Aqua Audit Smart Contract Final Audit Report

Project Synopsis

Project Name	Aqua Audit
Platform	BSC, Solidity
Github Repo	Not Provided
Deployed Contract	Not Deployed
Total Duration	Days
Timeline of Audit	7th July April 2021 to 10th July 2021

Contract Details

Total Contract(s)	1
Name of Contract(s)	AqarChain
Language	Solidity
Commit Hash	Null

Contract Vulnerabilities Synopsis

Issues	Open Issues	Closed Issues
Critical Severity	0	3
Medium Severity	1	1
Low Severity	3	3
Information	3	0
Total Found	7	7

Detailed Results

The contract has gone through several stages of the audit procedure that includes structural analysis, automated testing, manual code review etc.

All the issues have been explained and discussed in detail below. Along with the explanation of the issue found during the audit, the recommended way to overcome the issue or improve the code quality has also been mentioned.

A.Contract Name: AqarChain

Important point to NOTE from the Updated Code:

1. The **SUPPLY of SEED, PRIVATE and PUBLIC**, in the documentation provided, was as follows:

Stage	%	Supply
Seed Round	7.00%	7,000,000
Private Sale	12.00%	12,000,000
Public Sale	1.00%	1,000,000

However, in the updated smart contract, the Maximum Supply allowed for the SEED, PRIVATE and PUBLIC sale are as follows:

- SEED 10000000
- PRIVATE 12200000
- PUBLIC 300000

If this is not intended, The Code Should be updated correctly. Otherwise, the documentation should be updated with the right details in order to avoid any confusion.

Critical Severity Issues

A.1 Invalid require statement doesn't restrict user's action adequately.

Line no - 443,465,481, 501, 520, 540,555

STATUS: CLOSED

Explanation:

The **require** statement at the above-mentioned lines involves an assignment operator(=) instead of an Equality Validation Operator(==).

This leads to a completely unwanted scenario where the boolean values like **publicrun**, **seedrun** etc aren't being validated for TRUE or FALSE but simply being assigned a TRUE boolean value, every time the **require statement** is executed.

In other words, users can execute these functions even if the Seed round or Private Round boolean value is FALSE.

Recommendation:

The above-mentioned require statements should use the equality operator to impose an adequate require statement validation.

For instance,

```
require(seedrun == true, "seed round is not started or over");
or,
  require(seedrun, "seed round is not started or over");
```

A.2 <u>publicbnb</u> function stores Invalid Data on chain.

Line no - 546

STATUS: CLOSED

Explanation:

As per the current design of the **publicbnb** function, it stores a wrong uint value to the publicamount state variable.

```
if(publicamount.add(msg.value.mul(getBnbRate()).mul(publicp
usermappublic[msg.sender]=publicUserInfo({firstname:_firs
amountmaptouserpublic[_id]=amountmaptouserpublic[_id].add
publicamount=privateamount.add(msg.value.mul(getBnbRate())
i++;
usersarr.push(msg.sender);
}
```

The total amount of tokens being sold at the **Public Sale Round** is being stored in terms of the **Private Sale round**.

In other words, the **publicamount** state variable is being wrongly updated as it stores the value of tokens sold by adding it to the **privateamount** state variable instead of the **publicamount** state variable.

This will lead to a completely unwanted scenario where the data stored on chain about the total tokens Sold in the public round will be different from the actual tokens sold in the public round.

Recommendation:

The Line no 546 in the **publicbnb** function should be modified as follows:

```
publicamount=privateamount.add(msg.value.mul(getBnbRate()).mul(public
price).div(1e18).div(10));
```

A.3 Invalid Require statement could make "publicBnb" function completely inaccessible.

Line no - 541

STATUS: CLOSED

Explanation:

The **publicbnb** function includes a require statement in the above-mentioned line which checks whether or not the State Variable **privateamount** is less than Public Sale supply.

This is an inaccurate validation as the **require** statement checks the Public Sale Supply limit with the **privateamount** state variable instead of **publicamount** state variable.

Moreover, since the **Private Sale** supply(**12,000,000**) is comparatively larger than the **Public Sale supply(1,000,000**), the **privateamount** state variable might be greater than the Public Sale supply limit at any instance. At that point, the **require** statement at line 541 shall never qualify.

