



HAL
open science

Use of alimentary film for selective sorption of haloanisoles from contaminated red wine

María Reyes González-Centeno, Sophie Tempere, Pierre-Louis Teissedre,
Kleopatra Chira

► **To cite this version:**

María Reyes González-Centeno, Sophie Tempere, Pierre-Louis Teissedre, Kleopatra Chira. Use of alimentary film for selective sorption of haloanisoles from contaminated red wine. *Food Chemistry*, 2021, 350, pp.1-11. 10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.128364 . hal-03196644

HAL Id: hal-03196644

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03196644>

Submitted on 15 Mar 2023

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 **Use of alimentary film for selective sorption of haloanisoles from contaminated red**
2 **wine**

3

4 María Reyes González-Centeno, Sophie Tempère, Pierre-Louis Teissedre, Kleopatra

5 Chira*

6 Univ. Bordeaux, ISVV, EA 4577, Œnologie, 210 Chemin de Leysotte, 33140 Villenave

7 d'Ornon, France

8 INRA, ISVV, USC 1366 Œnologie, 210 Chemin de Leysotte, 33140 Villenave

9 d'Ornon, France

10 * e-mail: kleopatra.chira@u-bordeaux.fr

11 **Abstract**

12 Haloanisoles (HAs) are known to compromise wine quality because of their mouldy
13 off-flavours. Up to now no treatment exists to eliminate the presence of these
14 unpleasant volatiles in wine. This research aimed i) to assess the alimentary plastic film
15 efficacy to remove or lessen HAs content in polluted wines; and ii) to evaluate its
16 impact on wine quality. The film-treatment reduced significantly ($p<0.05$) the 2,4,6-
17 trichloroanisole (TCA) content of initial wine. This decrease became more noticeable as
18 the contact time film-wine increased.

19 Chromatic characteristics, phenolic and proanthocyanidin contents, and woody aroma
20 profile did not change because of the film treatment. A significant sorption of certain
21 esters was observed, but as HAs were removed under detection thresholds, fruity
22 perception of wines was improved.

23 Globally, the alimentary plastic film was able to improve the organoleptic quality of
24 wines contaminated with HAs, by reducing the cork taint and enhancing their overall
25 fruity aroma.

26 **Keywords** 2,4,6-trichloroanisole, oak wood barrel, plastic film, phenolic composition,
27 aroma profile, sensory analysis

28 **1. Introduction**

29 The mouldy, musty, earthy or 'wet cardboard' off-flavours in wine commonly called « cork
30 taint » are a serious quality-related problem for wine industry. There is no official
31 information about the real incidence and the whole economic losses incurred worldwide by
32 cork-tainted wine (Garde-Cerdán, Lorenzo, Zalacain, Alonso, & Salinas, 2012), but at least
33 5% of the bottled wines are affected (Sefton & Simpson, 2005).

34 At the beginning of the eighties, the 2,4,6-trichloroanisole (TCA) was identified as the main
35 component responsible for this flavour-damaging effect in wines (Buser, Zanier, & Tanner,
36 1982). Although different compounds (geosmin, 1-octen-1-ol, 1-octen-3-one, 2-
37 methylisoborneol, pyrazines, among others) have been claimed to be involved in this wine
38 defect (Callejon, Ubeda, Rios-Reina, Morales, & Troncoso, 2016), research has been
39 mainly focused on haloanisoles (HAs) and their corresponding precursors, halophenols
40 (HPs). This choice is especially driven by the low detection threshold values of HAs (part-
41 per-trillion range, ng/L), making possible their detection by consumers even under trace
42 amounts. The occurrence of these volatile compounds in wine notably decrease its
43 organoleptic quality, by masking the fruity notes (Tempere, Schaaper, Cuzange, de Revel,
44 & Sicard, 2017), and compromise the consumer acceptance of the product (Prescott, Norris,
45 Kunst, & Kim, 2005).

46 Until fairly recently, this off-flavour was erroneously considered as cork-derived, but
47 nowadays it is well known that corks are just one of many other possible sources of
48 contamination. HAs are very volatile and become airborne, thus, they may be transferred
49 into wine through the cellar's atmosphere or by contact or storage with contaminated
50 material (water, oak products, plastics...). Scientific data have shown that the actual origin
51 of wine spoilage by these organohalogen compounds is in fact a problem of environmental
52 contamination (Copete et al., 2009). According to the literature, HAs result from
53 biomethylation of HPs by different microorganisms (fungi, molds and/or bacteria, still not
54 identified), under particular conditions of temperature and humidity (Riu, Mestres, Busto,
55 & Guasch, 2006). During the twentieth century, these HPs have been widely used as

56 biocides (herbicides, insecticides and fungicides) in agriculture, and as wood preservatives
57 and flame-retardants in industry, contributing to their air, water and soil accumulation.
58 Furthermore, consistent data reveal their potential formation in the environment by low
59 levels of anthropogenic chlorine (urban water supply, sanitizer and/or cleaning products)
60 and endogenous phenols from plant material (Simpson & Sefton, 2007).

61 Chatonnet *et al.* (2010) revealed TCA contamination of wines that have had no contact with
62 polluted corks, but acquired mouldy character from oak wood of new barrels used to age
63 wine. The authors highlighted that both coopers and barrel-users seriously underestimate
64 the problem, because the localized and random pollution of barrel staves by HAs and/or
65 HPs makes difficult their systematic detection. According to the French Coopers
66 Federation, the suspect cases only represent around 0.04% of barrel production and there is
67 no significant accentuation in recent years. Meanwhile, to ensure a complete traceability to
68 their customers, coopers increasingly control the presence of these undesirable compounds.
69 From forest to shipping, different potential entry points of both HAs and HPs may be
70 considered for oak wood pollution during barrel manufacture. Since the origin of HAs and
71 HPs contamination for oak wood is not clearly identified at each individual cooperage,
72 different strategies (yeast hulls, Fibrafix TX-R filter sheets, plastic film, milk products,
73 grape seeds oil) are searched to eliminate or lessen the presence of these unpleasant volatile
74 compounds in wine (Jung, Schaefer, Christmann, Hey, Fischer, & Rauhut, 2008; Mirabel,
75 de Beauregard, Riquier, & Bertrand, 2006; Vidal, Puech, Fernández, Fauveau, Pellerin, &
76 Vuchot, 2007). Some taste and/or aroma distorting and/or reduction effects have been noted
77 for some of these treatments. Unfortunately, a lack of in-depth information about their
78 impact on wine matrix and quality seems to limit significantly their widespread use in wine
79 industry.

80 Within this context, the present research aimed i) to assess the efficacy of a plastic film
81 (certified for alimentary uses) to remove or lessen the HAs and HPs content in polluted
82 wines; and ii) to evaluate its impact on wine quality and more particularly on the

- 83 oenological and chromatic parameters, phenolic composition, analytical profile of aroma
- 84 compounds and sensory attributes of those wines.

85 **2. Materials and methods**

86 **2.1 Oak wood origin and drying conditions**

87 All barrels used were made up of French oak from two species (*Quercus robur* and
88 *Quercus petraea*) from the same forest located in the Center region of France. The raw
89 staves (100 cm x 11 cm x 0.12 cm) were naturally seasoned for 24 months in a wood yard.
90 Once assembled, barrels (225 L) were submitted to a medium toast (68 min at 57±3 °C)
91 using the traditional way over an oak wood fire. The barrel heads were not toasted. For the
92 purpose of the study, three barrels (A, B, C) with a different level of HAs and HPs pollution
93 were provided to the wine cellar. From barrel A to C, an increasing level of HAs and HPs
94 pollution was confirmed.

95 **2.2 Red wine vinification**

96 *Cabernet Sauvignon* (70%) and *Merlot* (30%) grapes (*Vitis vinifera* L.) were manually
97 harvested at maturity during the 2013 vintage. The same day, grapes were crushed and
98 destemmed. Potassium metabisulphite (5.0 ± 0.5 g/hL) was added during the transfer of
99 must to stainless steel tanks and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* was included to perform
100 alcoholic fermentation at 25-30 °C. Then, malolactic fermentation extended for one month
101 at a maintained temperature of 20 °C and its development was controlled by monitoring the
102 L-malic acid content of the wines.

