



Cryptocurrency regulation challenges for financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness worldwide across economies

Hendri Setiadi^{1*)}, Andam Dewi Syarif², Gregorius Paulus Tahu³, Ferry Novindra Idroes¹, Barnabas Tridig Silaban⁴

¹ Universitas Bunda Mulia, Indonesia

² Universitas Mercu Buana, Indonesia

³ Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Mahasaraswati, Indonesia

⁴ Universitas Kristen Maranatha, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jun 15th, 2026

Revised Aug 06th, 2026

Accepted Aug 19th, 2026

Keyword:

Cryptocurrency Regulation,
Regulatory Fragmentation,
Financial Stability,
Investor Protection,
Monetary Policy

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of cryptocurrency markets has created significant regulatory challenges for governments, financial authorities, and policymakers worldwide. This study examined how regulatory fragmentation affected financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness across different economies. A qualitative library research approach was employed by reviewing academic literature, international policy reports, and regulatory documents concerning cryptocurrency governance. The findings revealed that differences in regulatory frameworks across jurisdictions created governance gaps, facilitated regulatory arbitrage, complicated cross-border supervision, and weakened risk management. Regulatory fragmentation also increased vulnerabilities to financial instability, limited the effectiveness of investor protection mechanisms, and created challenges for monetary policy implementation in increasingly digitalized financial systems. These challenges were interconnected and could not be effectively addressed through isolated national measures. The study concluded that stronger international regulatory coordination and greater consistency in cryptocurrency governance are essential to strengthen market integrity, financial resilience, investor confidence, and long-term monetary stability in the evolving global digital economy.



© 2026 The Authors. Published by Indonesian Indovisi Institute
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0>)

Corresponding Author:

Hendri Setiadi,
Universitas Bunda Mulia,
Email: hendrisetiadi@gmail.com

Introduction

The rapid expansion of cryptocurrency markets has transformed the global financial landscape and challenged traditional approaches to financial regulation. Initially developed as decentralized digital payment systems, cryptocurrencies have evolved into a complex ecosystem that includes crypto-

assets, stablecoins, decentralized finance (DeFi), and cross-border digital financial services. Their increasing adoption by individuals, businesses, and institutional investors has generated significant economic opportunities while simultaneously creating new regulatory challenges. The rapid expansion of digital currencies has also intensified concerns regarding banking-sector resilience and the interaction between crypto-assets and conventional financial institutions, particularly as digital financial ecosystems become increasingly interconnected (Chen & Phelan, 2025). Recent macroprudential research further indicates that cryptocurrencies and decentralized finance (DeFi) have become increasingly interconnected with conventional financial systems, creating new channels of systemic risk transmission that require comprehensive regulatory oversight (Aquilina et al., 2026). As cryptocurrency activities increasingly interact with conventional financial systems, concerns regarding financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness have become central issues for policymakers worldwide (Goel, 2023; Xiong & Luo, 2024).

In response to these developments, governments and regulatory authorities have adopted different approaches to cryptocurrency governance. Some jurisdictions have implemented comprehensive regulatory frameworks, while others continue to rely on fragmented or evolving regulatory arrangements. The European Union's Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA), for example, represents one of the most comprehensive regulatory frameworks for crypto-assets, whereas many countries are still developing appropriate legal and supervisory mechanisms (Parliament & Union, 2023). According to Xiong and Luo (2024), these differences have produced a fragmented global regulatory environment that creates uncertainty for market participants and challenges effective cross-border supervision. International organizations have also emphasized that the borderless nature of cryptocurrency transactions makes isolated national regulatory strategies increasingly insufficient (Board, 2023b, 2023c). Recognizing these challenges, the International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2023) and the Financial Stability Board (Board, 2023b) have jointly emphasized the need for coherent international regulatory frameworks capable of mitigating cross-border risks, reducing regulatory arbitrage, and strengthening financial stability. Earlier policy guidance issued by the Financial Stability Board also highlighted that crypto-assets and global stablecoins require comprehensive international oversight because their cross-border nature may generate systemic risks extending beyond individual national jurisdictions (Board, 2021).

