**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Low vs high field 1

¹H Nmr spectroscopy for the detection of adulteration of cold pressed rapeseed oil with refined oils

McDowell, D., Defernez, M., Kemsley, E. K., Elliott, C. T., & Koidis, A. (2019). Low vs high field ¹H Nmr spectroscopy for the detection of adulteration of cold pressed rapeseed oil with refined oils. *LWT*, 111, 490-499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2019.05.065>

Published in:
LWT

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2019 Elsevier.

This manuscript is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

**LOW VS HIGH FIELD ¹H NMR SPECTROSCOPY FOR THE DETECTION OF
ADULTERATION OF COLD PRESSED RAPESEED OIL WITH REFINED OILS.**

Daniel McDowell¹, Marianne Defernez², E. Kate Kemsley², Christopher T. Elliott¹ and
Anastasios Koidis¹

¹ *Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK.*

² *Analytical Sciences Unit, Quadram Institute, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7UA,
UK*

Corresponding author:

Dr Anastasios (Tassos) Koidis, Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University
Belfast, 18-30 Malone Road, Belfast, BT9 5BN, Northern Ireland, UK, Tel: +44 28 90975569,
email: t.koidis@qub.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Cold pressed rapeseed oil (CPRO) is a relatively recent development in rapeseed processing, which produces a quality product with a high market value. High field NMR (400 MHz) is a well-established tool in food analysis, while low-field NMR (60 MHz) is much less studied. This study aims to establish the effectiveness of both techniques in identifying binary adulteration in CPRO. Three adulteration scenarios were investigated; a). CPRO and refined rapeseed oil (RRO), b). CPRO and refined sunflower oil (RSO), c) CPRO and RRO or RSO. A range of classification techniques were trialled as well as partial least squares regression to gauge predictive quantification performance. The 400 MHz NMR achieved classification rates of 100% in the scenarios with a single adulterant, and 93% in the multiple adulterant scenario. The 60 MHz NMR produced lower but still encouraging classification rates (RSO 92%; RRO 85%; both RRO and RSO 87%).

Keywords: NMR, authentication, cold pressed rapeseed oil, chemometrics, fraud

Abbreviations: CPRO – Cold pressed rapeseed oil; RRO – Refined rapeseed oil; RSO – Refined Sunflower oil; TPR – True positive rate; FNR – False negative rate

1. INTRODUCTION

Cold pressed rapeseed oil (CPRO) is a relatively new culinary oil in the UK and Ireland, as well as other parts of the world, that is locally cultivated, harvested and pressed. The seeds from the oilseed rape crop are mechanically crushed at a low temperature and the oil is collected. The oil is filtered and bottled, which concludes the processing (McDowell, Elliott, Koidis, 2017a). The final product has desirable organoleptic attributes and it is marketed towards the top end of the retail market. High quality edible oils such as this are particularly susceptible to adulteration, due to the ease with which low value oils can be mixed in to increase profit (McDowell, Elliott, Koidis, 2017a, b). One research paper has recently investigated cold pressed edible oil authentication with FT-IR spectroscopy (Ozulku, Yildirim, Toker, Karasu, & Durak, 2017), however cold pressed rapeseed oil was not covered. The utilisation of fraud monitoring systems have been established as an important component in reducing fraud vulnerability in food supply chains (van Ruth, Luning, Silvis, Yang, & Huisman, 2018). As cold pressed rapeseed oil continues to grow in popularity (SFD, 2013), it is important that techniques are developed which can ensure the sector maintains its high standards of quality.

Refined rapeseed oil (RRO) – sometimes simply branded as “vegetable oil” in retail – is a low cost oil which has been used extensively in the food industry (Przybylski, Mag, Eskin, & McDonald, 2005). The seeds from the oilseed rape plant undergo a much more complex processing pathway than the cold pressed sequence (Ghazani, García-Llatas, & Marangoni, 2014). More specifically, the seeds are mechanically crushed and solvent extracted to ensure maximum levels of oil are recovered. This oil then undergoes a range of intensive processing techniques that include degumming, neutralisation, bleaching and deodorisation which removes phospholipids, chlorophyll, free fatty acids and odour compounds associated with colour, flavour and odour defects. The resulting oil is low value and used exclusively for high temperature cooking. Refined rapeseed oil is, in terms of fatty acid composition, very similar