103 Once the MLF was finished (malic acid content ≤ 0.4 g/L), wines were racked, additionally
104 sulfited (3.0 – 3.5 g/hL) and transferred to oak barrels for ageing during 24 months at a
105 controlled temperature of 15-16 °C.

106 **2.3 Wine treatment and sample collection**

107 At the end of the 24-months ageing, wine was transferred to stainless steel tanks to perform
108 the film-treatment. A plastic film, composed of a mixture of synthetic polymers and
109 certified for alimentary uses (no migration of plastic molecules to wine takes place) was
110 added to the wine at a dose of 20 m² film/hL.

111 Wine was sampled after 8, 24 and 48h of wine-film contact, and then, bottled and stored at
112 16 °C until further analysis. All bottle caps were covered with aluminum foil to avoid a
113 sorption or a second potential entry of compounds contributor to cork taint.

114 **2.4 Oenological and chromatic parameters in wines**

115 Conventional oenological parameters of wines, i.e., pH, density (g/L), alcoholic degree (%),
116 both titratable and volatile acidity (g tartaric acid/L), glucose/fructose ratio (GFR), total
117 polyphenol index (TPI) and malic, lactic and tartaric acid contents (g/L), were determined
118 in duplicate by Infrared Spectrometry with Fourier Transformation (IRTF) with a
119 WineScan™ Flex (FOSS Analytical, Denmark), which was previously calibrated with wine
120 samples analyzed in accordance with official OIV methods (OIV, 2016).

121 Chromatic parameters of wines, i.e., absorbance's at 420 (d420), 520 (d520) and 620 nm
122 (d620) were also measured in triplicate under 1 mm optical way with a V-630 UV-VIS
123 spectrophotometer (JASCO, Japan). The color intensity (CI, sum of the three absorbances),
124 the hue (d420/d520) and the components yellow (d420%), red (d520%) and blue (d620%)
125 were calculated.

126 **2.5 Total phenolics, proanthocyanidins and anthocyanins analyses**

127 A modified Folin Ciocalteu method to be applied in 96-well microplates (González-
128 Centeno, Chira, & Teissedre, 2016) was used to measure total phenolics with an automated
129 microplate reader (FLUOstar Optima, BMG LabTech, France). Proanthocyanidin and
130 anthocyanin contents of wines were also spectrophotometrically determined, by using the
131 same UV-Vis equipment as for chromatic parameters, through the Bate-Smith reaction
132 (Ribereau-Gayon & Stonestreet, 1966) and the sodium bisulfite discoloration method
133 (Ribereau-Gayon & Stonestreet, 1965), respectively. Wines were diluted in water at a ratio
134 1:20 and 1:50 for total phenolics and total proanthocyanidins measurements, respectively.

135 **2.6 HPLC analysis of anthocyanins**

136 Anthocyanin separation was performed according to the elution conditions, flow rate and
137 composition of the mobile phases previously reported by González-Centeno et al. (2017).

138 This HPLC methodology was conducted on an Agilent Nucleosil 100-5C18 (250 mm × 4.0
139 mm, 5 μm) column by using a Thermo-Accela HPLC instrument including a UV–vis
140 detector (Accela PDA detector), an autosampler (Accela autosampler), and a quaternary
141 pump (Accela 600 pump). Wines were filtered and injected directly, with no prior
142 treatment.

143 Anthocyanin 3-*O*-monoglucosides (delphinidin, Dp; cyanidin, Cy; petunidin, Pt; peonidin,
144 Pn; and malvidin, Mlv), as well as the acetylated and *p*-coumaroylated forms of Pn and
145 Mlv, were identified by comparison to injected external standards and/or previous results.
146 All anthocyanin analyses were performed in duplicate and results were expressed in mg of
147 Mlv-3-*O*-monoglucoside per liter of wine.

148 **2.7 Haloanisoles and halophenols of wines: extraction and gas chromatography** 149 **analysis**

150 Both haloanisoles and halophenols analyses were conducted in wines. Prior to gas-
151 chromatographic analyses, three liquid/liquid consecutive extractions were performed using
152 4, 2 and 2 mL of iso-hexane. Lindane solution (50 μL) was used as internal standard. The
153 organic fractions were all combined. Then, emulsion was broken thanks to a slow-agitation
154 by a magnetic stirrer and aqueous phase was progressively removed to get wine organic
155 extracts. All samples were extracted in duplicate.

156 Quantitative determination of both haloanisoles and halophenols in wines was adapted from
157 the gas chromatography OIV method (OIV, 2006). The equipment used for this analysis
158 consisted of an Agilent HP 5980 GC equipped with an electron capture detector (Agilent
159 Technologies, USA). Wine organic extracts (2 μL) were injected in split-splitless mode.
160 The experimental conditions were temperature set at 250 °C for both injector and detector,
161 and 40 °C for oven (programmed at 3 °C/min to 160 °C, and then at 5 °C/min to 220 °C, the
162 final step lasting 10 min); splitless time set at 30 s and split flow at 30 mL/min. The column
163 was a CP-Sil 5CB (PDMS, 50 m x 0.32 mm, 0.2 μm) and nitrogen was used as carrier gas.
164 Target compounds (TCA, 2,4,6-trichloroanisole; TeCA, 2,3,4,6-tetrachloroanisole; PCA,
165 pentachloroanisole; TBA, 2,4,6-tribromoanisole; TCP, 2,4,6-trichlorophenol; TeCP,

166 2,3,4,6-tetrachlorophenol; PCP, pentachlorophenol; TBP, 2,4,6-tribromophenol) were
167 identified by comparing their retention times with those of the pure reference standards.

168 **2.8 Volatile composition of wines: extraction and gas chromatography analysis**

169 Woody and fruity aroma composition was determined by adapting the gas chromatography
170 procedures described by Barbe and Bertrand (1996) and Antalick *et al.* (2010) respectively.
171 The equipment used for woody and fruity aroma analyses consisted of an Agilent HP 5890
172 GC (Hewlett-Packard, Wilmington, DE, USA) coupled with a mass spectrometer (Agilent
173 HP 5972, electron impact 70 eV, eMV = 2 kV), and an Agilent HP 7890 GC (Hewlett-
174 Packard, Wilmington, DE, USA) coupled to a quadrupole mass spectrometer (Agilent HP
175 5975), respectively. Target compounds were identified by comparing their retention times
176 and mass spectra with those of the pure reference standards. All samples were analyzed in
177 duplicate. Calibration curves were established using pure reference standards analyzed
178 under the same conditions than wine samples.

179 *Woody aroma.* For the identification of the target compounds, selected ions were m/z 99 for
180 β -methyl- γ -octalactone, m/z 151 for vanillin, m/z 164 for eugenol, and m/z 83 for the
181 internal standard (dodecan-1-ol).

182 *Fruity aroma.* The following ions were used to identify the target compounds: ethyl
183 isobutyrate, m/z 116; ethyl propanoate and ethyl 2-methylbutyrate, m/z 102; ethyl
184 butanoate, ethyl hexanoate, ethyl octanoate, ethyl decanoate, ethyl dodecanoate and ethyl 3-
185 methylbutyrate, m/z 88; isoamyl acetate, m/z 70; propyl acetate, m/z 61; and m/z 56 for
186 isobutyl acetate and butyl acetate.

187 **2.9 Sensory analysis**

188 Sensory analysis was performed by a panel of 22 expert judges (5 males and 17 females),
189 all research staff at the Institute of Vine and Wine Sciences of the University of Bordeaux,
190 selected for their experience in wine tasting.

191 All evaluations were conducted in a standard sensory-analysis chamber (ISO-8589, 2010),
192 equipped with individual tasting booths, where an uniform temperature (19-22 °C) and

193 source of lighting, absence of noise and distracting stimuli were guaranteed. Wines (30 mL)
194 were presented in standard black INAO glasses, covered with a Petri dish to minimize the
195 escape of volatile components and randomly coded with three-digit numbers. The position
196 of the samples was balanced in all sensory tests.

