



# Exiled Racers

## Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: April 11th, 2022 - April 22nd, 2022

Visit: [Halborn.com](https://Halborn.com)

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY	4
CONTACTS	4
1 EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	5
1.1 INTRODUCTION	6
1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY	6
1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	6
RISK METHODOLOGY	7
1.4 SCOPE	9
2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	10
3 FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	11
3.1 (HAL-01) CLAIMREWARDITEMS AND BURNTOREDEEMINVENTORYITEMS FUNCTIONS CAN BE FRONTRUN - CRITICAL	13
Description	13
Risk Level	14
Recommendation	15
Remediation Plan	15
3.2 (HAL-02) WEAK PRNG IN CLAIMRANDOMITEMS: USERS CAN ALWAYS REDEEM THE RAREST CATEGORY AND RARIRY - CRITICAL	16
Description	16
Proof of Concept	18
Risk Level	19
Recommendation	19
Remediation Plan	19
3.3 (HAL-03) WEAK PRNG IN REDEEMPILOT AND REDEEMRACECRAFT FUNCTIONS - CRITICAL	21
Description	21

	Risk Level	23
	Recommendation	24
	Remediation Plan	24
3.4	(HAL-04) MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS ARE VULNERABLE TO REPLAY ATTACKS - HIGH	26
	Description	26
	Functions Affected	28
	Risk Level	28
	Recommendation	28
	Remediation Plan	28
3.5	(HAL-05) SAME SEED AND SIGNATURE CAN BE REUSED IN REDEEMPILOT AND REDEEMRACECRAFT FUNCTIONS - HIGH	30
	Description	30
	Risk Level	31
	Recommendation	31
	Remediation Plan	32
3.6	(HAL-06) ERC721FRAGMENTABLE MAX SUPPLY CAN BE EXCEEDED BY 1 IF THE FIRSTID OF FRAGMENT 0 IS 0 - LOW	33
	Description	33
	Proof of Concept	34
	Risk Level	36
	Recommendation	36
	Remediation Plan	36
3.7	(HAL-07) INCORRECT EVENT EMISSION - LOW	37
	Description	37
	Risk Level	37
	Recommendation	38

	Remediation Plan	38
3.8	(HAL-08) UNUSED EVENT - INFORMATIONAL	39
	Description	39
	Risk Level	39
	Recommendation	39
	Remediation Plan	39
4	AUTOMATED TESTING	40
4.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	41
	Description	41
	Slither results	41
4.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	46
	Description	46
	MythX results	46

## DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	04/11/2022	Roberto Reigada
0.2	Document Updates	04/22/2022	Roberto Reigada
0.3	Draft Review	04/22/2022	Gabi Urrutia
1.0	Remediation Plan	04/28/2022	Roberto Reigada
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	04/28/2022	Gabi Urrutia

## CONTACTS

CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL
Rob Behnke	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Rob.Behnke@halborn.com">Rob.Behnke@halborn.com</a>
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com">Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com</a>
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com">Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com</a>
Roberto Reigada	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com">Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com</a>



# EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW



## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Exiled Racers engaged Halborn to conduct a security audit on their smart contracts beginning on April 11th, 2022 and ending on April 22nd, 2022. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts provided in the GitHub repository [Sokoke-Labs/exr-contracts-public](https://github.com/Sokoke-Labs/exr-contracts-public).

## 1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided two weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to audit the security of the smart contracts. The security engineer is a blockchain and smart-contract security expert with advanced penetration testing, smart-contract hacking, and deep knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of this audit is to:

- Ensure that smart contract functions operate as intended
- Identify potential security issues with the smart contracts

In summary, Halborn identified some security risks that were addressed by the [Exiled Racers team](#).

## 1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of manual and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy in regard to the scope of this audit. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the code and can quickly identify items that do not follow the security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used during the audit:

- Research into architecture and purpose
- Smart contract manual code review and walkthrough
- Graphing out functionality and contract logic/connectivity/functions ([solgraph](#))
- Manual assessment of use and safety for the critical Solidity variables and functions in scope to identify any arithmetic related vulnerability classes
- Manual testing by custom scripts
- Scanning of solidity files for vulnerabilities, security hotspots or bugs. ([MythX](#))
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. ([Slither](#))
- Testnet deployment ([Brownie](#), [Remix IDE](#))

#### RISK METHODOLOGY:

Vulnerabilities or issues observed by Halborn are ranked based on the risk assessment methodology by measuring the **LIKELIHOOD** of a security incident and the **IMPACT** should an incident occur. This framework works for communicating the characteristics and impacts of technology vulnerabilities. The quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that were used to generate the Risk scores. For every vulnerability, a risk level will be calculated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest likelihood or impact.

#### RISK SCALE - LIKELIHOOD

- 5 - Almost certain an incident will occur.
- 4 - High probability of an incident occurring.
- 3 - Potential of a security incident in the long term.
- 2 - Low probability of an incident occurring.
- 1 - Very unlikely issue will cause an incident.

#### RISK SCALE - IMPACT

- 5 - May cause devastating and unrecoverable impact or loss.
- 4 - May cause a significant level of impact or loss.



- 3 - May cause a partial impact or loss to many.
- 2 - May cause temporary impact or loss.
- 1 - May cause minimal or un-noticeable impact.

The risk level is then calculated using a sum of these two values, creating a value of 10 to 1 with 10 being the highest level of security risk.

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
----------	------	--------	-----	---------------

- 10 - CRITICAL
- 9 - 8 - HIGH
- 7 - 6 - MEDIUM
- 5 - 4 - LOW
- 3 - 1 - VERY LOW AND INFORMATIONAL

## 1.4 SCOPE

IN-SCOPE:

The security assessment was scoped to the following [smart contracts](#):

- [EXRGameAssetERC721.sol](#)
- [EXRInventoryController.sol](#)
- [EXRInventoryERC1155.sol](#)
- [EXRMintPassERC1155.sol](#)
- [EXRSalesContract.sol](#)

Initial Commit ID:

[7d04aa3277631539cd5fa2acb4c4eaa388aefea1](#) - Private Repository

Fixed Commit ID: [55b75c192fb18a87b385f448b727b2d37fc64259](#)

## 2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
3	2	0	2	1

### LIKELIHOOD

IMPACT

		(HAL-04)		(HAL-01) (HAL-02) (HAL-03)
				(HAL-05)
	(HAL-06)			
		(HAL-07)		
(HAL-08)				

