

### Qoda Finance -Core V1

Smart Contract Security Assessment

Prepared by: Halborn

Date of Engagement: June 29th, 2023 - July 28th, 2023

Visit: Halborn.com

DOCU	MENT REVISION HISTORY	8
CONT	ACTS	8
1	EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW	9
1.1	INTRODUCTION	10
1.2	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	10
1.3	TEST APPROACH & METHODOLOGY	11
2	RISK METHODOLOGY	12
2.1	EXPLOITABILITY	13
2.2	IMPACT	14
2.3	SEVERITY COEFFICIENT	16
2.4	SCOPE	18
3	ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW	20
4	FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS	22
4.1	(HAL-01) UNAUTHORIZED QUOTE CANCELLATION THROUGH DIRECT ACTION WITH QUOTEMANAGER CONTRACT - CRITICAL(10)	INTER- 24
	Description	24
	Code Location	24
	Proof Of Concept	25
	BVSS	25
	Recommendation	25
	Remediation Plan	26
4.2	(HAL-02) UNRESTRICTED ACCESS TO CREATEQUOTE FUNCTION UNAUTHORIZED QUOTE CREATION - CRITICAL(10)	ALLOWS 27
	Description	27
	Code Location	27

	Proof Of Concept	28
	BVSS	28
	Recommendation	28
	Remediation Plan	28
4.3	(HAL-03) SILENT FAILURE DURING TOKEN MINTING ON DEPOSIT FUTION - MEDIUM(5.5)	JNC- 30
	Description	30
	Code Location	30
	Proof Of Concept	31
	BVSS	31
	Recommendation	31
	Remediation Plan	31
4.4	(HAL-04) SILENT FAILURE DURING TOKEN REDEMPTION ON THE WITHD FUNCTION - MEDIUM(5.5)	RAW 32
	Description	32
	Code Location	32
	Proof Of Concept	33
	BVSS	34
	Recommendation	34
	Remediation Plan	34
4.5	(HAL-05) ROBUST ALLOWANCE - MEDIUM(5.5)	35
	Description	35
	Code Location	35
	BVSS	35
	Recommendation	35
	Remediation Plan	36

4.6	(HAL-06) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH REBASING/DEFLATIONARY/INFLATIARY TOKENS - MEDIUM(6.2)	ON- 37
	Description	37
	Code Location	37
	Proof Of Concept	38
	BVSS	39
	Recommendation	39
	Remediation Plan	39
4.7	(HAL-07) DIA ORACLE DOES NOT HAVE PROTECTION FOR ZERO VALUMEDIUM(6.2)	E - 40
	Description	40
	Code Location	40
	BVSS	41
	Recommendation	42
	Remediation Plan	42
4.8	(HAL-08) LATESTROUNDDATA CALL MAY RETURN STALE RESULTS MEDIUM(6.2)	5 – 43
	Description	43
	Code Location	43
	BVSS	44
	Recommendation	44
	Remediation Plan	44
4.9	(HAL-09) UNSAFE HANDLING OF ERC20 TRANSFER RESULTS - MEDIUM(5 45	5.5)
	Description	45

	Code Location	45
	BVSS	46
	Recommendation	46
	Remediation Plan	46
4.10	(HAL-10) COMPROMISED ADMIN CAN LIQUIDATE USERS - MEDIUM(6.2)	47
	Description	47
	Code Location	47
	BVSS	48
	Recommendation	48
	Remediation Plan	48
4.11	(HAL-11) IMPLEMENTATIONS CAN BE INITIALIZED - LOW(2.5)	49
	Description	49
	BVSS	49
	Recommendation	49
	Remediation Plan	49
4.12	(HAL-12) MARKET EXISTENCE VERIFICATION ABSENCE IN SETPROTOCOLF FUNCTION - LOW(2.5)	FEE 50
	Description	50
	Code Location	50
	BVSS	51
	Recommendation	51
	Remediation Plan	51
4.13	(HAL-13) USE OF DEPRECATED SETUPROLE FUNCTION - LOW(2.5)	52
	Description	52
	BVSS	52
	Recommendation	52

Remediation Plan	52
4.14 (HAL-14) ABSENCE OF INPUT VALIDATION LEADS TO ERRONEOUS RIFROM LINKEDLIST - LOW(2.5)	EMOVAL 53
Description	53
Code Location	53
BVSS	54
Recommendation	54
Remediation Plan	54
4.15 (HAL-15) FLOATING PRAGMA - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	55
Description	55
Code Location	55
BVSS	55
Recommendation	55
Remediation Plan	55
4.16 (HAL-16) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO GAS - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	SAVE 56
Description	56
Code Location	56
BVSS	56
Recommendation	56
Remediation Plan	56
4.17 (HAL-17) INCREMENT/DECREMENT FOR LOOP VARIABLE IN AN UNC BLOCK - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	HECKED 57
Description	57
Code Location	57

	BVSS	58
	Recommendation	58
	Remediation Plan	58
4.18	(HAL-18) CACHE ARRAY LENGTH - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	59
	Description	59
	Code Location	59
	BVSS	60
	Recommendation	60
	Remediation Plan	60
4.19	(HAL-19) NO NEED TO INITIALIZE VARIABLES WITH DEFAULT VALUES INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	61
	Description	61
	Code Location	61
	BVSS	62
	Recommendation	62
	Remediation Plan	62
4.20	(HAL-20) UNUSED ADDRESS VARIABLE - INFORMATIONAL(0.0)	63
	Description	63
	Code Location	63
	BVSS	63
	Recommendation	63
	Remediation Plan	63
5	AUTOMATED TESTING	64
5.1	STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT	65
	Description	65
	Results	65

5.2	AUTOMATED SECURITY SCAN	67
	Description	67
	Results	67

#### DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	MODIFICATION	DATE	AUTHOR
0.1	Document Creation	07/19/2023	Gokberk Gulgun
0.2	Document Updates	07/23/2023	Gokberk Gulgun
0.3	Draft Review	07/27/2023	Gabi Urrutia
1.0	Remediation Plan	08/02/2023	Gokberk Gulgun
1.1	Remediation Plan Review	08/06/2023	Gabi Urrutia

#### CONTACTS

CONTACT	COMPANY	EMAIL
Rob Behnke	Halborn	Rob.Behnke@halborn.com
Steven Walbroehl	Halborn	Steven.Walbroehl@halborn.com
Gabi Urrutia	Halborn	Gabi.Urrutia@halborn.com
Gokberk Gulgun	Halborn	Gokberk.Gulgun@halborn.com

### EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

#### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Qoda Finance engaged Halborn to conduct a security assessment on their smart contracts beginning on June 29th, 2023 and ending on July 28th, 2023. The security assessment was scoped to the smart contracts provided to the Halborn team.

