

On-field monitoring of fruit ripening evolution and quality parameters in olive mutants using a portable NIR-AOTF device

1

2 Marco Cirilli^a, Stefania Urbani^b, Maurizio Servili^b, Sonia Esposito^b, Fabio Mencarelli^c, Andrea
3 Bellincontro^{c*} and Rosario Muleo^{a*}

4

5 ^aDepartment of Agriculture, Forestry, Nature and Energy (DAFNE) - Molecular Ecophysiology of
6 Woody Plant Laboratory, University of Tuscia, Viterbo, Via San Camillo de Lellis snc, 01100
7 Viterbo, Italy

8 ^bDepartment of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Sciences, University of Perugia, Via S.
9 Costanzo, 06126 Perugia, Italy

10 ^cDepartment for Innovation in Biological Agro-food and Forest systems (DIBAF) - Postharvest
11 Laboratory, University of Tuscia, Viterbo, Via San Camillo de Lellis snc, 01100 Viterbo, Italy

12

13 **Corresponding authors:**

14 *Phone: 0039 0761 357532 Fax: 0039 0761 357531, E-mail: muleo@unitus.it

15 *Phone: 0039 0761 3575 Fax: 0039 0761 3575, E-mail: bellin@unitus.it

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Abstract**

26 This study optimizes the application of portable Near Infrared-Acousto Optically Tunable
27 Filter (NIR) device to meet the increasing demand for cost-effective, non-invasive and easy-to-use
28 methods for measuring physical and chemical properties during olive fruit development. Fruits from
29 different phenotypically cultivars were sampled for firmness, total and specific phenols detection by
30 HPLC, total anthocyanins, chlorophyll and carotenoids detection by spectrophotometry. On the
31 same fruits, a portable NIR device in diffuse reflectance mode was employed for spectral
32 detections. Predictive models for firmness, chlorophyll, anthocyanins, carotenoids and rutin were
33 developed by Partial Least Square analysis. Oleuropein, verbascoside, 3,4-DHPEA-EDA, and total
34 phenols were used to develop a validation model. Internal cross-validation was applied for
35 calibration and predictive models. The standard errors for calibration, cross-validation, prediction,
36 and RPD ratios (SD/SECV) were calculated as references for the model effectiveness. The
37 determination of the optimal harvesting time facilitates the production of high quality extra virgin
38 olive oil and table olives.

39
40 **Keywords:** olive fruits, total phenols, oleuropein, verbascoside, rutin, NIR-AOTF spectroscopy,
41 firmness, partial least square regression (PLSR)

42 **Chemical compounds studied in this article**

43 Rutin (PubChem CID: 5280805); Oleuropein (PubChem CID: 5281544); Verbascoside (PubChem
44 CID: 5281800).

45

46

47

48

49

50

51 **1. Introduction**

52 Virgin olive oil (VOO) is a key component of the Mediterranean diet, which is associated
53 with a reduced risk of cardiovascular disease as well as colon and prostate cancers (Tuck &
54 Hayball, 2002). Several studies have linked the health-benefits of VOO to its unique characteristics
55 with respect to other vegetables oils, namely the high content of monounsaturated fatty acids, the
56 balanced content of polyunsaturated fatty acid and the presence of at least 30 phenolic compounds
57 having antioxidant and radical scavenging activities (Servili et al., 2009).

58 In addition to genetic properties, agronomics and environmental factors, the production of
59 high-quality VOO strongly depends on the degree of ripening of olive drupes. Ripening is the
60 process of physiological and biochemical changes by which drupes attain several key quality
61 parameters such as color, texture, flavor and nutritional properties (Conde, Delrot, & Gerós, 2008;
62 García, Seller, & Pérez-Camino, 1996). During ripening, the olive fruit undergoes a color shift
63 owing to a progressive decrease of total chlorophyll and carotenoids followed by the appearance of
64 anthocyanins, hydrophilic pigments, conferring the typical purple/black color of mature drupes
65 (Mínguez-Mosquera, & Gallardo-Guerrero, 1991). In contrast to anthocyanins, chlorophylls and
66 carotenoids are lipid-soluble and, therefore, contribute to olive oil colour (Moyano, Melendez-
67 Martinez, Alba, & Heredia, 2008). Both groups of compounds have functional properties because
68 they affect the oxidative stability of olive oil, and carotenoids are also vitamin-A precursors
69 (Aparicio-Ruiz, Gandul-Rojas, & Roca, 2009). The evolution profile of phenolic compounds during
70 olive fruit maturation has been extensively investigated as their content strongly influences
71 sensorial attributes, shelf life and the nutritional value of olive oil (Alagna et al., 2012).

72 The secoiridoids oleuropein and ligstroside as well as their aglycon forms are the main
73 phenols present in olive fruit. Their concentrations reach relatively high levels in the earlier stages
74 of drupe growth, after which they sharply decline, particularly during maturation. The extent of
75 decrement varies widely among the cultivars, and it depends strongly on environmental conditions
76 (Romani, Mulinacci, Pinelli, Vinciert, & Cimato, 1999). Olive fruit also contains an appreciable

77 amount of flavonoids, mainly luteolin, apigenin, quercetin-3-rutinoside (rutin) and anthocyanins
78 (Servili & Montedoro, 2002). Some of these compounds are also found in olive oil and may
79 contribute to its antioxidant properties (Carrasco-Pancorbo et al., 2006). The leucocarpa variety is a
80 natural mutant producing drupes with an ivory-white color at the ripening, due to the very low or
81 null accumulation of flavonoid compounds (Pasqualone et al., 2012).

82 Olive drupe maturation is associated with changes in the cell wall structure and composition
83 that lead to a modification of the fruit texture as well as a progressive loss of firmness due to
84 enzymatic activity involved in the degradation of cell wall polysaccharides (Jiménez et al., 2001a).
85 The major textural changes, which generally occur concomitantly with color appearance, are driven
86 by the solubilization of pectins and the reduction of tightly bound hemicelluloses (Jiménez et al.,
87 2001b). Firmness correlates with drupe resistance to mechanical damage, an important parameter
88 for storage and processing (García, Seller, & Pérez-Camino, 1996). It has been demonstrated in
89 many studies on grape berries that changes in the textural characteristics during maturation strongly
90 affect the extractability of phenolic compounds and other metabolites during winemaking (Rolle,
91 Torchio, Zeppa, & Gerbi, 2009). The importance of textural characteristics are also well-known in
92 the olive oil industry, which has long introduced enzymatic preparations during milling process,
93 which aids in degrading olive fruit cell-wall and improves oil yield and phenol extraction (Vierhuis
94 et al., 2001).

