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Abstract: The profile of volatile organic compounds (VOC), the composition of the essential oils (EOs) and the micromorphology of the leaf trichomes were investigated in two rosemary hybrids, Salvia × mendizabalii (Sagredo ex Rosúa) Roma-Marzio & Galasso (S×m) and Salvia × lavandulacea (de Noé) Roma-Marzio & Galasso (S×l). The phytochemical analysis highlighted the dominance of monoterpene hydrocarbons in both aroma profiles (65.8% in S×m and 77.9% in S×l, respectively), although they displayed different main compounds except for α-pinene (28.2% in S×m and 24.5% in S×l). In S×m the EOs extracted from both fresh and dried leaves exhibited camphor (29.7% and 25.9%, respectively), α-pinene (21.0% and 18.2%, respectively) and 1,8-cineole (11.1% and 13.6%, respectively) as major compounds. Noteworthy is the occurrence of β-pinene (2.6%) in the EO dried samples, whereas sabinene and limonene were exclusive of the fresh samples. In S×l the EOs from the fresh and dried leaves shared the same main compounds: camphor (24.0% and 27.5%, respectively), myrcene (14.9% and 14.8%, respectively) and α-pinene (13.1% and 12.2%, respectively).

The micro-morphological observations on leaves proved the occurrence of non-glandular dendritic hairs with smooth cuticle in both hybrids. The glandular trichomes include three main morphotypes: peltate, short capitate and medium-long capitate. The peltate and the short capitates are common to both hybrids, however in the peltate the number of the head secreting cells is different, eight in S×m and sixteen in S×l. The medium-long capitate occurs exclusively on the leaf adaxial side of S×m.
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**Highlights**

- Phytochemical and morphological surveys were combined in two Rosemary hybrids.
- The leaf aroma profiles characterized specifically each hybrid.
- The leaf essential oils varied in fresh and dried samples in both hybrids.
- The leaf glandular trichomes resulted useful for the discrimination of the hybrids.
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Abstract

The profile of volatile organic compounds (VOC), the composition of the essential oils (EOs) and the micromorphology of the leaf trichomes were investigated in two rosemary hybrids, \textit{Salvia × mendizabalii} (Sagredo ex Rosúa) Roma-Marzio & Galasso (\textit{S×m}) and \textit{Salvia × lavandulacea} (de Noé) Roma-Marzio & Galasso (\textit{S×l}). The phytochemical analysis highlighted the dominance of monoterpene hydrocarbons in both aroma profiles (65.8\% in \textit{S×m} and 77.9\% in \textit{S×l}, respectively), although they displayed different main compounds except for \textit{α}-pinene (28.2\% in \textit{S×m} and 24.5\% in \textit{S×l}). In \textit{S×m} the EOs extracted from both fresh and dried leaves exhibited camphor (29.7\% and 25.9\%, respectively), \textit{α}-pinene (21.0\% and 18.2\%, respectively) and 1,8-cineole (11.1\% and 13.6\%, respectively) as major components.
compounds. Noteworthy is the occurrence of β-pinene (2.6%) in the EO dried samples, whereas sabinene and limonene were exclusive of the fresh samples. In S×l the EOs from the fresh and dried leaves shared the same main compounds: camphor (24.0% and 27.5%, respectively), myrcene (14.9% and 14.8%, respectively) and α-pinene (13.1% and 12.2%, respectively).

The micro-morphological observations on leaves proved the occurrence of non-glandular dendritic hairs with smooth cuticle in both hybrids. The glandular trichomes include three main morphotypes: peltate, short capitate and medium-long capitate. The peltate and the short capitates are common to both hybrids, however in the peltate the number of the head secreting cells is different, eight in S×m and sixteen in S×l. The medium-long capitate occurs exclusively on the leaf adaxial side of S×m.

Keywords

Salvia × mendizabalii, Salvia × lavandulacea, Rosmarinus, VOCs, essential oil, glandular trichomes.
1. Introduction

Rosmarinus L. (rosemary, Lamiaceae) has been recently included within the genus Salvia L. on the base of the phylogenetic results by Drew et al. (2017). In this updated circumscription, Salvia accounts for almost 1000 species native to Asia, Africa, America and Europe, with the Mediterranean basin being an important centre of diversity (Kasmaei et al., 2019). Salvia uses vary from medicinal, culinary and cosmetic sectors to ornamental purposes and this can explain its worldwide cultivation (de Mesquita et al., 2019).

