

# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Třebický, Vít, Delplanque, Sylvain, Ferdenzi, Camille, Fink, Bernhard, Jelínková, Lucie, Pátková, Žaneta, Roberts, S. Craig, Röder, Susanne, Saxton, Tamsin, Schwambergová, Dagmar, Štěřbová, Zuzana, Fialová, Jitka Třebická and Havlíček, Jan (2023) Cross-modal associations of human body odour attractiveness with facial and vocal attractiveness provide little support for the backup signals hypothesis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 44 (1). pp. 19-29. ISSN 1090-5138

Published by: Elsevier

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2022.11.001>  
<<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2022.11.001>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:  
<https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/51402/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

# **Cross-modal associations of human body odour attractiveness with facial and vocal attractiveness provide little support for the backup signals hypothesis: A systematic review and meta-analysis**

Vít Třebický<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>

Sylvain Delplanque<sup>4</sup>

Camille Ferdenzi<sup>5</sup>

Bernhard Fink<sup>6</sup>

Lucie Kuncová<sup>3</sup>

Žaneta Pátková<sup>3</sup>

S. Craig Roberts<sup>7</sup>

Susanne Röder<sup>8</sup>

Tamsin K. Saxton<sup>9</sup>

Dagmar Schwambergová<sup>3</sup>

Zuzana Štěrbová<sup>3,10</sup>

Jitka Třebická Fialová<sup>3</sup>

Jan Havlíček<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>2</sup>National Institute of Mental Health, Klecany, Czech Republic

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>4</sup>Swiss Center for Affective Sciences, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

<sup>5</sup>Lyon Neuroscience Research Center, Bron, France

<sup>6</sup>Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, University of Vienna, Vienna, and Biosocial Science Information, Biedermannsdorf, Austria

<sup>7</sup>Division of Psychology, University of Stirling, Stirling, United Kingdom

<sup>8</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Sozialstiftung Bamberg, Bamberg, Germany

<sup>9</sup>Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

<sup>10</sup>Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

\* Vít Třebický

vit.trebicky@ftvs.cuni.cz

Faculty of Physical Education and Sport


Charles University

José Martího 31

162 52, Prague 6

Czech Republic



Supplementary online material (e.g., datafile, materials)”




Click here to access/download


**Supplementary online material (e.g., datafile, materials)”**

Supplementary online materials.rar








### Congruence between body odour and facial attractiveness





### Congruence between body odour and vocal attractiveness











# Cross-modal associations of human body odour attractiveness with facial and vocal attractiveness provide little support for the backup signals hypothesis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

## Abstract

Assessing the attractiveness of potential mating partners typically involves multiple sensory modalities, including the integration of olfactory, visual, and auditory cues. However, predictions diverge on how the individual modalities should relate to each other. According to the *backup signals* hypothesis, multimodal cues provide redundant information, whereas the *multiple messages* hypothesis suggests that different modalities provide independent and distinct information about an individual's mating-related quality. The *backup signals* hypothesis predicts a positive association between assessments based on different modalities, whereas no substantial correlation across modalities is expected under the 'multiple messages' hypothesis. Previous studies testing the two hypotheses have provided mixed results, but a systematic evaluation is currently missing.

We performed a systematic review and a meta-analysis of published and unpublished studies to examine the congruence in assessments between human body odour and facial attractiveness, and between body odour and vocal attractiveness. We found positive but weak associations between ratings of body odours and faces ( $r = 0.1$ ,  $k = 25$ ), and between body odours and voices ( $r = 0.1$ ,  $k = 9$ ). No sex differences were observed in the magnitude of effects.

Compared to judgments of facial and vocal attractiveness, our results suggest that assessment of body odour provides independent and non-redundant information about human mating-related quality. Our findings thus provide little support for the *backup signals* hypothesis and may be better explained by the *multiple messages* hypothesis.

## Keywords

Human; Mate choice; Body odor; Face; Voice; Perception; Attractiveness; Backup signals, Multiple messages

# 1 Introduction

Across many different taxa, individuals assess potential mating partners via telereceptive senses such as vision, olfaction, and hearing (Aglioti & Pazzaglia, 2011). Although some vertebrates appear to rely predominantly on a single sense (Arakawa et al., 2008; Candolin, 2003; Gosling & Roberts, 2001), most species, including humans, employ multiple senses (Candolin, 2003; Higham & Hebets, 2013) in their assessment. Frog calls, for example, are often accompanied by conspicuous vocal sac movements and/or water surface vibrations, while many bird species show complex, rhythmic and vigorous visual displays during courtship singing (for a review, see Halfwerk et al., 2019).

Perceived variation in these physical traits may provide information about an individual's mating-related quality, such as health and fertility (e.g., Grammer et al., 2003; Rhodes, 2006; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999b). As the judgment of an individual's attractiveness based on any single modality entails a certain level of error, using multiple sensory channels could enable a more reliable assessment (Moller & Pomiankowski, 1993). Two competing hypotheses have been proposed to explain the use of multiple modalities in the assessment of potential mates (Groyecka et al., 2017; Higham & Hebets, 2013). According to the '*backup signals*' hypothesis (Grammer et al., 2001; also coined redundant signalling, Moller & Pomiankowski, 1993; Thornhill & Grammer, 1999), certain cues may provide similar (redundant) information; assessing this same information in several different modalities will then tend to reduce error and facilitate a more accurate overall assessment of underlying quality. In contrast, the '*multiple messages*' hypothesis (Cunningham et al., 1990; Moller & Pomiankowski, 1993) suggests that each trait provides distinct and independent (non-redundant) information about an individual's mating-related quality, but in combination, these can facilitate more accurate assessment of overall individual quality than any single cue in isolation. With all this in mind, we can make predictions to test these two ideas. One can expect that if attractiveness assessments based on different sensory channels are closely and positively associated, such congruence would suggest redundancy in information across traits and provide support for the backup hypothesis. Weak or absent cross-modal congruence (i.e. cues convey non-redundant information), however, would support the multiple messages hypothesis. The mating-related animal research provided some support for both of these hypotheses. The use of backup signals of quality was demonstrated, for instance, in *Drosophila saltans* where removing one courtship component (either visual, auditory, chemical or tactile) did not eliminate the female's decision to mate (Colyott et al., 2016). On the other hand, the study on peacock spiders (*Maratus Volans*) showed that both visual and vibratory signalling is important for mating success supporting the multiple messages hypothesis (Girard et al., 2015). Overall, the majority of available animal research seems to provide more evidence in favour of the multiple messages hypothesis (Candolin, 2003).

Most research on human mate preferences has focused on visual cues, typically by investigating people's assessments of facial and/or body attractiveness. Although physical appearance certainly plays a prominent role (Groyecka et al., 2017; Herz & Inzlicht, 2002; Walter et al., 2020), the assessment of attractiveness in potential mating partners is undeniably multimodal. Research suggests that body odour (Havlíček et al., 2008; S. C. Roberts et al., 2011) and vocal cues (Hill & Puts, 2016; Pisanski et al., 2017; Zäske et al., 2020) also contribute substantially to human mate preferences (Groyecka et al., 2017). However, studies that examine potential cross-modal congruency and redundancy of attractiveness judgments are scarce. In one of the first such studies, Rikowski and Grammer (1999) reported a positive relationship between judgments of women's faces and their body odour. They also found a similar association in men's faces and odour, when rated by women in the fertile phase of their menstrual cycle (Please note that authors assessed cycle phase based on counting methods which appears to be highly unreliable, see Gangestad et al., 2016; Havlíček & Roberts, 2022). Rikowski and Grammer concluded that human faces and body odours provide similar information about mate quality. Several other studies have subsequently reported positive associations between perceived attractiveness of faces and body odours (Mahmut & Stevenson, 2019; Roth et al., 2021; Thornhill et al., 2003; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999a), although the strengths of some associations were weak and two other studies (Roberts et al., 2011; Röder et al., 2013) found no support for this association (see Table S0-6 and Figure 2). Collectively, the available studies provide some support for both the *backup signals* and *multiple messages* hypotheses.

In view of this, we set out to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis of the relationship between human body odour and facial attractiveness, to test between the two hypotheses. We collated the published studies and complemented these with unpublished datasets. During this process, we noticed that

several of the unpublished datasets that we obtained from researchers also contained ratings of perceived vocal attractiveness. Therefore, we also performed meta-analyses of congruence between body odour and vocal attractiveness. As body odour perception and its relation to other modalities are still somewhat overlooked research topics, we focus our study primarily on the relationships between body odour attractiveness and other sensory modalities. Although of interest, the investigation of the association between facial and vocal attractiveness to a comparable extent (e.g. collecting both published and unpublished evidence) is beyond the scope of the current study

## 2 Material and methods

### 2.1 Systematic review and Meta-analysis

#### 2.1.1 Literature search and study selection

Following the PRISMA 2020 protocol (Page et al., 2021) and PRISM 2020 checklists (see Supplementary material), we conducted a systematic literature search in July 2020 to identify empirical studies reporting data on the associations between perceived body odour and facial and/or vocal attractiveness. We searched the PubMed and Web of Science (WoS) databases. Topics (WoS) and all fields (PubMed) were searched using the keyword combinations 'odour AND face AND attractiveness', 'odour AND facial AND attractiveness', 'odour AND voice AND attractiveness' and 'odour AND vocal AND attractiveness' (WoS search query example TS=(odour) AND TS=(face) AND TS=(attractive); PubMed search query example ((odour[Title/Abstract]) AND (face[Title/Abstract])) AND (attractiveness[Title/Abstract])); results for each query and database are provided in the Supplementary material). Studies were also searched through cross-referencing and by direct correspondence with researchers who had published previously on body odour attractiveness. We contacted 13 authors, 7 of whom responded that they had no suitable data, and 6 of whom provided data<sup>1</sup>. Only articles and research papers written in English were reviewed. Both published and unpublished studies were considered. The complete list of search results is reported in Table S0-5 - Systematic literature search and Prisma Flow diagram (Supplementary material).

#### 2.1.2 Inclusion criteria

A two-step selection process was adopted. First, titles and abstracts of studies identified by the search were screened for inclusion by one team member (VT). Studies were included if they met each of the following criteria: focused on humans (not other species); included ratings of body odour samples and either facial photographs or voice recordings (or both); provided data about perceived body odour attractiveness, and perceived facial and/or vocal attractiveness of the target participants. Second, all entries reporting the relevant data or unclear about reporting the relevant data were screened against the same criteria, where their full texts were examined for suitability. Studies were excluded from the meta-analysis if the key data (perceived body odour and facial or voice attractiveness) were collected but the relevant analyses were not conducted or not reported, unless the authors provided respective effect sizes or raw data for effect size calculations after we contacted them.

We used Pearson's  $r$  (correlation coefficient) as a measure of the effect size of the association between body odour and facial and/or vocal attractiveness. We excluded studies reporting effect size measures that could not be converted to Pearson's  $r$  and/or were not available from the authors.

For further details, see the PRISMA 2020 Flow Diagram and Table S0-5 (in the Supplementary material) that contains all selection steps.

#### 2.1.3 Data extraction

Data extracted from the selected studies are reported in Table S0-6 - Summary of published and unpublished data. Two research team members (VT and JTF) individually extracted the data, summarised them, and verified their validity.

#### 2.1.4 Analysis

All statistical tests within this article were performed in jamovi (The jamovi project, 2021). We used the MAJOR (Hamilton, 2021) jamovi module to perform a correlation coefficients meta-analysis, following recommendations by Harrer et al. (2021a). The correlation coefficients of the associations between

---

<sup>1</sup> All authors who provided unpublished data were offered co-authorship of the resulting manuscript. Their involvement in the study is described in the Author Contributions list.

perceived body odour and facial attractiveness and body odour and vocal attractiveness were converted with Fisher's r-to-z transformation and accompanied by their 95% confidence intervals. Fisher's r-to-z transform is the recommended procedure for correcting for bias in studies with small sample sizes (Harrer et al., 2021a)<sup>2</sup>. Separate meta-analyses were performed for correlations between each pair of stimuli (body odour – facial attractiveness and body odour – voice attractiveness). We performed each meta-analysis first for both target sexes combined and then separately for each target sex; the results for both sexes combined are reported in the main text, and the results for each sex are provided in the Supplementary material (Table S0-7 - Supplementary Meta-analyses results). We assumed that variation in effect sizes between studies was due to sampling error of true effect sizes or because of other (e.g., methodological) differences between studies. Therefore, we used the random-effects model with a restricted maximum-likelihood estimator (Harrer et al., 2021b) for heterogeneity statistics (Tau<sup>2</sup>). Heterogeneity examines whether variation in the observed correlations results from sampling error. Cochran's Q (which tests whether effect size variability across samples is larger than would be expected by sampling error) and I<sup>2</sup> (which indicates the percentage of variability due to true heterogeneity; I<sup>2</sup> values of 25% are considered low, 50% moderate, and 75% high variability; (Higgins et al., 2003) were computed to quantify the proportion of variance in the observed effects attributable to sampling error (i.e., the extent to which true effect sizes vary within a meta-analysis) (Harrer et al., 2021b). In the case of heterogeneity, the meta-analytic results are reported with their 95% prediction intervals (PI). We inspected small-study effects and between-study heterogeneity using contour-enhanced funnel plots and Egger's regression test for funnel plot asymmetry (Harrer et al., 2021b); this test was carried out only for the association between perceived body odour and facial attractiveness as its usage is recommended when the number of studies (k) is ≥ 10 (Harrer et al., 2021b; Sterne et al., 2011). To explore potential biases in published vs unpublished effects, we tested the moderator effect and performed separate meta-analyses for published and unpublished effects. Lastly, we also explored the potential moderating effect of the rating design (between- and within-subject design) on observed meta-analytic estimates. These comparisons were carried out only for the association between perceived body odour and facial attractiveness, as both published and unpublished effects were available for this association, and the number of available studies was k ≥ 10.

### 2.1.5 Power analysis

We performed analyses of statistical power for the meta-analytic effects in both meta-analyses following (Quintana, 2015; Quintana & Tiebel, 2019). We conducted a sensitivity analysis to estimate what meta-analytical average effects we have the power to observe with the resulting number of effects per meta-analysis, the average number of stimuli per study (within a given meta-analysis), 5%  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  error rates ( $p \leq 0.05$  in two-tailed tests,  $1-\beta$  error probability  $\leq 0.95$  Power), and for potentially low, moderate, and high heterogeneity of the effects (Higgins et al., 2003) (Figure 1).

### 2.1.6 Effect size distributions

We calculated effect size distributions (ESD) (e.g. Brydges, 2019; Gignac & Szodorai, 2016; Lovakov & Agadullina, 2021; Nordahl-Hansen et al., 2022; Quintana, 2017) for both investigated associations (body odour – facial attractiveness and body odour – voice attractiveness). Alongside meta-analytic averages, ESD can facilitate more accurate power analyses to determine sample and effect sizes when planning future research in a particular area. However, ESD primarily allows for the determination of empirically-based normative guidelines. Thus, instead of Cohen's (1988) traditional 'rule of thumb' conventions for correlations ( $r \approx 0.10$ : small effect;  $r \approx 0.30$ : moderate effect;  $r \approx 0.50$ : large effect), ESD serves as an evidence synthesis derived, field-specific benchmark against which effects from individual studies are compared (e.g., whether the observed effect size in a particular study is smaller, average/medium, or larger than in similar studies). We emphasise that the ESD provides effect size comparison with similar studies but is not designed to quantify the practical significance of observed effects.

