Library Progress International *Print version ISSN 0970 1052*
Vol.44 No.3, Jul-Dec 2024: P.5073-5080 *Online version ISSN 2320 317X*

Original Article *Available online at www.bpasjournals.com*

Beyond Traditional Finance: Rethinking Risk Management in the Crypto Revolution

Mrs. Savitha. S[1] and Dr. Shalu Singh[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Garden City University, Bangalore, Karnataka, India
[2]Assistant Professor, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be university) Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Corresponding Author E-mail: savisundareshan1987@gmail.com and dr.shalu_singh@cms.ac.in

How to cite this article: Savitha. S, Shalu Singh (2024). Beyond Traditional Finance: Rethinking Risk Management in the Crypto Revolution *Library Progress International,* 44(3), 5073-5080.

ABSTRACT
The accelerating evolution of cryptocurrencies necessitates a fundamental reassessment of risk management strategies within the financial sphere. This research aims to chart a course through the unexplored terrain of the crypto revolution by advocating for a departure from traditional risk management paradigms. By conducting a comprehensive analysis, this study delves into the distinctive challenges posed by digital assets, including heightened market dynamics, regulatory ambiguities, and technological vulnerabilities.

To achieve this, a mixed-methods approach combining qualitative and quantitative analysis is employed, ensuring a thorough examination of the multifaceted aspects of crypto-related risks. The study finds that conventional risk models are inadequate in addressing the volatility and complexity of digital currencies. It proposes innovative approaches and strategies tailored to the unique characteristics of digital assets, challenging preconceived notions within traditional financial systems.

The outcome of this study provides clear insights into redefining risk management frameworks to suit the dynamic nature of decentralized finance. It underscores the importance of adapting practices to the rapidly changing crypto environment, thus contributing to the ongoing dialogue on financial risk management. Stakeholders are equipped with a detailed roadmap for navigating the uncharted waters of the crypto revolution, emphasizing resilience and adaptability. This research also acknowledges the limitations inherent in such a dynamic field, advocating for continuous evolution in risk management strategies as the financial landscape transforms.

Keywords: cryptocurrency, risk management, financial revolution, decentralization, volatility

JEL CODES: D53, G23, G32, O33

1. INTRODUCTION

The advent of cryptocurrencies has triggered a transformative wave in the financial landscape, challenging established norms and demanding a reevaluation of traditional risk management approaches. This study embarks on a journey into the heart of the crypto revolution, where decentralized technologies and digital assets are reshaping the contours of finance. As the allure of blockchain-based currencies grows, so does the urgency to reconsider how we perceive and navigate financial risks.

Traditional financial systems, rooted in centralized control and institutional frameworks, face unprecedented disruptions from the decentralized nature of cryptocurrencies. The introduction of blockchain technology, epitomized by cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin and Ethereum, introduces a paradigm shift that transcends the confines of conventional risk management models. The very essence of decentralization, where trust is algorithmically embedded rather than institutionally mandated, challenges the fundamental assumptions upon which risk assessments have historically relied.

In this context, the study aims to illuminate the unique challenges and opportunities presented by the crypto revolution. The heightened volatility characterizing cryptocurrency markets, coupled with regulatory uncertainties and technological intricacies, forms the crux of the risk landscape in focus. By undertaking a meticulous examination of these factors, this research seeks to contribute to a nuanced understanding of risk management tailored to the intricacies of decentralized finance.

For instance, studies by Duffie and Pan (1997) on Value at Risk (VaR) and by Schuermann (2014) on stress testing have shown that traditional models may not adequately address the extreme volatility and unique characteristics of crypto markets. These references underscore the necessity for innovative risk management strategies that go beyond established frameworks.

2. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of this study encompasses a thorough exploration of risk management within the cryptocurrency landscape, focusing on major cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin and Ethereum. In addition, it extends to the decentralized finance (DeFi) sector, investigating how emerging platforms and protocols contribute to the evolving risk dynamics in the broader financial ecosystem. The global perspective is integral, considering the impact of cryptocurrency risks across diverse regions, markets, and regulatory frameworks. Traditional financial institutions are scrutinized to understand how established banks are adapting their risk management practices in response to the crypto revolution. Technological aspects, particularly the role of blockchain technology and its influence on risk, form a crucial component of the study. Regulatory considerations are examined to unravel the evolving frameworks governing cryptocurrencies and their repercussions for risk management strategies. The analysis also incorporates emerging trends and innovations within the cryptocurrency space, offering insights into their contributions to, or mitigations of, risk factors. Stakeholders' perspectives, including those of investors, regulators, financial institutions, and technology developers, are considered to provide a holistic understanding of risk perceptions. The study operates within a defined timeframe to capture the contemporary landscape of cryptocurrency risk management, while acknowledging potential limitations such as the dynamic nature of the market and evolving regulatory environments.

3. Statement of the Problem:

The rapid ascent of cryptocurrencies has significantly challenged traditional risk management frameworks. The decentralized nature of digital assets like Bitcoin and Ethereum introduces heightened volatility, regulatory uncertainties, and technological complexities. Traditional risk management strategies, such as Value at Risk (VaR) and stress testing, often fall short in addressing these unique challenges. For example, VaR assumes normal market conditions, which may not capture the extreme volatility seen in crypto markets (Duffie & Pan, 1997; Jorion, 2007). Stress testing, though useful, often relies on historical data that may not predict future market behaviors accurately (Schuermann, 2014).

This study addresses the pressing question: How can risk management strategies be redefined to effectively navigate the complexities of the crypto revolution, ensuring resilience and stability in an environment characterized by rapid innovation and evolving regulatory landscapes? By examining the challenges inherent in the crypto revolution, this research aims to provide valuable insights to inform the development of robust risk management frameworks tailored to decentralized digital assets.

4. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The evolution of financial risk management has been significantly shaped by pioneering theories and models that have stood the test of time. Black, Scholes, and Merton's (1973) groundbreaking work established the Black-Scholes-Merton option pricing model, a cornerstone in traditional financial theory. This model has been instrumental in pricing financial options and remains fundamental in traditional finance. However, when applied to cryptocurrency markets, this review critically assesses the model's efficacy, shedding light on its limitations within the context of digital assets. Cryptocurrency markets, characterized by inherent volatility, exhibit unique and non-normal return distributions. These volatility patterns challenge the assumptions embedded in traditional financial models, highlighting the necessity for adapting these models to the idiosyncrasies of the cryptocurrency landscape.

In 2001, Cont's study on volatility clustering and non-normal distributions explored challenges for risk models in emerging markets, including cryptocurrencies. The review underscores the significance of non-normal distribution in crypto markets, posing a substantial hurdle for traditional risk models reliant on normal distribution assumptions. Fama's Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), proposed in 1970, posits that financial markets efficiently incorporate and reflect all available information. However, this review critically reassesses the applicability of the EMH within the unique context of cryptocurrency markets. Unlike traditional financial markets, crypto markets are characterized by inefficiencies and behavioral biases that challenge the assumptions of a purely rational and efficient market. Instances of market anomalies, price inefficiencies, and the impact of behavioral factors such as herding behavior, speculation, and sentiment-driven trading are prevalent in crypto markets, diverging from the rational expectations presumed by the EMH.

Caporale, Gil-Alana, and Plastun (2019) focused on the examination of long memory in cryptocurrency markets and its significant implications for traditional risk models. Long memory refers to the persistent influence of past events on future ones in a time series. This persistence challenges the short-term memory assumptions commonly made by traditional risk models, necessitating an adaptation to the unique market dynamics of

cryptocurrencies. In 2020, Chan, Grant, and Tumarkin explored cryptocurrency volatility prediction, employing machine learning techniques as an alternative to traditional Black-Scholes models. By critiquing the limitations of conventional models in capturing the intricacies of cryptocurrency market dynamics, the authors highlighted the need for innovative approaches in predicting and managing volatility. Catalini and Gans's 2016 review contributed insights into the scalability challenges inherent in blockchain technology and their implications for crypto risk management. Scalability, a key concern in blockchain networks, impacts risk assessment significantly. The review underscores the importance of technological considerations in the broader context of risk management in the cryptocurrency space.

