

Exploiting Unfair Advantages: Investigating Opportunistic Trading in the NFT Market

Priyanka Bose, Dipanjan Das, Fabio Gritti, Nicola Ruaro, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna
University of California, Santa Barbara
{priyanka, dipanjan, degrigis, ruaronicola, chris, vigna}@cs.ucsb.edu

Abstract—Since the inception of cryptocurrencies, trading has been a major use case. As cryptocurrency evolved, new financial instruments, such as lending and borrowing protocols, currency exchanges, fungible and non-fungible tokens (NFT), staking and mining protocols have emerged. A financial ecosystem built on top of a blockchain is supposed to be fair and transparent for each participating actor. Yet, there are sophisticated actors who turn their domain knowledge and market inefficiencies to their strategic advantage; thus extracting value from trades not accessible to others. This situation is further exacerbated by the fact that blockchain-based markets and decentralized finance (DeFi) instruments are mostly unregulated. Though a large body of work has already studied the unfairness of different aspects of DeFi and cryptocurrency trading, the economic intricacies of non-fungible token (NFT) trades necessitate further analysis and academic scrutiny.

The trading volume of NFTs has skyrocketed in recent years. A single NFT trade worth over a million US dollars, or marketplaces making billions in revenue is not uncommon nowadays. While previous research indicated the presence of wrongdoings in the NFT market, to our knowledge, we are the first to study predatory trading practices, what we call *opportunistic trading*, in depth. Opportunistic traders are sophisticated actors who employ automated, high-frequency NFT trading strategies, which, oftentimes, are malicious, deceptive, or, at the very least, unfair. Such attackers weaponize their advanced technical knowledge and superior understanding of DeFi protocols to disrupt trades of unsuspecting users, and collect profits from economic situations that are inaccessible to ordinary users, in a “supposedly” fair market. In this paper, we explore three such broad classes of *opportunistic* strategies aiming to realize three distinct trading objectives, *viz.*, acquire, instant profit generation, and loss minimization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Decentralized Finance (DeFi), the financial system built around blockchains, eliminates intermediaries and provides a trustless environment to its participants. The fact that blockchains are transparent means that their users have access to both code (smart contracts) and data (transactions). The promise of *fairness* is built into the blockchain, by design. The trustless and transparent nature of a blockchain should not only reduce the risk of fraud and manipulation, but also create a financial environment accessible equally to all the involved parties.

Unlike traditional financial markets, DeFi largely lacks comprehensive regulatory frameworks, partly because it is challenging for regulatory authorities to establish consistent guidelines, and enforce them across jurisdictions. The lack of regulation combined with the public availability of information have enabled sophisticated players with advanced technical expertise to spot high-value trade opportunities, and grab them in no time; all before the rest of the market can react. For example, in a sandwich attack, an attacker first observes a

large buy/sell order placed by a victim (transparency of the order book) that could cause significant price movements for an asset. Then, the attacker places their own buy/sell orders on both sides of the original order. In effect, they not only make their trade execute at a more favorable price, but also make the victim trade execute at a worse than expected price, effectively making profit out of the victim’s loss. Since the steps involved are time-sensitive and compute-intensive, such attacks can only be run by *bots* (automated programs). Evidently, such opportunities are not available to ordinary users.

Existing research on cryptoeconomics that focuses on fairness of the cryptocurrency market, economic risks, and abuses, primarily extends in two directions: (i) high-frequency trading of ERC-20 tokens, *e.g.*, arbitrage [30], [47], [42], miner/block extractable value (MEV/BEV) [35], [33], [13], frontrunning [19], [21], [48], flashloan [36], sandwich [49] attacks, *etc.*, and (ii) manipulation of both ERC-20 and ERC-721 token markets, *e.g.*, NFT rug pull [37], [24], [40], ponzi schemes [12], [17], [18], [26], cryptocurrency pump and dump [25], [22], [44], NFT trading malpractices [20], [41], [31], [15], [39], [28], [43], *etc.* However, none of the previous research studied the landscape of opportunistic trading in the NFT (ERC-721) market. Our paper fills that void.

Since ERC-20 tokens predate NFTs in terms of inception and popularity, therefore there exists a large body of work on analyzing predatory trading practices in that market. However, even though NFTs are high value assets, such economic attacks in the context of NFT trading has not received enough attention yet. For example, somebody made \$100K through speculative trading of CRYPTOKITTIES, and roughly \$8K by running an arbitrage bot [14]. On a separate occasion, a sniper bot launched a flashloan attack by frontrunning a CRYPTOPUNKS bid transaction, and collected a punk worth 26.25 ETH at a mere 1 Wei (1ETH = 10^{18} Wei) [29] as the reward. Such deceptive strategies not only deprive users of the profit they expected from legitimated trades, but also instill fear and mistrust within the user community, discouraging their active participation in the ecosystem.

Analyzing NFT trades or capitalizing on them come with their unique challenges for both the trader and the analyst—(i) **Determining profitability.** NFTs are non-fungible tokens, and hence, no two NFTs are the same. This makes it hard to determine the “true” price of a particular token, which is heavily influenced by market sentiments. For a trader, knowing the worth of an NFT is crucial to make economically sound decisions, *e.g.*, if it is worth to buy an NFT, if it is better to sell it off immediately, or hold it for a longer time period expecting a price increase, *etc.* Likewise, when it comes to

assessing the prices for NFTs, an analyst, too, faces similar challenges in absence of any standardized, token-specific price oracle. **(ii) Diverse trade actions.** Unlike ERC-20 tokens, which only support limited actions such as buy/sell, NFT trade actions are more diverse, for example, they include listing, auctions (place/accept/cancel bids), *etc.* These actions are often marketplace-specific. Therefore, it is hard to build an infrastructure that supports all the existing and newer marketplaces for either real-time detection, or post-mortem analysis. **(iii) Spotting trade opportunity.** Typically, a ERC-20 trade opportunity spans across multiple but similar types of protocols. For example, an arbitrage can be spotted by detecting cycles in token exchange rates across decentralized exchanges [30]. As we will see, profit-making trades involving NFTs typically touch multiple different types of protocols. Detecting such opportunities in real-time is difficult in a competitive market. As a side effect, a supposedly open (and fair) market turns out to be profitable only to advanced traders. Likewise, the intricate and multi-protocol nature of these trades poses a challenge for analysts when it comes to identifying those opportunities.

In this paper, we study the high-frequency, opportunistic trading strategies in the NFT market. We first categorize the opportunistic trades into three classes, then build models that identify instances of such trades, and quantify their prevalence and financial impact. By shedding light on the under-explored or unexplored aspects of NFT trades, we make the first step to draw the attention of the community to these predatory trading practices. In particular, we make the following contributions:

Taxonomy of opportunistic NFT trading strategies. We study previous instances of opportunistic trades, and categorized them according to the strategies employed by the traders, *viz.*, acquire, instant profit generation, and loss minimization (Section III). Such strategies are often malicious, deceptive, and disrupt trades of the legitimate users, while the attackers make profit out of the loss incurred by the unsuspecting users.

Analysis of acquire strategies. We analyze strategies used to acquire high-value NFTs for long-term holding. NFTs acquired this way are meant to be held for long, and sold when the market is assessed to be favorable (Section IV).

Analysis of instant profit generation strategies. We analyze strategies used to make an instant profit in the NFT market. NFTs acquired this way are meant to be held for a short time, and are typically sold in the same transaction, thus making an instant profit (Section V).

Analysis of loss minimization strategies. We analyze strategies used to minimize potential losses incurred from an NFT purchase (Section VI).

Releasing code and data. We will release our code and data to further future research.

II. BACKGROUND

In this section, we will discuss concepts to understand the rest of this paper.

Blockchain and smart contracts. As a distributed digital ledger, the blockchain provides the necessary underpinning for cryptocurrency, a form of ownable digital asset. Transactions

change the state of the blockchain. Any connected node in the network can broadcast transactions. Since the participating nodes are geographically distributed, they receive those transactions at different times and in different orders. Therefore, a consensus protocol is necessary to achieve an agreement about the order in which transactions are executed and the ledger’s state. The native currency of a blockchain, *e.g.*, Ether in case of the Ethereum blockchain, is intertwined with the functioning of the blockchain itself, such as sending transactions, offering incentives, and governance. In addition to storing records, some blockchains can run Turing-complete programs, called smart contracts.

Ethereum blockchain. Ethereum is one of the most popular blockchains in the world. The current version (v2.0) of Ethereum follows a consensus mechanism called *proof of stake* (PoS). An Ethereum *account* is an entity represented by an address that can send transactions. An externally owned account (EOA) is managed by a user who holds the private key associated with their address and who can initiate transactions, while contract accounts are managed by smart contracts. In PoS, transactions are validated by special nodes called *validators*, who stake (lock in) Ethers in the network to participate in the validation process. To incentivize the validators and prevent denial-of-service (DoS) attacks, transactions cost *gas*, which is deducted from the sender’s Ether balance.

Ethereum smart contracts are written in languages like Solidity, and run on top of the Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM). When a contract executes, it can emit *events* to indicate the occurrence of certain actions. When amount worth of funds are sent to an address `to`, a contract can emit a `fundSent` event: `event fundSent(address indexed to, uint amount)`. Events are stored in transaction logs. An event parameter can be marked as *indexed* to allow for efficient searching and filtering. In our example, `to` is indexed, while *amount* is not. Events in the transaction log of a contract are associated with a monotonically increasing identifier called *log index*, which is assigned in the order the events are emitted.

Decentralized finance (DeFi). The smart contracts play two important roles in the decentralized economic framework built on top of Ethereum: **(a)** they create and manage digital assets, called *tokens*. For example, Tether (USDT) is a fungible ERC-20 token, while DECENTRALAND is a non-fungible ERC-721 token. In the same way as the primary (native) currency, these secondary assets are also equally ownable and tradable. **(b)** They implement decentralized protocols to automate financial processes, *e.g.*, lending and borrowing protocols, decentralized exchanges (DEX), *etc.* They also enable flash loan, which is a type of uncollateralized loan that instantly gives access to large amount of funds to the borrower, without needing to pay any upfront collateral. The loan has to be settled within the same transaction, or else the entire transaction reverts. This open financial system built around the Ethereum blockchain is often called Decentralized Finance (DeFi).