197 *Training.* To familiarize the panelists with TCA odor, all judges were trained over a period
198 of two weeks. Training sessions were adapted from Cravero *et al.* (2015) and consisted of
199 tests for elucidating the individual olfactory sensitivity to TCA. First, a TCA identification
200 test was conducted. For this purpose, various TCA (CAS number 87-40-1, grade purity of
201 99%, Merck) solutions of the following concentrations 0, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0,
202 8.0 and 16.0 ng/L prepared in two different matrices: distilled water and red wine (100%
203 Merlot 2016, Languedoc Roussillon), were evaluated. The selected wine had a bag-in-box
204 closure system to reduce the risk of cork taint. The ten TCA concentrations were presented
205 in ascending order (from 0 to 16 ng/L), preceded by control (water or wine), which was
206 placed in the initial position. Judges were requested to indicate if the sample was perceived
207 to be identical or not to the control. TCA detection test was repeated in triplicate for each
208 matrix on three consecutive days.

209 Secondly, a series of three alternative forced-choice tests (ISO-13301, 2018) with eight
210 ascending TCA concentrations (from 0.1 to 6 ng TCA/L) were carried out in red wine
211 (100% Merlot 2016, Languedoc Roussillon). For each TCA concentration, three glasses
212 were proposed: two controls and a third one containing the substance under test. Sensory
213 panel was asked to identify the odd sample olfactory perceived as different from the others.
214 This sensory test was repeated in triplicate on three consecutive days. Best Estimate
215 Threshold (BET)-method was used to calculate the TCA threshold of the sensory panel.
216 The individual BET was calculated as the geometric mean of the highest concentration
217 missed and the next higher concentration (the lowest TCA concentration detected within a
218 series of correct answers). The sensory panel BET was determined as the geometric mean
219 of the individual BETs.

220 *Wine evaluation.* Triangle test (ISO-4120, 2007) was performed to determine whether the
221 panel was able to distinguish between contaminated wine and wines treated with film for 8,
222 24 and 48h. For this discriminatory test, the sensory panel attended six formal tasting
223 sessions (two per contaminated wine). In each session, contaminated wine from one out of
224 the three barrels considered was compared to the corresponding three film-treated wines
225 (after 8, 24 and 48h of wine-film contact). For each duo of wines, three glasses were
226 presented and judges were asked to indicate the one olfactory perceived as different from
227 the others (forced choice: even if s/he was not sure). The presentation order was
228 randomized, corresponding to the six possible presentation orders.

229 Descriptive sensory analysis was also performed to assess the sensory profile of all wines.
230 Samples were first evaluated orthonasally. Olfactory descriptors considered were fruity,
231 overall woody, corky and vegetal. Then, after a short break, both bitterness and astringency
232 attributes were also evaluated. The sensory panel was asked to rate the intensity level of all
233 descriptors on a line scale (10 cm) ranging from ‘absence’ (note 0) to ‘maximum intensity’
234 (note 10). Results of each descriptor were then expressed as the mean value of all the
235 judges from two formal tasting sessions.

236 **2.10 Additional experiment to control the impact of the plastic film on flavan-3-ol** 237 **composition and fruity character of wines**

238 In order to check the real impact of the plastic film on the flavan-3-ol profile and the fruity
239 character of wine, an additional experiment was conducted. A HAs-free wine (70%
240 *Cabernet Sauvignon*, 30% *Merlot*, 24-months of barrel ageing) was considered as control
241 and supplemented with three different TCA levels corresponding to the initial polluted
242 wines from barrels A (1.0 ng TCA/L wine), B (3.0 ng TCA/L wine) and C (9.1 ng TCA/L
243 wine). For this purpose, a stock solution of TCA (CAS number 87-40-1, grade purity of
244 99%, Merck) was prepared in EtOH (1 g/L) and, then, diluted for use. Film treatment was
245 conducted in all cases at a dose of 20 m² film/hL wine.

246 *Flavan-3-ol composition of wines.* To evaluate the impact of the film treatment on the
247 flavan-3-ol profile, all three supplemented wines were film-treated for a length determined

248 by the tasters' capacity to find significant differences at the triangle tests between the
249 untreated and film-treated wines of *Wine evaluation* (see 3.6 Sensory analysis section).
250 Specifically, wine supplemented with 1.0 ng TCA/L was film-treated during 8h; wine
251 supplemented with 3.0 ng TCA/L, during 48h; and wine supplemented with 9.1 ng TCA/L,
252 during 24h.

253 Monomeric and oligomeric flavan-3-ols were quantified in control wine, as well as in the
254 three supplemented and film-treated wines, on a Thermo-Finnigan Surveyor HPLC system.
255 The flow rate, elution conditions, composition of mobile phases and column characteristics
256 were adapted from González-Centeno et al. (2012). Wines were filtered and injected
257 directly in triplicate. Results were expressed in mg of (+)-catechin/L wine.

258 *Fruity character of wines.* Four different modalities were considered for each TCA
259 supplementation level: I. control wine (not supplemented and not film-treated), II.
260 supplemented wine, III. film-treated wine (not supplemented), and IV. supplemented and
261 film-treated wine. The length of the film treatment for modalities III and IV corresponded
262 once again to that for what tasters found significant differences at the triangle tests between
263 the untreated and the film-treated wines of *Wine evaluation* (see 3.6 Sensory analysis
264 section).

265 Triangle test (ISO-4120, 2007) was carried out to evaluate whether the panel was able to
266 distinguish between: a) modalities II and IV (to confirm the obtained results about the film
267 treatment efficacy); and b) modalities I and III (to evaluate both the film sorption of esters,
268 and the resulting effect on fruity aroma perception). If difference was perceived at the
269 triangle test, bilateral paired comparison test (ISO-5495, 2007) was also performed to
270 identify to what sensory descriptors judges related that difference. HAs content and fruity
271 aroma profile of all four modalities for the three levels of TCA contamination were also
272 analyzed by chromatography.

273 **2.11 Statistical analysis**

274 All experimental results were reported as mean values with their corresponding standard
275 deviations. Statistical analysis was performed by the statistical package R version 3.5.0 (R
276 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Wien, Austria). Normality and homocedasticity of
277 the residuals were evaluated for all parameters, by using the Shapiro–Wilk test and
278 Levene’s test, respectively. When populations were distributed normally and presented
279 homogeneity in variance, the parametric ANOVA and Tukey tests were used to evaluate
280 the existence and degree of significant differences. If populations were not distributed
281 normally and/or presented heterogeneity in variance ANOVA was replaced by the
282 nonparametric Friedman test. Differences at $p \leq 0.05$ were considered to be statistically
283 significant.

284 The results of the sensory triangle tests were analyzed by the probability theory that the
285 number of right answers follows a binomial distribution ($n, p = 1/3$ for triangle test), where
286 n is the panel size. Wines were considered as differently perceived for a probability lower
287 than 5%.

288 3. Results and discussion

289 3.1 Haloanisoles and halophenols content of wines

290 Both haloanisoles (HA) and halophenols (HP) content of wines are shown in Table 1. The
291 presence of these compounds in the initial wines, non-treated with the film, proved the
292 contamination of the corresponding barrels. Each one presented a different contamination
293 level, being the untreated wine from barrel C the most contaminated one, with a TCA
294 content of 9.1 ± 0.2 ng/L wine. Untreated wine from barrel B showed an intermediate TCA
295 contamination (3.0 ± 0.1 ng/L wine) and that from barrel A just presented some traces of
296 TCA (≤ 1.0 ng/L wine).

297 As observed, the use of the plastic film reduced significantly ($p < 0.05$) the TCA content of
298 the initial wines. This decrease became more noticeable as the contact time film-wine
299 increased. In the case of barrel B, after 8h of film-treatment TCA concentration lessened up
300 to 47% of the initial content. A longer treatment of 24h and 48h led to a reduction of 73%
301 and 83% of the TCA contamination, respectively. In the case of barrel C, a slightly higher
302 decrease of the TCA level (57%) was observed after the first 8h of film-treatment.
303 Meanwhile, similar values were obtained after 24h (reduction of 75% initial TCA content)
304 and 48h (diminution of 81% initial TCA concentration) of film-wine contact. In the case of
305 barrel A, TCA decontamination was no quantifiable (values under the limit of
306 quantification, 0.5 ng/L), but it is important to point out that there was a diminution of the
307 TCA content up to no detection in wine after 48h of film-treatment.

