

1         **THE ROLE OF PHENOLIC COMPOUNDS ON OLIVE OIL AROMA RELEASE**

2  
3             Alessandro Genovese<sup>1\*</sup>, Ni Yang<sup>2</sup>, Robert Linforth<sup>2</sup>, Raffaele Sacchi<sup>1</sup>, Ian Fisk<sup>2</sup>

4  
5  
6             <sup>1</sup> *Department of Agricultural Sciences, University of Naples Federico II, Via Università 100,*

7   *80055 Portici (NA), Italy*

8             <sup>2</sup> *Division of Food Sciences, School of Biosciences, University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington*

9   *Campus, Loughborough, Leicestershire LE12 5RD, United Kingdom*

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20            \*Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 081 2539352.

21            E-mail address: [alessandro.genovese@unina.it](mailto:alessandro.genovese@unina.it) (A. Genovese)

24       **ABSTRACT**

25

26   In this study, atmospheric pressure chemical ionisation-mass spectrometry (APCI-MS) was  
27   successfully applied to understand the effect of phenolic compounds on the release of olive oil  
28   aroma compounds. Eight aroma compounds were monitored under *in-vivo* and *in-vitro* dynamic  
29   conditions in olive oil with and without the addition of virgin olive oil (VOO) biophenols. Three  
30   model olive oils (MOOs) were set up with identical volatile compounds concentrations using a  
31   refined olive oil (ROO). Phenolics were extracted from VOOs and were added to two MOOs in  
32   order to obtain two different concentrations of phenolic compounds ( $P+ = 354 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ;  $P++ = 593$   
33    $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$ ). Another MOO was without VOO biophenols ( $P-$ ). Phenolic compounds impacted both the  
34   intensity and time of aroma release. In the *in-vivo* study, 1-penten-3-one, *trans*-2-hexenal and esters  
35   had lower release in the presence of higher levels of biophenols after swallowing. In contrast,  
36   linalool and 1-hexanol had a greater release. The more hydrophobic compounds had a longer  
37   persistence in the breath than the hydrophilic compounds. VOO phenolics-proline-rich proteins  
38   complexes could explain the binding of aroma compounds and consequently their decrease during  
39   analysis and during organoleptic assessment of olive oil.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46       **Keywords:** Virgin olive oil; APCI-MS; Phenolic compounds; saliva; Aroma release; *In-vivo*  
47   study; volatile compounds.

50

51

## 1. Introduction

Virgin olive oil (VOO) is one of the most appreciated fat products of the Mediterranean diet, and many positive nutritional properties have been associated with its consumption (Keys, 1995; Psaltopoulou, Kosti, Haidopoulos, Dimopoulos, & Panagiotakos, 2011). The popularity of VOO is linked both to its health properties and pleasant aroma. While its health properties are attributed to phenolic compounds, which are also responsible for its bitterness and pungency, its pleasant aroma is due to the presence of volatile aroma compounds (Aparicio, Morales, & Alonso, 1996; Servili *et al.*, 2009). The latter are composed large number (about 100) of different volatiles. These are concentration dependent and vary with variety, growing conditions, and post-harvest processing (Reiners & Grosch, 1998). The lipoxygenase pathway accounts for the main enzymatic reaction producing the most of the aroma compounds of olive oil, which are mainly C<sub>6</sub> and C<sub>5</sub> aldehydes, alcohols and esters (Sánchez-Ortiz, Pérez, & Sanz, 2013).

Olive oil phenolic compounds are mainly phenolic acids, simple phenols like tyrosol and hydroxytyrosol, secoiridoid derivatives of the glycosides oleuropein and ligstroside, lignans, flavonoids, and hydroxyl-isochromans (Servili *et al.*, 2009).

Olive oil bitterness can be classified by its biophenol content into four categories. A quantity of phenolic compounds equal or lower than 220 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> corresponds to non-bitter oils or almost imperceptible bitterness. Slight bitterness of VOO corresponds to 220–340 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> of phenolic compounds. On the contrary, bitter oils have biophenols levels ranging from 340 to 410 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, while phenolics higher than 410 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> correspond to quite bitter or very bitter oils (Beltran, Ruano, Jimenez, Uceda, & Aguilera, 2007).

The flavour notes, derived from volatile and phenolic compounds, are the main features evaluated in the organoleptic assessment of VOO. This assessment identifies mainly positive attributes and defects in the oil, and it is critical for the oil's quality classification according to European legislation (EEC Reg. 2568/91 and further amendments UE Reg. 1348/2013) and the

78 International Olive Council (IOC, 2015). Bitter and pungency notes of VOO are very desirable,  
79 even if it is not considered important in commodity classification (De Santis & Frangipane, 2015).

80 Furthermore, the aroma release from VOO could be also affected by saliva during an  
81 organoleptic assessment, the ability of salivary constituents to interact with aroma compounds has  
82 recently been reviewed (Ployon, Morzel, & Canon, 2017). Mucin and  $\alpha$ -amylase are the most  
83 important proteins of saliva. It has been reported that such proteins affect the volatility of some  
84 aroma compounds by their capacity to trap volatiles through with hydrophobic interactions (Friel &  
85 Taylor, 2001; Pagès-Hélary, Andriot, Guichard, & Canon, 2014). In the case of mucin, covalent  
86 interactions with aldehydes and ketones have also been shown (Friel & Taylor, 2001). Moreover, it  
87 has been also reported that human saliva has a stronger effect compared to artificial saliva probably  
88 due to the presence of different proteins and the activity of certain enzymes (Buettner 2002; Pagès-  
89 Hélary *et al.*, 2014).

