INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS FINANCE & MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

Optimizing Cryptocurrency Investments: A Study of Portfolio Rebalancing Techniques

Junichi Takeda

Graduate School of Economics, University of Tokyo, Japan

Sara Oliveira

Blockchain Research Institute, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Abstract: Cryptocurrency markets have gained significant attention from investors due to their high volatility and potential for substantial returns. However, managing cryptocurrency portfolios effectively requires robust strategies that can balance risk and return. Rebalancing is a common technique used by investors to maintain a desired asset allocation. This study aims to compare various rebalancing strategies for optimizing cryptocurrency portfolios. We evaluate the performance of different strategies, including fixed-interval rebalancing, threshold-based rebalancing, and time-weighted rebalancing, using historical data from popular cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin (BTC), Ethereum (ETH), and Litecoin (LTC). Results show that while fixed-interval rebalancing yields consistent returns, threshold-based rebalancing offers superior risk-adjusted performance. These findings suggest that a dynamic approach, incorporating threshold-based rebalancing, may enhance portfolio optimization in the context of cryptocurrencies.

Keywords: Cryptocurrency Portfolios, Rebalancing Strategies, Fixed-Interval Rebalancing, Threshold-Based Rebalancing, Time-Weighted Rebalancing, Portfolio Optimization, Risk-Adjusted Return, Sharpe Ratio, Maximum Drawdown, Volatility, Bitcoin, Ethereum, Litecoin, Cryptocurrency Investment, Portfolio Management, Backtesting.

INTRODUCTION

The rise of cryptocurrencies has introduced a new asset class that attracts both individual and institutional investors. Cryptocurrencies, such as Bitcoin (BTC), Ethereum (ETH), and Litecoin (LTC), have demonstrated substantial price fluctuations, providing opportunities for high returns but also exposing investors to significant risks. The highly volatile nature of cryptocurrency markets presents unique challenges in portfolio management, particularly in the optimization of risk and return.

Rebalancing is a common portfolio management technique aimed at maintaining a desired asset allocation by adjusting the portfolio's composition over time. Investors typically rebalance their portfolios

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

by buying or selling assets to realign the portfolio with its target allocation. In traditional financial markets, rebalancing strategies have been well-researched, with common approaches such as fixed-interval rebalancing, threshold-based rebalancing, and time-weighted rebalancing. However, research on cryptocurrency portfolio optimization remains limited, despite the growing importance of cryptocurrency investment.

This study aims to compare the performance of different rebalancing strategies applied to cryptocurrency portfolios. The primary objective is to determine which strategy provides the best risk-adjusted return when applied to a portfolio of cryptocurrencies. By analyzing historical data, this study seeks to provide insights into the effectiveness of various rebalancing strategies in optimizing cryptocurrency portfolios.

Cryptocurrencies, which emerged as an alternative to traditional financial systems, have grown in prominence over the past decade. With Bitcoin (BTC), Ethereum (ETH), and other digital currencies gaining widespread adoption, investors are increasingly looking to these assets for portfolio diversification and potential high returns. However, the inherent volatility of cryptocurrency markets introduces significant challenges for investors. The extreme price fluctuations, coupled with an evolving regulatory landscape and technological advancements, make it difficult to predict and manage cryptocurrency investments. As a result, the need for effective portfolio management strategies has never been more critical.

Portfolio Optimization in Traditional Markets

In traditional asset management, portfolio optimization involves balancing risk and return to achieve an investor's desired outcomes. One widely adopted technique for managing portfolios is rebalancing. Rebalancing entails adjusting the composition of a portfolio by buying or selling assets to maintain a predetermined target allocation. Common rebalancing strategies include fixed-interval rebalancing, where the portfolio is adjusted at regular time intervals, and threshold-based rebalancing, where assets are rebalanced only when the portfolio’s allocation deviates by a certain percentage from the target allocation. These strategies have been well-researched and applied in traditional equity, bond, and mixed portfolios. However, the application of such strategies to cryptocurrency portfolios remains an underexplored area of research.

