

# Does Money Laundering on Ethereum Have Traditional Traits?

Qishuang Fu\*, Dan Lin†, Yiyue Cao\*, Jiajing Wu\*‡

\*School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China

†School of Software Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai 519082, China

‡Corresponding Author: wujiajing@mail.sysu.edu.cn

**Abstract**—As the largest blockchain platform that supports smart contracts, Ethereum has developed with an incredible speed. Yet due to the anonymity of blockchain, the popularity of Ethereum has fostered the emergence of various illegal activities and money laundering by converting ill-gotten funds to cash. In the traditional money laundering scenario, researchers have uncovered the prevalent traits of money laundering. However, since money laundering on Ethereum is an emerging means, little is known about money laundering on Ethereum. To fill the gap, in this paper, we conduct an in-depth study on Ethereum money laundering networks through the lens of a representative security event on *Upbit Exchange* to explore whether money laundering on Ethereum has traditional traits. Specifically, we construct a money laundering network on Ethereum by crawling the transaction records of *Upbit Hack*. Then, we present five questions based on the traditional traits of money laundering networks. By leveraging network analysis, we characterize the money laundering network on Ethereum and answer these questions. In the end, we summarize the findings of money laundering networks on Ethereum, which lay the groundwork for money laundering detection on Ethereum.

**Index Terms**—Ethereum, money laundering, network analysis

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the debut of Bitcoin in 2008 [1], blockchain, as the underlying technology of Bitcoin, has taken the world by storm with its mushrooming applications in various fields. As the largest blockchain platform that supports smart contracts [3], Ethereum becomes prosperous and has attracted lots of investors. The native cryptocurrency on Ethereum is called Ether (ETH for short) and other cryptocurrencies on Ethereum are collectively called tokens [4]. Numerous investors register the account without cost on Ethereum to make transactions with ETH and tokens [2].

While Ethereum thrives, it attracts criminals to engage in illegal activities because of a lack of powerful law enforcement on Ethereum [24]. According to a crypto crime report of Chainalysis [5], the total cryptocurrency value received by illicit accounts from 2017 to 2021 is highly reached 42.5 billion USD. The ill-gotten money with an astronomical figure is moved to some service providers, such as mixing services, token swap services, and loan services, and then converted to cash by cybercriminals, which is the process of money laundering (ML for short). Generally, ML process consists of 3 parts [13], placement, layering, and integration. Due to the

avarice of criminals for money, ML is the downstream activity of almost all forms of cryptocurrency-based crimes.

The arrogant ML activity by criminals on Ethereum has drawn the attention of industry [5–8], and anti-money laundering (AML for short) techniques urgently need to be proposed to protect the Ethereum ecosystem from being polluted by criminals. Owing to the lack of understanding of ML on Ethereum, AML research on Ethereum is still in the preliminary stage of exploration. On the contrary, AML research in traditional financial scenarios is very mature [9–12, 14, 15], and a variety of AML techniques are proposed based on ML characteristics. For example, Sun et al. [9] combines three typical characteristics of ML to design a multi-attribute metric and apply it to a near-greedy algorithm to detect ML transactions in a bank. Li et al. [10] utilizes two traits of ML to formulate an anomalousness metric and proposes an algorithm called Flowscope to detect dense ML networks.

Having an adequate understanding of the characteristics of ML paves the way to come up with AML techniques. We summarize five traits of ML in traditional financial scenarios from existing works [9–12]:

**Trait 1. [9]** Traditional ML accounts are fast-in and fast-out accounts. Most of those accounts transfer money in and out within a short interval.

**Trait 2. [10]** Traditional ML accounts prefer to transfer high-volume money since the number of accounts is limited.

**Trait 3. [11]** Traditional ML accounts are zero out middle accounts. Most received money of ML accounts will be transferred out.

**Trait 4. [9]** Traditional ML networks are dense. The accounts on ML networks cooperate to trade with one another frequently many times.

**Trait 5. [12]** Accounts of integration subset on the traditional ML network have high closeness centrality, since the ill-gotten money will concentrate on the accounts of integration subset.

Researchers can not help but wonder if ML networks on Ethereum have these traditional traits. They will have a better understanding of ML networks on Ethereum after acquiring the answer, which provides theoretical foundations to design and improve ML detection methods on Ethereum and fills the

gap of AML on Ethereum.

In this paper, we provide insights into the ML network on Ethereum through the analysis of network properties. We collect the transactions of *Upbit Hack*<sup>1</sup> to construct ML network as the example of ML dataset on Ethereum. Then, we conduct analysis on the ML network properties by comparing the ML network with normal network on Ethereum and dig out the traits of ML network on Ethereum which are different or similar with traditional ML networks.

