DETERMINING THE PRIMARY DRIVERS OF LIKING TO PREDICT CONSUMER ACCEPTANCE OF FRESH NECTARINES AND PEACHES

DRIVERS OF LIKING OF FRESH NECTARINES AND PEACHES

Claudia Delgado[a*], Gayle M. Crisosto[a] , Hildegarde Heymann[b], and Carlos H Crisosto[a]

[a] Department of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

[b] Department of Viticulture and Enology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

Corresponding author:

[*]Claudia Delgado,

University of California, Davis,

Department of Plant Sciences

One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616

Email: cdelgado@ucdavis.edu

Tel.: +1 530-752 9356 Fax: +1 530 752 8502

New address:

Chromocell Corporation

685 U.S. Highway One, North Brunswick, NJ 08902

Email: Claudia.Delgado@Chromocell.com

Tel.: +1 732-565-1113 ext. 7418 Fax: +1 732-565-1183

ABSTRACT

A generic descriptive analysis using 11 judges provided 16 sensory attributes that described the aroma, flavor, and texture characteristics of seven nectarine and peach cultivars selected for their predominant sensory attributes. Simultaneously, the 'in-store' acceptability of these cultivars was evaluated by 120 consumers from northern California. The relationships among instrumental measurements (flesh firmness, ripe soluble solids concentration (RSSC), and ripe titratable acidity (RTA)), sensory panel descriptors, and consumer hedonic responses were studied. In these cultivars, RSSC was the only instrumental measurement significantly related to overall liking. Cultivars with medium acidity and/or flavor-aroma were liked "very much", and consumer willingness to pay more was correlated with overall liking without regard to cultivar. External preference mapping revealed three clusters that were associated with ethnicity and consumer preferences within each cluster. Sweetness was the main driver of liking for two consumer clusters; however, for the third cluster, the perception of fruit aromas described as grassy/green fruit and pit aromas were the main drivers of liking. There was a high correlation between instrumental measurements and their sensory perception; however, the sensory attribute measurements explained cultivar characteristics better than instrumental measurements alone. Sweetness correlated positively with overall liking and consumer acceptance.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS:

The main objective of this study was to identify drivers of liking for fresh peaches and nectarines in order to understand consumer preferences for these fruits. This information can be used by postharvest researchers to evaluate the potential of new postharvest technologies and consumer

acceptance and for plant breeders to develop new cultivars with desirable sensory attributes driven by the consumer.

KEYWORDS:

Instrumental quality; Descriptive analysis; Fruit sensory attributes; Consumer acceptance; External preference mapping, L-PLS regression.

INTRODUCTION

Despite increasing knowledge of the health benefits of eating fruits and vegetables, consumption of some tree fruit commodities in the United States, such as peaches, nectarines, and plums, has been static. Since 1980, consumption has averaged 5.5 pounds per capita per year (USDA Economic Research Data, 2009). A recent consumer quality survey of 1,552 consumers (Sterling-Rice Group, 2006) corroborates previous survey results (Bruhn 1995) concluding that lack of flavor and chilling injury symptoms are still the main barriers restricting California peach, nectarine, and plum purchasing in the U.S. market. Some researchers have tried to predict tree fruit consumer acceptance and/or preference using fruit physicochemical quality measurements at harvest, such as soluble solids concentration (SSC) for overall sweetness, penetration force for firmness-texture, and titratable acidy (TA) for sourness (Crisosto *et al.* 2003). A similar approach was used in Italy (Esti *et al.* 1997) and Slovenia (Colaric *et al.* 2005) to predict consumer quality. However, most of these studies did not attempt to relate these measurements to consumer responses. Other groups have attempted to evaluate the efficacy of such physicochemical measurements to explain consumer responses to apples (Hoehn *et al.* 2003) pears (Predieri and Gatti 2009), pineapples (Schulbach *et al.* 2007), mangos (Malundo *et al.* 2001), blueberries (Saftner *et al.* 2008), and oranges (Obenland *et al.* 2009). In some instances, fruit physicochemical measurements were related to consumers' hedonic ratings or acceptance percentages (Crisosto, Crisosto and Bowerman 2003; Crisosto and Crisosto 2001; Crisosto and Crisosto 2005; Crisosto *et al.* 2004; Guerra *et al.* 2009; Gunness *et al.* 2009). Despite general agreement that measured soluble sugars and/or organic acid concentrations are key components in predicting consumer acceptability of fresh fruits, other fruit quality characteristics also affect liking. In peaches, fruit firmness, color, and aroma were important

characteristics consumers used to evaluate fruit quality when selecting fruit to purchase (Bruhn 1995; Bruhn *et al.* 1991). These physicochemical measurements and sensory techniques can be used by the industry to evaluate the potential effect of new postharvest technologies on consumer acceptance; by shippers to evaluate current postharvest practices; by retail managers to validate their handling practices; and by plant breeders to develop new cultivars with desirable sensory attributes. Although significant correlations have been reported between physicochemical parameters measured instrumentally and sensory properties/hedonic scores (Colaric *et al.* 2005; Crisosto and Crisosto 2005; Rossiter *et al.* 2000), these correlations usually do not predict consumer behavior well. Despite the expense of consumer tests, they are more effective in predicting consumer behavior (Bett 2002; Harker *et al.* 2008; Saftner *et al.* 2008). In an ideal situation, researchers should simultaneously use physical instrumental fruit quality measurements and sensory methodology to evaluate consumer responses; however, because of budget constraints, fast rotation, intensive preparation, and/or limited quantities of fruit available, it is not always possible to conduct sensory evaluations. Descriptive analysis will provide with the characterization of the most important attributes for the fruit cultivars, while consumer tests will indicate how much those fruit cultivars are liked. External preference mapping is a well known technique used in the sensory field to relate sensory and consumer data with the purpose of identifying the drivers of liking (Lawless and Heymann, 2010, Yenken *et al.* 2011). L-PLS analysis is a relatively new technique based on partial least square regression (PLS) used to characterize three different datasets: the sensory attributes [X], consumers liking [Y] and consumers information [Z] to identify demographic differences among consumers (Lengard and Kermit, 2006).

Several researchers have explored the relationship between instrumental measurements, sensory properties, and consumer perception in other fruit commodities for example: apples (Daillant-Spinnler *et al.* 1996; Harker *et al.* 2003; Harker *et al.* 2008; Harker *et al.* 2002; Kühn and Thybo 2001; Oraguzie *et al.* 2009), tomatoes (Causse *et al.* 2010; Lee *et al.* 1999; Sinesio *et al.* 2010), and strawberries (Ares *et al.* 2009). We believe that the recent release and marketing of tree fruit cultivars with different flavors and the establishment of ripening protocols (Crisosto 1999) justify the expense of developing drivers of liking for tree fruit. Thus, the main goal of this study was to identify drivers of liking for fresh nectarines and peaches that predict consumer acceptance and/or preferences for these fruits during postharvest handling.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cultivar selection and fruit preparation

Seven peach and nectarine cultivars were selected for this study for their commercial importance, differences in titratable acidity, flavor, and aroma, and similar melting flesh texture after ripening (Table 1). 'August Pearl' is a low acid, white flesh nectarine; 'Fire Sweet', a medium acid, flavorful, yellow flesh nectarine; 'August Bright', a high acid, yellow flesh nectarine; 'Autumn Snow', a low acid, white flesh peach; 'Ryan Sun', a medium acid, yellow flesh peach with balanced sensory attributes; 'O'Henry', a medium acid, flavorful, yellow flesh peach; and 'Summer Lady', a medium acid, sweet, yellow flesh peach. The cultivars were selected based on their previously determined sensory attributes (Crisosto and Crisosto 2005; Crisosto *et al.* 2006; Crisosto *et al.* 1998). For each cultivar, fruit were harvested at peak size and California Well-mature for that cultivar from commercial orchards in Fresno Co., CA, then held at 0 °C (85% RH) for up to 10 d, except for 'Summer Lady', which was held at 5 °C (85%

RH) prior to ripening to induce onset of chilling injury (Crisosto and Labavitch 2002). The same fruit from each cultivar was used for both descriptive analysis and the consumer study.

