Resilient Portfolio Strategies and Risk Dynamics in Digital Financial Markets During Global Uncertainty

Priyanka Muppuri*
Department of Computer Science and
Engineering California State
University, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California, USA
priyankamuppuri92@gmail.com

Abstract. The objective of this study is to carry out a systematic investigation of risk-optimized portfolio models in digital financial ecosystems, during the 2020 pandemic crisis. This paper uses computational frameworks to estimate digitally available market data. We investigate performance of minimum variance and maximum risk-adjusted return portfolios against typical equally weighted benchmarks. The research suggests that return maximization comes at the expense of risk minimization in stressed market conditions, implying difficulties in always making money. The findings of this paper contribute to the further development of algorithmic asset management methods that can help create resilient digital finance strategies to cope with systemic market disruptions.

Keywords: Portfolio Optimization, Minimum Variance Portfolio, Sharpe ratio, Digital Financial Markets, Risk Management, COVID-19 Market Volatility

1 Foundations of Portfolio Resilience in Digital Markets

The increasing digitization of financial markets has transformed how investors conceptualize risk, diversification, and portfolio construction. Traditional portfolio theories, most notably the Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT) introduced by Markowitz, emphasize the balance between risk and return through diversification (1). Although MPT continues to be one of the core tools used in financial economics, the rise of high-frequency trading, algorithmic investing, and increasingly connected global markets has made its practical applications more complicated. As a result, investors need to know resilience in the context of portfolio management in global uncertainty.

The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the fragility of conventional investment strategies that rely heavily on historical correlations and stable macroeconomic conditions (2). During this time, correlations to diversifying assets came closer together and systematically increased risk. Resilience will thus mean not only

P. Johri et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Computing and Artificial Intelligence (ICSCAI 2025)*, Advances in Engineering Research 298,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6239-674-6_29

reducing variance but also designing portfolio so that shocks whether protracted, unexpected or both does not ruin you.

The rapid technology adoption giving rise to digital financial markets creates various portfolio management opportunities and challenges. The presence of real time data, algorithmic strategies, and decentralized financial instruments create many risks and upside potential (3). Digital markets are more volatility than physical equity markets. This is because they are sensitive to news flows and investor sentiment. We need to rethink resilience strategies beyond static means variance.

Designing lasting portfolios can be a challenge due to the conflict between attempts to reduce volatile returns and targeting efficient rates of return. Research has shown that many investors overreact to extreme events and that this causes procyclical behavior (4). Consequently, for resilient portfolios, the strategies must factor in behavioral biases, liquidity constraints and contagion effects that are often inadequately captured by variance-based models.

Digital connectedness has increased systemic risk, which shows that diversification alone won't suffice. When global shocks cause all asset classes to fall, even the most diversified portfolios can underperform (5). As previously noted, the significant output volatility of different production assets calls for stress test analysis of their unit production cash flows. By using these tools, investors are able to hedge tail risk while maintaining some growth exposure.

Novel procedures for measuring resilience have emerged thanks to recent advancements in computational finance, including modelling networks consisting of assets and utilizing machine learning applications for volatility forecasts (6). By capturing nonlinear relationships and adapting dynamically to changing market conditions, the insights of MPT have been extended. However, their use raises concerns regarding interpretability, overfitting, and robustness under stress.

Portfolio resilience is highly influenced by policy and macroeconomic action. During the COVID crisis, central banks and governments introduced stimulus measures never seen before that changed the risk–return characteristics of asset classes (7). While such interventions stabilized markets in the short term, they also contributed to new uncertainties regarding inflation, interest rates, and fiscal sustainability. Therefore, policy risk must be integrated into resilient strategies as a dimension of portfolio optimization.

As financial markets go digital, retail investors can now compete with institutional investors. Platforms for fractional ownership, mobile trading, and decentralized finance (DeFi) protocols increase the heterogeneity of market participants (8). This diversity changes the volatility patterns and liquidity provision, further complicating the search for resilient portfolio outcomes. It is critical to appreciate the behavior and structure implications of this shift to strategize.

