

# Oracle-Supported Dynamic Exploit Generation for Smart Contracts

Haijun Wang<sup>1</sup>, Yi Li<sup>1</sup>, Shang-Wei Lin<sup>1</sup>, Cyrille Artho<sup>2</sup>, Lei Ma<sup>3</sup>, and Yang Liu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

{haijun.wang, yi.li, shang-wei.lin, yangliu}@ntu.edu.sg

<sup>2</sup> KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

artho@kth.se

<sup>3</sup> Kyushu University, Japan

malei@ait.kyushu-u.ac.jp

**Abstract.** Despite the high stakes involved in smart contracts, they are often developed in an undisciplined manner, leaving the security and reliability of blockchain transactions at risk. In this paper, we introduce ContraMaster — an oracle-supported dynamic exploit generation framework for smart contracts. Existing approaches mutate only single transactions; ContraMaster exceeds these by mutating the transaction sequences. ContraMaster uses data-flow, control-flow, and the dynamic contract state to guide its mutations. It then monitors the executions of target contract programs, and validates the results against a general-purpose semantic test oracle to discover vulnerabilities. Being a dynamic technique, it guarantees that each discovered vulnerability is a violation of the test oracle and is able to generate the attack script to exploit this vulnerability. In contrast to rule-based approaches, ContraMaster has not shown any false positives, and it easily generalizes to unknown types of vulnerabilities (e.g., logic errors). We evaluate ContraMaster on 218 vulnerable smart contracts. The experimental results confirm its practical applicability and advantages over the state-of-the-art techniques, and also reveal three new types of attacks.

## 1 Introduction

Smart contracts are computer programs that execute on top of blockchains (e.g., Bitcoin [1] and Ethereum [2]) to manage the flow of funds, exchange of assets, and transfer of digital rights between various parties [3,4]. Transactions within smart contracts are stored persistently in the blockchain and thus immutable, without requiring a central third party to validate them. Due to these unique advantages, smart contracts have gained a lot of popularity and attraction in recent years. Many believe that this technology has the potential to reshape a number of industries, e.g., banking, insurance, supply chains, and financial exchanges [5].

The role of smart contracts in managing shared assets (often cryptographic currencies) requires a high level of security and reliability. Yet, an increasing

number of high-profile attacks have occurred, resulting in great financial losses. Such attacks are facilitated by the lack of a rigorous development and testing process. One notorious example is the “DAO” attack, where attackers stole more than 3.5 million **Ether** (equivalent to about \$45 million *USD* at that time) from “DAO” contract [6].

These incidents have spurred activities in detecting vulnerabilities in smart contracts [6,7,8,9,10,11,12]. Existing techniques usually detect smart contract vulnerabilities based on rule-based approaches: the contract behaviors are matched to a limited set of *vulnerability patterns* identified beforehand. The precision and recall of these techniques largely depend on the size and quality of their collections of vulnerability patterns. Most such patterns are defined at the syntax level such as particular statements/calls sequences, ignoring their actual effects on contracts and resulting in false positives. For example, Zeus [11] treats the `refund` function in DaoChallenge [13] contract (shown in Fig. 11) as vulnerable, because it may potentially be reentered. However, such reentrancy behavior cannot be exploited in stealing **Ether** from it, since the authors have incorporated defensive mechanisms to prevent from transferring unauthorized **Ether** (c.f. Sect. 5.5). Similar problems exist in how ContractFuzzer [8] detects *exception disorder* (more details in Sect. 5.5).

To address above issues, we propose to dynamically execute transactions and observe their actual effects on the contract states in order to detect exploitable vulnerabilities. Our key insight is that almost all the existing (syntactical) vulnerability patterns result in a (semantic) mismatch between the externally visible events (e.g., amount transferred and contract balance changed) and the internal contract states (e.g., amount maintained in the contract’s internal bookkeeping) in a transaction. As a result, the internal bookkeeping becomes inconsistent, indicating a successful exploit. Based on this observation, we define a general-purpose semantic test oracle, which can be used to detect such mismatches at runtime.

Our technique is dynamic and works on target contracts that run on a realistic test environment. Thus, it does not suffer from the imprecision faced by most static techniques. All the vulnerabilities detected by our approach can be successfully reproduced. When generating attack inputs, we take into account the unique characteristics of smart contracts which make traditional fuzzers ineffective. For example, attackers need to synthesize a sequence of transactions to successfully mount an attack (e.g., the transaction sequence “*deposit* → *withdraw*” is required for the DAO attack) [14]. In contrast, traditional fuzzers such as AFL [15] focus on vulnerabilities triggered by a *single* test case. We extend traditional grey-box fuzzers with mutation operators customized for smart contracts, including *transaction sequences*, *gas limits*, *fallback functions*, and *contract states*, apart from *function inputs*. We also develop the novel feedback mechanisms to guide the fuzzing process, by considering the data-flow and dynamic contract state information, together with the control-flow information.

We implemented our approach in ContraMaster and evaluated it on 218 vulnerable smart contracts reported by ContractFuzzer [8] and Zeus [11]. We found that, of these potentially vulnerable contracts, only 28 (12.84%) are

exploitable, and the remaining (87.16%) are not. In addition, ContraMaster detected 26 hitherto unknown vulnerabilities, which could not be detected using previously identified vulnerability patterns.

In this paper, we make the following novel contributions:

- We design a general-purpose semantic oracle, which can be used to detect a wide range of vulnerabilities, such as reentrancy, exception disorder, gasless send and integer overflow/underflow.
- We develop an oracle-supported dynamic exploit generation framework for smart contracts — ContraMaster. Specifically, we design customized mutation operators and feedback mechanisms, which are shown useful at improving the effectiveness of vulnerability detection.
- We evaluate ContraMaster on 218 smart contracts and demonstrate its advantages in discovering *exploitable* vulnerabilities over state-of-the-art techniques. Among the 218 vulnerabilities reported by the state-of-the-art techniques, only 28 are exploitable, and ContraMaster detects all of them without false positives.
- We present our findings on the 26 newly identified vulnerabilities, which cannot be detected by previously identified vulnerability patterns.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Sect. 2 provides the necessary background and definitions for the rest of the paper. Sect. 3 illustrates our semantic test oracle. Sect. 4 introduces the technical details of our oracle-supported fuzzing and automated exploit generation. Sect. 5 discusses challenges for implementing ContraMaster and the evaluation results on real Ethereum smart contracts. Finally, we discuss related work and conclude in Sect. 6 and Sect. 7, respectively.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we provide the necessary background and definitions for the rest of the paper.

### 2.1 Blockchain and Smart Contract

A *blockchain* is a shared, transparent distributed ledger, and is maintained by a decentralized network of peers (miners) [16]. The miners perform the mining process of adding a block and verifying the validity of transactions through a *proof-of-work* (PoW) [17] or other consensus protocols, such as *proof-of-stake* (PoS) [18]. Thus, a blockchain can be considered as an ever-growing list of blocks, each encoding a sequence of transactions, always available for inspection and safe from tampering. Each block contains a cryptographic signature of its previous block. No previous block can be changed or rejected, unless 51% of miners are controlled and all its successors are changed or rejected. With this structure, blockchain achieves decentralization, traceability, transparency, and immutability.




Fig. 1. Illustration of Ethereum smart contracts running on blockchains.

A *smart contract* is computer program which allows users to define and execute transactions automatically on the blockchain [19]. A smart contract resides at a specific address on the blockchain, providing a number of publicly accessible functions and fields. Moreover, a special *balance* variable records the cryptocurrencies owned by the contract address and cannot be freely altered by programmers. When a function of the smart contract is invoked, the current state of the contract is retrieved from the blockchain, and the updated state of the contract is stored back on the blockchain after execution.

A transaction is carried out in the form of a message sent to a particular address on the blockchain, which can either be a normal user account address or a contract address. A user sends transactions to the blockchain in order to: (1) create new contracts, (2) invoke a function of a contract, or (3) transfer cryptocurrencies to contracts or other users. All the transactions sent by participants, called *external transactions*, are recorded on the blockchain. Upon receiving an external transaction, a contract can also trigger some internal transactions, which are not explicitly recorded on the blockchain, but still have effects on the balance of participants or contracts.

The Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM) [2] is a stack-machine with an instruction set including standard arithmetic instructions, conditional and unconditional jump instructions, basic cryptography primitives, and primitives for gas computation. The data is stored on the persistent memory area storage (a key-value store that maps 256-bit words to 256-bit words), the contract-local memory (a contract obtains a freshly cleared instance for each message call), or a stack (since the EVM is not a register machine but a stack machine, all computations are performed on the stack). When Ethereum smart contracts are compiled and deployed, they are run on the EVM.

Fig. 1 is a schematic representation of the Ethereum smart contracts running on blockchains. When participants submit a transaction to the blockchain, they may be mined by a *miner*  $m$  and executed on  $m$ 's EVM. When the transaction is finished, the execution result is appended to the block list and propagated over the blockchain network. At this point, other miners, such as  $m + 1$  may discover the new block list and validate it. When majority of the miners validate the new block list, it becomes the confirmed block list, and cannot be changed or rejected.

