

How to Save My Gas Fees: Understanding and Detecting Real-world Gas Issues in Solidity Programs

MENGTING HE, The Pennsylvania State University , USA
SHIHAO XIA, The Pennsylvania State University , USA
BOQIN QIN, China Telecom Cloud Computing Corp , China
NOBUKO YOSHIDA, University of Oxford , UK
TINGTING YU, University of Cincinnati , USA
LINHAI SONG, The Pennsylvania State University , USA
YIYING ZHANG, University of California, San Diego , USA

The execution of smart contracts on Ethereum, a public blockchain system, incurs a fee called *gas fee* for its computation and data-store consumption. When programmers develop smart contracts (*e.g.*, in the Solidity programming language), they could unknowingly write code snippets that unnecessarily cause more gas fees. These issues, or what we call *gas wastes*, could lead to significant monetary waste for users. Yet, there have been no systematic examination of them or effective tools for detecting them. This paper takes the initiative in helping Ethereum users reduce their gas fees in two important steps: we conduct the first empirical study on gas wastes in popular smart contracts written in Solidity by understanding their root causes and fixing strategies; we then develop a static tool, *PeCatch*, to effectively detect gas wastes with *simple* fixes in Solidity programs based on our study findings. Overall, we make seven insights and four suggestions from our gas-waste study, which could foster future tool development, language improvement, and programmer awareness, and develop eight gas-waste checkers, which pinpoint 383 previously unknown gas wastes from famous Solidity libraries.

1 INTRODUCTION

Ethereum is a public blockchain system that empowers users to deploy and execute smart contracts [22, 65]. These smart contracts significantly enhance the fundamental capabilities of cryptocurrencies, enabling programmers to craft intricate decentralized applications (dapps) [67]. Smart contracts play a crucial role in fostering a booming Ethereum-centered digital economy, with approximately 1 million transactions happening daily and a total volume exceeding \$4 billion [5]. Moreover, multiple projects on Ethereum have achieved remarkable market values of surpassing \$1 billion [66, 69].

Solidity is the official programming language offered by Ethereum for writing smart contracts [68]. Featuring a syntax akin to ECMAScript [20], Solidity effectively hides most complexities of the underlying Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM), such as EVM's stack-based instructions (*i.e.*, no registers) and four distinct data store areas. Moreover, Solidity incorporates various security features to safeguard its programs from potential attacks, *e.g.*, overflow and underflow compiler checks at arithmetic operations. With these benefits, Solidity has gained immense popularity among smart-contract programmers [8, 42]. Almost all smart contracts on Ethereum are implemented in Solidity [60], with over 1 million new smart contracts written in Solidity being added to Ethereum every quarter.

To safeguard Ethereum's computational resources from potential DoS attacks, a fee called *gas* is charged for executing each smart contract [21, 27]. While correctness, performance, energy consumption, reliability, and security are some of the important metrics for traditional programs, gas becomes a crucial and distinct metric for smart contracts running on Ethereum. Different EVM operations result in different amounts of gas. While Solidity hides the complexity of working with EVM, it also hides the gas implication of user programs. As a result, even though gas is one of the most important optimization criteria for Solidity programs, programmers cannot easily reason

about the gas cost of their programs and can thus often write *gas-inefficient* code. Unfortunately, today’s Solidity compiler falls short of effectively optimizing gas-inefficient code. As a result, programs running on Ethereum often waste large amounts of gas that could otherwise be saved.

Given the substantial daily expenditure of millions of dollars on gas fees by Solidity programs operating on Ethereum [24], it is crucial to optimize code for gas efficiency. To achieve this over-arching goal, the foundational step is to comprehend how gas inefficiency occurs in real Solidity programs and how such inefficiency could be avoided. Doing so can guide the focus of tool development and language improvements, which in turn could help Ethereum users save substantial amounts of money. In this paper, we define one gas-inefficient code site in a Solidity program as one *gas waste*.

Unfortunately, no existing work has studied gas wastes empirically in real Solidity programs. While software defects or bugs, including those affecting correctness [35, 40] and performance [31, 47, 58], have been extensively studied for traditional programs, the findings and tools employed for detecting these bugs cannot be applied to Solidity programs to identify gas wastes. This disparity arises because the amount of gas consumption of a code segment is *not proportional to its performance or execution outcome*. Moreover, since EVM offers unique non-register-based instructions, an intricate data-store system, and a complex gas cost model, gas wastes have *root causes and buggy code patterns not existing in other programming languages*.

We employ a two-step approach to address gas wastes in Solidity programs. We first empirically study real gas wastes. We then leverage the insights gained from the study to detect previously unknown gas wastes.

Our empirical study of real gas wastes covers five popular Solidity applications. We manually inspect gas-waste code sites reported and fixed in the applications’ GitHub commit logs. With our study of 100 wastes (54 being Solidity-specific), we understand and categorize their root causes and fixing policies. Specifically, we separate gas wastes into four categories, corresponding to Solidity’s four types of data store/transfer mechanisms: *stack*, where instruction operands and results sit on; *memory*, volatile and byte-addressable area whose accesses consume slightly more gas than stack accesses; *storage*, persistent key-value data store area whose accesses consume 50× more gas than stack and memory; and *calldata*, byte-addressable arrays for sending data across contracts.

We find the misuse of stack and storage to be the topmost and second most gas-waste causes, with memory being the least common cause even though the memory data type is used extensively in Solidity programs. This finding matches our expectation, as unlike memory, stack and storage are new data types introduced by Solidity, and programmers are more likely to overlook the gas-cost implications of them. Furthermore, we notice that programmers frequently miss opportunities offered by Solidity’s distinct language features (e.g., `unchecked`, `calldata`) for optimizing gas usage, and automated compiler techniques are desired to apply those features. Overall, via our extensive study and thorough understanding of all our studied gas wastes, we make seven insights and four suggestions for future language designers, tool builders, and programmers.

Guided by the findings of our study, we build *PeCatch*, a suite of eight static checkers to detect gas wastes in Solidity programs, including four targeting stack-related wastes, two targeting storage-related ones, one targeting memory-related ones, and one for *calldata*. We effectively combine classical program analysis algorithms (e.g., live variable analysis, mutability analysis) with Solidity’s distinctive data store mechanism and language features such as `unchecked` and *calldata*. Our checkers pinpoint gas wastes that widely exist in real-world Solidity programs but are missed by existing gas-waste detection and compiler optimization techniques. Besides the specific gas-waste checkers, *PeCatch* also contains multiple inspiring static analysis routines that can serve as a foundation for researchers to construct advanced analysis techniques for Solidity programs.

We evaluate PeCatch on the latest versions of the five Solidity applications we studied and four other open-source Solidity projects. We compare PeCatch with five existing techniques, including three gas-waste detection techniques [6, 16, 46] and two compiler suites [23, 39]. PeCatch identifies a total of 383 previously unknown gas wastes from these programs, or 5× to 95× more than the existing techniques. Meanwhile, PeCatch only has five false positives, or 1.5% of true positives, while existing techniques have 9.5% to 300% false positive rates. These outcomes highlight PeCatch’s superior gas-waste detection capability, accuracy, and generality, which make PeCatch a practical tool that can help real Solidity programmers. Moreover, PeCatch’s superior results over existing gas-waste detection techniques reassure the value of our empirical study, as existing techniques are *not* rooted in empirical studies.

We have made PeCatch and all our study results publicly available (currently anonymized) [52]. In sum, we make the following contributions.

- We conduct the first empirical study on gas wastes in real Solidity programs, with a particular focus on those associated with Solidity’s unique language features.
- We design and implement PeCatch a suite of static gas-waste detectors.
- We conduct thorough experiments to assess PeCatch and confirm its effectiveness, accuracy, and coverage.

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

This section describes the background of this project, including Ethereum, the Solidity programming language, gas wastes, and existing techniques related to ours.

2.1 Ethereum and the Gas Mechanism

Ethereum is a blockchain system that empowers programmers to create smart contracts for the development of decentralized applications [22, 65]. Ethereum’s native cryptocurrency is Ether (ETH). Within Ethereum, both users and smart contracts are treated as distinct accounts, each possessing unique addresses for sending or receiving Ethers. An Ethereum transaction comprises a series of computations initiated by a message from a user account. Transactions can be as straightforward as transferring Ethers between accounts or involve complex computations conducted by multiple smart contracts. The Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM) serves as the execution environment for these transactions. Its design ensures determinism, regardless of the underlying hardware and operating systems, to guarantee consensus upon committing a transaction.

Gas represents the cost of executing computations on Ethereum, and users must pay gas fees to exercise transactions on Ethereum [21, 27]. When submitting a transaction to Ethereum, the user must specify both the amount of Ether they want to pay for each gas unit (“gas price”) and the maximum amount of gas they want to use for the transaction. If the gas usage reaches the specified limit during the transaction’s execution, the transaction will be canceled and any changes made to Ethereum will be rolled back. The main purpose of gas is to prevent DoS attacks, since Ethereum operates as an open platform, and without the gas mechanism, hackers could submit malicious computations and deplete Ethereum’s computational resources. Additionally, gas can also be used to prioritize transactions, as miners prefer to handle transactions with higher gas prices earlier for larger rewards.

In this paper, our goal is to reduce gas costs by identifying gas-inefficient code sites within a contract prior to its deployment on Ethereum. Programmers can fix the identified code sites following our suggestions. Subsequently, after deployment, the contract users will pay reduced gas fees for equivalent computations, potentially fostering greater willingness among users to engage with the contract.

```

1  contract Warehouse {
2      mapping(address => uint) private _balances;
3      uint _sig;
4      struct CTX {uint warehouse_sig;}
5      function transfer(address from, address to, uint amount, CTX calldata data) external {
6          CTX memory ctx = data; // 621 gas units
7          require(_sig == ctx.warehouse_sig, "invalid request"); // 2142 gas units
8          uint old = _balances[from]; // 208 gas units
9          unchecked { old -= amount;} // 21 gas units
10         _balances[from] = old; // 214 gas units
11         _balances[to] += amount; // 22415 gas units
12     }
13 }

```

Fig. 1. A smart contract example.

