

Analytical characterization of the aroma of Tinta Negra Mole red wine: Identification of the main odorants compounds

R. Perestrelo^a, A. Fernandes^a, F.F. Albuquerque^b, J.C. Marques^a, J.S. Câmara^{a,*}

^a Madeira Chemistry Research Center, Depto. de Química da Universidade da Madeira, Campus,
Universitário da Penteada, 9000-390 Funchal, Portugal

^b Madeira Wine Company, Rua dos Ferreiros, 191, 9000-82 Funchal, Portugal

Received 10 August 2005; received in revised form 7 October 2005; accepted 12 October 2005

Available online 11 November 2005

Abstract

A method for the simultaneous determination of major and minor volatiles composition in different types (dry, medium dry, sweet and medium sweet) of a young Tinta Negra Mole (TNM) monovarietal red wine from 2003 harvest has been validated. Wine samples preparation includes a dichloromethane liquid–liquid extraction followed by concentration under a nitrogen atmosphere. The extracted fraction was analysed by gas chromatography–mass spectrometry and give quantitative information for more than 86 analytes whose concentration range from few $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ to 259.1 mg l^{-1} . The method enables high recovery of volatile compounds in wine good linearity with (r^2) values higher than 0.980 and good sensitivity. The limits of detection range from 0.003 to 0.534 mg l^{-1} and limits of quantification from 0.009 to 1.170 mg l^{-1} .

The method allows satisfactory determination of more than 80 compounds in the TNM red wines. These wines are characterized by a high content of higher alcohols, ethyl esters, fatty acids and lactones. The levels of sulphur compounds in Tinta Negra Mole medium sweet wines are very low, but they have the highest concentration of carbonyl compounds. Quantitative analysis of the main odorants followed by the determination of aroma index allow us elucidate the aroma of these varieties. On the basis of their odour description and odour threshold, the most powerful odorants of Tinta Negra Mole wines were tentatively established.

© 2005 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Wine; Tinta Negra Mole variety; Aroma compounds; Odorants

1. Introduction

Tinta Negra Mole (TNM) is the main grape variety used in the production of Madeira wines. This variety represents 85–90% of the Madeira Island Vineyard, with a mean production of 42,000 hl. As far as we know, the aroma of this variety has not yet been characterized [1]. The Madeira wines alcoholic content lies between 17 and 22% (v/v) and is commercially available in different types: dry, medium dry, sweet, medium sweet, according to the sugar content [2].

Among the many factors that contributed to the typicity and quality of wine, aroma is probably the most important organoleptic characteristic and a key attribute for consumers. Several hundred chemically different flavour compounds such as: higher alcohols, aldehydes, ethyl esters of fatty acids, fatty

acids, ketones, monoterpenes, volatile phenols, among others, have been found in wines [3]. They have quite different chemical and physical properties like polarity and volatility and their concentrations range from few ng l^{-1} to more than 100 mg l^{-1} [4].

Among the aromas that are released to the medium as secondary products of the metabolism of the yeasts, were the fusel alcohols: *iso*-butanol, *iso*-amyl alcohol, 2-phenylethanol and propanol. These compounds can be synthesised by yeast action through two mechanisms: anabolic pathway from glucose, or catabolic pathway from their corresponding amino acids (valine, leucine, *iso*-leucine and phenylalanine) [5]. Another compound related with the catabolic pathway and which was associated with this factor was methionol, formed from the amino acid methionine (Fig. 1). It should be remembered that the composition in amino acids depends on the variety of grape [6–8] and for that reason all these volatile compounds are related to the variety of grape used.

Over the last few decades wine aroma has been thoroughly studied, resulting in knowledge of about 800 compounds as con-

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +351 291705112; fax: +351 291705149.
E-mail address: jsc@uma.pt (J.S. Câmara).




Fig. 1. Suggested mechanism for methionol formation from methionine by yeasts.

stituents of the volatile fraction of the wine. Some components are present in high concentration (hundreds of mg l^{-1}), but most of them are found at the low ng l^{-1} level [9–13]. Therefore some components need to be extracted and concentrated before analysis, while others can be analysed by GC with direct injection. Several classical analytical methods such as liquid–liquid extraction [14,15], simultaneous distillation–extraction [16], solid phase extraction [17], supercritical fluid extraction [18], microwaves extraction [19] and ultrasound extraction [20], among others, have been developed for the analysis of the minor volatile compounds in wines. Although it is a time-consuming technique liquid–liquid extraction is a widely used sample preparation method for the determination of wine volatiles which extract contains a wide spectrum of components [21]. Among the solvents that have been used for the enrichment of aroma substances, dichloromethane has been found to be well suited for extracting volatiles from a matrix with a high alcohol content such as TNM wines.

Identification of wine aroma components and the relationships between their relative content may be a useful tool in differentiating the wines from different varieties and establishing criteria of genuineness to improve the quality of the wines, prevent fraud and guarantee their origin. Volatile composition of TNM wines was investigated in this work. The pool of compounds analysed include: grape aroma compounds such as the terpene alcohols; pre-fermentative compounds which are the C_6 alcohols; a large group of secondary or fermentative volatile compounds in which are included: higher alcohols, ethyl esters of fatty acids, acetates of higher alcohols, fatty acids and lactones; and finally, post-fermentative compounds in which are included those extracted from wood such as vanillin, 2-furfural and its derivatives. The aroma index values were determined to elucidate which compounds are considered as aroma contributing substances, in order to offer a means of evaluating the potential aroma of this variety.

2. Experimental

2.1. Reagents

All reagents used were of analytical quality. Absolute ethanol was purchased from Panreac (Barcelona, Spain), dichloromethane was HPLC grade quality was from LabScan and solid anhydrous sodium sulphate (analytical grade) was purchased from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). Water was obtained

from a Milli-Q purification system (Millipore). Solvents did not require additional distillation. The pure reference compounds used were from Sigma–Aldrich (Spain).

2.2. Standard solutions

Exact volumes of the chemical standard compounds were dissolved in absolute ethanol and made up to volume (50 ml). This standard solution was dissolved in ethanol at concentration three orders of magnitude higher than typically found in wines with approximately six calibration points for each standard. These solutions were then diluted with water and ethanol adjusting the final alcohol content to 18% (v/v) to prepare the calibration plots and to spike different wine samples. All the synthetic wines samples used in the calibration graphs were 6 g l^{-1} of tartaric acid and pH 3.3–3.4 adjusted with 1 M NaOH (synthetic wine matrix). Octan-3-ol was employed as internal standard. All these solutions were stored at 4°C .

2.3. Sample wines

The TNM red wines used in this study were made from the 2003 harvest grapes grown in the Portuguese RAM Appellation. Grapes of TNM were crushed, de-stemmed, raked and pressed. The musts were fermented in stainless-steel containers, with spontaneous yeast. Alcoholic fermentation was carried out at 22°C and stopped by addition of natural grape spirits according to the wine sugar content to obtain. The different TNM wines types produced were: dry (TNM-D), medium dry (TNM-MD), sweet (TMN-S) and medium sweet (TNM-MS). The wine samples, 12 of each wine type, were taken directly from the cellars in October 2004, and stored at -28°C until analysis.

