

Infinity Rocket Token Smart Contract Audit Report



18 Sep 2021



# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

#### Audited Details

- Audited Project
- Blockchain
- Addresses
- Project Website
- Codebase

#### Summary

- Contract Summary
- Audit Findings Summary
- Vulnerabilities Summary

#### **Conclusion**

#### Audit Results

#### Smart Contract Analysis

- Detected Vulnerabilities

#### **Disclaimer**

#### About Us



# AUDITED DETAILS

### Audited Project

| Project name          | Token ticker | Blockchain          |  |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--|
| Infinity Rocket Token | IRT          | Binance Smart Chain |  |

### Addresses

| Contract address          | 0xcbe5bca571628894a38836b0bae833ff012f71d8 |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Contract deployer address | 0x805920b5F79377D521e685477c632A6a17a9f6B9 |  |

### Project Website

#### https://irocket.pro/

### Codebase

https://bscscan.com/address/0xcbe5bca571628894a38836b0bae833ff012f71d8#code



# SUMMARY

Infinity Rocket is a multi-purpose platform that allows you to simplify the launch and promotion of any projects on the blockchain.

### Contract Summary

#### **Documentation Quality**

Infinity Rocket Token provides a very good documentation with standard of solidity base code.

• The technical description is provided clearly and structured and also dont have any high risk issue.

#### **Code Quality**

The Overall quality of the basecode is standard.

• Standard solidity basecode and rules are already followed by Infinity Rocket Token with the discovery of several low issues.

#### Test Coverage

Test coverage of the project is 100% (Through Codebase)

### Audit Findings Summary

- SWC-101 | It is recommended to use vetted safe math libraries for arithmetic operations consistently on lines 349, 386, 407, 438, 439, 458, 459, 481, 482 and 580.
- SWC-103 | Pragma statements can be allowed to float when a contract is intended on lines 11, 38, 108, 212, 548, 589 and 609.



# CONCLUSION

We have audited the Infinity Rocket Token project released on September 2021 to discover issues and identify potential security vulnerabilities in Infinity Rocket Token Project. This process is used to find technical issues and security loopholes which might be found in the smart contract.

The security audit report provides satisfactory results with low-risk issues.

The issues found in the Infinity Rocket Token smart contract code do not pose a considerable risk. The writing of the contract is close to the standard of writing contracts in general. The low-risk issues are some arithmetic operation issues, and floating pragma is set. Specifying a fixed compiler version is recommended to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.



# AUDIT RESULT

| Article                              | Category           | Description   | Result         |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------|
| Default Visibility                   | SWC-100<br>SWC-108 | Functions and state variables visibility should be set explicitly. Visibility levels should be specified consciously. | PASS           |
| Integer Overflow<br>and Underflow    | SWC-101            | If unchecked math is used, all math operationsISSshould be safe from overflows and underflows.FOI                     |                |
| Outdated Compiler<br>Version         | SWC-102            | It is recommended to use a recent version of the Solidity compiler.   |                |
| Floating Pragma                      | SWC-103            | Contracts should be deployed with the same compiler version and flags that they have been tested thoroughly.          | ISSUE<br>FOUND |
| Unchecked Call<br>Return Value       | SWC-104            | The return value of a message call should be checked.   |                |
| Unprotected Ether<br>Withdrawal      | SWC-105            | Due to missing or insufficient access controls,<br>malicious parties can withdraw from the contract.                  |                |
| SELFDESTRUCT<br>Instruction          | SWC-106            | The contract should not be self-destructible while it has funds belonging to users.                                   |                |
| Reentrancy                           | SWC-107            | Check effect interaction pattern should be followed if the code performs recursive call.                              |                |
| Uninitialized<br>Storage Pointer     | SWC-109            | Uninitialized local storage variables can point to unexpected storage locations in the contract.                      |                |
| Assert Violation                     | SWC-110<br>SWC-123 | Properly functioning code should never reach a failing assert statement.  |                |
| Deprecated Solidity<br>Functions     | SWC-111            | Deprecated built-in functions should never be used.   |                |
| Delegate call to<br>Untrusted Callee | SWC-112            | Delegatecalls should only be allowed to trusted addresses.  | PASS           |



