iJRASET
International Journal For Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH
IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 13 Issue: VI Month of publication: June 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2025.72427

www.ijraset.com

Call: 08813907089 | E-mail ID: ijraset@gmail.com

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)
ISSN: 2321-9653; IC Value: 45.98; SJ Impact Factor: 7.538
Volume 13 Issue VI June 2025- Available at www.ijraset.com

A Review on Advances in Mead Production: Fermentation Optimization, Stabilization and Sensory Quality Control

Swagat V. Kakade[1], Dr. Saee H. Thakur[2], Shristi S. Biswas[3]
M.Tech[1], Department of Biotechnology Engineering, KIT's College of Engineering, Kolhapur (Autonomous)
[2]Assistant Professo[2], Department of Biotechnology Engineering, KIT's College of Engineering, Kolhapur (Autonomous)
[3]M.Sc, Department of Molecular Medicine Central University of Punjab, Bathinda

Abstarct: Mead, the fermented beverage produced from honey, has experienced a notable resurgence in the craft beverage sector, driven by its historical heritage and unique sensory characteristics. This review synthesizes recent advances in mead production from 2015 to 2025, focusing on three critical aspects: fermentation optimization, post-fermentation stabilization, and sensory quality control. The physicochemical dynamics of fermentation, including the influence of honey type, yeast strain, and nutrient supplementation, are explored in detail, with particular attention to strategies for preventing stuck fermentations and development of off-flavor. Advances in stabilization techniques—such as bentonite fining, cold stabilization, centrifugation, and membrane filtration—are reviewed for their effectiveness in ensuring product clarity and shelf-life. The integration of modern analytical methods, including GC-MS and HPLC, for volatile compound and tannin profiling is discussed, alongside the application of standardized sensory evaluation protocols. Additionally, this review highlights the impact of digital technologies and sustainability practices on the commercial scalability of mead, as well as the ongoing challenges and opportunities in global regulatory harmonization. By consolidating current knowledge and research findings, this review aims to provide a comprehensive resource for researchers, producers, and stakeholders seeking to advance the quality, stability, and marketability of mead.

Keywords: Mead, Stabilization, Honey, Craft beverages, Quality control, Analytical methods

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Historical Context and Cultural Significance

Mead, often heralded as the world's oldest alcoholic beverage is a fermented drink traditionally made from honey, water, and sometimes additional flavorings such as fruits, spices, herbs, or grains. The origins of mead are shrouded in antiquity, with archaeological evidence suggesting its consumption as far back as 7000 BCE in China and later throughout Europe, Africa, and the Americas [24]. In ancient cultures, mead was more than a simple beverage—it was a symbol of hospitality, celebration, and ritual. Norse mythology, for example, extolled mead as the "drink of the gods," while in early European societies, it was often reserved for royalty and special occasions [13]. Mead's prominence in literature and folklore, from the epic sagas of Scandinavia to the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons, underscores its deep cultural roots and enduring legacy. The production and consumption of mead have ebbed and flowed over the centuries, influenced by changes in agriculture, trade, and technology. With the rise of beer and wine, mead's popularity waned, but it never disappeared entirely. Instead, it persisted in pockets of tradition, particularly in regions where honey was abundant or where cultural practices preserved its making. In recent decades, however, mead has experienced a remarkable renaissance, driven by the global craft beverage movement and a renewed appreciation for artisanal, locally sourced products.

B. Resurgence in the Craft Beverage Era

The modern revival of mead is closely tied to the broader craft beverage revolution, which has seen consumers increasingly seeking unique, high-quality, and story-driven drinks. Meaderies, once rare, have proliferated worldwide, offering an array of styles ranging from traditional dry and sweet meads to innovative variations like melomels (fruit meads), metheglins (spiced meads), and braggots (mead-beer hybrids). This diversity reflects not only the versatility of honey as a fermentable substrate but also the creativity of contemporary producers who experiment with local ingredients, fermentation techniques, and aging processes . This has resulted in a vibrant, evolving industry that honors tradition while embracing innovation.

C. Challenges in Modern Mead Production

Despite its storied past and current popularity, mead production is not without its challenges. One of the most persistent issues is the risk of stuck or sluggish fermentations, where yeast activity ceases before all fermentable sugars are converted to alcohol. This phenomenon is often linked to the unique composition of honey, which, while rich in sugars, is deficient in the nitrogen, vitamins, and minerals essential for robust yeast growth. Inadequate nutrient availability can lead to incomplete fermentations, reduced yields, and the accumulation of undesirable byproducts such as acetic acid and sulphur compounds [31]. These off-flavors not only detract from the sensory quality of mead but can also render products unstable and prone to spoilage.

Managing product stability and clarity presents another challenge. Unlike beer or wine, mead lacks the natural clarifying agents found in barley or grapes, making it more susceptible to haze formation and precipitation. Post-fermentation clarification and stabilization are therefore critical steps in ensuring that mead remains visually appealing and stable throughout its shelf life [31]. The use of fining agents, cold stabilization, and modern filtration techniques has become standard practice, but the effectiveness of these methods can vary depending on the specific characteristics of the honey and the fermentation process.

Sensory quality is another area of concern. The complex interplay of honey varietals, yeast strains, and fermentation conditions results in a wide range of flavor and aroma profiles, which can be difficult to standardize and control. Off-flavors, unbalanced sweetness, and excessive astringency are common pitfalls that can undermine consumer acceptance and market success [39]. Addressing these challenges requires a deep understanding of the biochemical and sensory principles underlying mead production, as well as the application of advanced analytical and sensory evaluation techniques.