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
HAL01 - CLAIMREWARDITEMS AND BURNTOREDEEMINVENTORYITEMS FUNCTIONS CAN BE FRONTRUN	Critical	SOLVED - 04/28/2022
HAL02 - WEAK PRNG IN CLAIMRANDOMITEMS: USERS CAN ALWAYS REDEEM THE RAREST CATEGORY AND RARIRY	Critical	SOLVED - 04/28/2022
HAL03 - WEAK PRNG IN REDEEMPILOT AND REDEEMRACECRAFT FUNCTIONS	Critical	SOLVED - 04/28/2022
HAL04 - MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS ARE VULNERABLE TO REPLAY ATTACKS	High	SOLVED - 04/28/2022
HAL05 - SAME SEED AND SIGNATURE CAN BE REUSED IN REDEEMPILOT AND REDEEMRACECRAFT FUNCTIONS	High	SOLVED - 04/28/2022
HAL06 - ERC721FRAGMENTABLE MAX SUPPLY CAN BE EXCEEDED BY 1 IF THE FIRSTID OF FRAGMENT 0 IS 0	Low	SOLVED - 04/28/2022
HAL07 - INCORRECT EVENT EMISSION	Low	SOLVED - 04/28/2022
HAL08 - UNUSED EVENT	Informational	SOLVED - 04/28/2022



# FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS



### 3.1 (HAL-01) CLAIMREWARDITEMS AND BURNTOREDEEMINVENTORYITEMS FUNCTIONS CAN BE FRONTRUN - CRITICAL

#### Description:

The `claimRewardItems()` and `burnToRedeemInventoryItems()` functions are used to claim different inventory items from the `EXRInventoryController` contract:

Listing 1: `EXRInventoryController.sol` (Line 89)

```

81 function claimRewardItems(
82     bytes32 seed,
83     uint256 qty,
84     Coupon calldata coupon
85 ) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant {
86     if (usedSeeds[seed]) revert InventoryReusedSeed();
87
88     usedSeeds[seed] = true;
89     bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encode(CouponType.Reward, qty,
    ↳ seed));
90     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert
    ↳ InventoryInvalidCoupon();
91
92     _claimRandomItems(seed, qty);
93     emit InventoryRewardClaimed(_msgSender(), qty);
94 }

```

Listing 2: `EXRInventoryController.sol` (Line 113)

```

103 function burnToRedeemInventoryItems(
104     bytes32 seed,
105     uint256 qty,
106     Coupon calldata coupon
107 ) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant {
108     if (mintpassContract.balanceOf(_msgSender(), inventoryPassId)
    ↳ == 0)

```

```

109         revert InventoryInsufficientPassBalance();
110         if (usedSeeds[seed]) revert InventoryReusedSeed();
111
112         usedSeeds[seed] = true;
113         bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encode(CouponType.Inventory,
114         ↳ qty, seed));
115
116         if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert
117         ↳ InventoryInvalidCoupon();
118
119         mintpassContract.authorizedBurn(_msgSender(), inventoryPassId)
120         ↳ ;
121         _claimRandomItems(seed, qty);
122     }

```

The **digest** is formed by:

- CouponType.Inventory
- qty
- seed

Since the **digest** is not linked to the caller's address (**msg.sender**), the following exploit would be possible:

1. The signer creates a signature and shares it with user1.
2. User1 calls **claimRewardItems()**.
3. User1's transaction hits the public mempool.
4. The attacker detects the **claimRewardItems()** call in the mempool.
5. The attacker extracts the transaction signature of user1 in the mempool, and calls the **claimRewardItems()** functions front running user1.
6. The attacker manages to claim the items.
7. The User1 lost his claim. Since his transaction was front run, he gets the error **InventoryReusedSeed**.

**Risk Level:**

**Likelihood - 5**

**Impact - 5**

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended to add the address of the eligible user to claim the Coupon in the `digest`:

```
bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encode(msg.sender, CouponType.Inventory,
    qty, seed));
```

**Remediation Plan:**

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` solved the issue by adding the address of the user eligible to claim the Coupon in the `digest`:

**Listing 3: EXRInventoryController.sol (Lines 90-92)**

```
82 function claimRewardItems(
83     bytes32 seed,
84     uint256 qty,
85     Coupon calldata coupon
86 ) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant hasValidOrigin {
87     if (usedSeeds[seed]) revert InventoryReusedSeed();
88
89     usedSeeds[seed] = true;
90     bytes32 digest = keccak256(
91         abi.encode(address(this), block.chainid, CouponType.Reward
92         ↪ , qty, seed, _msgSender())
93     );
94     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert
95     ↪ InventoryInvalidCoupon();
96
97     _claimRandomItems(seed, qty);
98     emit InventoryRewardClaimed(_msgSender(), qty);
99 }
```



## 3.2 (HAL-02) WEAK PRNG IN CLAIMRANDOMITEMS: USERS CAN ALWAYS REDEEM THE RAREST CATEGORY AND RARITY – CRITICAL

### Description:

In the `EXRInventoryController` contract, the `_claimRandomItems()` internal function is called by `claimRewardItems()` and `burnToRedeemInventoryItems()`:

Listing 4: `EXRInventoryController.sol` (Lines 232-234)

```

226 function _claimRandomItems(bytes32 seed, uint256 amount) internal
    ↳ {
227     uint256[] memory ids = new uint256[](amount);
228     uint256[] memory amounts = new uint256[](amount);
229
230     for (uint256 i; i < amount; i++) {
231         // Every category has an equal chance of being selected
232         uint256 randomCategorySelector = (uint256(
233             keccak256(abi.encode(_msgSender(), block.number - 1,
    ↳ seed, i))
234             ) % (categories.length * 100)) + 1;
235
236         uint256 id;
237         for (uint256 ii; ii < categories.length; ii++) {
238             if (randomCategorySelector < (ii + 1) * 100) {
239                 id = _selectIdByRarity(randomCategorySelector, ii)
    ↳ ;
240                 break;
241             }
242         }
243
244         ids[i] = id;
245         amounts[i] = 1;
246     }
247
248     inventoryContract.mintBatch(_msgSender(), ids, amounts, "");