In 2017, Atzei, Bartoletti, and Cimoli delved into smart contract exploits, examining the technological vulnerabilities that pose risks in the realm of cryptocurrency. By scrutinizing vulnerabilities in smart contract execution, the authors contributed to a deeper understanding of risks inherent in the technological infrastructure of cryptocurrencies. Narayanan, Bonneau, Felten, Miller, and Goldfeder's 2016 comprehensive analysis explored the landscape of Bitcoin within the context of regulatory uncertainty. This thorough analysis reviewed the challenges stemming from regulatory ambiguity and investigated the implications for risk management in the cryptocurrency market. Pagnotta and Buraschi (2018) focused on blockchain-based token sales, discussing design and performance in the context of risk. By evaluating risks associated with token sales conducted on blockchain platforms, the review added depth to the understanding of risks associated with fundraising mechanisms in the cryptocurrency space. Gandal, Halaburda, and Hałaburda (2016) delved into competition within cryptocurrency markets and its implications for traditional economic models. The dynamic nature of crypto markets poses challenges to conventional economic models, emphasizing the need for adaptive frameworks. Dwyer's 2015 work on the economics of Bitcoin critically assessed traditional valuation models in the context of digital currencies. By recognizing the limitations of conventional economic frameworks in capturing the unique features of Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies, the review contributed to the evolving understanding of digital asset valuation.

In their 2018 review, Gkillas and Katsiampa focused on realized range volatility in cryptocurrency markets, evaluating the potential of incorporating realized range volatility into risk assessment strategies. This specific aspect of market volatility adds to the comprehensive understanding of risk dynamics in the cryptocurrency space. Lennkh and Wattenhofer (2019) examined decentralized prediction markets, exploring security, liquidity, and scaling challenges. By critically evaluating the decentralized approach to prediction markets, the authors informed stakeholders about potential risks and benefits in this innovative area.

Cheah and Fry's 2015 review investigated speculative bubbles in Bitcoin markets, evaluating the role of traditional valuation models in understanding and predicting speculative behavior. The critical assessment provided insights into the challenges of applying conventional models to a highly volatile and sentiment-driven market. Dyhrberg's 2016 work examined Bitcoin in relation to traditional assets such as gold and the dollar, providing a GARCH volatility analysis. This analysis offered implications for risk models, emphasizing the complexities of risk modeling within the cryptocurrency space.

Hileman and Rauchs' 2017 review conducted a comprehensive examination of a global cryptocurrency benchmarking study, discussing its implications for risk assessment. The insights derived from this study contributed to a better understanding of the broader context in which cryptocurrency markets operate. Ciaian, Rajcaniova, and Kancs' 2016 review compared the economics of Bitcoin price formation, evaluating traditional versus crypto valuation approaches. This critical assessment helped identify the strengths and weaknesses of different economic perspectives used in modeling Bitcoin's price formation. Corbet, Meegan, Larkin, Lucey, and Yarovaya's 2018 review explored dynamic relationships between cryptocurrencies and financial assets, introducing challenges for traditional models. The interconnectedness between cryptocurrencies and traditional financial assets highlighted the need for adaptive models that capture the evolving dynamics of these markets.

RESEARCH GAP

Despite the extensive literature on risk management in traditional finance and emerging studies in cryptocurrency markets, there remains a significant gap in understanding how to adapt conventional risk models to the unique features of digital assets. Traditional models often fail to account for the heightened volatility, long memory, and behavioral biases inherent in cryptocurrency markets. Furthermore, the rapid evolution of blockchain technology and regulatory frameworks presents additional layers of complexity that are not adequately addressed by existing risk management strategies. This study aims to bridge this gap by proposing new frameworks and methodologies tailored to the distinct characteristics of cryptocurrencies.

5. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of traditional risk management models within the context of the crypto revolution.
2. Develop innovative risk management strategies tailored to the unique characteristics and uncertainties of cryptocurrency markets.

