Use of density sorting for the selection of aromatic grape berries with different volatile profile



Use of density sorting for the selection of aromatic grape berries with different volatile profile

Matteo Pollon, Fabrizio Torchio, Simone Giacosa, Susana Río Segade, Luca Rolle

PII: S0308-8146(18)31805-3
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.10.040
Reference: FOCH 23701

To appear in: Food Chemistry

Received Date: 17 December 2017
Revised Date: 9 May 2018
Accepted Date: 8 October 2018

Please cite this article as: Pollon, M., Torchio, F., Giacosa, S., Segade, S.R., Rolle, L., Use of density sorting for the selection of aromatic grape berries with different volatile profile, Food Chemistry (2018), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.10.040

se of density sorting for the selection of aromatic grape berries with different volatile profile

DOI:10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.10.040

2.3 Technological ripeness parameters

Grape samples were manually crushed and centrifuged at 3000 × *g* for 10 min (Hettich 32R centrifuge, Tuttinglen, Germany), and the supernatants were used for the following determinations: glucose, fructose, citric acid, tartaric acid, and malic acid (g L^{-1}) were determined through an 1260 HPLC system (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, US) equipped with a diode array detector (DAD) set to 210 nm (Rolle, Gerbi, Schneider, Spanna & Río Segade, 2011), pH was determined by potentiometry using an InoLab 730 pHmeter (WTW, Weilheim, Germany), and titratable acidity (g L^{-1} tartaric acid, as TA) was estimated following the OIV-MA-F1-05:R2011 method (OIV, 2015).

2.4 Varietal and prefermentative volatile compounds

For each variety and density class, the determination of free and glycosylated aroma compounds was performed as reported by Torchio et al. (2016), with slight modifications as described in the following subsections.

2.4.1 Free volatile compounds determination

For each subsample, 200 g of grape berries were blended (Sunbeam Products, Boca Raton, FL, US) under nitrogen atmosphere for 1 min, and then centrifuged at 3000 × *g* for 10 minutes at 4 °C. 5 mL of supernatant were diluted with a buffer solution at pH 5 (21 g L^{-1} of citric acid monohydrate, 28.4 g L^{-1} of sodium dihydrogen phosphate in ultrapure water), transferred to a 20 mL glass vial containing 2 g of sodium chloride (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, US) and 200 µL of internal standard (1.552 mg L^{-1} of 1-heptanol in 10% v/v ethanol). Three replicates for each variety and density class were carried out.

2.4.2 Glycosylated compounds determination

10 mL of supernatant previously obtained were introduced on a 1-g Sep-Pak C18 reverse solid phase cartridge (Waters Corporation, Milford, MA, US) previously activated with 5 mL of methanol (Sigma-Aldrich) and washed with 10 mL of ultrapure water. After the passage of the sample, the cartridge was washed with 10 mL of ultrapure water. The free volatile compounds adsorbed on the C18 polymer were eluted with 10 mL of dichloromethane (Sigma-Aldrich) and discarded. Glycosylated compounds were eluted with 10 mL of methanol. For each passage of liquid through the C18 cartridge the flow rate was approximately 2 mL min^{-1}. The obtained methanolic extract was evaporated to dryness using a vacuum rotavapor (Buchi R-210, Flawil, Switzerland) at 35 °C and redissolved in 5 mL of the buffer solution at pH 5 previously described.

The enzymatic hydrolysis was performed by the addition of 50 mg of AR-2000 glycosidase enzyme (DSM Oenology, Delft, The Netherlands) with an incubation at 40 °C for 24 h. After the hydrolysis of glycosylated compounds, the extract was added of 200 µL of internal standard (1.552 mg L^{-1} of 1-heptanol in 10% v/v ethanol) and transferred in a 20-mL glass vial containing 2 g of sodium chloride and 5 mL of ultrapure water. Three replicates for each variety and density class were carried out.

2.4.3 HS-SPME-GC-MS conditions

The analytical determinations were performed as described by Sánchez-Palomo, Diaz-Maroto, and Perez-Coello (2005) as modified by Torchio et al. (2016). The vials were sealed using 18-mm diameter screw caps with a silicone septum (Supelco, Bellefonte, PA, US), and were then shaken for 20 min using an automated procedure (Gerstel MPS Automated SPME, Gerstel, Mülheim an der Ruhr, Germany). A 50/30 µm DVB/CAR/PDMS fibre from Supelco was exposed to the headspace of the capped vial for 20 min at 40 °C. SPME injections were performed in splitless mode at 250 °C for 5 min for the thermal desorption of analytes from the fibre. The GC–MS system used was a

Agilent 7890C gas chromatograph coupled to an Agilent 5975 mass selective detector (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, US).

A DB–WAX capillary column (30 m x 0.25 mm, J&W Scientific Inc., Folsom, CA, US) was used for the separation. The temperature program started at 40 °C for 5 min, increased at a rate of 2 °C min^{-1} to 200 °C for 10 min, and 5 °C min^{-1} to 220 °C, then holding at 220 °C for 5 min. The carrier gas used was helium with a flow-rate of 1 mL min^{-1}. The ion source temperature was maintained to 150 °C and the interface temperature was 280 °C. Molecules ionization took place with an energy of 70 eV. The acquisition range was 35–350 *m/z*. Peak identification and data elaboration were carried out as described by Torchio et al. (2016).

2.5 Data analysis

The R suite version 3.2.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) was used for all the statistical evaluations. Univariate analysis and their assumptions were performed thanks to the package *agricolae*. Variances homoskedasticity were checked through Bartlett's test, normal distribution of ANOVA residuals were verified thanks to the Shapiro-Wilk's test on ANOVA residuals. ANOVA null hypothesis was rejected at p value < 0.05. Tukey's HSD test was applied as *post-hoc* comparison. PCA analysis was performed thanks to the package *FactoMineR*, after standardization of the data matrix (z-scores).

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Percentage distribution of berries in density classes and related technological ripeness parameters

The berry density heterogeneity in the vineyard, assessed using the sorting method previously described, is shown in Figure 1 as berry distribution percentage in density classes. For each variety,

we clearly observed remarkable differences in berries ripeness at harvest in the same vineyard, as already pointed out in scientific literature (Dai et al., 2011; Rolle, Río Segade et al., 2011; Torchio et al., 2016). These differences are attributable to multiple factors like exposure, soil, topography, microclimate, plant asynchronous genetic programming of the maturation process into the same bunch, position of the berry into the cluster, and plant external biotic factors (Gouthu, O'Neil¸ Di, Ansarolia, Megraw, & Deluc, 2014; Pisciotta, Di Lorenzo, Barbagallo, & Hunter, 2013; Río Segade et al., 2017).

Two types of berry distributions were observed (Figure 1): Moscato giallo and Brachetto were characterized by a distinguishable Gaussian-shaped bell curve, with the central point reaching about 39–45 % berry distribution by weight. Malvasia nera lunga and Malvasia di Schierano varieties, although evidencing a similar behaviour, presented a less narrow curve, with a higher dispersion of the berries distribution across multiple density classes. Similar distributions were previously observed for Nebbiolo, Cabernet sauvignon, and Muscat Hamburg berries sorted by densimetric flotation (Kontoudakis, Esteruelas, Fort, Canals, De Freitas, & Zamora, 2011; Rolle, Río Segade et al., 2011; Rolle et al., 2015). Regarding Malvasia di Schierano, Malvasia nera lunga, and Brachetto, the most represented berry density class was 1100 kg m^{-3}, while for Moscato giallo it was observed a greater percentage by weight of berries (45 %) in the 1094 kg m^{-3} class. This factor is undoubtedly affected by the overall ripeness in the vineyard and hence by the harvest date choice.