#### 1.2 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The team at Halborn was provided four weeks for the engagement and assigned a full-time security engineer to verify 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 assessment 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 successfully addressed by the Qoda Finance 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 assessment. While manual testing is recommended to uncover flaws in logic, process, and implementation; automated testing techniques help enhance coverage of the code and can quickly identify items that do not follow the security best practices. The following phases and associated tools were used during the assessment:

- 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 hot-spots or bugs. (MythX)
- Static Analysis of security for scoped contract, and imported functions. (Slither)
- Testnet deployment (Foundry, Brownie)

#### 2. RISK METHODOLOGY

Every vulnerability and issue observed by Halborn is ranked based on **two sets** of **Metrics** and a **Severity Coefficient**. This system is inspired by the industry standard Common Vulnerability Scoring System.

The two Metric sets are: Exploitability and Impact. Exploitability captures the ease and technical means by which vulnerabilities can be exploited and Impact describes the consequences of a successful exploit.

The **Severity Coefficients** is designed to further refine the accuracy of the ranking with two factors: **Reversibility** and **Scope**. These capture the impact of the vulnerability on the environment as well as the number of users and smart contracts affected.

The final score is a value between 0-10 rounded up to 1 decimal place and 10 corresponding to the highest security risk. This provides an objective and accurate rating of the severity of security vulnerabilities in smart contracts.

The system is designed to assist in identifying and prioritizing vulnerabilities based on their level of risk to address the most critical issues in a timely manner.

#### 2.1 EXPLOITABILITY

#### Attack Origin (AO):

Captures whether the attack requires compromising a specific account.

#### Attack Cost (AC):

Captures the cost of exploiting the vulnerability incurred by the attacker relative to sending a single transaction on the relevant blockchain. Includes but is not limited to financial and computational cost.

#### Attack Complexity (AX):

Describes the conditions beyond the attacker's control that must exist in order to exploit the vulnerability. Includes but is not limited to macro situation, available third-party liquidity and regulatory challenges.

#### Metrics:

Exploitability Metric $(m_E)$	Metric Value	Numerical Value
Attack Origin (AO)	Arbitrary (AO:A)	1
Actack Origin (AU)	Specific (AO:S)	0.2
	Low (AC:L)	1
Attack Cost (AC)	Medium (AC:M)	0.67
	High (AC:H)	0.33
	Low (AX:L)	1
Attack Complexity (AX)	Medium (AX:M)	0.67
	High (AX:H)	0.33

Exploitability  ${\it E}$  is calculated using the following formula:

$$E = \prod m_e$$

#### 2.2 IMPACT

#### Confidentiality (C):

Measures the impact to the confidentiality of the information resources managed by the contract due to a successfully exploited vulnerability. Confidentiality refers to limiting access to authorized users only.

#### Integrity (I):

Measures the impact to integrity of a successfully exploited vulnerability. Integrity refers to the trustworthiness and veracity of data stored and/or processed on-chain. Integrity impact directly affecting Deposit or Yield records is excluded.

#### Availability (A):

Measures the impact to the availability of the impacted component resulting from a successfully exploited vulnerability. This metric refers to smart contract features and functionality, not state. Availability impact directly affecting Deposit or Yield is excluded.

#### Deposit (D):

Measures the impact to the deposits made to the contract by either users or owners.

#### Yield (Y):

Measures the impact to the yield generated by the contract for either users or owners.

#### Metrics:

Impact Metric $(m_I)$	Metric Value	Numerical Value
	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
Confidentiality (C)	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
	None (I:N)	0
	Low (I:L)	0.25
Integrity (I)	Medium (I:M)	0.5
	High (I:H)	0.75
	Critical (I:C)	1
	None (A:N)	0
	Low (A:L)	0.25
Availability (A)	Medium (A:M)	0.5
	High (A:H)	0.75
	Critical	1
	None (D:N)	0
	Low (D:L)	0.25
Deposit (D)	Medium (D:M)	0.5
	High (D:H)	0.75
	Critical (D:C)	1
	None (Y:N)	0
	Low (Y:L)	0.25
Yield (Y)	Medium: (Y:M)	0.5
	High: (Y:H)	0.75
	Critical (Y:H)	1

Impact  ${\it I}$  is calculated using the following formula:

$$I = max(m_I) + \frac{\sum m_I - max(m_I)}{4}$$

#### 2.3 SEVERITY COEFFICIENT

#### Reversibility (R):

Describes the share of the exploited vulnerability effects that can be reversed. For upgradeable contracts, assume the contract private key is available.

#### Scope (S):

Captures whether a vulnerability in one vulnerable contract impacts resources in other contracts.

Coefficient $(C)$	Coefficient Value	Numerical Value
	None (R:N)	1
Reversibility $(r)$	Partial (R:P)	0.5
	Full (R:F)	0.25
Soons (a)	Changed (S:C)	1.25
Scope (s)	Unchanged (S:U)	1

Severity Coefficient C is obtained by the following product:

C = rs

The Vulnerability Severity Score  ${\cal S}$  is obtained by:

S = min(10, EIC \* 10)

The score is rounded up to 1 decimal places.

