



zkSync Lido Bridge

Security Review

Cantina Managed review by:

Noah Marconi, Lead Security Researcher

cccz, Security Researcher

Sujith Somraaj, Associate Security Researcher

September 13, 2023

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	About Cantina	2
1.2	Disclaimer	2
1.3	Risk assessment	2
1.3.1	Severity Classification	2
2	Security Review Summary	3
3	Findings	4
3.1	Critical Risk	4
3.1.1	setGovernance does not validate the caller	4
3.2	Medium Risk	4
3.2.1	Unrecoverable states through misconfiguration	4
3.2.2	Duplicate action is not enforced between actions queued in different blocks	5
3.2.3	Updating _gracePeriod may cause expired actions to be executable.	5
3.2.4	When _ethereumGovernanceExecutor is updated to an EOA account, the contract cannot be recovered	6
3.2.5	Bridge Executor delegatecall can bring governance into a unexpected or unusable states	7
3.3	Low Risk	8
3.3.1	_disableInitializers not used where indicated	8
3.3.2	Inconsistent use of storage gaps in upgradeable contracts	8
3.3.3	Address validation	9
3.3.4	Too many actions in the set may cause execution to fail due to exceeding the block gas limit	9
3.3.5	Guardian may prevent their own removal and dos updateGuardian	9
3.3.6	Prefer manual storage slots with unknown preimage	10
3.3.7	package.json dependencies with vulnerability fixes available	10
3.3.8	Ownership and contract upgrade management and timelocks	10
3.4	Gas Optimization	11
3.4.1	Reverting on L1 due to zero address _l2Receiver will save gas	11
3.4.2	Token and Bridge data may be immutable	11
3.5	Informational	12
3.5.1	Increase test coverage	12
3.5.2	Mapping may be simplified as there is only one L2 token address	12
3.5.3	Inconsistent L2 Bridge interfaces in use	12
3.5.4	Avoid variable shadowing	13
3.5.5	DepositInitiated event does not log the refundRecipient	13
3.5.6	Interface naming inconsistent with @matterlabs repo	13

1 Introduction

1.1 About Cantina

Cantina is a security services marketplace that connects top security researchers and solutions with clients. Learn more at cantina.xyz

1.2 Disclaimer

Cantina Managed provides a detailed evaluation of the security posture of the code at a particular moment based on the information available at the time of the review. While Cantina Managed endeavors to identify and disclose all potential security issues, it cannot guarantee that every vulnerability will be detected or that the code will be entirely secure against all possible attacks. The assessment is conducted based on the specific commit and version of the code provided. Any subsequent modifications to the code may introduce new vulnerabilities that were absent during the initial review. Therefore, any changes made to the code require a new security review to ensure that the code remains secure. Please be advised that the Cantina Managed security review is not a replacement for continuous security measures such as penetration testing, vulnerability scanning, and regular code reviews.

1.3 Risk assessment

Severity	Description
Critical	<i>Directly</i> exploitable security vulnerabilities that need to be fixed.
High	Security vulnerabilities that may not be directly exploitable or may require certain conditions in order to be exploited. All high issues should be addressed.
Medium	Objective in nature but are not security vulnerabilities. Should be addressed unless there is a clear reason not to.
Low	Subjective in nature. They are typically suggestions around best practices or readability. Code maintainers should use their own judgment as to whether to address such issues.
Gas Optimization	Suggestions around gas saving practices.
Informational	Suggestions around best practices or readability.

1.3.1 Severity Classification

The severity of security issues found during the security review is categorized based on the above table. When determining the severity one first needs to determine whether the finding is subjective or objective. All subjective findings are considered of Minor severity.

Next it is determined whether the finding can be regarded as a security vulnerability. Some findings might be objective improvements that need to be fixed, but do not impact the project's security overall (Medium).

Finally, objective findings of security vulnerabilities are classified as either critical or major. Critical findings should be directly vulnerable and have a high likelihood of being exploited. Major findings on the other hand may require specific conditions that need to be met before the vulnerability becomes exploitable.

2 Security Review Summary

The primary objective of this project is to establish a robust foundation to facilitate the seamless integration of Lido into zkSync protocol. Additionally, the project aims to expand the availability of Lido's staking token (stETH) within the decentralized finance (DeFi) ecosystem on zkSync network. This initiative is part of a broader, long-term strategy to enhance Lido's presence and functionality in the evolving landscape of blockchain technology and to expand the zkSync DeFi possibilities.

From Aug. 2nd - Aug. 18th the Cantina team conducted a review of [zkSync Lido Bridge](#) on commit hash [a4d5c5...ea34ba](#). The team identified a total of **22** issues in the following risk categories:

- Critical Risk: 1
- High Risk: 0
- Medium Risk: 5
- Low Risk: 8
- Gas Optimizations: 2
- Informational: 6

3 Findings

3.1 Critical Risk

3.1.1 `setGovernance` does not validate the caller

Severity: Critical Risk

Context: `L2BridgeExecutor.sol#L78`

Description: The `setGovernance` function allows anyone to update `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor`, which then can propose malicious action sets to the queue.

Recommendation:

- remove the function as the `updateEthereumGovernanceExecutor` function serves the same purpose.
- if the function is still considered valid, add appropriate caller validations to ensure only allowed actors can call this function.

zkSync: We removed permissionless function in this commit <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-l2/commit/8af93de464f83f8d0be587cdeaa80f5eba4d9bc9>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.2 Medium Risk

3.2.1 Unrecoverable states through misconfiguration

Severity: Medium Risk

Context: `L2BridgeExecutor.sol#L64`

Description: Governance may produce transactions which render the contracts into an unrecoverable state:

- `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` may be set to an incorrect address, making it impossible to queue new actions.
- Setting `_delay` to `type(uint256).max` or other high value will make queuing excessively long

Impact: high, likelihood: low

Recommendation: There are a number of ways to reduce the potential for misconfiguration:

1. Have configuration updates thoroughly reviewed before proceeding through governance.
2. Make use of two step ownership updates for owners and admin (e.g. `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor`).
3. Consider an upper bound on `_maximumDelay`

zkSync: We introduced the `MAXIMUM_DELAY` constant set to 2 weeks to prevent values that are too high (<https://github.com/txfusion/lido-l2/blob/main/zksync/l2/contracts/governance/BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L19>).

Cantina: Confirmed `MAXIMUM_DELAY` is now enforced.

3.2.2 Duplicate action is not enforced between actions queued in different blocks

Severity: Medium Risk

Context: [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L304-L314](#)

Description: Queuing aims to prevent the same action from being queued if the action is already queued within a set that has not been executed/cancelled.

Queuing stores a boolean to indicate a particular `actionHash` is queued, cancelling or executing updates the bool to false. Expiring does not update the boolean.

The `actionHash`, however, is determined using the action details along with the current block's timestamp (`uint256 executionTime = block.timestamp + _delay`):

```
bytes32 actionHash = keccak256(
    abi.encode(
        targets[i],
        values[i],
        signatures[i],
        calldatas[i],
        executionTime,
        withDelegatecalls[i]
    )
)
```

Duplicates may be introduced by queuing the same action in another block, thereby giving it a different `executionTime` and a different `actionHash`.

Caution: if the implementation is amended to strictly enforce no queued duplicates, when an action expires it will still be recorded as `_queuedActions[actionHash] = true`;

Recommendation: Consider whether duplicate detection is required at the action level at all. If duplicate avoidance is required, a refactor is required to detect duplicates without the use of the block's timestamp included in the `actionHash` (or other duplicate detection hash).

Note the caution above and in other tickets as a queued action with strict duplicate detection may do desired actions.

zkSync: Since enforcing the strict duplicate action detection may cause DOS, I believe it is not necessary to make changes to the current implementation of the `BridgeExecutorBase` contract. The current implementation only prevents duplicate actions to be queued in a single block, which is good enough in our use case.

Cantina: Acknowledged.

