



HAL
open science

From expert knowledge and sensory science to a general model of food and beverage pairing with wine and beer

Anastasia Eschevins, Agnès Giboreau, Perrine Julien, Catherine Dacremont

► To cite this version:

Anastasia Eschevins, Agnès Giboreau, Perrine Julien, Catherine Dacremont. From expert knowledge and sensory science to a general model of food and beverage pairing with wine and beer. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 2019, 17 (UNSP 100144), pp.100144. 10.1016/j.ijgfs.2019.100144 . hal-02292640

HAL Id: hal-02292640

<https://institut-agro-dijon.hal.science/hal-02292640v1>

Submitted on 25 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Title: From expert knowledge and sensory science to a general model of food and beverage
2 pairing with wine and beer.

3

4 Authors:

5 A. Eschevins^{a,b}, A. Giboreau^b, P. Julien^a, C. Dacremont^a

6 ^aCentre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, AgroSup Dijon, CNRS, INRA, Université
7 Bourgogne Franche-Comté, F-21000 Dijon, France; anastasia.eschevins@inra.fr;

8 perrine.julien@inra.fr ; catherine.dacremont@u-bourgogne.fr

9 ^bInstitut Paul Bocuse research centre, 69130, Ecully, France;

10 agnes.giboreau@institutpaulbocuse.com

11

12 Corresponding author: Anastasia Eschevins

13

14 Abstract:

15 Pairing food and beverages is a traditional practice in French gastronomy. Culinary literature
16 provides recommendations in terms of food and beverage pairing but identifying general
17 strategies to create a match is still difficult.

18 This work aims at identifying what makes a match between food and beverage according to
19 experts and at investigating whether explanations are domain-specific or generalizable.

20 Explanation interviews (or self-confrontation interviews) were conducted with sommeliers
21 (n=10) and beer experts (n=10). They were asked to suggest food-beverage pairings and to
22 explain why the pairs would or not would match.

23 From these interviews, fifteen pairing principles were identified. They correspond to
24 strategies and prerequisites to consider to create a match. They are related to perceptual,
25 conceptual and affective categories and aim at creating pairing according to various
26 objectives: creating a unique match experience, highlighting one of the two products, and
27 enjoying the experience of each product in the pair. These principles are related to both
28 perceptual and physiochemical underlying mechanisms. Generally the same pairing principles
29 may be considered to match food with either wine or beer. However matches based on norms
30 and conceptual association were more often mentioned for wine than beer. Some differences
31 were also highlighted between experts of different domain: beer experts used more
32 experiential discourse than sommeliers who more often referred to conceptual principles.

33

34 Keywords: Wine, beer, food-beverage pairing, pairing principles, experts.

35

36 1. Introduction

37 Pairing food and beverages is a traditional practice of French gastronomy. Most (87%) French
38 consumers consider wine to be the most important element to match with food (Ifop, 2014)
39 and food-wine pairing is part of the French Gastronomic Meal, registered since 2010 in the
40 Intangible Cultural Heritage of Unesco. Although beer is less culturally anchored in France,
41 with the exception of some regions, it was added to the “French protected cultural,
42 gastronomic and landscaped” heritage in 2014. Although only 11% of French people consume
43 beer at meals (Ifop, 2012), pairing beer and dishes is emerging as a new trend in addition to
44 the deeply embedded wine and food pairing (Pierre, 2014).

45 Generally, culinary books or blogs suggest dishes to go with a selection of beverages, or vice
46 versa, but without any explanation on why they match. However, Maresca (1994, p.7)
47 mentioned that “Success in wine and food matching depends on nothing more abstruse than
48 finding out why certain foods and wines affect each other for good or for ill and learning how
49 to generalize from that simple information to predict the way other wines and food will
50 interact”. In line with this comment, some experts try to go further by listing the main pairing
51 principles corresponding to strategies and prerequisites to consider to create a match
52 (Harrington, 2008; Paulsen et al., 2015; Pierre, 2014). These principles rely primarily on
53 products’ perceptual properties including all sensations perceived during tasting: tastes (acid,
54 bitter, sweet, salty, umami), aromas (lemon, smoked, red fruits, etc.), texture (fattiness,
55 astringency, carbonation), appearance (colour, shape, turbidity, etc.), temperature (hot, cold,
56 cool etc.), and trigeminal sensations (pungency of mustard, fresh menthol or hot pepper).
57 Principles are also based on non-perceptual properties, such as the principle based on
58 “geographical identity” consisting of matching two products coming from the same area.

59

60 However, experts’ terminology related to pairing principles is not always standardized and
61 different experts may use different words to refer to the same principle. It is often difficult to
62 distinguish shared knowledge from personal opinions. Moreover, external factors such as
63 context or social surrounding, considered as elements conditioning the overall gastronomic
64 satisfaction, were also suggested as being involved in food and beverage pairing experience
65 (Nusswitz, 1991; Pettigrew & Charters, 2006; Pierre, 2014).

66

67 The main objective of this work was to identify, in a more exhaustive way, what makes a
68 match between food and beverage according to experts.
69 To overcome these issues, several experts were interviewed. They were placed in a realistic
70 situation, asked to suggest food-beverage pairings, and asked to explain why the pairs would
71 or would not match.
72 Another objective was to determine whether pairing principles are product-specific or can be
73 generalised. As a matter of fact, Pettigrew and Charters (2006) reported that consumers' and
74 experts' expectations differ when pairing food with either beer or wine. The symbolic, social,
75 and hedonic aspects weight differently. Moreover, because sommeliers and beer experts differ
76 in their expertise, the objective of this work was also to verify whether experts mention
77 similar principles according to their expertise domain or if their discourse differs.
78 Thus, sommeliers and beer experts were interviewed and asked to suggest dishes that would
79 match with two wines (one white and one red) and two beers (one blond and one white).
80 Pairing principles were first identified from the experts' statements based on a thematic
81 analysis of the transcripts. Then, the use of these principles was compared according to
82 expertise domains (sommeliers vs. beer experts) and product types (wine vs. beer).

83

84 2. Materials and Methods

85

86 2.1. Participants:

87 Ten sommeliers (3 women and 7 men) and ten beer experts (1 woman and 9 men) were
88 interviewed. Wine experts, of French nationality, were recruited through the ASLERA
89 (Association des Sommeliers Lyonnais et de la Région Rhône Alpes) and the Trophée Lyon
90 Beaujolais Nouveau contest. Beer experts, 9 French and 1 French Belgian, were recruited
91 through the Association Française des Biéologues (Association of French beer experts). All
92 the experts practice in France with the exception of one who works in Belgium. The experts
93 had a professional experience of 1 to 48 years (mean = 18 years). They have different
94 occupations: consultants (3 sommeliers / 4 beer experts), teacher at culinary school (1
95 sommelier), wine or beer retailers (2 sommeliers / 4 beer experts), restaurant sommeliers (3
96 sommeliers), contests organizer (1 sommelier), brewing group employee (1 beer expert) and a
97 beer expert still in the training period.

98

99

100

101 2.2. Procedure:

102 Face-to-face explanation interviews were conducted with the experts. Two French wines and
103 two international Belgian beers were selected to be presented as descriptions to the experts in
104 a randomized order. The two wines were selected by a French sommelier to represent French
105 wines often offered with food (one red wine and one white wine). The two Belgian beers are
106 among the most popular commercial beers in France. The beverages were chosen to be
107 different enough to elicit different pairings.

108 For wines, the appellation, the vintage, the producer, the cuvée, and a general description
109 from the producer's web site were available. For beers, the products' name and description
110 were available and came directly from the producer (See Appendix A).

