

BRC20 Pinning Attack

Minfeng Qi^{1,*}, Qin Wang^{2,*}, Zhipeng Wang³, Lin Zhong⁴
Tianqing Zhu¹, Shiping Chen², William Knottenbelt³

¹City University of Macau, China | ²CSIRO Data61, Australia
³Imperial College London, UK | ⁴New Huo Digital Limited, Singapore

ABSTRACT

BRC20 tokens are a type of non-fungible asset on the Bitcoin network. They allow users to embed customized content within Bitcoin’s satoshis. The related token frenzy has reached a market size of US\$3,650b over the past year (2023Q3-2024Q3). However, this intuitive design has not undergone serious security scrutiny.

We present the first in-depth analysis of the BRC20 transfer mechanism and identify a critical attack vector. A typical BRC20 transfer involves two “bundled” on-chain transactions with different fee levels: the first (i.e., $Tx1$) with a lower fee inscribes the transfer request, while the second (i.e., $Tx2$) with a higher fee finalizes the actual transfer. We find that an adversary can exploit this by sending a manipulated fee transaction (falling between the two fee levels), which allows $Tx1$ to be processed while $Tx2$ remains pinned in the mempool. This locks the BRC20 liquidity and disrupts normal transfers for users. We term this *BRC20 pinning attack*.

Our attack exposes an inherent design flaw that can be applied to 90+% inscription-based tokens within the Bitcoin ecosystem.

We also conducted the attack on Binance’s ORDI hot wallet (the most prevalent BRC20 token and the most active wallet), resulting in a temporary suspension of ORDI withdrawals on Binance for 3.5 hours, which were shortly resumed after our communication.

KEYWORDS

Bitcoin, Non-fungibility, BRC20, ORDI, Attacks

1 INTRODUCTION

First glance at BRC20. BRC20, short for Bitcoin Request for Comment 20 [1, 2], is a framework that enables the creation of non-fungible assets (or NFTs) [3] on the Bitcoin network.

The core aspect of non-fungibility is to implement uniqueness. Ethereum NFTs [3, 4] introduce the tokenID (defined in ERC721 [5]) as a unique identifier for each token. These unique tokens can be exclusively associated with external digital assets. Ownership of these NFTs is account-based, meaning they are linked to specific addresses and transferred via smart contracts. In contrast, BRC20 [6] takes a fundamentally different approach due to Bitcoin’s UTXO (i.e., unspent transaction output) model.

BRC20 tokens inscribe additional context directly into each satoshi (Sat, the smallest unit of Bitcoin) [7] and assign them sequential identifiers using Ordinal Theory [8, 9]. These inscriptions are inherently unique without the need to be tied to external resources. Their ownership is determined by each individual transaction. Although these inscriptions are in the form of plaintext strings, they can be irreversibly converted into versatile formats, including text, images, videos, or opcodes serving as operational guidance [10].

We present more technical details in Sec.2.

BRC20 is really hot. BRC20 has garnered significant attention, evident from various Bitcoin’s market indicators¹ including block size (surging from an average of 1.11MB to 1.85MB+), mempool transactions (reaching a peak of 315,257 transactions), and transaction fees (averaging a 10%+ increase²). To date, the total number of BRC20 tokens has reached 795, with a trading volume of US\$83,186,051,519 and a market capitalization of US\$2,650,864,039,923. Statistical resources (e.g., Ordinal Wallet [11], UniSat [12], Dune Analytics [13, 14]) corroborate the upward trend in minted Ordinals.

The development of BRC20 has also been documented in recent studies (also see Sec.8), including a series of reports [1, 10, 15–17], market investigations [7, 18], and analytical works [19–22]. Many projects with similar design principles are deployed on their corresponding platforms, such as Ethscription [23], BSC20 [24], ASC20 [25], PRC20 [26], and SOLs [27].

But BRC20 is not secure! Our work differs from existing ones [7, 18–22, 28], which primarily focus on describing the BRC20 protocol and the role of off-chain indexers in managing the transaction process. Instead, we dive into its operational on-chain transferring mechanisms and present the first security assessment.

We find that BRC20 is surprisingly vulnerable. It is susceptible to a straightforward attack by freezing one of the transactions (typically needs two) during its transfer operation. We introduce this attack as the *BRC20 pinning attack*. Our attack has the potential to cause prolonged functional blockages and can be applied to all relevant hot wallets. Unlike mere programming flaws, the issue stems from an inherent design dilemma within BRC20, making it extremely challenging to fully eliminate.

We present our discoveries (i.e., **contributions**) step by step.

① *Deep dive to dynamically transferring BRC20s* (Sec.3, Fig.1).

We provide the first in-depth analysis of the mechanisms involved in transferring BRC20 tokens over the Bitcoin network. Existing studies [1][2][7] primarily focus on the static aspects of BRC20 (i.e., how to inscribe tokens). A few studies [21][22] acknowledge that BRC20 tokens can be transferred, but they overlook the detailed dynamic transfer mechanisms (i.e., how to transfer these inscriptions over networks) by instead focusing mainly on the role of off-chain indexers handling the process.

We find that, contrary to what might be recognized, the inscribed transfer is not an actual operation executed on the Bitcoin network. Instead, it is merely a form of script, written after OP_False (meaning that it will never be executed on-chain) and stored on-chain.

The execution of such a transfer operation relies on the movement of real Bitcoin transactions (UTXOs). To complete a BRC20

¹Data from: YChart https://ycharts.com/indicators/bitcoin_average_block_size and https://ycharts.com/indicators/bitcoin_average_transaction_fee [Oct. 2024]; BRC20.IO <https://www.BRC20.io/> [Oct. 2024]; Blockchain.com <https://www.blockchain.com/explorer/charts/mempool-count> [peak at Aug 12, 2023].

²Based on data spanning from early Feb. 2023 to Apr. 2024.

* Equal contribution.

transfer operation, two UTXO-based transactions (i.e., $Tx1$, $Tx2$ in sequence) are required. $Tx1$ inscribes the operation (typically by sending it to oneself) and includes essential information such as the amount and recipient. $Tx2$ transfers the inscription to the recipient. These two transactions are typically initiated from an off-chain wallet and “bundled” together for execution.

② New attack: BRC20 pinning attack (Sec.4, Fig.2).

We introduce *BRC20 pinning attack*, a new attack (to our knowledge, also the first) specifically targeted BRC20 tokens. Our attack is rooted in leveraging the BRC20 transfer operation (Sec.3.3) and transaction pinning techniques (Sec.4.1).

We discovered that the seemingly “bundled” transactions sent from users’ wallets are not actually bundled. The two transactions are created and sent independently, with a short time period that makes them appear as a single bundled transaction. Our attack exploits this gap by pinning $Tx2$ in the mempool, delaying the final token transfer to the recipient.

To achieve this, we strategically set a low-fee transaction (i.e., the malicious $Tx2$). The fee is carefully chosen to fall between two thresholds: sufficient for $Tx1$ to be processed but insufficient for $Tx2$. Since accurate transaction fees are theoretically unknown³, we begin with a very low fee (insufficient for either $Tx1$ or $Tx2$) and gradually increase the fee by resending the request. Once the fee is adequate for $Tx1$ but still below the threshold for $Tx2$, our attack succeeds. At this point, $Tx2$ will not be picked up by miners immediately and will remain in the mempool for an extended period (becoming *pinned*). These processes occur on-chain.

For off-chain processes, BRC20 movement relies on the usable state of *transferable balance* (Fig.1(c)). When a transfer request is initiated, tokens in $Tx1$ move from the *available balance* (which shows the current balance but cannot be spent directly) to the *transferable balance* (ready for spending). In $Tx2$, these transferable tokens are sent to the recipient, leaving the *transferable balance* at zero. In this sense, our attack immobilizes liquidity by prolonging the time tokens are locked within the transferable balance.

Our attack disrupts the normal BRC20 token transfer flow and creates a window for potential DoS-style attacks that can further impact the availability for the entire wallet and protocols.

③ Launching attacks against real project (Sec.5&Sec.6).

We first implement and evaluate our attack locally. We conduct experiments to assess the impact of parameters such as the transfer amount, transaction fee, mempool congestion level, and the number of attack attempts on the effectiveness of the pinning attack.

Our evaluation reveals that the frequency of attack attempts, combined with low transaction fees, can substantially extend the delay time for transaction confirmations, especially under high mempool congestion. Moreover, our results indicate that both larger individual transfers and a greater number of small transfers can effectively lock liquidity in the target’s transferable balance.

We then extended our attack to Binance’s ORDI hot wallet, the most popular/active BRC20 wallet (handling 26.24% [29] of the total transaction volume). Through four attack attempts, we locked the entire transferable balance of the wallet.

³but what is known: based on empirical investigation, we observed that the fee required for $Tx1$ is greatly lower – around 3 to 5 times less – than the fee required for $Tx2$.

By monitoring relevant transaction activities and tracking the wallet’s available liquidity, our attack induced a temporary suspension of ORDI withdrawals for approximately 3.5 hours. We reported our attack to Binance and shortly restored its withdrawal function by sending counterpart recovery transactions.

Responsible disclosure. We have notified the Binance team and shared operational details to assist in expediting the resumption of withdrawals. Binance successfully resumed ORDI withdrawals. In addition, we have publicly disclosed our findings in early times through various media channels, including (but not limited to) [Binance Square](#), [PANews](#), [Mirror](#), [ForsightNews](#), [TechFlow](#).

④ Extended discussion (Sec.7&Sec.8).

We propose defenses including dynamic fee adjustments, real-time transaction monitoring, and hierarchical authorization. We find that dynamically adjusting transaction fees based on mempool congestion levels can make it costly for attackers to execute prolonged pinning attempts. Real-time monitoring systems are also valuable, as they can detect unusual patterns, such as abnormally low fees or large transaction amounts, allowing exchanges to act swiftly by temporarily suspending these flagged transactions. Hierarchical authorization further strengthens defense mechanisms by implementing multi-layered transaction approvals, particularly for high-value transfers, which require multi-factor authentication (MFA) or multi-signature authorization.

However, the effectiveness of these defense strategies is limited by inherent design aspects of the BRC20 protocol. Because the protocol treats all transfer requests as valid without distinguishing intent, it remains challenging to prevent attacks aimed at locking liquidity, underscoring the need for further protocol-level enhancements.

We also discuss the adaptability of our attack to other BRC20 tokens and various inscription protocols on other blockchains. Our findings show that the attack is broadly applicable to 93.3% of BRC20 tokens on Bitcoin, which follow the same standardized inscription-based transfer mechanism as ORDI. However, the attack proves *ineffective* (in around 80% of cases) against inscription protocols on other blockchains, such as ETHS20 on Ethereum and TON20 on Arbitrum. This is primarily because these protocols utilize a single-transaction process rather than a two-step transfer method, eliminating the possibility of delaying a second transaction.

Acknowledgement. This work was partially collaborated with *TrustlessLab*. We acknowledge their early contributions to attack implementations. In line with their preference for anonymity, we express credit to the team for their support in this project.

2 DISSECTING BRC20

2.1 Technical Foundation

Bitcoin “standards”. Bitcoin standards commonly refer to Bitcoin Improvement Proposals (BIPs) [30], which are established specifications or protocols defining various aspects of the Bitcoin network and its ecosystem, similar to ERC standards in the Ethereum ecosystem. These standards include a broad spectrum of topics, including protocols, transactions, address systems, wallets, and security. Here, we introduce BIPs that are relevant to the creation of BRC20.