2.2 Solidity Programming Language

As the most popular programming language for writing smart contracts [60], many of Solidity’s language elements are tailored to reflect smart contracts’ semantics. The building block in Solidity is contract (similar to class in Java), which encompasses contract fields for storing contract states, functions for offering contract functionalities, and events for logging purposes. There are two types of function calls in Solidity, message calls when invoking a function in a different contract, and internal calls where a caller and a callee are in the same contract. Solidity provides both primitive types (e.g., various integer types, address) and complex types (e.g., struct, mapping) to construct diverse transaction protocols.

Solidity offers a complex data store system. In sum, it provides four distinct data store areas, each with its own set of instructions for interaction and gas-cost model. Misunderstanding these can easily write gas-inefficient code.

Stack. The EVM is a stack-based machine and does not have registers available. Thus, stack is the primary area to interact with instructions, by providing their operands and receiving their results. The stack area can hold a maximum of 1024 32-byte words, with direct accesses limited to the topmost 16 words. When a message call is invoked, a new stack is created on the callee side, while calling an internal function, the callee shares the same stack with the caller. The stack is the cheapest storage area, as most stack operations only consume two or three gas units each.

Memory. Memory is designed to hold complex types (e.g., struct, bytes) that cannot be kept on the stack. Memory is a byte-addressable array. Solidity provides `mload` to read data from the memory to the stack for processing, and `mstore` and `mstore8` to modify the memory. The memory is not persistent across transactions. Similar to the stack, when a caller and a callee are within the same contract, they share the same memory, while using different memory areas, if they are in different contracts. Accessing a previously untouched memory slot triggers a memory expansion gas cost. Except for memory expansion, accessing the memory is only slightly more expensive than accessing the stack. For example, both `mload` and `mstore` consume three units of gas.

Storage. The storage area holds contracts’ state variables (contract fields) that remain persistent across transactions. It operates as a key-value store, with keys being unique IDs assigned following contract fields’ declaration orders and values being 32-byte words. Solidity attempts to pack multiple consecutive contract fields into one single word for better storage usage when the fields are smaller than 32 bytes. Solidity provides `sload` and `sstore` to interact with the storage, both of which consume 50X more gas compared to instructions for other areas.

Calldata. Calldata is designed to transfer data from the caller to the callee when conducting a message call. It is a byte-addressable array. The first four bytes are used to identify the callee

function, while the remaining bytes are used to save arguments. Instructions such as `calldataload` and `calldatacopy` are provided to read values in the `calldata`. The whole `calldata` area is `readonly`, and thus no instructions are available to modify the `calldata`. Reading data on the `calldata` consumes the same amount of gas as reading data on the memory, except that accessing the `calldata` does not cause memory expansion.

Figure 1 shows an example of Solidity code featuring the Warehouse contract. Warehouse employs its `_balances` field (line 2) to monitor the quantity of tokens held by each address. The `transfer()` function in line 5 is designed to transfer tokens between addresses, with its four parameters representing sender, receiver, transferred amount, and context, respectively. Notably, as illustrated in line 7, the transfer is only permitted when the input context data aligns with the `_sig` field.

This code involves all four store areas. All contract fields (e.g., `_balances` in line 2) are saved on the storage. Function parameters are on the stack. Moreover, the results of reading from a storage slot (e.g., line 8) and the outcomes of mathematical computations are also on the stack (e.g., line 9). The `calldata` parameter data is copied to the memory struct `ctx` in line 6. Gas consumption for each source-code line is also shown in the figure. Reading or writing a storage slot (e.g., line 8, line 10) consumes more than 200 gas units. The write in line 11 consumes significantly more gas than line 10, because it alters a storage slot from zero to non-zero. If the `unchecked` in line 9 is removed, an underflow check will be added by the compiler, resulting in gas consumption of more than 100. The gas consumption for `calldata` and memory operations is lower than that of storage operations. However, line 6 involves memory allocation and boundary check operations, leading to a gas consumption exceeding 600 units.

2.3 Gas Wastes

Ethereum calculates gas usages in a highly intricate manner, with different types of opcodes consuming varying amounts of gas. Additionally, accessing data from different store areas incurs different gas costs (e.g., accessing storage is more costly than accessing the memory or the stack). To further complicate matters, even the same opcode on the same store area can have different gas consumption. For example, when a previously unused memory word is touched, memory expansion occurs. For the first 724 memory bytes, the expansion cost is linearly related to the used memory, but beyond 724 bytes, it becomes quadratic. Another instance is changing a storage word from 0 to 1, which consumes over 10K gas units – significantly more expensive than changing the word from one non-zero value to another. As a result, Solidity programmers may easily write gas-inefficient code. Moreover, Ethereum incurs millions of dollars in gas fees daily, underscoring the paramount importance of optimizing gas usage for Solidity programs [24].

In this paper, we define “gas wastes” as code sites that unnecessarily consume more gas. These gas wastes can be fixed without compromising the original functionalities while reducing gas usage. Gas wastes resemble performance bugs in traditional programming languages [13, 31, 32, 38, 49] in that neither affects the correctness of the program outcome, but gas wastes differ in several ways. First, the impacts of gas wastes and performance bugs are measured in different ways: gas wastes are measured by the monetary cost of running a program, but performance bugs are measured by the time (latency, throughput) to run a program. Second, different types of data-store operations in Solidity directly impact the gas costs of running a Solidity program, but the performance of a program is affected by many factors. Third, EVM has its unique opcodes while lacking some opcodes and hardware features (e.g., registers) commonly provided by traditional architectures, causing gas wastes unique to EVM. Finally, when a transaction reaches its specified gas limit, an out-of-gas exception will be triggered, leading to the cancellation of the entire transaction. Gas wastes raise the likelihood of having an out-of-gas exception, and they could potentially be exploited for out-of-gas attacks [28, 29]. Therefore, study results of traditional performance bugs

Table 1. Information of Selected Solidity Applications. (*Used By*: how many GitHub repositories using an application counted by GitHub, *LoC*: lines of Solidity source code, *Wastes*: the number of studied wastes, *Unique Wastes*: the number of wastes related to Solidity’s unique language features, and *-*: not available.)

Apps	Start Time	Stars	Commits	Used By	LoC	Wastes	Unique Wastes
OpenZeppelin	2016/08	22623	3311	20534	9684	23	14
Uniswap V3	2019/08	3725	1005	6090	4247	27	13
uniswap-lib	2020/04	140	73	17946	666	4	1
solmate	2021/07	3231	426	476	6833	25	13
Seaport	2022/01	1992	5400	-	61077	21	13

cannot be applied to gas wastes and the smart-contract environment. We perform the *first* empirical study on gas wastes in smart contracts and propose new detection strategies for these issues.

2.4 Related Work

Gas Usage Optimization and Gas Waste Detection. Gas usage optimization is a crucial focus for the official Solidity language team. In version 0.8.0, Solidity introduced automated overflow and underflow checks for all mathematical operations. Additionally, it offered the “unchecked” feature, allowing programmers to mark specific code regions to disable the checks and save gas [25]. The Solidity compiler provides two types of gas usage optimizations [23]. The first type, enabled by default, involves simple peephole optimizations on opcodes (e.g., simplifying “a + 0” to “a”). The second type operates on Yul IR and must be explicitly enabled. It offers various optimizations commonly found in traditional programming language compilers, such as eliminating redundant assignments and simplifying mathematical expressions. Unfortunately, most gas wastes studied in Section 3, especially those unique to Solidity, cannot be resolved by existing Solidity compiler optimizations. As a result, further research and development are necessary to address these gas-related issues effectively.

Researchers have developed multiple detection techniques to identify gas wastes in Solidity programs [6, 7, 10–12, 16, 33, 44]. Brandstätter *et al.* investigate whether traditional compiler optimizations remain effective when applied to Solidity programs [6]. They further build a tool named python-solidity-optimizer, which incorporates nine traditional optimization algorithms (e.g., loop unrolling, unconditional branch elimination) to identify potential optimization opportunities within Solidity programs. Slither is a static analysis framework [16], and it comprises checkers to detect seven gas-inefficiency patterns. These patterns include scenarios where the length field of a storage array is read within a loop, struct fields that could be declared as constant or immutable, public functions that can be declared as external and the parameters of the functions can be declared as calldata, cases where keyword `this` is used, loops with expensive operations, and situations where a callee unexpectedly depletes all the gas provided by its caller. GasSaver [46] contains seven checkers, with four related to Solidity unique language features (e.g., detecting parameters that can be labeled as calldata), and the other three constructed according to traditional optimization algorithms (e.g., combining two consecutive loops). Although useful, these techniques either solely apply traditional compiler optimizations to Solidity, overlooking the language’s unique features (e.g., python-solidity-optimizer), or concentrate on detecting only a restricted set of gas-inefficient code patterns associated with Solidity’s unique language features. As a result, these methods fall short of detecting the majority of gas wastes examined in Section 3. There is a need for innovative gas-waste detection techniques, to address these limitations effectively.

PeCatch is different from the existing techniques in three aspects. First, PeCatch is guided by our empirical study of real-world gas wastes. As such, it detects issues that are more likely to happen in real programs. Second, as shown by the experimental results in Section 5, PeCatch covers significantly more gas issues related to Solidity’s distinctive language features than existing

Table 2. Solidity-specific gas wastes categorized by root causes and fixing strategies. (*Store: changing store area; Stack-Op: changing stack operations; Computation: eliminating computation.*)

Root Cause (Store Area)	Fixing Strategies				Total
	Store	Stack-Op	Computation	Other	
Stack	0	9	14	1	24
Memory	3	0	1	0	4
Storage	17	0	0	3	20
Calldata	6	0	0	0	6
Total	26	9	15	4	54

techniques. Third, PeCatch incorporates several innovative static analysis algorithms. Researchers can create bug detection or code transformation tools with these algorithms as a foundation. In summary, our work advances static Solidity gas-waste detection by introducing a significantly more effective technique and by offering practical, inspiring algorithms.

