Scholastic Case Reports (ISSN: 3108-1827) Conceptual Perspective Article

Volume 2 Issue 3 March 2026

# AI, Mind Genomics, and the Psychophysics of Odor Mixtures as a Scientific and Competitive Imperative

**Dipak Paul[1], Howard Moskowitz[1,2] * ,Sharon Wingert[2], David Stevens[3], Daniel Moskowitz[1], Brown Fitterman[4]**

[1]*Mind Genomics Associates Inc., White Plains, New York, USA*

[2]*Tactical Data Group, Stafford, Virginia, USA*

[3]*Advanced Learning Strategies, Silver Lake, New Hampshire, USA*

[4] *TikunTek, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*

**Corresponding Author:** Howard Moskowitz, Mind Genomics Associates Inc., White Plains, New York, USA.

**Received:** March 28, 2026; **Published:** March 30, 2026

## Abstract

The fragrance industry relies on intuition, tradition, and preference based evaluation rather than systematic scientific discovery. This approach produces commercially viable products but does not generate cumulative knowledge about odor mixtures, perceptual mechanisms, or consumer response structures. Advances in psychophysics, odor neuroscience, sensory science, data driven consumer research, and AI now support a scientific foundation for fragrance development that extends beyond golden nose intuition and beauty contest testing. This paper presents a knowledge development paradigm in which companies build mixture level databases, map perceptual drivers and suppressors, identify consumer mind sets, and use modeling to predict responses to novel formulations. The paper links psychophysics, sensory analysis, perfumery practice, and market research to show that a knowledge development strategy can reshape competitive advantage, accelerate innovation, and redefine the roles of perfumers, sensory scientists, and researchers over the coming decades.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence; Mind Genomics; Psychophysics; Odor Mixtures; Olfactory Perception; Sensory Analysis; Consumer Research

## Introduction

The fragrance industry operates within a product-centric development system that delivers launches but does not build an explicit science of mixture perception. Companies create formulas, test them with panels and consumers, select winners, and move to market, yet they retain little structured understanding of how components and accords combine to drive perception, emotion, and choice. This cycle repeats through time and leaves organizations with portfolios of successful products, archives of test reports, and scattered expert memories, but with a thin, fragmented base of generalizable knowledge about odor mixtures. Psychophysics demonstrates that sensory systems follow lawful relations between stimulus and response, and olfactory experiments show that detection thresholds, intensity functions, and discrimination judgments for odors can be measured reliably and modeled quantitatively [1]. These findings contradict the idea that fragrance perception lies outside the reach of systematic measurement.

Neuroscience research reinforces the view that odor perception rests on structured mechanisms, not on mystery. Work on olfactory coding shows that patterns of receptor activation and glomerular input converge on cortical representations that carry information about both individual odorants and mixtures [2]. Studies of odor mixtures reveal suppression, enhancement, and configural perception that follow consistent rules rather than random effects [3]. Learning experiments demonstrate that semantic cues and experience reshape mixture perception, which means that cognitive factors modulate but do not erase underlying stimulus–response structure [4]. These strands of evidence support a view of fragrance as a domain where scientific methods can uncover mixture mechanisms and predict human responses with increasing precision.

Industry practice lags behind this scientific potential because its dominant methods target evaluation rather than discovery. Sensory programs in fragrance and cosmetic companies often focus on descriptive analysis, quality control, and comparative testing of finished products, which provides useful metrics for decision making but seldom

Copyrights: @2026. Open Access by scholastic is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License Based on a work at https://www.scholasticopenaccess.org/

investigates component-level interactions or mixture structure [5]. Consumer research relies on monadic product tests, preference rankings, and purchase-intent scales that summarize liking but do not expose the drivers of perception across segments [6]. Perfumers work with deep tacit knowledge built through apprenticeship and experience, yet that knowledge typically remains in personal notebooks, internal lore, and habits of practice rather than in shared, testable models [7]. The result is an industry that behaves as if the science of psychophysics and sensory analysis does not apply to its core activity.