111 Interview guides were used to ensure topics of major interest were covered. For each
112 beverage, experts were asked, first, to suggest dishes to match it and to explain the reasons for
113 their choices and second, to suggest dishes that do not go well with the beverage and to
114 explain these choices also. Appendix B provides a list of suggested dishes, for each beverage.
115 Before starting the interview, all experts gave their informed consent. Each interview lasted
116 about one hour and was recorded with a voice recorder. The participants' anonymity was
117 assured according to the laboratory's instructions.

118

119 3. Analyses

120 The discourse analysis was performed by three investigators. In the first step, they identified
121 principles used by experts from interviews. This led to an analysis matrix used for the final
122 analysis. Each investigator, independently, identified for each expert and each wine/beer the
123 mentioned principles. Then, they compared their analyses. Whenever disagreement was
124 observed, they sought consensus by discussion. When consensus was not possible, the
125 verbatim was not considered for further analysis.

126

127 In the second step, the number of sommeliers and beer experts who had mentioned each
128 principle was determined for wines and beers separately. Data were arranged in a frequency
129 matrix with principles in columns and every expert type/beverage type combinations in rows.
130 The matrix was analyzed by a Correspondence Analysis (CA) which converts data into
131 graphical display to describe the relationships among variables (pairing principles) (Benzécri
132 & Bellier, 1976).

133

134

135 4. Results and discussion

136 4.1. Identified pairing principles

137 Experts mentioned eighteen pairing principles related to three categories: a perceptual
 138 category related to characteristics such as aroma, taste, texture, etc., a conceptual category
 139 related to geographical identity and context of consumption, and an affective category related
 140 to consumers' preferences and emotions.

141

Category	Pairing principle	Proportion of experts mentioning the principle (%)				
		Total experts	Sommeliers	Beer experts	Wine	Beer
Perceptual	Balance of intensity	100	100	100	90	90
	Balance of quality	75	70	80	70	50
	Harmony	65	60	70	45	55
	Similarity	100	100	100	90	95
	Culinary practices	75	80	70	65	50
	Avoid off-flavor	30	40	20	30	5
	Rinsing effect	70	70	70	55	45
	Decrease of sensory property	85	90	80	70	50
	Enhancement of sensory property	80	80	80	70	35
Conceptual	Norms	65	60	70	60	40
	Geographical identity	75	90	60	65	35
	Quality level	65	90	40	40	55
	Moment of the meal	80	80	80	60	45
	Specific situation	65	90	40	50	50
	Season	40	40	40	20	30
Affective	Individual preferences	60	50	70	30	40
	Surprise	40	30	50	25	30
Other	Experience	25	20	30	10	15

142 Table 1: Identified pairing principles and proportion of experts who used them, in total, by
 143 expert specialty (sommelier vs beer experts) and by beverage type (wine vs beer).

144

145

146

147

148 4.1.1. Perceptual pairing principles

149

150 **Balance of intensity**

151 The prerequisite to match food and beverage seems to be a global balance of intensity
152 between the two products such that neither the food nor the beverage dominates overly within
153 the pair:

154 *“We stay in a range where both wine and dish are balanced in terms of power, degree of*
155 *power, that is very important at that level” “on reste dans un registre où on a à la fois un vin,*
156 *à la fois un plat qui s'équilibrent en terme de puissance, de degrés de puissance qui est très*
157 *important à ce niveau-là” (Sommelier).*

158 Balance of intensity seems so obvious that experts specified this principle to explain reasons
159 for bad matches, whereas they rarely mentioned it when suggesting good matches. Indeed,
160 they stated that whenever the properties of the dominant product completely mask the
161 properties of the other one, it is not a match.

162 *“we would not choose a cabbage stew, because there is pork with a lot of salt, and with*
163 *strong tastes, so the white beer will be crushed” “on ne mettrait pas une potée au chou,*
164 *parce qu'on est sur du porc avec beaucoup de sel, et avec des goûts marqués, donc là, la bière*
165 *blanche elle va se faire écraser” (Sommelier).*

166 Few studies have demonstrated such a principle except Paulsen et al. (2015) who showed that
167 for beer and soup pairing, balance of intensity was a good predictor of liking the match.

168 Others studies showed similar results (Bastian et al., 2010; Bastian et al., 2009; Donadini et
169 al., 2008; King and Cliff, 2005). However, the authors used bi-polar rating scales anchored
170 with “the food dominates” at one extremity, “the drink dominates” at the other, and “ideal
171 match” in the middle. As the scale itself conveys the idea that balance of intensity leads to a
172 good match, finding a link between those two dimensions seems to be tautological. By
173 contrast, Donadini and colleagues (2012, 2013, 2014), reported that unbalanced pairs are
174 favoured over balanced ones. The discrepancies between Donadini's findings and experts'
175 statements may come from the fact that experts refer to a massive imbalance with one product
176 that "overwhelms" the other one or one product that "disappears". In Donadini's studies,
177 imbalance seems rather moderate; one product is more intense than the other one but both are
178 still perceived. Therefore, a strong imbalance could be detrimental to pairing whereas a
179 moderate imbalance may leave room for other association principles. Donadini et al. (2012)
180 and Donadini and Fumi (2014) hypothesised that unbalanced pairing could be favoured over
181 perfectly balanced ones as long as the dominant property has a positive hedonic valence.

182 Experts bring out another consideration in justifying a slight imbalance of intensity in pairing:
183 the aim of the association. If the pairing is aimed at valuating one of the two products in the
184 pair, this product should be slightly more intense. The second product is then perceived in the
185 background, highlighting or enhancing the “main” product.

186 *“Sometimes a food and wine pairing can be ah ... Stéphane Montez (a wine producer)*
187 *presents his products, we may imagine that we make dishes a little bit below, a little more*
188 *discreet, which finally let the wine express fully, because we will try to flatter the wine. [...] the wine will dominate the dish a little”* *“Parfois un accord mets et vin ça peut être ah...*
189 *Stéphane Montez présente ses produits on peut imaginer qu’on fasse des plats un petit peu en-*
190 *dessous, un peu plus discrets, qui laissent finalement le vin s’exprimer, parce qu’on va*
191 *chercher à flatter le vin. [...] le vin va dominer un peu le plat” (Sommelier).*

193
194 This shows that food-drink pairing may address two goals. It can either promote a unique
195 consumer’s experience where food and drink are perceived as a whole with both products’
196 characteristics perceived together, or it could be aimed at promoting one product, the
197 characteristics of which should dominate, whereas the companion product is in the
198 background.

199 200 **Balance of quality**

201 Together with balance of intensity, a good match needs a balance of quality. Balance of
202 quality implies that contrasted flavors are perceived with equivalent intensity levels, as
203 illustrated by this quote: *“I would choose Blue cheese for its smooth, fresh, sweet, acid*
204 *characteristics, so with the sweet bitterness of the white beer, there will be sweetness,*
205 *sourness, bitterness, forming some balances in the mouth”* *“pour le côté onctueux, frais,*
206 *sucré, acide donc avec la douce amertume de la blanche là on aura le sucré, acide, amer et*
207 *en bouche il y a des équilibres qui se formeraient” (Sommelier).*

208 Here, sweetness, sourness, and bitterness intensities are balanced; thus, the resulting flavor is
209 equilibrated. Such balance of quality, also called “contrast” in expert literature, seems close to
210 the oenologists’ notion of well-balanced wine. It refers to a balance in intensity of taste and
211 astringency perceptions, in line with the definition of wine balance provided by Meillon et al.
212 (2010): “none of the perceived sensations dominate in the mouth”.