2.4. Sample extraction conditions

To 50 ml of each sample wines were added $25 \mu\text{l}$ of internal standard (octan-3-ol), in hydro alcoholic solution (1/1, v/v) at 422 mg l^{-1} and 5 g of sodium sulphate was added to the samples which was extracted twice with 5 ml of dichloromethane. Both organic phases obtained were blended and dried over anhydrous sodium sulphate and concentrated in a roto-evaporator to a final volume of 2–3 ml and, finally, under a stream of pure N_2 to $500 \mu\text{l}$. The extract was injected ($1 \mu\text{l}$) into the GC–MS. A total ion chromatogram of volatile compounds from TNM red wine samples is illustrated in Fig. 2. Identification was achieved by




Fig. 2. TIC chromatogram of a TNM-MD red wine dichloromethane extract. Peak identification: (1) 2-methylpropan-1-ol; (2) isoamyl acetate; (3) butan-1-ol; (4) 3-methylbutan-1-ol; (5) ethyl hexanoate; (6) ethyl lactate; (7) octan-3-ol (internal standard); (8) ethyl octanoate; (9) acetic acid; (10) *cis*-dioxane; (11) (D,L)-butan-2,3-diol; (12) 2-methylpropanoic acid; (13) (R,S)-butan-2,3-diol; (14) ethyl decanoate; (15) diethyl succinate; (16) methionol; (17) methyl-2-ethylhexanoate; (18) β -phenylethanol; (19) ethyl 3-hydroxybutyrate; (20) octanoic acid; (21) γ -octalactone; (22) γ -nonalactone; (23) α -hydroxyphenylpropanoic acid; (24) ethyl succinate.

comparisons with mass spectra obtained from the sample with those from the pure standards injected in the same conditions by comparing the Kováts index and the mass spectra presents in the NIST MS library Database, or in the literature.

2.5. Gas chromatography–mass spectrometry (GC–MS) conditions

Extracts were analysed using a Varian Star 3400 Cx Series II gas chromatograph equipped with Varian Saturn III mass selective detector and Saturn GC–MS workstation software. The column used was DB-Waxetr (30 m \times 0.25 mm i.d. \times 0.25 μ m film thickness) silica capillary column. Splitless injection was used. The carrier gas was helium at a flow rate of 1 ml min⁻¹. The oven temperature program was: 40 °C (for 1 min), then increased to 220 °C, at 2 °C min⁻¹, and held for 10 min. The ion trap detector was set as follows: transfer line temperature 220 °C; manifold and trap temperatures 180 °C. The mass range was *m/z* 30–300, the emission current 15 μ A and the electron multiplier was set in the relative mode to the auto tune procedures. All mass spectra were acquired in the electron impact (EI) mode ($E_i = 70$ eV, source temperature, 180 °C).

2.6. Method validation

The validation parameters studied were, response linearity, the determination of repeatability (precision), evaluation of the recovery of known quantities of substances (accuracy) and the determination of limits of detection and quantification.

2.6.1. Study of linearity, repeatability and recovery

For each component five-point graphs were obtained in the range of concentrations showed in Table 1. Duplicate calibration graphs, were drawn by the least-squares linear regression method using the relative peak area as response versus concentration. The correlation coefficient was >0.98. Regression,

slope and origin intercept (Table 1) were calculated by linear least-squares regression.

Repeatability (precision) was evaluated by the relative standard deviation of six independent assays performed under the same analytical conditions in the shortest period of time. For each assay the mean values, standard deviation and coefficients of variation for all compounds were calculated.

Recovery was evaluated by addition of volatile compounds to wines. Samples were submitted to six successive extractions with dichloromethane, after concentration, each organic phase was injected twice into GC/MS. For each volatile compounds the recovery percentage was determined by the ratio $(C_1 - C_0/C_2) \times 100$, where C_0 is the concentration of the analyte in the wine, C_1 the concentration of the analyte in spiked wine sample and C_2 is the concentration of the analyte added to wine sample.

2.6.2. Limits of detection and quantification

The limits of detection (LOD) were estimated as the concentration of the analyte that produce a signal-to-noise ratio of three times the standard deviation of the *y*-residuals of the calibration graph, that is $3s_{y/x}/b$, where $s_{y/x}$ is the blank standard deviation and b is the slope of the line regression. The linear range experiments provide the necessary information to calculate the limits of detection, by extrapolating from the lowest concentration point on the linear calibration curve. The limit of quantification (LOQ) can also be estimated as the concentration of analyte producing a signal 10 times that of the noise.

2.7. Quantification

The quantification was carried out following the internal standard quantification method. Thus, octan-3-ol was chosen as internal standard [25 μ l of a 0.422 mg l⁻¹ solution in ethanol (1:1, v/v) of this internal standard was added to each standard and sample]. Quantitative data of the identified compounds were obtained by interpolation of the relative areas versus the internal standard area, in the calibration graphs built for pure reference compounds. The concentration of volatile compounds for which there was no pure reference available was obtained by using the same calibration graphs as one of the compounds with the most similar chemical structure. Since the repeatability of the chromatographic method was very good (with coefficients of variation lower than 4.0% in average), only two injection of each dichloromethane extract was carried out.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Method validation

The performance of the method in terms of linearity, precision and accuracy are shown in Tables 1 and 2. The method had to be assessed by estimating the linear range, limits of detection and quantification and percentage of recoveries and yields of extraction. The quantification was carried through construction of calibration curves at five levels, with the extracted standards, using the same analytical conditions that the samples

Table 1
Method linearity data for the compounds identified in different types TNM red wines