Other Research on Solidity. Researchers have conducted studies to comprehend various aspects of Solidity programs, including inline assembly code and loops in them [4, 9], their functionalities and associated design patterns [4], their processed on-chain data [53], and their measurements on source-code metrics [61]. However, none of these studies try to understand gas-inefficient code patterns in Solidity programs. Our work is the first to investigate this topic.

Researchers build many techniques to pinpoint other types of Solidity bugs, including reentrancy bugs [36, 54, 79], nondeterministic payment bugs [34, 64], consensus bugs [14, 81] and eclipse attacks [41, 70, 75]. For example, there have been proposed techniques for identifying code segments that consistently lead to exceptions during every execution after being attacked [28, 29]. These techniques mainly improve Solidity programs’ safety and security, not gas efficiency like ours.

Researchers have also established formal execution semantics for Solidity programs to search for gas-optimized programs [2, 43], validate the equivalence of two Solidity programs [1], or assess a Solidity program with a user-provided property [3]. These techniques are orthogonal to our work and can be applied to ensure semantic preservation after fixing gas wastes identified by PeCatch.

3 EMPIRICAL STUDY

This section presents our empirical study on gas wastes collected from real-world Solidity programs, including the methodology employed in our study, the underlying root causes of the gas wastes, and the strategies used to fix them.

3.1 Methodology

Our studied gas wastes are gathered from five open-source Solidity applications. Table 1 shows their detailed information. We selected these five applications for several reasons. First, they are popular GitHub repositories. For instance, OpenZeppelin [50] boasts 22K GitHub stars, while solmate [57] has 3K GitHub stars. Second, these applications serve as fundamental components for numerous essential blockchain applications. Consequently, analyzing gas inefficiency patterns within them can yield a substantial impact. For instance, OpenZeppelin is utilized by 20K GitHub repositories, and Uniswap-lib [63] is shared among Uniswap contracts. Third, these applications encompass common functionalities found in Solidity programs, such as mathematical computations, token or NFT trading, access control, and verification. The code within the applications accurately reflects typical coding practices employed by Solidity programmers.

To collect gas wastes, we adopt the established practice for gathering real-world bugs [55, 62]. Initially, we employ a set of gas-inefficiency-related keywords to search through the GitHub commit logs of the aforementioned applications. Then, we conduct a manual analysis of the search results to identify commits that fix gas wastes. We choose a set of keywords that are related to gas

```

1  contract ERC20 {
2      uint public totalSupply;
3      mapping(address => uint) public balanceOf;
4      function transfer(address to, uint value) external returns (bool) {
5          balanceOf[msg.sender] -= value;
6          - balanceOf[to] += value;
7          + unchecked { balanceOf[to] += value; }
8          return true;
9      }
10     function _mint(address to, uint256 value) internal {
11         totalSupply += value;
12         - balanceOf[to] += value;
13         + unchecked { balanceOf[to] += value;}
14     }
15 }

```

Fig. 2. A gas waste fixed by unchecked in OpenZeppelin. (Code simplified for illustration purpose.)

optimizations or to Solidity’s unique language features. They include “gas”, “opt”, “store”, “load”, and “unchecked”. In sum, we collect 100 gas wastes, as shown in Table 1.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of a gas waste, we primarily rely on the information provided within the corresponding commit. We thoroughly examine the modified code and its surrounding code context. Moreover, we also pay careful attention to the textual descriptions accompanying the commit. Furthermore, if the commit contains references to related pull requests and issue reports, we delve into the discussions among programmers within those pull requests and issue reports.

Our analysis focuses on identifying the root causes behind these gas wastes, seeking to comprehend why they consume more gas than necessary. Additionally, we investigate the strategies employed to fix these gas wastes, aiming to gain insights into resolving them and optimizing gas usage. Each gas waste is studied by at least two paper authors. All study results are thoroughly discussed to solve disparities.

3.2 Root Causes

We employ a two-step approach to investigate the root causes of gas wastes. Initially, we identify gas wastes that are specific to Solidity. As depicted in Table 2, out of the 100 gas wastes, 54 are associated with Solidity’s unique language features. For the remaining 46 gas wastes, their code may lead to performance issues in other programming languages as well. These gas wastes can be detected using existing compiler optimizations and performance bug detection techniques [15, 17–19, 26, 30–32, 37, 38, 45, 47–49, 56, 59, 71–74, 76–78, 80, 82], or they can be optimized with better algorithms, regardless of programming languages or underlying architectures. For instance, six gas wastes can be patched by inlining a callee function, three gas wastes stem from the unnecessary usage of temporary variables, and seven gas wastes are resolved by adopting new bitwise or mathematical algorithms. Since these gas wastes have been covered in previous research, our focus will primarily center on gas wastes unique to Solidity, unless stated otherwise.

In the second step, we categorize the 54 gas wastes unique to Solidity based on the store area where the data manipulated by the gas-inefficient code is stored. This categorization is essential as different store areas involve distinct instructions for interaction, leading to varying code patterns for corresponding gas wastes. By organizing gas wastes according to store areas, we can gain guidance for the design of gas-waste detection methods (as presented in Section 4).

3.2.1 Stack. The EVM is a stack-based machine and does not have any register. Thus, the stack is the most frequently accessed store area. For example, all mathematical operations in Solidity take


```

1  abstract contract ERC1155 {
2      mapping(address => mapping(uint => uint)) balanceOf;
3      function safeBatchTransferFrom(address from, address to, uint[] memory ids, uint[] memory
         amounts) public {
4          uint idsLength = ids.length;
5          + uint id;
6          + uint amount;
7          for (uint i = 0; i < idsLength;) {
8              - uint id = ids[i];
9              - uint amount = amounts[i];
10             + id = ids[i];
11             + amount = amounts[i];
12             balanceOf[from][id] -= amount;
13             balanceOf[to][id] += amount;
14             unchecked { i++; }
15         }
16     }}

```

Fig. 3. A cross-loop-iteration gas waste in solmate. (Code simplified for illustration purpose.)

operands from the stack and output results back to the stack. As a result, the “stack” category has the most gas wastes.

Not using unchecked when possible. In order to achieve good security guarantees, Solidity provides various compiler checks. For example, the Solidity compiler automatically adds overflow and underflow checks to stack variables before each mathematical computation to prevent overflow-based attacks. These checks consume additional gas. To avoid this gas consumption, Solidity allows programmers to mark operations with the unchecked keyword, which will disable the checks (e.g., line 7 in Figure 2). One execution of an unchecked operation saves more than 150 units of gas. As using unchecked relaxes the security guarantee, it is intended to be used only when programmers are certain that no overflow or underflow could occur at the marked operation.

12 stack-based gas wastes are about not enabling the unchecked feature when possible. In four of the gas wastes, the program semantic ensures that the result of an addition is smaller than another number in the same type or another addition result that has been checked for overflow (and similarly, a subtraction result is bigger than another number or the result has already been checked for underflow). In such cases, the operation under examination does not need to be checked and can be marked as unchecked but was not, resulting in gas wastes. An example is illustrated in Figure 2. The totalSupply field (line 2) holds the total number of tokens among all addresses. The balanceOf structure (line 3) is a map tracking the number of tokens for each address. The addition operation in line 6 cannot overflow since the added value is the number of tokens of another address, and adding it is still smaller than or equal to totalSupply. Furthermore, the addition in line 12 does not overflow, since it is smaller than the addition result in line 11, and line 12 can only be executed when line 11 passes the overflow check.

For another five gas wastes, the programmers understand the workload, and thus, they are confident to uncheck certain mathematical operations. For the last three gas wastes, there are control flow checks to guarantee when the program reaches a mathematical operation, the values of the operands satisfy certain conditions, and thus the operation cannot overflow or underflow.

Insight 1: *Programmers miss many opportunities of leveraging language features for trading security for lower gas.*

Suggestion 1: *Static analysis tools could be developed to help programmers leverage program features at the development phase or the testing phase.*

Using && in if conditions. As EVM is a stack-based virtual machine, its implementation of opcodes relies solely on stack. For example, its implementation of the “&&” operator involves pushing the evaluation result of the left-hand-sided condition to the stack and copying the result to another stack variable representing the result of the “&&” operator, both causing gas consumption. This happens even when the left-hand-sided condition is evaluated to false. The gas consumption could be avoided if a “&&” statement is broken into two separate ones, for example, by breaking an if statement with a “&&” into two nested if statements. As each if statement works on its own, the evaluation result of each statement is not pushed to the stack. Four gas wastes stem from the use of “&&” in an if statement’s condition. One execution of such a gas-inefficient code snippet can waste more than 20 gas units.

Returning local variables in a function. Solidity allows programmers to declare the return value (denoted as “retD”) of a function in the function’s declaration. Programming in this way saves gas compared to returning a local variable (denoted as “retLocal”). This is because no matter whether “retD” is declared in the function’s declaration, Solidity implicitly creates a slot on the stack representing “retD” when entering the function. The use of “return retLocal” causes Solidity to copy the value of “retLocal” to the stack variable representing “retD”, while “return retD” avoids allocating the stack space for retLocal and the copy. Four of our studied gas wastes are caused by the use of “return retLocal”. Fixing one such gas waste saves more than 10 gas units for each execution.

Allocation in a loop. As discussed in Section 2.2, Solidity restricts direct access to only the top 16 words on the stack. To access other stack slots, Solidity must first remove some elements from the stack. However, when there are many local variables used in a nested manner, the Solidity compiler may not find a way to generate code, resulting in a “stack too deep” compiler error. To prevent such errors, Solidity identifies unused local variables and deallocates them earlier. For instance, Solidity removes a local variable from the stack at the closing curly bracket of the code block declaring the variable, instead of deallocating the variable at the end of the function, like C/C++. Unfortunately, if the code block is within a loop, continuously creating and deallocating a local variable on the stack can lead to gas wastage.

