

Contents of 3-alkyl-2-methoxypyrazines in musts and wines from *Vitis vinifera* variety Cabernet sauvignon: influence of irrigation and plantation density.

Cristina Sala^{*a}, Olga Busto^a, Josep Guasch^a and Fernando Zamora^b

^a Departament de Química Analítica i Química Orgànica. ^b Departament de Bioquímica i Biotecnologia. Unitat d'Enologia, CeRTA. Facultat d'Enologia de Tarragona, Universitat Rovira i Virgili. Avda. Ramón y Cajal 70, E-43005 Tarragona, Spain. E-mail: qaenol@fe.urv.es

Abstract

The influence of irrigation and plantation density in the contents of methoxypyrazines in musts and wines has been studied. Samples were monitored throughout grape ripening and winemaking. 3-isobutyl-2-methoxypyrazine, 3-sec-butyl-2-methoxypyrazine and 3-isopropyl-2-methoxypyrazine were identified and quantified.

Keywords

3-alkyl-2-methoxypyrazines, Cabernet sauvignon, , Grape, Irrigation, Plantation density, Wine.

Introduction

Trace amounts of 3-alkyl-2-methoxypyrazines (MPs) can be found in a wide range of The results indicate that irrigation increased significantly the contents of 3-isobutyl-2-methoxypyrazine. It also has been noticed that the average levels of this compound were higher in the samples from the vines with the highest plantation density.vegetables, like peas and bell peppers (1-2). These substances are important flavor compounds due to their extremely low sensory detection thresholds. 3-isobutyl-2-methoxypyrazine (IBMP) is perceptible at 0.5-2 ngL⁻¹ in water, synthetic wine and white wine; and at 10-16 ng L⁻¹ in red wine. 3-sec-butyl-2-methoxypyrazine (SBMP) can be detected by the human nose at 1 ng L⁻¹ in water. And the sensory detection threshold of 3-isopropyl-2-methoxypyrazine (IPMP) in water is 2 ng L⁻¹ (3-9). These three compounds have been associated with the green, herbaceous or vegetative aromas that are characteristic of Cabernet Sauvignon, Cabernet Franc, Sauvignon blanc and Merlot (6, 10-17). They can occur in berries and wines of these varieties at levels higher than their sensory detection thresholds and have an important impact on wine quality.

The 'vegetative' aromas found in red wines containing IBMP are generally considered as unfavourable to wine quality (6, 18). However, the presence of this compound at relatively high levels can be compatible with the high quality of red wines (19-20), as long as it is not too dominant and it is complemented with other aromas (6, 21).

Different grape cultivars have proven to contain diverse amounts of MPs, suggesting that these compounds can contribute to their varietal distinction. IBMP levels of Merlot samples were lower than Cabernet sauvignon wines of the same vintage (20). And important differences in MP contents in grapes between the varieties Cabernet sauvignon, Merlot, Semillon, Sauvignon blanc and Riesling have been reported (22). MPs are part of the characteristic aromas of the variety

Sauvignon blanc, together with other aromas, among which the sulfur-containing 4-mercapto-4-methyl-pentan-2-one and 3-mercapto-hexan-1-ol are also important contributors (23-24).

Several reports on how viticultural factors may influence the MP contents in grapes and wines have been published (10, 17, 20-22). But information about how plantation density and irrigation can affect the amounts of these compounds in grapes and wines is rather scarce.

Climatic conditions over grape ripening, particularly at the unripe grape stage, may determine IBMP contents in final wines (22). A higher humidity in the pre-veraison month may result in higher IBMP contents in the grapes at harvest: a sunnier and less humid year led to lower IBMP amounts, whereas levels of this compound were clearly higher in the following year, which was marked by frequent rainfalls. The authors explained that the reconstitution of soil water reserves favoured the growth of the vine until harvest, which in turn increased the production and retention of IBMP (18).