213
214 However, experts moderate this statement, explaining that if the intensities of the opposed
215 flavors are too strong, the contrast is too pronounced and does not lead to a good match:

216 “A total opposition between sweetness and sourness, very strong on both sides, too much to
217 match” “opposition complète de l’univers du sucre et l’univers de l’acidité très marqué des
218 deux côtés, trop pour qu’ils puissent s’entendre” (Sommelier).

219

220 In both balance of intensity and balance of quality principles, the pair is considered as a whole
221 and the match as a global perceptual experience. Characteristics of the two products should be
222 perceived as a harmonious whole.

223 “For me, in a pair, the ideal is that the two products express themselves, are harmonious [...]
224 the idea is that we can taste both of them” “Pour moi, dans un accord, l’idéal est que les
225 deux produit s’expriment, soit harmonieux [...] l’idée c’est qu’on puisse sentir les deux”
226 (Beer expert).

227

228 **Harmony**

229 Experts stated that a good match should have a high level of harmony. Harmony, defined as
230 “how well sensations go together”, highly correlates with the liking of the match (Eschevins
231 et al., 2018; Paulsen et al., 2015). Therefore, harmony seems to be the objective to reach in
232 matching food and beverages.

233

234 **Experience**

235 In some occasions, experts suggested matches based on autobiographic memories. They only
236 mentioned that they already tasted the association and experienced harmony. In this case, they
237 do not analyze the match in terms of pairing principles. However, this way of suggesting
238 pairing is not very frequent. Generally, experts refer to one or several principles to explain
239 their choice.

240

241 **Similarity**

242 Similarity consists of associating two products that share one or more properties namely
243 aroma and taste but other modalities such as texture and color were also considered. For
244 aromatic similarity, the idea is that similarity between the two products increases with the
245 number of their shared aromatic note.

246 “a small fruit salad with a small scoop of vanilla ice-cream because we would have also the
247 vanilla aroma that is there (in the beer)” “une petite salade de fruit avec une petite boule de
248 glace vanille parce qu’on retrouverait la vanille qui est là (dans la bière)” (Sommelier).

249 Or " A St Joseph wine with a "black forest" patisserie [(a cake with cherry, Chantilly cream,
250 and chocolate)] where we would have also the red fruit aromas" "avec une Forêt Noire où on
251 va retrouver les arômes de fruits rouges" (Beer expert).

252 Aromatic similarity has been found to increase harmony as well as to modulate complexity of
253 the pairing and thus increase pair liking (Eschevins et al., 2018).

254

255 Experts reported similarity as an easy and safe way to match products, while minimizing risks
256 of mismatch. They also mentioned that associating food and beverages based on similarity
257 increases the intensity of the shared properties in the match. Therefore, the pleasurable
258 disposition of this type of pairing may depend on both the hedonic valence and the resulting
259 intensity of the shared characteristics.

260 "with a vanilla dessert, all of a sudden, it will drive the Blond Leffe in a totally different
261 direction, suddenly the vanilla of the blond Leffe stands out with an enhancement on both
262 sides" "si on la met sur un dessert à la vanille tout à coup ça va mettre la Leffe blonde en
263 avant sous un angle totalement différent, tout à coup la vanille de la Leffe blonde ressort de
264 façon qu'il y ait une accentuation qui se répète des deux côtés" (Beer expert).

265

266 **Culinary practices**

267 More challenging than similarity, associating characteristics that have different qualities was
268 mentioned by 75% of the experts. They stated that this association mimics common culinary
269 practices. The principle is that one product, usually the drink, adds some target property to the
270 food. This type of pairing works because it echoes a classical accord in the culinary tradition,
271 in which food is often consumed in association with another one, for instance a seasoning,
272 which brings about a target property:

273 "you have that fruit, so it's like you'd served a red and black fruit coulis with your chocolate
274 mousse" "vous allez avoir que le fruit donc c'est comme si vous avez servi un coulis de fruit
275 rouge et noir avec votre mousse au chocolat" (Sommelier).

276 Because two flavors are encountered together on a regular basis, the association becomes
277 familiar and its appreciation increases. This could be explained by a mere-exposure effect
278 (Zajonc, 1968).

279

280

281

282

283 **Avoid off-flavor**

284 Associating similar or dissimilar aromas aims to create harmonious associations. However,
285 experts explain that it may also lead to an opposite effect by creating an “off-flavor” or “off-
286 taste” that was not originally perceived in the food or in the drink. The idea is therefore to
287 avoid the emergence of off-flavor to create good match.

288 *“Of course, we will avoid goat cheese [...] for the chemical issue, tannins flocculate in the*
289 *presence of lactic acid. Then, they become soapy, sapid and generate a lot of bitterness” “on*
290 *évitera bien entendu tous les chèvres [...] pour la problématique chimique, les tannins*
291 *floculent avec la présence de l’acide lactique. Donc ils vont devenir savonneux, sapide et*
292 *générer énormément d’amertume” (Sommelier).*

293 Off-flavor or off-taste seems to result from physicochemical interactions leading to new
294 compounds as mentioned above. For example, Spence, Wang, and Youssef (2017) mentioned
295 that the association of red wines with seafood is known to develop an unpleasant fishy
296 aftertaste resulting from physicochemical interactions between the wine’s ferrous ions and
297 lipid hydroperoxides derived from unsaturated fatty acids in seafood (Tamura et al., 2009).

298
299 The pairing principles presented so far create a match because the food-drink association
300 leads to a unified experience. But, experts also match products in order to preserve or even
301 enhance the experience of each product. They distinguish three principles: 1) **rinsing** aims to
302 preserve the original qualities of each product, 2) **masking** aims to suppress off-flavor in one
303 product, and 3) **synergy** aims to enhance one positive characteristic in one product. All three
304 principles relate to temporal modulation of perceptions in repeated and alternate consumption,
305 originating from carry-over effects.

306

307 **Rinsing effect**

308 In a pair that employs the rinsing effect, the beverage allows the taster to take full advantage
309 of the next bit of food by “rinsing his palate” and preventing an increase in intensity. A
310 number of experts stated that some beverage characteristics allow for taking the grease out of
311 the mouth. This rinsing effect may be due to acidity, astringency, or carbonation:

312 *“Blond Leffe will give me a light fizzing on the tongue, [...], and thus, I will get rid of the*
313 *greasiness of my foie gras. So, I would not have saturation enjoying the slice of foie gras”*

314 *“Leffe blonde va me donner un léger pétilllement sur la langue, [...], et que du coup, je vais*
315 *me débarrasser du gras de mon foie gras. Donc, je vais dire que je n’aurais pas de saturation*
316 *pour apprécier la tranche de foie gras.” (Beer expert)*

317 This phenomenon has also been raised in interviews in which the interviewee claimed to drink
318 a great deal of wine “because it’s a good beverage to wash down food” (Pettigrew and
319 Charters, 2006, p 174).
320 Peyrot des Gachons et al. (2012) demonstrated that tea consumption between bites of fatty
321 food decreased oral fattiness more than water. This phenomenon is due to the highly
322 emulsifying properties of tea-leaf saponins (Mura et al., 2017). Conversely fatty food
323 consumption decreases astringency perception. For instance, Donadini et al. (2015) showed
324 that cheeses such as Gorgonzola or Mozzarella decrease beer astringency. Peyrot des Gachons
325 et al. (2012) also found a similar effect with dried meat and tea. This effect is especially
326 noticeable in repeated consumption. For instance, Galmarini et al. (2016) showed that wine
327 astringency increases over repeated sips, leading to a decrease in liking. However, this effect
328 almost disappears when bites of cheese are consumed between consecutive sips.
329 Consequently the liking of the wine was stable over the series of sips. In this case, matching
330 wine and cheese keeps both products enjoyable over the whole tasting experience.
331 The mechanisms that underlie astringency perception are complex (Laguna, Bartolomé, et al.,
332 2017; Laguna, Sarkar, et al., 2017). Among others, astringency is related to the creation of an
333 insoluble complex between astringent compounds (tannins in wine for instance) and salivary
334 proteins, inducing a loss in lubrication of oral surfaces (Garcia-Estevez et al., 2018; Ployon et
335 al., 2018). But when wine is consumed with cheese, fat from the cheese decreases friction in
336 the mouth and restores lubrication (de Wijk and Prinz, 2005).

