Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) in the Global Wine Sector

Regulatory, Oenological, and Public Health Analysis

November 6, 2025

Executive Summary

Context

Sulfur dioxide (SO2), commonly known as sulfites, remains the most critical, effective, and universally used additive in modern oenology. Its historical and current indispensability is based on a dual functionality that no other additive has managed to replicate with the same cost-effectiveness and efficacy: it is a potent antioxidant agent and a selective antimicrobial agent.[1] Despite its central role in preserving wine quality, its use is at a critical crossroads in 2025, driven by a confluence of consumer demand for "clean" products, public confusion about its health impact, and, most significantly, renewed and stricter regulatory scrutiny.

Key Findings - Regulation vs. Market Reality

An analysis of global market data reveals a significant gap between the maximum legal limits allowed for total SO2 (which can range from 150 mg/L to 400 mg/L depending on the wine type) [4] and the average levels actually detected in commercial wines. Exhaustive studies by the International Organisation of Vine and Wine (OIV) show that the average levels of total SO2 in the market are substantially lower, typically falling in the 60-130 mg/L range.[1] This indicates that the industry, overall, operates with wide safety margins, using SO2 moderately. However, public perception often mistakenly focuses on the legal maximums, assuming wines are saturated to the permitted limit.

Key Findings - Health (The Myth): Headaches and Quercetin

Accumulated scientific evidence, particularly cutting-edge research from 2023-2024, convincingly refutes the popular belief directly linking sulfite ingestion to wine headaches.[6] For decades, sulfites have been the scapegoat for this phenomenon, despite contradictory evidence (e.g., white wines often have more SO2 than reds, but complaints focus on red wine).

A transformative study from the University of California, Davis (2023) has identified a much more likely culprit: **quercetin**, a natural flavanol found in high concentrations in red grape skins.[8] The proposed mechanism is that, in the bloodstream, metabolized quercetin inhibits the enzyme ALDH2, which is crucial for breaking down acetaldehyde (a toxic byproduct of alcohol metabolism). This blockage causes a toxic accumulation of acetaldehyde, resulting in facial flushing, nausea, and, critically, headaches—a mechanism identical to that of the drug disulfiram.[8]

Key Findings - Health (The Real Risk): Hypersensitivity and EFSA Re-evaluation

While the headache myth has been scientifically displaced, SO2 presents real risks to specific subsets of the population. Sulfite hypersensitivity is an established clinical phenomenon, manifesting primarily as bronchoconstriction in asthmatics (5-10% of this group) and dermatological reactions.[9] The legitimacy of this risk was underscored by the designation of sulfites as the "Allergen of the Year 2024" by the American Contact Dermatitis Society (ACDS).[11]

However, the most critical development on the health front is the recent re-evaluation by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA, 2022-2024). Citing a "lack of data" from adequate toxicological studies by the industry, EFSA could not reaffirm the traditional Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI). Instead, it applied a stricter **Margin of Exposure (MOE)**.[12] EFSA concluded that there is a "safety concern for high consumers" of sulfites, as their intakes exceed the safe level (MOE < 80) by up to 60% in adults. Alarmingly, EFSA identified new potential risks, including indications of **neurotoxicity** (delayed response of nerve cells).[12]

Key Findings - The Future: Oenological Alternatives

The dual pressure of consumer demand and EFSA's regulatory scrutiny has accelerated research into alternatives.[13] SO2 remains the gold standard in cost-effectiveness [2], but viable options are emerging. Physical technologies like Pulsed Electric Fields (PEF) and High Pressure Processing (HPP) are proving effective for microbial sterilization.[15] On the biological level, "bioprotection" (using benign microbes to outcompete pathogens) [16] and innovations in "upcycling," such as the use of polyphenol extracts from grape pomace (e.g., Bioma technology), are demonstrating the ability to replicate the dual antioxidant and antimicrobial function of SO2.[17]

Strategic Conclusion

The global wine sector must manage a complex dual narrative in 2026. First, it must launch a proactive public education campaign, armed with the new quercetin science [8], to dismantle the sulfite-headache myth and refocus the conversation on the real (and natural) cause of the "red wine headache." Second, and more urgently, it must internally address the serious regulatory concern from EFSA regarding neurotoxicity in high consumers.[12] This demands immediate investment in (1) the toxicological research needed to fill the "data gaps" identified by EFSA and (2) the accelerated implementation of viable oenological alternatives to reduce overall SO2 levels in all wines, with the strategic goal of bringing as much product as possible below the 10 ppm labeling threshold.

Part 1: Chemical Foundations and Indispensable Oenological Role of SO2

1.1. Chemistry of SO2 in Wine: Total, Free, and Molecular SO2

The effective management of sulfur dioxide (SO2) in winemaking begins with understanding its complex chemical equilibrium in the wine matrix, which is fundamentally dependent on pH.[1] When SO2 (usually added as potassium metabisulfite or gaseous SO2) dissolves in must or wine, it does not remain as a single molecule. Instead, it enters a dynamic equilibrium among three main forms. Managing this equilibrium is at the heart of modern oenological practice.

These forms are classified into three key analytical and functional categories:

1. **Total SO2:** This is the metric used for legal compliance and labeling. As defined by standard OIV methodologies [18], total SO2 is the sum of all different forms of sulfur dioxide present in the wine, both those that are free and those that are bound to other components.[1]
2. **Bound (or Combined) SO2:** A significant fraction of the added SO2 reacts and becomes "bound," either irreversibly or reversibly, to various wine compounds, especially acetaldehyde (a byproduct of fermentation), but also to sugars, ketones, and certain polyphenols.[1] This bound fraction is largely "sequestered" and is considered to have minimal to no protective efficacy. Acetaldehyde is the primary binding compound, and a poorly managed fermentation that produces high levels of acetaldehyde will "consume" much of the added SO2, neutralizing its effect.
3. **Free SO2:** This is the portion of SO2 that remains unreacted and dissolved in the wine. It is the fraction that possesses the desired antioxidant and antimicrobial properties.[1] Winemakers do not manage total SO2; rather, they actively manage free SO2 to ensure sufficient active protection is available. During maturation and storage, recommended free SO2 levels are typically 25 mg/L for red wine and 30 mg/L for white wine.[1]
4. **Molecular (Active) SO2:** Within the *free* SO2 fraction, there is a further equilibrium (dependent on pH) between the bisulfite ion (HSO_3^-), the sulfite ion (SO_3^{2-}), and molecular SO2 (the dissolved gaseous form). Molecular SO2 is the *true antimicrobial form* of the additive; it is the only form that can penetrate the cell membrane of yeasts

and bacteria to inactivate them.[1]

The relationship between pH and molecular SO_2 is exponential and non-linear. A wine with a low pH (e.g., 3.2, more acidic) will have a much higher percentage of its free SO_2 in the active molecular form. A wine with a high pH (e.g., 3.8, less acidic) will have a dramatically lower percentage in molecular form.[1] This means a high-pH wine needs a much larger total SO_2 dose (and thus higher free SO_2) to achieve the same level of antimicrobial protection (e.g., the target of 0.6 mg/L of molecular SO_2).[1] This relationship is why there is no "one-size-fits-all" dose for sulfites and why pH management is critical to modern winemaking.

1.2. Oenological Suitability: The Dual Mechanism of Action

The suitability of SO_2 as a wine additive, which has kept it indispensable for centuries [1], is based on the fact that it is the only low-cost additive that performs two critical functions simultaneously.[2]

Antioxidant Mechanism:
The primary function of SO_2 is to prevent oxidation. Wine, from grape pressing to bottle aging, is constantly exposed to oxygen.3 SO_2 acts as a potent reducing agent: it "scavenges" dissolved oxygen before it can react with the desirable components of the wine.1 In white wines, this prevents the oxidation of polyphenols, which would otherwise cause enzymatic browning (darkening) and the loss of fresh fruit aromas, leading to "bruised fruit" notes. In all wines, it protects volatile aromatic compounds, which are extremely sensitive to oxidative degradation, thereby preserving the wine's varietal character and freshness throughout its shelf life.19
Antimicrobial Mechanism (Preservative):
Simultaneously, SO_2 (specifically the molecular form) acts as a selective antimicrobial agent.3 It suppresses the growth of a wide range of unwanted spoilage microorganisms that can ruin wine. This includes acetic acid bacteria (e.g., Acetobacter), which turn alcohol into vinegar (acetic acid), and wild yeasts (e.g., Brettanomyces), which can produce unpleasant "barnyard" or "band-aid" odors.15 Crucially, SO_2 is selective: at the doses used, it inhibits these spoilage microbes but is largely tolerated by the desired winemaking yeast, Saccharomyces cerevisiae, allowing it to dominate the fermentation. This selectivity is key to achieving a clean alcoholic fermentation and is essential for ensuring the microbiological stability of the wine after bottling, especially in wines containing residual sugar.20
This dual functionality is why SO_2 is so difficult to replace. Most alternatives (discussed in Part 4) only address one of these functions, but not both.

