Cryptocurrency Market and Digital Money: An Empirical Investigation of Market Dynamics, Regulatory Frameworks, and Consumer Adoption in India

Authors:

Raijada Atmikraj Piyushkumar (Enrolment No. 2406142000674)

Patel Vibhuti Nitinbhai (Enrolment No. 2406142000664)

Research Supervisor:

Dr. Vaishali Shah, Faculty of Management Studies

Institution:

Parul Institute of Engineering and Technology (PIET)

Parul University, Vadodara, Gujarat – 391760

April 2026

ABSTRACT

The emergence of cryptocurrencies alongside the rapid expansion of state-sanctioned digital payment systems has created a dual-track financial transformation globally and within India. This paper presents an empirical investigation into the market dynamics, regulatory ecosystems, and consumer adoption behaviour of both cryptocurrency and digital money. Drawing on primary survey data collected from 101 respondents across Gujarat, supplemented by secondary analysis of industry projections and peer-reviewed literature, the study evaluates four hypotheses concerning the relationships between financial awareness, regulatory clarity, technological literacy, and adoption intent. Findings confirm that young adults — particularly the 21–30 age cohort — are the dominant participants in digital finance, while actual cryptocurrency investment lags behind awareness due to risk perceptions and regulatory ambiguity. Pearson correlation analysis validates positive associations across all four hypotheses, with awareness demonstrating the strongest influence on investment intent ($r = 0.343$). The paper concludes with strategic recommendations for policymakers, financial institutions, and educators.

Keywords: *Cryptocurrency, Digital Money, Blockchain, UPI, CBDC, FinTech, Consumer Adoption, Regulatory Framework, India*

1. INTRODUCTION

The global financial architecture has undergone profound structural change over the past two decades, driven by advances in digital infrastructure, mobile connectivity, and cryptographic technology. Two interconnected yet distinct phenomena have risen to prominence within this transformation: decentralized cryptocurrency markets and state-supported digital money ecosystems. While both operate within digital environments, they embody fundamentally different philosophies of monetary governance, trust, and value creation.

Cryptocurrencies — typified by Bitcoin, introduced in 2008 by the pseudonymous Satoshi Nakamoto — are peer-to-peer electronic payment networks secured by cryptographic proof rather than institutional trust. Their defining characteristic is the absence of a central issuing authority, with transaction validity affirmed by distributed network consensus. In contrast, digital money — encompassing mobile wallets, Unified Payments Interface (UPI) platforms, and

Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) — represents the electronic migration of traditional sovereign currency, retaining the governance structures and legal protections associated with conventional financial systems.

India presents a particularly instructive context for examining the coexistence of these two paradigms. The country has emerged as the world leader in cryptocurrency adoption according to the Chainalysis 2025 Global Crypto Adoption Index, with an estimated 118.97 million crypto asset holders. Simultaneously, India's UPI infrastructure accounts for approximately 48.5 per cent of global real-time payment volumes, reflecting a formidable state-backed digital finance architecture. This simultaneous ascent creates opportunity and tension, with regulatory policy attempting to balance innovation with consumer protection.

This research paper investigates the market dimensions, regulatory contours, and behavioral drivers characterizing this dual transformation. By combining secondary market analysis with primary survey data from Gujarat-based respondents, the study offers a grounded empirical assessment of how Indian consumers engage with, understand, and respond to both cryptocurrency and digital money. The structure proceeds as follows: review of relevant literature; industry and market analysis; research methodology; empirical findings and hypothesis testing; and conclusion with policy recommendations.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The scholarly discourse on cryptocurrency and digital finance spans multiple disciplines — economics, computer science, law, and behavioral finance. The foundational contribution of Nakamoto (2008) established the conceptual basis for decentralized digital currency by proposing a peer-to-peer transaction system capable of operating without trusted intermediaries, initiating a rich literature on blockchain-based assets.

Yermack (2013) concluded that Bitcoin's extreme price volatility rendered it unsuitable as a medium of exchange and more akin to a speculative financial instrument. This view was reinforced by Baur, Hong, and Lee (2018), whose empirical investigation found Bitcoin predominantly attracted speculative activity rather than transactional usage. Dyhrberg (2016) demonstrated complementary hedging properties comparable to gold, suggesting portfolio diversification utility rather than transactional currency function.

