

Supplementary Table 1. Basic chemical composition of the 10 wines used in the consumer trial.

CODE	pH	TA	Alc%	VA (g/L)	Residual Sugar (g/L)	Total SO ₂ (ppm)	Free SO ₂ (ppm)	Total Phenolics (a.u.)*	Chroma*	Hue Angle*
AGL2	3.46e	6.81cd	13.5f	0.81a	0.6g	40c	24ab	33	65.7	1.17
BAR2	3.29f	7.7a	14.2d	0.54de	1.46d	24e	5.6e	30	44.89	2.09
DUR	3.46e	6.12ef	14.5c	0.41g	0.74f	50ab	26a	50	52.71	1.62
GRA	3.54d	6.43de	13.4g	0.74b	1.86b	35d	22b	39	51.99	1.66
MEN1	3.59c	5.6g	13.2h	0.38h	0.44h	13f	10de	44	49.89	1.75
MON1	3.66b	5.74fg	13.7e	0.57d	7.02a	45b	16c	57	41.42	2.47
NER1	3.51d	6.34e	14.4c	0.47f	2.36b	46b	21b	39	59.43	1.39
SHI	3.43e	7.25bc	14.9b	0.66c	0.75f	54a	24ab	53	47.5	1.93
TOU3	3.45e	7.36ab	16.1a	0.55e	0.95e	21e	13cd	56	48.56	1.9
TOU4	3.78a	6.5de	14.9b	0.56de	0.45h	54a	24ab	70	44.11	1.1

*As the variances were zero for these three chemical measures, it was not possible to compare the means.

Supplementary Table 2. Significant attributes identified by RATA in 24 red wine samples.

Attribute	Code	p-value
Colour Red	C_R	<0.0001
Colour Purple	C_P	<0.0001
Colour Brown	C_B	<0.0001
Aroma Dark Fruit	A_DaF	<0.0001
Aroma Red Fruit	A_RF	<0.0001
Aroma Dried Fruit	A_DrF	<0.0001
Aroma Jammy	A_J	<0.0001

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Laura V. Mezei, Trent E. Johnson, Steven Goodman, Cassandra Collins and Susan E. P. Bastian (2021). Meeting the demands of climate change: Australian consumer acceptance and sensory profiling of red wines produced from non-traditional red grape varieties. *OENO One*, 55(2). <https://doi.org/10.20870/oeno-one.2021.55.2.4571>

Aroma Confectionary	A_CON	<0.0001
Aroma Chocolate	A_CH	0.0053
Aroma Cooked Vegetables	A_CV	<0.0001
Aroma Earthy/Dusty	A_ED	<0.0001
Aroma Eucalypt/Mint	A_EM	<0.0001
Aroma Floral	A_FL	<0.0001
Aroma Forest Floor	A_FF	<0.0001
Aroma Green Pepper/Capsicum	A_GP	0.0001
Aroma Leather	A_L	<0.0001
Aroma Pepper	A_P	0.0007
Aroma Savoury	A_SAV	<0.0001
Aroma Stemmy/Stalky	A_SS	0.0370
Aroma Toasty/Smoky	A_TS	<0.0001
Aroma Vanilla	A_V	<0.0001
Aroma Woody	A_W	0.0026
Taste Bitter	T_B	0.0017
Taste Sweet	T_S	<0.0001
Taste Sour	T_A	<0.0001
Flavour Dark Fruit	F_DaF	<0.0001
Flavour Red Fruit	F_RF	<0.0001
Flavour Dried Fruit	F_DrF	<0.0001
Flavour Jammy	F_J	0.0004
Flavour Confectionery	F_CON	<0.0001
Flavour Chocolate	F_CH	<0.0001
Flavour Coconut	F_CO	0.0081
Flavour Cooked Vegetables	F_CV	<0.0001
Flavour Earthy/Dusty	F_ED	<0.0001