1.3. Impact on Wine Quality and Stability (2024-2025 Studies)

Recent scientific research continues to validate the essential role of SO2 in the sensory quality and long-term stability of wine. Studies comparing wines made with SO2 versus those made without it (known as "No Sulfites Added" or NSA) conclusively demonstrate the risks of its omission.

A 2024 study analyzing white wines from the Solaris variety (a disease-resistant grape) explored different SO2 management regimes.[19] After 12 months of storage, a trained sensory panel evaluated the wines. The results were clear: wines produced "Without SO2" (as well as those where SO2 was added only to the juice pre-fermentation and was consumed) developed significantly stronger perceptions of negative sensory notes, described as 'chemical', 'overripe fruit', and 'honey'.[19] In contrast, wines with standard post-fermentation SO2 additions maintained a more stable and clean aromatic profile. This underscores the critical influence of SO2 on flavor stability over time.[19]

These findings are corroborated by studies in the commercial market. A 2024 analysis of Bordeaux red wines marketed as "No Sulfites Added" (NSA) [21] investigated their quality. While the study confirmed it is *possible* to produce NSA wines without defects, it also found that these wines exhibited a "much higher frequency of defects" sensorially compared to wines made using conventional winemaking methods that utilize SO2.[21]

The "natural wine" trend [3] is based on a philosophy of minimal intervention, which often includes the elimination of added SO2. However, this choice faces a fundamental chemical and microbiological barrier. In the absence of SO2 protection, wine is exponentially more vulnerable to oxidation and microbial contamination.[3] The success of an NSA wine requires an extraordinary level of cellar hygiene, flawless viticulture (perfectly healthy grapes), and often, consumer acceptance of a "different" or more "rustic" sensory profile [23], which may include higher levels of volatile acidity (a precursor to vinegar) or *Brettanomyces* characteristics. Effective SO2 management thus remains the winemaker's primary tool for ensuring wine quality, stability, and longevity.[3]

Part 2: Global Regulatory Framework and Labeling (Current as of 2025)

The regulation of sulfur dioxide in wine is a pillar of global food legislation, designed to balance the technical needs of oenology with consumer protection, especially for those with hypersensitivity. As of 2025, this regulation is based on international standards and is applied with specific nuances in major production and consumption jurisdictions.

2.1. The Global Standard: International Organisation of Vine and Wine (OIV)

The International Organisation of Vine and Wine (OIV) functions as the intergovernmental scientific and technical reference body. Its standards, while often recommendations, form the basis of most national legislation and trade agreements, including those of the European Union.[24]

The OIV's Compendium of International Methods of Analysis of Wines and Musts (2024-2025 editions) [25] and the International Code of Oenological Practices [5] establish the maximum acceptable limits for total SO2 in wine at the time of sale to the consumer. These limits are not arbitrary but reflect a deep oenological understanding of the technical need for protection:

- **Red Wines (dry):** 150 mg/L limit (for wines with < 4 g/L of reducing substances).[4]
- **White and Rosé Wines (dry):** 200 mg/L limit (for wines with < 4 g/L of reducing substances).[4]
- **Wines with Residual Sugar:** Limits increase with sugar content. For wines (red, white, or rosé) containing more than 4 g/L of reducing substances, the limit rises to 300 mg/L.[4]
- **Exceptions (Sweet Wines):** In exceptional cases, certain sweet white wines (like late-harvest or botrytized wines) may have limits up to 400 mg/L.[4]

The logic for this stratification is clear: red wines contain high levels of tannins and other polyphenols extracted from the skins, which act as natural antioxidants, thereby reducing the *need* for added SO2 for protection. White and rosé wines, lacking this phenolic protection, are more susceptible to oxidation and require a higher limit.[27] Similarly, wines with residual sugar (sweet) are microbiologically unstable, as the sugar serves as food for yeasts and bacteria, thus requiring a higher level of SO2 to prevent unwanted refermentation in the bottle.[4]

2.2. Comparative Analysis of Legislation: EU, US, and Australia/NZ

While the OIV sets the baseline, major market jurisdictions implement their own regulations, which differ subtly in limits but crucially in labeling.

European Union (EU)

The EU, the world's largest wine producer and consumer [28], largely harmonizes its SO2 limits with those of the OIV.[30] The general limits are 150 mg/L for dry reds and 200 mg/L for dry whites/rosés, with the same exceptions for sweet wines.[4]

Labeling (Allergen): The EU pioneered allergen labeling. If a wine contains more than 10 milligrams per liter (mg/L), or 10 parts per million (ppm), of sulfites (expressed as total SO2), the label must include the statement "Contains sulphites" (or its linguistic variants).[31]

Labeling (Ingredients - New for 2024/2025): The most significant regulatory transformation has been the full implementation of Regulation (EU) 2021/2117.[32] Since December 8, 2023, all wines marketed in the EU must include an ingredients list and a nutritional declaration (which can be provided digitally via a QR code). Sulfites, classified as additives (E220-E228), must be included in this ingredients list.[31] The regulation allows them to be grouped under the functional category, for example, "preservatives (sulphites)". However, since sulfites are also a designated allergen, they must be visually highlighted in the ingredients list (e.g., in **bold**) to comply with allergen labeling requirements.[32]

United States (US)

Regulation in the US is managed by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB).
Limits: The TTB sets a higher general upper limit than the OIV/EU for table wine: 350 mg/L of total SO2.27
Labeling: Like the EU, the TTB imposes a 10 ppm (10 mg/L) threshold.[34] Any wine containing 10 ppm or more of total SO2 *must* carry the "Contains Sulfites" declaration.[35] This regulation (specified in 27 CFR 4.32(e)) was implemented in the 1980s, not due to general toxicity concerns, but explicitly to protect the sulfite-sensitive population, particularly asthmatics.[36] If a producer wishes to market a wine without this declaration, they must submit a laboratory analysis (conducted by the TTB or a certified lab) to the TTB demonstrating the wine is below the 10 ppm threshold, obtaining what is known as a "sulfite labeling waiver".[34]

Australia and New Zealand

Regulation is managed by Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) through the Food Standards Code, specifically Standard 4.5.1.
Limits: FSANZ limits largely parallel those of the OIV and EU, albeit with slightly different terminology. They generally permit up to 250 mg/L for wines with less than 35 g/L of sugar and up to 300 mg/L for wines with more sugar.
Labeling: FSANZ also applies the 10 ppm international standard. A sulfite declaration is mandatory if they are present in concentrations of 10 mg/kg (or 10 mg/L) or more.[38]

Below is a table summarizing these key regulatory frameworks.

Table 1: Comparison of Maximum Legal Limits for Total SO2 (mg/L) by Jurisdiction (2025)

Wine Type	OIV (Global Reference)	European Union (EU)	United States (TTB)	Australia / NZ (FSANZ)
Dry Red Wine	150 mg/L (with < 4 g/L sugar) [4]	150 mg/L	350 mg/L (general limit for wine) [27]	250 mg/L
Dry White/Rosé Wine	200 mg/L (with < 4 g/L sugar) [4]	200 mg/L	350 mg/L (general limit for wine) [27]	250 mg/L
Sweet Wine	300-400 mg/L (with > 4 g/L sugar) [4]	300-400 mg/L (depending on sugar/type)	350 mg/L (general limit for wine) [27]	300 mg/L (with > 35 g/L sugar)
Organic Wine (Red)	Not specified by OIV	100 mg/L [39]	< 10 mg/L (for "USDA Organic") [40]	125 mg/L (Approx.)
"Contains Sulfites" Labeling	10 mg/L [41]	10 mg/L [31]	10 mg/L (10 ppm) [34]	10 mg/L (10 ppm) [38]

Threshold				

This table highlights a key regulatory tension: the legal limit in the US (350 mg/L) is significantly higher than the OIV and EU limits (150-200 mg/L) for dry wines. It is important to note that, as will be analyzed in the next section, this difference in the *legal ceiling* does not necessarily translate to higher usage levels in US wines; it simply provides a wider regulatory margin. The 10 ppm labeling threshold, however, is a nearly universal global standard.

