

# Security Audit of Octo project contracts

---

## Conclusion

---

Audit was made by Vladimir Smelov

**vladimirfol@gmail.com** (<mailto:vladimirfol@gmail.com>).

TODO In the final contract were not found:

- Backdoors for investor funds withdrawal by anyone.
- Bugs allowing to steal money from the contract.
- Any serious security problems causing misfunctionality.

The client was acknowledged about all notes below

## Scope

---

**github.com** (<http://github.com>): `gkozyrev/studious-octo-enigma-v2`  
commit - `7368e313580ff3ebc2b6155e5f765cb08f25697a`

## Methodology

---

1. Blind audit. Understand the structure of the code without reading any docs
2. Find info in internet
3. Ask questions to developers
4. Draw the scheme of cross-contracts interactions
5. Write user-stories, usage cases
6. Run static analyzers

Find problems with:

- backdoors
- bugs
- math
- potential leaking of funds
- potential locking of the contract
- validate arguments and events
- others

## Result

---

### Critical

**CRITICAL-1. MALICIOUS WINNER MAY BLOCK PAYOUTS.**

At:

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:229

if `_tokenOwner` is a contract

```

contract Hacker {
    receive() external payable {
        revert("you was hacked!");
    }
}

```

then no one will be able to get their rewards.

**Recommendation.**

Use push-pull, allow anyone to withdraw his reward by himself.

Why users should wait for others if they are ready to get reward?

**Status.**

NEW

**CRITICAL-2. USING OF `_USERRANDOMNUMBER` OPENS THE DOOR FOR MANIPULATIONS.**

In BaseToken.sol

User can easily brute-force the random number he needs to get expected output, knowing current `block.timestamp`, `block.number` and current contract state, with for-loop over 100 possible numbers and dozens of possible `msg.senders`.  
pseudo-code:

```

HackerContract
function tryHack(state)
    for proxy in proxyList
        for i in 0 .. 100
            if randomize(BaseContractState, i, proxy) == (x, y, z, d)
                proxy.mint(i)
            revert("not found") # spent gas with no success

```

**Recommendation.**

Remove this manipulation-handle from the randomness.

**Status.**

NEW

**CRITICAL-3. USING OF `BLOCK.TIMESTAMP`, `BLOCK.NUMBER`, ETC OPENS THE DOOR FOR MANIPULATIONS.**

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:70

this random is not safe.

It may be easily manipulated via agreement with a miner or via flashbots network.

**<https://www.certik.com/resources/blog/top-10-defi-security-best-practices>**  
(<https://www.certik.com/resources/blog/top-10-defi-security-best-practices>).

The paragraph number #3

More:

**<https://alcibiades.capital/blog/wolf-game-exploit/>**  
(<https://alcibiades.capital/blog/wolf-game-exploit/>).

**<https://quantstamp.com/blog/proper-treatment-of-randomness-on-evm-compatible-networks>**  
(<https://quantstamp.com/blog/proper-treatment-of-randomness-on-evm-compatible-networks>).

**<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2206.04185.pdf>**  
(<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2206.04185.pdf>).

**<https://github.com/flashbots/mev-geth/issues/117>**  
(<https://github.com/flashbots/mev-geth/issues/117>).

**<https://docs.flashbots.net/flashbots-auction/searchers/advanced/rpc-endpoint>**  
(<https://docs.flashbots.net/flashbots-auction/searchers/advanced/rpc-endpoint>).

## Recommendation.

Use ChainLink VRF.

Take a look on a simmilar NFT project which uses VRF -

**<https://polygonscan.com/address/0x817baabb4d8e48b2eaa6f69b70f47e63867a7ee6#code>**  
(<https://polygonscan.com/address/0x817baabb4d8e48b2eaa6f69b70f47e63867a7ee6#code>).