Two gas wastes are caused by the allocation of local variables within a loop. One such example is shown in Figure 3. Local variables `id` and `amount` are allocating and deallocating in each loop iteration. After declaring them outside the loop in lines 5 and 6, the patched program only allocates and frees the variables once, saving 15 gas units per loop iteration. Although moving the allocation of stack variables to the beginning of a function is a common practice of traditional compilers, the Solidity compiler does not perform this move as doing so could lead to the “stack-too-deep” error. If programmers are not aware of this, they would assume that the compiler automatically optimizes the allocation site, leading to this type of gas wastes.

Other causes. There are two gas wastes not belonging to the above cases. One is related to bit shifting. In Solidity, a `bytes32` number is 32 bytes long, and an address is 20 bytes. This gas-inefficient code left-shifts a `bytes32` number by 20 bytes and extracts the most-significant 20 bytes as an address. This gas waste consumes 31 more gas units than necessary for each execution, since the same result can be achieved by extracting the least-significant 20 bytes directly. The final gas waste is about replacing “`a!=b`” with “`a<b`”. The reason is that “`!=`” is implemented with two opcodes

```

1  contract ERC1155 {
2      mapping(uint => mapping(address => uint)) private _bal;
3      function safeTransferFrom(address from, address to, uint id, uint amount) public {
4          require(_bal[id][from] >= amount, "insufficient balance");
5          _bal[id][from] -= amount;
6          uint256 fromBalance = _bal[id][from];
7          require(fromBalance >= amount, "insufficient balance");
8          _bal[id][from] = fromBalance - amount;
9      }
10 }

```

Fig. 4. A gas waste due to redundant contract-field reads. (Code simplified for illustration purpose.)

and thus consumes more gas. The right operand “b” in the original program is the largest uint256 number. Thus, “a>b” can never happen, allowing the statement to be reduced to “a<b”.

Insight 2: *As EVM does not have registers, the implementation of many traditional types of operations in Solidity implicitly uses stack. Programmers are easy to overlook such usage, causing gas wastes.*

Suggestion 2: *Certain language features such as “&&” and “retLocal” could be improved to save gas. Meanwhile, programmers should not only know how to use Solidity but also understand the gas implication behind its implementation.*

3.2.2 Memory. Four gas wastes are in the memory category. Three wastes are caused by reading a loop-invariant object field inside a loop, and the object is on the memory. These wastes are fixed by caching the object field in a stack variable and reading the stack variable in the loop instead of reading the object field, similar to the caching of `ids.length` with `idsLength` in Figure 3. Caching a memory object field in a stack variable saves around 3 gas units for each loop iteration. Note that even though similar loop-level optimizations could happen in traditional languages, this optimization is specific to Solidity, as the amount of gas spent is dependent on the store area.

The remaining gas waste is due to the use of an `mstore` that modifies 32 bytes when translating all letters in a string. For every letter, the gas-inefficient code performs a left-shift operation to move the translated letter to the right-most byte location of a 32-byte word before using `mstore` to write the 32-byte word to the memory. To save gas, using `mstore8` to update one byte at a time can eliminate the left-shift operation.

Insight 3: *There are less memory-related gas wastes than other types likely because memory and its relationship to stack are similar to traditional heap and thus more familiar to programmers than other data-store types.*

3.2.3 Storage. Among the different store areas, storage incurs the highest cost. Consequently, gas wastes resulting from the improper utilization of data on the storage are more likely to be perceived and addressed. This category comprises 20 gas wastes, ranking second in number only to the gas wastes falling under the “stack” category.

Repetitive reads to storage. 14 gas wastes stem from repetitive access to the same data on the storage. Among them, 12 involve accessing a contract field, while the remaining two involve accessing an input parameter stored on the storage. Out of the 14 gas wastes, 11 solely read the storage data, while the other three perform both read and write operations on the storage data. Instructions `sload` and `ssstore` are required to access storage data, and each execution of them consumes more than 100 gas units. Copying the data to either the stack or the memory and then accessing the copied version significantly reduce the gas usage, since accessing the stack or the memory once only consumes two to three gas units. Figure 4 shows a gas waste example. `_bal[id][from]` is read with an `sload` instruction for the first time in line 4, and it is read again by another `sload` instruction in line 5. The patch stores `_bal[id][from]` in stack variable `fromBalance`, replacing

the second sload on `_bal[id][from]` with a read on the stack and saving more than 100 gas units per execution.

Read-after-write to storage. Three gas wastes are caused by writing a stack value to a contract field and subsequently reading the same field without any modifications in between. Replacing the read on the contract field with reading on the stack value can save more than 100 gas units.

Insight 4: *Specific patterns of reading and writing to storage could always lead to extra gas.*

Suggestion 3: *Static analysis of storage reads and writes could capture gas wastes and automatically fix them.*

0-to-1 gas charge. Changing a zero to a non-zero value on storage consumes 100X more gas than modifying non-zero values, because the size of blockchain data of zero value is also zero but non-zero data's size is 256 bits. While changing from zero to non-zero is unavoidable for regular values, it could be avoided for Booleans. Changing a Boolean storage value from false to true implicitly changes the storage data from 0 to 1, consuming more than 10K gas. Instead of using Boolean, if `uint256` is used and 1 and 2 are used to represent false and true, one could avoid this high gas consumption.

Three gas wastes are caused by this Boolean usage and fixed with the above strategy. Importantly, it is not advisable to convert all Boolean contract fields into `uint256`. When a Boolean field is packed with other fields in the same storage slot, all of them only consumes one 256-bit storage area. Changing the Boolean to `uint256` increases storage size, potentially incurring more cost when deploying the contract.

Insight 5: *The gas-cost model can be tricky and requires a careful examination of trade-offs to determine the best way to write code.*

3.2.4 Calldata. Six gas wastes are caused by incorrectly labeling function arguments or returns as memory instead of calldata. Among these, four gas wastes arise when labeling a read-only argument of an external function as memory. External functions can only be invoked through message calls, and the argument resides in the calldata at the beginning of the invocation. Using memory results in unnecessary copying of the argument from calldata to memory when entering the function, which wastes gas, since the argument can be directly read from calldata. For example, changing an array parameter with 100 elements from memory to calldata saves 23196 gas units.

Another gas waste occurs due to labeling an internal function's argument as memory, even though it can be labeled as calldata. Since the function is only called with a real parameter on the calldata for the argument, and the function does not modify the argument, changing the label from memory to calldata can avoid the unnecessary copy of the argument.

Similarly, we can use calldata to label a return value when the function returns a piece of data from the calldata, and that return is read-only for all its callers. One gas waste arises from failing to label a function's return as calldata.

Insight 6: *The failure of using calldata causes gas wastes, likely as a result of programmers' unfamiliarity with the new calldata type in Solidity but not in traditional languages.*

Suggestion 4: *Static analysis of function arguments and return values could potentially avoid calldata-related gas wastes.*

3.2.5 Summary. Misuse of stack is the topmost cause for our studied gas wastes, while storage is the second most cause. This suggests that 1) programmers could be less familiar with stack and storage operations than with memory operations, and/or 2) Solidity performs more intricate compiler operations with stack and storage that are different from traditional compilers.

On the other hand, the gas cost per execution of a storage-related gas waste is the highest among all types of gas wastes, because the storage area has a higher gas consumption in general. In comparison, stack-related gas wastes usually consume less gas per execution. However, depending on how often these gas wastes are exercised in real execution, the overall impact on application gas fees can vary greatly.

Besides the Solidity-specific gas wastes presented in this section, we also study the remaining 46 gas wastes we collected that are not Solidity specific. These gas wastes are distributed across store areas in a similar manner as Solidity-specific gas wastes, and their code patterns are similar to those in traditional programming languages (e.g., C/C++, Java).

3.3 Fixing Strategies

As shown in Table 2, we categorize the fixing strategies of gas wastes into four categories.

Changing store areas. A total of 26 gas wastes are fixed by making changes to the store area for the gas-inefficient code’ manipulated data. Out of these, 13 gas wastes are resolved by replacing the accesses to storage data with accesses to stack data. For instance, the read operation of `_bal[id][from]` from the storage in line 5 in Figure 4 is changed to reading `fromBalance` from the stack. Four gas wastes are patched by transitioning from using storage to memory and converting repetitive storage accesses to memory accesses. All six gas wastes that resulted from failing to label a memory argument as `calldata` are fixed by modifying the respective arguments’ labels. Lastly, the three gas wastes arising from accessing loop-invariant memory data are resolved by moving the data to the stack.

Changing stack operations. Nine gas wastes are patched by changing the way of implementing semantics differently using stack operations. They are the gas wastes caused by `&&` in `if` conditions, returning local variables as “`retLocal`” in functions, and stack-variable allocation in loops, as explained in Section 3.2.1. Their fixes are using nested `if` statements, changing function returns to “`retD`”, and moving allocation outside loops.

Eliminating computation. 15 gas wastes are resolved by eliminating computation. Among these, 12 gas wastes are fixed by adding the `unchecked` tag to computation for avoiding compiler overflow/underflow checks (e.g., Figure 2). The remaining three gas wastes are not related to `unchecked`. One is fixed by avoiding a left-shift operation and directly extracting the corresponding bits. One is fixed by replacing the two-opcode operation “`a!=b`” with the single-opcode operation “`a<b`”, as explained in Section 3.2.1. The last gas waste is fixed by using `mstore8` to replace `mstore` to avoid left-shift operations when modifying each letter in a string, as shown in Section 3.2.2.

Others. Four gas wastes fall outside the scope of the previous categories, including three gas wastes resolved by replacing Boolean contract fields with `uint256` contract fields, and the final gas waste addressed through the implementation of a smart algorithm to compute an `if` condition that involved the “`&&`” operator.

Insight 7: *Most of the gas wastes caused by misuse of memory, storage, and calldata are resolved by modifying store areas, and these account for about half of all the fixes. Differently, stack-related gas wastes are fixed by changing or eliminating stack-related operations. This indicates that non-stack-related gas wastes could more easily be automatically fixed, while stack-related ones are more complex and more difficult to fix.*

4 GAS WASTE DETECTION

This section presents the design of *PeCatch*, our gas-waste detection tool targeting Solidity’s unique language features. *PeCatch* consists of eight separate checkers, each designed based on the findings

gained from the empirical study in Section 3. Similar to our study, we separate the checkers based on which store areas the targeted gas wastes happen. We discuss our checkers’ design, corresponding fixing strategies, and how fixes preserve the original semantics accordingly.