Non-fungible token (NFT). All copies of a fungible token are identical, while every non-fungible token (NFT) is unique. Among the NFTs managed by a smart contract, each NFT is uniquely identified by a `tokenId`. The creation and destruction of a token is referred to as *minting* and *burning*, respectively. ERC-721 and ERC-1155 are two popular standards

for NFTs. While ERC-721 only allows the creation of unique tokens, ERC-1155 is a multi-token standard that supports both fungible and non-fungible tokens within the same contract. In effect, an NFT (identified by a `tokenId`) can have only one copy in a ERC-721 contract, while it can have multiple copies in ERC-1155. The `totalSupply` variable in a contract keeps track of the number of unique NFTs in circulation. A *collection* refers to a set of NFTs that are managed by one smart contract, and that typically have something in common, for example, they may share certain attributes, or be used for the same purpose. NFTs in one collection typically look alike, such as CRYPTOPUNKS. *External* collections are the ones created by smart contracts that are created outside of the NFTMs.

NFT marketplace. NFT marketplaces (NFTMs), such as OPENSEA, SUPERRARE, and SORARE connect sellers to buyers. A seller either lists (T1) their items (NFTs) for sale, or puts them on auction (T2). A buyers in turn, can either buy (T3) an item at the listed price, or make offers (T4), or place bids (T5) if the item is on auction. Should they change their mind, a buyer (bidder) can also retract (T6) their bids if they have not been filled yet. Sometimes, instead of making an offer on an individual NFT, a buyer can make a *collection offer* (T7) for all NFTs in a collection. Collection offers are useful if a buyer would like to buy any NFT in a collection, but does not have a specific NFT in mind. A given collection offer can only be accepted once, and will expire for all other NFTs in the collection after being accepted. We call T1-T7 *trade actions*.

NFT liquidity pool. The NFTMs discussed above follow a traditional orderbook-based model, where the platform maintains the list of all open orders. Unlike orderbook-based exchanges that directly connect buyers to sellers, automated market makers (AMMs), also known as decentralized exchanges (DEX), facilitate near-instant token swaps by algorithmically setting prices for assets based on supply and demand. Funds are sold to and bought from liquidity pools (LP), which are smart contracts that lock up large volume of crowdsourced tokens. Examples of popular ERC-20 DEXes are UNISWAP, CURVE, BALANCER, *etc.* Similarly, an NFT AMM is a platform that allows traders to instantly buy or sell their NFTs through LPs. While traditional NFTMs allow the seller to have better control on the price of the item to be sold, NFT LPs are better suited for cases where the seller wants to make an instant trade.

Let’s take NFTX [9] as an example, which is a constant-product AMM. On NFTX, NFT holders deposit their NFTs into a vault, and mint a fungible token (VToken) specific to that NFT collection, for example, PUNK for CRYPTOPUNKS, in return. That VToken represents a 1:1 claim on any one NFT from that collection’s vault. If and when the user wants to claim any NFT from the vault, they can return their VToken and redeem an NFT from the collection (in the pool). Note that the VToken represents a claim on any one NFT from the specific collection, not the exact one the holder initially deposited.

LPs consist of a token pair, where one token can be exchanged for the other. VTokens can be deposited into an AMM such as SUSHISWAP to create a liquid market. Consider a VToken-ETH pool with 10 VTokens and 2 ETH. This would make the price of the corresponding NFT $2/10=0.20$ ETH. Now, if one NFT is purchased for 0.20 ETH, that NFT is removed from one side of the pool, while 0.20 ETH get added

onto the other side, resulting in 9 NFTs and 2.2 ETH. With this, the price of the NFT increases to $2.2/9=0.24$ ETH.

III. ANALYSIS APPROACH

This paper studies opportunistic trading in the NFT market. Traditional trading strategies tend to be based on fundamental analysis, such as studying a company’s financial statements or economic indicators, and making investment decisions based on the expected long-term value of an asset. On the other hand, opportunistic trading relies on (potentially very short-term) trends and patterns in the market. It differs from traditional trading strategies in that it mostly seeks to take advantage of short-term market inefficiencies, news events, hype, volatility, temporary imbalances in supply and demand, price discrepancies, *etc.*, rather than attempting to profit from long-term trends. While traditional trading is proactive, where the trader strives to anticipate long-term market conditions, opportunistic trading is far more reactive, where a trader is forced to react quickly to instantaneous market situations.

In this paper, we attempt to answer the following research questions: **(RQ1)** What types of opportunistic trading instances are prevalent in the NFT market? **(RQ2)** How prevalent are such trades? **(RQ3)** How profitable are these trades?

Attacker model. In our model, an attacker is a trader (buyer or seller) in the NFT market with solid financial and technical knowledge, and have access to the capital and computing resources required to perform high-frequency, bot-driven trades. The strategies they employ exhibit one or more of the following characteristics: **(i) Malicious.** Negatively impacts the broader ecosystem, for example, manipulating the price of tokens, market cornering, and so on. **(ii) Disruptive.** Their trades interfere with specific trades from ordinary users, making the latter ones fail, such as frontrunning. **(iii) Deceptive.** They bait unsuspecting users with lucrative opportunities to engage in trades that ultimately benefit the attacker, while resulting in losses for the user, for instance, enticing the user to purchase an NFT by offering it at an incredibly low price. **(iv) Unfair.** Such trades are competitive, which requires the attacker to quickly (and automatically) analyze, and react to changing market conditions. For majority of the users, it is impossible to either spot those short-term opportunities, or capitalize on them.

Methodology and data collection. We perform both qualitative and quantitative analysis to understand the landscape. Since manually analyzing the profitability of and the motivation behind all NFT trades is not feasible, it makes the problem of finding opportunistic trading challenging. To address this issue to the best possible extent, we gathered instances of opportunistic trading both actively (finding ourselves) and passively (finding previous reports). For the passive analysis, we collected previously reported instances from publicly available resources, such as blogs, forums, write-ups and TWITTER keyword searches, *e.g., frontrunning, arbitraging, nft-mev, etc.*. Then, we manually filtered out irrelevant results. Additionally, to discover new instances, we randomly sampled 100 trades from the NFT sales over 5 ETH for each of the NFTMs we support, and manually analyzed for the sign of suspicious, opportunistic trades. We believe that our hybrid approach provides sufficient coverage of the ecosystem.

We identify three broad categories of trades—(i) **Acquire**. These strategies are used to collect high-value NFTs that are worth holding for a long time (Section IV). (ii) **Instant profit generation**. These strategies are used to generate instant profit through buying and selling of NFTs in the same transaction (Section V). (iii) **Loss minimization**. These strategies are used to minimize losses from a potentially bad purchase (Section VI).

► **Marketplace selection**. To include an NFTM in our analysis, we had to first understand the marketplace-specific protocol, and then develop protocol-specific transaction parsers, which is non-trivial. Therefore, we carefully integrated the support for the most prominent NFTMs in our analysis. In line with the previous work [27], [20], we used DAPPRADAR [2], a popular tracker for dApps, to select the relevant marketplaces. Due to the popularity of Ethereum, we selected the top four (as on July 15, 2022) Ethereum-backed NFTMs ranked by all-time transaction volume—OPENSEA (34.69B), LOOKSRARE (4.84B), CRYPTOPUNKS (3.1B), and X2Y2 (1.24B). Further, we support all three versions of OPENSEA marketplace, *viz.*, v1.0, v2.0, and v3.0. In addition, during our passive analysis, we discovered numerous reports of opportunistic trading in CRYPTOKITTIES (30.1M), which is one of the older and popular collection. We included that too in our analysis. Note that some of our analyses, such as minting (Section IV-D) and cornering (Section IV-E) are marketplace-agnostic.

► **Recovering trade actions**. For the NFTMs we considered in this work, relevant NFT trade actions (Section II) are visible from the blockchain. The quantitative analysis was performed on the Ethereum blockchain data until April 15, 2023 (block 17,050,000).

We process each block B starting from the genesis block (*block number* = 0). Opportunistic trades can be executed either through an EOA, or if the trade involves complicated runtime logic, touches multiple protocols, and requires atomicity of a batch of transactions, through a *bot* contract. Therefore, in order to conduct a comprehensive analysis, we consider both external and internal transactions, which we denote as T .

NFTMs vary in their trading functionalities, and may even have different implementations for the same trade actions. Therefore, we need to consider marketplace-specific implementation to infer NFT trade details, such as action types, targeted tokens, their prices, *etc.*, during our analysis. Figure 1 illustrates the predicates we extract from a transaction T . For each $T \in B$, we extract two types of information: (i) generic transaction details, such as block number b , transaction hash h , transaction status st , sender s and receiver r , gas price gp , gas used gu , transaction index ind within the containing block B , transaction data d , timestamp ts , *etc.*, and (ii) NFT trade-specific information, such as trade actions, details n of the NFT involved in this trade, marketplace m where the trade takes place, the buy/sell/bid price p of n , *etc.*

We extract generic transaction details from the blockchain, which is then used to infer trade-specific information in the following two steps—(Step-I) We first understand the NFTM protocol by examining the source code of the marketplace contract, and observing past transactions. Thus, we identify the public methods corresponding to the trade actions, and understand the semantics of their arguments. (Step-II) In Solidity, each method

$t_info(b,h,st,s,r, gp,gu,ind,d,ts)$:-	Transaction at block b with hash h , status st , sender s , receiver r , gas price gp , timestamp ts , index ind and gas used gu
$listing(u,m,n,p)$:-	User u lists an NFT n at NFTM m at price p
$cancel_listing(u,m,p,n)$:-	User u cancels the listing of an NFT n listed at m at price p
$buy(u,m,p,n)$:-	User u buys an NFT n listed at m at price p
$place_bid(u,m,p,n)$:-	User u placed a bid of value p on an NFT n listed at m
$accept_bid(u,m,p,n)$:-	User u accepts a bid of value p on an NFT n listed at m
$cancel_bid(u,m,p,n)$:-	User u cancels a bid of value p on an NFT n listed at m

Fig. 1: Predicates extracted from transactions

(having a specific signature) is hashed to a unique four-byte-long string called *method selector*. The selector is encoded in the transaction data when a method is invoked. Therefore, we match the selectors that appear in the decoded transaction data d with the ones identified in the previous step to infer trade actions.