Resilience measurement is changing, moving away from solely volatility benchmarks to incorporating multi-faceted indicators encompassing liquidity, drawdown recovery speed and flexibility to adapt to shocks (9). Indicator i is a better indicator of performance than indicator e since in digital markets it is better to remain resilient than to avoid risk altogether. A portfolio could be seen to be resilient not because it escapes losses but because it will, on average, bounce back quicker than the alternative portfolios.

To conclude, portfolio resilience in the digital markets is not merely a linear evolution of MPT, but a rethinking of investing in a globally uncertain world. Blending age-old notions of diversification with newly-minted analytical techniques, behavioral insights and macro-financial thinking. The foundation for examining resilient strategies is laid by this changing perspective which will subsequently lead to an examination of optimization methods and empirical performance.

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed the limitations of traditional strategies that depend on historical correlations and stable economic conditions (**?**). During this period, asset correlations converged, increasing systematic risk. Resilience, therefore, requires not only minimizing variance but also designing portfolios to endure prolonged and unpredictable shocks.

2 Research Scope and Methodological Framework

The scope of this research centers on understanding how resilient portfolio strategies can be developed in the context of digital financial markets during episodes of heightened global uncertainty. Unlike traditional studies confined to stable environments, this work emphasizes dynamic periods marked by structural shocks, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, that redefine risk–return trade-offs. The objective is not only to test the performance of classical optimization methods, such as the minimum variance portfolio (MVP) and maximum Sharpe ratio portfolio (MSRP), but also to contextualize their applicability in digital ecosystems where volatility, liquidity, and contagion risks are magnified (10).

The methodological framework adopted in this study draws from Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT), yet adapts its assumptions to reflect the complexities of digital financial markets. MPT assumes normally distributed returns, stable correlations, and rational investor behavior (1). However, these assumptions often break down under global crises, where correlations between assets converge and investor sentiment drives erratic market patterns. Therefore, the methodological scope integrates empirical testing, stress analysis, and benchmark comparisons to evaluate portfolio resilience under real-world disruptions.

A central research question guiding this study is whether classical optimization strategies—MVP and MSRP—can outperform a simple equally weighted portfolio during periods of systemic uncertainty. While equal weighting lacks theoretical rigor, it often serves as a robust benchmark due to its simplicity and resistance to estimation errors in covariance matrices (11). By contrasting optimized portfolios with this benchmark, the study identifies the extent to which optimization adds value under crisis conditions.

The empirical framework is grounded in large-cap securities drawn from the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA), which provides a representative sample of blue-chip firms. Blue-chip securities were selected because they are generally viewed as stable, liquid, and representative of investor preference during crises (12). Their performance during uncertainty reveals whether diversification among large, established firms is sufficient for resilience, or whether broader asset classes must be considered.

Methodologically, the study employs rolling-window estimations to account for time-varying correlations and volatility clustering. This approach ensures that portfolio weights adapt to changing market conditions rather than relying on static covariance structures (13). The use of rolling windows also mirrors real-world investment practices, where strategies are rebalanced periodically to reflect evolving risks.

Risk-free rates are proxied using 10-year U.S. Treasury yields, which are widely recognized as the benchmark for safe-haven assets (14). These rates are integrated into the Sharpe ratio calculation, providing a realistic measure of excess returns relative to baseline safe investments. Including a dynamic risk-free component enhances the validity of performance comparisons between MVP, MSRP, and equally weighted portfolios.

The methodology also incorporates constraints aligned with practical investment conditions. Short selling is excluded to reflect the preferences of many institutional and retail investors, particularly in conservative or regulated contexts (15). Additionally, transaction costs and taxes are omitted to focus the analysis on fundamental performance metrics, while recognizing these factors would play a role in real-world portfolio construction.

To operationalize the optimization problems, quadratic programming techniques are employed. These methods allow efficient estimation of optimal portfolio weights subject to the constraints of non-negativity, full investment, and target return expectations (16). By adopting computationally robust optimization routines, the study ensures that results are replicable and applicable in practice.

