



OXSCANS

GEMTOOLS

AI Generated at 08:36 PM, UTC

March 07, 2024

OVERVIEW

This audit has been prepared for 'GEMTOOLS' to review the main aspects of the project to help investors make an informative decision during their research process

You will find a summarized review of the following **key points**:



Contract's source code



Owner wallets



Tokenomics



Team transparency and goals



Website's age, code, security and UX



Whitepaper and roadmap



Social media and online presence

Table of Content

1 General Info

2 General Analysis

3 Vulnerability check

4 Threat Analysis

5 Risks & Recommendations

6 Conclusions

7 Disclaimer

General Information

GEMTOOLS

Name

GEMTOOLS

Info

General Information

Tokenomics

Contract Address

0xea55f9d4a1bcea5e3e806f169f33f0092d5fb7f0

General Analysis

Audit Review Process

- 1 Testing the smart contracts against both common and uncommon vulnerabilities
- 2 Assessing the codebase to ensure compliance with current best practices and industry standards
- 3 Ensuring contract logic meets the specifications and intentions of the client
- 4 Cross referencing contract structure and implementation against similar smart contracts produced by industry leaders
- 5 Thorough line-by-line AI review of the entire codebase by industry

Token Transfer Stats

Transactions (Latest Mine Block)



1

Token holders



284

Compiler



v0.8.18

Smart Contract Stats

Functions



58

Events



7

Constructor



1

Detail Analysis

Threat Level

● High	Issues on this level are critical to the smart contract's performace/functionality and should be fixed before moving to a live enviroment
● Medium	Issues on this level are critical to the smart contract's performace/functionality and should be fixed before moving to a live enviroment
● Low	Issues on this level are minor details and warning that can remain unfixed
● Informational	Informational level is to offer suggestions for improvement of efficacy or secuirty for fratures with risk free factor

Threat Level

● High	0 threats found
● Medium	0 threats found
● Low	0 threats found
● Informational	0 threats found

Detail Analysis

Vulnerability Check



21 Passed



0 Fail



Arbitrary Jump/Storage Write



Centralization of Control



Compiler Issues



Delegate Call to Untrusted Contract



Dependence on Predictable Variables



Ether/Token Theft



Flash Loans



Front Running



Improper Events



Improper Authorization Scheme



Integer Over/Underflow



Logical Issues



Oracle Issues



Outdated Compiler Version



Race Conditions



Reentrancy



Signature Issues



Sybil Attack



Unbounded Loops



Unused Code



Overall Contract Safety

Detail Analysis

Detail Analysis



21 Passed



0 Fail

CATEGORY	STATUS	NOTES
Arbitrary Jump/Storage Write		The contract does not exhibit arbitrary jumps or storage writes, as it adheres to standard Solidity development patterns.
Centralization of Control		No risk of centralization as the contract owner is a dead address.
Compiler Issues		Compiled with a recent Solidity version (0.8.18) with no known compiler issues.
Delegate Call to Untrusted Contract		The contract does not use delegatecall, mitigating risks associated with delegate calls.
Dependence on Predictable Variables		The contract does not rely on variables like block.timestamp or block.number in a way that affects core functionalities or security.

Detail Analysis

Detail Analysis



21 Passed



0 Fail

CATEGORY	STATUS	NOTES
Ether/Token Theft		No functions are present that directly transfer Ether or tokens to arbitrary addresses in an unauthorized manner.
Flash Loans		The contract does not interact with flash loan functions, making it unaffected by flash loan attacks.
Front Running		The contract's design and functionality do not inherently facilitate front-running opportunities.
Improper Events		All critical functions emit events correctly, providing transparency and traceability.
Improper Authorization Scheme		The contract's authorization scheme is not risky due to the owner being a dead address, eliminating centralization concerns.
Integer Over/Underflow		SafeMath library is used consistently for arithmetic operations, mitigating risks of overflows and underflows.

Detail Analysis

Detail Analysis



21 Passed



0 Fail

CATEGORY	STATUS	NOTES
Logical Issues		No apparent logical issues or inconsistencies in the contract logic.
Oracle Issues		The contract does not interact with oracles, thus not exposing it to oracle-related risks.
Outdated Compiler Version		The contract uses a recent Solidity compiler version (0.8.18), which is not outdated.
Race Conditions		No functions or patterns were found that could lead to race conditions.
Reentrancy		The contract's functions are structured in a way that avoids reentrancy vulnerabilities.
Signature Issues		The contract does not rely on external signatures, hence is not exposed to signature-related risks.

Detail Analysis

Detail Analysis

21 Passed


0 Fail

CATEGORY	STATUS	NOTES
Sybil Attack	<div></div>	The nature of the contract does not make it susceptible to Sybil attacks.
Unbounded Loops	<div></div>	All loops in the contract have bounded conditions, avoiding risks of gas limit issues or denial-of-service.
Unused Code	<div></div>	The contract's code does not contain redundant or unused code, ensuring efficiency and reducing attack surface.
Overall Contract Safety	<div></div>	The contract follows general best practices and does not exhibit critical vulnerabilities.


Market Analysis

Score

Total Audit Score



Security Score





Legal Disclaimer

0xscans operates as an automated system for smart contract due diligence, acknowledging the possibility of bugs or vulnerabilities impacting token values. We do not hold specific obligations regarding your trading outcomes or the utilization of audit content. Users release 0xscans from any liability associated with content obtained through the tool.



AI generated by 0xscans AI technology

Chat with us

Telegram

For more information. Visit below:

Twitter

Github