



# OpenVM v1.2.1 rc.0

## Security Review

Cantina Managed review by:

**Guido Vranken**, Lead Security Researcher

**Om Parikh**, Security Researcher

Advisor: **Zigtur**, Lead Security Researcher

July 10, 2025

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	About Cantina . . . . .	2
1.2	Disclaimer . . . . .	2
1.3	Risk assessment . . . . .	2
1.3.1	Severity Classification . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Security Review Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Medium Risk . . . . .	4
3.1.1	recover_from_prehash succeeds when it should fail due to missing overflow check . .	4
3.1.2	recover_from_prehash succeeds when it should fail due to missing public key validation	5
3.1.3	recover_from_prehash succeeds when it should fail due to missing ECDSA verification	6
3.1.4	VerifyingKey::from_sec1_bytes panics when parsing unreduced coordinates . . . .	7
3.1.5	VerifyingKey::from_sec1_bytes accepts infinity point whereas upstream does not .	8

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 About Cantina

Cantina is a security services marketplace that connects top security researchers and solutions with clients. Learn more at [cantina.xyz](https://cantina.xyz)

## 1.2 Disclaimer

Cantina Managed provides a detailed evaluation of the security posture of the code at a particular moment based on the information available at the time of the review. While Cantina Managed endeavors to identify and disclose all potential security issues, it cannot guarantee that every vulnerability will be detected or that the code will be entirely secure against all possible attacks. The assessment is conducted based on the specific commit and version of the code provided. Any subsequent modifications to the code may introduce new vulnerabilities that were absent during the initial review. Therefore, any changes made to the code require a new security review to ensure that the code remains secure. Please be advised that the Cantina Managed security review is not a replacement for continuous security measures such as penetration testing, vulnerability scanning, and regular code reviews.

## 1.3 Risk assessment

Severity	Description
<b>Critical</b>	<i>Must fix as soon as possible (if already deployed).</i>
<b>High</b>	Leads to a loss of a significant portion (>10%) of assets in the protocol, or significant harm to a majority of users.
<b>Medium</b>	Global losses <10% or losses to only a subset of users, but still unacceptable.
<b>Low</b>	Losses will be annoying but bearable. Applies to things like griefing attacks that can be easily repaired or even gas inefficiencies.
<b>Gas Optimization</b>	Suggestions around gas saving practices.
<b>Informational</b>	Suggestions around best practices or readability.

### 1.3.1 Severity Classification

The severity of security issues found during the security review is categorized based on the above table. Critical findings have a high likelihood of being exploited and must be addressed immediately. High findings are almost certain to occur, easy to perform, or not easy but highly incentivized thus must be fixed as soon as possible.

Medium findings are conditionally possible or incentivized but are still relatively likely to occur and should be addressed. Low findings a rare combination of circumstances to exploit, or offer little to no incentive to exploit but are recommended to be addressed.

Lastly, some findings might represent objective improvements that should be addressed but do not impact the project's overall security (Gas and Informational findings).

## 2 Security Review Summary

OpenVM is a performant and modular zkVM framework built for customization and extensibility.

From Jun 3rd to Jun 8th the Cantina team conducted a review of `openvm-v1.2.1-rc.0` on commit hash `2c352538`. The team identified a total of **5** issues:

### Issues Found

Severity	Count	Fixed	Acknowledged
Critical Risk	0	0	0
High Risk	0	0	0
Medium Risk	5	5	0
Low Risk	0	0	0
Gas Optimizations	0	0	0
Informational	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

The Cantina Managed team reviewed OpenVM's `openvm-v1.2.1-rc.0` holistically on commit hash `3c800070` and concluded that all issues were addressed and no new vulnerabilities were identified.

## 3 Findings

### 3.1 Medium Risk

#### 3.1.1 recover\_from\_prehash succeeds when it should fail due to missing overflow check

**Severity:** Medium Risk

**Context:** [ecdsa.rs#L381](#)

**Description:** The upstream code performs a checked\_add and returns Error if an overflow occurs:

- [recovery.rs#L306-L310](#)

```
Option::<C::Uint>::from(
    C::Uint::decode_field_bytes(&r.to_repr()).checked_add(&C::ORDER),
)
.ok_or_else(Error::new)?
.encode_field_bytes()
```

But openvm does add\_assign unconditionally.