## II. DATASET AND ML NETWORK

### A. Data Collection

Since there is no publicly available ML dataset on Ethereum, we utilize XBlock<sup>2</sup>, a prominent blockchain explorer, and BlockchainSpider [16], an open-source crawler toolkit, to collect ML dataset on Ethereum. In XBlock’s Label Word Cloud, there are 815 accounts labeled as *Upbit Hack*. The *UpbitHack* event is a representative event of ML on Ethereum. Notorious *Upbit Hack* stole approximately 342,000 ETH on November 27, 2019, then transferred the funds in layers to various service providers and eventually withdraw funds from those service providers. So we use BlockchainSpider to crawl transaction records of *Upbit Hack* to build an ML dataset on Ethereum.

The ML dataset is crawled layer by layer. In the first step, we crawled transaction records of 815 *Upbit Hack*. In the second step, we divided those transaction records into two categories, layering transactions and integration transactions, based on the labels of receiving accounts of transactions. If receiving accounts are service providers, such as exchanges and mixing services, the transactions are integration transactions, which are signs of successful ML. The transactions of non-service provider accounts are layering transactions, which indicate ML is still going on. Then, we crawled non-service providers’ transactions until transactions of the last layer are integration transactions.

### B. Network Construction

Consider a ML network on Ethereum (LaunderNet for short)  $G = (N, E)$ , where  $N, E$  represent the set of ML accounts and ML transactions, respectively. Each transaction  $e(u, v, w, t, c) \in E$  denotes that at timestamp  $t$ , account  $u$  transfers cryptocurrency  $c$  of amount  $w$  to account  $v$ , where  $u, v \in N$ .

Because Ethereum allows the creation of tokens, transactions on Ethereum consist of ETH transactions and token transactions categorized by the type of cryptocurrency. To make network analysis more convenient, we divide LaunderNet into LaunderEtherNet and LaunderTokenNet. The transactions on LaunderEtherNet only trade in ETH while the transactions on LaunderTokenNet only trade in tokens. Table I shows the statistics of three networks. We can find the sum of the number of accounts on LaunderEtherNet and LaunderTokenNet

<sup>1</sup>[https://upbit.com/service\\_center/notice?id=1085](https://upbit.com/service_center/notice?id=1085)

<sup>2</sup><https://www.xblock.pro/cloud>




Fig. 1: Average transaction interval of account on normal network and money laundering network.

is greater than the number of accounts on LaunderNet. That is because some accounts both trade in ETH and Tokens.

In order to find traits of the ML network on Ethereum, we prepare a normal transaction network [17] and normal accounts [18] with detailed transactions on Ethereum, which are regarded as references to judge the traits of the ML network on Ethereum.

TABLE I: Statistics of ML networks

Networks	#Accounts	#Transactions
LaunderEtherNet	377,912	1,627,861
LaunderTokenNet	239,736	720,319
LaunderNet	577,313	2,348,180

## III. THE ANALYSIS OF NETWORK PROPERTIES

In this section, we calculate and compare the network properties of the ML network and normal network on Ethereum to analyze whether the ML network on Ethereum has traditional ML traits.

### A. How fast is ETH transferred in and out on LaunderEtherNet?

In order to compare with Trait 1 to explore whether ML accounts on Ethereum are fast-in and fast-out accounts, we introduce the average transaction interval to measure the transaction velocity of the ML accounts. The average transaction interval (Avg. Tx Interval for short) of an account  $u$  is defined as

$$I(u) = \frac{\sum T(e_{pair}(u))}{N(e_{pair}(u))}, (e_{pair} \in E),$$

where  $e_{pair}(u)$  is the transaction pair of  $u$ . For example,  $u$  receives one ETH and then transfers it to other account, and those two transactions are a transaction pair.  $T(e_{pair}(u))$  is the interval within a transaction pair of  $u$  and  $N(e_{pair}(u))$  is the number of transaction pairs of  $u$ .

Then we calculate Avg. Tx Interval of normal accounts and ML accounts. In Fig. 1, we present the boxplot of Avg. Tx Interval of normal network and ML network. As shown in Fig. 1, the mean and median value of Avg. Tx Interval of the ML network are all quite smaller than those of the normal network, which indicates that dirty money is transferred in and out quickly by ML accounts. We can infer that transferring




Fig. 2: Transaction volume on normal network and money laundering network.

money in and out quickly on Ethereum is a means to reduce the attention of regulators and complete the process of ML more quickly to gain revenue.