From a market structure perspective, Corbet et al. (2018) documented low correlation between cryptocurrencies and conventional assets, underscoring diversification benefits. Makarov and Schoar (2020) identified persistent price inefficiencies across global exchanges owing to capital flow restrictions and market fragmentation. Bariviera (2017) observed that Bitcoin's return dynamics shifted from random walks to structured patterns as market maturity increased, consistent with evolving efficiency.

Regulation attracted scholarly attention as governments grappled with implications of private digital currencies. Böhme et al. (2015) outlined governance challenges intrinsic to decentralized systems, and Foley, Karlsen, and Putniņš (2019) estimated that a substantial fraction of early Bitcoin transactions involved illegal commerce. Auer and Claessens (2018) examined central bank perspectives and argued that widespread crypto adoption posed risks to monetary policy transmission — a view that accelerated CBDC research globally.

In the Indian context, the Reserve Bank of India's Concept Note on CBDC (2022) articulated the rationale for a sovereign digital rupee emphasizing efficiency, inclusion, and systemic safety. Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2017) argued that FinTech and digital currencies could substantially advance financial inclusion among underbanked populations. Polasik et al. (2015) identified usability, security, and social influence as primary determinants of digital currency adoption — dimensions directly relevant to India's semi-urban demographics. Collectively, this body of literature establishes the theoretical and empirical foundation for the present study.

3. INDUSTRY AND MARKET OVERVIEW

3.1 Global Cryptocurrency Market

The global cryptocurrency market has expanded from a niche technological experiment into a multi-trillion-dollar financial ecosystem. Market capitalization estimates place the global sector at approximately USD 2,492.7 billion in 2024, with projections from IMARC Group anticipating growth to USD 6,293.2 billion by 2033, representing a CAGR of approximately 9.7 per cent. GlobeNewswire estimates that specific segments — stablecoins, DeFi platforms, digital wallets, and NFTs — may register even higher growth of approximately 15.4 per cent annually through 2030.

The composition of market participants has shifted considerably. Early crypto markets were dominated by retail-oriented speculators; institutional engagement has grown substantially through spot Bitcoin ETFs, corporate treasury allocations, and regulated custody platforms. This institutionalization has improved market depth and liquidity but has also introduced new systemic interdependencies with conventional financial markets. Geographically, Asia-Pacific has emerged as the most dynamic regional market, with transaction volumes increasing approximately 69 per cent year-on-year in the twelve months ending June 2025.

3.2 India and Gujarat

India's digital financial ecosystem exhibits a dual trajectory of state-led payment infrastructure development and organic grassroots cryptocurrency adoption. The country's digital payments sector is projected to reach USD 81.65 billion in 2025, growing at an annual rate exceeding 30 per cent. UPI alone processes nearly half of all global real-time payments by volume. Digital transaction volumes in India are expected to triple from approximately 159 billion in FY2023–24 to 481 billion by FY2028–29.

Approximately 75 per cent of Indian crypto investors are under 35 years of age, and tier-2 and tier-3 cities are increasingly active in digital asset markets. Gujarat exemplifies these national trends: Botad has entered the top ten most active crypto investment hubs in India, while Surat demonstrates consistent market participation. The regulatory posture of Indian authorities has evolved from initial restriction toward cautious engagement — the 30 per cent taxation regime introduced in Union Budget 2022, combined with one per cent TDS, signals official recognition of crypto as a taxable asset class. The RBI's e-Rupee pilot marks a decisive step toward sovereign digital currency.

3.3 Major Industry Players

Globally, Binance leads by trading volume with an extensive product suite spanning spot and derivatives trading, staking, custody, and DeFi integration. Coinbase differentiates itself through regulatory compliance and institutional custody services. Ripple and XRP focus on cross-border institutional settlement. In India, CoinDCX, WazirX, and ZebPay constitute the primary domestic exchange infrastructure, while Paytm, PhonePe, and Google Pay dominate the UPI-based consumer ecosystem. The RBI's Digital Rupee adds a state-issued layer to this landscape, with significant implications for monetary policy and financial inclusion.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods research design integrating descriptive-analytical inquiry with empirical hypothesis testing. The descriptive component synthesizes secondary data from industry reports, academic publications, and regulatory documents to characterize the current state of cryptocurrency markets and digital money systems globally and within India. The analytical component applies correlational statistical analysis to primary survey data to evaluate hypothesized relationships between financial awareness, regulatory clarity, technological literacy, and adoption behavior.

