

# Helios Security Audit

Report Version 1.1

February 20, 2024

Conducted by:

**George Hunter**, Independent Security Researcher

## Table of Contents

|          |  |          |
|----------|--|----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>About George Hunter</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Disclaimer</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Risk classification</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| 3.1      | Impact . . . . .   | 3        |
| 3.2      | Likelihood . . . . .   | 3        |
| 3.3      | Actions required by severity level . . . . .                                       | 3        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Executive summary</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Findings</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| 5.1      | High . . . . .   | 5        |
| 5.1.1    | Wrong Uniswap pool used for obtaining ETH price . . . . .                          | 5        |
| 5.1.2    | Mint cost cap is reached sooner than intended . . . . .                            | 5        |
| 5.2      | Medium . . . . .   | 6        |
| 5.2.1    | An adversary can block the burning functionality for stakers and minters . . . . . | 6        |
| 5.3      | Low . . . . .  | 6        |
| 5.3.1    | Unsafe integer downcasting . . . . .   | 6        |

## 1 About George Hunter

George Hunter is a proficient and reputable independent smart contract security researcher with over 50 solo and team security engagements contributing to the security of numerous smart contract protocols in the past 2 years. Previously held roles include Lead Smart Contract Auditor at Paladin Blockchain Security and Smart Contract Engineer at Nexo. He has audited smart contracts for clients such as LayerZero, Euler, TraderJoe, Maverick, Ambire, and other leading protocols.

## 2 Disclaimer

Audits are a time-, resource-, and expertise-bound effort where trained experts evaluate smart contracts using a combination of automated and manual techniques to identify as many vulnerabilities as possible. Audits can reveal the presence of vulnerabilities **but cannot guarantee their absence**.

## 3 Risk classification

| Severity           | Impact: High | Impact: Medium | Impact: Low |
|--------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| Likelihood: High   | High         | High           | Medium      |
| Likelihood: Medium | High         | Medium         | Low         |
| Likelihood: Low    | Medium       | Low            | Low         |

### 3.1 Impact

- **High** - leads to a significant loss of assets in the protocol or significantly harms a group of users.
- **Medium** - involves a small loss of funds or affects a core functionality of the protocol.
- **Low** - encompasses any unexpected behavior that is non-critical.

### 3.2 Likelihood

- **High** - a direct attack vector; the cost is relatively low compared to the potential loss of funds.
- **Medium** - only a conditionally incentivized attack vector, with a moderate likelihood.
- **Low** - involves too many or unlikely assumptions; offers little to no incentive.

### 3.3 Actions required by severity level

- **High** - client **must** fix the issue.
- **Medium** - client **should** fix the issue.
- **Low** - client **could** fix the issue.

## 4 Executive summary

### Overview

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Project Name      | Helios  |
| Repository        | <a href="https://github.com/DudeGuy420/helios-contracts">https://github.com/DudeGuy420/helios-contracts</a> |
| Commit hash       | e73ef3e07c58dbb88e5d47555605bfc0dd6ef13c  |
| Mitigation review | 95723f685c164f2e2bd3bad98bb2ba52bbc96caf  |
| Methods           | Manual review   |

### Scope - Full review

|                        |
|------------------------|
| contracts/Treasury.sol |
| contracts/HlxStake.sol |

### Scope - Changes review

|                           |
|---------------------------|
| contracts/BurnInfo.sol    |
| contracts/GlobalInfo.sol  |
| contracts/Helios.sol      |
| contracts/MintInfo.sol    |
| contracts/OwnerInfo.sol   |
| contracts/StakeInfo.sol   |
| libs/calcFunctions.sol    |
| libs/constant.sol         |
| libs/enum.sol             |
| BuyAndBurn/BuyAndBurn.sol |

### Issues Found

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| High risk   | 2 |
| Medium risk | 1 |
| Low risk    | 1 |