**[Example]** In ML dataset, *Upbit Hack 7.5<sup>3</sup>* is a typical example with five transaction pairs and the interval with each pair is less than ten minutes.

**Finding 1.** Like traditional ML accounts, ML accounts on Ethereum are fast-in and fast-out accounts. They transfer money in and out in a short period of time to reduce the risk of being regulated.

#### B. How high is transfer volume on LaunderEtherNet?

To analyze the preference of ML accounts for the volume of transactions, We divide the transaction volume into four ranges, then calculate the percentage of each kind range of the ML network and the normal network. Fig. 2 shows the percentage of transaction volume of ML network and normal network. It can be seen from Fig. 2 that nearly 60% of the volume of ML transactions are for less than one ETH and the percentage of less than one ETH of ML transactions is larger than that of normal transactions. Unlike traditional ML accounts, ML accounts on Ethereum do not transfer high-volume money at once, as this will easily attract attention of regulator. Instead, tricky ML accounts transfer very small-volume money multiple times.

**[Example]** In ML dataset, *0x5217c<sup>4</sup>* is a representative example, which received 0.6 ETH and then transferred those ETH with 304 transactions of very small volume, and 85% of these transactions are for less than 0.001 ETH.

**Finding 2.** Compared with traditional ML accounts that usually transfer high-volume money, prudent ML accounts on Ethereum tend to transfer very small-volume money to evade the attention of regulatory authorities.

#### C. How balanced is ETH transferred in and out on LaunderEtherNet?

To compare with Trait 3 to find whether ML accounts on Ethereum are zero out middle accounts, we put forward the

<sup>3</sup><https://cn.etherscan.com/address/0xec305a14191fa627b151f16f59183e7e274d81ed>

<sup>4</sup><https://cn.etherscan.com/address/0x5217c74fc29fe53c5f75a11cd95f08282fb97a1>




Fig. 3: Account balance on normal network and money laundering network.

account balance, and the account balance of an account  $u$  is defined as

$$B(u) = In(u) - Out(u), (u \in N),$$

where  $In(u)$  is the sum amount of ETH transferred to  $u$  and  $Out(u)$  is the sum amount of ETH transferred out from  $u$ .

We divide the account balance into 6 ranges, then calculate the percentage of each balance range of ML accounts and normal accounts. Fig. 3 shows the percentage of account balance of ML accounts and normal accounts. We can find: (i) Comparing the percentage of different balance ranges of ML accounts, the balance of 88.4% ML accounts is less than 1 ETH; (ii) Comparing with normal accounts, the percentage of ML accounts with an account balance of  $[0, 10^{-2})$  is larger than that of normal Account, while the percentage of ML accounts with an account balance greater than  $10^{-2}$  is smaller than that of normal accounts. Those findings indicate most ML accounts do not prefer to keep lots of money because transferring almost all incoming money out not only maximizes the amount of their withdrawals but also reduces the risk of being discovered.

**[Example]** In ML dataset, *0x0a290<sup>5</sup>* is a classic zero out middle account with 24 transaction pairs. Every time the account received a sum of money, it would all be transferred out, resulting in a balance of 0.

**Finding 3.** Like traditional ML accounts, ML accounts on Ethereum are zero out middle accounts. They transfer almost all incoming money out to potentially benefit in a big way.

#### D. How dense are ML networks on Ethereum?

To compare with Trait 4 and see if the ML network on Ethereum is also dense, we use density as an indicator. The density of a network  $G$  is defined as [17]

$$D(G) = \frac{4|E|}{|N|(|N| - 1)},$$

where  $|N|$  is the number of nodes and  $|E|$  is the number of edges in network  $G$ .

<sup>5</sup><https://cn.etherscan.com/txs?a=0x0a29073f68fb0962a527996a37e85d4ed8504a50>

The densities of several networks are shown in Table II, the TransactionNet and TokenNet are the normal network trading in ETH and in tokens respectively. We observe from Table II: (i) The density of LaunderEtherNet is much higher than that of TransactionNet, and the density of LaunderTokenNet is much higher than that of TokenNet. This is enough to show that the ML network on Ethereum is dense, because the ML accounts carry out frequent transfer transactions. (ii) The LaunderEtherNet density is slightly less than the LaunderTokenNet density. This is because illegal accounts complete multiple token transactions by calling a smart contract, which makes the LaunderTokenNet denser. For example, 0x41f5f<sup>6</sup> is a transaction of calling a smart contract which leads to four token transactions.