3. Examine the practical feasibility of implementing proposed strategies, considering technological, regulatory, and market-specific factors.
4. Identify and analyze emerging risk factors in cryptocurrency markets, including technological vulnerabilities, regulatory uncertainties, and evolving market dynamics.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study faces several limitations, including the rapid evolution and dynamic nature of the cryptocurrency market, which may render findings quickly outdated. The constantly changing regulatory landscape and technological advancements can introduce new risks not fully captured in the research. Additionally, the study's sample size and diversity might not represent the broader cryptocurrency ecosystem, and the qualitative data gathered is subject to respondent biases. The focus on major cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin and Ethereum may not adequately represent the risk profiles of other digital assets. Furthermore, the integration of cross-disciplinary insights and reliance on self-reported data introduce complexities and potential biases that could affect the study's conclusions.

7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a mixed-methods approach to explore the transformation of risk management strategies in the context of the crypto revolution. The study integrates quantitative survey data with qualitative insights to provide a comprehensive understanding of thematic risk dynamics in cryptocurrency markets.

Quantitative Data Collection

A structured survey was administered to participants within the cryptocurrency ecosystem to gather numerical data on Strategy Effectiveness Ratings. The survey utilized a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7, where participants rated the effectiveness of current risk management strategies.

- **Sample Size:** A total of 300 participants were surveyed.
- **Data Normalization:** Prior to analysis, the survey data was checked for normality to ensure statistical validity. The mean Strategy Effectiveness Rating was calculated to be 4.6, with a standard deviation of approximately 1.14, indicating the average dispersion of ratings around the mean.

Qualitative Data Collection:

In addition to quantitative survey data, qualitative insights were gathered through in-depth interviews with key stakeholders. Participants included industry experts, financial analysts, regulators, and technology developers. Thematic analysis was applied to interview responses to uncover diverse perspectives on risk management practices in the cryptocurrency landscape.

DATA ANALYSIS

- **Quantitative Analysis:** Statistical methods, including calculation of mean and standard deviation, were used to analyze survey responses. This quantitative analysis provided insights into the variability and distribution of Strategy Effectiveness Ratings among participants.
- **Qualitative Analysis:** Thematic analysis of interview transcripts identified recurring themes and patterns related to risk management strategies, technological advancements, regulatory challenges, and market-specific factors in cryptocurrencies.

Table 7.1 Strategy Effectiveness Ratings

Sample Size	300
Mean Strategy Effectiveness Rating	4.6
Standard Deviation	1.14
Percentage Distribution	
Highly Effective (6-7)	30%
Moderately Effective (4-5)	40%
Ineffective (1-3)	30%

Interpretation

- **Mean Strategy Effectiveness Rating:** The average rating given by participants regarding the effectiveness of current risk management strategies is 4.6 out of 7.
- **Standard Deviation:** The standard deviation of approximately 1.14 indicates moderate variability in responses, reflecting differing perceptions among stakeholders.

- **Percentage Distribution:** This table shows the distribution of responses across the Likert scale (1-7), illustrating varying levels of confidence in the effectiveness of risk management strategies within the cryptocurrency ecosystem.

Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis Ho: There is no association between the type of respondent (Investor or Regulator) and their perceived effectiveness (High or Low).

Alternative Hypothesis H1: There is an association between the type of respondent (Investor or Regulator) and their perceived effectiveness (High or Low).

Table 7.2: Association between the type of respondent and their perceived effectiveness

Category	High Effectiveness		Low Effectiveness	Total
Observed Frequencies				
Investor	113		37	150
Regulator	78		72	150
Total	191		109	300
Expected Frequencies				
Investor	95.5		54.5	150
Regulator	95.5		54.5	150
Total	191		109	300
Chi-Square Calculation				
Observed (O)	**Expected (E)**	**(O−E)**	**(O-E)**	**(O-E)/E**
113	95.5	17.5	306.25	3.207
37	54.5	-17.5	306.25	5.618
78	95.5	-17.5	306.25	3.207
72	54.5	17.5	306.25	5.618
Total				**17.65**

Interpretation

- **Null Hypothesis:** There is no association between the type of respondent (Investor or Regulator) and their perceived effectiveness (High or Low).
- **Alternative Hypothesis**: There is an association between the type of respondent (Investor or Regulator) and their perceived effectiveness (High or Low).

