



**HAL**  
open science

## Understanding retention and metabolization of aroma compounds using an in vitro model of oral mucosa

Sarah Ployon, Marine Brulé, Isabelle Andriot, Martine Morzel, Francis Canon

### ► To cite this version:

Sarah Ployon, Marine Brulé, Isabelle Andriot, Martine Morzel, Francis Canon. Understanding retention and metabolization of aroma compounds using an in vitro model of oral mucosa. *Food Chemistry*, 2020, 318, pp.126468. 10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.126468 . hal-02623609

**HAL Id: hal-02623609**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02623609v1>**

Submitted on 22 Aug 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Understanding retention and metabolization of aroma compounds using**  
2 **an *in vitro* model of oral mucosa**

3 Sarah PLOYON<sup>1</sup>, Marine BRULE<sup>1</sup>, Isabelle ANDRIOT<sup>1,2</sup>, Martine MORZEL<sup>1</sup>, Francis CANON<sup>1</sup> \*

4 <sup>1</sup> Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, AgroSup Dijon, CNRS, INRAE, Université de  
5 Bourgogne Franche-Comté, F-21000 Dijon, France

6 <sup>2</sup> ChemoSens Platform, CSGA, F-21000 Dijon, France

7 \* Corresponding author: francis.canon@inrae.fr

8 **Abstract**

9 The mechanism leading to aroma persistence during eating is not fully described. This study aims  
10 at better understanding the role of the oral mucosa in this phenomenon. Release of 14 volatile  
11 compounds from different chemical classes was studied after exposure to *in vitro* models of oral  
12 mucosa, at equilibrium by Gas-Chromatography-Flame Ionization Detection (GC-FID) and in  
13 dynamic conditions by Proton Transfer Reaction- Mass Spectrometry (PTR-MS). Measurements at  
14 equilibrium showed that mucosal hydration reduced the release of only two compounds, pentan-2-  
15 one and linalool ( $p < 0.05$ ), and suggested that cells could metabolize aroma compounds from  
16 different chemical families (penta-2,3-dione, trans-2-hexen-1-al, ethyl hexanoate, nonan- and decan-  
17 2-one). Dynamic analyses for pentan-2-one and octan-2-one evidenced that the constituents of the  
18 mucosal pellicle influenced release kinetics differently depending on molecule hydrophobicity. This  
19 work suggests that mucosal cells can metabolize aroma compounds and that non-covalent  
20 interactions occur between aroma compounds and oral mucosa depending on aroma chemical  
21 structure.

22 **Keywords**

23 Aroma persistence, oral mucosa, mucosal pellicle, TR146/MUC1 cells, aroma retention, aroma  
24 metabolism, aroma release, in vitro model

25

## 26 1. Introduction

27 When consuming food, most aroma notes are perceived almost instantly after placing food in the  
28 mouth and they dissipate rapidly after swallowing, while some continue to be perceived for a longer  
29 time. This phenomenon, called aroma persistence or “long lasting aroma” contributes to the quality  
30 of food. However, the biological and physicochemical mechanisms responsible for persistence are  
31 not fully understood. Aroma perception during eating is a complex process, initiated by the release  
32 of odorants from the food into the oral cavity and their transport via the retronasal route to the  
33 olfactory receptors in the nose. The main hypothesis for explaining aroma persistence is that aroma  
34 compounds adsorb at the surface of the oral mucosa, before being progressively desorbed and  
35 released into the oral cavity after the equilibrium has changed due to food swallowing (Buettner,  
36 Beer, Hannig, Settles, & Schieberle, 2002; Esteban-Fernández, Rocha-Alcubilla, Munoz-Gonzalez,  
37 Moreno-Arribas, & Pozo-Bayon, 2016). This implies that aroma compounds bind through non-  
38 covalent interactions to the mucosal surface, as reported for tannins in astringency perception  
39 (Ployon et al., 2018). Some *in vivo* experiments have evaluated the ability of the oral and pharyngeal  
40 mucosae to retain aroma compounds, for example by the Spit-Off Odorant Measurement method,  
41 i.e. quantification of odorants remaining in aqueous samples (Buettner et al., 2002; Hussein,  
42 Kachikian, & Pidel, 1983) and wine (Esteban-Fernández et al., 2016) after expectoration. Other *in*  
43 *vivo* measurements followed in-mouth release of aroma compounds using the Buccal Odor  
44 Screening System (Buettner & Welle, 2004) or more recently an intra oral Solid phase  
45 Microextraction (SPME) fiber (Esteban-Fernández, Munoz-Gonzalez, Jimenez-Giron, Perez-  
46 Jimenez, & Pozo-Bayon, 2018; Esteban-Fernández et al., 2016) and Proton-Transfer-Reaction  
47 Mass Spectrometry (PTR-MS) (Muñoz-Gonzalez, Canon, Feron, Guichard, & Pozo-Bayon, 2019;  
48 Sanchez-Lopez, Ziere, Martins, Zimmermann, & Yeretziyan, 2016). It emerges from those studies  
49 that the physicochemical properties of aroma compounds do not fully explain in-mouth persistence.  
50 For example, a decrease of intra-oral persistence with aroma compounds polarity was noted  
51 (Buettner & Schieberle, 2000) but guaiacol, a highly polar compound, has high intra-oral retention  
52 (Esteban-Fernández et al., 2016) and higher persistence than less polar compounds (Muñoz-  
53 Gonzalez et al., 2019). Also globally the most persistent compounds are hydrophilic and the least  
54 persistent ones are hydrophobic, but there are many exceptions and compounds with similar

55 hydrophobicity may have very different persistence behaviors (Esteban-Fernández et al., 2016;  
56 Linforth & Taylor, 2000). This may be explained by the different natures of the non-covalent  
57 interactions involved. Another mechanism to consider when studying persistence is that some  
58 aromas may be enzymatically converted to new compounds in the oral cavity by salivary enzymes  
59 (Buettner, 2002a, 2002b; Pagès-Hélary, Andriot, Guichard, & Canon, 2014) or by cellular enzymes  
60 as demonstrated in the nasal cavity (Robert-Hazotte et al., 2019; Schoumacker, Robert-Hazotte,  
61 Heydel, Faure, & Le Quere, 2016). The outer part of the oral mucosa is composed of an epithelium  
62 onto which is anchored the mucosal pellicle, a hydrated layer of epithelial and salivary proteins  
63 (Bradway, Bergey, Jones, & Levine, 1989). Mucins are very abundant at the mucosal surface,  
64 specifically the salivary mucins MUC5B and MUC7 (Gibbins, Proctor, Yakubov, Wilson, & Carpenter,  
65 2014). Because mucins have a well-documented capacity to interact with aroma compounds (Friel  
66 & Taylor, 2001; Muñoz-González, Feron, & Canon, 2018; Pagès-Hélary et al., 2014; Ployon, Morzel,  
67 & Canon, 2017), the involvement of the mucosal pellicle in aroma persistence arouses the interest  
68 of food scientists (Canon, Neiers, & Guichard, 2018). The purpose of this work was to evaluate the  
69 capacity of the oral mucosa to interact with aroma compounds, to describe the respective role of the  
70 cell surface and the mucosal pellicle in this phenomenon and to identify the nature of the interactions  
71 involved. The strategy was to measure aroma release in presence of an *in vitro* model of oral mucosa  
72 previously developed (Ployon, Belloir, Bonnotte, Lherminier, Canon, & Morzel, 2016). As any  
73 simplified model, this system presents some limitations. For example, the preserved cells surface  
74 integrity of the model differs from the cell status in the superficial layer of mouth mucosa, and  
75 interactions between aromas and other food matrix constituents are not considered. However, the  
76 use of an *in vitro* model allowed controlling the experimental parameters (e.g. air flow, volume of the  
77 system, pellicle composition) and avoided human inter-individual variability. First, static headspace  
78 measurements were performed to investigate the capacity of the model mucosa (without and with a  
79 pellicle) to retain aroma compounds at thermodynamic equilibrium, using gas-chromatography –  
80 flame ionization detection (GC-FID). Then, a real-time monitoring method by PTR-MS was  
81 developed to study the dynamic of aroma compounds release from the model mucosa. The ability  
82 of the model mucosa to metabolize aroma compounds was also investigated in both static and  
83 dynamic approaches.

