

# Bridging the Gap: A Comparative Study of Academic and Developer Approaches to Smart Contract Vulnerabilities

Francesco Salzano · Lodovica Marchesi ·  
Cosmo Kevin Antenucci · Simone  
Scalabrino · Roberto Tonelli · Rocco  
Oliveto · Remo Pareschi

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** In this paper, we investigate the strategies adopted by Solidity developers to fix security vulnerabilities in smart contracts. Vulnerabilities are categorized using the DASP TOP 10 taxonomy, and fixing strategies are extracted from GitHub commits in open-source Solidity projects. Each commit was selected through a two-phase process: an initial filter using natural language processing techniques, followed by manual validation by the authors. We analyzed these commits to evaluate adherence to academic best practices. Our results show that developers often follow established guidelines for well-known vulnerability types such as Reentrancy and Arithmetic. However, in less-documented categories like Denial of Service, Bad Randomness, and Time

---

F. Salzano  
University of Molise, Italy  
E-mail: francesco.salzano@unimol.it

L. Marchesi  
University of Cagliari, Italy  
E-mail: lodovica.marchesi@unica.it

C. K. Antenucci  
University of Molise, Italy  
E-mail: c.antenucci2@studenti.unimol.it

S. Scalabrino  
University of Molise, Italy  
E-mail: simone.scalabrino@unimol.it

R. Tonelli  
University of Cagliari, Italy  
E-mail: roberto.tonelli@unica.it

R. Oliveto  
University of Molise, Italy  
E-mail: rocco.oliveto@unimol.it

R. Pareschi  
University of Molise, Italy  
E-mail: remo.pareschi@unimol.it

Manipulation, adherence is significantly lower, suggesting gaps between academic literature and practical development. From non-aligned commits, we identified 27 novel fixing strategies not previously discussed in the literature. These emerging patterns offer actionable solutions for securing smart contracts in underexplored areas. To evaluate the quality of these new fixes, we conducted a questionnaire with academic and industry experts, who assessed each strategy based on Generalizability, Long-term Sustainability, and Effectiveness. Additionally, we performed a post-fix analysis by tracking subsequent commits to the fixed files, assessing the persistence and evolution of the fixes over time. Our findings offer an empirically grounded view of how vulnerabilities are addressed in practice, bridging theoretical knowledge and real-world solutions in the domain of smart contract security.

**Keywords** Smart Contract engineering · Smart Contract vulnerabilities · Smart Contract vulnerability fix · Solidity Vulnerabilities

## 1 Introduction

Blockchain technology has garnered significant attention since the introduction of Bitcoin [29]. Smart Contracts (SCs) are programs that run logic on blockchains, and have seen increasing adoption, becoming responsible for managing high stakes [54]. Vulnerabilities in the context of blockchain refer to flaws or weaknesses in the design, implementation, or use of blockchain technologies that can be exploited to perform malicious or unwanted actions. These vulnerabilities also exist in the Smart Contracts code. Such vulnerabilities can lead to substantial value losses, as seen in the case of the Decentralized autonomous organization (DAO) attack, which resulted in the malicious withdrawal of cryptocurrencies worth approximately \$60 million [33].

Therefore, security is crucial, and as a consequence, several vulnerability detection tools have been developed and are available in the literature [17, 44, 18]. In addition, there are empirical studies on their effectiveness [14, 21]. These studies focused on Ethereum, in which Solidity serves as a predominant language [34], and we follow the same setting in our work, although Ethereum supports another language for SC development, namely Vyper. Research in the field of software reliability has identified security smells as indicators that may signal underlying security vulnerabilities which can adversely affect the execution and reliability of SCs [11]. These security smells serve as early warning signs, alerting developers to potential issues that could lead to significant security breaches if not addressed promptly. Security defects, as defined in current literature, refer to errors that result in incorrect outputs or operational failures within the software [7]. Such defects encompass a wide range of issues, including both software bugs—programming mistakes that produce unintended behavior—and vulnerabilities, which are specific flaws that could be exploited by attackers to compromise the integrity or confidentiality of the system. Moreover, the literature provides security code recommendations, which are established best practices and guidelines specifically crafted to enhance

the security of software code. These recommendations aim to help developers implement more secure coding practices, thereby minimizing the risk of introducing security defects into their applications [53].

Despite the availability of these guidelines, a significant gap remains in understanding the extent to which developers adhere to them. It is currently unclear whether developers are consistently following the provided fixing strategies or if they are employing alternative, potentially effective strategies when addressing security issues in their smart contracts. This raises important questions about the practices and decision-making processes of Solidity developers in vulnerability-fixing activities.

In this research, we propose a study to bridge these gaps. As SCs are still in the early stages of development, it is important to periodically review security guidelines. Developers may introduce new solutions that can improve existing approaches, and our objective is to analyze these to determine their validity. Our approach involved gathering vulnerability fix recommendations from the existing literature. Subsequently, we examined Solidity GitHub repositories to identify commits addressing vulnerabilities and verify whether these fixes align with the recommendations in the literature. For each type of vulnerability included in the Decentralized Application Security Project (DASP) taxonomy, we reported the level of adherence to literature guidelines in terms of percentage.

Additionally, we collected and analyzed vulnerability fixes that are not covered in the existing literature to assess their suitability for the community. Our findings indicate that only the most documented vulnerabilities receive significant consideration when developers fix their SCs. Conversely, when dealing with several less-studied vulnerability classes in the context of SCs, such as *denial of service* and *time manipulation*, our results show that developers do not follow academic recommendations. This underscores the need to modernize the existing set of fixing approaches. To address this requirement, our study provides new fixing strategies extracted from the commits we analyzed. Specifically, we identified 143 commits containing vulnerability resolution patterns not tracked in the current academic literature, from which we extracted 35 undocumented fixing strategies with 22 distinct approaches along with descriptions that report the underlying motivations supporting their generalizable usage.

To add depth to our mining study, we also evaluated the stability of the gathered fixing commit over time, such an evaluation highlighted the stability of the fixes. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the knowledge required to understand our study; Section 3 presents an overview of the current state of the art; Section 4 summarizes the guidelines collected by reviewing the literature to fix SC vulnerabilities; Section 5 outlines the design of the empirical study we conducted; Section 6 underscores and discusses the achieved findings; Section 7 presents the evaluation of the new fixes and the and the evaluation regarding the stability over time of the changes made by the collected commits; Section 8 discusses the empirical study results

as well as practical development behaviors; Section 9 shows the threats to validity of our work and Section 10 concludes the paper.

## 2 Background

In this Section, we explain the technologies and the concepts involved in our study to ensure understanding of our work.

**Blockchain.** Satoshi Nakamoto introduced Blockchain technology as a peer-to-peer cash system in 2008 [29]. Since then, this technology has expanded beyond the financial sector into many other fields. One significant factor driving its increasing adoption has been the support for Smart Contracts, first enabled by Buterin with the introduction of Ethereum, currently the second most important and widest Blockchain network [3].

The Blockchain is a self-governed peer-to-peer network transaction system that allows secure operation execution eliminating the need for a trusted third party [1]. Transactions are executed on a decentralized ledger composed of linked sequential blocks, with an immutable connection to the predecessor, ensuring the integrity of the chain. Each block stores validated transactions according to a consensus algorithm. The ledger is shared and replicated, and participants in the network can read and write data on it, granting transparent access to its stored data to every network participant.

Blockchain networks are not all alike; instead, they can vary significantly while still adhering to the same basic principles. The main differentiation among blockchain systems lies in managing access permissions to the network's ledger, which can be public or restricted. Access to the ledger divides blockchains into two main categories: permissionless and permissioned.

**Smart Contracts.** The concept of SC was introduced in the 1990s by Szabo, initially described as computerized protocols that executed in transactions the terms of a contract [43]. Contemporary interpretations consider SCs as event-driven software replicated on decentralized nodes in equal copies, which are set to automatically execute code when certain conditions are met [54]. Blockchains are immutable, as well as SCs. Although SCs can be made updatable by using a proxy that routes calls to a new implementation, the original contract remains published on the blockchain, maintaining its immutability [2].

Users or other SCs can interact with SCs by calling them via transactions. Nodes in the Blockchain network validate the transactions; when a transaction is valid, the result of the execution of the logic codified in the SC is written on their local copy of the Blockchain. To reach inclusion in a block, all the nodes must execute this logic in the same way; now stored data are irreversible due to the immutability of the Blockchain. This implies that if a transaction finishes unexpectedly, the result may not be reversible.

**Ethereum & Solidity.** Ethereum is the largest blockchain-based smart contract platform, while Bitcoin is the largest cryptocurrency platform. Ethereum enables smart contract execution through the Ethereum Virtual Machine,

making it the most widely used smart contract environment. Smart contracts written in high-level programming languages are compiled into Ethereum bytecode, with Solidity being the predominant language used on the Ethereum platform [54, 4].

Solidity is a programming language that shares a syntax similar to JavaScript, that was introduced in 2015. Since then, its grammar has undergone several changes. The language has received numerous new features while deprecated ones have been removed. These changes have been made to improve the language’s safety and usability [48]. As a domain-specific language (DSL) it is a programming language of limited expressiveness focused on a particular domain, in essence, it serves mainly for SC development [49].

**Ethereum’s Gas.** Gas is the unit of measurement used to determine the work done by Ethereum for interactions within the network. SCs are run by miners on their nodes, and they receive a quantity of gas as a reward. Miners can establish the conditions that transactions must meet in order to be accepted and transmitted through the network using Ethereum clients. For instance, they can set the minimum Gas price required to mine a transaction and determine the desired amount of Gas per block when mining a new block [32].

Users requesting transactions pay this reward. Every transaction has a *gas limit* that determines the maximum gas cost. If the cost exceeds the limit, the transaction will be reversed, and an exception will be raised [7]. In addition to paying for gas, users must also have an Ether (ETH) balance in their wallets to cover the transaction fees. This ETH is deducted from the user’s account when the transaction is executed. Without a sufficient balance of ETH, the transaction will not be processed [3].

**Smart Contract Vulnerabilities.** The research refers to the DASP<sup>1</sup> TOP 10 SC vulnerabilities for classifying security issues [14, 18, 13]. The vulnerabilities included in the DASP are listed in Table 1, along with a description.

To provide further insights, we also include a comparison with vulnerabilities from the SWC Registry [16]. Both classifications are designed to identify and describe common vulnerabilities in smart contracts, particularly those developed with Solidity for the Ethereum blockchain. Both systems aim to improve smart contract security by educating developers about potential risks and providing guidelines to avoid them. The DASP TOP 10 focuses on 10 main categories that reflect the most serious and well-known security issues, using educational and concise language. On the other hand, the SWC Registry offers a more granular classification and includes more specific vulnerabilities, such as details on unchecked calls, arithmetic overflow issues, and highly technical attacks like buffer overflow. The table provides a high-level comparison that links vulnerabilities between these two taxonomies, helping to strengthen the study’s understanding of the overlaps and potential gaps in the categorization. Some categories in DASP, like Unknowns, do not have a direct match in the SWC Registry, as it focuses on known vulnerabilities. In our analysis, we used the SWC Registry classification and IDs to provide a clear and

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://dasp.co/>

comparable mapping between known vulnerabilities, as its structure facilitates cross-referencing. However, we acknowledge that the SWC Registry has not been actively maintained since 2020 and may be incomplete. Therefore, we cross-checked our mapping with the most recent EEA EthTrust Security Levels specification [15], which offers updated guidance for smart contract security. For an additional perspective, particularly regarding alignment with software-level taxonomies, we refer the reader to the SWC-CWE mapping resource provided in [16].

### 3 Related Work

This section reviews the existing literature related to SCs vulnerabilities and their fixing approaches, in detail, we carried out our literature review on papers resulting from the following query string: `smart contract AND fix AND (vulnerability OR defect OR recommendation)`.

We specifically considered only peer-reviewed journal and conference papers written in English and consequently excluded studies where Solidity was not utilized in the SCs. Additionally, we thoroughly searched sources from popular digital libraries such as IEEE Explore, ACM, ScienceDirect, and Springer.

SCs require a thorough security assessment before being deployed. In a survey conducted by Zou et al., it was found that most of the respondents stated that SC development has a higher requirement for code security compared to traditional development [54]. This is due to the management of digital assets and the irreversible nature of the transactions involved. Academic research has delved heavily into SC security due to its important role in fulfilling research motivations. Indeed, a plethora of vulnerability detection tools have been released and published, assisting the academic and developer communities in seeking security vulnerabilities. Such tools encompass static analysis tools [17, 44, 18], fuzzing tools [25], as well Machine Learning and Deep Learning-based tools [38, 51]. These contributions are recently been sided by Large Language Model (LLM) based vulnerability scanners, such as Gptscan, a new tool that detects logic vulnerabilities in smart contracts by using Large Language Models such as Generative Pre-training Transformer [42].

Duriex et al. carried out an empirical review to assess the effectiveness of vulnerability detectors [14], which led to a suggestion for a high false negative rate. In their study, Ghaleb and Pattabiraman assessed the effectiveness of static analysis tools by intentionally introducing security-related bugs [21]. Their findings align with the work of Duriex et al., highlighting the need to improve the detection performance of smart contract vulnerability detection tools.

As a consequence, despite the availability of a wide range of vulnerability detectors, developers still rely on manual detection of vulnerabilities [20], remarking a high awareness of security vulnerabilities. A recent study carried out by Chen et al. employed ChatGPT as a security vulnerability detector on the contracts comprised in the curated dataset shared by Duriex et al.

DASP TOP 10 Category	Description	SWC Registry Equivalent
Reentrancy	Contracts are able to call other contracts. Reentrancy occurs when the target contract is recursively called by an external contract before completing the update of its state, leading to an inconsistent state.	SWC-107: Reentrancy
Access Control	When there is a lack of secure access and proper authorization to functions, it creates opportunities for attackers to gain direct access to private values or functions, potentially compromising sensitive information and system integrity.	SWC-105: Unprotected Ether Withdrawal, SWC-106: Unprotected SELF-DESTRUCT Instruction
Arithmetic	Math operations are performed on variables with fixed dimensions. Numbers that exceed these dimensions overflow or underflow. When exploited, arithmetic vulnerabilities can lead to incorrect results, compromising reliability.	SWC-101: Integer Overflow and Underflow
Unchecked Calls	Solidity provides low-level calls, such as <code>call()</code> , in which the error is not propagated and does not revert the current execution. Instead, these calls return a Boolean value set to false. Failing to check this value can lead to undesirable outcomes.	SWC-123: Unchecked Call Return Value
Denial of Service	There are several ways that could lead to denial of service, such as maliciously increasing the gas required to compute a function. For example, sending an array with a huge dimension to a function that loops over it. In this case, if gas block limitations are exceeded, transactions will be reverted.	SWC-113: DoS with Failed Call, SWC-128: DoS With Block Gas Limit
Bad Randomness	Randomness is difficult to achieve in blockchains due to the need for consensus. The sources of randomness within Solidity are predictable, allowing malicious users to exploit this predictability.	SWC-120: Weak Sources of Randomness from Chain Attributes
Front Running	Transactions need to undergo a waiting period before they are added to a block. A potential attacker could potentially view the transaction pool and add another transaction block before the original one. This process could be exploited to reorder transactions in favor of the attacker.	SWC-114: Transaction Order Dependence
Time Manipulation	Decisions are often made based on time-related conditions. The current time is typically obtained using "block.timestamp" or "now" instructions. However, this value comes from the miners and can be maliciously manipulated by them.	SWC-116: Block values as a proxy for time
Short Address	Solidity pads shorter arguments to 32 bytes. An attacker may manipulate the data sent, making the smart contract read more data than was sent.	SWC-102: Outdated Compiler Version
Unknowns	The DASP TOP 10 highlights a category of vulnerabilities that are currently unknown.	N/A

**Table 1** Vulnerabilities included in the DASP TOP 10 taxonomy and comparison with the SWC Registry vulnerabilities.

[14]; their LLM-based framework achieved a good recall, nonetheless, the low precision problem is yet to be overcome [5]. Therefore, given the low reliance

on detection tools, providing developers with security smells and vulnerability mitigation approaches is crucial. Several researchers have made contributions to the topic; Demir et al. conducted a comprehensive review of the existing literature in order to identify various vulnerabilities that must be avoided [11]. They also created a catalog of security smells to serve as a reference for developers and security professionals.