Within the rosemary complex, three species native to the Mediterranean region are recognized (Bendif et al., 2018): Salvia rosmarinus Schleid (ex Rosmarinus officinalis L), Salvia jordanii J.B.Walker (ex Rosmarinus eryocalix Jord. & Fourr.) and Salvia granatensis B.T.Drew (ex Rosmarinus tomentosus Hub.-Mor. & Maire). Salvia rosmarinus is a perennial evergreen shrub with needle-like leaves and light blue-lilac flowers (Yeddes et al., 2019); it displays a peculiar aroma due to the volatile oil accumulated in typical peltate and capitate glandular trichomes (Marin et al., 2006; Díaz-Maroto et al., 2007). Salvia jordanii is endemic to North Africa (Dobignard and Chatelain, 2010-2013) and Spain (Fadel et al., 2011). Several features distinguish this species from S. rosmarinus, e.g. the prostrate habit, the smaller leaves and the more densely hairy flowers (Fadel et al., 2011; Benbelaïd et al., 2016). Salvia granatensis is endemic to South-Eastern Spain (Málaga and Granada), where it grows along the coasts.

The introgression of the latter two species with S. rosmarinus originate two hybrids (Roma-Marzio and Galasso, 2019): Salvia x lavandulacea (de Noé) Roma-Marzio & Galasso (S. jordanii x S. rosmarinus; ≡ Rosmarinus × lavandulaceus Noé, ≡ R. eriocalyx x R. officinalis) and Salvia x mendizabalii (Sagredo ex Rosúa) Roma-Marzio & Galasso (S. granatensis × S. rosmarinus; ≡ Rosmarinus × mendizabalii Sagredo ex Rosa, ≡ R. officinalis × R. tomentosum). These hybrids display variable morphological characteristics especially with
regards to inflorescences and flowers (in particular, the calyx), and this caused problems in
the recognition from the parental species. Diagnostic traits are represented by the features of
the leaf adaxial surface, defined cano-tomentose in *S. x mendizabalii* and almost hairless in *S.
*x lavandulacea* (Rosuà, 1981).

Among the parental species, *S. rosmarinus* is the most exploited and studied one with an
average number of 120 papers focused on phytochemistry and biological activity per year
since 2010 (Andrade *et al*., 2018). It is cultivated all over the world mainly due to its richness
in essential oils with high commercial value (Borges *et al*., 2019). About *S. jordanii* and *S.
granatensis*, previous phytochemical investigations were focused on the essential oil
composition of Spanish natural populations (Cano and Sánchez, 1993), while the former was
also analysed for both spontaneous volatiles and essential oils from Algerian samples
(Benbelaid *et al*., 2016; Bendif *et al*., 2017). Concerning the hybrids, the literature reports
information on the essential oil composition of plants grown in Spain (Cano and Sánchez,
1993), while a detailed description of the *indumentum* is lacking, apart from general
indications on the occurrence of trichomes on leaves and calyces.

In this framework, the primary objective was to investigate the volatilome (volatile organic
compounds (VOCs) and essential oils (EOs)) obtained from both fresh and dried leaves of *S.
x mendizabalii* (*S×m*) and *S. x lavandulacea* (*S×l*), collected at Centro di Ricerca Orticoltura
e Florovivaismo (CREA-OF, Sanremo Italy) as part of their collection addressed to maintain
and improve plant species for ornamental purposes. In addition, for the first time, we
combined the production of these secondary metabolites to the micromorphology of the leaf
*indumentum*.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Plant material
The plants of *Salvia x menzizabili* and *Salvia x lavandulacea* used in this study were cultivated in Sanremo (Imperia, Italy) at the Consiglio per la Ricerca in Agricoltura e l’Analisi dell’Economia Agraria (CREA). The climate of this site is Mediterranean-type, with mild winters, very light and rare (if any) frosts, hot and sunny summers. The plants were propagated by cutting and potted in 9-liter plastic containers using a peat-based substrate containing about 10% of pumex 7-12 mm (Hochmoor Vulcan invernale, Terflor, Brescia, Italy), added with 4 g/l of a slow release fertilizer (Osmocote Exact Standard 5-6M, 15-9-12+2MgO+ME, ICL Corporate). Plants were grown for one year in open air under uniform experimental conditions, providing water during all growth period by a drip irrigation system. The samplings for the phytochemical and micromorphological investigations were performed simultaneously from 1-year-old, 30 cm tall plants in full blooming in October 2018. For the VOC analysis and the morphological survey, similar leaves for whole size and position were selected from 1-year-old twigs of the same individual. For the EO analysis, both fresh and dried samples were used.

2.2 Phytochemical analysis

2.2.1 VOC analysis and EO extraction

The VOC analysis was carried on at least three fresh leaves cut from the same individual and immediately put in glass vial for 3 min before analysis (equilibration time). The SPME was performed by Supelco SPME devise coated with polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS, 100 μm) following the procedure described by Najar *et al.* (2017). EOs were obtained from plant material collected from at least 5 individuals per hybrid. Fresh and air-dried samples (each 100 g) were used for each hybrid; the air-drying process was carried out at room temperature, in the dark, and in controlled humidity conditions for one
The whole plant material was divided into three equal aliquots that were separately subjected to hydrodistillation for 2h using a Clevenger-type apparatus according to the European Pharmacopeia [EMA, 2015]. The obtained oils were preserved at 4°C until the time of the analysis by GC-MS.