```

```

249     emit InventoryItemsClaimed(ids, amounts);
250 }

```

#### Listing 5: EXRInventoryController.sol

```

259 function _selectIdByRarity(uint256 seed, uint256 category)
    ↳ internal view returns (uint256) {
260     uint256 randomIdSelector = (uint256(keccak256(abi.encode(seed,
    ↳ category)))) % 3000) + 1;
261     uint8[9] memory options = categories[category].tokenIds;
262
263     if (randomIdSelector > 2500) {
264         return options[0]; // common ( 2500 - 3000)
265     } else if (randomIdSelector > 2000) {
266         return options[1]; // common (2000 - 2500)
267     } else if (randomIdSelector > 1500) {
268         return options[2]; // common ( 1500 - 2000)
269     } else if (randomIdSelector > 1150) {
270         return options[3]; // mid (1150 - 1500)
271     } else if (randomIdSelector > 800) {
272         return options[4]; // mid (800 - 1150)
273     } else if (randomIdSelector > 450) {
274         return options[5]; // mid ( 450 - 800)
275     } else if (randomIdSelector > 300) {
276         return options[6]; // rare ( 300 - 450 )
277     } else if (randomIdSelector > 150) {
278         return options[7]; // rare ( 150 - 300)
279     } else {
280         return options[8]; // rare ( 0 - 150)
281     }
282 }

```

The `_claimRandomItems()` is used to generate “random” token IDs. With the current implementation, an attacker could:

1. Create a malicious parent contract.
2. Precompute different contract addresses with different salts until finding a contract address that results in the rarest category:
 

```

uint256 randomCategorySelector = (uint256(keccak256(abi.encode(
    _msgSender(), block.number - 1, seed, i))))% (categories.length *
    100))+ 1;

```

3. Deploy the precomputed address using `CREATE2`.
4. Call the `claimRewardItems()` from the deployed child contract.

This way, it would be possible for an attacker to always redeem the rarest category for all claimed items:

## Proof of Concept:

In the Proof of Concept below, we managed to claim 2 items, both with the rarest category, after precomputing 37 different addresses (37 iterations):

## Exiled Racers - PRNG Exploitation Video

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 5

Impact - 5

Recommendation:

It is recommended to disallow calls from smart contracts to `claimRewardItems()` and `burnToRedeemInventoryItems()` functions by adding the following require statement:

```
require(tx.origin == msg.sender);
```

On the other hand, it is also recommended to remove `msg.sender` from the PRNG generation.

Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` solved the issue by adding the `hasValidOrigin` modifier to the `claimRewardItems()` and `burnToRedeemInventoryItems()` functions:

Listing 6: `EXRInventoryController.sol`

```
303 modifier hasValidOrigin() {
304     require(
305         isTrustedForwarder(msg.sender) || msg.sender == tx.origin,
306         "Non-trusted forwarder contract not allowed"
307     );
308     _;
309 }
```

This modifier will restrict smart contract calls to these functions. On the other hand, `msg.sender` was removed from the PRNG generation:

Listing 7: `EXRInventoryController.sol` (Lines 246-248)

```
240 function _claimRandomItems(bytes32 seed, uint256 amount) internal
    ↳ {
241     uint256[] memory ids = new uint256[](amount);
```

```

242     uint256[] memory amounts = new uint256[](amount);
243
244     for (uint256 i; i < amount; i++) {
245         // Every category has an equal chance of being selected
246         uint256 randomCategorySelector = (uint256(
247             keccak256(abi.encode(seed, blockhash(block.number),
248                 ↪ block.basefee, i))
249             ) % (categories.length * 100)) + 1;
250
251         uint256 id;
252         for (uint256 ii; ii < categories.length; ii++) {
253             if (randomCategorySelector < (ii + 1) * 100) {
254                 id = _selectIdByRarity(randomCategorySelector, ii)
255                 ↪ ;
256                 break;
257             }
258         }
259         ids[i] = id;
260         amounts[i] = 1;
261     }
262
263     inventoryContract.mintBatch(_msgSender(), ids, amounts, "");
264     emit InventoryItemsClaimed(ids, amounts);
265 }

```

### 3.3 (HAL-03) WEAK PRNG IN REDEEMPILOT AND REDEEMRACECRAFT FUNCTIONS - CRITICAL

#### Description:

In the `EXRSalesContract` contract, the `redeemPilot()` and `redeemRacecraft()` functions are used to redeem a pilot or racecraft. These functions internally call the `EXRGameAsset.mint()` function:

Listing 8: `EXRGameAsset.sol` (Line 77)

```

62 function mint(
63     address recipient,
64     uint256 count,
65     uint8 fragment,
66     bytes32 seed
67 ) external whenNotPaused onlyRole(MINTER_ROLE) {
68     if (recipient == address(0)) revert GameAssetZeroAddress();
69     if (count == 0) revert GameAssetZeroCount();
70
71     Fragment memory assetFragment = fragments[fragment];
72     if (assetFragment.status != 1) revert GameAssetInvalidFragment
    ↳ (fragment);
73     if (assetFragment.publicTokens.issuedCount + count >
    ↳ assetFragment.publicTokens.supply)
74         revert GameAssetFragmentTokenPoolSupplyExceeded();
75
76     for (uint256 i; i < count; i++) {
77         uint256 tokenId = issueRandomId(fragment, seed, recipient)
    ↳ ;
78
79         if (tokenId < assetFragment.firstTokenId + assetFragment.
    ↳ reservedTokens.supply)
80             revert GameAssetTokenIdReserved({tokenId: tokenId});
81
82         if (tokenId > assetFragment.firstTokenId + assetFragment.
    ↳ supply - 1)
83             revert GameAssetInvalidFragmentTokenId();
84
85         _createAndMintGameAsset(recipient, tokenId, fragment);

```

```

86     }
87 }

```

As we can see above, the mint function makes use of `issueRandomId()` to choose the tokenID that will be minted:

**Listing 9: ERC721Fragmentable.sol (Lines 236-238)**

```

223 function issueRandomId(
224     uint256 fragment,
225     bytes32 seed,
226     address recipient
227 ) internal returns (uint256) {
228     Fragment storage currentFragment = fragments[fragment];
229
230     uint256 remaining = currentFragment.publicTokens.supply -
231         currentFragment.publicTokens.issuedCount;
232     if (remaining == 0) revert TokenPoolEmpty();
233
234     // returns a random number between 0 and the number of tokens
235     // used as the random ID if the slot in the matrix
236     // corresponding to the index is empty
237     uint256 randomIndex = uint256(
238         keccak256(abi.encodePacked(recipient, blockhash(block.
239             number - 1), seed))
240     ) % remaining;
241
242     // If the matrix is empty at the given random index (slot), we
243     // use the index as the token ID.
244     // However, if the slot contains an ID, we'll assign that
245     // instead.
246     uint256 offset = fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex
247         ] == 0
248         ? randomIndex
249         : fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex];
250
251     currentFragment.publicTokens.issuedCount++;
252
253     uint256 temp = fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][remaining -
254         1];
255
256     // ...