AutoMESC, proposed by Soud et al., introduces a framework for mining and classifying Ethereum SC vulnerabilities and their fixes. It aims to address the lack of open datasets on SC vulnerabilities [40]. This tool gathers and categorizes SC vulnerabilities and their fixes using seven well-known detection security tools.

Chen et al. have gone deeper, not only providing an extended set of smells but also a wider range of smells along with defining 20 types of defects in contracts. These defects are categorized according to potential safety, availability, performance, maintenance, and reuse issues. This categorization underscores the importance of security concerns as well [7]. An important contribution of this study is the valuable solution provided to address such defects, some of which are devoted to addressing security vulnerabilities of Solidity SCs.

The growing body of knowledge and the increasing number of examples regarding fixing approaches have powered automatic program repair (APR) for SCs. Starting from the promising results brought by Yu et al. [50], more recent studies and tools have further enhanced SC APR.

For instance, Nguyen et al. presented *SGUARD* an approach developed to automatically transform smart contracts so that they are free of 4 common kinds of vulnerabilities [30], for which they also shared some strategies to fix vulnerabilities. Moreover, Chen et al. proposed *TIPS*, another automated approach to patch SC security vulnerabilities, and provided fixing patterns in their research [7].

A novel related work is accomplished by Zhou et al., who created *SmartREP*, a one-line fixing technique for SC repair [53]. As part of their study on software development, the researchers conducted a literature review to identify vulnerabilities commonly encountered in SC development. Based on their findings, they provided 13 code recommendations to address these vulnerabilities. They also paved the way for explicit studies of code changes related to bugs.

The most recent work in the field of SC code repair recommendation has been steered by Guo et al., who introduced RLRep, a reinforcement learning-based approach for automatically providing repair recommendations for smart contract developers [22]. They elaborated deeply on repair recommendations, giving a detailed view of fixing patterns in the shape of code snippets.

Wang et al. conducted an empirical study on SC bug fixes in real-world Solidity projects, shedding light on bug-fixing through a multi-faceted analysis, considering file type and amount, fix complexity, bug distribution, and fixes of 46 SC projects [45]. In such a work, they shared insight into bug-fixing effects and implications. Their findings include the types and the number of files involved during bug fixes, fix actions and complexity, and bug distribution over 14 distinct categories. Moreover, they supplied information regarding how

many bugs have been fixed, how many bugs have been newly introduced, and how developers fix them during the fixing bug task in real-world projects.

## 4 Literature Guidelines

In this section, we provide details on the literature guidelines we gathered. Once the literature review was terminated, three authors built up a set of guidelines on the knowledge obtained from the papers that we reviewed. After conducting a detailed analysis of the resolution models provided in the research, we were able to extract the resolution methods. These patterns were then carefully categorized based on the DASP TOP 10 taxonomy, which helped us to understand better and classify each resolution approach.

To build the guideline set, the papers resulting from the literature review were inspected, searching for distinct fixing strategies. We considered as a guideline only those fixing procedures reported in the reviewed literature that delivered an example of safe code, as we mentioned in our registered report [37]. These fixes were explicitly mentioned as security vulnerability fixes by the authors of the reviewed papers. In light of the knowledge obtained from the aforementioned research, we will reference established methods for fixing security vulnerabilities and provide an online appendix featuring a compendium of literature guidelines in our replication package [36]. From this point forward, we will refer to these approaches as “literature guidelines”. Only fixing approaches that provide safe code were considered as guidelines.

We present a summary of the collected fixing strategies identified during the literature review. Notice that we defined a literature guideline as a process in the reviewed studies that provides a solution for a given vulnerability class of the DASP taxonomy, along with the code that demonstrates the fixing logic. Consequently, we excluded descriptive fixing approaches that lacked a practical implementation. For example, while research frequently identified `block.timestamp` as a vector for time manipulation attacks, none of the reviewed papers provided a practical method to address this issue.

In Table 2, we summarize the known fixing approaches, categorized by vulnerability type. The complete catalog of known fixing strategies identified through the literature review is available in the replication package of this study [36], available at: <https://github.com/fsalzano/Smart-Contract-Vulnerabilities-A-Comparative-Study-of-Academic-and-Developer-Solutions>.

## 5 Empirical Study Design

The purpose of the study we propose is to assess whether developers adhere to the current research guidelines when fixing SC security vulnerabilities and also to identify any valid fixes that are not covered in the existing literature. The study is aimed at researchers who are interested in SC security. The context

Category	Strategies
Reentrancy	Use <code>NonReentrant</code> modifier from OpenZeppelin; use <code>send()</code> or <code>transfer()</code> instead of <code>call()</code> .
Access Control	Use <code>OnlyOwner</code> modifier from OpenZeppelin.
Arithmetic Issues	Use SafeMath library from OpenZeppelin; use <code>require</code> statements to check arithmetic operations.
Unchecked Return Values for Low Level Calls	Check the return value of low-level calls with a <code>require</code> or an <code>if</code> .
Denial of Service	Avoid using <code>transfer()</code> in loop statements.
Bad Randomness	Reviewed literature provided some instructions; however, there are no practical examples to address bad randomness.
Front Running	Require the current allowance to match the expected value or be zero before updating it, preventing malicious transactions from exploiting outdated approvals.
Time Manipulation	Reviewed literature provided some instructions; however, there are no practical examples to address time manipulation.
Short Addresses	Reviewed literature provided some instructions; however, there are no practical examples for dealing with short addresses, except for avoiding hard-coded addresses by receiving them as an input parameter.

**Table 2** Summary of literature guidelines indicating known fixing approaches categorized by vulnerability type.

of the study is based on a dataset of security vulnerability commits that have been fixed in public Solidity SC repositories.

In order to achieve our objective, we will be guided by the following research questions:

- **RQ<sub>1</sub>**: To what extent do developers adhere to the fixing guidelines provided in the literature?
- **RQ<sub>2</sub>**: What are the valid fixing approaches beyond those documented in the literature?

## 5.1 Data Collection

The context of our study is a dataset composed of commits addressing security vulnerabilities included in the DASP TOP 10. This taxonomy was chosen because it gained high popularity [14], which may increase the chances of finding the names of its categories in commit messages. Moreover, even if this taxonomy is outdated, it is still used in recent research [6]. These commits provide pairs of vulnerable and fixed code, offering valuable insights into fixing procedures. We selected these commits from Solidity repositories that meet our defined filters, as outlined later in this section, and subjected them to thorough manual analysis. In detail, the dataset was created by mining commits from GitHub since Ethereum’s inception. Further details on the procedures for selecting the sample of interest and the process to identify vulnerability-fixing commits will be discussed in the following sections.

### 5.1.1 Selection of Data

We focused our study on Solidity SCs by collecting repositories from GitHub. During the data collection process, we applied specific filters to ensure the quality and relevance of the repositories. Specifically, we only considered repositories containing code written in Solidity with a star count of 10 or more. The star count in GitHub repositories is a metric used to indicate the popularity or appreciation of a repository among the GitHub community. When users find a repository valuable, interesting, or worth revisiting, they can “star” it. This approach significantly reduced the number of repositories, allowing us to select those that are most appreciated by the community. As a result, we obtained a limited number of high-quality repositories, adhering to common practices in the field [10, 35], which consist of using star counts as a key criterion for repository selection. Similarly to Dabic et al., we select repositories with at least 10 stars as it significantly reduces the number of repositories stored, enhancing the scalability of the data collection process [10].

This selection was motivated by several factors. Star count serves as a social indicator and proxy for assessing the quality or relevance of a repository [10]. Moreover, this approach allowed us to focus on a manageable number of repositories that are more likely to be both relevant and of higher quality. Since SCs are typically independent, we did not set a minimum file count for repositories. However, we found no repositories with only a single file that met the star-based filter criteria.

Using GitHub’s API, we searched for repositories matching the specified filters for language and star count, which returned a total of 5,874 repositories. Given this manageable number, we considered all of them in our analysis.

### 5.1.2 Mining Commits

Starting from the gathered repositories, we mined commits using *PyDriller*, a framework that helps developers in extracting information from Git repositories [41]. Since Solidity files are characterized by the extension *.sol*, we only stored commits that modified at least one file with this extension for the subsequent steps of our analysis. Moreover, we included only commits with messages related to vulnerability fixes, following the filtering procedure explained in detail later. Additionally, we excluded *merge commits* and duplicates to ensure the dataset’s quality and relevance. Given a commit *c*, it is a duplicate if there is at least another commit that has the same hash of *c* and the repository URL is the same as the repository of *c*.

### 5.1.3 Filtering Commits


The mined commits were filtered using an *NLP-based filter* implemented using *SpaCy*,<sup>2</sup> an open-source NLP library. This filter used *SpaCy*’s lemmatization

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://spacy.io/>

feature to extract the lemmas from commit messages. Lemmatization is the process of reducing words to their base or root form, known as the lemma, which helps in standardizing variations of a word. Tokenization involves breaking down a text into individual units, called tokens, such as words or phrases, making it easier to analyze or process each component separately. Stopword removal eliminates common words, which do not add significant meaning to the text. Together, these processes streamline the text by focusing on the most meaningful components, improving the efficiency and accuracy of NLP tasks. The filter was applied to each commit message after tokenization and stopwords removal.

The commit messages are first converted to lowercase, then tokenized using SpaCy. Subsequently, stop words are removed, and the remaining tokens are lemmatized to obtain their base forms. All these processes were carried out by using the `en_core_web_lg` model. We opted for an NLP-based filtering process due to its scalability and adaptability when analyzing large volumes of commit messages across diverse repositories. Indeed, these processes ensured that the core meaning of the text was retained while irrelevant or redundant elements were removed, enhancing the effectiveness of the filtering step. We designed the NLP-based filter to accept commit messages containing the lemma “fix” and the lemmas related to each vulnerability category listed in Table 1. This resulted in the selection of messages such as *fix: Arithmetic vulnerability*. This approach provided a restricted dataset with an adequate number of filtered commits for further analysis. Figure 1 shows the output of the NLP-pipeline for a determined output.



**Fig. 1** Example of the NLP pipeline applied to a real-world commit message, showing the extracted lemmatized tokens after processing.

The NLP-based filtering process was intentionally designed to accept a high false positive rate in order to minimize the risk of false negatives. This decision was motivated by the subsequent manual review phase, during which false positives could be identified and discarded. By prioritizing recall over precision

at this stage, we ensured that potentially relevant commit messages were not prematurely excluded from the analysis, thus preserving a more comprehensive candidate set for the manual evaluation.

Additionally, we applied another filter to exclude files lacking the *pragma solidity* declaration, which indicates to the Solidity compiler the version of the Solidity language to use. This exclusion was based on the rationale that contracts without this declaration might be intended solely for import purposes.

We also excluded files with `.t.sol` files, as these are commonly used for testing purposes.

At the end of this process, the collected commits were considered candidate commits. The resulting dataset of developers’ changes included 3,462 instances of modified Solidity files for manual analysis. It is important to note that a single commit can modify, add, or delete multiple files.

## 5.2 Experimental Procedure

This section details the experimental procedure followed to answer our  $\mathbf{RQ}_s$ . Specifically, Figure 2 illustrates the overall workflow carried out to address  $\mathbf{RQ}_1$ .




Fig. 2 Overall workflow to answer  $\mathbf{RQ}_1$

To answer  $\mathbf{RQ}_1$ , three authors independently analyzed each instance in the set of candidate commits, each commit was reviewed by two distinct evaluators. Commits involving modification to more than three files were excluded if the commit message did not specify the vulnerable file or provide other useful information to locate the fix, such as the name of a specific function. This approach aimed to leverage the guidance provided by developers who patched the contracts, improving the scalability of our analysis and reducing subjective interpretation by validators. Additionally, commits with messages that did not specify the type of vulnerability fixed were excluded unless the analyzers could confidently assign the vulnerability type through manual examination.

**Commit Relevance Analysis.** The two analyzers per commit labeled the commits independently. The labels used corresponded to the DASP TOP 10 categories, along with an additional label assigned to not relevant commits that passed the NLP-based filter. When both analyzers assigned the same label to a commit, it was tagged with that label. If the labels differed, the conflicts

were resolved through discussion. Specifically, if the two labels were assigned to a commit with different vulnerability types, the evaluators collaboratively decided on the most appropriate label after a discussion. To minimize bias, each conflict was resolved involving all the three evaluators. At the end of this phase, the remaining commits were selected for experimentation. We obtained 364 relevant commits after the resolution of 30 conflicts.

**NLP-based Filter Evaluation.** At the end of the manual evaluation of the relevance of each commit, the 34.02% of commits which passed the NLP-based filter were kept as deemed relevant and assigned to a DASP category.

Furthermore, we randomly selected a set of collected repositories, applying a minimum threshold of 50 commits to ensure sufficient development activity to build an evaluation dataset for the NLP filter. From these repositories, we mined the full commit history, excluding merge commits, to collect a comprehensive set of meaningful changes. We then randomly sampled 400 commits from the mined data. These commits served to calculate recall and specificity on a statistically relevant sample, as obtaining such metrics on all the repositories we mined in unpractical due to the need to know all the false negatives (FN).

Each of these commits was manually inspected to determine whether it should have been captured by an NLP-based filtering mechanism, providing a ground truth for evaluating the effectiveness of the approach. Each commit in the sample was annotated with a binary label indicating whether it should have been detected by the filter. We then compared this label with the actual output of the filtering system. A commit source code change was considered a true positive (TP) if it was correctly identified by the filter as relevant, and a FN if it was not detected despite being labeled as relevant. Such data served to get the recall of our filter, we received a recall of 0.8, there were 8 TPs resulting from the manual analysis. Commits that were not blocked by the filter did not contain “fix” in the message, for instance, “add no zero address check when setting beneficiary”. These keywords, namely, fix and vulnerability, were introduced to reduce the set of commits to be analyzed focusing more on the specific case under investigation.

