



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM  
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE  
DELLA RICERCA

## Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

A widely used spectrophotometric assay to quantify olive oil biophenols according to the health claim (EU Reg. 432/2012)

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

*Published Version:*

A widely used spectrophotometric assay to quantify olive oil biophenols according to the health claim (EU Reg. 432/2012) / Reboredo-Rodríguez, Patricia; Valli, Enrico; Bendini, Alessandra; Di Lecce, Giuseppe; Simal-Gándara, Jesus; Gallina Toschi, Tullia. - In: EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF LIPID SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. - ISSN 1438-7697. - ELETTRONICO. - 118:10(2016), pp. 1593-1599. [10.1002/ejlt.201500313]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/569580> since: 2016-11-22

*Published:*

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.201500313>

*Terms of use:*

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).  
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Reboredo-Rodríguez, P., Valli, E., Bendini, A., Di Lecce, G., Simal-Gándara, J. and Gallina Toschi, T. (2016), A widely used spectrophotometric assay to quantify olive oil biophenols according to the health claim (EU Reg. 432/2012). *Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol.*, 118: 1593-1599.

The final published version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.201500313>

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

*This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)*

***When citing, please refer to the published version.***

1 **A widely used spectrophotometric assay to quantify olive oil biophenols according to the health claim**

2 **(EU Reg. 432/2012)**

3  
4 Patricia Reboredo-Rodríguez<sup>1</sup>, Enrico Valli<sup>2</sup>, Alessandra Bendini<sup>2\*</sup>,

5 Giuseppe Di Lecce<sup>2</sup>, Jesus Simal-Gándara<sup>1</sup>, Tullia Gallina Toschi<sup>2</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1</sup>*Analytical and Food Chemistry Department, Nutrition and Bromatology Group, University of Vigo, Spain*

8 <sup>2</sup>*Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum- University of Bologna, Italy*

9  
10 **\*Corresponding author:** DiSTAL - Campus of Food Science - Piazza Goidanich 60, 47521 Cesena (FC) Italy

11 Tel.: +39 0547 338121; Fax: +39 0547 382348. E-mail address: [alessandra.bendini@unibo.it](mailto:alessandra.bendini@unibo.it)

12  
13 **Running title:** Spectrophotometric test to check olive oil health claim

14  
15 **Keywords:** extra virgin olive oil, phenolic compounds, health claim, acid hydrolysis, Folin-Ciocalteu assay.

16  
17 **List of abbreviations**

18 **Api**, apigenin; **DLA**, dialdehydic form of decarboxymethylelenolic acid linked to tyrosol; **DOA**, dialdehydic form  
19 of decarboxymethylelenolic acid linked to hydroxytyrosol; **EVOOs**, extra virgin olive oils; **FC**, Folin-Ciocalteu;  
20 **GA**, gallic acid; **HTyr**, hydroxytyrosol; **LA**, ligstroside aglycon; **Lut**, luteolin; **OA**, oleuropein aglycon; **Tyr**,  
21 tyrosol; **VOOs**, virgin olive oils.

23 **Abstract**

24 The purpose of this work was to find a simple, cheap and suitable method, among the most widely employed,  
25 able to guarantee a proper determination and quantification of the phenolic content of extra virgin olive oils  
26 (EVOOs), in order to satisfy the requirements of the specific health claim (EU Reg. 432/2012). Total phenolic  
27 content by Folin-Ciocalteu (FC) was used and compared vs phenolic profile by HPLC-UV, considering this  
28 latter as the most sensitive and specific method for evaluating the phenolic content. Both protocols were  
29 performed before and after an acid hydrolysis of the polar phenolic fraction that involves a break of the bound  
30 forms of hydroxytyrosol (HTyr) and tyrosol (Tyr), with a simplification of the phenolic profile, and quantification  
31 of their total free forms. Results of the phenolic compounds of twelve EVOOs, determined by the different  
32 analytical approaches, were statistically compared by means of two-tailed paired *t*-tests: data obtained by the  
33 FC assay (expressed as HTyr) before and/or after acid hydrolysis were statistically comparable with results  
34 obtained by acid hydrolysis-HPLC (as sum of HTyr and Tyr).