It has been reported that there is an association between the 'vegetative' notes of wines and the deep, clay-rich soils that are nutrient rich and have a high water holding capacity. On the other hand, fruitier wines, richer in berry aromas were linked to shallow, sandy soils that are nutrient poor and have a lower water holding capacity. The authors attributed this difference to the fact that the first type of soils produce more vigorous canopies, which limit the sunlight exposure of the berry, whereas vines grown in the latter type of soils produce a wide open canopy, the fruits of which are better exposed to sunlight (25).

Cabernet sauvignon grapes from vineyards with different plantation densities and in soils with different compositions showed different evolution of IBMP contents throughout the grape ripening process (18). Unfortunately, the effect of soil could not be separated from the effect of plantation density, so that further research is needed to understand to what extent each factor contributes to the differences in MP contents.

Grape growers and winemakers are interested on knowing how viticultural factors may influence MP contents in grapes and how these compounds pass to final wines, in order for them to manage and obtain the maximum wine quality. With the aim of enlarging the data available on this field, the present article focuses on the study of how irrigation and plantation density may affect the contents and evolution of MPs in grapes and wines. Analysis were performed by means of two fast, cheap and convenient methods based on HS-SPME and GC-NPD we developed previously (26-27).

Experimental

All samples were produced and collected at the experimental fields and cellar of the *Facultat d'Enologia de Tarragona (Universitat Rovira i Virgili)* at Constantí (Tarragona) in 1998. The weather in the region (average June, July and August, respectively) was as follows: temperature: 20.6, 23.6 and 23.5°C; maximum temperature: 26.1, 29.2 and 29.9°C; minimum temperature: 15.2, 17.8 and 17.6°C; daily solar irradiation: 21.7, 22.6 and 17.2 MJ(m²)⁻¹; rainfall: 1.0, 3.5 and 35.0 L(m²)⁻¹.

Vines

This study was carried out with Cabernet sauvignon variety. Concretely, the used clone was the number 15 of Rauscedo that was planted on rootstock 110 Richter. All vines involved in this study are trained in a bilateral cordon (Cordon de Royat double) and trellised in a spalier system with three levels (60, 110 and 150 cm). After pruning the vines had 16 buds per plant.

Samples for the study of irrigation were collected from a vineyard that has a total of 480 plants and a plantation density of 2,500 plants per hectare (40,000 buds per hectare). The plot is divided in 16 sub-plots, each one containing 5 rows of 6 plants per row: 5 vines are Cabernet sauvignon, and the sixth one, of another variety, is used to prevent possible interferences between treatments. There are 4 groups of 4 subplots, alternatively distributed according to the Latin Square structure. They received 4 different irrigation treatments, though only the two extremes, non irrigated and irrigated, were used in this study. Irrigation was achieved by means of a trickle system. Irrigated vines received 6 L per hour for a total of 4 hours per week, during 6 weeks all through grape ripening.

Samples for the study of plantation density were collected from an experimental plot that has a total of 270 plants. It was not irrigated. The plot is divided in 9 sub-plots and there are 3 groups of 3 subplots, alternated according to the Latin Square structure, with the following plantation densities: 2,000, 3,000 and 4,000 plants per hectare (32,000, 48,000 and 64,000 buds per hectare).

Sampling

In order to obtain random samples and not to repeat the same vine in the different sampling times, a mark was put every 5 vines of each vineyard. The first sample was collected only from the marked vines. The second sample was collected from the vine immediately next to the marked vine. The third to fifth samples were collected from the plants on the third to fifth places after the marked vine.

Grapes for sampling were also randomly selected within the vine, so that a homogeneous distribution between more and less exposed to sunshine was ensured.

3 berries of each grape were collected up to a total of about 100. They were randomly sampled, taking one from the top, one from the bottom, and one from the middle of the cluster. Special care was taken in order to obtain a good distribution between berries from inside and outside the grape. Three replicates of each kind of sample were collected in all cases.