Indeed, NLP-based filters are particularly suitable to ignore irrelevant commits. Thus, we obtained the Specificity of the NLP-based filter. Although the filter achieved 100% specificity on the random sample of 400 commits, this result must be interpreted within the statistical boundaries of the sampling process. Since the sample was drawn randomly from a larger population, the observed specificity is subject to sampling variability. A 100% specificity in the sample indicates that no false positives were observed, but this does not guarantee perfect specificity in the entire dataset. Indeed, when analyzing the full dataset, FPs were identified. This discrepancy can be explained by the confidence interval associated with the sample estimate. At a 95% confidence level, the true specificity in the overall population is likely to be slightly lower than 100%, even if no errors were observed in the sample.

**Asserting Adherence to Literature Guidelines.** For each commit in the manually analyzed dataset, we extracted the SC before and after the fixing commit, creating pre-fix and post-fix versions for each commit. Code changes were extracted by comparing the two versions using the *diff-parsed* property of the dictionary returned by PyDriller, which represents a single commit. This dictionary contains two keys: “added” and “deleted,” which hold the added and deleted lines, respectively. Originally, we relied on such a diff to see the main differences introduced by a commit, this served particularly in our preliminary analysis to get an initial view of the changes made.

However, the different diff algorithms in Pydriller could influence the results [31], in order to address this risk and to enhance the readability of these changes, we used a web application capable of showing the difference made by a Git commit, highlighting changes<sup>3</sup> that we integrated into the scripts we use to help us during evaluations. Such a web application displays the entire content for each file modified by a specific commit, highlighting the lines with differences between the version before and after the commit. Evaluators also accessed GitHub’s enriched information, such as Pull Request (PR) descriptions and discussions, when additional context was needed. Not all the commits were linked to PRs, however, when these were available we inspected them if we needed additional details to make our decision reliable. Indeed, the description enclosed in the PRs guided us to understand the motivation on the back of several fixes. These two options provided flexibility: the web application offered quick overviews, while GitHub supplied detailed context when required.

A fix was considered a change in which at least one row of the SC containing the vulnerability was modified; differences related to spaces, indentation, and empty rows were ignored. Fixing required actual changes, so if vulnerable lines were simply removed without a replacement, the changes were not considered a fix. When commits included multiple changes, the evaluators identified and isolated the relevant fix from the other changes. The evaluators then determined whether the differences between pre-fix and post-fix versions of the Solidity SCs could be attributed to mitigations available in the literature.

To this end, the two evaluators independently analyzed the commit instances, determining whether each instance contained resolution strategies previously identified in the literature. In cases of conflict, the evaluators discussed their findings until a consensus was reached. When disagreements persisted, a third evaluator reviewed the instance to finalize the decision. Discrepancies were documented, highlighting specific points of contention and outlining differing perspectives on whether the change aligned with literature-reported mitigations.

The inter-rater reliability between the two evaluators was calculated using Cohen’s kappa coefficient, which measures the level of agreement [9]. This ensured the reliability of the manual analysis and provided a quantitative measure of consistency.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://diff2html.xyz/>




Fig. 3 Overall workflow to answer RQ<sub>2</sub>

At the end of this step, we provided results showing how many fixes adhere to literature recommendations. To address RQ<sub>1</sub>, we report the number and percentage of fixing commits that adopted approaches known in the literature, categorized by each DASP category, and identified the most frequently fixed vulnerabilities. For each category, the computed percentage indicates the extent to which developers adhered to literature fixing guidelines. Fixing approaches not included in the collection of literature guidelines were further analyzed to address RQ<sub>2</sub>.

**Searching for new Fixes.** The plan to answer to RQ<sub>2</sub> involved analyzing changes made by developers that fixed vulnerabilities not included in the set of literature recommendations. The overall workflow to go through this is shown in Figure 3.

These changes were critically analyzed by three evaluators who searched for valid fixing approaches. The set of evaluators was composed of two researchers and one blockchain practitioner. We defined a valid fixing approach as a solution developers use to address a security issue that was evaluated and deemed suitable for the given type of vulnerability. The evaluators worked collaboratively to reach a consensus. The analysis incorporated qualitative metrics such as the adaptability and applicability of the fix, analyzing its ability to adapt in ever-changing scenarios like those in smart contracts and its flexibility in different contexts.

Each fix was evaluated from both a technical and theoretical perspective to ensure its effectiveness and reliability. The technical evaluation focused on determining whether the fix successfully mitigated the identified vulnerability while assessing any potential risks it might introduce. The theoretical evaluation examined the fix within the context of the defined attack scenario, ensuring that it remained robust against potential exploits by limiting or eliminating the attack surface. Additionally, long-term implications were considered, evaluating whether the fix provided a robust solution to the immediate issue or if it could potentially lead to future problems.

Adaptability was assessed by discussing whether the fix could be generalized beyond the specific case in which it was found and how widely it could be applied across different use cases. While applicability focused on whether the fix was limited to a single instance or could be extended to other smart contracts exhibiting similar vulnerabilities.

Emerging valid fixes were categorized according to the labels assigned to the commits during the manual analysis phase. We identified new, employable fixing strategies and provided a detailed qualitative discussion of each recurring fix. When answering **RQ<sub>2</sub>**, we report each type of valid patch that emerged along with the related explanations.

## 6 Empirical Study Results

In this section, we present the results of our experiments and address the **RQ<sub>s</sub>** that guided our study.

### 6.1 **RQ<sub>1</sub>**: Developer Adherence

To answer **RQ<sub>1</sub>** we started by engaging two evaluators per commit to determine whether the commit messages that passed the NLP-based filter were really relevant for further experiments. Each evaluator independently assigned a label to every commit. Before resolving conflicts, we calculated Cohen’s Kappa to assess the level of agreement between the evaluators. We obtained a Cohen’s Kappa value of 0.89, which indicated a strong agreement between the raters. Thereafter, each conflict was resolved through a discussion involving the evaluators, at the end of this step no conflict remained unresolved. Moreover, while checking to commit messages, if these were unclear we inspected the commit content and discarded irrelevant instances.

Following these phases, all commits labeled as irrelevant were removed from the study’s sample of interest, resulting in a final dataset comprising 364 instances.


Considering that using a ten-star filter is a proxy and may not reflect the repositories’ quality, for each repository, we obtained via GitHub APIs the number of commits and the number of contributors who made at least one commit. Hence, to provide additional metrics to validate the final dataset quality, Table 3 displays the number of commits and the number of contributors per unique repository in the 364 commits filtered dataset.

Statistic	Mean Value
Number of Commits	750.65
Number of Contributors	10.45

**Table 3** Mean Values for Number of Commits and Number of Contributors.

Overall, the reported statistics suggest a satisfactory complexity of the considered open-source Solidity projects from which the 364 filtered commits come. Most vulnerabilities in the obtained sample relate to arithmetic and reentrancy fixes, while fixes for short address attacks and front-running are

less frequently addressed. Figure 4 shows the distribution of the fixing commits we collected across the DASP TOP 10 vulnerability classes taxonomy.




**Fig. 4** Distribution of fixing commits across the DASP TOP 10 vulnerability classes in the analyzed sample.

Reentrancy and arithmetic are the most common SC vulnerabilities [14], as well as the most studied ones due to their severe impacts [47, 28, 46, 24, 39]. It is unsurprising that these vulnerabilities are more commonly fixed due to the knowledge they have gained. Additionally, access control vulnerability is quite widespread, likely due to its general nature.

To obtain results, for each fixing commit two raters stated whether the fixing strategies for the assigned vulnerability category are known in the literature. At the end of this analysis, we acquired 0.77 as Cohen’s Kappa value. Such a value indicates a good agreement concerning the labels assigned by the evaluators. Conflicts were resolved involving three authors to minimize bias.

Our result confirmed what was argued by Durieux et al., who obtained that these two categories of SC vulnerabilities are the most diffused [14]. Indeed, by combining the results of nine tools to create a consensus, they observed that 937 contracts were vulnerable to arithmetic and 133 to reentrancy. This could clearly influence the distribution of developers’ fixes as the more a vulnerability is diffused, the more it may be fixed. Once we concluded this evaluation, we got 221 commits with fixing strategies already tracked in the current literature and 143 patching approaches unknown in the state-of-the-art. Thus, for each category of vulnerability encompassed in the DASP TOP 10, we calculated the percentage of adherence. Hence, Figure 5 depicts this value for each kind of vulnerability, we do not report classes with 0% of adherence.

The graph indicates the level of adherence for each category of vulnerability. High adherence percentages suggest that many of the fixing strategies are already well-documented and employed in practice.



**Fig. 5** Percentage of adherence to literature-documented fixing strategies for each DASP TOP 10 vulnerability category.

As highlighted earlier in the discussion of vulnerability distributions, reentrancy, and arithmetic are among the most researched areas due to their critical implications, as well as among the fixed with high adherence to what is documented in the literature. This overlap emphasizes that prior academic research has extensively addressed these vulnerabilities and developers followed them. The adherence level here is also considerable when dealing with access control. This finding may be due to the widespread nature of access control flaws, which align with the *OWASP* Top 10, a standard awareness document for developers and web application security, thus, traditional well-known software. We do not discuss the percentage of unchecked return values for low-level calls and front-running vulnerabilities due to the limited number of fixing commits among those collected.

For vulnerabilities where adherence to literature is 0, we subsequently highlight the innovative strategies that developers may employ as new security patterns or patches that are still emerging in response to fixes that have not yet received widespread attention in the research community.

### Summary of Findings for **RQ<sub>1</sub>**

The analysis reveals that developers significantly adhere to documented fixing strategies in the literature for vulnerabilities such as reentrancy, arithmetic, and access control, which are the most studied and well-understood due to their critical impact. In contrast, adherence is null for other types of vulnerabilities. This stark difference highlights the need to update existing guidelines to better mitigate less researched vulnerabilities, further motivating our study.

At the end of the process dedicated to answering **RQ<sub>1</sub>** a total of 221 commits contained fixing strategies found in the current literature guidelines, revealing that 60.55% of the fixes in our sample follow the literature indications. On the other hand, 143 commits contained made changes untracked in the reviewed guidelines. These commits served as a base of the evaluation planned to address **RQ<sub>2</sub>**, as we subsequently detail.

## 6.2 **RQ<sub>2</sub>**: New fixes

As for the process dedicated to addressing **RQ<sub>1</sub>**, we employed different authors to analyze every candidate fix to be a new employable security vulnerability resolving strategy. Indeed, each commit was reviewed by two authors, and conflicts were resolved. To minimize bias, we employed three raters when passing through the conflict resolution phase. Before conducting the resolution of the conflicts, we obtained a good level of agreement by reaching a Cohen’s kappa value of 0.72.

To answer **RQ<sub>2</sub>**, we reviewed the changes made in the commits and discussed the general applicability of the patches, also considering long-term effects. In total, we obtained 35 commits that introduced 27 new fixing approaches. In the remainder of this section, we present the useful new fixes we identified, organized by vulnerability category. Similar or identical approaches to resolving vulnerabilities are presented only once to avoid repetition.

### 6.2.1 Access Control

This category includes 2 new fixes, which we have detailed below. The commit in Figure 6 addresses an access control issue. The function assumes that the caller (`msg.sender`) is always entitled to any remaining Ether in the contract. However, this assumption can be invalid in scenarios where multiple parties interact with the contract and the intended recipient of the refund is different from the caller, e.g., the refund should go to a predetermined address or the originator of a transaction, not the executor.

By requiring explicit addresses for refunds, the function avoids sending Ether to potentially unintended recipients. This change ensures that leftover

Ether is sent to `callValueRefundAddress_`, an explicitly provided refund address, instead of `msg.sender`. This prevents unauthorized refunds and improves security by ensuring that the recipient is always defined by the caller.

```

function initiateArbitrumNativeBatch(
    address switchboardAddress_,
+   address callValueRefundAddress_,
+   address remoteRefundAddress_,
    ArbitrumNativeInitiatorRequest[]
    calldata arbitrumNativeInitiatorRequests_
) external payable {
@@ -368,15 +370,17 @@ contract SocketBatcher is AccessControl {
    arbitrumNativeInitiatorRequests_[index].packetId,
    arbitrumNativeInitiatorRequests_[index].maxSubmissionCost,
    arbitrumNativeInitiatorRequests_[index].maxGas,
-   arbitrumNativeInitiatorRequests_[index].gasPriceBid
+   arbitrumNativeInitiatorRequests_[index].gasPriceBid,
+   callValueRefundAddress_,
+   remoteRefundAddress_
    );
    unchecked {
        ++index;
    }
}

if (address(this).balance > 0)
-   msg.sender.call{value: address(this).balance}("");
+   callValueRefundAddress_.call{value: address(this).balance}("");
}

```

Fig. 6 1<sup>st</sup> access control new fix.

The commit shown in Figure 7 reported as a commit message “fix: add missing access control”, in detail, changes made involved the addition of a custom modifier that we clarify below.

```

modifier onlyWhitelistedExecutor()
    if (!serviceExecutors[msg.sender])
        revert IVaultStorage_NotWhiteListed();
    -;
}

```

With `serviceExecutors` defined as a mapping from address to bool.

```
mapping(address => bool) public serviceExecutors;
```

This commit adds essential access control to the `pullToken` function, ensuring that only authorized addresses can call it, checking if the transaction invoker is among the analyzed ones. This specific modifier grants access with fewer restrictions than the widely used `onlyOwner` and could be generally employed when dealing with functions with a permitted list of callers.

```

- function pullToken(address _token) external returns (uint256) {
+ function pullToken(address _token) external onlyWhitelistedExecutor returns (uint256) {
    uint256 prevBalance = totalAmount[_token];
    uint256 nextBalance = IERC20Upgradeable(_token).balanceOf(address(this));

```

Fig. 7 2<sup>nd</sup> access control new fix.

#### Summary of Findings for Access Control fixes

Authorize function requests using the address of the caller passed as an input parameter instead of using `msg.sender`. Use a mapping with addresses as keys and boolean as values to permit or not permit access to a given function. These strategies are other than those collected in the literature indicating the use of `onlyOwner` modifier.

### 6.2.2 Arithmetic

Within this category, we present 8 newly identified fixes.

