

Olfactory Costimulation Influences Intranasal Somatosensory Perception

Prasanna R. Karunanayaka^{1, 2, 3}, **Jiaming Lu**^{1, 4}, **Qing X. Yang**^{1, 5} and **K.**

Sathian^{2, 6, 7}

¹Department of Radiology, The Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine, Hershey, PA,

USA

²Department of Neural and Behavioral Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University College of

Medicine, Hershey, PA, USA

³Department of Public Health Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine,

Hershey, PA, USA

⁴Drum Tower Hospital, Medical School of Nanjing University, Nanjing, China

⁵Department of Neurosurgery, The Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine, Hershey, PA,

USA

⁶Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine, Hershey, PA,

USA

⁷Department of Neurology, The Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine, Hershey, PA,

USA

Received 20 February 2019; accepted 17 February 2020

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: pkarunanayaka@pennstatehealth.psu.edu

Supplementary Material




Figure S1. The experimental setup. (A): Olfactometers that delivered weak puffs of air or phenyl ethyl alcohol and a baseline constant airflow of 1 l/min. Pilot studies were conducted to determine the intensity of weak air puffs by (i) varying the duration of the valve open time between 100 and 300 ms and (ii) by varying the peak air flow of the puff between 2 and 4 l/min; (B): two odorant carriers were used to stimulate the two nostrils; (C): a participant performing the localization experiment. E-prime visual presentation informed participants to hold their breath in order to localize incoming air-puffs or PEA embedded in the constant flow of odorless air, delivered bilaterally at a rate of 1 l/min; and (D): the overall experimental schematic.




Figure S2. The correlation between UPSIT and OLFACT odor identification test scores.