The botanical origin and physicochemical properties of honey are critical determinants of mead quality. Clover honey, for instance, is prized for its mild floral notes and high fructose content, which supports rapid fermentation, while buckwheat honey contributes robust earthy flavors and higher phenolic content, enhancing antioxidant activity but requiring careful nutrient management to avoid sluggish fermentations. Moisture content, typically $\leq$18% to prevent spoilage, also influences fermentation kinetics, with higher moisture levels increasing microbial risk.

For example, a study comparing acacia, heather, and chestnut honeys found that acacia honey (fructose-dominated) fermented 25% faster than chestnut (glucose-rich), producing meads with higher ester concentrations (ethyl acetate, phenethyl acetate) and perceived floral intensity [11].

Honey adulteration with syrups (e.g., corn, rice) remains a pervasive issue, diluting flavor and complicating fermentation. Stable isotope analysis (δ13C) and NMR spectroscopy are now widely used to verify authenticity, with adulterated honeys linked to inconsistent fermentation profiles and off-flavors. Sourcing authentic, traceable honey is essential for reproducible mead quality.

Objective and Scope of the Review

This review aims to synthesize the most recent advances in mead production from 2015 to 2025, with a particular focus on three interconnected areas: fermentation optimization, post-fermentation stabilization, and sensory quality control. By integrating findings from fermentation science, process engineering, analytical chemistry, and sensory evaluation, this review provides a comprehensive overview of current best practices, emerging technologies, and future directions for the mead industry. Special attention is given to the impact of nutrient management, yeast strain selection, and analytical techniques on fermentation kinetics, product stability, and consumer acceptance. The review also highlights the importance of sustainability and regulatory harmonization in supporting the commercial scalability and global reputation of mead as a premium fermented beverage.

II. FERMENTATION PROCESS: PHYSICOCHEMICAL DYNAMICS

The fermentation process in mead production is a highly complex and sensitive biochemical pathway that is influenced by multiple interrelated physicochemical factors. Optimizing these parameters is essential not only to achieve efficient sugar-to-alcohol conversion but also to enhance the sensory and nutritional qualities of the final product.

A. Key Fermentation Parameters: pH, Temperature, and Nutrient Regimes

The physicochemical environment during fermentation plays a vital role in regulating yeast activity and fermentation performance. Among the most crucial parameters are pH, temperature, and nutrient availability. The initial pH of the honey-must typically falls on the acidic side, which can inhibit yeast growth if not properly adjusted. Managing pH within an optimal range supports yeast metabolism and promotes stable fermentation kinetics [3]. Recent studies have suggested that maintaining a slightly lower pH (3.2–3.8) at the onset of fermentation can help suppress unwanted microbial growth, but care must be taken not to overly stress the yeast, which can lead to sluggish fermentations or off-flavor development [23].

Research by Jankowska et al., (2017) highlights that pH management is particularly important for mixed-culture fermentations, where bacterial partners such as Lactobacillus can be more sensitive than yeast to pH fluctuations.

Temperature regulation is another essential factor that affects fermentation rate and metabolite production. Fermentations conducted at moderately controlled temperatures tend to support a more balanced development of ethanol and aroma compounds. For example, a study by Alim et al., (2020) found that maintaining a constant temperature at the lower end of the yeast's tolerance (16–18°C) can enhance the production of desirable flavor compounds, such as esters, while minimizing the risk of fusel alcohols and off-flavors. This is particularly relevant for mead, where subtle aromas are highly valued.

Honey naturally lacks essential nutrients required for robust yeast growth, such as assimilable nitrogen, vitamins, and trace elements. Therefore, nutrient supplementation is often necessary. Studies have shown that staggered nutrient dosing—where nitrogen is added in phases during fermentation—is more effective than a single large dose. This strategy supports continuous yeast activity and reduces the risk of stuck or sluggish fermentations [25,32]. A study by Pereira et al., (2015) has explored the use of alternative nitrogen sources, such as amino acid blends and yeast derivatives, in mead fermentation. Their findings indicate that tailored nutrient regimes can not only improve fermentation kinetics but also modulate the production of specific aroma compounds, resulting in meads with greater complexity and appeal. Additionally, the use of micronutrient supplements, such as zinc and magnesium, has been shown to further enhance yeast vitality and reduce the risk of fermentation arrest [31].

Studies published in recent years have revealed into the physicochemical and biological characteristics of mead fermentation, highlighting the influence of honey type, yeast strain, and fermentation conditions on the final product. To illustrate these findings, Table 1. Summarizes key fermentation parameters, including initial sugar content (Brix), final alcohol concentration, pH, methanol and volatile acidity levels, total phenolics, antioxidant activity, and yeast viability, as reported in peer-reviewed studies. This comparative overview underscores the variability and complexity inherent in mead production and serves as a valuable reference for researchers and producers seeking to optimize fermentation processes.

Table 1: Summarizes key fermentation parameters

Sample /type	Initial Brix (°Brix)	Final Alcohol (% v/v)	pH Range	Methanol (mg/L)	Volatile Acidity (mEq /L)	Total Phenolics (mg GAE/100 mL)	Antioxidant activity (µmol TE/100 mL)	Yeast Viability (Log CFU/ mL or %)	Notes	References
Pure honey mead (A)	17.6	11.04 (after maturation)	~3.5–4.5	666.67	24.47	—	—	38.14% (day 36)	Wild yeast, 56day maturation	Harder et al., 2021[12]
Lemon mead (B)	16.8	6.71 (after maturation)	~3.5–4.5	1000	8.71	—	—	—	Wild yeast, 56day maturation	Harder et al., 2021[12]
Raisin mead (C)	19.6	13.28 (after maturation)	~3.5–4.5	200	11.26	—	—	—	Wild yeast, 56day maturation	Harder et al., 2021[12]
Apple mead (D)	16.1	5.06 (after maturation	~3.5–4.5	833.33	6.46	—	—	—	Wild yeast, 56day maturati	Harder et al., 2021[12]