## 84 **2. Material and methods**

### 85 **2.1. Saliva collection**

86 The study was performed in accordance with the guidelines of the declaration of Helsinki.  
87 Participants provided written informed consent when enrolling into the study. Saliva was obtained  
88 from fifteen volunteers who declared to be in good oral condition. Volunteers refrained from smoking,  
89 eating or drinking for at least two hours before saliva collection. Subjects donated saliva during  
90 approximately 1 h by spitting out at their own rhythm saliva accumulating spontaneously in their  
91 mouth into plastic vessels. **Over the whole collection time, plastic vessels were kept on ice in order**  
92 **to limit alteration and bacterial development.** All samples were subsequently pooled and centrifuged  
93 at 14 000 g for 20 min at 4 °C. The resulting pool of clarified saliva was aliquoted and immediately  
94 frozen at – 80 °C.

### 95 **2.2. Cell-based model of oral mucosa**

96 The TR146/MUC1 cell line was used in this study. Cells were seeded at a density of  $4 \cdot 10^4$  cell/cm<sup>2</sup>  
97 in 10 ml modified headspace vials coated with Cell-Tak™ (Corning Life Sciences, **New York, NY,**  
98 **USA**). Cells were cultured during 5 days as previously described (Ployon et al., 2016). In order to  
99 form a mucosal pellicle, clarified saliva diluted into growth medium (1:1) was deposited onto 5-days  
100 cells subcultures for 2 h. After incubation, samples were washed twice with PBS in order to eliminate  
101 the non-adsorbed saliva. **Exposure to aroma compounds and subsequent analyses were performed**  
102 **immediately after washing with PBS.**

### 103 **2.3. Aroma compounds**

104 Aroma compounds were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Saint Quentin Fallavier, **France**).  
105 Compounds used in this study and their relevant chemical properties are listed in table 1. Stock  
106 solutions were prepared in water at concentrations below the solubility threshold, and kept at 4°C.  
107 In order to evaluate the effect of molecule hydrophobicity, we studied a series of linear methyl  
108 ketones from C5 to C10, having a log *P* value, **which refers to the molecule hydrophobicity**, ranging  
109 from 0.91 to 3.73. The effect of the position of the chemical functional group was probed by  
110 comparing different methyl ketones having their ketone function in position 2 and 3.

111 **2.4. Toxicity assessment**

112 The toxicity of aroma compounds on TR146/MUC1 cells was evaluated. The cells were seeded in  
113 96-well plates. Confluent cells were incubated with 200  $\mu$ l of aroma solutions at  $10^{-4}$  mol/l in PBS  
114 (except for guaiacol prepared at  $10^{-3}$  mol/l in PBS) for 1 h à 37 °C. The concentrations in mg/l are  
115 listed in table 1. Molecule toxicity was assessed using the Neutral Red assay (Rat, Korwinzmijowska,  
116 Warnet, & Adolphe, 1994). Briefly, after incubation with aroma compounds, cells were incubated for  
117 3 h at 37 °C with 200 ml of medium containing neutral red at 50 mg/ml, washed twice with PBS and  
118 then incubated at room temperature for 1 h in neutral red eluent (ethanol:H<sub>2</sub>O:acetic acid, 50:49:1)  
119 with gentle agitation. Reading of fluorescence was performed with Victor3V microplate reader  
120 (PerkinElmer) with excitation and emission wavelengths fixed at 544 nm and 595 nm, respectively.  
121 Assays were performed in duplicates. **Viability of cells was above 90% for all aromas, confirming**  
122 **their non-cytotoxicity.**

123 **2.5. Evaluation of residual water retained on cell surfaces**

124 After rinsing with PBS, the cells' surface remains covered by a thin layer of residual PBS. Since this  
125 residual liquid phase may **affect** aroma retention and release, the PBS volume remaining onto the  
126 cells' surface after rinsing was estimated. Six vials containing the model mucosa were washed with  
127 PBS and **immediately** weighed. Open vials were evaporated for 30 min at room temperature and  
128 weighed again. The amount of PBS remaining onto cell surface was estimated as the difference  
129 between the two weights and was calculated to be  $24.9 \pm 5.6$  mg. In order to take into account the  
130 hydration of mucosa in the experiments, 25  $\mu$ l of PBS were added to the control vials (without  
131 mucosa): **this condition is referred to as** "hydrated control (HC)".

132 **2.6. Static equilibrium headspace analysis**

133 Single aroma solutions at  $10^{-4}$  mol/l in PBS were prepared from stock solutions (**cf table 1**), except  
134 for guaiacol and pyzarines for which  $10^{-3}$  mol/l solutions were prepared because preliminary work  
135 revealed that in our conditions, the molecules were not detected at  $10^{-4}$  mol/l by GC-FID headspace  
136 analysis. pH of the solutions was set at 7.4. In order to avoid competition between aroma  
137 compounds, each molecule was tested individually. 300  $\mu$ l of a single aroma solution were added to  
138 the vial, which was then sealed with silicone septum in magnetic caps (Supelco, Bellefont, PA, USA).

139 For each molecule, equilibrium headspace analysis was performed in 4 conditions: an empty vial  
140 named dry control (DC), an empty vial with 25  $\mu\text{l}$  of PBS named hydrated control (HC), a vial  
141 containing the TR146/MUC1 cells (T) and a vial containing the model mucosa: TR146/MUC1 cells  
142 with the mucosal pellicle (TP). **Headspace analysis of an empty vial with 25  $\mu\text{l}$  of PBS + 150  $\mu\text{l}$  of  
143 clarified saliva + 150  $\mu\text{l}$  of aroma solution at  $2 \cdot 10^4$  mol/L (i.e. final concentration of aroma compounds  
144 is  $10^4$  mol/L) (CS) was also performed to determine the effect of the clarified saliva on aroma release.**  
145 Static headspace sampling (SHS) experiments were performed using GC-FID. Vials were placed  
146 into the incubator of an automatic sampler (GERSTEL MPS2, Gerstel Inc., Mülheim an der Ruhr,  
147 Germany) and incubated at 37 °C for 40 min. Preliminary experiments confirmed that the  
148 thermodynamic equilibrium was reached after this duration in the control condition (HC).  
149 100  $\mu\text{l}$  of the headspace were sampled automatically using a syringe preheated at 42 °C and  
150 analyzed in splitless mode by a gas chromatograph coupled to a FID detector (Agilent 7890B, Agilent  
151 Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA). A 250  $\mu\text{l}$  liner was used. Injector temperature was set at  
152 240 °C and detector temperature was set at 250 °C. A DB-WAX column (30 m, 0.32 mm i.d., 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$ ;  
153 Agilent Technologies) was used with helium as carrier gas at a velocity of 21 cm/s. For each  
154 compound, the oven temperature was set to values leading to a retention time between 2 and 4 min  
155 (Table 1). Each condition was tested in triplicate, **repeating the analysis sequence DC, HC, T and  
156 TP three times.** For each aroma compound, a calibration curve was established by GC/FID in the  
157 same analytical conditions as reported above and using a 1  $\mu\text{l}$  liquid injection of a solution of aroma  
158 compounds in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  **using OpenLab (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA)**  
159 **(Supplementary Material S2).** The calibration curves were used to determine the concentration of  
160 each aroma compound in the gas phase.

## 161 **2.7. Analysis of compounds degradation by GC-MS.**

162 GC-MS analyses were performed to determine whether bioconversion occurred and to identify the  
163 resulting metabolites. The degradation of molecules was tested only for molecules for which **a  
164 decrease in headspace concentration** was observed **(i.e pentan-2,3-dione, trans-2-hexen-1-al, ethyl  
165 hexanoate, nonan-2-one, and decan-2-one).** For those molecules, 5 vials containing the model  
166 mucosa without pellicle (T) were incubated 40 min at 37 °C with 300  $\mu\text{l}$  of aroma solution **at  $10^{-4}$  mol/l**



167 in PBS. After incubation, supernatants were pooled (i.e. 1.5 ml) and aroma compounds were  
168 extracted with 750  $\mu$ l of CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. As a control, the same volume of aroma solution (1.5 ml) non  
169 exposed to cells was extracted with 750  $\mu$ l of CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. 1  $\mu$ l of extract was analyzed by GC-MS. A  
170 6890A gas chromatograph coupled to a 5973N mass selective detector (Agilent Technologies) was  
171 used. For electron ionization (EI), analyses were done at an electron energy of 70 eV at a rate of 4  
172 scans/s, covering the m/z range of 29-350 with a source temperature of 230 °C. The injector  
173 temperature was set at 240 °C. A DB-WAX column (30 m, 0.32 mm i.d., 0.5  $\mu$ m; Agilent  
174 Technologies) was used with helium as carrier gas at a velocity of 44 cm/s. The initial oven  
175 temperature was set at 40 °C for 5 min then increased to 240 °C at a rate of 5 °C/min. The  
176 compounds present in the extract were identified by comparison of their MS spectra to an internal  
177 mass spectra database (INRAMASS) and to mass spectra databases (NIST 2008, Wiley 138).