to CPRO, most of the variation between these two oils comes from the unsaponifiable fraction which remains in the oils after either cold pressing or industrial extraction (Ghazani et al., 2014). It is because of its similarities to CPRO and its low cost that RRO has been suggested as a potential adulterant in this study. A similar adulteration scenario became a problem for the extra-virgin olive oil industry when high value extra-virgin olive oil was being adulterated with lower value refined olive oil (Yang & Irudayaraj, 2001). This has led to the utilisation of spectroscopic techniques which can detect fraud in a quick non-destructive manner (Georgouli, Rincon, & Koidis, 2017; Jiménez-Carvelo, Osorio, Koidis, González-Casado, & Cuadros-Rodríguez, 2017).

Another potential candidate for adulterating CPRO is refined sunflower oil (RSO) due to its lower price and widespread availability. It is a popular culinary oil used across the world and would therefore be easily accessible in large quantities. Refined sunflower oil is produced from sunflower seeds by undergoing similar processing to that described for RRO. Being produced from a different seed, it differs much more in fatty acid composition from CPRO than RRO. It would therefore be expected that RSO should be easier to detect in CPRO using analytical techniques although no studies exist in the literature for these two cases of adulteration.

Oil speciation is a challenge which has been tackled by both chromatographic (Aparicio and Aparicio-Ruíz 2000) and spectroscopic (Che Man et al. 2011; Koidis and Osorio-Argüello 2013) techniques. Raman and FT-IR are the most dominant types of vibrational spectroscopy currently used (Osorio, Haughey, Elliott, & Koidis, 2014). Proton NMR is less well utilised in this area mainly due to the size and cost of its operation compared to other spectroscopic techniques. There have however been recent interesting developments in low field ^1H NMR systems, which are much smaller (lower footprint), less resource-heavy and less expensive than the high-field counterparts.

In the literature, high field ^1H NMR spectroscopy has been shown to be an effective tool for extra virgin olive oil quality assessment and authentication (Dais & Hatzakis, 2013). This type of spectroscopy is powerful enough to produce peaks which yield much more comprehensive structural information than other spectroscopic techniques. This information can be quantitated to show the ratios of unsaturated fatty acids/mono-unsaturated fatty acids/poly-unsaturated fatty acids, or even identify the molar percentage of individual fatty acids (Siciliano et al., 2013). Low field ^1H NMR produces spectra which do not have as sharp peaks as in high field ^1H NMR, and with more overlap between signals; nevertheless, certain regions can still be associated with specific fatty acid moieties and minor compounds. This ^1H NMR signal can be utilised when coupled with chemometrics for qualitative analysis of food and drinks (Jakes et al., 2015). With regards to edible oil authentication, 60 MHz ^1H NMR has been shown to be able to detect hazelnut oil adulteration in olive oil down to a limit of 11.2% w/w (Parker et al., 2014) and peaks can be used to estimate the amount of *Robusta* coffee in *Arabica* coffee with an approximate detection limit of 10-20% w/w (Defernez et al., 2017). It has also been recently show that 2D NMR can be utilised to further improve the performance of low field NMR (Gouilleux, Marchand, Charrier, Remaud, & Giraudeau, 2018).

The aim of this study therefore was to evaluate the effectiveness of 60 MHz and 400 MHz proton NMR in identifying refined rapeseed oil and refined sunflower oil as adulterants in cold pressed rapeseed oil.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Oil Samples and Reagents

The CPROs in this study were donated by reputable producers from the UK, Ireland and France. The RROs and RSOs were donated by international food companies with certificates of authenticity. All the RROs and the RSOs were fully refined i.e. no partially refined oils were

included in this study. The total number of different oil brands used in this study was 21 CPRO, 16 RRO and 15 RSO. Analytical grade chloroform and deuterated chloroform (Sigma Aldrich, Dorset, UK) were the solvents used in this study. All oil samples were analysed for acidity and peroxide value using standard methods to confirm their identity and to identify if there were any outliers.

2.2. Preparation of oil admixtures

Forty-five binary mixtures of either CPRO and RRO, or CPRO and RSO (both 2-98% CPRO), were prepared by weighing (± 0.001 g) the desired ratio of oils in a 20 mL vial. The mixtures (90 in total) were then vortexed and stored at -20°C in 30mL amber glass vials and defrosted at room temperature when required.