Stack. There are four PeCatch checkers in this category. One is for identifying mathematical computations free from overflow or underflow issues, and thus can be labeled as unchecked. The remaining three aim to detect gas-inefficient code caused by the absence of registers in the EVM.

Non-overflowable computation. The high-level idea of this checker is to identify a pair of integers (a, b) , where it can be guaranteed (through static analysis) that a is always greater than or equal to b throughout the whole program. If a has been checked for overflow, then an addition to b cannot overflow and can be marked as unchecked. Similarly, if b has been checked for underflow, then a subtraction from a can be marked as unchecked.

We analyze the entire contract when both a and b are contract fields, and one single function when both a and b are local variables of the function. We take three steps for each scenario: identifying candidate pairs, filtering out pairs where $a \geq b$ is not ensured, and pinpointing computations that can be marked as unchecked.

We consider a and b as a candidate pair if they both belong to the same integer type. Additionally, we permit b to be a collection (e.g., array, mapping) and represent the value of b as the sum of all its elements, as if we can safely infer that the whole collection of b is no larger than a and a cannot overflow, then any element of b cannot overflow. We then filter out candidates where the condition $a \geq b$ is not guaranteed. When dealing with contract fields, this filtering begins by examining the initial values of a and b at the contract’s constructor. For local variables, the filtering inspects the initial values of a and b inside the function. We only consider a - b pairs where both are initialized to constant values and a ’s initial constant value is no smaller than b ’s. Next, we examine each modification made to a or b within the contract (or within the function). If k is added to b , we verify whether k is added to a in the same function and whether k ’s value stays the same across the two additions. This involves inspecting whether such an addition operation exists and whether it either precedes and dominates the addition on b or succeeds and post-dominates the addition on b . For example, value is added to an element of `balanceOf` in line 12 in Figure 2, which is preceded and dominated by the addition of value to `totalSupply` in line 11. Similarly, if c is subtracted from a , we check whether c is subtracted from b in the same function. In the case where b is a collection, if c is subtracted from one of its elements and added to another element, the relationship between a and the sum of elements in b remains unchanged (e.g., lines 5 – 6 in Figure 2). After the filtering process, we identify all additions to b (e.g., lines 6 and 12 in Figure 2) and all subtractions from a as non-overflowable computations.

Moreover, the checker detects two extra cases by leveraging control-flow information. First, if a value is subtracted from a variable after checking the variable is not smaller than the value (through an `if` check), the subtraction cannot underflow. Second, for a loop whose iteration number is less than a loop-invariant value (e.g., the length of an array), the operation adding one to the loop-index variable (e.g., the index of an array) cannot overflow.

Fixing and Semantics Preservation. The fixing strategy is to mark all identified non-overflow computations as unchecked. This approach upholds the original semantics, either 1) because an identified computation can never overflow or underflow for all executions, or 2) because when an identified computation overflows (or underflows), the program triggers an exception (due to a check conducted on another computation). For instance, if an identified calculation like $b + k$ overflows, our

algorithm ensures that a related computation, $a + k$ within the same function, is always exercised and checked. Given that $a \geq b$, an overflow exception is triggered by $a + k$.

Using && in if. According to our finding in Section 3.2.1, we detect cases where && is used in an if's condition. If the if has an else branch, we consider it a false positive of the checker, since there is no simple way to remove the &&. Otherwise, we recommend programmers replace the original if with two nested ifs. The patching strategy does not change program semantics since how program paths are exercised is preserved.

Returning a local variable. This checker inspects each function and reports a gas waste if the function returns a local variable instead of declaring the return variable in the function's declaration. We conduct gas measure and confirm that if the return type is an integer type, address, struct, and bytes32, declaring the return variable in the function's declaration can save gas. If the return type is an array, returning a local variable is more gas-efficient. Our checker inspects the return type based on these measures. The fixing strategy is to move the declaration of a local variable to the declaration of the function. As the variable accesses are not changed, our fixes preserve program semantics.

Allocation in a loop. This checker first detects cases where a stack variable is declared inside a loop (e.g., lines 8 and 9 in Figure 3). It then moves each pinpointed declaration out from the loop (e.g., lines 5 and 6 in Figure 3). It runs the Solidity compiler to compile the modified program after each movement and check whether the movement triggers an "stack too deep" error. If not, the checker reports a gas waste. Otherwise, it concludes that the declaration cannot be moved and disregards it. Moving an identified variable out from the loop preserve the semantics, since the variable's value is reset to the initial value for each loop iteration (e.g., lines 10 and 11 in Figure 3), and the loop computation is not influenced.

Memory. There is only one checker in this category. The checker detects loop-invariant reads inside a loop, by first identifying reads reading the same address in different loop iterations and then filtering out cases where a write is potentially performed on the address. We only report reads whose memory slots are on the storage, the calldata, or the memory, since our measurements confirm that saving the read results on the stack can save gas. The fix is to save the read result in a stack variable outside the loop and then read the stack variable inside the loop instead of reading the original location. The fix preserves the semantics since we only move the loop-invariant read out from the loop.

Storage. Two PeCatch checkers aim to pinpoint gas wastes caused by misusing the storage area.

Replaceable sloads. This checker pinpoints instances where reading a storage variable with sload could be avoided by utilizing a stack variable, as studied in Section 3.2.3. Specifically, we target two gas-inefficient code patterns: 1) two consecutive reads are made on the same storage variable without any writes to the variable in between; and 2) a write to a storage variable is followed by a read on the same variable, and the variable remains unchanged in between. In both cases, the second read to the storage could be avoided by storing the data in the stack.

We perform live variable read/write analysis to detect these two patterns. Our main idea is to keep track of the set of variables that have been read but not written to (for the first code pattern) and that have been written to (for the second code pattern) until the point of a read. We inspect each instruction according to the program's control flow graph (CFG) and report a gas waste if the inspected instruction reads a variable that is in the set maintained for the first or the second gas-inefficient pattern. Afterwards, we update these two sets according to whether the inspected instruction reads or writes a variable (reading a variable would add it to the first pattern's set;

writing a variable would add it to the second set; writing an existing variable would remove the variable from both sets).

For example, when inspecting line 4 in Figure 4, we would add `_bal[id][from]` to the set maintained for the first gas-inefficient pattern as it is read in line 4, but the set for the second pattern remains empty as nothing is written to. Afterwards, `_bal[id][from]` is being read and then written to in line 5. This read will trigger the reporting of a gas waste of the first type. The write will add the variable to the second pattern’s set. If subsequently the variable is read, we will report a gas waste of the second type.

Our analyzed variables include contract fields, function parameters annotated with storage, and local variables annotated with storage. To reduce false positives, we ignore contract fields that are constant or immutable as they are not on the storage. We also ignore the reading of an object as a part of invoking a function on the object. Additionally, we only conduct intra-procedural analysis, because it is difficult to fix cases where two operations on the same storage variable are in different functions. To determine what constitutes a variable and what variable an instruction accesses, we use their declaration locations to differentiate variables in primitive types. For elements of a mapping or an array on the storage, we further consider the indexes used to access the elements. We consider two instructions operate on the same element only when they access the same mapping (or array), their indexes are must aliasing to each other, and there is no modification on the indices between the two instructions on the CFG.

Fixing and Semantics Preservation. To fix an identified waste of the first pattern, we will replace the second read of the storage variable with reading the stack variable holding the value of the first read. For a waste of the second pattern, we will read the stack variable whose value is written to the storage variable, instead of reading the storage variable. As discussed above, our analysis ensures that the read value of the stack variable is the same as the storage variable, so that the fixing keeps the semantics.

Boolean contract fields. This checker identifies Boolean contract fields that occupy an entire storage slot. When such a Boolean field is changed from false to true, it incurs a gas cost of more than 10K. However, we cannot blindly report every Boolean field, since some Boolean fields may be packed together with adjacent fields into one storage slot, and changing them to `uint256` could lead to higher gas consumption during contract deployment, as explained in Section 3.2.3. Thus, we need an effective algorithm to pinpoint Boolean fields occupying an entire storage word.

We analyze each contract field following their declaration orders. When a contract inherits another contract, the fields in the inherited contract are analyzed earlier. We maintain an integer variable `CurrentSize` to track the remaining size of the current storage word, and initialize its value to 32, since a storage word is 32 bytes long. Given a field, if its size is smaller than `CurrentSize`, it can be packed into the current word, and thus we subtract its size from `CurrentSize`. If its size is larger than `CurrentSize`, we reset `CurrentSize` to 32, indicating that the field cannot be packed in the current word. Once all fields are processed, we identify and report fields whose types are Boolean and do not share a storage word with other fields as detected gas wastes.

As discussed in Section 3.2.3, the fixing involves altering the identified fields to `uint256`, assigning 2 (or 1) instead of true (or false) to the fields, and inspecting their values equal to 2 (or 1) instead of true (or false). Evidently, following these modifications, all expressions involving the fields retain their original values, thus maintaining the semantics.

Calldata. One checker in PeCatch detects gas wastes caused by misusing the `calldata` area. Specifically, the checker identifies instances where a formal parameter should be labeled as `calldata`, but has been incorrectly labeled as `memory`, causing unnecessary gas consumption.

We classify functions within a contract into two types, those that can only be accessed from outside the contract, including external functions and public functions not invoked by any functions within the contract, and those called by a function within the contract.

For functions of the first type, we carefully examine each formal parameter labeled as memory. If a function does not modify the memory area of such a parameter, we can change its label from memory to calldata. Similarly, for functions of the second type, we inspect each formal parameter on the memory. We can label the parameter as calldata if it meets two conditions: 1) the function does not alter the memory area of the parameter, and 2) all corresponding real parameters are on the calldata. We perform this iterative inspection on all functions of the second type until we no longer find any parameters that can be changed to calldata.