3.2.3 Updating `_gracePeriod` may cause expired actions to be executable.

Severity: Medium Risk

Context: [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L148-L151](#), [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L224-L238](#), [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L111-L113](#)

Description: In `getCurrentState`, `_gracePeriod` is used to determine if the action is expired.

```
} else if (block.timestamp > actionsSet.executionTime + _gracePeriod) {
    return ActionsSetState.Expired;
} else {
    return ActionsSetState.Queued;
}
```

The problem here is that `_gracePeriod` can be changed by calling `updateGracePeriod` by actions, and if `_gracePeriod` gets larger, it may cause the expired action to be executable.

```
function updateGracePeriod(uint256 gracePeriod) external override onlyThis {
    if (gracePeriod < MINIMUM_GRACE_PERIOD) revert GracePeriodTooShort();
    _updateGracePeriod(gracePeriod);
}
```

To make matters worse, action in Queued state can be canceled, but action in Expired state cannot be canceled.

```
function cancel(uint256 actionsSetId) external override onlyGuardian {
    if (getCurrentState(actionsSetId) != ActionsSetState.Queued)
        revert OnlyQueuedActions();
}
```

This leads to the fact that if there is a malicious action that has expired, that action cannot be canceled, and once the `_gracePeriod` is increased, that action may be executed.

Recommendation: It is recommended to set the expiration time when queuing the action to prevent the state of the action from changing due to the increase of `_gracePeriod`.

```
function _queue(
    address[] memory targets,
    uint256[] memory values,
    string[] memory signatures,
    bytes[] memory calldatas,
    bool[] memory withDelegatecalls
) internal {
    if (targets.length == 0) revert EmptyTargets();
    uint256 targetsLength = targets.length;
    if (
        targetsLength != values.length ||
        targetsLength != signatures.length ||
        targetsLength != calldatas.length ||
        targetsLength != withDelegatecalls.length
    ) revert InconsistentParamsLength();

    uint256 actionsSetId = _actionsSetCounter;
    uint256 executionTime = block.timestamp + _delay;
    + uint256 expireTime = executionTime + _gracePeriod;
}
```

zkSync: Fixed based on your recommendation, check commit <https://github.com/txfusion/lido-l2/commit/251bda57166353aa70c9d582d869ef1edaf48180>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.2.4 When `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` is updated to an EOA account, the contract cannot be recovered

Severity: Medium Risk

Context: `L2BridgeExecutor.sol#L63-L71`, `ZkSyncBridgeExecutor.sol#L11-L17`

Description: `onlyEthereumGovernanceExecutor` modifier will always de-alias `msg.sender`. And it works well when `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` is a contract address

```
modifier onlyEthereumGovernanceExecutor() override {
    if (
        AddressAliasHelper.undoL1ToL2Alias(msg.sender) !=
        _ethereumGovernanceExecutor
    ) revert UnauthorizedEthereumExecutor();
    _;
}
```

However, `updateEthereumGovernanceExecutor` allows updating `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` to an arbitrary address.

```
function updateEthereumGovernanceExecutor(
    address ethereumGovernanceExecutor
) external onlyThis {
    emit EthereumGovernanceExecutorUpdate(
        _ethereumGovernanceExecutor,
        ethereumGovernanceExecutor
    );
    _ethereumGovernanceExecutor = ethereumGovernanceExecutor;
}
```

If `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` is updated to an EOA account, and when the EOA account wants to queue actions, `onlyEthereumGovernanceExecutor` modifier will de-alias the EOA account address to an unknown

address, thus making `onlyEthereumGovernanceExecutor`'s validation fails and `ZkSyncBridgeExecutor` cannot recover due to the unavailability of queuing actions.

The likelihood of updating `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` to an EOA account is low, but due to the high impact, this issue is considered as medium risk.

Recommendation: There are code based and docs based options:

- Since it is unable to know if the address of L1 is a contract address on L2, it is possible to implement a method dedicated to updating the `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` of L2 from L1, and to check if the address is a contract address of L1.
- Well-documented the risk of updating `_ethereumGovernanceExecutor` to EOA account

zkSync: Changes have been introduced to the `ZkSyncBridgeExecutor` contract that have enabled for EOA or a contract on L1 to become the governance executor.

In case the governance executor is a contract on L1, aliasing from L1 to L2 address must be performed in an off-chain script before assigning/updating the governor address. To alias the contract's address from L1 to L2 (or vice versa) in a script, the `zksync-web3` npm package is used.