2.2.2 Statistical analyses

The multivariate statistical analyses were carried out on all the detected EO compounds for both hybrids using the Past3 software package. The principal component analysis (PCA) was performed selecting the two highest principal components (PCs) obtained by the linear regressions. The hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) was performed by the Ward’s method. Statistically significant differences among the hybrids related to the aroma profiles and the EO compositions were assessed through the one-way PERMANOVA with Bray-Curtis-based similarity. The contribution of each compound in percentage to the observed dissimilarity was evaluated by means of the Similarity Percentage Analysis (SIMPER, Euclidean distance). The value for the statistical significance was $p < 0.05$. These analyses were performed with Past software (version 3) [Hammer et al., 2001].

2.3. Micromorphological analysis

At least five leaves per hybrid were observed to assess the level of variability of the glandular trichome morphotypes, their distribution pattern and the chemical nature of the secretory products. The observations were carried out by means of scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and light microscopy (LM) through histochemical procedures.

SEM - Small pieces of leaves were fixed in 2.5% glutaraldehyde in 0.1M phosphate buffer at pH 7.2 for 7 days at room temperature. Therefore, they were dehydrated in an ascending
ethanol series up to absolute and dried using a critical point dryer apparatus. The samples, mounted on aluminium stubs and coated with gold, were observed with a Scanning Electron Microscope Gaia 3 (Tescan s.r.o, Brno, Czech Republic) FIB-SEM (Focused Ion Beam- Scanning Electron Microscope) operating at the voltage of 10 kV and in high-vacuum mode with secondary electron (SE) detector.

LM - Fresh material was frozen, cryostat-cut in semi-thin sections (20-25 μm thick) and stained with the following dyes: Fluoral Yellow-088 for total lipids (Brundrett et al., 1991), Nile Red for neutral lipids (Greenspan et al., 1985), Nadi reagent for terpenes (David and Carde, 1964), Ruthenium Red for acid polysaccharides (Jensen, 1962), Alcian Blue for mucopolysaccharides (Beccari and Mazzi, 1966), Ferric Trichloride for polyphenols (Gahan, 1984) and aluminium trichloride for flavonoids (Guerin et al. 1971). Control procedures were contemporarily carried out for all the employed histochemical assays.

Primary fluorescence of the secretory products was also evaluated under UV and Blue lights. Observations were made with a Leitz DM-RB Fluo optic microscope.

3. Results

3.1 Phytochemical analysis

3.1.1 Salvia x mendizabalii

The VOC profile and the EO compositions of S×m are reported in Table 1. A total of 30 different compounds were isolated in the VOC profile accounting for 99.9% of the identified fraction. The spontaneous emission was dominated by monoterpens, both hydrocarbons (65.8%) and oxygenated compounds (33.3%), reaching almost the totality of the identified fraction (99.1%). High percentages of α-pinene (3, 28.2%), camphor (22, 19.8%) and
Camphene (4, 11.5%) were detected, followed by 1,8-cineole (14, 8.4%), limonene (6.1%), sabinene (9) and δ-3-carene (10) in equal amounts (5.2%). The EO analyses evidenced that the dried samples had a more complex profile in comparison to the fresh ones, accounting for a greater number of compounds [38 constituents (99.9%) vs 33 (99.4%), respectively], and for a higher EO yield (1.0% w/w vs 0.4% w/w, respectively). Monoterpenes dominated in both EOs (96.0%) and the major compounds resulted camphor (22, 25.9 vs 29.7), α-pinene (3, 18.2% vs 21.0%), 1,8-cineole (14, 11.1 vs 13.6%) and camphene (4, 8.1% vs 7.0%). Camphor (22) and α-pinene (3) showed a decrease of about 13.0% from fresh to dried samples, while an increase of 22.5% and 15.7% were observed in the other two main compounds, respectively.

In the fresh samples, it was noteworthy the occurrence of four exclusive constituents with sabinene (9, 2.5%) and limonene (13, 3.2%) present in higher percentages, while β-pinene (5, 2.6%) was characteristic of the dried samples, out of nine exclusive compounds in lower amounts.