| Kováts index | Compounds | Linear range (mg l ⁻¹) | r ² | Slope | Intercept | LOL (%) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Terpenes | | | | | | |
| 1501 | β-Citronellal | 0.4–103.2 | 0.997 | 0.921 ± 0003 | -2.178 | 99.0 |
| 1641 | Linalool | 0.4–115.2 | 0.997 | 0.473 ± 0.031 | -0.562 | 99.0 |
| 1725 | α-Terpineol | 0.24–45.4 | 0.998 | 1.358 ± 0.004 | -0.389 | 99.7 |
| 1827 | Nerol | 0.5–41.7 | 0.999 | 0.550 ± 0.046 | -0.449 | 99.0 |
| 1845 | β-Damascenone | 0.5–112.1 | 0.983 | 0.636 ± 0.057 | -1.088 | 99.0 |
| 1877 | Geraniol | 0.4–105.4 | 0.994 | 0.579 ± 0.017 | -1.104 | 99.0 |
| 2007 | (E)-Nerolidol | 0.4–105.0 | 0.997 | 0.548 ± 0.061 | -0.399 | 99.0 |
| Higher alcohols | | | | | | |
| 1165 | Butan-1-ol | 2.5–689.8 | 0.993 | 0.228 ± 0.0009 | -0.566 | 99.6 |
| 1227 | 3-Methylbutan-1-ol | 6.7–2825.6 | 0.982 | 0.082 ± 0.0004 | -0.046 | 99.6 |
| 1241 | Hexan-2-ol | 4.0–996.3 | 0.992 | 0.157 ± 0.001 | -1.464 | 99.3 |
| 1378 | Hexan-1-ol | 1.2–1023.9 | 0.995 | 0.025 ± 0.0001 | -0.020 | 99.4 |
| 1410 | (E)-3-hexen-1-ol | 0.7–50.7 | 0.998 | 0.292 ± 0.004 | -0.129 | 98.5 |
| 1434 | (Z)-2-hexen-1-ol | 0.4–50.0 | 0.999 | 0.250 ± 0.002 | -0.089 | 99.3 |
| 1515 | 2-Ethyl hexan-1-ol | 1.2–349.6 | 0.987 | 0.179 ± 0.001 | -0.101 | 99.4 |
| 1606 | (R,S)-Butan-2,3-diol | 17.0–1406.5 | 0.992 | 0.002 ± 0.001 | -0.030 | 100.0 |
| 1689 | Propan-2-ol | 5.6–235.6 | 0.987 | 0.006 ± 0.0001 | -0.032 | 97.4 |
| 1938 | 2-Phenylethanol | 14.9–744.3 | 0.993 | 0.750 ± 0.002 | -6.649 | 99.8 |
| 2107 | 2-Phenoxyethanol | 19.8–2980 | 0.992 | 0.158 ± 0.002 | -2.117 | 98.8 |
| Acetates | | | | | | |
| 1141 | Phenylethyl acetate | 2.2–540.7 | 0.997 | 0.007 ± 0.0001 | -0.014 | 100.0 |
| 1845 | Isoamly acetate | 0.4–302.8 | 0.991 | 0.2536 ± 0.008 | -0.120 | 96.5 |
| Ethyl esters | | | | | | |
| 1066 | Ethyl butyrate | 0.9–259.2 | 0.987 | 0.275 ± 0.013 | -0.338 | 95.2 |
| 1148 | Ethyl pentanoate | 1.0–100.9 | 0.998 | 0.547 ± 0.028 | -0.588 | 95.0 |
| 1254 | Ethyl hexanoate | 1.8–259.5 | 0.988 | 0.177 ± 0.007 | -0.223 | 95.8 |
| 1371 | Ethyl lactate | 2.0–480.4 | 0.999 | 0.113 ± 0.002 | -0.121 | 98.1 |
| 1456 | Ethyl octanoate | 19.5–994.8 | 1.000 | 0.002 ± 0.000 | -0.053 | 96.9 |
| 1546 | Ethyl 3-hydroxybutanoate | 1.5–102.0 | 0.990 | 0.290 ± 0.010 | -0.482 | 96.6 |
| 1659 | Ethyl decanoate | 0.1–211.4 | 0.996 | 0.599 ± 0.000 | -0.077 | 100.0 |
| 1673 | Ethyl benzoate | 1.2–303.1 | 0.985 | 0.165 ± 0.000 | -0.770 | 100.0 |
| 1697 | Ethyl 2-furoate | 2.1–256.2 | 0.994 | 0.010 ± 0.000 | -0.018 | 97.1 |
| 1706 | Ethyl succinate | 27.6–2158.7 | 0.987 | 0.136 ± 0.001 | -3.582 | 99.2 |
| 1837 | Ethyl salicylate | 5.2–1297.2 | 0.987 | 0.120 ± 0.003 | -4.724 | 97.8 |
| 1865 | Ethyl dodecanoate | 4.6–205.6 | 0.994 | 0.012 ± 0.000 | -0.014 | 100.0 |
| 2104 | Ethyl cinnamate | 4.8–1202.9 | 0.994 | 0.061 ± 0.003 | -0.674 | 95.6 |
| Fatty acids | | | | | | |
| 1485 | Acetic acid | 10.1–853.1 | 0.990 | 0.052 ± 0.0014 | -0.370 | 97.3 |
| 1600 | 3-Methylbutanoic acid | 0.5–1036.9 | 0.994 | 0.059 ± 0.000 | -0.032 | 100.0 |
| 1882 | Hexanoic acid | 1.5–363.1 | 0.999 | 0.477 ± 0.000 | -0.684 | 100.0 |
| 2059 | Octanoic acid | 5.6–1037.2 | 0.981 | 0.042 ± 0.000 | -0.216 | 99.7 |
| 2196 | Decanoic acid | 0.5–37.8 | 0.985 | 0.053 ± 0.000 | -0.005 | 100.0 |
| 2280 | Benzoic acid | 2.4–360 | 0.986 | 0.007 ± 0.000 | -0.041 | 97.9 |
| 2345 | Phenylacetic acid | 7.0–60.2 | 0.996 | 0.041 ± 0.006 | -0.035 | 84.9 |
| Carbonyl compounds | | | | | | |
| 1101 | Hexanal | 1.2–300 | 0.992 | 0.209 ± 0.007 | -0.161 | 96.6 |
| 1556 | (Z)-2-nonanal | 1.2–124.3 | 0.999 | 0.060 ± 0.000 | -0.088 | 100.0 |
| 1549 | Benzaldehyde | 0.6–381.4 | 0.995 | 0.033 ± 0.000 | -0.006 | 99.4 |
| 1674 | Phenylethanal | 1.3–586.7 | 0.989 | 0.118 ± 0.000 | -0.151 | 100.0 |
| Furan compounds | | | | | | |
| 1494 | 2-Furfural | 2.8–310.6 | 0.987 | 0.179 ± 0.002 | -0.512 | 98.7 |
| 1599 | 5-Methyl-2-furfural | 1.1–286 | 0.992 | 0.128 ± 0.003 | -0.319 | 97.7 |
| Sulphur compounds | | | | | | |
| 1748 | Methionol | 1.2–297.2 | 0.983 | 0.865 ± 0.004 | -1.183 | 99.6 |
| Volatile phenols | | | | | | |
| 1894 | 2-methoxyphenol | 5.6–1400 | 0.983 | 0.090 ± 0.001 | -1.428 | 99.1 |
| 2023 | Phenol | 1.1–38.4 | 0.986 | 0.033 ± 0.002 | -0.039 | 95.2 |
| 2118 | Eugenol | 0.5–127.2 | 0.991 | 0.028 ± 0.036 | -0.424 | 86.9 |
| 2143 | 4-Ethylphenol | 2.4–360 | 0.982 | 0.005 ± 0.000 | -0.015 | 100.0 |
| 2276 | Vanillin | 6.2–59.5 | 0.996 | 0.031 ± 0.004 | -0.070 | 87.5 |

Table 2
Performance characteristics of the liquid–liquid extraction method. Detection (LOD) and quantification (LOQ) limits, recoveries and yield extraction data

