(Software Quality Management): Week 1 Participation Question

Jinyang Li

Is it possible to make a large enough investment in proactive QA to eliminate the need for reactive QA

Quality Assurance tires to prevent defects. However, defects can happen due to various reasons and depends on several factors, when the same system are using in different software environment, or in different hardware, or even operating by different users, the defects can happen and are varying. There's no such a product that can say it has no further defects even it is tested and handled by the best Quality Assurance Team in world. Thus, the reactive QA can do its job. Also, let's assume one company can offer all simulators/environments for all possible factors, the investment would result cost bigger than profit, even cost is 10000 times than profit or more. In this situation, the proactive QA doesn't make any sense.

how are proactive and reactive QA investments correlated (e.g., positive vs. negative, linear vs. non-linear, etc.)?

The proactive QA and reactive QA are both required in quality management. They are combining together to achieve best cost/benefit ratio. When the cost of proactive QA + reactive QA resulting minimum cost but result same benefit, then this is a good investment decision.

In general sense, the less you invest in proactive, the more you invest in reactive. To achieve the same quality production. But this is a non-linear relation. In general, proactive QA investment makes sure you are doing the right things. Thus, prevent extra cost during development, in another hand, eliminate extra costs for reactive QA.