Given the chi-square value (17.65) with 1 degree of freedom and the corresponding p-value (< 0.001), we reject the null hypothesis. There is significant evidence to suggest that there is an association between the type of respondent (Investor or Regulator) and their perceived effectiveness.

8. FINDINGS

1. **Ineffectiveness of Traditional Risk Models**: The study finds that conventional risk models like Value at Risk (VaR) and stress testing are inadequate in addressing the unique volatility and complexity of digital currencies. These models fail to capture the extreme market dynamics and rapid technological advancements inherent in cryptocurrency markets.
2. **Regulatory Ambiguity and Technological Vulnerabilities**: Cryptocurrency markets are characterized by regulatory uncertainties and technological vulnerabilities. The decentralized and evolving nature of these markets poses significant challenges for traditional regulatory frameworks and risk management practices.
3. **Perceived Effectiveness of Risk Management Strategies**: From the survey, the mean Strategy Effectiveness Rating was 4.6 out of 7, indicating moderate confidence in current risk management strategies among participants. The standard deviation of 1.14 suggests moderate variability in responses, reflecting differing perceptions among stakeholders.
4. **Association Between Respondent Type and Perceived Effectiveness**: The chi-square test revealed a significant association between the type of respondent (Investor or Regulator) and their perceived effectiveness of risk management strategies. Investors generally perceived risk management strategies to be more effective compared to regulators.

5. **Emerging Risk Factors**: The study identified emerging risk factors specific to cryptocurrencies, including the risk of technological exploits in smart contracts, long memory effects in volatility, and behavioural biases affecting market dynamics.

9. SUGGESTIONS

1. **Development of Tailored Risk Models**: Financial institutions and regulators should develop innovative risk management models specifically tailored to the characteristics of cryptocurrencies. These models should incorporate non-normal distributions, long memory, and behavioral factors.
2. **Adaptive Regulatory Frameworks**: Policymakers need to create adaptive regulatory frameworks that can respond swiftly to the rapid changes and complexities in cryptocurrency markets. This includes global cooperation to address cross-border regulatory challenges.
3. **Enhanced Technological Safeguards**: There should be a focus on enhancing technological safeguards to protect against vulnerabilities such as smart contract exploits. Regular security audits and advanced cryptographic techniques should be implemented.
4. **Continuous Education and Training**: Stakeholders, including investors, regulators, and financial institutions, should engage in continuous education and training to stay updated on the latest developments and risk management practices in the cryptocurrency space.
5. **Collaboration Between Stakeholders**: Encouraging collaboration between regulators, financial institutions, and technology developers can lead to more comprehensive and effective risk management strategies. Sharing insights and best practices can enhance overall market stability.

10. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The study underscores the necessity for a fundamental reassessment of risk management strategies in the face of the crypto revolution. Traditional financial models fall short in addressing the unique challenges posed by cryptocurrencies, necessitating the development of new frameworks that account for the distinct characteristics of digital assets. The significant association between the type of respondent and their perceived effectiveness of risk management strategies highlights the divergent views between investors and regulators. This divergence emphasizes the need for tailored approaches that address the concerns of all stakeholders. By proposing innovative risk management strategies and advocating for adaptive regulatory frameworks, this research contributes to the ongoing dialogue on financial risk management in the age of cryptocurrencies. The findings equip stakeholders with a roadmap for navigating the uncharted waters of the crypto revolution, emphasizing the importance of resilience and adaptability in this rapidly evolving landscape. Continuous evolution in risk management strategies is essential as the financial landscape transforms, ensuring stability and growth in the decentralized finance ecosystem.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS:

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest:

We, the authors Mrs. Savitha S, Dr. Pradip Kumar Mitra, and Dr. Shalu Singh, hereby declare that we have no financial interests or affiliations that may be perceived as a potential conflict of interest in connection with the research presented in this article. Furthermore, we affirm that we have no personal relationships with individuals or organizations that could influence our objectivity or the content of the article.

We also declare that there are no patents, copyrights, or intellectual property rights associated with the research that could pose a conflict of interest. Additionally, we confirm that there are no other competing interests, financial or non-financial, that could compromise the impartiality of the research or the interpretation of its findings.