This will lead to an unexpected scenario where the **publicbnb** function will be completely inaccessible and will never get executed.

Recommendation:

The require statement of **publicbnb** function at the above mentioned line should be updated as follows:

require(publicamount<=1000000 ether,"Public token sale completed");

Medium Severity Issues

A.4 State Variable "<u>claimamount</u>" has no significant usage in the Protocol.

Line no - 396,557,562

STATUS: CLOSED

Explanation:

The State variable claim amount has no significant usage in the Contract, as per the current design of the protocol.

```
394
395 //claim amount variable
uint256 claimamount=0;
397
```

The variable is used to store the total claimable amount of a user which is then transferred to the user. However, once transferred, the claimable state variable is assigned a Zero Value again.

```
function claim() external {
554
             require(claimbool = true, "claiming amount
555
556
557
             claimamount = usermappublic[msg.sender].am
558
             token.transfer(msg.sender,claimamount);
559
             usermappublic[msg.sender].amount=0;
560
             usermapprivate[msg.sender].amount=0;
561
             usermapseed[msg.sender].amount=0;
562
             claimamount=0;
563
564
```

In simpler terms, the *claimamount* state variable shall always hold a **Zero** Value and never symbolize any imperative state change in the protocol.

Using claimamount as a State Variable unncessarily uses extra Spaces and affects the Gas Usage in the contract.

Is the USE of claimamount as a State Variable intended?

Recommendation:

If the above-mentioned scenario is not intended, it is recommended to modify the **claimamount** variable as a local variable instead of a state variable.

A.5 Violation of Check Effects Interaction pattern Explanation:

STATUS: OPEN

The **AqarChain** contract includes a few functions that update some of the very imperative state variables of the contract after the external calls are made.

An external call within a function technically shifts the control flow of the contract to another contract for a particular period of time. Therefore, as per the Solidity Guidelines, any modification of the state variables in the base contract must be performed before executing the external call.

The following functions in the contract update the state variables after making an external call at the lines mentioned below:

- seedusdt() at Line 446
- privateusdt() at Line 486
- publicusdt() at Line 525
- claim() at Line 558

```
function claim() external {
    require(claimbool = true, "claiming amount should be true");
    claimamount = usermappublic[msg.sender].amount.add(usermapse token.transfer(msg.sender, claimamount);
    usermappublic[msg.sender].amount=0;
    usermapprivate[msg.sender].amount=0;
    usermapseed[msg.sender].amount=0;
    claimamount=0;
    claimamount=0;
```

Recommendation:

<u>Check Effects Interaction Pattern</u> must be followed while implementing external calls in a function.

Low Severity Issues

A.6 Redundant State Variable Update

Line no: 393,396,409,410,411,412

STATUS: OPEN

Explanation

The AquarChain Smart contract involves redundant updating of some of the State variables in the contract.

```
bool public seedrun = false;
bool public privaterun = false;
bool public publicrun = false;
bool public claimbool = false;
bool public claimbool = false;
```

A boolean variable is by-default initialized to FALSE whereas a uint256 is initialized to ZERO. Hence, such state variables do not need to be initialized explicitly.

Recommendation:

Redundant initialization of state variables should be avoided.

A.7 Require statements can be used instead of IF and REVERT Statements

Line no - 454, 475, 492, 512, 531,551

STATUS: CLOSED

Explanation:

The function at the above-mentioned lines uses IF-REVERT statements to ensure that users do not buy tokens more than the allowed token supply for each round.

However, this is a strict validation as the users should not be able to execute the function if this IF statement fails. Therefore, it is considered a better practise in Solidity Smart Contracts, to use **require statements for such validations.**

Is this Function Design Intended?

Recommendation:

The IF-REVERT statements can be modified as follows, unless the current function design is Intended.

The above-mentioned IF ELSE and Revert statement can be re-written as:

A.8 Functions promise a return Value of uint256 but do not return anything.