## 2.2 A Customized Semantic Model

Smart contracts are similar to general computer programs in the sense that they are written in a Turing-complete language, e. g., Solidity [20]. Various formal semantic models of Solidity have been proposed in previous work [11,21], to enable formal verification of smart contracts. Since our goal in this paper is to perform dynamic analysis for Solidity contracts and verify runtime contract states against our test oracle, we propose a customized semantic model that is simple but expressive enough to capture the *transaction-related* contract behaviors. We define *contract state* and *transaction* as follows.

**Definition 1 (Contract and Contract State).** *A contract can be abstracted as a tuple  $C := \langle c, bal, A, \sigma \rangle$ , where  $c \in Addr$  is a unique address identifying the contract,  $bal \in \mathbb{N}$  is the externally visible balance of the contract,  $A \in 2^{Addr}$  is a set of account addresses of participants, and  $\sigma$  is the internal contract state. A contract state  $\sigma$  is a type-consistent valuation of the global variables ( $V$ ).*

The set of all states is denoted by  $\Sigma \cup \{Err\}$ , where *Err* is a special state indicating an *error state*. For a given state  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and an expression  $e$ ,  $e_\sigma$  denotes the evaluation of  $e$  in that state. The semantics of a contract program is a set of *execution traces*, where a trace corresponds to a sequence of internal contract states. In Ethereum, each contract also has an externally-visible *contract balance* ( $bal$ ) representing the total amount of funds in the contract, which is a part of the *blockchain state* (as opposed to the contract state).

**Definition 2 (Transaction).** *A transaction  $t := \langle s, r, v \rangle$ , if performed successfully, deducts amount  $v$  from the sending account's balance ( $s.bal$  where  $s \in Addr$ ) and transfers the funds to a receiving account at address  $r \in Addr$ . We denote the values of a variable  $g$  before and after the transaction as  $pre(g)$  and  $post(g)$ , respectively.*

A transaction usually alters the blockchain state, reflected as updates on the contract balance. In this case, the caller and callee contracts of a transaction correspond to the sending and receiving accounts, respectively.

## 2.3 Threat Model

To study the potential vulnerabilities of smart contracts, an important guarantee of a securely implemented contract is that it only allows *authorized* accounts to

transfer the *authorized* amount of **Ether** [22]. For example, the DAO contract, if implemented correctly, should only allow users to withdraw the amount of **Ether** have been deposited previously. We assume that a regular user with no special capabilities attempts to break through this guarantee. A smart contract is *vulnerable*, if adversaries can bypass authorization and steal more **Ether** from the contract than allowed, resulting in a loss for contract owner, or victims store **Ether** in the contract but receive a lower level of authorization than intended, resulting in a loss for the participants [22].

In this paper, we consider smart contracts which use internal bookkeeping variables to honestly record the authorized amount for authorized participants. This is common practice for contracts which manage shared funds. For example, in the standard Ethereum contracts such as ERC-20 [23] and ERC-721 [24], the function `balanceOf` returns the authorized amount for an authorized participant.

### 3 Semantic Test Oracle

The fundamental difficulty in detecting smart contract vulnerabilities is the lack of a general-purpose test oracle. This is because smart contracts do not crash like general computer programs, and their execution may be silently reverted in cases of irregularities. To address this issue, we propose a test oracle which detects irregularities in smart contracts at the semantic-level. Our semantic test oracle implements two types of invariants that transactions must comply with.

#### 3.1 Balance and Transaction Invariants

Smart contracts are mainly used to manage the transfer of assets and perform bookkeeping [25], thus they need to keep track of participants' individual account balances, called the *bookkeeping balances*. Contract programs use an internal *bookkeeping variable* (e. g., `balances` in Fig. 2) to record the bookkeeping balances. Suppose a bookkeeping variable  $m : Addr \mapsto \mathbb{N}$  is given.

**Definition 3 (Balance Invariant).** *For every contract  $\langle c, bal, A, \sigma \rangle$ ,  $\sum_{a \in A} m_\sigma(a) - bal = K$ , where  $K$  is a constant.*

The *balance invariant* requires that the difference between the contract balance and the sum of all participants' bookkeeping balances remains constant, before and after a transaction. This invariant is defined within a single contract, i. e., *intra-contract*, and it ensures the integrity of the bookkeeping balances. If the bookkeeping balances are not updated correctly within a transaction, then the violation of this invariant indicates that an irregular event has happened. For example, when an integer underflow happens during a transaction, the contract balance naturally goes down while the bookkeeping balances go up instead.

**Definition 4 (Transaction Invariant).** *For every outgoing transaction  $\langle c, r, v \rangle$  where  $c$  is the sending contract's address,  $\Delta(m_\sigma(r)) + \Delta(r.bal) = 0$ , where  $\Delta(x) = \text{post}(x) - \text{pre}(x)$ .*

The *transaction invariant* requires that the amount deducted from a contract’s bookkeeping balances is always deposited into the recipient’s balance. This *inter-contract* invariant ensures the consistency between the both ends of a transaction. Note that the consistency of incoming transactions can be guaranteed by the balance invariant or other contract’s outgoing transaction invariant. In some cases, a transaction in progress may fail and funds are not transferred. If the failure is not captured by the contract’s bookkeeping variables, the contract may become vulnerable (e. g., exception disorder).

### 3.2 Runtime Invariant Checking

Since the invariants are supposed to hold for each transaction among contracts involved, the test oracle can be implemented as a set of runtime checks before and after each transaction. Notice that the runtime checks mentioned here are on the transaction-level, in which multiple contracts are involved. Thus, adding assertions in contracts does not work since assertions in each contract cannot express inter-contract properties. The biggest challenge of implementing such runtime checks is to automatically identify the bookkeeping variables.

**Identification of Bookkeeping Variables.** Most contracts performing meaningful transactions among multiple participants contain a bookkeeping variable, usually with the name `balances` or `balanceOf`. The bookkeeping variable has a few characteristics distinguishing it from the others: (1) it is a mapping from account addresses to unsigned integers, i.e., `mapping(address => uint*)` (there are a few exceptions which are explained in Sect. 5); (2) it is at least updated once in a `payable` function; and (3) in a normal transaction, the amount received from an account address should be reflected as a balance increase for that address.

Based on these observations, we design an algorithm for the automatic identification of bookkeeping variables. For every mapping variable updated in `payable` functions, we send several transactions with randomly chosen values (including extremely large and small amounts). We then observe the increased amount at the sender’s address. If the increases always match with the amounts being sent, we record the variable as a bookkeeping variable.

The bookkeeping variables in some contracts may not refer to the amount of `Ether`. This is often the case in ERC-20 and ERC-721 contracts [23]. In these contracts, participants’ digital assets are reflected in terms of the number of available *tokens* rather than `Ether`. In such cases, standard APIs for getting individual account balances (`balanceOf`) and total contract balances (`totalSupply`) in terms of tokens are provided and can be directly used to implement the runtime checks.

### 3.3 Detecting Vulnerabilities with the Test Oracle

Now we discuss how previously reported vulnerabilities [7,10,26,16] can be detected by our test oracle [27].

```

1 contract SimpleDAO {
2   mapping (address => uint) public balances;
3   function donate(address to) {
4     balances[to] += msg.value;
5   }
6   function withdraw(uint amount) {
7     require(balances[msg.sender] >= amount);
8     msg.sender.call.value(amount)(); //Exception Disorder
9     balances[msg.sender] -= amount;
10  }
11  function another_withdraw(uint amount) {
12    require(balances[msg.sender] >= amount);
13    msg.sender.send(amount)(); //Gasless Send
14    balances[msg.sender] -= amount;
15  }
16 }

```

**Fig. 2.** A simple contract susceptible to the “DAO” attack.

```

1 contract attackDAO {
2   SimpleDAO public dao;
3   constructor(address _dao){
4     dao = SimpleDAO(_dao);
5   }
6   function donate(address to){
7     dao.donate.value(msg.value)(to);
8   }
9   function withdraw(uint amount){
10    dao.withdraw(amount);
11  }
12  .....
13  function () public payable {
14    dao.withdraw(...); //Reentrancy
15  }
16 }

```

**Fig. 3.** Reentrancy attack on the simple “DAO” contract.

**Reentrancy.** Programmers often believe that, when a non-recursive function is invoked, it cannot be re-entered before its termination. However, this is not always the case, due to the fallback function introduced by Solidity. Take the simplified “DAO” attack for example. Two contracts, `SimpleDAO` (the victim, in Fig. 2) and `attackDAO` (in Fig. 3), are deployed on the blockchain. The reentrancy vulnerability of `SimpleDAO` can be exploited by `attackDAO`. When `attackDAO` withdraws from `SimpleDAO` via Line 10 of Fig. 3, it will execute Lines 7–8 of Fig. 2. Then, due to fallback function mechanism, Line 8 of Fig. 2 executes Line 14 of Fig. 3, which further executes Lines 7–8 of Fig. 2 again and thus generate recursive calls. Notice that, the execution of Line 9 of Fig. 2 is delayed.