95 Several indices have been developed to evaluate the degree of olive drupe ripening, with the
96 goal of establishing an optimum balance between olive yield and quality. The most widely used
97 indices are based on simple and easily detectable parameters such as color, firmness, oil content and
98 sugar content (García, Seller, & Pérez-Camino, 1996). However, the application of these indices is
99 affected by many factors in the ripening process, including the properties of different cultivars. The
100 use of NIR spectroscopy possesses many advantages over traditional destructive approaches,
101 including simplicity, sensitivity and high-throughput. NIR spectroscopy allows simultaneous
102 monitoring of several parameters as well as repeated analysis of the same samples, which can be

103 used to obtain good predictive models for olive moisture, dry matter, oil content and free acidity
104 (Cayuela & Pérez-Camino, 2010). Marquez, Díaz and Reguera, (2005) applied an NIR sensor
105 during olive processing for real-time evaluation of oil acidity, bitter taste and fatty acids
106 composition. NIR spectroscopy has also been applied successfully to detect the fraudulent addition
107 of other vegetable oils to the olive oil (Wesley, Barnes, & McGill, 1995) and to determine
108 geographic origin (Galtier, et al., 2007). In a recent paper, Bellincontro et al. (2012) applied NIR-
109 AOTF spectroscopy to the on-field measurement of the evolution of the total phenolic profile and
110 other specific metabolites during olive fruit ripening, obtaining good predictive models. In
111 horticultural foods, fruit firmness is measured by puncture-based tests following the Magness-
112 Taylor procedure or using a texture analyzer or hand-held penetrometer to measure the maximum
113 penetration force and other related parameters (Chen, & Opara, 2013). The application of NIR
114 spectroscopy for the analysis of textural parameters has often led to unsatisfactory results in other
115 fruits (Nicolai et al., 2007). Difficulties arise from several factors, including the high instrumental
116 error of puncture-based tests, the variability of firmness values and, in general, the development of a
117 calibration model to predict an index that is not directly associable with a chemical species. In olive
118 fruit, Kavdir et al. (2009) applied NIRS for predicting firmness using the Magness-Taylor (MT)
119 maximum force as reference measure, obtaining a barely acceptable R^2 value of approximately 0.7
120 in cross-validation. Beghi et al. (2013) obtained a similar value, where the predictive model was
121 developed using a portable penetrometer as the reference measure.

122 The purpose of this work was to develop a NIRS-based approach for on-field monitoring of
123 olive drupe physical properties (i.e., texture, total chlorophylls, total carotenoids, total anthocyanin,
124 total and specific phenolic compounds) during ripening in three cultivars with extremely different
125 genetic and phenotypic properties. The three cultivars considered were Leccino and Buscionetto,
126 known in olive oil production as high and low phenolic content fruits, respectively (Bartolini,
127 2015), and the cv. Leucocarpa mutant, which synthesizes very low amount of flavonoids
128 (Pasqualone et al., 2012).

129 All of the results obtained were combined and used as reference data to compare with NIR
130 spectra, with the aim of developing accurate predictive models. These models could be used to
131 implement a rapid and functional method for determining, through a multiparametric approach, the
132 most advantageous harvesting time for high quality VOO production.

133

134 **2. Materials and Methods**

135 *2.1 Plant material*

136 Olive plants of from the cvs Leccino and Leucocarpa were cultivated at the experimental
137 farm of the University of Tuscia (42°250' N, 12°080' E), whereas those of the cv. Buscionetto were
138 at the ARSIAL field collection, located at Montopoli in Sabina (42°12' N, 12°38' E). The plants
139 were rain fed and fertilized in the spring, receiving a total of approx. 90 g of N, P₂O₅ and K₂O.
140 Drupes of the cv. Leccino are categorized as fruit with 'high phenolic content,' whereas those of
141 Buscionetto are considered to have a 'low phenolic content' the drupes of the cv. Leucocarpa are
142 defined as fruit without any accumulation of anthocyanin compounds (Pasqualone et al., 2012).
143 Drupes were randomly harvested from those positioned in the equatorial part of the entire canopy
144 for three plants from each cultivar. The fruits were sampled according to phenological observations
145 during the ripening process. At each sampling time point, a total number of 30 drupes were
146 collected and split into three aliquots of 10 drupes each. Texture analysis and NIR spectra
147 acquisition were rapidly performed on the collected fruit. The drupes were then immediately frozen
148 in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until destructive analysis was performed.

149 *2.2 Ripeness Index*

150 The ripening index (RI) was determined according to the method described by the
151 International Olive Oil Council (Salvador, Aranda, & Fregapane, 2001), and the ripening
152 developmental period was split into four stages according to the work of Conde, Delrot & Gerós
153 (2008). For this purpose, 100 drupes were randomly sampled as previously described and divided
154 into color groups according to the spread of pigmentation on the pericarp and mesocarp of the fruit.

155 The scale for color grouping varied from 0 (intense green) to 7 (100% colored of pericarp and
156 mesocarp). The index was calculated as the weighted average number of drupes within each subset
157 of samples.

158 *2.3 Fruit firmness measurement*

159 Olive firmness was estimated using a deformation test carried out on an Instron Universal
160 Testing Machine - model 5900 (Instron Inc., Canton, MA, USA). Each entire drupe was placed on
161 the flat surface support and pressed vertically in the middle part of the drupe using a flat 35 mm
162 probe, with a load of deformation equal to 5 N and a bar speed of 25 mm min⁻¹. This fixed load
163 value was determined after assessing the damage to several fruit peels and pulps under different
164 load values as well as the reliability of the response, which was reported as fruit deformation (mm).

165 *2.4 Total chlorophyll quantification*

166 The total chlorophyll amount was determined in the olive fruit as described by Moran
167 (1982), with slight modification. Briefly, the total chlorophylls were extracted by incubating 100
168 mg of drupe tissue in *N,N*-dimethylformamide (Sigma-Aldrich, Milano, Italy), using a 1:10
169 volume/weight ratio, for 24 hours at 4°C. The liquid phase was filtered and the absorbance was
170 measured at 625, 647 and 664 nm using a spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Milano, Italy) and
171 1 cm quartz cuvettes. The total chlorophyll concentration was determined by the equation $Chl_{tot} =$
172 $7.04 (A_{664}) + 20.27 (A_{647})$ and expressed as mg g⁻¹ of fresh tissue. Analyses were performed in
173 triplicate.