Since the address of the EOA is same on L1 and L2, it requires no aliasing. Check commit <https://github.com/txfusion/lido-l2/commit/6f8f117759f688249fc091c6fa399f17a48ec1f7>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.2.5 Bridge Executor `delegatecall` can bring governance into a unexpected or unusable states

Severity: Medium Risk

Context: [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L9375](#)

Description: The `delegatecall` allows the owner (via `L1Executor.sol`) to intentionally or accidentally update sensitive state variables and can execute malicious actions like

Set grace periods less than `MINIMUM_GRACE_PERIOD`

- delegate calling to a contract with a different `MINIMUM_GRACE_PERIOD` or direct access to `_gracePeriod` to circumvent the constant `MINIMUM_GRACE_PERIOD`, which, when set to 0, can effectively block all actions from execution.

Change actionSet's status

- activating an already executed action `actionsSetId`.
- switching a canceled/executed `actionSetId` to status `Queued`
- increase grace period & switch `actionSetId` status, effectively executing any past action sets in the future
- switching an upcoming `actionSetId` status to executed, preventing delivery/execution of future events

Change actionHash's status

- setting `_queuedActions[actionHash] = true` (particularly troublesome when duplicate actions are not permitted)

Change actionSet's target

- change the target address during execution and reset it after execution, resulting in false positives about the execution status

Set actionSetCounter to `type(uint256).max`

- can permanently push the governance contract into unusable state by setting the `actionSetCounter` to a max value of `uint256`.

Set `_delay` **to** `type(uint256).max` **or other high value**

- Can make queuing excessively long

Add & execute new queue transactions

- by effectively modifying state variables like `_delay` and `_gracePeriod`, `actionsSets` can be proposed and executed in the one atomic transaction.

Recommendation: Three options for consideration:

- Option 1: The `ZkSyncBridgeExecutor.sol` contract can be separated into two contracts, not allowing some variables to be changed during `delegatecall`.
- Option 2: The `delegatecall` can be removed
- Option 3: The risks associated with malicious `delegatecall` in `BridgeExecutorBase.sol` should, at minimum, be well documented, and extreme caution should be exercised whenever used.

zkSync: To remove the risks we have deleted the `delegatecall` option (commit <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-l2/commit/3d21e510343fdcb50c58de6718f032714315c561>)

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.3 Low Risk

3.3.1 `_disableInitializers` not used where indicated

Severity: Low Risk

Context: `L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L53`

Description: A comment indicates `_disableInitializers` is used in the constructor when it is not present. An uninitialised implementation contract may be initialized maliciously.

Recommendation: For safety add the function to the constructor.

zkSync: Resolved by adding `_disableInitializers` to constructor function, check line <https://github.com/txfusion/lido-l2/blob/main/zksync/l1/contracts/L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L55>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.3.2 Inconsistent use of storage gaps in upgradeable contracts

Severity: Low Risk

Context: `BridgeableTokensUpgradable.sol`, `BridgingManager.sol`, `AccessControl` import in `BridgingManager.sol`, `L2ERC20Bridge.sol`, `L1ERC20Bridge.sol`, `ReentrancyGuard` import in `L1ERC20Bridge.sol`, `L1Executor.sol`, `BridgeExecutorBase.sol`, `L2BridgeExecutor.sol`, `ZkSyncBridgeExecutor.sol`, `L2CrossDomainEnabled.sol`, `ERC20BridgedUpgradeable`, `ERC20CoreUpgradeable`, `ERC20MetadataUpgradeable`

Description: The `ERC20PermitUpgradeable` and `NoncesUpgradeable` contracts make use of storage gaps for safety: `uint256[N] private __gap;` however, many of the other upgradeable contracts do not. Further, not all upgradeable contracts import from the `@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable` package.

Recommendation: Two options to consider for all of the upgradeable contracts:

1. For consistency and safety, prefer `@openzeppelin/contracts-upgradeable` for upgradeable contracts and make use of storage gaps, reducing the opportunity for accidental storage slot collisions.
2. Consider `eip-1967`-like manually derived storage slots.

zkSync: We have added storage gaps to some contracts (e.g. `BridgeableTokensUpgradable`), but we don't see the need for all contract to have the storage gaps, since many of them implement just a specific set of functionalities that won't require storage updates, for example `BridgingManager`.