337

338 **Decrease of sensory property**

339 Beyond a mere rinsing effect, the companion product may have a corrective effect by masking
340 a negative or disliked characteristic in the primary product:

341 *“(the Blond Leffe beer) will bring a refreshing side, it will somewhat mitigate the violence of*
342 *anchovies or certain olives” “(la bière Leffe Blonde) apportera un côté rafraichissant, ça*
343 *atténuera un peu la violence des anchois ou de certaines variétés d’olives” (Sommelier).*

344

345 Such interactions were demonstrated for pairings between wine and cheese
346 (Madrigal-Galan and Heymann; 2006). The prior consumption of cheese induced a decrease
347 in the perceived intensity of oak and mushroom aromas in wine. Such aromas were identified
348 as factors that negatively influence pair liking.. In the same vein, prior consumption of
349 Parmigiano cheese decreases bitterness, astringency, malty flavor, carbonation, and level of
350 alcohol of beer (Donadini et al., 2013); high fat Hollandaise sauce decreases the citrus flavor

351 of Chardonnay unoaked wine (Nygren et al., 2001); and wine decreases the buttery flavor,
352 saltiness, and sourness of blue cheeses (Nygren et al., 2003).
353 This modulation occurs with off-flavor (Bastian et al., 2010) or with a property at a higher
354 than optimal intensity. In both cases, pairing improves liking of a product which was initially
355 moderately liked. Such an effect may involve several mechanisms. It could involve peripheral
356 interactions such as bitterness suppression by umami due to suppression of the salicin-induced
357 activation of the hTAS2R16 bitter taste receptor (Kim et al., 2015), or the competitive
358 interactions at the olfactory-receptor level for aroma-aroma interactions. It could involve
359 perceptual interactions occurring at the central level, such as lateral inhibition in the olfactory
360 bulb, leading to a loss of information about an odorant in a mixture (Thomas-Danguin et al.,
361 2014). Such an intensity decrease could also originate from a change in the stimuli
362 themselves. For instance, increasing viscosity decreases aroma diffusion and thus increases
363 the time to reach maximum aroma intensity (Tournier et al., 2009). Thus, consuming a drink
364 (liquid) and food (solid or semi-solid) in sequence increases the viscosity of the bolus and
365 decreases the intensity of some of the drink aromas.
366 Once again, as stressed by one expert, if the masking effect can act for the best by decreasing
367 negative characteristics, it can also be detrimental by decreasing the intensity of positive
368 characteristics; the product is less liked and the match is not so pleasant.

369

370 **Enhancement of sensory properties**

371 Finally, experts mentioned the enhancement of sensory properties. This refers to the increase
372 of the intensity of one or more positive characteristics of one product by the other one:
373 *“The slightly spicy aspects that we will find in this beer with cloves, delicately spiced, even a*
374 *little caramelized will be able to bring out the aromas of the cheese” “les aspects un peu*
375 *épicés qu'on va retrouver dans cette bière là avec clous de girofle, délicatement épicé, voire*
376 *même un peu caramélisé va pouvoir faire ressortir les goûts du fromage” (Beer expert).*

377

378 In their studies, Nygren et al. (2001) and Madrigal-Galan and Heymann (2006) demonstrated
379 that buttery flavor in wine was enhanced by the prior consumption of fatty food (cheese or
380 hollandaise sauce). Donadini and Fumi (2014) found that after the prior consumption of
381 chocolate with 30% cocoa content, teas were perceived as sweeter and richer in milky,
382 caramel, and dried fruit aromas. However, they also found that teas, paired with 70% and 99%
383 cocoa, were perceived as more astringent, sour, bitter, and salty than when tasted alone,

384 stressing that according to the hedonic valence of the enhanced property, the carry-over effect
385 can lead to a good or bad match.

386 Carry-over effects may be due to a change in the stimuli. For instance, residues from the first
387 product remain in the mouth and distort the perception of the subsequent product. They can
388 involve central mechanisms such as a synergy effect in aroma mixture perception (two
389 odorants in a mixture are both perceived with an intensity higher than their perceived
390 intensities alone) (Thomas-Danguin et al., 2014). Nevertheless, the taste-aroma interaction is
391 a well-known phenomenon inducing aroma enhancement (Noble, 1996). An expert indirectly
392 mentioned this type of interaction without necessarily knowing the underlying perceptual
393 mechanism:

394 *“in the mouth it could develop the lemon pie aromas as there is sourness” “en bouche ça*
395 *pourrait développer les arômes de la tarte au citron comme on est sur de l'acidité” (Beer*
396 *expert).*

397

398 4.1.2. Conceptual pairing principles

399 Although perceptual principles are the most often mentioned and usually in first position,
400 experts consider other kinds of principles that rely on extrinsic properties of the foods and
401 drinks as well as the context of consumption.

402

403 **Geographical identity**

404 Experts also suggested to associate two products that have the same geographical identity
405 related to a region or country (ex: Muscadet Sèvre et Maine with oysters or Belgian beer with
406 Flemish carbonade).

407 *“We echo the designation of origin that echoes a region, and that by default, when we have*
408 *regions with some gastronomic typicality, we speak of a local pairing and it may be*
409 *interesting to consider all products that can be found in this region” “on fait écho à*
410 *l'appellation qui fait écho à une région et que par défaut, lorsqu'on a des régions avec*
411 *certaines typicités de gastronomie, on parle d'accord de terroir et ça peut être intéressant de*
412 *s'orienter sur l'ensemble des produits qu'on peut trouver dans cette région” (Sommelier).*

413 In the culinary literature, this pairing is also called “Terroir” pairings (Pierre, 2014). However,
414 the word “terroir” is not only related to geographical origin but also refers to some traditional
415 practices. Thus, the wording “geographical identity” seems more relevant. In this case,
416 conceptual categorization rather than perceptual features orients the match.

417

418 **Norms**

419 Some experts evoked norms when suggesting matches. This refers to usual/classical
420 associations encountered in the French culinary culture, such as white wine with fish, or beer
421 with sauerkraut:

422 *“It's purely dogmatic, that's because we've got used drinking [...] we've maintained this*
423 *dogma to the point that it's a constant, that in the bibliography you will find a lot, but that's*
424 *just transmitted and reproduced for no other reason than its existence at a given moment”*
425 *“c'est purement dogmatique, c'est à dire que c'est parce qu'on a pris l'habitude de boire ou de*
426 *dire [...] on a entretenu ce dogme au point que c'est une constante qui là dans la*
427 *bibliographie vous allez pouvoir retrouver énormément mais qui est juste transmise et*
428 *reproduite sans aucune autre raison que son existence à un moment donné” (Beer expert).*

429 Such pairings are often encountered, thus they are familiar and consequently widely
430 appreciated (Borgogno et al., 2015).

431
432 The principles of norms and geographical identity might overlap as, historically, food
433 transportation was limited and people tended to consume local products. However, what may
434 have once been related to “geographical identity” may have evolved. The norms are rather
435 related to the type of products than to the products' geographical identity. For instance,
436 pairing sauerkraut and beer may come from the fact that both used to be commonly consumed
437 in Alsace. At this time, it was a match related to products geographical identity. But,
438 nowadays it becomes pairing norms as it may work with Belgian beer as well.

