



LI.FI

LI.FI Security Review

NEARIntentsFacet.sol(v1.0.0)

Security Researcher

Sujith Somraaj (somraajsujith@gmail.com)

Report prepared by: Sujith Somraaj

December 16, 2025

Contents

1	About Researcher	2
2	Disclaimer	2
3	Scope	2
4	Risk classification	2
4.1	Impact	2
4.2	Likelihood	3
4.3	Action required for severity levels	3
5	Executive Summary	3
6	Findings	4
6.1	Gas Optimization	4
6.1.1	Inline event emission to eliminate unnecessary internal function call	4
6.1.2	Remove unnecessary stack variables	4
6.2	Informational	4
6.2.1	Misleading variable name <code>receiverHash</code>	4
6.2.2	Fee-on-Transfer tokens permanently consume quote IDs while underfunding bridge	5
6.2.3	Redundant <code>minAmountOut</code> parameter in <code>NearIntentsData</code>	5

1 About Researcher

Sujith Somraaj is a distinguished security researcher and protocol engineer with over eight years of comprehensive experience in the Web3 ecosystem.

In addition to working as a Lead Security Researcher at Spearbit, Sujith is also the security researcher and advisor for leading bridge protocol LI.FI and also is a former founding engineer and current security advisor at Superform, a yield aggregator with over \$170M in TVL.

Sujith has experience working with protocols / funds including Coinbase, Uniswap, Layerzero, Edge Capital, Berachain, Optimism, Ondo, Sonic, Monad, Blast, ZkSync, Decent, Drips, SuperSushi Samurai, DistrictOne, Omni-X, Centrifuge, Superform-V2, Tea.xyz, Paintswap, Bitcorn, Sweep n' Flip, Byzantine Finance, Variational Finance, Satsbridge, Rova, Horizen, Earthfast and Angles

Learn more about Sujith on sujithsomraaj.xyz or on cantina.xyz

2 Disclaimer

Note that this security audit is not designed to replace functional tests required before any software release, and does not give any warranties on finding all possible security issues of that given smart contract(s) or blockchain software. i.e., the evaluation result does not guarantee against a hack (or) the non existence of any further findings of security issues. As one audit-based assessment cannot be considered comprehensive, I always recommend proceeding with several audits and a public bug bounty program to ensure the security of smart contract(s). Lastly, the security audit is not an investment advice.

This review is done independently by the reviewer and is not entitled to any of the security agencies the researcher worked / may work with.

3 Scope

- src/Facets/NEARIntentsFacet.sol(1.0.0)

4 Risk classification

Severity level	Impact: High	Impact: Medium	Impact: Low
Likelihood: high	Critical	High	Medium
Likelihood: medium	High	Medium	Low
Likelihood: low	Medium	Low	Low

4.1 Impact

- High** leads to a loss of a significant portion (>10%) of assets in the protocol, or significant harm to a majority of users.
- Medium** global losses <10% or losses to only a subset of users, but still unacceptable.
- Low** losses will be annoying but bearable — applies to things like griefing attacks that can be easily repaired or even gas inefficiencies.

4.2 Likelihood

- High** almost certain to happen, easy to perform, or not easy but highly incentivized
- Medium** only conditionally possible or incentivized, but still relatively likely
- Low** requires stars to align, or little-to-no incentive

4.3 Action required for severity levels

- Critical** Must fix as soon as possible (if already deployed)
- High** Must fix (before deployment if not already deployed)
- Medium** Should fix
- Low** Could fix

5 Executive Summary

Over the course of 6 hours in total, [LI.FI](#) engaged with the [researcher](#) to audit the contracts described in section 3 of this document ("scope").

In this period of time a total of 5 issues were found.