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Laura V. Mezei, Trent E. Johnson, Steven Goodman, Cassandra Collins and Susan E. P. Bastian (2021). Meeting the demands of climate change: Australian consumer acceptance and sensory profiling of red wines produced from non-traditional red grape varieties. *OENO One*, 55(2). <https://doi.org/10.20870/oeno-one.2021.55.2.4571>

Flavour Eucalypt/Mint	F_EM	0.0082
Flavour Floral	F_FL	<0.0001
Flavour Forest Floor	F_FF	0.0007
Flavour Green Pepper/Capsicum	F_GP	0.0001
Flavour Herbaceous	F_HE	0.0043
Flavour Leather	F_L	<0.0001
Flavour Savoury	F_SAV	<0.0001
Flavour Spicy	F_SP	0.0487
Flavour Stemmy/Stalky	F_SS	0.0090
Flavour Toasty/Smoky	F_TS	0.0009
Flavour Vanilla	F_V	<0.0001
Flavour Woody	F_W	0.0002
Mouthfeel Body	MF_B	<0.0001
Mouthfeel Alcohol	MF_OH	<0.0001
Mouthfeel Astringent	MF_A	<0.0001
Mouthfeel Smooth	MF_S	<0.0001
Mouthfeel Rough	MF_R	<0.0001
Mouthfeel Viscous	MF_V	0.0009
Length of Fruit Aftertaste	AT_F	<0.0001
Length of Non-Fruit Aftertaste	AT_NF	<0.0001

Supplementary Table 3. Demographic details of the Australian red wine consumers (n = 113).

Gender		%
	Female	50.0
	Male	50.0
Age		
	18 to 34	20.2
	35 to 54	29.8
	55+	50.0
Education		
	No Tertiary	29.8
	Bachelor's Degree	36.0
	Post Grad Degree	34.2
Household Income		
	\$0–\$49,999	18.4
	\$50K–\$99,999	29.8
	\$100K–\$149,999	26.3
	\$150K–\$199,999	12.3
	\$200K+	6.1
	Preferred not to say	7.0

Supplementary Table 4. Mean scores for each dimension of the FWI for the 3 identified FWS.

FWI Dimension	Wine Enthusiasts	Aspirants	No Frills
Connoisseur	6.88a	6.17b	4.97c
Knowledge	7.6a	5.81b	3.97c
Provenance	7.48a	5.91b	4.76c

Segments not sharing a letter within a row are significantly different (Fisher's LSD $p < 0.05$).

Supplementary Table 5. Demographic details of the 3 identified FWS.

Gender	Wine		
	Enthusiasts	Aspirants	No Frills
Female	22.8	38.6	38.6
Male	22.8	52.6	24.6
Age			
18 to 34	26.1	52.2	21.7
35 to 54	17.6	38.2	44.1
55+	24.6	47.4	28.1
Education			
No Tertiary	20.6	47.1	32.4
Bachelor's Degree	12.2	51.2	36.6
Post Graduate Degree	35.9b	38.5a	25.6a
Household Income			
\$0 - \$49,999	33.3	38.1	28.6
\$50K - \$99,999	17.6	44.1	38.2
\$100K - \$149,999	26.7	46.7	26.7
\$150K - \$199,999	7.1	57.1	35.7
\$200K+	28.6	28.6	42.9
Prefer not to say	25	62.5	12.5

All data are percentages. Each subscript letter denotes a subset of Fine Wine Segment categories whose column proportions do differ significantly from each other at $p < 0.05$ level.

Supplementary Table 6. Number of participants identified in each segment (FWS and WNS).

	Neophile	NONTO	Neophobe	Total
WE	13a	12b	1c	26
ASP	12a	22a	17a	51
NF	4a	20b	12b	36
Total	29	54	30	113

Neophobic segment not sharing a letter within a row denotes an FWS segment whose neophobic status groups differ significantly from the other using a Chi-square test at the $p < 0.05$ level.