The maximum penalty is the balance, by limiting the subtrahend to the max value of the minuend, underflow is actually fixed. The previous version allowed to underflow `inactiveJuror.balance - inactiveJuror.atStake` and then underflow `inactiveJuror.balance` which could have allowed an attacker to steal everything if he had managed to have `inactiveJuror.atStake > inactiveJuror.balance`. Figure 8 depicts the fix.

```

function penalizeInactiveJuror(address _jurorAddress, uint _disputeID, uint[] _draws) public {
    Dispute storage dispute = disputes[_disputeID];
    Juror storage inactiveJuror = jurors[_jurorAddress];
    require(period > Period.Vote);
    require(dispute.lastSessionVote[_jurorAddress] != session); // Verify the juror hasn't voted.
    dispute.lastSessionVote[_jurorAddress] = session;
    require(validDraws(_jurorAddress, _disputeID, _draws));
    uint penalty = _draws.length * minActivatedToken * 2 * alpha / ALPHA_DIVISOR;
-   penalty = (penalty < inactiveJuror.balance - inactiveJuror.atStake) ? penalty : inactiveJuror.balance - inactiveJuror.atStake;
+   what the juror can lose.
+   penalty = (penalty < inactiveJuror.balance) ? penalty : inactiveJuror.balance; // Make sure the penalty is not higher than
    inactiveJuror.balance -= penalty;
    jurors[msg.sender].balance += penalty / 2; // Give half of the penalty to the caller.
    jurors[this].balance += penalty / 2; // The other half to Kleros.

    msg.sender.transfer(_draws.length * dispute.arbitrationFeePerJuror);
}

```

Fig. 8 1<sup>st</sup> arithmetic new fix.

The function `.sub()` comes from *SafeMath* a common and known in the current literature way to securely deal with arithmetic operations without falling into overflows and underflows. This function returns an error in case of arithmetic issues. In the commit displayed in Figure 9, the developer substituted the `.sub` with a custom function, namely, `subMax0`, which is codified as shown in Listing 1:

**Listing 1** subMax0 function

```

1 function subMax0(uint256 a, uint256 b) internal pure
2   returns (uint256) {
3     return a >= b ? a - b : 0;
4   }

```

In Solidity, `uints` are unsigned integers, thus, variables of this type cannot represent negative values. The proposed fix assigns 0 if the value becomes negative, without returning an error message. This fix is particularly suitable when dealing with units that according to the business logic can have 0 as a minimum value. The commit message reports “*Fix bug of possible overflow subtraction in Aave LiqMining and Market*”. Where `AaveLiquidityMining` and `Market` are two contracts that were both involved in the same changes. These contracts extend the same base contract, `PendleLiquidityMiningBase`, and override the function `_getInterestValuePerLP`.

The function `_getInterestValuePerLP` is not called directly by external users, but it is internally used in the interest settlement mechanism. Specifically, it is first called through a `for` loop inside the function `claimLpInterests()`, which in turn invokes `_settleLpInterests` as illustrated in Listing 2.

The full call chain is the following:

`claimLpInterests`  $\longrightarrow$  `_settleLpInterests`  $\longrightarrow$  `_getInterestValuePerLP`

**Listing 2** claimLpInterests and \_settleLpInterests functions

```

1 function claimLpInterests() external override nonReentrant returns
2   (uint256 interests) {
3     for (uint256 i = 0; i < userExpiries[msg.sender].expiries.
4       length; i++) {
5       interests = interests.add(
6         _settleLpInterests(userExpiries[msg.sender].expiries[i]
7           ], msg.sender)
8       );
9     }
10  }
11
12 function _settleLpInterests(uint256 expiry, address account)
13   internal
14   returns (uint256 dueInterests)
15 {
16   ExpiryData storage exd = expiryData[expiry];
17
18   if (account == address(exd.lpHolder)) return 0;
19
20   _updateParamL(expiry);
21
22   uint256 interestValuePerLP = _getInterestValuePerLP(expiry,
23     account);
24   ...
25 }

```

In this scenario, if one uses the standard `sub()` and any subtraction results in a negative value, all operations performed within the loop will be reverted. This behavior is avoided by returning 0 as a result.

```

function _getInterestValuePerLP(uint256 expiry, address account)
    internal
    override
    returns (uint256 interestValuePerLP)
{
    ExpiryData storage exd = expiryData[expiry];
    if (userLastNormalizedIncome[expiry][account] == 0) {
        interestValuePerLP = 0;
    } else {
-       interestValuePerLP = exd.paramL.sub(
+       interestValuePerLP = exd.paramL.subMax0(
            exd.lastParamL[account].mul(globalLastNormalizedIncome[expiry]).div(
                userLastNormalizedIncome[expiry][account]
            )
        );
    }
}

```

**Fig. 9** 2<sup>nd</sup> arithmetic new fix.

Relying only on SafeMath to handle arithmetic vulnerabilities may be a limit. In some cases, if the logic is not correct, the contracts will return errors without functioning. On the other hand, using the arithmetic default check of Solidity 0.8+ will cause reverts. In the commit diff shown in Figure 10, if the contract already holds some ETH before the swap, `address(this).balance` includes this existing balance. Swap serves to obtain the exact amount of LUSD needed to repay the debt by swapping collateral or other tokens. If `collateralReturned` (which is `address(this).balance`) is greater than `collToWithdraw` due to the existing balance, the subtraction:

$$\text{collateralSold} = \text{collToWithdraw} - \text{collateralReturned}$$

results in an underflow. This causes `collateralSold` to wrap around to a very large number, leading to incorrect logic flow.

In the updated function, the ETH balance is stored before the swap, and `collateralReturned` is calculated based on the difference with the balance before the swap:

$$\text{ethBalanceBeforeSwap} = \text{address(this).balance}$$

$$\text{collateralReturned} = \text{address(this).balance} - \text{ethBalanceBeforeSwap}$$

This prevents incorrect execution paths, such as unintended reverts or security breaches due to manipulated `collateralSold` values. It ensures that the calculations accurately reflect only the ETH received from the swap, enhancing the security and reliability of the contract.

```

+ // Saving a balance to a local variable to later get a `collateralReturned` value unaffected by a previously
+ // held balance → This is important because if we set `collateralReturned` to `address(this).balance`
+ // the value might be larger than `collToWithdraw` which could cause underflow when computing `collateralSold`
+ uint256 ethBalanceBeforeSwap = address(this).balance;
+
+ (bool success, ) = LUSD_USDC_POOL.call(
+   abi.encodeWithSignature(
+     "swap(address,bool,int256,uint160,bytes)",
+     address(this), // recipient
+     false, // zeroForOne
+     -int256(lusdToBuy),
+     SQR_PRICE_LIMIT_X96,
+     abi.encode(SwapCallbackData({debtToRepay: debtToRepay, collToWithdraw: collToWithdraw}))
+   )
+ );
+
+ if (success) {
+   // Note: Debt repayment took place in the `uniswapV3SwapCallback(...)` function
+   - collateralReturned = address(this).balance;
+   + collateralReturned = address(this).balance - ethBalanceBeforeSwap;
+
+   {
+     // Check that at most `maxCost` of ETH collateral was sold for `debtToRepay` worth of LUSD
+     uint256 maxCost = (lusdToBuy * _maxPrice) / PRECISION;
+     uint256 collateralSold = collToWithdraw - collateralReturned;
+     if (collateralSold > maxCost) revert MaxCostExceeded();
+   }
+ }

```

Fig. 10 3<sup>rd</sup> arithmetic new fix.

The changes made in the commit in Figure 11 address the overflow bug by introducing boundary checks to ensure that `positionInArray` does not exceed the length of `arrayMem`. Without this check, if `_claimId` is not present in `arrayMem`, `positionInArray` would continue incrementing indefinitely, potentially causing an array out-of-bounds access or an overflow of `positionInArray`. By adding the condition `positionInArray < arrayMem.length`, the loop exits when `_claimId` is not in the array, thus preventing `positionInArray` from surpassing the array's bounds.

```

// Delete entries of helper directories.
uint256[] memory arrayMem = topics2ClaimIds[claim.topic];
topics2ClaimIds[claim.topic].length = 0;
topics2ClaimIds[claim.topic].length = arrayMem.length - 1;
uint256[] memory arrayStor = topics2ClaimIds[claim.topic];
uint32 positionInArray = 0;
- while(_claimId != arrayMem[positionInArray]) {
+ while(positionInArray < arrayMem.length && _claimId != arrayMem[positionInArray]) {
+   positionInArray++;
+ }
+
+ // Make sure that the element has actually been found.
+ require(positionInArray < arrayMem.length);
+

```

Fig. 11 4<sup>th</sup> arithmetic new fix.

The commit changes represented in Figure 12 fix an overflow vulnerability. If `liquidityDeltaD8` is positive or zero, use its value. If it is negative, use its

opposite (the absolute value). If the result exceeds  $2^{96} - 1$  (the maximum value for `uint96`), an overflow may occur during the cast to `uint96`. By casting to `uint96` before shifting, we ensure that `liquidityDeltaD8` fits within 96 bits.

Shifting a `uint96` value left by 8 bits results in a value that fits within 104 bits, which is safely accommodated by the final cast to `uint128`.

```
// calc amt{0,1} for the change of liquidity
- uint128 absL = uint128(uint96(liquidityDeltaD8 >= 0 ? liquidityDeltaD8 : -liquidityDeltaD8) << 8);
+ uint128 absL = uint128(uint96(liquidityDeltaD8 >= 0 ? liquidityDeltaD8 : -liquidityDeltaD8)) << 8;
```

Fig. 12 5<sup>th</sup> arithmetic new fix.

In Solidity `1e18` means  $1 \times 10^{18}$ . In code before the commit shown in 13, is calculated `amount0Min` and `amount1Min` by multiplying `amount0` and `amount1` by  $0.9999 \times 10^{18}$  (written as `0.9999e18`) and then dividing by  $1 \times 10^{18}$  (written as `1e18`). This approach was intended to compute 99.99% of `amount0` and `amount1`. However, when dealing with large numbers of type `uint128`, multiplying them by `0.9999e18` could cause an overflow because the intermediate result becomes too large to fit within a `uint128` variable. To fix this issue, the updated code changes the scaling factors from `0.9999e18` and `1e18` to `0.9999e4` and `1e4`. Now, they multiply by  $0.9999 \times 10^4$  (i.e., `0.9999e4`) and divide by  $1 \times 10^4$  (i.e., `1e4`). This adjustment still computes 99.99% of `amount0` and `amount1`, but using much smaller numbers.

By scaling down the factors, the intermediate multiplication results remain within the safe range of a `uint128`, mitigating overflow. This change preserves the original intent of calculating 99.99% of the amounts while ensuring the calculations are safe for large values.

```
// 0.9999e18 accounts for rounding errors in the Uniswap V3 protocol.
- uint128 amount0Min = amount0 == 0 ? 0 : (amount0 * 0.9999e18) / 1e18;
- uint128 amount1Min = amount1 == 0 ? 0 : (amount1 * 0.9999e18) / 1e18;
+ uint128 amount0Min = amount0 == 0 ? 0 : (amount0 * 0.9999e4) / 1e4;
+ uint128 amount1Min = amount1 == 0 ? 0 : (amount1 * 0.9999e4) / 1e4;
```

Fig. 13 6<sup>th</sup> arithmetic new fix.

The issue highlighted in Figure 14 is that the line `store.decrementBufferBalance(amount);` is executed before checking if `amount > bufferBalance`. If `amount` is greater than `bufferBalance`, subtracting `amount` from `bufferBalance` could cause an arithmetic underflow. The updated code first checks if `amount` is greater than `bufferBalance`. Only if `amount` is less than or equal to `bufferBalance` will the code proceed to `store.decrementBufferBalance(amount)`.

By performing the check first, the code ensures that the `decrementBufferBalance` operation is only called when there is enough balance in the buffer.

This is a different fix compared to using `SafeMath`, as it relies on explicit conditional checks and different order of operations to prevent underflows rather than using a library to handle arithmetic safety.

```

-     store.decrementBufferBalance(amount);
-
+     if (amount > bufferBalance) {
+         uint256 diffToPayFromPool = amount - bufferBalance;
+         uint256 poolBalance = store.poolBalance();
+         require(diffToPayFromPool < poolBalance, "!pool-balance");
+         store.decrementPoolBalance(diffToPayFromPool);
+     } else {
+         store.decrementBufferBalance(amount);
+     }

```

Fig. 14 7<sup>th</sup> arithmetic new fix.

The snippet depicted in Figure 15 is extracted from a contract with Solidity 0.8.22; in Solidity 0.8.0+, overflow and underflow checks are enabled by default, causing a revert. In the initial code, if `bidAmountFound` was greater than `type(uint240).max`, the contract would revert with an error `BidTooHigh`. This implies that the entire operation would fail if a bid amount is too high, influencing all the other operations executed in the for cycle.

In the fixed code, instead of reverting, bids that would cause an overflow (`bidAmountFound > type(uint240).max`) are now ignored. The logic increments `zeroBidCount` to treat these bids as zero bids, allowing the operation to continue smoothly.

```

for (uint256 i; i < solverOps.length; ++i) {
    bidAmountFound = _getBidAmount(dConfig, userOp, solverOps[i], returnData, key);
-     if (bidAmountFound == 0) {
+     if (bidAmountFound == 0 || bidAmountFound > type(uint240).max) {
+         // Zero bids are ignored: increment zeroBidCount offset
+         // Bids that would cause an overflow are also ignored
+         unchecked {
+             ++zeroBidCount;
+         }
+     } else {
-         if (bidAmountFound > type(uint240).max) revert BidTooHigh(i, bidAmountFound);
-

```

Fig. 15 8<sup>th</sup> arithmetic new fix.

This fix suggests that protection mechanisms based on `SafeMath` are being used less frequently, as Solidity 0.8.0+ includes built-in overflow and underflow checks by default. However, previous research has shown that the import of

SafeMath was historically the most frequently used OpenZeppelin import [26]. On the other hand, Wang et al. showed that although many new features are introduced and deprecated ones removed, not all changes necessarily work in favor of the developers [48].

This raises interesting questions about how developers are adapting to these changes and whether they are fully leveraging Solidity’s built-in protections. Future work should further investigate these aspects, examining whether SafeMath is still being used in certain contexts.

#### Summary of Findings for Arithmetic fixes

To prevent underflow limit the subtrahend to the max value of the minuend. Report 0 instead of a require error message if 0 is a valid result for a given operation and the requirement error propagation would break a loop. Before performing swaps save a local balance to perform further operations. Check counter overflow when looping over an array. Properly shift buffers when using typecasting at the end of the chain of arithmetic operations. Properly scale unit variable to be sure that these fit in the buffer. Gathered fixing procedures that suggest the use of SafeMath or require statements to check overflows and underflows.

### 6.2.3 Bad Randomness

We identified two previously undocumented fixes in this category, which we discuss in the following.

