

SPARTADEX

audit / code review report

July 10, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. License
- 2. Disclaimer
- 3. Approach and methodology
- 4. Description
- 5. Findings

SPARTADEX

audit / code review report

July 10, 2023

LICENSE

Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0)



SPARTADEX

audit / code review report

July 10, 2023

DISCLAIMER

THE CONTENT OF THIS AUDIT REPORT IS PROVIDED “AS IS”, WITHOUT
REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND.

THE AUTHOR AND HIS EMPLOYER DISCLAIM ANY LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE ARISING
OUT OF, OR IN CONNECTION WITH, THIS AUDIT REPORT.

COPYRIGHT OF THIS REPORT REMAINS WITH THE AUTHOR.

SPARTADEX

audit / code review report

July 10, 2023

APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE

1. Determine the correct operation of the protocol, according to the design specification.
2. Identify possible vulnerabilities that could be exploited by an attacker.
3. Detect errors in the smart contract that could lead to unexpected behavior.
4. Analyze whether best practices were followed during development.
5. Make recommendations to improve security and code readability.

CODEBASE

Repository	https://github.com/SpartaDEX/sdex-smart-contracts
Branch	main
Commit hash	0369f48e3b2a655616dc75afdf87b9915f64d720

METHODOLOGY

1. Reading the available documentation and understanding the code.
2. Doing automated code analysis and reviewing dependencies.
3. Checking manually source code line by line for security vulnerabilities.
4. Following guidelines and recommendations.
5. Preparing this report.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

DESCRIPTION

Issues Categories:

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Description</u>
CRITICAL	vulnerability that can lead to loss of funds, failure to recover blocked funds, or catastrophic denial of service.
HIGH	vulnerability that can lead to incorrect contract state or unpredictable operation of the contract.
MEDIUM	failure to adhere to best practices, incorrect usage of primitives, without major impact on security.
LOW	recommendations or potential optimizations which can lead to better user experience or readability.

Each issue can be in the following state:

<u>State</u>	<u>Description</u>
PENDING	still waiting for resolving
ACKNOWLEDGED	know but not planned to resolve for some reasons
RESOLVED	fixed and deployed

Auditor

bytes032

<https://bytes032.xyz/>

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

FINDINGS

<u>Finding</u>	<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
#1 - A malicious user can drain all the funds from the TokenVesting contract	CRITICAL	RESOLVED
#2 - <code>_getLPTokenPrice</code> can be manipulated through a flash loan	CRITICAL	RESOLVED
#3 - An adversary can lock user funds by spamming vesting schedules	CRITICAL	RESOLVED
#4 - Excessive user allocations can DoS the <code>calculateTotalReward</code> function and deprive the user from rewards	CRITICAL	RESOLVED
#5 - Unclaimed tokens are locked forever in the <code>Airdrop.sol</code> contract	HIGH	RESOLVED
#6 - <code>addTargetLiquidity</code> and <code>removeSourceLiquidity`</code> has no slippage protection, which can result in loss of funds	HIGH	RESOLVED
#7 - <code>LockdropPhase2</code> lacks token recovery mechanism	HIGH	RESOLVED
#8 - <code>exchangeTokens</code> lacks slippage control	HIGH	RESOLVED
#9 - <code>addLiquidity</code> and <code>removeLiquidity</code> is called without expiration	HIGH	RESOLVED
#10 - Potential mismatch between claimable amounts and actual token balance	MEDIUM	RESOLVED

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

FINDINGS

<u>Finding</u>	<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
#11 - Potential manipulation of airdrop claimable amounts in setClaimableAmounts function	MEDIUM	RESOLVED
#12 - Duplicate locking expiration timestamps can dilute the rewards	MEDIUM	RESOLVED
#13 - Missing sanity checks for _claimStartTimestamp in Airdrop contract	MINOR	RESOLVED
#14 - EPossibility for division by zero in LockdropPhase1	MINOR	RESOLVED
#15 - LockdropPhase2 is prone to reentrancy	MINOR	RESOLVED
#16 - Violation of the Check-Effects-Interaction pattern in getRewardAndSendOnVesting	MINOR	RESOLVED
#17 - Potential for Cross-Chain Replay attacks due to hard-coded Domain Separator	MINOR	RESOLVED
#18 - Inconsistency in 'LiquidityProvided' event parameters	MINOR	RESOLVED

