

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

## Microbial interactions in winemaking: Ecological aspects and effect on wine quality

### This is the author's manuscript

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1880621> since 2022-11-25T11:37:19Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1016/j.tifs.2022.06.015

*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)

1 **Microbial interactions in winemaking: ecological aspects and effect on wine quality**

2

3 **Vasileios Englezos<sup>1a</sup>, Neil P. Jolly<sup>1b</sup>, Paola Di Gianvito<sup>a</sup>, Kalliopi Rantsiou<sup>a</sup>, Luca**  
4 **Cocolin<sup>a,\*</sup>**

5

6 <sup>a</sup>Università degli Studi di Torino, Dipartimento di Scienze Agrarie, Forestali e Alimentari,  
7 Largo Braccini 2, 10095 Grugliasco, Italy.

8

9 <sup>b</sup>Post-Harvest and Agro-Processing Technologies Division, Agricultural Research Council  
10 Infruitec-Nietvoorbij, Stellenbosch, South Africa

11

12 <sup>1</sup>Vasileios Englezos and Neil P. Jolly contributed equally to this article.

13

14

15 \*Corresponding author: Luca Cocolin, Fax: +39-011-6708553, e-mail:  
16 lucasimone.cocolin@unito.it.

17

18

19 Total word count 7899 (except tables and references)

20 Number of references are 100

21 Number of tables are 3

22 Number of figures are 3

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 **ABSTRACT**

34

35 *Background:* Wine microbiota is a dense and diverse ecosystem that is directly involved in the  
36 production and synthesis of many metabolites of oenological interest thereby directly affecting  
37 wine composition. The biodiversity and successional evolution of yeast and lactic acid bacteria  
38 (LAB) species and strains within species during alcoholic (AF) and malolactic fermentation  
39 (MLF) is greatly influenced by the complexity of the wine environment. Consequently, the  
40 successful prediction of wine characteristics is limited.

41 *Scope and approach:* The use of starter cultures has allowed better control of the fermentation  
42 process and the production of wines with desired characteristics. Mixed culture fermentations  
43 with selected non-*Saccharomyces* and *Saccharomyces* yeasts has regained attention in recent  
44 years due to their potential to modulate a wide range of metabolites of oenological interest. In  
45 this context, interactions among yeast species and LAB throughout the AF and MLF are known  
46 to influence the main enological parameters and aromatic profile of the wines. Studies have  
47 been conducted to uncover the nature of these interactions, with the aim to better control the  
48 AF and MLF.

49 *Key findings and conclusions:* This review provides an overview of microorganism interactions  
50 during the different steps of the winemaking process. This gives wine producers the ability to  
51 control and fine-tune microorganism population dynamics and therefore the fermentation  
52 process and finally wine quality.

53

54 **Keywords:** Wine yeasts; Lactic acid bacteria; Interactions; Selection; Fermentation

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

## 67 1. Introduction

68

69 Grapes and fermenting must for wine production represent a complex ecological niche  
70 that determines the presence and activity of specific yeast and bacteria species (Ciani et al.,  
71 2016). Despite the frequent dominance of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, it is generally accepted  
72 that a wide variety of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts and lactic acid bacteria (LAB) are also present  
73 during spontaneous and inoculated wine fermentations. The non-*Saccharomyces* yeast and  
74 LAB also contribute significantly to the transformation of grape sugars into ethanol, carbon  
75 dioxide and other secondary metabolites essential to the flavour profile of wine (Dzialo, Park,  
76 Steensels, Lievens, & Verstrepen, 2017).

77 Currently, the use of inoculated mixed-cultures, based on the incorporation of multiple  
78 *S. cerevisiae* strains or specifically the addition of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts and/or LAB  
79 (either in co-inoculation and sequential inoculation strategy), has been proposed as a solution  
80 to achieve the benefits of spontaneous fermentation while reducing the risks of spoilage and/or  
81 stuck fermentation (Fig. 1) (Padilla, Gil, & Manzanares, 2016). The benefits include improved  
82 wine complexity by increasing the diversity of chemical compounds present. Generally, wines  
83 with increased complexity are more preferred by consumers, and in mixed-culture  
84 fermentations yeasts produce aromas and flavours in way that cannot be reached with a single  
85 pure starter culture of *S. cerevisiae* (Jolly et al., 2014). Despite these positive factors, the  
86 fermentation conditions in which yeasts are subjected to need to be carefully controlled to  
87 achieve the desired results (Albergaria et al., 2016).

88 Successful mixed-culture fermentations can be achieved by increasing the contribution  
89 of the non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts by enhancing their metabolic activity and survival time  
90 (Morrison-Whittle, Lee, Fedrizzi, & Goddard, 2020). However, several scientific publications  
91 have reported contrasting results, even when the same species were studied (Albertin et al.,  
92 2017; Benito, 2019). Until recently, scientists generally believed that non-*Saccharomyces*  
93 yeasts “die off” and disappear during the early stages of AF, due to their low capacity to resist  
94 the changes in fermenting must composition (increasing ethanol levels, nutrient depletion).  
95 However, detailed studies have shown that the survival time and the reason for the  
96 disappearance of non-*Saccharomyces* yeast and bacteria includes several types of antagonistic  
97 interactions among the microorganisms (Liu et al., 2017).

98 These interactions can be passive (nutrients, oxygen and space competition) or active  
99 (antimicrobial compounds, volatile organic compounds, organic acids, cell-to-cell contact) (Di  
100 Gianvito et al., 2022). More recently it was demonstrated that some wine-related strains such

101 as *S. cerevisiae* (Legras et al., 2018), *Lachancea thermotolerans* (Hranilovic et al., 2018) and  
102 *Torulaspora delbrueckii* (Albertin et al., 2014a), were able to survive until the end of wine  
103 fermentation because they underwent a domestication event that made them highly adapted to  
104 this man-made environment. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that in a wine environment  
105 positive interactions also took place through the formation of mixed-species biofilms,  
106 aggregation and/or cross-feeding (the product of one strain's metabolism may be utilised in the  
107 nutrition of another). These interactive phenotypes were observed between *S. cerevisiae* and  
108 *Lactobacillus* sp. (Xu et al., 2021) and between yeasts such as *Hanseniaspora vineae* (Bagheri  
109 et al., 2017), *Saccharomyces uvarum* (Cheraiti et al., 2005), *Metschnikowia pulcherrima*  
110 (Seguinot et al., 2020) or *Torulaspora delbrueckii* (Renault et al., 2016).

111 Scientific publications reporting on the impact of different non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts  
112 with selected *S. cerevisiae* strains in mixed culture fermentations has increased significantly in  
113 the last years. In both co-inoculation and sequential inoculation approaches it has been shown  
114 that there are numerous chemical and physical interactions that influence compatibility and the  
115 success of fermentation. The *S. cerevisiae*/non-*Saccharomyces* fermentation process presents  
116 a new environment in which malolactic fermentation (MLF) needs to take place. Although the  
117 effects of population dynamics during non-*Saccharomyces*/*S. cerevisiae* and LAB//*S.*  
118 *cerevisiae* mixed-culture fermentations have received extensive attention, little is known about  
119 the ability of LAB to perform MLF during or at the end of the fermentation of the wines  
120 produced by mixed-yeast cultures. This review summarizes the current knowledge on  
121 microbial interactions during wine making, with a focus on yeast-yeast and yeast-bacteria  
122 interactions during alcoholic and MLF. The impact of mixed culture fermentations on LAB  
123 involved in MLF and the most important factors that modulate these interactions, as well as  
124 their impact on wine production, are also considered.

125

## 126 **2. Impact of non-*Saccharomyces* species on wine quality**

127

128 The impact that non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts have on wine quality largely depends on  
129 the initial population (microbial numbers and species diversity) in the fermenting juice, albeit  
130 from a natural population or inoculated strain (commercial or other) (Table 1). Must  
131 characteristics such as osmotic pressure (sugar level), ratio of glucose to fructose, yeast  
132 assimilable nitrogen (YAN), presence of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), temperature, degree of  
133 clarification (for white musts) and presence/absence of inoculated *S. cerevisiae* all affects the  
134 activity of the initial non-*Saccharomyces* population (Padilla et al., 2016). The degree of non-

135 *Saccharomyces* activity in turn determines the concentrations of metabolites formed. The  
136 impact of more robust and ethanol tolerant non-*Saccharomyces* species can be expected to be  
137 greater than more sensitive ones. However, as large strain diversity exists within species (Liu  
138 et al., 2017) conclusions on the contribution after investigating a single strain, cannot necessary  
139 be extrapolated to the entire species.

140 Wine flavour (aroma and taste) is made up of primary flavours derived from  
141 compounds in the grapes themselves, secondary flavours due to yeast and LAB metabolites  
142 and yeast mediated aromas from non-volatile precursors (Dzialo et al., 2017; Sumbly et al.,  
143 2019). Depending on concentration, these compounds can contribute either positively or  
144 negatively to wine flavour. The range of flavour compounds produced or mediated by non-  
145 *Saccharomyces* yeasts includes esters, higher alcohols, glycerol, terpenoids, acetic acid,  
146 succinic acid, volatile fatty acids, carbonyl and sulfur compounds (Dzialo et al., 2017).

147 More than 160 esters have been identified with a positive effect on wine quality,  
148 especially in wines produced from neutral grape varieties (Dzialo et al., 2017). Non-  
149 *Saccharomyces* yeasts form varying levels of esters. Yeasts known to produce higher levels of  
150 esters include *Hansenula anomala* (*Pichia anomala*), *Hanseniaspora uvarum* (*Kloeckera*  
151 *apiculata*) and *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* (*Candida pulcherrima*) being regarded as higher  
152 producers (Jolly et al., 2014). Higher alcohols produced from amino acid catabolism through  
153 the Erlich pathway are generally not desired in wine, since high levels are strongly correlated  
154 with unpleasant sensory attributes. However, low levels of higher alcohols can impart fruity  
155 characters to wine and contribute to the wine's overall complexity (multiple identifiable  
156 sensory elements). Although there is a large strain variability, non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts often  
157 form lower levels of higher alcohols than *S. cerevisiae* (Jolly et al., 2014).

158 After ethanol, glycerol is the next major metabolite produced by yeast during wine  
159 fermentation. Glycerol is important for regulating redox potential in the yeast cell but can also  
160 contribute to mouth-feel, sweetness and complexity in wines (Dzialo et al., 2017). Extrinsic  
161 factors such as grape variety and wine style determines the extent to which increased glycerol  
162 levels impact on the wines' quality. Spontaneously fermented and non-*Saccharomyces*  
163 inoculated wines often have higher glycerol levels than *S. cerevisiae* inoculated wines,  
164 indicating a contribution by non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts (Jolly et al., 2014). Several non-  
165 *Saccharomyces* yeasts, such as *Lachancea thermotolerans* and *Starmerella bacillaris* (also  
166 known in older literature as *Candida zemplinina* or *Candida stellata*), consistently produce  
167 high glycerol concentrations (up to 14 g/L) during wine fermentation (Table 1; Fig. 2).  
168 However, increased glycerol production is linked to increased acetic acid (volatile acidity)

169 production (Dzialo et al., 2017). Volatile acidity is generally not desired in wine. However,  
170 decreased volatile acidity and acetic acid concentration can be obtained when using some non-  
171 *Saccharomyces* yeast in mixed fermentations with *S. cerevisiae* (Table 2). Volatile acidity is  
172 especially a problem during production of wines from botrytized and/or high-sugar musts using  
173 *S. cerevisiae* (Benito, 2019). A non-*Saccharomyces* yeast solution has been proposed whereby  
174 *Torulaspota delbrueckii* and *Starm. bacillaris* could be used, in combination with *S. cerevisiae*,  
175 to obtain wines with decreased levels of volatile acidity (Table 1).

176 Some non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts are linked to increased total acidity, a useful  
177 characteristic where natural acidity in wine is lacking due to variances in temperatures during  
178 grape ripening (Vilela 2019). *L. thermotolerans* is well known for its ability to produce lactic  
179 acid that can be beneficial to wines produced in geographical regions affected by global  
180 warming where grapes are characterized by low natural acidity (Binati et al. 2020; Balicki et  
181 al. 2016). Increases in acidity due to the metabolism of *T. delbrueckii* is a result of the  
182 production of succinic acid (Benito, 2019). However, as succinic acid is a harsher acid than  
183 lactic acid and has a ‘salt-bitter-acid’ taste, excessive levels could be detrimental to wine  
184 quality.

185 Wine aroma can also be affected when glycosylated flavourless precursors, present in  
186 grapes, are hydrolysed by  $\beta$ -glucosidase enzymes to form free flavour-active volatiles (Dzialo  
187 et al., 2017). These enzymes are not encoded by the *S. cerevisiae* genome (Maicas & Mateo,  
188 2016). However, non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts belonging to the genera *Debaryomyces*,  
189 *Hansenula*, *Candida*, *Pichia*, *Starmerella* and *Hanseniaspora* variably possess  $\beta$ -glucosidase  
190 activity (Maicas & Mateo, 2016) so can play a role in the expression of wine aroma.

