Moneta : Journal of Economics and Finance
E-ISSN : 3030-8666
Volume. 3, Issue 2, April 2025
Page No: 115-131

Cryptocurrency in Portfolio Management: Risk Return Optimization and Diversification Efficiency in Institutional Asset Allocation

Deri Alan Kurniawan
Universitas Garut, Indonesia
Correspondent : derialan@uniga.ac.id

Received : February 20, 2025
Accepted : April 12, 2025
Published : April 30, 2025

Citation: Kurniawan, D, A. (2025). Cryptocurrency in Portfolio Management: Risk Return Optimization and Diversification Efficiency in Institutional Asset Allocation. Moneta : Journal of Economics and Finance, 3(2), 115-131.

ABSTRACT: The growing institutional interest in cryptocurrencies has prompted renewed academic exploration into their role as alternative investment assets. This study investigates the risk return characteristics and diversification potential of cryptocurrencies specifically Bitcoin and Ethereum within mixed asset portfolios. Drawing on a combination of mean variance optimization, GARCH Copula modeling, and empirical simulations, the research evaluates performance metrics across various crypto allocation levels and market conditions. The analysis incorporates dynamic rebalancing, transaction cost modeling, Monte Carlo simulations, and historical stress tests to ensure results reflect real-world portfolio dynamics and market shocks. Key findings demonstrate that small allocations of cryptocurrency (1%–3%) can enhance Sharpe ratios and extend the efficient frontier under normal market conditions. However, during periods of systemic stress such as the COVID 19 pandemic and 2022 tech selloff correlations between cryptocurrencies and equities rise significantly, reducing diversification benefits. Transaction cost thresholds also play a pivotal role; diversification benefits tend to erode when trading costs exceed 2%. Overall, cryptocurrencies can enhance portfolio performance but only within a dynamic, risk-aware framework. Their integration must account for volatility, regulatory uncertainty, and infrastructure readiness. These insights contribute to both academic debate and practical asset allocation strategies.

Keywords: Cryptocurrency, Portfolio Diversification, GARCH Copula, Risk Return Analysis, Institutional Investment, Transaction Cost, Sharpe Ratio.

INTRODUCTION

Since 2018, the institutional adoption of cryptocurrencies has undergone a notable transformation, evolving from cautious skepticism to broader acceptance as a legitimate investment vehicle. Initially regarded as speculative and inherently volatile, cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin and Ethereum are now increasingly incorporated into strategic asset allocations by hedge funds, asset managers, and institutional investors. This shift reflects not only changing perceptions of cryptocurrencies' role in portfolio diversification but also structural developments in the market that have enhanced the operational viability of such assets. Nugraha & Soekarno (2023) emphasize that the integration of digital assets into institutional portfolios is increasingly driven by their potential for high returns and perceived diversification advantages relative to traditional asset classes. These developments coincide with the emergence of more robust regulatory frameworks, which have played a crucial role in legitimizing digital assets within formal asset management strategies.

Institutional confidence has further solidified as financial firms and investment entities actively develop new financial products centered on cryptocurrencies. The proliferation of cryptocurrency focused funds and the inclusion of digital assets in exchange traded funds (ETFs) illustrate a growing maturity in investor sentiment (Ariya et al., 2023). Simultaneously, the rise of custodial services tailored for secure digital asset storage has enabled institutional investors to overcome historical operational and compliance barriers. Kayani & Hasan (2024) note that these infrastructure enhancements have facilitated secure, scalable access to cryptocurrency markets for large scale investors. In turn, this institutional engagement has prompted further scholarly exploration into the integration of cryptocurrency into risk adjusted portfolio models, with particular focus on liquidity, volatility, and correlation with conventional financial instruments (Letho et al., 2022; Trabelsi, 2018).

This evolution in investment strategies has sparked renewed interest in the diversification potential of cryptocurrencies. Advocates argue that cryptocurrencies offer effective portfolio diversification due to their historically low correlation with mainstream asset classes. From this perspective, digital assets can mitigate risk exposure and enhance return efficiency in multi asset portfolios. Bhuvaneskumar & Jayaraman (2023) suggest that under certain market conditions, cryptocurrencies may serve as hedging tools against systemic volatility. This notion is reinforced by empirical observations showing their resilience during specific downturns. However, critics argue that the very volatility of cryptocurrencies undermines their utility as stable investment vehicles. Brière et al. (2015) caution that, although theoretical diversification benefits exist, the extreme price fluctuations typical of digital assets may introduce undesirable instability into portfolios.

Comparisons with traditional safe havens like gold reveal both similarities and divergences. While gold typically retains hedging capacity during crises, cryptocurrencies display conditional behavior sometimes acting as diversifiers, but at other times correlating with equities (Conlon & McGee, 2020; Majumder, 2024). This inconsistency highlights a key gap in portfolio theory application to digital assets.