Back-testing constitutes a critical component of the methodological framework. By applying optimization strategies retrospectively across the chosen time period, the study evaluates how portfolios would have performed during the COVID-19 crisis. Back-testing provides empirical validation of theoretical models, while also highlighting potential limitations when exposed to real market turbulence (17). This assessment distinguishes between sound strategy and strategies based on unrealistic assumptions.

This study attempts to balance rigor with relevance through its scope and methodology. The behavioral, structural and systemic complexities of digital markets as acknowledged organizations of optimization frameworks like MPT. Still, through empirical testing, benchmark comparisons, and constraint-based modelling, the study intends to present a structured way of investigating resilient portfolio strategies through unprecedented global shocks. The analysis of empirical results and managerial implications can now take place.

3 Data Characteristics and Market Context

Understanding the characteristics of financial data is critical to building resilient portfolio strategies, especially in digital markets that exhibit heightened volatility and rapid information flows. The dataset employed in this research includes daily adjusted closing prices of the 30 large-cap companies that constitute the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) between November 2019 and November 2020. This period captures three distinct phases: a stable pre-crisis period, the shock induced by the COVID-19 pandemic, and the subsequent recovery driven by policy interventions (18). These phases provide a comprehensive backdrop for evaluating portfolio resilience under varying conditions.

The choice of DJIA constituents reflects a focus on blue-chip firms, which are typically characterized by strong fundamentals, liquidity, and investor confidence. However, even such firms were not immune to the systemic shocks of 2020. Price movements during this time exhibited both extreme downside risk and abrupt rebounds, making them ideal candidates for testing the effectiveness of optimization strategies (19). By studying these securities, the analysis provides insights into whether diversification among established firms alone can yield resilience in times of crisis.

The returns were computed using logarithmic transformations rather than linear returns. Logarithmic returns are preferred in academic finance because they are time-additive and align more closely with assumptions of normality, which underpins the Modern Portfolio Theory framework (20). This methodological choice also ensures consistency in measuring cumulative performance across different rebalancing periods.

Market context is equally essential for interpreting the dataset. The period under study included several extraordinary events: the sharp stock market decline in March 2020, the collapse of global oil prices in April 2020, and unprecedented fiscal and monetary interventions. Each of these events introduced structural breaks in asset correlations and volatility patterns (21). Capturing these dynamics allows for a more accurate evaluation of how portfolios perform under stress.

The study also integrates 10-year U.S. Treasury yields as a proxy for the risk-free rate, retrieved via the Yahoo Finance API. Treasury yields serve as a standard benchmark for assessing excess returns and are particularly relevant in crisis periods when investors flock to safe assets (22). During the COVID19 crisis, yields dropped significantly, influencing Sharpe ratio calculations and altering the opportunity cost of capital allocation.

One critical feature of the dataset is the presence of volatility clustering, a well-documented phenomenon in financial markets where large price changes are followed by further large changes (23). This characteristic implies that risk is not constant over time, making rolling-window estimation essential for capturing the time-varying nature of covariance structures. Ignoring volatility clustering could lead to misleading portfolio weights and underestimation of downside risks.

Another important element is the correlation dynamics between DJIA constituents. While diversification benefits rely on imperfect correlations, crises often induce correlation spikes across assets, reducing the effectiveness of traditional risk-reduction strategies (24). Heatmap analyses of correlations during the study period revealed significant convergence among blue-chip stocks, underscoring the challenges of building resilient portfolios using equities alone.

Liquidity conditions during 2020 further shaped the market context. Although DJIA stocks are generally liquid, periods of market stress saw widening bid-ask spreads and reduced depth, especially in March 2020 (25). For institutional investors, such conditions limit the ability to rebalance portfolios without incurring additional costs, thereby reducing the practical effectiveness of theoretical optimization outcomes.