191 Wines from some grape varieties are more amenable to improvement by the  
192 contribution of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts than other varieties. For Chardonnay, co-  
193 fermentation with *Debaryomyces pseudopolymorphus* and *S. cerevisiae* led to increased  
194 concentrations of terpenols (citronellol, nerol and geraniol) in wine (Mateo & Maicas, 2016),  
195 although the effect on wine aroma was not investigated. Similarly, co-fermentation with  
196 *Debaryomyces vanriji* and *S. cerevisiae* produced Muscat wines with increased concentrations  
197 of several terpenols (Mateo & Maicas, 2016), that could make a positive contribution to the  
198 Muscat wine aroma. It was also shown that mixed cultures of *Starm. bacillaris* and *S. cerevisiae*  
199 or *T. delbrueckii* and *S. cerevisiae* produced Sauvignon Blanc wines with high concentrations  
200 of terpenols compared to reference wines fermented with only *S. cerevisiae* (Jolly et al., 2014).  
201 Varieties such as Sauvignon Blanc and Chenin Blanc depend on volatile thiols to contribute to  
202 the varietal character of the wine. It has been shown that non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts such as

203 *Starm. bacillaris* and *Pichia kluyveri* can produce significant amounts of the volatile thiols 3-  
204 sulfanyl hexanol (3SH) and 3-sulfanyl hexyl acetate (3SHA), respectively, in Sauvignon Blanc  
205 wines (Anfang, Brajkovich, & Goddard, 2009). Similarly, *T. delbrueckii*, *M. pulcherrima* and  
206 *L. thermotolerans* have also been described as being able to produce significant amounts of  
207 3SH during Sauvignon Blanc fermentation (Fig. 2, Table 1).

208 Ethanol, although the main product of alcoholic fermentation, is a cause for concern for  
209 modern consumers, who now demand wines containing low to moderate alcohol levels. The  
210 use of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts in fermentation can lead to lower ethanol yields due to lower  
211 sugar-ethanol transformation efficiencies when compared to *S. cerevisiae*. A possible counter  
212 effect is a high residual sugar concentration. Another natural approach to decrease wine ethanol  
213 levels is to take advantage of the respiratory metabolism found in some non-*Saccharomyces*  
214 species (Gonzalez, Quirós, & Morales, 2013). It has been shown that using an aeration regime,  
215 alcohol content could be lowered by 1.5, 2.0 and 3.8% by *T. delbrueckii*, *Zygosaccharomyces*  
216 *bailii* and *M. pulcherrima*, respectively (Contreras et al., 2015). The trials were done in a  
217 chemically defined medium, so the effect of aeration on wine aroma was not established. With  
218 more intensive aeration, the use of *Williopsis saturnus* in a laboratory-scale protocol could  
219 produce a 3.0 % (v/v) ethanol wine from a 15% (w/v) total sugar grape juice that was judged  
220 to have an interesting, but acceptable estery and fruity sensory profile (Jolly et al., 2014).

221 Non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts have also been reported to affect the mouth-feel properties  
222 (texture or body) and colour of wine (Table 1; Fig. 1) by increasing polysaccharides  
223 concentrations (Domizio et al., 2011;) and affecting phenolic composition, respectively  
224 (Escribano-Viano et al., 2019). Polysaccharides can affect wine taste and mouth-feel positively  
225 by increasing the perception of wine viscosity and fullness on the palate. Specifically strains  
226 of *Hanseniaspora osmophila*, *Pichia fermentans*, *Saccharomyces ludwigii*, *Z. bailii* and/or  
227 *Zygosaccharomyces florentinus* as mixed cultures with *S. cerevisiae* were found to produce  
228 wines with increased polysaccharides concentrations (Domizio et al., 2011).

229 Wine astringency, bitterness and colour is determined by phenolic content. Yeast cell  
230 walls can adsorb anthocyanins during fermentation. These anthocyanins can then interact with  
231 mannoproteins and arabinogalactans in the wine. The degree of adsorption is generally  
232 dependent on the yeast species and strain Non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts therefore affect the  
233 composition of polyphenols (Escribano-Viano et al., 2019).

234 Sequential fermentation of grape juice enriched with anthocyanins using *Pichia*  
235 *guilliermondii* and *S. cerevisiae* lead to increased formation of vinylphenolic  
236 pyranoanthocyanins molecules, which showed greater wine colour stability (Benito, Morata,

237 Palomero, Gonzalez, & Suarez-Lepe, 2011). *T. delbrueckii* has also been shown to improve  
238 colour (anthocyanins) and mouthfeel (flavanols) of red wine, but this was dependent on grape  
239 variety and as already mentioned, the specific yeast strain (Escribano Viana et al., 2019).

240 Some non-*Saccharomyces* can also play a non-fermentative role in the wine production  
241 process by producing extracellular proteolytic and pectolytic (polygalacturonase) enzymes.  
242 These enzymes could potentially play a role in reducing wine protein levels with the  
243 accompanying increase in wine protein stability (Belda et al., 2016). Therefore, lower doses of  
244 extraneous enzymes would be needed bringing about cost savings to the producer. Non-  
245 *Saccharomyces* yeast can also deplete essential nutrients in the fermenting must adversely  
246 affecting the ability for *S. cerevisiae* to complete a sequential fermentation. However, contrary  
247 to this is the death and lysis of weaker non-*Saccharomyces* yeast cells during the earlier phases  
248 of fermentation that can in turn be a source of nutrients, especially nitrogen, for *S. cerevisiae*  
249 (Prior, Bauer, & Divol, 2019).

250 Non-*Saccharomyces* yeast metabolites acting against spoilage organisms e.g.  
251 *Brettanomyces bruxellensis*, is another area receiving attention (Mewa Ngongang et al., 2019;  
252 Di Gianvito et al., 2022). This has potential for application during wine production, maturation  
253 and storage to preserve the wine quality. The success of the use of non-*Saccharomyces* yeast  
254 in research wines has led to the commercialisation of a number of species. The phenotypic  
255 traits of the commercial yeast available in the market are shown in Fig. 2.

256

### 257 **3. Mixed yeast alcoholic fermentations and their effect on LAB and malolactic** 258 **fermentation**

259

260 MLF is a secondary fermentation process that plays an important role in the production  
261 of many red and full-bodied white wines. During this secondary fermentation LAB are  
262 responsible for the enzymatic decarboxylation of L-malic to L-lactic acid thereby providing  
263 deacidification, with a concomitant increase in pH (Sumby, Bartle, Grbin, & Jiranek, 2019).  
264 Other benefits are the enhancement of microbial stability through removal of nutrients from  
265 the medium, and contributing to the flavour profile of the wine (Sumby et al., 2019). The LAB  
266 responsible for MLF, include the genera *Oenococcus*, *Lactobacillus sensu lato*,  
267 *Lactiplantibacillus*, *Pediococcus* and *Leuconostoc*. Over recent years, various reviews have  
268 been published giving increasing amounts of information on bacterial metabolism during MLF  
269 and the coexistence and compatibility of the LAB with yeast starter cultures (Krieger-Weber,  
270 Heras, & Suarez, 2020; Sumby et al., 2019). The phenotypic traits of the commercial LAB

271 available in the marker are presented in Fig. 2. *Oenococcus oeni* is best adapted to the harsh  
272 conditions found during fermentation, which includes high ethanol, low pH and the presence  
273 of SO<sub>2</sub>. Concomitantly, the majority of the commercial LAB starter cultures belong to this  
274 species. In recent years, *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* (formerly *Lactobacillus plantarum*) has  
275 also been considered to be a promising LAB to be used as a malolactic starter culture (Krieger-  
276 Weber et al., 2020). This is mainly due to its ability to conduct MLF and produce a wide range  
277 of extracellular enzymes like glucosidases, b-glucosidases, esterases, phenolic acid  
278 decarboxylase (PAD) and citrate lyases able to enhance the sensorial properties of the wines to  
279 higher levels than that achieved by *O. oeni* strains. The glucosidase activity of *L. plantarum*  
280 strains are greatly affected by the environmental factors such as pH, ethanol and temperature  
281 of the medium, while it was found to be strain-dependent (Krieger-Weber et al., 2020). Previous  
282 studies on *L. plantarum* isolated from grape and wine samples demonstrated that 60% of the  
283 overall isolates possess genes encoding for esterases.

284 The selection of LAB species and strains within species, as well as the inoculation  
285 protocol (co-inoculation or sequential inoculation), is crucial to ensure a fast and successful  
286 MLF. This is due the interactions between LAB and yeasts having a direct effect on LAB  
287 growth and malolactic activity (Bartle, Sumby, Sundstrom, & Jiranek, 2019). Table 2 reports  
288 a summary of the main outcomes of these interactions on wine composition. Wine is considered  
289 a selective medium for LAB, especially when they are inoculated at the end of the alcoholic  
290 fermentation, due mainly to the presence of high levels of inhibitory compounds such as  
291 ethanol, SO<sub>2</sub> and organic acids (Sumby et al., 2019). Conducting MLF by controlled co-  
292 inoculation of yeasts together with LAB starter cultures has gained attention in recent years,  
293 due to the potential reduction of the duration of MLF. The selection of compatible yeast and  
294 LAB strains is fundamental in order to ensure a successful AF and MLF (Liu et al., 2017), as  
295 yeast species have been found to have either stimulatory, inhibitory or neutral effect on LAB  
296 and vice versa. These interactions are mainly associated with the ability of the yeast to consume  
297 or release nitrogen compounds and/or to produce metabolites that affect LAB metabolism (Liu  
298 et al., 2017). Most of the studies evaluated the interactions between *S. cerevisiae* and LAB,  
299 mainly *O. oeni*. Using different *S. cerevisiae* strains and two LAB species (*O. oeni* and *L.*  
300 *plantarum*), Englezos et al. (2019a) and Lucio, Pardo, Krieger-Weber, Heras, & Ferrer (2016)  
301 concluded that co-inoculation of *S. cerevisiae* with the above-mentioned microorganisms  
302 clearly affect lactic acid and titratable acidity in a LAB species-dependent manner. More  
303 specifically, wines that underwent MLF with *L. plantarum* completed MLF faster and  
304 contained higher levels of lactic acid compared to the respective wines inoculated with *O. oeni*.

305 However, the amount of lactic acid formed, was also dependant on the *S. cerevisiae* strain used  
306 to conduct AF.

307 The use of mixed starter cultures with non-*Saccharomyces* and *S. cerevisiae* can result  
308 in wines with chemical compositions that differ in ways that cannot be attained by *S. cerevisiae*  
309 in pure culture fermentations (Table 1). This concept is not new. However, the focus of interest  
310 has now moved to the specific phenotypic characteristics of the non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts  
311 aligned to consumption of nitrogen compounds and production of metabolites that positively  
312 or negatively affects the LAB starter culture (Gobert, Tourdot-Maréchal, Sparrow, Morge, &  
313 Alexandre, 2019). To date only a few studies have investigated how non-*Saccharomyces*  
314 species (*Starm. bacillaris*, *H. uvarum*, *M. pulcherrima*, *L. thermotolerans*, and *T. delbrueckii*)  
315 affect the growth and malolactic activity of LAB in MLF performed by *O. oeni* (Capozzi,  
316 Berbegal, Tufariello, Grieco, & Spano, 2019; Du Plessis et al., 2017) and *L. plantarum* (Du  
317 Plessis et al., 2019; Russo et al., 2020).

318 In general, it was found that co-inoculation with LAB does not affect yeasts behaviour  
319 during alcoholic fermentation (Russo et al., 2020). In contrast, non-*Saccharomyces* yeast  
320 influence LAB development and consequently, the MLF in terms of both technological i.e.  
321 fermentation time and compositional aspects i.e. primary and secondary metabolite production,  
322 in a species and strain dependent manner (du Plessis et al., 2017; Russo et al., 2020). In  
323 particular, it was observed that in pure culture fermentation with *Starmerella stellata*  
324 (previously *Candida stellata*) the MLF took longer to complete due to the yeast inhibiting the  
325 bacteria and reducing their cell numbers (du Plessis et al., 2017). Divergently, other non-  
326 *Saccharomyces* yeasts (*L. thermotolerans*, *M. pulcherrima* and *Starm. bacillaris*) had a  
327 beneficial effect on MLF duration in pure and mixed fermentations with *S. cerevisiae*, leading  
328 to wines with improved quality parameters, such as improved body (du Plessis 2019; Russo et  
329 al., 2020). A particular case is represented by *H. uvarum*. The fermentation of grape must with  
330 this non-*Saccharomyces* yeast in pure culture led to a slight inhibitory effect on MLF, possibly  
331 due to depletion of essential nutrients for the LAB, or the production of toxic metabolites  
332 against the LAB. In mixed fermentation with *S. cerevisiae*, *H. uvarum* had a positive effect on  
333 the growth of inoculated and naturally occurring LAB in comparison to *S. cerevisiae* only (du  
334 Plessis et al., 2019). This further illustrates how different yeast/bacteria interactions varyingly  
335 affect fermentation processes.

336

#### 337 **4. Microbial interactions during alcoholic and malolactic fermentations**

338

339 As in several natural environments, wine microorganisms often form complex  
340 ecological ecosystems that result in the dominance of a specific species or a strain within a  
341 species, which then determines the final quality of wine (Knight, Klaere, Fedrizzi, & Goddard,  
342 2015). These interactions are presented in Fig. 3 and may mediate one-way, two-way, and  
343 multi-way communications, which in turn could be intra-species, inter-species or inter-  
344 kingdom interactions (Arneborg, Appels, & Howell, 2019). Starting from the surface of the  
345 grapes in the vineyard, these interactions continue during both the primary AF and the  
346 secondary MLF leading to the hegemonic role of *S. cerevisiae* and *O. oeni*, respectively  
347 (Knight, Karon, & Goddard, 2020; Liu et al., 2018). Yeasts and LAB interactions are strongly  
348 influenced by several factors that will be discussed below and in Fig. 1.

