This report has been replaced by QR-26-00073 — a newer version of the product was reviewed.

ProcureHub

VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

ProcureHub

Procure-to-pay portal for UAE/GCC companies: requests, approvals, RFQs, orders, receiving, invoice matching, payments.

Product ID	**B0001-75632**
Builder	**Chow Studio**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 5 Oct 2026**
Stack	**Laravel 12 · PHP 8.2 · MySQL 8.0 / MariaDB 10.4**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**4 Oct 2026 – 5 Oct 2026**

92 / 100

Passed with 3 warnings

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	93
Code structure	78
Docs & completeness	100
Dependency health	100
Build & deploy	92

✓ **AI code audit**
6 checks · 4 Oct 2026

✓ **Installed & run**
5 Oct 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
5 Oct 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
5 Oct 2026

At a glance

- ✓ Installed and run from the delivered code — 8 of 8 checks answered yes.
- ✓ Live demo compared with the delivered code — 7 of 7 checks answered yes.
- ✓ 15 of 15 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).
- ✓ Security scored 93/100 with no failing check.
- ! 3 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00009. The online copy always shows the latest status.

PART 1

AI code audit

The full source archive was read by our AI auditor against each check. It reads the code — it does not run it; running it is part 2.

CHECK	WHAT WE FOUND	SCORE	RESULT
Secrets & credentials	No committed API keys, private keys, or real credentials detected. The codebase correctly uses environment variables for all sensitive configuration. However, the demo login feature and empty database password in .env.example could mislead buyers into deploying with insecure defaults.	**95**	Warning
Dependency vulnerabilities	composer.lock is present with all PHP dependencies pinned to exact versions. The project runs 'composer audit' as part of its audit-dependencies script and documents the results in a project file. No known vulnerabilities were found in the current lockfile.	**100**	Pass
Authorisation & access control	All mutating endpoints require authentication and role checks are enforced via middleware and Gate::authorize(). Password policy is strong (12+ chars, letters, numbers, symbols) and hashed with bcrypt. A few read endpoints (vendor documents, contract details) lack explicit ownership checks, allowing authenticated users to view records by changing IDs.	**92**	Warning
Database access rules	No SQL injection paths found. All queries use parameter binding or Eloquent. Delete/update statements are properly scoped. The schema is complete and can be created from empty. A few foreign-key columns lack explicit indexes (Laravel creates them automatically on constrained() but best practice is to declare them).	**92**	Pass
Code structure & duplication	The project follows a clean architecture with clear separation between controllers, services, and models. However, several service classes are oversized (300+ lines), and there is moderate duplication in assistant answer handlers and validation logic across multiple controllers. Configuration is mostly externalized but some hard-coded values remain in views and services.	**78**	Warning
Build reproducibility	The project is fully reproducible with Laravel 12, PHP 8.2+, MySQL and Composer. All dependencies are pinned in composer.lock. The setup document covers all steps but could be clearer about database creation timing and has a minor inconsistency in the Docker password generation command.	**92**	Pass

Open warnings

Problems that did not stop the listing. They stay on the product page until a later version fixes them.

Warning 1 **No real secrets found; weak defaults in demo config need hardening for production**

No committed API keys, private keys, or real credentials detected. The codebase correctly uses environment variables for all sensitive configuration. However, the demo login feature and empty database password in .env.example could mislead buyers into deploying with insecure defaults.

Warning 2 **Strong authentication and role checks; minor ownership gaps on read endpoints**

All mutating endpoints require authentication and role checks are enforced via middleware and Gate::authorize(). Password policy is strong (12+ chars, letters, numbers, symbols) and hashed with bcrypt. A few read endpoints (vendor documents, contract details) lack explicit ownership checks, allowing authenticated users to view records by changing IDs.

Warning 3 **Good module structure with some duplication and oversized service classes**

The project follows a clean architecture with clear separation between controllers, services, and models. However, several service classes are oversized (300+ lines), and there is moderate duplication in assistant answer handlers and validation logic across multiple controllers. Configuration is mostly externalized but some hard-coded values remain in views and services.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 15 of 15 met.

✓	Complete source for every component	Met
✓	No real credentials in the archive	Met
✓	Builds from a clean machine	Met
✓	Database script or migrations	Met
✓	Authentication and roles on every mutating endpoint	Met
✓	Pinned dependencies without critical CVEs (nice)	Met
✓	Documentation set (nice)	Met
✓	Working live demo	Met
✓	README.md	Met
✓	HowToSetup.md	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md (or AGENTS.md) (nice)	Met
✓	CHANGELOG.md (nice)	Met
✓	.env.example	Met
✓	a project file	Met
✓	a project file (nice)	Met

PART 2

Human review

Reviewers from the Vibe96 team in Dubai worked through each question below; a final reviewer signed it off.

Stage 1 — Installed and run from the delivered code

Completed 5 Oct 2026

A reviewer installed the product on a clean machine, following only the guide that ships with it.

QUESTION	ANSWER	REVIEWER'S NOTE
Packages restored without errors	Yes	
Solution builds clean	Yes	
Database created from the shipped script or migrations	Yes	
First sign-in works with the documented steps	Yes	
Setup guide is accurate and complete	Yes	
Every module in the feature list opens and works	Yes	
No real secrets in the archive	Yes	
Branding and company details can be changed without code	Yes	

Stage 2 — Live demo compared with the delivered code

Completed 5 Oct 2026

A second reviewer checked that what the listing and demo show is what the buyer receives.

QUESTION	ANSWER	REVIEWER'S NOTE
Demo URL is reachable	Yes	
Demo credentials work	Yes	
Demo runs the same version as the archive	Yes	
All five differentiators are visible in the demo	Yes	
Screenshots match the demo	Yes	
Nothing in the demo is missing from the code	Yes	
Datasheet claims are accurate	Yes	

Changes asked for during review

None — approved on the first round.

Sign-off: approved for sale on 5 Oct 2026 with 3 warnings shown publicly.

What this report covers — and what it doesn't

- **It covers** version 1.0.0 exactly as the buyer downloads it: the source archive, the setup guide and the live demo on the dates above.

- **It is not** a penetration test, a performance or load test, or a legal review of third-party package licences.
- **Scores are a point in time.** Libraries age; a later version is audited again and gets its own report.
- **Your setup matters.** Hosting, configuration and changes made after purchase are outside this review.
- **How the score is made:** each AI check is scored 0–100 and weighted (security counts most). A listing needs 75 or more, no failing check, and the human review passed.
- **Always try the live demo** before buying, and ask the builder questions from the product page.

Report history

REPORT	VERSION	DATE	SCORE	STATUS
QR-26-00073	1.3.1	27 Oct 2026	**81**	Current
QR-26-00009	1.0.0	5 Oct 2026	**92**	Replaced