A knowledge-development framework repositions each project as a contribution to a growing matrix of mixture composition, sensory attributes, emotional responses, and behavioral outcomes. Mind Genomics exemplifies this kind of structured approach by presenting respondents with systematically varied combinations of elements and estimating the additive and interactive contribution of each element for different mind-sets within the population [8]. When applied to fragrance, these experimental designs can reveal how notes, accords, and contextual cues jointly shape perceived intensity, quality, imagery, and liking for distinct consumer segments. AI and statistical learning methods extend this logic by discovering relations in high-dimensional formulation–response matrices and predicting responses to new mixtures that share structural patterns with tested sets [9].

This paper argues that the industry now faces a strategic choice between continued reliance on golden-nose culture and beauty-contest testing, or a deliberate shift toward a cumulative science of odor mixtures. The paper first traces the historical foundations of perfumery and shows how artisan practice, chemistry, and market research converged on a product-centric, low-knowledge equilibrium. It then analyzes the structural weaknesses of golden-nose culture and preference-based testing. It next summarizes key findings from psychophysics, sensory analysis, consumer research, and cosmetic science that support a mixture-centric approach. It then outlines a knowledge-development framework that integrates Mind Genomics and AI within fragrance workflows. It concludes with implications for training, organization, and competitive strategy, and with a brief statement on the role of AI as a co-author in this work.

This conceptual direction motivates the need for a structured methodological framework capable of systematically capturing mixture–response relationships.

## Conceptual Framework and Methodological Approach

This study adopts a conceptual and integrative methodological approach rather than a conventional experimental design. Instead of relying on primary data collection or controlled laboratory experimentation, the present work develops a structured framework by synthesizing established findings from psychophysics, sensory science, consumer research, neuroscience, and cosmetic science. The objective is to organize existing scientific knowledge into a coherent system capable of explaining and predicting odor mixture perception and consumer response.

A knowledge development framework treats every formulation and every test as a contribution to a structured map of mixture–response relations. Within this framework, fragrance is conceptualized not as a fixed product but as a combinatorial system in which individual elements contribute to perceptual and behavioral outcomes.

Mind Genomics provides a practical architecture for this framework by using experimental designs that combine elements in controlled ways and estimate the impact of each element on responses for different mindsets [8]. In the fragrance context, these elements can include notes, accords, intensities, carrier systems, claims, and usage scenarios. Respondents evaluate systematically varied combinations of these elements on sensory, emotional, and behavioral scales, allowing the estimation of additive and interactive effects independent of specific pairings.

AI and statistical learning methods extend Mind Genomics outputs to larger formulation spaces. Once organizations assemble matrices linking mixtures, element-level descriptors, and mindset-specific responses, predictive models can be developed to estimate responses to new mixtures that share structural features with observed ones [9]. Techniques such as regression modeling, tree-based ensembles, and representation learning enable analysis of high-dimensional formulation spaces typical of complex fragrance systems.

A knowledge development workflow requires systematic changes in how formulation and testing processes are conducted. Formulation work must log compositional details in standardized, machine-readable formats and assign meaningful structural descriptors to mixtures. Sensory evaluation must move beyond isolated descriptive or preference testing toward structured experimental designs that allow estimation of driver and suppressor effects for notes and accords across mindsets [5]. Consumer research must incorporate sufficient structural variation to support predictive modeling rather than simple comparative testing.

Data management plays a critical role in this framework. Instead of storing results as isolated reports, organizations must develop integrated databases that connect formulation variables, sensory attributes, consumer responses, and market outcomes over time. This transformation enables cumulative knowledge building and supports predictive modeling across projects.

Organizational and cultural adaptation is also required. Perfumers, sensory scientists, and consumer researchers must operate within a shared knowledge system where mixture–response relationships are explicitly modeled. Management must adopt metrics that reflect knowledge accumulation, such as coverage of mixture space and predictive accuracy, rather than relying solely on product success rates. Evidence from knowledge management and R&D analytics suggests that such approaches improve innovation efficiency and reduce project risk [10].