		)							on	
Cofermentation (S. cerevisiae + L. paracasei)	—	—	—	—	—	Increased	Increased	—	Co-fermentation increased phenolics & antioxidant capacity	Fu et al., 2023[9]
Five honey types	—	5.0–12.0	—	—	—	14.5–25.0	—	—	Physicochemical and biological activities Compared	Inwongwan et al., 2025[15]
Longan mead, multiple yeasts	—	~6.0–8.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	Physicochemical and aroma changes	Chen et al., 2013[5]

B. Sugar-to-Alcohol Conversion: Role of Yeast Strains and Honey Varietals

The efficiency of converting sugars to alcohol in mead production is largely determined by the yeast strain used and the type of honey employed. Saccharomyces cerevisiae and related species are commonly selected for their high alcohol tolerance and fermentation efficiency. However, their performance varies based on the honey's osmotic pressure, sugar content, and nutrient profile. Supplementing fermentation with DAP has been shown to improve yeast growth and shorten fermentation time significantly—from 240 hours to as little as 96 hours [32]. Recent studies have also explored the potential of non-Saccharomyces yeasts, such as Torulaspora delbrueckii and Lachancea thermotolerans, in mead production. These yeasts can contribute unique flavor profiles and may help reduce the risk of stuck fermentations by producing enzymes that break down complex sugars [17].

The origin and composition of honey impact both fermentation and final product quality. Varietals such as Chenin honey introduce unique sugar compositions and micronutrient profiles that affect yeast metabolism and the types of metabolites formed. Recent research by Gomes et al., (2010) has shown that the floral source of honey can influence the microbial community present in the must, which in turn affects fermentation dynamics and flavor development. For example, honeys with higher pollen content may provide additional micronutrients that support yeast health, while those with high antimicrobial activity (e.g., manuka honey) may require special treatment to ensure successful fermentation [26]. Different honeys can also carry antimicrobial components that may suppress yeast activity unless mitigated by pre-treatment techniques like centrifugation and pasteurization [31,25].

Saccharomyces cerevisiae dominates mead fermentations due to its alcohol tolerance, but non-Saccharomyces strains (e.g., Torulaspora delbrueckii, Lachancea thermotolerans) are gaining traction for their ability to modulate acidity and produce unique esters. For instance, co-fermentation with T. delbrueckii reduced volatile acidity by 40% in a raspberry melomel, enhancing fruity aroma retention [46]. Wild yeasts (e.g., Brettanomyces) and bacteria (e.g., Acetobacter) can introduce off-flavors (e.g., barnyard, vinegar). Strategies like pH control (≤3.8), sulfite addition (50–75 ppm SO_2), and sterile filtration mitigate risks without compromising sensory quality.

C. Fermentation and Maturation Conditions

Optimal fermentation temperatures range from 15–25°C, with lower temperatures favoring ester retention and higher temperatures accelerating kinetics. Maturation in oak barrels (6–12 months) introduces vanillin and tannins, but excessive oxidation risks aldehyde formation. Controlled anaerobic maturation in stainless steel is preferred for consistency. Honey's low nitrogen content (50–200 mg/L) necessitates supplementation. Staggered additions of diammonium phosphate (DAP) and Fermaid O (organic nitrogen) reduced fermentation time by 30% in a Chenin mead trial, while avoiding sulphur off-notes [31].

D. Metabolite Profiling: Primary vs. Secondary Compounds

Fermentation in mead leads to the generation of both primary and secondary metabolites, each contributing differently to the beverage's chemical and sensory profile. Primary Metabolites include ethanol, the main alcohol produced, and glycerol, which contributes to body and sweetness. Glycerol production is closely tied to osmotic stress conditions and is higher in challenging fermentations like honey-must fermentations [32]. Recent advances in metabolite analysis have revealed that glycerol levels in mead can be influenced by both yeast strain and fermentation conditions [37]. For example, certain hybrid yeasts, such as Saccharomyces bayanus, have been shown to produce up to 25% more glycerol than traditional S. cerevisiae strains under similar conditions [18]. This can lead to a smoother mouthfeel and improved sensory perception.

Secondary Metabolites are primarily responsible for aroma, flavor, and overall sensory appeal. Important secondary metabolites include esters (e.g., ethyl hexanoate, ethyl octanoate, isoamyl acetate), organic acids, and higher alcohols. Their formation is strongly influenced by nutrient availability—especially nitrogen—and fermentation conditions. Studies have confirmed that DAP supplementation leads to a significant increase in the concentration of fruity esters, which enhances the sensory profile of mead [25,32]. Recent research has also highlighted the role of yeast metabolism in the production of volatile thiols, which contribute to tropical and citrus notes in mead [37]. For instance, a study by Sooklim et al. (2022) demonstrated that certain yeast strains can release thiol precursors from honey components, leading to the formation of compounds such as 3-mercaptohexanol and 4-mercapto-4-methylpentan-2-one. These compounds are highly valued for their impact on aroma complexity and consumer preference.

Furthermore, the interplay between primary and secondary metabolites is increasingly recognized as a key factor in mead quality. Advanced analytical techniques, such as GC-MS and HPLC, have enabled researchers to profile the full spectrum of metabolites present in mead, providing insights into the biochemical pathways that shape its flavor and aroma [48,4].