## 178 **2.8. Conversion rate calculation**

179 For each compound, we determined its concentration in the liquid phase from its partition coefficient  
180 in the buffer (HC) and concentration in the gas phase ( $C_{\text{gas}}$ ). First, we calculated the concentration  
181 of aroma compounds in the gas phase in the different conditions from the peak areas using the  
182 calibration curves (Supp. Material S2). Then, the partition coefficient of each compound was  
183 determined in the buffer condition by the formula  $K_{\text{HC}} = C_{\text{gasHC}}/C_{\text{liqHC}}$ .  
184 Then, the liquid phase concentrations  $C_{\text{liq}}$  in the T and TP conditions were calculated using the  
185 formula  $C_{\text{liq}(T \text{ or } TP)} = C_{\text{gas}(T \text{ or } TP)}/K_{\text{HC}}$ . Conversion rates were calculated in T or TP condition as  
186 following:  $r = (C_{\text{liq}(T \text{ or } TP)}(t_0) - C_{\text{liq}(T \text{ or } TP)}(t_{40}))/40$ .

## 187 **2.9. Dynamic aroma release monitoring by PTR-ToF-MS**

188 In this part, two aroma compounds that did not appear metabolized by the cells were tested: pentan-  
189 2-one (MH<sup>+</sup> m/z = 87.14) and octan-2-one (MH<sup>+</sup> m/z = 129.22). Aroma solutions at 10<sup>-5</sup> mol/l in PBS  
190 ([pentan-2one] = 0.86 mg/l and [octan-2-one] = 1.28 mg/l) were prepared from stock solutions. 300  $\mu$ l  
191 were injected in the vial using an automatic liquid dropper. Three biological replicates were analyzed  
192 per aroma compound. Compounds were analyzed separately in order to avoid competition using  
193 proton transfer reaction – mass spectrometry (PTR-MS). This technique allows the ionization of a  
194 volatile molecule through a proton transfer from [H<sub>2</sub>O+H]<sup>+</sup> ions to the volatile depending on its proton

195 affinity. For most volatile organic compounds their proton affinity is above that of water. The  
196 instrument used in this study includes a time-of-flight analyzer providing high resolution and high  
197 speed of acquisition. Thus, this instrument allows real time monitoring on a large range of m/z of  
198 volatile organic compounds, such as aromas. Furthermore, this more sensitive technique allows  
199 using lower aroma concentrations: this presents the advantage of limiting the risk of saturating the  
200 mucosa. The experimental device is illustrated in figure 4A. A PTR-ToF-MS (PTR-ToF-MS 8000,  
201 Ionicon Analytik, Innsbruck, Austria) was used with a scanning speed of 108 ms/spectrum for a mass  
202 range from 0 to 250 u. Calibration was performed following ions at m/z 21.022086 u ( $[\text{H}_2^{18}\text{O} + \text{H}]^+$ );  
203 39.03265 u  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}\cdot\text{H}_2^{18}\text{O} + \text{H}]^+$  and 59.042141  $[\text{acetone} + \text{H}]^+$ .  $[\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{H}]^+$  was used as reacting ion.  
204 Analyses were performed under a drift tube pressure of 2.3 mbar, at 80 °C, a voltage of 490 V and  
205 a ratio E/N of 110 Td. The air flow at the entrance of the system was set at 100 ml/min.  
206 A vial containing the model mucosa, without (T) or with (TP) a mucosal pellicle, was closed by a 3-  
207 way cap with silicon septum. A first way was connected to a Tedlar® bag containing wet air. A second  
208 way was connected to the PTR-MS. Aroma injection was performed through the third way. Two 3-  
209 way automatic valves were used to direct the airflow way through to two parallel circuits. The circuit  
210 connected to the glass vial with the model mucosa is called “indirect”, while the second circuit,  
211 directly connected to the Tedlar® bag, is called “direct”. The experiment started with the circuit in  
212 direct position. Aromatized gas was injected into the vials by the third way of the vial cap and exposed  
213 to the model mucosa for 1 min. Then, the circuit was turned to the indirect position and the air flow  
214 from the Tedlar® bag swept the glass vial headspace to the PTR for 3 minutes. The composition of  
215 the gas was analyzed by PTR-MS analysis. Area under the curve of the ions  $[\text{C}_5\text{H}_8\text{O}+\text{H}]^+$  (m/z =  
216 87.14) and  $[\text{C}_8\text{H}_{16}\text{O}+\text{H}]^+$  (m/z = 129.22) were extracted from the mass spectra as a function of time  
217 (Supplementary Material S1a). Then the average noise signal during the first 60 sec of acquisition  
218 was subtracted. The resulting curves of each of the peak area of the two ions as a function of time  
219 were established (Supplementary Material S1b). From these curves, the maximum intensity (Imax)  
220 and cumulated area (CA) as a function of time were determined for each condition (Supplementary  
221 Material S1c). Data were extracted using IgorPro 6.36 (Igor Pro Wavemetrics, USA).

## 222 **2.10. Statistical analysis**

223 For each aroma compound, partition coefficients measured by GC-FID in the DC and in the HC  
224 conditions (i.e.  $K_{DC}$  and  $K_{HC}$ ), and in the HC and the CS (ie  $K_{HC}$  and  $K_{CS}$ ) were compared using a  
225 Student t-test ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). HC was used as control for all further experiments. Partition coefficients  
226 measured in the different conditions (i.e.  $K_{HC}$ ,  $K_T$  or  $K_{TP}$ ) were submitted to univariate analysis of  
227 variance (ANOVA) followed by a Tukey multiple comparison test (significance for  $p < 0.05$ ).

228 Aroma conversion rates calculated in the T and in the TP conditions were compared using a Student  
229 t-test ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). Conversion rates of all aroma compounds for each condition (T or TP) were  
230 submitted to univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by a Tukey multiple comparison test  
231 (significance for  $p < 0.05$ ).

232 For PTR-MS analysis,  $I_{max}$  and CA in the three conditions HC, T or TP were compared by ANOVA  
233 followed by a post-hoc Tukey multiple comparison test (significance for  $p < 0.05$ ).

### 234 3. Results and discussion

#### 235 3.1. Effect of mucosal hydration on aroma partitioning

236 The mucosal pellicle is a lubricating layer containing mucins anchored at the surface of the epithelial  
237 cells. Mucins have hydrophilic regions with the ability to form H-bonds and electrostatic interactions  
238 (Bansil & Turner, 2006). As a consequence, the mucosal surface is wet and this property has to be  
239 considered as a factor that impacts on aroma retention (Dél ris, Saint-Eve, Saglio, Souchon, &  
240 Trelea, 2016). As described in the materials and methods section, we determined that the surface of  
241 the model mucosa retains on average  $24.9 \pm 5.6$  mg of buffer. In order to evaluate how this surface  
242 wetness impacts aroma partitioning, the partition coefficients (K) in the dry control (DC) and hydrated  
243 control (HC) conditions were measured and the ratio between the two partition coefficients was  
244 calculated for each studied molecule (figure 1A). A ratio below 100 % indicates that the considered  
245 aroma compound is significantly retained by the residual liquid. The signal/noise ratios for pyrazine  
246 and 2'3-dimethylpyrazine were below the limit of quantification, therefore it was not possible to  
247 establish the impact of the cells' wetness on their release. For the other compounds, we observed  
248 that the residual buffer significantly retained pentan-2-one ( $-18 \pm 7$  %) ( $p < 0.05$ ) of the 2-methyl  
249 ketone series, while hexan-2-one ( $-19 \pm 3$  %), and octan-2-one ( $-10 \pm 4$  %), heptan-2-one ( $-8 \pm 5$  %),  
250 nonan-2-one ( $-6 \pm 7$  %) and decan-2-one ( $-5 \pm 9$  %) were also retained but not significantly.  
251 Regarding other compounds, they tended to be retained by the presence of the buffer (except  
252 guaiacol), however this effect was only significant for linalool ( $p < 0.05$ ). This global tendency, despite  
253 being significant only for pentan-2-one and linalool, suggests that a part of aroma compounds is  
254 transferred into the buffer according to the thermodynamic laws and to their affinity for the liquid  
255 phase, decreasing the amount of aroma in the headspace. This could for example explain the high  
256 persistence of hydrophilic compounds such as pyrazines (Buffo, Rapp, Krick, & Reineccius, 2005;  
257 Linforth et al., 2000; Wright, Hills, Hollowood, Linforth, & Taylor, 2003) or small alcohols (ethanol,  
258 propan-2-ol) previously observed (Linforth et al., 2000).  
259 Since the presence of residual buffer on cells surface affected the partitioning of several compounds,  
260 the HC condition was used in the rest of the study as a control to test the effect of the cells and the  
261 mucosal pellicle.

