Agilent was used, equipped with either of
454 the columns described above. The oven was held at 40 °C for 2 min, increased from 40 °C to 250 °C
455 at a rate of 4 °C/min and then kept constant at 250 °C for 5 min. Helium was the carrier gas at a flow
456 rate of 1.2 mL/min. Mass spectra were recorded in electron impact mode at an ionisation voltage of 70
457 eV and source temperature of 220 °C. A scan range of m/z 20-300 with a scan time of 0.69 s was
458 employed and the data were controlled and stored by the ChemStation software (Agilent, Santa Clara,
459 CA).

460 **Identification of odour-active compounds.** Linear retention indices were calculated by comparison
461 with the retention times of C₆-C₂₅ n-alkane series analysed on the same day using the same conditions
462 as for sample analyses (Supplementary Table S3). Aromas eluting from the GC-O were identified by
463 comparing their LRIs, mass spectra and the odour as described by the experts with those of authentic
464 compounds on two columns of different polarity. Mass spectral libraries, such as NIST 2011 and
465 Inramass (INRA, France), were used for primary identification of compounds in the coffee extract
466 using ChemStation software (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA). In most cases, authentic compounds were
467 analysed using the same chromatographic method to confirm their identity by comparison of their
468 mass spectra, LRI, and odour quality. Identification was confirmed by GC-MS on a Stabilwax
469 column. For compounds at concentrations below the detection limit of the GC-MS, odour character
470 and LRI were used.

471 **Confirmation of molecules as trigger or non-trigger.** Three parosmic participants returned to assess
472 coffee on a polar column to confirm the identity of trigger compounds. Once identified, selected trigger
473 compounds were also presented to 2 parosmic participants in dilute form to verify their parosmic
474 character, using the sample preparation protocol described for the European test of olfactory
475 capabilities³⁶. Aroma chemicals were diluted in mineral oil or propylene glycol and applied to small
476 discs (5 mm diameter) of absorbent paper in vials which were presented to the participants. They were
477 asked to sniff the vial and indicate whether each compound released “that parosmia smell” which they
478 had described previously.

479 **Additional samples.** All additional samples were prepared as for coffee with the following
480 modifications. Cocoa: 3g of cocoa powder was dissolved in 10 g boiling water, stirred and a 3 g aliquot
481 was used for extraction. Meat: a lean breast fillet, thickness 1 cm was grilled for 3 min on either side
482 using a Cuisinart grill (Stamford, CT) set on high. Finely chopped meat (3 g) was used for extraction.
483 A 50:50 slurry of peanut butter (3 g) was used for extraction. Finely diced red pepper (3 g) was extracted
484 at 40 °C prior to desorption. The faecal sample was thawed, mixed with an equal weight of water, and
485 3 g transferred to an SPME vial Chromatography conditions for all samples remained the same as for
486 coffee.

487 **Statistics.** Analysis of variance was carried out on age and TDI scores to determine whether there
488 were significant differences between pre-COVID-19 parosmic participants, post-COVID-19 parosmic
489 participants and non-parosmic participants. Post hoc pairwise comparisons were performed using
490 Fishers LSD at $p=0.05$. Agglomerative hierarchical clustering (AHC) using Ward's Euclidean
491 distance was carried out on intensity data for the 17 compounds most frequently identified in coffee as
492 molecular triggers of parosmia. All statistical analyses were carried out using XLSTAT statistical and
493 data analysis solution (Addinsoft 2020).

