



UNIVERSITÀ POLITECNICA DELLE MARCHE
Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Yield and nutritional quality of highbush blueberry genotypes trialled in a Mediterranean hot summer climate

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original

Yield and nutritional quality of highbush blueberry genotypes trialled in a Mediterranean hot summer climate / Mazzoni, L.; Balducci, F.; Di Vittori, L.; Scalzo, J.; Capocasa, F.; Zhong, C. -F.; Forbes-Hernandez, T. Y.; Giampieri, F.; Battino, M.; Mezzetti, B.. - In: JOURNAL OF THE SCIENCE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE. - ISSN 0022-5142. - 100:9(2020), pp. 3675-3686. [10.1002/jsfa.10403]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11566/282749 since: 2024-04-05T14:31:25Z

Publisher:

Published

DOI:10.1002/jsfa.10403

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. The use of copyrighted works requires the consent of the rights' holder (author or publisher). Works made available under a Creative Commons license or a Publisher's custom-made license can be used according to the terms and conditions contained therein. See editor's website for further information and terms and conditions.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Politecnica delle Marche (<https://iris.univpm.it>). When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **YIELD AND NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF HIGHBUSH BLUEBERRY GENOTYPES**
2 **TRIALLED IN MEDITERRANEAN HOT SUMMER CLIMATE**

3 **Influence of genotype on Blueberries performance in a Mid-Adriatic area in Italy**

4 Luca MAZZONI^a, Francesca BALDUCCI^a, Lucia DI VITTORI^a, Jessica SCALZO^b, Franco CAPOCASA^a,
5 Chuan-Fei ZHONG^c, Tamara Y. FORBES-HERNANDEZ^d, Francesca GIAMPIERI^{d,e}, Maurizio
6 BATTINO^{d,e}, Bruno MEZZETTI^{a*}

7 ^aDepartment of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Sciences, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Via
8 Breccia Bianche, 60131 Ancona, Italy.

9 ^bCosta Berry Category, Range Road, Corindi, NSW 2456, Australia.

10 ^cInstitute of Forestry and Pomology, Beijing Academy of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences, Beijing
11 Engineering Research Center for Strawberry, Beijing Engineering Research Center for Deciduous Fruit
12 Trees. Key Laboratory of Biology and Genetic Improvement of Horticultural Crops, North China,
13 Ministry of Agriculture, P.R. China.

14 ^d Nutrition and Food Science Group, Department of Analytical and Food Chemistry, CITACA, CACTI,
15 University of Vigo - Vigo Campus, 32004 Ourense, Spain.

16 ^eDepartment of Odontostomatologic and Specialized Clinical Sciences, Università Politecnica delle
17 Marche, Via Ranieri 65, 60131 Ancona, Italy.

* **Correspondence to: Bruno Mezzetti**

Scienze Agrarie, Alimentari ed Ambientali (D3A), Università Politecnica delle Marche, Via Breccia
Bianche, 60131 Ancona, Italy.

Tel: +39-071.220.4933

Fax: +39-071.220.4685

E-mail: b.mezzetti@staff.univpm.it

18 **ABSTRACT**

19 **Background:** Cultivation of highbush blueberry (*Vaccinium corymbosum* L.) is increasing in Europe in
20 the last years, in particular due to the availability of new genotypes suitable for the cultivation in many
21 different environmental conditions. The aim of this study was to evaluate the resilience and nutritional
22 quality of eleven highbush blueberry cultivars and two new selections (from The New Zealand Institute for
23 Plant & Food Research Ltd breeding program) to Mediterranean hot summer climate conditions, by
24 measuring: plant yield; seasonality; fruit sensorial traits; phytochemical content in fruits.

25 **Results:** The new blueberry genotype PFR005 showed high adaptability to these environmental conditions,
26 with the highest total plant yield, while PFR075 was the best genotypes for the nutritional characteristics.
27 Among cultivars, ‘Cosmopolitan’ showed the maximum average fruit weight, ‘Blueray’ and ‘Hortblue
28 Poppins’ demonstrated a good sensorial profile, while the best cultivars from the nutritional point of view
29 were ‘Hortblue Poppins’, ‘Hortblue Petite’ and ‘Early Blue’.

30 **Conclusion:** Cultivated varieties or new genotypes could be suitable to satisfy the needs of different actors
31 of the productive chain. The integration of the germplasm evaluation with tailored breeding program will
32 help in the next future to create new cultivars useful to expand blueberry cultivation in Mediterranean hot
33 summer climate conditions, up to now of high limitation for this crop.

34

35 **Keywords:** *Vaccinium*; plant yield; fruit quality; phytochemicals; phenolic acids; vitamin C

36

37 INTRODUCTION

38 Cultivated highbush blueberries (*Vaccinium corymbosum*) are produced commercially in Europe and
39 recently the total blueberries production is duplicated, increasing from 47970 tons in 2010 to 100304 tons
40 in 2017 (<http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QC>) (Figure 1). This growth trend has continued in recent
41 years and has been accentuated by the diffusion of new genotypes that adapt to Mediterranean hot summer
42 climate. The growth of blueberry cultivation in lower chill areas around the world has contributed to the
43 release of cultivars that are suitable for those environments ¹. However, newly released low chill blueberry
44 cultivars might not be available in specific territories and the increased demand for blueberry cultivation
45 areas is limited by the low adaptability of the common knowledge varieties to different soils and climates.
46 The grower's access to those varieties is in fact crucial for the success of the commercial establishment of
47 a blueberry farm. A blueberry plantation of resilient cultivars has the potential to produce a good crop for
48 many years and thus planting the most suitable genotypes is fundamental. For the growers, the most
49 important traits of a cultivar are related to the berry plant yield efficiency, as the high plant yield, a high
50 harvest speed, good average fruit weight and resistance to pest and diseases ².

51 Blueberry fruits are believed to be good for human health for their high content of polyphenolic compounds.
52 Amongst the polyphenolic compounds, anthocyanins provide blueberries with their characteristic blue
53 color and have been shown to contribute to the antioxidant capacity of berry fruit ³. In general, the health
54 value of anthocyanins has been reviewed ⁴. Those compounds are reported to have a role in improving
55 circulation ⁵, preventing stroke ⁶, providing benefits to vision ⁵, and their anti-inflammatory and anti-
56 oxidative effects are extensively reported ^{7,8}.

57 Researches show that there is an interest in the anthocyanin content of blueberry fruit and that changes are
58 expected among fruits of different cultivars, harvested in different seasons and cultivated under different
59 conditions ^{9,10}. Blueberry fruit is also rich in phenolic acids, a group of phenolic compounds that possesses
60 free radical scavenging activity promoting human health benefits. Chlorogenic acid, the most prominent
61 phenolic acid found in blueberry ¹¹, resulted to slow the release of glucose into the bloodstream after meals
62 ¹². The content of vitamin C is another parameter considered for the assessment of the nutritional quality of
63 blueberries, even if there is a significant variability among *Vaccinium* species and cultivars ¹³. In particular,
64 the vitamin C content seems to be influenced mainly by the high brightness and the high pre-harvest
65 temperature ¹⁴, and by cracking of the blueberry skin ¹³. The increase of consumer attention to the healthy

66 aspects of fruit, and the demand of new fruit with high concentrations of health-promoting phytochemicals,
67 are reasons inspiring breeders to develop new tailored breeding programs ¹⁵.

68 Only in the last recent years, the highbush blueberry cultivation has been extended to central- Italy and
69 integrated with other berry fruit crops (i.e. strawberry, raspberry and blackberry). This climatic area is
70 considered of high potential in differentiating blueberry harvesting period, to anticipate the release on the
71 market of high-quality fruits. However, pedological characteristics frequently remains the main limiting
72 factors for expanding blueberry cultivation. New breeding program for this crop must be finalized to the
73 selection of new genotypes with increased adaptability to warmer climatic conditions and less acid – chalky
74 soils, maintaining high yield and fruit nutritional quality.

75 On the light of those considerations, an experimental trial was set for testing thirteen highbush genotypes,
76 combining some well-known commercial cultivars, more productive, and some newly released cultivars
77 and advanced selections which are known to be suitable for mid chilling conditions, with fruits of good
78 flavor and high phytochemical content ⁹.

79 The aim of this study is to report the results of the evaluation of highbush blueberry and to find genotypes
80 suited to grow in hot summer Mediterranean climate and not acid soils. The genotypes performances were
81 compared by evaluating: (1) the plant yield; (2) the seasonality; (3) the fruit qualitative traits; (4) the
82 phytochemical content in fruits.