The technological ripeness parameters, as well as the average berry weight, are presented in Table 1. For Moscato giallo and Malvasia di Schierano, the average berry weight was not significantly different among the berry groups obtained by density sorting. On the contrary, for Malvasia nera lunga the lowest values of the average berry weight were found at the extreme density classes (1107 and 1075 kg m^{-3}), while for Brachetto the lowest value was registered at the highest berry density considered (1119 kg m^{-3}). Berry weight is an important parameter which could be related to berry size and hence to the juice/skin ratio. Density sorting studies found some

correlations between grape density and the berry weight or berry size, with both decreasing when increasing grape density in cv. Nebbiolo sorted berries, although ripening and production area effects may limit the extent of this correlation (Rolle, Río Segade et al., 2011; Rolle et al., 2012).

As expected, the content of grape reducing sugars (glucose and fructose) is the main parameter that influenced berry density (Rolle et al., 2012). An increasing reducing sugars trend was found in all varieties when increasing berry density. When comparing the same density class among cultivars, the difference in reducing sugar contents may reach 12 g L^{-1} in some cases, and it was smaller at lower densities (less than 2 g L^{-1} in the class of 1081 kg m^{-3} for three varieties). No significant differences were found for the glucose/fructose ratio of Moscato giallo and Brachetto among different berry density classes, whilst for Malvasia di Schierano and Malvasia nera lunga this ratio increased when increasing the berry density considered. Previously, no differences were found for this parameter in Muscat Hamburg grapes among three different density classes (Rolle et al., 2015).

Moscato giallo and Brachetto showed a negative relationship between the berry density value and the malic acid content. This known fact can be explained by the physiological phenomena involved in berry ripening according to which malic acid can be used in different ways: after véraison, malic acid becomes the main source of energy for grape cells through respiration instead of glucose and fructose, and it can be also utilized in gluconeogenesis process (Etienne, Génard, Lobit, Mbeguié-A-Mbéguié, & Bugaud, 2013; Ruffner, 1982). Therefore, the riper berries, and hence those with higher densities and richer in reducing sugars, were affected more intensely by these phenomena. This behaviour was also reflected on the titratable acidity values because variations in the malic acid content may lead to a different acid equilibrium in the grape juice obtained, influencing the pH value and the dissociation reactions affecting titratable acidity. This supposition is supported by the pH differences observed and by the presence of not significantly different tartaric acid contents among the berries belonging to the density classes obtained for these

two varieties. Furthermore, a significant difference in citric acid was observed in Moscato giallo, where the lowest content was registered for the denser berries (1100 kg m^{-3}). Although the content and contribution of citric acid to acidity are limited, as occurs for malic acid after véraison it could be partially used as a cellular energy source or for the biosynthesis of other metabolites (Etienne et al., 2013).

In addition, it is worth to note that a common pH trend was found for all the varieties considered, with the lowest values corresponding to the berries of the lowest density values. Since these considered varieties are often used for the production of sweet, partially fermented or *passito* wines, the sugars/acidity ratio may be of relevant importance. Given the obtained results for these parameters, berry separation by density sorting may provide berry groups with different sugar/acidity characteristics. With this aim, a possible use of a berry sorting equipment in cellar could be interesting and useful in order to selection berries with different technological ripeness parameters.

3.2 Volatile compounds and precursors of them

Twenty free volatile compounds were found in all analysed samples for the four varieties studied (Tables 2, 3, 4, 5), except for geranic acid that was found only in Malvasia di Schierano and Brachetto. Among these compounds, five of them belong to the green leaf volatile compounds group (C6 and C9 compounds derived from the lipoxygenases pathway), and hence they are considered prefermentative aroma compounds (Carlomagno, Schubert, & Ferrandino, 2016). The other fifteen compounds found are terpene compounds, these latter are responsible for the typical floral scent findable in wines obtained from aromatic cultivars (Schwab & Wüst, 2015). In addition, 18 molecules belonging to the glycosylated aroma precursor compounds were determined, fifteen of them are terpenes and the remaining three belong to the biochemical class of benzene derivatives.

The most important terpenes commonly found in enological products, based on their low odour threshold, are (-)-*cis*-rose oxide, linalool, geraniol, citronellol, HO-trienol, α-terpineol, and nerol (Waterhouse et al., 2016). A great content in monoterpene compounds is a positive trait for the quality of wines produced from aromatic grape cultivars. However, it is worth to remember that the olfactory impact of a volatile compound is not determined only by its own olfactory threshold, but it can be modified by many chemical and physical interactions with other substances present in the matrix (Robinson, Ebeler, Heymann, Boss, Solomon, & Trengove, 2009). Glycosylated compounds in the wine, especially terpenes, represent the reserve of aroma and after the enzymatic or acidic hydrolysis (Pogorzelski & Wilkowska, 2007) these compounds become olfactory active, contributing to the perceivable aroma fraction.

The free and glycosidically bound terpene composition for each density class studied is shown in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 for Moscato giallo, Malvasia di Schierano, Malvasia nera lunga, and Brachetto, respectively. On one side, a differentiation of the contents of these terpene compounds is present among varieties. On the other side, as already mentioned above, the main factor affecting the grape berry density is the reducing sugar content, but the accumulation of volatile aroma compounds during ripening seems not to occur simultaneously to hexoses synthesis (Coombe & Iland, 2004; Torchio et al., 2016). In this study, it clearly emerges the different accumulation trend of hexoses and volatile compounds in the berries. This effect was not only observed at level of free and bound terpenes, but also for other chemical classes such as free C6-C9 compounds (green leaf volatile compounds) and glycosylated benzenoids (Tables S1-S4).

Regarding free terpenes sum, in Moscato giallo, Malvasia nera lunga, and Brachetto berry density classes (Tables 2, 4, 5), a similar Gaussian bell-shaped distribution was observed corresponding the highest values to intermediate berry density classes. For Malvasia di Schierano (Table 3), the highest total content of free terpenes was registered for the berries class with the lowest density value studied (1081 kg m^{-3}). This behaviour was not consistent with the glycosylated

terpenes sum: for Moscato giallo, Malvasia di Schierano and Brachetto berries, no significant differences were observed among the different density classes obtained; while for Malvasia nera lunga a progressive increase of total content of glycosylated terpenes was found with increasing berry density (Table 4). This aspect represents a further evidence that dynamics of volatile molecules accumulation is strongly variable within the *V. vinifera* germplasm.

Linalool was the most abundant terpene in Moscato giallo white cultivar, while in the red varieties studied, such as Malvasia di Schierano, Malvasia nera lunga, and Brachetto, the prevalent compound found was geraniol. Previously, Di Stefano and Corino (1984b) noted that geraniol was the predominant terpene compound in the red aromatic grape varieties historically cultivated in Piedmont growing zone.

3.2.1 Moscato giallo

Regarding terpene compounds, ten of the fourteen identified molecules displayed significant differences among the berry density classes studied. Berries belonging to 1088 and 1094 kg m^{-3} classes showed a greater content of these ten free terpene compounds compared to the other groups, driven by the linalool content (85.0–92.6% of total free terpene compounds). Some quantitative differences between the two berry density classes were also observed for HO-trienol and *trans*-pyran linalool oxide contents, which were significantly higher for the berries with 1094 kg m^{-3} density (Table 2).

The berry density sorting was previously applied for the study of the ripening effect on another Muscat cultivar, namely Moscato bianco (Torchio et al., 2016), where free and bound volatile compounds were determined at five different sampling times in the last stages of the ripening process. The authors found that the berries sampled at the third ripening stage were those richest in free terpene compounds, and in that point the highest content of total free terpenes, as well as of free linalool, geraniol, and nerol, was found in the berries with density between 1090 and

1100 kg m^{-3}. Taking into account that in the third sampling point of the cited study the most represented density classes by weight were 1075 and 1081 kg m^{-3}, we may deduce that in Moscato bianco the highest content of free terpene compounds was found in the underrepresented classes with density values above the average, while in this study for Moscato giallo the highest free terpene content was found in the most represented density class (Table 2 and Figure 1A). However, the behaviour of these three free terpene compounds (linalool, nerol, and geraniol), and therefore of total free terpenes, with the berry density for Moscato giallo white grape variety was quite similar to that published for Moscato bianco (Torchio et al., 2016).