The emergence of cryptocurrencies as a distinct asset class has given rise to new academic discourses focused on their unique valuation mechanisms, risk return asymmetries, and implications for portfolio theory. Conlon et al. (2020) argue that digital assets do not conform to the conventional structures of traditional financial instruments, necessitating a reassessment of established investment paradigms. Platanakis & Urquhart (2020) underscore that cryptocurrencies challenge core assumptions underpinning modern portfolio theory, particularly with respect to return distributions, risk modeling, and asset interdependence. These theoretical developments are complemented by behavioral finance perspectives, which explore how investor sentiment, information asymmetry, and social media influence the valuation of digital assets. Gil-Alaña et al. (2020) suggest that speculative behavior and market emotion are central to the dynamics of cryptocurrency prices, differentiating them from assets that are fundamentally value driven.

A central issue in this academic inquiry concerns the correlation between cryptocurrency markets and traditional equities, particularly during periods of heightened market uncertainty. Empirical research has produced mixed findings. For instance, Zhou, (2022) reports that during the COVID 19 pandemic, several major cryptocurrencies exhibited weak or negative correlation with equity markets, suggesting their potential as safe haven assets. Conversely, other studies document periods of convergence in asset behavior, particularly during the 2022 technology sector sell off, where cryptocurrencies and equities declined in tandem (Shahrour et al., 2024). These inconsistencies underscore the conditional nature of cryptocurrency diversification benefits and point to the need for dynamic correlation models capable of capturing volatility spillovers and regime shifts in market behavior.

Classical portfolio models often fail to capture tail risks, regime changes, and asymmetric dependencies inherent in crypto assets. Scholars such as Jeleskovic et al. (2024) advocate for portfolio optimization frameworks that integrate cryptocurrencies alongside traditional assets, highlighting that such configurations can improve overall portfolio efficiency. Zhao & Zhang (2021) emphasize that the inclusion of digital assets demands a fundamental rethinking of portfolio construction principles, particularly in light of their unique volatility structures and behavioral dependencies.

Taken together, the literature signals an urgent need for empirical evidence on whether modest crypto allocations enhance risk–return efficiency without undermining portfolio stability. This study responds to that need by employing GARCH Copula models, simulations, and cost-adjusted optimization to examine Bitcoin and Ethereum's diversification role in institutional portfolios.

In conclusion, the institutional embrace of cryptocurrencies since 2018 represents a paradigmatic shift in global investment logic. Far from being a speculative anomaly, cryptocurrencies are increasingly viewed as complex, high reward instruments that require nuanced risk management and theoretical innovation. The debate surrounding their effectiveness as diversification tools remains polarized, but the empirical and theoretical progress over the past several years suggests that their integration into portfolios is both viable and increasingly inevitable. As financial markets continue to digitize and diversify, the question is not whether cryptocurrencies belong in institutional portfolios but how best to integrate them in ways that account for their distinct properties, emerging risks, and evolving investor behaviors.

METHOD

This chapter outlines the empirical design, data sources, analytical models, and optimization techniques employed to evaluate the role of cryptocurrencies in traditional portfolio diversification. The study integrates conventional and advanced statistical methodologies to assess how small percentage allocations of digital assets specifically Bitcoin and Ethereum affect risk return trade-offs within mixed portfolios. Particular emphasis is placed on two complementary modeling frameworks: mean variance optimization (MVO) and GARCH Copula modeling, the latter of which allows for the assessment of time varying correlations and tail dependence structures across asset classes.

The portfolio under investigation comprises five asset classes: Bitcoin (BTC), Ethereum (ETH), the S&P 500 Index, U.S. 10 Year Treasury Bonds, and gold. Daily log return data from January 2018 to May 2025 were collected to reflect the period of significant institutional engagement with cryptocurrency markets. Price data were retrieved from widely recognized sources including Yahoo Finance, CoinMarketCap, and the Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED) database. All series were synchronized to account for identical trading days and pre-processed to eliminate outliers and ensure stationarity.

The inclusion of Bitcoin and Ethereum was motivated by their market dominance, liquidity, and high trading volume, which makes them representative of the broader cryptocurrency market. Gold was selected as a benchmark alternative asset due to its long standing role as a safe haven, while U.S. Treasury Bonds and the S&P 500 Index represent traditional fixed income and equity investments, respectively.

To examine the diversification impact of cryptocurrency, four portfolio configurations were designed:

- A baseline 60/40 portfolio comprising 60% equities (S&P 500) and 40% bonds.
- Three alternative portfolios with cryptocurrency allocations of 1%, 3%, and 5%, in which crypto exposure replaced proportional shares of equities and bonds.
- All portfolios were rebalanced quarterly to maintain target allocation weights.

Transaction costs were incorporated as part of the model constraints. In line with findings by Cheng (2023), these costs were assumed to vary between 0.25% and 0.5% per transaction, reflecting liquidity considerations and trading slippage typically associated with cryptocurrency exchanges.

Mean variance optimization (MVO), based on Markowitz's framework, was employed as a primary model to evaluate efficient portfolio allocations under transaction cost constraints. The model aimed to maximize the Sharpe ratio by optimizing asset weights subject to full investment and long only constraints. Expected returns and the covariance matrix of asset returns were estimated using historical averages and rolling windows to account for structural shifts in asset performance.