The consequences of regulatory fragmentation extend beyond legal uncertainty and directly affect broader policy objectives. Several studies have identified growing concerns regarding the potential impact of cryptocurrency markets on financial stability. Recent empirical evidence further indicates that inconsistent regulatory interventions may amplify cryptocurrency market volatility, thereby increasing uncertainty for investors and policymakers while weakening financial resilience (Dahlani, 2025). The increasing interconnectedness between crypto-assets and traditional financial institutions has raised the possibility of systemic risk transmission during periods of market stress (Hermans et al., 2022). Furthermore, the collapse of major crypto platforms and the rapid expansion of DeFi activities have exposed vulnerabilities related to governance, transparency, and market integrity (Doerr et al., 2021; Vidal-Tomás et al., 2023). At the same time, investor protection remains a significant challenge because cryptocurrency markets are often characterized by high volatility, information asymmetry, fraud risks, and limited consumer safeguards (Crane et al., 2023).

Beyond financial stability and investor protection concerns, cryptocurrencies may also influence the effectiveness of monetary policy. The growing use of digital assets as alternative stores of value and payment instruments has generated concerns regarding monetary sovereignty and policy transmission mechanisms. Manaa et al. (2019) argues that widespread crypto-asset adoption could weaken the effectiveness of conventional monetary instruments under certain circumstances. Similarly, the Bank for International Settlements (2023) and Shin (2023) highlight that ongoing digitalization and tokenization trends may reshape future monetary systems, requiring regulators and central banks to reconsider existing policy frameworks. More recently, Lagarde (2026) argued that the future of money depends on distinguishing the economic functions of money from the technological instruments through which those functions are delivered, emphasizing that stablecoins should complement rather than replace sovereign monetary systems. These developments demonstrate that cryptocurrency regulation is no longer solely a legal or technological issue but has become a broader economic governance challenge.

Although previous studies have examined cryptocurrency regulation, financial stability risks, investor protection, and monetary policy implications, most have analyzed these issues separately. Existing research tends to focus on regulatory frameworks (Xiong & Luo, 2024; Jaffri, 2026), financial stability concerns (Azar et al., 2022; Hermans et al., 2022), investor protection mechanisms, or monetary policy challenges (ECB, 2019; BIS, 2023). Consequently, limited attention has been given to understanding how regulatory fragmentation simultaneously affects financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness across different economies. This gap is particularly important because cryptocurrency markets operate globally, while regulatory responses remain largely national in scope.

Therefore, this study investigates the challenges of cryptocurrency regulatory fragmentation and its implications for financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness worldwide. Using a qualitative library research approach, the study reviews contemporary academic literature, international policy reports, and regulatory frameworks to examine the relationship between fragmented regulatory environments and key public policy objectives. The study contributes to the existing literature by providing an integrated perspective that connects financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy within a single analytical framework of global cryptocurrency governance. The findings are expected to support policymakers and regulators in developing more coordinated approaches to addressing the risks and opportunities associated with cryptocurrency markets. Accordingly, this study seeks to answer the following research question: How does regulatory fragmentation in cryptocurrency governance influence financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness across global economies?

Method

This study employed a qualitative library research approach to examine the challenges of cryptocurrency regulation and their implications for financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness across different economies. Library research was considered appropriate because the study focused on analyzing regulatory developments, policy frameworks, and scholarly discussions rather than collecting primary data from respondents. The population of the study consisted of academic publications, international policy reports, regulatory documents, and institutional reports addressing cryptocurrency governance and its economic implications. A purposive sampling strategy was used to select literature that directly addressed the relationship between cryptocurrency regulation, financial stability, investor protection, monetary policy, and global regulatory coordination. The selected sources included peer-reviewed journal articles, working papers, and reports published by internationally recognized institutions such as the Financial Stability Board (FSB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), Bank for International Settlements (BIS) (CGDFS, 2023), European Central Bank (ECB), Financial Action Task Force (FATF), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), and the World Economic Forum (WEF). To ensure relevance and currency, the study prioritized literature published between 2019 and 2026, while also including several foundational references considered essential for understanding the evolution of cryptocurrency governance. Data collection was conducted through systematic document review and literature identification using predefined thematic categories, namely cryptocurrency regulation and regulatory fragmentation, financial stability risks, investor protection, monetary policy effectiveness, and international regulatory coordination. Only sources with direct relevance to the research objective were included in the analysis to maintain analytical focus and avoid unnecessary expansion of the literature base.

