

Results of a Double Blind Test of the Catania Wine Enhancer

Background:

Goal: The goal of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Catania Wine Enhancer in changing the individual components of a wine.

Participants: Those chosen for this wine tasting ranged from professional tasters to well studied amateurs. All have extensive experience in blind tasting. Five tasters (plus Dr. Reiss) were included in this study.

Procedure: Three bottles of wine, each of the same type (Malbec) from the same vintage and producers were presented blind (all identifying indications were masked).

The tasters were presented with tasting sheets that emphasized the wine profile in that a separate rating on a scale of 0 – 10 was recorded for each component of the wine. e.g. Aroma, Fruit, Acidity, Tannin, Linger and Overall Impression.

1.5 oz, of each wine was poured into an INAO standard tasting glass. The tasters were given no information about the wines and were asked to profile each independently. They were not aware that the same wine (aside from bottle variation) was being tasted in all three glasses.

In order to mitigate the effect of any one wine changing the tasters ability to perceive the others, all of the wines were tasted before the first wine was assessed.

At the end of the first round all of the scoring sheets (one sheet for each wine) were collected.

Wine Enhancer Test Page 1

Test conducted between 7/22/06 and 7/ 29/06 by Stephen Reiss, Ph.D. Certified Wine Educator of WineEducation.com. All rights reserved, please do not reprint without permission.

In the second round one of the wines had been placed on the Catania Wine Enhancer for 12 minutes, and with this exception the second round proceeded as the first.

In the third round the same wine that had been placed on the Catania Wine Enhancer for 12 minutes was again returned to the enhancer for 60 more minutes (for a total exposure time of 72 minutes).

The third round proceeded exactly as the first two had.

Principal Findings:

Not one of the wines, enhanced or otherwise was shown to have significantly changed between any of the tastings. Small changes did occur, but well within with the limits of expectation for a subjective test. Averaging the data and rounding the results show a net effect of zero change for all three of the test subject wines.

Table A displays the average results for each of the wines.

Table B contains all of the raw data from the tasters.

Table C is the key to which wine was tasting in which glass for each round.

It should be noted that the third round of tasting, where the subject wine was placed on the enhancer for over an hour of total time had the greatest expectation of change. Even with this extreme exposure to the device the wine did not show any significant signs of change.

Wine Enhancer Test Page 2

Test conducted between 7/22/06 and 7/ 29/06 by Stephen Reiss, Ph.D. Certified Wine Educator of WineEducation.com. All rights reserved, please do not reprint without permission.

The manufacturer of the enhancer suggested that prolonged exposure to the product would be dramatic, but in fact the data shows no greater change at this level of exposure over any other length of exposure, or no exposure at all.

Table A

Wine A	Flight 1	Flight 2	Flight 3	Diff. 2nd	Diff. 3rd
Aroma	2	4	3	2	1
Fruit	3	4	3	1	0
Acidity	5	5	6	0	1
Tannin	4	3	4	-1	0
Linger	4	4	4	0	0
Overall	3	4	4	1	1
		avg.		0	0
Wine B	Flight 1	Flight 2	Flight 3	Diff. 2nd	Diff. 3rd
Aroma	3	2	2	-1	-1
Fruit	4	3	4	-1	0
Acidity	5	6	5	1	0
Tannin	5	6	4	1	-1
Linger	4	3	4	-1	0
Overall	3	3	4	0	1
		avg.		-0	-0
Wine C	Flight 1	Flight 2	Flight 3	Diff. 2nd	Diff. 3rd
Aroma	3	3	4	0	1
Fruit	4	3	3	-1	-1
Acidity	4	6	5	2	1
Tannin	4	4	4	0	0
Linger	3	4	4	1	1
Overall	4	4	3	0	-1
		avg.		0	0

Wine B was the wine exposed to the Wine Enhancing product.

The final 2 columns show the amount of change between the first and subsequent tastings. Negative zeros are due to rounding. Changes of 2 or greater (positive or negative) are considered significant.

Wine Enhancer Test Page 3

Test conducted between 7/22/06 and 7/ 29/06 by Stephen Reiss, Ph.D. Certified Wine Educator of WineEducation.com. All rights reserved, please do not reprint without permission.