The consequence of reentrancy is that Line 9 of Fig. 2 may be executed more times than allowed, and it leads to the integer underflow of bookkeeping variable `balances`. The underflow will produce the incorrect values for `balances`, which violates the balance invariant (Definition 3).



```

1 contract another_attackDAO {
2     .....
3     function () public payable {
4         throw; //No reentrancy
5     }
6 }

```

Fig. 4. Exception disorder example.

```

1 contract UnderflowAttack {
2     ...
3     function withdraw(uint amount) public {
4         require(balances[msg.sender] - amount > 0);
5         msg.sender.transfer(amount);
6         balances[msg.sender] -= amount; //Underflow
7     }
8     ...
9 }

```

Fig. 5. The underflow attack example [28].

**Exception Disorder.** Solidity is not uniform in handling exceptions. Within a chain of nested calls, there are two types of exception handling mechanisms [26]: (1) If a function in the chain is a `call` (the same for `delegatecall` and `send`), the exception is propagated along the chain, reverting all side effects, until it reaches the `call`. From that point on, the execution is resumed with the `call` returning `false`. (2) If all the functions in the chain are direct calls (not via `call`, `delegatecall` and `send`), the execution stops and all side effects are reverted, including the transfers of `Ether`.

Developers may handle exceptions incorrectly. For example, Line 8 of Fig. 2 tries to transfer `Ether` to account `msg.sender`. If this account is a contract, this transfer may fail, resulting in an exception. Since this exception is not properly handled, the balance of this account (`balances[msg.sender]`) is decreased but it does not actually receive `Ether`. Thus, this transaction will violate the transaction invariant (Definition 4).

**Gasless Send.** *Gasless send* is a special case of exception disorder. When transferring `Ether` from one contract to another with function `send`, it may lead to an out-of-gas exception. The default gas limit for function `send` is 2,300 `Wei`. If the recipient’s fallback function contains too many instructions, it may lead to an out-of-gas exception for function `send`, resulting in a *gasless send*. For example, at Line 13 of Fig. 2 the attacker (whose address is `msg.sender`) may have an expensive fallback function and the `send` function may fail. Since *gasless send* is a special case of exception disorder, it can also be detected by the transaction invariant (Definition 4).

**Integer Over/Under-flow.** Smart contracts heavily use integer arithmetic operations to manipulate participants’ balances. However, these variables are




Fig. 6. Overview of the ContraMaster.

susceptible to integer over/under-flow, e.g., in Fig. 5, `balances[msg.sender]` and `amount` are both unsigned integers. If `balances[msg.sender]` is less than `amount`, the check at Line 4 will pass due to integer underflow, leading to another underflow at Line 6. This produces the wrong value for the bookkeeping variable, which violates the balance invariant (Definition 3).

**Other Vulnerabilities.** There are a few other types of vulnerabilities, including the *timestamp dependency*, *block number dependency* and *freezing ether* [26]. Exploiting vulnerabilities such as timestamp and block number dependencies requires the cooperation of miners, therefore cannot be easily realized at the contract-level. In model checking [29] terms, freezing ether is an violation of the *liveness property*, while our dynamic approach can only detect violations of *safety properties*. ContraMaster mainly focuses on detecting reentrancy, exception disorder, gasless send, integer over/under-flow, and potentially other types of vulnerabilities triggered during transactions.

## 4 Oracle-Supported Fuzzing

Fig. 6 shows the overview of ContraMaster, which is driven by a grey-box fuzzing loop [15,30]. Given a set of initial seeds, ContraMaster randomly synthesizes a set of transaction sequences and picks one from the pool in each iteration of the fuzzing loop. ContraMaster runs each transaction in sequence on an instrumented EVM. When the transaction is finished, ContraMaster verifies the contract state against our *semantic test oracle* (details in Sect. 3). If a violation is detected,

ContraMaster reports a vulnerability and presents the generated attack contract and transaction sequence which can be used to reproduce the exploit. Otherwise, ContraMaster collects runtime execution information to guide the test sequence generation for the next iteration. The information collected mainly includes control-, data-flow graph and contract state information.

Furthermore, ContraMaster is equipped with a number of new mutation operators customized for smart contracts (c.f. Sect. 4.1). In addition to *function inputs* used in traditional fuzzers, we also use *gas limits*, *fallback functions*, *transaction sequences* and *contract states* as the mutation targets. Many vulnerabilities in smart contracts require the interplay of several contracts and can only be exploited by a particular transaction sequence with the correct gas limit [31]. Therefore, the customized mutation operators are important for triggering vulnerabilities. The newly generated inputs are added to the pool and the fuzzing process continues until it exceeds the allocated resource limits.

#### 4.1 Oracle-Supported Fuzzing Algorithm

The goal of the fuzzing component is to automatically generate transaction sequences that violate the test oracle. Algorithm 1 presents its high-level idea. Given a contract program  $C$  and a set of initial seeds  $T$ , it first generates a set of initial transaction sequences  $TS$  from  $T$  (Line 1). In every iteration of the fuzzing loop (Lines 2–22), we select a transaction sequence  $ts$  from  $TS$  (Line 3), and initializes the current execution trace sequence ( $E$ ) and contract state dictionary ( $dict$ ) as *empty* (Line 4). ContraMaster then executes each transaction  $t_i \in ts$  (Lines 5–10), and collects its execution trace  $e_i$  (Line 6). It would also stores observed contract states (e.g., the values of bookkeeping variables and contract balances) into dictionary (Line 7), similar to what is done in traditional fuzzers such as VUzzer [32]. The dictionary values are later used in generating function inputs. The execution trace of each transaction  $e_i$  is concatenated to form a transaction sequence trace  $E$  (Line 8). After that, ContraMaster checks whether the test oracle is violated. If so, it adds the current transaction sequence  $ts$  into the output  $TS'$ , which is a script exploiting the vulnerability (Line 10).

ContraMaster performs mutations at both the level of single transaction (Lines 11–18), and at the level of transaction sequences (Lines 19–22). If  $t_i$  achieves new branch coverage, we perform mutations on the function inputs and gas limit (Lines 13–14). When fallback function is called in the transaction, we also perform mutations on fallback functions at Line 17. If the transaction sequence’s trace  $E$  has new data dependence coverage, we perform transaction sequence mutation (e.g., switching the order of transactions) at Line 20. In the end, we randomly reset the whole smart contract states by contract state mutation at Line 22. More details about each mutation strategy are given in Sect. 4.2.

The highlighted code in Algorithm 1 shows the differences of ContraMaster from traditional grey-box fuzzing approaches such as AFL [15]. To summarize, traditional fuzzing techniques work on a single call, while ContraMaster works on a transaction sequence. The reason is that a lot of vulnerabilities can only be

**Algorithm 1:** Oracle-Supported Fuzzing

---

```

input : a contract program  $C$ , a set of initial seeds  $T$ 
output: transaction sequences  $TS'$  violating the test oracle

1  $TS \leftarrow$  generate initial transaction sequences from  $T$ ;
2 while time budget not reached and abort signal not received do
3    $ts \leftarrow$  selectNext( $TS$ );
4    $E, dict \leftarrow \emptyset, \emptyset$ ;
5   foreach transaction  $t_i$  in  $ts$  do
6     run  $t_i$  and collect execution trace  $e_i$  on EVM;
7      $dict \leftarrow$  extractValues( $e_i$ ) (store dictionary values);
8      $E \leftarrow E, e_i$  (append  $e_i$  to  $E$ );
9     if test oracle is violated then
10       $TS' \leftarrow TS' \cup ts$ ;
11   foreach transaction  $t_i$  in  $ts$  do
12     if  $t_i$  has new branch coverage in  $e_i$  then
13        $TS_i \leftarrow$  InputMutate( $t_i, dict$ );
14        $TS_g \leftarrow$  GasMutate( $t_i$ );
15        $TS \leftarrow TS \cup TS_i \cup TS_g$ ;
16     if  $t_i$  executes fallback function then
17        $TS_f \leftarrow$  FallbackMutate( $t_i$ );
18        $TS \leftarrow TS \cup TS_f$ ;
19   if  $E$  has new data dependence coverage then
20      $TS_t \leftarrow$  TransSequenceMutate( $ts, E, dict$ );
21      $TS \leftarrow TS \cup TS_t$ ;
22   ContractStateMutate();

```

---

triggered by a sequence of transactions. To effectively generate such sequences, we use data-flow information to guide its mutation, which cannot be achieved by control-flow information. Another important difference is that ContraMaster performs mutations on fallback functions, through which the attack contracts may interact with the target contract.

## 4.2 Mutation Strategies

In this section, we present our five mutation strategies, namely, the mutation of *function inputs*, *gas limit*, *fallback function*, *transaction sequence*, and *contract state*.

**Attack Contract.** ContraMaster uses the attack contracts to interact with target contract, thus we first automatically generate the attack contract, like in the example shown in Fig. 3. To synthesize the attack contracts, we use a variable to represent the target contract and initialize it in the constructor function

(lines 2–5). Then, for each function in target contract, ContraMaster develops a surrogate function to call this function, as shown in lines 5–11 in Fig. 3. Finally, we synthesize the fallback function as shown in lines 12–14.