```

```

251     if (temp == 0) {
252         fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex] = remaining
↳ - 1;
253     } else {
254         fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex] = temp;
255         delete fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][remaining - 1];
↳ // small gas refund
256     }
257
258     uint256 tokenId = currentFragment.publicTokens.startId +
↳ offset;
259     return tokenId;
260 }

```

The way the random number is generated, as in the [HAL-02](#) issue, allows an attacker to, for example:

1. Create a malicious parent contract.
2. Send this contract to the Pilot MintPass.
3. Precompute different contract addresses with different salts until you find a contract address that results in the desired nftID:
 

```
uint256 randomIndex = uint256(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(recipient
, blockhash(block.number - 1), seed)))% remaining;
```
4. Deploy the precomputed address using `CREATE2`.
5. Send the Pilot MintPass from the parent contract to the child contract.
6. Call the `redeemPilot()` from the deployed child contract.

This way, it would be possible for an attacker to always redeem the Pilot with the desired NFTid. The same issue also applies to the `redeemRacecraft()` function.

**Risk Level:**

**Likelihood - 5**

**Impact - 5**



**Recommendation:**

It is recommended to disallow smart contracts calls to `redeemPilot()` and `redeemRacecraft()` functions by adding the following require statement:  
`require(tx.origin == msg.sender);`

On the other hand, it is also recommended to remove the `recipient` address from the PRNG generation.

**Remediation Plan:**

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` solved the issue by adding the `hasValidOrigin` modifier to the `redeemPilot()` and `redeemRacecraft()` functions:

**Listing 10: EXRSalesContract.sol**

```

423 modifier hasValidOrigin() {
424     require(
425         isTrustedForwarder(msg.sender) || msg.sender == tx.origin,
426         "Non-trusted forwarder contract not allowed"
427     );
428     _;
429 }
```

This modifier will restrict smart contract calls to these functions. On the other hand, `recipient` was removed from the PRNG generation:

**Listing 11: ERC721Fragmentable.sol (Lines 237-239)**

```

224 function issueRandomId(
225     uint256 fragment,
226     bytes32 seed,
227     address recipient
228 ) internal returns (uint256) {
229     Fragment storage currentFragment = fragments[fragment];
230
231     uint256 remaining = currentFragment.publicTokens.supply -
232         currentFragment.publicTokens.issuedCount;
233     if (remaining == 0) revert TokenPoolEmpty();
234 }
```

```

235     // returns a random number between 0 and the number of tokens
    ↳ remaining - 1, this will be
236     // used as the random ID if the slot in the matrix
    ↳ corresponding to the index is empty
237     uint256 randomIndex = uint256(
238         keccak256(abi.encodePacked(block.basefee, blockhash(block.
    ↳ number - 1), seed))
239     ) % remaining;
240
241     // If the matrix is empty at the given random index (slot), we
    ↳ use the index as the token ID.
242     // However, if the slot contains an ID, we'll assign that
    ↳ instead.
243
244     uint256 offset = fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex
    ↳ ] == 0
245         ? randomIndex
246         : fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex];
247
248     currentFragment.publicTokens.issuedCount++;
249
250     uint256 temp = fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][remaining -
    ↳ 1];
251
252     if (temp == 0) {
253         fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex] = remaining
    ↳ - 1;
254     } else {
255         fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][randomIndex] = temp;
256         delete fragmentPoolTokenMatrix[fragment][remaining - 1];
    ↳ // small gas refund
257     }
258
259     uint256 tokenId = currentFragment.publicTokens.startId +
    ↳ offset;
260     return tokenId;
261 }

```

### 3.4 (HAL-04) MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS ARE VULNERABLE TO REPLAY ATTACKS - HIGH

#### Description:

The `claimRewardItems()` and `burnToRedeemInventoryItems()` functions are used to claim different inventory items from the `EXRInventory` contract:

Listing 12: `EXRInventoryController.sol` (Line 89)

```
81 function claimRewardItems(  
82     bytes32 seed,  
83     uint256 qty,  
84     Coupon calldata coupon  
85 ) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant {  
86     if (usedSeeds[seed]) revert InventoryReusedSeed();  
87  
88     usedSeeds[seed] = true;  
89     bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encode(CouponType.Reward, qty,  
↳ seed));  
90     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert  
↳ InventoryInvalidCoupon();  
91  
92     _claimRandomItems(seed, qty);  
93     emit InventoryRewardClaimed(_msgSender(), qty);  
94 }
```

Listing 13: `EXRInventoryController.sol` (Line 113)

```
103 function burnToRedeemInventoryItems(  
104     bytes32 seed,  
105     uint256 qty,  
106     Coupon calldata coupon  
107 ) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant {  
108     if (mintpassContract.balanceOf(_msgSender(), inventoryPassId)  
↳ == 0)  
109         revert InventoryInsufficientPassBalance();  
110     if (usedSeeds[seed]) revert InventoryReusedSeed();  
111 }
```

```

112     usedSeeds[seed] = true;
113     bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encode(CouponType.Inventory,
    ↳ qty, seed));
114     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert
    ↳ InventoryInvalidCoupon();
115
116     mintpassContract.authorizedBurn(_msgSender(), inventoryPassId)
    ↳ ;
117     _claimRandomItems(seed, qty);
118 }

```

The **digest** is formed by:

- CouponType.Inventory
- qty
- seed

This does not follow the [EIP 712](#) and it is vulnerable to multiple signature replay attacks. For example:

1. The `EXRInventoryController` contract is deployed on the testnet.
2. The signer with address `'0x00'` creates different Coupons.
3. Various users use these coupons to call the `claimRewardItems()` function.
4. One month later, after the testing phase is completed, the same contract is deployed in the mainnet.
5. The same signer is set in the mainnet.
6. An attacker could collect the signatures used in the testnet and now reuse them in the mainnet contract.

