# Metasecurelabs analysis report

## metasecurelabs.io

December 2, 2022

# 1 Introduction

# 1.1 dangerous\_enum\_conversion

```
SWC_ID: []

Description:out—of—range enum conversion may occur (solc; 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
Reported by checker:
```

# 1.2 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;
14
       function transfer_ public(address to, uint256 value) public
15
           require(value <= _ balances[msg.sender]);</pre>
           _ balances[msg.sender] { = value;
           _ balances[to] += value;
       function transfer_ external(address to, uint256 value)
           external {
           require(value <= _ balances[msg.sender]);</pre>
           _ balances[msg.sender] { = value;
           _ balances[to] += value;
27
  }
28
29
   /*The second function requires less gas.*/
 }
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: true
    Reported by checker:
  [{"checker_ id":9,"lines":[],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
      9"},{"checker_ id":9,"lines":[],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
      9"},{"checker_ id":9,"lines":[],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 9"}]
```

# 1.3 access\_control

**SWC\_ID:** [105,106,115]

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.

#### Example:

### 1.4 erc20\_event\_not\_indexed

### SWC\_ID: []

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

```
contract ERC20Bad {
       // ...
40
       event Transfer(address from, address to, uint value);
41
       event Approval(address owner, address spender, uint value);
42
43
       // ...
44
  }
45
   /*Transfer and Approval events should have the 'indexed'
    \hookrightarrow keyword on their two first parameters, as defined by the
    \hookrightarrow 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

Reported by checker:

48 []

### 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...

### Example:

#### 1.6 arithmetic

### **SWC\_ID:** [101]

58 []

**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).

```
Integer overflow/underflow
  * @source: https://capturetheether.com/challenges/math/token{
   → sale/
  * @author: Steve Marx
  */
63
  pragma solidity 0.4.21;
  contract TokenSaleChallenge {
       mapping(address => uint256) public balanceOf;
66
       uint256 constant PRICE_ PER_ TOKEN = 1 ether;
67
       function TokenSaleChallenge(address _ player) public payable
           require(msg.value == 1 ether);
       }
       function isComplete() public view returns (bool) {
73
           return address(this).balance < 1 ether;</pre>
       function buy(uint256 numTokens) public payable {
           require(msg.value == numTokens * PRICE_ PER_ TOKEN);
           balanceOf[msg.sender] += numTokens;
80
       }
81
  }
82
83
   /*Division issues*/
84
  contract Division {
86
       /*function unsigned_ division(uint32 x, uint32 y) returns
       \hookrightarrow (int r) {
         //if (y == 0) \{ throw; \}
        r = x / y;
       }*/
90
       function signed_ division(int x, int y) returns (int) {
         //if ((y == 0) ((x == { 2**255) & & (y == { 1))) {
93

    throw; }

         return x / y;
```

```
}
   }
97
98
    /*Type deduction overflow*/
99
   contract For_ Test {
     function Test () payable public {
102
       if ( msg . value > 0.1 ether ) {
         uint256 multi = 0;
104
         uint256 amountToTransfer = 0;
         for ( var i = 0; i < 2* msg . value ; i ++) {
106
           multi = i *2;
           if ( multi < amountToTransfer ) {</pre>
108
             break ;
           amountToTransfer = multi ;
         msg.sender.transfer( amountToTransfer );
112
113
114
  }
115
    DASP: Arithmetic
    Found: true
     Reported by checker:
116 [{"checker_ id":1,"lines":[{"code":"
                                           credit[to] +=

→ msg.value;\n","function_ name":"","line_
   → no":13}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 1"},{"checker_

    id":5,"lines":[{"code":"

                                    credit[to] +=

→ msg.value;\n","function_ name":"","line_
   \rightarrow no":13}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 5"},{"checker_

    id":6,"lines":[{"code":"

                                    credit[to] +=

    msg.value;\n","function_ name":"","line_
   → no":13}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 6"},{"checker_
      id":6,"lines":[{"code":"
                                      credit[msg.sender]{
      =amount; \n", "function_ name": "", "line_
   → no":20}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 6"},{"checker_
      id":7,"lines":[{"code":"
                                    credit[to] +=
      msg.value;\n","function_ name":"","line_
       no":13}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 7"}]
 1.7 incorrect_shift_in_assembly
 SWC_ID: []
```