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#1 - A MALICIOUS USER CAN DRAIN ALL THE FUNDS FROM THE TOKENVESTING CONTRACT

This vulnerability allows a malicious actor to drain the entire TokenVesting contract of its tokens prematurely. The issue arises from the lack of a proper check for whether the vesting schedule duration has elapsed.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
CRITICAL	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To fix this vulnerability, a check should be added to ensure the elapsed time does not exceed the vesting duration before calculating the vested amount. This can be done by adding a conditional statement to verify if `block.timestamp` is greater than `vestingSchedule.endTime`.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#2 - _GETLPTOKENPRICE CAN BE MANIPULATED THROUGH A FLASH LOAN

This vulnerability allows for manipulation of the Total Value Locked (TVL) and Liquidity Provider (LP) token price. If exploited, it could lead to incorrect pricing of LP tokens and potentially significant financial loss to users and the platform itself. It could also damage the platform's reputation and user trust.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
CRITICAL	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To mitigate this vulnerability, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Update the [getLPTokenPrice](#) algorithm to derive ideal reserve values from K and the underlying prices
 2. Implement safeguards against rapid and large changes in the TVL that could be indicative of manipulative actions.
 3. Consider introducing limits or controls on the amount of tokens a user can add to the pool at a given time.
 - 4.
- Additionaly, you can take inspiration from this [UniswapV2Oracle](#) by Alpha Homora.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#3 - AN ADVERSARY CAN LOCK USER FUNDS BY SPAMMING VESTING SCHEDULES

The way the `claim` function is currently implemented, it iterates over all vesting schedules of a user, regardless of the `scheduleIds` specified. This could potentially lead to a Denial of Service (DoS) attack if a malicious actor spams the `schedules` of an arbitrary user with a large number of vesting schedules. As a result, the targeted user's `claim` function call will run out of gas, effectively preventing them from claiming any of their vested tokens.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
CRITICAL	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To mitigate this potential issue, the `claim` function should be refactored to loop over only the `scheduleIds` specified by the user, rather than all vesting schedules associated with the user. This can be achieved by changing the `scheduleIdsLength` variable to be the length of the `schedules` array, rather than the length of the user's `schedules` array.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#4 - EXCESSIVE USER ALLOCATIONS CAN DOS THE CALCULATETOTALREWARD FUNCTION AND DEPRIVE THE USER FROM REWARDS

The presence of this vulnerability may discourage users from making numerous allocations, as it could potentially leave them unable to access their rewards. This issue stems from a scenario where a user has a significant number of allocations, leading to the exhaustion of gas in the `calculateTotalReward` function.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
CRITICAL	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

The `calculateTotalReward` function should be refactored to handle a large number of allocations without exceeding the gas limit. One approach could be to design the function so it can process allocations in ranges. This would allow it to handle a large number of allocations over multiple transactions, rather than attempting to process all allocations in a single transaction.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#5 - UNCLAIMED TOKENS ARE LOCKED FOREVER IN THE AIRDROP.SOL CONTRACT

As a result of this issue, tokens that are not claimed during the designated timeframe, or "dust" tokens left over due to small discrepancies in calculations, remain stuck in the Airdrop.sol contract indefinitely. This means these tokens are effectively lost, decreasing the total available supply and potentially distorting the token's market dynamics.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
HIGH	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

Implement a token recovery function that can be executed only by `onlyAirdropManagerRole`, but only after the airdrop period ends. This will allow addresses which have the `onlyAirdropManagerRole` to recover excess tokens from the contract.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#6 - ADDTARGETLIQUIDITY AND REMOVESOURCELIQUIDITY HAS NO SLIPPAGE PROTECTION, WHICH CAN RESULT IN LOSS OF FUNDS