Modifying the identified memory parameters to calldata does not impact the program’s semantics, since the identified parameters are read-only by the program, and relabeling them as calldata does not alter the values they hold when being read.

5 IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

5.1 Methodology

Implementation. We implement PeCatch using Slither, a static analysis framework designed for Solidity [16]. Slither takes Solidity source code as its input and converts it into SSA form, aiding researchers in constructing static detectors for Solidity bugs and vulnerabilities. We develop PeCatch by analyzing Solidity source code rather than examining bytecode (as done in prior work such as MadMax [29], eTainter [28], GasReducer [12]). This approach enables us to provide clear feedback on which sections of source code contribute to gas inefficiency and the corresponding patches, making it easier for programmers to comprehend the underlying reasons of the gas issues and helping them resolve the issues more effectively. In total, PeCatch comprises 2542 lines of Python code, encompassing static analysis routines utilized by various checkers (e.g., identifying loops, computing dominators and post-dominators, conducting simple alias analysis), as well as waste detection algorithms tailored for each checker.

Benchmark Programs. Besides the Solidity programs discussed in Section 3, we further include four additional Solidity programs for our evaluation to ensure our checkers are not an overfitting of the examined applications and have the capabilities to identify gas wastes beyond them. Similar to the ones mentioned in Section 3, we target open-source projects with many stars on GitHub. Furthermore, many of the projects are widely-used libraries that Solidity programmers often rely on to create their own contracts. For example, Uniswap V2 is used in more than 20K GitHub projects. Thus, detecting and resolving gas wastes in these projects can help real smart-contract practitioners. Table 3 shows all the benchmark programs used in our experiments.

Research Questions. We aim to answer the following research questions:

- **Effectiveness:** How successful is PeCatch in identifying previously unknown gas wastes in real-world Solidity programs? How much gas can be saved by PeCatch, and how fast can PeCatch run?
- **Accuracy and Coverage:** Does PeCatch report any false positives? What percentage of real-world gas wastes can PeCatch detect?

Specifically, we run PeCatch on the latest versions of the selected programs and count the number of gas wastes detected, the amount of gas saved, and false positives. Since we do not know the exact number of gas wastes present in the latest benchmark versions, we cannot use them to measure the coverage of PeCatch. As a result, we rely on the wastes studied in Section 3. We manually inspect those wastes and count how many of them PeCatch can pinpoint to gauge PeCatch’s coverage.

Table 3. Evaluation Results. (x_y : x real gas wastes, y false positives. “-”: zero detection.)

	PeCatch	slither	Python-Opt	GasSaver	solc	LLVM
OpenZeppelin	185 ₄	3 ₁	0 ₆	53 ₁	-	83
Uniswap V3	14 ₀	-	0 ₁	-	1	1
uniswap-lib	6 ₀	-	2 ₂	-	-	-
solmate	2 ₀	-	-	-	-	2
Seaport	59 ₁	-	-	2 ₀	2	5
SeaDrop	6 ₀	-	-	2 ₁	-	2
V3-Periphery	71 ₀	1 ₄	2 ₃	6 ₀	-	14
V2-Periphery	36 ₀	4 ₀	-	0 ₁	-	9
Uniswap V2	4 ₀	-	-	-	2	-
Total	383 ₅	8 ₅	4 ₁₂	63 ₆	5	116

Baseline Techniques. We compare PeCatch with five baseline techniques. They include three static gas-waste detection techniques: Slither [16], python-solidity-optimizer (referred as Python-Opt for short) [6], and GasSaver [46], whose details are illustrated in Section 2.4; and two compiler optimization suites: the Solidity compiler (solc) [23] and LLVM compiler optimizations [39]. As LLVM does not work for Solidity and solc does not report gas wastes or savings, we cannot directly run them on the benchmark programs. Instead, we manually inspect each gas waste reported by PeCatch on these programs and check whether the algorithms used by solc and LLVM could potentially capture it.

Experiment Setting. We choose Solidity versions according to the requirements in the benchmark programs. The Solidity versions used in our experiments range from 0.5.16 to 0.8.17. Each Solidity version has a default EVM version. We then use those default EVM versions based on the Solidity versions. All our experiments are conducted on a Mac Notebook, with an Intel Core i7 CPU, 16 GB RAM, and MacOS Ventura 13.4.1 (c).

5.2 Experimental Results

5.2.1 Detected Gas Wastes. As shown in Table 3, PeCatch reports 388 suspicious code sites. We carefully examine all the code sites and identify 383 previously unknown gas wastes, with 266 from the five programs we studied and 117 from the four additional programs. Our assessment involves checking whether each code site follows the corresponding code pattern of the checker and ensuring the correctness of patches, which we achieve by examining if they indeed reduce gas wastes and by validating the results of all available unit tests. We have reported 309 gas wastes to the programmers. As of the time of writing, programmers have already **fixed eight of them, commented that they would fix 32 of them in future versions, and confirmed another 100 as real gas wastes.** *The substantial number of detected and confirmed wastes highlights the real-world impact of PeCatch and the significance of the issues it has uncovered.*

As shown in Table 4, each of our checkers detects some previously unknown gas wastes. Among them, Alloc-Loop pinpoints the most gas wastes, uncovering 131 wastes from seven benchmark programs. We hypothesize that the reason behind this is that programmers may be unaware of the fact that the Solidity compiler does not optimize allocations inside loops as traditional programming language compilers do. Calldata-Para identifies the second most gas wastes. The calldata store area is unique to Solidity. Programmers may not be familiar with it and miss opportunities to better use it for gas saving.

As shown in Table 3, *PeCatch detects 5× to 95× more gas wastes than the three existing gas-waste detection techniques.* Unlike these techniques, PeCatch targets gas-waste types related to Solidity’s unique language features. Gas wastes following these patterns exist widely in real Solidity programs, resulting in PeCatch’s higher detection capability. Even for the same type of gas wastes, PeCatch

Table 4. Checkers’ Detected Gas Wastes and Gas Saving. (x_y : x real gas wastes, y false positives. *Ret-Local*: returning a local variable, *Loop-Inv*: loop-invariant memory read, *Re-Sload*: replaceable sload, and *Calldata-Para*: memory parameters that can be changed to calldata. More detailed information can be found at [51])

	Non-Overflow	And-in-If	Ret-Local	Alloc-Loop	Loop-Inv	Re-Sload	Bool-Field	Calldata-Para
# of Wastes	29 ₀	31 ₅	48 ₀	131 ₀	43 ₀	26 ₀	2 ₀	73 ₀
Gas Saving	179	23, 8	13, 12	15X – 15	3X – 12	266	20083	204X + 761

identifies a greater quantity. For instance, PeCatch, Slither, and GasSaver all attempt to pinpoint parameters that can be switched from memory to calldata. However, PeCatch identifies 73 instances (column “Calldata-Para” in Table 4), compared with four detected by slither and 58 detected by GasSaver. PeCatch detects more wastes for this category because unlike Slither and GasSaver, PeCatch takes into account functions called by another function within the same contract.

Existing compiler optimization algorithms also fail to detect most gas wastes identified by PeCatch. Solc’s algorithms can optimize only five wastes resulting from consecutively reading a contract field twice, without any intervening instructions. PeCatch’s Re-Sload not only identifies these five wastes but also pinpoints an additional 21 wastes involving more complex code. LLVM’s algorithms identify 116 wastes, all in two categories that capture wastes detected by PeCatch’s Calldata-Para and Loop-Inv. However, LLVM’s algorithms fail to identify any of the 267 wastes on Stack and Storage that PeCatch has discovered.

While PeCatch detects many more gas wastes than all existing techniques, there are 13 gas wastes that PeCatch misses but are identified by prior work. These missed wastes are attributed to three primary reasons. First, PeCatch does not address wastes already covered by traditional compiler optimizations, resulting in the omission of four gas wastes detected by Python-Opt. Second, slither and GasSaver contain some gas-waste patterns not covered by PeCatch, such as struct fields that can be declared as immutable, leading to the missing of eight wastes. Lastly, PeCatch does not perform inter-procedural analysis, causing it to miss one waste identified by slither as a costly loop. We defer the task of enhancing PeCatch to address these wastes for future work.

Gas Cost Saving. We categorize the identified gas wastes into three groups based on how gas units are saved after resolving them. We report gas savings for wastes detected by each checker in Table 4. Specifically, we report a single number if all wastes within a category have the same savings or otherwise multiple numbers or a formula.

Patches to three checkers result in the same gas saving for all gas wastes within the respective category, including Non-Overflow, Re-Sload, and Bool-Field, as for each of these categories, the same amount of instructions is prevented from execution after fixing these wastes. In cases where gas wastes stem from using `&&` in an `if` condition, the amount of saved gas depends on whether the second logical expression is evaluated. When the first logical expression evaluates to false (true), it results in a saving of 23 (8) gas units, respectively. The amount of gas saved after a Ret-Local fix depends on the type of the return variable. For example, 13 gas units are saved for an integer and 12 are saved for a string. Gas savings achieved by the remaining three checkers exhibit a linear relationship with the workload processed. For instance, after rectifying a waste due to allocating a local variable within a loop, if the loop iterates only once, the fixed version incurs the same gas consumption as the original version. However, if the loop iterates ten times, the gas consumption is reduced by 18, and if the loop iterates 100 times, the gas consumption is reduced by 288.

These gas measurements reflect a single execution of a fixed gas waste. Once a smart contract is deployed, it becomes unable to be altered. Consequently, an unpatched gas waste may persist

Table 5. Gas Waste Coverage.

Root Cause (Store Area)	Wastes	Techniques			
		PeCatch	slither	Python-Opt	GasSaver
Stack	24	15	0	0	0
Memory	4	3	3	0	0
Storage	20	18	0	0	0
Calldata	6	5	5	0	5
Total	54	41	8	0	5

across multiple executions, leading to significant and repetitive gas consumption. Therefore, it’s imperative to patch all detected gas wastes.

