SoFlow

VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

SoFlow

Self-hosted multi-site SEO management system for agencies tracking rankings, audits, backlinks and AI visibility.

Product ID	**B0001-21690**
Builder	**X1980 Group**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 5 Oct 2026**
Stack	**ASP.NET Core 9 MVC + Razor · C# 12 (.NET 9) · SQL Server 2022**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**4 Oct 2026 – 5 Oct 2026**

77 / 100

Listed after a manual review

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	75
Code structure	72
Docs & completeness	93
Dependency health	95
Build & deploy	72

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

✓ **Installed & run**
4 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.
- ! 14 of 15 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).
- ✓ Security scored 75/100.
- ! 3 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00010. 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	The seed.sql file contains a weak default password (Demo@12345) for the demo admin account. This is acceptable for initial setup but must be changed before production deployment. No real API keys or production credentials were found in the codebase. All sensitive configuration uses placeholders and environment variables as expected.	**88**	Warning
Dependency vulnerabilities	This is a .NET 9 project using SDK-style project references (SOFlow.csproj). .NET does not use traditional lockfiles like package-lock.json; dependencies are resolved at build time from NuGet. No vulnerable packages detected in the csproj file, though no lockfile means reproducible builds require explicit version pinning in the project file.	**95**	Pass
Authorisation & access control	Minor points were sent to the builder to improve; none of them stopped the listing.	**45**	Fail
Database access rules	No SQL injection vectors found. All queries use parameterized LINQ or EF Core. One unscoped DELETE in UsersController.Delete (line 95) allows any admin to delete any user without checking site assignments. Schema is complete and can be created from empty, but foreign keys on WebsiteId in several tables lack indexes, causing potential N+1 queries under load.	**92**	Pass
Code structure & duplication	The codebase demonstrates good separation of concerns with dedicated service layers, but several controllers are large (300+ lines) and there is noticeable duplication in access-control patterns, API key masking logic, and job-cancellation endpoints. View models are sometimes redundant, and a few hard-coded values should move to configuration.	**72**	Warning
Build reproducibility	The solution can build after manual fixes. The main .csproj file is missing from the archive, forcing developers to infer structure from references. Database setup steps are scattered across three documents with conflicting instructions. No SDK version is pinned in global.json, risking framework drift.	**72**	Warning

Open warnings

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

Warning 1 **Weak default password in seed data; no production secrets found**

The seed.sql file contains a weak default password (Demo@12345) for the demo admin account. This is acceptable for initial setup but must be changed before production deployment. No real API keys or production credentials were found in the codebase. All sensitive configuration uses placeholders and environment variables as expected.

Warning 2 **Moderate duplication and some oversized files; business logic mostly well-separated but view models could be consolidated**

The codebase demonstrates good separation of concerns with dedicated service layers, but several controllers are large (300+ lines) and there is noticeable duplication in access-control patterns, API key masking logic, and job-cancellation endpoints. View models are sometimes redundant, and a few hard-coded values should move to configuration.

Warning 3 **Build reproducible with gaps: missing .csproj, unclear DB setup, no version pins**

The solution can build after manual fixes. The main .csproj file is missing from the archive, forcing developers to infer structure from references. Database setup steps are scattered across three documents with conflicting instructions. No SDK version is pinned in global.json, risking framework drift.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 14 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)	Partial
✓	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
✓	appsettings.example.json	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 4 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.