174 *2.5 Total carotenoid quantification*

175 Carotenoids were extracted by incubating 100 mg of drupe tissues in 1 mL of 100% (v/v)
176 acetone for 24 hours at 4°C. The total carotenoid amount (xanthophylls plus carotenes) was
177 determined by measuring the absorbance at wavelengths of 470, 645 and 663 nm, using the
178 equation $C_{(x+c)} = (1000 A_{470} - 2.27 Chl_a - 81.4 Chl_b)/227$ (Lichtenthaler & Wellburn, 1983). The
179 total carotenoid content was expressed as mg g⁻¹ of fresh tissue. Analyses were performed in
180 triplicate.

181 2.6 Total anthocyanin quantification

182 Total anthocyanins were quantified using the protocol described by Martinelli & Tonutti
183 (2012). Briefly, 100 mg of fruit tissue was ground with pre-chilled mortar and pestle, extracted with
184 5 mL of a methanol:HCl (1%) solution and incubated overnight at 4°C in darkness. The supernatant
185 was obtained by centrifugation at 5000 RCF and filtered. Spectroscopic analysis was performed by
186 measuring the absorbance at 530 nm. Serial dilutions of a cyanidin-3-glucoside standard (SIGMA,
187 Italy) were used to generate a reference curve, and anthocyanin concentration was expressed as mg
188 g⁻¹ of fresh weight.

189 2.7 Sample preparation and HPLC analysis

190 Fruit were frozen in liquid nitrogen, stored at -80°C, and successively used to determine the
191 phenol content. Phenols were extracted from the olive pulp according to the procedure previously
192 published by Bellincontro et al. (2012) with slight modification. Briefly, 10 g of frozen olive pulp
193 was homogenized with 100 mL of 80% methanol containing 20 mg L⁻¹ butylated hydroxytoluene
194 (BHT); this extraction was performed in triplicate. After methanol removal, the aqueous extract was
195 used for the extraction of phenols by solid-phase separation (SPE). The SPE procedure was applied
196 by loading a 1000 mg Bond Elute Jr-C18 cartridge (Agilent Technologies, USA) with 1 mL of
197 sample and using 50 mL of methanol as the eluting solvent. After solvent removal under vacuum at
198 30°C, the phenolic extract was recovered, then dissolved in methanol (1 mL), and filtered through a
199 polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) syringe filter (0.2 µm). HPLC analyses for oleuropein,
200 verbascoside and 3,4-DHPEA-ED were then conducted according to the procedure of Selvaggini et
201 al. (2006) using a reversed-phase column on an Agilent Technologies system Model 1100 (Agilent
202 Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA) equipped with a vacuum degasser, a quaternary pump, an
203 autosampler, a thermostated column compartment, a diode-array detector (DAD) and a fluorescence
204 detector (FLD). The C18 column used in this study was a Spherisorb ODS-1 250 x 4.6 mm with a
205 particle size of 5 µm (Waters, Milford, MA, USA); the injected sample volume was 20 µL. The
206 mobile phase consisted of 0.2% acetic acid (pH 3.1) in water (solvent A) / methanol (solvent B) at a

207 flow rate of 1 mL min⁻¹ and the gradient was as follows: 95% (A) / 5% (B) for 2 min, 75% (A) /
208 25% (B) in 8 min, 60% (A) / 40% (B) in 10 min, 50% (A) / 50% (B) in 16 min and 0% (A) / 100%
209 (B) in 14 min. This composition was maintained for 10 min, returned to the initial conditions and
210 equilibrated for 13 min, giving a total running time of 73 min. Phenol detection was performed
211 using the DAD set at 278 nm. The oleuropein, verbascoside and quercetin-3-O-rutinoside (rutin)
212 were purchased from Extrasynthese (Genay, France). 3,4-DHPEA-EDA was extracted from virgin
213 olive oil using a procedure previously reported by Montedoro et al. (1993). The purity of this
214 compound was tested by analytical HPLC, and NMR test (Montedoro et al., 1993) verified its
215 chemical structure. The HPLC analyses of rutin were conducted with the same instrumentation
216 reported above. The C18 column used was Inertsil ODS-3, 150 m with a particle size of 5 mm (GL
217 Sciences Inc.). The volume of injected sample was 20 mL. The mobile phase was 5% formic acid in
218 water (A) / acetonitrile (B) at a flow rate of 0.9 mL min⁻¹. The total running time was 64 min, and
219 the gradient was as follows: 95% (A) / 5% (B) for 5 min, 35% (A) / 65% (B) in 50 min, 0% (A) /
220 100% (B) in 3 min, return to initial conditions in 2 min, and hold for 4 min. Rutin was detected by
221 the DAD at 360 nm.

222 *2.8 NIR spectra collection*

223 A laminar 5030 miniature Hand-held NIR Analyzer (Brimrose Corporation, Baltimore, 92
224 MD, USA), based on the Acousto-Optical Tunable Filter (AOTF) NIR principle, was used for
225 spectral detection. This instrument is a portable device that can be used directly in the field on tree,
226 although in this experimental work the spectral acquisition was performed under laboratory
227 conditions. Two distinct measurements were performed on each intact olive through contact
228 between the external gun of the NIR device and the pericarp of the fruit using the diffuse
229 reflectance method of detection, whereas the raw spectra were detected and recorded in
230 transmittance, as reported by Santos & Kaye (2005). Detection was conducted over the 1100-2300
231 nm range using 2 nm wavelength increments and a 10 spectra per average, which represented a

232 single measurement. The average of the two measurements was regarded as the spectral response of
233 the fruit.

234 *2.9 Near infrared spectroscopy analysis and chemometrics*

235 The raw spectra were statistically pre-treated for absorbance ($\log 1/T$) transformation using
236 SNAP 2.03 software (Brimrose, Crop, Baltimore, MD, USA). Before calibration and developing the
237 predictive models, the spectral variation in the data sets was analyzed using Principal Component
238 Analysis (PCA). The absorbance spectra, obtained as the spectral average for each olive subset,
239 were used as X-variables in the final models. Partial Least Squares (PLS) models were obtained on
240 the full spectrum observed, considering the spectrally significant variables at specific wavelength
241 intervals. The mean values and the standard deviation (SD) values obtained by analyzing the HPLC
242 measurements were used as Y-variables in the PLS matrices, in which they were contrasted with the
243 averaged spectra, as previously reported. Models were developed for the specific phenols as well as
244 for total phenols, calculated as the sum of the measured compounds. New models relative to total
245 chlorophylls, total carotenoids, total anthocyanins, rutin, and firmness were built by combining data
246 from all three cultivars and the total sample set of data ($n = 33$) both for the calibration and
247 validation procedures which, because of the small number of data, were carried out only using
248 leave-one-out cross-validation method (Dardenne, 2010). Each number of sample was represented
249 by 10 grouped drupes; two NIR spectra each drupe equal to 660 total spectra in the dataset. The
250 same dataset of spectra ($n = 33$) was used to perform the validation of specific models previously
251 assessed (Bellincontro et al, 2012) for oleuropein, verbascoside 3,4-DHPEA-EDA, and total
252 phenols. No outlier identification or elimination was applied. The following statistical indices were
253 used to determine the significance of the calculations: R^2 (coefficient of multiple determination) in
254 calibration, cross-validation and prediction; Root Mean Standard Error in Calibration, Cross-
255 Validation and Prediction (RMSEC, RMSECV, RMSEP); and bias. PCA, statistical pretreatments,
256 and PLS models were performed using Unscrambler v9.7 software (CAMO ASA, Oslo, Norway).