35

36 **Practical applications:**

37 The promising results obtained in this study show that the simple and cheap colorimetric assay based on the  
38 use of the FC reagent, commonly used for the evaluation of phenolic compounds in hydro-alcoholic extracts of  
39 EVOO, can be also efficiently applied, without acid hydrolysis of extracts and HPLC analysis, to verify the  
40 compliance to the polyphenols health claim introduced by EU Reg. 432/2012. In fact, in order to preserve the  
41 positive image of EVOO due to its healthy properties, it is necessary *i)* to share an analytical protocol to  
42 determine the amount of hydroxytyrosol and its derivatives having a demonstrated effect of protection of blood  
43 lipids from oxidative stress *ii)* to check by this protocol if EVOOs satisfy the EU requirement for including the  
44 specific health claim on the oil label.

## 45 1. Introduction

46 The most important phenolic compounds identified in virgin olive oils (VOOs) can be divided into different  
47 groups: phenolic acids, phenyl ethyl alcohols as hydroxytyrosol (HTyr) and tyrosol (Tyr), secoiridoids (mainly  
48 the dialdehydic form of elenolic acid linked to HTyr or Tyr and oleuropein aglycon isomers), lignans and  
49 flavones [1, 2]. Secoiridoids derivatives are the main phenolic compounds in fresh olive oils [3]. The qualitative  
50 and quantitative composition of this fraction is affected by genetic and agronomic factors of the olive cultivars  
51 (e.g. variety, geographical origin, maturation stage, part of the fruit, storage) as well as technological factors  
52 employed during the mechanical extraction of oil (e.g. malaxation operating conditions) [4]. Phenolic fraction is  
53 partially responsible for the healthy and sensory properties, together with the higher oxidative stability of the  
54 olive oil, in comparison with the rest of edible vegetable oils [5]. Among others, free radical scavenging,  
55 anticarcinogenic, cardiopreventive, and antimicrobial properties have been attributed to olive oil phenolics [6].  
56 Most of these biochemical and pharmacological effects have been associated to HTyr and, to a lesser extent,  
57 to Tyr. Both substances are absorbed in the intestine and can be detected in urine, plasma, and LDL particles  
58 [7-10]. In 2011, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) concluded that there is evidence of a cause and  
59 effect relationship between the consumption of olive oil phenols and the protection of low-density lipoprotein  
60 (LDL) cholesterol particles from oxidative damage [11]. In 2012, the European Commission approved the  
61 health claim "*Olive oil polyphenols contribute to the protection of blood lipids from oxidative stress*" for those  
62 olive oils which contain at least 5 mg of HTyr and its derivatives (e.g. oleuropein complex and Tyr) per 20 g of  
63 product [12]. The enacting of this Regulation requires the development of reliable quantification methods for  
64 only "*hydroxytyrosol and its derivatives (e.g. oleuropein complex and tyrosol)*". As no official method exists so  
65 far for the complete separation of all forms of HTyr and Tyr present in oils, it is of utmost importance to find a  
66 simple and reproducible protocol to protect consumers and avoid unfair competition [13-14]. The most reliable  
67 way to determine the amount required by the European legislation is to hydrolyze all the linked forms and thus  
68 determine free forms [11]. Mulinacci et al. (2006) [15] examined both acid and alkaline hydrolysis of the  
69 phenolic fraction obtained using a mixture of ethanol and water (7:3, v/v) acidified. Acid hydrolysis was  
70 proposed as a quantitative method for the evaluation of the HTyr and Tyr amounts, while alkaline hydrolysis

71 with the aim of improving the recognition of lignans in the minor polar compounds fraction. In fact, after acid  
72 hydrolysis these molecules almost disappeared from the HPLC profile. Afterwards, Purcaro et al. [14]  
73 examined also the acid hydrolysis applied to the phenolic fraction (obtained following the IOC method).  
74 Despite differentiations applied, they found that acid conditions liberate HTyr and Tyr without destroying them.  
75 Then, Romero and Brenes [16], applied a hydrolytic reaction (using HCl) directly to oil to ease the  
76 determination of total HTyr and Tyr [13]. More recently, Mastralexi, Nenadis and Tsimidou [13], provided  
77 evidences about the superiority of determining total HTyr and Tyr content in the hydrolysate of the phenolic  
78 fraction using the conditions proposed by Mulinacci et al. [15]. Recently, the robustness and the expression of  
79 such results were under debate in a comment [17] and in a rebuttal [18]. To evaluate the phenolic content of  
80 VOOs, the most widely employed methods are spectrophotometric – Folin-Ciocalteu (FC) and molybdate  
81 (MoM) assays – and chromatographic. FC assay is a simple and widespread procedure, but it does not  
82 permit to distinguish mono- from *o*-diphenols [19-20]. On the other hand, MoM assay is specific for the  
83 quantification of molecules having an *o*-diphenolic group [21]. As it is well known, HPLC-DAD determination is  
84 characterized by its sensitivity and specificity, but it is time and solvent consuming [22-24] and it is rather  
85 cumbersome, due to resolution problems and the lack of standards for a reliable quantification [13-14]. HPLC-  
86 MS or HPLC tandem MS (MS/MS) are other more sophisticated chromatographic methods that can be used  
87 but they require very expensive analytical tools. A part of its high sensitivity, these detection systems have the  
88 capability to both determine the molecular weight and provide structural information [25].

