

NiftyKit V2 Smart Contracts Review And Verification

By: ChainSafe Systems

August 2022

NiftyKit V2 Smart Contracts Review And Verification

Auditors: Anderson Lee, Tanya Bushenyova, Oleksii Matiiasevych

WARRANTY

This Code Review is provided on an "as is" basis, without warranty of any kind, express or implied. It is not intended to provide legal advice, and any information, assessments, summaries, or recommendations are provided only for convenience (each, and collectively a "recommendation"). Recommendations are not intended to be comprehensive or applicable in all situations. ChainSafe Systems does not guarantee that the Code Review will identify all instances of security vulnerabilities or other related issues.

Introduction

NIFTYKIT, INC. requested ChainSafe Systems to perform a review of the NiftyKit V2 smart contracts. The contracts can be identified by the following git commit hash:

a1141e7b29fb6cffc41b4c9f65159f5dfa0e59bc

There are 10 contracts and interfaces in scope. After the initial review, NiftyKit team applied a number of updates which can be identified by the following git commit hash:

1d71332b09dc38e5e14372bcca77f34cd03f44c4

Additional verification was performed after that.

Disclaimer

The review makes no statements or warranties about the utility of the code, safety of the code, suitability of the business model, regulatory regime for the business model, or any other statements about the fitness of the contracts for any specific purpose, or their bug free status.

Executive Summary

All the initially identified minor, and above, severity issues were fixed and are not present in the final version of the contract. There are no known compiler bugs for the specified compiler version (0.8.15), that might affect the contracts' logic. There were 0 critical, 0 major, 1 minor, 19 informational/optimizational issues identified in the initial version of the contracts. All the findings, except of two optimization ones, were fixed and are not present in the final version. They are described below for historical purposes. An additional issue, that could block minting new tokens in a collection, was identified and fixed by the NiftyKit team during the engagement. We are looking forward to future engagements with the NiftyKit team.

Critical Bugs and Vulnerabilities

No critical issues were identified.

Line by Line Review. Fixed Issues

- 1. DropCollection, Note: Consider adding a constructor with initialize() in it to avoid initialization of the implementation contract by anyone.
- 2. DropCollection, line 6: Note, the ERC2981Upgradeable import is not used.
- 3. DropCollection, line 17: Note, the MerkleProofUpgradeable using-declaration is not used.
- 4. DropCollection, line 34: Note, the onlyMintable() modifier has an incorrect revert message "Greater than 0", it should be something like "Must be greater than 0" or "Quantity is 0".

- 4. DropCollection, line 34: Note, the onlyMintable() modifier has an incorrect revert message "Greater than 0", it should be something like "Must be greater than 0" or "Quantity is 0".
- 5. DropCollection, line 74: Optimization, in the presaleMint() function, the _mintCount[_ msgSender()] variable is read multiple times (in presaleMint() function and in onlyMintable modifier, also in _purchaseMint() function).
- 6. DropCollection, line 93: Note, in the batchAirdrop() function arrays length validation, the error message is missing.
- 7. DropCollection, line 96: Note, no checks are performed for mint amount in the batchAirdrop() function. Incrementing _mintCount[to] could make sense for future checks during the sale.
- 8. DropCollection, line 158: Optimization, in the _purchaseMint() function, the quantity > 0 validation is performed twice, in the onlyMintable() modifier and in the _purchaseMint() function.
- 9. DropCollection, line 158: Note, the _purchaseMint() function quantity validation revert message is incorrect, it should be "Must be greater than 0".
- 10. TokenCollection, Note: Consider adding a constructor with initialize() in it to avoid initialization of the implementation contract by anyone.
- 11. TokenCollection, line 9: Note, the ERC2981Upgradeable import is not used.
- 12. TokenCollection, line 76: Optimization, in the redeem() function the redeemableAt(redeemableId) is called twice(every time reading from storage), second time inside the redeem() function.
- 13. BaseCollection, line 40: Optimization, in the withdraw() function the _niftyKit variable is read from storage three times.
- 14. BaseCollection, line 41: Optimization, in the withdraw() function the two consecutive calls to _niftyKit contract could be combined into one function to save gas.
- 15. NiftyKitV2, Note: Consider adding a constructor with initialize() in it to avoid initialization of the implementation contract by anyone.
- 16. NiftyKitV2, line 163: Minor, in the _createCollection() function, if msg.sender has too many tokens (too many entries in dropKitPass contract) then _dropKitPass. getFeeRateOf() will fail (because gas needed for the "for" loop can exceed the block gas limit). Collection creation will fail for this user.
- 17. Redeemables, line 31: Note, the MerkleProofUpgradeable using-declaration is not used.
- 18. Redeemables, line 121: Optimization, in the second _redeem() function the redeemableAt (redeemableId) is called twice (every time reading from storage).

Line By Line Verification. Acknowledged Findings

1. TokenCollection, line 92: Optimization, in the redeem() function the redeemableAt(redeemableId) is called twice (every time reading from storage), second time inside the _redeem() function.

2. Redeemables, line 91: Optimization, in the _redeem() function, the _redeemedByWallet[redeemableId][msgSender()] variable is read from storage twice.

Oleksii Matiiasevych

Tanya Bushenyova

Anderson Lee