Instrumental fruit quality measurements

Fruit were ripened in a temperature-controlled room at 20 °C (85% RH) until a subsample reached a flesh firmness of ≤ 17.8 N as described (Crisosto 1999). On the day of the descriptive analysis session or 'in-store' consumer study, a 2-cm diameter piece of skin was removed from one cheek of each ripened fruit of the cultivar to be tested and the flesh firmness (penetration force) was measured with a UC firmness tester (Western Industrial Supply, San Francisco, CA) equipped with an 8 mm tip. If the fruit was ripe (≤ 17.8 N flesh firmness), a numerical code was written on the tip of the fruit and the flesh firmness recorded. A sample consisted of one longitudinal slice cut from the stem end to the blossom end on the cheek opposite that on which flesh firmness was measured (Crisosto and Crisosto 2005). In addition, a longitudinal wedge was removed from the same area as the flesh firmness measurement, placed between two layers of cheesecloth, and the juice expressed for subsequent soluble solids concentration (SSC) and titratable acidity (TA) measurements. The SSC of the juice was measured with a digital temperature-compensated refractometer (model PR-32α, Atago Co., Tokyo, Japan). TA was measured with an automatic titrator (TitraLab®850, Radiometer Analytical, Copenhagen, Denmark) and expressed as percent malic acid.

'In-Store' consumer study

One hundred twenty consumers who reported eating fresh nectarines/peaches participated in the study. The experiment was conducted at a major supermarket in Davis, California. Each

consumer evaluated seven samples; the experimental design was a Williams Latin square design provided by the FIZZ software. One fruit sample per cultivar was evaluated by each consumer using a written questionnaire. For each nectarine or peach sample, consumers expressed their overall liking using the 9-point hedonic scale (Peryam and Pilgrim 1957). Consumer acceptance was calculated as the percentage of respondents who liked the sample, with scores >5. Consumer dislike of a sample was calculated as the percentage with scores <5. At the supermarket, the samples were prepared in the produce room out of sight of the testing area as described (Crisosto and Crisosto 2005).

Generic descriptive analysis

A generic descriptive analysis (Lawless and Heymann 2010) was used to identify sensory descriptors for fresh nectarines and peaches. The panel consisted of 11 judges (six women and five men) with an average age of 32 years. Each judge completed eight training sessions. The first two sessions covered the development of the language; four sessions were intended to achieve concept alignment, provide references, eliminate similar terms or ambiguities, and perfect use of the scale; and the last two sessions evaluated the judges' agreement and understanding of the attributes. FIZZ software (Biosystèmes) was used to build an automated session. Sixteen attributes were defined by the panel using standards (Table 2) and evaluated using a continuous, unstructured 10-cm line scale anchored at the ends by low and high intensity, except for firmness, which was anchored by soft and hard, and crunchy, which was anchored by not and very. Samples were evaluated in triplicate with one single fruit used for each judge. The order of presentation of the samples was randomized using a Latin square design provided by the FIZZ software.

142

143 **Statistical analysis**

144 The majority of the statistical analyses were executed using SAS version 9.1 (SAS
145 Institute, Cary, NC). To understand the relationships between physicochemical measurements,
146 sensory attributes, and consumer hedonic ratings, univariate analysis (correlation, analysis of
147 variance, and Fisher's LSD multiple mean comparisons) and multivariate analysis (canonical
148 variate analysis (CVA), MANOVA, and preference mapping) were performed. Market clusters
149 were determined using external preference mapping and cluster analysis. Cluster analysis was
150 performed with XL-Stat Version 2009.3.02 . The Unscrambler version 9.8 was used to perform
151 block partial least square regression (L-PLS) analysis.

152

153 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

154 **Instrumental fruit quality measurements**

155 RSSC varied from 10 to 13.4% and RTA ranged between 0.21 and 0.77% in the ripe fruit
156 (Table 1). In general, peaches had lower RSSC than nectarines and RTA varied among cultivars.
157 Among the nectarines, white-fleshed 'August Pearl' and yellow-fleshed 'Fire Sweet' had low
158 RTAs (~0.30%), while yellow-fleshed 'August Bright' had a high RTA (0.77%). 'Autumn
159 Snow', a white-fleshed peach, had the lowest RTA (0.21%) and the yellow-fleshed peaches
160 'O'Henry', 'Summer Lady', and 'Ryan Sun' had medium RTAs (0.50%). Our previous 10 years
161 of surveys indicated that RSSC is more variable than RTA for a given cultivar over years or
162 locations. Orchard management and environmental conditions have a strong effect on RSSC but
163 less on RTA. We observed larger changes in fruit TA than in SSC during ripening on and off the
164 tree. RTA measurements reported here are similar to those measured in previous surveys. RTA

values reported here for 'August Bright' nectarine (0.77%) and 'Summer Lady', 'O'Henry,' and 'Ryan Sun' (~0.50%) peaches were somewhat lower than previously reported for mature fruit (~0.60 to 0.80%). These differences in RTA are explained by loss of fruit acidity during ripening.

'In-Store' consumer study

For this consumer population, there were no significant differences in the distribution of female and male ages (p>0.05, chi-square test): 58% were female and 42% male. The average age was 33 years with a standard deviation of 17.5 years. Of the total population, 41% identified themselves as White-Caucasian, 36% as Asian-Asian American, 18% as Hispanic or Latino, 2% American Indian or Alaska Native, 1% Black-African American, 12% Mixed or other, and 9% preferred not to report their ethnicity. The consumption rate of nectarines and peaches for this consumer population was approximately equally distributed among once a month (23% nectarines, 24% peaches); two to three times a month (28% nectarines, 23% peaches); once a week (21% nectarines, 21% peaches), and two to four times a week (12% nectarines, 18% peaches). These consumption rates were low for when nectarines and peaches are in season; this supports reports that indicate a static consumption for nectarines and peaches since 1980 (USDA Economic Research Data, 2009).

The 120 consumers differed in their preferences for the seven cultivars (ANOVA p<0.05). Pearson's correlations ($p \leq 0.05$) between overall liking for each cultivar and instrumental quality measurements of ripe soluble solids concentration (RSSC), ripe titratable acidity (0.20 to 0.80% RTA), and flesh firmness (6.5 to 20.2 N) were not significant (p>0.05), except for RSSC (R^2= 90.2). Overall liking increased significantly from like slightly to like