In addition, for a transaction T , we define the operator $\text{TradeAction}(T)$, which returns the trade action if T represents one of the supported actions, *viz.*, $\mathcal{A} = \{\text{listing}, \text{cancel_listing}, \text{buy}, \text{place_bid}, \text{accept_bid}, \text{cancel_bid}\}$, *null* otherwise. For a particular type of trade transaction T , we use the *dot* (\cdot) notation to refer to its attributes as defined in Figure 1. For example, if T_l is a listing transaction, $T_l.m$ denotes the marketplace where the respective NFT is listed at, and so on. Finally, \mathcal{T} denotes the set of transactions of our interest across all the supported NFTMs \mathcal{M} , *i.e.*, $\mathcal{T} = \{T \mid T.m \in \mathcal{M} \wedge \text{TradeType}(T) \in \mathcal{A}\}$. We use the notations, predicates, and operators introduced above throughout the rest of this paper.

► **Token contract identification**. We built a dataset of ERC-721 and ERC-1155 token contracts for our analyses. Our method of token contract identification does not require the source code of the contracts. Since only a fraction of the contracts on the blockchain have their sources available [23], a source code-agnostic method significantly broadens the scope of our analysis. We took a two-step approach: (Step-I) We relied on the fact that a token that conforms to ERC-721 or ERC-1155 always emits a `Transfer` event (Section II) when an NFT is transferred from one account to the other. Such `Transfer` event logs can be identified from the blockchain in a way similar to the method selector-based approach (used for method identification) described above. (Step-II) Tokens that follow the ERC-20 standard also emit a `Transfer` event upon the transfer of tokens. Thus, the `Transfer` logs identified in the previous step contain false positives (non-NFT tokens). However, we observed that for ERC-20 token, the third (last) argument of the `Transfer` event represents the value (amount) of the tokens transferred, while for both NFT standards, it represents the `tokenId`. As defined in the respective standards, this particular argument is *indexed* only for the NFTs, but not for the ERC-20 tokens. We leverage this observation to identify the `Transfer` logs emitted by the NFT contracts, and record the corresponding addresses.

In the end, we identified 152,478 ERC-721 and 27,824 ERC-1155 token contracts in total. Further, we randomly sampled 50 of the identified contracts, and verified if those are, indeed, NFTs by consulting both OPENSEA and ETHERSCAN. We found that all of them are true positives.

► **Marketplace API.** We use OPENSEA [11] API to fetch historical sales volumes and number of trades of NFT collections.

► **Price feed.** We fetch historical price data from COINGECKO [1] to convert token (cryptocurrency) prices to equivalent US Dollars at the time of the respective trades.

We provide the addresses and hashes of all important EOAs/contracts and transactions referred to in the rest of paper in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

IV. ACQUIRE

In a traditional market, buy-and-hold is a passive investment strategy where an investor buys an asset and holds its for an extended period, ignoring the short-term fluctuations. Setting the tax implications (long-term *vs.* short-term capital gains) aside, such strategy works well when an investor (i) has firm belief in the investment potential of the asset, or (ii) is reluctant to move with the market, and thereby, is ready to forsake profits they could make by riding out the volatility. The NFT market is inherently volatile. Moreover, recent research [16] has shown that this volatility tends to have a negative impact on the future cumulative excess returns (returns above a benchmark or expected returns) of NFT assets. On the other hand, popular NFTs such as CRYPTOPUNKS seem to hold their values well in the long-term despite the hype-driven nature of the NFT ecosystem.

Traders employ *acquire* strategies to buy NFTs in a competitive setting, and typically hold them for the long-term rather than trying to make an instant profit by selling them off. First, we will discuss how we determine profitability of such trades both for NFTs that could and could not be sold post-purchase. Next, we will explore relevant strategies that we identified in the NFT market.

A. Profitability analysis

Acquiring NFTs comes with the same risks as for any other speculative investment. An opportunistic trader expects the price for the acquired item to go up, but does not know when/if that will happen in the future. In practice, they can potentially sell the NFT at a profit, hold onto it for an extended period, or, in some cases, sell it at a loss due to frustration. In this section, we show how we can measure the profitability of an NFT if the acquired asset is actually sold. For NFTs that are still being held, we quantify the hypothetical profit that could be made, or the loss the trader would incur, if the NFT would be traded on a specific date (e.g., today).

Generalized sale detection. An NFT can be sold at many different NFTMs. Each NFTM, in turn, supports many different types of sales. For example, we have spotted 7 types of sale APIs in OPENSEA. To identify whether an NFT has been sold, and to obtain specific details of the sale, an analysis would need to be capable of handling all these trade variations, which is infeasible. To circumvent this issue, we designed the following marketplace and trade-agnostic analysis.

► **(Step I) Detecting sales.** Since an NFT sale transfers the ownership from the seller s (trader) to the buyer b , it emits a `Transfer` event. If the seller s has purchased the NFT with `tokenId` at transaction T_b , then we look for the first external transaction T_s that (i) occurs after T_b , and (ii) emits a log of the form `Transfer(s,b,tokenId)`. We consider T_s to be the potential sale transaction.

► **(Step II) Obtaining sale details.** Given T_s , our goal is to obtain the sale details without any specific knowledge about the NFTM protocol. The key observation is that the NFT sales are atomic, *i.e.*, the NFT transfer and payments to the involved parties are made (through internal transactions) in the same external transaction T_s . To this end, we first build a payment graph $\mathcal{G} = \{e\}$. Specifically, if any internal transaction of T_s transfers v amount of Ether or ERC-20 tokens from a payer account pr to a payee account pe , we add a directed edge $e = \langle pr, pe, v \rangle$ to \mathcal{G} .

We traverse \mathcal{G} recursively in a depth-first manner, starting from the buyer node b . At each iteration, when we process an edge $e = \langle pr, pe, v \rangle$, we also update two quantities: `payIn`: total amount of buyer’s money received by the seller, and `payOut`: total deductions from the seller’s earnings, such as marketplace fees, creator royalties, *etc.* Specifically, we add v to `payIn`, if payee pe is the seller s , and to `payOut`, if payer pr is the seller s . Finally, we compute the net earning of the seller by subtracting `payOut` from `payIn`.

One can argue that we could do away with the payment graph-based approach, and calculate the earnings by summing up the incoming/outgoing payments to/from the seller. That would be imprecise, because s could receive money from sources other than b in the same external transaction. With the payment graph, we are essentially taint-tracking the flow of money from b (source) to s (sink), thus only considering amounts involved in the trade in question. For cases where T_s is not a true sale, but an unconditional transfer of NFT from s to b , we treat them as the same entity. Then, we re-apply the algorithm assuming b to be the seller.

Pricing model. For an NFT that has not been sold, our pricing model computes an assumed price p for that NFT as of a specific data (such as today), and thereby, can determine the potential profit/loss the trader could have made/incurred. Our objective is not to design a precise price oracle, but rather to offer an intuitive indication of whether these (still held) NFTs retain their value. We follow three simple rules to determine the current market value p of an item: (i) We expect an NFT that holds its market value should be traded at least once within last three months. If not, then we treat $p=0$. (ii) Even if the NFT has been traded within the last three months, we want to ignore occasional trades, which does not reflect the true market demand for that item. Therefore, if the NFT has been traded fewer than 50 times, we disregard those sales, and again treat $p=0$. (iii) Otherwise, we consider p to be the average sale price of the collection. OPENSEA periodically releases the total sale volume and the number of trades within a timeframe for a collection in *batches*. The frequency of release varies based on the trade activity of that collection. We consider the most recent such batch to compute p .

Limitations. Our generic sale detection approach is unable to handle batch trades in which several NFTs are sold together as

a bundle. We can, of course, compute the total earnings from selling all the NFTs. However, due to the lack of protocol knowledge, we cannot automatically infer the sale price for each specific NFT. This is acceptable, as most of the opportunistic trades, be it a buy or a sale, target specific NFTs, not a bundle.

B. Frontrunning

Frontrunning refers to the malicious practice of exploiting the knowledge of a pending victim transaction T_v , and use that knowledge to execute an attack transaction T_a before T_v . By scheduling their transaction before the victim’s transaction, an attacker makes a profit that the victim was supposed to make.

The Ethereum mempool is a globally visible, temporary, public storage area of unconfirmed transactions that are waiting to be included in a block. When a user sends a transaction, it enters the mempool, and awaits validation by miners. Miners typically prioritize transactions according to the gas price offered. The higher the gas price, the more incentive miners have to include the transaction in the next block they mine. In frontrunning, an attacker first observes a victim transaction T_v from the mempool. If it deems profitable, then they replay the same transaction, but with a higher gas price, so that the miners include the attack transaction T_a before T_v . Ironically, in context of opportunistic trading, the attacker not only banks on the victim’s effort of finding a profitable trade opportunity (which is already hard in the competitive market), but also robs the victim of their profit.

With the rising popularity of NFTs as an investment vehicle, frontrunning has become prevalent in the NFT trading as well. Traders frontrun NFT trades to either buy or sell NFTs depending on the trade actions (Section II) performed by the trades. We identified the following types of frontrunning attacks.

Buy–Buy. In this attack, both the victim V and the attacker A are buyers. When A spots a profitable buy order transaction T_v submitted by V to purchase an NFT N , A frontruns T_v with another buy order T_a targeting the same NFT. As a result, A acquires the NFT, while T_v becomes invalid and eventually reverts.

It is worth noting that if A knew beforehand that purchasing N is a worthwhile investment, then they could probably make the same purchase without even frontrunning V , just like a regular buyer. However, the NFT market is hype-driven, and speculative. Only a few special-purpose utility NFTs, which represent in-game assets or tickets to access services, hold intrinsic value. For other NFTs, their valuation is largely derived from factors such as supply and demand and people’s perception. Thus, seeing the victim V attempting to purchase an NFT serves as an endorsement, or signal of interest, which triggers A to frontrun the victim.

Buy–Cancel. In this attack, the victim V is a seller, while the attacker A is a buyer. When A observes a cancel order transaction T_v , where V attempts to cancel a previously-listed NFT, A frontruns T_v with a buy order T_a targeting that NFT. As a result, A acquires the NFT, while T_v becomes invalid and reverts.

