



Radiance DEX smart contract analysis

Prepared by [Pruvendo](#)

08/06/21

Executive Summary	1
Source data	1
Motivation	2
Audit outcome	2
Summary	2
List of issues	3

Executive Summary

In the course of this project, we shall perform an audit of the central smart contracts (*DEXClient*, *DEXConnector*, *DEXPair*, *DEXRoot RootTokenContract*, *TONTokenWallet*) in the DEX solution developed by Radiance.

The performed audit demonstrated a high quality of the smart contract, however a number of “easy to fix” issues, including critical and major, was discovered.

Source data

The source code of the smart contracts is available on Github at:

<https://github.com/radianceteam/dex2/commit/7d65f0d3b85e504ac33f01395b6ba0ffef9d5fe5>



Motivation

Ideally speaking, all smart contracts issued by the Free TON ecosystem must pass the formal verification process. However, as the formal verification is an extremely time-consuming process, in some cases the business cannot wait for such a long time. Additionally, each bug found during the formal verification requires a major rework of the whole underlying stuff already completed. To address both above-mentioned issues, we suggest to undertake the informal audit before proceeding to formal verification. Being capable to find most bugs, the completion of this kind of activity allows us to:

- Release a smart contract with a high (but not the highest) level of reliability (this should be undertaken exclusively in a case of a strong business need)
- Dramatically decrease the likelihood of finding a bug during the formal verification (taking into account that each bug found at the formal verification stage brings major overhead for the proving system)

Audit outcome

Summary

The audit confirmed the high quality of the provided contract. However, a few critical and major issues were found that need to be addressed before moving forward to the next stage of formal verification as well as to limited beta production.

Most of the issues are related to either potential exceptions after `tvm.accept()` or to potential lack of gas.

All the discovered issues require just cosmetic changes of the code so no re-spin of the audit will be required before moving to the Phase 1 of formal verification.

All the issues were submitted to the development team upon the completion of internal review in a timely manner via Telegram group [Radiance + ForMet](#) but the last set of issues were reviewed just before the submission.



List of issues

All the discovered issues were grouped according to their severity and similarity. The following levels of severity were used:

- **CRITICAL** - the fix is absolutely mandatory as the issue can lead to the immediate losing of money or contract corruption
- **MAJOR** - the fix is mandatory, however can be delayed in some cases
- **MINOR** - the fix is optional
- **NOTE** - just a recommendation



No	File	Element	Severity	Description	Suggested fix
1	DEXRoot	createDEXclient	CRITICAL	require after accept. In case of triggering can lead to balance exhausting	Use accept explicitly rather than in modifier and place it after the last require
		createNewPair			
2	DEXPair	tokenReceivedCallback	CRITICAL	This condition <code>totalSupply == 0 && balanceReserve[rootA] == 0 && balanceReserve[rootB] == 0</code> looks incorrect. Looks like "or" should be used instead of "and". In the current version the requires in the inline functions can trigger that will lead to balance exhausting.	Change "and" to "or"
3	DEXPair	burnCallback	CRITICAL	callbacks are removed up to three times when just one added. Eventually it will lead to the full exhausting of the callback list	Remove extra callback removals
4	TONTOKENWalletConstants	target_gas_balance	MAJOR	So small value looks dangerous in case gas price increases in future.	It's recommended to increase it to 1 TON
	DEXConnector				
	DEXClient				
4	DEXPair	constants	MAJOR	The constants are too low to be safe	Multiply them by three
5	TONTOKENWallet	deployEmptyWallet	MAJOR	In case of no accept external messages do not work	Insert <code>tvm.accept()</code> as well as a require to check if the balance is sufficient



		<i>createDEXclient</i>		If DEXClient does not start due to any reason (lack of gas or so) it still added to all the mappings and marked as created	Introduce a special callback that is invoked upon successful setup of DEXClient
6	<i>DEXRoot</i>	<i>createDEXPair</i>	MAJOR	If DEXPair does not start due to any reason (lack of gas or so) it still added to all the mappings and marked as created	Introduce a special callback that is invoked upon successful setup of DEXPair
7	<i>DEXPair</i>	<i>inline functions</i>	MAJOR	Require in inlines after accept. While normally they never should trigger in case they do it will lead to balance exhausting	Make all the assertions before accepting gas