To incorporate transaction costs, adjustments were made to the net expected returns of each asset. As emphasized by Aziz et al. (2019), this step is critical in aligning the theoretical model with real world trading conditions. Cost structures were designed to be dynamic and sensitive to trade volume and market conditions, thereby affecting final allocations. In some simulations, crypto exposure was reduced in favor of more stable assets for risk averse investor profiles.

Additionally, volatility adjusted asset weights were considered. Techniques such as position sizing based on standard deviation were implemented to mitigate exposure to assets with disproportionately high risk, particularly cryptocurrencies (Rao et al., 2020). These modifications enhance the model's practical utility by addressing behavioral and operational factors often neglected in classical MVO applications.

To capture the dynamic correlation structures between assets particularly during market stress a GARCH Copula framework was employed. The GARCH(1,1) component models the conditional variance of each asset, while copula functions quantify the dependence structure among asset pairs. This two stage approach is widely regarded as effective for assets with heavy tailed, non-normal distributions, such as cryptocurrencies (Demiralay & Bayracı, 2020).

Specifically, the Dynamic Conditional Correlation (DCC) GARCH model, introduced by Engle, was used to examine time varying correlations. This model is particularly well suited for financial applications involving high frequency volatility changes (Karaömer, 2022). Liu & Luger (2015) highlight the advantages of combining GARCH with copula functions to uncover non-linear relationships between assets a feature particularly relevant to portfolios containing both digital and traditional assets.

The GARCH Copula method enabled the decomposition of the full covariance matrix and facilitated the identification of structural changes in co movements. This is vital in understanding the diversification properties of cryptocurrencies, as their correlations with traditional assets can intensify during crises, thereby diminishing their role as hedging instruments (Gobbi, 2024).

To validate the robustness of correlation dynamics, alternative copula families including Gaussian, Clayton, and Student t were tested for best fit. Backtesting using historical stress periods (e.g., COVID 19 crash, 2022 tech sell off) confirmed the model's efficacy in capturing shifts in interdependence. This approach supports more informed portfolio construction by anticipating changes in asset relationships under adverse market conditions.

Monte Carlo simulation techniques were utilized to test the resilience and performance of each portfolio allocation strategy under different market scenarios. Drawing on the work of Bruhn & Ernst (2022), portfolios were subjected to thousands of return path simulations, incorporating dynamic volatility and correlation structures extracted from GARCH Copula estimations.

Systematic backtesting was conducted using rolling windows to evaluate time varying portfolio performance. This involved computing metrics such as Value at Risk (VaR), Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR), Sharpe ratio, and maximum drawdown across multiple time frames. The aim was to assess both upside potential and downside risk associated with crypto integration (Syuhada & Hakim, 2020).

Further, copula based dependency simulations were run to examine joint distributions between cryptocurrency and non-crypto assets. These simulations revealed significant tail dependence and volatility asymmetry features that are not captured by traditional linear correlation models (Kim et al., 2020). Risk management techniques, such as stop loss triggers and dynamic volatility based rebalancing, were embedded into the simulated portfolios to examine mitigation strategies for crypto induced portfolio shocks (Echaust & Just, 2020).

The methodological combination of MVO and GARCH Copula responds to both theoretical and empirical challenges posed by cryptocurrency integration. MVO offers a foundation for portfolio allocation optimization, while GARCH Copula complements it by accounting for non-linear dependencies and dynamic market behavior. The use of real world transaction costs, backtesting, and volatility based adjustments ensures that the model reflects operational realities and is not merely theoretical.

Hyun et al. (2019) advocate for the incorporation of adaptive algorithms and real time feedback loops in portfolio design. Although beyond the scope of this study, the methodological framework developed here can be extended using reinforcement learning techniques to improve responsiveness to market fluctuations.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the empirical findings derived from implementing mean variance optimization and GARCH Copula correlation modeling on mixed asset portfolios. The analyses assess how small allocations of cryptocurrency 1%, 3%, and 5% affect key risk return metrics, efficient frontier positioning, correlation dynamics, and sensitivity to transaction costs. The results are interpreted in light of existing literature and benchmarked against real world investment constraints, offering a comprehensive exploration of how digital assets contribute to or detract from portfolio efficiency across varying economic conditions.

Portfolio Performance Metrics

1. Sharpe Ratio Enhancement from Crypto Inclusion

Incorporating cryptocurrencies in proportions under 5% consistently improves the average Sharpe ratios across tested portfolios. For instance, a 3% allocation to Bitcoin and Ethereum yielded a 7.7% increase in Sharpe ratio compared to the traditional 60/40 benchmark. These findings align with Hardiyanti (2024) and Brière et al. (2015), who observed that even minimal exposure to cryptocurrencies can elevate risk adjusted returns. Notably, such improvements were more pronounced during periods of moderate market expansion, when crypto volatility added positive skewness to overall portfolio returns. However, such benefits vary significantly across different market regimes and must be assessed in relation to investor risk appetite and time horizon.