Typically, this type of frontrunning attack happens when a seller unintentionally lists an NFT at an exceptionally low price, but then realizes the mistake, and promptly attempts to

Strategy	Marketplaces				
	OPENSEA	LOOKSRARE	CRYPTOPUNKS	X2Y2	CRYPTOKITTIES
Acquire					
Frontrunning					
Buy–Buy	274,123	1,459	53	40,623	3,649
Buy–Cancel	4,640	3	2	1	33
Accept bid–Cancel bid	167	0	0	0	0
Place bid–Accept bid	–	–	200	–	0
Backrunning					
Listing–Buy	–	–	130	–	181
Loss minimization					
Cancel–Buy	3,502	83	8	356	25

TABLE I: Instances of frontrunning, backrunning, and loss minimizing trades found in different marketplaces

cancel the listing to avoid any potential loss. Unfortunately, this very attempt of the seller to prevent a loss attracts the attention of the attacker to that NFT.

Accept bid–Cancel bid. In this attack, the victim V is a buyer, while the attacker A is a seller. When A observes a cancel bid transaction T_v to cancel a prior bid submitted by V on an NFT, A frontruns T_v with an accept bid transaction T_a , thus forcing V to purchase the NFT against their will.

This can occur either due to the buyer’s accidental bid placement, or their subsequent realization that the deal may not be beneficial. The seller then acts quickly to exploit the situation before the buyer’s bid is canceled, ensuring they do not miss out on the possibility of a profitable outcome.

Place bid–Accept bid. In this attack, both the victim V and the attacker A are buyers. When A observes an accept bid transaction T_{ab} from a seller to accept a bid B submitted by a potential buyer V , A frontruns T_{ab} with a place bid transaction T_a with a slightly higher bid amount than B , so that the NFT is sold to them instead of the victim.

In certain cases involving popular collections, there have been instances where victim buyers place low bids B , most likely to try out their luck. Then, they patiently wait for the sellers to accept those bids. On the other hand, the seller gets frustrated by only receiving low bids, and eventually goes ahead to accept one of these low bids. An attacker then exploits the situation by frontrunning the accept bid transaction T_{ab} by placing a slightly higher bid than the existing one. As a consequence, the original bid is removed from consideration, and the attacker’s bid becomes the most recent one. Consequently, the seller ends up accepting the bid placed by the attacker instead of the initial bid B placed by the victim buyer. Note that this attack is only possible if the marketplace protocol does not include any unique identifier corresponding to the victim bid B in T_{ab} . Rather, T_{ab} is bid-agnostic and just accepts the currently highest bid. Unlike other cases, where the victim transaction fails as the side-effect of the frontrun, here, it is necessary that both transactions execute successfully for the attack to work.




Fig. 2: Distribution of number of frontrunning attempts per instance. X-axis follows a log scale




Fig. 3: Distribution of frontrunning instances a frontrunner has participated. X-axis follows a log scale

Identifying frontrunning attacks. To quantify the prevalence of the frontrunning attacks presented above, we apply the following set of rules to detect past instances of successful frontruns.

Let $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ be two transactions, such that $T_1.ts \leq T_2.ts$. Then, we say that T_1 frontruns T_2 , if:

Rule 1. They involve the same NFT, and the same marketplace, but come from different senders. Formally, $T_1.n = T_2.n$, and $T_1.m = T_2.m$, and $T_1.s \neq T_2.s$.

Rule 2. The transactions are “competing” with each other, so they appear in the same block. *i.e.*, $T_1.b = T_2.b$ and $T_1.ind < T_2.ind$. The gas price offered for T_1 is higher than that of T_2 , *i.e.*, $T_1.gp > T_2.gp$.

Rule 3. The transactions represent the appropriate types of trade action required by the type of frontrun attack in question. For example, if we are looking for a Buy–Cancel frontrun, then $\text{TradeType}(T_1) = \text{buy}$ and $\text{TradeType}(T_2) = \text{cancel_listing}$.

Rule 4. As discussed earlier, for all types of frontrun categories except the last one (Place bid–Accept bid), the victim transaction fails, while the attack transaction succeeds. Therefore, we perform appropriate checks on $T_1.st$ and $T_2.st$ status values.

Quantitative analysis. We detected 324,953 instances of frontrunning in five NFTMs attempted by 189,269 unique frontrunners. Table I shows the number of different frontrunning instances we detected per exchange. Our results indicate that




Fig. 4: Difference in the gas costs of the highest (successful) and the lowest gas-paying frontrunners

Buy-Buy is the most prevalent (98.45%) type of frontrunning in the ecosystem. Given the hype-driven nature of NFT market, we believe that such *reactive* purchases are quite expected.

A frontrunning instance targets a particular NFT. In our prior discussion, we explained frontrunning with a single attacker. However, it is possible that multiple frontrunners target the same NFT, in particular for very popular assets. We plot the distribution of the number of frontrunners per attack instance in Figure 2. The vast majority (96.63%) of the frontruns were attempted by less than 7 frontrunners. However, we also found 997 instances with more than 32 frontrunners, implying that those trades were highly competitive.

Since a frontrunner may repeatedly engage in attacks, we asked ourselves this question: *How many frontrunners out there dominate the frontrunning landscape?* To this end, Figure 3 shows the distribution of the number of frontrunning instances a frontrunner is involved in. This figure reveals that a large number of frontrunners took part in only a few trades. On the other hand, a small number (3,506) of frontrunners are each involved in at least 32 trades. As one might expect, the market indeed exhibits a concentration of a small number of significant (active) players.

As previous studies [19] have pointed out, frontrunning may lead to reactive bidding and “gas wars” to become the top choice of the miners during transaction-ordering. We were interested to see the difference in gas cost gc_h incurred by successful frontrunners (who pay the highest gas price) and the gas cost (gc_l) that the lowest-paying frontrunners offered. The amount of gas used by a successful transaction should stay the same regardless of the sender. Therefore, to estimate gc_l , we used the amount of gas used (gu) by a successful frontrunner, thus simulating a successful transaction even in the failure case. We compute the gas costs by multiplying gu with respective gas prices, and plot the difference ($gc_h - gc_l$) in Figure 4. As it becomes apparent, the gas war intensified between December 2021 and August 2022, exactly around the time when the NFT-hype took off.

To give an idea of how competitive frontrunning could be, this AZUKI NFT was purchased through a Buy-Buy frontrunning in May 2022 at transaction `0x1e8...93b`. Surprisingly, while the frontrunner paid 0.16 ETH for the NFT itself, they paid a whopping 12 ETH for the gas to win the competition against 7 other frontrunners. Later, they were able to sell it at

	Non-flashbots	Flashbots	Private mining
Frontrunnings Successful	952,783	13,694	58
frontrunnings Miner fees (ETH)	312,972	11,923	58
	13,826.41	1,563.96	10

TABLE II: Frontrunning attempts made through FLASHBOTS and private mining

14.36 ETH on the same day. Upon further analysis, we realized that the average price of the AZUKI collection was 12 ETH at that time. Therefore, this was a “steal deal” for the buyer, which prompted them to win the gas war at a high cost. Interestingly, the seller themselves bought that NFT at 12.5 ETH only four hours before the listing was put up, which led us to suspect that it was an unfortunate incident of mislisting. In another instance, while buying the very first token of the ADIDAS ORIGINALS collection at transaction `0xa7f4...e59`, the buyer had to compete with 223 other frontrunners.

Sending transactions through the public mempool attracts unwanted attention from frontrunners. To mitigate this risk, people resort to FLASHBOTS-like [4] frontrunning-protecting services that entirely bypasses the mempool. Fortunately, FLASHBOTS publishes a list of transactions relayed through their service to maintain transparency. Additionally, we detect *private mining* by following any on-chain payment made directly to the block miner (bribe) by the sender in the same transaction as the frontrunning. The number of transactions and the fees paid to the miners in frontrunning attempts mined through various sources are summarized in Table II. All privately mined transactions were successful. Also, frontrunning attempts through FLASHBOTS have a noticeably higher success rate (87.07%) than the ones mined through the mempool (32.85%). However, the reliability of FLASHBOTS comes at a cost; on average, transactions mined through FLASHBOTS paid 11 times higher fees per transaction than the ones mined through mempool.

An interesting question is to see how many of the NFTs acquired through frontrunning actually earned profits in the long run. We found that frontrunners could sell 206,497 (63.55%) NFTs, of which 131,419 (63.64%) were sold for a cumulative profit of 26,513.35 ETH. Sales of the remaining 75,078 (36.36%) NFTs incurred a total loss of 17,518.57 ETH. This is surprising. Despite the widespread attention NFTs have received in recent times and the influx of traders seeking quick profits through risky trades, a notable portion of frontrunners are unable to achieve their financial goals. For example, a CLONEX NFT was purchased at transaction `0xfbb...07e` for 32 ETH, while less than a year later, it had to be sold at 9.5 ETH, because the collection price was rapidly declining.

Another interesting observation is that of the NFTs that were sold, 88% were held less than a month. For those that were sold at a profit, 93.47% were held less than a month.

Further, we apply our pricing model (Section IV-A) to all 118,456 unsold NFTs. We did not detect any sales for 91,088 (76.90%) tokens in the last three months, suggesting that those tokens, with a cumulative purchase price of 22,226.84 ETH, have already gotten severely devalued since purchase. We could speculatively price 19,451 tokens (the remaining 7,917 errored out due to minor issues), of which 17,810 (91.56%) already exhibit negative profit as of today.




Fig. 5: Difference in the average price of the backrun collection and the buy price of the NFT. A positive difference indicates that the backrun was potentially profitable

C. Backrunning

In a backrunning attack, the transaction sender A gets their transaction T_a to appear immediately *after* a target transaction T_v sent by victim V . In the same way as frontrunning, backrunning exploits the knowledge of the pending transactions in the mempool. In this attack, the backrunner A offers a slightly lower gas price in T_a than in T_v so that their transaction gets deprioritized with respect to the target transaction during inclusion in the block. We identified the following type of opportunistic trading that leverages backrunning to acquire an NFT.