494

495 **References**

- 496 1. Boscolo-Rizzo, P.; Polesel, J.; Spinato, G.; Menegaldo, A.; Fabbris, C.; Calvanese, L.;
497 Borsetto, D.; Hopkins, C., Predominance of an altered sense of smell or taste among long-
498 lasting symptoms in patients with mildly symptomatic COVID-19. *Rhinology* **2020**, *58* (5),
499 524-525.
- 500 2. Gane, S. B.; Kelly, C.; Hopkins, C., Isolated sudden onset anosmia in COVID-19
501 infection. A novel syndrome? *Rhinology* **2020**, *58* (3), 299-301.
- 502 3. Boscolo-Rizzo, P.; Menegaldo, A.; Fabbris, C.; Spinato, G.; Borsetto, D.; Vaira, L. A.;
503 Calvanese, L.; Pettorelli, A.; Sonego, M.; Frezza, D.; Bertolin, A.; Cestaro, W.; Rigoli, R.;
504 Tirelli, G.; Mosto, M. C. D.; Menini, A.; Polesel, J.; Hopkins, C., High prevalence of long-term
505 psychophysical olfactory dysfunction in patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv* **2021**,
506 2021.01.07.21249406.
- 507 4. WHO WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. (accessed 12th December
508 2020).
- 509 5. Bonfils, P.; Avan, P.; Faulcon, P.; Malinvaud, D., Distorted odorant perception -
510 Analysis of a series of 56 patients with parosmia. *Archives of Otolaryngology-Head & Neck*
511 *Surgery* **2005**, *131* (2), 107-112.
- 512 6. Parker, J. K.; Kelly, C. E.; Smith, B.; Hopkins, C.; S., G., An analysis of patients'
513 perspectives on qualitative olfactory dysfunction using social media. *medRxiv*
514 2020.12.30.20249029; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.30.20249029> **2021**.
- 515 7. Burges Watson, D. L.; Campbell, M.; Hopkins, C.; Smith, B.; Kelly, C.; Deary, V.,
516 Altered Smell and Taste: anosmia, parosmia and the impact of long Covid-19. *medRxiv* **2020**,
517 2020.11.26.20239152.
- 518 8. Croy, I.; Nordin, S.; Hummel, T., Olfactory Disorders and Quality of Life-An Updated
519 Review. *Chemical Senses* **2014**, *39* (3), 185-194.
- 520 9. Kohli, P.; Soler, Z. M.; Nguyen, S. A.; Muus, J. S.; Schlosser, R. J., The Association
521 Between Olfaction and Depression: A Systematic Review. *Chemical Senses* **2016**, *41* (6), 479-
522 486.
- 523 10. Keller, A.; Malaspina, D., Hidden consequences of olfactory dysfunction: a patient
524 report series. *BMC ear, nose, and throat disorders* **2013**, *13* (1), 8-8.
- 525 11. Hummel, T.; Sekinger, B.; Wolf, S. R.; Pauli, E.; Kobal, G., 'Sniffin' Sticks': Olfactory
526 performance assessed by the combined testing of odor identification, odor discrimination and
527 olfactory threshold. *Chemical Senses* **1997**, *22* (1), 39-52.

- 528 12. Hummel, T.; Kobal, G.; Gudziol, H.; Mackay-Sim, A., Normative data for the "Sniffin'
529 Sticks" including tests of odor identification, odor discrimination, and olfactory thresholds: an
530 upgrade based on a group of more than 3,000 subjects. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-*
531 *Laryngology* **2007**, *264* (3), 237-243.
- 532 13. Czerny, M.; Christlbauer, M.; Christlbauer, M.; Fischer, A.; Granvogl, M.; Hammer,
533 M.; Hartl, C.; Hernandez, N. M.; Schieberle, P., Re-investigation on odour thresholds of key
534 food aroma compounds and development of an aroma language based on odour qualities of
535 defined aqueous odorant solutions. *Eur. Food Res. Technol.* **2008**, *228* (2), 265-273.
- 536 14. Rychlik, M.; Schieberle, P.; Grosch, W., *Compilation of odor thresholds, odor*
537 *qualities and retention indices of key food odorants*. Deutsche Forschungsanstalt für
538 Lebensmittelchemie:
539 Garching, Germany: 1998.
- 540 15. Blank, I.; Sen, A.; Grosch, W., Potent odorants of the roasted powder and brew of
541 Arabica coffee. *Z. Lebensm.-Unters. Forsch.* **1992**, *195* (3), 239-45.
- 542 16. Fors, S., Sensory properties of volatile Maillard reaction products and related
543 compounds: a literature review. *ACS Symp. Ser.* **1983**, *215*, 185-286.
- 544 17. Liu, X.; Su, X.; Wang, F.; Huang, Z.; Wang, Q.; Li, Z.; Zhang, R.; Wu, L.; Pan, Y.;
545 Chen, Y.; Zhuang, H.; Chen, G.; Shi, T.; Zhang, J., ODORactor: a web server for deciphering
546 olfactory coding. *Bioinformatics* **2011**, *27* (16), 2302-2303.
- 547 18. Sanz, G.; Thomas-Danguin, T.; Hamdani, E. H.; Le Poupon, C.; Briand, L.; Pernollet,
548 J.-C.; Guichard, E.; Tromelin, A., Relationships between molecular structure and perceived
549 odor quality of ligands for a human olfactory receptor. *Chemical Senses* **2008**, *33* (7), 639-653.
- 550 19. Moore, J. G.; Straight, R. C.; Osborne, D. N.; Wayne, A. W., Olfactory, gas-
551 chromatographic and mass-spectral analyses of fecal volatiles traced to ingested licorice and
552 apple. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* **1985**, *131* (1), 339-346.
- 553 20. Sanz, C.; Czerny, M.; Cid, C.; Schieberle, P., Comparison of potent odorants in a
554 filtered coffee brew and in an instant coffee beverage by aroma extract dilution analysis
555 (AEDA). *Eur. Food Res. Technol.* **2002**, *214* (4), 299-302.
- 556 21. Leopold, D., Distortion of olfactory perception: Diagnosis and treatment. *Chemical*
557 *Senses* **2002**, *27* (7), 611-615.
- 558 22. Weiss, T.; Soroka, T.; Gorodisky, L.; Shushan, S.; Snitz, K.; Weissgross, R.; Furman-
559 Haran, E.; Dhollander, T.; Sobel, N., Human Olfaction without Apparent Olfactory Bulbs.
560 *Neuron* **2020**, *105* (1), 35-+.

