

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

## Brettanomyces bruxellensis yeasts: impact on wine and winemaking

### **This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1655567> since 2018-01-04T11:20:02Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1007/s11274-017-2345-z

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

**This is the author's final version of the contribution published as:**

Monica Agnolucci, Antonio Tirelli, Luca Cocolin, Annita Toffanin. 2017. *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* yeasts: impact on wine and winemaking *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* (2017) 33:180. 10.1007/s11274-017-2345-z

**The publisher's version is available at:**

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11274-017-2345-z>

**When citing, please refer to the published version.**

**Link to this full text:**

<http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1655567>

This full text was downloaded from iris-Aperto: <https://iris.unito.it/>

# ***Brettanomyces bruxellensis* yeasts: impact on wine and winemaking**

**Monica Agnolucci<sup>1\*</sup>, Antonio Tirelli<sup>2</sup>, Luca Cocolin<sup>3</sup>, Annita Toffanin<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agriculture, Food and Environment (DAFE), University of Pisa, Via del Borghetto, 80, Pisa, Italy

<sup>2</sup>Department of Food, Environmental and Nutritional Sciences (DeFENS), University of Milano, Via Celoria 2, Milano, Italy

<sup>3</sup>Department of Agricultural, Forest and Food Sciences (DISAFA), University of Torino, Largo P. Braccini 2, Grugliasco, Italy

**\*Correspondence:** Monica Agnolucci, Department of Agriculture, Food and Environment (DAFE), University of Pisa, Via del Borghetto, 80, 56124 Pisa, Italy Tel: +390502216647 e-mail: monica.agnolucci@unipi.it

**Keywords:** *Dekkera bruxellensis*; Wine spoilage yeasts; Volatile phenols; Sulphur dioxide; VBNC.

## **Abstract**

Yeasts belonging to the *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* genus are non-conventional yeasts, which affect winemaking by causing wine spoilage all over the world. This mini-review focuses on recent results concerning the presence of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* throughout the wine processing chain. Here, culture-dependent and independent methods to detect this yeast on grapes and at the very early stage of wine production are encompassed. Chemical, physical and biological tools, devised for the prevention and control of such a detrimental species during winemaking are also presented. Finally, the mini-review identifies future research areas relevant to the improvement of wine safety and sensory profiles.

## **Introduction: *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* yeasts and their occurrence in the wine processing chain**

The term *Brettanomyces* was first introduced in 1904 by Claussen to describe a yeast used in the production of English beer. *Brettanomyces* became a recognized genus in 1920 when it was isolated from lambic beers in Belgium (Henschke et al. 2007) and first detected in wine in 1930 (Krumboltz et al. 1933).

*Brettanomyces* refers to the anamorphic (asexual) form, while the genus name *Dekkera* was proposed for the teleomorphic (sexual) form (Van Der Walt 1964). Currently the genus *Brettanomyces/Dekkera*, belonging to the *Pichiaceae* family, includes five species: *B. custersianus*, *B. naardenesis*, *B. nanus*, *B. anomalus* and *B. bruxellensis*. The species *B. intermedius* and *B. lambicus* are considered synonyms of *B. bruxellensis*. Teleomorphic forms have only been found in *B. anomalus* and *B. bruxellensis*, denominated *Dekkera anomala* and *Dekkera bruxellensis*, respectively (Kurtzman et al. 2011). *Dekkera* asci are formed directly from diploid vegetative cells, and contain from one to four hat-shaped or spheroidal ascospores, which tend to agglutinate when released (van der Walt 1964). *Brettanomyces* species multiply by multilateral budding, or, more rarely, by bipolar budding. The cell shape appears polymorphic - ellipsoidal, ogival or cylindrical - with dimensions ranging from 2 to 7  $\mu\text{m}$ , which often form pseudomyceliums (Kurtzman et al. 2011). Cells may become smaller under stress, thus filtration through 0.45 membranes is sometimes ineffective (Millet and Lonvaud-Funel 2000).

Under aerobic conditions *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* species produce high amounts of acetic acid and ethanol. The presence of oxygen stimulates growth, which subsequently stops for the inhibitory effect of acetic acid. *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* species, except for *B. naardenesis*, could also grow anaerobically and they can be classified as facultative anaerobic and Crabtree-positive yeast, as *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Rozpędowska et al., 2011). In 1940, Custer showed that oxygen

stimulates the fermentation of *Brettanomyces claussenii*, a phenomenon called "negative Pasteur effect". Subsequently, Scheffers and Wikén (1969) introduced the concept of the Custer effect, defined as the inhibition of alcoholic fermentation during the transition to anaerobic conditions and underlined that this effect was common to all species of *Brettanomyces*, suggesting it as a taxonomic criterion of the genus. Ciani and Ferraro (1997) reported that after 7-8 hours without oxygen, the culture adapted to the anaerobic conditions and growth resumed, although slowly, and with a lower production of ethanol.