8	RootTokenContract	sendExpectedWalletAddress	MINOR	No check if the <code>msg.value</code> is big enough. The risk of abnormal abrupton of the message chain. It's not clear if it's a real case, however, looks unsafe	Introduce <code>require</code> to check <code>msg.value</code>
		deployWallet			
		deployEmptyWallet			
		proxyBurn			
		mint			
	TONTokenWallet	approve		No check balance is big enough to complete the transaction	Introduce <code>require</code> to check balance. The better idea is to always have some minimal balance
		disapprove			
		burnByOwner			
		burnByRoot			
		onBounce			
internalTransfer	No check for sufficient balance in case <code>owner_address.value == 0</code>	Add some additional <code>require</code>			



	<i>DEXRoot</i>	<i>createDEXclient</i>				
		<i>createDEXPair</i>				
						<i>connectPair</i>
						<i>setPair</i>
						<i>getConnectorAddress</i>
						<i>connectRoot</i>
						<i>connectCallback</i>
						<i>getAllDataPreparation</i>
						<i>processSwapA</i>
						<i>processSwapB</i>
						<i>processLiquidity</i>
						<i>returnLiquidity</i>
						<i>getCallback</i>
						<i>DEXClient</i>
9	<i>RootTokenContract</i>	<i>deployWallet</i>	MINOR	<code>require(tokens >= 0)</code> is always true	Introduce <code>require</code> to check balance Replace with <code>require(tokens > 0)</code>	
10	<i>TONTokenWallet</i>	<i>approve</i>				
		<i>disapprove</i>				
		<i>burnByOwner</i>				
		<i>burnByRoot</i>				MINOR



11	<i>TONTokenWallet</i>	<i>internalTransferFrom</i>	MINOR	According to TonLabs 129 flag is equivalent to 128 (1 is ignored). Should be reviewed	Use flag 128 with some additional reservation
12	<i>DEXRoot</i>	<i>createDEXclient</i>	MINOR	Strange magic value 3100000 looks inappropriate	Remove this value
13	<i>DEXRoot</i>	<i>createDEXPair</i>	MINOR	0.5 TON is a dangerous limit	Increase it to at least 1 TON
14	<i>DEXClient</i>	<i>getFirstCallback</i>	MINOR	Looks like it should be an inline call	Make it inline
	<i>RootTokenContract</i>	<i>getVersion</i>	NOTE	No need to use responsible for pure getters	Remove responsible
		<i>getDetails</i>			
		<i>getTotalSupply</i>			
		<i>getWalletCode</i>			
		<i>getVersion</i>	NOTE	No need to use responsible for pure getters	Remove responsible
		<i>balance</i>			
		<i>getDetails</i>			
		<i>getWalletCode</i>			
15	<i>TONTokenWallet</i>	<i>allowance</i>	NOTE	No need to use responsible for pure getters	Remove responsible



16	DEXRoot	createDEXclient	NOTE	Requirement <code>!(prepay < GRAMS_CREATE_DEX_CLIENT)</code> looks poor readable	Change to <code>prepay >= GRAMS_CREATE_DEX_CLIENT</code>
		createDEXPair		Requirement <code>!(something < something)</code> is poor readable as well as <code>!(something==something)</code>	Change it to <code>something >= something</code>
	DEXConnector	deployEmptyWallet		The requirement <code>!(msg.value < GRAMS_TO_ROOT * 2)</code> is poor readable	Change it to <code>msg.value >= GRAMS_TO_ROOT * 2</code>
	DEXPair	tokensReceivedCallback		Condition <code>!(amountOut > balanceReserve[arg1])</code> is poor readable	Change it to <code>amountOut <= balanceReserve[arg1]</code>
17	DEXRoot	createDEXPair	NOTE	Numbers as <code>500000000</code> are unreadable	Change it to <code>0.5 ton</code>
	DEXClient	constants			
18	DEXRoot	createDEXPair	NOTE	The finalizing <code>transfer</code> should be put out of <code>if</code>	Put it out of <code>if</code>
19	DEXClient	getQuotient	NOTE	The same function is used by another contract so the code is duplicated	Implement the subcontract that implements this function and inherits all the participating high-level contracts from it
		getRemainder			
20	DEXClient	isReady	NOTE	Too long lines	Split them to two
		isReadyToProvide			
		createNewPair			
21	DEXPair	tokensReceivedCallback	NOTE	Too big function	Refactor it