First sample was taken at veraison and the last one at harvest. Three intermediate samples were collected throughout grape ripening. After removing the bunchstems, grapes were manually pressed at the laboratory and 1g L⁻¹ of NaF was added to the grape juice to preserve it. Samples were kept in dark bottles at -20°C until analysis. Classical red winemaking was followed in all types of samples. Musts were fermented in pilot-scale tanks. Sampling times over winemaking were the following: musts after one day of maceration, end of alcoholic fermentation and final wines at the end of malolactic fermentation. Three replicates of each sample were taken and analysed in all cases, each sample belonging to a different fermentation tank. Fermented samples were preserved with SO₂ and kept in dark bottles at 4°C until analysis.

Analytical Procedures

Analysis of samples was performed according to the previously published HS-SPME procedures (26-27). Every determination was made by duplicate. Chromatographic analysis was performed with a Hewlett Packard 5890 II gas chromatograph equipped with a Nitrogen-Phosphorous Detector (NPD). Injection (splitless, 1 min) was performed with an inlet of 0.75 mm ID and at 250°C. The analytical column was a CP-WAX 57 CB (50 m x 0.25 mm id, 0.2 µm film thickness). Carrier gas was high purity helium flowing at 0.8 mLmin⁻¹. Oven temperature was 30°C (1 min), 25°Cmin⁻¹ to 100°C (20 min). 3-isopropyl-2-ethoxy-pyrazine was used as internal standard, and was provided by Pyrazine Specialties (Atlanta, Georgia), its purity was above 97%. SPME device and Polydimethylsiloxane/Divinylbenzene (65 µm) fibres used in this study were purchased from Supelco (Bellefonte, USA). Each fibre was conditioned before use as well as cleaned after use by inserting them into a GC injector at 260°C a minimum of 5 min. They were immediately used to prevent contamination. Results were statistically analysed by means of two-factor ANOVA and Fisher test (p=0.05 for both).

Statistics

All the data are expressed as the arithmetic average ± standard deviation from three replicates. Two-factor ANOVA and Fisher test were carried out using Statview (28).

Results

MP contents in experimental musts and wines are shown in Tables 1 to 7. Figures 1 and 2 show several typical chromatograms obtained with the grape juices and wines analysed. IBMP, SBMP and IPMP were identified. 3-ethyl-2-methoxy-pyrazine was found in some samples, but its contents were usually below quantification limits. Generally, IBMP was the most abundant MP and concentrations of SBMP were higher than IPMP contents. IBMP levels decrease significantly throughout grape ripening in all monitored plots, so that the lowest concentrations are reached at harvest. The process of

alcoholic fermentation/maceration with the solid parts of the berries raised the IBMP contents in all samples analysed, particularly within the first day of maceration (Tables 2 and 6).

At veraison, samples from irrigated and non irrigated vines did not show important differences on IBMP contents (Table 1). This is logical because veraison took place only few days after starting the irrigation treatment and therefore no differences were expected at this stage. Afterwards, in both kinds of grapes, levels of this compound dropped throughout grape ripening. However, the decrease in grapes from irrigated plants happened later. At harvest, IBMP contents were low in both cases, though only in the samples from irrigated vines they were high enough to be determined.

Finally, wines from irrigated vines contained significantly higher levels of IBMP (Table 2). Similarly, SBMP contents in grapes from irrigated vines were significantly higher (Table 3). And, though statistical analysis could not be performed for IPMP, the contents of this compound also tend to be higher in grapes from the irrigated plants (Table 4). The contents of SBMP and IPMP throughout winemaking are not presented because they were close or below quantification limits all through this process and none of these compounds were detected in final wines.

Table 1. IBMP contents (ng L⁻¹) throughout grape ripening. Irrigation effect.

		NON IRRIGATED		IRRIGATED	
	Date	Sugar (g/L)	IBMP (ng/L)	Sugar (g/L)	IBMP (ng/L)
VERAISON	08-11	133	34.2 (3.6) a	131	38.0 (6.4) A
RIPENING 1	08-24	160	16.1 (8.8) b	159	20.0 (8.4) B
RIPENING 2	09-03	182	5.6 (3.4) c	190	17.3 (7.2) B
RIPENING 3	09-10	192	4.4 (0.4) c	199	6.1 (3.3) C
HARVEST	09-16	207	*	206	3.9 (2.0) C

TWO-FACTOR ANOVA: Ripening $p < 0.0001$; Treatment $p = 0.0306$; Interaction $p = 0.5538$
 *: below quantification limits. Values followed by a different letter are significantly different at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Table 2. IBMP contents (ng L⁻¹) throughout winemaking. Irrigation effect.

