

SymGPT: Auditing Smart Contracts via Combining Symbolic Execution with Large Language Models

Shihao Xia

The Pennsylvania State University
USA

Mengting He

The Pennsylvania State University
USA

Shuai Shao

University of Connecticut
USA

Tingting Yu

University of Connecticut
USA

Yiying Zhang

University of California San Diego
USA

Linhai Song

The Pennsylvania State University
USA

ABSTRACT

To govern smart contracts running on Ethereum, multiple Ethereum Request for Comment (ERC) standards have been developed, each having a set of rules to guide the behaviors of smart contracts. Violating the ERC rules could cause serious security issues and financial loss, signifying the importance of verifying smart contracts follow ERCs. Today’s practices of such verification are to manually audit each single contract, use expert-developed program-analysis tools, or use large language models (LLMs), all of which are far from effective in identifying ERC rule violations.

This paper introduces *SymGPT*, a tool that combines the natural language understanding of large language models (LLMs) with the formal guarantees of symbolic execution to automatically verify smart contracts’ compliance with ERC rules. To develop SymGPT, we conduct an empirical study of 132 ERC rules from three widely used ERC standards, examining their content, security implications, and natural language descriptions. Based on this study, we design SymGPT by first instructing an LLM to translate ERC rules into a defined EBNF grammar. We then synthesize constraints from the formalized rules to represent scenarios where violations may occur and use symbolic execution to detect them. Our evaluation shows that SymGPT identifies 5,783 ERC rule violations in 4,000 real-world contracts, including 1,375 violations with clear attack paths for stealing financial assets, demonstrating its effectiveness. Furthermore, SymGPT outperforms six automated techniques and a security-expert auditing service, underscoring its superiority over current smart contract analysis methods.

1 INTRODUCTION

Ethereum and ERC. Since the creation of Bitcoin, blockchain technology has evolved significantly. One of the most important developments is Ethereum [30, 73], a decentralized, open-source blockchain platform. Ethereum enables the creation and execution of decentralized applications (DApps) like financial services and smart contracts, which are self-executing agreements with the terms of the contracts directly written into code [31, 34].

To govern smart contracts running on Ethereum, a set of formal standards called Request for Comments (ERCs) have been developed [66]. For example, the ERC20 standard defines a common set of rules for fungible tokens—tokens (digital assets) that are interchangeable with one another [70]. ERCs play a crucial role in the Ethereum ecosystem by providing a common set of rules and specifications that developers can follow when implementing smart

```
1 contract ERC20 {
2   mapping(address => uint256) _balances;
3   mapping(address => mapping(address => uint256)) _allowances;
4   event Transfer(address _f, address _t, uint256 _v);
5
6   function transferFrom(address from, address to, uint256
7     amount) public returns (bool) {
8     + _allowances[from][msg.sender] -= amount;
9     _transfer(from, to, amount);
10    return true;
11  }
12  function _transfer(address from, address to, uint256 amount)
13    internal {
14    require(from != address(0), "from address 0");
15    require(to != address(0), "to address 0");
16    _balances[from] -= amount;
17    _balances[to] += amount;
18    emit Transfer(from, to, amount);
19  }
20  function allowance(address owner, address spender) public
21    returns (uint256) {
22    return _allowances[owner][spender];
23  }
24 }
```

Figure 1: An ERC20 rule violation that can be exploited to steal tokens. (Code simplified for illustration purpose.)

contracts. ERCs ensure interoperability and compatibility between different Ethereum-based projects, wallets, and DApps [31].

ERC violations. The violation of an ERC rule could result in interoperability issues where a violating contract may not work properly with wallets or DApps. ERC violations could also lead to security vulnerabilities and financial loss. Additionally, ERC violations could result in de-listing of tokens from exchanges, as many exchanges have listing requirements of following ERC standards [32].

Figure 1 shows a violation of an ERC20 rule in a real smart contract. The `_balances` field in line 2 monitors the number of tokens held by each address. Function `transferFrom()` in lines 6–10 transfers amount tokens from one address to another. ERC20 imposes multiple rules on `transferFrom()`, such as the necessity to fire an `Transfer` event for logging purposes and to treat the transfer of zero tokens the same as transferring other amounts, both of which the contract follows. However, `transferFrom()` violates a crucial ERC20 rule that mandates `transferFrom()` to verify whether its caller has the privilege to transfer amount tokens, which ensures financial security. Due to this violation, anyone can steal tokens from any address by invoking `transferFrom()` to transfer tokens to his address. The patch in line 7 illustrates how to fix the violation. The patch uses a two-dimensional map, `_allowances`, to track how many tokens “from” allows “msg.sender” to manipulate. The subtraction operation in this line triggers an exception and the termination of the transaction in case of underflow, thus preventing

a caller of the function from transferring tokens if they do not have enough privilege.

State of the art. Following ERC rules is crucial, but developers often struggle due to the need for a thorough understanding of all the requirements and corresponding contract code. ERC standards encompass numerous rules; for the three ERCs we examine, there are 132 rules in total. A single operation can involve multiple rules. For example, ERC20 requires that the public `transferFrom()` function of all ERC20 contracts comply with six rules, covering the function’s API, return value generation, caller privilege validation, logging, and input handling. The failure to check caller privileges leads to the issue above. Additionally, ERC rules are often described in different formats, with some being code declarations and others being natural languages, further complicating compliance.

Meanwhile, contract implementations are often complex as well. One contract and its dependent code usually contain hundreds to thousands of lines of source code in multiple files. Some code details may be obscured within intricate caller-callee relationships, while others may involve numerous objects and functionalities possibly written by different programmers. All these complexities in ERC rules and smart contracts make it extremely hard for programmers to manually check for ERC violations. As a result, ERC rule violations widely exist in real-world smart contracts [22].

Today’s practices to avoid ERC violations are on three fronts. First, program-analysis tools have been developed to automatically verify certain criteria of smart contracts [23, 47, 56, 57, 69]. These tools are limited by the types of verifications they can perform, and often fail to validate many complex ERC requirements like the rule violated in Figure 1. A fundamental reason is that many ERC rules involve semantic information (e.g., caller privileges) and require customization for individual contracts (e.g., configuring where caller privileges are stored)—a process that is time-consuming if not unfeasible. Second, there are several auditing services provided by security experts [2, 7, 15, 22, 42, 58, 65]. Although auditing services are more thorough and comprehensive than program-analysis tools, they are often costly and involve lengthy processing time, likely involving manual efforts behind the scenes. Third, there have been some primitive proposals to rely exclusively on large language models (LLMs) to check smart contracts for ERC compliance [39, 53]. Unfortunately, these techniques suffer from LLMs’ hallucinations and have high false positives and false negatives, as shown in our experiments.

Our proposal. The goal of this research is to develop a cheaper, automated, thorough, and accurate ERC rule verification approach. We believe that a well-structured method is grounded in a deep understanding of ERC rules. To this end, we commence our work with an empirical study of ERC standards. Specifically, we analyze three widely-used ERC standards and their 132 rules, focusing on the nature of these rules, the security implications of their non-compliance, and their articulation in natural language. Our study reveals four key insights that are valuable for Solidity developers, security analysts, and ERC protocol designers. Notably, we find that approximately one-sixth of ERC rules are dedicated to verifying whether an operator, token owner, or token recipient has the necessary privileges to perform specific operations. Violations of these rules can create clear attack paths, potentially leading to significant

financial losses (e.g., Figure 1). In addition, we discover that most ERC rules can be validated within a single function, and we identify recurring linguistic patterns used to describe these rules.

Leveraging the insights gained from our empirical study, we introduce SymGPT, a novel tool that combines the strength of large language models (LLMs) for natural language understanding with the formal guarantees of symbolic execution for code analysis, to automate the entire ERC rule verification process. This endeavor involves addressing three critical technical challenges: **Challenge I:** How can SymGPT be designed to handle the diverse program semantics (e.g., permission checking, logging, input handling) involved in ERC rules? **Challenge II:** How can we better utilize the LLM to reduce hallucinations while maintaining full automation? **Challenge III:** Given that different contracts may implement the same ERC rules in various ways, how can we generalize SymGPT to support these diverse implementations?

To tackle these challenges, we develop an Extended Backus-Naur Form (EBNF) grammar to formalize ERC rules using code constructs (e.g., contract fields) and contract execution events (e.g., burning tokens). This grammar empowers SymGPT to carry out program analysis tasks for verifying ERC compliance in a comprehensive manner and effectively addresses *Challenge I*. For *Challenge II*, we instruct the LLM to extract rules from descriptions pertaining to individual functions or events rather than from the entire ERC document. Once the rules are extracted, we direct the LLM to convert them into the EBNF grammar, which we subsequently transform into constraints for the symbolic execution engine. This two-step process significantly narrows the LLM’s output space, as it is bounded by the more limited grammar rather than by the broader constraints, consequently reducing the statistical variability and uncertainty associated with the LLM’s output. To resolve *Challenge III*, we define multiple constraint-variable types that represent generic contract execution states and implement corresponding update mechanisms in the symbolic execution engine. These innovations effectively mitigate implementation variations across different contracts, eliminating the necessity for contract-specific customization and distinguishing SymGPT from existing symbolic execution techniques [14, 21, 59]. To the best of our knowledge, no prior work addresses ERC requirements as comprehensively as ours.

We evaluate SymGPT using three datasets: a large dataset of 4,000 contracts randomly selected from etherscan.io [35] and polygon-scan.com [60], a ground-truth dataset of 40 contracts with violation labels (created by us), and a third containing ten contracts of an ERC not studied previously. SymGPT detects 5,783 ERC rule violations in the large dataset, with 1,375 exhibiting a clear attack path leading to potential financial losses (one is shown in Figure 1). The true-positive-to-false-positive rate is approximately 3.8. Overall, SymGPT is effective and accurate in identifying ERC violations. We compare SymGPT against two automated static analysis techniques [23, 47], one dynamic testing technique [69], three ChatGPT-based auditing approaches, and one human auditing service [22] using the ground-truth dataset. SymGPT detects at least 70% more violations than all the baselines, while reporting fewer or comparable false positives, demonstrating its superiority over the state of the art and the benefits of combining LLMs with symbolic execution for smart-contract auditing. Additionally, SymGPT reduces both

time and monetary costs by a factor of a thousand compared to the human auditing service, highlighting its cost efficiency. Finally, SymGPT identifies all violations in the third dataset, proving its ability to generalize beyond the ERCs studied during its design.

In sum, we make the following contributions.