Cantina: Acknowledged.

3.3.3 Address validation

Severity: Low Risk

Context: [L2BridgeExecutor.sol#L33](#), [L2BridgeExecutor.sol#L64](#)

Description: The `L2BridgeExecutor.constructor` and `L2BridgeExecutor.updateEthereumGovernanceExecutor` do not include a zero address check.

Recommendation: Protections can be added to the contracts themselves or to the deploy process:

1. Add a zero address check to avoid a misconfigured updates.
2. Consider using a factory based deployment similar to how the `L1ERC20Bridge` initialization doubles as a factory-like deployer for the `L2ERC20Bridge`.

zkSync: Zero address check added, check <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-12/commit/d8ba7c8eba318b69626f3507bd196466f860ce43>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.3.4 Too many actions in the set may cause execution to fail due to exceeding the block gas limit

Severity: Low Risk

Context: [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L281-L319](#), [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L81-L94](#)

Description: There is no limit on the amount of actions in a set, so if there are too many actions in a set, the execution may fail due to exceeding the block gas limit.

```
function execute(uint256 actionsSetId) external payable override {
    if (getCurrentState(actionsSetId) != ActionsSetState.Queued)
        revert OnlyQueuedActions();

    ActionsSet storage actionsSet = _actionsSets[actionsSetId];
    if (block.timestamp < actionsSet.executionTime)
        revert TimelockNotFinished();

    actionsSet.executed = true;
    uint256 actionCount = actionsSet.targets.length;

    bytes[] memory returnedData = new bytes[](actionCount);
    for (uint256 i = 0; i < actionCount; ) {
```

Recommendation: It is recommended to limit the amount of actions in the set when queuing.

zkSync: To stay on a safe side we limit the number of actions in the set to 3 (<https://github.com/txfusion/lido-12/blob/main/zksync/12/contracts/governance/BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L280>)

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.3.5 Guardian may prevent their own removal and dos updateGuardian

Severity: Low Risk

Context: [BridgeExecutorBase.sol#L137](#)

Description: When governance decides to remove a guardian account and replace it with a new one, the existing guardian may cancel the action.

Recommendation: A code based approach or an offchain approach may be used to address this topic:

1. Consider a refactor to stop the guardian from cancelling this particular function. Caution would be needed in implementing as the restriction should be for the particular action and not the broader actionSet
2. The guardian may dos any function and should be carefully chosen. A guardian is effectively a trusted party in the system.

zkSync: The guardian is a trusted party and caution should be exercised when assigning the guardian role due to the guardian's ability to cancel proposals that contain a function call for updating the guardian's address. To prevent this from happening, the guardian

role can remain uninitialized (role assigned to zero address) which would prohibit canceling proposals in general. We added additional docs to emphasize this, check commit <https://github.com/txfusion/lido-l2/commit/6053e2f570ae30e5416f9a95b8a98d30b6368ba4>

Cantina: Acknowledged.

3.3.6 Prefer manual storage slots with unknown preimage

Severity: Low Risk

Context: ERC20MetadataUpgradeable.sol#L22, BridgingManager.sol#L31-L32, BridgingManager.sol#L31-L32

Description: A number of the contract use a manually constructed storage slot by passing a string to keccak256 such as keccak256("BridgingManager.bridgingState"). The preimage of these storage slots are known and may be vulnerable to future malicious upgrades combined with targeted payloads.

See [EIP 1967 comment](#) and [Eth Magicians discussion](#) for context.

Recommendation: Subtract 1 from the hashed value as this example does: `bytes32(uint256(keccak256("BridgingManager.bridgingState") - 1));`

zkSync: Resolved based on recommendation, check <https://github.com/txfusion/lido-l2/commit/1799333748d0cf9e1fcd023d83572ab45a71a4c6>

Cantina: Confirmed for in scope contracts. The out of scope `BridgingManager.sol#L31-L32` is unmodified.

3.3.7 package.json dependencies with vulnerability fixes available

Severity: Low Risk

Context: package.json#L43-L85

Description: npm audit shows a number of patches available for dependencies correcting issues of varying severity.