90 Phenolic compounds are known to interact reversibly with proteins and aroma compounds. For  
91 example, for wine the interactions between phenolics and salivary proteins (Baxter, Lilley, Haslam, &  
92 Williamson, 1997) or phenolics and volatile compounds (Pozo-Bayon & Reineccius, 2009) are  
93 reported to affect the wine aroma release (Munoz-Gonzalez et al., 2014; Esteban-Fernández, Muñoz-  
94 González, Jiménez-Girón, Pérez-Jiménez, & Pozo-Bayón, 2018). So far, only a few studies have reported  
95 on VOO aroma-phenolic-salivary protein interactions. A study on the interaction effect between  
96 VOO biophenols and salivary mucin showed that VOO phenolic extracts had a greater interaction  
97 with mucin than individual phenolic compounds, even at low concentration (about 300 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>)  
98 (Quintero-Flórez, Sánchez-Ortiz, Gaforio Martínez, Jiménez Márquez, & Beltrán Maza, 2015). In  
99 an another study by SPME, a low-medium level of VOO phenolic compounds (about 300 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>)  
100 was shown to affect the release of olive oil aroma compounds in the presence of human saliva. The  
101 results have also shown the lowest headspace release of volatile compounds belonging to the  
102 chemical class of ethyl esters, acetates, alcohols and ketones (Genovese, Caporaso, Villani,  
103 Paduano, & Sacchi, 2015).

104 Therefore, the presence of biophenols may play a significant role during organoleptic  
105 assessment.

106 During the sensory evaluation of VOO (considered a dynamic oral process) the polyphenol-  
107 aroma and polyphenol-salivary protein interactions may alter the VOO-air partitioning (volatility)  
108 of the aroma compounds thereby affecting aroma release. This has been proved for other types of  
109 food and drink such as wine (Villamor & Ross, 2013).

110 Breath-by-breath by atmospheric pressure chemical ionisation-mass spectrometry (APCI-MS) is  
111 a very useful tool designed primarily to monitor real-time changes in the concentration of known  
112 volatiles while eating (Taylor, Linforth, Harvey, & Blake, 2000) and the impact of conscious and  
113 subconscious control of muscles while swallowing and subsequent breathing (Rabe, Linforth,  
114 Krings, Taylor, & Berger, 2004; Gierczynski, Labouré, Sémon, & Guichard, 2007).

115 The aim of this work was therefore to study key aroma compounds from VOO and to investigate  
116 how VOO phenolic compounds influence aroma release. For this purpose, three model olive oils  
117 (MOOs) with identical concentrations of volatile compounds, differing only for biophenols, were  
118 used. This allowed us to study aroma release from products with differences in phenolic compounds  
119 content but without major differences in the VOO composition. Aroma release was first determined  
120 by APCI-MS under *in-vivo*. Then, *in-vitro* dynamic measurements by APCI-MS were performed  
121 without and with the addition of artificial saliva to understand, the mechanism involved in the  
122 release of aroma compounds during consumption.

123

## 124 **2. Material and Methods**

125

### 126 *2.1. Samples, standards and reagents*

127

128 The refined olive oil (ROO) and virgin olive oil (VOO) from *Rotondella*, *Carpellese* and  
129 *Nostrale di Felitto* cultivars were supplied, respectively, by Dorella Oleificio Candela srl  
130 (Castellamare di Stabia, Napoli, Italy) and Azienda Agricola Marco Rizzo (Felitto, Salerno, Italy).

131 Ethyl butyrate (98%), *cis*-3-hexenylacetate (98%), ethyl acetate (99%), hexanal (97%), *trans*-2-  
132 hexenal (95%), 1-hexanol (98%), linalool (97%), and 1-penten-3-one (95%) were food grade and  
133 were supplied by Sigma–Aldrich (St.Louis, USA). The following reagents were used for the  
134 analysis: hexane (99%), distilled water, supplied by VWR International (Milan, Italy). HPLC grade  
135 methanol (>99.9% purity), hexane (>95%), Folin–Ciocalteu reagent, sodium carbonate anhydrous  
136 (>99.5%), caffeic acid (97%) were bought from Sigma–Aldrich (St.Louis, USA). Food grade ethyl  
137 alcohol (96%) was bought from Selex S.p.A. (Trezzano sul Naviglio, Milano, Italy).

138

## 139 2.2. Samples preparation

140

141 To study the effect of phenolic compounds on the release of olive oil aroma compounds, three  
142 MOOs were set up with identical volatile compounds concentrations using a refined olive oil  
143 (ROO). Phenolics were extracted from VOOs and were added to ROO in order to obtain MOOs  
144 with two different concentrations of phenolic compounds (P++ and P+). Another MOO was built  
145 with volatile compounds but without VOO biophenols (P-). The MOOs were stored at ambient  
146 conditions (19 °C) avoiding light exposure and high temperatures in order to prevent oxidation and  
147 were used within three months from their preparation. For each system, blank solutions without  
148 volatile compounds were also tested.

149

### 150 2.2.1. Preparation of the refined olive oil sample with added virgin olive oil phenolic compounds

151

152 The phenolic extract was obtained from a blend of three VOOs obtained from *Rotondella*,  
153 *Carpellese* and *Nostrale di Felitto* olive cultivars, respectively. An aliquot of the oil sample (50 g)

154 was dissolved in hexane (100 mL). A subsequent extraction was carried out using a water/methanol  
155 mixture (40/60 v/v) in a separating funnel (500 mL) after having shaken it vigorously for 15 min in  
156 a 500 mL bottle. This step was repeated twice using a total of 140 mL solvent. Subsequently, the  
157 obtained hydro-alcoholic extract was washed with hexane to remove any oil contamination and was  
158 centrifuged for 5 min at 3500 rpm (ALC International srl, PK-120, Milan, Italy). The organic phase  
159 was removed from the sample, and the hydro-alcoholic phase was collected in the flask and  
160 evaporated under vacuum in a rotary evaporator at 35 °C (Heidolph, VV 2000). The phenolic  
161 compounds were suspended using 10 mL ethyl alcohol (food grade). A total of 1.750 kg of VOO  
162 was used to extract phenolics. A total of 350 mL of biophenols extract in ethyl alcohol was obtained  
163 and subsequently concentrated up to a final volume of 100 mL using a rotary evaporator at 35 °C  
164 (Heidolph, VV 2000). 100 mL phenolic extract was added in a flask with 1500 g of refined olive  
165 oil. The oil mixture was stirred and treated in an ultrasonic bath for 5 min. Then, ethanol was  
166 evaporated in a vacuum evaporator (Heidolph VV 200) at 35 °C (Genovese *et al.*, 2015).