NOTE:

This attack can also be done with contracts on the same network, since the `digest` does not contain the address of the contract. The same issue occurs in `EXRSalesContract` with the `redeemPilot()` and `redeemRacecraft()` functions:

**Functions Affected:**

- EXRInventoryController.claimRewardItems()
- EXRInventoryController.burnToRedeemInventoryItems()
- EXRSalesContract.redeemPilot()
- EXRSalesContract.redeemRacecraft()

**Risk Level:****Likelihood - 3****Impact - 5****Recommendation:**

It is recommended to implement the [EIP 712](#) in the `EXRInventoryController` contract. For example:

**Listing 14**

```

1 bytes memory prefix = "\x19Ethereum Signed Message:\n32";
2 bytes32 messageHash = keccak256(abi.encode(address(this), block.
↳ chainid, CouponType.Reward, qty, seed));
3 bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encodePacked(prefix, messageHash));
4 if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert InventoryInvalidCoupon
↳ ();

```

**Remediation Plan:**

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` solved the issue by adding the smart contract address and the chainID in the `digest`:

**Listing 15: EXRInventoryController.sol (Lines 90-92)**

```

82 function claimRewardItems(
83     bytes32 seed,
84     uint256 qty,
85     Coupon calldata coupon
86 ) external whenNotPaused nonReentrant hasValidOrigin {
87     if (usedSeeds[seed]) revert InventoryReusedSeed();

```

```
88
89     usedSeeds[seed] = true;
90     bytes32 digest = keccak256(
91         abi.encode(address(this), block.chainid, CouponType.Reward
92     ↪ , qty, seed, _msgSender())
93     );
94     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert
95     ↪ InventoryInvalidCoupon();
96
97     _claimRandomItems(seed, qty);
98     emit InventoryRewardClaimed(_msgSender(), qty);
99 }
```

### 3.5 (HAL-05) SAME SEED AND SIGNATURE CAN BE REUSED IN REDEEMPILOT AND REDEEMRACECRAFT FUNCTIONS - HIGH

#### Description:

In the `EXRSalesContract` contract, the `redeemPilot()` and `redeemRacecraft()` functions do not check that the provided seed has not already been used:

Listing 16: `EXRSalesContract.sol`

```
188 function redeemPilot(bytes32 seed, Coupon calldata coupon)
    ↳ external nonReentrant {
189     if (state.redeemPilot == 0) revert
    ↳ SalesPilotRedemptionNotActive();
190     if (!pilotContract.fragmentExists(dedicatedFragment)) revert
    ↳ SalesNonExistentFragment();
191     if (pilotPassMaxSupply == 0) revert SalesMintpassQtyNotSet();
192
193     address caller = _msgSender();
194     if (mintPassContract.balanceOf(caller, pilotPassTokenId) == 0)
    ↳ revert SalesNoMintPass();
195
196     bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encode(CouponType.RandomSeed,
    ↳ seed));
197     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert SalesInvalidCoupon
    ↳ ();
198
199     mintPassContract.burnToRedeemPilot(caller, dedicatedFragment);
200     emit MintPassBurned(caller);
201
202     pilotContract.mint(caller, 1, dedicatedFragment, seed);
203     emit PilotRedeemed();
204 }
```

Listing 17: `EXRSalesContract.sol`

```
213 function redeemRacecraft(bytes32 seed, Coupon calldata coupon)
    ↳ external nonReentrant {
```

```

214     if (state.redeemRacecraft == 0) revert
    ↳ SalesRacecraftRedemptionNotActive();
215     if (!racecraftContract.fragmentExists(dedicatedFragment))
216         revert SalesNonExistentFragment();
217     if (racecraftPassMaxSupply == 0) revert SalesMintpassQtyNotSet
    ↳ ();
218
219     address caller = _msgSender();
220     if (mintPassContract.balanceOf(caller, racecraftPassTokenId)
    ↳ == 0)
221         revert SalesNoMintPass();
222
223     bytes32 digest = keccak256(abi.encode(CouponType.RandomSeed,
    ↳ seed));
224     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert SalesInvalidCoupon
    ↳ ();
225
226     mintPassContract.authorizedBurn(caller, racecraftPassTokenId);
227     racecraftContract.mint(caller, 1, dedicatedFragment, seed);
228     emit RacecraftRedeemed();
229 }

```

This allows any user to constantly reuse the same Coupon signature over and over again, and totally defeats the purpose of using signatures in the first place.

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 5**

**Impact - 4**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to check that the `seed` has not been previously used in the smart contract, but this would introduce the issue mentioned in [HAL-01](#). So once, the `seed` check is added, the same fix that was applied in [HAL-01](#) needs to be implemented here, moreover to avoid the front running.



## Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` now checks in the `redeemPilot()` and `redeemRacecraft()` functions that the seed was not previously used:

Listing 18: `EXRInventoryController.sol` (Line 202)

```

194 function redeemPilot(bytes32 seed, Coupon calldata coupon)
195     external
196     nonReentrant
197     hasValidOrigin
198 {
199     if (state.redeemPilot == 0) revert
200     ↳ SalesPilotRedemptionNotActive();
201     if (!pilotContract.fragmentExists(dedicatedFragment)) revert
202     ↳ SalesNonExistentFragment();
203     if (pilotPassMaxSupply == 0) revert SalesMintpassQtyNotSet();
204     if (usedSeeds[seed]) revert SalesReusedSeed();
205
206     usedSeeds[seed] = true;
207
208     address caller = _msgSender();
209     if (mintPassContract.balanceOf(caller, pilotPassTokenId) == 0)
210     ↳ revert SalesNoMintPass();
211
212     bytes32 digest = keccak256(
213         abi.encode(address(this), block.chainid, CouponType.Pilot,
214         ↳ seed, caller)
215     );
216     if (!_verifyCoupon(digest, coupon)) revert SalesInvalidCoupon
217     ↳ ();
218
219     mintPassContract.burnToRedeemPilot(caller, dedicatedFragment);
220     emit MintPassBurned(caller);
221
222     pilotContract.mint(caller, 1, dedicatedFragment, seed);
223     emit PilotRedeemed();
224 }

```

On the other hand, front running will not be possible as the Coupon digest includes the caller's address.