The collected data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. This method enabled the identification, classification, comparison, and interpretation of recurring themes, regulatory approaches, policy challenges, and governance issues discussed within the selected literature. The analysis proceeded through several stages. First, all selected documents were reviewed to identify key concepts, findings, and policy recommendations related to cryptocurrency regulation. Second, the extracted information was coded according to the main analytical dimensions of the study, namely regulatory fragmentation, financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness. Third, a comparative analysis was conducted to evaluate similarities and differences

among regulatory approaches adopted across jurisdictions and to assess their potential implications for broader public policy objectives. To enhance the credibility and validity of the findings, data triangulation was performed by comparing evidence from academic studies with reports issued by international regulatory and financial institutions. The study assumed that the selected literature accurately reflected contemporary developments in cryptocurrency governance and represented authoritative perspectives within the field. Nevertheless, several methodological limitations should be acknowledged. The study relied exclusively on secondary data and therefore did not incorporate primary evidence from regulators, market participants, or investors. Furthermore, the rapidly evolving nature of cryptocurrency markets may lead to regulatory developments that emerge after the completion of the literature review. Despite these limitations, the methodology provides a comprehensive and systematic framework for examining how regulatory fragmentation influences financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness within the global cryptocurrency ecosystem.

Results and Discussions

The literature review indicates that cryptocurrency regulation has evolved into a multidimensional policy issue that extends beyond legal compliance and market supervision. The reviewed studies consistently demonstrate that regulatory fragmentation has become a central challenge affecting financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness across global economies. Although many jurisdictions have introduced cryptocurrency regulations, substantial differences remain in regulatory objectives, supervisory mechanisms, and enforcement approaches. These differences create governance gaps that may weaken the effectiveness of national regulatory frameworks in addressing risks originating from globally interconnected cryptocurrency markets. Table 1 summarizes the major findings identified from the reviewed literature.

Table 1. Major Findings from the Literature Review

Analytical Dimension	Key Findings	Main References
Regulatory Fragmentation	Significant differences exist in cryptocurrency regulations across jurisdictions, resulting in inconsistent supervision and enforcement.	Xiong & Luo (2024); WEF (2023); Jaffri (2026)
Financial Stability	Cryptocurrency markets and DeFi activities increase systemic risks through volatility, leverage, liquidity vulnerabilities, and interconnectedness.	Hermans et al. (2022); Board (2023); BIS (2024); Azar et al. (2022)
Investor Protection	Investors remain vulnerable to fraud, market manipulation, governance failures, and information asymmetry.	Xiong et al. (2023); Crane et al. (2023)
Monetary Policy Effectiveness	Increasing cryptocurrency adoption may influence monetary transmission mechanisms and monetary sovereignty.	ECB (2019); BIS (2023); Shin (2023); IMF (2023)
Global Regulatory Coordination	International cooperation is increasingly necessary to address regulatory arbitrage and cross-border risks.	Board (2023b); FATF (2024); OECD (2024); Board (2025)

Regulatory Fragmentation in Global Cryptocurrency Governance

The first major finding of this study concerns the existence of significant regulatory fragmentation across jurisdictions. The reviewed literature reveals that governments and regulatory authorities have adopted diverse approaches to cryptocurrency governance, reflecting differences in legal systems, financial development levels, technological readiness, and policy priorities. While some jurisdictions have introduced comprehensive regulatory frameworks, others continue to rely on fragmented regulations or limited supervisory arrangements. The implementation of the Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA) in the European Union represents one of the most comprehensive

attempts to establish a unified regulatory framework for crypto-assets (Parliament & Union, 2023). However, similar levels of regulatory consistency are not yet evident across many other economies.