To examine the distribution of correlation coefficient effect sizes, we calculated the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, representing the average effect size, and the 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles, as these are equidistant from the

---

<sup>2</sup> Another approach is to use bias-corrected correlations. In the main paper, we report results using the Fisher's r-to-z transforms. We further ran the two presented meta-analyses with bias-corrected correlations for transparency and comparison between other meta-analyses and their effect size treatments; the analyses are reported in the Supplementary material. Both analyses produced essentially the same results with marginally smaller AIC values for Fisher's r-to-z transformed data.

average effect size representing small and larger effects size boundaries, respectively (Cohen, 1992; Quintana, 2017).

## 2.2 Analysis of the unpublished studies

Ten unpublished datasets (further referred to as Studies 1-10) were secured through personal communication. Data on the association between perceived body odour and facial attractiveness were available in all studies; five studies (Study 2, 5, 6, 7, 10) also included data on voice attractiveness. The Supplementary material contains a detailed description of the methods and results of each study, means per target (Table S0-1 - Means per target), and means per modality (Table S0-2 - Means per modality).

### 2.2.1 The stability and precision of mean rating estimates

To assess whether the number of ratings for each stimulus type within Studies 1-7, 9, 10 and part of Study 8 provided stable estimates, we calculated the point of stability (POS, a point at which means do not substantially change with additional observations) within a corridor of stability of a mean (COS) (Hehman et al., 2018a; Schönbrodt & Perugini, 2013) in R x64 (R Core Team & Team, 2019) via RStudio (R Core Team, 2021). We used the settings following Hehman et al. (2018a): for the 1-7 scale (Studies 1-4, 7, 9), the POS was specified as 95% CI of observed values falling within  $\pm 0.5$  points (approximately 14 %) (Fialová et al., 2020), for the 9-point scale (Study 5, -4 to +4 scale used for odour ratings) within  $\pm 0.6$  points (~ 14%), for the 0-1000 scale (Study 6) we set POS at 95% CI within  $\pm 70$  points (~ 14%), for the 1-10 scale (Study 8, the replication sample) we set POS at 95% CI within  $\pm 0.7$  points (~ 14%) and for the 1-5 scale (Study 10) we set POS at 95% CI within  $\pm 0.35$  points (~ 14%).

This analysis provided an estimate of the number of raters required to reach predefined POS (and allowed a comparison with the number of raters recruited and an estimation of the size of the raters' pool needed). We further calculated the mean rating precision each study reached with a COS of 95% CI, see Table S0-3 - Point of stability and Intra-class Correlation Coefficients (ICC) in the Supplementary material.

### 2.2.2 Assessment of inter-rater reliability

To assess inter-rater reliability for each stimulus type in Studies 1-7, 9, 10 and part of Study 8, we calculated the ICC (Koo & Li, 2016) using Reliability analysis in the SimplyAgree (version 0.0.2) jamovi module. We used a two-way random model for average agreement (type ICC2k) and followed recommended thresholds for values less than 0.5 as indicative of poor reliability, values between 0.5 and 0.75 as being of moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.9 indicating good reliability and values greater than 0.9 indicating excellent reliability (Koo & Li, 2016). See Table S0-3 – Point of stability and ICC in the Supplementary material for individual ICC values.

Further, using a linear mixed-effect model, we explored differences in ICCs for different stimulus types. Results are reported in the Supplementary material (ICC comparison).

### 2.2.3 Perceptual differences between rating sessions, side-related armpit differences, and an association between short- and long-term attractiveness ratings

In Studies 1, 2, 5, and 7, ratings were recorded in multiple sessions. To test for potential differences between sessions, we specified linear mixed-effect models. Attractiveness rating (for a specific modality) was set as the dependent variable, the number of sessions as a fixed effect factor, and both the rater and target participants' ID as random effects (example model syntax:  $\text{Odour attractiveness rating} \sim \text{session} + (1 | \text{rater ID}) + (1 | \text{target ID})$ ).

The raters in Study 5 were presented with the target's body odour samples from both armpits (separately, as two stimuli). Therefore, we used a bivariate correlation analysis (on aggregated ratings per armpit and target participant) to assess the association between the ratings of the two odour samples.

In several studies, body odour (Study 6-1, 6-2), facial (Study 4, 5, 6-1, 6-2, 9), and vocal stimuli (Study 6-1, 6-2) were rated for short- and long-term attractiveness. We used a bivariate correlation analysis (on aggregated ratings per scale type and target participant) to assess the association between these two scales. We initially set  $r \geq 0.8$  (Brown, 2006) as the level at which we considered the two attractiveness scales as highly correlated and thus difficult to discriminate. In fact, ratings of short-term and long-term attractiveness were highly positively correlated with all  $r$ 's  $\geq 0.856$ , thus fulfilling our criteria to consider the two ratings numerically interchangeable. We therefore used the long-term attractiveness ratings for subsequent analyses and labelled these simply as 'attractiveness'.

All linear mixed effect models were run using GAMLj jamovi module (Gallucci, 2021) with REML fit; fixed effect factors were set as 'Simple' contrasts and covariate scaling was set to 'Centred'.

For the individual results, see the Methods and Results of each study in the Supplementary material.

## 2.2.4 Association between attractiveness of different modalities

Previous research reported positive associations between the attractiveness of body odour and facial images (Rikowski & Grammer, 1999; Thornhill et al., 2003; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999a). Therefore, we ran one-tailed Pearson's  $r$  bivariate correlations ( $r \geq \rho$ ) (on aggregated attractiveness ratings per stimulus type and per participant, i.e., the mean rating of a participant was the unit of analysis) between odour and face, and between odour and voice pairs, within each dataset. The resulting correlation coefficients are reported with 95% CI [Lower limit, 1].

## 2.2.5 Power analysis

The current study used data from previous studies; therefore, we calculated the sensitivity to detect effects and their critical values for Exact Correlation (Bivariate normal model) using G\*Power (Erdfeiler et al., 2009; Faul et al., 2007). The parameters were set to a one-tailed test ( $r \geq \rho$ ), sample size (number of targets per individual dataset), 5%  $\alpha$  error probability ( $p = 0.05$ ) and 5%  $\beta$  error probability ( $1 - \beta$  error probability = 0.95 Power)<sup>3</sup>. For the sensitivity of individual studies, including observed effects and the power curves plot, see Table S0-4 - Power analysis, and Figure S0-1 *ibid* in the Supplementary material.

## 2.3 Data Availability and Supplemental materials

Datasets, tables of descriptive statistics, detailed descriptions of methods and statistical analyses of individual studies, literature review and meta-analysis methods, and jamovi outputs are all available in the Supplementary material.

# 3 Results

We extracted 25 effects for the relationship between body odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness, and 9 effects for body odour attractiveness and vocal attractiveness (Table S0-6). These were based on ten unpublished datasets and four published studies describing the association between body odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness, and between body odour attractiveness and vocal attractiveness (from 92 search results, see Table S0-5). The results reported below are based on 1001 target stimuli and 1350 raters.

## 3.1 Sensitivity to observe meta-analytical effects

With the 25 effects and an average sample size of 46 targets per group in the meta-analysis on the relationship between body odour and facial attractiveness, we reached a sensitivity to observe effects (with 5%  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  error rates) of 0.174, 0.214 and 0.303 for low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively (Figure 1 – left).


In the case of the meta-analysis on the relationship between body odour and vocal attractiveness, with 9 effects and an average sample size of 51 targets per group, we reached a sensitivity to observe effects (with 5%  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  error rates) of 0.276, 0.339 and 0.484 for low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively (Figure 1 – right).

Hence, effects smaller than those estimated by our sensitivity analysis would be observed with statistical power below 95%, following the associated curves in Fig. 1. For example, if the meta-analysis on the relationship between body odour and facial attractiveness would have small heterogeneity and observed effects of 0.2, 0.1, or 0.05, it would have ~99%, ~55%, or ~17% power to observe them, respectively.

*Fig. 1. Power curves for the sensitivity to detect meta-analytic effects as a function of heterogeneity. The plots display the sensitivity analysis for the meta-analysis of congruence between body odour and facial attractiveness (left panel) and between body odour and vocal attractiveness (right panel). Black solid, medium grey dashed, and light grey dotted curves represent low, moderate, and high heterogeneity. Power*

<sup>3</sup>We decided to choose a 1:1 ratio of the Type I and II error rates for all performed analyses, as we see committing both errors as of equal significance in this instance.

curve plots were generated in MS Excel 365 following (Quintana, 2015; Quintana & Tiebel, 2019) and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.




### 3.2 Association between body odour and facial attractiveness

All 25 effects were included in the meta-analysis on the association between body odour and facial attractiveness. The observed correlation coefficients ranged from -0.436 to 0.867, with the majority of estimates (68%) above zero. The meta-analytical mean showed a statistically significant, weak positive correlation coefficient of 0.104 [0.034, 0.174],  $Z = 2.93$ ,  $p = 0.003$  (Table 1, Figures 2 and 3). Although Cochran's Q test was not statistically significant, the effect tends to vary across the studies ( $Q_{24} = 35.945$ ,  $p = 0.056$ ), with small heterogeneity (Quintana & Tiebel, 2019) of about 22% attributable to sampling error. Based on the 95% Prediction Interval, the *true* outcome is expected to be between -0.069 and 0.277. Results of the Egger's regression suggest no asymmetry in the funnel plot ( $\beta_0 = 0.803$ ,  $p = 0.422$ , Figure 3). For female ( $k = 8$ ) and male ( $k = 17$ ) targets, the meta-analytical means were 0.163 [0.011, 0.314] and 0.086 [0.005, 0.168], respectively (Table S0-7 - Supplementary meta-analyses results).

Fig. 2. Forest plots for congruence meta-analyses. Squares represent weighted mean effects of individual studies, and error bars their 95% confidence intervals. Diamonds represent summary effects, their width the 95% confidence intervals, and dashed error bars their 95% prediction intervals. \*Female raters in fertile, \*\*non-fertile phase of their menstrual cycle, and °hormonal contraception users. Summary effects are reported in Fisher's z-transformed correlation coefficients with 95% confidence intervals and in heterogeneous effects also followed with 95% prediction intervals. Forest plots were generated in jamovi, and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.

### Congruence between body odour and facial attractiveness



### Congruence between body odour and vocal attractiveness








Fig. 3. Funnel plots for congruence meta-analyses. Area outside the contour-enhanced funnels represent  $p$  values  $< 0.01$ , dark grey areas  $p$  values between 0.01 and 0.05, light grey  $p$  values between 0.05 and 0.1, and areas inside the funnel  $p$  values  $> 0.1$ . Full circles illustrate published and empty circles unpublished studies. Dashed lines show summary effect sizes; Y-axis is the standard error of Fisher's  $z$ . Funnel plots were generated in jamovi, and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.



### 3.2.1 Comparison of published and unpublished effects

Considering only the published effects ( $k = 10$ ), the meta-analytical mean showed a positive correlation coefficient of 0.185 [0.041, 0.328] with a moderate level of heterogeneity (50%). Based on a 95% Prediction Interval, the *true* outcome thus can be expected between -0.156 and 0.526 (Table 2, Figure 4). When only the unpublished effects ( $k = 15$ ) are considered, the meta-analytic mean is 0.052 with 95% CI [-0.024, 0.128] overlapping 0, and 0% heterogeneity (Table 2, Figure 4). When the publication status (published/unpublished) is used as a moderator, its effect is statistically non-significant (estimate = -0.128 [-0.259, 0.004],  $p = 0.057$ , heterogeneity  $I^2 = 10.25\%$ ).

Fig. 4. Comparison of meta-analytic averages between published and unpublished effects. Black circles represent mean effects. Thick error bars their 95% CI and thin error bar 95% PI. Due to observed heterogeneity only in the published effects, the mean effect is accompanied by 95% PI. The plot was generated in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.



### 3.2.2 The effect of rating design

1 For studies ( $k = 16$ ) using a between-subject rating design (different groups of participants  
2 provide attractiveness ratings for different stimulus types), the meta-analytical mean estimate  
3 for body odour and facial attractiveness was 0.089 with 95% CI [-0.05, 0.183] overlapping  
4 zero ( $I^2 = 38.29\%$ ). Studies ( $k = 9$ ) using a within-subject rating design (each participant  
5 judged both stimulus types) also showed a weak positive association between the modalities,  
6 0.146 [0.036, 0.256] ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ), (Table 3). When the rating design was used as moderator, its  
7 effect is statistically non-significant (estimate = -0.034 [-0.201, 0.134],  $p = 0.692$ ,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ),  
8 Table 3.  
9

### 3.3 Association between body odour and vocal attractiveness

10  
11 The association between body odour and vocal attractiveness ( $k = 9$ ) was weakly positive  
12 and statistically significant. The observed correlation coefficients ranged from -0.189 to  
13 0.297, with the majority of estimates (89%) above zero. The meta-analytical mean estimate  
14 was 0.098 [0.004, 0.192] with  $Z = 2.038$ ,  $p = 0.041$  (Table 1, Figures 2 and 3). Cochran's Q  
15 ( $Q_8 = 4.8$ ,  $p = 0.779$ ) indicated that the effect did not vary between studies, with 0% of the  
16 observed effect attributable to sampling error. Considering females and males separately,  
17 the meta-analytical means were 0.143 [0.024, 0.263] for female targets ( $k = 5$ ) and 0.024 [-  
18 0.128, 0.177] for male targets ( $k = 4$ ) (Table S0-7 - Supplementary Meta-analyses results).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Table 1. Meta-analysis and heterogeneity results

Congruence in	k	Estimate (Fisher's z)	95% CI		p	95% PI	
			LL	UL		LL	UL
Body odour and Facial attractiveness	25	0.104	0.034	0.174	0.003	-0.069	0.277
Body odour and Vocal attractiveness	9	0.098	0.004	0.192	0.042		
Heterogeneity Statistics							
	Tau	Tau <sup>2</sup>	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	H <sup>2</sup>	Q	df	p
Body odour and Facial attractiveness	0.079	0.0062	20.84	1.263	35.696	24	0.059
Body odour and Vocal attractiveness	0	0	0	1	4.8	8	0.779

Table 2. Meta-analysis and heterogeneity results for published and unpublished effects

Origin	k	Estimate (Fisher's z)	95% CI		p	95% PI	
			LL	UL		LL	UL
Published effects	10	0.185	0.041	0.328	0.012	-0.156	0.526
Unpublished effects	15	0.052	-0.024	0.128	0.182		
Moderator		-0.128	-0.259	0.004	0.057		
Heterogeneity Statistics							
	Tau	Tau <sup>2</sup>	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	H <sup>2</sup>	Q	df	p
Published effects	0.158	0.0249	49.91	1.996	19.813	9	0.019
Unpublished effects	0	0	0	1	11.92	14	0.613
Moderator	0.052	0.0027	10.25	1.114	31.733	24	0.106

Table 3. Meta-analysis and heterogeneity results for between- and within-subject rating design

Rating Design	k	Estimate (Fisher's z)	95% CI		p	95% PI	
			LL	UL		LL	UL
Between-subject	16	0.089	-0.05	0.183	0.062	-0.155	0.334
Within-subject	9	0.146	0.036	0.256	0.009		
Moderator		-0.034	-0.201	0.134	0.692		

Heterogeneity Statistics	Tau	Tau <sup>2</sup>	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	H <sup>2</sup>	Q	df	p
Between-subject	0.115	0.0133	38.29	1.62	29.439	15	0.014
Within-subject	0	0	0	1	5.605	8	0.691
Moderator	0.087	0.0076	24.52	1.325	35.708	24	0.044

### 3.4 Effect size distributions

We constructed effect size distributions from all available effect sizes for the association between body odour and facial attractiveness (n = 25) and the association between body odour and vocal attractiveness (n = 9). In both cases, the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile values (average/medium effect size) are ~ 0.1 and equal to the meta-analytic averages (~ 0.1), the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile (small/below average effect size boundary) values are ~0, and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (above average/large effect size boundary) values are ~0.2. The distributions and percentiles for small (25<sup>th</sup>), medium (50<sup>th</sup>, median), and large (75<sup>th</sup>) effect sizes are presented in Fig. 5 and Table 4.