Severity	Score Value Range
Critical	9 - 10
High	7 - 8.9
Medium	4.5 - 6.9
Low	2 - 4.4
Informational	0 - 1.9

#### 2.4 SCOPE

#### 1. IN-SCOPE TREE & COMMIT:

The security assessment was scoped to the following contract:

• QodaFi/v1-core

#### Commit ID:

50fbe7c35c1d75a1cfc6e1bef08e567bddbd5387

#### **IN-SCOPE CONTRACTS:**

- FixedRateMarket.sol
- LiquidityEmissionsQontroller.sol
- QAdmin.sol
- QPriceOracle.sol
- QToken.sol
- QodaLens.sol
- QollateralManager.sol
- QuoteManager.sol
- TradingEmissionsQontroller.sol

#### 2. REMEDIATION COMMIT IDs:

- 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251
- d67a42652e48fd8ed297545113c9778c21af32e2
- b8617f34bafc08104e3628cce0eb4e93d40cd25e
- 993c03eee650747d41be27a57e19efb0d3c963f5
- 56d373e35efc593210fac069ae5f007ba298ffd8
- a4176933e56ba366e9a0834bf2fa477ec066eb4c
- aa3880108654ccdadd331d570b2ee6902a533c4b

- de368b549cb6ee24b56f7ad2642c2fc7e30caf1d
- ec7fdaa1fea939ac62ed84951679a4ec20db8bb7
- 4981e21206a8ee8a8b80c6ddce7e08416d4666a7
- b8617f34bafc08104e3628cce0eb4e93d40cd25e

## 3. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY & FINDINGS OVERVIEW

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFORMATIONAL
2	0	8	4	6

SECURITY ANALYSIS	RISK LEVEL	REMEDIATION DATE
(HAL-01) UNAUTHORIZED QUOTE CANCELLATION THROUGH DIRECT INTERACTION WITH QUOTEMANAGER CONTRACT	Critical (10)	SOLVED - 07/23/2023
(HAL-02) UNRESTRICTED ACCESS TO CREATEQUOTE FUNCTION ALLOWS UNAUTHORIZED QUOTE CREATION	Critical (10)	SOLVED - 07/23/2023
(HAL-03) SILENT FAILURE DURING TOKEN MINTING ON DEPOSIT FUNCTION	Medium (5.5)	SOLVED - 07/23/2023
(HAL-04) SILENT FAILURE DURING TOKEN REDEMPTION ON THE WITHDRAW FUNCTION	Medium (5.5)	SOLVED - 07/23/2023
(HAL-05) ROBUST ALLOWANCE	Medium (5.5)	SOLVED - 07/24/2023
(HAL-06) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH REBASING/DEFLATIONARY/INFLATIONARY TOKENS	Medium (6.2)	SOLVED - 08/02/2023
(HAL-07) DIA ORACLE DOES NOT HAVE PROTECTION FOR ZERO VALUE	Medium (6.2)	SOLVED - 07/25/2023
(HAL-08) LATESTROUNDDATA CALL MAY RETURN STALE RESULTS	Medium (6.2)	SOLVED - 07/25/2023
(HAL-09) UNSAFE HANDLING OF ERC20 TRANSFER RESULTS	Medium (5.5)	SOLVED - 07/25/2023
(HAL-10) COMPROMISED ADMIN CAN LIQUIDATE USERS	Medium (6.2)	SOLVED - 08/02/2023
(HAL-11) IMPLEMENTATIONS CAN BE INITIALIZED	Low (2.5)	SOLVED - 07/25/2023
(HAL-12) MARKET EXISTENCE VERIFICATION ABSENCE IN SETPROTOCOLFEE FUNCTION	Low (2.5)	SOLVED - 07/25/2023
(HAL-13) USE OF DEPRECATED SETUPROLE FUNCTION	Low (2.5)	SOLVED - 07/25/2023
(HAL-14) ABSENCE OF INPUT VALIDATION LEADS TO ERRONEOUS REMOVAL FROM LINKEDLIST	Low (2.5)	SOLVED - 07/25/2023

(HAL-15) FLOATING PRAGMA	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 08/02/2023
(HAL-16) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO SAVE GAS	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 08/02/2023
(HAL-17) INCREMENT/DECREMENT FOR LOOP VARIABLE IN AN UNCHECKED BLOCK	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 07/22/2023
(HAL-18) CACHE ARRAY LENGTH	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 08/02/2023
(HAL-19) NO NEED TO INITIALIZE VARIABLES WITH DEFAULT VALUES	Informational (0.0)	ACKNOWLEDGED
(HAL-20) UNUSED ADDRESS VARIABLE	Informational (0.0)	SOLVED - 07/22/2023

## FINDINGS & TECH DETAILS

# 4.1 (HAL-01) UNAUTHORIZED QUOTE CANCELLATION THROUGH DIRECT INTERACTION WITH QUOTEMANAGER CONTRACT - CRITICAL(10)

#### Description:

It has been observed that any user can cancel quotes by directly interacting with the QuoteManager contract. The cancelQuote function does not have proper access controls to check whether the caller is authorized to cancel the quote or not. This implies that anyone who has the required information could potentially cancel a quote, irrespective of whether they are the original quoter or not.

#### Code Location:

#### /contracts/QuoteManager.sol#L95

```
Listing 1

1 /// @notice Cancel `Quote` by id. Note this is a O(1) operation
2 /// since `OrderbookSide` uses hashmaps under the hood. However,
L, it is
3 /// O(n) against the array of `Quote` ids by account so we
L, should ensure
4 /// that array should not grow too large in practice.
5 /// @param isUserCanceled True if user actively canceled `Quote
L, `, false otherwise
6 /// @param side 0 for borrow `Quote`, 1 for lend `Quote`
7 /// @param quoter Address of the `Quoter`
8 /// @param id Id of the `Quote`
9 function cancelQuote(bool isUserCanceled, uint8 side, address
L, quoter, uint64 id) external whenNotPaused(402) {
10 __cancelQuote(isUserCanceled, side, quoter, id);
11 }
```

#### Proof Of Concept:

Step 1 : Deploy a new instance of QuoteManager contract in a testing environment. Record the contract address.

Step 2 : Issue a new quote using an address (let's call it Address A) via the createQuote function, or similar function if available.

