

Prevalence and correlates of parosmia and phantosmia among smell disorders

Article

Accepted Version

Pellegrino, R., Mainland, J. D., Kelly, C. E., Parker, J. K.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4121-5481> and Hummel,
T. (2021) Prevalence and correlates of parosmia and
phantosmia among smell disorders. *Chemical Senses*, 46.
bjab046. ISSN 1464-3553 doi: 10.1093/chemse/bjab046
Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/102256/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjab046>

Publisher: Oxford University Press

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 Title: Prevalence and Correlates of Parosmia and Phantosmia among Smell Disorders

2 Authors: Robert Pellegrino^{1,2}, Joel D. Mainland^{1,3}, Christine E. Kelly⁴, Jane K. Parker⁵, Thomas Hummel⁶

3 ¹Monell Chemical Senses Center, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

4 ²Department of Food Science, University of Tennessee, 2510 River Drive, Knoxville, Tennessee, USA

5 ³Department of Neuroscience, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

6 ⁴AbScent, 14 London Road, Andover, Hampshire, UK

7 ⁵Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, UK

8 ⁶Smell & Taste Clinic, Dept. of Otorhinolaryngology, TU Dresden, Dresden, Germany

9
10
11 Correspondence:

12 Robert Pellegrino, Monell Chemical Senses Center, 3500 Market St, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
13 email: rpellegrino@monell.org

14
15 Funding: T32 DC000014 to RP

16 Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Abstract

Among those many individuals who suffer from a reduced odor sensitivity (hyposmia/anosmia) some individuals also experience disorders that lead to odor distortion, such as parosmia (i.e., distorted odor with a known source), or odor phantoms (i.e., odor sensation without an odor source). We surveyed a large population with at least one olfactory disorder ($N = 2031$) and found that odor distortions were common (46%), with respondents reporting either parosmia (19%), phantosmia (11%), or both (16%). In comparison to respondents with hyposmia or anosmia, respondents with parosmia were more likely to be female, young, and suffering from post-viral olfactory loss ($p < 0.001$), while respondents with phantosmia were more likely to be middle-aged ($p < 0.01$) and experiencing symptoms caused by head trauma ($p < 0.01$). In addition, parosmia, compared to phantosmia or anosmia/hyposmia, was most prevalent 3 months to a year after olfactory symptom onset ($p < 0.001$), which coincides with the timeline of physiological recovery. Finally, we observed that the frequency and duration of distortions negatively affects quality of life, with parosmia showing a higher range of severity than phantosmia ($p < 0.001$). Previous research often grouped these distortions together, but our results show that they have distinct patterns of demographics, medical history, and loss in quality of life.

39 **Introduction**

40 Olfactory dysfunction affects a quarter of the population, and with the advent of COVID-19 this number
41 is likely to rise (Pellegrino, Cooper, et al., 2020). In addition to reduced odor sensitivity, some individuals
42 also experience odor distortion (Burges Watson et al., 2020; Keller & Malaspina, 2013; Leopold, 2002).
43 Reduced sensitivity has been well described in the literature leading to better diagnosis and treatment
44 (Hummel et al., 2017; Oleszkiewicz et al., 2019). Still, despite the differences between parosmia (i.e.,
45 distorted odor with a known source) and phantosmia (i.e., odor sensation without an odor source)
46 (Hummel et al., 2017) most studies do not separate them. This is partly due to the large variance in their
47 clinical presentation (Frasnelli et al., 2004) and because many patients report having both symptoms
48 (Sjölund et al., 2017).

49 In general, when patients with parosmia inhale odorants their perception does not match their
50 memory from before the distortion. In most cases of parosmia, the distorted odors are usually perceived as
51 unpleasant (“cacosmia”), but there have been cases in which the distortions were pleasant (“euosmia”,
52 (Landis et al., 2006)). Additionally, recent evidence suggests that specific odors, such as coffee, meat,
53 onion, and toothpaste, are more likely to trigger parosmia than others (Parker, Kelly, Smith, et al., 2021).
54 Phantosmia, on the other hand, describes the perception of an odor in the absence of a source – there is
55 only the illusion of a smell. Parosmia has been reported among 10% to 60% of olfactory dysfunction
56 patients (Nordin et al., 1996; Parma et al., 2020; Reden et al., 2007) while the range is much smaller (3 –
57 16 %) for phantosmia (Bainbridge et al., 2018; Nordin et al., 1996; Ohayon, 2000; Rawal et al., 2016;
58 Reden et al., 2007; Sjölund et al., 2017). These numbers indicate that incidences of parosmias and
59 phantosmias are not rare, but the variance indicates that the reported frequency depends on the definition
60 of parosmia or phantosmia.

61 Most parosmia appears to co-occur with olfactory loss due to viral infection, with the majority of
62 cases resolving within a year (Liu et al., 2020; Nordin et al., 1996; Quint et al., 2001; Reden et al., 2007).
63 Patients suffering from parosmia also had smaller olfactory bulbs compared to those with reduced

sensitivity and no distortion (Mueller et al., 2005; Rombaux et al., 2009). In addition, parosmia was eliminated by preventing odors from entering the olfactory cleft in a case study (Liu et al., 2020). This supports a peripheral etiology and is consistent with the theory that parosmia results from mistargeting that occurs when olfactory sensory neurons regrow axons to the olfactory bulb during recovery (Holbrook et al., 2005; Hong et al., 2012a).

With phantosmia, peripheral origins of distortion may be maintained through abnormally active olfactory sensory neurons, loss of inhibitory neurons, or microbial infection creating a malodor (D. Leopold, 2002). The removal of the olfactory epithelium or even briefly occluding a nostril (irrelevant of side) has been shown to eliminate the olfactory illusions for some patients (Leopold et al., 1991, 2002). Many phantosmia patients have a history of head trauma (Leopold, 2002; Sjölund et al., 2017), psychiatric disorders (Croy et al., 2013; Frasnelli et al., 2004), temporal lobe epilepsy, and phantosmic episodes in the form of auras (Aiello & Hirsch, 2013; Leopold, 2002), suggesting a central etiology from overactive neurons.

