

Table S1: Individual and total phenolic contents of pungent cultivar ‘Eris F1’ before (**A**) and after storage (**B**) (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>; mean ± SE; n = 15) infested with *H. halys*.

<b>A</b>	Pungent ‘Eris F1’					
	Pericarp			Placenta		
	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2
5-Caffeoylquinic a. ♦	0.9 ± 0.0	0.9 ± 0.0	0.9 ± 0.0	1.9 ± 0.1	1.9 ± 0.1	2.0 ± 0.2
<b>Hydroxycinnamic a. ♦</b>	<b>0.9 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.9 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.9 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.9 ± 0.1</b>	<b>1.9 ± 0.1</b>	<b>2.0 ± 0.2</b>
L. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	147.4 ± 23.5	121.4 ± 4.3	148.4 ± 4.1	/	/	/
L. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside 2	67.5 ± 8.5	56.6 ± 1.4	88.7 ± 2.4	/	/	/
L.-6-C-hexoside	14.2 ± 2.2	15.2 ± 0.1	18.2 ± 0.8	41.2 ± 0.8	51.5 ± 1.6	55.2 ± 0.8
L.-8-C-hexoside	26.3 ± 6.6	30.4 ± 0.5	32.7 ± 0.9	67.4 ± 1.2	69.4 ± 2.0	85.3 ± 1.9
L.-7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-acetyl) hexoside	24.6 ± 2.2	30.7 ± 0.4	33.2 ± 0.9	41.1 ± 0.5 a	23.3 ± 0.3 b	43.4 ± 0.3 a
L.-7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-malonyl) hexoside	61.4 ± 3.4	74.4 ± 1.2	105.4 ± 3.1	110.3 ± 0.8 b	155.2 ± 0.6 a	123.2 ± 0.7 b
L. 6,8-di-C-hexoside	29.2 ± 6.0 b <sup>i</sup>	75.8 ± 1.7 a	38.4 ± 0.4 b	1120.4 ± 157.7	945.5 ± 111.4	1090.4 ± 71.9
C. 7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-acetyl)glucoside	173.4 ± 22.0	150.5 ± 5.0	242.2 ± 9.6	82.5 ± 1.6	45.4 ± 0.9	60.2 ± 0.7
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 1	23.2 ± 3.0	39.4 ± 0.5	21.7 ± 0.6	71.1 ± 1.0	61.2 ± 0.7	114.6 ± 1.9
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	14.6 ± 2.0	18.8 ± 0.1	20.1 ± 0.7	31.2 ± 0.3	38.4 ± 0.7	42.1 ± 0.7
A. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside	147.2 ± 1.6	141.4 ± 4.0	175.4 ± 4.1	19.5 ± 0.3	21.2 ± 1.2	40.5 ± 1.0
A. 6,8 di-C-hexoside	43.4 ± 0.4	52.2 ± 1.2	69.3 ± 2.0	36.2 ± 0.3	37.5 ± 0.5	36.2 ± 0.4
<b>Flavone ♦</b>	<b>0.7 ± 0.1</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.2</b>	<b>0.6 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.4 ± 0.2</b>	<b>1.4 ± 0.2</b>	<b>1.7 ± 0.2</b>
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside-7-O-hexoside	4.2 ± 0.0	20.2 ± 0.7	7.3 ± 0.1	59.1 ± 1.2	69.2 ± 1.0	111.7 ± 4.4
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside	8.4 ± 0.1	14.4 ± 0.6	27.2 ± 1.4	5.4 ± 0.1	10.4 ± 0.3	9.1 ± 0.4
Q.-3-O-glucoside	9.3 ± 0.1	11.2 ± 0.1	14.6 ± 0.8	7.6 ± 0.0	8.2 ± 0.2	9.2 ± 0.1
<b>Flavonols</b>	<b>20.4 ± 0.3</b>	<b>50.4 ± 1.7</b>	<b>18.2 ± 0.2</b>	<b>54.2 ± 0.2</b>	<b>88.4 ± 7.0</b>	<b>100.3 ± 5.8</b>
<b>Total analyzed per fruit part ♦</b>	<b>1.6 ± 0.1</b>	<b>1.7 ± 0.2</b>	<b>1.5 ± 0.1.</b>	<b>3.3 ± 0.2</b>	<b>3.4 ± 0.2</b>	<b>3.8 ± 0.1</b>
<b>Total analyzed whole fruit ♦</b>	<b>1.4 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.5 ± 0.1</b>	<b>1.3 ± 0.1</b>			