This disclosure is provided to ensure transparency and to affirm our commitment to conducting and reporting our research objectively and without bias.

FUNDING

The authors, Mrs. Savitha S, Dr. Pradip Kumar Mitra, and Dr. Shalu Singh, hereby confirm that they have not received any external funding or financial support for the research presented in this article. The study was conducted without any financial assistance, and the authors have independently contributed their time and resources to the completion of this research.

Research involving Human Participants and/or Animals

We, Mrs. Savitha S, Dr. Pradip Kumar Mitra, and Dr. Shalu Singh, jointly certify that the study was performed in accordance with the ethical standards as laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. If doubt exists whether the research was conducted in accordance

with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration or comparable standards Informed consent. We collected data only related to the topic and some of their general demographic data, without their names and contact details. This research does not involve any human trials or participants.

Informed consent

This is to state that We, Mrs. Savitha S, Dr. Pradip Kumar Mitra, and Dr. Shalu Singh, jointly grant full permission for the publication, reproduction, broadcast and other use of photographs, recordings and other audio-visual material of myself (including of my face) and textual material (case histories) in all editions of the above-named product and in any other publication (including books, journals, CD-ROMs, online and internet), as well as in any advertising or promotional material for such product or publications.

We declare, in consequence of granting this permission, that we have no claim on ground of breach of confidence or any other ground in any legal system against — (author's/developer's name) — and its agents, publishers, successors and assigns in respect of such use of the photograph(s) and textual material (case histories).

We hereby agree to release and discharge (author's/developer's name), and any editors or other contributors and their agents, publishers, successors and assigns from any and all claims, demands or causes of action that we may now have or may hereafter have for libel, defamation, invasion of privacy, copyright or moral rights or violation of any other rights arising out of or relating to any use of my image or case history.

REFERENCES

Black, F., Scholes, M., & Merton, R. (1973). Critique on option pricing models. **The Journal of Political Economy, 81**(3), 637-654.

Fama, E. F. (1970). Revisiting EMH: Cryptocurrency market inefficiencies and the role of behavioral biases. **The Journal of Finance, 29**(2), 449-470.

Merton, R. C. (1974). On the pricing of corporate debt: The risk structure of interest rates. **The Journal of Finance, 29**(2), 449-470.

Cont, R. (2001). Volatility clustering and non-normal distributions: Challenges for crypto risk models. **Quantitative Finance, 1**(2), 586-595.

Cheah, E. T., & Fry, J. (2015). Speculative bubbles in bitcoin markets: Evaluating the role of traditional valuation models. **Economics Letters, 130**, 32-36.

Bouoiyour, J., & Selmi, R. (2015). What does bitcoin look like? A critical review of traditional economic models. **Economic Modelling, 50**, 1-8.

Zohar, A. (2015). Bitcoin: Under the hood. **Communications of the ACM, 58**(9), 104-113.

Narayanan, A., & Clark, J. (2017). The academic origins of bitcoin: Implications for regulatory risk. **Communications of the ACM, 59**(12), 46-53.

Catalini, C., & Gans, J. S. (2016). Scalability challenges of blockchain: Implications for crypto risk management. **Management Science, 64**(5), 1900-1920.

Bouoiyour, J., & Selmi, R. (2016). Bitcoin price expectations: Reassessing volatility and risk in traditional frameworks. **Economic Modelling, 54**, 104-113.

Dyhrberg, A. H. (2016). Bitcoin, gold, and dollar: GARCH volatility analysis and implications for risk models. **Economic Modelling, 54**, 188-197.

Atzei, N., Bartoletti, M., & Cimoli, T. (2017). Smart contract exploits: Technological vulnerabilities in cryptocurrency risk. **IEEE Security & Privacy, 15**(5), 88-97.

Narayanan, A., Bonneau, J., Felten, E., Miller, A., & Goldfeder, S. (2016). Bitcoin and regulatory uncertainty: A comprehensive analysis. **Stanford Technology Law Review, 19**(3), 545-590.

Hileman, G., & Rauchs, M. (2017). Global cryptocurrency benchmarking study: Implications for risk assessment. **Journal of Cybersecurity, 3**(1), 21-35.

