



# 0xNodes – SushiSwap Integration

Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: December 17th, 2021 – December 23rd, 2021

Visit: [Halborn.com](https://Halborn.com)

|   |    |
|---|----|
| DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY   | 5  |
| CONTACTS  | 5  |
| 1 EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW  | 6  |
| 1.1 INTRODUCTION  | 7  |
| 1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY   | 7  |
| 1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY   | 7  |
| RISK METHODOLOGY  | 8  |
| 1.4 SCOPE   | 10 |
| 2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW                                    | 11 |
| 3 FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS   | 12 |
| 3.1 (HAL-01) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH NON-STANDARD ERC20 TOKENS - MEDIUM        | 14 |
| Description   | 14 |
| Code Location   | 15 |
| Risk Level  | 15 |
| Recommendation  | 16 |
| Remediation Plan  | 16 |
| 3.2 (HAL-02) FRONT-RUNNING POSSIBILITY ON INITIALIZATION FUNCTIONS - MEDIUM | 17 |
| Description   | 17 |
| Risk Level  | 18 |
| Recommendation  | 18 |
| Remediation Plan  | 18 |
| 3.3 (HAL-03) MISSING REQUIRE STATEMENT IN UPDATESTAKELOCK FUNCTION - LOW    | 19 |
| Description   | 19 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
|     | Risk Level  | 20 |
|     | Recommendation  | 20 |
|     | Remediation Plan  | 20 |
| 3.4 | (HAL-04) MISSING ZERO ADDRESS CHECKS - LOW                                  | 21 |
|     | Description   | 21 |
|     | Code location   | 21 |
|     | Risk Level  | 22 |
|     | Recommendation  | 22 |
|     | Remediation Plan  | 23 |
| 3.5 | (HAL-05) SOLC 0.8.4 COMPILER VERSION CONTAINS MULTIPLE BUGS - INFORMATIONAL | 24 |
|     | Description   | 24 |
|     | Risk Level  | 24 |
|     | Recommendation  | 24 |
|     | Remediation Plan  | 24 |
| 3.6 | (HAL-06) POSSIBLE MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNCTIONS - INFORMATIONAL                | 25 |
|     | Description   | 25 |
|     | Risk Level  | 25 |
|     | Recommendation  | 25 |
|     | Remediation Plan  | 26 |
| 3.7 | (HAL-07) USING ++I CONSUMES LESS GAS THAN I++ IN LOOPS - INFORMATIONAL      | 27 |
|     | Description   | 27 |
|     | Code Location   | 27 |
|     | Proof of Concept  | 27 |
|     | Risk Level  | 28 |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
|      | Recommendation   | 28 |
|      | Remediation Plan   | 29 |
| 3.8  | (HAL-08) UNNEEDED INITIALIZATION OF UINT256 VARIABLES TO 0 - INFORMATIONAL | 30 |
|      | Description  | 30 |
|      | Code Location  | 30 |
|      | Risk Level   | 30 |
|      | Recommendation   | 30 |
|      | Remediation Plan   | 31 |
| 3.9  | (HAL-09) UINT32/UINT64 TYPES ARE LESS GAS EFFICIENT - INFORMATIONAL        | 32 |
|      | Description  | 32 |
|      | Code Location  | 32 |
|      | Risk Level   | 34 |
|      | Recommendation   | 34 |
|      | Remediation Plan   | 34 |
| 3.10 | (HAL-10) TYPO IN FUNCTION NAME - INFORMATIONAL                             | 35 |
|      | Description  | 35 |
|      | Code Location  | 35 |
|      | Risk Level   | 35 |
|      | Recommendation   | 36 |
|      | Remediation Plan   | 36 |
| 4    | AUTOMATED TESTING  | 37 |
| 4.1  | STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT   | 38 |
|      | Description  | 38 |
|      | Slither results  | 38 |
| 4.2  | AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN  | 44 |

|               |    |
|---------------|----|
| Description   | 44 |
| MythX results | 44 |

## DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

| VERSION | MODIFICATION            | DATE       | AUTHOR          |
|---------|-------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 0.1     | Document Creation       | 12/17/2021 | Roberto Reigada |
| 0.2     | Document Updates        | 12/23/2021 | Roberto Reigada |
| 0.3     | Draft Review            | 12/23/2021 | Gabi Urrutia    |
| 1.0     | Remediation Plan        | 01/27/2022 | Roberto Reigada |
| 1.1     | Remediation Plan Review | 01/27/2022 | Gabi Urrutia    |