To date, *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* yeasts have been found in grape berries, wine, wine-making equipment, beer, sherries, dairy products, sourdough, cider, kombucha, olives (Curtin et al., 2015), tequila (Lachance 1995), tamarind (Nassereddin and Yamani 2005), ogi, mawè, gowé, and tchoukoutou (Greppi et al. 2013).

*Dekkera anomala* may spoil beer, cider and soft drinks (Gray et al. 2011), but is not common in wine (Loureiro and Malfeito-Ferreira 2006), where *B. bruxellensis* is more prevalent. In the first phases of vinification, it is usually present at lower concentrations than other yeasts responsible for alcoholic fermentation. Successively and during malolactic fermentation (MLF), *B. bruxellensis* may increase (Renouf et al. 2006) and become the dominant yeast, therefore seriously affecting the sensorial traits of wine. The ability to tolerate environmental stresses such as high ethanol concentrations (up to 14,5-15%), low pH and oxygen, low sugar (smaller than 300 mg/l) and fermentable nitrogen concentrations suggests that *B. bruxellensis* adapted to this peculiar niche (Curtin et al. 2015).

*B. bruxellensis* may produce 4-vinylphenol and 4-ethylphenol from p-coumaric acid, and 4-vinylguaiacol and 4-ethylguaiacol from ferulic acid. At low concentrations, these volatile compounds can contribute to wine aroma complexity (cider, pepper, clove). However, at concentrations higher than their perception threshold, they negatively impact the sensory profile of wine, conferring off-flavours, such as animal odours, barnyard, horse sweat, medicine and animal leather (Chatonnet et al. 1992). Moreover, this yeast is able to produce biogenic amines. This trait was first described by

Caruso et al. (2002), who detected the production of phenylethylamine in wine by five strains. Vigentini et al. (2008) and Agnolucci et al. (2009) then showed that some strains of *B. bruxellensis* produce cadaverine, hexylamine, phenylethylamine, putrescine and spermidine, under wine-model conditions.

During the last twenty years the molecular and functional diversity of *B. bruxellensis* isolates collected worldwide has been extensively studied (see Oelofse et al. 2008, Curtin et al. 2015). Different strains of *B. bruxellensis* can produce variable yields of volatile phenols not always correlated with its growth (Silva et al. 2004; Conterno et al. 2006; Renouf et al. 2006; Curtin et al. 2007; Vigentini et al. 2008; Romano et al. 2008; Joseph et al. 2013). Barata et al. (2008), studying the effect of sugar concentration and temperature on cellular viability and 4-ethylphenol production, found that the levels of ethylphenols were intrinsically linked to *B. bruxellensis* growth. Agnolucci et al. (2009) reported that seven *B. bruxellensis* strains showed a relationship between growth rate and production kinetics of volatile phenols, while Curtin et al. (2013) found that under oxygen-limiting conditions, three predominant Australian *B. bruxellensis* strains did not differ in their capacity to produce ethylphenols in a chemically-defined wine medium.

Overall, the functional traits related to spoilage activity, such as growth rate, volatile phenol production and sulphite tolerance, were greatly affected by physico-chemical factors (*i.e.* sugar and nitrate source and concentration, temperature, oxygenation, ethanol content, pH) and by different wines and synthetic wine solutions (Curtin et al. 2015).

### **Methods to detect *B. bruxellensis* in winemaking**

*B. bruxellensis* has been the focus of decades of investigations, most of which aimed at developing methods to detect its presence in the wine chain, from the vineyard to the bottle. The need for more efficient tools to detect its occurrence and biological activity is related to several aspects of its

physiology, which makes its cultivation very difficult in traditional microbiological media, due to its very slow growth rate. In addition, it can enter in a viable-but-not-culturable (VBNC) state (Du Toit et al. 2005; Agnolucci et al. 2010; Serpaggi et al. 2012), remaining viable and potentially able to provoke spoilage.

Selective media have been developed for the isolation of *B. bruxellensis*, such as the Differential *Brettanomyces Dekkera* Medium, DBDM, (Couto et al. 2005a). Moreover, the formulation of novel enrichment media, allowed its isolation from grape surfaces (Renouf and Lonvaud-Funel 2007).