**Table 1.** *Salvia x mendizabalis*: chemical composition of the leaf spontaneous volatile emission (VOC) and of the essential oil (EO) profiles obtained from fresh and dried leaves as identified by GC-MS analysis (Average of triplicate analyses ± standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound $^4$</th>
<th>Class LRI $^a$</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>Fresh</th>
<th>Dried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 tricyclene</td>
<td>mh 927</td>
<td>0.5±0.20</td>
<td>0.2±0.15</td>
<td>0.3±0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 α-thujene</td>
<td>mh 930</td>
<td>0.6±0.24</td>
<td>0.1±0.12</td>
<td>0.2±0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 α-pinene</td>
<td>mh 939</td>
<td>28.2±1.83</td>
<td>21.0±1.37</td>
<td>18.2±1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 camphene</td>
<td>mh 954</td>
<td>11.5±1.53</td>
<td>7.0±0.59</td>
<td>8.1±0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 β-pinene</td>
<td>mh 979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6±0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 3-octanone</td>
<td>nt 984</td>
<td>0.1±0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1±0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 myrcene</td>
<td>mh 991</td>
<td>1.8±0.39</td>
<td>1.2±0.14</td>
<td>1.1±0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 α-phellandrene</td>
<td>mh 1003</td>
<td>0.6±0.10</td>
<td>0.3±0.07</td>
<td>0.4±0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 sabinene</td>
<td>mh 1007</td>
<td>5.2±0.57</td>
<td>2.5±0.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 δ-3-carene</td>
<td>mh 1011</td>
<td>5.2±0.37</td>
<td>2.8±0.22</td>
<td>2.7±0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 α-terpinene</td>
<td>mh 1017</td>
<td>0.3±0.08</td>
<td>0.5±0.08</td>
<td>0.6±0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only compounds with relative percentages > 0.1% were included in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Retention Index</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p-cymene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>3.3±0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limonene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>6.1±0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,8-cineol</td>
<td>Oxygenated Monoterpenes (om)</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>8.4±2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-terpinene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>0.8±0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cis-sabinene hydrate</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>0.5±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terpinolene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1.7±0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lnalool</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>0.3±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans-sabinene hydrate</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>0.2±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chrysanthenone</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>0.4±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans-pinocarveol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>0.1±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camphor</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>19.8±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pinocarvone</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borneol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1.2±0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terpinene-4-ol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>0.3±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-cymen-8-ol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-terpineol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>0.1±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dihydrocarveol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myrtenol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbenone</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>0.9±0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iso-bornyl acetate</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>1.1±0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-coapene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>0.1±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-caryophyllene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>0.4±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-humulene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>0.1±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-muurolene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valencene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans-γ-cadinene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ-cadinene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>0.1±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caryophyllene oxide</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (os)</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viridiflorol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (os)</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humulene epoxide II</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (os)</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cubenol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (os)</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermedeol</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (os)</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-hydroxy-9-epi-caryophyllene</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (os)</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (os)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yield: 0.4±0.08 1.0±0.02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of identified compounds</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monoterpene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>65.8±1.35</td>
<td>42.1±1.50</td>
<td>38.2±2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygenated Monoterpenes (om)</td>
<td>33.3±1.55</td>
<td>53.8±1.63</td>
<td>57.9±1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquiterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>0.7±0.28</td>
<td>2.0±0.34</td>
<td>1.9±0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygenated Sesquiterpene (os)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5±0.31</td>
<td>1.8±0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-terpene Derivatives</td>
<td>0.1±0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1±0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Identified (%): 99.9±0.10 99.4±0.60 99.9±0.10

* Only compounds with relative percentages > 0.1% were included in the table.

** LRI: linear retention indices relative to n-alkane on the DB5 column

### 3.1.2 Salvia x lavandulacea
The VOC profile and the EO compositions of S×l are reported in Table 2. A total of 29 different compounds accounting for 100.0% of the volatiles were identified in the SPME profile. Monoterpene hydrocarbons (77.9%) were the most represented class followed by the oxygenated monoterpenes (21.2%). Among the hydrocarbons, α-pinene (4, 24.5%), myrcene (9, 13.5%), camphene (5, 9.4%), β-pinene (8, 8.4%) and limonene (13, 5.2%) showed the highest amounts, whereas camphor (24, 11.4%) dominated among the oxygenated derivatives, followed by 1,8-cineole (14, 5.6%).

The EOs from the fresh and dried samples displayed a comparable number of compounds (38 vs 39, respectively) and a similar amount of the identified fraction (99.5% vs 99.9%, respectively). Despite this behaviour, the EO yields showed an increase of about 50.0% with drying (0.6 vs 0.9% (w/w)). Monoterpenes were the major class with a slight difference in the relative percentages of each hydrocarbons and oxygenated compounds (55.2% and 41.0%, respectively, in the fresh samples, while 53.7% and 43.3%, respectively, in the dried samples). Camphor (24) was the main compound in both EOs, with an increase in the relative amounts of about 15.0% with drying (24.0% vs 27.5%). The drying process caused also an increase of β-pinene (8, 3.8% vs 6.1%) and camphene (5, 8.8% vs 9.8%) and a decline of other compounds, e.g. γ-terpinene (17, 3.7% vs 2.0%), terpinen-4-ol (29, 2.6% vs 1.9%), limonene (13, 3.0% vs 2.6%) and α-pinene (4, 13.1% vs 12.2%). It is noteworthy the invariable amount of myrcene (9) and 1,8-cineole (14) in both fresh and dried samples.