- We conduct the first empirical study on Ethereum ERC rules made for smart-contract implementations.
- We design and implement SymGPT to audit smart contracts and pinpoint ERC rule violations.
- We confirm SymGPT’s effectiveness, advancement, cost efficiency, and generality through thorough experiments.

2 BACKGROUND

This section gives the background of the project, including Solidity smart contracts, ERCs, and techniques related to ours.

2.1 Ethereum and Solidity Smart Contracts

Ethereum is a blockchain system that enables programmers to write smart contracts for the building of decentralized applications [30, 73]. Both Ethereum users and smart contracts are represented by distinct addresses, which can be used to send and receive Ethers (the native Ethereum cryptocurrency) and interact with smart contracts, thereby leveraging their functionalities to perform complex transactions. Ethereum cultivates a thriving digital economy ecosystem. At the time of writing, the price of one Ether is over \$3K, with the total market value of all Ethers exceeding \$300B [8]. Daily transactions on Ethereum surpass one million, with a volume exceeding \$4B [5]. Smart contracts play a pivotal role in Ethereum’s success, as they guide most transactions and enable crucial functionalities [25, 29, 70].

Solidity is the most widely used programming language for writing smart contracts [16, 51]. With a syntax resembling ECMAScript [28], Solidity effectively conceals the intricacies of the Ethereum blockchain system. Implementing a contract in Solidity is similar to implementing a class in Java. A contract contains contract fields (state variables) to store the contract’s states and functions to realize its functionalities. A function in Solidity can be public, internal, or private. Public functions serve as the contract’s interface, providing external access to its functionalities. These functions can be invoked by a different contract or an Ethereum user through a message call, while private or internal functions cannot. Additionally, contracts can define events emitted during execution, serving as logs on-chain that can be analyzed by off-chain applications.

Figure 1 shows a contract example, with two contract fields in lines 2 and 3, and an event in line 4. It emits the event in line 16. The public function `transferFrom()` (lines 6–10) can be called by any Ethereum user or contract after the contract is deployed, while the internal function `_transfer()` (lines 11–17) is restricted to calls from the same address.

2.2 Ethereum Request for Comment (ERC)

ERCs are technical documents that outline the requirements for implementing smart contracts, ensuring interoperability and compatibility across various contracts, applications, and platforms and helping foster the Ethereum ecosystem [32, 33, 67]. Typically, an

ERC begins with a concise motivation. For example, ERC20 emphasizes its role in defining a standard token interface for applications like wallets and decentralized exchanges [70]. Subsequently, an ERC provides a detailed specification section, which outlines all necessary public functions and events, including their parameters, return values, and any optional attributes. Additionally, an ERC usually specifies requirements through plain text or code comments for each function or event, just before their declaration. For example, beyond the requirements for the function API and return value generation, ERC20 incorporates four additional rules for `transferFrom()` (e.g., Figure 1): mandating the emission of a `Transfer` event, verifying whether the message caller is approved to manipulate the tokens and throwing an exception if not, treating the transfer of zero tokens similarly to other amounts, and emitting an event when transferring zero tokens.

Violating ERC rules can result in substantial financial losses and unexpected contract behaviors. For instance, ERC721 mandates `onERC721Received()` to be called for each token transfer, when the recipient is a contract. Additionally, it further requires that the caller must verify that the return is a specific magic number. These two rules ensure that the recipient contract has the capability to handle the transferred tokens. Transferring tokens to a contract lacking this capability can result in the tokens being permanently trapped in the recipient contract. This issue was initially reported in 2017 on Ethereum Reddit, leading to a loss of \$10,000 worth of tokens at that time, and has since caused millions of dollars in losses [26]. As another example, the rule violation in Figure 1 opens the door for a hacker to pilfer tokens from any account. In summary, it is crucial to ensure that contracts adhere to ERC rules to safeguard financial assets and ensure the proper functionalities of the contracts.

2.3 Related work

There are tools designed to automatically detect ERC rule violations. For example, Slither includes specific checkers (i.e., `slither-checkerc` [23]) that assess whether a contract meets the requirements of 11 ERCs. However, these checkers have limited functionality, focusing mainly on verifying the presence of required functions and events, ensuring proper declarations, and confirming that functions emit the necessary events. Unfortunately, they cannot address more advanced requirements, such as the one violated in Figure 1. The ERC20 verifier is a tool dedicated to ERC20 contracts [56], performing checks similar to those done by Slither. ZepScope [47] extracts necessary checks from OpenZeppelin’s code and verifies whether contracts using OpenZeppelin’s code implement these checks. VerX [57] is an automated tool that verifies whether smart contracts meet specific properties identified from project documentation. While both ZepScope and VerX address some ERC rules (e.g., access control checks), they overlook many others (e.g., required event emissions). ERCx verifies ERC rule compliance with unit tests [69], but its tests are incomplete and often fail to trigger violations in smart contracts. Several customized ChatGPT services are available for auditing smart contracts on OpenAI’s GPTs platform [39, 53]. In Section 5.2, we evaluate one of these services and find it significantly underperforms in detecting ERC violations.

Researchers have also developed automated tools to identify other types of Solidity bugs, including reentrancy bugs [43, 46, 48, 62, 80], nondeterministic payment bugs [45, 71], consensus bugs [20, 82], eclipse attacks [50, 78, 79], out-of-gas attacks [37, 38], errors in DApps [27], accounting errors [83], and code snippets consuming unnecessary gas [10, 11, 17–19, 24, 44, 52]. However, these techniques focus on bugs unrelated to the semantics defined by ERCs and cannot detect ERC rule violations.

Security experts provide auditing services to identify vulnerabilities or logic flaws in smart contracts [2, 7, 15, 22, 42, 58, 65], with some also assessing ERC compliance. However, these services incur significantly higher financial and time costs compared to automated tools, which may make Solidity developers reluctant to use them.

Researchers have also leveraged LLMs to analyze Solidity code for detecting vulnerabilities [49, 68], patching bugs [41], generating exploits [77], and testing Solidity programs [1]. However, the problem we address differs from these techniques. Since ERCs define numerous implementation rules that are tied to program semantics, we address a broader range of bugs than these techniques.

In summary, existing program-analysis-based techniques either have limited ERC compliance verification capabilities or focus on bug types unrelated to ERCs. While manual audits are thorough, they are costly and time-consuming. LLM-based approaches show promise for general error detection but struggle to identify specific ERC rule violations. Our research overcomes these limitations by developing a fully automated, end-to-end solution for verifying smart contracts against a comprehensive set of ERC rules.

3 EMPIRICAL STUDY ON ERC RULES

This section presents our empirical study on ERC rules, including the methodology employed for the study and the categories established for the rules.

3.1 Methodology

From the 102 ERCs in the final status, we choose ERC20, ERC721, and ERC1155 as our study targets. We base our selection on their popularity, their complexity, and their significance in the Ethereum ecosystem.

ERC20 is a technical standard for fungible tokens (e.g., cryptocurrencies) and is the most famous ERC standard. It outlines operational requirements for minting, burning, and transferring tokens [70]. Presently, there are over 450,000 ERC20 tokens on Ethereum [9], with many boasting a market capitalization surpassing \$1 billion [72, 75, 76].

ERC721 is designed for non-fungible tokens (NFTs), where each token is distinct and indivisible [29]. ERC721 specifies how ownership of NFTs is managed. As the most popular NFT standard, it is adhered to by major NFT marketplaces [55, 64].

ERC1155 aims to enable a single contract to oversee both fungible and non-fungible tokens [63]. Additionally, it facilitates batch operations. ERC1155 has found adoption in various gaming and charity donation projects [4, 6, 74].

We carefully review the official documents (including text descriptions and associated code) and manually identify rules by evaluating their relevance to contract implementations, whether

they have clear restricting targets, and whether they offer actionable checking criteria. Certain rules explicitly use terms like “must” or “should” to convey obligations. We identify a total of 132 rules across the three ERCs: 32 from ERC20, 60 from ERC721, and 40 from ERC1155. Our study primarily answers three key questions regarding the identified rules: 1) what rules are specified? 2) why are they specified? and 3) how are they specified in natural languages? The objective is to garner insights for building techniques to automatically detect rule violations. To maintain objectivity, all study results are examined by at least two paper authors.

3.2 Rule Content (What)

An ERC rule generally requires that a public function includes a specific piece of code. Based on the semantic nature of the code, we classify the rules into four categories.

Privilege Checks. 24 rules delineate the necessary privileges for executing specific token operations. Regarding the pattern of required code, 20 rules involve performing a condition check and throwing an exception if the check fails, while others require calling a function for a subsequent check. We further analyze the object being checked in each rule. Among the 24 rules, 10 pertain to verifying if the operator (e.g., a message caller) possesses the required privilege. For example, the implementation in Figure 1 violates an ERC20 rule about `transferFrom()`, which requires the implementation to verify the message caller is authorized to transfer the tokens. Additionally, three rules address whether the token owner holds sufficient privilege. For example, function `safeTransferFrom()` in ERC1155 sends tokens of a particular type from one address to another, and ERC1155 mandates the source has enough tokens. The remaining 11 rules focus on the recipients of token transfer operations. For instance, ERC721 specifies the recipient cannot be address zero for `safeTransferFrom()`. Moreover, it also mandates calling `onERC721Received()` on the recipient when the receipt is a contract. It further requires the caller to check whether the return value is a magic number and mandates the caller to throw an exception if not.

Functionality Requirements. Five types of code are required by rules in this category. First, 24 rules specify how to generate the return value of a function. For example, ERC1155 mandates that `balanceOf(address _owner, uint256 _id)` should return the amount of tokens of type `_id` owned by `_owner`. In particular, when a function returns a Boolean value, it implicitly requires returning true upon successful execution and false otherwise. Second, 12 rules address the validation of input parameters and whether an exception should be thrown under certain conditions. For instance, ERC20 dictates that `transferFrom()` treats the transfer of zero tokens the same as the transfer of a non-zero amount. Figure 1 adheres to this rule. Third, two rules explicitly mandate the associated function to throw an exception when any error occurs. Fourth, three rules specify how to update particular variables. For instance, one ERC20 rule requires `approve(address _spender, uint256 _value)` to overwrite the allowance value that the message caller allows `_spender` to manipulate with `_value`. The remaining rule is from ERC1155 which allows transferring multiple types of tokens together and requires the balance update for each input token type to follow their order in the input array.

Table 1: ERC rules’ content and security impacts.

content \ impact	High	Medium	Low	Total
Privilege Check	24	0	0	24
Functionality	12	30	0	42
API	0	33	0	33
Logging	0	0	33	33
Total	36	63	33	132

API Requirements. The three ERCs require the declaration of 33 public functions that allow contract users to interact with contracts following the ERCs. Therefore, programmers must implement these APIs as specified to ensure compatibility.

