



**PALADIN**  
BLOCKCHAIN SECURITY

# Smart Contract Security Assessment

Final Report

For PolyKiwi Finance

21 August 2021



[paladinsec.co](http://paladinsec.co)



[info@paladinsec.co](mailto:info@paladinsec.co)

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Disclaimer	3
1 Overview	4
1.1 Summary	4
1.2 Contracts Assessed	4
1.3 Findings Summary	5
1.3.1 MasterChef	6
1.3.2 Timelock	6
2 Findings	7
2.1 MasterChef	7
2.1.2 Privileged Roles	7
2.1.3 Issues & Recommendations	8
2.2 Timelock	18
2.2.1 Issues & Recommendations	18



# Disclaimer

Paladin Blockchain Security ("Paladin") has conducted an independent audit to verify the integrity of and highlight any vulnerabilities or errors, intentional or unintentional, that may be present in the codes that were provided for the scope of this audit. This audit report does not constitute agreement, acceptance or advocacy for the Project that was audited, and users relying on this audit report should not consider this as having any merit for financial advice in any shape, form or nature. The contracts audited do not account for any economic developments that may be pursued by the Project in question, and that the veracity of the findings thus presented in this report relate solely to the proficiency, competence, aptitude and discretion of our independent auditors, who make no guarantees nor assurance that the contracts are completely free of exploits, bugs, vulnerabilities or deprecation of technologies. Further, this audit report shall not be disclosed nor transmitted to any persons or parties on any objective, goal or justification without due written assent, acquiescence or approval by Paladin.

All information provided in this report does not constitute financial or investment advice, nor should it be used to signal that any persons reading this report should invest their funds without sufficient individual due diligence regardless of the findings presented in this report. Information is provided 'as is', and Paladin is under no covenant to the completeness, accuracy or solidity of the contracts audited. In no event will Paladin or its partners, employees, agents or parties related to the provision of this audit report be liable to any parties for, or lack thereof, decisions and/or actions with regards to the information provided in this audit report.

Cryptocurrencies and any technologies by extension directly or indirectly related to cryptocurrencies are highly volatile and speculative by nature. All reasonable due diligence and safeguards may yet be insufficient, and users should exercise considerable caution when participating in any shape or form in this nascent industry.

The audit report has made all reasonable attempts to provide clear and articulate recommendations to the Project team with respect to the rectification, amendment and/or revision of any highlighted issues, vulnerabilities or exploits within the contracts provided. It is the sole responsibility of the Project team to sufficiently test and perform checks, ensuring that the contracts are functioning as intended, specifically that the functions therein contained within said contracts have the desired intended effects, functionalities and outcomes of the Project team.

# 1 Overview

This report has been prepared for PolyKiwi Finance. Paladin provides a user-centred examination of the smart contracts to look for vulnerabilities, logic errors or other issues from both an internal and external perspective.

## 1.1 Summary

<b>Project Name</b>	PolyKiwi
<b>URL</b>	<a href="https://polykiwi.finance/">https://polykiwi.finance/</a>
<b>Platform</b>	Polygon
<b>Language</b>	Solidity

## 1.2 Contracts Assessed

The contracts were provided to Paladin in a GitHub repository. We will update this report once we have verified that the deployed contracts match the ones we have audited.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Contract</b>	<b>Live Code Match</b>
MasterChef	<a href="https://github.com/polykiwi-finance/polykiwi-farms/blob/master/contracts/MasterChef.sol">https://github.com/polykiwi-finance/polykiwi-farms/blob/master/contracts/MasterChef.sol</a>	
Timelock	<a href="https://github.com/polykiwi-finance/polykiwi-farms/blob/master/contracts/Timelock.sol">https://github.com/polykiwi-finance/polykiwi-farms/blob/master/contracts/Timelock.sol</a>	

## 1.3 Findings Summary

Severity	Found	Resolved	Partially Resolved	Acknowledged (no change made)
● High	3	3	-	-
● Medium	2	2	-	-
● Low	4	4	-	-
● Informational	8	7	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

### Classification of Issues

Severity	Description
● High	Exploits, vulnerabilities or errors that will certainly or probabilistically lead towards loss of funds, control, or impairment of the contract and its functions. Issues under this classification are recommended to be fixed with utmost urgency.
● Medium	Bugs or issues with that may be subject to exploit, though their impact is somewhat limited. Issues under this classification are recommended to be fixed as soon as possible.
● Low	Effects are minimal in isolation and do not pose a significant danger to the project or its users. Issues under this classification are recommended to be fixed nonetheless.
● Informational	Consistency, syntax or style best practices. Generally pose a negligible level of risk, if any.