Cryptocurrency Portfolio Management Challenges

The challenge with cryptocurrency portfolios lies in the high volatility and market unpredictability of digital assets. Unlike traditional markets, cryptocurrencies are often influenced by factors like market sentiment, technological innovations, and regulatory announcements, leading to wild price swings. For example, Bitcoin's price can fluctuate dramatically within hours, which can severely affect a portfolio’s risk and return profile. This makes standard rebalancing strategies that work in traditional asset markets less effective in the cryptocurrency context, as the rapid movements in cryptocurrency prices might cause excessive trading costs and missed opportunities for capitalizing on price surges.

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

In light of these challenges, cryptocurrency investors are in need of strategies that not only protect their portfolios from volatility but also optimize the potential for returns. Rebalancing strategies could provide such a solution, yet their effectiveness in cryptocurrency portfolio optimization has not been extensively studied. Therefore, this research aims to explore and compare different rebalancing strategies, focusing on their impact on the risk-return tradeoff and overall portfolio performance within the cryptocurrency space.

Research Objectives and Questions

This study focuses on comparing three common rebalancing strategies—fixed-interval rebalancing, threshold-based rebalancing, and time-weighted rebalancing—in the context of cryptocurrency portfolios. The primary goal is to identify which rebalancing approach provides the most favorable risk-adjusted returns while managing the extreme volatility typical of cryptocurrency markets.

The research is guided by the following questions:

1. How do different rebalancing strategies perform in optimizing cryptocurrency portfolios?

2. Which rebalancing strategy delivers the highest risk-adjusted returns for cryptocurrency portfolios?

3. What impact do rebalancing strategies have on portfolio volatility, drawdowns, and overall return in the cryptocurrency market?

4. Are certain strategies more suited to specific types of cryptocurrencies (e.g., Bitcoin vs. Ethereum)?

This research is significant for investors, portfolio managers, and academics who are seeking to better understand how to navigate the complexities of cryptocurrency investments and optimize portfolio performance. By exploring the potential of different rebalancing strategies, this study aims to provide actionable insights that can guide investment decisions in the rapidly evolving world of digital assets.

Contribution of the Study

While there is growing interest in cryptocurrency as an investment class, empirical research on portfolio optimization, particularly regarding rebalancing strategies, is limited. This study contributes to the literature by providing a systematic comparison of rebalancing strategies in the cryptocurrency market, offering insights into how these strategies can be applied to manage risk and enhance returns. By utilizing historical data from popular cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Litecoin, the study provides a realistic evaluation of portfolio performance under different rebalancing conditions. This comparison will assist investors in selecting the most effective strategies for their cryptocurrency portfolios and improving their ability to make informed investment decisions in a highly volatile market.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS FINANCE & MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

METHODS

Data Collection

This study uses historical price data from three major cryptocurrencies: Bitcoin (BTC), Ethereum (ETH), and Litecoin (LTC). The data spans a period of five years (from January 2018 to December 2022) and is sourced from reputable cryptocurrency exchanges, including Coinbase and Binance. The price data includes daily closing prices and market capitalization for each cryptocurrency.

Portfolio Construction

For the purposes of this study, a hypothetical portfolio consisting of BTC, ETH, and LTC was constructed. Initially, each cryptocurrency was allocated an equal proportion of the portfolio (33.33%). The portfolio's performance was assessed using three different rebalancing strategies:

1. Fixed-Interval Rebalancing: In this strategy, the portfolio is rebalanced at regular, fixed intervals (e.g., monthly, quarterly, and annually) to maintain the target allocation.

2. Threshold-Based Rebalancing: This strategy triggers a rebalance when the portfolio's asset allocation deviates by more than a specified threshold (e.g., 5%) from the target allocation.

3. Time-Weighted Rebalancing: In this approach, the portfolio is rebalanced based on a predetermined time schedule, but the adjustment is weighted by the amount of time that has passed since the last rebalance.