Regarding the compounds derived from the action of lipoxygenase (Table S1), only two compounds [1-hexanol and *(E)*-3-hexenol] of the five detected showed significant differences among the berry groups obtained by density sorting. The highest contents of free lipoxygenases products also corresponded to the berries belonging to 1094 kg m^{-3} density class.

In Moscato giallo, no statistical differences were observed for glycosylated aroma precursors among the different berry density classes obtained, considering both bond terpenes (Table 2) and benzenoids (Table S1). Nevertheless, significant variations were observed in the contents of glycosylated terpene compounds with the berry density in Moscato bianco berries (Torchio et al., 2016). The total glycosylated terpene content ranged between 2.6 and 3.0 mg L^{-1}, with geraniol accounting for more than 1.2 mg L^{-1} in all the density classes analysed (42.6–46.3% of total glycosylated terpene compounds).

3.2.2 Malvasia di Schierano

Regarding free terpene compounds, 1081 kg m^{-3} berry density class exhibited the significantly greatest contents for some key aroma compounds such as HO-trienol, geranial, citronellol, nerol, geraniol, and geranic acid (Table 3). This class displayed also the greatest content of free terpenes sum. This particular behaviour of accumulating a higher amount of free terpene compounds in the

is important to take into account that the highest contents were achieved for the most abundant density class (1100 kg m^{-3}), although not significantly different quantities were also found in berries of 1094, 1107 and 1115 kg m^{-3} densities.

In Brachetto berries, all compounds detected belonging to the green leaf volatile compounds group showed significantly different contents among the density classes obtained. The 1088 kg m^{-3} berry density class recorded the lowest content of green leaf compounds sum (Table S4).

Only three glycosylated terpenes of the fifteen detected were variable in concentration among different berry density classes (Table 5): geranic acid, HO-trienol, and *trans*-pyran linalool oxide. These three compounds accounted for a very small contribution to the total glycosylated terpene content, thus evidencing a very little influence on the sensory traits. HO-trienol contents decreased with increasing density values, whereas geranic acid and *trans*-pyran linalool oxide showed a Gaussian-bell shaped curve with the maximum contents at 1107 kg m^{-3} density class. Nevertheless, the differences in total glycosylated terpene content among berries belonging to the density classes studied were not significant, as occurred for geraniol, the predominant compound, as its contribution to total glycosylated terpenes (ranging between 47.1–54.4%) decreased with increasing the berry density.

Among bound benzenoids (Table S4), only methyl salicilate evidenced significant differences among the six density classes, with the highest content at the 1094 kg m^{-3} density class. The sum of glycosylated benzenoids detected was statistically unaffected by the density sorting.

3.3 Multivariate analysis

Because the berry density effect on the volatile composition seems to be variety dependent, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was carried out on the free terpene composition data to better know the existence of common behaviours for the varieties studied with relation to berry density sorting, and therefore to exploit this technique to potentiate a certain target volatile compound

and/or a certain aroma profile independently on the variety. The resulting loadings plot and the scatter plot are shown in Figures S1a and S1b, respectively. The first principal component (PC1), which accounted for about 45% of total variance, was correlated mainly with linalool and its oxide forms, while geranial, geraniol, and nerol were satisfactorily correlated with PC2 (about 24% of total variance explained). Only Moscato giallo samples were well differentiated in the right side of the graph but no clear trend with berry density was observed.

When PCA was performed using glycosylated terpene compounds (Figure S2), PC1 and PC2 explained about 45 and 25% of total variance, respectively. Malvasia nera lunga samples are located at the most positive values of PC1, which was correlated mainly with *cis*-rose oxide, *trans*-rose oxide, and citronellol (Figure S2a), Brachetto samples are located at central values of PC1 and negative values of PC2. Moscato giallo and Malvasia di Schierano are located at the negative values of PC1 but not efficiently separated from each other either by PC1 or PC2. PC2 was highly correlated with nerol, α-terpineol, and *trans*-pyran linalool oxide (Figure S2a), and it permitted the separation of Malvasia nera lunga samples according to the berry density in three groups (particularly 1075, 1081-1088-1094-1100, and 1107 kg m^{-3}) and of Malvasia di Schierano samples in three groups (1081, 1088-1094, and 1100-1107 kg m^{-3}). No clear density effect was observed in the scatter plot for Moscato giallo and Brachetto (Figure S2b).

4 Conclusions

The application of density sorting in cellar is now possible thanks to new equipment present on the market. However, in this study the density sorting technique has proven only in part to be able to separate berry groups with different volatile compounds and aroma precursor profile. Furthermore, it is important to mention that these results are linked to the grape varieties analysed. In general, the highest accumulation of free volatile terpenes has never resulted coinciding with the highest berry density and hence with the greatest sugar content. This suggests that for the

maximization of free terpenes concentration in these varieties there is not the need to have berries with the maximum sugar concentration achievable: this aspect is important for wine production because a high hexoses concentration means possible issues during yeasts fermentation (as high osmotic pressure in must can cause high production of acetic acid by yeasts) and high ethanol contents. Higher berry densities involve also greater pH values and lower values of titratable acidity: this can be a negative aspect for obtaining aromatic sparkling wines or other special wines where a good acidity is a positive feature.

Therefore, preliminary analyses must be carried out to effectively evaluate the potential aroma of each grape batch in order to select a correct density when using density sorting equipment in winery. Although nowadays gas chromatography is quite widespread in enological laboratories, the cost of the volatile profile analyses is still generally high. A necessary condition is that the working density chosen must be able to valorise and differentiate the olfactory aspects of each of two potential groups of berries obtained by density sorting, considering in turn the actual quantity of berries belonging to each group. Given these results and considerations, the use of a density sorting equipment in winery could lose an applicative interest for this purpose when considering all varieties together, but it could have an applicative interest for Malvasia varieties. Particularly for Malvasia di Schierano and Malvasia nera lunga, the selection of 1100 kg m^{-3} density permitted to separate representative berry groups richer in aroma precursors of great relevance for the wine quality (density ≥ 1100 kg m^{-3}, berry distribution by weight ≥ 43%) but would penalize hardly free terpenes composition.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Anna Schneider and Stefano Raimondi (CNR-IPSP, Torino, Italy) for kindly providing the grape samples from the ampelographic collection of Grinzane Cavour (Cuneo, Italy).

References

Asproudi, A., Petrozziello, M., Cavalletto, S., & Guidoni, S. (2016). Grape aroma precursors in cv. Nebbiolo as affected by vine microclimate. *Food Chemistry*, **211**, 947-956.

Bakker, J., & Clarke, R.J. (2012). Volatile components. *Wine Flavour Chemistry*, Second edition, 155-238.

Carlomagno, A., Schubert, A., & Ferrandino, A. (2016). Screening and evolution of volatile compounds during ripening of 'Nebbiolo', 'Dolcetto' and 'Barbera' (*Vitis vinifera*). *European Food Research and Technology*, **242**, 1221-1233.

Coombe, B.G., & Iland, P. (2004). Grape berry development and wine grape quality. P. R. Dry & B. G. Coombe (Eds.), Viticulture volume 1 – Resources (2nd, pp. 210–248). Adelaide, South Australia: Wine titles.

