

HACKEN

SMART CONTRACT CODE REVIEW AND SECURITY ANALYSIS REPORT

Customer: Leech Protocol
Date: 17 Aug, 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 Leech Protocol
Approved By	Oleksii Zaiats SC Audits Head at Hacken OÜ
Tags	ERC20 token; Yield Aggregator
Platform	EVM
Language	Solidity
Methodology	Link
Website	https://website.com
Changelog	31.07.2023 - Initial Review 09.08.2023 - Second Review 17.08.2023 - Third Review

Table of contents

Introduction	4
System Overview	4
Executive Summary	5
Risks	6
Checked Items	7
Findings	10
Critical	10
C02. Signed Message Replay Attack	10
High	11
H01. Front-Running; Sandwich Attack	12
Medium	12
M01. Missing Validation	12
M02. Checks-Effects-Interactions Pattern Violation	13
M03. Redundant Modifier	13
M04. Uninitialized Implementation	
M05. Highly Permissive Admin Access	14
Low	14
L01. Missing Zero Address Validation	14
L02. Redundant Import	14
L03. Missing Events	15
L04. Funds Lock	16
Informational	17
I01. Natspec Mismatch	17
I02. Public Functions That Should Be External	17
I03. Public Functions That Should Be Internal; Best Practice Violation	17
I04. Redundant Variable Value Assignment	18
I05. Typos	18
I06. Redundant Code	19
I07. Inconsistency in Errors	19
Disclaimers	21
Appendix 1. Severity Definitions	22
Risk Levels	22
Impact Levels	23
Likelihood Levels	23
Informational	23
Appendix 2. Scope	24

Introduction

Hacken OÜ (Consultant) was contracted by Leech Protocol (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.

System Overview

Leech Protocol is a cross-chain yield aggregator. It allows users to deposit funds into different pools with underlying yield-generating strategies. It has the following contracts:

- *LeechRouterOptimism* – a contract that users use to make deposits and withdrawals to preferred pools.
- *LeechRouterBase* – The Router is the main protocol contract, for user interactions and protocol automatizations.
- *StrategyVelodrome* – FarmLeech Protocol farming strategy for Velodrome.
- *BaseFarmStrategy* – Base farming strategy.
- *Helpers* – Leech Protocol helpers and utilities.

Privileged roles

BaseFarmStrategy and *StrategyVelodromeFarm* are using *OwnableUpgradeable* to restrict access. Contract owner can:

- Sets paths for token swap.
- Sets fee taken by the Leech protocol.
- Sets the treasury address.
- Sets the controller address.
- Sets slippage tolerance.

LeechRouterBase and *LeechRouterOptimism* are using *AccessControlUpgradeable* to restrict access.

Addresses with *ADMIN_ROLE* can:

- Move liquidity to the new strategy.
- Move liquidity to another blockchain.
- Change strategy.
- Change address of validator, finalizer, transporter and treasury.
- Set a new pool, strategy and router.
- Set withdrawal delay.
- Unpause contract.
- Change Uniswap based router.
- Ban and unban given address.
- Set deposit token and minimal value that should be deposited.

Addresses with *PAUSER_ROLE* can pause a contract.

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 **10** out of **10**.

- Functional requirements are provided.
- Technical description is provided.

Code quality

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

- The code follows style guides and best practices.
- The development environment is configured.

Test coverage

Code coverage of the project is **100%** (branch coverage).

Security score

As a result of the audit, the code contains **no** 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: **10**. The system users should acknowledge all the risks summed up in the risks section of the report.



The final score 

Table. The distribution of issues during the audit

Review date	Low	Medium	High	Critical
31 July 2023	4	5	6	3
09 Aug 2023	3	0	0	0
17 Aug 2023	0	0	0	0

Risks

- Iterating over a dynamic array populated with custom tokenId can lead to Gas limit denial of service if the number of tokenId goes out of control.
- The multisig ADMIN role can perform migrations at any time without restrictions. This is part of the business logic of the protocol.