439

440 **Quality level**

441 The same principle applies to products' quality level. An exclusive wine matches with a fine
442 dish made with high quality products. It is irrelevant to associate it with a basic dish even
443 though their perceptual properties would go well together.

444 *“even though this wine is beautiful, it remains a Muscadet, hm and so we will not necessarily*
445 *give it dishes of exceptional nobility, so we must also stay in a pairing according to nobility”*
446 *“donc aussi belle cette cuvée là, ça reste un Muscadet, hm et donc on va pas forcément lui*
447 *accorder des plats d'une noblesse exceptionnelle, donc il faut aussi rester dans cet accord de*
448 *noblesse” (Sommelier).*

449 In their study, Pettigrew and Charters (2006) also reported such a principle. One of their
450 interviewees indeed stated that “good” wine would be wasted at a barbecue, but at a formal
451 dinner, it was appropriate while cask wine would fail.

452 **Moment of the meal**

453 According to experts the moment of the meal i.e., starter, main dish, or dessert, modulates
454 pairings and not only because the kinds of food consumed at these moments, are different.
455 Experts refer to vertical pairing as when the pairs consumed before and/or after are taken into
456 account.

457 *“So it makes it possible to finish a meal on a kind of lightness, a kind of thirst-quenching”*

458 *“Donc ça permet de finir un repas sur une forme de légèreté enfin une forme de désaltérant”*
459 *(Sommelier).*

460

461 **Specific situation**

462 In addition to the moment of the meal, experts took into account the context of consumption
463 and some of them mentioned a specific situation in which the pair would work well. They
464 mentioned for instance, an aperitif with a friend on a terrace or a dinner in a gastronomic
465 restaurant. Giacalone et al. (2015) demonstrated that consumers perceived several beers as
466 significantly different in appropriateness across different usage contexts. For example
467 Steinlager classic beer, gold medal Ale beer and Lion red beer were considered as more
468 appropriated to sport event such as rugby match, camping or fishing than Hopwired IPA beer
469 or Pot Kettle Black beer more appropriated to serve to guests or drink in a public house (*e.g.*
470 Bars). The same principle holds for food and beverage pairs and the pair needs to be
471 congruent with the consumption situation. Sester et al. (2013) showed that congruence
472 between the ambiance and the drink would orient consumers' choices. There is a large body
473 of literature dedicated to contextual effect on food choice and liking. The underlying
474 processes at work are also relevant to understanding food-beverage pairing.

475

476 **Season**

477 As part of the context, 40% of the experts took into account the season during which the
478 pairing is consumed:

479 *“But in mid-summer, I would make a citrus salad, slightly spicy, with sweet spices such as a*
480 *little bit of cinnamon and I would serve this wine, and it would be surprising because when*
481 *one thinks of a dessert wine, one thinks of a sweet wine, and there in summer I do not want to*
482 *offer a sweet wine” “Mais en plein été je ferais une salade d'agrumes, légèrement épicées,*
483 *avec des épices douces comme par exemple un petit peu de cannelle et je servirais ce vin, et*
484 *ça serait d'ailleurs étonnant parce que quand on pense à un vin de dessert, on pense à un vin*
485 *sucré, et là en été j'ai pas du tout envie d'offrir un vin sucré” (Beer expert).*

486 Indeed, preferences may change according to the season. Seo et al. (2009) found that
487 cinnamon aroma was more pleasant during the Christmas season than summertime. Wada et
488 al. (2012) demonstrated that infants tend to prefer an image of a strawberry tasted with a
489 congruent odor of strawberry when the task was performed during the strawberry season than
490 when the task was performed out of the strawberry season. In another study, Ristic et al.
491 (2019) asked participants to indicate their preference for different wine aromas in different
492 seasons. They found that chocolate aroma is more appropriate for winter whereas lemon,
493 strawberry, rose and passionfruit aromas are more appropriate for summer. These changes can
494 be explained by the ecological valence theory which suggests that stimulus preferences arise
495 from people's average affective responses to stimulus-associated objects (Palmer and Schloss,
496 2010). This theory explains seasonal changes in color liking such as preference for dark-warm
497 colors (dark-red, brown, olive, and dark-chartreuse) during fall more than other seasons
498 (Schloss et al., 2017), following the color of leaves in nature. This explains why the adequacy
499 between the seasonal natural colors and dish colors contributes to the creation of a pleasurable
500 dining experience (Lightner and Rand, 2014). This theory can be transposed to other sensory
501 modalities and seems relevant in the area of food-drink pairing.

502

503 4.1.3. Affective pairing principles

504

505 **Individual preferences**

506 A large share of the experts included individuals' preferences as a parameter to consider in the
507 search for a good match:

508 *“It may work with a buffet, if people prefer to take beer over wine” “ça peut aller sur un*
509 *buffet campagnard par exemple, si les gens préfèrent prendre de la bière plutôt que d’aller*
510 *prendre des vins” (Sommelier).*

511

512 The liking of the products, tasted alone, affects the liking of the pairing in which they are
513 associated (Bastian et al., 2010; Donadini and Fumi, 2014; Donadini et al., 2012, 2013;
514 Donadini et al., 2015; Harrington et al., 2008; Paulsen et al., 2015). However, pairing the
515 preferred food with the preferred beverage is not enough to create the perfect match
516 (Donadini et al., 2013; Tuorila et al., 1994). The enhancement of certain properties in food-
517 drink pairs could explain inter-individual differences in match assessments. Appreciation will
518 depend on the valence of the dominant notes in the pair for each consumer. If a pairing

519 induces the development of a lemon aroma, the liking of the match will depend on the
520 consumers' liking of lemon.

521

522 **Surprise**

523 Tradition and custom are often at stake in pairing principles. However, thinking outside the
524 box may be relevant on some occasions. Experts sometimes suggested a pairing that
525 deliberately breaks the rules, especially conceptual rules. Because the association is
526 unexpected, it would surprise tasters.

527 *“We prepare a very classic meal and we have a big surprise, we have blond Leffe beer and a*
528 *cake for dessert” “on fait un repas tout à fait classique et pis on fait une grosse surprise, on*
529 *fait goûter Leffe blonde et un gâteau au dessert” (Beer expert).*

530

531 4.2. Comparison of the usage of pairing principles according to expert and beverage types.

532

533 [Insert Figure 1 about here]

534

535 Use of pairing principles according to expert and beverage types was examined with a
536 correspondence analysis (Fig 1). The two first dimensions explain 89.03% of total variance.
537 The F1 axis distinguishes beer experts, represented on the positive part of the axis, from
538 sommeliers, represented on the negative part of the axis. The F2 axis divides pairings with
539 wine on the positive part of the axis, and pairings with beer, on the negative part. Moreover,
540 to help with reading, the principles of “Season”, “Specific situation” and “moment of the
541 meal” were merged in “context of consumption”.

542

543 Overall, perceptual principles such as “similarity”, “balance of intensity”, or “rinsing effect”,
544 are equally mentioned by sommeliers and beer experts whatever the beverage. Beer experts
545 seem to use pairing principles in a similar way when creating pairings with beer and wine. In
546 addition to perceptual principles, they used experiential arguments to justify a match. They
547 refer more often than sommeliers to their own tasting experiences and to the individual
548 preference of consumers. Sommeliers more often use conceptual principles and include
549 contextual considerations to match food and beverages. The relative weight of experiential
550 and conceptual dimensions has already been pointed out as an indicator of level and kind of
551 expertise in wine (Langlois et al., 2011).

