



# MatrixSwap – DEX aggregator

## Smart Contract Security Audit

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: October 11th, 2021 – October 18th, 2021

Visit: [Halborn.com](https://Halborn.com)

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY	4
CONTACTS	4
1 EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	5
1.1 INTRODUCTION	6
1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY	6
1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	6
RISK METHODOLOGY	7
1.4 SCOPE	9
2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	10
3 FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	11
3.1 (HAL-01) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH NON-STANDARD ERC20 TOKENS - HIGH	13
Description	13
Proof of Concept	13
Code Location	14
Risk Level	14
Recommendation	14
Remediation Plan	15
3.2 (HAL-02) UNCHECKED TRANSFER - MEDIUM	16
Description	16
Code Location	16
Risk Level	16
Recommendation	16
Remediation Plan	16
3.3 (HAL-03) UNUSED RETURN - LOW	17

	Description	17
	Code Location	17
	Risk Level	17
	Recommendation	17
	Remediation Plan	17
3.4	(HAL-04) MISSING RE-ENTRANCY PROTECTION - LOW	18
	Description	18
	Code Location	18
	Risk Level	20
	Recommendation	20
	Remediation Plan	20
3.5	(HAL-05) USE OF BLOCK.TIMESTAMP - LOW	21
	Description	21
	Code Location	21
	Risk Level	21
	Recommendation	21
	Remediation Plan	21
3.6	(HAL-06) FLOATING PRAGMA - LOW	22
	Description	22
	Code Location	22
	Risk Level	22
	Recommendation	22
	Remediation Plan	23
3.7	(HAL-07) EXTERNAL CALLS WITHIN A LOOP - INFORMATIONAL	24
	Description	24

	Code Location	24
	Risk Level	26
	Recommendation	26
	Remediation Plan	27
3.8	(HAL-08) POSSIBLE MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNCTIONS - INFORMATIONAL	28
	Description	28
	Risk Level	28
	Recommendation	28
	Remediation Plan	29
3.9	(HAL-09) USE OF ASSERT FUNCTION - INFORMATIONAL	30
	Description	30
	Code Location	30
	Risk Level	30
	Recommendation	30
	Remediation Plan	31
4	MANUAL TESTING	32
4.1	TESTING CONTRACT INITIALIZATION FRONT-RUNNING	33
4.2	TESTING CONTRACT UPGRADEABILITY	35
5	AUTOMATED TESTING	36
5.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	37
	Description	37
	Slither results	37
5.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	40
	Description	40
	MythX results	40

## DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	10/11/2021	Roberto Reigada
0.2	Document Edits	10/18/2021	Roberto Reigada
0.3	Document Review	10/22/2021	Gabi Urrutia
1.0	Remediation Plan	11/04/2021	Roberto Reigada
1.1	Remediation Plan Edits	11/29/2021	Roberto Reigada
1.2	Remediation Plan Review	11/29/2021	Gabi Urrutia

## CONTACTS

CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL
Rob Behnke	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Rob.Behnke@halborn.com">Rob.Behnke@halborn.com</a>
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com">Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com</a>
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com">Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com</a>
Roberto Reigada	Halborn	<a href="mailto:Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com">Roberto.Reigada@halborn.com</a>



# EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW



## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

MatrixSwap engaged Halborn to conduct a security audit on their smart contracts beginning on October 11th, 2021 and ending on October 18th, 2021. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts provided in the Github repository [Matrixswap/Nebuchadnezzar - main branch](#)

## 1.2 AUDIT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided one week for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to audit the security of the smart contract. The security engineer is a blockchain and smart-contract security expert with advanced penetration testing, smart-contract hacking, and deep knowledge of multiple blockchain protocols.

The purpose of this audit is to:

- Ensure that smart contract functions operate as intended
- Identify potential security issues with the smart contracts

In summary, Halborn identified some security risks that were addressed by the [MatrixSwap team](#).

## 1.3 TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Halborn performed a combination of manual and automated security testing to balance efficiency, timeliness, practicality, and accuracy in regard to the scope of this audit. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the bridge code and can quickly identify items that do not follow security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used throughout the term of the audit:

- Research into architecture and purpose
- Smart contract manual code review and walkthrough
- Graphing out functionality and contract logic/connectivity/functions ([solgraph](#))
- Manual assessment of use and safety for the critical Solidity variables and functions in scope to identify any arithmetic related vulnerability classes
- Manual testing by custom scripts
- Scanning of solidity files for vulnerabilities, security hotspots or bugs. ([MythX](#))
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. ([Slither](#))
- Testnet deployment ([Brownie](#), [Remix IDE](#))

#### RISK METHODOLOGY:

Vulnerabilities or issues observed by Halborn are ranked based on the risk assessment methodology by measuring the **LIKELIHOOD** of a security incident, and the **IMPACT** should an incident occur. This framework works for communicating the characteristics and impacts of technology vulnerabilities. It's quantitative model ensures repeatable and accurate measurement while enabling users to see the underlying vulnerability characteristics that was used to generate the Risk scores. For every vulnerability, a risk level will be calculated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the highest likelihood or impact.

#### RISK SCALE - LIKELIHOOD

- 5 - Almost certain an incident will occur.
- 4 - High probability of an incident occurring.
- 3 - Potential of a security incident in the long term.
- 2 - Low probability of an incident occurring.
- 1 - Very unlikely issue will cause an incident.

#### RISK SCALE - IMPACT

- 5 - May cause devastating and unrecoverable impact or loss.
- 4 - May cause a significant level of impact or loss.



- 3 - May cause a partial impact or loss to many.
- 2 - May cause temporary impact or loss.
- 1 - May cause minimal or un-noticeable impact.