The current implementation of the `removeSourceLiquidity()` function in the smart contract lacks slippage protection. This omission might expose users to potential price manipulation, where malicious actors could intentionally cause price slippage, leading to significant losses when users remove liquidity. As a result, users could lose a significant portion of their funds when they remove liquidity from the pool, which could erode trust in the smart contract.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
HIGH	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To mitigate the risk of losing funds due to price slippage, it's recommended to add slippage protection to both functions. This protection can be added by specifying the minimum amounts of tokens (`amountAMin` and `amountBMin`) that should be received when removing liquidity and pass them to `router.removeLiquidity` and `router.addLiquidity` respectively.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#7 - LOCKDROPPHASE2 LACKS TOKEN RECOVERY MECHANISM

The lack of a proper token recovery mechanism in the `LockdropPhase2` contract for unclaimed tokens presents a significant financial risk. In the current setup, any unclaimed "sparta" and "stable" tokens become irretrievable,

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
HIGH	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

Implement a token recovery function that can be executed only after a certain state and only by the owner of the contract.

This will allow the owners of the protocol to recover excess tokens from the contract.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#8 - EXCHANGETOKENS LACKS SLIPPAGE CONTROL

Without slippage protection, there's a significant risk of unfavorable trade outcomes. The lack of guarantee that `spartaTotalLocked` will equal the stable coins required can lead to substantial financial loss. This becomes particularly concerning during periods of high market volatility.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
HIGH	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To mitigate the risk of losing funds due to price slippage, it's recommended to add slippage protection to both functions. This protection can be added by specifying the minimum amounts of tokens (`amountAMin` and `amountBMin`) that should be received.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#9 - ADDLIQUIDITY AND REMOVELIQUIDITY IS CALLED WITHOUT EXPIRATION

The current implementation can lead to significant risks including unfavorable trade outcomes and potential financial loss. Without a user-specified deadline, transactions can remain in the mempool for an extended period, resulting in execution at a potentially disadvantageous time. Moreover, by setting the deadline to `block.timestamp`, a validator can hold the transaction without any time constraints, further exposing users to the risk of price fluctuations.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
HIGH	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To mitigate this issue, it's recommended to add deadline parameters to all functions interacting with AMMs and allow users to specify their preferred deadlines. These user-specified deadlines should then be passed on to the respective AMM function calls. This modification will give users more control over their transactions, reducing the associated risks.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#10 - POTENTIAL MISMATCH BETWEEN CLAIMABLE AMOUNTS AND ACTUAL TOKEN BALANCE

The `setClaimableAmounts` function could potentially allow the administrators to set claimable token amounts for users that exceed the actual token balance of the contract. This could lead to a situation where users are unable to claim their tokens despite being told they have a certain amount available. This discrepancy can undermine trust in the contract, the airdrop process, and the overall project.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MEDIUM	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

It's recommended to add a check to ensure the total claimable amounts do not exceed the actual token balance of the contract. This can be done by calculating the sum of all claimable amounts and comparing it to the contract's token balance.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#11 - POTENTIAL MANIPULATION OF AIRDROP CLAIMABLE AMOUNTS IN SETCLAIMABLEAMOUNTS FUNCTION

The `setClaimableAmounts` function sets the amount of tokens that specific users are eligible to claim from an airdrop. The function is only accessible by addresses with the `onlyAirdropManagerRole`. This function takes in two arrays, `users` and `amounts`, representing the addresses of the users and the respective amounts they can claim.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MEDIUM	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

Use `+=` instead of `=`

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#12 - DUPLICATE LOCKING EXPIRATION TIMESTAMPS CAN DILUTE THE REWARDS

The current implementation of the `calculateRewardRates()` function in the `LockdropPhase1.sol` smart contract has a potential vulnerability where rewards might get diluted. This dilution could occur if there are any duplicate locking expiration timestamps, which could lead to a duration of zero during reward calculation. As a result, users may receive less reward than they are supposed to, impacting the fairness and trustworthiness of the reward distribution mechanism.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MEDIUM	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to add a check during the constructor time to ensure that the `lockingExpirationTimestamps` array doesn't contain any duplicate values.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#13 - MISSING SANITY CHECKS FOR `_CLAIMSTARTTIMESTAMP` IN AIRDROP CONTRACT

The absence of sanity checks for the `_claimStartTimestamp` parameter in the Airdrop contract can lead to potential vulnerabilities and unexpected behavior. It may allow the contract to be initialized with a `claim` start timestamp that is not in the future, which could undermine the intended functionality and fairness of the airdrop.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MINOR	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To mitigate this vulnerability, it is crucial to implement sanity checks and ensure that the `_claimStartTimestamp` value provided in the constructor is in the future. For example, you can add a validation check within the constructor to ensure that `_claimStartTimestamp` is greater than the current block timestamp.

