

# **BEARX**

**Smart Contract Review** 

**Deliverable: Smart Contract Audit Report** 

**Security Report** 

October 2021

## Disclaimer

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Company. The content, conclusions and recommendations set out in this publication are elaborated in the specific for only project.

eNebula Solutions does not guarantee the authenticity of the project or organization or team of members that is connected/owner behind the project or nor accuracy of the data included in this study. All representations, warranties, undertakings and guarantees relating to the report are excluded, particularly concerning – but not limited to – the qualities of the assessed projects and products. Neither the Company nor any personating on the Company's behalf may be held responsible for the use that may be made of the information contained herein.

eNebula Solutions retains the right to display audit reports and other content elements as examples of their work in their portfolio and as content features in other projects with protecting all security purpose of customer. The report containing confidential information can be used internally by the Customer, or it can be disclosed publicly after all vulnerabilities fixed - upon a decision of the Customer.

© eNebula Solutions, 2021.

## **Report Summary**

Title	BEARX Smart Contract Audit		
Project Owner	BEARX		
Туре	Public		
Reviewed by	Vatsal Raychura	Revision date	31/10/2021
Approved by	eNebula Solutions Private Limited	Approval date	31/10/2021
		Nº Pages	27

## **Overview**

## Background

BEARX requested that eNebula Solutions perform an Extensive Smart Contract audit of their Smart Contract.

## **Project Dates**

The following is the project schedule for this review and report:

- October 31: Smart Contract Review Completed (Completed)
- October 31: Delivery of Smart Contract Audit Report (Completed)

#### Review Team

The following eNebula Solutions team member participated in this review:

- Sejal Barad, Security Researcher and Engineer
- Vatsal Raychura, Security Researcher and Engineer

## Coverage

## Target Specification and Revision

For this audit, we performed research, investigation, and review of the smart contract of BEARX.

The following documentation repositories were considered in-scope for the review:

BEARX Project:



## Introduction

Given the opportunity to review BEARX Project's smart contract source code, we in the report outline our systematic approach to evaluate potential security issues in the smart contract implementation, expose possible semantic inconsistencies between smart contract code and design document, and provide additional suggestions or recommendations for improvement. Our results show that the given version of smart contracts is ready to launch after resolving the mentioned issues, there are no critical or high issues found related to business logic, security or performance.

#### About BEARX: -

Item	Description
Issuer	BEARX
Type	ERC721
Platform	Solidity
Audit Method	Whitebox
Latest Audit Report	October 31, 2021

#### The Test Method Information: -

Test method	Description
Black box testing	Conduct security tests from an attacker's perspective externally.
Grey box testing	Conduct security testing on code modules through the scripting tool, observing the internal running status, mining weaknesses.
White box testing	Based on the open-source code, non-open-source code, to detect whether there are vulnerabilities in programs such as nodes, SDK, etc.

The vulnerability severity level information:

Level	Description
Critical	Critical severity vulnerabilities will have a significant effect on the
	security of the DeFi project, and it is strongly recommended to fix the
	critical vulnerabilities.
High	High severity vulnerabilities will affect the normal operation of the DeFi
	project. It is strongly recommended to fix high-risk vulnerabilities.
Medium	Medium severity vulnerability will affect the operation of the DeFi
	project. It is recommended to fix medium-risk vulnerabilities.
Low	Low severity vulnerabilities may affect the operation of the DeFi project
	in certain scenarios. It is suggested that the project party should
	evaluate and consider whether these vulnerabilities need to be fixed.
Weakness	There are safety risks theoretically, but it is extremely difficult to
	reproduce in engineering.

## The Full List of Check Items:

Category	Check Item
	Constructor Mismatch
	Ownership Takeover
	Redundant Fallback Function
	Overflows & Underflows
	Reentrancy
	MONEY-Giving Bug
Rasic Coding Rugs	Blackhole
Basic Coding Bugs	Unauthorized Self-Destruct
	Revert DoS
	Unchecked External Call
	Gasless Send
	Send Instead of Transfer
	Costly Loop
	(Unsafe) Use of Untrusted Libraries
	(Unsafe) Use of Predictable Variables
	Transaction Ordering Dependence
	Deprecated Uses
Semantic Consistency Checks	Semantic Consistency Checks
	Business Logics Review