| DoS (Denial of<br>Service)             | SWC-113<br>SWC-128            | Execution of the code should never be blocked by a specific contract state unless required.  | PASS |
|--|-------------------------------|--|------|
| Race Conditions                        | SWC-114                       | Race Conditions and Transactions Order Dependency should not be possible.  | PASS |
| Authorization through tx.origin        | SWC-115                       | tx.origin should not be used for authorization.  | PASS |
| Block values as a proxy for time       | SWC-116                       | Block numbers should not be used for time calculations.  | PASS |
| Signature Unique<br>ID                 | SWC-117<br>SWC-121<br>SWC-122 | Signed messages should always have a unique id. A transaction hash should not be used as a unique id.  | PASS |
| Incorrect<br>Constructor Name          | SWC-118                       | Constructors are special functions that are called only once during the contract creation.   |      |
| Shadowing State<br>Variable            | SWC-119                       | State variables should not be shadowed.  |      |
| Weak Sources of<br>Randomness          | SWC-120                       | Random values should never be generated from Chain<br>Attributes or be predictable.  |      |
| Write to Arbitrary<br>Storage Location | SWC-124                       | The contract is responsible for ensuring that only authorized<br>user or contract accounts may write to sensitive storage<br>locations.  |      |
| Incorrect<br>Inheritance Order         | SWC-125                       | When inheriting multiple contracts, especially if they have<br>identical functions, a developer should carefully specify<br>inheritance in the correct order. The rule of thumb is to<br>inherit contracts from more /general/ to more /specific/. |      |
| Insufficient Gas<br>Griefing           | SWC-126                       | Insufficient gas griefing attacks can be performed on contracts which accept data and use it in a sub-call on another contract.  |      |
| Arbitrary Jump<br>Function             | SWC-127                       | As Solidity doesnt support pointer arithmetics, it is impossible to change such variable to an arbitrary value.  |      |



| Typographical<br>Error        | SWC-129            | A typographical error can occur for example when the intent<br>of a defined operation is to sum a number to a variable.  |      |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--|------|
| Override control<br>character | SWC-130            | Malicious actors can use the Right-To-Left-Override unicode<br>character to force RTL text rendering and confuse users as<br>to the real intent of a contract. |      |
| Unused variables              | SWC-131<br>SWC-135 | Unused variables are allowed in Solidity and they do not pose a direct security issue.   | PASS |
| Unexpected Ether<br>balance   | SWC-132            | Contracts can behave erroneously when they strictly assume a specific Ether balance.   | PASS |
| Hash Collisions<br>Variable   | SWC-133            | Using abi.encodePacked() with multiple variable length arguments can, in certain situations, lead to a hash collision.   | PASS |
| Hardcoded gas<br>amount       | SWC-134            | The transfer() and send() functions forward a fixed amount of 2300 gas.  | PASS |
| Unencrypted<br>Private Data   | SWC-136            | It is a common misconception that private type variables cannot be read.   | PASS |



# **SMART CONTRACT ANALYSIS**

| Started          | Friday Sep 17 2021 06:41:35 GMT+0000 (Coordinated Universal Time)   |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|
| Finished         | Saturday Sep 18 2021 22:02:15 GMT+0000 (Coordinated Universal Time) |  |  |
| Mode             | Standard  |  |  |
| Main Source File | BurnableBEP20.sol   |  |  |

### Detected Issues

| ID      | Title                                | Severity | Status       |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED  | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+" DISCOVERED  | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED  | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED  | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+=" DISCOVERED | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+=" DISCOVERED | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+=" DISCOVERED | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED  | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-=" DISCOVERED | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED  | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-103 | A FLOATING PRAGMA IS SET.            | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-103 | A FLOATING PRAGMA IS SET.            | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-103 | A FLOATING PRAGMA IS SET.            | low      | acknowledged |
| SWC-103 | A FLOATING PRAGMA IS SET.            | low      | acknowledged |



| SWC-103 | A FLOATING PRAGMA IS SET. | low | acknowledged |
|---------|---------------------------|-----|--------------|
| SWC-103 | A FLOATING PRAGMA IS SET. | low | acknowledged |
| SWC-103 | A FLOATING PRAGMA IS SET. | low | acknowledged |
|         |                           |     |              |
|         |                           |     |              |



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED

**LINE 349** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
348 require(currentAllowance >= amount, "BEP20: transfer amount exceeds allowance");
349 _approve(sender, _msgSender(), currentAllowance - amount);
350
351 return true;
352 }
353
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+" DISCOVERED

**LINE 386** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
385 function increaseAllowance(address spender, uint256 addedValue) public virtual
returns (bool) {
386 _approve(_msgSender(), spender, _allowances[_msgSender()][spender] + addedValue);
387 return true;
388 }
389
390
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED

LINE 407

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
406 require(currentAllowance >= subtractedValue, "BEP20: decreased allowance below
zero");
407 _approve(_msgSender(), spender, currentAllowance - subtractedValue);
408
409 return true;
410 }
411
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED

**LINE 438** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
437 require(senderBalance >= amount, "BEP20: transfer amount exceeds balance");
438 _balances[sender] = senderBalance - amount;
439 _balances[recipient] += amount;
440
441 emit Transfer(sender, recipient, amount);
442
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+=" DISCOVERED

**LINE 439** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
438 _balances[sender] = senderBalance - amount;
439 _balances[recipient] += amount;
440
441 emit Transfer(sender, recipient, amount);
442 }
443
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+=" DISCOVERED

**LINE 458** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
457
458 _totalSupply += amount;
459 _balances[account] += amount;
460 emit Transfer(address(0), account, amount);
461 }
462
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "+=" DISCOVERED

