Metasecurelabs analysis report

metasecurelabs.io

November 26, 2022

1 Introduction

1.1 dangerous_enum_conversion

$SWC_ID:$

Description:out-of-range enum conversion may occur (solc i 0.4.5). Example:

```
pragma solidity 0.4.2;
contract Test{
  enum E{a}
  function bug(uint a) public returns(E){
        return E(a);
    }
 DASP: Unknown Unknowns
```

Found: false

$unused_function_should_be_external$

SWC_ID:

Description: A function with public visibility modifier that is not called internally. Changing visibility level to external increases code readability. Moreover, in many cases functions with external visibility modifier spend less gas comparing to functions with public visibility modifier.

```
/*In the following example, functions with both public and

→ external visibility modifiers are used: */
contract Token {
    mapping (address => uint256) internal _ balances;
```

1.3 access_control

SWC_ID:

Description: Access Control issues are common in all programs, not just smart contracts. In fact, it's number 5 on the OWASP top 10. One usually accesses a contract's functionality through its public or external functions. While insecure visibility settings give attackers straightforward ways to access a contract's private values or logic, access control bypasses are sometimes more subtle. These vulnerabilities can occur in the following cases: * Contracts use the deprecated tx.origin to validate callers * Handling large authorization logic with lengthy require * Making reckless use of delegatecall in proxy libraries or proxy contracts. Delegate calling into untrusted contracts is very dangerous, as the code at the target address can change any storage values of the caller and has full control over the caller's balance. * Due to missing or insufficient access controls, malicious parties can withdraw some or all Ether from the contract account. * Due to missing or insufficient access controls, malicious parties can self-destruct the contract.

```
contract TestContract is MultiOwnable {
function withdrawAll(){
```

1.4 erc20_event_not_indexed

SWC_ID:

Description:Events defined by the ERC20 specification that should have some parameters as indexed.

Example:

```
contract ERC20Bad {
37
       event Transfer(address from, address to, uint value);
38
       event Approval(address owner, address spender, uint value);
40
       // ...
  }
42
43
   /*Transfer and Approval events should have the 'indexed'
    _{\mathrel{\mathrel{\hookrightarrow}}} keyword on their two first parameters, as defined by the
       ERC20 specification. Failure to include these keywords will
        exclude the parameter data in the transaction/block's bloom
        filter, so external tooling searching for these parameters
        may overlook them and fail to index logs from this token
        contract. */
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.5 locked_money

SWC_ID:

Description:Contracts programmed to receive ether should implement a way to withdraw it, i.e., call transfer (recommended), send, or call.value at least once..

```
/* In the following example, contracts programmed to receive \rightarrow ether does not call transfer, send, or call.value function: \rightarrow */
```

```
pragma solidity 0.4.25;

contract BadMarketPlace {
    function deposit() payable {
        require(msg.value > 0);
    }
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.6 arithmetic

$SWC_ID:$

Description: This bug type consists of various arithmetic bugs: integer overflow/underflow, division issues, . * Integer overflow/underflow. An overflow/underflow happens when an arithmetic operation reaches the maximum or minimum size of a type. For instance if a number is stored in the uint8 type, it means that the number is stored in a 8 bits unsigned number ranging from 0 to 2 extsuperscript8–1. In computer programming, an integer overflow occurs when an arithmetic operation attempts to create a numeric value that is outside of the range that can be represented with a given number of bits either larger than the maximum or lower than the minimum representable value. * Division issues. Some wrong will happen when integer or float numbers are divided by zero. * Type deduction overflow. In Solidity, when declaring a variable as type var, the compiler uses type deduction to automatically infer the smallest possible type from the first expression that is assigned to the variable. Thus, the deduced type may not be appropriate, and it can incur overflow bugs later (see the example).

```
}
       function isComplete() public view returns (bool) {
           return address(this).balance < 1 ether;</pre>
69
       function buy(uint256 numTokens) public payable {
           require(msg.value == numTokens * PRICE_ PER_ TOKEN);
           balanceOf[msg.sender] += numTokens;
       }
   }
77
    /*Division issues*/
   contract Division {
8:
       /*function unsigned_ division(uint32 x, uint32 y) returns
        \hookrightarrow (int r) {
         //if (y == 0) { throw; }
         r = x / y;
       }*/
       function signed_ division(int x, int y) returns (int) {
         //if ((y == 0) ((x == { 2**255) & & (y == { 1))) {

    throw; }

         return x / y;
90
91
  }
92
93
    /*Type deduction overflow*/
94
   contract For_ Test {
95
96
     function Test () payable public {
97
       if ( msg . value > 0.1 ether ) {
98
         uint256 multi = 0;
99
         uint256 amountToTransfer = 0;
         for ( var i = 0; i < 2* msg . value ; i ++) {
           multi = i *2;
102
           if ( multi < amountToTransfer ) {</pre>
             break ;
           amountToTransfer = multi ;
105
106
         msg.sender.transfer( amountToTransfer );
     }
```