188 moderately (positive slope) as RSSC increased from 10.0 to 14.0%. Even though the
189 relationship between RTA and overall liking was not significant, it had a negative slope,
190 suggesting that cultivars with high acidity were less preferred. The significant negative effect of
191 high RTA on overall liking has been reported previously on fruit with RTA higher than 0.80 to
192 1.00% and RSSC lower than 12.0% (Crisosto and Crisosto 2001; Crisosto and Crisosto 2005).
193 The RTA for the tested cultivars ranged from 0.21 to 0.77%, which may explain the lack of
194 significant correlation between hedonic scores and RTA measurements. The relationship
195 between overall liking and flesh firmness had a flat slope and was not significant in any cultivar.
196 This lack of relationship differs from other fruit commodities such as apples, where texture
197 change is one of the most important drivers of liking (Harker *et al,* 2008). However, all fruit
198 tested here was ripened to a firmness penetration force of 6.3 to 17.8 N, considered "ready to
199 eat" with maximum sensory potential based on our previous work (Crisosto and Crisosto 2005).
200 Since acceptance of these cultivars measured as a degree of liking was not affected by
201 changes in RTA, and RSSC was the only significant instrumental measurement affecting overall
202 liking of nectarines and peaches, a detailed statistical analysis between RSSC and degree of
203 liking was pursued. In general, degree of liking increased as RSSC increased and then reached a
204 plateau (Table 3). Among the nectarine cultivars, RSSC did not affect degree of liking within
205 each cultivar and consumer acceptance ranged from 65 to 91% (Table 3). Nectarines with
206 predominant sensory characteristics of low acidity and/or flavor/aroma had high consumer
207 acceptance percentages (72 to 91%) and were liked "moderately" to "very much" (6.6 to 7.7).
208 Nectarines with high acidity were liked less (5.7 to 6.7) and less accepted (65 to 82%). In the
209 nectarine cultivar with high acidity (~0.80%), acceptance increased and rejection decreased for
210 fruit with RSSC $\geq$ 12.0%. In the peach with low acidity, RSSC from 10.4 to 14.5% did not

significantly affect degree of liking or acceptance. Rejection was around 17% and acceptance ranged from 67 to 84%. In peaches with predominant sensory characteristics of flavor or medium acidity, fruit with RSSC < 9.0% had a low degree of liking (~4.5) and acceptance (25 to 36%). For fruit with RSSC ≥ 9.0%, degree of liking increased for peaches with high flavor and for peaches with medium acidity reached a plateau above 9.0% RSSC. In this small population of consumers that tasted nectarines and peaches with predominant flavor and high RSSC, degree of liking and acceptance was very high (91%). This data also suggests that nectarines or peaches with very low acidity may have a low potential consumer acceptance; however, this is affected by ethnicity (Crisosto and Crisosto 2002). It is important to point out that perception of flavor in peaches decreased and "off flavor" increased during cold storage as a consequence of chilling injury (Crisosto and Labavitch 2002; Infante *et al.* 2009). In most cultivars, this flavor loss is faster when fruit is stored at 5 °C than at 0 °C. In this study, all cultivars were handled rapidly to avoid any onset of chilling injury except for 'Summer Lady', in which onset of loss of flavor or "off flavor" development may have occurred.

A further detailed analysis of nectarine and peach cultivars by hedonic scale categories for purchase intent, price expectation, second consumption, and RSSC was conducted (Tables 4, 5). In general, consumers were willing to pay more for fruit with a higher hedonic score; this trend was independent of the nectarine (Table 4) or peach (Table 5) cultivar. The same trends occurred for purchase intent and willingness to consume the fruit for a second time. Other researchers have found a correlation between overall liking and the price consumers would be willing to pay for specialty food such as extra virgin olive oil (Delgado and Guinard 2011; Stefani *et al.* 2006) and consumers agreed to pay more when they liked cheeses (Napolitano *et al.* 2010). These 'in-store' consumer test results agreed with previous studies (Crisosto *et al.*

2006), in which peaches and/or nectarines with predominant sensory attributes such as flavor and/or aroma had a slightly higher consumer acceptance (~10%) than the standard ones. These results confirmed our previous sensory study and demonstrate that tree fruit degree of liking is associated with buying habits and even willingness to pay more. These results justify changes in orchard management to produce more fruit with high RSSC and selection of cultivars with predominant sensory attributes by plant breeders during cultivar development and growers for future plantings (Crisosto *et al.* 1997).

Generic descriptive analysis

Sixteen attributes were defined by the judges to describe the sensory characteristics of the seven nectarine and peach cultivars (Table 2). These attributes were evaluated through a three-way ANOVA (judges, cultivars, replications, and all two-way interactions). The ANOVA F-ratios confirmed that the panel performance was satisfactory (data not shown). The replication effects were not significant ($p>0.05$) for the majority of attributes evaluated, except for firmness, crunchy, juicy, and melting. Given the complexity of fresh nectarines and peaches, this difference may be due more to variation in the fruit than to variation among judges. This explanation was confirmed because the replication per cultivar interaction was significant, indicating that there was some variation in the fruit that is reflected in the replication effect. Chilling injury symptoms such as mealy-woolly texture develop in specific areas in the fruit. Despite 'Summer Lady' peaches having the highest mealy texture score, 'Summer Lady' also had the highest overall, grassy/green fruit, and pit aromas; bitter taste; and melting and fibrous textures. This cultivar also had moderate sweetness and sourness, and the least floral aroma, firmness, and crunchy attributes among the cultivars. 'August Pearl' nectarine had the highest

floral aroma (Table 6). There were no significant differences in the sweetness of 'Autumn Snow' peach and 'August Pearl' and 'Fire Sweet' nectarines, which had the highest sweetness scores. The sourest cultivar was 'August Bright' nectarine, followed by 'Ryan Sun' and 'O'Henry' peaches; the descriptive panel was able to detect some minimal bitterness in these cultivars, highest for 'Ryan Sun', 'Summer Lady', and 'O'Henry' peaches. 'August Bright' and 'Fire Sweet' nectarines had the firmest flesh. Even though care was taken to follow recommended postharvest ripening practices for stone fruit, these cultivars still may behave differently during ripening and exhibit slight differences in texture. Differences in texture perception have also been observed in blueberries at different ripeness (Saftner *et al.* 2008). The three nectarine cultivars exhibited no significant differences in crunchy texture, which is somewhat expected because the nectarine cultivars were also the firmest cultivars. Other authors have found an association between firmness and crunchiness in processed tomatoes (Lee *et al.* 1999) and kiwifruit (Stec *et al.* 1989). The highest means for mealy, melting, and fibrous textures were found in 'Summer Lady' peach, which makes sense because this cultivar was held at a different temperature than the rest (5 °C) to induce mealy texture. We believe that the low floral and high grassy/green fruit and pit aromas, combined with high mealiness and low firmness and crunchy textures detected in 'Summer Lady' were the onset of chilling injury symptoms detected by the judges.

A canonical variate analysis (CVA) was conducted to understand sensory similarities and differences among the seven cultivars and characterize their significant sensory attributes (Fig. 1). The variance explained corresponds to 64.5% on the x axis and 22.3% on the y axis. There was a significant simultaneous effect among all attributes and cultivars (MANOVA, Wilks' Lambda, $F = 9.06$; df 72, $p < 0.05$). Sour, sweet, floral aroma, overall aroma, and mealy were

the main attributes associated with the first dimension (CV1), while firmness, grassy/green fruit aroma and bitterness were the attributes related to the second dimension (CV2). Pit aroma, fibrous, and melting have short vectors, an indication of low discrimination for these attributes. 'Autumn Snow' peach was defined as sweet and fibrous, with some grassy/green fruit aroma, and not sour or mealy. 'August Pearl' and 'Fire Sweet' nectarines were sweet, firm, crunchy, and not sour, with a floral aroma. 'Ryan Sun' and 'O'Henry' peaches and 'August Bright' nectarine were defined mainly by their sour taste; the main difference among them was in firmness. 'August Bright' was firmer, crunchier, and also had some floral aroma lacking in 'Ryan Sun' and 'O'Henry'. 'Summer Lady' did not cluster with any other cultivar and was characterized as melting and mealy, with the highest overall, grassy/green fruit, and pit aromas.

