



**RD  
AUDITORS**

# **Rektify, Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report**

---

Customer: Rektify  
Prepared on: 24th July, 2023  
Platform: Ethereum  
Language: Solidity

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

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Disclaimer</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Documentation</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 - REKTIFY.sol</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Code Flow Diagram - Slither Results Log</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Severity Definitions</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Audit Findings</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Note For Contract Users</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Our Methodology</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Disclaimers</b>	<b>24</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.

---

## Documentation

Name	Smart Contract Code Review and Security Analysis Report of Rektify
Platform	Ethereum/ Solidity
File 1	REKTIFY.sol
MD5 hash	1807f4660268fb0e7001f0c8bcf6a4a0
SHA256 hash	93c57085e92e961271224bc141a3d921d585400a4acebe63ffda00c7e0b85687
Date	24/07/2023

---

## Introduction

RD Auditors (Consultant) were contracted by Rektify (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 21st - 24rd July, 2023.

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**.



You are Here

 Insecure






 Poorly Secured

 Secure

 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;

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



## Documentation

We were given an Rektify smart contract code link:

<https://etherscan.io/token/0xf59b6497df02a1fae968461f070abdfa3aab9799#code>

The hash of that code is mentioned above 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

### REKTIFY.sol

#### File And Function Level Report


File: REKTIFY.sol  
Contract: Rektify  
Inherit: Ownable, ERC20  
Observation: Passed  
Test Report: Passed

Sl.	Function	Type	Observation	Test Report	Conclusion	Score
1	approve	public	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
2	approveMax	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
3	transfer	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
4	transferFrom	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
5	maxWalletRule	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
6	removeLimits	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
7	_transferFrom	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
8	_basicTransfer	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
9	checkTxLimit	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
10	shouldTakeFee	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
11	takeFee	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed

---

12	shouldSwapBack	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
13	manualSend	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
14	clearStuckToken	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
15	setStructure	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
16	startTrading	public	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
17	reduceFee	public	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
18	swapBack	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
19	set_fees	internal	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
20	setParameter	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
21	setWallets	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
22	setSwapBackSettings	external	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
23	checkRatio	public	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
24	showBacking	public	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed
25	showSupply	public	Passed	All Passed	No Issue	Passed

# Code Flow Diagram - REKTIFY.sol



# Code Flow Diagram - Slither Results Log

REKTIFY.sol

```

REKTIFY.setStructure(uint256,uint256,uint256) (REKTIFY.sol#405-410) should emit an event for:
- sellpercent = _percentonsell (REKTIFY.sol#406)
- buypercent = _percentonbuy (REKTIFY.sol#407)
- transferpercent = _wallettransfer (REKTIFY.sol#408)
REKTIFY.setParameters(uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256) (REKTIFY.sol#485-495) should emit an event for:
- liquidityFee = _liquidityFee (REKTIFY.sol#486)
- buybackFee = _buybackFee (REKTIFY.sol#487)
- marketingFee = _marketingFee (REKTIFY.sol#488)
- devFee = _devFee (REKTIFY.sol#489)
- burnFee = _burnFee (REKTIFY.sol#490)
- totalFee = _liquidityFee.add(_buybackFee).add(_marketingFee).add(_devFee).add(_burnFee) (REKTIFY.sol#491)
- feeDenominator = _feeDenominator (REKTIFY.sol#492)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-events-arithmetic

REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address).autoLiquidityReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) lacks a zero-check on :
- autoLiquidityReceiver = _autoLiquidityReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#499)
REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address).marketingFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) lacks a zero-check on :
- marketingFeeReceiver = _marketingFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#500)
REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address).devFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) lacks a zero-check on :
- devFeeReceiver = _devFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#501)
REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address).burnFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) lacks a zero-check on :
- burnFeeReceiver = _burnFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#502)
REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address).buybackFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) lacks a zero-check on :
- buybackFeeReceiver = _buybackFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#503)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#missing-zero-address-validation