4.2 Data Sources and Collection Instrument

Primary data were gathered through a structured questionnaire administered electronically via Google Forms during October 2025 through March 2026. The instrument comprised approximately 15 items organized into four thematic sections: respondent demographics and digital finance engagement; cryptocurrency awareness and investment behavior; perceptions of risk, regulation, and trust; and comparative assessments of cryptocurrency versus digital money. Close-ended multiple-choice items were complemented by five-point Likert-scale questions calibrated to measure attitude intensity.

Secondary data were obtained from the IMARC Group market intelligence repository, Chainalysis adoption indices, GlobeNewswire reports, RBI Currency and Finance reports, World Economic Forum publications, and peer-reviewed academic journals.

4.3 Sampling and Analysis

The target population comprised individuals in Gujarat actively using or aware of digital financial services. A non-probability convenience sampling approach was adopted, yielding a final usable sample of 101 responses. Although convenience sampling limits inferential generalizability, it is well-suited to attitudinal and awareness-focused research in rapidly evolving technological domains. Descriptive statistics encompassing frequency distributions were applied to characterize the sample. Hypothesis testing was conducted using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, with Likert-scale responses numerically coded from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.1 Respondent Profile

The survey attracted 101 valid responses. The demographic distribution reveals a pronounced concentration among young adults: 79 respondents (78.2 per cent) belonged to the 21–30 age group, followed by 14 respondents below 20 years (13.9 per cent), and four each in the 31–40 and above-40 cohorts. Occupationally, students constituted the largest segment at 62 respondents (61.4 per cent), followed by working professionals at 33 (32.7 per cent), and business owners at six (5.9 per cent). Table 1 presents a consolidated summary of key demographic and behavioral indicators.

Table 1: Summary of Respondent Demographics and Digital Finance Engagement

Variable	Count (n=101)	Percentage
Age 21–30 years	79	78.2%
Age below 20 years	14	13.9%
Age 31–40 years	4	4.0%
Above 40 years	4	4.0%
Students (occupation)	62	61.4%
Working professionals	33	32.7%
Daily digital payment users	77	76.2%
Basic/good crypto awareness	85	84.2%
Currently investing in crypto	15	14.9%
Social media as info source	43	42.6%

5.2 Digital Payment Behavior and Cryptocurrency Awareness

Digital payment adoption among respondents is near-universal: 77 respondents (76.2 per cent) reported using digital payment platforms daily, with a further 19 using them weekly. This pattern is consistent with India's dominance in global real-time payment volumes and the deep penetration of UPI-based applications.

Cryptocurrency awareness is reasonably widespread though concentrated at surface levels. Forty-five respondents (44.6 per cent) reported possessing basic knowledge, 40 (39.6 per cent) reported a good understanding, 11 had heard the term without substantive knowledge, and five indicated no familiarity. Despite widespread awareness, actual investment participation remained limited: only 15 respondents (14.9 per cent) reported current cryptocurrency investments, while 60 (59.4 per cent) had made no investments. This divergence between awareness and investment action underscores the influence of deterrent factors explored below.

5.3 Risk Perception, Regulation, and Investment Potential

Risk perception emerged as a dominant deterrent. Seventy-five respondents (74.3 per cent) agreed or strongly agreed that cryptocurrency transactions carry high risk, with concerns centering on price volatility, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and absence of regulatory protection. When asked to identify principal barriers to adoption, 37 respondents cited fraud and hacking risk, 27 each cited low awareness and regulatory absence, and 10 identified technological complexity.

Notwithstanding these concerns, a majority recognized cryptocurrency's investment potential: 64 respondents (63.4 per cent) agreed or strongly agreed that it represents a viable investment opportunity, while 32 remained neutral. On the role of government regulation, 64 respondents (63.4 per cent) agreed or strongly agreed that regulatory clarity would enhance trust. Regarding the Digital Rupee, 63 respondents (62.4 per cent) agreed that a CBDC would make payments more secure, reflecting higher institutional confidence accorded to sovereign-backed instruments. Confidence in digital finance applications was also high, with 72 respondents (71.3 per cent) expressing comfort using mobile wallets and financial apps.