83

84 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

85 **Plant material**

86 Cultivars and selections sourced from different nurseries were planted in 2010 at the “P. Rosati”
87 Experimental Farm in Agugliano, Italy (43°31’N 13°36’E. 46 m altitude). According to the Köppen climate
88 classification, this area falls within the climatic group “Csa” (Mediterranean hot summer climate). The soil
89 characteristics at the “P. Rosati” Experimental Farm are typical of the Italian mid-Adriatic area: pH 7.9,
90 active calcium 9%, texture composed by 40% clay, 25% sand and 35% silt. Those soil characteristics are
91 not suitable for growing highbush blueberry. For this reason, plants were planted in trenches filled with a
92 mixture of peat (65%), pumice (35%) and leonardite (5 kg m⁻³). Trenches were 30 cm wide, 35 cm deep
93 and spaced at 3.5 m between the rows. Plant density was 2.857 plants ha⁻¹. Every month, a Sulphuric
94 ammendant (Sulfer 90[®], Intertec International - Italy) has been distributed (40 kg ha⁻¹).

95 A drip irrigation and fertigation system of 120 kg ha⁻¹ nitrogen, 120 kg ha⁻¹ P₂O₅, 180 kg ha⁻¹ K₂O was used
96 as the basic agronomic technique.

97 In this study eleven northern highbush varieties were evaluated: ‘Duke’, ‘Hortblue Petite’, and ‘Nui’ were
98 early precocity genotypes; ‘Blueray’, ‘Cosmopolitan’, ‘Early Blue’, ‘Patriot’, and ‘Roxy Blue’ were mid
99 precocity genotypes; ‘Blue Silk’, ‘Bluecrop’, and ‘Hortblue Poppins’ were late precocity genotypes.
100 ‘Hortblue Poppins’, ‘Roxy Blue’, ‘Hortblue Petite’, ‘Blue Silk’, and ‘Cosmopolitan’ were released by the
101 New Zealand Plant and Food breeding program. In addition to those eleven cultivars, two new selections
102 always from Plant and Food breeding program were planted in the experimental block (PFR005 and
103 PFR075). Plants were planted in a complete randomized block design, with two plots of five plants each,
104 for all genotypes.

105 **Fruit harvest**

106 The plant production was monitored for two seasons (2014 and 2015) characterized by different climatic
107 conditions. At each year, the environmental conditions were recorded at site. Air temperature was measured
108 hourly in 2 m height directly in the field, through the installation of a Data Logger “testo 175T1”
109 (Lenzkirch, Germany). Temperature data were used to calculate growing degree days (GDD) based on 3°C
110 as used by Gough ¹⁶. GDDs were calculated from the first January of each year until harvest starts, in both
111 2014 and 2015 years. Another important parameter linked to the fruit harvest is the Precocity Index (PI);
112 PI represent the average of the weighted days number needed to collect the whole production of a cultivar,
113 from January 1, according to the following equation:

$$114 \text{PI} = \frac{\sum (Zqx)}{Q}$$

115 Where Z = number of elapsed days since January 1, q = total harvests production at the date Z, Q = total
116 Production of all harvests.

117 Within each season, multiple pickings were necessary to complete the total fruit harvest for each genotype.
118 Fully mature fruit were harvested in June and July, the total plant yield recorded (g fruits/plant), and the
119 Average Fruit Weight (AFW, grams) assessed at each harvest. In order to identify the different ripening
120 time of all genotype, the first harvest date is reported for each year and as mean of the two years (Tables 1
121 and 2).

122 For each plot, a subsample consisting of 300 g of undamaged fruits from the first, second and third main
123 pickings were bulked and frozen at -20 °C for the phytochemical analyses, while the remaining undamaged
124 fruits were frozen at -20°C for the quality parameters evaluation.

125 **Fruit Quality Parameters**

126 The fruit quality parameters were studied on undamaged fruit samples, harvested at ripening stage,
127 including pooled fruit of the three main harvests.

128 For the soluble solid content (SSC), the juice of the defrosted blueberries was squeezed out. One or two
129 drops of juice were put on the surface of a hand-held refractometer (model N-1 E, Atago Co., Tokyo, JP,
130 automatic temperature compensation). The quantity of SSC is expressed in °Brix (%).

131 The titratable acidity (TA) was determined with the automatic titrator HI 84532 Fruit Juice Titratable
132 Acidity (Hanna Instruments, Woonsocket, Rhode Island, USA). Briefly, 5 mL of the juice obtained above
133 was put in a plastic Becker, and 45 mL of ultrapure water were added. This solution was titrated
134 automatically by the instrument through the titrating solution provided by the manufacturer, until pH 8. The
135 acidity is expressed as percentage of Citric Acid (% Citric Acid).

136 Both the analyses were performed in triplicate for each plot, and results are expressed as mean value for
137 each genotype \pm standard error.

138 **Fruit Phytochemical Parameters**

139 Fruit extraction method

140 The fruit phytochemical quality was analysed on blueberry samples from the bulked frozen fruits. Fruit
141 samples were extracted by using the procedure described by Balducci *et al.* ¹⁷. Briefly, for each plot, 10 g
142 of chopped blueberries were weighed in a Falcon tube and the extraction started adding 20 ml of methanol,
143 followed by a homogenization with the Ultra-Turrax T 25 (IKA®-Werke GmbH & Co. KG, Staufen,
144 Germany). The suspension was then agitated in the dark continuously for 30 min at room. After 10 min of
145 centrifugation at 4500xg (Heraeus Megafuge 16, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA) the supernatant
146 was collected into amber vials. The pellet was subjected to a second extraction identical to the first one,
147 resuspending it in further 20 ml of methanol. The obtained supernatant was merged with the supernatant
148 from the first extraction. The extracts were stored in the amber vials at -20 °C until analysis. This extract
149 was used for the analyses of Total Antioxidant Capacity, Total Phenol Content, Total Anthocyanins
150 Content, and phenolic acids content.

151 For the vitamin C extraction, the method described by Zhong *et al.* ¹⁸ was adopted. Briefly, for each plot, 1
152 gram of frozen chopped blueberries was put in a 50 ml Falcon® tube together with 4 ml of the extracting
153 solution (5% metaphosphoric acid and 1 mM diethylenetriaminepentaacetic acid “DTPA”). After
154 homogenisation with Ultra-Turrax T 25 (IKA®-Werke GmbH & Co. KG, Staufen, Germany) and 5 min in

155 an ultrasonic bath (Transsonic 470, Elma GmbH, Singen, DE), the samples were centrifuged at 980xg for
156 10 min at 4°C (Heraeus Megafuge 16, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA). After filtering the
157 supernatant with 0.45 µm sterile nylon filter (ReliaPrep Syringe filters, Ahlstrom, Bärenstein, DE), the
158 samples were kept in 1.5 ml Eppendorf tubes at -20°C until analysis.

159 Total Antioxidant Capacity

160 The fruit total antioxidant capacity (TAC) was evaluated using the reduction of ferric tripyridyltriazine
161 (Fe^{+3} –TPTZ) – FRAP method ¹⁹, with some modifications ²⁰. Briefly, the FRAP reagent solution was
162 freshly prepared immediately prior to procedure, by combining ten volumes of sodium acetate (300 mM,
163 pH 3.6) with one volume of TPTZ (10 mM in HCl 40 mM) and one volume of ferric chloride (20 mM)
164 aqueous solutions. Then, 100 µL of sample (blank/Trolox standard/10-fold milliQ water diluted blueberry
165 methanolic extract) were added to 900 µL of FRAP reagent. The mixture was quickly vortexed for 15
166 seconds and allowed to react 4 minutes. Then, the absorbance of the solution was read at 593 nm with a
167 Shimadzu UV-1800 spectrophotometer (Shimadzu Corporation, Kyoto, Japan) against blank. Trolox
168 aqueous dilutions were used for calibration. Results were expressed as micro moles of Trolox equivalents
169 per gram of fresh weight ($\mu\text{MTE g}^{-1}$ FW). The analysis was performed in triplicate for each plot, and results
170 are expressed as mean value for each genotype \pm standard error.

171 Total Phenol Content

172 The fruit total phenol content (TPH) was evaluated on fruit extracts according to the Folin-Ciocalteu reagent
173 method ²¹ and quantified with Gallic Acid as standard. Briefly, a glass test-tube was filled with 7.0 mL
174 water. Afterwards, 1 mL of the diluted sample (1:20) was added, followed by the addition of 500 µL Folin-
175 Ciocalteu-Reagent and vortexing. After 3 min, 1.5 mL sodium carbonate (0.53 mol/L) was added, and the
176 tube was mixed once more and then stored in the dark for 60 min. The absorbance of the sample was then
177 measured at 760 nm. The data were calculated and expressed as mg gallic acid per kg fresh fruit (mg GA
178 kg^{-1} FW). The analysis was performed in triplicate for each plot, and results are expressed as mean value
179 for each genotype \pm standard error.

