

Proportionate Culinary Decisions: Connecting the Extent of a Defect to the Strength of Judgment

Culinary Judgment and Taste Chemistry — Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8334	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —		

By Ahmad Issam Maadarani

This essay examines how an observation affects a result. It proposes decisions proportionate to a condition's importance, evidence strength and extent of the effect, while preventing unrelated advantages from compensating for decisive failures.

1. A defect is not a ready-made decision

An unwanted effect may occur in one small location or throughout a bite, once or across samples. These cases need not carry identical weight. Failure of a central purpose also differs from a secondary imperfection. Establish the effect's domain before assigning its scoring consequence; "a defect exists" does not specify what should happen to the result.

2. Three dimensions

Separate criterion importance, effect extent and observational confidence. Importance is set by the task beforehand; extent describes the samples; confidence concerns what evidence supports. Weak evidence does not justify changing a criterion's weight: gather suitable evidence or acknowledge non-resolution. A potentially serious defect does not itself increase certainty that it occurred.

3. Hypothetical example

A rough particle appears in one bite of a sauce required to be smooth. Record it and examine representativeness under session rules. Repetition across independent samples and locations strengthens a conclusion about texture regularity. Immediate exclusion requires a rule making this defect decisive, rather than momentary disgust.

4. Limits to compensation

Some properties can be balanced, but certain task conditions are decisive and non-compensable. Define them and their verification beforehand. Attractive presentation cannot substitute for independent verification of a safety condition. A sensory impression alone cannot declare food safe or unsafe; those questions require their own evidence.

5. Consistency across cases

Review similar cases for consistent rule application and explain relevant differences. Equality does not mean identical penalties for every effect carrying one name: severity and function may differ. A different outcome nevertheless needs a documented distinction, not the creator's status. Preserve exception reasons so that criteria do not change with the preferred result.

6. A proportionate decision

State the observation, its spread, relevance to the task and rule translating it into a scoring effect. This enables review without requiring judges to hide discomfort. The proposal gives no universal numerical penalties because numbers depend on the task. It offers a logic for constructing and defending rules before applying them to particular

people and dishes.

7. A Discussion Worksheet

Field	Question	What to Record
Importance	Central or secondary condition?	An advance task definition.
Extent	Where did the effect recur?	Samples and locations.
Decision	Which rule was applied?	Reasoning proportionate to evidence.

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). "Proportionate Culinary Decisions: Connecting the Extent of a Defect to the Strength of Judgment". Analytical essay, version 1.0, 4 October 2026.

© 2026 Ahmad Issam Maadarani.