- 561 23. Mueller, A.; Rodewald, A.; Reden, J.; Gerber, J.; von Kummer, R.; Hummel, T.,
562 Reduced olfactory bulb volume in post-traumatic and post-infectious olfactory dysfunction.
563 *Neuroreport* **2005**, *16* (5), 475-478.
- 564 24. Rombaux, P.; Mouraux, A.; Bertrand, B.; Nicolas, G.; Duprez, T.; Hummel, T.,
565 Olfactory function and olfactory bulb volume in patients with postinfectious olfactory loss.
566 *Laryngoscope* **2006**, *116* (3), 436-439.
- 567 25. Bitter, T.; Siegert, F.; Gudziol, H.; Burmeister, H. P.; Mentzel, H. J.; Hummel, T.;
568 Gaser, C.; Guntinas-Lichius, O., Gray matter alterations in parosmia. *Neuroscience* **2011**, *177*,
569 177-182.
- 570 26. Iannilli, E.; Leopold, D. A.; Hornung, D. E.; Hummel, T., Advances in Understanding
571 Parosmia: An fMRI Study. *Orl-Journal for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology Head and Neck Surgery*
572 **2019**, *81* (4), 185-192.
- 573 27. Green, W. W.; Uyttingco, C. R.; Ukhanov, K.; Kolb, Z.; Moretta, J.; McIntyre, J. C.;
574 Martens, J. R., Peripheral Gene Therapeutic Rescue of an Olfactory Ciliopathy Restores
575 Sensory Input, Axonal Pathfinding, and Odor-Guided Behavior. *Journal of Neuroscience* **2018**,
576 *38* (34), 7462-7475.
- 577 28. Tadenev, A. L. D.; Kulaga, H. M.; May-Simera, H. L.; Kelley, M. W.; Katsanis, N.;
578 Reed, R. R., Loss of Bardet-Biedl syndrome protein-8 (BBS8) perturbs olfactory function,
579 protein localization, and axon targeting. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of*
580 *the United States of America* **2011**, *108* (25), 10320-10325.
- 581 29. Christensen, M. D.; Holbrook, E. H.; Costanzo, R. M.; Schwob, J. E., Rhinotomy is
582 disrupted during the re-innervation of the olfactory bulb that follows transection of the
583 olfactory nerve. *Chemical Senses* **2001**, *26* (4), 359-369.
- 584 30. Costanzo, R. M., Rewiring the olfactory bulb: Changes in odor maps following
585 recovery from nerve transection. *Chemical Senses* **2000**, *25* (2), 199-205.
- 586 31. St John, J. A.; Key, B., Axon mis-targeting in the olfactory bulb during regeneration of
587 olfactory neuroepithelium. *Chemical Senses* **2003**, *28* (9), 773-779.
- 588 32. Hawkes, C., Parosmia: treatment, mechanism, and types. *British Medical Journal* **2020**,
589 *371*.
- 590 33. Watt, W. C.; Sakano, H.; Lee, Z. Y.; Reusch, J. E.; Trinh, K.; Storm, D. R., Odorant
591 stimulation enhances survival of olfactory sensory neurons via MAPK and CREB. *Neuron*
592 **2004**, *41* (6), 955-967.

