Relationship between agronomic parameters, phenolic composition of grape skin and texture properties of Vitis vinifera L. cv. Tempranillo.

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

Relationship between agronomic parameters, phenolic composition of grape skin and texture properties of *Vitis vinifera* L. cv. Tempranillo

Ignacio García-Estévez[a], Paula Andrés-García[a], Cristina Alcalde-Eon[a], Simone Giacosa[b], Luca Rolle[b], Julián C. Rivas-Gonzalo[a], Natalia Quijada-Morín[a] and M. Teresa Escribano-Bailon[a*]

[a]*Grupo de Investigación en Polifenoles (GIP), Unidad de Nutrición y Bromatología, Facultad de Farmacia, Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain*

[b]*Dipartimento di Scienze Agrarie, Forestali e Alimentari, Università degli Studi di Torino, Grugliasco (TO), Italy*

**corresponding author: M. Teresa Escribano-Bailón: Tel: +34 923294537; Fax: + 34 923294515; E-mail: escriban@usal.es*

Abstract

The relationship between the agronomic parameters of grapevine and the phenolic composition of skin of *Vitis vinifera* L. cv. Tempranillo grapes was assessed. Physical and mechanical properties of berries and their skins were also determined and correlated to the chemical composition. Results showed a significant negative correlation between grapevine vigor-related parameters (such as leaf area and bunch weight) and anthocyanin composition, whereas the percentage (*w/w*) of seeds was negatively correlated with the amount of flavanols of grape skins. Texture properties of grape skins also showed an important relationship with chemical composition. Berry hardness showed a negative correlation with the coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives but it was positively correlated to skin flavanic composition. Moreover, significant regressions with high coefficients of determination were found between phenolic composition and grapevine vigor-related and texture variables, thus pointing out that these parameters might be useful for estimating phenolic composition of grape skins.

Keywords: phenolics, anthocyanins, flavanols, Tempranillo red grapes, HPLC-DAD-MS^n, grapevine vigor, mechanical properties

Introduction

Important wine organoleptic properties as color, bitterness and astringency are strongly influenced by the phenolic composition of grapes, which, in turn, also provides important information about the ageing potential of wines.[1] Anthocyanins, which are extracted from grape skins, are the main responsibles for wine color. In grapes, not only the monoglucosides of anthocyanidins are present, but also the acetyl, caffeoyl and *p*-coumaroyl derivatives and even other unusual glycoside-derivatives, such as galactosides.[2] In Tempranillo cultivar, monoglucosides are the main anthocyanins and acetic acid and *p*-coumaric acid are the most common acids esterifying the glucose moiety.[3] Although monoglucosides of anthocyanidins are the major pigments, acyl derivatives can play an important role in wine color stability since acylation can be related to an increase of the anthocyanidin stability against light, temperature or pH changes.[4] Moreover, the presence of a cinnamic acid, such as *p*-coumaric or caffeic acid, in the structure can favor intramolecular copigmentation processes, and, as a consequence, changes in anthocyanin color in comparison with the original non-acylated pigment.[5]

Flavanols are related to wine astringency and bitterness,[6] although they can also play an important role in long-term color stability.[7] Grape flavanols slightly differ in their structure and in their organoleptic properties according to their origin. Flavanols from grape seed derive from (epi)catechin and show higher levels of galloylation, whereas grape skin contain both catechins and gallocatechins and the corresponding derived proanthocyanidins.[8, 9] Furthermore, flavanol galloylation has been associated with more tannic and coarse notes in wine,[10] whereas higher levels of prodelphinidins in wines have as a consequence a reduction of these negative perceptions.[11] Moreover,

Kennedy[12] has pointed out that winemakers prefer winemaking procedures leading to an increase of flavanol levels from skins and to a less extraction from seeds.

Accumulation of phenolic compounds in red grapes takes place gradually during ripening[13] and their content at harvest time considerably depends on cultivar, agronomical practices, canopy microclimate, and bunch exposure.[14-16] It has been reported in literature that as vine vigor decreased, total soluble solid in grapes, total phenolics and anthocyanin content in wines increased.[17, 18] In particular, Cortell and co-workers[19] have reported greater anthocyanin accumulation in the low-vigor grapevines and significant increases in skin flavanol contents in berries harvested from zones with a reduction in vine vigor. However, it seems that vine vigor has not a significant influence on the flavanol concentration in seeds.[20] Furthermore, although grapevine vigor is mainly related to climatic conditions, it has been documented the occurrence of important differences in grapevine vigor even for an established vineyard with identical grape variety, age, and vineyard management practices. These differences have been related to variations in topography, physical and chemical characteristics of the soil.[20-22] As a result, it could be found within the same vineyard important differences on the levels of acids, anthocyanins, and phenolics that can lead to variations on composition and quality of wines.[23, 24]

The numerous physiological and chemical changes that grape berries undergo during grape ripening induce not only modifications on their chemical composition but also in their texture features.[25] These textural modifications have been studied through the evaluation of the grape mechanical properties, which in turn, have been correlated to grape quality.[26, 27] A strong relationship between texture parameters and phenolic ripeness degree and grape variety has been reported.[28-30] In addition, these textural parameters have been demonstrated to be an useful tool to study phenolic extractability

from grape skins.[31] However, the studies in literature about the relationship between grapevine-related characteristics, berry mechanical properties and phenolic composition of grapes are scarce.

Due to the importance of phenolic compounds for wine organoleptic properties, phenolic composition has to be taken into account for the selection of harvest date. However, the harvest date is traditionally and chiefly selected based on the technological maturity of grapes, which is related to sugar concentration of grapes and therefore determines the alcohol content of wine. Nevertheless, the environmental and climatic conditions may cause technological maturity to be reached before phenolic maturity, and it seems that global climate change is going to increase this delay,[32] making even more difficult to choose the appropriate harvest date in order to obtain high quality wines. For this reason, the knowledge about detailed phenolic composition of grapes can be helpful to establish strategies for harvest planning.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the usefulness of parameters related to grapevine vigor and grape texture as indicative tools of the grape skin phenolic composition. Specifically, the main objective of this work was to study the relationship between the phenolic composition of *Vitis vinifera* L. cv. Tempranillo grape skins and the vigor-related grapevine characteristics. In addition, the relation between texture properties of the berries and their phenolic composition has also been assessed.

Materials and Methods

Samples

Thirteen different locations of a vineyard (100 ha) located in Zamora, Spain (coordinates 41°18'26"N 5°21'45"W), were selected based on different orographic terrain features, such as orientation, altitude and slope. For each location, all the grapes (*Vitis vinifera* L. cv Tempranillo) from two different grapevines were collected. All

grape samples were collected in the same day at harvest time. Grape samples consisted of 300 berries randomly-selected from all collected grapes.

Analysis of phenolic composition

Skins were manually separated from berries and extracted following Ferrer-Gallego and co-workers.[33] The detailed phenolic composition of grape skins (mg/g of skin) was analyzed by means of HPLC-DAD-MS. Grape-skin extracts were directly analyzed for determining anthocyanin composition whereas it was fractionated as explained bellow before analysis of flavanols. In both cases, HPLC analyses were performed in a Hewlett–Packard 1200 Series HPLC (Agilent Technologies, Waldbronn, Germany). Mass spectrometry was carried out using an API 3200 Qtrap equipped with an ESI source and a triple-quadrupole linear ion trap mass analyzer that was controlled by Analyst 5.1 software (Applied Biosystems, Darmstadt, Germany). All the analyses were performed in triplicate.

Anthocyanin composition was determined by using the methodology described by Alcalde-Eon and co-workers.[3] Twenty-three different anthocyanins were identified and quantified, and grouped into eleven variables depending on the type of anthocyanidin and on the type of anthocyanin derivative (see **Table 1**). Quantification was performed by HPLC-DAD using external calibration curves of standards of 3-*O*-glucosides of delphinidin, cyanidin, petunidin, peonidin and malvidin, purchased from Extrasynthèse (Lyon, France). Each determined anthocyanin was quantified using the calibration curve of the corresponding anthocyanin monoglucoside.

In order to analyze flavanols and phenolic acids, grape-skin extracts were fractionated prior to HPLC-DAD-MS analysis with the objective of eliminating the anthocyanins. Fractionation was carried out according to the procedure described by González-Manzano and co-workers for wine samples.[34] Chromatographic analysis was

performed following the methodology reported by Ferrer-Gallego and co-workers.[10] Detection was carried out at 280 nm (proanthocyanidins) and 330 nm (phenolic acids) as the preferred wavelengths. Quantification was performed by HPLC-DAD using external calibration curves of purchased standards, unless standards of dimeric and trimeric procyanidins which were isolated in our laboratory as described by González-Manzano and co-workers.[34] Nineteen different flavanols were determined and grouped into twelve variables depending on the type of flavanol and the polymerization degree (see Table 1). The calibration curves of catechin, dimeric procyanidin and trimeric procyanidin were employed for quantifying catechin and epicatechin, dimeric procyanidins and trimers and tetramers of procyanidins respectively. Galloylated procyanidins were quantified using the epicatechin 3-*O*-gallate calibration curve, whereas gallocatechins and prodelphinidins were quantified using the gallocatechin calibration curve. Two hydroxybenzoic acids and eleven hydroxycinnamic acids and their tartaric esters or glucosidic derivatives were determined and grouped into seven variables (see Table 1). Hydroxybenzoic acids and hydroxycinnamic acids were quantified using the gallic acid and *p*-coumaric acid calibration curves respectively.

Biophysical and technological variables

Eight different biophysical variables were studied (see Table 1), which were also determined at harvest time for each grapevine selected. Data are the average of the values determined for the two grapevines of the same location. Leaf area (m^2) was the total leaf area of grapevine. In order to calculate this value, the number of long, medium-length and short vine shoot of each grapevine was determined. Considering that long vine shoots have in average 20 knots with 4 big-size leafs each one, whereas medium-long ones have 12 knots with 3 medium-size leafs each one and short vine shoots have 8 knots with 2 small-size leafs each one, the total number of leafs of each

size could be calculated. The average area of each kind of leaf was determined from the area of 10 leafs of each size, which was used to calculate the total leaf area. The grape production (kg) was the total weight of bunches of each grapevine. The average weight of bunches was calculated as the average of the weight of all bunches collected from the same grapevine. The average weight of berries was calculated from the weight of 50 different berries collected from the same grapevine. Moreover, the percentage (*w/w*) that skin and seeds represented in berry weight was also measured after manual separation of skin and seeds from berries. Grapevines were also pruned after leaf fall allowing us to calculate the weight of fresh wood. The pruned wood was then dried for 72 h at 60ºC and the weight of dried wood was determined.

ºBrix and pH were directly measured in the grape must by using an optical refractometer and a pH-meter, respectively. Titratable acidity was calculated after acid-base titration of must employing NaOH 0.1 M and expressed as tartaric acid equivalents (g/L).[35]

Instrumental mechanical properties

The mechanical properties of the berries were assessed following Letaief and co-workers methods.[36] A whole-berry texture profile analysis (TPA) double-compression test was carried out at a test speed of 1 mm/s until 25% of sample deformation (2 seconds waiting time between compressions), with the hardness (N), gumminess (N) and chewiness (mJ) parameters calculated from the force-distance curve.[36] Berry skin break force (F_{sk}, N) was evaluated with a puncture test on the intact berry performed at a test speed of 1 mm/s until 3 mm of sample deformation,[36] while the berry skin thickness (Sp_{sk}, μm) was assessed with a 0.2 mm/s compression of a piece of skin using a 2-mm flat cylindrical probe.[36] These parameters were determined analyzing 30 randomly selected berries collected from the two grapevines of each location.

Statistical analysis

Principal component analysis (PCA) was used for data analysis as unsupervised pattern recognition method. The data matrix was constituted by the values determined for all the 46 variables described in Table 1 for each selected location. Correlation analyses were carried out and Pearson's coefficient and the two-tailed *p*-value were obtained. Backward stepwise multiple linear regression (MLR) was performed in order to assess the relation between phenolic composition and the rest of variables. The coefficient of determination (R^2) and the signification (*p*-value, bilateral) of the built models were studied. The software package IBM® SPSS® Statistics v. 21.0 (IBM, Armonk (NY), USA) was used for data processing.

Results and Discussion

Study of correlations

Principal component analysis was conducted as unsupervised pattern recognition in order to observe relationships between biophysical, technological and texture variables and those related to phenolic composition. Fig. 1 shows the projection of the samples on the plane defined by the first and second principal components and also the corresponding loadings plot. The first principal component (PC1) describes 44.15% of the variability and the second principal component (PC2) describes 16.93% of the variability. As can be seen in Fig. 1a, the distribution of samples into the score plot did not show any important grouping, thus pointing out to the important differences among the selected grapevines (see also Table 1 in Supporting Information), which will allow us to study possible correlations between the variables employed. Fig. 1b shows the variables on the loadings plot. It can be observed that there is a strong opposition along PC1 between flavanol composition of grape skins and some of the biophysical variables studied, such as leaf area (*Leaf_area*), the average weight of bunch (*Bunch_weight*), the

weight of fresh (*Fresh_wood*) and dry wood (*Dry_wood*) and the percentage (*w/w*) of seeds in total grape weight (*Perc_seed*). This latter variable also showed a clear negative relationship with the total anthocyanin content (*Anthoc*). Hence, it seems that it might be a negative relationship between the biophysical features of grapevine determined in this work and the phenolic composition of grapes. In the same way, the acyl derivatives of anthocyanins [mainly the coumaroyl derivatives (*Coumar*)] showed high negative values in PC2, in contrast to texture variables and leaf area, which showed high positive values in this PC. Thus, there also may be a negative relationship not only between the composition on anthocyanin acyl derivatives of grapes and their texture properties but also between the levels of these compounds and the biophysical features of grapevine. Moreover, from the low loading values obtained for Brix degree in PC1 and in PC2 (lower than 0.45 and higher than -0.08 respectively), it seems that this variable barely contribute to explain sample variability. This could be related to similarities on the sugar content (ºBrix) of analyzed grapes (see Table 1 in Supporting Information), which would indicate that all samples were collected at a similar status of technological maturity. However, phenolic composition is crucial for samples differentiation, which may point out important differences on the phenolic maturity of collected samples. These results indicate that grapes collected from the same vineyard at a similar status of technological maturity can show important differences on phenolic ripeness. These differences, as it will be explained bellow, can be related to differences on grapevine vigor.

In order to assess the significance of these relationships, the correlation between all variables employed in the study was investigated by means of the Pearson's coefficients and its significance. Table 2 shows the most important significant correlations between the phenolic composition of grape skins and the rest of variables employed in this study.

The phenolic composition did not show any significant correlations with the percentage (*w/w*) of skins (data not shown). However, they corroborate the negative relationship between the percentage (*w/w*) of seeds in relation to the whole grape (*Perc_seed*) and the flavanic composition of grape skins indicated in the PCA plotting (Fig. 1b). This is in accordance with studies in literature which have reported that skin weight was not a determining factor for anthocyanin potential of the berries, but that seeds weight seemed to significantly affect the grape composition.[37] All variables related to flavanic composition showed high negative coefficients of Pearson with *Perc_seed* variable. Among them, the total content of flavanols (*PAC*), as well as the total content of procyanidins (*PC*) and prodelphinidins (*PD*) showed Pearson's coefficients lower than -0.76. Moreover, these correlations are highly significant ($p<0.01$). Thus, it seems that the heavier the seed, the lower amounts of flavanols in the skins. It might be possible that synthesis of flavanols in seeds and in skin could be competitive, and that the highest weight of the seed reflects higher synthesis rate of flavanols in this part of the berry, at the expense of the synthesis in the grape skin. This negative correlation is also observed between total hydroxybenzoic acids content in grape skin and the percentage (*w/w*) of seeds. Since one of the two hydroxybenzoic acids (the major one) found in the skin is gallic acid, and this acid is also found in grape seeds, this negative correlation might be also due to the same reason that those proposed for flavanols.

