

# NFT Wash Trading: Direct vs. Indirect Estimation

Brett Hemenway Falk, Gerry Tsoukalas, Niuniu Zhang\*

June 5, 2024

## Abstract

Recent studies estimate around 70% of traded value on off-chain crypto exchanges like Binance is wash trading. This paper turns to NFT markets, where the on-chain nature of transactions—a key tenet of Web3 innovation—enables more direct estimation methods to be applied. Focusing on three of the largest NFT marketplaces, we find 30-40% of NFT volume and 25-95% of traded value involve wash trading. We leverage this direct approach to critically evaluate recent indirect estimation methods suggested in the literature, revealing major differences in effectiveness, with some failing altogether. Trade-roundedness filters, as suggested in [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#), emerge as the most accurate indirect estimation method. In fact, we show how direct and indirect approaches can be closely aligned via hyper-parameter fine-tuning. Our findings underscore the crucial role of technological innovation in detecting and regulating financial misconduct in digital finance.

**Keywords:** Cryptocurrency, Financial Fraud, Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs), Wash Trading

---

\*Hemenway Falk: University of Pennsylvania (fbrett@cis.upenn.edu), Tsoukalas: Boston University (geryt@bu.edu), Zhang: University of Pennsylvania (niuniu@sas.upenn.edu)

# 1 Introduction

Web3 innovations hold the promise of decentralization, enhanced security, and greater transparency, fundamentally transforming various sectors. Among these, financial applications, have arguably been at the forefront since inception. While these innovations revolutionize the financial landscape, some of their features, such as account anonymization, also introduce new challenges, including novel methods of market manipulation. However, these same technologies also offer new opportunities for detecting and preventing such manipulations. The on-chain nature of transactions, for example, enables unprecedented transparency that can be analyzed using big data analytics. This paper explores the tension between the increased transparency offered by these technologies and the evolving strategies for market manipulation they enable.

In traditional stock and commodity markets, wash trading has been deemed illegal since 1936. This malpractice involves either a single actor or a coalition of actors engaging in self-directed trades to artificially manipulate market activity, aiming to exploit these distortions for profit. The SEC rigorously polices such activities in conventional financial markets; however, cryptocurrencies remain less stringently regulated. The anonymization of accounts mentioned above allows crypto traders to manipulate the appearance of market demand by easily creating and trading between multiple anonymous accounts. Accordingly, this subject is of considerable interest and debate to regulators, practitioners, and academics ([Cong et al. 2023](#), [Decrypt 2023](#), [Bonifazi et al. 2023](#), [Morgia et al. 2023](#), [von Wachter et al. 2022](#)).

Addressing wash trading in cryptocurrencies is complex: Approximately 83.3% of crypto trades occur on private, centralized exchanges like Binance, which often conduct off-chain transactions, limiting transparency ([Shimron 2022](#)). These exchanges usually provide only basic details such as trade pair and size, without revealing trader identities, making wash trading detection challenging. Additionally, there might be little incentive for these exchanges to combat wash trading, as the resulting inflated trading volumes can be advantageous. To tackle this challenge, current research

utilizes sophisticated statistical methods for pattern recognition. Studies like (Cong et al. 2023) estimate that up to 70% of the traded value on some exchanges could be attributed to wash trading—an alarming finding. However, without access to direct wash trading data, the accuracy of such indirect approaches remains open for debate.

## Research Questions

This paper seeks to bridge this gap by focusing on a specific segment of crypto markets: Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs). These tokens are unique for their on-chain trading nature and inherent transaction transparency. NFTs are usually traded on decentralized exchanges, where every transaction is recorded on a public ledger, revealing comprehensive details including the identities (wallet addresses) of buyers and sellers. Such transparency facilitates a more direct analysis of trading patterns, better enabling the identification of practices like wash trading. Consequently, NFTs provide a distinct advantage in data transparency and pattern identification compared to traditional centralized exchanges. In particular, NFT data can help answer several interrelated questions:

First, can we leverage increased NFT transparency to establish a more direct estimation method for wash trading levels? Relatedly, what effect does wash trading have on crypto prices and trader profits? Second, and perhaps more crucially, how do more direct estimation methods compare to indirect statistical approaches used in studies like Cong et al. (2023)? Do the two methodologies align, and if discrepancies exist, is there a way to harmonize them?

## Data

We concentrated our data collection on three of the top NFT marketplaces: LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea. From these platforms, we manually amassed a comprehensive dataset encompassing all recorded transactions. Each transaction in our dataset is represented by a single row, detailing critical information such as the transaction hash, block number, NFT seller and buyer, the NFT collection, tokenId, price, and date of the transaction. Additionally, we scrapped one degree up-

stream Ether transfers for all buyers and sellers from the sales dataset to identify possible collusion. This rich dataset offers an insightful view into the NFT trading landscape, encapsulating a diverse range of transactions across numerous collections. The depth of this data, covering thousands of NFT collections and a vast number of transactions with significant total value in ETH for both platforms, offers a comprehensive basis for our analysis of wash trading practices, allowing us to observe and decipher patterns and anomalies indicative of such activities. The details are discussed in §3.

### **Direct Estimation**

Using this dataset, we apply four distinct filters to “directly” estimate wash trading in NFT markets. Filter 1 targets the simplest form of wash trading by flagging transactions where the buyer and seller are using the same wallet address, effectively identifying cases where an individual is blatantly selling an NFT to themselves. Filter 2 steps up in complexity by detecting back-and-forth trades, activated when buyer and seller identities are inverted for the same NFT in sequential transactions, pointing to a scenario where a trader uses two accounts to repeatedly trade the same NFT. Filter 3 goes further by flagging instances where the same buyer acquires the same NFT three or more times, targeting wash traders cycling an NFT through multiple accounts, with the Filter triggering when the NFT completes at least three such cycles. Finally, Filter 4 identifies cases with common upstream buyer and seller wallet addresses, indicative of a single entity controlling both sides of a transaction, such as when the same wallet funds both the initial and subsequent purchases of an NFT. These filters yield a conservative, yet likely precise, estimate of wash trading. While one could theoretically devise more complex obfuscation strategies to evade these filters, higher complexity implies higher implementation costs, which would naturally restrict their use in practice. This crucial aspect reinforces the credibility of our estimate. Accordingly, we refer to our methodology as the “direct” estimation method in this study. The details are discussed in §4.

## Indirect Estimation

We also adapted the approach developed in [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) in the context of centralized exchanges, to our NFT data set, with the objective of comparing it to our direct estimation approach. As mentioned, [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) utilized statistical tools to identify irregularities in trading patterns, particularly focusing on fungible tokens. A key aspect of their methodology is the use of roundedness in transaction amounts, Benford’s law, and tail distribution analysis as proxies for detecting wash trading. They observed roundedness clustering in transaction amounts, where legitimate trades disproportionately end in round numbers, as a significant indicator of potential wash trading. In addition to this clustering, they also quantified wash trading activities, setting a specific threshold to discern normal trading from potential manipulation. Furthermore, they applied Benford’s law to analyze the distribution of the first significant digit in transaction sizes, identifying deviations from expected patterns that could signal manipulative practices. Finally, their examination of the tail distribution of trade sizes focused on uncovering anomalies that diverged from typical market behavior, further aiding in the identification of suspect trading activities. Accordingly, we refer to such methods as “indirect” estimation methods, in our study. The details are discussed in §5.

## Results

Direct estimation flagged 163320 trades (40.66%) on LooksRare, 1431537 trades (40.86%) on Blur, and 6717283 trades (31.22%) on OpenSea as wash trades. These accounted for 95.68%, 58.16%, and 26.39% of the total trading value on their respective platforms. As a comparison, [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) reported wash trading values averaging 77.5%, with a median of 79.1%, across unregulated cryptocurrency exchanges. In particular, they found that wash trades on twelve Tier-2 (based on web traffic) exchanges exceeded 80% of the total trade value. These findings reveal considerable variations in wash trading values across different exchanges and highlight the complexities involved in detecting and quantifying such activities in various market contexts. Our research also reveals

compelling evidence that wash trading increases NFT prices, but only limited evidence that such practices lead to significant profit gains for those engaged in them.

Using these direct estimation results as a benchmark, we then adapted the *four* different indirect statistical methods used in [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#), to our NFT data. Our results are summarized below.