Table 1: BRC20-related BIPs

BIP-	Title	Usage for BRC20
114	Merkelized Abstract Syntax Tree (MAST)	Batch Validation/Processing
117	Tail Call Execution Semantics	Batch Validation/Processing
125	Opt-in Full Replace-by-Fee Signaling	Transaction Pinning
141	Segregated Witness (Consensus layer)	Space Extension
144	Segregated Witness (Peer Services)	Space Extension
340	Schnorr Signatures for Secp256k1	Batch Validation
341	Taproot: SegWit version 1 spending rules	Inscription
342	Validation of Taproot Scripts	Inscription
343	Mandatory activation of Taproot deployment	Inscription

Schnorr signature. Schnorr signature [31] (cf. BIP-340) is adopted to replace ECDSA for an improved efficiency (reducing signature length from 71-72 bytes to 64) while still remaining ECDSA’s security promises. An outstanding benefit is key aggregation (a.k.a., *multisig*), which allows multiple signatures from collaborative parties to be combined into a single signature. This aggregation involves combining a public key and a public key formed from the Merkle root of many scripts that can be used to spend the output.

Taproot/Tapscript. Taproot (BIP-341/342/343) outlines the integration of Schnorr signatures and introduces the concept of locking outputs to multiple scripts using Merkle branches (MAST, BIP-114/117). This enables a new method of spending Bitcoin known as Pay-to-Taproot (P2TR) where users can pay to either a Schnorr public key or the Merkle root of various other scripts (e.g., Tapscrip).

Segregated witness. SegWit (BIP-141/144) enables larger scripting space. It introduces the *witness* structure, which can host extra data. A SegWit transaction consists of two parts: the original transaction structure (which contains sender&receiver data, excluding signatures) and a separate witness section appended at the end (which holds signatures and scripts). This reduces the storage size required for transactions and increases block capacity from 1 MB to 4 MB.

2.2 BRC20 Formation

Creating uniqueness. Unlike ERC721, which assigns a tokenID (an additional customizable field capable of accommodating any number) for NFTs [3], uniqueness in the Bitcoin network is established based on its smallest unit, *satoshi*, via the Ordinal Theory [8]. As satoshis are indivisible, the protocol essentially serves as a numbering scheme for satoshis, enabling each satoshi to be tracked/-transferred as an individual entity (cf. Fig.1(a)). It is preserved as transactions transfer from inputs to outputs, following the first-in-first-out principle, which is a fundamental feature of UTXO-based transactions. We defer the details in Sec.3.3.

Inscribing context. Inscription involves embedding personalized content into each unique satoshi. Such data is assigned the P2TR script type, and the generated inscriptions are stored within the SegWit section of a transaction (*witness*), presented in various formats such as text (JSON formats), images, audio, and even highly compressed video files (peep at [32][33]).

In particular, we take a text-based BRC20 (e.g., ORDI [34]) as the instance. The on-chain inscription contains several crucial details (see Listing 1), including the protocol name (*brc20*), operation (e.g., *transfer*), token name (e.g., *ordi*), total amount of tokens to be issued (*max*), maximum amount of tokens to be minted in each round (*lim*), and amount of tokens to be minted/transferred (*amt*).

```

1 # On-chain Inscription
2 "p" : "brc20" # protocol name
3 "op" : "deploy" # operation
4 "tick" : "ordi" # token name
5 "max" : "2100000" # total amount of issued token
6 "lim" : "1000" # maximum minted tokens per round
7 "amt" : "100" # the amount of token being actioned
8
9 # Inscription with the Transfer operation
10 "p" : "ordi", # protocol
11 "op" : "transfer", # inscribed transfer operation
12 "tick" : "ordi", # token to be transferred
13 "amt" : "100" # the amount of transferred tokens
14
15 # UTXO Transactions over the Bitcoin network
16
17 # Off-chain update
18 if state["tick"] NOT exists OR
19     "amt" > "lim" OR sum("amt") > "max":
20     raise errors
21 else
22     account["tick"]["balance"][minter] += amt

```

Listing 1: Inscriptions and the Transfer operation

On-chain storage. BRC20 tokens are fully settled on-chain, and their movement (i.e., implementing the Transfer operation) depends on the transfer of Bitcoin native transactions (i.e., the sending and receiving of satoshis) via the underlying layer-one network (cf. Fig.1(c)). The Bitcoin network only records native transaction activities related to these inscriptions, whereas it does not provide real-time insights into the status of existing BRC20 tokens or account balances (unlike account-based models [4]). These functionalities are delegated to off-chain layers.

Off-chain retrieves. Users interact with those on-chain tokens via off-chain validation services (also known as *indexers* [7]), which facilitate real-time data retrieval. Indexers are responsible for tracking which wallets minted the original token supply up to the maximum limit, determining where minting ceased, and tracing whether tokens traded in secondary markets can be linked back to wallets.

Indexers only track transactions without modifying or appending on-chain data. Even if an indexer fails, there is no risk of fund loss, as it can be deterministically reconstructed by reapplying the transaction rules. Many users may be unaware of these indexers, as their services are often integrated into user-friendly wallets such as Ordinals Wallet [11], UniSat [12], Binance’s hot wallet [35], etc.

3 TRANSFERRING BRC20 TOKENS

3.1 Inscribed Transfer Operation

BRC20 operations. BRC20 protocols support three operations. (i) Deploy: This operation involves the creation of a new type of BRC20 token by its creators, configuring initial settings such as upper limits. (ii) Mint: This operation primarily involves increasing the token amount, typically conducted by users with the help of external tools (i.e., indexers). (iii) Transfer: This operation facilitates the exchange of tokens via actual transactions in the Bitcoin network.

We present a sample code segment illustrating the inscribed Transfer operation (see the second part of Listing 1).

Not actions but signals! The inscribed operations are not executable actions. Instead, they leverage the OP_RETURN opcode in Bitcoin transactions, creating “False Return” scripts that generate

provably unspendable outputs [36]. These outputs can accommodate arbitrarily formatted data written after OP_FALSE [37], ensuring that none of the inscribed information is executed on-chain.

These inscriptions, however, serve as a signal to initiate the actual transfer operation via on-chain transactions.

Transfer and transactions. While the deploy and mint operations require only a single transaction (i.e., sent to oneself), the Transfer operation for BRC20 tokens involves two transactions (cf. Fig. 1(a)): one for token inscription ($Tx1$, sent to oneself) and another for the actual token exchange ($Tx2$, sent to the recipient). These two transactions are executed sequentially within a very short timeframe, giving the appearance of being bundled together. Upon completion of both transactions, an off-chain indexer recalculates the final UTXO-based balance and updates the account, which corresponds to the end-user’s wallet interface.


3.2 Transfer Foundations over Bitcoin Networks

Token balance structure. The BRC20 token balance structure is divided into three categories: *available balance*, *transferable balance*, and *overall balance*, each serving a distinct purpose in managing the state of a user’s tokens [6].


- **Available balance** (B_{avail}). The available balance represents the portion of a user’s tokens that can be freely used (i.e., the amount of funds they possess). It reflects the liquid amount of tokens in the user’s account address that are readily available for spending or transfer at any given time.
- **Transferable balance** (B_{trans}). The transferable balance consists of tokens that have been inscribed with a transfer operation but have NOT yet been transferred to the recipient. These tokens are temporarily locked and cannot be accessed or spent by the user until the inscription is finalized.
- **Overall balance** (B_{total}). The overall balance is the sum of both the available balance and the transferable balance. It represents the total number of tokens held by the user, including tokens that are currently locked in pending transfers. The relationship between these balances can be expressed as: $B_{total} = B_{avail} + B_{trans}$.

UTXOs. Bitcoin’s UTXO model serves as the backbone for tracking unspent funds in BRC20 transactions. Each UTXO is defined as a tuple, typically represented as: $utxo := (v, P, sn)$, Where v denotes the value, P represents the locking conditions(encumbrance), often a public key or script, and sn is the serial number ensuring uniqueness. UTXOs can be created and consumed through mint and transfer transactions. For BRC20 transactions, when a token is transferred, a set of input UTXOs is fully consumed, and a new set of output UTXOs is created (cf. Fig. 1(b)), encoded as follows: $tx_{Transfer} = (utxo_{inp}, \vec{v}_{out}, \vec{P}_{out})$, Where $utxo_{inp}$ is the list of input UTXOs, \vec{v}_{out} are the output values, and \vec{P}_{out} are the new encumbrances. The UTXO model used in BRC20 ensures that tokens remain transferable while being securely tracked.


Transaction fee. A transaction fee is determined by subtracting the total output value from the total input value. Any leftover satoshis in a transaction become the fee rewarded to miners. The higher the fee rate, the sooner the transaction will be confirmed. Transaction fees are typically measured in satoshis per byte (sats/vbyte), where the fee is divided by the size of the transaction in virtual bytes. Fee bumping mechanisms like Replace-by-Fee (RBF [38]) and Child



(a) **BRC20’s transfer operation on-chain:** It involves two transactions. The first one ($Tx1$) inscribes the JSON-style content (i.e., ordi’s transfer operation) into a satoshi, marked with a unique sequence number (e.g., Inscription #3), and sends it to oneself. The second transaction ($Tx2$) executes the actual transfer, carrying Inscription #3, which moves the inscribed ordi token instruction from the sender to the receiver.



(b) **Transferring inscriptions from end-to-end:** Transferring an inscription (or BRC20 tokens) is conducted by standard UTXO transactions. A sender sends 8 sats (containing Inscriptions #1-#8) to two recipients: 3 sats (#1-#3) are sent to Recipient A, 2 sats (#4, #5) to B, 2 sats (#6, #7) are returned to the sender, and 1 sat (#8) is used for fees.



(c) **Off-chain updates for inscribed BRC20 tokens:** The sender’s holding BRC20 tokens (ordi) move from an available state to a transferable state after $Tx1$. These tokens are then sent to the recipient after $Tx2$, reducing the sender’s total balance. The recipient’s balance increases correspondingly, but only after $Tx2$ is completed.

Figure 1: How to transfer BRC20 tokens

Pays for Parent (CPFP [39]) allow users to increase fees on pending transactions to speed up confirmation in case of delays.

In the two-step transfer process for BRC20 tokens, the fees for each step are distinct yet interrelated. Users typically only set up one transaction fee when initiating the token transfer, which can mask the fact that there are actually two transactions involved. $Tx1$ requires a lower fee, as it mainly inscribes the intent to transfer. Conversely, $Tx2$, which completes the actual transfer, generally incurs a higher fee – often 3 to 5 times more than that of $Tx1$. This discrepancy in fees ensures that $Tx2$ is confirmed swiftly after $Tx1$ under normal conditions.

To be unfortunately noted, while we can empirically determine that the fee for $\mathbf{Tx1}$ is lower than that for $\mathbf{Tx2}$, the exact fees for each transaction remain unknown until they are actually executed.

Mempool transaction exit. In Bitcoin, unconfirmed transactions remain in the mempool but are removed under specific conditions. (i) The most common scenario is when a transaction is confirmed by being included in a block mined by a miner. Once confirmed, the transaction is removed from the mempool, as it no longer needs to be broadcasted. (ii) Additionally, if the mempool reaches its maximum capacity, lower-fee transactions may be evicted to make space for higher-fee ones. (iii) Moreover, transactions can also exit the mempool through the RBF mechanism [38], where a user broadcasts a new transaction with a higher fee, replacing the original lower-fee transaction. (iv) Another reason for transaction removal is expiration. If a transaction remains unconfirmed in the mempool for an extended period — usually 14 days [40] — it may be dropped by nodes due to timeout. (v) Finally, conflicting transactions, such as those involved in double-spend attempts, will be removed if a competing transaction is prioritized.

