



Jianfeng Ding JMP R&D

Covered Topics

- What influences consumers' preferences?
- The goal of sensory and consumer studies
- L-shaped Data in Consumer Preference Analysis
- Application to real data: Perfume study
- Live demo in JMP
- Conclusions





CNN iReporter Calls Century Eggs "Disgusting," Chinese Company Demands CNN Apologize

by Josh Feldman | 12:43 pm, July 6th, 2011

y Tweet



You know the saying: one man's trash is another man's treasure. Our eating choices are just as subjective. What tastes good to us might be disgusting elsewhere, and vice versa.

Last month, CNN asked random people (a.k.a.

iReporters) to share their experiences eating all sorts of "revolting" foods, and listed them in no particular order. <u>The list</u> included such yummy morsels as dog meat and stir-fried cicadas. Mmm... cicadas. The dish that made the top of the list was a Chinese dish called "century eggs." The food was submitted to CNN by iReporter **Danny Holwerda**, who described the food on <u>his blog</u> as "*THE STUPIDEST*











Copyright © 2012, SAS Institute Inc. All rights reserved

The Goal of Sensory and Consumer Studies

Improve products Make/target a new product for a population segment

Sensory Panels



- Analytical methods
- 10 to 15 Trained panelists
- Attributes of products
- Describe products on the basis of taste, smell or feel.

Consumer Studies



- Affective methods
- 100 to 150 consumers
- How much do you like this product?





L-shaped Data in Consumer Preference Analysis







L-shaped Data in Consumer Preference Analysis







L-shaped Data in Consumer Preference Analysis







Application to Real Data: Perfume Study

Data description

- 12 perfumes (products).
- 12 descriptive evaluations (attributes) grade: 0 to 10
- 12 trained panelists.
- All panelists evaluated all the perfumes 2 times.
- **103 consumers grading their liking of the perfumes.** These data were collected by Melanie Cousin, Maelle Penven, Mathilde Philippe, and Marie Toularhoat as part of a large master's degree project.

Issues that we would like to discuss

- How to assess the overall quality of sensory data?
- How to detect the sensory differences and similarities between products?
- How to approach textual data when products are described by comments?
- How to approach hedonic (liking) data?



Relating customer preference to the attributes of perfumes







Commonly Used Statistical Tools







Issues that we would like to discuss

- How to assess the overall quality of sensory data?
 - Mixed ANOVA model for attributes
 - ANOVA and MFA for panelists
- How to detect the sensory differences and similarities between products?
- How to approach textual data when products are described by comments?
- How to approach hedonic data?





Overview of the Perfume Data (Data from Sensory Panel)

