

The Effect of Sensory Monitoring: Does Recording During Eating Change Evaluation?

A research protocol proposed by Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8325	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —		

By Ahmad Issam Maadarani

This proposal tests the evaluation instrument itself as an intervention that may change attention or eating rhythm. It compares concurrent recording with later reporting under specified conditions without assuming either captures a pure experience. Examine protocol effects before using its measurements as a reference for comparing dishes.

1. Literature and proposed contribution

Pineau and colleagues describe temporal sensation recording [P], while Hall and colleagues document some participants failing to notice a switched chosen sample [H]. Neither background proves concurrent recording spoils tasting or every later report is wrong. The proposed question concerns recording cost and influence within a culinary task, separating food changes from monitoring-procedure changes.

2. Question and alternatives

The null hypothesis is no practically relevant difference between specified protocols in the primary outcome, within a justified prespecified margin. The alternative involves a changed outcome or eating rhythm. A difference may reflect altered attention during recording, lost retrospective detail or both. Different answers therefore cannot establish one method's superiority. Define whether the objective is trajectory description, liking or a final professional judgment.

3. Comparable protocols where possible

One protocol records specified attributes during consumption; the other permits eating followed by a report after a declared interval. Use the same attribute vocabulary and comparable practice while acknowledging interface differences. Between-group allocation or a crossover design is possible, but repetition may introduce learning and memory. Justify the design and prespecify sessions, intervals and protocol order.

4. Food versus procedure

Produce independent preparations under comparable conditions, documenting temperatures, bite size and time. If recording slows consumption and changes food state, that is part of the protocol's real-world effect and must be recorded. A condition controlling eating time can address another aspect, but does not erase the original difference or automatically isolate attention. Every experiment has conditions; establish what each experiment's conditions are.

5. Variables and analysis

Choose one primary outcome, such as eating time, finish description or post-sample liking. Other variables aid interpretation rather than allow retrospective selection of favourable results. Detailed temporal data and an overall report are not automatically the same measure. Definitions must align before analysing agreement. Account for assessor, session and preparation relationships and examine timing accuracy and missing data.

6. What could challenge the proposal?

No practically meaningful change within uncertainty may indicate limited recording cost in this context. An effect confined to untrained participants may call for altered training rather than blanket rejection. Wide uncertainty prevents a conclusive distinction. A nonsignificant difference cannot establish equivalence; equivalence requires an appropriate margin and plan specified before data collection.

7. Reference use

The report describes what happens under a measurement method, not an ideal sensory experience outside measurement. Decisions relying on concurrent data should document collection effects and what remains hidden. Later reporting requires disclosure of delay and memory limits. The proposal's strength is examining the instrument itself instead of assuming every record directly and neutrally reflects the food.

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.

[H] Hall, L., Johansson, P., Tärning, B., Sikström, S., & Deutgen, T. (2010). Magic at the marketplace: Choice blindness for the taste of jam and the smell of tea. *Cognition*, 117(1), 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2010.06.010>

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

9. A concise working sheet

Field	Review question	What to record
Goal	Which experience is being measured?	Trajectory, liking or judgment.
Intervention	What does recording change?	Attention, rhythm, interface and timing.
Inference	Difference, equivalence or unresolved?	Primary outcome, practical margin and prior plan.

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). “The Effect of Sensory Monitoring: Does Recording During Eating Change Evaluation?” Methodological article, version 1.0.

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



IUOAMC
International Union Of
Arab Master Chefs