Fig. 5. Raincloud plots for effect size distribution. Density plots show effect sizes distribution, boxplots show median (thick line), 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (interquartile range, box), and minimum and maximum (error bars); jittered dots represent individual effect sizes; dotted vertical line shows effect size average for each meta-analysis (left 0.104, right 0.098). Raincloud plots were generated in JASP (0.16.2) and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.




Table 4. Effect size distributions

Congruence in	Number of effects	Percentiles		
		25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>
Body odour and Facial attractiveness	25	-0.013	0.1	0.206
Body odour and Vocal attractiveness	9	0.02	0.116	0.178

## 4 Discussion

Our results indicate that, although the association between body odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness is positive, the summary effect is relatively small ( $r \sim 0.1$ ). We observed similar patterns and magnitudes of effects for female and male targets and also for the odour-voice attractiveness association. We suggest that body odour may provide distinct and non-redundant information about an individual's mating-related qualities compared to that available within either facial or vocal cues. Thus, concerning perceived attractiveness, body odour may provide different and non-redundant cues to an individual's mating-related qualities compared to cues communicated through the face and voice.

These findings contrast with those of Rikowski and Grammer (1999), who observed a strong positive correlation ( $r_{19} = 0.7$ ) between facial and body odour attractiveness, but concur with more recent studies (Roth et al., 2021) that report a weak association between body odour, facial, and vocal attractiveness. Similarly, our findings are in line with those of two studies (Mahmut & Stevenson, 2019; Roth et al., 2021) that did not meet our ' formal inclusion criteria due to their non-parametric, non-frequentist data analysis (Table S0-5). In a sample of 82 female raters and 91 male donors, Mahmut and Stevenson (2019) reported Spearman's  $\rho = 0.3$  for the association between body odour and facial sexiness. Using Bayesian analysis with a sample of 70 participants who served as both donors and raters, Roth et al. (2021), reported that body odour, facial, and vocal attractiveness were positively correlated but with small effect sizes. It is worth noting, however, that the authors discuss their findings of small and positive effects in favour of the *backup signals* hypothesis; we would disagree with this interpretation. The shared variability of attractiveness ratings resulting from the summary effects across the two pairs of modalities in the present meta-analyses was less than 1%, suggesting minimal (if any) redundancy in information transferred through these modalities.

In studies concerning an association between facial and vocal attractiveness, the current evidence shows inconsistent results, ranging from strong positive correlations in women only (Abend et al., 2015; Collins & Missing, 2003; Wheatley et al., 2014) to weak (Zuckerman et al., 1995) or no significant associations (Zäske et al., 2020). This range suggests that the overall pattern of relationships might be similar to that found in the present study between odour and these other modalities. However, there is currently no systematic investigation or meta-analysis available for the association between facial and vocal attractiveness to our best knowledge.

Notes on the meta-analyses Although Figure 4 shows a stronger (over 3×) positive mean effect for published effects than unpublished ones, the meta-analytical mean of unpublished effects provides a more precise estimate: the mean effect (and over half of its 95%CI) falls within the 95% CI (and entirely within 95%PI) of the published effects. If the present study were based only on published evidence, it would thus report a stronger and less precise estimate of the meta-analytic effect for associations between assessments of body odour and facial attractiveness. Moreover, a meta-analysis of body odour and vocal attractiveness would not be possible as the literature search identified only a single study fulfilling the inclusion criteria (Roth et al., 2021 discussed above). This highlights the importance of considering unpublished data in quantifying effects through systematic reviews and evidence synthesis.

Although we generally observed low levels of heterogeneity in our meta-analyses, they rely on a relatively small number of effects and the sensitivity of our analyses is correspondingly low. In addition, the statistical power in many of the available studies is low, due to a relatively small number of stimuli (Table S0-4). The average number of raters per stimuli

(mostly body odour stimuli) often resulted in wider corridors of rating stability (Hehman et al., 2018b) and thus less precise estimates of mean ratings (Table S0-3). This mainly arises from logistical limitations related to procedures employed in body odour sampling and rating. In contrast to facial images and vocal recordings, body odour stimuli can be used only a limited number of times due to microbial transformation and signal degradation (Lenochová et al., 2009). Furthermore, the number of odour stimuli that one rater can assess within a reasonable time is limited by olfactory adaptation (Köster & de Wijk, 1991). These issues hinder the accuracy of the present findings and represent challenges for further research.

In addition to the meta-analytical results, the current article presents a systematic overview of studies conducted over the last two decades, including data collection methods, sample sizes, populations, and observed ratings (Tables S0-6). We also included observed effect size distributions showing that commonly used correlation thresholds overestimate effect sizes observed in studies, where average and larger-than-average effects (50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile, respectively) are 'only' ~0.1 and ~0.2. Based on the unpublished datasets, where more detailed insight can be provided, the average number of stimuli used in this type of research is ~46 giving us sensitivity to observe correlations  $\geq 0.49$  (with 0.05  $p_{\text{two-tailed}}$  and 95% power,  $\geq 0.39$  with 80% power). On average, in these studies, body odour, and facial and vocal stimuli are rated for attractiveness by ~25, 31, and 32 raters, respectively, though based on our corridor of stability analysis samples  $\geq 35$  seem to be needed for more precise estimates. Overall, all three stimulus types seem to be rated with good reliability (mean ICC2k ~0.8), and we found no differences in reliability between stimulus types. See Tables S0-1, 2, 3 and 4, and ICC comparison in the Supplemental materials for further extended details. Future research investigating the association in attractiveness rating between modalities could benefit from this systematic overview, including effect size distributions, to plan and convey magnitudes of observed effects in comparison to the body of up-to-date literature.

#### 4.1 Alternative reasons for the observed effects

It is conceivable that the associations between individual modalities are underestimated because (a) studies use 'snapshots' of an individual which might provide only a rough estimate of his or her mating-related qualities, and (b) these snapshots vary in duration across modalities. Odour stimuli are typically collected over a longer period (12-24h) and may, therefore, provide a more reliable quality estimate. In contrast, vocal stimuli often last less than 1 min. and visual images capture less than a second. Previous studies testing the association between body odour attractiveness and physical attractiveness assessed from videos found a stronger correlation ( $r = 0.32$ ) compared to the association between body odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness ( $r = -0.08$ ) (Roberts et al., 2011). Thus, sampling time might influence the reliability of mating-related quality estimates. A reviewer also argued that the reason for the weak correlation between odour attractiveness and the two other modalities could be higher variability in ratings of body odour, perhaps because it is considered that olfactory judgments are either more difficult or more subjective. However, our ICC analysis shows that the level of agreement is comparable across the three modalities.

Similarly, the weak correlations that we observe between attractiveness assessments of different stimulus types might result from experimental (laboratory-based) settings and some variations in protocols. These include, for example, control over facial expressions during image acquisition, the volume of voice recordings, and dietary restrictions in body odour sampling. Although methodologically challenging, the use of more naturalistic stimuli with facial expressiveness, the prosody of speech and natural variation in body odour (Roberts et al., 2022) may provide additional insight into the patterns of associations and congruence across sensory modalities investigated here.

1 Further, earlier studies reporting positive associations between attractiveness and putative  
2 markers of mating-related quality had failed to replicate, especially when they were based on  
3 small samples. Many studies that were included in the current analysis had different groups  
4 of participants providing attractiveness ratings of the stimulus types (between-subject rating  
5 design). A high inter-individual variation in attractiveness ratings in some modalities would  
6 lead to a weak correlation between the modalities because the target is rated by some  
7 people in one modality and by other people in the other. Studies using a design where each  
8 participant judged all stimulus types (within-subject rating design) also tend to show a weak  
9 correlation between the modalities, meaning that weak correlations in individual studies  
10 cannot be solely due to study design.  
11

12 An individual's mating-related quality may be perceived more accurately by combining cues  
13 from different modalities that independently correlate with mate preferences. However, most  
14 studies on physical attractiveness examine the influence of individual modalities separately,  
15 a design that lacks ecological validity because, in everyday life, we perceive others through  
16 multiple senses simultaneously (Groyecka et al., 2017). Similarly, the present meta-analysis  
17 is based on studies investigating several modalities separately, not on multimodal  
18 perception, which is a result of simultaneous perception across different sensory modalities.  
19 The resulting perception can differ qualitatively from the sum of the properties of its  
20 components and convey a unique message, or one modality can affect information  
21 transmitted by the other modalities, being different from the 'backup' and 'multiple messages'  
22 concepts (Halfwerk et al., 2019; Mitoyen et al., 2019). How information based on different  
23 modalities contributes to overall attractiveness judgements is poorly understood (e.g.,  
24 Ferdenzi et al., 2016). Current research into the integration of human mate preferences  
25 indicates that they are best described by the Euclidean model (Conroy-Beam et al., 2019).  
26 Whether a similar pattern of integration can be expected in the case of physical  
27 attractiveness or whether it would follow another form, as explained by additive or threshold  
28 models, remains to be investigated (Csajbók et al., 2022; Havlíček et al., 2022).  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 4.2 Theoretical implications

34 It has been proposed that attractiveness reflects an individual's mating-related qualities (e.g.,  
35 in terms of health and fertility). Perceived facial attractiveness is influenced by several  
36 features, including symmetry, prototypicality, sexual dimorphism, adiposity, and skin  
37 condition. For instance, prototypicality is thought to be a marker of heterozygosity, symmetry  
38 a marker of developmental stability, while sexual dimorphism is a marker of sex hormone  
39 levels and skin quality is a marker of health status (for review, see Stephen & Luoto, 2021).  
40 Similarly, it has been suggested that body odour may also provide information about  
41 heterozygosity, developmental stability, sex hormones and health (for review, see Havlíček  
42 et al., 2017). Hence, one might expect at least moderate associations between the  
43 attractiveness of these modalities, but we found only weak associations. Several  
44 associations between attractiveness and the proposed underlying qualities were recently  
45 revisited (Stephen & Luoto, 2021) and others are still debated. These include links between  
46 hormonal profiles and facial attractiveness (Jones et al., 2021) or between body odour  
47 attractiveness and MHC heterozygosity (Havlíček et al., 2020).  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Visual, olfactory, and acoustic modalities may provide unique (and non-redundant)  
53 information about an individual's mating-related quality. Our results are in line with the  
54 *multiple messages* hypothesis but seem to provide little support for the *backup signals*  
55 hypothesis. Moreover, they correspond with the majority of animal studies that have reported  
56 multiple traits to be unrelated, suggesting that backup signals are less common than multiple  
57 messages (Badyaev et al., 1998; Candolin, 2003; Kraak, 1999). We speculate that facial  
58 appearance primarily provides cues to more stable characteristics such as the development  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 of hormone-related secondary sexual characteristics and maturation (Marečková et al., 2011;  
2 Whitehouse et al., 2015). In contrast, body odour may provide cues to more variable  
3 characteristics, such as current health (Olsson et al., 2014; Sarolidou et al., 2020) and fertility  
4 status (Gildersleeve et al., 2012; Havlíček et al., 2006). These are provocative and open  
5 questions that require in-depth investigations.

6  
7 In conclusion, the present study found weak congruence between attractiveness  
8 assessments of human body odours and those of faces or voices. These results provide little  
9 support for the *backup signals* hypothesis in explaining the use of multiple modalities in  
10 attractiveness assessments, but favour the *multiple messages* hypothesis, suggesting that  
11 body odour provides information about mating-related quality different from that of faces or  
12 voices.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



## 5 Author Contributions

**Conceptualization:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová and Jan Havlíček.

**Data Curation:** Vít Třebický.

**Formal Analysis:** Vít Třebický.

**Funding Acquisition:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová and Jan Havlíček.

**Investigation:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Methodology:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Project Administration:** Vít Třebický.

**Resources:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Supervision:** S. C. Roberts and Jan Havlíček.

**Validation:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Visualization:** Vít Třebický.

**Writing - Original Draft Preparation:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová and Jan Havlíček.

**Writing - Review & Editing:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

The List of authors' contributions was generated using *Tenzing* (Holcombe et al., 2020); apart from the first and last author, all co-authors are listed alphabetically.

## 6 Declaration of competing interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest concerning the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## 7 Ethics

All procedures within the individual studies were carried out following the Declaration of Helsinki, and Institutional Review Boards approved each study. Individual approvals can be found in the Supplemental Materials.

## 8 Acknowledgements

We thank Radim Kuba, Tereza Nevolová, David Stella, Pavel Šebesta, and other members of the Human Ethology group ([www.etologiecloveka.cz](http://www.etologiecloveka.cz)) for their help with data collection. We also express our gratitude to all our volunteers for their participation.

## 9 Funding

This study was supported by the Czech Science Foundation GAČR P407/19/11822S, the Charles University Research Centres UNCE/HUM/025 (UNCE 204056), and the Charles university grant agency GA UK No 1374319.

## 10 References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Abend, P., Pflüger, L. S., Koppensteiner, M., Coquerelle, M., & Grammer, K. (2015). The sound of female shape: A redundant signal of vocal and facial attractiveness. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *36*(3), 174–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2014.10.004>
- Aglioti, S. M., & Pazzaglia, M. (2011). Sounds and scents in (social) action. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*(2), 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.12.003>
- Arakawa, H., Blanchard, D. C., Arakawa, K., Dunlap, C., & Blanchard, R. J. (2008). Scent marking behavior as an odorant communication in mice. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *32*(7), 1236–1248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.05.012>
- Badyaev, A. V., Etges, W. J., Faust, J. D., & Martin, T. E. (1998). Fitness correlates of spur length and spur asymmetry in male wild turkeys. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *67*(6), 845–852. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2656.1998.6760845.x>
- Brown, T. A. (2006). Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research. In *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. The Guilford Press.
- Brydges, C. R. (2019). Effect Size Guidelines, Sample Size Calculations, and Statistical Power in Gerontology. *Innovation in Aging*, *3*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igz036>
- Candolin, U. (2003). The use of multiple cues in mate choice. *Biological Reviews*, *78*(4), 575–595. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793103006158>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155–159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- Collins, S. A., & Missing, C. (2003). Vocal and visual attractiveness are related in women. *Animal Behaviour*, *65*(5), 997–1004. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2123>

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Colyott, K., Odu, C., & Gleason, J. M. (2016). Dissection of signalling modalities and courtship timing reveals a novel signal in *Drosophila saltans* courtship. *Animal Behaviour*, *120*, 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.07.015>
- Conroy-Beam, D., Buss, D. M., Asao, K., Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., Aavik, T., Akello, G., Alhabahba, M. M., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Atama, C. S., Duyar, D. A., Ayebare, R., Batres, C., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B., Boussena, M., ... Zupančič, M. (2019). Contrasting Computational Models of Mate Preference Integration Across 45 Countries. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 16885. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-52748-8>
- Csajbók, Z., Bérkics, M., & Havlíček, J. (n.d.). Meeting minimum mate preference thresholds can be more important than the overall score. *Personality and Individual Differences*.
- Cunningham, M. R., Barbee, A. P., & Pike, C. L. (1990). What do women want? Facialmetric assessment of multiple motives in the perception of male facial physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(1), 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.1.61>
- Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G\*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Ferdenzi, C., Delplanque, S., Atanassova, R., & Sander, D. (2016). Androstadienone's influence on the perception of facial and vocal attractiveness is not sex specific. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *66*, 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2016.01.016>
- Fialová, J., Třebický, V., Kuba, R., Stella, D., Binter, J., & Havlíček, J. (2020). Losing stinks! The effect of competition outcome on body odour quality. *Philosophical Transactions*

of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 375(1800), 20190267.