1. **Benford’s Law:** Benford’s Law predicts that in many natural datasets, the first digit is more likely to be small, a pattern expected in genuine financial transactions. The Benford’s Law test revealed that both wash and legitimate trades on LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea significantly deviated from Benford’s expected distribution, with  $p$ -values identically zero indicating significant differences. Surprisingly, legitimate trades displayed higher  $t$ -statistics, with 14385.70 vs 8231.39 on LooksRare, 53124.60 vs 32744.80 on Blur, and 211007.00 vs 127535.00 on OpenSea compared to wash trades, suggesting stronger deviation from Benford’s Law for legitimate trades. Thus, while Benford’s Law provides an insightful perspective, it does not effectively differentiate wash from legitimate trades in NFT marketplaces.
2. **Trade-Size Clustering:** This method assesses the clustering of trade sizes around round numbers, based on the human tendency to prefer rounded figures in financial transactions. Analysis of trade-size clustering using Student’s  $t$ -test showed significant differences between wash and legitimate trades across all platforms. All  $t$ -statistics are negative, indicating less clustering around round numbers compared to nearby unrounded numbers. Most legitimate trades had smaller absolute  $t$ -statistics compared to wash trades, indicating stronger clustering around round numbers, except for Blur, where legitimate trades in the 100 unit window had a  $t$ -statistic of -351.77 and wash trades had a  $t$ -statistic of -143.56. This analysis suggests that trade-size clustering is a highly effective method for distinguishing wash from legitimate trades, demonstrating clear differences in trading behaviors.
3. **Tail Distribution:** This method investigates whether the tail distribution of trade sizes adheres to a power-law, a common characteristic in financial data. Legitimate empirical

distribution of trade sizes in financial markets typically displays a power-law tail, characterized by a Pareto-Lévy regime with the power-law exponent  $\alpha$  in the range of 1 to 2. This pattern reflects the impact of large investors and strategic trading behaviors, making it a critical marker for analyzing market dynamics. In our study, among the six groups analyzed – Blur wash, Blur legitimate, LooksRare wash, LooksRare legitimate, OpenSea wash, and OpenSea legitimate trades – LooksRare’s wash trades (Hill exponent 1.9357), LooksRare’s legitimate trades (Hill exponent 1.9319), and Blur’s wash trades (Hill exponent 1.8675) fell within the Pareto-Lévy regime. This outcome, where only a subset conforms to expected power law behavior, is not a natural expectation for the power law test. Consequently, while the power law test of tail distribution offers valuable insights, it does not effectively differentiate between wash and legitimate trades in our analysis.

- 4. Trade-Size Roundedness:** This method evaluates the roundedness of trade sizes, with the hypothesis that wash trades will exhibit a lower level of roundedness. On Blur, the roundedness test flagged 2220503 trades (63.38%) as wash trades, with an accuracy of 48.77% compared to 1431537 trades (40.86%) from direct estimation. On LooksRare, it flagged 328890 trades (81.89%), with an accuracy of 44.89% compared to 163320 trades (40.66%) from direct estimation. On OpenSea, it flagged 16547683 trades (76.92%), with an accuracy of 39.21% compared to 6717283 trades (31.22%) from direct estimation. Thus, the roundedness test demonstrated moderate effectiveness, with results partially aligning with those from the direct estimation.

Our investigation into indirect statistical methods for detecting wash trading contributes to a broader understanding of market dynamics, applicable beyond just NFT markets. While the Benford test showed limited effectiveness, this insight is valuable for refining statistical methods across trading platforms for various financial assets. The effectiveness of trade-size clustering underscores the universality of human behavioral patterns in trading contexts. Furthermore, our analysis chal-

lenges the standard application of the Pareto-Lévy regime for power-law tails, suggesting a need for adaptable approaches in diverse market environments.

Notably, we observed key trends and optimization challenges in our application of trade-size roundedness as an indirect method for quantifying wash trading. The method, when applied with a default 1% threshold as used by [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#), yielded accuracies of 44.89% for LooksRare, 48.77% for Blur, and 39.21% for OpenSea. However, our analysis revealed that adjusting the roundness level threshold significantly impacts the accuracy. As the roundness threshold increases, the response of other metrics such as precision, recall, and fallout is not linear but exhibits a quadratic trend. This indicates a complex, non-monotonic relationship between the threshold setting and these metrics, with precision decreasing and both recall and fallout increasing in a curved pattern. This complexity in the metric responses highlights the importance of a nuanced approach to setting the roundness threshold for effective wash trade detection. Intriguingly, setting the threshold to zero so that all transactions are flagged as legitimate trades, an extreme and theoretically trivial case, resulted in an accuracy around 60% for all platforms, highlighting the sensitivity of this method to parameter settings. These findings, while pointing to the effectiveness of the roundedness test, also emphasize the need for careful calibration of hyper-parameters to ensure meaningful detection of wash trading across different markets.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we review prior work, setting the stage for our own investigations. Section 3 describes our data and summary statistics. Section 4 details our direct estimation methodology, where we introduce and describe four unique filters developed to identify wash trading behaviors, and presents the results of applying these direct estimation methods. In Section 5, we apply and analyze the effectiveness of [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#)'s indirect statistical methods in the context of NFT markets, offering a comparative perspective. The paper culminates in Section 6, where we discuss our findings in depth, reflecting on the complexities of the NFT market and the implications of our research for future studies and regulatory interventions.



## 2 Prior Work

Illicit market behaviors like wash trading on cryptocurrency exchanges and NFT marketplaces have attracted substantial academic interest. Initially scrutinized in traditional financial market settings, studies like those by [Mao et al. \(2015\)](#), [Cao et al. \(2014\)](#), [Zitzewitz \(2012\)](#), [O’Hara et al. \(2014\)](#) have laid the foundation for understanding market deceptions. These seminal works span from recognizing fraudulent transactions in monetary networks to examining the impact of odd-lot trades in equity markets, offering crucial perspectives on market scheming and the development of detection methods in financial trading environments.

Building upon these foundational studies, [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) introduce systematic tests for detecting fake transactions in cryptocurrency exchanges, which we apply to our own NFT dataset. Their findings highlight the prevalence of wash trading in unregulated markets, with over 70% of the traded value on such exchanges attributed to this practice.

Close to our work, [Aloosh and Li \(2024\)](#) investigate Bitcoin wash trading using leaked Mt.Gox internal transaction logs, which allow for direct estimation leveraging the availability of leaked trader identities. They first establish a lower bound of wash-trading estimation by defining wash trades as self-self transactions, evaluate indirect estimation methods, including those implemented by [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#), and then propose novel approaches to identify hidden wash trades. Our study contributes to these results, by employing a more comprehensive set of direct filters on public NFT data, without relying on trader identities. Key among the new tests we introduce is our trade-size roundedness test which is not considered in their analysis. We find that with proper fine-tuning, this test is significantly more accurate than all others in our NFT setting.<sup>1</sup>

[Bonifazi et al. \(2023\)](#) analyze the profitability of wash trading in NFTs, [Morgia et al. \(2023\)](#) investigate the exploitation of token reward systems of NFT trading platforms, and [von Wachter](#)

---

<sup>1</sup>More specifically: [Aloosh and Li \(2024\)](#) consider trade-size clustering which evaluates the frequency of trades occurring at round numbers (e.g., sales amount in multiples of 100, such as 50, 100, 150) within a specified window. In contrast, the trade-size roundedness we employ assesses the roundness of each transaction by comparing the least significant digit of sales amount to a threshold (e.g., 1% of its value). This transactional-level test can indirectly identify wash trades based only on sales amounts, without reference to trader identity.

[et al. \(2022\)](#) quantify suspicious behavior in NFT markets. Compared to all these works, our study extends the existing literature by providing a comprehensive comparison of direct and indirect methods for detecting wash trading. This approach allows us to offer new insights into the effectiveness of these methods in various market contexts, not limited to NFTs, thereby contributing to a broader understanding of market dynamics.

Regarding general NFT market studies, [Huang and Goetzmann \(2023\)](#) explore the behavioral bias of selection-neglect and its interaction with market dynamics during the NFT bubble. [Fridgen et al. \(2023\)](#) examine the herding behavior towards “blue-chip” NFTs, shedding light on factors influencing NFT pricing and market liquidity.

We aim to extend this body of work by offering new insights and analyses on wash trading across financial markets, beyond the NFT marketplaces. Our study is distinguished by conducting a comprehensive comparison of direct and indirect wash trading detection methods. This comparison reveals that not all indirect methods are equally effective across different market types, highlighting the necessity of fine-tuning these methods according to specific market dynamics for accurate detection.

### 3 Data Collection

Our study focuses on the NFT marketplaces LooksRare and Blur, selected due to their significant and different roles in the NFT market. As of May 2024, OpenSea held the number one position by all-time volume with \$36.9 billion, followed by Blur with \$10.54 billion, and LooksRare in third place with \$4.86 billion.<sup>2</sup> This selection is particularly relevant for analyzing different aspects of NFT wash trading: LooksRare is known for its problematic token reward system, which has been criticized for paving the way to severe wash trading, whereas a reward system is absent in OpenSea ([Morgia et al. 2023](#)). Blur’s program, more focused on user loyalty and platform engagement, offers a contrasting perspective ([Barter 2023](#)).