**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
Reported by checker:
```

# 1.8 multiple\_constructor\_schemes

# SWC\_ID: []

123

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

### Example:

Found: false

Reported by checker:

```
contract A {
        uint x;
        constructor() public {
126
            x = 0;
127
128
        function A() public {
            x = 1;
131
        function test() public returns(uint) {
133
            return x;
134
135
   }
136
137
    /*In Solidity 0.4.22, a contract with both constructor schemes
138
     \ \hookrightarrow \  will compile. The first constructor will take precedence
     → over the second, which may be unintended.*/
  }
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
```

# 1.9 local\_variable\_shadowing

### SWC\_ID: []

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

Example:

```
pragma solidity 0.4.24;
   contract Bug {
142
       uint owner;
143
144
       function sensitive_ function(address owner) public {
146
            require(owner == msg.sender);
147
148
149
       function alternate_ sensitive_ function() public {
150
            address owner = msg.sender;
152
            require(owner == msg.sender);
153
154
   }
155
156
    /*sensitive_ function.owner shadows Bug.owner. As a result, the

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

    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
    Reported by checker:
158 []
        redundant\_code
  1.10
```

```
SWC_ID: []
```

**Description**:Redundant statements may have no effect.

```
contract RedundantStatementsContract {

constructor() public {

uint; // Elementary Type Name
```

```
bool; // Elementary Type Name
163
            RedundantStatementsContract; // Identifier
       }
165
       function test() public returns (uint) {
167
            uint; // Elementary Type Name
168
            assert; // Identifier
            test; // Identifier
            return 777;
       }
172
   }
173
174
    /*Each commented line references types/identifiers, but
    \rightarrow performs no action with them, so no code will be generated
    \rightarrow for such statements and they can be removed.*/
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
    Reported by checker:
176 []
         should\_be\_view
  1.11
  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:
178
   contract C {
179
       function f(uint a, uint b) view returns (uint) {
180
            return a * (b + 42) + now;
182
183 }
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
    Reported by checker:
184 []
```

# 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
Reported by checker:
```

# 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
192
193
       function f() public {
           f1(x); // update x
195
           f2(x); // do not update x
       }
197
       function f1(uint[1] storage arr) internal { // by reference
199
           arr[0] = 1;
       function f2(uint[1] arr) internal { // by value
           arr[0] = 2;
       }
```

```
/*Bob calls f(). Bob assumes that at the end of the call x[0]

is 2, but it is 1. As a result, Bob's usage of the contract

is incorrect. */

}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns

Found: false

Reported by checker:
```

### 1.14 dead code

**SWC\_ID:** [135]

**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;
211
   contract DepositBox {
212
       mapping(address => uint) balance;
213
214
       // Accept deposit
215
       function deposit(uint amount) public payable {
           require(msg.value == amount, 'incorrect amount');
217
           // Should update user balance
           balance[msg.sender] = amount;
221
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
    Reported by checker:
222
```

# 1.15 incorrect\_using\_balance\_and\_msg\_value

### 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);
227
  }
229
   /*buy is meant to compute a price that changes a ratio over the
    lead to an incorrect price computation.*/
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
    Reported by checker:
231 []
       short_addresses
 1.16
 SWC_ID: []
    Description:MISSING
    Example:
232 MISSING
    DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
    Reported by checker:
```

# 1.17 blockhash\_current

### SWC\_ID: []

233 []

**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.