Part 3: Actual Presence of Sulfites in Commercial Wines (2023-2025 Studies)

One of the most significant disconnects in the sulfite debate is the gap between public perception, often informed by maximum legal limits, and the quantitative reality of wines on the market. Analysis of 2023-2025 market data demonstrates that common oenological practice is far more conservative than what the law allows.

3.1. Average Levels in Conventional Wines (Market Analysis)

To address this question, the OIV published a comprehensive collective review, "SO2 AND WINE: A REVIEW," which compiled real-world market data from various member states to determine actual total SO2 levels.[1]

The findings from this report are conclusive: the average total SO2 levels detected across all wine categories were "well below the OIV limit."[1]

A summary of the average levels detected in the OIV surveys reveals:

- **Dry Red Wines (< 4 g/L sugar):** Average level detected: **60-96 mg/L**. (OIV Legal Limit: 150 mg/L).
- **Dry White and Rosé Wines (< 4 g/L sugar):** Average level detected: **100-132 mg/L**. (OIV Legal Limit: 200 mg/L).
- **Sweet/Special Wines (> 4 g/L sugar):** Average level detected: **80-180 mg/L**. (OIV Legal Limit: 300-400 mg/L).

These data demonstrate that, on average, the wine industry uses between 50% and 65% of the permitted legal limit. Detailed data by country reinforces this conclusion [1]:

- **Spain (1,124 samples):** Average total SO2 of 92.1 mg/L in red wines and 107.2 mg/L in white wines.
- **Romania (729 samples):** Average of 86.76 mg/L in reds and 114.67 mg/L in whites.
- **Sweden (2016-2018 data):** Average of 76 mg/L in bottled reds and 105 mg/L in bottled whites.
- **Moldova (10,767 samples):** Average of 96.79 mg/L in dry reds and 132.8 mg/L in dry whites.

This is one of the most important conclusions of this report: the public perception that wines are "full of sulfites" up to the legal limit is factually and quantitatively incorrect. The industry operates with self-regulation that favors moderation.

Table 2: Actual vs. Legal Total SO2 Levels (mg/L) (Based on OIV 2023 Survey)

The following table illustrates the gap between legal compliance and actual oenological practice, using market survey data from the OIV.[1]

Wine Type	OIV Legal Limit (mg/L)	Average Level Detected (mg/L)	Maximum Level Detected (mg/L)
Dry Red (< 4g/L sugar)	150	60 - 96	185 - 218
Dry White/Rosé (< 4g/L sugar)	200	100 - 133	199 - 303
Sweet / Special Wine (> 4g/L sugar)	300 - 400	80 - 180	250 - 422

Source: Data compiled from the OIV report "SO2 AND WINE: A REVIEW," based on surveys from Spain, Moldova, Romania, and Sweden.[1]

Analysis of this table provides a crucial insight. While the *averages* are consistently low, the *maximums detected* in individual cases (e.g., 303 mg/L in a dry white wine from Moldova, or 422 mg/L in a Romanian rosé wine) [1] sometimes approach or even exceed the standard limits (often falling under exceptions for climatic conditions). This justifies *why* the high legal limits exist: they do not act as a production target, but as a safety check for outliers and difficult oenological vintages (e.g., grapes with rot) that require higher doses to be stabilized.

3.2. Comparative Study: Organic vs. Conventional Wines

The "organic wine" category is a primary source of consumer confusion regarding sulfites, as regulations on their use differ dramatically between major producing regions.

Regulatory Fragmentation:

- **United States:** The "USDA Organic" label is the strictest in the world. It categorically prohibits the *addition* of SO2 at any stage. To bear this seal, a wine can only contain naturally occurring sulfites (a yeast byproduct) and must have a total SO2 below the 10 ppm labeling threshold.[40] However, a second label, "Made with Organic Grapes," *does* permit the addition of sulfites (generally up to 100 mg/L).[43]
- **European Union:** The EU "Organic Wine" label *allows* the addition of SO2. However, it sets maximum limits that are lower than their conventional counterparts.[43] For example, the limit for organic red wines is typically 100 mg/L, compared to 150 mg/L for conventional ones.[39]

Actual Levels: Do They Really Have Fewer Sulfites?
The question of whether organic wines contain fewer sulfites in practice has been the subject of recent scientific studies (2024-2025) with mixed results.

- A meta-analysis of studies (2024) concluded that, while organic wines have significantly lower levels of pesticide residues, the difference in sulfite levels is "less pronounced" or "not always statistically significant".[27]
- However, a separate study, also from 2024 [48], comparing wines from the Canary Islands, found that organic wines were "lower in sulfites than their conventional counterparts (average of 55.62 mg/L vs. 76.52 mg/L)". The study attributed this directly to the stricter organic winemaking regulations.[48]

The implication for the market is confusion. The "organic" label is not a universal guarantee of "low sulfites," especially for a US consumer buying an EU organic wine (which can legally contain up to 100 mg/L or more). The global organic wine market is experiencing robust growth, with a projected Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of 11.5%.[19] This regulatory and labeling confusion remains a key obstacle to consumer transparency.

3.3. The "No Sulfites Added" (NSA) Niche and Natural Wines

Driven by consumer demand for transparency and "clean" products [50], a niche market has grown for "No Sulfites Added" (NSA) wines, often encompassed by the broader category of "natural wine".[52]

It is fundamental to establish that no wine is 100% "sulfite-free".[53] The yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* naturally produces sulfur dioxide as a byproduct of its metabolism during alcoholic fermentation. These naturally occurring levels typically range from 10 to 20 mg/L.[1] Therefore, the only legally and scientifically accurate label is "No Sulfites Added" [3], indicating the winemaker has not added exogenous SO2. Wines that naturally fall below the 10 ppm threshold can legally omit the "Contains Sulfites" declaration.

The commercial viability of this niche depends on quality control. The 2024 French study [21] on 52 commercial red wines labeled as NSA provides revealing data:

- 43 of the 52 wines (83%) had total SO2 levels below the 10 mg/L labeling threshold, fulfilling the label's promise.
- However, 5 wines (9.6%) had between 10 and 30 mg/L.
- 4 wines (7.7%) had even higher total SO2 levels.

This data demonstrates that, while NSA production below 10 ppm is the norm and is commercially viable, a compliance challenge or a risk of contamination (possibly from previously sulfited barrels) exists in the niche. This segment represents the purest form of winemaking, but, as noted in Part 1 [19], it also carries the highest risk of instability and sensory defects, requiring exceptional oenological skill.[54]

Part 4: Strategic Alternatives and the Search for an SO2 Substitute

4.1. The Challenge: Replacing a Multifunctional Additive

The search for an SO2 alternative is one of the greatest challenges in modern oenology. The difficulty lies not in replacing *one* of its functions, but in replacing *both* (antioxidant and antimicrobial) with a single additive that is equally effective, low-cost, easy to use, legally approved, and sensorially neutral.[2]

The reality is that no single substitute exists. Therefore, the industry's strategy has shifted from "replacement" to "reduction," employing a "hurdle approach" (or "hurdle technology"). This involves combining multiple techniques (physical, biological, and chemical) where each provides a layer of protection, collectively reducing the need for SO2.

4.2. Chemical and Biological Alternatives: Potential and Limitations

A 2025 review on SO2 substitutes and other recent studies [56] have evaluated a suite of chemical and biological alternatives, most of which only address one of the two key functions.

- **Lysozyme:** This enzyme (often derived from egg white, which poses allergen concerns) is highly effective as an *antimicrobial* agent, specifically against lactic acid bacteria (preventing unwanted malolactic fermentation). However, it has no *antioxidant* effect. Its use is limited, and its cost is relatively high.
- **Chitosan:** A biopolymer (derived from fungi or crustaceans) approved by the OIV. It has potent *antimicrobial* action, especially against the spoilage yeast *Brettanomyces*.[57] Its antioxidant capacity is limited or non-existent.[14]
- **Glutathione (GSH):** A tripeptide and potent natural *antioxidant* already present in grapes. It is extremely effective at preventing oxidative browning in white wines.[59] However, GSH is highly reactive and is rapidly consumed (it is unstable) if not protected—ironically—by a small amount of SO2. It is also very expensive to produce and add.
- **Dimethyl Dicarbonate (DMDC) (Velcorin):** This is not a substitute, but an end-point supplement. DMDC is a cold sterilization agent added at the bottling line. It is extremely effective at killing yeasts and bacteria, ensuring *microbiological* stability.[20] However, it hydrolyzes and disappears minutes after addition, offering *no long-term antioxidant protection* in the bottle.