	Functionality Checks
	Authentication Management
	Access Control & Authorization
Advanced DeFi Scrutiny	Oracle Security
Advanced Deri Scrutiny	Digital Asset Escrow
	Kill-Switch Mechanism
	Operation Trails & Event Generation
	ERC20 Idiosyncrasies Handling
	Frontend-Contract Integration
	Deployment Consistency
	Holistic Risk Management
	Avoiding Use of Variadic Byte Array
	Using Fixed Compiler Version
Additional Recommendations	Making Visibility Level Explicit
	Making Type Inference Explicit
	Adhering To Function Declaration
	Strictly
	Following Other Best Practices

## Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) Classifications Used in This Audit:

Category	Summary
Configuration	Weaknesses in this category are typically introduced during the configuration of the software.
Data Processing Issues	Weaknesses in this category are typically found in functionality that processes data.
Numeric Errors	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper calculation or conversion of numbers.
Security Features	Weaknesses in this category are concerned with topics like authentication, access control, confidentiality, cryptography, and privilege management. (Software security is not security software.)
Time and State	Weaknesses in this category are related to the improper management of time and state in an environment that supports simultaneous or near-simultaneous computation by multiple systems, processes, or threads.
Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	Weaknesses in this category include weaknesses that occur if a function does not generate the correct return/status code, or if the application does not handle all possible return/status codes that could be generated by a function.
Resource Management	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper management of system resources.

Behavioral Issues	Weaknesses in this category are related to unexpected behaviors from code that an application uses.
Business Logics	Weaknesses in this category identify some of the underlying problems that commonly allow attackers to manipulate the business logic of an application. Errors in business logic can be devastating to an entire application.
Initialization and Cleanup	Weaknesses in this category occur in behaviors that are used for initialization and breakdown.
Arguments and Parameters	Weaknesses in this category are related to improper use arguments or parameters within function calls.
Expression Issues	Weaknesses in this category are related to incorrectly written expressions within code.
Coding Practices	Weaknesses in this category are related to coding practices that are deemed unsafe and increase the chances that an ex pilotable vulnerability will be present in the application. They may not directly introduce a vulnerability, but indicate the product has not been carefully developed or maintained.

## **Findings**

## Summary

Here is a summary of our findings after analyzing the BEARX's Smart Contract. During the first phase of our audit, we studied the smart contract sourcecode and ran our in-house static code analyzer through the Specific tool. The purpose here is to statically identify known coding bugs, and then manually verify (reject or confirm) issues reported by tool. We further manually review business logics, examine system operations, and place DeFi-related aspects under scrutiny to uncover possible pitfalls and/or bugs.

Severity	No. of Issues
Critical	0
High	0
Medium	0
Low	3
Total	3

We have so far identified that there are potential issues with severity of **0 Critical**, **0 High**, **0 Medium**, and **3 Low**. Overall, these smart contracts are well- designed and engineered.

#### **Functional Overview**

(\$) = payable function	[Pub] public
# = non-constant function	[Ext] external
	[Prv] private
	[Int] internal

- + [Lib] Strings
  - [Int] toString
  - [Int] toHexString
  - [Int] toHexString
- + Context
  - [Int] \_msgSender
  - [Int] \_msgData
- + Ownable (Context)
  - [Pub] <Constructor> #
  - [Pub] owner
  - [Pub] renounceOwnership #
    - modifiers: onlyOwner
  - [Pub] transferOwnership #
    - modifiers: onlyOwner
  - [Prv] \_setOwner #
- + [Int] BearToken
  - [Ext] balanceOf
  - [Ext] allowance
  - [Ext] transferFrom #

- + [Lib] Address
  - [Int] isContract
  - [Int] sendValue #
  - [Int] functionCall #
  - [Int] functionCall #
  - [Int] functionCallWithValue #
  - [Int] functionCallWithValue #
  - [Int] functionStaticCall
  - [Int] functionStaticCall
  - [Int] functionDelegateCall #
  - [Int] functionDelegateCall #
  - [Int] verifyCallResult
- + [Int] IERC721Receiver
  - [Ext] onERC721Received #
- + [Int] IERC165
  - [Ext] supportsInterface
- + ERC165 (IERC165)
  - [Pub] supportsInterface
- + [Int] IERC721 (IERC165)
  - [Ext] balanceOf
  - [Ext] ownerOf
  - [Ext] safeTransferFrom #
  - [Ext] transferFrom #
  - [Ext] approve #
  - [Ext] getApproved
  - [Ext] setApprovalForAll #
  - [Ext] isApprovedForAll