3.3 Transfer In Action (Bitcoin Networks)

The transfer of BRC20 over the Bitcoin network is a two-step process comprised by two transactions (cf. Algorithm 1).

- **Step-①: Inscribing the transfer operation.** The first step involves the sender inscribing a transfer request (i.e., $\mathbf{Tx1}$) with a transaction fee f_{tx} , aiming to move a specified amount of tokens m to the recipient with address A_r . During this step, the sender’s available balance B_{avail}^{As} is reduced by m , and an equivalent amount is added to the sender’s transferable balance B_{trans} . At this stage, the tokens are placed in a pending state and are not yet executable to A_r . $\mathbf{Tx1}$ alone does not affect the recipient’s balances; it only logs the intention of transferring tokens. The overall balance B_{total} of the sender remains *unchanged* as tokens are still under the sender’s control, albeit temporarily locked in the B_{trans} .
- **Step-②: Executing the transfer operation.** In this step, the actual transfer (i.e. $\mathbf{Tx2}$) is executed over the network, finalizing the transfer initiated by $\mathbf{Tx1}$. $\mathbf{Tx2}$ moves the specified amount m from the sender’s transferable balance B_{trans}^{As} to the recipient’s available balance B_{avail}^{Ar} . Once the $\mathbf{Tx2}$ is confirmed, the B_{trans}^{As} is reset to zero, and the overall balance B_{total}^{As} is reduced by m . This marks the completion of the transfer. Simultaneously, the recipient’s B_{avail}^{Ar} and overall balance B_{total}^{Ar} are increased by m . If the transfer retry limit is reached ($r \geq R_{max}$) without success, the transfer is aborted to prevent unnecessary retries.

4 BRC20 PINNING ATTACK

4.1 Transaction Pinning

Transaction pinning [41] is a technique in blockchain where a *transaction is deliberately crafted to delay its confirmation time*.

Implementing transaction pinning. The core principle is to intentionally keep a transaction unconfirmed in the mempool for an extended period (thereby *pinning* it in place). This is achieved by manipulating transaction attributes — such as transaction fees,

sequence numbers, and inputs/outputs — to control and delay the confirmation of specific transactions.

We introduce three ways of conducting transaction pinning.

- **Setting low transaction fees:** In blockchain systems like Bitcoin and Ethereum, miners prioritize transactions based on the fees attached to them, processing higher-fee transactions first to maximize their rewards. By assigning a transaction fee lower than the average or recommended level, the transaction becomes less attractive to miners. As a result, the low-fee transaction remains unconfirmed for a longer duration.
- **Creating non-replaceable transactions:** Transactions can be constructed to opt out of replacement protocols such as RBF [38]) by setting the sequence number from $0xFFFFFFFF$ to the maximum value ($0xFFFFFFFF$). By marking a transaction as non-replaceable, the sender prevents it from being superseded by another transaction with a higher fee, maintaining its mempool position.
- **Establishing dependencies:** The confirmation time can be extended by creating a chain of transactions where the inputs spend outputs from other unconfirmed transactions. If the initial transactions have low fees or are otherwise delayed, subsequent transactions cannot be confirmed until the earlier ones are processed.

Pros and cons. Transaction pinning can serve several purposes within blockchain networks: (i) Users may intentionally set lower fees for non-urgent transactions to reduce costs; (ii) Users can use transaction pinning to prevent others from fee bumping a transaction [41], controlling over a reasonably average confirmation time; (iii) In certain multiparty protocols, it can be employed to ensure that transactions adhere to predefined rules or sequences, preventing unauthorized fee modifications.

Transaction pinning can also be exploited to execute malicious strategies: (i) It can be used to carry out DoS attacks by flooding the mempool with pinned transactions, causing network congestion; (ii) Delayed confirmations increase the risk of front-running [42][43], where attackers observe pending transactions and submit their own with higher fees to ensure they are processed first.

4.2 BRC20 Pinning Attack

We present the BRC20 pinning attack, an attack based on the *transaction pinning and inscription transfer mechanism* (cf. Sec.3).

Our BRC20 pinning attack strategically targets a critical vulnerability: **transferable balance**. When a token transfer is initiated via inscription, the tokens move from the B_{avail} to the B_{trans} , where they remain pending until the transaction is confirmed. By applying transaction pinning techniques, the attacker can prolong the time tokens remain in B_{trans} . This creates a window of opportunity for the attacker to initiate numerous transfers and overwhelm the target’s liquidity. This denial of liquidity can halt withdrawals, disrupt operations, and create significant financial damage for the target.

Our attack consists of two steps (cf. Algorithm 2).

- **Step-①: Inscribing falsified transfers.** Let A_t represent the target’s address and $A_{\mathcal{A}}$ the attacker’s address. The attacker initiates a BRC20 token transfer request (\mathbf{Tx}) to A_t (Line 1). Each transfer inscribes a fraction f of the target’s available balance $B_{avail}^{At}(t)$ (Line 2). The amount inscribed in each request i is:

$$m_i = f \cdot B_{avail}^{At}(t), \text{ for all } i = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}, f \in [0, 1]$$

Algorithm 1 BRC20 Incribed Transfer Process

Global Parameters: Available balance B_{avail} , Transferable balance B_{trans} , Total balance B_{total} , Transaction fee f_{tx} .

Local Parameters: Token amount m , Sender's address A_s , Recipient's address A_r , Max retries R_{max} , Single retry r .

- 1: **Step-①: Upon initiating an InscribeTransfer request (Tx1)**
- 2: Sender A_s inscribes m tokens for transfer to recipient A_r with f_{tx}
- 3: Update balances for the sender's A_s :
 - 4: $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_s} \leftarrow B_{\text{avail}}^{A_s} - m$
 - 5: $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_s} \leftarrow B_{\text{trans}}^{A_s} + m$
 - 6: $B_{\text{total}}^{A_s} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ▷ balance unchanged
- 7: Update balance for the recipient's A_r :
 - 8: $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_r} \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 9: $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_r} \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 10: $B_{\text{total}}^{A_r} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ▷ all unchanged
- 11: **Step-②: Execute transfer (Tx2)**
- 12: $r \leftarrow 0$ ▷ initialize retry counter
- 13: **while** $r < R_{\text{max}}$ **do**
- 14: A_s sends a transaction to A_r to transfer the inscribed amount m
- 15: **if** transaction fee f_{tx} is too low **then** ▷ triggering the attack
- 16: **retry:** increase f_{tx} and resend transaction
- 17: $r \leftarrow r + 1$
- 18: **else**
- 19: Update balances for A_s after transfer:
 - 20: $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_s} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ▷ balance unchanged
 - 21: $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_s} \leftarrow 0$
 - 22: $B_{\text{total}}^{A_s} \leftarrow B_{\text{total}}^{A_s} - m$
- 23: Update balances for A_r after transfer:
 - 24: $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_r} \leftarrow B_{\text{avail}}^{A_r} + m$
 - 25: $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_r} \leftarrow 0$
 - 26: $B_{\text{total}}^{A_r} \leftarrow B_{\text{total}}^{A_r} + m$
- 27: **break**
- 28: **end if**
- 29: **end while**
- 30: **if** $r = R_{\text{max}}$ **then**
- 31: Abort ▷ failed due to over-threshold for retries
- 32: **end if**

At this stage, the target total's balance $B_{\text{total}}^{A_t}$ remains unchanged, with only internal balances shifting— $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_t}$ decreases and $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_t}$ increases (Line 5), since the inscribed operation has been confirmed. The attacker can send multiple inscription transfer requests (Line 19&20) to flood the network, aiming to lock up a substantial portion of the target's liquidity.

- **Step-②: Delaying transfer execution.** The attacker delays the actual transfer process (Line 3) of the Tx by minimizing the transaction fees f_{tx} . Let f_{tx}^i represent the transaction fee for the i -th inscribed transfer. The attacker chooses the transaction fee that is high enough to prioritize Tx1 but remains low enough to prevent Tx2 from being immediately confirmed: $f_{\text{tx}}^i \in [f_{\text{min}}, f_{\text{sf}}]$, where f_{min} is the threshold fee for low-priority transactions in the mempool, and f_{sf} is the upper limit at which Tx2 avoids quick execution (Line 4&21).

The attacker further leverages mempool congestion C_m to maximize the delay in confirmation (Line 7&22). C_m is the ratio of the current number of unconfirmed transactions to a network-defined threshold that represents *normal* congestion levels [44]. The attacker calculates the total delay T_{delay} and compares it to the threshold time T_{bar} to assess whether the attack has succeeded or failed (Line 9&28). If successful, the target's liquidity is diminished by m . When m equals the maximum available amount

Algorithm 2 BRC20 Pinning Attack

Global Parameters: B_{avail} , B_{trans} , B_{total} , Transaction fee f_{tx} , Mempool congestion C_m , Critical delay T_{bar} .

Local Parameters: Token amount m , Attacker's address $A_{\mathcal{A}}$, Target's address A_t , Multiple retries R_{mul} , Single retry r , Delay time T_{delay} .

- 1: **Step-①: Attacker \mathcal{A} initiates BRC20 token transfer request (Tx).**
- 2: Attacker \mathcal{A} requests to inscribe m tokens to target A_t
- 3: **Attacker \mathcal{A} deliberately sets low transaction fee f_{tx}**
- 4: $f_{\text{tx}} \leftarrow f_{\text{min}}$ ▷ Minimum fee to avoid rejection but ensure delay
- 5: Update balances for the target A_t normally ▷ Total balance unchanged, only internal balances shift
- 6: **Check mempool congestion C_m .**
- 7: **if** C_m is high and f_{tx} is too low **then**
 - Transaction is *stuck* in mempool, delaying confirmation
- 8: Attacker \mathcal{A} calculates T_{delay}
- 9: **if** $T_{\text{delay}} > T_{\text{bar}}$ **then**
- 10: **Attack succeeds:** Tokens remain in $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_t}$, locked and unusable
- 11: **else**
- 12: Go to Step-②
- 13: **end if**
- 14: **else**
- 15: Transaction confirmed; tokens move out of $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_t}$
- 16: Balances updated normally for both $A_{\mathcal{A}}$ and A_t
- 17: **end if**
- 18: **Step-②: \mathcal{A} repeats (R_{mul}) low-fee transactions to lock more tokens.**
- 19: Attacker continues sending multiple low-fee inscription requests to A_t
- 20: **for** $r = 2$ to R_{mul} **do**
- 21: \mathcal{A} inscribes X tokens with f_{tx} , where X is the maximum number of m
- 22: **if** transaction is *stuck* due to high C_m and low f_{tx} **then**
 - Target A_t 's tokens are *locked* due to unconfirmed transactions
- 23: Update balance for A_t after attack:
 - 24: $0 \leftarrow B_{\text{avail}}^{A_t} - X$ ▷ Target A_t 's liquidity is drained
 - 25: $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_t} \leftarrow B_{\text{trans}}^{A_t} + X$
 - 26: $B_{\text{total}}^{A_t} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 27: Calculate T_{delay}
- 28: **if** $T_{\text{delay}} > T_{\text{bar}}$ **then**
- 29: **Exit loop** ▷ Attack succeeds, exit retry
- 30: **end if**
- 31: **else**
- 32: **Next loop;** transaction confirmed
- 33: Balances updated normally ▷ Attack failed, next retry
- 34: **end if**
- 35: **end for**
- 36:
- 37: **if** max retries $r = R_{\text{mul}}$ reached without $T_{\text{delay}} > T_{\text{bar}}$ **then**
- 38: Exit ▷ Attack failed
- 39: **end if**

X of $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_t}$ (i.e., $f = 1$), $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_t}$ is completely depleted, indicating a full drain of $B_{\text{avail}}^{A_t}$'s liquidity (Line 24). If the attack fails, the attacker can relaunch additional attempts (Line 20). The attack is considered a failure only if the maximum number of retries N is reached without meeting the success criterion (Line 38).

