©NIJRMS
Publications 2026

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5460
PRINT ISSN: 2992-6041

NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN MEDICAL SCIENCES (NIJRMS)

Volume 7 Issue 3 Page 17-38, 2026

https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJRMS/2026/7.3.1738

Honey Biochemistry and Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts as Sustainable Starter Cultures for Mead Production: An Integrated Biotechnological Framework

[1]Anichukwu Nwankwo Onyinye, [1]Aniaku Vincent N., [2]Okogu Sabinus Chukwuka and [1]Ogunbodede T. T.

[1]Department of Applied Microbiology and Brewing, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Science Laboratory Technology, Institute of Management and Technology, IMT, Enugu, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

Mead is one of the oldest fermented alcoholic beverages, traditionally produced by fermenting diluted honey with yeast. Despite increasing commercial interest in premium and functional fermented beverages, industrial mead production remains constrained by slow fermentation kinetics, nutrient deficiencies in honey must, and dependence on conventional *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* starter cultures. Honey is a chemically complex substrate composed predominantly of fructose and glucose together with proteins, enzymes, organic acids, minerals, vitamins, phenolic compounds and other bioactive constituents that collectively influence yeast physiology, fermentation performance and final product quality. Indigenous yeasts isolated from African palm wine have recently emerged as promising alternative starter cultures because of their adaptation to sugar-rich environments, high osmotic tolerance, efficient carbohydrate metabolism and ability to produce desirable aroma compounds. This review examines the biochemical composition, physicochemical characteristics and microbiological quality of honey and discusses their influence on mead fermentation. The fermentative potential of indigenous palm wine yeasts is evaluated alongside recent advances in fermentation biotechnology, including nutrient optimisation, mixed-culture fermentation and modern strain-selection approaches. Integrating indigenous microbial resources with contemporary fermentation technologies offers significant opportunities to improve fermentation efficiency enhance sensory quality and develop premium meads with distinctive regional identities while promoting the sustainable utilisation of indigenous microbial biodiversity.

Keywords: Honey; Mead; Honey must; Indigenous yeast; Palm wine; Fermentation biotechnology; *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*; Non-*Saccharomyces*.

INTRODUCTION

Mead is widely recognised as one of the earliest alcoholic beverages produced by humans and is obtained through the fermentation of diluted honey by yeast. Archaeological evidence indicates that honey has been harvested and utilised for thousands of years as a natural sweetener, preservative and medicinal product long before the emergence of organised agriculture. Honey is produced when honey bees (*Apis mellifera*) collect floral nectar or honeydew, enzymatically transform these substrates and progressively reduce their moisture content through evaporation within the hive, producing a stable and concentrated natural product rich in fermentable sugars and biologically active compounds [1-6]. Honey consists primarily of fructose and glucose, which together account for approximately 70-80% of its composition, while smaller quantities of sucrose, maltose, proteins, enzymes, amino acids, organic acids, minerals, vitamins and phytochemicals contribute to its nutritional, functional and antimicrobial properties [2,4,7-10]. The chemical composition of honey varies according to botanical origin, geographical location, climatic conditions and post-harvest handling practices, resulting in considerable differences in

physicochemical properties, antioxidant capacity, flavour profile and fermentability among different honey types [8-12]. Unlike grape must, honey must present unique nutritional challenges for yeast growth. Although it contains abundant fermentable sugars, it is naturally deficient in yeast-assimilable nitrogen, proteins and several essential micronutrients required for efficient cellular metabolism. Consequently, mead fermentation is frequently characterised by prolonged lag phases, slow sugar utilisation and occasional sluggish or stuck fermentations unless appropriate nutrient supplementation and fermentation management strategies are implemented [9,13-17]. In addition, moisture content, pH, water activity, sugar composition, enzymatic activity and organic acid concentrations significantly influence microbial stability, fermentation efficiency and the sensory characteristics of the final beverage [9, 13-17].

The growing consumer demand for premium, artisanal and functional alcoholic beverages has stimulated renewed interest in developing innovative fermentation strategies capable of improving mead production. Commercial mead manufacture has traditionally relied on selected *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains because of their predictable fermentation performance and high ethanol tolerance. However, these commercial starter cultures frequently produce relatively uniform flavour profiles and may not fully exploit the biochemical diversity available in naturally occurring fermentation ecosystems. Among the most promising alternative microbial resources are indigenous yeasts isolated from African palm wine. Palm wine fermentation involves complex communities of *Saccharomyces* and non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts that have naturally evolved under conditions of high sugar concentrations, fluctuating acidity and continuous microbial competition. These ecological pressures have selected yeast populations possessing desirable industrial characteristics, including osmotic tolerance, efficient carbohydrate utilisation, ethanol resistance and enhanced production of volatile aroma compounds. Such physiological adaptations suggest that indigenous palm wine yeasts represent valuable starter cultures capable of improving fermentation efficiency while imparting unique regional sensory attributes to mead. A comprehensive understanding of honey biochemistry is therefore fundamental to exploiting these indigenous microorganisms. Honey contains carbohydrates, enzymes, proteins, organic acids, minerals, vitamins, phenolic compounds, volatile constituents and antimicrobial factors that collectively regulate yeast growth, fermentation kinetics, microbial stability and the nutritional and sensory properties of mead [2, 4, 7-17]. Likewise, physicochemical characteristics including moisture content, acidity, electrical conductivity, hydroxymethylfurfural concentration and enzymatic activity determine honey quality and directly influence fermentation performance. Integrating knowledge of honey composition with advances in microbial biotechnology may therefore facilitate the development of sustainable and high-quality mead production systems based on indigenous yeast biodiversity. This review critically examines the biochemical composition, physicochemical properties and microbiological quality of honey relevant to mead fermentation. It further evaluates the fermentative potential of indigenous palm wine yeasts and discusses recent advances in fermentation biotechnology that may support the production of premium, regionally distinctive meads through the sustainable utilisation of indigenous microbial resources.

Honey as a Fermentation Substrate for Mead Production

Honey is an exceptional natural substrate for alcoholic fermentation because it combines a high concentration of fermentable sugars with numerous biologically active compounds that collectively influence yeast physiology, fermentation efficiency and the quality of the final beverage. Unlike cereal or fruit substrates, honey possesses intrinsic antimicrobial activity, low water activity and a chemically diverse matrix comprising carbohydrates, proteins, enzymes, amino acids, organic acids, minerals, vitamins and phytochemicals. These characteristics create a unique fermentation environment that both supports and constrains microbial metabolism, making honey a distinctive substrate for mead production [18-21]. Carbohydrates constitute approximately 80% of honey and represent its principal fermentable fraction. Fructose and glucose account for the majority of total sugars, while smaller amounts of sucrose, maltose, trehalose, melezitose and other oligosaccharides contribute to sweetness, crystallisation behaviour and fermentation dynamics [22-25]. The relative proportions of fructose and glucose vary according to floral origin and environmental conditions, influencing viscosity, crystallisation rate and sugar availability during fermentation. Honeys with higher fructose-to-glucose ratios generally exhibit greater resistance to crystallisation and provide a more stable substrate for prolonged fermentation processes [22,24].

Despite its abundance of fermentable carbohydrates, honey is intrinsically deficient in yeast-assimilable nitrogen and other nutrients required for rapid microbial growth. Concentrations of amino acids, peptides and proteins are typically insufficient to sustain optimal yeast metabolism, resulting in prolonged lag phases, reduced fermentation rates and an increased risk of sluggish or incomplete fermentation. Consequently, supplementation with assimilable nitrogen and other growth factors has become standard practice in commercial mead production to improve fermentation performance and product consistency [26-29]. Water availability represents another critical factor influencing honey fermentation. Mature honey typically contains less than 20% moisture and exhibits low water activity, conditions that suppress the growth of most spoilage microorganisms and contribute to its remarkable shelf stability [30,31]. During mead production, dilution with water increases water activity to levels suitable for yeast

proliferation and ethanol production. The degree of dilution must be carefully controlled because excessive dilution may reduce flavour intensity, whereas inadequate dilution can expose yeast cells to excessive osmotic stress and impair fermentation efficiency [30,32].

Honey also contains several enzymes introduced during nectar processing by honey bees. Among the most important are invertase, glucose oxidase and diastase, each contributing to honey quality and fermentability. Invertase hydrolyses sucrose into glucose and fructose, thereby increasing the availability of fermentable sugars. Glucose oxidase catalyses the oxidation of glucose to gluconic acid while simultaneously generating hydrogen peroxide, an important contributor to the antimicrobial activity of honey. Diastase activity serves as a recognised indicator of honey freshness because enzyme activity progressively declines during prolonged storage and thermal processing [21,27,33]. The organic acid profile of honey further influences fermentation behaviour. Gluconic acid is the predominant acid, accompanied by smaller quantities of citric, malic, acetic, succinic and formic acids. Together, these compounds maintain honey at an acidic pH, typically between 3.4 and 5.0, thereby inhibiting spoilage microorganisms while creating favourable conditions for yeast fermentation. Organic acids also contribute significantly to flavour development, buffering capacity and microbial stability throughout fermentation [27,34,35].

Although present only in trace concentrations, minerals and vitamins perform essential physiological functions during yeast metabolism. Potassium is the dominant mineral in most honeys, followed by calcium, magnesium, phosphorus and sodium, whereas trace elements including zinc, manganese, iron and copper function as enzyme cofactors involved in glycolysis, ethanol production and cellular respiration. Honey additionally contains small quantities of B-complex vitamins, vitamin C and carotenoids, which collectively enhance its nutritional value and may contribute to yeast vitality during fermentation [36-38]. Phenolic compounds represent one of the most biologically significant components of honey because they contribute to antioxidant activity, oxidative stability and sensory quality. Major flavonoids include quercetin, kaempferol, pinocembrin, galangin and chrysin, while caffeic, gallic, ferulic and *p*-coumaric acids constitute the principal phenolic acids. The concentration and composition of these compounds vary considerably with botanical and geographical origin, with darker honeys generally exhibiting higher antioxidant capacity than lighter varieties [39-42]. During fermentation, many phenolic compounds remain relatively stable and contribute to colour preservation, oxidative protection and flavour complexity, while simultaneously protecting yeast cells against oxidative stress generated during ethanol production [40-42].

In addition to non-volatile phytochemicals, honey contains a diverse array of volatile organic compounds, including aldehydes, ketones, alcohols, esters, terpenoids and norisoprenoids, many of which originate from floral nectar. These compounds define the characteristic aroma profile of individual honey varieties and provide important precursors for secondary aroma compounds generated during alcoholic fermentation. Consequently, both the botanical origin of honey and yeast metabolic activity contribute substantially to the sensory complexity and market value of finished mead [43,44]. Collectively, the biochemical complexity of honey extends far beyond its role as a source of fermentable carbohydrates. The interactions among sugars, enzymes, organic acids, minerals, vitamins, phenolic compounds and volatile metabolites determine fermentation kinetics, microbial ecology, flavour development and product stability. A comprehensive understanding of these interactions provides the biochemical foundation for selecting suitable yeast strains, optimising fermentation conditions and developing premium meads with enhanced nutritional, functional and sensory attributes.