INFORMAL: This is a big problem. If you are really care about VRF price, you may accumulate requests for minting (e.g. 30 in a row) and then request VRF once for all 30 nfts. Use it if you need instant revelation.

Or you can do randomization via verifiable revelation - you publish JSON with all attributes BEFORE revelation, people just mint NFT blindly, they know only tokenId, after all nft minted, you generate ONLY ONE VRF number, then you do off-chain shuffle of the JSON based on the number (anyone

can verify it) and then you push it to IPFS as a new baseURI!  
So all attributes will be verifiable shuffled at the moment of revelation!

### **Status.**

NEW

### **Major**

#### **MAJOR-1. CENTRALIZATION POWER - UNCONTROLLED WITHDRAWAL.**

At

- contracts/library/Withdrawable.sol:15
- contracts/library/Withdrawable.sol:21

it looks suspicious when owner may empty all contract balance at any time.

INFORMAL: it's called backdoor

### **Recommendation.**

Introduce restrictions to decrease centralization power.

### **Status.**

NEW

#### **MAJOR-2. CENTRALIZATION POWER - UNCONTROLLED SALETAX.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:55

owner may set saleTax to 100% at any time making it impossible to use NFT for any users.

### **Recommendation.**

Introduce restrictions to decrease centralization power.  
(e.g. require `_tax <= 5%`)

### **Status.**

NEW

#### **MAJOR-3. CENTRALIZATION POWER - BACKDOOR IN S1COMBINATIONTOKEN.**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:234

owner is able to flush the pool if he set `_rewards=[]`

### **Recommendation.**

Introduce restrictions to decrease centralization power.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **MAJOR-4. INCOMPLIENCY WITH EIP20 TRANSFER.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:219
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:217
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:166
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:168

according to EIP20, you MUST check return success status of `transfer/transferFrom`.

### **Recommendation.**

Use `safeERC20`.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **MAJOR-5. MINT MEMBERSHIP FOR FREE.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:303
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:277

if someone calls `presaleMint` with `_amount=0` he will get membership NFT for free.

### **Recommendation.**

Add require amount > 0

### **Status.**

NEW

## **MAJOR-6. TYPO IN IMPORTANT IDEA.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:343

`_blockDifficulty` equals to the other value.

### **Recommendation.**

Fix typo.

Also be aware that such random is not safe.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **MAJOR-7. USER IMPOSSIBLE TO USE CREATE 2 MARKETPLACE ORDERS.**

At

- `contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:118`
- `contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:189`
- `contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:240`

what if some owner wants to sell 2-3 nft? Which nonce should it use? It's currently impossible!

### **Recommendation.**

Use 3-levels mapping: `wallet -> nftId -> nonce`.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **MAJOR-8. REVEAL IS NOT POSSIBLE IN THE CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION.**

After mint all NFT parameters are public visible.

Users may go to OpenSea or another marketplace and exchange cards to build up combination.

INFORMAL: after a talk with Oleg I understood that such behaviour is not expected by you. You expect that people will get info after your revelation event.

### **Recommendation.**

Implement true-revelation. Also check CRITICAL-3.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **Warning**

**WARNING-1. NO DEREGISTERPROXY FUNCTION.**

At

- contracts/interfaces/IWyvernProxyRegistry.sol:9

there is no declared way to de-register proxy, so it will not be able for a user to deny OpenSea later to operate over his tokens.

**Recommendation.**

Add deregisterProxy function.

**Status.**

NEW

**WARNING-2. IT'S UNCLEAR HOW TO SET S1.MAXTOTALSUPPLY**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:27

it looks that it may happen that such number of success combination will never be achievable.

You have various number of different card

(  $13 \times 4 \times 6 \times 6 = 1872$  )

the same card can be minted multiple times.

There is a chance that users will never reach 380 successful combinations

**Recommendation.**

DISCUSS

**Status.**

NEW

**WARNING-3. CENTRALIZATION POWER - PAUABLE MARKETPLACE.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:59

owner may set treasury to a contract which denies any eth receiving, so marketplace will be stopped.