180 Total Anthocyanin Content

181 The fruit total anthocyanin content (ACY) was measured using the pH differential shift method ²². Briefly,
182 the methanolic extracts were diluted to a ratio of 1:10 with potassium chloride (pH 1.00) and with sodium
183 acetate (pH 4.50), and then the corresponding maximum absorbances for both of the solutions were
184 measured at 500 nm and at 700 nm. The data were expressed as mg of cyanidin-3-glucoside per kg of fresh

185 weight (mg CYA-3-GLU kg⁻¹ FW). The analysis was performed in triplicate for each plot, and results are
186 expressed as mean value for each genotype ± standard error.

187 Phenolic acids Content

188 The amount of the main phenolic acids present in blueberries was determined through HPLC methodology,
189 as described by Fredericks *et al.* ²³, with some modifications. The HPLC system comprised a Jasco PU-
190 2089 Plus (Jasco, Easton, MD, USA) controller with a flow rate set at 1.0 mL min⁻¹, a Jasco UV-2070 Plus
191 ultraviolet (UV) detector (Jasco, Easton, MD, USA) set at absorbance of 320 nm, and a column Aqua Luna
192 C18 250×4.6 mm (Phenomenex, Torrance, CA, USA). The mobile phase consisted of 2% (v/v) acetic acid
193 in Milli-Q water (eluent A) and of acetic acid in water and acetonitrile (1:49:50, v/v/v; eluent B). The
194 gradient program was as follows: 10% B to 55% B (50 min), 55% B to 100% B (10 min), 100% B to 10%
195 B (1 min), and 10% B for 5 min to re-equilibrate the column. The phenolic acids were quantified using
196 external chlorogenic acid and caffeic acid calibration curves. Values were calculated and expressed as mg
197 of the corresponding phenolic acid per kg of fresh weight (mg kg⁻¹ FW). The analysis was performed in
198 triplicate for each plot, and results are expressed as mean value for each genotype ± standard error.

199 Vitamin C Content

200 Vitamin C content was measured according to the method of Helsper *et al.* ²⁴, with some modifications.
201 The blueberry extracts previously obtained were subjected to HPLC analysis. The instrument consists of a
202 Jasco PU-2089 Plus pump (Jasco, Easton, MD, USA), flow rate 0.5 mL min⁻¹, equipped with a Jasco UV-
203 2070 Plus ultraviolet (UV) detector (Jasco, Easton, MD, USA) set at absorbances of 244 nm, and a column
204 Supelcosil LC8 150×4.6 mm (Supelco, Saint Louis, MO, USA). Quantification of the vitamin C content
205 was carried out through a calibration curve prepared by running standard concentrations of vitamin C.
206 Results are expressed as mg vitamin C per kg fresh weight (mg kg⁻¹ FW). The analysis was performed in
207 triplicate for each plot, and results are expressed as mean value for each genotype ± standard error.

208 Statistical analyses

209 The fruit productive, qualitative, and phytochemical parameters were analysed in triplicate for each sample.
210 Data were analysed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), with each genotype and years as an
211 independent variable. Significant differences within genotypes were calculated according to Duncan tests,
212 and differences at p<0.05 were considered as significant. Correlations among the productive (plant yield
213 and average fruit weight), qualitative (SSC and TA) and phytochemical (TAC, TPH, ACY, phenolic acids
214 and vitamin C) parameters were analyzed using Pearson's correlations (p<0.01 and p<0.05). Principal

215 Component Analysis (PCA) was also used to evaluate the levels of association among the productive,
216 qualitative and phytochemical parameters, and among the evaluated genotypes. The two most significant
217 factor loading values >0.4 were used to identify the most important variables and observations in each
218 dimension (PC). The factor loading values are the correlations of each parameter with the PC. They are
219 represented as vectors (positions) in the space represented by the axes of the PCA bi-plot. In the graphs,
220 the parameters and the genotypes that are closest to each other in the same geometric plane of the bi-plot
221 are considered as interrelated, and consequently the parameters and the genotypes that are distant to each
222 other are not related or negatively related. The greater the distance of a vector from the origin of the axis,
223 the higher the correlation of the variable with the PC represented in that dimension (axis). All the analyses
224 were performed with the software *Statistica 7* (StatSoft, TIBCO Software, Palo Alto, CA, USA).

225

226 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

227 **Fruit harvest**

228 According to first harvest date detected in the years 2014 and 2015, it is possible to divide the blueberry
229 genotypes into three groups: early, mid and late ripening time, as showed in Tables 1 and 2. Genotypes
230 belonging to the different ripening times maintain their tendency to ripen sooner or later in both years of
231 study. These data are confirmed by the GDDs values, which showed lower values for the early ripening
232 genotypes and increased in the mid and late ripening genotypes. The only exception could be considered
233 ‘Patriot’, which belong to the early genotypes in 2014, while it behaves as a mid-ripening time cultivar in
234 the year 2015. The PI is another fundamental value for the determination of the ripening time in blueberry
235 and, according to the mean values of PI for the two years, ‘Patriot’ results a mid-ripening cultivar.

236 As shown in Figure 2, the temperature trend in 2014 and 2015 years, from 1st January to late June, was
237 quite similar, even if there were some differences in specific moments of the year. As a result, the early
238 ripening cultivars (‘Duke’, ‘Hortblue Petite’, and ‘Nui’) slightly anticipate their first harvest date in the
239 year 2014. Contrarily, some mid (‘Blueray’, ‘Early Blue’ and ‘Roxy Blue’) and late-ripening genotypes
240 (‘Blue Silk’, ‘Hortblue Poppins’ and PFR075) slightly anticipated their first harvest in 2015 in respect to
241 2014 (Table 1).

242 The total average yield per plant and the AFW are also shown in Tables 1 and 2. The best AFW was
243 registered by ‘Nui’ in the year 2014, with 2.86 g/fruit, followed by ‘Cosmopolitan’ with 2.85 g/fruit.
244 ‘Cosmopolitan’ also showed a very interesting AFW in the 2015, being the highest with 2.14 g/fruit.

245 Interestingly, this cultivar was the only to present an AFW higher than 2.00 g/fruit in the year 2015. In a
246 previous study from our group ¹⁷, ‘Cosmopolitan’ (3.00 g/fruit) and ‘Nui’ (2.90 g/fruit) confirmed the big
247 size of their fruits in the productive seasons 2012-2013, in the same pedoclimatic conditions of the present
248 study.

249 All the other cultivars registered AFW values comprised between 1.00 and 1.99 g/fruit, except ‘Bluecrop’,
250 ‘Hortblue Petite’ and ‘Hortblue Poppins’ which presented values of 0.99, 0.64 and 0.72 g/fruit, respectively
251 (Table 1). This result underlines the importance of the cultivation year in determining the AFW. In fact, for
252 each of the analyzed genotypes, the highest value of AFW was registered in 2014. Many genotypes
253 performed for an AFW higher than 2.00 g/fruit in 2014, while only ‘Hortblue Poppins’ showed a value
254 lower than 1.00 (0.97 g/fruit). A different behavior of genotypes along years (1998-2007) has been also
255 reported by Ehlenfeldt and Martin ²⁵, with fruit weight of ‘Duke’ ranging from 1.2 to 2.3 g/fruit, while
256 ‘Bluecrop’ showed values comprised between 1.3 and 1.9 g/fruit. This genotype showed a similar range
257 also in Wach ²⁶, with fruits ranging from 1.73 to 1.98 g (years 1996-1999).

258 Differently from the AFW, the plant total yield varied in the years depending on the genotypes. In fact,
259 some genotypes showed higher values of total yield in 2014, while other showed higher values in 2015. As
260 an example, the selection PFR005 showed the highest yield in 2014 with 1433 g/plant, while in 2015 it
261 showed a lowest yield (984 g/plant). In the biennium 2012-2013, it showed an average value of 1160 g/plant
262 ¹⁷. Contrarily, the cultivar ‘Hortblue Petite’ showed the highest plant yield in 2015 with 1503 g/plant, while
263 in 2014 it produced only 833 g/plant; it even presented a very low mean value in the biennium 2012-2013
264 in the same pedoclimatic conditions (493 g/plant) ¹⁷. In Wach ²⁶, ‘Bluecrop’ also showed a great variability
265 of plant yield among years (0.71-3.5 kg/bush), and in Ehlenfeldt and Martin ²⁵ it showed again great
266 variability among years but with higher yields (3.7-7 kg/plants), as well as for ‘Duke’ (3.5-7.4 kg/plant).

