

# Audit Report April, 2022

For





# Contents

Scope of Audit	01
Check Vulnerabilities	01
Techniques and Methods	02
Issue Categories	03
Number of security issues per severity.	03
Introduction	04
Issues Found – Code Review / Manual Testing	05
<b>A. Contract - GunFunny</b>	<b>05</b>
High Severity Issues	05
Medium Severity Issues	05
1. Unknown interface implementation	05
Informational Issues	05
2. Multiple pragma directives have been used	05
3. No check or guard For renounceOwnership	06
Functional Tests	07
Automated Tests	08
Closing Summary	09



## Scope of the Audit

The scope of this audit was to analyze and document the GunFunny smart contract codebase for quality, security, and correctness.

## Checked Vulnerabilities

We have scanned the smart contract for commonly known and more specific vulnerabilities. Here are some of the commonly known vulnerabilities that we considered:

- Re-entrancy
- Timestamp Dependence
- Gas Limit and Loops
- DoS with Block Gas Limit
- Transaction-Ordering Dependence
- Use of tx.origin
- Exception disorder
- Gasless send
- Balance equality
- Byte array
- Transfer forwards all gas
- ERC20 API violation
- Malicious libraries
- Compiler version not fixed
- Redundant fallback function
- Send instead of transfer
- Style guide violation
- Unchecked external call
- Unchecked math
- Unsafe type inference
- Implicit visibility level



## Techniques and Methods

Throughout the audit of smart contract, care was taken to ensure:

- The overall quality of code.
- Use of best practices.
- Code documentation and comments match logic and expected behaviour.
- Token distribution and calculations are as per the intended behaviour mentioned in the whitepaper.
- Implementation of ERC-20 token standards.
- Efficient use of gas.
- Code is safe from re-entrancy and other vulnerabilities.

The following techniques, methods and tools were used to review all the smart contracts.

### Structural Analysis

In this step, we have analysed the design patterns and structure of smart contracts. A thorough check was done to ensure the smart contract is structured in a way that will not result in future problems.

### Static Analysis

Static analysis of smart contracts was done to identify contract vulnerabilities. In this step, a series of automated tools are used to test the security of smart contracts.

### Code Review / Manual Analysis

Manual analysis or review of code was done to identify new vulnerabilities or verify the vulnerabilities found during the static analysis. Contracts were completely manually analysed, their logic was checked and compared with the one described in the whitepaper. Besides, the results of the automated analysis were manually verified.

### Gas Consumption

In this step, we have checked the behaviour of smart contracts in production. Checks were done to know how much gas gets consumed and the possibilities of optimization of code to reduce gas consumption.

### Tools and Platforms used for Audit

Remix IDE, Truffle, Truffle Team, Solhint, Mythril, Slither, Solidity statistic analysis.



## Issue Categories

Every issue in this report has been assigned to a severity level. There are four levels of severity, and each of them has been explained below.

Risk-level	Description
<b>High</b>	A high severity issue or vulnerability means that your smart contract can be exploited. Issues on this level are critical to the smart contract's performance or functionality, and we recommend these issues be fixed before moving to a live environment.
<b>Medium</b>	The issues marked as medium severity usually arise because of errors and deficiencies in the smart contract code. Issues on this level could potentially bring problems, and they should still be fixed.
<b>Low</b>	Low-level severity issues can cause minor impact and or are just warnings that can remain unfixed for now. It would be better to fix these issues at some point in the future.
<b>Informational</b>	These are severity issues that indicate an improvement request, a general question, a cosmetic or documentation error, or a request for information. There is low-to-no impact.

## Number of issues per severity

Type	High	Medium	Low	Informational
<b>Open</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Acknowledged</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Closed</b>	0	1	0	2



# Introduction

During the period of **April 4, 2022 to April 08 , 2022** - QuillAudits Team performed a security audit for GunFunny smart contracts.

The code for the audit was taken from the Auditee:

**GunFunny Contract:** <https://github.com/GunfunnyHQ/TokenContracts>

**Branch:** main

**Commit:** [86ab029](#)

**Fixed In:** [c30dc9d](#)

**Contract Address** - 0xDEd4c8adE892A81D65333DFc3b96a6F9a126E884



# Issues Found – Code Review / Manual Testing

## A. Contract - GunFunny

### High severity issues

No issues found

### Medium severity issues

1. Unknown interface implementation, we are not sure about the IBPContract interface, as it was not provided during the audit, which might be a malicious contract.

```
82 interface IBPContract {  
83     function protect(address sender, address receiver, uint256 amount) external;  
84 }
```

**Recommendation:** The Implementation smart contract should be provided for audit.

**Status:** Resolved

### Low severity issues

No issues found

### Informational Issues

2. Multiple pragma directives have been used

**Recommendation:** Contracts should be deployed using the same compiler version/flags with which they have been tested. Locking the pragma (for e.g. by not using ^ in pragma solidity 0.8.2) ensures that contracts do not accidentally get deployed using an older compiler version with unfixed bugs. Ref: [Security Pitfall 2](#)

**Status:** Resolved



### 3. No check or guard For renounceOwnership

**Recommendation:** Contracts should have a double check for renounceOwnership function , because this will make the contract to have address 0x000 as the admin, when Admin mistakenly calls the function.

**Status:** Resolved



## Functional Tests

Complete functional testing report has been attached [here](#)

Some of the tests performed are mentioned below:

- should be able to mint 5m token at deployment PASS
- should be able to burn PASS
- should revert to burnFrom PASS
- should be able to pause , transfer PASS
- should be able to approve a contract to spend token PASS
- should be able transfer PASS
- should be able to transferFrom PASS
- should be able to transferOwnership PASS
- should be able to unpause PASS
- should be able to acceptOwnership PASS
- should revert if paused and transfer is called PASS



## Automated Tests

No major issues were found. Some false positive errors were reported by the tools. All the other issues have been categorized above according to their level of severity.





## Closing Summary

In this report, we have considered the security of the GunFunny Smart Contract. We performed our audit according to the procedure described above.

The audit showed one medium and two informational severity issues, which the Auditee has fixed.





## Disclaimer

QuillAudits smart contract audit is not a security warranty, investment advice, or an endorsement of the GunFunny Platform. This audit does not provide a security or correctness guarantee of the audited smart contracts.

The statements made in this document should not be interpreted as investment or legal advice, nor should its authors be held accountable for decisions made based on them. Securing smart contracts is a multistep process. One audit cannot be considered enough. We recommend that the GunFunny Team put in place a bug bounty program to encourage further analysis of the smart contract by other third parties.



# Audit Report April, 2022

For



QuillAudits

📍 Canada, India, Singapore, United Kingdom

🌐 [audits.quillhash.com](https://audits.quillhash.com)

✉ [audits@quillhash.com](mailto:audits@quillhash.com)