The risk level is then calculated using a sum of these two values, creating a value of 10 to 1 with 10 being the highest level of security risk.

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
----------	------	--------	-----	---------------

- 10 - CRITICAL
- 9 - 8 - HIGH
- 7 - 6 - MEDIUM
- 5 - 4 - LOW
- 3 - 1 - VERY LOW AND INFORMATIONAL

## 1.4 SCOPE

IN-SCOPE:

The security assessment was scoped to the following [smart contracts](#)

- [TokenPrice.sol](#)
- [Box.sol](#)
- [ApprovedTokens.sol](#)
- [AllRouterSwap.sol](#)
- All contracts inherited by these contracts

Commit ID: [ab7712521e699c6a8a99275d51662ebecffd63b0](#)

1st remediations Commit ID: [a0ff1260d21d253bab3b4ee053d8bbaf79ea6f2c](#)

2nd remediations Commit ID: [7fe0037de0bf9254b82e6726ff38dda1da2e57dc](#)

## 2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
0	1	1	4	3

### LIKELIHOOD

IMPACT

	(HAL-02)		(HAL-01)	
(HAL-04) (HAL-06)	(HAL-03)			
(HAL-07) (HAL-08) (HAL-09)		(HAL-05)		

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
HAL01 - INCOMPATIBILITY WITH NON-STANDARD ERC20 TOKENS	High	SOLVED - 11/29/2021
HAL02 - UNCHECKED TRANSFER	Medium	SOLVED - 11/04/2021
HAL03 - UNUSED RETURN	Low	SOLVED - 11/04/2021
HAL04 - MISSING RE-ENTRANCY PROTECTION	Low	SOLVED - 11/04/2021
HAL05 - USE OF BLOCK.TIMESTAMP	Low	SOLVED - 11/04/2021
HAL06 - FLOATING PRAGMA	Low	SOLVED - 11/04/2021
HAL07 - EXTERNAL CALLS WITHIN A LOOP	Informational	SOLVED - 11/04/2021
HAL08 - POSSIBLE MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNCTIONS	Informational	SOLVED - 11/04/2021
HAL09 - USE OF ASSERT FUNCTION	Informational	SOLVED - 11/04/2021



# FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS



### 3.1 (HAL-01) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH NON-STANDARD ERC20 TOKENS - HIGH

#### Description:

Some tokens (like USDT) don't correctly implement the EIP20 standard and their transfer/transferFrom functions return void, instead of a success boolean. Calling these functions with the correct EIP20 function signatures will always revert as it is done in the contract `AllRouterSwap.sol`.

Tokens that don't correctly implement the latest EIP20 spec, like USDT, will be unusable in the smart contract as they revert the transaction because of the missing return value.

We recommend using OpenZeppelin's SafeERC20 versions with the `safeTransfer` and `safeTransferFrom` functions that handle the return value check as well as non-standard-compliant tokens. On the other hand, in the 1st remediations Commit ID [a0ff1260d21d253bab3b4ee053d8bbaf79ea6f2c](#) the same issue with the `approve` function was added into the code.

#### Proof of Concept:

```
SwapHalbornTest (test_swap) deployed and initialized

Calling -> test_swap.swapToETHMock(erc20token.address, 10)
Transaction sent: 0x1b9bbf7b43d9c16ee90d579fbceela5e93921cfd5384a0b185b888c6fce4dc45
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 32
SwapHalbornTest.swapToETHMock confirmed Block: 13546090 Gas used: 46251 (0.69%)

Call trace for '0x1b9bbf7b43d9c16ee90d579fbceela5e93921cfd5384a0b185b888c6fce4dc45':
Initial call cost [21572 gas]
SwapHalbornTest.swapToETHMock 0:436 [1437 / 24679 gas]
├── MyToken.approve [CALL] 132:344 [1117 / 23242 gas]
│   ├── address: ERC20Token.address
│   ├── value: 0
│   └── input arguments:
│       ├── spender: test_swap.address
│       └── amount: 10
│       └── return value: True
├── ERC20Upgradeable.approve 231:324 [50 / 22125 gas]
└── ERC20Upgradeable._approve 239:316 [22075 gas]

Calling -> test_swap.swapToETHMock(usdt.address, 10)
Transaction sent: 0x0cd49e436c7e8fa9790cb35c120029e92476d3d098aec9a46b70f4dc25b8d451
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 35
SwapHalbornTest.swapToETHMock confirmed (reverted) Block: 13546091 Gas used: 47806 (0.71%)

Call trace for '0x0cd49e436c7e8fa9790cb35c120029e92476d3d098aec9a46b70f4dc25b8d451':
Initial call cost [21572 gas]
SwapHalbornTest.swapToETHMock 0:398 [1293 / 26234 gas]
├── TetherToken.approve [CALL] 132:352 [1885 / 24941 gas]
│   ├── address: usdt.address
│   ├── value: 0
│   └── input arguments:
│       ├── spender: test_swap.address
│       └── _value: 10
└── StandardToken.approve 233:345 [23056 gas]
```

**Code Location:**

- `require(IERC20(inputToken).transfer(msg.sender, _amountIn), errorMessage);` (AllRouterSwap.sol#296)
- `require(IERC20(inputToken).transfer(msg.sender, _amountIn), errorMessage);` (AllRouterSwap.sol#308)

1st remediations Commit ID `a0ff1260d21d253bab3b4ee053d8bbaf79ea6f2c`:

**Listing 1: AllRouterSwap.sol**

```
165 bool approved = IERC20Upgradeable(_tokenAddress).approve(address(
    _router), _amountIn.add(1000000000000000000));
166 require(approved, errorMessage);
```

**Listing 2: AllRouterSwap.sol**

```
196 bool approved = IERC20Upgradeable(_firstPath).approve(address(
    _router), _amountIn);
197 require(approved, errorMessage);
```

**Listing 3: AllRouterSwap.sol**

```
196 bool approved = IERC20Upgradeable(_tokenAddress).approve(address(
    _router), _amountIn.add(1000000000000000000));
197 require(approved, errorMessage);
```

**Risk Level:**

**Likelihood - 4**

**Impact - 4**

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended to use `SafeERC20`: `safeTransfer` and `safeApprove`.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap` team correctly uses now `safeTransfer` and `safeApprove`. The contract is now compatible with non-standard ERC20 tokens like USDT. Fixed in commit ID `7fe0037de0bf9254b82e6726ff38dda1da2e57dc`.



## 3.2 (HAL-02) UNCHECKED TRANSFER - MEDIUM

### Description:

In the contract `AllRouterSwap.sol` the return value of some external transfer/transferFrom calls are not checked. Several tokens do not revert in case of failure and return false. If one of these tokens is used, a deposit would not revert if the transfer fails, and an attacker could deposit tokens for free.

### Code Location:

- `IERC20(inputToken).transfer(owner,_fee)` (`AllRouterSwap.sol#148`)
- `IERC20(_firstPath).transfer(owner,_fee)` (`AllRouterSwap.sol#176`)
- `IERC20(_tokenAddress).transfer(owner,_fee)` (`AllRouterSwap.sol#196`)
- `IERC20(_token).transferFrom(msg.sender,address(this),_amountIn)` (`AllRouterSwap.sol#211`)
- `IERC20(inputToken).transferFrom(msg.sender,address(this),_amountIn[i])` (`AllRouterSwap.sol#331`)

### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 2**

**Impact - 4**

### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use `SafeERC20`, or ensure that the transfer/transferFrom return value is checked.

### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap team` correctly uses now `safeTransfer` and `safeTransferFrom`.

### 3.3 (HAL-03) UNUSED RETURN - LOW

Description:

The return value of some external calls are not stored in a local or state variable. In the contract `AllRouterSwap.sol` there are instances where external methods are being called and the return values are ignored.

## Code Location:

- IERC20(\_tokenAddress).approve(address(\_router),\_amountIn.add(1000000000000000000000)) (AllRouterSwap.sol#150)
- IERC20(\_firstPath).approve(address(\_router),\_amountIn) (AllRouterSwap.sol#179)
- \_router.swapExactTokensForETH(\_amountIn,\_minimumAmountOut,\_path,msg.sender,block.timestamp + 180) (AllRouterSwap.sol#180-186)
- IERC20(\_tokenAddress).approve(address(\_router),\_amountIn.add(1000000000000000000000)) (AllRouterSwap.sol#199)

Risk Level:

## Likelihood - 2

### Impact - 3

### Recommendation:

Ensure that all the return values of the function calls are used. Add a return value check to avoid an unexpected crash of the contract.

### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap` team correctly uses now `safeApprove`.

### 3.4 (HAL-04) MISSING RE-ENTRANCY PROTECTION - LOW

#### Description:

It was identified that the contract `AllRouterSwap` is missing `nonReentrant` guard in the public functions `swap` and `swapToETH`. Even if the functions are following the check-effects-interactions pattern we still recommend to use a mutex in order to be protected against cross-function reentrancy attacks. By using this lock, an attacker can no longer exploit the function with a recursive call. OpenZeppelin has its own mutex implementation called `ReentrancyGuard` which provides a modifier to any function called `nonReentrant` that guards the function with a mutex against the Reentrancy attacks.

#### Code Location:

##### Listing 4: AllRouterSwap.sol

```

312 function swap(uint[] memory _amountIn, address[] memory _token,
    uint8[][] memory _swapRoute, bool[] memory _isEth, address
    _tokenTarget, bool _isMultiToSingleToken, bool _isSingleEth,
    uint[] memory _minimumAmountOut, bool _isNukeTx) public payable
313 {
314     isSingleEth = _isSingleEth;
315     isMultiToSingleToken = _isMultiToSingleToken;
316     isMultiSwap = _token.length > 1;
317     isNukeTx = _isNukeTx;
318
319     for (uint8 i = 0; i < _token.length; i++)
320     {
321         inputToken = SwapLibrary._getToken(_token[i], _tokenTarget
            , _isMultiToSingleToken, true);
322         outputToken = SwapLibrary._getToken(_token[i],
            _tokenTarget, _isMultiToSingleToken, false);
323
324         if (!_isSingleEth && !_isMultiToSingleToken && _isEth[i])
325         {