167 The amount of total phenolic compounds added to the ROO ( $593\pm 33$  mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was chosen in  
168 order to reproduce very bitter oil (P++). An aliquot of this sample was diluted with ROO (50:50) in  
169 order to obtain MOO with a level of total phenolic compounds of  $354\pm 14$  mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in order to  
170 reproduce a bitter oil (P+) as indicated by Beltrán *et al.* (2007).

171

### 172 2.2.2. Preparation of the refined olive oil sample

173

174 In the control sample (P-) phenolic extract was not added, 66 mL ethanol food grade was added  
175 in a flask with 1000 g of refined olive oil. Then, the oil mixture was subjected to the same protocol,  
176 previously described, for the addition of the phenolic compounds.

177

### 178 2.2.3. Preparation of aroma solutions

179



180 Only well known significant volatile key aroma compounds of virgin olive oils were considered  
181 in our study when preparing the solutions of aroma compounds (Aparicio *et al.*, 1996). They  
182 included 2 aldehydes, 2 acetates, 1 ester, 1 alcohol, 1 ketone and 1 terpene (Table 1). Volatile  
183 compounds were dissolved in the target olive oil and homogeneously mixed by magnetic stirring.  
184 Two aroma solutions were prepared and analysed separately by APCI-MS. The aroma solution was  
185 added to oil sample 1 day before the analysis in order to avoid its oxidation. The final concentration  
186 for each volatile compound in oil sample is reported in Table 1.

187

#### 188 *2.2.4. Preparation of artificial saliva*

189

190 Artificial saliva was composed of recommended ingredients (Genovese, Piombino, Gambuti, &  
191 Moio, 2009): 5.2 g NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, 1.37 g K<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub> · 3H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.90 g NaCl, 0.5 g KCl, 0.44 g CaCl<sub>2</sub> · 2H<sub>2</sub>O,  
192 0.5 g NaN<sub>3</sub>, 2.2 g mucin (type 1-S from bovine submaxillary glands; Sigma, Milan, Italy) and  
193 200,000 units α-amylase (DFP-treated, Type I-A from porcine pancreas; Sigma, Milan, Italy) in 1 L  
194 of distilled water (adjusted to pH 7). The saliva was freshly prepared and heated gently to 37 °C  
195 prior to experimentation.

196

#### 197 *2.3. Extraction and analysis of phenolic compounds*

198

199 The extraction and quantification of total phenolic compounds was carried out by using the  
200 Folin–Ciocalteu colorimetric assay according to Sacchi, Caporaso, Paduano & Genovese (2015). It  
201 was performed to confirm the quantity of added phenolics in the MOOs. The concentration of  
202 phenolic compounds in the three MOO was statistically different ( $p < 0.05$ ).

203

#### 204 *2.4. APCI-MS analysis*

205

206       Headspace or breath was sampled into a MS Nose interface (Micromass, Manchester, UK) fitted  
207 to a Quattro Ultima mass spectrometer (Milford, Waters) at flow rates of 5 and 40 mL/min  
208 respectively (transfer line temperature 100 °C). The analytes present in the gas phase were ionized  
209 by a 4kV corona discharge (sample cone voltage 15V) in the source (75 °C) before passing them  
210 into the analyser region of the mass spectrometer. The compounds were monitored in selected ion  
211 mode using dwell time 0.2 s for headspace analysis and 0.01 s for breath-by-breath analysis. The  
212 ions monitored were the protonated molecular ion (MH<sup>+</sup>) with the exception of linalool and 1-  
213 hexanol, which dehydrated to form the (MH<sup>+</sup>) - H<sub>2</sub>O ion (Table 1). Two aroma solutions were  
214 prepared and separately analysed (Table 1). A signal was observed when only a solution containing  
215 the test compounds were present; while neither signals were observed for control samples (olive oil  
216 with and without biophenols with no added volatiles), nor interference was found in naturally  
217 compounds present in the breath.

218

#### 219       2.4.1. *Breath-by-breath measurements*

220

221       Panellists were instructed to consume a 3.5 mL aliquot of oil solution from a small plastic cup,  
222 and exhale (via the nose) into a “T” piece mounted onto the end of the MS Nose transfer line.

223       The third port of the T piece served as an outlet for excess breath. Thirteen exhalations were  
224 studied for the olive oil sample, so that the changes in breath volatile concentration (nosespace)  
225 could be followed over time. The first three exhalations were made with the sample retained in the  
226 mouth (named stripping) while the other breaths (named breath) occurred after the swallowing of  
227 the sample.