```
/*In the following example, currentBlockBlockhash function

→ always returns 0:*/

   pragma solidity 0.4.25;
236
237
   contract MyContract {
238
       function currentBlockHash() public view returns(bytes32) {
            return blockhash(block.number);
240
241
   }
242
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
243 []
  1.18
         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;
245
246
       function bad(address[] memory receivers) public payable {
247
            for (uint256 i=0; i < receivers.length; i++) {</pre>
248
                balances[receivers[i]] += msg.value;
249
            }
250
       }
251
   }
252
253
    /*msg.value should be tracked through a local variable and
        decrease its amount on every iteration/usage.*/
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
255 []
```

# 1.19 reentrancy

### **SWC\_ID:** [107]

**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.

```
256
   * @source: http://blockchain.unica.it/projects/ethereum{
   * @author: {
   * @vulnerable_ at_ lines: 19
259
260
261
   pragma solidity 0.4.2;
263
   contract SimpleDAO {
     mapping (address => uint) public credit;
269
     function donate(address to) payable {
267
       credit[to] += msg.value;
269
     function withdraw(uint amount) {
271
       if (credit[msg.sender]>= amount) {
272
         // <yes> <report> REENTRANCY
         bool res = msg.sender.call.value(amount)();
274
         credit[msg.sender]{ =amount;
275
       }
276
     }
   }
278
    DASP: Reentrancy
    Found: true
    Reported by checker:
```

```
[{"checker_ id":1,"lines":[{"code":"
   msg.sender.call.value(amount)(); \n", "function_
   name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
   1"},{"checker_ id":5,"lines":[{"code":"
    credit[msg.sender]{ =amount;\n","function_ name":"","line_
   no":20}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 5"},{"checker_
    id":4,"lines":[{"code":"
                                  bool res =
   msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_
   name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
   4"},{"checker_ id":6,"lines":[{"code":"
                                                  bool res =
   msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_
   name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
   6"},{"checker_ id":7,"lines":[{"code":"
                                                 bool res =
   msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_
   name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
   7"},{"checker_ id":8,"lines":[{"code":"
    <report> REENTRANCY\n","function_ name":"","line_
   no":18}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 8"},{"checker_
   id":9,"lines":[{"code":"
                                  credit[msg.sender]{
   =amount; \n", "function_ name": "", "line_ no": 20}, {"code": "
   bool res = msg.sender.call.value(amount)(); \n", "function_
   name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 9"}]
```

#### 1.20 visibility

#### **SWC\_ID:** [100,108]

**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.

```
/*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

Reported by checker:

# 1.21 array\_length\_manipulation

### **SWC\_ID:** [124]

**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).

### Example:

```
pragma solidity 0.4.24;
290
   contract dataStorage {
291
        uint[] public data;
292
293
        function writeData(uint[] _ data) external {
294
            for(uint i = data.length; i < _ data.length; i++) {</pre>
295
                 data.length++;
296
                 data[i]=_ data[i];
            }
298
        }
   }
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
301 []
```

### 1.22 denial\_of\_service

### **SWC\_ID:** [113,128]

**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:

```
for (var i = 0; i < array.length; i++) { /* ... */

}

DASP : Denial of Services
Found: true
Reported by checker:

[{"checker_ id":6,"lines":[{"code":" bool res = bounder = bounder = bounder = bounder = bounder = bounder = bool = bool
```

#### 1.23 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
```

Reported by checker:

```
[{"checker_ id":4,"lines":[{"code":"
                                         credit[to] +=

→ msg.value;\n","function_ name":"","line_
→ no":13}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 4"},{"checker_
→ id":4,"lines":[{"code":"
                                   credit[msg.sender]{
   =amount; \n", "function_ name": "", "line_
_{\hookrightarrow} no":20}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 4"},{"checker_
   id":4,"lines":[{"code":"
                                return credit[to];\n","function_
    name":"","line_ no":25}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
    4"},{"checker_ id":4,"lines":[{"code":" mapping (address =>
   uint) public credit;\n","function_ name":"","line_
→ no":10}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 4"},{"checker_
                                if (credit[msg.sender]>= amount)
   id":4,"lines":[{"code":"
   {\n","function_ name":"","line_
   no":17}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 4"}]
```

# 1.24 unchecked\_calls

# **SWC\_ID:** [104]

**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.