Checked Items

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

Item	Description	Status	Related Issues
Default Visibility	Functions and state variables visibility should be set explicitly. Visibility levels should be specified consciously.	Passed	
Integer Overflow and Underflow	If unchecked math is used, all math operations should be safe from overflows and underflows.	Not Relevant	
Outdated Compiler Version	It is recommended to use a recent version of the Solidity compiler.	Passed	
Floating Pragma	Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested thoroughly.	Passed	
Unchecked Call Return Value	The return value of a message call should be checked.	Passed	
Access Control & Authorization	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	The contract should not be self-destructible while it has funds belonging to users.	Not Relevant	
Check-Effect-Interaction	Check-Effect-Interaction pattern should be followed if the code performs ANY external call.	Passed	
Assert Violation	Properly functioning code should never reach a failing assert statement.	Passed	
Deprecated Solidity Functions	Deprecated built-in functions should never be used.	Passed	
Delegatecall to Untrusted Callee	Delegatecalls should only be allowed to trusted addresses.	Not Relevant	
DoS (Denial of Service)	Execution of the code should never be blocked by a specific contract state unless required.	Passed	

Race Conditions	Race Conditions and Transactions Order Dependency should not be possible.	Passed	
Authorization through tx.origin	tx.origin should not be used for authorization.	Not Relevant	
Block values as a proxy for time	Block numbers should not be used for time calculations.	Passed	
Signature Unique Id	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.	Passed	
Shadowing State Variable	State variables should not be shadowed.	Passed	
Weak Sources of Randomness	Random values should never be generated from Chain Attributes or be predictable.	Not Relevant	
Incorrect Inheritance Order	When inheriting multiple contracts, especially if they have identical functions, a developer should carefully specify inheritance in the correct order.	Passed	
Calls Only to Trusted Addresses	All external calls should be performed only to trusted addresses.	Passed	
Presence of Unused Variables	The code should not contain unused variables if this is not justified by design.	Passed	
EIP Standards Violation	EIP standards should not be violated.	Passed	
Assets Integrity	Funds are protected and cannot be withdrawn without proper permissions or be locked on the contract.	Passed	
User Balances Manipulation	Contract owners or any other third party should not be able to access funds belonging to users.	Passed	
Data Consistency	Smart contract data should be consistent all over the data flow.	Passed	

Flashloan Attack	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. Contracts shouldn't rely on values that can be changed in the same transaction.	Passed	
Token Supply Manipulation	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	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.	Passed	
Style Guide Violation	Style guides and best practices should be followed.	Passed	
Requirements Compliance	The code should be compliant with the requirements provided by the Customer.	Passed	
Environment Consistency	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	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	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.	Passed	
Stable Imports	The code should not reference draft contracts, which may be changed in the future.	Passed	

Findings

Critical

C02. Signed Message Replay Attack

Impact	High
Likelihood	High

The *LeechRouterBase* contract is not utilizing EIP712 for signatures and deadlines. The current implementation of signed messages lacks mechanisms to prevent replay attacks.

Without a standard such as EIP712, signed messages can potentially be reused on other chains (replay attacks).

This can result in the execution of a signed transaction when it is not desired by a signer.

Path: `./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : checkWhitelist();`

Recommendation: implement EIP712 for signatures in the protocol. EIP712 offers a standard way to structure data and generate signatures, which would significantly enhance the security of the contract by protecting it from replay attacks. Add nonce and chainId parameters to each signature, which will highly increase security.

Found in: `f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501`

Status: *Mitigated* (The customer has explained that the possibility of replaying doesn't pose a threat to their business logic, as it is by should be possible to "replay" the message within the given timeframe)

High

H01. Front-Running; Sandwich Attack

Impact	High
Likelihood	Medium

The minimum return amount is not specified, or `0` is specified as a minimum value during operations with the swap router.

This may lead to unexpected token loss and wrong swap rates during the interaction with the system.

Paths:

`./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : _deposit(),
 _withdraw();`

`./router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol : _swap();`

`./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : crosschainDeposit();`

Recommendation: specify the minimum amount manually or use oracles to calculate the minimum amount or use newer versions of the DEXs.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: 2f79620)

■ ■ Medium

M01. Missing Validation

Impact	Medium
Likelihood	Medium

It is considered that the project should be consistent and contain no self-contradictions.

According to docs the value `protocolFee` should be lower than `MAX_FEE` value (12%). However, in the `initialize()` the validation is missed.

