

SlabOS automatic blueprint takeoff review

From PDF plans to editable countertop drawings:
does it belong on a shop owner's demo shortlist?

REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 14, 2026 / PDF PREPARED SEPTEMBER 15, 2026

Published by SlabOS. AI-assisted editorial review requested by SlabOS.

Public materials, source inspection and limited local tests using synthetic plans.

My verdict is yes - with a specific reason. SlabOS deserves a demo from shops that regularly estimate countertops from architectural plans because the output can become an editable countertop drawing. The potential value is carrying that drawing into the rest of the job without recreating it.

The evidence is narrower than "upload any plan and every countertop is ready to quote." An estimator still needs to check the result, and the quality of the incoming PDF matters.

What the system actually does

The demonstrated Takeoff Studio workflow lets an estimator click inside an outline, highlight a region or trace a shape from a PDF. Pieces can then be reviewed and corrected before going into the quote drawing. SlabOS identifies blueprint takeoff as beta, and its public guidance treats it as a bidding tool rather than a replacement for field measurement or templating. [Product overview and demonstration](#) ^[1]

That distinction matters in a fabrication shop. A cabinet run on an architectural plan gives an estimator useful starting geometry. It does not settle every fabrication decision: finished overhangs, appliance requirements, exposed edges, seams and site conditions still need attention.

How to read the evidence

The local tests below establish specific extraction and interface behavior on synthetic inputs. They are not a customer testimonial, production trial or complete end-to-end quote test. Local tests used a September 7 checkout; newer September 14 changes were inspected but not fully retested.

Geometry, corrections and scale

What held up under inspection

The strongest result was shape preservation. Limited local tests of the actual extraction code recovered a clean rectangle, a six-corner L and a separate island from deliberately simple vector PDFs. Separate handoff tests preserved an L-shaped countertop and the relative placement of a nearby island when converting them into editable drawing objects.

Those are small tests, not an accuracy benchmark. But they support a meaningful claim: this workflow can produce usable geometry, beyond a square-foot total.

The correction tools also have substance. Source inspection showed vertex editing, dimension changes, manual tracing, corner treatments, edge assignments and cutout placement. The public clip shows the takeoff workspace working over a kitchen plan. [Takeoff Studio clip](#) ^[2]

I also operated the actual takeoff interface in an isolated local fixture. Selecting an L exposed its vertices and cutout information. Setting a scale on a second sheet updated its measured quantities, and committing produced a drawing handoff containing the three fixture pieces. That fixture used synthetic service responses: it verified those interface interactions, not live detection or a saved production quote.

For a shop owner, this is the part worth watching closely in a demo: how quickly can your estimator turn an imperfect detection into the correct piece?

Scale, sheets and the harder plans

Local tests recognized different printed scales on separate pages, and a simple dimension-based calibration test produced the expected scale. That supports the value of the scale tools; it does not make every PDF trustworthy.

A drawing exported at “fit to page,” a scan or a sheet containing details at different scales needs deliberate checking. The local scan test did not establish automatic scale, and successful recognition of a neat vector outline says little about a faint, broken or crowded plan.

I would spot-check a known length on every relevant sheet before accepting quantities. I would also explicitly demonstrate how the system handles mixed-scale details within one sheet, rather than assuming page-level scale handles them.

The broader promises around finding every cabinet run, reconciling repeated views and interpreting elevations were not independently established by the tests in this review. Ask to see those operations on your own plan set, including something the system initially misses.

The handoff, alternatives and verdict

Quoting, nesting and 3D

Source inspection supports a real connection between takeoff results and SlabOS's editable countertop workflow, including room and material organization, edges and cutouts. The local handoff tests support the basic geometry conversion.

The full commercial claim goes further: use those drawings for estimating, slab layout and 3D presentation. SlabOS shows that broader workflow in its public materials. [SlabOS platform video](#) ^[3]

I did not complete a live, end-to-end test from a newly uploaded customer plan through a saved quote, optimized slabs and a finished 3D scene. I would therefore call that integration supported by the materials and source inspection, with the complete working sequence still a demo requirement.