This finding suggests that cryptocurrency markets have developed within a regulatory environment characterized by substantial asymmetry. According to Xiong and Luo (2024), the absence of harmonized standards creates uncertainty regarding compliance requirements and supervisory responsibilities. Goel (2023) further argues that regulatory divergence facilitates regulatory arbitrage, allowing cryptocurrency service providers to relocate activities to jurisdictions with less restrictive oversight. Such practices may undermine the effectiveness of domestic regulatory interventions and reduce the ability of national authorities to monitor risks originating from cross-border activities.

The significance of this finding lies in its implications for global financial governance. Unlike traditional financial institutions that generally operate under clearly defined regulatory jurisdictions, cryptocurrency platforms frequently serve users across multiple countries simultaneously. Consequently, fragmented regulation creates governance gaps that cannot be effectively addressed through isolated national policies. This finding extends previous discussions by highlighting regulatory fragmentation as a foundational challenge influencing multiple dimensions of cryptocurrency governance rather than merely a legal or administrative concern.

Financial Stability Implications of Cryptocurrency Regulation

The second major finding relates to the growing relationship between cryptocurrency activities and financial stability risks. The reviewed studies consistently indicate that cryptocurrency markets exhibit characteristics associated with financial vulnerability, including high volatility, speculative behavior, concentrated ownership structures, and interconnected market exposures. Hermans et al. (2022) identifies crypto-assets as potential sources of systemic risk due to their increasing integration with conventional financial markets. Similarly, Azar et al. (2022) argue that the expansion of digital asset markets has created new channels through which financial disturbances may spread across institutions and markets.

The literature further reveals that decentralized finance has introduced additional layers of complexity to financial stability oversight. According to the Financial Stability Board (2023), DeFi platforms generate risks related to leverage, liquidity mismatches, governance weaknesses, and operational vulnerabilities. These concerns are reinforced by Doerr et al. (2021), who argue that many supposedly decentralized systems remain dependent on concentrated governance structures. The collapse of major cryptocurrency institutions and the resulting market disruptions provide practical evidence that weaknesses within the cryptocurrency ecosystem can trigger broader confidence shocks throughout digital financial markets (Vidal-Tomás et al., 2023). Recent empirical evidence further indicates that cryptocurrency regulation also influences stock market performance, suggesting that regulatory interventions in digital asset markets generate spillover effects extending beyond cryptocurrency ecosystems into broader capital markets (Wang & Wang, 2026).

These findings indicate that cryptocurrency regulation has become an essential component of contemporary financial stability policy. The evidence suggests that fragmented regulatory approaches may limit regulators' ability to identify, monitor, and mitigate emerging systemic risks. Therefore, effective regulation should not only focus on consumer protection and market conduct but also address macro-financial vulnerabilities that may threaten the resilience of broader financial systems.

Investor Protection Challenges in Cryptocurrency Markets

The third major finding concerns persistent weaknesses in investor protection within cryptocurrency markets. The reviewed literature demonstrates that investors frequently operate in environments characterized by limited transparency, inconsistent disclosure requirements, and varying levels of regulatory oversight. As cryptocurrency markets continue to expand globally, these conditions increase the exposure of investors to fraud, market manipulation, cyber risks, and governance failures.

Hackethal et al. (2021) reports that retail investors remain particularly vulnerable because many cryptocurrency products involve risks that are difficult to assess using traditional investment

frameworks. Stern (2025) further argues that investor protection frameworks should distinguish between retail and accredited investors because differences in financial sophistication, risk tolerance, and investment capacity require differentiated regulatory safeguards within cryptocurrency markets. Similarly, Xiong et al. (2023) identify multiple forms of market misconduct within decentralized finance ecosystems, including manipulation schemes and exploitative trading practices. These findings are supported by Crane et al. (2023), which emphasizes that market integrity and investor confidence depend on the existence of clear regulatory standards and effective supervisory mechanisms.