267 **Fruit quality parameters**

268 Figure 3 shows the mean values of fruit SSC in the two years of analysis. The best genotype for this
269 parameter resulted PFR075, which produced fruits with the highest two-years mean value (13.8 °Brix) of
270 SSC (Figure 4), followed by fruit of ‘Blue Silk’ (13.1 °Brix). From a statistical point of view, mean values
271 of both genotypes resulted similar to all the genotypes with more than 12 °Brix, such as ‘Hortblue Petite’,
272 ‘Nui’, ‘Blue Ray’, ‘Patriot’, ‘Blue Silk’ and ‘Hortblue Poppins’, then followed by the other genotypes
273 having fruit SSC values above 10 °Brix.

274 Regarding fruit TA, it is well-known that high values of TA can have a negative incidence in the sensorial
275 perception of the blueberry fruit by the consumer. Lower values of TA could better balance the sugar/acid
276 ratio of blueberry, increasing the acceptance by the consumer. On the light of this, Figure 3 showed that
277 ‘Blueray’ produced the less acidic fruits among the studied genotypes, presenting the two years mean value
278 of 0.93 % Citric Acid. The fruit of ‘Early Blue’ also presented a low TA value, below the 1 % of Citric
279 Acid (0.98).

280 Even if the statistical analysis did not show many significant differences, it is possible to divide the analyzed
281 genotypes into low fruit TA (from 0.93 % Citric Acid in ‘Blueray’ to 1.05 % Citric Acid in PFR005 and
282 ‘Roxy Blue’), medium fruit TA (from 1.20 % Citric Acid in ‘Patriot’ to 1.30 % Citric Acid in ‘Hortblue
283 Petite’), and high fruit TA (from 1.41 % Citric Acid in PFR075 to 1.59 % Citric Acid in ‘Nui’).

284 **Fruit phytochemical parameters**

285 Phytochemical parameters represent the healthfulness of the analyzed fruits, indicating the potential
286 positive impact of blueberry consumption on the health of the final consumer. It is possible to divide the
287 fruit phytochemical parameters analyzed in this study in two different groups. The first belongs to the
288 spectrophotometrically detected parameters, and comprises the TAC, TPH and ACY evaluation. The
289 second one comprises the parameters evaluated through the utilization of the High-Performance Liquid
290 Chromatography (HPLC) technique, in particular phenolic acids and vitamin C content.

291 **Spectrophotometric analyses**

292 In past decades, much attention has been given to the total antioxidant capacity (TAC) of foods as an eligible
293 parameter for quality and as an indicator of beneficial bioactive compounds present in foods and of their
294 capacity to attenuate the incidence of several chronic pathologies.

295 According to the ANOVA analysis, the year, the genotype, and the year x genotype effects were significant
296 in the determination of fruit TAC values (Table 3). For this trait, the PFR075 fruit stands out from all the
297 other genotypes, resulting with the highest two-years TAC mean value (25.76 $\mu\text{M TE g}^{-1}$ FW), and
298 demonstrating an improvement in the breeding program toward the healthiness of blueberry fruits.

299 For giving an idea about the difference between PFR075 and the other genotypes, it is to mention that the
300 other genotypes with high TAC fruit values were ‘Hortblue Petite’ and ‘Hortblue Poppins’, respectively
301 with 19.98 $\mu\text{M TE g}^{-1}$ FW and with 19.88 $\mu\text{M TE g}^{-1}$ FW. The fruit of ‘Cosmopolitan’ resulted with the
302 lowest TAC value (14.33 $\mu\text{M TE g}^{-1}$ FW, Table 3).

303 However, TAC values obtained in the present study could be considered very high in respect to other studies
304 found in literature. In Okan *et al.* ²⁷, many genotypes cultivated in different provinces of Turkey resulted
305 with lower TAC values of the fruit than in our study, measured with the same FRAP method: ‘Bluecrop’
306 (4.55-7.71 $\mu\text{M Trolox g}^{-1}$ FW), ‘Blueray’ (9.86 $\mu\text{M Trolox g}^{-1}$ FW), ‘Early Blue’ (9.54 $\mu\text{M Trolox g}^{-1}$ FW),
307 and ‘Patriot’ (12.87 $\mu\text{M Trolox g}^{-1}$ FW) presented almost half of the content measured in our study; only
308 ‘Duke’ (22.45 $\mu\text{M Trolox g}^{-1}$ FW) showed a better value than in our study (17.37 $\mu\text{M Trolox g}^{-1}$ FW).
309 The antioxidant capacity of blueberries could be ascribed to the phenolic phytochemicals present in these
310 fruits ²⁸. As a demonstration, the highest value of TPH was shown by PFR075 (3778.4 mg GA kg^{-1} FW),
311 which showed also the highest value of TAC. This result confirmed the optimal performance of PFR075
312 demonstrated in the previous biennium ¹⁷, when it showed a very high TAC value and a good TPH value
313 (2891 mg GA kg^{-1} FW).
314 Also ‘Hortblue Poppins’ fruits showed a high value of TPH (3115.6 mg GA kg^{-1} FW), confirming the
315 correspondence with the high FRAP value of the fruit. Furthermore, fruits of ‘Cosmopolitan’ and ‘Roxy
316 Blue’ showed the lowest values both for TPH (1594.3 and 1936.0 mg GA kg^{-1} FW, respectively) and TAC
317 (14.33 and 16.95 $\mu\text{M TE g}^{-1}$ FW, respectively), confirming the relation between TAC and TPH, and
318 showing the low interest of these two genotypes for the phytochemical content in the current
319 environmental/cultivation conditions (Table 3). However, those two genotypes showed slightly better
320 results for TPH in the previous biennium, in particular ‘Roxy Blue’, with 2186 mg GA kg^{-1} FW ¹⁷. Those
321 findings confirm that, as for the TAC, also for the TPH the year, the genotype, and the year x genotype
322 interactions are significant.
323 As for the TAC values, TPH results of our study differ from what achieved by Okan *et al.* ²⁷. The fruits of
324 four genotypes over five in common with our study registered a TPH value lower than what we detected
325 for ‘Cosmopolitan’, which was the worst. This difference can confirm the important role of
326 environment/cultivation conditions on blueberry fruits TAC value and TPH content.
327 The anthocyanin compounds represent the biggest group of water-soluble natural pigments and belong to
328 the flavonoids class, which in turn are the main phenolic representative class, as well as the main group of
329 phenolic assumed with the diet ²⁹. As expected, PFR075 fruit, which possessed the highest values for TAC
330 and TPH, confirmed its interest also for the highest total content of ACY (1908.8 mg CYA-3-GLU kg^{-1}
331 FW), followed again by ‘Hortblue Poppins’ (1566.8 mg CYA-3-GLU kg^{-1} FW), which in turn showed high
332 values of both TAC and TPH.

333 Similar ranges of ACY concentrations were found in literature for highbush blueberries ^{30,31}, while in the
334 previous biennium, we have found slightly lower values ¹⁷. This latter study, however, confirmed PFR075
335 as the best genotype for ACY content also in the biennium 2012-2013, with an average value of 1744 mg
336 CYA-3-GLU kg⁻¹ FW.

337 Beyond the high values, also the low values of ACY were related to the other phytochemical parameters:
338 in fact, genotypes like ‘Blue Silk’, ‘Duke’, and in particular ‘Cosmopolitan’, together with the lowest values
339 of TAC and TPH, showed also very low values for ACY, with 1109.0, 1110.4, and 1056.9 mg CYA-3-
340 GLU kg⁻¹ FW respectively (Table 3). However, for this parameter, the worst genotype resulted ‘Bluecrop’
341 with a value of 822.5 mg CYA-3-GLU kg⁻¹ FW. This genotype confirmed a very low value of ACY in
342 Okan *et al.* ²⁷, with only about 500 mg CYA-3-GLU kg⁻¹ FW. However, in Rodriguez-Mateos *et al.* ³⁰,
343 ‘Bluecrop’ resulted the best genotype for fruit ACY content (1873 mg kg⁻¹ FW), but it is known that the
344 concentrations of this class of compounds could be influenced by many factors, as extraction and analytical
345 methods, fruit ripening and the genotype and the pedoclimatic conditions ³⁷.

