

iOS So Far

Ten years of Aesthetic.Computer on Apple's store, read from the record

@jeffrey · Aesthetic.Computer · ORCID 0009-0007-4460-4913

9 September 2026

Abstract. Six app records have accumulated under one Apple developer account since 2016: *Finger Quilt*, *No Paint*, *Soft Wallpaper*, Aesthetic.Computer for iOS, *Menu Band*, and the unreleased *oskiewar*. Together they hold 152 lifetime customer reviews averaging 4.65 stars and have earned \$17.81 in developer proceeds across five paid units, all sold in a nine-week window of 2026. This paper reads that record from primary sources: the App Store Connect API, the store's own analytics reports, the runtime's boot telemetry, and the repository's commit history. Three findings organize it. First, the only demand event in ten years arrived from outside the store, when short-video attention drove 112 reviews of *No Paint* between June and September 2020 and decayed to nothing within a year. Second, the constraint on the current portfolio is the last mile rather than production: Aesthetic.Computer for iOS booted 13,830 handheld sessions in 2026 while serving a binary released in July 2023, because two later builds were uploaded, left unreleased, and allowed to expire. Third, every recorded sale of *Menu Band* occurred at \$4.99, and the app now lists at \$9.99. I close with nine ranked openings, each tied to the evidence that motivates it and the smallest action that would test it.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is an audit, and it exists because a smaller question had no answer. Asked in September 2026 whether *Menu Band* had sold any copies since the last check, the honest reply took a scripted pull against Apple's analytics API and arrived at five units. Asked the obvious follow-up, whether the same numbers were available for the other apps, the answer was that they were not, because no analytics report had ever been requested for any of them. Ten years of store presence had produced no measurement apparatus at all.

That gap is the subject. Aesthetic.Computer is a runtime and social network for creative computing whose principal surface is a URL [jeffrey, 2026a]. Its native surfaces have grown alongside it: a web wrapper for iPhone, a menu-bar instrument for macOS [jeffrey, 2026c], a native operating system for handheld hardware [jeffrey, 2026d]. Apple's store is one distribution channel among several, and it is the only one that reports back. What it reports is worth reading carefully, because the sums involved are small enough that every individual event is legible. Five transactions can be examined one at a time. One hundred thirty-one reviews can be read in full. This is an unusual condition for a distribution audit, and it makes conclusions available that a larger dataset would only average away.

Three questions structure the paper. What is actually in the record? Where did the demand that appeared in it come from? And given both, what is the smallest set of actions that would change the next ten years? Sections 2 through 7 answer the first two from primary evidence. Section 8 answers the third as nine ranked openings.

The paper's posture follows the sustainability thread

in the surrounding research platter [jeffrey, 2026e], which asks who pays for creative tools. Here the question narrows to a channel and a decade, and the finding is specific: the channel has been supplied with software and starved of the four or five administrative acts that convert software into distribution.

2. METHOD

Every number in this paper comes from a primary source pulled on 9 September 2026. Nothing is estimated and nothing is taken from a dashboard screenshot.

App Store Connect API. App records, version histories, build histories, category and age assignments, price points, and the complete customer-review corpus were pulled over the REST API [Apple Inc., 2026b] using an ES256 JSON Web Token signed with the account's admin key. The review endpoint returns full text, rating, territory, and creation date per review, so review counts here are censuses rather than samples.

Analytics reports. Unit sales come from the App Store Connect analytics pipeline [Apple Inc., 2026a], specifically an ONGOING report request of type *App Store Purchases Standard*. The pipeline has three properties that shape what can be claimed. Report instances restate earlier dates, so for each granularity and row date only the instance with the latest processing date counts. Days without sales produce no instance, so silence and zero are indistinguishable in the raw feed and are separated by checking that the request is still live. And each ONGOING request has a backfill horizon roughly four weeks before its creation, which for the one existing request is 13 July 2026. The tally script implementing these rules lives in the repository

at slab/menuband/bin/sales-tally.mjs.