**Recommendation.**

Be aware of it.

You may use push-pull-pattern.

You may ignore fails on fee sendings.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **WARNING-4. WHY STORE USE ENTERED COMBINATION NAME AT BLOCKCHAIN.**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:21

any minter can set any value to this mapping.

Even some ... curse words or politician declaraions.

It's risky for marketing. Not to mention extensive gas consumption.

### **Recommendation.**

Restrict users to set any string on blockchain.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **WARNING-5. CENTRALIZATION POWER - SETBASEURI.**

At

- contracts/library/Basis.sol:41
- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:116

Owner may reset all tokens metadata at any time.

### **Recommendation.**

Let the owner to renounce the ability to reset baseURI. To change it several times and then freeze forever.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **WARNING-6. CENTRALIZATION POWER - SETMAXTOTALSUPPLY.**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:247
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:524



- contracts/BaseToken.sol:530

owner may change the rules of the game at any point of time.

### **Recommendation.**

Restrict the owner.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **WARNING-7. BE AWARE OF OPENSEA HACK.**

**<https://therecord.media/hacker-abuses-opensea-to-buy-nfts-at-older-cheaper-prices/>** (<https://therecord.media/hacker-abuses-opensea-to-buy-nfts-at-older-cheaper-prices/>)

### **Recommendation.**

DISCUSS

### **Status.**

NEW

### **WARNING-8. USE STRICT EQUAL CHECK TO THE PRICE.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:82
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:272
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:299

You use "<=" but it's safer for a user to use "==" to require him to send exact amount of price.

### **Recommendation.**

Use strict "==" to check price.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **WARNING-9. NEVER USE PAYABLE(...).TRANSFER().**

At

- contracts/library/Withdrawable.sol:33
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:103

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:106
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:280
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:306
- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:229
- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:234

you use not recommended way to send native tokens.

See -

**<https://consensys.net/diligence/blog/2019/09/stop-using-soliditys-transfer-now/>**

(<https://consensys.net/diligence/blog/2019/09/stop-using-soliditys-transfer-now/>).

## Recommendation.

Use call with reentry protection.

## Status.

NEW

## WARNING-10. CONDITION MAY NEVER MET.

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:124

You cannot force people to buy base token. It may happen that this condition will never met. But some people will want to play the game.

## Recommendation.

DISCUSS

## Status.

NEW

## WARNING-11. PHANTOM OVERFLOW IS POSSIBLE.

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:101
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:164
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:215

I must note that phantom overflow is possible

See - **<https://medium.com/coinmonks/math-in-solidity-part-3-percents-and-proportions-4db014e080b1>**

(<https://medium.com/coinmonks/math-in-solidity-part-3-percents-and-proportions-4db014e080b1>).

**Recommendation.**

Be aware. Should not be the case for small decimals.

**Status.**

NEW

**WARNING-12. MULTIPLE MEMBERSHIP MINTING TO THE SAME WALLET.**

At

- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:83

it may happen that minter will transfer his membership to someone else and then mint membership again.

**Recommendation.**

DISCUSS, is it OK?

**Status.**

NEW

**WARNING-13. TRANSFER OF AMOUNT=0 VIA ERC20 SOMETIMES IMPOSSIBLE.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:219  
and similar places

I have to note that it's possible that `_price - tax` in current code could be `= 0`, and some tokens don't support transfer for `amount=0` so this code will fail.

**Recommendation.**

Check if transfer amount  $> 0$ .

Or require fee to be small.

**Status.**

NEW

**WARNING-14. REQUIRE PRESALE DID NOT START.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:502

it's wise to have a check that presale did not start yet.

**Recommendation.**

Add require.