346 Chromatographic analyses (HPLC)

347 Phytochemicals measured through HPLC comprised phenolic acids and vitamin C content. Regarding the
348 first group of compounds, chlorogenic acid is one of the most prominent phenolic acids in blueberries ¹¹.
349 ‘Bluecrop’ results the richest cultivar of chlorogenic acid for the years 2014 and 2015 (1581 mg kg⁻¹ FW)
350 (Table 4), differently from what observed by Rodriguez-Mateos *et al.* ³⁰, where ‘Bluecrop’ fruit showed the
351 lowest content of chlorogenic acid (about 400 mg kg⁻¹ FW) among six highbush blueberry varieties from
352 UK and a lowbush blueberry variety from North America. Together with ‘Bluecrop’, also ‘Blueray’ and
353 PFR075 showed high levels of fruit chlorogenic acid content (1401 and 1395 mg kg⁻¹ FW, respectively),
354 while fruit of ‘Cosmopolitan’, ‘Hortblue Petite’ and in particular ‘Hortblue Poppins’, revealed the lowest
355 values of chlorogenic acid (790, 658, and 321 mg kg⁻¹ FW respectively) (Table 4). The range of chlorogenic
356 acid fruit content measured in our study agrees with the results found by Ochmian *et al.* ³¹ but resulted
357 higher than Yousef *et al.* ³³ and Okan *et al.* ²⁷.

358 Regarding the caffeic acid, its presence in the studied blueberry genotypes was scarce, even if its biological
359 activities are effective also at small amounts. ‘Nui’ and again PFR075 were the genotypes with the highest
360 concentrations of this phenolic acid (246 and 182 mg kg⁻¹ FW, respectively), while ‘Roxy Blue’, ‘Blue
361 Silk’ and ‘Hortblue Poppins’ registered values of caffeic acid lower than 10 mg kg⁻¹ FW (7.7, 6.8, and 6.3

362 mg kg⁻¹ FW respectively) (Table 4). Yousef *et al.*³³, and especially Okan *et al.*²⁷, found values of caffeic
363 acid even lower than our study, with some genotypes that did not reveal any trace of caffeic acid.

364 Regarding fruit vitamin C content, only few studies assessed the amount of this compound in blueberries.
365 In this research, fruit of 'Hortblue Petite' had the highest mean value of vitamin C (43.2 mg kg⁻¹ FW),
366 followed by 'Nui' (36.2 mg kg⁻¹ FW) and 'Bluecrop' (33.4 mg kg⁻¹ FW) (Figure 4), while the lowest fruit
367 content was detected for PFR005 (24.0 mg kg⁻¹ FW), 'Hortblue Poppins' (23.5 mg kg⁻¹ FW) and 'Blue
368 Silk' (20.4 mg kg⁻¹ FW) (Figure 4). In general, vitamin C values in our study resulted slightly lower than
369 mean values reported for highbush blueberries in Prior *et al.*¹³ and Starast *et al.*³⁴. In the first study, it was
370 reported that highbush blueberries showed an average value of 72 mg kg⁻¹ FW, while in the second one the
371 half-highbush blueberry showed a content of vitamin C of 150 mg kg⁻¹ FW. One of the reasons of this
372 difference could be that, besides the genotype and environmental effect, the cracking of blueberry fruit skin
373 could lead to the oxidation of ascorbate, resulting in a significant decrease of its concentration¹³.

374 **Correlation matrix**

375 Fruit TAC (measured with FRAP method), TPH and ACY, two-years mean values, resulted strongly
376 correlated each other ($p < 0.01$), giving that TAC is strictly related to antioxidant activity induced by high
377 concentration of phenols and anthocyanins, among other phytochemical compounds in blueberries fruits
378 (Table 5). The same strong correlation ($p < 0.01$) among FRAP, TPH and ACY was also detected by Okan
379 *et al.*²⁷.

380 However, TAC did not result correlated to phenolic acids and vitamin C, even if those molecules are known
381 as strong antioxidant compounds. This is probably due to the low concentration of caffeic acid and vitamin
382 C accumulated in blueberry fruit. Furthermore, chlorogenic acid, even if is present in higher quantity, is not
383 correlated to TAC.

384 TAC, TPH (both at $p < 0.01$) and ACY ($p < 0.05$) content resulted strongly related to the SSC, which means
385 that sweeter fruits seems to be richer of bioactive compounds belonging to phenolic category (Table 5).
386 However, SSC was not related to phenolic acids and vitamin C. SSC was also inversely related to AFW
387 ($p < 0.05$). Those smaller fruits could also result healthier for the human consumption, giving that the AFW
388 is strongly inversely related to TAC ($p < 0.01$). AFW is correlated with caffeic acid, meaning that bigger
389 fruits contain higher amount of this phytochemical ($p < 0.05$).

390 Caffeic acid, chlorogenic acid, and vitamin C resulted correlated each other. In particular, caffeic acid
391 resulted strongly correlated with vitamin C concentration ($p < 0.01$). Caffeic acid ($p < 0.01$) and vitamin C

392 (p<0.05) resulted also inversely correlated with PI, meaning that higher biosynthesis of those compounds
393 could be stimulated in early-ripening blueberries, probably also associated to the milder climatic conditions
394 of early-ripening period (Figure 2). In fact, early ripening genotypes ('Nui', 'Hortblue Petite', 'Duke' and
395 'Patriot') were among the best genotypes for caffeic acid and vitamin C content (Table 4 and Figure 4). PI
396 resulted also inversely correlated to plant yield (p<0.05), indicating that early ripening genotypes tend to
397 be more productive than the late ripening genotypes. Similarly, this correspondence is evidenced in Table
398 2, where all the early ripening genotypes registered an average total production for the years 2014 and 2015
399 higher than all the late ripening genotypes. PI is also strongly correlated with TPH (p<0.01), meaning that
400 late ripening genotypes ('Bluecrop', 'Hortblue Poppins' and in particular PFR075) showed the highest
401 values of fruit TPH content (Table 3). On the light of these last considerations, it resulted that TPH was
402 strongly inversely correlated with plant yield (p<0.01) (Table 4).

403 **PCA**

404 The PCA bi-plot of productive, qualitative and phytochemical parameters showed interesting results,
405 highlighting a common trend for some of the analyzed parameters (Figure 5). The spectrophotometric
406 phytochemical parameters result in the same quadrant (higher left), together with the SSC content. The
407 interaction among phytochemical parameters and SSC content has been also evidenced by the correlation
408 matrix (Table 5). Similarly, AFW and plant yield relied on the lower right quadrant, opposite to the
409 phytochemicals and SSC quadrant. This means that among the phytochemicals (and SSC) parameters and
410 the productive parameters (AFW and plant yield) there is no relation or negative relation, as demonstrated
411 also by the correlation matrix (Table 5). Finally, it is interesting to note that all the HPLC-measured
412 compounds (chlorogenic acid, caffeic acid and vitamin C) are in the same lower left quadrant, so they are
413 related each other, as also suggested by the correlation matrix. Also the TA vector is placed in this quadrant
414 indicating that the TA of fruits could be related to the presence of those three acid compounds (chlorogenic,
415 caffeic or ascorbic acid).

416 Regarding the distribution of the genotypes on the bi-plot plan, it is possible to note some interesting results
417 (Figure 6). First of all, all the points belonging to the PFR075 genotype are located in the left part of the
418 graph, corresponding to the high content of TAC, TPH, ACY and SSC. As previously stated, this genotype
419 was effectively interesting for the high amount of those compounds. Then, 'Cosmopolitan' is concentrated
420 in the right part of the graph, close to the vectors of plant yield and AFW. 'Hortblue Poppins', which
421 resulted one of the latest genotypes, presents its points in the upper-left part of the graph, in correspondence

422 with the PI value. Furthermore, together with ‘Early Blue’ cultivar, it presents all its points in the same
423 quadrant of the phytochemical compounds’ vectors, confirming the interesting nutritional features already
424 evidenced in Table 3.

425

426 **CONCLUSION**

427 This study demonstrated that by using new breeding material it is possible to generate new genotypes with
428 higher adaptability to Mediterranean hot summer climate conditions in the mid-Adriatic area. The new
429 blueberry genotypes tested have shown contrasting results for the productive parameters: PFR005 showed
430 the higher average plant yield in the biennium of study, without an outstanding AFW, while PFR075
431 showed the lowest plant yield among all the studied genotypes, but with an AFW among the best in the
432 biennium, being the highest for the late-ripening genotypes. This selection showed fruits with the highest
433 SSC value that, combined with a medium-high TA value, gives a good sugar/acid ratio in the fruit.
434 Regarding the fruit nutritional parameters, the breeding program reached a very high-quality level with the
435 selection PFR075, resulting the best genotype, among all the tested blueberries, in terms of fruit TAC, TPH
436 and ACY. Fruits of PFR005 selection also showed good nutritional values, in particular for TAC, even if
437 at lesser extent than PFR075. For the HPLC analyses, PFR005 and mostly PFR075 showed very interesting
438 values of fruit chlorogenic and caffeic acid content.