---

<sup>2</sup><https://dappradar.com/rankings/nft/marketplaces?range=all>

We obtained transaction data of LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea through the Alchemy getNFTSales API. For LooksRare, our data covers all transactions from 11:04, December 29th, 2021 to 07:56, April 13th, 2023. For Blur, our data covers all transactions from 04:49, October 19th, 2022 to 17:14, March 7th, 2024. For OpenSea, our data covers all transactions from 19:57, February 18th, 2022 to 13:46, March 20th, 2024. In these datasets, each transaction is represented by a single row, with the schema detailed as follows:

- **Transaction hash:** A unique identifier for the transaction on the blockchain.
- **Block number:** The specific block on the blockchain where the transaction is recorded.
- **NFT seller:** The address of the individual or entity selling the NFT.
- **NFT buyer:** The address of the individual or entity purchasing the NFT.
- **NFT collection:** The specific collection to which the NFT belongs.
- **NFT tokenId:** A unique identifier for the specific NFT within its collection.
- **Price:** The sale price of the NFT, denominated in ETH.
- **Date:** The date and time when the transaction occurred.

The datasets from LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea exchanges are substantial. The Blur exchange dataset occupies 1.4 GB and comprises 3503420 transactions, the LooksRare dataset is 194.2 MB with 401636 transactions, and the OpenSea dataset is 10.6 GB with 21514100 transactions. These datasets were obtained through the Alchemy getNFTSales API. For data cleaning, the direct outputs from Alchemy for Blur and LooksRare are ready as is. However, for OpenSea, we combined transactions from both the Seaport and Wyvern protocols and excluded the 0.39% of transactions not conducted in ETH-type currencies (e.g., ETH, wETH) to ensure consistency in our analysis.

To identify potential collusions between NFT traders (buyer and seller), we collected one degree upstream transfers of all NFT traders per platform using Alchemy’s getAssetTransfers API. For each marketplace, we specified the to address as this marketplace’s unique trader, set fromBlock to be well before the marketplace’s contract deployment date, and toBlock to be well after the last transaction in the marketplace’s sales data. To err on the conservative side, we limited the transfers


to be of “external” type, i.e., Ether transfers from Externally Owned Accounts (EOAs).<sup>3</sup>

The resulting upstream dataset per marketplace includes schemas that contain “to” (unique buyers and sellers from the marketplace sales dataset) and all the “from” EOAs who sent Ether, and Ether only, to these traders. The upstream data sizes are 1.6 GB for Blur, 2.3 GB for LooksRare, and 14 GB for OpenSea, with a total of 6,961,436 Ether transfers for Blur, 10,100,725 Ether transfers for LooksRare, and 56,845,125 Ether transfers for OpenSea.


In total, we identified 9474 NFT collections on LooksRare, 7495 NFT collections on Blur, and 42442 NFT collections on OpenSea. Figure 1a shows a histogram of total sale value per collection on LooksRare, Figure 1b shows a histogram of total sales value per collection on Blur, and Figure 1c shows a histogram of total sales value per collection on OpenSea. The figures exclude any outlier collections that amassed total sale value above the 99th percentile - 741.78 ETH on LooksRare, 3319.01 ETH on Blur, and 1759.13 ETH on OpenSea respectively. Each bin of histograms represents an even 1/100 intervals from 0 to 99th percentile of total sale value.

---


<sup>3</sup><https://docs.alchemy.com/reference/transfers-api-quickstart#types-of-transfers>



(a) Histogram of total sales per NFT collection on LooksRare. This plot excludes outlier collections (those in the top 1%).



(b) Histogram of total sales per NFT collection on Blur. This plot excludes outlier collections (those in the top 1%).



(c) Histogram of total sales per NFT collection on OpenSea. This plot excludes outlier collections (those in the top 1%).

Figure 1: Comparison of total sales per collection between LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea NFT marketplaces.

These histograms illustrate the distribution of total sales per NFT collection on LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea, with each bar representing a range of sales in ETH. The height of each bar reflects the number of collections within that sales range, displayed on a logarithmic scale. This scale choice allows for a comprehensive view of sales distributions across diverse value ranges, making it easier to observe and compare patterns across the spectrum. The exclusion of the top 1% of collections is a deliberate choice to prevent scale distortion from exceptionally high sales, thus offering a clearer, more focused comparison across the broader range of collections. This

representation is designed to enable the identification of general sales trends and potential outliers within the data.

The histograms for all three platforms display a distribution that is heavily skewed to the left, indicating that a majority of NFT collections fall into the lower sales value category. This suggests that while there are a large number of NFT collections available on both platforms, the bulk of these collections are what might be termed “small fish,” with only a few reaching higher sales value. LooksRare and Blur show sparser distributions towards the right, while OpenSea appears “smoother” due to its significantly higher trade count of 21514100 compared to 3503420 for Blur and 401636 for LooksRare. This concentration in the lower end of the sales spectrum illustrates the long-tail nature of NFT collections in these marketplaces.

A technical note: transactions on LooksRare involve trading NFT for Ether. OpenSea includes sales done in Ether, Wrapped Ether, and other ERC20 tokens. Blur involves a mixture of Ether, Wrapped Ether (wETH), as well as their own Blur Pool token.<sup>4</sup> Like wrapped Ether, Blur pool tokens can be minted by depositing ETH, and redeemed for ETH in the pool. Since all three tokens (ETH, wETH, and Blur Pool Tokens) trade at the same valuation, we can treat all payments as being in Ether. Our LooksRare data set has 401636 transactions that amounts to a total value of 10026162.88 ETH. As for the Blur data set, it has 3503420 transactions that amounts to a total value of 3507602.25 ETH. Our OpenSea dataset, after filtering to include only sales done in Ether, wETH, and Blur Pool Tokens, resulted in 21514100 transactions (99.61% of the raw OpenSea sales data) amounting to 5910280.56 ETH.

## 4 Direct Estimation

In developing our direct estimator for wash trading, we started from four basic filters, and adapted them to the NFT setting. We discuss each in detail next.

---

<sup>4</sup>Blur implements its own token to reduce gas costs when interacting with the Blur exchange contract.

## 4.1 Wash Trading Filters

Figure 2 provides a visual representation of the four filters, and Table 1 summarizes them.




Figure 2: The four wash-trading filters.

Filter	Function
1	Buyer = Seller
2	Back & Forth Trades
3	Bought same NFTs 3 times or more
4	Funded by same wallet

Table 1: The four filters used to identify wash trading

Filter 1 flags trades where the buyer and seller account is one and the same – this is the most naïve form of wash-trading – literally selling the NFT to oneself.

Filter 2 detects back and forth trades, meaning, if buyer and seller are inverted for the same exact NFT, then Filter 2 will be triggered. This is intended to flag slightly more sophisticated wash trading activity, where the wash trader has created two accounts and sells the same NFT back and forth between these two accounts. It gets triggered even when there is just one instance of inversion between buyer and seller identities for the exact same NFT. This means if an NFT is sold from Address  $A$  to Address  $B$ , and then subsequently sold back from Address  $B$  to Address  $A$ , Filter 2 would identify this as a potential wash trade.

Filter 3 flags trades where the same buyer purchased the same NFT, three or more times. Imag-

ine a slightly more sophisticated wash trader, who generates multiple (more than two) accounts, and trades a single NFT between these accounts in a cycle. Unlike Filter 2, which flags direct back-and-forth trades between two accounts, Filter 3 identifies circular trading patterns involving three or more accounts. Filter 3 will flag this activity as wash trading, if the NFT passes around the cycle at least three times. For example, if an NFT is first sold to Buyer *A*, who then sells it to Buyer *B*, and Buyer *B* subsequently sells it to Buyer *C*, who then completes the loop by selling it back to Buyer *A*, this Filter would flag the activity when Buyer *A* acquires the NFT for the third time. This cycle could involve numerous parties and is designed to detect complex wash trading schemes where a single entity might be operating multiple accounts to simulate a closed loop of trades.

Finally, Filter 4 detects transactions with a common upstream wallet that has funded both the buyer and seller, indicating potential control over both sides of the trade. In our dataset, we analyze the transfer history up to one degree upstream for both buyers and sellers. This means, for example, if Wallet *A* sells an NFT to Wallet *B*, the Filter checks if there is a Wallet *C* that previously transferred funds (Ether only) to both Wallet *A* and Wallet *B*. The presence of such a common upstream wallet suggests a single entity may be orchestrating the trade from behind the scenes, using different wallets to create the illusion of a genuine transaction.

