

## Summary

Audit Report prepared by Solidified covering the pStake Ethereum smart contracts.

## **Process and Delivery**

Three (3) independent Solidified experts performed an unbiased and isolated audit of the code. The debrief on 2 August 2021.

### **Audited Files**

The source code has been supplied in the form of a GitHub repository:

https://github.com/persistenceOne/pStake-smartContracts

Commit number: ca3e035454dc565a762a1cc03fdd99c7bf52da37

The scope of the audit was limited to the following files:

```
contracts

LiquidStaking.sol

Migrations.sol

PSTAKE.sol

STokens.sol

StakeLPCore.sol

TokenWrapper.sol

UTokens.sol

holder

HolderUniswap.sol

interfaces

ILiquidStaking.sol

IPSTAKE.sol

ISTokens.sol

ISTokens.sol

IITokenwrapper.sol

IITokenwrapper.sol

IUTokens.sol

Bech32.sol

Bech32.validation.sol

FullMath.sol

TransferHelper.sol
```

### Intended Behavior

The smart contracts audited in this phase of the protocol's development implement the tokens and staking primitives necessary for liquid staking.



## **Code Complexity and Test Coverage**

Smart contract audits are an important step to improve the security of smart contracts and can find many issues. However, auditing complex codebases has its limits and a remaining risk is present (see disclaimer).

Users of a smart contract system should exercise caution. In order to help with the evaluation of the remaining risk, we provide a measure of the following key indicators: **code complexity**, **code readability**, **level of documentation**, and **test coverage**.

Note, that high complexity or lower test coverage does equate to a higher risk. Certain bugs are more easily detected in unit testing than a security audit and vice versa. It is, therefore, more likely that undetected issues remain if the test coverage is low or non-existent.

Criteria	Status	Comment
Code complexity	Medium	-
Code readability and clarity	Medium	-
Level of Documentation	High	-
Test Coverage	High	-



## **Issues Found**

Solidified found that the pStake contracts contain no critical issue, no major issue, 5 minor issues in addition to 6 informational notes.

We recommend all issues are amended, while the notes are up to the team's discretion, as they refer to best practices.

Issue #	Description	Severity	Status
1	TokenWrapper.sol: Allows fee that is more than 100%	Minor	Resolved
2	StakeLPCore.sol: The function removeLiquidity() does not follow the Checks-Effects-Interactions pattern	Minor	Acknowledged
3	TokenWrapper.sol: Event emitted only for the last token	Minor	Resolved
4	StakeLPCore.sol: Missing emit keyword for events	Minor	Resolved
5	HolderUniswap.sol: Wrong variable updated	Minor	Resolved
6	Wide compiler version pragma will not work with all versions	Note	Acknowledged
7	STokens.sol and UTokens.sol: Potential restriction with integrations with other DeFi products	Note	Resolved
8	STokens.sol: Function isContractWhitelisted() - an extra mapping could be used to avoid the search loop	Note	Resolved
9	HolderUniswap.sol: Unnecessary parameters	Note	Resolved
10	The values stored in the smart contract are not private	Note	Resolved
11	Code cleanup	Note	Acknowledged



### Critical Issues

No critical Issues found.

# **Major Issues**

No major Issues found.

## **Minor Issues**

## 1. TokenWrapper.sol: Allows fee that is more than 100%

The function setFees() contains a require statement that ensures the deposit fee and withdrawal fee are less than 100% of the amount. But the require statement is missing brackets while validating multiple AND/OR which results in wrong conditions. This allows the admin to set values that are more than 100% of the amount.

#### Recommendation

Consider grouping the validations to yield expected results.

Fixed

# 2. StakeLPCore.sol: The function removeLiquidity() does not follow the Checks-Effects-Interactions pattern

The function removeLiquidity() reduces the user's balance after transferring the lpToken tokens to the user.

#### Recommendation

Consider updating user balance before transferring the tokens to minimize the possibility of a re-entrancy based attack.

# 3. TokenWrapper.sol: Event emitted only for the last token



The method generateUTokensInBatch() emits the GenerateUTokens event only for the last generated token.