**Status.**

NEW

### **WARNING-15. BE AWARE OF REENTRY.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:103
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:277
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:280
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:303
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:306
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:168
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:217
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:219
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:86
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:152
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:207

you have sending eth or external contract call. Reentry may happen and influence your logic.

INFORMAL: i didnt found anything critical, but at least it may re-order your events.

also - **<https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.4.21/security-considerations.html#re-entrancy>**

<https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.4.21/security-considerations.html#re-entrancy>

**Recommendation.**

Use nonReentrant.

**Status.**

NEW

**Low.**

### **LOW-1. NO SPDX-LICENSE-IDENTIFIER**

At

- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:1
- contracts/library/CombinableTokenBasis.sol:1

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:1
- contracts/mocks/MockBaseToken4MNFT.sol:1
- contracts/interfaces/IBaseToken.sol:1
- contracts/library/Basis.sol:1
- contracts/mocks/MockSeason1CombinationToken.sol:1
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:1
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:1
- contracts/mocks/MockERC20.sol:1

there is no `SPDX-License-Identifier` set.

At

- contracts/interfaces/IWithdrawable.sol:1
- contracts/opensea/ERC721Tradable.sol:1
- contracts/library/Withdrawable.sol:1

the `SPDX-License-Identifier` value is different from the value in others files.

### **Recommendation.**

Use the same `SPDX-License-Identifier` value for all contracts.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-2 UNCLEAR PURPOSE OF THE EMPTY INTERAFACE.**

At

- contracts/interfaces/IWyvernProxyRegistry.sol:4

it's not clear why such empty interface is needed.

### **Recommendation.**

DISCUSS

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-3 USE MAPPING INSTEAD OF ARRAY TO SAVE GAS.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:68

it's better to use mapping (if you dont need iteration).

Mapping is cheaper.

### **Recommendation.**

Use mapping.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-4 THE CHECK IS NOT NEED.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:508

this check `_presaleStartTime > 0` is not need.

### **Recommendation.**

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-5 PRAGMA INCONSISTENCY.**

At

- contracts/interfaces/IBaseToken.sol:1

the pragma solidity value is different from a value in other contract.

### **Recommendation.**

Use the same value.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-6. INDEX IMPORTANT EVENT VALUES.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:19-36
- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:38-44
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:86-87

it's wise to index important arguments to allow easy searching over blockchain logs in future.

### **Recommendation.**

Index important event values.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-7. USAGE OF MAGIC CONST.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:275

magic const should be defined as a contract level constants and explained.

**Recommendation.****Status.**

NEW

**LOW-8. EVENTS SHOULD BE PART OF INTERFACES.**

At

- contracts/interfaces/ICombinableTokenBasis.sol:7
- contracts/interfaces/ICombinationToken.sol:7
- contracts/interfaces/IBaseToken.sol:5
- contracts/interfaces/IBasis.sol:7
- contracts/interfaces/IMembershipToken.sol:6

only functions are defined as a part of interface. But it's wise to also add events to the interface declaration.

**Recommendation.**

Events should be part of interfaces.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-9. USELESS NOTICE.**

At

- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:30

this comment is useless.

**Recommendation.**

Clear useless information from smart contracts.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-10. PRETTY IMPORTS ORDER.**

At

- contracts/library/Basis.sol:6

the order of imports is messed up.

**Recommendation.**

Reorder imports.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-11. EXPLICIT VARIABLE INITIALIZATION.**

At

- contracts/library/Basis.sol:12

better to initialize it explicitly to zero.

**Recommendation.**

Initialize.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-12. NAMING INCONSISTENCY.**

At

- contracts/library/Basis.sol:16
- contracts/interfaces/IBasis.sol:7

use baseURI for consistency.

**Recommendation.**

use baseURI for consistency.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-13. USELESS BLANK LINES.**

At

- contracts/library/Basis.sol:37
- contracts/library/Basis.sol:43
- contracts/library/CombinableTokenBasis.sol:47



- contracts/library/CombinableTokenBasis.sol:53
- contracts/library/CombinableTokenBasis.sol:59
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:61

the blank line is useless.

