

VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

Axioz CRM

Self-hosted Laravel and React CRM for SMBs: leads, sales documents, invoicing, projects, support tickets and reports.

Product ID	**B0842-80228**
Builder	**Md Sajjad Hossain**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 4 Nov 2026**
Stack	**Laravel 13 with Inertia.js 3 and React 19 · PHP 8.4 (with TypeScript and React 19 on the frontend) · MySQL 8.4**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**30 Oct 2026 – 4 Nov 2026 · 1 round of changes**

78 / 100

Passed with 5 warnings

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	75
Code structure	88
Docs & completeness	80
Dependency health	78
Build & deploy	82

✓ **AI code audit**
6 checks · 29 Oct 2026

✓ **Installed & run**
2 Nov 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
4 Nov 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
4 Nov 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.
- ! 20 of 25 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).
- ✓ Security scored 75/100 with no failing check.
- ! 5 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00091. 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 regex candidates are mostly Laravel password-validation code, config lookups, test constants and CI-only placeholders, none of which are real secrets. The README publishes a live demo login (demo@axioz.xyz plus a password) for a non-admin visitor account on the public demo. This is a deliberate, low-privilege demo credential, but it is still a real working login and should be flagged. The .env.example keeps all secrets empty.	80	Warning
Dependency vulnerabilities	The project has composer.json and package.json with caret-pinned ranges and no wildcards or 'latest'. The lock files are omitted from the digest, so installed versions could not be checked against advisories; the README says installs use lockfiles and CI runs composer/npm audit. A few small concerns remain, such as the suspicious 'cn' package, a license mismatch, and a dev-only AI tool in require-dev.	78	Warning
Authorisation & access control	The visible code uses Laravel's auth, hashed passwords, policies and Form Request validation, and the docs state every non-public route is inside the auth group. a project file and most controllers and policies were not in the digest, so route guards and ownership checks could not be verified. A demo account's credentials are published on the login page and in the README.	72	Warning
Database access rules	The digest omitted the models, services, migrations and schema, so no raw SQL, string-built query or unscoped delete could be checked. What is visible is positive: Eloquent, Form Requests, policies, migrations as source of truth and an encrypted mailbox password. The score is capped because the core of this check (queries, foreign keys, indexes) could not be verified.	72	Warning
Code structure & duplication	The digest shows a sensible layering: thin controllers, business logic in app/Services/<Area>/, shared helpers in app/Support/, and per-area policies and Form Requests. The visible excerpts do not show god files or copy-paste blocks, though the digest is truncated so full-file review was not possible.	88	Pass
Build reproducibility	Composer and npm manifests, Docker files, CI and a setup:check command are present, and the README install steps run in a sensible order (env, DB creation, migrate, seed). HowToSetup.md and the lockfiles were not in the digest, so the full walkthrough could not be confirmed. Small inconsistencies in table counts, the PHP version and an unusual npm dependency need cleaning up.	82	Warning

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 credentials found; a public demo login password is published in the README**

The regex candidates are mostly Laravel password-validation code, config lookups, test constants and CI-only placeholders, none of which are real secrets. The README publishes a live demo login (demo@axioz.xyz plus a password) for a non-admin visitor account on the public demo. This is a deliberate, low-privilege demo credential, but it is still a real working login and should be flagged. The .env.example keeps all secrets empty.

Warning 2 **No injection or unscoped deletes visible, but most data-layer code was not provided for review**

The digest omitted the models, services, migrations and schema, so no raw SQL, string-built query or unscoped delete could be checked. What is visible is positive: Eloquent, Form Requests, policies, migrations as source of truth and an encrypted mailbox password. The score is capped because the core of this check (queries, foreign keys, indexes) could not be verified.

Warning 3 **Auth and policies look solid, but routes were not visible and a public demo login is exposed**

The visible code uses Laravel's auth, hashed passwords, policies and Form Request validation, and the docs state every non-public route is inside the auth group. a project file and most controllers and policies were not in the digest, so route guards and ownership checks could not be verified. A demo account's credentials are published on the login page and in the README.

Warning 4 **Lockfiles not visible in digest; several unverifiable caret ranges and a stray package; no known critical vulns**

The project has composer.json and package.json with caret-pinned ranges and no wildcards or 'latest'. The lock files are omitted from the digest, so installed versions could not be checked against advisories; the README says installs use lockfiles and CI runs composer/npm audit. A few small concerns remain, such as the suspicious 'cn' package, a license mismatch, and a dev-only AI tool in require-dev.

Warning 5 **Build mostly reproducible; setup doc could not be fully verified and a few inconsistencies remain**

Composer and npm manifests, Docker files, CI and a setup:check command are present, and the README install steps run in a sensible order (env, DB creation, migrate, seed). HowToSetup.md and the lockfiles were not in the digest, so the full walkthrough could not be confirmed. Small inconsistencies in table counts, the PHP version and an unusual npm dependency need cleaning up.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 20 of 25 met.

✓	Complete source of the web app	Met
✓	No real credentials	Met
✓	Single example env file	Met
!	Pinned dependencies with lockfiles	Partial
!	Schema creates from empty	Partial
!	Role and ownership protection	Partial
✓	HowToSetup.md with two targets	Met
✓	Working demo with sample data	Met
✓	README with features and screenshots	Met
✓	AI coding guide (nice)	Met
✓	Changelog starting at 1.0.0 (nice)	Met
!	Seed data and docker-compose (nice)	Partial
!	API and ERD docs (optional)	Partial
✓	README.md	Met
✓	HowToSetup.md	Met
✓	Laravel a project filee	Met
✓	Laravel a project file	Met
✓	Laravel a project file	Met
✓	a project file	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md (nice)	Met

✓	CHANGELOG.md (nice)	Met
✓	a project file (nice)	Met
✓	docker-compose.yml (nice)	Met
✓	LICENSE-NOTE.md (optional)	Met
✓	docs/ (optional)	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 2 Nov 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 4 Nov 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 4 Nov 2026 with 5 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.