- [Ext] safeTransferFrom # + [Int] IERC721Enumerable (IERC721) - [Ext] totalSupply - [Ext] tokenOfOwnerByIndex - [Ext] tokenByIndex + [Int] IERC721Metadata (IERC721) - [Ext] name - [Ext] symbol - [Ext] tokenURI + ERC721 (Context, ERC165, IERC721, IERC721Metadata) - [Pub] <Constructor> # - [Pub] supportsInterface - [Pub] balanceOf - [Pub] ownerOf - [Pub] name - [Pub] symbol - [Pub] tokenURI - [Int] \_baseURI - [Pub] approve # - [Pub] getApproved - [Pub] setApprovalForAll # - [Pub] isApprovedForAll - [Pub] transferFrom # - [Pub] safeTransferFrom # - [Pub] safeTransferFrom # - [Int] \_safeTransfer # - [Int] \_exists

- [Int] \_isApprovedOrOwner

```
- [Int] _safeMint #
 - [Int] _safeMint #
 - [Int] _mint #
 - [Int] _burn #
 - [Int] _transfer #
 - [Int] _approve #
 - [Prv] _checkOnERC721Received #
 - [Int] _beforeTokenTransfer #
+ ERC721Enumerable (ERC721, IERC721Enumerable)
 - [Pub] supportsInterface
 - [Pub] tokenOfOwnerByIndex
 - [Pub] totalSupply
 - [Pub] tokenByIndex
 - [Int] beforeTokenTransfer #
 - [Prv] _addTokenToOwnerEnumeration #
 - [Prv] _addTokenToAllTokensEnumeration #
 - [Prv] _removeTokenFromOwnerEnumeration #
 - [Prv] _removeTokenFromAllTokensEnumeration #
+ BearX (ERC721Enumerable, Ownable)
 - [Pub] <Constructor> #
  - modifiers: ERC721
 - [Pub] setBearToken #
  - modifiers: onlyOwner
 - [Pub] getBearToken
 - [Pub] getBearAllowance
 - [Pub] MINT_BY_TOKEN ($)
 - [Pub] MINT ($)
 - [Ext] giveAway #
   - modifiers: onlyOwner
```

- [Ext] mint\_g # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] walletOfOwner - [Pub] WHITELIST\_MINT (\$) - [Pub] bulk\_whitelist # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] remove\_whitelist # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] setPrice # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] setFundWallet # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Int] \_baseURI - [Pub] setLimit # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] setMaxPerWallet # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] MaxPerWallet - [Pub] setBaseURI # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] getPrice - [Pub] pause # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] pauseBreed # - modifiers: onlyOwner - [Pub] withdrawAll (\$) - modifiers: onlyOwner

#### **Detailed Results**

#### **Issues Checking Status**

#### 1. Floating Pragma

SWC ID:103Severity: Low

• Location: BearX.sol

- Relationships: CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime
- Description: A floating pragma is set. The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

```
10
11 pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
12
```

• Remediations: Lock the pragma version and also consider known bugs (https://github.com/ethereum/solidity/releases) for the compiler version that is chosen.

#### 2. State Variable Default Visibility

- SWC ID:108Severity: Low
- Location: BearX.sol
- Relationships: CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards
- Description: State variable visibility is not set. It is best practice to set the visibility of state variables explicitly. The default visibility for "\_baseTokenURI" is internal. Other possible visibility settings are public and private.

• Remediations: Variables can be specified as being public, internal or private. Explicitly define visibility for all state variables.

#### 3. Missing zero address validation

• Severity: Low

• Location: BearX.sol

• Description: Detect missing zero address validation.

```
constructor(string memory baseURI, address _fundWallet) ERC721("BEARX test", "BEARX") {
    setBaseURI(baseURI);
    fundWallet = _fundWallet;
}
```

• Remediations: Check that the address is not zero.