According to docs the value `slippage` should be lower than `DENOMINATOR` value and greater than 0. However, in the `initialize()` the validation is missed.

This may lead to unexpected value processed by the contract.

Path: `./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol` : `initialize()`;

Recommendation: implement the validations of `protocolFee` and `slippage` in `initialize()`.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: 5202e8ca796e989437d07e390b7db7aef7dce5ac)

M02. Checks-Effects-Interactions Pattern Violation

Impact	Medium
Likelihood	Medium

The Checks-Effects-Interactions pattern is violated. During the functions, some state variables are updated after the external calls.

Paths: `./strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol` : `deposit()`

`./router/LeechRouterBase.sol` : `finalizeDeposit()`, `finalizeWithdrawal()`;

Recommendation: implement the functions according to the Checks-Effects-Interactions pattern or use reentrancy locks.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit:
 eea595310c0937e654acb446fc3276350497edf4)

M03. Redundant Modifier

Impact	Medium
Likelihood	Medium

The withdrawal mechanisms, `withdraw()` and `crosschainWithdraw()`, in `LeechRouterBase.sol` do not need to be payable since they do not expect to receive any native coins in transactions.

Path: `./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : withdraw();`

Recommendation: remove payable modifiers.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit:
 eea595310c0937e654acb446fc3276350497edf4)

M04. Uninitialized Implementation

Impact	Medium
Likelihood	High

It is considered following best practices to avoid unclear situations and prevent common attack vectors.

It is not recommended to leave an implementation contract uninitialized. An uninitialized implementation contract can be taken over by an attacker.

This may lead to the attacker taking over the contract and impacts the proxy.

Paths:

`./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : constructor();`

`./router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol : constructor();`

Recommendation: follow common best practices, invoke the `_disableInitializers` function in the constructor to automatically lock the contract when it is deployed.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: eea595310c0937e654acb446fc3276350497edf4)

M05. Highly Permissive Admin Access

Impact	High
Likelihood	Medium

ADMIN role can perform migrations anytime without notifying anyone.

If a key leak were to occur, the potential consequences could be significant, potentially leading to security breaches and undermining the overall integrity of the system.

Paths: `./router/LeechRouterBase.sol: migration(), crosschainMigration();`

Recommendation: to ensure transparency and accountability, it is advised to provide a comprehensive explanation of highly-permissive access in the system's public documentation. This would help to ensure that users are fully informed of the implications of such access and can make informed decisions accordingly.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Mitigated (The functionality and its necessity for the business logic was explained in the protocol documentation)

■ Low

L01. Missing Zero Address Validation

Impact	Low
Likelihood	Low

Address parameters are being used without checking against the possibility of `0x0`.

This can lead to unwanted external calls to `0x0`.

Paths:

`./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : initialize();`
`./router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol : initialize();`

Recommendation: implement zero address checks.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit:
 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

L02. Redundant Import

Impact	Low
Likelihood	Medium

The contract `BaseFarmStrategy` inherits OpenZeppelin's `IERC20` but it is already part of `SafeERC20`.

The contract `StrategyVelodromeFarm` inherits OpenZeppelin's `IERC20` but it is already part of `BaseFarmStrategy`.

The contract `StrategyVelodromeFarm` inherits OpenZeppelin's `SafeERC20` but it is already part of `BaseFarmStrategy`.

The contract `LeechRouterBase` inherits OpenZeppelin's `IERC20` but it is already part of `SafeERC20`.

The contract `LeechRouterBase` inherits OpenZeppelin's `Initializable` but it is already part of `AccessControlUpgradeable`.

The contract `LeechRouterOptimism` inherits OpenZeppelin's `IERC20` but it is already part of `LeechRouterBase`.

The contract `Helpers` inherits OpenZeppelin's `IERC20` but it is already part of `SafeERC20`.

The redundancy in inheritance and import can lead to unnecessary gas consumption during deployment and potentially impact code quality.

Paths:

```
./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : *;
./strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol : *;
./router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol : *;
./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : *;
./libraries/Helpers.sol : *;
```

Recommendation: remove redundant import and inheritance to save Gas on deployment and increase the code quality.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit:
 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

L03. Missing Events

Impact	Low
Likelihood	Medium

Events for critical state changes should be emitted for tracking things off-chain.