Total leaf area of grapevine also correlates negatively with phenolic composition of grape skin. Anthocyanin compounds presented the highest negative Pearson's coefficients. Malvidin derivatives (*Mv*) and the acyl-derived anthocyanins (*Acyl*) levels were the most strongly correlated to leaf area. The acyl-derived, and, in particular, the coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives (*Coumar*), also showed a strong negative relationship with the weight of wood pruned from the grapevine (*Fresh_wood* and

241 *Dry_wood*). These two variables, together with leaf area, could be related to vine vigor.
242 Our results are consistent with those recently reported by Song and co-workers[17] that
243 have found that as vine vigor decreased, total soluble solid in grapes and total phenolics
244 and anthocyanins in wines increased, thus pointing out a negative relationship between
245 vine vigor and grape phenolic composition. Moreover, vine vigor could be related to the
246 grapevine water availability that in turn seems to affect the composition of grapes since
247 an excess in water conditions has demonstrated to be more negative for anthocyanin
248 contents than strong deficit conditions.[37]

249 It could also be observed (Table 2) a significant negative relationship between the
250 average weight of bunches (*Bunch_weight*) and the monoglucoside (*Monoglc*) and total
251 anthocyanin (*Antoc_total*) contents. Moreover, the level of anthocyanin caffeoyl
252 derivatives is also strongly correlated ($r=-0.666$, $p<0.05$) to average weight of berries
253 (*Berry_weight*). Therefore it seems that the heavier the bunches and berries were, the
254 lower levels of anthocyanins (both total, monoglucoside and caffeoyl derivatives) the
255 skins and, consequently, the berries showed. These results are in accordance to those
256 reported in literature showing that the total anthocyanin content (mg/berry) and
257 anthocyanin concentration (mg/kg of berries and in mg/g of skin) were dependent on
258 berry mass variation.[38] Likewise, it seems that the berries in which seeds accounted for
259 a higher weight percentage (*Perc_seed*) show lower levels of monoglucosides, since a
260 significant negative correlation ($r=-0.600$, $p<0.05$) between these two variables was
261 observed. It has been reported that berry weight is more related to seed weight than to
262 skin and flesh weight,[37, 38] so this might explain why both *Berry_weight* and *Perc_seed*
263 variables showed a relationship with anthocyanin composition whereas no-relation were
264 found with *Perc_skin* variable. These correlations between physical features of berries
265 and its phenolic composition might be explained because grape development occurs in

two main stages. The first stage, comprising the flowering and green berry stages, and maybe even prior to that, during differentiation of the primordia,[39] seems critical in determining berry weight.[38] However, anthocyanin and sugars accumulation takes place in a second stage, from veraison to harvest. Thus, if the first stages were the most important, bunches, berries and seeds could be heavier but grapes may show lower levels of anthocyanins.

Finally, it was also observed a strong negative correlation between the texture features of grape and its phenolic composition. In particular the berry skin break force (F_{sk}) and the levels of anthocyanidin-coumaroylglucosides ($r=-0.635$, $p<0.05$) and of total acyl-derived anthocyanin ($r=-0.589$, $p<0.05$) are negatively correlated (Table 2). These results are in accordance with those reported by Giacosa and co-workers[40] who have observed on Shiraz grapes significant lower values of F_{sk} in berries showing higher levels of coumaroyl-anthocyanins derivatives in its composition. These results are also consistent with other studies available in literature pointing out to the potential of the mechanical properties of berry skin (such as F_{sk} and Sp_{sk}) to predict the anthocyanin extractability.[29, 31] Moreover, it has also been reported that cell-wall composition affects the anthocyanin extraction, in particular, the presence of higher amounts of glucose, rhamnose, 2-*O*-methylxylose and lignin in the cell-wall composition would prevent anthocyanin extraction from grape skin.[41] Considering this, there might be a relationship between the cell-wall composition and the levels of coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives that may be explained by a possible interaction between the acyl-derived anthocyanins and some components of grape cell-wall, which in turn may determine the texture features of grapes. Further studies about the cell-wall and phenolic composition and texture features of berry skin must be carried out to assess this possibility.

Moreover, it has been observed a significant positive correlation between berry hardness and its flavanic composition. It is worth noting the strong correlation between this texture parameter and the level of gallocatechin and epigallocatechin ($r=0.699$, $p<0.01$, Table 2). Thus, it seems that berry hardness might be indicative of the levels of flavanols in berry skin. Rio Segade and co-workers[30] has reported that break force and thickness of berry skin can be considered mechanical properties adequate for the estimation of the degradability of the skin cell-wall. Degradation is related to the changes in the structure of cell-wall by depolymerisation and formation of new cross-linking bridges,[42] and to changes in its composition by loss of galactose, and other pectic sugars such as arabinose and rhamnose.[30, 43, 44] Considering that these texture parameters could be related to cell-wall composition, the correlation found between flavanic composition and berry hardness might be explained, as in the case of acyl-derived anthocyanin, by a specific interaction of flavanols with some cell-wall components. In fact, Ruiz-García and co-workers[45] have pointed out that pectic polysaccharides have an important binding-affinity for flavanols, whereas cellulose, due to a low porosity, showed less affinity for these compounds. Thus, both higher levels of flavanols and higher values of hardness of berry might be related to higher levels of cellulose in cell-wall. However, further specific studies about the relationship between cell-wall composition and texture features of berries must be carried out to assess this possibility.