Recommendation: Where possible apply patches or update to later versions of npm based dependencies.

zkSync: Out of scope for now, we need to do this together with the Lido team since there are a lot of outdated dependencies they already use for other bridges in the repo.

3.3.8 Ownership and contract upgrade management and timelocks

Severity: Low Risk

Context: L1Executor.sol#L9C24-L9C42, OssifiableProxy.sol#L52-L74, BridgingManager.sol#L21-L28

Description: Some admin level state changes are not timelocked:

- The owner of the L1Executor
- The DEFAULT_ADMIN_ROLE may make role updates, e.g. changing deposit/withdrawal enabler/disabler roles to accounts without timelocks
- The OssifiableProxy admin
- The OssifiableProxy implementation

The ZkSync team has informed us the deposit/withdrawal enabler/disabler roles are to route through the governance contract which uses queuing delays as a timelock.

Further, the intended use of DEFAULT_ADMIN_ROLE is temporary (see [initialize-bridge-roles.ts](#)).

Recommendation: Code updates and post deploy checks are recommended:

1. Ensure all admin actions are either routed through governance or have appropriate timelocks in place.
2. Prefer two step ownership transfers to avoid accidental assignment to addresses such as `address(0)` or L2 aliased contract addresses on L1. See [OZ's Ownable2Step](#).

3. Prefer `OZ's AccessControlDefaultAdminRules` for `DEFAULT_ADMIN_ROLE`
4. Post deployment, confirm an EOA no longer has control over the `DEFAULT_ADMIN_ROLE`.

zkSync:

- added `Ownable2Step` for `L1Executor`
- implemented `OZ's AccessControlDefaultAdminRules` for `DEFAULT_ADMIN_ROLE`

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.4 Gas Optimization

3.4.1 Reverting on L1 due to zero address `_l2Receiver` will save gas

Severity: Gas Optimization

Context: `L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L120`

Description: There is zero address check on `_l2Receiver` until the transaction attempts to execute on L2. This comes at the expense of L1 gas to initiate the tx, L2 gas for the tx to fail, and finally L1 gas to `claimFailedDeposit`.

Recommendation: Perform a zero address check for `_l2Receiver` on the L1 side.

zkSync: Resolved, zero address check is added <https://github.com/txfusion/lido-12/blob/main/zksync/l1/contracts/L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L153>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.4.2 Token and Bridge data may be immutable

Severity: Gas Optimization

Context: `L1Executor`, `L1ERC20Bridge`, `L1ERC20Bridge.l2Bridge`, `BridgeableTokensUpgradable.sol#L11-L14`, `L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L216`

Description: In the token bridge contracts the `zkSyncAddress` is stored as an immutable, while in the `L1Executor` it is passed in as an argument.

In the L1 and L2 bridge contracts the token addresses are passed around as arguments and compared to storage variables. The pattern is consistent with the more generalised bridging contracts in the `@matterlabs/zksync-contracts` package.

Given these addresses are not intended to change, there is unnecessary gas overhead in passing/storing/reading these variables.

Recommendation: Exercise caution if ever upgrading and moving from constant to storage or vice versa

1. For governance, store the `zkSyncAddress` as a constant or immutable addresses.
2. For the bridges store `l1Token`, `l2Token`, `l1Bridge`, and `l2Bridge` as constants or immutable addresses.
3. Do not pass `l1Token` as data from L1 to L1.
4. Store `gettersData` on the L2 side as immutable or consider not logging it at all.

zkSync: The following things are fixed:

- removed `gettersData` function from the `L1ERC20Bridge` contract
- `_data` argument is no longer used in `finalizeDeposit` function in the `L1ERC20Bridge` contract
- `_data` argument is no longer emitted in `FinalizeDeposit` event in the `L1ERC20Bridge` contract
- the address of `zksync` is passed as an argument during initialization in the `L1Executor` contract

Cantina: Confirmed list of changes. Note: reading the address of `zksync` from storage does incur an extra `sload` cost. If the address is certain to never change, consider making it a constant or immutable.