2.3. 60 MHz ^1H NMR acquisition

All samples (pure and admixtures) were diluted with analytical standard chloroform, as this was shown to produce a more defined spectrum (narrower line width) than pure oil after initial tests. An aliquot of 300 μl of oil was pipetted directly into an Aldrich ColorSpec NMR tube, followed by 700 μl of chloroform. The tube was inverted several times until the oil was completely dissolved in the chloroform. Spectra were recorded on an Oxford Instruments 60 MHz benchtop NMR (Pulsar, Oxford Instruments, Oxford, UK). Instrument optimisation was performed with 12% TMS (tetramethylsilane) in chloroform before samples were analysed. The linewidth was maintained at an acceptable level by daily checking and shimming as and when necessary. The acquisition parameters were 16 scans and 10 sec recycle delay. All sample tubes were analysed three times and averaged. Each full spectrum consisted of 5,933 data points. The data was processed in MNOVA (phase-correction) and saved as text file before being further manipulated and analysed in Matlab.

2.4. 400 Hz ¹H NMR acquisition

All oil samples were diluted in deuterated chloroform in the ratio 60 µl of oil: 500 µl deuterated chloroform in an Aldrich ColorSpec NMR tube. The samples were inserted into a Bruker Ultrashield 400 Plus ¹H NMR (Bruker, Rheinstetten, Germany). Acquisition of the NMR data was done using the zg30 pulse program with a pulse time of 11 µsec and a recovery delay of 1 sec. Acquisition used a 30° excitation pulse. The number of scans was set at 16 and each full spectrum consisted of 65,536 data points. Acquisition time was set to 4.089 sec and the dwell time was set to 62.400 µsec. Transmitter frequency used in these experiments was 400.13 MHz. Samples were measured downfield from TMS (0 ppm). Acquisition was obtained at a temperature of 298 K.

2.5. Statistical analysis

Three different oil adulteration scenarios were explored: 1. CPRO adulterated with RSO; 2. CPRO adulterated with RRO; 3. CPRO adulterated with either RRO or RSO (Table 1). It should be noted that the CPROs used in scenario 1 were different oils/brands than scenario 2, the aim of this was to increase the diversity of oils in the adulteration test. Scenario 3 used CPRO which were present in both scenario 1 and 2.

Firstly, we looked to carry out a classification analysis of these scenarios. Samples relevant to each scenario were selected and their spectra were allocated to either the calibration or the validation set (60% and 40% of the total dataset respectively), on the condition that the oils (pure and admixtures) featured in the calibration set were not used again in the validation set. The mixtures of binary oils used in the calibration sets ranged from 4 – 97% CPRO, and in the validation sets from 2 – 93 % CPRO. Secondly, we looked a quantification analysis, partial least squares regression (PLS-R) was used to quantify the level of adulteration in the first two

scenarios. For this, all spectra listed in the first two scenarios (RSO as an adulterant and RRO as an adulterant) were used.

The spectra were examined in MNOVA and saved as text files, before being read into MATLAB. All chemometric data analysis was performed with in-house MATLAB routines (Mathworks Inc. MA, USA). For classification analysis, four different chemometric techniques were used to illustrate the most effective: Partial Least Squares – Discriminant Analysis (PLS-DA) (Ballabio & Consonni, 2013), Soft Independent Modelling by Class Analogy (SIMCA) (Brereton, 1992), Linear Discriminant Analysis - K-Nearest Neighbour (LDA-KNN), and Linear Discriminant Analysis - Support Vector Machine (LDA-SVM) (Xanthopoulos, Pardalos, & Trafalis, 2013). Classification results were expressed as the rate of true positives (TPR %) and the rate of false negatives (FNR %) that occurred in the validation dataset. The TPR was calculated by number of true positives/ (number of true positives + number of false positives). The FNR was calculated by number of false negative/ (number of false negative + number of true negatives). Quantification analysis was carried out with partial least squares regression (PLS-R) analysis. Three spectral regions were extracted (0.52-3ppm, 3.9-4.56ppm, and 4.94-5.8ppm) and each region was baseline-corrected using a polynomial function. The three regions were bolted together (with 3217 data points in total) and the data normalised on the glyceride peak (3.9-4.56ppm). Leave-one-out cross-validation was used at the calibration stage, and the optimal model applied to the validation data. The results show the predicted versus actual composition values, root mean square error (RMSE) and the R^2 value of the regression, obtained from the cross-validation calibration and validation sets. Limit of detection was calculated as 2 times the RMSEP (Downey & Kelly, 2004).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Spectral characteristics in different oils and instrumental operating frequencies

