Smart Contract Audit

Date: 2024-11-23

System State Contract Audit

Executive Summary

Type Smart Contract Audit

Audit Timeline 2 days

Runtime Environment EVM

Languages Solidity

Scope

 $./system_state_sc_Autovaults_V1_1$

Summary of Findings

ID	Name	Description	Severity
H-01	Potential DOS and Scalability Issues Due to Unbounded Loops	The contract utilize loops that iterate over arrays (holders, usersWithDeposits) that can grow indefinitely	High
M-01	Inefficient Depositor Tracking	The isDepositor function in Autovaults V1.1 uses a linear search over the usersWithDeposits array to check if an address is a depositor	Medium

Findings

[H-01] Potential DOS and Scalability Issues Due to Unbounded Loops

Severity: High

Description:

The contract utilize loops that iterate over arrays (holders, usersWithDeposits) that can grow indefinitely. Functions like distributeAutoVaultFee and updateParityAmount can exceed gas limits as the arrays grow, making them uncallable. Attackers can use this to their advantage by creating a lot of addresses and depositing dust amounts in the protocol to grow the array

Impact:

 Critical functions may become uncallable due to gas limitations, leading to denial of service for essential contract operations and affecting the contract's functionality.

Recommendation:

- 1. Optimize Data Structures:
 - a) Replace arrays with mappings to track holders, avoiding unbounded growth.
 - b) Remove holders from tracking when their balance reaches zero.
- 2. Implement Pull Mechanism:
 - a) Allow users to claim their rewards individually, reducing the need for loops.
 - b) Store rewards in a mapping, and let users pull their rewards when needed.
- 3. Batch Processing:
 - a) If looping is necessary, process in batches to stay within gas limits.

Proof of Concept

```
function _addHolder(address holder) internal {
    if (!isHolder[holder]) {
        isHolder[holder] = true;
        holders.push(holder);
        emit HolderAdded(holder);
}
```

```
uint256 AutoVaultFee,
      address excludeUser
      uint256 totalSupply = DAVPLS.totalSupply();
      uint256 excludeUserBalance = DAVPLS.balanceOf(excludeUser);
      if (totalSupply == 0 || AutoVaultFee == 0) {
      uint256 totalDistributableSupply =
totalSupply.sub(excludeUserBalance);
      uint256 holdersLength = DAVPLS.holdersLength();
      for (uint256 i = 0; i < holdersLength; i++) {</pre>
           address user = DAVPLS.holders(i);
          uint256 userBalance = DAVPLS.balanceOf(user);
          if (user == excludeUser) {
           if (userBalance > 0 && totalDistributableSupply > 0) {
              uint256 userShare = AutoVaultFee.mul(userBalance).div(
                   totalDistributableSupply
              );
              userAutoVault[user] = userAutoVault[user].add(userShare);
              emit AutoVaultFeeDistributed(user, userShare);
```

[M-01] Inefficient Depositor Tracking

Severity: Medium

Description:

The **isDepositor** function in **Autovaults V1.1** uses a linear search over the **usersWithDeposits** array to check if an address is a depositor, which is inefficient for large arrays.

Impact:

As the number of depositors increases, the gas cost for this function will rise, leading to higher transaction fees and potential performance issues.

Proof of Concept:

```
function isDepositor(address _depositor) internal view returns (bool) {
   for (uint256 i = 0; i < usersWithDeposits.length; i++) {
      if (usersWithDeposits[i] == _depositor) {
         return true;
      }
   }
   return false;
}</pre>
```

Recommendation

Use a mapping for constant-time lookup of depositors.

Implementing a mapping:

```
mapping(address => bool) private isDepositorMapping;

function deposit(uint256 value) public onlyDepositer {
    // ...
    if (!isDepositorMapping[msg.sender]) {
        isDepositorMapping[msg.sender] = true;
}
```

```
usersWithDeposits.push(msg.sender);
    NumberOfUser++;
}
// ...
}
function isDepositor(address _depositor) internal view returns (bool) {
    return isDepositorMapping[_depositor];
}
```