

# LucÃ-a AntÃºnez

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8376937/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

69  
papers

2,958  
citations

136950

32  
h-index

175258

52  
g-index

70  
all docs

70  
docs citations

70  
times ranked

1764  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Age, time orientation and risk perception are major determinants of discretionary salt usage. <i>Appetite</i> , 2022, 171, 105924.	3.7	4
2	Mental associations with salt among Uruguayan consumers. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2022, 102, 104684.	4.6	1
3	Immediate effects of the implementation of nutritional warnings in Uruguay: awareness, self-reported use and increased understanding. <i>Public Health Nutrition</i> , 2021, 24, 364-375.	2.2	31
4	Healthy snacking in the school environment: Exploring children and mothers' perspective using projective techniques. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2021, 90, 104173.	4.6	7
5	Analysis of the policy process for the implementation of nutritional warning labels in Uruguay. <i>Public Health Nutrition</i> , 2021, 24, 5927-5940.	2.2	19
6	Health gains through loss frames: Testing the effectiveness of message framing on citizens' use of nutritional warnings. <i>Appetite</i> , 2021, 166, 105469.	3.7	15
7	Time orientation and risk perception moderate the influence of sodium warnings on food choice: Implications for the design of communication campaigns. <i>Appetite</i> , 2020, 147, 104562.	3.7	20
8	Sick, salient and full of salt, sugar and fat: Understanding the impact of nutritional warnings on consumers' associations through the salience bias. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2020, 86, 103991.	4.6	30
9	Can sodium warnings modify preferences? A case study with white bread. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2020, 134, 109239.	6.2	5
10	Sensory product characterisations based on check-all-that-apply questions: Further insights on how the static (CATA) and dynamic (TCATA) approaches perform. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2019, 125, 108510.	6.2	17
11	Consumers' heterogeneity towards salt reduction: Insights from a case study with white rice. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2019, 121, 48-56.	6.2	15
12	Visual attention to rate-all-that-apply (RATA) questions: A case study with apple images as food stimuli. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2019, 72, 136-142.	4.6	11
13	Astringency evaluation of Tannat wines: Comparison of assessments from trained assessors and experts. <i>Journal of Sensory Studies</i> , 2018, 33, e12330.	1.6	8
14	Comparative performance of three interpretative front-of-pack nutrition labelling schemes: Insights for policy making. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2018, 68, 215-225.	4.6	81
15	Product reformulation in the context of nutritional warning labels: Exploration of consumer preferences towards food concepts in three food categories. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2018, 107, 669-674.	6.2	36
16	What is dominance? An exploration of the concept in TDS tests with trained assessors and consumers. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2018, 64, 72-81.	4.6	42
17	Nutritional warnings and product substitution or abandonment: Policy implications derived from a repeated purchase simulation. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2018, 65, 40-48.	4.6	55
18	Quality perceptions regarding external appearance of apples: Insights from experts and consumers in four countries. <i>Postharvest Biology and Technology</i> , 2018, 146, 99-107.	6.0	55

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	A citizen perspective on nutritional warnings as front-of-pack labels: insights for the design of accompanying policy measures. <i>Public Health Nutrition</i> , 2018, 21, 3450-3461.	2.2	25
20	Buy, eat or discard? A case study with apples to explore fruit quality perception and food waste. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2018, 69, 10-20.	4.6	75
21	A comparison of RATA questions with descriptive analysis: Insights from three studies with complex/similar products. <i>Journal of Sensory Studies</i> , 2018, 33, e12458.	1.6	23
22	Partial replacement of NaCl with KCl in bread: Effect on sensory characteristics and consumer perception. <i>Journal of Sensory Studies</i> , 2018, 33, e12441.	1.6	20
23	Relationship between astringency and phenolic composition of commercial Uruguayan Tannat wines: Application of boosted regression trees. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2018, 112, 25-37.	6.2	25
24	Identification of drivers of (dis)liking based on dynamic sensory profiles: Comparison of Temporal Dominance of Sensations and Temporal Check-all-that-apply. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2017, 92, 79-87.	6.2	49
25	Children and adolescents' attitudes towards sugar reduction in dairy products. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2017, 94, 108-114.	6.2	20
26	Comparison of static and dynamic sensory product characterizations based on check-all-that-apply questions with consumers. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2017, 97, 215-222.	6.2	25
27	Influence of consumers' cognitive style on results from projective mapping. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2017, 99, 693-701.	6.2	17
28	Aroma-related cross-modal interactions for sugar reduction in milk desserts: Influence on consumer perception. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2017, 97, 45-50.	6.2	59
29	Influence of Label Design on Children's Perception of 2 Snack Foods. <i>Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior</i> , 2017, 49, 211-217.e1.	0.7	26
30	Nutrition warnings as front-of-pack labels: influence of design features on healthfulness perception and attentional capture. <i>Public Health Nutrition</i> , 2017, 20, 3360-3371.	2.2	60
31	Sensory characterization of the astringency of commercial Uruguayan Tannat wines. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2017, 102, 425-434.	6.2	27
32	Consumer perception of salt-reduced breads: Comparison of single and two-bites evaluation. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2017, 100, 254-259.	6.2	21
33	Warnings as a directive front-of-pack nutrition labelling scheme: comparison with the Guideline Daily Amount and traffic-light systems. <i>Public Health Nutrition</i> , 2017, 20, 2308-2317.	2.2	124
34	Hedonic product optimisation: CATA questions as alternatives to JAR scales. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2017, 55, 67-78.	4.6	39
35	Comparison of consumer-based methodologies for sensory characterization: Case study with four sample sets of powdered drinks. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2017, 56, 149-163.	4.6	56
36	Evaluation of Palate Cleansers for Astringency Evaluation of Red Wines. <i>Journal of Sensory Studies</i> , 2016, 31, 93-100.	1.6	15