4.3 (Attack) Success Criteria

Operational Tolerance. We introduce the concept of *operational tolerance* to evaluate the success of our attack.

The attack is successful if the transaction with the inscribed transfer inscription is pinned at the first stage (i.e., *inscribeTransfer*) and fails to advance to the second stage (*executeTransfer*).

The key to this success is ensuring that the delay time exceeds a certain threshold, triggering the pinned stage. Specifically, the target's tokens must remain locked in $B_{\text{trans}}^{A_t}$ for a sufficient duration (measured as the total delay T_{delay}) to effectively disrupt the target's




Figure 2: BRC20 pinning attack: An attacker sends a low-fee transaction (denoted as f_{tx} , ranging between $[f_{min}, f_{sf}]$ requesting the withdrawal of the entire ordi balance (i.e., X) from the targeted wallet. $Tx1$ is completed since $f_{tx} > f_{min}$, moving ordi into a transferable (pending) state. However, $Tx2$ cannot be executed as $f_{tx} < f_{sf}$. $Tx2$ is pinned in the mempool and locks all ordi liquidity in the transferable state without progressing to transfer. If a normal user attempts a subsequent request, even $Tx1'$ will fail, as the available balance in the hot wallet is insufficient. Both $Tx1'$ and $Tx2'$ will be dropped.

operations. The attack achieves its objective if the added T_{delay} surpasses the threshold time T_{bar} , i.e., $T_{delay} > T_{bar}$.

We refer to this threshold time as *operational tolerance*, which represents the minimum delay required to cause liquidity disruptions and failed withdrawals.

Operational tolerance calculation. To estimate the operational tolerance T_{bar} for mainstream centralized exchanges (CEXs, e.g., Binance, Coinbase, Kraken), we consider several key factors that determine how long an exchange can endure liquidity being locked without experiencing disruptions in its operations.

- *Average transaction volume (V)*. The average volume of transactions that the exchange processes over a specific period.
- *Required liquidity (L_{req})*. The minimum amount of liquid tokens the exchange needs to meet its immediate transaction obligations.
- *Available liquidity reserves (L_{avail})*. The total amount of liquid tokens the exchange has on hand.
- *Liquidity consumption rate (C)*. The rate at which the exchange's liquidity reserves are consumed due to transactions.

We construct a formula to estimate T_{bar} , where $C = \frac{V}{T_{period}}$ and T_{period} is the time period over which V is measured.

$$T_{bar} = \frac{L_{avail} - L_{req}}{C}.$$

By applying typical values to our formula, we demonstrate the calculation of the operational tolerance range T_{bar} . For this analysis, we consider Binance as our target CEX.

Due to the lack of direct data from Binance, we approximate its values by analyzing ORDI transaction data from 2024 on OKX [45], a comparable CEX with a slightly smaller user base than Binance. We derive the following parameters⁴: L_{avail}^{high} , L_{avail}^{low} is approximately 5,000,000 and 2,500,000 tokens, respectively; L_{req} is estimated at 2,000,000 tokens; and V is around 1,000,000 tokens per hour. Based on these values, we calculate T_{bar}^h to be approximately **3 hours** as the upper bound. Conversely, the lower bound T_{bar}^l is calculated to be approximately **0.5 hours** for Binance.

Operational tolerance range. By calculation, our attack targets CEXs, where a reasonable operational tolerance range is estimated to be **between 0.5 and 3 hours**, depending on their available liquidity reserves and transaction volumes. For DeFi protocols that provide liquidity pools or offer staking services, T_{bar} tends to be slightly higher, usually spanning from a few hours to up to 24 hours, due to their decentralized nature and generally lower immediate liquidity demands compared to centralized exchanges. On the other hand, wallet services or newly launched DeFi projects may exhibit a shorter T_{bar} , often less than 30 minutes, as they have lower liquidity reserves and handle fewer transactions.

5 IMPLEMENTING ATTACKS LOCALLY

In this section, we simulate and evaluate our BRC20 pinning attack in a controlled local (or private) environment.

Table 2: Experiment Parameter Settings

Parameter	Levels	Range	Results
Transfer amount (m)	Small	10% of B_{avail}^A	Fig.4(b)
	Medium	50% of B_{avail}^A	
	Large	100% of B_{avail}^A	
Transaction fee (f_{tx})	Minimum fee	100 sat/vb	Fig.4(a)
	Medium fee	200 sat/vb	
	Higher fee	500 sat/vb	
Mempool congestion (C_m)	Low	25% network capacity	Fig.4(c)
	Medium	50% network capacity	
	High	75% network capacity	
Number of attack attempts (N)	Few attempts	2 times	Fig.3(a) & Fig.3(b)
	Moderate attempts	5 times	
	Many attempts	10 times	

5.1 Experiment Objectives (O)

We examine how the transfer amount m , transaction fee f_{tx} , mempool congestion level C_m , and number of attack attempts N impact the effectiveness of the attack. Specifically, we aim to

- $O-1$: evaluate how an attacker can optimize the choice of N in conjunction with variables m , f_{tx} , and C_m to maximize the impact of the attack while minimizing associated costs;
- $O-2$: investigate the impact of increased fees f_{tx} on the cumulative delay and liquidity disruption experienced by the target;
- $O-3$: examine whether a greater number of smaller transfer attempts can be as effective as fewer, larger transfers in attacks.

⁴The specific values are illustrative estimates based on typical CEXs and publicly available information up to September 2024. Actual values may vary depending on the exchange's size, the BRC20 tokens involved, and market conditions.





Figure 3: Our Evaluation of $O-1$

5.2 Experiment

Configurations. We conducted experiments on a high-performance workstation equipped with 16 multi-core processors for parallel transaction processing, 32GB RAM for running the Bitcoin node, and a 1TB SSD for storing blockchain data. The workstation was connected to a 100 Mbps high-speed internet connection to maintain real-time synchronization with the Bitcoin testnet.

For the software setup, we used Bitcoin Core (v27.0 [46]) to operate the Bitcoin testnet nodes and the Ordinals Wallet [11] for transferring BRC20 tokens. Python (v3.9) scripts were developed to automate transaction generation, utilizing key libraries such as *requests* (for node communication) and *time* (for handling transaction delays). Finally, we employed the REST API of Mempool.space [47] to monitor mempool congestion.

Procedure. Our experiments consist of three major steps.

- **Initialization.** Set the target address A_t 's $B_{avail}^{A_t}$ to a constant value for consistency throughout the experiment.
- **Parameter setting.** To evaluate the attack under various conditions, we generated all possible combinations of the parameters specified in Table 2. We consider the transfer amount m , transaction fee f_x , mempool congestion level C_m , and the number of attack attempts N , each with three levels. The transfer amounts were set at 10%, 50%, and 100% of the target's available balance $B_{avail}^{A_t}$, simulating small, medium, and large-scale attacks. Transaction fees were assigned values of 100, 200, and 500 sat/vbyte, corresponding to minimum, medium, and higher fees to assess the impact of fee manipulation on transactions. Mempool congestion levels were modeled at 25%, 50%, and 75% of network capacity to represent varying network conditions from low to high congestion. The number of attack attempts was varied between 2, 5, and 10 to examine the effects of repeated attacks on the target's liquidity. By combining each level of every parameter with all levels of the other parameters, we created a total of 81 unique experimental scenarios (i.e., calculated by $3 \times 3 \times 3 \times 3 = 81$).
- **Trial execution.** For each scenario, we set the specific parameter values and simulated the attack by initiating the specified number of Transfer operations from the attacker's address $A_{\mathcal{A}}$ to the target address A_t , using the designated transfer amounts m and transaction fees f_x under the given mempool congestion level C_m . We meticulously recorded the delay time T_{delay} for each transaction and observed the cumulative impact on the target's

transferring balance $B_{trans}^{A_t}$ and available balance $B_{avail}^{A_t}$, noting how much of the target's liquidity was locked and for how long.

Data collection & calculation. We collect the following data: (i) The delay T_{delay} caused by each Transfer operation initiated by the attacker; (ii) the total volume of tokens pinned in the target's transferable balance $B_{trans}^{A_t}$ as a result of the N attack attempts; (iii) whether each trial meets the attack's success criteria — specifically, if $T_{delay} > T_{bar}$ and if the cumulative impact on the target's liquidity is significant; (iv) for each parameter combination, we calculate the average liquidity outage duration and the attack success rate.

5.3 Evaluation Results

We provide a detailed analysis of experimental data, explaining how each attack parameter impacts the attack.

Evaluation on $O-1$. We first evaluate the success rate (see Fig.3(a)). We categorize success rates across three levels of mempool congestion (25%, 50%, and 75%) and three scales of attack attempts (2, 5, and 10 times) at a constant transfer amount and transaction fee (10% and 100 sat/vB, respectively).

Then, we evaluate the average transaction delay (cf. Fig.3(b)). We show the distribution of average transaction confirmation delays across different levels of mempool congestion (25%, 50%, and 75%) and varying scales of attack attempts (2, 5, and 10 attempts).

- **Key observations.** (i) As N increases from 2 to 10, there is a clear trend of increasing success rate across all levels of mempool congestion; (ii) higher mempool congestion levels significantly amplify the success rates of attacks. For instance, at 75% congestion, the success rates jump from around 60.68% at 2 attempts to an impressive 81.06% at 10 attempts; (iii) as N increases, not only does the success rate improve, but the variability in transaction delay also increases. At higher congestion levels, the delay peaks are notably higher, and the spread of delay times widens, indicating more frequent extreme values.
- **Strategic insights.** We obtain two insights: (i) the data suggests that **maximizing the number of attempts during periods of high mempool congestion** could be the most effective strategy for executing a pinning attack, capitalizing on the network's vulnerabilities during high traffic to maximize disruption; (ii) while increasing N at high C_m levels provides higher success rates, it also might raise the risk of detection if not managed stealthily, requiring attackers to balance the increased success potential against the potential for heightened scrutiny.




Figure 4: Our Evaluation of $O-2$ and $O-3$

Evaluation on $O-2$. We evaluate (Fig.4(a)) the variations in average transaction delays across different transaction fees (f_{tx}) under three predefined levels of mempool congestion (25%, 50%, and 75%).

- *Key observations.* (i) There is a notable decrease in transaction delays as the transaction fee increases from 100 sat/vb to 500 sat/vb, demonstrating a strong inverse correlation between f_{tx} and delay time; (ii) at lower fees (100 sat/vb), there is a wide range of transaction delays, particularly at higher congestion levels, indicating greater variability in transaction processing times; (iii) the reduction in delay is most pronounced when transitioning from 100 sat/vb to 200 sat/vb, suggesting that a minimal increase in fee can significantly enhance transaction processing speed.
- *Strategic insights.* (i) Regardless of the level of congestion, **employing lower transaction fees** is a strategic approach for attackers to prolong the duration of the attack; (ii) conversely, defenders might focus on anomalous transaction patterns at lower fees during peak congestion as potential indicators of pinning or similar attacks, especially when these transactions deviate from typical user behavior in terms of speed and fee levels.