### 3.6 (HAL-06) ERC721FRAGMENTABLE MAX SUPPLY CAN BE EXCEEDED BY 1 IF THE FIRSTID OF FRAGMENT 0 IS 0 - LOW

#### Description:

In the `ERC721Fragmentable` contract, the `createFragment()` function allows you to create a new fragment in the collection:

Listing 19: `ERC721Fragmentable.sol` (Line 165)

```

158 function createFragment(
159     uint8 id,
160     uint64 fragmentSupply,
161     uint64 firstId,
162     uint64 reserved
163 ) external onlyRole(FRAGMENT_CREATOR_ROLE) {
164     if (fragmentSupply <= 1) revert FragmentInvalidSupply();
165     if (firstId + fragmentSupply - 1 > MAX_SUPPLY) revert
    ↳ FragmentExceedsCollectionSupply();
166     if (reserved > fragmentSupply) revert
    ↳ FragmentTokenSupplyExceeded();
167     if (fragments[id].status == 1) revert FragmentExists();
168
169     if (id > 0) {
170         Fragment memory previousFragment = fragments[id - 1];
171         if (id != previousFragment.fragmentId + 1) revert
    ↳ FragmentNotSequential();
172         if (firstId != previousFragment.firstTokenId +
    ↳ previousFragment.supply)
173             revert FragmentsTokenIdsNotSequential();
174     }
175     fragmentCount++;
176     fragments[id] = Fragment({
177         status: 1,
178         locked: 0,
179         fragmentId: id,
180         firstTokenId: firstId,
181         supply: fragmentSupply,
182         baseURI: "",
183         renderer: IRenderer(address(0)),

```

```

184         publicTokens: TokenPool({
185             issuedCount: 0,
186             startId: firstId + reserved,
187             supply: fragmentSupply - reserved
188         }),
189         reservedTokens: reserved > 0
190             ? TokenPool({issuedCount: 0, startId: firstId, supply:
191               ↳ reserved})
191             : TokenPool(0, 0, 0)
192     });
193
194     emit FragmentCreated(id, fragmentSupply);
195 }

```

On the other hand, the contract has a hard-coded Maximum Supply of 8000 NFTs:

#### Listing 20: ERC721Fragmentable.sol

```

67 uint256 public constant MAX_SUPPLY = 8000;

```

However, this Maximum Supply value can be exceeded by 1 in case the `firstId` of the fragment 0 is 0. In total, the collection would have 8001 NFTs. The issue is due to the following check:

#### Listing 21: ERC721Fragmentable.sol

```

165 if (firstId + fragmentSupply - 1 > MAX_SUPPLY) revert
166     ↳ FragmentExceedsCollectionSupply();`

```

#### Proof of Concept:

In the proof of concept below, we create 4 different fragments:

##### Fragment 0:

- fragmentSupply = 1500
- firstId = 0
- reservedPilots = 20
- reservedRacecrafts = 20

## Fragment 1:

- fragmentSupply = 1500
- firstId = 1500
- reservedPilots = 20
- reservedRacecrafts = 20

## Fragment 2:

- fragmentSupply = 1500
- firstId = 3000
- reservedPilots = 20
- reservedRacecrafts = 20

## Fragment 3:

- fragmentSupply = 3501
- firstId = 4500
- reservedPilots = 20
- reservedRacecrafts = 20

```

Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.createFragment(0, 1500, 0, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0x15ce78eda00dc9126dadc71e40e75a7ac7bf22ea6c2a1111bf979b0c22f1003a
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 1
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628152 Gas used: 114481 (0.02%)

Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.createFragment(0, 1500, 0, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0xccc2f5f4701a7a61230a80eacd0ebecaf796701a9c9d699fe8ddaed2769eae33
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 2
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628153 Gas used: 114481 (0.02%)

contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.createFragment(1, 1500, 1500, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0x470d7be5914a7fb4d74c9d9b1c4cca8abcccd170fc265564e628b8424f3c43d6c
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 3
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628154 Gas used: 105866 (0.02%)

Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.createFragment(1, 1500, 1500, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0x4ec7679e91b73850a6ad270c346b40ea9a982359f9217739b2eeb2f194a0668e
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 4
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628155 Gas used: 105866 (0.02%)

contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(1) -> (1, 0, 1, 1500, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 1500, 20), (0, 1520, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(1) -> (1, 0, 1, 1500, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 1500, 20), (0, 1520, 1480))
Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.createFragment(2, 1500, 3000, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0xd9200e9f522b300b57009cd8e6b5c96788d5fa93b606db4f14ac2438d7fe83eb
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 5
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628156 Gas used: 105866 (0.02%)

Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.createFragment(2, 1500, 3000, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0x746f35e1e9e05d631e5bb9756b7346b4423ffa1cb02f90b0b15e148f164ec22
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 6
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628157 Gas used: 105866 (0.02%)

contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(1) -> (1, 0, 1, 1500, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 1500, 20), (0, 1520, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(1) -> (1, 0, 1, 1500, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 1500, 20), (0, 1520, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(2) -> (1, 0, 2, 3000, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 3000, 20), (0, 3020, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(2) -> (1, 0, 2, 3000, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 3000, 20), (0, 3020, 1480))
Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.createFragment(3, 3501, 4500, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0x718f97e0febe33b33215843f662edd51471d3d76fd1bc5ff5c70f8145ee6a3ee6
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 7
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628158 Gas used: 105866 (0.02%)

Calling -> contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.createFragment(3, 3501, 4500, 20, {'from': contract_EXRSalesContract1})
Transaction sent: 0x148b0fed1f470073cb5239b08fa0a4f6e6cae36d7b58246fd6d454e80e452
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6000000000 Nonce: 8
EXRGameAsset.createFragment confirmed Block: 14628159 Gas used: 105866 (0.02%)

contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(0) -> (1, 0, 0, 0, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 0, 20), (0, 20, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(1) -> (1, 0, 1, 1500, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 1500, 20), (0, 1520, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(1) -> (1, 0, 1, 1500, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 1500, 20), (0, 1520, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(2) -> (1, 0, 2, 3000, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 3000, 20), (0, 3020, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(2) -> (1, 0, 2, 3000, 1500, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 3000, 20), (0, 3020, 1480))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Pilot.fragments(3) -> (1, 0, 3, 4500, 3501, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 4500, 20), (0, 4520, 3481))
contract_EXRGameAsset_Racecraft.fragments(3) -> (1, 0, 3, 4500, 3501, '', '0x0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000', (0, 4500, 20), (0, 4520, 3481))

```

As we can see, we managed to create 4 different fragments successfully, which in total have a supply of  $1500+1500+1500+3501 = 8001$  NFTs.