439 Some cultivars also demonstrated a good adaptability to cultivation in mid-Adriatic area (characterized by
440 mild climate and chalky soils), with ‘Cosmopolitan’ and ‘Nui’ showing the highest AFW values, supported
441 also by medium-high levels of plant yields. The most positive SSC/TA ratios were obtained for fruits of
442 ‘Blueray’ and ‘Hortblue Poppins’, while high nutritional values were detected for ‘Hortblue Poppins’,
443 ‘Hortblue Petite’ and ‘Early Blue’. ‘Hortblue Petite’ resulted very interesting also for vitamin C content,
444 showing the highest value, while ‘Bluecrop’ and ‘Blueray’ fruits possessed the highest values for
445 chlorogenic acid.

446 The PCA analysis demonstrated high relation among parameters. As expected, the productive parameters
447 (Plant yield and AFW) are close to each other in the bi-plot graph. Thus, confirming the importance to
448 breed new blueberry cultivars with increased fruit size for increasing yield and reduce harvesting costs. The
449 sensorial quality of the fruit expressed as SSC resulted related to TPH, ACY and TAC. This confirming
450 the possibility to combine the high content of sensorial compounds, such as SSC, with health-related
451 compounds such as TPH, ACY. Their correlation with TAC also confirms their role in determining the

452 antioxidant capacity of blueberry fruit combined with a higher sweetness that can be better appreciated by
453 the consumer. On the contrary, TA is related to all the phytochemicals analyzed characterized by acid
454 compounds, such as caffeic acid, chlorogenic acid and ascorbic acid. Therefore, blueberry fruit nutritional
455 value determined with increased content of these compounds can result with a negative appreciation by the
456 consumer for the increased acidity.

457 Comparing our results with what available in literature, is emerging that varieties tested in our conditions
458 produced fruits with higher phytochemical content, in particular TPH associated with higher TAC values,
459 of the same varieties tested with the same analytical methods in other cultivation conditions. It could be
460 affirmed that our cultivating conditions, with warmer climate and soil pH inducing plant stress, promote
461 higher content of antioxidant/nutritional compounds in blueberry fruits.

462 The application of these results to blueberry germplasm evaluation and tailored breeding program will help
463 to create new resilient cultivars useful to expand blueberry cultivation in less optimal climatic and soil
464 conditions.

465

466 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

467 The research work was carried out thanks to the project on valuing of ‘Red Fruit Genetic Resources’
468 supported by the Italian Ministry of Environment, by the National Natural Science Foundation of China
469 (Grant No. 31201579) and for the last analyses to the EU FP7 EUBerry project No. 265942. The funders
470 had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the
471 manuscript.

472

473 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

474 None.

475

476 **REFERENCES**

- 477 1. Scalzo J, Wright G, Boettiger S, Adaptability of blueberries to lower chill growing regions in
478 Australia. *Acta Hort* **1117**:45-48 (2016).
- 479 2. Di Vittori L, Mazzoni L, Battino M, Mezzetti B, Pre-harvest factors influencing the quality of
480 berries. *Sci Hort* **233**:310–322 (2018).

- 481 3. Moyer RA, Hummer KE, Finn CE, Frei B, Wrolstad RE, Anthocyanins, phenolics, and antioxidant
482 capacity in diverse small fruits: vaccinium, rubus, and ribes. *J Agric Food Chem* **50(3)**:519-525
483 (2002).
- 484 4. Kong JM, Chia LS, Goh NK, Chia TF, Brouillard R, Analysis and biological activities of
485 anthocyanins. *Phytochemistry* **64(5)**:923-933 (2003).
- 486 5. Matsumoto H, Takenami E, Iwasaki-Kurashige K, Osada T, Katsumura T, Hamaoka T, Effects of
487 blackcurrant anthocyanin intake on peripheral muscle circulation during typing work in humans.
488 *Eur J Appl Physiol* **94(1-2)**:36-45 (2005).
- 489 6. Keli SO, Hertog MG, Feskens EJ, Kromhout D, Dietary flavonoids, antioxidant vitamins, and
490 incidence of stroke: the Zutphen study. *Arch Intern Med* **156(6)**:637-642 (1996).
- 491 7. Lyall KA, Hurst SM, Cooney J, Jensen D, Lo K, Hurst RD, Stevenson LM, Short-term
492 blackcurrant extract consumption modulates exercise-induced oxidative stress and
493 lipopolysaccharide-stimulated inflammatory responses. *Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol*
494 **297(1)**:R70-81 (2009).
- 495 8. Ghosh D, McGhie TK, Zhang J, Adaim A, Skinner M, Effects of anthocyanins and other phenolics
496 of boysenberry and blackcurrant as inhibitors of oxidative stress and damage to cellular DNA in
497 SH-SY5Y and HL-60 cells. *J Sci Food Agric* **86(5)**:678-686 (2006).
- 498 9. Scalzo J, Stevenson D, Hedderley D, Blueberry estimated harvest from seven new cultivars: Fruit
499 and anthocyanins. *Food Chem* **139**:44-50 (2013).
- 500 10. Wang SY, Chen H, Camp MJ, Ehlenfeldt MK, Genotype and growing season influence blueberry
501 antioxidant capacity and other quality attributes. *Int J Food Sci Tech* **47(7)**:1540-1549 (2012).
- 502 11. Taruscio TG, Barney DL, Exon J, Content and profile of flavanoid and phenolic acid compounds
503 in conjunction with the antioxidant capacity for a variety of northwest Vaccinium berries. *J Agric*
504 *Food Chem* **52**:3169-3176 (2004).
- 505 12. Johnston KL, Clifford MN, Morgan LM, Coffee acutely modifies gastrointestinal hormone
506 secretion and glucose tolerance in humans: glycemic effects of chlorogenic acid and caffeine. *Am*
507 *J Clin Nutr* **78**:728-733 (2003).
- 508 13. Prior R, Cao G, Martin A, Sofic E, McEwen J, O'Brien C, Lischner N, Ehlenfeldt M, Kalt W,
509 Krewer G, Mainlandet CM, Antioxidant capacity as influenced by total phenolic and anthocyanin
510 content, maturity, and variety of Vaccinium species. *J Agric Food Chem* **46**:2686-2693 (1998).

- 511 14. Lee SK, Kader AA, Preharvest and postharvest factors influencing vitamin C content of
512 horticultural crops. *Postharvest Biol Tec* **20**:207–220 (2000).
- 513 15. Diamanti J, Capocasa F, Balducci F, Battino M, Hancock J, Mezzetti B, Increasing Strawberry
514 Fruit Sensorial and Nutritional Quality Using Wild and Cultivated Germplasm. *PLoS One* **7**:10
515 (2012).
- 516 16. Gough RE (ed). *The highbush blueberry and its management*, Food Products Press, New York
517 (1994).
- 518 17. Balducci F, Capocasa F, Mazzoni L, Mezzetti B, Scalzo J, Study on adaptability of blueberry
519 cultivars in center-south Europe. *Acta Hortic* **1117**:53-58.
- 520 18. Zhong CF, Mazzoni L, Balducci F, Di Vittori L, Capocasa F, Giampieri F, Mezzetti B, Evaluation
521 of vitamin C content in fruit and leaves of different strawberry genotypes. *Acta Hortic*, **1156**:371-
522 378 (2017).
- 523 19. Benzie IFF, Strain JJ, The ferric reducing ability of plasma (FRAP) as a measure of “antioxidant
524 power”: The FRAP assay. *Anal Biochem* **239**:70–76 (1996).
- 525 20. Deighton N, Brennan R, Finn C, Davies HV, Antioxidant properties of domesticated and wild
526 *Rubus* species. *J Sci Food Agric* **80**:1307-1313 (2000).
- 527 21. Slinkard, K., Singleton, VL, Total phenol analysis: automation and comparison with manual
528 methods. *Am J Enol Viticult* **28**:49-55 (1977).
- 529 22. Giusti M, Wrolstad RE, Characterization and Measurement of anthocyanins by UV-visible
530 Spectroscopy, in *Current Protocols in Food Analytical Chemistry*, ed by Wrolstad RE. John Wiley
531 & Sons Inc, Chichester, pp. F1.2.1-F1.2.13 (2001).
- 532 23. Fredericks CH, Fanning KJ, Gidley MJ, Netzel G, Zabarás D, Herrington M, Netzel M, High-
533 anthocyanin strawberries through cultivar selection. *J Sci Food Agric* **93**(4):846–852 (2013).
- 534 24. Helsper JPDFG, de Vos CHR, Maas FM, Jonker HH, van den Broeck HC, Jordi W, Pot CS, Keizer
535 LCP, Schapendonk AHCM, Response of selected antioxidants and pigments in tissues of *Rosa*
536 *hybrida* and *Fuchsia hybrida* to supplemental UV-A exposure. *Physiol Plantarum* **117**:171–187
537 (2003).
- 538 25. Ehlenfeldt MK, Martin RB Jr, Seed Set, Berry Weight, and Yield interaction in the Highbush
539 Blueberry Cultivars (*Vaccinium corymbosum* L.) “Bluecrop” and “Duke”. *J Am Pomol Soc*
540 **64**(3):162-172 (2010).