## CONTACTS

| CONTACT          | COMPANY | EMAIL  |
|------------------|---------|--|
| Rob Behnke       | Halborn | <a href="mailto:Rob.Behnke@halborn.com">Rob.Behnke@halborn.com</a>             |
| Steven Walbroehl | Halborn | <a href="mailto:Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com">Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com</a> |
| Gabi Urrutia     | Halborn | <a href="mailto:Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com">Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com</a>         |
| Roberto Reigada  | Halborn | <a href="mailto:Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com">Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com</a>   |



# EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW



## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

0xNodes engaged Halborn to conduct a security audit on their smart contracts beginning on December 17th, 2021 and ending on December 23rd, 2021. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contract provided in the Github repository [0xNODES/platform/tree/audit](#)

## 1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided a week for the engagement and assigned a full time security engineer to audit the security of the smart contract. The security engineer is a blockchain and smart-contract security expert with advanced penetration testing, smart-contract hacking, and deep knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of this audit is to:

- Ensure that smart contract functions operate as intended
- Identify potential security issues with the smart contracts

In summary, Halborn identified some security risks that that were acknowledged by 0xNodes team.

## 1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of manual and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy in regard to the scope of this audit. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the bridge code and can quickly identify items that do not follow security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used throughout the term of the audit:



- Research into architecture and purpose
- Smart contract manual code review and walkthrough
- Graphing out functionality and contract logic/connectivity/functions ([solgraph](#))
- Manual assessment of use and safety for the critical Solidity variables and functions in scope to identify any arithmetic related vulnerability classes
- Manual testing by custom scripts
- Scanning of solidity files for vulnerabilities, security hotspots or bugs. ([MythX](#))
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. ([Slither](#))
- Testnet deployment ([Brownie](#), [Remix IDE](#))

#### RISK METHODOLOGY:

Vulnerabilities or issues observed by Halborn are ranked based on the risk assessment methodology by measuring the **LIKELIHOOD** of a security incident and the **IMPACT** should an incident occur. This framework works for communicating the characteristics and impacts of technology vulnerabilities. The quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that were used to generate the Risk scores. For every vulnerability, a risk level will be calculated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest likelihood or impact.

#### RISK SCALE - LIKELIHOOD

- 5 - Almost certain an incident will occur.
- 4 - High probability of an incident occurring.
- 3 - Potential of a security incident in the long term.
- 2 - Low probability of an incident occurring.
- 1 - Very unlikely issue will cause an incident.

#### RISK SCALE - IMPACT

- 5 - May cause devastating and unrecoverable impact or loss.
- 4 - May cause a significant level of impact or loss.

- 3 - May cause a partial impact or loss to many.
- 2 - May cause temporary impact or loss.
- 1 - May cause minimal or un-noticeable impact.

The risk level is then calculated using a sum of these two values, creating a value of 10 to 1 with 10 being the highest level of security risk.

|          |      |        |     |               |
|----------|------|--------|-----|---------------|
| CRITICAL | HIGH | MEDIUM | LOW | INFORMATIONAL |
|----------|------|--------|-----|---------------|

- 10 - CRITICAL
- 9 - 8 - HIGH
- 7 - 6 - MEDIUM
- 5 - 4 - LOW
- 3 - 1 - VERY LOW AND INFORMATIONAL

## 1.4 SCOPE

IN-SCOPE:

The security assessment was scoped to the following [smart contracts](#):

- [SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol](#)
- [SushiSwapIntegration.sol](#)
- [UserPositions.sol](#)

Commit ID: [c8d81b2ea99a82df511d47a66c24121d131fd24d](#)

## 2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

| CRITICAL | HIGH | MEDIUM | LOW | INFORMATIONAL |
|----------|------|--------|-----|---------------|
| 0        | 0    | 2      | 2   | 6             |

### LIKELIHOOD

IMPACT

|  |          |          |  |  |
|--|----------|----------|--|--|
| (HAL-01)<br>(HAL-02)   |          |          |  |  |
|  |          |          |  |  |
|  |          |          |  |  |
|  | (HAL-03) | (HAL-04) |  |  |
| (HAL-05)<br>(HAL-06)<br>(HAL-07)<br>(HAL-08)<br>(HAL-09)<br>(HAL-10) |          |          |  |  |