| Compounds | LOD (mg l ⁻¹) | LOQ (mg l ⁻¹) | %Recovery | R.S.D. (%) | %Yield extraction |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------|
| Terpenes | | | | | |
| β-Citronellal | 0.008 | 0.028 | 43.5 | 7.2 | 99.9 |
| Linalool | 0.008 | 0.028 | 51.6 | 4.6 | 91.1 |
| α-Terpineol | 0.003 | 0.011 | 73.9 | 5.3 | 100.7 |
| Nerol | 0.002 | 0.007 | 45.1 | 2.9 | 99.9 |
| β-Damascenone | 0.022 | 0.072 | 60.3 | 2.1 | 103.7 |
| Geraniol | 0.011 | 0.038 | 54.2 | 3.5 | 102.1 |
| (E)-Nerolidol | 0.021 | 0.011 | 49.9 | 6.2 | 106.4 |
| Higher alcohols | | | | | |
| Butan-1-ol | 0.087 | 0.290 | 56.6 | 5.1 | 103.9 |
| 3-Methylbutan-1-ol | 0.534 | 1.780 | 73.9 | 0.7 | 103.6 |
| Hexan-2-ol | 0.127 | 0.374 | 68.6 | 3.2 | 102.4 |
| Hexan-1-ol | 0.104 | 0.348 | 112.8 | 1.1 | 101.5 |
| (E)-3-hexen-1-ol | 0.003 | 0.010 | 80.5 | 4.3 | 101.2 |
| (Z)-2-hexen-1-ol | 0.003 | 0.009 | 81.2 | 10.6 | 101.0 |
| 2-Ethyl hexan-1-ol | 0.057 | 0.190 | 75.2 | 4.9 | 104.5 |
| (R,S)-Butan-2,3-diol | 0.196 | 0.653 | 42.9 | 6.7 | 95.8 |
| Propan-2-ol | 0.041 | 0.135 | 55.6 | 2.7 | 98.4 |
| 2-Phenylethanol | 0.095 | 0.317 | 76.3 | 0.9 | 97.4 |
| 2-Phenoxyethanol | 0.414 | 1.378 | 52.7 | 2.9 | 101.8 |
| Acetates | | | | | |
| Phenylethyl acetate | 0.047 | 0.157 | 76.9 | 1.4 | 100.6 |
| Isoamyl acetate | 0.038 | 0.126 | 81.8 | 3.8 | 102.7 |
| Ethyl esters | | | | | |
| Ethyl butyrate | 0.038 | 0.128 | 84.7 | 9.1 | 102.7 |
| Ethyl pentanoate | 0.006 | 0.015 | 71.8 | 4.9 | 100.6 |
| Ethyl hexanoate | 0.037 | 0.123 | 108.7 | 8.5 | 103.0 |
| Ethyl lactate | 0.029 | 0.096 | 86.8 | 4.6 | 100.5 |
| Ethyl octanoate | 0.084 | 0.281 | 109.3 | 1.3 | 100.1 |
| Ethyl 3-hydroxybutanoate | 0.013 | 0.042 | 55.1 | 5.1 | 103.0 |
| Ethyl decanoate | 0.017 | 0.056 | 75.0 | 1.9 | 101.7 |
| Ethyl benzoate | 0.082 | 0.287 | 52.1 | 7.2 | 105.2 |
| Ethyl 2-furoate | 0.030 | 0.101 | 28.9 | 6.1 | 96.6 |
| Ethyl succinate | 0.351 | 1.170 | 93.7 | 7.9 | 103.1 |
| Ethyl salicylate | 0.215 | 0.682 | 43.4 | 9.4 | 103.4 |
| Ethyl dodecanoate | 0.024 | 0.081 | 111.6 | 5.3 | 104.0 |
| Ethyl cinnamate | 0.131 | 0.548 | 56.8 | 8.3 | 114.9 |
| Fatty acids | | | | | |
| Acetic acid | 0.126 | 0.420 | 54.7 | 2.0 | 103.9 |
| 3-Methylbutanoic acid | 0.106 | 0.352 | 88.8 | 4.9 | 93.8 |
| Hexanoic acid | 0.014 | 0.048 | 88.9 | 1.8 | 100.7 |
| Octanoic acid | 0.204 | 0.679 | 65.8 | 1.1 | 103.6 |
| Decanoic acid | 0.007 | 0.022 | 81.4 | 8.5 | 106.2 |
| Phenylacetic acid | 0.005 | 0.018 | 59.4 | 3.4 | 100.5 |
| Benzoic acid | 0.066 | 0.221 | 49.5 | 1.5 | 105.6 |
| Carbonyl compounds | | | | | |
| Hexanal | 0.040 | 0.123 | 15.6 | 7.2 | 102.5 |
| (Z)-2-nonanal | 0.006 | 0.021 | 70.6 | 6.4 | 100.5 |
| Benzaldehyde | 0.039 | 0.131 | 67.1 | 1.9 | 119.0 |
| Phenylethanal | 0.081 | 0.269 | 103.8 | 4.7 | 98.7 |
| Furan compounds | | | | | |
| 2-Furfural | 0.051 | 0.171 | 80.3 | 1.3 | 103.1 |
| 5-Methyl-2-furfural | 0.037 | 0.149 | 54.5 | 4.6 | 102.4 |
| Sulphur compounds | | | | | |
| Methionol | 0.056 | 0.188 | 13.4 | 1.0 | 100.7 |
| Volatile phenols | | | | | |
| 2-Methoxyphenol | 0.265 | 0.837 | 48.0 | 6.0 | 103.6 |
| Phenol | 0.007 | 0.022 | 57.7 | 9.2 | 81.8 |
| Eugenol | 0.017 | 0.056 | 59.3 | 7.1 | 116.3 |
| 4-Ethylphenol | 0.075 | 0.251 | 34.5 | 9.4 | 84.9 |
| Vanillin | 0.074 | 0.245 | 33.8 | 8.8 | 99.6 |

were tested in duplicate. The (volatile compound/internal standard) peak area ratio was used for each compound. Calibration solutions, in the range specified in Table 1, were prepared by suitable dilution of the global solution. To calculate this calibration graphs, linear least-square regression was used. For most of the compounds studied, the resulting calibration curves obtained by plotting the GC–MS response versus analyte concentration were found to have good linearity in the range of concentrations studied, with regression coefficient (r^2) values ranging between 0.981 (octanoic acid) and 1.000 (ethyl octanoate). It was also corroborated by “on-line linearity” (LOL), with values higher than 85%.

The method sensitivity given by the slope of the straight calibration graphs depends on extraction efficiency and detector response for each compound. With this procedure, high sensitivities were obtained for α -terpineol, β -citronellal, methionol and 2-phenylethanol.

The recovery percentage of the studied compounds added to TNM wine were calculated and are shown in Table 2. As expected, the range of recoveries is very wide. The results show that the compounds highly soluble in water, such as acetic acid, methionol and ethyl lactate, are poorly extracted.

The repeatability of the method was estimated by the relative standard deviation (R.S.D.) of the concentrations for six consecutive extractions of a synthetic wine. The values obtained for this parameter ranged from 0.7% for 3-methylbutan-1-ol to 10.6% for (Z)-2-hexen-1-ol, with an average of about 4.0% for all analytes considered. The limits of detection (LOD) were estimated from the area corresponding to three-fold the system noise. As presented in Table 2 the obtained values ranged from 2.0 $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ for nerol to 0.53 mg l^{-1} for 3-methylbutan-1-ol. For the limits of quantification (LOQ) the values ranged from 9.0 $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ for (Z)-2-hexen-1-ol to 1.78 mg l^{-1} for ethyl 3-hydroxybutanoate (Table 2).

3.2. Identification of volatile components

The analytical method proposed allowed the correct identification and quantification over than 90 compounds in the volatile fraction of TNM red wines, the majority being higher alcohols (mainly isoamyl alcohols and (R,S)-butan-2,3-diol), ethyl esters of medium-chain fatty acids (hexanoic and octanoic acids), fatty acids, carbonyl compounds and acetates from higher alcohols. Amongst the other components present were detected several furan derivatives (5), seven lactones, the isomers of dioxanes and dioxolanes (4) and some volatile phenols. Only three sulphur-containing compounds were identified: 2-(methylthio)-ethanol, methionol and 5-ethoxythiazole.

Free volatile compounds isolated from TMN-D red wine accounted for 569.7 mg l^{-1} , a value much higher than that obtained for the others TMN wine types, which present contents of 247.5, 203.1 and 205.8 mg l^{-1} , for TMN-MD; TMN-S and TMN-MD, respectively. The results are consistent with the vinification process. The average values (mean \pm standard deviation) determined for the volatile compounds in TNM-D, TNM-MD, TNM-S and TNM-MS red wines from the 2003 harvest, are present in Table 3.

3.2.1. Higher alcohols

Are quantitatively the largest group of the volatile compounds in TNM red wines. This volatile fraction is composed mainly by *n*-alcohols of C_6 chain length (related to the lipoxygenase activity of the grape) and aromatic compounds such as benzyl alcohol and 2-phenylethanol. The presence of these two compounds may cause a “flowery” and “sweet” notes which could be considered as a positive characteristic for TNM wines variety. The total concentration of this family of compounds calculated in the different TNM wine types analysed are shown in Fig. 3.

TNM-S and TNM-MS are the wine types that show by far the lowest content of higher alcohols. The alcohol fraction of TNM-D is significantly different at the 95% level from the other types of TNM red wines studied. 3-Methylbutan-1-ol and (R,S)-butan-2,3-diol were markedly the most abundant higher alcohols, being present at levels higher than its perception threshold (30 mg l^{-1} for 3-methylbutan-1-ol), thus its sensorial contribution with “banana” and “alcohol, fusel” odour, is expected. Identical values of 3-methylbutan-1-ol were observed in the analysed wines from the TNM-S and TNM-MS ($29.7 \pm 0.3 \text{ mg l}^{-1}$), while in those from TNM-MD these values were slightly higher $61.9 \pm 0.03 \text{ mg l}^{-1}$). The highest contents of 3-methylbutan-1-ol (significantly different at the 95% level) were determined in TNM-D ($259.1 \pm 0.9 \text{ mg l}^{-1}$). The high contents of 3-methylbutan-1-ol could be justified by the higher content of the amino acid precursors of this alcohol, leucine and isoleucine [22]. The contents of 2-phenylethanol ($18.0 \pm 0.9 \text{ mg l}^{-1}$) were notably higher in the TNM-D wine and the other varietal alcohol, benzyl alcohol appeared in low concentrations but were similar in all the TNM wine types (Fig. 4).

