



# Physicochemical characterization of virgin olive oil obtained using an ultrasound-assisted extraction at an industrial scale: Influence of olive maturity index and malaxation time

Agnese Taticchi, Roberto Selvaggini, Sonia Esposto, Beatrice Sordini, Gianluca Veneziani\*, Maurizio Servili

Department of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Sciences, University of Perugia, Via S. Costanzo, 06126 Perugia, Italy

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

VOO quality  
Ultrasound  
Physicochemical composition  
Phenols  
Volatile compounds  
Fruit ripening  
Malaxation time

## ABSTRACT

Ultrasound-assisted extraction is an innovative technique applied to the extraction process for virgin olive oil (VOO), which is generally employed to increase plant efficiency and improve product quality. A high-power ultrasound (US) device was introduced at an industrial plant that can process at 2 tons/h to evaluate the technique's physicochemical impact on quality parameters of VOO that was caused by an intensive mass transfer induced by acoustic cavitation process and shockwaves. The impact on oil yield was also evaluated with respect to the ripening stage and malaxation time. No significant effects on the legal and commercial parameters of VOO (including quality indices, sterols, triterpene dialcohols, waxes and diacylglycerols) were found for olives at medium-early ripening stage. Significant physical changes, increased extraction yield (22.7%), enhanced phenol content (10.1%) were observed in US-VOO compared to control (C) oil extracted with a traditional process at an early maturity index.

## 1. Introduction

The quality of virgin olive oil originates in the orchard and its management, continues to be impacted through the regulation of operative parameters and technical considerations in the extraction process and evolves during the entire storage period until the oil is consumed. The first step involves the genetic origin of the olive, the geographical growing area, the climate and the agronomic practices, with attention often being particularly focused on fertilization and water availability (Caruso et al., 2017; Rallo et al., 2018). The second step concerns the regulation of the main variables (temperature, oxygen, enzymatic activities and the disruption level of olive cell tissues) involved in mechanical extraction processes of olive oil that are connected to increases in parameters associated with quality (Bejaoui, Sánchez-Ortiz, Sánchez, Jiménez, & Beltrán, 2017; Esposto et al., 2013; Selvaggini et al., 2014; Servili et al., 2015; Veneziani et al., 2015). The last step has a central role in preserving a high level quality after all other efforts have been undertaken, where factors that could drastically reduce the shelf-life of the product are controlled.

Many of the latest innovative technologies that have been applied in olive oil extraction plants have had the primary aim of increasing

extractability of oil, while preserving or improving the quality characteristics in VOO. A common role of microwaves, pulsed electric field, ultrasound and similar technologies is to cause a major cellular breakdown and release intracellular contents to enhance the olive oil yield (Clodoveo et al., 2017; Puertolas & Martinez de Maranon, 2015; Leone et al., 2018). Each different technology differently impacts olive cellular structure due to thermal and non-thermal treatments that are strictly related to sudden and rapid alterations in temperature, pressure, energy, electrical potential, or any combination of these. Extraction technologies produce structural modifications in the olive tissues, causing different effects like development of pores, increased cellular permeability and collapse of cellular membranes (Chemat et al., 2017). Novel treatments are often pursued for an additional increase in the crushing and malaxation phases; these treatments seek to improve the release of oil drops that are primarily located inside of the vacuoles of the mesocarp cells present in olive drupes. This process also causes a simultaneous release of other intracellular matter that allows different antioxidant compounds to diffuse into the aqueous and oily phases (Chemat et al., 2017). In addition to increased oil yields, several recent technological studies, concerning heat exchangers, pulsed electric field and ultrasound, showed there is a concomitant effect of improved VOO

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [gianluca.veneziani@unipg.it](mailto:gianluca.veneziani@unipg.it) (G. Veneziani).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2019.03.041>

Received 28 November 2018; Received in revised form 7 March 2019; Accepted 9 March 2019

Available online 13 March 2019

0308-8146/ © 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

quality due to enrichment of the relative content of  $\alpha$ -tocopherols and/or hydrophilic phenols that are strictly related to the health and sensory properties of the product (Iqdiam et al., 2018; Puertolas & Martinez de Maranon, 2015; Almeida, Valli, Bendini, & Toschi, 2017; Esposito et al., 2013; Veneziani et al., 2018a). The disruption effects on olive paste cells can also cause a release of other compounds (volatile compounds, waxes, sterols, metals, triterpene dialcohols, pro-oxidants, etc...) with properties that negatively impact olive oil characteristics (OJEC, 2015) and its antioxidant stability (Chemat et al., 2017). These possibly negative impacts on VOO quality through using novel technologies is scarcely addressed in the literature.

Ultrasound-assisted extraction, which is based on effects that cause cavitation that enables accelerated heat and mass transfers, is one of the recent technologies applied to the mechanical extraction process of VOO before and after the malaxation phase. The first studies evaluating high-power ultrasound were carried out at lab-scale processing plants, and these studies showed a limited effect on the efficiency of oil yield, a reduction in phenolic compounds and an increase in the content of  $\alpha$ -tocopherols, chlorophylls and carotenoids (Jiménez, Beltrán, & Uceda, 2007; Clodoveo, Durante, La Notte, Punzi, & Gambacorta, 2013). More recent experimental tests led to an improved working efficiency of ultrasound systems that also caused a further increased oil yield and an increase in their phenolic fraction, which was probably due to better control of both the parameters involved in the oxidation processes and of the enzymatic activities responsible for the reduction of the main phenolic compounds (Almeida et al., 2017; Clodoveo et al., 2017; Juliano et al., 2017, Leone et al., 2018). Some latest studies that examined the effects of ultrasound on olive oil extractability and its effects on concerns relating to quality were performed by evaluating data obtained in lab-scale or semi-industrial processing plants (Almeida et al., 2017; Bejaoui et al., 2017; 2018; Iqdiam et al., 2018; Juliano et al., 2017). This paper examines the impact of a high-power ultrasound technology on the physicochemical characteristics of VOO extracted by an industrial processing plant with a working capacity of 2 tons/h. Large-scale extractions were carried out using olives at three different ripening stages and applying three different times of malaxation to better evaluate the variables that can affect the process of disrupting olive cell membranes and cell walls, the consequent effect on oil yield, and the effects on the release of extractable compounds capable of modifying VOO quality.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Chemicals

Phenolic alcohols such as (*p*-hydroxyphenyl)ethanol (*p*-HPEA) and (3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)ethanol (3,4-DHPEA) were purchased from Cabru s.a.s. (Arcore, Milan, Italy) and Fluka (Milan, Italy), respectively. Vanillic acid,  $\alpha$ -tocopherol, 2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazil (DPPH), the analytical standards of aldehydes, alcohols, esters and ketones, sterols, triterpene dialcohols and waxes were supplied by Sigma-Aldrich (Milan, Italy). The isomer of oleuropein aglycon (3,4-DHPEA-EA), the dialdehydic forms of elenolic acid linked to tyrosol and hydroxytyrosol (*p*-HPEA-EDA and 3,4-DHPEA-EDA), (+)-1-acetoxypinoresinol and (+)-pinoresinol were obtained as reported by Veneziani et al. (2017).

### 2.2. VOO mechanical extraction process

Trials were conducted with Ogliarola garganica olives that were harvested in the Apulia region from mid-October to mid-November at three different ripening stages: 0.88, 2.82 and 3.31 were representative maturity indices (MI) in the control (C1, C2 and C3) and ultrasound VOOs (US1, US2 and US3), respectively. The maturity index was calculated as reported by Beltran, Uceda, Jimenez, and Aguilera (2003). Olives were processed within 48 h from harvesting and each VOO, obtained from batch of olives at different ripening stage and/or at a

different malaxation time (control and experimental trial), was extracted three times using a Pieralisi industrial system (Pieralisi S.p.A., Jesi, Ancona, Italy) with a working capacity of 2 tons/h, installed at Frantoio “Il Nocciolino” (Ponte Vallecceppi, Perugia, Italy). The VOO extraction plant was equipped with a hammer-type FP HP 30 INOX crusher (2800 rpm), four MOLINOVA TG MOD 600 malaxers, a Leopard 5 decanter and a BRAVO vertical separator.

The Leopard decanter, based on multi phase decanter (DMF) technology, is a two-phase centrifuge able to produce a little hydrated pomace, similar to one obtained from a three-phase decanter, and recovering a certain amount of pulp from the pomace to obtain an olive “paté” characterized by a high moisture content without the presence of olive pits. The bowl discharging device of DMF technology, automatically controlled, allows to extract the olive oil without the addition of water with the advantages of three-phase decanter extraction technology.