**Function Inputs.** Line 13 of Algorithm 1 mutates the parameters passed to each target function. We consider two types of function parameters: primitive and array types.

Primitive-type parameters include Booleans (`bool`), account addresses, unsigned integers (`uint*`), integers (`int*`), and arbitrary-length raw byte data (`byte*`). First, we pick special values from the dynamic dictionary of previously seen state variable values with matching types to generate multiple *mutation ranges*. Within these ranges, we randomly generate values as candidate function inputs. Second, we opportunistically negate bits in these inputs to produce new inputs (similar to the “flip1” operation used in AFL [15]). For account addresses, we simply enumerate addresses from a predefined account list. In most cases, the collected dynamic dictionary and “flip1” are enough for generating effective inputs, since most smart contracts have relatively simple program logic.

For array types, we consider both fixed- and arbitrary-length arrays. For fixed-length arrays of primitive-type elements (e.g., `address[n]` and `uint*[n]`), we use the same technique described above to generate random values for each element. For an arbitrary-length array, we first generate a positive random number as the array length, and then proceed as dealing with a fixed-length array. For arbitrary-length bytes or strings, we use values from the dictionary and mutate them with bit flips.

**Gas Limit.** Every instruction executed on EVM has an associated fee, known as the *gas*. If the gas cost of a transaction exceeds the *gas limit*, an out-of-gas exception is thrown. To simulate all possible behaviors with the exceptions thrown in the middle of a transaction, we mutate on the gas limits at Line 14 of Algorithm 1. First, we estimate the maximum gas cost  $G_t$  and the intrinsic gas cost  $G_i$  [33] (consisting of a constant transaction fee and a data-dependent fee) for a target transaction. Then, we divide the range between  $G_i$  and  $G_t$  into  $n$  equal intervals and randomly choose a gas limit from each interval to initiate the transaction with.

**Fallback Function.** The fallback function is an important mechanism in Ethereum and is highly relevant to the reentrancy and exception disorder vulnerabilities. When receiving funds from the target contract under test, the attacker’s contract may use specially crafted fallback function to perform malicious activities. To trigger these behaviors, ContraMaster performs mutations on the fallback function at Line 17 of Algorithm 1.

We generate multiple attack contracts with different fallback functions to interact with the target contract, such as in Figs. 3 and 4. In particular, we allow any function of the target contract to be called within the attacker’s fallback function. Apart from that, we also have an empty fallback function and one that contains a single `throw` statement (e.g., `revert()`) to trigger exception disorders.

**Transaction Sequence.** Some vulnerabilities can only be triggered with the correct transaction sequences. For example, the DAO attack can only be mounted by first depositing into the target contract and then withdrawing from it. To find a successful exploit, we mutate the call sequences as follows. For a given candidate transaction sequence, (1) if two transactions of a sequence operate on the same contract state variable, we switch their order; (2) we randomly select a transaction in the sequence, and replace it with a random new transaction; (3) we randomly select a transaction in the sequence, and delete it; (4) we randomly select a transaction in the sequence, and insert a random new transaction before it.

**Contract State.** The effects of a transaction depend on the contract state in which it is initiated. To mutate contract states, we allow the values of state variables to be carried forward across multiple test runs and reset the state periodically, say, after every  $n$  transactions. The reset of contract state is achieved by redeploying the contract code to the private test network.

### 4.3 Feedback Mechanisms

The feedback used by ContraMaster can be broadly categorized into the *control-driven* and *data-driven*, and *contract state* feedback information. The control-driven feedback mechanism strives to cover more CFG edges as with AFL [15], by favoring uncovered CFG edges.

**Data-Driven Feedback.** Since smart contract is state-relevant, we should synthesize a suitable transaction sequence to detect the vulnerabilities. However, the transaction sequence cannot be guided by the control-flow information, as a different transaction sequence does not necessarily cover new CFG edges. Thus, we propose to use data flow to guide transaction sequence mutations. If the mutated transaction sequence covers new data dependencies, it is an interesting transaction sequence. We first define the data dependency as follows.

**Definition 5 (Data Dependency [34,35]).** *There is a data dependency from  $y$  to  $x$  if there exists a directed path  $p$  from  $x$  to  $y$  where  $x$  defines a variable  $v \in V$ ,  $y$  uses  $v$  and there is no node  $z \in p$  that redefines  $v$ .*

In the execution of transaction sequence, if two transactions operate on the same contract state variable, we switch their order to generate new transaction sequence. For example, the transaction sequence “*withdraw*  $\rightarrow$  *deposit*” both operate on the bookkeeping variable *balances*, thus we switch their order to generate a new transaction sequence “*deposit*  $\rightarrow$  *withdraw*”, which may trigger the reentrancy vulnerability.

**Contract State Feedback.** Apart from the data dependency, we also use the contract states (Definition 1) to guide the function input generation. The basic idea is that, in most cases, the execution of current transaction heavily depends on the contracts’ states. For example, the sequence “*deposit*  $\rightarrow$  *withdraw*” may trigger the reentrancy, but it depends on whether the funds deposited is

greater than the funds withdrawn. Thus, we use contract states to guide function input generation, such that the less funds withdrawn than those deposited. to subsequently trigger potential vulnerabilities. In fact, we extract the dynamic contract states as a dynamic dictionary, which is similar to VUzzer [32]. However, the latter uses the `immediate` values in the code as the static dictionary.

#### 4.4 ContraMaster by Example

Take the DAO contract in Fig. 2 as an example. Based on the initial seeds  $\{withdraw(10), deposit.value(5)(*)\}$ , ContraMaster randomly synthesizes a transaction sequence, “ $ts_1 = withdraw(10) \rightarrow deposit.value(5)(*)$ ”. After  $ts_1$  is executed, we identify a data dependency between `withdraw` and `deposit` over the state variable `balances` by analyzing the data flow of the execution trace. Using this as feedback, we mutate  $ts_1$  and generate “ $ts_2 = deposit.value(5)(*) \rightarrow withdraw(10)$ ”. In  $ts_2$ ’s execution, we assume it does not produce the reentrancy, because the value withdrawn is greater than deposited. In addition, ContraMaster extracts the contract states as the dynamic dictionary, e.g., the amount deposited into `balances` is 5. Next, ContraMaster randomly generates three group of inputs ( $\leq 5$ , 5, and  $\geq 5$ ) as the parameters of `withdraw`, e.g., we get “ $ts_3 = deposit.value(5)(*) \rightarrow withdraw(3)$ ”. At present, we still assume the reentrancy does not happen, because the attack contract may not contain the right fallback function, e.g., `another_attackDAO` in Fig. 4. Since ContraMaster also performs mutation on fallback functions, and thus may generate new fallback functions, as `attackDAO` in Fig. 3. Finally, we have `attackDAO` in Fig. 3, as attack contract, and execute “ $deposit.value(5)(*) \rightarrow withdraw(3)$ ”, which triggers reentrancy.

When reentrancy occurs, `Ether` would be transferred to the attacker’s account via the `withdraw` function. At last, the update of `balances` at Line 9 would produce the underflow of balances. Since the value of bookkeeping variable `balances` is wrong, and thus the balance invariant (Definition 3) is violated.

## 5 Implementation and Evaluation

In this section, we discuss the implementation of ContraMaster and evaluate it on a set of benchmarks.

### 5.1 Implementation

We use go-ethereum 1.8.20 to build a private Ethereum blockchain as the test network, and Truffle Suite 4.1.14 as the test harness. ContraMaster consists of a front-end, which generates inputs and triggers transactions, and a back-end, which executes the smart contracts and validates its behavior.

The front-end triggers transactions and performs mutations based on feedback from earlier test runs. In the back-end, the stock EVM is modified to monitor the runtime execution: the test oracle is enforced by asserting invariants after each transaction is finished. If an invariant violation happens, the test sequence

is reported as an exploit. Otherwise, it performs data-flow, control-flow, and contract-state analysis to provide feedback to the front-end, which continues to generate new test inputs. In total, ContraMaster is implemented with more than 5,000 lines of Javascript, Python and Go languages.

## 5.2 Evaluation

Our empirical evaluation of ContraMaster tries to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How does ContraMaster perform compared to the state-of-the-art pattern-based approaches?
- **RQ2:** How effective is the feedback-guided test generation in speeding up the exploit generation?
- **RQ3:** Can ContraMaster discover previously unknown vulnerabilities?

**Setup.** All our experiments were performed on a 64-bit Ubuntu 18.04 desktop with an Intel Xeon CPU E5-1650 (3.60 GHz, 12 cores) and 16 GB of RAM. Since we focus on smart contract vulnerabilities, not the consensus protocol, we configure only one peer node for the mining process. We set the initial mining difficulty of the genesis block to 1 so that transaction confirmation is fast. We also assume that each participant owns as much **Ether** as the total **Ether** supply at the time of writing (currently about  $10^8$  **Ether**).