In the last 20 years new detection methods have been devised, targeted on nucleic acids, RNA and DNA. It is important to note that, as DNA is a molecule that remains stable long after cell death, it can be detected even if the microorganism is no longer alive. In the specific context, this aspect is extremely important as only viable cells can initiate spoilage.

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based approaches have been the most frequent option for detecting *B. bruxellensis*. Species-specific PCR protocols were developed first (Egli and Henick-Kling 2001), followed by further studies in which PCR was coupled with other molecular methods in order to differentiate the species within the genus (Cocolin et al. 2004). Furthermore, the use of the loop-mediated isothermal amplification method has also been used to detect *Brettanomyces* species in wine and beer (Hayashi et al. 2007).

Quantitative PCR (qPCR) has been subsequently used for detecting and quantifying *B. bruxellensis*. The first qPCR protocol was developed by Phister and Mills in 2003, followed by other experimental studies, which confirmed the advantages of this method (Delaherche et al. 2004; Tessonniere et al. 2009).

The availability of molecular methods, and more specifically of qPCR protocols, enabled scientists to better understand the involvement of this yeast in the wine chain, showing its occurrence in red wines from Spain and Italy (Portugal and Ruiz-Larrea 2013; Campolongo et al. 2010), in conventional and organic wines (Tofalo et al. 2012) and in pressed Sangiovese grapes (Agnolucci et al. 2007). The

results of such investigations have shed light on the prevalence and distribution of *B. bruxellensis* in all the winemaking-processing chain, including its occurrence on grape surfaces.

Also the issue of the presence of live/dead *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* cells has been addressed both by targeting messenger RNA (Willenburg and Divol 2012) and by pretreating the samples with intercalating dyes, able to bind covalently to dead cells DNA, preventing its amplification (Andorrà et al. 2010; Vendrame et al. 2014).

In addition to PCR and qPCR methods, other approaches targeted *B. bruxellensis* in wine samples, such as fluorescence in situ hybridization (Stender et al. 2001; Röder et al. 2007), dot blot hybridization (Cecchini et al. 2013) and the use of biosensors (Cecchini et al. 2012; Manzano et al. 2016). Finally, several spectroscopy methods, such as Raman (Rodriguez et al. 2013) and Fourier transform mid-infrared (FTMIR) (Oelofse et al. 2010), in combination with chemometrics, have been devised to identify *B. bruxellensis*, although no applications in wine have been carried out so far.

### **Preventing and controlling *B. bruxellensis* in winemaking**

Culturable *B. bruxellensis* cells close to  $10^6$  can heavily spoil wine in few weeks by the production of 4-ethylphenol (4EP) and 4-ethylguaiacol (4EG) (Agnolucci et al. 2014). The production of 4-vinylphenol (4VF) and 4-vinylguaiacol (4VG) can be carried out also by VBNC *B. bruxellensis*, even shortly after their death (Agnolucci et al. 2010; Laforgue and Lonvaud-Funel 2012). The ability of such a spoilage yeast to affect wine sensory traits even in the VBNC state, can encompass serious economic and safety consequences, and should be further and more in-depth investigated. Although vinyl compounds have negative off-flavour properties, their role in red wine is of minor importance, compared with 4EP and 4EG, in particular in anthocyanins rich wines, as 4VP and 4VG easily bind anthocyanins, forming unvolatile pyranoanthocyanin derivatives (Pozo-Bayon et al. 2004).

Sulfur dioxide is the traditional antimicrobial compound used in winemaking for an effective counteraction of *B. bruxellensis* in grape must and wine. The ability of *B. bruxellensis* to grow in the presence of sulfur dioxide is comparable to that of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Agnolucci et al. 2010; Usseglio-Tomasset 1992). Though, doses as high as 1 mg/L of molecular SO<sub>2</sub> (mSO<sub>2</sub>) have been found not effective against *B. bruxellensis*, which continued growing and producing volatile phenols in wine, or synthetic wine solution, with differences among strains and experimental conditions (Agnolucci et al. 2010; Curtin et al. 2012; Zuehlke et al. 2013; Vigentini et al. 2013). Moreover, whether the authors considered the effect of ethanol content on SO<sub>2</sub> dissociation is not always clear, though it can affect the mSO<sub>2</sub> concentration values up to about 70% (Usseglio-Tomasset 1992). Indeed, the mSO<sub>2</sub> concentrations needed for either killing or preventing the growth of *B. bruxellensis* in red wine may be higher than in model wine solutions, as most of the SO<sub>2</sub> combined with anthocyanins is quantified as free form when official analytical methods are applied (Usseglio-Tomasset et al. 1982). However, mSO<sub>2</sub> concentrations as high as 1.4 mg/L were not able to induce *B. bruxellensis* VBNC status in wine, whereas only SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations exceeding 2.1 mg/L were needed to kill *B. bruxellensis* (Agnolucci et al. 2014). Such high concentrations can have detrimental effects on vinification, by increasing the overall sulfite concentration beyond the legal limits, hindering the malolactic process, slowing down the phenolic evolution in ageing red wine, interfering with the olfactory properties of wine, and producing harmful effects on human health. The increased antimicrobial effect of sulfites in ethanol solutions (Sturm et al. 2014; Chandra et al. 2015) is likely due also to the thinning of the cell membrane due to ethanol, which affects cell permeability (Vanegas et al. 2010).