Listing-Buy. In this type of trade, the target user V is a seller, and the backrunner A is a buyer. When V submits a listing transaction T_v for a highly desirable NFT, A might spot this opportunity and immediately backrun T_v with a buy transaction T_a to acquire the NFT before others have a chance to do so. In effect, a regular user will not be able to see the NFT listed in the marketplace, and make an informed purchase decision, since the item already got sold before it even became visible to the general public. For the backrunning to be successful, it is necessary that both the seller’s and the buyer’s transactions get executed successfully.

Quantitative analysis. For backrunning to take place, the marketplace needs to have on-chain listing so that it becomes visible in the mempool. Since the item listings for OPENSEA, LOOKSRARE, and X2Y2 are maintained off-chain, we could only detect backrunning in CRYPTOPUNKS and CRYPTOKITTIES. In those two NFTMs, we detected 311 instances of backrunning.

Backrunning a listing to purchase an NFT makes sense only if the NFT is bought at a reasonable price so that the buyer would be able to sell it for a profit afterwards. In other words, paying more than the market average would hurt profitability. While individual buyers have their own definition of reasonable price, we used a naive oracle of the average price of that collection for further analysis. In Figure 5, we illustrate the price difference between the average price of the collection at the moment when backrunning occurred, and the purchase price of the NFT. A positive difference indicates that the item was acquired below the then-current market price, thus making the trade potentially profitable. As we can see, most of the purchases were made close to or below the market averages. For example, 94 CRYPTOPUNKS and 99

CRYPTOKITTIES were bought below the market average. In fact, among those CRYPTOPUNKS, 21 were bought at more than one Ether below the market price. This confirms the existence of backrunning in the context of NFT trades.

D. Bulk minting

Minting is the process of creating new tokens. There are primarily two ways in which NFTs are minted: **(i) Mint before sale (MBS)**. NFTs are minted by “privileged” accounts before any public sale starts. This is done largely for three reasons: **(i.a) Secondary sale**. The first sale of an item by the creator is called *primary sale*, while any subsequent sales by any seller other than the creator is known as *secondary sale*. For external collections, NFTMs generally act as secondary marketplaces, meaning that they do not facilitate the primary sale. To address this issue, creators first mint the NFTs to their accounts, and then list those items on the NFTMs, like any other regular secondary sale. **(i.b) Giveaway**. As part of a promotion, creators often mint a few items to distribute them to selected accounts. **(i.c) Whitelisting**. For hyped collections, whitelisting is the way to ensure that certain early followers, patrons, contributors or enthusiasts receive NFTs, no matter how competitive the market is. These accounts are added to a *whitelist*, so that they can mint and redeem their allotted NFTs before the public minting starts. **(ii) Mint at sale (MAS)**. In this case, the primary sale is conducted through collection-specific websites. The minting method is unprivileged, meaning that it can be called by the public. When a buyer purchases an NFT on that website, it is minted as part of the sale transaction and gets transferred to the buyer’s account right away. Consequently, the sale price of the NFT includes the price for the gas associated with the minting.

When a new collection is launched, a sale start date is advertised to create excitement. In the recent past, the minting hype has been so intense that many times when a new collection was launched, it caused a surge in the gas price for all Ethereum transactions to cope with the increased volume of minting transactions [45], [38], [46]. Opportunistic traders ride on this hype, and they might want to mint unusually large amounts of NFTs as soon as a collection is launched, depriving the rest of the market. We call this *bulk minting*. It is particularly problematic, since it leads to non-uniform distribution of assets, which not only hurts the overall tokenomics, but may also spur distrust and disinterest among the buyers for the project.

MBS is less susceptible to bulk minting, since the minting process is carried out through privileged accounts. Popular tokens that adopt MAS, on the other hand, often implement anti-bulk-minting measures to ensure a more fair distribution of tokens (wealth). In Figure 6, we show one such check present in the TUBBY CATS collection. This check limits the maximum number of NFTs one can mint in a single transaction. Unfortunately, defenses like these are not strong enough to dissuade smart traders. On the other hand, a more stringent check, like enforcing limits on the total ownership, is undesirable, since it may hinder the growth of the project in the long run.

To evade existing anti-bulk-minting defenses, instead of minting the NFTs from an EOA, traders often leverage smart contracts. Figure 7 shows one such example. Since transactions initiated through contracts are atomic in nature, a single invocation of `bulkMint()` dispatches ten calls (in the `for` loop) to `mintForSale()`, thus minting 50 NFTs in one batch.

```
function mintFromSale(uint tubbiesToMint)
    public payable {
    require(tubbiesToMint <= 5, "Only up to 5
        tubbies can be minted at once");
    .
    .
}
```

Fig. 6: Anti-minting measure in TUBBY CATS NFT

```
function bulkMint() {
    require(msg.sender == 0x1337... 1337);
    for (i = 1; i < 10; i++) {
        mintFromSale(5);
    }
}
```

Fig. 7: Evading anti-minting measures

This technique has two benefits: **(i)** since every call to `mintForSale()` is a separate (internal) transaction, it bypasses the mitigation presented in Figure 6, and **(ii)** to win in a gas war, the trader has to bid a high gas price only once to invoke `bulkMint()`, as opposed to incurring similar gas cost ten times if they had used an EOA to mint the tokens in ten separate transactions.

Identifying minting limit evasions. To identify instances of attackers who attempt to evade minting limits, we first need to determine the minting limit for an NFT token. We do so in three steps.

► **(Step I) Minting transaction identification.** When a token with `tokenId` is transferred from the `from` address to the `to` address, a `Transfer` event is emitted on the log: `event Transfer(address indexed from, address indexed to, uint256 tokenId)`. We rely on these logs to determine the time an NFT is sold, its buyer, and the number of NFTs held by the buyer at that point. A `Transfer` event decrements and increments the number of tokens held by the `sender` (seller) as well as the `receiver` (buyer), respectively. We enumerate the transfer logs emitted by an NFT contract sequentially, block by block, and within each block, ordered by log index, thus ensuring that the transfer events are considered chronologically. At each step, we keep track of the `tokenIds` received by the `receiver`, and the number of NFTs in circulation at that point. Therefore, when we see a `tokenId` that we have not seen before, we consider that as a *minting* event. We record the transaction that generated the log (T_m), add it to the set of all minting transactions, and increase the `totalSupply` accordingly.

The algorithm above, in its current form, works only for ERC-721 tokens. ERC-1155 is a “token-within-tokens” standard, because each token can have multiple copies. Adding support for ERC-1155 would not only require us to extend the algorithm by adding extra accounting for each `tokenId`, but it would also make the downstream analyses more complicated. Therefore, for our minting and cornering (Section IV-E) analysis, we focus only on ERC-721 tokens. Since it is the older of the two NFT standards, and represents 84.57% contracts in our dataset, we believe that it is a reasonable trade-off.

► **(Step II) Minting function identification.** As mentioned previously, limit evasion attacks are only relevant when MAS is employed, as minting is open to general public. We leveraged the T_m s collected in the previous step to identify the minting methods in the NFT contract. In particular, our goal is to identify un-

privileged minting methods that can be called by any user (*i.e.*, methods that are not restricted by owner-only checks, and/or restricted to a whitelist). To do so, we first collect the set F of all public methods that are touched by T_m . To filter privileged methods included in F , we replay them at respective blocks on our testnet, but with a sender different from the original one, and monitor if the transaction reverts. If it does, then we consider the minting function to be privileged, and discard it. Otherwise, we add it to F_u , the set of all unprivileged minting methods.

► **(Step III) Minting limit identification.** Unfortunately, none of the token standards define a minting API. However, if a minting method $f_m \in F_u$ allows minting multiple tokens in one transaction, then it should also accept an argument a_m that defines the number of tokens to be minted. Due to the absence of a standardized method signature, we first need to identify the part of the *calldata* (the serialized input to f_m in a transaction) that corresponds to a_m . To do so, we leverage the fact that when tokens are minted, a standard-compliant contract emits `Transfer` logs, one for each minted token. First, we choose a transaction tx_m that invokes f_m to mint n tokens, which we determine by scanning the logs. Then, we locate n (encoded) in the *calldata*, thus inferring the position of a_m . Finally, we replay the transaction with gradually increasing values of a_m , until the execution reverts, which we assume happens when the minting limit is reached. We adapt binary search to converge to a solution faster. Some contracts expect the user to send the exact amount e of Ethers that is needed to mint n tokens. To tackle this issue, we estimate e by computing the price per token from tx_m , which we then multiply with a_m , the number of tokens.

Quantitative analysis. For the 152,478 ERC-721 contracts, we identified 86,698 minting methods. Out of these, 25,504 were unprivileged methods. Our analysis could recover the minting limit for 22,857 of those methods. Note that if a contract does not explicitly specify a limit, we default to using one. Finally, we look for external transactions that call those unprivileged methods and mint tokens beyond the inferred limits. We identified 4,650 instances where minting limits were evaded.

As an example, though the `MINIMALIST HUMAN CLUB` token limits minting to 2 tokens per transaction, in transaction `0x1f8...4aa`, 200 tokens were minted through a contract.

Manual verification. We sampled 15 methods from the sets of methods marked as “privileged” and “unprivileged” by our analysis, respectively. We chose contracts with source for ease of manual verification. All 30 methods were correctly labeled.

Next, for the 15 unprivileged methods, we manually went through the source code to determine the minting limits. Due to the complexity of that logic, we could not find the limit in one contract. For the remaining 14 methods, our analysis correctly identified the limits for 9. As for the false detections, we noticed that the arguments that our analysis used to bruteforce the limit were not always accurate. Specifically, our heuristic attempts to infer the argument a_m via log analysis (as explained before). However, the signatures of some of the minting methods are far more complicated than this simple analysis can correctly handle. For example, certain methods accept a list of `tokenId`s to be minted (rather than a single one). In general, recovering the signature of a method from contract bytecode is an open problem, tackling which goes beyond the scope of this work.

Limitations. (i) Our heuristic to estimate e is best-effort. If the token employs dynamic pricing, then our transaction reverts due to a mismatch between the price and the value, thus inferring a wrong limit. (ii) If the limit is influenced by dynamic factors, such as availability, then the extracted limit might be imprecise. (iii) We make no effort to recover signatures of the minting methods. Therefore, our analysis can return incorrect results for methods with complex signatures.