89 The aim of this work is to assess if the most common colorimetric assay used for the evaluation of phenolic  
90 compounds in olive oils, Folin-Ciocalteu (FC), can be also efficiently applied to determine HTyr and Tyr and  
91 their derivatives in order to support the health claim introduced by EU Reg. 432/2012. Determinations were  
92 performed on VOO extracts previously hydrolyzed by acid media. The acid hydrolysis-HPLC determination  
93 was considered as reference method to compare experimental results obtained from the spectrophotometric  
94 assays.

95

96

## 97 **2. Material and Methods**

### 98 *2.1 Reagents and chemicals*

99 Commercial phenolic compound standards such as syringic acid (purity  $\geq 98\%$ ), caffeic acid ( $\geq 99\%$ ) and  
100 gallic acid (GA,  $\geq 98\%$ ) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA); HTyr ( $\geq 98\%$ ) and  
101 oleuropein (98%) were bought from Extrasynthèse (Geney, France); Tyr (98%) was from Merck (New Jersey,  
102 USA). Folin-Ciocalteu phenol reagent was purchased from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). The solvents  
103 acetonitrile, *n*-hexane, methanol (MeOH), H<sub>2</sub>O and formic acid were all HPLC-gradient grade and purchased  
104 from Sigma-Aldrich.

### 105 *2.2 Olive oil samples*

106 Twelve samples of extra virgin olive oils (EVOOs) produced in Italy and Spain from different varieties of  
107 olives and obtained by using different technological procedures were analyzed. These samples were selected  
108 on the basis of their phenolic content, previously evaluated by the FC assay, in order to cover a quite wide  
109 range in terms of phenolic content as can be seen in **Table 1** (from 177.5 mg GA kg<sup>-1</sup> oil to 687.2 mg GA kg<sup>-1</sup>  
110 oil).

### 111 *2.3 Phenolic compounds extraction*

112 Phenolic fraction was extracted from EVOOs following the International Olive Council method [26], with  
113 some modifications. Briefly, 2.0 g of olive oil were weighed in a 15 mL screw-cap tube and 1 mL of internal  
114 standard working solution (IS, containing syringic acid at 0.015 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>) was added. The tube was shaken for  
115 30 s before adding 5 mL of MeOH/H<sub>2</sub>O mixture (80/20, v/v) and shaken again for 1 min. The tube was placed in  
116 an ultrasonic bath for 15 min at room temperature and then centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 25 min. The  
117 MeOH/H<sub>2</sub>O phase was collected and was filtered through a 0.2  $\mu$ m filter with a nylon membrane. Syringic acid  
118 was not added [in extracts used for the](#) spectrophotometric determinations.

### 119 *2.4 Acid hydrolysis of the phenolic extracts*

120 Acid hydrolysis of complex phenols of HTyr and Tyr derivatives was carried out by adding 1 mL of 5 M  
121 HCl to 1 mL of hydroalcoholic phenolic extract and let react at 100°C in an oven for 1 h (the tube was closed  
122 using a screw cap). In order to prepare control samples not subjected to [acid](#) hydrolysis, 1 mL of water was

123 added to 1 mL of hydroalcoholic phenolic extract to obtain the same dilution. Preliminarily, a standard of  
124 oleuropein (500 mg L<sup>-1</sup>) and two different phenolic extracts (samples 11 and 12) underwent the above  
125 specified analytical protocol to verify the effectiveness of the hydrolytic reactions. On the other hand, the same  
126 standard solution and phenolic extracts (samples 11 and 12) were heated at 100°C for 1 h, but without the  
127 addition of 5 M HCl, to verify that there was no degradation of phenolic compounds due only to the effect of  
128 temperature. The reaction was stopped by freezing the tubes in an ice bath. Then, the hydrolyzed extracts  
129 were analyzed by HPLC and/or by spectrophotometric determinations.