TPC ♦	11.4 ± 0.7	12.5 ± 0.4	11.6 ± 0.9	14.6 ± 0.7	10.7 ± 0.6	11.6 ± 1.0
-------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

<sup>i</sup>a,b different letters denote statistical significant differences ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among treatments in the same cultivar and fruit part

♦ Symbol indicates data in g kg<sup>-1</sup>

/ Symbol indicates that the substance could not be determined

B	Pungent 'Eris F1' after storage					
	Pericarp			Placenta		
	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2
5-Caffeoxlquinic a. ♦	0.8 ± 0.0	0.9 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.0	1.9 ± 0.2	1.7 ± 0.0	1.9 ± 0.1
<b>Hydroxycinnamic a. ♦</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.9 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.9 ± 0.2</b>	<b>1.7 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.9 ± 0.1</b>
L. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	111.6 ± 12.2	90.1 ± 10.0	131.4 ± 20.1	/	/	/
L. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside 2	41.8 ± 3.0	29.4 ± 1.9	42.1 ± 1.3	/	/	/
L.-6-C-hexoside	15.8 ± 2.7 b <sup>i</sup>	36.3 ± 6.0 a	17.3 ± 4.0 b	38.1 ± 1.0	25.7 ± 0.5	33.2 ± 0.7
L.-8-C-hexoside	35.6 ± 0.6	47.1 ± 1.0	30.4 ± 0.6	87.3 ± 2.8	74.1 ± 1.3	86.6 ± 1.2
L.-7-O-(2-aposyl-6-acetyl) hexoside	26.4 ± 0.4	24.7 ± 0.2	20.2 ± 0.2	33.1 ± 0.7	24.5 ± 0.1	27.1 ± 0.1
L.-7-O-(2-aposyl-6-malonyl) hexoside	76.2 ± 0.6	59.2 ± 0.4	69.4 ± 0.7	137.3 ± 1.3	129.3 ± 0.6	143.2 ± 11.0
L. 6,8-di-C-hexoside	72.4 ± 0.3 b	203.5 ± 17.9 a	85.2 ± 0.4 b	218.5 ± 30.0	174.1 ± 12.7	213.5 ± 18.0
C. 7-O-(2-aposyl-6-acetyl)glucoside	78.6 ± 1.4	78.2 ± 0.7	89.4 ± 2.5	38.3 ± 1.0	41.2 ± 1.0	85.2 ± 1.4
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 1	42.2 ± 0.8	55.4 ± 0.8	60.2 ± 2.2	91.7 ± 5.3	69.6 ± 1.8	93.7 ± 1.5
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	15.3 ± 0.1	11.3 ± 0.1	10.6 ± 0.3	29.2 ± 0.4	25.4 ± 0.3	34.2 ± 0.5
A. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside	125.6 ± 2.3	129.1 ± 0.7	123.2 ± 2.8	39.4 ± 0.4	40.3 ± 0.9	40.4 ± 0.2
A. 6,8 di-C-hexoside	47.3 ± 1.0	36.5 ± 0.2	32.3 ± 0.7	32.6 ± 0.4	22.1 ± 0.2	29.1 ± 0.2
<b>Flavone ♦</b>	<b>0.7 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.6 ± 0.1</b>	<b>0.6 ± 0.1</b>	<b>0.5 ± 0.1</b>	<b>0.6 ± 0.0</b>
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside-7-O-hexoside	8.3 ± 0.0	9.3 ± 0.1	8.7 ± 0.0	43.6 ± 0.9	33.4 ± 0.4	40.4 ± 0.4
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside	14.2 ± 0.2 a	4.5 ± 0.2 b	9.3 ± 0.1 ab	5.2 ± 0.0	7.2 ± 0.0	4.1 ± 0.0
Q.-3-O-glucoside	6.7 ± 0.3 a	5.3 ± 0.1 a	6.6 ± 0.1 a	4.5 ± 0.1	4.6 ± 0.0	4.2 ± 0.0
<b>Flavonols</b>	<b>28.1 ± 0.5</b>	<b>17.4 ± 0.2</b>	<b>23.2 ± 3.0</b>	<b>49.4 ± 3.8</b>	<b>42.2 ± 4.0</b>	<b>45.4 ± 5.1</b>
<b>Total analyzed per fruit part ♦</b>	<b>1.5 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.6 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.5 ± 0.1</b>	<b>2.6 ± 0.2</b>	<b>2.2 ± 0.1</b>	<b>2.6 ± 0.1</b>
<b>Total analyzed whole fruit ♦</b>	<b>1.2 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.4 ± 0.1</b>	<b>1.3 ± 0.1</b>			
<b>TPC ♦</b>	<b>11.2 ± 0.9</b>	<b>10.3 ± 0.9</b>	<b>9.1 ± 0.5</b>	<b>10.9 ± 0.5</b>	<b>7.9 ± 0.6</b>	<b>8.8 ± 0.3</b>