As a 2024 review concludes, these chemical alternatives "suffer from negative problems such as lack of stability and high cost," limiting their widespread adoption as complete replacements.

4.3. Physical Alternatives (Non-Thermal Technologies)

Given that chemical alternatives are imperfect, the industry has turned to non-thermal physical technologies to replace the *antimicrobial* function of SO2, effectively pasteurizing the wine without the use of heat (which would destroy aromas).[15]

A comparative review [15] evaluates the efficacy of the leading technologies:

- **Pulsed Electric Fields (PEF):** This technology applies high-voltage pulses (kV/cm) for microseconds to the wine as it flows through a system. It has been shown to be highly effective at inactivating yeasts (*Brettanomyces*) and bacteria.[15] Its key advantage is that it is a *continuous* and extremely fast (microsecond) process, making it ideal for high-volume, high-throughput wineries. Its primary limitation is the high capital cost and the safety risks associated with high voltage.[15]
- **High Pressure Processing (HPP):** This technology subjects the wine (often already bottled) to extremely high hydrostatic pressures (e.g., 400 MPa). It is also highly effective at inactivating microbes.[15] Its main limitation is that it is a *batch* process, making it significantly slower and less scalable than PEF for large-volume operations.[15]
- **UV-C Irradiation:** The use of ultraviolet light (UV-C) has been proposed as an alternative.[65] However, its effectiveness is variable and highly dependent on the wine's turbidity and color (it is less effective in red wines). There is significant concern that UV-C treatment may alter the wine's polyphenols and negatively affect chemical and sensory properties.[65]
- **Membrane Filtration:** Sterile microfiltration (e.g., 0.45 microns) at bottling is a standard practice for removing yeasts and bacteria. However, it does not replace the need for SO2 as an antioxidant. Studies on more "aggressive" filtrations (e.g., nanofiltration) show that while they can stabilize the wine, they also risk "stripping" the wine of desirable phenolic and aromatic compounds.

Of these, PEF and HPP are the most technically viable technologies for microbial stabilization. Their adoption remains a decision based on capital cost and workflow integration.[15]

4.4. Innovation (2024-2025): Bioprotection and Upcycling

The most promising areas of research are focused on biological and natural solutions that mimic the functionality of SO2.

Bioprotection:
The OIV formally recognized this strategy with the publication of an expert document in March 2024, "USE OF BIOPROTECTION STRAINS IN WINEMAKING".16 Bioprotection is a preventative strategy. Instead of sterilizing the must with SO2, the winemaker inoculates it with a selected strain of non-Saccharomyces yeast (or benign bacteria). These strains "occupy the ecological niche," consuming nutrients and space, which prevents spoilage microorganisms (like

Acetobacter or Brettanomyces) from establishing themselves. This reduces the need for SO2 in the early stages. However, sensory studies have shown that, while effective, wines produced with bioprotection without SO2 can have distinguishable sensory profiles, indicating they are not a sensorially identical substitute.
Byproduct Upcycling (Bioma Innovation):
The most disruptive innovation of 2024-2025 comes from the valorization (upcycling) of winemaking byproducts. Studies published in 2024 and 2025 3 have analyzed a new technology from the company Bioma. This technology extracts and stabilizes polyphenol extracts (including anthocyanins, flavanols, and phenolic acids) from grape pomace 17, a winery waste product.
This approach is potentially transformative because, for the first time, it offers a natural substitute that replicates the *dual function* of SO2: the polyphenols provide both potent *antioxidant* capacity and *antimicrobial* properties.[17] This approach solves multiple problems simultaneously:

1. It offers a "clean," natural substitute for SO2.
2. The additive is sourced from the grape itself, aligning with "minimal intervention" philosophies.
3. It valorizes a waste stream (pomace), creating a value-added product and supporting a circular economy in the winery.[17]

Initial studies claim these polyphenol additives can maintain organoleptic and microbiological quality while achieving drastic SO2 reductions (e.g., cutting levels in half) or even producing stable wines below the 10 mg/L labeling threshold.[3]

Table 3: Evaluation Matrix for SO2 Alternatives (2025)

Alternative	Primary Function	Key Advantages	Limitations (Cost, Stability, Sensory Impact)
SO2 (Baseline)	Both (Antimicrobial & Antioxidant)	Low cost, highly effective, easy to use, decades of data [2]	Health concerns (allergy, EFSA), consumer perception [12]
Chitosan	Antimicrobial	Effective against *Brettanomyces*,	No antioxidant effect. Moderate

		natural derivative (fungi) [14]	cost. [58]
Lysozyme	Antimicrobial	Effective against lactic acid bacteria [14]	No antioxidant effect. High cost. Allergen (egg) [56]
Glutathione (GSH)	Antioxidant	Very potent against browning in whites [59]	No antimicrobial effect. Very unstable. Very high cost
DMDC (Velcorin)	Antimicrobial (Sterilant)	Complete sterilization at bottling	No long-term protection (antioxidant). Toxic before hydrolysis.
PEF	Antimicrobial (Sterilant)	Continuous process, fast, high throughput [15]	High capital cost. Requires high-voltage safety management [15]
HPP	Antimicrobial (Sterilant)	Highly effective, can treat in-bottle [15]	Batch process (slow, less scalable). High capital cost [15]
Bioprotection	Antimicrobial (Preventative)	Natural, "clean label," preventative approach [16]	Requires high hygiene. May alter sensory profile
Polyphenol Extracts (Upcycling)	Both (Antimicrobial & Antioxidant)	Natural (from grape), sustainable (upcycling), dual-function [17]	Emerging tech (2024-2025). Cost & scalability still under eval.

Part 5: Health Impact and Consumer Safety (2023-2025 Analysis)

The debate over sulfites and health is complex, clouded by ingrained myths yet defined by real, scientifically validated risks. The most recent analysis (2023-2025) has been pivotal in separating myths from real threats, redefining the consumer safety landscape.

5.1. The Global Safety Standard: JECFA/WHO and the Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI)

The global safety standard for food additives is set by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). The Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) for sulfites was established at **0-0.7 milligrams per kilogram of body weight** (mg/kg bw).[32] This ADI represents the amount of sulfites that can be ingested daily over a lifetime without appreciable health risk, based on the toxicological evidence available at the time of evaluation.[77]

However, JECFA's own report identified a specific point of concern: wine. Although the average sulfite intake for the majority of the population in most countries was below the ADI, the committee explicitly noted that "dietary exposure in high regular consumers of wine (97.5th percentile) was shown to **exceed the ADI**".[61] This conclusion was based on wine consumption at average analytical concentrations (around 100 mg/L) or at maximum permitted levels.[74]

5.2. The EFSA Re-evaluation (2022-2025): The Margin of Exposure and Neurotoxicity

The most critical and recent development in sulfite safety regulation comes from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). In its re-evaluation of sulfites (E220-E228) [78], the EFSA panel reached an alarming conclusion.

Due to a "lack of data" and "gaps in toxicity" [12], the EFSA panel determined it could not confirm the safety of the existing ADI (0.7 mg/kg bw). In the absence of sufficient industry data to establish a clear No-Observed-Adverse-Effect Level (NOAEL), EFSA applied a stricter, more precautionary approach: the **Margin of Exposure (MOE)**.[50]

The MOE is the ratio between the lowest dose at which an adverse effect is observed in animal studies and the level of human exposure.[12] For sulfites, EFSA determined that an **MOE**

below 80 indicates a safety concern.[12]

EFSA's key findings were [12]:

1. The calculated MOEs were **below 80** for *high consumers* in all population groups (except adolescents).[85]
2. The intake of these high consumers potentially exceeds what is considered safe. Specifically, adults (high consumers) exceed the safe level by up to **60%**, and children (3-10 years) exceed it by up to **12.5%**.[12]

Most worryingly about EFSA's assessment was not just the exposure, but the nature of the risk. The panel found "evidence of **adverse effects on the central nervous system**," describing a "delayed response of nerve cells to stimuli," an early sign of nervous system dysfunction.[12]

This fundamentally changes the game. The primary risk identified by EFSA is not allergy (a known but rare risk), but a general toxicological risk (neurotoxicity) that could affect a much larger portion of the population: "high consumers".[10] The industry's "lack of data" [33] to refute these findings has placed regulators in a default precautionary position.