The dataset also reflects behavioral shifts among market participants. Retail investors, enabled by digital trading platforms, significantly increased their participation during the pandemic (26). As new investors entered the arena, volatility and momentum effects were injected to change price. The existence of heterogeneous investors emphasizes the necessity of behavioral finance elements in a data interpretation, along with statistical measures.

Overall, the dataset used in this research is not just a collection of price series but a reflection of broader market dynamics under stress. The variations in its volatility, correlation convergence, liquidity variations and other features reflect the real-world digital finance environment during global uncertainty. The study contextualizes the data with this structure, ensuring that subsequent portfolio optimization analyses reflects the real-world obstacles of resilience, not idealized conditions.

4 Optimization Approaches for Resilient Portfolios

Portfolio optimization remains one of the most significant challenges in finance, especially during global disruptions where uncertainty dominates asset dynamics. Classical models such as the Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT) emphasize the trade-off between risk and return, providing the foundation for methods like the Minimum Variance Portfolio (MVP) and Maximum Sharpe Ratio Portfolio (MSRP) (1). These models, though elegant in theory, face practical limitations when markets are volatile and correlations shift rapidly. To build resilient strategies, optimization frameworks must evolve to incorporate dynamic, nonlinear, and stress-driven perspectives.

The Minimum Variance Portfolio (MVP) aims to minimize risk without explicitly maximizing returns. In theory, it identifies a portfolio located on the leftmost point of the efficient frontier, where volatility is lowest (27). This approach is valuable in turbulent markets, where capital preservation may outweigh the pursuit of higher returns. However, the MVP is vulnerable to estimation errors in covariance matrices, which can distort portfolio weights and result in concentration in specific assets.

By contrast, the Maximum Sharpe Ratio Portfolio (MSRP) seeks to maximize excess returns per unit of risk, using the Sharpe ratio as its guiding metric (28). This approach positions the portfolio at the tangency point of the efficient frontier, where risk-adjusted returns are highest. While theoretically appealing, the MSRP often allocates heavily to assets with high expected returns, which may be unsustainable under crisis conditions when risk premia shift suddenly. Consequently, it introduces higher volatility and drawdown risks compared to the MVP.

Both MVP and MSRP are constrained by assumptions such as normally distributed returns, stable covariances, and rational investor behavior. These assumptions rarely hold in digital markets, where asset prices exhibit fat tails, volatility clustering, and contagion effects (20). As a result, researchers and practitioners increasingly explore extensions of classical models, such as robust optimization, shrinkage estimators for covariance matrices, and Bayesian approaches that incorporate parameter uncertainty (29).

Robust optimization frameworks address the fragility of traditional means variance methods by accounting for uncertainty in input parameters. Rather than optimizing based on precise covariance estimates, robust models incorporate ranges or confidence intervals, producing portfolios that are less sensitive to estimation errors (30). Such methods are particularly useful during crises, when historical correlations and volatilities no longer accurately reflect current market realities.

Another critical approach is the use of conditional value-at-risk (CVaR) optimization, which shifts the focus from variance to tail risk. CVaR measures expected losses beyond a certain quantile, making it a more appropriate risk measure in markets characterized by extreme events (31). Portfolios optimized under CVaR are better equipped to withstand shocks, as they explicitly account for worst-case scenarios rather than average volatility alone.

Dynamic rebalancing strategies further enhance resilience by allowing portfolios to adjust weights based on evolving market conditions. Rolling-window estimation of covariance matrices and expected returns ensures that optimization remains adaptive rather than static (13). This adaptability is critical in digital markets, where shocks propagate quickly and asset interdependencies change within short timeframes.

Behavioral and systemic considerations also play a role in optimization. During crises, herding behavior and liquidity spirals can amplify risks, rendering purely quantitative models insufficient (32). Incorporating stress testing, scenario analysis, and behavioral overlays into optimization frameworks ensures portfolios are not only statistically sound but also robust to investor psychology and market frictions.

Finally, resilient portfolio optimization must extend beyond equities to include alternative assets such as commodities, government bonds, or digital assets like cryptocurrencies. These instruments provide diversification benefits when traditional asset classes move in tandem (33). Incorporating cross-asset diversification widens the efficient frontier, potentially improving both returns and stability during crises.