Several preservatives other than SO<sub>2</sub> but safer to humans, though not as much effective, have been proposed (Curtin et al. 2015), including killer toxins (Ciani and Comitini 2011; Oro et al. 2014a; 2014b, Villalba et al. 2016). The stability killer toxins and their selectivity against specific yeasts make this tool very interesting for practical use in both grape must and wine.

Physical approaches aimed at preventing *B. bruxellensis* contamination have been also proposed. Most of them show either limited effectiveness or important drawbacks. Ultra-high pressure is hard to apply in industrial winemaking because the high pressure/time conditions are unsuitable for bulk treatments (Gonzalez-Arenzana et al. 2016). Low electric currents proved as effective as SO<sub>2</sub> in killing *B. bruxellensis* with in-barrel ageing of wine (Lustrato et al. 2015), although the effects of applying an electric current through a sensitive redox system, such as wine, are far from being understood. An effective microbial destruction under continuous treatment can be obtained in grape must by exposure to UV-C light. Unfortunately the shielding effect exerted by the anthocyanins prevents effective results in red wine (Rizzotti et al. 2015).

The eradication of *B. bruxellensis* is even more important when wine is intended for wood barrel ageing. The residual yeast cells in wine can penetrate the wood pores and crevices and give rise to privileged ecological niches located as deep as 8 mm into the wood, contaminating and spoiling the aging wine (Malfeito-Ferreira et al. 2004). The upper inner surfaces of the barrel show the highest contamination of *B. bruxellensis* cells (Leaute and Giboulot 2013) probably because of the highest concentration of dissolved oxygen and the resulting lower SO<sub>2</sub> content. *B. bruxellensis* can multiply in wood barrels owing to its ability to exploit the wide number of pentoses, hexoses and disaccharides, including cellobiose, released from wood owing to the bending and toasting process of the staves (Crauwels et al. 2015).

Given the high cost of wood barrels and the risk of wine spoilage arising from contaminated wood, the effectiveness of approaches aimed at their sanitization has been assessed. Ozone was evaluated both as a gas and water solution, in order to achieve an in-depth removal of *B. bruxellensis*. Although this strong oxidant led to effective results in disinfecting the inner cask surface (Guzzon et al. 2013), its entry inside the staves was hindered by slow diffusion (Palacios et al. 2012). Moreover, the

occurrence in wood of highly oxidizable phenols may decrease the ozone concentration during its entry through the wood pores.

*B. bruxellensis* can also be removed from wood barrels by different heat treatments. For example, heating conditions such as 60°C for 19 min using hot water led to the effective sanitization of a wood barrel (Fabrizio et al. 2015). However, as the heat sensitivity of *B. bruxellensis* greatly decreases in wine, milder heating conditions proved to be effective (Couto et al. 2005b). Barrel heating can also be achieved by placing a microwave source inside the cask, although the technical tools needed to prevent cellars from being exposed to microwaves may be hard to use. So far, this approach has not given fully effective results (Gonzales-Arenzana et al. 2013).

### **Concluding remarks**

The occurrence of *B. bruxellensis* in the wine processing chain has been widely investigated and worldwide established as part of grape and cellar microbial diversity. Scientists and winemakers should join collaborative efforts to integrate the new findings from experimental studies and wine industry into a coherent body of knowledge, aimed at understanding the physiology of *B. bruxellensis* in order to prevent and control its detrimental effects on wine industry and consumers safety. Further studies are needed to answer questions as to whether different strains may differentially affect wine spoilage and at what extent; whether environmental variables and winemaking cellar conditions may differentially modulate the production of off-flavours and biogenic amines; whether *B. bruxellensis* different strains are inhibited by the differential concentrations of SO<sub>2</sub> both during normal vegetative growth and in their VBNC status; whether the physical, chemical and biological tools utilized for the control of *B. bruxellensis* show a differential efficiency against diverse strains.