257 Graphs, score plots and scatter plots were generated after data exportation from Unscrambler using
258 SigmaPlot v. 10.0 (Systat Software Inc., San Jose, CA, USA).

259

260 **3. Results and Discussion**

261 The onset and length of the ripening period for the olive fruit was different among the three
262 cultivars. The green stage (V-I) was reached approximately 130 days after bloom (DAFB) in cv.
263 Leccino, whereas it occurred later in cvs Leucocarpa and Buscionetto, at 155 and 158 DAFB,
264 respectively. The ripening process lasted for four weeks in the drupes of Leccino and Leucocarpa
265 and ended at 155 and 180 DAFB, respectively, whereas it was significantly shorter in Buscionetto,
266 lasting for three weeks and ending at 175 DAFB. As shown in Table 1, the Ripening Index
267 increased during olive fruit development differently between the colored Leccino and Buscionetto,
268 reaching values of 3.76 and 2.4, respectively. This parameter was not determinable in Leucocarpa
269 due to the lack of fruit pigmentation (Supplementary Fig. 1). The RI value determined in Leccino is
270 often indicated in the literature as the optimum harvest period (Rotondi et al., 2004), corresponding
271 to the stage V-IV of ripeness. At this stage, the pigmentation on the pericarp tissue of the drupes is
272 spread differently among the three cultivars, varying from the purple-black color of Leccino to the
273 reddish and white-ivory of Buscionetto and Leucocarpa, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 1).
274 Moreover, a different pigmentation was also visible in mesocarp tissues: a complete white color
275 was present in that of cv. Leucocarpa; white with a layer of reddish tissue near the pericarp tissue in
276 Buscionetto; and green-white in the mesocarp of Leccino (Supplementary Fig. 1). The diverse
277 pattern of pericarp and mesocarp pigmentation of the drupes could reflect differences in the pattern
278 of synthesis and accumulation of total chlorophylls, carotenoids and anthocyanins between the three
279 cultivars.

280 During ripening, drupe fresh weight increased until stage V-II in Leccino and then
281 decreased. The dynamics of fruit growth was different in the two other cultivars. Fruit growth
282 increased until full ripeness in Leucocarpa, whereas it slightly decreased in Buscionetto during the

283 ripening period (Table 1). The firmness values of the drupes decreased during the ripening of fruits,
284 although the softening process appeared to be cultivar-dependent (Fig. 1). Indeed, firmness dropped
285 rapidly in Leucocarpa compared to Buscionetto and Leccino, and in the last cultivar, the firmness
286 was consistently the highest until harvesting time. As expected, the total chlorophyll and carotenoid
287 content decreased during the ripening progress, although the rate of chlorophyll degradation was
288 higher. The extent of decrement was cultivar-dependent as the mature drupe of Leccino retained
289 nearly double the chlorophyll content of Leucocarpa and Buscionetto (Table 2). Total anthocyanins
290 were higher in the drupes of Leccino than in those of Buscionetto, and only trace amounts were
291 detected in the drupes of Leucocarpa. A high total phenol content was detected in the drupes of cv.
292 Leucocarpa and cv. Leccino, and the values were comparable to those reported in the literature for
293 the same as well as other cultivars (Alagna et al., 2012; Pasqualone et al., 2012). Typical of low-
294 phenol cultivar, a significantly lower total phenol content was detected in the fruits of Buscionetto,
295 which had the lowest value among the three cultivars studied. The amount of phenolic compounds
296 showed a decreasing trend during the ripening period. However, the dynamics of the decrement
297 were quite different among the cultivars as the decrease was more accentuated in Leccino and
298 Buscionetto than Leucocarpa (Table 2).

299 Qualitative analysis of single phenolic compounds also highlighted important differences
300 between the cultivars, i.e., the compound verbascoside was undetectable in the drupes of
301 Buscionetto, whereas rutin compound was undetectable in Leucocarpa. According to other research
302 reported in the literature (Alagna et al., 2012), the amount of each phenolic compound decreases
303 during ripening (Table 2). At harvest time (stage V-VI), the content of oleuropein, verbascoside and
304 3,4, DHPEA-EDA was higher in the drupe of Leucocarpa than in the other two cultivars. In
305 particular, at stage V-IV the oleuropein and verbascoside content was equal to or higher than that at
306 the stage V-I of the ripening period of the Leucocarpa drupe (Table 2). The qualitative and
307 quantitative variability in the phenolic composition of the olive fruit among the cultivars is

308 particularly interesting, considering that a widespread variability of data is favorable for generating
309 a model by multivariate regression.

310 Many wavelengths of the NIR spectrum affect the PLS modelling. Thus, the entire spectrum
311 (1100-2300 nm) was monitored to build a calibration model for each class of compounds and for
312 the firmness parameter. Principal component analysis (PCA) calculated for all spectral datasets
313 discriminated the three cultivars, and significant separation was obtained for Buscionetto
314 (Supplementary Fig. 2). In particular, the variance was well explained by PC1 and PC2 and
315 accounted for approximately 98% of the observed variability. The ability of NIR spectra to
316 discriminate cultivars was previously reported by Bellincontro et al. (2012).