- 593 34. Schwarting, G. A.; Henion, T. R., Olfactory axon guidance: the modified rules. *Journal*
594 *of neuroscience research* **2008**, *86* (1), 11-7.
- 595 35. Landis, B. N.; Frasnelli, J.; Croy, I.; Hummel, T., Evaluating the Clinical Usefulness of
596 Structured Questions in Parosmia Assessment. *Laryngoscope* **2010**, *120* (8), 1707-1713.
- 597 36. Thomas-Danguin, T.; Rouby, C.; Sicard, G.; Vigouroux, M.; Farget, V.; Johanson, A.;
598 Bengtson, A.; Hall, G.; Ormel, W.; De Graaf, C.; Rousseau, F.; Dumont, J. P., Development
599 of the ETOC: A European test of olfactory capabilities. *Rhinology* **2003**, *41* (3), 142-151.
- 600 37. Karahadian, C.; Johnson, K. A., Analysis of headspace volatiles and sensory
601 characteristics of fresh corn tortillas made from fresh masa dough and spray-dried masa flour.
602 *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **1993**, *41* (5), 791-9.
603

604 **Figure Captions**

605 **Fig. 1** Correlations between olfactory function and GC-O. A: Correlation between TDI score and
606 number of GC-O aromas detected at the GC-O. B: Relationship between number of triggers detected
607 in the coffee extract and TDI score. In both figures, non-parosmic participants = blue, pre-COVID-19
608 parosmic participants = orange, post-COVID-19 parosmic participants = green.

609 **Fig. 2** Agglomerative Hierarchical Clustering of intensity scores for 17 most frequently reported
610 triggers

611 **Fig. 3** Venn diagram showing molecular triggers and their known odour receptors. ORs are blue,
612 compounds in red are known triggers, whereas compounds in black have not been identified as
613 triggers. 2-Ethyl-5-methylpyrazine and 2,5-dimethylpyrazine may be triggers at much higher
614 concentrations but are rarely odour-active (high odour thresholds), other research (unreported)
615 suggests indole and skatole are unlikely to be triggers. For OR1J4 and OR2G3, pyrazines have been
616 abbreviated with a P: triggers within OR1J4 and OR2G3 from top to bottom are 3-ethyl-2-
617 methoxypyrazine, 2,3-diethyl-3-methylpyrazine, 2-ethyl-3,5-dimethylpyrazine, and non-triggers 2-
618 ethyl-5-methylpyrazine and indole. In addition, the following ligand OR pairs were retrieved:
619 butanedione: OR6Y1; guaiacol: OR5L2, OR1L8, OR5AS1, OR8G2, OR4K15, OR5D18, OR10R2,
620 OR5V1, OR8J1, OR6C75, OR1F1, OR8H2, OR1J2, OR7G1, OR1E3; 3-methyl-2-butene-1-thiol:
621 OR1L3; methanethiol: OR5B12, OR5AR1, OR4S2, OR2W5, OR5M3.

622

623 **Table 1** Summary of Participant Demographics

Participant demographic data	No	Male	Female	White	Mean age	Age range	CRS	PI	TBI
All Participants	45	12	33	43	53	23-73	3	29	1
Pre-COVID-19 parosmics	15	3	12	15	56	33-73	1	14	1
Post-COVID-19 parosmics	15	3	12	14	37	19-60	1	15	0
Non-parosmics	15	6	9	14	49	33-71	2	na	na

624 CRS = chronic rhinosinusitis, PI = post infection, TBI = post traumatic brain injury, na = not

625 applicable

Table 2 Molecular triggers reported in coffee by at least 3 pre- and post-COVID-19 parosmic participants