```
pragma solidity 0.4.25;
313
   contract ReturnValue {
   checked
316
   function callchecked(address callee) public {
317
       require(callee.call());
318
319
320
     function callnotchecked(address callee) public {
321
        callee.call();
322
323
   }
324
     DASP: Unchecked Low Level Calls
     Found: true
     Reported by checker:
```

```
[{"checker_ id":1,"lines":[{"code":" bool res =

msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_

name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{

"""","checker_ id":5,"lines":[{"code":" bool res =

msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_

name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{

"""","line_ id":8,"lines":[{"code":" // <yes>

""","function_ name":"","line_

""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ name":"","line_
""","function_ na
```

### 1.25 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{
328
           a.add(b);
329
330
   }
331
332
    /*MyConc calls add of SafeMath, but does not store the result
333
    → in a. As a result, the computation has no effect. */
 }
    DASP: Unknown Unknowns
    Found: true
    Reported by checker:
   [{"checker_ id":4,"lines":[{"code":"
       msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_
       name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 4"}]
```

### 1.26 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.

```
/*This code uses incorrect function signature:*/
336
   pragma solidity 0.5.1;
337
   contract Signature {
338
       function callFoo(address addr, uint value) public returns
339
           (bool) {
            bytes memory data = abi.encodeWithSignature("foo(uint)",

    value);

            (bool status, ) = addr.call(data);
            return status;
342
       }
343
   }
344
   /*Use "foo(uint256)" instead.*/
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
347 []
```

### 1.27 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;
349
   contract A{
359
        uint num = 5;
351
        constructor(uint x) public{
352
            num += x;
353
354
   }
355
356
   contract B is A{
357
        constructor() A(2) public { /* ... */ }
358
   }
359
360
   contract C is A {
361
        constructor() A(3) public { /* ... */ }
362
   }
363
364
```

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

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:
```

## 1.28 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
Reported by checker:
377 []
```

# 1.29 deprecated\_standards

### **SWC\_ID:** [111,118]

**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;
379
   contract BreakThisHash {
380
        bytes32 hash;
381
        uint birthday;
382
        constructor(bytes32 _ hash) public payable {
383
            hash = _ hash;
            birthday = now;
385
386
387
        function kill(bytes password) external {
            if (sha3(password) != hash) {
389
                 throw;
390
            }
391
            suicide(msg.sender);
392
393
394
        function hashAge() public constant returns(uint) {
395
            return(now { birthday);
396
397
   }
398
    /*Use keccak256, selfdestruct, revert() instead.*/
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
401 []
```

# 1.30 state\_variable\_shadowing

## **SWC\_ID:** [119]

**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) {
409
            return hardcap;
410
       }
411
   }
413
   contract Presale is Tokensale {
414
       //uint hardcap = 1000 ether;
415
       //If the hardcap variables were both needed we would have to
          rename one to fix this.
       function Presale() Tokensale() {
           hardcap = 1000 ether;
418
       }
   }
  }
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
421 []
```

# 1.31 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.

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

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

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:
```

# 1.32 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.

#### Example:

```
/* In the following example, the send function is used:*/
432
433
   if(!addr.send(42 ether)) {
434
       revert();
435
   }
437
    /*Preferred alternative:
439
   addr.transfer(42 ether); */
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
441 []
```

### 1.33 race\_condition

#### **SWC\_ID:** [114]

**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.*/

pragma solidity 0.4.16;

contract EthTxOrderDependenceMinimal {

address public owner;
```

```
bool public claimed;
448
       uint public reward;
449
450
       function EthTxOrderDependenceMinimal() public {
451
            owner = msg.sender;
452
       }
453
       function setReward() public payable {
455
            require (!claimed);
456
            require(msg.sender == owner);
457
            owner.transfer(reward);
            reward = msg.value;
459
       }
461
       function claimReward(uint256 submission) {
            require (!claimed);
463
            require(submission < 10);</pre>
            msg.sender.transfer(reward);
465
            claimed = true;
467
   }
468
    DASP: Front Running
    Found: true
     Reported by checker:
469 [{"checker_ id":8,"lines":[{"code":"
                                                // <yes> <report>
    → REENTRANCY\n", "function_ name": "", "line_
    → no":18}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 8"},{"checker_

    id":8,"lines":[{"code":"

                                      // <yes> <report>
      REENTRANCY\n","function_ name":"","line_
       no":18}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 8"}]
```

# 1.34 uninitialized\_func\_pointer

#### SWC\_ID:

**Description**:solc versions 0.4.5—— 0.4.26 and 0.5.0—— 0.5.8 contain a compiler bug leading to unexpected behavior when calling uninitialized function pointers in constructors.