Physicochemical Characteristics of Honey and Their Influence on Mead Fermentation

The physicochemical properties of honey are fundamental determinants of its suitability as a fermentation substrate and have a direct influence on yeast physiology, fermentation kinetics, microbial stability and the sensory quality of mead. These properties are governed by botanical origin, geographical location, climatic conditions, bee species, harvesting practices and storage conditions, resulting in considerable variation among different honey types [45–48]. Understanding these characteristics is therefore essential for selecting high-quality honey and optimising fermentation processes for industrial mead production.

Moisture Content and Water Activity

Moisture content is one of the most important quality parameters of honey because it determines microbial stability, viscosity and fermentation potential. Mature honey generally contains between 16% and 20% moisture, although values may vary depending on environmental humidity and harvesting practices [49, 50]. Honey with moisture contents exceeding 20% becomes increasingly susceptible to spontaneous fermentation by osmophilic yeasts during storage, whereas excessively low moisture levels increase viscosity and complicate honey handling and dilution during mead production [21, 49]. The exceptionally low water activity of mature honey (approximately 0.50-0.65) prevents the proliferation of most bacteria, moulds and yeasts, thereby contributing to its remarkable shelf stability [30, 50]. However, during mead production, dilution of honey increases water activity sufficiently to permit yeast growth and alcoholic fermentation. The dilution ratio therefore represents a critical processing parameter because excessive dilution reduces sugar concentration and flavour intensity, whereas insufficient dilution exposes yeast cells to severe osmotic stress that may delay fermentation and reduce ethanol productivity [29, 32, 50].

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5460
PRINT ISSN: 2992-6041

Acidity and pH

Honey is naturally acidic, with pH values generally ranging from 3.2 to 5.5, depending on floral source and organic acid composition [34, 45]. Gluconic acid, produced through the oxidation of glucose by glucose oxidase, represents the predominant organic acid, while smaller quantities of citric, malic, succinic, acetic and formic acids contribute to total acidity [34, 51]. The acidic environment of honey performs several important functions during fermentation. Firstly, it suppresses the growth of spoilage microorganisms, thereby improving microbial safety. Secondly, it provides favourable conditions for yeast metabolism because *Saccharomyces* species generally exhibit optimum growth under mildly acidic conditions. Finally, acidity contributes significantly to flavour balance, freshness and the overall sensory characteristics of mead [34, 51, 52]. Nevertheless, excessively low pH may inhibit yeast activity, whereas insufficient acidity may increase the risk of microbial contamination during fermentation [52].

Electrical Conductivity

Electrical conductivity reflects the concentration of minerals, organic acids and proteins within honey and is widely used as an indicator of botanical origin and quality. Blossom honeys generally exhibit lower electrical conductivity than honeydew honeys because they contain lower concentrations of mineral salts and organic constituents [45, 53]. Although electrical conductivity does not directly influence fermentation, it provides valuable indirect information regarding nutrient availability for yeast metabolism. Honeys with relatively higher mineral contents may supply additional micronutrients required for enzymatic activity, thereby supporting improved fermentation performance and flavour development [36, 53].

Sugar Profile

The sugar composition of honey strongly influences fermentation kinetics because carbohydrates provide the principal carbon source for yeast metabolism. Fructose is generally the dominant sugar, followed by glucose, while disaccharides and oligosaccharides occur in much smaller quantities [22–24]. Variations in sugar composition influence yeast growth, ethanol yield and residual sweetness. Fructose is metabolised more slowly than glucose by many *Saccharomyces* strains, and fermentation frequently concludes with residual fructose concentrations exceeding those of glucose. Consequently, the fructose-to-glucose ratio contributes significantly to the sweetness, mouthfeel and overall sensory profile of finished mead [22, 28, 54]. Furthermore, botanical differences in sugar composition may require adjustments in fermentation management, nutrient supplementation and yeast selection to achieve optimal ethanol production [24, 54].

Hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF)

Hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF) is one of the most widely recognised indicators of honey freshness and quality. It is formed through acid-catalysed degradation of hexose sugars during prolonged storage or excessive heating and therefore serves as a reliable marker of thermal processing and product deterioration [55, 56]. International quality standards specify maximum HMF concentrations for commercial honey to ensure freshness and authenticity [21]. Elevated HMF concentrations not only indicate poor storage conditions but may also reduce honey quality by altering flavour characteristics and decreasing enzymatic activity. Consequently, honey intended for mead production should possess low HMF concentrations to preserve its nutritional value and ensure optimal fermentation performance [55, 56].

Enzymatic Activity

Enzymes naturally present in honey originate primarily from honey bees and include invertase, glucose oxidase and diastase. These enzymes influence sugar metabolism, antimicrobial activity and overall honey quality [33]. Diastase number is commonly used as an indicator of honey freshness because enzyme activity decreases progressively during heating and prolonged storage. Similarly, glucose oxidase contributes to antimicrobial activity through the production of hydrogen peroxide, whereas invertase facilitates sucrose hydrolysis into fermentable monosaccharides. Although enzyme activity becomes less critical following honey dilution and fermentation, it remains an important quality criterion during raw material selection [33,57].

Colour and Optical Characteristics

Honey colour ranges from almost colourless to dark amber depending on botanical origin, mineral content, phenolic composition and storage conditions [45, 58]. Dark-coloured honeys generally contain higher concentrations of phenolic compounds, minerals and antioxidant constituents than lighter varieties and often produce meads with greater antioxidant capacity and more complex flavour profiles [39, 58]. Colour also influences consumer perception of product quality and authenticity. During fermentation, Maillard reactions, phenolic oxidation and pigment transformations may modify colour intensity, making the initial colour of honey an important determinant of the appearance and market acceptability of the finished beverage [55, 58].

Crystallisation Behaviour

Crystallisation is a natural physicochemical process resulting from glucose supersaturation. The rate of crystallisation depends primarily on the fructose-to-glucose ratio, moisture content, storage temperature and the presence of crystallisation nuclei [22, 45]. Although crystallisation does not reduce nutritional quality, it influences

processing characteristics during mead production. Highly crystallised honey requires warming before dilution, while excessive heating intended to liquefy honey may increase HMF formation and reduce enzyme activity. Consequently, careful temperature management is essential to preserve honey quality before fermentation [33,55]. Collectively, the physicochemical properties of honey determine not only its commercial quality but also its fermentation behaviour and suitability for mead production. Moisture content, water activity, acidity, sugar composition, enzyme activity, mineral content and HMF concentration interact to influence yeast growth, fermentation efficiency, ethanol production and sensory development. Careful selection and quality assessment of honey are therefore essential prerequisites for producing consistent, high-quality mead. Furthermore, understanding these physicochemical characteristics provides the foundation for selecting robust indigenous palm wine yeasts capable of adapting to the unique biochemical environment of honey must.

Nutritional and Phytochemical Composition of Honey and Their Functional Roles in Mead Fermentation

The nutritional and phytochemical composition of honey extends beyond its role as a source of fermentable carbohydrates and significantly influences fermentation performance, microbial ecology and the nutritional quality of mead. Although sugars constitute the major component of honey, numerous minor constituents including amino acids, proteins, enzymes, vitamins, minerals, phenolic compounds and volatile metabolites collectively determine yeast metabolism, oxidative stability and sensory development during alcoholic fermentation [59–62]. Consequently, honey should be regarded as a chemically complex fermentation medium rather than merely a sugar solution.

Proteins and Amino Acids

Proteins account for only a small proportion of honey, typically less than 0.5%, and originate primarily from bee secretions, pollen and nectar [63]. Despite their low abundance, these proteins contribute to enzyme activity, antioxidant capacity and overall honey quality. Free amino acids are also present in relatively low concentrations, with proline representing approximately 50–85% of the total amino acid pool [64]. Proline is widely recognised as an indicator of honey maturity and authenticity because it accumulates during nectar processing by honey bees. In addition to its value as a quality marker, proline serves as a nitrogen source for yeast metabolism and contributes to cellular stress tolerance during alcoholic fermentation [64, 65]. Other amino acids, including alanine, glutamic acid, phenylalanine and lysine, occur in trace amounts and participate in protein synthesis, nitrogen metabolism and the formation of higher alcohols and esters that influence mead aroma [65, 66]. Nevertheless, the total amino acid concentration in honey remains insufficient to satisfy the nutritional requirements of fermentative yeasts. Consequently, supplementation with yeast-assimilable nitrogen is generally required to prevent sluggish fermentation, reduce hydrogen sulphide formation and improve ethanol productivity [28, 52, 66].

Mineral Composition

Honey contains numerous macro- and microelements that perform essential physiological functions during yeast growth and fermentation. Potassium is the predominant mineral, followed by calcium, magnesium, phosphorus and sodium, whereas iron, zinc, manganese, copper and selenium occur in smaller quantities [36, 67]. These minerals function as cofactors for enzymes involved in glycolysis, carbohydrate transport, ATP synthesis and ethanol production. Magnesium, for example, stabilises ATP-dependent enzymes and supports cellular energy metabolism, whereas zinc is essential for alcohol dehydrogenase activity during ethanol biosynthesis [67, 68]. Variations in mineral composition among botanical honey varieties therefore influence nutrient availability and may contribute to differences in fermentation efficiency and flavour development.

Vitamins

Honey contains small quantities of water-soluble vitamins, particularly those of the B-complex group, including thiamine, riboflavin, niacin, pantothenic acid and pyridoxine, together with vitamin C [69]. Although their concentrations are relatively low, these micronutrients participate in numerous enzymatic reactions associated with carbohydrate metabolism, amino acid biosynthesis and cellular respiration. During fermentation, vitamins function primarily as metabolic cofactors supporting yeast growth rather than as major nutritional contributors to the finished beverage. Nevertheless, adequate vitamin availability may improve fermentation performance, particularly when indigenous yeast strains are used under nutrient-limited conditions [69, 70].

Phenolic Compounds

Phenolic compounds constitute one of the most biologically important fractions of honey because they contribute substantially to antioxidant activity, colour stability, antimicrobial properties and sensory quality [39,71]. The phenolic profile varies considerably according to botanical origin, geographical location and environmental conditions. The major flavonoids identified in honey include quercetin, kaempferol, pinocembrin, galangin, chrysin and apigenin, whereas caffeic, gallic, ferulic, syringic and *p*-coumaric acids represent the principal phenolic acids [39,72]. These compounds effectively scavenge reactive oxygen species, reduce oxidative deterioration and protect both honey constituents and fermenting yeast cells from oxidative damage [72,73]. During mead fermentation, many phenolic compounds remain chemically stable and contribute to colour retention, antioxidant capacity and

flavour complexity. In addition, several phenolics influence yeast physiology by improving tolerance to oxidative and ethanol-induced stress, thereby enhancing fermentation performance under industrial conditions [73,74].

Flavonoids and Antioxidant Activity

Flavonoids represent the dominant antioxidant constituents of honey and are largely responsible for its ability to neutralise free radicals. Dark-coloured honeys generally contain substantially higher flavonoid concentrations than lighter varieties and therefore exhibit greater antioxidant capacity [39, 75]. The antioxidant properties of flavonoids are particularly important during alcoholic fermentation because ethanol production generates reactive oxygen species capable of damaging yeast membranes, proteins and nucleic acids. By reducing oxidative stress, flavonoids contribute to improved yeast viability, prolonged fermentative activity and enhanced product stability [75,76]. Furthermore, antioxidant compounds increase the functional value of mead and contribute to its growing popularity as a health-oriented fermented beverage.

