Complex network analysis of cryptocurrency market during crashes

Kundan Mukhia^a, Anish Rai^a, S R Luwang^a, Md Nurujjaman^a, Sushovan Majhi^b, Chittaranjan Hens^c

^aDepartment of Physics, National Institute of Technology, 737139, Sikkim, India ^bThe George Washington University, Washington, DC, 20052, Washington, USA ^cInternational Institute of Information Technology, Hyderabad, 500032, Telangana, India

Abstract

This paper identifies the cryptocurrency market crashes and analyses its dynamics using the complex network. We identify three distinct crashes during 2017-20, and the analysis is carried out by dividing the time series into pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods. Partial correlation based complex network analysis is carried out to study the crashes. Degree density (ρ_D), average path length (\bar{l}), and average clustering coefficient (\bar{cc}) are estimated from these networks. We find that both ρ_D and \bar{cc} are smallest during the pre-crash period, and spike during the crash suggesting the network is dense during a crash. Although ρ_D and \bar{cc} decrease in the post-crash period, they remain higher than pre-crash levels for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 crashes suggesting a market attempt to return to normalcy. We get \bar{l} is minimal during the crash period, suggesting a rapid flow of information. A dense network and rapid information flow suggest that during a crash uninformed synchronized panic sell-off happens. However, during the 2019-20 crash, the values of ρ_D , \bar{cc} , and \bar{l} did not vary significantly, indicating minimal change in dynamics compared to other crashes. The findings of this study may guide investors in making decisions during market crashes.

Keywords: Complex network, Hilbert Spectrum, Degree density, Average path length, Average clustering coefficient.

1. Introduction

The cryptocurrency market has seen substantial development since its inception in the late 2000s, with a rapid increase in market capitalization and the proliferation of digital currencies [1, 2, 3]. As of March 2024, there were more than 23,000 currencies globally even though many of them are thinly traded and the total market capitalization of all these active cryptocurrencies is approximately USD 2.5 trillion [4]. Cryptocurrencies have garnered significant attention due to various economic factors following the challenges faced by central banks during the 2008 global financial crisis and the 2010-2013 European sovereign debt crisis [5]. The decentralized nature, lower transaction costs than traditional fiat currencies, and transaction transparency have attracted a growing number of traders, hence enhancing its popularity [6]. However, cryptocurrency as an asset class is still in the nascent stages and as a result, the price of cryptocurrency has had some remarkable fluctuations [5]. Further, with the realization of their potential to generate high returns, they have turned into rapidly growing speculative "investment tools" [7, 8, 9]. So, the growth has been coupled with periods characterized by large price fluctuations with increased transaction volume levels [10, 11]. Therefore, examining the dynamics and relationship between the return of cryptocurrencies during different price fluctuation periods is of high importance.

Although the popularity of cryptocurrencies has grown, a few studies have been conducted to examine the dynamics and relationship between cryptocurrencies during market crashes. As a result, there is a limited understanding of how the cryptocurrencies interact with one another in terms of return. Prior studies have uncovered the connectedness network among and within different markets that include equities [12, 13, 14], bonds [15, 16], currencies [17, 18], commodities [19, 20, 21], and interest rates [16, 22]. In a study, a time-varying parameters factor augmented vector autoregressive connectedness approach was employed to study the dynamic total connectedness across several cryptocurrencies [7]. The dynamic relationships between popular cryptocurrencies and various financial assets were also studied [23]. A study on volatility connectedness revealed that volatility spillovers among cryptocurrencies are not necessarily linked to market capitalization, where Bitcoin, despite its significant role, does not dominate the entire market in terms of emitting volatility shocks[24]. Further, spillover effects were quantified across major cryptocurrencies using the connectedness framework of Diebold and Yilmaz [1]. Asymmetric multifractal cross-correlation was carried out to examine the cross-correlation behavior between cryptocurrencies and fiat currencies [25].

Studies related to cryptocurrency market crashes are also very limited. A study on the correlation between Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies post the major crash in late 2017 to early 2018 was carried out [26]. The Bitcoin bubble between December 2017 and December 2018 was also studied, illustrating herding behavior during the Great Crypto Crash and indicating subsequent changes in market quality [27]. During the COVID-19 crash, a comparable investigation into herding behavior was carried out across the four highest-traded cryptocurrencies: Bitcoin, Ethereum, Litecoin, and Ripple [28, 29]. To the best of our knowledge, despite existing studies, no study has yet been carried out that compares the dynamics of different crash periods of cryptocurrency market crashes. Our approach employs complex network analysis based on partial correlation, which provides significant insights into the occurrence of crashes and their relationships with pre-crash and post-crash behaviors.