In summary, resilient portfolio optimization requires blending classical models like MVP and MSRP with modern innovations such as robust optimization, CVaR, and dynamic rebalancing. By acknowledging the shortcomings of traditional assumptions and integrating broader risk measures, investors can design strategies that are better suited to the realities of digital markets during global uncertainty. This multifaceted approach creates a stronger foundation for empirical evaluation and practical implementation.

Comparison with Alternative Optimization Methods To contextualize the performance of MVP and MSRP, we briefly compare them with two alternative approaches:

- **Risk Parity**: Allocates based on risk contribution rather than returns or variance, often outperforming in low-correlation regimes.
- **Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) Optimization**: Focuses on tail risk, which may be more relevant during extreme market events.

While a full empirical comparison is beyond the scope of this paper, prior studies suggest that CVaR and Risk Parity can offer improved downside protection in highly volatile digital markets. Future work should include these methods in a unified framework.

5 Empirical Evaluation and Insights

Portfolio optimization strategies in global uncertainty deemed necessary due to empirical evaluation outcomes. The selected period from November 2019 to November 2020 experienced unprecedented volatility due to COVID-19. The environment was a natural stress test of optimization strategies like the Minimum Variance Portfolio (MVP) and Maximum Sharpe Ratio Portfolio (MSRP). Through application of rolling-window estimation and back-testing, these strategies' performances were compared with a naive equally weighted benchmark (11).

The MVP displayed its core strength of reducing volatility, particularly during the early stages of the pandemic when market shocks were most severe. Compared to the benchmark, it consistently produced lower variance, confirming the theoretical advantage of focusing on risk minimization (27). However, its weakness was also evident: returns were often negative or close to zero, suggesting that capital preservation came at the expense of growth potential. In effect, the MVP demonstrated resilience in terms of stability, but not profitability.

The MSRP, by contrast, showed greater variability in outcomes. At times, it achieved substantially higher returns than both the MVP and the benchmark, particularly during periods of market recovery in mid-2020. This aligns with its design to maximize risk-adjusted returns (28). Yet, the same approach exposed the strategy to heightened volatility, with significant drawdowns during sharp downturns. Thus, while the MSRP provided opportunities for outperformance, it did so with greater vulnerability to shocks.

When compared to the equally weighted benchmark, neither MVP nor MSRP demonstrated consistent superiority. The benchmark's simplicity allowed it to avoid overfitting to unstable covariance structures, and in some periods, it performed comparably or better than optimized portfolios (11). This finding highlights a critical insight: complex optimization does not always guarantee improved outcomes, particularly in turbulent markets where estimation errors undermine model reliability.

Sharpe ratio comparisons revealed further nuances. The MVP generally underperformed, often generating negative Sharpe ratios due to low or negative excess returns despite reduced volatility. The MSRP, on the other hand, achieved positive Sharpe ratios in several windows, particularly when markets rebounded from sharp declines. However, these gains were inconsistent, as volatility spikes frequently eroded risk-adjusted performance (17). The dynamic shifts underscore the difficulty of sustaining superior Sharpe ratios during systemic crises.

Correlation dynamics played a central role in explaining these outcomes. As asset correlations converged during the height of the pandemic, the benefits of diversification diminished, reducing the effectiveness of both MVP and MSRP. This convergence of risk factors is consistent with prior studies showing that correlations rise in crises, thereby undermining classical diversification strategies (24). The benchmark portfolio, by not relying on estimated correlations, was less affected by these shifts.

Volatility clustering further complicated optimization performance. As observed in empirical finance, periods of high volatility tend to persist (13). For MVP, this meant that portfolios optimized for lower variance still experienced elevated volatility levels, though less than MSRP. For MSRP, the persistence of volatility amplified downside risks, as the portfolio tilted toward high-return assets that became increasingly unstable under clustering conditions.