When implementing these filters, we have to make a decision about granularity. For example, in Filter 2, when we say “the same” NFT was traded back and forth between, does the same NFT mean the same NFT contract (e.g. Bored Apes) or the same exact NFT (e.g. Bored Ape #3401). We can ask a similar question for Filter 3 as well. For Filter 2, we consider a typical wash trader would buy and sell from same NFT collections back and forth, but not necessarily the same token. Thus, we set Filter 2 at the collection level. For Filter 3, since it is reasonable for an legitimate trader to buy multiple tokens from the same collection, we impose Filter 3 up to token level so as not to over-estimate the number of wash trades.

To mitigate potential false positives in Filter 4, which identifies common upstream wallets, we



exclude *all* contract addresses. This targeted approach, described in the Data section (Section 3), focuses on Ether transfers involving Externally-Owned Accounts (EOAs) only to accurately isolate wash trading. While this method yields a conservative estimate by excluding other type of transfers, e.g., ERC20 tokens transfers, it reflects common wash trading practices where Ether is typically used to cover gas and transaction costs. By focusing only on EOAs, it also prevents the type of false-positives that could arise from common contracts like wETH or on-chain exchanges. For instance, if both buyer and seller minted Wrapped Ether (wETH), they would have received a “payment” from the wETH smart contract. Similarly, if both parties sold NFTs on OpenSea before transacting on LooksRare, they could mistakenly be flagged due to payments from OpenSea’s contract. Since wETH and OpenSea’s exchange are *contracts*, they would be excluded by our filter.

## 4.2 Direct Estimation Results

In this section, we establish our benchmark results and general statistics stemming from the “direct” estimation method. We applied the aforementioned filters on our LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea datasets. The results are summarized in Tables 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

On LooksRare, Filter 1 only flagged 57 trades, whereas Filter 4 flagged 147006 trades as wash trades. In total, filters 1 through 4 collectively identified 163320 wash trades, which is not simply the sum of the individual filters’ results. This is because a single transaction may meet the criteria of multiple filters, and the last line in the table represents any transaction flagged by at least one of these filters (logical OR). Therefore, 40.66% of wash trades on LooksRare contributed 95.68% of the value in ETH.

On Blur, Filter 1 flagged the least, 5239 trades, while Filter 4 flagged the most, 1244360 trades. Here, the combination of filters 1 through 4 caught 1431537 trades, with 40.86% of transactions accounting for 58.16% of the value. Again, this cumulative count is due to the application of a logical OR across the filters, leading to a non-summative total as transactions could be flagged by multiple filters.

On OpenSea, Filter 1 identified 2379 trades as wash trades, while Filter 4 flagged 5574336 trades. Collectively, filters 1 through 4 flagged 6717283 trades, where 31.22% of the flagged wash trades contributed 26.39% of the total value. This overall count, like the others, is the result of a logical OR operation, meaning any transaction flagged by at least one filter is included in the total, preventing a simple sum of the individual filter results.

The notable discrepancy in wash trade value between LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea, 95.68% versus 58.16% and 26.39%, despite having a similar fraction of wash trades (40.66% on LooksRare, 40.86% on Blur, and 31.22% on OpenSea), can be contextualized through the insights from [Morgia et al. \(2023\)](#). Their study of the NFT ecosystem on Ethereum indicates that LooksRare, despite processing fewer transactions, specializes in higher-value NFTs. This emphasis on more expensive assets is a key factor contributing to the stark difference in wash trade value observed.

<b>Filters</b>	<b>Wash Trades %</b>	<b>Wash Value %</b>	<b>Count</b>
1	0.01%	0.05%	57
2	7.51%	92.6%	30171
3	8.91%	88.46%	35770
4	36.6%	80.19%	147006
1, 2, 3, and 4	40.66%	95.68%	163320

Table 2: Wash trading filters for LooksRare. The last row represents transactions flagged by any of Filters 1, 2, 3, or 4 (logical OR). This means a transaction is flagged if it satisfies the criteria of at least one of these filters.

<b>Filters</b>	<b>Wash Trades %</b>	<b>Wash Value %</b>	<b>Count</b>
1	0.15%	0.36%	5239
2	7.2%	27.2%	252204
3	5.17%	23.56%	181240
4	35.52%	38.47%	1244360
1, 2, 3, and 4	40.86%	58.16%	1431537

Table 3: Wash trading filters for Blur. The last row combines the results of Filters 1, 2, 3, and 4 using a logical OR function, flagging any transaction that meets at least one filter’s criteria.


<b>Filters</b>	<b>Wash Trades %</b>	<b>Wash Value %</b>	<b>Count</b>
1	0.01%	0.0%	2379
2	0.56%	0.71%	120910
3	6.89%	5.1%	1483348
4	25.91%	22.43%	5574336
1, 2, 3, and 4	31.22%	26.39%	6717283

Table 4: Wash trading filters for OpenSea. The last row combines the results of Filters 1, 2, 3, and 4 using a logical OR function, flagging any transaction that meets at least one filter’s criteria.


### **Does wash trading drive up NFT prices?**

A question that follows is whether wash trading drives up NFT prices—specifically, median prices per collection. Given the high variance between top and bottom collections in total sales, it is sensible to measure each collection by their median sold price instead of the total sum of sales. Similar to total sales per collection, median price per collection exhibits concentration on the lower end—19.13 ETH achieves the 99th percentile on LooksRare, 7.37 ETH for Blur, and 2.74 ETH for OpenSea. Yet the single top collection went for 11307.24 ETH, 187.0 ETH, and 2000.0 ETH on LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea respectively.


In our study, we sub-sampled NFT collections into two groups: those involved in wash trading and those not involved. For each group, we calculated the median sale price for every NFT collection, which entails accounting for the various tokens traded from that collection. Excluding the outlier median price beyond the 99th percentile, we obtain the following results shown in Figure 3.



(a) LooksRare median price per collection



(b) Blur median price per collection



(c) OpenSea median price per collection

Figure 3: Comparison of median prices per collection between LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea NFT marketplaces.


The histograms display the distribution of median sales prices for NFT collections, categorized by whether the trades were identified as wash trading (purple bars) or legitimate trading (yellow bars). Prices are shown on a logarithmic scale to more clearly present the wide range of values. Collections with median prices in the top 1% are excluded to prevent skewing the distribution. These visualizations help illustrate the difference in pricing behavior between suspected wash trades and legitimate transactions across the two marketplaces.

The histograms for LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea reveal that NFT collections involved in wash trading typically exhibit higher median sales prices compared to legitimate trading collections, with

this trend more pronounced on Blur. Once we had these median prices for every collection in a group, we then calculated the overall median of these median prices. For collections involved in wash trading, the median of the median sale prices was 0.0333 ETH on LooksRare, 0.0189 ETH on Blur, and 0.0192 ETH on OpenSea. In contrast, collections not involved in wash trading had median sale prices of 0.0395 ETH on LooksRare, 0.0131 ETH on Blur, and 0.018 ETH on OpenSea. This suggests that wash trading may play a role in elevating the perceived value of NFT collections, impacting the median sale price across different tokens within these collections.

### Does wash trading increase wash trader profits?

Given wash trading seems to lead to increased median prices, it naturally follows to ask whether this activity actually increases the profit of wash traders? To help answer this question, we collapsed the wash traders into groups based on their connectivity through trades. Since wash trading usually takes more than one wallet, we group buyer and seller as one entity if their transaction is flagged as wash trading. Filtering through every transaction, eventually we obtained a complete list of disjoint wash trading groups. To illustrate, consider the following toy example involving 3 traders and 2 transactions. Suppose there are traders  $A, B$ , and  $C$ , in which the transaction from  $A$  to  $B$  is flagged as wash trade and the one from  $B$  to  $C$  is not.



In this case, trader  $A$  and  $B$  are both considered to be wash traders and a single wash trading group that either makes a profit or takes a loss through their transaction with legitimate trader  $C$ . To calculate the profit, we gather the revenue and expense of each trader and wash group.

We collapsed 64465 wash traders on LooksRare into 6643 disjoint wash trading groups. As for Blur, 115174 wash traders were categorized into 2007 wash groups. Similarly, on OpenSea, 942034

wash traders were grouped into 13194 disjoint wash trading groups. Excluding the traders who took a loss and those with profits over the 99th percentile to avoid extreme values, Figure 4 compares the wash trading group to legitimate trader profits:





Figure 4: Comparison of trader profit distribution between LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea NFT marketplaces.

These histograms visualize the profits earned by traders involved in wash trading versus those engaging in legitimate trading across both platforms. In each histogram, the x-axis represents the profit range in ETH, while the y-axis shows the number of traders or wash trading groups on a logarithmic scale, enabling a clear comparison of the frequency of profit amounts.

The histograms reveal that, across various profit brackets, wash traders do not consistently

secure higher profits when compared to their legitimate counterparts. This visual evidence is corroborated by empirical data.

