

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Effect of alternative fungicides and inoculation strategy on yeast biodiversity and dynamics from the vineyard to the winery

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1880626> since 2023-06-22T20:52:45Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.foodres.2022.111935

Terms of use:

Open Access

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

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Effect of alternative fungicides and inoculation strategy on yeast biodiversity and dynamics from**
2 **the vineyard to the winery**

3

4 Vasileios Englezos¹, Jatziri Mota-Gutierrez¹, Simone Giacosa¹, Susana Río Segade¹, Matteo Pollon¹,
5 Giorgio Gambino², Luca Rolle¹, Ilario Ferrocino¹, Kalliopi Rantsiou^{1*}

6

7 ¹Department of Agricultural, Forest, and Food Sciences, University of Turin, Largo Paolo Braccini 2,
8 10095, Grugliasco, Turin, Italy

9 ²Institute for Sustainable Plant Protection, National Research Council (IPSP-CNR), Torino. Strada delle
10 Cacce 73, 10135 Turin, Italy.

11

12

13 *Corresponding author: kalliopi.rantsiou@unito.it

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64

Abstract

Fungi and oomycetes found in vineyards cause diseases such as powdery and downy mildew. Consequently, conventional and alternative agronomical practices are widely used prior to harvest to protect grapes. Alternative products are considered more eco-friendly and environmentally sustainable in comparison to conventional chemical products. However, the effect of these alternative products on yeast ecology, from the vineyard to the winery, is poorly understood. This study compared the effect of alternative and conventional chemical antifungal compounds (copper and sulphur based) on grapes' mycobiota in the vineyard and during subsequent fermentation in winery using culture-dependent and -independent approaches. Culture-dependent data indicated a treatment-dependent effect on the load and diversity of yeast populations on grapes. It was found that the population of *Hanseniaspora uvarum* was higher on grapes previously treated with laminarin and copper, compared to the other levels registered on grapes previously treated with the rest of antifungal products tested in this study (including the untreated and conventional treatment controls). Concerning, wine quality, the chemical composition was not correlated to the application of antifungal treatment in the vineyard. Understanding the effect of different antifungal products on grape and wine microbial communities may help in setting up guidelines for wine grape production. These guidelines, can be used to guarantee quality in the pursuit of a sustainable competitive advantage in the market.

Keywords: Antifungal compounds, Grapes, Wine, Mycobiota, Fermentation, Sustainability

65

66 **1. Introduction**

67

68 Fungal and oomycete diseases, including grey mould (caused by *Botrytis cinerea*), black rot
69 (caused by *Guignardia bedwelli*), downy (caused by *Plasmopara viticola*) and powdery (caused by
70 *Uncinula necator*) mildew are considered the most serious grapevine diseases worldwide, able to cause
71 a significant reduction in crop yields and poor quality grapes (Reynier, 2012). Chemical compounds,
72 such as copper and sulphur-based products are commonly used in conventional and organic vineyard to
73 control fungal infection (Gadoury et al., 2012). However, the use of several pesticides in the field has
74 been associated with health (respiratory, neurological, carcinogenic effects etc.) and environmental
75 (environment and water pollution) issues (Nicolopoulou-Stamati, Maipas, Kotampasi, Stamatis, & Hens,
76 2016). Thus, the European Parliament and the council of the European Commission in 2009 reduced the
77 number of pesticides that can be applied in the field (Directive 2009/128/EC).

78 BIOcontrol products containing natural substances of mineral, plant or microbial origin (such as
79 laminarin, chitosan, potassium bicarbonate and calcium oxide), and resistance inducers able to activate
80 plant's own defence mechanism (such as acibenzolar-S-methyl, fosetyl-Al, potassium phosphonate) are
81 being considered against powdery and downy mildews by an increasing number of farmers (Lukas,
82 Innerebner, Kelderer, Finckh, & Hohmann, 2016; Trouvelot et al., 2014; Romanazzi et al., 2016;
83 Pugliese, Monchiero, Gullino, & Garibaldi, 2018). The effect of biofungicides, resistance inducers and
84 biostimulants (Gadoury et al., 2012; Gutiérrez-Gamboa, Romanazzi, Garde-Cerdan, & Perez-Alvarez,
85 2019) have recently been tested for their efficacy towards fungal diseases in the vineyard (Rantsiou et
86 al., 2020). Interestingly, potassium bicarbonate reduced powdery mildew on Nebbiolo grapes at harvest
87 with an efficiency similar to conventional chemical compounds (Rantsiou et al., 2020). Nevertheless, it
88 is important to investigate the effect of such alternatives on grape mycobiota at harvest.

89 Indigenous yeasts naturally occurring on the grape surface have an impact on wine fermentation,
90 either spontaneous or inoculated, especially in the first stages. Yeast population can reach levels up to
91 10^8 colony forming units (CFU/mL) at the beginning of the fermentation and their growth dynamics
92 depend on the grape health and fermentation conditions (Barata, Malfeito-Ferreira & Loureiro, 2012;
93 Fleet, Prakitchaiwattana, Beh, & Heard, 2002). As a consequence of the variable nature of the grape's
94 microbiota, an inconstant amount of biomass is produced during the fermentation process, as a
95 consequence of the variable nature of grape's microbiota and composition (Stefanini & Cavalieri, 2018).
96 The diversity and composition of the yeast community on the grape berries and musts is crucial to

97 produce distinctive and quality wines (Morrison-Whittle & Goddard, 2018; Liu, Zhang, Chen, & Howell,
98 2019).

99 Yeast ecology contributes largely to define regional wine characteristics which are important
100 factors for consumer acceptability (Belda, Zarraonaindia, Perisin, Palacios, & Acedo, 2017; Bokulich et
101 al., 2016; Morrison-Whittle & Goddard, 2018). Importantly, yeast biodiversity is influenced by
102 geographical location, climatic conditions of the area and health status of the grape berries, as well as by
103 the agronomical practices used during the annual cycle of the vineyard (Bokulich, Thorngate,
104 Richardson, & Mills, 2014; Gilbert, van der Lelie, & Zarraonaindia, 2014; Knight, Karon, & Goddard,
105 2020; Zarraonaindia et al., 2015). The microbial changes observed when applying conventional chemical
106 compounds in vineyards on grape berries and during subsequent fermentation has been extensively
107 investigated (Barata et al., 2012; Cordero-Bueso et al., 2011; Grangeteau et al., 2011; Milanovic,
108 Comitini, & Ciani, 2013; Schmid, Moser, Muller, & Berg, 2011). However, the ability of alternative
109 compounds to modulate the mycobiota during wine fermentations is poorly understood.

110 The goal of this study was to compare the mycobiota diversity, oenological parameters and
111 volatile organic compounds (VOCs) of grape berries and resultant wines following alternative and
112 conventional chemical compounds (copper and sulphur) treatments in the vineyard. Furthermore, two
113 fermentation series (spontaneous and inoculated with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) were performed in
114 winery conditions. Data and knowledge acquired may contribute in the informed decisions that should
115 be made to accommodate environmentally friendly vineyard protection against fungal disease and wine
116 quality.

117

118 **2. Materials and Methods**

119

120 *2.1 Field trials and sample sites*

121 Grape berries were collected from a vineyard located in Piobesi d'Alba (North-West Italy, GPS:
122 44.731760, 7.988324, hill area) during fall 2018. The vineyard was cultivated with *Vitis vinifera* cv.
123 Nebbiolo vines using a vertical shoot positioning training system. The distance among vines was 0.90 x
124 2.5 m. Vineyard management was uniform and in line with regional agricultural practices. In total twelve
125 experimental sites in quadruplicate were selected from the top, middle and bottom of the vineyard,
126 covering different topological profiles of the vineyard. Each experimental site included four randomized
127 blocks *per* treatment, each containing eight plants. The vines were sprayed with eleven different
128 treatments as reported in Table 1, while a non-treated vine was used as untreated control. Alternative and

129 conventional chemical treatments were applied using commercial formulations and sprayed with a hand-
130 pulled 2-stroke engine sprayer to ensure total coverage of the bunches, following manufacturer's
131 instructions and as previously reported by Rantsiou et al. (2020). Active ingredients as well as the dose
132 used for the preparation of the treatments are shown in Table 1.