In the PCA analysis, performed on the EO compositions of all the analysed samples, the first two axes explained for more than 93.0% of the total variability, indicating significant statistical differences between the EO compositions of the two hybrids (Fig. 1). The score plot showed a distribution of the samples based on their different compositions revealing that the fresh samples of S×m were characterized by camphor and α-pinene, whereas 1,8-cineole and verbenone characterized the dried ones. All the dried samples of S×l, as well as one of...
the fresh samples (S×l_Fr3), occurred in the upper right side of the score plot; all of them
displayed myrcene as the main characteristic compound. The remaining samples (S×l_Fr2
and S×l_Fr1) were located on the right lower quadrant, showing β-pinene and γ-terpinene as
distinctive components. HCA analysis (Fig. 2) confirmed the PCA results and evidenced two
distinct groups, A and B. Group A was formed by S×l, whereas group B was represented by
S×m. Each group was divided into two homogeneous subgroups, each constituted by samples
with the same state of conservation (fresh vs dried).

The one-way PERMANOVA test evidenced no significant differences between the aroma
profiles of the two hybrids, as well as between the EO compositions of the fresh and the dried
samples within each hybrid. Conversely, high significant differences resulted between the
EOs of the examined hybrids (p-value: 0.0019<<0.05 criterion of significance). The
SIMPER analysis pointed out eighteen compounds responsible for more than 90% of the
dissimilarity between the EOs (Table 3), with myrcene and α-pinene being the major
contributors (22.6% and 11.5%, respectively). All the compounds differed significantly
among the samples, except for camphor and sabinene.

**Table 2.** *Salvia x lavandulacea:* chemical composition of the leaf spontaneous volatile
emission (VOC) and of the essential oil (EO) obtained from fresh and dried leaves as
identified by GC-MS analysis (Average of triplicate analyses ± standard deviation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds¹</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>LRI²</th>
<th>VOC fresh</th>
<th>EO dry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Santolina triene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>0.1±0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tricyclene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>0.4±0.06</td>
<td>0.4±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 α-thujene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>8.9±0.31</td>
<td>1.4±0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 α-pinene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>24.5±2.36</td>
<td>12.2±0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 camphene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>9.4±0.06</td>
<td>9.8±0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Thuja-2.4(10)-diene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>0.2±0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sabinene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>0.2±0.04</td>
<td>0.4±0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 β-pinene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>8.4±1.12</td>
<td>6.1±0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 myrcene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>13.5±1.2</td>
<td>14.8±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 α-phellandrene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>0.2±0.03</td>
<td>0.2±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 α-terpinene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>1.2±0.01</td>
<td>1.0±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>LRI</td>
<td>Relative Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-cymene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>0.4±0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limonene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>5.2±0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-cineole</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>5.6±0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Z)-β-ocimene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>0.6±0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)-β-ocimene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>0.1±0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-terpinene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>3.2±0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cis-sabinene hydrate</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1.2±0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terpinolele</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1.4±0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limonene</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>0.7±0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans-sabinene hydrate</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>0.3±0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chrysanthenone</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>0.3±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-pinocarveol</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>0.1±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camphor</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>11.4±1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans-pinocamphone</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>0.1±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pinocarvone</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>0.1±0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borneol</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>0.3±0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cis-pinocamphone</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>0.7±0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terpinen-4-ol</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>0.5±0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-terpineol</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>0.2±0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myrtanol</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>0.4±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbeneone</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>0.1±0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isobornyl acetate</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>0.6±0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-copaene</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>0.1±0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-caryophyllene</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>0.7±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-humulene</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>0.1±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-muurolene</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>0.1±0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans-γ-cadinene</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>0.1±0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-curcumene</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>0.1±0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ-cadinene</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>0.1±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caryophyllene oxide</td>
<td>os</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>0.6±0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humulene epoxide II</td>
<td>os</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>0.2±0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caryophylla-4(14),8(15)-dien-5-ol</td>
<td>os</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>0.1±0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epi-α-bisabolool</td>
<td>os</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>0.2±0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8±0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6±0.01 0.9±0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of identified compounds</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monoterpenene Hydrocarbons (mh)</td>
<td>77.9±0.76</td>
<td>55.2±2.01</td>
<td>53.7±1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygenated Monoterpenes (om)</td>
<td>21.7±0.75</td>
<td>41.8±0.44</td>
<td>43.3±1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquiterpene Hydrocarbons (sh)</td>
<td>0.9±0.01</td>
<td>2.2±0.25</td>
<td>1.9±0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygenated Sesquiterpene (om)</td>
<td>1.1±0.72</td>
<td>1.0±0.25</td>
<td>1.0±0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only compounds with relative percentages > 0.1% were included in the table.*