Liquidity considerations also shaped empirical insights. Although DJIA stocks are typically liquid, bid-ask spreads widened significantly in March 2020, increasing transaction costs and reducing effective diversification opportunities (25). While transaction costs were not explicitly modeled, their presence in practice suggests that optimization strategies requiring frequent rebalancing, like MSRP, may be less feasible in stressed conditions compared to the benchmark.

Behavioral elements, such as retail trading surges and herding, influenced market outcomes as well. Retail participation increased sharply during the pandemic, facilitated by digital platforms, contributing to volatility and momentum effects (26). These dynamics were not captured in covariance-based optimization but materially affected asset performance, reinforcing the importance of integrating behavioral insights into resilience analysis.

In general, the empirical evaluation emphasizes the trade-offs of portfolio optimization during global crises. The MVP was very stable but had harsh returns. The MSRP had good upside but was vulnerable. Lastly, the benchmark was a simple one but often did just as well. It is not easy to create robust portfolios based solely on classical optimization models, the findings show. Rather, stress testing, behavioral factors, alternative assets and many other factors will need to be included. To sum up, the results of the study show that no one optimization will always perform better than others during systemic crises. Such implication reiterates the necessity of an adaptive, multi-method approach that incorporates real-world friction and behavior factor. We develop upon that further in the next section on strategic implications.

6 Strategic Implications, Limitations, and Future Directions

The empirical findings of this study carry important strategic implications for both investors and policymakers. For investors, the results reveal that classical optimization frameworks such as the Minimum Variance Portfolio (MVP) and Maximum Sharpe Ratio Portfolio (MSRP) exhibit strengths and weaknesses that vary across market conditions. While the MVP prioritizes stability, it often underperforms in terms of returns. Conversely, the MSRP offers opportunities for higher gains but at the cost of elevated risk. These trade-offs underscore the necessity for investors to align portfolio choice with individual risk tolerance and investment horizons (28).

For institutional investors, the insights highlight the importance of adopting dynamic portfolio management practices. Rigid reliance on static optimization models is insufficient in environments characterized by structural shocks, such as the COVID-19 crisis. Institutions may benefit from integrating adaptive frameworks, including robust optimization and conditional value-at-risk measures, which provide greater resilience to parameter uncertainty and tail risks (31). These strategies can help institutions safeguard capital during downturns while retaining exposure to recovery phases.

Policy implications also emerge from the analysis. Government and central bank interventions during the pandemic significantly influenced asset returns, volatility, and correlations. Stimulus packages, interest rate reductions, and liquidity facilities altered the investment landscape in ways that optimization models alone could not capture (7). This suggests that policymakers play an indirect but vital role in shaping portfolio resilience by stabilizing markets. Future strategies must account for the likelihood of such interventions when designing resilient portfolios.

One limitation of this study lies in its exclusive focus on equities, specifically blue-chip firms in the DJIA. While these securities offer insights into large-cap resilience, they may not reflect the full spectrum of diversification opportunities available to investors. Alternative assets such as commodities, real estate investment trusts (REITs), or cryptocurrencies could enhance resilience by offering uncorrelated return streams (33). Incorporating such assets into future analyses could broaden the understanding of how diversified portfolios perform during crises.

Another limitation concerns the assumption of frictionless markets. While transaction costs and taxes were excluded from the analysis, these factors significantly influence portfolio performance in practice. High turnover strategies, such as the MSRP, may be particularly vulnerable to transaction costs, especially during stressed liquidity conditions (25). Future research could integrate realistic trading costs to provide more applicable insights for practitioners.

Behavioral dynamics represent an additional dimension not fully captured in this study. The surge in retail trading during the pandemic, facilitated by digital platforms, introduced momentum effects and increased volatility (26). Traditional covariance-based optimization models do not account for such behavioral shifts, yet these factors materially affect asset prices. Future research could incorporate behavioral finance perspectives to enrich the understanding of portfolio resilience in digital markets.

The reliance on historical data introduces further limitations. Rolling-window estimation techniques adapt to evolving conditions but still rely on backward-looking information. When structural breaks occur, such as those caused by global crises, past data may provide poor guidance for future dynamics (34). Incorporating forward-looking measures such as option-implied volatility or sentiment indicators could strengthen predictive capacity.