Finally, this framework aligns with broader trends in data-driven innovation across cosmetic and consumer goods industries. Advances in high-throughput experimentation, in silico modeling, and predictive analytics have demonstrated the feasibility of designing formulations with targeted performance characteristics [11]. The proposed framework extends these principles to fragrance development, integrating scientific rigor with creative practice.

The materials of this study therefore consist of established scientific literature, conceptual models, and analytical principles, while the methods involve their systematic integration into a unified mixture–response framework. Accordingly, this section outlines the conceptual architecture and analytical logic underlying the proposed knowledge-development paradigm rather than describing conventional experimental procedures.

## Synthesis of Scientific Evidence

A growing body of research across psychophysics, sensory science, consumer behavior, and neuroscience provides converging evidence for a mixture-centric understanding of fragrance perception.

Psychophysics establishes that sensory systems respond to structured changes in stimuli, and olfactory research extends this principle to odor mixtures. Controlled studies show that perceived intensity of single odorants increases with concentration according to regular functions, and that just noticeable differences obey predictable patterns, implying that perception operates on stable sensitivity scales [12]. Multidimensional scaling studies of odor similarity further reveal that observers organize smells within perceptual spaces defined by interpretable dimensions such as pleasantness, familiarity, or descriptor-based axes [13]. Together, these findings indicate that odor mixtures occupy positions in structured perceptual spaces rather than forming an amorphous set of impressions.

Building on this foundation, mixture-specific research demonstrates that components interact in systematic and quantifiable ways. Studies of binary and complex odor mixtures document suppression effects, where one component reduces the perceived intensity or presence of another, as well as synergistic enhancement, where combinations yield stronger or qualitatively novel impressions not predictable from individual components [3]. Research on configural perception further shows that certain mixtures generate emergent percepts that are experienced as unified odor objects distinct from their ingredients, analogous to chord perception in audition [14]. These results collectively demonstrate that odor mixtures follow regular interaction patterns that can be studied experimentally and modeled using statistical and computational approaches.

Sensory analysis methods provide practical techniques for capturing these mixture effects in applied contexts. Descriptive analysis trains panelists to use standardized attribute vocabularies and scaling methods, enabling detailed profiling of odor intensity, character, and temporal evolution for complex samples [5]. Time–intensity and temporal dominance of sensations approaches further track perception across time, revealing how mixtures evolve from top to heart to base notes—an aspect directly relevant to fragrance design [15]. When combined with mixture-structured experimental designs, these methods allow quantification of how compositional changes influence specific sensory dimensions and temporal dynamics, rather than merely overall liking.

Consumer research findings extend this evidence by demonstrating structured heterogeneity in response patterns. Studies of fragrance choice and personal care product selection show that consumers segment into groups with distinct preference functions for notes, accords, and perceived benefits, with these differences remaining relatively stable across contexts [16]. Marketing science methodologies such as conjoint and choice experiments further estimate part-worth utilities for attributes—including sensory properties—which can be used to predict responses to new combinations [6]. Mind Genomics builds on this logic by embedding sensory and contextual elements within systematically varied vignettes and estimating their additive and interactive contributions to responses across different mindsets, directly aligning with mixture-based analytical approaches [8].

Additional support emerges from cosmetic science and functional fragrance research, which demonstrate that fragrances produce measurable psychophysiological outcomes. Studies of fragranced personal care products show associations between specific olfactory profiles and changes in reported mood, stress levels, and perceived product efficacy beyond basic hedonic responses [11]. Neuroscientific investigations further report that certain fragrance compositions modulate EEG activity, autonomic responses, and self-reported alertness or relaxation under controlled conditions [17]. These findings indicate that odor mixtures exert systematic effects on affect, physiology, and cognition, which can be linked to compositional features through structured experimental approaches.