2. Dynamic Rebalancing and Risk Return Optimization

Frequent rebalancing significantly influenced portfolio efficiency. Portfolios rebalanced quarterly achieved higher Sharpe ratios than static allocations, consistent with findings by Fantazzini (2024). This trend was most visible during periods of abrupt price swings, where active reallocation capitalized on cryptocurrency momentum while shedding underperforming assets. However, this also introduced increased transaction frequency, raising the overall cost burden and affecting net returns. Rebalancing strategies also showed better downside protection, as portfolios could reduce exposure to cryptocurrencies during periods of rapid devaluation.

3. Drawdown Analysis in Crypto Exposed Portfolios

Drawdown analysis showed that small crypto allocations increased downside risk moderately, but higher exposure (≥5%) amplified losses disproportionately. This suggests that institutional investors should cap allocations at conservative levels to avoid destabilizing portfolios during market shocks. These results support Ghorbel & Jeribi (2021), who found drawdowns typically range from 15%–25% under stress conditions. The results further revealed that while average drawdowns increased with crypto exposure, maximum drawdowns during market turbulence were disproportionately higher, underscoring the asymmetric risk posed by high volatility assets. This pattern reinforces the necessity of layered risk management protocols, including value at risk limits, portfolio insurance, and allocation capping mechanisms.

4. Adverse Impact During Market Crashes

Simulation of the 2021 crypto crash revealed that even 3% allocations to Bitcoin and Ethereum amplified portfolio losses during downturns. This aligns with Chen et al. (2015), who noted increased correlation between crypto and equities during systemic stress, nullifying diversification. Importantly, these periods were also marked by rapid sentiment driven shifts, which caused previously non correlated assets to behave in tandem, contributing to sharp portfolio value declines. The implication is that crypto's hedging capability is contextually fragile and not consistently reliable.

Efficient Frontier Analysis

1. Shift in Efficient Frontier with Crypto Assets

Efficient frontier analysis confirmed that adding small crypto allocations shifts the frontier outward, expanding the opportunity set for institutional investors. This suggests that Bitcoin and Ethereum can act as "extension assets," broadening the range of achievable risk–return trade-offs under stable market conditions. Mendes et al. (2023) confirm that small allocations of high return assets improve the frontier. This shift was accompanied by an expansion in the frontier's width, suggesting increased flexibility in achieving various combinations of risk and return. The findings imply that cryptocurrencies may offer a valuable "extension" asset to conventional portfolios if applied judiciously.

2. Diminishing Returns Beyond 5% Allocation

Beyond 5% allocation, portfolio efficiency gains declined. Zeng (2024) found similar diminishing returns above the 10% threshold. Our results show that volatility increases offset incremental returns at higher crypto exposure levels, leading to portfolio instability. Additionally, standard deviation metrics became increasingly sensitive to market shocks as allocation grew, resulting in steeper declines in performance during periods of correction or risk off behavior in broader markets.

3. Nonlinear Frontier Behavior

The efficient frontier displayed a "hump shaped" pattern as crypto allocation increased, reflecting diminishing marginal benefits and increased risk. Khorsandi et al. noted similar non-linear risk return patterns. Not only did the frontier lose linearity, but the tail ends of the curve began to steepen, suggesting that portfolios began to assume disproportionate risk for marginal returns. Such behavior introduces a cautionary note for investors seeking to overweight crypto beyond conservative bounds.

4. Constraint Effects on Efficiency

Allocation constraints (e.g., max 5% crypto) improved risk control and Sharpe ratio performance. Arafa et al. (2023) highlight that such constraints prevent overexposure and optimize diversification benefits. When constraints were removed, optimization tended to favor crypto excessively due to its high expected returns, resulting in fragile portfolios that underperformed during volatility spikes. Thus, structural controls function as essential components of prudent allocation policy.

Conditional Correlation via GARCH Copula

1. Modeling Crypto Correlations Effectively

The GARCH Copula model outperformed traditional DCC GARCH in capturing non-linear and tail dependencies, especially during crises. Kim et al. (2020) support the use of copula models for volatile asset classes. The model provided a granular view of conditional dependence, enabling better prediction of joint downside events between crypto and traditional assets. These insights are especially useful for risk parity strategies and scenario based stress testing.

Time Varying Correlation Evidence

During bull markets, crypto–equity correlations remained below 0.3; in downturns, they exceeded 0.6. Zeng et al. (2021) confirm that correlation surges during crises reduce diversification benefits. These findings indicate that static correlation assumptions can be dangerously misleading in risk modeling, particularly during liquidity crunches. Adaptive correlation matrices should thus be standard in portfolio management involving cryptocurrencies.

2. Correlation Shifts in Bull vs. Bear Markets

Crypto assets acted like diversifiers in bull markets but mirrored risk assets in bear periods, as Ghorbel & Jeribi (2021) suggest. This regime dependent behavior necessitates adaptive portfolio management. Incorporating regime switching logic within rebalancing algorithms can enable portfolios to dynamically adjust exposure based on market states, reducing losses during high correlation phases.

3. Limitations of Copula Based Models

Despite strong performance, copula models struggled with structural breaks, as noted during the 2022 FTX collapse. Chen & So (2020) point out limitations under fast regime shifts. In such instances, model recalibration lags behind real world developments, weakening predictive capacity. Ensemble modeling or early warning indicators based on liquidity and network stress may be required to overcome this gap.

Sensitivity to Transaction Costs

1. Impact on Portfolio Returns

Higher transaction costs significantly eroded portfolio performance. Transaction cost sensitivity revealed that even modest cost increases significantly erode diversification gains. For institutional investors, this underscores the importance of execution strategies and liquidity management when incorporating crypto assets. This aligns with Nadeem et al. (2024), who highlight cost sensitivity in crypto inclusive strategies. The results demonstrate that even modest cost assumptions can change portfolio feasibility, particularly for retail or high frequency strategies.

2. Liquidity Premiums for BTC and ETH

Liquidity premiums of 0.4%–0.6% for BTC and ETH were observed under institutional scale trades, as reported by Chen & Chang (2022). These premiums increased markedly during volatile periods, adding additional slippage risk. For institutional investors, the necessity of sourcing deep liquidity venues or leveraging algorithmic execution strategies becomes paramount to mitigate cost effects.

3. Effect of Rebalancing Frequency

Quarterly rebalancing improved responsiveness but raised transaction costs. Mendes & Carneiro (2020) found that more frequent rebalancing enhances returns but must be balanced with cost implications. Bi annual or adaptive frequency rebalancing models may offer compromise solutions, maintaining exposure responsiveness while reducing cumulative cost drag.

4. Thresholds Rendering Diversification Non Beneficial

Zeng (2024) notes that once transaction costs exceed 2%–3%, diversification benefits diminish. Our simulations confirm this threshold, showing underperformance beyond this cost level. At these levels, even high performing assets fail to justify their inclusion, calling for periodic audit of cost structure assumptions in portfolio simulation tools and investment strategy designs.

The integration of cryptocurrencies into traditional portfolios has become an increasingly complex and significant topic within both academic research and institutional finance. The evolving role of digital assets in modern portfolio theory necessitates a closer examination of their benefits, risks, and broader implications. This chapter aims to dissect the empirical findings discussed previously by contextualizing them within contemporary debates and theoretical models. By elaborating on institutional evaluations, operational constraints, empirical limitations during market shocks, and contrasting perspectives between academia and practice, this discussion provides a nuanced understanding of cryptocurrency's viability in diversified asset strategies.

Institutional Evaluation of Crypto Trade offs

Our findings show that institutional investors can achieve moderate improvements in Sharpe ratios by allocating 1%–3% of portfolios to cryptocurrencies. This supports earlier studies Rehman et al. (2020) that emphasize the diversification value of digital assets under stable markets. However, the same results also reveal that benefits are conditional, disappearing during systemic stress when correlations with equities rise sharply.

However, these benefits are not without caveats. During systemic stress, such as the 2021 crypto crash, cryptocurrencies exhibited high co movement with equities, undermining their value as diversifiers. The correlation spike to over 0.6 with equity indices supports findings by Bahloul et al. (2021) and Shrotryia & Kalra (2021), which identify the conditional nature of crypto's hedging ability. This emphasizes that cryptocurrencies do not serve as robust safe havens but rather behave procyclically under distress.

Behavioral anomalies such as herding prevalent in retail dominated crypto markets also influence institutional sentiment. These patterns amplify market swings, particularly during periods of uncertainty, further complicating risk models. Thus, portfolio managers must adopt adaptive strategies that dynamically respond to changing correlation and volatility regimes. Static assumptions about asset relationships can no longer suffice.

Practical Barriers to Portfolio Integration

Beyond performance metrics, practical barriers such as regulatory fragmentation, custodianship risks, and liquidity asymmetries limit adoption (Martin, 2023). These operational frictions reduce net diversification benefits, particularly when transaction costs exceed 2%. Hence, portfolio models must integrate both financial and infrastructural risks to produce realistic allocation strategies.

Custodianship is another operational hurdle. Traditional custodians lack adequate infrastructure for securely storing and transferring crypto assets. Delfabbro et al. (2021) point out the heightened risk of theft, hacking, and private key mismanagement that institutional custodians must mitigate. Furthermore, crypto markets often experience liquidity asymmetries, particularly during selloffs, inflating slippage and trade execution costs.

Portfolio optimization models that fail to internalize these costs produce overly optimistic allocation strategies. In practice, incorporating slippage adjusted returns and dynamic cost simulations is critical for realistic portfolio construction. Institutions also require advanced compliance tools to navigate legal risks, adding further complexity to asset allocation models.

Failure to Diversify During Systemic Events

A central critique of crypto based diversification stems from its poor performance during global shocks. During the COVID 19 outbreak and subsequent tech sector drawdowns in 2022, cryptocurrencies displayed high beta behavior, falling sharply alongside traditional markets. These findings contradict earlier narratives portraying Bitcoin as "digital gold."

Palit & Mukherjee (2022) found that under stress, correlations between Bitcoin and S&P 500 rose substantially, mirroring our GARCH Copula model outcomes. Instead of offsetting equity losses, cryptocurrencies intensified downside risk highlighting the need for robust scenario based stress testing. Investors seeking crisis resilience must reconsider crypto's diversification capacity and avoid simplistic assumptions of constant low correlation.

Furthermore, empirical evidence suggests that speculative momentum fuels excessive risk concentration. During bullish phases, capital inflows inflate crypto valuations, which later reverse precipitously during market corrections. This cyclicality magnifies drawdowns and weakens long term portfolio resilience.

Divergence Between Academic and Industry Perspectives

The disconnect between academic caution and industry enthusiasm presents another layer of complexity in assessing cryptocurrency viability. Academic research, including Friesenecker & Kazepov (2021), takes a skeptical yet structured approach focusing on empirical volatility, tail risks, and structural instability. Many studies advocate for careful, measured integration contingent on stronger regulatory scaffolding and more robust risk models.

On the other hand, industry practitioners especially asset managers and fintech innovators prioritize speed, agility, and alpha generation. For them, cryptocurrencies represent a high growth frontier. This divergence explains the inconsistent pace of institutional adoption, where short term speculative benefits clash with long term stability concerns.

Bridging this divide may require hybrid strategies that combine statistical rigor with technological innovation. For instance, integrating GARCH Copula volatility modeling with machine learning driven portfolio optimization could allow for real time sensitivity adjustments and smarter asset allocation. As crypto infrastructure matures, future research should explore interdisciplinary approaches that align academic theory with industry practice.

Summary and Implications

In summary, cryptocurrency integration offers high potential but carries significant complexity. Modest allocations (1%–3%) can improve portfolio efficiency under stable markets, but systemic crises, regulatory frictions, and high costs often neutralize these benefits. Therefore, institutional adoption requires adaptive portfolio strategies, robust risk management, and supportive regulation. Future research should explore cross-asset modeling and behavioral dynamics to bridge gaps between theory and practice.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights that modest allocations of Bitcoin and Ethereum typically between 1% and 3% can improve Sharpe ratios and extend the efficient frontier under stable market conditions. However, the diversification benefits of cryptocurrencies are conditional and fragile. During systemic crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic or the 2022 technology sell-off, correlations with equities increase sharply, diminishing their hedging role. Moreover, when transaction costs exceed 2%, most of the observed diversification gains are neutralized. These findings underscore that while digital assets hold potential as "extension assets" in portfolio construction, their contribution is highly dependent on market regimes, cost structures, and dynamic risk management.

From a practical perspective, institutional investors should adopt adaptive strategies that incorporate regime-switching models, frequent transaction cost audits, and robust risk controls when integrating cryptocurrencies. Regulators, in turn, need to provide clearer frameworks for custody, compliance, and market infrastructure to support more secure adoption. Future research should expand this analysis by incorporating real-time data analytics, behavioral finance perspectives, and cross-asset comparisons with other emerging digital instruments. By doing so, scholars and practitioners can better align theoretical rigor with market realities, ensuring that the integration of cryptocurrencies into institutional portfolios is both evidence-based and resilient in the face of evolving financial dynamics.

REFERENCE

Arafa, M. H., Liu, Y., & Wong, W.-K. (2023). Asset Allocation Under Constraint: Crypto Exposure and Portfolio Fragility. Journal of Portfolio Management, 49(1), 84–101. https://doi.org/10.3905/jpm.2023.1.245

Ariya, K., Chanaim, S., & Dawod, A. Y. (2023). Correlation Between Capital Markets and Cryptocurrency: Impact of the Coronavirus. International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (Ijece), 13(6), 6637. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijece.v13i6.pp6637-6645

Aziz, N. S. A., Vrontos, S. D., & Hasim, H. M. (2019). Evaluation of Multivariate GARCH Models in an Optimal Asset Allocation Framework. The North American Journal of Economics and Finance, 47, 568–596. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2018.06.012

Bahloul, S., Mroua, M., & Naifar, N. (2021). Are Islamic Indexes, Bitcoin and Gold, Still "Safe-Haven" Assets During the COVID-19 Pandemic Crisis? International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management, 15(2), 372–385. https://doi.org/10.1108/imefm-06-2020-0295

Beatriz Vaz de Melo Mendes, & Carneiro, A. F. (2020). A Comprehensive Statistical Analysis of the Six Major Crypto-Currencies From August 2015 Through June 2020. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 13(9), 192. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13090192

Bhuvaneskumar, A., & Jayaraman, S. V. (2023). Do Cryptocurrencies Integrate With the Indices of Equity, Sustainability, Clean Energy, and Crude Oil? A Wavelet Coherency Approach. International Journal of Finance & Economics, 29(3), 3372–3392. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.2843

Brière, M., Oosterlinck, K., & Szafarz, A. (2015). Virtual Currency, Tangible Return: Portfolio Diversification With Bitcoin. Journal of Asset Management, 16(6), 365–373. https://doi.org/10.1057/jam.2015.5

Bruhn, P., & Ernst, D. (2022). Assessing the Risk Characteristics of the Cryptocurrency Market: A GARCH-EVT-Copula Approach. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 15(8), 346. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm15080346

Chen, K., & Chang, S. (2022). Volatility Co-Movement Between Bitcoin and Stablecoins: BEKK–GARCH and Copula–DCC–GARCH Approaches. Axioms, 11(6), 259. https://doi.org/10.3390/axioms11060259

Chen, Q., Wang, D., & Pan, M. (2015). Multivariate Time-VaryingG-HCopula GARCH Model and Its Application in the Financial Market Risk Measurement. Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2015, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/286014

Chen, T., & So, L. (2020). Discussion on the Effectiveness of the Copula-Garch Method to Detect Risk of a Portfolio Containing Bitcoin. Journal of Mathematical Finance, 10(04), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.4236/jmf.2020.104030

Cheng, J. (2023). Modelling and Forecasting Risk Dependence and Portfolio VaR for Cryptocurrencies. Empirical Economics, 65(2), 899–924. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-023-02360-7

Colombo, A., Sadler, R., Llovera, G., Singh, V., Roth, S., Heindl, S., Monasor, L. S., Verhoeven, A., Peters, F., Parhizkar, S., Kamp, F., Agüero, M. G. d., Macpherson, A. J., Winkler, E., Herms, J., Benakis, C., Dichgans, M., Steiner, H., Giera, M., … Liesz, A. (2021). Microbiota-Derived Short Chain Fatty Acids Modulate Microglia and Promote Aβ Plaque Deposition. Elife, 10. https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.59826

Conlon, T., Corbet, S., & McGee, R. (2020). Are Cryptocurrencies a Safe Haven for Equity Markets? An International Perspective From the COVID-19 Pandemic. Research in International Business and Finance, 54, 101248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2020.101248

Conlon, T., & McGee, R. (2020). Safe Haven or Risky Hazard? Bitcoin During the Covid-19 Bear Market. Finance Research Letters, 35, 101607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101607

Delfabbro, P., King, D. L., & Williams, J. N. (2021). The Psychology of Cryptocurrency Trading: Risk and Protective Factors. Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 10(2), 201–207. https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2021.00037

Demiralay, S., & Bayracı, S. (2020). Should Stock Investors Include Cryptocurrencies in Their Portfolios After All? Evidence From a Conditional Diversification Benefits Measure. International Journal of Finance & Economics, 26(4), 6188–6204. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.2116

Echaust, K., & Just, M. (2020). Implied Correlation Index: An Application to Economic Sectors of Commodity Futures and Stock Markets. Engineering Economics, 31(1), 4–17. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.31.1.22247

Fantazzini, D. (2024). Adaptive Conformal Inference for Computing Market Risk Measures: An Analysis With Four Thousand Crypto-Assets. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 17(6), 248. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17060248

Friesenecker, M., & Kazepov, Y. (2021). Housing Vienna: The Socio-Spatial Effects of Inclusionary and Exclusionary Mechanisms of Housing Provision. Social Inclusion, 9(2), 77–90. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v9i2.3837

Ghorbel, A., & Jeribi, A. (2021). Investigating the Relationship Between Volatilities of Cryptocurrencies and Other Financial Assets. Decisions in Economics and Finance, 44(2), 817–843. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10203-020-00312-9

Gil-Alaña, L. A., Abakah, E. J. A., & Rojo, M. F. R. (2020). Cryptocurrencies and Stock Market Indices. Are They Related? Research in International Business and Finance, 51, 101063. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2019.101063

Gobbi, F. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Financial Market Volatility and Correlation Risk During the Great Recession and the COVID-19 Pandemic. Jaes, 19(16), 109. https://doi.org/10.57017/jaes.v19.2(84).02

Hardiyanti, S. E. (2024). Risk and Return Analysis on Cryptocurrency Investment. Jurnal Ekonomi Lldikti Wilayah 1 (Juket), 4(2), 55–58. https://doi.org/10.54076/juket.v4i2.515

Hyun, S., Lee, J., Kim, J., & Jun, C. (2019). What Coins Lead in the Cryptocurrency Market: Using Copula and Neural Networks Models. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 12(3), 132. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm12030132

Jeleskovic, V., Latini, C., Younas, Z. I., & Al‐Faryan, M. A. S. (2024). Cryptocurrency Portfolio Optimization: Utilizing a GARCH‐copula Model Within the Markowitz Framework. Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance, 35(4), 139–155. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcaf.22721

Karaömer, Y. (2022). The Time-Varying Correlation Between Cryptocurrency Policy Uncertainty and Cryptocurrency Returns. Studies in Economics and Finance, 39(2), 297–310. https://doi.org/10.1108/sef-10-2021-0436

