



HACKEN

SMART CONTRACT CODE REVIEW AND SECURITY ANALYSIS REPORT

Customer: S6k Labs

Date: April 5, 2023

This report 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 can be disclosed publicly after prior consent by another Party. Any subsequent publication of this report shall be without mandatory consent.

Document

Name	Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report for S6k Labs
Approved By	Marcin Ugarenko Lead Solidity SC Auditor at Hacken OU
Type	ERC20 token;
Platform	EVM
Language	Solidity
Methodology	Link
Website	https://www.s6klabs.com/
Changelog	05.04.2023 - Initial Review

Table of contents

Introduction	4
Scope	4
Severity Definitions	5
Executive Summary	6
Risks	7
System Overview	8
Checked Items	9
Findings	12
Critical	12
High	12
Medium	12
Low	12
L01. Unchecked Return Value	12
L02. Floating Pragma	12
L03. Functions That Can Be Declared External	13
Disclaimers	14

Introduction

Hacken OÜ (Consultant) was contracted by S6k Labs (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 contracts.

Scope

The scope of the project includes the following smart contracts from the provided repository:

Initial review scope

Repository	https://gitlab.com/s6k-labs/s6k-token-contract
Commit	9f55463c99daa4b731dc15bb2362a4156a81f38a
Whitepaper	Not provided
Functional Requirements	Hacken - s6kToken (\$SRP) audit.pdf SHA3:aa56190b21b83bb473954b6595341635bd5f26c04e5cfe045626f8348ad9d9c6151af9f7b9fd5c2486cd4f8b25f376b04f14bbee880007597a35e9d6d524bb51
Technical Requirements	Hacken - s6kToken (\$SRP) audit.pdf SHA3:aa56190b21b83bb473954b6595341635bd5f26c04e5cfe045626f8348ad9d9c6151af9f7b9fd5c2486cd4f8b25f376b04f14bbee880007597a35e9d6d524bb51
Contracts	File: ./contracts/s6k_token.sol SHA3:464a9445eec73c0369a030c2414f0d583e2c5cb3edef9dcde728b63a

Severity Definitions

Risk Level	Description
Critical	Critical vulnerabilities are usually straightforward to exploit and can lead to the loss of user funds or contract state manipulation by external or internal actors.
High	High vulnerabilities are usually harder to exploit, requiring specific conditions, or have a more limited scope, but can still lead to the loss of user funds or contract state manipulation by external or internal actors.
Medium	Medium vulnerabilities are usually limited to state manipulations but cannot lead to asset loss. Major deviations from best practices are also in this category.
Low	Low vulnerabilities are related to outdated and unused code or minor Gas optimization. These issues won't have a significant impact on code execution but affect code quality

Executive Summary

The score measurement details can be found in the corresponding section of the [scoring methodology](#).

Documentation quality

The total Documentation Quality score is **9** out of **10**.

- Functional requirements are provided.
- Technical requirements are provided.
- NatSpec is not provided.

Code quality

The total Code Quality score is **8** out of **10**.

- The code follows Solidity Style Guides.
- Unchecked transfer was used.
- Floating pragma is used.

Test coverage

Code coverage of the project is **0%** (branch coverage).

- Tests are not provided but do not affect the score because the Lines of Code of the scope are less than 250.

Security score

As a result of the audit, the code contains **3** low severity issues. The security score is **10** out of **10**.

All found issues are displayed in the “Findings” section.

Summary

According to the assessment, the Customer's smart contract has the following score: **9.5**. The system users should acknowledge all the risks summed up in the risks section of the report.



Table. The distribution of issues during the audit

Review date	Low	Medium	High	Critical
5 April 2023	3	0	0	0

Risks

- The PAUSER_ROLE in the s6kToken contract has highly permissive role access and can pause the transfer of tokens without any restrictions.

System Overview

The scope of the S6k Labs audit consists of an ERC20 token that is Burnable and Pausable. The Burning functionality can be done by token holders and addresses that are approved by the token holders. The admin and pauser roles are defined in the system, which can transfer locked ERC20 tokens in the contract and pause, unpause transfers of the token respectively.

According to the documentation, the *s6k Token* will be used on a Launchpad platform for staking and receiving allocations on sales and as the main currency for s6k projects such as the marketplace.

The files in the scope:

- **s6k-Token.sol**: The Burnable and Pausable ERC20 token of the system.

Privileged roles

- DEFAULT_ADMIN_ROLE: Can transfer ERC20 tokens that are sent to the contract by mistake.
- PAUSER_ROLE: Can pause, unpause transfer of tokens.

Recommendations

- Lock the pragma version for best practice.
- Use the external declaration in functions that are not accessed from within the contract.

Checked Items

We have audited the Customers' smart contracts for commonly known and specific vulnerabilities. Here are some items considered:

Item	Type	Description	Status
Default Visibility	SWC-100 SWC-108	Functions and state variables visibility should be set explicitly. Visibility levels should be specified consciously.	Passed
Integer Overflow and Underflow	SWC-101	If unchecked math is used, all math operations should be safe from overflows and underflows.	Passed
Outdated Compiler Version	SWC-102	It is recommended to use a recent version of the Solidity compiler.	Passed
Floating Pragma	SWC-103	Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested thoroughly.	Failed
Unchecked Call Return Value	SWC-104	The return value of a message call should be checked.	Passed
Access Control & Authorization	CWE-284	Ownership takeover should not be possible. All crucial functions should be protected. Users could not affect data that belongs to other users.	Passed
SELFDESTRUCT Instruction	SWC-106	The contract should not be self-destructible while it has funds belonging to users.	Not Relevant
Check-Effect-Interaction	SWC-107	Check-Effect-Interaction pattern should be followed if the code performs ANY external call.	Passed
Assert Violation	SWC-110	Properly functioning code should never reach a failing assert statement.	Passed
Deprecated Solidity Functions	SWC-111	Deprecated built-in functions should never be used.	Passed
Delegatecall to Untrusted Callee	SWC-112	Delegatecalls should only be allowed to trusted addresses.	Not Relevant
DoS (Denial of Service)	SWC-113 SWC-128	Execution of the code should never be blocked by a specific contract state unless required.	Passed