In this paper, we analyze cryptocurrency market crashes using complex network analysis. Initially, we used the Hilbert spectrum to identify crashes in 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20. To better understand the nature of these cryptocurrency crashes and their relationships with pre and post-crash periods, we divided each of the three crashes into pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods. Using partial correlation, we constructed networks for these different market periods. We calculated the degree density (ρ_D), average path length (\overline{I}), and average clustering coefficient (\overline{cc}) to analyze the network dynamics during these crash periods. By examining the network changes across different crashes and periods, we aim to uncover the underlying dynamics during crashes.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Sec. 2 describes the method of analyses and Sec. 3 describes the data employed for the study. It is followed by the results of the study as given in Sec. 4. Finally, Sec. 5 gives the concluding remarks.

2. Method of Analysis

To study the complex network of cryptocurrencies in different periods of a crash, we applied several methods. Initially, we use the Hilbert spectrum to detect the crash in the cryptocurrency market. It is followed by the evaluation of partial correlation. Next, we employed a threshold based approach to construct a network of cryptocurrencies. Finally, we apply complex network centrality measures to understand the inherent structural properties. Further details on each of these techniques are discussed below.

2.1. Hilbert Spectrum

The Empirical mode decomposition (EMD) method is extensively employed for decomposing nonlinear and nonstationary time-series data into distinct intrinsic mode functions (IMFs), each with a specific time scale, as described in several studies [30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. A time series must satisfy two conditions to be regarded as an IMF:

- 1. The count of extrema and zero crossings must be either identical or differ by a maximum of one.
- 2. The average of the envelope created by the local maxima and the envelope created by the local minima should be zero.

The following steps show the shifting process to acquire IMFs from a time series:

- 1. The upper and lower envelopes of the time series are constructed by connecting their respective maxima and minima using spline fitting.
- 2. The mean of the envelope is subtracted from the original time series to form a new time series.
- 3. Steps (1) & (2) are repeated with the new time series until the IMF conditions mentioned above are satisfied. When the conditions are satisfied, the new time series is considered the first IMF.
- 4. To identify the second IMF, we replicate the procedure by generating another time series. This series is derived by subtracting the first IMF from the original time series. The decomposition process continues until the monotonic time series is obtained. The original time series can be reconstructed by adding all the IMFs including the monotonic time series.

To obtain the instantaneous frequency, ω of an IMF, we perform Hilbert transform defined as

$$H(t) = \frac{CP}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{IMF}{t - t'} dt,$$
(1)

where CP is the Cauchy principal. We define ω as

$$\omega = \frac{d\phi}{dt}$$
, where $\phi_t = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{H(t)}{IMF}\right)$. (2)

Hilbert spectrum $(H(t, \omega))$ is the time-frequency distribution and is defined as

$$H(t,\omega) = \Re\left\{\sum_{i} K_{i}(t)e^{j\int\omega(t)\,dt}\right\},\tag{3}$$

where $K_i(t)$ is the amplitude. We further estimate the instantaneous energy, $\overline{E}(t)$ from $H(t, \omega)$ to identify crashes. $\overline{E}(t)$ can be estimated as

$$\overline{E}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H^2(t,\omega) \, d\omega. \tag{4}$$

In this analysis, we used Eqn. 3 to determine the $H(t, \omega)$ of the combined IMFs to identify high energy concentration regions in the spectrum, as carried out in these studies [35, 36]. The high energy concentration regions can be applied to identify sudden changes in a time series [35, 36]. Hence, this can be applied to identify crashes.

2.2. Partial Correlation

The partial correlation is commonly used as a statistical tool to assess the relationship between two variables [37, 38, 39]. To study the degree of similarity between cryptocurrency price changes, we calculate the daily return of the closing prices. We denote the return of the cryptocurrency, p at time t as $R_p(t)$. The average and the standard deviation of $R_p(t)$ over the interval $[t_i, t_f]$ are given by the following Eqns. 5 and 6, respectively:

$$E[R_p(t)] = \frac{1}{t_f - t_i} \sum_{t=t_i}^{t_f} R_p(t),$$
(5)

$$\sigma[R_p(t)] = \sqrt{\frac{1}{t_f - t_i} \sum_{t=t_i}^{t_f} \left[R_p(t) - E\{R_p(t)\} \right]^2}.$$
(6)

Furthermore, the Pearson correlation coefficient [40] for the returns $[R_p(t), R_q(t)]$ of two cryptocurrencies p and q is determined as follows:

$$C_{pq} = \frac{1}{t_f - t_i} \sum_{t=t_i}^{t_f} \left(\frac{R_p(t) - E\{R_p(t)\}}{\sigma\{R_p(t)\}} \right) \left(\frac{R_q(t) - E\{R_q(t)\}}{\sigma\{R_q(t)\}} \right).$$
(7)

The partial correlation matrix, C_{pq}^* [41, 42] is then calculated from the inverse of the correlation matrix, C_{pq} , where its elements are:

$$C_{pq}^{*} = -\frac{C_{pq}^{-1}}{\sqrt{C_{pp}^{-1}C_{qq}^{-1}}},$$
(8)

The value of C_{pq}^* ranges from -1 to 1, where $C_{pq}^* = 1$ indicates that cryptocurrencies p and q are strongly correlated, $C_{pq}^* = -1$ signifies they are strongly anti-correlated, and $C_{pq}^* = 0$ means they are uncorrelated.