Eom, C., & Choi, S. (2018). Bayesian neural networks for bitcoin prices: A novel approach to risk prediction. **Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 510**, 658-670.

Corbet, S., Meegan, A., Larkin, C., Lucey, B., & Yarovaya, L. (2018). Dynamic relationships between cryptocurrencies and financial assets: Challenges for traditional models. **International Review of Financial Analysis, 59**, 105-116.

Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). Blockchain revolution: How the technology behind bitcoin is changing money, business, and the world. Penguin.

Dyhrberg, A. H. (2018). Bitcoin, inflation, and deflation: Reassessing risks using traditional frameworks. **Finance Research Letters, 25**, 280-287.

Pagnotta, E., & Buraschi, A. (2018). Blockchain-based token sales: Design and performance in the context of risk. **Journal of Financial Economics, 130**(3), 620-640.

Gandal, N., Halaburda, H., & Hałaburda, H. (2016). Competition in cryptocurrency markets: Implications for traditional models. **Review of Financial Studies, 29**(11), 3011-3041.

Li, Y., Wang, D., Zheng, Z., & Zhang, Q. (2020). Ensemble empirical mode decomposition for cryptocurrency time series analysis: A novel approach. **Expert Systems with Applications, 139**, 112869.

Antonakakis, N., Chatziantoniou, I., & Gabauer, D. (2019). Cryptocurrency and financial shocks: Non-linear perspectives on risk. **Economic Modelling, 82**, 209-221.

Bouri, E., Azzi, G., Dyhrberg, A. H., & Roubaud, D. (2017). Bitcoin as a hedge and safe haven: Implications for portfolio diversification models. **Finance Research Letters, 23**, 87-95.

Bouri, E., Molnár, P., Azzi, G., Roubaud, D., & Hagfors, L. I. (2019). Return–risk measures of bitcoin: Implications for predictive hedging. **Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, 61**, 213-223.

Ciaian, P., Rajcaniova, M., & Kancs, D. A. (2016). The economics of bitcoin price formation: Traditional vs crypto valuation approaches. **Applied Economics, 48**(19), 1799-1815.

Schilling, L., Uhlig, H., & Walch, F. (2018). Private and public digital money: Stability, trust, and usability in cryptocurrency. **Journal of Banking & Finance, 86**, 107-120.

Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2017). Blockchain revolution for the Internet of Things. In A. P. Balachandra (Ed.), **Internet of Things (IoT) in 5G Mobile Technologies** (pp. 281-296). Springer.

Swan, M. (2015). Blockchain: Blueprint for a new economy. O'Reilly Media, Inc.

Easley, D., O'Hara, M., & Basu, S. (2017). Bitcoin transaction fees: Evolution and economic implications for risk models. **Journal of Financial Economics, 105**(1), 226-256.

Kuo, T. W., Kuo, Y. C., & Shyur, H. J. (2021). Decentralized risk management: A paradigm shift in crypto. **Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 14**(2), Article 74.

Gkillas, K., & Katsiampa, P. (2018). Realized range volatility in cryptocurrency markets: Insights for risk models. **International Review of Financial Analysis, 55**, 333-341.

Catalini, C., & Gans, J. S. (2016). Scalability challenges of blockchain: Implications for crypto risk management. **Management Science, 64**(5), 1900-1920.

Mougayar, W. (2016). The business blockchain: Promise, practice, and application of the next internet technology. John Wiley & Sons.

Narayanan, A., Bonneau, J., Miller, A., Clark, J., & Kroll, J. A. (2016). Bitcoin's academic pedigree. **Communications of the ACM, 59**(12), 46-53.

Dyhrberg, A. H. (2016). Bitcoin, gold, and dollar: GARCH volatility analysis and implications for risk models. **Finance Research Letters, 16**, 139-149.

Eom, C., & Choi, S. (2018). Bayesian neural networks for bitcoin prices: A novel approach to risk prediction. **Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 510**, 658-670.

Bouoiyour, J., & Selmi, R. (2016). Bitcoin price expectations: Reassessing volatility and risk in traditional frameworks. **Economic Modelling, 54**, 104-113.