	NON IRRIGATED	IRRIGATED
HARVEST	*	3.9 (2.0) A
1 DAY MACER.	4.3 (1.9) a	6.1 (1.3) B
END ALC. FERM.	8.3 (3.3) a	13.1 (3.2) C
END MAL. FERM	9.6 (3.8) a	15.3 (4.1) C

TWO-FACTOR ANOVA: Winemaking $p < 0.0001$; Treatment $p = 0.0067$; Interaction $p = 0.6477$
 *: below quantification limits. Values followed by a different letter are significantly different at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Table 3. SBMP contents (ng L⁻¹) throughout grape ripening. Irrigation effect.

		NON IRRIGATED		IRRIGATED	
	Date	Sugar (g/L)	SBMP (ng/L)	Sugar (g/L)	SBMP (ng/L)
VERAISON	08-11	133	4.9 (1.4) a	131	5.8 (2.4) A
RIPENING 1	08-24	160	2.6 (0.5) a	159	10.2 (4.7) AB
RIPENING 2	09-03	182	5.8 (2.9) a	190	16.1 (7.5) B
RIPENING 3	09-10	192	2.8 (1.3) a	199	4.6 (2.5) A
HARVEST	09-16	207	*	206	3.3 (1.1) A

TWO-FACTOR ANOVA: Ripening $p = 0.0035$; Treatment $p = 0.0015$; Interaction $p = 0.0908$
 *: below quantification limits. Values followed by a different letter are significantly different at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Table 4. IPMP contents (ng L⁻¹) throughout grape ripening. Irrigation effect.

		NON IRRIGATED		IRRIGATED	
	Date	Sugar (g/L)	IPMP (ng/L)	Sugar (g/L)	IPMP (ng/L)
VERAISON	08-11	133	2.6 (0.5) a	131	4.3 (0.9) A
RIPENING 1	08-24	160	*	159	4.9 (1.5) A
RIPENING 2	09-03	182	3.4 (1.2) a	190	15.0 (7.1) B
RIPENING 3	09-10	192	*	199	2.7 (0.6) A
HARVEST	09-16	207	*	206	*

TWO-FACTOR ANOVA: Ripening $p = 0.0035$; Treatment $p = 0.0015$; Interaction $p = 0.0908$
 *: below quantification limits. Values followed by a different letter are significantly different at the $p < 0.05$ level. Results could not be analysed by means of two-factor ANOVA test due to the lack of data above quantification limits.

Over grape ripening, contents of IBMP and SBMP were significantly higher in samples from vines with the highest plantation density (Tables 5 and 7). Levels of SBMP were low over grape ripening and did not show any clear increase or decrease, except that at the harvest they were below quantification levels in all cases (Table 7). IBMP contents raised during winemaking (Table 6), but not the levels of SBMP or IPMP, which remained close or below quantification limits until the end of the process. Final wines made with grapes from the highest plantation density vines contained significantly higher contents of IBMP (Table 6). IPMP levels were between 2.8 and 5.9 (with no significant differences over the process) in samples from vines with a plantation density of 4,000 plants per hectare throughout winemaking. However, they were below quantification limits in samples from both 3,000 and 2,000 plants per hectare vines.

Table 5. IBMP contents (ng L⁻¹) throughout grape ripening. Effect of Plantation density (plants per hectare).