228       The panellist was asked to regulate his breathing and strip before each analysis. Accordingly, the  
229 panellist started with regular breathing. At a certain time, while breathing in, the panellist brought  
230 the sample his mouth cavity using a small plastic cup (20 mL), mixed the oil sample and saliva in  
231 mouth with tongue moving for 10 s without swallowing and without breathing, the panellist then

232 inhaled air through the mouth (semi-closed) 3 times in a rapid succession (stripping) and pushed air  
233 in through his nose, simulating a VOO sensory assessment. Then the panellist swallowed the entire  
234 sample at once and paused for 2 s, and subsequently, exhaled 10 times but every 3 breaths  
235 swallowed his saliva. The swallowing of saliva during MOO assay was necessary as olive oil  
236 stimulates saliva production. Such exhalations represent the aroma persistence of olive oil sample.  
237 The panellist washed the mouth with water and ate bread to clean the mouth from the bitter  
238 biophenols. The analysis of each sample lasted about 1.8 min. All analyses were performed in  
239 triplicate and were repeated on three different days (n=9).

240 In Figure 1A an example of a breath-by-breath release profile collected from the panellist after  
241 VOO consumption is shown. Acetone (m/z 59) is generated in the liver, and considerable amounts  
242 of it are transferred in exhaled breath. Therefore, it is useful as a marker for exhalation events  
243 (Linforth, Martin, Carey, Davidson, & Taylor, 2002). Other ions are protonated molecular ions  
244 (MH<sup>+</sup>) of 1-penten-3-one (m/z 85), *trans*-2-hexenal (m/z 99), ethyl butyrate (m/z 117) and *cis*-3-  
245 hexenyl acetate (m/z 143). The length of exhalation and the intensity of released flavour during  
246 exhalation correspond to quantity of volatiles reaching the olfactory region. The intensity of each  
247 exhalation was reported as a peak area (in Figure 1A each peak has a different colour). After the  
248 initial stripping period, a MOO sample previously brought into the mouth was swallowed at  
249 approximately 0.3 min, afterwards volatile delivery was measured for other 1 min with ten breaths.  
250 An example of normalized time-release curve for ion 143 (*cis*-3-hexyl acetate) obtained from two  
251 MOOs, with and without phenolics addition, is shown in Figures 1B.

252 The concentration used for each volatile compound for breath-by-breath analysis is reported in  
253 Table 1. The chromatograms generated in the MassLynx software (v4.1) (Micromass, Manchester,  
254 U.K.) were integrated so that peak areas and corresponding times could be extracted. Then the  
255 extracted data was processed using CDC-2000 (Cut, Delete and Calibration for APCI-MS analysis)  
256 and Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation, USA) software without the application of smoothing

257 algorithm. Changes in headspace concentrations in the *in-vivo* experimental system were expressed  
258 as changes on a relative percentage scale where the first breath was considered as 100 %.

259

#### 260 2.4.2. *Dynamic headspace measurements*

261

262 Aliquots of oil (25 g) were placed in 100-mL flasks (Schott bottle; Fischer Scientific,  
263 Loughborough, UK), each fitted with a lid with three ports. Headspace was sampled via the central  
264 port into the MS Nose at a flow rate of 5 mL/min while nitrogen was bubbled through the sample  
265 (65 mL/min) via a tube into another inlet port of the lid. Measurements were made for a total of 13  
266 min on model solutions containing aroma compounds at different concentrations (Table 1). Samples  
267 were allowed to equilibrate at room temperature (21 °C) for 3 h before measurement. To simulate  
268 the oral process, 5 mL of artificial saliva was added to each oil sample. The ratio of saliva to olive  
269 oil was 1/5, as previously defined (Genovese *et al.*, 2015) and was chosen in order to approximate,  
270 as much as possible, the real oral conditions according to literature (Roberts & Acree, 1995). For  
271 the first two min of the sampled headspace, oil and saliva were stirred at 300 rpm. Data was  
272 processed using MassLynx (v4.1) (Micromass Ltd., Manchester, U.K.), CDC-2000 (Cut, Delete and  
273 Calibration 2000 for APCI-MS analysis), and Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation, USA). The  
274 ion current intensity was not subjected to smoothing algorithm. Changes in headspace  
275 concentrations in the dynamic experimental system were expressed as changes on a relative  
276 percentage scale, where the highest height was considered as 100 %. All the analyses were  
277 performed in quadruplicate.

278

#### 279 2.5. *Statistical analysis of data*

280

281 Significant biophenols differences among the different MOOs were determined by one-way  
282 ANOVA statistical analysis. Fisher's test was used to discriminate among the means of the

283 variables. Data elaboration was carried out using Minitab statistical software (version 17.2.1,  
284 Minitab Inc).

285

### 286 **3. Results and discussion**

287

288 Breath-by-breath APCI-MS measurements for eight volatile compounds from three MOOs with  
289 different phenolic compounds concentrations are reported in Figure 2. The time-release curves were  
290 expressed as polynomial functions to better show the trend. They were extracted from the  
291 normalized breath-by-breath curves (Supplementary material).

292 The highest release of aroma compounds in exhaled air occurred directly after swallowing the  
293 olive oil sample (0.3 min), followed by a decrease over subsequent exhalations. Swallowing induces  
294 the opening of the velum (Buettner, Beer, Hannig, & Settles, 2001) and thus, it is at this time that  
295 the major part of the aroma is released from the oral cavity to the pharynx (Buettner, Otto, Beer,  
296 Mestres, Schieberle, & Hummel, 2008).

297 The highest level of olive oil biophenols (P++) showed a lower initial release rate of 1-penten-3-  
298 one and *trans*-2-hexenal compared to the other two samples (P+ and P-). After 0.8 min the release  
299 was similar for all the samples (Figure 2).

300 Concerning esters (ethyl butyrate and *cis*-hexenyl acetate), the P++ sample exhibited a lower  
301 release than the P- and P+. On the contrary, to the previous compounds, the persistence of these  
302 aroma compounds in the breath at 0.8 min showed an increase in the presence of biophenols (Figure  
303 2). Similar behaviour is also shown by ethyl acetate, although the differences are less evident.