5.4 Information Ecosystem

The primary information channels through which respondents encountered cryptocurrency content were social media platforms (43 respondents, 42.6 per cent) and personal networks of friends and family (40 respondents, 39.6 per cent). Traditional media accounted for only 12 responses. This pattern underscores the informal, peer-mediated character of crypto-financial education and the limited role of institutional or regulated information channels — which may contribute to knowledge gaps and vulnerability to misinformation.

6. HYPOTHESIS TESTING AND RESULTS

6.1 Hypotheses Formulated

H_1: There is a significant positive relationship between cryptocurrency awareness and intention to invest among Indian users.

H_2: Regulatory clarity positively influences trust and adoption of digital money platforms.

H_3: Cryptocurrency market growth perception is positively associated with technological literacy and internet accessibility.

H_4: Effective regulatory frameworks enhance the coexistence and complementary utilization of cryptocurrency and digital money.

Each hypothesis was tested using Pearson product-moment correlation applied to Likert-scale responses from the 101-respondent dataset. Table 2 presents the resulting coefficients with directional interpretations.

Table 2: Hypothesis Testing Results – Pearson Correlation Coefficients

H	Variables	r value	Interpretation
H_1	Awareness → Investment Intent	0.343	Moderate positive: higher awareness drives investment intent
H_2	Regulatory Clarity → Trust & Adoption	0.266	Weak-to-moderate positive: regulation improves platform trust
H_3	Tech Literacy → Market Growth Perception	0.231	Weak positive: literacy partially shapes market outlook
H_4	Regulation → Crypto–CBDC Coexistence	0.288	Moderate positive: regulation supports ecosystem coexistence

6.2 Discussion of Results

H_1 returned the strongest correlation (r = 0.343), confirming a moderate positive relationship between cryptocurrency awareness and investment intent. This aligns with Polasik et al. (2015), who identified awareness as a foundational antecedent of digital payment adoption. The policy implication is direct: targeted financial literacy initiatives are likely to yield measurable increases in investment willingness.

H_2 demonstrated a weak-to-moderate positive association (r = 0.266) between perceived regulatory clarity and trust in digital finance platforms, consistent with findings from Auer and Claessens (2018) and the RBI CBDC Concept Note (2022). The moderate magnitude suggests regulation is a necessary but not sufficient condition for trust, which also depends on platform security and user experience.

H_3 produced the weakest correlation (r = 0.231), indicating that technological literacy exerts a positive but comparatively modest influence on market growth perceptions. This implies that factors beyond individual digital competence — macroeconomic sentiment, media coverage, and peer influence — play considerable roles. Educational investments alone may not substantially alter adoption trajectories without accompanying regulatory and security improvements.

H_4 yielded a moderate positive correlation (r = 0.288) between belief in regulatory effectiveness and support for cryptocurrency–CBDC coexistence. This result is significant: it suggests that well-designed regulatory frameworks are not perceived as threats to crypto adoption but as enablers of a diversified digital finance ecosystem in which private and sovereign digital currencies complement one another.

7. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: CRYPTOCURRENCY VS. DIGITAL MONEY

A nuanced comparison of cryptocurrency and digital money reveals complementary strengths and divergent risk profiles that together define the contours of India's evolving financial landscape. Table 3 provides a structured comparison across dimensions relevant to consumer and institutional use cases.

Table 3: Comparative Framework — Cryptocurrency and Digital Money

Dimension	Cryptocurrency	Digital Money
Control	Decentralized; no central authority	Centralized; governed by banks or state
Stability	Highly volatile; speculation-driven	Stable; pegged to fiat
Primary Use	Investment, store of value, remittances	Daily transactions, merchant payments
Trust Basis	Cryptographic algorithms and consensus	Legal frameworks and regulatory oversight
Examples	Bitcoin, Ethereum, Solana, XRP	UPI, Paytm, Google Pay, Digital Rupee

From an economic governance standpoint, digital money operates within established monetary frameworks that offer predictability, consumer redress mechanisms, and systemic stability. Its primary value proposition — convenience, speed, and accessibility — has driven adoption rates that are among the highest globally, as evidenced by India's UPI statistics. Cryptocurrency, by contrast, introduces a decentralized alternative premised on algorithmic trust, enabling permissionless access and novel investment vehicles. Its value is contingent on speculative markets rather than sovereign backing, rendering it unsuitable as a primary medium of exchange for risk-averse populations.