The experimental tests were carried out using a high-power UIP4000 hdT ultrasound system (Hielscher Ultrasonics GmbH, Teltow, Germany). The ultrasound industrial equipment produced by Hielscher GmbH, and installed by Seneco Science (Seneco S.r.l., Milano, Italy), is for continuous operation, and is composed by a generator with a touch screen control panel, with the possibility of a remote control by ethernet connection and a transducer with 4 kW power and 20 kHz; to be in position to work in continuous operation the ultrasound equipment have a flow cell special designed with inlet at the bottom and outlet at the upper part, connection DN90. At the outlet part there are connection for temperature and pressure control. A pinch valve is used to regulate the pressure inside the flow cell. A special designed radial cathode in titanium is located inside of the flow-cell to provide an adequate cavitation; the amplitude of cavitation is possible to regulate by the touch-screen control panel. The unit was positioned between the crusher and the malaxer, connection is by food-grade pipes only. The olive paste, coming out from the crusher was processed in continuous mode with ultrasound at a frequency of 20 kHz, a power of 2.8 kW, 3 bars of pressure and an 80% of amplitude. The ultrasound treatment was followed by a malaxation phase regulated at a kneading time of 30 min at 25 °C. The batch of olives at an early ripening stage (0.88 MI) was also processed at two additional malaxation times of 10 min and 20 min (C4 and US4 control and ultrasound tests, respectively).

### 2.3. VOO physicochemical analysis

#### 2.3.1. Turbidity grade

A Ratio Turbidimeter Hach Model 18,900 (Hach Company Loveland, Colorado, US) was used to detect the turbidity level of the VOO. The values of the turbidity grade were expressed in nephelometric turbidity units (NTU).

#### 2.3.2. Moisture content

The moisture contents of VOO samples were evaluated as described in the ISO 662 method (ISO 662, 1998). Five grams of each oil sample were weighted in an aluminum capsule and placed in an oven (Binder GmbH, Tuttlingen, Germany) at 105 °C for approximately 5 h until a constant weight was obtained.

#### 2.3.3. Oil content

The Soxhlet extractor was utilized to analyze paté and pomace oil content where 10 g of dried sample with 5 g of pumice stone was loaded into a thimble made from thick filter paper and placed inside the main compartment of the Soxhlet extractor. The process was undertaken for six hours using hexane as an extraction solvent. The solvent was removed by using a Rotavapor R-210 rotary evaporator (Buchi Italia s.r.l., Cornaredo, Italy); afterwards, the residual oil content was detected (AOAC, 1995).

### 2.3.4. Oil color

VOO color measurements were carried out over the whole visible spectrum (380–770 nm) using a Cary 100 Scan UV–Visible Spectrophotometer (Varian, Walnut Creek, CA, U.S.A.) with illuminant D65 and a 10° observer. CIELAB color space was used to evaluate the scalar coordinates ( $L^*$ ,  $a^*$ ,  $b^*$ ) and the angular coordinates of chroma ( $C^*$ ) and hue ( $h$ ) related to psychophysical characteristics of color (Moyano, Heredia, & Meléndez-Martínez, 2010).  $L^*$ ,  $a^*$  and  $b^*$  coordinates described the color parameters of lightness, red (positive)/green (negative) color components and yellow (positive)/blue (negative) color components, respectively. All of the recorded data were elaborated on using Cary WinUV Color software. The Euclidean distance between two points were assessed in three-dimensional space in control and ultrasound VOOs, and the values of color differences were calculated using the following equation:

$$\Delta E = [(\Delta L^*)^2 + (\Delta a^*)^2 + (\Delta b^*)^2]^{1/2}$$

### 2.3.5. Antioxidant activity

The antioxidant activities of VOOs were obtained in VOOs that had been extracted with and without an ultrasound-assisted extraction process and were assessed for their Radical Scavenging Capacity (RSC) using the 2,2-difenil-1-picrilidrazil (DPPH) radical. Total antioxidant capacity was evaluated directly dissolving the VOO sample in ethyl acetate as was described in Mancebo-Campos, Salvador, and Fregapane (2014). The assays were spectrophotometrically performed with a Cary 100 Scan UV–Visible spectrophotometer (Varian, Walnut Creek, CA, U.S.A.), where 0.5 ml of ethyl acetate solution, at different concentrations of sample (0.1–0.4 ml), was added to 3 ml of DPPH ethyl acetate solution. Measurements were carried out at 515 nm in cuvettes that were kept at room temperature in the dark for 20 min. For each VOO samples the concentration of antioxidant, able to reduce to 50% the initial concentration of DPPH solution ( $EC_{50}$ ), was detected. The RSC value was expressed as mg of oil/ml of mixture reaction (MR).

### 2.3.6. Quality indices

The values of free acidity, peroxide value,  $K_{232}$ ,  $K_{270}$  and  $\Delta K$  were detected according to the analysis methods described by Regulation (EU) 2015/1830 (OJEC, 2015).

### 2.3.7. Sterols, triterpene dialcohols and waxes

The sterol composition, total sterols, amount of erythrodiol and uvaol, and waxes were detected using the official methods of analysis (Regulation (EU) 2015/1830, OJEC, 2015).

### 2.3.8. Diacylglycerols (DAGs)

1,2- and 1,3 diacylglycerols contents in control and ultrasound-treated VOOs were evaluated using the methods of analysis described by the IOC (2013).

### 2.3.9. Chlorophylls and carotenoids

The analysis of VOO pigments were carried out following the spectrophotometric method described by Mínguez-Mosquera, Rejano-Navarro, Gandul-Rojas, SanchezGomez, and Garrido-Fernandez (1991). The absorbance at 670 nm and 470 nm was detected to determine the chlorophylls and carotenoids content, respectively. Chlorophyll and carotenoid total fractions were expressed as mg/kg of VOO using the respective coefficient of extinction (613 and 2000).

### 2.3.10. $\alpha$ -Tocopherol

HPLC–DAD–FLD was used to detect the content of  $\alpha$ -tocopherol in VOOs. Samples were prepared by dissolving one gram of oil into 10 ml of *n*-hexane that was then filtered with a 0.25- $\mu$ m polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF) syringe filter (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA) and injected into an HPLC system. The  $\alpha$ -tocopherol content was evaluated at an excitation wavelength of 294 nm and at an emission

wavelength of 300 nm as described by Esposto et al. (2015).

### 2.3.11. Hydrophilic phenols

An Agilent Technologies system Model 1100 (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA), that consists of a vacuum degasser, a quaternary pump, an autosampler, a thermostated column compartment, a diode array detector (DAD), and a fluorescence detector (FLD) was used to perform HPLC analysis of the main phenolic compounds in VOO. The extraction methods and the chromatographic tests were carried out as described by Selvaggini et al. (2014). The quantitative and qualitative compositions of hydrophilic phenols were separated and determined using a Spherisorb ODS1 column (5  $\mu$ m, 4.6 mm  $\times$  250 mm, Waters, Milford, MA, USA) and was elaborated using ChemStation software (Agilent Technologies, Palo Alto, CA, USA).

### 2.3.12. Volatile compounds

Headspace solid-phase microextraction followed by gas chromatography–mass spectrometry (HS-SPME/GC-MS) was used to identify the quantitative and qualitative volatile composition of VOO treated or untreated with the ultrasound system. Gas chromatographic analysis of aldehydes, alcohols, esters and ketones that were primarily concerned with the development of VOO sensory notes was carried out using a Varian 4000 GC-MS controlled by Varian MS Workstation Software, Version 6.6. The instrument's working parameters for the identification, detection and quantification of VOO volatile compounds were adjusted using the analysis method reported by Veneziani et al. (2015).

## 2.4. Statistical analysis

All the physicochemical data of oil treated and untreated with ultrasound-assisted extraction were elaborated on by using SigmaPlot Software 12.3 (Systat Software Inc., San Jose, CA, USA) for the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), where differences were considered to be significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. Physicochemical characterization of VOO

The impact of ultrasound-assisted extraction on the physicochemical composition of VOO was evaluated in an industrial plant that was capable of processing Ogliarola garganica olives at a working capacity of 2 tons/h at an early maturity index of 0.88 for a conventional malaxation time of 30 min.

The ultrasound system did not modify the legal quality indices of free acidity, peroxide value and spectrophotometric constants, as reported by other studies (Clodoveo et al., 2013; Juliano et al., 2017).

Epicuticular and intracuticular waxes, mainly found in the epicarp of olive drupe as three dimensional complexes or embedded in the cutin matrix (Lanza & Di Serio, 2015), can modify their own availability and solubility relating to levels of physical shock and increased temperature. The cavitation process due to ultrasound waves causes sudden temperature increases and disruptive effects on the fruit skin that did not change the waxes content in either type of VOO, as is shown in Table 1.