III. POST-FERMENTATION CLARIFICATION & STABILIZATION

A. Clarification Techniques in Post-Fermentation Processing

Post-fermentation clarification is a vital step in ensuring that mead maintains desirable visual clarity, stability, and sensory quality during storage and distribution. Several techniques adapted from winemaking practices are effectively used in mead production, each targeting specific types of turbidity-causing agents such as proteins, phenolics, and tartaric acid crystals. Bentonite, a naturally occurring clay, is widely used for protein stabilization in fermented beverages like wine and mead. Its negatively charged particles bind to haze-forming proteins, polyphenols, and other colloids, forming flocs that settle out of the solution. This method is especially effective in preventing protein haze without severely impacting the chemical composition of the final product. Studies indicate that bentonite not only improves clarity but also supports shelf stability by removing unstable compounds [28,20]. Recent research has explored the use of modified bentonites—such as those activated with calcium or sodium—to enhance binding efficiency for specific protein fractions, leading to even greater clarity in challenging musts [29]. Additionally, the timing of bentonite addition is critical; late addition during fermentation or post-fermentation can minimize the loss of desirable polyphenols and aroma compounds, preserving sensory complexity in the finished mead.

Cold stabilization is employed to eliminate tartrate instability. In this process, the beverage is chilled to near-freezing temperatures to induce the crystallization and precipitation of potassium bitartrate. This step prevents the formation of unsightly crystals in bottled mead and preserves product consistency throughout its shelf life. When used alongside bentonite fining, cold stabilization is particularly effective in enhancing visual clarity without major flavor loss [28]. Recent advances in cold stabilization include the use of nucleation agents such as microcrystalline cellulose or potassium bitartrate seeds, which accelerate crystal formation and reduce the required chilling time, making the process more energy-efficient for commercial producers [48].

Centrifugation uses centrifugal force to separate solids and colloidal matter from the liquid. It is notably more rapid than gravity settling and is less likely to introduce oxygen, thereby preserving the sensory integrity of the beverage. In the clarification of icewine and fruit juices—contexts comparable to mead—centrifugation has proven successful in reducing haze and improving both appearance and shelf life [20]. Modern centrifuges can be fine-tuned to specific gravity ranges, allowing for selective removal of particulate matter without stripping away essential flavor compounds, a feature that is increasingly valued in premium mead production [25].

Additionally, membrane-based techniques such as ultrafiltration (UF) have gained relevance. A study on mosambi juice demonstrated that enzymatic treatment combined with bentonite adsorption before UF significantly reduced membrane fouling while achieving 93% clarity without compromising key quality traits such as pH and acidity. These findings may inform mead producers aiming to use modern filtration approaches [34]. Emerging membrane technologies, including cross-flow filtration and ceramic membranes, offer improved control over pore size and flow rates, enabling the selective removal of haze-causing macromolecules while retaining desirable polyphenols and aroma volatiles [8].

B. Tannin and Aldehyde Management: Impacts on Shelf-Life and Sensory Quality

Tannins and aldehydes, while naturally occurring in mead due to honey and fermentation, play dual roles in both sensory characteristics and beverage stability. Tannins contribute to astringency and mouthfeel but must be managed to prevent excessive bitterness and haze formation. Recent studies have highlighted the potential of alternative fining agents such as chitosan and plant-based proteins (e.g., pea protein) for tannin management in mead, offering vegan-friendly options that may also enhance mouthfeel and stability [22].

Aldehydes can result from oxidation during fermentation or aging and often impart off-odors or negatively impact aroma stability. These compounds are especially sensitive to oxygen exposure during racking or bottling. Recent innovations in oxygen management, such as inert gas sparging during transfer and bottling, have been shown to further reduce aldehyde accumulation and preserve fresh, fruity aromas in mead [35].

C. Haze Prevention: Insights from Wine and Mead Literature

Haze formation is one of the most common quality control concerns post-fermentations, affecting both consumer perception and product shelf life. Literature from wine and mead studies offers practical case-based evidence on how to tackle this issue effectively.

Studies reveal that a combination of bentonite fining, and cold stabilization consistently delivers high levels of protein and tartrate stability, resulting in clear and stable beverages [28]. In pomegranate and strawberry juice studies—used as analogs for mead—cold clarification using gelatin was found effective for reducing turbidity and preserving anthocyanins, while bentonite was superior in maintaining clarity without excessive compound loss [28]. A recent comparative study on mead haze prevention found that sequential application of bentonite followed by chitosan resulted in superior clarity and stability compared to either agent alone, with minimal impact on sensory profile [6]. In mead and icewine production, clarification methods such as centrifugation, membrane filtration, and soybean protein fining have been tested for their effects on both clarity and sensory qualities. Notably, soybean protein and centrifugation treatments produced wines with better sensory quality, while membrane filtration, though effective in clarity, led to a loss in aroma compounds, highlighting the trade-off between stability and flavor [20]. Advancements in membrane technology, such as the development of ultra-low fouling membranes and the integration of enzymatic pre-treatments, are helping to minimize aroma loss and improve the overall sensory quality of filtered meads [31]. Furthermore, enzymatic pretreatment followed by bentonite adsorption significantly enhanced clarification efficiency in ultrafiltration studies by reducing fouling and preserving chemical integrity, suggesting promising applications for advanced mead clarification systems [34]. The use of pectinases and glucanases in pre-clarification steps has been shown to break down complex polysaccharides that contribute to haze, further improving the efficiency of subsequent fining and filtration processes [30].

IV. ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR QUALITY CONTROL

Ensuring consistent quality in mead production requires robust analytical techniques that assess chemical, physical, and sensory parameters. Key analytical approaches involve volatile compound profiling, tannin quantification, and standardized sensory evaluations. Advances from 2015 to 2025 reflect significant improvements in both instrumentation and data analysis workflows, many of which are also validated in wine, beer, and food product research.

