1. Liquity Recap (Core Mechanics)

Liquity is an ETH-backed borrowing protocol:

- Open Trove → Lock ETH, borrow LUSD.
- Overcollateralization → CR (Collateralization Ratio) = Collateral Value ÷ Debt Value.
 - Must stay ≥ 110% in normal mode.
- **Liquidations** → If CR < 110%, trove is liquidated; debt absorbed by Stability Pool.
- TCR (Total Collateral Ratio) = Total Collateral Value ÷ Total Debt Value.
 - Measures system-wide health.

2. Recovery Mode

- Trigger: TCR < CCR (150%).
- · Changes rules instantly:
 - Liquidation threshold jumps from 110% → 150%.
 - Even "safe" troves can be liquidated.
- Purpose: Quickly remove systemic risk.
- Protections:
 - Users can't maliciously self-liquidate profitably.
 - No operation should directly trigger Recovery Mode unless the system is already close to CCR.
 - Cannot add more risky debt while in Recovery Mode.

Example:

- Normal mode: Bob at CR = 140% is safe.
- Recovery mode: Bob at CR = 140% is liquidatable.

3. Beraborrow's Vault Accounting

Beraborrow integrated vault-like (ERC4626-ish) share accounting in its *Den Manager*, which manages user-specific vaults holding collateral.

- Shares represent proportional claim on assets.
- PPFS (Price Per Full Share) = totalAssets / totalShares.
- Should only change with deposits/withdrawals in a predictable way.

4. The Fuzzer's Finding

They ran a global invariant:

```
PPFS after any user action ≥ PPFS before (except for legitimate withdrawals)
```

The fuzzer found a **PPFS drop** after a redemption:

- totalAssets ↓ by 2
- totalShares ↓ by only 1

This meant more shares were in circulation than assets backing them.

5. Root Cause

- Fees were collected in shares, not assets.
- Fee share amount was rounded up.
- When redeeming, instead of burning X shares, it burned (X fee) shares rounding caused 1 wei of shares not to be burned.
- Result:

Assets drop more than shares → PPFS decreases slightly.

Example:

```
Before: totalAssets = 100, totalShares = 100 → PPFS = 1.0

After: totalAssets = 98, totalShares = 99 → PPFS ≈ 0.9899
```

This tiny PPFS drop affects **all depositors** system-wide.

6. Why It's Dangerous

PPFS is used to value collateral in the system.

If PPFS drops, every trove's collateral is valued less, lowering TCR.

If TCR was near CCR (150%), a small PPFS drop could:

- 1. Push TCR < 150%.
- Instantly trigger Recovery Mode.
- Mass-liquidate troves between 110%–150% CR.

7. The Attack Chain

Step 1 – Setup:

Attacker opens a large trove, borrowing enough to push TCR to just above 150%. Protocol check prevents going below CCR directly.

Step 2 – Trigger the Drop:

Attacker redeems in a way that exploits the rounding bug, causing a **1 wei share leftover** \rightarrow PPFS drops \rightarrow TCR falls below 150%.

Step 3 – Recovery Mode On:

Instant state change: liquidation threshold = 150% CR.

Many "safe" troves now liquidatable.

Step 4 – Liquidate Others:

Liquidate from healthiest (just above 150%) to unhealthiest to maximize profits.

Step 5 – Exit:

Close attacker's trove after collecting rewards.

8. Profits vs. Costs

- Costs:
 - Gas
 - Trove opening fee

Gains:

- 0.5% liquidation bonuses on all liquidated collateral.
- Additional profit if attacker is in Stability Pool (gets seized ETH from liquidations).
- Flashloan → Temporarily inflate Stability Pool position to grab more liquidated collateral.

9. Why Manual Reviews Missed It

- 1 wei rounding difference is hard to spot in a manual review.
- Looks like a small accounting quirk, not an exploit path.
- Without fuzzing, it's unlikely an auditor would:
 - Notice the PPFS drop
 - Connect it to TCR mechanics
 - Chain it into Recovery Mode mass-liquidations

10. Key Takeaways

- 1. Tiny math errors can have protocol-wide consequences if they impact global metrics.
- 2. Fuzzing excels at catching edge cases that are near-impossible to see via manual reasoning.
- Low severity → high severity: A small bug can be chained with protocol rules for large-scale profit.
- 4. Always check:
 - Price per share invariants
 - How global thresholds (like CCR) are computed
 - Whether attacker-controlled state changes can trigger systemic mode shifts