5.3. Real Hypersensitivity: Asthma and Dermatitis (Allergen of the Year 2024)

It is critical to separate the general toxicological risk (EFSA) from hypersensitivity (allergy), which is a real but distinct risk.[87] Sulfites *are* a real and potent allergen for a specific subset of the population.

Affected Population: Sulfite sensitivity is extremely rare in the general population (estimated at ~1%).[88] However, it occurs far more frequently in asthmatic adults, affecting 5-10% of this subgroup.[9]

Real Symptoms: The symptoms of sulfite hypersensitivity are *not* headaches. The clinical manifestations are well-documented and include :

- **Respiratory (most common):** Bronchoconstriction, wheezing, and acute asthma attacks, often triggered by inhaling the gaseous SO2 released from the wine in the stomach or directly in the glass.
- **Dermatological:** Urticaria (hives), angioedema (swelling), and contact dermatitis.
- **Gastrointestinal:** Abdominal pain, diarrhea.[9]

2024 Validation: In recognition of the severity of these reactions and the fact that they are often undiagnosed (as sulfites are not on standard allergy test panels), the **American Contact Dermatitis Society (ACDS) named sulfites the "Allergen of the Year 2024"**.[11] This designation aims to raise awareness among dermatologists to consider sulfites (in food, drugs, and cosmetics) as a source of allergic dermatitis.

The 10 ppm labeling threshold, applied universally [31], was designed and is maintained *specifically* to protect this asthmatic and sensitive population.

5.4. The "Wine Headache" Myth: The Quercetin Hypothesis (2023-2024)

Despite the real risk being asthma, the most common consumer complaint about sulfites is, by far, the headache. However, current science (2024-2025) considers this connection a myth, based on three lines of contradictory evidence:

1. **Dose Contradiction:** Other foods, such as dried fruits (e.g., dried apricots), contain drastically higher levels of sulfites (up to 1000-2000 mg/L) than wine, but are not commonly associated with headaches.
2. **Color Contradiction:** White wines and sweet wines *generally* have higher levels of added SO2 than red wines, as they lack the antioxidant protection of tannins.
3. **The Red Wine Paradox:** Despite having fewer sulfites, the phenomenon predominantly reported by consumers is the "Red Wine Headache" (RWH).

This paradox has puzzled scientists for decades. Now, a landmark study from the University of California, Davis, published in late 2023 , has proposed a compelling mechanism that finally explains RWH—and it does not involve sulfites.

The Quercetin Hypothesis:
The study 8 postulates that the culprit is a natural grape flavanol called Quercetin.
The Mechanism of Action (proposed by UC Davis):

1. **Ingestion:** Red wine has much higher levels of quercetin than white because it is extracted from the grape skins during red fermentation.
2. **Metabolism:** When a person drinks red wine, their body metabolizes the quercetin into a different form, called "quercetin glucuronide".[8]
3. **Enzyme Inhibition:** This molecule, quercetin glucuronide, is a potent inhibitor of a key liver enzyme: **Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 2 (ALDH2)**.[8]
4. **Toxic Accumulation:** ALDH2 is the vital enzyme the body uses to break down and eliminate **acetaldehyde**, a highly toxic, irritating, and inflammatory byproduct of alcohol (ethanol) metabolism.[8]
5. **Result:** By blocking ALDH2, the quercetin in red wine causes a rapid accumulation of

acetaldehyde in the bloodstream. This buildup of toxins is what causes the classic symptoms of facial flushing, nausea, and, critically, a rapid and intense **headache**.[8]

This finding is a milestone. It shifts the blame from an additive (sulfites) to a natural grape compound (quercetin) interacting with alcohol. It perfectly explains why *red* wine is the primary problem, why only some people are susceptible (people have different levels of ALDH2 enzyme efficiency, similar to the "Asian flush"), and why sulfites were always an illogical scapegoat.

Table 4: Summary of Health Impacts (Myth vs. Reality) (2025)

Health Issue	Probable Culprit (Compound)	Mechanism	Affected Population	Level of Evidence (2025)
Headache	**Quercetin** + Alcohol (Ethanol)	Blockage of ALDH2 enzyme; accumulation of toxic acetaldehyde [8]	General (susceptible)	Strong (UC Davis Hypothesis 2023)
Asthma Attack / Wheezing	**Sulfites (SO2)**	Hypersensitivity (inhalation/ingestion) [9]	Specific (5-10% of asthmatics) [10]	Definitive (JECFA, EFSA)
Dermatitis / Hives	**Sulfites (SO2)**	Contact / systemic allergy [11]	Specific (sensitive)	Definitive (ACDS Allergen 2024) [11]
Chronic Risk (Neurotoxicity)	**Sulfites (SO2)**	Accumulated exposure (MOE < 80) [12]	High Consumers	Emerging (EFSA Concern 2022) [12]

Source: Compiled from.[8]

5.5. New Research Horizons: Impact on Gut Microbiota (2025 Study)

The newest research is beginning to explore a new avenue of health impact: how sulfites affect the gut microbiome.[82]

A pioneering *in vitro* study published in the *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* in 2025 investigated the digestion of wines (red and synthetic) with and without a dose of SO2 (200 mg/L) using an advanced gastrointestinal simulation model (simgi).[97]

The findings revealed a complex interaction [97]:

- **Negative Impact:** SO2-treated wines "slightly" modified the gut microbiota composition. They caused a **decrease** in beneficial bacteria (like *Bacteroides* and *Ruminococcus*).
- **Pro-inflammatory Impact:** Simultaneously, SO2 led to an **increase** in potentially pro-inflammatory bacteria (like *Escherichia/Shigella*).

However, the study also found two crucial nuances:

1. **Protective Role of Polyphenols:** This negative effect was "partially mitigated" in the real red wine test, suggesting a **protective role of wine polyphenols** (like quercetin) against the effects of SO2 in the gut.[97]
2. **Increased Bioavailability:** Paradoxically, the SO2 treatment also *enhanced* the metabolism of phenols in the gut, increasing the bioavailability of other beneficial low-molecular-weight phenolic compounds.[97]

This is an incipient but critical area of research.[70] It demonstrates a complex "three-way" interaction (sulfites, polyphenols, and microbiota). The negative impact of SO2 on the microbiota could be another driver for reduction, but the protective role of wine polyphenols (which SO2 itself helps preserve in the bottle) vastly complicates the narrative.

Part 6: Conclusions and Strategic Outlook for 2026

This report has analyzed the status of sulfur dioxide (SO2) in the 2025 wine sector, integrating market data, regulatory frameworks, oenological science, and the latest public health assessments. The strategic conclusions for the industry moving into 2026 are as follows:

1. The Verdict on SO2: Indispensable, but in Transition

SO_2 remains, in 2025, the most effective, versatile, and economically viable oenological additive available.2 Industry practice is largely responsible; market analyses show average use levels (60-130 mg/L) are far below maximum legal limits.1 This indicates careful management and a wide margin of safety in standard production.

2. The Consumer Tension: Solving the Myth, Respecting the Reality

The industry faces a critical communication challenge. The "headache myth" is the primary consumer perception barrier. The industry now has the scientific ammunition to combat this.

- **Action Required:** A proactive communication strategy must be developed and implemented to educate consumers, sommeliers, and the media about the UC Davis **quercetin hypothesis**.[8] The narrative must shift from "sulfites cause headaches" (false) to "a natural compound in red wine, quercetin, can block alcohol metabolism and cause headaches in sensitive people" (emerging science).
- **Action Required:** Simultaneously, the industry must show respect and validation for the *real* risk of hypersensitivity (asthma, dermatitis).[9] The designation of sulfites as the "2024 Allergen of the Year" [11] should be seen as a justification for the 10 ppm labeling practices, not as a threat.

3. The Regulatory Tension: The Imminent Threat from EFSA

The most significant and existential threat to the current use of SO_2 comes not from consumers, but from regulators. The EFSA re-evaluation (2022-2024) 12 is a paradigm shift.

- **The Key Risk:** The identification of a **neurotoxicity** risk and the conclusion that "high consumers" (a significant group) are already **exceeding the safe Margin of Exposure (MOE)** [12] is a regulatory red flag of the highest order.
- **The Industry Failure:** EFSA's position was prompted by a "lack of data".[33] This failure by the industry to provide modern toxicological data to defend the existing ADI is an untenable strategic position.
- **Action Required:** Urgent and unified investment is required from the global wine industry to fund the toxicological studies (per modern OECD guidelines) that EFSA requested.[72] Without this data, the industry risks regulators (starting with the EU) drastically lowering the maximum legal SO_2 limits in the coming years, based on the precautionary principle.