Runtime telemetry. *Aesthetic.Computer* writes one document per page load to a MongoDB collection named *boots*, carrying user agent, host, path, screen geometry, language, timezone, and a coarse geographic region. The iOS application sets the custom user-agent string *Aesthetic*; its macOS sibling sets the same string, and the two are separated by screen geometry, treating a device pixel ratio of two or more together with a logical width at or below 1024 points as handheld. Boot counts are page loads. They are not people, and the runtime carries no per-user analytics by design.

Repository history. Commit counts and first and last touch dates per application directory come from `git log` against the monorepo. Submission narratives come from `apple/PROGRESS.md`, which records per-build notes written at the time.

The evidence tables sit beside this paper in `data/`, with a README recording what is solid, what is soft, and what is missing. Store listing strings, which are lowercased for some records, are preserved verbatim in `data/app-records.csv`; this paper writes every product name in house style.

3. THE RECORD

Table 1 is the account as it stands. Six app records span ten years and four bundle-identifier conventions, which is itself a readable trace of a practice that changed names.

Read as a shape, the account has two dense periods separated by a long thin one. Between 2016 and 2018 three small iOS pieces shipped and stopped. Between 2018 and 2026 one app shipped, once. Then in a single summer, 2026 produced eleven *Menu Band* releases, a macOS build of *Aesthetic.Computer* for iOS, and a complete *oskiewar* submission package.

The reception is consistent and positive wherever there is enough of it to read. Across 152 lifetime reviews the mean rating is 4.65. The distribution is bimodal in the way small-sample app reviews usually are, with 133 five-star ratings against nine one-star ratings and almost nothing between. Reading the nine, three are jokes about the app being haunted, one is a complaint about a since-changed price, one is a professional dispute unrelated to the software, and two are genuine usability failures that recur elsewhere in the corpus. The two are worth naming because they are actionable: no visible way to start a new painting, and no undo.

Menu Band has zero reviews after eleven releases and five sales, which is the expected outcome of that sample size rather than a signal. *No Paint* carries sixteen published developer responses, and at least one reviewer noticed, opening a 2026 five-star review with delight that anyone replies at all.

4. THE ONE DEMAND EVENT

Figure 1 plots the whole decade on one axis: release marks per app above, monthly *No Paint* review volume below. The asymmetry is the paper’s first finding. Of 131 reviews collected over ten years, 112 arrived in four months.

The reviews say where the attention came from. Seven name a short-video platform explicitly, one of them naming the *@whistlegraph* account directly and instructing readers to go watch the videos that explain the app. The vocabulary of the spike is consistent and unprompted: across the corpus, *calming* appears fourteen times, *relaxing* twelve, *creative* thirteen, *anxiety* five. Reviewers described a drawing tool they had been handed by a video, and they described it as a way to feel better.

Three features of the event matter for what follows.

It was external. Nothing in the App Store produced it. The store received the traffic and converted it, which is a real service, and the store did not originate it.

It was monetized thinly and then abandoned. Two reviews from the peak complain about price, one calling roughly \$3 expensive and another calling it terrible value, which fixes the app as paid during its most visible months. It is free today. The last release shipped in August 2021, twelve months after the peak, and nothing has shipped since.

It decayed completely. Review volume fell from 49 in July 2020 to three in October 2020 and to single digits per year thereafter. The audience was acquired and not retained, and no mechanism existed to retain it, because the app had no account, no notification, and no path back to the wider *Aesthetic.Computer* network that was being built in parallel.

Soft Wallpaper shows a fainter version of the same signature, with eight of its seventeen reviews arriving in June 2020, which suggests the attention spilled across the developer’s catalog rather than landing on one title alone.

5. THE PAID EXPERIMENT

Menu Band is the portfolio’s only commercial test and its only actively developed product: 420 commits between 27 April and 8 September 2026, eleven store releases in 111 days. It is the AWSED and notepad keymap [\[@jeffrey, 2026b\]](#) delivered as a macOS menu-bar instrument, with a sandboxed App Store subset alongside a fuller direct-download build.