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0267>

Gallucci, M. (2021). *GAMLj: General analyses for linear models (2.3.0)*.

Gangestad, S. W., Haselton, M. G., Welling, L. L. M. M., Gildersleeve, K., Pillsworth, E. G.,

Burriss, R. P., Larson, C. M., & Puts, D. A. (2015). How Valid are Assessments of

Conception Probability in Ovulatory Cycle Research? Evaluations,

Recommendations, and Theoretical Implications. *Evolution and Human Behavior*,

17(October), 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.09.001>

Gignac, G. E., & Szodorai, E. T. (2016). Effect size guidelines for individual differences

researchers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 74–78.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.069>

Gildersleeve, K. A., Haselton, M. G., Larson, C. M., & Pillsworth, E. G. (2012). Body odor

attractiveness as a cue of impending ovulation in women: Evidence from a study

using hormone-confirmed ovulation. *Hormones and Behavior*, 61(2), 157–166.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.11.005>

Girard, M. B., Elias, D. O., & Kasumovic, M. M. (2015). Female preference for multi-modal

courtship: Multiple signals are important for male mating success in peacock spiders.

*Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1820), 20152222.

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2222>

Gosling, L. M., & Roberts, S. C. (2001). Scent-marking by male mammals: Cheat-proof

signals to competitors and mates. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 30(FEBRUARY

2001), 169–217. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-3454\(01\)80007-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-3454(01)80007-3)

Grammer, K., Fink, B., Juette, A., Ronzal, G., & Thornhill, R. (2001). Female faces and

bodies: N-dimensional feature space and attractiveness. In G. Rhodes & L. Zebrowitz

(Eds.), *Advances in visual cognition* (pp. 91–125). Ablex Publishing.

Grammer, K., Fink, B., Miller, A. P., & Thornhill, R. (2003). Darwinian aesthetics: Sexual

selection and the biology of beauty. *Biological Reviews*, 78(3), 385–407.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793102006085>

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Groyecka, A., Pisanski, K., Sorokowska, A., Havlíček, J., Karwowski, M., Puts, D. A., Roberts, S. C., Sorokowski, P., & Craig Roberts, S. (2017). Attractiveness Is Multimodal: Beauty Is Also in the Nose and Ear of the Beholder. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(May), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00778>
- Hamilton, W. K. (2021). *MAJOR - Meta-Analysis for JAMOVl* (1.1.1).
- Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. A., & Ebert, D. D. (2021a). Doing Meta-Analysis with R. *Doing Meta-Analysis with R*, June, 2020–2023. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003107347>
- Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. A., & Ebert, D. D. (2021b). *Doing Meta-Analysis with R: A Hands-On Guide*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
- Havlíček, J., Dvorakova, R., Bartos, L., & Flegr, J. (2006). Non-Advertized does not Mean Concealed: Body Odour Changes across the Human Menstrual Cycle. *Ethology*, 112(1), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2006.01125.x>
- Havlíček, J., Fialová, J., & Roberts, S. C. (2017). Individual Variation in Body Odor. *Springer Handbook of Odor*, 125–126. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26932-0\\_50](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26932-0_50)
- Havlíček, J., & Roberts, S. C. (n.d.). Menstrual cycle variation in women’s mating psychology: Empirical evidence and theoretical considerations. In J. K. Mogilski & T. K. Shackelford (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology and Romantic Relationships*. Oxford University Press.
- Havlíček, J., Saxton, T. K., Roberts, S. C., Jozífková, E., Lhota, S., Valentová, J., & Flegr, J. (2008). He sees, she smells? Male and female reports of sensory reliance in mate choice and non-mate choice contexts. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45(6), 565–570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.06.019>
- Havlíček, J., Štěrbová, Z., & Csajbók, Z. (n.d.). Human mate choice. In E. Ridley, A., & d’Ettorre, P., Freeberg, T.M. (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Comparative Psychology*. Routledge.
- Havlíček, J., Winternitz, J., & Roberts, S. C. (2020). Major histocompatibility complex-associated odour preferences and human mate choice: Near and far horizons.

1 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 375(1800),

2 20190260. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0260>

3  
4 Hehman, E., Xie, S., Ofosu, E., & Nespoli, G. (2018a). Assessing the point at which  
5 averages are stable: A tool illustrated in the context of person perception. *PsyArXiv*  
6 *Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/2n6jq>

7  
8  
9  
10 Hehman, E., Xie, S., Ofosu, E., & Nespoli, G. (2018b). Assessing the point at which  
11 averages are stable: A tool illustrated in the context of person perception. *PsyArXiv*  
12 *Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/2n6jq>

13  
14  
15  
16 Herz, R. S., & Inzlicht, M. (2002). Sex differences in response to physical and social factors  
17 involved in human mate selection. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 23(5), 359–364.  
18  
19  
20  
21 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(02\)00095-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(02)00095-8)

22  
23  
24 Higgins, J. P. T., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J., & Altman, D. G. (2003). Measuring  
25 inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*, 327(7414), 557–560.  
26  
27  
28  
29 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557>

30  
31 Higham, J. P., & Hebets, E. A. (2013). An introduction to multimodal communication.  
32  
33 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 67(9), 1381–1388.  
34  
35  
36 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-013-1590-x>

37  
38 Hill, A. K., & Puts, D. A. (2016). Vocal Attractiveness. In T. K. Shackelford & V. A. Weekes-  
39 Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science* (Issue  
40 February, pp. 1–3). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16999-6)  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

113 Jones, B. C., Jones, A. L., Shiramizu, V., & Anderson, C. (2021). What Does Women ' s  
114 Facial Attractiveness Signal? Implications for an Evolutionary Perspective on  
115 Appearance Enhancement. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 0123456789.  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, *15*(2), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>
- Köster, E. P., & de Wijk, R. A. (1991). Olfactory Adaptation. In *The Human Sense of Smell* (pp. 199–215). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-76223-9\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-76223-9_10)
- Kraak, S. B. M. (1999). Sexual selection in sticklebacks in the field: Correlates of reproductive, mating, and paternal success. *Behavioral Ecology*, *10*(6), 696–706. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/10.6.696>
- Lenochová, P., Roberts, S. C., & Havlíček, J. (2009). Methods of human body odor sampling: The effect of freezing. *Chemical Senses*, *34*(2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjn067>
- Lovakov, A., & Agadullina, E. R. (2021). Empirically derived guidelines for effect size interpretation in social psychology. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*(3), 485–504. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2752>
- Mahmut, M. K., & Stevenson, R. J. (2019). Do Single Men Smell and Look Different to Partnered Men? *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*(FEB), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00261>
- Marečková, K., Weinbrand, Z., Chakravarty, M. M., Lawrence, C., Aleong, R., Leonard, G., Perron, M., Pike, G. B., Richer, L., Veillette, S., Pausova, Z., & Paus, T. (2011). Testosterone-mediated sex differences in the face shape during adolescence: Subjective impressions and objective features. *Hormones and Behavior*, *60*(5), 681–690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.09.004>
- Moller, A. P., & Pomiankowski, A. (1993). Why have birds got multiple sexual ornaments? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, *32*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00173774>
- Nordahl-Hansen, A., Cogo-Moreira, H., Panjeh, S., & Quintana, D. S. (2022). Redefining Effect Size Interpretations for Psychotherapy RCTs in Depression. *OSF Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/erhmw>

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Olsson, M. J., Lundström, J. N., Kimball, B. A., Gordon, A. R., Karshikoff, B., Hosseini, N., Sorjonen, K., Olgart Höglund, C., Solares, C., Soop, A., Axelsson, J., & Lekander, M. (2014). The Scent of Disease. *Psychological Science*, *25*(3), 817–823. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613515681>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *The BMJ*, *372*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Pisanski, K., Feinberg, D., Oleszkiewicz, A., & Sorokowska, A. (2017). Voice cues are used in a similar way by blind and sighted adults when assessing women’s body size. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-10470-3>
- Quintana, D. S. (2015). From pre-registration to publication: A non-technical primer for conducting a meta-analysis to synthesize correlational data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01549>
- Quintana, D. S. (2017). Statistical considerations for reporting and planning heart rate variability case-control studies. *Psychophysiology*, *54*(3), 344–349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12798>
- Quintana, D. S., & Tiebel, J. (2019). *How to calculate statistical power for your meta-analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/5C7UZ>
- R Core Team. (2021). *RStudio: Integrated development for R*.
- R Core Team, & Team, R. C. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Rhodes, G. (2006). The evolutionary psychology of facial beauty. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *57*, 199–226. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190208>



1 Rikowski, A., & Grammer, K. (1999). Human body odour, symmetry and attractiveness.

2 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 266(1422), 869–874.

3 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1999.0717>

4 Roberts, S. C., Kravovich, A., Ferdenzi, C., Saxton, T. K., Jones, B. C., DeBruine, L. M.,

5 Littleb, A. C., & Havlíček, J. (2011). Body Odor Quality Predicts Behavioral

6 Attractiveness in Humans. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40(6), 1111–1117.

7 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-011-9803-8>

8 Roberts, S., Třebická Fialová, J., Sorokowska, A., Langford, B., Sorokowski, P., Třebický, V.,

9 & Havlíček, J. (2022). Emotional expression in human odour. *Evolutionary Human*

10 *Sciences*, 4, 1–22.

11 Röder, S., Fink, B., & Jones, B. C. (2013). Facial, olfactory, and vocal cues to female

12 reproductive value. *Evolutionary Psychology: An International Journal of Evolutionary*

13 *Approaches to Psychology and Behavior*, 11(2), 392–404. <https://doi.org/epjournal->

14 2875 [pii]

15 Roth, T. S., Samara, I., & Kret, M. E. (2021). Multimodal mate choice: Exploring the effects of

16 sight, sound, and scent on partner choice in a speed-date paradigm. *Evolution and*

17 *Human Behavior*, xxxx. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2021.04.004>

18 Sarolidou, G., Axelsson, J., Kimball, B. A., Sundelin, T., Regenbogen, C., Lundström, J. N.,

19 Lekander, M., & Olsson, M. J. (2020). People expressing olfactory and visual cues of

20 disease are less liked. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*

21 *Sciences*, 375(1800), 20190272. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0272>

22 Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations stabilize?

23 *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(5), 609–612.

24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.05.009>

25 Stephen, I. D., & Luoto, S. (2021). Physical Cues of Partner Quality. In J. K. Mogilski & T. K.

26 Shackelford (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology and Romantic*

27 *Relationships*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/pk84y>

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Sterne, J. A. C., Sutton, A. J., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Terrin, N., Jones, D. R., Lau, J., Carpenter,  
2 J., Rucker, G., Harbord, R. M., Schmid, C. H., Tetzlaff, J., Deeks, J. J., Peters, J.,  
3 Macaskill, P., Schwarzer, G., Duval, S., Altman, D. G., Moher, D., & Higgins, J. P. T.  
4 (2011). Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in  
5 meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*, *343*(jul22 1), d4002–d4002.  
6  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4002>  
8  
9

10 The jamovi project. (2021). *Jamovi (Version 2.0.0)* (<https://www.jamovi.org>).  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999a). The Scent of Symmetry: A Human Sex  
Pheromone that Signals Fitness? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *20*(3), 175–201.

Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999b). Facial attractiveness. *Trends in Cognitive  
Sciences*, *3*(12), 452–460. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(99\)01403-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(99)01403-5)

Thornhill, R., Gangestad, S. W., Miller, R., Scheyd, G., McCollough, J. K., & Franklin, M.  
(2003). Major histocompatibility complex genes, symmetry, and body scent  
attractiveness in men and women. *Behavioral Ecology*, *14*(5), 668–678.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arg043>

Thornhill, R., & Grammer, K. (1999). The body and face of woman: One ornament that  
signals quality? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *20*(2), 105–120.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(98\)00044-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(98)00044-0)

Walter, K. V., Conroy-Beam, D., Buss, D. M., Asao, K., Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P.,  
Aavik, T., Akello, G., Alhabahba, M. M., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Atama, C. S.,  
Atamtürk Duyar, D., Ayebare, R., Batres, C., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B.,  
... Zupančič, M. (2020). Sex Differences in Mate Preferences Across 45 Countries: A  
Large-Scale Replication. *Psychological Science*, *31*(4), 408–423.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620904154>

Wheatley, J. R., Apicella, C. a., Burriss, R. P., Cárdenas, R. a., Bailey, D. H., Welling, L. L.  
M., & Puts, D. A. (2014). Women's faces and voices are cues to reproductive  
potential in industrial and forager societies. *Evolution and Human Behavior*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2014.02.006>

1 Whitehouse, A. J. O., Gilani, S. Z., Shafait, F., Mian, A., Tan, D. W., Maybery, M. T., Keelan,  
2 J. A., Hart, R., Handelsman, D. J., Goonawardene, M., & Eastwood, P. (2015).  
3 Prenatal testosterone exposure is related to sexually dimorphic facial morphology in  
4 adulthood. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1816), 1–9.  
5  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1351>  
7  
8  
9

10 Zäske, R., Skuk, V. G., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2020). Attractiveness and distinctiveness  
11 between speakers' voices in naturalistic speech and their faces are uncorrelated.  
12  
13 *Royal Society Open Science*, 7(12), 201244. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201244>  
14  
15  
16

17 Zuckerman, M., Miyake, K., & Elkin, C. S. (1995). Effects of Attractiveness and Maturity of  
18 Face and Voice on Interpersonal Impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality*,  
19  
20 29(2), 253–272. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1995.1015>  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

# Cross-modal associations of human body odour attractiveness with facial and vocal attractiveness provide little support for the backup signals hypothesis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

10

## Abstract

11

Assessing the attractiveness of potential mating partners are typically assessed for their attractiveness by involves integrating multiple sensory modalities, including the integration of olfactory, visual, and auditory cues. However, there have been diverging predictions diverge on how the individual modalities should relate to each other. According to the *backup signals* hypothesis, the assessment of multimodal cues provides redundant information, whereas the *multiple messages* hypothesis suggests that different modalities provide independent and distinct non-redundant information about an individual's mating-related quality. The *backup signals* hypothesis predicts a positive association between assessments based on of different modalities, whereas no substantial correlation across modalities is expected under the 'multiple messages' hypothesis. Previous studies testing the two hypotheses have provided mixed results, but a systematic evaluation is currently missing.

12

We performed a systematic review and a meta-analysis of published and unpublished studies to examine the congruence in assessments between human body odour and facial attractiveness, and between body odour and vocal attractiveness, ~~in humans~~. We found positive but weak associations between attractiveness ratings of body odours and faces ( $r = 0.1$ ,  $k = 25$ ), and between body odours and voices ( $r = 0.1$ ,  $k = 9$ ). No sex differences were observed in the magnitudes of effects.

13

Compared to judgments of facial and vocal attractiveness, our results suggest that assessments of body odour provides independent and non-redundant information about human mating-related qualities. Our findings of the present study thus provide little support for the *backup signals* hypothesis and may be better explained by the *multiple messages* hypothesis.