308 HAs have very low detection thresholds in alcoholic solution (in the range of ng/L), which
309 make their mouldy, musty, earthy or 'wet cardboard' off-flavours easily recognizable
310 (Callejón, Ubeda, Ríos-Reina, Morales, & Troncoso, 2016). In the case of TCA, published
311 detection threshold may vary considerably depending not only on panel expertise,
312 sensitivity and training, but also on wine style and matrix (Mazzoleni & Maggi, 2007).
313 Specifically, the most extended values of TCA perception threshold in red wine range
314 between 1.5 and 3.0 ng/L (Grainger & Tattersall, 2016). As observed in Table 1, at the end

315 of the film treatment, wines presented TCA contents around the bottom limit of that range,
316 or even much lower values.

317 TBA was not detected in any of the wine samples analyzed, while no quantifiable amounts
318 of TeCA and/or PCA were found in the three untreated wines. As observed in Table 1, the
319 plastic film was able to eliminate the TeCA from wines of barrels B and C up to non-
320 detection.

321 HAs are considered among the most non-polar compounds present in wine. For this reason,
322 hydrophobic materials such as cork particles and plastics are effective at diminishing their
323 levels from contaminated wines (Waterhouse, Sacks, & Jeffery, 2016).

324 With regard to the halophenols, no quantifiable amounts of TeCP were found in any wine
325 sample. The film-treatment significantly decreased the PCP and TBP contamination of
326 wines to concentrations under the limit of quantification (3.0 ng/L for both halophenols)
327 and up to non-detection, respectively. Meanwhile, it did not seem to be very effective to
328 reduce/eliminate their TCP content. As for the HAs, untreated wine from barrel C presented
329 the highest TCP level (64.3 ng/L wine), followed by untreated wines from barrels B (11.8
330 ng/L wine) and A (8.1 ng/L wine), in this order. After 48h of wine-film contact, TCP
331 contamination only diminished in a 33% (barrel A), 6% (barrel B) and 11% (barrel C) from
332 initial values. Taking into account that HPs are not volatile compounds and that under
333 bottled wine conditions they may not become the corresponding HAs, the presence of TCP
334 still after the film treatment is not a matter of concern with regard to the cork taint off-
335 flavour.

336 **3.2 Oenological and chromatic parameters in wines**

337 The comparison of initial TCA-contaminated wines (untreated) and the corresponding film-
338 treated wines suggests that their basic structure is virtually identical. All of them presented
339 the same oenological characteristics, i.e., pH of 3.5, a density of 992 g/L wine, an alcohol
340 content of 14.0%, a titratable acidity of 3.7 g tartaric acid/L, a volatile acidity of 0.7 g
341 tartaric acid/L, a glucose/fructose ratio of 3.1, a total polyphenol index of 65 ± 1 and malic,

342 lactic and tartaric acid contents of 0.4, 0.8 and 2.2 g/L wine, respectively. Thus, the use of
343 the plastic film to eliminate/reduce both HA and HP content in wines did not influence their
344 oenological parameters, and this regardless of the contact time of the film-treatment.
345 Chromatic characteristics (color intensity, hue and yellow, red and blue components) of all
346 wines analyzed are depicted in Figure 1. A priori, no chromatic parameter really changed
347 because of the film treatment and/or the contact time film-wine. Nevertheless, some
348 differences between untreated and film-treated wines, and even among wines treated with
349 film for different contact times, were found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). These
350 differences ($\leq 6\%$ with regard to the corresponding untreated wine) were mainly attributed
351 to the highly reproducibility of the absorbance measurements, but they were not visually
352 perceived by any taster during sensory analysis.

353 **3.3 Total phenolic, proanthocyanidin and anthocyanin content**

354 Table 2 shows the total phenolic, proanthocyanidin and anthocyanidin contents of all
355 untreated and film-treated wines analyzed in the present study. After the film-treatment to
356 remove HA and HP from wines, total phenolic and total proanthocyanidin values remained
357 constant for wines from barrels B and C ($p > 0.05$), regardless of the contact time film-
358 wine. Meanwhile, in the case of barrel A, a slightly decrease (4.4%) of total phenolics was
359 observed with regard to the untreated wine after 48h of film-treatment.

360 With regard to the anthocyanin results, film-treated wines from barrels A and C displayed a
361 little but significant rise of total anthocyanins at 48h and 24h of contact, respectively ($p <$
362 0.05). This increase suggested that the plastic film might absorb certain wine components
363 that anthocyanins are used to combine. In fact, anthocyanins are the main pigments present
364 in young red wines, being responsible for their intense red color. During oak wood wine
365 aging anthocyanins can yield polymeric pigments by their reaction with flavanols (directly
366 or mediated by aldehydes). Moreover, A-type vitisins (the main pyranoanthocyanins found
367 in red wines) can also react with other wine components giving origin to polymeric
368 pigments with different colors ranging from yellow to turquoise blue.

369 According to these results, it may be globally stated that the use of the plastic film to
370 eliminate/reduce both HAs and HPs content in wines did not impact significantly their
371 phenolic, proanthocyanidin and anthocyanin contents up to 24h of film-treatment.

372 **3.4 Anthocyanin composition of wines**

373 Since some evolution of the total anthocyanin content was observed during the film
374 treatment, the anthocyanin profile of both untreated and film-treated wines was also
375 analyzed to get in-depth information. The total anthocyanin content of all wines, calculated
376 by adding up the individual concentration of each anthocyanin compound, ranged from
377 38.5 to 45.1 mg Mlv/L wine. The same anthocyanin profile was observed for both untreated
378 and film-treated wines, malvidin-3*O*-glucoside being the most abundant component and
379 accounting for 29–32% of the total anthocyanin fraction. In all cases, delphinidin-3*O*-
380 glucoside was the second main anthocyanin (~15%), followed by similar concentrations of
381 both petunidin and peonidin (~13%), and then, the acetyl form of malvidin (~11%),
382 cyanidin (~9%) and the acetyl form of peonidin (~8%), in that order (Table 3).

383 Film-treatment length did not lead to significant differences ($p > 0.05$) among film-treated
384 wines from each barrel for any individual anthocyanin. However, when compared to the
385 untreated wines, film-treated wines presented slightly greater concentrations ($p < 0.05$) of
386 some anthocyanins after 8h of film contact (2 –14%). Malvidin-3*O*-glucoside and
387 delphinidin-3*O*-glucoside were the main responsible of these increases. This observation
388 corroborates the results derived from the total anthocyanin analysis of wines from barrels A
389 and C and may be explained by the same chemical approach: a potential film absorption of
390 certain carbonyl compounds which tend to combine anthocyanins.

391 **3.5 Volatile composition of wines**

392 *3.5.1 Woody aroma*

393 The evolution of the main direct contributors to the overall woody aroma (whiskeylactones,
394 eugenol, vanillin) during film-treatment is also described in Table 4. Woody aroma profile
395 of all three wines remained constant throughout the film-treatment. Only a decrease of

396 vanillin (13 – 26%) content was observed in wine from barrel B beyond 8h of wine-film
397 contact. Meanwhile, it is important to point out that vanillin content remained at
398 concentrations well above its perception threshold (320 µg/L) (Boidron, Chatonnet, &
399 Pons, 1988), regardless of the length of the film-treatment.

400 In any case, the concentration of both *cis*- and *trans*-whiskeylactones, main responsible of
401 the coconut, woody and oak-like notes of wine aged in barrels, and the eugenol content,
402 related to spicy and smoked flavors, were not modified by the film-treatment in any of the
403 wines considered.

404 Globally, it may be concluded that the plastic film did not sorb the oak woody volatiles,
405 since the woody aroma profile was not significantly impacted by the film-treatment used to
406 eliminate/reduce both HAs and HPs content in wines.