The code change shown in Figure 16 fixes a randomness flaw that could allow an attacker to generate multiple random seeds and select the best outcome. By casting the seed to `uint64`, the random seed remains consistent no matter how the function is called, reducing the potential for manipulation and making the randomness harder to exploit. The developer’s comment summarizes the justification for this fix.

```

getEmissionDataForUser[currentIdOwner].emissionMultiple += uint64(newCurrentIdMultiple);

// Update the random seed to choose a new distance for the next iteration.
- currentRandomSeed = uint256(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(currentRandomSeed)));
+ // It is critical that we cast to uint64 here, as otherwise the random seed
+ // set after calling revealGobblers(1) thrice would differ from the seed set
+ // after calling revealGobblers(3) a single time. This would enable an attacker
+ // to choose from a number of different seeds and use whichever is most favorable.
+ currentRandomSeed = uint64(uint256(keccak256(abi.encodePacked(currentRandomSeed))));
}

```

**Fig. 16** 1<sup>st</sup> bad randomness new fix.

In the code shown in Figure 17, `msg.sender` is used as part of the input to generate randomness, before the update made by the commits. `msg.sender` is the address of the caller of the contract. An attacker knows that their own

address (`msg.sender`) is included in the randomness calculation, and they can potentially influence the result. For example, they could call the contract repeatedly with different addresses (or from different wallets) until they get a desired outcome, thus manipulating the randomness. The randomness generation becomes less dependent on variables that can be controlled or influenced by an external party, mitigating bad randomness.

```
        tokenId < metadatas[i].endIndex
    ) {
        randomness = uint256(
-         keccak256(
-             abi.encode(metadatas[i].entropy, msg.sender, tokenId)
-         )
+         keccak256(abi.encode(metadatas[i].entropy, tokenId))
        );
        metadataCleared = true;
    }
```

Fig. 17 2<sup>nd</sup> bad randomness new fix.

#### Summary of Findings for Bad Randomness fixes

Disallow malicious users to choose among different seeds not to enable them to pick the most favorable. Remove all the randomness sources that may be controlled or known by attackers.

#### 6.2.4 Denial of Service

In this category, we identified 4 new fixes. The fix highlighted in Figure 18 addresses Denial of Service vulnerability pattern that arises from repeated, unnecessary actions on the same state. The introduced check returns an error if a claim has already been requested preventing DoS vulnerabilities caused by redundant operations.

In Figure 19, the added line under the comment sets an upper limit on the number of reward tokens processed in order to prevent a DOS attack. Without the added line iterating too many times could consume excessive gas and make the transaction fail.

The fixing strategy underscored in Figure 20 disallows a DOS attack. The function `onRepay` checks how much of the daily limit the user has used, ensuring fair access to borrowing for all users and preventing one user from denying service through repeated borrow-repay cycles.

The patch to DOS vulnerability reported in Figure 21 sets a minimum value for each deposit of 1 ether, which is a valuable amount. Establishing a high minimum deposit for each transaction prevents attackers from successfully denying service to a specific contract.

```

+ challengeDefended = false;
  err = this.bondDeposit(superblockHash, msg.sender, minProposalDeposit);
  require(err == ERR_SUPERBLOCK_OK);

@@ -227,6 +228,10 @@ contract SyscoinClaimManager is Initializable, SyscoinDeposits
    emit ErrorClaim(superblockHash, ERR_SUPERBLOCK_BAD_CLAIM);
    return (ERR_SUPERBLOCK_BAD_CLAIM, superblockHash);
  }
+   if(challengeDefended == true){
+     emit ErrorClaim(superblockHash, ERR_SUPERBLOCK_CLAIM_ALREADY_DEFENDED);
+     return (ERR_SUPERBLOCK_CLAIM_ALREADY_DEFENDED, superblockHash);
+   }
  if (claim.decided || claim.invalid) {
    emit ErrorClaim(superblockHash, ERR_SUPERBLOCK_CLAIM_DECIDED);
    return (ERR_SUPERBLOCK_CLAIM_DECIDED, superblockHash);
  }

```

Fig. 18 1<sup>st</sup> DoS new fix.

```

function _checkpoint(address _account, bool claim) internal {
  uint256 supply = managed_assets;
  uint256 depositedBalance;
  depositedBalance = aggregatedAssetsOf(_account);

  IRewardStaking(convexPool).getReward(address(this), true);

  uint256 rewardCount = rewards.length;
+ // Assuming that the reward distribution takes an avg of 230k gas per reward token we are setting an
+ upper limit of 40 to prevent DOS attack
+ rewardCount = rewardCount >= 40 ? 40 : rewardCount;
  for (uint256 i; i < rewardCount; ++i) {
    _calcRewardIntegral(i, _account, depositedBalance, supply, claim);
  }
}

```

Fig. 19 2<sup>nd</sup> DoS new fix.

```

+ function onRepay(uint amount) public {
+   uint day = block.timestamp / 1 days;
+   if(dailyBorrows[msg.sender][day] < amount) {
+     dailyBorrows[msg.sender][day] = 0;
+   } else {
+     dailyBorrows[msg.sender][day] -= amount;
+   }
+ }
}

```

Fig. 20 3<sup>rd</sup> DoS new fix.

#### Summary of Findings for Denial of Service fixes

To address DoS vulnerabilities caused by redundant operations, track the state of each operation or entity and validate the state before allowing subsequent actions. Set an upper limit while looping. Set a temporal limit needed to recall a given function. Set a minimum deposit to discourage attackers from repeatedly calling a SC function. The collected approaches are diverse from barely avoiding to use `transfer()` in loops.

```

@@ -11,6 +11,9 @@ uint256 constant VALIDATORS_MAX_AMOUNT = 400;
  /// @dev Collateral size of 1 validator
  uint256 constant COLLATERAL = 32 ether;

+ /// @dev Minimal 1 time deposit
+ uint256 constant MIN_DEPOSIT = 1 ether;
+
  /// @dev Lockup time to allow P2P to make ETH2 deposits
  /// @dev If there is leftover ETH after this time, it can be refunded
  uint40 constant TIMEOUT = 1 days;

```

Fig. 21 4<sup>th</sup> DoS new fix.

### 6.2.5 Front-Running

This category includes 2 new fixes, that we detail below.

In the previous version of the contract, the salt is derived using: `bytes32 salt = keccak256(abi.encode(owner))`.

Here, the salt is only dependent on the `owner` address. This predictability allows a malicious actor to see the transaction and, if advantageous, front-run the transaction by submitting a similar one with the same predictable salt, but with a higher gas price, ensuring their transaction is processed first. The fix used in Figure 22 introduces `tx.origin` into the salt computation. `tx.origin` is the original sender of the transaction, even if multiple contract calls are involved. the salt becomes tied to the original transaction initiator, even if an attacker sees the transaction, they cannot simply replicate or predict the salt unless they are the original sender.

The `onlyGovernance` modifier restricts certain functions so that only the governance entity (e.g., a *multisig* wallet, or *DAO*) can call them. Here is how it typically functions:

```

1 modifier onlyGovernance() {
2     require(msg.sender == governanceManager, "Not_governance");
3     -;
4 }
5

```

Listing 3 onlyGovernance Modifier.

The change in the commit shown in Figure 23 is the order of the modifiers `initializer` and `onlyGovernance`. Specifically, the order was changed from `onlyGovernance initializer` to `initializer onlyGovernance`. This change is important because of how Solidity processes modifiers, which are processed in order.

Proxied contracts do not make use of a constructor, it is indeed common to move constructor logic to an external initializer function. It then becomes

```

- function deployFor(address owner) public override returns (address payable proxy) {
- // Deploy the proxy contract with CREATE2.
+ function deployFor(address owner, bytes32 salt) public override returns (address payable proxy) {
+ // Load the proxy bytecode.
  bytes memory bytecode = type(PRBProxy).creationCode;
- bytes32 salt = keccak256(abi.encode(owner));
+
+ // Prevent front running the salt by hashing the concatenation of msg.sender and the user-provided salt.
+ salt = keccak256(abi.encode(tx.origin, salt));
+
+ // Deploy the proxy with CREATE2.
  assembly {
    let endowment := 0
    let bytecodeStart := add(bytecode, 0x20)
    let bytecodeLength := mload(bytecode)
    proxy := create2(endowment, bytecodeStart, bytecodeLength, salt)
  }

  // Transfer the ownership from this factory contract to the specified owner.
  IPRBProxy(proxy)._transferOwnership(owner);

  // Mark the proxy as deployed in the mapping.
  isProxy[proxy] = true;

  // Log the proxy via an event.
  emit DeployProxy(msg.sender, owner, address(proxy));
}
}

```

Fig. 22 1<sup>st</sup> front-running new fix.

necessary to protect this initializer function so it can only be called once to prevent reinitializations.

The `initializer` modifier in this contract comes from OpenZeppelin Initializable. It ensures that the initialize function can only be called once. By placing `initializer` before `onlyGovernance`, the contract ensures that the initializer modifier's logic is executed first. This prevents any other action from being taken before the initializer check is enforced, then it checks the permission to call the function.

```

function initialize(
  address newVePendle,
  address newGaugeController,
  bytes memory _marketCreationCode
- ) external onlyGovernance initializer {
+ ) external initializer onlyGovernance {
  require(newVePendle != address(0) && newGaugeController != address(0), "zero address");
  vePendle = newVePendle;
  gaugeController = newGaugeController;
  marketCreationCodePointer = SSTORE2Deployer.setCreationCode(_marketCreationCode);
}

```

Fig. 23 2<sup>nd</sup> front-running new fix.

### Summary of Findings for Front Running fixes

Prevent the manipulation of the transaction order by tidying the transaction to specific users, using their provided and self-known data. To avoid leaving the proxy in an uninitialized state, the initializer function should be called as early as possible, making the initialization done just one time by disallowing attackers to front-run logic in other modifiers before initialization. Such strategies vary from requiring the current allowance to match the expected value or zero that we found in the literature.

#### 6.2.6 Reentrancy

Within this category, we present 5 newly identified fixes. Evidence in literature treats deeply reentrancy when dealing with token transfer [7,52,8]. This vulnerability can also occur with other kinds of state manipulations, as underscored in Figure 24, which are less considered. The Checks-Effects-Interactions pattern results even in this case a valid mitigation. By deleting or updating the state variables before making any external calls, the contract ensures that even if a reentrancy attack is attempted, the critical state has already been modified, and the attacker cannot exploit the previous state.

```

function finalizeRecovery(BaseWallet _wallet) external onlyWhenRecovery(_wallet) {
    RecoveryConfig storage config = recoveryConfigs[address(_wallet)];
    require(uint64(now) > config.executeAfter, "RM: the recovery period is not over yet");
-   _wallet.setOwner(config.recovery);
-   emit RecoveryFinalized(address(_wallet), config.recovery);
-   guardianStorage.setLock(_wallet, 0);
+   address recoveryOwner = config.recovery;
+   delete recoveryConfigs[address(_wallet)];
+
+   _wallet.setOwner(recoveryOwner);
+   guardianStorage.setLock(_wallet, 0);
+
+   emit RecoveryFinalized(address(_wallet), config.recovery);
}

```

Fig. 24 1<sup>st</sup> reentrancy new fix.

Operating with ERC777 from version 3.3.0 or earlier, and defining a custom `_beforeTokenTransfer` function that writes to a storage variable, may be vulnerable to a reentrancy attack. One characteristic of ERC777 is that it permits reentrancy through the send-and-receive hooks. Therefore, the token must be programmed carefully to prevent a reentrancy attack. Specifically, the contract should be consistent whenever an external call is made to an untrusted address. When burning tokens, the function `_beforeTokenTransfer` is called before the transfer hook is activated for the sender. While the token balances are adjusted after this function is executed, there is a moment during the call

to the sender where reentrancy could occur. At this point, the state managed by `_beforeTokenTransfer` may not reflect the actual token balances or the total supply.

The fix reported in Figure 25 addresses the described issue by calling the custom `_beforeTokenTransfer` after changing the state of the contract.

```

function _burn(
    address from,
    uint256 amount,
    bytes memory data,
    bytes memory operatorData
)
    internal
    virtual
{
    require(from != address(0), "ERC777: burn from the zero address");

    address operator = _msgSender();

-   _beforeTokenTransfer(operator, from, address(0), amount);
-
    _callTokensToSend(operator, from, address(0), amount, data, operatorData);

+   _beforeTokenTransfer(operator, from, address(0), amount);
+
    // Update state variables
    _balances[from] = _balances[from].sub(amount, "ERC777: burn amount exceeds balance");
    _totalSupply = _totalSupply.sub(amount);

    emit Burned(operator, from, amount, data, operatorData);
    emit Transfer(from, address(0), amount);
}

```

Fig. 25 2<sup>nd</sup> reentrancy new fix.

The fixing strategy in Figure 26 introduces a new variable `beforeNFTBalance` to capture the NFT balance of the recipient before transferring tokens. It also added a `require` statement to ensure that the NFT balance remains unchanged, protecting against reentrancy, and ensuring that a reentrant call cannot manipulate the NFT balance and perform an attack.

Functions like `.transfer()` and `.send()` have often been proposed as valid reentrancy fixes [52]. The behavior underlying the mitigation relies on limiting the amount of gas forwarded to the called contract. Specifically, both `.transfer()` and `.send()` forward only 2300 gas to the recipient. This amount of gas is insufficient to execute complex operations, such as reentering the vulnerable contract and making further external calls. This guidance made sense under the assumption that gas costs would not change, but that assumption turned out to be incorrect. Indeed, each opcode supported by the EVM has an associated gas cost that could change, so SCs should not depend on any

```

        // Call router to transfer tokens from user
        uint256 beforeBalance = _token.balanceOf(_assetRecipient);
-
+   uint256 beforeNFTBalance = nft().balanceOf(_assetRecipient);
        router.pairTransferERC20From(
            _token,
            routerCaller,
@@ -71,6 +71,10 @@ abstract contract LSSVMPairERC20 is LSSVMPair {
            inputAmount,
            "ERC20 not transferred in"
        );
+   require(
+       beforeNFTBalance == nft().balanceOf(_assetRecipient),
+       "Reentrant call from router"
+   );
    } else {
        // Transfer tokens directly
        _token.safeTransferFrom(msg.sender, _assetRecipient, inputAmount);

```

**Fig. 26** 3<sup>rd</sup> reentrancy new fix.

particular gas costs, as they do with `.send()` and `.transfer()`. Therefore, if the gas cost changes these changes could enable reentrancy.

As Figure 27 shows, it is recommended to use `.call()` when there are no state changes involved, or when the function has a lock, a *nonReentrant* modifier, or follows the Checks-Effects-Interactions Pattern. This avoids reentrancy even considering long-term effects.

```

    /// @inheritdoc IKrStaking
    function rescueNative() external payable onlyRole(OPERATOR_ROLE) {
-   payable(msg.sender).transfer(address(this).balance);
+   (bool success, ) = msg.sender.call{value: address(this).balance}("");
+   require(success, "Transfer failed.");
    }

```

**Fig. 27** 4<sup>th</sup> reentrancy new fix.

The removed line in Figure 28 checks whether the contract is in an “executing” state using a boolean flag `isExecuting`. This flag is meant to ensure that the `executeWithdrawOrder` function can only be executed when the contract is in a specific state.