2.3. Network construction

The cryptocurrency network is constructed using the threshold method to simplify the analysis. It reduces the complexity and preserves the most significant relevant features [43]. This method represents cryptocurrencies as interconnected nodes, where an undirected edge connects the nodes *m* and *n* if the absolute value of C_{pq}^* meets or exceeds a fixed threshold (θ), with $0 \le \theta \le 1$. The threshold method retains all crucial data within the network. The θ used in this study was determined using the percentile method [43].

A network is defined as, G = (V, E, f), comprising nodes V, edges E, and a function f that maps edges to node pairs, m and n. In simpler terms, a network without self-loops is represented as G = (V, E). In a cryptocurrency network, vertices represent individual cryptocurrencies, while edges are established based on the partial correlation coefficient C_{pq}^* and a threshold θ . The set of edges E is defined as [44]:

$$E = \begin{cases} e_{mn} = 1, & \text{if } m \neq n \text{ and } C_{pq}^* \ge \theta, \\ e_{mn} = 0, & \text{if } m = n. \end{cases}$$
(9)

2.4. Topological features of the network

2.4.1. Degree Density

Degree density (ρ_D), reflecting the average degree or connectivity of nodes, is crucial for understanding the compactness of a network. It is calculated as the ratio of the actual number of edges to the maximum possible number of edges in the network [45, 46], given by:

$$\rho_D = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} C_D(k)}{N(N-1)} \tag{10}$$

Here, $C_D(k)$ denotes the degree centrality of node k which is defined as the count of links that a node has with other nodes within the same network [47, 48]. It quantifies the number of direct connections a node has, indicating its interaction level with the network [49, 50, 51]. Mathematically, the degree centrality for node k is expressed as:

$$C_D(k) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha(i,k) \tag{11}$$

where *n* represents the total number of nodes, and $\alpha(i, k)$ is 1 if there is a connection between node *i* and node *k*, and 0 otherwise.

2.4.2. Average path length

The average path length (\bar{l}) is calculated as the average of all shortest path lengths between any pair of nodes [52, 53, 54]. The shortest path length between two nodes represents the minimum number of connections required to travel from one node to another [51, 55]. The shorter path length indicates that the information diffuses more quickly within the network [51, 55]. Mathematically, the average path length, \bar{l} is written as,

$$\bar{l} = \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{\substack{m,n \ m < n}} l_{mn}$$
(12)

Here, l_{mn} denotes the shortest distance between nodes m and n, and N is the network's total node count.

2.4.3. Clustering Coefficient

The clustering coefficient (cc_j) quantifies the connectivity level among a vertex's neighbors. It is calculated by the ratio of the actual number of edges linking a vertex's neighbors to the total number of potential edges between them [52, 53, 55, 54]. The formula used to calculate the clustering coefficient of a given node *j* is as follows:

$$cc_j = \frac{2u_j}{v_i(v_j - 1)},$$
 (13)

where v_j represents the count of neighbors surrounding node *j*, and u_j indicates the total edges among those neighbors.

We calculate the average clustering coefficient (\overline{cc}) of the cryptocurrency network by taking the mean of the clustering coefficients of all nodes in the network. The \overline{cc} is given by the formula:

$$\overline{cc} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} cc_j \tag{14}$$

where *n* represents the total number of nodes in the network, and cc_i is the clustering coefficient for node *j*.

3. Data Description: Different cryptocurrencies

To study the network dynamics during various cryptocurrency market crash periods, we utilized daily closing price data obtained from [4] and [56]. Cryptocurrencies were chosen based on their market capitalization at the time of the crash. The number of cryptocurrencies included in our analysis varies across different crash periods due to irregularities and missing data. Specifically, we analyzed 49 cryptocurrencies for the 2017-18 crash, 35 cryptocurrencies for the 2018-19 crash, and 46 cryptocurrencies for the 2019-20 crash.

4. Results

In Subsec. 4.1, we identify three different crashes in the cryptocurrency market, and Subsec. 4.2 and Subsec. 4.3 present the results of a partial correlation and complex network analysis of cryptocurrencies in the pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods of the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 crashes respectively.