Regression studies

Considering the aforementioned correlations, different multiple linear regressions (MLR) were carried out to assess the influence of biophysical, technological and texture variables employed in this work on the phenolic composition of grape skin. Backward-stepwise strategy was employed for MLR, in which all the considered variables were

used at the start of the process and then the least significant one is removed at each step. The model is refitted after each step including only the most significant variables. First, due to the correlation found between the amount of coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives and the texture parameters that pointed out a possible relationship between these compounds and cell-wall composition, the variable *Coumar* was selected as dependent variable whereas the biophysical, technological and texture variables described in Table 1 were used as independent variables. Among all the variables considered, only the dry weight of pruned wood (*Dry_wood*), the berry skin break force (F_{sk}) and the berry skin thickness (Sp_{sk}) were considered statistically significant ($p<0.05$) in the fitted final model. The value of the coefficient of determination (R^2), the non-standardized coefficients (B) and the standardized coefficients (β) were obtained. The coefficient of determination ($R^2=0.856$) indicates that the proposed model explains the 85.6% of the variability of the levels of coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives, which supposed a good fit to the data. Table 3 shows the values of the regression constant and of the β parameter for each variable, which could be considered the best estimation about its contribution to the model. As can be observed in the study of correlations, these three variables (*Dry_wood*, F_{sk} and Sp_{sk}) showed a negative relationship with the levels of coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives. The most important variable in the study was *Dry_wood* (β=-0.741), thus indicating out the importance of grapevine vigor in the levels of these anthocyanin-type compounds in grapes.

Considering the important role of flavanols in some organoleptic properties of wines such as astringency or color, MLR was also performed using the levels of total flavanols (*PAC*) as dependent variable and the biophysical, technological and texture variables described in Table 1 as independent variables. Table 3 shows the result of fitting. The proposed model explained 82.9% of the variability of total flavanol levels ($R^2=0.829$),

340 which indicates the goodness of data fitting. As can be observed in Table 3, the
341 percentage (*w/w*) of seeds and leaf area showed a negative relationship whereas berry
342 hardness showed a positive relationship with flavanol content. The most important
343 variable in this model is the percentage (*w/w*) of seeds, thus pointing out the importance
344 of seed size on the flavanic composition of grape skins.
345 The proposed models indicated that there is a strong relationship between the
346 biophysical parameters of grapevine (mostly vine vigor represented by leaf area, dry
347 weight of pruned wood and seed weight), the texture features (evaluated as instrumental
348 mechanical properties) of berries and the phenolic composition of grape skins. Although
349 this study has been carried out only in one vintage; we have chosen a vineyard large
350 enough to have important differences on orographic terrain features. This could be
351 observed in the PCA and also in the high variability of variables that have been used in
352 this work (see Table 1 in Supporting Information). Thus, the results here presented set
353 an important precedent since they establish the importance of agronomic parameters and
354 texture properties for estimating phenolic composition of grape skins. However further
355 studies involving different vineyards, grape cultivars and different vintages must be
356 done in order to corroborate the quantitative relationship between these variables.
357 In conclusion, the results obtained pointed out an important relationship between
358 phenolic composition of grape skin, biophysical features of grapevines and berry texture
359 properties. Anthocyanin composition showed significant negative correlation with
360 grapevine vigor-related parameters (such as leaf area and bunch weight), whereas the
361 amount of flavanols of grape skins was negatively correlated with the percentage (*w/w*)
362 of seeds. Moreover, the phenolic composition is also correlated to some mechanical
363 properties of grapes. Berry skin break force showed a negative correlation with the
364 coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives, whereas berry hardness was positively correlated to

365 flavanic composition. Thus, it could be proposed a relationship between both acyl-
366 derived anthocyanins and flavanols and grape cell-wall composition. A significant
367 regression was found between coumaroyl-anthocyanin derivatives and some biophysical
368 (weight of pruned wood) and texture (berry skin break force and berry skin thickness)
369 variables. Likewise, a significant regression was also found between flavanol levels and
370 the percentage (w/w) of seeds, leaf area and berry hardness. These results pointed out
371 that grapevine vigor-related and texture parameters might be useful for estimating
372 phenolic composition of grape skins.

373 **Supporting Information description**

374 Supporting Information Available: Minimum, maximum, average values and coefficient
375 of variation of all the variables employed in this study. This material is available free of
376 charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

377 **References**

378 1. Moreno-Arribas, M. V.; Polo, M. C. *Wine Chemistry and Biochemistry*. Springer
379 Science: New York (NY, USA), 2009.
380 2. Alcalde-Eon, C.; Escribano-Bailón, M. T.; Santos-Buelga, C.; Rivas-Gonzalo, J. C.
381 Changes in the detailed pigment composition of red wine during maturity and ageing -
382 A comprehensive study. *Anal. Chim. Acta* **2006**, *563*, 238-254.
383 3. Alcalde-Eon, C.; García-Estévez, I.; Ferreras-Charro, R.; Rivas-Gonzalo, J. C.;
384 Ferrer-Gallego, R.; Escribano-Bailón, M. T. Adding oenological tannin vs. overripe
385 grapes: Effect on the phenolic composition of red wines. *J. Food Comp. Anal.* **2014**, *34*,
386 99-113.
387 4. He, F.; Liang, N.-N.; Mu, L.; Pan, Q.-H.; Wang, J.; Reeves, M. J.; Duan, C.-Q.
388 Anthocyanins and their variation in red wines I. Monomeric anthocyanins and their
389 color expression. *Molecules* **2012**, *17*, 1571-1601.
390 5. Dangles, O.; Saito, N.; Brouillard, R. Anthocyanin intramolecular copigment effect.
391 *Phytochemistry* **1993**, *34*, 119-124.
392 6. Gawel, R. Red wine astringency: a review. *Aust. J. Grape Wine Res.* **1998**, *4*, 74-95.
393 7. Somers, T. C. Polymeric nature of wine pigments. *Phytochemistry* **1971**, *10*, 2175-
394 2186.
395 8. Kennedy, J. A.; Hayasaka, Y.; Vidal, S.; Waters, E. J.; Jones, G. P. Composition of
396 grape skin proanthocyanidins at different stages of berry development. *J. Agric. Food*
397 *Chem.* **2001**, *49*, 5348-5355.