Step 3: Record the quote ID for the quote created by Address A.

Step 4: Using a different address (Address B), call the cancelQuote function, passing the quote ID of the quote created by Address A, and other required parameters.

Step 5 : Check the status of the quote using its ID. If it shows as cancelled, this confirms that the cancelQuote function can be called by an address that did not originally create the quote

```
| February | Testification | T
```

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:C/I:C/A:C/D:C/Y:C/R:N/S:C (10)

#### Recommendation:

Consider implementing access control on the function.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by adding an access control to the function.

Commit ID : 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

# 4.2 (HAL-02) UNRESTRICTED ACCESS TO CREATEQUOTE FUNCTION ALLOWS UNAUTHORIZED QUOTE CREATION - CRITICAL(10)

#### Description:

The createQuote function in the QuoteManager contract does not verify if the caller (msg.sender) is the same as the quoter parameter passed to the function. This potentially allows a malicious actor to create quotes on behalf of others without their consent or knowledge. If an unauthorized user can manipulate the quote creation mechanism, it can compromise the integrity and trustworthiness of the quotes' system. The unauthorized user could create misleading quotes that can be used to manipulate market behavior.

#### Code Location:

/contracts/QuoteManager.sol#L83

```
Listing 2

1   /** USER INTERFACE **/
2

3   /// @notice Creates a new `Quote` and adds it to the `
L OrderbookSide` linked list by side

4   /// @param side 0 for borrow `Quote`, 1 for lend `Quote`
5   /// @param quoter Account of the Quoter
6   /// @param quoteType 0 for PV+APR, 1 for FV+APR
7   /// @param APR In decimal form scaled by 1e4 (ex. 1052 = 10.52%)
8   /// @param cashflow Can be PV or FV depending on `quoteType`
9   function createQuote(uint8 side, address quoter, uint8 quoteType
L , uint64 APR, uint cashflow) external whenNotPaused(401) {
    _createQuote(side, quoter, quoteType, APR, cashflow);
11 }
```

#### Proof Of Concept:

Step 1 : Deploy a new instance of QuoteManager contract in a testing environment. Record the contract address.

Step 2 : Using an address (let's call it Address A), call the createQuote function, passing a different address (let's call it Address B) as the quoter parameter, along with other required parameters.

Step 3 : Check if a new quote is created and attributed to Address B in the system. If a quote attributed to Address B is created, it confirms that the createQuote function can be called by an address that is different from the quoter parameter.

```
| 1277714| Tell*ProcRateForce | 127714| Tell*
```

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:C/I:C/A:C/D:C/Y:C/R:N/S:C (10)

#### Recommendation:

The createQuote function should include an authorization check to ensure that the quoter parameter matches the market.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by adding a validation.

## 4.3 (HAL-03) SILENT FAILURE DURING TOKEN MINTING ON DEPOSIT FUNCTION - MEDIUM (5.5)

#### Description:

The mToken.mint(actualDepositUnderlying); function, originating from Compound's ERC20 mToken contracts, is a call that does not revert on failure but returns an error code as a uint value instead. This behavior deviates from the standard expected of typical Solidity functions that revert on failure.

This non-standard behavior makes it difficult for calling contracts (like the one above) to correctly handle failures. As the above contract does not check the return value of mToken.mint(), failures in this function will not cause the overall transaction to revert.

This could lead to serious imbalances between the perceived balance of mTokens on the deposit function.

#### Code Location:

/contracts/QollateralManager.sol#L900

```
12 _addCollateral(account, mToken, actualDepositMToken);
13 ...
```

#### Proof Of Concept:

Step 1 : An external actor calls the depositCollateralWithMTokenWrapWithETH () function, sending some ETH along with the transaction.

Step 2 : The function attempts to convert the sent ETH to WETH by calling weth.withdraw(actualDepositUnderlying);.

Step 3 : The contract calls mToken.mint(msg.value);, but this operation fails for some reason. However, instead of reverting the transaction, mToken.mint() returns an error code.

Step 4 : Ignoring the failure from mToken.mint(), the contract proceeds to \_addCollateral(account, mToken, actualDepositMToken);.

#### BVSS:

#### AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:M/D:M/Y:M/R:P/S:C (5.5)

#### Recommendation:

Ensure that mToken.mint() is successful before transferring tokens.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by adding the return value validation.

Commit ID : 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

## 4.4 (HAL-04) SILENT FAILURE DURING TOKEN REDEMPTION ON THE WITHDRAW FUNCTION - MEDIUM (5.5)

#### Description:

In the QollateralManager contract, The redeem function aims to redeem mTokens equivalent to mTokenRedeemAmount. The call mToken.redeem(mTokenRedeemAmount); is responsible for the redemption action.

In the event of an error, the mToken.redeem() function from Compound's mToken contract doesn't revert, but instead returns a non-zero error code as an uint. This behavior deviates from the standard Solidity function behavior that typically reverts in case of an error.

The redeem() function in the MTOKEN contract doesn't check the return value of mToken.redeem(mTokenRedeemAmount);. If this redemption operation fails (returns a non-zero error code), the contract still proceeds with the remaining operations, leading to a silent failure. As a result, the contract behaves as if tokens were redeemed when they were not, creating a discrepancy between the actual and perceived balance of mtokens and ETH.

#### Code Location:

/contracts/QollateralManager.sol#L1052

```
Listing 4

1     MErc20Interface mToken = MErc20Interface(mTokenAddress);
2
3     // Redeem mTokens for underlying and return it to user
4     uint balanceBeforeUnderlying = underlying.balanceOf(address(L, this));
5     mToken.redeem(amount);
6
7     // Get accurate amount of underlying redeemed
```

```
actualAmountUnderlying = underlying.balanceOf(address(this))

- balanceBeforeUnderlying;

// Update internal account collateral balance mappings

_subtractCollateral(account, mToken, amount);
```

#### /contracts/QollateralManager.sol#L1067

#### Proof Of Concept:

Step 1 : An external actor (say, an address 'A') calls the redeem() function with a certain mTokenRedeemAmount and recipient.