On LooksRare, the median profit for wash trading groups is approximately zero ETH, with a maximum profit reaching 69398.18 ETH. In contrast, legitimate traders attain a higher median profit of 0.01672 ETH and achieve up to 9861.77 ETH at the higher end.

On Blur, wash trading groups achieve a median profit close to zero ETH, with their most profitable outcomes peaking at 107.55 ETH. This is lower than the median profit for legitimate traders, which stands at 0.014515 ETH, and legitimate traders also reach much more substantial maximum profits of 5647.13 ETH.

On OpenSea, both wash trading groups and legitimate traders achieve a median profit close to zero ETH. However, legitimate traders can achieve significantly higher maximum profits, reaching up to 124374.95 ETH, compared to wash trading groups with a maximum profit of 2891.45 ETH. These findings suggest that while wash trading may influence market dynamics, it does not necessarily result in greater profitability for those who engage in it.<sup>5</sup>

## Summary of Direct Estimation Findings

As a summary, the application of direct estimation filters across LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea data yields the following key insights:

- (R1) Wash trading is identified as a percentage of total trades 40.66% on LooksRare, 40.86% on Blur, and 31.22% on OpenSea; yet these trades contribute disproportionately to the total value, accounting for 95.68%, 58.16%, and 26.39% of the value in ETH, respectively.
- (R2) NFT collections implicated in wash trading typically show higher median sales prices when compared to legitimate trading collections, with a more noticeable discrepancy observed on Blur. This indicates a potential influence of wash trading on inflating NFT collection values.

---

<sup>5</sup>Note, the direct filters discussed in this section are rooted in practice, e.g., as discussed in a post by [Hildobby \(2022\)](#), but we are not aware of any peer-reviewed work analyzing the relationship of filter-based estimation methods, to indirect estimation methods.

(R3) Wash trading activities do not guarantee higher profits. Data reveals that wash traders do not consistently outperform legitimate traders in terms of profit margins.

## 5 Indirect Estimation

As mentioned in the introduction, the indirect statistical methods developed in [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) were designed to identify crypto wash trading on *centralized* exchanges. In particular, they applied four distinct methods - Benford’s Law, Trade-Size Clustering, Tail Distribution, and Trade-Size Roundedness, each providing binary outcomes (yes/no) on the presence of anomalies, with only Trade-Size Roundedness quantifying the actual fraction of wash value. Here, we adapt these methods and tailor them to our NFT dataset. Our main objective is to contrast the results obtained using indirect estimation with those obtained using direct estimation in Section 4.

### 5.1 Benford’s Law

Benford’s Law, also known as the First-Digit Law, is a statistical principle that predicts the frequency distribution of the first digits in numerical datasets. Specifically, it posits that in many naturally occurring collections of numbers, the leading digit is likely to be small. For example, the number 1 will appear as the leading digit about 30% of the time, while larger numbers like 9 will appear as the first digit less frequently, about 5% of the time.

In a genuinely random set of financial figures, such as stock prices, transaction amounts, or accounting data, the distribution of first digits should conform to Benford’s distribution. If the data significantly deviates from what Benford’s Law predicts, it may suggest that the numbers have been manipulated or that there are artificial forces influencing the market, such as price fixing or wash trading.

We extracted the first significant number of each NFT price (e.g. 1 for 0.125 ETH), then apply the Benford law test on 6 groups of sub-samples: wash and legitimate trades of LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea flagged by our 4 filters. The null hypothesis is that the empirical distribution of



the first significant digit of traded prices should follow Benford's law. We set  $\alpha = 0.05$  to be the probability of making a Type I error, that is, incorrectly concluding the empirical distribution does not follow Benford's law. Our results are illustrated in Figures 5, 6, and 7.




Figure 5: Distribution comparison of first significant digits in prices for LooksRare wash and legitimate trades.





Figure 6: Distribution comparison of first significant digits in prices for Blur wash and legitimate trades.



(a) OpenSea Wash Trades (b) OpenSea Legitimate Trades

Figure 7: Distribution comparison of first significant digits in prices for OpenSea wash and legitimate trades.

In these visualizations, the black bars denote the empirical distribution of the first significant digit in the datasets, contrasting with the red dots that represent the expected distribution according to Benford’s Law. A deviation from the red dots visually indicates a potential non-conformity with Benford’s Law. The graphs also include a  $p$ -value, which mathematically quantifies the likelihood of the empirical distribution occurring if Benford’s Law were indeed the governing rule; a lower  $p$ -value signals a statistically notable divergence. Additionally, the  $t$ -statistic is included as a numerical measure of this deviation’s extent: higher values correspond to a more significant departure from the expected Benford distribution.

For LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea, both wash and legitimate trades showed significantly low  $p$ -values (all zero), indicating a notable deviation from Benford’s Law for all categories. Surprisingly, legitimate trades registered higher  $t$ -statistics than wash trades on all platforms. These results indicate that Benford’s Law, while a valid tool in numerous contexts, does not seem to apply effectively in our setting.

This contrasts with the findings in Cong et al. (2023) where regulated exchanges consistently conformed to Benford’s Law, while many unregulated exchanges, particularly those classified as Tier-2 by web traffic, displayed significant deviations from it.

## 5.2 Trade-Size Clustering

Trade-Size clustering is based on the idea that legitimate traders prefer round numbers in trade sizes, which reflects a broader behavioral pattern in financial markets aimed at minimizing negotiation efforts and transaction costs. Such clustering also serves as a cognitive simplification strategy, with traders opting for round figures as intuitive benchmarks in decision-making processes. Adapting [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#)'s methodology to our context, we examine trade-size clustering in the NFT prices, where NFTs are traded for ETH. To maintain consistency with the original method's focus on meaningful round trade sizes, the base unit for our analysis is set in 0.001 ETH. We specifically look for clustering at multiples of 100 base units of ETH to discern patterns that may distinguish between legitimate and algorithm-driven wash trading behaviors. Figures 8, 9, and 10 illustrate our findings.




Figure 8: Trade-size clustering analysis for LooksRare wash and legitimate trades.




Figure 9: Trade-size clustering analysis for Blur wash and legitimate trades.




Figure 10: Trade-size clustering analysis for OpenSea wash and legitimate trades.

These histograms represent the frequency of trade sizes, plotted on a logarithmic scale. The blue bars indicate the count of trades at each size interval, while red bars highlight trade sizes that are multiples of 100s, aiding in the visual detection of patterns. Regular peaks at these intervals could suggest a propensity for trades to cluster around round numbers, which may be characteristic of either manual trading preferences or algorithmic trading activity. Differences between wash and legitimate trades could indicate manipulative practices in the former.

Note, in these visualizations, a constant cutoff of 1000 base units (x-axis) was implemented for

all trade sizes data on LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea. The bins start from 0 base unit upwards to 1000 base units with 10 as increment. We highlight every bin that sits at the multiple of 100 base units to illustrate the clustering effect. For LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea, it is evident that neither wash trades nor legitimate trades exhibit a strong clustering effect around multiples of 100s.

To further quantify the effect of trade-size clustering, we reproduce [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#)'s Student's  $t$ -test on our trading data sets, in which the test statistic is calculated as:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu_0}{s/\sqrt{n}} \quad (1)$$

where  $\bar{x}$  denotes the average of rounded trade frequencies minus unrounded frequencies,  $s$  is the sample standard deviation and  $n$  is the sample size. [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) computed trade frequency of a given trade size based on two sets of observation windows: windows centered on multiples of 100 units (100X) with radius of 50 units (100X-50, 100X+50), and windows centered on multiples of 500 units (500X) with radius of 100 units (500X-100, 500X+100).

Given the set of windows, say (100X-50, 100X+50), trade frequency is defined to be the number of transaction with size  $i$  over the total transaction numbers in (100X-50, 100X+50). We consider trade sizes as multiple of 100s or 500s, depending on observation windows, to be round. Any other trade sizes within the same window are considered to be unrounded.

Similarly, our null hypothesis of the test is that the difference between frequencies at rounded numbers and nearby unrounded trades is zero. Consider the results of the  $t$ -stats of each sub-sample:

	Windows in 100s	Windows in 500s
<b>LooksRare wash</b>	-16.46	-24.00
<b>LooksRare legitimate</b>	-8.53	-11.06
<b>Blur wash</b>	-143.56	-27.51
<b>Blur legitimate</b>	-351.77	-16.16
<b>OpenSea wash</b>	-246.86	-114.11
<b>OpenSea legitimate</b>	-4.04	-1.56

Table 5:  $t$ -statistics for trade size clustering in 100 and 500 unit windows

Across all sub-samples,  $t$ -statistics are all negative, indicating that trades at round numbers are less frequent than those at nearby unrounded numbers. The magnitude of the absolute  $t$ -statistics reflects the strength of this effect: larger absolute values suggest a stronger deviation from clustering around round numbers, while smaller absolute values indicate a weaker deviation.