**Acknowledgements** We apologize to the colleagues whose work has not been cited due to space limitations. This work was funded by a University of Pisa grant (Progetti di Ateneo).

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## References

- Agnolucci M, Scarano S, Rea F, Toffanin A, Nuti M (2007) Detection of *Dekkera/Brettanomyces bruxellensis* in pressed sangiovese grapes by real time PCR. *Ital J Food Sci* 19:153-164.
- Agnolucci M, Vigentini I, Capurso G, Merico A, Tirelli A, Compagno C, Foschino R, Nuti M (2009) Genetic diversity and physiological traits of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* strains isolated from Tuscan Sangiovese wines. *Int J Food Microbiol* 130:238-244.
- Agnolucci M, Rea F, Sbrana C, Cristani C, Fracassetti D, Tirelli A, Nuti M (2010) Sulphur dioxide affects culturability and volatile phenol production by *Brettanomyces/Dekkera bruxellensis*. *Int J Food Microbiol* 143:76-80.
- Agnolucci M, Cristani C, Maggini S, Rea F, Cossu A, Tirelli A, Nuti M (2014) Impact of sulphur dioxide on the viability, culturability, and volatile phenol production of *Dekkera bruxellensis* in wine. *Ann Microbiol* 64:653-659.
- Andorrà I, Esteve-Zarzoso B, Guillamón JM, Mas A (2010) Determination of viable wine yeast using DNA binding dyes and quantitative PCR. *Int J Food Microbiol* 144:257-262.
- Barata A, Pagliara D, Piccininno T, Tarantino F, Ciardulli W, Malfeito Ferreira M, Loureiro V (2008) The effect of sugar concentration and temperature on growth and volatile phenol production by *Dekkera bruxellensis* in wine. *FEMS Yeast Res* 8:1097-1102.
- Campolongo S, Rantsiou K, Giordano M, Gerbi V, Cocolin L (2010) Prevalence and biodiversity of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* in wine from northwestern Italy. *Am J Enol Vitic* 61:486-491.
- Caruso M, Fiore C, Contrusi M, Salzano G, Paparella A, Romano P (2002) Formation of biogenic amines as criteria for the selection of wine yeasts. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* 18:159-163.

- Cecchini F, Manzano M, Mandabi Y, Perelman E, Marks RS (2012) Chemiluminescent DNA optical fibre sensor for *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* detection. J Biotechnol 157:25-30.
- Cecchini F, Iacumin L, Fontanot M, Comuzzo P, Comi G, Manzano M (2013) Dot blot and PCR for *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* detection in red wine. Food Control 34:40-46.
- Chandra M, Oro I, Ferreira-Dias S, Malfeito-Ferreira M (2015) Effect of ethanol, sulfur dioxide and glucose on the growth of wine spoilage yeasts using response surface methodology. PLoS ONE 10(6): e0128702. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128702.
- Chatonnet P, Dubourdieu D, Boidron JN, Pons M (1992) The origin of ethylphenols in wines. J Sci Food Agric 60:165-178.
- Ciani M, Comitini F (2011) Non-*Saccharomyces* wine yeasts have a promising role in biotechnological approaches to winemaking. Ann Microbiol 61:25-32.
- Ciani M, Ferraro L (1997) Role of oxygen on acetic acid production by *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* in winemaking. J Sci Food Agric 75:489-495.
- Cocolin L, Rantsiou K, Iacumin L, Zironi R, Comi G (2004) Molecular detection and identification of *Brettanomyces/Dekkera bruxellensis* and *Brettanomyces/Dekkera anomalous* in spoiled wines. Appl Environ Microbiol 70:1347-1355.
- Conterno L, Joseph CML, Arvik TJ, Henick-Kling T, Bisson LF (2006) Genetic and physiological characterization of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* strains isolated from wines. Am J Enol Vitic 57:139-147.
- Couto JA, Barbosa A, Hogg T (2005a) A simple cultural method for the presumptive detection of the yeasts *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* in wines. Lett Appl Microbiol 41:505-510.
- Couto JA, Neves F, Campos F, Hogg T (2005b) Thermal inactivation of the wine spoilage yeasts *Dekkera/Brettanomyces*. Int J Food Microbiol 104:337-344.
- Crauwels S, Assche A van, Jonge R de, Borneman, AR, Verreth C, Troels P, Samblanx G de, Marchal K, Peer Y van de, Willems KA, Verstrepen KJ, Curtin CD, Lievens B (2015)

Comparative phenomics and targeted use of genomics reveals variation in carbon and nitrogen assimilation among different *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* strains. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 99:9123-9134.