4.1. Crash Identification using Hilbert Spectrum



Figure 1: Plot (a) & (b) represent the daily closing price of BTC-USD from September 2018 to February 2019 and the Hilbert spectrum of the combination of IMFs, respectively.

We estimated the Hilbert spectrum $[H(t, \omega)]$ of the time series by combining all the intrinsic mode functions (IMFs) to identify a crash in the cryptocurrency market as described in Subsec. 2.1. Fig. 1 (a) and Fig. 1 (b) represent the daily closing price plot of the Bitcoin (BTC-USD) from September 2018 to February 2019, and its $H(t, \omega)$ respectively. The sudden price changes are identified by $H(t, \omega)$ as shown by the reddish region in the spectrum, indicating the maximum energy concentration, and hence the sharp change in the energy spectrum identifies the crash. Similarly, we have identified crashes during the year 2017-18 and 2019-20 using the $H(t, \omega)$. The duration of the crash period is taken as the interval from the day with the highest closing price before the crash to the day with the lowest closing price after the crash.

Crash period	Pre-crash	Crash	Post-crash
2017 19	01.09.2017 -	17.12.2017 -	06.02.2017 -
2017-16	16.12.2017	05.02.2018	20.05.2018
2018 10	01.08.2018 -	13.11.2017 -	16.12.2018 -
2010-19	12.11.2018	15.12.2018	25.02.2019
2010 20	01.11.2019 -	13.02.2020 -	13.03.2020 -
2019-20	12.02.2020	12.03.2020	25.06.2020

Table 1: Durations of pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods during the year 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20.

The periods before and after the crash are considered as the pre-crash and post-crash periods, respectively. For both the pre-crash and post-crash periods, we selected a timeframe of 3.5 months. This selection ensures that the analysis remains focused on the critical transitions associated with the crash. The consistency of results across various durations supports this choice, as extending the period to up to 5 months for both pre-crash and post-crash periods gives similar outcomes. Hence, we have identified the crashes using $H(t, \omega)$ and divided the crashes into pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods. Table 1 presents the durations of these periods. In the subsequent subsections, we will estimate the partial correlations between the cryptocurrencies and construct the network during these periods of the three crashes. We have omitted the 2022 cryptocurrency crash from our study due to its extended duration, the cessation of operations of some cryptocurrencies used in our analysis, and the emergence of thousands of new cryptocurrencies in 2022. Therefore, a separate analysis of the 2022 crash is required.

4.2. Partial correlation of the crashes



Figure 2: The heatmap plot represents the partial correlation matrices among different cryptocurrencies. (a), (b) and (c) represent pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods for the 2017-18 crash.

Figs. 2(a), 2(b), and 2(c) show the heatmap of the partial correlation among various cryptocurrencies during the pre-crash, crash, and post-crash period of the 2017-18 crash, respectively. In these figures, the color spectrum signifies the strength of the correlation. The intensity of the correlations corresponds to the depth of color, with darker red indicating stronger correlations. From these figures, we observe that the heatmap for the crash period is the most intense than the pre-crash and post-crash periods. This shows that during the crash period, the cryptocurrencies are more correlated. Figs. 2(a) and 2(c) show the correlation is less in the pre-crash and post-crash periods, respectively. The mean values of the partial correlations during pre-crash, crash, and post-crash of 2017-18 are 0.290, 0.769, and 0.299, respectively.

We have also obtained similar results for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 crashes, as shown in Figs. 3(a)-(c) and 3(d)-(f) respectively. The mean values of the partial correlations during pre-crash, crash, and post-crash of 2018-19 are 0.304, 0.898, and 0.312, respectively. For the 2019-20 crash, the values are 0.312, 0.339, and 0.316, respectively.



Figure 3: The heatmap plot represents the partial correlation matrices among different cryptocurrencies. (a), (b), and (c) represent pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods for the 2018-19 crash, and (d), (e), and (f) for the 2019-20 crash, respectively.

The results indicate that the pre-crash period exhibits the lowest correlation, suggesting a stable market, consistent with findings from studies conducted in Refs. [57, 58]. The mean value of partial correlation increases significantly during the crash periods, suggesting a synchronized movement of the market during the crash. We find the correlation decreases in the post-crash period. This decrease in the correlation may indicate that the market is returning to a normal period as was in the pre-crash period, ultimately pointing toward a path of stabilization. The transition of correlation values from the pre-crash period to the crash and, subsequently, to the post-crash period captures the dynamics of market behavior at different periods of a crash.

4.3. Network dynamics of the crashes

Based on the partial correlation among the cryptocurrencies, we define a threshold value (θ) as discussed in Sec. 2.3 and construct a network graph for pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods for different market crashes. The θ plays a crucial role in constructing the network by determining which connections or interactions are significant, thereby shaping the structure and behavior of the network. In this study, the cryptocurrency connections whose partial correlation is greater than the θ are considered, and hence, the network size varies for different periods. Each cryptocurrency is represented by the nodes and the edges show their partial correlation which are greater than the θ . The time intervals for the network construction during the pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods are shown in Table 1.

Figs. 4(a), 4(b), and 4(c) show the network distribution of different cryptocurrencies during the pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods of the 2017-18 crash, respectively. We observe that in the crash period, the connections between



Figure 4: The figure represents the network of 2017-18 cryptocurrency crashes during different periods. Plots (a), (b), and (c) represent the network during pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods for the 2017-18 crash. A dense network is formed during the crash periods.

the cryptocurrencies are very dense with a higher connectedness. This indicates a synchronized price movement as a result of uniform reactions from the investors. Such uniform reaction results in herding behavior, often leading to a panic sell-off in the market [59]. However, in the post-crash period, the connections become less dense as the market enters a period of adjustment, characterized by various market corrections. In the pre-crash period, we observed the least connections, suggesting a stable and normal market environment characterized by independent movements rather than collective shifts.



Figure 5: The figure represents the network of 2018-19 cryptocurrency crashes during different periods. Plots (a), (b), and (c) represent the network during pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods for the 2018-19 crash. A dense network is formed during the crash periods.

Similar changes between pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods are observed in 2018-19 crashes, as shown in Figs. 5(a)-(c). For the 2019-20 crash, we observed a different pattern where the pre-crash period shows denser connections compared to the post-crash period, as shown in Figs. 6(a)-(c). This distinct pattern may be due to the different dynamics leading to the crash. To further analyze and quantify these changes in network dynamics across different periods of these crashes, we have calculated the degree density (ρ_D), average path length (\bar{l}), and average clustering coefficient (\bar{cc}).

We have estimated the ρ_D , \overline{cc} , and \overline{l} for all the networks during the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 cryptocurrency crashes. ρ_D measures the average number of connections per node, reflecting the network's density and the potential for widespread influence, and \overline{cc} demonstrates a tendency for nodes to cluster tightly and form interconnected groups.



Figure 6: The figure represents the network of 2019-20 cryptocurrency crashes during different periods. Plots (a), (b), and (c) represent the network during pre-crash, crash, and post-crash periods for the 2019-20 crash period.

	Table 2: Table contains the degree density	(ρ_D) of the cryptocurren	cy network across differen	t crash periods
--	--	--------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

Market period	Pre-crash	Crash	Post-crash
2017-18	0.097	0.884	0.181
2018-19	0.115	0.97	0.235
2019-20	0.118	0.25	0.096

\overline{l} measures the minimal steps required to move from one node to another.

Table 3: Table contains the average clustering coefficient (\overline{cc}) of the cryptocurrency network during different crash periods.

Market period	Pre-crash	Crash	Post-crash
2017-18	0.226	0.956	0.282
2018-19	0.174	0.977	0.338
2019-20	0.241	0.316	0.167

Tables 2, 3 and 4 show the ρ_D , \overline{cc} , and \overline{l} values during the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 cryptocurrency crashes, respectively. From these tables, we observe that the ρ_D and \overline{cc} are significantly high while \overline{l} is very low during the crash period as compared to the pre-crash and post-crash periods. This suggests a higher level of connectivity and potential for information flow among cryptocurrencies, which may contribute to increased market volatility and rapid transmission of price changes during crash periods. Hence, a strong, uninformed, and synchronized panic-driven selling spree among traders happens, leading to a major plunge in the cryptocurrency market. However, in the post-crash period for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 crashes. This may be due to the fact that during the post-crash period, the network dynamics are in a transitional phase where the market is gradually returning to the previous pre-crash period with some volatile phases. While the crash period has passed, the market still shows traces of its impact, indicating a lingering effect of past events and occasional aftershocks. Therefore, the network distribution during the post-crash period can be seen as a blend of characteristics from both the crash and pre-crash periods.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have identified the crashes in the cryptocurrency market and studied their dynamics using complex network analysis. We have identified three cryptocurrency crashes from the year 2017 to 2020, using Hilbert Spectrum. In order to understand the characteristics of crashes, we have divided each market crash into three periods

Table 4: Table contains the average path length (\bar{l}) of the cryptocurrency network during different crash periods.

Market period	Pre-crash	Crash	Post-crash
2017-18	2.792	1.116	2.236
2018-19	2.742	1.03	1.961
2019-20	2.578	1.82	2.901

namely pre-crash, crash, and post-crash period. We have calculated the partial correlation during these periods. The partial correlation is highest during the crash period, followed by the post-crash period, and least in the pre-crash period. The partial correlation is further applied to construct the network between the cryptocurrencies during different periods of the three market crashes.

