



SMART CONTRACT SECURITY AUDIT

Final report

Plan: Simple

Mew Pepe

May 2024

 rugdog.net

 the@rugdog.net



◆ CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. Contracts checked	3
3. Audit Process	3
4. Overview of Relevance levels	4
5. Issues	4
5.1 High relevance issues	4
5.2 Medium relevance issues	4
5.3 Low relevance issues	5
6. Conclusion	6
7. Disclaimer	7

✦ INTRODUCTION

The report has been prepared for Mew Pepe.

Name	Mew Pepe
Audit date	2024-05-01 - 2024-05-01
Language	Rust
Network	Solana

✦ CONTRACTS CHECKED

Name	Address
Mew Pepe	Dp5ZXMg6jFp1hX2Cry93UYu8DnsSbg6pTACMTRBvyEfg

✦ AUDIT PROCESS

The code was audited by the team according to the following order:

Automated analysis

- ✦ Scanning the project's smart contracts with several publicly available automated Solidity analysis tools
- ✦ Manual confirmation of all the issues found by the tools

Manual audit

- ✦ Thorough manual analysis of smart contracts for security vulnerabilities
- ✦ Smart contracts' logic check

◆ OVERVIEW OF RELEVANCE LEVELS

High relevance

Issues of high relevance may lead to losses of users' funds as well as changes of ownership of a contract or possible issues with the logic of the contract.

High-relevance issues require immediate attention and a response from the team.

Medium relevance

While issues of medium relevance don't pose as high a risk as the high-relevance ones do, they can be just as easily exploited by the team or a malicious user, causing a contract failure and damaging the project's reputation in the process. Usually, these issues can be fixed if the contract is redeployed.

Medium-relevance issues require a response from the team.

Low relevance

Issues of low relevance don't pose high risks since they can't cause damage to the functionality of the contract. However, it's still recommended to consider fixing them.

◆ ISSUES

High relevance issues

No high relevance issues found

Medium relevance issues

No medium relevance issues found

Low relevance issues

No low relevance issues found

✦ CONCLUSION

Mew Pepe Mew Pepe contract was audited. No relevance issues were found.


❖ DISCLAIMER

This report is subject to the terms and conditions (including without limitation, description of services, confidentiality, disclaimer and limitation of liability) set forth in the Services Agreement, or the scope of services, and terms and conditions provided to the Company in connection with the Agreement. This report provided in connection with the Services set forth in the Agreement shall be used by the Company only to the extent permitted under the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement. This report may not be transmitted, disclosed, referred to or relied upon by any person for any purposes without RugDog prior written consent.


This report is not, nor should be considered, an "endorsement" or "disapproval" of any particular project or team. This report is not, nor should be considered, an indication of the economics or value of any "product" or "asset" created by any team or project that contracts RugDog to perform a security assessment. This report does not provide any warranty or guarantee regarding the absolute bug-free nature of the technology analyzed, nor do they provide any indication of the technologies proprietors, business, business model or legal compliance.

This report should not be used in any way to make decisions around investment or involvement with any particular project. This report in no way provides investment advice, nor should be leveraged as investment advice of any sort. This report represents an extensive assessing process intending to help our customers increase the quality of their code while reducing the high level of risk presented by cryptographic tokens and blockchain technology.

The rights to publish the results of this audit are exclusively retained by RugDog.



WOOF!

 rugdog.net

 the@rugdog.net