### 3.2. Aroma partitioning in presence of oral cells and/or a mucosal pellicle

Partition coefficients (K) were measured by static headspace analyses (SHS) in the hydrated control (HC), TR146/MUC1 (T) and TR146/MUC1 + mucosal pellicle (TP) conditions after 40 min of incubation at 37 °C. Results are presented in figure 1B, as the ratio between the K values in the condition T or TP ( $K_T$  or  $K_{TP}$ ) and the partition coefficient in the control HC ( $K_{HC}$ ). A ratio lower than 100% indicates that aroma release is lower in the vial containing the cells alone (T) or the model mucosa with a mucosa pellicle (TP) than in the control vial (HC).

The partitioning ratios calculated for hexan-3-one, guaiacol, octan-3-one and the four other linear ketones pentan-2-one, hexan-2-one, heptan-2-one and octan-2-one indicate that there were no significant differences in the  $K_T$  and  $K_{TP}$  of these compounds compared to the  $K_{HC}$  (control condition). Thus, the release of these compounds was not affected by the model mucosa with and without pellicle at equilibrium.

In contrast, a significant decrease ( $p < 0.05$ ) of aroma partitioning was observed in both conditions T and TP compared to the HC control condition, for pentan-2,3-dione ( $-73 \pm 16\%$  for T and  $-83 \pm 1\%$  for TP), trans-2-hexen-1-al ( $-69 \pm 3\%$  for T and  $-75 \pm 1\%$  for TP), ethyl hexanoate ( $-16 \pm 3\%$  for T and  $-19 \pm 6\%$  for TP), nonan-2-one ( $-16 \pm 3\%$  for T and  $-17 \pm 3\%$  for TP) and decan-2-one ( $-37 \pm 6\%$  for T and  $-34 \pm 6\%$  for TP). There was no significant difference measured between the conditions with and without pellicle, except for trans-2-hexen-1-al, which was significantly less released in presence of the mucosal pellicle. The effect of diluted clarified saliva on the partition coefficient of these aroma compounds was also measured by SHS: there was no retention effect of saliva (CS) compared to the control condition of aroma diluted in the buffer without saliva (HC) (figure 1C). Interestingly, even though a strong effect of the model oral mucosa was observed on penta-2,3-dione partitioning, it did not impact the partitioning of the mono ketone pentan-2-one. The position of the ketone group on hexan-2 or 3-one and octan-2 or 3-one (i.e. in C2 or C3) did not modify the effect of the model mucosa.

Aroma compounds exhibit a large range of hydrophobicity. This physico-chemical characteristic can be at the origin of their behavior. The hydrophobicity of a molecule can be measured by determining its octanol/water partition coefficient, abbreviated log  $P$ . The higher log  $P$  value of a compound, the higher the compound's hydrophobicity.

291 Ketones belonging to the 2-methyl ketone series differ only by the length of their aliphatic chain,  
292 which is correlated to the molecule hydrophobicity. Thus, in order to probe the effect of molecule  
293 hydrophobicity, the ratios  $K_T/K_{HC}$  and  $K_{TP}/K_{HC}$  were expressed as a function of  $\log P$  values (figures  
294 2A and 2B). Partitioning of molecules when exposed to the model mucosa appeared to be negatively  
295 correlated with  $\log P$  ( $R^2 = 0.87$  and  $R^2 = 0.96$  respectively for T and TP), meaning that molecules  
296 were less readily released from the model mucosa as their hydrophobicity increased. A negative  
297 correlation between linear methyl ketones partitioning in presence of salivary proteins and molecules  
298 hydrophobicity was previously reported (Pagès-Hélary et al., 2014). Here, the slopes of the curves  
299 were comparable ( $-0.161$  and  $-0.167$  respectively for T and TP), indicating that there is no effect of  
300 the pellicle on the partitioning of methyl ketones for cells expressing MUC1 at their surface. When  
301 plotting K values of the 13 molecules as function of their  $\log P$ , no correlation was found between  
302 molecule hydrophobicity and retention by the oral mucosa ( $R = 0.09$ , data not shown). The two  
303 compounds for which partitioning was the most reduced in the presence of the model mucosa, pent-  
304 2,3-dione ( $\log P = -0.85$ ) and trans-2-hexen-1-al ( $\log P = 1.58$ ), have very different hydrophobicity.  
305 Therefore, it appears that the functional group has also a strong impact on the effect of the model  
306 mucosa on aroma release.

307 In order to explain the effect of the model mucosa on aroma release, two main hypotheses can be  
308 formulated. The first one is that aromas bind to the surface of the cells in presence or not of the  
309 mucosal pellicle. The second one postulates that the cell line is able to metabolize the studied aroma  
310 compounds.

### 311 3.3. Compounds degradation by model mucosa

312 In order to explore the hypothesis that modification of the release of aroma compounds in presence  
313 of the model of oral mucosa results from their metabolization by cells, the composition of the liquid  
314 phase of aroma solutions incubated in presence of the model mucosa without pellicle was  
315 characterized by GC–MS after extraction with dichloromethane for pentan-2,3-dione, trans-2-hexen-  
316 1-al, ethyl hexanoate, nonan-2-one and decan-2-one. The example of nonan-2-one extracts  
317 analyses is presented in figure 3. A decrease in the initial concentration of nonan-2-one (eluted at  
318 13.1 min) was observed in the same order of magnitude of the one observed in GC-FID. A new

319 compound eluted at 16.5 min (figure 3B) in the presence of cells compared to the hydrated control  
320 extract (figure 3A). MS spectrum extracted at 16.5 min is provided in figure 3C. Comparison with MS  
321 databases allowed identifying the new compound as nonan-2-ol. The chromatograms and MS  
322 spectra of the five compounds studied are given in supplementary material S3. For the five aroma  
323 compounds, a decrease in initial compounds amount in comparison to the control condition was  
324 associated with the presence of new compounds in the T condition. The identified molecules and  
325 the conversion rate of initial compounds in the T and TP conditions are reported in table 2. The  
326 decrease in nonan-2-one and decan-2-one concentrations was associated with the production of the  
327 corresponding alcohols, namely nonan-2-ol and decan-2-ol, respectively. Decrease of pentan-2,3-  
328 dione solution concentration was associated with the production of two reduced forms of the  
329 molecule: 2-hydroxy-pentan-3-one and 3-hydroxy-pentan-2-one. Ethyl hexanoate was hydrolyzed  
330 into hexanoic acid, and trans-2-hexen-1-al was oxidized into its corresponding acid hexenoic acid.

331 Although conversion rates of aroma by the model mucosa were in the same order of magnitude,  
332 small differences were observed between aroma compounds. Pentan-2,3-dione and trans-2-hexen-  
333 1-al were converted significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) faster. Concerning the impact of the mucosal pellicle, a  
334 significant difference between the oral mucosa with and without the mucosal pellicle was observed  
335 only for trans-2-hexen-1-al. These observations indicate that the TR146/MUC1 cell line is able to  
336 metabolize the molecules reported in table 2. The ability of epithelial cells to metabolize organic  
337 volatile compounds from different chemical families has already been observed on primary cells  
338 cultures of human nasal mucosa or rat olfactory mucosa. Zaccone et al (2015) reported oxidation of  
339 two diketones into monoketones (diacetyl and pentan-2,3-dione to 3-hydroxybutanone and 2-  
340 hydroxy-3-pentanone, respectively) in a culture of bronchial/tracheal human epithelial cells (Zaccone  
341 et al., 2015). Microsomal and cellular fractions obtained from rat olfactory mucosa exhibited ability  
342 to metabolize quinoline (heterocycle) and coumarin (lactone) into oxygenated metabolites, and  
343 isoamyl acetate (ester) into isoamylic alcohol (Thiebaud et al., 2013). Although the respective  
344 contributions of the mucus and the epithelial cells was not determined, *ex vivo* rat olfactory mucosa  
345 converted ethyl acetate into ethanol (Schoumacker et al., 2016) and pentan-2,3-dione into 2-  
346 hydroxy-pentan-3-one and 3-hydroxy-pentan-2-one (Robert-Hazotte et al., 2019). These reactions

347 are catalyzed by a range of enzymes named Odorant Metabolizing Enzyme (OME) (Heydel, Hanser,  
348 Faure, & Neiers, 2017) that belong to the xenobiotic metabolism enzymes (XMEs) family. Overall,  
349 XMEs are specialized in the catabolism of exogenous compounds in order to facilitate their  
350 elimination by the organism (Croom, 2012). Xenobiotics elimination results from three main steps.  
351 During the first phase, **nonpolar and reactive** compounds are converted **into more polar and less**  
352 **reactive compounds** through different reactions, such as epoxidation, hydroxylation, desalkylation,  
353 oxidation or reduction. **This step involves enzymes such as the cytochrome P450 or**  
354 **carboxylesterase (Thiebaud et al., 2013).** In the second phase, conjugate enzymes, **such as**  
355 **glutathione transferase**, catalyze reaction of conjugation with polar compound such as glutathione,  
356 glucuronic acid or a sulfate (Heydel et al., 2019). Finally, metabolites can be easily excreted **via**  
357 **transporter proteins.** The OMEs family includes a large variety of enzymes. **The reduction of pentan-**  
358 **2,3-dione into 2-hydroxy-pentan-3-one and 3-hydroxy-pentan-2-one, previously observed in**  
359 **presence of bronchial/tracheal human epithelial cells and rat nasal mucosa has been attributed to**  
360 **the dicarbonyl/L-xylulose reductase (DCXR) (Robert-Hazotte et al., 2019; Zaccone et al., 2015).**  
361 Hydrolysis of isoamyle acetate **into its corresponding acid has been previously attributed to a**  
362 **carboxylesterase (Thiebaud et al., 2013). Thus, we hypothesized that the conversion of ethyl**  
363 **hexanoate into acid hexanoic is catalyzed by a carboxylesterase. Regarding the conversion of**  
364 **ketones into alcohols, such activity has been previously reported in presence of saliva and was**  
365 **proposed to be due to an aldo-keto reductase (Muñoz-González, Feron, Brulé, & Canon, 2018). The**  
366 **oxidation of aldehyde (Trans-2-hexen-1-al) into carboxylic acid (hexenoic acid) could result from the**  
367 **activity of aldehyde dehydrogenases. Moreover, the presence of aldo-keto reductases (AKR1C3,**  
368 **AKR1C2, AKR7AC2, AKR1C1, SPR and KCNAB2) DCXR, carboxylesterase (CES1, CES2, CES3,**  
369 **CES4A) and aldehyde dehydrogenases (ALDH9A1, ALDH1B1, ALDH3A1, ALDH3B2, ALDH4A1,**  
370 **ALDH5A1, AGPS) in the oral mucosa has been previously reported using specific antibodies (Uhlén**  
371 **et al., 2015). All these enzymes have been reported to be present in the oral mucosa at different**  
372 **concentrations (Uhlén et al., 2015), which could explain the difference of metabolization between**  
373 **the different affected compounds.** RNA encoding for cytochrome P450 have been detected in  
374 salivary glands (Kragelund et al., 2008) and human oral mucosa (Vondracek et al., 2001).  
375 Carboxylesterase activity has already been observed in rats and mice's oral cavity (Robinson,



376 Bogdanffy, & Reed, 2002). The presence of these enzymes in the oral mucosa indicates that this  
377 latter has the potential to metabolize xenobiotics. Indeed, like the nasal cavity, oral mucosa is a  
378 tissue exposed to exogenous and potentially toxic compounds, which have to be eliminated. From a  
379 sensory point of view, it was recently reported that metabolic activity in the nasal and oral cavities  
380 impacts on perception (Ijichi et al., 2019). This work demonstrates for the first time the importance  
381 of aroma conversion activity in oral mucosal cells. This activity is probably due to different enzymes,  
382 which have different enzymatic activities (kinetics, affinity,...) on aroma compounds as a function of  
383 their structure.

#### 384 **3.4. Effect of oral mucosa on kinetics of *in vitro* aroma release**

385 In-mouth aroma release is a dynamic process. Static headspace (SHS) experiments require the  
386 establishment of the thermodynamic equilibrium, which takes approximatively 20 min (Pagès-Hélary  
387 et al., 2014). To obtain information on earlier phases, we studied the kinetic release of two aroma  
388 compounds unaffected by the presence of the epithelial cells, pentan-2-one and octan-2-one, during  
389 the first 2.5 minutes using Proton-Transfer-Reaction Mass Spectrometry (PTR-MS).

390 The maximum of intensity ( $I_{max}$ ) and the cumulated area (CA) of aroma release at  $t= 5, 15, 30, 60,$   
391  $90, 120$  and  $160$  sec in the 2 conditions T and TP are presented in figure 4.

392 There was no significant difference in the  $I_{max}$  for octan-2-one between the three conditions , i.e. in  
393 buffer (HC) or in presence of the model mucosa with (TP) and without pellicle (T). However, for  
394 pentan-2-one the  $I_{max}$  was significantly higher in presence of the cells with the mucosal pellicle (TP  
395 vs HC), but was not significantly different between T and TP conditions. This observation suggests  
396 that the rate of transfer of molecules pentan-2-one from the gas phase to the liquid phase is affected  
397 by the presence of cells plus the mucosal pellicle. The cells could indeed alter the capacity of water  
398 to solubilize the molecules and provoke a salting-out effect explaining the increase of the intensity  
399 of the release in presence of the cells plus the mucosal pellicle for pentan-3-one. The absence of  
400 effect for octan-2-one could be explain by non-covalent interactions between the compound and the  
401 cells with or without the mucosal pellicle, decreasing the result of this salting-out effect.

402 For pentan-2-one, a significant decrease in cumulated area values was observed for all times after  
403 60 sec for the TP conditions. Furthermore, a significant difference was measured between the two

404 conditions at 160 sec, with a significantly lower release from the model with a mucosal pellicle  
405 compared to the cells-only model (figure 4C). In other words, the reduced release was observable  
406 more rapidly when cells were lined by a mucosal pellicle.

407 Regarding octan-2-one release, a significant decrease of octan-2-one release occurred after 120  
408 sec for the condition T compared to the control condition (figure 4D). Thus, the reduced release was  
409 greater for cells with the mucosal pellicle for pentan-2-one, while it was greater for cells without the  
410 salivary proteins forming the pellicle for octan-2-one. In these experiments, we used the  
411 TR146/MUC1 cell line which expresses at its surface the extracellular domain of the mucin MUC1/Y-  
412 LSP (Zhang, Vlad, Milcarek, & Finn, 2013). The presence of this domain at the cells' surface  
413 increases the anchoring of the salivary proteins (Ployon et al., 2016), while modifying the cell surface  
414 properties. Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) experiments using functionalized tip and conducted on  
415 the TR146/MUC1 cell line revealed first that the surface of the cells present both highly hydrophobic  
416 and hydrophilic domains due to the expression of MUC1/Y-LSP, and second that the anchoring of  
417 salivary proteins decreases the number of these highly hydrophobic or hydrophilic domains,  
418 suggesting that the anchoring of salivary proteins involves these domains (Aybeke et al., 2019).  
419 Thus, the surface of the model mucosa is less hydrophobic in presence of the mucosal pellicle (TP)  
420 than without it (T). Octan-2-one differs from pentan-2-one by the length of the aliphatic chain making  
421 this molecule more hydrophobic. Previous investigations on the effect of mucin on aroma release  
422 have revealed that mucin can retain aroma compounds through non-covalent interactions involving  
423 hydrophobic effect (Pagès-Hélary et al., 2014). Therefore, it can be hypothesized that the most  
424 hydrophobic compounds are more prone to interact with the most hydrophobic cell surface (cells  
425 without a mucosal pellicle T), which is the case for octan-2-one. Conversely, pentan-2-one, which is  
426 less hydrophobic, is significant more retained in presence of the salivary proteins forming the  
427 mucosal pellicle. This result suggests that pentan-2-one is more prone to interact with salivary  
428 proteins than octan-2-one. This observation could be explained by the hypothesis that the presence  
429 of salivary proteins increases the number of pentan-2-one binding sites, while the longer aliphatic  
430 chain of octan-2-one precludes its access to these binding sites due to steric hindrance. The nature  
431 of the non-covalent interaction involved remains unknown.