133

134 *2.2 Samples collection*

135 Grape berries were aseptically and randomly collected with the pedicel attached at maturation
136 stage for each experimental site and block. For each block, 200 grape berries (800 in total for each
137 treatment) were chosen from different grape bunches and immediately placed in sterile stomacher bags
138 and transported to the laboratory at 4 °C. Once in laboratory, 50 g of single grape berries from each block
139 were placed in a sterile stomacher bag and, after manual crushing, the resulting juice was subjected to
140 microbiological analysis. Aliquots of 1 mL were collected, centrifuged for 10 min at 6000 rpm and the
141 resulting pellet was placed in sterile Eppendorf tubes and stored at – 20 °C for molecular analysis.

142

143 *2.3 Fermentation trials*

144 Grapes for downstream analysis were chosen from the treatments that showed the lowest
145 percentage of berries affected by powdery and downy mildew (this selection was based on the results
146 reported by Rantsiou et al. (2020) and the quality of the grapes at harvest). Briefly, five alternative
147 chemical products, namely T02, T05, T06, T07, and T10 and one conventional chemical product, namely
148 T08 followed two different fermentation protocols, a) spontaneous fermentation; and b) inoculated
149 fermentation with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* BRL97 (Lallemand Inc. Montreal, Canada). In total,
150 twenty-four fermentations (2 inoculation protocols x 6 treatments x 2 independent biological replicates)
151 were performed in micro-scale condition in the experimental winery scale at the University of Turin.
152 Samples were aseptically collected with sterile serological pipettes at different stages of the alcoholic
153 fermentation (immediately after grape crushing and inoculation and after 2, 4, 7, and 14 days) for
154 microbiological culture-dependent analysis and chemical analysis. Samples for culture-independent
155 analysis were collected immediately after grape crushing and inoculum addition and at the end of the
156 monitored period (14 days), placed on ice and immediately frozen at -20 °C for further DNA extraction.
157 At the end of the fermentation, wines were analysed for basic oenological parameters, and volatile
158 compounds.

159

160 *2.3.1 Winery micro-scale fermentations*

161 About 12 kg of grapes from each of the six abovementioned selected grapes were crushed together
162 and distributed in 15 L glass fermenters. Two sets of fermentations were performed (spontaneous and
163 inoculated). Inoculated fermentations were performed by using *S. cerevisiae* BRL 97 at 1.0×10^6
164 cells/mL as active dry yeast (ADY), previously rehydrated in sterile glucose solution (5 %) for 20 min at
165 37 °C. Ferments were kept at 25 °C until the end of the fermentation. The cap was punched down twice
166 a day and racking was performed when residual sugars levels were less than 2 g/L. Afterwards, wines
167 were clarified, supplemented with 50 mg/L of total SO₂, and then bottled and subjected to chemical
168 analysis.

169

170 2.4 Microbiological analyses

171 At each sampling point, samples were serially diluted in sterile peptone water solution (0.1 %)
172 and the number of colony-forming units *per* milliliter (CFU/mL) was determined by plating aliquots of
173 appropriate serial decimal dilutions. The non-selective Wallerstein laboratory nutrient medium agar
174 (WLN, Biogenetics, Milan, Italy) for the enumeration of fungi and the selective medium Lysine medium
175 agar (Oxoid, Milan, Italy) for the enumeration of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts were used. Plates were
176 incubated at 28 °C for 5 days. Results were expressed as means of Log CFU/mL from two independent
177 determinations. Yeast colonies present on WLN were counted based on their color and morphology
178 (Cravero et al., 2016). Ten isolates from each colony morphotype were selected, purified by streaking
179 and maintained in Yeast extract-peptone-dextrose (YPD) broth (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone and 2%
180 dextrose, all from Biogenetics) with 25 % glycerol at -20 °C.

181

182 2.5 Molecular analysis

183 2.5.1 Molecular identification of the isolates

184 Overnight cultures of the isolates in YPD broth were centrifuged at 14000 rpm for 10 min and
185 the resulting pellet was subjected to DNA extraction, as previously described by Cravero et al. (2016).
186 Isolates were identified by Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (RFLP) analysis of the 5.8S ITS
187 rDNA region, by using the restriction endonucleases *HinfI*, *HaeIII* and *CfoI* (Promega, Milan, Italy) using
188 the protocols reported by Esteve-Zarzoso, Belloch, Uruburu, & Querol, (1999). Identification at species
189 level was further confirmed by sequencing the D1-D2 loop of the 26S rRNA gene (Kurtzman & Robnett,
190 1997).

191

192 2.5.2 Molecular characterization of *S. cerevisiae* isolates

193 Putative colonies of *S. cerevisiae* were isolated from each sampling point during spontaneous and
194 inoculated fermentation to verify the presence and dominance of *S. cerevisiae* BRL 97 in the inoculated
195 trials and uncover the molecular fingerprinting of the indigenous *S. cerevisiae* strains in spontaneous
196 fermentation. In total 580 putative *S. cerevisiae* colonies were isolated and then characterized using the
197 primers delta12 and delta 21, following the protocols described by Legras & Karst (2003).

198

199 2.5.3 DNA extraction, sequencing and bioinformatics

200 The total DNA of grape must at the beginning and end of the fermentation was extracted from 1
201 mL of the first decimal dilution using the MasterPure Complete DNA & RNA Purification kit (Illumina
202 Inc, San Diego, CA) following the manufacturer's instructions. Mycobiota was analysed by amplification
203 of the D1 domain of 26S rRNA gene using the primers and conditions described elsewhere (Mota-
204 Gutierrez et al., 2019). Briefly, PCR was carried out using a PCR mixture prepared with 12.5 µL of the
205 2X Kapa HiFi HotStart ReadyMix Taq (Roche, Milan, Italy), 1 µM each primer, 2.5 µL of DNA template,
206 and PCR-grade water. Each PCR assay was performed according to the following amplification
207 conditions: thirty cycles of 30 s of denaturation (95 °C), 30 s of primer annealing (55 °C), and 30 s of
208 primer extension (72 °C), followed by a final extension step (72 °C) of 10 min. The PCR products were
209 purified twice using the Agencourt AMPure kit (Beckman Coulter, Milan, Italy). Library preparation and
210 sequencing was performed according to the Illumina guidelines. Sequencing was performed using a
211 MiSeq instrument (Illumina).

212

213 2.5.3.1 Microbial community and dynamics

214 After sequencing, raw reads were analyzed by using the Quantitative Insights into Microbial
215 Ecology QIIME2 (Bolyen et al., 2019). Primers and adapters were first trimmed by using Cutadapter and
216 then quality filtered using the DADA2 package (version 1.10.1; Callahan et al., 2017), removing low-
217 quality bases, chimeric sequences, and sequences shorter than 300 bp by using the dada2 denoise-paired
218 plug in of QIIME2. Amplicon Sequence Variants (ASVs) generated by DADA2 were mapped against
219 the constructed 26S database for fungi (Mota-Gutierrez, Ferrocino, Rantsiou, & Cocolin, 2019) by means
220 of the RDP Classifier. To avoid biases due to the different sequencing depth, ASVs tables were rarefied
221 to the lowest number of sequences per sample. The ASVs table displays the higher taxonomy resolution
222 that was reached; when the taxonomy assignment was not able to reach species level the genus was
223 displayed. Only ASVs with relative frequency above 1 % in at least two samples are reported.

224

225 2.6 *Chemical analyses*

226 Main oenological parameters (glucose, fructose, glycerol, organic acids expressed as g/L and
227 ethanol expressed as %v/v) were measured during and at the end of the fermentation process, using a
228 high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) apparatus (Rolle et al., 2018). Total acidity of wines
229 (expressed as g/L of tartaric acid) was determined by titration, following the OIV-MA-AS313-01:R2015
230 official method (OIV, 2015). The pH was measured using an InoLab 730 pH meter (WTW, Weilheim,
231 DE). Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in wines at the end of the monitored fermentations were
232 identified using a headspace solid-phase microextraction coupled to gas chromatography-mass
233 spectrometry (HS-SPME/GC-MS) following the protocols reported by Englezos et al. (2019a).

234

235 2.7 *Statistical analyses*

236 The plate count data of the yeast populations present on grapes surface at harvest and during
237 fermentation were subjected to one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), using the IBM SPSS Statistics
238 software package. When a significant difference was revealed, the Tukey-HSD post-hoc test for test
239 comparison was performed to identify statistical differences between trials. Alpha and beta diversity
240 calculations of metataxonomic data were performed through the qiime2 diversity script. Bray Curtis
241 distance matrix generated through qiime2 was used to performed Principal coordinate analyses (PCoA)
242 as well as PERMANOVA as a function of fermentation time, type or fungicide treatment. Shannon index
243 was analysed by Kruskal-Wallis test as a function of fermentation time, type or fungicide treatment. In
244 order to see if the different fungicides can affect the mycobiota composition in grapes and at the
245 beginning or at the end of the fermentations we performed differential abundance analysis by using the
246 non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test on ASVs table in R environment. P value was adjusted by the
247 Bonferroni's method for multiple comparison. Evolution of the mycobiota during the fermentation was
248 performed through (ANOVA). When a significant difference was revealed, the Tukey-HSD post-hoc test
249 for test comparison was performed to identify statistical differences across time. Kruskal-Wallis test for
250 differential abundance on ASVs table was performed in order to see differences in the mycobiota
251 composition at the end of the fermentation process (T14) under spontaneous or inoculated fermentation.
252 Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was obtained as a measure of the association between the fungal
253 ASVs that occurred in at least 2 samples and the chemical variables through the *psych* function and
254 plotted through the *corrplot* package of R. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of the main oenological
255 parameters and VOCs were performed to differentiate wines.

256

257 **Accession number.** The 26S rRNA gene sequences are available in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive
258 (BioProject accession number PRJNA631884).

259

260 **3. Results**

261

262 *3.1 Yeasts count and biodiversity on grape berries surface*

263 The average total yeast population in grape berries after harvest ranged from 4.56 ± 0.20 to 6.25
264 ± 0.36 Log CFU/mL. Classical plate count revealed a significant difference in the mycobiota load of the
265 treated grape berries (Fig. 1, Panel A, ANOVA, $P = 0.038$). In detail, significantly lower yeast
266 populations were found for grape berries treated with T04 (Potassium phosphonate + Sulphur + Copper
267 hydroxide) when compared to the controls (untreated grapes (T01) and grapes treated with Sulphur +
268 Metiram + Copper hydroxide (T08), commonly used as conventional treatment in viticulture) (ANOVA,
269 $P = 0.0037$).

270 PCR-RFLP analysis of the ITS1-5.8S-ITS region and further sequencing of the D1/D2 loop of
271 the 26S rRNA encoding gene of the isolates identified a total of eight species in all grape berries
272 previously treated with different antifungal compounds (Fig. 1, Panel B, Table S1 in Supplementary
273 Material). *Aureobasidium pullulans*, *Cladosporium cladosporioides*, *Filobasidium magnus*,
274 *Hanseniaspora uvarum* and *Metchnikowia pulcherrima* were present in all control and treated trials. The
275 predominant yeast species in all grape berries were *A. pullulans* and *C. cladosporioides*. No significant
276 differences in the relative abundance (differential counting of all colonies) of each species detected in
277 grape samples was observed as a function of treatment by one-way ANOVA analysis. However,
278 *Rhodotorula glutinis* was not isolated in the conventional control treatment T08 and conventional
279 treatment T12 (Metiram + Copper hydroxide), and one alternative chemical treatment T09 (Calcium
280 oxide). *Pichia kluyveri* and *Starmerella bacillaris* were not isolated in alternative and conventional
281 chemical treatments T05 (Laminarin + Metiram and Laminarin + Copper hydroxide) and T12,
282 respectively.

283 Concerning the metataxonomic data of grape berries, the average of Good's coverage for fungal
284 communities indicated a satisfactory coverage (99%). Overall, the grape berries mycobiota did not show
285 any significant difference in terms of alpha diversity index or taxa frequency as a function of fungicide
286 treatment, between the controls (T01 and T08) and the rest trials. The metataxonomic approach identified
287 *A. pullulans*, *C. cladosporioides* and *H. uvarum* as the most abundant ASVs with a relative frequency of

288 more than 50 % (Table 2). It should be pointed out that *S. cerevisiae* and *B. cinerea* were found in all
289 samples with a relative frequency less than 1 % (Table 2).

290

291 3.2 Yeast diversity and winery fermentation kinetics by culture-dependent and independent approaches

292 Yeast diversity (Fig. 2, panel A), total yeast population (Fig. 2, panel B) and fermentation kinetics
293 (Fig. 2, panel C) of grape berries pre-treated with one conventional control treatment (T08) and five
294 antifungal compounds (T02, T05, T06, T07 and T12) at the different stages of spontaneous and
295 inoculated fermentations conducted winery scale conditions are shown in Fig. 2. These yeasts were
296 identified using PCR-RFLP analysis of the rRNA operon ITS region and sequencing of the partial 26S
297 rRNA gene. Regarding species heterogeneity, in all trials, *S. cerevisiae* dominated the fermentation
298 process, and was the only species isolated after 14 days, except for trial WS8 where the presence of *Starm.*
299 *bacillaris* and *H. uvarum* was observed at the end of the fermentation (Fig. 2, panel A).

300 Total yeast population reached the highest values (ANOVA, $P = 0.019$), after the fifth day in
301 spontaneous trials with the only exception of WS6 and WS10 that reached the maximum levels after 2
302 and 7 days, respectively (Fig. 2, panel B). On the contrary, the total yeast population reached the
303 maximum levels (ANOVA, $P = 0.021$), after the second day in inoculated trials (Fig. 2, panel B). Overall,
304 we observed that the starter culture induced a faster sugar consumption rate compared to the respective
305 fermentations performed with indigenous strains (ANOVA, $P = 0.010$), however, this rate varies between
306 the fermentation of the grapes treated with six different antifungal compounds. In the case of inoculated
307 fermentation, after 5 days, we observed that grapes previously treated with the treatment T2 (WI2)
308 contained more sugars (about 142 g/L of sugars) if compared to the other inoculated fermentations (about
309 100 g/L of sugars, ANOVA, $P = 0.010$). Regarding spontaneous fermentation, sugar consumption was
310 slower in WS2 and WS5. These fermentations contained more than 100 g/L of residual sugars after 7
311 days, while the other trials contained sugars ranging from 49 g/L to 94 g/L (Fig. 2, panel C, ANOVA, P
312 $= 0.004$).

313

314 3.2.1 Mycobiota composition of Nebbiolo fermentations

315 A total of 5.669.920 high-quality reads were used for the downstream analysis with an average
316 of 59.061 reads/sample. Shannon index increased when T0 was compared with T7 ($P=0.043$) and was
317 highest in spontaneous fermentation if compared with inoculated once ($P=0.002$). No differences were
318 observed as function of the fungicide's treatments. Beta diversity calculation based on Bray Curtis
319 distance matrix showed a significant separation of samples according to fermentation type (spontaneous

320 vs. inoculated) or according to fermentation time (Fig. 3, PERMANOVA $p=0.001$), while no effect of
321 the fungicide was observed.

322 Regarding mycobiota composition and evolution during fermentation, in spontaneous
323 fermentations we observed that *H. uvarum* increased from 0.7% of the relative frequency at T0 till 6%
324 after 14th days ($P = 0.001$, Fig. 4), *Pichia kudriavzevii* from 25% of the relative frequency at T0 to 0%
325 after 14th days ($P = 0.001$), while *S. cerevisiae* increased from 27% to 48% from T0 to T14 ($P = 0.003$,
326 Fig. 4). During inoculated winery fermentations we observed that *S. cerevisiae* (90% of the relative
327 frequency at T0) was reduced till 59% at the end of the fermentations ($P = 0.001$) while *Starm. bacillaris*
328 increased from 0.1 to 17% during the fermentation ($P = 0.001$, Fig. 4). Spontaneous winery fermentations
329 were associated with the predominance of *Hanseniaspora*, *Hanseniaspora uvarum* and *Pichia*
330 *kudriavzevii* while inoculated winery fermentations were associated with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (P
331 < 0.001).