317 The accuracy of the PLS was described by the coefficient of determination in calibration
318 (R^2) and cross-validation or prediction (R^2_{cv} , R^2_p), the root mean square error of calibration
319 (RMSEC) and the root mean square of cross-validation (RMSECV) or prediction (RMSEP). The
320 number of latent variables (LVs) was selected to minimize the RMSECV or RMSEP. In general,
321 fitted models are characterized by high R^2 and by low RMSEC and RMSEP values but with small
322 differences to each other. Indeed, elevated differences between RMSEC and RMSEP indicate the
323 introduction of too many latent variables in the model. Excluding the PLS model of total
324 chlorophylls, which had a value of $R^2 = 0.86$, the other PLS models had values close to or higher
325 than 0.9, indicating valid quantitative information in the detected results (Table 3, 4). The values for
326 calibration and cross-validation of the physical and biochemical parameters in the olive drupes
327 during the ripening period are presented in Table 3, whereas the values of biochemical parameters
328 that were used to validate the previous calculations already performed for the other cultivars are
329 presented in Table 4 (Bellincontro et al., 2012). The highest correlation ($R^2 = 0.997$) value was
330 obtained for firmness (Fig. 2a), whereas slightly lower values were obtained for total phenol and
331 verbascoside content ($R^2 = 0.965$ for both; Fig. 2b and Fig. 2d, respectively), 3,4-DHPEA-EDA (R^2
332 $= 0.934$; Fig. 2c), rutin ($R^2 = 0.925$; Fig. 2f) and total anthocyanins ($R^2 = 0.910$; Fig. 2h). Lower but
333 still acceptable R^2 were obtained for the calibration models for oleuropein ($R^2 = 0.897$; Fig. 2e),

334 total carotenoids ($R^2 = 0.887$; Fig. 2i) and total chlorophylls ($R^2 = 0.868$; Fig. 2g). The RMSEC
335 index, expressed as milligrams per gram of fresh weight, varied from the lowest value of 0.002 for
336 total carotenoids to the highest of 1.44 for 3,4-DHPEA-EDA, whereas the number of LVs was in
337 the range of 4-8, except for verbascoside, where it was of 10. The leave-one-out cross-validation
338 method was used to evaluate the predictive ability of the PLS models. This method is considered
339 appropriate for a limited sample data set (Dardenne, 2010).

340 The cross-validation of PLS models was characterized by a reduction of the R^2_{cv} coefficient,
341 particularly for total anthocyanins and rutin ($R^2_{cv} = 0.80$ and $R^2_{cv} = 0.83$, respectively). However,
342 the RMSEC and RMSECV indices for total chlorophyll and carotenoids had very similar values,
343 indicating that an optimum number of factors were included in the models. Interestingly, the cross-
344 validated model for the firmness parameter still had a high R^2_{cv} value (0.99) and low error.
345 Oleuropein, verbascoside, 3,4-DHPEA-EDA and total phenols were validated using PLS models
346 already created by Bellincontro et al.³⁶ in the cvs Moraiolo, Dolce d'Andria and Nocellara Etnea.
347 The validation showed a substantial reduction in the R^2 value and an approximately 2-fold increase
348 in the error of RMSEP (Table 4). The R^2_p ranged from the lowest value of 0.74 for oleuropein and
349 was highest for total phenols, 3,4-DHPEA-EDA and verbascoside ($R^2_p = 0.85$, 0.84 and 0.82,
350 respectively). The observed reduction in the determination coefficient using the PLS model
351 obtained from different cultivars highlights the necessity of developing specific models for each
352 cultivar to improve the predictive ability of NIR. Residual predictive deviation (RPD), which is the
353 ratio between the standard deviations of reference measures and the standard error of prediction,
354 was also calculated for all models. Except for oleuropein, which had value that was not sufficient,
355 the RPD values for the other models indicated a discrete discrimination ability. Firmness parameters
356 were highly discriminant, showing a very high value of 13.86 (Table 3, Table 4).

357 Although the increased expectations of consumers for food products that are of high quality
358 and safety necessitate accurate quality determination, many agronomical and food process decisions
359 are based on fast of determination these characteristics. New techniques, therefore, become

360 necessary to enable control over the quality parameters to meet requirements during handling,
361 storage and acceptability by the consumer (Chen & Opara, 2013). In the olive, the identification of
362 the optimum harvesting time of the fruit through accurate, rapid and cost-effective methods is a new
363 challenge for producing extra virgin high-quality oils enriched with phenolic compounds (Bonoli,
364 Bendini, Cerretani, Lercker, & Gallina-Toschi, 2004). The intrinsic variability of the olive fruit
365 ripening process, which is influenced by genetic, environmental and agronomic factors, requires
366 intensive and accurate monitoring of compounds to determine oil quality. Pigments and phenolic
367 compounds affect important quality attributes of VOO, such as color, stability, sensory profile and
368 nutritional properties (Inglese et al., 2011). The firmness of the olive drupe should also be
369 considered an important marker as it has practical implications during olive fruit processing for the
370 extraction yield of oil and phytochemicals as well as for oil quality (García, Seller, & Pérez-
371 Camino, 1996). Kavdir et al. (2009) and, more recently Beghi et al. (2013), have correlated olive
372 firmness measured with a portable penetrometer to reflectance spectra; in the first case the spectra
373 were detected by a FT-NIR spectrometer (ranging from 800 to 2500 nm), whereas a vis/NIR
374 spectrophotometer (ranging from 400 to 1000 nm) was used in the second. In Kavdir's work⁴⁰ the
375 R² results obtained in calibration and in cross-validation were of 0.75 and 0.68, respectively,
376 whereas they were equal to 0.68 and 0.66, respectively, in Beghi's work (2013).

377 In the present study, non-destructive NIR-AOTF technology provides a suitable method for
378 the on field monitoring of the maturation process. The firmness R² values for calibration and cross-
379 validation were as high as 0.99. The R² values for total chlorophyll, total carotenoids, total
380 anthocyanins and rutin ranged from 0.86 to 0.92 for calibration and from 0.80 and 0.85 for cross-
381 validation. This experience gave us the opportunity to develop a predictive model of firmness for
382 intact drupes with high degree of fitness and statistical significance and low RMSEC/RMSECV
383 ratio. Recently, Giovenzana et al. (2015) described models for the prediction of texture, using
384 vis/NIR and NIR spectroscopy on Moraiolo and Frantoio olive drupes directly at the mill, just

385 before the oil extraction process, and obtained calibration and validation R^2 values ranging from
386 0.86 to 0.88 for spectroscopic techniques.

