


VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

Axioz HRM

Self-hosted HR suite for a single company: employees, ZKTeco attendance, leave, payroll, recruitment and performance.

Product ID	**B0842-59451**
Builder	**Md Sajjad Hossain**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 20 Nov 2026**
Stack	**Laravel 13 with Inertia 3 and React 19 · PHP 8.4 / 8.5 with TypeScript and React 19 · MySQL 8.0 or later**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**16 Nov 2026 – 20 Nov 2026**

79 / 100

Passed with 3 warnings

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	79
Code structure	72
Docs & completeness	80
Dependency health	82
Build & deploy	84

✓ **AI code audit**
6 checks · 15 Nov 2026

✓ **Installed & run**
20 Nov 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
20 Nov 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
20 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.
- ! 12 of 15 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).
- ✓ Security scored 79/100 with no failing check.
- ! 3 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00148. 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 secret-scan candidate is a placeholder, a hash call, a settings lookup, or a generated value (Makefile uses openssl rand, SeedPassword uses Str::password). .env.example has every secret blank and no .env was shipped. The only caveat is the seed.sql file (995 KB), which could not be inspected fully and should be checked for stored settings values.	92	Pass
Dependency vulnerabilities	Both composer.json and package.json pin exact versions, and composer.lock plus package-lock.json are reported present. I could not confirm any known critical RCE or auth-bypass advisory from the visible manifests. A few versions look unusual and should be verified against the lockfiles before release.	82	Pass
Authorisation & access control	Passwords use Hash::make and the project ships a route-authorization test and report claiming 384 write routes with 0 unguarded. The digest does not include routes/app/*.php, a project file, or the controllers, so these claims cannot be independently verified here, and several risky spots could not be traced. Score is capped until the guards and ownership checks can be confirmed.	72	Warning
Database access rules	The visible evidence is positive: Eloquent throughout, documented scoping rules (`whereIn('created_by', getCompanyAndUsersId())`), tests for record access, and a schema.sql plus 98 migrations. The digest omitted the services, models, controllers, and schema contents, so injection paths, unscoped updates/deletes, and missing FK indexes could not be verified.	72	Warning
Code structure & duplication	The project splits code into controllers, services, models and route files per module, which is a sound boundary. However, the digest shows a 995 KB seed.sql, a route file set that is generated and repeated, and several large lint-level concerns that a buyer would need to work through. The digest is truncated, so the score reflects only the visible evidence.	72	Warning
Build reproducibility	composer.json and package.json pin exact versions, lockfiles ship, .env.example is clean and the vite config fails fast with a clear message if composer install was skipped. Declared PHP and Node prerequisites are consistent across the manifests and CLAUDE.md. HowToSetup.md, the Dockerfile and the compose file were not shown, so step order and Docker coherence could not be fully confirmed.	84	Pass

Open warnings

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

Warning 1 Large codebase with clear module folders, but oversized files and some duplication limit maintainability

The project splits code into controllers, services, models and route files per module, which is a sound boundary. However, the digest shows a 995 KB seed.sql, a route file set that is generated and repeated, and several large lint-level concerns that a buyer would need to work through. The digest is truncated, so the score reflects only the visible evidence.

Warning 2 Database layer looks disciplined, but most SQL and schema code was not visible, so the score is capped

The visible evidence is positive: Eloquent throughout, documented scoping rules (`whereIn('created_by', getCompanyAndUsersId())`), tests for record access, and a schema.sql plus 98 migrations. The digest omitted the services, models, controllers, and schema contents, so injection paths, unscoped updates/deletes, and missing FK indexes could not be verified.

Warning 3 **Strong claimed guard model, but route files and controllers weren't visible; ownership checks unverified**

Passwords use Hash::make and the project ships a route-authorization test and report claiming 384 write routes with 0 unguarded. The digest does not include routes/app/*.php, a project file, or the controllers, so these claims cannot be independently verified here, and several risky spots could not be traced. Score is capped until the guards and ownership checks can be confirmed.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 12 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	Met
!	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 20 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 20 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 20 Nov 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.