332

333 3.3 Oenological parameters and volatilome profile

334 Oenological parameters and VOCs data were used to build a Principal Component Analysis
335 (PCA) to visualize the differences among wines produced in the winery scale conditions (Fig. 5, Panel
336 A and B). The PC1 explained 35.3 % and the PC2 21.0 % of the variation on the data set. Wines produced
337 from grape berries treated with the alternative treatment T05 (Laminarin + Metiram) regardless of
338 inoculation protocol used (S or I) were characterized by high ethanol, acetic acid and ethyl acetate values.
339 Noteworthy, a lesser variability between wines produced from grape berries treated with T02, T06 and
340 T07, regardless of inoculation protocol, was observed compared to T05, T08 and T10.

341

342 3.4 Correlation between mycobiota and oenological parameters

343 Significant correlations between oenological parameters and frequency of mycobiota taxa were
344 obtained (exact P -values and R coefficients are reported in Table S2 in Supplementary Material).

345 Concerning correlation patterns in wine produced with spontaneous fermentation, positive
346 correlations were observed between *P. kluyveri* and glycerol (Fig. 6, $P < 0.05$). Interestingly, in
347 inoculated fermentations, we observed negative correlations between *Starm. bacillaris* and acetic acid,
348 ethanol and total acidity, while positive correlations were observed between *S. cerevisiae* and glycerol,
349 total acidity and pH and *H. uvarum* and ethanol (Fig. 6, $P < 0.05$).

350

351 3.5 Grape-mycobiota contribution to wine aroma

352 Significant correlations between VOCs and ASVs were obtained (exact *P*-values and R
353 coefficients are reported in Table S3 in Supplementary Material).

354 By plotting the Spearman's correlation between metabolites and fungal ASVs in wine obtained
355 under spontaneous winery fermentation we observed positive correlations between *S. cerevisiae* with
356 1,3-benzothiazole and *H. uvarum* with 1-nonanol, and ethyl-2-hexenoate, while negative correlations
357 were observed between *B. cinerea* with ethyl decanoate, ethyl hexadecanoate and isopentyl hexanoate;
358 *C. cladosporoides* with benzoic acid, benzyl alcohol, decanoic acid and methyl octanoate and *P.*
359 *kudriavzevii* with 2-phenyl ethanol, 2-phenylethyl acetate, 4-methylpentanol, ethyl octanoate, octanoic
360 acid and linalool (Fig. 6, *P* < 0.05). In inoculated fermentations positive correlations were observed
361 between *S. cerevisiae* with geraniol, *P. kluyveri* with linalool (Fig. 6, *P* < 0.05). Concerning negative
362 correlations, *H. uvarum* was negatively correlated with isoamyl alcohol, *S. cerevisiae* with 1-octanol,
363 and *B. cinerea* with 1-butanol, ethyl decanoate and isopentyl hexanoate (Fig. 6, *P* < 0.05).

364

365 4. Discussion

366

367 The effect of alternative and conventional chemical antifungal compounds on mycobiota of
368 "Nebbiolo" grapes and corresponding wines, oenological parameters and volatilome profile were
369 investigated. The total yeast population on wine grapes at harvest time ranged from 4.5 to 6.5 Log
370 CFU/mL, in accordance with those reported in the literature for mature grapes (Alessandria et al., 2015).
371 Similar yeast load among grape samples treated with both alternative and conventional chemical
372 treatments, compared to untreated Control (T01) and the control conventional treatment (T08) was
373 observed, suggesting that both alternative and conventional chemical-based antifungal compounds do
374 not affect significantly the colonization by indigenous yeasts. A significant variation was only observed
375 when applying the alternative treatment T04 (potassium phosphonate and sulphur + copper hydroxide)
376 on grape berries, that led to a reduction of the overall yeast population (about 4.5 Log CFU/mL). The
377 high antifungal activity of sulphur and copper-based treatments against yeasts of oenological interest has
378 been already suggested by Milanović et al. (2013). However, the reduction observed in sample T04 could
379 be attributed to the synergistic effect of potassium phosphonate with sulphur + copper hydroxide, since
380 the last two active ingredients are also present in the control conventional treatment T08.

381 Concerning yeast diversity on grape samples, culture-dependent approach highlight a dominance
382 and colonization of non-fermenting microorganisms, mainly *A. pullulans* and *C. cladosporioides* and
383 reduction of the population of fermenting yeasts such as *H. uvarum* and *Starm. bacillaris*, when

384 grapevines were treated with all alternative (T02-T07, T09) and two conventional treatments (T11 and
385 T12) independently of the active ingredient used if compared to the untreated (T01) and the treated
386 conventional control product (T08). The ability of these compounds to increase the presence of *A.*
387 *pullulans* on grapes could be of great interest since this yeast-like fungus has bioprotective antagonistic
388 features against yeasts and moulds and may influence the overall grape ecology, as previously reported
389 by Bozoudi & Tsaltas (2008). On the other hand, culture-independent approach did not show any
390 significant difference in terms of alpha diversity index or taxa frequency as a function of treatment,
391 indicating the importance of applying a multiphasic approach to uncover yeast communities associated
392 with grapes (Alessandria et al., 2015). Also, it is worth noticing that *S. cerevisiae* was detected on all the
393 grape samples using the metataxonomic approach, independently of the treatment applied. This evidence
394 is in line with recent literature and underlines the power of sequencing approach to provide a more
395 sensitive and comprehensive overview of complex microbial communities (Bokulich & Mills, 2012),
396 since culture-based approaches may miss about 95 % of the fungal community (Taylor, Tsai, Anfang,
397 Ross, & Goddard, 2019).

398 The initial mycobiota composition of each fermentation encompassing both non-*Saccharomyces*
399 and *S. cerevisiae* yeast was further affected in the winery as revealed by both plate counts and
400 metataxonomic analyses. Non-*Saccharomyces* species (*Starm. bacillaris* and *H. uvarum*) have been
401 shown to contribute to the overall chemical and sensorial profile of wines by producing metabolites
402 associated with wine quality (Englezos et al., 2019ab, Jolly, Varela, & Pretorius, 2014). In the present
403 study, *Starm. bacillaris* was identified by culture-dependent method until the middle of the fermentation
404 period in all spontaneous fermentations, except grapes treated with alternative chemical compounds T05.
405 This suggests that this yeasts species might contribute to the wine composition since is correlated with
406 an increase in glycerol and total acidity.

407 In the same context, metataxonomic analyses at the of the monitored period revealed that
408 mycobiota was greatly influenced by the addition of the starter culture. This is the case of *H. uvarum* and
409 *P. kluyveri*, since were greatly associated with spontaneous fermentations. Concerning, inoculated
410 fermentations, these were mainly associated with *P. kluyveri* and *Starm. bacillaris*, together with *S.*
411 *cerevisiae*. All these findings, highlight the contribution of the indigenous yeast species and strains within
412 species to overall yeast ecology, in accordance with Morrison & Goddard (2018). Regarding *S.*
413 *cerevisiae*, this species was dominant in all fermentations regardless of the type of treatment applied,
414 inoculation protocol, confirming the high ability of this yeast to tolerate adverse conditions during the
415 fermentation process (Knight, Klaere, Fedrizzi, & Goddard, 2015). The dominance of the starter culture

416 was confirmed in inoculated fermentation using interdelta-PCR fingerprinting analysis, while indigenous
417 strains were identified on spontaneous fermentation (data not shown).

418 The application of copper to the vine has an important role in ensuring a successful must
419 fermentation; however high concentrations of this compound in must could have a negative impact on
420 yeasts growth, fermentation kinetics and the performance of starter cultures during fermentation (Capece,
421 Romaniello, Scrano, Siesto, & Romano, 2018). In the present study we showed that the concentrations
422 of copper as active ingredient from the alternative treatments (T05, T06 and T10) increased the yeast
423 counts of *S. cerevisiae*, indicating the ability of this species to dominate the must environment during
424 fermentation and reduce the proportion of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts in the short term. This finding is
425 of particular interest, since several non-*Saccharomyces* species, mainly *H. uvarum* are associated with
426 negative attributes (Belda et al., 2017). However, further studies based on the quantification of the
427 amount of residual copper in the grape must are necessary in order to better investigate this correlation.