349

#### 350 4.1 Environmental conditions

351

352 One of the most important factors that should be considered in the study of interactions  
353 among different wine microorganisms is the role of environmental conditions. Furthermore, it  
354 is also important to remember that the wine ecosystem is continually changing due to the  
355 utilisation of compounds e.g. sugar and the production of alcohol, organic compounds, fatty  
356 acids, peptides and antimicrobial compounds by the microorganism involved (Branco, Viana,  
357 Albergaria, & Arneborg, 2015). As a result, compatibility between yeasts and LAB is affected  
358 by chemical and physical parameters that are strain and cultivar specific (Bartle et al., 2019).  
359 Several studies have investigated the effect of grape variety and vineyard management  
360 practices (organic, bio-dynamic or conventional) on the composition, number and biodiversity  
361 of indigenous yeasts and bacteria on grape berries (Martins et al., 2012). Although these studies  
362 all showed an effect on the diversity of yeasts and bacteria, the results cannot be generalized  
363 and are often contradictory.

364 Another important factor that can influence population dynamics is must composition.  
365 It was demonstrated that even small changes in must composition results in a critical affect on  
366 the growth and metabolism of wine yeasts and LAB, and thus affects the formation of aroma  
367 compounds. For example, Brou Taillandier, Beaufort, & Brandam, (2018) showed that a  
368 modification of nutrient concentration completely reversed the domination of *S. cerevisiae* in  
369 a mixed fermentation with *T. delbrueckii* and *S. cerevisiae*. In particular, they found that an  
370 increase in lipids affected growth and fermentation performance that was dependant on the  
371 nature of the lipid mixture, the yeast genus and the medium composition. Fatty acid content,  
372 as well as an increase in SO<sub>2</sub> addition, as part of winemaking, and a decrease in pH also

373 influence LAB ethanol tolerance (Bartle et al., 2019). Additionally, pH directly affects the  
374 growth and fermentation rate of yeasts and LAB, and the constitution of fermentation products  
375 (Bartle et al., 2019; Ciani et al., 2016). Consequently, this parameter is a determinant factor  
376 when choosing *O. oeni* or *L. plantarum* to conduct MLF. *O. oeni* is well adapted to low pH  
377 fermentations (pH below 3.5), while *L. plantarum* shows the best performances at higher pH  
378 values (pH above 3.5) (Krieger-Weber et al., 2020).

379 A decisive variable of microorganisms interactions is the nitrogen content of the must.  
380 Nitrogen depletion can lead to slow or sluggish alcoholic fermentations. Therefore, the addition  
381 of exogenous nitrogen sources is a common practice in wineries. Grape musts contain a wide  
382 range of YAN (yeast assimilable nitrogen) sources, including, not only amino acids and  
383 ammonium, but also urea and small peptides (Gobert et al., 2019). The YAN content is  
384 dependent on many factors including rootstock, irrigation, grape variety, climate, vine growing  
385 conditions and grape processing. During fermentation, a diverse pattern of nitrogen  
386 consumption has been observed for different yeasts species and strains (Englezos et al., 2018b;  
387 Su et al., 2019). Such diverse behaviour is related to both the nature of the nitrogen source  
388 (amino acids or ammonium) (Englezos et al., 2018b; Kemsawasd, Viana, Ardö, & Arneborg,  
389 2015), as well as the type of amino acids required (Englezos et al., 2018b; Medina, Boido,  
390 Dellacassa, & Carrau, 2012; Su et al., 2020). Su et al. (2020) found that proline, generally  
391 considered an unassimilable nitrogen source for *S. cerevisiae* under anaerobic conditions, was  
392 consumed by non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts. Furthermore, in mixed fermentations with sequential  
393 inoculums, the non-*Saccharomyces* yeast species release significant amounts of nitrogen (and  
394 probably other nutrients) supporting the growth and fermentation of *S. cerevisiae* (Englezos et  
395 al., 2018b; Su et al., 2019) and LAB (Bartle et al., 2019).

396

#### 397 4.2 Winemaking practices

398

399 Wine production involves numerous practices that affect the dynamics of microbial  
400 populations during fermentation. The most important are: harvesting (hand-picked or machine  
401 harvested grapes), manner of transportation to the winery, pre-fermentation operations such as  
402 method of crushing and/or juice extraction (pressing), juice clarification and SO<sub>2</sub> addition, and  
403 yeast/LAB inoculation. In winemaking, pre-fermentation operations comprise the time  
404 between grape harvest until the start of AF. This phase can last from a few hours to several  
405 days and leads to substantial changes in the indigenous biota (Albertin et al., 2014b). Albertin  
406 et al. (2014b) showed that pre-fermentation operations had a great impact on species with high

407 initial population in a Chardonnay grape must, such as *Hanseniaspora* spp. and *Starm.*  
408 *bacillaris*. In contrast, these two yeasts were less affected by cold settling of white grape juice  
409 than *H. anomala*, *Issatchenkia terricola* and *S. cerevisiae* (Grangeteau et al., 2017).

410 Maceration may also affect the grape must microbiota. In general, the dominance of  
411 yeasts and LAB starter cultures is easier to achieve in white musts than in red. This is probably  
412 due to contact with grape skins in red wine maceration that increase the quantity of yeasts  
413 naturally present that are able to compete with the starter culture. In fact, some authors found  
414 that the duration of inoculated MLF in sterile-filtered red wine samples was reduced, in  
415 comparison to the non-sterile must, due to reduction or complete elimination of competing  
416 microorganisms (Cinquanta, De Stefano, Formato, Niro, & Panfili, 2018). Furthermore,  
417 Guzzon Malacarne, Larcher, Franciosi, & Toffanin, (2020) found that carbonic maceration  
418 (delayed crushing for some days while grapes are anaerobically stored in fermentation vats),  
419 used in some wine regions like Beaujolais and the Rhone Valley in France or Rioja in Spain,  
420 had a strong impact on the evolution of the microbiota during fermentation. In that study,  
421 carbonic maceration, and consequently the unavailability of oxygen, affected the biodiversity  
422 and the development of the microbial groups usually found during fermentation. It was  
423 especially *Saccharomyces* spp. that were characterized by a slow development. Other  
424 researchers studied the effect of grape juice saturation with CO<sub>2</sub> and highlighted that growth  
425 of *H. uvarum* and *Starm. bacillaris* was strongly inhibited, while *Metschnikowia* spp., *P.*  
426 *kluyveri* and *T. delbrueckii* species were promoted (Chasseriaud, Coulon, Marullo, Albertin, &  
427 Bely, 2018).

428 Oxygen concentration is one of the main forces driving microbial growth during  
429 fermentation (Guzzon et al., 2020) and consequently, yeast and bacteria interactions. During  
430 fermentation the decrease in levels of oxygen are dependent on the shape and size of the vats,  
431 as well CO<sub>2</sub> released. However, oxygen can be supplied to fermenting must to facilitate yeast  
432 biomass accumulation and to promote colour extraction in red wines (Gonzalez et al., 2013).  
433 Several authors demonstrated that during wine fermentation, changes in the initial aeration  
434 regime had a strong impact on the growth of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts in mixed culture  
435 fermentations. In particular, *M. pulcherrima* (Morales, Rojas, Quirós, & Gonzalez, 2015),  
436 *Starm. bacillaris* (Englezos et al., 2019), *Hanseniaspora viniae*, *T. delbrueckii*, *L.*  
437 *thermotolerans* (Yan, Zhang, Joseph, & Waterhouse, 2020) and *Saccharomyces kudriavzevii*  
438 (Arroyo-López, Pérez-Través, Querol, & Barrio, 2011) were able to survive and coexist for  
439 longer period with *S. cerevisiae* when oxygen was added to the fermentation medium.  
440 Recently, oxygen addition to fermenters, under a controlled flowrate, was applied to promote

441 the respiratory consumption of sugars by non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts in order to reduce alcohol  
442 content in the wines (Gonzalez et al., 2013; Alonso-del-Real, Contreras-Ruiz, Castiglioni,  
443 Barrio, & Querol, 2017a). Judicious addition of oxygen could help increase the overall impact  
444 of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts on wine quality, accelerate transformation of phenols to reduce  
445 astringency and avoid the excessive production of unpleasant metabolites, such as acetic acid.

446 Another oenological practice that can influence interactions between microorganisms  
447 is the fermentation temperature, due to its effect on microbial performance. This evidence was  
448 widely reported for yeasts in pure and mixed fermentations (Arroyo-López, Orlic, Querol, &  
449 Barrio, 2009). During wine fermentation, temperatures naturally increase mainly due to *S.*  
450 *cerevisiae* fermentative activity. Although the fermentation temperature is usually controlled  
451 in modern wineries, any increase represents an inhibition factor for temperature sensitive  
452 species (Liu et al., 2017). However, at lower temperatures e.g. 10°C and 15°C, ethanol  
453 tolerance of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts is higher enabling a stronger contribution in low-  
454 temperature fermentations (Jolly et al., 2014). This phenomenon is also evident within the  
455 *Saccharomyces* genus. Alonso- del- Real, Lairón-Peris, Barrio, & Querol (2017b) evaluated  
456 the performance of *S. cerevisiae* and *Saccharomyces non-cerevisiae* strains in mixed culture  
457 fermentations at different temperatures. These authors revealed that cryotolerant  
458 *Saccharomyces non-cerevisiae* particularly *S. uvarum*, has a notable effect on *S. cerevisiae*  
459 dominance at low and intermediate temperatures (8, 12 and 20°C). This clarifies why *S. uvarum*  
460 can replace *S. cerevisiae* during wine fermentations in European regions with oceanic and  
461 continental climates (Alonso- del- Real et al., 2017b), where *S. uvarum* can be found naturally  
462 on grapes.

463 The use of SO<sub>2</sub> as an antioxidant and antimicrobial agent is known since Roman times  
464 where it was used to prevent food and beverage spoilage. In winemaking, SO<sub>2</sub> is often added  
465 at the end of the fermentation process or before bottling to act as a preservative agent, however,  
466 it is mostly used before the start of the fermentation. At this stage, it promotes the establishment  
467 of *S. cerevisiae* as the dominant yeast because generally non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts (*Candida*,  
468 *Cryptococcus*, *Hanseniaspora* and *Metschnikowia*), LAB and acetic acid bacteria are more  
469 sensitive to SO<sub>2</sub> (Albertin et al., 2014b). In this context, Cinquanta et al. (2018) found that SO<sub>2</sub>  
470 has a major effect against LAB at low pH where there is a high percentage of SO<sub>2</sub> in the  
471 molecular form. Additionally, during wine fermentation yeasts can release SO<sub>2</sub> due to their  
472 metabolism. Generally, *S. cerevisiae* strains can produce more than 100 mg/L SO<sub>2</sub>. Information  
473 regarding non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts is lacking.

474           Given the importance of SO<sub>2</sub> and the synergic effect of pH together with ethanol on the  
475 survival of specific microorganisms, knowledge of the tolerance of this metabolite by the  
476 microorganisms present during the fermentation process is necessary. This can lead to the  
477 desired reduction of added SO<sub>2</sub> levels in wine (to satisfy consumers) while avoiding the  
478 inhibition of the microorganisms necessary during the winemaking process.

479           The development of large-scale fermentations, as often required in commercial  
480 wineries, highlighted the unpredictability and complexity of spontaneous fermentations due to  
481 the interactions among microorganisms. Therefore, to maintain repeatable results, the use of  
482 selected cultures tailored to complete AF and MLF has become the norm in commercial  
483 wineries. However, the dominance of a specific starter culture depends on factors such as the  
484 species/strain used, the yeast/yeast or yeast/bacteria combination chosen, the inoculum size and  
485 ratio, and the rehydration conditions. The species that inhabit the must ecosystem have  
486 different responses to wine fermentation parameters and the behaviour of the non-  
487 *Saccharomyces* yeast is influenced by *S. cerevisiae* and vice versa (Bagheri, Bauer, & Setati,  
488 2017). Generally, in the presence of *S. cerevisiae*, populations of *Wickerhamomyces anomalus*,  
489 *M. pulcherrima*, *Pichia terricola*, and *Candida parapsilosis* decrease in the early stages of the  
490 fermentation, while *L. thermotolerans*, *T. delbrueckii* and *Starm. bacillaris* survive until late  
491 stages of fermentation. The presence of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts in the initial stages of the  
492 alcoholic fermentation could limit the growth of *S. cerevisiae* yeasts by utilizing large  
493 quantities of nitrogen and oxygen from the must (Liu et al., 2017). However, in contrast,  
494 growth of *H. vineae* is promoted by the presence *S. cerevisiae* suggesting a positive interaction  
495 between these two yeasts (Bagheri et al., 2017).

496           The diversity of yeasts involved in the AF affects the growth of LAB and their capacity  
497 to conduct MLF (Du Plessis et al., 2017, 2019; Capozzi et al., 2019). Du Plessis et al. (2017)  
498 found that *S. cerevisiae*, *T. delbrueckii* and *M. pulcherrima* possessed a larger inhibitory effect  
499 on the levels of the naturally occurring LAB than *Starm. bacillaris* and *H. uvarum*. The reduced  
500 MLF duration in mixed fermentations using *Starm. bacillaris* co-inoculated with *S. cerevisiae*  
501 was probably due to the chemical composition of the medium. Firstly, *Starm. bacillaris* was  
502 found to produce less ethanol compared to sugar consumed, implying that *O. oeni* had more  
503 favourable environmental conditions for growth and consumption of malic acid. Secondly,  
504 *Starm. bacillaris* consumed less nitrogen compounds, compared to *S. cerevisiae*, further  
505 benefiting the growth of the LAB. Results from *L. thermotolerans* trials were conflicting  
506 thereby highlighting that interactions are also strain-specific and not only species-specific  
507 (Bagheri et al., 2017; Du Plessis et al., 2017). The MLF inoculation strategy is also important

508 and Capozzi et al. (2019) found that some *O. oeni* strains showed better malolactic activity  
509 when co-inoculated with the selected yeasts at 0% (v/v) ethanol or added up to 4% (v/v) of  
510 ethanol.