14

## Keywords

15

Human; Mate choice; Body odour; Face; Voice; Perception; Attractiveness; Backup signals, Multiple messages

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

## 1 Introduction

Across many different taxa, individuals assess potential mating partners via telereceptive senses such as vision, olfaction, and hearing (Aglioti & Pazzaglia, 2011). Although some vertebrates appear to rely predominantly on a single sense (Arakawa et al., 2008; Candolin, 2003; Gosling & Roberts, 2001), most the majority of species, including humans, employ multiple senses (Candolin, 2003; Higham & Hebets, 2013) in their assessments. Frog calls, for example, are often accompanied by conspicuous vocal sac movements and/or water surface vibrations, while many bird species show complex, rhythmic and vigorous visual displays during courtship singing (for a review, see Halfwerk et al., 2019).

Perceived variation in these physical traits may provide information about an individual's mating-related quality, such as health and fertility (e.g., Grammer et al., 2003; Rhodes, 2006; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999b). Using a single modality in the judgment assessment of an individual's attractiveness based on any single modality entails a certain level of error. Hence, the employment of multiple sensory channels could lead to a more reliable assessment (Moller & Pomiankowski, 1993). Two competing hypotheses have been proposed to explain the use of multiple modalities in the assessment of potential mates (Groyecka et al., 2017; Higham & Hebets, 2013). According to the 'backup signals' hypothesis (Grammer et al., 2001; also coined redundant signalling, Moller & Pomiankowski, 1993; Thornhill & Grammer, 1999), certain cues may provide similar (redundant) information; assessing this same information in several different modalities will then tend to reduce error and facilitate a more accurate overall assessment of the underlying quality. In contrast, the multiple messages hypothesis (Cunningham et al., 1990; Moller & Pomiankowski, 1993) suggests that each trait provides distinct and independent (non-redundant) information about an individual's mating-related quality, but in combination, these can facilitate a more accurate assessment of overall individual quality than any single cue in isolation. With all this in mind, we can make clear predictions to test between these two ideas. One can expect that if attractiveness assessments based on different sensory channels of redundant cues should be congruent (closely and are closely and positively associated, such congruence would suggest redundancy in information across traits and provide support for the backup hypothesis. On the other hand, weak or absent cross-modal congruence (i.e. cues convey while the assessment of non-redundant information), however, cues should be associated weakly, if at all, would support the multiple messages hypothesis. The mating-related animal research provided some support for both of these hypotheses. The use of backup signals of quality was demonstrated, for instance, in *Drosophila saltans* where removing one courtship component (either visual, auditory, chemical or tactile) did not eliminate the female's decision to mate (Colyott et al., 2016). On the other hand, the study on peacock spiders (*Maratus Volans*) showed that both visual and vibratory signalling is important for mating success supporting the multiple messages hypothesis (Girard et al., 2015). Overall, the majority of available animal research seems to provide more evidence in favour of the multiple messages hypothesis (Candolin, 2003).

Most research on human mate preferences has focused on visual cues, typically by investigating people's assessments of facial and/or body attractiveness. Although physical appearance certainly plays a prominent role (Groyecka et al., 2017; Herz & Inzlicht, 2002; Walter et al., 2020), the assessment of attractiveness in potential mating partners is undeniably multimodal. Research suggests that, in addition to physical appearance, body odour (Havlicek et al., 2008; S. C. Roberts et al., 2011) and vocal cues (Hill & Puts, 2016; Pisanski et al., 2017; Zäske et al., 2020) also contribute substantially to human mate preferences (Groyecka et al., 2017). However, studies that examining potential cross-modal the congruency and potential redundancy of attractiveness judgments across modalities are scarce. In one of the first such studies, Rikowski and Grammer (1999) reported a positive relationship between attractiveness assessments judgments of women's faces and their body odour. They also found a similar association was found in men's faces and odour, when rated by women in the fertile phase of their menstrual cycle (Please note that authors assessed cycle phase based on counting methods which appears to be highly unreliable, see Gangestad et al., 2016; Havlicek & Roberts, 2022). Rikowski and Grammer These authors concluded that human faces and body odours provide similar information about an individual's mating-related mate qualities. Several other studies have subsequently reported positive associations between perceived attractiveness of faces and body odours (Mahmut & Stevenson, 2019; Roth et al., 2021; Thornhill et al., 2003; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999a) reported similar positive

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

Associations between perceived attractiveness of faces and body odours, although the strengths of some associations were weak, and two other studies (S.-C. Roberts et al., 2011; Röder et al., 2013) found no support for this association (see Table S0-6 and Figure 2). Collectively, the available studies provide some support for both the *backup signals* and *multiple messages* hypotheses.

On view of this, we set out to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis of the relationship between human body odour and facial attractiveness, published studies to test between the two hypotheses. We and complemented the collated the published studies and complemented these with unpublished datasets to examine the evidence for the alleged congruent relationship between human body odour and facial attractiveness. During this process, in addition, we noticed that several of the obtained unpublished datasets that we obtained from researchers also contained ratings of perceived vocal attractiveness. To our knowledge, there is only one published study (Roth et al., 2021) reporting a weak positive correlation between human body odour and vocal attractiveness. Therefore, we also performed meta-analyses of congruence between body odour and vocal attractiveness. As body odour perception and its relation to other modalities are still somewhat overlooked research topics, we focus our study primarily on the relationships between body odour attractiveness and other sensory modalities. Although being of interest, the investigation of the association between facial and vocal attractiveness to a comparable extent (e.g. collecting both published and unpublished evidence) is beyond the scope of the current study. Given our focus on relationships between body odour attractiveness and other sensory modalities, we did not consider the association between facial and vocal attractiveness in the current study, although this would also be of interest in the future.

24

## 2 Material and methods

### 2.1 Systematic review and Meta-analysis

#### 2.1.1 Literature search and study selection

Following the PRISMA 2020 protocol (Page et al., 2021) and PRISMA 2020 checklists (see Supplementary material), we conducted a systematic literature search in July 2020 to identify empirical studies reporting data on the associations between perceived body odour and facial and/or vocal attractiveness. We searched the PubMed and Web of Science (WoS) databases. Topics (WoS) and all fields (PubMed) were searched using the keyword combinations 'odour AND face AND attractiveness', 'odour AND facial AND attractiveness', 'odour AND voice AND attractiveness', and 'odour AND vocal AND attractiveness' (WoS search query example TS=(odour) AND TS=(face) AND TS=(attractive); PubMed search query example ((odour[Title/Abstract]) AND (face[Title/Abstract])) AND (attractiveness[Title/Abstract])); results for each query and database are provided in the Supplementary material). Studies were also searched through cross-referencing and by direct correspondence with researchers who had published previously on body odour attractiveness. We contacted 13 authors, 7 of whom responded that they had no suitable data, and 6 of whom provided data<sup>1</sup>. Only articles and research papers written in English were reviewed. Both published and unpublished studies were considered. The complete list of search results is reported in Table S0-5 - Systematic literature search and Prisma Flow diagram (Supplementary material).

#### 2.1.2 Inclusion criteria

A two-step selection process was adopted. First, titles and abstracts of studies identified by the search were screened for inclusion by one team member (VT). Studies were included if they met each of the following criteria: focused on humans (not other species); included ratings of body odour samples, and either facial photographs or and/or voice recordings (or both); provided data about perceived body odour attractiveness, and perceived facial and/or vocal attractiveness of the target participants. Second, all entries reporting the relevant data or unclear about reporting the relevant data were screened against the same criteria, where their full texts were examined for suitability. See the PRISMA 2020 Flow Diagram and Table S0-5 containing all selection steps in the Supplementary material for further details.

Studies were excluded from the meta-analysis if the key data were collected (perceived body odour and facial or voice attractiveness) were collected, but the relevant analyses were not conducted or not reported,

51

52

---

<sup>1</sup> All authors who provided unpublished data were offered co-authorship of the resulting manuscript. Their involvement in the study is described in the Author Contributions list.

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 unless the authors provided respective effect sizes or raw data for effect size calculations after we  
7 contacted them (7 authors contacted, 6 replied providing data).

8 We used Pearson's  $r$  (correlation coefficient) as a measure of the effect size of the association between  
9 body odour and facial and/or vocal attractiveness. We excluded studies reporting effect size measures that  
10 could not be converted to Pearson's  $r$  and/or were not available from the authors.

11 For further details, see the PRISMA 2020 Flow Diagram and Table S0-5 (in the Supplementary material)  
12 that containing all selection steps in the Supplementary material for further details.

### 13 2.1.3 Data extraction

14 Data extracted from the selected studies are reported in Table S0-6 - Summary of published and  
15 unpublished data. Two research team members (VT and JTF) individually extracted the data, summarised  
16 them, and verified their validity.

### 17 2.1.4 Analysis

18 All statistical tests within this article were performed in jamovi (The jamovi project, 2021). We used the  
19 MAJOR (Hamilton, 2021) jamovi module to perform a correlation coefficients meta-analysis, following  
20 recommendations by Harrer et al. (2021a). The correlation coefficients of the associations between  
21 perceived body odour and facial attractiveness and body odour and vocal attractiveness were converted  
22 with Fisher's  $r$ -to- $z$  transformation and accompanied by their 95% confidence intervals. The Fisher's  $r$ -to- $z$   
23 transform is the recommended procedure for correcting for bias in studies with small sample sizes (Harrer  
24 et al., 2021a)<sup>2</sup>. Separate meta-analyses were performed for correlations between each pair of stimuli (body  
25 odour – facial attractiveness and body odour – voice attractiveness). We performed each meta-analysis  
26 first for both target sexes combined and then separately for each target sex; the results for both sexes  
27 combined are reported in the main text, and the results for each sex are provided in the Supplementary  
28 material (Table S0-7 - Supplementary Meta-analyses results). We assumed that variation in effect sizes  
29 between studies was due to sampling error of true effect sizes or and because of other (e.g.,  
30 methodological) differences between studies. Therefore, we used the random-effects model with a  
31 restricted maximum-likelihood estimator (Harrer et al., 2021b) for heterogeneity statistics ( $\tau^2$ ).  
32 Heterogeneity examines whether variation in the observed correlations results from sampling error.  
33 Cochran's  $Q$  (which tests whether effect size variability across samples is larger than would be expected by  
34 sampling error) and  $I^2$  (which indicates the percentage of variability due to true heterogeneity;  $I^2$  values of  
35 25% are considered low, 50% moderate, and 75% high variability; (Higgins et al., 2003) were computed to  
36 quantify the proportion of variance in the observed effects attributable to sampling error (i.e., the extent to  
37 which true effect sizes vary within a meta-analysis) (Harrer et al., 2021b). In the case of heterogeneity, the  
38 meta-analytic results are reported with their 95% prediction intervals (PI). We inspected small-study effects  
39 and between-study heterogeneity using contour-enhanced funnel plots and Egger's regression test for  
40 funnel plot asymmetry (Harrer et al., 2021b); this test was carried out only for the association between  
41 perceived body odour and facial attractiveness as its usage is recommended when the number of studies  
42 ( $k$ ) is  $\geq 10$  (Harrer et al., 2021b; Sterne et al., 2011). To explore potential biases in published vs  
43 unpublished effects, we tested the moderator effect and performed separate meta-analyses for published  
44 and unpublished effects. Lastly, we also explored the potential moderating effect of the rating design  
45 (between- and within-subject design) on observed meta-analytic estimates. These comparisons were  
46 carried out only for the association between perceived body odour and facial attractiveness, as both  
47 published and unpublished effects were available for this association, and the number of available studies  
48 was  $k \geq 10$ .

### 49 2.1.5 Power analysis

50 We performed analyses of statistical power for the meta-analytic effects in both meta-analyses following  
51 Quintana, 2015; Quintana & Tiebel, 2019). We conducted a sensitivity analysis to estimate what meta-  
52 analytical average effects we have the power to observe with the resulting number of effects per meta-  
53 analysis, the average number of stimuli per study (within a given meta-analysis), 5%  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  error rates ( $p$

54 <sup>2</sup> Another approach is to use bias-corrected correlations. In the main paper, we report results using the Fisher's  $r$ -to- $z$   
55 transforms. We further ran the two presented meta-analyses with bias-corrected correlations for transparency and  
56 comparison between other meta-analyses and their effect size treatments; the analyses are reported in the  
57 Supplementary material. Both analyses produced essentially the same results with marginally smaller AIC values for  
58 Fisher's  $r$ -to- $z$  transformed data.

59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

≤ 0.05 in two-tailed tests, 1-β error probability ≤ 0.95 Power), and for potentially low, moderate, and high heterogeneity of the effects (Higgins et al., 2003) (Figure 1).

### 2.1.6 Effect size distributions

We calculated effect size distributions (ESD) (e.g. Brydges, 2019; Gignac & Szodorai, 2016; Lovakov & Agadullina, 2021; Nordahl-Hansen et al., 2022; Quintana, 2017) for both investigated associations (body odour – facial attractiveness and body odour – voice attractiveness). Alongside meta-analytic averages, ESD can facilitate more accurate power analyses to determine sample and effect sizes when planning future research in a particular area. However, ESD primarily allows for the determination of empirically-based normative guidelines. Thus, instead of Cohen's (1988) traditional 'rule of thumb' conventions for correlations ( $r \approx 0.10$ : small effect;  $r \approx 0.30$ : moderate effect;  $r \approx 0.50$ : large effect), ESD serves as an evidence synthesis derived, field-specific benchmark against which effects from individual studies are compared (e.g., whether the observed effect size in a particular study is smaller, average/medium, or larger than in similar studies). We emphasise that the ESD provides effect size comparison with similar studies but is not designed to quantify the practical significance of observed effects.

To examine the distribution of correlation coefficient effect sizes, we calculated the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, representing the average effect size, and the 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles, as these are equidistant from the average effect size representing small and larger effects size boundaries, respectively (Cohen, 1992; Quintana, 2017).

## 2.2 Analysis of the unpublished studies

Ten unpublished datasets (further referred to as Studies 1-10) were secured through personal communication. Data on the association between perceived body odour and facial attractiveness were available in all studies; five studies (Study 2, 5, 6, 7, 10) also included data on voice attractiveness. The Supplementary material contains a detailed description of the methods and results of each study, means per target (Table S0-1 - Means per target), and means per modality (Table S0-2 - Means per modality).

### 2.2.1 The stability and precision of mean rating estimates

To assess whether the number of ratings for each stimulus type within Studies 1-7, 9, 10 and part of Study 8 provided stable estimates, we calculated the point of stability (POS, a point at which means do not substantially change with additional observations) within a corridor of stability of a mean (COS) (Hehman et al., 2018a; Schönbrodt & Perugini, 2013) in R x64 (R Core Team & Team, 2019) via RStudio (R Core Team, 2021). We used the settings following Hehman et al. (2018a): for the 1-7 scale (Studies 1-4, 7, 9), the POS was specified as 95% CI of observed values falling within ± 0.5 points (approximately 14 %) (Fialová et al., 2020), for the 9-point scale (Study 5, -4 to +4 scale used for odour ratings) within ± 0.6 points (~ 14%), for the 0-1000 scale (Study 6) we set POS at 95% CI within ± 70 points (~ 14%), for the 1-70 scale (Study 8, the replication sample) we set POS at 95% CI within ± 0.7 points (~ 14%) and for the 1-5 scale (Study 10) we set POS at 95% CI within ± 0.35 points (~ 14%).