552 Overall, matching food with either wine or beer seems to mobilise the same principles. A few
553 differences were observed. “Norms” and “Geographical identity” were more often mentioned
554 with wine than with beer. This is not surprising as in France, pairing food with beer is a
555 relatively new trend whereas pairing food and wine is part of the French culture and history.
556 The region of production of wine is an important characteristic of the beverage but it is less
557 advertised for beer.

558 By contrast, the notion of “surprise” was mentioned more often with beer than wine. In
559 France, pairing wine with food is very normative. Unlike drinking beer, drinking wine is a
560 habit and an element of the French cultural background (Do, Patris, & Valentin, 2009). Hence
561 offering beer as companion to food may be a first source of surprise for French consumers.
562 From a more methodological point of view, these differences could also be explained by the
563 differential anchoring of selected beers and wines in the French culture and terroir. For
564 example, the two beers were industrial Belgian beers not linked to a specific production area
565 for French experts. By contrast, the two wines were AOC (Appellation d’Origine Contrôlée)
566 wines with a strong regional identity. AOC is one of the French geographical indications. This
567 system works in parallel to the European PDO (protected designation of origin) / PGI
568 (protected geographical indication) system. This regulation protects the reputation of regional
569 products and promotes rural and agricultural activity. It is well known by French people in
570 general and in the area of wine particularly. A study with French craft beers, for which the
571 production area is emphasized, would be necessary to see whether the “Geographical identity”
572 pairing principle would be used as frequently for beer than for wine or if it is really product-
573 dependent.

574

575 Sommeliers also used the notion of “new characteristics” that emerge when associating food
576 and beverages but only for wine. They actually mentioned a potential risk of creating “off-
577 flavor” when pairing food and wine.

578

579 5. General discussion

580

581 This work confirms that pairing food and beverages is a complex task. There are several
582 methods to match food and beverages. The method to implement primarily depends on the
583 objective of the pairing: to create a unique perceptual experience by combining the two
584 products, to highlight one of the two products and make it more attractive, or to enjoy each of
585 the two products in the pair as much as possible. According to the objective, one principle or

586 another would be as a means to reach the objective. Moreover, principles are used in
587 combination including several perceptual, conceptual, and affective principles. The weights of
588 the three kinds of principles may vary according to the expertise of the person pairing the
589 food and beverage as well as the person for whom the pair is intended.

590 Individual factors were also mentioned by experts. They acknowledged inter-individual
591 differences in food-pairing perception, underlining the importance of liking (liking of each
592 product, tasted alone). This is undoubtedly a major issue. But other inter-individual
593 differences based on attitudes and motivations such as health issues, cultural specificities, or
594 social influences, are probably as relevant, since they are known to affect eating behavior
595 (Higgs and Thomas, 2016; Renner et al., 2012).

596

597 Interviews were conducted with 10 wine and 10 beer experts. Considering such a number,
598 analyses based on number of occurrence needs to be confirmed with a larger group.

599 Moreover, all experts were French. Thus, results have to be considered cautiously when
600 generalized to other cultures. Culture may affect the content of the principles. For instance,
601 when considering the principle of “Culinary practices”, two flavors that would work in one
602 culture may not be relevant in another. So experts of different cultures, calling upon this same
603 principle, would end up with different pairings according to classical accords in their own
604 culinary culture. Culture may also affect the relative weight of principles used in combination.
605 The principle of “geographical identity” is likely to be more important in a country such as
606 France where products of origin (PDO) are numerous and well established, compared to other
607 countries where the notion of geographical identity is less developed. Ultimately, experts
608 from different cultures may consider principles other than those considered by French experts.

609

610 6. Conclusion

611 The results demonstrate that French sommeliers and beer experts use pairing principles
612 related to perceptual, conceptual and affective categories. Overall, matching food with either
613 wine or beer seems to rely on the same principles. However, matches based on norms and
614 conceptual association, were more often mentioned for wine than beer. Beer experts used
615 more experiential discourse than sommeliers who referred more often to conceptual
616 association.

617 Further work is needed to experimentally test the principles listed by experts. Some have
618 already been studied using sensory science approaches. But others need to be explored deeper.
619 Finally, as principles are called upon in combination rather than in isolation, further work

620 needs to be undertaken to understand how experts choose one combination rather than
621 another.

622

623

624 Acknowledgements:

625 This work was funded by a Baillet Latour Fund grant and by the Association Nationale
626 Recherche Technologie (ANRT) [grant number 2014-1465, the French national association of
627 technical research]. The authors thank all the experts who agreed to take some of their time to
628 contribute to this project.

629

630 References:

631

632 Bastian, S. E. P., Collins, C., Johnson, T. E. (2010). Understanding consumer preferences for Shiraz
633 wine and Cheddar cheese pairings. *Food Quality and Preference*, 21(7), 668-
634 678.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2010.02.002>.

635 Bastian, S. E. P., Payne, C. M., Perrenoud, B., Joscelyne, V. L., Johnson, T. E. (2009). Comparisons
636 between Australian consumers' and industry experts' perceptions of ideal wine and cheese
637 combinations. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*, 15(2), 175-
638 184.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0238.2008.00043.x>.

639 Borgogno, M., Favotto, S., Corazzin, M., Cardello, A. V., Piasentier, E. (2015). The role of product
640 familiarity and consumer involvement on liking and perceptions of fresh meat. *Food Quality
641 and Preference*, 44, 139-147.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2015.04.010>.

642 de Wijk, R. A., Prinz, J. F. (2005). The role of friction in perceived oral texture. *Food Quality and
643 Preference*, 16(2), 121-129.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2004.03.002>.

644 Do, V.-B., Patris, B., & Valentin, D. (2009). Opinions on wine in a new consumer country: A
645 comparative study of Vietnam and France. *Journal of Wine Research*, 20(3), 253-271. doi:
646 10.1080/09571260903471894

647 Donadini, G., Fumi, M. D. (2014). An investigation on the appropriateness of chocolate to match tea
648 and coffee. *Food Research International*, 63, 464-
649 476.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2014.05.038>.

650 Donadini, G., Fumi, M. D., Lambri, M. (2012). The hedonic response to chocolate and beverage
651 pairing: A preliminary study. *Food Research International*, 48(2), 703-
652 711.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2012.06.009>.

653 Donadini, G., Fumi, M. D., Lambri, M. (2013). A preliminary study investigating consumer preference
654 for cheese and beer pairings. *Food Quality and Preference*, 30(2), 217-
655 228.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2013.05.012>.

656 Donadini, G., Fumi, M. D., Newby-Clark, I. R. (2015). An investigation of matches of bottom
657 fermented red beers with cheeses. *Food Research International*, 67, 376-
658 389.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2014.11.004>.

659 Donadini, G., Spigno, G., Fumi, M. D., Pastori, R. (2008). Evaluation of ideal everyday italian food and
660 beer pairings with regular consumers and food and beverage experts. *Journal of the Institute
661 of Brewing*, 114(4), 329-342.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2050-0416.2008.tb00777.x>.

662 Eschevins, A., Giboreau, A., Allard, T., Dacremont, C. (2018). The role of aromatic similarity in food
663 and beverage pairing. *Food Quality and Preference*, 65, 18-
664 27.<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2017.12.005>.

665 Galmarini, M., Loiseau, A.-L., Visalli, M., Schlich, P. (2016). Use of multi-intake temporal dominance of
666 sensations (TDS) to evaluate the influence of cheese on wine perception. *Journal of Food*
667 *Science*, 81(10), S2566-S2577. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1750-3841.13500>.

668 Garcia-Estevez, I., Ramos-Pineda, A. M., Escribano-Bailon, M. T. (2018). Interactions between wine
669 phenolic compounds and human saliva in astringency perception. *Food & Function*, 9, 1294-
670 1309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c7fo02030a>.