4. The Path Forward: From Reduction to (Strategic) Elimination

The combined pressure of consumer "clean label" demand 50 and the EFSA regulatory risk 12 makes investment in alternatives a strategic necessity, not a niche marketing exercise.

- **The Future is the "Hurdle Approach":** The industry must aggressively adopt a combined approach. The future of low-SO_2 winemaking involves (1) **Bioprotection** [16] in the vineyard and must; (2) **Physical technologies** (like PEF) [15] for pre-bottling microbial stabilization; and (3) implementation of new **dual-function alternatives** (like "upcycled" polyphenol extracts) [17] for in-bottle antioxidant protection.
- **The Strategic Goal:** The medium-term goal for most mass-market wines should no longer be to simply "reduce" SO_2, but to achieve the strategic objective of producing

stable, high-quality wines with total SO2 levels *below the 10 ppm labeling threshold*. Achieving this removes the allergen declaration from the label, satisfies consumer demand, and, most importantly, completely mitigates the exposure risk identified by EFSA.

Part 7: References and Sources

The following scientific, technical, and governmental sources were used in the preparation of this report (November 6, 2025).

1

Sources

1. SO2 AND WINE: A REVIEW - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/public/medias/7840/oiv-collective-expertise-document-so2-and-wine-a-review.pdf
2. Replacement of Sulfur Dioxide in White, Rosé, and Red Wines by a Blend of Tannins Extracted from Multiple Plant Materials - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2306-5710/10/4/110
3. Towards Sulphite-Free Winemaking: A New Horizon of Vinification and Maturation - NIH, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11012185/
4. Annex C - Maximum Acceptable Limits of Various Substances | OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/standards/compendium-of-international-methods-of-wine-and-must-analysis/annex-c/annex-c-maximum-acceptable-limits-of-various-substances
5. Maximum acceptable limits - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/standards/international-code-of-oenological-practices/annexes/maximum-acceptable-limits
6. (PDF) Wine and Headache - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262109668_Wine_and_Headache
7. Why Does Wine Give You a Headache? - Food & Wine, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.foodandwine.com/wine/red-wine/why-does-wine-give-you-headache
8. Why Does Red Wine Give Me A Headache | UC Davis, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.ucdavis.edu/health/news/why-do-some-people-get-headaches-drinking-red-wine
9. Sulfite sensitivity: significance in human health - PubMed, fecha de acceso:

noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8586770/
10. Sulphur dioxide and sulphites: EFSA re-evaluation identifies health risks at high consumption; data situation still incomplete, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.bfr.bund.de/cm/349/sulphur-dioxide-and-sulphites-efsa-re-evaluation-identifies-health-risks-at-high-consumption-data-situation-still-incomplete.pdf
11. Sulfites: The 2024 American Contact Dermatitis Society Allergen of ..., fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdedge.com/cutis/article/271496/contact-dermatitis/sulfites-2024-american-contact-dermatitis-society-allergen
12. Sulfites: safety concern for high consumers, but data lacking | EFSA, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/news/sulfites-safety-concern-high-consumers-data-lacking
13. Review of practices for the reduction of so2 doses used in winemaking - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/standards/review-of-practices-for-the-reduction-of-so2-doses-used-in-winemaking-
14. Research progress of sulfur dioxide addition substitutes and new non-thermal sterilization technology in wine production, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://manu61.magtech.com.cn/zgnz/EN/10.11882/j.issn.0254-5071.2025.04.003
15. Emerging Non-Thermal Technologies as Alternative to SO2 for the ..., fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8469166/
16. USE OF BIOPROTECTION STRAINS IN WINEMAKING - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/2024-04/OIV_Expertise_Document_USE_OF_BIOPROTECTION_STRAINS_IN_WINEMAKING.pdf
17. Upcycling vineyard by-products as natural sulphite alternatives ..., fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.foodtimes.eu/research/wine-innovation-upcycling-sulfite-alternatives-bioma/
18. Total Sulfur dioxide (titrimetry) (Type-II) | OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/standards/annex-a-methods-of-analysis-of-wines-and-musts/section-3-chemical-analysis/section-3-2-non-organic-compounds/section-3-2-3-other-non-organic-compounds/total-sulfur-dioxide-%28titrimetry%29-%28type-ii%29
19. Sulfite Management during Vinification and Impact on the Flavor of Solaris Wine - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2311-5637/10/4/210
20. Impact of Sulfur Dioxide and Dimethyl Dicarbonate Treatment on the Quality of White Wines: A Scientific Evaluation - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2311-5637/11/2/86
21. Sensory characterisation of Bordeaux red wines produced without added sulfites - OENO One, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025,

https://oeno-one.eu/article/view/3794/13452
22. Reducing Post-Fermentation (SO2) Additions in Quality Wine: Exploring Options & Implications - Sommeliers Choice Awards, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://sommelierschoiceawards.com/en/blog/insights-1/reducing-post-fermentation-so2-additions-in-quality-wine-exploring-options-implications-789.htm
23. Sensory characterisation of wines without added sulfites via specific and adapted sensory profile | OENO One, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://oeno-one.eu/article/view/3566
24. European Union Wine Overseas Market Access Requirements 2025 - Ministry for Primary Industries, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/34896-Wine-Notice-European-Union-Wine-OMAR
25. INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ŒNOLOGICAL PRACTICES - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/publication/2025-04/CPO%202025%20EN.pdf
26. COMPENDIUM OF INTERNATIONAL METHODS OF WINE AND MUST ANALYSIS - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/publication/2024-06/Compendium%20MA%20Wines%202024%20EN%20complet_0.pdf
27. What Are Sulfites in Wine? Everything You Need to Know - Coravin, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.coravin.com/blogs/community/what-are-sulfites-in-wine
28. Wine - European Commission - Agriculture and rural development, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/farming/crop-productions-and-plant-based-products/wine_en
29. State of the World Vine and Wine Sector in 2024 - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/2025-04/OIV-State_of_the_World_Vine-and-Wine-Sector-in-2024.pdf
30. C_202502240ES.000101.fmx.xml - EUR-Lex, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/ES/TXT/HTML/?uri=OJ:C_202502240
31. What are sulphites in wine and are they bad for you? - FoodSafety4EU, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://foodsafetyplatform.eu/knowledge/articles/what-are-sulphites-in-wine-and-are-they-bad-for-you/
32. The new rules on wine labeling entering into force | Agrovin, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://agrovin.com/en/the-new-rules-on-wine-labeling-entering-into-force/
33. Follow-up of the re-evaluation of sulfur dioxide (E 220), sodium sulfite (E 221), sodium bisulfite (E 222), sodium metabisulfite (E 223), potassium metabisulfite (E 224), calcium sulfite (E 226), calcium bisulfite (E 227) and potassium bisulfite (E 228 - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/plain-language-summary/follow-re-evaluation-sul

fur-dioxide-e-220-sodium-sulfite-e-221-sodium
34. Wine Labeling: Declaration of Sulfites | TTB: Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.ttb.gov/regulated-commodities/beverage-alcohol/wine/wine-labeling-declaration-of-sulfites
35. Wine Labeling: Declaration of Sulfites | TTB: Alcohol and Tobacco ..., fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.ttb.gov/regulated-commodities/beverage-alcohol/wine/labeling-wine/wine-labeling-declaration-of-sulfites
36. Sulfites - USA | Food Allergy Research & Resource Program | Nebraska - FARRP, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://farrp.unl.edu/farrp-resources/regulatory/sulfites-usa/
37. Alternativas al anhídrido sulfuroso en la elaboración de vinos: antioxidantes de naturaleza fenólica procedentes de subproductos de la industria oleícola y enológica | Documentos - Universidad Pública de Navarra, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://observatorio-investigacion.unavarra.es/documentos/5f7e676d2999520bf971ffb0
38. Sulphites - Food Standards Australia New Zealand, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/consumer/additives/sulphite
39. Sulphites in Wine: Everything You Need to Know - Vintage Roots, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://vintageroots.co.uk/wine-guides/sulphites-in-wine/
40. Blind Tasting Challenge: Organic vs. Conventional Wines - SYLTBAR.com, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://syltbar.com/blogs/wine/blind-tasting-challenge-organic-vs-conventional-wines
41. International OIV Standard for Labelling of Wines: Indication for sulphites, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/node/3672
42. 27 CFR Part 4 -- Labeling and Advertising of Wine - eCFR, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-27/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-4
43. Organic Wine Market Size, Share, Industry Report 2024-2031 - DataM Intelligence, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.datamintelligence.com/research-report/organic-wine-market
44. Do organic wines contain lower levels of pesticides and sulfites compared to conventional wines? - Consensus, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://consensus.app/search/do-organic-wines-contain-lower-levels-of-pesticide/_VSgIX_VRzWRfUDZnr7J0w/
45. Do organic wines contain lower levels of pesticides and sulfites compared to conventional wines? - Consensus, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://consensus.app/search/do-organic-wines-contain-lower-levels-of-pesticide/p9zYQvuBQqeat8X5Cz0ZIg/
46. Summary - Food Standards Australia New Zealand, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025,