Ensuring that the function can only be executed by the contract itself, prevents external attackers from directly calling this function in a way that could manipulate the contract’s state maliciously. This pattern makes it impossible for an attacker to execute the function through a fallback or reentrant call from an external contract.

```

function executeWithdrawOrder(WithdrawOrder memory _order) external {
    // if not in executing state, then revert
-   if (!isExecuting) revert ICrossMarginHandler_NotExecutionState();
+   if (msg.sender != address(this)) revert ICrossMarginHandler_NotExecutionState();

    // Call service to withdraw collateral
    if (_order.shouldUnwrap) {

```

**Fig. 28** 5<sup>th</sup> reentrancy new fix.

#### Summary of Findings for Reentrancy fixes

Delete or update state variables before external interactions. Check if the previous balance is unchanged before updating the state of the contract. When using ERC777 from version 3.3.0 or earlier, use custom *beforeTokenTransfer* after state changes. Use *call()* instead **transfer()** if *send()* if the function does not update the state, follow the Checks-Effects-Interactions pattern or use locking mechanisms. Ensure that reentrancy-prone functions can only be invoked by the contract itself. These approaches diverge from those found in the literature reviewed by differing from using OpenZeppelin modifiers, using standard patterns, and avoiding the use of *call()*.

#### 6.2.7 Short Address

We identified 1 new fix in this category. The commit displayed in Figure 29 patches a short address vulnerability. The **transfer** function in the original code does not check the size of the payload in `msg.data`, making it vulnerable to the short-address attack. The `onlyPayloadSize` modifier checks the length of the `msg.data` and ensures it is the expected size for the **transfer** function.

`msg.data.length` is the length of the input data for the transaction. The expected size for the **transfer** function parameters is  $2 * 32$  bytes (since both `address` and `uint` are 32 bytes each), plus an extra 4 bytes for the function selector.

`assert(msg.data.length == size + 4);` ensures that the transaction data has the correct length. If the length is incorrect, the transaction will be reverted, preventing a short address attack. By validating the size of `msg.data`, the `onlyPayloadSize` modifier ensures that the parameters passed to the **transfer** function are of the expected length. This prevents malicious actors from providing a shortened address that could lead to incorrect value calculations or balance updates.

#### 6.2.8 Time Manipulation

Within this category, we present 2 new fixes. Figure 30 displays a time manipulation fixing approach, which is reached by avoid to rely on `now` and using as

```

- function transfer(address _to, uint _value) {
+ /*
+ * Fix for the ERC20 short address attack
+ */
+ modifier onlyPayloadSize(uint size) {
+     assert(msg.data.length == size + 4);
+     _;
+ }
+
+ function transfer(address _to, uint _value) onlyPayloadSize(2 * 32) {
    balances[msg.sender] = safeSub(balances[msg.sender], _value);
    balances[_to] = safeAdd(balances[_to], _value);
    Transfer(msg.sender, _to, _value);
}

```

Fig. 29 1<sup>st</sup> short address new fix.

a timestamp a value passed as an input of the function. In Solidity, `now` is an alias of `block.timestamp` which could be manipulated by the miners, relying on a timestamp received in input or from a trusted oracle the issue is solved. Notice that `_startDate` stands out as an input parameter instead of a variable created and initialized in the function, and `startDate` is a state variable<sup>4</sup>.

```

...
function StandardMarketWithPriceLogger(address _creator, Event _eventContract, MarketMaker _marketMaker, uint24 _fee, uint _startDate)
    public
    StandardMarket(_creator, _eventContract, _marketMaker, _fee)
{
    if (_startDate == 0)
        startDate = now;
    else {
        // The earliest start date is the market creation date
-         require(startDate >= now);
+         require(_startDate >= now);
        startDate = _startDate;
    }
}

```

Fig. 30 1<sup>st</sup> time manipulation new fix.

The Yellow Paper<sup>5</sup> does not have any answer to “how much can it be off before it is rejected by other nodes”. If `block.timestamp` is used, the only guarantee (equation 43) is that `block.timestamp` is greater than that of its parent. Ethereum clients like Geth and Parity reject blocks if their timestamps are more than 15 seconds in the future, therefore, this is the temporal window that may permit the validation of manipulated blocks. This implies that one can safely use `block.timestamp` if the time-dependent logic can tolerate a potential variation of up to 15 seconds.

The fix shown in Figure 31 involves the removal of `require(nextMint[_localFarmAddress] < block.timestamp)`; which is manipulable by the

<sup>4</sup> <https://github.com/gnosis/pm-contracts/commit/81b40df2fe17dbcf1e4c65d7e2f946fed23cb351>

<sup>5</sup> <https://ethereum.github.io/yellowpaper/paper.pdf>

miners. The reported fix introduces a more sophisticated time-checking mechanism that ensures that minting rewards can only occur if a sufficient duration (`rewardDuration`) has passed since the last minting event. Thus, it prevents unauthorized reward minting for timeframes that could be manipulated, since Ethereum miners can only slightly influence the value of `block.timestamp`.

```

-
-     uint256 amount = tokensPerYear * _period / 365 days; // for all farms
-     amount = amount * localFarms[localFarmId[_localFarmAddress]].multiplier / totalMultipliers; // amount
-
-     nextMint[_localFarmAddress] = nextMint[_localFarmAddress] + _period;
-
-     rewardsToken.mint(_localFarmAddress, amount);
-     ILocalFarm(_localFarmAddress).notifyRewardAmount(amount);
+     require (_period > 0, "Cannot claim reward for a timeframe of 0 seconds");
+     //require (nextMint[_localFarmAddress] < block.timestamp); // Can not place a "requirement" on auto-
+
+     if(localFarms[localFarmId[_localFarmAddress]].lastMintTimestamp + rewardDuration < block.timestamp)
+     {
+         // We should check if sufficient time since the last minting session passed for this Local Farm.
+
+         if(_period < block.timestamp - localFarms[localFarmId[_localFarmAddress]].lastMintTimestamp)
+         {
+             // Claiming for less-than-maximum period.
+             // This can be necessary if the contract stayed without claiming for too long
+             // and the accumulated reward can not be minted in one transaction.
+
+             // In this case this function `mintFarmingReward` can be manually claimed by a user multiple
+             // in order to mint reward part-by-part.
+
+             // Last Mint Timestamp of the local farm must be updated to match the time period
+             // that user already claimed reward for.
+
+             localFarms[localFarmId[_localFarmAddress]].lastMintTimestamp += _period;
+         }
+         else
+         {
+             // Otherwise the reward is distributed for the total reward period duration,
+             // it is important to note that user can not cause the contract to print reward in the future
+
+             _period = block.timestamp - localFarms[localFarmId[_localFarmAddress]].lastMintTimestamp;
+             localFarms[localFarmId[_localFarmAddress]].lastMintTimestamp = block.timestamp;
+         }
+
+         // Reward is then calculated based on the _period
+         // it can be either "specified period" or "now - Local Farm's previous minting timestamp".
+         uint256 amount = tokensPerYear * _period / 365 days; // for all farms
+         amount = amount * localFarms[localFarmId[_localFarmAddress]].multiplier / totalMultipliers; // amount
+
+         // Local farm is then notified about the reward minting session.
+         rewardsToken.mint(_localFarmAddress, amount);
+         ILocalFarm(_localFarmAddress).notifyRewardAmount(amount);
+     }

```

Fig. 31 2<sup>nd</sup> time manipulation new fix.

### Summary of Findings for Time Manipulation fixes

Since `now` and `block` properties are prone to be manipulated by the miners, to mitigate time manipulation attacks, it is indicated to rely on timestamps passed as input parameters in the function that uses them. To use `block.timestamp` when a 15-second variance in time is acceptable for your application.

#### 6.2.9 Unchecked Return Values for Low Level Call

This category includes one new fix that we detail below. The function `transfer(address _to, uint256 _value)` is included in the `IERC20` interface provided by OpenZeppelin. According to the docs, it returns a boolean value indicating whether the operation succeeded. In the context of ERC20 tokens, the `transfer` and `transferFrom` functions are essential for transferring tokens between accounts. These functions are designed to return a boolean value indicating whether the operation was successful. However, many smart contracts interacting with ERC20 tokens often assume that `transfer` and `transferFrom` will always succeed and do not check the returned boolean value. This assumption can create a false sense of security, as a transfer may fail without the contract recognizing it. Such oversight can lead to incorrect token balances and other contract state inconsistencies.

`SafeTransfer` used as a fix comes from `SafeERC20.sol` of OpenZeppelin, which provides a wrapper around the standard ERC20 functions and handles the returns values. Such a fix is depicted in Figure 32.

This fixing procedure diverges from barely checking with an `if` or a `require` statement the return value of the low-level call, by using an external library function.

```

ITWAPOracle(manager.twapOracleAddress()).update();
uint256 toTransfer =
    IERC20(manager.curve3PoolTokenAddress()).balanceOf(address(this));
- IERC20(manager.curve3PoolTokenAddress()).transfer(
+ IERC20(manager.curve3PoolTokenAddress()).safeTransfer(
    manager.treasuryAddress(), toTransfer
);
emit PriceReset(

```

**Fig. 32** 1<sup>st</sup> unchecked return values for low level call new fix.

## 7 Evaluation of New Fixes

To assess the quality and long-term reliability of the proposed fixes for smart contract vulnerabilities, we conducted a two-pronged empirical evaluation. The first relied on a structured questionnaire to gather expert feedback on three key dimensions: generalizability, long-term sustainability, and effectiveness of each

fix. The second involved mining and analyzing historical commit data from real-world repositories to investigate how fixes persist, evolve, or are revised over time. Together, these complementary approaches provide a comprehensive view of the practical impact and robustness of the correction strategies proposed in this study.

## 7.1 Expert-Based Evaluation via Questionnaire

This section presents the questionnaire-based evaluation designed to assess the newly identified correction strategies. The decision to use a questionnaire stems from the need to collect structured and systematic feedback from academic and industry experts. The goal was to evaluate each fix in terms of three essential criteria: its generalizability to similar contexts, its sustainability over time, and its effectiveness in mitigating the associated vulnerability. This method captures both quantitative and qualitative insights into how these strategies are perceived by experienced practitioners in the field of smart contract security.

### 7.1.1 Questionnaire Description

The questionnaire is divided into two parts: a preliminary section that gathers background information about the participants, and an evaluation section covering the 27 proposed fixes.

In the preliminary section, participants were asked to specify their professional background (academic or industry), years of experience with smart contract security and development, and their familiarity with the DASP TOP 10 taxonomy. This information helps contextualize the feedback based on each participant's expertise.

The evaluation section asked participants to rate each fix on a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high) along three dimensions:

- *Generalizability*: How applicable do you think the fix is to similar or recurring cases?
- *Long-Term Sustainability*: To what extent do you believe the fix can remain effective and manageable over time, even as the context or codebase changes?
- *Effectiveness*: How effectively do you think the fix resolves the identified vulnerability?

Each fix was presented with a detailed description, code example, and unique identifier (as defined in Section 6.2), allowing respondents to provide consistent and informed evaluations.

### 7.1.2 Questionnaire's Results

We received a total of nine responses: five from academics and researchers and four from industry professionals, particularly from ICT firms. We specifically sought participants with expertise in both decentralized application (dApp) development and smart contract security.

Regarding professional experience, eight respondents reported between five and eight years of Solidity development, while one respondent reported over ten years of experience. As for familiarity with the DASP TOP 10 taxonomy, five participants declared themselves well-acquainted with it, three had heard of it but were not familiar with its specifics, and one was completely unfamiliar with it.

The collected ratings are summarized in Table 4. Each fix is evaluated across the three dimensions, with statistical indicators such as mean, standard deviation, variance, and mode.


From a statistical perspective, the analysis highlights notable trends across categories. Fixes addressing vulnerabilities such as *Reentrancy* and *Unchecked Return Values for Low Level Call* consistently received higher mean values across all three dimensions, accompanied by relatively low standard deviation and variance. These metrics suggest not only a strong perceived quality of these fixes but also a high degree of consensus among respondents, reinforcing the idea that such fixes are both effective and stable over time. In contrast, categories like *Time Manipulation* and *Arithmetic* display lower average scores and higher variability, indicating that the perceived quality of the solutions may be highly context-dependent or that the proposed strategies are still immature or less convincing for experienced developers.

The dimension of generalizability is particularly polarized. While *Reentrancy* fixes reach values above 4.0 with low dispersion, indicating high confidence in their adaptability, fixes in the *Time Manipulation* category have both lower means and higher variance, suggesting they may be perceived as more tailored to specific scenarios or lacking broader applicability.

Regarding long-term sustainability, the results reflect a similar distribution. Fixes with high average scores and low variance, such as those for *Unchecked Return Values*, indicate that respondents believe these corrections are structurally sound and maintainable over time. On the other hand, the broader standard deviations observed in categories like *Bad Randomness* and *Denial of Service* may reflect uncertainty about how these fixes will behave under evolving operational conditions or in more complex systems.

In terms of effectiveness, the majority of fixes achieved a mode of 5, denoting that most respondents considered them highly effective. However, this unanimity is sometimes contradicted by substantial standard deviation values, particularly in the *Arithmetic* and *Denial of Service* categories. This suggests divergent opinions, possibly due to varied experiences or differing interpretations of what constitutes effectiveness in practice. For instance, a fix may theoretically eliminate a vulnerability but may introduce performance overheads or reduce modularity, influencing subjective assessments.

To deepen the statistical interpretation, we examined the distribution of scores across the three dimensions using a boxplot, shown in Figure 33. The plot displays the median, interquartile range, and outliers, offering insight into the central tendency and variability of perceptions across evaluation dimensions. This visualization clearly shows that *Effectiveness* is the most highly rated and consistent dimension overall, with a median just above 4 and a tight interquartile range. This suggests broad agreement on the impact and practical utility of the fixes. *Generalizability* and *Long-term Sustainability*, although still positively rated, exhibit more dispersion. The whiskers for Generalizability extend from approximately 2.9 to 4.3, indicating that while many fixes are seen as broadly applicable, some are considered highly context-specific. Sustainability shows a similar pattern but with slightly less spread, reflecting moderate consensus about the maintainability of most solutions. These distributions help clarify not only how the fixes perform on average, but also how consistently they are perceived across different evaluators. The presence of outliers, especially in Generalizability, further underscores the importance of tailoring certain fixes to specific use cases.



**Fig. 33** Boxplot of respondent scores for Generalizability, Long-term Sustainability, and Effectiveness across all fixes.

Overall, this statistical analysis enables a nuanced assessment of the proposed correction strategies. The aggregated data clearly indicate that some fixes, particularly in the *Reentrancy* and *Unchecked Return Values* categories, are not only considered highly effective but also generalizable and sustainable. In contrast, other categories reflect greater variability, signaling a need for refinement or more context-sensitive implementations.

The analysis of the collected data revealed that the overall evaluations of the new correction strategies provide valuable insights into their applicability and perceived robustness. In particular, the results suggest that some of the new solutions could be seamlessly integrated into current development prac-

---

tices, enhancing both security and maintainability. These findings, combined with the qualitative comments collected during the study, provide a comprehensive picture of the operational relevance and maturity of each fix. They represent a significant contribution toward the development of more structured and reliable security guidelines for smart contracts. Moreover, they lay the groundwork for future research that could explore the practical deployment of these strategies, their interaction with other security patterns, and their evolution in response to emerging threats.

