International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development-– Volume 8 Issue 5, Sep-Oct 2025
Available at www.ijsred.com

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Centralized vs. Decentralized Financial Systems Economic Trade-offs and Policy Implications

Ekaterina Balykova*
*(Faculty of International Business and Cross-Border E-Commerce, University of International Business and Economics, Beijin
Email: ms.balykova99@mail.ru)

----------**********----------

Abstract:

This article explores the economic trade-offs between centralized and decentralized financial systems. Centralized finance (CeFi) relies on regulated intermediaries such as banks and custodians, offering stability, regulatory oversight, and support for monetary policy. Decentralized finance (DeFi), based on smart contracts and cryptographic protocols, reduces barriers to entry and increases flexibility but introduces technical and operational risks. The paper examines efficiency, risk allocation, financial inclusion, innovation, and international implications, supported by quantitative evidence such as global account ownership, cryptocurrency market capitalization, and total value locked (TVL) in DeFi. The analysis highlights that neither system is categorically superior; effective policy should balance innovation and stability through coordinated, technically informed, and proportionate regulations.

Keywords **— centralized finance, decentralized finance, DeFi, financial stability, financial inclusion, policy coordination, total value locked (TVL).**

----------**********----------

I. ARTICLE

Centralized and decentralized financial systems operate according to different economic logics and have distinct implications for resource allocation, risk sharing, and innovation. Centralized finance (CeFi) relies on regulated intermediaries such as banks, custodians, and exchanges. These institutions benefit from economies of scale, which allow them to monitor risks efficiently, provide liquidity, and settle payments reliably. By concentrating expertise and capital, centralized systems enable long-term loans, large-scale maturity transformation, and the effective implementation of monetary policy. For example, deposit insurance and lender-of-last-resort mechanisms reduce borrowing costs, creating positive spillovers for investment, employment, and economic stability.

Decentralized finance (DeFi) replaces traditional intermediaries with smart contracts, algorithmic rules, and cryptographic trust. This approach lowers barriers to entry, increases composability of financial services, and can reduce friction in cross-border payments. DeFi allows innovative financial products such as tokenized lending, automated market-making, and algorithmic stablecoins. However, it also shifts certain risks from institutions to code and participants, including smart-contract vulnerabilities, liquidity mismatches, and governance attacks. While DeFi can provide more flexible and open financial services, these benefits are unevenly distributed and can expose users to significant risks without proper oversight.

From an efficiency perspective, centralized systems reduce transaction costs through standardized governance, regulatory backstops, and pooled information. Banks and other intermediaries leverage these advantages to provide lower-cost funding to creditworthy borrowers. DeFi attempts to replicate some of these benefits using algorithmic verification and decentralized governance. Protocols can outperform traditional institutions in areas like speed of settlement, programmability, and composability of services. Yet the economic impact of DeFi depends on whether protocols

genuinely reduce intermediation costs or merely redistribute profits. When protocols simply reallocate rents without improving monitoring, they may increase vulnerability to systemic failures, such as runs or oracle failures.

Risk management also differs significantly between CeFi and DeFi. Centralized institutions internalize certain risks and rely on regulatory protections for others. Weak supervision or poor governance can result in concentrated failures that transmit across the financial system. Decentralized systems shift risk to private counterparties and code, meaning failures often arise from technical errors, design flaws, or governance attacks. One key metric for measuring DeFi's economic scale is total value locked (TVL), representing the total capital in protocols. TVL has grown from near zero in 2018 to hundreds of billions of dollars by 2024, reflecting meaningful economic activity but also showing concentration and volatility (DeFiLlama, 2024; BIS, 2025). Periods of market stress have demonstrated that protocol failures can cascade through algorithmic leverage, causing real losses for users and interconnected platforms.

Financial inclusion is another important trade-off. Centralized systems have historically excluded parts of the population due to geographic, cost, or documentation barriers. According to the World Bank's Global Findex, global account ownership increased from 51% in 2011 to 76% in 2021, yet gaps persist in low-income countries (World Bank, 2021). DeFi can broaden access by allowing anyone with a smartphone and internet connection to participate in financial services. However, challenges such as digital literacy, network reliability, and the absence of consumer protections can limit its impact. While DeFi may improve nominal access, it may also expose unsophisticated users to high risks, potentially increasing economic volatility for vulnerable households.