428 Metataxonomic analyses are now commonly used for ecological analysis, however, relatively
429 few studies have employed such methods to characterize the microbial ecology of wine fermentations
430 using grapes previously treated in the winery using alternative fungicide treatments. In this study, no
431 effect of the fungicide treatments was observed in the yeast communities. Especially, in inoculated
432 fermentations in which *S. cerevisiae* strain was inoculated in the medium in all ferments.. These results
433 are in disagreement with those reported by Agarbati et al. (2019), that demonstrated conventional and
434 organic based vineyard treatments can influence yeast communities and therefore wine quality.

435 Correlations between wine mycobiota and main oenological parameters and VOCs have been
436 extensively investigated (Bokulich et al., 2016; Cravero et al., 2016; Tufariello et al., 2021). In the present
437 study, wines appear to be differentiated by the inoculation protocol, since spontaneously fermented wines
438 contained higher levels of glycerol and total acidity, compared to the respective inoculated fermentations,
439 independently of the treatment applied in the vineyard. The higher levels of glycerol could be explained
440 by the relatively high presence of non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts, mainly *Starm. bacillaris* during
441 fermentation, as previously reported by Englezos et al. (2019b). While, the higher levels of total acidity
442 could be explained by the ability of the non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts to produce higher levels of organic
443 acids, compared to *S. cerevisiae* (Jolly et al., 2014).

444

445 **5. Conclusion**

446 This study has demonstrated that the application of antifungal compounds against powdery and
447 downy mildew has an impact on the mycobiota present on grapes and in fermenting musts and suggests

448 the absence of a link between principal active compounds, yeast biodiversity and wine composition. It
449 is, important to underline that only one vineyard from one geographical region and one time point were
450 taken in consideration in this study, therefore further studies are necessary to confirm the findings of this
451 preliminary work. Since, the effect of vineyard management on overall microbial biodiversity differs
452 between organisms and across time and space, as previously demonstrated by Giraldo-Perez, Raw,
453 Greven, & Goddard (2021). Increasing our knowledge of the response of indigenous mycobiota
454 inhabiting grapes and during the fermentation process to the application of different antifungal
455 compounds with low environmental impact serves as a foundation to develop new grape management
456 procedures and guarantee wine quality and fulfilling consumer demands for sustainable wines.

457

458

459 **6. Acknowledgements**

460 This research was financially supported by the *SAFEGRAPPE* project (Sustainable grapevine
461 protection against fungal pathogens) funded by Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Cuneo. Authors
462 gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Tenuta Carretta and Agroinnova for vineyard management
463 and supplying grapes.

464

465 **7. References**

466

467 Abdo, H., Catacchio, C. R., Ventura, M., D'Addabbo, P., Alexandre, H., Guilloux-Bénatier, M., &
468 Rousseaux, S. (2020). The establishment of a fungal consortium in a new winery. *Scientific*
469 *Reports*, *10*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-64819-2>.

470

471 Agarbati, A., Canonico, L., Mancabelli, L., Milani, C., Ventura, M., Ciani, M., & Comitini, F. (2019).
472 The influence of fungicide treatments on mycobiota of grapes and its evolution during
473 fermentation evaluated by metagenomic and culture-dependent methods. *Microorganisms*, *7*(5),
474 114. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms7050114>.

475

476 Alessandria, V., Marengo, F., Englezos, V., Gerbi, V., Rantsiou, K., & Cocolin, L. (2015). Mycobiota of
477 Barbera grapes from the Piedmont region from a single vintage year. *American Journal of*
478 *Enology and Viticulture*, *66*(2), 244-250. <https://doi.org/10.5344/ajev.2014.14071>.

479

- 480 Barata, A., Malfeito-Ferreira, M., & Loureiro, V. (2012) The microbial ecology of wine grape berries.
481 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 153, 243–259.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2011.11.025>.
483
- 484 Belda, I., Zorraonaindia, I., Perisin, M., Palacios, A., & Acedo A. (2017). From vineyard soil to wine
485 fermentation: microbiome approximations to explain the “terroir” concept. *Frontiers in*
486 *Microbiology*, 8, 821 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.00821>.
487
- 488 Bokulich, N. A., & Mills, D. A. (2012). Next-generation approaches to the microbial ecology of food
489 fermentations. *BMB Reports*, 45(7), 377-389. <https://10.5483/bmbrep.2012.45.7.148>.
490
- 491 Bokulich, N. A., Thorngate, J. H., Richardson, P. M., & Mills, D. A. (2014). Microbial biogeography of
492 wine grapes is conditioned by cultivar, vintage, and climate. *Proceedings of the National*
493 *Academy of Sciences*, 111, E139-E148. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1317377110>.
494
- 495 Bokulich, N. A., Collins, T. S., Masarweh, C., Allene, G., Heymann, H., Ebeler, S. E., & Mills, D.A.
496 (2016). Associations among wine grape microbiome, metabolome, and fermentation behavior
497 suggest microbial contribution to regional wine characteristics. *MBio*, 7, e00631-16.
498 <https://10.1128/mBio.00631-16>.
499
- 500 Bolyen, E., Rideout, J. R., Dillon, M. R., Bokulich, N. A., Abnet, C. C., Al-Ghalith, G.A., Alexander,
501 H., Alm, E. J., Arumugam, M., Asnicar, F., Bai, Y., Bisanz, J.E., Bittinger, K., Brejnrod, A.,
502 Brislawn, C. J., Brown, C. T., Callahan, B. J., Caraballo-Rodríguez, A. M., Chase, J., Cope, E.
503 K., Da Silva, R., Diener, C., Dorrestein, P. C, Douglas, G. M., Durall, D. M., Duvall, C.,
504 Edwardson, C. F., Ernst, M., Estaki, M., Fouquier, J., Gauglitz, J. M., Gibbons, S. M., Gibson,
505 D. L., Gonzalez, A., Gorlick, K., Guo, J., Hillmann, B., Holmes, S., Holste, H., Huttenhower, C.,
506 Huttley, G. A., Janssen, S., Jarmusch, A. K., Jiang, L., Kaehler, B. D., Kang, K. B., Keefe, C. R.,
507 Keim, P., Kelley, S. T., Knights, D., Koester, I., Kosciulek, T., Kreps, J., Langille, M. G. I., Lee,
508 J., Ley, R., Liu, Y. X., Loftfield, E., Lozupone, C., Maher, M., Marotz, C., Martin, B. D.,
509 McDonald, D., McIver, L. J., Melnik, A. V., Metcalf, J. L., Morgan, S. C., Morton, J. T., Naimey,
510 A. T., Navas-Molina, J. A., Nothias, L. F., Orchanian, S. B., Pearson, T., Peoples, S. L., Petras,
511 D., Preuss, M. L., Pruesse, E., Rasmussen, L. B., Rivers, A., Robeson, M. S., Rosenthal, P.,

512 Segata, N., Shaffer, M., Shiffer, A., Sinha, R., Song, S. J., Spear, J. R., Swafford, A. D.,
513 Thompson, L. R., Torres, P. J., Trinh, P., Tripathi, A., Turnbaugh, P. J., Ul-Hasan, S., van der
514 Hooft, J. J. J., Vargas, F., Vázquez-Baeza, Y., Vogtmann, E., von Hippel, M., Walters, W., Wan,
515 Y., Wang, M., Warren, J., Weber, K. C., Williamson, C. H. D., Willis, A. D., Xu, Z. Z., Zaneveld,
516 J. R., Zhang, Y., Zhu, Q., Knight, R., & Caporaso, J. G. (2019). Reproducible, interactive, scalable
517 and extensible microbiome data science using QIIME 2. *Nature Biotechnology*, *37*, 852–857.
518 [https://doi: 10.1038/s41587-019-0209-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0209-9).