Evaluation on $O-3$. We evaluate (cf. Fig.4(b)) the impact of the number of attempts (i.e., 2, 5, 10) on the percentage of pinned tokens, segmented by the size of the transfer (small, medium, large). Additionally, we also evaluate (see Fig.4(c)) the attack success rate impacted by mempool congestion levels (25%, 50%, 75%).

- *Key observations.* (i) An increase in pinned tokens as the number of attempts N increases, with larger transfers having a more pronounced effect; (ii) the success rate is independent of the transfer size. It consistently increases with mempool congestion across all transaction sizes, reinforcing the findings from $O-1$.
- *Strategic insights.* (i) While large transfers inherently pin a high percentage of tokens in fewer attempts, **multiple small transfers** can cumulatively achieve similar disruption levels; (ii) under high congestion, even small transfers become considerably effective. This tactic is particularly useful in scenarios where avoiding attack detection is important, as transactions with large transfer amounts are more easily noticed.

6 APPLYING ATTACKS AGAINST BINANCE

In this section, we extend our attack to a real-world project by targeting Binance’s ORDI wallet. ORDI ranks as the **No.1⁵** BRC20

⁵As of the time of writing, ORDI’s MarketCap is \$711M, according to CoinMarketCap.

token in terms of market capitalization and on-chain activity. Binance has the **largest** trading volume for ORDI, occupying 26.24%⁶ of the total market volume, making its ORDI wallet the most active. The second-largest volume is held by OKX, occupying 15.99%⁶. This significant market share makes Binance’s ORDI wallet an ideal target to demonstrate the practical implications of our attack.

6.1 Preparation

Attack target. The target of the attack was Binance’s ORDI wallet address: `bc1qhuv3dhpnm0wktasd3v0kt6e4aqfqs0uhfdu7d`. At the time of the attack, this wallet held a substantial amount of **8,196,950** ORDI tokens (valued at approx. **US\$9,052,645** based on the then-current ORDI price of US\$1.10 per token). We selected this address as our primary target for attacking for several reasons: (i) The large amount of tokens held in the wallet: This significant holding means that any successful attack could impact a considerable volume of assets, demonstrating the potential severity of the BRC20 pinning attack. (ii) OKX explorer [45] indicates that it is one of the most active addresses for ORDI, handling deposits and withdrawals for a large user base. By focusing on an address with high transactional throughput (150 txns/day⁷), we can easily assess how the attack might disrupt normal operations.

Attack tools. We used the Ordinals wallet interface [11] to interact with the ORDI protocol, creating multiple inscribeTransfer transactions targeting the wallet. We employed the Mempool.space API [47] to monitor Bitcoin’s mempool congestion in real-time. We also used the Ordiscan explorer [48] to verify the status of the ORDI wallet during the attack and Unisat [12] to track specific transaction details and evaluate the impact on Binance’s operations.

6.2 Execution of Attack

Attack overview. Our pinning attack against Binance’s ORDI wallet consisted of several successive attack attempts (cf. Fig.5). We achieved this by executing transactions with *low transaction fees* and *large token amounts* under high mempool congestion, pinning Binance’s ORDI in the transferable balance for an extended period. During the execution of our attack, we successfully locked the entire liquidity of the wallet and caused an operational shutdown of Binance’s ORDI wallet. This led to a temporary halt in withdrawals

⁶Data from CoinMarketCap: <https://coinmarketcap.com/currencies/ordi/> [Oct. 2024].

⁷Data is calculated by Total_txns/Total_days, according to OKX [Oct 2024]

and transfers for users, lasting approximately **3.5 hours**. Following this period, recovery mechanisms were implemented, and normal operations were restored.

We mark the malicious inscriptions (i.e., under our attacks) in **purple**, while the recovery ones are in **teal**. The remaining normal inscriptions/transactions (i.e., requests from users) are in black.

Ethical considerations. It is important to highlight that this attack was conducted under **white-hat** principles. Our intention was to stress-test the BRC20 protocol and inform Binance about potential vulnerabilities. After the attack, we immediately disclosed our findings to the Binance security team to prevent malicious actors from exploiting similar vulnerabilities.

First attempt (1st Tx in Fig.5). The first attack (**1st Tx**, inscriptionID: #46374444) took place on Dec. 7, 2023, at 16:36:58, targeting Binance’s ORDI wallet to inscribe a transfer of 8,196,950 ORDI tokens, the entire balance of the wallet. Given the high mempool congestion (149.48% capacity), we executed the attack using a low-fee and large-amount strategy (200 sats/vB, approximately 0.000278 BTC), significantly lower than the average transaction fee of 0.00051525 BTC [49], to delay transaction confirmation. We provided the attack information below.

Attack	1st Tx
Block ID	#820,107
Inscription ID	#46374444
Transaction ID	8f609c036686f478b6123...291f27479fa9995
Source Address	bc1p7k2nuhqg5anj6ds5...e778x8swgk439 (Taproot address)
Target Address	bc1qhuv3dhpnm0...sd0uhfdu7d (Binance’s ORDI address)
Amount	Input: 0.00028346 BTC, Output: 0.00000546 BTC
Fee rate:	200 sats/vB
Fee used:	27,800 sats (between fees for Tx1 and Tx2)
Attack result	Fail

The first attack failed due to an unforeseen concurrent transaction. While we initiated the attack to inscribe a transfer of 8,196,950 ORDI tokens, a withdrawal transaction (InscriptionID: #46374443) was simultaneously confirmed, reducing the Binance wallet’s balance by 6,337 ORDI tokens.

This reduction in the wallet’s balance resulted in our attack attempting to lock more tokens than were available in the wallet – specifically, our inscribed amount exceeded the wallet’s remaining total by the amount withdrawn. Since the intended amount to be locked could not surpass the wallet’s actual holdings, the attack was ultimately unsuccessful.

Subsequent attempts (2nd-4th Txs in Fig.5). After the initial failure, we proceeded to launch three successive attacks approximately one hour later⁸. We continued to use an attack strategy with large inscription transfer amounts and low fees. Inscriptions with higher amounts effectively maximize liquidity locking, while low fees prolong the transaction’s presence in the mempool.

At 19:02:21, we initiated our second attack (**2nd Tx**, inscriptionID: #46385830) using a fee rate of 201 sats/vB and successfully locked 8,210,108 ORDI tokens, nearly the entire balance of the target address. This rendered the withdrawal functionality of the target wallet inoperative, as all tokens were locked in $B_{trans}^{A_t}$.

Subsequently, at 19:11:19, the target address received two consecutive token transfers totaling 5,076 and 1,022 tokens (inscriptionIDs: #46387804 and #46387805). These two transactions appeared to be legitimate inscriptions initiated by Binance. OKLink⁹ indicates that the sending addresses are associated with Binance’s internal wallets. The likely purpose of these transfers was to replenish the target wallet’s available balance $B_{avail}^{A_t}$ by transferring additional ORDI tokens to it, thereby restoring withdrawal functionality for users.

Attack	2nd Tx
Block ID	#820,119
Inscription ID	#46385830
Transaction ID	de31d83400784112a3e...7f14087b351971f0e
Source Address	bc1pclw7e5azt70plf...xgesc4jh7s9vta4y (Taproot address)
Target Address	bc1qhuv3dhpnm0...sd0uhfdu7d (Binance’s ORDI address)
Amount	Input: 0.00028146 BTC, Output: 0.00000546 BTC
Fee rate:	201 sats/vB
Fee used:	27,800 sats
Attack result	Success

We launched the third attack (**3rd Tx**, inscriptionID: #46389818) at 19:42:02, targeting exactly the sum of the newly received 6,099 tokens, which once again locked all liquidity at the target address.

Concurrently with this third attack, the target address received an additional transfer of 2,683 tokens (inscriptionID: #46391171), prompting us to initiate one more attack (**4th Tx**, inscriptionID: #46393039) at 19:59:47, with an equal amount of 2,683 tokens.

Attack	3rd Tx
Block ID	#820,123
Inscription ID	#46389818
Transaction ID	b1de4af2a262bf2732f550...750c33e32a32c129e9486
Source Address	bc1ppre27yktksz34...240c2g504qs403sks (Taproot address)
Target Address	bc1qhuv3dhpnm0...sd0uhfdu7d (Binance’s ORDI address)
Amount	Input: 0.00028346 BTC, Output: 0.00000546 BTC
Fee rate:	201 sats/vB
Fee used:	27,800 sats
Attack result	Success

Attack	4th Tx
Block ID	#820,125
Inscription ID	#46393039
Transaction ID	fa5680d61e17dde63954...1c149164bbf2e35d0a4b3e1
Source Address	bc1pymxt2kuqrcm...l6uedrl28nsv6nu29 (Taproot address)
Target Address	bc1qhuv3dhpnm0...sd0uhfdu7d (Binance’s ORDI address)
Amount	Input: 0.00014346 BTC, Output: 0.00000546 BTC
Fee rate:	201 sats/vB
Fee used:	27,800 sats
Attack result	Success

These consecutive attacks completely stripped the target address of liquidity, rendering it unable to perform standard operational transactions, including withdrawals and receipts. We noted that no further transactions occurred at the target address in the Bitcoin network for about 3.5 hours following the attacks. This sequence not only demonstrated the effectiveness of pinning attacks but also highlighted the strategic value of successive attack tactics in practical scenarios.

Liquidity recovery. After we alerted Binance to our white-hat pinning attack on their ORDI wallet, the Binance team promptly undertook measures to restore the wallet’s liquidity at 23:36:11.

The recovery approach used by Binance involved initiating a new transfer transaction (**Tx2**) that corresponded to the original inscribed transaction (**Tx1**) in the two-step inscription-based transfer

⁸During this interval, a normal ORDI transfer transaction (#46382402) occurred

⁹OKLink is a blockchain explorer that provides address associations for transactions; see #46387804 and #46387805, respectively.

process. Specifically, **Tx1** only inscribes the intent to transfer, and as long as **Tx2** remains unconfirmed, the tokens are in a limbo state but still under the originating wallet’s control. Binance leveraged this by initiating new **Tx2s** transaction from its wallet, targeting the *transferable balance* created by initial **Tx1s** and rerouting the tokens back to its wallet address.

The recovery process is evidenced by the three transactions (confirmed in Block #820,133) highlighted with green boxes in Fig.5 (InscriptionIDs: #46393039 with details below, #46389818, and #46389830). By executing these transactions, Binance transferred amounts equivalent to those we had previously locked back into their own wallet address. Specifically, they moved a total of 8,218,890 ORDI tokens from the transferable balance back into the available balance, reinstating full liquidity in their wallet. Subsequently, approximately half an hour after this recovery operation, normal transactional activities —including withdrawals and deposits — resume, as indicated by the transactions marked as Normal TXs (e.g., InscriptionIDs: #46424262).

Recovery	1st Tx (corresponding to our 4th attack)
Block ID	#820,133
Inscription ID	#46393039
Transaction ID	fa5680d61e17dde63954c...c149164bbf2e35d0a4b3e1
Source Address	bc1qhuv3dhpnm0...sd0uhfdu7d (Binance’s ORDI address)
Target Address	bc1qhuv3dhpnm0...sd0uhfdu7d (same as source address)
Amount	Input 0.97875162 BTC, Output: 0.97736318 BTC
Fee rate:	404 sats/vB
Fee used:	138,844 sats (larger than fees for Tx2)
Recovery result	Success

7 ATTACK INSIGHTS

7.1 Potential Defenses

Defense strategies. We discuss several defense mechanisms that can be implemented to prevent our attacks.