Date	2,000		3,000		4,000	
	Sugar (g/L)	IBMP (ng/L)	Sugar (g/L)	IBMP (ng/L)	Sugar (g/L)	IBMP (ng/L)
VERAISON 08-12	128	32.4 (7.4) a	129	28.0 (7.5) A	129	42.5 (8.6) α
RIPENING 1 08-26	162	10.9 (3.8) b	158	13.7 (5.8) B	163	15.6 (5.3) β
RIPENING 2 09-05	185	5.7 (2.9) c	192	7.4 (6.3) BC	189	10.7 (3.3) β
RIPENING 3 09-10	201	5.8 (2.3) c	199	4.0 (2.0) C	199	7.0 (2.9) β
HARVEST 09-17	216	*	214	*	218	2.6 (0.4) γ

TWO-FACTOR ANOVA: Ripening p < 0.0001; Treatment p = 0.0267; Interaction p = 0.4084

	2,000	3,000
3,000	0.8468	-
4,000	0.0237	0.0153

*: below quantification limits. Values followed by a different letter are significantly different at the p < 0.05 level.

Table 6. IBMP contents (ng L⁻¹) throughout winemaking. Effect of Plantation density (plants per hectare).

	2,000	3,000	4,000
HARVEST	*	*	2.6 (0.4) α
1 DAY MACER.	6.7 (3.4) a	6.4 (0.9) A	9.5 (3.6) β
END ALC. FERM.	11.6 (3.9) a	10.8 (3.2) B	14.8 (3.2) βγ
END MAL. FERM	9.8 (3.4) a	9.9 (2.9) B	15.5 (2.4) γ

TWO-FACTOR ANOVA: Winemaking p = 0.0341; Treatment p = 0.0463; Interaction p = 0.953

	2,000	3,000
3,000	0.9196	-
4,000	0.0279	0.0347

*: below quantification limits. Values followed by a different letter are significantly different at the p < 0.05 level.

Discussion and conclusions

Concentrations of IBMP in final wines (4.6-15.5 ng L⁻¹) (Tables 2 and 6) match the literature: it has been reported that red wines contain 3.6-56.3 ng L⁻¹ of this compound (6, 11, 20). The fact that IBMP contents are generally higher than the levels of both SBMP and IBMP can also be found in the literature (3, 11, 15-17). SBMP and IPMP contents in final wines, close or below quantification limits, also agree with the reported studies: 0.05-1.9 (11) and 0.92-10.1 ng L⁻¹ (12), respectively, in red wines.

Table 7. SBMP contents (ng L⁻¹) throughout grape ripening. Effect of Plantation density (plants per hectare).

Date	2,000		3,000		4,000	
	Sugar (g/L)	SBMP (ng/L)	Sugar (g/L)	SBMP (ng/L)	Sugar (g/L)	SBMP (ng/L)
VERAISON 08-12	128	4.3 (1.3) a	129	4.0 (2.0) A	129	7.4 (3.1) α
RIPENING 1 08-26	162	2.5 (0.3) a	158	4.9 (2.1) A	163	4.6 (2.2) α
RIPENING 2 09-05	185	3.0 (0.6) a	192	4.1 (0.9) A	189	6.4 (1.6) α
RIPENING 3 09-10	201	3.9 (1.2) a	199	3.5 (2.0) A	199	3.6 (1.4) α
HARVEST 09-17	216	*	214	*	218	*

TWO-FACTOR ANOVA: Ripening p = 0.0634; Treatment p = 0.0457; Interaction p = 0.3861

	2,000	3,000
3,000	0.3346	-
4,000	0.0142	0.1097

*: below quantification limits. Values followed by a different letter are significantly different at the p < 0.05 level.

Taking into account the sensory thresholds mentioned in the introduction, results reveal that IBMP is the MP more likely to have an influence in the flavour of the final wines. Our findings agree with previous studies (12, 20, 22). Therefore, in terms of sensory impact, this compound can be considered the most important methoxypyrazine in the studied Cabernet sauvignon samples.

The decrease of IBMP contents over grape ripening (Tables 1 and 5) agree with the literature (16, 17, 20-21). Results also show that such decrease happens mainly at the first stage of the ripening process, as reported (10, 17, 26-27). This means that MP contents in final wines can be determined by the harvest date. Therefore, the analytical quantification of MPs in grapes, together with a further knowledge on how MPs pass to wines, may be useful to determine the suitable grape maturity conditions for producing high quality wines.