The spectra produced when edible oils are analysed with NMR are representations of the resonances of ^1H nuclei within the oil. Hydrogen nuclei are present in both the glycerol and the fatty acid sections of triacylglycerols (TAGs). Edible oil tends to be around 95-98% TAGs and 2-5% minor compounds (Cert, Moreda, & Pérez-Camino, 2000), therefore the peaks produced are directly related to TAG composition (Table 2). Minor compounds found in edible oil like phytosterols and tocopherols can be detected with ^1H NMR, although are better represented when extracted from oil to avoid spectral suppression from the more dominant TAG peaks (Alonso-Salces et al., 2010). The spectra of the three types of pure oil used in this study can be seen in Fig. 1. As expected the structure of the peaks in the 60 MHz spectra is less detailed than that of the 400 MHz spectra. The 400 MHz NMR spectrum (Fig. 1A) shows a signal with low noise and clearly identifiable regions associated with specific fatty acid groups. Cold pressed rapeseed oil and refined rapeseed oil have very similar fatty acid compositions (Wroniak, Krygier, & Kaczmarczyk, 2008) which would explain the close similarities between the two spectra (Fig. 1). Sunflower oil does however differ from rapeseed oil in its fatty acid composition (Kostadinovic Velickovska & Mitrev, 2013), and this can be seen when the 400 MHz spectra of CPRO and RSO are compared.

On the other hand, the spectra produced by the 60 MHz ^1H NMR contains less specific detail compared with the 400 MHz spectra (Fig. 1). The reduction in field-strength means that the peaks' structure corresponding to specific nuclei interactions (J-coupling) is not immediately visible. Instead a broader spectrum is produced, with many overlapped peaks and a few isolated ones (glyceryl CH_2 at 4.2 ppm and *bis*-allylic CH_2 at 2.8 ppm). The 60 MHz spectra of the three types of pure oils used in this study can be seen in Fig. 1B. There appears to be little visible variation in the three spectra apart from the peak at 1.3 ppm which has a different shape

in RSO compared to rapeseed oils. Subtle differences can also be seen in the *bis*-allylic CH₂ peak at 2.8 ppm, as well as the peak at 1 ppm. It is unclear as to the exact fatty acids responsible for this variation, although it is likely to be at least partly due to the difference in unsaturated fatty acid composition between RSO and CPRO (Supplementary data).

To highlight the extent of spectral variation within oil admixtures, multiple spectra (ranging from 3-97% CPRO) were superimposed (Fig. 2 and 3). The superimposed NMR spectra of mixtures of RRO and CPRO (Fig. 2) show there is no discernible variation in the 400 MHz spectra. This illustrates the close similarities between CPRO and RRO. There is some variation within the 60 MHz superimposed spectra (Fig. 2A); however, this is not systematic and is likely to be due to instrumental variation rather than to chemical composition. It should be remembered that the 60 MHz NMR operates at room temperature using rare earth magnets, therefore the operating parameters cannot be as tightly controlled as the larger, cryogen-cooled 400 MHz instrument (Parker et al., 2014). This initial exploration would suggest that RRO could be difficult to detect in CPRO, by both types of NMR spectroscopy. When mixtures of sunflower oil (RSO) and cold pressed rapeseed oil (CPRO) in 400 MHz and 60 MHz were superimposed, there is clear variation in many of the peaks both at 60 and 400 MHz (Fig. 3). Refined sunflower oil has a much more dissimilar fatty acid composition than CPRO and should therefore be easier to be detected as an adulterant, due to the difference in omega-3 to omega-6 ratios (Supplementary data).