On LooksRare, the negative  $t$ -statistics with moderate magnitude for both wash and legitimate trades in both the 100 and 500 unit windows indicate that trades at round numbers are less frequent than those at nearby unrounded numbers. Wash trades have  $t$ -statistics of  $-16.46$  and  $-24.00$  for the 100 and 500 unit windows, while legitimate trades have  $t$ -statistics of  $-8.53$  and  $-11.06$  respectively. This suggests that both wash and legitimate trades on LooksRare do not exhibit strong clustering around round numbers, with legitimate trades showing slightly less deviation from clustering compared to wash trades.

On Blur, the  $t$ -statistics show a stronger avoidance of round numbers for both wash and legitimate trades, particularly in the 100 unit window. Wash trades exhibit  $t$ -statistics of  $-143.56$  and  $-27.51$  for the 100 and 500 unit windows, respectively, while legitimate trades have  $t$ -statistics of  $-351.77$  and  $-16.16$ . These results suggest that trades on Blur, whether wash or legitimate, tend to avoid round numbers. However, it's worth noting that legitimate trades showed a much more pronounced avoidance in the 100 unit window.

On OpenSea, the  $t$ -statistics also reflect an avoidance of round numbers for both wash and legitimate trades, with wash trades having  $t$ -statistics of  $-246.86$  and  $-114.11$  for the 100 and 500 unit windows respectively, and legitimate trades showing  $t$ -statistics of  $-4.04$  and  $-1.56$ . This indicates that OpenSea trades generally avoid round numbers, but the effect is less pronounced in legitimate trades, especially in the larger 500 unit window.

These results suggest that while both wash and legitimate trades generally avoid round numbers, legitimate trades exhibit a weaker avoidance. The exception is Blur in the 100 unit window, where wash trades show a lesser degree of avoidance.

Our results represent an interesting parallel to those of [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#). While their study

found consistent clustering around round numbers in regulated exchanges, analogous to our legitimate trades, our findings indicate a general avoidance of round numbers across both wash and legitimate trades. Notably, legitimate traders tend to avoid round numbers less than wash traders, except on Blur in the 100 unit window where wash trades show less clustering avoidance. This divergence may reflect different trading strategies or a mix of algorithmic and human trading activities, which is a level of detail not distinctly addressed in [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#)’s study.

### 5.3 Tail Distribution

The tail distribution test acknowledges that distributions within economic and financial domains, including cryptocurrency markets, often display “fat tails”, which are aptly described by power-law distributions. Such distributions are mathematically characterized by their Cumulative Density Function (CDF), denoted as

$$P(X > x) \sim x^{-\alpha} \tag{2}$$

where  $\alpha$  represents the power-law exponent. This framework effectively captures the increased probability of encountering extreme trade size values. The prevalence of power-law tails in financial datasets is frequently linked to the trading activities of large investors, who typically engage in substantial volume transactions while striving to mitigate their impact on the market. This observation is consistent with theories suggesting that trade size distributions are shaped by the strategic decisions of these significant market players, as well as by other contributory factors such as limited information regarding asset valuation and herding behavior among investors.

To adapt this methodology to our NFT datasets, we truncate data points below the 90th percentile and then estimate the tail exponent of the power law distribution,  $\hat{\alpha}$ , through both Ordinary Least Square (OLS) and Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) using the Hill estimator. The resulting exponents,  $\hat{\alpha}_{\text{OLS}}$  and  $\hat{\alpha}_{\text{Hill}}$ , are expected to fall within the Pareto-Lévy regime ( $1 < \alpha < 2$ ) for traditional financial assets and Bitcoin that do not have explicit market manipulation. Deviation from such a regime is considered to be anomalous. Our results are illustrated in Figures 11,

12, and 13.




Figure 11: Comparison of trade-size tail distributions for LooksRare wash and legitimate trades




Figure 12: Comparison of trade-size tail distributions for Blur wash and legitimate trades






Figure 13: Comparison of trade-size tail distributions for OpenSea wash and legitimate trades

The plots depict trade sizes against their respective probability densities on a log-log scale. Blue dots represent empirical data for the top 10% of trade sizes, highlighting the tail of the distribution. The red line is the fit from Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), and the black line is the fit from Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) using the Hill estimator. Steeper slopes on these lines correspond to higher values of the power-law exponent, indicating “thinner tails”, whereas shallower slopes indicate “fatter tails”, characteristic of larger trades having a higher likelihood. Comparing the fits to the empirical data points provides insight into the conformity of trade-size distributions to expected power-law behavior in the absence of manipulation.

	$\hat{\alpha}_{OLS}$	$\hat{\alpha}_{Hill}$
<b>LooksRare wash</b>	2.2957	1.9357
<b>LooksRare legitimate</b>	2.3559	1.9319
<b>Blur wash</b>	2.8993	1.8675
<b>Blur legitimate</b>	2.8925	2.1322
<b>OpenSea wash</b>	2.5178	2.0780
<b>OpenSea legitimate</b>	2.6357	2.0164

Table 6: Power-law exponents ( $\hat{\alpha}$ ) from OLS and Hill Estimator (MLE) for trade size tails

Visually, the MLE method seems to fit the log-log data points more accurately compared to OLS. Interestingly, the MLE and OLS regression lines intersect for all the subsamples, except for

the LooksRare Wash Trades subsample, where they appear to run parallel to each other. This divergence in the LooksRare Wash Trades could be due to unique characteristics of this dataset, such as specific tail behavior, the presence of outliers, or idiosyncrasies in the trade size distribution that are better captured by the MLE method. The parallel nature of the lines in this particular case indicates a consistent proportional difference in the scaling of trade sizes, suggesting that the underlying distribution of this subsample might deviate from the typical power-law pattern observed in the other subsamples.

In terms of the estimators, a striking observation emerges: among legitimate subsamples, only the “LooksRare legitimate” trades, as per the MLE Hill exponent, conform to the expected Pareto-Lévy regime. Surprisingly, the “LooksRare wash” and “Blur wash” trades also fit within this regime, suggesting that the power-law behavior of these trades might deviate from what’s observed in traditional financial markets.

This result is in contrast to [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#)’s findings, where power-law distribution with stable Pareto-Lévy distributions (with exponents between 1 and 2) was a common characteristic in the tails of trade-size distributions for regulated exchanges and some unregulated exchanges. While they reported a variety of divergent behaviors in tail distributions, particularly on unregulated Tier-2 exchanges, our results reveal a more pronounced deviation from the expected power-law exponent range. This suggests that the tail behavior in trade sizes, especially in the context of our dataset, may not conform to traditional financial market patterns, reinforcing the idea that market dynamics can significantly vary and that analytical methods, such as power-law fitting, need to be contextually adapted for accurate interpretation across different market types.

## 5.4 Trade-size Roundedness

Among all the indirect statistical methods analyzed in [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#), Trade-size Roundedness stands out for its ability to classify individual trades as wash trades. By contrast, Benford’s law (Section 5.1), trade-size clustering (Section 5.2), and power-law tails (Section 5.3) are distribution-

level analyses, and cannot call out specific trades as wash trades. This trade-level classification parallels our direct detection methods from Section 4, and this unique capability allows us to compute classification metrics, a distinctive feature not available in other indirect tests.

The basic intuition between the roundedness filter in [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) is that legitimate trades should occur at “rounded” prices. In the context of NFTs, this means that a sale for a “round” price (e.g. 2.1 ETH) is an legitimate sale, whereas a sale for an unrounded price (e.g. 2.12824 ETH) is a wash trade.

A critical question in this analysis is: what classifies a “round” price? In [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#), a price is defined to be “round” if the last nonzero digit is more than 1% of the total price. For example, 2.1 is “round” because .1 is more than 1% of 2.1. On the other hand, 1.135 is not round because the last nonzero digit, .005, is less than 1% of 1.135. It should be clear that this 1% threshold is somewhat arbitrary, and this roundedness filter could be applied for varying definitions of roundedness. Although [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) only considered the 1% cutoff for roundedness, with our richer data set, we can examine the efficacy of the filter at different roundedness cutoffs.


For example, a sale price of .213 would be considered round at the 1% level (because .003 is more than 1% of the sale price .213), but would *not* be considered round at the 2% level (because .003 is not more than 2% of the sale price).

### **Do wash trades have low round level?**


Before we attempt to find the optimal roundedness cutoff, the first question we need to ask is whether the intuition that legitimate trades exhibit rounder prices than wash trades even makes sense. So our first question is: are rounder sale prices more likely to be legitimate than wash trades?