Logging. ERCs impose logging requirements by emitting events. For example, ERC20 mandates the emission of a Transfer event when a transfer operation occurs (e.g., line 14 in Figure 1). In total, there are 33 rules related to logging. Out of these, 24 specify when an event should be emitted, with 8 further requiring the parameters of the event, while the remaining 9 pertain to event declarations.

Insight 1: *Given that ERC rules involve various contract semantics, building program analysis techniques to cover those semantics and identify rule violations poses a significant challenge.*

We further study the valid scope for each rule. Among the 132 rules, the valid scopes of 106 rules are confined to a single function. For instance, ERC20 mandates `transferFrom()` in Figure 1 scrutinizes whether the message caller has the privilege to handle the token owner’s tokens. Moreover, 9 rules pertain to event declarations. In the remaining 17 cases, their valid scopes encompass the entire contract. For instance, ERC20 necessitates emitting a Transfer event whenever a token transfer occurs. Similarly, ERC721 requires calling `onERC721Received()` on the recipient contract for each token transfer, along with checking the return value.

Insight 2: *Most ERC rules can be checked within a function or at an event declaration site, and there is no need to analyze the entire contract for compliance with these rules.*

3.3 Violation Impact (Why)

We analyze the security implications of rule violations to understand why the rules are specified, and categorize the rules’ impacts into three levels in Table 1.

High. A rule is deemed to have a high-security impact if there exists a clear attack path exploiting its violation, resulting in financial loss. As shown in Table 1, 36 rules fall into this category, encompassing all rules related to privilege checks. For instance, the failure to verify an operator’s privilege can enable a hacker to pilfer tokens (e.g., Figure 1) and neglect to inspect whether a recipient address is non-zero can lead to tokens being lost permanently.

Regarding the rules governing the functionalities, non-compliance with 12 of them can also result in financial loss. Of these, 9 rules outline how to generate return values representing token ownership or privileges to operate tokens, such as `balanceOf()` returning the number of tokens of an address. Errors that provide incorrect returns for these functions can lead to valid tokens being trapped in an address or allow an address to manipulate tokens without necessary privilege. The remaining three rules pertain to the correct updating of token ownership. For instance, ERC20 requires function `approve(address _spender, uint256 _value)` to use `_value`

Table 2: Linguistic Patterns. (*[*]: a parameter, and {*}: an optional parameter. P: privilege, F: functionality, and L: logging. [sub] can be a function and a contract. [must] can be “must”, “must not”, “cannot” and “should”. [action] can be any operation in a function. [assign] can be “overwrite”, “be reset”, “allow”, “be set”, “be”, “==”, and “create”. [prep] can be “with” and “to”. [value] can be any specific value. [order] can be any order description. [ret] can be “return” and “@return”. [throw] can be “throw”, “revert”, and “be treated as normal”. [emit] can be “fire”, “trigger”, and “emit”. [var] can be any variable.*)

ID	Patterns	Content			Total
		P	F	L	
TP1	{sub} [must] [throw] [condition]	18	10	0	28
TP2	[action] [must] [throw]	0	2	0	2
TP3	caller [must] be approved to [action]	2	0	0	2
TP4	[action] are considered invalid	0	2	0	2
CP1	[condition] [sub] [must] call [sub] {, [var] [must] be [value]}	4	0	0	4
EP1	{event} {must} [emit] {condition} {, [var] {must} [assign] {prep} [value]}	0	0	15	15
EP2	{action} {must} [emit] [event] {with [var] set to [value] [condition]}	0	0	9	9
RP1	{sub} {must} [ret] [value] {condition}	0	24	0	24
AP1	[sub]{must}[assign][value]{prep}{value}	0	2	0	2
AP2	[value] {must} [assign] [prep] [value]	0	1	0	1
OP1	[action] [must] follow [order]	0	1	0	1
Total		24	42	24	90

to overwrite the amount of tokens the message caller authorizes `_spender` to manage.

Medium. A rule has a medium impact if its violation can lead to unexpected contract or transaction behavior, while not having a clear attack path to causing financial loss. For example, if a public function’s API fails to adhere to its ERC declaration requirement, invoking the function with a message call following the requirement would trigger an exception. Another example is ERC20’s requirement that the function `transferFrom()` (e.g., Figure 1) treats the transfer of zero tokens the same way as transferring non-zero values. If a contract does not adhere to this rule, its behavior would be unexpected for the message caller.

Low. All event-related rules are about logging. We consider their security impact as low.

Insight 3: *For numerous rules, their violations present a clear attack path for potential financial loss, emphasizing the urgency of detecting and addressing these violations.*

3.4 Linguistic Patterns (How)

Among the 132 rules, 42 specifically address function or event declarations, which are clearly defined using the Solidity code in the ERCs. The remaining 90 rules are described in natural language. As shown in Table 2, we have identified 11 linguistic patterns to classify how these rules are presented. These 11 patterns correspond to six types of code implementations, as indicated by their ID prefixes (column ID in Table 2): TP indicates throwing or not throwing an exception under certain conditions; CP involves calling a function, possibly with specific argument requirements; EP denotes emitting




Figure 2: The workflow of SymGPT. (Components with a pattern background are powered by an LLM.)

an event under certain conditions, potentially with argument requirements; RP involves returning a required value under certain conditions; AP refers to updating a variable with a new value; and OP indicates performing an action in a specific order.

As shown in Table 2, four patterns (TP1, EP1, EP2, and RP1) account for over 80% of the rules. TP1 is primarily used for privilege checks. For example, the ERC20 rule violated in Figure 1 states, “the function SHOULD throw unless the `_from` account has deliberately authorized the sender of the message via some mechanism,” which falls under TP1. EP1 and EP2, indicated by their prefixes, are used to emit events, while RP1 specifies return values. In contrast, the remaining patterns cover much fewer rules. For instance, AP2 and OP1 each associate with only one rule.

Insight 4: *The majority of rules can be specified using common linguistic patterns, while there are a few rules that are specifically outlined in a distinct manner.*

4 THE DESIGN OF SYMGPT

As shown in Figure 2, SymGPT is an automated tool that takes contract source code and ERC documents as input. It outputs the ERC rules violated by the contracts, along with details about which lines of the source code violate which specific rules.

The components of SymGPT can be divided into two parts. The upper part processes input ERC documents, involving extracting ERC rules, converting the rules into an intermediate representation (IR), and generating constraints representing when rules are violated. To automate the rule extraction and translation, we leverage an LLM due to its strong natural language understanding capabilities [81]. As discussed in Section 3, ERC rules cover various contract semantics, making manual extraction and translation a tedious and error-prone process. Additionally, an automated approach enables easier extension of SymGPT to support more ERCs (See Section 5.4). The lower part analyzes contract files. The static analysis component checks if all function and event declarations comply with ERC requirements and gathers necessary information for symbolic execution. The symbolic execution component, using the generated constraints, evaluates each public function and its callees to determine if any inputs could trigger an execution satisfying the constraints and reports rule violations if so. This section follows the workflow to detail the key components of SymGPT.

4.1 ERC Rule Extraction

SymGPT aims to verify a contract adheres to all the rules outlined in the ERC document it implements. Thus, its first step is to extract rules from ERC documents. While we acknowledge that some correctness and performance rules can be identified and extracted from smart contract code [40, 47], validating compliance with these

rules is beyond the scope of this paper. Furthermore, as shown by the experimental results in Section 5.2, the rules extracted from contract code cover only a small subset of ERC requirements.

A naïve way to extract rules from an ERC document with an LLM is to provide the entire ERC document and ask the model to identify all the rules. However, this makes it difficult for the LLM to accurately and completely extract all rules. Instead, we break each ERC document into subsections and send each one to the LLM. Specifically, since each ERC’s rules are detailed in the specification section and precede the relevant function or event declarations, we use regular expressions to isolate the specification section and divide the section into subsections, ending at each function or event declaration. We then instruct the LLM to analyze each function or event declaration along with the preceding text description.

We design prompts based on the linguistic patterns in Table 2. Each prompt begins with a brief introduction, followed by a set of specific linguistic patterns (all sharing the same ID prefix). It then provides the text description and declaration of a function (or event) and asks the LLM to extract rules from the description, including any relevant value requests (e.g., emitting an event with a specific parameter), based on the patterns. Finally, the prompt explains the JSON schema for outputting the extracted rules. We include linguistic patterns in the prompts to help the LLM better understand what ERC rules are, leading to more accurate extraction results. The prompt template extracting rules in the TP linguistic group is shown in Figure 6 in the Appendix. As discussed in Section 3.4, most rules follow a limited number of patterns, making it likely that the patterns will also apply to ERC rules we have not yet studied. The extracted rules are indexed with their corresponding functions and pattern groups.

4.2 ERC Rule Translation

Generating constraints directly from natural language rules is challenging for the LLM due to the vast space of possible constraints, which increases uncertainty and the likelihood of hallucinations. To mitigate this, we define an EBNF grammar to formalize ERC rules and instruct the LLM to translate the extracted rules into this IR. The EBNF grammar effectively limits the LLM’s output space, improving accuracy. Additionally, formalizing the rules with the EBNF simplifies processing for subsequent tasks. The EBNF essentially acts as a bridge between natural languages and constraint inputs for symbolic execution, addressing *Challenge-II* in Section 1.

We design the EBNF grammar based on the empirical study in Section 3. This grammar covers a wide range of ERC requirements and represents a key technical contribution of this paper, effectively addressing *Challenge-I* in Section 1. Additionally, it is a one-time effort with long-term benefits, as it can accommodate future ERCs not yet studied (see Section 5.4).