Sensory profiles and evaluations of panelists on the perfumes

Perfumes are rated by panelist with several lists of attributes

| 📰 perfumes_experts_clean - JMP Pro | | | | | | | | | | | | E) perfumes_fcp_clean - JMP Pro | | | | | | | | | | | • × | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------|---------|----------|----------|-------|--------|--------|---------|-------|--------|---------------------------------|---|-----|--------|----------|----------|-------|--------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|--------|----------|--------|----------|---------|
| File Edit Tables Rows Cols DOE Analyze Graph Tools Add-Ins View Window Help | | | | | | | | | | | | | File Edit Tables Rows Cols DOE Analyze Graph Tools Add-Ins View Window Help | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ■ perfumes_experts ▷ | ۹ 🔍 🖻 |) | | | | | | | | | | | perfumes_fcp ▷ | 4 | | | Wrapping | Green | Floral | Citrus | Vanilla \ | Noody | Fruity | Greedy | Oriental | Citrus | Floral \ | Vanilla |
| Tabulate_Product_A | • | Product | Session | Panelist | Wrapping | Green | Floral | Citrus | Vanilla | Woody | Fruity | | Rename column r | • | P | roduct | _CM | _CM | _CM | _CM | _CM | _CM | _CR | _CR | CR | _CR | _CR | _CR |
| PCA_analysis | 1 | Angel | 1 | СМ | 9.2 | 0 | 1.7 | 0 | 8.7 | 0 | 0.1 | ſ. | ▶ subset MLD | • 🔁 | 1 An | gel | 7.45 | 0 | 1.6 | 0 | 6 | 0.45 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 0.15 | 0.9 | 4.1 | 7.05 🖆 |
| ▶ Fit model_Citrus_pc ⁼ | 2 | Angel | 2 | CM | 5.7 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 3.3 | 0.9 | (| | ▶ PCA | | 2 4 10 | omotic | 5.2 | 0 | 2.25 | 0 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 0.25 | 0.15 | 7.0 | 0.65 | 4 75 | 0.65 |
| Iabulate_contigenc Tabulate_fee | 3 | Aromatics El | 1 | СМ | 6.4 | 0 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 2.2 | (| 0 | Create a normaliz | • | 2 AIL | Jinauc | 3.5 | 0 | 5.25 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.25 | 0.15 | 7.9 | 0.05 | 4.75 | 0.05 |
| Fit Least Squares C | 4 | Aromatics El | 2 | CM | 4.2 | 0 | 2.2 | 0 | 1.2 | 2 | (| | MFA_original | • 🔁 | 3 Ch | anel N°5 | 9.2 | 0.85 | 6.2 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 8.55 | 0.15 | 7.45 | 0.45 |
| Find City | | Cl. INIT | | CIVI | 7.2 | 17 | 2.2 | 0 | 1.2 | 2 | | | Columns (81/0) | •0 | 4 Cin | néma | 9.1 | 0.45 | 6.05 | 0.5 | 6.75 | 0 | 3.45 | 4.3 | 0.15 | 0.9 | 7.2 | 4 |
| Columns (16/0) | 5 | Chanel N°5 | 1 | CM | 9.6 | 1.7 | 6.4 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 1 | 2 I | Product | •(| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 🔒 Product 🙉 🛛 📩 | 6 | Chanel N°5 | 2 | СМ | 8.8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | Wranning CM | • 🔁 | 5 Co | co Ma | 8.9 | 0.85 | 8.8 | 3.05 | 0.4 | 0.35 | 1.9 | 1.25 | 9.35 | 0.15 | 9.55 | 1.1 |
| Session | 7 | Cinéma | 1 | CM | 9.4 | 0.7 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6. | 7 | Green CM | •@ | 6 J'ad | dore EP | 7.8 | 4.95 | 9.15 | 2.05 | 0.75 | 0 | 8.85 | 1.5 | 4.2 | 0.2 | 9.25 | 0.6 |
| A Wrapping | 8 | Cinéma | 2 | СМ | 8.8 | 0.2 | 6.1 | 0 | 7.5 | 0 | 2. | 2 | Floral CM | | 7 | 1 | C 05 | 1.0 | 0.05 | 1.45 | 0.05 | 0 | 7.0 | 2 | 0.15 | 0.7 | | 0.5 |
| A Green | 0 | Coco Made | 1 | CM | Q | 1 | 8.8 | 43 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 2. | 7 | Citrus_CM | • 🔁 | / J'ad | dore El | 6.05 | 1.9 | 9.25 | 1.45 | 0.25 | 0 | 7.8 | 3 | 0.15 | 0.7 | 8.4 | 0.5 |
| ▲ Floral | | | - | CIVI | | - | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 2. | | ▲ Vanilla_CM | • 🔁 | 8 L'ir | nstant | 8.3 | 0.25 | 5.95 | 2.45 | 7.65 | 0 | 7.45 | 2 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 8.15 | 7.9 |
| Citrus 🔹 | 10 | Coco Made | 2 | СМ | 8.8 | 0.7 | 8.8 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 0 | 3.: | 5 | Woody_CM | | 9 0 | lita La | 0.35 | 1.45 | 81 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 0 | 7.85 | 9.05 | 0.25 | 1 | 5.6 | 0.2 |
| Rows | 11 | J'adore EP | 1 | СМ | 8.1 | 5.7 | 9.3 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 0 | 7. | 7 | Fruity_CR | • | 5 10 | into Le | 5.55 | 1.45 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 5.1 | Ű | 7.05 | 5.05 | 0.25 | 1 | 5.0 | 5.2 |
| All rows 288 | 12 | J'adore EP | 2 | CM | 7.5 | 4.2 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4.3 | 3 | ⊿ Greedv CR 🔹 | •@ | 10 Ple | asures | 3.6 | 7.1 | 8.35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7.8 | 1.45 | 0.15 | 3.15 | 7.9 | 0.3 |
| Selected 0 | 13 | J'adore ET | 1 | СМ | 5.4 | 3.1 | 9.5 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 0 | 5. | 5 | Rows | •@ | 11 Pu | re Pois | 8.7 | 1.15 | 7.7 | 2.25 | 5.7 | 0 | 2.2 | 0.15 | 5.45 | 0.2 | 7.25 | 0.35 |
| Excluded 0 | 14 | L'adore ET | - 2 | CM | 6.7 | 0.7 | 0 | 1 2 | 0 | - | 4 | | All rows 12 📩 | -(- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hidden 0 | 14 | Jadore El | 2 | CIVI | 0.7 | 0.7 | 9 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | | Selected 0 ≡ | •@ | 12 Sha | alimar | 6.7 | 0 | 5.3 | 0 | 2.85 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.05 | 9 | 0 | 8.3 | 0.9 |
| Labelled 0 | 15 | L'instant | 1 | CM | 8.4 | 0 | 5.8 | 1.2 | 8.3 | 0 | 1.3 | 3 - | Excluded 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| evaluations done | | • | | III | | | | | | | > T | | Hidden 0 * | | ٠. | | | | | | | | | | | | | + |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 222 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Summarized table