*LRI: linear retention indices relative to n-alkane on the DB5 column.*
Table 3. List of the compounds responsible for the dissimilarity in the EO compositions of *S. x lavandulacea* and *S. x mendizabalii* according to SIMPER analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>Contrib. %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>$S \times l$</th>
<th>$S \times m$</th>
<th>Stat. Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 myrcene</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 α-pinene</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1,8-cineol</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 verbenone</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 β-pinene</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 borneol</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 camphor</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 δ-3-carene</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 γ-terpinene</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 camphene</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 limonene</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 α-thujene</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 sabinene</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 4-terpineol</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 α-terpineol</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 isobornyl acetate</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 α-terpineol</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 cis-pinocamphone</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stat. Sign.: Statistical significance; *: p<0.05 criterion of significance; ns: not significant
Figure 1. Score plot of the principal compound analysis (PCA) of the EOs obtained from the fresh and dried samples of *S. x lavandulacea* and *S. x mendizabali*. Dr1 Dr2 Dr3, Fr1 Fr2 Fr3 represent the three replicates of the dried (Dr) and fresh (Fr) samples of the two hybrids.
Figure 2. HCA Dendrogram of the essential oils (EOs) from both *S. x lavandulacea* and *S. x mendizabali*. Dr1 Dr2 Dr3, Fr1 Fr2 Fr3 represent the three replicates of the dried (Dr) and fresh (Fr) samples of the two hybrids.

3.2 Micro-morphological analysis

The leaf *indumentum* of the investigated hybrids consisted of both non-glandular and glandular trichomes (Fig. 3, A-I). Abundant non-glandular dendritic trichomes with smooth cuticle were observed in both hybrids, especially on the abaxial lamina (Fig. 3 A-B, D); they were sporadic on the adaxial side and in this case they were located at the edges (Fig. 3 A, E). These projections generally presented pointed apices at all the branches and the main axes were perpendicular to the epidermis or point apically toward the top of the organ forming acute angles to the surface (Fig. 3, C-D, F).

The glandular trichomes included the peltate type and two types of capitates. The peltate hair, present on both hybrids (Fig. 3 A-B, D-E, G-H) was constituted by a basal epidermal cell, a neck-cell and by a multicellular glandular head made up of 8 (*S×m*) until 16 secreting cells (*S×l*, Fig. 3 H). The head was surrounded by a wide subcuticular chamber in which the secretory products were accumulated. The responses to all the lipophilic stainings
were positive as well as to AlCl₃, indicating the presence of terpenes and of major flavonoidic
derivatives (Fig. 3 J-K, Table 4).

The short capitate was widespread in both hybrids (Fig. 3 A-B, D-E, G-H). It was constituted
by an elongated basal cell, a neck-stalk cell and by a glandular head of 1-2 cells surrounded by
a thin subcuticular space. The secreted material proved positive only to the lipophilic dyes,
indicating the exclusive production of terpenes (Fig. 3 L, Table 4).

The medium-long capitate, occurring only on the leaf adaxial side of S×m (Fig. 3 D, I), was
made up of a basal cell, a stalk cell, a neck cell and by a globose head of 1-2 secretory cells
surrounded by a wide storing chamber. The secretion proved positive to all the lipophilic
stainings, particularly to the Nadi reagent, indicating that they were typical terpene producers
(Fig. 3 M, Table 4).

Table 4. Results of the histochemical tests on the leaf glandular trichomes in S. x
lavandulacea and S. x mendizabalii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stainings</th>
<th>Target-compounds</th>
<th>S. x lavandulacea</th>
<th>S. x mendizabalii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peltate</td>
<td>short capitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoral yellow-088</td>
<td>Total lipids</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile Red</td>
<td>Neutral lipids</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadi reagent</td>
<td>Terpenoids</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenium Red</td>
<td>Acid polysaccharides</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muco-polysaccharides</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcian Blue</td>
<td>Polyphenols</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferric Trichloride</td>
<td>Flavonoids</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium Trichloride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(−) negative; (+) positive; (++) strongly positive
Figure 3. 

A-C. Leaf of *S. x lavandulacea*: abaxial surface (A), adaxial surface at the edges (B), non-glandular dendritic trichomes (C). 

D-F. Leaf of *S. x mendizabalii*: abaxial surface (D), adaxial surface (E), non-glandular dendritic trichomes (F). 

G-I. Glandular trichomes: peltate and short capitate in *S. x lavandulacea* (G), peltates and short capititates in *S. x mendizabalii* (H), short capititates and medium capititates in *S. x mendizabalii* (I). 

J-M. Histochemistry of the glandular trichomes: peltate, Nadi reagent (J) and Aluminium Trichlorides (K); short capitate, Nadi reagent (L); medium capitate, Nadi reagent (M). 