9. Escribano-Bailón, M. T.; Guerra, M. T.; Rivas-Gonzalo, J. C.; Santos-Buelga, C. Proanthocyanidins in skins from different grape varieties. *Z. Lebensm. Unters. For.* **1995**, *200*, 221-224.
10. Ferrer-Gallego, R.; García-Marino, M.; Miguel Hernández-Hierro, J.; Rivas-Gonzalo, J. C.; Escribano-Bailón, M. T. Statistical correlation between flavanolic composition, colour and sensorial parameters in grape seed during ripening. *Anal. Chim. Acta* **2010**, *660*, 22-28.
11. Bindon, K. A.; Smith, P. A.; Holt, H.; Kennedy, J. A. Interaction between Grape-Derived Proanthocyanidins and Cell Wall Material. 2. Implications for Vinification. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2010**, *58*, 10736-10746.
12. Kennedy, J. A. Grape and wine phenolics: Observations and recent findings. *Cien. Investig. Agrar.* **2008**, *35*, 107-120.
13. Fernández-López, J. A.; Hidalgo, V.; Almela, L.; Roca, J. M. L. Quantitative changes in anthocyanin pigments of Vitis Vinifera cv Monastrell during maturation. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* **1992**, *58*, 153-155.
14. Spayd, S. E.; Tarara, J. M.; Mee, D. L.; Ferguson, J. C. Separation of sunlight and temperature effects on the composition of Vitis vinifera cv. Merlot berries. *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.* **2002**, *53*, 171-182.
15. Chorti, E.; Guidoni, S.; Ferrandino, A.; Novello, V. Effect of Different Cluster Sunlight Exposure Levels on Ripening and Anthocyanin Accumulation in Nebbiolo Grapes. *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.* **2010**, *61*, 23-30.
16. Guidoni, S.; Allara, P.; Schubert, A. Effect of cluster thinning on berry skin anthocyanin composition of *Vitis vinifera* cv. Nebbiolo. *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.* **2002**, *53*, 224-226.
17. Song, J.; Smart, R. E.; Dambergs, R. G.; Sparrow, A. M.; Wells, R. B.; Wang, H.; Qian, M. C. Pinot Noir wine composition from different vine vigour zones classified by remote imaging technology. *Food Chem.* **2014**, *153*, 52-59.
18. King, P. D.; Smart, R. E.; McClellan, D. J. Within-vineyard variability in vine vegetative growth, yield, and fruit and wine composition of Cabernet Sauvignon in Hawke's Bay, New Zealand. *Aust. J. Grape Wine Res.* **2014**, *20*, 234-246.
19. Cortell, J. M.; Halbleib, M.; Gallagher, A. V.; Righetti, T. L.; Kennedy, J. A. Influence of vine vigor on grape (Vitis vinifera L. cv. Pinot Noir) anthocyanins. 1. Anthocyanin concentration and composition in fruit. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2007**, *55*, 6575-6584.
20. Cortell, J. M.; Halbleib, M.; Gallagher, A. V.; Righetti, T. L.; Kennedy, J. A. Influence of vine vigor on grape (Vitis vinifera L. cv. Pinot noir) and wine proanthocyanidins. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2005**, *53*, 5798-5808.
21. Dry, P. R.; Loveys, B. R. Factors influencing grapevine vigour and the potential for control with partial rootzone drying. *Aust. J. Grape Wine Res.* **1998**, *4*, 140-148.
22. Johnson, L. F.; Bosch, D. F.; Williams, D. C.; Lobitz, B. M. Remote sensing of vineyard management zones: Implications for wine quality. *Appl. Eng. Agric.* **2001**, *17*, 557-560.
23. Lamb, D. W.; Weedon, M. M.; Bramley, R. G. V. Using remote sensing to predict grape phenolics and colour at harvest in a Cabernet Sauvignon vineyard: Timing

observations against vine phenology and optimising image resolution. *Aust. J. Grape Wine Res.* **2004**, *10*, 46-54.
24. Bramley, R. G. V.; Ouzman, J.; Boss, P. K. Variation in vine vigour, grape yield and vineyard soils and topography as indicators of variation in the chemical composition of grapes, wine and wine sensory attributes. *Aust. J. Grape Wine Res.* **2011**, *17*, 217-229.
25. Rolle, L.; Siret, R.; Segade, S. R.; Maury, C.; Gerbi, V.; Jourjon, F. Instrumental Texture Analysis Parameters as Markers of Table-Grape and Winegrape Quality: A Review. *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.* **2012**, *63*, 11-28.
26. Rolle, L.; Gerbi, V.; Schneider, A.; Spanna, F.; Segade, S. R. Varietal Relationship between Instrumental Skin Hardness and Climate for Grapevines (Vitis vinifera L.). *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2011**, *59*, 10624-10634.
27. Giordano, M.; Zecca, O.; Belviso, S.; Reinotti, M.; Gerbi, V.; Rolle, L. Volatile fingerprint and physico-mechanical properties of 'muscat blanc' grapes grown in mountain area: A first evidence of the influence of water regimes. *Ital. J. Food Sci.* **2013**, *25*, 329-338.
28. Maury, C.; Madieta, E.; Le Moigne, M.; Mehinagic, E.; Siret, R.; Jourjon, F. Development of a mechanical texture test to evaluate the ripening process of Cabernet Franc grapes. *J. Texture Stud.* **2009**, *40*, 511-535.
29. Río Segade, S.; Orriols, I.; Giacosa, S.; Rolle, L. Instrumental texture analysis parameters as winegrapes varietal markers and ripeness predictors. *Int. J. Food Prop.* **2011**, *14*, 1318-1329.
30. Rio Segade, S.; Rolle, L.; Gerbi, V.; Orriols, I. Phenolic ripeness assessment of grape skin by texture analysis. *J. Food Comp. Anal.* **2008**, *21*, 644-649.
31. Rolle, L.; Torchio, F.; Ferrandino, A.; Guidoni, S. Influence of wine-grape skin hardness on the kinetics of anthocyanin extraction. *Int. J. Food Prop.* **2012**, *15*, 249-261.
32. Mira de Orduña, R. Climate change associated effects on grape and wine quality and production. *Food Res. Int.* **2010**, *43*, 1844-1855.
33. Ferrer-Gallego, R.; Hernández-Hierro, J. M.; Rivas-Gonzalo, J. C.; Escribano-Bailón, M. T. Determination of phenolic compounds of grape skins during ripening by NIR spectroscopy. *LWT-Food Sci. Technol.* **2011**, *44*, 847-853.
34. González-Manzano, S.; Santos-Buelga, C.; Pérez-Alonso, J. J.; Rivas-Gonzalo, J. C.; Escribano-Bailón, M. T. Characterization of the mean degree of polymerization of proanthocyanidins in red wines using liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS). *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2006**, *54*, 4326-4332.
35. OIV. Recueil international des méthodes d'analyse des vins et des moûts. In Organisation Internationale de la Vigne et du Vin: Paris, 2008.
36. Letaief, H.; Rolle, L.; Gerbi, V. Mechanical behavior of winegrapes under compression tests. *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.* **2008**, *59*, 323-329.
37. Ferrer, M.; Echeverria, G.; Carbonneau, A. Effect of Berry Weight and its Components on the Contents of Sugars and Anthocyanins of Three Varieties of Vitis vinifera L. under Different Water Supply Conditions. *S. Afr. J. Enol. Vitic.* **2014**, *35*, 103-113.

485 38. Barbagallo, M. G.; Guidoni, S.; Hunter, J. J. Berry Size and Qualitative
486 Characteristics of Vitis vinifera L. cv. Syrah. *S. Afr. J. Enol. Vitic.* **2011**, *32*, 129-136.
487 39. Gray, J. D.; Coombe, B. G. Variation in Shiraz berry size originates before fruitset
488 but harvest is a point of resynchronisation for berry development after flowering. *Aust.*
489 *J. Grape Wine Res.* **2009**, *15*, 156-165.
490 40. Giacosa, S.; Marengo, F.; Guidoni, S.; Rolle, L.; Hunter, J. J. Anthocyanin yield and
491 skin softening during maceration, as affected by vineyard row orientation and grape
492 ripeness of *Vitis vinifera* L. cv. Shiraz. *Food Chem.* **2015**, *174*, 8-15.
493 41. Hernández-Hierro, J. M.; Quijada-Morín, N.; Martinez-Lapuente, L.; Guadalupe, Z.;
494 Ayestaran, B.; Rivas-Gonzalo, J. C.; Escribano-Bailón, M. T. Relationship between skin
495 cell wall composition and anthocyanin extractability of Vitis vinifera L. cv. Tempranillo
496 at different grape ripeness degree. *Food Chem.* **2014**, *146*, 41-47.
497 42. Hanlin, R. L.; Hrmova, M.; Harbertson, J. F.; Downey, M. O. Review: Condensed
498 tannin and grape cell wall interactions and their impact on tannin extractability into
499 wine. *Aust. J. Grape Wine Res.* **2010**, *16*, 173-188.
500 43. Ortega-Regules, A.; Romero-Cascales, I.; Ros-García, J. M.; López-Roca, J. M.;
501 Gómez-Plaza, E. A first approach towards the relationship between grape skin cell-wall
502 composition and anthocyanin extractability. *Anal. Chim. Acta* **2006**, *563*, 26-32.
503 44. Ortega-Regules, A.; Ros-García, J. M.; Bautista-Ortín, A. B.; López-Roca, J. M.;
504 Gómez-Plaza, E. Changes in skin cell wall composition during the maturation of four
505 premium wine grape varieties. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* **2008**, *88*, 420-428.
506 45. Ruiz-García, Y.; Smith, P. A.; Bindon, K. A. Selective extraction of polysaccharide
507 affects the adsorption of proanthocyanidin by grape cell walls. *Carbohyd. Polym.* **2014**,
508 *114*, 102-114.
509

510 Thanks are due to the Spanish MICINN and FEDER (Projects ref. AGL2011-30254-
511 C02-01 and AGL2014-58486-C2-1-R) for financial support.

512

513 **Figure captions**

514 **Figure 1**. Representation of the samples in the score plot (**a**) and the variables in the
515 loading plot (**b**) on the plane defined by the first and second principal components.