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 2**

**Impact - 3**

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to force the first fragment to start with a `firstId == 1`.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` states that the project is designed to start with `firstId == 0`. For this reason, the following fix was applied instead: `if (firstId + fragmentSupply - 1 >= MAX_SUPPLY) revert FragmentExceedsCollectionSupply();`



#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use the `account` parameter instead of `msg.sender` when the event is emitted:

```
emit PilotRedeemed(account);
```

Also consider removing this event emission from the `burnToRedeemPilot()` function, as an identical event is emitted in the `redeemPilot()` function.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` removed the `PilotRedeemed` event emission from the `burnToRedeemPilot()` function.

## 3.8 (HAL-08) UNUSED EVENT - INFORMATIONAL

### Description:

In the `EXRInventory` contract, the event `MintRoleGranted` is declared but is not used anywhere in the code:

#### Listing 23: `EXRInventoryERC1155.sol`

```
33 event MintRoleGranted(address indexed minter);
```

### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 1**

### Recommendation:

It is recommended to remove the `MintRoleGranted` event declaration to reduce the deployment gas costs.

### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `Exiled Racers team` removed the `MintRoleGranted` event declaration from the `EXRInventory` contract.





# AUTOMATED TESTING



# AUTOMATED TESTING

## 41

## EXRInventoryController.sol

```

EPMInventoryController.retrieveCategories(uint8) : (contracts/EPMInventoryController.sol#181) is a local variable never initialized
EPMInventoryController.claimAndDeleteItems(bytes32,uint32,uint32) : (contracts/EPMInventoryController.sol#217) is a local variable never initialized
EPMInventoryController.claimAndDeleteItems(bytes32,uint32,uint32) : (contracts/EPMInventoryController.sol#216) is a local variable never initialized
EPMInventoryController.claimAndDeleteItems(uint8,uint8) : (contracts/EPMInventoryController.sol#191) is a local variable never initialized
EPMInventoryController.claimAndDeleteItems(bytes32,uint32,uint32) : (contracts/EPMInventoryController.sol#216) is a local variable never initialized
EPMInventoryController.retrieveCategories(uint8) : (contracts/EPMInventoryController.sol#180) is a local variable never initialized
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/Slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#uninitialized-local-variables

```

CouponSystem.constructor(address) : signer (contracts/extensions/CouponSystem.sol#129) lacks a zero-check on :

```

- adminSigner = signer (contracts/extensions/CouponSystem.sol#130)

```

```

+Inventory in EXInventoryController, claimAmounts (bytes32,uint256) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#226-259);
+External call:
+InventoryContract.manhatch_manpender(), (id,amounts) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#245)
+Event emitted after the call(s):
+InventoryContract.manhatch_manpender(), (id,amounts) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#245)
+Inventory in EXInventoryController, burnToReleaseInventoryItems (bytes32,uint256,CompoundSupply.Coupon) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#103-110);
+External call:
+manhatchContract.authorizedBurn_manpender(), (inventoryId,Id) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#116)
+claimAmounts (seed,qty) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#117)
+InventoryContract.manhatch_manpender(), (id,amounts) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#245)
+Event emitted after the call(s):
+InventoryContract.manhatch_manpender(), (id,amounts) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#245)
+claimAmounts (seed,qty) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#117)
+Inventory in EXInventoryController, claimAmounts (bytes32,uint256,CompoundSupply.Coupon) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#181-184);
+External call:
+claimAmounts (seed,qty) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#182)
+InventoryContract.manhatch_manpender(), (id,amounts) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#245)
+Event emitted after the call(s):
+InventoryContract.manhatch_manpender(), (id,amounts) (contracts/EXInventoryController.sol#245)
+Reference: https://github.com/crytic/etherwalk/detector-Documentation/feintentry-vulnerabilities#3
+
+ECG177Context_manpender() (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/metadata/ECG177Context.sol#161-33) uses assembly
+Reference: https://github.com/crytic/etherwalk/detector-Documentation/feintentry-vulnerabilities#3
+
+ECG177Context_manpender() (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/metadata/ECG177Context.sol#161-33) uses assembly
+Reference: https://github.com/crytic/etherwalk/detector-Documentation/feintentry-vulnerabilities#3

```

```

Different versions of Solidity is used:
Version used ["0.6.9", "0.6.8", "0.6.7"]
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/Ownable.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/OwnableControl.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/math/SafeMath.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/security/ReentrancyGuard.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/security/ReentrancyGuard.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/token/ERC20/IERC20.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/Strings.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/introspection/ENS.sol#)
-0.6.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/introspection/IERC165.sol#)
-0.6.9 (contract/XRInventoryController.sol#2)
-0.6.9 (contract/extensions/IDomestic.sol#2)
-0.6.9 (contract/interface/IXRInventory.sol#2)
-0.6.9 (contract/interface/IXRInventory.sol#2)
Reference: https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/master/docs/using-the-documents.md#different-versions-directives-are-used

```

[illegible][illegible]

```
grantRole(bytes32,address) should be declared external;
    - AccessControl.grantRole(bytes32,address) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#130-132)
revokeRole(bytes32,address) should be declared external;
    - AccessControl.revokeRole(bytes32,address) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#143-145)
renounceRole(bytes32,address) should be declared external;
    - AccessControl.renounceRole(bytes32,address) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#146-148)
Reference: https://github.com/erc721/erc721/blob/master/contracts/ERC721Enumerable.sol#L20-L21 could be declared external;
```

EXRInventoryERC1155.sol

[illegible]

EXRMintPassERC1155.sol

[illegible]

```
EXRSalesContract.airdropMintpass(uint256,uint256[],address[]) .i_sc
EXRSalesContract.airdropMintpass(uint256,uint256[],address[]) .i (c
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Document
```

Reference: <https://github.com/cryptic/slither/wiki/Detector-Document>

Reference: <https://github.com/cryptic/slither/wiki/Detector-Document>

```
- mintPassContract.incrementPilotPassClaimCount (caller, ded
- mintPassContract.mint (caller, qty, pilotPassTokenId, dedica
```

```
Reentrancy in EXRSalesContract.claimPilotPass(CouponSystem.Coupon,
External calls:
```

```
- refundCaller(caller,paid - amountOwed) (contracts/EXRSal
  - (success) = buyer.call{value: amount}() (contrac
```

```
- refundCaller(caller,paid - amountOwed) (contracts/EXRSel
    - (success) = buyer.call(value: amount)() (contrac
```

```

- refundCaller(caller,paid - amountOwed) (contract
Reentrancy in EXRSalesContract.createFragments(uint64,uint64,uint6

