# Palatability Study Report — Two-Bowl Preference

Study no. PNL-PAL-0000 (sample) · Final report

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Client** | [Redacted] | **Report date** | DD Month YYYY |
| **Question** | Is the new recipe (A) preferred to the current recipe (B)? | **Species** | Dog (adult) |
| **Products** | A: new recipe · B: current recipe (dry, extruded) | **Panel** | Partner expert panel, India |
| **Ethics** | Protocol approved by an independent ethics committee | **Welfare** | Non-invasive; 3Rs applied |

## 1. Study design

| Item | Design |
|---|---|
| Animals | 30 healthy adult dogs, mixed breed and size (incl. Indian breeds and indie dogs), 2–9 years |
| Method | Two-bowl preference, 2 test days after 1 adaptation day; one meal per day |
| Bias control | Products coded and blinded; bowl positions alternated daily and randomised per animal |
| Offer | Each bowl offered in excess of daily energy needs; 30-minute meal |
| Measures | Intake of each product (g), intake ratio A/(A+B), first choice |
| Statistics | Intake ratio: one-sample t-test vs 0.5; first choice: two-sided binomial test; $\alpha = 0.05$ |

## 2. Results

| Endpoint | Product A | Product B | Result | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean intake per dog per meal (g) | 248 | 140 | A eaten more | **p < 0.01** |
| Intake ratio A/(A+B) | 0.64 | 0.36 | 95% CI 0.58–0.70 | **p < 0.01** |
| First choice (dogs) | 19 of 30 (63%) | 11 of 30 (37%) | Trend to A | **p = 0.20 (ns)** |
| Animals preferring A (ratio > 0.5) | 21 of 30 | — | Majority prefer A | Descriptive |

**Intake ratio by day** — Day 1: 0.62 · Day 2: 0.66. No side bias detected (left-bowl intake ratio 0.51).

## 3. Conclusion

Recipe A was significantly preferred to recipe B on intake (intake ratio 0.64). First choice favoured A but was not statistically significant, indicating the advantage is driven by continued eating rather than initial attraction (aroma).

**Recommendations:** proceed with recipe A. If initial attraction matters for the product (e.g. retail sampling), consider a palatant top-coat trial and confirm with a cat panel if the range includes cat food. Consider an in-home test before launch to confirm the result with owners.

## 4. Notes

Palatability indicates acceptance and preference only; it does not demonstrate nutritional adequacy or health benefit. Reporting follows ARRIVE 2.0 principles. Methods follow published palatability assay practice (e.g. Aldrich & Koppel 2015; Tobie et al. 2015).

**Study director**
[Name], Pet Nutrition Lab

**Panel manager**
[Name], partner facility

**Statistics**
[Name]

Illustrative sample only: data are fictitious and client details are redacted. Results relate only to the items tested. Not to be reproduced except in full.