	Aroma	Fruit	Acidity	Tannin	Linger	Overall
T2W1	1	3	6	5	2	5
T2W2	3	3	4	5	3	4
T2W3	1	4	5	4	1	3
T3W1	2	3	3	3	4	3
T3W2	2	3	5	5	2	2
T3W3	2	3	4	4	6	3
T4W1	8	5	3	3	3	5
T4W2	2	3	3	3	4	5
T4W3	3	4	5	4	4	4
T5W1	3	3	4	7	5	4
T5W2	2	4	4	6	5	4
T5W3	4	5	7	6	7	5
T6W1	2	5	6	2	2	3
T6W2	3	3	7	2	4	2
T6W3	3	3	3	7	2	2
T2W1B	1	3	8	6	1	4
T2W2B	2	2	9	7	2	2
T2W3B	1	2	9	3	2	2
T3W1B	3	3	2	2	3	3
T3W2B	2	4	3	3	4	3
T3W3B	4	3	3	3	3	2
T4W1B	4	4	6	5	5	4
T4W2B	3	5	5	5	4	4
T4W3B	5	5	5	3	4	4
T5W1B	3	4	4	6	7	6
T5W2B	2	3	7	5	1	1
T5W3B	4	6	3	5	7	7
T6W1B	2	2	8	2	2	2
T6W2B	3	3	8	2	2	3
T6W3B	4	5	5	3	3	5
T2W1C	1	1	9	3	1	2
T2W2C	1	1	8	4	1	2
T2W3C	1	2	9	2	1	2
T3W1C	2	3	3	3	4	2
T3W2C	3	3	2	3	3	2
T3W3C	2	3	3	3	3	3

Table B

The first column represents the taster, glass tasted from and round.

For example T2W1B is taster 2's first wine glass during the second round (B).

And T4W3C is taster 4's 3rd glass during the 3rd round (C).

Taster 1 was Dr. Reiss, who's scores are not included because he was aware of some of the variables of the tasting.

Wine Enhancer Test Page 4

Test conducted between 7/22/06 and 7/ 29/06 by Stephen Reiss, Ph.D. Certified Wine Educator of WineEducation.com. All rights reserved, please do not reprint without permission.

	Aroma	Fruit	Acidity	Tannin	Linger	Overall
T4W1C	3	6	5	5	7	8
T4W2C	6	5	4	3	5	5
T4W3C	5	5	4	4	6	6
T5W1C	4	6	2	5	7	7
T5W2C	7	3	7	5	6	5
T5W3C	6	3	7	6	7	6
T6W1C	2	2	8	2	2	2
T6W2C	2	3	6	3	3	3
T6W3C	3	3	8	3	2	2

Table B - cont.

Table C - Blind Tasting Key

Tasting Flight	Wine #	Bottle Letter
1	1	C
1	2	A
1	3	B
2	1	C
2	2	B Enhanced 10 minutes
2	3	A
3	1	B Enhanced 60 minutes
3	2	C
3	3	A

Wine Enhancer Test Page 5

Test conducted between 7/22/06 and 7/ 29/06 by Stephen Reiss, Ph.D. Certified Wine Educator of WineEducation.com. All rights reserved, please do not reprint without permission.

Secondary Findings:

It is unsurprising to discover that each of the three wines, while ostensibly the same scored differently in each test. It is likely that the test participants were trying to find differences in the wines, assuming that they were different, and so manufactured variations that may not have actually been there.

This is significant in any wine tasting, as overcoming personal biases and assumptions is the goal of blind tasting.

In the event of an open tasting (as was conducted separately) the power of suggestion and natural inclination of individuals to find differences even when none exists renders the results to be moot.

Limitations: Because of the subjectivity of wine tasting it is difficult to create an environment where all of the variables are controlled.

Every effort was made to create a tasting environment and procedure to mitigate these variables, but future studies may want to add even more controls.

As well, because of cost and time requirements only three wines were used in this tasting, and only 5 tasters. Future studies may want to increase both the number of tasters and wines to be tasted.

Only Malbec (a grape variety) was included in this test (Zinfandel was used in subsequent, non empirical tests). Future studies may want to test other grape varieties as well. Malbec was chosen for this test because of its tendency towards high tannin balance. A random sampling of grape varieties may represent a more balanced approach.

Wine Enhancer Test Page 6

Test conducted between 7/22/06 and 7/ 29/06 by Stephen Reiss, Ph.D. Certified Wine Educator of WineEducation.com. All rights reserved, please do not reprint without permission.

The one hour gap of time between the second and third rounds allowed tasters to eat and drink indiscriminately (although no food or drink was allowed before the first two rounds). As well all of the same tasters were used for all three rounds. Future studies may want to limit the tasters to a single round; although this may bring other variations into the study.

Summary:

While no correlation between the wine that was enhanced by the product and change in the wine over time was found, further study and peer review are, as always, called for.

Subsequent tastings, not included in the trial, found that suggestion played an overwhelming role in creating anecdotal evidence to support the claims of the product.

This trial was deliberately designed to reduce or eliminate the power of suggestion and it is suggested that any further studies not only do the same, but endeavor to add even more controls.

Wine Enhancer Test Page 7

Test conducted between 7/22/06 and 7/ 29/06 by Stephen Reiss, Ph.D. Certified Wine Educator of WineEducation.com. All rights reserved, please do not reprint without permission.