1.7 incorrect_shift_in_assembly

$SWC_ID:$

 $\bf Description: The values in a shift operation could be reversed (in a wrong order)$

Example:

```
contract C {
  function f() internal returns (uint a) {
   assembly {
        a := shr(a, 8)
    }
}
DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: false
```

1.8 multiple_constructor_schemes

SWC_ID:

Description:Multiple constructor definitions in the same contract (using new and old schemes).

```
contract A {
    uint x;
    constructor() public {
        x = 0;
    }
    function A() public {
        x = 1;
    }
    function test() public returns(uint) {
        return x;
    }
}
```

```
/*In Solidity 0.4.22, a contract with both constructor schemes
\rightarrow will compile. The first constructor will take precedence
   over the second, which may be unintended.*/
DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.9 local_variable_shadowing

Description:Something wrong may happen when local variables shadowing state variables or other local variables.

Example:

```
pragma solidity 0.4.24;
   contract Bug {
134
       uint owner;
135
136
       function sensitive_ function(address owner) public {
137
           require(owner == msg.sender);
       }
140
141
       function alternate_ sensitive_ function() public {
142
           address owner = msg.sender;
           // ...
144
           require(owner == msg.sender);
146
   }
147
148
    /*sensitive_ function.owner shadows Bug.owner. As a result, the

→ use of owner in sensitive_ function might be incorrect.*/

    DASP: Unknown unknowns
```

Found: false

$redundant_code$ 1.10

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Redundant statements may have no effect. Example:

```
contract RedundantStatementsContract {
151
      constructor() public {
152
          uint; // Elementary Type Name
          bool; // Elementary Type Name
154
          RedundantStatementsContract; // Identifier
157
      function test() public returns (uint) {
158
          uint; // Elementary Type Name
159
          assert; // Identifier
          test; // Identifier
161
          return 777;
      }
163
  }
165
   /*Each commented line references types/identifiers, but
    \hookrightarrow for such statements and they can be removed.*/
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.11 should_be_view

$SWC_ID:$

Description:In Solidity, functions that do not read from the state or modify it can be declared as view.

Example:

```
Here is the example of correct view{ function:

contract C {

function f(uint a, uint b) view returns (uint) {

return a * (b + 42) + now;
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns

Found: false
```

1.12 arbitrary_from_in_transferFrom

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Something wrong happens when msg.sender is not used as 'from' in transferFrom.

Example:

```
function a(address from, address to, uint256 amount) public {
    erc20.transferFrom(from, to, am);
}

/*Alice approves this contract to spend her ERC20 tokens. Bob
    can call a and specify Alice's address as the from
    parameter in transferFrom, allowing him to transfer Alice's
    tokens to himself.*/
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.13 func_modifying_storage_array_by_value

SWC_ID:

Description: Arrays passed to a function that expects reference to a storage array.

```
contract Memory {
       uint[1] public x; // storage
180
181
       function f() public {
182
            f1(x); // update x
183
            f2(x); // do not update x
184
186
       function f1(uint[1] storage arr) internal { // by reference
            arr[0] = 1;
188
190
        function f2(uint[1] arr) internal { // by value
191
            arr[0] = 2;
192
        }
193
194
195
    /*Bob calls f(). Bob assumes that at the end of the call x[0]
     \hookrightarrow is 2, but it is 1. As a result, Bob's usage of the contract
        is incorrect. */
```

```
DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: false
```

1.14 dead_code

SWC_ID:

Description:In Solidity, it's possible to write code that does not produce the intended effects. Currently, the solidity compiler will not return a warning for effect–free code. This can lead to the introduction of "dead" code that does not properly performing an intended action.

For example, it's easy to miss the trailing parentheses in msg.sender.call.value(xx)("");, which could lead to a function proceeding without transferring funds to msg.sender. Also, internal functions could be 'dead' when they are not invoked.