432 To summarize, the anchoring of salivary proteins to MUC1 changes the cell surface properties and

433 the nature of the exposed aroma binding sites. As a result, it modifies the ability of the mucosa to  
434 interact with aroma compounds depending on their structure, leading to either a decrease or an  
435 increase of the binding of some aroma compounds and to a modification of the release of aroma  
436 compounds through time depending on their structure. The present study suggests that both  
437 compounds are less released in presence of the epithelial cells both with or without the mucosal  
438 pellicle. Moreover, this latter decreases the release of pent-2-one while it does not significantly affect  
439 octan-2-one. As a result, the mucosal pellicle seems to play a role in aroma persistence as a function  
440 of aroma compounds structure.

#### 441 4. Conclusion

442 The study allowed deciphering the respective impact of hydration, the epithelial cells and the  
443 mucosal proteins on the release of several aroma compounds. First, hydration of the mucosal  
444 surface modified the release of only two aroma compounds over 13 studied (here, pentan-2-one and  
445 linalool), suggesting that it does not play a prominent role in the impact of the oral mucosa on aroma  
446 release.

447 The model mucosa impacted both the partitioning of pentan-2,3-dione, trans-2-hexen-1-al, ethyl  
448 hexanoate, nonan-2-one and decan-2-one at equilibrium and the release of the pentan-2-one and  
449 octan-2-one (the only two aroma compounds studied in dynamic condition). This impact appears to  
450 result from the ability of oral cells to metabolize aroma compounds (herein methyl ketones,  
451 aldehydes and esters) depending on their structure. The ability of cells to metabolize aroma  
452 compounds results from the activity of the enzymes that they express. Enzymes are biological  
453 catalysts that accelerate specific chemical reactions as a function of their three-dimensional structure  
454 and the structure of the metabolized compound. OMEs which specifically metabolize different  
455 families of aroma compounds, are present in the oral mucosa at different concentrations to detoxify  
456 reactive aroma compounds as a function of their structure. The metabolic activity observed here  
457 could result from the activity of DCXR for pentan-2,3-dione, aldo-keto-reductases for nonan-2-one  
458 and decan-2-one, carboxyesterase for ethyl hexanoate and aldehyde dehydrogenase for trans-2-  
459 hexen-1-al. Moreover, the difference of activity observed between the different compounds could  
460 result from either a difference in the enzymatic reaction as a function of the affinity of the enzyme –  
461 aroma compound couple and/or differences of enzyme concentrations as previously reported in the  
462 oral mucosa. Thus, no generalization could be drawn and each compound is a specific case that will  
463 be metabolized as a function of its structure and the composition of the oral epithelial cell proteome.  
464 The dynamic study was only performed on two compounds (here two 2-methyl ketones) and  
465 suggested that other phenomena such as non-covalent interactions between the two studied aroma  
466 compounds and mucosa (cells and mucosal pellicle) also occur. As a result, times after 60 s were  
467 significantly affected for both molecules, with a decrease of their release in presence of the cells and  
468 the pellicle mucosal. The mucosal pellicle significantly affected the release of pentan-2-one in the

469 TR146/MUC1/Y-LSP cell line. Thus, this model of mucosa appears as a promising tool to study the  
470 effect of the oral mucosa on aroma release as a function of aroma compounds structure and/or  
471 pellicle composition. It may also aid in further researches on the role of the mucosa on aroma  
472 **metabolization**. In the future, it would be of interest to perform real time monitoring of aroma release  
473 and persistence in nasal and/or oral cavities after *in vivo* consumption of aroma solution in order to  
474 establish a comparison with *in vitro* experiments.

475 To conclude, this paper, by demonstrating that the oral mucosa both impacts the kinetic of aroma  
476 compounds release and metabolizes aroma compounds, opens new avenues of research on the  
477 role of the oral mucosa in aroma persistence and aroma perception.

478 **Conflict of interest statement**

479 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

480 **Acknowledgments**

481 This work was funded by the French National Research Agency (MUFFIN N° 14-CE20-0001-01).

482 The French Ministry of Higher Education and Research provided the PhD fellowship for Sarah  
483 Ployon.

484 The authors thank the ChemoSens Platform, especially Etienne Semon, for analytical support.

- 486 Aybeke, E. N., Ployon, S., Brulé, M., De Fonseca, B., Bourillot, E., Morzel, M., . . . Canon, F. (2019). Nanoscale  
487 Mapping of the Physical Surface Properties of Human Buccal Cells and Changes Induced by Saliva.  
488 *LANGMUIR*, 35(39), 12647-12655. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.9b01979>.
- 489 Bansil, R., & Turner, B. S. (2006). Mucin structure, aggregation, physiological functions and biomedical  
490 applications. *Current Opinion in Colloid & Interface Science*, 11(2-3), 164-170.  
491 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cocis.2005.11.001>.
- 492 Bradway, S. D., Bergey, E. J., Jones, P. C., & Levine, M. J. (1989). Oral mucosal pellicle - adsorption and  
493 transpeptidation of salivary components to buccal epithelial-cells. *Biochemical Journal*, 261(3), 887-  
494 896. <https://doi.org/10.1042/bj2610887>.
- 495 Buettner, A. (2002a). Influence of human saliva on odorant concentrations. 2. aldehydes, alcohols, 3-Alkyl-2-  
496 methoxypyrazines, methoxyphenols, and 3-hydroxy-4,5-dimethyl-2(5H)-furanone. *Journal of*  
497 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 50(24), 7105-7110. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf020714o>.
- 498 Buettner, A. (2002b). Influence of human salivary enzymes on odorant concentration changes occurring in  
499 vivo. 1. Esters and thiols. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 50(11), 3283-3289.  
500 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf011586r>.
- 501 Buettner, A., Beer, A., Hannig, C., Settles, M., & Schieberle, P. (2002). Quantitation of the In-Mouth Release  
502 of Heteroatomic Odorants. In *Heteroatomic Aroma Compounds* (pp. 296-311): American Chemical  
503 Society.
- 504 Buettner, A., & Schieberle, P. (2000). Influence of mastication on the concentrations of aroma volatiles —  
505 some aspects of flavour release and flavour perception. *Food Chemistry*, 71(3), 347-354.  
506 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-8146\(00\)00199-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-8146(00)00199-0).
- 507 Buettner, A., & Welle, F. (2004). Intra-oral detection of potent odorants using a modified stir-bar sorptive  
508 extraction system in combination with HRGC-0 known as the buccal odor screening system (BOSS).  
509 *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, 19(6), 505-514. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ffj.1473>.
- 510 Buffo, R. A., Rapp, J. A., Krick, T., & Reineccius, G. A. (2005). Persistence of aroma compounds in human  
511 breath after consuming an aqueous model aroma mixture. *Food Chemistry*, 89(1), 103-108.  
512 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.02.038>.
- 513 Canon, F., Neiers, F., & Guichard, E. (2018). Saliva and Flavor Perception: Perspectives. *Journal of Agricultural*  
514 *and Food Chemistry*, 66(30), 7873-7879. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.8b01998>.
- 515 Croom, E. (2012). Metabolism of Xenobiotics of Human Environments. *Toxicology and Human Environments*,  
516 112, 31-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-415813-9.00003-9>.
- 517 Déléris, I., Saint-Eve, A., Saglio, A., Souchon, I., & Trelea, I. C. (2016). Insights in aroma compound retention  
518 by mucosa during consumption through mathematical modelling. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 190,  
519 123-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2016.06.018>.
- 520 Esteban-Fernández, A., Muñoz-Gonzalez, C., Jimenez-Giron, A., Perez-Jimenez, M., & Pozo-Bayon, M. A.  
521 (2018). Aroma release in the oral cavity after wine intake is influenced by wine matrix composition.  
522 *Food Chemistry*, 243, 125-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.09.101>.
- 523 Esteban-Fernández, A., Rocha-Alcubilla, N., Muñoz-Gonzalez, C., Moreno-Arribas, M. V., & Pozo-Bayon, M. A.  
524 (2016). Intra-oral adsorption and release of aroma compounds following in-mouth wine exposure.  
525 *Food Chemistry*, 205, 280-288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2016.03.030>.
- 526 Friel, E. N., & Taylor, A. J. (2001). Effect of Salivary Components on Volatile Partitioning from Solutions.  
527 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 49(8), 3898-3905. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf010371e>.
- 528 Gibbins, H. L., Proctor, G. B., Yakubov, G. E., Wilson, S., & Carpenter, G. H. (2014). Concentration of salivary  
529 protective proteins within the bound oral mucosal pellicle. *Oral Diseases*, 20(7), 707-713.  
530 <https://doi.org/10.1111/odi.12194>.
- 531 Heydel, J.-M., Menetrier, F., Belloir, C., Canon, F., Faure, P., Lirussi, F., . . . Neiers, F. (2019). Characterization  
532 of rat glutathione transferases in olfactory epithelium and mucus. *PLoS ONE*, 14(7), e0220259.  
533 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220259>.
- 534 Heydel, J. M., Hanser, H. I., Faure, P., & Neiers, F. (2017). Odorant metabolizing enzymes in the peripheral  
535 olfactory process. *Flavour: From Food to Perception*, 34-56. [https://doi.org/Book\\_Doi\\_10.1002/9781118929384](https://doi.org/Book_Doi_10.1002/9781118929384).
- 536

