Supplemental Data for:
Buffon, P., H. Heymann, and D.E. Block. 2014.
Sensory and chemical effects of cross-flow filtration on white and red wines.
Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 65:305-314. doi: 10.5344/ajev.2014.13090.

Supplemental Table 1 Wine composition for filtered white wine and filtered red wine and their respective unfiltered controls.

Sample	pH	Titratable acidity (g/L)	Ethanol (v/v%)	Malate (g/L)	Volatile acidity (g/L)	Glucose+ fructose (g/L)
White						
Subsample 1	3.38	6.36	12.63	2.274	0.28	0.87
Subsample 2	3.38	6.39	13.00	2.338	0.28	0.91
Subsample 3	3.38	6.38	13.03	2.424	0.27	0.91
Control	3.40	6.45	12.73	2.381	0.28	0.92
Red						
Subsample 1	3.75	5.51	13.48	0.1688	0.45	0.53
Subsample 2	3.77	5.48	13.57	0.07130	0.45	0.52
Subsample 3	3.77	5.50	13.55	0.06897	0.45	0.51
Control	3.78	5.46	13.57	0.06928	0.46	0.050

Supplemental Table 2 Mean color values including absorbance at 420 nm, absorbance at 520 nm, density, and hue for three filtered white wine subsamples and an unfiltered control. Each value is an average of eight time points and three technical repetitions (n = 24).

Product	A420	% Reduction
Subsample 1	0.0029 b[a]	25.6
Subsample 2	0.0031 b	25.8
Subsample 3	0.0031 b	25.8
Control	0.0039 a	–

[a]Means within a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $\alpha = 0.05$).

Supplemental Table 3 Mean total iron reactive phenolics values determined by the Adams–Harbertson assay for three filtered white wines subsamples and an unfiltered control. Time points shown are after bottling. Each individual time point value is an average of two bottle repetitions and three technical repetitions (n = 6).

Product	Week 1	Month 2	Month 6	Month 8
Subsample 1	87	67	32	29
Subsample 2	92	71	28	31
Subsample 3	93	72	28	30
Control	92	69	32	37

Supplemental Data for:
Buffon, P., H. Heymann, and D.E. Block. 2014.
Sensory and chemical effects of cross-flow filtration on white and red wines.
Am. J. Enol. Vitic. 65:305-314. doi: 10.5344/ajev.2014.13090.

Supplemental Table 4 Mean polyphenolic components determined by the Adams–Harbertson assay for three filtered red wines subsamples and an unfiltered control. Time points shown are after bottling. Each individual time point value is an average of two bottle repetitions and three technical repetitions (n = 6).

Product	Week 1	Month 2	Month 6	Month 8
Anthocyanin[a]				
Subsample1	280	275	187	173
Subsample2	292	280	192	192
Subsample3	295	286	204	186
Control	302	283	232	204
Tannin[b]				
Subsample1	197	198	251	255
Subsample2	255	247	191	328
Subsample3	248	246	281	317
Control	272	260	349	330
NTP[c]				
Subsample1	547	547	458	434
Subsample2	557	576	495	454
Subsample3	555	599	469	468
Control	535	592	490	490
SPP[d]				
Subsample1	2.05	2.66	3.17	2.18
Subsample2	2.11	2.73	3.05	2.43
Subsample3	2.05	2.61	3.13	2.35
Control	2.37	2.96	3.35	2.21
LPP[e]				
Subsample1	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03
Subsample2	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subsample3	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.31
Control	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.20

[a]Anthocyanin in mg/L malvidin-3-glucoside equivalents.
[b]Tannin in mg/L catechin equivalents.
[c]Nontannin iron reactive phenolics in mg/L catechin equivalents.
[d]Small polymeric pigment in absorbance.
[e]Large polymeric pigment in absorbance.