```

```

Reentrancy in REKTIFY._transferFrom(address,address,uint256) (REKTIFY.sol#318-341):
  External calls:
  - swapBack() (REKTIFY.sol#333)
    - router.swapExactTokensForETHSupportingFeeOnTransferTokens(amountToSwap,0,path,address(this),block.timestamp) (REKTIFY.sol#440-446)
    - (tmpSuccess) = address(marketingFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHMarketing}() (REKTIFY.sol#457)
    - (tmpSuccess,None) = address(devFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHdev}() (REKTIFY.sol#458)
    - (tmpSuccess,None) = address(buybackFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHbuyback}() (REKTIFY.sol#459)
    - router.addLiquidityETH{value: amountETHLiquidity}(address(this),amountToLiquify,0,0,autoLiquidityReceiver,block.timestamp) (REKTIFY.sol#464-471)
  External calls sending eth:
  - swapBack() (REKTIFY.sol#333)
    - (tmpSuccess) = address(marketingFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHMarketing}() (REKTIFY.sol#457)
    - (tmpSuccess,None) = address(devFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHdev}() (REKTIFY.sol#458)
    - (tmpSuccess,None) = address(buybackFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHbuyback}() (REKTIFY.sol#459)
    - router.addLiquidityETH{value: amountETHLiquidity}(address(this),amountToLiquify,0,0,autoLiquidityReceiver,block.timestamp) (REKTIFY.sol#464-471)
  Event emitted after the call(s):
  - Transfer(sender,address(this),contractTokens) (REKTIFY.sol#372)
    - amountReceived = takeFee(sender,amount,recipient) (REKTIFY.sol#336)
  - Transfer(sender,ZERO,burnTokens) (REKTIFY.sol#377)
    - amountReceived = takeFee(sender,amount,recipient) (REKTIFY.sol#336)
  - Transfer(sender,recipient,amountReceived) (REKTIFY.sol#339)
Reentrancy in REKTIFY.swapBack() (REKTIFY.sol#429-474):
  External calls:
  - router.swapExactTokensForETHSupportingFeeOnTransferTokens(amountToSwap,0,path,address(this),block.timestamp) (REKTIFY.sol#440-446)
  - (tmpSuccess) = address(marketingFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHMarketing}() (REKTIFY.sol#457)
  - (tmpSuccess,None) = address(devFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHdev}() (REKTIFY.sol#458)
  - (tmpSuccess,None) = address(buybackFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHbuyback}() (REKTIFY.sol#459)
  - router.addLiquidityETH{value: amountETHLiquidity}(address(this),amountToLiquify,0,0,autoLiquidityReceiver,block.timestamp) (REKTIFY.sol#464-471)

```

```
External calls sending eth:
- (tmpSuccess) = address(marketingFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHMarketing}() (REKTIFY.sol#457)
- (tmpSuccess,None) = address(devFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHdev}() (REKTIFY.sol#458)
- (tmpSuccess,None) = address(buybackFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHbuyback}() (REKTIFY.sol#459)
- router.addLiquidityETH{value: amountETHLiquidity}(address(this),amountToLiquify,0,0,autoLiquidityReceiver,block.timestamp) (REKTIFY.sol#464-471)
Event emitted after the call(s):
- AutoLiquify(amountETHLiquidity,amountToLiquify) (REKTIFY.sol#472)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#reentrancy-vulnerabilities-3

Context._msgData() (REKTIFY.sol#46-49) is never used and should be removed
REKTIFY.shouldTakeFee(address) (REKTIFY.sol#354-356) is never used and should be removed
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#dead-code

REKTIFY._maxTxAmount (REKTIFY.sol#205) is set pre-construction with a non-constant function or state variable:
- _totalSupply.mul(1).div(100)
REKTIFY._maxWalletToken (REKTIFY.sol#206) is set pre-construction with a non-constant function or state variable:
- _totalSupply.mul(1).div(100)
REKTIFY.totalFee (REKTIFY.sol#218) is set pre-construction with a non-constant function or state variable:
- buybackFee + marketingFee + liquidityFee + devFee + burnFee
REKTIFY.swapThreshold (REKTIFY.sol#243) is set pre-construction with a non-constant function or state variable:
- _totalSupply * 60 / 1000
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#function-initializing-state

Pragma version0.8.20 (REKTIFY.sol#21) necessitates a version too recent to be trusted. Consider deploying with 0.6.12/0.7.6/0.8.16
solc-0.8.20 is not recommended for deployment
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#incorrect-versions-of-solidity
```

```
Low level call in REKTIFY.swapBack() (REKTIFY.sol#429-474):
- (tmpSuccess) = address(marketingFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHMarketing}() (REKTIFY.sol#457)
- (tmpSuccess,None) = address(devFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHdev}() (REKTIFY.sol#458)
- (tmpSuccess,None) = address(buybackFeeReceiver).call{value: amountETHbuyback}() (REKTIFY.sol#459)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#low-level-calls

Variable Ownable._owner (REKTIFY.sol#53) is not in mixedCase
Function IDEXRouter.WETH() (REKTIFY.sol#92) is not in mixedCase
Event REKTIFYUser_exemptfromfees(address,bool) (REKTIFY.sol#194) is not in CapWords
Event REKTIFYUser_TxExempt(address,bool) (REKTIFY.sol#195) is not in CapWords
Event REKTIFYset_Receivers(address,address,address,address) (REKTIFY.sol#198) is not in CapWords
Event REKTIFYset_MaxWallet(uint256) (REKTIFY.sol#199) is not in CapWords
Event REKTIFYset_MaxTX(uint256) (REKTIFY.sol#200) is not in CapWords
Event REKTIFYset_SwapBack(uint256,bool) (REKTIFY.sol#201) is not in CapWords
Parameter REKTIFY.setStructure(uint256,uint256,uint256)._percentonbuy (REKTIFY.sol#405) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setStructure(uint256,uint256,uint256)._percentonsell (REKTIFY.sol#405) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setStructure(uint256,uint256,uint256)._wallettransfer (REKTIFY.sol#405) is not in mixedCase
Function REKTIFY.set_fees() (REKTIFY.sol#477-483) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setParameters(uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256)._liquidityFee (REKTIFY.sol#485) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setParameters(uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256)._buybackFee (REKTIFY.sol#485) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setParameters(uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256)._marketingFee (REKTIFY.sol#485) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setParameters(uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256)._devFee (REKTIFY.sol#485) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setParameters(uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256)._burnFee (REKTIFY.sol#485) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setParameters(uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256)._feeDenominator (REKTIFY.sol#485) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address)._autoLiquidityReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address)._marketingFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address)._devFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address)._burnFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setWallets(address,address,address,address,address)._buybackFeeReceiver (REKTIFY.sol#498) is not in mixedCase

Parameter REKTIFY.setSwapBackSettings(bool,uint256)._enabled (REKTIFY.sol#508) is not in mixedCase
Parameter REKTIFY.setSwapBackSettings(bool,uint256)._amount (REKTIFY.sol#508) is not in mixedCase
Variable REKTIFY.WETH (REKTIFY.sol#182) is not in mixedCase
Constant REKTIFY._name (REKTIFY.sol#187) is not in UPPER_CASE_WITH_UNDERSCORES
Constant REKTIFY._symbol (REKTIFY.sol#188) is not in UPPER_CASE_WITH_UNDERSCORES
Constant REKTIFY._decimals (REKTIFY.sol#189) is not in UPPER_CASE_WITH_UNDERSCORES
Variable REKTIFY._totalSupply (REKTIFY.sol#203) is not in mixedCase
Variable REKTIFY._maxTxAmount (REKTIFY.sol#205) is not in mixedCase
Variable REKTIFY._maxWalletToken (REKTIFY.sol#206) is not in mixedCase
Variable REKTIFY._balances (REKTIFY.sol#208) is not in mixedCase
Variable REKTIFY._allowances (REKTIFY.sol#209) is not in mixedCase
Variable REKTIFY.TradingOpen (REKTIFY.sol#239) is not in mixedCase
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#conformance-to-solidity-naming-conventions

Redundant expression "this (REKTIFY.sol#47)" inContext (REKTIFY.sol#40-50)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#redundant-statements

Variable IDEXRouter.addLiquidity(address,address,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,address,uint256).amountADesired (REKTIFY.sol#97) is too similar to IDEXRouter.addLiquidity(address,address,uint256,uint256,uint256,uint256,address,uint256).amountBDesired (REKTIFY.sol#98)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#variable-names-too-similar

REKTIFY.slitherConstructorVariables() (REKTIFY.sol#179-528) uses literals with too many digits:
- _totalSupply = 400000000000000 * 10 ** decimals (REKTIFY.sol#203)
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#too-many-digits

REKTIFY.setRatio (REKTIFY.sol#231) should be constant
REKTIFY.setRatioDenominator (REKTIFY.sol#232) should be constant
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#state-variables-that-could-be-declared-constant

REKTIFY.WETH (REKTIFY.sol#182) should be immutable
REKTIFY.pair (REKTIFY.sol#237) should be immutable
REKTIFY.pairContract (REKTIFY.sol#236) should be immutable
REKTIFY.router (REKTIFY.sol#235) should be immutable
Reference: https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/Detector-Documentation#state-variables-that-could-be-declared-immutable
REKTIFY.sol analyzed (8 contracts with 84 detectors), 70 result(s) found
```