Paths:

```
./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : setRoutes(),
  _withdraw(), _deposit();
```

```
./strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol : setFee(), setTreasury(),
  setController(), setSlippage(), migrate();
```

```
./router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol : setRoutes();
```

```
./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : migration(), crosschainMigration(),
  migrateAllocations(), finalizeCrosschainMigration(), setValidator(),
  setFinalizer(), setStrategy(), setPool(), setRouter(),
  setTransporter(), setWithdrawDelay(), switchWhitelistStatus(),
  setUniV2(), setTreasury(), setBanned(), setDepositToken();
```

Recommendation: create and emit related events.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit:
 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

L04. Funds Lock

Impact	Low
Likelihood	Medium

The contract accepts token deposits but lacks a withdrawal mechanism, which can result in funds being locked in the contract. The deposit() function in the LeechRouterBase.sol contract accepts native tokens however, the function is not designed to process the native tokens this will lead the sent amount to be stuck in the contract.

This may lead to imbalances and miscalculations in the project.

Path: ./router/LeechRouterBase.sol: deposit();

Recommendation: remove the payable modifier from this function so that it will not accept native tokens.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: 2f79620)

Informational

I01. Natspec Mismatch

`setDepositToken()` and `pause()` functions' NatSpec descriptions are different than the implementation

Path: ./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : setDepositToken(), pause();

Recommendation: update the NatSpecs.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

I02. Public Functions That Should Be External

Functions that are only called from outside the contract should be defined as external. External functions are much more gas efficient compared to public functions.

Paths:

./strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol : deposit(), withdraw(), quotePotentialWithdraw();

./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : quotePotentialWithdraw();

./router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol : initialize();

Recommendation: make these functions external.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

I03. Public Functions That Should Be Internal; Best Practice Violation

Functions that are only called inside the contract should be defined as internal. Internal functions are much more Gas efficient compared to public functions.

Path: ./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : initialize();

Recommendation: make this function internal. Change name of `LeechRouterBase initialize()` function to `__LeechRouterBase_init()`.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Reported

I04. Redundant Variable Value Assignment

The `withdrawDelay` value assignment of `0` is redundant in `initialize()`. Default value of `uint` is `0`.

Path: ./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : initialize();

Recommendation: remove redundant variable value assignment.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

I05. Typos

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `setTreasury()` in `BaseFarmStrategy`. It says `tresury`, however, it should be `treasury`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `protocolFee` in `BaseFarmStrategy`. It says `comission`, however, it should be `commission`.

There is a typo in comments of `deposit()` in `BaseFarmStrategy`. It says `allcation`, however, it should be `allocation`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `routes` in `StrategyVelodromeFarm`. It says `exchnage`, however, it should be `exchange`.

There is a typo in variable names used in `_deposit()` in `StrategyVelodromeFarm`. It says `swapedAmounts`, however, it should be `swappedAmounts`.

There is a typo in variable names used in `_swap()` in `LeechRouterOptimism`. It says `swapedAmounts`, however, it should be `swappedAmounts`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `enabled()` in `LeechRouterBase`. It says `exlude`, however, it should be `exclude`.

There is a typo in comments in `crosschainDeposit()` in `LeechRouterBase`. It says `transtorder`, however, it should be `transporter`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `withdraw()`, `finalizeWithdrawal()` and `crosschainWithdraw()` in `LeechRouterBase`. It says `withdrwalas`, however, it should be `withdrawals`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `setBanned()` in `LeechRouterBase`. It says `address`, however, it should be `addresses`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description and variable names used in `_swap()` in `LeechRouterBase`. It says `swapedAmounts`, however, it should be `swappedAmounts`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `withdraw()`, `finalizeWithdrawal()` and `crosschainWithdraw()` in `ILeechRouter`. It says `withdrwalas`, however, it should be `withdrawals`.

There is a typo in NatSpec's description of `WithdrawCompleted` and `CrosschainWithdrawCompleted` in `ILeechRouter`. It says `completeing`, however, it should be `completing`.

There is a typo in the `PercentExceedsMaximalValue` event name in `Helpers`. It says `PercentExceedsMaximalValue`, however, it should be `PercentExceedsMaximalValue`.