The next most abundant higher alcohol in the TMN red wines is hexan-1-ol, that contributed with “herbaceous” and “vegetal” odour when its concentration surpass 8 mg l^{-1} . The average concentration of hexan-1-ol in TNM red wines studied ($8.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ mg l}^{-1}$), is higher than the perception threshold thus its sensorial contribution is expected. The highest concentration of this compound was present in TNM-D wines. The obtained values were similar to those reported by Falqué et al. [22].

3.2.2. Ethyl esters and acetates

One of the most important groups of aroma compounds in wine are the ethyl esters of fatty acids that are produced enzy-




Fig. 3. Total concentration of the main chemical classes of volatile compounds (HA: higher alcohols; EE: ethyl esters; FA: fatty acids; CC: carbonyl compounds) determined in TNM red wines (D: dry; MD: medium dry; S: sweet; MS: medium sweet).

Table 3
Average concentration (mean \pm standard deviation) of volatile composition of TNM red wines from 2003 harvest

| Compounds | Concentration (mg l ⁻¹) ^a | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | TNM-D | TNM-MD | TNM-S | TNM-MS |
| Terpenes | | | | |
| α -Terpineol | 0.288 \pm 0.733 | 0.288 \pm 0.733 | 0.287 \pm 0.733 | 0.287 \pm 0.733 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| Subtotal (%) | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| Higher alcohols | | | | |
| 2-Methylpropan-1-ol ^b | 3.056 \pm 0.199 | 0.723 \pm 0.035 | 0.516 \pm 0.034 | 0.601 \pm 0.084 |
| Butan-1-ol | 2.585 \pm 0.198 | 2.513 \pm 0.199 | 2.678 \pm 0.198 | 2.518 \pm 0.199 |
| 3-Methylbutan-1-ol | 259.09 \pm 0.881 | 61.974 \pm 0.028 | 29.476 \pm 0.112 | 29.951 \pm 0.110 |
| 3-Methylpentano-1,5-diol ^b | 0.070 \pm 0.002 | 0.007 \pm 0.000 | 0.002 \pm 0.000 | 0.006 \pm 0.002 |
| α -Phenylbenzenemethanol ^b | 0.014 \pm 0.002 | 0.006 \pm 0.000 | 0.014 \pm 0.001 | 0.021 \pm 0.006 |
| 2-Acethoxypropan-1-ol ^b | ND | ND | 0.003 \pm 0.000 | 0.005 \pm 0.000 |
| 3-Methylpentan-1-ol ^b | 0.010 \pm 0.001 | 0.002 \pm 0.000 | 0.000 \pm 0.000 | 0.002 \pm 0.000 |
| Heptan-1-ol ^b | 0.006 \pm 0.000 | 0.002 \pm 0.000 | 0.001 \pm 0.000 | 0.006 \pm 0.000 |
| Hexan-1-ol | 8.779 \pm 0.466 | 7.604 \pm 0.473 | 8.366 \pm 0.468 | 8.685 \pm 0.467 |
| (Z)-3-Hexen-1-ol ^b | 0.005 \pm 0.001 | 0.008 \pm 0.000 | 0.007 \pm 0.001 | 0.007 \pm 0.001 |
| 3-Etoxypropan-1-ol ^b | 0.031 \pm 0.000 | 0.013 \pm 0.001 | 0.008 \pm 0.001 | 0.016 \pm 0.000 |
| (E)-3-hexen-1-ol | 0.488 \pm 0.093 | 0.505 \pm 0.093 | 0.523 \pm 0.094 | 0.518 \pm 0.115 |
| (Z)-2-hexen-1-ol | ND | 0.397 \pm 0.115 | 0.397 \pm 0.115 | 0.444 \pm 0.115 |
| 2-Ethylhexan-1-ol | 0.574 \pm 0.216 | 0.574 \pm 0.216 | 0.575 \pm 0.216 | 0.574 \pm 0.216 |
| (D,L)-Butan-2,3-diol ^b | 1.264 \pm 0.201 | 0.327 \pm 0.009 | 0.232 \pm 0.021 | 0.231 \pm 0.033 |
| (R,S)-Butan-2,3-diol | 104.102 \pm 3.134 | 40.209 \pm 3.134 | 34.646 \pm 3.134 | 38.076 \pm 3.134 |
| Propan-2-ol | 8.983 \pm 0.348 | 7.045 \pm 0.397 | 6.358 \pm 0.415 | ND |
| 2,2-Dimethylpentan-3-ol ^b | 0.030 \pm 0.002 | 0.003 \pm 0.000 | 0.001 \pm 0.000 | ND |
| Benzyl alcohol ^b | 0.111 \pm 0.003 | 0.224 \pm 0.007 | 0.106 \pm 0.008 | 0.107 \pm 0.008 |
| 2-Phenylethanol | 18.005 \pm 0.998 | 11.881 \pm 1.012 | 9.706 \pm 1.017 | 9.8 \pm 1.017 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 407.20 | 134.02 | 93.62 | 91.57 |
| Subtotal (%) | 7147 | 54.14 | 46.09 | 44.58 |
| Acetates | | | | |
| Isoamly acetate | 0.654 \pm 0.339 | 0.515 \pm 0.344 | 0.508 \pm 0.344 | 0.491 \pm 0.345 |
| Hexyl acetate ^b | 0.002 \pm 0.000 | 0.036 \pm 0.003 | 0.032 \pm 0.001 | 0.003 \pm 0.000 |
| 2-Phenylethyl acetate | 5.09 \pm 0.113 | 3.182 \pm 0.113 | 2.993 \pm 0.113 | 3.07 \pm 0.113 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 5.75 | 3.73 | 3.53 | 3.56 |
| Subtotal (%) | 1.01 | 1.51 | 1.74 | 1.73 |
| Ethyl esters | | | | |
| Ethyl butyrate | ND | ND | 1.372 \pm 0.444 | ND |
| Ethyl hexanoate | 2.271 \pm 0.383 | 1.73 \pm 0.406 | 1.608 \pm 0.411 | 1.544 \pm 0.414 |
| Ethyl pyruvate ^b | 0.006 \pm 0.001 | 0.032 \pm 0.001 | 0.017 \pm 0.003 | 0.046 \pm 0.001 |
| Ethyl lactate | 7.206 \pm 0.135 | 6.855 \pm 0.142 | 4.051 \pm 0.196 | 3.088 \pm 0.215 |
| Ethyl octanoate | 54.823 \pm 7.160 | 32.696 \pm 6.464 | 30.437 \pm 6.383 | 29.069 \pm 6.350 |
| Ethyl 3-hydroxybutanoate | 1.706 \pm 0.228 | 1.674 \pm 0.229 | 1.659 \pm 0.230 | 1.66 \pm 0.223 |
| Ethyl decanoate | 0.38 \pm 0.014 | 0.238 \pm 0.014 | 0.192 \pm 0.014 | 0.181 \pm 0.014 |
| Diethyl succinate ^b | 1.049 \pm 0.065 | 0.702 \pm 0.030 | 0.184 \pm 0.030 | 0.329 \pm 0.029 |
| Ethyl pentanedioate ^b | 0.007 \pm 0.001 | 0.006 \pm 0.001 | 0.001 \pm 0.000 | 0.003 \pm 0.000 |
| Ethyl benzeneacetate ^b | 0.016 \pm 0.003 | 0.006 \pm 0.000 | 0.003 \pm 0.000 | 0.005 \pm 0.000 |
| Methyl 2-ethylhexanoate ^b | 0.284 \pm 0.019 | 0.193 \pm 0.030 | 0.073 \pm 0.014 | 0.060 \pm 0.001 |
| Ethyl dodecanoate | 1.318 \pm 0.116 | 1.236 \pm 0.116 | ND | ND |
| Ethyl 3-hydroxyhexanoate ^b | 1.786 \pm 0.103 | 1.325 \pm 0.121 | 1.761 \pm 0.324 | 3.613 \pm 0.546 |
| Ethyl 2-furoate | ND | ND | 2.525 \pm 0.129 | 6.535 \pm 0.244 |
| Ethyl succinate | 30.079 \pm 1.659 | 28.867 \pm 1.678 | 27.056 \pm 1.683 | 27.562 \pm 1.679 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 100.93 | 75.56 | 70.94 | 73.70 |
| Subtotal (%) | 17.72 | 30.52 | 34.93 | 35.88 |
| Fatty acids | | | | |
| Acetic acid | 27.101 \pm 2.673 | 14.388 \pm 3.017 | 14.995 \pm 3.000 | 14.492 \pm 3.014 |
| Propanoic acid ^b | ND | 0.031 \pm 0.001 | 0.002 \pm 0.000 | ND |
| 2-Methylpropanoic acid ^b | 0.160 \pm 0.019 | 0.045 \pm 0.002 | 0.043 \pm 0.003 | 0.822 \pm 0.014 |
| Butanoic acid ^b | 0.040 \pm 0.001 | 0.022 \pm 0.002 | 0.022 \pm 0.007 | 0.019 \pm 0.001 |
| 3-Methylbutanoic acid | 1.83 \pm 0.121 | 0.902 \pm 0.121 | 0.884 \pm 0.121 | 0.763 \pm 0.121 |