EBNF Grammar. As shown by line 1 in Figure 3, the EBNF grammar contains five top-level non-terminals (symbols enclosed by “<>”) corresponding to five linguistic pattern groups in Table 2. The grammar encompasses all groups except the one related to return value generation. This omission stems from the difficulty of using contract elements explicitly required by ERCs to define the required return values. For instance, ERC20 specifies that the `name()` function of every ERC20 contract must return the name of

```

1 <check> = <throw>|<call>|<emit>|<assign>|<follow>;
2 //top-level non-terminals
3 <throw> = if <b_exp> then checkThrow(<fun>, <flag>);
4 <call> = [if <b_exp> then] checkCall(<fun>, <fun>) [with <b_exp
>];
5 <emit> = [if <b_exp> then] checkEmit(<fun>, <event>) [with <
b_exp>];
6 <assign> = checkEndValue(<fun>, <value>, <value>)
7 <follow> = checkOrder(<op>, <op>, <order>);
8
9 <b_exp> = not <b_exp> | <b_exp> (and|or) <b_exp> | <value><b_op
><value> | <change> | <mint> | <burn>;
10 <value> = msg.sender|<field>|<para>|<constant>|...;
11 <field> = getFieldValue(<field_name> (<key>)* );
12 <field_name> = getFieldName(<anchor_fun>);
13 <para> = getPara(<fun>|<event>, <index>);
14 <order> = getOrder(<op>, <op>);
15 <change> = checkChange(<fun>, <field_name>(<key>)*);
16 <mint> = checkMint(<fun>, <field_name>);
17 <burn> = checkBurn(<fun>, <field_name>);

```

Figure 3: EBNF grammar. (The grammar has been simplified for illustration. Terminals highlighted in violet represent utility functions, and more details can be found in Table 7.)

the token the contract manages, but does not mandate where the name should be stored, making it challenging to formalize this rule across diverse ERC20 implementations.

The grammar expands all non-terminal symbols into terminal ones (those not enclosed by “<>”). The grammar’s terminals include contract elements (e.g., public functions and their parameters) defined by ERCs, utility functions (shown in violet in Figure 3), control-flow constructs (e.g., if, then, with), and Boolean operators. Utility functions are analysis routines we define, and their names are carefully chosen to reflect their exact functionalities. This naming approach aids the LLM in understanding these functions and performing the formalization. For example, checkThrow(<fun>, <flag>) returns a Boolean value, indicating whether the contract function <fun> throws an exception or not as expected by <flag>. Table 7 lists all utility functions and their respective purposes.

Non-terminal <throw>. <throw> in line 3 formalizes how to check rules requiring a function to throw or not throw an exception under a specific condition. For one such rule, both non-terminal <b_exp>, representing the condition, and the parameter of utility function checkThrow(<fun>, <flag>) need to be specified.

How to extend non-terminal <b_exp> is shown in lines 9–17. A <b_exp> in line 9 could be a compound Boolean expression, a Boolean expression that compares two <value>s, or the returns of three utility functions. A <value> in line 10 could be msg.sender, a field value of the contract, a parameter, or similar elements. Utility function getFieldValue() in line 11 returns the value of a contract field, taking the field name as input. Since a field could be a multi-dimensional array or mapping, getFieldValue() takes optional <key> parameters. ERCs do not impose any requirements on field names but do require the names of certain public functions that return the values of contract fields. We consider these functions as anchor functions to identify field names. For example, function allowance() in lines 18–20 of Figure 1 is explicitly required by ERC20, and it is the anchor function to identify the contract field that records how many tokens one address allows another to manipulate (e.g., _allowances). Utility function getFieldName() in line 12 takes an anchor function as input and outputs the name of the field accessed by the anchor function.

```

1 //The function associated with the rule is
2 //transferFrom(address _from, address _to, uint256 _value)
3 //getPara(0) == _from, getPara(2) == _value
4 if not (getFieldValue(getFieldName('allowance()'), getPara('
transferFrom()', 0), msg.sender)) >= getPara('transferFrom
()', 2)
5 then
6   checkThrow('transferFrom()', true);

```

Figure 4: The formalization of the rule violated in Figure 1.

As an example, Figure 4 shows the formalization of the rule violated in Figure 1. This rule is about the transferFrom() contract function, whose declaration is in line 2. In line 4, contract function allowance() required by ERC20, is identified by the LLM as the anchor function for the field tracking how many tokens one address allows another to manage (e.g., _allowances in Figure 1). Utility function getFieldName() analyzes contract function allowance() to extract the field name. Since the contract field is a two-dimensional mapping, utility function getFieldValue() requires two additional parameters as keys. If the mapping element is greater than or equal to the transfer amount (the third parameter of contract function transferFrom()), it indicates that the token owner has granted sufficient privileges to msg.sender. Otherwise, contract function transferFrom() should throw an exception, verified by utility function checkThrow() in line 6.

Non-terminals <call> & <emit>. These two check whether a contract function calls another function or emits an event under specific conditions. They also ensure that the parameters of the called function or emitted event meet the required criteria. For example, ERC1155 requires a function to emit a TransferSingle event with the event’s second parameter set to zero when minting tokens. To enforce this rule, we use the utility function checkMint(<func>) as the first <b_exp> of <emit> to verify that the analyzed contract function only increases token balances without decreasing them, indicating a token minting action. Once confirmed, we then check if the contract function emits the required event using checkEmit(). If this is also confirmed, we proceed to verify that the second parameter of the emitted event is zero, specified by the second <b_exp>. **Non-terminal <assign>.** <assign> performs an unconditional check using utility function checkEndValue(<fun>, <value>, <value>) in line 6 of Figure 3. The utility function checks whether the first <value> matches the second at the end of contract function <fun>. **Non-terminal <follow>.** <follow> checks whether the two input operations follow the specified order. An order can be represented by another pair of operations, as demonstrated by utility function getOrder(<op>, <op>) in line 14 of Figure 3.

Prompting the LLM. Some ERC rules apply directly to function and event declarations and can be inspected without translation. For the other rules extracted by the LLM, we use the LLM to translate each one individually. Figure 7 shows the prompt template. It begins with a function or event’s source code declaration, followed by an extracted natural language rule for the function or event and any possible arguments. The template then specifies the JSON schema for the top-level non-terminal of the rule to help the LLM understand the EBNF grammar. For example, the JSON schema of <throw> is used for the rule violated in Figure 1. Next, the template introduces all anchor functions of the ERC, and finally instructs the LLM to translate the rule into the EBNF and output the result according to the JSON schema.

Table 3: How Φ_{if} , Φ_{check} and Φ_{with} are combined.

Non-Terminals	Violation Constraints
<throw>	$\Phi_{if} \wedge \neg\Phi_{check}$
<call>	$(\Phi_{if} \wedge \neg\Phi_{check}) \vee (\Phi_{if} \wedge \Phi_{check} \wedge \neg\Phi_{with})$
<emit>	$(\Phi_{if} \wedge \neg\Phi_{check}) \vee (\Phi_{if} \wedge \Phi_{check} \wedge \neg\Phi_{with})$
<assign>	$\neg\Phi_{check}$
<follow>	$\neg\Phi_{check}$

4.3 Constraint Synthesizing

Since smart contracts have diverse implementations for the same ERC, to eliminate the need for customizing symbolic execution for each contract, we define a set of constraint variables to represent generic contract execution states shared across contracts, along with their update mechanisms during symbolic execution. These designs are essential for expressing ERC requirements and generating constraints equivalent to the EBNF grammar. They differentiate SymGPT from existing symbolic execution techniques [14, 21, 59] and serve as the second major technical contribution of this paper.

Constraint Variables. For each public function fun , we define six types of *state variables* to track whether fun or its callees perform specific actions, thereby entering corresponding states. Specifically, we define a TH variable to indicate whether fun throws an exception, possibly triggered by `require`, `revert`, `assert`, or `throw`. Solidity programmers often use modifiers to enforce checks, and exceptions may be thrown if these checks fail. Those modifiers are naturally supported through inter-procedural analysis. Additionally, we define an EM variable for each event declared in the contract to track whether fun emits that event, and a CA variable for each contract function to track whether fun calls it. For each contract field, we define BI , BD , and BC variables to indicate whether fun increases, decreases, or modifies the field, respectively. These variables are initialized to `false` before analyzing fun and are set to `true` when the corresponding actions are performed by fun or its callees.

For example, if the condition in line 12 of Figure 1 evaluates to `false`, function `transferFrom()` throws an exception, and thus, the TH variable is set to `true`. After executing line 15, $BI_{balances}$ is set to `true`, representing the sum of all mapping elements has ever been increased.

In addition to the state variables, we define an O variable for each executed instruction, representing the instruction sequence along a concrete execution path. We also define value variables for contract fields, formal and actual function parameters, event parameters, local variables, and values defined by Ethereum (e.g., `msg.sender`). These value variables are updated during symbolic execution or constrained by path conditions.

Generating Violation Constraints. For the five top-level non-terminals, we generate constraints for `if`’s condition (Φ_{if}), the check part (Φ_{check}), and `with`’s condition (Φ_{with}). We then combine these to form violation constraints based on the rules in Table 3. Specifically, if a rule requires an action (e.g., `assign`), its violation occurs when the action is not performed. If a rule requires an action under a condition, its violation happens when the condition is met but the action is not performed (e.g., `<throw>`), or when the action is performed, but the action’s parameters do not meet the requirements (e.g., `<emit>`). For rules that require no exceptions under certain conditions, we design validation constraints

as “ $\neg\Phi_{if} \wedge \neg\Phi_{check}$.” A violation is reported only when the violation constraints are met, but the validation constraints are not met, ensuring that the exception is indeed due to the specified conditions. Additionally, for `call` and `emit`, we inspect whether analyzed contacts contain the called functions or emitted events before synthesizing constraints.

When synthesizing Φ_{if} , Φ_{check} , and Φ_{with} , we use defined value variables to replace relevant contract elements (e.g., formal and real parameters, contract fields) and utility functions with the “get” prefix. We use the checks of state variables to replace utility functions with the “check” prefix. Additionally, for each constraint variable, we consider two key values when synthesizing constraints: its initial value before executing a public function and its final value afterward. Except for formal parameters and contract fields accessed through formal parameters, we use the final values of all other variables to generate constraints.

Consider the rule violated in Figure 1. The generated constraints are “ $\neg(\text{allowances}[\text{from}_{first}][\text{msg.sender}_{last}]_{first} \geq \text{amount}_{first}) \wedge \neg(TH_{last} = \text{true})$.” Subscripts $first$ and $last$ indicate whether the initial or final value is used. Variable $\text{allowances}[\text{from}][\text{msg.sender}]$ is accessed via a formal parameter, and both $from$ and $amount$ are formal parameters as well. Therefore, their initial values are used. On the other hand, TH ’s final value is used, representing whether the function throws an example after a concrete execution.

4.4 Static Analysis and Symbolic Execution

We develop static analysis routines to verify API compliance and compute auxiliary information, along with a symbolic execution engine to check against the formalized ERC rules.

Static Analysis. We implement static analysis routines for three purposes: 1) verifying contracts include the necessary functions and events specified by the corresponding ERC, and their declarations meet the required parameters, 2) implementing utility functions, such as `getFieldName()` and `getOrder()`, and 3) identifying contract fields with constant values and constraints enforced by the implementations (e.g., keys of a mapping field being all non-zeros).