Molecular triggers	Code	Class	Odour threshold ug/L	Number times detected by parosmic	Number times reported as trigger	Source ^a
2-furanmethanethiol	fft	furanthiol	0.005 ¹³	24	20	TCI
2-ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine	edmp1	pyrazine	0.01	19	14	Oxford
2,3-diethyl-5-methylpyrazine	demp	pyrazine	0.05 ¹³	21	12	Oxford
2-furanmethyl methyl disulfide	ffsm	disulfide	0.04 ¹⁶	18	11	Sigma
2-methyl-3-furanthiol	mft	furanthiol	0.0004 ¹⁴	20	10	TCI
2-ethyl-3,5-dimethylpyrazine	edmp2	pyrazine	1 ³⁷	19	10	Oxford
2-methyl-3-furyl methyl disulfide	mfssm	disulfide	0.004 ¹⁴	19	10	Sigma
3-methyl-2-butene-1-thiol	mbt	thiol	0.005 ^{Aroxa}	21	9	Aroxa
2-ethyl-3-methoxypyrazine	emp	methoxypyrazine	0.4 ¹⁶	12	9	Sigma
2-isobutyl-3-methoxypyrazine	ibmp	methoxypyrazine	0.002 ¹³	18	7	Sigma
3-mercapto-3-methylbutanol	3mmbo	thiol		14	6	Sigma
sotolone	sot	furanone	0.5 ¹³	10	6	Sigma
trimethylpyrazine	tmp	pyrazine	9.6 ¹⁶	11	5	Sigma
guaiacol	gc	phenol	12 ¹³	15	5	Sigma
3-mercapto-3-methylbutyl formate	3mmbf	thiol ester		15	5	Fluorochem
unknown LRI 981	unk			12	4	-
2-isopropyl-3-methoxypyrazine	ipmp	methoxypyrazine	0.001 ¹³	15	3	TCI

^aSource of authentic standard: Aroxa (Leatherhead, UK), Fluorochem (Hadfield, UK), Oxford Chemicals (Hartlepool, UK), Sigma (Poole, UK), TCI (Oxford, UK).





Fig. 1 Correlations between olfactory function and GC-O. A: Correlation between TDI score and number of GC-O aromas detected at the GC-O. B: Relationship between number of triggers detected in the coffee extract and TDI score. In both figures non-parosmic participants = blue, pre-COVID-19 parosmic participants = orange, post-COVID-19 parosmic participants = green.




Fig. 2 Agglomerative Hierarchical Clustering of intensity scores for 17 most frequently reported triggers




Fig. 3 Venn diagram showing molecular triggers and their known odour receptors. ORs are blue, compounds in red are known triggers, whereas compounds in black have not been identified as triggers. 2-Ethyl-5-methylpyrazine and 2,5-dimethylpyrazine may be triggers at much higher concentrations but are rarely odour-active (high odour thresholds), other research (unreported) suggests indole and skatole are unlikely to be triggers. For OR1J4 and OR2G3, pyrazines have been abbreviated with a P: triggers within OR1J4 and OR2G3 from top to bottom are 3-ethyl-2-methoxypyrazine, 2,3-diethyl-3-methylpyrazine, 2-ethyl-3,5-dimethylpyrazine, and non triggers 2-ethyl-5-methylpyrazine and indole. In addition, the following ligand OR pairs were retrieved: butanedione: OR6Y1; guaiacol: OR5L2, OR1L8, OR5AS1, OR8G2, OR4K15, OR5D18, OR10R2, OR5V1, OR8J1, OR6C75, OR1F1, OR8H2, OR1J2, OR7G1, OR1E3; 3-methyl-2-butene-1-thiol: OR1L3; methanethiol: OR5B12, OR5AR1, OR4S2, OR2W5, OR5M3.

Table S1 Participant Data: Demographics, answers to pre-screening questionnaire, TDI Scores and GC-O scores