```

```

- pilotContract.createFragment(dedicatedFragment, fragments
- racecraftContract.createFragment(dedicatedFragment, fragm
Event emitted after the call(s):

```



```

Reentrancy in EXRSalesContract.redeemPilot(bytes32,CouponSystem.Coupon) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#188-204):
  External call:
    - minPassContract.burnToRedeemPilot(caller,dedicatedFragment) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#199)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
    - BurnPassIssued(caller) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#200)
Reentrancy in EXRSalesContract.redeemPilot(bytes32,CouponSystem.Coupon) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#188-204):
  External call:
    - minPassContract.burnToRedeemPilot(caller,dedicatedFragment) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#199)
    - pilotContract.mint(caller,1,dedicatedFragment,seed) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#202)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
    - PilotRedeemed() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#203)
Reentrancy in EXRSalesContract.redeemRacercraft(bytes32,CouponSystem.Coupon) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#213-229):
  External call:
    - minPassContract.authorizeBurn(caller,racercraftPassTokenId) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#226)
    - racercraftContract.mint(caller,1,dedicatedFragment,seed) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#227)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
    - RacercraftRedeemed() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#228)
Reentrancy in EXRSalesContract.refundSeller(address,uint256) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#379-383):
  External call:
    - (success) = buyer.call{value: amount}() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#380)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
    - RefundIssued(buyer,amount) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#382)
Reentrancy in EXRSalesContract.withdrawBalance() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#365-369):
  External call:
    - (success) = msg.sender.call{value: address(this).balance}() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#366)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
    - BalanceWithdrawn() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#368)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerabilities-3
ERC2771Context_msgSender() (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/metatools/ERC2771Context.sol#24-33) uses assembly
- INLINE ASM (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/metatools/ERC2771Context.sol#27-29)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#assembly-usage

Different versions of Solidity is used:
- Version used: [0.8.9, "0.8.0", "0.8.9"]
- "0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#4)
- "0.8.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/IAccessControl.sol#4)
- "0.8.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/ERC2771Context.sol#4)
- "0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/security/ReentrancyGuard.sol#4)
- "0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/Context.sol#4)
- "0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/Strings.sol#4)
- "0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/introspection/ERC165.sol#4)
- "0.8.9 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/introspection/ERC165.sol#4)
- 0.8.9 (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#2)
- 0.8.9 (contracts/extensions/CouponSystem.sol#2)
- 0.8.9 (contracts/interfaces/IERC20Metadata.sol#2)
- 0.8.9 (contracts/interfaces/IERC20Metadata.sol#2)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#different-pragma-directives-are-used

AccessControl._setRoleAdmin(bytes32,bytes32) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#194-199) is never used and should be removed
AccessControl._setRole(bytes32,address) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#185-187) is never used and should be removed
Context_msgSender() (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/metatools/Context.sol#21-23) is never used and should be removed
ERC2771Context._msgData() (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/metatools/ERC2771Context.sol#35-41) is never used and should be removed
EXRSalesContract._msgData() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#401-409) is never used and should be removed
Strings.concatString(uint256,uint256) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/Strings.sol#142-151) is never used and should be removed
Strings.concatString(uint256) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/Strings.sol#151-155) is never used and should be removed
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#dead-code

Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/metatools/ERC2771Context.sol#4) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.4/0.8.7
Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/security/ReentrancyGuard.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/Context.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/Strings.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/introspection/ERC165.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.0 (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/utils/introspection/ERC165.sol#4) allows old versions
Pragma version^0.8.9 (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#2) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.4/0.8.7
Pragma version^0.8.9 (contracts/extensions/CouponSystem.sol#2) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.4/0.8.7
Pragma version^0.8.9 (contracts/interfaces/IERC20Metadata.sol#2) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.4/0.8.7
Pragma version^0.8.9 (contracts/interfaces/IERC20Metadata.sol#2) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.4/0.8.7
solc^0.8.9 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity

Low level call in EXRSalesContract.withdrawBalance() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#365-369):
- (success) = msg.sender.call{value: address(this).balance}() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#366)
Low level call in EXRSalesContract.refundSeller(address,uint256) (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#379-383):
- (success) = buyer.call{value: amount}() (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#380)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#low-level-calls

Constant EXRSalesContract.pilotPassTokenId (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#40) is not in UPPER_CASE_WITH_UNDERSCORES
Constant EXRSalesContract.racercraftPassTokenId (contracts/EXRSalesContract.sol#40) is not in UPPER_CASE_WITH_UNDERSCORES
Variable CouponSystem_adminId (contracts/extensions/CouponSystem.sol#4) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#naming-conventions

grantRole(bytes32,address) should be declared external:
- AccessControl.grantRole(bytes32,address) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#130-132)
revokeRole(bytes32,address) should be declared external:
- AccessControl.revokeRole(bytes32,address) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#143-145)
renounceRole(bytes32,address) should be declared external:
- AccessControl.renounceRole(bytes32,address) (node_modules/@openzeppelin/contracts/access/AccessControl.sol#141-145)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#public-function-that-could-be-declared-external

```

- The weak PRNG was correctly flagged by Slither.
- The reentrancies flagged by Slither are all false positives.

## 4.2 AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN

### Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues, and to identify low-hanging fruits on the targets for this engagement. Among the tools used was MythX, a security analysis service for Ethereum smart contracts. MythX performed a scan on all the contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities.

### MythX results:

#### EXRGameAssetERC721.sol

No issues found by MythX.

#### EXRInventoryController.sol

Report for contracts/EXRInventoryController.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/2cf0d038-e635-4998-ab6f-3b5e22412919>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
233	(SWC-120) Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes	Low	Potential use of "block.number" as source of randomness.

#### EXRInventoryERC1155.sol

Report for contracts/EXRInventoryERC1155.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/27f720b5-cf1f-4bb8-a9d5-d509e9de156a>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
22	(SWC-123) Requirement Violation	Low	Requirement violation.

#### EXRMintPassERC1155.sol

Report for contracts/EXRMintPassERC1155.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/0299f56e-14de-4705-85e6-c0ecl7e34de0>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
26	(SWC-123) Requirement Violation	Low	Requirement violation.

#### EXRSalesContract.sol

No issues found by MythX.

- The weak source of randomness issue was correctly flagged by MythX.
- The requirement violations are all false positives.



THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

 **HALBORN**