Curtin CD, Bellon JR, Henschke PA, Godden PW, de Barros Lopes MA (2007) Genetic diversity of *Dekkera bruxellensis* yeasts isolated from Australian wineries. *FEMS Yeast Res* 7:471-481.

Curtin CD, Kennedy E, Henschke PA (2012) Genotype-dependent sulphite tolerance of Australian *Dekkera (Brettanomyces) bruxellensis* wine isolates. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 55:56-61.

Curtin CD, Langhans G, Henschke PA, Grbin PR (2013) Impact of Australian *Dekkera bruxellensis* strains grown under oxygen-limited conditions on model wine composition and aroma. *Food Microbiol* 36:241-247.

Curtin CD, Varela C, Borneman A (2015) Harnessing improved understanding of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* biology to mitigate the risk of wine spoilage. *Aust J Grape Wine Res* 21:680-692.

Custers MTJ (1940) Onderzoekingen over het gistgeslacht *Brettanomyces*. Thesis, Delft

Delaherche A, Claisse O, Lonvaud-Funel A (2004) Detection and quantification of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* and 'ropy' *Pediococcus damnosus* strains in wine by real-time polymerase chain reaction. *J Appl. Microbiol* 97:910-915.

Du Toit WJ, Pretorius IS, Lonvaud-Funel A (2005) The effect of sulphur dioxide and oxygen on the viability and culturability of a strain of *Acetobacter pasteurianus* and a strain of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* isolated from wine. *J Appl Microbiol* 98:862-871.

Egli CM, Henick-Kling T (2001) Identification of *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* species based on polymorphism in the rRna internal transcribed spacer region. *Am J Enol Vitic* 52:241-246.

Fabrizio V, Vigentini I, Parisi N, Picozzi C, Compagno C, Foschino R (2015) Heat inactivation of wine spoilage yeast *Dekkera bruxellensis* by hot water treatment. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 61:186-191.

- Gonzalez-Arenzana L, Santamaria P, Lopez R, Garijo P, Gutierrez AR, Garde-Cerdan T, Lopez-Alfaro I (2013) Microwave technology as a new tool to improve microbiological control of oak barrels: A preliminary study. *Food Control* 30:536-539.
- Gonzalez-Arenzana L, Sevenich R, Rauh C, Lopez R, Knorr, D., Lopez-Alfaro, I. (2016). Inactivation of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* by High Hydrostatic Pressure technology. *Food Control*. 59, 188-195.
- Gray S, Rawsthorne H, Dirks B, Phister T (2011) Detection and enumeration of *Dekkera anomala* in beer, cola, and cider using real-time PCR. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 52:352-359.
- Greppi A, Rantsiou K, Padonou W, Hounhouigan J, Jespersen L, Jakobsen M, Cocolin L (2013) Determination of yeast diversity in ogi, mawè, gowé and tchoukoutou by using culture-dependent and -independent methods. *Int J Food Microbiol* 165:84-88.
- Guzzon R, Nardin T, Micheletti O, Nicolini G, Larcher R (2013) Antimicrobial activity of ozone. Effectiveness against the main wine spoilage microorganisms and evaluation of impact on simple phenols in wine. *Aust J Grape Wine Res* 19:180-188.
- Henschke P, Curtin C, Grbin P (2007) Molecular characterization of the wine spoilage yeast *Dekkera (Brettanomyces) bruxellensis*. *Microbiol Aust* 28:76-78.
- Hayashi N, Arai R, Tada S, Taguchi H, Ogawa Y (2007) Detection and identification of *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* sp. yeasts with a loop-mediated isothermal amplification method. *Food Microbiol* 24:778-785.
- Ivey ML, Phister TG (2011) Detection and identification of microorganisms in wine: a review of molecular techniques. *J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol* 38:1619-1634.
- Joseph CL, Gorton LW, Ebeler SE, Bisson LF (2013) Production of volatile compounds by wine strains of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* grown in the presence of different precursor substrates. *Am J Enol Vitic* 64:231–240.