511 The size and ratio of the yeast inoculum is a key parameter for a successful pure and  
512 mixed (multistarter) fermentation (Comitini et al., 2011). In a multistarter fermentation,  
513 inoculum ratios of 10:1, 100:1 and 10,000:1 (non-*Saccharomyces*:*S. cerevisiae*) caused a  
514 reduced or delayed growth of *S. cerevisiae*. In contrast, an inoculum ratio of 1:1 between non-  
515 *Saccharomyces* yeasts (*C. zemplinina*, *L. thermotolerans*, *M. pulcherrima* and *T. delbrueckii*)  
516 and *S. cerevisiae* did not affect the performance of the second yeast (Comitini et al., 2011;  
517 Medina et al., 2012). However, inhibition was not observed between *S. kudriavzevii* and *S.*  
518 *cerevisiae* in low temperature fermentation (Alonso-del-Real et al., 2017a) demonstrating the  
519 synergistic effect of temperature and inoculum sizes.

520 Co- or sequential inoculation of *S. cerevisiae* has a great impact on the performance of the non-  
521 *Saccharomyces* yeasts. In general, when simultaneously inoculated, *S. cerevisiae* shows a  
522 highly antagonistic behaviour and reduces the other population in comparison to sequential  
523 inoculations (Table 1). The chemical composition of the wine produced from simultaneously  
524 inoculated fermentations is very similar to the respective pure fermented wine with *S.*  
525 *cerevisiae* only. On the contrary, in sequential fermentations the initial growth of the non-  
526 *Saccharomyces* yeasts enables further modulation of metabolites of oenological interest due  
527 the ability of this group of species to achieve higher population levels and be present for a  
528 longer time, in comparison to the respective co-inoculated fermentations.

529

#### 530 4.3 Interaction mechanisms

531

532 In the wine ecosystem, microorganisms interact at different levels. Firstly, they are  
533 driven by the need to consume nutrients. Secondly, their existence necessarily leads to physical  
534 contact with each other as well as the production of metabolites that can affect other  
535 populations, either as a source of nutrients, or by producing inhibitory factors. In the following  
536 two sections the mechanisms responsible for the above-mentioned interactions will be further  
537 discussed in relation to the various steps of the winemaking process.

538

##### 539 4.3.1 Interactions concerning substrate

540

541 During wine fermentation, all microorganisms must consume nutrients from the same  
542 source, so competition between different populations takes place. Starting from the grape  
543 crushing, yeasts consume oxygen, sugars, nitrogen, vitamins and lipids (Brou et al., 2018)  
544 thereby determining the inhibition level for other species. In general, spontaneous and co-  
545 inoculated wine fermentations end with the dominance of the glucophilic *S. cerevisiae*, due to  
546 its extensively reprogrammed gene expression during the first phases of the fermentation. This  
547 change results in an enhanced nutrient uptake and an up-regulation of genes involved in amino  
548 acids, vitamins and lipids uptake. This behaviour was observed in competition against bacteria,  
549 non-*Saccharomyces* and *Saccharomyces non-cerevisiae* yeasts (Bartle et al., 2019). Yeasts  
550 such as *Starm. bacillaris* and *H. uvarum* can probably survive during fermentation due to their  
551 fructophilic nature (ability to consume fructose preferentially to glucose as a carbon source)  
552 enabling them to compete against *S. cerevisiae* (Fig. 1). Divergently, when a sequential  
553 inoculation is followed, *S. cerevisiae* performs poorly in comparison to a pure fermentation  
554 equivalent. This is independent from the non-*Saccharomyces* used (Medina et al., 2012; Lleixà,  
555 Manzano, Mas, & Portillo, 2016). A sluggish or stuck fermentation has been attributed to  
556 nutrient unavailability (Gobert et al., 2019). This was observed for *S. cerevisiae* in mixed  
557 fermentations with *Hanseniaspora* spp., *M. pulcherrima* and *T. delbrueckii*, and was probably  
558 due to nitrogen and vitamin depletion (Medina et al., 2012). In a mixed fermentation between  
559 *L. thermotolerans* and *S. cerevisiae*, Petigonnet et al. (2019) showed that the non-  
560 *Saccharomyces* yeast consumed most of the oxygen and approximately 68% of the  $\beta$ -sitosterol,  
561 14% of the stigmasterol and all the campesterol content present in the must in only 24 h of  
562 fermentation. Consequently, *S. cerevisiae* growth was slow, as ergosterol and unsaturated fatty  
563 acids biosynthesis were inhibited due to the oxygen unavailability (enzymes for their formation  
564 are oxygen-dependent) and because phytosterols needed to replace ergosterol in the membrane  
565 had been consumed (Petigonnet et al., 2019).

566 Competition for nutrients have differing outcomes dependant on the yeast species  
567 involved. Yeasts with complex nutrient requirements show an increased antagonistic behaviour  
568 with LAB (Bartle et al., 2019). Some *S. cerevisiae* strains and non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts (*T.*  
569 *delbrueckii*, *Starm. bacillaris*, *M. pulcherrima*, *I. orientalis* and *Schizosaccharomyces* spp.)  
570 are able to consume L-malic acid that then becomes unavailable for LAB during MLF  
571 (Balmaseda, Bordons, Reguant, & Bautista-Gallego, 2018). Nutrient depletion has an essential  
572 role in promoting wine shelf life. During fermentation LAB consume L-malic acid and other  
573 nutrients. This impoverishes the wine and prevents the development of contaminant  
574 microorganisms (Balmaseda et al., 2018).

575 During wine fermentation, nutrients may also lead to mutualism (positive interactions  
576 between species). Some yeasts are able to produce or release amino acids and vitamins that can  
577 stimulate LAB growth (Ivey, Massel, & Phister, 2013). This cross feeding was observed  
578 between *S. cerevisiae* and *L. plantarum* in grape juice (Ponomarova et al., 2017). It was  
579 highlighted that the yeast released amino acids and other metabolites able to stimulate the  
580 growth of the LAB strain. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that this metabolic dependency of  
581 *L. plantarum* was unidirectional and was conserved among diverse yeast isolates. Another  
582 nutrient source is a consequence of yeast autolysis when weaker yeast cells die off during  
583 fermentation. This phenomenon is characterized by the release of extra nitrogen sources that  
584 can be used by LAB as nutrient source during MLF, and by *S. cerevisiae* when it is added in  
585 the wine towards the end of fermentation (Lleixà et al., 2016).

586

#### 587 4.3.2 Chemical-physical interactions

588

589 Throughout the last decade, many studies demonstrated that the reduction in the  
590 numbers of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts during early to late stages of mixed culture wine  
591 fermentations involves physical cell-to-cell contact. In non-*Saccharomyces/S. cerevisiae*  
592 mixed culture fermentations conducted in double compartment fermentors (in which a  
593 membrane separates the cells of the two species), the disappearance of non-*Saccharomyces*  
594 yeasts was not associated with nutrient limitation or the presence of inhibitory compounds. It  
595 was concluded that the reduction was induced by direct physical contact through  
596 receptor/ligand like interactions. This phenomenon was observed when *S. cerevisiae*  
597 populations reached high cell densities in fermentation with *Starm. bacillaris* (Englezos et al.,  
598 2019b), *L. thermotolerans* (Petitgonnet et al., 2019), *T. delbrueckii* (Branco et al., 2017a),  
599 *Hanseniaspora* spp. (Rossouw et al., 2015), *K. marxianus* (Lopez, Beaufort, Brandam, &  
600 Taillandier, 2014), *H. uvarum*, *M. fructicola*, *P. kudriavzevii* or *Cr. flavescens* (Borded et al.,  
601 2020; Rossouw et al., 2015). Other authors observed that a contact-dependent mechanism also  
602 occurs in intra-species competition, highlighting that physical contact is a prerequisite for  
603 dominance (Pérez-Torrado et al., 2017). It was also shown by Kemsawasd et al. (2015) that the  
604 association between cell-to-cell contact and other inhibitory factors (antimicrobial peptides  
605 [AMPs]) was responsible for *L. thermotolerans* death during mixed-culture fermentation with  
606 *S. cerevisiae*.

607 Antimicrobial compounds (AMCs) such as fatty acids, peptides, proteins, SO<sub>2</sub> and  
608 other molecules are produced by yeasts (Liu et al., 2017). Additionally, LAB in wine are able

609 to excrete carboxylic acids, proteases, glucanases and bacteriocins (Balmaseda et al., 2018;  
610 Bartle et al, 2019). The aforementioned can all have an effect on the yeast and bacterial  
611 population in the wine. The use of antimicrobial compounds is an attractive topic for many  
612 researchers, due to consumer demands for safer alternatives to SO<sub>2</sub>. However, sometimes it is  
613 difficult to understand which molecules are responsible for the inhibition. Simonin et al. (2018)  
614 found that the inoculation of *T. delbrueckii* at the start of AF induced a decrease in must  
615 biodiversity, spoilage microorganisms included. However, they could not explain the cause of  
616 this observation. In addition, Mewa-Ngongang et al. (2019) demonstrated that *C. pyralidae* and  
617 *P. kluyveri* showed growth inhibition activity against spoilage yeasts and fungi namely *D.*  
618 *bruxellensis*, *D. anomala*, *Z. bailii*, *Botrytis cinerea*, *C. acutatum* and *Rhizopus stolonifera* *in*  
619 *vitro* and on fruits (grapes and apples). These authors found that both direct contact and  
620 extracellular volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were two of the mechanisms of inhibition.  
621 VOCs include alcohols, organic acids and esters previously described with antimicrobial  
622 properties. However, it was not clear which compound, or combinations were responsible for  
623 the growth inhibition activity.

624 Antimicrobial compounds, and specifically AMPs have been proposed for use in the  
625 biocontrol of undesired microorganisms during winemaking. Peptides are generally used as  
626 host defence molecules, but some microorganisms are able to produce AMPs with the purpose  
627 of ensuring survival (Mahlapuu, Håkansson, Ringstad, & Björn, 2016). However, this  
628 biocontrol strategy has not been thoroughly investigated against wine-related spoilage  
629 microorganisms (Di Gianvito et al., 2022).

630 *S. cerevisiae* is able to release an AMP called “Saccharomycin” (Kemsawasd et al.,  
631 2015; Branco et al. 2017a). This is a natural biocide (2–10 kDa) active against several wine-  
632 related non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts and LAB (Branco et al., 2014, Kemsawasd et al. 2015;  
633 Branco et al., 2017a, 2019). Branco et al. (2017a) demonstrated that “Saccharomycin” is a  
634 fragment of the glycolytic enzyme glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH), an  
635 energy metabolism-related enzyme. These authors revealed that during wine fermentation this  
636 peptide is involved in the death of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts by cell-to-cell contact, because  
637 GAPDH-derived AMPs accumulate on the *S. cerevisiae* cell surface at the end of the growth  
638 phase (24 - 48 h). With reference to non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts, a recent study reported the  
639 release of an AMP by the *C. intermedia* strain LAMAP1790. This peptide affected the growth  
640 of several strains of the spoilage yeast, *B. bruxellensis*, without influencing the *S. cerevisiae*  
641 performance during fermentation (Peña & Ganga, 2019).

642 The production of yeast killer toxins, a characteristic first observed in *S. cerevisiae*, is  
643 well distributed in several yeast genera such as *Candida*, *Hansenula*, *Pichia*, *Williopsis*,  
644 *Tetrapisispora*, *Schwanniomyces*, *Debaryomyces*, *Ustilago*, *Cryptococcus*, *Metschnikowia*,  
645 *Williopsis*, *Kluyveromyces* and *Zygosaccharomyces* (Liu et al., 2017). Yeast killer toxins are  
646 effective under wine conditions and for this reason the production of killer toxins are often a  
647 sought after characteristic for wine yeast starter culture selections. Killer toxins are able to  
648 inhibit *S. cerevisiae* as well as spoilage yeast species in the presence of reduced SO<sub>2</sub>  
649 concentrations (Di Gianvito et al., 2022). Oro, Ciani, Bizzaro, & Comitini (2016) found that  
650 Kwkt and Pikt, two killer toxins produced by *K. wickerhamii* and *W. anomalus*, respectively,  
651 had an antimicrobial activity against *B. bruxellensis*. Furthermore, Mehlomakulu, Prior, Setati,  
652 & Divol (2017) exposed this spoilage yeast to the killer toxin CpKT1 produced by *C. pyralidae*  
653 and revealed that the loss of viability was due to damages to the cell membrane and cell wall.  
654 Mazzucco, Ganga, & Sangorrín (2019), also observed an inhibition against *B. bruxellensis*.  
655 These authors studied the killer toxin SeKT, produced by *Saccharomyces eubayanus*, in wine,  
656 demonstrating that this protein could be used for the biocontrol of four common spoilage wine  
657 yeasts (*B. bruxellensis*, *Pichia membranifaciens*, *P. guilliermondii* and *Pichia manshurica*).  
658 However, further studies are necessary to understand the efficacy against undesired  
659 microorganisms under real winemaking conditions. A factor missing in some investigations is  
660 the determination whether populations die off or if they enter in a viable but not culturable  
661 (VBNC) state. In this context, Branco et al. (2015) demonstrated that interactions through  
662 excreted compounds determined the VBNC status of *Hanseniaspora guilliermondii* during  
663 fermentation.

664

## 665 **5. Conclusion and future perspectives**

666

667 Currently, mixed fermentations with selected non-*Saccharomyces* and *S. cerevisiae*  
668 starter cultures are considered a state of art strategy to modulate the production of target  
669 metabolites. Investigations on how these species interact with each other and/or with LAB are  
670 developing fast, highlighting the potential future directions in this research area. However,  
671 more comprehensive data is needed to further uncover the nature of these interactions. This  
672 will permit the management of starter cultures in specific inoculation protocols and  
673 winemaking conditions in order to increase their metabolic activity and survival time  
674 (Morrison-Whittle, Lee, Fedrizzi, & Goddard, 2020). This will ensure their dominance and  
675 enhance their contribution to the final wine.