Patients with symptoms of olfactory distortion may suffer to a larger extent than those with a reduced sensitivity, as they are continually reminded of their problem. In fact, individuals with reduced perception of odors are often not even aware of their disorder (Oleszkiewicz et al., 2020; Oleszkiewicz & Hummel, 2019). However, most reports on odor distortions have not used a quantitative approach to compare them with anosmia and hyposmia— instead reporting anecdotal patient experiences. Here we compared them directly using a survey designed to gather information about parosmia and phantosmia. This quantitative approach allowed us to provide diagnostic criteria and reveal patterns of the disorder. Using this method, we saw several distinct differences among the disorders and created a severity metric for clinical use.

Materials and Methods

88 *Participants*

89 A total of 2246 individuals filled out an online questionnaire survey that was distributed globally in
90 English with English speaking countries (UK and USA) representing the largest proportions of
91 respondents. The survey was launched in parallel with a new informational website about smell loss
92 (www.abscent.org) which had two parts: an area with information that could be accessed by anyone, and
93 a "member area" with a closed forum, access to the Sniff Smell Training app, and other more premium
94 features. Access to the member area was given to anyone who completed the survey. Primary areas of
95 recruitment were the AbScent website and social media posts to AbScent's Facebook and Twitter
96 accounts. Survey data was collected between May of 2019 and October of 2020. This procedure was
97 conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki for studies on human subjects and approved by the
98 University of Tennessee IRB review for research involving human subjects (IRB # 19-05253-XM).

99 *Procedure*

100 The Sense of Smell Questionnaire was created from prior research surveys (Frasnelli et al., 2004; Keller
101 & Malaspina, 2013; Landis et al., 2010) and patient observations by the authors. It was designed to
102 specifically address features of odor distortion (Supp. Appendix I). Two binary response (yes or no)
103 questions accompanied by a descriptive caption were used to create four groups of smell impairment:

104 A. Parosmia - the experience of distorted smells which have an obvious source:

105 Do you have parosmia (distorted sense of smell)?

106 B. Phantosmia - the experience of smells that have no obvious origin:

107 Do you experience smells that are not present (phantosmia)?

108 Participants who only chose A or B were classified as Parosmic and Phantosmic respectively while those
109 choosing both were considered both Parosmic/Phantosmic. All other smell impaired participants were

considered Anosmic/Hyposmic. The questionnaire used a branching design such that questions specific to each disorder were only presented to those who responded with “Yes” to the quality disorder.

Statistical Analysis

We used a unimodal analysis to look at differences across groups. We used chi-square analysis for categorical responses and analysis of variance (ANOVA) for continuous responses. Responses were bootstrapped to provide confidence intervals using the boot package (Davison & Hinkley, 1997). Here, we resampled (with replacement) the responses 1000 times to estimate error in all comparisons and visualizations.

To determine degree of severity, three questions were considered - each were asked within each odor distortion question block (answering “Yes” to Parosmia or Phantosmia) and had the same options. Below is an example of the questions for Phantosmia/Parosmia.

A. How often do you experience smells that are not present (for phantosmia) or how often do you experience parosmia (distorted sense of smell)? (daily, once every week, once every month)

B. How long does a Phantosmia/Parosmia episode last? (seconds, minutes, hours, days)

C. How would you describe your Phantosmia/Parosmia? (mild, strong)

These questions together had a low intercorrelation coefficient (0.55). Questions A and C loaded onto the same principal component with question C explaining less variance (89% compared to 77%). Therefore, question C was dropped and A and B were summed to create a severity score of the disorder. Analysis was done with the psych package in R (Revelle, 2017).

Two open-ended text questions describing distortions of parosmia or phantosmia underwent text analysis. Sentences were cleaned and words were spell checked with hunspell using a large English dictionary (Ooms, 2020). Sentimental analysis, using the sentimentr package (Rinker, 2019), was done at the

sentence-level across participants that provided sentences longer than the 1st quartile length of all sentences (> 7 words) and density plots were used to provide a visual representation. Average sentiment and negative emotion count of each sentence were then used as predictors for degree of severity. Furthermore, sentences were broken down into one word nouns with SpacyR (Benoit & Matsuo, 2018). Summary tables of counts were constructed and visually represented in wordclouds with the size representing the frequency using ggwordcloud (Pennec & Slowikowski, 2018).

All analysis were done in R (version 4.3) and the code along with data can be found here:
<https://osf.io/5ebjt/>

Results

Only participants reporting an olfactory disorder, 18 years of age or over, and not born with the smell problem (congenital) were considered in the analysis (N = 2031). From this large population with an olfactory disorder, we report that odor distortions are common to smell impairment (46%) with individuals reporting either parosmia (19%), phantosmia (11%), or both (16%) (Figure 1a). Exploratory analysis revealed individuals reporting “both” types of odor distortion did not represent parosmia and phantosmia evenly (Supp Fig. 1). Due to this heterogeneity, we excluded this population from the rest of the analysis leaving three groups – Anosmic/Hyposmic, Parosmic, and Phantosmic. Parosmia and phantosmia showed distinct patterns, both from each other as well as from those with reduced sensitivity, in demographics, medical history, and impacts to quality of life. Using two questions, we were able to derive a severity score that influences many of these patterns.

Demographics and Medical History

Our sample was predominantly female (72%) with an age range from 21 to over 71 (see Supp Table 1). Respondents with parosmia were more likely to be female and younger than phantosmic ($\chi^2 = 5.84, p = 0.047$ and $\chi^2 = 4.79, p < 0.001$ respectively) or anosmic/hyposmic individuals ($\chi^2 = 14.12, p < 0.001$ and $\chi^2 = 4.62, p < 0.001$ respectively) (Figure 1B). In contrast, phantosmia prevalence peaked for 41-50 year

old ($\chi^2 = 2.82, p = 0.01$) and anosmia/hyposmia was more prominent in older individuals (61 and over; $\chi^2 = 5.18, p < 0.001$). There were no differences in gender between phantosmic vs. anosmic/hyposmic populations ($\chi^2 = 0.08, p = 0.78$).