### **Recommendation.**

Keep code compact.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-14. DEFINE CONSTANTS AS `CONSTANT` .**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:14
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:80

this should be defined as a constant.

And named in UPPER\_CASE style.

### **Recommendation.**

Define constants as `constant` .

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-15. UNCLEAR COMMENT.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:10

it's not clear what does "using EC" means.

### **Recommendation.**

Remove unclear comments.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-16. No `CONTRACTURI` IN INTERFACE.**

At

- contracts/interfaces/IBasis.sol:9
- contracts/interfaces/IMembershipToken.sol:12

there is no declared view function for contractURI but only setter.

### **Recommendation.**

Define getter as well as setter.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-17. NO AMOUNT IN EVENT.**

At

- contracts/library/Withdrawable.sol:24

it makes sense to add amount as an event argument.

### **Recommendation.**

Add an argument.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-18. USE STATIC SIZED ARRAY.**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:19

you know for sure that the length of any array will be =4, so use static sized arrays to save gas.

### **Recommendation.**

Use static sized array.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-19. INFORMATION DUPLICATION.**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:23
- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:25
- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:182

```
baseIsCombined_[tokenId] ==  
bool(childByParent_[tokenId] != 0)
```

### **Recommendation.**

Get rid of duplication.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-20. PURPOSELESS MODIFIERS.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:212
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:231

why do you need these modifiers. This code could be part of the functions itself. You will avoid some SLOAD's.

### **Recommendation.**

Optimize.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-21. UNUSED FUNCTION ARGUMENT RAISES WARNING ON COMPILATION.**

At

- contracts/library/CombinableTokenBasis.sol:65
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:200

### **Recommendation.**

Remove or comment out the variable name to silence this warning.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-22. CHECK IS NOT NEED.**

At

- contracts/library/Withdrawable.sol:29

This check is not need, because it's already checked inside of the eth transfer.

### **Recommendation.**

Remove this check.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-23. NAMING TYPO.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:203

in fact it's buyerSignature

#### **Recommendation.**

Rename

#### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-24. EVENT IS NOT NEED.**

At

- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:47

You can use `Transfer(from: address(0), to, tokenId)` .

- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:50

the purpose of the event is not clear.

#### **Recommendation.**

Remove this event.

#### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-25. DECLARE VARIABLE AS IMMUTABLE.**

At

- contracts/opensea/ERC721Tradable.sol:10

this is immutable variable.

#### **Recommendation.**

Declare variable as immutable.

#### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-26. UNCLEAR ENUMS.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:42

it's not clear why all values are  $2^{**p}$ .

Why not use 1, 2, 3, 4 and % for random?

### **Recommendation.**

Add any explanations as a comment.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-27. CONST SHOULD BE UPPER\_CASE.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:48
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:50
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:54
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:56

### **Recommendation.**

Const should be UPPER\_CASE.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-28. USE NATSPEC.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:42

### **Recommendation.**

Use NatSpec for comments for arguments.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-29. USE OPENZEPPELIN INITIALIZABLE.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:62

you can take implementation of Initializable from OpenZeppelin.

### **Recommendation.**

Use OpenZeppelin Initializable.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-30. PURPOSELESS INITIALIZATION.**

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:193

It is not clear why you initialize contract in 2 steps - constructor + initialize.

### **Recommendation.**

Use constructor. Use immutable variables to save gas.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-31. NO PUBLIC GETTER FOR ARRAY LENGTH.**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:33

there is no getter for array.length.

### **Recommendation.**

Add getter for length or for a whole array.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-32. OPTIMIZE IF-CONDITION.**

At

- contracts/opensea/ERC721Tradable.sol:22-26

you can use `return cond1 || cond2`

### **Recommendation.**

Optimize.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-33. UNUSED ARGUMENT.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:69

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:140

the argument nonce is not used.