| SECURITY ANALYSIS  | RISK LEVEL    | REMEDIATION DATE |
|--|---------------|------------------|
| (HAL-01) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH NON-STANDARD ERC20 TOKENS        | Medium        | RISK ACCEPTED    |
| (HAL-02) FRONT-RUNNING POSSIBILITY ON INITIALIZATION FUNCTIONS | Medium        | RISK ACCEPTED    |
| (HAL-03) MISSING REQUIRE STATEMENT IN CREATEPOOL FUNCTION      | Low           | RISK ACCEPTED    |
| (HAL-04) MISSING ZERO ADDRESS CHECKS                           | Low           | RISK ACCEPTED    |
| (HAL-05) SOLC 0.8.4 COMPILER VERSION CONTAINS MULTIPLE BUGS    | Informational | ACKNOWLEDGED     |
| (HAL-06) POSSIBLE MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNCTIONS                   | Informational | ACKNOWLEDGED     |
| (HAL-07) USING ++I CONSUMES LESS GAS THAN I++ IN LOOPS         | Informational | ACKNOWLEDGED     |
| (HAL-08) UNNEEDED INITIALIZATION OF UINT256 VARIABLES TO 0     | Informational | ACKNOWLEDGED     |
| (HAL-09) UINT32/UINT64 TYPES ARE LESS GAS EFFICIENT            | Informational | ACKNOWLEDGED     |
| (HAL-10) TYPO IN FUNCTION NAME                                 | Informational | ACKNOWLEDGED     |



# FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS



### 3.1 (HAL-01) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH NON-STANDARD ERC20 TOKENS – MEDIUM

#### Description:

In the contracts `SushiSwapIntegrationV2`, `SushiSwapIntegration` some functions perform a call to `safeApprove()`.

Some tokens like `USDT` require that the allowance is zero before an approval call, for example:

Listing 1: USDT token approve function (Lines 205)

```

199 function approve(address _spender, uint _value) public
    onlyPayloadSize(2 * 32) {
200
201     // To change the approve amount you first have to reduce the
        addresses`
202     // allowance to zero by calling `approve(_spender, 0)` if it
        is not
203     // already 0 to mitigate the race condition described here:
204     // https://github.com/ethereum/EIPs/issues/20#issuecomment
        -263524729
205     require(!((_value != 0) && (allowed[msg.sender][_spender] !=
        0)));
206
207     allowed[msg.sender][_spender] = _value;
208     Approval(msg.sender, _spender, _value);
209 }

```

This is not considered by `SushiSwapIntegrationV2`, `SushiSwapIntegration`. With the current implementation, if for example USDT was used as the `tokenIn` in the call to `swapExactInput()` would revert.

#### Code Location:

##### SushiSwapIntegrationV2

- Line 164:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(pairAddress).safeApprove(masterChef, type(
uint256).max);
```

- Line 548:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(pairFor(pool.tokenA, pool.tokenB)).
safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, liquidityToWithdraw);
```

- Line 625:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenIn).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress,
amountIn);
```

##### SushiSwapIntegration

- Line 102:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenA).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, type(
uint256).max);
```

- Line 114:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenB).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, type(
uint256).max);
```

- Line 167:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(pairAddress).safeApprove(masterChef, type(
uint256).max);
```

- Line 489:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(pairFor(pool.tokenA, pool.tokenB)).
safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, liquidityToWithdraw);
```

- Line 583:

```
IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenIn).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress,
amountIn);
```

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 5**



**Recommendation:**

It is recommended calling `safeApprove(<address>, 0)` before calling `safeApprove(<address>, <amount>)`.

**Remediation Plan:**

**RISK ACCEPTED:**The `0xNodes team` accepted the risk in this issue.

## 3.2 (HAL-02) FRONT-RUNNING POSSIBILITY ON INITIALIZATION FUNCTIONS - MEDIUM

### Description:

The contracts `SushiSwapIntegrationV2`, `SushiSwapIntegration` and `UserPositions` have initialization functions that can be front-run. These smart contracts should be deployed using a factory pattern to prevent the front-running:

<https://docs.openzeppelin.com/learn/upgrading-smart-contracts>

As we can see, the deployment scripts given with the project do not make use of any factory pattern:

Listing 2: `008_deploy_sushiswap_integration_V2.ts` (Lines 17)

```
16 console.log("deploying SushiSwapIntegrationV2...");
17 const sushiIntegrationV2 = await deployContract(
18   hre,
19   "SushiSwapIntegrationV2",
20   [
21     [(await hre.ethers.getContract("YieldManager")).address],
22     (await hre.ethers.getContract("ModuleMap")).address,
23     addresses.sushiSwapFactoryAddress,
24     addresses.sushiSwapRouterAddress,
25     addresses.masterChefV2,
26     addresses.sushi,
27     slippageNumerator,
28   ]
29 );
```

Listing 3: `007_deploy_sushiswap_integration.ts` (Lines 17)

```
15 console.log("Deploying SushiSwapV1...");
16
17 const sushiIntegration = await deployContract(hre, "
    SushiSwapIntegration", [
18   [(await hre.ethers.getContract("YieldManager")).address],
```

```

19 (await hre.ethers.getContract("ModuleMap")).address,
20 addresses.sushiSwapFactoryAddress,
21 addresses.sushiSwapRouterAddress,
22 addresses.masterChef,
23 addresses.sushi,
24 slippageNumerator,
25 ]);

```

#### Listing 4: 003\_deploy\_user\_positions.ts (Lines 7)