519

520 Bozoudi, D., and Tsaltas, D. (2018). The multiple and versatile roles of *Aureobasidium pullulans* in the
521 vitivincultural sector. *Fermentation*, *4*, 85. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation4040085>

522

523 Callahan, B. J., McMurdie, P. J., Rosen, M. J., Han, A. W., Johnson, A. J. A., & Holmes, S. P. (2016).
524 DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nature Methods*, *13*,
525 581–583. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3869>.

526

527 Calhelha, R. C., Andrade, J. V., Ferreira, I. C., & Estevinho, L. M. (2006). Toxicity effects of fungicide
528 residues on the wine-producing process. *Food Microbiology*, *23*(4), 393-
529 398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2005.04.008>.

530

531 Capece, A., Romaniello, R., Scrano, L., Siesto, G., & Romano, P. (2018). Yeast starter as a
532 biotechnological tool for reducing copper content in wine. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *8*, 2632.
533 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.02632>

534

535 Cordero-Bueso, G., Arroyo, T., Serrano, A., Tello, J., Aporta, I., Vélez, M. D., & Valero, E. (2011).
536 Influence of the farming system and vine variety on yeast communities associated with grape
537 berries. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, *145*(1), 132-139. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.11.040)
538 [10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.11.040](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.11.040).

539

540 Cravero, F., Englezos, V., Torchio, F., Giacosa, S., Segade, S. R., Gerbi, V., Rantsiou, K., Rolle, L., &
541 Cocolin, L. (2016). Post-harvest control of wine-grape mycobiota using electrolyzed
542 water. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, *35*, 21-28.
543 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2016.03.010>.

544

545 Englezos, V., Pollon, M., Rantsiou, K., Ortiz-Julien, A., Botto, R., Segade, S. R., Giacosa, S., Rolle, L.,
546 & Cocolin, L. (2019a). *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*-*Starmerella bacillaris* strains interaction
547 modulates chemical and volatile profile in red wine mixed fermentations. *Food Research*
548 *International*, 122, 392-401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2019.03.072>.

549

550 Englezos, V., Cachón, D. C., Rantsiou, K., Blanco, P., Petrozziello, M., Pollon, M., Giacosa, S., Segade,
551 R. S., Rolle, L., & Cocolin, L. (2019b). Effect of mixed species alcoholic fermentation on growth
552 and malolactic activity of lactic acid bacteria. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 103(18),
553 7687-7702. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-019-10064-1>.

554

555 Esteve-Zarzoso, B., Belloch, C., Uruburu, F., & Querol, A. (1999). Identification of yeasts by RFLP
556 analysis of the 5.8S rRNA gene and the two ribosomal internal transcribed spacers. *International*
557 *Journal of Systematic Bacteriology*, 49,329-37. <https://doi.org/10.1099/00207713-49-1-329>.
558 PMID: 10028278.

559

560 Fleet, G., Prakitchaiwattana, C., Beh, A., & Heard, G. (2002). The yeast ecology of wine grapes. In: Ciani
561 M (ed) Biodiversity and biotechnology of wine yeasts Research Signpost, Kerala, India 95: 1-17.

562

563 Gadoury, D. M., Cadle-Davidson, L., Wilcox, W. F., Dry, I. B., Seem, R. C., & Milgroom, M. G. (2012).
564 Grapevine powdery mildew (*Erysiphe necator*): a fascinating system for the study of the biology,
565 ecology and epidemiology of an obligate biotroph. *Molecular Plant Pathology*, 13, 1–16.
566 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1364-3703.2011.00728.x>.

567

568 Gilbert, J.A., van der Lelie, D., & Zarraonaindia, I. (2014). Microbial terroir for wine grapes. *Proceedings*
569 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111: 5-6. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1320471110>.

570

571 Giraldo-Perez, P., Raw, V., Greven, M., & Goddard, M. R. (2021). A small effect of conservation
572 agriculture on soil biodiversity that differs between biological kingdoms and geographical
573 locations. *iScience*, 24 (4), 102280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2021.102280>.

574

575 Grangeteau, C., Roullier-Gall, C., Rousseaux, S., Gougeon, R. D., Schmitt-Kopplin, P., Alexandre, H.,

576 & Guilloux-Benatier, M. (2017). Wine microbiology is driven by vineyard and winery
577 anthropogenic factors. *Microbial Biotechnology*, *10*(2), 354-370. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.12428)
578 7915.12428.

579

580 Gutiérrez-Gamboa, G., Romanazzi, G., Garde-Cerdà, T., & Pérez-Alvarez, E. P. (2019). A review of
581 the use of biostimulants in the vineyard for improved grape and wine quality: effects on
582 prevention of grapevine diseases. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, *99*, 1001–
583 1009. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.9353>

584

585 Jolly, N. P., Varela, C., & Pretorius, I. S. (2014). Not your ordinary yeast: non-*Saccharomyces* yeasts in
586 wine production uncovered. *FEMS Yeast Research*, *14*(2), 215-237.
587 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1567-1364.12111>.

588

589 Knight, S., Klaere, S., Fedrizzi, B., & Goddard, M. R., (2015). Regional microbial signatures positively
590 correlate with differential wine phenotypes: evidence for a microbial aspect to terroir. *Scientific*
591 *Reports*, *5*, 14233 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep14233>

592

593 Knight, S. J., Karon, O., & Goddard, M. R. (2020). Small scale fungal community differentiation in a
594 vineyard system. *Food Microbiology*, *87*, 103358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.103358>.

595

596 Kurtzman, C. P., & Robnett, C. J. (1997). Identification of clinically important ascomycetous yeast based
597 on nucleotide divergence in the 5' end of the large-subunit (26S) ribosomal DNA gene. *Journal*
598 *of Clinical Microbiology*, *35*, 1216–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.35.5.1216-1223.1997>.

599

600 Legras, J. L., & Karst, F. (2003). Optimisation of interdelta analysis for *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain
601 characterisation. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, *221*(2), 249-255. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1097(03)00205-2)
602 1097(03)00205-2.

603

604 Liu, Y., Rousseaux, S., Tourdot-Maréchal, R., Sadoudi, M., Gougeon, R., Schmitt-Kopplin, P., &
605 Alexandre, H. (2017). Wine microbiome: A dynamic world of microbial interactions. *Critical*
606 *Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, *57*(4), 856-873.
607 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2014.983591>.

608

609 Liu, D., Zhang, P., Chen, D., & Howell, K. S. (2019). From the vineyard to the winery: how microbial
610 ecology drives regional distinctiveness of wine. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *10*, 2679.
611 <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffmicb.2019.02679>.

612

613 Lukas, K., Innerebner, G., Kelderer, M., Finckh, M. R., & Hohmann, P. (2016). Efficacy of copper
614 alternatives applied as stop-sprays against *Plasmopara viticola* in grapevine. *Journal of Plant*
615 *Diseases and Protection*, *123*, 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S41348-016-0024-1>.

616

617 Medina, K., Boido, E., Dellacassa, E., & Carrau, F. (2012). Growth of non- *Saccharomyces* yeasts affects
618 nutrient availability for *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* during wine fermentation. *International*
619 *Journal of Food Microbiology*, *157*, 245–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.05.012>.

620

621 Milanović, V., Comitini, F., & Ciani, M. (2013). Grape berry yeast communities: Influence of fungicide
622 treatment. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, *161*, 240–246.
623 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.12.019>.

624

625 Morrison-Whittle, P., Lee, S. A., & Goddard, M. R. (2017). Fungal communities are differentially
626 affected by conventional and biodynamic agricultural management approaches in vineyard
627 ecosystems. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *246*, 306–313.
628 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.05.022>

629

630 Morrison-Whittle, P., & Goddard, M. R. (2018). From vineyard to winery: a source map of microbial
631 diversity driving wine fermentation. *Environmental Microbiology*, *20* (1), 75–84.
632 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.13960>.

633

634 Mota-Gutierrez, J., Ferrocino, I., Rantsiou, K., & Cocolin, L. (2019). Metataxonomic comparison
635 between internal transcribed spacer and 26S ribosomal large subunit (LSU) rDNA gene.
636 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, *290*, 132–140.
637 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2018.10.010>.