676 A relatively unexplored field that requires more detailed investigation is the impact of  
677 mixed culture fermentations on the LAB responsible for MLF. Recent studies demonstrated  
678 that certain non-*Saccharomyces* yeast caused a strong inhibition or stimulated the growth and  
679 malolactic activity of *O. oeni* and *L. plantarum*, but more clarification is required before a  
680 practical application can be devised.

681 In recent years, there has been a rapid increase in omics-methodology based studies,  
682 with the aim to extract more information from the wine microbiome. The integration of  
683 multiple-omics approaches has revealed molecular based information and enhanced the  
684 existing knowledge regarding microbial diversity during the various steps of wine production.  
685 This knowledge will help to further understand the complex interactions between  
686 microorganisms, the substrate and physical fermentations conditions. However, the overall  
687 potential of combining the different omics approaches remains underexploited and there are  
688 significant challenges to be addressed before any of these techniques become a routine  
689 procedure (Siren et al., 2019). Among the different challenges is the difficulty to extract RNA  
690 from grape must and wine, due to the increased levels of inhibitors, such as polyphenols and  
691 polysaccharides. Furthermore, since most of the studies are performed in a synthetic grape must  
692 medium, the optimization of omics-analysis in samples of natural origin need attention. This  
693 could help reveal the effect of specific stress conditions during the fermentation process and  
694 identify metabolic pathways that lead to the formation of metabolites responsible for wine  
695 quality. Such approaches could help to predict the population dynamics and biochemical  
696 activities of yeasts and bacteria and allow better control of their growth during the fermentation  
697 process. This will have a positive impact on wine quality, according to the needs of wine  
698 producers.

699 Continued advances in the knowledge of microbial interactions could provide many  
700 opportunities for innovation and adaptation to a changing market, as recently proposed by Di  
701 Gianvito et al. (2022). This will enable the development of new products based on the ability  
702 of the starter cultures to control the growth of spoilage microorganisms. More research is  
703 required to identify the mechanisms of action exerted by wine yeasts and LAB during the  
704 different steps of wine production. Mainstream consumer's demand for diverse wine styles and  
705 their increasing concern of the effects of chemical preservatives (such as SO<sub>2</sub>) on human health  
706 present new challenges for innovation in wine industries. Legislation regarding permitted  
707 additives to wine and the continuous search for wines without, or reduced levels of SO<sub>2</sub>, are  
708 likely to have a cascading effect on microbial community dynamics during wine production.  
709 Consequently, a comprehensive understanding of microbial interactions during wine

710 fermentation will be a key factor for the future elaboration of quality wines. This will assist in  
711 addressing the challenges and opportunities (Table 3) that lie ahead in winemaking industries.

712

## 713 **References**

714

715 1. Aplin, J. J., Paup, V. D., Ross, C. F., & Edwards, C. G. (2021). Chemical and Sensory  
716 Profiles of Merlot Wines Produced by Sequential Inoculation of *Metschnikowia*  
717 *pulcherrima* or *Meyerzima guilliermondii*. *Fermentation*, 7(3), 126.  
718 <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation7030126>

719

720 2. Albertin, W., Chasseriaud, L., Comte, G., Panfili, A., Delcamp, A., Salin, F., et al.  
721 (2014a). Winemaking and bioprocesses strongly shaped the genetic diversity of the  
722 ubiquitous yeast *Torulaspora delbrueckii*. *PLoS One*, 9(4), e94246.  
723 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094246>.

724

725 3. Albertin, W., Zimmer, A., Miot-Sertier, C., Bernard, M., Coulon, J., Moine, V., et al.  
726 (2017). Combined effect of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* lag phase and the non-  
727 *Saccharomyces* consortium to enhance wine fruitiness and complexity. *Applied*  
728 *Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 101, 7603-7620. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-017-8492-1)  
729 [017-8492-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-017-8492-1)

730

731 4. Alonso-del-Real, J., Contreras-Ruiz, A., Castiglioni, G. L., Barrio, E., & Querol, A.  
732 (2017a). The use of mixed populations of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *S. kudriavzevii*  
733 to reduce ethanol content in wine: limited aeration, inoculum proportions, and  
734 sequential inoculation. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 8, 2087.  
735 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.02087>.

736

737 5. Alonso-del-Real, J., Lairón-Peris, M., Barrio, E., & Querol, A. (2017b). Effect of  
738 temperature on the prevalence of *Saccharomyces non cerevisiae* species against a *S.*

- 739 *cerevisiae* wine strain in wine fermentation: competition, physiological fitness, and  
740 influence in final wine composition. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 8, 150.  
741 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.00150>.
- 742
- 743 6. Anfang, N., Brajkovich, M., & Goddard, M. R. (2009). Co-fermentation with *Pichia*  
744 *kluuyveri* increases varietal thiol concentrations in Sauvignon Blanc. *Australian Journal*  
745 *of Grape and Wine Research*, 15, 1-8. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0238.2008.00031.x)  
746 [0238.2008.00031.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0238.2008.00031.x)
- 747
- 748 7. Arroyo-López, F. N., Pérez-Través, L., Querol, A., & Barrio, E. (2011). Exclusion of  
749 *Saccharomyces kudriavzevii* from a wine model system mediated by *Saccharomyces*  
750 *cerevisiae*. *Yeast*, 28, 423–435. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yea.1848>.
- 751
- 752 8. Bagheri, B., Bauer, F. F., & Setati, M. E. (2017). The impact of *Saccharomyces*  
753 *cerevisiae* on a wine yeast consortium in natural and inoculated fermentations.  
754 *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 8, 1988. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.01988>.
- 755
- 756 9. Balmaseda, A., Bordons, A., Reguant, C., & Bautista-Gallego, J. (2018). Non-  
757 *Saccharomyces* in wine: effect upon *Oenococcus oeni* and malolactic fermentation.  
758 *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 9, 534. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.00534>.
- 759
- 760 10. Balikci, E. K., Tanguer, H., Jolly, N. P., & Erten, H. (2016). Influence of *Lachancea*  
761 *thermotolerans* on cv. Emir wine fermentation. *Yeast*, 33(7), 313-321.  
762 <https://doi.org/10.1002/yea.3166>.

763

- 764 11. Bartle, L., Sumbly, K., Sundstrom, J., & Jiranek, V. (2019). The microbial challenge of  
765 winemaking: yeast-bacteria compatibility. *FEMS Yeast Research*, *19*, foz040.  
766 <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsyr/foz040>.
- 767
- 768 12. Benito, S., Morata, A., Palomero, F., Gonzalez, M. C., & Suarez-Lepe, J. A. (2011).  
769 Formation of vinylphenolic pyranoanthocyanins by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and  
770 *Pichia guilliermondii* in red wines produced following different fermentation strategies.  
771 *Food Chemistry*, *124*, 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2010.05.096>.
- 772
- 773 13. Benito, S. (2018). The impact of *Torulaspora delbrueckii* yeast in  
774 winemaking. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *102*, 3081–3094.  
775 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-018-8849-0>.
- 776
- 777 14. Belda, I., Navascués, E., Marquina, D., Santos, A., Calderon, F., & Benito, S. (2015).  
778 Dynamic analysis of physiological properties of *Torulaspora delbrueckii* in wine  
779 fermentations and its incidence on wine quality. *Applied Microbiology and*  
780 *Biotechnology*, *99*(4), 1911-1922. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-014-6197-2>.
- 781
- 782 15. Belda, I., Ruiz, J., Alastruey-Izquierdo, A., Navascués, E., Marquina, D., & Santos, A.  
783 (2016). Unraveling the Enzymatic Basis of Wine "Flavorome": A Phylo-Functional  
784 Study of Wine Related Yeast Species. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *7*, 12.  
785 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00012>
- 786
- 787 16. Belda, I., Ruiz, J., Beisert, B., Navascués, E., Marquina, D., Calderón, F., et al. (2017).  
788 Influence of *Torulaspora delbrueckii* in varietal thiol (3-SH and 4-MSP) release in wine  
789 sequential fermentations. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, *257*, 183-191.  
790 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2017.06.028>.

791

792 17. Binati, R.L., Lemos Junior, W.J.F., Luzzini, G., Slaghenaufi, D., Ugliano, M., Torriani,  
793 S.. (2019). Contribution of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts to wine volatile and sensory  
794 diversity: A study on *Lachancea thermotolerans*, *Metschnikowia* spp. and *Starmerella*  
795 *bacillaris* strains isolated in Italy. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 318,  
796 108470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2019.108470>

797

798 18. Branco, P., Viana, T., Albergaria, H. & Arneborg, N. (2015). Antimicrobial peptides  
799 (AMPs). produced by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* induce alterations in the intracellular  
800 pH, membrane permeability and culturability of *Hanseniaspora guilliermondii* cells.  
801 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 205, 112–118.  
802 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2015.04.015>.

803

804 19. Branco, P., Francisco, D., Monteiro, M., Almeida, M. G., Caldeira J, Arneborg, N., et  
805 al. (2017a). Antimicrobial properties and death-inducing mechanisms of  
806 saccharomycin, a biocide secreted by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Applied Microbiology*  
807 *and Biotechnology*, 101, 159 – 171. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-016-7755-6>.

808

809 20. Branco, P., Kemsawasd, V., Santos, L., Diniz, M., Caldeira, J., Almeida, M. G., et al.  
810 (2017b) *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* accumulates GAPDH-derived peptides on its cell  
811 surface that induce death of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts by cell-to-cell contact. *FEMS*  
812 *Microbiology Ecology*, 93, fix055. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fix055>.

813

814 21. Branco, P., Sabir, F., Diniz, M., Carvalho, L., Albergaria, H., & Prista, C. (2019).  
815 Biocontrol of *Brettanomyces/Dekkera bruxellensis* in alcoholic fermentations using  
816 saccharomycin-overproducing *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains. *Applied*

817 *Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 103, 3073-3083. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253->  
818 019-09657-7.

819

820 22. Brizuela, N. S., Franco-Luesma, E., Bravo-Ferrada, B. M., Pérez-Jiménez, M.,  
821 Semorile, L., Tymczynszyn, E. E., et al. (2021). Influence of Patagonian  
822 *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* and *Oenococcus oeni* strains on sensory perception of  
823 Pinot Noir wine after malolactic fermentation. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine*  
824 *Research*, 27(1), 118-127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12460>.

825

826 23. Brou, P., Taillandier, P., Beaufort, S., & Brandam, C. (2018). Mixed culture  
827 fermentation using *Torulasporea delbrueckii* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* with direct  
828 and indirect contact: impact of anaerobic growth factors. *European Food Research and*  
829 *Technology*, 244, 1699-1710. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00217-018-3095-3>

830

831 24. Capozzi, V., Berbegal, C., Tufariello, M., Grieco, F., & Spano, G. (2019). Impact of  
832 co-inoculation of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Hanseniaspora uvarum* and *Oenococcus*  
833 *oeni* autochthonous strains in controlled multi starter grape must fermentations. *LWT—*  
834 *Food Science and Technology*, 109, 241-249.  
835 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2019.04.045>

836

837 25. Chasseriaud, L., Coulon, J., Marullo, P., Albertin, W., & Bely, M. (2018). New  
838 oenological practice to promote non-*Saccharomyces* species of interest: saturating  
839 grape juice with carbon dioxide. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 102, 3779-  
840 3791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-018-8861-4>.

841

842 26. Cheraiti, N., Guezenec, S., & Salmon, J. M. (2005). Redox interactions between  
843 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Saccharomyces uvarum* in mixed culture under

844 oenological conditions. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 71, 255–260.  
845 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.71.1.255-260.2005>

846

847 27. Ciani, M., Capece, A., Comitini, F., Canonico, L., Siesto, G., & Romano, P. (2016).  
848 Yeast Interactions in Inoculated Wine Fermentation. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, 555.  
849 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00555>

850

851 28. Cinquanta, L., De Stefano, G., Formato, D., Niro, S., & Panfili, G. (2018). Effect of pH  
852 on malolactic fermentation in southern Italian wines. *European Food Research and*  
853 *Technology*, 244, 1261-1268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00217-018-3041-4>.

854

855 29. Comitini, F., Gobbi, M., Domizio, P., Romani, C., Lencioni, L., Mannazzu, I., & Ciani,  
856 M. (2011). Selected non-*Saccharomyces* wine yeasts in controlled multistarter  
857 fermentations with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Food Microbiology*, 28, 873-882.  
858 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2010.12.001>.

859

860 30. Contreras, A., Hidalgo, C., Schmidt, S., Henschke P. A. Curtun, C. & Varela, C. (2015).  
861 The application of non-*Saccharomyces* yeast in fermentations with limited aeration as  
862 a strategy for the production of wine with reduced alcohol content. *International*  
863 *Journal of Food Microbiology*, 205, 7-15.  
864 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2015.03.027>.