https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/sites/default/files/food-standards-code/applications/Documents/A1127-ExecSummary.pdf
47. Towards Sulphite-Free Winemaking: A New Horizon of Vinification and Maturation - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2304-8158/13/7/1108
48. PLEASE REFER TO ANZFA'S GUIDE TO APPLICATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR A MORE DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE PROCESS ON HOW TO UNDERTAKE - Food Standards Australia New Zealand, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/sites/default/files/food-standards-code/applications/Documents/A474%20Winemaking%20FAR.doc
49. Differences in the levels of pesticides, metals, sulphites and ochratoxin A between organically and conventionally produced wines | Request PDF - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320773498_Differences_in_the_levels_of_pesticides_metals_sulphites_and_ochratoxin_A_between_organically_and_conventionally_produced_wines
50. Organic Wine Trends Are On The Rise In 2025 - Tastewise, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://tastewise.io/blog/organic-wine-trends
51. Alcohol and migraine: trigger factor, consumption, mechanisms. A review - PubMed, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18231712/
52. Descubre qué vinos contienen más sulfitos - VINATIS, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.vinatis.es/blog-todos-los-vinos-contienen-sulfitos
53. Low-Sulfite Wines: Facts and Myths - La Mesa Vineyards, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://lamesavineyards.com/blogs/news/low-sulfite-wine-facts-and-myths
54. 2024 EFSA Annual Report Emerging Risks and Horizon Scanning Activities, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/en-9475
55. DECREASING MOLECULAR SO2 ELIMINATED SULFUROUS OFF-AROMAS IN WINE STORED IN ALUMINUM BEVERAGE CANS - Cornell eCommons, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://ecommons.cornell.edu/bitstreams/5cc8dc51-792f-4ed3-866b-5d9dbb260824/download
56. Effect of Yeast Polysaccharides Replacing Sulfur Dioxide on ... - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2304-8158/14/18/3188
57. (PDF) Alternatives for replacing or reducing the content of added sulfites in Tannat red wines elaborated with commercial yeasts or with minimal intervention - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391144955_Alternatives_for_replacing_or_reducing_the_content_of_added_sulfites_in_Tannat_red_wines_elaborated_with_commercial_yeasts_or_with_minimal_intervention
58. Re-evaluation - European Commission's Food Safety, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025,

https://food.ec.europa.eu/food-safety/food-improvement-agents/additives/re-evaluation_en
59. Alternativas al sulfuroso en la elaboración de vinos rosados, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://federacionenologia.com/eno-23029/
60. Wine market observatory - Agriculture and rural development - European Commission, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/data-and-analysis/markets/overviews/market-observatories/wine_en
61. Chemical and physical methodologies for the replacement/reduction of sulfur dioxide use during winemaking: Review of their potentialities and limitations - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225090565_Chemical_and_physical_methodologies_for_the_replacementreduction_of_sulfur_dioxide_use_during_winemaking_Review_of_their_potentialities_and_limitations
62. Wine FAQs | TTB - Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.ttb.gov/regulated-commodities/beverage-alcohol/wine/wine-faqs
63. Free sulphur dioxide trend during winemaking (24 September 2022–4... - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Free-sulphur-dioxide-trend-during-winemaking-24-September-2022-4-December-2022-and_fig1_379582535
64. Reducing SO 2 content in wine by combining High Pressure and glutathione addition, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://oeno-one.eu/article/view/4558
65. UV-C and Nanomaterial-Based Approaches for Sulfite-Free Wine Preservation: Effects on Polyphenol Profile and Microbiological Quality - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/1420-3049/30/2/221
66. Sulfite Allergy - News-Medical, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.news-medical.net/health/Sulfite-Allergy.aspx
67. Impact of pre-fermentation SO2 addition on microbial, chemical, and sensory characteristics of Viognier (2024) | Winemakers Research Exchange, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://winemakersresearchexchange.com/library/fermentation/impact-of-pre-fermentation-so2-addition-on-microbial-chemical-and-sensory-characteristics-of-viognier-2024
68. Replacement of SO2 with an Unripe Grape Extract and Chitosan during Oak Aging: Case Study of a Sangiovese Wine - PMC - NIH, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9952752/
69. Wine and Juice Treating Materials and Processes for Domestic Wine Production - TTB, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.ttb.gov/regulated-commodities/beverage-alcohol/wine/treating-materials
70. May Sulfites in Wine Affect Gut Microbiota? An In Vitro Study of Their Digestion and Interplay with Wine Polyphenols | Request PDF - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393953159_May_Sulfites_in_Wine_Affect_Gut_Microbiota_An_In_Vitro_Study_of_Their_Digestion_and_Interplay_with_Wine_Polyphenols
71. Compositional Consequences of Ultrafiltration Treatment of White and Red Wines - PMC, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11202439/
72. Follow-up of the re-evaluation of sulfur dioxide (E 220), sodium sulfite (E 221), sodium bisulfite (E 222), sodium metabisulfite (E 223), potassium metabisulfite (E 224), calcium sulfite (E 226), calcium bisulfite (E 227) and potassium bisulfite (E 228 - PubMed Central, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9685353/
73. REPORT Analysis of the Wine Market in the United States: Situation in 2024, Evolution, and Future Prospects - Vinetur, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.vinetur.com/documentos/article/86901/US%20Wine%20Market%202024.pdf
74. sulfites - WHO | JECFA, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://apps.who.int/food-additives-contaminants-jecfa-database/chemical.aspx?chemID=289
75. 951. Sulfites (WHO Food Additives Series 42) - Inchem.org, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.inchem.org/documents/jecfa/jecmono/v042je25.htm
76. Sulfite concentration and the occurrence of headache in young adults: a prospective study, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30962515/
77. Reports - Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-expert-committee-on-food-additives-(jecfa)/publications/reports
78. Comparison of the evaluations performed on sulfur dioxide-sulfites (E220-228) as food ... - EFSA, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2022-12/so2-joint-echa-efsa-document-19-12-2022.pdf
79. May Sulfites in Wine Affect Gut Microbiota? An In Vitro Study of Their Digestion and Interplay with Wine Polyphenols - PubMed, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40698647/
80. ¿Quieres producir vino con baja o ninguna adición de SO2? - Enartis, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.enartis.com/es/quieres-producir-vino-con-baja-o-ninguna-adicion-de-so2/
81. Margin of Exposure - EFSA - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/margin-exposure
82. Four strange secrets scientists just found in beer and wine | ScienceDaily, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2025/09/250927031219.htm
83. Replacement of sulfur dioxide by lysozyme and oenological tannins during

fermentation: Influence on volatile composition of white wines | Request PDF - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229658710_Replacement_of_sulfur_dioxide_by_lysozyme_and_oenological_tannins_during_fermentation_Influence_on_volatile_composition_of_white_wines
84. Association between wine consumption and migraine: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional - PubMed, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39950360/
85. Food Additives and Flavourings - EFSA - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/science/scientific-committee-and-panels/faf
86. INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ŒNOLOGICAL PRACTICES - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/publication/2024-03/CPO%202024%20EN%20.pdf
87. Considerations for the diagnosis and management of sulphite sensitivity - PMC - NIH, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4017445/
88. Sulfite hypersensitivity – retrospective study in a Food Allergy Unit - PMC - PubMed Central, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4412520/
89. ¿Qué es el vino sin sulfitos? Beneficios y diferencias - Lavinia, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.lavinia.com/es-es/blog/vino-sin-sulfitos-todo-sobre-ellos/
90. World Wine Production Outlook - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/documents/OIV_2024_World_Wine_Production_Outlook_1.pdf
91. Sulfites: Allergen of the Year 2024 - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373193739_Sulfites_Allergen_of_the_Year_2024
92. Effects of Berry, Cluster Thinning and No-Sulfites Addition on the Sensory Quality of 'Monastrell' Organic Wines - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2311-7524/11/9/1105
93. Follow-up of the re-evaluation of sulfur dioxide (E 220), sodium sulfite (E 221), sodium bisulfite (E 222), sodium metabisulfite (E 223), potassium metabisulfite (E 224), calcium sulfite (E 226), calcium bisulfite (E 227) and potassium bisulfite (E 228 - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/7594
94. The Healthiest Organic Wine Brands We've Found (Updated 2025) - Gimme the Good Stuff, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://gimmethegoodstuff.org/blogs/guides-and-product-reviews/the-healthiest-organic-wine-brands-we-ve-found-updated-2025
95. The Conversation: Why Does Red Wine Cause Headaches? - UC Davis, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025,