- 541 26. Wach D, Estimation of growth and yielding of five highbush blueberry (*Vaccinium corymbosum*
542 L.) cultivars. *Folia Horti* **24(1)**:61-65 (2012).
- 543 27. Okan OT, Deniz I, Yayli N, Şat IG, Öz M, Hatipoglu Serdar G, Antioxidant Activity, Sugar
544 Content and Phenolic Profiling of Blueberries Cultivars: A Comprehensive Comparison. *Not Bot*
545 *Horti Agrobo* **46(2)**:639-652 (2018).
- 546 28. Alarcón-Barrera KS, Armijos-Montesinos DS, García-Tenesaca M, Iturralde G, Jaramilo-Vivanco
547 T, Granda-Albuja MG, Giampieri F, Alvarez-Suarez JM, Wild Andean blackberry (*Rubus glaucus*
548 Benth) and Andean blueberry (*Vaccinium floribundum* Kunth) from the Highlands of Ecuador:
549 Nutritional composition and protective effect on human dermal fibroblasts against cytotoxic
550 oxidative damage. *J Berry Res* **8(3)**:223-236 (2018).
- 551 29. Giampieri F, Tulipani S, Alvarez-Suarez JM, Quiles JL, Mezzetti B, Battino M, The strawberry:
552 Composition, nutritional quality, and impact on human health. *Nutrition* **28**:9-19 (2012).
- 553 30. Rodriguez-Mateos A, Cifuentes-Gomez T, Tabatabaee S, Lecras C, Spencer JP, Procyanidin,
554 anthocyanin, and chlorogenic acid contents of highbush and lowbush blueberries. *J Agric Food*
555 *Chem* **60(23)**: 5772-5778 (2012).
- 556 31. Ochmian I, Kozos K, Chelpiński P, Szczepanek M, Comparison of berry quality in highbush
557 blueberry cultivars grown according to conventional and organic methods. *Turk J Agric For*
558 **39**:174-181 (2015).
- 559 32. Khanal RC, Howard LR, Prior RL, Procyanidin composition of selected fruits and fruit byproducts
560 is affected by extraction method and variety. *J Agric Food Chem* **57(19)**:8839-8843 (2009).
- 561 33. Yousef GG, Brown AF, Funakoshi Y, Mbeunkui F, Grace MH, Ballington JR, Loraine A, Lila
562 MA, Efficient quantification of the health-relevant anthocyanin and phenolic acid profiles in
563 commercial cultivars and breeding selections of blueberries (*Vaccinium* spp.). *J Agric Food Chem*
564 **61(20)**:4806-4815 (2013).
- 565 34. Starast M, Karp K, Vool E, Moor U, Tonutare T, Paal T, Chemical Composition and Quality of
566 Cultivated and Natural Blueberry Fruit in Estonia. *Veg Crop Res Bull* **66**:143-153 (2007).

567

568 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

569 **Figure 1:** Evolution of the blueberry production area in the World in the last 20 years (Source FAOSTAT
570 <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QC/visualize>).

571 **Figure 2:** Daily mean temperatures from 1st January to 24th June for the two years of study (2014 and
572 2015) at the experimental field, Agugliano (AN), Italy.


573 **Figure 3:** Mean Soluble Solids Content (SSC) and Titratable Acidity (TA) for the biennium (2014-2015)
574 of the blueberry genotypes. Genotypes are listed in order of ripening time, from earlier to later. Different
575 lowercase letters mean significant differences for SSC (Duncan test $p < 0.05$). Different uppercase letters
576 mean significant differences for TA (Duncan test $p < 0.05$). Data are shown as means \pm standard errors
577 ($n=6$).

578 **Figure 4:** Mean vitamin C content for the biennium (2014-2015) of the blueberry genotypes. Genotypes
579 are listed in order of ripening time, from earlier to later. Different letters mean significant difference
580 (Duncan test $p < 0.05$). Data are shown as means \pm standard errors ($n=6$).


581 **Figure 5:** Bi-plot of the productive, qualitative and phytochemical parameters analyzed in this study (vector
582 distribution). Factor 1 and Factor 2 explain 40.41% of the data variation.

583 **Figure 6:** Bi-plot of blueberry genotypes analyzed in this study (case distribution). Only the ten genotypes
584 with a clear grouping-distribution are indicated. Factor 1 and Factor 2 explain 40.41% of the data variation.


585



1997



2007




2017

587

588 **Figure 1**


589



590

591 **Figure 2**


592



593

594 **Figure 3**


595



596

597 **Figure 4**


598



599

600 **Figure 5**

601



602

603 **Figure 6**

604

605 TABLES

606 **Table 1.** First harvest data, Growing Degree Days (GDD), Precocity Index (PI), Average Fruit Weight (AFW), and Total Plant Yield for the years 2014 and 2015 of the
 607 blueberry genotypes. Genotypes are listed in order of ripening time, from earlier to later. Data are shown as means \pm standard errors (n=10).

PRECOCITY	YEAR	GENOTYPE	FIRST HARVEST DATA	GDD (°C)	PI (days)	AFW (g/fruit)	PLANT YIELD (g/plant)
EARLY	2014	DUKE	3-Jun	1590	160.66 \pm 0.11	1.87 \pm 0.10	1170.61 \pm 75.90
EARLY	2014	HORTBLUE PETITE	3-Jun	1590	155.87 \pm 0.05	1.06 \pm 0.06	832.68 \pm 48.08
EARLY	2014	NUI	3-Jun	1590	160.48 \pm 3.38	2.86 \pm 0.19	954.77 \pm 244.04
MID	2014	BLUERAY	13-Jun	1823	167.33 \pm 4.09	2.33 \pm 0.18	1069.17 \pm 249.54
MID	2014	COSMOPOLITAN	9-Jun	1723	169.25 \pm 0.45	2.85 \pm 0.19	1242.54 \pm 54.00
MID	2014	EARLY BLUE	13-Jun	1823	173.33 \pm 5.26	1.38 \pm 0.20	808.59 \pm 97.77
MID	2014	PATRIOT	6-Jun	1652	167.95 \pm 3.09	1.94 \pm 0.17	1275.73 \pm 12.48
MID	2014	PFR005	9-Jun	1723	170.35 \pm 0.61	1.67 \pm 0.02	1433.30 \pm 12.18
MID	2014	ROXY BLUE	13-Jun	1823	171.80 \pm 4.20	1.68 \pm 0.17	993.19 \pm 293.38
LATE	2014	BLUE SILK	17-Jun	1896	177.12 \pm 1.33	2.00 \pm 0.08	1146.33 \pm 92.05
LATE	2014	BLUECROP	20-Jun	1954	181.17 \pm 2.65	1.79 \pm 0.21	529.10 \pm 306.07
LATE	2014	HORTBLUE POPPINS	20-Jun	1954	183.59 \pm 3.85	0.97 \pm 0.14	680.94 \pm 47.61
LATE	2014	PFR075	17-Jun	1896	172.90 \pm 2.37	2.66 \pm 0.22	762.26 \pm 282.64
EARLY	2015	DUKE	4-Jun	1442	159.39 \pm 0.87	1.08 \pm 0.01	1168.00 \pm 56.00
EARLY	2015	HORTBLUE PETITE	4-Jun	1442	159.74 \pm 0.01	0.64 \pm 0.01	1503.00 \pm 205.00
EARLY	2015	NUI	6-Jun	1489	160.85 \pm 1.54	1.34 \pm 0.07	1237.00 \pm 39.00
MID	2015	BLUERAY	11-Jun	1603	165.98 \pm 0.25	1.38 \pm 0.22	1325.50 \pm 575.50
MID	2015	COSMOPOLITAN	9-Jun	1558	164.20 \pm 1.09	2.14 \pm 0.13	775.50 \pm 66.50
MID	2015	EARLY BLUE	11-Jun	1603	166.04 \pm 0.78	1.01 \pm 0.08	933.00 \pm 519.00
MID	2015	PATRIOT	9-Jun	1558	164.16 \pm 2.47	1.00 \pm 0.14	1112.33 \pm 644.33
MID	2015	PFR005	9-Jun	1558	164.08 \pm 4.21	1.26 \pm 0.29	984.00 \pm 380.00
MID	2015	ROXY BLUE	8-Jun	1536	162.61 \pm 0.21	1.27 \pm 0.04	680.00 \pm 70.00
LATE	2015	BLUE SILK	16-Jun	1716	172.20 \pm 1.13	1.15 \pm 0.07	877.40 \pm 119.40
LATE	2015	BLUECROP	20-Jun	1793	174.63 \pm 2.75	0.99 \pm 0.07	906.39 \pm 298.99
LATE	2015	HORTBLUE POPPINS	16-Jun	1716	172.27 \pm 1.25	0.72 \pm 0.06	1264.00 \pm 654.00
LATE	2015	PFR075	16-Jun	1716	171.68 \pm 0.75	1.15 \pm 0.07	621.00 \pm 233.00

608

609 **Table 2.** Mean first harvest data, Growing Degree Days (GDD), Precocity Index (PI), Average Fruit Weight (AFW), and Total Plant Yield for the biennium (2014-2015) of
 610 the blueberry genotypes. Genotypes are listed in order of ripening time, from earlier to later. Data are shown as means \pm standard errors (n=20).