407 3.5.2 Fruity aroma

408 The evolution of the fruity aroma profile during film-treatment is also depicted in Table 4.
409 Among the three main families of esters contributing to the fruity character of red wine, the
410 concentrations of both higher alcohol acetates and ethyl esters branched acids, remained
411 practically constant during the whole film treatment of wines.

412 Only the ethyl esters of straight-chain fatty acids displayed a significant reduction
413 throughout the film-treatment ($p < 0,05$). These volatiles, responsible for pineapple, plum,
414 apple and blackberry aromatic notes, decreased in a higher extent as the contact time film-
415 wine increased. Specifically, ethyl hexanoate experimented a lessening from 17% to 26%
416 compared to the untreated wine. In the case of ethyl octanoate, ethyl decanoate and ethyl
417 dodecanoate, the decline percentages were much higher. Losses accounted for $\geq 31\%$ of
418 their initial contents after only 8h of wine-film contact. A longer treatment of 48h led to a
419 reduction from up to 82% of their initial concentrations. Thus, the plastic film seemed to
420 display a selective sorption of those four ethyl esters.

421 As previously noted in the literature, both concentration and hydrophobicity of aroma
422 compounds may govern their affinity for plastic films (Dury-Brun, Chalier, Desobry, &

423 Voilley, 2008). According to the apolar nature of the plastic film used, it is well known that
424 i. aromatic volatiles are easily sorbed, in particular, the hydrophobic ones (Dombre, Rigou,
425 Wirth, & Chalier, 2015); and that ii. the higher the hydrophobicity in the chemical family,
426 the greater the sorption coefficient (Peyches-Bach, Moutounet, Peyron, & Chalier, 2009).
427 Among the three ester families quantified, that of ethyl esters of straight-chain fatty acids
428 presents very hydrophobic molecules. This particularity may justify their selective sorption
429 by the plastic film.

430 The question remains as to whether the decline of these fruity volatiles, even if present at
431 sub-threshold concentrations, may impact both the expression and perception of red wine
432 fruity aroma, due to their potential synergism, modulation and/or enhancement phenomena
433 of fruity character (Lytra, Tempere, de Revel, & Barbe, 2012; Lytra, Tempere, Le Floch, de
434 Revel, & Barbe, 2013). In order to answer this query, a second sensory analysis experiment
435 has been performed (see *Wine evaluation – Experiment II* sub-section at 2.9 Sensory
436 analysis section).

437 **3.6 Sensory analysis**

438 After training sessions, all judges were able to clearly identify the presence of TCA in red
439 wine. Moreover, the BET results showed that the sensory panel may detect TCA in red
440 wine at 1.2 ng TCA/L. This value is in quite agreement with the odor detection threshold of
441 TCA in red wine (0.9 ng TCA/L) previously reported by Teixeira *et al.* (2006).

442 *Wine evaluation.* According to the results of the triangle test, sensory panel significantly
443 distinguished between untreated wines and film-treated wines after 8h, 24h and 48h of film
444 contact for barrels A (52% of correct answers, $p \leq 0.007$), C (50% of correct answers, $p \leq$
445 0.016) and B (50% of correct answers, $p \leq 0.016$), respectively. Specifically, these film-
446 treatments corresponded to a reduction of TCA pollution under the limit of quantification
447 (0.5 ng/L) in the case of barrel A, and a decrease of 75% and 83% of the initial TCA
448 content of the wine for barrels C and B, respectively.

449 It was maybe expected that judges significantly distinguish film-treated from untreated
450 wine at 24h for the wine presenting the intermediate TCA pollution (barrel B) and at 48h
451 for the wine with the highest TCA level (barrel C), and not vice versa. Nevertheless, the
452 TCA level of the untreated wine from barrel B is so closed to the detection threshold of this
453 unpleasant volatile that it might slow the differentiation down. In the case of barrel C, the
454 untreated wine is so polluted that a shorter treatment was enough to perceive the TCA
455 decrease.

456 In the case of barrel A, even if the selected panel significantly distinguished the 8h film-
457 treated wine from the contaminated initial wine, differences were not significantly
458 associated to any of the organoleptic attributes considered during the descriptive sensory
459 analysis ($p > 0.05$). This behavior may be explained because the pollution levels of both
460 untreated and film-treated wines from barrel A (< 1.0 ng/L wine) were very close or under
461 the TCA threshold of the selected panel (BET = 0.8 ng/L wine). It is important to note that,
462 as depicted in Figure 2A, after 8h of film contact judges perceived wine with slightly higher
463 fruity notes than the untreated one. Even if it was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$),
464 these results confirm the observations of Tempere *et al.* (2017) regarding the masking
465 effect of TCA on fruity notes at infra-threshold concentrations. Their study provides
466 experimental confirmation that non-perceptible concentrations of TCA may also negatively
467 influence the perceived olfactory quality of a wine.

468 In the case of barrel B, different perception of untreated and 48h film-treated wines was
469 related to the fruity, overall woody and corky descriptors (Figure 2B). Specifically, wine
470 from barrel B treated with the plastic film during 48h was described as fruitier and woodier,
471 and less corky than the untreated wine. As previously noted, no increase of the fruity and/or
472 woody volatile content was observed during the film treatment (Table 4). Thus, according
473 to the judges' perception, both fruity and woody notes just appeared because of the 83%
474 decrease of the initial TCA contamination after 48h of film-treatment, and consequently, an
475 important reduction of the corky aroma, which was acting as a potent masking agent of
476 pleasant aromas.

477 In the case of barrel C, sensory differences between untreated and 24h film-treated wines
478 were associated to the fruity and corky olfactory descriptors, as well as to both bitterness
479 and astringency attributes. Just like wine from barrel B, the higher fruity character of the
480 film-treated wine was directly linked to the significant 75% decrease of the initial TCA
481 contamination. Furthermore, as observed in Figure 2C, untreated wine was described as
482 more bitter and astringent ($p < 0.05$) than the corresponding film-treated wines. Judges,
483 even if they are trained, do not always describe bitter and astringent perceptions with the
484 expected descriptors. When consumers like the wines, they tend to not use the term 'bitter'
485 as a descriptor. It is normally used to express dislike and is usually associated with acid and
486 astringent sensory characteristics. On the other hand, consumers who like astringent wines
487 described them as having 'a lot of character' or 'a long aftertaste' (Chira, Schmauch,
488 Saucier, Fabre, & Teissedre, 2009). As the wines treated with the film were perceived as
489 fruitier than the non-treated wines, judges characterized them instantaneously as less
490 astringent and bitter.

491 It is important to point out that all film-treated wines (from barrels B and C) were
492 significantly perceived as less corky than the corresponding initial untreated wines,
493 regardless of the length of the film treatment. These results suggested that the plastic film
494 was able to improve the organoleptic quality of wines contaminated with HAs, by reducing
495 the corky notes and increasing the perception of their overall woody and/or fruity aromas.

496 **3.7 Impact of the film treatment on flavan-3-ol composition and fruity character of** 497 **wines**

498 *Flavan-3-ol composition of wines.* As previously described in section 3.3, total
499 proanthocyanidin content of film-treated wines did not change significantly compared to
500 untreated wine. The analysis of the flavan-3-ol profile performed in the additional
501 experiment corroborated those results, since regardless of the TCA supplementation level
502 applied, all film-treated wines presented the same flavan-3-ol content and profile than
503 control wine. As observed in Table S2 (at the Supplementary material section), neither
504 monomers or dimers have not been affected by the film treatment. Thus, this additional

505 experiment confirmed that the film-treatment of wines did not impact their flavan-3-ol
506 profile.

507 *Fruity character of wines.* Even if film-treated wines presented a significant reduction of
508 some fruity volatiles, they were described as fruitier than the untreated wines. The
509 additional sensory experience aimed to check the real impact of the film treatment on fruity
510 aroma perception.

511 Results from the triangle test for modalities II (supplemented wine) and IV (supplemented
512 and film-treated wine) corroborated the results obtained in the present research about the
513 great efficacy of the film treatment (wine supplemented with 1.0 ng TCA/L, 58% of correct
514 answers, $p \leq 0.09$; wines supplemented with 3.0 and 9.1 ng TCA/L, 54% of correct
515 answers, $p \leq 0.025$). At the three levels of TCA supplementation, judges were able to
516 distinguish significantly between the wine untreated (mod. II) and the film-treated one
517 (mod. IV). In all cases, this differentiation was associated to the lowest corky and greater
518 fruity notes ($p < 0.05$) of film-treated wines (mod. IV).