Paths:

```
./strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol : setTreasury(), protocolFee, deposit();
```

```
./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : routes, _deposit();
```

```
./router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol : _swap();
```

```
./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : enabled(), crosschainDeposit(), withdraw(), finalizeWithdrawal(), crosschainWithdraw(), setBanned(), _swap();
```

```
./router/ILeechRouter.sol : withdraw(), finalizeWithdrawal(), crosschainWithdraw(), WithdrawCompleted, CrosschainWithdrawCompleted;
```

```
./libraries/Helpers.sol : PercentExceedsMaximalValue;
```

Recommendation: fix typos.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Fixed (Revised commit: 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

I06. Redundant Code

The contract inherits OpenZeppelin's `AccessControlUpgradeable` but there is a custom role based mechanism implemented to restrict access.

The redundancy in code can lead to unnecessary gas consumption during deployment and potentially impact code quality.

Path: `./router/LeechRouterBase.sol : onlyFinalizer();`

Recommendation: create FINALIZER_ROLE using AccessControlUpgradeable.

Found in: f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501

Status: Reported

I07. Inconsistency in Errors

There is inconsistency in returned error types.

Inside `setSlippage()`, if `_slippage` parameter is bigger than `DENOMINATOR` value, then transaction is reverted with `SlippageTooHigh` error.

Inside `initialize()`, if the `slippage` parameter is bigger than the `DENOMINATOR` value, then the transaction is reverted with `BadAmount` error.

Paths:

```
./strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol : setSlippage();
```

```
./strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol : initialize();
```

Recommendation: fix the mismatch between errors used in the same check.

Found in: 5202e8ca796e989437d07e390b7db7aef7dce5ac

Status: Fixed (Revised commit:
21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7)

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.

Appendix 1. Severity Definitions

When auditing smart contracts Hacken is using a risk-based approach that considers the potential impact of any vulnerabilities and the likelihood of them being exploited. The matrix of impact and likelihood is a commonly used tool in risk management to help assess and prioritize risks.

The impact of a vulnerability refers to the potential harm that could result if it were to be exploited. For smart contracts, this could include the loss of funds or assets, unauthorized access or control, or reputational damage.

The likelihood of a vulnerability being exploited is determined by considering the likelihood of an attack occurring, the level of skill or resources required to exploit the vulnerability, and the presence of any mitigating controls that could reduce the likelihood of exploitation.

Risk Level	High Impact	Medium Impact	Low Impact
High Likelihood	Critical	High	Medium
Medium Likelihood	High	Medium	Low
Low Likelihood	Medium	Low	Low

Risk Levels

Critical: Critical vulnerabilities are usually straightforward to exploit and can lead to the loss of user funds or contract state manipulation.

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.

Medium: Medium vulnerabilities are usually limited to state manipulations and, in most cases, cannot lead to asset loss. Contradictions and requirements violations. Major deviations from best practices are also in this category.

Low: Major deviations from best practices or major Gas inefficiency. These issues won't have a significant impact on code execution, don't affect security score but can affect code quality score.

Impact Levels

High Impact: Risks that have a high impact are associated with financial losses, reputational damage, or major alterations to contract state. High impact issues typically involve invalid calculations, denial of service, token supply manipulation, and data consistency, but are not limited to those categories.

Medium Impact: Risks that have a medium impact could result in financial losses, reputational damage, or minor contract state manipulation. These risks can also be associated with undocumented behavior or violations of requirements.

Low Impact: Risks that have a low impact cannot lead to financial losses or state manipulation. These risks are typically related to unscalable functionality, contradictions, inconsistent data, or major violations of best practices.

Likelihood Levels

High Likelihood: Risks that have a high likelihood are those that are expected to occur frequently or are very likely to occur. These risks could be the result of known vulnerabilities or weaknesses in the contract, or could be the result of external factors such as attacks or exploits targeting similar contracts.

Medium Likelihood: Risks that have a medium likelihood are those that are possible but not as likely to occur as those in the high likelihood category. These risks could be the result of less severe vulnerabilities or weaknesses in the contract, or could be the result of less targeted attacks or exploits.

Low Likelihood: Risks that have a low likelihood are those that are unlikely to occur, but still possible. These risks could be the result of very specific or complex vulnerabilities or weaknesses in the contract, or could be the result of highly targeted attacks or exploits.