```

5 const func: DeployFunction = async (hre: HardhatRuntimeEnvironment
  ) => {
6   const defaultBiosRewardsDuration = 2592000;
7   const userPositionsResult = await deployContract(hre, "
      UserPositions", [
8     [(await hre.ethers.getContract("Kernel")).address],
9     (await hre.ethers.getContract("ModuleMap")).address,
10    defaultBiosRewardsDuration,
11   ]);
12   await setModuleAddress(hre, 1, userPositionsResult.address);
13 };

```

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 5**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use a factory pattern that will deploy and initialize the contracts atomically to prevent front-running of the initialization.

#### Remediation Plan:

**RISK ACCEPTED:**The 0xNodes team accepted the risk in this issue.

### 3.3 (HAL-03) MISSING REQUIRE STATEMENT IN UPDATESTAKELOCK FUNCTION - LOW

#### Description:

The contracts `SushiSwapIntegrationV2` and `SushiSwapIntegration` contain the function `createPool()`. This function is missing a require statement that checks that the `tokenA` and `tokenB` are not the same:

Listing 5: `SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol`

```

86 function createPool(
87     address tokenA,
88     address tokenB,
89     uint256
90 ) external override onlyManager {
91     poolCount++;
92     pools[poolCount].tokenA = tokenA;
93     pools[poolCount].tokenB = tokenB;
94     poolIds.push(poolCount);
95
96     if (
97         IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenA).allowance(
98             address(this),
99             swapRouterAddress
100         ) == 0
101     ) {
102         IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenA).safeApprove(
103             swapRouterAddress,
104             type(uint256).max
105         );
106     }
107
108     if (
109         IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenB).allowance(
110             address(this),
111             swapRouterAddress
112         ) == 0
113     ) {
114         IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(tokenB).safeApprove(

```

```
115         swapRouterAddress,  
116         type(uint256).max  
117     );  
118 }  
119 }
```

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 2**

**Impact - 2**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to add a require statement in the `createPool()` function that checks that the `tokenA` and `tokenB` are not the same.

#### Remediation Plan:

**RISK ACCEPTED:**The `0xNodes team` accepted the risk in this issue.

### 3.4 (HAL-04) MISSING ZERO ADDRESS CHECKS - LOW

#### Description:

The contracts `SushiSwapIntegrationV2`, `SushiSwapIntegration` and `UserPositions` are missing address validation in their `initialize` functions. Every address should be validated and checked that is different from zero.

#### Code location:

Listing 6: `SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol`

```

65 function initialize(
66     address[] memory controllers_,
67     address moduleMap_,
68     address factoryAddress_,
69     address swapRouterAddress_,
70     address masterChef_,
71     address sushi_,
72     uint24 slippageNumerator_
73 ) public initializer {
74     __Controlled_init(controllers_, moduleMap_);
75     factoryAddress = factoryAddress_;
76     swapRouterAddress = swapRouterAddress_;
77     masterChef = masterChef_;
78     slippageNumerator = slippageNumerator_;
79     sushi = sushi_;
80     wethAddress = IIntegrationMap(
81         moduleMap_.getModuleAddress(Modules.IntegrationMap)
82     ).getWethTokenAddress();
83 }

```

Listing 7: `SushiSwapIntegration.sol`

```

65 function initialize(
66     address[] memory controllers_,
67     address moduleMap_,

```

```

68     address factoryAddress_,
69     address swapRouterAddress_,
70     address masterChef_,
71     address sushi_,
72     uint24 slippageNumerator_
73 ) public initializer {
74     __Controlled_init(controllers_, moduleMap_);
75     factoryAddress = factoryAddress_;
76     swapRouterAddress = swapRouterAddress_;
77     masterChef = masterChef_;
78     slippageNumerator = slippageNumerator_;
79     sushi = sushi_;
80     wethAddress = IIntegrationMap(
81         moduleMap_.getModuleAddress(Modules.IntegrationMap)
82     ).getWethTokenAddress();
83 }

```

#### Listing 8: UserPositions.sol