387 In terms of spectra contribution to the PLS modeling, our previous works already have
388 established significant correlations about prediction of total and specific phenols (Bellincontro et
389 al., 2012). Here the interest is addressed to evaluate NIR spectra performance in relation to the new
390 models carried out for chlorophylls, carotenoids, and firmness. In supplementary figure S3,
391 regression coefficients for chlorophylls and carotenoids models (a), and for firmness model (b) have
392 been reported. Even though it is largely known the stronger absorption response of chlorophylls and
393 carotenoids in the visible range of light spectra, literature reports significant results in correlation
394 obtained by applying NIR spectroscopy to predict the content of these pigments, mostly carotenoids
395 (McGoverin et al., 2010). Both for chlorophylls and carotenoids (Figure S3a), correlation peaks
396 were found at 1198 nm, 1725 nm, 1930 nm, 2255 nm, and 2280 nm. By working on kale for
397 prediction of specific carotenoids content, Chen et al. (2009) found significant correlations at 1235
398 nm, 1770 nm, 2176 nm, and 2376 nm. The wavelength range between 1100-1300 nm is related to
399 the second overtone and 1700-1900 nm to the first overtone of C-H bonds, while 2000-2500 nm to
400 the deformation of C-H bonds. The quite similar behavior that we observed both for chlorophylls
401 and carotenoids is probably due to the strong correlation between them (Sims & Gamon, 2000).
402 Regarding firmness (Figure S3b), PLS regression peaks were individuated at 1248 nm, 1449 nm,
403 1758 nm, 1917 nm, 1990 nm, and 2238 nm. Negative correlation related to absorption at 1449 and
404 1917 nm are for sure dominated by the H₂O response, respectively associated to the first overtone
405 of the symmetric and asymmetric OH stretching and/or combination bands (1450 nm), and to the
406 combination of the OH stretching band and to the OH bending band (1920 nm). Absorptions at
407 1248 nm and 1758 are referred to the second and to the first overtone of the CH stretching
408 vibrations of CH₃, CH₂, and CH=CH, respectively. It is known that fruit firmness is affected by dry
409 matter (McGlone & Kawano, 1998), and in olives dry matter is in turn related to the oil content

410 (Cayuela & Pérez-Camino, 2010). On this basis, we may consider that firmness detection can be an
411 indirect index which helps to establish yield prediction and oil quality.

412 The obtained results confirmed the ability of NIRS-AOTF to predict total phenol content
413 and specific metabolites, as previously reported in other cultivars. The use of fruits collected from
414 the plants of cultivars defective in specific phenotypical characters and, therefore, considered as
415 natural mutants allowed for the robustness of the procedure to be assessed. The cultivars diverged in
416 phenol composition: Leccino fruit contains a high amount of phenols and a complete phenolic
417 composition, Leucocarpa fruit does not contain any flavonoids and Buscionetto fruit contains a low
418 amount of phenols and does not contain verbascoside. These fruit properties contributed to the
419 validation of the NIRS-AOTF as a non-destructive method for estimating the phenolic content in
420 olive fruit during ripening (Bellincontro et al., 2012). In fact, a large degree of phenolic variability
421 is included in the pool of those cultivars, resembling the variability that is found in the olive fruit
422 (Alagna et al., 2011). This strategy was interesting as it also allowed us to elaborate satisfactory
423 models for the prediction of chlorophyll and carotenoid content.

424 Interestingly, a very high correlation with a low RMSEC/RMSECV ratio was also found for
425 firmness prediction. Indeed, the use of a non-destructive compression-test and accurate instruments
426 for texture analysis to obtain reference measures appear to have improved the predictive capabilities
427 of NIR. Although an additional number of samples will be required to improve the model's
428 robustness, the results are particularly encouraging, especially considering that the application of
429 NIR spectroscopy for firmness prediction has encountered considerable difficulties.

430 Knowledge of the optimal ripening stage of the olive fruit is a strategic point for producing
431 high quality virgin olive oil. In addition to some important compounds and their evolution during
432 the ripening process, the firmness of the drupe was also considered, which is also an important
433 parameter necessary for predicting bruising damage during and between harvesting as well as
434 during olive processing (García & Yousfi, 2006). The opportunity to monitor olive firmness
435 through the in-field use of a rapid and accurate non-destructive tool, is strictly related to the fruit

436 maturity identification. More in detail, the relationship among textural properties, water content and
437 water status, and cell wall degradation metabolisms (Brummel, 2006) suggests that fruit firmness
438 can be considered a significant indicator of the cellular extractability. This has a strong involvement
439 in the olive oil richness and final quality. Furthermore, avoiding physical and biological
440 deterioration of the fruit is a goal for the production of both high quality virgin oil and high quality
441 table olives. This importance of this goal might be accentuated by the total mechanization of
442 farming, from planting to harvesting, and the need to characterize new cropping systems
443 (Camposeo, Vivaldi, & Gattullo, 2013). The accumulation of anthocyanin compounds increases
444 during the ripeness, except in the null mutant *Leucocarpa*, and this behavior is counterpoised to that
445 of total chlorophyll, phenolic and carotenoid compounds. Thus, anthocyanins can be considered an
446 important analytical marker for determining the best ripening stage of fruit, in combination with
447 traditional indices such as oil accumulation. The results obtained from the two cultivars, from the
448 natural mutant for the accumulation of phenols, and from the cv. *Leccino*, define and validate the
449 rapid method for evaluating phenolic compounds directly in olives using a non-destructive
450 technology such as NIR-AOTF spectroscopy. The use of the natural mutants improved the
451 robustness of the predicting models by considering a large biological variability. This technology
452 has the important advantage that it can be used on field, even for measuring firmness and total
453 anthocyanin in null mutants and specific phenolic compounds in the cultivars.

454

455 **4. Conclusion**

456 We studied the applicability of NIR-AOTF spectroscopy as a rapid and inexpensive
457 technique, using a portable instrument for physical and chemical analysis of olive properties during
458 ripening and at maturation, just before oil extraction. The obtained results for some parameters
459 enabled us to develop specific models that can be used as predictive systems, even for other
460 cultivars. In the meantime, the accumulation of data here improved the predictive power and
461 robustness of models previously developed for other cultivars. The asynchronous maturation of the

462 fruit causes extreme variability in the evolution of physical and chemical properties among the
463 fruits of a canopy. Therefore, the opportunity to overcome the difficulty of estimating a ripeness
464 index that is not directly correlated with specific chemicals using reference data from many physical
465 and chemical properties of a single drupe will allow for good results to be obtained for the
466 development of maturation models for olive fruit by optical, non-destructive systems. The
467 accumulation of experience and data as well as the selection of specific wavelength ranges for
468 spectral analyses will be helpful for improving the portable inexpensive device and the overall
469 program to monitor physical and chemical properties of fruit. Understanding the firmness and
470 quality properties of olive drupes, which can develop differently into various fruits of a canopy, is
471 key to developing novel approaches that will advance our ability to identify and characterize the
472 stages of ripeness, detect the optimal harvesting time and, ultimately, produce high quality extra
473 virgin olive oil and table olives.

