

SMART CONTRACT CODE REVIEW AND SECURITY ANALYSIS REPORT



Customer: Codyfight

Date: November 25th, 2021



This document may contain confidential information about IT systems and the intellectual property of the Customer as well as information about potential vulnerabilities and methods of their exploitation.

The report containing confidential information can be used internally by the Customer, or it can be disclosed publicly after all vulnerabilities are fixed — upon a decision of the Customer.

Document

Name	Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report for Codyfight.		
Approved by	Andrew Matiukhin CTO Hacken OU		
Туре	ERC20 token		
Platform	Ethereum / Solidity		
Methods	Architecture Review, Functional Testing, Computer-Aided Verification, Manual Review		
Repository	https://github.com/codyfight/token-contract		
Commit	86f551b3d5bc6966138abd8b9e013a9e776d70d0		
Technical	YES		
Documentation			
	No.		
JS tests	NO NO		
Website	codyfight.com		
Timeline	22 NOVEMBER 2021 - 25 NOVEMBER 2021		
Changelog	25 NOVEMBER 2021 - INITIAL AUDIT		






Table of contents

Introduction	
Scope	4
Executive Summary	5
Severity Definitions	6
Audit overview	7
Conclusion	7
Disclaimers	9



Introduction

Hacken OÜ (Consultant) was contracted by Codyfight (Customer) to conduct a Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis. This report presents the findings of the security assessment of the Customer's smart contract and its code review conducted between November 22^{nd} , 2021 - November 25^{th} , 2021.

Scope

The scope of the project is smart contracts in the repository:

Repository:

https://github.com/codyfight/token-contract

Commit:

86f551b3d5bc6966138abd8b9e013a9e776d70d0

Technical Documentation: Yes (WP: https://codyfight.gitbook.io/white-

paper/tokenomics/codyfight-token)

JS tests: No Contracts:

CodyfightToken.sol

We have scanned this smart contract for commonly known and more specific vulnerabilities. Here are some of the commonly known vulnerabilities that are considered:

Category	Check Item
Code review	Reentrancy
	• Ownership Takeover
	Timestamp Dependence
	Gas Limit and Loops
	DoS with (Unexpected) Throw
	DoS with Block Gas Limit
	 Transaction-Ordering Dependence
	Style guide violation
	Costly Loop
	ERC20 API violation
	 Unchecked external call
	Unchecked math
	Unsafe type inference
	Implicit visibility level
	Deployment Consistency
	 Repository Consistency
	Data Consistency



Functional review	 Business Logics Review
	Functionality Checks
	Access Control & Authorization
	Escrow manipulation
	 Token Supply manipulation
	Assets integrity
	 User Balances manipulation
	 Data Consistency manipulation
	Kill-Switch Mechanism

Operation Trails & Event Generation

Executive Summary

According to the assessment, the Customer's smart contracts are well-secured.

Insecure	Poor secured	Secured	Well-secured
		You are here	

Our team performed an analysis of code functionality, manual audit, and automated checks with Mythril and Slither. All issues found during automated analysis were manually reviewed, and important vulnerabilities are presented in the Audit overview section. All found issues can be found in the Audit overview section.

As a result of the audit, security engineers found no issues.



Severity Definitions

Risk Level	Description
Critical	Critical vulnerabilities are usually straightforward to exploit and can lead to assets loss or data manipulations.
High	High-level vulnerabilities are difficult to exploit; however, they also have a significant impact on smart contract execution, e.g., public access to crucial functions
Medium	Medium-level vulnerabilities are important to fix; however, they can't lead to assets loss or data manipulations.
Low	Low-level vulnerabilities are mostly related to outdated, unused, etc. code snippets that can't have a significant impact on execution



Audit overview

■ ■ ■ Critical

No critical issues were found.

High

No high severity issues were found.

■ ■ Medium

No medium severity issues were found.

Low

No low severity issues were found.



Conclusion

Smart contracts within the scope were manually reviewed and analyzed with static analysis tools.

The audit report contains all found security vulnerabilities and other issues in the reviewed code.

As a result of the audit, security engineers found no issues.



Disclaimers

Hacken Disclaimer

The smart contracts given for audit have been analyzed in accordance with the best industry practices at the date of this report, in relation to cybersecurity vulnerabilities and issues in smart contract source code, the details of which are disclosed in this report (Source Code); the Source Code compilation, deployment, and functionality (performing the intended functions).

The audit makes no statements or warranties on the security of the code. It also cannot be considered as a sufficient assessment regarding the utility and safety of the code, bug-free status, or any other statements of the contract. While we have done our best in conducting the analysis and producing this report, it is important to note that you should not rely on this report only — we recommend proceeding with several independent audits and a public bug bounty program to ensure the security of smart contracts.

Technical Disclaimer

Smart contracts are deployed and executed on a blockchain platform. The platform, its programming language, and other software related to the smart contract can have vulnerabilities that can lead to hacks. Thus, the audit can't guarantee the explicit security of the audited smart contracts.