Taken together, these converging lines of evidence establish a robust scientific foundation for a mixture-centric approach to fragrance research. Odor mixtures exhibit lawful and measurable interactions; sensory analysis provides tools to capture these interactions; consumer responses reflect stable yet heterogeneous structures; and fragrance compositions influence emotional and physiological states in reproducible ways. These findings support a transition from product-level evaluation toward mixture-level investigation and provide an empirical basis for structured knowledge-development approaches in fragrance science.

## Discussion: Industry Practices, Limitations, and Knowledge Gaps

To interpret the implications of the present analysis, it is necessary to situate current fragrance practices within their historical, methodological, and structural context. The following discussion integrates historical development, cultural practices, and evaluation systems to explain why a gap persists between scientific knowledge and industry application.

### 4.1. Historical Foundations of Fragrance Development

The modern fragrance industry emerged from an artisan tradition in which perfumers developed expertise through apprenticeship and direct engagement with natural materials. Historic accounts of early perfumery describe a craft culture built on olfactory memory, manual blending, and practical knowledge of animalic and botanical sources, rather than on experimental measurement or formal theory [18]. Masters guided apprentices through repeated smelling and replication exercises, and evaluation occurred through the judgment of senior noses and clients. This process produced striking creative achievements and a powerful professional identity for perfumers, but it did not cultivate explicit, testable models of mixture perception.

The introduction of synthetic aroma chemicals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries transformed the material basis of perfumery while preserving its epistemology. Synthetic musks, ionones, aldehydes, and many other compounds expanded the compositional palette and enabled large scale, consistent production of complex accords [19]. Fragrance houses built internal libraries of synthetics and naturals, developed proprietary bases, and protected formulas as trade secrets, yet they continued to design and refine mixtures through iterative trial, guided by the sensory judgment of experienced perfumers [20]. Chemical structure received systematic attention, but the psychological structure of perception remained mostly implicit, inferred from experience rather than mapped through formal experiments.

During the second half of the twentieth century, sensory science and consumer research grew as established disciplines and gradually entered fragrance, flavor, and cosmetic companies. Sensory methodology introduced controlled panel recruitment, training, scaling strategies, and statistical analysis that improved reliability in descriptive profiling and product comparison [21]. Consumer research introduced conjoint analysis, segmentation, and concept testing tools that drew on marketing science and psychometrics [6]. These developments strengthened evaluation and decision support but did not shift the underlying focus from finished products to mixtures or from outcomes to mechanisms. Panels described and ranked samples; consumers expressed liking; analysts produced summaries; organizations made go no go decisions. The basic scientific question of how mixtures create specific sensory and emotional experiences remained secondary.

Psychophysics developed in parallel as a branch of experimental psychology dedicated to quantifying relations between stimulus and sensation, and olfactory research took shape within this tradition. Work on detection thresholds and intensity ratings for volatile compounds

showed that odor perception could be described with psychophysical functions that relate concentration to perceived strength, often following power laws or other systematic forms [12]. Studies of just noticeable differences in odor intensity illustrated that observers could discriminate small changes in concentration with consistent sensitivity across sessions, which supports the assumption of stable perceptual metrics [22]. Research on multidimensional scaling and similarity judgments revealed that people represent odor quality within structured spaces where proximities reflect shared perceptual attributes [13]. These findings framed olfaction as a domain of lawful relations, not as a purely subjective phenomenon.

Trade literature and industry commentary show how the sector responded to these scientific advances. Articles in perfumery and flavor magazines describe new aroma chemicals, creative directions, regulatory pressures, and consumer trends, but they rarely place psychophysical modeling and mixture experiments at the center of development practice [23]. Reports of consumer testing in trade outlets emphasize top box scores, preference splits, and brand fit narratives rather than explicit mixture–response functions. Technical features on cosmetic fragrance development discuss stability, compatibility with bases, and sensory alignment with product position but treat perception as something assessed rather than modeled [11]. The industry adopted a narrow slice of scientific tools that supported evaluation and control but did not open a path toward a cumulative science of mixtures.

This historical trajectory clarifies that current practices are not accidental but are rooted in longstanding traditions that prioritize product outcomes over mechanistic understanding.