638

639 Nicolopoulou-Stamati, P., Maipas, S., Kotampasi, C., Stamatis, P., & Hens, L. (2016). Chemical

640 pesticides and human health: the urgent need for a new concept in agriculture. *Frontiers in Public*
641 *Health*, 4, 148. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Fpubh.2016.00148>

642

643 Pugliese, M., Monchiero, M., Gullino, M. L., & Garibaldi, A. (2018). Application of laminarin and
644 calcium oxide for the control of grape powdery mildew on *Vitis vinifera* cv. Moscato. *Journal of*
645 *Plant Diseases and Protection*, 125, 477–482. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s41348-018-0162-8>

646

647 Rantsiou, K., Giacosa, S., Pugliese, M., Englezos, V., Ferrocino, I., Río Segade, S., Monchiero, M.,
648 Gribaudo, I., Gambino, G., Gullino, M. L., & Rolle, L. (2020). Impact of chemical and alternative
649 fungicides applied to grapevine cv Nebbiolo on microbial ecology and chemical-physical grape
650 characteristics at harvest. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 11, 700.
651 <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpls.2020.00700>.

652

653 Reynier, A., 2012. Manuel de Viticulture, 11 edition. Lavoisier, Paris, pp. 592.

654

655 Rolle, L., Englezos, V., Torchio, F., Cravero, F., Río Segade, S., Rantsiou, K., Giacosa, S., Gambuti, A.,
656 Gerbi, V., & Cocolin, L. (2018). Alcohol reduction in red wines by technological and
657 microbiological approaches: A comparative study. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine*
658 *Research*, 24(1), 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12301>.

659

660 Romanazzi, G., Mancini, V., Feliziani, E., Servili, A., Endeshaw, S., & Neri, D. (2016). Impact of
661 alternative fungicides on grape downy mildew control and vine growth and development. *Plant*
662 *Disease*, 100, 739–748. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-05-15-0564-RE>.

663

664 Russo, P., Berbegal, C., De Ceglie, C., Grieco, F., Spano, G., & Capozzi, V. (2019). Pesticide residues
665 and stuck fermentation in wine: New evidences indicate the urgent need of tailored
666 regulations. *Fermentation*, 5(1), 23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation5010023>.

667

668 Schmid, F., Moser, G., Müller, H., & Berg, G. (2011). Functional and structural microbial diversity in
669 organic and conventional viticulture: Organic farming benefits natural biocontrol agents. *Applied*
670 *and Environmental Microbiology*, 77(6), 2188-2191. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02187-10>.

671

672 Stefanini, I., & Cavalieri, D. (2018). Metagenomic approaches to investigate the contribution of the
673 vineyard environment to the quality of wine fermentation: Potentials and difficulties. *Frontiers*
674 *in Microbiology*, 9. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffmicb.2018.00991>.
675

676 Swiegers, J. H., Bartowsky, E. J., Henschke, P. A., & Pretorius, I. (2005). Yeast and bacterial modulation
677 of wine aroma and flavour. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*, 11(2), 139-173.
678 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0238.2005.tb00285.x>.
679

680 Taylor, M. W., Tsai, P., Anfang, N., Ross, H. A., & Goddard, M. R. (2014). Pyrosequencing reveals
681 regional differences in fruit-associated fungal communities. *Environmental Microbiology*, 16(9),
682 2848-2858. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111%2F1462-2920.12456>.
683

684 Trouvelot, S., Héloir, M. C., Poinssot, B., Gauthier, A., Paris, F., Guillier, C., Combier, M., Trda, L.,
685 Daire, X., & Adrian M. (2014). Carbohydrates in plant immunity and plant protection: roles and
686 potential application as foliar sprays. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 5, 592.
687 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00592>.
688

689 Tufariello, M., Fragasso, M., Pico, J., Panighel, A., Castellarin, S. D., Flamini, R., & Grieco, F. (2021).
690 Influence of non-*Saccharomyces* on wine chemistry: a focus on aroma-related
691 compounds. *Molecules*, 26(3), 644. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules26030644>.
692

693 Zorraonaindia, I., Owens, S.M., Weisenhorn, P., West, K., Hampton-Marcell, J., Lax, S. Bokulich, N. A.,
694 Mills, D. A., Martin, G., Taghavi, S., van der Lelie, D., & Gilbert, J. A. (2015). The soil
695 microbiome influences grapevine-associated microbiota. *MBio*, 6, e02527-02514.
696 <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.02527-14>.
697
698

699 **TABLE LEGENDS**

700

701 **Table 1** Description of the fungicide treatments used, including active ingredients and dosages. For this
702 study we considered T08 as the control conventional treatment as it is the one commonly employed for
703 vineyard protection against fungal diseases.

704

705 **Table 2** Frequency of mycobiota taxa of Nebbiolo grapes treated with alternative and conventional treatments
706 based on the relative frequency of the amplicon sequence variants (ASVs). T01: untreated control; T08:
707 conventional control.

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730 **Table 1**

#	Category	Active ingredients	Dose (g/ha)
T01	Untreated control	Untreated control	-
T02	Alternative chemical treatment	Acibenzolar-S-methyl	100
		Sulphur + Copper hydroxide	3200+600
T03	Alternative chemical treatment	Fosetyl-Al	3200
		Sulphur + Copper hydroxide	3200+600
T04	Alternative chemical treatment	Potassium phosphonate	3020
		Sulphur + Copper hydroxide	3200+600
T05	Alternative chemical treatment	Laminarin + Metiram	90 + 1400
		Laminarin + Copper hydroxide	90 + 600
T06	Alternative chemical treatment	Chito-oligosaccharides and oligogalacturonides + Metiram	31.25+1400
		Chito-oligosaccharides and oligogalacturonides + Copper hydroxide	31.25+600
T07	Alternative chemical treatment	Potassium bicarbonate+Metiram	4250+1400
		Potassium bicarbonate + Copper hydroxide	4250+600
T08	Conventional control chemical treatment	Sulphur + Metiram	3200+1400
		Sulphur + Copper hydroxide	3200+600
T09	Alternative chemical treatment	Calcium oxide	884
T10	Alternative chemical treatment	Calcium oxide + Metiram	884 + 1400
		Calcium oxide + Copper hydroxide	884 + 1400
T11	Conventional chemical treatment	Sulphur	3200
T12	Conventional chemical treatment	Metiram	1400
		Copper hydroxide	600