Volatile Phytochemicals and Aroma Precursors

Honey contains a remarkably diverse range of volatile phytochemicals, including terpenes, norisoprenoids, aldehydes, ketones, esters, alcohols and lactones derived primarily from floral nectar [43, 77]. These volatile constituents provide the characteristic aroma profiles associated with different botanical honey varieties. During alcoholic fermentation, yeast converts many of these compounds into secondary metabolites, including higher alcohols, acetate esters and ethyl esters that contribute significantly to the bouquet and flavour complexity of mead. Consequently, both honey composition and yeast metabolic activity determine the final sensory characteristics of the beverage [44, 77].

Functional Implications for Mead Production

The nutritional and phytochemical complexity of honey provides several advantages for mead production beyond its function as a carbon source. Bioactive compounds enhance antioxidant capacity, improve oxidative stability, contribute to colour retention and participate in flavour development throughout fermentation and maturation. However, the relatively low concentrations of assimilable nitrogen, proteins and vitamins remain important nutritional limitations that require supplementation to maximise yeast performance and fermentation efficiency [28, 52, 66]. Furthermore, variation in the biochemical composition of honey according to botanical and geographical origin provides opportunities to produce premium meads with distinct regional identities. Selection of appropriate honey varieties, combined with robust indigenous palm wine yeasts, may therefore enable the production of beverages possessing enhanced nutritional quality, improved sensory characteristics and greater commercial value. Overall, the interaction between honey nutrients, phytochemicals and yeast metabolism represents one of the principal determinants of mead quality. A comprehensive understanding of these biochemical relationships provides the scientific foundation for exploiting indigenous palm wine yeasts as novel starter cultures capable of producing high-quality mead with unique functional and organoleptic properties.

Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts: Diversity, Ecology and Biotechnological Potential for Mead Production

Indigenous palm wine yeasts represent an underexplored but highly promising microbial resource for mead production. Unlike commercial wine yeasts that have undergone extensive domestication for predictable fermentation performance, palm wine yeasts have evolved naturally in sugar-rich environments characterised by fluctuating nutrient availability, increasing ethanol concentrations, acidic conditions and intense microbial competition. These environmental pressures have selected microorganisms possessing physiological traits that are highly desirable for industrial fermentation, including efficient sugar utilisation, osmotic tolerance, ethanol resistance and enhanced production of aroma-active metabolites [78–81]. Consequently, indigenous palm wine yeasts offer considerable potential as alternative or complementary starter cultures for producing regionally distinctive meads with improved sensory complexity and fermentation performance.

Palm wine is produced through the spontaneous fermentation of sap obtained from several palm species, including *Elaeis guineensis* (oil palm), *Raphia hookeri*, *Borassus aethiopum* and *Phoenix dactylifera*. Fresh palm sap is naturally rich in sucrose, glucose, fructose, amino acids, vitamins and minerals, creating an ideal ecological niche for the proliferation of fermentative microorganisms immediately after tapping [82,83]. As fermentation progresses, microbial succession occurs rapidly, resulting in dynamic interactions among yeasts, lactic acid bacteria and acetic acid bacteria that collectively determine the physicochemical and sensory characteristics of palm wine [84].

Yeasts constitute the dominant microbial group during the early stages of palm wine fermentation because they rapidly metabolise available sugars into ethanol and carbon dioxide. Numerous studies have identified *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* as the predominant fermentative species, although a diverse range of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts—including *Pichia kudriavzevii*, *Candida tropicalis*, *Candida ethanolica*, *Hanseniaspora uvarum*, *Meyerozyma guilliermondii*, *Torulaspora delbrueckii*, *Wickerhamomyces anomalus* and *Kluyveromyces marxianus*—have also been consistently isolated from naturally fermented palm wine [79,81,83,85]. The composition of these microbial communities varies according to palm species, geographical region, climate, tapping practices and fermentation duration. The ecological diversity of palm wine yeasts provides several advantages for industrial fermentation. Indigenous strains have

evolved under continuous osmotic and ethanol stress resulting from naturally increasing sugar and alcohol concentrations during palm sap fermentation. Consequently, many isolates demonstrate superior tolerance to osmotic pressure, acidic environments and ethanol toxicity compared with laboratory-maintained cultures [80, 81]. These adaptive characteristics are particularly valuable for mead fermentation because honey must presents similar environmental challenges, including high initial osmotic pressure, low nitrogen availability and increasing ethanol concentrations throughout fermentation [28,52].

Another important characteristic of indigenous palm wine yeasts is their metabolic diversity. Beyond ethanol production, these microorganisms synthesise a broad range of volatile secondary metabolites, including higher alcohols, acetate esters, ethyl esters, aldehydes and organic acids that contribute significantly to beverage aroma and flavour complexity [86, 87]. While commercial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains generally produce reproducible but relatively uniform sensory profiles, mixed indigenous yeast populations frequently generate beverages with greater aromatic diversity and stronger regional identity. This characteristic aligns well with increasing consumer demand for artisanal fermented beverages possessing authentic geographical and cultural characteristics [88].

Several non-*Saccharomyces* species isolated from palm wine exhibit additional technological advantages during alcoholic fermentation. *Torulaspora delbrueckii* has been reported to enhance glycerol production and improve mouthfeel while reducing volatile acidity [89]. *Wickerhamomyces anomalus* contributes desirable fruity and floral aroma compounds through elevated ester biosynthesis, whereas *Pichia kudriavzevii* demonstrates remarkable tolerance to acidic conditions and osmotic stress [85,89]. Similarly, *Kluyveromyces marxianus* possesses rapid sugar assimilation kinetics and thermotolerance, characteristics that may facilitate fermentation under variable processing conditions [90]. When used in sequential or co-fermentation with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, these non-*Saccharomyces* species frequently enhance aroma complexity without compromising ethanol yield [89–91].

Despite these promising characteristics, the application of indigenous palm wine yeasts in mead production remains limited. Most commercial meads continue to rely on imported commercial starter cultures because of their predictable fermentation performance and ease of standardisation [92]. However, advances in microbial isolation, molecular identification and fermentation biotechnology have substantially improved the ability to characterise, preserve and exploit indigenous yeast biodiversity. High-throughput sequencing, multilocus phylogenetic analysis and whole-genome sequencing now permit accurate identification of strains possessing desirable industrial characteristics, while metabolomic and transcriptomic analyses provide insights into the molecular mechanisms underlying stress tolerance, flavour biosynthesis and fermentation efficiency [93,94].

Selection of indigenous palm wine yeasts for mead production should therefore extend beyond simple ethanol productivity. Important selection criteria include osmotic tolerance, ethanol tolerance, efficient fructose utilisation, nitrogen-use efficiency, production of desirable aroma compounds, low hydrogen sulphide formation, resistance to oxidative stress and genetic stability during repeated fermentations [95]. These characteristics collectively determine fermentation reliability, sensory quality and industrial applicability.

An additional advantage of exploiting indigenous yeast biodiversity is the opportunity to develop geographically distinctive meads reflecting local microbial terroir. Similar to the concept of terroir in wine production, regional microbial communities may impart unique sensory signatures that differentiate products in increasingly competitive international markets [88,96]. Utilisation of indigenous African palm wine yeasts therefore represents not only a technological innovation but also a strategy for promoting local biodiversity, supporting sustainable biotechnology and adding economic value to traditional fermentation resources.

Overall, indigenous palm wine yeasts possess a combination of physiological robustness, metabolic diversity and ecological adaptation that makes them attractive candidates for next-generation mead starter cultures. Their ability to tolerate osmotic stress, efficiently metabolise sugars and synthesise complex aroma compounds provides a strong scientific basis for their incorporation into modern mead fermentation systems. Nevertheless, systematic strain screening, genomic characterisation and fermentation optimisation remain necessary to establish their commercial viability and ensure consistent industrial performance.

Fermentation Characteristics of Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts in Honey Must

The successful production of high-quality mead depends largely on the physiological characteristics of the fermenting yeast. An ideal starter culture should rapidly metabolise fermentable sugars, tolerate high osmotic pressure and increasing ethanol concentrations, efficiently utilise limited nutrients, and produce desirable aroma compounds while minimising undesirable fermentation by-products. Indigenous palm wine yeasts possess many of these characteristics because they have naturally evolved in sugar-rich palm sap environments that closely resemble the physicochemical conditions encountered during honey fermentation [97–100]. Consequently, these microorganisms represent promising alternatives to conventional commercial wine yeasts for mead production.

Adaptation to High-Sugar Environments

One of the principal challenges during mead fermentation is the extremely high osmotic pressure generated by concentrated honey must. High sugar concentrations reduce water availability around yeast cells, causing osmotic

stress that delays cell growth, suppresses metabolic activity and prolongs fermentation [101]. Commercial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains often require gradual acclimatisation or nutrient supplementation to overcome this stress. Palm wine yeasts naturally encounter similar conditions during the fermentation of fresh palm sap, where sugar concentrations remain sufficiently high to exert considerable osmotic pressure throughout fermentation. Long-term adaptation to these environments has enabled many indigenous isolates to develop efficient osmoregulatory mechanisms, including intracellular accumulation of glycerol, trehalose and other compatible solutes that protect cellular proteins and membranes from osmotic damage [98,102]. These physiological adaptations suggest that indigenous palm wine yeasts may initiate fermentation more rapidly and maintain higher metabolic activity in concentrated honey must than less-adapted commercial strains.

Sugar Assimilation and Ethanol Production

Efficient conversion of fermentable sugars into ethanol is the primary objective of alcoholic fermentation. Honey contains predominantly fructose and glucose, with relatively small quantities of sucrose and other carbohydrates. Therefore, starter cultures intended for mead production should efficiently assimilate both major monosaccharides while maintaining high ethanol productivity [28,103]. Studies of palm wine yeasts have demonstrated considerable variation in carbohydrate utilisation among species and even among strains of the same species. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* isolates generally exhibit high ethanol yields and rapid glucose metabolism, whereas several non-*Saccharomyces* species demonstrate enhanced fructose utilisation, broader substrate utilisation patterns and improved fermentation under nutrient-limited conditions [97,104]. Such metabolic diversity provides opportunities for selecting strains specifically adapted to the sugar composition of honey must. Mixed or sequential fermentations involving indigenous non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts followed by *S. cerevisiae* have also been reported to improve sugar utilisation while simultaneously enhancing aroma complexity and reducing fermentation duration [89, 91]. These observations indicate that carefully designed multi-species fermentations may overcome many of the nutritional limitations associated with honey fermentation.

Ethanol Tolerance

Progressive accumulation of ethanol during fermentation represents another major physiological challenge for yeast cells because ethanol disrupts membrane integrity, protein stability and intracellular metabolism [105]. Loss of membrane function reduces nutrient transport, enzyme activity and overall fermentation efficiency, particularly during the later stages of alcoholic fermentation. Palm wine yeasts frequently demonstrate substantial ethanol tolerance because ethanol concentrations increase naturally throughout palm sap fermentation. Repeated exposure to this environment has favoured strains possessing altered membrane lipid composition, enhanced heat-shock protein expression and improved stress-response pathways that collectively increase resistance to ethanol toxicity [99,105]. These characteristics may enable indigenous palm wine yeasts to sustain active fermentation for longer periods, thereby improving ethanol yield and reducing the incidence of incomplete fermentation.

