الاتحاد الدولي ماستر شيف العرب
International Union of Arab Master Chefs

OFFICIAL INSTITUTIONAL ARTICLE

Independence of Culinary Criteria: Detecting Repeated Counting of the Same Effect

A research protocol proposed by Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author **Ahmad Issam Maadarani**	Article number 8323
Article code –	Protection number –
Reference —	

Scan to verify the article

IUOAMC
International Union Of
Arab Master Chefs

By Ahmad Issam Maadarani

This article addresses repeated penalties or rewards across criteria whose names appear independent. It proposes a map linking observation, function and scoring location, then compares the map's clarity with a conventional form. The procedural contribution is testable and does not assume every correlation between criteria is an error.

1. Origin of the question

Correlated criterion scores alone do not prove identical measurement. Good execution may improve both, or one may depend functionally on the other. Taste-interaction literature [G] concerns existing research on relationships between tastes; that background cannot establish overlap in any judging scale. Examine descriptors and how observations are counted, then test the procedure in documented cases.

2. Defining unjustified repetition

Imagine a cutting difficulty recorded under texture, then penalised under ease of eating for the same observation, and again under execution without new evidence. A system may legitimately recognise separate effects in two criteria, but must explain their different functions and allocated weights. Unjustified repetition is counting the same effect again without declared differentiation, not simply mentioning an observation in several lines.

3. Mapping observation to function

Assign each observation a short identifier and its conditions, then affected functions and the primary scoring criterion. Describe any second effect with independently distinguishable evidence where possible: cutting resistance differs from collapse after cutting. Replacing firm with difficult does not create two pieces of evidence. Cross-reference in reasoning may remain appropriate without requiring another numerical penalty.

4. A comparative procedural study

Prepare documented training cases using presentation images, records or samples appropriate to the question. Compare a conventional form with an observation-map form under equivalent instructions and recorded time. Prespecify a primary outcome, such as counting decisions whose reasoning violates a written independence rule, or an independent reviewer's ability to trace the decision. With food samples, maintain comparable service and avoid confounding batch changes with form changes.

5. Building a review reference

Calling counting unjustified requires a prior rule and reviewers able to apply it, not an assumption that lower scores indicate error. Preserve reviewer disagreement and reasons for unresolved cases. Review can conceal form type if feasible; otherwise disclose that limitation. Do not build the reference from answers whose improvement is intended and then treat agreement with that reference as independent confirmation.

IUOAMC
International Union Of Arab Master Chefs

6. Analysis and relationship limits

A correlation matrix describes data but cannot replace an evidence map. Analyse how one observation moves across criteria while accounting for repeated assessors and cases. Record time cost and inability to use the map: reduced repetition may bring greater burden. Do not remove criteria automatically because they correlate. Legitimately different purposes may call for clarified descriptors or weights rather than deletion.

7. Reference use

A report should allow another reader to trace why points were awarded or deducted. Testing may show that the map does not help, costs time without better traceability, or works only in certain cases. These are useful findings if the questions were defined before expecting success. Develop the model through critical cases; its name cannot certify that every resulting decision avoids repeated counting.

8. References and limits of source use

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

[G] Green, B. G., Lim, J., Osterhoff, F., Blacher, K., & Nachtigal, D. (2010). Taste mixture interactions: suppression, additivity, and the predominance of sweetness. Physiology & Behavior, 101, 731–737. https://osuseafoodlab.oregonstate.edu/publication/taste-mixture-interactions-suppression-additivity-and-predominance-sweetness

Source use: publication metadata and topic context; the full text was not reviewed for this version.

9. A concise working sheet

Field	Review question	What to record
Observation	One item of evidence or several?	Observation identity and conditions.
Function	Do the criteria have distinct functions?	Primary and independent effects.

Field	Review question	What to record
Counting	Does the system allow both?	Declared rule and traceable reasoning.

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). “Independence of Culinary Criteria: Detecting Repeated Counting of the Same Effect” Methodological article, version 1.0.

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

IUOAMC
International Union Of
Arab Master Chefs