JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 2, Page 497-499 | Article No. 60
DOI: 10.4898/jener.v2i2.a60
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

Leverage, Network Dependencies and Informational Efficiency in Cryptocurrency Markets

Shaik Ayub[1]

[1]School of Business, Economics, and Technology, Campbellsville University

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: February 2026

Keywords:
Leverage
Network Dependencies
Informational Efficiency
Cryptocurrency Markets

ABSTRACT

Cryptocurrency markets operate within fragmented exchange ecosystems characterized by heterogeneous leverage regimes, cross-platform arbitrage, and persistent volatility spillovers. These markets resemble complex distributed systems in which institutional design shapes equilibrium outcomes. This paper develops a structural interpretation linking leverage constraints, exchange fragmentation, network spillovers, and informational efficiency. Drawing on financial economics, volatility modeling, and distributed systems research, the analysis argues that cryptocurrency exchanges function as interdependent nodes in a global dependency network. Leverage policies influence trader sorting across venues, altering volatility amplification and price discovery allocation. The discussion bridges financial market microstructure with graph-based dependency modeling and distributed system resilience, offering a unified framework for understanding systemic risk and informational leadership in decentralized yet interconnected markets.

1. Introduction

Cryptocurrency markets differ fundamentally from traditional financial markets not only in the absence of conventional cash-flow fundamentals but also in their system architecture. Identical assets trade across multiple exchanges that differ in leverage policies, compliance rules, technological infrastructure, and liquidity depth. These exchanges are not isolated platforms; rather, they form an interconnected network linked through arbitrage, cross-exchange traders, and shared investor sentiment.

Empirical research shows that cryptocurrency returns are highly volatile and largely disconnected from traditional macroeconomic risk factors (Baur, Hong, and Lee, 2018; Liu and Tsyvinski, 2021). At the same time, price discovery and volatility spillovers propagate across exchanges (Makarov and Schoar, 2020; Dimpfl and Peter, 2021). Multivariate volatility modeling documents persistent bi-directional spillovers across major exchanges (Hossain et al., 2024), while intraday evidence confirms strong cross-exchange shock transmission (Hossain, 2024).

Recent evidence indicates that leverage policies further shape these dynamics. Black, Hossain, and McFarland (2024) show that restricting margin trading reduces volatility and trading volume while increasing relative information share on the affected exchange. Hossain (2024) extends this insight by introducing the information share ratio (ISR) and demonstrating that leveraged products can contribute disproportionately to price discovery relative to market share.

To deepen understanding of these dynamics, it is useful to view cryptocurrency exchanges not merely as trading venues but as nodes within a distributed dependency network. Research in distributed systems and microservice architectures provides useful analogies. Dependency structures in large-scale systems can create cascading failures and interdependent performance outcomes (Abdelfattah et al., 2025). Similarly, graph-based modeling of service dependencies reveals how structural relationships shape scalability and resilience (Uddin, 2025). These insights are conceptually transferable to cryptocurrency exchange networks, where volatility spillovers resemble cascading dependency effects across system nodes.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Cryptocurrency Market Dynamics

Bitcoin's speculative nature and volatility clustering are well documented (Baur, Hong, and Lee, 2018; Klein, Thu, and Walther, 2018). Returns appear driven by attention and momentum rather than traditional factors (Liu and Tsyvinski, 2021). Theoretical models emphasize heterogeneous beliefs and disagreement as central drivers of trading volume (Sockin and Xiong, 2023; Biais et al., 2023). Exchange fragmentation has been studied extensively. Makarov and Schoar (2020) show persistent cross-exchange price deviations, indicating limits to arbitrage. Dimpfl and Peter (2021) demonstrate uneven informational leadership across venues. Volatility spillovers are persistent and networked. Hossain et al. (2024) document multivariate spillover effects across exchanges and coins. Hossain (2024) finds strong intraday transmission across Bitcoin currency pairs.

2.2 Leverage and Institutional Design

Leverage has ambiguous effects in financial markets. It can enhance liquidity but also amplify speculative volatility (Chowdhry and Nanda, 1998). Evidence from Chinese markets shows that relaxing constraints can improve efficiency under certain conditions (Chang, Luo, and Ren, 2014). In cryptocurrency markets, Black, Hossain, and McFarland (2024) show that margin bans reduce volatility and volume while increasing informational contribution. Hossain (2024) demonstrates that leveraged structures alter price discovery relative to market share.

2.3 Network Dependency and System Analogies

Large-scale distributed systems exhibit dependency-driven behavior, where structural relationships among components determine resilience and cascading risk (Abdelfattah et al., 2025). Graph-based dependency modeling improves scalability and fault tolerance (Uddin, 2025). AI-driven log analysis further reveals how system-level patterns propagate across components (Uddin et al., 2026). These insights suggest that cryptocurrency exchanges can be conceptualized as dependency nodes in a volatility network, where leverage policies act as system-level configuration parameters.