519 At a chemical level, the film treatment reduced significantly the ester content (Table S3, at
520 the Supplementary material section), but also the TCA supplementation (up to no detection
521 for wines supplemented with 1.0 and 3.0 ng TCA/L, and a reduction of 83% after 24h of
522 film treatment for wine supplemented with 9.1 ng TCA/L). Losses of fruity volatiles by
523 film sorption reached again the highest values for ethyl esters of straight-chain fatty acids,
524 surely due to their greater hydrophobicity.

525 When comparing modalities I (control wine) and III (film-treated wine), both without TCA
526 supplementation, the triangle test revealed that the film treatment had not a significant
527 impact on fruity perception. Regardless of the contact time wine-film, judges were not able
528 to differentiate between control wine and film-treated wine ($p > 0.05$). Thus, even if a
529 significant decrease of certain esters was observed due to the film treatment (Table S3), it
530 did not influence the perception of the fruity character of the wine.

531 **4. Conclusions**

532 The film treatment i. allowed to gradually remove TCA from polluted wine (81 – 83 %
533 after 48h of wine-film contact); ii. did not impact neither colour attributes, nor both total
534 phenolic and tannin contents, and the woody aroma profile; iii. slightly increased
535 anthocyanin content beyond 24h of wine-film contact and absorbed significantly only
536 certain esters; iv. nonetheless, did not influence the fruity perception of wines; and v.
537 reduced significantly the corky notes, regardless of the contact time (8h, 24h or 48h).

538 Overall, the present research highlighted that this film treatment is highly efficient to
539 improve the organoleptic quality of wines contaminated with HAs, by reducing the cork
540 taint and increasing their overall fruity aroma, without highly impacting their chromatic
541 parameters, phenolic and aromatic composition.

542 **Acknowledgements.** The authors gratefully acknowledge all the judges who participated in
543 the sensory analyses.

544 **References**

- 545 Antalick, G., Perello, M.-C., & de Revel, G. (2010). Development, validation and application of a
546 specific method for the quantitative determination of wine esters by headspace-solid-
547 phase microextraction-gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. *Food Chemistry*, *121*(4),
548 1236-1245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2010.01.011>.
- 549 Barbe, J. C., & Bertrand, A. (1996). Quantitative analysis of volatile compounds stemming from
550 oak wood. Application to the ageing of wines in barrels *Journal of Cooperage Science and*
551 *Technology* *2*, 83-88.
- 552 Boidron, J.-N., Chatonnet, P., & Pons, M. (1988). Effects of wood on aroma compounds of wine.
553 *Connaissance de la Vigne et du Vin*, *22*, 275-294.
- 554 Buser, H. R., Zanier, C., & Tanner, H. (1982). Identification of 2,4,6-trichloroanisole as a potent
555 compound causing cork taint in wine. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *30*(2),
556 359-362. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf00110a037>.
- 557 Callejon, R. M., Ubeda, C., Rios-Reina, R., Morales, M. L., & Troncoso, A. M. (2016). Recent
558 developments in the analysis of musty odour compounds in water and wine: A review.
559 *Journal of Chromatography A*, *1428*, 72-85.
560 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2015.09.008>.
- 561 Callejón, R. M., Ubeda, C., Ríos-Reina, R., Morales, M. L., & Troncoso, A. M. (2016). Recent
562 developments in the analysis of musty odour compounds in water and wine: A review.
563 *Journal of Chromatography A*, *1428*, 72-85.
564 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2015.09.008>.
- 565 Chatonnet, P., Fleury, A., & Boutou, S. (2010). Identification of a new source of contamination of
566 *Quercus* sp. oak wood by 2,4,6-trichloroanisole and its impact on the contamination of
567 barrel-aged wines. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *58*(19), 10528-10538.
568 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf102571v>.
- 569 Chira, K., Schmauch, G., Saucier, C., Fabre, S., & Teissedre, P.-L. (2009). Grape variety effect on
570 proanthocyanidin composition and sensory perception of skin and seed tannin extracts
571 from Bordeaux wine grapes (*Cabernet Sauvignon* and *Merlot*) for two consecutive
572 vintages (2006 and 2007). *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *57*(2), 545-553.
573 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf802301g>.
- 574 Copete, M. L., Zalacain, A., Lorenzo, C., Carot, J. M., Esteve, M. D., Climent, M., & Salinas, M. R.
575 (2009). Haloanisole and halophenol contamination in Spanish aged red wines. *Food*
576 *Additives and Contaminants Part a-Chemistry Analysis Control Exposure & Risk*
577 *Assessment*, *26*(1), 32-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02652030802273130>.
- 578 Cravero, M. C., Bonello, F., Alvarez, M. D. P., Tsolakis, C., & Borsa, D. (2015). The sensory
579 evaluation of 2,4,6-trichloroanisole in wines. *Journal of the Institute of Brewing*, *121*(3),
580 411-417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jib.230>.
- 581 Dombre, C., Rigou, P., Wirth, J., & Chalier, P. (2015). Aromatic evolution of wine packed in virgin
582 and recycled PET bottles. *Food Chemistry*, *176*, 376-387.
583 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2014.12.074>.
- 584 Dury-Brun, C., Chalier, P., Desobry, S., & Voilley, A. (2008). Properties of treated papers and plastic
585 film influencing ethyl ester transfer. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *88*(1), 114-125.
586 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2008.01.020>.
- 587 Garde-Cerdán, T., Lorenzo, C., Zalacain, A., Alonso, G. L., & Salinas, M. R. (2012). Using near
588 infrared spectroscopy to determine haloanisoles and halophenols in barrel aged red
589 wines. *LWT-Food Science and Technology*, *46*(2), 401-405.
590 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2011.12.012>.
- 591 González-Centeno, M. R., Chira, K., & Teissedre, P.-L. (2017). Comparison between malolactic
592 fermentation container and barrel toasting effects on phenolic, volatile, and sensory
593 profiles of red wines. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *65*, 3320–3329.

594 González-Centeno, M. R., Chira, K., & Teissedre, P.-L. (2016). Ellagitannin content, volatile
595 composition and sensory profile of wines from different countries matured in oak barrels
596 subjected to different toasting methods. *Food Chemistry*, *210*, 500-511.

597 González-Centeno, M. R., Jourdes, M., Femenia, A., Simal, S., Rosselló, C., & Teissedre, P. L. (2012).
598 Proanthocyanidin composition and antioxidant potential of the stem winemaking
599 byproducts from 10 different grape varieties (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Journal of Agricultural and*
600 *Food Chemistry*, *60*(48), 11850-11858. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf303047k>.

601 Grainger, K., & Tattersall, H. (2016). *Wine production and quality*. (2nd ed.).

602 ISO-4120. (2007). Sensory analysis — Methodology — Triangle test. *International Organization for*
603 *Standardization, Genève*.

604 ISO-5495. (2007). Sensory analysis — Methodology — Paired comparison test.

605 ISO-8589. (2010). Sensory analysis – General guidance for the design of test rooms. *International*
606 *Organization for Standardization, Genève*.

607 ISO-13301. (2018). Sensory analysis - Methodology - General guidance for measuring odour,
608 flavour and taste detection thresholds by a three-alternative forced-choice (3-AFC)
609 procedure.

610 Jung, R., Schaefer, V., Christmann, M., Hey, M., Fischer, S., & Rauhut, D. (2008). Removal of 2,4,6-
611 trichloroanisole (TCA) and 2,4,6-tribromoanisole (TBA) from wine. *Mitteilungen*
612 *Klosterneuburg*, *58*, 58-67.

613 Lytra, G., Tempere, S., de Revel, G., & Barbe, J. C. (2012). Impact of perceptive interactions on red
614 wine fruity aroma. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *60*(50), 12260-12269.
615 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf302918q1>.

