Examination of the potential for using chemical analysis as a surrogate for sensory analysis

John Blackman a, Douglas N. Rutledge b, Dejan Tesic a,1, Anthony Saliba a, Geoffrey R. Scollary c,∗

a National Wine and Grape Industry Centre, School of Agricultural and Wine Sciences, Charles Sturt University, Locked Bag 588, Wagga Wagga, 2678, Australia
b Laboratoire de Chimie Analytique, AgroParisTech. 16, rue Claude Bernard, 75905 Paris, France
c School of Chemistry, The University of Melbourne, Swanston St, Parkville, Vic 3010, Australia

Abstract

The application of a multi-block statistical analysis method, known as Common Components and Specific Weight Analysis, to the determination of connections between sensory descriptors and analytical data for Hunter Valley Semillon is described. Sixteen wines were used in the data analysis with 15 sensory descriptors and 10 analytical measurements available for each wine. The multi-block analysis simplifies the comparison between the data sets and allows relationships between the sensory and analytical parameters to be readily ascertained, more effectively than a linear regression approach. A sweetness zone established the connections between several sensory descriptors and analytical measurements based on fructose. Glucose was not part of the sweetness connections, although glycerol was connected to the sensory sweetness descriptors. Sensory assessment of acidity was positively related to the titratable acidity and pH was negatively related. The malic acid concentration was also negatively related to sensory acidity and the possible reasons for this are described. Several sensory descriptors including toast, honey and kerosene were found to be in opposition to the sweetness sensory parameters and not connected to any analytical parameters. The outcomes of this multi-block treatment indicate the potential for using analytical measurements as a surrogate for sensory analysis.

© 2009 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Sensory analysis involves the application of human senses to the description and/or evaluation of a product for consumer use. Rigorous sensory analysis involves a panel of assessors that have been trained for a specific evaluation. For example, the determination of descriptors to characterise a wine style or to assess the impact of a processing step on the wine style is now a routine practice. Each separate sensory exercise, however, requires an intensive training program for the assessors.

A full sensory analysis, particularly descriptive, texture and time-intensity analyses, are complex processes demanding considerable time with an associated high cost. A proper sensory analysis of a food or beverage, including wine, can take at least 3 months and possibly 6 months of training and application. Extensive training is necessary to ensure consistency in and between assessors. The time period demands commitment from panel members and this in turn implies a high cost of the operation [1]. The time and cost factors restrict the extent to which full sensory analysis can be routinely applied.

The generation of analytical measurements for a range of quality parameters related to aroma, flavour and texture is faster, generally less expensive and more objective than sensory analysis. That is analytical measurements, when properly collected, do not suffer from bias due to personal preference [2]. The application of chemometrics to the interpretation of analytical data has opened up many interesting possibilities in food and beverage studies, particularly with respect to process monitoring, determination of geographical origin, authentication, adulteration and substitution [3–6].

The possibility of using analytical data as a surrogate for sensory data is less well examined, although Lesschaeve [personal communication] argues that this has been a sought after goal in many studies over the last 20 or more years. This position is supported by Piggott [7], who argues that flavour cannot be measured directly by instruments. That is only individual chemical compounds can be measured quantitatively by instrumental analysis and not the interactions between them that give rise to flavour.

While there have been several studies examining the link between sensory properties and aroma compounds, the main focus has tended to be on validation of the product type or characterising
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its origin. For example, there have been studies examining the link between sensory properties and non-volatile and volatile parameters on dry-cured ham [8], drinking water [9], balsamic vinegar [10], broiler chicken cuts [11] and netted muskmelon [12]. Bakker and Arnold [13] have described the positive relationship between sensory perception and chemical data for colour in port wines, while Kennedy et al. have examined the relationship between several methods of tannin analysis in red wines and perceived astringency [14]. Neural networks have been applied to modelling the sensory characteristics in Scotch whiskey [2] and beer [15]. The potential of instrumental texture measurements as a substitute for the sensory assessment of grape berry ripening properties has been evaluated [16].

A predictive model for the characterisation of the aromas in coffee based on the correlation between descriptive sensory profiling and analytical measurement obtained by proton transfer reaction-mass spectrometry [17] opens up new possibilities for using chemical analysis as a surrogate for sensory analysis. Principal Component Analysis was used in this coffee study. The recent advances in chemometric methods for the interpretation of multi-block data have provided new methodologies for data treatment [18]. Multi-block methods facilitate the comparison of different blocks of variables describing the same samples, highlighting similarities and differences among the blocks and also among the variables within each block. The present study investigates the potential of using a multi-block technique known as Common Components and Specific Weight Analysis [19] to the comparison of sensory descriptors and chemical analysis of a white wine. Semillon wine from the Hunter Valley, Australia, was chosen for this study. This wine is characterised by its low alcohol concentration (about 10%, v/v), high acidity (pH 3.2 or less), low residual sugar and capacity for ageing [20,21].