To answer this question, we calculate a linear regression – with sale price as our independent variable and fraction of wash trades at that price as our dependent variable. If our intuition is correct, this regression should have a clear downward trend, indicating that rounder trades are less likely to be wash trades. Figure 14 shows that this intuition holds for LooksRare and Blur, but not

for OpenSea.



(a) LooksRare round vs wash regression,  $r$ -value =  $-0.0365$ ,  $p$ -value =  $2.376 \cdot 10^{-118}$  (b) Blur round vs wash regression,  $r$ -value =  $-0.1350$ ,  $p$ -value =  $0$



(c) OpenSea round vs wash regression,  $r$ -value =  $0.0975$ ,  $p$ -value =  $0$

Figure 14: These regression plots compare the roundness level of trade size with the fraction of wash trades for LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea, illustrating the correlation between trade roundness and wash trading activities. The downward trend of the regression line for LooksRare and Blur indicates that rounder trades are less likely to be wash trades. However, OpenSea does not follow this trend, showing a positive slope in the regression line.

Each plot in Figure 14 displays a scatter of data points representing the fraction of wash trades at a given roundness level. The linear regression line (in red) provides a model of the relationship between roundness and the likelihood of a trade being a wash. The slope of the line suggests a trend where a higher round level correlates with a lower fraction of wash trades, which is consistent with the heuristic of using the using higher roundedness to classify trades as organic.

Notice that there are no data points for roundedness levels between .5 and 1. This is an artifact

of the definition of roundedness. See Lemma 1 in Appendix A for the details.

For both LooksRare and Blur, we observe notable downward trends. The fraction of wash trades tends to decrease as the round level of trade value increases. Specifically, for LooksRare, the regression yielded an  $r$ -value of  $-0.0365$  and a statistically significant  $p$ -value of  $2.376 \cdot 10^{-118}$ , indicating a weak but significant inverse relationship. This suggests that higher roundness levels are associated with a reduced likelihood of wash trading. For Blur, the slope was also negative, with an  $r$ -value of  $-0.1350$  and a statistically significant  $p$ -value of  $0$ , reinforcing the inverse relationship between roundness and wash trading.

In contrast, OpenSea shows a different pattern. The regression for OpenSea yielded a positive  $r$ -value of  $0.0975$  and a statistically significant  $p$ -value of  $0$ , indicating that higher roundness levels are associated with an increased likelihood of wash trading. Overall, these findings lend empirical support to [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#)'s rationale, which posits that wash trading is less prevalent in more rounded trade value, potentially due to the use of algorithms in wash trading that result in less rounded trade sizes. The divergent trend observed on OpenSea may reflect different trading dynamics or strategies on this platform.

### **Is a Fixed 1% Threshold Optimal?**

As discussed, [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#) employ a roundedness filter with a cutoff of 1%, i.e., trades which were rounded to the 1% level (or higher) were considered legitimate. In this Section, we assess the accuracy of this filter to our datasets from LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea.

In Tables 7, 8, and 9, we assess the accuracy, precision and recall of the 1% roundedness filter (using our direct-estimation methods as ground truth). Accuracy measures the proportion of trades correctly classified by the roundedness filter. Precision measures the fraction of true wash trades among those classified as wash trades by the roundedness filter. Recall measures the fraction of wash trades that were correctly identified by the roundedness filter.

In the final row of Tables 7, 8, and 9, we report "1% vs Direct," which reports simply what

fraction of trades are identified as wash trades using the roundedness estimator as compared to direct estimation. We report this additional metric as a way to gauge whether the 1% roundedness heuristic can accurately estimate the *fraction* of wash trades that occur on a platform.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
LooksRare Accuracy	44.89%
LooksRare Precision	41.18%
LooksRare Recall	82.92%
1% vs Direct	81.89% vs 40.66%

Table 7: LooksRare Classification Metrics

<b>Category</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Blur Accuracy	48.77%
Blur Precision	41.82%
Blur Recall	64.87%
1% vs Direct	63.38% vs 40.86%


Table 8: Blur Classification Metrics

<b>Category</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
OpenSea Accuracy	39.21%
OpenSea Precision	30.78%
OpenSea Recall	75.83%
1% vs Direct	76.92% vs 31.22%

Table 9: OpenSea Classification Metrics


The data presented in Tables 7, 8, and 9 show that employing the roundedness filter with a default 1% threshold delivers consistent accuracy ( $\approx 40\%$ ) when applied across LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea datasets. Moreover, the roundedness filter, as a metric to assess the proportion of wash trading, generally results in an overestimation of the amount of wash trading on the platform. This uniformity in accuracy and the tendency of the round filter to overestimate highlight the need for potential adjustments in the threshold to accurately capture the prevalence of wash trading. To further elucidate these findings, the following confusion matrices (Figures 15a, 15b, and 15c) provide a visual representation of the roundedness filter’s classification effectiveness, shedding light

on its precision and recall in distinguishing between wash and legitimate trades.



(a) LooksRare Confusion Matrix

(b) Blur Confusion Matrix



(c) OpenSea Confusion Matrix

Figure 15: Confusion matrix comparison for LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea classification metrics.

The confusion matrices in Figure 15a, 15b, and 15c assess the performance of the 1% roundness filter to identify wash trades. The top left quadrant displays the true negatives: actual legitimate trades that were correctly predicted as such. The top right quadrant represents false positives: legitimate trades incorrectly labeled as wash trades. The bottom left quadrant shows false negatives: wash trades that were not detected and were mislabeled as legitimate. Finally, the bottom right quadrant shows true positives: actual wash trades correctly identified. The intensity

of the color corresponds to the count of trades in each category, with darker colors signifying higher frequencies.

The confusion matrices for LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea exhibit the highest concentration in False Positive (Predicted Positive, Actual Negative), followed by True Positives (Predicted Positive, Actual Positive). This consistent pattern across three different platforms indicates that the 1% roundedness filter is effective in identifying wash trades, but it also frequently mislabels legitimate trades as wash trades. Decreasing the roundedness cutoff would make it less likely to label trades as wash, and thus reduce the frequency of “Predicted Positive”. This indicates that we might be able to get better performance from the roundedness filter by decreasing the roundedness cutoff.

In the next section, we explore how adjusting the roundedness cutoff within a range of values affects the accuracy of the roundedness filter.

### **Benefits of Adaptive Roundness Thresholds**

Looking at the confusion matrices (Figure 15a, 15b, and 15c), we see a high concentration in the upper-right quadrant (False Positives). These are legitimate trades that were incorrectly labeled as wash trades. Decreasing the roundedness cutoff would cause the filter to classify fewer trades as wash trades, potentially increasing the overall accuracy of the filter.


There is, however, a clear tradeoff. Decreasing the roundedness cutoff will decrease false positives, but it will increase false negatives. To explore this tradeoff, we characterized precision, recall, fallout, and accuracy of the roundedness classifier across a variety of roundedness cutoffs ranging from 0.01% to 9%.

Figures 16a, 16b, and 16c plot four common metrics used to judge the quality of a classifier: precision (PPV), recall (TPR), fallout (FPR), and accuracy (ACC) for varying roundness thresholds. Precision measures the proportion of true positives among all identified positives, while recall assesses the proportion of true positives identified out of all actual positives. Fallout is the proportion of false positives out of all actual negatives, indicating the rate of false alarms. Accuracy




represents the proportion of true results (both true positives and true negatives) among the total number of cases examined.

As expected, as the threshold increases, the recall increases (a larger fraction of trades classified as wash trades are indeed wash trades). Interestingly, both precision and accuracy decrease as the roundedness threshold increases.



(a) LooksRare Classification Metrics

(b) Blur Classification Metrics



(c) OpenSea Classification Metrics

Figure 16: Classification metrics for LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea using the roundedness test.

When the cutoff threshold is 0, all prices are considered “round” so the roundedness classifier classifies *all* trades as legitimate. Since the majority of trades on all three platforms are, in fact,

legitimate, this means the accuracy of the roundedness classifier is around 60% when the cutoff is 0. Of course, setting the cutoff to 0 means the classifier is completely independent of the trade.

The plots show that for LooksRare and Blur, increasing the cutoff leads to moderate losses in precision, whereas for OpenSea, increasing the roundedness cutoff yields big gains in recall for only minimal losses in precision. This indicates that when using this type of classifier, a platform-specific calibration can be beneficial. Specifically, for OpenSea, a higher roundedness cutoff offers better tradeoffs, whereas for LooksRare and Blur, a lower roundedness cutoff tends to offer better performance.

### **Summary of Indirect Estimation Findings**

This summary encapsulates the key insights derived from the application of indirect estimation methods across our NFT dataset, covering the four distinct methodologies: Benford’s Law, Trade-Size Clustering, Tail Distribution, and Trade-Size Roundedness.