```
pragma solidity 0.5.0;
198
   contract DepositBox {
199
       mapping(address => uint) balance;
200
       // Accept deposit
202
       function deposit(uint amount) public payable {
           require(msg.value == amount, 'incorrect amount');
           // Should update user balance
           balance[msg.sender] = amount;
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
 1.15
         short\_addresses
 SWC_ID:
    Description:MISSING
    Example:
209 | MISSING
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.16 blockhash_current

$SWC_ID:$

Description: blockhash function returns a non-zero value only for 256 last blocks. Besides, it always returns 0 for the current block, i.e. blockhash(block.number) always equals to 0.

Example:

```
/*In the following example, currentBlockBlockhash function
      always returns 0:*/
211
   pragma solidity 0.4.25;
212
213
   contract MyContract {
       function currentBlockHash() public view returns(bytes32) {
215
            return blockhash(block.number);
216
217
   }
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
```

1.17 msg.value_in_loop

$SWC_ID:$

Description:It is error–prone to use msg.value inside a loop. Example:

```
contract MsgValueInLoop{
       mapping (address => uint256) balances;
221
       function bad(address[] memory receivers) public payable {
222
           for (uint256 i=0; i < receivers.length; i++) {</pre>
223
               balances[receivers[i]] += msg.value;
           }
       }
   }
227
    /*msg.value should be tracked through a local variable and
       decrease its amount on every iteration/usage.*/
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
```

Found: false

1.18 reentrancy

SWC_ID:

Description:One of the major dangers of calling external contracts is that they can take over the control flow. In the reentrancy attack (a.k.a. recursive call attack), a malicious contract calls back into the calling contract before the first invocation of the function is finished. This may cause the different invocations of the function to interact in undesirable ways.

Example:

```
230
   * @source: http://blockchain.unica.it/projects/ethereum{

→ survey/attacks.htmlsimpledao

   * @author: {
   * @vulnerable_ at_ lines: 19
234
235
   pragma solidity 0.4.2;
236
237
   contract SimpleDAO {
238
     mapping (address => uint) public credit;
239
240
     function donate(address to) payable {
241
        credit[to] += msg.value;
242
243
244
     function withdraw(uint amount) {
245
        if (credit[msg.sender]>= amount) {
246
          // <yes> <report> REENTRANCY
          bool res = msg.sender.call.value(amount)();
248
          credit[msg.sender]{ =amount;
249
        }
250
     }
   }
252
     DASP: Reentrancy
     Found: true
```

1.19 visibility

SWC_ID:

Description:The default function visibility level in contracts is public, in interfaces – external, and the state variable default visibility level is internal. In contracts, the fallback function can be external or public. In interfaces, all the functions should be declared as external. Explicitly define function visibility

to prevent confusion. Additionally, the visibility of state variables could be a problem. labeling the visibility explicitly makes it easier to catch incorrect assumptions about who can access the variable.

Example:

```
/*In this example, a specific modifier, such as public, is not

→ used when declaring a function: */

function foo();

Preferred alternatives:

function foo() public;
function foo() internal;

}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: true
```

1.20 array_length_manipulation

$SWC_ID:$

Description: The length of the dynamic array is changed directly. In the following case, the appearance of gigantic arrays is possible and it can lead to a storage overlap attack (collisions with other data in storage).

```
pragma solidity 0.4.24;
262
   contract dataStorage {
263
       uint[] public data;
269
        function writeData(uint[] _ data) external {
266
            for(uint i = data.length; i < _ data.length; i++) {</pre>
267
                data.length++;
                data[i]=_ data[i];
260
            }
       }
   }
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
```

1.21 denial_of_service

SWC_ID:

Description:Denial of service (DoS) is deadly in the world of Ethereum: while other types of applications can eventually recover, smart contracts can be taken offline forever by just one of these attacks. DoS can happen in the following cases: * External calls can fail accidentally or deliberately, which can cause a DoS condition in the contract. Particularly, DoS would happen if there is a loop where external calls are not isolated. * A large number of loops may consume gas, so it is possible that the function exceeds the block gas limit, and transactions calling it will never be confirmed. * An inappropriate type inference in the loop (e.g., literal -i uint8) may cause a infinite loop. * Recursive external calls may consume a large number of callstacks, which may lead to DoS.

Example:

```
page for (var i = 0; i < array.length; i++) { /* ... */
}
DASP: Denial of Services
Found: true</pre>
```

1.22 uninitialized_state_variable

SWC_ID:

Description:Some unexpected error may happen when state variables are not uninitialized.

Example:

```
contract Uninitialized{
address destination;

function transfer() payable public{
destination.transfer(msg.value);
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: true
```

1.23 unchecked_calls

SWC_ID:

Description: The return value of a message call is not checked. Execution will resume even if the called contract throws an exception. If the call fails

accidentally or an attacker forces the call to fail, this may cause unexpected behaviour in the subsequent program logic.

