

AUDIT



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Executive Summary	2
Findings	3
user.amount and user.rewardDebt should be reassigned before safeTransfer function	3
setDevFeeReciever() should be pointed to a multisig or a timelock instance	4
pending_DEV_rewards should be reassigned before if/else	5
feePercentX100 should be set to private	6
noFeeList mapping should be set to private	7
NOTE : Avoid leaving unused arguments in functions.	8
Disclaimer	9
Document Information	9



Executive Summary

A Representative Party of the Polkalnsure Finance ("Polkalnsure") engaged The Arcadia Group ("Arcadia"), a software development, research, and security company, to conduct a review of the following Polkalnsure smart contracts on the Polkalnsure repo at Commit #345cb5e72a6c3569079bf9f0bf43017565a80c91.

FeeCalculator.sol

PISVault.sol

Conclusion

After presenting the audit of the codebase to the Polkalnsure Team, we also reviewed the deployed contracts and confirmed with them that findings #1, #3, #4 and #5 are not currently affecting the protocol security at the time of this report. #2 has been taken under advisement.



Findings

 user.amount and user.rewardDebt should be reassigned before safeTransfer function

CODE-1

Severity: Theoretical Impact: None

Contract: PISVault.sol Category: Security Finding Type: Dynamic

Lines: 606-617

In the emergencyWithdraw function, user.amount and user.rewardDebt should be reassigned and set to zero before transfering the token amount. Updating them after a transfer could lead to some reentrancy bug which can be prevented by reassigning them first.

This finding doesn't affect the actual deployed contract since the external call is made to a known and trusted contract. Care should be taken when adding new pools, reviewing the potential downside based on the actual code.

```
function emergencyWithdraw(uint256 _pid) public {
   PoolInfo storage pool = poolInfo[_pid];
   require(
        pool.emergencyWithdrawable,
        "Withdrawing from this pool is disabled"
   );
   UserInfo storage user = userInfo[_pid][msg.sender];
   pool.token.safeTransfer(address(msg.sender), user.amount);
   emit EmergencyWithdraw(msg.sender, _pid, user.amount);
   user.amount = 0;
```



```
user.rewardDebt = 0;
}
```

2. setDevFeeReciever() should be pointed to a multisig or a timelock instance

CODE-2 Severity: Low Impact: Medium Contract: PISVault.sol Category: Governance Finding Type: Dynamic

Lines: 647- 650

In the setDevFeeReciever() function, through intended functionality can change its own address to a different one. To prevent the risk of wrench attacks, this address should be pointed to an address that is not controlled by a single key (i.e. a multisig), or one that allows for action to be taken in the event of compromise (i.e. a timelock contract).

```
function setDevFeeReciever(address _devaddr) public {
    require(devaddr == msg.sender, "only dev can change");
    devaddr = _devaddr;
}
```



3. pending_DEV_rewards should be reassigned before if/else

CODE-3

Severity: Theoretical Impact: None

Contract: PISVault.sol Category: Security Finding Type: Dynamic

Lines: 632-644

pendin_DEV_rewards should be set to zero before any transfer, it would be better to reassign it to another variable, then set it to zero and use the new one to send the proper amount.

This finding is a theoretical issue in the code itself, it doesn't affect the actual deployed contract because we already know the PIS token contract so that this issue won't happen.

But if this contract were to be deployed with a different token contract, an issue could arise.

```
function transferDevFee() public {
      if (pending DEV rewards == 0) return;
      uint256 pisBal = pis.balanceOf(address(this));
       if (pending DEV rewards > pisBal) {
           pis.transfer(devaddr, pisBal);
          pisBalance = pis.balanceOf(address(this));
          pis.transfer(devaddr, pending DEV rewards);
          pisBalance = pis.balanceOf(address(this));
      pending DEV rewards = 0;
```



4. feePercentX100 should be set to private

CODE-4 Severity: Low Impact: None Contract: FeeCalculator.sol Category: Informational Finding Type: Dynamic

Lines: 24

Considering set feePercentX100 to private and access or modify it with the corresponding function setFeeMultiplier().

Setting a variable to private ensures that it can only be manipulated via functions in the contract designed for that purpose and never by a successor contract that inherited it.

uint8 public feePercentX100;



5. noFeeList mapping should be set to private

CODE-5 Severity: Low Impact: None Contract: FeeCalculator.sol Category: Informational Finding Type: Dynamic

Lines: 26

Considering set noFeeList mapping to private and access or modify it only with the corresponding function editNoFeeList().

This mapping shouldn't be accessed or be updatable directly as public but should only be modified with its corresponding function.

Setting a mapping to private ensures that it can only be manipulated via functions in the contract designed for that purpose and never by a successor contract that inherited it.

mapping(address => bool) public noFeeList;



NOTE: Avoid leaving unused arguments in functions.

Severity: Informational

Impact: None

Contract: FeeCalculator.sol Category: Informational Finding Type: Dynamic

Lines: 26

Recipient argument is not used in this function, even if possibly needed in the future, it would still require an implementation so it would be better to remove it and make a reminder somewhere else, eventually the contract will have to be redeployed.

```
function calculateAmountsAfterFee(
   address sender,
   address recipient,
   uint256 amount
)
   public
   returns (
       uint256 transferToAmount,
       uint256 transferToFeeDistributorAmount
)
```



Disclaimer

While best efforts and precautions have been taken in the preparation of this document, The Arcadia Group and the Authors assume no responsibility for errors, omissions, or damages resulting from the use of the provided information. Additionally, Arcadia would like to emphasize that the use of Arcadia's services does not guarantee the security of a smart contract or set of smart contracts and does not guarantee against attacks. One audit on its own is not enough for a project to be considered secure; that categorization can only be earned through extensive peer review and battle testing over an extended period.

Document Information

Title	Polkalnsure Audit
Client	Polkalnsure Finance
Auditor(s)	Andrea Burzi
Reviewed by	Joel Farris
Approved by	Rasikh Morani
Contact Details	Rasikh Morani (972) 543-3886 rasikh@arcadiamgroup.com https://t.me/thearcadiagroup



