

# Smart Contract Audit Report

for

## DefinaNFTMarket



**TRUSTLOOK**

Version 0.1

Trustlook Blockchain Labs

Email: [bd@trustlook.com](mailto:bd@trustlook.com)

## ***Project Overview***

---

<b>Project Name</b>	DefinaNFTMarket
<b>Contract codebase</b>	N/A
<b>Platform</b>	Ethereum
<b>Language</b>	Solidity
<b>Submission Time</b>	2021.09.16

## ***Report Overview***

---

<b>Report ID</b>	TBL_20210916_00
<b>Version</b>	0.1
<b>Reviewer</b>	Trustlook Blockchain Labs
<b>Starting Time</b>	2021.09.16
<b>Finished Time</b>	2021.09.19

## ***Disclaimer***

---

Trustlook audit reports do not provide any warranties or guarantees on the vulnerability-free nature of the given smart contracts, nor do they provide any indication of legal compliance. The Trustlook audit process is aiming to reduce the high level risks possibly implemented in the smart contracts before the issuance of audit reports.

Trustlook audit reports can be used to improve the code quality of smart contracts and are not able to detect any security issues of smart contracts that will occur in the future. Trustlook audit reports should not be considered as financial investment advice.

## **About Trustlook Blockchain Labs**

---

Trustlook Blockchain Labs is a leading blockchain security team with a goal of security and vulnerability research on current blockchain ecosystems by offering industry-leading smart contracts auditing services. Please contact us for more information at (<https://www.trustlook.com/services/smart.html>) or Email ([bd@trustlook.com](mailto:bd@trustlook.com))

The Trustlook blockchain laboratory has established a complete system test environment and methods.

Black-box Testing	The tester has no knowledge of the system being attacked. The goal is to simulate an external hacking or cyber warfare attack.
White-box Testing	Based on the level of the source code, test the control flow, data flow, nodes, SDK etc. Try to find out the vulnerabilities and bugs.
Gray-box Testing	Use Trustlook customized script tools to do the security testing of code modules, search for the defects if any due to improper structure or improper usage of applications.

## Introduction

---

By reviewing the implementation of DefinaNFTMarket's smart contracts, this audit report has been prepared to discover potential issues and vulnerabilities of their source code. We outline in the report about our approach to evaluate the potential security risks. Advice to further improve the quality of security or performance is also given in the report.

## About DefinaNFTMarket

---

DefinaNFTMarket is a data aggregator specially designed for DeFi and NFT, providing customisable smart contracts to simplify the investment process of DeFi and NFT for users of all levels.

## About Methodology

---

To evaluate the potential vulnerabilities or issues, we go through a checklist of well-known smart contracts related security issues using automatic verification tools and manual review. To discover potential logic weaknesses or project specific implementations, we thoroughly discussed with the team to understand the business model and reduce the risk of unknown vulnerabilities. For any discovered issue, we might test it on our private network to reproduce the issue to prove our findings.

The checklist of items is shown in the following table:

Category	Type ID	Name	Description
Coding Specification	CS-01	ERC standards	The contract is using ERC standards.
	CS-02	Compiler Version	The compiler version should be specified.
	CS-03	Constructor Mismatch	The constructor syntax is changed with Solidity versions. Need extra attention to make the constructor function right.
	CS-04	Return standard	Following the ERC20 specification, the transfer and approve