#### Recommendation

Consider emitting the event for all tokens if it was not intended.

Fixed

# 4. StakeLPCore.sol: Missing emit keyword for events

Some events do not use the **emit** keyword while emitting an event. By default, the compiler prevents the code from compiling, but there is a bug in some solidity compiler versions which allows events without the **emit** keyword.

#### Recommendation

We recommend adding the emit keyword to all the events emitted to avoid compatibility issues.

Fixed

## 5. HolderUniswap.sol: Wrong variable updated

The contract defines two different variables \_sTokenContract and \_sTokens to store the ISTokens address. Considering how the variables and update methods are used across the project, it looks like this was by mistake and the developer intended to use one variable name.

#### Recommendation

Consider using the same variable name for ISTokens contract.

Fixed

## **Informational Notes**

## 6. Wide compiler version pragma will not work with all versions



The codebase specifies compiler version 0.7.0 or above to be used. However, this is a very wide range and will not work in all cases.

For example, FullMath.sol library only compiles with versions below 0.8.0.

Furthermore, the BytesLib.sol library used in the project was specifically written for compiler equal or above version 0.8.0, since it has math overflow checks removed - see the commits history of

https://github.com/GNSPS/solidity-bytes-utils/commits/feat/update-0.8.0/contracts/BytesLib.sol .

#### Recommendation

Consider specifying an exact Solidity compiler version.

# 7. STokens.sol and UTokens.sol: Potential restriction with integrations with other DeFi products

The functions burn() and mint() require that the target account of mint/burn operation equals tx.origin.

While this strict requirement reduces the attack surface it also prevents from minting/burning tokens to/from contract addresses (only Externally Owned Accounts which can sign an Ethereum transaction are allowed). Such a restriction might prevent future integrations with other DeFi products.

#### Recommendation

Consider if restricting tx.origin is really necessary.

Fixed

# 8. STokens.sol: Function isContractWhitelisted() - an extra mapping could be used to avoid the search loop

The function isContractWhitelisted() could utilize a mapping from lpContractAddress to an index of its \_whitelistedAddresses to eliminate the loop.

#### Recommendation

Consider if it is worth creating such an extra mapping.

Fixed



## 9. HolderUniswap.sol: Unnecessary parameters

The function getTokenSupply() declares the parameters from and amount, which are never used and seem unnecessary in a supply function.

#### Recommendation

Review if these parameters are necessary in any scenario for this interface.

Fixed

# 10. The values stored in the smart contract are not private

The contracts define several private variables. From the comments provided, it looks like the contract is trying to hide these values from the user/public.

Blockchains are generally designed to be transparent and any value stored in the Ethereum smart contract can be easily retrieved. The private keyword makes the values to be hidden from the contract interface, but it can be read from the blockchain directly.

#### Recommendation

This note is added to make sure the contract developer and user understands how the private methods work.

Fixed

## 11. Code cleanup

Consider cleaning up the code based on the following recommendations.

- StakeLPCore.sol: function calculateRewardsAndLiquidity() is never used.
- 2. StakeLPCore.sol: missing curly brackets for branches of if statement in function \_calculateRewardsAndLiquidity() at lines 105 and 109
- 3. STokens.sol: function setWhitelistedAddress() conducts an unnecessary check:
   if (!\_whitelistedAddresses.contains(whitelistedAddress))



- 4. STokens.sol: Incorrect documentation and incorrect comments in functions isContractWhitelisted() and getHolderData()
- 5. TokenWrapper.sol: Unused import libraries/Bech32Validation.sol
- 6. Library Bech32Validation.sol is not used



## **Disclaimer**

Solidified audit is not a security warranty, investment advice, or an endorsement of Persistence or its products. This audit does not provide a security or correctness guarantee of the audited smart contract. Securing smart contracts is a multistep process, therefore running a bug bounty program as a complement to this audit is strongly recommended.

The individual audit reports are anonymized and combined during a debrief process, in order to provide an unbiased delivery and protect the auditors of Solidified platform from legal and financial liability.

Solidified Technologies Inc.