

# Review of: "Review on measuring volatility of cryptocurrencies: 1980-2020"

Clio Ciaschini<sup>1</sup>

1 Università Politecnica delle Marche

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

# Originality

The paper provides a detailed review of the different GARCH models, studied in the period 1980-20 to assess the intensity of volatility persistence in relation to time scales, market returns and data regimes. This should help investors in the decision between cryptocurrencies and fiat currency since sometimes, volatility in prices of digital currencies could lead to relevant losses. The methodology adopted in the work is already known and does not contain significant novelty. Nevertheless, its application on cryptocurrencies could be of interest.

#### Literature

The literature review deals with topics as cryptocurrencies and bitcoins and their measures and volatility. In my opinion, the review is lacking in some updated references that should be added. In addition, I find the written text not so homogeneous and systematic. It proceeds in short sentences not very well connected between each other. I suggest revising the part of literature review going more in depth in the topic, with updated references and trying to provide a homogeneous and exhaustive chapter.

#### Methodology

The paper intends to assess the intensity of volatility persistence in respect to time scale using the already existing GARCH model. The methodology is not new but could be appropriate in consideration of the performed studies.

#### Results

The last paragraph lists the pros and cons of GARCH models but I think that a deeper discussion and description of results could be useful to a better understanding of the power of the work and the effectiveness of each specification.

## **Implications**

It seems that the work intends to orientate investors on whether owning cryptocurrencies or fiat currencies. Nevertheless I think that a most clear definition of the objective and the contribution of the paper should be careful provided.

### **Quality of Communication**

I think that the paper should be deeply revised to clarify the contribution, a more homogeneous literature background has



to be provided that develops from a concept highlighting further steps of evolution of in the definition of cryptocurrencies and bitcoins. Finally a more concise and clear discussion and conclusion must be provided to remark the power of the already clarified contribution.