```

```

326         _everySwapToEth(_amountIn[i], inputToken, _swapRoute[i
           ], _minimumAmountOut[i]);
327         continue;
328     }
329     else if (!(SwapLibrary._isInputAllEth(isMultiToSingleToken
           , isSingleEth) || (_isEth[i] && isMultiToSingleToken)))
330     {
331         IERC20(inputToken).transferFrom(msg.sender, address(
           this), _amountIn[i]);
332     }
333
334     // 1 Router, 2 Tokens
335     if (_swapRoute[i][0] == _swapRoute[i][2] && _swapRoute[i
           ][1] == 0)
336     {
337         _twoTokensSwap(routerList[_swapRoute[i][0]-1],
           _amountIn[i], _isEth[i], _minimumAmountOut[i]);
338     }
339
340     // 1 Router, 3 Tokens
341     else if (_swapRoute[i][0] == _swapRoute[i][2] &&
           _swapRoute[i][1] > 0)
342     {
343         _threeTokensSwap(commonTokens[_swapRoute[i][1]-1],
           routerList[_swapRoute[i][0]-1], _amountIn[i],
           _isEth[i], _minimumAmountOut[i]);
344     }
345
346     // 2 Routers, 3 Tokens
347     else if (_swapRoute[i][0] != _swapRoute[i][2])
348     {
349         _twoRoutersSwap(commonTokens[_swapRoute[i][1]-1],
           routerList[_swapRoute[i][0]-1], routerList[
           _swapRoute[i][2]-1], _amountIn[i], _isEth[i],
           _minimumAmountOut[i]);
350     }
351 }
352 }
353
354 function swapToETH(uint[] memory _amountIn, address[] memory
           _token, uint8[][] memory _swapRoute, uint[] memory
           _minimumAmountOut) public
355 {
356     isMultiSwap = _token.length > 1;

```

```
357     for (uint i = 0; i < _token.length; i++)
358     {
359         inputToken = _token[i];
360         outputToken = addressWETH;
361         _everySwapToEth(_amountIn[i], _token[i], _swapRoute[i],
            _minimumAmountOut[i]);
362     }
363 }
```

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 3**

#### Recommendation:

We recommend using ReentrancyGuard through the `nonReentrant` modifier.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap team` correctly added the `nonReentrant` modifier.

## 3.5 (HAL-05) USE OF BLOCK.TIMESTAMP - LOW

### Description:

During a manual review, we noticed the use of `block.timestamp`. The contract developers should be aware that this does not mean current time. Miners can influence the value of `block.timestamp` to perform Maximal Extractable Value (MEV) attacks. The use of `block.timestamp` creates a risk that miners could perform time manipulation to influence price oracles. Miners can modify the timestamp by up to 900 seconds.

### Code Location:

- `block.timestamp + 180` (AllRouterSwap.sol#139)
- `block.timestamp + 180` (AllRouterSwap.sol#156)
- `block.timestamp + 180` (AllRouterSwap.sol#185)
- `block.timestamp + 180` (AllRouterSwap.sol#205)

### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 3**

**Impact - 1**

### Recommendation:

Use `block.number` instead of `block.timestamp` or now to reduce the risk of Maximal Extractable Value (MEV) attacks. Check if the timescale of the project occurs across years, days and months rather than seconds. If possible, it is recommended to use Oracles.

### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap` team is not using `block.timestamp` anymore in the smart contract.

## 3.6 (HAL-06) FLOATING PRAGMA - LOW

### Description:

Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags used during development and testing. Locking the pragma helps to ensure that contracts do not accidentally get deployed using another pragma. For example, an outdated pragma version might introduce bugs that affect the contract system negatively or recently released pragma versions may have unknown security vulnerabilities.

### Code Location:

#### Listing 5

```
1 utils/SafeMath.sol:3:pragma solidity ^0.8.0;  
2 utils/Initializable.sol:3:pragma solidity ^0.8.0;  
3 TokenPrice.sol:2:pragma solidity ^0.8.0;  
4 library/SwapLibrary.sol:2:pragma solidity ^0.8.0;  
5 Box.sol:3:pragma solidity ^0.8.0;  
6 ApprovedTokens.sol:2:pragma solidity ^0.8.7;  
7 AllRouterSwap.sol:2:pragma solidity ^0.8.7;  
8 AdminBox.sol:3:pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
```

### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 3**

### Recommendation:

Consider locking the pragma version. It is not recommended to use a floating pragma in production. It is possible to lock the pragma by fixing the version both in truffle-config.js for Truffle framework or in hardhat.config.js for HardHat framework.

### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap team` correctly locked the pragma version to the `0.8.7` version.



## 3.7 (HAL-07) EXTERNAL CALLS WITHIN A LOOP – INFORMATIONAL

### Description:

Calls inside a loop might lead to a Denial of Service attack. If the `i` variable iterates up to a very high value or is reset by the external functions called, this could cause a Denial of Service.

### Code Location:

ApprovedTokens.sol

Listing 6: ApprovedTokens.sol (Lines 29,31,35)

```

23 function searchApprovedTokens(address[] memory _tokens)
24     external
25     view
26     returns (address[] memory)
27 {
28     address[] memory _approvedTokens = new address[](_tokens.
        length);
29     for (uint16 i = 0; i < _tokens.length; i++) {
30         console.log("token:", _tokens[i]);
31         uint256 _allowance = IERC20(_tokens[i]).allowance(
32             msg.sender,
33             swapContract
34         );
35         uint256 _balance = IERC20(_tokens[i]).balanceOf(msg.sender
        );
36         // console.log("_allowance:", _allowance);
37         // console.log("_balance:", _balance);
38
39         if (_allowance > _balance) {
40             _approvedTokens[i] = (_tokens[i]);
41         }
42     }
43     return _approvedTokens;
44 }