```
d70 contract bad0 {

d71 d72 d73 /* Uninitialized function pointer */
```

```
function(uint256) internal returns(uint256) a;
        a(10);
     }
476
   }
477
478
   The call to a(10) will lead to unexpected behavior because
    \ \ \hookrightarrow \ \  function pointer a is not initialized in the constructor.
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
480 []
         modifier\_like\_Sol\_keyword
  1.35
  SWC_ID:
     Description: A contract may contain modifier that looks similar to Solidity
  keyword
     Example:
   contract Contract{
        modifier pub1ic() {
482
483
484
        function doSomething() public {
            require(owner == msg.sender);
486
            owner = newOwner;
487
        }
488
   }
489
490
    /*public is a modifier meant to look like a Solidity keyword.*/
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
492 []
         incorrect\_ERC721\_interface
  1.36
  SWC_ID: []
```

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

### Example:

### 1.37 incorrect\_ERC20\_interface

### SWC\_ID: []

**Description:**Incorrect return values for ERC20 functions. A contract compiled with Solidity ¿ 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;
//...
}

/*Token.transfer does not return a boolean. Bob deploys the
token. Alice creates a contract that interacts with it but
assumes a correct ERC20 interface implementation. Alice's
contract is unable to interact with Bob's contract. */

}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:
```

# 1.38 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;
    mapping(address => uint) balances;
}
mapping(address => BalancesStruct) public stackBalance;

function remove() internal{
    delete stackBalance[msg.sender];
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:

[]
```

#### 1.39 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]);
}

/*balances[msg.sender] is deleted before it's sent to the
    caller, leading the transfer to always send zero.*/
}

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:
```

# 1.40 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:*/
524
   pragma solidity 0.4.25;
525
526
   contract NewContract {
       uint minimumBuy;
528
       function setMinimumBuy(uint256 newMinimumBuy) returns
            (bool){
            minimumBuy = newMinimumBuy;
531
532
   }
533
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
534
```

### 1.41 controlled\_lowlevel\_call

### SWC\_ID: []

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

```
\mathbf{DASP}: Unknown Unknowns
```

Found: true

Reported by checker:

```
[{"checker_ id":5,"lines":[{"code":" bool res =

msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_

name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 5"}]
```

### 1.42 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:*/
544
   pragma solidity 0.4.24;
545
   contract C {
546
     function f(uint a, uint b) pure returns (address) {
547
       address public multisig =
548
           0xf64B584972FE6055a770477670208d737Fff282f;
       return multisig;
549
            }
   }
551
552
    /*Do not forget to check the contract at the address
553
        0xf64B584972FE6055a770477670208d737Fff282f for
        vulnerabilities.*/
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
554 []
```

# 1.43 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
    \hookrightarrow DELIMITER and then multiplied by BONUS. Thus, a rounding
       error appears (consider amount = 9000):*/
556
   pragma solidity 0.4.25;
557
558
   contract MyContract {
559
560
       uint constant BONUS = 500;
561
       uint constant DELIMITER = 10000;
562
       function calculateBonus(uint amount) returns (uint) {
564
            return amount/DELIMITER*BONUS;
566
       }
   }
567
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
568
```

### 1.44 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;
579
   contract A{
571
        uint num = 5;
572
        constructor(uint x) public{
573
            num += x;
574
575
   }
576
577
   contract B is A{
578
        constructor() A(2) public { /* ... */ }
579
   }
580
581
   contract C is A {
582
        constructor() A(3) public { /* ... */ }
583
584 }
```