PRECOCITY	GENOTYPE	FIRST HARVEST DATA	GDD (°C)	PI (days)	AFW (g/fruit)	PLANT YIELD (g/plant)
EARLY	DUKE	2-Jun	1516	160.03 \pm 0.73	1.48 \pm 0.33	1169.31 \pm 54.47
EARLY	HORTBLUE PETITE	2-Jun	1516	157.81 \pm 1.58	0.85 \pm 0.18	1167.84 \pm 299.44
EARLY	NUI	3-Jun	1540	160.67 \pm 2.15	2.10 \pm 0.63	1095.89 \pm 183.40
MID	BLUERAY	11-Jun	1713	166.65 \pm 2.43	1.86 \pm 0.42	1197.34 \pm 376.97
MID	COSMOPOLITAN	8-Jun	1641	166.72 \pm 2.17	2.49 \pm 0.32	1009.02 \pm 196.98
MID	EARLY BLUE	11-Jun	1713	169.69 \pm 4.28	1.19 \pm 0.20	870.80 \pm 309.12
MID	PATRIOT	6-Jun	1605	166.05 \pm 2.76	1.47 \pm 0.41	1194.03 \pm 378.01
MID	PFR005	8-Jun	1641	167.21 \pm 3.55	1.47 \pm 0.24	1208.65 \pm 286.05
MID	ROXY BLUE	9-Jun	1680	167.21 \pm 4.47	1.47 \pm 0.20	836.60 \pm 216.04
LATE	BLUE SILK	15-Jun	1806	174.66 \pm 2.25	1.57 \pm 0.35	1011.86 \pm 140.11
LATE	BLUECROP	19-Jun	1874	177.90 \pm 3.47	1.39 \pm 0.35	717.74 \pm 291.12
LATE	HORTBLUE POPPINS	17-Jun	1835	177.93 \pm 5.18	0.84 \pm 0.14	972.47 \pm 447.20
LATE	PFR075	15-Jun	1806	172.29 \pm 1.52	1.91 \pm 0.63	691.63 \pm 219.20

611

612

613 **Table 3.** Mean Total Antioxidant Capacity (TAC), Total Phenol Content (TPH), and Total Anthocyanin Content (ACY) for the biennium (2014-2015) of the blueberry
614 genotypes. Genotypes are listed in order of ripening time, from earlier to later. Different letters mean significant difference (Duncan test $p < 0.05$). Data are shown as means \pm
615 standard errors (n=6).

PRECOCITY	GENOTYPE	TAC ($\mu\text{MTE g}^{-1}$ FW)	TPH (mgGA kg^{-1} FW)	ACY (mg CYA-3-GLU kg^{-1} FW)
EARLY	DUKE	17.37 \pm 1.03 ^{ef}	1942.17 \pm 58.76 ^l	1110.40 \pm 29.55 ⁱ
EARLY	HORTBLUE PETITE	19.98 \pm 0.55 ^b	2409.17 \pm 192.62 ^s	1371.65 \pm 6.83 ^d
EARLY	NUI	17.62 \pm 1.00 ^{def}	2197.45 \pm 31.67 ^h	1195.64 \pm 9.49 ^f
MID	BLUERAY	17.81 \pm 0.72 ^{def}	2493.23 \pm 171.01 ^{fg}	1089.81 \pm 70.03 ^l
MID	COSMOPOLITAN	14.33 \pm 0.30 ^g	1594.30 \pm 65.32 ^m	1056.89 \pm 16.53 ^m
MID	EARLY BLUE	19.12 \pm 1.08 ^{bc}	2944.98 \pm 58.49 ^c	1534.13 \pm 41.28 ^c
MID	PATRIOT	18.19 \pm 0.97 ^{dc}	2574.83 \pm 38.15 ^{ef}	1317.80 \pm 23.00 ^e
MID	PFR005	19.22 \pm 0.86 ^{bc}	2658.96 \pm 70.01 ^e	1160.56 \pm 40.49 ^g
MID	ROXY BLUE	16.95 \pm 1.14 ^f	1936.04 \pm 125.16 ^l	1142.82 \pm 21.98 ^h
LATE	BLUE SILK	17.11 \pm 0.94 ^f	2087.59 \pm 117.72 ⁱ	1109.00 \pm 16.10 ⁱ
LATE	BLUECROP	18.58 \pm 0.90 ^{cd}	2764.47 \pm 97.64 ^d	822.45 \pm 17.15 ⁿ
LATE	HORTBLUE POPPINS	19.88 \pm 0.29 ^b	3115.59 \pm 129.10 ^b	1566.77 \pm 44.75 ^b
LATE	PFR075	25.76 \pm 0.28 ^a	3778.38 \pm 82.57 ^a	1908.78 \pm 114.72 ^a

616

617

618 **Table 4.** Mean chlorogenic acid and caffeic acid content for the biennium (2014-2015) of the blueberry genotypes. Genotypes are listed in order of ripening time, from earlier
 619 to later. Different letters mean significant difference (Duncan test $p < 0.05$). Data are shown as means \pm standard errors (n=6).

PRECOCITY	GENOTYPE	CHLOROGENIC ACID (mg kg ⁻¹ FW)	CAFFEIC ACID (mg kg ⁻¹ FW)
EARLY	DUKE	1248.5 \pm 34.2 ^{abc}	14.9 \pm 3.3 ^{bcd}
EARLY	HORTBLUE PETITE	658.4 \pm 27.5 ^d	16.0 \pm 0.8 ^{bc}
EARLY	NUI	1134.0 \pm 86.2 ^{abcd}	24.6 \pm 0.6 ^a
MID	BLUERAY	1400.8 \pm 144.5 ^{ab}	12.0 \pm 0.2 ^{cdef}
MID	COSMOPOLITAN	789.9 \pm 25.9 ^{cd}	10.3 \pm 0.6 ^{defg}
MID	EARLY BLUE	1145.6 \pm 32.0 ^{abcd}	10.1 \pm 0.7 ^{defg}
MID	PATRIOT	1007.5 \pm 176.5 ^{bcd}	11.2 \pm 2.1 ^{cdefg}
MID	PFR005	1100.5 \pm 126.2 ^{abcd}	12.6 \pm 1.1 ^{cde}
MID	ROXY BLUE	1075.1 \pm 165.1 ^{abcd}	7.7 \pm 1.0 ^{efg}
LATE	BLUE SILK	911.5 \pm 155.6 ^{bcd}	6.8 \pm 0.8 ^{fg}
LATE	BLUECROP	1581.3 \pm 129.7 ^a	13 \pm 0.5 ^{cde}
LATE	HORTBLUE POPPINS	321.4 \pm 30.8 ^c	6.3 \pm 0.5 ^g
LATE	PFR075	1395.3 \pm 161.8 ^{ab}	18.2 \pm 1.0 ^b

620

621

622 **Table 5:** Pearson's correlation matrix of the fruit productive, qualitative and phytochemical parameters. *, **, correlation levels significant at $p \leq 0.05$ and $p \leq 0.01$
 623 respectively. Red asterisks represent a positive correlation, while black asterisks represent a negative correlation. n.s. = not significant.

PARAMETERS	AFW	Pl. Yield	SSC	TA	TAC	TPH	ACY	Chlor. Ac.	Caff. Ac.	Vit. C
PI	n.s.	*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	**	n.s.	n.s.	**	*
AFW		n.s.	*	n.s.	**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	*	n.s.
Pl. Yield			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
SSC				n.s.	**	**	*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
TA					n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
TAC						**	**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
TPH							**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
ACY								n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Chlor. Ac.									*	n.s.
Caff. Ac.										**

624
 625