Symbolic Execution. As discussed in Section 3.2, most rules apply to a public function. For these, we perform symbolic execution on the function. For the remaining rules, which apply to the entire contract, we analyze each public function individually.

Given a public function, we initialize all state variables to `false` and set contract fields to the identified constants, if applicable. All other constraint variables are treated as symbolic. At the end of each execution path, we use static analysis to determine O variable values and employ a solver (i.e., Z3 [61]) to compute the values of all other variables. Additionally, we initialize the constraint set to reflect common Ethereum requirements (e.g., `msg.sender > 0`) and type-enforced constraints.

The symbolic execution process is similar to existing techniques [14, 21, 59], with the key difference being how we update state variables. We change the values of these variables to `true`, if the corresponding actions are performed. For example, when an event is emitted, we set the corresponding EM variable to `true`. To manage path explosion, we limit each loop to a maximum of two iterations. When a path reaches the end of the public function (i.e., the function’s return) or throw an exception, we compute the conjunction of the

initial constraints, those enforced by the implementation of the entire contract, those collected during symbolic execution along the path, and the violation constraints synthesized for the rule being checked. If Z3 finds a solution for the conjunction, we find a violation of the rule.

For example, when checking path 8-9-12-13-14-15-16-9 in Figure 1 against the formalized rule in Figure 4, the initial constraints include “ $from_{first} \geq 0$ ”, “ $to_{first} \geq 0$ ”, “ $amount_{first} \geq 0$ ”, and “ $TH = false$ ”. After executing lines 12 and 13, “ $from_{first} \neq 0$ ” and “ $to_{first} \neq 0$ ” are added to the constraint set due to the path conditions. Similarly, besides constraints about how the final values of `_balance[from]` and `_balance[to]` are computed from their initial values, we set `BI_balance`, `BD_balance`, and `BC_balance` to true after analyzing lines 14 and 15. `EM_Transfer` is set to true after line 16. We request Z3 to compute a solution for the conjunction of those constraints and the violation constraints discussed in Section 4.3 after line 9. Z3 finds a solution for `from_{first}`, `to_{first}`, `amount_{first}`, `_balance[from_{first}]_{first}`, and `_balance[to_{first}]_{first}`, representing when given those values, a violation of the rule occurs.

5 EVALUATION

Implementation. We utilize the GPT-4 Turbo model [54] of ChatGPT as the LLM in SymGPT, and interact with it via OpenAI’s APIs. The remaining functionality is developed in Python, including generating prompts to automatically extract rules from ERC documents and translate natural language rules into the EBNF grammar, synthesizing constraints, and performing symbolic execution.

The symbolic execution engine is built using Slither [24]. It inspects each public function, along with its called functions, to verify compliance with the rules specified for it in the ERC. We employ the SSA form during symbolic execution, ensuring a clear distinction between values defined prior to function execution and those defined within the function.

Research Questions. Our experiments are designed to answer the following research questions:

- *Effectiveness:* Can SymGPT accurately pinpoint ERC rule violations?
- *Advancement:* Does SymGPT outperform existing auditing solutions?
- *Cost:* What are the monetary and time costs of using SymGPT?
- *Generality:* Can SymGPT detect violations for ERCs beyond those studied in Section 3?

Experimental Setting. We configure the temperature parameter to zero to make our experimental results stable when interacting with the LLM. All our experiments are performed on a server machine, with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4110 CPU @ 2.10GHz, 256GB RAM, and Red Hat Enterprise Linux 9.

5.1 Effectiveness of SymGPT

5.1.1 Methodology. We create a *large* dataset with 4,000 contracts for this evaluation, consisting of 3,400 ERC20 contracts, 500 ERC721 contracts, and 100 ERC1155 contracts. These contracts are randomly sampled from etherscan.io [35] and polygonscan.com [60]. We choose the former platform because of its prominence and the latter due to its higher contract deployment compared to other platforms (e.g., Arbitrum [3], BscScan [12]). All contracts are relatively

Table 4: Evaluation results on the large dataset. ($x_{(y)}$: x true positives, and y false positives.)

	High	Medium	Low	Total
ERC20	1353 ₁₂₂	3686 ₀	172 ₀	5211 ₁₂₂
ERC721	18 ₀	22 ₁₀₀₀	502 ₀	542 ₁₀₀₀
ERC1155	4 ₀	12 ₃₈₈	14 ₀	30 ₃₈₈
Total	1375 ₁₂₂	3720 ₁₃₈₈	688 ₀	5783 ₁₅₁₀

new, deployed between September 2023 and July 2024. On average, each contract contains 469.3 lines of Solidity source code.

We run SymGPT on the dataset and count the violations and false positives SymGPT reports to assess its effectiveness. For each flagged violation, we manually review the result of symbolic execution, the rule description, and the relevant smart contract code to determine whether it is a true violation or a false positive. Each reported violation is reviewed by at least two paper authors, with any disagreements resolved through multiple rounds of discussion. Since the number of the contracts in the dataset is large, we do not manually analyze the contracts to identify all their ERC rule violations, so false negatives are not evaluated in this experiment.

5.1.2 Experimental Results. As shown in Table 4, SymGPT identifies 5,783 ERC rule violations, including 1,375 with a high-security impact, 3,720 with a medium impact, and 688 with a low impact. The substantial number of violations detected highlights *SymGPT’s effectiveness in validating ERC rule compliance*. Across the three ERCs, SymGPT detects violations for all of them, including 5,211 violations from ERC20 contracts, 542 from ERC721 contracts, and 30 from ERC1155 contracts. This demonstrates that *SymGPT’s violation detection capability extends across multiple ERCs*.

High-Security Impact. Among the 1,353 high-security impact violations detected in ERC20 contracts, 14 are due to failing to validate that the message caller of `transferFrom(address _from, address _to, uint256 _value)` has sufficient privileges to transfer the `_value` tokens. An example of this violation is shown in Figure 1, with similar code patterns found in the other 13 cases. Another 1,266 cases violate the same rule, but stem from a different issue: instead of comparing the allowed amount with `_value`, these implementations check whether the allowed amount equals `type(uint256).max`. Furthermore, they fail to update the allowed amount after the transfer, which we believe creates a backdoor in the contract. This loophole potentially enables one address to drain any amount of tokens from another account. Another 73 violations breach the rule that `transfer()` should revert if the message caller does not have enough tokens to transfer. Exploiting these violations could allow an address to spend more tokens than it actually possesses. The flawed implementations either use unchecked to bypass the underflow check when reducing the caller’s balance or include a path that does not decrease the caller’s balance at all.

SymGPT identifies 18 high-security violations that do not comply with ERC721 requirements. These violations are related to functions responsible for transferring NFT ownership. The flawed implementations fail to check whether the sender is the rightful owner of the NFT or whether the recipient address is not the zero address. Exploiting these vulnerabilities could lead to NFTs being stolen or permanently lost at the zero address.

```

1  contract MyERC1155Token {
2    mapping(uint256 => mapping(address => uint256)) _balances;
3    mapping(address => mapping(address => bool)) _approvals;
4
5    function safeTransferFrom(address from, address to, uint256
6      id, uint256 value, ...) public {
7      + require(to != 0, "invalid receiver")
7 + require(_approvals[from][msg.sender], "the caller is not
8      approved to manage the tokens");
9      _update(from, to, id, value);
9 + if (to.isContract()) {
10 +   try IERC1155Receiver(to).onERC1155Received(...) returns
11 +     (bytes4 response) {...}
12   }
13   function _update(address from, address to, uint256 id,
14     uint256 value) internal {
15     if (from != address(0)) {
16       _balances[id][from] -= value;
17     }
18     if (to != address(0)) {
19       _balances[id][to] += value;
20     }
21   }

```

Figure 5: An ERC1155 contract contains four high-security impact violations. (Code simplified for illustration purpose.)

SymGPT pinpoints four violations with a high-security impact in an ERC1155 contract. The simplified contract is shown in Figure 5. Function `safeTransferFrom()` in lines 5–12 is designed to transfer value tokens of type `id` from one address to another. Similar to ERC20, ERC1155 mandates that the message caller must be approved to manage the tokens for the token owner. Unfortunately, neither `safeTransferFrom()` nor its callee `_update()` performs this crucial check (via `_approvals`), allowing anyone to transfer tokens from any address to their own. The patch in line 7 introduces a verification step to ensure that the token owner has approved the message caller to handle his tokens, thus aligning with the ERC1155 requirement. Moreover, ERC1155 mandates that `safeTransferFrom()` checks whether the recipient is a contract and if so, whether the contract is capable of handling ERC1155 tokens by calling `onERC1155Received()` on the contract. Unfortunately, the implementation in Figure 5 neglects these requirements. Transferring tokens to a recipient contract without the required capability results in the tokens being indefinitely trapped within the contract. Lines 9–11 show the necessary checks to fulfill the requirements. The remaining violation arises from the failure to check whether the recipient is address zero. Transferring tokens to address zero leads to the irreversible loss of the tokens. The violation is patched by line 6 in Figure 5.

Medium-Security Impact. The 3,720 violations with a medium impact stem from several reasons. Of these, 3,611 violations involve ERC20 rules, where the `transfer()` and `transferFrom()` functions incorrectly throw an exception when transferring zero tokens, instead of treating it as a normal transfer. Additionally, 55 violations result from the absence of a required function specified by the relevant ERC. Another 32 violations occur due to missing or incorrect return-value types in functions, contrary to ERC specifications. Finally, 22 violations stem from failing to throw an exception for invalid input parameters in ERC721 contracts.

Low-Security Impact. Of the 688 event-related violations, 672 are due to the omission of an event declaration, 16 fail to emit an event, and one emits an event but with a wrong parameter.

False Positives. In general, *SymGPT demonstrates high accuracy*, reporting 1,510 false positives when analyzing 4,000 contracts. The true-violation-to-false-positive ratio is approximately 3.8. These false positives arise from two main sources.

First, all 1,388 false positives from ERC721 and ERC1155 contracts result from errors when the LLM performs rule extraction. Specifically, the LLM makes seven mistakes: it misses one rule (for ERC1155), reports four unnecessary rules (two for ERC721 and two for ERC1155), and misrepresents two rules (for ERC1155). Each of the last six errors leads to a false positive in every contract of the ERC unless the contract lacks the relevant function. For instance, the LLM incorrectly identifies a rule in ERC721 that prohibits function `safeTransferFrom()` from throwing an exception when the destination is a contract, a requirement not specified by ERC721. This error causes a false positive in all 500 ERC721 contracts in the dataset. We argue that it is highly unlikely for all contracts to not adhere to a specific ERC rule. Therefore, a simple strategy of ignoring rules violated by all contracts can effectively eliminate false positives caused by rule extraction errors made by the LLM.