```

47 function initialize(
48     address[] memory controllers_,
49     address moduleMap_,
50     uint32 biosRewardsDuration_
51 ) public initializer {
52     __Controlled_init(controllers_, moduleMap_);
53     _biosRewardsDuration = biosRewardsDuration_;
54 }

```

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 3**

**Impact - 2**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to validate that every address input is different from zero.

Remediation Plan:

**RISK ACCEPTED:**The 0xNodes team accepted the risk in this issue.



### 3.5 (HAL-05) SOLC 0.8.4 COMPILER VERSION CONTAINS MULTIPLE BUGS - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

Solidity compiler version 0.8.3, 0.8.4 and 0.8.9 fixed important bugs in the compiler. The version 0.8.4 is missing the following fix:

- 0.8.9

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 1**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use the most tested and stable versions, such as 0.6.12 or 0.7.6. Otherwise, if ^0.8.0 is still chosen to be used because of the new functionality it provides, it is recommended to use the 0.8.10 version.

#### Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:**The 0xNodes team acknowledged this issue.

## 3.6 (HAL-06) POSSIBLE MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNCTIONS – INFORMATIONAL

### Description:

In the following contracts there are functions marked as `public` but they are never directly called within the same contract or in any of their descendants:

#### `SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol`

- `initialize()` (`SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#65-83`)
- `withdraw()` (`SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#409-423`)
- `getTokensOrdered()` (`SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#729-741`)

#### `SushiSwapIntegration.sol`

- `initialize()` (`SushiSwapIntegration.sol#65-83`)
- `withdraw()` (`SushiSwapIntegration.sol#351-365`)

#### `UserPositions.sol`

- `initialize()` (`UserPositions.sol#47-54`)
- `totalTokenBalance()` (`UserPositions.sol#460-467`)
- `getBiosRewardsDuration()` (`UserPositions.sol#484-486`)

### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 1**

### Recommendation:

If the functions are not intended to be called internally or by their descendants, it is better to mark all of these functions as `external` to reduce gas costs.

Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:**The 0xNodes team acknowledged this issue.

## 3.7 (HAL-07) USING ++I CONSUMES LESS GAS THAN I++ IN LOOPS - INFORMATIONAL

### Description:

In all the loops, the counter variable is incremented using `i++`. It is known that, in loops, using `++i` costs less gas per iteration than `i++`.

### Code Location:

`SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol`

- Line 307: `for (uint32 i = 0; i < poolCount; i++){`

`SushiSwapIntegration.sol`

- Line 306: `for (uint32 i = 0; i < poolCount; i++){`

`UserPositions.sol`

- Line 118: `for (uint256 tokenId; tokenId < tokens.length; tokenId++){`
- Line 223: `for (uint256 tokenId; tokenId < tokens.length; tokenId++){`
- Line 268: `for (uint256 tokenId; tokenId < tokens.length; tokenId++){`
- Line 362: `for (uint256 tokenId; tokenId < tokenCount; tokenId++){`
- Line 440: `for (uint256 tokenId; tokenId < tokenCount; tokenId++){`
- Line 502: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < tokens.length; i++){`
- Line 558: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < _tokens.length; i++){`
- Line 565: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < _strategies.length; i++){`
- Line 574: `for (uint256 j = 0; j < strategyTokens.length; j++){`
- Line 591: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < tokens.length; i++){`
- Line 620: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < users.length; i++){`

### Proof of Concept:

For example, based in the following test contract:

## Listing 9: Test.sol

```

1 //SPDX-License-Identifier: MIT
2 pragma solidity 0.8.9;
3
4 contract test {
5     function postiincrement(uint256 iterations) public {
6         for (uint256 i = 0; i < iterations; i++) {
7             }
8         }
9     function preiincrement(uint256 iterations) public {
10        for (uint256 i = 0; i < iterations; ++i) {
11            }
12        }
13 }

```

We can see the difference in the gas costs:

```

>>> test_contract.postiincrement(1)
Transaction sent: 0x1ecede6b109b707786d3685bd71dd9f22dc389957653036ca04c4cd2e72c5e0b
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 44
test.postiincrement confirmed Block: 13622335 Gas used: 21620 (0.32%)

<Transaction '0x1ecede6b109b707786d3685bd71dd9f22dc389957653036ca04c4cd2e72c5e0b'>
>>> test_contract.preiincrement(1)
Transaction sent: 0x205f09a4d2268de4c1a40f35bb2ec2847bf2ab8d584909b42c71a022b047614a
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 45
test.preiincrement confirmed Block: 13622336 Gas used: 21593 (0.32%)

<Transaction '0x205f09a4d2268de4c1a40f35bb2ec2847bf2ab8d584909b42c71a022b047614a'>
>>> test_contract.postiincrement(10)
Transaction sent: 0x98c04430526a59balecf947c114b62666a4417165947d31bf300cd6ae68328033
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 46
test.postiincrement confirmed Block: 13622337 Gas used: 22673 (0.34%)

<Transaction '0x98c04430526a59balecf947c114b62666a4417165947d31bf300cd6ae68328033'>
>>> test_contract.preiincrement(10)
Transaction sent: 0xf060d04714eff8482a828342414d5a20be9958c822d42860e7992aba20e1de05
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 47
test.preiincrement confirmed Block: 13622338 Gas used: 22601 (0.34%)