**Subjects.** To evaluate our approach, we selected the experimental subjects as follows. We compared ContraMaster with ContractFuzzer [8], which is currently the only other dynamic fuzzing tool, and the static verification tool Zeus [11]. These two tools reflect the state of the art in dynamic and static smart-contract analysis, and use properties that are stronger than our test oracle. Thus, we use the reported vulnerabilities as our experimental subjects (except *timestamp dependency*, *block number dependency*, and *dangerous delegatecall*, which cannot be easily exploited).

First, we included all the 188 contracts reported as vulnerable by ContractFuzzer into our benchmark. Since ContractFuzzer does not analyze integer overflow/underflow [8], we augment the set of benchmarks with 30 contracts containing overflow/underflow vulnerabilities. These 30 contracts were randomly selected from a set of 1,095 smart contracts that reported by Zeus [11] to have this vulnerability. In total, we selected 218 smart contracts for our experiments, among which there are only 33 (15%) contracts whose bookkeeping variables cannot be automatically identified. We have manually investigated these contracts and found that they use complicated data structures such as structures or user-defined types to record the bookkeeping. Our simple heuristic is able to automatically identify bookkeeping variables for 85% of the contracts.

## 5.3 Comparison with the State-of-the-Art

RQ 1 and RQ 3 relate to the effectiveness of ContraMaster. To evaluate this, we compared ContraMaster with ContractFuzzer and Zeus. Table 1 shows the



**Table 1.** Vulnerabilities reported by ContractFuzzer, Zeus and ContraMaster.

Vulnerability Types	Pattern-based Detection			ContraMaster
	#Vul	#Exp	(%)	
Reentrancy	14	6	42.86 %	6
Exception Disorder	36	13	36.11 %	13
Gasless Send	138	6	4.34 %	6
Integer Over/Under-flow	30	3	10.00 %	3
New Vulnerabilities	—	—	—	26
Total/Avg.	218	28	12.84 %	54

vulnerability type, the number of reported vulnerabilities, the number of actually exploitable vulnerabilities, and the percentage of exploitable vulnerabilities over the vulnerabilities reported by the state of the art. The last column lists the exploitable vulnerabilities reported by ContraMaster. Row “*New Vulnerabilities*” shows the new vulnerabilities ContraMaster found; these are different from the vulnerability types covered by the state-of-the-art ContractFuzzer and Zeus.

ContractFuzzer reports 14 reentrancy vulnerabilities. Out of these, only 6 contracts were reported exploitable by ContraMaster. For the 8 smart contracts not reported by ContraMaster, we manually checked the contract code and confirmed that they are non-exploitable. Our investigation showed that ContractFuzzer over-reports reentrancy vulnerabilities (around 42.86 % exploitable) because its oracle is defined at the syntactic level.

For the exception disorder, ContractFuzzer reported 36 vulnerabilities, while ContraMaster only reported 13. ContractFuzzer only considers a transaction being safe if the exceptional case is followed by a `throw` statement. However, an exception can be handled by multiple ways, e. g., reverting the modified variables, in which the exception would not lead to an exploitable vulnerability.

ContractFuzzer also reports 138 gasless send vulnerabilities. However, the gasless send vulnerabilities are not exploitable if the `transfer()` function is used to send `Ether`, because the `transfer()` function automatically reverts the program state if there is not enough gas. These cases were reported by ContractFuzzer as vulnerable. Out of the 138 gasless send vulnerabilities, only 6 were reported exploitable by ContraMaster (4.34 %).

Integer overflow/underflows constitute another important issue in smart contracts. Zeus detects integer overflow/underflow based on the predefined syntactic patterns [36]. However, whether these really happen depends on the execution environment and program contexts. In the 30 sampled integer overflow/underflow vulnerabilities, only 3 were reported exploitable by ContraMaster (10.00 %).

**Summary.** In the 218 detected vulnerabilities by ContractFuzzer and Zeus, only 28 vulnerabilities were reported exploitable by ContraMaster (12.84%). For the non-exploitable vulnerabilities, we manually checked and confirmed that they are indeed not exploitable. Furthermore, ContraMaster finds 26 new vulnerabilities, which are different from the vulnerability types in ContractFuzzer and Zeus.

From the above experiments, we observe that ContraMaster only reports exploitable vulnerabilities because its oracle is defined at the semantic level. In addition to that, ContraMaster is able to discover previously unknown vulnerabilities. Two of the authors have independently verified the results by replaying the exploit scripts manually. The authors of ContractFuzzer also confirmed our findings. Later, in Section ??, we explain why some vulnerabilities reported by ContractFuzzer and Zeus are not exploitable, and illustrate the new attacks.

#### 5.4 Evaluation of Effectiveness

RQ 2 questions the effectiveness of feedback in fuzzing. To answer this question, we implemented a variant of ContraMaster (called ContraAFL), which only uses the control-flow information to guide the fuzzing process, similar to AFL. Then, we performed the experiments on the 23 exploitable examples (5 exploitable vulnerabilities are repetitive in *exception disorder* and *gasless send*) by repeating each experiment 8 times, and the compared the performance of ContraMaster and ContraAFL. We set a timeout of 600 seconds for each benchmark program, in which ContraMaster can successfully finish all experiments.

Fig. 7 shows the comparison results, where the  $x$  and  $y$  axes show the time taken by ContraMaster and ContraAFL, respectively. ContraMaster performs better than ContraAFL for points above the diagonal line, which was observed for all examples we ran. From the results, we can see that ContraMaster is highly efficient, compared with ContraAFL, in recognizing exploitable vulnerabilities. Specially, 3 exploitable vulnerabilities cannot be found by ContraAFL in the given timeout (points lying on the top  $x$ -axis) in their all experiments.

Furthermore, a manual investigation revealed that the test sequences generated by ContraAFL are mostly meaningless. For example, ContraAFL often chooses amounts of **Ether** to send that are larger than the amount it owns. Thus, the transaction would be reverted, resulting in no actual effect on the smart contracts. On the other hand, ContraMaster is guided by feedback and gradually generates meaningful transactions.

**Mann Whitney U-test Scoring.** Following Klees et al.’s [37] recommendation, we apply the *Mann Whitney U-test* on the time used to find the vulnerabilities. As shown in Tab. 2, in most experiments, the p-values are smaller than or close to a significance level of 0.05. Thus, we conclude there exists a statistically significant difference in the time used to find the vulnerabilities, compared to ContraAFL.

**Vargha and Delaney  $\hat{A}_{12}$  Scoring.** To determine the extent to which ContraMaster outperforms ContraAFL, we also use Vargha and Delaney’s  $\hat{A}_{12}$  statistical test [37]. From Tab. 2, we can see among benchmark experiments the resulting  $\hat{A}_{12}$  statistic exceeds the conventionally large effect size of 0.71 in 18 out of 23 cases (78.3%). Therefore, we conclude that the time usage in ContraMaster to find vulnerabilities is statistically different from that in ContraAFL.




Fig. 7. Time taken by ContraMaster and ContraAFL.

## 5.5 Case Studies

In this section, we report on interesting findings from our case studies. Sect. 5.5 introduces some new attacks found by ContraMaster in the experiments, and Sect. 5.5 investigates on some non-exploitable vulnerabilities reported by ContractFuzzer [8], Zeus [11], and Oyente [9].

**New Attack Surfaces** There are three different types of new attacks found by ContraMaster in 26 smart contracts.

**Incorrect Access Control.** Access control is important in smart contracts, which allows critical operations to be performed only by the owner of the contract. Access control-related issues are ranked the second most severe among all vulnerability types [38]. It is very hard to define a pattern/property to capture all incorrect access controls, unlike for other vulnerabilities, e.g., reentrancy. However, when incorrect access control is exploited, our approach is able to detect it based on its detrimental effects.

A code snippet from the smart contract `CreditDepositBank` (in Fig. 8) is vulnerable and was detected by our approach. The contract `CreditDepositBank` has a public function `takeOver()`, which can transfer ownership to the sender of the message. A sender who acquires the ownership can then call the `withdraw()` function to withdraw `Ether` of any other participant. Furthermore, the book-keeping variable “`balances`” is not updated after the “`send`” (Line 10), thus violating the balance invariant.