Execution Time. We also measure the execution time of PeCatch on each program, by running each checker 10 times on the program and summing up the average execution time of each checker. Overall, it takes PeCatch from 4 seconds to 7 minutes to analyze a benchmark program. Thus, *PeCatch’s can potentially be leveraged during Solidity programmers’ daily development practice.*

5.2.2 Accuracy. As shown by the subscripts in Table 3, PeCatch only reports 5 false positives across all programs, with a false-positive rate (number of false positives over true positives) of less than 1.5%. The 5 false positives of PeCatch are reported by And-in-If. The reported if statement includes an else branch, making it challenging to replace the if statement with nested ifs. Therefore, they are considered false positives.

In comparison, Slither, Python-Opt, and GasSaver report much higher false-positive rates, 62.5%, 300%, and 9.5%, respectively. Among these false positives, 15 are caused by inaccurate analysis algorithms or implementation. For instance, GasSaver recommends labeling five contract fields as constant, but these fields are initialized with Ethereum block ID and block timestamp, and thus cannot be changed to constant. The remaining eight false positives are due to the difficulty in fixing the wastes. For example, Python-Opt suggests unrolling four loops with large numbers of iterations, but unrolling them significantly increases code size and compromises readability. Overall, *PeCatch advances the accuracy of gas-waste capturing* compared to prior works, while achieving higher numbers of captured wastes.

5.2.3 Coverage. We conduct a manual inspection to count the number of gas wastes examined in the empirical study (Table 2) that can be detected by PeCatch. As shown in Table 5, we find that PeCatch can detect 41 out of the 54 wastes, showcasing *its robust coverage of real gas wastes linked to Solidity’s distinct features.* In comparison, slither, Python-Opt, and GasSaver can only identify eight, zero, and five gas wastes, respectively. Python-Opt is designed based on traditional compiler optimization algorithms and cannot detect any wastes studied in Section 3. Although slither and GasSaver aim to pinpoint wastes related to Solidity’s unique language features, they fail to detect six types of wastes detected by PeCatch: Non-Overflow, And-in-If, Ret-Local, Alloc-Loop, Re-Sload, and Bool-Field.

PeCatch misses 13 wastes for the following reasons. First, Non-Overflow overlooks five wastes because programmers rely on workload information to uncheck the computations, which PeCatch is unaware of. Second, the same checker misses two additional wastes due to its limited effectiveness in path-condition analysis, causing it to miss non-overflowable cases ensured by complex path conditions. Third, Re-Sload misses two gas wastes as it does not conduct inter-procedural analysis. Fourth, Calldata-Para misses one waste as it fails to consider scenarios where a return can be changed from memory to calldata. Lastly, PeCatch misses the remaining three wastes because it does not consider specific opcodes (e.g., `mstore8`) or particular values (e.g., `type(uint256).max`) in Solidity. To avoid these misses, we plan to extend PeCatch by conducting more complex static

analysis (e.g., interprocedural analysis, path-condition analysis) and considering more Solidity language features in its future versions.

6 CONCLUSION

Facing the growing popularity of blockchain systems and smart contracts, this paper presents the first empirical study on real-world gas wastes in Solidity smart contracts. The study examines two key aspects: the root causes of gas wastes and their fixing strategies, with special attention given to gas wastes related to Solidity’s distinctive language features. Using insights gained from this study, we develop a novel static gas-waste detection technique called PeCatch, and find numerous previously undiscovered gas wastes in popular Solidity projects. We expect this research to enhance people’s comprehension of gas wastes and stimulate further research and practical efforts to combat gas wastes. Future work can improve PeCatch by detecting more types of gas wastes, automatically synthesizing patches for wastes detected by PeCatch, and formally validating the semantic preservation of patched Solidity programs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Elvira Albert, Samir Genaim, Daniel Kirchner, and Enrique Martin-Martin. 2023. Formally Verified EVM Block-Optimizations. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV ’23)*. Paris, France.
- [2] Elvira Albert, Pablo Gordillo, Albert Rubio, and Maria A Schett. 2020. Synthesis of super-optimized smart contracts using max-smt. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV ’20)*. Springer, 177–200.
- [3] Leonardo Alt, Martin Blicha, Antti E. J. Hyvärinen, and Natasha Sharygina. 2022. SolCMC: Solidity Compiler’s Model Checker. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV ’22)*. Haifa, Israel.
- [4] Massimo Bartoletti and Livio Pompianu. 2017. An Empirical Analysis of Smart Contracts: Platforms, Applications, and Design Patterns. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*.
- [5] BitInfoCharts. 2023. Ethereum (ETH) price stats and information. <https://bitinfocharts.com/ethereum/>
- [6] Tamara Brandstätter, Stefan Schulte, Jürgen Cito, and Michael Borkowski. 2020. Characterizing efficiency optimizations in solidity smart contracts. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain ’20)*. IEEE, 281–290.
- [7] Tamara Brandstätter, Stefan Schulte, Jürgen Cito, and Michael Borkowski. 2020. Characterizing efficiency optimizations in solidity smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain ’20)*. IEEE, 281–290.
- [8] Chainlink. 2023. Top 6 Smart Contract Languages in 2023. <https://chain.link/education-hub/smart-contract-programming-languages>
- [9] Stefanos Chaliasos, Arthur Gervais, and Benjamin Livshits. 2022. A Study of Inline Assembly in Solidity Smart Contracts. (2022).
- [10] Ting Chen, Youzheng Feng, Zihao Li, Hao Zhou, Xiaopu Luo, Xiaoqi Li, Xiuzhuo Xiao, Jiachi Chen, and Xiaosong Zhang. 2020. Gaschecker: Scalable analysis for discovering gas-inefficient smart contracts. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computing* 9, 3 (2020), 1433–1448.
- [11] Ting Chen, Xiaoqi Li, Xiapu Luo, and Xiaosong Zhang. 2017. Under-optimized smart contracts devour your money. In *Proceedings of the 24th IEEE international conference on software analysis, evolution and reengineering (SANER ’17)*. IEEE, 442–446.
- [12] Ting Chen, Zihao Li, Hao Zhou, Jiachi Chen, Xiapu Luo, Xiaoqi Li, and Xiaosong Zhang. 2018. 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)*. IEEE, 81–84.
- [13] Tse-Hsun Chen, Weiyi Shang, Zhen Ming Jiang, Ahmed E. Hassan, Mohamed Nasser, and Parminder Flora. 2014. Detecting Performance Anti-patterns for Applications Developed Using Object-relational Mapping. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE ’14)*. Hyderabad, India.
- [14] Yuanliang Chen, Fuchen Ma, Yuanhang Zhou, Yu Jiang, Ting Chen, and Jiaguang Sun. 2023. Tyr: Finding consensus failure bugs in blockchain system with behaviour divergent model. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*.
- [15] Zhuangbin Chen, Jinyang Liu, Yuxin Su, Hongyu Zhang, Xiao Ling, Yongqiang Yang, and Michael R. Lyu. 2022. Adaptive Performance Anomaly Detection for Online Service Systems via Pattern Sketching. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE ’22)*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

- [16] Crytic. 2023. Slither, the Solidity source analyzer. <https://github.com/crytic/slither>
- [17] Yufei Ding and Xipeng Shen. 2017. GLORE: Generalized Loop Redundancy Elimination Upon LER-notation. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages (OOPSLA '17)*. Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- [18] Zishuo Ding, Jinfu Chen, and Weiyi Shang. 2020. Towards the Use of the Readily Available Tests from the Release Pipeline as Performance Tests: Are We There Yet?. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '20)*. Seoul, South Korea.
- [19] Bruno Dufour, Barbara G. Ryder, and Gary Seivitsky. 2008. A scalable technique for characterizing the usage of temporaries in framework-intensive Java applications. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE '08)*. Atlanta, GA, USA.
- [20] ECMA. 2023. ECMA-262. <https://www.ecma-international.org/publications-and-standards/standards/ecma-262/>
- [21] Ethereum. [n. d.]. GAS AND FEES. <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/gas/>
- [22] Ethereum. 2023. Ethereum. <https://ethereum.org/en/>
- [23] Ethereum. 2023. The Optimizer. <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/latest/internals/optimizer.html>
- [24] Etherscan. 2023. Ethereum Gas Tracker. <https://etherscan.io/gastracker>
- [25] Faizan Nehal. 2023. How Solidity 0.8 protect against integer underflow/overflow and how they can still happen in Solidity 0.8. <https://faizannehal.medium.com/how-solidity-0-8-protect-against-integer-underflow-overflow-and-how-they-can-still-happen-7be22c4ab92f>
- [26] Lu Fang, Liang Dou, and Guoqing Xu. 2015. PerfBlower: Quickly Detecting Memory-Related Performance Problems via Amplification. In *Proceedings of the 29th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP '15)*. Prague, Czech Republic.
- [27] Gabriel Delight. 2023. A Comprehensive Guide To Gas And Gas Price In Solidity. <https://blog.openreplay.com/a-comprehensive-guide-to-gas-and-gas-price-in-solidity/>
- [28] Asem Ghaleb, Julia Rubin, and Karthik Pattabiraman. 2022. eTainter: detecting gas-related vulnerabilities in smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA '22)*. 728–739.
- [29] Neville Grech, Michael Kong, Anton Jurisevic, Lexi Brent, Bernhard Scholz, and Yannis Smaragdakis. 2018. Madmax: Surviving out-of-gas conditions in ethereum smart contracts. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 2, OOPSLA (2018), 1–27.
- [30] Jingzhu He, Yuhang Lin, Xiaohui Gu, Chin-Chia Michael Yeh, and Zhongfang Zhuang. 2022. PerfSig: Extracting Performance Bug Signatures via Multi-Modality Causal Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '22)*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- [31] Guoliang Jin, Linhai Song, Xiaoming Shi, Joel Scherpelz, and Shan Lu. 2012. Understanding and detecting real-world performance bugs. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '12)*. Beijing, China.
- [32] Charles Killian, Karthik Nagaraj, Salman Pervez, Ryan Braud, James W. Anderson, and Ranjit Jhala. 2010. Finding latent performance bugs in systems implementations. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE '10)*. Santa Fe, NM, USA.
- [33] Que-Ping Kong, Zi-Yan Wang, Yuan Huang, Xiang-Ping Chen, Xiao-Cong Zhou, Zi-Bin Zheng, and Gang Huang. 2022. Characterizing and Detecting Gas-Inefficient Patterns in Smart Contracts. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* 37, 1 (2022), 67–82.
- [34] Yue Li, Han Liu, Zhiqiang Yang, Qian Ren, Lei Wang, and Bangdao Chen. 2020. SafePay on Ethereum: A Framework For Detecting Unfair Payments in Smart Contracts. In *2020 IEEE 40th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*. 1219–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDCS47774.2020.00116>
- [35] Zhenmin Li, Lin Tan, Xuanhui Wang, Shan Lu, Yuanyuan Zhou, and Chengxiang Zhai. 2006. Have Things Changed Now? An Empirical Study of Bug Characteristics in Modern Open Source Software. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Architectural and System Support for Improving Software Dependability (ASID '06)*. San Jose, California.
- [36] Chao Liu, Han Liu, Zhao Cao, Zhong Chen, Bangdao Chen, and Bill Roscoe. 2018. ReGuard: Finding Reentrancy Bugs in Smart Contracts. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings (ICSE '18)*. Gothenburg, Sweden.
- [37] Xinyu Liu, Qi Zhou, Joy Arulraj, and Alessandro Orso. 2022. Automatic Detection of Performance Bugs in Database Systems Using Equivalent Queries. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '22)*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- [38] Yepang Liu, Chang Xu, and Shing-Chi Cheung. 2014. Characterizing and Detecting Performance Bugs for Smartphone Applications. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '14)*. Hyderabad, India.
- [39] LLVM. 2023. LLVM's Analysis and Transform Passes. <https://llvm.org/docs/Passes.html>
- [40] Zohar Manna. 1969. The correctness of programs. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 3, 2 (1969), 119–127.

