

# CODE SECURITY ASSESSMENT

ZEROBASE

# **Overview**

## **Project Summary**

• Name: ZeroBase - V2

• Platform: EVM-compatible chains

• Language: Solidity

• Repository:

https://github.com/ZeroBase-Pro/ZKFi

• Audit Range: See Appendix - 1

# **Project Dashboard**

## **Application Summary**

Name	ZeroBase - V2
Version	v2
Туре	Solidity
Dates	Sep 16 2025
Logs	Aug 22 2025; Sep 16 2025

## **Vulnerability Summary**

Total High-Severity issues	0
Total Medium-Severity issues	0
Total Low-Severity issues	3
Total informational issues	2
Total	5

#### **Contact**

E-mail: support@salusec.io



# **Risk Level Description**

High Risk	The issue puts a large number of users' sensitive information at risk, or is reasonably likely to lead to catastrophic impact for clients' reputations or serious financial implications for clients and users.
Medium Risk	The issue puts a subset of users' sensitive information at risk, would be detrimental to the client's reputation if exploited, or is reasonably likely to lead to a moderate financial impact.
Low Risk	The risk is relatively small and could not be exploited on a recurring basis, or is a risk that the client has indicated is low impact in view of the client's business circumstances.
Informational	The issue does not pose an immediate risk, but is relevant to security best practices or defense in depth.



# **Content**

Introduction	4
1.1 About SALUS	4
1.2 Audit Breakdown	4
1.3 Disclaimer	4
Findings	5
2.1 Summary of Findings	5
2.2 Notable Findings	6
1. Centralization risk	6
2. The deprecated admin still retains the pause permission	7
3. Lack of remove supported token function	8
2.3 Informational Findings	9
4. Unnecessary lastRewardUpdateTime update	9
5. Gas optimization suggestions	10
Appendix	11
Appendix 1 - Files in Scope	11



## Introduction

#### 1.1 About SALUS

At Salus Security, we are in the business of trust.

We are dedicated to tackling the toughest security challenges facing the industry today. By building foundational trust in technology and infrastructure through security, we help clients to lead their respective industries and unlock their full Web3 potential.

Our team of security experts employ industry-leading proof-of-concept (PoC) methodology for demonstrating smart contract vulnerabilities, coupled with advanced red teaming capabilities and a stereoscopic vulnerability detection service, to deliver comprehensive security assessments that allow clients to stay ahead of the curve.

In addition to smart contract audits and red teaming, our Rapid Detection Service for smart contracts aims to make security accessible to all. This high calibre, yet cost-efficient, security tool has been designed to support a wide range of business needs including investment due diligence, security and code quality assessments, and code optimisation.

We are reachable on Telegram (https://t.me/salusec), Twitter (https://twitter.com/salus\_sec), or Email (support@salusec.io).

#### 1.2 Audit Breakdown

The objective was to evaluate the repository for security-related issues, code quality, and adherence to specifications and best practices. Possible issues we looked for included (but are not limited to):

- Risky external calls
- Integer overflow/underflow
- Transaction-ordering dependence
- Timestamp dependence
- Access control
- Call stack limits and mishandled exceptions
- Number rounding errors
- Centralization of power
- · Logical oversights and denial of service
- Business logic specification
- Code clones, functionality duplication

#### 1.3 Disclaimer

Note that this security audit is not designed to replace functional tests required before any software release and does not give any warranties on finding all possible security issues with the given smart contract(s) or blockchain software, i.e., the evaluation result does not guarantee the nonexistence of any further findings of security issues.



# **Findings**

# 2.1 Summary of Findings

ID	Title	Severity	Category	Status
1	Centralization risk	Low	Centralization	Acknowledged
2	The deprecated admin still retains the pause permission	Low	Business Logic	Acknowledged
3	Lack of remove supported token function	Low	Business Logic	Acknowledged
4	Unnecessary lastRewardUpdateTime update	Informational	Redundancy	Acknowledged
5	Gas optimization suggestions	Informational	Gas Optimization	Acknowledged



## 2.2 Notable Findings

Significant flaws that impact system confidentiality, integrity, or availability are listed below.

1. Centralization risk	
Severity: Low	Category: Centralization
Target: - V2/src/WithdrawVault.sol - V2/src/Vault.sol	

#### **Description**

In the Vault contract, there exists one privileged role, `DEFAULT\_ADMIN\_ROLE`. The role has the authority to execute some key functions such as `setRewardRate`, `setPenaltyRate` and `setCeffu`, etc.

If the role's private key is compromised, an attacker could trigger these functions to steal remaining funds in the vault.