The choice between centralized and decentralized systems also affects innovation and investment. Centralized institutions tend to invest in stable, well-regulated markets with predictable returns, which supports traditional credit and payment systems. DeFi fosters rapid experimentation, encouraging the creation of new products such as algorithmic stablecoins, decentralized lending, and cross-chain interoperability solutions. However, this innovation comes with uncertainty, and failures can result in substantial financial losses. Hybrid arrangements, in which centralized institutions integrate decentralized features, may balance stability with innovation, but require careful risk management.

International economic implications are significant. Centralized finance benefits from established supervision and cross-border coordination, while DeFi protocols often operate globally with limited regulatory oversight. This creates the potential for regulatory arbitrage, cross-border contagion, and challenges for tax authorities. Coordinated policy responses – such as standardized AML frameworks, custody regulations, and monitoring of stablecoins – are essential to reduce systemic vulnerabilities (FSB, 2023; Eurofi, 2022). Countries with strong regulatory and supervisory capacities can safely support innovation while protecting users; those with weaker capacities may need stricter entry rules, transparency requirements, and consumer-education programs.

Quantitative indicators reinforce these points. Cryptocurrency market capitalization reached multi-trillion-dollar levels in 2024, reflecting the economic significance of digital assets (Reuters, 2024). DeFi TVL rebounded after the 2022 downturn to tens or low hundreds of billions of dollars by 2024-2025 (DeFiLlama, 2024; BIS, 2025). These figures indicate that decentralized systems represent a non-trivial share of tradable and interest-bearing assets, demonstrating real economic impact. Episodes of centralized exchange failures or DeFi exploits highlight the need for targeted regulatory measures to protect consumers and maintain stability.

Effective policy should neither eliminate decentralization nor freeze centralization. Instead, it should guide innovation toward socially beneficial outcomes while mitigating risks. This requires clear legal definitions, enforceable custody and disclosure rules, and technical standards for operational resilience. Public authorities need the capacity to oversee digital systems, and firms should internalize resilience and consumer-protection costs. Regulatory sandboxes and phased approaches allow innovation to occur under

controlled conditions, balancing flexibility with safety.

In conclusion, centralized systems remain the backbone of financial stability and monetary policy implementation, while decentralized systems expand access, reduce frictions, and enable new product architectures. The economic trade-offs are nuanced: centralization provides stability but can concentrate power and risk, while decentralization lowers barriers and fosters innovation but introduces operational and systemic vulnerabilities. Policymakers who understand these trade-offs and implement coordinated, proportionate, and technically informed regulations can capture the benefits of both systems while safeguarding consumers and financial stability.

II. REFERENCES

[1] S. Ansar, A. Demirguc-Kunt, L. Klapper, and D. Singer, The Global Findex Database 2021: Financial Inclusion, Digital Payments, and Resilience in the Age of COVID-19 (English). Washington, DC, USA: World Bank, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099818107072234182

[2] P. Saggese, Towards verifiability of total value locked (TVL) in decentralized finance (BIS Working Papers). Basel, Switzerland: Bank for International Settlements (BIS), 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.bis.org/publ/work1268.htm

[3] DeFiLlama, DeFiLlama Dashboard and TVL Aggregates. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://defillama.com

[4] Eurofi, Decentralized Finance (DeFi): Opportunities, Challenges and Policy Implications (Conference Briefings and Syntheses). Paris, France: Eurofi Policy Papers, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.eurofi.net/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/eurofi_decentralized-finance-defi_opportunities-challenges-and-policy-implications_paris_february-2022.pdf

[5] Financial Stability Board (FSB), Synthesis Paper: Policies for Crypto-Assets. Basel, Switzerland: FSB, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.fsb.org/2023/09/imf-fsb-synthesis-paper-policies-for-crypto-assets/

[6] International Monetary Fund (IMF), Global Crypto Market Tops $3 Trillion on Hopes of Trump-Fuelled Boom, Global Financial Stability Report, Oct. 2021.

[7] Reuters, “Crypto market capitalisation hits record $3.2 trillion, CoinGecko says,” Reuters Technology, Nov. 14, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.reuters.com/technology/crypto-market-capitalisation-hits-record-32-trillion-coingecko-says-2024-11-14