671 Giacalone, D., Frøst, M. B., Bredie, W. L. P., Pineau, B., Hunter, D. C., Paisley, A. G., Beresford, M. K.,
672 Jaeger, S. R. (2015). Situational appropriateness of beer is influenced by product familiarity.
673 *Food Quality and Preference*, 39, 16-27. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2014.06.012>.

674 Harrington, R. J. (2008). Food & wine pairing. A sensory experience: John Wiley & Sons, inc

675 Harrington, R. J., Miszczac, D. C., Ottenbacher, M. C. (2008). The impact of beer type, pizza spiciness
676 and gender on match perceptions. *PASOS. Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage*, 6(2),
677 173-188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2008.06.014>.

678 Higgs, S., Thomas, J. (2016). Social influences on eating. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1-
679 6. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.10.005>.

680 Ifop. (2012). Les français et la bière [French and beer]. In. www.ifop.com

681 Ifop. (2014). Baromètre de l'image du vin [Barometer of the wine image] - Vague 5. In. www.ifop.com

682 Kim, M. J., Son, H. J., Kim, Y., Misaka, T., Rhyu, M.-R. (2015). Umami-bitter interactions: The
683 suppression of bitterness by umami peptides via human bitter taste receptor. *Biochemical*
684 *and Biophysical Research Communications*, 456(2), 586-
685 590. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2014.11.114>.

686 King, M., Cliff, M. (2005). Evaluation of ideal wine and cheese pairs using a deviation-from-ideal scale
687 with food and wine experts. *Journal of Food Quality*, 28(3), 245-
688 256. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4557.2005.00033.x>.

689 Laguna, L., Bartolomé, B., Moreno-Arribas, M. V. (2017). Mouthfeel perception of wine: Oral
690 physiology, components and instrumental characterization. *Trends in Food Science &*
691 *Technology*, 59, 49-59. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2016.10.011>.

692 Laguna, L., Sarkar, A., Bryant, M. G., Beadling, A. R., Bartolomé, B., Victoria Moreno-Arribas, M.
693 (2017). Exploring mouthfeel in model wines: Sensory-to-instrumental approaches. *Food*
694 *Research International*, 102, 478-486. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2017.09.009>.

695 Langlois, J., Dacremont, C., Peyron, D., Valentin, D., Dubois, D. (2011). Lexicon and types of discourse
696 in wine expertise: The case of vin de garde. *Food Quality and Preference*, 22(6), 491-
697 498. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2010.10.008>.

698 Lightner, M., Rand, S. (2014). The enhancement of natural colors to provoke seasonality.
699 *International journal of Gastronomy and Food science*, 2, 55-59.
700 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2014.05.002>.

701 Madrigal-Galan, B., Heymann, H. (2006). Sensory effects of consuming cheese prior to evaluating red
702 wine flavor. *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, 57(1), 12-22

703 Maresca, T. (1994). *The Right Wine*: Grove/Atlantic, Incorporated

704 Meillon, S., Viala, D., Medel, M., Urbano, C., Guillot, G., Schlich, P. (2010). Impact of partial alcohol
705 reduction in Syrah wine on perceived complexity and temporality of sensations and link with
706 preference. *Food Quality and Preference*, 21(7), 732-
707 740. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2010.06.005>.

708 Mura, E., Yagi, M., Kizaki, Y., Matsumiya, K., Matsumura, Y., Hayashi, Y. (2017). Analysis of active
709 components on oral fat sensations in Oolong tea. *Food Science and Technology Research*,
710 23(1), 71-78. <http://doi.org/10.3136/fstr.23.71>.

711 Noble, A. C. (1996). Taste-aroma interactions. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 7(12), 439-
712 444. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244\(96\)10044-3](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244(96)10044-3).

713 Nusswitz, P. (1991). L'accord des vins et des mets [wines and food pairing](Dormonval ed.):
714 Dormonval.

715 Nygren, T., Gustafsson, I. B., Haglund, Å., Johansson, L., Noble, A. C. (2001). Flavor changes produced
716 by wine and food interactions: Chardonnay wine and Hollandaise sauce. *Journal of Sensory*
717 *Studies*, 16(5), 461-470.<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-459x.2001.tb00313.x>

718 Nygren, T., Gustafsson, I. B., Johansson, L. (2003). Perceived flavour changes in blue mould cheese
719 after tasting white wine. *Food Service Technology*, 3(3-4), 143-
720 150.<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-5740.2003.00070.x>.

721 Palmer, S. E., Schloss, K. B. (2010). An ecological valence theory of human color preference.
722 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(19), 8877-
723 8882.<http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0906172107>.

724 Paulsen, M. T., Rognså, G. H., Hersleth, M. (2015). Consumer perception of food–beverage pairings:
725 The influence of unity in variety and balance. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food*
726 *Science*, 2(2), 83-92.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2014.12.003>.

727 Pettigrew, S., Charters, S. (2006). Consumers' expectations of food and alcohol pairing. *British Food*
728 *Journal*, 108(3), 169-180.<http://doi.org/10.1108/00070700610650990>.

729 Peyrot des Gachons, C., Mura, E., Speziale, C., Favreau, C. J., Dubreuil, G. F., Breslin, P. A. S. (2012).
730 Opponency of astringent and fat sensations. *Current Biology*, 22(19), R829-
731 R830.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.08.017>.

732 Pierre, E. (2014). Le guide hachette des bières [the Hachette guide of beers]: Hachette

733 Ployon, S., Morzel, M., Belloir, C., Bonnotte, A., Bourillot, E., Briand, L., Lesniewska, E., Lherminier, J.,
734 Aybeke, E., Canon, F. (2018). Mechanisms of astringency: Structural alteration of the oral
735 mucosal pellicle by dietary tannins and protective effect of bPRPs. *Food Chemistry*, 253, 79-
736 87.<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.01.141>.

737 Renner, B., Sproesser, G., Strohbach, S., Schupp, H. T. (2012). Why we eat what we eat. The Eating
738 Motivation Survey (TEMS). *Appetite*, 59(1), 117-
739 128.<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2012.04.004>.

740 Ristic, R., Danner, L., Johnson, T. E., Meiselman, H. L., Hoek, A. C., Jiraneek, V., & Bastian, S. E. P.
741 (2019). Wine-related aromas for different seasons and occasions: Hedonic and emotional
742 responses of wine consumers from Australia, UK and USA. *Food Quality and Preference*, 71,
743 250-260. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.07.011>

744 Schloss, K. B., Nelson, R., Parker, L., Heck, I. A., Palmer, S. E. (2017). Seasonal variations in color
745 Preference. *Cognitive Science*, 41(6), 1589-1612.<http://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12429>.

746 Seo, H.-S., Buschhüter, D., Hummel, T. (2009). Odor attributes change in relation to the time of the
747 year. Cinnamon odor is more familiar and pleasant during Christmas season than
748 summertime. *Appetite*, 53(2), 222-225.<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2009.06.011>.

749 Sester, C., Deroy, O., Sutan, A., Galia, F., Desmarchelier, J.-F., Valentin, D., Dacremont, C. (2013).
750 “Having a drink in a bar”: An immersive approach to explore the effects of context on drink
751 choice. *Food Quality and Preference*, 28(1), 23-
752 31.<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2012.07.006>.

753 Spence, C., Wang, Q. J., & Youssef, J. (2017). Pairing flavours and the temporal order of tasting.
754 *Flavour*, 6(1), 4. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13411-017-0053-0>.

755 Tamura, T., Taniguchi, K., Suzuki, Y., Okubo, T., Takata, R., Konno, T. (2009). Iron is an essential cause
756 of fishy aftertaste formation in wine and seafood pairing. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*
757 *Chemistry*, 57(18), 8550-8556.<http://doi.org/10.1021/jf901656k>.