The relationship among sweetness, sourness, and firmness, measured both instrumentally and by a descriptive analysis panel, was studied using principal component analysis (PCA). A correlation matrix was used to explain the relationship between the instrumental quality measurements and the descriptive panel sensory attributes measurements (Fig. 2). The total variance explained was 46.4% on the x axis and 28.4% on the y axis. The PCA analysis demonstrated that the sensory attributes sourness, firmness, and sweetness were highly correlated with the instrumental measurements (RTA, firmness, and RSSC). The length of the vector indicates the discrimination among samples provided by a particular attribute; for example, firmness as rated by the descriptive panel and firmness as measured instrumentally have exactly the same length vector, indicating that both methods provide similar discrimination among samples. However, sweetness and sourness as rated by the descriptive panel had slightly longer vectors than those generated by RSSC and RTA; this may be an indication that sensory methods provide better discrimination and characterization among samples for these attributes.

External preference mapping was selected to study the relationship between the sensory properties and the hedonic responses; cluster analysis (Wards Method, Euclidean distance) revealed three segments among the consumer population. Consumers in cluster 1 (n=52) preferred 'O'Henry' peaches and 'August Bright' nectarines. Cluster 2 (n=54) and cluster 3 (n=14) were similar: consumers in both liked 'August Pearl' and 'Fire Sweet' nectarines and 'Autumn Snow' peaches. However, while consumers in cluster 2 accepted cultivars that were mainly characterized by sourness, consumers in cluster 3 did not like these sour cultivars at all. Verification of the differences among clusters was accomplished by one-way ANOVA applied to overall liking on each cluster per cultivar, with the exception of 'Fire Sweet' nectarine that had no difference in liking among the three clusters. Overall liking was significantly different for each cluster for the rest of the cultivars, so even though the number of consumers in cluster 3 is small, it is important to keep this cluster. 'August Bright' nectarines were liked equally by clusters 1 and 2, but were disliked by cluster 3. 'August Pearl' nectarines received the lowest average hedonic score from cluster 1, but fared better with clusters 2 and 3. 'O'Henry' peaches were preferred by consumers in cluster 1 only, while 'Ryan Sun' was liked only by consumers in cluster 2. Consumers in cluster 3 provided the highest hedonic score for 'Autumn Snow' peaches, while cluster 1 provided the highest hedonic score for 'Summer Lady' peaches (Fig. 3). The external preference mapping provided the main drivers of liking and which cultivars were preferred most by consumers. Sweetness was the main driver of liking for clusters 2 and 3, while cluster 1 preferences were mainly driven by the aroma composition (overall, grassy/green fruit and pit aromas). The fact that sweetness was a key driver of liking agrees with other fruit commodities such as apples (Daillant-Spinnler *et al.* 1996; Thybo *et al.* 2004), strawberries

(Lado *et al.* 2010), pineapples (Schulbach *et al.* 2007), tomatoes (Causse *et al.* 2010), and fruit-based products such as apple juice (Rødbotten *et al.* 2009) or pear fruit leathers (Huang and Hsieh 2005). The perception of grassy/green fruit and pit aromas that were detected in 'Summer Lady' stored at 5 ^{o}C to induce chilling injury could be the first signs of chill injury development; it has been suggested that specific volatiles can be used to detect onset of mealiness (Crisosto and Labavitch 2002). Block-Partial least square regression, (L-PLS) was used to study the relationship between the sensory descriptors given by the panel and the hedonic responses of consumers. L-PLS demonstrated differences in demographics for the clusters (Fig. 4). There were some differences in preferences according to gender; male consumers preferred more firm, crunchy cultivars and females tended to like the nectarine 'August Bright' more. Ethnicity had a strong influence on preferences within each cluster; for example, preferences in cluster 1 were mainly associated with White-Caucasian ethnicity that assigned more importance to overall aroma. Consumers in clusters 2 and 3 were mainly Asian-Asian Americans who preferred sweet nectarines and peaches.

CONCLUSIONS

There were strong correlations between the instrumental measurements of penetration firmness, ripe soluble solids concentration (RSSC), and ripe titratable acidity (RTA), and their respective sensory panel descriptors of firmness-texture, sweet, and sour. The sensory descriptors explained cultivar differences better than instrumental measurements alone.

RSSC (sweetness predictor) was the only instrumental measurement that was highly associated with overall liking by consumers. The expected price that consumers were willing to

pay and purchase intent increased with the overall degree of liking and was not affected by cultivar.

Sweetness perception was the main driver of liking for two consumer clusters; however, for the third cluster the sensory attributes of grassy/green fruit and pit aromas were the main drivers of liking.

353 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

354 The authors would like to acknowledge financial support from USDA NIFA grant #
355 2009-51181-05783, "Increasing consumption of specialty crops by enhancing their quality and
356 safety" and the California Tree Fruit Agreement for making this work possible. Thanks to Dr.
357 Helene Hopfer, Melanie Lai, Catherine Hsu, Lauren Ginn, Paulo Wu Liu, and John Zuanyuan
358 Chan for their assistance on this work.

359

360

REFERENCES

ARES, G., BARRIOS, S., LAREO, C. and LEMA, P. 2009. Development of a sensory quality index for strawberries based on correlation between sensory data and consumer perception. Postharvest Biology and Technology *52*, 97-102.

BETT, K. 2002. Evaluating sensory quality of fresh-cut fruits and vegetables. In *Fresh-Cut Fruits and Vegetables*, (O. Lamikanra, ed.) pp. 427-438, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida

BRUHN, C.M. 1995. Consumer and retailer satisfaction with the quality and size of california peaches and nectarines. Journal of Food Quality *18*, 241–256.

BRUHN, C.M., FELDMAN, N., GARLITZ, C., HARWOOD, J., IVANS, E., MARSHALL, M., RILEY, A., THURBER, D. and WILLIAMSON, E. 1991. Consumer perceptions of quality: apricots, cantaloupes, peaches, pears, strawberries, and tomatoes. Journal of Food Quality *14*, 187-195.

CAUSSE, M., FRIGUET, C., COIRET, C., LÉPICIER, M., NAVEZ, B., LEE, M., HOLTHUYSEN, N., SINESIO, F., MONETA, E. and GRANDILLO, S. 2010. Consumer Preferences for Fresh Tomato at the European Scale: A Common Segmentation on Taste and Firmness. Journal of Food Science *75*, S531-S541.

COLARIC, M., VEBERIC, R., STAMPAR, F. and HUDINA, M. 2005. Evaluation of peach and nectarine fruit quality and correlations between sensory and chemical attributes. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture *85*, 2611-2616.

CRISOSTO, C.H. 1999. Optimum procedures for ripening stone fruit. In: Management of Fruit, Ripening. Postharvest Horticulture Series No. 9. University of California, Davis, CA, pp. 28–30.

CRISOSTO, C.H., CRISOSTO, G. and BOWERMAN, E. 2003. Understanding consumer acceptance of peach, nectarine and plum cultivars. Acta Hort. (ISHS) 115-119.

CRISOSTO, C.H. and CRISOSTO, G.M. 2001. Understanding consumer acceptance of early harvested `Hayward' kiwifruit. Postharvest Biology and Technology *22*, 205-213.

CRISOSTO, C.H. and CRISOSTO, G.M. 2002. Understanding American and Chinese consumer acceptance of 'Redglobe' table grapes. Postharvest Biology and Technology *24*, 155-162.

CRISOSTO, C.H. and CRISOSTO, G.M. 2005. Relationship between ripe soluble solids concentration (RSSC) and consumer acceptance of high and low acid melting flesh peach and nectarine (Prunus persica (L.) Batsch) cultivars. Postharvest Biology and Technology *38*, 239-246.

CRISOSTO, C.H., CRISOSTO, G.M., ECHEVERRIA, G. and PUY, J. 2006. Segregation of peach and nectarine (Prunus persica (L.) Batsch) cultivars according to their organoleptic characteristics. Postharvest Biology and Technology *39*, 10-18.