Informational

Informational issues are mostly connected to violations of best practices, typos in code, violations of code style, and dead or redundant code.

Informational issues are not affecting the score, but addressing them will be beneficial for the project.

Appendix 2. Scope

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

Initial review scope

Repository	https://github.com/Leech-Protocol/leech-contracts/tree/feature/dev-audit
Commit	f1019667115308f0945d38120d9af9c88c853501
Whitepaper	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1P4bDeogfeWANMeTuXz1EeggtLUwnMEUi/view?usp=sharing
Requirements	https://github.com/Leech-Protocol/leech-contracts/blob/feature/dev-audit/docs/SC_documentation.md
Technical Requirements	https://github.com/Leech-Protocol/leech-contracts/blob/feature/dev-audit/docs/SC_documentation.md
Contracts	<p>File: contracts/interfaces/ILeechRouter.sol SHA3: 1578cfa57394754f617c492b293eed42bfb29c11a47928ce00de216c72b795fb</p> <p>File: contracts/interfaces/ILeechTransporter.sol SHA3: f7f9952d85bca717533ef93bf533572586710d09e81ae8a179d8a95b01c3f3b3</p> <p>File: contracts/interfaces/IRouterVelodrome.sol SHA3: 1b82704c8ffe94f9a1b734002f9d5deb3068dccf37e75ae440906af9a6a880c7</p> <p>File: contracts/interfaces/IStrategyMasterchefFarmV2.sol SHA3: 396e11e844f7b8ba8a555a8d107fbfc1806e73b72fb382b509489cb5bf57ee0a</p> <p>File: contracts/libraries/Helpers.sol SHA3: 84bba73e8e3687fdac5c86a301b63fc8fc34d66b0fb2c02bb26c83df94c41581</p> <p>File: contracts/router/ILeechRouter.sol SHA3: 729d05390ef98c39faabca9793923af4b6999a45e330783ff6e023c61b0f6e23</p> <p>File: contracts/router/LeechRouterBase.sol SHA3: 33e827f8a9be224cd988f492f89d89e07437b7aef0956325883e70551da7bc0f</p> <p>File: contracts/router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol SHA3: 41b8df5da0462f259c5285503900b1b86fcce84a0a2ccc822d59a2507d614813</p> <p>File: contracts/strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol SHA3: 883405390d27d2d8d1a367da03daa0c099b335ada020ed26c6162020fb8cc692</p> <p>File: contracts/strategies/VelodromeFarm/IGauge.sol SHA3: 233d8f9e595f4f0ffd16226111e4c215fa386eebdb79ed0e531d8537987e235d</p> <p>File: strategies/VelodromeFarm/IVelodromePair.sol SHA3: ecc5c6733d8c43eaa9d2c7896c70fe4e6f425601be3307b27c02d1b491d4e17f</p> <p>File: contracts/strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol SHA3: cdb3b2755d3201c93f5d1ced7668d3fa127cf183866bf11391bb77685fab9fa7</p>