865

866 31. Di Gianvito, P., Englezos, V., Rantsiou, K., & Cocolin, L. (2022). Bioprotection  
867 strategies in winemaking. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 109532.  
868 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2022.109532>

869

- 870 32. Diez, L., Rojo-Bezares, B., Zarazaga, M., Rodriguez, J. M., Torres, C., & Ruiz-Larrea,  
871 F. (2012). Antimicrobial activity of pediocin PA-1 against *Oenococcus oeni* and other  
872 wine bacteria. *Food Microbiology*, 31, 167–172.  
873 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2012.03.006>
- 874
- 875 33. Diez-Ozaeta, I., Lavilla, M., & Amárita, F. (2021). Wine aroma profile modification by  
876 *Oenococcus oeni* strains from Rioja Alavesa region: selection of potential malolactic  
877 starters. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 356, 109324.  
878 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2021.109324>.
- 879
- 880 34. Domizio, P., Romani, C., Lencioni, L., Comitini, F., Gobbi, M., Mannazzu, I., et al.  
881 (2011). Outlining a future for non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts: Selection of putative spoilage  
882 wine strains to be used in association with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for grape juice  
883 fermentation. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 147, 170-180.  
884 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2011.03.020>.
- 885
- 886 35. Domizio, P., Liu, Y., Bisson, L.F., & Barille, D. (2014). Use of non-*Saccharomyces*  
887 wine yeasts as novel sources of mannoproteins in wine. *Food Microbiology*, 43, 5-15.  
888 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2014.04.005>.
- 889
- 890 36. Du Plessis, H. W., Du Toit, M., Hoff, J. W., Hart, R. S., Ndimba, B. K., & Jolly, N. P.  
891 (2017). Characterisation of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts using different methodologies  
892 and evaluation of their compatibility with malolactic fermentation. *South African*  
893 *Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, 38, 46-63. <https://doi.org/10.21548/38-1-819>.
- 894
- 895 37. Du Plessis, H., Du Toit, M., Nieuwoudt, H., Van der Rijst, M., Hoff, J., & Jolly, N.  
896 (2019). Modulation of wine flavor using *Hanseniaspora uvarum* in combination with

897 different *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, lactic acid bacteria strains and malolactic  
898 fermentation strategies. *Fermentation*, 5(3),  
899 64. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation5030064>.

900

901 38. Dutraive, O., Benito, S., Fritsch, S., Beisert, B., Patz, C. D., & Rauhut, D. (2019). Effect  
902 of sequential inoculation with non-*Saccharomyces* and *Saccharomyces* yeasts on  
903 Riesling wine chemical composition. *Fermentation*, 5(3),  
904 79. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation5030079>

905

906 39. Dzialo, M. C., Park, R., Steensels, J., Lievens, B., & Verstrepen, K. J. (2017).  
907 Physiology, ecology and industrial applications of aroma formation in yeast. *FEMS*  
908 *Microbiology Reviews*, 41, S95-S128. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fux031>.

909

910 40. Englezos, V., Rantsiou, K., Cravero, F., Torchio, F., Pollon, M., Fracassetti, D., et al.  
911 (2018a). Volatile profile of white wines fermented with sequential inoculation of  
912 *Starmerella bacillaris* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Food chemistry*, 257, 350-360.  
913 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.03.018>.

914

915 41. Englezos, V., Cocolin, L., Rantsiou, K., Ortiz-Julien, A., Bloem, A., Dequin, S., et al.  
916 (2018b). Specific phenotypic traits of *Starmerella bacillaris* related to nitrogen source  
917 consumption and central carbon metabolite production during wine fermentation.  
918 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 84, e00797-18.  
919 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00797-18>.

920

921 42. Englezos, V., Torchio, F., Vagnoli, P., Krieger-Weber, S., Rantsiou, K., & Cocolin, L.  
922 (2019a). Impact of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Strain Selection on Malolactic

- 923 Fermentation by *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Oenococcus oeni*. *American Journal of*  
924 *Enology and Viticulture*, 71, 157-165.10.5344/ajev.2019.19061
- 925
- 926 43. Englezos, V., Rantsiou, K., Giacosa, S., Segade, S. R., Rolle, L., & Cocolin, L. (2019b).  
927 Cell-to-cell contact mechanism modulates *Starmerella bacillaris* death in mixed culture  
928 fermentations with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *International journal of food*  
929 *microbiology*, 289, 106-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2018.09.009>.
- 930
- 931 44. Escribano-Viana, R., Portu, J., Garijo, P., López, R., Santamaría, P., López-Alfaro, I.,  
932 et al. (2019). Effect of the Sequential Inoculation of Non-  
933 *Saccharomyces/Saccharomyces* on the Anthocyanins and Stilbenes Composition of  
934 Tempranillo Wines. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 9;10:773.  
935 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.00773>.
- 936
- 937 45. Gobert, A., Tourdot-Maréchal, R., Sparrow, C., Morge, C., & Alexandre, H. (2019).  
938 Influence of nitrogen status in wine alcoholic fermentation. *Food Microbiology*, 83, 71-  
939 85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.04.008>.
- 940
- 941 46. Gonzalez, R., Quirós, M., & Morales, P. (2013). Yeast respiration of sugars by non-  
942 *Saccharomyces* yeast species: a promising and barely explored approach to lowering  
943 alcohol content of wines. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 29(1), 55-61.  
944 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2012.06.015>.
- 945
- 946 47. Grangeteau, C., Roullier-Gall, C., Rousseaux, S., Gougeon, R. D., Schmitt-Kopplin, P.,  
947 Alexandre, H., & Guilloux-Benatier, M. (2017). Wine microbiology is driven by  
948 vineyard and winery anthropogenic factors. *Microbial Biotechnology*, 10, 354-370.  
949 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.12428>.

950

951 48. Guzzon, R., Malacarne, M., Larcher, R., Franciosi, E., & Toffanin, A. (2020). The  
952 impact of grape processing and carbonic maceration on the microbiota of early stages  
953 of winemaking. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 128(1), 209-224.  
954 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.14462>.

955

956 49. Hranilovic, A., Gambetta, J. M., Schmidtke, L., Boss, P. K., Grbin, P. R., Masneuf-  
957 Pomarede, I., et al. (2018). Oenological traits of *Lachancea thermotolerans* show signs  
958 of domestication and allopatric differentiation. *Scientific reports*, 8(1), 1-13.  
959 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-33105-7>

960

961 50. Hranilovic, A., Gambetta, J. M., Jeffery, D. W., Grbin, P. R., & Jiranek, V. (2020).  
962 Lower-alcohol wines produced by *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* and *Saccharomyces*  
963 *cerevisiae* co-fermentations: The effect of sequential inoculation timing. *International*  
964 *Journal of Food Microbiology*, 329, 108651.  
965 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2020.108651>.

966

967 51. Hu, K., Zhao, H., Edwards, N., Peyer, L., Tao, Y., & Arneborg, N. (2022). The effects  
968 of cell-cell contact between *Pichia kluyveri* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on amino  
969 acids and volatiles in mixed culture alcoholic fermentations. *Food Microbiology*, 103,  
970 103960. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2021.103960>.

971

972 52. Ivey, M., Massel, M., & Phister, T. G. (2013). Microbial interactions in food  
973 fermentations. *Annual Review of Food Science and Technology*, 4, 141-162.  
974 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-food-022811-101219>.

975

- 976 53. Jolly, N P., Varela, C., & Pretorius, I. S. (2014). Not your ordinary yeast: non-  
977 *Saccharomyces* yeasts in wine production uncovered. *FEMS Yeast Research*, 14, 215-  
978 237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1567-1364.12111>
- 979
- 980 54. Kemsawasd, V., Viana, T., Ardö, Y., & Arneborg, N. (2015). Influence of nitrogen  
981 sources on growth and fermentation performance of different wine yeast species during  
982 alcoholic fermentation. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 99, 10191-10207.  
983 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-015-6835-3>.
- 984
- 985 55. Knight, S., Klaere, S., Fedrizzi, B., & Goddard, M.R. (2015). Regional microbial  
986 signatures positively correlate with differential wine phenotypes: Evidence for a  
987 microbial aspect to terroir. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 14233.  
988 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep14233>
- 989
- 990 56. Knight, S.J., Karon, O., & Goddard, M.R. (2020). Small scale fungal community  
991 differentiation in a vineyard system. *Food Microbiology*, 87, 103358.  
992 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.103358>.
- 993
- 994 57. Krieger-Weber, S., Heras, J. M., & Suarez, C. (2020). *Lactobacillus plantarum*, a new  
995 biological tool to control malolactic fermentation: a review and an  
996 outlook. *Beverages*, 6, 23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/beverages6020023>.
- 997
- 998 58. Legras, J. L., Galeote, V., Bigey, F., Camarasa, C., Marsit, S., Nidelet, T., et al. (2018).  
999 Adaptation of *S. cerevisiae* to fermented food environments reveals remarkable genome  
1000 plasticity and the footprints of domestication. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 35(7),  
1001 1712-1727. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msy066>

1002

1003 59. Liu, Y., Rousseaux, S., Tourdot-Maréchal, R., Sadoudi, M., Gougeon, R., Schmitt-  
1004 Kopplin, P., et al. (2017). Wine microbiome: a dynamic world of microbial interactions.  
1005 *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 57, 856-873.  
1006 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2014.983591>.

1007

1008 60. Lleixà, J., Manzano, M., Mas, A., & Portillo, M. D. C. (2016). *Saccharomyces* and non-  
1009 *Saccharomyces* competition during microvinification under different sugar and  
1010 nitrogen conditions. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, 1959.  
1011 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.01959>.

1012

1013 61. Lopez, C. L. F., Beaufort, S., Brandam, C., & Taillandier, P. (2014). Interactions  
1014 between *Kluyveromyces marxianus* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* in tequila must type  
1015 medium fermentation. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 30, 2223-  
1016 2229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-014-1643-y>.

1017

1018 62. Lucio, O., Pardo, I., Krieger-Weber, S., Heras, J.M. & Ferrer, S. (2016) Selection of  
1019 *Lactobacillus* strains to induce biological acidification in low acidity wines. *LWT—*  
1020 *Food Science and Technology*, 73, 334–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2016.06.031>

1021

1022 63. Mahlapuu, M., Håkansson, J., Ringstad, L., Björn, C. (2016). Antimicrobial Peptides:  
1023 An Emerging Category of Therapeutic Agents. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection*  
1024 *Microbiology*, 6, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2016.00194>.

1025

1026 64. Maicas, S., Mateo, J.J. (2016). Microbial Glycosidases for Wine  
1027 Production. *Beverages*, 2, 20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/beverages2030020>.

1028

1029 65. Mangani, S., Buscioni, G., Guerrini, S., & Granchi, L. (2020). Influence of sequential  
1030 inoculum of *Starmerella bacillaris* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on flavonoid  
1031 composition of monovarietal Sangiovese wines. *Yeast*, 37(9-10), 549-557.  
1032 <https://doi.org/10.1002/yea.3474>.

1033

1034 66. Marcon, A. R., Schwarz, L. V., Dutra, S. V., Moura, S., Agostini, F., Delamare, A. P.  
1035 L., et al. (2018). Contribution of a Brazilian *Torulaspota delbrueckii* isolate and a  
1036 commercial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* to the aroma profile and sensory characteristics  
1037 of Moscato Branco wines. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*, 24(4), 461-  
1038 468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12347>

1039

1040 67. Martins, G., Miot-Sertier, C., Lauga, B., Claisse, O., Lonvaud-Funel, A., Soulas, G., et  
1041 al. (2012). Grape berry bacterial microbiota: Impact of the ripening process and the  
1042 farming system. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 158, 93-100.  
1043 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.06.013>.

1044

1045 68. Mateo, J. J., & Maicas, S. (2016). Application of Non-*Saccharomyces* Yeasts to Wine-  
1046 Making Process. *Fermentation*, 2, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation2030014>

1047

1048 69. Mazzucco, M. B., Ganga, M. A., & Sangorrín, M. P. (2019). Production of a novel  
1049 killer toxin from *Saccharomyces eubayanus* using agro-industrial waste and its  
1050 application against wine spoilage yeasts. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek*, 1-9.  
1051 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-019-01231-5>

1052

1053 70. Medina, K., Boido, E., Dellacassa, E., & Carrau, F. (2012). Growth of non-  
1054 *Saccharomyces* yeasts affects nutrient availability for *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* during

- 1055 wine fermentation. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 157, 245-250.  
1056 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.05.012>.
- 1057
- 1058 71. Mehlomakulu, N. N., Prior, K. J., Setati, M. E., & Divol, B. (2017). *Candida pyralidae*  
1059 killer toxin disrupts the cell wall of *Brettanomyces bruxellensis* in red grape juice.  
1060 *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 122, 747-758. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.13383>.
- 1061
- 1062 72. Mewa-Ngongang, M., du Plessis, H. W., Ntwampe, S. K. O., Chidi, B. S., Hutchinson,  
1063 U. F., Mekuto, L., & Jolly, N. P. (2019). The Use of *Candida pyralidae* and *Pichia*  
1064 *kluyveri* to Control Spoilage Microorganisms of Raw Fruits Used for Beverage  
1065 Production. *Foods*, 8, 454. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods8100454>.
- 1066
- 1067 73. Morales, P., Rojas, V., Quirós, M., & Gonzalez, R. (2015). The impact of oxygen on  
1068 the final alcohol content of wine fermented by a mixed starter culture. *Applied*  
1069 *Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 99, 3993-4003. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-014-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-014-6321-3)  
1070 [6321-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-014-6321-3)
- 1071
- 1072 74. Morrison-Whittle, P., & Goddard, M.R. (2018). From vineyard to winery: a source map  
1073 of microbial diversity driving wine fermentation. *Environmental Microbiology*, 20, 75-  
1074 84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.13960>
- 1075
- 1076 75. Nisiotou, A., Sgouros, G., Mallouchos, A., Nisiotis, C. S., Michaelidis, C., Tassou, C.,  
1077 et al. (2018). The use of indigenous *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Starmerella*  
1078 *bacillaris* strains as a tool to create chemical complexity in local wines. *Food Research*  
1079 *International*, 111, 498-508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.05.035>.
- 1080