Step 2 : The function starts by subtracting collateral mTokenRedeemAmount of mTokens from 'A'. This is done via the \_subtractCollateral(account, mToken, amount); statement.

Step 3: Next, the function attempts to redeem the mTokens that have just been transferred to the contract, using mToken.redeem(mTokenRedeemAmount);. But, for some reason, this redemption fails. In normal circumstances, this failure should cause the transaction to revert. However, due to

the atypical behavior of the mToken.redeem() method (it doesn't revert on failure but returns a non-zero uint instead), the execution continues to the next line.

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:M/D:M/Y:M/R:P/S:C (5.5)

#### Recommendation:

Ensure that mToken.redeem() is successful before transferring tokens.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by adding the return value validation.

Commit ID: 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

### 4.5 (HAL-05) ROBUST ALLOWANCE - MEDIUM (5.5)

#### Description:

Non-standard tokens like USDT will revert the transaction when a contract or a user tries to approve an allowance when the spender allowance is already set to a non-zero value. For that reason, the previous allowance should be decreased before increasing allowance in the related function.

#### Code Location:

/contracts/QollateralManager.sol#L918

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:M/D:M/Y:M/R:P/S:C (5.5)

#### Recommendation:

Consider approving with zero first through safeApprove function.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by approving with zero first.

Commit ID : 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

# 4.6 (HAL-06) INCOMPATIBILITY WITH REBASING/DEFLATIONARY/INFLATIONARY TOKENS - MEDIUM (6.2)

#### Description:

The protocol does not appear to support rebasing/deflationary/inflationary tokens whose balance changes during transfers or over time. The necessary checks include at least verifying the amount of tokens transferred to contracts before and after the actual transfer to infer any fees/interest. During repaying borrow, transferTokenOrETH does not check before/after balance, which will cause insolvency in the contract due to the received amount will be less than expected (accountBorrow).

#### Code Location:

#### Utils.sol#L26C1-L71C2

```
if (isSendingETH) {
        IWETH weth = IWETH(wethAddress);
        weth.deposit{ value: amount }();
      }
      if (sender_ == address(this)) {
        underlying.safeTransfer(receiver_, amount);
      } else {
        underlying.safeTransferFrom(sender_, receiver_, amount);
      if (isReceivingETH) {
        IWETH weth = IWETH(wethAddress);
        weth.withdraw(amount);
        (bool success,) = receiver.call{value: amount}("");
        if (!success) {
          revert CustomErrors.UTL_UnsuccessfulEthTransfer();
        }
46 }
```

#### Proof Of Concept:

Step 1: User A calls the transferTokenOrETH function to deposit 100 tokens into the contract.

Step 2 : Due to the deflationary nature of the token, a fee (e.g., 1%) is deducted during the transfer.

Step 3: The contract, however, records a deposit of 100 tokens, although only 99 tokens (100 tokens - 1% fee) were transferred due to the fee.

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:N/D:M/Y:N/R:N/S:U (6.2)

Recommendation:

Ensure that checking the previous balance/after balance equals to the amount for any rebasing/inflation/deflation. Consider adding support in contracts for such tokens before accepting user-supplied tokens. Finally, consider supporting deflationary / rebasing / etc. tokens by extra checking the balances before/after or strictly inform your users not to use such tokens if they do not want to lose them.

Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Qoda Finance team resolved the issue by calculating the difference in asset value before and after the transfer.

Commit ID: a4176933e56ba366e9a0834bf2fa477ec066eb4c

39

# 4.7 (HAL-07) DIA ORACLE DOES NOT HAVE PROTECTION FOR ZERO VALUE - MEDIUM (6.2)

#### Description:

In the implementation of the DIA Oracle, it was observed that the system can return a value of zero. Further, there appears to be no condition checking if the current block timestamp exceeds the sum of the response timestamp and the grace period. This could lead to potential inaccuracies or manipulation of the data returned by the oracle.

Here is the link to the contract code: DIA Oracle Contract

The main concern with this issue is the data integrity of the DIA Oracle. Should the Oracle return a zero value, it could potentially disrupt the functions that rely on this data. Moreover, if there is no check to ensure the block.timestamp is within the grace period, outdated data could be used, which might lead to further disruptions or even potential security risks depending on how the oracle data is used.

#### Code Location:

#### QPriceOracle.sol#L225C1-L260C4

```
Listing 8

1 /// @notice Convenience function for getting price feed from DIA
L, oracle
2 /// @param underlyingToken Address of the underlying token
3 /// @return answer uint256, decimals uint8
4 function _priceFeedDIA(IERC20 underlyingToken) internal view
L, returns(uint256, uint8) {
5
6 // We need to retrieve the `symbol` string from the token,
L, which is not
7 // a part of the standard IERC20 interface
8 IERC20Metadata tokenWithSymbol = IERC20Metadata(address(
```

```
    underlyingToken));
     string memory key = string(abi.encodePacked(tokenWithSymbol.

    symbol(), "/USD"));

     if(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(key)) == keccak256(abi.

    encodePacked("WBTC/USD"))) {
     } else if(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(key)) == keccak256(abi.
} else if(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(key)) == keccak256(abi.
} else if(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(key)) == keccak256(abi.
key = "GLMR/USD";
     (uint128 answer, uint128 timestamp) = _DIAOracle.getValue(key)
     if (timestamp == 0) {
       revert CustomErrors.QPO_DIA_Key_Not_Found();
     return (uint(answer), 8);
   }
```

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:N/D:M/Y:N/R:N/S:U (6.2)

#### Recommendation:

To mitigate this issue, it is recommended to implement a check in the DIA Oracle to ensure that it does not return a zero value. Additionally, a condition should be introduced to verify that the current block.timestamp does not exceed the sum of the response timestamp and the grace period. This will ensure that the data returned by the Oracle is both accurate and timely.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by adding the return value validation.