The oils extracted from the three distinct layers of olive pericarp are characterized by different sterolic compositions (Guillaume, Ravetti, Lala Ray, & Johnson, 2012). The different fruit tissues of skin, pulp and seed show different concentrations of sterols that are mainly represented as  $\beta$ -sitosterol, campesterol, delta-5-avenasterol and stigmasterol, with the highest total content of sterols detected in the endocarp oil (which is approximately two-fold higher than what is observed in the mesocarp and epicarp). The possible more abundant extraction, as a result of ultrasound treatment, of oil contained in the cells of skin and seed tissues and characterized by different concentrations of sterols did not determine any significant alteration of the

**Table 1**

Physicochemical parameters and antioxidant activity of VOO control (C1, C2 and C3) and extracted with ultrasound system (US1, US2 and US3) using Ogljarola garganica olives at different maturity index and malaxed for 30 min.<sup>a</sup>

| Maturity index                                 | C1               | US1              | C2               | US2              | C3               | US3              |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|  | 0.88             |                  | 2.82             |                  | 3.31             |                  |
| Turbidity (NTU)                                | 131 ± 28a        | 64 ± 24b         | 240 ± 28a        | 218 ± 16a        | 300 ± 26a        | 235 ± 25b        |
| Oil moisture content (%)                       | 0.160 ± 0.01a    | 0.131 ± 0.01b    | 0.178 ± 0.01a    | 0.172 ± 0.03a    | 0.195 ± 0.01a    | 0.176 ± 0.005b   |
| Free fatty acid (% oleic acid)                 | 0.25 ± 0.0000a   | 0.25 ± 0.0000a   | 0.29 ± 0.007a    | 0.31 ± 0.007a    | 0.27 ± 0.007a    | 0.27 ± 0.007a    |
| Peroxide values (meqO <sub>2</sub> /kg)        | 4.7 ± 0.6a       | 4.9 ± 0.7a       | 7.3 ± 1.0a       | 7.3 ± 0.4a       | 5.8 ± 0.1a       | 5.7 ± 0.1a       |
| K <sub>232</sub>                               | 1.974 ± 0.01a    | 1.968 ± 0.02a    | 2.156 ± 0.09a    | 2.075 ± 0.02a    | 2.087 ± 0.02a    | 2.06 ± 0.04a     |
| K <sub>270</sub>                               | 0.195 ± 0.003a   | 0.197 ± 0.003a   | 0.187 ± 0.02a    | 0.184 ± 0.002a   | 0.195 ± 0.008a   | 0.186 ± 0.01a    |
| ΔK   | -0.006 ± 0.0003a | -0.006 ± 0.0003a | -0.004 ± 0.0004a | -0.004 ± 0.0007a | -0.004 ± 0.0004a | -0.004 ± 0.0004a |
| 1.2/1.3 DAGs (%)                               | 99.3 ± 0.3a      | 98.7 ± 0.4a      | 82.25 ± 3.3a     | 83.1 ± 3.1a      | 86.6 ± 0.1a      | 86.0 ± 2.0a      |
| Waxes (mg/kg)                                  | 19.9 ± 0.8a      | 18.2 ± 0.2a      | 13.8 ± 1.3a      | 14.5 ± 0.6a      | 12.2 ± 1.4a      | 15.3 ± 1.1b      |
| Cholesterol (%)                                | 0.2 ± 0.07a      | 0.2 ± 0.07a      | 0.2 ± 0.03a      | 0.2 ± 0.01a      | 0.3 ± 0.007a     | 0.2 ± 0.03a      |
| Brassicasterol (%)                             | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       |
| 24-Methylenecholesterol (%)                    | 0.1 ± 0.01a      | 0.1 ± 0.02a      | 0.1 ± 0.01a      | 0.1 ± 0.0a       | 0.2 ± 0.007a     | 0.2 ± 0.0a       |
| Campesterol (%)                                | 3.3 ± 0.2a       | 3.2 ± 0.02a      | 3.2 ± 0.01a      | 3.2 ± 0.01a      | 3.1 ± 0.0        | 3.1 ± 0.01       |
| Campestanol (%)                                | 0.2 ± 0.01a      | 0.2 ± 0.02a      | 0.2 ± 0.06a      | 0.2 ± 0.0a       | 0.2 ± 0.04a      | 0.2 ± 0.07a      |
| Stigmasterol (%)                               | 0.5 ± 0.01a      | 0.5 ± 0.02a      | 0.6 ± 0.007a     | 0.5 ± 0.02a      | 0.5 ± 0.06a      | 0.5 ± 0.05a      |
| Δ7-Campesterol (%)                             | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       |
| Δ5,23-Stigmastadienol (%)                      | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       | 0.0 ± 0.0a       |
| Cholesterol (%)                                | 1.0 ± 0.02a      | 1.1 ± 0.1a       | 1.1 ± 0.01a      | 1.0 ± 0.04a      | 1.1 ± 0.007a     | 1.0 ± 0.01a      |
| β-Sitosterol (%)                               | 85.0 ± 0.2a      | 85.5 ± 0.3a      | 85.7 ± 0.1a      | 86.0 ± 0.3a      | 84.4 ± 0.08a     | 84.5 ± 0.3a      |
| Sitosterol (%)                                 | 1.3 ± 0.09a      | 1.3 ± 0.01a      | 1.2 ± 0.07a      | 1.2 ± 0.1a       | 1.5 ± 0.007a     | 1.4 ± 0.1a       |
| Δ5-Avenasterol (%)                             | 6.4 ± 0.05a      | 6.2 ± 0.1a       | 6.1 ± 0.07a      | 5.8 ± 0.01a      | 6.9 ± 0.1a       | 7.0 ± 0.08a      |
| Δ5,24-Stigmastadienol (%)                      | 1.1 ± 0.02a      | 1.0 ± 0.1a       | 0.8 ± 0.07a      | 0.9 ± 0.0a       | 1.0 ± 0.04       | 1.0 ± 0.03a      |
| Delta-7-Stigmastenol (%)                       | 0.3 ± 0.01a      | 0.2 ± 0.1a       | 0.3 ± 0.04a      | 0.4 ± 0.2a       | 0.3 ± 0.007a     | 0.4 ± 0.1a       |
| Delta-7-Avenasterol (%)                        | 0.7 ± 0.02a      | 0.5 ± 0.2a       | 0.5 ± 0.007a     | 0.5 ± 0.01a      | 0.6 ± 0.007a     | 0.6 ± 0.03a      |
| App β-sitosterol (%) <sup>b</sup>              | 94.8 ± 0.2a      | 95.1 ± 0.4a      | 94.9 ± 0.0a      | 94.9 ± 0.2a      | 94.8 ± 0.04a     | 94.9 ± 0.1a      |
| Total sterols (mg/kg)                          | 1273.4 ± 33a     | 1301.5 ± 31a     | 995.1 ± 5.0a     | 981.4 ± 8.5a     | 904.4 ± 13.8a    | 952.8 ± 3.1b     |
| Erythrodiol and uvaol (%)                      | 1.4 ± 0.04a      | 1.1 ± 0.5a       | 2.2 ± 0.1a       | 2.4 ± 0.2a       | 2.4 ± 0.1a       | 2.6 ± 0.2a       |
| Chlorophyll (mg/kg)                            | 4.0 ± 0.09a      | 4.9 ± 0.4b       | 4.4 ± 0.4a       | 4.5 ± 0.01a      | 3.1 ± 0.2a       | 2.9 ± 0.3a       |
| Carotenoid (mg/kg)                             | 3.1 ± 0.02a      | 3.7 ± 0.3b       | 3.3 ± 0.2a       | 3.5 ± 0.04a      | 2.8 ± 0.06a      | 2.8 ± 0.2a       |
| Colour:  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| L*   | 90.151 ± 0.1a    | 93.171 ± 1.6b    | 80.419 ± 1.6a    | 81.765 ± 0.8a    | 82.081 ± 2.1a    | 82.215 ± 0.6a    |
| a*   | -5.277 ± 0.2a    | -5.644 ± 0.1b    | -4.907 ± 0.1a    | -5.061 ± 0.02a   | -4.132 ± 0.1a    | -4.299 ± 0.01a   |
| b*   | 48.315 ± 0.5a    | 53.204 ± 2.0b    | 44.016 ± 2.8a    | 46.110 ± 0.01a   | 40.541 ± 1.1a    | 38.644 ± 2.2a    |
| C*   | 48.744 ± 0.4a    | 53.498 ± 2.1b    | 44.290 ± 2.8a    | 46.367 ± 0.04a   | 40.751 ± 1.1a    | 38.595 ± 1.9a    |
| h  | 96.22 ± 0.2a     | 96.06 ± 0.4a     | 96.38 ± 0.6a     | 96.03 ± 0.3a     | 95.82 ± 0.04a    | 95.74 ± 0.5a     |
| EC <sub>50</sub> -DPPH <sup>+</sup> (mg/ml MR) | 7.05 ± 0.3a      | 6.57 ± 0.2b      | 9.33 ± 0.3a      | 8.62 ± 0.3b      | 9.2 ± 0.2a       | 8.94 ± 0.5a      |

<sup>a</sup> The data are the mean values of three independent extractions, ± standard deviation. For each different maturity index, the values in each row having different letters (a-b) are significantly different from one another ( $p < 0.05$ ).

<sup>b</sup> App β-sitosterol: Δ5,23-stigmastadienol + cholesterol + β-sitosterol + sitosterol + Δ5-avenasterol + Δ5,24-stigmastadienol. DAGs = diacylglycerols; MR = reaction mixture; L\*a\*b\* = CIE coordinates; C\* = chroma; h = hue.

sterols composition compared to the control test, as shown by sterols content of C1 and US1 VOOs (Table 1).