The three most common etiologies resulting in an olfactory disorder are viral (70%), sinonasal disease (10%) and traumatic impact (8%) (Figure 1C). Among those with post-viral disorders, parosmia was the most common disorder ($\chi^2 = 8.58, p < 0.001$) and among those who suffered traumatic impact, phantosmia was the most common disorder ($\chi^2 = 3.69, p = 0.006$).

Compared to phantosmic and anosmic/hyposmic individuals, parosmia occurred suddenly ($\chi^2 = 3.61, p < 0.001$) with less nasal blockage ($\chi^2 = 4.56, p < 0.001$) (Figure 1F, G). Parosmia, compared to other olfactory conditions, was less likely to last more than two years ($\chi^2 = 8.36, p < 0.001$) and more likely to appear during recovery from the initial olfactory impairment (3 – 12 months) ($\chi^2 = 13.35, p < 0.001$) (Figure 1D). Similarly, parosmic individuals were more likely to say their condition was improving ($\chi^2 = 10.02, p < 0.001$) and less likely to report their condition as unchanged ($\chi^2 = 2.68, p = 0.02$). Phantosmia, on the other hand, was more stable, with no change in improvement across time in comparison to the anosmic/hyposmic group ($\chi^2 = 1.59, p = 0.33$) (Figure 1E). Overall, parosmic individuals showed the most deviation from the other olfactory disorders (phantosmia and anosmia/hyposmia).




Figure 1. Parosmia and Phantosmia are distinct disorders. (A) The number of study participants reporting having either parosmia, phantosmia or both. The two disorders were distinct in demographics (B), etiology (C), the time course of disease (D-F), and amount of congestion (G). Colors and icons represent olfactory disorders: green with a distorted grid icon represents individuals with parosmia, orange with an outlined cigarette icon represents individuals with phantosmia, as cigarette smell was a common phantom smell reported in our sample pool, and purple with a nose deny icon represents individuals with no parosmia nor phantosmia, but who reported an issue with smell (hyposmia/anosmia). Normalized prevalence represents the frequency difference between anosmia/hyposmia (baseline) and the other two olfactory disorders (parosmia or phantosmia). Error bars represent bootstrapped standard errors. Mo., Months; Y, Year

Parosmia is defined as distortion with an odor source, but the triggers for phantosmia are unknown. We report that all but one parosmic patient had specific sources that were distorted (99.7%, Figure 2A) while only a few phantosmic individuals had situations that triggered a distorted episode (17.0%). Sentences (N = 547) used to describe distortions for parosmia mostly had a negative sentiment, but there were positively described distortions (e.g., “my smell disorders are actually pleasant, flatulence smell like extra

and motivation to eat (42.1%) (Figure 3B). Among olfactory disorders, there was a higher anxiety for cleanliness among those with phantosmia and those with parosmia had a lower motivation to eat, cook and socialize. Both olfactory disorders reported more social anxiety than anosmic/hyposmic. Parosmic individuals also found it difficult to adjust to their disorder ($\chi^2=3.76$, $p < 0.001$) which might be a result of its acute nature during recovery. Phantomsics reported changes in their weight, with some gaining and others losing weight since the onset of the disorder ($\chi^2 = 5.27$, $p < 0.001$) (Figure 4C). Intimacy was altered among 24% of respondents, but there were no differences across olfactory disorders ($\chi^2 = 5.40$, $p = 0.24$).




Figure 3. Impacts on quality of life. Percentage of respondents (A) concerned about failing to detect common hazards and (B) reporting changes in common behaviors. Error bars represent bootstrapped standard errors.

Developing a Severity Score

A single scale of severity from structured questions has proven to be a clinically useful measure for parosmia, and here, we extend this idea to phantosmia (Landis et al., 2010). We combined the frequency and duration of distortion episodes to develop a severity score for both phantosmia and parosmia. Increases in the overall severity of the disorder affects the quality of life of individuals suffering from these disorders. Those with parosmia show a higher severity score than those with phantosmia ($B = 1.96$, $t = 11.66$, $p < 0.001$); Figure 4A), and an increased severity score was inversely correlated with overall quality of life for both disorders ($B = -0.39$, $t = 4.16$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 4B). More specifically, BMI

232 trended towards a significant correlation with severity score for those with phantasmia ($b = 0.05$, $t = 1.79$,
233 $p = 0.07$; Figure 4C). As determined by the sentiment analysis, there was no relationship between severity
234 score and negative emotions ($B = -1.35$, $SE = 2.45$, $t = 0.55$, $p = 0.58$), the type of emotion ($F(3) = 0.02$, p
235 $= .99$), or overall sentiment ($B = -0.53$, $SE = 0.49$, $t = 1.09$, $p = 0.28$) .




Figure 4 Degree of severity for parosmia and phantosmia. (A) Distribution of severity scores among parosmic and phantosmic groups. (B) The severity score correlates with the reported impact of the olfactory disorder on their quality of life. Error bands represent 95% confidence intervals. (C) Differences in frequency of weight fluctuation. Error bars represent bootstrapped standard errors. (D) Relationship between degree of severity score and body mass index. Error bands represent 95% confidence intervals.

Discussion

To date, little attention has been given to parosmia and phantosmia— with studies often combining them rather than studying them separately. Our study reveals some distinct differences between parosmia and phantosmia, as well as from hyposmia/anosmia. They are common olfactory impairments, with half of the participants with smell dysfunction reporting these disorders. Both parosmia and phantosmia vary in severity and are distinct in terms of demographics, medical history, and quality of life issues. Our survey also suggests that parosmia and phantosmia have distinct underlying mechanisms.

261 Parosmia represents a distortion of smell when an odorous source is present. Instead of smells becoming
262 weaker, as described in hyposmia/anosmia, they change in quality such that perceived smells are not the
263 same as patients remember from before the onset of parosmia. In our survey, there is a distinct
264 demographic that more commonly experiences parosmia – individuals who are younger, female, and
265 recovering from a virus.