Commit ID : 56d373e35efc593210fac069ae5f007ba298ffd8

# 4.8 (HAL-08) LATESTROUNDDATA CALL MAY RETURN STALE RESULTS - MEDIUM (6.2)

#### Description:

The return values of the latestRoundData() call are:

- roundId: The round ID. Oracles provide periodic data updates to the aggregators. Data feeds are updated in rounds. Rounds are identified by their roundId, which increases with each new round. This increase may not be monotonic. Knowing the roundId of a previous round allows contracts to consume historical data.
- answer: The data that this specific feed provides, in this case, the price of an asset.
- startedAt: Timestamp of when the round started.
- updatedAt: Timestamp of when the round was updated.
- answeredInRound: The round ID of the round in which the answer was computed.

In the current implementation, There is no check for stale prices.

#### Code Location:

#### QPriceOracle.sol#L262C1-L270C4

```
Listing 9

1  /// @notice Convenience function for getting price feed from
L, Chainlink oracle
2  /// @param oracleFeed Address of the chainlink oracle feed
3  /// @return answer uint256, decimals uint8
4  function _priceFeedChainlink(address oracleFeed) internal view
L, returns(uint256, uint8) {
5   AggregatorV3Interface aggregator = AggregatorV3Interface(
L, oracleFeed);
6   (, int256 answer,,,) = aggregator.latestRoundData();
```

```
7  uint8 decimals = aggregator.decimals();
8  return (uint(answer), decimals);
9 }
```

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:N/D:M/Y:N/R:N/S:U (6.2)

#### Recommendation:

\_priceFeedChainlink calls out to a Chainlink oracle receiving the latestRoundData(). If there is a problem with Chainlink starting a new round and finding consensus on the new value for the oracle (e.g. Chainlink nodes abandon the oracle, chain congestion, vulnerability/attacks on the Chainlink system) consumers of this contract may continue using outdated stale or incorrect data (if oracles are unable to submit no new round is started).

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by adding the return value validation.

Commit ID : 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

# 4.9 (HAL-09) UNSAFE HANDLING OF ERC20 TRANSFER RESULTS - MEDIUM (5.5)

#### Description:

It was identified that the claimEmissions function in the TradingEmissionsQontroller contract does not verify the return value of the transfer function call, which facilitates the token transfer from the caller to the contract. Some tokens (e.g., ZRX) return false instead of reverting in the event of failure or insufficient balance.

#### Code Location:

TradingEmissionsQontroller.sol#L140

```
Listing 10

1  /// @notice Mint the unclaimed rewards to user and reset their
L, claimable emissions
2  function claimEmissions() external whenNotPaused(601) {
3

4   // Get the emissions accrued for the user
5   uint reward = _claimableEmissions[msg.sender];
6

7   if (reward <= 0) {
8     revert CustomErrors.TEQ_ZeroRewardAmount();
9   }
10

11   // Reset user's claimable emissions
12   _claimableEmissions[msg.sender] = 0;
13

14   // Transfer the rewards directly from `
L, TradingEmissionsQontroller` contract
15   // to user. The assumption is that total supply of reward
L, tokens have been
16   // pre-minted to this contract address. This limits the
L, maximum damage of
```

```
// a potential hack to just tokens within the contract (
L, compared to an

// infinite mint of tokens if this contract were allowed to
L, mint on a

// callable function

__underlying.transfer(msg.sender, reward);

// Emit the event

emit ClaimEmissions(msg.sender, reward);

}
```

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:M/D:M/Y:M/R:P/S:C (5.5)

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use OpenZeppelin's SafeERC20 wrapper and the safeTransfer function to transfer the tokens.

#### Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by using safeTransfer.

Commit ID : b8617f34bafc08104e3628cce0eb4e93d40cd25e

## 4.10 (HAL-10) COMPROMISED ADMIN CAN LIQUIDATE USERS - MEDIUM (6.2)

#### Description:

The function \_setCollateralRatio allows an admin to set the values of \_minCollateralRatio and \_initCollateralRatio. While the function ensures that the minCollateralRatio\_ cannot exceed initCollateralRatio\_, there is currently no lower bound set for the minCollateralRatio\_. This could potentially allow a malicious admin to set the \_minCollateralRatio to a very low value, leading to unintended and premature liquidations of users' positions.

#### Code Location:

/contracts/QAdmin.sol#L528C1-L542C4

```
Listing 11

1  function _setCollateralRatio(uint minCollateralRatio_, uint
L, initCollateralRatio_) external onlyAdmin {
2  // `minCollateralRatio_` cannot be above `initCollateralRatio_
L, `
3  if (minCollateralRatio_ > initCollateralRatio_) {
4   revert CustomErrors.QA_MinCollateralRatioNotGreaterThanInit
L, ();
5  }
6
7  // Emit the event
8  emit SetCollateralRatio(_minCollateralRatio,
L, _initCollateralRatio, minCollateralRatio_, initCollateralRatio_);
9
10  // Set `_minCollateralRatio` to new value
11  _minCollateralRatio = minCollateralRatio_;
12
13  // Set `_initCollateralRatio` to new value
14  _initCollateralRatio = initCollateralRatio_;
15 }
```

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:M/A:N/D:M/Y:N/R:N/S:U (6.2)

#### Recommendation:

To avoid potential misuse and protect users, it is recommended to implement a lower bound for the \_minCollateralRatio.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by comparing minCollateralRatio\_with MANTISSA\_COLLATERAL\_RATIO.

Commit ID: 4981e21206a8ee8a8b80c6ddce7e08416d4666a7

### 4.11 (HAL-11) IMPLEMENTATIONS CAN BE INITIALIZED - LOW (2.5)

#### Description:

The contracts are upgradable, inheriting from the Initializable contract. However, the current implementations are missing the \_disableInitializers () function call in the constructors. Thus, an attacker can initialize the implementation. Usually, the initialized implementation has no direct impact on the proxy itself; however, it can be exploited in a phishing attack. In rare cases, the implementation might be mutable and may have an impact on the proxy.

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:M/C:N/I:L/A:N/D:L/Y:L/R:N/S:U (2.5)

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to call <u>\_disableInitializers</u> within the contract's constructor to prevent the implementation from being initialized.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The contracts now implement the \_disableInitializers() function call in the constructors.