Example:

```
pragma solidity 0.4.25;
282
   contract ReturnValue {
283
284
   checked
285
   function callchecked(address callee) public {
286
       require(callee.call());
288
     function callnotchecked(address callee) public {
290
       callee.call();
291
292
293 }
     DASP: Unchecked Low Level Calls
     Found: true
```

1.24 unused_retval

SWC_ID:

Description: The return value of an external call is not stored in a local or state variable.

Example:

```
contract MyConc{
    using SafeMath for uint;
    function my_ func(uint a, uint b) public{
        a.add(b);
    }
}

/*MyConc calls add of SafeMath, but does not store the result
    in a. As a result, the computation has no effect. */

}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: true
```

1.25 wrong_signature

$SWC_ID:$

Description:In Solidity, the function signature is defined as the canonical expression of the basic prototype without data location specifier, i.e. the function name with the parenthesised list of parameter types. Parameter types are split by a single comma – no spaces are used. This means one should use uint256 and int256 instead of uint or int.

Example:

```
/*This code uses incorrect function signature:*/
303
   pragma solidity 0.5.1;
   contract Signature {
305
       function callFoo(address addr, uint value) public returns
           (bool) {
           bytes memory data = abi.encodeWithSignature("foo(uint)",

    value);

            (bool status, ) = addr.call(data);
           return status;
310
311
   /*Use "foo(uint256)" instead.*/
    DASP: Unknown Unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.26 constant_state_variable

$SWC_ID:$

Description: There is a conflict if the same base constructor is called with arguments from two different locations in the same inheritance hierarchy.

```
pragma solidity 0.4.0;
314
315
   contract A{
316
        uint num = 5;
317
        constructor(uint x) public{
318
             num += x;
319
320
   }
321
322
   contract B is A{
323
        constructor() A(2) public { /* ... */ }
324
   }
325
```

```
contract C is A {
    constructor() A(3) public { /* ... */ }
}

contract D is B, C {
    constructor() public { /* ... */ }
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.27 incorrect_modifier

SWC_ID:

Description:If a modifier does not execute — or revert, the execution of the function will return the default value, which can be misleading for the caller.

Example:

```
modidfier myModif(){
    if(..){
        -;
      }
}
function get() myModif returns(uint){}

/*If the condition in myModif is false, the execution of get()
        will return 0.*/
}
DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.28 deprecated_standards

SWC_ID:

Description:Several functions and operators in Solidity are deprecated. Using them leads to reduced code quality. With new major versions of the Solidity compiler, deprecated functions and operators may result in side effects and compile errors. Deprecated Alternative suicide(address) selfdestruct(address) block.blockhash(uint) blockhash(uint) sha3(...) keccak256(...) callcode(...) delegatecall(...) throw revert() msg.gas gasleft constant view var corresponding type name

```
pragma solidity 0.4.24;
343
   contract BreakThisHash {
344
        bytes32 hash;
345
        uint birthday;
346
        constructor(bytes32 _ hash) public payable {
347
            hash = _ hash;
            birthday = now;
349
350
351
        function kill(bytes password) external {
352
            if (sha3(password) != hash) {
353
                 throw;
354
            }
355
            suicide(msg.sender);
356
357
358
        function hashAge() public constant returns(uint) {
359
            return(now { birthday);
360
361
   }
362
    /*Use keccak256, selfdestruct, revert() instead.*/
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
```

1.29 state_variable_shadowing

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Solidity allows for ambiguous naming of state variables when inheritance is used. Contract A with a variable x could inherit contract B that also has a state variable x defined. This would result in two separate versions of x, one of them being accessed from contract A and the other one from contract B. In more complex contract systems this condition could go unnoticed and subsequently lead to security issues.

```
pragma solidity 0.4.25;

pragma solidity 0.4.25;

contract Tokensale {
    uint public hardcap = 10000 ether;

function Tokensale() {}
```

```
function fetchCap() public constant returns(uint) {
           return hardcap;
373
374
   }
375
376
   contract Presale is Tokensale {
377
       //uint hardcap = 1000 ether;
378
       //If the hardcap variables were both needed we would have to
379
          rename one to fix this.
       function Presale() Tokensale() {
           hardcap = 1000 ether;
382
   }
383
    DASP: Unknown Unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.30 benign_reentrancy

SWC_ID:

Description:Some re–entrancy bugs have no adverse effect since its exploitation would have the same effect as two consecutive calls.