**Proof of Concept:**

```
use hex_literal::hex;

use ecdsa::RecoveryId;
use p256::ecdsa::{VerifyingKey, Signature};

/// Signature recovery test vectors
struct RecoveryTestVector {
    pk: [u8; 33],
    msg: [u8; 32],
    sig: [u8; 64],
    recid: u8,
    ok: bool,
}

const RECOVERY_TEST_VECTORS: &[RecoveryTestVector] = &[
    RecoveryTestVector{pk:hex!("0200000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000"),msg:hex!(
↳ "0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000"),
↳ "0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000"),
↳ "0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000"),
↳ "01"),recid:2,ok:false},
];

fn main() {
    for vector in RECOVERY_TEST_VECTORS {
        let sig = match Signature::try_from(vector.sig.as_slice()) {
            Ok(_v) => _v,
            Err(_) => {
                assert_eq!(vector.ok, false);
                continue;
            }
        };
        let recid = match RecoveryId::from_byte(vector.recid) {
            Some(_v) => _v,
            None => {
                assert_eq!(vector.ok, false);
                continue;
            }
        };
        let _ = match VerifyingKey::recover_from_prehash(&vector.msg, &sig, recid) {
            Ok(_v) => {
                /* openvm p256 takes this code path */
                _v
            },
            Err(_) => {
                /* Original p256 crate takes this code path */
                assert_eq!(vector.ok, false);
                continue;
            }
        };
    }
}
```



**OpenVM:** Fixed in [PR 1743](#).

### 3.1.3 `recover_from_prehash` succeeds when it should fail due to missing ECDSA verification

**Context:** [ecdsa.rs#L392](#)

- [recovery.rs#L312-L313](#):

### Proof of Concept:

6

```
    },  
    Err(_) => {  
        println!("recover_from_prehash: err");  
        /* k256 crate takes this code path */  
        assert_eq!(vector.ok(), false);  
        continue;  
    }  
}  
  
}
```

**Recommendation:** Return error when the recovered public key and signature combination does not pass ECDSA verification for full compatibility.

**OpenVM:** The discrepancy is actually because k256 has an extra step in their `verify_prehash` that forces the signature to be normalized. We address this in [PR 1744](#) and give a proof that the rest of the ECDSA signature verification is automatic from a successful public key recovery.

**Cantina Managed:** Fix verified.

### 3.1.4 VerifyingKey::from\_sec1\_bytes panics when parsing unreduced coordinates

**Severity:** Medium Risk

**Context:** (No context files were provided by the reviewer)

**Description:** If `VerifyingKey::from_sec1_bytes` is called when a point representation whose coordinate(s) are equal or greater than the curve prime, a panic (assert failure) will occur due to field arithmetic assuming reduced input:

- [is\\_eq.rs#L349](#).
- [weierstrass.rs#L94](#).

The proof of concept demonstrates this for `k256` but it applies to `p256` as well.

### Proof of Concept:

[illegible]



```

    * Fails because from_sec1_bytes rejects points with oversized coordinates,
    * even if the point is valid after reduction.
    *
    * This also panics in openvm in is_eq.rs.
    */
    assert!(
        VkSecp256k1::from_sec1_bytes(
            &hex!("04"
                "ffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffc30"
                "4218f20ae6c646b363db68605822fb14264ca8d2587fdd6fbc750d587e76a7ee")
            ).is_err()
        );
    }
}

```

**Recommendation:** Reject coordinates  $\geq$  prime in `from_sec1_bytes` by returning error, and do this before invoking any arithmetic that assumes reduced inputs.

**OpenVM:** Fixed in [PR 1746](#).

**Cantina Managed:** Fix verified.

### 3.1.5 `VerifyingKey::from_sec1_bytes` accepts infinity point whereas upstream does not

**Severity:** Medium Risk

**Context:** (No context files were provided by the reviewer)

**Description:** The infinity point is not a valid `VerifyingKey`. Upstream correctly rejects it whereas `openvm` does not.

**Proof of Concept:**

```

use hex_literal::hex;
use k256::ecdsa::VerifyingKey;

fn main() {
    assert_eq!(
        VerifyingKey::from_sec1_bytes(
            &hex!("04"
                "0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000"
                "000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000")
            ).is_ok(), false);
}

```

**Recommendation:** Reject the infinity point as a `VerifyingKey`.

**OpenVM:** Fixed in [PR 1747](#).

**Cantina Managed:** Fix verified.