### 130 *2.5 Determination of phenolic content by HPLC analysis*

131 HPLC analysis was performed with an Agilent 1200 Series HPLC system (Hewlett-Packard, Waldbronn,  
132 Germany). The column (100 × 3 mm ID, particle size of 2.6 µm) was a C18 Phenomenex Kinetex (Torrance,  
133 CA, USA). Gradient elution was carried out with a solvent system of water/formic acid (99.5:0.5 v/v) as mobile  
134 phase A and acetonitrile as mobile phase B; the total run time was 13 min (plus 5 min of post-run), and the  
135 gradient elution was as follows: 0 min, 95% A; 3 min, 80% A; 4 min, 60% A; 5 min, 55% A; 9 min, 40% A; 10  
136 min, 0%; 12 min, 95 % A and 13 min, 95% A. The samples were injected into a 5 µL loop, with a mobile-phase  
137 flow rate of 0.7 mL min<sup>-1</sup> and the column maintained at 40°C. The chromatograms were monitored with MS  
138 and UV detectors. The UV wavelengths were suitable for detecting, respectively, [derivative of benzoic acid](#),  
139 [phenyl ethyl alcohol derivatives and secoiridoids](#) (280 nm) and [derivative of cinnamic acid and flavones](#) (330  
140 nm). The MS conditions and parameters were set as: ESI interface; nebulizer gas pressure, 50 psi; drying gas  
141 flow, 9 L min<sup>-1</sup> at 350°C; capillary voltage, 3 kV. Nitrogen was used as nebulizer and drying gas. The spectra  
142 were scanned within the m/z 50-800 range, both in the positive and negative ion mode. Identification of phenol  
143 compounds was achieved by comparing their retention time values with pure standards (in particular, phenyl  
144 ethyl alcohols and phenolic acids) and on the basis of the interpretation of their mass spectra; concentrations  
145 were then calculated based on the calibration curves of HTyr and Tyr. Calibration curves ( $r^2=0.999$  for both)  
146 showed good linearity in the studied range of concentrations.

### 147 *2.6 Determination of phenolic content by spectrophotometric analysis*

148 Phenolic extracts used for spectrophotometric assays were obtained following the procedure explained  
149 in the section 2.3 and analyzed by an UV-Vis 1800 spectrophotometer (Shimadzu Co., Kyoto, Japan).

#### 150 2.7 Folin-Ciocalteu (FC) assay

151 The FC assay was performed according to Singleton and Rossi [27] and Mateos et al. [28]. A volume of  
152 0.2 mL of the phenolic extract (subjected and not to the acid hydrolysis) was added to 0.5 mL Folin-Ciocalteu  
153 reagent and 2 mL of Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> (15% w/v), in a 10 mL volumetric flask reaching the final volume with purified  
154 water. Each sample was stored for 2 h at room temperature. Phenolic compounds were detected at 750 nm  
155 and quantified using HTyr calibration curve ( $r^2=0.999$ ). The data were expressed as mg HTyr 20 g<sup>-1</sup> of oil.

#### 156 2.9 Statistical Analysis

157 Two-tailed paired *t*-tests were carried out by the statistical software XLSTAT 7.5.2 version (Addinsoft,  
158 USA) to identify significantly differences between the means obtained by the proposed methods ( $\alpha = 0.05\%$ ).

159

### 160 3. Results and Discussion

161 The phenolic content of 12 EVOO samples was evaluated by acid hydrolysis-HPLC and by the FC (before and  
162 after acid hydrolysis of the polar phenolic extract). Results allowed to assess if the most common colorimetric  
163 assay is an useful tool for the determination of the total content of HTyr and Tyr in VOOs and, consequently, to  
164 check if samples satisfied the EU requirement to add the specific health claim on the oil label [12].

#### 165 3.1 Acid hydrolysis: preliminary experiments

166 To set up the acid hydrolysis procedure, different acid concentrations (0.5 M, 1 M and 5 M), times of  
167 reaction (30 min, 2 h and 6 h) and temperatures (50°C, 100°C) chosen according to studies already reported  
168 in the literature [14-16] were preliminarily tested. On the basis of these results performed on two phenolic  
169 extracts (samples 11 and 12), after 1 hour of hydrolysis at 100°C by using HCl 5 M (the adopted hydrolytic  
170 conditions) more than 90% of OA and LA (and their derivatives) present in the phenolic profiles of samples  
171 were hydrolysed to HTyr and Tyr (**Figure 1**). At the same time, flavones such as Lut and Api showed no  
172 significant variations after hydrolysis, while the syringic acid showed a slight decrease after the hydrolysis,

173 making it impossible its use as internal standard for the quantification. Moreover, no degradation of phenolic  
174 compounds due only to the high temperature was found by thermostating OA (without acid reagent), following  
175 the same hydrolytic condition.