Second, all 122 false positives from ERC20 contracts arise during symbolic execution. Of these, 116 occur when a contract retrieves the token balance of an account from another contract, whose code is unavailable during our experiment. As a result, SymGPT incorrectly assumes that the `transfer()` implementation does not verify the caller’s balance. Another five false positives are due to SymGPT’s inability to handle assembly code. The remaining false positive arises from an implementation of `transferFrom()`, where the source address is compared with the message caller and an authorization check is only performed if they differ. We consider this a false positive, as the check is skipped only when the caller is transferring her own tokens, making exploitation impossible.

Answer to effectiveness: SymGPT accurately detects a wide range of ERC rule violations across multiple ERCs, with many violations clearly linked to potential financial loss.

5.2 Comparison with Baselines

5.2.1 Methodology. Since the large dataset lacks “ground-truth” labels and cannot assess violation coverage, we create a small, ground-truth dataset to compare SymGPT with existing auditing solutions. Specifically, we randomly select 30 ERC20 contracts audited by the Ethereum Commonwealth Security Department (ECSA), a group of experts who handle auditing requests submitted as GitHub issues and release audit results in response [22]. These contracts and their audit results enable a comparison between automated techniques and expert reviews. For ERC721 and ERC1155, we only find one contract for each of them from ECSA’s GitHub. Additionally, we randomly sample eight more contracts for the two ERCs from the website of ERCx [69].

In total, the ground-truth dataset contains 40 contracts, including 30 ERC20 contracts, 5 ERC721 contracts, and 5 ERC1155 contracts. Each contract contains an average of 553 lines of code. These contracts are either audited by ECSA from January 2019 to October 2023 or analyzed by ERCx from May 2024 to December 2024. Since some contracts are written in outdated Solidity versions and cannot be analyzed by certain baseline techniques, we update all contracts

Table 5: Evaluation results on the ground-true dataset. ($x_{(y,z)}$: x true positives, y false positives, and z false negatives.)

	SCE	ZS	ERCx	GPT-All	GPT-O	GPT-A	SymGPT
High	0 _(0,28)	0 _(28,28)	0 _(2,28)	1 _(0,27)	7 _(0,21)	3 _(0,25)	28 _(1,0)
Medium	26 _(0,29)	2 _(19,53)	12 _(21,43)	15 _(19,40)	36 _(138,19)	17 _(22,38)	54 _(28,1)
Low	13 _(0,63)	0 _(0,76)	0 _(0,76)	7 _(0,69)	45 _(149,31)	15 _(0,61)	76 _(0,0)
Total	39 _(0,120)	2 _(47,157)	12 _(23,147)	23 _(19,136)	88 _(287,71)	35 _(22,124)	158 _(29,1)

to Solidity version 0.8.20. This involves renaming contract constructors, adding necessary visibility specifiers, and saving extra return values to “-”. Our modifications do not introduce or remove any rule violations. We carefully inspect the contracts and identify 159 rule violations, including 28 with high-security impact, 55 with a medium-security impact, and 76 with a low-security impact.

We select six automated techniques as baselines: two static analysis tools, Slither-check-erc (SCE) [23] and ZepScope (ZS) [47]; one dynamic analysis tool, ERCx [69]; and three GPT-based methods. The GPT-based techniques vary in their configurations. *GPT-All* prompts ChatGPT to audit the entire contract for ERC compliance in one request, while *GPT-O* verifies each ERC rule individually, providing the rule description, relevant public function code, called functions, and accessed contract fields. Both *GPT-All* and *GPT-O* use the same model as SymGPT. The third GPT-based technique, *GPT-A*, uses a customized version of ChatGPT (“Smart Contract Auditor” developed by Ryan Harvey [39]) to audit the entire contract in a single prompt. *GPT-A* is based on GPT-4. These baseline techniques rely either entirely on program analysis or LLMs, making comparisons with SymGPT valuable for highlighting the advantages of combining both approaches. Furthermore, ZS, published in 2024, and ERCx, a commercial service, represent the state of the art in smart-contract analysis. Additionally, we compare SymGPT with ECSD using all contracts from ECSD’s GitHub, as ECSD is the only service for which we have access to auditing results.

5.2.2 Experimental Results. As shown in Table 5, SymGPT detects 157 out of the 158 violations, *far surpassing the six baseline techniques*, though it reports 29 false positives.

SymGPT accurately identifies all 28 violations with a high-security impact. Among them, 27 violations result from failing to throw an exception when the sender of a transfer lacks sufficient balance, the message caller lacks the required privilege, or the destination of a transfer is zero. One ERC20 rule requires function `approve(address _spender, uint256 _value)` to overwrite `_spender`’s allowance with the input `_value`. The remaining violation incorrectly increases `_spender`’s allowance by `_value`. Additionally, SymGPT identifies 54 medium impact violations, including 11 related to missing required functions, 21 with API declarations not meeting ERCs’ requirements, and 22 allowing or not allowing zero-value inputs and contrary to ERCs’ requirements. Moreover, SymGPT detects all low-security impact violations, 64 of which result from failing to emit a required event, while the remaining 12 are due to missing event declarations or mismatches between the declarations and the requirements.

SymGPT reports 29 false positives when analyzing the ground-truth dataset. Among them, 28 false positives are due to rules not required by ERC721 or ERC1155, but mistakenly extracted by SymGPT. Those rules cause false positives for every ERC721 or ERC1155 contract, unless the contract does not have the related

function. The remaining false positive happens when analyzing the implementation of `transferFrom(address _from, address _to, uint256 _value)` of an ERC20 contract, whose code pattern also causes a false positive when evaluating the large dataset in Section 5.1. The implementation compares `_from` with the message caller and if they are equal, the authorization check is skipped. Although SymGPT flags this as a violation due to the bypassed authorization check, we consider it a false positive because this bypass cannot be exploited.

SymGPT fails to detect one violation where the rule requires `totalSupply()` to return the total quantity of supplied tokens, but the implementation incorrectly returns the result of subtracting the balance of the zero address from the supplied tokens. SymGPT does not verify compliance with rules that govern how to generate return values, leading to this oversight. Despite missing this single violation, the tool successfully detects all other 158 violations, *demonstrating its strong coverage of ERC rule violations*.

SCE. As explained in Section 5, the functionality of SCE is relatively straightforward, leading it only to identify 39 violations. All these violations are also identified by SymGPT. Among these violations, 26 involve instances where a function mandated by an ERC is either not implemented or does not match the required API. The remaining 13 violations are event-related. Given that the rules covered by SCE are uncomplicated, SCE does not generate any false positives.

ZepScope (ZS) reports 49 cases where a check required by OpenZeppelin’s code is missing. However, only two cases where the functions `ownerOf()` and `balanceOf()` of an ERC721 contract fail to check whether their inputs are zero are true bugs. These checks are also required by ERC721 and the two issues are also detected by SymGPT. All other reports are false positives. 37 are cases where the check exists in the contract, but ZS mistakenly identifies it as missing. For the remaining ten cases, while the contract lacks the check, we believe there is no security or functionality issue. For example, ZS flags `approve()` of an ERC721 contract for not checking if the input address is not the message sender. However, we see no issue with a caller allowing itself to manage its own tokens, although it already has such a privilege.

On the other hand, ZS misses 157 violations, demonstrating that relying solely on rules inferred from OpenZeppelin’s code is insufficient for detecting ERC violations.

ERCx identifies 12 true violations, including five cases of non-compliance with ERC API requirements, six instances where zero input values are prohibited by the implementations but explicitly allowed by ERC20, and one case where `getApproved(uint256 _tokenId)` of an ERC721 contract fails to validate its input `_tokenId`. On the other hand, the significant number of missed violations is primarily due to ERCx’s unit tests not being comprehensive enough to dynamically trigger the violations.

ERCx reports 23 false positives. Among them, six cases result from misunderstanding ERC rules, such as incorrectly identifying four APIs as non-compliant with ERC requirements, even though these APIs are not required by the ERCs. The remaining 17 cases are due to ERCx’s incomplete or incorrect unit tests. For example, ERCx reports two cases where `safeBatchTransferFrom()` fails to call a required function under ERC1155. However, this function call is

Table 6: Costs on the ground-truth dataset. (s: seconds.)

	SCE	ZS	ERCx	GPT-All	GPT-O	GPT-A	ECSD	SymGPT
Time	1.4s	351s	1340s	937s	$2.82 * 10^4$ s	892s	$1.09 * 10^7$ s	1037s
Money	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$3.87	\$37.68	\$20	$\$1.60 * 10^5$	\$2.94

only required when transferring to a contract, and ERCx’s tests do not trigger this scenario.

GPT-All, GPT-O & GPT-A. GPT-All, GPT-O, and GPT-A detect 23, 88, and 35 violations, respectively — significantly fewer compared to the violations identified by SymGPT. All the three techniques produce a certain number of false positives and false negatives, mainly due to ChatGPT’s misinterpretation of the prompts, the rules, and the smart contract code, along with unintended discussions of vulnerabilities unrelated to ERCs (e.g., reentrancy attacks). *Comparing with the ECSD auditing service.* We compare SymGPT with ECSD using the 32 contracts from ECSD’s GitHub. ECSD identifies 68 violations and SymGPT captures all of them. Additionally, SymGPT identifies another 70 violations that the auditing service cannot detect. The service has 12 false positives. Two false positives occur because auditors are unaware that Solidity automatically generates getter functions for contract fields, leading them to mistakenly believe two required APIs are not implemented. ERC20 mandates `transfer()` to check if the token owner has enough balance for the transfer, but no such rule applies to `transferFrom()`. However, security auditors mistakenly assume a similar rule exists for `transferFrom()`, resulting in the remaining ten false positives.

Answer to advancement: SymGPT identifies far more violations than the baselines, with fewer or comparable false positives, highlighting its superiority over existing auditing solutions and the advantages of combining symbolic execution with LLMs.

5.3 Monetary and Time Costs

5.3.1 Methodology. We evaluate the time and monetary costs using the ground-truth dataset. Since SymGPT’s analysis of an ERC applies to all contracts of the ERC, its execution time is calculated as the sum of the analysis time for three ERCs and the code analysis time for all contracts. Measurements are performed three times, with the average reported. For baseline techniques, each tool is executed on every contract file three times, and the average execution time is recorded. The time for ECSD is measured only for contracts collected from ECSD’s GitHub. It is measured as the time between when an auditing request is submitted on GitHub and when a security expert provides the result, reflecting the waiting period required for a Solidity programmer to receive feedback.