- 1081 76. Oro, L., Ciani, M., Bizzaro, D., & Comitini, F. (2016). Evaluation of damage induced  
1082 by Kwkt and Pikt zymocins against *Brettanomyces/Dekkera* spoilage yeast, as  
1083 compared to sulphur dioxide. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, *121*, 207-214.  
1084 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.13121>.
- 1085
- 1086 77. Padilla, B., Gil, J. V., & Manzanares, P. (2016). Past and future of non-*Saccharomyces*  
1087 yeasts: from spoilage microorganisms to biotechnological tools for improving wine  
1088 aroma complexity. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *7*, 411.  
1089 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00411>.
- 1090
- 1091 78. Peña, R., & Ganga, M. A. (2019). Novel antimicrobial peptides produced by *Candida*  
1092 *intermedia* LAMAP1790 active against the wine-spoilage yeast *Brettanomyces*  
1093 *bruxellensis*. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek*, *112*, 297-304. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-018-1159-9)  
1094 [018-1159-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-018-1159-9).
- 1095
- 1096 79. Pérez-Torrado, R., Rantsiou, K., Perrone, B., Navarro-Tapia, E., Querol, A., & Cocolin,  
1097 L. (2017). Ecological interactions among *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains: insight into  
1098 the dominance phenomenon. *Scientific reports*, *7*, 43603.  
1099 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep43603>.
- 1100
- 1101 80. Pérez-Magariño, S., Cano-Mozo, E., Albors, C., Santos, A., & Navascués, E. (2021).  
1102 Autochthonous *Oenococcus oeni* Strain to Avoid Histamine Formation in Red Wines:  
1103 A Study in Real Winemaking Conditions. *American Journal of Enology and*  
1104 *Viticulture*, *72*(2), 170-180. <https://doi.org/10.5344/ajev.2020.20010>.
- 1105
- 1106 81. Petitgonnet, C., Klein, G. L., Roullier-Gall, C., Schmitt-Kopplin, P., Quintanilla-Casas,  
1107 B., Vichi, S., et al. (2019). Influence of cell-cell contact between *L. thermotolerans* and

- 1108 *S. cerevisiae* on yeast interactions and the exo-metabolome. *Food Microbiology*, 83,  
1109 122-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.05.005>.
- 1110
- 1111 82. Ponomarova, O., Gabrielli, N., Sévin, D. C., Mülleder, M., Zirngibl, K., Bulyha, K., et  
1112 al. (2017). Yeast creates a niche for symbiotic lactic acid bacteria through nitrogen  
1113 overflow. *Cell systems*, 5, 345-357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2017.09.002>.
- 1114
- 1115 83. Renault, P., Coulon, J., Moine, V., Thibon, C., & Bely, M. (2016) Enhanced 3-  
1116 sulfanylhexan-1-ol production in sequential mixed fermentation with *Torulaspora*  
1117 *delbrueckii*/*Saccharomyces cerevisiae* reveals a situation of synergistic interaction  
1118 between two industrial strains. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, 293.  
1119 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00293>
- 1120
- 1121 84. Ruiz, J., Belda, I., Beisert, B., Navascués, E., Marquina, D., Calderón, F., et al. (2018).  
1122 Analytical impact of *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* in the volatile profile of Verdejo  
1123 white wines. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 102(19), 8501-8509.  
1124 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-018-9255-3>.
- 1125
- 1126 85. Russo, P., Englezos, V., Capozzi, V., Pollon, M., Segade, S. R., Rantsiou, K., et al.  
1127 (2020). Effect of mixed fermentations with *Starmerella bacillaris* and *Saccharomyces*  
1128 *cerevisiae* on management of malolactic fermentation. *Food Research*  
1129 *International*, 134, 109246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2020.109246>
- 1130
- 1131 86. Seguinot, P., Ortiz-Julien, A., & Camarasa, C. (2020). Impact of nutrient availability  
1132 on the fermentation and production of aroma compounds under sequential inoculation  
1133 with *M. pulcherrima* and *S. cerevisiae*. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 11, 305.  
1134 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.00305>

1135

1136 87. Simonin, S., Alexandre, H., Nikolantonaki, M., Coelho, C., & Tourdot-Maréchal, R.  
1137 (2018). Inoculation of *Torulaspota delbrueckii* as a bio-protection agent in  
1138 winemaking. *Food Research International*, 107, 451-461.  
1139 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.02.034>

1140

1141 88. Su, Y., Seguinot, P., Sanchez, I., Ortiz-Julien, A., Heras, J. M., Querol, A., et al. (2020).  
1142 Nitrogen sources preferences of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts to sustain growth and  
1143 fermentation under winemaking conditions. *Food Microbiology*, 85, 103287.  
1144 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.103287>.

1145

1146 89. Sumbly, K. M., Bartle, L., Grbin, P. R., & Jiranek, V. (2019). Measures to improve wine  
1147 malolactic fermentation. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 103, 2033-2051.  
1148 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-018-09608-8>.

1149

1150 90. Tufariello, M., Capozzi, V., Spano, G., Cantele, G., Venerito, P., Mita, G., et al. (2020).  
1151 Effect of co-inoculation of *Candida zemplinina*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and  
1152 *Lactobacillus plantarum* for the industrial production of Negroamaro wine in Apulia  
1153 (Southern Italy). *Microorganisms*, 8(5), 726.  
1154 <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms8050726>.

1155

1156 91. Varela, C., Bartel, C., Espinase Nandorfy, D., Bilogrevic, E., Tran, T., Heinrich, T., et  
1157 al. (2021). Volatile aroma composition and sensory profile of Shiraz and Cabernet  
1158 Sauvignon wines produced with novel *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* yeast starter  
1159 cultures. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*, 27(3), 406-418.  
1160 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12484>.

1161

- 1162 92. Vilela, A. (2019). Use of Nonconventional Yeasts for Modulating Wine  
1163 Acidity. *Fermentation*, 5, 27. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation5010027>.  
1164
- 1165 93. Wang, S., Li, S., Zhao, H., Gu, P., Chen, Y., Zhang, B., et al., (2018). Acetaldehyde  
1166 released by *Lactobacillus plantarum* enhances accumulation of pyranoanthocyanins in  
1167 wine during malolactic fermentation. *Food Research International*, 108, 254–263.  
1168 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.03.032>.  
1169
- 1170 94. Wang, S. Y., Zhu, H. Z., Lan, Y. B., Liu, R. J., Liu, Y. R., Zhang, B. L., et al., (2020).  
1171 Modifications of phenolic compounds, biogenic amines, and volatile compounds in  
1172 Cabernet Gernishct wine through malolactic fermentation by *Lactobacillus plantarum*  
1173 and *Oenococcus oeni*. *Fermentation*, 6(1), 15.  
1174 <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation6010015>.  
1175
- 1176 95. Whitener, M. B., Stanstrup, J., Carlin, S., Divol, B., Du Toit, M., & Vrhovsek, U.  
1177 (2017). Effect of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts on the volatile chemical profile of Shiraz  
1178 wine. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*, 23(2), 179-192.  
1179 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12269>.  
1180
- 1181 96. Yan, G., Zhang, B., Joseph, L. & Qaterhouse, A. (2020). Effects of initial oxygenation  
1182 on chemical and aromatic composition of wine in mixed starters of *Hanseniaspora*  
1183 *vineae* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Food Microbiology*, 90, 10340.  
1184 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2020.103460>.  
1185
- 1186 97. Ženišová, K., Cabicarova, T., Sidari, R., Kolek, E., Pangallo, D., Szemes, T., et al.  
1187 (2021). Effects of co-fermentation with *Lachancea thermotolerans* or *Metschnikowia*  
1188 *pulcherrima* on concentration of aroma compounds in Pinot Blanc wine. *Journal of*  
1189 *Food & Nutrition Research*, 60(1), 87-91.

1190

1191 98. Zhang, B., Ivanova-Petropulos, V., Duan, C., & Yan, G. (2021). Distinctive chemical  
1192 and aromatic composition of red wines produced by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* co-  
1193 fermentation with indigenous and commercial non-*Saccharomyces* strains. *Food*  
1194 *Bioscience*, *41*, 100925. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbio.2021.100925>.

1195

1196 99. Zhang, B. Q., Luan, Y., Duan, C. Q., & Yan, G. L. (2018a). Use of *Torulaspora*  
1197 *delbrueckii* co-fermentation with two *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains with different  
1198 aromatic characteristic to improve the diversity of red wine aroma profile. *Frontiers in*  
1199 *Microbiology*, *9*, 606. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.00606>.

1200

1201 100. Zhang, B. Q., Shen, J. Y., Duan, C. Q., & Yan, G. L. (2018b). Use of indigenous  
1202 *Hanseniaspora vineae* and *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* co-fermentation with  
1203 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* to improve the aroma diversity of Vidal Blanc icewine.  
1204 *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *9*, 2303. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.02303>.

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209 **Figure Captions**

1210

1211 **Fig. 1** Wine mycobiota and their evolution during the various steps of wine production

1212

1213 **Fig. 2** Phenotypic traits of the commercial yeasts and lactic acid bacteria available for wine  
1214 production (except *Starmerella bacillaris*)

1215

1216 **Fig. 3** Factors affecting microorganisms interactions in wine

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237  
1238  
1239

**Table 1.** Summary of recent studies evaluating the influence of mixed fermentations with different non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* on wine composition

Species	Inoculation protocol	Trial conditions	Grape cultivar	Impact on chemical composition or sensory attributes	Reference
<i>Lachancea thermotolerans</i>	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 20-23°C - pH: 3.23 - Total SO <sub>2</sub> : 60 mg/L - Inoculation size: <i>L. thermotolerans</i> : 1 × 10 <sup>7</sup> cells/mL, <i>S. cerevisiae</i> 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL	Cabernet Sauvignon	- Increase in lactic acid - Increase in terpenes (linalool and geraniol)	Zhang et al., 2021
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 22 °C - pH: not reported - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> CFU/mL	Pinot Grigio	- Reduction in ethanol content - L-lactic acid production ranged from 0.53 to 4.42 g/L -- Decrease in fatty acids	Binati et al., 2020
	Co-inoculation and sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 18 °C - pH: 3.37 - Total SO <sub>2</sub> : not reported - Inoculation size: 5 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL	Emir	- Increase in total acidity Sequential fermentations: - Increase in n-propanol, acetaldehyde and decrease in esters and higher alcohols (except n-propanol) Co-inoculation: - Increase in isoamyl acetate	Balikci et al., 2016
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 25° C - pH: 3.8 - Total SO <sub>2</sub> : 60 mg/L - Inoculation size: 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> CFU/mL Malolactic fermentation: YES	Shiraz	- Increase in 2-methyl propanoic acid and some of its esters - Increase in esters (isoamyl lactate, acetic acid, butyl ester, butanoic acid, pentylester, 3-nonenic acid, ethyl ester, propanoic acid, and 2-hydroxy-, ethyl ester)	Whitener et al., 2017
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 20-23 °C - pH: 3.23 - Total SO <sub>2</sub> : 60 mg/L - Inoculation size: <i>T. delbrueckii</i> : 1 × 10 <sup>7</sup> cells/mL, <i>S. cerevisiae</i> 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL	Cabernet Sauvignon	- Decrease in acetic acid - Increase in 2-phenylethyl alcohol and esters	Zhang et al., 2021
	Co-inoculation and sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 18 °C - pH: 3.16 - Total SO <sub>2</sub> : 60 mg/L - Inoculation size: <i>T. delbrueckii</i> : 1 × 10 <sup>7</sup> cells/mL, <i>S. cerevisiae</i> 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL	Cabernet Sauvignon	- Decrease in acetic acid - Reduction in ethanol content from 0.05% to 0.82% (v/v) - Decrease in succinic acid - Decrease in fatty acids - Increase in Phenylethyl alcohol - Decrease in volatile phenols	Zhang et al., 2018a
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 20 °C	Verdejo	- Ethanol reduction content (0.52% (v/v))	Belda et al., 2017

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- pH: 3.42</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 1 × 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in glycerol</li> <li>- Increase in pyruvic acid (from 27 to 52 mg/L)</li> <li>- Decrease in acetic acid</li> <li>- Decrease in higher alcohols</li> <li>- Increase in 2- phenylethyl acetate and 2-phenyl-ethanol</li> <li>- Volatile thiols release (3-sulfanylhexas-1-ol and methyl-4-sulfanylpentan-2-one)</li> </ul>	
<i>Torulaspora delbrueckii</i>	Co-inoculation and sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 20 °C</li> <li>- pH: 3.42</li> <li>- Total SO<sub>2</sub>: 40 mg/kg</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 1 × 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Tempranillo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease in total acidity</li> <li>- Increase in pH (higher malic acid consumption)</li> <li>- Decrease in ethanol content</li> <li>- Increase in glycerol</li> <li>- Mannoproteins release</li> <li>- Decrease in higher alcohols</li> </ul>	Belda et al., 2015
	Co-inoculation and sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 24 °C</li> <li>- pH: 3.15</li> <li>- Total SO<sub>2</sub>: 60 mg/L</li> <li>-Inoculation size: <i>T. delbrueckii</i>: 2 × 10<sup>7</sup> cells/mL, <i>S. cerevisiae</i> 1 × 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Sauvignon Blanc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Volatile thiols release (3-Sulfanylhexas-1-ol and its acetate, 3-sulfanylhexyl acetate increase)</li> </ul>	Renault et al., 2016
	Co-inoculation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 22 °C</li> <li>- pH: 3.5</li> <li>-Total SO<sub>2</sub>: 10 mg/L</li> <li>- Inoculum ratio: 1:1, 3:1 T.d/S.c, 1:3 T.d/S.c (5 × 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL)</li> </ul>	Moscato Branco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in 2-Phenylethanol and ethyl esters (Ratio 3:1 NS/S)</li> <li>- Increase in acetaldehyde</li> <li>- Release of Linalyl acetate (Ratio 3:1 NS/S and 1:1 NS/S)</li> </ul>	Marcon et al., 2018
	Sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 16°C</li> <li>- pH: 3.0</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 10<sup>6</sup>-10<sup>7</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Pinot blank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease in ethanol content</li> <li>- Increase in 2-phenylethanol, diethyl succinate, phenylethyl acetate and 3-methylbutanoic acid</li> </ul>	Ženišová et al., 2021
	Co-inoculation and sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 16° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.35</li> <li>- High sugar content (400 g/L)</li> <li>- SO<sub>2</sub>: 80 mg/L</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 5 × 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Vidal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethanol reduction</li> <li>- Decrease in fatty acid ethyl esters</li> </ul>	Zhang et al., 2018b
	Sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 20 °C</li> <li>- pH: 3.31</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 1 × 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL</li> </ul>	Verdejo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease in ethanol content (0.6% v/v)</li> <li>- Decrease in acetaldehyde</li> <li>- Decrease in higher alcohols (increase on for phenylethanol)</li> <li>- Varietal thiols release (4-methyl ulfanylpentan-2-one)</li> </ul>	Ruiz et al., 2018