In this paper, we have identified three crashes in the cryptocurrency market from 2017 to 2020, using Hilbert Spectrum, and studied their dynamics using complex network analysis. In order to understand the characteristics of crashes, we have divided each market crash into three periods namely pre-crash, crash, and post-crash period. We have calculated the partial correlation during these periods. The partial correlation is highest during the crash period, followed by the post-crash period, and least in the pre-crash period. The partial correlation is further applied to construct the network between the cryptocurrencies during different periods of the three market crashes.

We have constructed the network for different periods of the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 cryptocurrency crashes. Degree density (ρ_D), average clustering coefficient (\overline{cc}), and average path length (\overline{l}) are estimated from these networks. During the crash periods of 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20, we observed that ρ_D and \overline{cc} were significantly higher, while \overline{l} was notably lower compared to the pre-crash and post-crash periods. For the 2017-18 and 2018-19 crashes, ρ_D and \overline{cc} decreased in the post-crash period from their levels during the crash and reached their lowest points in the pre-crash period. Whereas, the average path length (\overline{l}) increased after the crash and peaked in the pre-crash period. However, during the 2019-20 crash, ρ_D and \overline{cc} were highest during the crash period, decreased in the pre-crash period. \overline{l} exhibited the opposite pattern, being lowest in the pre-crash period and highest in the post-crash period.

A higher value of ρ_D and \overline{cc} , along with a smaller value of \overline{l} obtained during the crash period confirms the formation of the dense network. The dense network shows a rapid and efficient spread of information across the network, potentially accelerating market reactions and increasing volatility. As a result, there is an uninformed, synchronized panic sell-off by traders, resulting in extreme price declines in the crash period. For the 2017-18 and 2018-19 crashes, ρ_D is comparatively less during the post-crash periods with a least during the pre-crash periods, as validated by the sparse connections in the networks. The relatively high ρ_D and \overline{cc} observed during the post-crash period compared to the pre-crash period may indicate the market does not abruptly return to a stable form after the main crash. However, the variations in ρ_D , \overline{l} , and \overline{cc} during the 2019-20 crash are relatively modest across the pre-crash, crash, and postcrash periods, suggesting a less pronounced interaction among cryptocurrencies compared to the more significant shifts observed during the 2017-18 and 2018-19 crashes.

Understanding the network dynamics during different periods of cryptocurrency market crashes reveals a complex interaction. Expanding this research could enhance our broader understanding, potentially guiding investors and traders toward more informed decisions in their future market activities.

6. Acknowledgement

We extend our sincerest gratitude to the institute for the generous fellowship support, and our colleague, Buddhanath Sharma for his invaluable contributions to the writing and publication of our research article.

References

 Q. Ji, E. Bouri, C. K. M. Lau, D. Roubaud, Dynamic connectedness and integration in cryptocurrency markets, International Review of Financial Analysis 63 (2019) 257–272.

[3] T. Aste, Cryptocurrency market structure: connecting emotions and economics, Digital Finance 1 (1) (2019) 5–21.

^[2] G. M. Caporale, L. Gil-Alana, A. Plastun, Persistence in the cryptocurrency market, Research in International Business and Finance 46 (2018) 141–148.