3.2. Classification with Multivariate Analysis (PLS-DA, SIMCA, and LDA)

Classification analysis was carried out on spectra produced from both 60 MHz and 400 MHz instruments. The results were expressed in terms of the true positive rate (TPR) and the false negative rate (FNR), which together portray the sensitivity and specificity of each chemometric model (Table 3). In general, for a good model, the aim is for FNR to be kept as lower as possible (<5%) whereas at the same time the TPR remains as high as possible. In the dataset containing

235 CPRO, RSO and its mixtures (modelling scenario 1), the 60 MHz NMR instrument had the
236 best classification outcome of TPR 92% and FNR 4% when using the LDA-KNN classifier.
237 The 400 MHz instrument provided data that when coupled with LDA-SVM or PLS-DA could
238 achieve 100% TPR and an FNR of 0%. The high classification rate for 400 MHz NMR is
239 explained by the clear spectral variation associated with oil type deriving from the richer
240 molecular structural information it provides. This becomes evident when comparing the
241 spectral data (Fig. 4B) to the PLS-R regression coefficient vector. This vector directly relates
242 the spectra to the compositional information. There are many regions where the magnitude of
243 the regression coefficients is large, and these correspond to regions of the spectra where CPRO
244 and RSO differ most. These include regions 2.70-2.90 ppm where *bis*-allylic peaks associated
245 with linolenic (C18:3) and linoleic (C18:2) fatty acids are present. Rapeseed oil has higher
246 levels of linolenic fatty acids while sunflower oil has higher levels of linoleic fatty acids
247 (Supplementary data). This is reflected in the regression coefficients, where there is a negative
248 peak corresponding to linoleic acid at very slightly lower chemical shifts than a positive peak
249 corresponding to linolenic acid (Guillén & Ruiz, 2001). The region 2.00-2.10 ppm is also
250 associated with linoleic, linolenic, as well as oleic fatty acids, but this time in relation to the
251 allyl nuclei response. There is a negative coefficient peak attributed to the linoleic region and
252 a positive peak associated with the linolenic and oleic region. The region between 0.95-0.99
253 ppm corresponds to terminal methyl protons which are only present in CPRO. The absence of
254 any peaks in this region from RSO confirms these are the terminal methyl protons from the
255 omega 3 - linolenic fatty acids in CPRO. The regression coefficient vector corresponds to this
256 by showing a large positive peak with no negative values associated with RSO. The region
257 between 0.85-0.92 ppm corresponds to the terminal methyl protons of saturated,
258 monounsaturated and polyunsaturated fatty acids. It is unclear exactly which fatty acids are
259 responsible for the coefficient values in this region, although it is undoubtedly an important

and potentially discriminant region of the spectra. Differences in saturated fatty acid content are evident in 1.23-1.39 ppm which corresponds to methylene protons on saturated carbon chains. The coefficient peaks come from the difference in abundance of C16:0, C18:0 and C20:0 between the two oils. The region between 5.20-5.45 ppm is associated with unsaturated fatty acids and protons found on the middle branch of glycerol in triglycerides. There are therefore multiple fatty acids which produce peaks in this region and the subsequent loading vectors could therefore not be attributed to one fatty acid.

In the 60 MHz NMR spectra which had a less defined shape than the 400 MHz ones, it is seen that the regions which have the greatest regression coefficient magnitude differ (Fig. 4A). The region with the largest coefficient was 1.20-1.40 ppm, which corresponds to saturated fatty acids. The terminal methyl protons in the region of 0.94 -1.00 ppm exhibited large coefficient values for 400 MHz spectra, but were less defined in the 60 MHz and consequently did not have such influential coefficients. The region 2.70-2.90 ppm corresponds to *bis*-allylic protons associated with linolenic and linoleic fatty acids, although the effect of there being different relative amounts of these fatty acids in rapeseed and sunflower oils is less directly interpretable than in the high-field, due to increased peak overlap. It is also worth noting that for the 400 MHz data, coefficient values associated with the spectral baseline were essentially zero throughout, whereas there is clearly some (unwanted) variance in the 60 MHz baseline that is entering the regression coefficients. This is a consequence of the greater comparative stability of the 400 MHz instrumentation.

Although the spectra produced by the low-field are less clear than the high-field NMR with regards to peak definition, the 60 MHz instrument still produced competitive classification results which could be used to screen for detecting RSO in CPRO presence. This is a positive outcome, in view of the comparative ease-of-use and significantly lower cost of the spectrometer. With regards to the 400 MHz NMR, its sensitivity and faultless classification

rate with RSO means it could be used as a screening tool or as a confirmatory procedure. As implied earlier, the reason such high classification rates were achieved was that the highly-detailed spectra exhibited many differences associated with variation in fatty acid composition between the two oils.