			functions should return a bool value, and a return value code needs to be added.
	CS-05	Address(0) validation	It is recommended to add the verification of <code>require(!_to!=address(0))</code> to effectively avoid unnecessary loss caused by user misuse or unknown errors.
	CS-06	Unused Variable	Unused variables should be removed.
	CS-07	Untrusted Libraries	The contract should avoid using untrusted libraries, or the libraries need to be thoroughly audited too.
	CS-08	Event Standard	Define and use Event appropriately
	CS-09	Safe Transfer	Using transfer to send funds instead of send.
	CS-10	Gas consumption	Optimize the code for better gas consumption.
	CS-11	Deprecated uses	Avoid using deprecated functions.
	CS-12	Sanity Checks	Sanity checks when setting key parameters in the system
Coding Security	SE-01	Integer overflows	Integer overflow or underflow issues.
	SE-02	Reentrancy	Avoid using calls to trade in smart contracts to avoid reentrancy vulnerability.
	SE-03	Transaction Ordering Dependence	Avoid transaction ordering dependence vulnerability.
	SE-04	Tx.origin usage	Avoid using tx.origin for authentication.
	SE-05	Fake recharge	The judgment of the balance and the transfer amount needs to use the "require function".
	SE-06	Replay	If the contract involves the demands for entrusted management, attention should be paid to the non-reusability of verification to avoid replay attacks.
	SE-07	External call checks	For external contracts, pull instead of push is preferred.
	SE-08	Weak random	The method of generating random numbers on smart contracts requires more considerations.
Additional Security	AS-01	Access control	Well defined access control for functions.
	AS-02	Authentication management	The authentication management is well defined.
	AS-03	Semantic Consistency	Semantics are consistent.
	AS-04	Functionality checks	The functionality is well implemented.

	AS-05	Business logic review	The business model logic is implemented correctly.
--	-------	-----------------------	--

The severity level of the issues are described in the following table:

<b>Severity</b>	<b>Description</b>
Critical	The issue will result in asset loss or data manipulations.
High	The issue will seriously affect the correctness of the business model.
Medium	The issue is still important to fix but not practical to exploit.
Low	The issue is mostly related to outdated, unused code snippets.
Informational	This issue is mostly related to code style, informational statements and is not mandatory to be fixed.

## Audit Results

---

Here are the audit results of the smart contracts. The new release of the smart contracts add more features to restrict the privilege of the owner to reduce the risk of private key loss or hacking events.

## Scope

---

Following files have been scanned by our internal audit tool and manually reviewed and tested by our team:

File names	Sha1
DefinaNFTMarket.sol	89bb1a91b77bd049ab2dcace29fe365d136002e5

## Summary

---

Issue ID	Severity	Location	Type ID	Status
TBL_SCA_001	Info	DefinaNFTMarket.sol:96	CS-08	open
TBL_SCA_002	Info	DefinaNFTMarket.sol:199	CS-12	open
TBL_SCA_003	Info	DefinaNFTMarket.sol:184 DefinaNFTMarket.sol:189 DefinaNFTMarket.sol:194 DefinaNFTMarket.sol:199 DefinaNFTMarket.sol:209	CS-08	open
TBL_SCA_004	Info	DefinaNFTMarket.sol:116	AS-03	open





## Details

---

- ID: TBL\_SCA-001
- Severity: Informational
- Type: CS-08 (Event Standard)
- Description:

The Event emit on line 96 and line 99 should be swapped based on the meaning whether *whiteListOnly* is *True* or *False*.

- Remediation:

- ID: TBL\_SCA-002
- Severity: Informational
- Type: CS-12 (Sanity Checks)
- Description:

For key parameters in the system, it is recommended to add some sanity checks on update.

It is recommended to validate parameter `supportedBoxSizes_` to be a non-zero length. Otherwise the original `supportedBoxSizes` list would be empty and no new list is created.

- Remediation:

- ID: TBL\_SCA-003
- Severity: Informational
- Type: CS-08 (Event Standard)
- Description:

Multiple functions such as `setCurrToken()`, `setNftPrice()`, `setErc20TokenReceiveAddress()`, `setNftsGrades()`, and `setSupportedBoxSizes()` did not emit an event for the operation. Recommend emitting events for all the essential state variables that can be changed during runtime.

- Remediation:

- ID: TBL\_SCA-004
- Severity: Informational
- Type: AS-03 (Semantic Consistency)
- Description:

The function name is defined as `setupWhitelist` which implies the function would reset the Whitelist with the supplied argument. But it seems to only append the argument into the original list which is consistent with the Event name `AddedToWhiteList()`.

It is recommended to make the function name consistent with the Event name.

- Remediation: