

HACKEN

SMART CONTRACT CODE REVIEW AND SECURITY ANALYSIS REPORT

Customer: StrongBlock
Date: December 08th, 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 StrongBlock.
Approved by	Andrew Matiukhin CTO Hacken OU
Type	Staking
Platform	Ethereum / Solidity
Methods	Architecture Review, Functional Testing, Computer-Aided Verification, Manual Review
Repository	https://github.com/StrongBlock/service2.contract
Commit	8981673b4000b3b10cf627db9b25019fd728b0ee
Technical Documentation	NO
JS tests	NO
Website	strongblock.com
Timeline	29 NOVEMBER 2021 - 08 DECEMBER 2021
Changelog	02 DECEMBER 2021 - INITIAL AUDIT 08 DECEMBER 2021 - SECOND REVIEW



Table of contents

Introduction	4
Scope	4
Executive Summary	5
Severity Definitions	8
Audit overview	9
Conclusion	11
Disclaimers	12

Introduction

Hacken OÜ (Consultant) was contracted by StrongBlock (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 29th, 2021 - December 2nd, 2021.

Second review conducted on December 8th, 2021.

Scope

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

Repository:

<https://github.com/StrongBlock/service2.contract>

Commit:

[8981673b4000b3b10cf627db9b25019fd728b0ee](https://github.com/StrongBlock/service2.contract/commit/8981673b4000b3b10cf627db9b25019fd728b0ee)

Technical Documentation: No

JS tests: No

Contracts:

[MultiNodeV1.sol](#)
[interfaces/IERC20.sol](#)
[interfaces/IStrongPool.sol](#)
[interfaces/IStrongNFTBonus.sol](#)
[interfaces/IAdminControl.sol](#)
[lib/AdminAccess.sol](#)
[lib/MultiNodeSettings.sol](#)
[lib/SbMath.sol](#)
[lib/Context.sol](#)
[lib/InternalCalls.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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.




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 **4** low severity issues.

After second review security engineers found **1** low severity issue.

Graph 1. The distribution of vulnerabilities after the audit.



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

1. ETH could be locked.

In case param `_returnValue` is **false** and `msg.value` is bigger than the calculated fee, the contract will accumulate ETH, but there is no way to withdraw.

Contract: MultiNodeV1.sol

Functions: pay, claim

Recommendation: remove param `_returnValue` and unconditionally send reminder back to the caller or add the ability to withdraw ETH

Status: fixed

2. Boolean equality

Boolean constants can be used directly and do not need to be compared to true or false.

Contracts: MultiNodeV1.sol

Functions: migrateNode

Recommendation: remove the equality to the boolean constant.

Status: fixed

3. Missing events for changing `nodeTypeActive[]`, `nodeTypeSettings[][]`, `nodeTypeNFTBonus[][]`, `strongNFTBonus`, `serviceContractEnabled[]` and for method `migrateNode`

Contracts: MultiNodeSettings.sol, MultiNodeV1.sol

Functions: setNodeTypeActive, setNodeTypeSetting,
setNodeTypeNFTBonus, setNFTBonusContract, setServiceContractEnabled,
migrateNode

Changing critical values should be followed by the event emitting for better tracking off-chain.



Recommendation: Please emit events on the critical values changing.

Status: fixed

4. No tests were provided.

It's recommended to cover all non-trivial contracts with tests.

The recommended coverage is minimum 95% for branches, while it should be definitely 100% for the main logic contracts.



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 **4** low severity issues.

After second review security engineers found **1** low severity issue.



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.