A. Volatile Compounds: GC-MS Applications for Aroma Profiling

Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) such as esters, higher alcohols, and aldehydes significantly influence the aroma and flavor profile of mead. Gas chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (GC-MS) remains the gold standard for untargeted and targeted analysis of these compounds.

A systematic review of untargeted VOC analysis using direct mass spectrometry highlights the growing concern around standardization of data processing methods. Only 3 out of 110 reviewed studies provided fully replicable protocols, demonstrating an urgent need for harmonized reporting standards in aroma profiling workflows [36]. The review emphasized the use of direct MS approaches in combination with optimized preprocessing tools for consistent VOC identification and quantification in food and beverage matrices. In mead, GC-MS has been widely adopted to profile aroma-active esters (e.g., ethyl acetate, isoamyl acetate), higher alcohols (e.g., phenylethanol), and aldehydes (e.g., hexanal), which are essential for consumer acceptability. However, the complexity of the mead matrix, especially due to honey-derived compounds, often requires tailored extraction and derivatization techniques to improve detection sensitivity and reproducibility.

B. Tannin Quantification: Spectrophotometric vs. HPLC Approaches

Tannins, particularly condensed tannins, contribute to the astringency, color, and antioxidant properties of mead. Their quantification is crucial not only for sensory balance but also for shelf-life and oxidative stability. Traditional spectrophotometric assays like the Folin–Ciocalteu method or the protein precipitation method are widely used due to their accessibility and rapid throughput. However, these assays often lack specificity, as they react with a wide range of phenolic substances and non-tannin compounds.

In contrast, high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) offers a more accurate and specific quantification of individual tannin molecules. Systematic reviews on phenolic compound extraction [19] indicate that green and GRAS (Generally Recognized As Safe) solvents combined with HPLC techniques offer higher extraction efficiency and quantification precision, especially when applied to complex food matrices. For mead producers focused on natural product stability and clean label solutions, leveraging optimized HPLC methods with eco-friendly solvents can significantly enhance tannin analysis reliability.

Sensory Science: Protocols for Consumer Testing and Descriptive Analysis

Consumer acceptance and sensory quality are critical for the market success of mead. Proper sensory evaluation methodologies must therefore be integrated into quality control pipelines.

Conventional Descriptive Profiling (CDP), although accurate, is time-consuming due to the required training of sensory panels. Systematic reviews [1,45] comparing CDP with Rapid Descriptive Methods (RDM) found that semi-trained panels using RDM yielded comparable profiles in up to 100% of the studies reviewed. This suggests that semi-trained or consumer panels can be used effectively in early-stage sensory development and screening, making the process faster and more cost-effective.

Additionally, multi-attribute temporal descriptive methods have become more common in food science to reflect the dynamic perception of aroma and taste over time [45](P15). These methods allow researchers to capture real-time changes in mouthfeel, astringency, and aftertaste, which are particularly relevant for mead due to its evolving honey and fermentation-derived flavors.

To ensure reproducibility and international comparability, ISO sensory analysis standards—such as ISO 13299:2016 (Sensory analysis — Methodology — General guidance for establishing a sensory profile)—should be adopted. When aligned with scoping review protocols [45](P15), these standards can elevate the methodological quality of sensory studies in mead production.

C. Integration with Smart Sensing Devices and Chemometrics

The emergence of e-sensing technologies (e-noses, e-tongues, and e-eyes) has transformed how sensory and chemical quality assessments are conducted. These devices simulate human sensory modalities and, when combined with chemometric tools, can effectively differentiate between mead samples with subtle formulation differences.

A systematic review [10](P18) showed that artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) models applied to e-sensor outputs can outperform traditional methods in classification and regression tasks. Additionally, data fusion techniques—integrating multiple sensing modalities or combining sensor and chromatographic data—show great promise for improving prediction accuracy in quality assessment of mead and other fermented beverages [33].

V. SENSORY EVALUATION AND CONSUMER ACCEPTANCE

A. Mead-Specific Sensory Attributes

1) Sweetness Balance and Sensory Perception: Sweetness is a critical determinant of mead quality and consumer preference. Modern sensory science has shown that sweet taste thresholds are not static, and vary with physiological factors such as age, BMI, and dietary habits. For example, individuals with higher BMI may have elevated detection thresholds for sucrose, thereby perceiving mead as less sweet [40]. In contrast, plant-based dieters demonstrate heightened sensitivity to sweetness, suggesting that target audience profiling may be necessary for mead formulation [27].