Status	Pre-screening questionnaire				TDI score ^c	#GCO aromas ^d	#Triggers detected ^e
	Onset of parosmia	Nasal patency	Taste of food different ^a	Odours unpleasant ^b			
Participants with parosmia							
Pre-COVID-19	3-12 months	always	always	often	36	32	9
Pre-COVID-19	>2 years	always	always	rarely	35	52	2
Pre-COVID-19	1-2 years	sometimes	often	often	35	22	9
Pre-COVID-19	3-12 months	always	always	always	32	9	3
Pre-COVID-19	3-12 months	always	rarely	often	31	18	13
Pre-COVID-19	3-12 months	always	often	always	31	25	13
Pre-COVID-19	>2 years	always	often	often	30	22	4
Pre-COVID-19	1-2 years	always	always	often	29	25	4
Pre-COVID-19	>2 years	always	often	often	26	16	6
Pre-COVID-19	1-2 years	always	always	often	26	22	7
Pre-COVID-19	3-12 months	always	often	often	26	22	8
Pre-COVID-19	3-12 months	sometimes	often	often	22	13	10
Pre-COVID-19	3-12 months	always	always	never	22	0	0
Pre-COVID-19	1-2 years	always	often	always	12	9	5
Pre-COVID-19	>2 years	always	often	never	10	0	0
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	sometimes	often	often	38	25	9
Post-COVID-19	< 3 months	always	often	often	37	45	2
Post-COVID-19	< 3 months	always	often	often	36	33	11
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	often	often	32	10	6
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	often	often	29	12	12
Post-COVID-19	< 3 months	always	always	always	29	28	8
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	always	often	28	17	9
Post-COVID-19	< 3 months	sometimes	often	often	27	20	5
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	always	rarely	27	24	8

Post-COVID-19	< 3 months	always	often	often	25	12	7
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	always	always	24	22	6
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	always	often	24	7	3
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	often	often	23	8	4
Post-COVID-19	3-6 months	always	always	often	19	10	7
Post-COVID-19	< 3 months	always	often	often	15	5	1

Participants without parosmia

Without parosmia					44	53
Without parosmia					44	33
Without parosmia					43	54
Without parosmia					42	44
Without parosmia					38	54
Without parosmia					40	53
Without parosmia					40	47
Without parosmia					40	27
Without parosmia					38	52
Without parosmia					37	28
Without parosmia					35	34
Without parosmia					34	35
Without parosmia					30	11
Without parosmia					29	21
Without parosmia					25	14

^aAnswer to the question “Are odours that are pleasant to others, unpleasant to you? Never/rarely/often/always”; ^bAnswer to the question “Is the taste of food different to what you expect? Never/rarely/often/always”; ^cTDI score from Sniffin Sticks, range 0-48; ^dNumber of GC-O aromas detected in coffee extract; ^eNumber of triggers reported in GC-O of coffee extract

Table S2 Pre-screening Questionnaire Part 1

What is your title?
What is your full name?
What is your full address (including postcode)?
What is your date of birth?
Please indicate your ethnicity
What is your height (please indicate units)?
What is your weight (please indicate units)?
How would you describe your gender?
What is your daytime telephone number?
What is your evening telephone number?
What is the best time to call?
Are you a current smoker?
What is your email address?
Do you use emails on a regular basis?
How did you hear about the study?
As far as you know, do you have chronic sinusitis?
As far as you know, do you have olfactory dysfunction?
Have you had surgery to your nose or head?
Please list any current medication you're taking. If no medication is taken, please write 'none'.
Are you prepared to spend a day at the Flavour lab at University of Reading?
Do you experience a problem with your sense of smell or taste?

Pre-screening Questionnaire Part 2 for those reporting smell disorders

Does your problem with your sense of smell or taste relate to your (select one answer)

- Sense of Smell
- Sense of Taste
- Both smell and taste

Can you tell the difference between salt and sugar? Yes/No

When did your problem start? (select one answer)

- Less than 3 months ago
- 3-12 months ago
- 1-2 years ago
- More than 2 years ago

How did the problem start? (select one answer)

- Slowly
- Suddenly
- I don't know

How has your problem changed since it started? (select one answer)

- There's been an improvement
- No change
- It's got worse
- Not sure

What do you think might have caused it? (select one or more answers)

- Accident
- Nasal polyps
- Cold or infection
- Surgery
- I was born without a sense of smell
- Other
- I don't know

Do you have any of these signs/symptoms? (select one or more answers)

- Stuffy nose

Allergies
Sneezing
None of these

Does the smell problem come and go or is it always present? (select one answer)

It's always present
It comes and goes
I don't know

Can you breathe clearly through your nose? (select one answer)

Always
Sometimes
Never

Have you seen a specialist such as an ENT doctor or neurologist for your condition? Y/N

How long does your parosmia linger? (select one answer)

Briefly
Minutes
Hours
Days
Not applicable

How do you experience your parosmia? (select one answer)

Right nostril only
Left nostril only
Both nostrils
Not sure

Is the taste of food different to what you expect? (select one answer)

Rarely
Often
Always
Never

Are odours that are pleasant to others, unpleasant to you? (select one answer)

Rarely
Often
Always
Never

Which odours (or foods or drinks) do you find particularly unpleasant and distorted? Please list, starting with the most unpleasant.