Mixed Model (ANOVA) : The Importance of Sensory Attributes



- The panel discriminates between the products for all attributes.
- The panel is repeatable from one section to the other for all attributes, except for *Floral* and *Marine* (Product*Section).
- Attribute *Marine* is insignificant.





ANOVA Model and Graph Builder : The Performance of Panelists

 $Y_{is} \sim \mu + \alpha_i + \gamma_s + \varepsilon_{is}$



Both ANOVA and the profile plot indicate that all panelists have well discriminated the perfumes except for panelist *NMA*.





Copyright © 2012, SAS Institute Inc. All rights reserved

Multiple Factor Analysis (MFA): Agreement Between Panelists



- An agreement exists between panelists on attributes such as *Greedy* and *Fruity*, but not on attribute *Oriental*.
- Wrapping on the one side, and Floral on the other side suggests that an agreement exists between panelists.





Issues that we would like to discuss

- How to assess the overall quality of sensory data?
- How to detect the sensory differences and similarities between products?
 - PCA
 - K means cluster
- How to approach textual data when products are described by comments?
- How to approach hedonic data?





PCA and K Means Cluster: Sensory Profile for Each Product



- The first dimension opposes perfume such as *Pleasure* to perfumes such as *Angel*.
- The first dimension opposes attributes such as *Floral*, *Citrus*, *Green* and *Fruity* to attributes such as *Oriental*, *Heady*, *Spicy* and *Wrapping*.
- Angel has been perceived as Greedy, Heady, to a lesser degree as Spicy.
- *Pleasure* has been perceived as *Floral*, *Fruity* and it has not been perceived as *Wrapping* nor as *Heady*.





Issues that we would like to discuss

How to assess the overall quality of sensory data?
How to detect the sensory differences and similarities between products?

How to approach textual data when products are described by comments?

- Text explorer
- MCA
- Hierarchical cluster

How to approach hedonic data?