516

Table 1: Variables

Name of variable	Meaning of the variable	Name of variable	Meaning of the variable
Anthocyanins (mg/g of skin)		*Phenolic acids (mg/g of skin)*	
Dp	Total delphinidin derivatives	a_caftaric	Total caftaric acids
Cy	Total cyanidin derivatives	a_coutaric	Total coutaric acids
Pt	Total petunidin derivatives	a_fertaric	Total fertaric acids
Pn	Total peonidin derivatives	a_caffeic	Total caffeic acids
Mv	Total malvidin derivatives	a_coumaric	Total coumaric acids and its glucoside derivatives
Monoglc	Total anthocyanin monoglucosides	HC	Total hydroxycinnamic acids
Acet	Total anthocyanin acetylglucosides	HB	Total hydroxybenzoic acids
Coumar	Total anthocyanin coumaroylglucosides	*Agronomic, biophysical and technological variables*	
Caffeo	Total anthocyanin caffeoylglucosides	Leaf_area	Total leaf area (m^2)
Acyl	Total anthocyanin acylglucosides	Fresh_wood	Total weight of fresh wood (kg)
Anthoc	Total anthocyanins	Dry_wood	Total weight of dry wood (kg)
Flavanols (mg/g of skin)		Grape_prod	Total weight of bunches (kg)
Cs	Catechin and epicatechin	Bunch_weight	Average of the weight of bunches (g)
PC_dimer	Dimers of procyanidins	Berry_weight	Average of the weight of berries (g)
PC_trimer	Trimers of procyanidins	Perc_skin	Percentage (*w/w*) of berry skin
PC_tetra	Tetramers of procyanidins	Perc_seed	Percentage (*w/w*) of berry seeds
PC_gal	Total of galloylated procyanidins	Brix	ºBrix of grape must
PC_nongal	Total of non-galloylated procyanidins	pH	pH of grape must
PC	Total of catechins and procyanidins	Titratable_ac	Titratable acidity of must (g/L of tartaric acid)
GCs	Gallocatechin and epigallocatechin	*Mechanical properties variables*	
PD_dimer	Dimers of prodelphinidins	Hardness	Berry hardness by TPA test (N)
PD_trimers	Trimers of prodelphinidins	Gumminess	Berry gumminess by TPA test (N)
PD	Total of gallocatechins and prodelphinidins	Chewiness	Berry chewiness by TPA test (mJ)
PAC	Total catechins, gallocatechins and proanthocyanidins	F_{sk}	Berry skin break force (N)
		Sp_{sk}	berry skin thickness (μm)

Table 2. Pearson's Coefficients Of The Most Important Significant Correlation Between Phenolic Composition Of Grape Skins And Biophysical, Technological And Texture Variables.

	Perc_seed	Leaf_area	Fresh_wood	Dry_wood	Bunch_weight	Berry_weight	F_{sk}	Hardness
Mv	ns	-0.691**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Monoglc	-0.600*	-0.561*	ns	ns	-0.577*	ns	ns	ns
Coumar	ns	-0.607*	-0.698**	-0.706**	ns	ns	-0.635*	ns
Caffeo	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	-0.666*	ns	ns
Acyl	ns	-0.660*	-0.682*	-0.692**	ns	ns	-0.589*	ns
Anthoc	ns	-0.652*	ns	ns	-0.586*	ns	ns	ns
GCs	-0.825**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.699**
PC_gal	-0.616*	-0.563*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.648*
PC_nongal	-0.792**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.653*
PC	-0.764**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.661*
PD	-0.782**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.630*
PAC	-0.791**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.660*
HB	-0.723**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	0.678*

See Table 1 for further information about variable meaning. ns, * and ** indicate the level of significance (no significant, $p<0.05$ and $p<0.01$, respectively, n=26)

Table 3. Results Of The MLR Carried Out Using The Level Of Coumaroyl-Glucoside Anthocyanins (Up) And Of Total Flavanols (Down) As Dependent Variables.

Dependent variable: Coumaroyl-glucoside anthocyanins (Coumar, mg/g of skin) R^2=0.856

	Non-standardized coefficients (B)	Standardized coefficients (β)	*p*-value
Constant	1.934		<0.001
Dry_wood (kg)	-0.333	-0.741	<0.001
F_{sk} (N)	-0.715	-0.300	0.008
Sp_{sk} (mm)	-0.002	-0.352	0.006

Dependent variable: Total Flavanols (PAC, mg/g of skin) R^2=0.829

	Non-standardized coefficients (B)	Standardized coefficients (β)	*p*-value
Constant	2.664		0.020
Leaf_area (m^2)	-8.331	-0.406	0.019
Perc_seed	-0.335	-0.507	0.001
Hardness (N)	0.181	0.310	0.009

Figure 1


a
PC2 (16.9%)
PC1 (44.1%)
P11
P7
P10
P4
P6
P1
P8
P2
P3
P12
P13
P5
P9
b
PC2 (16.9%)
PC1 (44.1%)
Fsk
Spsk
Gumminess
Chewiness
Hardness
Leaf_area
Titratable ac
Dry_wood
Fresh_wood
Berry_weight
Bunch_weight
Grape_prod
HB
Cs
a_caftaric
PC_trimer
GCs
PC_nongal
PC_gal
PC
PC_dimer
a_caffeic
a_coumaric
PAC
a_coutaric
Cy
PD
Perc_skin
a_fertaric
PD_dimer
Pn
HC
Brix
PD_trimers
PC_tetra
Dp
Monoglc
Pt
Perc_seed
pH
Anthoc
Acet
Caffeo
Mv
Coumar
Acyl

TOC Graphic