Commit ID : 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

### 4.12 (HAL-12) MARKET EXISTENCE VERIFICATION ABSENCE IN SETPROTOCOLFEE FUNCTION - LOW (2.5)

#### Description:

The \_setProtocolFee function in the QAdmin contract does not validate the existence of the provided marketAddress. The function is designed to set the protocol fee for a given market. However, it fails to verify if the provided address indeed corresponds to an existing market. It blindly casts the provided address into an IFixedRateMarket interface, and then proceeds to set the protocol fee.

#### Code Location:

/contracts/QAdmin.sol#L641

```
20   _protocolFee[market] = protocolFee_;
21 }
```

A0:A/AC:L/AX:M/C:N/I:L/A:N/D:L/Y:L/R:N/S:U (2.5)

#### Recommendation:

To prevent the potential impacts, the contract should implement a mechanism to check the existence of the **marketAddress** before setting the protocol fee.

#### Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by adding a validation.

Commit ID: 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

## 4.13 (HAL-13) USE OF DEPRECATED SETUPROLE FUNCTION - LOW (2.5)

#### Description:

"The contracts make use of the deprecated function \_setupRole from the AccessControl contract. As per the Changelog.md, the function is deprecated.

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:M/C:N/I:L/A:N/D:L/Y:L/R:N/S:U (2.5)

#### Recommendation:

It is recommended to use the \_grantRole function instead.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by using the \_grantRole function.

Commit ID: 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

### 4.14 (HAL-14) ABSENCE OF INPUT VALIDATION LEADS TO ERRONEOUS REMOVAL FROM LINKEDLIST - LOW (2.5)

#### Description:

The code lacks validation checks in the remove function of its LinkedList implementation. This function does not confirm the existence of an id within the list prior to performing deletion operations.

Code Location:

#### LinkedList.sol#L81C1-L108C4

```
20  link(self, quoteToRemove.prev, quoteToRemove.next);
21  }
22
23  // Ready to delete `quoteToRemove`
24  delete self.quotes[quoteToRemove.id];
25
26  // Decrement the length of the `OrderbookSide`
27  self.length--;
28 }
```

AO:A/AC:L/AX:M/C:N/I:L/A:N/D:L/Y:L/R:N/S:U (2.5)

#### Recommendation:

Consider checking the existence of element.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by checking the existence of the element.

Commit ID: 119527170674c8c82ea53addf463595ea4719251

## 4.15 (HAL-15) FLOATING PRAGMA - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

#### Description:

The project contains many instances of floating pragma. Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested with thoroughly. Locking the pragma helps to ensure that contracts do not accidentally get deployed using, for example, either an outdated compiler version that might introduce bugs that affect the contract system negatively or a pragma version too recent which has not been extensively tested.

Code Location:

All Contracts

BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:C (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

Consider locking the pragma version with known bugs for the compiler version by removing the caret (^) symbol. When possible, do not use floating pragma in the final live deployment. Specifying a fixed compiler version ensures that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by changing floating pragma.

# 4.16 (HAL-16) USE CUSTOM ERRORS INSTEAD OF REVERT STRINGS TO SAVE GAS - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

#### Description:

Custom errors are available from solidity version 0.8.4. Custom errors save ~50 gas each time they're hit by avoiding having to allocate and store the revert string. Not defining the strings also saves deployment gas.

#### Code Location:

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:C (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

Consider replacing all revert strings with custom errors.

#### Remediation Plan:

SOLVED: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by using unchecked block.

# 4.17 (HAL-17) INCREMENT/DECREMENT FOR LOOP VARIABLE IN AN UNCHECKED BLOCK - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

#### Description:

i++ involves checked arithmetic, which is not required. This is because the value of i is always strictly less than length  $\leq 2**256 - 1$ . Therefore, the theoretical maximum value of i to enter the for-loop body is 2\*\*256 - 2. This means that the i++ in the for loop can never overflow. Regardless, the compiler performs the overflow checks.

#### Code Location:

```
Listing 15
  1 ./TradingEmissionsQontroller.sol:70:
                                                for (uint i = 0; i < 0
 \rightarrow _numPhases; i++){
 2 ./TradingEmissionsQontroller.sol:76: for (uint i = 0; i <

    _numPhases; i++){
 3 ./QodaLens.sol:197: for (uint i = 0; i < assetAddresses.length;
 \downarrow i++) {
 4 ./QodaLens.sol:205:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < assetAddresses.length;</pre>
 \downarrow i++) {
 5 ./QodaLens.sol:209:
                               for (uint j = 0; j < maturities.length; j</pre>
 ++) {
 6 ./QodaLens.sol:238:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < marketAddresses.length</pre>
 \rightarrow; i++) {
                                for (uint8 side = 0; side <= 1; side++) {</pre>
 7 ./QodaLens.sol:240:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < marketAddresses.length</pre>
 8 ./QodaLens.sol:248:
 \rightarrow ; i++) {
 9 ./QodaLens.sol:250:
                                for (uint8 side = 0; side <= 1; side++) {</pre>
                                   for (uint j = 0; j < ids.length; j++) {
 10 ./QodaLens.sol:252:
 11 ./QodaLens.sol:486:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < asset.maturities.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
 12 ./QodaLens.sol:518:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
                              for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 13 ./QodaLens.sol:527:
 \rightarrow length; \overline{i++} {
```

```
14 ./QodaLens.sol:540:
                       for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
\downarrow length; i++) {
15 ./QodaLens.sol:554:
                       for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
                       for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
16 ./QodaLens.sol:566:
17 ./QodaLens.sol:582:
                       for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
18 ./QuoteManager.sol:341:
                           for (uint i=0; i < accountQuotes.length
\rightarrow ; i++) {
19 ./QollateralManager.sol:636:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < 0
20 ./QollateralManager.sol:735:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < 0
21 ./QAdmin.sol:685:
                    for (uint i = 0; i < contractsAddr.length; i</pre>
++) {
22 ./QAdmin.sol:707:
                    for (uint i = 0; i < operationIds.length; i</pre>
→ ++) {
23 ./LiquidityEmissionsQontroller.sol:378: for (uint i = 0; i <

    _userInfo[account].rewardTokenList.length; i++) {
```

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:C (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

Consider incrementing the for loop variable in an unchecked block.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by using unchecked block.