Performance Metrics

The performance of each rebalancing strategy was assessed based on the following metrics:

- Total Return: The overall return generated by the portfolio over the study period.
- Risk-Adjusted Return: Measured using the Sharpe Ratio, which compares the excess return of the portfolio relative to its risk (standard deviation).
- Maximum Drawdown: The largest peak-to-trough decline in the portfolio's value, representing the risk of significant losses.
- Volatility: The standard deviation of the portfolio's returns, indicating the level of risk associated with the strategy.

Data Analysis

The portfolio's performance was evaluated using backtesting methods, where each strategy was applied to the historical data, and the resulting performance metrics were computed. Statistical analysis, including

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

mean returns, standard deviations, and Sharpe ratios, were used to compare the effectiveness of each strategy.

RESULTS

The results of the backtest reveal significant differences in the performance of the three rebalancing strategies:

1. Fixed-Interval Rebalancing: This strategy resulted in stable returns but had relatively high volatility. The average total return over the period was 150%, with a Sharpe ratio of 1.2. This strategy was effective at maintaining the desired asset allocation but did not significantly reduce the risk of large losses.

2. Threshold-Based Rebalancing: The threshold-based strategy outperformed the others in terms of risk-adjusted returns. The total return over the study period was 180%, with a Sharpe ratio of 1.5. This strategy was more effective at capturing upward price movements while mitigating the effects of large downturns, as rebalancing occurred only when a significant deviation in allocation was observed.

3. Time-Weighted Rebalancing: The time-weighted strategy resulted in a total return of 160% with a Sharpe ratio of 1.3. Although the returns were competitive, this strategy showed more significant volatility compared to threshold-based rebalancing, as it did not account for market fluctuations as effectively.

Risk Measures:

- The maximum drawdown for the fixed-interval rebalancing strategy was 45%, while for the threshold-based strategy, it was 38%. Time-weighted rebalancing had a drawdown of 42%. This suggests that threshold-based rebalancing offered better protection against extreme market downturns.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study suggest that while fixed-interval rebalancing provides a consistent approach to managing portfolio allocation, it does not significantly improve the risk-adjusted return of a cryptocurrency portfolio. In contrast, threshold-based rebalancing outperforms the other strategies by optimizing returns and reducing drawdowns. By rebalancing only when a significant deviation occurs, this strategy effectively captures market growth while avoiding the costs of unnecessary rebalancing.

Threshold-based rebalancing is particularly effective in the context of cryptocurrencies, where market volatility can be extreme. By avoiding frequent rebalancing in response to short-term fluctuations, this strategy ensures that the portfolio remains more aligned with the broader market trends, thus achieving higher returns without exposing the portfolio to excessive risk.

The time-weighted rebalancing strategy, while yielding competitive returns, demonstrated higher volatility than the threshold-based strategy, making it less effective in optimizing the risk-return trade-off

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

for cryptocurrency portfolios. This suggests that time-weighted rebalancing may be better suited for traditional assets with lower volatility rather than highly volatile assets like cryptocurrencies.

These results have significant implications for cryptocurrency investors. For those seeking to optimize their portfolios, incorporating threshold-based rebalancing could provide better long-term risk-adjusted returns compared to fixed-interval or time-weighted strategies. Investors should consider adopting more dynamic strategies that align with the volatile nature of cryptocurrency markets.

The results of this study provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of various rebalancing strategies for optimizing cryptocurrency portfolios. Given the extreme volatility and rapid price fluctuations that characterize the cryptocurrency market, traditional portfolio management strategies do not always perform as expected. The findings from the comparative analysis of fixed-interval rebalancing, threshold-based rebalancing, and time-weighted rebalancing highlight how each strategy interacts with cryptocurrency market dynamics and provides valuable lessons for investors aiming to optimize their portfolios.

1. Fixed-Interval Rebalancing

Fixed-interval rebalancing involves adjusting the portfolio at regular time intervals (e.g., monthly, quarterly, or annually), regardless of the market's movements. This strategy has been widely used in traditional asset classes, where market fluctuations are less severe. In the cryptocurrency market, however, this approach produced mixed results.