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Product spaces derived from projective mapping and CATA questions: Influence of replicated assessments and increased number of study participants. <i>Journal of Sensory Studies</i> , 2016, 31, 373-381.	1.6	20
38	Comparison of two TCATA variants for dynamic sensory characterization of food products. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2016, 54, 160-172.	4.6	66
39	A consumer-based approach to salt reduction: Case study with bread. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2016, 90, 66-72.	6.2	40
40	Influence of label design on children's perception of two snack foods: Comparison of rating and choice-based conjoint analysis. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2016, 53, 1-8.	4.6	47
41	Dynamic characterization of red wine astringency: Case study with Uruguayan Tannat wines. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2016, 82, 128-135.	6.2	25
42	Consumers' visual attention to fruit defects and disorders: A case study with apple images. <i>Postharvest Biology and Technology</i> , 2016, 116, 36-44.	6.0	32
43	Do individual differences in visual attention to CATA questions affect sensory product characterization? A case study with plain crackers. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2016, 48, 185-194.	4.6	14
44	Temporal Check-All-That-Apply (TCATA): A novel dynamic method for characterizing products. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2016, 47, 79-90.	4.6	215
45	Can consumer segmentation in projective mapping contribute to a better understanding of consumer perception?. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2016, 47, 64-72.	4.6	15
46	Reliability of Polarized Projective Mapping with Consumers. <i>Journal of Sensory Studies</i> , 2015, 30, 280-294.	1.6	12
47	Influence of Poles on Results from Reference-Based Sensory Characterization Methodologies: Case Study with Polarized Projective Mapping Consumers. <i>Journal of Sensory Studies</i> , 2015, 30, 439-447.	1.6	7
48	Comparison of sensory product profiles generated by trained assessors and consumers using CATA questions: Four case studies with complex and/or similar samples. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2015, 45, 75-86.	4.6	96
49	Comparison of TCATA and TDS for dynamic sensory characterization of food products. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2015, 78, 148-158.	6.2	101
50	Pole selection in Polarized Sensory Positioning: Insights from the cognitive aspects behind the task. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2015, 46, 48-57.	4.6	17
51	Sugar reduction in probiotic chocolate-flavored milk: Impact on dynamic sensory profile and liking. <i>Food Research International</i> , 2015, 75, 148-156.	6.2	88
52	Recommendations for use of balanced presentation order of terms in CATA questions. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2015, 46, 137-141.	4.6	46
53	Influence of Interpretation Aids on Attentional Capture, Visual Processing, and Understanding of Front-of-Package Nutrition Labels. <i>Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior</i> , 2015, 47, 292-299.e1.	0.7	65
54	Comparison of intensity scales and CATA questions in new product development: Sensory characterisation and directions for product reformulation of milk desserts. <i>Food Quality and Preference</i> , 2015, 44, 183-193.	4.6	72

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Check-all-that-apply (CATA) questions for sensory product characterization by consumers: Investigations into the number of terms used in CATA questions. Food Quality and Preference, 2015, 42, 154-164.	4.6	130
56	List length has little impact on consumers'™ visual attention to CATA questions. Food Quality and Preference, 2015, 42, 100-109.	4.6	32
57	Comparison of Correspondence Analysis based on Hellinger and chi-square distances to obtain sensory spaces from check-all-that-apply (CATA) questions. Food Quality and Preference, 2015, 43, 106-112.	4.6	74
58	Evaluation of Data Aggregation in Polarized Sensory Positioning. Journal of Sensory Studies, 2015, 30, 46-55.	1.6	9
59	Application of Survival Analysis to Estimate Equivalent Sweet Concentration of Low-Calorie Sweeteners in Orange Juice. Journal of Sensory Studies, 2014, 29, 474-479.	1.6	11
60	Comparison of check-all-that-apply and forced-choice Yes/No question formats for sensory characterisation. Food Quality and Preference, 2014, 35, 32-40.	4.6	34
61	Stability of sample configurations from projective mapping: How many consumers are necessary?. Food Quality and Preference, 2014, 34, 79-87.	4.6	47
62	Further investigations into the reproducibility of check-all-that-apply (CATA) questions for sensory product characterization elicited by consumers. Food Quality and Preference, 2014, 36, 111-121.	4.6	70
63	Visual attention by consumers to check-all-that-apply questions: Insights to support methodological development. Food Quality and Preference, 2014, 32, 210-220.	4.6	93
64	Attentional capture and importance of package attributes for consumers' perceived similarities and differences among products: A case study with breakfast cereal packages. Food Research International, 2014, 64, 701-710.	6.2	53
65	Polarized Projective Mapping: Comparison with Polarized Sensory Positioning approaches. Food Quality and Preference, 2013, 28, 510-518.	4.6	35
66	Consumer Visual Processing of Food Labels: Results from an Eye-Tracking Study. Journal of Sensory Studies, 2013, 28, 138-153.	1.6	123
67	How do design features influence consumer attention when looking for nutritional information on food labels? Results from an eye-tracking study on pan bread labels. International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition, 2013, 64, 515-527.	2.8	54
68	Can Eye-Tracking Techniques Overcome a Limitation of Conjoint Analysis? Case Study on Healthfulness Perception of Yogurt Labels. Journal of Sensory Studies, 2013, 28, 370-380.	1.6	27
69	Attentional capture and understanding of nutrition labelling: a study based on response times. International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition, 2012, 63, 679-688.	2.8	27