V2/src/Vault.sol: L714-L720

```
function setCeffu(address _newCeffu) external onlyRole(DEFAULT_ADMIN_ROLE) {
   Utils.CheckIsZeroAddress(_newCeffu);
   require(_newCeffu != ceffu);

   emit UpdateCeffu(ceffu, _newCeffu);
   ceffu = _newCeffu;
}
```

#### Recommendation

We recommend transferring privileged accounts to multi-sig accounts with timelock governors for enhanced security. This ensures that no single person has full control over the accounts and that any changes must be authorized by multiple parties.

#### **Status**



#### 2. The deprecated admin still retains the pause permission

Severity: Low Category: Business Logic

Target:

V2/src/WithdrawVault.sol

#### **Description**

The changeAdmin function updates the contract admin but does not reassign the <code>`PAUSER\_ROLE`</code>. This can leave the previous admin with <code>`pause/unpause`</code> privileges, resulting in inconsistent access control and potential abuse.

V2/src/WithdrawVault.sol: L24-L41, L83-L87

#### Recommendation

Add a revoke for the `PAUSER\_ROLE` in the `changAdmin` function.

#### **Status**



#### 3. Lack of remove supported token function

Severity: Low Category: Business Logic

#### Target:

V2/src/WithdrawVault.sol

V2/src/Vault.sol

#### **Description**

The contract lacks a mechanism to remove supported tokens. Once a token has been added, it cannot be removed from the system even if it has a security vulnerability or needs to be delisted, which increases the overall security risk for the contract.

#### Recommendation

Implement an admin function that allows for the removal or deactivation of tokens.

#### **Status**



## 2.3 Informational Findings

# 4. Unnecessary lastRewardUpdateTime update

Severity: Informational Category: Redundancy

Target:

- V2/src/Vault.sol

#### **Description**

When users want to transfer their shares, we will update both 'from' and 'to' accounts' reward state.

The problem here is that in the function `\_updateRewardState`, we will update this account's lastRewardUpdateTime. But we will update this again in the function `\_assetsInfoUpdate`. This update is redundant.

V2/src/Vault.sol: L592-L615

```
function _assetsInfoUpdate(address token, address from, address to, uint256 amount,
uint256 tokenBefore) internal{
    _updateRewardState(from, token);
    _updateRewardState(to, token);
    ...
    assetsInfoTo.lastRewardUpdateTime = block.timestamp;
}
```

V2/src/Vault.sol: L494-L512

```
function _updateRewardState(address _user, address _token) internal {
    AssetsInfo storage assetsInfo = userAssetsInfo[_user][_token];
    ...
    newAccumulatedRewardForAll = _getClaimableRewards(address(this), _token);
    // This user's rewards will be recorded into the accumulatedReward.
    assetsInfo.accumulatedReward = newAccumulatedReward;
    // update the last reward update time.
    assetsInfo.lastRewardUpdateTime = block.timestamp;
    _lastRewardUpdatedTime[_token] = block.timestamp;
    totalRewardsAmountByToken[_token] = newAccumulatedRewardForAll;
}
```

#### Recommendation

Suggest removing the unnecessary lastRewardUpdateTime update.

#### **Status**



# 5. Gas optimization suggestions Severity: Informational Category: Gas Optimization Target: - V2/src/Vault.sol

#### **Description**

**Finding 1:** The function `transferOrTransferFrom` is declared as `public`, but there is no indication that it needs to be called internally by the contract.

Using `public` instead of `external` introduces unnecessary overhead, since Solidity will copy input arguments into memory. Declaring the function as `external` can save a small amount of gas on external calls.

V2/src/Vault.sol: L548-L569

```
function transferOrTransferFrom(address token, address from, address to, uint256 amount)
public returns (bool) {
    ...
}
```

**Finding 2:** Memory reading saves more gas than storage reading multiple times when the state is not changed. So caching the storage variables in memory and using the memory instead of storage reading is effective. Cache array length outside of the loop can save gas.

V2/src/Vault.sol:L278, L320

```
for(uint256 i = 0; i < pendingClaimQueueIDs.length; i++) {</pre>
```

#### Recommendation

Consider using the above suggestions to save gas.

#### Status



# **Appendix**

# Appendix 1 - Files in Scope

This audit covered the following files in commit <u>3391353</u>:

File	SHA-1 hash
V2/src/IVault.sol	c0805d4be6a97c36cf2cf8ae30462abdd6fa0c7d
V2/src/lzkToken.sol	59f56ae27e26003e909bf8e944375549703ee61a
V2/src/IWithdrawVault.sol	cc903f6d1e58f87a8f358c60bfe79e83abcd419d
V2/src/utils.sol	787b1f5b70928dd2a6767541f6628777c2361b2f
V2/src/Vault.sol	e14530676bb327831d3361611062afcda4b88317
V2/src/WithdrawVault.sol	b0874a98d72ab698177344e2fc6ed28cff60d3d4
V2/src/zkToken.sol	825d0ecd48564f77477d89295c20c7cb9d24d832

