

The Value of Additional Evidence: When Is Retasting Worth Its Cost?

A research protocol proposed by Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8320	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —		

By **Ahmad Issam Maadarani**

This proposal selects additional examinations capable of changing an unresolved decision, rather than repeating tastings without a purpose. It distinguishes new information from reassurance gained by hearing another opinion. The framework can investigate procedural efficiency, but grants no new authority and cannot justify changing competition rules during the event.

1. Decision background

Sensory consistency and inconsistency measures have been studied, including a preprint by Sipos and colleagues [5]. They do not automatically answer which further examination should now be requested. The proposed contribution links examination choice to a specific decision point and records its effect and cost. Retasting is no universal remedy: it may reproduce the same limitation or introduce a changed food state.

2. Specifying the unresolved case

Imagine two judges disagreeing about how widely a dish's base has softened. One sampled the edge, the other the centre. The question is whether location explains their difference, not who is more experienced. Specify three possible outcomes: a clear location difference, similarity within a practical boundary, or continuing uncertainty. Define each outcome's implications for the decision before seeing the new sample.

3. Comparing alternative procedures

Options include retasting the same location, sampling elsewhere, reviewing the serving record or requesting independent assessment. These are not equivalent. A record can establish timing without demonstrating texture, and another judge may see a different sample. Specify time, material and delay costs, excluding procedures not permitted by the rules. Compare information value under equal constraints rather than unrestricted authority.

4. Studying the procedure

Create documented training cases rather than experimenting with undeclared rules on real competition results. Allocate cases to specified evidence procedures and obtain the first decision before the addition and the second afterwards, with reasons for changes. Reserve new cases for validation where possible. Re-presenting a case after a short interval can prompt memory; assess repetition and order, and do not treat repeated answers as independent decisions.

5. Defining information value

A primary outcome might be reduced error against a justified operational reference in appropriately designed cases, or fewer unresolved decisions without increased false confidence. Calling a decision erroneous requires a defensible reference, not merely majority agreement. Without one, analyse reasoning quality and evidence completeness against declared descriptors. A changed decision is not necessarily improved, and greater confidence does not prove correctness.

6. Preventing selective stopping

Prespecify continuation and stopping rules, with a procedural ceiling. Repetition until a desirable result appears changes inference. Statistical sequential analysis requires an appropriate design, not repeatedly applying a fixed-sample test. This article supplies no universal threshold or ready-made power calculation. Match the stopping plan to the question, resources and acceptable error type.

7. Limits of use

An examination useful in one case may be unhelpful in another. Delay can change the food so the decision no longer concerns its original sample. Report each procedure's value in tested cases and preserve unresolved outcomes. The reference contribution is a defensible method for requesting evidence or stopping, including its fairness implications. It does not require retasting outside declared rules.

8. References and limits of source use

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

[S] Sipos, L., Ágoston, K. C., Biró, P., Bozóki, S., & Csató, L. (2023). How to measure consumer's inconsistency in sensory testing?. Preprint, arXiv:2312.08141.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.08141>

Source use: preprint abstract; this link does not establish peer-review status.

9. A concise working sheet

Field	Review question	What to record
Uncertainty	Which question needs evidence?	Decision point and possible outcomes.
Examination	Does it test that question?	Procedure, cost and authority.
Stopping	When does examination end?	A prior rule, not a desired-result search.

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). "The Value of Additional Evidence:

When Is Retasting Worth Its Cost?" Methodological article, version 1.0.

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



IUOAMC
International Union Of
Arab Master Chefs