https://www.ucdavis.edu/curiosity/blog/conversation-why-does-red-wine-cause-headaches
96. INTERNATIONAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF WINES - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/publication/2025-03/OIV%20Wine%20Labelling%20Standard%20EN_2025%20complet.pdf
97. May Sulfites in Wine Affect Gut Microbiota? An In Vitro Study of Their Digestion and Interplay with Wine Polyphenols - NIH, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12510145/
98. Report of the Second Hong Kong Total Diet Study: Sulphites - Centre for Food Safety, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.cfs.gov.hk/english/programme/programme_firm/files/2nd%20HKTDS_Report_%20Sulphites%20(English)%20(final).pdf
99. LOS SULFITOS DEL VINO - Vinalium, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://vinalium.com/blog/blog-vinalium/los-sulfitos-del-vino/
100. Los datos más destacados del sector del vino en 2024 - Tecnovino, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.tecnovino.com/los-datos-mas-destacados-del-sector-del-vino-en-2024-segun-el-informe-de-oiv-superficie-de-vinedo-consumo-produccion-y-comercio/
101. Food Standards Code Compilation, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/sites/default/files/2025-03/Food%20Standards%20Code%20-%20Compilation%20%28March%202025%29.pdf
102. Know your sulphite limits | Wine Australia, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.wineaustralia.com/news/articles/know-your-sulphite-limits
103. Sulfites in Wine: What They Are and Why They Matter - Napa Valley Wine Academy, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://napavalleywineacademy.com/blogs/pouring-points/sulfites-in-wine
104. Do sulfites in wine cause headaches? - MedicalNewsToday, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/sulfites-in-wine-headache
105. ¿Qué son los sulfitos en el vino? Todo lo que necesitas saber - Coravin, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.coravin.com.es/blogs/community/what-are-sulfites-in-wine-everything-you-need-to-know
106. Alcohol and migraine: trigger factor, consumption, mechanisms. A review - PubMed Central, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3476173/
107. Implementing regulation - EU - 2025/32 - EN - EUR-Lex - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2025/32/oj/eng
108. Publication of a communication of approval of a standard amendment to a product specification for a name in the wine sector, as - EUR-Lex, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C_202502240

109. 27 CFR § 4.50 - Certificates of label approval., fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/27/4.50
110. 27 CFR 4.50 -- Certificates of label approval. - eCFR, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-27/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-4/subpart-F/section-4.50
111. Normativa etiquetado vino 2025: ingredientes, nutricional y QR obligatorio - Isagri, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.isagri.es/blog/normativa-etiquetado-vino
112. Publicación de la comunicación de una modificación normal aprobada del pliego de condiciones de una indicación geográfica c - EUR-Lex, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/ES/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C_202502465
113. Determination of sulphite in wine samples with the aid of three different analytical techniques - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363404894_Determination_of_sulphite_in_wine_samples_with_the_aid_of_three_different_analytical_techniques
114. Sulfitos en el vino: roles y controversias - Château de Berne, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://chateauberne-vin.com/es/blogs/news/les-sulfites-dans-le-vin-roles-et-contreverses
115. Ya es posible determinar la cantidad de sulfitos en vino en un minuto empleando un smartphone, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://federacionenologia.com/smarthphone-sulfitos/
116. STATE OF THE WORLD VINE AND WINE SECTOR IN 2023 - OIV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/2024-04/OIV_STATE_OF_THE_WORLD_VINE_AND_WINE_SECTOR_IN_2023.pdf
117. Total vs free so2 : r/winemaking - Reddit, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/winemaking/comments/pb450k/total_vs_free_so2/
118. The Influence of Sulfur Dioxide Concentration on Antioxidant Activity, Total Polyphenols, Flavonoid Content and Individual Polyphenolic Compounds in White Wines during Storage - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/13/7/1439
119. Total sulphur dioxide trend during winemaking (24 September 2022–4... - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Total-sulphur-dioxide-trend-during-winemaking-24-September-2022-4-December-2022-and_fig2_379582535
120. Sulphites in Wine: The In-Depth Guide - Vinerra, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.vinerra.com/in-depth-guides/sulphites-in-wine-the-in-depth-guide
121. Publications - ASEV, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.asev.org/publications
122. (PDF) Explore the impact of free sulfur dioxide on red and white wine - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382606266_Explore_the_impact_of_free_sulfur_dioxide_on_red_and_white_wine
123. Effect of Yeast Polysaccharides Replacing Sulfur Dioxide on Antioxidant Property and Quality Characteristics of Cabernet Sauvignon Wines - PMC - NIH, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12469342/
124. Fortification of White Wines with Antioxidants and Se: Impacts on Browning Development and Phenolic Content - MDPI, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2306-5710/10/2/31
125. (PDF) Towards Sulphite-Free Winemaking: A New Horizon of Vinification and Maturation, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379582535_Towards_Sulphite-Free_Winemaking_A_New_Horizon_of_Vinification_and_Maturation
126. (PDF) ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF SULFUR DIOXIDE USED IN WINE PRODUCTION, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342444928_ALTERNATIVE_METHODS_OF_SULFUR_DIOXIDE_USED_IN_WINE_PRODUCTION
127. Adverse reactions to the sulphite additives - PMC - NIH, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4017440/
128. Review of sulfite sensitivity - PubMed, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3904432/
129. A suggested mechanism of action for sulfite sensitivity - PubMed, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3944370/
130. Sulfites: Allergen of the Year 2024. - Semantic Scholar, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Sulfites%3A-Allergen-of-the-Year-2024.-Ekstein-Warshaw/43f6671898926108067b67e827cc2971fff67a6a
131. Association between wine consumption and migraine: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional - PubMed Central, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11826089/
132. FoodEx2 maintenance 2024 - EFSA - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/en-9414
133. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.fao.org/food-safety/scientific-advice/jecfa/en/
134. COMPENDIUM OF FOOD ADDITIVE SPECIFICATIONS - FAO Knowledge Repository, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/b566a876-858c-46eb-a6cf-730f87c2f011/content
135. Why Can Drinking Red Wine Cause an Almost Immediate Headache? - Everyday Health, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.everydayhealth.com/headache/does-drinking-red-wine-give-you-a-headache-a-new-study-may-explain-why/
136. The Level of Sulfites in Kosovo Wines - Horizon Research Publishing, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025,

https://www.hrpub.org/download/20250730/FST4-11140930.pdf
137. Rapid Colorimetric Detection of Sulfite in Red Wine Using Alginate-Copper Laccase Nanozyme with Smartphone as an Optical Readout | ACS Measurement Science Au, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsmeasuresciau.4c00085
138. Direct quantification of sulfur dioxide in wine by Surface Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy | Request PDF - ResearchGate, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341223590_Direct_quantification_of_sulfur_dioxide_in_wine_by_Surface_Enhanced_Raman_Spectroscopy
139. RE_El mercado del vino en RU_2024 - ICEX, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.icex.es/content/dam/icex/centros/reino-unido/documentos/2024/estudio-mercado-mercado-vino-reino-unido-2024-resumen-ejecutivo.pdf
140. INFORME Consumo Mundial de Vino en 2024: Adaptación y Evolución en un Mercado en Transformación - Vinetur, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.vinetur.com/documentos/article/88555/Consumo%20Mundial%20de%20Vino%20en%202024.pdf
141. Niveles de SO2 como conservante: revisión de los compuestos ligados a SO2 y papel relevante de la fermentación maloláctica - Acenología, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.acenologia.com/compuestos_so2_fml_cienc1211/
142. Organic Winemaking and Its Subsets; Biodynamic, Natural, and Clean Wine in California, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2304-8158/10/1/127
143. Re-evaluation of sulfur dioxide–sulfites (E 220–228) - EFSA - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/4438
144. More data on sulfites needed to “fully confirm” safety | EFSA - European Union, fecha de acceso: noviembre 6, 2025, https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/160414a