As previously reported relating to VOO sterol concentration, the amount of triterpene dialcohols is largely influenced by cultivar, ripening stage and environmental conditions (Lukić, Lukić, Krapac, Sladonja, & Piližota, 2013) and technological factors (Guillaume et al., 2012). The concentration of erythrodiol and uvaol also varies in relation to a single part of the olive fruit. All of these aspects could suggest that ultrasound treatment may impact the content of triterpene dialcohols, but chemical analysis determined no differences in these compounds relating to ultrasound extraction (Table 1).

Ultrasound-assisted extraction can modify the chemical structure of some compounds during the treatment of the food matrix that can induce isomerization, degradation effects, or both. The analysis of diacylglycerols did not show any alteration of the content of 1,2- and 1,3-diacylglycerols, confirming the other qualitative parameters of VOO samples analyzed.

The turbidity grade and moisture content of VOOs were also assessed after the separation process by using a vertical centrifuge. The data reported in Table 1 show how this innovative technological treatment determines an improved separation of the water phase from the oil phase, highlighted by a significant reduction in the turbidity and moisture level of US1 oil (Table 1); these values confirm the results from the study by Veneziani et al. (2018b) that related water content to veiled oil.

The data from the CIELAB coordinates showed that there were slight increases of lightness (L\*), green value (a\*) and yellow value (b\*) in VOO obtained by ultrasound treatment that were probably due to the reduced turbidity grade and were likely connected to oil transparency (Gordillo, Ciaccheri, Mignani, Gonzalez-Miret, & Heredia, 2011) and increased pigment contents (chlorophylls and carotenoids) as described by other authors (Clodoveo et al., 2013; Iqdim et al., 2018). The chroma value was also enhanced from the ultrasound-assisted extraction, while the hue data showed no difference when compared with the control (Table 1). The Euclidean distance (ΔE) between two points in the three-dimensional CIELAB color space, which respectively belong to experimental (US1) and control oil (C1), reached a value of 5.76 CIELAB units, which is a difference in color that is easily distinguished by the human eye, as shown by the range of values used to correlate visual and numerical analyses of CIELAB units (Gordillo et al., 2011).

The analysis of chlorophylls and carotenoids content showed an increase of 21.5% and 15.4% of the US1 VOO, confirming as mentioned above about oil color changes due to the impact of ultrasound technology.

The physical and chemical effects of the cavitation phenomenon caused by ultrasound treatment resulted in a significant enhancement of the extraction yield that increased from 11.9 kg of oil per 100 kg of olives in the C1 sample to 14.6 kg in the US1 sample, with a 22.7% increase when compared to oil obtained by the control test in olives that were at an early ripening stage. The data was confirmed by the

**Table 2**

VOO extraction yield, moisture and oil content of paté and pomace obtained from olives at different maturity index and for a malaxation time of 30 min.

| Maturity index              | C1          | US1         | C2          | US2         | C3          | US3         |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                             | 0.88        |             | 2.82        |             | 3.31        |             |
| Extraction yield (%)        | 11.9 ± 0.3a | 14.6 ± 0.3b | 17.5 ± 0.2a | 18.1 ± 0.2b | 17.8 ± .3a  | 17.3 ± 0.2a |
| Paté moisture content (%)   | 74.8 ± 3.5a | 77.6 ± 2.1a | 76.7 ± 1.5a | 76.7 ± 1.2a | 80.6 ± 1.3a | 78.1 ± 2.1a |
| Paté oil content (% d.w.)   | 26.2 ± 2.3a | 20.4 ± 2.2b | 24.9 ± 0.3a | 26.8 ± 2.5a | 21.4 ± 2.1a | 23.9 ± 3.1a |
| Pomace moisture content (%) | 50.8 ± 3.5a | 46.8 ± 0.5a | 47.3 ± .1a  | 47.6 ± 0.3a | 49.4 ± 0.7a | 48.9 ± 0.2a |
| Pomace oil content (% d.w.) | 3.9 ± 0.4a  | 4.0 ± 0.1a  | 3.6 ± 0.3a  | 3.3 ± 0.02a | 4.2 ± 0.6a  | 3.6 ± 0.2a  |

<sup>a</sup>The data are the mean values of three independent extractions, ± standard deviation. For each different maturity index the values in each row having different letters (a-b) are significantly different from one another (p < 0.05). C1, C2 and C3 = control test; US1, US2 and US3 = ultrasound test; dw = dry weight.

**Table 3**Phenolic composition (mg/kg) of VOOs control (C1, C2 and C3) and extracted with ultrasound system (US1, US2 and US3) processing Ogliarola garganica olives at different maturity index for 30 min of malaxation time.<sup>a</sup>

| Maturity index            | C1             | US1            | C2            | US2           | C3            | US3           |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                           | 0.88           |                | 2.82          |               | 3.31          |               |
| 3,4-DHPEA                 | 1.1 ± 0.1a     | 1.4 ± 0.1b     | 5.4 ± 1.8a    | 5.1 ± 0.4a    | 5.1 ± 0.2a    | 5.1 ± 0.6a    |
| p-HPEA                    | 3.0 ± 0.7a     | 3.6 ± 0.1a     | 6.5 ± 1.1a    | 6.2 ± 0.1a    | 5.8 ± 0.1a    | 5.7 ± 0.1a    |
| Vanillic acid             | 0.4 ± 0.04a    | 0.3 ± 0.1a     | 0.4 ± 0.1a    | 0.4 ± 0.01a   | 0.3 ± 0.003a  | 0.3 ± 0.04a   |
| 3,4-DHPEA-EDA             | 588.5 ± 30.0a  | 666.6 ± 34.7b  | 475.5 ± 6.5a  | 485.2 ± 6.4a  | 442.1 ± 31.3a | 430.9 ± 40.7a |
| p-HPEA-EDA                | 202.4 ± 3.2a   | 204.7 ± 3.9a   | 169.8 ± 4.2a  | 189.4 ± 4.0b  | 181.4 ± 9.5a  | 175.7 ± 8.8a  |
| 3,4-DHPEA-EA              | 187.1 ± 3.9a   | 207.8 ± 2.7b   | 166.1 ± 6.3a  | 170.9 ± 7.6a  | 153.4 ± 17.8a | 150.5 ± 9.9a  |
| Ligstroside aglycone      | 18.5 ± 0.1a    | 20.4 ± 0.5b    | 18.5 ± 0.5a   | 17.0 ± 0.1b   | 18.0 ± 0.9a   | 17.8 ± 0.6a   |
| (+)-1-Acetoxy-pininosinol | 40.3 ± 1.3a    | 39.3 ± 2.1a    | 38.2 ± 1.2a   | 38.7 ± 1.1a   | 38.8 ± 1.1a   | 39.1 ± 1.0a   |
| (+)-Pininosinol           | 22.0 ± 0.4a    | 23.3 ± 0.3b    | 23.6 ± 1.0a   | 22.8 ± 0.4a   | 21.6 ± 1.1a   | 20.2 ± 0.2a   |
| Total phenols             | 1063.3 ± 30.5a | 1167.4 ± 35.1b | 904.1 ± 10.8a | 935.9 ± 10.4b | 866.4 ± 41.3a | 845.3 ± 43.9a |
| α-Tocopherol              | 245.3 ± 2.7a   | 272.9 ± 1.9b   | 272.1 ± 5.4a  | 268.7 ± 4.1a  | 267.7 ± 0.8a  | 261.4 ± 5.1a  |

<sup>a</sup> The data are the mean values of three independent VOO extractions, ± standard deviation. For each different maturity index the values in each row having different letters (a-b) are significantly different from one another (p < 0.05).

**Table 4**Volatile composition (µg/kg) of VOOs control (C1, C2 and C3) and extracted with ultrasound system (US1, US2 and US3) processing Ogliarola garganica olives at different maturity index.<sup>a</sup>

| Maturity index                                     | C1            | US1           | C2           | US2           | C3             | US3           |
|--|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
|  | 0.88          |               | 2.82         |               | 3.31           |               |
| <i>Aldehydes</i>                                   |               |               |              |               |                |               |
| (E)-2-Pentenal                                     | 40 ± 1a       | 42 ± 2a       | 30 ± 1a      | 30 ± 0a       | 32 ± 3a        | 35 ± 3a       |
| Hexanal  | 430 ± 14a     | 357 ± 7b      | 333 ± 9a     | 351 ± 2b      | 250 ± 1a       | 277 ± 44a     |
| (E)-2-Hexenal                                      | 20,352 ± 383a | 19,357 ± 117b | 14,250 ± 35a | 14,245 ± 390a | 9944 ± 1081a   | 11,238 ± 628a |
| (E,E)-2,4-Hexadienal                               | 118 ± 4a      | 102 ± 2b      | 69 ± 1a      | 67 ± 1a       | 55 ± 5a        | 62 ± 1b       |
| 2,4-Hexadienal (i)                                 | 203 ± 11a     | 173 ± 5b      | 117 ± 1a     | 114 ± 3a      | 93 ± 8a        | 108 ± 1b      |
| Sum of C <sub>5</sub> and C <sub>6</sub> aldehydes | 21,142 ± 384a | 20,031 ± 117b | 14,799 ± 36a | 14,807 ± 390a | 10,373 ± 1081a | 11,719 ± 629a |
| <i>Alcohols</i>                                    |               |               |              |               |                |               |
| Ethanol  | 2037 ± 111a   | 2249 ± 130a   | 2873 ± 39a   | 2844 ± 73a    | 1284 ± 78a     | 1366 ± 131a   |
| Benzyl alcohol                                     | 79 ± 4a       | 77 ± 1a       | 93 ± 1a      | 87 ± 4a       | 117 ± 10a      | 98 ± 4b       |
| Phenylethyl alcohol                                | 157 ± 10a     | 150 ± 4a      | 236 ± 3a     | 212 ± 12b     | 332 ± 25a      | 272 ± 16b     |
| 1-Pentanol   | 15 ± 1a       | 15 ± 0.2a     | 12 ± 1a      | 12 ± 1a       | 35 ± 20a       | 41 ± 4a       |
| 1-Penten-3-ol                                      | 589 ± 12a     | 587 ± 27a     | 410 ± 10a    | 415 ± 10a     | 423 ± 12a      | 399 ± 11a     |
| (E)-2-Penten-1-ol                                  | 60 ± 3a       | 61 ± 2a       | 33 ± 1a      | 33 ± 1a       | 51 ± 0.2a      | 53 ± 2a       |
| (Z)-2-Penten-1-ol                                  | 455 ± 10a     | 449 ± 18a     | 356 ± 11a    | 360 ± 6a      | 336 ± 21a      | 324 ± 14a     |
| 1-Hexanol  | 464 ± 30a     | 432 ± 23a     | 442 ± 13a    | 423 ± 0.3b    | 417 ± 6a       | 397 ± 8b      |
| (E)-2-Hexen-1-ol                                   | 285 ± 9a      | 274 ± 24a     | 248 ± 11a    | 230 ± 0a      | 219 ± 2a       | 206 ± 5b      |
| (Z)-3-Hexen-1-ol                                   | 464 ± 8a      | 383 ± 17b     | 219 ± 12a    | 221 ± 11a     | 212 ± 20a      | 221 ± 1a      |
| Sum of C <sub>5</sub> and C <sub>6</sub> alcohols  | 2331 ± 36a    | 2200 ± 49b    | 1719 ± 26a   | 1693 ± 16a    | 1691 ± 37a     | 1641 ± 20a    |
| <i>Esters</i>                                      |               |               |              |               |                |               |
| Hexyl acetate                                      | 34 ± 2a       | 34 ± 2a       | 41 ± 3a      | 25 ± 1b       | 11 ± 1a        | 12 ± 1a       |
| (Z)-3-Hexenyl acetate                              | 80 ± 2a       | 63 ± 3b       | 11 ± 0.2a    | 13 ± 2b       | 20 ± 2a        | 20 ± 1a       |
| Sum of esters                                      | 113 ± 3a      | 97 ± 4b       | 51 ± 3a      | 37 ± 2b       | 30 ± 2a        | 32 ± 1a       |
| <i>Ketones</i>                                     |               |               |              |               |                |               |
| 3-Pentanone  | 96 ± 2a       | 102 ± 2a      | 304 ± 23a    | 267 ± 17b     | 71 ± 1a        | 72 ± 0.3a     |
| 1-Penten-3-one                                     | 268 ± 11a     | 286 ± 18a     | 122 ± 34a    | 149 ± 2a      | 165 ± 2a       | 165 ± 2b      |
| 6-Methyl-5-hepten-2-one                            | 3 ± 0.2a      | 2 ± 0.5b      | 4 ± 0a       | 4 ± 0.3a      | 3 ± 0a         | 3 ± 0a        |
| Sum of ketones                                     | 366 ± 11a     | 391 ± 18b     | 430 ± 41a    | 420 ± 17a     | 240 ± 2a       | 240 ± 2a      |

<sup>a</sup> The data are the mean values of three independent VOO extractions, ± standard deviation. For each different maturity index the values in each row having different letters (a-b) are significantly different from one another (p < 0.05).



**Table 5**

Phenolic composition (mg/kg) of VOOs control (C4) and extracted with ultrasound system (US4) at different malaxation times processing Ogliarola garganica olives at 0.88 maturity index.<sup>a</sup>

| Malaxation time            | C4             |                 |                 | US4            |                 |                 |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                            | 10 min         | 20 min          | 30 min          | 10 min         | 20 min          | 30 min          |
| 3,4-DHPEA <sup>b</sup>     | 1.7 ± 0.3aAB   | 2.5 ± 0.5aA     | 1.1 ± 0.1aB     | 1.6 ± 0.1aA    | 2.1 ± 0.5aA     | 1.4 ± 0.1bA     |
| p-HPEA                     | 4.6 ± 0.5aA    | 3.8 ± 1.2aA     | 3.4 ± 0.5aA     | 3.7 ± 0.4aA    | 5.0 ± 1.4aA     | 3.4 ± 0.3aA     |
| Vanillic acid              | 0.4 ± 0.1aA    | 0.5 ± 0.1aA     | 0.4 ± 0.06aA    | 0.5 ± 0.1aA    | 0.5 ± 0.1aA     | 0.3 ± 0.1aA     |
| 3,4-DHPEA-EDA              | 506.6 ± 19.0aA | 597.0 ± 15.5aB  | 601.9 ± 41.0aB  | 555.2 ± 26.2aA | 651.5 ± 24.9bB  | 715.6 ± 37.3bB  |
| p-HPEA-EDA                 | 188.7 ± 11.2aA | 203.0 ± 4.2aA   | 205.5 ± 3.7aA   | 187.9 ± 7.3aA  | 204.9 ± 6.2aB   | 204.4 ± 4.9aB   |
| 3,4-DHPEA-EA               | 176.0 ± 11.2aA | 184.5 ± 10.1aA  | 187.3 ± 2.4aA   | 169.0 ± 7.2aA  | 200.9 ± 8.4aB   | 205.5 ± 1.7bB   |
| Ligstroside aglycone       | 16.9 ± 0.6aA   | 20.1 ± 0.3aB    | 18.5 ± 0.2aC    | 16.6 ± 0.5aA   | 20.0 ± 0.9aB    | 19.8 ± 0.4bB    |
| (+)-1-Acetoxy-pinoreosinol | 38.4 ± 1.9aA   | 42.1 ± 1.1aA    | 42.2 ± 2.5aA    | 39.9 ± 2.2aAB  | 43.6 ± 0.5aA    | 37.7 ± 2.1aB    |
| (+)-Pinoreosinol           | 21.9 ± 1.2aA   | 23.3 ± 0.6aA    | 22.5 ± 0.6aA    | 20.7 ± 1.0aA   | 22.4 ± 0.3aAB   | 23.7 ± 0.8aB    |
| Total phenols              | 955.3 ± 24.9aA | 1076.8 ± 19.0aB | 1082.7 ± 41.3aB | 995.0 ± 28.2aA | 1150.7 ± 27.1bB | 1211.8 ± 37.7bB |
| α-Tocopherol               | 267.7 ± 10.2aA | 270.7 ± 11.0aA  | 242.8 ± 1.9aB   | 301.4 ± 10.2bA | 306.8 ± 7.7bA   | 270.8 ± 3.1bB   |

<sup>a</sup> The data are the mean values of three independent VOO extractions, ± standard deviation. For each different malaxation times the values in each row having different letters (a-b) are significantly different from one another ( $p < 0.05$ ). For control (C4) and ultrasound (US4) test the values in each row having different letters (A-C) are significantly different from one another ( $p < 0.05$ ).

residual oil content value in the olive pomace and paté that were lower in the US1 sample compared to the C1 sample (Table 2).

The introduction of ultrasound treatment of crushed olive paste during the VOO mechanical extraction process caused a release of phenolic compounds into the oily phase that caused an increased amount of hydrophilic phenols in US1 oil compared to the corresponding control oil (Table 3). The percentage increase was 9.8% and was mainly due to the aglycon derivatives of oleuropein (3,4-DHPEA-EDA, 3,4-DHPEA-ED and 3,4-DHPEA) that are among the most important bioactive molecules characterized by their activities that convey health and sensory benefits (Di Maio et al., 2011, Parkinson & Cicerale, 2016). The lipophilic fraction, mainly represented by α-tocopherol, was also positively enhanced, with a higher concentration of approximately 30 mg/kg that represented an increase of 11.3% compared to the content of the C1 sample. Both increases in hydrophilic and lipophilic concentrations of VOO phenols that are due to the improvement of cellular degradation of the olive drupe are in accordance with other studies that showed different enhancements of the phenolic fraction when using different ultrasound systems and different operating parameters (Almeida et al., 2017; Clodoveo et al., 2017; Juliano et al., 2017, Leone et al., 2018). However, other studies did not confirm an increase in the hydrophilic fraction of phenolic compounds, but ultrasound seems to have a universal positive effect on the α-tocopherol content in all experimental investigations (Bejaoui, Beltran, Aguilera, & Jimenez, 2016; Clodoveo et al., 2013; Iqdiem et al., 2018; Jimenez et al., 2007). The higher amount of bioactive compounds in US1 virgin olive oil, characterized by significant biological properties such as antioxidant activities (Di Maio et al., 2011, Servili et al., 2014), was also confirmed by RSC analysis that used the DPPH radical. The antioxidant capacity of the US1 sample showed a 6.8% reduction in the EC<sub>50</sub> value compared to the control, pointing out a major increase in total antioxidant activity of VOO that was extracted with ultrasound (Table 1).