### 4.2. Limitations of Golden Nose Culture

Building on this historical foundation, golden nose culture positions the perfumer as the central instrument of evaluation and creation, but that culture weakens the industry's ability to build cumulative knowledge. The image of the gifted nose emphasizes personal intuition, idiosyncratic vocabulary, and stylistic signatures, which supports brand differentiation but discourages codification of underlying mixture principles [7]. Training processes focus on memorizing raw materials and classic accords, matching benchmarks, and adjusting submissions based on senior feedback, which promotes tacit pattern recognition but not explicit formulation rules. When a master perfumer retires or moves, the organization often loses access to personal mental models that never appeared in shared, testable form.

Research on expert olfaction shows that perfumers and trained professionals develop refined internal odor spaces and can arrange stimuli along latent perceptual dimensions that support classification and retrieval. Studies using similarity judgments and mapping techniques demonstrate that experts show more structured and consistent spatial organizations of odors than novices, and that these organizations reflect acquired conceptual categories and experience [24]. This evidence confirms the existence of genuine, learned expertise, yet it also reveals that these internal maps differ across individuals and cultural backgrounds. The private nature of these cognitive structures makes it difficult for firms to build shared predictive tools that transcend personal style.

Golden nose culture also encourages a narrow view of the consumer. Perfumers often internalize an implicit model of the target user based on their own taste, brief interpretations, and selective feedback from clients and evaluators. Consumer research shows that fragrance preference structures vary across gender, age, culture, and usage context, and that even within segments, preference functions for key attributes show substantial heterogeneity [16]. Person by fragrance interactions remain large in studies that consider both body odor and applied scent, which indicates that no single expert template can capture population responses. When decisions rely mainly on a few expert noses, the development system risks converging on narrow solutions that align with expert taste but fail to explore the wider landscape of consumer mind sets.

Golden nose models separate perfumers from empirical data streams that could refine their internal theories. Sensory and consumer data usually reside in other functions, and perfumers receive brief summaries rather than detailed analyses that link compositional features to response patterns. Many development organizations convey feedback as simple verdicts such as "too heavy," "too weak," or "not modern," without showing how specific note changes shifted liking or imagery scores across segments [5]. This arrangement sustains the myth of the inspired creator but limits opportunities for feedback driven learning grounded in psychophysics and consumer modeling. A knowledge development framework maintains the central role of perfumer creativity while embedding that creativity within transparent mixture databases and response maps.

Trade narratives in perfumery and cosmetic magazines often reinforce golden nose culture by focusing on personality, story, and inspiration. Profiles of star perfumers highlight biographical details, signature works, and aesthetic philosophies, while giving little space to systematic discussion of formula structure or consumer response metrics [23]. Brand success stories emphasize positioning, storytelling, and iconic bottles, with only brief mention of structured research. This communication pattern strengthens the prestige of the creative role but discourages public exploration of scientific tools that could augment it.

These observations suggest that while expertise is real and valuable, its current form limits scalability, transparency, and cumulative knowledge generation.

### 4.3 Structural Weaknesses of Beauty Contest Testing

In parallel with golden nose culture, beauty contest testing treats fragrance evaluation as a race between candidate formulas judged by preference scores, but that structure blocks the path to scientific knowledge. Standard consumer tests recruit panels of target users, expose them to one or more samples under controlled conditions, and collect ratings of liking, purchase intent, and attribute impressions [6]. Analysts compare mean scores, identify winners, and sometimes build simple preference segments. This process helps select better candidates relative to others in the test set, but it yields little information about how specific mixture features drive responses. The test functions as a filter rather than a lens.

Psychophysics and sensory analysis highlight the limitations of pure preference measures for scientific purposes. Preference ratings collapse complex experiences into single numbers and discard information about intensity, quality, temporal profile, and contextual associations that feed into liking judgments [5]. Studies in taste and smell show that different consumers can arrive at similar liking scores through different sensory pathways, such as high sweetness with low bitterness for one person and moderate sweetness with distinctive aroma for another [25]. When organizations rely exclusively on preference scores, they treat diverse underlying perceptual profiles as equivalent and lose the chance to build models that explain how mixtures act across mind sets.