The monetary costs for SymGPT, GPT-All, and GPT-O are the fees charged by OpenAI. GPT-A requires a \$20 monthly subscription, while analyzing the ground-truth dataset with ERCx costs \$100 for a team plan. For ECSD, we have cost data for one contract, amounting to \$1,000. To estimate costs for other ECSD contracts, we calculate the average hourly rate by dividing \$1,000 by the hours spent on the contract and then apply this rate to other contracts. For ERCx contracts, we cannot estimate auditing costs by ECSD experts due to the lack of information on how many hours ECSD experts would spend on the contracts. SCE and ZS are open-source, so they incur no monetary costs.

5.3.2 Experimental Results. As shown in Table 6, SymGPT analyzes the ground-truth dataset in under 18 minutes, costing just three dollars. The costs for each stage are as follows: 215 seconds and \$0.92 for rule extraction, 324 seconds and \$2.02 for rule translation, and 498 seconds and \$0 for symbolic execution.

SymGPT interacts with ChatGPT, leading to longer processing time than SCE and ZS, which use only static analysis. However, SymGPT is faster than ERCx, which likely runs its unit tests on a cloud. While SymGPT’s costs are higher than GPT-All’s, they are lower than GPT-O’s, because SymGPT requires more interactions with ChatGPT than GPT-All but fewer than GPT-O, and these interactions take longer than static analysis and are charged by OpenAI. It’s important to note that SymGPT uses ChatGPT exclusively to analyze ERCs, so its monetary cost does not increase with the number of contract files. In contrast, the monetary costs for GPT-All and GPT-O rise linearly with the contract number. For example, to analyze the large dataset, SymGPT’s monetary cost remains the same, but the estimated monetary costs for GPT-All and GPT-O would increase to \$387 and \$3,768, respectively. Compared to the automated techniques, the manual service provided by ECSD incurs significantly higher time and monetary costs.

Answer to cost: SymGPT incurs minimal costs and offers superior cost efficiency compared to the manual service.

5.4 Validating ERC3525 Contracts

5.4.1 Methodology. We select ERC3525 to test whether SymGPT can validate contracts beyond the ERCs we have studied. ERC3525 was released two years after the studied ERCs and has already been used in financial instruments [13, 36], making it a representative and more recent standard. After a thorough review, we identify 58 rules in ERC3525, including 15 with a high-security impact, 27 with a medium impact, and 16 with a low impact. We search GitHub for ERC3525 contracts but find only one. After auditing it, we confirm it complies with all ERC3525 rules and has no violations. Then, we decide to inject violations into the contract to create a testing dataset. Specifically, to inject a violation of a rule, we remove the code ensuring compliance with the rule. In the end, the created dataset contains ten ERC3525 contracts, and each contract violates three randomly selected rules, resulting in 30 violations in total.

5.4.2 Experimental Results. After applying SymGPT to the ten contracts, it successfully identifies all 30 violations, while reporting zero false positives. We further analyze the results at each step. During rule extraction, the LLM in SymGPT correctly extracts all required rules but mistakenly includes six additional ones that are not part of ERC3525. These extra rules require a function to call a non-existent function with the same name as an event in ERC3525. However, during constraint generation, SymGPT detects the absence of these callee functions and disregards the extraneous rules, leading them not to affect the final results. SymGPT does not make any errors in the subsequent steps.

Answer to generality: SymGPT has the capability to validate contracts beyond the three ERCs studied in Section 3.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present an empirical study of the implementation rules specified in ERCs, examining three key aspects: their content, security implications, and the detailed specifications provided in the ERCs. Based on our findings, we have developed an automated tool called SymGPT, which integrates an LLM with symbolic execution to evaluate whether smart contracts comply with ERC requirements. SymGPT has proven effective in identifying numerous rule violations and outperforms six baseline techniques and a manual auditing service. We anticipate that this research will enhance the understanding of ERC rules and their violations, fostering further exploration in this field. Additionally, our work highlights the benefits of combining LLMs with formal methods and encourages continued research in this area.

REFERENCES

- [1] U. I. Ahci, A. Oksuztepe, O. Kılınççeker, and E. Karaarslan. Openai chatgpt for smart contract security testing: Discussion and future directions. Available at SSRN 4412215, 2023.
- [2] Antiersolutions. Smart contract auditing services, 2023. <https://www.antiersolutions.com/smart-contract-audit/>.
- [3] Arbitrum. The future of ethereum, 2024. <https://arbitrum.io/>.
- [4] L. Arena. 9lives arena - the ultimate pvp gaming experience, 2023. <https://www.9livesarena.com/>.
- [5] BitInfoCharts. Ethereum (ETH) price stats and information, 2023. <https://bitinfocharts.com/ethereum/>.
- [6] T. Blackstone. Reewardio loyalty platform putting enj nft items to work – real use case, 2019. <https://www.castlecrypto.gg/reewardio-loyalty-platform-demo-review/>.
- [7] BLOCKHUNTERS. Smart contract audit, 2023. <https://blockhunters.io/smart-contract-audit/>.
- [8] Blockworks. Today’s Cryptocurrency Prices by Market Cap, 2023. <https://blockworks.co/prices>.
- [9] B. Blog. Erc-20 tokens: What they are and how they are used, 2023. <https://bitpay.com/blog/erc-20-tokens-what-they-are-and-how-they-are-used/>.
- [10] T. Brandstätter, S. Schulte, J. Cito, and M. Borkowski. Characterizing efficiency optimizations in solidity smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain ’20)*, Virtual Event, 2020.
- [11] T. Brandstätter, S. Schulte, J. Cito, and M. Borkowski. Characterizing efficiency optimizations in solidity smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain ’20)*, Virtual Event, 2020.
- [12] BscScan. Bnb smart chain (bnb) blockchain explorer, 2025. <https://bscscan.com/>.
- [13] Buffer. Buffer finance – options trading simplified, 2023. <https://buffer.finance/>.
- [14] C. Cadar, D. Dunbar, and D. Engler. Klee: unassisted and automatic generation of high-coverage tests for complex systems programs. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI ’08)*, San Diego, California, 2008.
- [15] CertiK. Securing the web3 world, 2023. <https://www.certik.com/>.
- [16] Chainlink. Top 6 Smart Contract Languages in 2023, 2023. <https://chain.link/education-hub/smart-contract-programming-languages>.
- [17] T. Chen, Y. Feng, Z. Li, H. Zhou, X. Luo, X. Li, X. Xiao, J. Chen, and X. Zhang. Gaschecker: Scalable analysis for discovering gas-inefficient smart contracts. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computing*, 9(3):1433–1448, 2020.
- [18] T. Chen, X. Li, X. Luo, and X. Zhang. Under-optimized smart contracts devour your money. In *Proceedings of the 24th IEEE international conference on software analysis, evolution and reengineering (SANER ’17)*, Klagenfurt, Austria, 2017.
- [19] T. Chen, Z. Li, H. Zhou, J. Chen, X. Luo, X. Li, and X. Zhang. Towards saving money in using smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 2018 IEEE/ACM 40th international conference on software engineering: New ideas and emerging technologies results (ICSE-NIER ’18)*, Gothenburg, Sweden, 2018.
- [20] Y. Chen, F. Ma, Y. Zhou, Y. Jiang, T. Chen, and J. Sun. Tyr: Finding consensus failure bugs in blockchain system with behaviour divergent model. In *Proceedings of the 43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP ’23)*, San Francisco, California, 2023.
- [21] V. Chipounov, V. Kuznetsov, and G. Candea. S2e: a platform for in-vivo multi-path analysis of software systems. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS ’11)*, Newport Beach, California, USA, 2011.
- [22] E. Commonwealth. Callisto smart-contract auditing department, 2023. <https://github.com/EthereumCommonwealth/Auditing>.
- [23] Crytic. Erc conformance, 2023. <https://github.com/crytic/slither/wiki/ERC-Conformance>.
- [24] Crytic. Slither, the smart contract static analyzer, 2023. <https://github.com/crytic/slither>.
- [25] defiprime. Ethereum DeFi Ecosystem, 2023. <https://defiprime.com/ethereum>.
- [26] Dexaran. Erc-20 token standard, 2023. <https://dexaran820.medium.com/erc-20-token-standard-7fa2316cdca6>.
- [27] Y. Duan, X. Zhao, Y. Pan, S. Li, M. Li, F. Xu, and M. Zhang. Towards automated safety vetting of smart contracts in decentralized applications. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS ’22)*, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2022.
- [28] ECMA. ECMA-262, 2023. <https://www.ecma-international.org/publications-and-standards/standards/ecma-262/>.
- [29] W. Entriken, D. Shirley, J. Evans, and N. Sachs. Erc-721: Non-fungible token standard, 2018. <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-721>.
- [30] Ethereum. Ethereum, 2023. <https://ethereum.org/en/>.
- [31] Ethereum. Ethereum dapps, 2023. <https://ethereum.org/en/dapps>.
- [32] Ethereum. Ethereum improvement proposals, 2023. <https://eips.ethereum.org/erc>.
- [33] Ethereum. ethereum/ercs, 2023. <https://github.com/ethereum/ERCs/blob/master/ERCs/eip-1.md>.
- [34] Ethereum. Smart contract anatomy, 2023. <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/smart-contracts/anatomy>.
- [35] Etherscan. The ethereum blockchain explorer. <https://etherscan.io>.
- [36] F. Finance. Fujidao – the auto-refinancing borrow protocol, 2023. <https://v1.fuji.finance/>.
- [37] A. Ghaleb, J. Rubin, and K. Pattabiraman. etainter: detecting gas-related vulnerabilities in smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA ’22)*, pages 728–739, 2022.
- [38] N. Grech, M. Kong, A. Jurisevic, L. Brent, B. Scholz, and Y. Smaragdakis. Madmax: Surviving out-of-gas conditions in ethereum smart contracts. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(OOPSLA):1–27, 2018.
- [39] R. Harvey. Smart contract auditor, 2024. <https://chatgpt.com/g/g-VRtUR3Jpv-smart-contract-auditor>.
- [40] M. He, S. Xia, B. Qin, N. Yoshida, T. Yu, L. Song, and Y. Zhang. How to save my gas fees: Understanding and detecting real-world gas issues in solidity programs, 2024.
- [41] G. Ibbá, M. Ortu, R. Tonelli, and G. Destefanis. Leveraging chatgpt for automated smart contract repair: A preliminary exploration of gpt-3-based approaches.
- [42] ImmuneBytes. Smart contract audit services, 2023. <https://www.immunebytes.com/smart-contract-audit/>.
- [43] S. Kalra, S. Goel, M. Dhawan, and S. Sharma. Zeus: Analyzing safety of smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS ’18)*, San Diego, California, USA, 2018.
- [44] Q.-P. Kong, Z.-Y. Wang, Y. Huang, X.-P. Chen, X.-C. Zhou, Z.-B. Zheng, and G. Huang. Characterizing and detecting gas-inefficient patterns in smart contracts. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 37(1):67–82, 2022.
- [45] Y. Li, H. Liu, Z. Yang, Q. Ren, L. Wang, and B. Chen. Safepay on ethereum: A framework for detecting unfair payments in smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 40th IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS ’20)*, Singapore, 2020.
- [46] C. Liu, H. Liu, Z. Cao, Z. Chen, B. Chen, and B. Roscoe. Reguard: Finding reentrancy bugs in smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings (ICSE ’18)*, Gothenburg, Sweden, 2018.
- [47] H. Liu, D. Wu, Y. Sun, H. Wang, K. Li, Y. Liu, and Y. Chen. Using my functions should follow my checks: Understanding and detecting insecure OpenZeppelin code in smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security ’24)*, Philadelphia, PA, 2024.
- [48] L. Luu, D.-H. Chu, H. Olickel, P. Saxena, and A. Hobor. Making smart contracts smarter. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS ’16)*, Vienna, Austria, 2016.
- [49] W. Ma, D. Wu, Y. Sun, T. Wang, S. Liu, J. Zhang, Y. Xue, and Y. Liu. Combining fine-tuning and llm-based agents for intuitive smart contract auditing with justifications, 2024.
- [50] Y. Marcus, E. Heilman, and S. Goldberg. Low-resource eclipse attacks on ethereum’s peer-to-peer network. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2018.
- [51] Markus Waas. Top 7 Reasons To Learn Solidity Programming ASAP, 2022. <https://zerotomastery.io/blog/top-7-reasons-to-learn-solidity-programming/>.
- [52] K. Nelaturu, S. M. Beillahit, F. Long, and A. Veneris. Smart contracts refinement for gas optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 3rd Conference on Blockchain Research & Applications for Innovative Networks and Services (BRAINS ’21)*, Paris, France, 2021.
- [53] M. D. Norman. Smart contract auditor, 2024. <https://chatgpt.com/g/g-XFYkAnTpO-smart-contract-auditor>.
- [54] OpenAI. Openai gpt4 turbo. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4-and-gpt-4-turbo>.
- [55] OpenSea. Opensea, the largest nft marketplace, 2023. <https://opensea.io/>.