	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 22 °C - pH: not reported - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> CFU/mL	Pinot Grigio	- Increase in the esters and higher alcohols - Decrease in volatile phenols	Binati et al., 2020
<i>Metschnikowia pulcherrima</i>	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 22.5 °C - pH: not reported - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 5 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL	Chardonnay / Semillon blend	- Decrease in acetic and ethanol - Increase in ethanol and fumarate - Increase in acetate esters (mainly ethyl acetate, isoamyl acetate and phenylethyl acetate) - Increase in higher alcohols and monoterpenoids	Hranilovic et al., 2020
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 22.5 °C - pH: 3.5 - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 5 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL	Merlot	- Reduction in ethanol content from 1.0 to 1.1% (v/v) - Increase in total acidity - Decrease in pH - Increase in higher alcohols (1-Propanol, 2-Phenylethanol)	Aplin et al., 2021
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 16°C - pH: 3.0 - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 10 <sup>6</sup> -10 <sup>7</sup> CFU/mL	Pinot blank	- Increase in 2-phenylethanol and diethyl succinate - Decrease in acetaldehyde	Ženišová et al., 2021
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 20° C - pH: 3.90 (Shiraz), 3.88 (Cabernet Sauvignon) - Total SO <sub>2</sub> : 50 mg/L - Inoculation size: 5 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL - Malolactic fermentation: YES	Shiraz, Cabernet Sauvignon	Shiraz: - Increase in total esters carbon disulphide Cabernet Sauvignon: - Decrease in volatile acids and dimethyl sulphide - Increase in total esters	Varela et al., 2021
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 25° C - pH: 3.8 - SO <sub>2</sub> : 60 mg/L - Inoculation size: 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL - Malolactic fermentation: YES	Shiraz	- Increase in esters (butyl octanoate, isobutyl acetate, pentanoic acid, 4-methyl-, ethyl ester, hexanoic acid, 2-methylpropyl ester, 6-octen-1-ol, 3,7-dimethyl-, acetate, acetic acid, methyl ester, and cis-3-hexen-1-ol)	Whitener et al., 2017
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 20 °C - pH: 2.9 - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL	Riesling	- Malic acid degradation - Reduction in ethanol content - Increase in glycerol - Increase in ethyl hexanoate and ethyl octanoate	Dutraive et al., 2019
	Sequential	- Fermentation temperature: 25° C - pH: 3.8 - SO <sub>2</sub> : 60 mg/L - Inoculation size: 1 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells /mL - Malolactic fermentation: YES	Shiraz	- Increase in acetic acid - Increase in acetaldehyde, ester and butyl octanoate	Whitener et al., 2017

	Sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 20 °C</li> <li>- pH: 2.9</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Riesling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction in ethanol content</li> <li>- Increase in glycerol content</li> <li>- Increase in total esters (ethyl acetate, isoamyl acetate and 2-methyl butyl acetate, 2-Phenylethyl acetate)</li> <li>- Increase in higher alcohols (2-phenylethanol, 3-methyl-butanol and 2-methylbutanol)</li> <li>- Increase in valeric acid</li> </ul>	Dutraive et al., 2019
	Simultaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 24 °C</li> <li>- pH: 3.5</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 2 x 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Pinot noir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in esters (ethyl acetate, isobutyl acetate, isoamyl acetate, hexyl acetate, benzyl acetate, 2-phenylethyl acetate, ethyl hexanoate and ethyl octanoate)</li> <li>- Increase in higher alcohols (isobutyl alcohol, isoamyl alcohol, benzyl alcohol)</li> <li>- Increase in volatile fatty acids (isobutyric acid, hexanoic acid)</li> </ul>	Hu et al., 2022
<i>Pichia kluyveri</i>	Sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 22 °C</li> <li>- pH: not reported</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 1.0 × 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL</li> </ul>	Pinot Grigio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction in ethanol content</li> <li>- Increase in glycerol (average value 5.83 g/L)</li> <li>- Decrease in acetaldehyde</li> <li>- Decrease in fatty acids</li> <li>- Increase in production of nerol, benzyl alcohol and (E)-3-hexen-1-ol</li> </ul>	Binati et al., 2020
	Sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 25° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.8</li> <li>- SO<sub>2</sub>: 60 mg/L</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 1 × 10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL</li> <li>Malolactic fermentation: YES</li> </ul>	Shiraz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Terpens release (linalool and geraniol amount increase)</li> <li>- Increase in δ -valerolactone and pentolactone as well as 2-hexenoic acid and 2-hexanoic acid, ethyl ester</li> </ul>	Whitener et al., 2017
	Co-inoculation and sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 25° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.44</li> <li>- Total SO<sub>2</sub>: 30 mg/L</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 10<sup>6</sup>- 10<sup>7</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Kotsifali and Mandilar (3:1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction in ethanol content</li> <li>- Increase in glycerol</li> <li>- Increase in ethyl esters (ethyl octanoate, 2-Phenylethyl acetate, Hexyl acetate)</li> <li>- Decrease in higher alcohols</li> </ul>	Nisiotou et al., 2018
<i>Starmerella bacillaris</i>	Sequential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 20° C</li> <li>- pH: Chardonnay 3.99, Muscat 3.81, Riesling 3.82, Sauvignon blanc 3.56</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub>: addition</li> <li>-Inoculation size: 5 x 10<sup>6</sup>- 10<sup>7</sup> cells/mL</li> </ul>	Chardonnay, Muscat, Riesling and Sauvignon blanc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction in ethanol content</li> <li>- Increase in glycerol</li> <li>- Decrease in acetic acid</li> <li>- Increase in higher alcohols and esters in Sauvignon blanc (ethyl octanoate and ethyl decanoate)</li> <li>- Increase 2-Phenylethanol in Riesling and Sauvignon blanc</li> </ul>	Englezos et al., 2018

				- Decrease in esters in Chardonnay and Muscat Increase - Decrease in terpenes - Increase in 3-mercapto-1-hexanol (3MH)	
	Co-inoculation	- Fermentation temperature: 25° C - pH: 3.52 - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition -Inoculation size: <i>Starm. bacillaris</i> 1 x 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL, <i>S. cerevisiae</i> : 1 x 10 <sup>4</sup> cells/mL	Negroamaro	- Increase in glycerol - Increase in terpenes	Truffariello et al., 2020
	Sequential	-Fermentation temperature: 28° C -pH: 3.4 -No SO <sub>2</sub> addition -Inoculation size: <i>Starm. bacillaris</i> 1 x 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL, <i>S. cerevisiae</i> : 1 x 10 <sup>4</sup> CFU/mL	Sangiovese	- Reduction in ethanol content - Increase in glycerol content - Decrease in anthocyanins and flavan-3-ols - Increase in Vitisin A and Vitisin B	Mangani et al., 2020

1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258

**Table 2.** Summary of recent studies evaluating the influence of lactic acid bacteria on wine composition

Species	Inoculation protocol	Trial conditions	Must/wine	Quality advantages	References
<i>Oenococcus oeni</i>	After AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 21° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.73</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 5 x 10<sup>7</sup> CFU/mL</li> <li>- Malic acid: 2 g/L</li> <li>- Ethanol: 14.5% (v/v)</li> <li>- Malic acid: 2.00 g/L</li> </ul>	Pinot noir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in colour intensity and redness</li> <li>- Increase in procyanidin</li> <li>- Increase in esters (ethyl hexanoate, ethyl octanoate and ethyl cinnamate)</li> <li>- Increase in octanoic and n-decanoic fatty acids</li> <li>- Increase in 4-ethyl phenol</li> <li>- Increase in vanillin</li> </ul>	Brizuela et al., 2021
	After AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 21° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.52</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 3 × 10<sup>7</sup> CFU/mL</li> <li>- Ethanol: 13.3 % (v/v)</li> <li>- L-malic acid: 3.17 g/L</li> </ul>	Tempranillo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in acetate and ethyl esters (isoamyl acetate, phenylethyl acetate, ethyl hexanoate, ethyl octanoate, ethyl decanoate)</li> <li>- Increase in ethyl succinate and ethyl lactate</li> <li>- Increase in terpenes (linalool, α-Terpineol, citronellol and nerolidol)</li> </ul>	Diez-Ozaeta et al., 2021
	After AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 23° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.46</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 10<sup>8</sup> CFU/mL</li> <li>- Ethanol: 12.5 % (v/v)</li> <li>- L-malic acid: 2.51 g/L</li> </ul>	Cabernet Gernischt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease in phenolic compounds</li> <li>- Production of caffeic acid and 4-hydroxycinnamic acid</li> <li>- Production of ethyl lactate and isoamyl lactate</li> <li>- Accumulation of 3,4-dimethylbenzaldehyde</li> <li>- Accumulation of linalool and α-terpineol accumulation</li> </ul>	Wang et al., 2020
	Co-inoculation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 22° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.7</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 1 x 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL</li> <li>- Ethanol: 15.0 % (v/v)</li> <li>- L-malic acid: 1.91 g/L</li> </ul>	Tinto Fino (Tempranillo)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prevention of the increase of histamine values during wine aging</li> </ul>	Pérez-Magariño et al., 2021
	After 24h from the beginning of AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 23° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.32</li> <li>- SO<sub>2</sub> addition: 30 mg/L</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 1 x 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL</li> <li>- Malic acid: 1.85 g/L</li> </ul>	Barbera	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease of yellow/blue coordinate (b*) and increase of red/green coordinate (a*)</li> </ul>	Englezos et al., 2019a
<i>Lactiplantibacillus plantarum</i>	Co-inoculation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fermentation temperature: 25° C</li> <li>- pH: 3.52</li> <li>- No SO<sub>2</sub> addition</li> <li>- Inoculation size: 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL</li> <li>- Malic acid: 2.17 g/L</li> </ul>	Negroamaro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in higher alcohols (1-Hexanol, phenylethanol, benzyl alcohol)</li> <li>- Production of ethyl lactate and diethyl succinate</li> </ul>	Truffariello et al., 2020

		- Ethanol: 12.1 % (v/v)			
	After AF	- Fermentation temperature: 21° C - pH: 3.73 - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 5 x 10 <sup>7</sup> CFU/mL - Malic acid: 2 g/L - Ethanol: 14.5 % (v/v)	Pinot noir	- Increase in neutral polysaccharides - Increase in procyanidin - Increase in esters (diethyl succinate and ethyl cinnamate) - Increase in β -citronellol - Increase in 2-phenylethyl alcohol - Increase in vanillin	Brizuela et al., 2021
	After AF	- Fermentation temperature: 23° C - pH: 3.46 - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 1 x 10 <sup>8</sup> CFU/mL - Malic acid: 3.5 g/L - Ethanol: 12.5% (v/v)	Cabernet Gernischt	wine color stabilization: - Increase in pyranoanthocyanins increase - Decrease in total anthocyanins - Vitisin B release - b* and H* values decrease	Wang et al., 2018
	After AF	- Fermentation temperature: 23° C - pH: 3.46 - No SO <sub>2</sub> addition - Inoculation size: 10 <sup>8</sup> CFU/mL - Ethanol: 12.5 % (v/v) - L-malic acid: 2.51 g/L	Cabernet Gernischt	- Decrease in phenolic compounds - Decrease in biogenic amines reduction (strain dependent) - Release of 2-hydroxyisovaleric acid ethyl ester - Increase in esters (isoamyl hexanoate) - Production of ethyl lactate and isoamyl lactate - Accumulation of ((E)-3-hexen-1-ol, 2-nonanol and 2,3-butanediol) - Release of 4-ethylphenol	Wang et al., 2020

1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274

1275 **Table 3.** Factors affecting microorganisms interactions in wine

1276

<b>Challenges<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Opportunities<sup>a</sup></b>
Further investigate the interaction mechanisms among wine microorganisms	Control the fermentation process and greater management of specific microorganisms
Integrate the knowledge of microbial dynamics and their impact on wine	Modulate specific metabolites concentration
Explore the potential of omics-based technologies in wine production	Omics could help to better predict the behavior of microorganisms during fermentation
Produce wines with less SO <sub>2</sub> by using bioprotective microorganisms	Fulfil consumer demands for wines free of chemical additives which are considered negative for health
Accessing low SO <sub>2</sub> addition to microbial interactions	

1277 <sup>a</sup>Ciani et al., 2016, Di Gianvito et al., 2022, Liu et al., 2017, Siren et al., 2019.

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289