A-I SEM. J-M. LM. 

Scale bars: A, 200 μm; B-D, G-I, 100 μm; E, 1 mm; F, 20 μm; J-K, 50 μm; L-M, 25 μm.
4. Discussion

4.1 Phytochemical analysis

The total number of the isolated compounds, the dominant terpenoidal classes, and the major components of the aroma profiles, although present in relatively variable percentages, resulted consistent between the two hybrids. The common compounds included the dominant constituents, while the exclusive compounds were 5 in $S\times m$ and 4 in $S\times l$, with a prevailing presence of $\delta$-3-carene and $\beta$-pinene in the two hybrids, respectively. The other exclusive compounds occurred in relative percentages lower than 1.0%.

The literature on the phytochemistry of rosemary is rich, but only few contributions focused on the aroma profile (D’auria and Racioppi, 2015; Bendif et al., 2017; Carruba et al., 2020). The first authors reported that the fresh leaves of $S$. rosmarinus (common parent of both hybrids) from Italy were characterized by $\alpha$-pinene (23.9%), limonene (8.3%) and $\beta$-pinene (8.0%) as the main constituents. The two hybrids showed a similar $\alpha$-pinene amount, while limonene was present in lower relative percentages in our samples. Noteworthy is the lack of $\beta$-pinene in $S\times m$.

Bendif et al. (2017) studied the leaf aroma profile of $S$. jordanii (one of the parental species of $S\times l$) from Algeria. They pointed out, in agreement with our results on $S\times l$, that the main classes were monoterpane hydrocarbons (67.0%) and oxygenated monoterpenes (31.9%), with camphene (37.4%) as the main compound instead of $\alpha$-pinene evidenced herein.

The experimental investigation was also associated to a literature research on the ecological role of the main compounds. Among the major common ones, $\alpha$-pinene, camphene, 1,8-cineole and limonene are documented as attractants towards member of the genus Bombus and different bees (Williams et al., 1983; Borg-Karlson et al., 1996; Granero et al. 2005). Camphene plays an attractive role towards pollinators in several species of Sileneae (Prieto-Benítez et al. 2015).
Volatile biosynthesis is also a defensive response: the production of 1,8-cineole, as an example, seems to be induced by herbivory (Bedoya-Pérez et al., 2014), whereas the synthesis of camphor displays a repellent function and toxicity against red fire ants (Zhang et al., 2014).

Among the main exclusive compounds, β-pinene which characterizes the aroma profile of S×l was demonstrated to be involved in the flower attraction by bumblebees and honeybees (Aronne et al., 2014; Hetherington-Rauth and Ramirez, 2016). Information on the ecological properties of δ-3-carene which characterizes S×m are lacking.

Concerning the EOs, the statistical data processing indicated significant differences among the hybrids, also allowing to evidence the main compounds that characterized the various samples: camphor and α-pinene for the fresh samples of S×m; 1,8-cineole and verbenone for the dried ones; myrcene for the dried samples of S×l, as well as one of the fresh samples; β-pinene and γ-terpinene for the remaining fresh samples of S×l.

The essential oil composition of the species belonging to the Rosemary complex was the subject of considerable research in recent years. Cano and Sánchez (1993) investigated the oil compositions of Spanish samples of both hybrids, together with two of the parental species. These authors evidenced that S×l EO were dominated by 1,8-cineole (18.8%), camphor (17.0%), α-pinene (15.1%) and camphene (9.6%). S. jordanii EO was slightly different, with 1,8-cineole detected in fourth position after the other three compounds in the same order. All these constituents were also identified in our study, even though with different relative percentages; noteworthy the difference in the amount of myrcene, which was present in a very low percentage in comparison to the Spanish samples (0.85% vs 14.9%). The same authors investigated also S×m and one of its parents, S. granatensis, showing consistent compositions with camphor, α-pinene, camphene and 1,8-cineole as dominant constituents.

These data were in agreement with our results.
Recent studies focused on the EOs of *S. jordanii* from Algeria (Benbelaïd *et al.*, 2016; Bendif *et al.*, 2017). The former authors studied the EO obtained from the whole aerial parts, revealing the highest amount of camphor (37.8%) followed by 1,8-cineole (17.4%), camphene (13.3) and α-pinene (10.9%). Bendif *et al.* (2017) extracted EOs from different plant parts, detecting camphor (41.2% in stems; 36.9% in leaves and 29.7% in flowers) followed by camphene (10.0%, 15.6%, and 13.1%, respectively) and α-pinene (7.8%, 17.8%, and 15.1%, respectively), as dominant constituents.

*S. rosmarinus* is a common parental species for the studied hybrids. Raeisi *et al.* (2016) reported α-pinene (22.8%) and 1,8-cineole (24.3%) as the major compounds followed by camphor (12.1%). A more recent study by Feriotto *et al.* (2017) highlighted that half of the identified fraction was dominated by 1,8-cineole (50.6%), camphene (13.3%) and α-pinene (10.1%).