<Transaction '0xf060d04714eff8482a828342414d5a20be9958c822d42860e7992aba20e1de05'>

```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

It is recommended to use `++i` instead of `i++` to increment the value of an uint variable inside a loop. This is not applicable outside of loops.

Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:**The 0xNodes team acknowledged this issue.

### 3.8 (HAL-08) UNNEEDED INITIALIZATION OF UINT256 VARIABLES TO 0 - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

As `i` is an `uint`, it is already initialized to 0. `uint i = 0` reassigns the 0 to `i` which wastes gas.

#### Code Location:

SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol

- Line 307: `for (uint32 i = 0; i < poolCount; i++){`

SushiSwapIntegration.sol

- Line 306: `for (uint32 i = 0; i < poolCount; i++){`

UserPositions.sol

- Line 502: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < tokens.length; i++){`
- Line 558: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < _tokens.length; i++){`
- Line 565: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < _strategies.length; i++){`
- Line 574: `for (uint256 j = 0; j < strategyTokens.length; j++){`
- Line 591: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < tokens.length; i++){`
- Line 620: `for (uint256 i = 0; i < users.length; i++){`

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 1**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to not initialize `i` variable to 0 to save some gas.  
For example:

```
for (uint256 i; i < tokens.length; ++i){
```

Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:**The 0xNodes team acknowledged this issue.



### 3.9 (HAL-09) UINT32/UINT64 TYPES ARE LESS GAS EFFICIENT - INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

`uint32`, `uint64`... variables are less gas efficient than `uint256`. Due to how the EVM natively works on 256 bit numbers, using for example 32 bit numbers introduces additional costs as the EVM has to properly enforce the limits of this smaller type.

This issue happens with multiple functions and state variables of the smart contracts.

In general, the usage of these smaller types only improves the gas costs in cases where the variables can be packed together, for example structs.

#### Code Location:

`SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol`

- Line 22: `uint24 private constant SLIPPAGE_DENOMINATOR = 1_000_000;`
- Line 23: `uint24 slippageNumerator;`
- Line 32: `uint32 public poolCount;`
- Line 33: `uint32[] private poolIds;`
- Line 35: `mapping(uint32 => uint256)private stakings;`
- Line 45: `mapping(uint32 => uint256)public yieldBalances;`
- Line 72: `uint24 slippageNumerator_`
- Line 121:

```
function configureStaking(uint32 poolId, uint256 masterChefPoolId)
```

- Line 128: `function configureStackingOverwrite(uint32 poolId, uint256 masterChefPoolId)`
- Line 136: `uint32 poolId,`
- Line 176: `uint32 poolId`
- Line 184: `uint32 poolId,`
- Line 191: `function getPool(uint32 pid)public view override returns ( Pool memory){`
- Line 196: `function getBalance(uint32 poolId, address token)`

- Line 204: `function getPoolBalance(uint32 poolId)`
- Line 213:
- `function deploy(uint32 poolId)external override onlyController {`
- Line 217:
- `function manualDeploy(uint32 poolId)external override onlyManager {`
- Line 221: `function _deploy(uint32 poolId)internal {`
- Line 291: `function stakeLPTokens(uint32 poolId)external onlyManager {`
- Line 307: `for (uint32 i = 0; i < poolCount; i++){`
- Line 321: `uint32 poolId`
- Line 412: `uint32 poolId`
- Line 425: `function getTokensPoolValue(uint32 poolId)`
- Line 455: `uint32 poolId,`
- Line 503: `uint32 poolId,`
- Line 520: `uint32 poolId,`
- Line 764: `uint32 poolId,`

#### SushiSwapIntegration.sol

- Line 22: `uint24 private constant SLIPPAGE_DENOMINATOR = 1_000_000;`
- Line 23: `uint24 slippageNumerator;`
- Line 32: `uint32 public poolCount;`
- Line 33: `uint32[] private poolIds;`
- Line 35: `mapping(uint32 => uint256)private stakings;`
- Line 45: `mapping(uint32 => uint256)public yieldBalances;`
- Line 72: `uint24 slippageNumerator_`
- Line 121:
- `function configureStaking(uint32 poolId, uint256 masterChefPoolId)`
- Line 128: `function configureStakingOverwrite(uint32 poolId, uint256`  
`masterChefPoolId)`
- Line 136: `uint32 poolId,`
- Line 179: `uint32 poolId`
- Line 187: `uint32 poolId,`
- Line 194: `function getPool(uint32 pid)public view override returns (`  
`Pool memory){`
- Line 199: `function getBalance(uint32 poolId, address token)`
- Line 207: `function getPoolBalance(uint32 poolId)`
- Line 216:
- `function deploy(uint32 poolId)external override onlyController {`
- Line 220:

```
function manualDeploy(uint32 poolId)external override onlyManager {
- Line 224: function _deploy(uint32 poolId)internal {
- Line 294: function stakeLPTokens(uint32 poolId)external onlyManager {
- Line 306: for (uint32 i = 0; i < poolCount; i++){
- Line 320: uint32 poolId
- Line 354: uint32 poolId
- Line 370: uint32 poolId
- Line 384: function getTokensPoolValue(uint32 poolId)
- Line 414: uint32 poolId,
- Line 462: uint32 poolId,
- Line 515: uint32 poolId,
- Line 707: uint32 poolId,
```

#### UserPositions.sol

```
- Line 29: uint32 private _biosRewardsDuration;
- Line 50: uint32 biosRewardsDuration_
- Line 57: function setBiosRewardsDuration(uint32 biosRewardsDuration_)
- Line 484:
function getBiosRewardsDuration()public view override returns (uint32){
```

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 1**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to make use of `uint256` variables, for example, in state variables like `HighStreetPoolFactory.lastRatioUpdate` that are not part/packed in any struct to reduce gas costs.

#### Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:**The `0xNodes team` acknowledged this issue.

## 3.10 (HAL-10) TYPO IN FUNCTION NAME - INFORMATIONAL

### Description:

In the contract `SushiSwapIntegrationV2` there is a function called `configureStackingOverwrite` when it actually should be called `configureStakingOverwrite`, as it is done in the contract `SushiSwapIntegration`.

### Code Location:

Listing 10: SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol (Lines 128)

```
128 function configureStackingOverwrite(uint32 poolId, uint256
    masterChefPoolId)
129     external
130     onlyManager
131 {
132     _configureStaking(poolId, masterChefPoolId, true);
133 }
```

Listing 11: SushiSwapIntegration.sol (Lines 128)

```
128 function configureStakingOverwrite(uint32 poolId, uint256
    masterChefPoolId)
129     external
130     onlyManager
131 {
132     _configureStaking(poolId, masterChefPoolId, true);
133 }
```

### Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to rename the function `SushiSwapIntegrationV2.configureStackingOverwrite()` to `configureStakingOverwrite`.

#### Remediation Plan:

**ACKNOWLEDGED:**The `0xNodes` team acknowledged this issue.



# AUTOMATED TESTING



Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the scoped contracts. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified all the contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their abi and binary formats, Slither was run on the all-scoped contracts. This tool can statically verify mathematical relationships between Solidity variables to detect invalid or inconsistent usage of the contracts' APIs across the entire code-base.

# SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol

38