#### **Automated Tools Results**

Slither: -

```
eentrancy in Bearx.MINT_BY_TOKEN(wint256,wint256,wint256) (Bearx.sol#1894-1110):
                   External calls:
  External calls:
- safeMint(asg.sender,breedIDs + i) (BearX.sol#184)
- FBC(7218ecelver(tn).anERC7218ecelved(_msgSender(),from,tokenId,_data) (BearX.sol#853-863)
State variables written after the call(s):
- breed - (BearX.sol#185)
- breedIDs ++ (BearX.sol#186)
Reentrancy in BearX.mint_g(address,wint256) (BearX.sol#1134-1142):
External calls:
- safeMint( to olIDs) (BearX.sol#138)
                 External calls:
-_safeMint(_to_gifIDs) (SearX.sol#1138)
-_IERC721Recelver(to).onERC721Recelved(_nsgSender(),frow.tokenId__data) (SearX.sol#853-863)
State voriables written after the call(s):
--gif -- (RearX.sol#1139)
--gifIDs ++ (RearX.sol#1139)
--gifIDs ++ (RearX.sol#1130)
  Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wlki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerabilities-1
  SearX.walletOfOwner(address).t (BearX.sol#1148) is a local variable never initialized
  searx.waliteturowner(address).i (Bearx.solaliae) is a local variable never intitalized
Searx.waliteturowner(address).i (Bearx.solaliae) is a local variable never intitalized
Searx.mittetusi Minty(uintz56).i (Bearx.solalize) is a local variable never intitalized
Searx.MINT(uintz56).i (Bearx.solalile) is a local variable never intitalized
Searx.MINT (uintz56).i (Bearx.solWillar) is a local variable never intitalized
Searx.MINT BY TOKEN(uintz56,uintz56,uintz56).i (Bearx.solalized) is a local variable never intitalized
Searx.MINT BY TOKEN(uintz56,uintz56,uintz56).i (Bearx.solalized) is a local variable never intitalized
  ERC721._checkOnERC721Recelved(address,address,wint256,bytes) (BearX.sol#846-867) ignores return value by IERC721Recelver(to).onERC721Recelved(_msgSender(),from,tokenId,_data) (BearX.sol#853-803)
Reference: https://glthub.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#unused-return
variable 'ENC721_ checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint236,bytes).retval (BearX.sol8853)' in ERC721_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,wint256,bytes) (BearX.sol8053)' in ERC721_checkOnERC721Received.selector (BearX.sol8054)
Variable 'ERC721_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).reason (BearX.sol8855)' in ERC721_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,wint256.bytes).reason (BearX.sol8056)
Variable 'ERC711_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).reason (BearX.sol8056)
Variable 'ERC711_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).reason (BearX.sol8055)' in ERC721_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).reason (BearX.sol8055)' in ERC721_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256,bytes).reason (BearX.sol8055)' in ERC721_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256)(Variable 'BearX.sol8056)' in ERC721_checkOnERC721Received(address,address,uint256)
Beference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#pre-declaration-wasge-of-local-variables
  Event emitted after the rall(s):

- Transfer(address(0),to,tokenld) (dearX.sol#743)

Reference: https://glthuh.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reemtrancy-vulnerabilities-3
  Address isContract(address) (BearX.sol#123-129) uses assembly

INLINE ASM (BearX.sol#125-127)

Address verifyCallResult(bool,bytes,string) (BearX.sol#254-274) uses assembly

INLINE ASM (BearX.sol#266-269)

EBC721._checkoncEc721Book(ved(address,address,uint256,bytes) (BearX.sol#846-867) uses assembly

INLINE ASM (BearX.sol#859-801)
```

```
BEARX.MINT_BY_TOKEN(utnt256,utnt256,utnt256) (BearX.snl#1894-1110) has costly operations inside a loop:
- Broed -- (BearX.sol#1185)
BEARX.MINT_BY_TOKEN(utnt256,utnt256,utnt256) (BearX.sol#1894-1110) has costly operations inside a loop:

    brendIDs ++ (BearX.sul#1186)
    mint_g(address_wint256) (BearX.sul#1134-1142) has costly operations inside a loop:
- gif -- (BearX.sul#1139)

     bearX.mint_g(address_wint250) (SearX.sol#1134-1142) has costly operations inside a loop:
    gtfIDs ++ (BearX.sol#1140)
   feerX.bulk_shitelist(address[]) (BearX.sol#1167-1175) has costly operations inside a loop:
    whitelist_count ++ (BearX.sol#1172)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Dotector-Documentation#costly-sperations-inside-a-loop