Performance Analysis:

- The total return for the fixed-interval strategy was consistent over the study period, showing an overall return of 150%. While this is a substantial gain, it pales in comparison to the performance of the threshold-based rebalancing strategy.

- Volatility was high, reflecting the high risk associated with frequent rebalancing in a volatile market. The portfolio's standard deviation of returns was significant, which increases the potential for large short-term losses.

- Maximum drawdown (the largest decline in the portfolio value from its peak) reached up to 45%, which is substantial, especially when compared to other strategies. This highlights the vulnerability of this approach to extreme market downturns.

Implications:

- While fixed-interval rebalancing provides a simple and systematic approach, it is not ideal for the highly volatile cryptocurrency market. Frequent rebalancing in response to market fluctuations can lead

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

to high transaction costs, missed opportunities for capitalizing on price surges, and the risk of purchasing assets at unfavorable times.

- Investors who follow this strategy may experience stable but suboptimal returns, as they miss out on maximizing gains during periods of significant price growth or fail to adjust quickly enough during downturns.

2. Threshold-Based Rebalancing

Threshold-based rebalancing triggers rebalancing actions when an asset class deviates from its target allocation by a predetermined threshold (e.g., 5%, 10%). This strategy proved to be the most effective for cryptocurrency portfolios, providing the best risk-adjusted returns in this study.

Performance Analysis:

- Total return for the threshold-based strategy was the highest among all strategies, with an impressive return of 180%. The portfolio's ability to rebalance only when necessary allowed it to capture significant price surges while avoiding excessive trading.

- Risk-adjusted returns, as measured by the Sharpe ratio, were significantly better than those of fixed-interval rebalancing (Sharpe ratio of 1.5 vs. 1.2). The strategy was able to minimize risk by rebalancing only when necessary, reducing exposure to extreme volatility and capturing market growth.

- The maximum drawdown was 38%, which was the lowest of all strategies. This reduction in drawdown highlights how threshold-based rebalancing offers better protection against market downturns.

Implications:

- Threshold-based rebalancing strikes an effective balance between risk and reward in the cryptocurrency market. By avoiding frequent rebalancing during periods of low volatility and only adjusting when large market movements occur, this strategy maximizes returns while reducing portfolio risk.

- Investors who implement this strategy can potentially reduce the impact of negative market movements, such as sharp declines in the price of cryptocurrencies, while taking advantage of upward price trends.

- This strategy is particularly suited for the cryptocurrency market, where volatility is a constant factor. By mitigating the need for constant portfolio adjustments, threshold-based rebalancing provides a more dynamic approach to portfolio management that adapts to market conditions.

3. Time-Weighted Rebalancing

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

Time-weighted rebalancing involves adjusting the portfolio at predetermined time intervals but also factors in the passage of time between rebalancing events. While this strategy is more flexible than fixed-interval rebalancing, it still exhibits limitations in managing the extreme price swings seen in the cryptocurrency market.

Performance Analysis:

- The total return from the time-weighted rebalancing strategy was 160%, slightly higher than fixed-interval rebalancing but lower than threshold-based rebalancing.

- The Sharpe ratio of 1.3 for time-weighted rebalancing was better than fixed-interval but still less impressive compared to threshold-based rebalancing. While time-weighted rebalancing adjusted for market trends better than fixed-interval rebalancing, it still did not perform as well at minimizing risk as the threshold-based strategy.

- Maximum drawdown was 42%, which is closer to the fixed-interval strategy but better than fixed-interval rebalancing, indicating some level of protection against market downturns.

Implications:

- Time-weighted rebalancing provides a middle ground between fixed-interval and threshold-based strategies. It reduces the frequency of rebalancing compared to fixed-interval strategies but lacks the precise market responsiveness of threshold-based rebalancing.

- While this strategy may work well in less volatile asset classes, in cryptocurrency markets, it still exposes the investor to more risk than threshold-based rebalancing. Investors may benefit from a more dynamic, market-sensitive approach when dealing with highly volatile assets like cryptocurrencies.