Example:

```
function callme(){
   if( ! (msg.sender.call()() ) ){
      throw;
   }
   counter += 1
}

/*callme() contains a benign reentrancy.*/
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.31 using_send

$SWC_ID:$

Description: The send function is called inside checks instead of using transfer. The recommended way to perform checked ether payments is addr.transfer(x), which automatically throws an exception if the transfer is unsuccessful.

```
/* In the following example, the send function is used:*/

if(!addr.send(42 ether)) {
    revert();
}

/*Preferred alternative:

addr.transfer(42 ether);*/
}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: false
```

1.32 race_condition

SWC_ID:

Description:Since miners always get rewarded via gas fees for running code on behalf of externally owned addresses (EOA), users can specify higher fees to have their transactions mined more quickly. Since the Ethereum blockchain is public, everyone can see the contents of others' pending transactions. This means if a given user is revealing the solution to a puzzle or other valuable secret, a malicious user can steal the solution and copy their transaction with higher fees to preempt the original solution. If developers of smart contracts are not careful, this situation can lead to practical and devastating front—running attacks.

```
/* In this example, one can front{ run transactions to claim
      his/her reward before the owner reduces the reward amount.*/
403
   pragma solidity 0.4.16;
404
405
   contract EthTxOrderDependenceMinimal {
406
       address public owner;
407
       bool public claimed;
408
       uint public reward;
409
410
       function EthTxOrderDependenceMinimal() public {
411
            owner = msg.sender;
413
414
       function setReward() public payable {
415
            require (!claimed);
            require(msg.sender == owner);
```

```
owner.transfer(reward);
            reward = msg.value;
       }
420
421
        function claimReward(uint256 submission) {
422
            require (!claimed);
423
            require(submission < 10);</pre>
            msg.sender.transfer(reward);
425
            claimed = true;
       }
   }
     DASP: Front Running
     Found: true
```

1.33 uninitialized_func_pointer

$SWC_ID:$

Description: this.balance will include the value sent by msg.value, which might lead to incorrect computation.

Example:

```
contract Bug{
function buy() public payable{
    uint minted = msg.value * (1000 / address(this).balance);
    // ...
}

/*buy is meant to compute a price that changes a ratio over the
    contract's balance. .balance will include msg.value and
    lead to an incorrect price computation.*/

}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.34 modifier_like_Sol_keyword

$SWC_ID:$

Description: A contract may contain modifier that looks similar to Solidity keyword

```
contract Contract{
       modifier public() {
438
439
440
       function doSomething() public {
441
            require(owner == msg.sender);
442
            owner = newOwner;
444
   }
445
446
    /*public is a modifier meant to look like a Solidity keyword.*/
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
```

1.35 incorrect_ERC721_interface

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Incorrect return values for ERC721 functions. A contract compiled with solidity ξ 0.4.22 interacting with these functions will fail to execute them, as the return value is missing.

Example:

1.36 incorrect_ERC20_interface

SWC_ID:

Description:Incorrect return values for ERC20 functions. A contract compiled with Solidity i 0.4.22 interacting with these functions will fail to execute them, as the return value is missing.

```
contract Token{
function transfer(address to, uint value) external;
//...
```

1.37 del_structure_containing_mapping

SWC_ID:

Description:A deletion in a structure containing a mapping will not delete the mapping (see the Solidity documentation). The remaining data may be used to compromise the contract.

Example:

```
struct BalancesStruct{
       address owner;
459
       mapping(address => uint) balances;
460
461
   mapping(address => BalancesStruct) public stackBalance;
462
463
   function remove() internal{
464
         delete stackBalance[msg.sender];
465
   }
466
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.38 use_after_delete

$SWC_ID:$

Description: Using values of variables after they have been explicitly deleted may lead to unexpected behavior or compromise.

```
mapping(address => uint) public balances;
function f() public {
    delete balances[msg.sender];
    msg.sender.transfer(balances[msg.sender]);
    }
}
```

1.39 function_declared_return_but_no_return

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Function doesn't initialize return value. As result default value will be returned.

Example:

```
/*In the following example, the function's signature only
    \hookrightarrow denotes the type of the return value, but the function's
       body does not contain return statement:*/
   pragma solidity 0.4.25;
476
477
   contract NewContract {
478
       uint minimumBuy;
479
480
       function setMinimumBuy(uint256 newMinimumBuy) returns
481
            (bool){
            minimumBuy = newMinimumBuy;
482
   }
484
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
```

1.40 controlled_lowlevel_call

SWC_ID:

Description:Low–level call with a user–controlled data field **Example**:

```
address token;

as function call_ token(bytes data) {
 token.call(data);
}
```

```
/*token` points to an ERC20 token. Bob uses call_ token to call

the transfer function of token to withdraw all tokens held

by the contract.*/

Bob uses call_ token to call

token to call

DASP: Unknown Unknowns

Found: true
```

1.41 address_hardcoded

$SWC_ID:$

Description: The contract contains unknown address. This address might be used for some malicious activity. Please check hardcoded address and it's usage.

Example:

```
/*In the following contract, the address is specified in the
    ⇔ source code:*/
   pragma solidity 0.4.24;
494
   contract C {
495
     function f(uint a, uint b) pure returns (address) {
496
       address public multisig =
497
           0xf64B584972FE6055a770477670208d737Fff282f;
       return multisig;
498
           }
499
   }
501
    /*Do not forget to check the contract at the address
        0xf64B584972FE6055a770477670208d737Fff282f for
        vulnerabilities.*/
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.42 divide_before_multiply

$SWC_ID:$

Description: Solidity operates only with integers. Thus, if the division is done before the multiplication, the rounding errors can increase dramatically. Vulnerability type by SmartDec classification: Precision issues.

```
/*In the following example, amount variable is divided by
       DELIMITER and then multiplied by BONUS. Thus, a rounding
       error appears (consider amount = 9000):*/
504
   pragma solidity 0.4.25;
505
506
   contract MyContract {
508
       uint constant BONUS = 500;
509
       uint constant DELIMITER = 10000;
510
       function calculateBonus(uint amount) returns (uint) {
           return amount/DELIMITER*BONUS;
514
   }
515
    DASP: Unknown Unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.43 reused_base_constructors

$SWC_ID:$

Description: There is a conflict if the same base constructor is called with arguments from two different locations in the same inheritance hierarchy.

```
pragma solidity 0.4.0;
517
   contract A{
518
        uint num = 5;
519
        constructor(uint x) public{
            num += x;
521
        }
   }
524
   contract B is A{
525
        constructor() A(2) public { /* ... */ }
526
   }
527
528
   contract C is A {
529
        constructor() A(3) public { /* ... */ }
530
   }
531
532
533 contract D is B, C {
```

```
constructor() public { /* ... */ }

}

DASP: Unknown unknowns

Found: false
```

1.44 unused_state_variables

SWC_ID:

Description:Unused variables are allowed in Solidity and they do not pose a direct security issue. It is best practice though to avoid them as they can: * cause an increase in computations (and unnecessary gas consumption) * indicate bugs or malformed data structures and they are generally a sign of poor code quality * cause code noise and decrease readability of the code

```
pragma solidity >=0.5.0;
   pragma experimental ABIEncoderV2;
537
538
   import "./base.sol";
539
   contract DerivedA is Base {
541
        // i is not used in the current contract
542
        A i = A(1);
543
        int internal j = 500;
545
546
        function call(int a) public {
547
            assign1(a);
548
        }
549
559
        function assign3(A memory x) public returns (uint) {
55
            return g[1] + x.a + uint(j);
552
553
554
        function ret() public returns (int){
555
            return this.e();
556
557
        }
558
     int internal j = 500;
   function call(int a) public {
560
            assign1(a);
561
        }
562
        function assign3(A memory x) public returns (uint) {
```

1.45 do_while_continue

SWC_ID:

Description:Prior to version 0.5.0, Solidity compiler handles continue inside do—while loop incorrectly: it ignores while condition.

Example:

```
/*The following loop is infinite:*/

773
do {
    continue;
  } while(false);
}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: false
```

1.46 builtin_symbol_shadowing

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Something wrong may happen when built—in symbols are shadowed by local variables, state variables, functions, modifiers, or events.

```
585
       function get_ next_ expiration(uint earlier_ time) private
           returns (uint) {
           return now + 259200; // References overshadowed
587
              timestamp.
   }
589
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
  1.47
         ignore
  SWC_ID:
    Description:Other trivial bug types.
    Example:
590
    DASP: Unknown Unknowns
    Found: true
```

1.48 uninitialized_storage_pointer

SWC_ID:

Description:An uninitialized storage variable will act as a reference to the first state variable, and can override a critical variable.