**Table 2.** Statistical results for feedback-directed fuzzing.

Contracts	ContraMaster (s)		ContraAFL (s)		Statistics	
	Avg.	Variance	Avg.	Var	p-value	$\hat{A}_{12}$
BountyHunt	25	137	214	62081	0.0043	0.898
Eth_VAULT	46	2148	399	57003	0.0035	0.906
PIGGY_BANK	98	5940	339	79022	0.0625	0.734
Private.accumulation.fund	124	12614	463	64123	0.0135	0.828
Private.Bank	76	3412	534	34848	0.0013	0.937
PrivateDeposit	156	8555	600	0	0.0002	1.000
EthSplit	21	14	23	45	0.3952	0.547
FreeEth	38	718	164	25189	0.0010	0.968
HelpMeSave	50	1253	116	9234	0.0328	0.781
HFConditionalTransfer	12	9	15	10	0.0755	0.719
Honey	44	524	104	10249	0.0704	0.727
MultiplicatorX4	35	401	86	3659	0.0091	0.859
Pie	53	1224	133	5455	0.0203	0.813
TokenBank	131	1066	600	0	0.0002	1.000
transferIntwopart	23	49	27	119	0.2468	0.609
WahleGIveaway	49	1153	162	26793	0.0781	0.718
CreditDepositBank	106	4070	436	40511	0.0009	0.968
SafeConditionalHFTransfer	25	37	30	75	0.1465	0.664
Soleau	24	75	30	101	0.1125	0.688
Etheramid	23	27	28	26793	0.0940	0.703
SimpleLotto	132	879	193	2896	0.0157	0.828
MyToken	116	651	240	25187	0.0023	0.929
SimpleCoinFlipGame	58	90	600	0	0.0002	1.000
Avg.	63.58	1958.62	240.60	20582.36	—	—

**Honey Trap.** Some contracts, e.g., `ETH_VAULT` and `WhaleGiveaway`, contain honey traps where the participants deposit `Ether` into the contracts, and cannot withdraw it again. These smart contracts are unfair to the participants. We take the code snippet from `ETH_VAULT` in Fig. 9 to illustrate its mechanism.

The contract has a minimum deposit value, which is set by the owner of contract. When the participant deposits less `Ether` than the minimum value by invoking the payable function “`deposit`” (false branch at Line 3 in Fig. 9), the `Ether` is still deposited into the contract without any record. Therefore, the participant cannot withdraw his contribution again, The transaction reduces the balance of participant without changing the bookkeeping variable. This violates the transaction invariant. The expected behavior should be to return the fund to the participant and roll back the transaction, if the contribution is less than the minimum requirement.

**Deposit Less and Withdraw More.** Some smart contracts, e.g., `BountyHunt`, `LZLCoin` and `PowerCoin`, are vulnerable by allowing an adversary to withdraw more `Ether` than they have deposited.

```

1 contract CreditDepositBank is Ownable {
2     function takeOver() public {
3         if (balances[msg.sender] > 0) {
4             owner = msg.sender;
5         }
6     }
7     ...
8     function withdraw(address client) public onlyOwner {
9         require (balances[client] > 0);
10        msg.sender.send(balances[client]);
11    }
12 }

```

Fig. 8. A vulnerability due to incorrect access control.

```

1 contract ETH_VAULT {
2     function deposit() public payable {
3         if (msg.value > MinDeposit) {
4             balance[msg.sender] += msg.value;
5             TransferLog.addMessage(msg.sender, msg.value,
6                 ↵ 'Deposit');
7         }
8     }
9     ...
10 }

```

Fig. 9. A honey trap example.

A code snippet from LZLCOIN (Fig. 10) illustrates this vulnerability. The vulnerable function takes two parameters `_tkA` and `_etA`, which represent the balance a participant is able to withdraw and the `Ether` actually being sent out, respectively. The values of these two parameters should always be equal, otherwise, the adversary is able to choose a smaller value for `_tkA` and a larger value for `_etA`, to withdraw more than pledged. This behavior violates our balance invariant.

**Non-Exploitable Vulnerabilities Reported by the Pattern-Based Approaches** In this section, we illustrate the reasons why some vulnerabilities detected by existing techniques are not exploitable.

**Reentrancy.** Reentrancy describes the situation where a function is re-entered while in the midst of its execution. Reentrancy has become notorious due to the DAO bug [6], and is considered as the top vulnerability [38]. Based on predefined properties, existing techniques, e.g., Zeus, can detect reentrancy. However, these properties, based on fixed patterns, are so strong that non-exploitable reentrancy is also reported. For example, the contract `DaoChallenge` shown in Fig. 11 was

```

1 contract LZLCoin is Ownable, StandardToken {
2   function eT(address _pd, uint _tkA, uint _etA) returns
   ↪ (bool) {
3     balances[msg.sender] = safeSub(balances[msg.sender],
   ↪ _tkA);
4     balances[_pd] = safeAdd(balances[_pd], _tkA);
5     if (!_pd.call.value(_etA()) revert();
6     ET(_pd, tkA, _etA);
7     return true;
8   }
9   ...
10 }

```

**Fig. 10.** An example for deposit less and withdraw more.

reported by Zeus as vulnerable [11]. However, based on the official website [39] where the contract was originally from, this is not an exploitable reentrancy.

This contract first checks whether the balance of the message sender is zero at Line 11. If so, it throws an exception and reverts the program state. Otherwise, it sets the balance of the sender to zero at Line 12, and then uses `withdrawEtherOrThrow()`, the safe withdraw function, to fetch `Ether` at Line 13. Through this safe withdraw function, the program may re-enter the function `refund()`. When reentering function `refund()`, the balance will be set to zero. Thus, the reentrancy cannot pass the check at Line 11 again, and the program state is reverted. As a result, an adversary cannot steal `Ether` from this contract.

Although `ContractFuzzer` adds extra conditions (e.g., a `call()` invocation has a greater-than-zero value) to reduce false positives, it still reports non-exploitable reentrancy cases. This is because the extra conditions are only based on syntax without considering the semantics. For example, the code snippet from `FunFairSale` (Fig. 12) is a non-exploitable reentrancy detected by `ContractFuzzer`. At Line 4, the owner of the contract may withdraw all the balance. Even if the `withdraw()` function is reentered, its program state is reverted due to not having enough funds to withdraw.

**Exception Disorder.** An exception disorder occurs where there are inconsistencies in exception handling. These inconsistencies are very hard to detect in smart contracts. `ContractFuzzer` uses a pattern to detect exception disorders: it checks if a `throw` statement is executed after a failed `send()`, in order to revert the transaction [8]. Zeus [11] checks whether there is a write operation on a global variable after a failed `send()`. However, both checks are purely syntactic, and many non-exploitable vulnerabilities are reported because of this.

For example, consider the code snippet from `Store` in Fig. 13. At Line 5, the contract pays out `Ether` to the message sender and the `send()` operation may fail. When the `send()` operation fails, the contract reverts the program states at Line 8. This is in fact a correct way to handle the exception. However, it is

```

1 contract DaoChallenge {
2     function withdrawEtherOrThrow(uint256 amount) private {
3         bool result = msg.sender.call.value(amount)();
4         if (!result) {
5             throw;
6         }
7     }
8     ...
9     function refund() noEther {
10        address sender = msg.sender;
11        uint256 tokenBalance = tokenBalanceOf[sender];
12        if (tokenBalance == 0) { throw; }
13        tokenBalanceOf[sender] = 0;
14        withdrawEtherOrThrow(tokenBalance * tokenPrice);
15        notifyRefundToken(tokenBalance, sender);
16    }
17 }

```

Fig. 11. An example for non-exploitable reentrancy.

```

1 contract FunFairSale is Owned, TokenReceivable {
2     function withdraw() onlyOwner {
3         if (block.timestamp < deadline) throw;
4         if (!owner.call.value(this.balance) throw;
5     }
6     ...
7 }

```

Fig. 12. Another example for non-exploitable reentrancy.

reported as a vulnerability by both ContractFuzzer and Zeus. There is no easy way to precisely detect exception disorder without semantic understandings.

**Integer Overflow/Underflow.** Integer overflow/underflow is an important issue in smart contracts, as they may allow adversaries to steal **Ether** or tokens from smart contracts. The 1,095 out of 1,523 smart contracts in the dataset used by Zeus were reported as susceptible to integer overflow/underflow [36]. Although many integer overflow/underflows may occur in theory, not all of them are practical. First, the total amount of **Ether** available on the Ethereum platform is limited to 140 million **Ether** [40]. Therefore, one cannot use infinite amount of **Ether** to overflow/underflow an `uint256` variable. Second, the numbers of transactions and participants are also much smaller than the upper bound of `uint256`. Finally, many smart contracts use safe mathematics operations protected from overflow/underflow. This is not recognized by the property(pattern)-based techniques, such as Zeus.

We take the code snippet from **JamCoin** (Fig. 14) as an example. In this contract, before the integer operations at Lines 5 – 6, it checks whether the operations would produce overflow/underflow at Lines 3 – 4. However, these

```

1 contract Store {
2   function payout() returns (uint) {
3     uint amount = ownerBalances[msg.sender];
4     ownerBalances[msg.sender] = 0;
5     if (msg.sender.send(amount)) {
6       return amount;
7     } else {
8       ownerBalances[msg.sender] = amount;
9     }
10    }
11  }
12  ...
13 }

```

Fig. 13. Non-exploitable exception disorder.

```

1 contract JamCoin {
2   function transfer(address _to, uint256 _value) {
3     if (balanceOf[msg.sender] < _value) throw;
4     if (balanceOf[_to] + _value < balanceOf[_to]) throw;
5     balanceOf[msg.sender] -= _value;
6     balanceOf[_to] += _value;
7     Transfer(msg.sender, _to, _value);
8   }
9   ...
10 }

```

Fig. 14. Non-exploitable integer overflow/underflow.

checks are ignored by Zeus [11]. It requires program contexts being considered to accurately identify integer overflow/underflow.