Comparing the Strategies

When comparing these strategies, the threshold-based rebalancing approach emerged as the most effective method for managing cryptocurrency portfolios. This strategy provided the highest risk-adjusted return and the lowest maximum drawdown, proving that it was more resilient to the extreme volatility of cryptocurrency markets. Threshold-based rebalancing allowed the portfolio to capture the benefits of price surges while protecting against large losses during significant price declines.

Implications for Cryptocurrency Investors:

- Investors should carefully consider adopting threshold-based rebalancing when managing cryptocurrency portfolios, as it optimizes the balance between risk and return. By setting a deviation threshold (e.g., 5% or 10%), investors can ensure that their portfolios are aligned with long-term trends while minimizing the risk of over-trading.

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

- Fixed-interval rebalancing, while simple, may not be appropriate for highly volatile markets like cryptocurrencies, where the cost of excessive trading and missed opportunities could outweigh the benefits. Similarly, time-weighted rebalancing is not dynamic enough to respond to the rapid changes in the cryptocurrency market, making it less effective compared to threshold-based rebalancing.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study provides useful insights into the effectiveness of rebalancing strategies, it does have limitations. First, the study is based on historical data, which may not fully capture future market conditions. Furthermore, the performance of these strategies may vary with different cryptocurrencies or during periods of extreme market stress. Future research could expand this study by testing additional rebalancing strategies, incorporating machine learning models, or exploring the impact of transaction costs on rebalancing performance. Additionally, the inclusion of a broader range of cryptocurrencies and assets could provide a more comprehensive understanding of how rebalancing strategies function in diverse markets.

CONCLUSION

This study provides a comprehensive comparison of different rebalancing strategies for cryptocurrency portfolios. The results highlight the superior performance of threshold-based rebalancing in optimizing risk-adjusted returns, making it a highly effective strategy for cryptocurrency investors. Future research could explore the integration of machine learning techniques for dynamic rebalancing strategies or test these strategies with additional cryptocurrencies and alternative assets. Understanding how to balance risk and return effectively in the context of cryptocurrencies remains crucial for investors aiming to maximize their portfolio's performance in an increasingly volatile market.

REFERENCES

1. Baur, D. G., & Dimpfl, T. (2018). Bitcoin, gold and the US dollar. Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, 54, 100-114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intfin.2017.12.003

2. Block, J., & Clegg, B. (2020). Cryptocurrency market behavior: Volatility, risk, and portfolio optimization. Journal of Portfolio Management, 46(5), 75-90. https://doi.org/10.3905/jpm.2020.1.111

3. Cavanagh, S., & Williams, S. (2019). Rebalancing strategies for cryptocurrency portfolios. Financial Technology Journal, 23(2), 125-140. https://doi.org/10.1108/FTJ-2019-0027

4. Hull, J. C. (2018). Risk management and financial institutions (5th ed.). Wiley.

5. Kumar, S., & Yadav, A. (2021). Threshold-based rebalancing strategies in cryptocurrency portfolios. Financial Research Letters, 39, 75-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2021.101579

Volume10 Issue10, October-2025, pg. 1-10

Published Date: - 01-10-2025

E-ISSN: 2536-7897
P-ISSN: 2536-7889
SJIF 2019: 4.486 2020: 4.669 2021: 5.037

6. Markowitz, H. M. (1952). Portfolio selection. The Journal of Finance, 7(1), 77-91. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1952.tb01525.x

7. Nakamoto, S. (2008). Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. Retrieved from https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf

8. Shaikh, M., & Li, Y. (2022). Optimizing cryptocurrency portfolios: A comparison of traditional and machine learning models. Journal of Financial Markets, 29(3), 415-438. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.finmar.2021.11.002

9. Westerholm, P. (2017). Volatility dynamics and return predictability of Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 80, 99-118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2017.01.001

10. Zohar, A., & Shakory, M. (2021). Risk-adjusted portfolio performance in digital assets: A review of rebalancing strategies. Journal of Alternative Investments, 23(1), 34-49. https://doi.org/10.3905/jai.2021.1.026