

Descriptive Integrity of a Dish: What Can Its Name and Promise Establish?

A proposal by Ahmad Issam Maadarani separating descriptive conformity, quality and preference

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8312	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —	International Union Of Arab Master Chefs	

By Ahmad Issam Maadarani

A dish's name or description frames assessment. This article separates examinable promises from creative language and personal enjoyment. It offers neither legal judgment of menus nor identification of unknown ingredients through tasting; it reviews relationships between statements, observations and documentation.

1. Descriptions are promises, not evidence

“Crisp” does not establish crispness, and “inspired” does not establish precise historical attribution. Preserve wording available before tasting without improving it afterwards. Distinguish component or functional statements from open metaphors. Legitimate creative language does not automatically become compositional fact or a measurable criterion.

2. Three requirement types

Ingredient claims need suitable preparation records and cannot be established by sensation alone. Performance claims such as crispness or accessible bites can be examined under declared conditions. Interpretive claims such as “a memory of the sea” need bounded explanation without demanding identical responses. These proposed categories guide examination rather than exhaust language; mixed statements need decomposition.

3. Quality and conformity are separate

An enjoyable dish may miss declared texture; a conforming dish may lack required balance. Preserve both results. Enjoyment cannot grant complete conformity, and one mismatch cannot erase every strength. If conformity affects ranking, predefine its criterion and consequences rather than introducing penalties after discovery.

4. Hypothetical case: crisp shell

“Crisp shell with soft centre” declares a clear function. In the examined sample, the shell bends without breaking while the centre meets its description. Record partial fulfilment without inferring softness cause. “An amazing journey” alone cannot determine lost points; connect it to a specified requirement if used for assessment. This hypothetical sample establishes no universal testing sufficiency.

5. Missing information and substitutions

A concealed ingredient may be impossible to confirm visually or through taste. Request documentation where required and record uncertainty instead of absence. Declared substitutions before service follow the revised promise and rules. Do not rename a defect intentional by editing the description after tasting. Questions beyond sensory scope require appropriate examination, not claimed comprehensive tasting proof.

6. A conformity record

Record original phrase, requirement type, examination method, evidence, conformity or unverifiability, and declared decision effect. Unknown does not automatically mean failure.

Preserve description versions across languages: translation can turn a bounded term into an absolute promise. Review meaning and examples rather than similar length.

7. Test the tool

Training can ask what descriptions permit observation, need records or remain interpretation. Predefine review criteria: separating enjoyment and conformity, avoiding absence-of-sensation as proof of ingredient absence, and clear promise-to-score relationships. Elegant wording does not establish success; the proposed benefit is bounded claims and examination.

8. Conclusion

Descriptive integrity connects statement, dish and evidence without stripping creative language. It prevents creativity from overriding explicit requirements. Reports should show fulfilled and unfulfilled promises and what remains unverifiable.

9. A concise working sheet

Field	Review question	What to record
Promise	What statement was made?	Retain the wording and when it was presented.
Type	Ingredient, performance or interpretation?	Identify appropriate support for each type.
Conformity	Could the promise be examined?	Record fulfilment and what remains unverified.
Quality	Did execution succeed in its own terms?	Separate execution quality from descriptive conformity.
Change	Was a substitution declared beforehand?	Record revised wording without rewriting promises after results.

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). “Descriptive Integrity of a Dish: What Can Its Name and Promise Establish?” Methodological article, version 1.0.

© 2026 Ahmad Issam Maadarani. All rights reserved, subject to applicable legal exceptions.