


VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

Votedesk - Feedback Boards, Roadmap & Changelog SaaS

Self-hosted feedback boards, public roadmap and changelog. Run it for your product or sell it as a multi-tenant SaaS.

Product ID	**B0055-84814**
Builder	**Asad · Devwhite**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 5 Nov 2026**
Stack	**Laravel 13 (laravel/framework ^13.17) · PHP 8.3 or later · MySQL 8 or MariaDB 10.3+ (SQLite for local development)**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**31 Oct 2026 – 5 Nov 2026 · 1 round of changes**

78 / 100

Passed with 4 warnings

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	77
Code structure	84
Docs & completeness	73
Dependency health	82
Build & deploy	72

✓ **AI code audit**
6 checks · 31 Oct 2026

✓ **Installed & run**
5 Nov 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
5 Nov 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
5 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.
- ! 11 of 15 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).
- ✓ Security scored 77/100 with no failing check.
- ! 4 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00099. 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	Regex candidates in PHP code are validation rules, framework calls, or variable names, not secrets. The docker-compose.yml ships fixed database passwords, and the demo accounts use a well-known password. These are weak defaults rather than live credentials, and .env.example is blank.	88	Warning
Dependency vulnerabilities	composer.json is well-formed with caret-pinned production dependencies and a committed composer.lock (324 KB). No wildcard or 'latest' versions appear. The contents of the lockfiles were not available, so installed versions could not be checked against advisories, and no package-lock.json appears in the tree (it may have been omitted as a lock file).	82	Pass
Authorisation & access control	The architecture is solid: Form Requests, Policies, a tenant WorkspaceScope, scopeBindings, a super-admin middleware and bcrypt hashing via the User model. However a project file and most controllers were omitted from the digest, so per-route guards and ownership checks could not be traced. A few concrete risks stood out in the visible code.	72	Warning
Database access rules	The architecture is good: a global WorkspaceScope on tenant models, workspace_id kept out of mass assignment, scopeBindings() on routes, and Eloquent used throughout. The digest did not include the migrations, services, raw queries or WorkspaceScope itself, so I could not confirm there is no string-built SQL, unscoped destructive statements, or missing foreign keys and indexes. The score is capped until those files are reviewed.	72	Warning
Code structure & duplication	The digest shows a sensible layout: thin controllers, Form Requests, Policies, a services layer and a documented architecture in CLAUDE.md. Duplication and god-file risks cannot be fully verified from the excerpts, and a few hard-coded demo values are visible.	84	Pass
Build reproducibility	composer.json, package.json, lockfile and migrations are coherent, and vendor/ node_modules are excluded from the archive. However HowToSetup.md was not visible in the digest, so prerequisites and step order could not be verified, and there are several small version and packaging inconsistencies.	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 **No real credentials found; weak default passwords in docker-compose and demo accounts ship to buyers**

Regex candidates in PHP code are validation rules, framework calls, or variable names, not secrets. The docker-compose.yml ships fixed database passwords, and the demo accounts use a well-known password. These are weak defaults rather than live credentials, and .env.example is blank.

Warning 2 **Authz design looks sound, but routes/controllers were mostly not visible, so full coverage is unverified**

The architecture is solid: Form Requests, Policies, a tenant WorkspaceScope, scopeBindings, a super-admin middleware and bcrypt hashing via the User model. However a project file and most controllers were omitted from the digest, so per-route guards and ownership checks could not be traced. A few concrete risks stood out in the visible code.

Warning 3 **Mostly reproducible Laravel build; setup doc unverified and a few consistency gaps**

composer.json, package.json, lockfile and migrations are coherent, and vendor/node_modules are excluded from the archive. However HowToSetup.md was not visible in the digest, so prerequisites and step order could not be verified, and there are several small version and packaging inconsistencies.

Warning 4 **Tenant scoping looks solid, but the migrations and queries could not be inspected, so the review is incomplete**

The architecture is good: a global WorkspaceScope on tenant models, workspace_id kept out of mass assignment, scopeBindings() on routes, and Eloquent used throughout. The digest did not include the migrations, services, raw queries or WorkspaceScope itself, so I could not confirm there is no string-built SQL, unscoped destructive statements, or missing foreign keys and indexes. The score is capped until those files are reviewed.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 11 of 15 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)	Met
!	Working live demo	Partial
✓	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 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 5 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 5 Nov 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.