304 Linalool and 1-hexanol showed a salting out effect in the P++ sample at 0.3 min. While for 1-  
305 hexanol at 0.8 min the release decreased until becoming similar to the other samples (P+ and P-),  
306 linalool (P++) had enhanced persistence in the breath for the whole duration of the analysis (Figure  
307 2). Finally, for hexanal no important differences were reported.

308 These results are in agreement with our previous work on olive oil aroma except for 1-hexanol  
309 and linalool (Genovese *et al.*, 2015). The authors reported that the VOO phenolic compounds  
310 reduced the headspace concentration of different volatile compounds, among them there were ethyl  
311 butyrate and *cis*-hexenyl acetate, 1-penten-3-one and *trans*-2-hexenal. However, the above  
312 mentioned work was not an *in-vivo* real-time study but it simulated the retronasal conditions using  
313 SPME technique with the addition of human saliva and a time sampling of aroma release of 4 min.  
314 No other data has been published so far about the interaction between olive oil phenolics and  
315 volatile compounds. On the contrary, in other studies on wine, sensory approaches were employed  
316 to explore the changes in wine aroma perception due to the action of polyphenols. In general, it has  
317 been stated that the intensities of fruity and floral aromas seem to decrease when the level of  
318 polyphenols increases (Goldner, Lira, van Baren, & Bandoni, 2011). Moreover, the addition of  
319 grape seed extracts (about 80% consists of proanthocyanidins and polymers of catechin) to wine not  
320 only changes astringency, but also enhances the woody/earthy aroma and reduces the fruity aroma  
321 (Cliff, Stanich, Edwards, & Saucier, 2012). Aronson & Ebeler (2004) found that the presence of  
322 both gallic acid and naringin decreased the perceived aroma intensity of 2-methylpyrazine, and  
323 naringin had a greater negative effect on ethyl benzoate. Lorrain, Tempere, Iturmendi, Moine, de  
324 Revel, & Teissedre (2013) found that catechin significantly altered the sensory perception of most  
325 esters (ethyl isobutyrate, ethyl butyrate and ethyl octanoate). Jung & Ebeler (2003) showed a  
326 significant reduction in the headspace of hexanal and ethyl hexanoate by catechin. Esteban-  
327 Fernández *et al.* (2018) found that wine phenolic acids favoured the intra-oral release of  $\beta$ -  
328 phenylethanol, linalool and  $\beta$ -ionone, while wine flavonoids induced lower intra-oral release of  
329 certain esters. Wine polyphenols have been reported to interact with aroma compounds in solution,  
330 mainly by non-covalent binding, and to directly affect wine aroma release. This interaction can also  
331 occur through hydrogen binding, hydrophobic or hydrophilic interactions, as recently reviewed by  
332 Villamor & Ross (2013).

333 In order to verify if there is a binding effect between phenolic compounds and aroma  
334 compounds, which could explain the reduction of the VOO compounds, the three MOOs were also  
335 analysed *in-vitro* dynamic conditions without and with the addition of artificial saliva.

336 Figure 3 shows the dynamic headspace curves of volatile compounds in three MOOs without the  
337 addition of artificial saliva. Among them linalool, 1-hexanol and hexanal showed a difference in the  
338 headspace release demonstrating a binding effect due to the presence and the level of phenolics in  
339 olive oil. *cis*-3-Hexenyl acetate showed a very low binding effect but only at the highest  
340 concentration of biophenols. Figure 4 shows the dynamic headspace release curves of volatile  
341 compounds from MOOs at different concentration of phenolic compounds with the addition of  
342 artificial saliva. In this emulsion system, VOO phenolic compounds in the presence of  $\alpha$ -amylase  
343 and mucin caused modifications in the dynamic headspace release only for linalool, 1-hexanol and  
344 hexanal similar to our previous *in-vitro* test (Figure 3). These *in-vitro* tests could indicate that VOO  
345 phenolic compounds could interact with some volatile compounds through non-covalent bonds and  
346 that could be released slowly over time. Moreover, the possible interaction between VOO phenolics  
347 and mucin (Quintero *et al.*, 2015) did not involve any significant change in aroma release, probably  
348 it is a very weak interaction.

349 For wine polyphenols the reactivity is due its numerous hydroxyl functional groups and its  
350 aromatic rings (Jung, de Ropp, & Ebeler, 2000) but it is also suggested that steric hindrance may  
351 reduce the magnitude of the interaction (Lorrain *et al.*, 2013). The latter might explain the minor  
352 interaction which occurs between the *trans*-2-hexenal and polyphenols if compared to hexanal,  
353 which is explained by its steric hindrance due to the double bond.

354 However, these *in-vitro* tests did not explain the results obtained from the *in-vivo* test.  
355 Particularly, the volatile compounds, which demonstrated in the *in-vivo* test a lower release in the  
356 presence of VOO biphenols, but did not interact with the polyphenols *in-vitro*. In contrast, volatile  
357 compounds that demonstrated a higher release interacted with VOO phenolic compounds.