Table 3 (Continued)

| Compounds | Concentration (mg l ⁻¹) ^a | | | |
|---|--|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | TNM-D | TNM-MD | TNM-S | TNM-MS |
| Hexanoic acid | 1.625 ± 0.208 | 1.535 ± 0.208 | 1.502 ± 0.208 | 1.486 ± 0.208 |
| (<i>E</i>)-Hex-2-enoic acid | 0.001 ± 0.000 | 0.003 ± 0.000 | 0.010 ± 0.000 | 0.006 ± 0.002 |
| Octanoic acid | 9.076 ± 0.543 | 6.654 ± 0.551 | 5.911 ± 0.551 | 5.843 ± 0.554 |
| Decanoic acid | 1.607 ± 0.080 | 0.098 ± 0.080 | 0.507 ± 0.080 | 0.565 ± 0.080 |
| α-Hydroxyphenylpropanoic acid ^b | 0.200 ± 0.008 | 0.064 ± 0.002 | 0.021 ± 0.003 | 0.031 ± 0.009 |
| 2-Furancarboxylic acid ^b | 0.022 ± 0.002 | 0.021 ± 0.001 | 0.023 ± 0.004 | ND |
| Dodecanoic acid ^b | 0.021 ± 0.002 | 0.030 ± 0.001 | ND | ND |
| Phenylacetic acid | 1.188 ± 0.538 | 1.161 ± 0.539 | 1.033 ± 0.554 | 1.046 ± 0.542 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 42.87 | 24.92 | 24.95 | 25.07 |
| Subtotal (%) | 7.53 | 10.07 | 12.29 | 12.21 |
| Carbonyl compounds | | | | |
| P-aldehyde ^b | 0.038 ± 0.009 | 0.097 ± 0.016 | 0.228 ± 0.012 | 0.701 ± 0.020 |
| Benzaldehyde | 6.649 ± 0.104 | 1.35 ± 0.138 | 2.742 ± 0.129 | 4.07 ± 0.120 |
| Phenylethanal | 1.611 ± 0.039 | 1.28 ± 0.039 | 1.358 ± 0.039 | 1.573 ± 0.039 |
| 5-Methylheptan-2-one ^b | 0.331 ± 0.012 | 0.010 ± 0.000 | 0.230 ± 0.073 | 0.567 ± 0.070 |
| 3-Penten-2-one ^b | 0.000 ± 0.000 | ND | 0.007 ± 0.002 | 0.004 ± 0.000 |
| 5-Methoxypentan-2-one ^b | 0.002 ± 0.000 | 0.003 ± 0.000 | 0.041 ± 0.003 | 0.011 ± 0.002 |
| 2-Hydroxypentan-3-one ^b | 0.010 ± 0.003 | 0.008 ± 0.001 | 0.009 ± 0.001 | 0.018 ± 0.005 |
| 5-Acethoxypentan-3-one ^b | 0.008 ± 0.001 | 0.066 ± 0.002 | 0.041 ± 0.003 | 0.032 ± 0.002 |
| Cyclopentanone ^b | 0.015 ± 0.003 | 0.045 ± 0.017 | 0.066 ± 0.012 | 0.119 ± 0.031 |
| N-ethyl acetamide ^b | 0.004 ± 0.000 | 0.002 ± 0.000 | ND | ND |
| N-(3-Methylbutyl) acetamide ^b | 0.083 ± 0.007 | 0.059 ± 0.001 | 0.009 ± 0.001 | 0.024 ± 0.003 |
| (N,N)-ethylphenyl acetamide ^b | 0.020 ± 0.006 | 0.030 ± 0.001 | ND | ND |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 8.77 | 2.95 | 4.73 | 7.12 |
| Subtotal (%) | 1.54 | 1.19 | 2.33 | 3.46 |
| Lactones ^b | | | | |
| Butalactone | 0.001 ± 0.000 | 0.003 ± 0.000 | 0.000 ± 0.000 | 0.000 ± 0.000 |
| Pantolactone | 0.032 ± 0.002 | 0.017 ± 0.001 | 0.012 ± 0.003 | 0.019 ± 0.004 |
| γ-Hexalactone | 0.010 ± 0.002 | 0.001 ± 0.0030 | 0.000 ± 0.000 | 0.001 ± 0.000 |
| γ-Octalactone | 0.511 ± 0.116 | 0.098 ± 0.010 | 0.065 ± 0.018 | 0.102 ± 0.021 |
| γ-Nonalactone | 0.317 ± 0.087 | 0.144 ± 0.007 | 0.063 ± 0.010 | 0.084 ± 0.023 |
| γ-Decalactone | 0.001 ± 0.000 | 0.001 ± 0.000 | ND | 0.001 ± 0.000 |
| THMP | 0.001 ± 0.000 | 0.000 ± 0.000 | 0.005 ± 0.001 | 0.009 ± 0.000 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 0.87 | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.21 |
| Subtotal (%) | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.10 |
| Acetals ^b | | | | |
| <i>cis</i> -Dioxane | 0.040 ± 0.000 | 0.021 ± 0.002 | 0.031 ± 0.002 | 0.048 ± 0.008 |
| 1,1-Diethoxyethane | 0.004 ± 0.001 | 0.003 ± 0.000 | 0.006 ± 0.001 | 0.003 ± 0.000 |
| <i>cis</i> -Dioxolane | 0.017 ± 0.001 | 0.034 ± 0.001 | 0.029 ± 0.006 | 0.034 ± 0.004 |
| <i>trans</i> -Dioxane | 0.014 ± 0.001 | 0.008 ± 0.001 | 0.013 ± 0.001 | 0.023 ± 0.005 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.11 |
| Subtotal (%) | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Furan compounds | | | | |
| 2-Furfural | 2.89 ± 0.346 | 2.92 ± 0.345 | 2.961 ± 0.345 | 3.015 ± 0.344 |
| 5-Ethyl hydro-2(3H)-furanone ^b | ND | 0.005 ± 0.000 | ND | 0.006 ± 0.002 |
| 5-Ethoxydihydro-2(3H)-furanone ^b | ND | 0.010 ± 0.001 | 0.010 ± 0.001 | 0.127 ± 0.024 |
| 5-Methyl-2-furancarboxaldehyde ^b | ND | ND | 0.001 ± 0.000 | 0.006 ± 0.001 |
| HMF | ND | 0.064 ± 0.004 | 0.065 ± 0.013 | 0.127 ± 0.024 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 2.89 | 3.00 | 3.04 | 3.28 |
| Subtotal (%) | 0.51 | 1.21 | 1.49 | 1.59 |
| Sulfur compounds | | | | |
| 2-(Methylthio)-ethanol ^b | 0.005 ± 0.001 | 0.002 ± 0.000 | 0.001 ± 0.000 | 0.001 ± 0.000 |
| Methionol | 1.623 ± 0.306 | 1.439 ± 0.306 | 1.385 ± 0.307 | 1.384 ± 0.307 |
| 5-Ethoxythiazole ^b | 0.103 ± 0.005 | 0.010 ± 0.001 | 0.007 ± 0.001 | 0.015 ± 0.001 |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 1.73 | 1.45 | 1.39 | 1.40 |
| Subtotal (%) | 0.30 | 0.58 | 0.68 | 0.68 |