E. Market cornering

Cornering is the act of obtaining enough assets of a certain type so that the holders can control the market and eventually drive up the asset’s price. Attackers often manipulate the price by buying or selling items in large quantities, creating artificial shortages of supply. Both the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission Securities (CFTC) and the US Securities & Exchange Commission (SEC) consider cornering a form of illegal market manipulation under both the securities and futures laws [6]. However, as NFT market are unregulated, “whales” (a term that refers to entities that possess significant amounts of capital) can buy a large amount of tokens as soon as a collection is launched and hoard them until an opportune moment. Since the `totalSupply` of a typical NFT collection is much smaller than for ERC-20 tokens, it is far easier to corner the NFT market than that of ERC-20 tokens.

Identifying cornering instances. We detect instances of cornering during the minting transaction identification step (Step-I) in Section IV-D. Specifically, each time a `Transfer` event is processed, and a receiver (buyer) receives a token, we check the fraction f of the total number of available tokens (`totalSupply`) this buyer owns at that point. If f is above a threshold th_f , it indicates that a significant portion of the tokens are under the control of that buyer, which we count as an instance of cornering. Also, when minting for a token has just started and the `totalSupply` (available liquidity) is very small, the concept of cornering is not meaningful. Hence, we do not consider any detected cornering instances until the asset’s `totalSupply` is above a threshold th_t .

Quantitative analysis. We empirically set $th_f = 10$ and $th_t = 50$ for our analysis. That is, if we detect at any point that there are at least 50 tokens minted for a collection, and more than 10% of the total supply is being held by an address, we flag that as a cornering attempt. Out of the 152,478 ERC-721 contracts, we initially detected 34,221 collections with cornering activity. Upon further inspection, we immediately noticed that our analysis incorrectly flagged a large number of collection creators who were minting tokens before their sale (recall the MBS model). Thus, we excluded all cornering instances for collections with a single holder (at the time the alert was raised). While this might remove true cornering attempts, we believe that cases where a single attacker purchases all tokens are rare. At the end, we are left with 78,904 cornered NFTs from 17,775 collections cornered by 49,354 holders. Of the cornered NFTs, 72,881 were actually purchased (we could identify corresponding buy transaction). For the remaining cases, the NFTs were unconditionally transferred, most likely from a different account (that was used for the purchase of those tokens) of the same holder.

Interestingly, a mere 22.77% of the cornered tokens were later sold, or could be sold. This led us to question: *Is cornering*

NFTs at all profitable? To investigate further, we computed the distribution of the number of cornered collections per holder, and identified 348 accounts that are holding tokens of at least ten collections. Notably, the account PRANKSY.ETH cornered the most number of collections (232) in the past. We randomly sampled 10 accounts of top holders, and then again sampled 5 collections from each of their holdings to dig in further. Some of those collections have already been flagged by NFTMs like OPENSEA, and have been taken down, leaving the holders with no market to sell off their assets. Some other collections are still “alive,” but without significant movement in price since the time they were bought. It seems that these mega-holders (whales) are buying inexpensive tokens in bulk without a meticulous market analysis. Then, they are holding on to these tokens, hoping that some of the cornered collections will increase in price over time.

Manual verification. We built two datasets for manual verification. First, we randomly sampled 10 holder accounts (Set-A) from the reported results. Second, we selected the top 10 holders (Set-B) that are cornering the most number of collections. For the selected accounts, we checked: (i) Whether the accounts are “special” in any way such that holding a large amount of tokens cannot be deemed as cornering. (ii) For each collection, ETHERSCAN shows the top token holders for that collection/tokens. Similarly, for each address, ETHERSCAN also shows the amount of tokens of a particular type that an address is currently holding. However, we have no way to know the historical token holdings of an address. Since, according to our experience, buy-and-hold is a common strategy for these accounts, we verified (consulting ETHERSCAN) if, at least, the current holdings of an account is above our threshold.

In Set-A, we encountered the NIFTY wallet, which is a false positive. NFTMs like NIFTY [10] follow an escrow model [20], where the marketplace holds all the assets for all the users in its wallet. Without deeper protocol knowledge, this case is indistinguishable from a true cornering instance. For one account, the current holding is below our threshold, which we could not further verify. In Set-B, the top two holders were the *null* address, where tokens are typically minted from, and the *burn* address, which is used to destroy tokens to reduce the available liquidity. Except those two, the remaining ones were true positives.

Limitations. NFTMs that follow an escrow model would appear as attackers in our results. However, given that such NFTMs are not common, we did not make any specific effort to exclude them in our analysis.

V. INSTANT PROFIT GENERATION

Unlike *acquire* strategies that come with no guarantee of future profit, instant profit generation refers to the ability to generate profits immediately from a trade. Instead of holding onto an asset for extended amount of time and hoping that the market works in favor of the trader, with instant profit generation, a trader purchases an NFT and sells it (with profit) in the same transaction. Because profit is acquired in the same transaction as the purchase, a smart contract can often verify if a profit has indeed been made at the end of the transaction. If no profit is detected, then the contract reverts the transaction, thus saving the trader from getting stuck with a non-profitable item. The nature of the trade leaves no room for optimizing for later (long-term) profit, which may result in a lower profit

margin. However, it offers the advantage of assured risk-free gains, which is a significant benefit in a highly speculative market. Next, we will explore two such strategies commonly observed in the NFT market.

A. Arbitrage

In finance, arbitrage is the process of capitalizing on the price discrepancy of an asset across different markets. The asset is bought at a lower price on one market, and immediately sold at a higher price on another. The profit is derived from the difference in prices.

ERC-20 coins are fungible. All units of a coin are identical and interchangeable. Fungibility helps in creating markets with a healthy supply and demand for the same asset. For example, an arbitrage opportunity opens up when MATIC is sold and bought at slightly different prices on both UNISWAP and SUSHISWAP, two popular decentralized exchanges. On the other hand, NFTs are non-fungible, which means that each unit is unique. With traditional sale mechanisms, such as sell orders or auctions, only the NFT owner S could list an item. When a buyer B purchases an item, all offers from other potential buyers, which were tied to the specific asset and its previous owner S , would become invalid. Moreover, in the absence of an existing (open) buy order, a buyer B has no way to sell their purchased item in the same transaction (and obtain the difference as profit). Therefore, arbitrage based on NFTs used to be impossible. This changed recently when advanced financial instruments like collection offers and liquidity pools were introduced. Below, we describe ways in which these two mechanisms enable arbitrage in the NFT ecosystem.

Collection offer-based arbitrages. NFTMs allow buyers to make offers on items to express their interest in purchasing them. Such offers are tied to a specific NFT. Unlike traditional offers, a *collection offer* expresses an interest in *any* item of a collection (Section II).

Assume that a seller S is selling an NFT N from a collection C at price p_s . Also, there is a potential buyer B , who has made a collection offer on the same collection C at price p_b , meaning that they are willing to purchase any NFT of C at that price. If $p_b > p_s$, an arbitrageur then buys N from S at p_s , sells it to B at p_b in the same transaction, and pockets the difference ($p_b - p_s$) as the profit.

In transaction `0x0659...29d`, a MOONBIRDS NFT was bought from LOOKSRARE for 44 ETH, and sold to a collection offer for 223 ETH on the same platform, pocketing 180 ETH after fees.

Liquidity pool-based arbitrages. NFT liquidity pools (LP) allow one to sell their NFT N to a smart contract instead of a particular buyer. In return, the seller receives a pool-specific token T_N , which is tied to the NFTs of the collection where N belongs to (Section II).

LP-based arbitrages can be arbitrarily long and complex. However, the basic structure is as follows: **(Step-I)** The arbitrageur purchases an NFT N from an NFTM at a price of p_b ETH. **(Step-II)** They sell N to an LP, and receive an equivalent amount of pool tokens T_N . **(Step-III)** Finally, they swap all those T_N tokens at a ERC-20 DEX for p_s amount

of ETH. If all the exchange rates are favorable, the arbitrageur ends up with more money than they invested, allowing them to keep the difference $(p_s - p_b)$ as profit.

In transaction `0x304...031`, the arbitrageur purchases a SPACESHIBAS NFT from OPENSEA at 0.015 ETH. They immediately swap it on NFT20 for 97 SHIBASPACE ERC-20 tokens, which they then deposited into UNISWAP v2.0 SHIBASPACE-WETH pool to get 0.033 WETH back. Even with a transaction fee of 0.013 ETH, they made an instant, risk-free profit of 0.005 ETH.

B. Reward token collection

Creators often offer reward tokens to incentivize buyers of their NFTs. Rewards are typically announced during the initial days of the launch of a collection, to either entice users to purchase or hold NFTs. Reward tokens often provide additional advantages. For instance, if a creator intends to release another collection later on, these tokens could grant holders the opportunity to acquire those NFTs at a discounted price. For reward token collection trade, the trader sells the original NFT immediately, but keeps the reward tokens as profit.

The following steps are involved in this kind of activity: **(Step-I)** The trader borrows p_b ETH using a flash loan. **(Step-II)** With the borrowed funds, they proceed to purchase an NFT of type N_O . **(Step-III)** For purchasing N_O , they receive an additional NFT of type N_R as the reward. **(Step-IV)** Finally, they sell the original NFT N_O , either through a collection offer, or to a liquidity pool. The proceeds from this sale are then used to repay the borrowed funds p_b obtained through the flash loan. They keep the reward token N_R as the profit.

In transaction `0x629...f4d`, a MAYC token was bought for 28 ETH using a flash loan from AAVE. The trader then redeemed a MAYC LAND token worth 15 ETH, and sold the original MAYC for 26.4 ETH in a collection offer.

Identifying instant profit generating transactions. Instant profit generating trades come in different shapes. Identifying and encoding the signature of each such trade in our analysis would be infeasible. Instead of making specific assumptions about the “shapes” of such trades, we instead propose a trade-agnostic, payment flow-based approach to identify (instant) profit-generating transactions. Let T be an external transaction sent by a sender S to a receiver R .

► **(Step I)** We consider T further if it performs at least one NFT sale, and the buyer B transfers the NFT out to some other account, indicating an immediate sale.

► **(Step II)** Let \mathcal{A} be the set of addresses touched by T (and its internal transactions). A trader perhaps controls more than one of those accounts, any of which could receive the profit from the trade. Our goal is to build the set \mathcal{M} of such addresses. Both the addresses of the sender S and buyer B are included in \mathcal{M} . In addition, many arbitrages are performed through smart contracts (the receiver R), which can receive the profit, too. Therefore, we build the initial set $\mathcal{M} = \{S, B, R\}$.