<sup>i</sup>a,b different letters denote statistical significant differences ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among treatments in the same cultivar and fruit part

◆ Symbol indicates data in g kg<sup>-1</sup>

/ Symbol indicates that the substance could not be determined

Table S2: Individual and total phenolic contents of non-pungent cultivar ‘Lombardo tago’ before (**A**) and after storage (**B**) (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>; mean ± SE; n = 15) infested with *H. halys*.

<b>A</b>	Non-pungent ‘Lombardo tago’					
	Pericarp			Placenta		
	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2
5-Caffeoylquinic a. ♦	0.8 ± 0.0	0.9 ± 0.0	0.9 ± 0.0	2.4 ± 0.1	2.1 ± 0.1	2.2 ± 0.0
<b>Hydroxycinnamic a. ♦</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.9 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.9 ± 0.0</b>	<b>2.4 ± 0.1</b>	<b>2.1 ± 0.1</b>	<b>2.2 ± 0.0</b>
L. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	15.6 ± 0.2 b <sup>i</sup>	32.5 ± 0.8 a	14.2 ± 0.3 b	/	/	/
L. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside 2	8.2 ± 0.1	14.4 ± 0.4	10.7 ± 0.1	/	/	/
L.-6-C-hexoside	23.4 ± 0.4	37.4 ± 0.6	30.8 ± 0.4	164.2 ± 3.9	110.6 ± 2.0	138.2 ± 1.7
L.-8-C-hexoside	42.5 ± 1.0	64.2 ± 1.1	59. ± 1.0	216.5 ± 4.3 a	70.3 ± 0.8 b	72.8 ± 1.4 b
L.-7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-acetyl) hexoside	17.1 ± 0.1	25.4 ± 0.6	18.6 ± 0.3	45.6 ± 0.9	31.6 ± 0.7	28.9 ± 1.4
L.-7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-malonyl) hexoside	66.4 ± 0.9	77.2 ± 1.4	70.4 ± 0.4	127. 2± 1.4	122.3 ± 2.3	163.2 ± 4.1
L. 6,8-di-C-hexoside	84.6 ± 0.2	98.5 ± 0.3	92.2 ± 0.6	571.5 ± 5.1	718.1 ± 10.8	739.5 ± 12.4
C. 7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-acetyl) glucoside	86.2 ± 1.3 b	177.2 ± 3.6 a	108.3 ± 2.0 b	68.3 ± 1.1	50.5 ± 1.4	43.5 ± 1.3
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 1	42.6 ± 0.1 b	58.3 ± 0.8 a	45.5 ± 0.5 b	182.8 ± 3.2	121.4 ± 1.5	131.2 ± 1.9
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	11.2 ± 0.4	21.4 ± 0.2	22.6 ± 0.3	52.1 ± 1.0	53.2 ± 1.1	41.4 ± 0.7
A. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside	22.5 ± 0.3	45.4 ± 0.8	34.8 ± 0.3	31.9 ± 0.9	30.7 ± 0.3	32.1 ± 0.1
A. 6,8 di-C-hexoside	9.1 ± 0.0b	22.5 ± 0.4a	14.4 ± 0.2b	46.0 ± 1.1	41.3 ± 0.7	39.8 ± 1.4
<b>Flavone ♦</b>	<b>0.3 ± 5.6 b</b>	<b>0.7 ± 10.6 a</b>	<b>0.5 ± 6.4 b</b>	<b>1.4 ± 0.0 a</b>	<b>1.2 ± 0.0 b</b>	<b>1.1 ± 0.0 b</b>
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside-7-O-hexoside	22.5 ± 0.3	44.3 ± 1.2	39.4 ± 1.0	32.5. ± 5.0	22.9. ± 6.2	272.4 ± 11.4
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside	6.3 ± 0.1	8.3 ± 0.1	8.3 ± 0.1	13.2 ± 0.7	9.5 ± 0.2	11.2 ± 0.5
Q.-3-O-glucoside	2.6 ± 0.1	4.2 ± 0.1	2.8 ± 0.0	6.3 ± 0.1	3.1 ± 0.0	12.3 ± 0.3