In general, the literature survey indicated a high variability in the EOs composition within the Rosemary complex; however, some considerations emerge: (i) the main terpenoidal class was invariably represented by monoterpenes, both hydrocarbons and oxygenated derivatives; (ii) the principal volatile compounds were, although represented in comparatively different amounts, camphor, 1,8-cineole, α-pinene and camphene.

Concerning the biological activity of the main compounds, camphor is known for its broad range of insecticidal and antibacterial activities and is used as acaricidal agent against house dust mites (Jeon *et al.*, 2014). 1,8-cineole and α-pinene showed antimicrobial, insecticidal and repellent, cytotoxic and anti-inflammatory activities (Barbosa Damasceno *et al.*, 2019).

Camphene, a bycyclic monoterpane, evidenced significant antidiabetic, antidysslipemic and antioxidant properties (Mishra *et al.*, 2018) together with a larvicidal and ovicidal activities against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Benelli *et al.*, 2018).
In both hybrids, the drying process implied the increase or the decline of several volatiles, including the major ones. Therefore, the sensory profile of the oils was affected, as evidenced in a previous paper on the variation of the sensory quality of the EOs of *R. officinalis* following different drying techniques (Szumny et al., 2010).

In *S×m*, camphor and α-pinene showed a decrease from fresh to dried samples, while increases were observed for 1,8-cineole and camphene. Therefore, the drying of fresh samples implied decreases of some sensory attributes: *camphor odour* (camphor), *woody* (α-pinene), but increases of some others: *fruity, sweet* (1,8-cineole) and *vanilla* (camphene).

In *S×l*, the relative amounts of camphor (descriptor: *camphor odour*), β-pinene (woody) and camphene (vanilla) increased with drying, whereas a decrease was detected for limonene (citrus) and α-pinene (woody). Noteworthy is the invariable amount of 1,8-cineole (fruity, sweet).

### 4.2 Micro-morphological analysis

The observed glandular trichomes showed overall morphological features comparable to those already known in the literature for the Rosemary complex (Giuliani and Maleci Bini, 2008; Hallahan, 2000; Werker, 2000).

The micro-morphological observations on leaves proved the occurrence of abundant non-glandular dendritic hairs in both hybrids, in accordance with literature data on rosemary (Maleci Bini and Giuliani, 2006; Boix et al., 2011). A previous taxonomic paper (Rosuà, 1981) defined the leaf adaxial surface as cano-tomentose in *S×m* and almost hairless in *S×l*.

On the contrary, our observations proved that the features of the non-glandular *indumentum* are not discriminant for the recognition of the examined hybrids.

Concerning the glandular hairs, the peltates and the short capititates, common to both hybrids, were widespread in the Lamiaceae family. The peltates however differed in the examined
hybrids since the number of the head secreting cells was eight in \textit{S×m} and sixteen in \textit{S×l}.

Their productivity in secondary metabolites was instead homogeneous, since major terpenoidic and flavonoidic fractions were detected in agreement with previous results on \textit{R. officinalis} (Marin et al., 2006; Boix et al., 2011). The short capitates synthetized exclusively terpenes, whereas in most of the investigated Lamiaceae species they were typical polysaccharides producers (Giuliani and Maleci Bini, 2008). The medium-long capitates occurred exclusively on the leaf adaxial side of \textit{S×m}, thus constituting a diagnostic micro-character.

5. Conclusions

The present contribution on \textit{S. x mendizabalii} and \textit{S. x lavandulacea} combined for the first time a phytochemical and morphological investigation on the leaves, with the aim to sketch a link between the productivity in volatile compounds and the glandular indumentum.

From the phytochemical perspective, the aroma profiles of the examined hybrids resulted consistent with regards to the total number of the isolated compounds, the dominant terpenoidic classes and the high number of common components, including the major ones. Variability was related to the occurrence of exclusive compounds, the main one being δ-3-carene and β-pinene in \textit{S. x mendizabalii} and \textit{S. x lavandulacea}, respectively.

The EO compositions were characterized by significant statistical differences, however a general phytochemical affinity emerged due to the occurrence of major common compounds, \textit{i.e.} camphor, 1,8-cineole, α-pinene and camphene, also in accordance with the literature data on the EOs of the species belonging to \textit{S. subgenus rosmarinus}.

The drying process, implying the increase or the decline of several volatiles in the oils of both hybrids, affected their sensory attributes, and potentially also their biological activity; in...
particular, in *S. x mendizabalii* the camphor odour became more intense, whereas in *S. x lavandulacea* declined, while the vanilla flavour increased in both hybrids.

From the micromorphological perspective, three morphotypes of glandular trichomes were described and all resulted responsible for the productivity of the volatile components characterized herein.
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