537 Hussein, M. M., Kachikian, R., & Pidel, A. R. (1983). Analysis for Flavor Residuals in the Mouth by Gas  
538 Chromatography. *Journal of Food Science*, 48(6), 1884-1885. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1983.tb05113.x)  
539 [2621.1983.tb05113.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1983.tb05113.x).

540 Ijichi, C., Wakabayashi, H., Sugiyama, S., Ihara, Y., Nogi, Y., Nagashima, A., . . . Touhara, K. (2019). Metabolism  
541 of Odorant Molecules in Human Nasal/Oral Cavity Affects the Odorant Perception. *Chemical Senses*.  
542 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjz041>.

543 Kragelund, C., Hansen, C., Torpet, L. A., Nauntofte, B., Broesen, K., Pedersen, A. M. L., . . . Reibel, J. (2008).  
544 Expression of two drug-metabolizing cytochrome P450-enzymes in human salivary glands. *Oral*  
545 *Diseases*, 14(6), 533-540. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1601-0825.2007.01415.x>.

546 Linforth, R., & Taylor, A. J. (2000). Persistence of volatile compounds in the breath after their consumption in  
547 aqueous solutions. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 48(11), 5419-5423.  
548 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf000488n>.

549 Muñoz-Gonzalez, C., Canon, F., Feron, G., Guichard, E., & Pozo-Bayon, M. A. (2019). Assessment Wine Aroma  
550 Persistence by Using an in Vivo PTR-ToF-MS Approach and Its Relationship with Salivary Parameters.  
551 *Molecules*, 24(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules24071277>.

552 Muñoz-González, C., Feron, G., Brulé, M., & Canon, F. (2018). Understanding the release and metabolism of  
553 aroma compounds using micro-volume saliva samples by ex vivo approaches. *Food Chemistry*, 240,  
554 275-285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.07.060>.

555 Muñoz-González, C., Feron, G., & Canon, F. (2018). Main effects of human saliva on flavour perception and  
556 the potential contribution to food consumption. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 1-9.  
557 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665118000113>.

558 Pagès-Hélary, S., Andriot, I., Guichard, E., & Canon, F. (2014). Retention effect of human saliva on aroma  
559 release and respective contribution of salivary mucin and  $\alpha$ -amylase. *Food Research International*,  
560 64, 424-431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2014.07.013>.

561 Ployon, S., Belloir, C., Bonnotte, A., Lherminier, J., Canon, F., & Morzel, M. (2016). The membrane-associated  
562 MUC1 improves adhesion of salivary MUC5B on buccal cells. Application to development of an in  
563 vitro cellular model of oral epithelium. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 61, 149-155.  
564 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2015.11.002>.

565 Ployon, S., Morzel, M., Belloir, C., Bonnotte, A., Bourillot, E., Briand, L., . . . Canon, F. (2018). Mechanisms of  
566 astringency: Structural alteration of the oral mucosal pellicle by dietary tannins and protective effect  
567 of bPRPs. *Food Chemistry*, 253, 79-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.01.141>.

568 Ployon, S., Morzel, M., & Canon, F. (2017). The role of saliva in aroma release and perception. *Food Chemistry*,  
569 226, 212-220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.01.055>.

570 Rat, P., Korwinmijowska, C., Warnet, J. M., & Adolphe, M. (1994). New in-Vitro Fluorometric Microtitration  
571 Assays for Toxicological Screening of Drugs. *Cell Biology and Toxicology*, 10(5-6), 329-337.  
572 <https://doi.org/10.1007/Bf00755779>.

573 Robert-Hazotte, A., Schoumacker, R., Semon, E., Briand, L., Guichard, E., Le Quere, J. L., . . . Heydel, J. M.  
574 (2019). Ex vivo real-time monitoring of volatile metabolites resulting from nasal odorant metabolism.  
575 *Sci Rep*, 9(1), 2492. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-39404-x>.

576 Robinson, D. A., Bogdanffy, M. S., & Reed, C. J. (2002). Histochemical localisation of carboxylesterase activity  
577 in rat and mouse oral cavity mucosa. *Toxicology*, 180(3), 209-220. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0300-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0300-483x(02)00375-X)  
578 [483x\(02\)00375-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0300-483x(02)00375-X).

579 Sanchez-Lopez, J. A., Ziere, A., Martins, S. I. F. S., Zimmermann, R., & Yeretian, C. (2016). Persistence of  
580 aroma volatiles in the oral and nasal cavities: real-time monitoring of decay rate in air exhaled  
581 through the nose and mouth. *Journal of Breath Research*, 10(3). [https://doi.org/Artn](https://doi.org/Artn03600510.1088/1752-7155/10/3/036005)  
582 [03600510.1088/1752-7155/10/3/036005](https://doi.org/Artn03600510.1088/1752-7155/10/3/036005).

583 Schoumacker, R., Robert-Hazotte, A., Heydel, J. M., Faure, P., & Le Quere, J. L. (2016). Real-time monitoring  
584 of the metabolic capacity of ex vivo rat olfactory mucosa by proton transfer reaction mass  
585 spectrometry (PTR-MS). *Anal Bioanal Chem*, 408(6), 1539-1543. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-015-9289-7)  
586 [015-9289-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-015-9289-7).


587 Thiebaud, N., Da Silva, S. V., Jakob, I., Sicard, G., Chevalier, J., Menetrier, F., . . . Le Bon, A. M. (2013). Odorant  
588 Metabolism Catalyzed by Olfactory Mucosal Enzymes Influences Peripheral Olfactory Responses in  
589 Rats. *PLoS ONE*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059547>.




- 590 Uhlén, M., Fagerberg, L., Hallström, B. M., Lindskog, C., Oksvold, P., Mardinoglu, A., . . . Pontén, F. (2015).  
591 Tissue-based map of the human proteome. *Science*, 347(6220), 1260419.  
592 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260419>.
- 593 Vondracek, M., Xi, Z., Larsson, P., Baker, V., Mace, K., Pfeifer, A., . . . Grafstrom, R. C. (2001). Cytochrome  
594 P450 expression and related metabolism in human buccal mucosa. *Carcinogenesis*, 22(3), 481-488.  
595 <https://doi.org/DOI.10.1093/carcin/22.3.481>.
- 596 Wright, K. M., Hills, B. P., Hollowood, T. A., Linforth, R. S. T., & Taylor, A. J. (2003). Persistence effects in  
597 flavour release from liquids in the mouth. *International Journal of Food Science and Technology*,  
598 38(3), 343-350. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2621.2003.00680.x>.
- 599 Zaccone, E. J., Goldsmith, W. T., Shimko, M. J., Wells, J. R., Schwegler-Berry, D., Willard, P. A., . . . Fedan, J. S.  
600 (2015). Diacetyl and 2,3-pentanedione exposure of human cultured airway epithelial cells: Ion  
601 transport effects and metabolism of butter flavoring agents. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*,  
602 289(3), 542-549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.taap.2015.10.004>.
- 603 Zhang, L., Vlad, A., Milcarek, C., & Finn, O. J. (2013). Human mucin MUC1 RNA undergoes different types of  
604 alternative splicing resulting in multiple isoforms. *Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy*, 62(3), 423-  
605 435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00262-012-1325-2>.