358 This inconsistency could be explained by specific interactions of VOO phenolic with proline-rich  
359 proteins (PRPs) that were not included in the artificial saliva in our *in-vitro* study. The PRPs  
360 comprise up to 70% of the proteins in human parotid saliva (Baxter *et al.*, 1997). For instance, PRPs  
361 have demonstrated a high affinity for tannins, resulted by their extended conformation (Canon *et*  
362 *al.*, 2013). Smaller polyphenols (propyl gallate and epicatechin) can bind with one phenolic ring  
363 stacked against each proline residue, whereas larger polyphenols occupy two or three consecutive  
364 prolines (Baxter *et al.*, 1997). As supposed for red wines (Munoz-Gonzalez *et al.*, 2014; Esteban-  
365 Fernández *et al.*, 2018), the formation of VOO phenolic compounds-PRPs complexes could retain  
366 volatile compounds in the hydrophobic cavities and therefore, decrease aroma release into the  
367 headspace. The influence of VOO phenolics-PRPs complexes on aroma release also depends on the  
368 physiochemical properties of the aroma compounds. On the contrary, the aroma compounds,  
369 hydrophobically retained by VOO phenolic compounds, could be released when phenolics interact  
370 with the PRPs during the olive oil assessment generating a salting out effect, *i.e.* linalool and 1-  
371 hexanol. Linalool also had the greatest persistence in the breath for the whole duration of the  
372 analysis while esters showed a persistence but lower than the highest release obtained at 0.3 min  
373 (Figure 2). Generally, the more hydrophobic and less volatile compounds have been reported to  
374 persist longer in the breath than hydrophilic (Repoux *et al.*, 2012).

375 Another important aspect to consider in an *in-vivo* test, which could affect the aroma release, is  
376 the different secretion of saliva in the presence of biophenols. In fact, changes in the saliva flow and  
377 composition could affect the partitioning of all aroma compounds. It is currently unknown if VOO  
378 phenolic compounds are able to change the secretion of saliva both in term of composition and  
379 flow. However, this type of taste stimuli is known to strongly affect salivary gland functionality and  
380 therefore, could induce modifications of saliva composition (Dawes 1984). For wine, the perceived  
381 intensity and duration of bitterness and astringency were affected by saliva flow rate, salivary  
382 volume, salivary pH and protein composition (Fischer, Boulton, & Noble, 1994).

383



384 **4. Conclusion**

385

386 Phenolic compounds were proved to play an important role in the intensity and timing of the  
387 release of certain aroma compounds during the consumption of virgin olive oil. High levels of VOO  
388 phenolic compounds resulted in a smaller total release of 1-penten-3-one, *trans*-2-hexenal and  
389 esters at the swallowing of olive oil sample. Probably, the complex formed between phenolics and  
390 PRPs entrap aroma compounds and consequently reduce their volatility during the organoleptic  
391 assessment of olive oil. Phenolic compounds were shown to interact with certain volatile  
392 compounds (mainly linalool, 1-hexanol and hexanal) through proposed to be due to reversible non-  
393 covalent bonds. VOO phenolic compounds could release these aroma compounds when interact  
394 with PRPs generating a salting out effect and a longer persistence.

395 Although the effect of biophenols on VOO aroma release has not received as much scientific  
396 attention as other foods and drinks, it is clear that it is necessary to consider it since phenolic  
397 compounds may influence the release of VOO aroma compounds during its consumption, thereby  
398 influencing the flavour perception and consumer acceptance. However, further sensorial studies are  
399 needed to confirm our findings and better understand whether and to what extent VOO biophenols  
400 affect sensory perception and consumer acceptance.

401

402 **Funding**

403 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial,  
404 or not-for-profit sectors.

405

406 **References**

407

408 Aparicio, R., Morales, M. T. & Alonso, M. V. (1996). Relationship between Volatile Compounds  
409 and Sensory Attributes of Olive Oils by the Sensory Wheel. *Journal of American Oil Chemistry*  
410 *Society*, 73, 1253–1264.

411 Aronson, J., & Ebeler, S. E. (2004). Effect of polyphenol compounds on the headspace volatility of  
412 flavors. *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, 55(1), 13–21.

413 Baxter, N. J., Lilley, T. H., Haslam, E., & Williamson, M. P. (1997). Multiple interactions between  
414 polyphenols and a salivary proline-rich protein repeat result in complexation and precipitation.  
415 *Biochemistry*, 36(18), 5566–5577.

416 Beltrán, G., Ruano, M. T., Jiménez, A., Uceda, M., & Aguilera, M. P. (2007). Evaluation of virgin  
417 olive oil bitterness by total phenol content analysis. *European Journal of Lipid Science and*  
418 *Technology*, 108, 193–197.

419 Buettner, A. (2002). Influence of human salivary enzymes on odorant concentration changes  
420 occurring in vivo. 1. Esters and thiols. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 50, 3283–  
421 3289.

422 Buettner, A., Beer, A., Hannig, C., & Settles, M. (2001). Observation of the swallowing process by  
423 application of videofluoroscopy and real-time magnetic resonance imaging—consequences for  
424 retronasal aroma stimulation. *Chemical Senses*, 26(9), 1211–1219.

425 Buettner, A., Otto, S., Beer, A., Mestres, M., Schieberle, P., & Hummel, T. (2008). Dynamics of  
426 retronasal aroma perception during consumption: Cross-linking on-line breath analysis with  
427 medico-analytical tools to elucidate a complex process. *Food Chemistry*, 108(4), 1234–1246.

428 Canon, F., Paté, F., Cheynier, V., Sarni-Manchado, P., Giuliani, A., Pérez, J., ... & Cabane, B.  
429 (2013). Aggregation of the salivary proline-rich protein IB5 in the presence of the tannin EgCG.  
430 *Langmuir*, 29(6), 1926–1937.

431 Cliff, M. A., Stanich, K., Edwards, J. E., & Saucier, C. T. (2012). Adding grape seed extract to wine  
432 affects astringency and other sensory attributes. *Journal of Food Quality*, 35(4), 263–271.

433 Commission Regulation (EEC) No. 2568/91 of 11 July 1991 on the Characteristics of Olive Oil and  
434 Olive Residue Oil and on the Relevant Methods of Analysis. *Official Journal*, L248, 1–83.

435 Dawes, C. (1984). Stimulus effects on protein and electrolyte concentrations in parotid saliva. *The*  
436 *Journal of Physiology*, 346(1), 579–588.