- *Abnormal transaction monitoring.* One strategy is the adoption of transaction monitoring systems that can detect anomalies in real-time. By analyzing patterns such as unusually large token transfer requests accompanied by abnormally low transaction fees, these systems can flag potential pinning attempts. Wallet providers and exchanges can then implement safeguards, such as temporarily suspending suspicious transactions or requiring additional confirmations before processing large transfers.
- *Dynamic fee adjustments.* By dynamically adjusting minimum transaction fees that align with the current mempool congestion levels, it becomes economically unfeasible for attackers to prolong the confirmation time of their malicious transactions. This policy ensures that all transactions interacting with the exchange’s wallets are prioritized for confirmation by miners, reducing the likelihood of liquidity being locked.
- *Hierarchical authorization.* Establishing a multi-tiered access control architecture within the transaction infrastructure of a wallet or exchange can reduce the success rate of such attacks. It leverages role-based access control [51] and defines specific authorization requirements based on transaction attributes such as amount, frequency, and destination address. For instance, the architecture may employ smart policy engines that automatically approve low-value or routine transactions using standard authentication protocols. In contrast, high-value or atypical transactions trigger

additional security measures, requiring multi-factor authentication (MFA) or cryptographic signatures from multiple authorized personnel (i.e., multi-signature schemes).

Limitation in defense. Certain limitations inherent to the BRC20 protocol make complete defense challenging. The protocol’s design allows for the inscription of transfer operations broadcasted to the network but not immediately confirmed. This feature is fundamental to how BRC20 tokens operate on the Bitcoin network. Consequently, it is difficult to prevent attackers from creating transactions that appear legitimate but are intended to lock liquidity.

Moreover, the BRC20 protocol lacks the ability to distinguish between genuine and malicious transfers at the protocol level. All transfer requests are treated equally, without any built-in mechanisms or additional verification processes to ascertain the intent or legitimacy of transactions. The absence of programmability in Bitcoin makes it challenging to develop effective defense measures for the BRC20 protocol, such as implementing multi-signature requirements, time locks, or conditional fund releases.

7.2 Attack Bounds

Transaction fee. The transaction fee bounds in our attack are determined by two key thresholds: the minimum fee f_{min} and the safety fee f_{sf} . The lower bound, f_{min} , represents the minimum amount required for **Tx1** to remain in the Bitcoin mempool and avoid rejection, typically ranging from 1 to 10 sat/vB in low-congestion scenarios. Setting a fee slightly above this threshold ensures **Tx1** stays active without quickly confirming **Tx2**. The upper bound, f_{sf} , is the maximum fee that keeps the transaction from being prioritized by miners, often 2 to 2.5 times f_{min} .

Since network congestion directly influences both f_{min} and f_{sf} , these bounds are dynamic and fluctuate in real-time across different platforms. For example, wallets like Ordiscan and OKX may have distinct minimum fee requirements based on their operational thresholds. In addition, during high congestion, f_{min} may rise significantly, and the attack range — typically between 30 and 80 sat/vB — becomes more practical.

Suspension tolerance. It’s essential to recognize that tolerance times vary across platforms, network conditions, and external events. Our estimate of the suspension tolerance is based on analyzing a large dataset across diverse time periods and congestion levels in OKX. This allows for a generalized window, but each platform’s specific suspension tolerance may differ — wallets like Binance, Ordiscan, and OKX, for example, have distinct operational thresholds influenced by transaction volume and user activity. Additionally, special events, such as network upgrades or spikes in token popularity, may temporarily skew the suspension tolerance, which in turn impacts the effectiveness of an attack.

7.3 Attack Applicability

Applicability to more BRC20 protocols. Our pinning attack is inherently applicable to other BRC20 tokens (cf. the *upper* part in Table 3) due to the uniformity of their operational mechanism, two-step transactions: the first records the intent to transfer tokens by embedding data into a Bitcoin transaction (via opcode), and the second actualizes the transfer when the transaction is confirmed. While these two transactions appear to be bundled, they are, in fact,

	Number	Method	Quantity	Balance	From	To	Date Time
Normal TXs	#46440279	receive	+909.138	8,220,822.28922299	1MJU2...izU3J	bc1qh...fdu7d	08/12/2023, 03:10:15
	#46440278	receive	+662.644632	8,219,913.15122299	1LhDC...17SAJ	bc1qh...fdu7d	08/12/2023, 03:10:15
	#46440272	receive	+936	8,219,250.50659099	1QETy...J2az3	bc1qh...fdu7d	08/12/2023, 03:10:15
	#46424262	send	-575.71	8,218,314.50659099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qf...msma6	08/12/2023, 01:02:12
	#46424262	inscribe-transfer	575.71	8,218,890.21659099		bc1qh...fdu7d	08/12/2023, 01:02:12
Recovery !!	#46385830	receive	+8,210,108	8,218,890.21659099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 23:36:11
3rd Tx	#46385830	send 🤔	-8,210,108	8,782.21659099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 23:36:11
	#46389818	receive	+6,099	8,218,890.21659099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 23:36:11
2nd Tx	#46389818	send 🤔	-6,099	8,212,791.21659099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 23:36:11
	#46393039	receive	+2,683	8,218,890.21659099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 23:36:11
1st Tx	#46393039	send 🤔	-2,683	8,216,207.21659099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 23:36:11
Attack !!	#46393039	inscribe-transfer 🤔	2,683	8,218,890.21659099		bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 19:59:47
4th Tx (Succeed)	#46391171	receive	+2,683	8,218,890.21659099	1246R...oqLn6	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 19:42:02
3rd Tx (Succeed)	#46389818	inscribe-transfer 🤔	6,099	8,216,207.21659099		bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 19:42:02
	#46387805	receive	+1,022.748	8,216,207.21659099	1MJU2...izU3J	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 19:11:19
2nd Tx (Succeed)	#46387804	receive	+5,076.2806	8,215,184.46859099	14DhZ...apY8B	bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 19:11:19
	#46385830	inscribe-transfer 🤔	8,210,108	8,210,108.18799099		bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 19:02:21
1st Tx (Failed)	#46382402	send	-10,000	8,210,108.18799099	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1pd...8xny1	07/12/2023, 18:10:40
	#46382402	inscribe-transfer	10,000	8,220,108.18799099		bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 18:10:40
Normal Tx	#46374444	inscribe-transfer 🤔	8,196,950.19	8,190,612.91626645		bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 16:36:58 Ⓞ
	#46374443	send	-6,337.28	8,190,612.91626645	bc1qh...fdu7d	bc1qe...sr72u	07/12/2023, 16:36:58
	#46374443	inscribe-transfer	6,337.28	8,196,950.19626645		bc1qh...fdu7d	07/12/2023, 16:36:58

Timestamp gaps > 3.5hours In-time follow-up Tx

Figure 5: Transaction Details of Our Attack on Unisat [50] (from bottom to top)

independent of each other. Our attack pins the first transaction, thereby obstructing the execution of the second one, where the actual token exchange takes place.

The vulnerabilities exploited in our pinning attack are not specific to a single token but are systemic, affecting a wide range of tokens, including but not limited to those listed in Table 3.

Inapplicability to any inscription protocols? When considering other types of inscription protocols (cf. the *bottom* part of Table 3), such as Etherscriptions (ETHS) on Ethereum [23], our attack is not applicable due to fundamental differences in transaction structures.

Etherscriptions utilize the calldata field in Ethereum transactions to inscribe data on-chain. For instance, to create an Etherscription containing image data, the user converts the image (up to 96KB) into a Base64-encoded data URI formatted as `data/png;base64,...`. This URI is then converted into a hexadecimal string and included in the calldata (an editable field in EVM-based transactions) of a native ETH transfer transaction. The recipient address specified in the transaction becomes the owner of the Etherscription tokens.

For EVM-compatible blockchains (e.g., BNB chain, Solana), the inscription method is similar to Etherscriptions, i.e., storing fixed-format data (`data:"p":_"op":_"tick":_"amt":_"`) in the calldata

field. The format is structured similar to BRC20. However, their operational transfer mechanism is fundamentally different.

Instead of the two-step process used in BRC20 token transfers, the transfer of tokens on EVM-compatible chains is completed within a single transaction. The inscription of data and the execution of the transfer occur simultaneously via the actual transaction's settlement between two parties.

7.4 Open Problems and Planned Studies

Pinning attack extension. We discovered that multiple platforms supporting the PSBT (Partially Signed Bitcoin Transaction) mechanism may also be susceptible to our attack.

PSBT [52] is a Bitcoin transaction format that allows multiple parties to collaborate in signing a transaction. Several inscription trading platforms, such as Ordinals Wallet, utilize PSBT to enable secure and trustless transactions.

Because a PSBT remains only partially signed, it does not complete as a full transaction on the Bitcoin network until confirmed. As long as the transaction is unconfirmed, it remains in a "pending" state in the mempool. This mechanism can introduce vulnerabilities in specific scenarios. For example, if a platform only allows one buyer to lock in the transaction, only the original buyer can

continue modifying the PSBT through RBF. Although unconfirmed by miners, the platform won't release the PSBT back to the market for other buyers to access. As a result, an attacker could leverage *low-fee pinning techniques* to occupy the transaction signature for an extended period, blocking other buyers from completing the purchase until the mempool clears the transaction.

Beyond attacks in PSBT-supported platforms, another challenge is the development of effective timeout mechanisms to prevent a single buyer from indefinitely holding a transaction. Another area for exploration is the implementation of multi-party verification processes that could allow other buyers to compete for a transaction if the original buyer's transaction is pending for an extended period.

Fee distribution in transfer. Another open problem for exploration is to investigate how transaction fees (f_{tx}) are distributed between the two transactions — $Tx1$ (inscribed transfer) and $Tx2$ (executed transfer) — in the BRC20 protocol. While our empirical findings indicate that the f_{tx} for $Tx2$ is often 3 to 5 times higher than $Tx1$, the protocol's specific mechanism for determining these allocations remains unclear. This distribution is crucial for developing countermeasures against pinning attacks, as attackers exploit this discrepancy to manipulate transaction confirmation times.

8 RELATED WORK

Bitcoin pinning attack. The attack is a strategy that deliberately keeps an unconfirmed transaction in the mempool and delays its confirmation on-chain [53]. This introduces vulnerabilities for services that depend on timely transaction processing. For example, (i) in payment channels like the Lightning Network [54][55], participants often need to close the channel within a specified timeframe, and an attacker can pin transactions to prevent the channel from closing on time; (ii) in escrow services, where time-based conditions dictate when funds are released, an attacker can exploit these conditions by delaying the confirmation of critical transactions. Our attack follows a similar principle, wherein an attacker can pin an unconfirmed transaction (inscribeTransfer) to prevent it from advancing to the settlement stage (Transfer).