Category	Generalizability			Long-term Sustainability			Effectiveness		
	Mean	Std Dev	Variance	Mean	Std Dev	Variance	Mean	Std Dev	Variance
<b>Access Control</b>									
Fix 1	3.56	1.24	1.53	3.67	0.71	0.50	4.33	0.71	0.50
Fix 2	4.11	1.05	1.11	3.67	0.71	0.50	4.44	0.73	0.53
<b>Arithmetic</b>									
Fix 1	3.44	1.33	1.78	3.33	1.22	1.50	3.78	1.30	1.69
Fix 2	3.22	1.09	1.19	3.33	0.87	0.75	3.67	0.87	0.75
Fix 3	3.78	1.09	1.19	4.00	0.87	0.75	3.89	0.93	0.86
Fix 4	4.00	1.00	1.00	3.78	0.97	0.94	4.22	0.67	0.44
Fix 5	3.56	1.33	1.78	3.33	0.87	0.75	4.22	1.36	1.86
Fix 6	3.89	1.36	1.86	3.78	0.97	0.94	4.22	0.83	0.69
Fix 7	4.00	1.32	1.75	3.78	1.20	1.44	4.11	1.17	1.36
Fix 8	3.89	1.45	2.11	4.00	1.12	1.25	4.22	1.09	1.19
<b>Bad Randomness</b>									
Fix 1	3.89	1.36	1.86	3.67	1.32	1.75	3.89	1.45	2.11
Fix 2	3.56	1.51	2.28	3.89	1.54	2.36	3.78	1.56	2.44
<b>Denial of Service</b>									
Fix 1	3.56	1.24	1.53	3.67	1.22	1.50	3.89	1.36	1.86
Fix 2	3.56	1.01	1.03	3.44	1.01	1.03	4.00	1.12	1.25
Fix 3	3.67	1.12	1.25	3.89	1.36	1.86	3.89	1.27	1.61
Fix 4	2.89	1.27	1.61	2.89	1.45	2.11	3.11	1.17	1.36
<b>Front-Running</b>									
Fix 1	3.78	1.30	1.69	3.67	1.32	1.75	4.11	1.05	1.11
Fix 2	3.67	1.50	2.25	3.78	1.48	2.19	4.00	1.32	1.75
<b>Reentrancy</b>									
Fix 1	4.00	1.32	1.75	3.89	1.36	1.86	4.00	1.12	1.25
Fix 2	4.00	1.22	1.50	4.00	0.87	0.75	4.11	0.93	0.86
Fix 3	3.89	1.17	1.36	3.78	1.09	1.19	4.11	1.05	1.11
Fix 4	3.89	1.36	1.86	3.78	1.30	1.69	3.78	1.39	1.94
Fix 5	3.89	1.36	1.86	3.56	1.24	1.53	4.00	1.41	2.00
<b>Short Address</b>									
Fix 1	3.78	1.09	1.19	3.89	1.05	1.11	4.44	0.73	0.53
<b>Time Manipulation</b>									
Fix 1	3.00	1.20	1.43	3.13	1.25	1.55	3.50	1.41	2.00
Fix 2	3.22	1.20	1.44	3.67	1.32	1.75	3.67	1.32	1.75
<b>Unchecked Return Values for Low Level Call</b>									
Fix 1	4.33	0.87	0.75	4.56	0.73	0.53	4.44	1.01	1.03

Table 4 Statistical Analysis of Generalizability, Long-term Sustainability and Effectiveness of new Fixes.

## 7.2 Post-Fix Evolution Analysis through Repository Mining

Starting from the set of fixing commits previously collected and filtered during  $\mathbf{RQ}_1$ , we extracted all subsequent commits that modified the same files involved in the fixes. For each fixing commit, we identified the associated file and traversed the commit history of the corresponding repository to gather all later commits that performed further modifications to those files. We excluded merge commits and retained only those that introduced actual changes. This procedure allowed us to build a dataset of later commits, which contains modifications related to the previously fixed vulnerable code. The extraction was performed using PyDriller, and for each relevant commit, we collected its metadata (e.g., hash, author, date, and message), the corresponding code diff, and the post-commit version of the modified file. The size of such a dataset is 6716 records.

Starting from the dataset of later commits, we aimed to identify cases where the same types of vulnerabilities might have reoccurred after the initial fix. To achieve this, we developed a script that analyzes subsequent commits to the fixing ones we collected that could represent post-fix security patches. In particular, we leveraged NLP techniques, relying even in this case on Spacy to detect commits whose messages contain security-related terminology (e.g., *fix*, *security*, *vulnerability*).

For each project, we searched for commits containing these keywords and associated them with their previously identified fixing commit. We excluded commits already marked as relevant in the initial dataset. This process allowed us to collect a set of 10 security fixes that appeared after the initial fixing commits. One of the authors manually inspected these commits, and all but one preserved the original fix introduced in the earlier commit. Eight of these commits were performed after a fixing commit that adhered to literature guidelines, including the one that did not preserve the fix previously done.

Relying only on the commit message may result in letting pass out important details, to add more depth to the post-fix analysis we systematically evaluated the modification of the later commits. In detail, for each commit identified in the set produced during  $\mathbf{RQ}_1$ , we extracted the lines added to the fixed file and checked whether all of these lines were still present in the source code of the later commits. If at least one of these lines was missing, we marked the commit for subsequent manual inspection. 201 commits were further evaluated in this way, each diff was viewed on the GitHub page of the associated repository. Hence, one author categorized the modifications, as Table 5 reports. Thus, we describe the category used in the classification task:

- Changes in the business logic: Changes in the functional requirements met by the source code;
- General refactoring: General refactoring operations;
- Gas optimization: Gas optimizations;
- Whitespace, comment or message difference: Modifications in the file that do not change or introduce new logic content;

- Extract variable or method: Extraction of variable, variable declaration, and initialization before using it, as well as for methods;
- Replace a general type with a specific type: Changing a given type or access modifier with a more specific one, for instance, `uint`  $\rightarrow$  `uint128`;
- Improved fix: Improvement of the fixes;
- Replace a specific type with a general type: Changing a specific type or access modifier with a more general one, for instance, `uint128`  $\rightarrow$  `uint`;

Motivation	Occurrences
Changes in business logic	70
General refactoring	57
Gas optimization	23
Whitespace, comment, or message difference	21
Extract variable or method	19
Replace a general type with a specific type	4
Improved fix	4
Replace a specific type with a general type	3

**Table 5** Distribution of Motivations

None of the four fix improvements was performed on a fix in our set of new fixing approaches. Overall, this analysis confirms the stability of the collected fixing commits over time. Moreover, we can conclude that fixes are definitive and generally involve modification in a few lines of code, as already discussed by Zhou et al. [53].

## 8 Discussion

This section discusses the main findings of the study and practical development behaviors.

### 8.1 Results Discussion

The results show that adherence to academic guidelines is low or even null for certain vulnerabilities. This reflected the dedication of current research to some categories of security threats such as Reentrancy and Arithmetic. The motivations for this are enclosed in the severity and the popularity of these kinds of vulnerabilities. Indeed, previous research showed how Reentrancy and Arithmetic are more diffused than other categories [14].

The spread of such vulnerabilities is reflected too in academic research. To provide deep insight into this, we report the number of papers containing “smart contract” or “smart contracts” and “name of the vulnerability” and “vulnerability” or “vulnerabilities” in the title. Paraphrasing of the vulnerability category name was considered, hence, Table 6 indicates the count of papers responding to the query for each vulnerability category.

Vulnerability Class	Count
Access Control	3
Arithmetic	13
Reentrancy	31
Bad Randomness	0
Denial of Service	9
Front Running	3
Time Manipulation	0
Short Address	0
Unchecked Low Level Calls	10

**Table 6** Aggregated count of vulnerabilities

To collect such counts we leveraged SerpAPI<sup>6</sup>, a Google scraper that can work with the engine of Google Scholar. Overall, this result enforces the hypothesis that literature adherence is higher for some categories as these are more studied in the current literature. In addition, in this scenario, we can conclude that the low or null following of literature guidelines may be correlated to the lack of academic studies or fixing strategies for vulnerability classes such as bad randomness.

The access control category should be considered in a diverse way, due to the presence of this category also in OWASP TOP 10, which reports the most common vulnerability typologies in traditional web apps. Therefore, such kind of threat is already well-known by the developers.

To address the gaps posed by the low adherence for specific vulnerabilities, future research should be devoted to going alongside developers' behaviors, to enrich the available guidelines in an ever-changing world such as blockchain development. This should be done also by periodically reviewing the output of blockchain technology associations, such as Consensys, and specifically Consensys Diligence<sup>7</sup> which is involved in Ethereum policy discussions and security audits for SCs.

The new fixing strategies identified in this study can guide Solidity developers in addressing security threats by providing them with a broader range of options for managing security vulnerabilities. On the other hand, these approaches improve academic guidelines by incorporating patching procedures used in real practice, thus bridging the gap between academic research and developers' methods to mitigate security problems.

Our analysis revealed that in several commits, developers either removed `send/transfer` in favor of `call`, or replaced SafeMath with Solidity 0.8+ built-in checks. This indicates that developers' fixing strategies are evolving in response to language changes. Therefore, the reliance on Solidity updates is not only a theoretical implication but also observed in practical codebases. These points and implications are deeply discussed next.

<sup>6</sup> <https://serpapi.com/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://diligence.consensys.io/>

## 8.2 Reliance on Mitigation based on Solidity Updates and new Features

The Solidity language has often met the predominant vulnerability-addressing requirement. After the DAO attack, it introduces `send()` and `transfer()` functions, which came with a limited amount of gas to prevent state modifications. Using such functions has been reported as a reentrancy fix in many studies [7,8,52]. The Ethereum Improvement Proposal (EIP) 1884 raises the gas cost associated with the `SLOAD` operation, which may cause some existing smart contracts to malfunction. These contracts will encounter issues because their fallback functions previously required less than 2300 gas, but they now exceed this limit. Therefore, gas costs can be varied in the future.

This underscores possible issues for contracts whose developers are supposed to be reentrancy bullet-proof without using the `call()` function, as well as for each gas-related problem that might occur. Thus, we pinpoint the need to study more deeply the implications of relying solely on `send` and `transfer` functions. This seems to have already been received to some extent by the developer as we found a few commits that involved the removal of these functions in favor of `call()`.

Another point that needs to be stressed is the reliance on the default arithmetic check introduced with Solidity 0.8+. Since transactions that induce overflow and underflow are reverted, gas costs related to this behavior must be considered and developers must deal with the transaction revert, handling it. Causing an overflow and letting the default check take care of it, results in a revert that is not accompanied by a detailed message, as we show in Figure 34. This could cause difficulties with error comprehension.

As Solidity, when releasing the arithmetic default check state that:

“Checks for overflow are very common, so we made them the default to increase readability of code, even if it comes at a slight increase of gas costs.”

Such variation in readability and gas should be studied considering as a baseline the `SafeMath` usage, as it is the most used way to address arithmetic issues and reported in work we reviewed as a best practice to go through this [52].

## 8.3 Utilization of Contract Vulnerability Handling vs. Library-based Vulnerability Handling

Not using external libraries reduces risks associated with vulnerabilities or errors in imported libraries. eliminates the risk that a library might be compromised in the future, and reduces the risk of losing control or understanding over the flow of execution in code. Moreover, it allows for tailored customizations specific to your use case, as the code is not reliant on external codebases, as we found in some commits, for instance, in the one shown in Figure 9. Importing libraries can reduce deployment gas costs, but may increase execution



## 9 Threats to Validity

**Construct Validity.** Construct validity threats primarily arise from errors in manually tagging the relevance of each commit and its associated vulnerability class. To address this issue, two evaluators independently tagged each instance and resolved any conflicts through discussion. Furthermore, the manual evaluation resulted in a very high Cohen’s kappa value, indicating strong inter-rater reliability.

**Internal Validity.** A potential threat that might influence our results relates to whether each fix is accurately recognized in the existing literature. To mitigate this threat, we conducted double and independent analyses. Similarly, the same approach was applied when determining if a given fix was overlooked by the state of the art. To further minimize bias, we involved three authors in the conflict resolution process for this step.

**External Validity.** The sample under study may not fully reflect real-world conditions. Specifically, a contract in our sample might be part of projects hosted on GitHub as open repositories but may not be deployed on the blockchain. Such information is typically not obtainable from GitHub repositories. However, we could assume that contracts in projects with at least ten stars are not toy projects. Thus, we expect that most contracts of our sample are actively deployed on the blockchain. The choice of the DASP taxonomy may limit the generalizability of our findings, as alternative taxonomies could group vulnerabilities differently or include more recent categories. While DASP is still in use in recent literature, its coverage might not fully reflect the evolving landscape of smart contract vulnerabilities.

## 10 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we analyzed the content of 364 commits, each representing changes that address Smart Contract security vulnerabilities categorized according to the DASP TOP 10 taxonomy—a widely recognized classification of common issues in the domain [14]. Each commit was considered relevant following a double-checked manual evaluation process, including independent labeling and consensus-based conflict resolution.

Our study pursued two main objectives. First, we aimed to measure the degree to which Solidity developers adhere to established vulnerability mitigation guidelines as documented in the literature. Second, we sought to uncover and characterize fixing strategies that, while used in practice, have not yet been systematically captured in academic work. Through this twofold investigation, we identified 27 distinct and actionable correction strategies that expand the current understanding of how security issues are addressed in real-world smart contract development.

Our results show that developers tend to closely follow recommended practices for certain well-studied vulnerability classes—such as Reentrancy and Arithmetic issues—demonstrating a clear alignment with academic guidance.

However, in categories that are less represented or less precisely documented in the literature, such as Time Manipulation or Unchecked Return Values, the adherence is noticeably lower. This finding underscores the presence of gaps between academic knowledge and practical development practices, suggesting that developers are actively experimenting with novel solutions to bridge those gaps. Our study contributes to addressing this disconnect by capturing and analyzing these emerging strategies, thereby enriching the field with practical insights that had not been formally systematized before.

To evaluate the impact, stability, and perceived quality of these new fixes, we conducted a two-pronged empirical evaluation. The first involved a structured expert questionnaire aimed at assessing the generalizability, long-term sustainability, and effectiveness of each proposed fix. The responses gathered from nine experienced professionals in academia and industry, revealed that fixes in categories like Reentrancy and Unchecked Return Values for Low Level Call were not only rated highly across all dimensions but also perceived as robust and reusable. Conversely, categories like Arithmetic and Denial of Service exhibited more variability in responses, reflecting diverse opinions and possibly context-dependent effectiveness. A supporting boxplot visualization highlighted that Effectiveness was consistently rated highest across all fixes, whereas Generalizability showed greater dispersion, indicating the need for case-specific adaptation in some scenarios.