CRISOSTO, C.H., GARNER, D., CRISOSTO, G.M. and BOWERMAN, E. 2004. Increasing `Blackamber' plum (Prunus salicina Lindell) consumer acceptance. Postharvest Biology and Technology *34*, 237-244.

CRISOSTO, C.H., JOHNSON, R.S., DAY, K.R. and DEJONG, T. 1997. Orchard factors affecting postharvest stone fruit quality. HortScience, 820-823.

CRISOSTO, C.H. and LABAVITCH, J.M. 2002. Developing a quantitative method to evaluate peach (Prunus persica) flesh mealiness. . Postharvest Biology and Technology, 151-158.

CRISOSTO, G.M., CRISOSTO, C.H. and WATKINS, M. 1998. Chemical and organoleptic description of white flesh nectarines and peaches. Acta Hort. (ISHS) *465*, 497-506.

DAILLANT-SPINNLER, B., MACFIE, H.J.H., BEYTS, P.K. and HEDDERLEY, D. 1996. Relationships between perceived sensory properties and major preference directions of 12 varieties of apples from the Southern Hemisphere. Food Quality and Preference *7*, 113-126.

DELGADO, C. and GUINARD, J.-X. 2011. How do consumer hedonic ratings for extra virgin olive oil relate to quality ratings by experts and descriptive analysis ratings? Food Quality and Preference *22*, 213-225.

ESTI, M., MESSIA, M.C., SINESIO, F., NICOTRA, A., CONTE, L., LA NOTTE, E. and PALLESCHI, G. 1997. Quality evaluation of peaches and nectarines by electrochemical and multivariate analyses: relationships between analytical measurements and sensory attributes. Food Chemistry *60*, 659-666.

GUERRA, M., SANZ, M.A. and CASQUERO, P.A. 2009. Influence of Harvest Dates on Quality, Storage Capacity and Sensory Attributes of European Plum cv. Green Gage. Food Science and Technology International *15*, 527-534.

GUNNESS, P., KRAVCHUK, O., NOTTINGHAM, S.M., D'ARCY, B.R. and GIDLEY, M.J. 2009. Sensory analysis of individual strawberry fruit and comparison with instrumental analysis. Postharvest Biology and Technology *52*, 164-172.

HARKER, F.R., GUNSON, F.A. and JAEGER, S.R. 2003. The case for fruit quality: an interpretive review of consumer attitudes, and preferences for apples. Postharvest Biology and Technology *28*, 333-347.

HARKER, F.R., KUPFERMAN, E.M., MARIN, A.B., GUNSON, F.A. and TRIGGS, C.M. 2008. Eating quality standards for apples based on consumer preferences. Postharvest Biology and Technology *50*, 70-78.

HARKER, F.R., MAINDONALD, J., MURRAY, S.H., GUNSON, F.A., HALLETT, I.C. and WALKER, S.B. 2002. Sensory interpretation of instrumental measurements 1: texture of apple fruit. Postharvest Biology and Technology *24*, 225-239.

HOEHN, E., GASSER, F., GUGGENBÜHL, B. and KÜNSCH, U. 2003. Efficacy of instrumental measurements for determination of minimum requirements of firmness, soluble solids, and acidity of several apple varieties in comparison to consumer expectations. Postharvest Biology and Technology *27*, 27-37.

HUANG, X. and HSIEH, F.-H. 2005. Physical Properties, Sensory Attributes, and Consumer Preference of Pear Fruit Leather. Journal of Food Science *70*, E177-E186.

INFANTE, R., MENESES, C. and CRISOSTO, C.H. 2009. Preconditioning treatment maintains taste characteristic perception of ripe 'September Sun' peach following cold storage. International Journal of Food Science & Technology *44*, 1011-1016.

KÜHN, B.F. and THYBO, A.K. 2001. The influence of sensory and physiochemical quality on Danish children's preferences for apples. Food Quality and Preference *12*, 543-550.

LADO, J., VICENTE, E., MANZZIONI, A. and ARES, G. 2010. Application of a check-all-that-apply question for the evaluation of strawberry cultivars from a breeding program. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture *90*, 2268-2275.

LAWLESS, H.T. and HEYMANN, H. 2010. *Sensory Evaluation of Food*, Second Ed., Springer, NY.

LEE, S.Y., LUNA-GUZMÁN, I., CHANG, S., BARRETT, D.M. and GUINARD, J.X. 1999. Relating descriptive analysis and instrumental texture data of processed diced tomatoes. Food Quality and Preference *10*, 447-455.

LENGARD, V. and KERMIT, M. 2006. 3-Way and 3-block PLS regressions in consumer preference analysis. Food Quality and Preference 17, 234-242

MALUNDO, T.M.M., SHEWFELT, R.L., WARE, G.O. and BALDWIN, A.E.A. 2001. An alternative method for relating consumer and descriptive data used to identify critical flavor properties of mango (*Mangifera indica l.).* Journal of Sensory Studies *16*, 199-214.

NAPOLITANO, F., BRAGHIERI, A., PIASENTIER, E., FAVOTTO, S., NASPETTI, S. and ZANOLI, R. 2010. Cheese liking and consumer willingness to pay as affected by information about organic production. Journal of Dairy Research *77*, 280-286.

OBENLAND, D., COLLIN, S., MACKEY, B., SIEVERT, J., FJELD, K. and ARPAIA, M.L. 2009. Determinants of flavor acceptability during the maturation of navel oranges. Postharvest Biology and Technology *52*, 156-163.

ORAGUZIE, N., ALSPACH, P., VOLZ, R., WHITWORTH, C., RANATUNGA, C., WESKETT, R. and HARKER, R. 2009. Postharvest assessment of fruit quality parameters in apple using both instruments and an expert panel. Postharvest Biology and Technology *52*, 279-287.

PERYAM, D.R. and PILGRIM, F.J. 1957. Hedonic scale method of measuring food preferences. Food Technology *11*, 9-14.

PREDIERI, S. and GATTI, E. 2009. Effects of cold storage and shelf-life on sensory quality and consumer acceptance of 'Abate Fetel' pears. Postharvest Biology and Technology *51*, 342-348.

RØDBOTTEN, M., MARTINSEN, B.K., BORGE, G.I., MORTVEDT, H.S., KNUTSEN, S.H., LEA, P. and NÆS, T. 2009. A cross-cultural study of preference for apple juice with different sugar and acid contents. Food Quality and Preference *20*, 277-284.

ROSSITER, K.L., YOUNG, H., WALKER, S.B., MILLER, M. and DAWSON, D.M. 2000. The effects of sugars and acids on consumer acceptability of kiwifruit. Journal of Sensory Studies *15*, 241-250.

SAFTNER, R., POLASHOCK, J., EHLENFELDT, M. and VINYARD, B. 2008. Instrumental and sensory quality characteristics of blueberry fruit from twelve cultivars. Postharvest Biology and Technology *49*, 19-26.

SCHULBACH, K.F., PORTIER, K.M. and SIMS, C.A. 2007. Evaluation of overall acceptability of fresh pineapple using the regression tree approach. Journal of Food Quality *30*, 993-1008.

SINESIO, F., CAMMARERI, M., MONETA, E., NAVEZ, B., PEPARAIO, M., CAUSSE, M. and GRANDILLO, S. 2010. Sensory Quality of Fresh French and Dutch Market Tomatoes: A Preference Mapping Study with Italian Consumers. Journal of Food Science *75*, S55-S67.