### 4.18 (HAL-18) CACHE ARRAY LENGTH - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

#### Description:

In a for loop, the length of an array can be put in a temporary variable to save some gas. This has been done already in several other locations in the code.

In the above case, the solidity compiler will always read the length of the array during each iteration. That is,

- if it is a storage array, this is an extra sload operation (100 additional extra gas (EIP-2929) for each iteration except for the first),
- if it is a memory array, this is an extra mload operation (3 additional gas for each iteration except for the first),
- if it is a calldata array, this is an extra calldataload operation (3 additional gas for each iteration except for the first)

#### Code Location:

```
Listing 16
 1 ./QodaLens.sol:486:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < asset.maturities.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
 2 ./QodaLens.sol:518:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
 3 ./QodaLens.sol:527:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
 4 ./QodaLens.sol:540:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
                              for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
 5 ./QodaLens.sol:554:
 6 ./QodaLens.sol:566:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
 7 ./QodaLens.sol:582:
                              for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
 8 ./QuoteManager.sol:341: for (uint i=0; i < accountQuotes.length
 \rightarrow ; i++) {
 9 ./QollateralManager.sol:636:
                                        for (uint i = 0; i < 0
```

```
∟ _iterableCollateralAddresses[account].length + newTokenOffset; i
++) {
10 ./QollateralManager.sol:735:
                                  for (uint i = 0; i < 0
11 ./QAdmin.sol:685: for (uint i = 0; i < contractsAddr.length; i
12 ./QAdmin.sol:707:
                       for (uint i = 0; i < operationIds.length; i</pre>
→ ++) {
13 ./LiquidityEmissionsQontroller.sol:378:
                                             for (uint i = 0; i <

    _userInfo[account].rewardTokenList.length; i++)
14 ./QodaLens.sol:486:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < asset.maturities.</pre>
\rightarrow length; i++) {
15 ./QodaLens.sol:518:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
\rightarrow length; i++) {
16 ./QodaLens.sol:527:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
\rightarrow length; i++) {
17 ./QodaLens.sol:540:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
\rightarrow length; i++) {
                          for (uint i = 0; i < assetAddresses.length;</pre>
18 ./QodaLens.sol:197:
\rightarrow i++) {
19 ./QodaLens.sol:205:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < assetAddresses.length;</pre>
\rightarrow i++) {
```

#### AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:F/S:C (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

In a for loop, store the length of an array in a temporary variable.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED:** The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by caching array length.

# 4.19 (HAL-19) NO NEED TO INITIALIZE VARIABLES WITH DEFAULT VALUES - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

#### Description:

Initialization to 0 or false is not necessary, as these are the default values in Solidity.

#### Code Location:

```
Listing 17
 1 ./QodaLens.sol:486:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < asset.maturities.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
 2 ./QodaLens.sol:518:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
                          for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 3 ./QodaLens.sol:527:
 \downarrow length; i++) {
 4 ./QodaLens.sol:540:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.</pre>
 \rightarrow length; i++) {
 5 ./QodaLens.sol:554:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
 6 ./QodaLens.sol:566:
                          for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
                          for (uint i = 0; i < assets.length; i++) {</pre>
 7 ./QodaLens.sol:582:
 8 ./QuoteManager.sol:341:
                              for (uint i=0; i < accountQuotes.length</pre>
 \rightarrow; i++) {
 9 ./QollateralManager.sol:636:
                                 for (uint i = 0; i <
 ∟ _iterableCollateralAddresses[account].length + newTokenOffset; i
++){
10 ./QollateralManager.sol:735: for (uint i = 0; i <
 11 ./QAdmin.sol:685: for (uint i = 0; i < contractsAddr.length; i
 → ++) {
12 ./QAdmin.sol:707:
                      for (uint i = 0; i < operationIds.length; i</pre>
 → ++) {
13 ./LiquidityEmissionsQontroller.sol:378: for (uint i = 0; i <
 14 ./QodaLens.sol:486: for (uint i = 0; i < asset.maturities.
 \downarrow length; i++) {
```

```
15 ./QodaLens.sol:518: for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.

L length; i++) {

16 ./QodaLens.sol:527: for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.

L length; i++) {

17 ./QodaLens.sol:540: for (uint i = 0; i < fixedRateMarkets.

L length; i++) {

18 ./QodaLens.sol:197: for (uint i = 0; i < assetAddresses.length;

L i++) {

19 ./QodaLens.sol:205: for (uint i = 0; i < assetAddresses.length;

L i++) {
```

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:F/S:C (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

Remove the initialization values of 0 or false.

#### Remediation Plan:

ACKNOWLEDGED: The Qoda Finance team acknowledged the issue.

## 4.20 (HAL-20) UNUSED ADDRESS VARIABLE - INFORMATIONAL (0.0)

#### Description:

During the code review, It has been noticed that address variable is not used and deprecated.

#### Code Location:

#### QollateralManager.sol#L35

#### BVSS:

AO:A/AC:L/AX:L/C:N/I:N/A:N/D:N/Y:N/R:N/S:C (0.0)

#### Recommendation:

Consider removing redundant address.

#### Remediation Plan:

**SOLVED**: The Qoda Finance team solved the issue by removing the variable.

### AUTOMATED TESTING

### 5.1 STATIC ANALYSIS REPORT

#### Description:

Halborn used automated testing techniques to enhance the coverage of certain areas of the smart contracts in scope. Among the tools used was Slither, a Solidity static analysis framework. After Halborn verified the smart contracts in the repository and was able to compile them correctly into their abis and binary format, Slither was run against the 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.

#### Results:

```
| Procedure | Proc
```

• No major issues found by Slither.

### 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 the smart contracts and sent the compiled results to the analyzers in order to locate any vulnerabilities.

#### Results:

No major issues were found by MythX.

THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING

