



# CFG NINJA AUDITS


Security Assessment

**Sluts Token**

May 19, 2023

Audit Status: Pass

Audit Edition: Pinksale



POWERED BY  
**BLADE POOL**

# Table of Contents

## **1 Assessment Summary**

## **2 Project Overview**

2.1 Token Summary

2.2 Risk Analysis Summary

2.3 Main Contract Assessed

## **3 Smart Contract Risk Checks**

3.1 Mint Check

3.2 Fees Check

3.3 Blacklist Check

3.4 MaxTx Check

3.5 Pause Trade Check

3.6 Contract Ownership

3.7 Liquidity Ownership

3.8 KYC Check

## **4 Smart Contract Vulnerability Checks**

4.1 Smart Contract Vulnerability Details

4.2 Smart Contract Inheritance Details

4.3 Smart Contract Privileged Functions

## **5 Technical Findings Details**

## **6 Social Media Check(Informational)**

## **7 Assessment Results and Notes(Important)**

7.1 Score Results

## **8 Disclaimer**



# Assessment Summary

This report has been prepared for Sluts Token on the Binance Smart Chain network. CFGNINJA provides both client-centered and user-centered examination of the smart contracts and their current status when applicable. This report represents the security assessment made to find issues and vulnerabilities on the source code along with the current liquidity and token holder statistics of the protocol.

A comprehensive examination has been performed, utilizing Cross Referencing, Static Analysis, In-House Security Tools, and line-by-line Manual Review.

The auditing process pays special attention to the following considerations:

- Testing the smart contracts against both common and uncommon attack vectors.
- Inspecting liquidity and holders statistics to inform the current status to both users and client when applicable.
- Assessing the codebase to ensure compliance with current best practices and industry standards.
- Verifying contract functions that allow trusted and/or untrusted actors to mint, lock, pause, and transfer assets.
- Cross referencing contract structure and implementation against similar smart contracts produced by industry leaders
- Thorough line-by-line manual review of the entire codebase by industry experts.



# Project Overview

## Token Summary

Parameter	Result
Address	0x54459826125288F8A565A609bB0fA76Df16a9a5E
Name	Sluts
Token Tracker	Sluts (SLUTS)
Decimals	18
Supply	690,690,690
Platform	Binance Smart Chain
compiler	v0.8.4+commit.c7e474f2
Contract Name	StandardToken
Optimization	Yes with 200 runs
LicenseType	MIT
Language	Solidity
Codebase	<a href="https://bscscan.com/address/0x54459826125288F8A565A609bB0fA76Df16a9a5E#code">https://bscscan.com/address/0x54459826125288F8A565A609bB0fA76Df16a9a5E#code</a>
Payment Tx	0x287e208790947a09a026c97de14aebb174756433cee1409b56393cf4bb52f66d



# Project Overview

## Simulation Summary

Parameter	Result
Transfer From Owner	Pass
Transfer From Holder	Pass
Add Liquidity	Pass
RemoveLiquidity	Pass
Buy from Owner	Pass
Buy from Holder	Pass
Sale from Owner	Pass
Sale from Holder	Pass
Remove Liquidity	Pass
SwapAndLiquify	Pass
SwapAndSale w/Fee	Pass
SwapAndSale TX	
SwapAndSaleNoFee	Pass
SwapAndSale No/Fee TX	
ExcludeFromFees	Pass
LaunchPad	PinkSale



Parameter	Result
Pool Creation	Pass
Pool Creation TX	
Pool Finalize	Pass
Pool Finalize TX	
Enable	Pass

The following quick summary it's added to the project overview; however, there are more details about the audit and its results. Please read every detail.





## Main Contract Assessed Contract Name

Name	Contract	Live
Sluts	0x54459826125288F8A565A609bB0fA76Df16a9a5E	Yes

## TestNet Contract was Not Assessed

### Solidity Code Provided

SolID	File Sha-1	FileName
Fronk	2b7d33417014176eca495013c05c817c6f6a2299	fronk.sol
Fronk		
Fronk		
Fronk		





# Mint Check

**The project owners of Sluts do not have a mint function in the contract, owner cannot mint tokens after initial deploy.**

**The Project has a Total Supply of 690,690,690 and cannot mint any more than the Max Supply.**

Mint Notes:

Auditor Notes:

Project Owner Notes:



# Fees Check

**The project owners of Sluts do not have the ability to set fees higher than 0 .**

**The team May have fees defined; however, they can't set those fees higher than 0 or may not be able to configure the same.**

**Tax Fee Notes:**

**Auditor Notes:** The contract currently has 0% buy and 0% sale taxes.

**Project Owner Notes:**



# Blacklist Check

**The project owners of Sluts do not have a blacklist function their contract.**

**The Project allow owners to transfer their tokens without any restrictions.**

**Token owner cannot blacklist the contract: Malicious or compromised owners can trap contracts relying on tokens with a blacklist.**

**Blacklist Notes:**

**Auditor Notes: .**

**Project Owner Notes:**



# MaxTx Check

**The Project Owners of Sluts cannot set max tx amount**

**The Team allows any investors to swap, transfer or sell their total amount if needed.**

MaxTX Notes:

Auditor Notes:

Project Owner Notes:

**Project Has No MaxTX**



# Pause Trade Check

**The Project Owners of Sluts don't have the ability to stop or pause trading.**

**The Team has done a great job to avoid stop trading, and investors has the ability to trade at any given time without any problems**

Pause Trade Notes:

Auditor Notes:

Project Owner Notes: .

Owner can't pause trading



# Contract Ownership

The contract ownership of Sluts is not currently renounced. The ownership of the contract grants special powers to the protocol creators, making them the sole addresses that can call sensible ownable functions that may alter the state of the protocol.

The current owner is the address  
`0x7e895a1ae962a6be299dbf1fa2bd2f293acc653e`  
which can be viewed:  
[HERE](#)

The owner wallet has the power to call the functions displayed on the privileged functions chart below, if the owner's wallet is compromised, they could exploit these privileges.

We recommend the team renounce ownership at the right time, if possible, or gradually migrate to a timelock with governing functionalities regarding transparency and safety considerations.

We recommend the team use a Multisignature Wallet if the contract is not going to be renounced; this will give the team more control over the contract.



# Liquidity Ownership

The token does not have liquidity at the moment of the audit, block 28352507


If liquidity is unlocked, then the token developers can do what is infamously known as 'rugpull'. Once investors start buying token from the exchange, the liquidity pool will accumulate more and more coins of established value (e.g., ETH or BNB or Tether). This is because investors are basically sending these tokens of value to the exchange, to get the new token. Developers can withdraw this liquidity from the exchange, cash in all the value and run off with it. Liquidity is locked by renouncing the ownership of liquidity pool (LP) tokens for a fixed time period, by sending them to a time-lock smart contract. Without ownership of LP tokens, developers cannot get liquidity pool funds back. This provides confidence to the investors that the token developers will not run away with the liquidity money. It is now a standard practice that all token developers follow, and this is what really differentiates a scam coin from a real one.

[Read More](#)



# Call Graph

The contract for Sluts has the following call graph structure.





# KYC Information

**The Project Owners of Sluts is not KYC.**

**KYC Information Notes:**

**Auditor Notes:** KYC to be completed by PinkSale, project will be a SAFU Project.

**Project Owner Notes:**



# Smart Contract Vulnerability Checks

The Smart Contract Weakness Classification Registry (SWC Registry) is an implementation of the weakness classification scheme proposed in EIP-1470. It is loosely aligned to the terminologies and structure used in the Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) while overlaying a wide range of weakness variants that are specific to smart contracts.

ID	Severity	Name	File	location
SWC-100	Pass	Function Default Visibility	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-101	Pass	Integer Overflow and Underflow.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-102	Pass	Outdated Compiler Version file.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-103	Pass	A floating pragma is set.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-104	Pass	Unchecked Call Return Value.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-105	Pass	Unprotected Ether Withdrawal.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-106	Pass	Unprotected SELFDESTRUCT Instruction	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-107	Pass	Read of persistent state following external call.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-108	Pass	State variable visibility is not set..	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-109	Pass	Uninitialized Storage Pointer.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-110	Pass	Assert Violation.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0



ID	Severity	Name	File	location
SWC-111	Pass	Use of Deprecated Solidity Functions.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-112	Pass	Delegate Call to Untrusted Callee.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-113	Pass	Multiple calls are executed in the same transaction.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-114	Pass	Transaction Order Dependence.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-115	Pass	Authorization through tx.origin.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-116	Pass	A control flow decision is made based on The block.timestamp environment variable.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-117	Pass	Signature Malleability.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-118	Pass	Incorrect Constructor Name.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-119	Pass	Shadowing State Variables.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-120	Low	Potential use of block.number as source of randommness.	StandardToken.sol	L: 630 C: 21
SWC-121	Pass	Missing Protection against Signature Replay Attacks.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-122	Pass	Lack of Proper Signature Verification.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-123	Pass	Requirement Violation.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-124	Pass	Write to Arbitrary Storage Location.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-125	Pass	Incorrect Inheritance Order.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0



ID	Severity	Name	File	location
SWC-126	Pass	Insufficient Gas Griefing.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-127	Pass	Arbitrary Jump with Function Type Variable.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-128	Pass	DoS With Block Gas Limit.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-129	Pass	Typographical Error.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-130	Pass	Right-To-Left-Override control character (U+202E).	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-131	Pass	Presence of unused variables.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-132	Pass	Unexpected Ether balance.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-133	Pass	Hash Collisions with Multiple Variable Length Arguments.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-134	Pass	Message call with hardcoded gas amount.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-135	Pass	Code With No Effects (Irrelevant/Dead Code).	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0
SWC-136	Pass	Unencrypted Private Data On-Chain.	StandardToken.sol	L: 0 C: 0

We scan the contract for additional security issues using MYTHX and industry-standard security scanning tools.