2.4 Hypothesis Development

Viewing exchanges as networked nodes implies that institutional heterogeneity influences shock propagation. If leverage availability attracts speculative traders, high-leverage exchanges may function as volatility amplifiers. Given persistent spillovers (Hossain et al., 2024), shocks originating in such venues may cascade across the network.

When margin trading is restricted, speculative traders may migrate toward permissive venues. Informed traders may remain. As shown by Black, Hossain, and McFarland (2024), this can increase relative information share even as volume declines.

Therefore, I propose the following hypotheses:

H1: Margin-restricting exchanges exhibit lower volatility relative to leverage-permissive venues.

H2: Volatility spillovers persist but are amplified by high-leverage exchanges acting as network hubs.

H3: Exchanges with leverage restrictions exhibit higher information share relative to market share.

These hypotheses reflect the interaction between heterogeneous beliefs, institutional design, and network dependency.

3. Discussion

Cryptocurrency markets resemble distributed systems with interdependent components. Volatility spillovers operate analogously to cascading failures in dependency networks. Just as microservice dependencies determine system resilience (Abdelfattah et al., 2025), exchange interdependence shapes volatility transmission.

Leverage policies function as structural parameters. High leverage increases amplification sensitivity. Restricted leverage reduces local volatility but may shift risk to other nodes. Graph-based modeling suggests that systemic outcomes depend on network topology (Uddin, 2025). In cryptocurrency markets, dominant exchanges function as central nodes. Policy changes at these nodes may disproportionately influence system-wide volatility.

The distinction between trading volume and informational contribution is central. Hossain (2024) shows that leveraged structures can contribute disproportionately to price discovery. Black, Hossain, and McFarland (2024) show that margin bans increase information share ratio. Thus, volume concentration does not imply informational leadership.

From a regulatory perspective, localized leverage restrictions may redistribute risk rather than eliminate it. Coordinated policy across interconnected venues may be necessary to reduce systemic amplification.

4. Conclusion

Cryptocurrency exchanges operate within a networked dependency systemshaped by leverage regimes and heterogeneous beliefs. Volatility spillovers and informational leadership emerge from trader sorting across fragmented venues. Margin restrictions reduce noise-driven volatility while potentially strengthening informational efficiency. Viewing cryptocurrency markets through a network dependency lens clarifies how institutional design influences systemic risk and price discovery.

References

[1] Abdelfattah, A. S., Cerny, T., Chy, M. S. H., Uddin, M. A., Perry, S., Brown, C., ... & Kazman, R. (2025). Multivocal study on microservice dependencies. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *222*, 112334.

[2] Baur, D. G., Hong, K., & Lee, A. D. (2018). Bitcoin: Medium of exchange or speculative assets?. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, *54*, 177-189.

[3] Biais, B., Bisiere, C., Bouvard, M., & Casamatta, C. (2019). The blockchain folk theorem. *The Review of Financial Studies*, *32*(5), 1662-1715.

[4] Black, J., Hossain, J., & McFarland, S. (2024). Margin Trading and Price Dynamics on Cryptocurrency Exchanges. *Available at SSRN 4881388*.

[5] Dimpfl, T., & Peter, F. J. (2021). Nothing but noise? Price discovery across cryptocurrency exchanges. *Journal of Financial Markets*, *54*, 100584.

[6] Hossain, M. J. (2024). *Three Essays in Leverage ETFs and Cryptocurrency Price Dynamics*. The University of Memphis.

[7] Hossain, J. (2025). An examination of volatility spillover in major Bitcoin currency pairs. *Available at SSRN 5160830*.

[8] Hossain, J. (2025). Volatility Dynamics and Spillover Effects of Cryptocurrencies in Major Crypto Exchanges: An Empirical Analysis. *Available at SSRN 5159623*.

[9] Liu, Y., & Tsyvinski, A. (2021). Risks and returns of cryptocurrency. *The Review of Financial Studies*, *34*(6), 2689-2727.

[10] Makarov, I., & Schoar, A. (2020). Trading and arbitrage in cryptocurrency markets. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *135*(2), 293-319.

[11] Sockin, M., & Xiong, W. (2023). A model of cryptocurrencies. *Management Science*, *69*(11), 6684-6707.

[12] Uddin, M. A. (2025, July). Graph-Based LLM Prompting for Scalable Microservice API Testing. In *2025 IEEE International Conference on Service-Oriented System Engineering (SOSE)* (pp. 243-244). IEEE.

[13] Uddin, M., Weerasinghe, S., Gajewski, D., Akbarsharifi, M., Akbarsharifi, R., Stoner, C., ... & He, S. (2026). Microservice Logs Analysis Employing AI: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 112786.

[14] Cerny, T., Chy, M. S. H., Uddin, M. A., Abdelfattah, A. S., Soldani, J., & Bogner, J. (2024, May). On Dependencies in Microservices: Dependency Management and Maintainability. In *International Conference on Cloud Computing and Services Science* (pp. 29-52). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.