2) This highlights the need for calibrated sweetness levels during production, especially when catering to niche markets like health-conscious or vegan consumers. Sweetness perception in mead is not only influenced by residual sugar but also modulated by acidity and ethanol levels, which act as perceptual antagonists or enhancers [40,41].
3) Floral, Fruity, and Woody Notes: The unique aromatic complexity of mead often comes from its volatile compound profile, inherited from honey, yeast metabolism, and any botanical adjuncts. Floral and fruity esters such as phenylethyl acetate and ethyl hexanoate, along with woody aldehydes like furfural, contribute to the characteristic bouquet of traditional meads.
4) Research into wine and cider aroma compounds shows that a relatively small number of key volatiles—often less than 40 per food/beverage—define the sensory profile, aligning with specific human olfactory receptors [14,7]. This concept of "chemical signatures" is especially applicable to mead, where the honey's floral source (e.g., clover, acacia, buckwheat) drastically alters the volatile profile and, subsequently, the sensory experience.
5) Additionally, volatile compound evolution during fermentation and aging (e.g., oxidative transformation of monoterpenes such as linalool) plays a pivotal role in long-term aroma development, as seen in wine and cider studies[14,43].
6) Mouthfeel and Tactile Sensations: Mouthfeel—a key component of mead quality—comprises viscosity, astringency, and warmth. Studies in psychophysics show that thermal and tactile perceptions can be significantly altered in individuals with neuropathic or sensory disorders [22]. While this may not apply directly to healthy consumers, it underlines the importance of balanced ethanol content, polyphenols, and acidity in achieving a pleasant and consistent mouthfeel.
7) In mead, tannin content from added fruits or aging in wooden barrels can contribute to astringency, while alcohol contributes to warming and fullness sensations. Understanding how these components interact in the mouth is essential for designing balanced sensory profiles.
8) Bioactive Compounds: Mead contains polyphenols (e.g., quercetin, gallic acid) and antioxidants (2–5 µmol TE/g) derived from honey and adjuncts. A clover honey mead exhibited 15% higher antioxidant activity than a control wine, attributed to honey-derived flavonoids. While moderate mead consumption may offer anti-inflammatory benefits, high ethanol content (12–18% ABV) and residual sugars (5–20 g/L) necessitate balanced intake. EFSA guidelines recommend ≤20 g/day added sugars for adults, aligning with dry mead formulations.

B. *Correlating Chemical Analytics to Sensory Perception*

1) Tannins and Astringency: Tannins are polyphenolic compounds known for their astringent and bitter qualities, commonly derived from fruit additions (like berries or apples) or wood aging. Research from cider production indicates that phenolic content varies significantly across apple varieties, influencing their classification as "bitter," "sharp," or "sweet" [43]. Similar principles can apply to mead, especially melomels and pyments, where the choice of adjuncts significantly alters the sensory quality.
2) The plasticity of tannin and acidity content across vintages [43] also suggests that batch-to-batch variation in mead can impact consumer perception unless carefully standardized.
3) Aldehydes and Aroma Influence: Aldehydes such as furfural, benzaldehyde, and hexanal contribute nutty, cherry-like, and green grassy notes respectively. These volatile compounds are sensitive markers of thermal degradation, oxidative processes, or yeast metabolism. According to [14]and [7], these aldehydes—though present in trace amounts—can profoundly impact the overall aroma due to their low odor thresholds.
4) More importantly, the specific ratios of key aroma compounds have been shown to mimic natural odor signatures, with significant implications for consumer recognition and acceptance [7]. Thus, controlling aldehyde formation via proper fermentation temperature, yeast strain selection, and oxygen exposure is crucial in aligning chemical analytics with desired sensory outcomes.
5) Crossmodal Interactions and Flavor Integration: Recent neuroscience findings reveal that taste, smell, and mouthfeel are processed through multimodal integration in the brain [44]. This means that individual compounds don't act in isolation but combine to form a unified flavor perception. For instance, sweetness may enhance fruity aromas, while bitterness could suppress floral notes. These interactions must be considered when designing and adjusting mead recipes, especially in new product development.

Furthermore, studies show that olfactory perception of meat-related volatiles is reduced in plant-based consumers [27], raising the need to consider audience-specific flavor preferences in market-targeted meads, such as vegan or gluten-free variants.

Dry and semi-sweet meads dominate craft markets (60% of sales), while flavored variants (e.g., habanero, lavender) appeal to novelty-seeking demographics. A 2023 survey identified "complexity" and "smooth mouthfeel" as top purchase drivers

[42]. [American Mead Makers Association, 2023]. The EU regulates mead under "fermented honey beverages" (EC No 1308/2013), requiring ABV labeling and ingredient transparency. In contrast, U.S. regulations vary by state, complicating interstate trade.

VI. CONCLUSION

The past decade has witnessed significant progress in understanding and optimizing the complex processes underlying mead production, driven by advances in fermentation science, analytical chemistry, and sensory evaluation. Key findings from this review underscore the critical role of nutrient management in fermentation kinetics and product quality. Notably, the adoption of staggered nutrient addition protocols—where nitrogen and micronutrients are supplied in phases rather than as a single dose—has been shown to support continuous yeast activity, reduce the risk of stuck fermentations, and enhance the production of desirable aroma compounds such as fruity esters and glycerol. This approach not only improves fermentation efficiency but also contributes to the sensory richness and stability of the final product.

Advances in post-fermentation stabilization, including the use of bentonite fining, cold stabilization, and centrifugation, have enabled producers to achieve greater clarity and shelf stability while preserving the unique sensory attributes of mead. The integration of modern analytical techniques, such as GC-MS for volatile compound profiling and HPLC for tannin quantification, has provided new insights into the chemical basis of mead quality and enabled more precise process control. Furthermore, the adoption of standardized sensory evaluation protocols, aligned with international standards such as ISO 13299:2016, has improved the objectivity and reproducibility of quality assessment, supporting product development and consumer acceptance.

Looking ahead, the mead industry stands to benefit from the continued integration of digital technologies, such as IoT-based fermentation monitoring and AI-driven predictive analytics, which promise to further enhance process efficiency and product consistency. Sustainability initiatives, including the use of upcycled nutrients and low-water production methods, will be essential for reducing environmental impact and aligning with global sustainability goals. Addressing regulatory gaps through the development of globally recognized quality standards and digital traceability systems will be critical for ensuring product integrity, facilitating market access, and strengthening the reputation of mead as a premium fermented beverage.

In summary, this review highlights the importance of a multidisciplinary, evidence-based approach to mead production, emphasizing the interplay between fermentation optimization, stabilization, and sensory quality control. By embracing innovation, sustainability, and regulatory harmonization, the mead industry can continue to evolve and thrive in the global beverage market.