This analysis provided an estimate of the number of raters required to reach predefined POS (and allowed a comparison with the number of raters recruited and an estimation of the size of the raters' pool needed). We further calculated the mean rating precision each study reached with a COS of 95% CI, see Table S0-3 Point of stability and Intra-class Correlation Coefficients (ICC) in the Supplementary material.

### 2.2.2 Assessment of inter-rater reliability

To assess inter-rater reliability for each stimulus type in Studies 1-7, 9, 10 and part of Study 8, we calculated the ICC (Koo & Li, 2016) using Reliability analysis in the SimplyAgree (version 0.0.2) jamovi module. We used a two-way random model for average agreement (type ICC2k) and followed recommended thresholds for values less than 0.5 as indicative of poor reliability, values between 0.5 and 0.75 as being of moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.9 indicating good reliability and values greater than 0.9 indicating excellent reliability (Koo & Li, 2016). See Table S0-3 – Point of stability and ICC in the Supplementary material for individual ICC values.

Further, using a linear mixed-effect model, we explored differences in ICCs for different stimulus types. Results are reported in the Supplementary material (ICC comparison).

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5

### 2.2.3 Perceptual differences between rating sessions, side-related armpit differences, and an association between short- and long-term attractiveness ratings

6 In Studies 1, 2, 5, and 7, ratings were recorded in multiple sessions. To test for potential differences between sessions, we specified linear mixed-effect models. Attractiveness rating (for a specific modality) was set as the dependent variable, the number of sessions as a fixed effect factor, and both the rater and target participants' ID as random effects (example model syntax:  $\text{Odour attractiveness rating} \sim \text{session} + (1 | \text{rater ID}) + (1 | \text{target ID})$ ).

7 The raters in Study 5 were presented with the target's body odour samples from both armpits (separately, as two stimuli). Therefore, we used a bivariate correlation analysis (on aggregated ratings per armpit and target participant) to assess the association between the ratings of the two odour samples.

8 In several studies, body odour (Study 6-1, 6-2), facial (Study 4, 5, 6-1, 6-2, 9), and vocal stimuli (Study 6-1, 6-2) were rated for short- and long-term attractiveness. We used a bivariate correlation analysis (on aggregated ratings per scale type and target participant) to assess the association between these two scales. We initially set  $r \geq 0.8$  (Brown, 2006) as the level at which we considered the two attractiveness scales as highly correlated and thus difficult to discriminate. In fact, ratings of short-term and long-term attractiveness were highly positively correlated with all  $r$ 's  $\geq 0.856$ , thus fulfilling our criteria to consider the two ratings numerically interchangeable. We therefore used the long-term attractiveness ratings were used for the subsequent analyses and labelled these simply as 'attractiveness'.

9 All linear mixed effect models were run using GAMLj jamovi module (Gallucci, 2021) with REML fit; fixed effect factors were set as 'Simple' contrasts, and covariate scaling was set to 'Centred'.

10 For the individual results, see the Methods and Results of each study in the Supplementary material.

### 2.2.4 Association between attractiveness of different modalities

11 Previous research reported positive associations between the attractiveness of body odour and facial images (Rikowski & Grammer, 1999; Thornhill et al., 2003; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999a). Therefore, we ran one-tailed Pearson's  $r$  bivariate correlations ( $r \geq p$ ) (on aggregated attractiveness ratings per stimulus type and per participant, i.e., the mean rating of a participant was the unit of analysis) between odour and face, and between odour and voice pairs, within each dataset. The resulting correlation coefficients are reported with 95% CI [Lower limit, 1].

### 2.2.5 Power analysis

12 The current study used data from previous studies; therefore, we calculated the sensitivity to detect effects and their critical values for Exact Correlation (Bivariate normal model) using G\*Power (Erdfelder et al., 2009; Faul et al., 2007). The parameters were set to a one-tailed test ( $r \geq p$ ), sample size (number of targets per individual dataset), 5%  $\alpha$  error probability ( $p = 0.05$ ) and 5%  $\beta$  error probability ( $1 - \beta$  error probability = 0.95 Power)<sup>3</sup>. For the sensitivity of individual studies, including observed effects and the power curves plot, see Table S0-4 - Power analysis, and Figure S0-1 *ibid* in the Supplementary material.

## 2.3 Data Availability and Supplemental materials

13 All datasets, tables of descriptive statistics, detailed descriptions of methods and statistical analyses of individual studies, literature review and meta-analysis methods, and jamovi outputs for all performed analyses are all available in the Supplementary material.

## 3 Results

14 We extracted 25 effects for the relationship between body odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness, and 9 effects for body odour attractiveness and vocal attractiveness (Table S0-6). These were based on ten unpublished datasets and four published studies describing the association between body odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness, and between body odour attractiveness and vocal attractiveness (from 92 search results, see Table S0-5). The results reported below are based on 1001 target stimuli and 1350 raters.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

3 We decided to choose a 1:1 ratio of the Type I and II error rates for all performed analyses, as we see committing both errors as of equal significance in this instance.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

### 3.1 Sensitivity to observe meta-analytical effects


With the 25 effects and an average sample size of 46 targets per group in the meta-analysis on the relationship between body odour and facial attractiveness, we reached a sensitivity to observe effects (with 5%  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  error rates) of 0.174, 0.214 and 0.303 for low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively (Figure 1 – left).

In the case of the meta-analysis on the relationship between body odour and vocal attractiveness, with 9 effects and an average sample size of 51 targets per group, we reached a sensitivity to observe effects (with 5%  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  error rates) of 0.276, 0.339 and 0.484 for low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively (Figure 1 – right).

Hence, effects smaller than those estimated by our sensitivity analysis would be observed with statistical power below 95%, following the associated curves in Fig. 1. For example, if the meta-analysis on the relationship between body odour and facial attractiveness would have small heterogeneity and observed effects of 0.2, 0.1, or 0.05, it would have ~99%, ~55%, or ~17% power to observe them, respectively.

Fig. 1. Power curves for the sensitivity to detect meta-analytic effects as a function of heterogeneity. The left plot displays the sensitivity analysis for the meta-analysis of congruence between body odour and facial attractiveness (left panel) and between body odour and vocal attractiveness (right panel). Black solid, medium grey dashed, and light grey dotted curves represent low, moderate, and high heterogeneity. Power curves were generated in MS Excel 365 following (Quintana, 2015; Quintana & Tiebel, 2019) and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.

25



39

### 3.2 Association between body odour and facial attractiveness

All 25 effects were included in the meta-analysis on the association between body odour and facial attractiveness. The observed correlation coefficients ranged from -0.436 to 0.867, with the majority of estimates (68%) above zero. The meta-analytical mean showed a statistically significant, weak positive correlation coefficient of 0.104 [0.034, 0.174],  $Z = 2.93$ ,  $p = 0.003$  (Table 1, Figures 2 and 3). Although Cochran's Q test was not statistically significant, the effect tends to vary across the studies ( $Q_{24} = 35.945$ ,  $p = 0.056$ ), with small heterogeneity (Quintana & Tiebel, 2019) of about 22% attributable to sampling error. Based on the 95% Prediction Interval, the true outcome is expected to be between -0.069 and 0.277.

Results of the Egger's regression suggest no asymmetry in the funnel plot ( $\beta_0 = 0.803$ ,  $p = 0.422$ , Figure 3). For female ( $k = 8$ ) and male ( $k = 17$ ) targets, the meta-analytical means were 0.163 [0.011, 0.314] and 0.086 [0.005, 0.168], respectively (Table S0-7 - Supplementary meta-analyses results).


Fig. 2. Forest plots for congruence meta-analyses. Squares represent weighted mean effects of individual studies, and error bars their 95% confidence intervals. Diamonds represent summary effects, their width the 95% confidence intervals, and dashed error bars their 95% prediction intervals. \*Female raters in fertile,

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65


1  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 \*non-fertile phase of their menstrual cycle, and hormonal contraception users. Summary effects are reported in Fisher's z-transformed correlation coefficients with 95% confidence intervals and in heterogeneous effects also followed with 95% prediction intervals. Forest plots were generated in jamovi, and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.

10 **Congruence between body odour and facial attractiveness**




30 **Congruence between body odour and vocal attractiveness**



40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65


Fig. 3. Funnel plots for congruence meta-analyses. Area outside the contour-enhanced funnels represent  $p$  values  $< 0.01$ , dark grey areas  $p$  values between 0.01 and 0.05, light grey  $p$  values between 0.05 and 0.1, and areas inside the funnel  $p$  values  $> 0.1$ . Full circles illustrate published and empty circles unpublished studies. Dashed lines show summary effect sizes; Y-axis is the standard error of the Fisher's z. Funnel plots were generated in jamovi, and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.



### 3.2.1 Comparison of published and unpublished effects

Considering only the published effects ( $k = 10$ ), the meta-analytical mean showed a positive correlation coefficient of 0.185 [0.041, 0.328] with a moderate level of heterogeneity (50%). Based on a 95% Prediction Interval, the true outcome thus can be expected between -0.156 and 0.526 (Table 2, Figure 4). When only the unpublished effects ( $k = 15$ ) are considered, the meta-analytic mean is 0.052 with 95% CI [-0.024, 0.128] overlapping 0, and 0% heterogeneity (Table 2, Figure 4). When the publication status (published/unpublished) is used as a moderator, its effect is statistically non-significant (estimate = -0.128 [-0.259, 0.004],  $p = 0.057$ , heterogeneity  $I^2 = 10.25\%$ ).

Fig. 4. Comparison of meta-analytic averages between published and unpublished effects. Black circles represent mean effects. Thick error bars their 95% CI and thin error bar 95% PI. Due to observed heterogeneity only in the published effects, the mean effect is accompanied by 95% PI. The plot was generated in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

### 3.2.2 The effect of rating design

For studies (k = 16) using a between-subject rating design (different groups of participants provide attractiveness ratings for different stimulus types), the meta-analytical mean estimate for body odour and facial attractiveness was 0.089 with 95% CI [-0.05, 0.183] overlapping zero ( $I^2 = 38.29\%$ ). Studies (k = 9) using a within-subject rating design (each participant judged both stimulus types) also showed a weak positive association between the modalities, 0.146 [0.036, 0.256] ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ), (Table 3). When the rating design was used as moderator, its effect is statistically non-significant (estimate = -0.034 [-0.201, 0.134],  $p = 0.692$ ,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ), Table 3.

### 3.3 Association between body odour and vocal attractiveness

The association between body odour and vocal attractiveness (k = 9) was weakly positive and statistically significant. The observed correlation coefficients ranged from -0.189 to 0.297, with the majority of estimates (89%) above zero. The meta-analytical mean estimate was 0.098 [0.004, 0.192] with  $Z = 2.038$ ,  $p = 0.041$  (Table 1, Figures 2 and 3). Cochran's Q ( $Q_8 = 4.8$ ,  $p = 0.779$ ) indicated that the effect did not vary between studies, with 0% of the observed effect attributable to sampling error. Considering females and males separately, the meta-analytical means were 0.143 [0.024, 0.263] for female targets (k = 5) and 0.024 [-0.128, 0.177] for male targets (k = 4) (Table S0-7 - Supplementary Meta-analyses results).




Table 1. Meta-analysis and heterogeneity results

Congruence in	k	Estimate (Fisher's z)	95% CI		P	95% PI	
			LL	UL		LL	UL
Body odour and Facial attractiveness	25	0.104	0.034	0.174	0.003	-0.069	0.277
Body odour and Vocal attractiveness	9	0.098	0.004	0.192	0.042		
<b>Heterogeneity Statistics</b>	<b>Tau</b>	<b>Tau<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>I<sup>2</sup> (%)</b>	<b>H<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
Body odour and Facial attractiveness	0.079	0.0062	20.84	1.263	35.696	24	0.059
Body odour and Vocal attractiveness	0	0	0	1	4.8	8	0.779

Table 2. Meta-analysis and heterogeneity results for published and unpublished effects

Origin	k	Estimate (Fisher's z)	95% CI		P	95% PI	
			LL	UL		LL	UL
Published effects	10	0.185	0.041	0.328	0.012	-0.156	0.526
Unpublished effects	15	0.052	-0.024	0.128	0.182		
Moderator		-0.128	-0.259	0.004	0.057		
<b>Heterogeneity Statistics</b>	<b>Tau</b>	<b>Tau<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>I<sup>2</sup> (%)</b>	<b>H<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
Published effects	0.158	0.0249	49.91	1.996	19.813	9	0.019
Unpublished effects	0	0	0	1	11.92	14	0.613
Moderator	0.052	0.0027	10.25	1.114	31.733	24	0.106

Table 3. Meta-analysis and heterogeneity results for between- and within-subject rating design

Rating Design	k	Estimate (Fisher's z)	95% CI		P	95% PI	
			LL	UL		LL	UL
Between-subject	16	0.089	-0.05	0.183	0.062	-0.155	0.334
Within-subject	9	0.146	0.036	0.256	0.009		
Moderator		-0.034	-0.201	0.134	0.692		

Heterogeneity Statistics	Tau	Tau <sup>2</sup>	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	H <sup>2</sup>	Q	df	p
Between-subject	0.115	0.0133	38.29	1.62	29.439	15	0.014
Within-subject	0	0	0	1	5.605	8	0.691
Moderator	0.087	0.0076	24.52	1.325	35.708	24	0.044

### 3.4 Effect size distributions

We constructed effect size distributions (ESD) from all available effect sizes for the association between body odour and facial attractiveness (n = 25) and the association between body odour and vocal attractiveness (n = 9). In both cases, the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile values (average/medium effect size) are ~ 0.1 and equal to the meta-analytic averages (~ 0.1), the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile (small/below average effect size boundary) values are ~0, and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (above average/large effect size boundary) values are ~0.2. The effect size distributions and effect-percentiles for small (25<sup>th</sup>), medium (50<sup>th</sup>, median), and large (75<sup>th</sup>) effect sizes are presented in Fig. 5 and Table 4.

Fig. 5. Raincloud plots for effect size distribution. Density plots show effect sizes distribution, boxplots show median (thick line), 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (interquartile range, box), and minimum and maximum (error bars); jittered dots represent individual effect sizes; dotted vertical line shows effect size average for each meta-analysis (left 0.104, right 0.098). Raincloud plots were generated in JASP (0.16.2) and edited in Adobe Photoshop CC2022.




Table 4. Effect size distributions

Congruence in	Number of effects	Percentiles		
		25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>
Body odour and Facial attractiveness	25	-0.013	0.1	0.206
Body odour and Vocal attractiveness	9	0.02	0.116	0.178

## 4 Discussion

The results of the current study indicate that, although the association between body odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness is positive, the summary effect is relatively small (with  $r \sim 0.1$ , and this is further supported by the ESD (Fig. 5). We observed similar patterns and magnitudes of effects for female and male targets and also for the odour-voice attractiveness association. We suggest that body odour may provide distinct and non-redundant information about an individual's mating-related qualities compared to that available within either facial or vocal cues. Our results are in line with the *multiple messages* hypothesis but seem to provide little support for the *backup signals* hypothesis. Moreover, they correspond reported (Badyaev et al., 1998; Candolin, 2003; Kraak, 1999). Thus, we suggest that body odour attractiveness and facial and vocal attractiveness may provide distinct diverse and non-redundant information about cues to an individual's mating related qualities compared to that available within either facial or vocal cues. Thus, in terms of  $G$ , concerning perceived attractiveness, body odour may provide different and non-redundant cues to an individual's mating-related qualities compared to cues communicated through the face and voice.