Table 3 (Continued)

| Compounds | Concentration (mg l ⁻¹) ^a | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | TNM-D | TNM-MD | TNM-S | TNM-MS |
| Volatile phenols | | | | |
| Phenol | 1.254 ± 0.145 | 1.269 ± 0.144 | 1.237 ± 0.145 | ND |
| Vanillin | ND | 3.008 ± 1.015 | 2.19 ± 1.117 | 2.356 ± 1.096 |
| Acetovanillin ^b | 0.005 ± 0.002 | 0.015 ± 0.000 | 0.001 ± 0.000 | ND |
| Subtotal (mg l ⁻¹) | 1.26 | 4.29 | 3.43 | 2.36 |
| Subtotal (%) | 0.22 | 1.73 | 1.68 | 1.15 |
| Total (mg l ⁻¹) | 569.75 | 247.54 | 203.10 | 205.38 |

ND: not detected; THMP: tetrahydro-4-hydroxy-4-methyl-2-H-pyran-2-one; HMF: 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furfural.

^a Mean of 12 extraction replicates.

^b Concentration determined by the equation $C_x = n \times C_{is}$, where C_x is the concentration of x compound, n the relative peak area and C_{is} is the internal standard concentration in the sample.

matically during yeast fermentation and from ethanolsis of acylCoA that is formed during fatty acids synthesis or degradation. Their concentration is dependent on several factors mainly: yeast strain, fermentation temperature, aeration degree and sugar contents. These compounds make a positive contribution to the general quality of wine being responsible for their “fruity” and “floral” sensory properties. The TNM-S wines showed the lowest concentration of ethyl esters of fatty acids (6–10 carbon atoms). The maximum values for all the ethyl esters were found for TNM-D and TNM-MD, being higher than the respective TNM-MS. With exception of the TNM-D wines, the concentration of ethyl esters in the different types of studied wines was reasonably constant and the differences were not significant. Between the ethylic esters that it has been possible to identify, ethyl esters of C₆ and C₈ fatty acids, which are responsible for the “fruity” and “wine-like” aroma, hexanoate and octanoate, were those found at the highest concentrations in the TNM analysed wines. They have similar concentrations with exception for ethyl octanoate determined in TNM-D wines (significantly different at the 95% level), and are present at concentrations exceeding their flavour threshold (Table 4). From the ethyl esters of diprotic acids, the concentration of diethyl succinate (28.4 ± 1.3 mg l⁻¹) is much higher than that found for ethyl lactate (Table 3). Identical concentrations of diethyl succinate were observed in all the analysed TNM wines (Table 3). The concentration of ethyl lactate in TNM-D and TNM-MD was higher than that determined

in the TNM-S and TNM-MS red wines. Fig. 3 compare the total concentration of the ethyl esters of fatty acids in the different TNM wine types analysed.

3.2.3. Acetates

Are the result of the reaction of acetylCoA with higher alcohols that are formed from degradation of amino acids or carbohydrates. Isoamyl acetate with a characteristic odour of “banana”, was found at similar values in different TNM wine types and above its perception threshold ($30 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$) in all the samples with an average content of about 0.54 ± 0.08 mg l⁻¹. The concentration of 2-phenylethyl acetate determined in TNM-D, which give “roses, flowery, honey” nuances to the wine, was significantly different at the 95% level, from the determined in TNM-MD, TNM-S and TNM-MS wines.

3.2.4. Fatty acids

Within the family of fatty acids (Table 3), acetic, hexanoic and octanoic acids were notable for their higher concentrations. Acetic acid was markedly the most abundant acid, being present at levels lower than its perception threshold (200 mg l⁻¹). The TNM-D wine, present the highest concentration of these compounds (42.9 mg l⁻¹). The fatty acids concentration in the TNM-MD, TNM-S and TNM-MS red wines were not significantly different at the 95% level. The contents of hexanoic, octanoic and decanoic acids although high, showing values of 1.5, 6.9 and 0.7 mg l⁻¹, respectively, were in agreement with those found for other wine varieties. Fig. 3 shows the total concentration of these compounds in the different TNM wine types analysed.

3.2.5. Carbonyl compounds

This group includes aldehydes and ketones. The former compounds, namely C₆ aldehydes, are formed from unsaturated fatty acids, such as linoleic and linolenic acids. Also, can be considered as products of lipoxygenase catalysis. Only few aldehydes have been detected among the wine aroma constituents, probably because they can be reduced to the corresponding alcohols during the course of fermentation. Benzaldehyde and phenylethanal present the highest levels of this group of compounds. They have similar concentrations in TNM-MD; TNM-S and TNM-




Fig. 4. Total concentration of the minor chemical classes of volatile composition (ACET: acetates from higher alcohols; L: lactones; Ac: acetals; FC: furan compounds; SC: sulphur compounds; P: volatile phenols) determined in TNM red wines (D: dry; MD: medium dry; S: sweet; MS: medium sweet).

Table 4
Odour descriptor, odour threshold (LOP) and aroma index (*I*) of the main odorants found in TNM red wines

| Compounds | Odour descriptor ^a | LOP (mg l ⁻¹) ^a | Aroma index (<i>I</i>) | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | TNM-D | TNM-MD | TNM-S | TNM-MS |
| Ethyl butyrate | Fruity, apple | 0.02 | ND | ND | 68.6 | ND |
| 2-Methylpropan-1-ol | Bitter, green, harsh | 0.2 | 15.3 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.0 |
| Phenylethyl acetate | Roses, flowery | 0.25 | 20.4 | 12.7 | 12.0 | 12.3 |
| 3-Methylbutan-1-ol | Alcohol, fusel | 30.0 | 8.6 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Ethyl hexanoate | Green apple, anise | 0.014 | 162.2 | 123.5 | 114.9 | 110.3 |
| Hexan-1-ol | Green, grass | 8.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| Ethyl octanoate | Sweet, fruity, fresh | 0.005 | 10964.6 | 6539.1 | 6087.5 | 5813.8 |
| Benzaldehyde | Bitter, cherry | 2.0 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| 3-Methylbutanoic acid | Cheese, fatty, rancid | 0.0334 | 54.8 | 27.0 | 26.5 | 22.8 |
| Ethyl decanoate | Pleasant, soap | 0.2 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Phenylethanal | Flowery, rose, honey | 0.005 | 322.1 | 256.0 | 271.6 | 314.6 |
| Ethyl succinate | Wine | 6.0 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| α-Terpineol | Piney, iris, teil | 0.11 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Methionol | Baked cabbage | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Isoamyl acetate | Banana | 0.03 | 21.8 | 17.2 | 16.9 | 16.4 |
| Hexanoic acid | Fatty acid, cheese | 0.42 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 |
| Octanoic acid | Fatty acid, rancid | 0.5 | 18.2 | 13.3 | 11.8 | 11.7 |
| 2-Phenylethanol | Roses, sweet | 14.0 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| γ-Nonalactone | Coconut | 0.03 | 10.6 | 4.8 | 2.1 | 2.8 |
| Vanillin | Vanilla, candy | 0.2 | ND | 15.0 | 10.9 | 11.8 |
| Decanoic acid | Fatty, rancid, soap | 1.0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Phenylacetic acid | Honey, pollen, flowery | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

ND: not detected.