The findings suggest that investor protection challenges are closely linked to regulatory fragmentation. When regulatory standards differ significantly across jurisdictions, investors may face varying levels of protection depending on the location of cryptocurrency service providers. This situation creates uncertainty regarding legal recourse, dispute resolution, and enforcement procedures. Consequently, improving investor protection requires not only stronger domestic regulations but also greater international cooperation to establish consistent minimum standards across jurisdictions.

Cryptocurrency and Monetary Policy Effectiveness

The fourth major finding relates to the implications of cryptocurrency adoption for monetary policy effectiveness. The literature indicates that the growing use of crypto-assets, stablecoins, and tokenized financial instruments may influence traditional monetary transmission mechanisms. This concern is particularly relevant for stablecoins, whose stabilization mechanisms directly affect their capacity to function as reliable payment instruments. Pernice et al. (2019) argue that sustainable cryptocurrency adoption depends not only on regulatory oversight but also on effective monetary stabilization designs capable of reducing excessive price volatility while preserving decentralization. Although cryptocurrencies currently do not replace sovereign currencies on a large scale in most economies, their increasing use as stores of value and payment alternatives has generated concerns among policymakers and central banks.

According to Manaa et al. (2019), widespread cryptocurrency adoption could potentially reduce the effectiveness of conventional monetary policy tools by weakening the relationship between central bank actions and economic behavior. Recent empirical evidence also demonstrates that changes in the Federal Reserve's monetary policy significantly influence cryptocurrency market dynamics, indicating that crypto-assets have become increasingly integrated with global monetary conditions (Tosun & Ugurlu, 2025). Similar concerns are expressed by the Bank for International Settlements (2023), which highlights the transformative impact of digitalization on the future monetary system. Shin (2023) further argues that tokenization technologies may alter the structure of financial intermediation and payment infrastructures, thereby influencing monetary governance frameworks.

These findings suggest that cryptocurrency regulation should also be evaluated from a macroeconomic perspective. While current evidence does not indicate an immediate threat to monetary sovereignty, the continuing expansion of digital asset ecosystems may require central banks to adapt existing policy frameworks. The findings therefore support the argument that cryptocurrency regulation and monetary policy can no longer be treated as entirely separate policy domains.

Toward a Coordinated Global Regulatory Framework

A final and particularly important finding emerging from the literature is the growing recognition of the need for international regulatory coordination. The reviewed studies consistently indicate that many cryptocurrency-related risks originate from the global and borderless nature of digital asset markets. Consequently, national regulatory measures alone may be insufficient to address challenges associated with financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness.

The Financial Stability Board (2023b) emphasize that effective cryptocurrency governance requires coordinated policy responses capable of addressing cross-border risks. Similar recommendations are presented by FATF (2024), OECD (2024), and Board (2025), all of which stress the importance of regulatory consistency, information sharing, and supervisory cooperation. The

literature further suggests that international coordination may reduce opportunities for regulatory arbitrage while improving the effectiveness of risk monitoring and enforcement activities.

This finding represents the principal contribution of the present study. The analysis demonstrates that financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness should not be viewed as separate regulatory objectives. Instead, they are interconnected outcomes influenced by the degree of regulatory coherence within the global cryptocurrency ecosystem. By positioning regulatory fragmentation as a common underlying challenge, this study advances a more integrated understanding of cryptocurrency governance and highlights the importance of coordinated regulatory frameworks for managing the opportunities and risks associated with digital assets. Nevertheless, the study is limited by its reliance on secondary data and published literature. Future research may extend these findings through comparative empirical studies involving regulators, financial institutions, cryptocurrency service providers, and investors across different jurisdictions.