These findings of the present study are in contrast with those of Rikowski and Grammer (1999), who observed a strong positive correlation ( $r_{19} = 0.7$ ) between facial and body odour attractiveness, but concur with more recent studies (Roth et al., 2021) that reporting a weak small association between body odour, facial, and vocal attractiveness. Similarly, our findings are in line with those of two studies (Mahmut & Stevenson, 2019; Roth et al., 2021), that which did not meet our the present meta-analysis's formal inclusion criteria due to their non-parametric, non-frequentist data analysis (Table S0-5). In a sample of 82 female raters and 91 male donors, Mahmut and Stevenson (2019) reported Spearman's  $\rho = 0.3$  for the association between body odour and facial sexiness. Roth et al. (2021), using Bayesian analysis with a sample of 70 participants who served as both donors and raters, Roth et al. (2021), reported that body odour, facial, and vocal attractiveness were positively correlated but with small effect sizes. It is worth noting, however, that the authors discuss their findings of small and positive effects in favour of the *backup signals* hypothesis; we would disagree with this interpretation. However, the shared variability of attractiveness ratings resulting from the summary effects across the two pairs of modalities in the present meta-analyses was less than 1%, in our view suggesting minimal (if any) redundancy in information transferred through these modalities.

In studies concerning an association between facial and vocal attractiveness, the current evidence shows inconsistent results, ranging from strong positive correlations in women only (Abend et al., 2015; Collins & Missing, 2003; Wheatley et al., 2014) to weak (Zuckerman et al., 1995) or no significant associations (Zäske et al., 2020). Between the two, this range suggests that the overall pattern of relationships might be similar to that found in the present study between odour and these other modalities. However, there is currently no systematic investigation or meta-analysis available for the association between facial and vocal attractiveness to our best knowledge.

### 4.1 Notes on the meta-analyses

Although Figure 4 shows a stronger (over 3×) positive mean effect for published effects than unpublished ones. However, the meta-analytical mean of unpublished effects provides a more less-precise estimate than unpublished effects. The mean meta-analytic effect of unpublished effects (and over half of its 95%CI) falls within the 95% CI (and entirely within 95%PI) of the published effects. If the present study were based only on published evidence,

Formatted: Not Highlight



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 it would thus report a stronger and less precise estimate of the meta-analytic effect for  
8 associations between assessments of body odour and facial attractiveness. Moreover, a  
9 meta-analysis of body odour and vocal attractiveness would not be possible as the literature  
10 search identified only a single study fulfilling the inclusion criteria (Roth et al., 2021 discussed  
11 above). This highlights the importance of considering unpublished data in quantifying effects  
12 through systematic reviews and evidence synthesis.

13 ~~There are some limitations to the present study. Although~~ ~~Though~~ ~~Although~~ we generally  
14 observed low levels of heterogeneity in our meta-analyses, they rely on a relatively small  
15 number of effects ~~and reducing~~ the sensitivity of our analyses is correspondingly low. In  
16 addition, the statistical power in many of the available studies is low, due to a relatively small  
17 number of stimuli (Table S0-4). The average number of raters per stimuli (mostly body odour  
18 stimuli) often resulted in wider corridors of rating stability (Hehman et al., 2018b) ~~and~~, thus  
19 less precise estimates of mean ratings (Table S0-3). This mainly arises from logistical  
20 limitations related to procedures employed in body odour sampling and rating. In contrast to  
21 facial images and vocal recordings, body odour stimuli can be used only a limited number of  
22 times due to microbial transformation and signal degradation (Lenochová et al., 2009).  
23 ~~Furthermore~~ Also, the number of odour stimuli that one rater can assess within a reasonable  
24 time is limited by olfactory adaptation (Köster & de Wijk, 1991). These issues hinder the  
25 accuracy of the present findings and represent challenges for further research.

26 In addition to the meta-analytical results, the current article presents a systematic overview of  
27 studies conducted over the last two decades, including data collection methods, sample  
28 sizes, populations, and observed ratings (Tables S0-6). We also included observed effect  
29 size distributions (e.g., ~~effect size distributions~~ ESD for individual differences, see Gignac &  
30 Szodorai, 2016; for distributions in ESD for social psychology, see Lovakov & Agadullina,  
31 2021) showing that commonly used correlation thresholds overestimate effect sizes  
32 observed in studies, where average and larger-than-average effects (50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile,  
33 respectively) are 'only' ~0.1 and ~0.2. Based on the unpublished datasets, where more  
34 detailed insight can be provided, the average number of stimuli used in this type of research  
35 is ~46 giving us sensitivity to observe correlations  $\geq 0.49$  (with 0.05  $p_{\text{two-tailed}}$  and 95% power,  
36  $\geq 0.39$  with 80% power). On average, in these studies, body odour, and facial and vocal  
37 stimuli are rated ~~for~~ attractiveness by ~25, 31, ~~and~~ 32 raters, respectively, though based  
38 on our corridor of stability analysis samples  $\geq 35$  seem to be needed for more precise  
39 estimates. Overall, all three stimulus types seem to be rated with good reliability (mean  
40 ICC2k ~0.8), and we found no differences in reliability between stimulus types. See Tables  
41 S0-1, 2, 3 and 4, and ICC comparison in the Supplemental materials for further extended  
42 details. Future research investigating the association in attractiveness rating between  
43 modalities could benefit from this systematic overview, including effect size distributions  
44 ~~ESDs~~, to plan and convey magnitudes of observed effects in comparison to the body of up-  
45 to-date literature.

#### 4.24.1 Alternative reasons for the observed effects

46 It is conceivable that the associations between individual modalities are underestimated  
47 because (a) studies use 'snapshots' of an individual which might provide only a rough  
48 estimate of his or her mating-related qualities, and (b) these snapshots vary in duration  
49 across modalities. Odour stimuli are typically collected over a longer period (12-24h) and  
50 may, therefore, provide a more reliable quality estimate. In contrast, vocal stimuli often last  
51 less than 1 min. and visual images capture less than a second. Previous studies testing the  
52 association between body odour attractiveness and physical attractiveness assessed from  
53 videos found a stronger correlation ( $r = 0.32$ ) compared to the association between body  
54 odour attractiveness and facial attractiveness ( $r = -0.08$ ) (Roberts et al., 2011). Thus,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 sampling time might influence the reliability of mating-related quality estimates. A reviewer  
8 also ~~One may further argued~~ that the reason for the weak correlation between odour  
9 attractiveness and the two other modalities could be ~~is the~~ higher variability in ratings of body  
10 odour, perhaps because it is considered that olfactory judgments are either more difficult or  
11 more subjective ratings. However, our ICC analysis shows that the level of agreement is  
12 comparable across the three modalities.

13 ~~The~~ Similarly, the weak correlations that we observe between attractiveness assessments of  
14 different stimulus types ~~observed here might also result~~ from experimental (laboratory-based)  
15 settings and some variations in protocols. These include, for example, control over facial  
16 expressions during image acquisition, the volume of voice recordings, and dietary restrictions  
17 in body odour samplings. Al ~~though~~ methodologically challenging, the use of ~~using~~ more  
18 naturalistic stimuli with facial expressiveness, the prosody of speech and natural variation in  
19 body odour (S. Roberts et al., 2022) may provide additional insight into the patterns of  
20 associations and congruence across sensory modalities investigated here.

21 Further, E ~~earlier~~ studies reporting positive associations between attractiveness and putative  
22 markers of mating-related quality had failed to replicate, especially when they were based on  
23 small samples. Many studies that were included in the current analysis had different groups  
24 of participants providing attractiveness ratings of the stimulus types (between-subject rating  
25 design). A high inter-individual variation in attractiveness ratings in some modalities would  
26 lead to a weak correlation between the modalities because the target is rated by some  
27 people in one modality and by other people in the other. Studies using a design where each  
28 participant judged all stimulus types (within-subject rating design) also tend to show a weak  
29 correlation between the modalities, meaning that weak correlations in individual studies  
30 cannot be solely due to study design.

31 An individual's biological mating-related quality may be perceived more accurately by  
32 combining cues from different modalities that independently correlate with mate  
33 preferences ~~mating-related quality measures~~. However, most of ~~the~~ studies on physical  
34 attractiveness examine the influence of individual modalities separately, a design that lacks  
35 ecological validity because, in everyday life, we perceive others through multiple senses  
36 simultaneously (Groyecka et al., 2017). Similarly, the present meta-analysis is based on  
37 studies investigating several modalities separately, not on multimodal perception, which is a  
38 result of simultaneous perception across different sensory modalities. The resulting  
39 perception can differ qualitatively from the sum of the properties of its components and  
40 convey a unique message, or one modality can affect information transmitted by the other  
41 modalities, being different from the 'backup' and 'multiple messages' concepts (Halfwerk et  
42 al., 2019; Mitoyen et al., 2019). How information based on different modalities contributes to  
43 overall attractiveness judgements is poorly understood (e.g., Ferdenzi et al., 2016). Current  
44 research into the integration of human mate preferences indicates that they are best  
45 described by the Euclidean model (Conroy-Beam et al., 2019). Whether a similar pattern of  
46 integration can be expected in the case of physical attractiveness or whether it would follow  
47 another form, as explained by additive or threshold models, remains to be investigated  
48 (Csajbók et al., n.d.2022; Havlíček et al., n.d.2022).

#### 4.34.2 Theoretical implications

49 It has been proposed that attractiveness reflects an individual's mating-related qualities (e.g.,  
50 in terms of health and fertility). Perceived facial attractiveness is influenced by several  
51 features, including symmetry, prototypicality, sexual dimorphism, adiposity, and skin  
52 condition. For instance, prototypicality is thought to be a marker of heterozygosity, symmetry  
53 a marker of developmental stability, while sexual dimorphism is a marker of sex hormone  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 levels, and skin quality is a marker of health status (for review, see Stephen & Luoto, 2021).  
8 Similarly, it has been suggested that body odour may also provide information about  
9 heterozygosity, developmental stability, sex hormones and health (for review, see Havlíček  
10 et al., 2017). Hence, one might expect at least moderate associations between the  
11 attractiveness of these modalities, but. However, the current study we found only weak  
12 associations between these modalities. Several associations between attractiveness and the  
13 proposed underlying qualities were recently revisited (Stephen & Luoto, 2021) and others are  
14 still debated. These include links between hormonal profiles and facial attractiveness (Jones  
15 et al., 2021) or between body odour attractiveness and MHC heterozygosity (Havlíček et al.,  
16 2020).

17 ~~Our results suggest that~~ Visual, olfactory, and acoustic modalities may provide unique  
18 (and non-redundant) information about an individual's mating-related quality. Our results are  
19 in line with the *multiple messages* hypothesis but seem to provide little support for the  
20 *backup signals* hypothesis. Moreover, they correspond with the majority of animal studies  
21 that have reported multiple traits to be unrelated, suggesting that backup signals are less  
22 common than multiple messages (Badyaev et al., 1998; Candolin, 2003; Kraak, 1999). We  
23 speculate that facial appearance primarily provides cues to more stable characteristics such  
24 as the development of hormone-related secondary sexual characteristics and maturation  
25 (Marečková et al., 2011; Whitehouse et al., 2015). In contrast, body odour may provide cues  
26 to more variable characteristics, such as current health (Olsson et al., 2014; Sarolidou et al.,  
27 2020) and fertility status (Gildersleeve et al., 2012; Havlíček et al., 2006). These are  
28 provocative and open questions that require in-depth investigations.

29 In conclusion, the present study found weak congruence between attractiveness  
30 assessments of human body odours and those of faces or voices. These results provide little  
31 support for the *backup signals* hypothesis in explaining the use of multiple modalities in  
32 attractiveness assessments, but favour the *multiple messages* hypothesis, suggesting that  
33 body odour provides information about mating-related quality different from that of faces or  
34 voices.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 5 Author Contributions

**Conceptualization:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová and Jan Havlíček.

**Data Curation:** Vít Třebický.

**Formal Analysis:** Vít Třebický.

**Funding Acquisition:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová and Jan Havlíček.

**Investigation:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Methodology:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Project Administration:** Vít Třebický.

**Resources:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Supervision:** S. C. Roberts and Jan Havlíček.

**Validation:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

**Visualization:** Vít Třebický.

**Writing - Original Draft Preparation:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová and Jan Havlíček.

**Writing - Review & Editing:** Vít Třebický, Jitka Třebická Fialová, Camille Ferdenzi, Sylvain Delplanque, Dagmar Schwambergová, Žaneta Pátková, Lucie Kuncová, Zuzana Štěrbová, Tamsin Saxton, S. C. Roberts, Susanne Röder, Bernhard Fink, and Jan Havlíček.

The List of authors' contributions was generated using *Tenzing* (Holcombe et al., 2020); apart from the first and last author, all co-authors are listed alphabetically.

## 6 Declaration of competing interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest concerning the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## 7 Ethics

All procedures within the individual studies were carried out following the Declaration of Helsinki, and Institutional Review Boards approved each study. Individual approvals can be found in the Supplemental Materials.

## 8 Acknowledgements

We thank Radim Kuba, Tereza Nevolová, David Stella, Pavel Šebesta, and other members of the Human Ethology group ([www.etologiecloveka.cz](http://www.etologiecloveka.cz)) for their help with data collection. We also express our gratitude to all our volunteers for their participation.

## 9 Funding

This study was supported by the Czech Science Foundation GAČR P407/19/11822S, the Charles University Research Centres UNCE/HUM/025 (UNCE 204056), and the Charles university grant agency GA UK No 1374319.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **10 References**

- 9 Abend, P., Pflüger, L. S., Koppensteiner, M., Coquerelle, M., & Grammer, K. (2015). The  
10 sound of female shape: A redundant signal of vocal and facial attractiveness.  
11 *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 36(3), 174–181.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2014.10.004>  
13  
14 Aglioti, S. M., & Pazzaglia, M. (2011). Sounds and scents in (social) action. *Trends in*  
15 *Cognitive Sciences*, 15(2), 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.12.003>  
16  
17 Arakawa, H., Blanchard, D. C., Arakawa, K., Dunlap, C., & Blanchard, R. J. (2008). Scent  
18 marking behavior as an odorant communication in mice. *Neuroscience &*  
19 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 32(7), 1236–1248.  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.05.012>  
21  
22 Badyaev, A. V., Etges, W. J., Faust, J. D., & Martin, T. E. (1998). Fitness correlates of spur  
23 length and spur asymmetry in male wild turkeys. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 67(6),  
24 845–852. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2656.1998.6760845.x>  
25  
26 Brown, T. A. (2006). Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research. In *Confirmatory factor*  
27 *analysis for applied research*. The Guilford Press.  
28  
29 Brydges, C. R. (2019). Effect Size Guidelines, Sample Size Calculations, and Statistical  
30 Power in Gerontology. *Innovation in Aging*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igz036>  
31  
32 Candolin, U. (2003). The use of multiple cues in mate choice. *Biological Reviews*, 78(4),  
33 575–595. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793103006158>  
34  
35 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence  
36 Erlbaum Associates.  
37  
38 Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159.  
39 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>  
40  
41 Collins, S. A., & Missing, C. (2003). Vocal and visual attractiveness are related in women.  
42 *Animal Behaviour*, 65(5), 997–1004. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2123>  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Colyott, K., Odu, C., & Gleason, J. M. (2016). Dissection of signalling modalities and  
8 courtship timing reveals a novel signal in *Drosophila saltans* courtship. *Animal*  
9 *Behaviour*, *120*, 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.07.015>
- 10  
11  
12 Conroy-Beam, D., Buss, D. M., Asao, K., Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., Aavik, T., Akello,  
13 G., Alhababha, M. M., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Atama, C. S., Duyar, D. A.,  
14 Ayebare, R., Batres, C., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B., Boussena, M., ...  
15 Zupančič, M. (2019). Contrasting Computational Models of Mate Preference  
16 Integration Across 45 Countries. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 16885.  
17 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-52748-8>
- 18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Csajbók, Z., Bérkics, M., & Havlíček, J. (n.d.). Meeting minimum mate preference thresholds  
23 can be more important than the overall score. *Personality and Individual Differences*.  
24  
25  
26 Cunningham, M. R., Barbee, A. P., & Pike, C. L. (1990). What do women want? Facialmetric  
27 assessment of multiple motives in the perception of male facial physical  
28 attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(1), 61–72.  
29 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.1.61>
- 30  
31  
32 Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using  
33 G\*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research*  
34 *Methods*, *41*(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- 35  
36  
37 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical  
38 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*  
39 *Research Methods*, *39*(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- 40  
41  
42 Ferdenzi, C., Delplanque, S., Atanassova, R., & Sander, D. (2016). Androstadienone's  
43 influence on the perception of facial and vocal attractiveness is not sex specific.  
44 *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *66*, 166–175.  
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2016.01.016>
- 46  
47  
48  
49 Fialová, J., Třebický, V., Kuba, R., Stella, D., Binter, J., & Havlíček, J. (2020). Losing stinks!  
50 The effect of competition outcome on body odour quality. *Philosophical Transactions*  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 375(1800), 20190267.