Table 2 is the entire commercial history, five rows, reconstructed transaction by transaction from the analytics segments.

Three observations follow, and the third is the one to act on.

Apple’s own surfaces did the discovery work. Three of

Table 1: The six app records, pulled from the App Store Connect API on 9 September 2026. Released versions counts App Store version records that reached distribution. *No Paint* charged roughly \$3 during its 2020 peak and is free today; the API retains only current prices.

App	Platform	First release	Last release	Vers.	Price	Category	Reviews
No Paint	iOS	2016-04-24	2021-08-03	7	free	Games	131
Finger Quilt	iOS	2016-09-11	2016-09-15	3	free	Photo & Video	2
Soft Wallpaper	iOS	2018-05-26	2018-06-14	5	free	Utilities	17
Aesthetic.Computer (iOS)	iOS	2023-07-04	2023-07-04	1	free	Games	2
Menu Band	macOS	2026-05-07	2026-08-25	11	\$9.99	Music	0
oskiewar	iOS + macOS	—	—	0	—	—	0




Figure 1: Ten years on one axis. Above: every store release, one lane per app, with the release count at the left of each lane. Below: monthly review volume for *No Paint*, the only app with enough reviews to plot. The 2020 spike is the single demand event in the record, and it originated outside the App Store.

Table 2: Every recorded *Menu Band* sale. Sales are gross customer price; proceeds are the developer’s share. The 2026-07-13 GB row is higher gross with lower proceeds, reflecting local price equalization and VAT.

Date	Terr.	Discovery source	Sale	Proc.
2026-07-13	US	App Store search	4.99	3.50
2026-07-13	GB	App Store browse	6.57	3.81
2026-07-13	US	App referrer	4.99	3.50
2026-07-15	US	App referrer	4.99	3.50
2026-08-13	US	App Store search	4.99	3.50
Total			26.53	17.81

five sales came from App Store search or browse, with no marketing attached. Two came from an app referrer, meaning another app’s link. The product page was the conversion surface in four of the five.

The buyers were not early adopters. Their systems ran macOS 12.7, 14.7, 26.3, and 26.5. Two of five were on releases several years old, which argues for keeping the deployment target low rather than tracking the newest system.

Every sale happened at \$4.99. The app lists at \$9.99 today, and no unit has sold at that price. The API does not retain the date of the change, so the causal claim cannot be made from this evidence, and the coincidence

is exact: the last sale is 13 August 2026, and the record since is empty. With five data points this is a hypothesis. It is also the cheapest hypothesis in the paper to test, requiring one price change and four weeks of waiting.

The wider commercial context is unflattering and worth stating plainly. Five units over four months, against 420 commits, is an effective hourly rate near zero. Two decades of app-market research describe the shape: value in mobile application markets concentrates in a small head while the tail earns almost nothing [Bresnahan et al., 2014, Ghose and Han, 2014, Anderson, 2006]. A single paid utility with no marketing budget lands in the tail by default. The useful question is what the store can be asked to do besides sell copies, and Section 8 answers it.

6. THE LAST MILE

The account’s sharpest finding is structural. Software was written that never became distribution, and the failure is concentrated in a handful of administrative steps at the end of the pipeline.

Apple’s release pipeline has five stages. A build is archived and uploaded. An App Store version record is created and the build is attached to it. The version is submitted for review. Review completes. The version is released. A build that stops after the first stage is invisible to every customer, and it expires. Figure 2 places




Figure 2: Where each app sits in Apple’s release pipeline. *Menu Band* completes all four stages routinely. Two finished applications stop at the first, which is invisible to every customer and reversible in an afternoon.

each app at the stage it currently occupies.