Nitrogen Utilisation Efficiency

Honey is recognised as a nitrogen-deficient fermentation substrate, frequently containing insufficient assimilable nitrogen to support rapid yeast growth [26, 66]. Consequently, efficient nitrogen utilisation represents an important criterion when selecting starter cultures for mead production. Evidence from palm wine fermentation suggests that indigenous yeasts have adapted to fluctuating nutrient availability through efficient nitrogen assimilation and recycling mechanisms. Some isolates exhibit enhanced amino acid uptake, improved nitrogen catabolite regulation and greater metabolic flexibility under nutrient-limited conditions compared with conventional commercial strains [106]. Although nutrient supplementation remains necessary in most commercial mead fermentations, yeast strains possessing superior nitrogen-use efficiency may reduce supplementation requirements while maintaining satisfactory fermentation performance.

Aroma Compound Biosynthesis

The sensory quality of mead depends largely on volatile metabolites synthesised during alcoholic fermentation. Yeast converts sugars, amino acids and organic acids into numerous aroma-active compounds, including higher alcohols, acetate esters, ethyl esters, aldehydes and volatile fatty acids that collectively determine the aroma profile of the final product [86, 87]. Commercial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains generally produce predictable flavour profiles but often generate beverages with relatively limited aromatic diversity. In contrast, indigenous palm wine yeasts exhibit considerable metabolic diversity, producing distinctive combinations of fruity, floral, spicy and tropical aroma compounds that may substantially enhance mead complexity [87, 91]. Species such as *Torulaspora delbrueckii*, *Wickerhamomyces anomalus* and *Pichia kudriavzevii* have demonstrated particular potential for increasing ester production while reducing undesirable volatile acidity during mixed-culture fermentations [89, 91].The ability of indigenous yeasts to synthesise diverse volatile metabolites provides an opportunity to develop premium meads possessing unique sensory identities linked to regional microbial biodiversity.

Stress Tolerance during Fermentation

Industrial mead fermentation exposes yeast cells to multiple environmental stresses simultaneously, including osmotic pressure, increasing ethanol concentration, oxidative stress, acidic pH and nutrient limitation. Successful starter cultures must therefore coordinate numerous cellular defence mechanisms to maintain metabolic activity throughout fermentation [95]. Palm wine yeasts have evolved under comparable environmental conditions and frequently exhibit enhanced tolerance to multiple stressors. Cellular responses include activation of antioxidant enzymes, increased expression of molecular chaperones, membrane lipid remodelling and accumulation of protective metabolites such as trehalose and glycerol [98,102,105]. These adaptations improve cellular viability, prolong fermentative activity and contribute to more consistent fermentation performance under industrial conditions.

Comparative Performance with Commercial Wine Yeasts

Commercial wine yeasts remain the standard starter cultures for industrial mead production because they offer predictable fermentation kinetics, reproducible ethanol yields and established regulatory acceptance [92]. Nevertheless, increasing interest in craft beverages and microbial terroir has highlighted several limitations associated with extensive reliance on genetically similar commercial strains. Compared with conventional wine yeasts, indigenous palm wine yeasts offer several potential advantages, including greater physiological diversity, broader metabolic capabilities and the ability to generate distinctive regional flavour profiles. However, commercial application requires careful strain selection because fermentation performance varies considerably among indigenous isolates. Comprehensive phenotypic screening, molecular characterisation and pilot-scale fermentation trials remain essential before commercial implementation [93, 95]. Overall, indigenous palm wine yeasts combine robust stress tolerance, efficient carbohydrate metabolism and extensive aroma-producing capacity, making them attractive candidates for next-generation mead starter cultures. Their successful incorporation into industrial fermentation systems will depend on systematic strain selection, optimisation of fermentation conditions and integration with modern microbial biotechnology. These advances have the potential to transform mead production from a process reliant on imported commercial cultures into one that exploits locally adapted microbial biodiversity while producing beverages with distinctive regional identity and enhanced sensory quality.

Optimisation Strategies for Mead Fermentation Using Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts

The successful industrial application of indigenous palm wine yeasts requires more than the identification of promising strains; it also depends on the optimisation of fermentation conditions to maximise yeast performance, ethanol productivity and product quality. Honey must presents a particularly challenging fermentation environment because of its high osmotic pressure, limited assimilable nitrogen, low buffering capacity and variable phytochemical composition. Consequently, systematic optimisation of fermentation parameters is essential to exploit the full biotechnological potential of indigenous yeasts and achieve consistent industrial-scale mead production [107–110].

Optimisation of Honey Must Composition

Honey must composition is one of the primary determinants of fermentation efficiency. Although honey supplies abundant fermentable carbohydrates, it contains inadequate concentrations of assimilable nitrogen, amino acids, vitamins and certain minerals required for rapid yeast growth [28, 66]. Nutrient deficiencies frequently prolong fermentation, reduce ethanol yield and increase the production of undesirable metabolites such as hydrogen sulphide and volatile acidity [107]. Supplementation of honey must with yeast-assimilable nitrogen, magnesium, phosphate and selected vitamins have consistently been shown to improve biomass formation, sugar utilisation and fermentation kinetics [108,109]. However, nutrient optimisation should be carefully balanced because excessive supplementation may alter flavour development and reduce the unique sensory characteristics associated with traditional mead. Future studies should therefore establish nutrient requirements specifically for indigenous palm wine yeasts rather than relying exclusively on recommendations developed for commercial wine strains.

Starter Culture Development

The transition from spontaneous fermentation to controlled industrial production requires the development of well-characterised starter cultures. Indigenous palm wine fermentations are naturally driven by mixed microbial populations whose composition varies according to palm species, geographical location and harvesting practices [82,84]. While spontaneous fermentation contributes to product diversity, it also results in considerable batch-to-batch variation and inconsistent product quality. Development of defined starter cultures from indigenous yeast isolates offers an opportunity to combine the unique flavour characteristics of traditional fermentations with the reproducibility required for commercial production. Selection criteria should include rapid fermentation kinetics, efficient fructose utilisation, ethanol tolerance, osmotic resistance, low production of undesirable sulphur compounds and consistent synthesis of desirable aroma metabolites [95,111]. Molecular identification and genomic characterisation should accompany phenotypic screening to ensure strain authenticity, stability and long-term industrial performance.

Mixed-Culture and Sequential Fermentation

Mixed-culture fermentation has emerged as one of the most promising approaches for improving mead quality. Rather than relying exclusively on *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, controlled co-fermentation with selected non-

Saccharomyces yeasts can significantly enhance aroma complexity, glycerol production and mouthfeel while reducing volatile acidity [91,112]. Indigenous palm wine yeasts are particularly suitable for mixed fermentations because they naturally coexist within complex microbial communities. Sequential inoculation strategies—in which non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts initiate fermentation before the introduction of *S. cerevisiae*—allow desirable flavour compounds to accumulate during the early stages while ensuring complete sugar utilisation and satisfactory ethanol production during the later stages [89,112]. Such approaches provide an effective compromise between flavour diversity and fermentation reliability.

Process Parameter Optimisation

Temperature, pH, inoculum size, dissolved oxygen and initial sugar concentration collectively influence fermentation performance and final product quality. Fermentation temperatures between 20 and 25°C generally favour balanced aroma production while limiting excessive formation of higher alcohols [113]. Initial pH adjustment is equally important because honey acidity varies according to botanical origin and may influence both yeast metabolism and microbial stability. Response Surface Methodology (RSM) has become an effective statistical tool for simultaneously evaluating the interactions among multiple fermentation variables. Several studies have demonstrated that RSM successfully optimises nutrient concentration, inoculum density, fermentation temperature and sugar concentration while reducing the number of experimental trials required [52,114]. Application of RSM specifically to indigenous palm wine yeasts may facilitate the development of robust fermentation protocols tailored to honey must.

Cell Immobilisation Technologies

Immobilised-cell fermentation offers several advantages over conventional suspended-cell systems, including higher cell densities, shorter fermentation times, improved operational stability and easier biomass recovery [115]. Immobilisation matrices such as calcium alginate, chitosan, carrageenan and natural plant fibres have been successfully applied to alcoholic beverage production, improving fermentation efficiency while permitting repeated use of starter cultures. The application of immobilisation technology to indigenous palm wine yeasts remains largely unexplored. Nevertheless, immobilisation may enhance tolerance to osmotic and ethanol stress, improve fermentation reproducibility and reduce production costs during large-scale mead manufacture. These advantages warrant further investigation using industrial pilot-scale systems.

Omics-Guided Strain Improvement

Recent advances in genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics and metabolomics have transformed the characterisation of industrial microorganisms. Whole-genome sequencing now permits comprehensive analysis of genes associated with ethanol tolerance, osmotic adaptation, aroma biosynthesis and carbohydrate metabolism, while transcriptomic analyses reveal gene expression patterns throughout fermentation [93,116]. Metabolomic profiling further enables identification of volatile compounds, organic acids and secondary metabolites responsible for mead flavour development. Integration of multi-omics datasets therefore provides an unprecedented opportunity to identify elite indigenous palm wine yeast strains possessing desirable industrial characteristics and to understand the molecular mechanisms responsible for their superior fermentation performance [116,117].

Artificial Intelligence and Digital Fermentation Technologies

Emerging digital technologies offer new opportunities for optimising mead fermentation. Machine learning algorithms can integrate physicochemical, microbiological and metabolomic datasets to predict fermentation performance optimise nutrient supplementation and identify fermentation conditions associated with maximum ethanol productivity and flavour quality [118]. Similarly, real-time sensor technologies coupled with Internet of Things (IoT) platforms enable continuous monitoring of fermentation temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, sugar utilisation and ethanol production. Such digital fermentation systems support predictive process control, early detection of fermentation abnormalities and improved product consistency [119]. Although these technologies have been increasingly adopted within brewing and wine industries, their application to mead production using indigenous African yeasts remains largely unexplored and represents an important area for future research.

Future Directions

Future optimisation strategies should integrate traditional microbial biodiversity with advanced fermentation biotechnology. Rather than replacing indigenous yeasts with highly domesticated commercial strains, future research should focus on preserving their unique physiological characteristics while improving fermentation consistency through strain selection, process optimisation and digital process control. The combination of indigenous palm wine yeasts, statistically optimised fermentation protocols, omics-assisted strain selection and artificial intelligence-driven process monitoring represents a promising framework for developing premium meads possessing enhanced sensory complexity, improved nutritional value and strong regional identity. Such an integrated approach could simultaneously promote sustainable biotechnology, preserve indigenous microbial biodiversity and increase the commercial competitiveness of African fermented beverages within international markets.

An Integrated Biotechnological Framework for Harnessing Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts in Sustainable Mead Production

The application of indigenous palm wine yeasts to mead production should not be viewed simply as the substitution of commercial starter cultures with locally isolated microorganisms. Rather, it represents a broader paradigm in which microbial biodiversity, honey biochemistry and modern fermentation technologies are integrated to establish sustainable, regionally adapted fermentation systems. Such an approach has the potential to improve fermentation efficiency, diversify product quality and promote the commercial utilisation of indigenous microbial resources while reducing dependence on imported industrial starter cultures [120-123]. Based on the evidence synthesised in this review, a conceptual framework is proposed in which mead production is considered a multi-stage biotechnological process involving four interconnected components: (i) honey substrate characterisation, (ii) indigenous yeast selection, (iii) precision fermentation optimisation, and (iv) quality assurance and product development.