Project Summary	
Project Name	LI.FI
Repository	lifinance/contracts
Commit	4696d22
Audit Timeline	December 15, 2025
Methods	Manual Review
Documentation	High
Test Coverage	Medium-High

Issues Found	
Critical Risk	0
High Risk	0
Medium Risk	0
Low Risk	0
Gas Optimizations	2
Informational	3
Total Issues	5

6 Findings

6.1 Gas Optimization

6.1.1 Inline event emission to eliminate unnecessary internal function call

Context: [NEARIntentsFacet.sol#L241](#)

Description: The `_startBridge()` function delegates event emission to a separate internal function `_emitEvents()`.

This introduces unnecessary function call overhead including JUMP operations, stack frame setup, and parameter passing. The `_emitEvents()` function is only called once and serves no abstraction purpose.

Recommendation: Inline the event emission directly into `_startBridge()` function to save ~40 GAS per call.

LI.FI: Fixed in [4e5b2ec](#)

Researcher: Verified fix.

6.1.2 Remove unnecessary stack variables

Context: [NEARIntentsFacet.sol#L282](#), [NEARIntentsFacet.sol#L193](#)

Description:

1. The `_verifySignature()` function creates a temporary boolean variable, `isNonEVM`, that is only used once in a ternary expression. This adds an unnecessary stack variable allocation and a DUP operation, consuming approximately 2-3 gas per invocation.
2. The `swapAndStartBridgeTokensViaNEARIntents()` function creates a temporary uint256 variable, `positiveSlippage`, that is only used once. This could also be removed.

Recommendation: Consider removing the temporary variable:

```
- uint256 positiveSlippage = actualAmountAfterSwap - _bridgeData.minAmount;
  LibAsset.transferAsset(
    _bridgeData.sendingAssetId,
    payable(_nearData.refundRecipient),
-   positiveSlippage
+   actualAmountAfterSwap - _bridgeData.minAmount
  );

- bool isNonEVM = _bridgeData.receiver == NON_EVM_ADDRESS;
- bytes32 receiverHash = isNonEVM
+ bytes32 receiverHash = _bridgeData.receiver == NON_EVM_ADDRESS
```

LI.FI: Fixed in [4e5b2ec](#). The `isNonEVM` variable was successfully removed, but the `positiveSlippage` variable was kept as removing it causes a "Stack too deep" compilation error. The variable is necessary for managing stack depth in the function.

Researcher: Verified fix.

6.2 Informational

6.2.1 Misleading variable name `receiverHash`

Context: [NEARIntentsFacet.sol#L284](#)

Description: The variable `receiverHash` in the `_verifySignature()` function is misleadingly named. The variable does not contain a hash but rather a bytes32-encoded representation of the receiver address.

Recommendation: Rename the variable to accurately reflect its purpose:

```
- bytes32 receiverHash = isNonEVM
+ bytes32 receiverBytes32 = isNonEVM
```

LI.FI: Fixed in [4e5b2ec](#)

Researcher: Verified fix.

6.2.2 Fee-on-Transfer tokens permanently consume quote IDs while underfunding bridge

Context: [NEARIntentsFacet.sol#L231](#)

Description: When users try to bridge fee-on-transfer tokens (such as SafeMoon, PAXG, etc.) via the NEAR Intents facet, the transaction fails, but the quote ID is permanently used up. This happens because the contract marks the quote as used without validating the destination balance.

Recommendation: Add an explicit warning in the contract documentation about this behavior to avoid bridging fee-on-transfer tokens using this facet.

LI.FI: Fixed in [4e5b2ec](#)

Researcher: Verified fix.

6.2.3 Redundant `minAmountOut` parameter in `NearIntentsData`

Context: [NEARIntentsFacet.sol#L53](#)

Description: The `minAmountOut` field in `NearIntentsData` struct is included in the signature but never used or validated in the contract.

Recommendation: Consider removing it from the struct if unused, or if required for off-chain tracking, emit it in the `NEARIntentsBridgeStarted` event.

LI.FI: Fixed in [4e5b2ec](#)

Researcher: Verified fix.