**LINE 459** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
458 _totalSupply += amount;
459 _balances[account] += amount;
460 emit Transfer(address(0), account, amount);
461 }
462
463
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED

**LINE 481** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
480 require(accountBalance >= amount, "BEP20: burn amount exceeds balance");
481 _balances[account] = accountBalance - amount;
482 _totalSupply -= amount;
483
484 emit Transfer(account, address(0), amount);
485
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-=" DISCOVERED

LINE 482

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
481 __balances[account] = accountBalance - amount;
482 __totalSupply -= amount;
483
484 emit Transfer(account, address(0), amount);
485 }
486
```



## SWC-101 | ARITHMETIC OPERATION "-" DISCOVERED

**LINE 580** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

This plugin produces issues to support false positive discovery within mythril.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
579 require(currentAllowance >= amount, "BEP20: burn amount exceeds allowance");
580 _approve(account, _msgSender(), currentAllowance - amount);
581 _burn(account, amount);
582 }
583 }
584
```



LINE 11

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
10
11 pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
12
13 /*
14 * @dev Provides information about the current execution context, including the
15
```





LINE 38

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

```
37
38 pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
39
40 /**
41 * @dev Contract module which provides a basic access control mechanism, where
42
```





**LINE 108** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

#### Locations

107
108 pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
109
110 /\*\*
111 \* @dev Interface of the BEP standard.
112



LINE 212

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

#### Locations

211 212 pragma solidity ^0.8.0; 213 214 215 216



**LINE 548** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

#### Locations

547 548 pragma solidity ^0.8.0; 549 550 551 /\*\* 552



**LINE 589** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

#### Locations

588
589 pragma solidity ^0.8.0;
590
591 interface IPayable {
592 function pay(string memory serviceName) external payable;
593



**LINE 609** 

#### **Iow SEVERITY**

The current pragma Solidity directive is ""^0.8.0"". It is recommended to specify a fixed compiler version to ensure that the bytecode produced does not vary between builds. This is especially important if you rely on bytecode-level verification of the code.

#### Source File

- BurnableBEP20.sol

#### Locations

608 609 pragma solidity ^0.8.0; 610 611 612 613



## DISCLAIMER

This report is subject to the terms and conditions (including without limitation, description of services, confidentiality, disclaimer and limitation of liability) set forth in the Services Agreement, or the scope of services, and terms and conditions provided to you ("Customer" or the "Company") in connection with the Agreement. This report provided in connection with the Services set forth in the Agreement shall be used by the Company only to the extent permitted under the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement. This report may not be transmitted, disclosed, referred to, or relied upon by any person for any purposes, nor may copies be delivered to any other person other than the Company, without Sysfixed's prior written consent in each instance.

This report is not, nor should be considered, an "endorsement" or "disapproval" of any particular project or team. This report is not, nor should be considered, an indication of the economics or value of any "product" or "asset" created by any team or project that contracts Sysfixed to perform a security assessment. This report does not provide any warranty or guarantee regarding the absolute bug-free nature of the technology analyzed, nor do they provide any indication of the technologies proprietors, business, business model, or legal compliance.

This is a limited report on our findings based on our analysis, in accordance with good industry practice as of the date of this report, in relation to cybersecurity vulnerabilities and issues in the framework and algorithms based on smart contracts, the details of which are set out in this report. In order to get a full view of our analysis, it is crucial for you to read the full report. While we have done our best in conducting our analysis and producing this report, it is important to note that you should not rely on this report and cannot claim against us on the basis of what it says or doesn't say, or how we produced it, and it is important for you to conduct your own independent investigations before making any decisions. We go into more detail on this in the below disclaimer below – please make sure to read it in full.

This report should not be used in any way to make decisions around investment or involvement with any particular project. This report in no way provides investment advice, nor should be leveraged as investment advice of any sort. This report represents an extensive assessing process intending to help our customers increase the quality of their code while reducing the high level of risk presented by cryptographic tokens and blockchain technology.

This report is provided for information purposes only and on a non-reliance basis and does not constitute investment advice. No one shall have any right to rely on the report or its contents, and Sysfixed and its affiliates (including holding companies, shareholders, subsidiaries, employees, directors, officers, and other representatives) (Sysfixed) owe no duty of care.



# ABOUT US

Sysfixed is a blockchain security certification organization established in 2021 with the objective to provide smart contract security services and verify their correctness in blockchain-based protocols. Sysfixed automatically scans for security vulnerabilities in Ethereum and other EVM-based blockchain smart contracts. Sysfixed a comprehensive range of analysis techniques—including static analysis, dynamic analysis, and symbolic execution—can accurately detect security vulnerabilities to provide an in-depth analysis report. With a vibrant ecosystem of world-class integration partners that amplify developer productivity, Sysfixed can be utilized in all phases of your project's lifecycle. Our team of security experts is dedicated to the research and improvement of our tools and techniques used to fortify your code.