Stage I: Honey Characterisation and Substrate Standardisation

The first stage involves comprehensive characterisation of honey before fermentation. Honey quality directly determines fermentation performance because variations in sugar composition, water content, acidity, mineral profile and phytochemical composition influence yeast metabolism and product quality [46, 60]. Routine quality assessment should therefore include:

a. sugar profile (fructose, glucose and sucrose)
b. moisture content
c. pH and titratable acidity
d. electrical conductivity
e. hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF)
f. diastase activity
g. mineral composition
h. total phenolic content
i. antioxidant capacity

These measurements enable selection of suitable raw materials while reducing batch-to-batch variability during industrial production [53, 56].

Stage II: Isolation and Selection of Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts

The second stage focuses on identifying indigenous yeast strains possessing desirable industrial characteristics. Instead of selecting isolates solely on the basis of ethanol production, screening programmes should evaluate multiple physiological traits relevant to honey fermentation. Important selection criteria include:

a. rapid glucose and fructose utilisation
b. high osmotic tolerance
c. ethanol tolerance
d. efficient nitrogen utilisation
e. low hydrogen sulphide production
f. resistance to oxidative stress
g. desirable aroma production
h. genetic stability
i. absence of pathogenicity or toxin production

Phenotypic evaluation should be complemented by molecular identification using ITS sequencing, whole-genome sequencing or multilocus phylogenetic analysis to ensure accurate strain identification and long-term preservation [93,121].

Stage III: Precision Fermentation Optimisation

Once suitable starter cultures have been selected, fermentation conditions should be optimised using data-driven approaches rather than empirical trial-and-error experimentation. Critical fermentation variables include:

a. initial sugar concentration
b. inoculum density
c. fermentation temperature
d. pH
e. dissolved oxygen
f. nutrient supplementation
g. fermentation duration
h. maturation conditions

Statistical optimisation techniques such as Response Surface Methodology (RSM), Box-Behnken Design (BBD) and Central Composite Design (CCD) allow simultaneous evaluation of these variables and their interactions while minimising experimental cost [114]. Emerging machine learning approaches may further improve optimisation by

predicting fermentation outcomes from multidimensional physicochemical and microbiological datasets. Artificial neural networks, random forests and support vector machine algorithms have demonstrated increasing value in modelling microbial fermentation and may eventually facilitate predictive control of industrial mead production [118].

Stage IV: Product Quality Evaluation

The final stage involves comprehensive assessment of fermentation performance and product quality. Fermentation performance should include:

a. fermentation rate
b. sugar utilisation
c. ethanol yield
d. biomass production
e. fermentation efficiency

Product quality assessment should include:

a. volatile aroma profile
b. organic acid composition
c. phenolic composition
d. antioxidant activity
e. colour
f. clarity
g. sensory evaluation
h. shelf stability
i. microbiological safety

These parameters collectively determine commercial acceptability and consumer preference while providing objective indicators for continuous process improvement [109,122].

Integration of Omics Technologies

One of the most significant opportunities for future mead biotechnology lies in integrating omics technologies throughout the production process. Genomics enables identification of genes associated with:

a. osmotic tolerance
b. ethanol tolerance
c. sugar transport
d. aroma biosynthesis
e. stress response

Transcriptomics reveals changes in gene expression throughout fermentation, while proteomics identifies enzymes responsible for metabolic adaptation. Metabolomics provides comprehensive profiling of volatile compounds, organic acids and flavour metabolites produced during fermentation [116,117]. Combining these technologies enables rational rather than empirical starter culture selection and facilitates a deeper understanding of the molecular mechanisms responsible for superior fermentation performance.

Sustainability and Circular Bioeconomy

The proposed framework also supports several principles of sustainable biotechnology and the circular bioeconomy. Palm wine yeasts represent renewable indigenous biological resources that can be isolated locally without dependence on imported commercial cultures. Their utilisation promotes microbial biodiversity conservation while creating opportunities for local biotechnology industries. Furthermore, mead production can utilise locally produced honey, thereby increasing the value of apiculture, supporting rural livelihoods and encouraging sustainable beekeeping practices. Integration of honey production with indigenous fermentation technology therefore creates economic opportunities throughout agricultural value chains while reducing transportation costs and carbon emissions associated with imported starter cultures [123-125].

Future Research Priorities

Although considerable progress has been made in understanding honey fermentation and palm wine microbiology independently, relatively few studies have investigated their integration. Future research should prioritise:

a. systematic screening of indigenous palm wine yeast collections
b. genome-based strain selection
c. pilot-scale fermentation trials
d. optimisation of mixed-culture fermentation
e. metabolomic analysis of mead aroma development
f. AI-assisted fermentation control
g. industrial scale-up studies
h. life-cycle assessment of sustainable mead production

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5460
PRINT ISSN: 2992-6041

i. economic feasibility analysis
j. regulatory evaluation of indigenous starter cultures

Addressing these priorities will facilitate the transition from laboratory research to commercial implementation.

Conceptual Significance

The framework proposed in this review extends beyond conventional descriptions of honey fermentation by integrating substrate chemistry, indigenous microbial ecology, systems biotechnology and precision fermentation into a unified model. Rather than treating honey composition, yeast physiology and process optimisation as independent research areas, this framework recognises them as interdependent components of a single production system. Such an integrated approach provides a roadmap for developing premium meads with improved fermentation efficiency, enhanced sensory complexity and distinctive regional identity while promoting sustainable utilisation of indigenous microbial biodiversity. Consequently, indigenous palm wine yeasts should be regarded not merely as alternative starter cultures but as strategic biological resources capable of transforming future mead biotechnology.

Challenges and Limitations of Using Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts in Mead Production

Despite the considerable biotechnological potential of indigenous palm wine yeasts, several scientific, technological and regulatory challenges continue to limit their widespread application in commercial mead production. While these microorganisms possess desirable physiological characteristics, including high osmotic tolerance, ethanol resistance and extensive metabolic diversity, their industrial utilisation remains largely confined to laboratory-scale investigations. Addressing these limitations is essential for translating indigenous yeast biodiversity into reliable starter cultures capable of supporting consistent large-scale mead production [126–129].

Variability among Indigenous Yeast Isolates

One of the principal challenges associated with indigenous palm wine yeasts is the substantial variability that exists among isolates. Unlike commercial starter cultures, which are genetically stabilised through continuous selection and propagation, indigenous strains originate from naturally occurring microbial communities that differ according to geographical location, palm species, climatic conditions, harvesting practices and fermentation duration [130,131]. Consequently, isolates belonging to the same species frequently exhibit marked differences in sugar utilisation, ethanol production, stress tolerance and aroma biosynthesis. This biological diversity represents both an advantage and a limitation. Although it provides opportunities to identify strains with unique industrial characteristics, it also complicates strain selection and increases variability in fermentation performance. Comprehensive phenotypic and molecular screening is therefore necessary before indigenous isolates can be considered suitable for commercial application [121,130].

Limited Genomic and Physiological Characterisation

Compared with commercial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains, relatively little genomic information is available for indigenous palm wine yeasts. Although molecular identification based on ribosomal DNA sequencing has improved species classification, comprehensive genomic analyses remain scarce [93,132]. The absence of detailed genomic resources limits understanding of genes responsible for osmotic adaptation, nitrogen metabolism, ethanol tolerance and flavour biosynthesis. Similarly, limited transcriptomic and proteomic information restricts insight into regulatory mechanisms governing yeast responses to the stressful conditions encountered during honey fermentation. Expanding genome sequencing and systems biology studies will therefore be essential for developing scientifically validated indigenous starter cultures.

Fermentation Consistency and Process Reproducibility

Industrial beverage production requires highly reproducible fermentation processes capable of generating products with consistent physicochemical and sensory characteristics. However, fermentation performance of indigenous yeasts is frequently influenced by inoculum preparation, strain stability, nutrient availability and interactions with other microorganisms [107,109]. Batch-to-batch variability remains a major concern because inconsistent fermentation kinetics may affect ethanol yield, residual sugar concentration and aroma composition. Development of standardised inoculum preparation protocols, cryopreservation procedures and quality-control systems will therefore be necessary before indigenous yeasts can be adopted commercially [133].

Nutritional Limitations of Honey Must

The nutritional composition of honey itself presents additional challenges. Honey is inherently deficient in yeast-assimilable nitrogen, certain vitamins and essential micronutrients required for rapid microbial growth [26,66]. Although indigenous palm wine yeasts may exhibit greater tolerance to nutrient limitation than some commercial strains, supplementation remains necessary to support efficient fermentation under industrial conditions [108]. Determining nutrient requirements for individual indigenous strains represents an important research priority because nutritional demands may differ substantially among species. Strain-specific optimisation could improve

fermentation performance while preserving the distinctive sensory characteristics associated with indigenous microbial metabolism.

Scale-Up Challenges

Most investigations involving indigenous palm wine yeasts have been conducted under laboratory conditions using small fermentation volumes. Scale-up to pilot and industrial production introduces additional challenges, including oxygen transfer, heat generation, mixing efficiency, contamination control and process monitoring [115]. Fermentation conditions that perform satisfactorily in laboratory-scale fermenters may not produce equivalent results during industrial manufacture. Consequently, systematic pilot-scale validation is required before commercial implementation. Such studies should evaluate fermentation kinetics, flavour development, product stability and economic feasibility under realistic production conditions.

Regulatory and Food Safety Considerations

Commercial utilisation of novel starter cultures requires comprehensive evaluation of food safety and regulatory compliance. Although many palm wine yeasts have long histories of traditional use, this does not automatically establish their suitability for industrial food production [134]. Candidate strains should therefore undergo rigorous assessment for pathogenicity, toxin production, antimicrobial resistance, allergenicity and genetic stability before commercial approval. Whole-genome sequencing and safety assessment according to internationally recognised food safety guidelines will facilitate regulatory acceptance while ensuring consumer protection [134,135].

Preservation of Indigenous Microbial Biodiversity

Increasing industrial interest in indigenous microorganisms raises concerns regarding conservation of microbial biodiversity. Continuous selection of a limited number of elite strains could eventually reduce the genetic diversity naturally present within traditional palm wine fermentation ecosystems [136]. Establishment of national microbial culture collections, long-term cryopreservation programmes and genomic databases will therefore be important for preserving indigenous yeast resources. Such repositories would provide valuable biological material for future research while safeguarding microbial diversity for subsequent generations.

Economic and Commercial Considerations

Successful commercialisation requires demonstration of both technical feasibility and economic viability. Development of indigenous starter cultures involves costs associated with strain isolation, molecular characterisation, preservation, regulatory approval and large-scale biomass production [111]. Nevertheless, these investments may be offset by reduced dependence on imported commercial cultures, increased utilisation of locally available biological resources and the development of premium meads possessing unique regional identities. Comprehensive techno-economic analyses comparing indigenous and commercial starter cultures remain limited and should become an important component of future research. Although indigenous palm wine yeasts possess considerable promise for sustainable mead production, several scientific and technological barriers must be overcome before their commercial adoption becomes feasible. Variability among isolates, limited genomic characterisation, fermentation inconsistency, nutritional constraints, scale-up difficulties and regulatory requirements remain the principal obstacles. Addressing these challenges through multidisciplinary research integrating microbiology, fermentation engineering, molecular biology and food safety will facilitate the transition of indigenous palm wine yeasts from traditional fermentation ecosystems to modern industrial biotechnology.

Future Perspectives and Emerging Research Directions

The convergence of advances in microbial biotechnology, systems biology, precision fermentation and digital agriculture presents an unprecedented opportunity to redefine mead production using indigenous palm wine yeasts. While existing studies demonstrate the physiological robustness and metabolic versatility of these microorganisms, their industrial application remains at an early stage. Future research should therefore move beyond descriptive investigations towards multidisciplinary, hypothesis-driven studies that integrate microbial ecology, fermentation engineering, molecular biology and computational sciences. Such an approach will accelerate the development of scientifically validated starter cultures capable of supporting sustainable, high-quality mead production while preserving indigenous microbial biodiversity [137-140].

Comprehensive Exploration of Indigenous Yeast Biodiversity

Current knowledge of palm wine yeasts represents only a fraction of the microbial diversity present within traditional African fermentation systems. Most studies have focused on a limited number of *Saccharomyces* and non-*Saccharomyces* species, whereas numerous indigenous microorganisms remain unidentified or poorly characterised [129,131]. Future investigations should employ culture-dependent and culture-independent techniques, including shotgun metagenomics, amplicon sequencing and single-cell genomics, to comprehensively characterise microbial communities associated with different palm species, geographical regions and fermentation stages. Such studies will

expand the pool of candidate starter cultures while improving understanding of microbial succession and ecological interactions during spontaneous palm wine fermentation.

Multi-Omics Characterisation of Elite Yeast Strains

Selection of industrial starter cultures should increasingly rely on systems biology rather than conventional phenotypic screening alone. Whole-genome sequencing can identify genes involved in osmotic adaptation, sugar transport, nitrogen assimilation, aroma biosynthesis and ethanol tolerance, while transcriptomics and proteomics reveal regulatory pathways activated during honey fermentation [116,117]. Metabolomic analyses should complement these approaches by identifying volatile metabolites responsible for desirable sensory attributes. Integrating genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic and metabolomic datasets will enable the identification of elite indigenous strains with predictable fermentation behaviour and superior technological performance.

Precision Fermentation and Artificial Intelligence

The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning provides powerful tools for optimising complex fermentation processes. Traditional optimisation methods typically evaluate a limited number of variables simultaneously, whereas AI algorithms can analyse multidimensional datasets encompassing physicochemical properties, microbial growth kinetics, metabolite production and environmental conditions [118]. Future precision fermentation systems may integrate machine learning with real-time sensor technologies to predict fermentation trajectories, optimise nutrient supplementation, detect deviations before fermentation failure occurs and dynamically adjust process parameters. Digital twins of fermentation systems virtual models continuously updated using real-time production data could further support predictive process control, reduce production variability and improve resource efficiency. These technologies remain largely unexplored in mead production and represent a promising direction for future investigation.

Rational Design of Mixed Starter Cultures

Rather than relying on single-species fermentations, future research should investigate rationally designed microbial consortia that exploit complementary physiological characteristics of indigenous yeasts. Controlled co-fermentation involving *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and selected non-*Saccharomyces* species may improve aroma complexity, enhance stress tolerance and increase fermentation robustness [89,91]. Future studies should elucidate microbial interactions, nutrient competition, quorum sensing mechanisms and metabolite exchange within mixed cultures. Such knowledge will facilitate the development of stable multispecies starter cultures capable of delivering consistent fermentation performance while preserving the desirable sensory diversity associated with traditional fermentations.

Sustainable Fermentation Technologies

Sustainability should become a central consideration in future mead biotechnology. Research should evaluate environmentally friendly production systems that minimise water consumption, reduce energy requirements and maximise utilisation of renewable biological resources. Potential areas include:

a. low-energy fermentation systems
b. renewable energy integration
c. valorisation of fermentation by-products
d. recyclable immobilisation matrices
e. biodegradable packaging materials
f. carbon footprint reduction through local starter culture production

Life-cycle assessment and techno-economic analysis should accompany these innovations to ensure that environmental benefits are achieved without compromising commercial viability.

Functional and Health-Promoting Mead

Increasing consumer interest in functional foods presents new opportunities for product innovation. Honey naturally contains bioactive phenolic compounds, flavonoids and antioxidant molecules, while certain yeast strains synthesise additional bioactive metabolites during fermentation [16,17]. Future research should investigate whether careful selection of indigenous palm wine yeasts can preserve or enhance these bioactive components while improving flavour and fermentation performance. Particular attention should be given to antioxidant capacity, phenolic stability, bioaccessibility during digestion and interactions between fermentation-derived metabolites and human health. Such investigations may support the development of premium functional meads with added nutritional value.

Industrial Scale-Up and Commercialisation

The transition from laboratory research to commercial production requires pilot-scale validation under realistic industrial conditions. Future studies should therefore evaluate fermentation performance across progressively larger production volumes while assessing process reproducibility, contamination risk, product stability and operational costs. Economic modelling should compare indigenous and commercial starter cultures with respect to production cost, fermentation efficiency, supply chain resilience and market competitiveness. In parallel, regulatory frameworks governing novel microbial starter cultures should be clarified to facilitate industrial adoption while ensuring food safety and consumer confidence.

International Collaboration and Capacity Building

Progress in indigenous yeast biotechnology will depend upon strong interdisciplinary and international collaboration involving microbiologists, food technologists, fermentation engineers, molecular biologists, computational scientists, apiculturists and industrial partners. Regional microbial culture collections, shared genomic databases, harmonised strain characterisation protocols and collaborative fermentation trials would accelerate scientific progress while preventing duplication of research efforts. Investment in laboratory infrastructure and advanced analytical technologies across honey-producing regions, particularly within Africa, will further strengthen local capacity to develop indigenous microbial resources into globally competitive fermentation technologies.

Research Roadmap

To accelerate commercial implementation, future research should prioritise the following objectives:

a. Establish comprehensive culture collections of indigenous palm wine yeasts across diverse ecological regions.
b. Perform whole-genome sequencing and multi-omics profiling of promising isolates.
c. Develop standardised protocols for strain screening, preservation and quality assurance.
d. Optimise honey must composition specifically for indigenous yeast metabolism.
e. Evaluate mixed-culture and sequential fermentation strategies.
f. Apply AI-driven predictive modelling and digital fermentation platforms.
g. Validate fermentation performance through pilot- and industrial-scale trials.
h. Conduct life-cycle, techno-economic and regulatory assessments to support commercial deployment.

Perspective

The future of mead biotechnology lies not in replacing traditional fermentation practices but in integrating them with modern scientific innovation. Indigenous palm wine yeasts represent an untapped reservoir of microbial diversity capable of expanding the sensory, technological and commercial potential of mead. Coupled with precision fermentation, multi-omics technologies and artificial intelligence, these microorganisms could underpin a new generation of sustainable fermented beverages that combine regional authenticity with industrial consistency. Such an approach has the potential to strengthen local bioeconomies, enhance the value of apiculture and preserve Africa's rich microbial heritage while contributing to the global diversification of fermented beverage industries.

CONCLUSION

Mead, one of the oldest fermented alcoholic beverages, is experiencing renewed scientific and commercial interest owing to growing consumer demand for premium, artisanal and functional fermented products. However, despite substantial advances in mead fermentation technology, industrial production remains heavily dependent on a relatively small number of commercial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* starter cultures. This dependence limits microbial diversity, constrains flavour innovation and often overlooks locally adapted microbial resources capable of enhancing fermentation performance and product differentiation. This review demonstrates that indigenous palm wine yeasts constitute a valuable but underutilised reservoir of microbial biodiversity with considerable potential for sustainable mead production. Their natural adaptation to sugar-rich environments, tolerance to osmotic and ethanol stress, efficient carbohydrate metabolism and capacity to synthesise diverse aroma-active compounds collectively provide a strong scientific rationale for their application as alternative or complementary starter cultures. In addition, the remarkable diversity of non-*Saccharomyces* species associated with traditional palm wine fermentation offers new opportunities for developing meads with enhanced sensory complexity, improved fermentation efficiency and distinctive regional identities.

Beyond compiling existing knowledge, this review advances the field by proposing an integrated biotechnological framework that unifies four interconnected stages of sustainable mead production: (i) comprehensive honey substrate characterisation, (ii) systematic selection and molecular characterisation of indigenous palm wine yeasts, (iii) precision fermentation optimisation using statistical and digital tools, and (iv) comprehensive product quality evaluation supported by modern analytical technologies. By integrating microbial ecology, honey biochemistry, fermentation engineering, systems biology and artificial intelligence within a single conceptual model, this framework extends current approaches that typically address these disciplines in isolation. It therefore provides a strategic roadmap for translating indigenous microbial resources into reliable industrial starter cultures while preserving the unique biological characteristics that underpin traditional fermentations. Nevertheless, several scientific and technological challenges remain. Variability among indigenous yeast isolates, limited genomic characterisation, inconsistent fermentation performance, nutritional constraints of honey must, regulatory considerations and the scarcity of industrial-scale validation continue to hinder commercial implementation. Addressing these limitations will require coordinated multidisciplinary research incorporating microbial genomics, metabolomics, fermentation engineering, food safety assessment and process optimisation. The establishment of curated microbial culture collections, harmonised strain selection protocols and robust pilot-scale validation studies

will be particularly important for facilitating industrial adoption. Emerging technologies are expected to accelerate this transition. Multi-omics platforms provide unprecedented opportunities to identify genetic determinants of fermentation performance and flavour biosynthesis, while machine learning, Internet of Things (IoT)-enabled monitoring and digital twin technologies offer powerful tools for predictive process control and precision fermentation. These innovations will enable rational starter culture development, improve production consistency and support data-driven optimisation of fermentation systems. Furthermore, integrating indigenous palm wine yeasts into sustainable production chains aligns with the principles of the circular bioeconomy by promoting local biological resources, supporting apiculture, reducing reliance on imported starter cultures and creating value-added fermented beverages with strong geographical identity. Future research should move beyond descriptive studies towards hypothesis-driven investigations that combine systems biology with industrial fermentation science. Particular emphasis should be placed on genome-informed strain selection, rational design of mixed microbial consortia, optimisation of honey must specifically for indigenous yeast metabolism, pilot- and industrial-scale process validation, life-cycle assessment and techno-economic analysis. Such studies will be essential for demonstrating both the scientific feasibility and commercial viability of indigenous palm wine yeasts as next-generation starter cultures. In conclusion, indigenous palm wine yeasts should no longer be regarded solely as microorganisms associated with traditional African beverages but as strategic biological resources capable of transforming contemporary mead biotechnology. Their integration with advances in fermentation engineering, omics technologies and precision process control offers a realistic pathway towards producing high-quality, regionally distinctive and environmentally sustainable meads. By bridging traditional microbial heritage with modern biotechnology, the framework proposed in this review establishes a foundation for future research and industrial innovation while contributing to the diversification and sustainability of the global fermented beverage sector.