References to the observed raise in IBMP contents throughout winemaking (Tables 2 and 6) can also be found on the literature (29). However, not observe major changes in MP concentrations were observed after racking. As discussed in a previous work (27), all these results point to the hypothesis that MPs pass to the juice during the winemaking process because they are partly located at the skins, seeds and stems of the fruits (16, 20, 22, 30). The raise in MP contents happens mainly the first day after destemming and crushing the grapes, before starting the alcoholic fermentation. Therefore, it is probable that the highest contact between skin/seeds/stems and juice after crushing the grapes is what accelerates the pass of MPs from the solid parts to the musts. On account to this, it is possible that the duration of maceration may influence the levels of MPs in the final wines (20).

The observed delay in the drop of IBMP levels of the grapes belonging to the irrigated plants (Table 1) can be due to the fact that these fruits ripen at a slightly slower rhythm, though they reach the harvest with the same sugar level. Plantation density seems to be a factor that can condition IBMP levels in grapes and wines (Tables 5 and 6), since it has been observed that averages show a tendency to be significantly higher in samples from vines with the highest plantation density in all cases. Finally, considering the sensory detection threshold of IBMP (6), samples from irrigated vines and also from vines with a higher plantation density are more likely to have the characteristic 'vegetative' flavour.

Acknowledgement

We thank the CICYT (Project ALI 97-0765) for their financial support.