Conclusions

The growing integration of cryptocurrency into the global financial system has transformed regulatory governance into a multidimensional policy challenge that extends beyond market supervision. The analysis demonstrates that regulatory fragmentation constitutes a fundamental obstacle to achieving three interconnected public policy objectives: financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy effectiveness. Differences in regulatory approaches across jurisdictions create governance gaps that facilitate regulatory arbitrage, weaken investor safeguards, complicate risk monitoring, and reduce the effectiveness of policy responses to cross-border cryptocurrency activities. As cryptocurrency markets continue to evolve beyond national boundaries, the effectiveness of regulatory interventions increasingly depends on the degree of international consistency and coordination rather than on isolated domestic measures. The significance of this study lies in its integrated perspective on cryptocurrency governance. While previous discussions have often treated financial stability, investor protection, and monetary policy as separate regulatory concerns, the present analysis highlights their interdependence within a fragmented global regulatory environment. This perspective contributes to a broader understanding of cryptocurrency regulation by positioning regulatory fragmentation as a common underlying challenge affecting multiple policy outcomes simultaneously. Consequently, the future sustainability of digital asset markets will depend not only on technological innovation but also on the development of more coordinated governance frameworks capable of balancing innovation, market integrity, financial resilience, and monetary stability across economies.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to their respective institutions, namely Universitas Bunda Mulia, Universitas Mercu Buana, and Universitas Mahasaraswati, for providing academic support and access to scholarly resources that contributed to the completion of this study. The authors are also grateful to colleagues and academic peers who provided constructive feedback and valuable insights during the development of the manuscript. The authors declare that this research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. Any opinions, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of their affiliated institutions.

References

- Aquilina, M., Cornelli, G., Frost, J., & Gambacorta, L. (2026). Cryptocurrencies And Decentralised Finance: Functions And Financial Stability Implications. In *Research Handbook Of Macprudential Policy* (Pp. 522–545). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Azar, P., Baughman, G., Carapella, F., Gerszten, J., Lubis, A., Perez-Sangimino, J. P., Rappoport, D., Scotti, C., Swem, N., Vardoulakis, A., & Werman, A. (2022). The Financial Stability Implications Of Digital