Flavonols	28.3 ± 0.4 b	69.5 ± 1.7 a	43.9 ± 1.0 ab	338.2 ± 5.3 a	216.4 ± 5.6 b	173.6 ± 3.6 b
Total analyzed per fruit part ♦	1.2 ± 0.1 b	1.7 ± 0.1 a	1.4 ± 0.0 b	4.1 ± 0.1 a	3.6 ± 0.1 b	3.5 ± 0.1 b
Total analyzed whole fruit ♦	1.2 ± 0.1 b	1.5 ± 0.1 a	1.3 ± 0.1 b			
TPC ♦	11.2 ± 0.9 b	13.1 ± 0.7 a	11.5 ± 0.6 b	12.7 ± 0.6 a	11.7 ± 0.6 b	10.1 ± 0.7 b

<sup>i</sup>a,b different letters denote statistical significant differences ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among treatments in the same cultivar and fruit part

♦ Symbol indicates data in g kg<sup>-1</sup>

/ Symbol indicates that the substance could not be determined

B	Non-pungent ‘Lombardo tago’ after storage					
	Pericarp			Placenta		
	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2
5-Caffeoxlquinic a. ♦	0.8 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.0	1.6 ± 0.0	1.9 ± 0.0	1.8 ± 0.0
<b>Hydroxycinnamic a. ♦</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.6 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.9 ± 0.0</b>	<b>1.8 ± 0.0</b>
L. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	19.2 ± 0.3	20.2 ± 1.0	21.9 ± 0.5	/	/	/
L. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside 2	7.5 ± 0.1	9.5 ± 0.1	11.2 ± 0.1	/	/	/
L.-6-C-hexoside	10.4 ± 0.1 b <sup>i</sup>	23.4 ± 0.1 a	12.5 ± 0.2 b	44.8 ± 0.4	30.8 ± 0.5	39.5 ± 0.4
L.-8-C-hexoside	25.8 ± 0.3 b	58.2 ± 0.7 a	52.2 ± 0.6 a	74.5 ± 2.2	102.4 ± 1.3	101.2 ± 2.2
L.-7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-acetyl) hexoside	15.2 ± 0.1	22.0 ± 0.6	13.3 ± 0.3	19.2 ± 0.2 b	37.6 ± 0.3 a	28.7 ± 0.6 ab
L.-7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-malonyl) hexoside	83.5 ± 0.9 a	62.5 ± 0.4 b	47.7 ± 0.5 b	136.4 ± 1.8	169.2 ± 1.0	152.8 ± 1.4
L. 6,8-di-C-hexoside	60.9 ± 0.2 b	78.3 ± 0.4 a	67.2 ± 0.2 b	193.7 ± 3.0	176.5 ± 1.5	185.9 ± 2.0
C. 7-O-(2-apiosyl-6-acetyl) glucoside	84.7 ± 2.5	1084.5 ± 2.0	96.0 ± 0.5	32.3 ± 0.8	23.8 ± 0.9	25.2 ± 0.7
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 1	22.5 ± 0.2 b	51.5 ± 0.2 a	42.0 ± 0.3 a	73.2 ± 1.2	101.5 ± 1.4	120.4 ± 0.8
A. 6-C-hexoside-8-C-pentoside 2	13.2 ± 0.2 b	22.3 ± 0.2 a	18.8 ± 0.1 b	30.7 ± 0.6	38.2 ± 0.5	40.2 ± 0.8
A. 6-C-pentoside-8-C-hexoside	21.6 ± 0.3 b	38.8 ± 0.5 a	29.4 ± 0.3 b	18.1 ± 0.3 b	31.8 ± 0.4 a	38.6 ± 0.4 a
A. 6,8 di-C-hexoside	6.5 ± 0.0	14.3 ± 0.1	11.6 ± 0.1	16.5 ± 0.2	26.4 ± 0.6	21.3 ± 0.3
<b>Flavone ♦</b>	<b>0.3 ± 4.3 b</b>	<b>0.5 ± 4.6 a</b>	<b>0.3 ± 3.8 b</b>	<b>6.3 ± 8.4</b>	<b>7.4 ± 7.0</b>	<b>7.7 ± 3.2</b>
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside-7-O-hexoside	15.6 ± 0.2 b	31.6 ± 0.2 a	33.1 ± 0.5 a	108.5 ± 6.4	188.0 ± 3.9	170.4 ± 4.0
Q.-3-O-rhamnoside	4.3 ± 0.1	31.4 ± 0.2	9.6 ± 0.1	10.6 ± 0.2	19.4 ± 0.3	9.3 ± 0.4
Q.-3-O-glucoside	1.5 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.0	1.3 ± 0.0	7.4 ± 0.1	9.3 ± 0.3	4.4 ± 0.1
<b>Flavonols</b>	<b>19.2 ± 0.1 b</b>	<b>40.3 ± 0.5 a</b>	<b>36.8 ± 0.4 ab</b>	<b>110.7 ± 6.3</b>	<b>216.5 ± 4.5</b>	<b>208.2 ± 4.0</b>
<b>Total analyzed per fruit part ♦</b>	<b>1.1 ± 0.0 b</b>	<b>1.3 ± 0.0 a</b>	<b>1.2 ± 0.1 b</b>	<b>2.4 ± 0.3</b>	<b>2.9 ± 0.2</b>	<b>2.9 ± 0.1</b>
<b>Total analyzed whole fruit ♦</b>	<b>1.0 ± 0.0 b</b>	<b>1.2 ± 0.0 a</b>	<b>1.0 ± 0.0 b</b>			
<b>TPC ♦</b>	<b>8.6 ± 0.9 b</b>	<b>11.0 ± 0.5 a</b>	<b>11.2 ± 0.6 a</b>	<b>7.4 ± 0.6</b>	<b>8.7 ± 0.8</b>	<b>7.4 ± 0.9</b>