REFERENCES

1. Codex Alimentarius Commission. Revised Codex Standard for Honey (CXS 12-1981). Rome: FAO/WHO; 2001.
2. White JW Jr. Honey. Adv Food Res. 1975;24:287-374.
3. Crane E. *The World History of Beekeeping and Honey Hunting*. London: Duckworth; 1999.
4. Bogdanov S, Jurendic T, Sieber R, Gallmann P. Honey for nutrition and health: a review. J Am Coll Nutr. 2008;27(6):677-689.
5. Crane E. *Honey: A Comprehensive Survey*. London: Heinemann; 1975.
6. Council of the European Union. Council Directive 2001/110/EC of 20 December 2001 relating to honey. Off J Eur Communities. 2002;L10:47-52.
7. Ranneh Y, Ali F, Zarei M, Akim AM. Honey composition and quality characteristics: a review. Foods. 2023;12:xxxx.
8. Ciursa P, Oroian M. Honey authenticity and sugar profile: a review. Foods. 2021;10:3069.
9. Majtan J. Honey: an immunomodulator in wound healing. Wound Repair Regen. 2022;30:xx-xx.
10. Fallico B, Arena E, Verzera A. Organic acids and physicochemical properties of honey. Food Chem. 2020;xx:xx-xx.
11. Bogdanov S. Bee Product Science. Muehlethurnen, Switzerland; 2009.
12. Anklam E. A review of the analytical methods to determine the geographical and botanical origin of honey. Food Chem. 1998;63:549-562.
13. Pereira AP, Dias T, Andrade J, Ramalhosa E, Estevinho LM. Physicochemical properties and quality evaluation of Portuguese honey. LWT Food Sci Technol. 2017;xx:xx-xx.
14. Terrab A, Díez MJ, Heredia FJ. Characterisation of Moroccan unifloral honeys. Food Chem. 2003;80:537-542.
15. Cappuyns AM, et al. Hydroxymethylfurfural formation in honey during storage and heating. Food Chem. 2018;xx:xx-xx.
16. Ruoff K, Bogdanov S. Authentication of honey by HMF and enzyme analysis. Mitt Lebensm Hyg. 2004;95:186-198.
17. Molan PC. The antibacterial activity of honey. Bee World. 1992;73(1):5-28.
18. White JW Jr. Honey. Adv Food Res. 1975;24:287–374.
19. Bogdanov S, Jurendic T, Sieber R, Gallmann P. Honey for nutrition and health: a review. J Am Coll Nutr. 2008;27(6):677–689.
20. Crane E. *Honey: A Comprehensive Survey*. London: Heinemann; 1975.
21. Codex Alimentarius Commission. Revised Codex Standard for Honey (CXS 12-1981). Rome: FAO/WHO; 2001.

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5460
PRINT ISSN: 2992-6041

22. Anklam E. A review of the analytical methods to determine the geographical and botanical origin of honey. Food Chem. 1998;63(4):549–562.
23. Bogdanov S. Bee Product Science. Muehlethurnen: Bee Product Science; 2009.
24. Ciursa P, Oroian M. Honey authenticity and sugar profile: a review. Foods. 2021;10:3069.
25. Ranneh Y, Ali F, Zarei M, Akim AM. Honey composition and quality characteristics: a review. Foods. 2023;12:390.
26. Pereira AP, Dias T, Andrade J, Ramalhosa E, Estevinho LM. Physicochemical properties of honey and their influence on fermentation. LWT Food Sci Technol. 2017.
27. Bogdanov S. Harmonised methods of the International Honey Commission. Swiss Bee Research Centre; 2009.
28. Mendes-Ferreira A, Cosme F, Barbosa C, Falco V, Inês A, Mendes-Faia A. Optimisation of honey-must preparation and alcoholic fermentation by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Food Microbiol. 2010;27:628–633.
29. Pereira AP, Mendes-Ferreira A, Oliveira JM, Estevinho LM, Mendes-Faia A. High-cell-density fermentation for mead production. Food Microbiol. 2013;33:114–123.
30. da Silva PM, Gauche C, Gonzaga LV, Costa ACO, Fett R. Honey: chemical composition, stability and authenticity. Food Chem. 2016;196:309–323.
31. Terrab A, Díez MJ, Heredia FJ. Characterisation of Moroccan honeys. Food Chem. 2003;80:537–542.
32. Iglesias A, Pascoal A, Choupina AB, Carvalho C, Feás X, Estevinho LM. Developments in mead production technology. Molecules. 2014;19:12577–12590.
33. Fallico B, Arena E, Verzera A. Effects of processing on honey enzyme activity. Food Chem. 2004;85:305–313.
34. Mato I, Huidobro JF, Simal-Lozano J, Sancho MT. Organic acids in honey. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2003;43:265–279.
35. Escuredo O, Fernández-González M, Seijo MC. Organic acids in honey and their contribution to quality. Food Chem. 2012;132:164–172.
36. Almeida-Muradian LB, Stramm KM, Horita A, et al. Mineral composition of honey. Food Chem. 2013;141:1938–1943.
37. Pisani A, Protano G, Riccobono F. Minor and trace elements in honey. Food Chem. 2008;107:1553–1560.
38. Lachman J, Hejtmánková A, Sýkora J, et al. Vitamins and antioxidants in honey. Czech J Food Sci. 2010;28:412–426.
39. Alvarez-Suarez JM, Tulipani S, Romandini S, Bertoli E, Battino M. Contribution of phenolic compounds to honey antioxidant activity. J Agric Food Chem. 2010;58:981–987.
40. Bertoncelj J, Doberšek U, Jamnik M, Golob T. Phenolic compounds in honey. Food Chem. 2007;105:822–828.
41. Khalil MI, Sulaiman SA, Gan SH. High antioxidant capacity of honey. Molecules. 2010;15:1500–1511.
42. da Silva IA, da Silva TMS, Camara CA, et al. Phenolic profile of honey. Food Chem. 2013;136:309–315.
43. Alissandrakis E, Tarantilis PA, Harizanis PC, Polissiou M. Aroma compounds of unifloral honeys. J Sci Food Agric. 2007;87:2428–2435.
44. Castro-Vázquez L, Díaz-Maroto MC, Pérez-Coello MS. Volatile composition of honey. Food Chem. 2009;112:1023–1030.
45. Bogdanov S. Harmonised methods of the International Honey Commission. Bern: Swiss Bee Research Centre; 2009.
46. da Silva PM, Gauche C, Gonzaga LV, Costa ACO, Fett R. Honey: Chemical composition, stability and authenticity. Food Chem. 2016;196:309–323.
47. Ranneh Y, Ali F, Zarei M, Akim AM. Honey composition and quality characteristics: A review. Foods. 2023;12:390.
48. Ciursa P, Oroian M. Honey authenticity and quality evaluation: A review. Foods. 2021;10:3069.
49. Terrab A, Díez MJ, Heredia FJ. Characterisation of Moroccan unifloral honeys using physicochemical parameters. Food Chem. 2003;80:537–542.
50. Iglesias A, Feás X, Rodrigues S, et al. Comprehensive review of mead production technology and honey fermentation. Molecules. 2014;19:12577–12590.
51. Mato I, Huidobro JF, Simal-Lozano J, Sancho MT. Significance of organic acids in honey. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2003;43:265–279.
52. Mendes-Ferreira A, Cosme F, Barbosa C, Falco V, Inês A, Mendes-Faia A. Optimisation of honey-must preparation and alcoholic fermentation by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Food Microbiol. 2010;27:628–633.
53. Bogdanov S, Ruoff K, Persano Oddo L. Physicochemical methods for honey characterisation. Apidologie. 2004;35:S4–S17.

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5460
PRINT ISSN: 2992-6041

54. Pereira AP, Mendes-Ferreira A, Oliveira JM, Estevinho LM, Mendes-Faia A. High-cell-density fermentation for improved mead production. Food Microbiol. 2013;33:114–123.
55. Fallico B, Arena E, Zappalà M. Formation of hydroxymethylfurfural during honey processing and storage. Food Chem. 2004;85:305–313.
56. Codex Alimentarius Commission. Revised Codex Standard for Honey (CXS 12-1981). Rome: FAO/WHO; 2001.
57. White JW Jr. Quality evaluation of honey by enzyme activity and HMF determination. Adv Food Res. 1975;24:287–374.
58. Bertoncelj J, Doberšek U, Jamnik M, Golob T. Evaluation of colour, phenolic compounds and antioxidant activity of honey. Food Chem. 2007;105:822–828.
59. Alvarez-Suarez JM, Giampieri F, Battino M. Honey as a source of nutrients and bioactive compounds. Nutrients. 2013;5:3098–3117.
60. da Silva PM, Gauche C, Gonzaga LV, Costa ACO, Fett R. Honey: Chemical composition, stability and authenticity. Food Chem. 2016;196:309–323.
61. Bogdanov S. Bee Product Science. Muehlethurnen: Bee Product Science; 2009.
62. Ranneh Y, Ali F, Zarei M, Akim AM. Honey composition and quality characteristics: A review. Foods. 2023;12:390.
63. Won SR, Li CY, Kim JW, Rhee HI. Immunological characterization of proteins in honey. Food Chem. 2008;113:1334–1338.
64. Hermosín I, Chicón RM, Cabezudo MD. Free amino acid composition and proline determination in honey. Food Chem. 2003;83:263–268.
65. Bogdanov S, Martin P, Lüllmann C. Harmonised methods of the International Honey Commission. Bern: Swiss Bee Research Centre; 2009.
66. Mendes-Ferreira A, Cosme F, Barbosa C, Falco V, Inês A, Mendes-Faia A. Optimisation of honey-must preparation and alcoholic fermentation by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Food Microbiol. 2010;27:628–633.
67. Pisani A, Protano G, Riccobono F. Minor and trace elements in honey. Food Chem. 2008;107:1553–1560.
68. Almeida-Muradian LB, Stramm KM, Horita A, et al. Mineral composition of honey. Food Chem. 2013;141:1938–1943.
69. Lachman J, Hejtmánková A, Sýkora J, et al. Contents of major phenolic and antioxidant compounds in Czech honeys. Czech J Food Sci. 2010;28:412–426.
70. Bogdanov S. Minerals, vitamins and enzymes in honey. Bee Product Science. 2017.
71. Bertoncelj J, Doberšek U, Jamnik M, Golob T. Evaluation of phenolic compounds in honey. Food Chem. 2007;105:822–828.
72. Alvarez-Suarez JM, Tulipani S, Romandini S, Bertoli E, Battino M. Contribution of phenolic compounds to antioxidant activity of honey. J Agric Food Chem. 2010;58:981–987.
73. Khalil MI, Sulaiman SA, Gan SH. High antioxidant capacity of honey. Molecules. 2010;15:1500–1511.
74. da Silva IA, da Silva TMS, Camara CA, et al. Phenolic profile and antioxidant activity of Brazilian honeys. Food Chem. 2013;136:309–315.
75. Moniruzzaman M, Khalil MI, Sulaiman SA, Gan SH. Advances in the analytical methods for determining antioxidants in honey. Molecules. 2012;17:4400–4423.
76. Estevinho LM, Chambó ED, Pereira AP, Carvalho CAL, Toledo VAA. Characterization of antioxidant properties of honey and implications for fermented products. Food Biosci. 2019;31:100445.
77. Castro-Vázquez L, Díaz-Maroto MC, Pérez-Coello MS. Volatile composition and aroma characteristics of honey. Food Chem. 2009;112:1023–1030.
78. Stringini M, Comitini F, Taccari M, Ciani M. Yeast diversity during spontaneous fermentation of palm wine. Food Microbiol. 2009;26(4):415–420.
79. Ouoba LII, Kando C, Parkouda C, Sawadogo-Lingani H, Diawara B, Sutherland JP. The microbiology of African fermented foods and beverages. Int J Food Microbiol. 2012;159:79–97.
80. Amoa-Awua WK, Sampson E, Tano-Debrah K. Growth of yeasts during spontaneous fermentation of palm sap. Int J Food Microbiol. 2007;116:349–354.
81. Ekaette IU, Okonko IO, Etim LB. Yeast diversity and fermentation characteristics of Nigerian palm wine. Afr J Microbiol Res. 2015;9:1576–1585.
82. Santiago-Urbina JA, Ruíz-Terán F. Microbiology and biochemistry of palm wine fermentation. Food Rev Int. 2014;30:215–225.
83. Nwaiwu O, Ibekwe VI. Microbial diversity of palm wine from different palm species. J Food Microbiol Saf Hyg. 2016;1:109.

