

Asymmetry of the Bite Path: Component Order Within One Tasting Experience

A research protocol proposed by Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8318	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —		

By **Ahmad Issam Maadarani**

This proposal examines whether identical quantities presented in reversed sequences produce different sensory descriptions. It distinguishes dish order from component order within a bite, and tasting time from time that changes the food itself. The contribution is a paired-path protocol that records departures from the intended sequence, not an established theory prescribing which component should always come first.

1. Scientific background

Pineau and colleagues show how temporal evaluation can describe sensation sequences and compare temporal dominance with time–intensity measurement [P]. Time is therefore an existing research domain. The narrower culinary question here is what happens when two components are presented in reversed order with quantities preserved. The paired-path terminology is not attributed to that paper, and recording sensory dominance does

not automatically establish quality.

2. A falsifiable hypothesis

In a hypothetical case, an acidic component precedes a creamy one; the second condition reverses their order while keeping quantities unchanged. The null hypothesis is no difference beyond a justified practical margin in the selected outcome. The alternative concerns sensation timing or the description of the finish. A liking difference alone cannot prove a changed sensory path, and a different path cannot establish which version is better.

3. Separating order from time

Different intervals between components change both order and timing. Cooling before consumption changes product state. Specify interval, eating procedure and component quantities, and measure relevant temperatures where appropriate. A third mixed condition is possible, but adds mixture structure to the question. Define it before examining results, rather than adding it to search for a difference.

4. Study procedure

Produce multiple independent preparations and allocate tasting paths across participants and sessions so condition order is less confounded with session time. Explain one recording tool using understandable terms, with practice separate from study data. Instructions may reveal component order; if so, do not claim full blinding. Record adherence to the intended path separately from each person's perception of flavour.

5. Selecting the primary outcome

Possible outcomes include the first reported appearance of a specified attribute, its proportion of recorded time, or the evaluation of the finish. Do not combine them into one index without justification. The sensation attracting most attention need not be the most intense. Button-press time is not a pure measure of sensation onset. Check instructions and timing precision, and prespecify analysis of assessor, batch and repeated measurements.

6. Limits of interpretation

A difference supports an effect of the tested order protocol in this sample, not a particular neural mechanism. Oral movement, waiting, memory and chewing may be involved. The proposal is weakened if no practically relevant difference recurs, or if it is confined to participants who understood a special instruction. Retain these possibilities instead of selecting one bite that confirms a desired beginning-and-ending narrative.

7. Culinary use

The cook can specify a desired path and test whether presentation actually invites people to follow it. Extensive instructions needed to reveal the effect constitute a design constraint worth documenting. Judges assess performance within the declared task, without penalising an unfamiliar sequence merely for its novelty. The practical value is to turn component order into an examinable hypothesis rather than an expressive description that cannot be challenged.

8. References and limits of source use

References support the stated background. Proposed protocols and hypothetical cases are not findings attributed to those studies.

[P] Pineau, N., Schlich, P., Cordelle, S., Mathonnière, C., Issanchou, S., Imbert, A., Rogeaux, M., Etiévant, P., & Köster, E. P. (2009). Temporal Dominance of Sensations: Construction of the TDS curves and comparison with time-intensity. *Food Quality and Preference*, 20(6), 450–455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2009.04.005>

Source use: abstract and publication metadata; the full text was not reviewed.

9. A concise working sheet

Field	Review question	What to record
Paths	Are quantities constant?	Component order, interval and eating procedure.
Outcome	Timing, intensity or dominance?	One defined primary variable.
Challenge	Does the difference recur?	Batches, deviations and uncertainty.

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). "Asymmetry of the Bite Path: Component Order Within One Tasting Experience" Methodological article, version 1.0.

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



IUOAMC
International Union Of
Arab Master Chefs