**Finding 4.** Like traditional ML networks, ML networks on Ethereum are dense. At the same time, cunning criminals will complete multiple token transactions by calling a smart contract.

TABLE II: Density of networks

Networks	Launder Net	LaunderEther Net	Tansaction Net [17]	LaunderToken Net	TokenNet [17]
<b>Density</b>	1.41E-05	2.28E-05	1.87E-07	2.51E-05	1.87E-07

#### E. How different is closeness centrality on ML subsets?

In order to compare with Trait 5, we explore the characteristics of integration subset of ML network by closeness centrality. We estimate the level of closeness centrality of integration subset through comparing it with that of layering subset. Closeness centrality<sup>7</sup> is the reciprocal of the average shortest path distance of an account  $u$  to all others. Formally,

$$C(u) = \frac{|N| - 1}{\sum_{v=1}^{|N|-1} dist(u, v)}, (u, v \in N),$$

The closeness centrality statistics of the two subsets measured are shown in table III. By analyzing these data, we find: The average of closeness centrality in the integration subset is lower than that in the layering subset. The reason is that there are various types of service providers on Ethereum, for example, gambling, lending platform, centralized exchange, decentralized exchange, and coin mixing service, etc., which provide criminals with many options to withdraw cash. In order to reduce the risk of exposure, accounts will be extra cautious to convert cash from multiple service providers in the integration subset, and the average shortest path distance of each account to others is longer, resulting in closeness centrality not high. But in traditional ML, they can only aggregate money into several accounts because of the limited number of withdrawal platforms and accounts available, and the average shortest path distance of each account to others is shorter, leading to high closeness centrality.

<sup>6</sup>0x41f5f63f1c4d5cd0d58d7dc19efcb1f6b5f779ca59a82a593697ac80d56eeb90

<sup>7</sup><https://networkx.org/documentation/stable/reference>

**Finding 5.** Different from traditional ML networks, the closeness centrality of integration subset is not much high, because the decentralization flourishes various service providers on Ethereum.

TABLE III: Avg. closeness centrality of ML subsets.

Subset	Description	Avg. closeness centrality
Layering	Accounts dispersing ill-gotten money from source accounts	5.01E-06
Integration	Accounts integrating dispersive money into service providers	<b>1.46E-06</b>

## IV. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we conducted a systematic study to analyze whether the ML networks on Ethereum have traditional traits of ML from the perspectives of network properties. We collect ML transaction of *Upbit Hack* event as an example of the ML dataset on Ethereum. Based on the dataset, we acquire a series of interesting findings by analyzing five network properties. The ML networks on Ethereum have some similar traits with the traditional ML networks, such as fast velocity of transfer, zero balance of accounts, and high density of network. While they have several different traits with the traditional ML networks, for example, the ML accounts on Ethereum prefer to transfer small-volume money and the closeness centrality of integration subset is not high. These findings contributes to a better understanding of the ML on Ethereum.

**Future work.** Following our insights into ML networks on Ethereum, there are ample opportunities for future work: (i) By characterizing the money laundering (ML) networks on Ethereum, the analysis can be used for feature extraction in downstream tasks such as account classification and son on [19, 20, 25], which may lead to more accurate detection of ML transactions and accounts; (ii) It is potential to propose a AML detection frame on Ethereum referring to the traditional AML detection frame of existing work [9, 10], and the traits of ML accounts on Ethereum can be leveraged to design abnormal indicators of the detection frame; (iii) Further analysis of the evolution of ML networks on Ethereum from a temporal perspective would be interesting [21, 22], as would have better understanding of the entire process of ML on Ethereum, from the start of the laundering process to its completion; (iv) A similar line of measurements and analyses can be applied to token transaction networks [23] to unearth interesting phenomena and traits on ML networks.

## V. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The work described in this paper is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (61973325), the Natural Science Foundations of Guangdong Province (2021A1515011661), and the Guangzhou Basic and Applied Basic Research Project (202102020616).

