



From: C.K. Haun ([REDACTED])
To: Jason Anthony Guy ([REDACTED])
CC: Guillermo Ortiz ([REDACTED])
BCC:
Subject: Re: Reviewing complex apps
Attachments:
Sent: 12/09/2010 03:11:26 AM 0000 (GMT)

We review, we do not test. That's been a guiding principle in App Review since we conceived of it. There are iOS apps that are very deep, and we don't get to all of the parts of them. That's OK, and should be the norm. We review what we can quickly and competently get to, we will never have all the expertise or time to go into everything.

There will be times when launch/quit, and poke around at things as best we can, is the appropriate level of review. We can never, and will never, be able to find all the crashes hidden in a complex (or even simple) app. From a functionality standpoint, developers agree (in the PLA and in the guidelines) that they are providing our app store customers with quality apps that do not crash. We review to have some comfort in that assurance, never 100% assurance.

If we find a hotspot of app types that we think needs particular expertise then we'll develop that, but not for only a few.

And in the case of an app like this we'll take it one-off, not make a policy.

--ck

On Dec 8, 2010, at 6:52 PM, Jason Anthony Guy wrote:

> C.K.,
>
> I'd like your advice from your experience.
>
> How do you suggest we approach reviewing complex applications. For example, Keymap Pro (402732159) appears to be a deep app that is for musicians who know what they're doing (and have additional apps like Logic).
>
> From what I can tell, this app was not reviewed for actual functionality, but approved based on its apparent depth, and perhaps the website and other marketing materials (including videos on the website).
>
> I'm concerned about not giving an app its proper review, and letting apps that consistently crash, into the store (for example). Yet we can't really use apps without proper hardware, software and, in some cases, expertise.
>
> What do you recommend?
>
> Jason.

--CKH