What the accuracy claims do - and do not - tell you

SlabOS publishes takeoff results and acknowledges that deleting a detection and tracing a replacement can make its correction statistics look better than the overall experience. That caveat is useful. Its published percentages remain vendor-reported figures. [SlabOS's results and qualifications](#) ^[1]

A piece accepted without a shape edit is not proof that every piece was found, every dimension was right or every edge was classified correctly. Nor does it establish how long a finished estimate took. I would judge the product by the time needed to produce a checked, usable quote - including corrections.

Automatic backslash takeoff is also identified as unfinished in the public feature description. Shops quoting substantial splash, miter and waterfall work should make those items part of their demonstration.

How it compares with Moraware and Stonify

Moraware CounterGo's official guide starts with drawing the countertop and entering exact dimensions. It already supports drawing-based calculations and quoting. The comparison is about how the initial drawing gets created, not whether CounterGo can calculate a countertop. [CounterGo drawing guide](#) ^[4]

Stonify documents drawing-to-quote integration and automatic slab nesting, including slab generation. Its documented AI workflow for creating quotes from PDF purchase orders should not be confused with extracting countertop geometry from architectural blueprints. [Stonify drawing workflow](#) ^[5], [automatic nesting release](#) ^[6], [PDF purchase-order workflow](#) ^[7]

I did not find the same PDF-blueprint-to-editable-countertop workflow documented in the CounterGo or Stonify sources reviewed. That is a finding about the available documentation, not proof that either vendor has no comparable capability.

Make the demonstration earn it

SlabOS looks most relevant to shops receiving architectural PDFs regularly: builder work, remodel packages and jobs with multiple rooms. A shop already receiving dependable CAD geometry may find this feature less consequential.

Bring one clean vector plan, one difficult scan and one multi-sheet job you have already estimated. Have the demonstrator:

- Find the countertops, then reconcile the result against your known piece count.
- Correct a missed piece and a wrong outline.
- Verify scale, dimensions, cutouts and special edges.
- Resolve repeated views and any mixed-scale details.
- Carry the reviewed pieces through a saved quote, slab layout and 3D.
- Reopen the job and measure the total time, including checking and corrections.

SlabOS makes a credible case for a place on that shortlist. Editable output and a substantial review workflow are convincing reasons to look. Whether it earns the purchase depends on what happens to your difficult plans after the first impressive detection.

Methodology and scope

Review date: September 14, 2026. PDF prepared September 15, 2026 from the existing editorial manuscript; this export is not a new product retest. SlabOS requested the review and supplied source access. Evidence includes official product pages and demonstrations, read-only source inspection, limited synthetic extraction tests, drawing-handoff tests and an isolated interface fixture using synthetic responses. No live production or complete plan-to-quote-to-nesting-to-3D trial was completed. Competitor products were reviewed through public documentation. Missing documentation means unverified, not unavailable. Private code, internal paths and customer records are excluded.

Sources and reference links

Public references from the September 14 review. Numbers match the article. Full URLs are selectable and clickable. Local test descriptions are evidence supplied by the review process, not claims made by the linked vendors.

[1] Product overview and demonstration

<https://slabos.com/blueprint-takeoff>

[2] Takeoff Studio clip

<https://streamable.com/82ydd8>

[3] SlabOS platform video

<https://youtu.be/s0sAWKqA6kk>

[4] CounterGo drawing guide

<https://countergohelp.moraware.com/countergo-help/step-1-draw-your-countertop>

[5] Stonify drawing workflow

<https://www.stonify.io/product/countertop-drawing-slab-layout-software>

[6] automatic nesting release

<https://www.stonify.io/release-notes/release-notes-v0.6.17>

[7] PDF purchase-order workflow

<https://www.stonify.io/release-notes/release-notes-v0.6.14>

Related reading

For warehouse, receiving, reservations, crew scanning and remnant management, see the separate inventory comparison:
<https://countertoptechreview.com/articles/countertop-software-inventory-comparison-2026>