437 De Santis, D., & Frangipane, M. T. (2015). Sensory Perceptions of Virgin Olive Oil: New Panel  
438 Evaluation Method and the Chemical Compounds Responsible. *Natural Science*, 7, 132–142.

439 Esteban-Fernández, A., Muñoz-González, C., Jiménez-Girón, A., Pérez-Jiménez, M., & Pozo-  
440 Bayón, M. Á. (2018). Aroma release in the oral cavity after wine intake is influenced by wine  
441 matrix composition. *Food chemistry*, 243, 125–133.

442 Fischer, U., Boulton, R. B., & Noble, A. C. (1994). Physiological factors contributing to the  
443 variability of sensory assessments: Relationship between salivary flow rate and temporal  
444 perception of gustatory stimuli. *Food Quality and Preference*, 5(1), 55–64.

445 Friel, E. N., & Taylor, A. J. (2001). Effect of salivary components on volatile partitioning from  
446 solution. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 49, 3898–3905.

447 Genovese, A., Caporaso, N., Villani, V., Paduano, A., & Sacchi, R. (2015). Olive oil phenolic  
448 compounds affect the release of aroma compounds. *Food Chemistry*, 181, 284–294.

449 Genovese, A., Piombino, P., Gambuti, A., & Moio, L. (2009). Simulation of retronasal aroma of  
450 white and red wine in a model mouth system. Investigating the influence of saliva on volatile  
451 compound concentrations. *Food Chemistry*, 114, 100–107.

452 Gierczynski, I., Labouré, H., Sémon, E., & Guichard, E. (2007). Impact of hardness of model fresh  
453 cheese on aroma release: in vivo and in vitro study. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*,  
454 55(8), 3066–3073.

455 Goldner, M. C., di Leo Lira, P., van Baren, C., & Bandoni, A. (2016). Influence of Polyphenol  
456 Levels on the Perception of Aroma in *Vitis vinifera* cv. Malbec wine. *South African Journal of*  
457 *Enology and Viticulture*, 32(1), 21–27.

458 Jung, D. M., & Ebeler, S. E. (2003). Headspace solid-phase microextraction method for the study of  
459 the volatility of selected flavor compounds. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *51*(1),  
460 200–205.

461 Jung, D. M., de Ropp, J. S., & Ebeler, S. E. (2000). Study of interactions between food phenolics  
462 and aromatic flavors using one-and two-dimensional <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy. *Journal of*  
463 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *48*(2), 407–412.

464 Keys, A. (1995). Mediterranean diet and public health: personal reflections. *The American Journal*  
465 *of Clinical Nutrition*, *61*(6), 1321S–1323S.

466 Linforth, R., Martin, F., Carey, M., Davidson, J. and Taylor A.J. (2002). Retronasal transport of  
467 aroma compounds. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *50*, 1111–1117.

468 Lorrain, B., Tempere, S., Iturmendi, N., Moine, V., de Revel, G., & Teissedre, P. L. (2013).  
469 Influence of phenolic compounds on the sensorial perception and volatility of red wine esters in  
470 model solution: An insight at the molecular level. *Food Chemistry*, *140*(1), 76–82.

471 Muñoz-González, C., Feron, G., Guichard, E., Rodríguez-Bencomo, J. J., Martin-Alvarez, P. J.,  
472 Moreno-Arribas, M. V., & Pozo-Bayón, M. A. (2014). Understanding the role of saliva in aroma  
473 release from wine by using static and dynamic headspace conditions. *Journal of Agricultural and*  
474 *Food Chemistry*, *62*(33), 8274–8288.

475 Pagès-Hélary, S., Andriot, I., Guichard, E., & Canon, F. (2014). Retention effect of human saliva on  
476 aroma release and respective contribution of salivary mucin and  $\alpha$ -amylase. *Food Research*  
477 *International*, *64*, 424–431.

478 Ployon, S., Morzel, M., & Canon, F. (2017). The role of saliva in aroma release and perception.  
479 *Food Chemistry*, *226*, 212–220.

480 Pozo-Bayon, M. A., & Reineccius, G. (2009). Interactions between wine matrix macro-components  
481 and aroma compounds. In M. V. Moreno-Arribas & M. C. Polo (Eds.), *Wine chemistry and*  
482 *biochemistry* (pp. 417–435). New York, USA: Springer.

483 Psaltopoulou, T., Kosti, R. I., Haidopoulos, D., Dimopoulos, M., & Panagiotakos, D. B. (2011).  
484 Olive oil intake is inversely related to cancer prevalence: a systematic review and a meta-  
485 analysis of 13800 patients and 23340 controls in 19 observational studies. *Lipids in health and*  
486 *disease*, 10(1), 127–142.

487 Quintero-Flórez, A., Sánchez-Ortiz, A., Gaforio Martínez, J. J., Jiménez Márquez, A., & Beltrán  
488 Maza, G. (2015). Interaction between extra virgin olive oil phenolic compounds and mucin.  
489 *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 117(10), 1569–1577.

490 Rabe, S., Linforth, R. S., Krings, U., Taylor, A. J., & Berger, R. G. (2004). Volatile release from  
491 liquids: a comparison of in vivo APCI-MS, in-mouth headspace trapping and in vitro mouth  
492 model data. *Chemical senses*, 29(2), 163–173.

493 Reiners, J., & Grosch, W. (1998). Odorants of virgin olive oils with different flavor profiles.  
494 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 46(7), 2754–2763.

495 Repoux, M., Labouré, H., Courcoux, P., Andriot, I., Sémon, É., Yven, C., Feron, G., & Guichard, E.  
496 (2012). Combined effect of cheese characteristics and food oral processing on in vivo aroma  
497 release. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, 27(6), 414–423.