STEC, M.G.H., HODGSON, J.A., MACRAE, E.A. and TRIGGS, C.M. 1989. Role of fruit firmness in the sensory evaluation of kiwifruit (Actinidia deliciosa cv Hayward). Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture *47*, 417-433.

STEFANI, G., ROMANO, D. and CAVICCHI, A. 2006. Consumer expectations, liking and willingness to pay for specialty foods: Do sensory characteristics tell the whole story? Food Quality and Preference *17*, 53-62.

THYBO, A.K., KÜHN, B.F. and MARTENS, H. 2004. Explaining Danish children's preferences for apples using instrumental, sensory and demographic/behavioural data. Food Quality and Preference *15*, 53-63

YENKET, R., CHAMBERS IV, E. and ADHIKARI, K. 2011. A comparison of seven preference mapping techniques using four software programs. Journal of Sensory Studies 26, 135-150.

TABLE 1. CODES, MEANS (X) AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (S.D.) OF FLESH FIRMNESS, RIPE SOLUBLE SOLIDS CONCENTRATION (RSSC) AND RIPE TITRATABLE ACIDITY (RTA) FOR NECTARINE AND PEACH CULTIVARS EVALUATED IN THE DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS AND CONSUMER STUDY.

Fruit	Cultivar	Type*	Cultivar Code	Flesh Color	Firmness (N)		RSSC (%)		RTA (%)	
					X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.
Nectarine	Fire Sweet	N-F	FS	Yellow	14.6	0.8	13.4	1.2	0.31	0.04
	August Bright	N-HA	AB	Yellow	12.8	0.7	11.8	1.2	0.77	0.08
	August Pearl	N-LA	AP	White	18.0	1.0	13.1	1.2	0.24	0.04
Peach	O'Henry	P-F	OH	Yellow	15.0	0.8	10.0	1.1	0.49	0.07
	Ryan Sun	P-MA	RS	Yellow	17.7	1.2	10.8	1.4	0.48	0.07
	Autumn Snow	P-LA	AS	White	17.5	1.5	12.6	1.2	0.21	0.04
	Summer Lady	P-SM	SL	Yellow	6.3	0.5	12.0	1.1	0.51	0.07

* N-F = nectarine flavorful, N-HA = nectarine high acidity, N-LA = nectarine low acidity, P-F = peach flavorful, P-MA = peach medium acidity, P-LA = peach low acidity, P-SM = peach slightly mealy.

553 TABLE 2. SENSORY ATTRIBUTE DEFINITIONS AND STANDARDS USED FOR
554 TRAINING THE DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS PANEL TO EVALUATE NECTARINE AND
555 PEACH CULTIVARS.
556

Attributes	Description	Standard
Overall aroma	Intensity of aroma (whole aroma)	Verbal description
Floral	Smell of flowers	Nectarine cultivars
Almond	Smell of almonds	1% Artificial flavor (McCormick) over 50 g of peach/nectarine paste*
Grassy/green fruit	Smell of grass associated with unripe fruit	0.01 grams over 50 g of peach/nectarine paste*
Pit	Woody aroma associated with fruit with traces of pit	10 pits were removed from the fruit and used as a standard
Overall flavor	Intensity of flavor (whole flavor)	Verbal description
Sweet	Sweet taste, example sucrose solution	Sucrose solutions 0- 50 g/L in spring water Fruit with different soluble solids concentrations ranging from 8-16%
Sour	Sour taste, example citric acid solution	Citric acid solutions 0 – 1.5 g/L in spring water Fruit with different titratable acidities ranging from 0.2% to 0.8%
Bitter	Bitter taste, example like coffee	Caffeine solutions 0.7 g/L – 2.5 g/L
Firmness	Flesh only: measured at the first bite ranging from soft to hard	Fruit with different firmness, ranging from 4.4 to 44.4 N
Crunchy	Flesh only: making a crunching sound when chewed or pressed	Verbal description
Juicy	Flesh only: amount of liquid	Verbal description
Mealy	Gritty, sandy texture, dry not juicy	Verbal description Fruit with different degrees of mealiness
Melting	How easy to fracture into mouth (high melting examples ice cream, chocolate)	Verbal description and use of ice cream and chocolate to explain concept
Smooth	Texture of the fruit related to having a continuous even surface	Verbal description
Fibrous	After first two bites, amount of fibers in the sample	Verbal description

557

558 * A paste (50/50) peach/nectarine was prepared as base.

559

560 TABLE 3. DEGREE OF LIKING AND CONSUMER ACCEPTANCE ACCORDING TO RIPE
561 SOLUBLE SOLIDS CONCENTRATION (RSSC) CLASSES FOR DIFFERENT NECTARINE
562 AND PEACH CULTIVARS AND THEIR CORRESPONDING INSTRUMENTAL
563 MEASUREMENTS.
564

Cultivar Type*	RSSC class (%)	n	Liking (1-9)**	Acceptance (%)	Neutral (%)	Rejection (%)	RSSC (%)	RTA (%)
N-LA	11-11.9	19	7.2 a***	84	5	11	11.6	0.26
	12-12.9	41	7.0 a	83	7	10	12.5	0.24
	13-13.9	39	7.1 a	82	15	3	13.4	0.24
	14->15	19	7.3 a	89	11	0	14.6	0.23
	RSSC class	n	Liking	Acceptance	Neutral	Rejection	RSSC	RTA
N-F	9.8-11.9	12	6.6 a	75	17	8	11.3	0.31
	12-12.9	25	6.6 a	72	16	12	12.5	0.31
	13-13.9	48	6.7 a	83	6	10	13.5	0.31
	14-14.9	24	7.0 a	88	4	8	14.2	0.31
	15->16	11	7.7 a	91	0	9	15.7	0.29
	RSSC class	n	Liking	Acceptance	Neutral	Rejection	RSSC	RTA
N-HA	10-10.9	31	5.7 a	65	3	32	10.4	0.75
	11-11.9	43	6.0 a	74	0	26	11.4	0.78
	12-12.9	28	6.7 a	82	0	18	12.3	0.80
	13->16	18	6.5 a	78	6	17	13.6	0.80
	RSSC class	n	Liking	Acceptance	Neutral	Rejection	RSSC	RTA
P-LA	<10-10.9	9	5.6 a	67	11	22	10.4	0.20
	11-11.9	34	6.4 a	71	12	18	11.6	0.20
	12-12.9	34	6.5 a	68	12	21	12.5	0.20
	13-13.9	31	6.7 a	84	6	10	13.4	0.20
	14-<16	12	6.7 a	75	8	17	14.5	0.20
	RSSC class	n	Liking	Acceptance	Neutral	Rejection	RSSC	RTA
P-F	<9	22	4.8 a	36	23	41	8.5	0.47
	9-9.9	41	5.4 ab	59	7	34	9.3	0.47
	10-10.9	33	6.2 bc	76	6	18	10.4	0.49
	11-11.9	13	5.7 abc	62	8	31	11.4	0.54
	12-<13	11	7.2 c	91	0	9	12.4	0.54
	RSSC class	n	Liking	Acceptance	Neutral	Rejection	RSSC	RTA
P-MA	<9	12	4.2 a	25	8	67	8.4	0.483
	9-9.9	25	6.0 bc	72	4	24	9.5	0.455
	10-10.9	34	5.4 ab	62	12	26	10.4	0.452
	11-11.9	28	6.3 bc	71	4	25	11.3	0.487
	12-<15	21	6.6 c	71	19	10	12.7	0.472
	RSSC class	n	Liking	Acceptance	Neutral	Rejection	RSSC	RTA
P-SM	9-9.9	5	5.6a	60	20	20	9.5	0.5