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Nakamoto, "Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system," <https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf>, 2008.
- [2] D. Lin, J. Wu, Q. Xuan, and K. T. Chi, "Ethereum transaction tracking: Inferring evolution of transaction networks via link prediction," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 600, p. 127504, 2022.
- [3] D. Lin, J. Chen, J. Wu, and Z. Zheng, "Evolution of ethereum transaction relationships: Toward understanding global driving factors from microscopic patterns," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 559–570, 2022.
- [4] J. Wu, J. Liu, Y. Zhao, and Z. Zheng, "Analysis of cryptocurrency transactions from a network perspective: An overview," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 190, p. 103139, 2021.
- [5] Chainalysis Team. (2022) The chainalysis 2022 crypto crime report. [Online]. Available: <https://go.chainalysis.com/2022-crypto-crime-report.html>
- [6] SlowMist Team. (2022) First half of the 2022 blockchain security and anti-money laundering analysis report. [Online]. Available: <https://www.slowmist.com/report/first-half-of-the-2022-report.pdf>
- [7] CipherTrace Team. (2022) Cryptocurrency crime and anti-money laundering report. [Online]. Available: <https://ciphertrace.com/crime-and-anti-money-laundering-report-october-2022/>
- [8] FATF. (2022) Money laundering and terrorist financing red flag indicators associated with virtual assets. [Online]. Available: <http://www.fatf-gafi.org/publications/fatfrecommendations/documents/Virtual-Assets-Red-Flag-Indicators.html>
- [9] X. Sun, J. Zhang, Q. Zhao, S. Liu, J. Chen, R. Zhuang, H. Shen, and X. Cheng, "Cubeflow: Money laundering detection with coupled tensors," in *Proceedings of the Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2021, pp. 78–90.
- [10] X. Li, S. Liu, Z. Li, X. Han, C. Shi, B. Hooi, H. Huang, and X. Cheng, "Flowscope: Spotting money laundering based on graphs," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 04, 2020, pp. 4731–4738.
- [11] X. Sun, W. Feng, S. Liu, Y. Xie, S. Bhatia, B. Hooi, W. Wang, and X. Cheng, "Monlad: Money laundering agents detection in transaction streams," in *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 2022, pp. 976–986.
- [12] M. Mahootiha, A. H. Golpayegani, and B. Sadeghian, "Designing a new method for detecting money laundering based on social network analysis," in *Proceedings of the International Computer Conference, Computer Society of Iran*, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [13] M. E. Lokanan, "Predicting money laundering using machine learning and artificial neural networks algorithms in banks," *Journal of Applied Security Research*, pp. 1–25, 2022, to be published, doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2530874/v1.
- [14] K. Singh and P. Best, "Anti-money laundering: using data visualization to identify suspicious activity," *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, vol. 34, p. 100418, 2019.
- [15] M. Jullum, A. Løland, R. B. Huseby, G. Ånonsen, and J. Lorentzen, "Detecting money laundering transactions with machine learning," *Journal of Money Laundering Control*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 173–186, 2020.
- [16] Z. Wu, J. Liu, J. Wu, and Z. Zheng, "Transaction tracking on blockchain trading systems using personalized pagerank," *doi preprint doi:2201.05757*, 2022.
- [17] X. T. Lee, A. Khan, S. Sen Gupta, Y. H. Ong, and X. Liu, "Measurements, analyses, and insights on the entire Ethereum blockchain network," in *Proceedings of the Web conferenc*, 2020, pp. 155–166.
- [18] J. Wu, Q. Yuan, D. Lin, W. You, W. Chen, C. Chen, and Z. Zheng, "Who are the phishers? Phishing scam detection on ethereum via network embedding," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 1156–1166, 2022.
- [19] T. Huang, D. Lin, and J. Wu, "Ethereum account classification based on graph convolutional network," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 2528–2532, 2022.
- [20] J. Liu, J. Zheng, J. Wu, and Z. Zheng, "Fa-gnn: Filter and augment graph neural networks for account classification in ethereum," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 2579–2588, 2022.
- [21] D. Lu, J. Liu, S. Zhao, and J. Wu, "Evolution of locality on ethereum transaction network," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, 2022, pp. 3527–3531.
- [22] B. Huang, J. Liu, J. Wu, Q. Li, and H. Lin, "Temporal analysis of transaction ego networks with different labels on ethereum," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, 2022, pp. 3517–3521.
- [23] W. Chen, T. Zhang, Z. Chen, Z. Zheng, and Y. Lu, "Traveling the token world: A graph analysis of ethereum erc20 token ecosystem," in *Proceedings of The Web Conference*, 2020, pp. 1411–1421.
- [24] D. Lin, J. Wu, Q. Yuan, and Z. Zheng, "Modeling and understanding ethereum transaction records via a complex network approach," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 2737–2741, 2020.
- [25] J. Wu, J. Liu, W. Chen, H. Huang, Z. Zheng, and Y. Zhang, "Detecting mixing services via mining bitcoin transaction network with hybrid motifs," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 2237–2249, 2022.