## 1.3.1 MasterChef

ID	Severity	Summary	Status
01	HIGH	Severely excessive rewards issue when a token with a transfer tax is added	RESOLVED
02	HIGH	emergencyWithdraw transfers no funds	RESOLVED
03	HIGH	User balances does not properly record deposits if there are no deposit fees	RESOLVED
04	MEDIUM	payReferral function can fail if there are insufficient tokens	RESOLVED
05	MEDIUM	Duplicated pools may be added to the Masterchef	RESOLVED
06	LOW	Setting feeAddress to the zero address will break most functionality	RESOLVED
07	LOW	The pendingKiwi function will revert if totalAllocPoint is zero	RESOLVED
08	LOW	Adding an EOA or a non-token contract as a pool will break updatePool and massUpdatePools	RESOLVED
09	LOW	updateEmissionRate has no maximum safeguard	RESOLVED
10	INFORMATIONAL	Native token and associated comments still reference CAKE (from PancakeSwap)	PARTIALLY RESOLVED
11	INFORMATIONAL	BONUS_MULTIPLIER looks to be redundant	RESOLVED
12	INFORMATIONAL	Rounding vulnerability to tokens with a very large supply can cause large supply tokens to receive zero emissions	RESOLVED
13	INFORMATIONAL	Various unused comments remain in the contract	RESOLVED
14	INFORMATIONAL	kiwi and startBlock can be made immutable	RESOLVED
15	INFORMATIONAL	Pools use the contract balance to figure out the total deposits	RESOLVED
16	INFORMATIONAL	add, set, deposit, withdraw, emergencyWithdraw, setFeeAddress, updateEmissionRate, toggleReferrals can be made external	RESOLVED
17	INFORMATIONAL	Lack of events for add, set, setFeeAddress, updateEmissionRate, toggleReferrals	RESOLVED

## 1.3.2 Timelock

No issues found.

# 2 Findings

---

## 2.1 MasterChef

The Masterchef is a fork of PancakeSwap's Masterchef but with the `migrator` function removed, which as of late has been used maliciously to steal tokens staked in the Masterchef. We commend PolyKiwi on their decision in making this modification of the Masterchef. PolyKiwi has also imposed an upper limit of 4.2% on deposit fees in the MasterChef, so the deposit fee cannot be set to a value higher than 4.2%.

### 2.1.2 Privileged Roles

The following functions can be called by the owner of the contract:

- `add`
- `set`
- `setFeeAddress`
- `updateEmissionRate`
- `toggleReferrals`



## 2.1.3 Issues & Recommendations

**Issue #01**      **Severely excessive rewards issue when a token with a transfer tax is added**

**Severity**

 HIGH SEVERITY

**Description**

When tokens with a transfer tax are added to the pools, this will result in significant excessive rewards. Due to the way the Masterchef handles rewards, rewards can be heavily inflated when the balance of the Masterchef no longer matches that of user deposits. This happens for example with transfer tax tokens. This issue is further amplified on Masterchefs like this one with a referral mechanism, since tokens can be minted directly.

This flaw of the Masterchef has recently been exploited on a significant number of projects, all of which their native tokens went to \$0 afterwards because the exploit resulted in a large number of native tokens being minted and dumped.

This issue was also present in SushiSwap (the original Masterchef). Since they were never meant to have any tokens but LP tokens, it was not a problem there but has become a problem to projects who have started forking it for usage with less standard tokens.

**Recommendation**    Consider using the current standard of handling deposits, which is based on how Uniswap handles transfer fees:

```
uint256 balanceBefore = pool.lpToken.balanceOf(address(this));
pool.lpToken.transferFrom(msg.sender, address(this), _amount);
_amount = pool.lpToken.balanceOf(address(this)).sub(balanceBefore);
```

Note that by using this method, you can also add the specific transfer tax logic for the native token if you so wish.

**Resolution**

 RESOLVED

The before-after method has been implemented.

**Issue #02****emergencyWithdraw transfers no funds****Severity** HIGH SEVERITY**Description**

In the emergencyWithdraw function, `user.amount` is set to 0 before the transfer function, with the end result being that no funds are transferred when this function is called as the user balance has been removed.

**Recommendation**

Consider first caching `user.amount` as follows :

```
uint256 amount = user.amount;  
user.amount = 0;  
user.rewardDebt = 0;  
pool.lpToken.safeTransfer(msg.sender, amount);
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

`user.amount` is transferred out before being set to zero. Note that this does not implement the [Check-Effects Interaction pattern](#).

**Issue #03****User balances does not properly record deposits if there are no deposit fees****Severity** HIGH SEVERITY**Location**

Line 196  
`user.amount.add(_amount);`

**Description**

This does not correctly add `_amount` to the current balance of the user.

**Recommendation**

This can be resolved by correcting to the following :

```
user.amount = user.amount.add(_amount);
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

The client has implemented the recommendation.