### 176 3.2 Comparison between acid hydrolysis-HPLC and the FC assay

177 FC assay is a widespread method that involves oxidation in alkaline solution of phenols by the yellow  
178 molybdotungstophosphoric heteropolyanion reagent and the colorimetric measurement of the resultant  
179 molydotungstophosphate blue [27]. In the present experimentation, total phenolic content was determined by  
180 acid hydrolysis-HPLC and by the FC method (after and without the hydrolysis of the polar phenolic extract).  
181 Taking into consideration the poor contribution of other molecules having reducing activity, in the present  
182 investigation the FC assay was used to determine “total phenols” in EVOO extracts, basically containing  
183 tyrosol and hydroxytyrosol derivatives. As can be seen in **Table 2**, total phenolics determined by acid  
184 hydrolysis-HPLC were expressed as a sum of the concentrations of HTyr and Tyr, identified and quantified  
185 each one by using the respective external calibration curves. Concentrations ranged from 1.3 to 8.4 mg HTyr +  
186 Tyr 20 g<sup>-1</sup> oil. On the other hand, FC results were expressed as mg HTyr 20 g<sup>-1</sup> of oil and ranged from 3.0 to  
187 9.9 mg HTyr 20 g<sup>-1</sup> of oil (without hydrolysis) and from 2.7 to 8.6 mg HTyr 20 g<sup>-1</sup> of oil (with hydrolysis).  
188 Concentrations obtained by the FC assay have been expressed as HTyr to compare them with the results of  
189 the acid hydrolysis-HPLC. In this case, to develop the FC assay with acid hydrolysis extract it was not  
190 necessary to introduce modifications because the addition of Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> is enough to reach basic pH. The  
191 comparison between the concentrations obtained by acid hydrolysis-HPLC and the FC assay were performed  
192 studying test samples (**Table 2**) and looking at the differences between each pair of results using the two-  
193 tailed paired *t*-test. The methods studied did not give statistically different values for the mean concentration  
194 ( $t < t$  (critical value)), but in some EVOOs (5, 6, 11, 12) major differences were detected: considering that a little  
195 amount (less of 10%) of secoiridoids did not undergo acid hydrolysis, it is plausible that the results obtained  
196 from acid hydrolysis-HPLC (in which only HTyr and Tyr peaks were quantified) can be lower than the ones  
197 resulting by FC method without hydrolysis (in which all the molecules detected in the extract were exposed to  
198 the reaction). This could explain differences evidenced for samples 11 and 12. Moreover, the higher values

199 showed by samples 5 and 6 obtained with FC method after hydrolysis, respect to the ones resulting from the  
200 same extracts analyzed by acid hydrolysis-HPLC, could be due to hydrolysis of some molecules, as for  
201 example lignans or caffeoylquinic acids, with release of guaiacol moieties and caffeic acid respectively, that  
202 are efficient as electron donors [29] but not quantifiable as HTyr and Tyr by the HPLC method. It is important  
203 to highlight that the same results (data not shown) were found by expressing the results of the FC assay as  
204 mg GA 20 g<sup>-1</sup> of oil (GA it is the most commonly phenolic compound used to quantify the total phenol content)  
205 [30,31]. As a conclusion, results obtained by the FC assay (expressed both as HTyr or as GA) do not  
206 significantly differ from those obtained following the acid hydrolysis-HPLC (expressed as sum of HTyr + Tyr).  
207 In other words, for the verification of the health claim in olive oils object of this study, the simple and rapid FC  
208 method, even performed without hydrolysis, could give results proportional to the ones obtained by the more  
209 laborious and solvent consuming acid hydrolysis-HPLC. Simple linear regressions has been done between the  
210 sum of the concentration of HTyr and Tyr identified by acid hydrolysis-HPLC-DAD and quantified using  
211 external calibration curves and the results of the FC assay, expressed as mg GA 20 g<sup>-1</sup> of oil (without and with  
212 the hydrolysis of the polar phenolic fraction). The best correlation coefficient corresponds to the correlation  
213 between the acid hydrolysis-HPLC-DAD results and the FC without hydrolysis results ( $r = 0.94$ ).