Dai, Z. W., Ollat, N., Gomès, E., Decroocq, S., Tandonnet, J.P., Bordenave, L., Pieri, P., Hilbert, G., Kappel, K., van Leeuwen, C., Vivin, P., & Delrot, S., (2011). Ecophysiological, genetic, and molecular causes of variation in grape berry weight and composition: a review. *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, **62**, 413-425.

Di Stefano, R., Borsa, D., Maggiorotto, G., & Corino L. (1995). Terpeni e polifenoli di uve aromatiche a frutto colorato prodotte in Piemonte. *L'Enotecnico*, **31**, 75-85.

Di Stefano, R., & Corino, L. (1984a). Terpeni ed antociani di alcuni uve rosse aromatiche. *Rivista di Viticoltura ed Enologia*, **37**, 581-595.

Di Stefano, R., & Corino, L. (1984b). Valutazioni comparative tra Moscato bianco e Moscato giallo con particolare riferimento alla componente terpenica. *Rivista di Viticoltura ed Enologia*, **37**, 657-670.

Dziadas, M., & Jeleń, H.H. (2016). Comparison of enzymatic and acid hydrolysis of bound flavor compounds in model system and grapes. *Food Chemistry*, **190**, 412-418.

Etienne, A., Génard, M., Lobit, P., Mbeguié-A-Mbéguié, D., & Bugaud, C. (2013). What controls fleshy fruit acidity? A review of malate and citrate accumulation in fruit cells. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **64**, 1451-1469.

Ferreira, V., Sáenz-Navajas, M.P., Campo, E., Herrero, P., De La Fuente, A., & Fernández-Zurbano, P. (2016). Sensory interactions between six common aroma vectors explain four main red wine aroma nuances. *Food Chemistry*, **199**, 447-456.

Fournand, D., Vicens, A., Sidhoum, L., Souquet, J.M., Moutounet, M., & Cheynier, V. (2006). Accumulation and extractability of grape skin tannins and anthocyanins at different advanced physiological stages. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, **54**, 7331-7338.

Gouthu, S., O'Neil, S.T., Di, Y., Ansarolia, M., Megraw, M., & Deluc, L.G. (2014). A comparative study of ripening among berries of the grape cluster reveals an altered transcriptional programme and enhanced ripening rate in delayed berries. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **65**, 5889-5902.

Guth, H. (1997) Quantitation and sensory studies of character impact odorants of different white wine varieties. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, **45**, 3027-3032.

Kontoudakis, N., Esteruelas, M., Fort, F., Canals, J.M., De Freitas, V., & Zamora, F. (2011). Influence of the heterogeneity of grape phenolic maturity on wine composition and quality. *Food Chemistry*, **124**, 767-774.

Lasanta, C., Caro, I., Gómez, J., & Pérez, L. (2014). The influence of ripeness grade on the composition of musts and wines from *Vitis vinifera* cv. Tempranillo grown in a warm climate. *Food Research International*, **64**, 432-438.

Matsui, K. (2006). Green leaf volatiles: hydroperoxidelyase pathway of oxylipin metabolism. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, **9**, 274-280;

Mozzon, M., Savini, S., Boselli, E., & Thorngate, J.H. (2016). The herbaceous character of wines. *Italian Journal of Food Science*, **28**, 190-207.

OIV (2015). *Compendium of International Methods of Analysis of Wines and Musts*. Organisation International de la Vigne et du Vin, Paris, France.

Pagay, V., & Cheng, L. (2010). Variability in berry maturation of Concord and Cabernet franc in a cool climate. *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, **61**, 61-67.

Palomo, E.S., Pérez-Coello, M. S., Díaz-Maroto, M.C., Viñas, M.G., & Cabezudo, M.D. (2006). Contribution of free and glycosidically-bound volatile compounds to the aroma of muscat "a petit grains" wines and effect of skin contact. *Food Chemistry*, **95**, 279-289.

Pisarnitskii, A.F. (2001). Formation of wine aroma: tones and imperfections caused by minor components (review). *Applied Biochemistry and Microbiology*, **37**, 552-560;

Pisciotta, A., Di Lorenzo, R., Barbagallo, M.G., & Hunter, J.J. (2013). Berry characterisation of cv. Shiraz according to position on the rachis. *South African Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, **34**, 100-107.

Podolyan, A., White, J., Jordan, B., & Winefield, C. (2010). Identification of the lipoxygenase gene family from *Vitis vinifera* and biochemical characterisation of two 13-lipoxygenases expressed in grape berries of Sauvignon Blanc. *Functional Plant Biology*, **37**, 767-784.

Pogorzelski, E., & Wilkowska, A. (2007). Flavour enhancement through the enzymatic hydrolysis of glycosidic aroma precursors in juices and wine beverages: a review. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, **22**, 251-254.

Ribéreau- Gayon, P., Glories, Y., Maujean, A., & Dubourdieu, D. (2006). Varietal aroma. *Handbook of Enology: The Chemistry of Wine Stabilization and Treatments, Volume 2*, 2nd Edition, 205-230.

Río Segade, S., Vilanova, M., Giacosa, S., Perrone, I., Chitarra, W., Pollon, M., Torchio, F., Boccacci, P., Gambino, G., Gerbi, V., & Rolle, L. (2017) Ozone Improves the Aromatic Fingerprint of White Grapes. *Scientific Reports,* **7**:16301, 1-16.

Robinson, A.L., Boss, P.K., Solomon, P.S., Trengove, R.D., Heymann, H., & Ebeler, S.E. (2014). Origins of grape and wine aroma. Part 1. Chemical components and viticultural impacts. *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture,* **65**, 1-24.

Robinson, A.L., Ebeler, S.E., Heymann, H., Boss, P.K., Solomon, P.S., & Trengove, R.D. (2009). Interactions between wine volatile compounds and grape and wine matrix components influence aroma compound headspace partitioning. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, **57**, 10313-10322.

Rolle L., Gerbi V., Schneider A., Spanna F., & Río Segade, S. (2011). Varietal relationship between instrumental skin hardness and climate for grapevines (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry,* **59**, 10624-10634.

Rolle, L., Río Segade, S., Torchio, F., Giacosa, S., Cagnasso, E., Marengo, F., & Gerbi, V. (2011). Influence of grape density and harvest date on changes in phenolic composition, phenol extractability indices, and instrumental texture properties during ripening. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry,* **59**, 8796-8805.

Rolle, L., Torchio, F., Giacosa, S., & Río Segade, S. (2015). Berry density and size as factors related to the physicochemical characteristics of Muscat Hamburg table grapes (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Food Chemistry,* **173**, 105-113.

Rolle, L., Torchio, F., Giacosa, S., Río Segade, S., Cagnasso, E., & Gerbi, V. (2012). Assessment of physicochemical differences in Nebbiolo grape berries from different production areas and sorted by flotation. *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, **63**, 195-204.

Ruffner, H.P. (1982). Metabolism of tartaric and malic acids in *Vitis*: A review-Part B. *Vitis*, **21**, 346-358.

Sánchez-Palomo, E., Diaz-Maroto, M.C., & Perez-Coello, M.S. (2005). Rapid determination of volatile compounds in grapes by HS-SPME coupled with GC–MS. *Talanta*, **66**, 1152-1157.

Schwab, W., & Wüst, M. (2015). Understanding the Constitutive and Induced Biosynthesis of Mono-and Sesquiterpenes in Grapes (*Vitis vinifera*): A Key to Unlocking the Biochemical Secrets of Unique Grape Aroma Profiles. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, **63**, 10591-10603.

Torchio, F., Giacosa, S., Vilanova, M., Río Segade, S., Gerbi, V., Giordano, M., & Rolle, L. (2016). Use of response surface methodology for the assessment of changes in the volatile composition of Moscato Bianco (*Vitis vinifera* L.) grape berries during ripening. *Food Chemistry*, **212**, 576-584.