**Issue #04****payReferral function can fail if there are insufficient tokens****Severity** MEDIUM SEVERITY**Description**

The payReferral function transfers tokens from the feeAddress to the referral address. This is contingent on the feeAddress actually having sufficient tokens to pay on each transfer, which may fail should there be insufficient tokens or even zero tokens. This may happen if, for example, the feeAddress is controlled by the project team and can freely withdraw tokens, or if the referral payment amount exceeds the balance in the feeAddress.

**Recommendation**

Consider minting referral rewards rather than transferring them, as is the mechanism in most Pantherswap forks. This ensures that referral rewards will always be paid out, and can be implemented as such:

```
function payReferral (address referral, uint amount) internal {
    if (referral != address(0) && referralStatus == true) {
        amount = amount.div(40); // 2.5%

        kiwi.mint(referral, amount);
        emit ReferralPayment(referral, address(this), amount);
    }
}
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

Kiwi tokens are now minted to referrals.



**Issue #05****Duplicated pools may be added to the Masterchef****Severity** MEDIUM SEVERITY**Description**

The add function allows for duplicate pools to be added, which would lead to dilution of emission rewards to stakers.

**Recommendation**

The addition of a modifier that checks for duplicate pools could help prevent this incident from occurring.

```
mapping(IBEP20 => bool) public poolExistence;
modifier nonDuplicated(IBEP20 _lpToken) {
    require(poolExistence[_lpToken] == false, "nonDuplicated: duplicated");
    -;
}

// Add a new lp to the pool. Can only be called by the owner.
function add(uint256 _allocPoint, IBEP20 _lpToken, uint16 _depositFeeBP, bool
_withUpdate) external onlyOwner nonDuplicated(_lpToken) {
    require(_depositFeeBP <= 10000, "add: invalid deposit fee basis points");
    if (_withUpdate) {
        massUpdatePools();
    }
    uint256 lastRewardBlock = block.number > startBlock ? block.number : startBlock;
    totalAllocPoint = totalAllocPoint.add(_allocPoint);
    poolExistence[_lpToken] = true;
    poolInfo.push(PoolInfo({
        lpToken: _lpToken,
        allocPoint: _allocPoint,
        lastRewardBlock: lastRewardBlock,
        accH20PerShare: 0,
        depositFeeBP: _depositFeeBP
    }));
    updateStakingPool();
}
```

Alternatively, you could account for this by adding in an lpSupply variable under poolInfo. This has the benefit of accurately accounting for deposits in the Masterchef.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

nonDuplicate modifier and lpSupply variable have been added.

**Issue #06****Setting feeAddress to the zero address will break most functionality****Severity** LOW SEVERITY**Description**

In the deposit function, the deposit fees are paid to the feeAddress. Should this be set to the zero address, then transfers will fail and thus break the deposit function.

**Recommendation**

To prevent this from ever happening by accident and to limit governance risks, consider adding a requirement like

```
require(_feeAddress != address(0), "!nonzero");
```

to the configuration function.

**Resolution** RESOLVED**Issue #07****The pendingKiwi function will revert if totalAllocPoint is zero****Severity** LOW SEVERITY**Description**

In the pendingKiwi function, at some point a division is made by the totalAllocPoint variable. If all pools have their rewards set to zero, this variable will be zero as well. The requests will then revert with a division by zero error.

**Recommendation**

Consider only calculating the accumulated rewards since the lastRewardBlock if the totalAllocPoint variable is greater than zero. This check can simply be added to the existing check that verifies the block.number and lpSupply, like so:

```
if (block.number > pool.lastRewardBlock && lpSupply != 0 && totalAllocPoint > 0) {
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #08****Adding an EOA or a non-token contract as a pool will break updatePool and massUpdatePools****Severity** LOW SEVERITY**Description**

updatePool will always call `balanceOf(address(this))` on the token of this pool, and will fail if the token is not an actual token contract address.

**Recommendation**

Consider simply adding a test line in the add function. If the token does not exist, this will make sure the add function fails.

```
_lpToken.balanceOf(address(this));
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED**Issue #09****updateEmissionRate has no maximum safeguard****Severity** LOW SEVERITY**Description**

Projects sometimes accidentally update their emission rate to a severely high number either by accident or with malicious intent.

**Recommendation**

Consider adding a `MAX_EMISSION_RATE` variable and setting it to a reasonable value.