## 214 **Conclusions**

215 Considering the analyzed samples no significant differences were found between the total phenolic  
216 content determined by acid hydrolysis-HPLC and by the FC method (without and with hydrolysis step). For this  
217 reason, the simple and cheap FC method, performed also without hydrolysis, could give results, for the  
218 verification of the health claim in olive oils, comparable to the ones obtained by the more laborious and solvent  
219 consuming acid hydrolysis-HPLC. Obviously, it has to be considered that this is a preliminary study and a  
220 large number of samples would be required to draw any final conclusions from these promising results.

221

## 222 **Acknowledgments**

223 This work was funded by EU FEDER and also under the contract (GRC2014/017) (Xunta de Galicia).

224 P. Reboredo-Rodríguez acknowledges the pre-doctoral and short-stay fellowships from the University of Vigo.

225

226 **Conflict of interest**

227 The authors have declared no conflict of interest.

228

229 **References**

230 [1] Bendini, A., Cerretani, L., Carrasco-Pancorbo, A., Gómez-Caravaca, A.M., Segura-Carretero, A.,  
231 Fernández-Gutiérrez, A., Lercker, G. Phenolic molecules in virgin olive oils: A survey of their sensory  
232 properties, health effects, antioxidant activity and analytical methods. An overview of the last decade.  
233 *Molecules* 2007, 12, 1679–1719.

234 [2] Brenes, M., Hidalgo, F.J., García, A., Ríos, J.J., García, P., Zamora, R., Garrido, A. Pinoresinol and 1-  
235 acetoxypinoresinol, two new phenolic compounds identified in olive oil. *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.* 2000, 77, 715–  
236 720.

237 [3] Oliveras-López, M.J., Innocenti, M., Giaccherini, C., Ieri, F., Romani, A., Mulinacci, N. Study of the phenolic  
238 composition of spanish and italian monocultivar extra virgin olive oils: Distribution of lignans, secoiridoidic,  
239 simple phenols and flavonoids. *Talanta* 2007, 73, 726–732.

240 [4] Boskou, D., Blekas, G., Tsimidou, M. Phenolic compounds in olive oil and olives. *Curr. Topics Nutr. Res.*  
241 2005, 3, 125-136.

242 [5] Velasco, J., Dobarganes, C. Oxidative stability of virgin olive oil. *Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol.* 2002, 104, 661-  
243 676.

244 [6] Frankel, E.N. Nutritional and biological properties of extra virgin olive oil. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 2011, 59,  
245 785-792.

246 [7] Bonanome, A., Pagnan, A., Caruso, D., Toia, A., Xamin, A., Fedeli, E., Berra, B., Zamburlini, A., Ursini, F.,  
247 Galli, G. Evidence of postprandial absorption of olive oil phenols in humans. *Nutr. Metab. Cardio. Dis.* 2000,  
248 10, 111-120.

249 [8] Vissers, M.N., Zock, P.L., Roodengurb, A. J.C., Leenen, R., Katan, M.B. Olive oil phenols are absorbed in  
250 humans. *J. Nutr.* 2002, 132, 409-417.

251 [9] Visioli, F., Poli, A., Galli, C. Antioxidant and other biological activities of phenols from olives and olive oil.  
252 *Med. Res. Rev.* 2002, 22, 65-75.

253 [10] Covas, M.I., Nyyssonen, K., Poulsen, H.E., Kaikkonen, J., Zunft, H.J., Kiesewetter, H., Gaddi, A., de la  
254 Torre, R., Mursu, J., Baumler, H., Nascetti, S., Salonen, J.T., Fito, M., Virtanen, J., Marrugat, J., Group, E.S.  
255 The effect of polyphenols in olive oil on heart disease risk factors: a randomized trial. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 2006,  
256 145, 333-341.

257 [11] EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products Nutrition and Allergens. Scientific Opinion on the substantiation of health  
258 claims related to polyphenols in olive and protection of LDL particles from oxidative damage (ID 1333, 1638  
259 1639, 1696, 2865), maintenance of normal blood HDL cholesterol concentrations (ID 1639), maintenance of  
260 normal blood pressure (ID 3781), “anti-inflammatory properties” (ID 1882), “contributes to the upper  
261 respiratory tract health” (ID 3468), “can help to maintain a normal function of gastrointestinal tract”(3779), and  
262 “contributes to body defences against external agents” (ID 3467) pursuant to Article 13(1) of Regulation (EC)  
263 No 1924/2006. *EFSA J.* 2011, 9, 2033-2058.

