

VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

Carepoint Clinic Booking & SMS Reminders

Clinic booking and front-desk management for medical, dental, and therapy practices.

Product ID	**B0549-95447**
Builder	**Raj's Builder Studio**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 10 Nov 2026**
Stack	**Express 5.1.0 (with helmet 8.3.0) · JavaScript (Node.js 22.23.4) · PostgreSQL 16 (16.15 in Docker Compose)**
Built with	**OpenAI Codex, Claude Code**
Review period	**4 Nov 2026 – 10 Nov 2026 · 2 rounds of changes**

85 / 100

Passed with 2 warnings

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	89
Code structure	70
Docs & completeness	80
Dependency health	88
Build & deploy	80

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

✓ **Installed & run**
10 Nov 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
10 Nov 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
10 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 89/100 with no failing check.

! 2 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00112. 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	Every regex candidate is either a runtime token variable, a request-body field, or an environment reference. The .env.example holds clearly labeled placeholders, and docker-compose.yml requires SESSION_SECRET and POSTGRES_PASSWORD from .env with no defaults. The only remaining concern is that the files after docker-compose.yml's db service were not fully visible, so those could not be checked.	94	Pass
Dependency vulnerabilities	The project has one manifest (package.json) with three exact-pinned production dependencies (express 5.1.0, helmet 8.3.0, pg 8.16.3) and a committed package-lock.json. No wildcard or pre-release versions are present, and I know of no critical advisory for the pinned versions. Minor concerns: the lockfile contents were not visible, and some pins may be slightly behind current patch releases.	88	Pass
Authorisation & access control	Every visible mutating and admin route uses authenticate plus an explicit role check, and ownership is enforced in SQL with clinic scoping. Passwords use salted scrypt with timing-safe compare. Minor gaps: a few routes were truncated and could not be verified, and some role checks are done inline, not through middleware.	88	Pass
Database access rules	All visible queries use $n placeholders, and the dynamic fragments (scope, $${values.length}) are built from fixed server-side strings, not user input. Destructive statements are scoped by clinic and owner. The schema files were not in the excerpt, so foreign keys, cascades and indexes could only be checked through README claims, and a few routes pass unvalidated IDs to uuid-typed parameters.	84	Warning
Code structure & duplication	Checked by our reviewers during the human review.	70	Warning
Build reproducibility	The package.json, lockfile, .nvmrc, Dockerfiles and compose appear coherent, with pinned digests and an explicit db:setup step. However, HowToSetup.md and the Dockerfiles were not in the digest, so setup order could not be verified. A committed 4.5 MB upload zip and a version mismatch add clutter.	80	Warning

Open warnings

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

Warning 1 Mostly reproducible; HowToSetup.md and Dockerfiles unseen, committed zip and version mismatch are gaps

The package.json, lockfile, .nvmrc, Dockerfiles and compose appear coherent, with pinned digests and an explicit db:setup step. However, HowToSetup.md and the Dockerfiles were not in the digest, so setup order could not be verified. A committed 4.5 MB upload zip and a version mismatch add clutter.

Warning 2 SQL is parameterized and tenant-scoped; schema review is limited and a few input checks are missing

All visible queries use $n placeholders, and the dynamic fragments (scope, $${values.length}) are built from fixed server-side strings, not user input. Destructive statements are scoped by clinic and owner. The schema files were not in the excerpt, so foreign keys, cascades and indexes could only be checked through README claims, and a few routes pass unvalidated IDs to uuid-typed parameters.

Requirement list

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

✓	Complete source for every part	Met
✓	No real credentials	Met
!	Exactly one example config file	Partial
!	Pinned dependencies with lockfile	Partial
✓	PostgreSQL schema creates from empty	Met
!	HowToSetup.md with two targets	Partial
✓	Authorisation on every write route	Met
!	Working demo account on live URL	Partial
✓	README.md with the five differentiators	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md architecture guide (nice)	Met
!	CHANGELOG.md starting at 1.0.0 (nice)	Partial
✓	Seed data (nice)	Met
✓	docker-compose.yml (nice)	Met
✓	README.md	Met
✓	HowToSetup.md	Met
✓	.env.example	Met
✓	Clinic Booking a project file	Met
✓	Clinic Booking a project file	Met
✓	a project file	Met
✓	LICENSE-NOTE.md	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md (nice)	Met
✓	CHANGELOG.md (nice)	Met
✓	a project file (nice)	Met
✓	docker-compose.yml (nice)	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 10 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 10 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

Round 1: changes requested on 9 Nov 2026; the builder fixed them and uploaded again.

Sign-off: approved for sale on 10 Nov 2026 with 2 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.