## 5 Findings

### 5.1 High

#### 5.1.1 Wrong Uniswap pool used for obtaining ETH price

**Severity:** *High*

**Context:** BuyAndBurn.sol#L698

**Description:** In the previous version of `BuyAndBurn`, swaps were executed only from WETH to TitanX, but now swaps from TitanX to Helios are performed as well. For that reason, the `getCurrentTitanPrice` function was implemented which is used in the slippage checks:

```
function getCurrentTitanPrice() public view returns (uint256) {
    uint256 sqrtPriceX96 = getSqrtPriceX96(s_poolAddress);
    uint256 numerator1 = sqrtPriceX96 * sqrtPriceX96;
    uint256 numerator2 = 10 ** 18;
    uint256 price = FullMath.mulDiv(numerator1, numerator2, 1 << 192);
    price = TITANX < s_hlxAddress ? (1 ether * 1 ether) / price : price;

    return price;
}
```

It uses the `s_poolAddress` which is the TitanX:Helios UniswapV3 pool to fetch the `sqrtPriceX96` from `slot0` and convert to the actual token price.

The problem is that the `s_poolAddress` is used in the `getCurrentEthPrice` function as well which should actually use the `TITANX_WETH_POOL`:

```
function getCurrentEthPrice() public view returns (uint256) {
    uint256 sqrtPriceX96 = getSqrtPriceX96(s_poolAddress); // @audit wrong pool
    ...
}
```

Therefore, a TitanX:Helios price is returned when the expected is WETH:TitanX meaning that the WETH:TitanX transfers would either be blocked or the slippage protection will not work.

**Recommendation:** Use the `TITANX_WETH_POOL` constant instead of `s_poolAddress` in `getCurrentEthPrice()`.

**Resolution:** Resolved. The correct pool is now used.

#### 5.1.2 Mint cost cap is reached sooner than intended

**Severity:** *High*

**Context:** GlobalInfo.sol#L171-L173

**Description:** The `_dailyUpdate` function performs the following check and update of the mint cost:

```
if (newMintCost > 1_000_000 ether) {
    newMintCost = CAPPED_MAX_MINT_COST;
}
```

The problem is that the `CAPPED_MAX_MINT_COST` constant has a value of `2_000_000_000e18` instead of `1_000_000`. Therefore, the mint cost will reach its cap way sooner than intended.

**Recommendation:** Consider either using the `CAPPED_MAX_MINT_COST` constant in the if-check or changing the constant value from `2_000_000_000e18` to `1_000_000_000e18`.

**Resolution:** Resolved. The correct constant is now used.

## 5.2 Medium

### 5.2.1 An adversary can block the burning functionality for stakers and minters

**Severity:** *Medium*

**Context:** Helios.sol#L143-L145

**Description:** The `Helios` contract implements the `onBurn` callback function called by the TitanX contract in the `_burnAfter` hook:

```
function onBurn(address, uint256 amount) external override {  
    s_totalTitanBurned += amount;  
}
```

The problem is that the function can be called by anyone. An adversary may exploit this by passing `max uint256` as `amount` which would cause any sequential calls to the function by TitanX to revert effectively blocking the additional incentive given for users that burn TitanX tokens when starting mints and stakes.

**Recommendation:** Implement an access control modifier that allows only the TitanX contract to call the corresponding function.

**Resolution:** Resolved. The `onBurn` function now implements an access control check.

## 5.3 Low

### 5.3.1 Unsafe integer downcasting

**Severity:** *Low*

**Context:** GlobalInfo.sol, MintInfo.sol

**Description:** Multiple structs properties and storage variables of integer type are not using a full ethereum word (32 bytes) but smaller sizes. At the same time, many constant values have been increased which means that some variables might need more space in order not to overflow.

**Recommendation:** Consider removing all unsafe downcasts and using only full integers (`uint256` and `int256`).

**Resolution:** Resolved. All relevant unsafe downcasts have been removed.