266 In general, there is a negative correlation between age and recovery from smell loss, such that
267 losing smell at an older age results in slower recovery. One possibility is that parosmia is a symptom of
268 recovery, and those who are older have a smaller chance of developing parosmia (Cavazzana et al., 2018;
269 Hummel & Lötsch, 2010; London et al., 2008; Ogawa et al., 2020; Reden et al., 2006). Supporting this
270 idea, individuals in the early stages of recovery from smell loss who report parosmia also reported more
271 improvement over time than those with either phantosmia or a simple reduction in smell. Others have
272 reported this co-occurrence of parosmia through times of recovery (Liu T. et al., 2020; Nordin et al.,
273 1996; Quint et al., 2001; Reden et al., 2007). The presence of parosmia has indicated faster return to the
274 sense of smell in some studies (Liu T. et al., 2020; Reden et al., 2007), but not others (Hummel & Lötsch,
275 2010). This discrepancy may be due to patient age, since older patients have reduced olfactory
276 regenerative capacity (Mobley et al., 2014).

277 Past research has reported parosmia commonly occurs with olfactory loss due to viral infection
278 and frequently resolves within a year of the incident, with only 26% of an initial parosmic patient sample
279 (N = 112) having parosmia after 14 months (Liu et al., 2020; Nordin et al., 1996; Quint et al., 2001;
280 Reden et al., 2007). Similarly, in a study by Damm and coworkers (2014), 26% from a group of 47
281 initially parosmic patients reported no parosmia after an observation period of 4 months (Damm et al.,
282 2014). Parosmia was the most prevalent outcome among post-viral disorders in our sample (nearly 90 %
283 of parosmics) while parosmia had the lowest prevalence among those suffering from head trauma or
284 conductive loss etiologies (e.g. polyps). As mentioned, patients with parosmia also showed higher

prevalence of the disorder after the initial incident (> 3 months – 1 year), not during, and did not show issues with nasal patency.

Leading theories for parosmia suggest a peripheral origin of the disorder. Although these patients do show differences in neural activation (Iannilli et al., 2019), this might be a downstream effect. In fact, in hyposmic patients with parosmia, olfactory bulb volumes have been shown to be smaller compared to hyposmic patients without parosmia (Mueller et al., 2005; Rombaux et al., 2009). In neurogenesis, the axons of newly born sensory neurons must find the correct targets in the olfactory bulb. Abnormalities may occur during the process (Murai et al., 2016; Schwob et al., 2017), such that a sensory neuron tuned to one odor mistakenly stimulates an area of the bulb that signals the presence of a different odor. Axons reach the bulb approximately 1-3 months after injury, which matches the timing of parosmia in this survey. Taken together, our data support a peripheral cause of distortion that may result from a variety of mechanisms related to recovery such as differences across olfactory sensory neurons in time to recover or a mismatch in rewiring in the olfactory bulb. This is supported by animal models where olfactory maps significantly change after regeneration of ablated neurons, leading animals to have to relearn the correct odor match (Yee & Costanzo, 1998) and this is most likely due to mistargeting by a receptor-defined subset of peripheral neurons (Christensen et al., 2001; Holbrook et al., 2005).

Parosmic patients showed higher disturbances to their social life, leading to an avoidance of social and eating activities. In comparison to hyposmia/anosmia, this did not lead to any associated behavioral outcomes that we measured, such as weight fluctuation, but more rigorous assessments are warranted (Mattes & Cowart, 1994). For instance, we clearly show that individuals with parosmia are reminded of their disorder regularly, which has been hypothesized as a reason for greater disruption in daily life (Croy et al., 2013; Frasnelli & Hummel, 2005; Hong et al., 2012b). These patients also report more difficulty adjusting to their disorder, which may explain a recent report showing higher depression and anxiety symptoms in this patient group (Giguere et al., 2020).

The distortions experienced describe a common thread of sources (e.g. coffee) that has been reported in the literature and there is little doubt that the terms used to describe these distortions generally have a negative valence associated with them (dirty, sewage, unpleasant, rotting, disgusting, sickly sweet and vomit-inducing) (Burges Watson et al., 2020; Keller & Malaspina, 2013; Parker, Kelly, Smith, et al., 2021). Some explanations for this negative valence towards distorted odors has been the low familiarity to odors activating unlearned neuronal mapping or the fact that many unpleasant odorants within an odor mixture have low detection thresholds. Although our question about distortions had a negative phrasing, “Which odors do you find particularly unpleasant and distorted? (Describe in as much detail as possible)”, individuals still reported some positive changes. Looking at the positive and negative sentimental sentences, there seems to be a valence shift in which odors commonly perceived as positive are described negatively, but a few, usually related to body odors, shift from negative to positive. For instance, fecal smells may turn pleasant whereas coffee becomes unpleasant. One explanation for this shift from negative to positive is that some of the key aroma compounds responsible for the strong and usually repulsive smell of feces were not perceived at all by those with parosmia (Parker, Kelly, & Gane, 2021). In the absence of these potent odors, other pleasant compounds may dominate perception of the mixture.

Phantosmia

Phantosmia is an olfactory experience when there is no odor source present. These phantom odors may be high or low in intensity and may be familiar or unfamiliar odors and cannot be perceived by others nearby. Unlike previous reports done at a population level (Bainbridge et al., 2018; Sjölund et al., 2017), in our sample females were not more prone to phantosmia ($p = 0.78$). This difference in findings may be due to previous studies categorizing parosmia and phantosmia together. For instance, a population level study found females to be almost twice as likely to have phantosmia than men, but the group under study also reported they were 6 times more likely to have parosmia thus representing a heterogeneous group (Sjölund et al., 2017). However, our results do agree with previous findings regarding age, in which

individuals between 40 and 60 years of age were more likely to have phantosmia than older individuals (> 60 years) (Bainbridge et al., 2018).

Phantosmia was the most common olfactory disorder among those who suffered a head trauma. Phantosmic patients have previously been reported to have a history of head trauma (Leopold, 2002; Sjölund et al., 2017), as well as psychiatric disorders (Croy et al., 2013; Frasnelli et al., 2004), temporal lobe epilepsy and phantosmic episodes commonly preceding seizures, and migraines in the form of auras (Aiello & Hirsch, 2013; Leopold, 2002). Additionally, we show that phantosmic patients had more sinonasal diseases (e.g. polyps) and more blockage than those suffering from parosmia. This suggests that at least some of these phantom odors do not come from an odorous source, as airflow is needed to carry volatiles.

The mechanisms of phantosmia are largely unknown. Hallucinations in other senses can be due to overactive neurons, either peripheral or in the brain. Olfactory sensations can also result from temporal lobe seizure or direct stimulation of the olfactory bulb (Bérard et al., 2021; Kumar et al., 2012a; R.N.DeJ., 1954). Debilitating cases of phantosmia have been treated by the removal of the olfactory bulb (Kaufman et al., 1988; Markert et al., 1993), removal of the olfactory epithelium (Leopold et al., 1991, 2002), or unilateral blockage of the olfactory cleft (Liu et al., 2020). The central or peripheral origin of phantosmia is unclear, and may be heterogeneous across cases (Leopold, 2002).

Phantosmic patients, compared to parosmics, reported worries about not being able to detect hazards (fire, gas) that might be noticed through smell. As previously discussed, phantosmics showed increased blockage and sinonasal diseases and this might decrease odor sensitivity to all odors, including hazards. Only a few (~20%) had recurring situations that triggered a phantom episode, describing these triggers as place, temporal, or cognitive events. Additionally, phantosmic patients reported more changes in weight, with individuals experiencing more severe phantoms having an increase in weight (measured by BMI). Fluctuation in appetite with olfactory dysfunction occurs due its involvement in metabolic status (Guzmán-Ruiz et al., 2021), which could lead to changes in food preference (Pellegrino, et al.,

2020) and weight (Kershaw & Mattes, 2018). However, it is difficult to say whether phantoms are causal. For example insulin-dependent diabetics, who often have a comorbidity of being overweight, were twice as likely to experience phantom odors (Chan et al., 2018). This may warrant additional studies to replicate our findings and delve into specific dietary changes and whether adiposity is related to a higher rate of smell phantoms.

Study Limitations

Our study is based on cross-sectional data from a survey, therefore, direction of associations among variables with time cannot be established and this may undermine our causal inference in recovery for parosmia patients. Longitudinal studies with this patient group should be done to confirm our results. There is also an issue of subjective reporting for olfactory disorder types. We provided clear definitions of each type of distorted disorder, but it is difficult to exclude the possibility that some participants did not understand the meaning of parosmia and phantosmia. Indeed, we have a large category of respondents reporting both parosmia and phantosmia that were not included in the analysis as it did not fall into a separate group and were difficult to interpret. The group who reported both parosmia and phantosmia could be either those who experience distortions from both known and unknown sources, or those with a hybrid scenario where they recognize the source of their distortions, but for whom the distorted smell persists for hours or days after the stimulus has disappeared. Patients have reported this before as a "smell lock" and clinicians have referred to it as olfactory perseveration (Parker et al. 2021a). Lastly, we sampled from a smell loss group that has interest in their disorder (actively joining an interest group / charity) that might have prioritized severe cases relative to mild ones. There was also an overlap in our sampling times with the COVID-19 pandemic. Post-viral loss was the most prominent etiology in our sample – this might be due to our sampling times overlapping with the COVID-19 pandemic, where smell loss is a prominent symptom of the disease. This overshadowed other important etiologies from our analysis including smell disorders induced by chemotherapy, neurotoxicity, and neurodegenerative diseases. Thus, our results may

not represent the typical patient population at large. We report half the smell loss patients to experience odor distortion and this should be considered a liberal estimate.

Conclusion

Two common symptoms of olfactory dysfunction, parosmia and phantosmia, represent distinct conditions that, along with hyposmia and anosmia, have characteristic patterns of medical history, demographics and how they affect quality of life. They are not rare, with almost half our sample reporting symptoms, and cause additional distress typically after an initial olfactory dysfunction starts to resolve. The mechanisms for distinct features of these smell distortions should undergo consideration in the clinic and research setting. If parosmia relates to neurogenesis, what does the character of distortion tell us about the underlying population of recovered neurons? Similarly, if phantosmia is centrally caused what does this tell us about our perception of reality? Distortions among olfactory disorders may provide answers to interesting research questions.

References

- Aiello, S. R., & Hirsch, A. R. (2013). Phantosmia as a meteorological forecaster. *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 57(5), 813–815. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-013-0639-x>
- Bainbridge, K. E., Byrd-Clark, D., & Leopold, D. (2018). Factors Associated With Phantom Odor Perception Among US Adults: Findings From the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, 144(9), 807–814. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2018.1446>
- Benoit, K., & Matsuo, A. (2018). *Package ‘spacyr’*. (1.2.1) [R Package].
- Bérard, N., Landis, B. N., Legrand, L., Tyrand, R., Grouiller, F., Vulliémot, S., Momjian, S., & Boëx, C. (2021). Electrical stimulation of the medial orbitofrontal cortex in humans elicits pleasant olfactory perceptions. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 114, 107559. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2020.107559>
- Bolding, K. A., & Franks, K. M. (2018). Recurrent cortical circuits implement concentration-invariant odor coding. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 361(6407). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat6904>
- Burges Watson, D. L., Campbell, M., Hopkins, C., Smith, B., Kelly, C., & Deary, V. (2020). Altered Smell and Taste: Anosmia, parosmia and the impact of long Covid-19. *MedRxiv*, 2020.11.26.20239152. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.26.20239152>
- Cavazzana, A., Larsson, M., Münch, M., Hähner, A., & Hummel, T. (2018). Postinfectious olfactory loss: A retrospective study on 791 patients. *The Laryngoscope*, 128(1), 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.26606>
- Chan, J. Y. K., García-Esquinas, E., Ko, O. H., Tong, M. C. F., & Lin, S. Y. (2018). The Association Between Diabetes and Olfactory Function in Adults. *Chemical Senses*, 43(1), 59–64. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjx070>

417 Christensen, M. D., Holbrook, E. H., Costanzo, R. M., & Schwob, J. E. (2001). Rhinotomy is Disrupted
 418 During the Re-innervation of the Olfactory Bulb that Follows Transection of the Olfactory Nerve.
 419 *Chemical Senses*, 26(4), 359–369. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/26.4.359>
 420 Croy, I., Yarina, S., & Hummel, T. (2013). Research Letter Enhanced parosmia and phantosmia in patients
 421 with severe depression. *Psychological Medicine*, 43(11), 2460–2464.
 422 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291713001773>
 423 Damm, M., Pikart, L. K., Reimann, H., Burkert, S., Göktas, Ö., Haxel, B., Frey, S., Charalampakis, I., Beule,
 424 A., Renner, B., Hummel, T., & Hüttenbrink, K.-B. (2014). Olfactory training is helpful in
 425 postinfectious olfactory loss: A randomized, controlled, multicenter study: Olfactory Training.
 426 *The Laryngoscope*, 124(4), 826–831. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.24340>
 427 Davison, A. C., & Hinkley, D. V. (1997). Bootstrap methods and their application. In *Cambridge Series of*
 428 *Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics* (Vol. 1). Cambridge university press.
 429 Franks, K. M., Russo, M. J., Sosulski, D. L., Mulligan, A. A., Siegelbaum, S. A., & Axel, R. (2011). Recurrent
 430 Circuitry Dynamically Shapes the Activation of Piriform Cortex. *Neuron*, 72(1), 49–56.
 431 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.08.020>
 432 Frasnelli, J., & Hummel, T. (2005). Olfactory dysfunction and daily life. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-*
 433 *Laryngology and Head & Neck*, 262(3), 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-004-0796-y>
 434 Frasnelli, J., Landis, B. N., Heilmann, S., Hauswald, B., Hüttenbrink, K. B., Lacroix, J. S., Leopold, D. A., &
 435 Hummel, T. (2004). Clinical presentation of qualitative olfactory dysfunction. *European Archives*
 436 *of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology: Official Journal of the European Federation of Oto-Rhino-*
 437 *Laryngological Societies (EUFOS): Affiliated with the German Society for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology -*
 438 *Head and Neck Surgery*, 261(7), 411–415. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-003-0703-y>
 439 Guzmán-Ruiz, M. A., Jiménez, A., Cárdenas-Rivera, A., Guerrero-Vargas, N. N., Organista-Juárez, D., &
 440 Guevara-Guzmán, R. (2021). Regulation of Metabolic Health by an “Olfactory-Hypothalamic

441 Axis" and Its Possible Implications for the Development of Therapeutic Approaches for Obesity
 442 and T2D. *Cellular and Molecular Neurobiology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10571-021-01080-9>
 443 Holbrook, E. H., Leopold, D. A., & Schwob, J. E. (2005). Abnormalities of Axon Growth in Human
 444 Olfactory Mucosa. *The Laryngoscope*, 115(12), 2144–2154.
 445 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.MLG.0000181493.83661.CE>
 446 Hong, S.-C., Holbrook, E. H., Leopold, D. A., & Hummel, T. (2012a). Distorted olfactory perception: A
 447 systematic review. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 132(sup1), S27–S31.
 448 <https://doi.org/10.3109/00016489.2012.659759>
 449 Hong, S.-C., Holbrook, E. H., Leopold, D. A., & Hummel, T. (2012b). Distorted olfactory perception: A
 450 systematic review. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 132(sup1), S27–S31.
 451 <https://doi.org/10.3109/00016489.2012.659759>
 452 Hummel, T., & Lötsch, J. (2010). Prognostic Factors of Olfactory Dysfunction. *Archives of Otolaryngology*
 453 *- Head and Neck Surgery*, 136(4), 347–351.
 454 Hummel, T., Whitcroft, K. L., Andrews, P., Altundag, A., Cinghi, C., Costanzo, R. M., Damm, M., Frasnelli,
 455 J., Gudziol, H., Gupta, N., Haehner, A., Holbrook, E., Hong, S. C., Hornung, D., Hüttenbrink, K. B.,
 456 Kamel, R., Kobayashi, M., Konstantinidis, I., Landis, B. N., ... Welge-Luessen, A. (2017). Position
 457 Paper on Olfactory Dysfunction. *Rhinology. Supplement*, 54(26), Article 26.
 458 <https://doi.org/10.4193/Rhino16.248>
 459 Iannilli, E., Leopold, D. A., Hornung, D. E., & Hummel, T. (2019). Advances in Understanding Parosmia: An
 460 fMRI Study. *ORL*, 81(4), 185–192. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000500558>
 461 Kaufman, M. D., Lassiter, K. R. L., & Vittal Shenoy, B. (1988). Paroxysmal unilateral dysosmia: A cured
 462 patient. *Annals of Neurology*, 24(3), 450–451. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.410240315>
 463 Keller, A., & Malaspina, D. (2013). Hidden consequences of olfactory dysfunction: A patient report
 464 series. *BMC Ear, Nose and Throat Disorders*, 13(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6815-13-8>

465 Kershaw, J. C., & Mattes, R. D. (2018). Nutrition and taste and smell dysfunction. *World Journal of*
466 *Otorhinolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, 4(1), 3–10.
467 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wjorl.2018.02.006>

468 Kumar, G., Juhasz, C., Sood, S., & Asano, E. (2012a). Olfactory hallucinations elicited by electrical
469 stimulation via subdural electrodes: Effects of direct stimulation of olfactory bulb and tract.
470 *Epilepsy & Behavior : E&B*, 24(2), 264–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2012.03.027>

471 Kumar, G., Juhasz, C., Sood, S., & Asano, E. (2012b). Olfactory hallucinations elicited by electrical
472 stimulation via subdural electrodes: Effects of direct stimulation of olfactory bulb and tract.
473 *Epilepsy & Behavior : E&B*, 24(2), 264–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2012.03.027>

474 Landis, B. N., Frasnelli, J., Croy, I., & Hummel, T. (2010). Evaluating the clinical usefulness of structured
475 questions in parosmia assessment. *The Laryngoscope*, 120(8), 1707–1713.
476 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.20955>

477 Landis, B. N., Frasnelli, J., & Hummel, T. (2006). Euosmia: A rare form of parosmia. *Acta Oto-*
478 *Laryngologica*, 126(1), 101–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016480510043954>

479 Lecuyer Giguere, F., Jobin, B., Robert, J., Bastien, L., Giguère, J.-F., De Beaumont, L., de Guise, E., &
480 Frasnelli, J. (2020). Early Parosmia Signs and Affective States Predict Depression and Anxiety
481 Symptoms 6 Months After a Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Chemical Senses*, 45(6), 483–490.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjaa037>

483 Leopold, D. (2002). Distortion of Olfactory Perception: Diagnosis and Treatment. *Chemical Senses*, 27(7),
484 611–615. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/27.7.611>

485 Leopold, D. A., Loehrl, T. A., & Schwob, J. E. (2002). Long-term follow-up of surgically treated
486 phantosmia. *Archives of Otolaryngology--Head & Neck Surgery*, 128(6), 642–647.
487 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.128.6.642>

488 Leopold, D. A., Schwob, J. E., Youngentob, S. L., Hornung, D. E., Wright, H. N., & Mozell, M. M. (1991).
 489 Successful Treatment of Phantosmia With Preservation of Olfaction. *Archives of*
 490 *Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, 117(12), 1402–1406.
 491 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.1991.01870240094016>
 492 Liu, D., T., Sabha, M., Damm, M., Philpott, C., Oleszkiewicz, A., Hahner, A., & Hummel, T. (2020).
 493 Parosmia is Associated with Relevant Olfactory Recovery After Olfactory Training. *The*
 494 *Laryngoscope*, 00, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.29277>
 495 Liu, J., Pinheiro-Neto, C. D., Zhao, J., Chen, Z., & Wang, Y. (2020). A novel surgical treatment for long
 496 lasting unilateral peripheral parosmia: Olfactory cleft blocking technique. *Auris Nasus Larynx*.
 497 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anl.2020.07.018>
 498 London, B., Nabet, B., Fisher, A. R., White, B., Sammel, M. D., & Doty, R. L. (2008). Predictors of
 499 prognosis in patients with olfactory disturbance. *Annals of Neurology*, 63(2), 159–166.
 500 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.21293>
 501 Markert, J. M., Hartshorn, D. O., & Farhat, S. M. (1993). Paroxysmal bilateral dysosmia treated by
 502 resection of the olfactory bulbs. *Surgical Neurology*, 40(2), 160–163.
 503 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-3019\(93\)90129-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-3019(93)90129-O)
 504 Mattes, R. D., & Cowart, B. J. (1994). Dietary assessment of patients with chemosensory disorders.
 505 *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 94(1), 50–56. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-8223(94)92041-9)
 506 [8223\(94\)92041-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-8223(94)92041-9)
 507 Mobley, A. S., Rodriguez-Gil, D. J., Imamura, F., & Greer, C. A. (2014). Aging in the olfactory system.
 508 *Trends in Neurosciences*, 37(2), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2013.11.004>
 509 Mueller, A., Rodewald, A., Reden, J., Gerber, J., von Kummer, R., & Hummel, T. (2005). Reduced
 510 olfactory bulb volume in post-traumatic and post-infectious olfactory dysfunction. *NeuroReport*,
 511 16(5), 475–478.

512 Murai, A., Iwata, R., Fujimoto, S., Aihara, S., Tsuboi, A., Muroyama, Y., Saito, T., Nishizaki, K., & Imai, T.
 513 (2016). Distorted Coarse Axon Targeting and Reduced Dendrite Connectivity Underlie Dysosmia
 514 after Olfactory Axon Injury. *ENeuro*, 3(5). <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0242-16.2016>
 515 Nordin, S., Murphy, C., Davidson, T. M., Quiñonez, C., Jallowayski, A. A., & Ellison, D. W. (1996).
 516 Prevalence and Assessment of Qualitative Olfactory Dysfunction in Different Age Groups. *The*
 517 *Laryngoscope*, 106(6), 739–744. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005537-199606000-00014>
 518 Ogawa, T., Nakamura, K., Yamamoto, S., Tojima, I., & Shimizu, T. (2020). Recovery Over Time and
 519 Prognostic Factors in Treated Patients with Post-Infectious Olfactory Dysfunction: A
 520 Retrospective Study. *Annals of Otolaryngology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, 129(10), 977–982.
 521 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003489420922563>
 522 Ohayon, M. M. (2000). Prevalence of hallucinations and their pathological associations in the general
 523 population. *Psychiatry Research*, 97(2), 153–164. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781(00)00227-4)
 524 [1781\(00\)00227-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781(00)00227-4)
 525 Oleszkiewicz, A., & Hummel, T. (2019). Whose nose does not know? Demographical characterization of
 526 people unaware of anosmia. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*, 276(6), 1849–1852.
 527 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-019-05414-8>
 528 Oleszkiewicz, A., Kunkel, F., Larsson, M., & Hummel, T. (2020). Consequences of undetected olfactory
 529 loss for human chemosensory communication and well-being. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
 530 *Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 375(1800), 20190265.
 531 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0265>
 532 Oleszkiewicz, A., Schriever, V. A., Croy, I., Hähner, A., & Hummel, T. (2019). Updated Sniffin' Sticks
 533 normative data based on an extended sample of 9139 subjects. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-*
 534 *Laryngology*, 276(3), 719–728. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-018-5248-1>

535 Ooms, J. (2020). *hunspell: High-Performance Stemmer, Tokenizer, and Spell Checker* (3.0.1) [Computer
536 software]. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/hunspell/index.html>

537 Parker, J. K., Kelly, C. E., & Gane, S. B. (2021). *Molecular Mechanism of Parosmia* [Preprint].
538 Otolaryngology. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251085>

539 Parker, J. K., Kelly, C. E., Smith, B., Hopkins, C., & Gane, S. B. (2021). An analysis of patients' perspectives
540 on qualitative olfactory dysfunction using social media. *MedRxiv*, 2020.12.30.20249029.
541 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.30.20249029>

542 Parma, V., Ohla, K., Veldhuizen, M. G., Niv, M. Y., Kelly, C. E., Bakke, A. J., Cooper, K. W., Bouysset, C.,
543 Pirastu, N., Dibattista, M., Kaur, R., Liuzza, M. T., Pepino, M. Y., Schoepf, V., Pereda-Loth, V.,
544 Olsson, S. B., Gerkin, R. C., Dominguez, P. R., Albayay, J., ... Hayes, J. E. (2020). More Than
545 Smell—COVID-19 Is Associated With Severe Impairment of Smell, Taste, and Chemesthesis.
546 *Chemical Senses*, 45(7), 609–622. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjaa041>

547 Pellegrino, R., Cooper, K. W., Di Pizio, A., Joseph, P. V., Bhutani, S., & Parma, V. (2020). Coronaviruses
548 and the Chemical Senses: Past, Present, and Future. *Chemical Senses*, 45(6), 415–422.
549 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjaa031>

550 Pellegrino, R., Farruggia, M., C., Small, D., M., & Veldhuizen, M., G. (2021). Post-traumatic olfactory loss
551 and brain response beyond olfactory cortex. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 4043. [https://doi.org/DOI:](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1038/s41598-021-83621-2)
552 [10.1038/s41598-021-83621-2](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1038/s41598-021-83621-2)

553 Pellegrino, R., Hummel, T., Emrich, R., Chandra, R., Turner, J., Trone, T., Dorminy, C., & Lockett, C. R.
554 (2020). Cultural determinants of food attitudes in anosmic patients. *Appetite*, 147, 104563.
555 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APPET.2019.104563>

556 Pennec, E., & Slowikowski, K. (2018). *ggwordcloud: A Word Cloud Geom for 'ggplot2'*. (0.3.0) [Computer
557 software].

558 Quint, Q., Temmel, A., Schickinger, b, Pabinger, S., Ramberger, P., & Hummel, T. (2001). Patterns of
 559 non-conductive olfactory disorders in eastern Austria: A study of 120 patients from the
 560 Department of Otorhinolaryngology at the University of Vienna. *Wiener Klinische Wochenschrift*,
 561 *113*(1–2), 52–57.

562 Rawal, S., Hoffman, H. J., Bainbridge, K. E., Huedo-Medina, T. B., & Duffy, V. B. (2016). Prevalence and
 563 Risk Factors of Self-Reported Smell and Taste Alterations: Results from the 2011–2012 US
 564 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *Chemical Senses*, *41*(1), 69–76.
 565 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjv057>

566 Reden, J., Maroldt, H., Fritz, A., Zahnert, T., & Hummel, T. (2007). A study on the prognostic significance
 567 of qualitative olfactory dysfunction. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology: Official*
 568 *Journal of the European Federation of Oto-Rhino-Laryngological Societies (EUFOS): Affiliated*
 569 *with the German Society for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, *264*(2), 139–144.
 570 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-006-0157-0>

571 Reden, J., Mueller, A., Mueller, C., Konstantinidis, I., Frasnelli, J., Landis, B. N., & Hummel, T. (2006).
 572 Recovery of Olfactory Function Following Closed Head Injury or Infections of the Upper
 573 Respiratory Tract. *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, *132*(3), 265.
 574 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.132.3.265>

575 Revelle, W. R. (2017). *psych: Procedures for Personality and Psychological Research*.
 576 [https://www.scholars.northwestern.edu/en/publications/psych-procedures-for-personality-](https://www.scholars.northwestern.edu/en/publications/psych-procedures-for-personality-and-psychological-research)
 577 [and-psychological-research](https://www.scholars.northwestern.edu/en/publications/psych-procedures-for-personality-and-psychological-research)

578 Rinker, T. W. (2019). *sentimentr: Calculate Text Polarity Sentiment* (2.7.1) [R Package].

579 R.N.DeJ. (1954). Epilepsy and the Functional Anatomy of the Human Brain. *Neurology*, *4*(6), 483–483.
 580 <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.4.6.483>

581 Rombaux, P., Duprez, T., & Hummel, T. (2009). Olfactory bulb volume in the clinical assessment of
582 olfactory dysfunction. *Rhinology*, 47(1), 3–9.

583 Ryu, B., Nagappan, S., Santos-Valencia, F., Lee, P., Rodriguez, E., Lackie, M., Takatoh, J., & Franks, K. M.
584 (2021). Chronic loss of inhibition in piriform cortex following brief, daily optogenetic stimulation.
585 *Cell Reports*, 35(3), 109001. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2021.109001>

586 Schwob, J. E., Jang, W., Holbrook, E. H., Lin, B., Herrick, D. B., Peterson, J. N., & Coleman, J. H. (2017).
587 Stem and progenitor cells of the mammalian olfactory epithelium: Taking poietic license. *Journal*
588 *of Comparative Neurology*, 525(4), 1034–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.24105>

589 Sjölund, S., Larsson, M., Olofsson, J. K., Seubert, J., & Laukka, E. J. (2017). Phantom Smells: Prevalence
590 and Correlates in a Population-Based Sample of Older Adults. *Chemical Senses*, 42(4), 309–318.
591 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjx006>

592 Yee, K. K., & Costanzo, R. M. (1998). Changes in Odor Quality Discrimination following Recovery from
593 Olfactory Nerve Transection. *Chemical Senses*, 23(5), 513–519.
594 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/23.5.513>
595