498 Roberts, D. D., & Acree, T. E. (1995). Simulation of retronasal aroma using a modified headspace  
499 technique: investigating the effects of saliva, temperature, shearing, and oil on flavor release.  
500 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 43(8), 2179–2186.

501 Sacchi, R., Caporaso, N., Paduano, A., & Genovese, A. (2015). Industrial-scale filtration affects  
502 volatile compounds in extra virgin olive oil cv. Ravece. *European Journal of Lipid Science and*  
503 *Technology*, 117(12), 2007–2014.

504 Sánchez-Ortiz, A., Pérez, A. G., & Sanz, C. (2013). Synthesis of aroma compounds of virgin olive  
505 oil: Significance of the cleavage of polyunsaturated fatty acid hydroperoxides during the oil  
506 extraction process. *Food research international*, 54(2), 1972–1978.

507 Servili, M., Esposito, S., Fabiani, R., Urbani, S., Taticchi, A., Mariucci, F., & Montedoro, G. F.  
508 (2009). Phenolic compounds in olive oil: antioxidant, health and organoleptic activities  
509 according to their chemical structure. *Inflammopharmacology*, 17(2), 76–84.

510 Taylor, A. J., Linforth, R. S. T., Harvey, B. A., & Blake, A. (2000). Atmospheric pressure chemical  
511 ionisation mass spectrometry for in vivo analysis of volatile flavour release. *Food Chemistry*,  
512 71(3), 327–338.

513 Villamor, R. R., & Ross, C. F. (2013). Wine matrix compounds affect perception of wine aromas.  
514 *Annual Review of Food Science and Technology*, 4, 1–20.


515

516

517 Figure captions:


518

519 **Figure 1.** Example of a breath-by-breath APCI-MS release profile collected from a panellist after  
520 sample consumption following the instructions given in material section. m/z 59, 85, 99, 117 and  
521 143 represent molecular ions of acetone, 1-penten-3-one, *trans*-2-hexenal, ethyl butyrate and *cis*-3-  
522 hexenyl acetate, respectively (A). Example of normalized time-release curve for ion 143 (*cis*-3-  
523 hexenyl acetate) obtained from two model olive oil with and without phenolics addition (B).




524

525 **Figure 2.** Time-release curves of volatile compounds from model olive oil without phenolics (P-  
 526 —), with low (P+ ..... ) and high concentration of phenolics (P++ — —), expressed as  
 527 polynomial function. Dashed lines at 0.3 and 0.8 min indicate the swallowing of model olive oil and  
 528 saliva, respectively. The volatile compounds were ordered by their octanol–water partition  
 529 coefficients.






531 **Figure 3.** Dynamic headspace release of volatile compounds in P++ (◆), P+ (■) and P- (▲) model  
 532 olive oils. The volatile compounds were ordered by their octanol–air partition coefficients.




533

534 **Figure 4.** Dynamic headspace release of volatile compounds in P++ (◆), P+ (■) and P- (▲) model  
 535 olive oils with artificial saliva addition. The volatile compounds were ordered by their octanol-  
 536 water partition coefficients.



537

538



540

541 Time-release curves of volatile compounds from model olive oil without phenolics (P- —),

542 with low (P+ .....). Dashed lines at 0.3 and 0.8 min

543 indicate the swallowing of model olive oil and saliva, respectively.

544 Table 1. Chemical standards, concentration added, odor descriptor, physical-chemical properties, and molecular masses monitored by the APCI-  
545 MS.

Compound	Odor descriptor <sup>a</sup>	Molecular weight	Carbon atoms	log <i>P</i> <sup>b</sup>		Vapour pressure (Pa at 25 °C) <sup>b</sup>	Stock solution	Concentration added (mg Kg <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>c</sup>		Ion (MH <sup>+</sup> ) Mass
				o/w	o/a			DH	BB	
Ethyl butyrate	Cheesy, fruity, sweet	116	6	1.85	3.64	1946	A	78	238	117
<i>cis</i> -3-Hexenylacetate	Banana-like, green, fruity, floral, ester	142	8	2.61	4.20	152	A	880	2566	143
Ethyl acetate	Sticky, sweet	88	4	0.86	2.99	13106	B	33	90	89
1-Penten-3-one	Green, pungent, sweet, strawberry, sharp, metallic	84	5	0.90	3.75	5092	A	18	67	85
<i>trans</i> -2-Hexenal	Green, apple-like, bitter almond, cut grass	98	6	1.58	4.28	629	A	271	698	99
Hexanal	Green, green apple, cut grass, fatty	100	6	1.80	3.84	1276	B	280	701	101
1-Hexanol	Fruit, grass, floral, aromatic	102	6	1.82	5.19	117	B	260	725	85
Linalool	Lilac, lavender	154	10	3.38	6.03	11	B	499	1339	137

546  
547 <sup>a</sup> The odor descriptors were indicated as reported in Genovese et al., 2015. <sup>b</sup> The logarithm of octanol/water and octanol/air partition coefficients  
548 (log *P*) and vapor pressure of the volatile compounds were calculated using EPI Suite v.4.1 software, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and  
549 Syracuse Research Corp. <sup>c</sup> DH = Dynamic headspace experiment; BB = Breath-by-breath experiment.

550

551 Chemical compounds studied in this article:

552 Hexanal (PubChem CID: 6184); *trans*-2-hexenal (PubChem CID: 5281168); 1-hexanol (PubChem CID: 8103); linalool (PubChem CID: 6549);  
553 ethyl butyrate (PubChem CID: 7762); ethyl acetate (PubChem CID: 8857); *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (PubChem CID: 5363388); 1-penten-3-one  
554 (PubChem CID: 15394).

555

556