---

# Solidity Static Analysis

REKTIFY.sol

## 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: 445:12:

## Low level calls:

Use of "call": should be avoided whenever possible. It can lead to unexpected behavior if return value is not handled properly. Please use Direct Calls via specifying the called contract's interface.

[more](#)

Pos: 459:24:

## Gas costs:

Gas requirement of function REKTIFY.removeLimits is infinite: If the gas requirement of a function is higher than the block gas limit, it cannot be executed. Please avoid loops in your functions or actions that modify large areas of storage (this includes clearing or copying arrays in storage)

Pos: 312:6:

## Gas costs:

Gas requirement of function REKTIFY.showSupply is infinite: If the gas requirement of a function is higher than the block gas limit, it cannot be executed. Please avoid loops in your functions or actions that modify large areas of storage (this includes clearing or copying arrays in storage)

Pos: 522:4:

### ERC20:

ERC20 contract's "decimals" function should have "uint8" as return type

[more](#)

Pos: 276:4:

### Similar variable names:

REKTIFY.swapBack() : Variables have very similar names "pair" and "path". Note: Modifiers are currently not considered by this static analysis.

Pos: 443:12:

### No return:

ERC20.totalSupply(): Defines a return type but never explicitly returns a value.

Pos: 24:4:

### Guard conditions:

Use "assert(x)" if you never ever want x to be false, not in any circumstance (apart from a bug in your code). Use "require(x)" if x can be false, due to e.g. invalid input or a failing external component.

[more](#)

Pos: 493:8:

### 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: 493:27:

---

## 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.

---

## Conclusion

We were given a contract code in the form of an Ethereum link 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

Technical auditing does not guarantee the project's ethical side.

---

## 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)**