Beauty contest tests often lack the experimental structure required to study mixtures. Many projects compare only a handful of candidate formulas, each representing a complex and opaque combination of ingredients, and they present these formulas to respondents without manipulations of context, dose, or usage scenario. Under such designs,

the data cannot identify which aspects of the mixture drive differences in response. Even when analysts add attribute ratings such as "fresh," "clean," or "long lasting," the link between compositional changes and attribute shifts remains obscure [5]. By contrast, mixture experiments in psychophysics vary component levels in planned designs and model their effects on perception, which permits clear attribution of effects to ingredients and their interactions [3].

Beauty contest testing also encourages short term optimization at the expense of long term learning. Each study addresses a specific brief under particular market conditions, and teams rarely integrate datasets across projects to infer general principles. Reports remain in archives as static documents rather than feeding into shared databases that relate formulas, sensory profiles, and consumer responses across time. Studies in marketing science demonstrate that cross project data integration and model building can reveal stable preference structures and attribute utilities that support better predictions for new offerings [26]. The fragrance industry possesses the raw material for such integration but lacks the methodological orientation and infrastructure to exploit it.

Trade discussions of testing often present consumer research as a gatekeeper rather than a discovery tool. Articles in industry magazines describe product tests that confirm or challenge internal expectations, illustrate regional differences, or validate claims, but they seldom present detailed mixture–response insights or learning agendas [23]. The narrative frames testing as a necessary check on creative and marketing decisions, not as a central engine of knowledge creation.

Taken together, these limitations highlight that current evaluation systems prioritize short-term selection over long-term understanding, reinforcing the need for a structured, knowledge-driven approach.

## Conclusion

The fragrance industry stands at a juncture where scientific knowledge about odor perception, mixture interactions, and consumer response has advanced, while development practice still reflects older product-centric and intuition-driven models. Psychophysics, sensory analysis, consumer research, cosmetic science, and functional fragrance studies all show that odor mixtures follow structured rules, that responses vary in patterned ways across mind-sets, and that mixtures influence affect and physiology in reproducible fashion. Golden-nose culture and beauty-contest testing sustain successful brands and compelling stories but do not build cumulative knowledge about how mixtures work in the mind.

A knowledge-development framework for fragrance uses structured experimental designs, Mind Genomics principles, and AI-based modeling to convert each project into new entries in a growing map of mixture–response relations. This framework treats formulas as data points, tests as engines for learning, and consumer diversity as a source of insight rather than noise. It preserves perfumer creativity while connecting it to explicit, shareable, and testable models that predict how notes, accords, and contexts influence perception and behavior across segments. It redefines competitive advantage from guarding secret formulas toward building deep, proprietary knowledge systems.

The adoption of this framework requires changes in workflow, measurement, data infrastructure, and culture, but the ingredients already exist within and around the industry. Scientific disciplines have produced tools and findings that support mixture-centric thinking; trade literature documents pressures for faster, more reliable innovation; and digital technologies make large-scale data integration and modeling feasible. Fragrance companies that commit to knowledge development can transform their development pipelines from sequences of isolated bets into cumulative scientific enterprises that generate both successful products and enduring understanding. This paper offers a conceptual foundation for that transformation and invites further practical work to implement and refine a knowledge-development paradigm for fragrance innovation.

## AI Assistance Disclosure

This manuscript was developed with the assistance of an artificial intelligence (AI) system (Microsoft Copilot), which supported the generation of draft text, organization of arguments, and integration of literature across psychophysics, sensory analysis, consumer research, cosmetic science, and perfumery-related sources under the direction of the authors.

The conceptual framework, critical interpretation, and final structuring of the manuscript were guided and determined by the authors. All content was reviewed, edited, and approved by the authors, who take full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the work.