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

DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:
```

#### 1.45 unused\_state\_variables

## **SWC\_ID:** [131]

**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;
591
592
   import "./base.sol";
593
   contract DerivedA is Base {
595
        // i is not used in the current contract
596
        A i = A(1);
597
        int internal j = 500;
599
600
        function call(int a) public {
601
            assign1(a);
603
        function assign3(A memory x) public returns (uint) {
605
            return g[1] + x.a + uint(j);
        }
607
        function ret() public returns (int){
            return this.e();
610
611
        }
612
      int internal j = 500;
```

```
function call(int a) public {
            assign1(a);
615
        }
616
617
        function assign3(A memory x) public returns (uint) {
618
            return g[1] + x.a + uint(j);
619
621
        function ret() public returns (int){
622
            return this.e();
623
     }
   }
625
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
626 []
```

### 1.46 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:*/
628
do {
    continue;
631
} while(false);

}

DASP: Unknown Unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:
632
[]
```

# 1.47 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.

```
pragma solidity 0.4.24;
634
   contract Bug {
635
        uint now; // Overshadows current time stamp.
636
637
        function assert(bool condition) public {
638
            // Overshadows built{ in symbol for providing
             \hookrightarrow assertions.
640
641
        function get_ next_ expiration(uint earlier_ time) private
        \hookrightarrow returns (uint) {
            return now + 259200; // References overshadowed
643
             \hookrightarrow timestamp.
        }
644
   }
645
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
646 []
  1.48
         ignore
  SWC_ID: []
     Description:Other trivial bug types.
     Example:
647
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: true
     Reported by checker:
```

```
[{"checker_ id":8,"lines":[{"code":"\n","function_
→ name":"","line_ no":23},{"code":"contract SimpleDAO
→ no":9},{"code":"\n","function_ name":"","line_
→ no":11},{"code":"\n","function_ name":"","line_
→ no":15}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 8"},{"checker_
  id":9,"lines":[{"code":"pragma solidity
   0.4.2;\n","function_ name":"","line_
  no":7}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 9"},{"checker_
  id":9,"lines":[],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 9"},{"checker_
  id":9,"lines":[{"code":"
                               bool res =
  msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_
  name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
  9"},{"checker_
  id":10,"lines":[{"code":"call.value(amount)()","function_
   name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
   10"},{"checker_ id":10,"lines":[{"code":" ","function_
  name":"","line_ no":7}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
   10"},{"checker_
   id":10,"lines":[{"code":"call.value(amount)()","function_
  name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
  10"},{"checker_ id":11,"lines":[{"code":" mapping (address
   => uint) public credit; \n", "function_ name": "", "line_
  no":10}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
  id":11,"lines":[{"code":" function donate(address to)
→ payable {\n", "function_ name": "", "line_
  no":12}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
  msg.value;\n","function_ name":"","line_
\rightarrow no":13}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
   id":11,"lines":[{"code":" }\n","function_ name":"","line_
→ no":14}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
  id":11,"lines":[{"code":" function withdraw(uint amount)
  {\n","function_ name":"","line_
   no":16}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
  id":11,"lines":[{"code":" if (credit[msg.sender]>=
  amount) {\n", "function_ name": "", "line_
   no":17}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
   id":11,"lines":[{"code":"
                              bool res =

→ msg.sender.call.value(amount)();\n","function_
→ name":"","line_ no":19}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{
  11"},{"checker_ id":11,"lines":[{"code":"
→ no":20}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
  id":11,"lines":[{"code":" }\n","function_ name":"","line_
   no":21}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
  id":11,"lines":[{"code":" }\n","function_ name":"","line_
→ no":22}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
→ id":11,"lines":[{"code":" function queryCredit(address to)
  returns (uint){\n","function_ name":"","line_
→ no":24}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_