- Kurtzman CP, Fell JW, Boekhout T (2011) *The yeasts: A taxonomic study*. (5th ed.) Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Krumbholz G, Tauschanoff W (1933) *Mycotorula intermedia* n. sp., ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Gärungserreger im Wein. Zentralbl Bakteriol 88:366-373.
- Laforgue R, Lonvaud-Funel A (2012) Hydroxycinnamic acid decarboxylase activity of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* involved in volatile phenol production: Relationship with cell viability. Food Microbiol 32:230-234.
- Lachance MA (1995) Yeast communities in a natural tequila fermentation. Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek 68:151-160.
- Leaute B, Giboulot M (2013) Study of the distribution of the contamination of the inner surface of a new wine barrel by *Brettanomyces bruxellensis*. Revue des Oenologues 146:29-30.
- Loureiro V, Malfeito-Ferreira M (2006) *Dekkera/Brettanomyces* spp. In: Food spoilage microorganisms. ed. C. de W. Blackburn (Woodhead Publishing Ltd, Abington, Cambridge, UK), pp. 353-398.
- Lustrato G, Alfano G, De Leonardis A, Macciola M, Ranalli G (2015) Inactivation of *Dekkera bruxellensis* yeasts in wine storage in brand new oak barrels using low electric current technology. Ann Microbiol 65:2091-2098.
- Malfeito-Ferreira M, Laureano P, Barata A, D'Antuono I, Stender H, Loureiro V (2004) Effect of different barrique sanitation procedures on yeasts isolated from the inner layers of wood. Abstr. Am J Enol Vitic 55:304A.
- Manzano M, Vizzini P, Jia K, Adam P-M, Ionescu RE (2016) Development of localized surface plasmon resonance biosensors for the detection of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* in wine Sensors and Actuators. B: Chemical 223:295-300.

- Millet V, Lonvaud-Funel A (2000) The viable but non-culturable state of wine micro-organisms during storage. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 30:136-41.
- Nassereddin RA, Yamani MI (2005) Microbiological quality of sous and tamarind, traditional drinks consumed in Jordan. *J Food Prot* 68:773-777.
- Oelofse A, Pretorius IS, du Toit M (2008) Significance of *Brettanomyces* and *Dekkera* during winemaking: a synoptic review. *South Afr J Enol Vitic* 29:128-144.
- Oelofse A, Malherbe S, Pretorius IS, Du Toit M (2010) Preliminary evaluation of infrared spectroscopy for the differentiation of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* strains isolated from red wines. *Int J Food Microbiol* 143:136-142.
- Oro L, Ciani M, Comitini F (2014a) Antimicrobial activity of *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* on wine yeasts. *J Appl Microbiol* 116:1209-1217.
- Oro L, Zara S, Fancellu F, Mannazzu I, Budroni M, Ciani M, Comitini F (2014b) TpBGL2 codes for a *Tetrapisispora phaffii* killer toxin active against wine spoilage yeasts. *FEMS Yeast Res* 14:464-471.
- Palacios A, Borinaga I, Carrillo D (2012) Comparative study on wine barrel disinfection systems and their use as alternatives to sulfur treatment. *Enologos* 14:46-54.
- Phister TG, Mills DA (2003) Real-Time PCR Assay for detection and enumeration of *Dekkera bruxellensis* in wine. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 69:7430-7434.
- Portugal C, Ruiz-Larrea F (2013) Comparison of specific real-time PCR and conventional culture for detection and enumeration of *Brettanomyces* in red wines. *Am J Enol Vitic* 64:139-145.
- Pozo-Bayon MA, Monagas M, Polo MC, Gomez-Cordoves C (2004) Occurrence of pyranoanthocyanins in sparkling wines manufactured with red grape varieties. *J Agric Food Chem* 52:1300-1306.

- Renouf V, Falcou M, Miot-Sertier C, Perello MC, De Revel G, and Lonvaud-Funel A (2006) Interactions between *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* and other yeast species during the initial stages of winemaking. *J Appl Microbiol* 100:1208-1219.
- Renouf V, Lonvaud-Funel A (2007) Development of an enrichment medium to detect *Dekkera/Brettanomyces bruxellensis*, a spoilage wine yeast, on the surface of grape berries. *Microbiol Res* 162:154-167.
- Rizzotti L, Levav N, Fracchetti F, Felis GE, Torriani S (2015) Effect of UV-C treatment on the microbial population of white and red wines, as revealed by conventional plating and PMA-qPCR methods. *Food Control* 47:407-412.
- Röder C, König H, Fröhlich J (2007) Species-specific identification of *Dekkera/Brettanomyces* yeasts by fluorescently labeled DNA probes targeting the 26S rRNA. *FEMS Yeast Res* 7:1013-1026.
- Rodriguez SB, Thornton MA, Thornton RJ (2013) Raman spectroscopy and chemometrics for identification and strain discrimination of the wine spoilage yeasts *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Zygosaccharomyces bailii*, and *Brettanomyces bruxellensis*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 79:6264-6270.
- Romano A, Perello MC, de Revel G, Lonvaud-Funel A (2008) Growth and volatile compound production by *Brettanomyces/Dekkera bruxellensis* in red wine. *J Appl Microbiol* 104:1577-1585.
- Rozpędowska E, Hellborg L, Ishchuk OP, Orhan F, Galafassi S, Merico A, Woolfit M, Compagno C, Piškur J (2011) Parallel evolution of the make–accumulate–consume strategy in *Saccharomyces* and *Dekkera* yeasts. *Nature Communications* 2:302  
<http://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms1305>.