731

Table 2

	Untreated		Alternative treatments																Conventional treatments					
	T01		T02		T03		T04		T05		T06		T07		T09		T10		T08		T11		T12	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
<i>Alternaria</i>	3.12	1.93	3.22	3.29	3.61	2.13	1.7	0.3	0.97	0.57	1.39	1.21	2.61	1.82	4.91	5.13	3.42	2.91	1.09	0.99	1.65	0.49	0.95	0.1
<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.03	0.05	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.22	0.38	0	0
<i>Aureobasidium pullulans</i>	27.2	7.39	49.52	23.41	48.79	4.61	41.24	20.05	59.43	12.9	36.04	23.47	53.52	23.39	35.3	18.08	47.04	36.93	28.99	4.23	38.75	11.52	72.87	13.04
<i>Botrytis cinerea</i>	0.22	0.07	0.17	0.16	0.28	0.26	0.42	0.27	0.14	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.31	0.3	1.12	1.69	0.16	0.13	0.37	0.54	0.55	0.7	0.06	0.07
<i>Cladosporium cladosporoides</i>	37.02	19.8	26.91	23.35	27.88	15.37	29.16	16.15	27.51	10.16	44.86	38.61	15.82	12.54	39.09	23.28	35.6	35	24.3	21.85	39.75	26.22	10.49	2.5
<i>Erysiphe necator</i>	0.08	0.05	0.26	0.36	0.31	0.5	0.2	0.27	0.18	0.3	0.44	0.59	0.52	0.89	0.27	0.44	0.18	0.15	0.34	0.51	0.3	0.27	0	0
<i>Filobasidium</i>	0.12	0.09	0.61	0.84	0.12	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.14	0.17	0.16	0.2	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.02	0	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01
<i>Filobasidium magnus</i>	6.27	2.39	5.06	3.13	4.49	4.91	9.47	5.47	2.95	2.61	4.95	5.94	3.3	3.2	6.67	7.26	3.39	2.57	0.97	0.04	5.63	6.18	2.05	2.53
<i>Fusarium</i>	0.47	0.28	0.63	0.48	0.47	0.28	1.21	1.11	0.25	0.29	0.26	0.32	0.22	0.23	0.76	0.62	0.37	0.61	0.19	0.32	0.38	0.42	0.46	0.72
<i>Hanseniaspora</i>	0.22	0.37	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.15	0.19	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.06	0.56	0.71	0.26	0.23	0.02	0.01	0.11	0.08	0.13	0.17	0.23	0.2
<i>Hanseniaspora uvarum</i>	11.74	20.23	0.53	0.72	1.17	1.73	1.78	3.08	0.13	0.11	1.03	1.76	14.48	24.68	0.68	1.09	0.95	1.17	30.22	32.96	1.27	2.19	7.46	12.86
<i>Pichia kluyveri</i>	0	0	0.02	0.04	0	0	0.02	0.03	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04	0	0	0.48	0.83
<i>Pichia occidentalis</i>	0	0	0	0	0.04	0.05	0	0	0.03	0.03	0.34	0.58	0.18	0.31	0.14	0.16	0.08	0.07	0	0.01	0	0.01	0.18	0.32
<i>Pichia terricola</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.09	0.15	0	0	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.08	0	0.01	0	0	0.08	0.13	0	0	0	0
<i>Rhodotorula glutinis</i>	0.37	0.38	0.36	0.33	0.26	0.25	0.47	0.41	0.36	0.34	1.02	1.49	0.46	0.42	1.21	1.02	0.94	1.04	0.16	0.14	1.22	1.32	0.59	0.85
<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.15	0.08	0.12	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.58	0.99	0.29	0.24	0.04	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.27	0.42	0.07	0.12
<i>Sporidiobolus pararoseus</i>	0.14	0.05	0.58	0.24	0.4	0.19	3.34	5.08	0.22	0.19	0.59	0.61	0.13	0.11	0.34	0.31	0.36	0.41	0.09	0.1	0.31	0.27	0.14	0.24
<i>Sporobolomyces roseus</i>	0.46	0.21	0.37	0.04	0.26	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.2	0.17	0.35	0.4	0.12	0.11	0.35	0.33	0.31	0.2	0.04	0.05	0.44	0.4	0.08	0.13
<i>Starmerella bacillaris</i>	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.07	0.35	0.58	0.33	0.54	0.08	0.14	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.12	7.75	13.4	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.15
<i>Symmetrospora</i>	0.56	0.11	1.49	1.53	2.07	1.87	1.15	1.15	0.65	0.57	0.85	0.83	0.64	0.87	0.54	0.52	0.17	0.19	0.07	0.08	0.59	0.63	0.1	0.17
<i>Symmetrospora oryzzicola</i>	2.29	1.74	1.17	0.27	1	0.9	1	0.81	0.93	0.73	0.55	0.51	0.51	0.56	1.08	0.66	0.69	0.6	0.14	0.2	0.92	0.8	0.54	0.68
<i>Tilletiopsis washingtonensis</i>	0.22	0.25	0.4	0.55	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.06	0.1	0.16	0.14	0.9	1.54	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.1	0	0
<i>Vishniacozyma carnescens</i>	2.3	0.64	3.52	2.7	3.82	3.54	3.74	2.83	2.8	2.44	3.4	3.47	1.56	1.35	2.24	2.29	3.38	3.24	1.16	0.62	3.5	3.19	1.37	2.35
<i>Vishniacozyma victoriorae</i>	1.38	0.52	1.51	0.56	2.11	1.2	1.47	1.51	0.96	0.75	1.04	1.02	1.17	0.7	1.43	1.54	0.72	0.18	0.26	0.25	0.93	0.83	0.17	0.29
<i>Wickerhamomyces anomalus</i>	0	0	0.12	0.19	0.05	0.06	0.39	0.65	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	1.54	2.66	0.74	1.15	0.08	0.09	0.66	1.15	0.54	0.87	0.77	1.33

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1 Total yeast population (Panel A) and yeast species biodiversity (Panel B), registered on Nebbiolo grapes after harvest, as determined by plate counts on WLN medium. Data are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation of four biological replicates. Different letters in each column, mean significant differences according to Tukey-HSD test ($P < 0.001$). Fungicide treatment descriptors are reported in Table 1. T01: untreated control; T08: conventional control.

Fig. 2 Yeast diversity (Panel A), total yeast population (Panel B) and evolution of metabolites during the alcoholic fermentation (Panel C) of spontaneous musts previously sprayed with alternative chemical fungicides (WS2, WST5, WS6, WS7, and WS10) and conventional chemical fungicide (WST8) and inoculated musts previously sprayed with alternative chemical fungicides (WI2, WI5, WI6, WI7, and WI10) and conventional chemical fungicide (WIT8) performed in winery conditions are described. Yeast diversity and total yeast population were determined by plate counts on WLN medium. Panel C displays sugar (black circle), ethanol (white square) and glycerol (white diamond) concentrations. **Abbreviations:** Winery, W; Laboratory, L; Spontaneous, S; Inoculated, I, T; treatment previously applied on grapes.

Fig. 3 Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) of Bray–Curtis distance with each sample represented as a circle and color code according to fermentation time, type or fungicide treatment

Fig. 4 Boxplot showing the development of fungal taxa during the fermentation time. According to the inoculum protocol of the fermentation conditions (laboratory fermentation or winery fermentation). Only Fungal taxa that display a significant development are shown ($p < 0.05$; $**p < 0.01$).

Fig. 5 Score plot (A) and loading plots (B) of standard chemical compounds and volatile organic compounds determined in Nebbiolo wines at the end of winery scale fermentations. [1] Acetic acid; [2] Glycerol; [3] Glucose; [4] Fructose; [5] Ethanol; [6] Residual sugars; [7] Total acidity; [8] pH; [9] Yglycerol; [10] Yethanol; [11] Ethyl acetate; [12] Ethyl butanoate; [13] Isobutanol; [14] Isoamyl acetate; [15] 1-butanol; [16] Isoamyl alcohol; [17] Ethyl hexanoate; [18] Hexyl acetate; [19] 1-hexanol; [20] Methyl octanoate; [21] Ethyl octanoate; [22] Ethyl nonanoate; [23] Linalool; [24] 1-octanol; [25] Ethyl decanoate; [26] Diethyl succinate; [27] Methionol; [28] Cintronello; [29] 2-Phenylethy; ethylacetate; [30] β -damascenon; [31] Ethyl dodecanoate; [32] Geraniol; [33] 2-phenyl ethanol; [34] Ethyl myristate; [35] Ethyl heptanoate* ; [36] 4-methylpentanol*; [37] (S)-3-methylpentanol*; [38] Ethyl-2-hexenoate*; [39] Isopentyl

hexanoate*; [40] 2-ethyl hexanol*; [41] (S)-3-ethyl-4-methylpentanol*; [42] Butyrolactone*; [43] Ethyl-3-methylbutyloctanoate*; [44] 1-nonanol*; [45] 3-methylbutyrate*; [46] Ethyl-9-decenoate*; [47] Ethyl undecanoate*; [48] Ethyl phenylacetate*; [49] Hexanoic acid*; [50] Nerolidol 2*; [51] Benzyl alcohol*; [52] 1,3-benzothiazole*; [53] Ethyl tetradecanoate*; [54] Octanoic acid*; [55] Cadalene*; [56] Ethyl hexadecanoate*; [57] Decanoic acid*; [58] Benzoic acid*.

Fig. 6 Correlation plot showing Spearman's correlation between the fungal ASVs and oenological parameters observed with an incidence above > 1% in at least 2 samples during spontaneous and inoculated winery fermentation. Only significant associations between the relative frequency of ASVs and the concentration of metabolites are shown ($P < 0.05$). The intensity of the colors represents the degree of correlation between the fungal ASVs and oenological parameters, as measured by Spearman's correlation, where the blue color represents a positive degree of correlation and red a negative correlation between the oenological parameters and fungal OTUs.

Figures
Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3






Fig. 4




Fig. 5




Fig. 6

