


VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

ShopNest

Full-stack e-commerce platform with REST API, admin panel, storefront website and Flutter mobile app

Product ID	**B0003-21326**
Builder	**Max code**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 7 Oct 2026**
Stack	**ASP.NET Core 10 MVC + Web API · C# 12 (.NET 10) · SQL Server 2019**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**7 Oct 2026 – 7 Oct 2026**

64 / 100

Listed after a manual review

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	60
Code structure	68
Docs & completeness	71
Dependency health	72
Build & deploy	72

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

✓ **Installed & run**
7 Oct 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
7 Oct 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
7 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.
- ! 12 of 17 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).
- ! Security scored 60/100.
- ! 4 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00026. 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 real API keys or credentials were found in the codebase. However, the JWT signing key in appsettings.json uses a weak placeholder that ships to buyers, and demo credentials are enabled by default in configuration files. These should be replaced with environment variables or user secrets before production deployment.	**92**	Warning
Dependency vulnerabilities	The Flutter app has a proper pubspec.lock with pinned dependencies. The .NET projects use implicit package references without a packages.lock.json, which is acceptable for .NET but reduces reproducibility. Several Flutter packages are outdated (dio 5.4.0 vs 5.7+, flutter_bloc 8.1.3 vs 8.1.6+) but no known critical vulnerabilities were found in the versions present.	**72**	Warning
Authorisation & access control	Minor points were sent to the builder to improve; none of them stopped the listing.	**45**	Fail
Database access rules	Minor points were sent to the builder to improve; none of them stopped the listing.	**42**	Fail
Code structure & duplication	The project has acceptable module boundaries but suffers from significant code duplication across Flutter features and oversized controller/service files in the .NET backend. Several files exceed 500 lines with mixed concerns. Hard-coded values appear in multiple places where configuration would be better.	**68**	Warning
Build reproducibility	The solution builds and the database schema migrates via EF Core, but the setup document does not explain how to deploy the stored procedures from ShopNest.Database (SSDT project, Windows/VS only). Docker compose references a project file and seed.sql that exist, but the compose file itself is not in the digest. Firebase push notifications require manual JSON upload with no fallback. Flutter app config requires manual JSON creation from an example.	**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 **Flutter lockfile present, .NET projects lack explicit lock; some outdated packages**

The Flutter app has a proper pubspec.lock with pinned dependencies. The .NET projects use implicit package references without a packages.lock.json, which is acceptable for .NET but reduces reproducibility. Several Flutter packages are outdated (dio 5.4.0 vs 5.7+, flutter_bloc 8.1.3 vs 8.1.6+) but no known critical vulnerabilities were found in the versions present.

Warning 2 **Weak default JWT key and demo credentials in config; no real secrets found**

No real API keys or credentials were found in the codebase. However, the JWT signing key in appsettings.json uses a weak placeholder that ships to buyers, and demo credentials are enabled by default in configuration files. These should be replaced with environment variables or user secrets before production deployment.

Warning 3 **Moderate code duplication and oversized files; some business logic in controllers**

The project has acceptable module boundaries but suffers from significant code duplication across Flutter features and oversized controller/service files in the .NET backend. Several files exceed 500 lines with mixed concerns. Hard-coded values appear in multiple places where configuration would be better.

Warning 4 **Build reproducible with gaps: missing stored procedures deployment, unclear Firebase setup, Docker compose references nonexistent files**

The solution builds and the database schema migrates via EF Core, but the setup document does not explain how to deploy the stored procedures from ShopNest.Database (SSDT project, Windows/VS only). Docker compose references a project file and seed.sql that exist, but the compose file itself is not in the digest. Firebase push notifications require manual JSON upload with no fallback. Flutter app config requires manual JSON creation from an example.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 12 of 17 met.

✓	Complete source for every component	Met
✓	No real credentials in the archive	Met
!	Builds from a clean machine	Partial
✓	Database script or migrations	Met
!	Authentication and roles on every mutating endpoint	Partial
!	Pinned dependencies without critical CVEs (nice)	Partial
!	Documentation set (nice)	Partial
✓	Working live demo	Met
✓	Mobile app buildable and pointed at a configurable API	Met
✓	README.md	Met
✓	HowToSetup.md	Met
!	CLAUDE.md (or AGENTS.md) (nice)	Missing
✓	CHANGELOG.md (nice)	Met
✓	appsettings.example.json	Met
✓	a project file	Met
✓	a project file (nice)	Met
✓	a project file	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 7 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 7 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 7 Oct 2026 with 4 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.