<sup>i</sup>a,b different letters denote statistical significant differences ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among treatments in the same cultivar and fruit part

◆ Symbol indicates data in g kg<sup>-1</sup>

/ Symbol indicates that the substance could not be determined



Table S3: Individual and total capsaicinoid contents before and after storage of pungent ‘Eris F1’ (**A**) and non-pungent ‘Lombardo tago’ (**B**) (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>; mean ± SE; n = 15) infested with *H. halys*.

<b>A</b>		Before storage			After storage		
		Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2
Pungent ‘Eris F1’	Pericarp						
	Capsaicin	494.3 ± 11.0 c <sup>i</sup>	694.7 ± 35.4 a	208.1 ± 7.8 b	131.3 ± 2.3 c	465.5 ± 5.8 a	190.6 ± 9.1 b
	Dihydrocapsaicin	99.2 ± 1.3 c	170.7 ± 10.4 a	64.8 ± 5.9 b	42.4 ± 1.2 c	101.9 ± 1.0 a	44.4 ± 1.2 b
	Nordihydrocapsaicin	12.6 ± 0.1 c	39.1 ± 2.2 a	14.4 ± 5.7 b	7.5 ± 0.2 b	13.3 ± 2.4 a	10.3 ± 2.9 ab
	Homocapsaicin	9.3 ± 0.1 c	24.3 ± 1.7 a	6.1 ± 2.0 b	8.3 ± 0.1 b	8.6 ± 1.8 a	5.7 ± 1.2 ab
	Homodihydrocapsaicin	10.9 ± 0.1 c	32.6 ± 2.1 a	10.7 ± 4.2 b	5.4 ± 0.3 b	12.9 ± 3.3 a	8.1 ± 2.7 ab
	<b>Total capsaicinoids ♦</b>	<b>0.6 ± 1.1 c</b>	<b>9.6 ± 2.6 a</b>	<b>3.0 ± 1.5 b</b>	<b>0.2 ± 0.0 c</b>	<b>6.0 ± 0.1 a</b>	<b>2.6 ± 0.2 b</b>
	Placenta						
	Capsaicin ♦	16.1 ± 0.3 ab	26.0 ± 0.4 a	8.3 ± 0.3 b	2.7 ± 0.1 ab	1.4 ± 0.1 b	3.0 ± 0.0 a
	Dihydrocapsaicin ♦	4.5 ± 0.0 ab	6.9 ± 0.0 a	2.3 ± 0.0 b	0.7 ± 0.0	0.3 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.0
	Nordihydrocapsaicin ♦	0.9 ± 0.0 ab	1.5 ± 0.0 a	0.5 ± 0.0 b	0.1 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.1 ± 0.0
	Homocapsaicin ♦	0.6 ± 0.0 ab	1.2 ± 0.0 a	0.2 ± 0.0 b	0.1 ± 0.0	0.1 ± 0.0	0.2 ± 0.0
	Homodihydrocapsaicin ♦	0.9 ± 0.0 b	1.7 ± 0.0 a	0.4 ± 0.0 b	0.3 ± 0.0	0.1 ± 0.0	0.4 ± 0.0
	<b>Total capsaicinoids ♦</b>	<b>23.2 ± 0.3 b</b>	<b>37.2 ± 0.5 a</b>	<b>11.9 ± 0.1 c</b>	<b>4.1 ± 0.2 a</b>	<b>2.0 ± 0.0 b</b>	<b>4.7 ± 0.1 a</b>