- [41] Yuval Marcus, Ethan Heilman, and Sharon Goldberg. 2018. Low-resource eclipse attacks on ethereum’s peer-to-peer network. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2018).
- [42] Markus Waas. 2022. Top 7 Reasons To Learn Solidity Programming ASAP. <https://zerotomastery.io/blog/top-7-reasons-to-learn-solidity-programming/>
- [43] Julian Nagele and Maria Anna Schett. 2020. Blockchain Superoptimizer. *ArXiv abs/2005.05912* (2020). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:218596321>
- [44] Keerthi Nelaturu, Sidi Mohamed Beillahit, Fan Long, and Andreas Veneris. 2021. Smart Contracts Refinement for Gas Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 3rd Conference on Blockchain Research & Applications for Innovative Networks and Services (BRAINS '21)*. IEEE, 229–236.
- [45] Khanh Nguyen and Guoqing Xu. 2013. Cachetor: Detecting Cacheable Data to Remove Bloat. In *Proceedings of the 2013 9th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE '13)*. Saint Petersburg, Russia.
- [46] Quang-Thang Nguyen, Bao Son Do, Thi Tam Nguyen, and Ba-Lam Do. 2022. GasSaver: A Tool for Solidity Smart Contract Optimization. In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Symposium on Blockchain and Secure Critical Infrastructure (BSCI '22)*. Nagasaki, Japan, 125–134.
- [47] Adrian Nistor, Po-Chun Chang, Cosmin Radoi, and Shan Lu. 2015. CARAMEL: Detecting and Fixing Performance Problems That Have Non-Intrusive Fixes. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Software Engineering - Volume 1 (ICSE '15)*. Piscataway, NJ, USA.
- [48] Adrian Nistor, Linhai Song, Darko Marinov, and Shan Lu. 2013. Toddler: Detecting Performance Problems via Similar Memory-Access Patterns. In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '13)*. Piscataway, NJ, USA.
- [49] Oswaldo Olivo, Isil Dillig, and Calvin Lin. 2015. Static Detection of Asymptotic Performance Bugs in Collection Traversals. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '15)*. Portland, OR, USA.
- [50] OpenZeppelin. 2023. OpenZeppelin Contracts is a library for secure smart contract development. <https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts>
- [51] PeCatch. 2023. Measured Gas Wastes. <https://github.com/PeCatch-Artifact/PeCatch-Artifact/tree/main/results/gas%20impact-bugs>
- [52] PeCatch. 2023. The code and results for PLDI 2024 Artifact Evaluation. <https://github.com/PeCatch-Artifact/PeCatch-Artifact>
- [53] Andrea Pinna, Simona Ibba, Gavina Baralla, Roberto Tonelli, and Michele Marchesi. 2019. A Massive Analysis of Ethereum Smart Contracts Empirical Study and Code Metrics. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 78194–78213. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2921936>
- [54] Peng Qian, Zhenguang Liu, Qinming He, Roger Zimmermann, and Xun Wang. 2020. Towards automated reentrancy detection for smart contracts based on sequential models. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 19685–19695.
- [55] Boqin Qin, Yilun Chen, Zeming Yu, Linhai Song, and Yiyang Zhang. 2020. Understanding memory and thread safety practices and issues in real-world Rust programs. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '20)*. London, UK.
- [56] Ajeet Shankar, Matthew Arnold, and Rastislav Bodik. 2008. Jolt: Lightweight Dynamic Analysis and Removal of Object Churn. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-oriented Programming Systems Languages and Applications (OOPSLA '08)* (Nashville, TN, USA).
- [57] solmate. 2023. Modern, opinionated, and gas optimized building blocks for smart contract development. <https://github.com/transmissions11/solmate>
- [58] Linhai Song and Shan Lu. 2017. Performance Diagnosis for Inefficient Loops. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '17)*. Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- [59] Pengfei Su, Qingsen Wang, Milind Chabbi, and Xu Liu. 2019. Pinpointing Performance Inefficiencies in Java. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE '19)*. Tallinn, Estonia.
- [60] Swathi Kashettar. 2023. Top 5 Blockchain Programming Languages for Smart Contracts. <https://www.analyticsinsight.net/top-5-blockchain-programming-languages-for-smart-contracts/>
- [61] Roberto Tonelli, Giuseppe Destefanis, Michele Marchesi, and Marco Ortu. 2018. Smart Contracts Software Metrics: a First Study. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25506.12483>
- [62] Tengfei Tu, Xiaoyu Liu, Linhai Song, and Yiyang Zhang. 2019. Understanding Real-World Concurrency Bugs in Go. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '19)*. Providence, RI.
- [63] uniswap-lib. 2023. Solidity libraries that are shared across Uniswap contracts. <https://github.com/Uniswap/solidity-lib>
- [64] Shuai Wang, Chengyu Zhang, and Zhendong Su. 2019. Detecting Nondeterministic Payment Bugs in Ethereum Smart Contracts. (2019).

- [65] Wikipedia. 2023. Ethereum. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethereum>
- [66] Wikipedia. 2023. OpenSea. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/OpenSea>
- [67] Wikipedia. 2023. Smart contract. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smart_contract
- [68] Wikipedia. 2023. Solidity. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solidity>
- [69] Wikipedia. 2023. Uniswap. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uniswap>
- [70] Karl Wüst and Arthur Gervais. 2016. *Ethereum eclipse attacks*. Technical Report. ETH Zurich.
- [71] Guoqing Xu. 2012. Finding Reusable Data Structures. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Object Oriented Programming Systems Languages and Applications (OOPSLA '12)*. Tucson, AZ, USA.
- [72] Guoqing Xu. 2013. Resurrector: A Tunable Object Lifetime Profiling Technique for Optimizing Real-world Programs. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object Oriented Programming Systems Languages and Applications (OOPSLA '13)*. Indianapolis, IN, USA.
- [73] Guoqing Xu, Matthew Arnold, Nick Mitchell, Atanas Rountev, and Gary Sevitsky. 2009. Go with the flow: profiling copies to find runtime bloat. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '09)*. Dublin, Ireland.
- [74] Guoqing Xu, Michael D. Bond, Feng Qin, and Atanas Rountev. 2011. LeakChaser: Helping Programmers Narrow Down Causes of Memory Leaks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '11)*. San Jose, CA, USA.
- [75] Guangquan Xu, Bingjiang Guo, Chunhua Su, Xi Zheng, Kaitai Liang, Duncan S Wong, and Hao Wang. 2020. Am I eclipsed? A smart detector of eclipse attacks for Ethereum. *Computers & Security* 88 (2020), 101604.
- [76] Guoqing Xu, Nick Mitchell, Matthew Arnold, Atanas Rountev, Edith Schonberg, and Gary Sevitsky. 2010. Finding low-utility data structures. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '10)*. Toronto, ON, Canada.
- [77] Guoqing Xu and Atanas Rountev. 2010. Detecting inefficiently-used containers to avoid bloat. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '10)*. Toronto, ON, Canada.
- [78] Guoqing Xu, Dacong Yan, and Atanas Rountev. 2012. Static Detection of Loop-invariant Data Structures. In *Proceedings of the 26th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP '12)*. Beijing, China.
- [79] Yinxing Xue, Mingliang Ma, Yun Lin, Yulei Sui, Jiaming Ye, and Tianyong Peng. 2020. 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)*.
- [80] Junwen Yang, Pranav Subramaniam, Shan Lu, Cong Yan, and Alvin Cheung. 2018. How Not to Structure Your Database-Backed Web Applications: A Study of Performance Bugs in the Wild. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '18)*. Gothenburg, Sweden.
- [81] Youngseok Yang, Taesoo Kim, and Byung-Gon Chun. 2021. Finding consensus bugs in ethereum via multi-transaction differential fuzzing. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI '21)*. 349–365.
- [82] Yutong Zhao, Lu Xiao, Pouria Babvey, Lei Sun, Sunny Wong, Angel A. Martinez, and Xiao Wang. 2020. Automatically Identifying Performance Issue Reports with Heuristic Linguistic Patterns. In *Proceedings of the 2020 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE '20)*. Virtual Event, USA.