Existing studies on BRC20. Wang et al. [7] analyze the activities surrounding BRC20 hype and conduct a multi-dimensional evaluation of market function and social sentiment. Louis [19] investigates the transaction fee fluctuation of Bitcoin Ordinals and assesses its impact on the Bitcoin network. Kiraz et al. [56] introduce a proof system leveraging recursive SNARKs to establish the linkage of two Bitcoin transactions. While they do not explicitly mention BRC20 or token inscription, the method for transferring NFTs via Bitcoin adheres to the same underlying principle. Wen et al. [21] designed a decentralized Bitcoin indexer, a type of distributed relays. They leverage Verkle trees [57] to prove the states, replacing committee indexers with heavy computations with lightweight users. Wang et al. [22] proposed a unilateral bridge to allow initiating operational actions from the Bitcoin side to Ethereum smart contracts. Additionally, several studies have initiated discussions on BRC20 within the broader scope of NFTs, including analyses of NFTs themselves [58–60], price fluctuations [20], and market sentiment [61].

Further studies stemming from BRC20. Several technical routes have emerged: (i) A line of protocols modify the functionalities of BRC20. For instance, ARC20 [62] removes the constraints of upper

bound characters, while Rune [63] embeds more token data. (ii) Several studies focus on improving the performance and properties of specific components, such as off-chain indexers for data availability [21]. (iii) Many UTXO-based blockchains draw inspiration from BRC20 on the Bitcoin network and begin to extend their inscription functions on-chain, such as DRC20 [64] on Dogechain. (iv) Similarly, a lot of heterogeneous chains compared to Bitcoin also propose their inscriptions, such as Ethscriptions [65] on Ethereum, BSC20 [24] on BNB Smart Chain, ASC20 [25] on Avalanche, PRC20 [26] on Polygon, SOLs [27] on Solana, MRC20 [66] on Move, and APT20 [67] on Aptos. (v) Some studies focus on establishing connections between Bitcoin networks (inscribed tokens included) and wider blockchain ecosystems, such as relying on checkpoints [68] and bridges [22]. (vi) Recent studies extended the existing inscription mechanism (which adds plaintext scripts) by embedding more complex inscriptions, such as comments (e.g., NANDGate [69]) and customized functions [70]. (vii) More broadly, many active teams invest efforts in implementing smart contracts on the Bitcoin network, which is also known as the Bitcoin layer two (L2) [28] (more sharply focused than the previous L2 [71]), such as BitVM [69] and BitLayer [72].

BRC20 wallets are more than just wallets! Blockchain wallets play an important role in managing digital assets, performing tasks such as storing private keys, tracking balances, and facilitating transactions [73–75]. However, unlike state-based wallets (e.g., MetaMask) that serve as an insulated interface [76], BRC20 wallets offer expanded functionalities: (i) managing UTXOs that hold BRC20 tokens, which includes operations such as splitting and merging UTXOs based on transfer scripts; and (ii) interpreting and executing protocol-defined rules and functions encoded within transaction scripts (see Sec.2 for technical details), such as Ordinals, which govern transaction behavior. These wallets essentially function as off-chain executors (i.e., *indexers* [2]), performing predefined functions to implement an off-chain state machine [21][22].

Token incidents. Token incidents manifest in various forms, including design flaws in intentional arbitrage (e.g., Flashloan attacks [77], MEV exploits [78][42]), complex strategies (primarily in DeFi [79]), malicious fraud (e.g., Ponzi schemes [80], scams [81], rug pulls [82][83]), as well as the unpredictable collapse of major players (e.g., SVB [84], FTX [85][86]). Most of these incidents occur with ERC20 tokens¹⁰ in the Ethereum ecosystem. Our attack reports the first upper-layer token incident within the Bitcoin ecosystem.

Attacking real blockchain projects. Many studies present their attack against various active blockchain projects with responsible disclosure, including Ethereum [87–89], Solana [90], Menero [91], NEO [92], and PoA implementations [93–95]. We commend their contributions to advancing blockchain security.

9 CONCLUSION

We present *BRC20 pinning attack*, first practical attack against BRC20 tokens. Our attack exploits the UTXO-based inscription transfer mechanism, which utilizes two “bundled” transactions ($Tx1$ and $Tx2$) to move BRC20 tokens on the Bitcoin network. By exploiting the loose dependency of two transactions, our attack initiates manipulated low-fee $Tx2$ transactions, make it pinned in the

¹⁰We majorly focused on upper-layer tokens rather than native platform tokens, largely due to the more complex attack strategies involved.

Table 3: Applicability to mainstream BRC20 tokens and other similar tokens

Tokens	MarketCap	Price	T. Sup.	C. Sup. P.	Network	Protocol	Inscription	Transfer	Required Tx's	Applicable?
Ordi	\$711M	\$33.52	21M	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
Sats	\$612M	\$0.0002904	2.1Q	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
Rats	\$115M	\$0.00011571	1T	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
LeverFi	\$74M	\$0.002241	35B	95.12%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
PIZZA	\$61M	\$2.9	21M	-	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
WZRD	\$57M	\$2.72	21M	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
PUPS	\$48M	\$6.19	7.77M	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
TEXO	\$46M	\$0.09176	510M	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
Multibit	\$33M	\$0.03426	1B	95%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
TRAC	\$28M	\$1.35	21M	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
Atomicals	\$27M	\$1.32	21M	-	Atomicals (BL2)	ARC20	Tx's metadata	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✗
Piin	\$11.27M	\$0.0001129	100B	100%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
Orange	\$8M	\$0.1002	100M	25.66%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
BNSx	\$1.22M	\$0.0565	21M	38.29%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
cats	\$1.19M	\$0.0005659	2.1B	77.79%	Bitcoin	BRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
ETHS	\$19M	\$0.9251	21M	100%	Ethereum	ETHS20	Tx's calldata	Account model	Single transaction	✗
DOGI	\$17M	\$0.8198	21M	100%	Dogecoin	DRC20	Tx's opcode	UTXO/FIFO	Two "bundled" transactions	✓
Gram	\$9.89M	\$0.004007	5B	100%	Arbitrum	TON20	Tx's opcode	Account model	Single transaction	✗
BSCS	\$1.15M	\$0.004677	500M	79.8%	BNB Chain	BSC20	Tx's calldata	Account model	Single transaction	✗
SOLS	\$90,278	\$0.004299	21M	100%	Solana	SPL20	Tx's calldata	Account model	Single transaction	✗

Abbreviation: T. Sup. for total supply; C. Sup. P. for circulating supply percentage; Tx for transaction; FIFO for First-in-first-out; BL2: Bitcoin Layer 2; - for no data available.
Note: The table includes tokens based on *inscription technology* that are liquid and hold market value. Tokens like PIPE, which were hot but now have lost value, are excluded.

mempool and stay in an unconfirmed state. This results in an insufficient *available balance* at the targeted address, blocking liquidity and disrupting withdrawal functionalities of BRC20 tokens.

Our attack is applicable for 90+% BRC20 tokens within Bitcoin ecosystem. Furthermore, the successful attack on Binance's ORDI wallet demonstrated the significant operational impact achievable by temporarily halting withdrawals for 3.5 hours (ethical reports submitted, and media coverage published in late-2023).

In addition to revealing a critical vulnerability within the BRC20 protocol, our work also proposes defense mechanisms to mitigate these risks. We also outline essential attack bounds and applicability considerations. We encourage further engagement in developing stronger safeguards for BRC20 tokens.

REFERENCES

- [1] Binance Research. BRC-20 tokens: A primer. <https://research.binance.com/static/pdf/BRC-20%20Tokens%20-%20A%20Primer.pdf>, 2023.
- [2] Binance Research. Navigating the inscriptions landscape. <https://public.bnbstatic.com/static/files/research/navigating-the-inscriptions-landscape.pdf>, 2024.
- [3] Qin Wang, Rujia Li, Qi Wang, and Shiping Chen. Non-fungible token (NFT): Overview, evaluation, opportunities and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07447*, 2021.
- [4] Gavin Wood et al. Ethereum: A secure decentralised generalised transaction ledger. *Ethereum project yellow paper*, 151(2014):1–32, 2014.
- [5] Entriken William, Shirley Dieter, Evans Jacob, and Sachs Nastassia. Eip-721: ERC-721 non-fungible token standard. *Accessible: https://eips.ethereum.org/EIP/eip-721*, 2018.
- [6] BRC-20 experiment. <https://domo-2.gitbook.io/brc-20-experiment/>, 2023.
- [7] Qin Wang and Guangsheng Yu. Understanding BRC-20: Hope or hype. *Available at SSRN 4590451*, 2023.
- [8] Ordinal Theory Authors. Ordinal theory handbook. <https://docs.ordinals.com/>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [9] Casey Rodarmor. Ordinal numbers. <https://github.com/casey/ord/blob/master/bip.mediawiki>, 2022.
- [10] Binance Research. The future of Bitcoin #3: Scaling Bitcoin. <https://public.bnbstatic.com/static/files/research/the-future-of-bitcoin-3-scaling-bitcoin.pdf>, 2024.
- [11] Ordinal wallet. <https://ordinalswallet.com/brc20>, 2023.
- [12] Unisat wallet: Open source chrome extension for Bitcoin ordinals & BRC-20. <https://unisat.io/brc20?ref=bankless.ghost.io>, 2023.
- [13] cryptokoryo. Dune analytics: Bitcoin tokens, BRC-20 (BRC20 Ordinals). <https://dune.com/cryptokoryo/brc20>, 2023.
- [14] dataalways. Dune analytics: Ordinals - Inscriptions on Bitcoin). <https://dune.com/dataalways/ordinals>, 2023.

- [15] Binance Research. A new era for Bitcoin. <https://research.binance.com/static/pdf/a-new-era-for-bitcoin.pdf>, 2023.
- [16] Binance Research. The future of Bitcoin #1: The halving & what's next. <https://public.bnbstatic.com/static/files/research/the-future-of-bitcoin-1-the-halving-and-whats-next.pdf>, 2024.
- [17] Binance Research. The future of Bitcoin #2: Tokens. <https://public.bnbstatic.com/static/files/research/the-future-of-bitcoin-2-tokens.pdf>, 2024.
- [18] Ningran Li et al. Bitcoin inscriptions: Foundations and beyond. *International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*, 2024.
- [19] Louis Bertucci. Bitcoin ordinals: Determinants and impact on total transaction fees. *Research in International Business and Finance*, page 102338, 2024.
- [20] Pawel Szydio, Marcin Wkatoek, Jaroslaw Kwapien, and Stanislaw Drozd. Characteristics of price related fluctuations in non-fungible token (NFT) market. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 34(1), 2024.
- [21] Hongbo Wen, Hanzhi Liu, Shuyang Tang, Shuhan Cao, Yu Feng, et al. Modular indexer: Fully user-verified execution layer for meta-protocols on bitcoin. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2024.
- [22] Qin Wang, Guangsheng Yu, and Shiping Chen. Bridging BRC-20 to Ethereum. *IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*, 2024.
- [23] Etherscripts documentation: protocol specification. <https://docs.etherscripts.com/overview/protocol-specification/>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [24] Gate Learn. Understanding BNB chain inscriptions: BRC-20, BSC-20, BNBS-20 explained. <https://www.gate.io/learn/articles/understanding-bnb-chain-inscriptions/1473>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [25] ASC-20 AVAX MARKET Team. Overview - ASC-20 AVAX market. <https://docs.avaxmarket.xyz/introduction/overview>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [26] PlatON Team. PRC-20 contract. https://platonnetwork.github.io/docs/en/PRC20_contract/. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [27] Magic Eden. Unlocking the future: Inscriptions on Solana. <https://help.magiceden.io/en/articles/8615097-unlocking-the-future-inscriptions-on-solana>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [28] Minfeng Qi et al. SoK: Bitcoin layer two (L2). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02650*, 2024.
- [29] ORDI market. <https://coinmarketcap.com/currencies/ordi/>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [30] Github: BIPs. <https://github.com/bitcoin/bips>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [31] Claus-Peter Schnorr. Efficient signature generation by smart cards. *Journal of cryptography*, 4:161–174, 1991.
- [32] OrdinalsBot. <https://ordinalsbot.com/>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [33] Ordiscan. <https://ordiscan.com/>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [34] BRC20-ORDI. <https://ordinalswallet.com/collection/brc20-ORDI>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [35] Binance Web3 Wallet. <https://www.binance.com/en/web3wallet>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [36] Bitcoin SV: Opcodes used in Bitcoin script. https://wiki.bitcoinsv.io/index.php/Opcodes_used_in_Bitcoin_Script, 2024.
- [37] Bitcoin SV: OP_RETURN. https://wiki.bitcoinsv.io/index.php/OP_RETURN, 2024.