Urcan, D.E., Giacosa, S., Torchio, F., Río Segade, S., Raimondi, S., Bertolino, M., Gerbi, V. Pop, N., & Rolle, L. (2017). 'Fortified' wines volatile composition: Effect of different postharvest dehydration conditions of wine grapes cv. Malvasia moscata (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Food Chemistry*, **219**, 346-356.

Waterhouse, A.L., Sacks, G.L., & Jeffery, D.W. (2016). *Understanding Wine Chemistry*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, United Kingdom.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Berry weight distribution among density classes obtained for the four varieties analysed: (a) Moscato giallo, (b) Malvasia di Schierano, (c) Malvasia nera lunga, (d) Brachetto. Curve points with values in black colour were samples above 3 % by total weight and hence considered for the volatile composition study.


(A) MOSCATO GIALLO
Berry distribution % (w/w)
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
1
6
27
45
20
0
0
0
1069
1075
1081
1088
1094
1100
1107
1115
1119
(B) MALVASIA DI SCHIERANO
Berry distribution % (w/w)
0
1
6
14
29
30
18
2
0
(C) MALVASIA NERA LUNGA
Berry distribution % (w/w)
1
3
8
16
28
32
10
1
0
(D) BRACHETTO
Berry distribution % (w/w)
0
0
1
6
19
39
19
10
5
Density class kg m-3

Table 1. Non-volatile physicochemical parameters of the juices derived from berries sorted by density class.

Cultivar (harvest date)	Density class kg m^{-3}	Berry weight g	Reducing sugars g L^{-1}	Glucose /Fructose ratio	Citric acid g L^{-1}	Tartaric acid g L^{-1}	Malic acid g L^{-1}	pH	Titratable acidity g L^{-1} as tartaric acid
Moscato giallo (August 31st, 2012)	1081	2.28	195.00 d	0.97	0.31 a	4.28	2.37 a	3.55 c	4.31 a
	1088	2.44	208.24 c	0.97	0.30 a	4.36	2.13 a	3.59 c	4.20 b
	1094	2.49	223.03 b	0.96	0.29 a	4.17	1.90 b	3.69 b	3.77 c
	1100	2.07	239.86 a	0.95	0.26 b	4.24	1.56 c	3.76 a	3.45 d
	Sign.	ns	***	ns		ns	***	***	***
Malvasia di Schierano (September 21st, 2012)	1081	2.93	196.45 c	0.89 d	0.13	6.03	1.08	3.23 c	5.70
	1088	2.89	206.35 c	0.90 c	0.12	5.87	1.13	3.26 bc	6.15
	1094	2.90	220.20 b	0.92 b	0.12	5.91	1.18	3.29 bc	5.81
	1100	2.85	234.77 a	0.92 b	0.12	6.27	1.14	3.32 ab	6.04
	1107	2.75	243.66 a	0.93 a	0.11	6.23	1.06	3.36 a	5.91
	Sign.	ns	***	***	ns	ns	ns	***	ns
Malvasia nera lunga (September	1075	2.44 c	180.97 d	0.88 b	0.20	4.64 ab	1.26	3.44 d	3.86
	1	2	19	0.92 ab		4	1	3	3.

13th, 2012)	081	.66 b	6.87 cd		.20	.91 a	.26	.48 cd	98	
	088	1.91 a	218.26 bc	0.93 a	.19	4.03 c	1.21	3.51 c	34	3.
	094	1.01 a	230.91 ab	0.93 a	.20	4.26 bc	1.12	3.52 c	43	3.
	100	1.66 b	240.84 a	0.94 a	.17	4.31 bc	1.08	3.59 b	23	3.
	107	1.28 c	248.41 a	0.94 a	.19	4.70 ab	0.96	3.65 a	23	3.
	Sign.	**	**	*	ns	*	ns	*		ns
Brachetto (August 29th, 2012)	088	1.87 ab	213.89 c	0.98	.30	6.67	2.75 a	3.35 e	60 ab	6.
	094	1.04 a	222.34 c	0.98	.29	6.75	2.54 ab	3.37 de	32 bc	6.
	100	1.91 ab	229.96 bc	0.98	.29	6.75	2.40 b	3.44 cd	04 cd	6.
	107	1.86 ab	247.58 abc	0.98	.31	6.96	2.61 ab	3.48 bc	93 d	5.
	115	1.74 b	257.91 ab	0.98	.33	6.64	2.42 b	3.51 ab	74 d	5.
	119	1.42 c	268.59 a	0.98	.33	6.27	2.37 b	3.57 a	36 e	5.
	Sign.	*	*	ns	ns	ns	*	*	*	**

All data are expressed as average value ± standard deviation (n=3). Sign.: *, **, *** and ns indicate significance at $p < 0.05$, 0.01, 0.001 and not significant, respectively. Different Latin letters within the same column and cultivar indicate significant differences among density classes according to Tukey HSD test ($p< 0.05$).

Table 2. Free and glycosylated terpene composition (µg L^{-1} juice) of the berries sorted by flotation for Moscato giallo cultivar.

Compound	Density class				
	1081 kg m^{-3}	**1088 kg m^{-3}**	**1094 kg m^{-3}**	**1100 kg m^{-3}**	**ign.**
Moscato giallo – Free terpenes					
β-Ocimene	3.86 ± 0.80 c	19.94 ± 5.67 ab	22.30 ± 1.76 a	9.54 ± 1.58 bc	
cis-Furan linalool oxide	1.67 ± 0.15	8.53 ± 5.58	13.50 ± 0.25	6.92 ± 0.89	s
trans-Furan linalool oxide	0.73 ± 0.21	5.60 ± 4.06	8.28 ± 0.40	3.70 ± 1.28	s
Linalool	592.66 ± 64.39 b	1662.01 ± 196.29 a	1805.78 ± 26.40 a	663.22 ± 54.24 b	**
HO-trienol	0.12 ± 0.14 c	1.89 ± 0.46 b	4.61 ± 0.29 a	0.68 ± 0.14 c	**
α-Terpineol	0.48 ± 0.01	2.54 ± 1.06	3.49 ± 0.75	2.59 ± 0.59	s
Geranial	0.18 ± 0.22 b	3.06 ± 1.72 ab	6.02 ± 0.32 a	2.06 ± 0.05 b	
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	2.03 ± 0.67 c	5.86 ± 1.06 bc	12.41 ± 0.21 a	7.49 ± 1.87 b	*
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	4.24 ± 0.88 b	15.65 ± 1.76 a	16.49 ± 1.26 a	11.96 ± 3.16 ab	
Citronellol	0.04 ± 0.01	0.59 ± 0.82	0.77 ± 0.04	0.15 ± 0.20	s
Nerol	9.11 ± 1.17 c	25.82 ± 7.50 ab	31.86 ± 1.14 a	12.92 ± 2.14 bc	
Geraniol	24.41 ± 1.51 b	85.83 ± 15.23 a	81.81 ± 1.01 a	56.69 ± 12.74 ab	
trans-Rose oxide	0.50 ± 0.05 c	2.55 ± 0.60 ab	3.26 ± 0.19 a	1.58 ± 0.14 bc	*
cis-Rose oxide	0.14 ± 0.01 c	0.71 ± 0.14 ab	0.92 ± 0.01 a	0.49 ± 0.05 b	*
Geranic acid	nd	nd	nd	nd	
Free terpenes sum	**640.16 ± 68.42 b**	**1840.58 ± 224.83 a**	**2011.50 ± 23.77 a**	**780.00 ± 72.24 b**	**
Moscato giallo – Glycosylated terpenes					
β-Ocimene	27.01 ± 2.50	28.57 ± 0.26	23.73 ± 8.40	23.54 ± 2.88	s
cis-Furan linalool oxide	11.61 ± 1.57	14.52 ± 2.35	16.32 ± 0.54	16.18 ± 1.46	s
trans-Furan	0.38 ±	0.45 ±	0.48 ±	0.26 ±	