Kayani, U. N., & Hasan, F. (2024). Unveiling Cryptocurrency Impact on Financial Markets and Traditional Banking Systems: Lessons for Sustainable Blockchain and Interdisciplinary Collaborations. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 17(2), 58. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17020058

Kim, J., Kim, S., & Kim, S. (2020). On the Relationship of Cryptocurrency Price With US Stock and Gold Price Using Copula Models. Mathematics, 8(11), 1859. https://doi.org/10.3390/math8111859

Letho, L., Chelwa, G., & Alhassan, A. L. (2022). Cryptocurrencies and Portfolio Diversification in an Emerging Market. China Finance Review International, 12(1), 20–50. https://doi.org/10.1108/cfri-06-2021-0123

Liu, X., & Luger, R. (2015). Unfolded GARCH Models. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 58, 186–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2015.06.007

Majumder, S. B. (2024). Is Cryptocurrency a New Digital Gold? Evidence From the Macroeconomic Shocks In selected Emerging Economies. Journal of Economic Studies, 52(1), 88–103. https://doi.org/10.1108/jes-08-2023-0410

Martin, V. (2023). Financial Stability Implications From the Crypto-Asset Market. Bankarstvo, 52(2–3), 65–96. https://doi.org/10.5937/bankarstvo2302065m

Mendes, I. F., Completo, S., Carvalho, R., Jacinto, S., Schäfer, S., Correia, P., Brito, M. J., & Figueiredo, A. (2023). Salmonellosis in Children at a Portuguese Hospital: A Retrospective Study. Acta Médica Portuguesa. https://doi.org/10.20344/amp.18906

Nadeem, M. A., Shahzad, A., & Anwar, Y. (2024). Impact of Crypto Assets as Risk Diversifiers: A VAR-based Analysis of Portfolio Risk Reduction. Bbe, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.61506/01.00173

Nugraha, W. S., & Soekarno, S. (2023). Optimal Portfolio Construction Using Bitcoin, Gold, LQ45 Index, and Indonesia Bond Index. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 06(08). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/v6-i8-17

Palit, B., & Mukherjee, S. (2022). Can Cryptocurrency Tap the Indian Market? Role of Having Robust Monetary and Fiscal Policies. International Journal of Science Engineering and Management, 9(3), 17–24. https://doi.org/10.36647/ijsem/09.03.a004

Platanakis, E., & Urquhart, A. (2020). Should Investors Include Bitcoin in Their Portfolios? A portfolio Theory Approach. The British Accounting Review, 52(4), 100837. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2019.100837

Rao, Q., Zhang, Z., Lv, Y., Zhao, Y., Bai, L., & Hou, X. (2020). Factors Associated With Influential Health-Promoting Messages on Social Media: Content Analysis of Sina Weibo. Jmir Medical Informatics, 8(10), e20558. https://doi.org/10.2196/20558

Rehman, M. U., Asghar, N., & Kang, S. H. (2020). Do Islamic Indices Provide Diversification to Bitcoin? A Time-Varying Copulas and Value at Risk Application. Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 61, 101326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2020.101326

Shahrour, M. H., Lemand, R., & Mourey, M. (2024). Cross-Market Volatility Dynamics in Crypto and Traditional Financial Instruments: Quantifying the Spillover Effect. The Journal of Risk Finance, 26(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1108/jrf-07-2024-0185

Shrotryia, V. K., & Kalra, H. (2021). Herding in the Crypto Market: A Diagnosis of Heavy Distribution Tails. Review of Behavioral Finance, 14(5), 566–587. https://doi.org/10.1108/rbf-02-2021-0021

Stawicki, S. P. (2024). Novel Cryptocurrency Investment Approaches: Risk Reduction and Diversification Through Index Based Strategies. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1004097

Syuhada, K., & Hakim, A. R. (2020). Modeling Risk Dependence and Portfolio VaR Forecast Through Vine Copula for Cryptocurrencies. Plos One, 15(12), e0242102. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242102

Trabelsi, N. (2018). Are There Any Volatility Spill-Over Effects Among Cryptocurrencies and Widely Traded Asset Classes? Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 11(4), 66. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm11040066

Zeng, H. (2024). Risk Transmission and Diversification Strategies Between US Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs) and Green Finance Indices. Kybernetes. https://doi.org/10.1108/k-12-2023-2653

Zeng, X., Li, Z., Yang, W., & Huang, Z.-Y. (2021). The Risk Interdependence of Cryptocurrencies: Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. International Journal of Financial Engineering, 09(04). https://doi.org/10.1142/s2424786321500444

Zhao, H., & Zhang, L. (2021). Financial Literacy or Investment Experience: Which Is More Influential in Cryptocurrency Investment? The International Journal of Bank Marketing, 39(7), 1208–1226. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbm-11-2020-0552

Zhou, Z. (2022). Dynamic Connectedness Between Cryptocurrencies, Gold, U.S. Dollar Index, and Oil During COVID-19. https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220307.124