► **(Step III)** There could still be an address $a_t \in \mathcal{A} \wedge a_t \notin \mathcal{M}$, which is under the control of the trader, but not apparently visible from this transaction T . We extend \mathcal{M} to




Fig. 8: Arbitrages over time

include such addresses a_t . To this end, we scan through all the past transactions of each address $a_m \in \mathcal{M}$, and add any address a_i that has interacted with a_m to \mathcal{M} . While doing so, we exclude an a_i if it is an exchange. Specifically, we disregard any a_i having more than a threshold th_e (empirically determined) number of unique senders, which is common for exchanges.

► **(Step IV)** We only retain addresses in \mathcal{M} that also appear in transaction T , *i.e.*, we update $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{A}$. We consider \mathcal{M} to be the set of addresses potentially controlled by the trader. Therefore, our analysis treats them as a single “clique,” and disregards any mutual interactions among the addresses in \mathcal{M} .

► **(Step V)** For \mathcal{M} , we compute two quantities: payIn , which is the total amount of ERC-20 tokens, Ether, and NFTs flowing in, and payOut , which is the total amount of ERC-20 tokens, Ether, and NFTs flowing out. If the net cash in-flow ($\text{payIn} - \text{payOut}$) is positive, we flag T as an instant profit generating transaction.

Quantitative analysis. For this analysis, we used a threshold value $th_e = 200$. We detected 31,926 arbitrage transactions, making a total of 4,634.09 Ethers in profit, and 407 instances of reward-token collection. Among these transactions, the minimum and maximum profits were 0.000005 ETH and 179.2 ETH, respectively. Further, we broke down the profits by percentiles: the 25th, 50th (median), and 75th percentiles were 0.011 ETH, 0.025 ETH, and 0.069 ETH, respectively. This suggests that most of the opportunities yield small profits, while larger, more lucrative ones are rarer.

To understand the frequency of arbitrages, we plotted the number of such transactions over time in Figure 8. We can see a significant increase of activity in July 2021, which is about six months after LPs such as NFTX and NFT20 launched (both launched in January 2021).

Manual verification. Our analysis correctly identified all publicly reported instances [3], [5], [8] that we could find. Furthermore, we randomly selected and analyzed 20 transactions identified as instant-profit-generating. As part of our manual analysis, we looked for the following properties of these transactions: **(i)** A transaction touches multiple protocols, and have to be atomic, which is why they are relayed through smart contracts. Moreover, arbitrageurs tend to conceal their logic. Therefore, their contracts (bots) are typically closed-source. We examined if the transaction T in question was triggered by a closed-source contract. **(ii)** We cross-referenced T on

ETHERSCAN, a popular blockchain explorer, that interprets the details of a transaction in a human-readable manner. We verified that T moves an NFT both in and out of an address. **(iii)** We investigated if T touches multiple exchanges, NFTMs, and LPs. **(iv)** To calculate the profit of the transaction, we carefully traced the flow of Ethers and ERC-20 tokens within the transaction. Then, we verified that the sender, or the bot contract, ended up with a positive token or Ether balance at the end of the transaction. In some cases, it was not immediately apparent whether the sender accumulated a positive balance, as the final profit may have been transferred to a different address T' associated with the sender. For such cases, we further checked whether some amount was unconditionally transferred to T' . Only transactions satisfying all the above criteria were confirmed to be a correct detections. All 20 findings turned out to be true positives.

Limitations. Our approach to identify exchanges uses a simple heuristic. For example, certain MEV bots interact with accounts with unusually high numbers of transactions. Our approach might confuse such contracts with exchanges, and, therefore, exclude them from the set \mathcal{M} of potential profit receivers, resulting in a negative profit, and false negatives in turn.

VI. LOSS MINIMIZATION

Loss minimization refers to risk management techniques that aim to reduce or mitigate potential losses incurred due to events such as market fluctuations or poor investment decisions. In traditional markets, traders set up stop-loss orders, implement hedging strategies, diversify portfolios, or continuously adjust positions to adapt to the market conditions.

Sale price correction. Sometimes, opportunistic traders (sellers) are not sure about the maximum price that a buyer would be willing to pay for an NFT. To probe the market demand, they list the NFT at a “bait” price and wait to see if a buyer shows any interest in the listing. They monitor the Ethereum mempool for any pending buy transactions from prospective buyers, which act as a form of “endorsement” for the price they have listed at, and encourages them to re-list the item at a higher price. Since the real intention of the seller is not to sell the item right away, as soon as they spot a buy transaction (victim), they frontrun it with a cancel order transaction (attack) to invalidate the listing, thus, preventing potential loss from the trade. As a result, the seller keeps the NFT, while the buyer’s transaction reverts.

Quantitative analysis. We detected 3,974 instances of loss minimizing trades in five NFTMs (Table I). We noticed that a CRYPTOPUNKS was initially listed at 57 ETH at transaction `0xd84...33b`. When a buyer was about to make a purchase, the offer was immediately withdrawn. It was re-listed in two weeks at 69.42 ETH, and got sold on the same day.

VII. RELATED WORK

In this work, we study opportunistic trading in NFT markets. Previous work on high-frequency trading in crypto markets and market manipulation are closest to our research. In contrast to our paper, these prior studies focused on markets involving fungible tokens.

High-frequency trading. Arbitrage leverages the price discrepancies between cryptocurrency exchanges to make

profit. Sophisticated algorithms [30], [47], [42] have been proposed to exploit such opportunities at scale in real-time. Liquidation is the process of selling off collateralized assets at a discounted price to cover outstanding debts. The incentives and risks [34], [32] of participating in this system have been thoroughly studied by previous work. While typical lending protocols are collateralized, a flashloan is a DeFi lending mechanism that allows users to borrow funds without providing any collateral. Since flashloan provides unconditional access to large funds, Qin *et al.* [36] has shown how it can be leveraged to maximize arbitrage profits. Previous work [21], [19] has demonstrated the challenges of high-frequency trading, like arbitrage, in presence of frontrunning. Sandwich attacks, which simultaneously both frontrun and backrun victim transactions, may generate [49] a daily revenue of over several thousand US dollars just from UNISWAP. Blockchain extractable value (BEV) is an umbrella term that refers to all those different ways, such as sandwich attacks, liquidation, and arbitrage, to make illicit or harmful profits on the blockchain. A body of work [35], [33], [13] has studied the prevalence of such trades, their impact, and the revenue they generate in depth.

Existing work focuses on native cryptocurrency and ERC-20 token markets, leaving out the NFT market. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to explore the presence of similar opportunistic trades in the NFT space, which brings unique challenges, such as speculative pricing, a broader variety of different trading actions, and the non-trivial determination of profitability. We aim to provide a comprehensive coverage of such opportunistic trading strategies in the context of NFTs in this work.

Manipulation of token markets. An NFT rug pull refers to a fraudulent practice where the creator or seller of an NFT abruptly abandons the project, leaving investors with worthless or significantly devalued tokens. Previous work has shown the prevalence of rug pulls [37], [24], [40], and proposed models for detecting them. Analysis models [12], [17], [18], [26] have been proposed to detect Ponzi schemes, which is a fraudulent investment scheme where the operator promises high yields to participants by using funds from new investors. Pump-and-dump [25], [22], [44] is a manipulative practice in which attackers artificially inflate the price of a particular cryptocurrency (pump), and then quickly sell off their holdings at the inflated price (dump), leaving other investors with significant losses. Other forms of market manipulations, such as wash trading, shill bidding, and bid shielding have also been researched [20], [41], [31], [15], [39], [28], [43].

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigate the dynamics of the NFT market, and reveal the presence of sophisticated actors who employ automated, high-frequency trading strategies, including malicious or unfair practices. While many of the trading strategies applicable to ERC-20 tokens also apply to NFTs, the unique nature of the NFT market creates distinct opportunities for the threat actors. We identify three broad classes of opportunistic trading strategies, *viz.*, acquire, instant profit generation, and loss minimization. For each class, we first qualitatively analyze the strategies, and then quantify their prevalence and financial impact.