linalool oxide	0.17	0.25	0.17	0.08	s
Linalool	812.03 ± 83.35	792.67 ± 29.07	883.90 ± 88.07	753.93 ± 1.54	s
HO-trienol	13.33 ± 8.48	13.58 ± 3.67	8.59 ± 3.35	5.57 ± 1.76	s
α-Terpineol	16.94 ± 1.81	15.88 ± 2.01	14.63 ± 0.14	9.27 ± 3.27	s
Geranial	25.21 ± 14.92	37.55 ± 1.28	38.17 ± 0.03	35.27 ± 3.52	s
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	1.64 ± 0.06	1.82 ± 0.60	1.04 ± 0.60	1.43 ± 0.57	s
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	0.89 ± 0.05	1.55 ± 0.48	2.50 ± 0.21	1.58 ± 0.52	s
Citronellol	24.26 ± 1.67	24.14 ± 1.35	24.99 ± 2.22	23.93 ± 3.81	s
Nerol	664.13 ± 44.65	675.35 ± 53.51	600.81 ± 52.41	490.87 ± 51.94	s
Geraniol	1210.31 ± 59.62	1275.77 ± 103.52	1320.49 ± 124.08	1221.38 ± 141.00	s
trans-Rose oxide	5.58 ± 1.22	6.82 ± 3.57	7.35 ± 1.44	9.24 ± 0.09	s
cis-Rose oxide	1.90 ± 0.27	1.57 ± 0.04	3.77 ± 0.69	2.34 ± 1.31	s
Geranic acid	27.85 ± 3.39	34.49 ± 7.78	33.02 ± 5.94	45.64 ± 6.03	s
Glycosylated terpenes sum	**2843.05 ± 196.19**	**2924.73 ± 199.33**	**2979.79 ± 74.90**	**2640.44 ± 197.05**	**s**

All data are expressed as average value ± standard deviation (n=3). Sign.: *, **, *** and ns indicate significance at $p < 0.05$, 0.01, 0.001 and not significant, respectively. Different Latin letters within the same row indicate significant differences among density classes according to Tukey HSD test ($p< 0.05$). nd: not detected.

Table 3. Free and glycosylated terpene composition (µg L^{-1} juice) of the berries sorted by flotation for Malvasia di Schierano cultivar.

Compound	Density class					
	1081 kg m^{-3}	**1088 kg m^{-3}**	**1094 kg m^{-3}**	**1100 kg m^{-3}**	**1107 kg m^{-3}**	**ign.**
Malvasia di Schierano – Free terpenes						
β-Ocimene	3.03 ± 1.60	2.16 ± 0.24	2.87 ± 1.15	3.61 ± 3.19	0.26 ± 0.14	s
cis-Furan linalool oxide	0.18 ± 0.08	0.11 ± 0.05	0.05 ± 0.06	0.22 ± 0.16	0.01 ± 0.00	s
trans-Furan linalool oxide	0.04 ± 0.01	0.04 ± 0.01	0.07 ± 0.03	0.09 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.07	s
Linalool	120.15 ± 8.45 ab	96.92 ± 7.00 bc	84.93 ± 1.58 c	143.07 ± 12.71 a	139.68 ± 2.70 a	*
HO-trienol	0.49 ± 0.09 a	0.06 ± 0.05 b	0.05 ± 0.02 b	0.13 ± 0.13 b	0.12 ± 0.03 b	*
α-Terpineol	4.81 ± 2.35	1.63 ± 0.45	1.00 ± 0.77	0.67 ± 0.93	2.52 ± 0.60	s
Geranial	9.26± 0.52 a	4.43 ± 2.17 b	3.72 ± 0.53 b	4.13 ± 0.51 b	3.33 ± 1.18 b	
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	0.11 ± 0.05	0.16 ± 0.07	0.11 ± 0.06	0.17 ± 0.08	0.28 ± 0.13	s
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	4.44 ± 1.08	15.39 ± 6.26	12.61 ± 6.32	18.59 ± 0.72	14.72 ± 1.41	s
Citronellol	12.47 ± 4.56 a	3.27 ± 0.58 b	1.59 ± 0.39 b	0.67 ± 0.04 b	1.37 ± 0.42 b	
Nerol	87.76 ± 1.31 a	60.32 ± 4.16 b	62.91 ± 1.25 b	68.94 ± 0.90 b	62.57 ± 6.45 b	*
Geraniol	234.85 ± 3.07 a	162.95 ± 8.45 b	158.52 ± 9.58 b	174.97 ± 3.18 b	169.76 ± 15.35 b	*
trans-Rose oxide	2.82 ± 0.38 a	2.16 ± 0.42 ab	1.34 ± 0.01 b	1.77 ± 0.42 ab	1.47 ± 0.02 b	
cis-Rose oxide	0.94 ± 0.14 a	0.69 ± 0.09 ab	0.49 ± 0.02 b	0.61 ± 0.07 b	0.54 ± 0.04 b	
Geranic acid	37.00 ± 2.26 a	17.06 ± 7.59 b	2.21 ± 0.49 c	5.42 ± 1.05 bc	2.04 ± 0.52 c	**
Free terpenes sum	**518.34 ± 4.15 a**	**367.34 ± 37.36 bc**	**332.49 ± 8.37 c**	**423.05 ± 15.72 b**	**398.73 ± 23.90 bc**	*****
Malvasia di Schierano – Glycosylated terpenes						
β-Ocimene	25.98 ± 4.12	35.14 ± 0.24	37.99 ± 3.27	39.84 ± 6.96	39.36 ± 1.28	s
cis-Furan linalool oxide	5.49 ± 0.56 c	6.45 ± 0.28 c	8.07 ± 0.16 bc	11.45 ± 1.11 a	10.48 ± 0.69 ab	*

trans-Furan linalool oxide	0.51 ± 0.40	0.29 ± 0.16	0.72 ± 0.01	1.96 ± 0.03	1.25 ± 0.89	s
Linalool	838.89 ± 84.74 b	873.61 ± 14.60 b	1146.27 ± 62.47 b	1554.29 ± 111.95 a	1635.37 ± 128.80 a	**
HO-trienol	1.31 ± 0.29 b	1.75 ± 1.38 b	2.23 ± 0.38 ab	4.17 ± 0.76 ab	4.77 ± 0.13 a	
α-Terpineol	13.52 ± 1.38 b	16.18 ± 1.17 ab	19.80 ± 0.64 ab	26.53 ± 6.88 ab	29.38 ± 2.60 a	
Geranial	40.40 ± 0.60	42.00 ± 1.00	46.71 ± 4.92	45.41 ± 3.33	43.40 ± 3.23	s
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	0.82 ± 0.30	0.77 ± 0.28	0.80 ± 0.04	1.68 ± 0.97	2.02 ± 0.25	s
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	0.24 ± 0.18 b	0.45 ± 0.32 ab	0.69 ± 0.12 ab	1.40 ± 0.24 a	0.62 ± 0.33 ab	
Citronellol	22.22 ± 2.32	25.38 ± 1.21	25.47 ± 2.34	25.94 ± 3.35	26.65 ± 3.11	s
Nerol	598.73 ± 68.07	766.20 ± 33.47	793.74 ± 60.21	764.62 ± 186.21	810.25 ± 51.09	s
Geraniol	1183.42 ± 119.20	1626.59 ± 65.07	1768.38 ± 176.70	1710.18 ± 421.54	1777.44 ± 126.61	s
trans-Rose oxide	10.42 ± 2.16	10.39 ± 0.42	12.22 ± 1.24	11.76 ± 1.72	11.77 ± 0.92	s
cis-Rose oxide	3.46 ± 0.77	3.66 ± 0.16	4.24 ± 0.49	3.97 ± 0.45	4.00 ± 0.14	s
Geranic acid	7.44 ± 5.48	5.39 ± 0.51	4.33 ± 1.08	5.91 ± 0.83	6.44 ± 2.30	s
Glycosylated terpenes sum	**2752.86 ± 289.06**	**3414.25 ± 117.91**	**3871.67 ± 313.82**	**4209.13 ± 744.14**	**4403.20 ± 321.46**	**s**

All data are expressed as average value ± standard deviation (n=3). Sign.: *, **, *** and ns indicate significance at $p < 0.05$, 0.01, 0.001 and not significant, respectively. Different Latin letters within the same row indicate significant differences among density classes according to Tukey HSD test ($p< 0.05$).