The second adulteration scenario (RRO, CPRO and their mixtures) was predicted to be more difficult due to the similarities between the two oils in terms of chemical composition and corresponding spectral fingerprints (Fig. 1). The 60 MHz instrument achieved a top classification rate of 85% TPR and 7% FNR. It is less clear which regions of the 60 MHz spectra are important for CPRO and RRO classification. It can be seen in Fig. 5A, that the spectral regions from 0.8-2.4 ppm have the largest effect on loading intensity. This region corresponds to many fatty acids and it is therefore not possible to specifically identify the cause of the differentiation between the two oils.

The 400 MHz instrument was again able to produce faultless classification regarding refined rapeseed oil as an adulterant. The PLS-R regression coefficients go some way towards explaining how compositional differences between the two oils enabled successful classification with 400 MHz spectra. The coefficient region amongst the largest magnitudes is 0.95-1.0 ppm, which corresponds to linolenic acid (Fig. 5B). The superimposed spectra of the two oils show that RRO appears to exhibit slightly higher levels of this fatty acid which would explain the importance of this region. A region which seems more important when RRO is an adulterant rather than RSO, is 1.53-1.69 ppm which corresponds to the six methylene protons in the *beta* position from the carbonyl carbon. The other regions of the spectra all appear to have an influence on the regression coefficients, which is most likely due to subtle differences in fatty acid composition. It is well known that CPRO has a greater abundance of pigments than RRO (Wroniak et al., 2008). However, in the NMR spectra we would not expect to see peaks specifically assigned to pigments or other minor compounds.

A larger adulteration scenario (no.3) including both RRO and RSO was also tested with both 60 MHz and 400 MHz instruments. Unlike the previous three-class scenarios, no technique could achieve 100% correct classification rate with a five-class scenario. The 60 MHz NMR could produce classification results of 87% TPR and 3% FNR while the 400 MHz NMR produced 93% TPR and 2% FNR. This would suggest that both types of NMR could be used as screening tools for cold pressed rapeseed oil authentication. With regards to the choice of classification model, either LDA-KNN or LDA-SVM were the best performing classifiers depending on the NMR field-strength and dataset (Table 3).

3.3. Quantification with multivariate analysis (PLS-R)

Partial least squares regression (PLS-R) is a multivariate regression technique, closely related to PLS-DA, but where the dependent variable is continuous (e.g. composition data) rather than discrete (i.e. classification group). PLS-R analyses were carried out for the modelling scenarios as detailed in Table 4. The amount of CPRO in each of the validation set samples is plotted against the amount of CPRO predicted by each model in Fig. 6. The R^2 value indicates the effectiveness of the regressions, and as seen in Table 4, when RSO is the adulterant the models perform to a higher standard. Both the 400 MHz and 60 MHz gave high R^2 values and low standard deviation of residuals. The 400 MHz NMR was shown to be more sensitive than 60 MHz NMR, as it is able to detect RSO adulteration down to 8% compared to 12.2%. The PLS model for CPRO/RRO mixtures was much less accurate (Fig. 6), showing that RRO is a more difficult to quantify adulterant. Neither the 400 MHz NMR nor the 60 MHz NMR could achieve acceptable levels of detection, with limits of 72% and 74% respectively.

These results show that both 400 MHz and 60 MHz NMR can detect and quantify RSO in CPRO down to low levels with 95% certainty. 60 MHz NMR may not be suitable however, if adulteration is taking place below levels of 12% RSO. It is unlikely that adulteration would be economically viable for potential fraudsters at levels below 8% RSO, therefore the 400 MHz

NMR would be suitable for quantification of RSO in CPRO in real world situations. In contrast, the limits of detection of RRO in CPRO were unacceptably high as RRO in CPRO would likely be below 75% RRO. This indicates that both the 400 MHz NMR and the 60 MHz are inadequate tools for quantifying the amount of RRO in CPRO with the experimental conditions explored in this study.