The AI system functioned as a supportive tool in the writing process and does not hold authorship or independent responsibility for the content presented.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no Conflicts of Interest.

## References

1. Gescheider GA (1997). *Psychophysics: The Fundamentals*. 3rd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
2. Shepherd GM (2006). Smell images and the flavour system in the human brain. *Nature.* 444(7117): 316-321.
3. Thomas-Danguin T, Sinding C, Romagny S, El Mountassir F, Atanasova B, Le Berre E, et al (2014). The perception of odor objects in everyday life: a review on the processing of odor mixtures. *Front Psychol*. 5: 504.
4. Le Berre E, Jarmuzek E, Béno N, Etiévant P, Prescott J, Thomas-Danguin T (2010). Learning influences the perception of odor mixtures. *Chemosens Percept*. 3: 156–166.
5. Lawless HT, Heymann H (2010). *Sensory Evaluation of Food: Principles and Practices*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer.
6. Green PE, Srinivasan V (1990). Conjoint analysis in marketing: new developments with implications for research and practice. *J Mark*. 54(4): 3-19.
7. Calkin RR, Jellinek JS (1994). *Perfumery: Practice and Principles*. New York, NY: Wiley.
8. Moskowitz HR (2012). Mind genomics: the experimental, inductive science of the ordinary, and its application to aspects of food and feeding. *Food Qual Prefer*. 24(1): 1-13.
9. Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction.* 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer.
10. Wong KY, Aspinwall E (2006). Development of a knowledge management initiative and system: A case study. *Expert Syst Appl*. 30: 633-641.
11. Barel AO, Paye M, Maibach HI (2009). *Handbook of Cosmetic Science and Technology.* 3rd ed. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

12. Cain WS (1974). Perception of odor intensity and the time course of olfactory adaptation. *Ann NY Acad Sci*. 237(1): 28-34.

13. Berglund B, Berglund U, Engen T, Ekman G (1973). A quantitative principle of perceived intensity summation in odor mixtures. *J Exp Psychol*. 100(1): 29-38.

14. Jinks A, Laing DG (1999). A limit in the processing of components in odour mixtures. *Perception.* 28(3): 395-404.

15. Pineau N, Schlich P, Cordelle S, Mathonnière C, Issanchou S, Imbert A, et al (2009). Temporal dominance of sensations: Construction of the TDS curves and comparison with time-intensity. *Food Qual Prefer*. 20(6): 450-455.

16. Lenochová P, Vohnoutová P, Roberts SC, Oberzaucher E, Grammer K, Havlíček J (2012). Psychology of fragrance use: perception of individual odor and perfume blends reveals a mechanism for idiosyncratic effects on fragrance choice. *PLoS ONE*. 7(3): e33810.

17. Warrenburg S (2002). Measurement of emotion in olfactory research. In: *Chemistry of Taste.* pp. 243-260.

18. Spring K (2006). Early perfumery and the roots of the fragrance industry. *Perfumer & Flavorist*. 31(5): 40-46.

19. Arctander S (1969). *Perfume and Flavor Chemicals (Aroma Chemicals).* Montclair, NJ: Arctander Publishing Co.

20. Sell C (2006). *The Chemistry of Fragrances: From Perfumer to Consumer*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry.

21. Stone H, Sidel JL (2004). *Sensory Evaluation Practices*. 3rd ed. San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

22. Engen T (1982). *The Perception of Odors*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

23. Curtis T (1996). The evolution of perfumery: art, science and industry. *Perfumer & Flavorist.* 21(3): 1-8.

24. Zarzo M, Stanton DT (2009). Understanding the underlying dimensions in perfumers' odor perception space as a basis for developing meaningful odor maps. *Atten Percept Psychophys*. 71(2): 225–247.

25. Köster EP (2003). The psychology of food choice: some often encountered fallacies. *Food Qual Prefer*. 14(5–6): 359-373.

26. Wittink DR, Cattin P (1989). Commercial use of conjoint analysis: an update. *J Mark.* 53 (3): 91-96.