- [38] Replace-by-fee (RBF). <https://bitcoinops.org/en/topics/replace-by-fee/>, 2024.
- [39] Bitcoin optech. Child pays for parent (CPFP). <https://bitcoinops.org/en/topics/cpfp/>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [40] Muhammad Anas Imtiaz, David Starobinski, Ari Trachtenberg, and Nabeel Younis. Churn in the bitcoin network: Characterization and impact. In *IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*. IEEE, 2019.
- [41] Bitcoin Optech. Transaction pinning. <https://bitcoinops.org/en/topics/transaction-pinning/>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [42] Philip Daian, Steven Goldfeder, Tyler Kell, Yunqi Li, Xueyuan Zhao, Iddo Bentov, Lorenz Breidenbach, and Ari Juels. Flash boys 2.0: Frontrunning in decentralized exchanges, miner extractable value, and consensus instability. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 910–927. IEEE, 2020.
- [43] Christof Ferreira Torres, Ramiro Camino, et al. Frontrunner jones and the raiders of the dark forest: An empirical study of frontrunning on the Ethereum blockchain. In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Sec)*, pages 1343–1359, 2021.
- [44] Matteo Romiti, Aljoshia Judmayer, Alexei Zamyatin, and Bernhard Haslhofer. A deep dive into bitcoin mining pools: An empirical analysis of mining shares. *The Workshop on the Economics of Information Security (WEIS)*, 2019.
- [45] OKX.com. <https://www.okx.com/web3/explorer/btc/address/bc1qhuvs3dhpnm0wktasd3v0kt6e4aqfqsduhfdu7d>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [46] Bitcoin core. Download bitcoin core. <https://bitcoin.org/en/download/>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [47] Mempool space API documentation. <https://mempool.space/docs/api/rest>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [48] Ordscan explorer. <https://ordinalswallet.com/>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [49] Blockchain.com. <https://www.blockchain.com/explorer/blocks/btc/820107>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [50] Unisat. <https://unisat.io/brc20?t=1725689435511&q=bc1qhuvs3dhpnm0wktasd3v0kt6e4aqfqsduhfdu7d&tick=ordi>. Accessed: Sep, 2024, 2024.
- [51] Ravi S Sandhu. Role-based access control. In *Advances in computers*, volume 46, pages 237–286. Elsevier, 1998.
- [52] Bitcoin Community. BIP 174: Partially Signed Bitcoin Transaction Format. <https://github.com/bitcoin/bips/blob/master/bip-0174.mediawiki>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2017.
- [53] transaction-pinning. <https://bitcoinops.org/en/topics/transaction-pinning/>, 2024.
- [54] Pinning attacks in lightning network. <https://github.com/t-bast/lightning-docs/blob/master/pinning-attacks.md#attacks-on-lightning>, 2024.
- [55] Antoine Riard. Pinning : The good, the bad, the ugly. <https://lists.linuxfoundation.org/pipermail/lightning-dev/2020-June/002758.html>, 2020.
- [56] Mehmet Sabir Kiraz, Enrique Larraia, and Owen Vaughan. NFT trades in Bitcoin with off-chain receipts. *International Conference on Applied Cryptography and Network Security (ACNS)*, 2023.
- [57] John Kuszmaul. Verkle trees. <https://math.mit.edu/research/highschool/primes/materials/2018/Kuszmaul.pdf>, 1:1, 2019.
- [58] Qaiser Razi, Aryan Devrani, Harshal Abhyankar, GSS Chalapathi, et al. Non-fungible tokens (NFTs)-survey of current applications, evolution and future directions. *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, 2023.
- [59] Darcy WE Allen and Jason Potts. Web3 toolkits: A user innovation theory of crypto development. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 9(2):100050, 2023.
- [60] Thomas Conlon and Shaen Corbet. The problem with NFTs. Available at SSRN 4640796, 2023.
- [61] Valeriia Baklanova et al. Investor sentiment and the NFT hype index: to buy or not to buy? *China Finance Review International*, 2023.
- [62] Atomicals Team. ARC20 tokens - atomicals guidebook. <https://docs.atomicals.xyz/arc20-tokens>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [63] Luminex introduces Rune issuance tool: Seamless effortless rune token creation on Bitcoin. <https://www.blog.luminex.io/luminex-introduces-rune-issuance-tool-seamless-effortless-rune-token-creation-on-bitcoin/>, 2024.
- [64] DRC-20 Development Team. DRC-20 standard. <https://docs.drc-20.org/>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [65] Ethscriptions Team. Introducing ethscriptions. <https://docs.ethscriptions.com/overview/introducing-ethscriptions>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [66] CoinLive. What’s going on with MOVE: Smart inscription (MRC20). <https://www.coinlive.com/news/what-s-going-on-with-move-smart-inscription-mrc20>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [67] APT-20 Development Team. APT-20 protocol. <https://apt-20.com/>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2023.
- [68] Luminex. Bitcoin staking: Unlocking 21m Bitcoins to secure the proof-of-stake economy. https://docs.babylonchain.io/assets/files/btc_staking_litepaper-32bfe40c243773f0bfac63e148387aef.pdf. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [69] BitVM. BitVM: Compute anything on Bitcoin. <https://bitvm.org/bitvm.pdf>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [70] James Lovejoy, Madars Virza, Cory Fields, Kevin Karwaski, Anders Brownworth, and Neha Narula. Hamilton: A high-performance transaction processor for central bank digital currencies. In *USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, pages 901–915, 2023.
- [71] Lewis Gudgeon, Pedro Moreno-Sanchez, Stefanie Roos, Patrick McCorry, and Arthur Gervais. SoK: Layer-two blockchain protocols. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 201–226. Springer, 2020.
- [72] Bitlayer. Bitlayer: A Bitcoin computational layer architecture based on the BitVM paradigm. <https://static.bitlayer.org/Bitlayer-Technical-Whitepaper.pdf>. Accessed: April, 2024, 2024.
- [73] Sabine Houy, Philipp Schmid, and Alexandre Bartel. Security aspects of cryptocurrency wallets—a systematic literature review. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(1):1–31, 2023.
- [74] Easwar Vivek Mangipudi, Udit Desai, Mohsen Minaei, Mainack Mondal, and Aniket Kate. Uncovering impact of mental models towards adoption of multi-device crypto-wallets. In *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, pages 3153–3167, 2023.
- [75] Ittay Eyal. On cryptocurrency wallet design. In *International Conference on Blockchain Economics, Security and Protocols (Tokenomics)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [76] Panagiotis Chatzigiannis, Foteini Baldimtsi, and Konstantinos Chalkias. SoK: Blockchain light clients. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 615–641. Springer, 2022.
- [77] Zhiyang Chen, Sidi Mohamed Beillahi, and Fan Long. Flashsyn: Flash loan attack synthesis via counter example driven approximation. In *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [78] Lioba Heimlich and Roger Wattenhofer. SoK: Preventing transaction reordering manipulations in decentralized finance. In *ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies (AFT)*, pages 47–60, 2022.
- [79] Liyi Zhou, Xihan Xiong, Jens Ernstberger, Stefanos Chaliasos, Zhipeng Wang, Ye Wang, Kaihua Qin, Roger Wattenhofer, Dawn Song, and Arthur Gervais. SoK: Decentralized finance (DeFi) attacks. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 2444–2461. IEEE, 2023.
- [80] Weimin Chen, Xinran Li, Yuting Sui, Ningyu He, Haoyu Wang, Lei Wu, and Xiapu Luo. Sadponzi: Detecting and characterizing Ponzi schemes in Ethereum smart contracts. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems (POMACS)*, 5(2):1–30, 2021.
- [81] Pengcheng Xia, Haoyu Wang, et al. Trade or trick? detecting and characterizing scam tokens on uniswap decentralized exchange. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems (POMACS)*, 5(3):1–26, 2021.
- [82] Federico Cerneria, Massimo La Morgia, Alessandro Mei, and Francesco Sassi. Token spammers, rug pulls, and sniper bots: An analysis of the ecosystem of tokens in Ethereum and in the Binance smart chain (BNB). In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Sec)*, pages 3349–3366, 2023.
- [83] Sharad Agarwal, Gilberto Atondo-Siu, Marilyne Ordekian, Alice Hutchings, Enrico Mariconti, and Marie Vasek. Short paper: DeFi deception—uncovering the prevalence of Rugpulls in cryptocurrency projects. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 363–372. Springer, 2023.
- [84] Qin Wang, Guangsheng Yu, and Shiping Chen. Cryptocurrency in the aftermath: Unveiling the impact of the SVB collapse. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems (TCSS)*, 2024.
- [85] Shange Fu et al. FTX collapse: a Ponzi story. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 208–215. Springer, 2023.
- [86] Akanksha Jalan and Roman Matkovskyy. Systemic risks in the cryptocurrency market: Evidence from the FTX collapse. *Finance Research Letters*, 2023.
- [87] Mingfei Zhang, Rujia Li, and Sisi Duan. Max attestation matters: Making honest parties lose their incentives in Ethereum PoS. In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Sec)*, pages 6255–6272, 2024.
- [88] Aviv Yaish, Kaihua Qin, Liyi Zhou, Aviv Zohar, and Arthur Gervais. Speculative Denial-of-Service attacks in Ethereum. In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Sec)*, pages 3531–3548, 2024.
- [89] Kaihua Qin, Stefanos Chaliasos, Liyi Zhou, Benjamin Livshits, Dawn Song, and Arthur Gervais. The blockchain imitation game. In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Sec)*, pages 3961–3978, 2023.
- [90] Sven Smolka, Jens-Rene Giesen, Pascal Winkler, Oussama Draissi, Lucas Davi, Ghassan Karame, and Klaus Pohl. Fuzz on the beach: Fuzzing Solana smart contracts. In *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, pages 1197–1211, 2023.
- [91] Ruisheng Shi et al. Eclipse attack on menoro’s peer to peer network. In *Proceedings of Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2025.
- [92] Qin Wang, Jiangshan Yu, Zhiniang Peng, Van Cuong Bui, Shiping Chen, Yong Ding, and Yang Xiang. Security analysis on dBFT protocol of NEO. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, 2020.
- [93] Xinrui Zhang et al. Time-manipulation attack: Breaking fairness against proof of authority aura. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference (WWW)*, 2023.
- [94] Parinya Ekparinya, Vincent Gramoli, and Guillaume Jourjon. The attack of the clones against proof-of-authority. In *Proceedings of Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*. Internet Society, 2020.
- [95] Qin Wang, Rujia Li, Qi Wang, and other. Exploring unfairness on proof of authority: Order manipulation attacks and remedies. In *ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (AsiaCCS)*, pages 123–137, 2022.