## 5.6 Threats to validity

We have selected a benchmark set that is large enough to show the capabilities of ContraMaster and compare it with other tools. However, both the set of benchmarks we selected ours from, as well as our own selection, may include a certain sample bias. Thus, the results may not generalize to all smart contracts. Moreover, while our approach is generic and also applicable to other types of smart contracts, some implementation details and issues found are specific to Ethereum.

## 6 Related Work

Existing work on smart contract vulnerability detection can be categorized into static analysis [7,6,9,10,11,41] and dynamic analysis [8,12].



## 6.1 Static Analysis

**Program Analysis.** Securify [7] first infers semantic information by analyzing control- and data-dependencies of the contract code. Then, it checks against both the predefined compliance and violation properties to detect vulnerabilities. SmartCheck [42] is an automated static code analyzer for smart contracts. It automatically checks smart contracts against a knowledge base for security vulnerabilities and bad practices. Slither [43] is a static analysis framework for Solidity, which contains a suite of vulnerability detectors and also provides an API for developing custom analyses.

**Symbolic Execution.** Oyente [9] is the first tool to apply symbolic execution in finding potential vulnerabilities in smart contracts. It formulates the vulnerabilities as intra-procedural properties, and uses symbolic execution to check against these properties. TEETHER [22] focuses their analysis on the critical paths of a contract program. Specifically, a path is critical if it includes an instruction whose arguments can be controlled by an attacker. Once a critical path is found, TEETHER computes the path conditions and infers the corresponding attack sequences for triggering the vulnerability. In addition, TEETHER also requires that the value transmitted in the final CALL instruction is greater than the sum of all values sent to the contract. This is similar to our approach but imprecise, because it does not model the whole transaction. MAIAN [10] is designed to find three types of problematic contracts: the prodigal, greedy and suicidal contracts. It formulates these three types of problems as inter-procedural properties, and performs bounded inter-procedural symbolic execution to search for property violations. EthRacer [31] investigates a family of event-ordering bugs in smart contracts. These bugs are intimately related to the dynamic ordering of contract events, i.e., function calls. The technical challenge in detecting event-ordering bugs in smart contract is the inherent combinatorial blowup in the path and state space analysis, even for simple contracts. The authors propose to use partial-order reduction techniques, using automatically extracted *happens-before* relations along with several dynamic symbolic execution optimizations.

**Formal Verification.** There are also attempts to formally verify smart contracts using either model checking or theorem-proving [29,11,44,45,46,41,47,48,49,50]. Zeus [11] first translates Solidity source code into LLVM [51] intermediate language, and then performs the verification with the SeaHorn verification framework [52]. Hirai [44] defines a formal semantic model for EVM using the Lem language, and proves safety properties of contract programs compiled to Lem, with the interactive theorem prover Isabelle/HOL. KEVM [45] is a semantic encoding of EVM bytecode in the K-framework based on the rewriting logic. VerX [48] is an automated verifier for proving functional properties of smart contracts. VerX addresses an important problem, as all real-world contracts must satisfy custom functional specifications. VerX combines three techniques, enabling it to automatically verify temporal properties of infinite state smart contracts: (1) reduction of temporal property verification to reachability checking, (2) a new symbolic execution engine for EVM that is precise and efficient for

a practical fragment of smart contracts, and (3) delayed predicate abstraction which uses symbolic execution during transactions and abstraction at transaction boundaries. VERISOL [53] studies the safety and security of smart contracts in the Azure Blockchain Workbench, an enterprise Blockchain-as-a-Service offering from Microsoft. It formalizes the *semantic conformance* of smart contracts against a state machine model with access-control policies, and develops a highly-automated formal verifier for Solidity that can produce proofs as well as discover counterexamples.

Static analysis approaches can be more efficient in terms of running time, but they often suffer from high false-positive rate. The main difference between our approach and these techniques is that, our approach dynamically executes the contract code on the real EVM environment, and therefore the detected vulnerabilities are guaranteed to be exploitable.

## 6.2 Dynamic Analysis

Some dynamic analysis techniques are proposed to stress the vulnerabilities of smart contracts [54,55].

**Input generation.** ContractFuzzer [8] is a fuzzing framework for detecting vulnerabilities of Ethereum smart contracts. It proposes seven specific patterns for seven types of vulnerabilities. Based on these patterns, it generates fuzzing inputs, instruments the EVM to collect the execution traces, and analyzes the traces to identify vulnerabilities. ReGuard [12] developed a fuzzing-based analyzer to automatically detect reentrancy vulnerabilities. Specially, it performs fuzz testing on smart contracts by iteratively generating random but diverse transactions. Based on the runtime traces, ReGuard dynamically identifies the reentrancy vulnerabilities. Echidna [56] takes a contract program as well as a set of invariants as input, and generates random inputs to trigger potential vulnerabilities. The invariants used by Echidna have to be written within the contract itself, thus they are not expressive enough to encode our inter-contract invariants. Wstholz and Christakis [57] present a technique that extends greybox fuzzing with a method for learning new inputs based on already explored smart contract executions. The learned inputs can be used to guide exploration towards specific executions, for instance, ones that increase path coverage.

The main difference between our approach and other dynamic approaches is that we provide general principles that drill down to the very root of vulnerabilities, while other approaches use generic properties to detect specific vulnerabilities. By definition, fixed collections of properties are limited and modeled at the syntactic level; thus, they usually suffer from both false negatives and false positives. We believe that the absence of a general and precise test oracle is the main reason that there exist very few dynamic techniques for detecting vulnerabilities in smart contracts.

**Test oracle.** The lack of a precise test oracle is often the main bottleneck in software test automation [58]. An empirical analysis of model-derived test cases for Java programs shows that using a test oracle roughly doubles the defect

detection rate [59]. Most activities to support the test oracle focus on providing better specification mechanisms, or on mining properties from the documentation or comments [58]. An *implicit test oracle* covers assumptions that have to hold globally for well-defined applications, e.g., no memory access to unallocated or uninitialized memory should ever happen. Sereum [60] protects the deployed smart contracts from being exploited. It addresses this problem in the context of re-entrancy exploits and propose a novel smart contract security technology, which protects existing, deployed contracts against re-entrancy attacks in a backwards compatible way based on run-time monitoring and validation. Sereum does not require any modification to or any semantic knowledge of existing contracts. Our work is also within that domain, as we cover the implicit assumption that no funds are created or destroyed by transactions. We therefore provide a valuable contribution in a field where it is in general very difficult to find useful implicit assumptions [58].

In general, specifications are provided by developers, either on a case-by-case based in code, or as more general rules that apply throughout the program. Specifications can be provided as executable code in the form of software design requirement, as preconditions, invariants, and postconditions [61]. These facilities have been made available in the Solidity language as of version 0.4.10 [62,63], but are not widely used yet. Compared to verification on traditional platforms, these features on Solidity have the drawback that their usage incurs side effects (in terms of the gas cost of computing the expression being evaluated); in general, side effects should be avoided in such expressions [64].

## 7 Conclusion

We propose ContraMaster, a grey-box fuzzing approach for finding exploitable vulnerabilities in smart contracts. Different from previous works, the proposed test oracle captures the very roots of transaction-related vulnerabilities based on invariants (Definitions 3 and 4), which are essential and not specific to any particular attack pattern. We also use feedback computed from the efficient runtime monitoring on EVM to guide the mutation of transaction sequences for fuzzing. We have demonstrated that ContraMaster is effective in finding exploitable vulnerabilities and produces much fewer false positives than the state-of-the-art. Furthermore, we find and confirm three new attacks.

## References

1. “Bitcoin Project,” <https://bitcoin.org/>, 2019.
2. “Ethereum Project,” <https://www.ethereum.org/>, 2019.
3. G. W. Peters and E. Panayi, “Understanding Modern Banking Ledgers Through Blockchain Technologies: Future of Transaction Processing and Smart Contracts on the Internet of Money,” in *Banking Beyond Banks and Money*. Springer, 2016, pp. 239–278.