8  
9 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0267>

10 Gallucci, M. (2021). *GAMLj: General analyses for linear models (2.3.0)*.

11  
12 Gangestad, S. W., Haselton, M. G., Welling, L. L. M. M., Gildersleeve, K., Pillsworth, E. G.,

13  
14 Burriss, R. P., Larson, C. M., & Puts, D. A. (2015). How Valid are Assessments of  
15 Conception Probability in Ovulatory Cycle Research? Evaluations,

16  
17 Recommendations, and Theoretical Implications. *Evolution and Human Behavior*,  
18 17(October), 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.09.001>

19  
20 Gignac, G. E., & Szodorai, E. T. (2016). Effect size guidelines for individual differences  
21 researchers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 74–78.

22  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.069>

24  
25 Gildersleeve, K. A., Haselton, M. G., Larson, C. M., & Pillsworth, E. G. (2012). Body odor  
26 attractiveness as a cue of impending ovulation in women: Evidence from a study  
27 using hormone-confirmed ovulation. *Hormones and Behavior*, 61(2), 157–166.

28  
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.11.005>

30  
31 Girard, M. B., Elias, D. O., & Kasumovic, M. M. (2015). Female preference for multi-modal  
32 courtship: Multiple signals are important for male mating success in peacock spiders.  
33  
34 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1820), 20152222.

35  
36 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2222>

37  
38 Gosling, L. M., & Roberts, S. C. (2001). Scent-marking by male mammals: Cheat-proof  
39 signals to competitors and mates. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 30(FEBRUARY  
40 2001), 169–217. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-3454\(01\)80007-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-3454(01)80007-3)

41  
42 Grammer, K., Fink, B., Jütte, A., Ronzal, G., & Thornhill, R. (2001). Female faces and  
43 bodies: N-dimensional feature space and attractiveness. In G. Rhodes & L. Zebrowitz  
44 (Eds.), *Advances in visual cognition* (pp. 91–125). Ablex Publishing.

45  
46 Grammer, K., Fink, B., Miller, A. P., & Thornhill, R. (2003). Darwinian aesthetics: Sexual  
47 selection and the biology of beauty. *Biological Reviews*, 78(3), 385–407.

48  
49 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793102006085>  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Groyecka, A., Pisanski, K., Sorokowska, A., Havlíček, J., Karwowski, M., Puts, D. A.,  
8  
9 Roberts, S. C., Sorokowski, P., & Craig Roberts, S. (2017). Attractiveness Is  
10  
11 Multimodal: Beauty Is Also in the Nose and Ear of the Beholder. *Frontiers in*  
12  
13 *Psychology*, 8(May), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00778>
- 14 Hamilton, W. K. (2021). *MAJOR - Meta-Analysis for JAMOVI* (1.1.1).
- 15  
16 Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. A., & Ebert, D. D. (2021a). Doing Meta-Analysis with  
17  
18 R. *Doing Meta-Analysis with R*, June, 2020–2023.  
19  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003107347>
- 21  
22 Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. A., & Ebert, D. D. (2021b). *Doing Meta-Analysis with*  
23  
24 *R: A Hands-On Guide*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
- 25  
26 Havlíček, J., Dvorakova, R., Bartos, L., & Flegr, J. (2006). Non-Advertized does not Mean  
27  
28 Concealed: Body Odour Changes across the Human Menstrual Cycle. *Ethology*,  
29  
30 112(1), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2006.01125.x>
- 31  
32 Havlíček, J., Fialová, J., & Roberts, S. C. (2017). Individual Variation in Body Odor. *Springer*  
33  
34 *Handbook of Odor*, 125–126. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26932-0\\_50](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26932-0_50)
- 35  
36 Havlíček, J., & Roberts, S. C. (n.d.). Menstrual cycle variation in women's mating  
37  
38 psychology: Empirical evidence and theoretical considerations. In J. K. Mogilski & T.  
39  
40 K. Shackelford (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology and*  
41  
42 *Romantic Relationships*. Oxford University Press.
- 43  
44 Havlíček, J., Saxton, T. K., Roberts, S. C., Jozífková, E., Lhota, S., Valentová, J., & Flegr, J.  
45  
46 (2008). He sees, she smells? Male and female reports of sensory reliance in mate  
47  
48 choice and non-mate choice contexts. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45(6),  
49  
50 565–570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.06.019>
- 51  
52 Havlíček, J., Štěrbová, Z., & Csajbók, Z. (n.d.). Human mate choice. In E. Ridley, A., &  
53  
54 d'Etorre, P., Freeberg, T.M. (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Comparative Psychology*.  
55  
56 Routledge.
- 57  
58 Havlíček, J., Winternitz, J., & Roberts, S. C. (2020). Major histocompatibility complex-  
59  
60 associated odour preferences and human mate choice: Near and far horizons.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 375(1800),  
8  
9 20190260. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0260>

10  
11 Hehman, E., Xie, S., Ofofu, E., & Nespoli, G. (2018a). Assessing the point at which  
12 averages are stable: A tool illustrated in the context of person perception. *PsyArXiv*  
13 *Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/2n6jq>

14  
15 Hehman, E., Xie, S., Ofofu, E., & Nespoli, G. (2018b). Assessing the point at which  
16 averages are stable: A tool illustrated in the context of person perception. *PsyArXiv*  
17 *Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/2n6jq>

18  
19 Herz, R. S., & Inzlicht, M. (2002). Sex differences in response to physical and social factors  
20 involved in human mate selection. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 23(5), 359–364.  
21  
22 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(02\)00095-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(02)00095-8)

23  
24 Higgins, J. P. T., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J., & Altman, D. G. (2003). Measuring  
25 inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*, 327(7414), 557–560.  
26  
27 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557>

28  
29 Higham, J. P., & Hebets, E. A. (2013). An introduction to multimodal communication.  
30  
31 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 67(9), 1381–1388.  
32  
33 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-013-1590-x>

34  
35 Hill, A. K., & Puts, D. A. (2016). Vocal Attractiveness. In T. K. Shackelford & V. A. Weekes-  
36 Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science* (Issue  
37 February, pp. 1–3). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16999-6>

38  
39 Holcombe, A. O., Kovacs, M., Aust, F., & Aczel, B. (2020). Documenting contributions to  
40 scholarly articles using CRediT and tenzing. *PLoS ONE*, 15(12 12), 1–11.  
41  
42 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244611>

43  
44 Jones, B. C., Jones, A. L., Shiramizu, V., & Anderson, C. (2021). What Does Women ' s  
45 Facial Attractiveness Signal? Implications for an Evolutionary Perspective on  
46 Appearance Enhancement. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 0123456789.  
47  
48 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-01955-4>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 15(2), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>

Köster, E. P., & de Wijk, R. A. (1991). Olfactory Adaptation. In *The Human Sense of Smell* (pp. 199–215). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-76223-9\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-76223-9_10)

Kraak, S. B. M. (1999). Sexual selection in sticklebacks in the field: Correlates of reproductive, mating, and paternal success. *Behavioral Ecology*, 10(6), 696–706. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/10.6.696>

Lenochová, P., Roberts, S. C., & Havlíček, J. (2009). Methods of human body odor sampling: The effect of freezing. *Chemical Senses*, 34(2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjn067>

Lovakov, A., & Agadullina, E. R. (2021). Empirically derived guidelines for effect size interpretation in social psychology. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 51(3), 485–504. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2752>

Mahmut, M. K., & Stevenson, R. J. (2019). Do Single Men Smell and Look Different to Partnered Men? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(FEB), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00261>

Marečková, K., Weinbrand, Z., Chakravarty, M. M., Lawrence, C., Aleong, R., Leonard, G., Perron, M., Pike, G. B., Richer, L., Veillette, S., Pausova, Z., & Paus, T. (2011). Testosterone-mediated sex differences in the face shape during adolescence: Subjective impressions and objective features. *Hormones and Behavior*, 60(5), 681–690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.09.004>

Moller, A. P., & Pomiankowski, A. (1993). Why have birds got multiple sexual ornaments? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 32(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00173774>

Nordahl-Hansen, A., Cogo-Moreira, H., Panjeh, S., & Quintana, D. S. (2022). Redefining Effect Size Interpretations for Psychotherapy RCTs in Depression. *OSF Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/erhmw>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Olsson, M. J., Lundström, J. N., Kimball, B. A., Gordon, A. R., Karshikoff, B., Hosseini, N., Sorjonen, K., Olgart Höglund, C., Solares, C., Soop, A., Axelsson, J., & Lekander, M. (2014). The Scent of Disease. *Psychological Science*, 25(3), 817–823. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613515681>

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *The BMJ*, 372. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>

Pisanski, K., Feinberg, D., Oleszkiewicz, A., & Sorokowska, A. (2017). Voice cues are used in a similar way by blind and sighted adults when assessing women's body size. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-10470-3>

Quintana, D. S. (2015). From pre-registration to publication: A non-technical primer for conducting a meta-analysis to synthesize correlational data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01549>

Quintana, D. S. (2017). Statistical considerations for reporting and planning heart rate variability case-control studies. *Psychophysiology*, 54(3), 344–349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12798>

Quintana, D. S., & Tiebel, J. (2019). *How to calculate statistical power for your meta-analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/5C7UZ>

R Core Team. (2021). *RStudio: Integrated development for R*.

R Core Team, & Team, R. C. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Rhodes, G. (2006). The evolutionary psychology of facial beauty. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 199–226. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190208>

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Rikowski, A., & Grammer, K. (1999). Human body odour, symmetry and attractiveness.  
8  
9 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 266(1422), 869–874.  
10 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1999.0717>  
11
- 12 Roberts, S. C., Kraleovich, A., Ferdenzi, C., Saxton, T. K., Jones, B. C., DeBruine, L. M.,  
13 Littleb, A. C., & Havlíček, J. (2011). Body Odor Quality Predicts Behavioral  
14 Attractiveness in Humans. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40(6), 1111–1117.  
15 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-011-9803-8>  
16
- 17 Roberts, S., Třebická Fialová, J., Sorokowska, A., Langford, B., Sorokowski, P., Třebický, V.,  
18 & Havlíček, J. (2022). Emotional expression in human odour. *Evolutionary Human*  
19 *Sciences*, 4, 1–22.  
20
- 21 Röder, S., Fink, B., & Jones, B. C. (2013). Facial, olfactory, and vocal cues to female  
22 reproductive value. *Evolutionary Psychology: An International Journal of Evolutionary*  
23 *Approaches to Psychology and Behavior*, 11(2), 392–404. [https://doi.org/epjournal-](https://doi.org/epjournal-2875)  
24 2875 [pii]  
25
- 26 Roth, T. S., Samara, I., & Kret, M. E. (2021). Multimodal mate choice: Exploring the effects of  
27 sight, sound, and scent on partner choice in a speed-date paradigm. *Evolution and*  
28 *Human Behavior*, xxxx. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2021.04.004>  
29
- 30 Sarolidou, G., Axelsson, J., Kimball, B. A., Sundelin, T., Regenbogen, C., Lundström, J. N.,  
31 Lekander, M., & Olsson, M. J. (2020). People expressing olfactory and visual cues of  
32 disease are less liked. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
33 *Sciences*, 375(1800), 20190272. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0272>  
34
- 35 Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations stabilize?  
36 *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(5), 609–612.  
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.05.009>  
38
- 39 Stephen, I. D., & Luoto, S. (2021). Physical Cues of Partner Quality. In J. K. Mogilski & T. K.  
40 Shackelford (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology and Romantic*  
41 *Relationships*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/pk84y>  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Sterne, J. A. C., Sutton, A. J., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Terrin, N., Jones, D. R., Lau, J., Carpenter, J., Rucker, G., Harbord, R. M., Schmid, C. H., Tetzlaff, J., Deeks, J. J., Peters, J., Macaskill, P., Schwarzer, G., Duval, S., Altman, D. G., Moher, D., & Higgins, J. P. T. (2011). Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*, *343*(jul22 1), d4002–d4002. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4002>

The jamovi project. (2021). *Jamovi (Version 2.0.0)* (<https://www.jamovi.org>).

Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999a). The Scent of Symmetry: A Human Sex Pheromone that Signals Fitness? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *20*(3), 175–201.

Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999b). Facial attractiveness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *3*(12), 452–460. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(99\)01403-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(99)01403-5)

Thornhill, R., Gangestad, S. W., Miller, R., Scheyd, G., McCollough, J. K., & Franklin, M. (2003). Major histocompatibility complex genes, symmetry, and body scent attractiveness in men and women. *Behavioral Ecology*, *14*(5), 668–678. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arg043>

Thornhill, R., & Grammer, K. (1999). The body and face of woman: One ornament that signals quality? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *20*(2), 105–120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(98\)00044-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(98)00044-0)

Walter, K. V., Conroy-Beam, D., Buss, D. M., Asao, K., Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., Aavik, T., Akello, G., Alhabahba, M. M., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Atama, C. S., Atamtürk Duyar, D., Ayebare, R., Batres, C., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B., ... Zupančič, M. (2020). Sex Differences in Mate Preferences Across 45 Countries: A Large-Scale Replication. *Psychological Science*, *31*(4), 408–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620904154>

Wheatley, J. R., Apicella, C. a., Burriss, R. P., Cárdenas, R. a., Bailey, D. H., Welling, L. L. M., & Puts, D. A. (2014). Women's faces and voices are cues to reproductive potential in industrial and forager societies. *Evolution and Human Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2014.02.006>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Whitehouse, A. J. O., Gilani, S. Z., Shafait, F., Mian, A., Tan, D. W., Maybery, M. T., Keelan, J. A., Hart, R., Handelsman, D. J., Goonawardene, M., & Eastwood, P. (2015). Prenatal testosterone exposure is related to sexually dimorphic facial morphology in adulthood. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1816), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1351>

Zäske, R., Skuk, V. G., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2020). Attractiveness and distinctiveness between speakers' voices in naturalistic speech and their faces are uncorrelated. *Royal Society Open Science*, 7(12), 201244. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201244>

Zuckerman, M., Miyake, K., & Elkin, C. S. (1995). Effects of Attractiveness and Maturity of Face and Voice on Interpersonal Impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 29(2), 253–272. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1995.1015>