Aesthetic.Computer for iOS is the costly case. The App Store serves version 1.0, released 4 July 2023. Two later builds were uploaded, on 23 April and 1 May 2026, and no version record was ever created for them, so neither reached a single user. Both are now expired. The repository shows what they contained: `apple/PROGRESS.md` records build 2 as a push-notification rewrite and build 3 as a reliability pass fixing a documented failure in which the app hangs on the boot animation with no recovery short of force-quit, addressed with a watchdog timer, a navigation-failure delegate, pull-to-refresh, and an offline retry path. That fix exists, was tested, and is not in the hands of anyone who has the app. Section 7 shows how many people that is.

oskiewar is the cheap case. A complete build was uploaded on 17 August 2026, it has not expired, and both the iOS and macOS version records sit in `PREPARE_FOR_SUBMISSION`. The submission tooling to finish it already exists and is proven: `bin/asc.mjs submit` performs the whole last mile idempotently, and it was written for *Menu Band* precisely because doing it by hand across three resource types in the wrong order leaves a version that looks ready and was never sent.

The dormant three carry a deadline that is not self-imposed. Apple’s App Store Improvements process identifies for removal any app that has gone three years without an update and falls below a minimum download threshold over a rolling twelve months, with ninety days to respond [Apple Inc., 2022]. *Finger Quilt* last shipped in 2016, *Soft Wallpaper* in 2018, *No Paint* in 2021. All three are past the update window, and whether they are past the download threshold is unknown, because until 9 September 2026 no analytics report existed for any of them to say. A removed app keeps working for people who already have it and disappears for everyone else, which for *No Paint* would mean losing a ten-year listing carrying 131 reviews at 4.74 stars.

Table 3: Monthly boots by surface in 2026. The iOS application is identified by its custom user agent together with handheld screen geometry. February is an unexplained web outlier and is excluded from typical-month reasoning. September is partial, covering nine days.

Month	iOS app	iOS web	All web
2026-02	1,429	1,827	51,276
2026-03	2,638	1,020	7,507
2026-04	2,944	1,248	8,877
2026-05	2,273	1,068	6,005
2026-06	1,362	1,395	7,574
2026-07	1,087	649	6,194
2026-08	1,604	1,199	7,860
2026-09	493	333	3,003
Total	13,830	8,739	98,296

7. WHAT THE RUNTIME ALREADY CARRIES

The store is one distribution channel and the web is the other. Boot telemetry lets the two be compared directly, because both surfaces load the same runtime and both report.

Table 3 carries the argument for finishing the iOS release. In every month of 2026 except February and June, the wrapped iOS application produced more sessions than mobile Safari did. Over the period it produced 13,830 handheld boots against 8,739 from iPhone and iPad browsers. Whatever its store presence looks like, the app is a live, load-bearing surface, and it is running a binary from July 2023 with a known hang whose fix expired in TestFlight.

The comparison also sets the scale honestly. Native sessions are about one seventh of total web sessions. The store is a real but minority channel, and the case for investing in it rests on what it uniquely provides rather than on volume: a discovery surface that demonstrably converts, a payment mechanism, a permanent listing, and access to system capabilities the browser withholds.

8. OPENINGS

Nine actions, ordered by evidence-to-effort. Each names the finding that motivates it and the smallest test that would settle it.

1. **Finish *oskiewar*’s macOS listing, then submit it.** A finished, unexpired macOS build (build 7) has sat since 17 August 2026 against a version record in `PREPARE_FOR_SUBMISSION`, and the submission tooling exists. Three things stand between it and review, none of them a build: `asc.mjs` was written against *Menu Band*’s application identifier and the macOS platform, so it must be told which app it is addressing; the store listing is empty on both platforms, with `description`, `keywords` and `supportUrl` all null and no

screenshots attached; and build 7’s pre-release version records `MAC_OS`, so it cannot serve the iOS record beside it. The listing is the work, and it is an afternoon of writing rather than an hour of shipping. *This entry was corrected after the audit: the first draft described the submission as one command away, which the App Store Connect API does not support.*