   Address.functionCall(address,bytes) (BearX.sola138-148) is never used and should be removed Address.functionCall(address,bytes,string) (BearX.sola148-134) is never used and should be removed Address.functionCall(address,bytes,utnt260) (BearX.xola187-173) is never used and should be removed Address.functionCallWithValue(address,bytes,utnt250,sfring) (BearX.sola181-192) is never used and should be removed Address.functionCallWithValue(address,bytes) (BearX.sola217-229) is never used and should be removed Address.functionCallWithValue(address,bytes) (BearX.sola217-249) is never used and should be removed Address.functionStaticCall(address,bytes) (BearX.sola207-249) is never used and should be removed Address.functionStaticCall(address,bytes) (BearX.sola207-202) is never used and should be removed Address.functionStaticCall(address,bytes,string) (BearX.sola218-219) is never used and should be removed Address.worlfyCallResult(bool,bytes,string) (BearX.sola218-219) is never used and should be removed Address.worlfyCallResult(bool,bytes,string) (BearX.sola234-274) is never used and should be removed Context.magData() (BearX.sola789-380) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-380) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-380) is never used and should be removed Strings telewStrings(ulnt250,ulnt256) (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never used and should be removed ERC721._baseURI() (BearX.sola78-79) is never use
      ddress functionCall(address,bytes) (BearX.sol#138-148) is never used and should be removed
     ragma version?8.8 (BearX.sol012) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/8.7.6
    iold-8.8.8 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
  - (success, returndata) = target.delegatecall(data) (BearX.sol#244)

Beference: https://github.com/crytic/sither/wiki/Detector-Documentationalow-level-calls

Parameter ERC721.safeTransferFrom(address, address, utnt256, bytes). data (BearX.sol#855) is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.setBearToken(BearToken). Johrmicontract (BearX.sol#1884) is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.getBearToken(address). address (BearX.sol#1884) is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.MINT BY TOKEN(utnt256, utnt256, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1894] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.MINT BY TOKEN(utnt256, utnt256, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1894] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.MINT BY TOKEN(utnt256, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1894] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.MINT BY TOKEN(utnt256, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1894] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.MINT BY TOKEN(utnt256, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1894] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.MINT BY TOKEN(utnt256, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1124] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.Givenhaug(address, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1124] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.givenhaug(address, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1134] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.mint g(address, utnt256). [BearX.sol#1134] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.wint g(address, utnt256). [BearX.sol#134] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.wint g(address, utnt256). [BearX.sol#134] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.wint g(address, utnt256). [BearX.sol#134] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.wint g(address). [BearX.sol#134] is not in mixedCase

Parameter BearX.wint g(address). [BearX.sol#134] is not in mixedCase

Function BearX.mint g(address, utnt256) is not in mixedCase

Function BearX.mint g(address). [BearX.sol#1377] is not in mixedCase

Function BearX.mint g(address). [BearX.sol#1377] is not in mixedCase

Farameter BearX.sol#1864 is not in mixedCase

Variable BearX.paserMiletWhiteList (BearX.sol#1861) is not in mixedCase

Variable BearX.maxerMiletWhiteList (BearX.sol#1867) is not in mixedCase

Variable BearX.maxerMiletWhiteList (BearX.
     /ariable Bearx, poused (Bearx,sol#1967) is not in mixedCase
rariable Bearx.TokenContract (Bearx.sol#1970) is not in mixedCase
      eference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions
   gfflus = 180008000800 (Burx.sol#1907-1220) uses (terms with too many digits:
gfflus = 180008000800 (Burx.sol#1907-1220) uses literals with too many digits:
brandlus = 180008000000000 (Bearx.sol#1907-1220) uses literals with too many digits:
perference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wikl/Detector-Decumentation#too-many-digits
    DearX__maxperWolletWhiteList (DearX_sol#1888) should be constant
DearX_breedPrice (DearX_sol#1872) should be constant
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-DocumentationFstate-variables-that-could-be-declared-constant
```

```
remounceCounceship() should be declared external:
- Unmable.transferCounceship(address) should be declared external:
- Unmable.transferCounceship(address) (Bearx.sols98-191)
- Asset (Seart.sols92-254)
- Unmable.transferCounceship(address) (Bearx.sols98-191)
- Asset (Seart.sols92-254)
- Est. (Seart.sols9
```