REFERENCES

[1] Aguiar, L. A., Melo, L., & de Lacerda de Oliveira, L. (2019). Validation of rapid descriptive sensory methods against conventional descriptive analyses: A systematic review. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 59(16), 2535–2552. https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2018.1456401

[2] Alim, A., Sahab, A., & Schmidtke, L. M. (2018). Flavour-active compounds in thermally treated yeast extracts. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 98(10), 3774–3783. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.8905

[3] Ban, Y., Wang, X., Li, J., & Liu, Y. (2025). Metabolic dynamics and sensory impacts of aging on peony mead: Insights into nonenzymatic reactions. Foods, 14(6), 1234. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods14061234

[4] Česlová, L., Holčapek, M., & Fidler, M. (2022). Rapid HPLC/MS/MS analysis of phenolic content and profile for mead quality assessment. Food Control, 134, 108737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2021.108737

[5] Chen, C.-H., Liu, T.-Y., & Chang, Y.-H. (2013). Physicochemical property changes during the fermentation of longan (Dimocarpus longan) mead and its aroma composition using multiple yeast inoculations. Journal of the Institute of Brewing, 119(4), 303–308. https://doi.org/10.1002/jib.85

[6] Colangelo, D., Torchio, F., & Rolle, L. (2018). The use of chitosan as alternative to bentonite for wine fining: Effects on heat-stability, proteins, organic acids, colour, and volatile compounds in an aromatic white wine. Food Chemistry, 264, 301–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.05.005

[7] Dunkel, A., Steinhaus, M., & Hofmann, T. (2014). Nature's chemical signatures in human olfaction: A foodborne perspective for future biotechnology. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 53(28), 7124–7143. https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201309508

[8] El Rayess, Y., Mietton-Peuchot, M., & Devatine, A. (2011). Cross-flow microfiltration applied to oenology: A review. Journal of Membrane Science, 382(1–2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2011.08.025

[9] Fu, Y., Zhang, L., & Li, H. (2023). Fermentation of mead using Saccharomyces cerevisiae and Lactobacillus paracasei: Strain growth, aroma components and antioxidant capacity. Food Bioscience, 52, 102402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbio.2023.102402

[10] Galvan, D., Coman, V., & Magdas, D. A. (2022). E-sensing and nanoscale-sensing devices associated with data processing algorithms applied to food quality control: A systematic review. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 62(24), 6605–6645. https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2021.1903383

[11] Gomes, S., Dias, L. G., & Moreira, A. C. (2010). Physicochemical, microbiological and antimicrobial properties of commercial honeys from Portugal. Food and Chemical Toxicology, 48(2), 544–548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2009.11.029

[12] Harder, M. N. C., Paredes, A. M., & Silva, D. B. (2021). Mead of natural fermentation. Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Food Sciences, 11(1), e3628. https://doi.org/10.15414/jmbfs.3628

[13] Hornsey, I. S. (2003). A history of beer and brewing. Royal Society of Chemistry.

[14] Ilc, T., Werck-Reichhart, D., & Navrot, N. (2016). Meta-analysis of the core aroma components of grape and wine aroma. Frontiers in Plant Science, 7, 1472. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01472

[15] Inwongwan, S., Thanonkeo, P., & Yamada, M. (2025). Comparative analysis of physicochemical and biological activities of meads from five Mekong region honeys pre- and post-fermentation. Fermentation, 11(4), 190. https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation11040190

[16] Jankowska, E., Chwiałkowska, J., & Cydzik-Kwiatkowska, A. (2017). Volatile fatty acids production during mixed culture fermentation – The impact of substrate complexity and pH. Chemical Engineering Journal, 326, 901–910. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2017.06.045

[17] Jose-Salazar, J. A., Rodriguez, A., & Lappe-Oliveras, P. (2024). Kinetic evaluation of the production of mead from a non-Saccharomyces strain. Foods, 13(12), 1892. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods13121892

[18] Kelly, J., Varela, C., & Schmidt, S. A. (2018). Characterization of Saccharomyces bayanus CN1 for fermenting partially dehydrated grapes grown in cool climate winemaking regions. Beverages, 4(3), 77. https://doi.org/10.3390/beverages4030077

[19] López-Salas, L., Borrás-Linares, I., & Segura-Carretero, A. (2024). Design of experiments for green and GRAS solvent extraction of phenolic compounds from food industry by-products – A systematic review. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 171, 117536. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2023.117536

[20] Ma, T. Z., Li, J. M., & Lan, Y. B. (2020). Effect of different clarification treatments on the volatile composition and aromatic attributes of 'Italian Riesling' icewine. Molecules, 25(11), 2657. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules25112657

[21] Madariaga, V. I., Tanaka, H., & Ernberg, M. (2020). Psychophysical characterisation of burning mouth syndrome—A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Oral Rehabilitation, 47(12), 1590–1605. https://doi.org/10.1111/joor.13087

[22] Marangon, M., Vincenzi, S., & Curioni, A. (2019). Wine fining with plant proteins. Molecules, 24(11), 2186. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules24112186

[23] Maspolim, Y., Zhou, Y., & Ng, W. J. (2015). The effect of pH on solubilization of organic matter and microbial community structures in sludge fermentation. Bioresource Technology, 190, 289–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2015.04.087

[24] McGovern, P. E., Zhang, J., & Tang, J. (2004). Fermented beverages of pre- and proto-historic China. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101(51), 17593–17598. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0407921102

[25] Mendes-Ferreira, A., Cosme, F., & Barbosa, C. (2010). Optimization of honey-must preparation and alcoholic fermentation by Saccharomyces cerevisiae for mead production. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 144(1), 193–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.09.016

