

# Blind Tasting and Its Limits: When Is Information Part of the Question?

Culinary Judgment and Taste Chemistry — Ahmad Issam Maadarani

## Official article information

|                                                |                               |                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Article author<br><b>Ahmad Issam Maadarani</b> | Article number<br><b>8332</b> | <br>Scan to verify the article |
| Article code<br>—                              | Protection number<br>—        |                                                                                                                   |
| Reference<br>—                                 |                               |                                                                                                                   |

By **Ahmad Issam Maadarani**

This essay examines what should be hidden or disclosed in assessment. Blinding is a procedure serving a specified question, rather than an absolute guarantee of fairness.

## 1. The question precedes the procedure

When comparing sensory properties, hiding the cook's identity, price and awards may reduce irrelevant informational influence. When examining fulfilment of a written promise, that promise becomes evidence. Concealment is valuable when it removes information that changes answers without belonging to the question. Hiding necessary information may instead create an entirely different task.

## **2. Information levels**

Separate information needed for participation, information defining the task and information about reputation. Do not conceal food-participation safety information for experimental purity. A texture test, conversely, need not disclose the creator's biography. Define boundaries before the session and for the participants concerned. Blinding does not justify guessing ingredients and treating the guess as proof of recipe compliance.

## **3. Hypothetical case**

Two desserts are compared for clarity of a specified fruit flavour. Disclose that goal without the creator's name or price. If the question is instead which offers a richer sensory experience, a neutral task statement may suffice. Switching questions after tasting confounds comparison. No participant should receive extra expectation-shaping information unavailable to others.

## **4. Checking concealment**

Codes do not prevent recognition of a familiar dish from its appearance. Record possible identity disclosure and procedure limits rather than claiming context-free testing. Vessel differences and service order can also carry information. Explain what was actually hidden, what remained inferable and whether efforts to disguise the product altered it.

## **5. Two stages when appropriate**

A session may begin with limited-information description and then assess promise fulfilment after disclosure. These stages are not fully independent because the first experience affects the second. Studying the statement's influence may require suitable groups or sessions rather than consecutive retasting. This is a proposal for defining questions, not a fixed recipe eliminating every bias.

## **6. Informational fairness**

Fairness means providing the same appropriate information for a legitimate purpose, not simply providing as little as possible. Explain each decision to conceal or disclose. Readers can then examine the relationship between procedure and result. Successful blinding does

not establish that the quality criterion itself is correct; that definition remains open to discussion.

## 7. A Discussion Worksheet

| Field       | Question                   | What to Record                        |
|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Purpose     | What is the test question? | A fixed statement before the session. |
| Information | Necessary or leading?      | A disclosure and concealment map.     |
| Limits      | Was identity revealed?     | What the procedure actually achieved. |

Philosophical arguments belong to the author. Applications and worksheets are unvalidated proposals, and examples are hypothetical. This article presents no new experimental dataset, claim of worldwide priority or claim that this text has undergone peer review.

## 8. References and Source Limits

A philosophical analysis by the author; its arguments are not attributed to experimental findings.

---

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). "Blind Tasting and Its Limits: When Is Information Part of the Question?". Analytical essay, version 1.0, 4 October 2026.

© 2026 Ahmad Issam Maadarani.