- [4] Coinmarketcap, https://coinmarketcap.com/, accessed: April 17, 2024.
- [5] M. Shu, W. Zhu, Real-time prediction of bitcoin bubble crashes, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 548 (2020) 124477.
- [6] H. Gupta, R. Chaudhary, An empirical study of volatility in cryptocurrency market, Journal of Risk and Financial Management 15 (11) (2022) 513.
- [7] N. Antonakakis, I. Chatziantoniou, D. Gabauer, Cryptocurrency market contagion: Market uncertainty, market complexity, and dynamic portfolios, Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money 61 (2019) 37–51.
- [8] C. Baek, M. Elbeck, Bitcoins as an investment or speculative vehicle? a first look, Applied Economics Letters 22 (1) (2015) 30–34.
- [9] P. E. Mandaci, E. C. Cagli, Herding intensity and volatility in cryptocurrency markets during the covid-19, Finance Research Letters 46 (2022) 102382.
- [10] Y. B. Kim, J. G. Kim, W. Kim, J. H. Im, T. H. Kim, S. J. Kang, C. H. Kim, Predicting fluctuations in cryptocurrency transactions based on user comments and replies, PloS one 11 (8) (2016) e0161197.
- [11] Z. Tong, Z. Chen, C. Zhu, Nonlinear dynamics analysis of cryptocurrency price fluctuations based on bitcoin, Finance Research Letters 47 (2022) 102803.
- [12] B. Fowowe, M. Shuaibu, Dynamic spillovers between nigerian, south african and international equity markets, International economics 148 (2016) 59–80.
- [13] S. J. H. Shahzad, J. A. Hernandez, M. U. Rehman, K. H. Al-Yahyaee, M. Zakaria, A global network topology of stock markets: Transmitters and receivers of spillover effects, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 492 (2018) 2136–2153.
- [14] S. Rabindrajit Luwang, A. Rai, M. Nurujjaman, O. Prakash, C. Hens, High-frequency stock market order transitions during the us-china trade war 2018: A discrete-time markov chain analysis, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 34 (1) (2024).
- [15] W. Ahmad, A. V. Mishra, K. J. Daly, Financial connectedness of brics and global sovereign bond markets, Emerging Markets Review 37 (2018) 1–16.
- [16] D. P. Louzis, Measuring spillover effects in euro area financial markets: a disaggregate approach, Empirical Economics 49 (4) (2015) 1367– 1400.
- [17] V. K. Singh, S. Nishant, P. Kumar, Dynamic and directional network connectedness of crude oil and currencies: Evidence from implied volatility, Energy Economics 76 (2018) 48–63.
- [18] J. Baruník, E. Kočenda, L. Vácha, Asymmetric volatility connectedness on the forex market, Journal of International Money and Finance 77 (2017) 39–56.
- [19] Q. Ji, J.-B. Geng, A. K. Tiwari, Information spillovers and connectedness networks in the oil and gas markets, Energy Economics 75 (2018) 71–84.
- [20] Q. Ji, J.-F. Guo, Oil price volatility and oil-related events: An internet concern study perspective, Applied Energy 137 (2015) 256–264.
- [21] D. Zhang, D. C. Broadstock, Global financial crisis and rising connectedness in the international commodity markets, International Review of Financial Analysis 68 (2020) 101239.
- [22] M. L. Bech, E. Atalay, The topology of the federal funds market, Physica A: Statistical mechanics and its applications 389 (22) (2010) 5223–5246.
- [23] S. Corbet, A. Meegan, C. Larkin, B. Lucey, L. Yarovaya, Exploring the dynamic relationships between cryptocurrencies and other financial assets, Economics letters 165 (2018) 28–34.
- [24] S. Yi, Z. Xu, G.-J. Wang, Volatility connectedness in the cryptocurrency market: Is bitcoin a dominant cryptocurrency?, International Review of Financial Analysis 60 (2018) 98–114.
- [25] L. H. Fernandes, W. Kristjanpoller, B. M. Tabak, Asymmetric multifractal cross-correlation dynamics between fat currencies and cryptocurrencies, Fractals 31 (01) (2023) 2350006.
- [26] O. S. Yaya, A. E. Ogbonna, O. E. Olubusoye, How persistent and dynamic inter-dependent are pricing of bitcoin to other cryptocurrencies before and after 2017/18 crash?, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 531 (2019) 121732.
- [27] V. Manahov, The great crypto crash in september 2018: why did the cryptocurrency market collapse?, Annals of Operations Research (2023) 1–38.
- [28] L. Yarovaya, R. Matkovskyy, A. Jalan, The effects of a "black swan" event (covid-19) on herding behavior in cryptocurrency markets, Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money 75 (2021) 101321.
- [29] D. Susana, J. Kavisanmathi, S. Sreejith, Does herding behaviour among traders increase during covid 19 pandemic? evidence from the cryptocurrency market, in: Re-imagining Diffusion and Adoption of Information Technology and Systems: A Continuing Conversation: IFIP WG 8.6 International Conference on Transfer and Diffusion of IT, TDIT 2020, Tiruchirappalli, India, December 18–19, 2020, Proceedings, Part I, Springer, 2020, pp. 178–189.
- [30] N. E. Huang, Z. Shen, S. R. Long, M. C. Wu, H. H. Shih, Q. Zheng, N.-C. Yen, C. C. Tung, H. H. Liu, The empirical mode decomposition and the hilbert spectrum for nonlinear and non-stationary time series analysis, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: mathematical, physical and engineering sciences 454 (1971) (1998) 903–995.
- [31] A. Mahata, D. P. Bal, M. Nurujjaman, Identification of short-term and long-term time scales in stock markets and effect of structural break, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 545 (2020) 123612.
- [32] A. Mahata, M. Nurujjaman, Time scales and characteristics of stock markets in different investment horizons, Frontiers in Physics 8 (2020) 590623.
- [33] A. Mahata, A. Rai, M. Nurujjaman, O. Prakash, Modeling and analysis of the effect of covid-19 on the stock price: V and I-shape recovery, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 574 (2021) 126008.
- [34] A. Rai, A. Mahata, M. Nurujjaman, S. Majhi, K. Debnath, A sentiment-based modeling and analysis of stock price during the covid-19: U-and swoosh-shaped recovery, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 592 (2022) 126810.
- [35] A. Rai, S. R. Luwang, M. Nurujjaman, C. Hens, P. Kuila, K. Debnath, Detection and forecasting of extreme events in stock price triggered by fundamental, technical, and external factors, Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 173 (2023) 113716.
- [36] A. Mahata, A. Rai, M. Nurujjaman, O. Prakash, D. Prasad Bal, Characteristics of 2020 stock market crash: The covid-19 induced extreme event, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 31 (5) (2021).