Table 4. Free and glycosylated terpene composition (µg L^{-1} juice) of the berries sorted by flotation for Malvasia nera lunga cultivar.

Compound	Density class: 1075 kg m^{-3}	1081 kg m^{-3}	1088 kg m^{-3}	1094 kg m^{-3}	1100 kg m^{-3}	1107 kg m^{-3}	sign.
Malvasia nera lunga – Free terpenes							
β-Ocimene	0.11 ± 0.05	0.30 ± 0.12	1.1 ± 1.50	2.48 ± 0.37	0.61 ± 0.85	0.61 ± 0.06	s
cis-Furan linalool oxide	0.02 ± 0.01 b	0.07 ± 0.04 b	0.13 ± 0.03 b	0.07 ± 0.01 b	0.33 ± 0.07 a	0.38 ± 0.07 a	*
trans-Furan linalool oxide	0.04 ± 0.03 b	0.11 ± 0.08 b	0.13 ± 0.02 b	0.28 ± 0.23 ab	0.38 ± 0.01 ab	0.67 ± 0.03 a	*
Linalool	11.18 ± 1.34 b	16.05 ± 8.41 b	33.42 ± 1.84 b	73.53 ± 2.19 a	33.09 ± 11.47 b	17.08 ± 0.14 b	**
HO-trienol	0.09 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.02	1.08 ± 0.14	1.55 ± 0.61	0.82 ± 0.26	0.62 ± 0.87	s
α-Terpineol	0.10 ± 0.01	0.32 ± 0.10	0.24 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.41	0.24 ± 0.05	0.22 ± 0.10	s
Geranial	0.90 ± 0.08 a	2.36 ± 0.44 a	1.30 ± 0.42 a	4.35 ± 1.15 a	3.17 ± 1.59 a	5.41 ± 1.96 a	
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	0.03 ± 0.01	0.07 ± 0.01	0.08 ± 0.04	0.08 ± 0.10	0.18 ± 0.07	0.09 ± 0.07	s
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	3.50 ± 1.15 c	5.17 ± 0.30 bc	7.30 ± 0.39 abc	10.55 ± 1.00 a	8.41 ± 2.47 ab	2.76 ± 0.18 c	*
Citronellol	8.37 ± 1.28 b	9.39 ± 0.58 b	18.58 ± 1.07 b	37.43 ± 0.05 a	18.60 ± 7.38 b	19.67 ± 1.52 b	**
Nerol	10.88 ± 4.03 c	44.11 ± 3.53 b	43.02 ± 2.88 b	101.36 ± 1.01 a	60.14 ± 14.97 b	60.09 ± 0.52 b	**
Geraniol	25.87 ± 15.80 c	104.59 ± 5.66 b	87.79 ± 6.74 b	218.12 ± 1.36 a	87.31 ± 21.80 b	92.68 ± 0.90 b	**
trans-Rose oxide	3.02 ± 0.55	8.98 ± 0.80	8.52 ± 3.46	13.82 ± 2.88	16.35 ± 14.90	9.71 ± 4.28	s
cis-Rose oxide	0.69 ± 0.38 b	1.56 ± 0.84 b	1.69 ± 0.19 b	6.47 ± 0.60 a	3.43 ± 0.22 ab	2.26 ± 1.54 b	*
Geranic acid	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	
Free terpenes sum	**64.81 ± 14.10 c**	**193.24 ± 0.15 b**	**204.37 ± 17.15 b**	**470.92 ± 0.83 a**	**233.09 ± 70.65 b**	**212.27 ± 2.66 b**	**
Malvasia nera lunga – Glycosylated terpenes							

β-Ocimene	15.67 ± 1.12 d	16.42 ± 0.45 cd	20.99 ± 0.73 bc	20.07 ± 1.09 bcd	22.23 ± 0.17 b	47.17 ± 2.53 a	**
cis-Furan linalooloxide	0.55 ± 0.24	3.42 ± 1.61	1.92 ± 0.15	4.13 ± 1.48	5.20 ± 0.59	4.86 ± 2.45	s
trans-Furan linalool oxide	2.52 ± 0.60 c	8.60 ± 0.49 ab	5.00 ± 2.64 bc	7.76 ± 0.08 ab	7.47 ± 0.62 ab	9.71 ± 0.03 a	*
Linalool	46.45 ± 3.47 c	127.77 ± 4.12 b	124.55 ± 1.66 b	152.65 ± 10.55 a	161.55 ± 5.32 a	158.21 ± 2.18 a	**
HO-trienol	4.70 ± 1.03 ab	5.66 ± 1.47 ab	3.50 ± 0.06 b	5.24 ± 2.96 ab	4.53 ± 0.61 ab	10.80 ± 1.84 a	
α-Terpineol	7.27 ± 0.67 b	15.41 ± 0.18 b	13.82 ± 0.97 b	14.26 ± 0.29 b	11.20 ± 5.26 b	27.42 ± 3.14 a	*
Geranial	14.87 ± 0.74 c	27.41 ± 1.36 b	26.91 ± 0.25 b	26.76 ± 0.37 b	27.82 ± 2.72 b	38.07 ± 2.40 a	**
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	0.48 ± 0.30	1.72 ± 0.88	1.48 ± 1.06	1.31 ± 0.18	1.96 ± 1.15	3.10 ± 0.66	s
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	0.70 ± 0.23	0.08 ± 0.01	0.43 ± 0.24	0.47 ± 0.19	0.78 ± 0.40	0.45 ± 0.13	s
Citronellol	66.61 ± 4.85 b	158.42 ± 11.83 a	160.43 ± 1.99 a	148.24 ± 4.65 a	154.09 ± 3.99 a	171.08 ± 3.04 a	**
Nerol	488.86 ± 34.56 d	1171.53 ± 54.18 c	1224.88 ± 43.69 bc	1288.37 ± 7.96 bc	1386.20 ± 76.28 b	1826.25 ± 15.33 a	**
Geraniol	329.78 ± 23.48 d	686.24 ± 32.86 bc	646.62 ± 39.03 c	709.38 ± 13.08 bc	751.86 ± 14.90 b	955.05 ± 0.02 a	**
trans-Rose oxide	71.65 ± 1.33 c	112.35 ± 2.17 ab	119.52 ± 10.43 ab	95.04 ± 13.79 bc	117.61 ± 5.14 ab	137.51 ± 9.79 a	*
cis-Rose oxide	24.06 ± 1.41 b	35.83 ± 8.69 ab	41.73 ± 3.95 ab	32.83 ± 5.26 ab	39.66 ± 3.49 ab	46.00 ± 3.80 a	
Geranic acid	3.60 ± 0.61 b	23.83 ± 2.67 a	23.41 ± 2.69 a	23.05 ± 6.09 a	27.52 ± 0.15 a	32.32 ± 8.19 a	*
Glycosylated terpenes sum	**1077.75 ± 67.98 d**	**2394.69 ± 94.36 c**	**2415.20 ± 75.37 c**	**2529.57 ± 33.28 bc**	**2719.70 ± 102.44 b**	**3468.01 ± 39.23 a**	**

All data are expressed as average value ± standard deviation (n=3). Sign.: *, **, *** and ns indicate significance at $p < 0.05$, 0.01, 0.001 and not significant, respectively. Different Latin letters within the same row indicate significant differences among density classes according to Tukey HSD test ($p< 0.05$). nd: not detected.