```

- External calls
-   - IshabiSwapInput(weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#343-349)
-   - IshabiSwapInput(weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#351-361)
-   - returnData = address(token).functionCall(data, SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).swapExactTokenForTokens(amountIn, amountOutMin, path, recipient, deadline) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#631-638)
- External calls sending eth
-   - amount = swapExactInput(pool.token, weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#343-349)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - amount_scope_0 = swapExactInput(pool.token, weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#377-382)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).swapExactTokenForTokens(amountIn, amountOutMin, path, recipient, deadline) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#631-638)
-   - amount_scope_1 = swapExactInput(sushi, weiToken, address(this), sushiAmount) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#392-397)
-   - returnData = address(token).functionCall(data, SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).swapExactTokenForTokens(amountIn, amountOutMin, path, recipient, deadline) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#631-638)
- External calls sending eth
-   - amount = swapExactInput(pool.token, weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#343-349)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - amount_scope_0 = swapExactInput(pool.token, weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#377-382)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - amount_scope_1 = swapExactInput(sushi, weiToken, address(this), sushiAmount) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#392-397)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
- State variable written after the call(s)
-   - yieldBalanceAmount = yieldAmount (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#401)
- Reference: https://github.com/crytic/Slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerability-2
- Reentrancy in SushiSwapIntegrationV2_deploy(uint32) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#21-29):
-   - External calls
-   - (None, None, liquidityAcquired) = IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).addLiquidity(pool.token, token, amount, amountB, 0, 0, address(this), block.timestamp) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#271-281)
-   - DepositToPool(poolId, liquidityAcquired) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#287)
-   - LPtokensAcquired(liquidityAcquired) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#296)
- Reentrancy in SushiSwapIntegrationV2_withdraw(address, uint256, uint256, bool) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#517-601):
-   - External calls
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).withdraw(staking(poolId), liquidityY0Withdraw, address(this)) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#543-546)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(poolId) (pool.token, token, tokenB).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, liquidityY0Withdraw) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#548-549)
-   - (amountToToken, amountToTokenB) = IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).removeLiquidity(pool.token, pool.token, liquidityY0Withdraw, 0, 0, address(this), block.timestamp + 360) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#551)
-   - amountScopeTokenReceived = swapExactInput(pool.token, token, tokenB, address(this), amountToToken) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#567-572)
-   - returnData = address(token).functionCall(data, SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).swapExactTokenForTokens(amountIn, amountOutMin, path, recipient, deadline) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#631-638)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(pool.token).safeTransfer(moduliMap, getModuliAddress(Modulus.Fee), amountToTokenA + amountToTokenReceived) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#574-577)
-   - amountScopeTokenReceived = swapExactInput(pool.token, token, tokenB, address(this), amountToToken) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#567-572)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
- Event emitted after the call(s)
-   - WithdrawFromPool(poolId, amountOfTokenReceived) (1 + amountToToken) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#579-582)
- Reentrancy in SushiSwapIntegrationV2_withdraw(address, uint256, uint256, bool) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#517-601):
-   - External calls
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).withdraw(staking(poolId), liquidityY0Withdraw, address(this)) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#543-546)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(pool.token, token, tokenB).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, liquidityY0Withdraw, 0, 0, address(this), block.timestamp + 360) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#548-549)
-   - (amountToToken, amountToTokenB) = IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).removeLiquidity(pool.token, pool.token, liquidityY0Withdraw, 0, 0, address(this), block.timestamp + 360) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#551)
-   - amountScopeTokenReceived = swapExactInput(pool.token, token, tokenB, address(this), amountToToken) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#567-572)
-   - returnData = address(token).functionCall(data, SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).swapExactTokenForTokens(amountIn, amountOutMin, path, recipient, deadline) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#631-638)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(pool.token).safeTransfer(moduliMap, getModuliAddress(Modulus.Fee), amountToTokenA + amountToTokenReceived) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#574-577)
- External calls sending eth
-   - amountScopeTokenReceived = swapExactInput(pool.token, token, tokenB, address(this), amountToToken) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#567-572)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
- Event emitted after the call(s)
-   - WithdrawFromPool(poolId, amountOfTokenReceived) (1 + amountToToken) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#579-582)
- Reentrancy in SushiSwapIntegrationV2_harvestField() (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#594-599):
-   - External calls
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(withdrawAddress).safeTransfer(moduliMap, getModuliAddress(Modulus.YieldManager), yieldAmount) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#591-594)
-   - YieldEvent(yieldAmount, amount) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#595)
- Reentrancy in SushiSwapIntegrationV2_harvestFieldByPool(uint32, uint256, uint256, bool) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#630-661):
-   - External calls
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).harvest(staking(poolId), address(this)) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#634-640)
-   - amount = swapExactInput(pool.token, weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#343-349)
-   - returnData = address(token).functionCall(data, SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).swapExactTokenForTokens(amountIn, amountOutMin, path, recipient, deadline) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#631-638)
-   - amount_scope_0 = swapExactInput(pool.token, weiToken, address(this), tokenAddr) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#377-382)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - IERC20MetadataUpgradeable(token).safeApprove(swapRouterAddress, amountIn) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#625-628)
-   - IshabiSwapRouter(swapRouterAddress).swapExactTokenForTokens(amountIn, amountOutMin, path, recipient, deadline) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#631-638)
-   - amount_scope_1 = swapExactInput(sushi, weiToken, address(this), sushiAmount) (contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol#392-397)
-   - returnData = address(token).functionCall(data, SafeERC20: low-level call failed) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/token/ERC20/utils/SafeERC20Upgradeable.sol#71)
-   - (success, returnData) = target.call(value value) (data) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable/utils/AddressUpgradeable.sol#119)
-   - <
```



## SushiSwapIntegration.sol

# SushiSwapIntegration.sol



# UserPositions.sol

[illegible][illegible]



- No major issues found by Slither.

## 4.2 AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN

### Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues, and to identify low-hanging fruits on the targets for this engagement. Among the tools used was MythX, a security analysis service for Ethereum smart contracts. MythX performed a scan on all the contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities.

### MythX results:

MythX only found some issues in the following smart contracts:

#### SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol

Report for contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegrationV2.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/2cab125a-8338-48a2-8979-74d341ddb482>

| Line | SWC Title                                   | Severity | Short Description                     |
|------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|
| 19   | (SWC-123) Requirement Violation             | Low      | Requirement violation.                |
| 23   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 25   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 26   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 27   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 28   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 29   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |

#### SushiSwapIntegration.sol

Report for contracts/yield-integrations/SushiSwapIntegration.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/b0abe757-d691-4c58-aida-b024b7e00317>

| Line | SWC Title                                   | Severity | Short Description                     |
|------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|
| 19   | (SWC-123) Requirement Violation             | Low      | Requirement violation.                |
| 23   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 25   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 26   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 27   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 28   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |
| 29   | (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility | Low      | State variable visibility is not set. |

- No major issues were found by MythX.



THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

 **HALBORN**