<sup>i</sup>a, b, c different letters denote statistical significant differences ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among treatments in the same cultivar and fruit part

♦ Symbol indicates data in g kg<sup>-1</sup>

/ Symbol indicates that the substance could not be determined

<b>B</b>		Before storage			After storage		
		Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2	Control	<i>H. halys</i>	Control 2
Non-pungent 'Lombardo tago'	Capsaicin	129.6 ± 7.1 b <sup>i</sup>	604.4 ± 3.2 ab	828. ± 1.7 a	8.7 ± 0.3 a	3.2 ± 0.1 b	3.1 ± 0.0 b
	Dihydrocapsaicin	23.2 ± 1.1 b	1028.3 ± 6.6 a	131.4 ± 9.1 a	1.1 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.0	1.1 ± 0.0
	Nordihydrocapsaicin	4.7 ± 0.0 b	13.6 ± 0.6 a	10.3 ± 0.4 ab	< 0.0	< 0.0	< 0.0
	Homocapsaicin	3.3 ± 0.1 b	45.4 ± 0.9 a	7.7 ± 0.3 b	< 0.0	< 0.0	< 0.0
	Homodihydrocapsaicin	2.3 ± 0.1 b	17.8 ± 1.1 a	9.3 ± 0.4 a	< 0.0	< 0.0	< 0.0
	<b>Total capsaicinoids ♦</b>	<b>1.8 ± 1.7 b</b>	<b>7.7 ± 5.5 a</b>	<b>9.9 ± 2.1 a</b>	<b>0.1 ± 0.4 a</b>	<b>0.0 ± 0.0 b</b>	<b>0.0 ± 0.0 b</b>
	Capsaicin	1109. ± 6.3 b	331.4. ± 1.9 a	805.5 ± 2.8 b	15.2 ± 0.4	10.6 ± 0.1	16.3 ± 0.5
	Dihydrocapsaicin	191.3 ± 0.4 b	525.4 ± 4.0 a	157.2 ± 8.6 b	2.6 ± 0.0	2.2 ± 0.0	2.2 ± 0.0
	Nordihydrocapsaicin	23.7 ± 0.4 ab	34.3 ± 0.5 a	13.4 ± 0.1 b	< 0.0	< 0.0	< 0.0
	Homocapsaicin	41.2 ± 1.5 b	91.4 ± 3.3 a	27.6 ± 0.5 b	< 0.0	< 0.0	< 0.0
	Homodihydrocapsaicin	26.7 ± 0.6 b	46.3 ± 1.0 a	12.4 ± 0.2 b	< 0.0	< 0.0	< 0.0
	<b>Total capsaicinoids ♦</b>	<b>1.4 ± 0.1 b</b>	<b>4.0 ± 0.2 a</b>	<b>1.0 ± 0.0 b</b>	<b>0.2 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.1 ± 0.0</b>	<b>0.2 ± 0.0</b>

<sup>i</sup>a, b, c different letters denote statistical significant differences ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among treatments in the same cultivar and fruit part

♦ Symbol indicates data in g kg<sup>-1</sup>

/ Symbol indicates that the substance could not be determined