### **Recommendation.**

Remove unused argument.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-34. USE NAMMED ARGS.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:74

and in a lot of places when you have more than 2 arguments it's always better to use nammed args notation to decrease the chance to misuse an argument.

### **Recommendation.**

Use nammed args notation.

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-35. FIX TYPO.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:83

fix typo "enought".

### **Recommendation.**

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-36. SLOAD OPTIMIZATION.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:76-78

you use two timestamps always together. You can pack them in one bytes32 storage slot, to decrease SLOAD number.

### **Recommendation.**

### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-37. AVOID DOUBLE SLOAD THE SAME VARIABLE.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:217
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:245

you have 2 SLOAD of the same variable.

#### **Recommendation.**

Optimize.

#### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-38. IDENTATION.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:246
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:349

no identation.

#### **Recommendation.**

#### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-39. SIMMILAR NAMES.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:370

baseTokenMainTraits\_

and

\_baseTokenMainTraits

are very simmilar. Easy to misuse.

#### **Recommendation.**

Rename.

#### **Status.**

NEW

### **LOW-40. DOUBLE CONDITION.**

At



- contracts/BaseToken.sol:462

you already checked it in external functions.

### **Recommendation.**

Optimize.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-41. USELESS VARIABLES.**

At

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:112
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:213
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:214
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:232-233
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:270
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:297

msg.sender and block.timestamp does not come from structure. They come from specific OPCALLs. You don't optimize anything.

### **Recommendation.**

Remove them.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-42. USE RELAXED COMPARISON FOR DEADLINE.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:94
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:160
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:211

if you want to use such mechanism inside single transaction you may use relaxed comparison " $\leq$ " instead of " $<$ " (as in uniswap)

### **Recommendation.**

Use relaxed comparison for deadline.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-43. ARGUMENT SHADOWS EXTERNAL DECLARATION.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:113-117

Argument name shadows external declaration.

**Recommendation.**

Rename.

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-44. OPTIMIZE CALCULATIONS.**

At

- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:86
- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:128
- contracts/BaseToken.sol:471

you calculate the same value twice.

**Recommendation.**

optimize

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-45. OPTIMIZE TOKENURI.**

At

- contracts/MembershipToken.sol:138

you can make "/" a part of the baseURI so optimize the encoding.

**Recommendation.**

optimize

**Status.**

NEW

**LOW-46. USELESS \_MSGSENDER .**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:166-171
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:220

and in all other places where you use `_msgSender()`  
you never switch context, so get rid of Context library.

### **Recommendation.**

Use direct `msg.sender` etc.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-47. USELESS GETTERS TO INTERNAL VARIABLES.**

At

- contracts/BaseToken.sol:131-184

these functions are just wasting of gas.

### **Recommendation.**

Remove them.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-48. INTERFACE INCONCISTENCY.**

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:137

there is no buyer as at

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:67

### **Recommendation.**

Have consistent interface.

### **Status.**

NEW

## **LOW-49. DISCUSS HOW IS `LASTTOKENID_ > _REWARDS.LENGTH` POSSIBLE.**

- contracts/S1CombinationToken.sol:217

how is `lastTokenId_ > _rewards.length` possible?

### **Recommendation.**

Discuss.

**Status.**

NEW

## LOW-50. USE SYNTAX SUGAR FOR LIBRARIES.

At

- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:86
- contracts/library/ERC721Buyable.sol:152
- 

**Recommendation.**

instead of

```
require(
    SignatureChecker.isValidSignatureNow(
        _seller,
        digest,
        _sellerSignature
    ),
    "ERC721Buyable: Invalid signature"
);
```

use syntax sugar

```
require(
    _seller.isValidSignatureNow(
        digest,
        _sellerSignature
    ),
    "ERC721Buyable: Invalid signature"
);
```

**Status.**

NEW