



### SphynxFi Fair Launch

Smart Contract Audit Report



### **ABOUT AUDITACE**

Audit Ace is built, to combat financial fraud in the cryptocurrency industry, a growing security firm that provides audits, Smart contract creation, and end-to-end solutions to all cryptorelated queries.

Website - https://auditace.tech/
Telegram - https://t.me/Audit\_Ace
Twitter - https://twitter.com/auditace\_
Github - https://github.com/Audit-Ace



## Overview

AUDITACE team has performed a line-by-line manual analysis and automated review of smart contracts. Smart contracts were analyzed mainly for common contract vulnerabilities, exploits, and manipulation hacks.

Token Name: SphynxFi (SF)

Contract address: 0x5F2D91c698f2Bc1Fd9E4a92b1fcdA4D4aD17e0d3

Audit Result: Passed

Audit Date: October 03, 2022

KYC: Done

Audit Team: TEAM AUDITACE



### Disclaimer

All the content provided in this document is for general information only and should not be used as financial advice or a reason to buy any investment. Team provides no guarantees against the sale of team tokens or the removal of liquidity by the project audited in this document. Always Do your own research and protect yourselves from being scammed. The Auditace team has audited this project for general information and only expresses their opinion based on similar projects and checks from popular diagnostic tools. Under no circumstances did Auditace receive a payment to manipulate those results or change the awarding badge that we will be adding in our website. Always Do your own research and protect yourselves from scams. This document should not be presented as a reason to buy or not buy any particular token. The Auditace team disclaims any liability for the resulting losses.



## SphynxF

#### Social Media Overview



https://t.me/sphynxfiglobal



https://twitter.com/SphynxFi\_



https://sphynxfi.com/



# Token Summary

| Parameter        | Result  |
|------------------|---|
| Address          | 0x5F2D91c698f2Bc1Fd9E4a92b1fcdA4D4aD17e0d3                                      |
| Name             | SphynxFi  |
| Token Tracker    | SphynxFi (SF)   |
| Decimals         | 18  |
| Supply           | 100,000,000   |
| Platform         | Binance Smart Chain   |
| Compiler         | v0.8.17+commit.8df45f5f   |
| Contract Name    | PlanetApeClub   |
| Optimization     | Yes with 5000 runs  |
| License Type     | MIT   |
| Language         | Solidity  |
| Codebase         | https://bscscan.com/address/0x5F2D91c698f2Bc1Fd9E4a92b1fcdA4D4<br>aD17e0d3#code |
| Contact Checksum | 0x05ba1e1d8b6a2054015b8799c38179cbd321d69b971e9c0816<br>38defb131804ca          |



### **CONTRACT FUNCTION SUMMARY**



Can edit Tax?

**DETECTED** 

Can take back Ownership?

**NOT DETECTED** 

Is Blacklisted?

**NOT DETECTED** 

Is Whitelisted?

**NOT DETECTED** 

Is Mintable?

**NOT DETECTED** 

Can transfer Pausable?

**NOT DETECTED** 

Is Trading with CooldownTime?

**NOT DETECTED** 



### **AUDIT METHODOLOGY**

The auditing process will follow a routine as special considerations by Auditace:

- Review of the specifications, sources, and instructions provided to Auditace to make sure the contract logic meets the intentions of the client without exposing the user's funds to risk.
- Manual review of the entire codebase by our experts, which is the process of reading source code line-byline in an attempt to identify potential vulnerabilities.
- Specification comparison is the process of checking whether the code does what the specifications, sources, and instructions provided to Auditace describe.
- Test coverage analysis determines whether the test cases are covering the code and how much code isexercised when we run the test cases.
- Symbolic execution is analysing a program to determine what inputs cause each part of a program to execute.
- Reviewing the codebase to improve maintainability, security, and control based on the established industry and academic practices.