	10-10.9	14	6.6a	71	7	21	10.5	0.5
	11-11.9	30	6.7a	80	3	17	11.5	0.5
	12-<15	71	6.5a	78	4	18	12.8	0.5

565

566 * Cultivar type: N-F = nectarine flavorful, N-HA = nectarine high acidity, N-LA = nectarine low acidity,
567 P-F = peach flavorful, P-MA = peach medium acidity, P-LA = peach low acidity, P-SM = peach slightly
568 mealy.
569
570 ** Degree of liking: 1 = dislike extremely, 2 = dislike very much, 3 = dislike moderately, 4 = dislike
571 slightly, 5 = neither like nor dislike, 6 = like slightly, 7 = like moderately, 8 = like very much, 9 = like
572 extremely.
573
574 *** Same letters within the same column indicate no significant difference between means $p < 0.05$.
575

576 TABLE 4. PURCHASE INTENT, PRICE EXPECTATION, SECOND CONSUMPTION, AND
577 RIPE SOLUBLE SOLIDS CONCENTRATION (RSSC) BY DEGREE OF LIKING (1-9) FOR
578 NECTARINE CULTIVARS BY NORTHERN CALIFORNIA CONSUMERS.
579

Cultivar type[*]	Degree of liking[**] (score)	Purchase Intent[***]	Price[****] ($)	Second Consumption[*****]	RSSC (%)
N-F	1.0	1.0 a[******]	0.00 a	1.0 a	12.7
	2.0	-	-	-	-
	3.0	2.0 a	0.40 a	2.0 a	13.1
	4.0	2.2 a	0.70 a	2.3 a	13.8
	5.0	3.1 b	0.60 a	3.0 b	12.6
	6.0	3.4 b	1.30 b	3.1 b	13.4
	7.0	3.9 c	1.30 b	3.9 c	13.3
	8.0	4.5 d	1.60 b	4.5 d	13.5
	9.0	4.8 d	1.60 b	4.9 d	14.3
	P-value	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.09
N-HA	1.0	1.0 a	0.00 a	1.0 a	11.5
	2.0	1.1 a	0.30 a	1.3 ab	11.8
	3.0	1.7 b	0.40 a	1.9 bc	11.6
	4.0	2.4 c	0.40 a	2.2 cd	10.8
	5.0	4.0 de	0.70 ab	3.0 de	11.8
	6.0	3.6 d	1.30 b	3.5 e	11.5
	7.0	3.8 d	1.40 b	3.9 e	11.8
	8.0	4.3 e	1.50 b	4.3 f	11.8
	9.0	4.9 f	2.50 c	4.8 g	12.5
	P-value	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.10
N-LA	1.0	-	-	-	-
	2.0	-	-	-	-
	3.0	2.3 ab	0.80 ab	1.9 a	11.8
	4.0	1.8 a	0.40 a	2.2 ab	12.6
	5.0	2.8 b	0.70 ab	3.0 bc	13.3
	6.0	3.1 b	1.10 b	3.5 c	13.1
	7.0	3.8 c	1.10 b	3.9 d	13.0
	8.0	4.5 d	1.70 c	4.3 e	13.1
	9.0	5.0 e	1.90 c	4.8 f	13.1
	P-value	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.49

580

581 [*] Cultivar type: N-F = nectarine flavorful, N-HA = nectarine high acidity, N-LA = nectarine low acidity,
582 P-F = peach flavorful, P-MA = peach medium acidity, P-LA = peach low acidity, P-SM = peach slightly
583 mealy.
584
585 [**] Degree of liking score: 1 = dislike extremely, 2 = dislike very much, 3 = dislike moderately, 4 = dislike
586 slightly, 5 = neither like nor dislike, 6 = like slightly, 7 = like moderately, 8 = like very much, 9 = like
587 extremely.
588
589 [***] Purchase intent: 1 = definitely would not buy, 2 = probably would not buy, 3 = neither would not buy,
590 nor would buy, 4 = probably would buy, 5 = definitely would buy.

591
592 **** Price willing to pay per pound of the sample tasted at retail.
593
594 *****Second consumption: 1 = certainly will not consume this nectarine again, 2 = probably will not
595 consume this nectarine again, 3 = not sure or undecided, 4 = probably will consume this nectarine again, 5
596 = certainly will consume this nectarine again.
597
598 ****** Same letters within the same column indicate no significant difference between means.
599

600

TABLE 5. PURCHASE INTENT, PRICE EXPECTATION, SECOND CONSUMPTION, AND RIPE SOLUBLE SOLIDS CONCENTRATION (RSSC) BY DEGREE OF LIKING (1-9) FOR PEACH CULTIVARS BY NORTHERN CALIFORNIA CONSUMERS.

Cultivar Type*	Degree of liking** (score)	Purchase Intent***	Price**** ($)	Second Consumption*****	RSSC (%)
P-F	1.0	1.0 a******	0.00 a	1.0 a	9.9 ab
	2.0	1.4 a	0.10 a	1.4 a	9.9 ab
	3.0	2.0 b	0.40 a	1.7 ab	9.6 ab
	4.0	2.2 b	0.50 a	2.1 b	9.5 ab
	5.0	2.9 c	0.70 ab	3.0 c	9.3 a
	6.0	3.1 c	1.00 bc	3.0 c	9.8 ab
	7.0	3.9 d	1.40 cd	3.9 d	10.1 bc
	8.0	4.3 e	1.60 d	4.2 de	10.6 cd
	9.0	5.0 f	1.5cd	4.8 e	11.8 d
	P-value	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.001
P-MA	1.0	1.0 a	0.10 a	1.0 a	10.5 ab
	2.0	1.1 a	0.40 ab	1.6 a	9.4 a
	3.0	1.8 b	0.30 a	1.5 a	10.3 ab
	4.0	2.3 b	0.80 abc	2.4 b	10.3 ab
	5.0	2.8 c	0.80 abc	2.6 b	11.3 b
	6.0	3.3 d	0.90 bc	3.4 c	10.3 ab
	7.0	3.6 d	1.20 c	3.7 c	10.8 b
	8.0	4.6 e	1.70 d	4.4 d	11.2 b
	9.0	5.0 e	2.00 d	5.0 d	10.6 ab
	P-value	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.03
P-LA	1.0	1.0 a	-	3.0 cd	13.1
	2.0	2.0 ab	0.30 ac	1.5 ab	12.7
	3.0	1.2 a	0.20 ab	1.3 a	11.8
	4.0	1.9 a	0.60 bc	2.2 bc	12.5
	5.0	2.7 bc	0.80 bc	2.6 c	12.4
	6.0	3.0 c	0.90 c	3.2 d	12.3
	7.0	3.6 d	1.50 d	3.9 d	12.6
	8.0	4.5 e	1.30 d	4.7 e	12.5
	9.0	4.8 e	2.0 e	4.9 e	12.9
	P-value	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.74
P-SM	1.0	1.0 a	0.0 a	1.0 a	10.9
	2.0	1.0 a	0.1 ab	1.0 a	12.2
	3.0	1.8 b	0.1 ab	1.8 b	12.1
	4.0	2.4 c	0.7 bcd	2.7 c	11.7
	5.0	2.5 c	0.8 cde	3.0 cd	11.4
	6.0	3.2 d	1.0 de	3.5 d	11.9
	7.0	3.9 e	1.4 e	3.9 e	12.2
	8.0	4.4 f	1.7 f	4.5 f	12.2
	9.0	4.8 g	2.0 f	4.7 f	11.8
	P-value	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.42

606 * Cultivar type: N-F = nectarine flavorful, N-HA = nectarine high acidity, N-LA = nectarine low acidity,
607 P-F = peach flavorful, P-MA = peach medium acidity, P-LA = peach low acidity, P-SM = peach slightly
608 mealy.
609
610 ** Degree of liking score: 1 = dislike extremely, 2 = dislike very much, 3 = dislike moderately, 4 = dislike
611 slightly, 5 = neither like nor dislike, 6 = like slightly, 7 = like moderately, 8 = like very much, 9 = like
612 extremely.
613
614 *** Purchase intent: 1 = definitely would not buy, 2 = probably would not buy, 3 = neither would not buy,
615 nor would buy, 4 = probably would buy, 5 = definitely would buy.
616
617 ****Price willing to pay per pound of the sample tasted at retail.
618
619 ***** Second consumption: 1 = certainly will not consume this nectarine again, 2 = probably will not
620 consume this nectarine again, 3 = not sure or undecided, 4 = probably will consume this nectarine again, 5
621 = certainly will consume this nectarine again.
622
623 ******Same letters within the same column indicate no significant difference between means.
624
625

TABLE 6. OVERALL MEANS FOR THE SIGNIFICANT SENSORY ATTRIBUTES OF AROMA, TASTE AND TEXTURE FOR SEVEN NECTARINE AND PEACH CULTIVARS.