C1 and US1 oil samples were also subjected to an assessment of volatile compounds that showed a global decrease in such compounds (Table 4) after ultrasound treatment (Kalua, Bedgood Jr., Bishop, & Prenzler, 2013). The sum of C<sub>5</sub> and C<sub>6</sub> saturated and unsaturated aldehydes was 21142 µg/kg and 20031 µg/kg for C1 and US1 VOOs, respectively, with a 5.3% decrease. The reduction of aldehydes was mainly observed in the concentration of hexenal, (E)-2-hexenal and 2,4-hexadienal (i), which are responsible for the “green” sensory note in VOO (Kalua, Bedgood, Bishop, & Prenzler, 2013). The reduction of the sum of C<sub>5</sub> and C<sub>6</sub> saturated and unsaturated alcohols and of the sum of esters in US1 oil (5.6% and 14.2%, respectively) was essentially due to the decreased concentration of 1-hexanol, (Z)-3-hexen-1-ol and (Z)-3-hexenyl acetate. The decrease in the volatile fraction of US1 VOO could

be due to a partial inactivation of the enzymes belonging to the lipoxygenase pathway that resulted from disruption or denaturation of enzymatic molecular structures due to the physical and chemical effects of the cavitation phenomena, which resulted in a significant reduction in levels of enzymatic activity after the crushing phase and during the 30 min of the malaxation step (Terefe, Buckow, & Versteeg, 2015).

### 3.2. Impact of the ultrasound system on VOO extracted at different malaxation times

The high increase of extraction yield obtained in the US1 VOO suggested that a supplementary investigation should be pursued on the impact on oil extractability using the same technology with the same cultivar at the same maturity index (0.88) but with a reduction in the time of malaxation to determine how a hypothetical conversion of the traditional mechanical extraction process to a continuous extraction system might be achieved. A new test was repeated using three different malaxation times (10 min, 20 min and 30 min) for VOO extraction using control conditions (C4) and the ultrasound system (US4). The oil extraction yield showed a progressively decrease reducing the time of malaxation (data not shown). The US4 VOO extracted at 20 min of malaxation time showed a reduced oil yield of 0.4 kg per 100 kg of olives compared to the US4 VOO extracted at 30 min of malaxation time, but which still had a higher value than that of the control at 20 min of malaxation time (and represented a 9.2% increase). After 10 min of malaxation VOO that was extracted using ultrasound registered an extraction yield that was no longer improved than when it was compared to the control, underlining that a malaxation phase longer than 10 min is necessary to improve oil extractability with a high-power ultrasound system at an early ripening stage of the processed olives.

The decreased malaxation time also caused a progressive reduction in the hydrophilic phenols content in both the control and ultrasound VOOs, with a reduction from 30 min to 10 min representing 11.8% and 17.9% decreases, respectively. The amount of phenolic compounds in US4 were always higher than what was observed in C4 at each respective malaxation time even if the data obtained with 10 min of malaxation was not statistically significant (Table 5).

Alpha-tocopherol was increasingly concentrated at 30 min, 20 min and 10 min of malaxation where US4 VOOs exhibited 11.5%, 13.3% and 12.6% increases when compared to controls, respectively, demonstrating low variability as a function of time.

The highest values of volatile composition were observed in the VOOs extracted at 20 min of malaxation in both the C4 and US4 trials (Table 6).

No significant differences were detected in the volatile composition

**Table 6**

Volatile composition ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) of VOOs control (C4) and extracted with ultrasound system (US4) at different malaxation times processing Ogliarola garganica olives at 0.88 maturity index.<sup>a</sup>

| Malaxation time                                    | C4            |                |               | US4           |               |               |
|--|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|  | 10 min        | 20 min         | 30 min        | 10 min        | 20 min        | 30 min        |
| <i>Aldehydes</i>                                   |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| (E)-2-Pentenal                                     | 42 ± 2aA      | 46 ± 4aA       | 40 ± 1aA      | 43 ± 2aA      | 42 ± 2aA      | 44 ± 1bA      |
| Hexanal  | 439 ± 11aA    | 434 ± 34aA     | 414 ± 6aA     | 395 ± 9bA     | 478 ± 19aB    | 362 ± 18bA    |
| (E)-2-Hexenal                                      | 21968 ± 438aA | 21970 ± 2395aA | 20710342aA    | 22197 ± 753aA | 22603 ± 282aA | 19390 ± 141bB |
| (E,E)-2,4-Hexadienal                               | 219 ± 5aA     | 223 ± 32aA     | 112 ± 1aB     | 216 ± 4aA     | 230 ± 9aA     | 99 ± 1bB      |
| 2,4-Hexadienal (i)                                 | 1293aA        | 130 ± 20aA     | 189 ± 5aB     | 135 ± 5aA     | 135 ± 6aA     | 167 ±         |
| Sum of C <sub>5</sub> and C <sub>6</sub> aldehydes | 22796 ± 438aA | 22802 ± 2395aA | 21464 ± 343aA | 22986 ± 753aA | 23489 ± 282aA | 20061 ± 143bB |
| <i>Alcohols</i>                                    |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| Ethanol  | 2373 ± 41aA   | 2334 ± 114aA   | 2073 ± 88aB   | 1998 ± 155bA  | 2306 ± 34aB   | 2066 ± 126aAB |
| Benzyl alcohol                                     | 130 ± 14aA    | 143 ± 7aA      | 81 ± 0aB      | 157 ± 17aA    | 129 ± 9aB     | 77 ± 1bC      |
| Phenylethyl alcohol                                | 267 ± 25aA    | 264 ± 23aA     | 152 ± 9aB     | 336 ± 25bA    | 271 ± 13aB    | 155 ± 25aC    |
| 1-Pentanol   | 15 ± 1aA      | 16 ± 1aA       | 16 ± 1aA      | 17 ± 3aA      | 13 ± 1bB      | 15 ± 0aC      |
| 1-Penten-3-ol                                      | 590 ± 40aA    | 570 ± 42aA     | 604 ± 14aA    | 580 ± 36aAB   | 551 ± 34aA    | 619 ± 12aB    |
| (E)-2-Penten-1-ol                                  | 86 ± 5aA      | 75 ± 6aA       | 59 ± 26aA     | 87 ± 2aA      | 74 ± 2aA      | 61 ± 20aA     |
| (Z)-2-Penten-1-ol                                  | 469 ± 34aA    | 485 ± 47aA     | 469 ± 13aA    | 412 ± 25aA    | 455 ± 17aAB   | 466 ± 11aB    |
| 1-Hexanol  | 342 ± 11aA    | 488 ± 101aA    | 427 ± 15aA    | 358 ± 19aA    | 391 ± 25aAB   | 414 ± 12aB    |
| (E)-2-Hexen-1-ol                                   | 354 ± 11aA    | 332 ± 67aA     | 274 ± 14aA    | 305 ± 32aAB   | 306 ± 24aA    | 241 ± 1bB     |
| (Z)-3-Hexen-1-ol                                   | 302 ± 5aA     | 447 ± 10aB     | 453 ± 13aB    | 354 ± 32bA    | 404 ± 30aA    | 404 ± 8bA     |
| Sum of C <sub>5</sub> and C <sub>6</sub> alcohols  | 2157 ± 55aA   | 2413 ± 137aB   | 2301 ± 40aAB  | 2114 ± 66aA   | 2193 ± 60aA   | 2219 ± 30bA   |
| <i>Esters</i>                                      |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| Hexyl acetate                                      | 44 ± 7aAB     | 53 ± 3aA       | 35 ± 1aB      | 37 ± 3aA      | 34 ± 6bA      | 36 ± 3aA      |
| (Z)-3-Hexenyl acetate                              | 53 ± 1aA      | 100 ± 10aB     | 83 ± 1aC      | 55 ± 2aA      | 87 ± 8aB      | 67 ± 2bA      |
| Sum of esters                                      | 97 ± 7aA      | 153 ± 11aB     | 118 ± 2aC     | 92 ± 3aA      | 121 ± 10bB    | 102 ± 3bA     |
| <i>Ketones</i>                                     |               |                |               |               |               |               |
| 3-Pentanone  | 103 ± 13aA    | 90 ± 8aA       | 99 ± 1aA      | 110 ± 19aA    | 68 ± 16aB     | 99 ± 2aAB     |
| 1-Penten-3-one                                     | 275 ± 20aA    | 287 ± 18aA     | 284 ± 8aA     | 272 ± 13aA    | 260 ± 9aA     | 309 ± 13bB    |
| 6-Methyl-5-hepten-2-one                            | 3 ± 0aA       | 3 ± 0.5aA      | 3 ± 1aA       | 3 ± 0aA       | 3 ± 0.4aA     | 2 ± 0aB       |
| Sum of ketones                                     | 381 ± 24aA    | 380 ± 20aA     | 385 ± 8aA     | 385 ± 23aA    | 331 ± 19bB    | 410 ± 13bA    |

<sup>a</sup> The data are the mean values of three independent VOO extractions, ± standard deviation. For each different malaxation time the values in each row having different letters (a-b) are significantly different from one another ( $p < 0.05$ ). For control (C4) and ultrasound (US4) test the values in each row having different letters (A-C) are significantly different from one another ( $p < 0.05$ ).

between C4 VOOs and US4 VOOs at 10 and 20 min of malaxation. The data did not confirm the decrease of volatile compounds showed at 30 min of malaxation (Tables 4 and 6) for the olives harvested at an early maturity index. For that reason, the variability of volatile fraction seem to be mainly influenced by malaxation parameters rather than ultrasound treatment as described by other authors (Iqdiem et al., 2018; Kalua, Bedgood Jr., Bishop, & Prenzler, 2006; Reboredo-Rodriguez, Gonzalez-Barreiro, Cancho-Grande, & Simal-Gandara, 2014; Selvaggini et al., 2014).

