



# Everus Token Audit

OPENZEPPELIN SECURITY | OCTOBER 26, 2017

Security Audits



## Everus Token Audit

 OpenZeppelin | security

The [Everus](#) team asked us to review and audit their Everus Token (EVR) contract. We looked at the code and now publish our results.

The audited code is located in the [EverusWorld/Contracts](#) repository. The version used for this report is commit `41cd2da8382225b5f6e5eebd5eafae9dc9ae1b85`.

Here's our assessment and recommendations, in order of importance.



## High Severity

No issues of high severity.

## Medium Severity

No issues of medium severity.

## Low Severity

### Unnecessary low level `call`

The implementation of `approveAndCall` is using a low level `call` to invoke a function on another contract. A comment explains this is “*so one doesn’t have to include a contract in here just for this*”. We would actually strongly recommend including the extra contract, and replacing the usage of `call` for a Solidity function call. Manually crafting the function signature is highly error prone, and on top of that, the arguments are not typechecked. Consider adding an abstract contract with the `receiveApproval` function declared, and using it to implement `approveAndCall`.

### No Transfer event for minted tokens

It is recommended, in the ERC20 spec, to emit a `Transfer` event with the source (`_from`) set to `0x0` when minting new tokens. This enhances user experience by allowing applications such as Etherscan to learn of the new token holders. In this case this is only relevant for the constructor, where the initial balance is assigned to the contract creator. Nonetheless, consider emitting the corresponding event: `Transfer(0x0, msg.sender, _initialAmount)`.

## Notes & Additional Information

- The ERC20 implementation used is the HumanStandardToken from ConsenSys.
- It is generally recommended to use a safe math module because otherwise operations may silently overflow and cause bugs. In this case it is not strictly necessary because in this simple contract all integer amounts will be at most the token’s initial supply. However, it is something that should be kept in mind for any further lines of code added.



functionality of ERC20 tokens, described [here](#). Consider implementing one of the proposed mitigations, or using [the ERC20 implementation from OpenZeppelin](#) which already has one in place.

## Conclusion

No critical or high severity issues were found. Some small changes were proposed to follow best practices and reduce potential attack surface.

*Note that as of the date of publishing, the above review reflects the current understanding of known security patterns as they relate to the Everus Token contract. We have not reviewed the related Everus project. The above should not be construed as investment advice. For general information about smart contract security, check out our thoughts [here](#).*

## Related Posts



**Beefy**

Zap Audit



Beefy Zap Audit



**OpenBrush Contracts  
Library Security Review**



**OpenBrush Contracts  
Library Security Review**

OpenBrush is an open-source smart contract library written in the Rust programming language and the...



**Bridge Audit**



Linea Bridge Audit



Security Audits

Security Audits

Security Audits

**Defender Platform**

- Secure Code & Audit
- Secure Deploy
- Threat Monitoring
- Incident Response
- Operation and Automation

**Company**

- About us
- Jobs
- Blog

**Services**

- Smart Contract Security Audit
- Incident Response
- Zero Knowledge Proof Practice

**Contracts Library**

**Learn**

- Docs
- Ethernaut CTF
- Blog

**Docs**