→ id":11,"lines":[{"code":" return

    credit[to];\n","function_ name":"","line_

→ no":25}],"tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"},{"checker_
  id":11,"lines":[{"code":" }\n","function_ name":"","line_
```

a no":26}] "tool":"metasecurelabs{ 11"}]

# 1.49 uninitialized\_storage\_pointer

### **SWC\_ID:** [109]

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

### Example:

```
contract Uninitialized{
649
        address owner = msg.sender;
650
651
        struct St{
652
            uint a;
653
654
        function func() {
656
            St st;
657
            st.a = 0x0;
658
        }
659
660
    /*Bob calls func. As a result, owner is overridden to 0.*/
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
662
```

# 1.50 should\_be\_pure

#### $SWC_ID: []$

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

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

664
665
667
contract C {
function f(uint a, uint b) pure returns (uint) {
return a * (b + 42) + now;
670
671
}

}
```

**DASP**: Unknown unknowns

Found: false

Reported by checker:

672

## 1.51 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).

## Example:

```
contract C {
       function f(uint z) public returns (uint) {
674
            uint y = x + 9 + z; // 'z' is used pre{ declaration
675
            uint x = 7;
676
            if (z \% 2 == 0) {
678
                uint max = 5;
679
                // ...
680
685
            // 'max' was intended to be 5, but it was mistakenly
683
                declared in a scope and not assigned (so it is
                zero).
            for (uint i = 0; i < max; i++) {
                x += 1;
689
            }
686
687
            return x;
689
   }
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
```

691 []

## $1.52 ext{ storage\_ABIEncoderV2\_array}$

### SWC\_ID:

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

```
contract A {
       uint[2][3] bad_ arr = [[1, 2], [3, 4], [5, 6]];
693
694
       /* Array of arrays passed to abi.encode is vulnerable */
695
       function bad() public {
696
           bytes memory b = abi.encode(bad_ arr);
697
698
   }
699
    /*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
    Reported by checker:
702 []
```

# 1.53 costly\_ops\_in\_loop

### SWC\_ID: []

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

```
contract CostlyOperationsInLoop{
       uint loop_ count = 100;
       uint state_ variable=0;
       function bad() external{
            for (uint i=0; i < loop_ count; i++){
                state_ variable++;
            }
       }
712
       function good() external{
714
         uint local_ variable = state_ variable;
715
         for (uint i=0; i < loop_ count; i++){</pre>
716
            local_ variable++;
718
         state_ variable = local_ variable;
```

```
/*Incrementing state_ variable in a loop incurs a lot of gas

→ because of expensive SSTOREs, which might lead to an out{
     → of{ gas.*/
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
    Found: false
    Reported by checker:
723 []
         msg.value_equals_zero
  SWC_ID:
     Description: The msg.value == 0 condition check is meaningless in most
  cases.
     Example:
<sub>724</sub> | msg.value == 0
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
    Found: false
     Reported by checker:
725 []
```

## 1.55 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;

representation of pragma solidity of the pr
```

```
constructor() {
735
             owner = msg.sender;
736
737
738
        function setRate(_ rate) public onlyOwner {
739
             rate = _ rate;
740
742
        {\tt function\ setCap(\_cap)\ public\ \{}
             require (msg.sender == owner);
744
             cap = _ cap;
745
        }
746
   }
747
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
748 []
```

## 1.56 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.

```
contract A {
     int[3] ether_ balances; // storage signed integer array
759
     function bad0() private {
751
752
       ether_ balances = [{ 1, { 1, { 1];
753
       // ...
754
755
   }
756
757
    /*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

Reported by checker:

759 []

## 1.57 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,  $\xi$  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
Reported by checker:
```

## 1.58 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: /*
765
   pragma solidity 0.4.25;
766
767
   contract NewContract {
768
        uint limiter = 100;
769
770
        function longLoop() {
            for(uint i = 0; i < limiter; i++) {</pre>
772
                /* ... */
            }
        }
   }
```

```
}
DASP: Unknown unknowns
Found: false
Reported by checker:
```