2. Experimental

2.1. Wine samples

Sixteen Semillon wines from the Hunter Valley, Australia, were provided by wine companies supporting a major study entitled ‘Matching Semillon characteristics to consumer expectations’. All wines were in bottle and opened only for sensory and chemical analysis. The selected wines spanned 10 vintages.

2.2. Chemical analysis

Table 1 contains the analytical parameters for the 16 Semillon wines. Glucose and fructose concentrations were determined using a d-glucose/o-fructose enzymatic kit from Boehringer (Mannheim, Germany). The total glucose plus fructose concentration (Total \((G+F)\) in Table 1) was obtained by summing the individual values, while the sugar sweetness response was calculated as \(\text{glucose} + 2.382 \times \text{fructose}\) concentration to allow for the enhanced sweetness of fructose with respect to glucose and to allow for its earlier perception [22]. Malic acid was determined enzymatically using a l-malic acid kit from Boehringer (Mannheim, Germany). Glycerol was also determined enzymatically using a Megazyme K-GCROL kit (Megazyme International Ireland Ltd.). The pH and titratable acidity (TA) were assessed using a Cyberscan 510 pH meter, with the TA being determined by titration to pH 8.2 with sodium hydroxide and quoted as gram tartaric acid equivalents per litre. The volatile acidity was determined using a Foss Winescan™ analyser. An Anton Parr Alcolyser DMA 450 density meter was used to determine the alcohol concentration.

2.3. Sensory analysis

The sensory descriptors were determined by a panel composed of six females and nine males aged 21–45 years. An exhaustive list of descriptors was gradually refined during a 9-week period in May–July 2007 such that 15 common descriptors were included in the final testing. The inclusion criteria followed the international standard ISO 11035:94 [23], where consideration was given to the relevance to Hunter Valley Semillon, the discrimination between samples afforded and the panel’s ability to detect and easily recognise each descriptor.

The descriptors, acidity and sweetness, could be considered to be taste parameters, while the remaining 13 descriptors characterise the aroma profile. Table 2 (taken from [24]) summarises the sensory data used in this analysis.

2.4. Data analysis

Simple linear regressions and multiple linear regressions were performed on the sensory and analytical parameters using Statistics 7.1 (StatSoft, Inc., 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis code</th>
<th>A1 Glucose</th>
<th>A2 Fructose</th>
<th>A3 Total ((G+F))</th>
<th>A4 Sugar sweetness response</th>
<th>A5 Titratable acidity</th>
<th>A6 pH</th>
<th>A7 Alcohol</th>
<th>A8 Malic acid</th>
<th>A9 Volatile acidity</th>
<th>A10 Glycerol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wine code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Total \((G+F)\), sum of the glucose \((G)\) and fructose \((F)\) concentration.

\(b\) Sugar sweetness response; see text for details of calculation.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensory code</th>
<th>S1 LEMON/LIME</th>
<th>S2 FLORAL</th>
<th>S3 GRAPE</th>
<th>S4 PINE</th>
<th>S5 HAY/STRAW</th>
<th>S6 ORANGE</th>
<th>S7 HONEY</th>
<th>S8 TOAST</th>
<th>S9 GRASSY</th>
<th>S10 ASPARAGUS</th>
<th>S11 LYCHEE</th>
<th>S12 KEROSENE</th>
<th>S13 CONFECTIONARY</th>
<th>S14 ACIDITY</th>
<th>S15 SWEETNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wine code</td>
<td>A 5.24</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 3.73</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C 4.29</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 4.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 4.08</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 3.20</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G 5.37</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 3.75</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J 4.50</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 4.18</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L 3.98</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 4.55</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 3.74</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O 4.50</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 4.51</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Results and discussion

The correlations among all the analytical variables (columns and rows 1–10) and sensory variables (11–25) are presented graphically in Fig. 1 (see also Supplementary Fig. S1) where it is clear that the positive and negative correlations are much stronger within the sensory variables block than between the analytical and the sensory variables blocks. Supplementary Figs. S2–S4 show the correlations between all pairs of analytical parameters, all pairs of sensory parameters and sensory and analytical parameters respectively.