The two systems exhibit natural complementarity. Stablecoins — cryptocurrencies pegged to fiat values — serve as bridges, preserving blockchain's programmability while mitigating extreme volatility. CBDCs similarly synthesize distributed ledger technology with the legitimacy of central bank money. As the regulatory landscape matures, these hybrid instruments may become the primary interface between decentralized and traditional financial worlds. India's dual strength in UPI infrastructure and crypto adoption uniquely positions the country to lead this integration.

8. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Several limitations qualify interpretation and generalizability of the findings. The use of non-probability convenience sampling restricts the extent to which results can be extrapolated to the broader Indian or global population. The sample, while representative of young, digitally engaged individuals in Gujarat, does not capture rural demographics, older age cohorts, or regions with limited digital infrastructure.

Reliance on self-reported Likert-scale data introduces potential response bias, particularly where social desirability effects or limited domain knowledge distort attitudinal measures. Respondents with superficial cryptocurrency awareness may have expressed opinions shaped more by media sentiment than direct experience. The temporal scope of the study is bounded by the rapid pace of change in digital finance; findings from the October 2025 – March 2026 data collection window may have diminished applicability in subsequent periods. Longitudinal research designs tracking cohorts over multiple years would offer richer adoption trajectory insights. Finally, the geographic focus on Gujarat limits cross-regional comparability within India's diverse socio-economic landscape.

9. CONCLUSION

This research paper has examined the structure, dynamics, and behavioral dimensions of cryptocurrency markets and digital money systems in India, with particular attention to Gujarat as a region of growing digital finance engagement. India occupies a distinctive position globally: it simultaneously leads in real-time digital payment volumes and grassroots cryptocurrency adoption, creating an environment of rich complementarity and complex policy trade-offs.

The empirical analysis demonstrates that awareness, regulatory confidence, and technological literacy each exert positive influences on cryptocurrency adoption intent and perceived ecosystem legitimacy. The strongest relationship — between awareness and investment intent (H_1, $r = 0.343$) — underscores financial education as a pivotal lever for market development. Moderate associations for regulatory factors reinforce the importance of clear, consistent, and consumer-protective governance as preconditions for institutional trust.

The gap between awareness and actual investment behavior — wherein 85 per cent of aware respondents have not invested — reveals that awareness alone is insufficient. Persistent concerns regarding fraud, cybersecurity, and regulatory uncertainty constitute structural barriers requiring coordinated responses from policymakers, financial institutions, and the technology sector. The Digital Rupee's favorable reception among respondents suggests that sovereign digital currency enjoys a trust premium that private cryptocurrencies have yet to fully establish.

The coexistence of decentralized and centralized digital finance is not merely a technical possibility but, as hypothesis testing confirms, a scenario actively supported by users when regulatory frameworks provide clarity and security. The strategic imperative for India is to cultivate this dual ecosystem — leveraging UPI's world-class infrastructure while creating governance conditions that allow responsible crypto-asset participation — in service of broader goals of financial inclusion, economic modernization, and digital sovereignty.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 For Policymakers and Regulatory Authorities

Regulatory bodies should prioritize a comprehensive, technology-neutral legal framework for digital assets providing unambiguous definitions, investor protections, anti-money-laundering provisions, and dispute resolution mechanisms. Regulatory sandboxes enabling controlled innovation would allow new financial products to be tested without exposing consumers to systemic risk. Coordination between the Reserve Bank of India, SEBI, and the Ministry of Finance is essential to prevent regulatory arbitrage and create a coherent investment environment.

10.2 For Financial Institutions and Technology Providers

Banks, fintech companies, and crypto exchanges should invest in multi-layered cybersecurity architectures, transparent audit mechanisms, and user-centric interface design. Proactive communication about regulatory compliance status should be maintained to build institutional credibility. Interoperability between CBDC infrastructure and existing UPI rails would accelerate mainstream adoption and reduce fragmentation.