-
- Assets. *Finance And Economics Discussion Series*, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.17016/FEDS.2022.058>
- Board, F. S. (2021). *Crypto Assets And Global Stable Coins*. FSB Publications.
- Board, F. S. (2023a). Global Regulatory Framework For Crypto-Asset Activities. *Financial Stability Board*. URL: <https://www.fsb.org/2023/07/fsb-global-regulatory-framework-for-cryptoasset-activities>.
- Board, F. S. (2023b). IMF-FSB Synthesis Paper: Policies For Crypto-Assets. Nd <https://www.fsb.org/2023/09/imf-fsb-synthesis-paper-policies-for-crypto-assets>.
- Board, F. S. (2023c). The Financial Stability Risks Of Decentralised Finance. *Financial Stability Board: Basel, Switzerland*.
- Board, F. S. (2025). Thematic Review On FSB Global Regulatory Framework For Crypto-Asset Activities. *Financial Stability Board: Basel, Switzerland*.
- CGDFS, C. G. Of D. Of F. S. (2023). Financial Stability Risks From Cryptoassets In Emerging Market Economies. In *BIS Papers* (Issue 138). Bank For International Settlements. <https://www.bis.org/publ/bppdf/bispap138.pdf>
- Chen, W., & Phelan, G. (2025). Digital Currency And Banking-Sector Stability. *Journal Of Financial Stability*, 78, 101414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2025.101414>
- Crane, J., Everhart, J., & Weiss, A. (2023). Deep Dive: Enhancing Market Integrity And Investor Protection In Crypto Asset Markets. In *Bretton Woods Committee Brief* (Issue 6). Bretton Woods Committee. https://brettonwoods.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/BWC-Brief6-Crypto-Integrity_FNL2lo.pdf
- Dahliani, S. D. S. H. T. D. A. H. Y. (2025). Cryptocurrency Regulation And Market Volatility: Analyzing The Impact Of Global Policy Interventions On Financial Stability. *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)*, Vol. 11 No. 3 (2025): *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 272–284. <https://doi.org/10.29210/020254965>
- Doerr, J. F., Kosse, A., Khan, A., Lewrick, U., Mojon, B., Nolens, B., & Rice, T. (2021). Defi Risks And The Decentralisation Illusion. *BIS Quarterly Review*, 21, 21–36.
- Force, F. A. T. (2023). *Virtual Assets And Virtual Asset Service Providers: Updated Guidance*. FATF.
- Goel, A. (2023). *Pathways To The Regulation Of Crypto-Assets: A Global Approach*.
- Hackethal, A., Hanspal, T., Lammer, D., & Rink, K. (2021). The Characteristics And Portfolio Behavior Of Bitcoin Investors: Evidence From Indirect Cryptocurrency Investments. *Review Of Finance*, 26, 855–898. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfab034>
- Hermans, L., Ianiro, A., Kochanska, U., Törmälehto, V.-M., Van Der Kraaij, A., & Simón, J. M. V. (2022). Decrypting Financial Stability Risks In Crypto-Asset Markets. *Financial Stability Review*, 1.
- IMF, I. M. F. (2023). *Policy Paper: Elements Of Effective Policies For Crypto Assets*. February.
- Jaffri, A. (2026). Regulating Crypto Assets In The United States: Balancing Regulatory Effectiveness, Investor Protection, And Cross-Border Challenges. *Capital Markets Law Journal*, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cmlj/kmag015>
- Lagarde, C. (2026). *Stablecoins And The Future Of Money: Separating Functions From Instruments*. European Central Bank. <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2026/html/ecb.sp260508~dd909fbed1.en.html>
- Manaa, M., Chimienti, M., Adachi, M., Athanassiou, P., Balteanu, I., Calza, A., Devaney, C., Fernandez, E., Eser, F., Ganoulis, I., Laot, M., Günther, P., Poinet, R., Sauer, S., Schneeberger, D., Stracca, L., Tapking, J., Toolin, C., Tyler, C., & Wacket, H. (2019). Crypto-Assets: Implications For Financial Stability, Monetary Policy, And Payments And Market Infrastructures. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3391055>
- Parliament, E., & Union, C. Of The E. (2023). Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 Of The European Parliament And Of The Council Of 31 May 2023 On Markets In Crypto-Assets, And Amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 And (EU) No 1095/2010 And Directives 2013/36/EU And (EU) 2019/1937. In *Official Journal Of The European Union* (Vol. L150, Pp. 40–205). Publications Office Of The European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/1114/oj/eng>
- Pernice, I., Henningsen, S., Proskalovich, R., Florian, M., Elendner, H., & Scheuermann, B. (2019). *Monetary Stabilization In Cryptocurrencies – Design Approaches And Open Questions*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVCBT.2019.00011>
- Settlements, B. For I. (2023). *Annual Economic Report 2023*. Bank For International Settlements.
-

- <https://www.bis.org/publ/arpdf/ar2023e.htm>
- Shin, H. S. (2023). Tokenisation And The Future Of Monetary Systems. In *BIS Working Papers*. Bank For International Settlements.
- Stern, L. (2025). Understanding Accredited Investors In Cryptocurrency Markets: A Comprehensive Analysis. *Journal Of Economic Criminology*, 9, 100187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconc.2025.100187>
- Tosun, T. T., & Uğurlu, E. (2025). The Impact Of The Fed' s Monetary Policy On Cryptocurrencies: Novel Policy Implications For Central Banks. *Journal Of Risk And Financial Management*, 18(7), 393. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18070393>
- Vidal-Tomás, D., Briola, A., & Aste, T. (2023). *FTX's Downfall And Binance's Consolidation: The Fragility Of Centralized Digital Finance*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/Arxiv.2302.11371>
- Wang, X., & Wang, Y. (2026). Cryptocurrency Regulation And Stock Market Performance. *Finance Research Letters*, 98, 109839. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2026.109839>
- Xiong, X., & Luo, J. (2024). Global Trends In Cryptocurrency Regulation: An Overview. *The International Conference On Mathematical Research For Blockchain Economy*, 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.48550/Arxiv.2404.15895>
- Xiong, X., Wang, Z., Cui, T., Knottenbelt, W., & Huth, M. (2023). Market Misconduct In Decentralized Finance (Defi): Analysis, Regulatory Challenges And Policy Implications. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2311.17715*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/Arxiv.2311.17715>