4. R. Xu, L. Zhang, H. Zhao, and Y. Peng, "Design of Network Media's Digital Rights Management Scheme Based on Blockchain Technology," in *International Symposium on Autonomous Decentralized System*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 128–133.
5. M. Iansiti and K. R. Lakhani, "The Truth about Blockchain," *Harvard Business Review*, 2017.
6. J. Chang, B. Gao, H. Xiao, J. Sun, and Z. Yang, "sCompile: Critical Path Identification and Analysis for Smart Contracts," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00624*, 2018.
7. P. Tsankov, A. Dan, D. D. Cohen, A. Gervais, F. Buenzli, and M. Vechev, "Securify: Practical Security Analysis of Smart Contracts," in *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2018, pp. 67–82.
8. B. Jiang, Y. Liu, and W. Chan, "ContractFuzzer: Fuzzing Smart Contracts for Vulnerability Detection," in *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. ACM, 2018, pp. 259–269.
9. L. Luu, D.-H. Chu, H. Olickel, P. Saxena, and A. Hobor, "Making Smart Contracts Smarter," in *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2016, pp. 254–269.
10. I. Nikolic, A. Kolluri, I. Sergey, P. Saxena, and A. Hobor, "Finding the Greedy, Prodigal, and Suicidal Contracts at Scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.06038*, 2018.
11. S. Kalra, S. Goel, M. Dhawan, and S. Sharma, "Zeus: Analyzing Safety of Smart Contracts," in *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, 2018.
12. C. Liu, H. Liu, Z. Cao, Z. Chen, B. Chen, and B. Roscoe, "ReGuard: finding reentrancy bugs in smart contracts," in *ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*. ACM, 2018, pp. 65–68.
13. "DaoChallenge Source," <https://etherscan.io/address/0x80f1f62b8b365c5326100d462d8570771b8d0e57>, 2019, accessed 2019.
14. Y. Feng, E. Torlak, and R. Bodík, "Precise Attack Synthesis for Smart Contracts," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06067*, vol. abs/1902.06067, 2019.
15. M. Zalewski, "American Fuzzy Lop," <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/afl/>, 2016.
16. N. Grech, M. Kong, A. Jurisevic, L. Brent, B. Scholz, and Y. Smaragdakis, "Madmax: Surviving Out-of-Gas Conditions in Ethereum Smart Contracts," *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, p. 116, 2018.
17. M. Jakobsson and A. Juels, "Proofs of Work and Bread Pudding Protocols," in *Secure Information Networks*. Springer, 1999, pp. 258–272.
18. S. King and S. Nadal, "PPCoin: Peer-to-Peer Crypto-Currency with Proof-of-Stake," <https://bitcoin.peryaudo.org/vendor/peercoin-paper.pdf>.
19. S. Wu, Y. Chen, Q. Wang, M. Li, C. Wang, and X. Luo, "CReam: A Smart Contract Enabled Collusion-Resistant E-Auction," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 1687–1701, 2018.
20. "Solidity," <https://solidity.readthedocs.io/en/v0.5.1/>, 2018.
21. J. Jiao, S. Kan, S.-W. Lin, D. Sanan, Y. Liu, and J. Sun, "Executable Operational Semantics of Solidity," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.01295*, 2018.
22. J. Krupp and C. Rossow, "teEther: Gnawing at Ethereum to Automatically Exploit Smart Contracts," in *27th USENIX Security Symposium USENIX Security*. ACM, 2018, pp. 1317–1333.
23. "ERC-20," [https://theethereum.wiki/w/index.php/ERC20\\_Token\\_Standard/](https://theethereum.wiki/w/index.php/ERC20_Token_Standard/), 2018.
24. "ERC-721," <http://erc721.org/>, 2019.
25. K. Chatterjee, A. K. Goharshady, and Y. Velner, "Quantitative Analysis of Smart Contracts," in *European Symposium on Programming*. Springer, 2017, pp. 494–509.

26. N. Atzei, M. Bartoletti, and T. Cimoli, “A Survey of Attacks on Ethereum Smart Contracts,” in *Principles of Security and Trust*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2017, pp. 164–186.
27. H. Wang, Y. Li, S.-W. Lin, L. Ma, and Y. Liu, “Vultron: Catching Vulnerable Smart Contracts Once and for All,” in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results*. IEEE Press, 2019, pp. 1–4.
28. “Decentralized Application Security Project (or DASP) Top 10 of 2018,” <http://www.dasp.co/>, 2018, accessed 2018.
29. E. M. Clarke Jr, O. Grumberg, D. Kroening, D. Peled, and H. Veith, *Model Checking*. MIT press, 2018.
30. Y. Li, B. Chen, M. Chandramohan, S.-W. Lin, Y. Liu, and A. Tiu, “Steelix: Program-State Based Binary Fuzzing,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*. ACM, 2017, pp. 627–637.
31. A. Kolluri, I. Nikolic, I. Sergey, A. Hobor, and P. Saxena, “Exploiting the Laws of Order in Smart Contracts,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. ACM, 2019, pp. 363–373.
32. S. Rawat, V. Jain, A. Kumar, L. Cojocar, C. Giuffrida, and H. Bos, “VUzzer: Application-aware Evolutionary Fuzzing,” in *The Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, vol. 17, 2017, pp. 1–14.
33. G. Wood, “Ethereum: A Secure Decentralised Generalised Transaction Ledger. Ethereum Project Yellow Paper (2018),” 2018.
34. H. Wang, T. Liu, X. Guan, C. Shen, Q. Zheng, and Z. Yang, “Dependence Guided Symbolic Execution,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 252–271, 2017.
35. J. Ferrante, K. J. Ottenstein, and J. D. Warren, “The Program Dependence Graph and Its Use in Optimization,” *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 319–349, Jul. 1987.
36. Yoichi Hirai, “Integer Overflow/Underflow,” <https://github.com/ethereum/solidity/issues/796#issuecomment-253578925>, 2016, accessed 2019.
37. G. Klees, A. Ruef, B. Cooper, S. Wei, and M. Hicks, “Evaluating Fuzz Testing,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2018, pp. 2123–2138.
38. NCC Group, “DASP: Decentralized Application Security Project,” <https://www.dasp.co/>, 2019.
39. Sjors Provoost, “Dao Challenge,” <https://medium.com/@dao.challenge/challenge-3-how-i-almost-lost-100-1a11a9824ccb>, 2016, accessed 2019.
40. Vitalik Buterin, “Ether Total Supply,” <https://github.com/ethereum/EIPs/issues/960>, 2018, accessed 2019.
41. K. Bhargavan, A. Delignat-Lavaud, and e. a. Fournet, “Formal Verification of Smart Contracts: Short Paper,” in *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security*. ACM, 2016, pp. 91–96.
42. “smartCheck,” <https://tool.smartdec.net/>, 2019.
43. Trail of Bits, “Slither,” <https://github.com/trailofbits/slither>, 2019, accessed 2019.
44. Y. Hirai, “Defining the Ethereum Virtual Machine for Interactive Theorem Provers,” in *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. Springer, 2017, pp. 520–535.
45. E. Hildenbrandt, M. Saxena, N. Rodrigues, X. Zhu, P. Daian, D. Guth, B. Moore, D. Park, Y. Zhang, A. Stefanescu, and G. Rosu, “KEVM: A Complete Formal Semantics of the Ethereum Virtual Machine,” in *2018 IEEE 31st Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 204–217.

46. FStarLang, “Fstartlang,” <https://www.fstar-lang.org/>, 2019, accessed 2019.
47. Why3, “Why3,” <http://why3.lri.fr/>, 2019, accessed 2019.
48. A. Permenev, D. Dimitrov, P. Tsankov, D. Drachler-Cohen, and M. Vechev, “Verx: Safety verification of smart contracts,” 2020.
49. D. Harz and W. Knottenbelt, “Towards safer smart contracts: A survey of languages and verification methods,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09805*, 2018.
50. J. Liu and Z. Liu, “A Survey on Security Verification of Blockchain Smart Contracts,” *IEEE Access*, 2019.
51. The LLVM Foundation, “LLVM,” <https://llvm.org/>, accessed 2019.
52. “SeaHorn,” <http://seahorn.github.io/>, 2019.
53. S. K. Lahiri, S. Chen, Y. Wang, and I. Dillig, “Formal Specification and Verification of Smart Contracts for Azure Blockchain,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08829*, 2018.
54. P. Zheng, Z. Zheng, X. Luo, X. Chen, and X. Liu, “A Detailed and Real-Time Performance Monitoring Framework for Blockchain Systems,” in *2018 IEEE/ACM 40th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice Track (ICSE-SEIP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 134–143.
55. Y. Feng, E. Torlak, and R. Bodik, “Precise Attack Synthesis for Smart Contracts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06067*, 2019.
56. Trail of Bits, “Echidna,” <https://github.com/trailofbits/echidna>, 2019, accessed 2019.
57. V. Wüstholtz and M. Christakis, “Learning Inputs in Greybox Fuzzing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.07875*, 2018.
58. E. T. Barr, M. Harman, P. McMinn, M. Shahbaz, and S. Yoo, “The Oracle Problem in Software Testing: A Survey,” *IEEE transactions on software engineering*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 507–525, 2015.
59. N. Li and J. Offutt, “An Empirical Analysis of Test Oracle Strategies for Model-Based Testing,” in *IEEE Seventh International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation*, March 2014, pp. 363–372.
60. M. Rodler, W. Li, G. O. Karame, and L. Davi, “Sereum: Protecting existing smart contracts against re-entrancy attacks,” 2019.
61. B. Meyer, “Applying ‘Design by Contract,’” *Computer*, vol. 25, pp. 40–51, 1992.
62. “Smart Contract Security Best Practices,” <https://github.com/ConsenSys/smart-contract-best-practices>, 2019, accessed 2019.
63. Ethereum, “Security Considerations,” <https://solidity.readthedocs.io/en/develop/security-considerations.html>, 2019, accessed 2019.
64. P. Fritzson, M. Auguston, and N. Shahmehri, “Using Assertions in Declarative and Operational Models for Automated Debugging,” *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 223–239, 1994.