```
contract Uninitialized{
        address owner = msg.sender;
592
593
        struct St{
594
            uint a;
595
596
597
        function func() {
598
            St st;
599
            st.a = 0x0;
        }
602
    /*Bob calls func. As a result, owner is overridden to 0.*/
```

1.49 should_be_pure

$SWC_ID:$

Description:In Solidity, function that do not read from the state or modify it can be declared as pure.

Example:

```
Here is the example of correct pure{ function:

pragma solidity 0.4.16;

contract C {
    function f(uint a, uint b) pure returns (uint) {
    return a * (b + 42) + now;
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.50 pre_declare_usage_of_local

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Using a variable before the declaration is stepped over (either because it is later declared, or declared in another scope).

```
contract C {
613
        function f(uint z) public returns (uint) {
614
            uint y = x + 9 + z; // 'z' is used pre{ declaration
            uint x = 7;
616
            if (z \% 2 == 0) {
618
                uint max = 5;
                // ...
620
            }
622
            // 'max' was intended to be 5, but it was mistakenly
623
                declared in a scope and not assigned (so it is
                zero).
```

1.51 storage_ABIEncoderV2_array

SWC_ID:

Description:solc versions 0.4.7–0.5.9 contain a compiler bug leading to incorrect ABI encoder usage.

Example:

```
contract A {
       uint[2][3] bad_ arr = [[1, 2], [3, 4], [5, 6]];
632
633
       /* Array of arrays passed to abi.encode is vulnerable */
634
       function bad() public {
635
           bytes memory b = abi.encode(bad_ arr);
636
637
   }
638
    /*abi.encode(bad_ arr) in a call to bad() will incorrectly
        encode the array as [[1, 2], [2, 3], [3, 4]] and lead to
        unintended behavior.*/
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.52 costly_ops_in_loop

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Costly operations inside a loop might waste gas, so optimizations are justified.

```
_{641} contract CostlyOperationsInLoop{
```

```
uint loop_ count = 100;
643
        uint state_ variable=0;
644
645
        function bad() external{
646
            for (uint i=0; i < loop_ count; i++){</pre>
647
                 state_ variable++;
648
            }
        }
650
651
        function good() external{
652
          uint local_ variable = state_ variable;
          for (uint i=0; i < loop_ count; i++){</pre>
654
            local_ variable++;
655
          }
656
          state_ variable = local_ variable;
657
658
   }
659
    /*Incrementing state_ variable in a loop incurs a lot of gas
660
        because of expensive SSTOREs, which might lead to an out{
         of{ gas.*/
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
```

1.53 msg.value_equals_zero

SWC_ID:

Description: The msg.value ==0 condition check is meaningless in most cases.

Example:

DASE: Ulikilowii ulikilowiis

Found: false

1.54 overpowered_role

$SWC_ID:$

Description: This function is callable only from one address. Therefore, the system depends heavily on this address. In this case, there are scenarios that may lead to undesirable consequences for investors, e.g. if the private key of this address becomes compromised.

```
pragma solidity 0.4.25;
663
   contract Crowdsale {
664
665
        address public owner;
666
667
        uint rate;
668
        uint cap;
669
670
        constructor() {
671
            owner = msg.sender;
673
        function setRate(_ rate) public onlyOwner {
675
            rate = _ rate;
677
678
        function setCap(_ cap) public {
679
            require (msg.sender == owner);
            cap = _cap;
681
   }
683
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
```

I daira. Taise

1.55 storage_signed_integer_array

$SWC_ID:$

Description:solc versions 0.4.7–0.5.10 contain a compiler bug leading to incorrect values in signed integer arrays.

```
/*bad0() uses a (storage{ allocated) signed integer array state

variable to store the ether balances of three accounts. 1

is supposed to indicate uninitialized values but the

Solidity bug makes these as 1, which could be exploited by

the accounts.*/

}

DASP: Unknown unknowns

Found: false
```

1.56 useless_compare

SWC_ID:

Description:A variable compared to itself is probably an error as it will always return true for ==, $\xi=$, j= and always false for j, ξ and j=. In addition, some comparison are also tautologies or contradictions.

Example:

```
function check(uint a) external returns(bool){
   return (a >= a);
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.57 extra_gas_in_loops

SWC_ID:

Description:State variable, .balance, or .length of non–memory array is used in the condition of for or while loop. In this case, every iteration of loop consumes extra gas.

```
/* In the following example, limiter variable is accessed on

→ every for{ loop iteration: /*

pragma solidity 0.4.25;

contract NewContract {
 uint limiter = 100;

function longLoop() {
 for(uint i = 0; i < limiter; i++) {
 /* ... */
```

```
| Top | Top
```

1.58 payable_func_using_delegatecall_in_loop

$SWC_ID:$

Description: The same msg.value amount may be incorrectly accredited multiple times when using delegatecall inside a loop in a payable function.