- (I1) **Benford’s Law:** Wash and legitimate trades from LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea exhibited significant deviations from Benford’s Law. Notably, legitimate trades showed higher deviations than wash trades, challenging the traditional application of Benford’s Law in this context.
- (I2) **Trade-Size Clustering:** Legitimate trades on LooksRare, Blur, and OpenSea mostly exhibit less avoidance of clustering around round numbers compared to wash trades. This result reinforces the method’s effectiveness across different trading scenarios.
- (I3) **Tail Distribution:** The power-law behavior of NFT trade sizes diverges from traditional financial market patterns, indicating the limited applicability of the Tail Distribution method in this analysis.
- (I4) **Trade-Size Roundedness:** Regression analysis generally supports the rationale that wash trades have lower roundness levels. The fixed 1% threshold proved mostly effective, yet our

findings also indicate room for improvement by fine-tuning this threshold to enhance detection accuracy in specific market contexts.

## 6 Discussion

Wash trading is rampant on decentralized NFT marketplaces, but wash trading activity varies significantly across different platforms. Our analysis indicates that on Blur, approximately 40.86% of trades, amounting to 58.16% of the total trading value, were flagged as wash trades, while on OpenSea, 31.22% of trades, representing 26.39% of the total trading value, were identified as wash trades. In stark contrast, LooksRare exhibited a higher incidence, with 40.66% of trades identified as wash trades, representing a staggering 95.68% of the total trading value. This disparity not only confirms the widespread presence of wash trading in our context of NFTs, but also underscores the significant differences in its manifestation across various markets.

The application of [Cong et al. \(2023\)](#)'s statistical tests to NFT trading datasets in our study has provided valuable insights, underscoring the broader applicability of these methods in detecting wash trading behaviors in diverse marketplaces, including but not limited to NFT DEXs.

The Benford test did not distinctly differentiate between wash and legitimate trades, suggesting that while this method has been effective in more traditional financial datasets, its applicability might vary across different types of markets.

The trade-size clustering heuristic, however, showed promise in both NFT and likely other market contexts. Our analysis indicated that legitimate trades often exhibit more clustering around round numbers, a pattern less pronounced in wash trades, which tend to be algorithmically driven.

Contrary to our expectations, the tail distribution analysis did not conform to the typical power-law behaviors seen in traditional financial assets, indicating the need for a more nuanced approach in interpreting these results across different market types.

The most compelling findings came from the trade-size roundedness test, where we observed a clear correlation between roundness levels and the fraction of wash trades. This test, showing

a high degree of effectiveness in our NFT dataset, also suggests potential applicability in other markets, particularly when optimizing the roundness threshold for specific market characteristics. This points to the broader relevance of adapting and fine-tuning analytical tools like the trade-size roundedness test to enhance wash trade detection across various trading platforms.

Overall, our analysis across different heuristics indicates that while some methods developed for cryptocurrency CEXs are informative when applied to NFT DEXs, their effectiveness can vary drastically. This variability highlights the importance of a flexible, market-specific approach in analyzing wash trading behaviors, applicable across a spectrum of trading platforms and market types. As markets continue to evolve, refining these tools to suit the specific dynamics of different trading activities becomes essential.

Looking ahead, our study paves the way for further research in developing specialized models and heuristics tailored to the unique patterns of various trading platforms. By leveraging the transparency enabled by the on-chain nature of transactions, we can refine detection methods for market manipulation. Additionally, exploring the impact of regulatory and technological changes on market dynamics and wash trading activities will enhance our understanding of these phenomena. As these technologies evolve, they present both new challenges and opportunities for market oversight. The maturation of markets like NFTs, with their wealth of accessible data, offers a valuable opportunity to improve these methodologies. Ultimately, this will advance our grasp of market behaviors and the efficacy of regulatory measures, balancing the promise of Web3 innovations with the need to mitigate their risks.

## References

Barter, J. (2023), 'Blur continues momentum with incentive program', *Meta Digest* . Accessed: 2023-11-23.

**URL:** <https://metadigest.io/blur-continues-momentum-with-incentive-program/>

Bonifazi, G., Causeruccio, F., Corradini, E., Marchetti, M., Montella, D., Scarponi, S., Ursino, D. and

Virgili, L. (2023), 'Performing wash trading on NFTs: Is the game worth the candle?', *Big Data and*

*Cognitive Computing* **7**(1).

**URL:** <https://www.mdpi.com/2504-2289/7/1/38>

Cao, Y., Li, Y., Coleman, S., Belatreche, A. and McGinnity, T. M. (2014), Detecting wash trade in the financial market, *in* ‘2014 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence for Financial Engineering & Economics (CIFEr)’, pp. 85–91.

CoinGecko (2023), ‘Most popular NFT marketplaces by market share’, <https://www.coingecko.com/research/publications/market-share-nft-marketplaces>. Accessed: 2023-11-23.

Cong, L. W., Li, X., Tang, K. and Yang, Y. (2023), ‘Crypto wash trading’, *Management Science* **69**(11), 6427–6454.

**URL:** <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2021.02709>

Aloosh, A. and Li, J. (2024), ‘Direct Evidence of Bitcoin Wash Trading’, *Management Science* **0**(0), null.

**URL:** <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2021.01448>

Decrypt (2023), ‘How much wash trading is really happening on blur?’.

**URL:** <https://decrypt.co/122369/wash-trading-blur-ethereum-nfts>

Fridgen, G., Kraeussl, R., Papageorgiou, O. and Tugnetti, A. (2023), ‘Pricing dynamics and herding behavior of NFTs’, *Center for Financial Studies Working Paper No. 709* .

**URL:** <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4337173>

Hildobby (2022), ‘NFT wash trading on Ethereum’, <https://community.dune.com/blog/nft-wash-trading-on-ethereum>.

Huang, D. and Goetzmann, W. N. (2023), Selection-neglect in the NFT bubble, Working Paper 31498, National Bureau of Economic Research.

**URL:** <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31498>

Mao, R., Li, Z. and Fu, J. (2015), Fraud transaction recognition: A money flow network approach, *in* ‘Proceedings of the 24th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management’, CIKM ’15, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, p. 1871–1874.

**URL:** <https://doi.org/10.1145/2806416.2806647>

Medvedev, E., Silberling, M., Razhev, M., Filatov, E. and Svanevik, A. (2023), ‘Ethereum ETL’, <https://github.com/blockchain-etl/ethereum-etl>.

Morgia, M. L., Mei, A., Mongardini, A. M. and Nemmi, E. N. (2023), ‘A game of NFTs: Characterizing NFT wash trading in the Ethereum blockchain’.

O’Hara, M., Yao, C. and Ye, M. (2014), ‘What’s not there: Odd lots and market data’, *The Journal of Finance* **69**(5), 2199–2236.

**URL:** <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43612955>

Shimron, L. (2022), ‘DEXs gain market share as faith in centralized crypto players erodes’, *Forbes* .

**URL:** <https://www.forbes.com/sites/leeorshimron/2022/11/23/dexs-gain-market-share-as-faith-in-centralized-crypto-players-erodes/?sh=6f91cde83f40>

von Wachter, V., Jensen, J. R., Regner, F. and Ross, O. (2022), ‘NFT wash trading: Quantifying suspicious behaviour in NFT markets’.

Zitzewitz, E. (2012), ‘Forensic economics’, *Journal of Economic Literature* **50**(3), 731–69.

**URL:** <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jel.50.3.731>

## A Roundedness

Lemma 1 explains the absence of data points between 0.5 and 1 for round level.

**Lemma 1.** Fix  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , denote its last non-zero digit as  $\ell$ , then  $\frac{\ell}{x} \notin [0.5, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . Suppose  $x$  is a  $N$  digit number, where  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\ell$  be the last non-zero digit of  $x$ , say  $n$ -th digit of  $x$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $n < N$ . Denote  $a_i$  to be the  $i$ -th digit of  $x$ , then we may rewrite:

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \quad (3)$$

$$\ell = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \quad (4)$$

For the sake of contradiction, we assume  $\frac{\ell}{x} \in [0.5, 1)$ , that is to say

$$\frac{\ell}{x} \geq 0.5 \implies 2\ell \geq x \quad (5)$$

Expanding  $\ell$  and  $x$ , we get

$$2 \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \geq \sum_{i=n+1}^N a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \quad (7)$$

Note the fact that

$$\sum_{i=n+1}^N a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \geq 10^{N-1} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \cdot 10^{i-1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n 9 \cdot 10^{i-1} = 10^n - 1 \quad (9)$$

It follows that

$$10^{N-1} \leq 10^n - 1 \implies 10^n \leq 10^n - 1 \quad (10)$$

Contradiction, as desired.

□