The second part of our evaluation examined the evolution of code after the application of a fix. By tracking more than 6,700 subsequent commits to the same files that contained the original security patches, we investigated whether and how the fixed code changed over time. This analysis, supported by automated filtering and manual inspection, revealed that the majority of the fixes were preserved, indicating their long-term stability. In some cases, improvements were introduced without removing the original logic. We also developed a classification scheme for subsequent modifications—including logic changes, refactoring, and optimization—that provided further evidence of how and why smart contract code evolves after an initial fix.

Overall, our findings offer a comprehensive and empirically grounded picture of how smart contract vulnerabilities are addressed in practice. By identifying not only the fixes commonly used in the field but also assessing their reception by experts and persistence in real-world repositories, this study provides both practical value to developers and analytical depth to the academic community.

Future work may extend this research by exploring patterns and techniques used by developers to optimize gas consumption while maintaining security. This is particularly relevant for contracts with frequent library interactions or repetitive security checks. A comparative analysis of SafeMath usage versus the built-in overflow protections in Solidity versions 0.8 and above could yield valuable insights into the trade-offs between gas efficiency, code readability, and developer preferences. Additionally, further study into the balance between library reuse and custom logic could help identify best practices for minimizing both gas costs and security risks. Furthermore, systematically ana-

lyzing the contracts deployed on the blockchain or exploring SC repositories to understand whether certain types of vulnerabilities are more widespread than others and uncovering the reasons behind this difference would be highly valuable and would deepen our understanding of SC security. For the vulnerability classes that we considered in this study, the adherence to literature guidelines varied considerably. Investigating why developers diverge from academic recommendations would be interesting and crucial to better understanding both developer practices and the adequateness and completeness of the fixing approaches currently known in research.

## Declarations

**Funding:** This work is funded by PRIN Project *Trust Machines for TrustlessNess (TruMaN): The Impact of Distributed Trust on the Configuration of Blockchain Ecosystems* (Identifier Code 2022F5CLN2–CUP H53D23002400006) financed by the Italian Ministry of University and Research, by the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), Mission 4 Component 2 Investment 1.5 - Call for tender No.3277 published on December 30, 2021 by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR) funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU. Project Code ECS0000038 – Project Title eINS Ecosystem of Innovation for Next Generation Sardinia – CUP F53C22000430001-Grant Assignment Decree No. 1056 adopted on June 23, 2022 by the Italian Ministry of Ministry of University and Research (MUR), and by Università degli Studi di Cagliari - Prog n. FTE0000522 – CUP: B27H21009670008 - COR: 22390257, sulle risorse di cui all'articolo 3, comma 1, del decreto 24 giugno 2022 per progetto di ricerca e sviluppo MASSIVE – Multi-platform Application to the Self Sovereign Identity Validation Environment, and financed by the Italian Ministry of University and Research, project SOP (Securing sOftware Platforms - CUP: H73C22000890001), as part of the SERICS project (Security and Rights in CyberSpace - n. PE00000014 - CUP: B43C22000750006), and the W.E. B.E.S.T. (Wine EVOO Blockchain Et Smart Contract) PRIN 2020 project, financed by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR), CUP: F73C22000430001.

**Ethical approval:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent:** Not applicable.

**Author Contributions:** Francesco Salzano and Simone Scalabrino contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection, and analysis were performed by Francesco Salzano, Lodovica Marchesi, and Cosmo Kevin Antenucci. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Francesco

Salzano and Lodovica Marchesi and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read, reviewed, and approved the final manuscript. Simone Scalabrino, Rocco Oliveto, and Remo Pareschi supervised the work.

**Data Availability Statement** The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available in the replication package of the study, available at: <https://github.com/fsalzano/Smart-Contract-Vulnerabilities-A-Comparative-Study-of-Academic-and-Developer-Solutions>.

**Conflict of Interests:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Alsunaidi, S.J., Alhaidari, F.A.: A survey of consensus algorithms for blockchain technology. In: 2019 International Conference on Computer and Information Sciences (ICCIS), pp. 1–6 (2019). DOI 10.1109/ICCISci.2019.8716424
2. Bodell III, W.E., Meisami, S., Duan, Y.: Proxy hunting: Understanding and characterizing proxy-based upgradeable smart contracts in blockchains. In: 32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23), pp. 1829–1846 (2023)
3. Buterin, V., et al.: Ethereum white paper. GitHub repository **1**, 22–23 (2013)
4. Buterin, V., et al.: A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. white paper **3(37)**, 2–1 (2014)
5. Chen, C., Su, J., Chen, J., Wang, Y., Bi, T., Yu, J., Wang, Y., Lin, X., Chen, T., Zheng, Z.: When chatgpt meets smart contract vulnerability detection: How far are we? ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (2023)
6. Chen, J., Chen, C., Hu, J., Grundy, J., Wang, Y., Chen, T., Zheng, Z.: Identifying smart contract security issues in code snippets from stack overflow. In: Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, pp. 1198–1210 (2024)
7. Chen, J., Xia, X., Lo, D., Grundy, J., Luo, X., Chen, T.: Defining smart contract defects on ethereum. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering **48(1)**, 327–345 (2020)
8. Chen, Q., Zhou, T., Liu, K., Li, L., Ge, C., Liu, Z., Klein, J., Bissyandé, T.F.: Tips: towards automating patch suggestion for vulnerable smart contracts. Automated Software Engineering **30(2)**, 31 (2023)
9. Cohen, J.: A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and psychological measurement **20(1)**, 37–46 (1960)
10. Dabic, O., Aghajani, E., Bavota, G.: Sampling projects in github for msr studies. In: 2021 IEEE/ACM 18th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR), pp. 560–564. IEEE (2021)
11. Demir, M., Alalfi, M., Turetken, O., Ferworn, A.: Security smells in smart contracts. In: 2019 IEEE 19th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security Companion (QRS-C), pp. 442–449 (2019). DOI 10.1109/QRS-C.2019.00086
12. Di Sorbo, A., Laudanna, S., Vacca, A., Visaggio, C.A., Canfora, G.: Profiling gas consumption in solidity smart contracts. Journal of Systems and Software **186**, 111193 (2022)
13. Dia, B., Ivaki, N., Laranjeiro, N.: An empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of smart contract verification tools. In: 2021 IEEE 26th Pacific Rim International Symposium on Dependable Computing (PRDC), pp. 17–26. IEEE (2021)
14. Durieux, T., Ferreira, J.F., Abreu, R., Cruz, P.: Empirical review of automated analysis tools on 47,587 ethereum smart contracts. In: Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International conference on software engineering, pp. 530–541 (2020)

15. Enterprise Ethereum Alliance, I.E.: Eea ethtrust security levels specification version 2 (2023). URL <https://entethalliance.org/specs/ethtrust-s1/v2/>
16. Ethereum Developer Community: SWC Registry - Smart Contract Weakness Classification and Test Cases (2020). URL <https://swcregistry.io/>. Last accessed: March 2025
17. Feist, J., Grieco, G., Groce, A.: Slither: a static analysis framework for smart contracts. In: 2019 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Workshop on Emerging Trends in Software Engineering for Blockchain (WETSEB), pp. 8–15. IEEE (2019)
18. Ferreira, J.F., Cruz, P., Durieux, T., Abreu, R.: Smartbugs: A framework to analyze solidity smart contracts. In: Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, pp. 1349–1352 (2020)
19. Gao, B., Shen, S., Shi, L., Li, J., Sun, J., Bu, L.: Verification assisted gas reduction for smart contracts. In: 2021 28th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC), pp. 264–274. IEEE (2021)
20. Ghaleb, A.: Towards effective static analysis approaches for security vulnerabilities in smart contracts. In: 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, pp. 1–5 (2022)
21. Ghaleb, A., Pattabiraman, K.: How effective are smart contract analysis tools? evaluating smart contract static analysis tools using bug injection. In: Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis, pp. 415–427 (2020)
22. Guo, H., Chen, Y., Chen, X., Huang, Y., Zheng, Z.: Smart contract code repair recommendation based on reinforcement learning and multi-metric optimization. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* **33**(4), 1–31 (2024)
23. Huang, M., Chen, J., Jiang, Z., Zheng, Z.: Revealing hidden threats: An empirical study of library misuse in smart contracts. In: Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, pp. 1–12 (2024)
24. Huang, R., Shen, Q., Wang, Y., Wu, Y., Wu, Z., Luo, X., Ruan, A.: Reenrepair: Automatic and semantic equivalent repair of reentrancy in smart contracts. *Journal of Systems and Software* **216**, 112107 (2024)
25. Jiang, B., Liu, Y., Chan, W.: Contractfuzzer: Fuzzing smart contracts for vulnerability detection. In: 2018 33rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), pp. 259–269 (2018). DOI 10.1145/3238147.3238177
26. Khan, F., David, I., Varro, D., McIntosh, S.: Code cloning in smart contracts on the ethereum platform: An extended replication study. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **49**(4), 2006–2019 (2022)
27. Kondo, M., Oliva, G.A., Jiang, Z.M., Hassan, A.E., Mizuno, O.: Code cloning in smart contracts: a case study on verified contracts from the ethereum blockchain platform. *Empirical Software Engineering* **25**, 4617–4675 (2020)
28. Liu, C., Liu, H., Cao, Z., Chen, Z., Chen, B., Roscoe, B.: Reguard: finding reentrancy bugs in smart contracts. In: Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings, pp. 65–68 (2018)
29. Nakamoto, S.: Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. *Decentralized Business Review* p. 21260 (2008)
30. Nguyen, T.D., Pham, L.H., Sun, J.: Sguard: towards fixing vulnerable smart contracts automatically. In: 2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), pp. 1215–1229. IEEE (2021)
31. Nugroho, Y.S., Hata, H., Matsumoto, K.: How different are different diff algorithms in git? use-histogram for code changes. *Empirical Software Engineering* **25**, 790–823 (2020)
32. Pierro, G.A., Rocha, H.: The influence factors on ethereum transaction fees. In: 2019 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Workshop on Emerging Trends in Software Engineering for Blockchain (WETSEB), pp. 24–31. IEEE (2019)
33. Porru, S., Pinna, A., Marchesi, M., Tonelli, R.: Blockchain-oriented software engineering: challenges and new directions. In: 2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion (ICSE-C), pp. 169–171. IEEE (2017)
34. Rameder, H., Di Angelo, M., Salzer, G.: Review of automated vulnerability analysis of smart contracts on ethereum. *Frontiers in Blockchain* **5**, 814977 (2022)

35. Rosa, G., Scalabrino, S., Bavota, G., Oliveto, R.: What quality aspects influence the adoption of docker images? *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2018)
36. Salzano, F., Antenucci, C.K., Marchesi, L., Scalabrino, S., Tonelli, R., Oliveto, R., Pareschi, R.: Replication package for "fixing smart contract vulnerabilities: A comparative study of academic solutions and developer approaches". GitHub Repository (2024). Available at: <https://github.com/fsalzano/Smart-Contract-Vulnerabilities-A-Comparative-Study-of-Academic-and-Developer-Solutions>
37. Salzano, F., Scalabrino, S., Oliveto, R., Pareschi, R.: Fixing smart contract vulnerabilities: A comparative analysis of literature and developer's practices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07458* (2024)
38. Shakya, S., Mukherjee, A., Halder, R., Maiti, A., Chaturvedi, A.: Smartmixmodel: machine learning-based vulnerability detection of solidity smart contracts. In: *2022 IEEE international conference on blockchain (Blockchain)*, pp. 37–44. IEEE (2022)
39. So, S., Lee, M., Park, J., Lee, H., Oh, H.: Verismart: A highly precise safety verifier for ethereum smart contracts. In: *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 1678–1694. IEEE (2020)
40. Soud, M., Qasse, I., Liebel, G., Hamdaqa, M.: Automesc: Automatic framework for mining and classifying ethereum smart contract vulnerabilities and their fixes. In: *2023 49th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (SEAA)*, pp. 410–417. IEEE (2023)
41. Spadini, D., Aniche, M., Bacchelli, A.: Pydriller: Python framework for mining software repositories. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint meeting on european software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*, pp. 908–911 (2018)
42. Sun, Y., Wu, D., Xue, Y., Liu, H., Wang, H., Xu, Z., Xie, X., Liu, Y.: Gptscan: Detecting logic vulnerabilities in smart contracts by combining gpt with program analysis. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–13 (2024)
43. Szabo, N.: Formalizing and securing relationships on public networks. *First monday* (1997)
44. Tikhomirov, S., Voskresenskaya, E., Ivanitskiy, I., Takhaviev, R., Marchenko, E., Alexandrov, Y.: Smartcheck: Static analysis of ethereum smart contracts. In: *Proceedings of the 1st international workshop on emerging trends in software engineering for blockchain*, pp. 9–16 (2018)
45. Wang, Y., Chen, X., Huang, Y., Zhu, H.N., Bian, J., Zheng, Z.: An empirical study on real bug fixes from solidity smart contract projects. *Journal of Systems and Software* p. 111787 (2023)
46. Wang, Z., Chen, J., Wang, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhang, W., Zheng, Z.: Efficiently detecting reentrancy vulnerabilities in complex smart contracts. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* **1**(FSE), 161–181 (2024)
47. Wang, Z., Chen, J., Zheng, P., Zhang, Y., Zhang, W., Zheng, Z.: Unity is strength: Enhancing precision in reentrancy vulnerability detection of smart contract analysis tools. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2024)
48. Wang, Z., Chen, X., Zhou, X., Huang, Y., Zheng, Z., Wu, J.: An empirical study of solidity language features. In: *2021 IEEE 21st International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security Companion (QRS-C)*, pp. 698–707. IEEE (2021)
49. Wöhler, M., Zdun, U.: Domain specific language for smart contract development. In: *2020 IEEE International Conference on blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*, pp. 1–9. IEEE (2020)
50. Yu, X.L., Al-Bataineh, O., Lo, D., Roychoudhury, A.: Smart contract repair. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* **29**(4), 1–32 (2020)
51. Zhang, Z., Lei, Y., Yan, M., Yu, Y., Chen, J., Wang, S., Mao, X.: Reentrancy vulnerability detection and localization: A deep learning based two-phase approach. In: *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pp. 1–13 (2022)
52. Zhou, K., Huang, J., Han, H., Gong, B., Xiong, A., Wang, W., Wu, Q.: Smart contracts vulnerability detection model based on adversarial multi-task learning. *Journal of Information Security and Applications* **77**, 103555 (2023)

- 
53. Zhou, X., Chen, Y., Guo, H., Chen, X., Huang, Y.: Security code recommendations for smart contract. In: 2023 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER), pp. 190–200 (2023). DOI 10.1109/SANER56733.2023.00027
  54. Zou, W., Lo, D., Kochhar, P.S., Le, X.B.D., Xia, X., Feng, Y., Chen, Z., Xu, B.: Smart contract development: Challenges and opportunities. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **47**(10), 2084–2106 (2019)