2. **Build *oskiewar* for iOS.** The iOS version record has existed since 17 August 2026 with no build behind it. Until one is archived and uploaded, the claim that *oskiewar* supplies the account’s first iOS release since 2023 has nothing to stand on.
3. **Ship *Aesthetic.Computer* for iOS 1.1.** 13,830 handheld sessions run a three-year-old binary while its reliability fix expires in TestFlight. Rebuild from the code documented in `apple/PROGRESS.md`, create the version record, submit. The app’s one negative review complains about unwanted notifications, which the build 2 push rework directly addresses.
4. **Return *Menu Band* to \$4.99.** Every recorded sale happened at \$4.99 and none at \$9.99. Change the price, wait four weeks, read the analytics. If units resume, the finding is worth more than the four dollars of margin.
5. **Update *No Paint* before Apple removes it.** A ten-year listing with 131 reviews at 4.74 stars sits five years past its last release and inside the removal window. A minimal build that clears the deployment target, adds a visible new-painting control and an undo button, and points at the current `nopaint.art` redirect would protect the asset and close the two usability complaints the review corpus repeats.
6. **Instrument everything.** Four ONGOING analytics report requests were created on 9 September 2026 for the apps that lacked them, and their first instances land within days. Read them, and read the App Downloads Standard report alongside purchases, so the download-threshold half of the removal criterion stops being invisible.
7. **Recover the vendor number.** Sales and Trends gives same-day exact units across the whole catalog, and it is blocked on one value readable from the Payments and Financial Reports page in App Store Connect. Everything commercial in this paper is currently limited by a four-week backfill horizon that Sales and Trends does not have.
8. **Rebuild the referral path that worked.** The one demand event in ten years came from short-video attention pointed at a free drawing tool, and it decayed because nothing caught it. The catalog now has an account system, a notification path, and a network to arrive into. A store listing that leads into *Aesthetic.Computer* rather than terminating in a single app converts attention into membership.
9. **Treat the listing as the artifact.** Four of five *Menu Band* sales converted on the product page,

and three of five were discovered by Apple’s own search and browse. That makes screenshots, subtitle, and keywords the highest-leverage surface in the account, and they are already generated from real UI by `bin/app-store-real.mjs`. Extend that pipeline to the other apps rather than writing new marketing.

Items 1 through 5 are executable within a week and need no new code, though item 1 needs a listing written and item 2 needs a build archived. Items 6 and 7 are measurement. Items 8 and 9 are the strategy the first seven make possible.

9. LIMITATIONS

The commercial record is incomplete at the front. The analytics backfill horizon of 13 July 2026 means *Menu Band* sales between its 7 May launch and 12 July are unrecoverable through this route, so five units is a floor rather than a total. Lifetime downloads for every app remain unknown pending the vendor number.

Boot counts are page loads. A single enthusiastic session inflates them the same way a hundred visitors would, and no per-user identity is attached, so nothing here should be read as an audience size. The February 2026 web figure of 51,276 is an outlier this paper does not explain and does not use.

The price hypothesis rests on five transactions. It is stated as a test to run rather than a conclusion, and it would be irresponsible to describe it otherwise.

Reviews are a biased instrument everywhere, over-representing delight and grievance and under-representing the ordinary middle. Their value here is in the specific and repeated complaints, which are actionable regardless of what the ratings mean.

Finally, the removal risk is a policy reading rather than a notice. Apple’s stated criteria are conjunctive, requiring both staleness and low downloads [Apple Inc., 2022], and the download half is exactly what has never been measured. No removal warning has been received for any app in this account.

10. ETHICS AND PRIVACY

Review text quoted here is public on the App Store. Reviewer nicknames are omitted throughout, and quotations are limited to what supports a stated finding. One low-rated review makes a professional allegation about the developer; it is counted in the distribution and its content is not reproduced, because it concerns conduct rather than software and repeating it would neither test it nor answer it.

Boot telemetry is aggregate. No document is quoted, no handle is named, and no geographic detail finer than a country is used. The runtime collects this data to debug boot failures, and reusing it for a distribution audit is a secondary use of records already held, which is worth

stating rather than assuming.

Commercial figures are the developer’s own. The five transactions include territory and discovery source as Apple reports them, and no purchaser is identifiable from any field used here.