```

## AllRouterSwap.sol

Listing 7: AllRouterSwap.sol (Lines 319,321,322,326,329,331,337,343,349,357,361)

```

312 function swap(uint[] memory _amountIn, address[] memory _token,
    uint8[][] memory _swapRoute, bool[] memory _isEth, address
    _tokenTarget, bool _isMultiToSingleToken, bool _isSingleEth,
    uint[] memory _minimumAmountOut, bool _isNukeTx) public payable
313 {
314     isSingleEth = _isSingleEth;
315     isMultiToSingleToken = _isMultiToSingleToken;
316     isMultiSwap = _token.length > 1;
317     isNukeTx = _isNukeTx;
318
319     for (uint8 i = 0; i < _token.length; i++)
320     {
321         inputToken = SwapLibrary._getToken(_token[i], _tokenTarget
            , _isMultiToSingleToken, true);
322         outputToken = SwapLibrary._getToken(_token[i],
            _tokenTarget, _isMultiToSingleToken, false);
323
324         if (!_isSingleEth && !_isMultiToSingleToken && _isEth[i])
325         {
326             _everySwapToEth(_amountIn[i], inputToken, _swapRoute[i]
                , _minimumAmountOut[i]);
327             continue;
328         }
329         else if (!(SwapLibrary._isInputAllEth(isMultiToSingleToken
            , isSingleEth) || (_isEth[i] && isMultiToSingleToken)))
330         {
331             IERC20(inputToken).transferFrom(msg.sender, address(
                this), _amountIn[i]);
332         }
333
334         // 1 Router, 2 Tokens
335         if (_swapRoute[i][0] == _swapRoute[i][2] && _swapRoute[i]
            ][1] == 0)
336         {
337             _twoTokensSwap(routerList[_swapRoute[i][0]-1],
                _amountIn[i], _isEth[i], _minimumAmountOut[i]);
338         }
339
340         // 1 Router, 3 Tokens
341         else if (_swapRoute[i][0] == _swapRoute[i][2] &&

```

```

        _swapRoute[i][1] > 0)
342     {
343         _threeTokensSwap(commonTokens[_swapRoute[i][1]-1],
            routerList[_swapRoute[i][0]-1], _amountIn[i],
            _isEth[i], _minimumAmountOut[i]);
344     }
345
346     // 2 Routers, 3 Tokens
347     else if (_swapRoute[i][0] != _swapRoute[i][2])
348     {
349         _twoRoutersSwap(commonTokens[_swapRoute[i][1]-1],
            routerList[_swapRoute[i][0]-1], routerList[
            _swapRoute[i][2]-1], _amountIn[i], _isEth[i],
            _minimumAmountOut[i]);
350     }
351 }
352 }
353
354 function swapToETH(uint[] memory _amountIn, address[] memory
    _token, uint8[][] memory _swapRoute, uint[] memory
    _minimumAmountOut) public
355 {
356     isMultiSwap = _token.length > 1;
357     for (uint i = 0; i < _token.length; i++)
358     {
359         inputToken = _token[i];
360         outputToken = addressWETH;
361         _everySwapToEth(_amountIn[i], _token[i], _swapRoute[i],
            _minimumAmountOut[i]);
362     }
363 }

```

Risk Level:

Likelihood - 1

Impact - 1

Recommendation:

If possible, use pull over push strategy for external calls or limit the max. size of the arrays being iterated.

## Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The **MatrixSwap team** correctly limited the maximum iterations of the loops by casting the **i** variable to **uint8** and adding a **require** statement. For example:

Listing 8: AllRouterSwap.sol (Lines 381,387)

```

379 function swapToETH(uint[] memory _amountIn, address[] memory
    _token, uint8[][] memory _swapRoute, uint[] memory
    _minimumAmountOut, uint[] memory _uintArray) external
    nonReentrant
380 {
381     require(_token.length < uint8(40), "Block gas limit exceeded")
        ;
382     // uint[] memory _uintArray = [_discount, _deadline]
383     isMultiSwap = _token.length > 1;
384     discount = _uintArray[0];
385     deadline = _uintArray[1];
386
387     for (uint8 i = 0; i < _token.length; i++)
388     {
389         inputToken = _token[i];
390         outputToken = addressWETH;
391         _everySwapToEth(_amountIn[i], _token[i], _swapRoute[i],
            _minimumAmountOut[i]);
392     }
393 }

```

### 3.8 (HAL-08) POSSIBLE MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNCTIONS – INFORMATIONAL

#### Description:

In the contract `Box.sol` there are functions marked as public but they are never directly called within the same contract or in any of its descendants:

#### `Box.sol`

- `store(uint256)` (`Box.sol`#12-15)
- `retrieve()` (`Box.sol`#18-20)
- `decrement()` (`Box.sol`#22-25)

#### `AllRouterSwap.sol`

- `initialize(address,address,address[],address[])` (`AllRouterSwap.sol`#64-77)
- `changeOwner(address)` (`AllRouterSwap.sol`#88-91)
- `addCommonToken(address)` (`AllRouterSwap.sol`#93-96)
- `showOwner()` (`AllRouterSwap.sol`#98-101)
- `swap(uint256[],address[],uint8[][][],bool[],address,bool,bool,uint256[],bool)` (`AllRouterSwap.sol`#312-352)
- `swapToETH(uint256[],address[],uint8[][][],uint256[])` (`AllRouterSwap.sol`#354-363)

#### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 1**

#### Recommendation:

If the function is not intended to be called internally or by descendants, it is better to mark all these functions as `external` to reduce gas costs.

### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap team` set all the mentioned functions as external to reduce gas costs.

## 3.9 (HAL-09) USE OF ASSERT FUNCTION – INFORMATIONAL

### Description:

In the contract `AllRouterSwap.sol` the function `assert` is used. As per [Solidity documentation](#):

The `assert` function creates an error of type `Panic(uint256)`. `Assert` should only be used to test for internal errors, and to check invariants. Properly functioning code should never create a `Panic`, not even on invalid external input.

### Code Location:

#### Listing 9: Assert1 (Lines 125)

```
121 if (SwapLibrary._isWrapUnwrap(_path[0], _path[1], addressWETH))
122 {
123     WETH = IWETH(_path[0]);
124     WETH.deposit{value: _amountIn}();
125     assert(WETH.transfer(msg.sender, _amountIn));
126 }
```

### Risk Level:

**Likelihood - 1**

**Impact - 1**

### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use a `require` statement instead.

Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The `MatrixSwap team` is correctly using now a `require` statement.





# MANUAL TESTING



## 4.1 TESTING CONTRACT INITIALIZATION FRONT-RUNNING

As the contracts `Swap` and `AdminBox` make use of `initialize` functions we have checked if they could be front-run but this is not the case as they have a `constructor`:

“Do not leave an implementation contract uninitialized. An uninitialized implementation contract can be taken over by an attacker, which may impact the proxy. You can either invoke the initializer manually, or you can include a constructor to automatically mark it as initialized when it is deployed”:

`AdminBox` contract

```

7  contract AdminBox is Initializable {
8      uint256 private _value;
9      address private _admin;
10     address[] private _admin2;
11     uint256 private _addedNumber;
12
13     // Emitted when the stored value changes
14     event ValueChanged(uint256 value);
15
16     function initialize(address admin, address[] memory admin2) public initializer {
17         _admin = admin;
18         _admin2 = admin2;
19         _addedNumber = 69;
20     }
21
22     /// @custom:oz-upgrades-unsafe-allow constructor
23     constructor() initializer {}

```

`Swap` contract

```

64     function initialize(address _owner, address _admin, address[] memory _routerList, addre
65     {
66         errorMessage = "Tx Fail";
67         amount = new uint[](2);
68
69         owner = _owner;
70         admin = _admin;
71         commonTokens = _commonTokens;
72
73         for (uint8 i = 0; i < _routerList.length; i++)
74         {
75             routerList.push(IUniswapV2Router02(_routerList[i]));
76         }
77     }
78
79     /// @custom:oz-upgrades-unsafe-allow constructor
80     constructor() initializer {}

```

Below we can see how they were automatically initialized right after being deployed:

```
>>> swapcontract = owner.deploy(Swap)
Transaction sent: 0x9eb75cb104ab52298324ddb309a334805eddc5aecaccf46bdd22f25d5f2de4d0
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 0
Swap.constructor confirmed Block: 13449735 Gas used: 2882072 (42.88%)
Swap deployed at: 0x201d80501fD8c318d806Dcc8BAad4f85c634fbf2

>>> swapcontract.initialize(owner.address, user1.address, ['0xA102072A4C07F06EC3B4900FDC4C7B80b6c57429', '0x1b02dA8Cb0d097e88D57A175b88c7D8b47997506',
'0xa5E0829CaEd8fFDD4De3c43696c57F7D7A678f', '0xC0788A3aD43d79aa53B09cc2EaCc313A787d1de07', '0x6466CDC2615f11dc6Dbd0EfeFDD209F5Ff8d184',
'0xb3b20c485F7a2d438a9901DC4A0E2aC477D9F28', '0xc608E14F4568b102F9Ca6246a999123440088', '0x6466CDC2615f11dc6Dbd0EfeFDD209F5Ff8d184',
'0x3a1D87F206D12415f5b0A33E7869e7e80AAB4fed', '0x3a1D87F206D12415f5b0A33E7869e7e80AAB4fed'],
['0x04050081d8f8e3f3121c9941D09a6444d3Adf1270', '0x7ceb23fd6bc0adD58F62ac25578270cFf1b9f619', '0x2791Bca1f2de4661ED88A30C99A7a9449Aa4174',
'0xc2132D05D31c914a87C6611C10748AEb04B58e8F', '0x8f3C7ad23Cd3CadDbD9735Aff958023239c6A063'])
Transaction sent: 0xf892920f7834e6fc30de0f88b38d858a01229aca5cc853c02056561e83bbe7cf
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 1
Swap.initialize confirmed (Initializable: contract is already initialized) Block: 13449736 Gas used: 33166 (0.49%)

<Transaction '0xf892920f7834e6fc30de0f88b38d858a01229aca5cc853c02056561e83bbe7cf'>
>>> adminbox = owner.deploy(AdminBox)
Transaction sent: 0x97aa59423ac610346982a303236ec78e45c35fa1529264c5c70708a2f0f9f43
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 2
AdminBox.constructor confirmed Block: 13449737 Gas used: 341605 (5.08%)
AdminBox deployed at: 0xb7826c89f7EE9f6807e686243855d788b358074

>>> adminbox.initialize(owner.address, [user1.address])
Transaction sent: 0x6582a5dc3bd2ff2ba4ad8e9990dc05fa84d7c92d3d20117c9d00246f5fd5bc6c
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 3
AdminBox.initialize confirmed (Initializable: contract is already initialized) Block: 13449738 Gas used: 24714 (0.37%)

<Transaction '0x6582a5dc3bd2ff2ba4ad8e9990dc05fa84d7c92d3d20117c9d00246f5fd5bc6c'>
```

## 4.2 TESTING CONTRACT UPGRADEABILITY

In this test we wanted to test the upgradeability of the contract. In order to do that we have created a `SwapV2` contract which adds a new simple getter function:

Listing 10: SwapV2 - `getisSingleEth()`

```
1 function get_isSingleEth() public view returns (bool){
2     return isSingleEth;
3 }
```