264 [12] European Union Commission. (2012). Commission Regulation (EU) No 432/2012 of 16 May 2012  
265 establishing a list of 199 permitted health claims made on foods, other than those referring to the 200  
266 reduction of disease risk and to children’s development and health.

267 [13] Mastralexi, A., Nenadis, N., Tsimidou, M.Z. Addressing analytical requirements to support health claims  
268 on "olive oil polyphenols" (EC regulation 432/2012). *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 2014, 62, 2459-2461.

269 [14] Purcaro, G., Codony, R., Pizzale, L., Mariani, C., Conte, L. Evaluation of total hydroxytyrosol and tyrosol  
270 in extra virgin olive oils. *Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol.* 2014, 116, 805-811.

- 271 [15] Mulinacci, N., Giaccherini, C., Ieri, F., Innocenti, M., Romani, A., Vincieri, F.F. Evaluation of lignans and  
272 free and linked hydroxy-tyrosol and tyrosol in extra virgin olive oil after hydrolysis processes. *J. Sci. Food*  
273 *Agric.* 2006, 86, 757-764.
- 274 [16] Romero, C., Brenes, M. Analysis of total contents of hydroxytyrosol and tyrosol in olive oils. *J. Agric. Food*  
275 *Chem.* 2012, 60, 9017-9022.
- 276 [17] Romero, C., Brenes, M. Comment on addressing analytical requirements to support health claims on  
277 "olive oil polyphenols" (EC regulation 432/212). *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 2014, 62, 10210-10211.
- 278 [18] Mastralexi, A., Nenadis, N., Tsimidou, M.Z. Rebuttal to the comment on addressing analytical  
279 requirements to support health claims on "olive oil polyphenols" (EC regulation 432/212). *J. Agric. Food Chem.*  
280 2014, 62, 10212-10213.
- 281 [19] Garcia, B., Coelho, J., Costa, M., Pinto, J. Paiva-Martins, F. A simple method for the determination of  
282 bioactive antioxidants in virgin olive oils. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* 2013, 93, 1727-1732.
- 283 [20] Magalhães, L.M., Segundo, M.A., Reis, S., Lima, J.L.F.C., Rangel, A. Automatic method for the  
284 determination of Folin-Ciocalteu reducing capacity in food products. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 2006, 54, 5241-  
285 5246.
- 286 [21] Cert., A., Romero, A., Cert, R. (Revised Method: December 2007). Colorimetric method for the  
287 determination of o-diphenolic compounds in olive oils. International Olive Council, URL  
288 (<http://www.internationaloliveoil.org/documents/viewfile/3857-testing12eng>).
- 289 [22] Alessandri, S., Cimato, A., Mattei, A., Modi, G. Characterization of olive oils from Tuscany according to  
290 harvesting time, by means of their phenols contents. *Boll. Chim. Igien.* 1992, 43, 141-161.
- 291 [23] Romani, A., Mulinacci, N., Pinelli, P., Vincieri, F.F., Cimato, A. Polyphenolic content in five Tuscany  
292 cultivars of *Olea Europaea* L. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 1999, 47, 964-967.
- 293 [24] Romani, A., Pinelli, P., Mulinacci, N., Galardi, C., Vincieri, F.F., Liberatore, L., Cichelli, A. HPLC and  
294 HRGC analyses of polyphenols and secoiridoids in olive oil. *Chromatographia* 2001, 53, 279-284.

295 [25] Suárez, M., Macià, A., Romero, M.P., Motilva, M.J. Improved liquid chromatography tandem mass  
296 spectrometry method for the determination of phenolic compounds in virgin olive oil. *J. Chrom. A* 2008, 1214,  
297 90-99.

298 [26] International Olive Council, Determination of biophenols in olive oils by HPLC, COI/T.20/Doc 334 No 29  
299 November 2009.

300 [27] Singleton, V.L., Rossi, J. A. Colorimetry of total phenolics with phosphomolybdic–phosphotungstic acid  
301 reagents. *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.* 1965, 16, 144-158.

302 [28] Mateos, R., Espartero, J.L., Trujillo, M., Rios, J. Determination of phenols, flavones, and lignans in virgin  
303 olive oils by solid-phase extraction and high-performance liquid chromatography with diode array ultraviolet  
304 detection. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 2001, 49, 2185-2192.