# 1.59 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:

```
contract DelegatecallInLoop{
       mapping (address => uint256) balances;
781
       function bad(address[] memory receivers) public payable {
           for (uint256 i = 0; i < receivers.length; i++) {</pre>
                    address(this).delegatecall(abi.encodeWithSignature("addBalance(address)",
                    receivers[i]));
           }
       }
786
787
       function addBalance(address a) public payable {
           balances[a] += msg.value;
   }
     DASP: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
    Reported by checker:
792 []
```

## 1.60 right\_to\_left\_char

**SWC\_ID:** [130]

**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
796
   pragma solidity 0.5.0;
797
798
   contract GuessTheNumber
799
800
        uint _ secretNumber;
801
        address payable _ owner;
802
        event success(string);
   event wrongNumber(string);
804
805
        function guess(uint n) payable public
806
            require(msg.value == 1 ether);
808
            uint p = address(this).balance;
810
            checkAndTransferPrize(/*The prize/*rebmun desseug*/n ,
            → p/*
                     /*The user who should benefit */,msg.sender);
812
        }
813
814
        function checkAndTransferPrize(uint p, uint n, address
815
            payable guesser) internal returns(bool)
816
            if(n == _ secretNumber)
817
818
                guesser.transfer(p);
819
                emit success("You guessed the correct number!");
            }
821
            else
            {
                 emit wrongNumber("You've made an incorrect guess!");
            }
825
     }
827
  }
     \mathbf{DASP}: Unknown Unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
828 []
```

## 1.61 assert\_state\_change

```
SWC_ID: [110]
    Description:Incorrect use of assert(). See Solidity best practices.
    Example:
   contract A {
     uint s_ a;
830
831
     function bad() public {
832
       assert((s_a + = 1) > 10);
833
834
  }
835
    /*The assert in bad() increments the state variable s_ a while
    DASP: Unknown Unknowns
    Found: false
    Reported by checker:
837 []
```

## 1.62 pausable\_modifier\_absence

## SWC\_ID: []

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Description}: ERC20 \ balance/allowance is modified without when Not Paused modifier (in pausable contract).x \end{tabular}$ 

```
function buggyTransfer(address to, uint256 value) external
   → returns (bool){
           balanceOf[msg.sender] { = value;
839
           balanceOf[to] += value;
           return true;
841
842
843
    /*In a pausable contract, buggyTransfer performs a token
      transfer but does not use Pausable's whenNotPaused
        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

Reported by checker:

845 []

### 1.63 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;
847
848
   contract MyContract {
849
850
        function withdraw() {
851
            if (msg.sender.call.value(1)()) {
852
            /*...*/
853
            }
854
        }
855
   }
856
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
```

## 1.64 time\_manipulation

### **SWC\_ID:** [116]

857 []

**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();
event notFinished();
```

```
// Sale should finish exactly at January 1, 2019
862
     function isSaleFinished() private returns (bool) {
       return block.timestamp >= 1546300800;
864
865
866
     function run() public {
867
        if (isSaleFinished()) {
868
            emit Finished();
869
       } else {
870
            emit notFinished();
871
873
   }
874
     DASP: Time Manipulation
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
875
```

## 1.65 uninitialized\_local\_variable

### SWC\_ID: []

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

```
contract Uninitialized is Owner{
        function withdraw() payable public onlyOwner{
877
            address to;
            to.transfer(this.balance)
879
880
   }
881
882
    /*Bob calls transfer. As a result, all Ether is sent to the
     \hookrightarrow address 0x0 and is lost.*/
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
884 []
```

### 1.66 strict\_balance\_equality

## **SWC\_ID:** [132]

**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.

## Example:

```
if (address(this).balance == 42 ether ) {
       /* ... */
886
   }
887
    secure alternative:
888
889
   if (address(this).balance >= 42 ether ) {
891
892
     DASP: Unknown unknowns
     Found: false
     Reported by checker:
893 []
```

### 1.67 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:*/
895
   pragma solidity 0.4.24;
896
897
   contract C {
898
        byte[] someVariable;
899
900
901
902
   Alternative:
904
   pragma solidity 0.4.24;
905
906
   contract C {
        bytes someVariable;
```