This can be done using a condition such as `require(_claimStartTimestamp > block.timestamp, "Claim start time must be in the future");`

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#14 - POSSIBILITY FOR DIVISION BY ZERO IN LOCKDROPPhase1

The vulnerability in the [LockdropPhase1.sol](#) contract can potentially lead to a division by zero error. This error can cause the function execution to revert, resulting in unexpected behaviour or denial of service for users interacting with the contract.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MINOR	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To address this, make sure to sanitize the [lockingExpirationTimestamps](#) for erroneous values before calculating the reward rate.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#15 - LOCKDROPPHASE2 IS PRONE TO REENTRANCY

The code block performs a token transfer before updating the internal state (`stableTotalLocked`, `walletStableLocked[msg.sender]`). This violates the check-effects-interaction pattern, which is a best practice in smart contract development. If the token used is an ERC20 compatible ERC777 or has similar re-entrancy capabilities, the receiver of the transfer call could re-enter the contract and interact with it while its internal state is not yet updated, leading to unlimited withdrawals.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MINOR	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To respect the check-effects-interaction pattern, the internal state should be updated before interacting with external contracts (i.e., before calling the `transfer` function).

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#16 - LOCKDROPPHASE2 IS PRONE TO REENTRANCY

This vulnerability can lead to potential unlimited claims of the reward if the reward token adheres to the ERC777 standard, which is backward compatible with ERC20. Although it's currently minor as the reward token is supposedly the sparta token, it can be a major issue if any other tokens are used in the future.

The `getRewardAndSendOnVesting` function is designed to distribute rewards to a user in a two-fold manner: immediate transfer and vesting. The function first validates if the second phase of locking has ended, then calculates the total reward for the user, divides it in half, and sends one half immediately while the other half is designated for vesting.

The issue is that it does not follow the Check-Effects-Interaction (CEI) pattern. Specifically, it attempts to transfer tokens before updating the critical `userRewardWithdrawn` state variable. This sequence can potentially allow a reentrancy attack, exploiting the token's hooks to call `getRewardAndSendOnVesting` again before the state variable is updated.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MINOR	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

The solution to this vulnerability is to follow the Check-Effects-Interaction pattern by updating the state (`userRewardWithdrawn[msg.sender] = reward`) before attempting to transfer the tokens.

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#17 - POTENTIAL FOR CROSS-CHAIN REPLAY ATTACKS DUE TO HARD-CODED DOMAIN SEPARATOR

This vulnerability could lead to unauthorized transactions on a new chain after a split, posing significant security risks to users. In the worst case, assets could be unintentionally transferred or manipulated on the unintended chain.

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MINOR	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

To mitigate this vulnerability, it is recommended that the chain ID be computed dynamically rather than being hard-coded into the `DOMAIN_SEPARATOR` during initialization. This can be done using the `chainid()` function within the EVM

SPARTADEX

audit report

July 10, 2023

#18 - POTENTIAL FOR CROSS-CHAIN REPLAY ATTACKS DUE TO HARD-CODED DOMAIN SEPARATOR

The inconsistent usage of event parameters in the `LiquidityProvided` event can lead to confusion and incorrect data representation

<u>Severity</u>	<u>Status</u>
MINOR	RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION

1. Update the event declaration in the `ILockdropPhase1` contract to match the usage in the `LockdropPhase1` contract. If the last parameter represents the `_value`, revise the event declaration to reflect this.
2. Alternatively, if the intended usage is to represent the duration, modify the event emission in the `LockdropPhase1` contract to include the correct duration value instead of `_value`.

auditmos.com



contact@auditmos.com