616 Lytra, G., Tempere, S., Le Floch, A., de Revel, G., & Barbe, J.-C. (2013). Study of sensory
617 interactions among red wine fruity esters in a model solution. *Journal of Agricultural and*
618 *Food Chemistry*, *61*(36), 8504-8513. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf4018405>.

619 Mazzoleni, V., & Maggi, L. (2007). Effect of wine style on the perception of 2,4,6-trichloroanisole,
620 a compound related to cork taint in wine. *Food Research International*, *40*(6), 694-699.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2006.11.014>.

622 Mirabel, M., de Beauregard, D., Riquier, L., & Bertrand, A. (2006). Traitements des vins moisis,
623 bouchonnés : le point sur la question. *La Revue des Oenologues*, *119*, 31-33.

624 OIV. (2006). Resolution Oeno 8/2006. Determining the presence and content of
625 polychlorophenols and polychloroanisols in wines, cork stoppers, woods and bentonites
626 used as atmospheric traps.

627 OIV. (2016). *Compendium of International Methods of Analysis of Wines and Musts*. (2016 ed.).
628 Paris (France).

629 Peyches-Bach, A., Moutounet, M., Peyron, S., & Chalier, P. (2009). Factors determining the
630 transport coefficients of aroma compounds through polyethylene films. *Journal of Food*
631 *Engineering*, *95*(1), 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2009.04.012>.

632 Prescott, J., Norris, L., Kunst, M., & Kim, S. (2005). Estimating a "consumer rejection threshold" for
633 cork taint in white wine. *Food Quality and Preference*, *16*(4), 345-349.
634 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2004.05.010>.

635 Ribereau-Gayon, P., & Stonestreet, E. (1965). Le dosage des anthocyanes dans le vin rouge.
636 *Bulletin de la Société Chimique de France*, *9*, 2649-2652.

637 Ribereau-Gayon, P., & Stonestreet, E. (1966). Dosage des tanins du vin rouge et détermination de
638 leur structure. *Chimie Analytique*, *48*(4), 188-196.

639 Riu, M., Mestres, M., Busto, O., & Guasch, J. (2006). Determination of total chloroanisoles in
640 different kinds of cork stoppers. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, *563*, 310-314.
641 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2005.10.045>.

642 Sefton, M. A., & Simpson, R. F. (2005). Compounds causing cork taint and the factors affecting
643 their transfer from natural cork closures to wine - A review. *Australian Journal of Grape*
644 *and Wine Research*, *11*(2), 226-240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0238.2005.tb00290.x>.

- 645 Simpson, R. F., & Sefton, M. A. (2007). Origin and fate of 2,4,6-trichloroanisole in cork bark and
646 wine corks. *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*, 13(2), 106-116.
647 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0238.2007.tb00241.x>.
- 648 Teixeira, M. I. V., San Romao, M. V., Bronze, R. B., & Vilas, B. L. (2006). 2,4,6-trichloroanisole: a
649 consumer panel evaluation. *Ciência Técnica Vitivinícola*, 21(2), 53-65.
- 650 Tempere, S., Schaaper, M. H., Cuzange, E., de Revel, G., & Sicard, G. (2017). Masking of several
651 olfactory notes by infra-threshold concentrations of 2,4,6-trichloroanisole. *Chemosensory*
652 *Perception*, 10(3), 69-80. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12078-017-9227-5>.
- 653 Vidal, S., Puech, C., Fernández, O., Fauveau, C., Pellerin, P., & Vuchot, P. (2007). Utilisation dans le
654 vin d'écorces de levures hautement adsorbantes pour éliminer les goûts de bouchon et de
655 moisissure ou traiter une contamination par l'ochratoxine A. *Revue Française d'Oenologie*,
656 226, 1-7.
- 657 Waterhouse, A. L., Sacks, G. L., & Jeffery, D. W. (2016). *Understanding wine chemistry*. United
658 Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

659

Figure captions

Figure 1. Chromatic parameters of untreated and film-treated wines. (A) colour intensity (CI) and hue; (B) yellow, red and blue components (%).

Figure 2. Descriptive sensory evaluation of untreated wines and film-treated wine perceived as significantly different from untreated wine at the triangle test, for barrel A (A), barrel B (B) and barrel C (C). * Significant at $p < 0.05$.

Figure 1







Figure 2



..... Untreated wine - - - - 8h film-treated wine - . . 24h film-treated wine — 48h film-treated wine

Table 1. Haloanisoles and halophenols evolution of untreated and film-treated wines from barrels A, B and C.

	Haloanisoles				Halophenols			
	TCA	TeCA	PCA	TBA	TCP	TeCP	PCP	TBP
Barrel A								
<i>Untreated wine</i>	1,0	< LoQ	< LoQ	nd	8,1	< LoQ	3,9	< LoQ
<i>8h film-treated wine</i>	< LoQ	< LoQ	< LoQ	nd	8,6	< LoQ	3,1	< LoQ
<i>24h film-treated wine</i>	< LoQ	< LoQ	< LoQ	nd	5,6	< LoQ	3,1	nd
<i>48h film-treated wine</i>	nd	< LoQ	< LoQ	nd	5,4	< LoQ	< LoQ	nd
Barrel B								
<i>Untreated wine</i>	3,0	< LoQ	nd	nd	11,8	< LoQ	5,3	< LoQ
<i>8h film-treated wine</i>	1,6	nd	nd	nd	12,3	< LoQ	< LoQ	< LoQ
<i>24h film-treated wine</i>	0,8	nd	nd	nd	13,8	< LoQ	< LoQ	< LoQ
<i>48h film-treated wine</i>	0,5	nd	nd	nd	11,1	< LoQ	< LoQ	nd
Barrel C								
<i>Untreated wine</i>	9,1	< LoQ	nd	nd	64,3	< LoQ	< LoQ	< LoQ
<i>8h film-treated wine</i>	3,9	nd	nd	nd	59,7	< LoQ	< LoQ	< LoQ
<i>24h film-treated wine</i>	2,3	nd	nd	nd	63,9	< LoQ	< LoQ	< LoQ
<i>48h film-treated wine</i>	1,7	nd	nd	nd	57,4	< LoQ	< LoQ	nd

TCA, 2,4,6-trichloroanisole. TeCA, 2,3,4,6-tetrachloroanisole. PCA, pentachloroanisole. TBA, 2,4,6-tribromoanisole. TCP, 2,4,6-trichlorophenol. TeCP, 2,3,4,6-tetrachlorophenol. PCP, pentachlorophenol. TBP, 2,4,6-tribromophenol. LoQ, limit of quantification. nd, not detected. All results were expressed in ng/L wine.

Table 2. Total phenolic, total proanthocyanidin, and total anthocyanin contents of untreated and film-treated wines from barrels A, B and C.

	Total phenolics ^a	Total proanthocyanidins ^b	Total anthocyanins ^c
Barrel A			
<i>Untreated wine</i>	2891 ± 36 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,2 <i>b</i>	133,4 ± 4,0 <i>b</i>
<i>8h film-treated wine</i>	2876 ± 45 <i>a</i>	3,7 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>	138,8 ± 4,6 <i>ab</i>
<i>24h film-treated wine</i>	2874 ± 87 <i>a</i>	4,1 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	147,0 ± 3,4 <i>ab</i>
<i>48h film-treated wine</i>	2766 ± 36 <i>b</i>	3,6 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>	149,5 ± 9,3 <i>a</i>
Barrel B			
<i>Untreated wine</i>	2781 ± 77 <i>a</i>	3,7 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	171,9 ± 3,4 <i>a</i>
<i>8h film-treated wine</i>	2782 ± 125 <i>a</i>	4,1 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	177,2 ± 5,6 <i>a</i>
<i>24h film-treated wine</i>	2750 ± 68 <i>a</i>	3,8 ± 0,3 <i>a</i>	175,1 ± 7,6 <i>a</i>
<i>48h film-treated wine</i>	2852 ± 57 <i>a</i>	3,6 ± 0,6 <i>a</i>	165,1 ± 2,2 <i>a</i>
Barrel C			
<i>Untreated wine</i>	2847 ± 134 <i>a</i>	3,7 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	144,9 ± 10,2 <i>b</i>
<i>8h film-treated wine</i>	2814 ± 122 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,3 <i>a</i>	160,2 ± 7,2 <i>ab</i>
<i>24h film-treated wine</i>	2809 ± 117 <i>a</i>	3,6 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	171,1 ± 5,5 <i>a</i>
<i>48h film-treated wine</i>	2852 ± 67 <i>a</i>	3,6 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	169,6 ± 3,8 <i>a</i>

All results are reported as mean values ± standard deviation. ^aTotal phenolics expressed as mg gallic acid/L wine. ^bTotal proanthocyanidins expressed as g tannins/L wine. ^cTotal anthocyanins expressed as mg malvidin/L wine. For each spectrophotometric measurement, lower case letters a–b show significant differences between untreated and film-treated wines from each barrel separately ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Anthocyanin profile of untreated and film-treated wines from barrels A, B and C.