Line no: 569, 572, 575, 578

STATUS: CLOSED

Explanation

The functions at the above-mentioned lines indicate a uint256 return value at their function signature.

```
function toggleclaim() external onlyOwner returns (uint256) {
570
             claimbool = !claimbool;
571
572
         function toggleseed() external onlyOwner returns (uint256) {
573
             seedrun = !seedrun;
574
575
          function toggleprivate() external onlyOwner returns (uint256) {
576
             privaterun = !privaterun;
577
578
           function togglepublic() external onlyOwner returns (uint256) {
             publicrun = !publicrun;
579
580
```

However, none of those functions actually return any uint256 value. If no uint value is not explicitly returned, the function will simply return a default return value for uint256, i.e., ZERO.

Recommendation:

If the above-mentioned functions are not supposed to return any uint256 value, the function signatures should be modified accordingly.

A.9 External Visibility should be preferred

STATUS: OPEN

Explanation

Those functions that are never called throughout the contract should be marked as **external** visibility instead of **public** visibility.

This will effectively result in Gas Optimization as well.

Therefore, the following function must be marked as **external** within the contract:

getBnbBalance()

Recommendation:

If the PUBLIC visibility of the above-mentioned functions is not intended, then the EXTERNAL Visibility keyword should be preferred.

A.10 Constant declaration should be preferred

Line no - 399 to 401

STATUS: OPEN

Explanation

State variables that are not supposed to change throughout the contract should be declared as **constant**.

Recommendation:

The following state variables could be declared as **constant**, unless the current contract design is intended.

- privateprice
- publicprice
- Seedprice

A.11 Too many Digits used

Line no - 440-456, 458-477, 478-494, 495-514, 516-533, 534-553

STATUS: CLOSED

Explanation

The above-mentioned lines have a large number of digits that makes it difficult to review and reduces the readability of the code.

The following functions in the contract have this issue:

- seedusdt()
- seedbnb()
- privateusdt
- privatebnb
- publicusdt
- publicbnb

Recommendation:

Ether Suffix could be used to symbolize the 10^18 zeros.

For instance, the require statement at Line number 441,

Can be written as:

```
require(_amount>=100 ether ,"Enter amount greater than 100 usd");
```

Informational

A.12 Contract includes Hardcoded address

Line no: 418, 425, 429, 430 STATUS: Not Considered

Explanation

Keeping in mind the immutable nature of smart contracts, it is not considered a better practise to hardcode any address in the contract before deployment.

Recommendation:

Instead of including hardcoded addresses in the contract, initialize those addresses within the constructors at the time of deployment.

A.13 Code Style Issues

STATUS: Not Considered

Explanation

Code readability of a Smart Contract is largely influenced by the Coding Style issues and in some specific scenarios may lead to bugs in the future.

During the automated testing, it was found that the **AqarChain** contract had quite a few code style issues.

```
Struct aqarchain.seedUserInfo (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#352-360) is not in CapWords
Struct aqarchain.privateUserInfo (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#370-378) is not in CapWords
Struct aqarchain.publicUserInfo (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#370-378) is not in CapWords
Parameter aqarchain.seetoken(address). token (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#37) is not in mixedCase
Parameter aqarchain.seedusdt(string, string, string, uint256). [first (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#440) is not in mixedCase
Parameter aqarchain.seedusdt(string, string, string, uint256). [alst (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#440) is not in mixedCase
Parameter aqarchain.seedusdt(string, string, string, uint256). [alst (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#440) is not in mixedCase
Parameter aqarchain.seedusdt(string, string, string, uint256). [id (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#440) is not in mixedCase
Parameter aqarchain.seedusdt(string, string, string, uint256). [amount (contracts/Updated_AQR.sol#440) is not in mixedCase
Parameter aqarchain.seedbnb(string, string, string). [string]. [
```

Recommendation:

Therefore, it is recommended to fix the issues like naming convention, indentation, and code layout issues in a smart contract.

A.14 Commented codes must be wiped-out before deployment

Line no: 236-276

STATUS: Not Considered

Explanation

The AqarChain contract includes quite a few commented codes regarding a **INonStandardERC20 interface** at the above-mentioned line.

This badly affects the readability of the code.

Recommendation:

Therefore, it is recommended to fix the issues like naming convention, indentation, and code layout issues in a smart contract.

Automated Test Results

```
per chair sectual intring string, stri
```