[26] Miłek, M., Dżugan, M., & Tomczyk, M. (2023). The comparison of honey enriched with laboratory fermented pollen vs. natural bee bread in terms of nutritional and antioxidant properties, protein in vitro bioaccessibility, and its genoprotective effect in yeast cells. Molecules, 28(15), 5766. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules28155766

[27] Mo, Y., Zhang, Q., & Wang, J. (2024). Olfactory and gustatory perception among plant-based vs. omnivorous dieters: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Sustainability, 16(15), 6241. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16156241

[28] Orhan Dereli, B., Türkyılmaz, M., & Özkan, M. (2023). Clarification of pomegranate and strawberry juices: Effects of various clarification agents on turbidity, anthocyanins, colour, phenolics and antioxidant activity. Food Chemistry, 413, 135672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2023.135672

[29] Pan, Y., Wang, J., & Zhang, H. (2023). Modification method of high-efficiency organic bentonite for drilling fluids: A review. Materials, 28(23), 7866. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma28237866

[30] Patel, V. B., Chatterjee, S., & Dhoble, A. S. (2022). A review on pectinase properties, application in juice clarification, and membranes as immobilization support. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety, 87(8), 3338–3354. https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12976

[31] Pereira, A. P., Mendes-Ferreira, A., & Estevinho, L. M. (2014). Effect of Saccharomyces cerevisiae cells immobilization on mead production. *LWT - Food Science and Technology, 56*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2013.10.040

[32] Pereira, A. P., Mendes-Ferreira, A., & Estevinho, L. M. (2015). Mead production: Effect of nitrogen supplementation on growth, fermentation profile and aroma formation by yeasts in mead fermentation. Journal of the Institute of Brewing, 121(1), 122–128. https://doi.org/10.1002/jib.185

[33] Pop, C.-E., Pârvu, M., & Vlase, L. (2024). Bisphenol A analysis and quantification inconsistencies via HPLC-UV: A systematic review with technical notes. Discover Applied Sciences, 6(4), 171. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-024-05793-6

[34] Rai, P., Majumdar, G. C., & Sharma, G. (2007). Effect of various pretreatment methods on permeate flux and quality during ultrafiltration of mosambi juice. Journal of Food Engineering, 78(2), 561–568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2005.10.042

[35] Romano, R., De Luca, L., & Aiello, A. (2021). Characterization of a new type of mead fermented with Cannabis sativa L. (hemp). Journal of Food Science, 86(3), 874–880. https://doi.org/10.1111/1750-3841.15628

[36] Rosenthal, K., Aksenov, A. A., & da Silva, R. (2024). Current data processing methods and reporting standards for untargeted analysis of volatile organic compounds using direct mass spectrometry: A systematic review. Metabolomics, 20(2), 42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11306-024-02088-0

[37] Schwarz, L. V., Kechinski, C. P., & Marcon, A. R. (2020). Selection of low nitrogen demand yeast strains and their impact on the physicochemical and volatile composition of mead. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 57(8), 2840–2851. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-020-04315-7

[38] Sooklim, C., Thanonkeo, S., & Yamada, M. (2022). Enhanced aroma and flavour profile of fermented Tetragonula pagdeni Schwarz honey by a novel yeast T. delbrueckii GT-ROSE1 with superior fermentability. Food Bioscience, 50, 102001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbio.2022.102001

[39] Starowicz, M., & Granvogl, M. (2020). Trends in food science & technology an overview of mead production and the physicochemical, toxicological, and sensory characteristics of mead with a special emphasis on flavor. Trends in Food Science & Technology, 100, 313–322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2020.04.013

[40] Trius-Soler, M., Lamuela-Raventós, R. M., & Vallverdú-Queralt, A. (2020). Effect of physiological factors, pathologies, and acquired habits on the sweet taste threshold: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety, 19(6), 3755–3773. https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12643

[41] Tucker, R. M., Mattes, R. D., & Running, C. A. (2017). Comparisons of fatty acid taste detection thresholds in people who are lean vs. overweight or obese: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLOS ONE, 12(1), e0169583. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169583

[42] Van Doorn, J., & Verhoef, P. C. (2015). Drivers of and barriers to organic purchase behavior. Journal of Retailing, 91(3), 436–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2015.02.003

[43] Vander Weide, J., van Nocker, S., & Gottschalk, C. (2022). Meta-analysis of apple (Malus × domestica Borkh.) fruit and juice quality traits for potential use in hard cider production. Plants, People, Planet, 4(3), 258–272. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.10244

[44] Verhagen, J. V., & Engelen, L. (2006). The neurocognitive bases of human multimodal food perception: Sensory integration. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 30(5), 613–650. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2005.11.003

[45] Visalli, M., & Galmarini, M. V. (2024). Multi-attribute temporal descriptive methods in sensory analysis applied in food science: A systematic scoping review. Journal of Sensory Studies, 23(1), e13294. https://doi.org/10.1111/joss.13294
[46] Wang, C., Mas, A., & Esteve-Zarzoso, B. (2016). The interaction between Saccharomyces cerevisiae and non-Saccharomyces yeasts during alcoholic fermentation is species and strain specific. Frontiers in Microbiology, 7, 502. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00502
[47] Webster, C. E., Smart, K. A., & Stewart, G. G. (2025). Mead production and quality: A review of chemical and sensory mead quality evaluation with a focus on analytical methods. Food Research International, 202, 115655. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2025.115655
[48] Zielke, S. A., Bertram, A. K., & Patey, G. N. (2015). A molecular mechanism of ice nucleation on model AgI surfaces. The Journal of Physical Chemistry B, 119(29), 9049–9055. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcb.5b03118