758 Thomas-Danguin, T., Sinding, C., Romagny, S., El Mountassir, F., Atanasova, B., Le Berre, E., Le Bon,
759 A.-M., Coureaud, G. (2014). The perception of odor objects in everyday life: a review on the
760 processing of odor mixtures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5,
761 504.<http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00504>.

762 Tournier, C., Sulmont-Rossé, C., Sémon, E., Vignon, A., Issanchou, S., Guichard, E. (2009). A study on
763 texture–taste–aroma interactions: Physico-chemical and cognitive mechanisms. *International*
764 *Dairy Journal*, 19(8), 450-458.<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2009.01.003>.

765 Tuorila, H., HyvÖNen, L., Vainio, L. (1994). Pleasantness of cookies, juice and their combinations rated
766 in brief taste tests and following ad libitum consumption. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, 9(2),
767 205-216.<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-459X.1994.tb00241.x>.
768 Wada, Y., Inada, Y., Yang, J., Kunieda, S., Masuda, T., Kimura, A., . . . Yamaguchi, M. K. (2012). Infant
769 visual preference for fruit enhanced by congruent in-season odor. *Appetite*, 58(3), 1070-
770 1075. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2012.02.002>
771 Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social*
772 *Psychology*, 9(2, Pt.2), 1-27.<http://doi.org/10.1037/h0025848>.
773
774
775

Muscadet Sèvre et Maine	Vintage	2014
	Producer	Joseph Landron, domaine de la Louveterie
	Cuvée	Cuvée amphibolite nature
	Description (from the producer's website)	Dry white wine Produced at the top of the Nantes vineyards, on the slopes of the Sèvre Alcohol content: 12% Intense aroma of ripe citrus Lemon flavor Grapefruit flavor Rich and complex palate, underpinned by mineral acidity. Superb balance with a crystalline mineral density. Persistence of salinity remains pure with high precision of the fruit.
St Joseph	Vintage	2013
	Producer	Stéphane Montez, domaine du Monteillet
	Cuvée	Cuvée du papy
	Description (From the producer's website)	Red wine produced on the right bank of the Rhone, in the department of the Loire Alcohol content: 12.5% Red fruit aromas (blackcurrant) Violet aroma Spice (nutmeg, pepper) Licorice aroma Vanilla aroma The palate is elegant and long with a solid tannic structure with soft tannins.
Hoegaarden	Description (from the producer)	Belgian white beer internationally sold Alcohol content: 4.9% Lemon aroma Sweet Acid Smooth Clove aroma Coriander aroma Creamy Bitter Banana aroma
Blond Leffe	Description (from the producer)	Belgian blond beer internationally sold Alcohol content: 6.6% Fruity Delicately spiced

		Clove aroma Vanilla aroma Smoky aroma Phenolic aroma Caramel aroma Butterscotch aroma Grilled aroma Sulphide in aftertaste Sweet Bitter Dense Alcohol aroma
--	--	--

776 **Appendix A:** Product information provided to the experts

777

778 **Appendix B:** Examples of dishes suggested by experts (at least three of them) to match each beverage
 779 (no matches were also included).

780

781 Table B1. Example of dishes suggested to be matched with **Hoegaarden** beer.

Match/no match	Dishes category + number of experts (total and by specialty (B= beer experts/ S= Sommeliers))	Dishes
Match	Cheese (10 experts (B=6/ S=4))	Bannons, chaourse, raclette, panacotta, comté, beaufort goat cheese
	Desserts (7 experts (B=7))	Lemon pie, fruit pie, tiramisu with beer, meringue
	Fish (5 experts (B=5))	
	Seafood (5 experts (B=5))	Shrimp, Oysters, mussels with French fries
	Mixed salad (3 experts (B=3))	Cesar salad, avocado salad, rocket salad
No match	Red meat (8 experts (B=2/S=6))	Beef meat
	Desserts (7 experts (B=4/S=3))	Chocolate desserts, coffee desserts
	Game meat (6 experts (B=3/S=3))	Duck, deer meat
	Cheese (4 experts (B=2/S=2))	Roquefort, intense cheese, Epoisse, Maroilles
	Dishes with sauce (3 experts (B=1/S=2))	Powerful sauce

782

783 Table B2. Example of dishes suggested to be matched with **Blond Leffe** beer.

Match/no match	Dishes category + number of experts (total and by specialty (B= Beer experts/ S= Sommeliers))	Dishes
Match	Cheese (11 experts (B=5/S=6))	Mainly cow cheeses (Comté, St Marcelin, Maroilles, Livarot, etc...)
	White meat and poultry (8 experts (B=3/S=5))	
	Dessert (5 experts (B=4/S=1))	Dessert with vanilla, yellow or white fruits pie, chocolate, cakes ...
	Fish (4 experts (B=1/S=3))	Fried fish, smoked or grilled fish, with vanilla or honey;
	Mixed salad (3 experts (B=2/S=1))	
	Red meat (3 experts (B=1/S=2))	Horse meat, beef meat
No match	Dessert (6 experts (B=3/S=3))	Speculoos biscuit (crunchy biscuits flavoured cinnamon), chocolate
	Red meat (5 experts (B=1/S=4))	Beef meat, red meat with sauce
	Fish (5 experts (B=3/S=2))	Red mullet, fine-textured fish
	Cheese (3 experts (B=1/S=2))	Brie de Melun, Maroilles
	White meat (3 experts (B=1/S=2))	Calf sweetbread, pork meat

784

785 Table B3. Example of dishes suggested to be matched with **Muscadet Sèvre et Maine** wine.

Match/no match	Dishes category + number of experts (total and by specialty (B= Beer experts / S= Sommeliers))	Dishes
Match	Fish (17 experts (B=8/S=9))	
	Seafood (16 experts (B=6/S=10))	Oysters, seafood
	Cheese (12 experts (B=5/S=7))	Mainly Goat cheese
	Mixed salad (3 experts (S=3))	Salad with citrus fruit
No match	Red meat (5 experts (S=5))	Beef meat
	Dessert (3 experts (S=3))	Chocolate, cake, cream

786

787

788

789 Table B4. Examples of dishes suggested to be matched with **St Joseph** wine.

Match/no match	Dishes category + number of experts (total and by specialty (B= Beer experts/ S= Sommeliers))	Dishes
Match	Red meat (10 experts (B=2/S=8))	Beef, lamb meat
	Game meat (8 experts (B=3/S=5))	Duck, deer, guinea fowl, hare, boar meat
	Dessert (7 experts (B=5/S=2))	Chocolate cake, Forêt Noire cake, Pear with wine
	White meat (6 experts (B=3/S=3))	
	Fish (5 experts (B=3/S=2))	Salmon, eel, fish prepared with wine
	Cheese (5 experts (B=3/S=2))	St Nectaire, Nanterre cheese, Picodon
	Barbecue (4 experts (B=2/S=2))	
No match	Charcuterie (3 experts (B=2/S=1))	
	Fish (12 experts (B=5/S=7))	White fish
	Cheese (5 experts (B=1/S=4))	Goat cheese
	Seafood (4 experts (B=2/S=2))	Oysters, shellfish
	Red meat (4 experts (B=2/S=2))	Powerful meat, kangaroo meat
	Game meat (3 experts (S=3))	Boar meat, doe and pheasant meat

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810 Figure caption

811

812 Figure 1: Overview of the usage of pairing principles according to expert type and beverage
813 type (+, blue). Markers shapes and colors represent the categories to which pairing principles
814 are related: perceptual (●, red), conceptual (◆, green) and affective (■, purple). “Experience”,
815 (▲, black) is not related to any of the categories.

816

817

818

819