474

475 **Abbreviations and Nomenclature**

476 AOTF, Acousto Optically Tunable Filter; cv., cultivar; DAD, diode-array detector; FLD,
477 fluorescence detector; NIR, Near Infrared; PCA, Principal Component Analysis; PLS, Partial Least
478 Square; RMSEC, Root Mean Standard error in Calibration; RMSECV, Root Mean Standard error in
479 Cross-Validation; RMSEP, Root Mean Standard error in Prediction; RPD, Residual predictive
480 deviation; 3,4-DHPEA-EDA, 3,4-DHPEA-Elenolic acid Di-Aldehyde (Oleuropein-aglycone di-
481 aldehyde).

482

483 **Conflict of interest**

484 The authors declare no conflicts of interest

485

486 **Acknowledgments**

487 This work was partially supported by MiPAAF, project "OLEA-Genomics and Genetic
488 Improvement of the olive", by "Dondazione Anna Maria Catalano - ONLUS", and "Fondazione
489 CARIVIT – Valorizzazione della varietà di olivo e degli oli della Tuscia Viterbese: proprietà
490 biochimiche e molecolari che impattano la filiera produttiva e gli aspetti nutritivi e salutistici
491 dell'uomo", and by "Ministero Italiano dell'Università della Ricerca MIUR – Italy (Project
492 PROSIT, Cluster Agrifood Nazionale)". Thanks to Mr. Roberto Forniti for his technical assistance
493 in Instron detections.

494

495 **Appendix A. Supplementary data**

496 This document contains Supplementary Fig. S1 and S2.

497 **References**

- 498 Alagna, F., Mariotti, R., Panara, F., Caporali, S., Urbani, S., Veneziani, G., et al. (2012). Olive
499 phenolic compounds: metabolic and transcriptional profiling during fruit development. *BMC Plant*
500 *Biology*, *12*, 162–183.
- 501 Aparicio-Ruiz, R., Gandul-Rojas, B., & Roca, M. (2009). Pigment profile in non-Spanish olive
502 varieties (*Olea europaea* L. var Coratina, Frantoio, and Koroneiki. *Journal of Agricultural and*
503 *Food Chemistry*, *57*, 831–836.
- 504 Bartolini, G. OLEA databases, URL (<http://www.oleadb.it/>), most recent access data on 3rd of June
505 2015.
- 506 Beghi, R., Giovenzana, V., Civelli, R., Cini, E., & Guidetti, R. (2013). Characterisation of olive fruit
507 for the milling process by using visible/near infrared spectroscopy. *Journal of Agricultural*
508 *Engineering*, *XLIV:e8*, 56–61.
- 509 Bellincontro, A., Taticchi, A., Servili, M., Esposto, S., Farinelli, D., & Mencarelli, F. (2012).
510 Feasible application of a portable NIR-AOTF tool for on-field prediction of phenolic compounds

511 during the ripening of olives for oil production. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *60*,
512 2665–2673.

513 Bonoli, M., Bendini, A., Cerretani, L., Lercker, G., & Gallina-Toschi, T. (2004). Qualitative and
514 semiquantitative analysis of phenolic compounds in extra virgin olive oils as a function of the
515 ripening degree of olive fruits by different analytical techniques. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*
516 *Chemistry*, *52*, 7026–7032.

517 Brummell, D. A. (2006). Cell wall disassembly in ripening fruit. *Functional Plant Biology*, *33*,
518 103–119.

519 Camposeo, S., Vivaldi, G. A., & Gattullo, C. E. (2013). Ripening indices and harvesting times of
520 different olive cultivars for continuous harvest. *Scientia Horticulturae*, *151*, 1–10.

521 Carrasco-Pancorbo, A., Gómez-Caravaca, A. M., Cerretani, L., Bendini, A., Segura-Carretero, A.,
522 & Fernández-Gutiérrez, A. (2006). Rapid quantification of the phenolic fraction of Spanish virgin
523 olive oils by capillary electrophoresis with UV detection. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*
524 *Chemistry*, *54*, 7984–7991.

525 Cayuela, J. A., & Pérez-Camino, M. C. (2010). Prediction of quality of intact olives by near infrared
526 spectroscopy. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, *112*, 1209–1217.

527 Chen, X., Wub, J., Zhoua, S., Yanga, Y., Nib, X., Yangb, J., Zhuc, Z., & Chunhai, S., (2009).
528 Application of near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy to evaluate the lutein and β -carotene in
529 Chinese kale. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, *22*(2), 148–153.

530 Chen, L., & Opara, U. L. (2013). Texture measurement approaches in fresh and processed foods - A
531 review. *Food Research International*, *51*(2), 823–835.

532 Conde, C., Delrot S., & Gerós H. (2008). Physiological, biochemical and molecular changes
533 occurring during olive development and ripening. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, *165*, 1545–1562.

534 Dardenne, P. (2010). Some considerations about NIR spectroscopy: closing speech at NIR-2009.
535 NIR News, *21*, 8–14.

536 Galtier, O., Dupuy, N., Le Dréau, Y., Olivier, D., Pinatel, C., Kister, J., et al. (2007). Geographical
537 origins compositions of virgin olive oils determined by chemometric analysis of NIR spectra.
538 *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 595, 136–144.

539 García, J.M., & Yousfi, K. (2006). The postharvest of the mill olives. *Grasas Y Aceites*, 57(1), 14–
540 24.

541 García, J. M., Sella, S., & Pérez-Camino, M. C. (1996). Influence of fruit ripening on olive oil
542 quality. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 44, 3516–3520.

543 Giovenzana, V., Beghi, R., Civelli, R., Marai, S., & Guidetti, R. (2015). Postharvest
544 Characterization of Olive Oil Fruits Texture by NIR and Vis/NIR Spectroscopy. *Chemical*
545 *Engineering Transactions*, 44, 61–66.

546 Inglese, P., Famiani, F., Galvano, F., Servili, M., Esposito, S., & Urbani, S. (2011). Factors affecting
547 extra virgin olive oil composition. *Horticultural Reviews*, 38, 83–147.

548 Kavdir, I., Buyukcan, M.B., Lu, R., Kocabiyik, H., & Seker, M. (2009). Prediction of olive quality
549 using FT-NIR spectroscopy in reflectance and transmittance modes. *Biosystems Engineering*, 103,
550 304–312.

551 Jiménez, A., Rodríguez, R., Fernández-Caro, I., Guillén, R., Fernández-Bolaños, J., & Heredia, A.
552 (2001a). Olive fruit cell wall: Degradation of cellulosic and hemicellulosic polysaccharides during
553 ripening. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 49, 2008–2013.

554 Jiménez, A., Rodríguez, R., Fernández-Caro, I., Guillén, R., Fernández-Bolaños, J., & Heredia, A.
555 (2001b). Olive fruit cell wall: Degradation of pectic polysaccharides during ripening. *Journal of*
556 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 49, 409–415.

557 Lichtenthaler, H. K., & Wellburn, A. R. (1983). Determination of total carotenoids and chlorophyll
558 a and b of leaf extract in different solvents. *Biochemical Society Transactions*, 11, 591–592.

559 Martinelli, F., & Tonutti, P. (2012). Flavonoid metabolism and gene expression in developing olive
560 (*Olea europaea* L.) fruit. *Plant Biosystems*, 146(1), 1–7.

561 Marquez, A. J., Díaz, A. M., & Reguera, M. I. P. (2005). Using optical NIR sensor for on-line
562 virgin olive oils characterization. *Sensors Actuators B: Chemical*, *107*, 64–68.

563 Mínguez-Mosquera, M. I., & Gallardo-Guerrero, M. L. (1991). Disappearance of chlorophylls and
564 carotenoids during the ripening of the olive. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, *69*, 1–
565 6.

566 McGlone, V. A., & Kawano, S. (1998). Firmness, dry-matter and soluble-solids assessment of
567 postharvest kiwifruit by NIR spectroscopy. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, *13*, 131–141.

568 McGoverin, C. M., Weeranantanaphan, J., Downey, G., & Manley, M. (2010). Review: the
569 application of near infrared spectroscopy to the measurement of bioactive compounds in food
570 commodities. *Journal of Near Infrared Spectroscopy*, *18*, 87–111.

571 Montedoro, G., Servili, M., Baldioli, M., Selvaggini, R., Miniati, E., & Macchioni, A. (1993).
572 Simple and hydrolyzable compounds in virgin olive oil. 3. Spectroscopic characterization of the
573 secoiridoids derivatives. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *41*, 2228–2234.

574 Moran, R. (1982). Formulae for determination of chlorophyllous pigments extracted with N,N-
575 Dimethylformamide. *Plant Physiology*, *69*, 1376–1381.

576 Moyano, M. J., Melendez-Martinez, A. J., Alba, J., & Heredia, F. J. (2008). A comprehensive study
577 on the colour of virgin olive oils and its relationship with their chlorophylls and carotenoids indexes
578 (I): CIEXYZ non-uniform colour space. *Food Research International*, *41*, 505–512.

579 Nicolai, B., Beullens, K., Bobelyn, E., Peirs, A., Saeys, W., Theron, K. I., et al. (2007). Non-
580 destructive measurements of fruit and vegetable quality by means of NIR spectroscopy: A review.
581 *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, *46*, 99–118.

582 Pasqualone, A., Di Rienzo, V., Blanco, A., Summo, C., Caponio, F., & Montemurro, C. (2012).
583 Characterization of virgin olive oil from Leucocarpa cultivar by chemical and DNA analysis. *Food*
584 *Research International*, *47*(2), 188–193.

585 Rolle, L., Torchio, F., Zeppa, G., & Gerbi, V. (2009). Relations between break skin force and
586 anthocyanin extractability at different stages of ripening. *American Journal of Enology and*
587 *Viticulture*, *60*, 93–97.

588 Romani, A., Mulinacci, N., Pinelli, P., Vinciert, F., & Cimato, A. (1999). Polyphenolic content in
589 five Tuscany cultivar of *Olea europaea* L. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *47*,
590 964–967.

591 Rotondi, A., Bendini, A., Cerratani, L, Mari, M., Lercker, G., & Gallina Toschi, T. (2004). Effect of
592 olive ripening degree on the oxidative stability and organoleptic properties of cv. Nostrana di
593 Brisighella extra virgin olive oil. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *52*, 3649-3654.

594 Salvador, M., Aranda, F., Fregapane, G. (2001). Influence of fruit ripening on “Cornicabra” virgin
595 olive oil quality. A study of four successive crop seasons. *Food Chemistry*, *73*, 45–53.

596 Santos, O. A., & Kaye, O. (2005). Grapevine water potential based upon near infrared spectroscopy.
597 *Scientia Agricola*, *66*, 287–292.

598 Selvaggini, R., Servili, M., Urbani, S., Esposito, S., Taticchi, A., & Montedoro, G. (2006).
599 Evaluation of phenolic compounds in virgin olive oil by direct injection in high-performance liquid
600 chromatography with fluorometric detection. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *54*,
601 2832–2838.

602 Servili, M., & Montedoro, G. (2002). Contribution of Phenolic Compounds to Virgin Olive Oil
603 Quality European. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, *104*(9–10), 602–613.

604 Servili, M., Esposito, S., Fabiani, R., Urbani, S., Taticchi, A., Mariucci, F., et al. (2009). Phenolic
605 compounds in olive oil: antioxidant, health and sensory activities according to their chemical
606 structure. *Inflammopharmacology*, *17*, 1–9.

607 Sims, D. A., & Gamon, J. A. (2002). Relationships between leaf pigment content and spectral
608 reflectance across a wide range of species, leaf structures and developmental stages. *Remote*
609 *Sensing of Environment*, *81*, 337 – 354

610 Tuck, K. L., & Hayball, P. J. (2002). Major phenolic compounds in olive oil: metabolism and health
611 effects. *Journal of Nutritional Biochemistry*, *13*, 636–644.

612 Vierhuis, E., Servili, M., Baldioli, M., Schols, H. A., Voragen, A. G. J., & Montedoro, G. (2001).
613 Effect of enzyme treatment during mechanical extraction of olive oil on phenolic compounds and
614 polysaccharides. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, *49*, 1218–1223.

615 Wesley, I. J., Barnes, R. J., & McGill, A. E. J. (1995). Measurement of adulteration of olive oils by
616 near-infrared spectroscopy. *Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society*, *72*, 289–292.

617 **Figure captions**

618 Figure 1. Firmness evolution during drupe development in the ripening stages in Leccino,
619 Leucocarpa and Buscionetto olive cultivars. Firmness is expressed in N/mm of deformation under a
620 constant load force of 5 N. Values are the mean of three biological replicates (10 drupes per
621 replication) \pm standard deviation. Asterisks indicate a statistically significant difference with
622 $p < 0.05$; ns, not significant.

623

624

625 Figure 2. Scatter plots compared to the predictive models for the drupe firmness (**a**), total phenols
626 (**b**), DHPEA-EDA (**c**), verbascoside (**d**), oleuropein (**e**), rutin (quercetin-3-O-rutinoside) (**f**), total
627 chlorophylls (**g**), total anthocyanins (**h**) and total carotenoids (**i**) for the global data set of olive
628 samples (sum of the three cultivars). For each compound measured, experimental values are plotted
629 versus predicted values.

630