Overview of the Perfume Data (Data from Consumer Study)

Consumer comments about the perfumes

imp

Consumers' liking on the perfumes

| perfumes_comments - JMR | Pro | | | | 🖳 perfumes_liking - JMP Pro | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------------------|---|---|------|---------------|----------|--------|-----|--|--|--|--|
| File Edit Tables Rows | Cols DOE A | nalyze Graph Tool | s Add-Ins Vie | w Window Help | File Edit Tables Rows Cols DOE Analyze Graph Tools Add-Ins View Window Help | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ∃ ⊨ Ľx ≫ 💌 📕 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| perfumes_com Text Explorer of Con | | Product | Consumer | Comment | | ■ perfumes_I ▶ Tabulate_coms | | Product | Consumer | Liking | | | | | |
| with stopped words | •@ 1 | 1 Aromatics El | 1 | cleaning product | <u></u> | Hierarchical Clu | • 1 | Angel | 171 | 3 | * | | | | |
| cluster_comments | •@ 2 | 2 Angel | 1 | . digestive;pharmaceutical | | Decision Tree c | • 2 | Aromatics Eli | 171 | 3 | | | | | |
| | •@ | 3 Chanel N°5 | 1 | elderly | | | • 3 | Chanel N°5 | 171 | 7 | | | | | |
| | •@ | 4 Coco Made | 1 | flowery | | Columns (3/0) | • 4 | Cinéma | 171 | 6 | | | | | |
| | • 🔊 | 5 Pure Poison | 1 | flowery | | 🔥 Product 🙉 | • 5 | Coco Made | 171 | 6 | | | | | |
| | | | - 1 | | | Consumer | • 6 | J'adore EP | 171 | 5 | | | | | |
| Columns (3/0) | •@ (| b Lolita Lempi | 1 | truity;sour | | Liking | • 7 | J'adore ET | 171 | 6 | | | | | |
| 🔒 Product 🥥 | • 🔁 🚽 | 7 Cinéma | 1 | fruity;sour | | | • 8 | L'instant | 171 | 3 | | | | | |
| L Comment | ۶ 📮 | 8 L'instant | 1 | fruity;sour | | | • 9 | Lolita Lempi | 171 | 3 | | | | | |
| | •@ | 9 J'adore ET | 1 | fruity;sweet | | | • 10 | Pleasures | 171 | 5 | | | | | |
| Rows | •@ 10 | 0 J'adore EP | 1 | fruity;sweet | | Rows | • 11 | Pure Poison | 171 | 6 | | | | | |
| All rows 900 🗠 | •@ 1 | 1 Pleasures | 1 | lily of the valley | | All rows 1,236 * | • 12 | Shalimar | 171 | 3 | | | | | |
| Selected 0 = Excluded 0 | •@ 12 | 2 Shalimar | 1 | soap in hospital | - | Selected 0 = Excluded 0 | • 13 | Angel | 553 | 3 | | | | | |
| Hidden 0 - | | • | | " | • | Hidden 0 - | • 14 | A | | | - F | | | | |
| | | | | | ▲ □ ▼ | | | | | 1 | | | | | |



Text Explorer: When Products are Depicted by Comments



Comments such as **"flowery"**, **"fresh"** and **"flowery"** are associated with perfume *J'adore ET* and *Coco Mademoiselle*, whereas comments such as **"soap"**, **"strong"** and **"spicy"** are associated with perfume *Shalimar* and *Chanel N5*. Topic analysis based on comments in Text Explorer identifies 2 clusters of perfumes.





Issues that we would like to discuss

- How to assess the overall quality of sensory data?
- How to detect the sensory differences and similarities between products?
- How to approach textual data when products are described by comments?
- How to approach hedonic data?
 - PCA
 - K means cluster





PCA and K Means Cluster: Identify the Best Product with Hedonic Data



K Means cluster: 2 clusters of perfumes are chosen

- One the first dimension, perfume *J'adore EP* and *J'adore ET* are preferred by the majority of the consumers.
- Customers who prefer perfumes such as *Shalimar* and *Chanel N5*, by opposition to consumers who prefer perfumes such as *Pleasures* and *J'adore ET*.



PCA map: relation between perfumes and consumers





Relating customer preference to the attributes of perfumes

- PLS
- MFA



These data were collected by Melanie Cousin, Maelle Penven, Mathilde Philippe, and Marie Toularhoat as part of a large master's degree project.





Combine Sensory and Consumer Data Together

| 📰 perfumes_preference_mapping - JMP Pro | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------|-------------|-------|--------|-----------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|------|------|-----------|---------|---------|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| File Edit Tables Rows Cols DOE Analyze Graph Tools Add-Ins View Window Help | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 🔛 🔁 🚰 🐰 🛛 | b 🕰 🛛 | . 🖶 🛛 | 🖩 🎛 📄 💆 🏓 | • 🕑 📕 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ▼perfumes_p ▷ | ٩ | 17/0 💌 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Partial Least Squ | - | | Product | Spicy | Heady | Fruity | Green | 171 | 553 | 991 | 1344 | 1661 | 1679 | age_20+ | age_30+ | age_40+ | age_50+ | |
| MFA_original MFA_interactive | •@ | 1 | Angel | 3.9 | 7.841 | 1.92 | 0.1125 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | -0.0404 | 0.05722 | -0.1583 | 0.27829. | ^ |
| ▶ PLS_age | •@ | 2 | Aromatics | 6.30 | 8.308 | 0.6125 | 0.516 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0.00933 | 0.00702 | -0.0510 | 0.10433. | |
| | •@ | 3 | Chanel N°5 | 3.73 | 8.2125 | 0.96 | 0.4375 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 0.09252 | 0.06470 | -0.1756 | 0.11597. | |
| | •@ | 4 | Cinéma | 1.08 | 2.195 | 5.125 | 0.2125 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 | -0.0574 | 0.10735 | -0.0078 | -0.0392. | |
| Columns (123 | •@ | 5 | Coco Mad | 0.91 | 1.141 | 5.0625 | 0.779 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0.01112 | 0.04302 | -0.1055 | 0.10932. | |
| 4 1344 | •@ | 6 | J'adore EP | 0.26 | 1.179 | 6.40 | 1.5625 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 0.11840 | 0.06346 | -0.1944 | -0.0427. | = |
| 1661 1679 | •@ | 7 | J'adore ET | 0.34 | 1.2875 | 5.625 | 1.483 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 0.06633 | 0.13258 | -0.2322 | 0.09649. | |
| ▲ 1755 € | •@ | 8 | L'instant | 0.73 | 2.283 | 3.84 | 0.295 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 0.01898 | 0.16850 | -0.1067 | 0.08247. | |
| 1801 | •@ | 9 | Lolita Lem | 1.4 | 4.408 | 3.35 | 0.491 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 0.04013 | -0.1395 | 0.04710 | 0.04013. | |
| ▲ 1956 € ▲ 2119 € | •@ | 10 | Pleasures | 0.49 | 0.9125 | 4.4625 | 3.25 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0.14091 | -0.0144 | -0.0560 | -0.0649. | |
| Rows | •@ | 11 | Pure Poison | 1.66 | 1.895 | 3.54 | 0.629 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | -0.0448 | -0.0435 | -0.0441 | 0.05858. | _ |
| Selected 0 = | •@ | 12 | Shalimar | 6.16 | 7.8875 | 0.925 | 0.379 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0.06120 | -0.0258 | -0.0544 | 0.10747. | |
| Hidden 0 - | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ŧ |
| evaluations done | | | | | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | ▼ | |
| <u></u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Sensory Consumer preferences Consumer att | | | | | | | | | | | | | ttributes | 5 | | | | |
| imp | | | | | | Copyright | ι© 2012, SAS Ι | nstitute Inc | c. All rights re | eserved. | | | | | | S sas | THE POWER TO KNOW. | |

PLS and MFA: Link between Sensory Profiles, **Products and Consumers' Preference**





-1.0

-0.5



1.0

Show Labels

X Effects Label

0.0 Factor 1 (X Rsg=64.05%, Y Rsg=26.03%) 0.5

PLS and MFA: Link between Sensory Profiles, Products and Consumers' Preference



MFA shows that sensory profiles can be used to explain consumer preferences. *J'adore ET* and *L'instant* are the most common products to the two groups, whereas *Lolita Lempicka* and *Pleasures* are less common to the two groups.





Conclusions

- Support all standard methods.
- The most appropriate methods are related to each other.
- ✤ PLS and MFA are very efficient.
- ✤ An automatic way to do MFA and L-PLS is on the way.







Thank you for your attention



Jianfeng.Ding@jmp.com