Table 5. Free and glycosylated terpene composition (μg L^{-1} juice) of the berries sorted by flotation for Brachetto cultivar.

Compound	Density class						
	1088 kg m^{-3}	**1094 kg m^{-3}**	**1100 kg m^{-3}**	**1107 kg m^{-3}**	**1115 kg m^{-3}**	**1119 kg m^{-3}**	**ign.**
Brachetto – Free terpenes							
β-Ocimene	0.35 ± 0.12	2.64 ± 1.28	0.91 ± 1.25	0.31 ± 0.04	1.49 ± 0.76	0.46 ± 0.15	s
cis-Furan linalool oxide	0.01 ± 0.01 c	0.06 ± 0.01 a	0.09 ± 0.01 a	0.02 ± 0.01 b	0.06 ± 0.00 a	0.02 ± 0.01 b	**
trans-Furan linalool oxide	0.03 ± 0.02	0.06 ± 0.02	0.09 ± 0.08	0.03 ± 0.02	0.03 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.01	s
Linalool	0.56 ± 0.75 c	4.81 ± 1.17 b	11.55 ± 0.54 a	5.15 ± 1.72 b	3.75 ± 0.23 bc	1.93 ± 0.87 bc	**
HO-trienol	0.05 ± 0.01 c	0.18 ± 0.23 bc	0.96 ± 0.14 ab	1.12 ± 0.18 a	0.72 ± 0.42 abc	0.06 ± 0.01 c	*
α-Terpineol	0.06 ± 0.01	0.10 ± 0.12	0.22 ± 0.27	0.30 ± 0.08	0.05 ± 0.05	0.09 ± 0.04	s
Geranial	0.62 ± 0.39	3.17 ± 0.74	5.39 ± 2.19	7.52 ± 1.78	5.09 ± 3.42	3.22 ± 1.08	s
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	0.05 ± 0.04	0.18 ± 0.11	0.10 ± 0.05	0.05 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.01	0.04 ± 0.03	s
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	2.50 ± 1.14	9.59 ± 6.24	10.58 ± 0.53	16.75 ± 3.51	13.33 ± 0.23	10.69 ± 4.21	s
Citronellol	1.86 ± 0.59 c	7.52 ± 1.28 bc	25.04 ± 1.25 abc	36.38 ± 4.05 a	34.28 ± 14.47 ab	23.12 ± 8.31 abc	
Nerol	11.34 ± 4.84 d	49.90 ± 5.14 b	71.08 ± 4.61 a	68.62 ± 3.37 a	54.74 ± 3.37 ab	31.00 ± 5.66 c	**
Geraniol	65.97 ± 8.68 c	205.37 ± 19.63 ab	281.11 ± 21.31 a	231.97 ± 40.14 ab	179.19 ± 16.19 b	92.50 ± 4.95 c	**
trans-Rose oxide	1.31 ± 1.45	5.43 ± 0.67	7.61 ± 2.10	6.09 ± 1.57	4.39 ± 4.09	0.53 ± 0.24	s
cis-Rose oxide	0.26 ± 0.05	1.26 ± 0.98	1.23 ± 0.18	0.99 ± 0.05	1.48 ± 0.09	1.35 ± 0.92	s
Geranic acid	8.06 ± 4.89 b	36.58 ± 12.73 ab	53.11 ± 20.30 ab	64.04 ± 10.93 a	51.74 ± 13.45 ab	36.00 ± 5.66 ab	
Free terpenes sum	**93.02 ± 11.75 c**	**326.85 ± 45.14 ab**	**469.07 ± 43.62 a**	**439.34 ± 41.77 a**	**350.37 ± 41.26 a**	**201.02 ± 16.46 bc**	**
Brachetto – Glycosylated terpenes							

β-Ocimene	28.25 ± 2.35	31.30 ± 0.31	36.34 ± 5.08	20.67 ± 0.94	22.11 ± 10.60	14.36 ± 6.90	s
cis-Furan linalool oxide	1.53 ± 0.20	2.95 ± 1.64	2.39 ± 1.65	4.50 ± 0.07	4.59 ± 1.74	3.77 ± 0.20	s
trans-Furan linalool oxide	0.15 ± 0.11	0.50 ± 0.01	0.22 ± 0.10	0.73 ± 0.52	0.71 ± 0.54	0.30 ± 0.18	s
Linalool	59.91 ± 13.89	55.46 ± 3.58	54.40 ± 10.22	55.77 ± 0.12	70.15 ± 12.78	46.28 ± 0.14	s
HO-trienol	3.65 ± 0.98 a	3.77 ± 0.37 a	1.92 ± 0.77 ab	1.06 ± 0.25 b	1.30 ± 0.34 b	0.39 ± 0.41 b	*
α-Terpineol	14.15 ± 2.99	15.44 ± 1.41	15.61 ± 2.59	13.36 ± 0.28	16.50 ± 11.86	12.71 ± 0.05	s
Geranial	23.68 ± 14.95	24.89 ± 11.11	32.72 ± 2.86	32.91 ± 2.52	32.55 ± 1.96	26.76 ± 0.29	s
trans-Pyran linalool oxide	0.02 ± 0.01 c	0.03 ± 0.01 c	0.73 ± 0.36 bc	2.45 ± 0.01 a	1.06 ± 0.17 b	0.93 ± 0.23 b	**
cis-Pyran linalool oxide	0.35 ± 0.06	0.47 ± 0.38	0.42 ± 0.19	0.89 ± 0.15	0.67 ± 0.53	0.30 ± 0.22	s
Citronellol	63.06 ± 3.58	70.28 ± 2.72	73.67 ± 5.49	74.04 ± 3.70	64.80 ± 3.86	68.56 ± 1.27	s
Nerol	627.14 ± 38.80	708.46 ± 44.89	720.34 ± 104.35	814.98 ± 14.50	819.68 ± 102.47	781.15 ± 10.43	s
Geraniol	1056.12 ± 70.08	1146.92 ± 64.77	1122.38 ± 158.79	1113.64 ± 12.35	1089.44 ± 152.23	909.19 ± 21.04	s
trans-Rose oxide	29.09 ± 0.29	34.74 ± 2.60	35.38 ± 5.65	40.53 ± 1.50	41.28 ± 11.12	31.78 ± 2.58	s
cis-Rose oxide	11.63 ± 1.76	9.21 ± 4.57	8.39 ± 2.51	13.92 ± 0.63	10.51 ± 6.84	10.72 ± 0.75	s
Geranic acid	24.07 ± 6.58 b	37.06 ± 0.33 ab	37.13 ± 2.84 ab	53.45 ± 1.52 a	45.00 ± 9.20 ab	21.86 ± 9.32 b	
Glycosylated terpenes sum	**1942.81 ± 151.80**	**2141.49 ± 115.10**	**2142.04 ± 285.52**	**2242.89 ± 35.01**	**2220.34 ± 267.39**	**1929.08 ± 44.95**	**s**

All data are expressed as average value ± standard deviation (n=3). Sign.: *, **, *** and ns indicate significance at $p < 0.05$, 0.01, 0.001 and not significant, respectively. Different Latin letters within the same row indicate significant differences among density classes according to Tukey HSD test ($p< 0.05$).

Highlights

- Four grape varieties were analyzed for their volatile profile after density sorting
- Changes in free volatile compounds were variety-dependent, with few common trends
- Little differences in total glycosylated content among berries sorted by flotation
- Limited effectiveness of density sorting to obtain different aroma profiles