`SwapV1` was deployed. As the next step, the owner of the `SwapV1` contract was updated by calling `changeOwner` function. The new owner is `accounts[1]`. Then using a proxy upgrade pattern, we upgraded the `Swap` contract to the `SwapV2`, checked that the owner of the `SwapV2` contract was still `accounts[1]` and called the new function:

```
>>> account = accounts[0]
>>> swap = Swap.deploy({"from": account})
Transaction sent: 0xd402acf4cd58f6ea6d941d8383dbd49c14ae3db710872ef08c5f28916ca21622
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 0
Swap.constructor confirmed Block: 13455454 Gas used: 2528244 (43.56%)
Swap deployed at: 0x98c7497555271f2e08e32ab0fb1fd172E51876E

>>> proxy_admin = ProxyAdmin.deploy({"from": account})
Transaction sent: 0x81928659c9f40a9ba5ae178f83812c45c802e5387b2a3510f8a9ed9af0fd703
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 1
ProxyAdmin.constructor confirmed Block: 13455455 Gas used: 471462 (7.01%)
ProxyAdmin deployed at: 0xb8Caf26Fb113D011A021BE0D77Ff5562dcb91A72

>>> swap_encoded_initializer_function = encode_function_data(swap.initialize, account.address, [], [])
>>> proxy = TransparentUpgradeableProxy.deploy(swap.address, proxy_admin.address, swap_encoded_initializer_function, {"from": account, "gas_limit": 1000000})
Transaction sent: 0x859393237dce779060c4d7f2eb88cd9f9cd225c1ffab0d77bd9b867e05516b0eecc
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 1000000 Nonce: 2
TransparentUpgradeableProxy.constructor confirmed Block: 13455456 Gas used: 704818 (70.48%)
TransparentUpgradeableProxy deployed at: 0x9f61590eD0321cDe909680FE1BFe98A45CA4Cf7

>>> proxy_box = Contract.from_abi("Swap", proxy.address, Swap.abi)
>>> proxy_box.changeOwner(accounts[1].address, {"from": account})
Transaction sent: 0x855fd72027414be3c944640efd6615a5772b4b5fa3747077497decf6f4540eac9
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 3
Transaction confirmed Block: 13455457 Gas used: 31275 (0.47%)

<Transaction '0x855fd72027414be3c944640efd6615a5772b4b5fa3747077497decf6f4540eac9'>
>>> output.redd("proxy_box.showOwner() -> " + str(proxy_box.showOwner()))
proxy_box.showOwner() -> 0x8f95a4d83337d1aBcb8Ae42d503D551d2f0E5bfa
>>> a[1]
<Account '0x8f95a4d83337d1aBcb8Ae42d503D551d2f0E5bfa'>
>>> swap_v2 = SwapV2.deploy({"from": account})
Transaction sent: 0x75da008fab729be775ae7219eb982a1817f5c52284df40c4eadb2ca8080aa77
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 4
SwapV2.constructor confirmed Block: 13455458 Gas used: 2897292 (43.10%)
SwapV2 deployed at: 0x87CED42BCB7276eA111909e757D97249862eBd46

>>> upgrade(account, proxy, swap_v2, proxy_admin.contract.proxy_admin)
Transaction sent: 0x7cd0b11300110491f802f95f0289079e20a8333b51926c68eae6daf87a5073a2
Gas price: 0.0 gwei Gas limit: 6721975 Nonce: 5
ProxyAdmin.upgrade confirmed Block: 13455459 Gas used: 33800 (0.50%)

<Transaction '0x7cd0b11300110491f802f95f0289079e20a8333b51926c68eae6daf87a5073a2'>
>>> proxy_box = Contract.from_abi("SwapV2", proxy.address, SwapV2.abi)
>>> output.redd("proxy_box.get_isSingleEth({'from': account}) -> " + str(proxy_box.get_isSingleEth({'from': account})))
proxy_box.get_isSingleEth({'from': account}) -> False
>>> output.redd("proxy_box.showOwner() -> " + str(proxy_box.showOwner()))
proxy_box.showOwner() -> 0x8f95a4d83337d1aBcb8Ae42d503D551d2f0E5bfa
>>> a[1]
<Account '0x8f95a4d83337d1aBcb8Ae42d503D551d2f0E5bfa'>
```

It is also possible, as included in the test cases of the project, to upgrade the contract using the [OpenZeppelin Upgrades Plugins](#).



# AUTOMATED TESTING



## 5.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

### Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the scoped contracts. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified all the contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their abi and binary formats, Slither was run on the all-scoped contracts. This tool can statically verify mathematical relationships between Solidity variables to detect invalid or inconsistent usage of the contracts' APIs across the entire code-base.

