



# **Illuminati Finance, Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report**

---

Customer: Illuminati Finance  
Prepared on: 18th July 2022  
Platform: BSC  
Language: Solidity

[rdauditors.com](https://rdauditors.com)

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Disclaimer</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Document</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Project Scope</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Code Quality</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Documentation</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Use of Dependencies</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>AS-IS Overview</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Code Flow Diagram - Illuminati Token</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Code Flow Diagram - Slither Results Log</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Severity Definitions</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Audit Findings</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Note For Contract Users</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Our Methodology</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Disclaimers</b>	<b>23</b>

---

## Disclaimer

This document may contain confidential information about its systems and 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 the decision of the customer.

---

## Document

Name	Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report of Illuminati Finance
Platform	BSC / Solidity
File	IlluminatiToken.sol
MD5 hash	4ec5c9453e91c724234857b568dde850
SHA256 hash	6e7f3c9635d788a65e3b5edb07d7958a162ec2e470ff373d5a6f7ff843912c60
Date	18/07/2022

---

## Introduction

RD Auditors (Consultant) were contacted by Illuminati Finance (Customer) to conduct a Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis. This report represents the findings of the security assessment of the customer`s smart contract and its code review conducted between 13th - 18th July 2022.

This contract consists of one file.

---

## Project Scope

The scope of the project is a smart contract. We have scanned this smart contract for commonly known and more specific vulnerabilities, below are those considered (the full list includes but is not limited to):

- Reentrancy
- Timestamp Dependence
- Gas Limit and Loops
- DoS with (Unexpected) Throw
- DoS with Block Gas Limit
- Transaction-Ordering Dependence
- Byte array vulnerabilities
- Style guide violation
- Transfer forwards all gas
- ERC20 API violation
- Malicious libraries
- Compiler version not fixed
- Unchecked external call - Unchecked math
- Unsafe type inference
- Implicit visibility level

---

## Executive Summary






According to the assessment, the customer's solidity smart contract is now **Well-Secured**.



Automated checks are with smartDec, Mythril, Slither and remix IDE. All issues were performed by our team, which included the analysis of code functionality, the manual audit found during automated analysis were manually reviewed and applicable vulnerabilities are presented in the audit overview section. The general overview is presented in the AS-IS section and all issues found are located in the audit overview section.

We found the following;

**Important: Must read section 'Note For Contract Users' before using contract**

Total Issues	0
 Critical	0
 High	0
 Medium	0
 Low	0
 Very Low	0

---

## Code Quality

The libraries within this smart contract are part of a logical algorithm. A library is a different type of smart contract that contains reusable code. Once deployed on the blockchain (only once), it is assigned to a specific address and its properties/methods can be reused many times by other contracts.

The Illuminati Finance team has not provided scenario and unit test scripts, which helped to determine the integrity of the code in an automated way.

Overall, the code is not commented. Commenting can provide rich documentation for functions, return variables and more. Use of the Ethereum Natural Language Specification Format (NatSpec) for commenting is recommended.



---

## Documentation

The hash of that file is mentioned in the table. As mentioned above, It's recommended to write comments in the smart contract code, so anyone can quickly understand the programming flow as well as complex code logic.

Comments are very helpful in understanding the overall architecture of the protocol. It also provides a clear overview of the system components, including helpful details, like the lifetime of the background script.

---

## Use of Dependencies

As per our observation, the libraries are used in this smart contract infrastructure. Those were based on well known industry standard open source projects and even core code blocks that are written well and systematically.

---

## AS-IS Overview

### IlluminatiToken.sol

#### File And Function Level Report

File : IlluminatiToken.sol  
Contract: IlluminatiToken  
Inherit: ERC20Detailed, VaultOwned  
Observation: Passed  
Test Report: Passed


Sl.	Function	Type	Observation	Test Report	Conclusion	Score
1	checkFeeExempt	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
2	checkSwapThreshold	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
3	isNotInSwap	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
4	isOverLiquidified	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
5	getLiquidityBacking	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
6	getCirculatingSupply	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
7	totalSupply	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
8	balanceOf	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
9	allowance	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
10	approve	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed

11	decreaseAllowance	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
12	increaseAllowance	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
13	mint	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
14	transfer	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
15	transferFrom	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
16	_transferFrom	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
17	_basicTransfer	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
18	setBlacklist	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
19	setFeeExempt	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
20	setNextRebase	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
21	setAutoRebase	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
22	setRebaser	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
23	setRewardYield	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
24	setSwapBackSettings	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
25	setTargetLiquidity	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
26	setMaxSellTransaction	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
27	setTreasury	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
28	setLiquidityHelper	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
29	setFees	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
30	setAutomatedMarketMakerPair	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
31	_rebase	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed

---

32	coreRebase	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
33	manualRebase	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
34	manualSync	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
35	takeFee	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
36	swapBack	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
37	shouldRebase	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
38	shouldTakeFee	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
39	shouldSwapBack	read	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
40	transferToAddresETH	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
41	clearStuckBalance	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
42	rescueToken	write	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed

# Code Flow Diagram - Illuminati Token



## Code Flow Diagram - Slither Results Log

```
INFO:Detectors:
Reentrancy in IlluminatiToken._transferFrom(address,address,uint256) (IlluminatiToken.sol#489-528):
  External calls:
  - swapBack() (IlluminatiToken.sol#505)
    - ILiquidityHelper(LiquidityHelper).swapAndLiquify(amountToLiquify) (IlluminatiToken.sol#716)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
  - LogRebase(epoch,_totalSupply) (IlluminatiToken.sol#652)
    - _rebase() (IlluminatiToken.sol#520)
  - LogRebase(epoch,_totalSupply) (IlluminatiToken.sol#670)
    - _rebase() (IlluminatiToken.sol#520)
  - Transfer(sender,address(this),feeAmount.div(_gonsPerFragment)) (IlluminatiToken.sol#699)
    - gonAmountReceived = takeFee(sender,recipient,gonAmount) (IlluminatiToken.sol#510)
  - Transfer(sender,recipient,gonAmountReceived.div(_gonsPerFragment)) (IlluminatiToken.sol#513-517)
Reentrancy in IlluminatiToken.constructor(address) (IlluminatiToken.sol#366-384):
  External calls:
  - pair = IDEXFactory(router.factory()).createPair(BUSD,address(this)) (IlluminatiToken.sol#368)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
  - SetAutomatedMarketMakerPair(_pair,_value) (IlluminatiToken.sol#636)
    - setAutomatedMarketMakerPair(pair,true) (IlluminatiToken.sol#371)
  - Transfer(address(0x0),msg.sender,_totalSupply) (IlluminatiToken.sol#383)
Reentrancy in IlluminatiToken.swapBack() (IlluminatiToken.sol#704-724):
  External calls:
  - ILiquidityHelper(LiquidityHelper).swapAndLiquify(amountToLiquify) (IlluminatiToken.sol#716)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
  - SwapBack(contractTokenBalance,amountToLiquify,amountToBlackHole) (IlluminatiToken.sol#723)
  - Transfer(from,to,amount) (IlluminatiToken.sol#535)
    - _basicTransfer(address(this),DEAD,amountToBlackHole) (IlluminatiToken.sol#720)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerabilities-3
INFO:Detectors:
IlluminatiToken._transferFrom(address,address,uint256) (IlluminatiToken.sol#489-528) uses timestamp for comparisons
  Dangerous comparisons:
  - shouldRebase() && autoRebase (IlluminatiToken.sol#519)
IlluminatiToken.manualRebase() (IlluminatiToken.sol#674-684) uses timestamp for comparisons
  Dangerous comparisons:
  - require(bool,string)(nextRebase <= block.timestamp,Not in time) (IlluminatiToken.sol#677)
IlluminatiToken.shouldRebase() (IlluminatiToken.sol#726-728) uses timestamp for comparisons
  Dangerous comparisons:
```

---

## Solidity Static Analysis

### Data truncated:

Division of integer values yields an integer value again. That means e.g.  $10 / 100 = 0$  instead of 0.1 since the result is an integer again. This does not hold for division of (only) literal values since those yield rational constants.

Pos: 354:39:

### Constant/View/Pure functions:

`ILiquidityHelper.swapAndLiquify(uint256)` : Potentially should be constant/view/pure but is not. Note: Modifiers are currently not considered by this static analysis.

[more](#)

Pos: 300:4:

### Block timestamp:

Use of "block.timestamp": "block.timestamp" can be influenced by miners to a certain degree. That means that a miner can "choose" the block.timestamp, to a certain degree, to change the outcome of a transaction in the mined block.

[more](#)

Pos: 677:30:



---

## Severity Definitions

Risk Level	Description
Critical	Critical vulnerabilities are usually straightforward to exploit and can lead to lost tokens etc.
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 cannot lead to lost tokens.
Low	Low level vulnerabilities are most related to outdated, unused etc. These code snippets cannot have a significant impact on execution.
Lowest Code Style/ Best Practice	Lowest level vulnerabilities, code style violations and information statements cannot affect smart contract execution and can be ignored.