4. CONCLUSION

As expected the 400 MHz NMR produced superior classification and quantification results when compared with the 60 MHz NMR. In spite of this the 60 MHz NMR could still be considered competitive, especially when size and instrument cost are factored. When assessing the two NMR instruments for the potential to authenticate cold pressed rapeseed oil, the 60 MHz NMR produced classification results which were only slightly less sensitive than the more powerful 400 MHz NMR. The 400 MHz NMR was able to produce almost faultless classification results. Quantification analysis showed that 400 MHz NMR was better able to estimate the percentage of adulteration than the 60 MHz NMR.

The inherent strengths of the techniques investigated in this paper are their speed, non-destructive nature and high throughput. Their disadvantages are difficulty in quantifying adulteration and targeted analysis. Both 400 MHz and 60 MHz NMR have shown potential to act as rapid screening techniques to classify potentially adulterated cold pressed rapeseed oils.

Acknowledgements: *This research was supported with funding from the Department for Economy Northern Ireland (DMD). The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC); this research was funded by the BBSRC Core Capability Grant BB/CCG1860/1 (MD, EKK). Cold-pressed rapeseed oil*

producers of the UK, Ireland and France are acknowledged for sharing their knowledge, expertise and for their sample donations, as well as Dr Panagiotis Manesiotis and Dr Lauren Ford from the School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering of Queen's University Belfast for their kind help with the NMR acquisition.

There are no financial or commercial conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

Alonso-Salces, R. M., Héberger, K., Holland, M. V., Moreno-Rojas, J. M., Mariani, C., Bellan, G., Reniero, F., Guillou, C. (2010). Multivariate analysis of NMR fingerprint of the unsaponifiable fraction of virgin olive oils for authentication purposes. *Food Chemistry*, 118, 956–965.

Aparicio, R., & Aparicio-Ruiz, R. (2000). Authentication of vegetable oils by chromatographic techniques. *Journal of Chromatography A*, 881, 93–104.

Ballabio, D., & Consonni, V. (2013). Classification tools in chemistry. Part 1: linear models. PLS-DA. *Analytic Methods*, 5, 3790–3798.

Brereton, R. G. (1992). Multivariate Pattern Recognition in Chemometrics: Illustrated by Case Studies. (Vol. 9) *Elsevier Science*.

Cert, A., Moreda, W., & Pérez-Camino, M. . (2000). Chromatographic analysis of minor constituents in vegetable oils. *Journal of Chromatography A*, 881, 131–148.

Che Man, Y. B., Rohman, A., & Mansor, T. S. T. (2011). Differentiation of Lard From Other Edible Fats and Oils by Means of Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy and Chemometrics. *Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society*, 88, 187–192.

381 Dais, P., & Hatzakis, E. (2013). Quality assessment and authentication of virgin olive oil by
 382 NMR spectroscopy: A critical review. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 765, 1–27.

383 Defernez, M., Wren, E., Watson, A. D., Gunning, Y., Colquhoun, I. J., Le Gall, G., Williamson,
 384 D., Kemsley, E. K. (2017). Low-field ¹H NMR spectroscopy for distinguishing between
 385 arabica and robusta ground roast coffees. *Food Chemistry*, 216, 106–113.

386 Downey, G., & Kelly, J. D. (2004). Detection and Quantification of Apple Adulteration in
 387 Diluted and Sulfited Strawberry and Raspberry Purées Using Visible and Near-Infrared
 388 Spectroscopy. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 52, 204–209.

389 Georgouli, K., Rincon, J. M. Del, & Koidis, A. (2017). Continuous statistical modelling for
 390 rapid detection of adulteration of extra virgin olive oil using mid infrared and Raman
 391 spectroscopic data. *Food Chemistry*, 217, 735–742.

392 Ghazani, S. M., García-Llatas, G., & Marangoni, A. G. (2014). Micronutrient content of cold-
 393 pressed, hot-pressed, solvent extracted and RBD canola oil: Implications for nutrition and
 394 quality. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 116, 380–387.

395 Gouilleux, B., Marchand, J., Charrier, B., Remaud, G. S., & Giraudeau, P. (2018). High-
 396 throughput authentication of edible oils with benchtop Ultrafast 2D NMR. *Food Chemistry*,
 397 244, 153–158.

398 Guillén, M. D., & Ruiz, A. (2001). High resolution ¹H nuclear magnetic resonance in the study
 399 of edible oils and fats. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 12, 328–338.