^a Odour descriptor and odour threshold reported in the literature [14–22].

MS wines, with exception for benzaldehyde in TNM-D wines whose concentration is significantly different at the 95% level. The ketones can be formed by condensation of activated fatty acids. The most important in the TNM analysed wines are cyclopentanone.

3.2.6. Furan compounds

Another group of aroma compound that have been studied were the furanic compounds, formed by degradation of carbohydrates. The major components in this group were 2-furfural and 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furfural (HMF). Furfural was the most abundant compound (Table 4) but is present at levels lower than its perception threshold. The average values for the different TNM wine types are similar (not significantly different at the 95% level).

3.2.7. Lactones

Seven lactones were identified. These compounds are among the most important to the sensory characteristics of wines namely when aged in oak wood. These compounds are formed by cyclization of the corresponding γ-hydroxycarboxylic acids. The odour of these lactones depends on the chemical structure, functional groups and the length of side chains. The odour of these compounds are described as being “fruity” and in some cases as “coconut-like; fruity” (γ-hexalactone); “coconut-like” (γ-octalactone); “peach-like, milky” (γ-decalactone) and “fruity, sweet floral” (γ-dodecalactone). γ-Octalactone is the most abundant lactone in TNM-D (58.5%), TNM-S (44.8%), TNM-MS (49.3%) red wines and γ-nonalactone is the most representative of TNM-MD (54.5%) wine.

3.2.8. Sulphur compounds

Comprise a structurally diverse class of molecules that a whole range of aromatic notes, generally considered detrimental to wine quality [23]. Most of the sulphur compounds identified in wines are usually found at level below their threshold values. The main sulphur compound identified in TNM red wines was 3-(methylthio)-propan-1-ol (methionol). This is usually found at levels above its olfactive perception threshold value. The analysis of TNM red wines (Table 3) showed that the highest concentration of sulphur compounds was observed for methionol in TNM-D wine.

3.2.9. Volatile phenols

These compounds detected in different wine samples, can originate from *p*-coumaric and ferulic acids by decarboxylation. Within the family of volatile phenols (Table 3) vanillin was notable for their higher concentrations. Its content exceed their flavour threshold contributing with “vanilla” and “candy” odours to the TNM wines (Table 4).

3.3. Identification of the main odorants

As a preliminary step to achieve the identification of the potentially most important wine odorants of TNM wine, the aroma index (*I*), the ratio between the concentration of each volatile compound (*c*) with the corresponding odour threshold (*s*), was assessed using the equation $I = c/s$ (Table 4). On the basis of their odour description and threshold, the most powerful odorants of TNM wines were tentatively established. As shown in Table 4, at least 22 components were present at concen-

trations higher than their corresponding odour thresholds. Thus these compounds exhibit an aroma index value higher than the unity were considered to contribute individually to the TNM wine aroma.

There was a great similarity among the intensities of these odorants in the different of TNM red wine samples. According to the results presented in Table 4, the five most potent aromas of each wine type are practically the same. The highest *I* values were obtained for several well-known by-products of yeast metabolism such as ethyl octanoate, ethyl hexanoate and their corresponding fatty acids; isoamyl acetate; 2-phenylethyl acetate, phenylethanal; 3-methylbutanoic acid; the higher alcohols 2-methylpropan-1-ol and 3-methylbutan-1-ol; methionol and γ -nonalactone and seems to be important odorants of this wine. Diethyl succinate, phenylacetic acid, 2-phenylathanol and hexan-1-ol were also at concentrations higher than their corresponding threshold. The relevant content of vanillin, associated with “vanilla” and “chocolate” odour descriptors, with *I* values higher than 10 for TNM-MD, TNM-S and TNM-MS wines, should be considered to have a sensorial contribution for these red wines.

4. Conclusions

TNM red wines are characterized by the presence of higher levels of higher alcohols, ethyl esters and acetates, fatty acids, carbonyl compounds and sulphur compounds. The TNM-MD shows the highest values of volatile phenols. In contrast, they have the lowest contents of acetals. The highest values of furan compounds and acetals were determined in TNM-S wines. These wines present the lowest concentrations of higher alcohols. TNM-MS shows the lowest values of acetates, lactones and sulphur compounds.

Quantitatively, the higher alcohols (aliphatic and aromatic) are the largest group of the volatile composition in the TNM red wine. The ethyl esters and fatty acids formed enzymatically during the fermentation process constitute important groups of aroma compounds that contribute with “fruity” and “cheese/fatty” notes to wine sensory properties, respectively. The dominating esters are the ethyl esters of fatty acids and acetates of higher alcohols. Ethyl octanoate and ethyl hexanoate predominated in TNM red wines analysed.

From all compound identified in TNM red wines, ethyl octanoate, phenylethanal, ethyl hexanoate, isoamyl acetate, octanoic acid and 2-phenylethyl acetate are the most powerfull

odorants. The proposed methodology seems to be adequate to establish the potentially most important wine odorants of TNM wines.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Instituto do Vinho Madeira and Madeira Wine Company for the supply of the samples used in this study.

References

- [1] J.S. Câmara, P. Herbert, J.C. Marques, M.A. Alves, *Anal. Chim. Acta* 513 (2004) 203.
- [2] J.S. Câmara, J.C. Marques, M.A. Alves, A. Silva Ferreira, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 52 (2004) 6765.
- [3] M.A. Pozo-Bayón, E. Pueyo, P.J. Martín-Álvarez, M.C. Polo, *J. Chromatogr. A* 922 (2001) 267.
- [4] R. Castro, P. Natera, P. Benitez, C.G. Barroso, *Anal. Chim. Acta* 513 (2004) 141.
- [5] C. Ortega, R. López, J. Cacho, V. Ferreira, *J. Chromatogr. A* 923 (2001) 205.
- [6] V. Ferreira, R. López, A. Escudero, J. Cacho, *J. Chromatogr. A* 806 (1998) 349.
- [7] M.G. Chisholm, L.A. Guiher, S.M. Zaczekiewicz, *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.* 46 (1) (1995) 56.
- [8] V. Ferreira, N. Ortin, A. Escudero, R. Lopez, J. Cacho, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 50 (2002) 4048.
- [9] H. Guth, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 45 (1997) 3027.
- [10] S.M. Rocha, F. Rodrigues, P. Coutinho, I. Delgado, M.A. Coimbra, *Anal. Chim. Acta* 513 (2001) 257.
- [11] S. Nakamura, E.A. Crowell, C.S. Ough, A. Totsuka, *J. Food Sci.* 53 (1988) 1243.
- [12] V. Ferreira, R. López, J. Cacho, *J. Sci. Food Agric.* 80 (2000) 1659.
- [13] Y. Kotseridis, R. Baumes, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 48 (2000) 400.
- [14] K. Wada, T. Shibamoto, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 45 (1997) 4362.
- [15] V. Ferreira, A. Rapp, J. Cacho, H. Hastrich, I. Yavas, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 41 (1993) 1413.
- [16] J.M. Nuñez, H. Bemelmans, *J. Chromatogr.* 294 (1984) 361.
- [17] R. López, M. Aznar, J. Cacho, V. Ferreira, *J. Chromatogr. A* 966 (2002) 166.
- [18] G.P. Blanch, G. Reglero, M. Herraiz, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 43 (1995) 1251.
- [19] A. Razungles, H. Tarhi, R. Baumes, C. Günata, C. Tapiero, C. Bayon-nove, *Sci. Aliment* 14 (1993) 59.
- [20] C. Cocito, G. Gaetano, C. Delfini, *Food Chem.* 52 (1995) 311.
- [21] J. Marais, S. Afric, *J. Enol. Vitic.* 7 (1986) 21.
- [22] E. Falqué, E. Fernández, D. Dubourque, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 50 (2002) 538.
- [23] A. Anoncibar Belouqui, A. Bertrand, *Ital. J. Food Sci.* 93 (1995) 279.