### Slither results:

#### TokenPrice.sol

```
INFO:Detectors:
TokenPrice_getPriceOutputCommonToken(uint256,address[]).amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#181) is a local variable never initialized
TokenPrice_getPriceDiffRouters(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#160) is a local variable never initialized
TokenPrice_getPriceThreeTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#129) is a local variable never initialized
TokenPrice_getPriceTwoTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#108) is a local variable never initialized
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#uninitialized-local-variables
INFO:Detectors:
TokenPrice_getPriceTwoTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#108-116) ignores return value by _router.getAmountOut(_amountIn,_path) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#108-113)
TokenPrice_getPriceThreeTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#118-142) ignores return value by _router.getAmountOut(_amountIn,_newPath) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#118-140)
TokenPrice_getPriceDiffRouters(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#144-175) ignores return value by _routerIn.getAmountOut(_amountIn,_newPath) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#160-173)
TokenPrice_getPriceOutputCommonToken(uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#177-194) ignores return value by _routerList[i].getAmountOut(_amountIn,_path) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#191-192)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#unused-return
INFO:Detectors:
TokenPrice_getPriceThreeTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#118-142) has external calls inside a loop: _router.getAmountOut(_amountIn,_newPath) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#118-140)
TokenPrice_getPriceDiffRouters(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#144-175) has external calls inside a loop: _routerIn.getAmountOut(_amountIn,_newPath) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#160-173)
TokenPrice_getPriceOutputCommonToken(uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#177-194) has external calls inside a loop: _routerList[i].getAmountOut(_amountIn,_path) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#191-192)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#calls-inside-a-loop
INFO:Detectors:
Variable TokenPrice_getPriceTwoTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#108) in TokenPrice_getPriceTwoTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#108-116) potentially u
sed before declaration: _price[0] = amounts[1] (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#110)
Variable TokenPrice_getPriceThreeTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#129) in TokenPrice_getPriceThreeTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#118-142) potential
ly used before declaration: _price[0] < amounts[2] (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#131)
Variable TokenPrice_getPriceThreeTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#129) in TokenPrice_getPriceThreeTokens(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#118-142) potential
ly used before declaration: _price[0] = amounts[2] (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#131)
Variable TokenPrice_getPriceDiffRouters(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#140) in TokenPrice_getPriceDiffRouters(IDelegateV2Router02,uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#144-175) potential
ly used before declaration: _price[0] = _getPriceOutputCommonToken(amountIn,_passedPath) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#142)
Variable TokenPrice_getPriceOutputCommonToken(uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#181) in TokenPrice_getPriceOutputCommonToken(uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#177-194) potentially used before declaration
: _price[0] < amounts[1] (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#183)
Variable TokenPrice_getPriceOutputCommonToken(uint256,address[]) amounts (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#181) in TokenPrice_getPriceOutputCommonToken(uint256,address[]) (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#177-194) potentially used before declaration
: _price[0] = amounts[1] (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#185)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#pre-declaration-usage-of-local-variables
INFO:Detectors:
Pragma version"0.8.0" (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#2) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.6
solc"0.8.0" is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
INFO:Detectors:
Parameter TokenPrice.getPrice(uint256,address[])._amountIn (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#44) is not in mixedCase
Parameter TokenPrice.getPrice(uint256,address[])._path (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#44) is not in mixedCase
Variable TokenPrice.ITI (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#12) is not in mixedCase
Variable TokenPrice.WTHR (contracts/TokenPrice.sol#13) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions
```

#### Box.sol

```
INFO:Detectors:
Pragma version"0.8.0" (contracts/Box.sol#3) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.6
solc"0.8.0" is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
INFO:Detectors:
store(uint256) should be declared external:
- Box.store(uint256) (contracts/Box.sol#12-15)
retrieve() should be declared external:
- Box.retrieve() (contracts/Box.sol#18-20)
document() should be declared external:
- Box.document() (contracts/Box.sol#22-25)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#public-function-that-could-be-declared-external
```

#### ApprovedTokens.sol

```
INFO:Detectors:
ApprovedTokens.searchApprovedTokens(address[]) (contracts/ApprovedTokens.sol#23-44) has external calls inside a loop: _allowance = IERC20(_tokens[i]).allowance(msg.sender,_swapContract) (contracts/ApprovedTokens.sol#31-34)
ApprovedTokens.searchApprovedTokens(address[]) (contracts/ApprovedTokens.sol#23-44) has external calls inside a loop: _balance = IERC20(_tokens[i]).balanceOf(msg.sender) (contracts/ApprovedTokens.sol#35)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#calls-inside-a-loop
INFO:Detectors:
Pragma version"0.8.0" (contracts/ApprovedTokens.sol#2) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.6
solc"0.8.0" is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
INFO:Detectors:
Parameter ApprovedTokens.searchApprovedTokens(address[])._tokens (contracts/ApprovedTokens.sol#23) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions
```

# AUTOMATED TESTING

INFO:Detectors:

```
Variable Swap.addCommonToken(address)._commonToken (contracts/AllRouterSwap.sol#53) is too similar to Swap.commonTokens (contracts/AllRouterSwap.sol#50)
Reference: https://github.com/cryptic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation/variable-names-are-too-similar
```

- The external calls inside a loop flagged by Slither in the `TokenPrice` contract are limited to 5 and 10 as the size of `commonTokens` array is 5 and the size of `routerList` is 10 so there is no issue here. On the other hand, `searchApprovedTokens` function in the contract `ApprovedTokens.sol` is not limited and was correctly flagged by Slither.
- Some public functions were flagged as they are never called within the same contract, hence they can be declared external to reduce gas costs.
- The flagged reentrancies in `AllRouterSwap.sol` are false positives although we still recommend using the `ReentrancyGuard`.
- Unchecked transfers and unused returns were correctly flagged in the `AllRouterSwap.sol` contract.



## 5.2 AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN

### Description:

Halborn used automated security scanners to assist with detection of well-known security issues, and to identify low-hanging fruits on the targets for this engagement. Among the tools used was MythX, a security analysis service for Ethereum smart contracts. MythX performed a scan on all the contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers to locate any vulnerabilities.

### MythX results:

#### TokenPrice.sol

Report for contracts/TokenPrice.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/490419b2-81a1-4291-a0c2-77f5b440027a>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

#### Box.sol

Report for contracts/Box.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/211deedf-32b6-4343-b9e0-3a4288ca79de>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
3	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

#### ApprovedTokens.sol

Report for contracts/ApprovedTokens.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/04cfd79-ab35-43d3-8a7b-729eca473481>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.

#### AllRouterSwap.sol

Report for AllRouterSwap.sol  
<https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/0f578a13-lee4-4502-952c-8d6bec18c9e4>

Line	SWC Title	Severity	Short Description
2	(SWC-103) Floating Pragma	Low	A floating pragma is set.
48	(SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility	Low	State variable visibility is not set.

- No relevant findings by MythX.



THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

// HALBORN

