

VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

BookNow- Appointments, teams, and payments

Laravel & Vue appointment booking for clinics, salons and service businesses, with branches, staff, rooms and payments.

Product ID	**B0489-76661**
Builder	**Muntasir Hasan**
Version reviewed	**1.0.0 · released 27 Nov 2026**
Stack	**Laravel 13 with Vue 3 and Inertia 3 · PHP 8.4 with TypeScript and Vue 3 · MySQL 8.4**
Built with	**OpenAI Codex**
Review period	**12 Nov 2026 – 27 Nov 2026 · 2 rounds of changes**

69 / 100

Listed after a manual review

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	68
Code structure	84
Docs & completeness	59
Dependency health	72
Build & deploy	62

✓ **AI code audit**
6 checks · 12 Nov 2026

✓ **Installed & run**
24 Nov 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
27 Nov 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
27 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.

! 17 of 29 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).

! Security scored 68/100 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-26-00160. 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	None of the regex candidates is a real credential: .env.example, HowToSetup.md and docker-compose.yml use placeholders or required env vars, and the remaining hits are Laravel validation rules, random token generation and generated route helpers. The only concern is a weak, publicly documented demo password ([hidden]) that seeders create for several role accounts, including a manager and a receptionist.	88	Warning
Dependency vulnerabilities	composer.lock and package-lock.json exist, and the Composer constraints are caret ranges on current majors (Laravel 13, Inertia 3, Fortify). The npm side pins old rollup native binaries (4.9.5) and relies on pre-1.0 and very new toolchain packages. The shipped audit JSON files could not be checked in this digest, so no clean bill can be given.	72	Warning
Authorisation & access control	The digest omits a project file, the middleware bodies, policies and nearly all controllers, so route guards and ownership checks could not be traced. The structure looks sound (role middleware, policies, Form Requests, Fortify with hashed passwords), but token-based public management and documented manager permission deviations need review. The score is capped because most endpoints are unverified.	55	Warning
Database access rules	The digest contained no migration, model or query-builder code, and no raw SQL appeared in the excerpts, so no injection path or unscoped delete was observed. Schema completeness, foreign keys, indexes and tenant scoping could not be verified. The score is conservative because of this gap, not because a defect was found.	60	Warning
Code structure & duplication	The project follows a clear layout: role-specific controllers, Form Requests, dedicated services for booking, availability and payments, and separate enums and models. The main weaknesses visible from the digest are generated Wayfinder files that are large by nature and demo seeders that hard-code credentials and counts in messages.	84	Pass
Build reproducibility	The Laravel 13/Inertia 3 project has consistent manifests and lockfiles, and Docker compose is coherent. However, README references a packaging script that is not in the tree, package.json pins mismatched platform-specific binaries, and HowToSetup.md could not be verified for ordering or prerequisite versions.	62	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 shared demo passwords ship in seeders and README**

None of the regex candidates is a real credential: .env.example, HowToSetup.md and docker-compose.yml use placeholders or required env vars, and the remaining hits are Laravel validation rules, random token generation and generated route helpers. The only concern is a weak, publicly documented demo password ([hidden]) that seeders create for several role accounts, including a manager and a receptionist.

Warning 2 **Database layer not auditable: models, migrations and query code were not in the digest; limited evidence**

The digest contained no migration, model or query-builder code, and no raw SQL appeared in the excerpts, so no injection path or unscoped delete was observed. Schema completeness, foreign keys, indexes and tenant scoping could not be verified. The score is conservative because of this gap, not because a defect was found.

Warning 3 **Authz cannot be verified: a project file and controller bodies were not provided; only structure and docs visible**

The digest omits a project file, the middleware bodies, policies and nearly all controllers, so route guards and ownership checks could not be traced. The structure looks sound (role middleware, policies, Form Requests, Fortify with hashed passwords), but token-based public management and documented manager permission deviations need review. The score is capped because most endpoints are unverified.

Warning 4 **Mostly coherent Laravel/Vue build, but unverified setup doc, missing script and risky npm optional deps**

The Laravel 13/Inertia 3 project has consistent manifests and lockfiles, and Docker compose is coherent. However, README references a packaging script that is not in the tree, package.json pins mismatched platform-specific binaries, and HowToSetup.md could not be verified for ordering or prerequisite versions.

Warning 5 **Lockfiles present, but pinned native binaries, pre-1.0 packages and unverified audit evidence need review**

composer.lock and package-lock.json exist, and the Composer constraints are caret ranges on current majors (Laravel 13, Inertia 3, Fortify). The npm side pins old rollup native binaries (4.9.5) and relies on pre-1.0 and very new toolchain packages. The shipped audit JSON files could not be checked in this digest, so no clean bill can be given.

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 17 of 29 met.

✓	Complete source for every part	Met
✓	No real credentials	Met
!	Single example config file	Partial
!	Lockfiles for reproducible installs	Partial
!	MySQL schema that creates from empty	Partial
!	HowToSetup.md for two targets	Partial
!	Working demo with sample data	Partial
!	Role-gated routes and record isolation	Partial
✓	Scheduling conflict logic (nice)	Met
✓	Database seed data (nice)	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md architecture guide (nice)	Met
!	CHANGELOG and README content (nice)	Partial
!	Docker compose for server setup (nice)	Partial
!	Automated tests (nice)	Partial
!	API and ERD docs (optional)	Missing
✓	README.md	Met
✓	HowToSetup.md	Met
✓	Laravel a project filee	Met
✓	Laravel a project file	Met

✓	Laravel a project file	Met
✓	Vue a project file	Met
✓	Vue a project file	Met
✓	a project file	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md (nice)	Met
✓	CHANGELOG.md (nice)	Met
!	a project file (nice)	Missing
✓	docker-compose.yml (nice)	Met
✓	LICENSE-NOTE.md (optional)	Met
!	a project file (optional)	Missing

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 24 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 27 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 24 Nov 2026; the builder fixed them and uploaded again.

Sign-off: approved for sale on 27 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.