400 Jakes, W., Gerdova, A., Defernez, M., Watson, A. D., McCallum, C., Limer, E., Colquhoun,
 401 I.J., Williamson, D.C., Kemsley, E. K. (2015). Authentication of beef versus horse meat using
 402 60MHz ¹H NMR spectroscopy. *Food Chemistry*, 175 (Supplement C), 1–9.

403 Jiménez-Carvelo, A. M., Osorio, M. T., Koidis, A., González-Casado, A., & Cuadros-
 404 Rodríguez, L. (2017). Chemometric classification and quantification of olive oil in blends with
 405 any edible vegetable oils using FTIR-ATR and Raman spectroscopy. *LWT - Food Science and*
 406 *Technology*, 86, 174–184.

407 Koidis, A., & Osorio Argüello, M. T. (2013). Identification of oil mixtures in extracted and
 408 refined vegetable oils. *Lipid Technology*, 25, 247–250.

409 McDowell, D, Elliott C. T., Koidis, A. (2017a). Characterization and comparison of UK, Irish,
 410 and French cold pressed rapeseed oils with refined rapeseed oils and extra virgin olive oils.
 411 *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 119(8), 1600327-39.

412 McDowell, D, Elliott C. T., Koidis, A. (2017b). Pre-processing Effects on Cold Pressed
 413 Rapeseed Oil Quality Indicators and Phenolic Compounds. *European Journal of Lipid Science*
 414 *and Technology*, 119(9), 1600357-67.

415 Osorio, M. T., Haughey, S. A., Elliott, C. T., & Koidis, A. (2014). Evaluation of methodologies
 416 to determine vegetable oil species present in oil mixtures: Proposition of an approach to meet
 417 the EU legislation demands for correct vegetable oils labelling. *Food Research International*,
 418 60, 66–75.

419 Ozulku, G., Yildirim, R. M., Toker, O. S., Karasu, S., & Durak, M. Z. (2017). Rapid detection
 420 of adulteration of cold pressed sesame oil adulterated with hazelnut, canola, and sunflower oils
 421 using ATR-FTIR spectroscopy combined with chemometric. *Food Control*, 82, 212–216.

422 Parker, T., Limer, E., Watson, A. D., Defernez, M., Williamson, D., & Kemsley, E. K. (2014).
 423 60MHz ¹H NMR spectroscopy for the analysis of edible oils. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry*,
 424 57, 147–158.

425 Przybylski, R., Mag, T., Eskin, N. A. M., & McDonald, B. E. (2005). Canola Oil. In Bailey's
 426 Industrial Oil and Fat Products. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

427 Scotland-Food & Drink (2013) Know your Market – The UK Retail Edible Rapeseed oil
 428 category. Available from;
 429 [http://www.scotlandfoodanddrink.org/media/38079/rapeseed%20oil%20report%20march%2](http://www.scotlandfoodanddrink.org/media/38079/rapeseed%20oil%20report%20march%202013.pdf)
 430 [02013.pdf](http://www.scotlandfoodanddrink.org/media/38079/rapeseed%20oil%20report%20march%202013.pdf) [Accessed on 25.03.17].

431 Siciliano, C., Belsito, E., De Marco, R., Di Gioia, M. L., Leggio, A., & Liguori, A. (2013).
 432 Quantitative determination of fatty acid chain composition in pork meat products by high
 433 resolution ¹H NMR spectroscopy. *Food Chemistry*, 136, 546–554.

434 van Ruth, S. M., Luning, P. A., Silvis, I. C. J., Yang, Y., & Huisman, W. (2018). Differences
 435 in fraud vulnerability in various food supply chains and their tiers. *Food Control*, 84, 375–381.

436 Wroniak, M., Krygier, K., & Kaczmarczyk, M. (2008). Comparison of the Quality of Cold
 437 Pressed and Virgin Rapeseed Oils With Industrially Obtained Oils. *Polish Journal of Food and*
 438 *Nutrition Science*, 58, 85–89.

439 Xanthopoulos, P., Pardalos, P. M., & Trafalis, T. B. (2013). Linear Discriminant Analysis. In
 440 Robust Data Mining (pp. 27–33). New York, NY: Springer New York.

441 Yang, H., & Irudayaraj, J. (2001). Comparison of near-infrared, fourier transform-infrared, and
 442 fourier transform-raman methods for determining olive pomace oil adulteration in extra virgin
 443 olive oil. *Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society*, 78, 889.