Second review scope

Repository	File: leech-contracts.zip SHA3: 2f796208115b3d7eb49c18a6229122823172c895e241a8efc7de13585e9af683
Commit	-
Whitepaper	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1P4bDeogfeWANMeTuXz1EeggtLUwnMEUi/view?usp=sharing
Requirements	https://github.com/Leech-Protocol/leech-contracts/blob/feature/dev-audit/docs/SC_documentation.md
Technical Requirements	https://github.com/Leech-Protocol/leech-contracts/blob/feature/dev-audit/docs/SC_documentation.md
Contracts	<p>File: interfaces/ILeechRouter.sol SHA3: 1578cfa57394754f617c492b293eed42bfb29c11a47928ce00de216c72b795fb</p> <p>File: interfaces/ILeechTransporter.sol SHA3: f7f9952d85bca717533ef93bf533572586710d09e81ae8a179d8a95b01c3f3b3</p> <p>File: interfaces/IRouterVelodrome.sol SHA3: 0eadbc5ae1627ff67add07e4e7be6653130263df34ae75bdb344e1d78f6e75e0</p> <p>File: interfaces/IStrategyMasterchefFarmV2.sol SHA3: 396e11e844f7b8ba8a555a8d107fbfc1806e73b72fb382b509489cb5bf57ee0a</p> <p>File: libraries/Helpers.sol SHA3: 84bba73e8e3687fdac5c86a301b63fc8fc34d66b0fb2c02bb26c83df94c41581</p> <p>File: router/ILeechRouter.sol SHA3: 3f565388e39fd4da65b7cd9e50d3c90c9a1e6ccb066296b9fc5310c990e2707a</p> <p>File: router/LeechRouterBase.sol SHA3: dc4c462607030e4076dba30c0c59692abe249b12ed41acb03fae380eaf3c56dc</p> <p>File: router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol SHA3: e79f20701c9a960ed66b0af02f0fb324bd3af800b2268be4425edaaf746c40de</p> <p>File: strategies/VelodromeFarm/IGauge.sol SHA3: 233d8f9e595f4f0ffd16226111e4c215fa386eebdb79ed0e531d8537987e235d</p> <p>File: strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol SHA3: 883405390d27d2d8d1a367da03daa0c099b335ada020ed26c6162020fb8cc692</p> <p>File: strategies/VelodromeFarm/IVelodromePair.sol SHA3: ecc5c6733d8c43eaa9d2c7896c70fe4e6f425601be3307b27c02d1b491d4e17f</p> <p>File: strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol SHA3: bcd05698b964917e9ad9981847436a789eb08f4320dceb9f1fcaeb9c323f9e6</p>

Third review scope

Repository	File: leech-contracts.zip SHA3: 21decfda4f6de62f3a0113a4ca9c810025f464da280d015b2c17f511b9bb0fa7
Commit	-

Whitepaper	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1P4bDeogfeWANMeTuXz1EeggtLUwnMEUi/view?usp=sharing
Requirements	https://github.com/Leech-Protocol/leech-contracts/blob/feature/dev-audit/docs/SC_documentation.md
Technical Requirements	https://github.com/Leech-Protocol/leech-contracts/blob/feature/dev-audit/docs/SC_documentation.md
Contracts	<p>File: interfaces/ILeechRouter.sol SHA3: 181a3b51376b0e0f0cc091d8b10076133b1e4c91e8fb01a0b8167d880873f247</p> <p>File: interfaces/ILeechTransporter.sol SHA3: 8896d8f2389d284a9a34ecda221830874360ab9dcf342ca6eee91bd7b2811fe7</p> <p>File: interfaces/IRouterVelodrome.sol SHA3: 6d4689ce40729b7461610aabf560f060520cd79812f5feffe0dc681f9ee16ae</p> <p>File: interfaces/IStrategyMasterchefFarmV2.sol SHA3: 542d0e929ec3496b8ab5358ed8b21c30632bd5f47b51bbe81e81495eb4b72f1d</p> <p>File: libraries/Helpers.sol SHA3: e764e5d9eb18fb415d8f793b0cab62d1f63a293d7d822964af4bdf9b5e1bd460</p> <p>File: /router/ILeechRouter.sol SHA3: afa38549352ac0f277697d5232a63cf90ec319d6e548390ccdd36cae2cf060a</p> <p>File: router/LeechRouterBase.sol SHA3: af8d4ceaf73ad0e97b35e69e0b764215535860273c54d1faee22eea3b9621a39</p> <p>File: router/LeechRouterOptimism.sol SHA3: e78a6750b02475649e163fd9e9d1cc7f8ec73f39294ff10138384e30b222c6f8</p> <p>File: strategies/VelodromeFarm/IGauge.sol SHA3: 20f4c8826086592814a9181381968dbd1d09fad93508ba0fa385e36558939e81</p> <p>File: strategies/BaseFarmStrategy.sol SHA3: a15de9a52cfb0b2ae96f0426975ed451ad5dd4fcb39c482ffd7ad86517c076aa</p> <p>File: strategies/VelodromeFarm/IVelodromePair.sol SHA3: 14e483b333b865f8e766b03c6bad7b5acdca2174b84edca209cdcfcfb549e4b07a</p> <p>File: strategies/VelodromeFarm/StrategyVelodromeFarm.sol SHA3: a068d5c6dd46d7b6ea0d82e017d7d645d7faa3ca495b5cb911a8fe58c077ccff</p>