- [56] S. Palladino. Erc20 verifier, 2019. <https://github.com/spalladino/erc20-verifier>.
- [57] A. Permenev, D. Dimitrov, P. Tsankov, D. Drachslar-Cohen, and M. Vechev. Verx: Safety verification of smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 41st IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP '20)*, Virtual Event, 2020.
- [58] PixelPlex. Smart contract audit, 2023. <https://pixelplex.io/smart-contract-audit/>.
- [59] S. Poeplau and A. Francillon. Symbolic execution with SymCC: Don't interpret, compile! In *Proceedings of the 29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security '20)*, Virtual Event, 2020.
- [60] PolygonScan. Polygon pos chain explorer. <https://polygonscan.com>.
- [61] T. Z. T. Prover. Z3, 2022. <https://github.com/Z3Prover/z3>.
- [62] P. Qian, Z. Liu, Q. He, R. Zimmermann, and X. Wang. Towards automated reentrancy detection for smart contracts based on sequential models. *IEEE Access*, 8:19685–19695, 2020.
- [63] W. Radomski, A. Cooke, P. Castonguay, J. Therien, E. Binet, and R. Sandford. Erc-1155: Multi token standard, 2018. <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-1155>.
- [64] Rarible. Rarible – aggregated nft marketplace with rewards, 2023. <https://rarible.com/>.
- [65] Revoluzion. Revoluzion smart contract audit report services, 2023. <https://www.revoluzion.io/audit>.
- [66] C. Smith. Token standards, 2023. <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/standards/tokens/>.
- [67] M. Stefanović, Đ. Pržulj, D. Stefanović, S. Ristić, and D. Čapko. The proposal of new ethereum request for comments for supporting fractional ownership of non-fungible tokens. *Computer Science and Information Systems*, (00):38–38, 2023.
- [68] Y. Sun, D. Wu, Y. Xue, H. Liu, H. Wang, Z. Xu, X. Xie, and Y. Liu. 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 (ICSE '24)*, Lisbon, Portugal, 2024.
- [69] R. Verification. Secure your assets with ercx, 2024. <https://ercx.runtimeverification.com/>.
- [70] F. Vogelsteller and V. Buterin. Erc-20: Token standard, 2015. <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-20>.
- [71] S. Wang, C. Zhang, and Z. Su. Detecting nondeterministic payment bugs in ethereum smart contracts. 2019.
- [72] Wikipedia. Binance, 2023. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Binance>.
- [73] Wikipedia. Ethereum, 2023. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethereum>.
- [74] Wikipedia. Horizon (video game series), 2023. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Horizon_\(video_game_series\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Horizon_(video_game_series)).
- [75] Wikipedia. Shiba inu (cryptocurrency), 2023. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shiba_Inu_\(cryptocurrency\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shiba_Inu_(cryptocurrency)).
- [76] Wikipedia. Tether (cryptocurrency), 2023. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tether_\(cryptocurrency\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tether_(cryptocurrency)).
- [77] Y. Wu, X. Xie, C. Peng, D. Liu, H. Wu, M. Fan, T. Liu, and H. Wang. Advscanner: Generating adversarial smart contracts to exploit reentrancy vulnerabilities using llm and static analysis. In *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE '24)*, Sacramento, CA, USA, 2024.
- [78] K. Wüst and A. Gervais. Ethereum eclipse attacks. Technical report, ETH Zurich, 2016.
- [79] G. Xu, B. Guo, C. Su, X. Zheng, K. Liang, D. S. Wong, and H. Wang. Am i eclipsed? a smart detector of eclipse attacks for ethereum. *Computers & Security*, 88:101604, 2020.
- [80] Y. Xue, M. Ma, Y. Lin, Y. Sui, J. Ye, and T. Peng. Cross-contract static analysis for detecting practical reentrancy vulnerabilities in smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE '20)*, Melbourne, Australia, 2020.
- [81] J. Yang, H. Jin, R. Tang, X. Han, Q. Feng, H. Jiang, S. Zhong, B. Yin, and X. Hu. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 18(6):1–32, 2024.
- [82] Y. Yang, T. Kim, and B.-G. Chun. Finding consensus bugs in ethereum via multi-transaction differential fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI '21)*, Virtual Event, 2021.
- [83] B. Zhang. Towards finding accounting errors in smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '24)*, Lisbon, Portugal, 2024.

APPENDIX

Table 7: Utility functions and corresponding constraints.(- : not applicable.)

Name	Description	Constraints
checkThrow(<fun>, <flag>)	Examines whether <fun> throws or does not throw an exception, as indicated by <flag>.	$TH_{last} = flag$
checkCall(<fun>, <fun>)	Examines whether the first input <fun> calls the second input <fun>.	$CA_{fun2,last} = true$
checkEmit(<fun>, <event>)	Examines whether <fun> emits <event>.	$EM_{event,last} = true$
checkEndValue(<fun>, <value>, <value>)	Examines whether the first input <value> equals the second input <value> at the end of <fun>.	$value1_{last} = value2_{last}$
checkOrder(<op>, <op>, <order>)	Examines whether the two <op>s follow the given <order>.	$(O_{op1} < O_{op2} \wedge O_{op3} < O_{op4}) \vee (O_{op1} > O_{op2} \wedge O_{op3} > O_{op4})$
getFieldValue(<field_name>, (, <key>)*)	Returns the value of contract field <field_name>, if field <field_name> is an array or mapping, then <key>s are used to return one of its elements.	-
getFieldName(<anchor_function>)	Computes the name of a contract field by checking which contract field is accessed inside <anchor_function>.	-
getPara(<fun> <event>, <index>)	Returns the parameter of the input <fun> or <event> at the specified <index>.	-
getOrder(<op>, <op>)	Computes the order of the two input <op>s.	-
checkChange(<fun>, <field_name>, (, <key>)*)	Checks whether <fun> modifies the value of the input contract field.	$BC_{field_name,last}$
checkMint(<fun>, <field_name>)	Checks whether <fun> exclusively increases the value of the contract field without decreasing it.	$BI_{field_name,last} \wedge \neg BD_{field_name,last}$
checkBurn(<fun>, <field_name>)	Checks whether <fun> exclusively decreases the value of the contract field without increasing it.	$\neg BI_{field_name,last} \wedge BD_{field_name,last}$

```

1 Given an ERC, which contains a list of functions, events, and
  rules. Each function has its own rules, usually above their
  Solidity declaration. Rules indicating throw or check usually
  have patterns like
2 """
3 {sub} [must] [throw] [condition]
4 [action] [must] [throw]
5 caller [must] be approved to [action]
6 [action] are considered invalid
7 """
8 Other patterns that serve similar purposes also count.
9
10 Rules: """
11 {{description}}
12 {{API}}
13 """
14 List the conditions that need to be thrown or checked in the
  given rules for function {{API}} in a JSON array with the
  following format:
15
16 if: <string, condition to throw or check>
17 throw: <boolean, whether it needs to throw or should not be
  thrown>
18
19 If there is no such rule, simply left empty.

```

Figure 6: The template for prompts extracting TP rules. (“*description*”): text descriptions precede a function declaration in an ERC document. “*API*”: the function declaration itself.)

```

1 For {{API}}
2 rule: {{rule}}
3 {{args}}
4 By using the following JSON schema of the configuration for the
  rule verification:
5 {{JSON schema for EBNF}}
6 {{anchor function lists}}
7 Generate the JSON for the rule. {" if <args rule> else "Do not
  generate the arg part if there is no arg in the rule."}

```

Figure 7: The prompt template to translate a rule in natural language into the EBNF grammar. (“*API*”): the declaration in source code of a function or event. “*rule*”: the extracted natural language rule for that function or event. “*args*” describes the possible arguments for the rule in natural language.)