11. CONCLUSION

Ten years produced six app records, 152 reviews averaging 4.65 stars, one demand event, and \$17.81.

The record’s lesson is narrower than the numbers suggest. The work was done. Three small iOS pieces shipped and found real affection, one of them at a scale that briefly mattered. A menu-bar instrument received 420 commits and eleven releases in a single summer. A reliability fix for the most-used native surface was written, tested, and documented. What failed repeatedly was the conversion of finished software into distribution, which on Apple’s store is four administrative steps that take an afternoon and are invisible when skipped. Two applications sit at the first of those steps right now, and one of them serves nearly fourteen thousand sessions a year with a binary from 2023.

The measurement failure compounds it. Until the day this audit began, no analytics report existed for five of six apps, which meant the account could not answer whether anything was being downloaded, could not see the removal risk accumulating against its oldest and best-loved listing, and could not have noticed a price change coinciding with the end of sales. That is now fixed, and the first reports arrive within days.

The strategic finding is the one worth carrying forward. Attention has never been the constraint. In 2020 it arrived unbidden and was allowed to drain away, and in 2026 Apple’s own search surface found buyers for an unmarketed instrument three times out of five. The constraint is the last mile, and the last mile is cheap.

A. RATING DISTRIBUTION

Table 4 is the full rating census behind the mean quoted in Section 3. It is included because the mean alone misleads: 4.65 stars across 152 reviews sounds like a normal distribution centred high, and the actual shape is 133 five-star ratings, nine one-star ratings, and ten reviews in between. Small-sample app reviews behave this way generally, and the practical consequence is that the middle of the scale carries almost no information here while the two poles carry all of it. The nine one-star reviews were therefore read individually rather than counted, and two of them produced the usability items in opening 4.

References

Chris Anderson. *The Long Tail: Why the Future of Business Is Selling Less of More*. Hyperion, 2006.

Table 4: Rating census across all reviewed apps, pulled complete from the App Store Connect API on 9 September 2026. *Menu Band* and *oskiewar* have no reviews and are omitted.

App	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean
No Paint	6	1	1	5	118	131	4.74
Soft Wallpaper	2	0	2	0	13	17	4.29
Finger Quilt	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.50
Aesthetic.Computer (iOS)	1	0	0	0	1	2	3.00
Total	9	2	3	5	133	152	4.65

Apple Inc. Clarifying criteria and new timing extension for App Store improvements process. Apple Developer News, 2022. <https://developer.apple.com/news/?id=gi6npkmf>.

Apple Inc. Analytics reports: App Store Connect API, 2026a. <https://developer.apple.com/documentation/appstoreconnectapi/analytics>.

Apple Inc. App Store Connect API, 2026b. <https://developer.apple.com/documentation/appstoreconnectapi>.

Timothy F. Bresnahan, Jason P. Davis, and Pai-Ling Yin. Economic value creation in mobile applications. *The Changing Frontier: Rethinking Science and Innovation Policy*, pages 233–286, 2014.

Anindya Ghose and Sang Pil Han. Estimating demand for mobile applications in the new economy. *Management Science*, 60(6):1470–1488, 2014.

@jeffrey. Aesthetic.Computer ’26: A mobile-first runtime for creative computing, 2026a. arXiv preprint draft in repository.

@jeffrey. Keymaps as social software: Versioned virtual objects via social contract, 2026b. arXiv preprint draft in repository.

@jeffrey. notepat.com: From keyboard toy to system front door, 2026c. arXiv preprint draft in repository.

@jeffrey. AC Native OS ’26, 2026d. arXiv preprint draft in repository.

@jeffrey. Who pays for creative tools?, 2026e. arXiv preprint draft in repository.



Source bundle

The attached ZIP contains the paper’s machine-readable text sources and a plain-text inventory. It supports accessibility, audit, quotation, and reproducible editing; the PDF remains the canonical reading edition. Private evidence, credentials, raw datasets, generated PDFs, and unlisted assets are excluded.