### **Issues Checking Status**

| No | Issue Description   | Checking Status |
|----|---|-----------------|
| 1  | Compiler warnings.  | Passed          |
| 2  | Race conditions and Reentrancy. Cross-function race conditions. | Passed          |
| 3  | Possible delays in data delivery.                               | Passed          |
| 4  | Oracle calls.   | Passed          |
| 5  | Front running.  | Passed          |
| 6  | Timestamp dependence.   | Passed          |
| 7  | Integer Overflow and Underflow.                                 | Passed          |
| 8  | DoS with Revert.  | Passed          |
| 9  | DoS with block gas limit.                                       | Passed          |
| 10 | Methods execution permissions.                                  | Passed          |
| 11 | Design Logic.   | Passed          |
| 12 | Cross-function race conditions.                                 | Passed          |
| 13 | Safe Zeppelin module.   | Passed          |
| 14 | Malicious Event log.  | Passed          |
| 15 | Scoping and Declarations.                                       | Passed          |
| 16 | Fallback function security.                                     | Passed          |
| 17 | Arithmetic accuracy.  | Passed          |



### **SWC ATTACK TEST**

| SWC ID  | Description                          | Test Result |
|---------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| SWC-100 | Function Visibility                  | Passed      |
| SWC-101 | Integer Overflow and Underflow       | Passed      |
| SWC-102 | Outdated Compiler Version            | Passed      |
| SWC-103 | Floating Pragma                      | Passed      |
| SWC-104 | Unchecked Call Return Value          | Passed      |
| SWC-105 | Unprotected Ether Withdrawal         | Passed      |
| SWC-106 | Unprotected SELFDESTRUCT Instruction | Passed      |
| SWC-107 | Re-entrancy                          | Passed      |
| SWC-108 | State Variable Default Visibility    | Passed      |
| SWC-109 | Uninitialized Storage Pointer        | Passed      |
| SWC-110 | Assert Violation                     | Passed      |
| SWC-111 | Use of Deprecated Solidity Functions | Passed      |
| SWC-112 | Delegate Call to Untrusted Callee    | Passed      |
| SWC-113 | DoS with Failed Call                 | Passed      |
| SWC-114 | Transaction Order Dependence         | Passed      |
| SWC-115 | Authorization through tx.origin      | Passed      |
| SWC-116 | Block values as a proxy for time     | Passed      |



| SWC ID  | Description   | Test Result |
|---------|---|-------------|
| SWC-117 | Signature Malleability                                  | Passed      |
| SWC-118 | Incorrect Constructor Name                              | Passed      |
| SWC-119 | Shadowing State Variables                               | Passed      |
| SWC-120 | Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes        | Passed      |
| SWC-121 | Missing Protection against Signature Replay Attacks     | Passed      |
| SWC-122 | Lack of Proper Signature Verification                   | Passed      |
| SWC-123 | Requirement Violation                                   | Passed      |
| SWC-124 | Write to Arbitrary Storage Location                     | Passed      |
| SWC-125 | Incorrect Inheritance Order                             | Passed      |
| SWC-126 | Insufficient Gas Grieving                               | Passed      |
| SWC-127 | Arbitrary Jump with Function Type Variable              | Passed      |
| SWC-128 | DoS With Block Gas Limit                                | Passed      |
| SWC-129 | Typographical Error                                     | Passed      |
| SWC-130 | Right-To-Left-Override control character (U+202E)       | Passed      |
| SWC-131 | Presence of unused variables                            | Passed      |
| SWC-132 | Unexpected Ether balance                                | Passed      |
| SWC-133 | Hash Collisions with Multiple Variable Length Arguments | Passed      |
| SWC-134 | Unencrypted Private Data On-Chain                       | Passed      |



#### Classification of Risks

#### Severity

#### **Description**

High-Risk

A vulnerability that affects the desired outcome when using a contract, or provides the opportunity to use a contract in an unintended way.

Medium-Risk

A vulnerability that could affect the desired outcome of executing the contract in a specific scenario.

Low-Risk

A vulnerability that does not have a significant impact on possible scenarios for the use of the contract and is probably subjective.

🔷 Informational

A vulnerability that has an informational character but is not affecting any of the code.

### **Findings**

| Severity        | Found |
|-----------------|-------|
| ♦ High-Risk     | 0     |
| ♦ Medium-Risk   | 0     |
| ♦ Low-Risk      | 1     |
| ◆ Informational | 0     |
| Total           | 1     |



#### **MANUAL AUDIT**

#### Low Risk:

Centralization - Setting taxes:

Owner is able to set buy/sell/transfer taxes up to 5% each.



### **AUDIT FINDINGS**

- Owner is able is not able to set taxes over 5% on buys sells and transfers
- Owner is not able to set max tax amount.
- Owner is not able to disable trades
- Owner is not able to blacklist an arbitrary wallet
- Owner is not able to mint new tokens