```
require(_kiwiPerBlock <= MAX_EMISSION_RATE, "Too high");
```

**Resolution** RESOLVED

A maximum emission rate of 0.0002 tokens per block has been set.

**Issue #10****Native token and associated comments still reference CAKE (from PancakeSwap)****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

Throughout the contract, the native token is still named and referred to as CAKE. As the project is called PolyKiwi, we are unsure if the native token is truly meant to retain the CAKE name, or if there is a specific name they would like their token to be known.

**Recommendation**

Consider renaming the CAKE token to the project's intended native token name, as well as making the necessary adjustments to the associated comments and functions. If CAKE is truly the project's native token, then this is a non-issue.

**Resolution** PARTIALLY RESOLVED

Comments still reference CAKE but functions and variables have been renamed to Kiwi.

**Issue #11****BONUS\_MULTIPLIER looks to be redundant****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

The constant variable BONUS\_MULTIPLIER does not contain any extra information since it is constant and cannot be changed from 1, and thus would not have any impact or contribution on the `getMultiplier` function.

**Recommendation**

Consider removing BONUS\_MULTIPLIER and associated comments.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #12****Rounding vulnerability to tokens with a very large supply can cause large supply tokens to receive zero emissions****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

Within `updatePool`, `accKiwiPerShare` is based on the `lpSupply` variable.

```
pool.accKiwiPerShare =  
pool.accKiwiPerShare.add(kiwiReward.mul(1e12).div(lpSupply));
```

However, if this `lpSupply` becomes a severely large value, precision errors may occur due to rounding. This is famously seen when pools decide to add meme-tokens which usually have huge supplies and no decimals.

**Recommendation**

Consider increasing precision to `1e18` across the entire contract.

**Resolution** RESOLVED**Issue #13****Various unused comments remain in the contract****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

There are various comments in the contract, including removed functions, that can be removed to make the contract more readable by third-party reviewers.

These include but are not limited to :

```
//function updateMultiplier(uint256 multiplierNumber) public  
onlyOwner {  
//    BONUS_MULTIPLIER = multiplierNumber;  
//    cake.mint(devaddr, cakeReward.div(10));
```

**Recommendation**

Consider removing these comments.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #14****kiwi and startBlock can be made immutable****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

Variables that are only set in the constructor but never modified can be indicated as such with the `immutable` keyword. This is considered best practice since it makes the code more accessible for third-party reviewers and saves gas.

**Recommendation**

Consider making the above variables explicitly `immutable`.

**Resolution** RESOLVED**Issue #15****Pools use the contract balance to figure out the total deposits****Severity** INFORMATIONAL**Description**

As with pretty much all Masterchefs, the total number of tokens in the Masterchef contract is used to determine the total number of deposits. This can cause dilution of rewards when people accidentally send tokens to the Masterchef.

More severely, because the native token is constantly minted, this will cause severe dilution on the native token pool. This dilution is amplified even a bit more because the native token in question is a reflection token.

**Recommendation**

Consider adding an `lpSupply` variable to the `PoolInfo` that keeps track of the total deposits.

**Resolution** RESOLVED

**Issue #16**

**add, set, deposit, withdraw, emergencyWithdraw, setFeeAddress, updateEmissionRate, toggleReferrals can be made external**

**Severity**

 INFORMATIONAL

**Description**

The above functions can be changed from public to external. Apart from being a best practice when the function is not used within the contract, this can lead to a [lower gas usage in certain cases](#).

**Recommendation**

Consider making these functions external.

**Resolution**

 RESOLVED

**Issue #17**

**Lack of events for add, set, setFeeAddress, updateEmissionRate, toggleReferrals**

**Severity**

 INFORMATIONAL

**Description**

Functions that affect the status of sensitive variables should emit events as notifications.

**Recommendation**

Add events for add, set, setFeeAddress, updateEmissionRate, toggleReferrals.

**Resolution**

 RESOLVED



---

## 2.2 Timelock

The Timelock contract is a clean fork of Compound Finance's timelock. This is the most common contract used in DeFi to time lock governance access and is thus compatible with most third-party tools.

Parameter	Value	Description
<b>Delay</b>	-	The delay indicates the time the administrator has to wait after queuing a transaction to execute it.
<b>Minimum Delay</b>	24 hours	<p>The minDelay indicates the lowest value that the delay can minimally be set.</p> <p>Sometimes, projects will queue a transaction that sets the delay to zero with the hope that nobody notices it. However, because of the minimum delay parameter, the value of delay can never be lower than that of the minDelay value. Note that the administrator could still queue a transaction to simply transfer the ownership back to their own account so it is still important to inspect every transaction carefully.</p>
<b>Grace Period</b>	14 days	After the delay has expired after queueing a transaction, the administrator can only execute it within the grace period. This is to prevent them from hiding a malicious transaction among much earlier transactions, hoping that it goes unnoticed or buried, which can be executed in the future.

### 2.2.1 Issues & Recommendations

No issues found.



**PALADIN**  
BLOCKCHAIN SECURITY