Literature cited

1. Maga JA, Pyrazine update. *Food Rev Int* 8: 479-558 (1992).
2. Murray KE and Whitfield FB, The Occurrence of 3-Alkyl-2-Methoxy-pyrazines in Raw Vegetables. *J Sci Food Agric* 26: 973-986 (1975).
3. Allen MS, Lacey MJ, Harris RLN and Brown WV, Contribution of Methoxy-pyrazines to Sauvignon blanc Wine Aroma. *Am J Enol Vitic* 42: 109-112 (1991).
4. Buttery RG, Seifert RM, Lundin R E, Guadagni DG and Ling LC, Characterisation of an important aroma component of bell peppers. *Chem Ind* 04: 490-491 (1969).
5. Buttery RG, Seifert RM, Guadagni DG and Ling LC, Characterization of Some Volatile Constituents of Bell Peppers. *J Agric Food Chem* 17: 1322-1327 (1969).
6. Kotseridis Y, Anocibar Beloqui A, Bertrand A and Doazan JP, An Analytical Method for Studying the Volatile Compounds of Merlot noir Clone Wines. *Am J Enol Vitic* 49: 44-48 (1998).
7. Maga JA, Sensory and stability properties of added methoxy-pyrazines to model and authentic wines. In *Flavours and Off-Flavours*, Proceedings of the 6th International Flavor Conference, Charalambous, G Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp 61-70 (1990).
8. Murray KE, Shipton J and Whitfield FB, 2-Methoxy-pyrazines and the flavour of green peas (*Pisum sativum*). *Chem Ind* 07: 897-898 (1970).
9. Seifert RM, Buttery RG, Guadagni DG, Black DR and Harris JG, Synthesis of Some 2-Methoxy-3-Alkyl-pyrazines with Strong Bell Pepper-Like Odors. *J Agric Food Chem* 18: 246-249 (1970).
10. Allen MS and Lacey MJ, Methoxy-pyrazine grape flavour: influence of climate, cultivar and viticulture. *Wein-Wissenschaft* 48: 211-213 (1993).
11. Allen MS, Lacey MJ and Boyd S, Determination of Methoxy-pyrazines in Red Wines by Stable Isotope Dilution Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry. *J Agric Food Chem* 42: 1734-1738 (1994).
12. Allen MS, Lacey MJ, and Boyd S, Methoxy-pyrazines in red wines: occurrence of 2-methoxy-3-(1-methylethyl) pyrazine. *J Agric Food Chem* 43: 769-772 (1995).
13. Augustyn OPH, Rapp A and Wyk J, Some Volatile Aroma Components of *Vitis vinifera* L cv Sauvignon blanc. *S Afr J Enol Vitic* 3: 53-60 (1982).
14. Bayonove C, Cordonnier R and Dubois P, Étude d'une fraction caractéristique de l'arôme du raisin de la variété Cabernet sauvignon, mise en évidence de la 2-méthoxy-3-isobutylpyrazine. *C R Acad Sc Paris* 281 (D): 75-78 (1975).
15. Harris RLN, Lacey MJ, Brown WV and Allen MS, Determination of 2-methoxy-3-alkylpyrazines in wine by gas chromatography / mass spectrometry. *Vitis* 26: 201-207 (1987).
16. Hashizume K and Umeda N, Methoxy-pyrazine content of Japanese red wines. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 60: 802-805 (1996).
17. Lacey MJ, Allen MS, Harris RLN and Brown WV, Methoxy-pyrazines in Sauvignon blanc Grapes and Wines. *Am J Enol Vitic* 42: 103-108 (1991).
18. Roujou-de-Boubee D, Leeuwen C Van and Dubordieu D, Organoleptic Impact of 2-Methoxy-3-isobutylpyrazine on Red Bordeaux and Loire Wines Effect of Environmental Conditions on Concentrations in Grapes during Ripening. *J Agric Food Chem* 48: 4830-4834 (2000).
19. Allen MS, What level of methoxy-pyrazines is desired in red wines? The flavour perspective of the classic red wines of Bordeaux. *Austr Grapegr Winem* 381: 7-9 (1995).
20. Kotseridis Y, Anocibar-Beloqui A, Bayonove C, Baumes RL and Bertrand A, Effects of selected viticultural and enological factors on levels of 2-methoxy-3-isobutylpyrazine in wines. *J Int Sci Vigne Vin* 33: 19-23 (1999).
21. Marais J, Sauvignon blanc cultivar aroma - a review. *S Afr J Enol Vitic* 15: 41-45 (1994).
22. Hashizume K and Samuta T, Grape maturity and light exposure affect berry methoxy-pyrazines concentration. *Am J Enol Vitic* 50: 194-198 (1999).
23. Schneider R, Kotseridis Y, Ray J-L, Augier C and Baumes R, Quantitative determination of sulfur-containing wine odorants at sub parts per billion levels Development and application of a stable isotope dilution assay. *J Agric Food Chem* 51: 3243-3248 (2003).
24. Tominaga T, Guimbertau G and Dubordieu D, Contribution of benzenemethanethiol to smoky aroma of certain *Vitis vinifera* L wines. *J Agric Food Chem* 51: 1373-1376 (2003).
25. Noble AC, Elliott-Fisk DL and Allen MS, Vegetative flavor and methoxy-pyrazines in Cabernet Sauvignon. *Fruit Flavors* 596: 226-234 (1995).
26. Sala C, Mestres M, Martí MP, Busto O and Guasch J, Headspace solid-phase microextraction method for determining 3-alkyl-2-methoxy-pyrazines in musts by means of polydimethylsiloxane-divinylbenzene fibres. *J Chromatogr A* 880: 93-99 (2000).
27. Sala C, Mestres M, Martí MP, Busto O and Guasch J, Headspace solid-phase microextraction analysis of 3-alkyl-2-methoxy-pyrazines in wines. *J Chromatogr A* 953: 1-6 (2002).
28. Haycock K, Roth J, Gagnon J, Finzer WF and Soper C, Statview 4.0, ABACUS Concepts, Inc., Berkeley, California (1992).
29. Allen MS, Commercial support for methoxy-pyrazine flavour research. *Austr Grapegr Winem* 366: 22-23 (1994).
30. Roujou de Boubee D, Cumsille AM, Pons M and Dubordieu D, Location of 2-Methoxy-3-isobutylpyrazine in Cabernet sauvignon grape bunches and its extractability during vinification. *Am J Enol Vitic* 53:1-5 (2002).