Aroma Attributes																				
Overall					Floral				Grassy/green fruit							Pit				
Cultivar type *	Mean				Cultivar type	Mean			Cultivar Type	Mean						Cultivar type	Mean			
P-SM	5.4	a**			N-LA	4.2	a		P-SM	2.5	a					P-SM	2.9	a		
P-F	4.6	a	b		N-HA	3.1	b		P-F	2.1	a	b				P-F	1.9	b		
N-LA	4.5		b		P-MA	2.9	b		N-F	1.7	c	b				N-HA	1.7	b		
N-HA	4.4	c	b		P-LA	2.7	b		N-HA	1.4	c	b	d			N-F	1.5	b	c	d
P-MA	4.4	c	b		N-F	2.5	b		P-MA	1.3	c		d			P-MA	1.3		c	d
N-F	3.7	c	d		P-F	2.4	b		N-LA	1.0	c		d			P-LA	0.9		c	d
P-LA	3.3		d		P-SM	2.4	B		P-LA	0.9			d			N-LA	0.8			
LSD	0.78				LSD	0.83			LSD	0.68						LSD	0.61			

Taste Attributes												
Sweet Cultivar type	Mean				Sour Cultivar type	Mean			Bitter Cultivar Type	Mean				
P-LA	5.3	a			N-HA	6.0	a		P-MA	1.3	a			
N-LA	5.1	a			P-MA	4.6	b		P-SM	1.2	a	b		
N-F	4.9	a			P-F	4.6	b		P-F	1.0	a	b	c	
P-SM	3.6	b			P-SM	3.7	c		P-LA	0.8		b	c	
P-MA	3.0	b	c		P-LA	1.3	d		N-F	0.7		b	c	
N-HA	2.7		c		N-F	1.3	d		N-LA	0.6			c	
P-F	2.4		c		N-LA	0.8	d		N-HA	0.5			c	
LSD	0.69				LSD	0.68			LSD	0.51				

Texture Attributes																								
Firmness Cultivar type	Mean					Crunchy Cultivar Type	Mean			Mealy Cultivar Type	Mean				Melting Cultivar type	Mean			Fibrous Cultivar type	Mean				
N-HA	4.6	a				N-HA	3.6	a		P-SM	2.2	a			P-SM	6.8	a		P-SM	4.8	a			
N-F	4.1	a	b			N-LA	3.3	a		N-LA	1.3	b			P-LA	4.7	b		N-LA	4.6	a	b		
N-LA	3.8	c	b			N-F	3.0	a		N-HA	1.1	b	c		P-MA	4.4	b		P-F	4.4	a	b		
P-F	3.6	c	b	d		P-F	2.3	b		N-F	1.1	b	c		N-LA	3.8	b	c	P-LA	4.4	a	b		
P-LA	3.2	c		d		P-LA	1.9	b		P-LA	0.8	b	c		N-F	3.8	b	c	N-HA	4.3	a	b	c	
P-MA	3.0			d		P-MA	1.9	b		P-MA	0.8	b	c		P-F	3.8	b	c	P-MA	3.8		b	c	
P-SM	1.2	e				P-SM	1.0	c		P-F	0.5				N-HA	3.4		c	N-F	3.4			c	
LSD	0.63					LSD	0.68			LSD	0.68				LSD	0.97			LSD	0.95				

634 * Cultivar type: N-F = nectarine flavorful, N-HA = nectarine high acidity, N-LA = nectarine low acidity,
635 P-F = peach flavorful, P-MA = peach medium acidity, P-LA = peach low acidity, P-SM = peach slightly
636 mealy.
637
638 ** Same letters within the same column indicate no significant difference between means $p<0.05$.
639

Figure captions:

FIG. 1. CANONICAL VARIATE ANALYSIS (CVA) FOR SEVEN FRESH NECTARINE AND PEACH CULTIVARS.

Each sphere represents a cultivar * (refer to Table 1 for cultivar descriptions). There is no significant difference between cultivars ($p<0.05$) when two spheres overlap. Attributes are represented by vectors.

* Cultivar type (cultivar): N-F = nectarine flavorful ('Fire Sweet'), N-HA = nectarine high acidity ('August Bright'), N-LA = nectarine low acidity ('August Pearl'), P-F = peach flavorful ('O'Henry'), P-MA = peach medium acidity ('Ryan Sun'), P-LA = peach low acidity ('Autumn Snow'), P-SM = peach slightly mealy ('Summer Lady').

FIG. 2. PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS BY CORRELATION OF INSTRUMENTAL VS. DESCRIPTIVE VARIABLES.

Cultivars are represented by ellipses and attributes by vectors. Please refer to Table 1 for a full description of the samples. Cultivar type (cultivar): N-F = nectarine flavorful ('Fire Sweet'), N-HA = nectarine high acidity ('August Bright'), N-LA = nectarine low acidity ('August Pearl'), P-F = peach flavorful ('O'Henry'), P-MA = peach medium acidity ('Ryan Sun'), P-LA = peach low acidity ('Autumn Snow'), P-SM = peach slightly mealy ('Summer Lady').

FIG. 3. EXTERNAL PREFERENCE MAPPING INCLUDING CONSUMER SEGMENTS

Cultivars are represented by solid circles. Please refer to Table 1 for a full description of the samples. Cultivar type (cultivar): N-F = nectarine flavorful ('Fire Sweet'), N-HA = nectarine high acidity ('August Bright'), N-LA = nectarine low acidity ('August Pearl'), P-F = peach flavorful ('O'Henry'), P-MA = peach medium acidity ('Ryan Sun'), P-LA = peach low acidity ('Autumn Snow'), P-SM = peach slightly mealy ('Summer Lady').

Solid square indicates consumers belong to cluster 1(n=52). Consumers in cluster 2 (n=54) are indicated by a triangle, and cluster 3 (n=14) by a cross.

FIG. 4. BLOCK-PARTIAL LEAST SQUARE REGRESSION (L-PLS).

Descriptive analysis data: sensory attributes per cultivar [X] vs. overall liking by 120 consumers indicated by solid squares [Y] and consumers' demographics [Z]. Variables in the outer circle are more important than variables in the inner circle. Cultivar type (cultivar): N-F = nectarine flavorful ('Fire Sweet'), N-HA = nectarine high acidity ('August Bright'), N-LA = nectarine low acidity ('August Pearl'), P-F = peach flavorful ('O'Henry'), P-MA = peach medium acidity ('Ryan Sun'), P-LA = peach low acidity ('Autumn Snow'), P-SM = peach slightly mealy ('Summer Lady').