### 3.3. Impact of ultrasound system processing olives at different maturity indices

This experimental study also evaluated VOO extraction yield as measured using Ogliarola garganica olives at other two different maturity indices: 2.82 and 3.31 for control (C2 and C3) and ultrasound tests (US2 and US3), respectively, performed at 30 min of malaxation time. The ultrasound system showed a reduced capacity for improving the oil extraction yield in increasingly ripe olives, as higher maturity indices coincided with a decreased oil yield compared to oil extracted from olives at a 0.88 MI (Table 2). However, US2 sample showed a significant enhancement of oil yield from 17.5 kg per 100 kg of olives of C2 sample to 18.1 kg with a 3.4% increase as compared to control VOO, whereas US3 did not show a difference in oil yield when compared to the control (Table 2). This decreasing trend of oil extraction yield could be related to a physiological increase of the activity of endogenous depolymerizing enzymes (pectinase, cellulase and hemicellulase) during the ripening of the olive fruit that have the same roles of cell wall and membrane degradation that occur in the cavitation phenomenon caused by ultrasound waves that may promote the release of oil

and other organic material from the olive cells before and during the VOO mechanical extraction process (Dag et al., 2011; Vierhuis et al., 2001). Increasingly intensive enzymatic activity may reduce the impact of ultrasound treatment on extraction yield and thus limit its efficacy when olives are processed at a medium-late ripening stage.

No significant differences were detected from the analysis of free acidity, peroxide value,  $K_{232}$ ,  $K_{270}$  and  $\Delta K$  between experimental and control VOOs extracted from fruits at the other two ripening stages (Table 1).

The turbidity grade and moisture content of VOOs showed the same decreasing trend pointed out for the oils obtained from olives at an early maturity index (0.88 MI) but with a more limited impact. The reduction of moisture in the VOOs treated with ultrasound was 9.0% and 9.7%, respectively for US2 and US3 compared to control test (Table 1). On the whole, the turbidity levels were higher than the values showed for the first ripening stage of olives and the same reduction effect of US treatment was detected for both the other VOOs, even if the data was not statistically significant for the VOO obtained from fruits at 2.82 MI (Table 1).

The analysis of CIE Lab color space did not show any significant effects due to the use of US system compared to the test conducted processing olives at 0.88 MI, the data of VOOs from olives at 2.82 and 3.31 MI were supported by the analysis of chlorophylls and carotenoid that were also not significant confirming absence of color alterations.

As shown for the first stage of fruit ripening, the other two batches of olives did not show differences of triterpene dialcohols and 1,2- and 1,3-diacylglycerols, whereas the content of waxes and total sterols increased in the last ripening stage, with values of 25.4% and 5.6% compared to the control trial, respectively (Table 1). The results suggest a more intensive effect of ultrasound treatment on the release of waxes

and sterols into the water/oily phase from olive cells at a late ripening stage, when the different tissues of fruit are subjected to high levels of depolymerizing enzymatic activities. However, the sterol content, that decreased during the olives ripening in both US and C tests, did not modified its percentage composition after the ultrasound treatment for all the VOOs extracted from fruits at different maturity indices (Table 1). The high percentage increase of waxes compared to control at the highest maturity index did not compromise the quality of the product with a content (15.3 mg/kg) abundantly below the limit ( $\leq 150$  mg/kg) fixed by the regulation of European Union (OJEC, 2015).

The minor effect of high-power ultrasound also concerned the phenolic fraction (Table 3) showing there was no significant impact on both the concentration of hydrophilic phenols and the concentration of  $\alpha$ -tocopherol that is further confirmed by results from Bejaoui et al. (2017) in olives at an advanced stage of development and ripening. Others studies even showed reduced phenolic content accompanied by reduced extraction yields in olive fruits that were processed at a maturity index over 1.9 units (Clodoveo et al., 2013; Jimenez et al., 2007).

Concentrations of volatile compounds in VOOs extracted at 2.82 and 3.31 maturity indices did not follow the same trend observed in the test using olives at the early ripening stage, showing no significant differences between ultrasound-treated and untreated oil samples (Table 4).

#### 4. Conclusions

The impact of high-power ultrasound technology on oil yield and quality parameters were evaluated, along with a first time of evaluating how it impacted the concentration of sterols, triterpene dialcohols, waxes, diacylglycerols and other physicochemical characteristics of VOOs extracted at different maturity indices of olives. No effects were observed on VOO legal and quality characteristics, maintaining an unchanged commercial category in the product, with the only exception of a slight increase of waxes and total sterols at the highest maturity index. Hydrophilic phenols and  $\alpha$ -tocopherols were increased in their concentrations in many VOOs that were extracted using high-power ultrasound. The ultrasound system showed a positive impact on VOOs obtained from olive fruits at an early ripening stage, as it was able to cause a highly disruptive effect on the cells that are still characterized with intense physiological activities and thus guaranteed an abundant release of intracellular contents into the liquid medium. This phenomenon allowed an increased oil yield and a significant improvement in the phenolic fraction that are, however, negatively influenced by the enhancement of fruit ripening. The cavitation phenomena and shock-waves caused by this new technology were applied to the VOO mechanical extraction process, and their effects on cell walls and membranes seemed to have been minimized when there is increased activity of endogenous enzymes. The impact of ultrasound technology was observed to be progressively reduced when used with olives at higher maturity indices, canceling its positive effect on both oil extractability and enhancement of quality parameters in drupes at a medium-high level of ripening. The effects of the new technology should be evaluated on different cultivar at different maturity indices and further studies should be also developed on the correct management of the different operative parameters (frequency, power, pressure and amplitude) of ultrasound system to investigate the possible performances on quality and extraction yield of fruits at a medium-late ripening stages.

#### Declaration of interest

None.

#### Acknowledgements

We thank Lucia Mangialasche and Giampaolo Sauchella (Frantoio II

Nocciolino, Ponte Valleceppi, Perugia, Italy), Maria Rita Strappatelli (Seneco S.r.l., Milano, Italy) and Lorenzo Lunetti (Monini SPA, Spoleto, Perugia, Italy) for their technical assistance during this study.

