

## Wallet Analysis: Top 5 vs Bottom 5 Performers


This analysis highlights behavioral and financial patterns of the top 5 and bottom 5 wallets by PCA-computed score from Compound V2 Ethereum transactions.

---

### Top 5 Wallets — High-Scoring Profiles

These wallets show characteristics of active, long-term users who were frequently liquidated but not acting as liquidators.

Common Traits	Observations
High Activity Span	All wallets have activity across ~2086–2118 days — i.e., nearly the protocol's full lifespan.
Large Net Deposits	Especially wallet <code>0x9366...a389</code> with <b>\$19.2K net deposits</b> , indicating significant capital supply.
High Net Borrowing	E.g., <code>0x9366...a389</code> borrowed \$8.2K — active borrower-supplier profiles.
High Liquidation Counts	All were frequently <b>liquidated (3–15 times)</b> , but never acted as liquidators.
Broad Asset Diversity	Holding 2–5 unique assets, suggesting diversified interaction with the protocol.
Zero Liquidator Profit	Indicates these users were borrowers or suppliers, not arbitrageurs.

 *Insight:* These wallets seem like "whale lenders" or "aggressive borrowers" who remained long-term participants despite facing liquidations. The scoring model likely rewards consistent engagement and transaction volume.

---

### Bottom 5 Wallets — Low-Scoring Profiles

These wallets exhibit brief, minimal activity, some with odd transaction patterns like **negative net deposits**.

Common Traits	Observations
<b>Extremely Low Active Days</b>	Ranges from just <b>0.007 to 3.3 days</b> — brief or one-off activity.
<b>Low or Negative Deposits</b>	E.g., <code>0x99fd...83c8</code> has <b>-66 USD net deposit</b> , implying net withdrawal without corresponding deposit.
<b>Zero Net Borrowing &amp; Liquidated</b>	No evidence of lending, borrowing, or being liquidated (except as liquidators).
<b>Some High Liquidator Profits</b>	<code>0x5e32...268c</code> and <code>0xa769...97ca</code> show <b>profit as liquidators</b> , yet still scored poorly due to brief usage and low diversity.
<b>High num_liquidator values</b>	Some wallets like <code>0x5e32...268c</code> executed <b>33 liquidations in under a day</b> — flash-like behavior.

📌 *Insight:* These are likely **bot-like liquidators** or short-term exploiters with low interaction diversity and minimal engagement time. The scoring punishes such flash actors despite liquidation profits.

---

## 🧠 Conclusion

The PCA-based scoring captures a user's **longevity, diversity, and overall engagement**, rather than mere financial profit. Long-lived participants with varied transactions rank highest, while wallets with bursty, narrow use cases score the lowest.