- Scheffers WA, Wiken TO (1969) The Custer effect (negative Pasteur effect) as a diagnostic criterion for the genus *Brettanomyces*. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek. Supplement: Yeast Symposium*, 35:31-32.
- Serpaggi V, Remize F, Recorbet G, Gaudot-Dumas E, Sequeira-LeGrand A, Alexandre H (2012) Characterization of the “Viable but non culturable” (VBNC) state in the wine spoilage yeast *Brettanomyces*. *Food Microbiol* 30:438-447.
- Silva P, Cardoso H, Gerós H (2004) Studies on the wine spoilage capacity of *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* spp. *Am J Enol Vitic* 55:65-72.
- Stender H, Kurtzman C, Hyldig-Nielsen JJ, Sørensen D, Broomer A, Oliveira K, Perry-O'Keefe H, Sage A, Young B, Coull J (2001) Identification of *Dekkera bruxellensis* (*Brettanomyces*) from wine by fluorescence in situ hybridization using peptide nucleic acid probes. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 67:938-941.
- Sturm ME, Arroyo-Lopez FN, Garrido-Fernandez A, Querol A, Mercado LA, Ramirez ML, Combina M (2014) Probabilistic model for the spoilage wine yeast *Dekkera bruxellensis* as a function of pH, ethanol and free SO<sub>2</sub> using time as a dummy variable. *Int J Food Microbiol* 170:83-90.
- Tessonnière H, Vidal S, Barnavon L, Alexandre H, Remize F (2009) Design and performance testing of a real-time PCR assay for sensitive and reliable direct quantification of *Brettanomyces* in wine. *Int J Food Microbiol* 129:237-243.
- Tofalo R, Schirone M, Corsetti A, Suzzi G (2012) Detection of *Brettanomyces* spp. in red wines using real-time PCR. *J Food Sci* 77:M545-M549.
- Usseglio-Tomasset L, Ciolfi G, Di Stefano R (1982) Influence of anthocyanins on inhibitory action of SO<sub>2</sub> in yeasts. *Vini d'Italia* 24:86-94.
- Usseglio-Tomasset L (1992) Properties and use of sulphur dioxide. International symposium on current issues with food preservatives. Chemico-technical, nutritional and safety in use aspects. *Food Addit Contam* 9:399-404.

- van der Walt JP (1964) *Dekkera*, a new genus of the *Saccharomycetaceae*. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* 30:273-280.
- Vanegas JM; Faller R; Longo ML. (2010). Influence of ethanol on lipid/sterol membranes: phase diagram construction from AFM imaging. *Langmuir* 26:10415-10418.
- Vendrame M, Manzano M, Comi G, Bertrand J, Iacumin L (2014) Use of propidium monoazide for the enumeration of viable *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* in wine and beer by quantitative PCR. *Food Microbiol* 42:196-204.
- Vigentini I, Romano A, Compagno C, Merico A, Molinari F, Tirelli A, Foschino R, Volonterio G (2008) Physiological and oenological traits of different *Dekkera/Brettanomyces bruxellensis* strains under wine-model conditions. *FEMS Yeast Res* 8:1087-1096.
- Vigentini I, Joseph CL, Picozzi C, Foschino R, Bisson LF (2013) Assessment of the *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* metabolome during sulphur dioxide exposure. *FEMS Yeast Res* 13:597-608.
- Villalba ML, Saez JS, del Monaco S, Lopes CA, Sangorrin MP (2016) TdKT, a new killer toxin produced by *Torulasporea delbrueckii* effective against wine spoilage yeasts. *Int J Food Microbiol* 217:94-100.
- Willenburg E, Divol B (2012) Quantitative PCR: An appropriate tool to detect viable but not culturable *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* in wine. *Int J Food Microbiol* 160:131-136.
- Zuehlke JM, Edwards CG (2013) Impact of sulfur dioxide and temperature on culturability and viability of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* in wine. *J Food Protection* 76:2024-2030.