Table 3 and also Fig. S4 present a summary of the correlations found by this approach. The sensory SWEETNESS (S15) score is clearly significantly correlated with the analytical measures of residual sugar that is with the total sugar concentration adjusted for the enhanced sweetness of fructose (A3, A4). Similarly, the CONFECTIONARY (S13) sensory descriptor also tended to correlate with the analytical measures of residual sugar, that is with the total sugar concentration adjusted for the enhanced sweetness of fructose (A3, A4). The sensory ACIDITY (S14) score is significantly correlated with titratable acidity (A5) and shows significant, but negative, correlations with malic acid (A8) and pH (A6). Although a strong negative link between pH and sensory assessment of acidity is logical, it is somewhat unexpected here, given the narrow range of pH values.
Correlation parameters for linear regression analysis between sensory scores and analytical data. Data analysis performed using Statistica 7.1 (StatSoft, Inc., 2005).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensory descriptor</th>
<th>Analytical parameter *</th>
<th>Correlation, r</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Standard error of estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWEETNESS</td>
<td>Total (G + F)</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEETNESS</td>
<td>Sugar sweetness response</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFECTIONARY</td>
<td>Total (G + F)</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFECTIONARY</td>
<td>Sugar sweetness response</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.0120</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIDITY</td>
<td>pH</td>
<td>-0.829</td>
<td>0.00007</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIDITY</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIDITY</td>
<td>Malic acid</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
<td>0.0430</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORAL</td>
<td>Total (G + F)</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORAL</td>
<td>Sugar sweetness response</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORAL</td>
<td>Glycerol</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.0322</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMON/LIME</td>
<td>Glycerol</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINEAPPLE</td>
<td>Glycerol</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.0263</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRASSY</td>
<td>Glycerol</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPARAGUS</td>
<td>pH</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPARAGUS</td>
<td>Malic acid</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE MARMALADE</td>
<td>Volatile acidity</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.0448</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total G + F, sum of the glucose (G) and fructose (F) concentration; sugar sweetness response: see text for details of calculation.

do pH values of these wines, from pH 2.84 to pH 3.16 (Table 1). The malic acid correlation is discussed in more detail below.

Intriguingly, positive and significant correlations were also found between some analytical measurements and aroma sensory scores (Table 3). For example, FLORAL sensory score (S2) is positively correlated with fructose (A2), the total residual sugar score (A3) and sugar sweetness response (A4) as well as with the glycerol concentration (A10). Glycerol also showed a relationship with LEMON/LIME, FLORAL, PINEAPPLE (S1–S4) and GRASSY (S9). There was a positive correlation between ASPARAGUS (S10) with pH (A6) and malic acid (A8) as well as between ORANGE MARMALADE (S6) and volatile acidity (A9), a reflection of acetic acid in the main.

This initial linear regression analysis implied that the potential for developing a model that used analytical data as a surrogate for sensory descriptors might be achievable. Several of the sweetness and acidity correlations are very significant when the probability values and standard errors (Table 3) are considered. Several of the other correlations in Table 3 are also moderately strong, implying that there may be a real relationship. This suggested that an in-depth analysis of the relation among sensory and analytical parameters using the more sophisticated multi-block ComDim analysis would be of value.

Several relations of proximity and opposition can be seen in the projection of the sensory and analytical parameters onto the CD1–CD2 plot (Fig. 2). It is clear that there are several regions of related descriptors in the CD1–CD2 plot. The region labelled Sweetness represents the commonality between the mouthfeel sensory parameter of SWEETNESS (S15), the aroma parameters of LEMON/LIME (S1), FLORAL (S2), GRAPEFRUIT (S3), PINEAPPLE (S4), GRASSY (S9), LYCHEE (S11) and CONFECTIONARY (S15) and the analytical parameters of fructose (A2) and glycerol (A10) and the calculated parameters of total glucose + fructose (A3) and sugar sweetness (A4). These groupings of descriptors are in general agreement with the linear regression analysis (Fig. 1 and Table 3), but of course the multi-block ComDim data are presented on a single map, rather than calculated individually as in linear regression.

Glucose (A1) is not part of the Sweetness region, but perhaps this is not surprising, given its zero to low concentrations in the wines examined here (Table 1). Ethanol (A7), which is sometimes considered to show sweetness [25], is not part of the Sweetness region. The ethanol concentration in the 16 wines is essentially invariant (Table 1), so it is reasonable to expect that it would not have any commonality with the common dimensions identified here.