# Smart Contract Vulnerability Details

## SWC-120 - Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes

### CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values

#### Description:

Solidity allows for ambiguous naming of state variables when inheritance is used. Contract A with a variable x could inherit contract B that also has a state variable x defined. This would result in two separate versions of x, one of them being accessed from contract A and the other one from contract B. In more complex contract systems this condition could go unnoticed and subsequently lead to security issues.

Shadowing state variables can also occur within a single contract when there are multiple definitions on the contract and function level.

#### Remediation:

Using commitment scheme, e.g. RANDAO. Using external sources of randomness via oracles, e.g. Oraclize. Note that this approach requires trusting in oracle, thus it may be reasonable to use multiple oracles. Using Bitcoin block hashes, as they are more expensive to mine.

#### References:

How can I securely generate a random number in my smart contract?)


When can BLOCKHASH be safely used for a random number? When would it be unsafe?

The Run smart contract.



# Inheritance

The contract for Sluts has the following inheritance structure.



# Social Media Checks

Social Media	URL	Result
Twitter	<a href="https://twitter.com/Sluts_TokenBNB">https://twitter.com/Sluts_TokenBNB</a>	Pass
Other		Fail
Website	<a href="https://slutscoin.net/">https://slutscoin.net/</a>	Pass
Telegram	<a href="https://t.me/slutsbsc">https://t.me/slutsbsc</a>	Pass

We recommend to have 3 or more social media sources including a completed working websites.

**Social Media Information Notes:**

**Auditor Notes:** undefined

**Project Owner Notes:**



# Audit Result

## Final Audit Score

Review	Score
Security Score	85
Auditor Score	80

The Following Score System Has been Added to this page to help understand the value of the audit, the maximum score is 100, however to attain that value the project must pass and provide all the data needed for the assessment. Our Passing Score has been changed to 80 Points, if a project does not attain 80% is an automatic failure. Read our notes and final assessment below.

## Audit Passed





## Assessment Results

### Important Notes:

- No issues or vulnerabilities were found.
- This is a Pinksale Generated Standard token.
- Please DYOR on the project.

**Auditor Score =80**  
**Audit Passed**



# Appendix

## Finding Categories

### Centralization / Privilege

Centralization / Privilege findings refer to either feature logic or implementation of components that act against the nature of decentralization, such as explicit ownership or specialized access roles in combination with a mechanism to relocate funds.

### Gas Optimization

Gas Optimization findings do not affect the functionality of the code but generate different, more optimal EVM opcodes resulting in a reduction on the total gas cost of a transaction.

### Logical Issue

Logical Issue findings detail a fault in the logic of the linked code, such as an incorrect notion on how block.timestamp works.

### Control Flow

Control Flow findings concern the access control imposed on functions, such as owner-only functions being invoke-able by anyone under certain circumstances.

### Volatile Code

Volatile Code findings refer to segments of code that behave unexpectedly on certain edge cases that may result in a vulnerability.

### Coding Style

Coding Style findings usually do not affect the generated byte-code but rather comment on how to make the codebase more legible and, as a result, easily maintainable.

### Inconsistency

Inconsistency findings refer to functions that should seemingly behave similarly yet contain different code, such as a constructor assignment imposing different requirements on the input variables than a setter function.

### Coding Best Practices

ERC 20 Coding Standards are a set of rules that each developer should follow to ensure the code meets a set of criteria and is readable by all the developers.



## Disclaimer

CFGNINJA has conducted an independent security assessment to verify the integrity of and highlight any vulnerabilities or errors, intentional or unintentional, that may be present in the reviewed code for the scope of this assessment. This report does not constitute agreement, acceptance, or advocacy for the Project, and users relying on this report should not consider this as having any merit for financial advice in any shape, form, or nature. The contracts audited do not account for any economic developments that the Project in question may pursue, and the veracity of the findings thus presented in this report relate solely to the proficiency, competence, aptitude, and discretion of our independent auditors, who make no guarantees nor assurance that the contracts are entirely free of exploits, bugs, vulnerabilities or deprecation of technologies.

All information provided in this report does not constitute financial or investment advice, nor should it be used to signal that any persons reading this report should invest their funds without sufficient individual due diligence, regardless of the findings presented. Information is provided 'as is, and CFGNINJA is under no covenant to audited completeness, accuracy, or solidity of the contracts. In no event will CFGNINJA or its partners, employees, agents, or parties related to the provision of this audit report be liable to any parties for, or lack thereof, decisions or actions with regards to the information provided in this audit report.

The assessment services provided by CFGNINJA are subject to dependencies and are under continuing development. You agree that your access or use, including but not limited to any services, reports, and materials, will be at your sole risk on an as-is, where-is, and as-available basis. Cryptographic tokens are emergent technologies with high levels of technical risk and uncertainty. The assessment reports could include false positives, negatives, and unpredictable results. The services may access, and depend upon, multiple layers of third parties.