Do you experience smell that are not present (phantosmia)? Y/N/not sure

Do you sometimes get a smell in your nose that persists, sometimes for extended periods of time (smell locks)? Y/N/not sure

Are you smell training? (select one answer)

Yes
No – I never tried
No – I tried in the past and stopped.

Table S3 Confirmation of Identity of Molecular Triggers of Parosmia

Descriptors from GC-O ^a	Compound	DB5 Column		Wax Column		Found in coffee by GC-O ^c	Parosmic ^d Authentic	Parosmic ^e Wax
		LRI GC-O	confirmation of identity ^b	LRI GC-O	confirmation of identity ^b			
weed marijuana	3-methyl-2-butene-1-thiol	820	LRI,O	1110	lri,O	abe	y	
meat gravy	2-methyl-3-furanthiol	865	LRI,O,MS	1334	lri,O,MS	abce	y	y
coffee, toast chicken crisps	2-furanmethanethiol	910	LRI,O,MS	1450	lri,O	abcdefj	y	y
cats pee fruity unknown	3-mercapto-3-methylbutanol	943	LRI,O,MS			fg	y	y
cats pee cats pee	<i>ethyl 2-(methylthio) acetate (unk 981)</i>	981	LRI,O					
biscuit (with veg) crisps	trimethylpyrazine	1007	LRI,O,MS			ajk		y
cats pee blackcurrant	3-mercapto-3-methylbutyl formate	1024	lri,O,ms	1539	lri,O,MS	abcdefgj		y
bell pepper coffee remains	2-ethyl-3-methoxypyrazine	1055	LRI,O,MS	1444	lri,O	a	y	
earthy green, cereal, burnt	2-ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine	1081	LRI,O,MS	1476	lri,O, MS	chjk	y	
dogfood, earthy mouldy mop	2-ethyl-3,5-dimethylpyrazine	1088	LRI,O,MS	1487	lri,O,MS	abcdefj	y	
smoke clove smoky bacon crisps	guaiacol	1091	LRI,O,MS	1893	lri,O,ms	abcdefhjk		
veg, green peeled potato	2-isopropyl-3-methoxypyrazine	1097	LRI,O	1444	lri,O	acgj		
celery, spicy, curry, maple	sotolone	1111	LRI,O,MS	2257	lri,O,ms	acdi j		
earthy woody	2,3-diethyl-5-methylpyrazine	1159	LRI,O,MS			abcdefj	y	

faecal, meat, gravy cooking	2-methyl-3-furyl methyl disulfide	1175	LRI,O	1694	lri,O,ms		y	y
bell pepper stem	2-isobutyl-3-methoxypyrazine	1184	LRI,O			abcdj	y	y
bad coffee chicken crisps	2-furanmethyl methyl disulfide	1214	LRI,O,MS	1839	lri,O,MS	j	y	y

Compounds identified as triggers, those in italics have only been tentatively identified, sorted according LRI. ^aDescriptors from two expert assessors, each separated by a | ^bLRI=LRI of compound matches LRI of authentic standard, lri=matches that found in literature, MS=mass spectrum of compound matches that of authentic compound, ms matches that of library spectrum, O=odour matches reference or published descriptor, ^cReferences for compounds found in coffee by GC-O: a Blank, Sen, & Grosch (1992), b Semmelroch & Grosch (1995), c Sanz, Czerny, Cid, & Schieberle (2002), d Semmelroch & Grosch, (1996), e Akiyama, Murakami, Ohtani, Iwatsuki, Sotoyama, Wada, et al. (2010), g Chin, Eyres, & Marriott (2011), h Kim, Lee, Bang, Lee, Rhee, & Na (2019), i Blank, Sen, & Grosch (1991), j Pua, Lau, Liu, Tan, Goh, Lassabliere, et al. (2020), k Sanz, Ansorena, Bello, & Cid (2001), ^dparosmic volunteer confirmed parosmic character of authentic sample, ^eparosmic volunteer confirmed parosmic character on Wax column.

Figure S1 Flavour wheel provided to all participants during GC-O session