	Barrel A				Barrel B				Barrel C			
	Untreated wine	8h film-treated wine	24h film-treated wine	48h film-treated wine	Untreated wine	8h film-treated wine	24h film-treated wine	48h film-treated wine	Untreated wine	8h film-treated wine	24h film-treated wine	48h film-treated wine
<i>Dp-3O-glc</i>	5,8 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>	6,0 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	6,1 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	6,1 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	6,5 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	6,7 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	6,7 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	6,7 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,6 ± 0,1 <i>c</i>	6,1 ± 0,0 <i>b</i>	6,3 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	6,2 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>
<i>Cy-3O-glc</i>	3,7 ± 0,0 <i>b</i>	3,8 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,8 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,8 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,8 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	3,9 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,9 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,9 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,7 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,8 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,8 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,8 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>
<i>Pt-3O-glc</i>	5,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,4 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,7 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,9 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,9 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,9 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	5,1 ± 0,0 <i>b</i>	5,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,5 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>
<i>Pn-3O-glc</i>	5,3 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,4 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	5,4 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,6 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,7 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,7 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	5,8 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,2 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>	5,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	5,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>
<i>Mlv-3O-glc</i>	11,8 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>	12,7 ± 0,3 <i>a</i>	12,8 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	12,6 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	13,7 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>	14,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	14,4 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	14,4 ± 0,2 <i>a</i>	11,3 ± 0,1 <i>c</i>	12,8 ± 0,0 <i>b</i>	13,1 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	12,9 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>
<i>Pn-3O-acgld</i>	3,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,4 ± 0,0 <i>b</i>	3,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	3,4 ± 0,0 <i>ab</i>
<i>Mlv-3O-acgld</i>	4,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	4,4 ± 0,1 <i>a</i>	4,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	4,4 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	4,7 ± 0,0 <i>b</i>	4,8 ± 0,1 <i>ab</i>	4,8 ± 0,1 <i>ab</i>	4,9 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>	4,3 ± 0,1 <i>b</i>	4,4 ± 0,0 <i>ab</i>	4,4 ± 0,1 <i>ab</i>	4,5 ± 0,0 <i>a</i>

All results are reported as mean values ± standard deviation and expressed in mg malvidin/L wine. *Glc*, monoglucoside; *acgld*, 6"-acetylglucoside; *Dp*, delphinidin; *Cy*, cyaniding; *Pt*, petunidin; *Pn*, peonidin; *Mlv*, malvidin. For each individual anthocyanin, lower case letters *a–c* show significant differences between untreated and film-treated wines from each barrel separately ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4. Fruity and woody aroma evolution of untreated and film-treated wines from barrels A, B and C.

	Barrel A				Barrel B				Barrel C			
	Untreated wine ^a	8h film-treated wine ^b	24h film-treated wine ^b	48h film-treated wine ^b	Untreated wine ^a	8h film-treated wine ^b	24h film-treated wine ^b	48h film-treated wine ^b	Untreated wine ^a	8h film-treated wine ^b	24h film-treated wine ^b	48h film-treated wine ^b
Fruity aroma												
<i>Ethyl esters of straight-chain fatty acids</i>												
<i>Ethyl propanoate</i>	262,4 ± 15,2	ns	ns	ns	297,0 ± 15,2	ns	ns	ns	283,0 ± 18,5	ns	ns	ns
<i>Ethyl butanoate</i>	123,8 ± 3,6	ns	ns	ns	132,4 ± 8,1	ns	ns	ns	129,3 ± 9,3	ns	ns	ns
<i>Ethyl hexanoate</i>	141,9 ± 5,6 a	ns	- 21% b	- 21% b	148,4 ± 6,1 a	- 17% b	- 19% b	- 26% b	148,3 ± 9,9 a	ns	- 19% b	- 24% b
<i>Ethyl octanoate</i>	115,3 ± 6,5 a	- 48% b	- 69% c	- 76% c	118,4 ± 10,2 a	- 54% b	- 70% c	- 78% d	115,9 ± 8,1 a	- 42% b	- 63% c	- 73% d
<i>Ethyl decanoate</i>	40,3 ± 1,8 a	- 48% b	- 62% c	- 80% d	32,9 ± 0,2 a	- 58% b	- 77% c	- 82% d	41,9 ± 0,1 a	- 51% b	- 72% c	- 81% d
<i>Ethyl dodecanoate</i>	9,5 ± 0,0 a	- 53% b	- 65% c	- 81% d	7,5 ± 0,0 a	- 50% b	- 64% c	- 81% d	9,7 ± 0,7 a	- 31% b	- 60% c	- 82% d
<i>Higher alcohol acetates</i>												
<i>Isobutyl acetate</i>	61,2 ± 1,4	ns	ns	ns	66,2 ± 2,4	ns	ns	ns	60,1 ± 4,6	ns	ns	ns
<i>Isoamyl acetate</i>	267,9 ± 4,0	ns	ns	ns	274,1 ± 10,2 a	ns	ns	- 7,7% b	252,6 ± 20,4	ns	ns	ns
<i>Propyl acetate</i>	20,4 ± 1,6	ns	ns	ns	21,8 ± 0,5	ns	ns	ns	19,9 ± 0,9 b	+14% a	+8% a	+10% a
<i>Butyl acetate</i>	11,3 ± 0,1	ns	ns	ns	11,7 ± 0,9	ns	ns	ns	11,3 ± 0,2	ns	ns	ns
<i>Ethyl esters branched acids</i>												
<i>Ethyl isobutyrate</i>	191,2 ± 7,0	ns	ns	ns	201,8 ± 2,1	ns	ns	ns	214,8 ± 16,6	ns	ns	ns
<i>Ethyl 2-methylbutanoate</i>	23,8 ± 1,1	ns	ns	ns	23,5 ± 0,7	ns	ns	ns	27,2 ± 1,7 a	ns	- 14% b	- 16% b
<i>Ethyl 3-methylbutanoate</i>	38,3 ± 2,9	ns	ns	ns	35,6 ± 1,5	ns	ns	ns	39,0 ± 1,1 a	- 11% b	- 15% bc	- 16% c
Woody aroma												
<i>trans-whiskeylactone</i>	277,6 ± 11,7	ns	ns	ns	514,4 ± 25,1	ns	ns	ns	238,5 ± 10,4	ns	ns	ns
<i>cis-whiskeylactone</i>	350,6 ± 1,8	ns	ns	ns	400,8 ± 12,0	ns	ns	ns	462,3 ± 23,0	ns	ns	ns
<i>Eugenol</i>	11,3 ± 0,3	ns	ns	ns	11,6 ± 0,4	ns	ns	ns	10,8 ± 0,2	ns	ns	ns
<i>Vanillin</i>	1207,4 ± 33,3	ns	ns	ns	1353,1 ± 14,8 a	- 13% b	- 28% b	- 26% b	1269,2 ± 105,2	ns	ns	ns

^a Reported as mean values ± standard deviation and expressed in µg/L wine. ^b Expressed in decline percentages during film treatment with regard to untreated wine. ns, no significant differences with regard to the untreated wine. For each individual aromatic compound, lower case letters a–d show significant differences between untreated and film-treated wines from each barrel separately ($p < 0.05$).