---

## Audit Findings

### Critical:

No critical severity vulnerabilities were found.

### High:

No high severity vulnerabilities were found.

### Medium:

No medium severity vulnerabilities were found.

### Low:

No low severity vulnerabilities were found.

### Very Low:

No very low severity vulnerabilities were found.

---

## Discussion

1. Please make sure this highlighted value is ok, if not then it should be tokenDecimal.

```
function getLiquidityBacking(uint256 accuracy) public view returns (uint256) {
    uint256 liquidityBalance = 0;
    for(uint i = 0; i < _markerPairs.length; i++){
        liquidityBalance.add(balanceOf(_markerPairs[i]).div(10 ** 9));
    }
    return accuracy.mul(liquidityBalance.mul(2)).div(getCirculatingSupply().div(10 ** 9));
}
```

2) Using the latest solidity version will prevent any compiler level bugs. Please use >=0.8.0 version which is the latest version.

```
// SPDX-License-Identifier: MIT
pragma solidity ^0.7.5;
```

---

## Conclusion

We were given a contract file and have used all possible tests based on the given object. So it is ready to go for production. We have used all the latest static tools and manual observations to cover maximum possible test cases to scan everything.

The security state of the reviewed contract is “**Well-Secured**”.

---

## Note For Contract Users

There are some owner only functions. Those can be called by the owner's wallet only. So, if the owner's wallet is compromised, then it carries the risk of the contract becoming vulnerable.

The owner has full privilege to withdraw all tokens/BNB from the contract.

```
function clearStuckBalance(address _receiver) external onlyOwner {
    uint256 balance = address(this).balance;
    payable(_receiver).transfer(balance);
}

function rescueToken(address tokenAddress, uint256 amount) public onlyOwner returns (bool success) {
    return ERC20Detailed(tokenAddress).transfer(msg.sender, amount);
}
```

Owner has full control over the smart contract. Thus, technical auditing does not guarantee the project's ethical side.

Please do your due diligence before investing. Our audit report is never an investment advice.

---

## Our Methodology

We like to work with a transparent process and make our reviews a collaborative effort. The goals of our security audits are to improve the quality of systems we review and aim for sufficient remediation to help protect users. The following is the methodology we use in our security audit process.

### Manual Code Review

In manually reviewing all of the code, we look for any potential issues with code logic, error handling, protocol and header parsing, cryptographic errors, and random number generators. We also watch for areas where more defensive programming could reduce the risk of future mistakes and speed up future audits. Although our primary focus is on the in-scope code, we examine dependency code and behavior when it is relevant to a particular line of investigation.

### Vulnerability Analysis

Our audit techniques included manual code analysis, user interface interaction, and whitebox penetration testing. We look at the project's web site to get a high level understanding of what functionality the software under review provides. We then meet with the developers to gain an appreciation of their vision of the software. We install and use the relevant software, exploring the user interactions and roles. While we do this, we brainstorm threat models and attack surfaces. We read design documentation, review other audit results, search for similar projects, examine source code dependencies, skim open issue tickets, and generally investigate details other than the implementation.

---

## Documenting Results

We follow a conservative, transparent process for analyzing potential security vulnerabilities and seeing them through successful remediation. Whenever a potential issue is discovered, we immediately create an Issue entry for it in this document, even though we have not yet verified the feasibility and impact of the issue. This process is conservative because we document our suspicions early even if they are later shown to not represent exploitable vulnerabilities. We generally follow a process of first documenting the suspicion with unresolved questions, then confirming the issue through code analysis, live experimentation, or automated tests. Code analysis is the most tentative, and we strive to provide test code, log captures, or screenshots demonstrating our confirmation. After this we analyse the feasibility of an attack in a live system.

## Suggested Solutions

We search for immediate mitigations that live deployments can take, and finally we suggest the requirements for remediation engineering for future releases. The mitigation and remediation recommendations should be scrutinised by the developers and deployment engineers, and successful mitigation and remediation is an ongoing collaborative process after we deliver our report, and before the details are made public.

---

## Disclaimers

### RD Auditors Disclaimer

The smart contracts given for audit have been analysed 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).

Because the total number of test cases are unlimited, 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, bugfree 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 security of smart contracts.

### Technical Disclaimer

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





**Email: [info@rdauditors.com](mailto:info@rdauditors.com)**

**Website: [www.rdauditors.com](http://www.rdauditors.com)**