606


607



609



610




611

612

613 **Figure 2**


614



615

616


617 **Figure 3**




618

619


620 **Figure 4**



621



622



623

624

**Table 1: list of compounds used in the study with their main physicochemical parameters**

Compound	CAS number	MW <sup>a</sup> (g/mol)	Log P <sup>b</sup>	Sol <sup>c</sup> (mg/l)	Pvap <sup>d</sup> (mmHg)	GC Oven Temp (°C)	Stock solution conc. (mg/l)	Final conc. tested for toxicity test and GC-FID-HS analyses (mg/l)
Pentan-2-one	107-87-9	86	0.91	2.1.10 <sup>4</sup>	39.4	70	86.0	8.6
Hexan-2-one	591-78-6	100	1.38	7.7.10 <sup>3</sup>	11.6	80	100.0	10
Heptan-2-one	110-43-0	114	1.98	2.1.10 <sup>3</sup>	3.86	95	114.0	11.4
Octan-2-one	111-13-7	128	2.37	884.2	1.35	100	128.0	12.8
Nonan-2-one	821-55-6	142	3.14	170.6	0.62	125	142.0	14.2
Decan-2-one	693-54-9	156	3.73	46.43	0.27	135	31.2	15.6
Hexan-3-one	589-38-8	100	1.24	1.0.10 <sup>4</sup>	13.90	80	100.0	10.0
Octan-3-one	106-68-3	128	2.22	1.2. 10 <sup>3</sup>	2.00	95	128.0	12.8
Pentan-2,3-dione	600-14-6	100	-0.85	6.2.10 <sup>5</sup>	31.1	80	100.0	10.0
Linalool	78-70-6	154	2.97	1.5.10 <sup>3</sup>	0.16	135	154.0	15.4
Guaiacol	90-05-1	124	1.32	2.8.10 <sup>4</sup>	0.10	Grad <sup>e</sup>	1.24.10 <sup>3</sup>	124.0
Trans-2-Hexen-1-al	6728-26-3	98	1.58	1.6.10 <sup>4</sup>	4.72	95	98.0	9.8
Ethyl hexanoate	123-66-0	144	2.83	629	1.8	95	144.0	14.4
Pyrazine	290-37-9	80	-0.26	2.2.10 <sup>5</sup>	10.8	100	800.0	80.0
2,3-dimethylpyrazine	5910-89-4	108	0.54	3.8.10 <sup>4</sup>	2.74	100	1.08.10 <sup>3</sup>	108.0

<sup>a</sup> Molecular weight <sup>b</sup> partition coefficient octanol/water Episuit <sup>c</sup> Solubility in water at 25 °C <sup>d</sup> Vapour pressure

<sup>e</sup> Temperature gradient for guaiacol analysis: 120°C to 150°C at 8°C/min then 150°C to 200°C at 5°C/min.

628 **Table 2: GC-MS identification of new compounds generated after aroma exposure to the**  
 629 **model mucosa and their conversion rates.** Conversion rates are expressed as mean value  $\pm$  SD.  
 630 Different letters indicate a significant difference (Tukey test,  $\alpha=0.05$ ) between aroma compounds.  
 631 Different numbers indicate a significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) between T and TP condition ( $p < 0.05$ ).

632

Initial aroma compounds	New compounds identified	Calculated conversion rate (T) (mM/L/min)	Calculated conversion rate (TP) (mM/L/min)
Pentan-2,3-dione	2-hydroxy-pentan-3-one + 3-hydroxy-pentan-2-one	1.87 $\pm$ 0.38 <sup>1,a</sup>	2.11 $\pm$ 0.02 <sup>1,a</sup>
Trans-2-hexen-1-al	Hexenoic acid	1.74 $\pm$ 0.07 <sup>1,a</sup>	1.90 $\pm$ 0.03 <sup>2,a</sup>
Ethyl hexanoate	Hexanoic acid	0.42 $\pm$ 0.07 <sup>1,b</sup>	0.51 $\pm$ 0.15 <sup>1,b</sup>
Nonan-2-one	Nonan-2-ol	0.53 $\pm$ 0.07 <sup>1,bc</sup>	0.55 $\pm$ 0.07 <sup>1,bc</sup>
Decan-2-one	Decan-2-ol	1.00 $\pm$ 0.15 <sup>1,c</sup>	0.93 $\pm$ 0.13 <sup>1,c</sup>

633

634 **Figure captions**

635 **Figure 1:** (A) Partition coefficient of aroma in hydrated control (HC)  $K_{HC}$  expressed as percentage  
636 of the value in dry control DC ( $K_{DC}$ ). Mean values are reported with their standard deviation (SD).  
637 Asterisks indicate a ratio significantly lower than 100% (ANOVA, \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ). (B) Partition coefficient  
638 of aroma after exposure to model mucosa without ( $K_T$ ) and with mucosal pellicle ( $K_{TP}$ ). Values are  
639 expressed as the percentage of the HC value  $K_{HC}$ . Different letters indicate significant difference  
640 between the conditions HC, T and TP (Tukey test,  $\alpha=0.05$ ). (C) Partitioning of aroma in clarified  
641 saliva (CS):  $K_{CS}$ . Values are expressed as the percentage of the HC value  $K_{HC}$ . All results are  
642 presented as the mean value  $\pm$  SD.

643 **Figure 2:** Partition coefficient of 2-methyl ketones ( $K$ ) as a function of molecules hydrophobicity ( $\log$   
644  $P$ ) after exposure to oral mucosa without a mucosal pellicle ( $K_T$ ) (A) or with a mucosal pellicle ( $K_{TP}$ )  
645 (B). Values are expressed as the percentage of the HC value  $K_{HC}$ . Mean values are reported with  
646 their standard deviation (SD). Asterisks indicate a ratio significantly lower than 100% (ANOVA, \*  $p <$   
647  $0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ )

648 **Figure 3:** Data supporting the hypothesis of metabolization of nonan-2-one by oral epithelial cells.  
649 (A) GC-MS chromatogram of nonan-2-one extract in hydrated control (HC) (B) GC-MS  
650 chromatogram of supernatant extract of TR146/MUC1 cells (T) after exposure to nonan-2-one (C)  
651 MS spectrum at elution time of the new compound generated in T condition ( $t=16.5$  min).

652 **Figure 4:** Effect of model mucosa without (T) or with (TP) a mucosal pellicle on dynamic release of  
653 pentan-2-one and octan-2-one. (A) Experimental set-up for the real-time measurements of aroma  
654 release from model mucosa (B)  $I_{max}$  = maximum aroma release intensity,  $CA(t)$  = Cumulated Area  
655 of pentan-2-one (C) and octan-2-one (D) release at different times. Results are presented as the  
656 mean value  $\pm$  SD. For each parameter, different letters indicate significant difference between the  
657 conditions HC, T and TP (Tukey test,  $\alpha=0.05$ ).

658 **Table 1:** list of compounds used in the study with their main physicochemical parameters



659 **Table 2:** GC-MS identification of new compounds generated after aroma exposure to the model  
660 mucosa and their conversion rates.

661 **Supplementary Material S1:** (a) real time monitoring of m/z ion intensity (b) curve of release of ion  
662 m/z (c) curve of cumulated area under the curve.

663 **Supplementary Material S2:** GC-FID calibration curves of aroma compounds.

664 **Supplementary Material S3:** Data supporting the hypothesis of metabolization of aroma  
665 compounds by oral epithelial cells. **(Left)** GC-MS chromatograms of initial compounds extract in  
666 hydrated control (HC) **(Middle)** GC-MS chromatogram of supernatant extract of TR146/MUC1 cells  
667 (T) after exposure to aroma solution **(Right)** MS spectra at elution time of the new compound  
668 generated in T condition.

669