305 [29] Huang, D., Boxin, O.U., Prior, R.L. The chemistry behind antioxidant capacity assays. *J. Agric. Food*  
306 *Chem.* 2005, 53, 1841-1856.

307 [30] Alessandri, S., Ieri, F., Romani, A. Minor polar compounds in extra virgin olive oil: Correlation between  
308 HPLC-DAD-MS and the Folin-Ciocalteu spectrophotometric method. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 2014, 62, 826-835.

309 [31] Blainski, A., Lopes, G. C., Palazzo de Mello, J. C. Application and analysis of the Folin Ciocalteu method  
310 for the determination of the total phenolic content from *Limonium Brasiliense* L. *Molecules* 2013, 18, 6852-  
311 6865.

312

313 **Figure Captions**

314 **Figure 1.** Overlay among three chromatographic profiles of sample 12. Upper trace: not hydrolyzed extract,  $\lambda=$   
315 280 nm; middle trace: hydrolyzed extract,  $\lambda=$  280 nm; lower trace: hydrolyzed extract,  $\lambda=$  330 nm for the.  
316 Tentative identification of phenolic compounds: I.S., syringic acid; 1, HTyr; 2, Tyr; 3, cinnamic acid derivative I;  
317 4, benzoic acid derivative I; 5, cinnamic acid derivative II; 6, benzoic acid derivative II; 7a+b, oxidized form of  
318 DOA + pinoresinol; 8a+b, DOA + cinnamic acid; 9, Lut; 10, DLA; 11, 1-acetoxypinoresinol; 12, oxidized form of  
319 DLA; 13, Api; 14, OA; 15, LA.

320

321 **Table 1.** Total phenols concentrations in the analyzed EVOOs.

322

<i>EVOO sample</i>	Total phenols concentration (mg GA kg <sup>-1</sup> oil)
1	534.1±1.5
2	687.2±2.9
3	378.8±21.9
4	404.5±23.5
5	219.8±31.0
6	216.7±5.9
7	332.6±18.4
8	348.1±30.5
9	213.5±28.9
10	225.4±16.4
11	177.5±6.9
12	345.3±2.7

323

324 **Table 2.** Sum of HTyr and Tyr content (expressed as mg 20 g<sup>-1</sup> oil) determined in EVOOs by acid hydrolysis-  
 325 HPLC and by the FC assay.

326

<i>EVOO sample</i>	<i>Concentration (mg 20 g<sup>-1</sup> oil ± SD)</i>		
	<i>Acid hydrolysis-HPLC (HTyr+Tyr)</i>	<i>Folin-Ciocalteu -without hydrolysis- (HTyr)</i>	<i>Folin-Ciocalteu -with hydrolysis- (HTyr)</i>
1	<b>5.5±0.2</b>	6.8±0.5	5.7±0.7
2	<b>8.4±0.1</b>	9.9±0.4	8.6±0.3
3	<b>4.9±0.1</b>	5.3±0.1	4.9±0.9
4	<b>5.0±0.2</b>	5.3±0.2	4.4±0.2
5	3.3±0.0	3.0±0.1	<b>6.2±0.5</b>
6	2.7±0.1	3.4±0.0	<b>4.9±0.2</b>
7	<b>8.0±0.1</b>	<b>7.3±0.4</b>	<b>6.8±1.1</b>
8	<b>7.7±0.5</b>	<b>7.7±0.6</b>	<b>7.4±0.9</b>
9	4.4±0.1	<b>5.0±0.6</b>	<b>5.1±0.4</b>
10	<b>6.2±0.2</b>	<b>5.2±0.3</b>	<b>5.4±0.4</b>
11	1.3±0.3	4.0±0.4	2.7±0.4
12	<b>5.1±1.0</b>	<b>7.4±0.3</b>	4.2±0.7
<b>Statistical analysis*</b>			
$\bar{x}_d$		0.629	0.249
$S_d^{**}$		1.134	1.269
<b>T</b>		1.754	0.621
<b>Conclusion</b>		<b>t &lt; t (critical value)</b>	<b>t &lt; t (critical value)</b>

327 \*Two-tailed paired *t*-test; *t* critical value: 2.201.

328 \*\*Differences are calculated between reference method (HPLC) and the proposed assay.

329 In bold, concentrations ≥ 5 mg of HTyr and its derivatives (e.g. oleuropein complex and Tyr) per 20 g of  
 330 product.

Figure 1