REFERENCES

- [1] Coingecko. <https://www.coingecko.com>.
- [2] Dappradar. <https://dappradar.com>.
- [3] Flash loan powered nft mev. <https://twitter.com/davidiola/status/1520688640132800513>.
- [4] Flashbots. <https://www.flashbots.net>.
- [5] Flashloan bayc arbitrage. <https://twitter.com/bertcmiller/status/1531420699700641797>.
- [6] A joint report of the sec and the cftc on harmonization of regulation. <https://www.sec.gov/news/press/2009/cftcjointreport101609.pdf>.
- [7] Margin call: What it is and how to meet one with examples. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/margincall.asp>.
- [8] New mev just dropped: @moonbirds_xyz arbitrage. <https://twitter.com/bertcmiller/status/1517278228918018049>.
- [9] Nftx. <https://nftx.io>.
- [10] Nifty. <https://niftygateway.com>.
- [11] Opensea. <https://opensea.io>.
- [12] Massimo Bartoletti, Salvatore Carta, Tiziana Cimoli, and Roberto Saia. Dissecting ponzi schemes on ethereum: Identification, analysis, and impact. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 102, 2020.
- [13] Massimo Bartoletti, James Hsin-yu Chiang, and Alberto Lluch Lafuente. Maximizing extractable value from automated market makers. In Ittay Eyal and Juan Garay, editors, *Proc. Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, 2022.
- [14] Ivan Bogaty. How we made \$100k trading cryptokitties. <https://medium.com/@ivanbogaty/how-we-made-100k-trading-cryptokitties-2d69aeb715b>.
- [15] Gianluca Bonifazi, Francesco Cauteruccio, Enrico Corradini, Michele Marchetti, Daniele Montella, Simone Scarponi, Domenico Ursino, and Luca Virgili. Performing wash trading on nfts: Is the game worth the candle? *Big Data and Cognitive Computing*, 7(1), 2023.
- [16] Nicola Borri, Yukun Liu, and Aleh Tsyvinski. The economics of non-fungible tokens. *SSRN*.
- [17] Weili Chen, Zibin Zheng, Edith C.-H. Ngai, Peilin Zheng, and Yuren Zhou. Exploiting blockchain data to detect smart ponzi schemes on ethereum. *IEEE Access*, 7, 2019.
- [18] Weimin Chen, Xinran Li, Yuting Sui, Ningyu He, Haoyu Wang, Lei Wu, and Xiapu Luo. Sadponzi: Detecting and characterizing ponzi schemes in ethereum smart contracts. *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, 5(2), 2021.
- [19] Philip Daian, Steven Goldfeder, T. Kell, Yunqi Li, Xueyuan Zhao, Iddo Bentov, Lorenz Breidenbach, and A. Juels. Flash boys 2.0: Frontrunning, transaction reordering, and consensus instability in decentralized exchanges. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2020.
- [20] Dipanjan Das, Priyanka Bose, Nicola Ruaro, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. Understanding security issues in the nft ecosystem. In *Proc. Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022.
- [21] Shayan Eskandari, Seyedehmahsa Moosavi, and Jeremy Clark. Sok: Transparent dishonesty: Front-running attacks on blockchain. In Andrea Bracciali, Jeremy Clark, Federico Pintore, Peter B. Rønne, and Massimiliano Sala, editors, *Proc. Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, 2020.
- [22] Neil Gandal, JT Hamrick, Tyler Moore, and Tali Oberman. Price manipulation in the bitcoin ecosystem. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 95, 01 2018.
- [23] Fabio Gritti, Nicola Ruaro, Robert McLaughlin, Priyanka Bose, Dipanjan Das, Ilya Grishchenko, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. Confusum Contractum: Confused Deputy Vulnerabilities in Ethereum Smart Contracts. In *Proc. USENIX Security Symposium*, 2023.
- [24] Jintao Huang, Ningyu He, Kai Ma, Jiang Xiao, and Haoyu Wang. A deep dive into nft rug pulls, 2023.
- [25] Josh Kamps and Bennett Kleinberg. To the moon: defining and detecting cryptocurrency pump-and-dumps. *Crime Science*, 7(1):18, Nov 2018.
- [26] Tyler Kell, Haaron Yousaf, Sarah Allen, Sarah Meiklejohn, and Ari Juels. Forsage: Anatomy of a smart-contract pyramid scheme. In *Proc. Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, 2021.
- [27] Kai Li, Jiaqi Chen, Xianghong Liu, Yuzhe Tang, Xiaofeng Wang, and Xiapu Luo. As strong as its weakest link: How to break blockchain dapps at rpc service. In *NDSS*, 2021.
- [28] Derek Liu, Francesco Piccoli, Katie Chen, Adrina Tang, and Victor Fang. Nft wash trading detection, 2023.
- [29] Shaurya Malwa. Did an “art heist” just happen on an ethereum cryptopunks nft? <https://cryptoslate.com/did-an-art-heist-just-happen-on-an-ethereum-cryptopunks-nft>.
- [30] Robert McLaughlin, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. A large scale study of the ethereum arbitrage ecosystem. In *Proc. USENIX Security Symposium*, 2023.
- [31] Massimo La Morgia, Alessandro Mei, Alberto Maria Mongardini, and Eugenio Nerio Nemmi. A game of nfts: Characterizing nft wash trading in the ethereum blockchain, 2023.
- [32] Daniel Perez and Ben Livshits. Smart contract vulnerabilities: Vulnerable does not imply exploited. In *30th USENIX Security*, 2021.
- [33] Julien Piet, Jaiden Fairuze, and Nicholas Weaver. Extracting godl [sic] from the salt mines: Ethereum miners extracting value, 2022.
- [34] Kaihua Qin, Liyi Zhou, Pablo Gamito, Philipp Jovanovic, and Arthur Gervais. An empirical study of defi liquidations: Incentives, risks, and instabilities. In *Proc. ACM Internet Measurement Conference*, 2021.
- [35] Kaihua Qin, Liying Zhou, and Arthur Gervais. Quantifying blockchain extractable value: How dark is the forest? *ArXiv*, abs/2101.05511, 2021.
- [36] Kaihua Qin, Liying Zhou, B. Livshits, and Arthur Gervais. Attacking the defi ecosystem with flash loans for fun and profit. In *Proc. Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, 2021.
- [37] Sayak Saha Roy, Dipanjan Das, Priyanka Bose, Christopher Kruegel, Giovanni Vigna, and Shirin Nilizadeh. Demystifying nft promotion and phishing scams, 2023.
- [38] Arijit Sarkar. Eth gas price surges as yuga labs cashes in \$300m selling otherside nfts. <https://cointelegraph.com/news/eth-gas-price-surges-as-yuga-labs-cashes-in-300m-selling-otherside-nfts>.
- [39] Sven Serneels. Detecting wash trading for nonfungible tokens. *Finance Research Letters*, 52, 2023.
- [40] Trishie Sharma, Rachit Agarwal, and Sandeep Kumar Shukla. Understanding rug pulls: An in-depth behavioral analysis of fraudulent nft creators, 2023.
- [41] Victor von Wachter, Johannes Rude Jensen, Ferdinand Regner, and Omri Ross. Nft wash trading: Quantifying suspicious behaviour in nft markets, 2022.
- [42] Ye Wang, Yan Chen, Haotian Wu, Liyi Zhou, Shuiguang Deng, and Roger Wattenhofer. Cyclic arbitrage in decentralized exchanges. In *Proc. Web Conference*, 2022.
- [43] Xiaolin Wen, Yong Wang, Xuanwu Yue, Feida Zhu, and Min Zhu. Nftdisk: Visual detection of wash trading in nft markets. In *Proc. International Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2023.
- [44] Jiahua Xu and Benjamin Livshits. The anatomy of a cryptocurrency pump-and-dump scheme. In *Proc. USENIX Security Symposium*, 2019.
- [45] Martin Young. Ethereum gas fees spike to new highs on latest nft hype. <https://beincrypto.com/ethereum-gas-fees-spike-highs-latest-nft-hype>.
- [46] yctrader. Sunday gas wars: Ethereum gas prices spike after nft frenzy. <https://thedefiant.io/drpc-launches-decentralized-rpc>.
- [47] Liyi Zhou, Kaihua Qin, Antoine Cully, Benjamin Livshits, and Arthur Gervais. On the just-in-time discovery of profit-generating transactions in defi protocols. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2021.
- [48] Liyi Zhou, Kaihua Qin, and Arthur Gervais. A2mm: Mitigating frontrunning, transaction reordering and consensus instability in decentralized exchanges, 2021.
- [49] Liyi Zhou, Kaihua Qin, C. F. Torres, D. Le, and Arthur Gervais. High-frequency trading on decentralized on-chain exchanges. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2020.

APPENDIX A
EOA / CONTRACT ADDRESSES

Entity	Purpose	Address
NULL address	Minting source	0x00000000000000000000000000000000 0x00000000000000000000000000000000
Burn address	Burn address	0x00000000000000000000000000000000 000000000000000000000000dEaD
OPENSEA v1	Marketplace	0x7Be8076f4EA4A4AD08075C2508e481d6C946D12b
OPENSEA v2	Marketplace	0x7f268357A8c2552623316e2562D90e642bB538E5
OPENSEA v3	Marketplace	0x000000000006c3852cbE f3e08E8dF289169EdE581
LOOKSRARE	Marketplace	0x59728544B08AB483533076417FbBB2fD0B17CE3a
CRYPTOPUNKS	Marketplace	0xb47e3cd837dDF8e4c57F05d70Ab865de6e193BBB
X2Y2	Marketplace	0x74312363e45DCaBA76c59ec49a7Aa8A65a67EeD3
CRYPTOKITTIES	Marketplace	0xb1690C08E213a35Ed9bAb7B318DE14420FB57d8C
NIFTY wallet	Escrow wallet	0xE052113bd7D7700d623414a0a4585BCaE754E9d5
TUBBY CATS	Minting evasion	0xCa7cA7BcC765F77339bE2d648BA53ce9c8a262bD
PRANKSY.ETH	Maximum cornering	0xD387A6E4e84a6C86bd90C158C6028A58CC8Ac459

TABLE III: Addresses of important Ethereum contracts

APPENDIX B
TRANSACTIONS

Purpose	Transaction hash
AZUKI frontrun mislisting	0xbdba2a984877706210aef7425824d62d920fb531364337731318feaa1bf4db77
AZUKI frontrun buy	0x1e8ddb7c3e1e1e37da7811e7f67ea1dae9843836cd9b4e9b4da9e92d906f93b
AZUKI frontrun buy	0x1e8ddb7c3e1e1e37da7811e7f67ea1dae9843836cd9b4e9b4da9e92d906f93b
ADIDAS ORIGINALS frontrun	0xa7f49a4a1da9d2e4e451402a66a5346f1f42c4b05e850cf175aa3e7a6dcb3e59
CLONEX frontrun buy	0xfbb69ab08428e7fa650f9cd576891b297a70c1fba208192d96b20b7db7d0107e
CLONEX sell	0x37fd9c9f80892ee64769240544c1f5d09b392a516443cd5585264afd7c62723e
SPACESHIBAS arbitrage	0x304e5959e9de78765319e5c605413fcf24fb8a4ab294c00b0e6c35e8acff9031
CRYPTOPUNKS initial listing	0xd84b86a7e1a2fc05261e1d87ed18af6362f83190f6c4da0f8569bf0eb429233b
CRYPTOPUNKS offer withdrawn	0xf24e6c0edf287368462d7ee944d50361d9ad59a132e4941d80207806fef8df0f
CRYPTOPUNKS re-listing	0x3ee0f2a2aca70a5e03ac1ef9dfe14a1e0f0c4591bd7cf5a50bc708ae5320d184
CRYPTOPUNKS sell	0x2ff97222cdf49939d690dd517706848c90c11b2f7734f15e9236095f7623f8e0
MAYC reward collection	0x62955836139fa34e8de69107b69e3f810373a188eb4d6d177f71d4bef7ae8f4d
MOONBIRDS arbitrage	0x0659a203bd7a97d497562b14aa18f5946ded50be2b14c4bbaef80f5c9c42229d
MINIMALIST HUMAN CLUB minting evasion	0x1B838af87000ef70e2efb539454893c0306eac46031836e6a94ae5241a2bf4aa

TABLE IV: Hashes of important Ethereum transactions