- [37] K. Baba, R. Shibata, M. Sibuya, Partial correlation and conditional correlation as measures of conditional independence, Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics 46 (4) (2004) 657–664.
- [38] D. Y. Kenett, M. Tumminello, A. Madi, G. Gur-Gershgoren, R. N. Mantegna, E. Ben-Jacob, Dominating clasp of the financial sector revealed by partial correlation analysis of the stock market, PloS one 5 (12) (2010) e15032.
- [39] Y. Shapira, D. Y. Kenett, E. Ben-Jacob, The index cohesive effect on stock market correlations, The European Physical Journal B 72 (2009) 657–669.
- [40] J. Adler, I. Parmryd, Quantifying colocalization by correlation: the pearson correlation coefficient is superior to the mander's overlap coefficient, Cytometry Part A 77 (8) (2010) 733–742.
- [41] S. Epskamp, E. I. Fried, A tutorial on regularized partial correlation networks., Psychological methods 23 (4) (2018) 617.
- [42] D. Stosic, D. Stosic, T. B. Ludermir, T. Stosic, Collective behavior of cryptocurrency price changes, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 507 (2018) 499–509.
- [43] R. Xu, W.-K. Wong, G. Chen, S. Huang, Topological characteristics of the hong kong stock market: A test-based p-threshold approach to understanding network complexity, Scientific Reports 7 (1) (2017) 41379.
- [44] W.-Q. Huang, X.-T. Zhuang, S. Yao, A network analysis of the chinese stock market, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 388 (14) (2009) 2956–2964.
- [45] A. Nobi, S. Lee, D. H. Kim, J. W. Lee, Correlation and network topologies in global and local stock indices, Physics Letters A 378 (34) (2014) 2482–2489.
- [46] M. I. Rakib, A. Nobi, J. W. Lee, Structure and dynamics of financial networks by feature ranking method, Scientific Reports 11 (1) (2021) 17618.
- [47] L. Lü, D. Chen, X.-L. Ren, Q.-M. Zhang, Y.-C. Zhang, T. Zhou, Vital nodes identification in complex networks, Physics reports 650 (2016) 1–63.
- [48] M. Newman, Networks, Oxford university press, 2018.
- [49] F. Battiston, G. Cencetti, I. Iacopini, V. Latora, M. Lucas, A. Patania, J.-G. Young, G. Petri, Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics, Physics Reports 874 (2020) 1–92.
- [50] H. E. Moghadam, T. Mohammadi, M. F. Kashani, A. Shakeri, Complex networks analysis in iran stock market: The application of centrality, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 531 (2019) 121800.
- [51] A. Papana, C. Kyrtsou, D. Kugiumtzis, C. Diks, Financial networks based on granger causality: A case study, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 482 (2017) 65–73.
- [52] D. J. Watts, S. H. Strogatz, Collective dynamics of 'small-world'networks, nature 393 (6684) (1998) 440-442.
- [53] B. Jiang, C. Claramunt, Topological analysis of urban street networks, Environment and Planning B: Planning and design 31 (1) (2004) 151–162.
- [54] H. Liu, The complexity of chinese syntactic dependency networks, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 387 (12) (2008) 3048–3058.
- [55] S. Porta, P. Crucitti, V. Latora, The network analysis of urban streets: A dual approach, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications 369 (2) (2006) 853–866.
- [56] Yahoo finance, https://finance.yahoo.com/, accessed: April 17, 2024.
- [57] A. Nobi, S. E. Maeng, G. G. Ha, J. W. Lee, Random matrix theory and cross-correlations in global financial indices and local stock market indices, Journal of the Korean Physical Society 62 (2013) 569–574.
- [58] V. Plerou, P. Gopikrishnan, B. Rosenow, L. A. N. Amaral, T. Guhr, H. E. Stanley, Random matrix approach to cross correlations in financial data, Physical Review E 65 (6) (2002) 066126.
- [59] A. Rai, A. Mahata, M. Nurujjaman, O. Prakash, Statistical properties of the aftershocks of stock market crashes: Evidence based on the 1987 crash, 2008 financial crisis and covid-19 pandemic (2020).