10.3 For Educational Institutions and Civil Society

Structured financial literacy programs addressing blockchain fundamentals, investment risk management, and digital security should be integrated into university curricula and professional development platforms. Community-level awareness campaigns in tier-2 and tier-3 cities — particularly in Gujarat — would help bridge the urban-rural information divide. Given social media's dominance in the current information ecosystem, partnerships with verified financial educators may offer a pragmatic and scalable dissemination channel.

10.4 For Future Research

Subsequent studies should employ probability-based sampling frameworks and extend geographical coverage beyond Gujarat to permit nationally representative inference. Longitudinal panel designs tracking individuals across adoption decision points would provide causal insights beyond the correlational associations established here. Qualitative methodologies — including in-depth interviews with regulatory officials and institutional investors — would complement quantitative findings with contextual understanding. Comparative cross-national studies benchmarking India against other high-adoption economies such as Nigeria, Vietnam, and Brazil could further illuminate the determinants of digital finance diffusion.

REFERENCES

Al-Yahyaee, K., Mensi, W., & Yoon, S. (2018). Efficiency and volatility in cryptocurrency markets. Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 510, 77–91.

Arner, D., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. (2017). FinTech and RegTech in a nutshell, and the future in a sandbox. CFA Institute Research Foundation Briefs, 3(4), 1–20.

Auer, R., & Claessens, S. (2018). Regulating cryptocurrencies: Assessing market reactions. BIS Quarterly Review, September 2018.

Bariviera, A. F. (2017). The inefficiency of Bitcoin revisited: A dynamic approach. Economics Letters, 161, 1–4.

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

Böhme, R., Christin, N., Edelman, B., & Moore, T. (2015). Bitcoin: Economics, technology, and governance. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29(2), 213–238.

Catalini, C., & Gans, J. S. (2016). Some simple economics of the blockchain. NBER Working Paper No. 22952.

Corbet, S., Lucey, B., Urquhart, A., & Yarovaya, L. (2018). Cryptocurrencies as a financial asset: A systematic analysis. International Review of Financial Analysis, 62, 182–199.

Dyhrberg, A. H. (2016). Bitcoin, gold and the dollar: A GARCH volatility analysis. Finance Research Letters, 16, 85–92.

Foley, S., Karlsen, J. R., & Putniņš, T. J. (2019). Sex, drugs, and bitcoin: How much illegal activity is financed through cryptocurrencies? Review of Financial Studies, 32(5), 1798–1853.

Gandal, N., Hamrick, J., Moore, T., & Oberman, T. (2018). Price manipulation in the Bitcoin ecosystem. Journal of Monetary Economics, 95, 86–96.

Glaser, F., Zimmermann, K., Haferkorn, M., Weber, M., & Siering, M. (2014). Bitcoin: Asset or currency? Revealing users' hidden intentions. Proceedings of ECIS 2014.

Kim, Y. (2017). Consumer risk in digital payment systems. International Journal of Services Technology and Management, 23(5–6), 491–511.

Li, X., & Wang, C. A. (2017). The technology and economic determinants of cryptocurrency exchange rates: The case of Bitcoin. Decision Support Systems, 95, 49–60.

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

Nakamoto, S. (2008). Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. Satoshi Nakamoto Institute.

Polasik, M., Piotrowska, A. I., Wisniewski, T. P., Kotkowski, R., & Lightfoot, G. (2015). Price fluctuations and the use of bitcoin: An empirical inquiry. International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 20(1), 9–49.

Puschmann, T. (2017). Fintech. Business & Information Systems Engineering, 59(1), 69–76.

Reserve Bank of India. (2022). Concept note on central bank digital currency. Reserve Bank of India.

Schilling, L., & Uhlig, H. (2019). Some simple Bitcoin economics. Journal of Monetary Economics, 106, 16–26.

Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). Blockchain revolution. Portfolio/Penguin.

World Economic Forum. (2021). Central bank digital currencies (CBDCs): The next frontier in digital money. WEF White Paper.

Yermack, D. (2013). Is Bitcoin a real currency? An economic appraisal. NBER Working Paper No. 19747.