The inclusion of glycerol (A10) in the Sweetness region is intriguing. Glycerol is known to affect various sensory attributes including sweetness, acidity, mouthfeel and viscosity. However, the actual concentration at which these attributes are expressed is the subject of considerable debate. Gawel et al. [26] found varying taster responses to different concentrations of glycerol. Noble and Bursick [27] suggested that additions of 26 g L⁻¹ of glycerol were necessary before an increase in viscosity could be perceived, while Nurgel and Pickering [28] claimed a perceived increase in viscosity could be detected as the glycerol concentration increased from 10 to 25 g L⁻¹ in a model wine. Intriguingly, the glycerol concentration in the wine studied here is much less than that for the levels examined by others. Clarification of these conflicting reports is outside the scope of this present work, but the ComDim analysis used here may well have the capacity to provide a better interpretation of published data and lead the way to a better understanding of the sensory aspects of glycerol in wine.

Two opposing relations of Acidity are identified in the ComDim variables plot for CD1 and CD2 (Fig. 2). One zone in the positive CD2 direction contains the sensory attribute ACIDITY (S14) and the analytical parameter titratable acidity (A5). Titratable acidity is a measure of the amount of acid present in the wine, so the commonality with the sensory acidity attribute is to be expected. The second Acidity zone in the negative CD2 direction contains only the analytical parameters of pH (A6) and malic acid (A8). The placement of pH opposed to sensory acidity is also as expected, given
its negative relationship with acid concentration, as noted above with the linear regression analysis. The placement of malic acid is unexpected, but also in accord with the linear regression analysis (Table 3 and Fig. S2).

Malic acid is sometimes regarded as ‘green’, while tartaric acid is considered to be ‘hard’[29]. The relative acid taste of these two acids in white wine is still the subject of debate. Early work by Amerine et al.[30] on white wine showed that at the same titratable acidity, malic acid is perceived as more acidic, reflected as an increase in sourness. Relative sourness was also found to be higher for malic acid when the wines were adjusted to the same pH[30]. Noble et al.[31] focused on a comparison of sourness of organic acid anions at equal pH and equal titratable acidity in binary acid solutions. Only succinic acid (a minor component of wine) was found to be more sour than malic acid. Lugaz et al.[32] in a study of the time-intensity effects of organic acids on saliva suggested that it is the hydrogen ion that is the stimulus and not the neutral acid molecule or its monoanion.

In the Hunter Valley Semillon wines used here, the pH is generally around 3.2 or less and the malic acid concentration is only a small component of the titratable acidity (Table 1). The main acid is tartaric acid, a stronger acid than malic acid (pK$_a$1 (tartaric): 2.93; pK$_a$1 (malic): 3.46), suggesting that the hydrogen ion may well be the dominating factor in determining sensory acidity. Clearly more work is required, and the multi-block analysis approach used here may well provide greater insight into the competing effects than has been possible in earlier studies.

The sensory aromas fall into two categories: one group (labelled Aromas in Fig. 2) consists of HAY/STRAW (S5), ORANGE MARMALADE (S6), HONEY (S7), TOAST (S8) and KEROSENE (S12). There is no commonality between these sensory attributes and the analytical measurements used here. These same attributes are in opposition to the sweetness aroma attributes of LEMON/LIME (S1), FLORAL (S2), GRAPEFRUIT (S3), PINEAPPLE (S4), LYCHEE (S11) and CONFECTIONARY (S13) (Fig. 2). LEMON/LIME (S1), GRAPEFRUIT (S3), PINEAPPLE (S4), LYCHEE (S11) and ORANGE MARMALADE (S6) and volatile acidity (A9) in the CD1–CD2 plot, despite the correlation observed using linear regression (Table 3 and Fig. S4). This confirms the weakness of that correlation.

The CD2–CD3 plot (Fig. 3) confirms the strong connection among the analytical sweetness parameters A2, A3, A4. The unexpected proximity of pH (A6), malic acid (A8) and volatile acidity (A9) with titratable acidity (A5) and ACIDITY (S14) in opposition, is also confirmed in this plot. HONEY (S7) and SWEETNESS (S15) are at this time in the same quadrant as glucose (A1).

### 4. Conclusion

In summary, the multi-block analysis, ComDim, has provided considerable insight into the connections between analytical data and sensory descriptors for Hunter Valley Semillon. Zones for Sweetness and Acidity describing the connections between various analytical and sensory parameters were readily identified. The orthogonal relationship between the analytical measurement for malic acid and the sensory score for acidity opens up the possibility of further research on the factors contributing to acid taste. One group of aroma sensory attributes did not show any connection with the analytical data used in this analysis. A GC–MS study of the aroma compounds in these Semillon wines is presently underway. The future inclusion of these data in the multi-block analysis may provide information on connections in addition to those already identified.
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