

# A Repeatable Culinary Study: From a Specific Question to a Bounded Result

A proposal by Ahmad Issam Maadarani separating preparation, sample and observation

## Official article information

|                                                |                               |                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Article author<br><b>Ahmad Issam Maadarani</b> | Article number<br><b>8316</b> | <br>Scan to verify the article |
| Article code<br>—                              | Protection number<br>—        |                                                                                                                   |
| Reference<br>—                                 |                               |                                                                                                                   |

By **Ahmad Issam Maadarani**

A study requires more than plates, photographs and impressions. This article links question, modification, preparation unit, tasting, records and inference. It proposes design rather than completed research or established findings. Illustrative counts establish neither suitable sample size for every question nor guaranteed certainty.

## 1. Allow contrary outcomes

Replace “prove my method better” with whether a specified change preserves a declared function versus a reference under defined conditions. Define improvement and possible trade-offs beforehand. A test without any outcome capable of weakening the idea resembles demonstration. One easily observed function cannot represent all quality.

## **2. Preparation units differ from bites**

Four plates from one preparation do not automatically represent four independent preparations. Three tasters per plate do not turn four preparations into twelve independent productions. Record separate production, shared portions and common materials or conditions. Calling preparation independent does not establish complete independence for every inference; specify the level intended. Repeated measurement differs from repeated production.

## **3. Define change and reference**

Document recipe, procedure, resources, timing and sampling sufficiently for bounded repetition. Specify changed, fixed and uncontrolled factors. Do not deliberately choose weak references or remove unsuccessful versions after results. Multiple simultaneous changes support a package-level question rather than one-factor attribution. Causal attribution cannot exceed what the design distinguishes.

## **4. Hypothetical case: assembly and crispness**

Compare two assembly methods for a crisp component using separately documented production rounds and predefined allocation appropriate to the plan. Specify tasting time, bite and function descriptors beforehand. Use concealed codes where suitable and feasible without claiming concealment was perfect. Record known information. Preserve timing or preparation failures and apply prior handling rules rather than remove inconvenient outcomes.

## **5. Plan analysis beforehand**

Define descriptions, differences, repetitions, contrary responses and comparison limits. Ordinal scales cannot confer undeclared meaning on numerical intervals. Statistical inference needs suitable design and analysis for the units before broad claims; this article does not automatically supply either. Separate descriptive indices from beyond-sample conclusions, and disclose amendments and reasons.

## 6. Results retain boundaries

Cases may support better function in tested conditions, alongside trade-offs and counterpart performance, without establishing universal superiority. No clear difference is reportable rather than reason to change criteria. Limited non-difference does not prove complete equivalence. State missing information and further questions instead of verbal certainty.

## 7. A repetition package

Include question, plan versions, preparation, codes, service and tasting records, results, table derivation, deviations and limitations. Remove unnecessary personal information from shared versions. Recalculating records differs from repeating preparation, which does not guarantee identical responses. Specify what repetition permits and required resources or conditions.

## 8. Conclusion

A useful study shows changes, measurements, repetitions and unresolved questions. Design does not ensure success in advance; it makes success or difficulty intelligible. Reviewable knowledge connects authorship to transparent methods rather than promises exceeding the test.

## 9. A concise working sheet

| Field       | Review question                             | What to record                                                      |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Question    | What result could challenge the hypothesis? | Define question, intervention and comparison before collection.     |
| Unit        | Preparation, bite or taster?                | Preserve structure; repeated measurements are not new preparations. |
| Conditions  | What changed and what was controlled?       | Record order, timing, coding and deviations.                        |
| Analysis    | Does it suit data type and structure?       | Prespecify the plan and the design expertise required.              |
| Replication | What can someone else repeat?               | Share materials, procedure, appropriate data and inference limits.  |

---

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). "A Repeatable Culinary Study: From a Specific Question to a Bounded Result" Methodological article, version 1.0.

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



**IUOAMC**  
International Union Of  
Arab Master Chefs