3.5 Informational

3.5.1 Increase test coverage

Severity: Informational

Description: There is less than complete test coverage of key contracts under review. Adequate test coverage and regular reporting is an essential process in ensuring the codebase works as intended. Insufficient code coverage may lead to unexpected issues and regressions arising due to changes in the underlying smart contract implementation.

Recommendation: Add to test coverage ensuring all execution paths are covered. A draft set of test stubs is available here [review-bridge-zksync-txfusion/tree/diagrams/docs](#). See also Paul R Berg's BTT [thread](#) and [talk](#).

3.5.2 Mapping may be simplified as there is only one L2 token address

Severity: Informational

Context: [L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L46](#)

Description: Given there is only one L1 token address, the extra nesting of the depositAmount mapping is not needed.

Recommendation: Simplify the mapping to not consider the L1 token:

```
-/// @dev A mapping account => L1 token address => L2 deposit transaction hash => amount
+/// @dev A mapping account => L2 deposit transaction hash => amount
-/// @dev Used for saving the number of deposited funds, to claim them in case the deposit transaction will fail
-+mapping(address => mapping(address => mapping(bytes32 => uint256)))
+mapping(address => mapping(bytes32 => uint256))
    public depositAmount;
```

zkSync: This is resolved based on your recommendation, check commit <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-l2/commit/a6dab8d74dfc91e7b3b89a57ab10800a4da37bd0>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.5.3 Inconsistent L2 Bridge interfaces in use

Severity: Informational

Context: [IL2ERC20Bridge.sol](#)

Description: The [L2ERC20Bridge](#) implements the [IL2ERC20Bridge](#) interface. This interface varies slightly from the [@matterlabs/zksync-contracts](#) package in that events are added and the `_` is a suffix rather than a prefix on function arguments. It also differs from the [zksync/l1/contracts/interfaces/IL2ERC20Bridge.sol](#) version which only has an `initialize` function.

Both interfaces are in use either on the L1 side or the L2 side.

Further, the events emitted in the [zksync/l2/contracts/interfaces/IL2ERC20Bridge.sol](#) interface do differ from the events in the [contracts/optimism/interfaces/IL2ERC20Bridge.sol](#) version of the interface.

Recommendation: Consider if possible to adopt and use single interface. Where differences are needed, consider using the [@matterlabs](#) published interface and supplementing with an extension interface only.

zkSync: Bridge interfaces are aligned with the ones from [@matterlabs/zksync-contracts](#) package, with the only difference that `DepositInitiated` event contains the `refundRecipient` address based on your recommendation in this issue <https://github.com/cantinasec/review-bridge-zksync-txfusion/issues/35> (check commit <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-l2/commit/a6dab8d74dfc91e7b3b89a57ab10800a4da37bd0>).

Cantina: Acknowledged interface updates.

3.5.4 Avoid variable shadowing

Severity: Informational

Context: L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L285, L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L322

Description: The storage variable `l1Token` is shadowed locally in some functions.

Recommendation: Rename the local variables to avoid variable shadowing.

zkSync: Resolved based on your recommendation, check commit <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-12/commit/f50f445b403e2a815773040a7d327bb14bca34a9>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.5.5 DepositInitiated event does not log the refundRecipient

Severity: Informational

Context: L1ERC20Bridge.sol#L187

Description: The `refundRecipient` is contextually relevant but is not included in the `DepositInitiated` event.

Recommendation: Add `refundRecipient` to the event.

zkSync: Resolved, check line <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-12/pull/45/files#diff-34f63599b2b0a8e326959e08c435a09c7d0f033c8f4b94528c237392c597e1f3R198>

Cantina: Confirmed.

3.5.6 Interface naming inconsistent with @matterlabs repo

Severity: Informational

Context: IL2Messenger

Description: The local `zksync/12/contracts/interfaces/IL2Messenger.sol` names the interface with `L2` in the prefix whereas the `@matterlabs` repo refers to this contract as the `L1Messenger`.

Recommendation: To avoid confusion or potential future error, rename to match `@matterlabs`.

zkSync: Fixed, `L1Messenger` from `@matterlabs` repo is used, check <https://github.com/lidofinance/lido-12/pull/45/files#diff-7568171104512d78040540e0ef60465014e79a5d2e21f1aab3c04a84b60a919d>

Cantina: Confirmed.