Race Conditions	SWC-114	Race Conditions and Transactions Order Dependency should not be possible.	Passed
Authorization through tx.origin	SWC-115	tx.origin should not be used for authorization.	Not Relevant
Block values as a proxy for time	SWC-116	Block numbers should not be used for time calculations.	Not Relevant
Signature Unique Id	SWC-117 SWC-121 SWC-122 EIP-155 EIP-712	Signed messages should always have a unique id. A transaction hash should not be used as a unique id. Chain identifiers should always be used. All parameters from the signature should be used in signer recovery. EIP-712 should be followed during a signer verification.	Not Relevant
Shadowing State Variable	SWC-119	State variables should not be shadowed.	Passed
Weak Sources of Randomness	SWC-120	Random values should never be generated from Chain Attributes or be predictable.	Not Relevant
Incorrect Inheritance Order	SWC-125	When inheriting multiple contracts, especially if they have identical functions, a developer should carefully specify inheritance in the correct order.	Not Relevant
Calls Only to Trusted Addresses	EEA-Leve1-2 SWC-126	All external calls should be performed only to trusted addresses.	Passed
Presence of Unused Variables	SWC-131	The code should not contain unused variables if this is not justified by design.	Passed
EIP Standards Violation	EIP	EIP standards should not be violated.	Passed
Assets Integrity	Custom	Funds are protected and cannot be withdrawn without proper permissions or be locked on the contract.	Passed
User Balances Manipulation	Custom	Contract owners or any other third party should not be able to access funds belonging to users.	Passed
Data Consistency	Custom	Smart contract data should be consistent all over the data flow.	Passed

Flashloan Attack	Custom	When working with exchange rates, they should be received from a trusted source and not be vulnerable to short-term rate changes that can be achieved by using flash loans. Oracles should be used.	Not Relevant
Token Supply Manipulation	Custom	Tokens can be minted only according to rules specified in a whitepaper or any other documentation provided by the Customer.	Passed
Gas Limit and Loops	Custom	Transaction execution costs should not depend dramatically on the amount of data stored on the contract. There should not be any cases when execution fails due to the block Gas limit.	Not Relevant
Style Guide Violation	Custom	Style guides and best practices should be followed.	Passed
Requirements Compliance	Custom	The code should be compliant with the requirements provided by the Customer.	Passed
Environment Consistency	Custom	The project should contain a configured development environment with a comprehensive description of how to compile, build and deploy the code.	Passed
Secure Oracles Usage	Custom	The code should have the ability to pause specific data feeds that it relies on. This should be done to protect a contract from compromised oracles.	Not Relevant
Tests Coverage	Custom	The code should be covered with unit tests. Test coverage should be sufficient, with both negative and positive cases covered. Usage of contracts by multiple users should be tested.	Failed
Stable Imports	Custom	The code should not reference draft contracts, which may be changed in the future.	Passed

Findings

Critical

No critical severity issues were found.

High

No high severity issues were found.

Medium

No medium severity issues were found.

Low

L01. Unchecked Return Value

In the `transferToken()` function, the return value of the call `IERC20(token).transfer(to, amount)` is not checked.

Execution will resume even if the called contract throws an exception. If the call fails accidentally or an attacker forces the call to fail, this may cause unexpected behavior in the subsequent program logic.

Path: `./contracts/s6k_token.sol : transferToken()`

Recommendation: Check the return value of the `.transfer()` call or use [safeTransfer](#).

Found in: 9f55463

Status: New

L02. Floating Pragma

The project uses floating pragma `^0.8.9`.

This may result in the contracts being deployed using the wrong pragma version, which is different from the one they were tested with. For example, they might be deployed using an outdated pragma version which may include bugs that affect the system negatively.

Path: `./contracts/s6k_token.sol`

Recommendation: Consider locking the pragma version whenever possible and avoid using a floating pragma in the final deployment. Consider known bugs (<https://github.com/ethereum/solidity/releases>) for the compiler version that is chosen.

Found in: 9f55463

Status: New

L03. Functions That Can Be Declared External

In order to save Gas, public functions that are never called in the contract should be declared as external.

Path: ./contracts/s6k_token.sol : pause(), unpause(), transferToken()

Recommendation: Use the external attribute for functions never called from the contract.

Found in: 9f55463

Status: New

Disclaimers

Hacken Disclaimer

The smart contracts given for audit have been analyzed based on best industry practices at the time of the writing of this report, with 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 report contains no statements or warranties on the identification of all vulnerabilities and security of the code. The report covers the code submitted and reviewed, so it may not be relevant after any modifications. Do not consider this report as a final and sufficient assessment regarding the utility and safety of the code, bug-free status, or any other contract statements.

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.

English is the original language of the report. The Consultant is not responsible for the correctness of the translated versions.

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 Consultant cannot guarantee the explicit security of the audited smart contracts.