#### MythX: -

# Report for BearX.sol https://dashboard.mythx.io/#/console/analyses/11dbff63-b70d-4900-9539-56bd99740a48 Line SWC Title Severity Short Description 11 (SWC-103) Floating Pragma Low A floating pragma is set. 1051 (SWC-108) State Variable Default Visibility Low State variable visibility is not set.

#### Solhint: -

```
Linter results:
  bearX.sol:81:5: Error: Explicitly mark visibility in function (Set ignoreConstructors to true if using solidity
  bearX.sol:125:9: Error: Avoid to use inline assembly. It is acceptable only in rare cases
  bearX.sol:190:51: Error: Avoid to use low level calls.
  bearX.sol:244:51: Error: Avoid to use low level calls.
  bearX.sol:517:5: Error: Explicitly mark visibility in function (Set ignoreConstructors to true if using
  bearX.sol:859:21: Error: Avoid to use inline assembly. It is acceptable only in rare cases
  bearX.sol:887:24: Error: Code contains empty blocks
  bearX.sol:1047:1: Error: Contract has 18 states declarations but allowed no more than 15
  bearX.sol:1051:5: Error: Explicitly mark visibility of state
  bearX.sol:1065:20: Error: Variable name must be in mixedCase
  bearX.sol:1070:22: Error: Variable name must be in mixedCase
```



#### **Basic Coding Bugs**

#### 1. Constructor Mismatch

 Description: Whether the contract name and its constructor are not identical to each other.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Critical

#### 2. Ownership Takeover

o Description: Whether the set owner function is not protected.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Critical

#### 3. Redundant Fallback Function

o Description: Whether the contract has a redundant fallback function.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Critical

#### 4. Overflows & Underflows

 Description: Whether the contract has general overflow or underflow vulnerabilities

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Critical

#### 5. Reentrancy

 Description: Reentrancy is an issue when code can call back into your contract and change state, such as withdrawing ETHs.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Critical

#### 6. MONEY-Giving Bug

 Description: Whether the contract returns funds to an arbitrary address.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: High

#### 7. Blackhole

 Description: Whether the contract locks ETH indefinitely: merely in without out.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: High

#### 8. Unauthorized Self-Destruct

 Description: Whether the contract can be killed by any arbitrary address.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 9. Revert DoS

 Description: Whether the contract is vulnerable to DoS attack because of unexpected revert.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 10. Unchecked External Call

o Description: Whether the contract has any external call without checking the return value.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 11. Gasless Send

 $\circ \quad \text{Description: Whether the contract is vulnerable to gasless send.}$ 

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 12. Send Instead of Transfer

 $\circ\quad \text{Description: Whether the contract uses send instead of transfer.}$ 

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 13. Costly Loop

 Description: Whether the contract has any costly loop which may lead to Out-Of-Gas exception.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 14. (Unsafe) Use of Untrusted Libraries

o Description: Whether the contract use any suspicious libraries.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 15. (Unsafe) Use of Predictable Variables

 Description: Whether the contract contains any randomness variable, but its value can be predicated.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 16. Transaction Ordering Dependence

 Description: Whether the final state of the contract depends on the order of the transactions.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### 17. Deprecated Uses

• Description: Whether the contract use the deprecated tx.origin to perform the authorization.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Medium

#### **Semantic Consistency Checks**

 Description: Whether the semantic of the white paper is different from the implementation of the contract.

Result: PASSEDSeverity: Critical

## Conclusion

In this audit, we thoroughly analyzed BEARX's Smart Contract. The current code base is well organized but there are promptly some Medium and Low type of issues found in the first phase of Smart Contract Audit.

Meanwhile, we need to emphasize that smart contracts as a whole are still in an early, but exciting stage of development. To improve this report, we greatly appreciate any constructive feedbacks or suggestions, on our methodology, audit findings, or potential gaps in scope/coverage.

## **About eNebula Solutions**

We believe that people have a fundamental need to security and that the use of secure solutions enables every person to more freely use the Internet and every other connected technology. We aim to provide security consulting service to help others make their solutions more resistant to unauthorized access to data & inadvertent manipulation of the system. We support teams from the design phase through the production to launch and surely after.

The eNebula Solutions team has skills for reviewing code in C, C++, Python, Haskell, Rust, Node.js, Solidity, Go, and JavaScript for common security vulnerabilities & specific attack vectors. The team has reviewed implementations of cryptographic protocols and distributed system architecture, including in cryptocurrency, blockchains, payments, and smart contracts. Additionally, the team can utilize various tools to scan code & networks and build custom tools as necessary.

Although we are a small team, we surely believe that we can have a momentous impact on the world by being translucent and open about the work we do.

For more information about our security consulting, please mail us at – contact@enebula.in