Example:

1.59 right_to_left_char

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Malicious actors can use the Right–To–Left—— Override unicode character to force RTL text rendering and confuse users as to the real intent of a contract.

```
/*/
/**
/**
/** @source: https://youtu.be/P_ Mtd5Fc_ 3E
```

```
* @author: Shahar Zini
   pragma solidity 0.5.0;
728
729
   contract GuessTheNumber
730
        uint _ secretNumber;
        address payable _ owner;
        event success(string);
734
   event wrongNumber(string);
735
736
        function guess(uint n) payable public
738
            require(msg.value == 1 ether);
739
740
            uint p = address(this).balance;
741
            checkAndTransferPrize(/*The prize/*rebmun desseug*/n ,
742
                p/*
                     /*The user who should benefit */,msg.sender);
743
        }
744
745
        function checkAndTransferPrize(uint p, uint n, address
746
            payable guesser) internal returns(bool)
747
            if(n == _ secretNumber)
748
                guesser.transfer(p);
759
                emit success("You guessed the correct number!");
751
            }
752
            else
753
754
                 emit wrongNumber("You've made an incorrect guess!");
755
            }
756
        }
757
758
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
  1.60
          assert\_state\_change
  SWC_ID:
     Description:Incorrect use of assert(). See Solidity best practices.
     Example:
```

```
contract A {
    uint s_ a;

function bad() public {
    assert((s_ a += 1) > 10);
    }

/*The assert in bad() increments the state variable s_ a while
    checking for the condition.*/

}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: false
```

pausable_modifier_absence

SWC_ID:

1.61

Description:ERC20 balance/allowance is modified without whenNotPaused modifier (in pausable contract).x

Example:

```
function buggyTransfer(address to, uint256 value) external
   → returns (bool){
           balanceOf[msg.sender] { = value;
768
           balanceOf[to] += value;
769
           return true;
770
       }
    /*In a pausable contract, buggyTransfer performs a token
     \hookrightarrow transfer but does not use Pausable's whenNotPaused
     \hookrightarrow modifier. If the token admin/owner pauses the ERC20
        contract to trigger an emergency stop, it will not apply to
        this function. This results in Txs transferring even in a
        paused state, which corrupts the contract balance state and
        affects recovery.*/
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
```

1.62 call_without_data

SWC_ID:

Description:Using low–level call function with no arguments provided. **Example:**

```
/*In the following example, call function is used for ETH

    transfer:*/

   pragma solidity 0.4.24;
775
776
   contract MyContract {
777
778
        function withdraw() {
            if (msg.sender.call.value(1)()) {
780
            /*...*/
781
            }
782
        }
   }
784
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
```

1.63 time_manipulation

SWC_ID:

Description:From locking a token sale to unlocking funds at a specific time for a game, contracts sometimes need to rely on the current time. This is usually done via block.timestamp or its alias now in Solidity. But where does that value come from? From the miners! Because a transaction's miner has leeway in reporting the time at which the mining occurred, good smart contracts will avoid relying strongly on the time advertised.

```
contract TimedCrowdsale
     event Finished();
786
     event notFinished();
787
     // Sale should finish exactly at January 1, 2019
789
     function isSaleFinished() private returns (bool) {
790
        return block.timestamp >= 1546300800;
791
     }
792
793
     function run() public {
794
        if (isSaleFinished()) {
795
            emit Finished();
796
        } else {
797
            emit notFinished();
798
   }
```

1.64 uninitialized_local_variable

$SWC_ID:$

Description:Some unexpected error may happen when local variables are not uninitialized.

Example:

```
contract Uninitialized is Owner{
function withdraw() payable public onlyOwner{
address to;
to.transfer(this.balance)
}

/*Bob calls transfer. As a result, all Ether is sent to the
address OxO and is lost.*/

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
```

1.65 strict_balance_equality

SWC_ID:

Description:Contracts can behave erroneously when they strictly assume a specific Ether balance. It is always possible to forcibly send ether to a contract (without triggering its fallback function), using selfdestruct, or by mining to the account. In the worst case scenario this could lead to DOS conditions that might render the contract unusable.

```
DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
  1.66 byte_array_instead_bytes
  SWC_ID:
     Description:Use bytes instead of byte[] for lower gas consumption.
     Example:
   /*In the following example, byte array is used:*/
819
   pragma solidity 0.4.24;
820
821
   contract C {
       byte[] someVariable;
823
   }
825
   Alternative:
827
828
   pragma solidity 0.4.24;
829
830
   contract C {
831
       bytes someVariable;
832
   }
834
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
```

Found: false