Workshop on:

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SENSORY PROFILING DATA REVISITED WITH THE CONCEPT OF SCALING

Organized by:
Caroline Peltier[1, 2, 3], Pascal Schlich[1, 2, 3]
[1]CNRS, UMR6265 Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, F-21000 Dijon, France.
[2]INRA, UMR1324 Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, F-21000 Dijon, France.
[3]Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté, UMR Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, F-21000 Dijon, France.

Abstract:
Sensory profiling data features a panel of trained judges having scored the intensities of a number of sensory attributes, possibly belonging to several sensory modalities, on a number of products to be compared. The panel leader should first monitor panelist performances, including at least repeatability, discrimination and agreement with the panel. Several systems were proposed for monitoring those performances and we will focus of the CAP (Control of Panelist performances) proposed by Schlich (1997). Indeed, CAP was accepted by a large number of users who for using it contributed to build the SensoBase (www.sensobase.fr) composed of the raw data of about 1 500 sensory profiling studies. Then the panel leader has to find out the differences among products for each attribute separately and for all of them simultaneously by a multivariate approach. Sensory community has been using principal Component Analysis (PCA) of the product mean table for that purpose. We argued that Canonical Variate Analysis (PCA) (Peltier, Visalli, & Schlich, 2015a) is a better solution. However, we did not find many differences when comparing them on hundreds of studies (Peltier, Visalli, & Schlich, 2015b).

However, all of these approaches assume that the panelists use a comparable width of the sensory scales, which is in practice known to be untrue, either due to psychological, physiological or both reasons. (Brockhoff, Schlich, & Skovgaard, 2015) proposed the Mixed Assessor Model (MAM) to take this scaling heterogeneity into account. The MAM includes individual scaling parameters cleaning off the product by panelist interaction from the panel heterogeneity towards scaling. We proposed an extension of the CAP system to the MAM model under the name MAM-CAP (Peltier, Brockhoff, Visalli, & Schlich, 2014).

Considering several attributes simultaneously, we proposed to define a single scaling coefficient per panelist applying to every attributes and being interpreted as a psychological component of the scaling (Peltier, Visalli, & Schlich, 2015c). Thus, we proposed to correct the usual scaling coefficient by this overall scaling coefficient in order to get a physiological component of scaling. Finally, we defined a new MAM-CVA by taking into account the scaling effect (Peltier, 2015). Applied to several hundreds of datasets from the SensoBase, this method provided significantly higher discriminative product maps compared to both PCA and CVA.

To popularize the use of the MAM model in the sensory community, we have developed two R-packages: one for the MAM-CAP and one for the MAM-CVA techniques. Note that both of them also allow performing the regular CAP and CVA techniques, in such a way that the users are able to compare classical and new approaches on their own data.

The aim of this tutorial is first to introduce the theory behind these new techniques and then to demonstrate the use of the corresponding R-packages. The participants are encouraged to bring their own laptop in order to be able to play with the R-packages in the last part of the tutorial. Either they can bring their own datasets for analyzing them or they will be able to play with the ones used by the instructors during the tutorial.

Workshop will be done in three parts:

1. Theory of MAM, MAM-CAP and MAM-CVA (1h30)
2. Demonstration of the R-Packages (30m)
3. Participants play with the R-packages with the help of the instructors (1h00)

References

Brockhoff, P. B., Schlich, P., & Skovgaard, I. (2015). Taking individual scaling differences into account by analyzing profile data with the Mixed Assessor Model. *Food Quality and Preference, 39*(0), 156-166.

Peltier, C. (2015). L'analyse statistique du profil sensoriel revisitée par une approche base de données. *Ph. D.*

Peltier, C., Brockhoff, P. B., Visalli, M., & Schlich, P. (2014). The MAM-CAP table: A new tool for monitoring panel performances. *Food Quality and Preference, 32, Part A*(0), 24-27.

Peltier, C., Visalli, M., & Schlich, P. (2015a). Canonical Variate Analysis of sensory profiling data. *Journal of Sensory Studies, 30*, 316-328.

Peltier, C., Visalli, M., & Schlich, P. (2015b). Comparison of Canonical Variate Analysis and Principal Component Analysis on 422 descriptive sensory studies. *Food Quality and Preference, 40, Part B*(0), 326-333.

Peltier, C., Visalli, M., & Schlich, P. (2015c). Multiplicative decomposition of the scaling effect in the Mixed Assessor Model into a descriptor specific and an overall coefficients. *Food Quality and Preference, (accepted).*

Schlich, P. (1997). CAP : une méthode et un outil de contrôle rapide et synthétique des performances des sujets en évaluation sensorielle descriptive. . *5èmes journées Agro-industries et Méthodes Statistiques, Versailles, 3-5 Décembre*