#### References

- Almeida, B., Valli, E., Bendini, A., & Toschi, T. G. (2017). Semi-industrial ultrasound-assisted virgin olive oil extraction: impact on quality. (Special Issue: Olive oil.). *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 1600230, 119–125.
- AOAC (1995). *Approved methods of Association of Official Analytical Chemists* (16th ed.). Virginia, USA: Association of Official Analytical Chemists.
- Bejaoui, M. A., Beltran, G., Aguilera, M. P., & Jimenez, A. (2016). Continuous conditioning of olive paste by high power ultrasounds: Response surface methodology to predict temperature and its effect on oil yield and virgin olive oil characteristics. *LWT – Food Science and Technology*, 69, 175–184.
- Bejaoui, M. A., Sánchez-Ortiz, A., Sánchez, S., Jiménez, A., & Beltrán, G. (2017). The high power ultrasound frequency: Effect on the virgin olive oil yield and quality. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 207, 10–17.
- Bejaoui, M. A., Sánchez-Ortiz, A., Aguilera, M. P., Ruiz-Moreno, M. J., Sánchez, S., Jiménez, A., & Beltrán, G. (2018). High power ultrasound frequency for olive paste conditioning: Effect on the virgin olive oil bioactive compounds and sensorial characteristics. *Innovative Food Science and Emerging Technologies*, 47, 136–145.
- Beltran, G., Uceda, M., Jimenez, A., & Aguilera, M. P. (2003). Olive oil extractability index as a parameter for olive cultivar characterisation. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 83, 503–506.
- Caruso, G., Gucci, R., Sifola, M. I., Selvaggini, R., Urbani, S., Esposto, S., ... Servili, M. (2017). Irrigation and fruit canopy position modify oil quality of olive trees (cv. Frantoio). *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 97(11), 3530–3539.
- Chemat, F., Rombaut, N., Sicaire, A.-G., Meullemiestre, A., Fabiano-Tixier, A.-S., & Abert-Vian, M. (2017). Ultrasound assisted extraction of food and natural products. Mechanisms, techniques, combinations, protocols and applications. A review. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 34, 540–560.
- Clodoveo, M. L., Moramarco, V., Paduano, A., Sacchi, R., Di Palma, T., Crupi, P., ... Amirante, R. (2017). Engineering design and prototype development of a full scale ultrasound system for virgin olive oil by means of numerical and experimental analysis. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 37, 169–181.
- Clodoveo, M. L., Durante, V., La Notte, D., Punzi, R., & Gambacorta, G. (2013). Ultrasound-assisted extraction of virgin olive oil to improve the process efficiency. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 115, 1062–1069.
- Dag, A., Kerem, Z., Yogev, N., Zipori, I., Lavee, S., & Ben-David, E. (2011). Influence of time of harvest and maturity index on olive oil yield and quality. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 127, 358–366.
- Di Maio, I., Esposto, S., Taticchi, A., Selvaggini, R., Veneziani, G., Urbani, S., & Servili, M. (2011). HPLC-ESI-MS investigation of tyrosol and hydroxytyrosol oxidation products in virgin olive oil. *Food Chemistry*, 125, 21–28.
- Esposto, S., Veneziani, G., Taticchi, A., Selvaggini, R., Urbani, S., Di Maio, I., ... Servili, M. (2013). Flash thermal conditioning of olive pastes during the olive oil mechanical extraction process: Impact on the structural modifications of pastes and oil quality. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 61, 4953–4960.
- Esposto, S., Taticchi, A., Di Maio, I., Urbani, S., Veneziani, G., Selvaggini, R., ... Servili, M. (2015). Effect of an olive phenolic extract on the quality of vegetable oils during frying. *Food Chemistry*, 176, 184–192.
- Gordillo, B., Ciaccheri, L., Mignani, A. G., Gonzalez-Miret, M. L., & Heredia, F. J. (2011). Influence of turbidity grade on color and appearance of virgin olive oil. *Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society*, 88, 1317–1327.
- Guillaume, C., Ravetti, L., Lala Ray, D., & Johnson, J. (2012). Technological factors affecting sterols in Australian olive oils. *Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society*, 89, 29–39.
- Iqdam, B. M., Mostafa, H., Goodrich-Schneider, R., Baker, G. L., Welt, B., & Marshall, M. R. (2018). High power ultrasound: Impact on olive paste temperature, malaxation time, extraction efficiency, and characteristics of extra virgin olive oil. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 11(3), 634–644.
- IOC (2013a). International Olive Council. Determination of composition of triacylglycerols and composition and content of di-acylglycerols by capillary gas chromatography, in vegetable oils. COI/T.20/Doc. No 32, November 2013.
- ISO 662. (1998). Animal and vegetable fats and oils. Determination of moisture and volatile matter content.
- Jiménez, A., Beltrán, G., & Uceda, M. (2007). High-power ultrasound in olive paste pretreatment. Effect on process yield and virgin olive oil characteristics. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 14, 725–731.
- Juliano, P., Balczyk, F., Swiergon, P., Supriyatna, M. I. M., Guillaume, C., Ravetti, L., ... Xu, X. Q. (2017). Extraction of olive oil assisted by high-frequency ultrasound standing waves. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 38, 104–114.
- Kalua, C. M., Bedgood, D. R., Jr., Bishop, A. G., & Prenzler, P. D. (2006). Changes in volatile and phenolic compounds with malaxation time and temperature during virgin olive oil production. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 54(20), 7641–7651.
- Kalua, Curtis M., Bedgood, Danny R., Jr., Bishop, Andrea G., & Prenzler, Paul D. (2013). Flavour quality critical production steps from fruit to extra-virgin olive oil at consumption. *Food Research International*, 54(2), 2095–2103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2013.04.021>.
- Lanza, B., & Di Serio, M. G. (2015). SEM characterization of olive (*Olea europaea* L.) fruit epicuticular waxes and epicarp. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 191, 49–56.
- Leone, A., Romaniello, R., Tamborrino, A., Urbani, S., Amarillo, M., Grompone, M. A., ...



- Juliano, P. (2018). Application of microwaves and megasound to olivepaste in an industrial olive oil extraction plant: Impact on virgin olive oil quality and composition. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 120, 1700261–1700269.
- Lukić, M., Lukić, I., Krapac, M., Sladonja, B., & Piližota, V. (2013). Sterols and triterpenoids in olive oil as indicators of variety and degree of ripening. *Food Chemistry*, 136, 251–258.
- Mancebo-Campos, V., Salvador, M. D., & Fregapane, G. (2014). Antioxidant capacity of individual and combined virgin olive oil minor compounds evaluated at mild temperature (25 and 40 °C) as compared to accelerated and antiradical assays. *Food Chemistry*, 150, 374–381.
- Mínguez-Mosquera, I., Rejano-Navarro, L., Gandul-Rojas, B., Sanchez-Gomez, H. A., & Garrido-Fernandez, J. (1991). Color-pigment correlation in virgin olive oil. *Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society*, 68, 332–336.
- Moyano, M. J., Heredia, F. J., & Meléndez-Martínez, A. J. (2010). The color of olive oils: The pigments and their likely health benefits and visual and instrumental methods of analysis. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 9, 278–291.
- OJEC (2015). Official Journal of the European Community COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) 2015/1830 of 8 July 2015 amending Regulation (EEC) No 2568/91 on the characteristics of olive oil and olive-residue oil and on the relevant methods of analysis.
- Parkinson, L., & Cicerale, S. (2016). The health benefiting mechanisms of virgin olive oil phenolic compounds. *Molecules*, 21, 1734–1746.
- Puertolas, E., & Martínez de Marañón, I. (2015). Olive oil pilot-production assisted by pulsed electric field: Impact on extraction yield, chemical parameters and sensory properties. *Food Chemistry*, 167, 497–502.
- Rallo, L., Díez, C. M., Morales-Sillero, A., Miho, H., Priego-Capote, F., & Rallo, P. (2018). Quality of olives: A focus on agricultural preharvest factors. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 233, 491–509.
- Reboredo-Rodríguez, P., Gonzalez-Barreiro, C., Cancho-Grande, B., & Simal-Gandara, J. (2014). Improvements in the malaxation process to enhance the aroma quality of extra virgin olive oils. *Food Chemistry*, 158, 534–545.
- Selvaggini, R., Esposto, S., Taticchi, A., Urbani, S., Veneziani, G., Di Maio, I., ... Servili, M. (2014). Optimization of the temperature and oxygen concentration conditions in the malaxation during the oil mechanical extraction process of four Italian olive cultivars. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 62, 3813–3822.
- Servili, M., Sordini, B., Esposto, S., Urbani, S., Veneziani, G., Di Maio, I., ... Taticchi, A. (2014). Biological activities of phenolic compounds of extra virgin olive oil. *Antioxidants*, 3, 1–23.
- Servili, M., Esposto, S., Taticchi, A., Urbani, S., Di Maio, I., Veneziani, G., & Selvaggini, R. (2015). New approaches to virgin olive oil quality, technology, and by products valorization. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 117, 1882–1892.
- Terefe, N. S., Buckow, R., & Versteeg, C. (2015). Quality-related enzymes in plant-based products: Effects of novel food-processing technologies part 3: Ultrasonic processing. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 55(2), 147–158.
- Veneziani, G., Esposto, S., Taticchi, A., Selvaggini, R., Urbani, S., Di Maio, I., ... Servili, M. (2015). Flash thermal conditioning of olive pastes during the oil mechanical extraction process: Cultivar impact on the phenolic and volatile composition of virgin olive oil. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 63, 6066–6074.
- Veneziani, G., Esposto, S., Taticchi, A., Urbani, S., Selvaggini, R., Sordini, B., & Servili, M. (2017). Cooling treatment of olive paste during the oil processing: Impact on the yield and extra virgin olive oil quality. *Food Chemistry*, 221, 107–113.
- Veneziani, G., Esposto, S., Taticchi, A., Urbani, S., Selvaggini, R., Sordini, B., & Servili, M. (2018a). Characterization of phenolic and volatile composition of extra virgin olive oil extracted from six Italian cultivars using a cooling treatment of olive paste. *LWT – Food Science and Technology*, 87, 523–528.
- Veneziani, G., Esposto, S., Minnocci, A., Taticchi, A., Urbani, S., Selvaggini, R., ... Servili, M. (2018b). Compositional differences between veiled and filtered virgin olive oils. *LWT – Food Science and Technology*, 94, 87–95.
- Vierhuis, E., Servili, M., Baldioli, M., Schols, H. A., Voragen, A. G. J., & Montedoro, G. F. (2001). Effect of enzyme treatment during the mechanical extraction of olive oil on phenolic compounds and polysaccharides. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 49, 1218–1223.