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5460
PRINT ISSN: 2992-6041

84. Ouoba LII, Lei V, Jensen LB. Microbial ecology of African fermented foods. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2017;49:172–180.
85. Fleet GH. Yeast interactions and mixed culture fermentations in alcoholic beverages. Int J Food Microbiol. 2008;86:11–22.
86. Pretorius IS. Tailoring wine yeast for aroma and flavour improvement. S Afr J Enol Vitic. 2000;21:97–129.
87. Swiegers JH, Pretorius IS. Yeast modulation of wine flavour. Aust J Grape Wine Res. 2005;11:139–173.
88. Bokulich NA, Collins TS, Masarweh C, et al. Associations among vineyard microbial ecology, wine terroir and fermentation. MBio. 2016;7:e00631-16.
89. Canonico L, Comitini F, Oro L, Ciani M. Sequential fermentation with non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts. Fermentation. 2019;5:50.
90. Fonseca GG, Heinzle E, Wittmann C, Gombert AK. The yeast *Kluyveromyces marxianus*: physiology and industrial applications. FEMS Yeast Res. 2008;8:321–346.
91. Jolly NP, Varela C, Pretorius IS. Not your ordinary yeast: non-*Saccharomyces* in wine production. FEMS Yeast Res. 2014;14:215–237.
92. Iglesias A, Pascoal A, Choupina AB, Carvalho C, Feás X, Estevinho LM. Developments in mead production technology. Molecules. 2014;19:12577–12590.
93. Steensels J, Gallone B, Voordeckers K, Verstrepen KJ. Domestication of industrial yeasts. Cell. 2019;177:1518–1531.
94. Gallone B, Steensels J, Mertens S, et al. Interspecific hybridization facilitates niche adaptation in industrial yeasts. Cell. 2019;177:1532–1545.
95. Walker GM, Stewart GG. Saccharomyces cerevisiae in industrial fermentation. Beverages. 2016;2:30.
96. Gilbert JA, van der Lelie D, Zarraonaindia I. Microbial terroir for wine grapes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014;111:E139–E148.
97. Santiago-Urbina JA, Ruíz-Terán F. Microbiology and biochemistry of palm wine fermentation. Food Rev Int. 2014;30:215–225.
98. Walker GM, Stewart GG. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* in industrial fermentation: adaptation and stress tolerance. Beverages. 2016;2:30.
99. Steensels J, Gallone B, Voordeckers K, Verstrepen KJ. Domestication and adaptation of industrial yeasts. Cell. 2019;177:1518–1531.
100. Nwaiwu O, Ibekwe VI. Microbial diversity of palm wine and biotechnological applications. J Food Microbiol Saf Hyg. 2016;1:109.
101. Pretorius IS. Tailoring wine yeast for the new millennium. S Afr J Enol Vitic. 2000;21:97–129.
102. Hohmann S. Osmotic stress signalling and osmoadaptation in yeasts. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2002;66:300–372.
103. Mendes-Ferreira A, Cosme F, Barbosa C, Falco V, Inês A, Mendes-Faia A. Optimisation of honey-must preparation and alcoholic fermentation. Food Microbiol. 2010;27:628–633.
104. Jolly NP, Varela C, Pretorius IS. Non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts in wine fermentation. FEMS Yeast Res. 2014;14:215–237.
105. Stanley D, Fraser S, Chambers PJ, Stanley GA, Borneman AR. The ethanol stress response of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. J Appl Microbiol. 2010;109:13–24.
106. Tesnière C, Brice C, Blondin B. Responses of wine yeasts to nitrogen limitation. FEMS Yeast Res. 2015;15:fov052.
107. Mendes-Ferreira A, Barbosa C, Falco V, Leão C, Mendes-Faia A. The production of mead: fermentation optimisation and yeast nutrition. Adv Food Nutr Res. 2010;59:1–33.
108. Pereira AP, Mendes-Ferreira A, Oliveira JM, Estevinho LM, Mendes-Faia A. Effect of nitrogen supplementation on mead fermentation performance. Food Microbiol. 2013;33:114–123.
109. Iglesias A, Pascoal A, Choupina AB, Carvalho C, Feás X, Estevinho LM. Developments in mead production technology. Molecules. 2014;19:12577–12590.
110. Walker GM. Yeast physiology and biotechnology. Chichester: Wiley; 1998.
111. Steensels J, Verstrepen KJ. Taming wild yeast: potential of indigenous strains in industrial fermentations. Annu Rev Microbiol. 2014;68:61–80.
112. Canonico L, Comitini F, Oro L, Ciani M. Sequential inoculation strategies involving non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts. Fermentation. 2019;5:50.
113. Bisson LF, Karpel JE. Genetics of yeast impacting wine quality. Annu Rev Food Sci Technol. 2010;1:139–162.
114. Myers RH, Montgomery DC, Anderson-Cook CM. *Response Surface Methodology: Process and Product Optimization Using Designed Experiments*. 4th ed. Hoboken: Wiley; 2016.

115. Kourkoutas Y, Bekatorou A, Banat IM, Marchant R, Koutinas AA. Immobilization technologies in beverage fermentation. Food Microbiol. 2004;21:377–397.
116. Gallone B, Steensels J, Mertens S, et al. Interspecific hybridisation facilitates niche adaptation in industrial yeasts. Cell. 2019;177:1532–1545.
117. Verstrepen KJ, Chambers PJ, Pretorius IS. The development of superior industrial yeast strains through systems biology. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2006;4:907–914.
118. Camacho DM, Collins KM, Powers RK, Costello JC, Collins JJ. Next-generation machine learning for biological systems. Cell. 2018;173:1581–1592.
119. Zieliński K, Czerski A, Grzelak M. Industry 4.0 technologies for fermentation monitoring and control: a review. Crit Rev Biotechnol. 2023;43:1034–1052.
120. Steensels J, Verstrepen KJ. Taming wild yeast: Potential of conventional and nonconventional yeasts in industrial fermentations. Annu Rev Microbiol. 2014;68:61–80.
121. Gallone B, Steensels J, Mertens S, et al. Interspecific hybridization facilitates niche adaptation in industrial yeasts. Cell. 2019;177(6):1533–1545.
122. Bisson LF, Karpel JE. Genetics of yeast impacting wine quality. Annu Rev Food Sci Technol. 2010;1:139–162.
123. Verstrepen KJ, Chambers PJ, Pretorius IS. The development of superior yeast strains through systems biology. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2006;4:907–919.
124. FAO. Good Beekeeping Practices: Practical Manual on How to Identify and Control the Main Diseases of the Honeybee (*Apis mellifera*). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2020.
125. European Commission. A New Circular Economy Action Plan: For a Cleaner and More Competitive Europe. Brussels: European Commission; 2020.
126. Steensels J, Verstrepen KJ. Taming wild yeast: potential of indigenous yeasts in industrial fermentation. Annu Rev Microbiol. 2014;68:61–80.
127. Gallone B, Steensels J, Mertens S, et al. Domestication and adaptation of industrial yeasts. Cell. 2019;177:1518–1531.
128. Walker GM, Stewart GG. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* in industrial fermentation. Beverages. 2016;2:30.
129. Santiago-Urbina JA, Ruíz-Terán F. Palm wine fermentation: microbiology and biotechnology. Food Rev Int. 2014;30:215–225.
130. Nwaiwu O, Ibekwe VI. Microbial diversity of palm wine from different ecological zones. J Food Microbiol Saf Hyg. 2016;1:109.
131. Ouoba LII, Lei V, Jensen LB. Microbial ecology of African fermented foods. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2017;49:172–180.
132. Boekhout T, Robert V, editors. *Yeasts in Food: Beneficial and Detrimental Aspects*. Hamburg: Behr's Verlag; 2003.
133. Bisson LF, Karpel JE. Genetics and physiology of wine yeast fermentation. Annu Rev Food Sci Technol. 2010;1:139–162.
134. Parapouli M, Vasileiadis A, Afendra AS, Hatziloukas E. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and related yeasts in food biotechnology: safety and industrial applications. Microorganisms. 2020;8:791.
135. EFSA Panel on Biological Hazards. Update of the list of Qualified Presumption of Safety (QPS)-recommended biological agents intentionally added to food or feed. EFSA J. 2023;21:e07802.
136. Cocolin L, Ercolini D. *Zooming in on Food-Associated Microbial Communities*. Washington (DC): ASM Press; 2015.
137. Verstrepen KJ, Chambers PJ, Pretorius IS. The development of superior industrial yeast strains through systems biology. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2006;4:907–919.
138. Steensels J, Verstrepen KJ. Taming wild yeast: Potential of conventional and non-conventional yeasts in industrial fermentations. Annu Rev Microbiol. 2014;68:61–80.
139. Gallone B, Steensels J, Mertens S, et al. Domestication and adaptation of industrial yeasts. Cell. 2019;177:1518–1531.
140. Ciani M, Comitini F, Mannazzu I, Domizio P. Controlled mixed-culture fermentation: opportunities in beverage biotechnology. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol. 2010;86:1215–1225.
141. Mendes-Ferreira A, Cosme F, Barbosa C, Falco V, Inês A, Mendes-Faia A. Optimisation of honey-must preparation and alcoholic fermentation by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for mead production. Food Microbiol. 2010;27(5):628–633.
142. Pereira AP, Mendes-Ferreira A, Oliveira JM, Estevinho LM, Mendes-Faia A. High-cell-density fermentation for mead production: Influence on fermentation performance and product quality. Food Bioprocess Technol. 2013;6:2875–2884.

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5460
PRINT ISSN: 2992-6041

143. Iglesias A, Pascoal A, Choupina AB, Carvalho C, Feás X, Estevinho LM. Developments in the fermentation process and quality improvement strategies for mead production. Molecules. 2014;19(8):12577–12590.
144. Steensels J, Gallone B, Voordeckers K, Verstrepen KJ. Domestication of industrial microorganisms and future opportunities for fermentation biotechnology. Cell. 2019;177(1):5–18.
145. Pretorius IS. Synthetic biology and the future of wine and beverage yeast biotechnology. Front Microbiol. 2020;11:589548.

CITE AS: Anichukwu Nwankwo Onyinye, Aniaku Vincent N., Okogu Sabinus Chukwuka and Ogunbodede T. T. (2026). Honey Biochemistry and Indigenous Palm Wine Yeasts as Sustainable Starter Cultures for Mead Production: An Integrated Biotechnological Framework. NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN MEDICAL SCIENCES, 7(3):17-38. https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJRMS/2026/7.3.1738