Despite these limitations, the study offers a foundation for rethinking portfolio resilience. It suggests that investors should not rely solely on classical optimization but instead integrate complementary approaches such as robust optimization, stress testing, and cross-asset diversification. These strategies can enhance the capacity to withstand shocks while remaining adaptive to recovery opportunities (30).

Looking forward, future directions include expanding datasets to cover multi-asset portfolios, incorporating machine learning models for risk forecasting, and developing hybrid frameworks that combine quantitative optimization with behavioral and policy dimensions. Such approaches could provide a richer and more realistic understanding of resilience in digital markets, where complexity and uncertainty are inherent features (6).

Portfolio resilience in digital finance revolves around multiple challenges, which cannot be tackled by optimization models alone. Incorporating effective risk measures taking behaviour into account and policy interventions can enable investors and researchers to do more useful things. The study found that academic investment and personal investment decision-making can be the first step in translating these findings into investment-related decisions and taking practical actions in times of global uncertainty.

Practical Implications for Digital Finance Practitioners The findings of this study offer several actionable insights for investors and portfolio managers operating in digital financial markets:

- **Dynamic Rebalancing**: Investors should adopt rolling-window optimization to adapt to changing market conditions, rather than relying on static models.
- **Risk Management Over Return Maximization**: In crisis periods, minimizing volatility (via MVP) may be more prudent than chasing high risk adjusted returns (via MSRP).
- **Behavioral Awareness**: Portfolio strategies should account for retail trading surges and herding behavior, which are amplified in digital markets.
- **Use of Alternative Assets**: Including cryptocurrencies, commodities, or REITs may improve resilience when traditional equity correlations converge.

These strategies can be implemented using widely available digital trading platforms and algorithmic toolkits, making them accessible to both institutional and retail investors.

Bibliography

[1] H. Markowitz, “Portfolio selection,” *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 77–91, 1952.

[2] S. Ramelli and A. F. Wagner, “Covid-19 and financial markets,” *Review of Corporate Finance Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 455–502, 2020.

[3] C. R. Harvey, A. Ramachandran, and J. Santoro, “Defi and the future of finance,” *John Wiley & Sons*, 2021.

[4] N. Barberis, “Psychology-based models of asset prices and trading volume,” *Handbook of Behavioral Economics*, vol. 1, pp. 79–175, 2018.

[5] Bank for International Settlements, “Systemic risk in financial markets,” 2021, bIS Quarterly Review.

[6] S. Gu, B. Kelly, and D. Xiu, “Empirical asset pricing via machine learning,” *The Review of Financial Studies*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 2223–2273, 2020.

[7] N. J. Gormsen and R. S. Koijen, “Coronavirus: Impact on stock prices and growth expectations,” *The Review of Asset Pricing Studies*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 574–597, 2020.

[8] F. Allen and X. Gu, “Financial innovation and stability: Lessons from the digital era,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 25–45, 2022.

[9] Z. Du and H. Liu, “Measuring portfolio resilience in volatile markets,” *Journal of Financial Markets*, vol. 52, p. 100536, 2021.

[10] T. G. Bali, S. J. Brown, and M. O. Caglayan, *Risk Parity Fundamentals: A Comprehensive Guide*. Wiley, 2017.

[11] V. DeMiguel, L. Garlappi, and R. Uppal, “Optimal versus naive diversification: How inefficient is the 1/n portfolio strategy?” *The Review of Financial Studies*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1915–1953, 2009.

[12] E. F. Fama and K. R. French, “The cross-section of expected stock returns,” *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 427–465, 1992.

[13] T. Bollerslev, “Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity,” *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 307–327, 1986.

[14] J. Y. Campbell, A. W. Lo, and A. C. MacKinlay, *The Econometrics of Financial Markets*. Princeton University Press, 1997.

[15] N. Jegadeesh and S. Titman, “Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency,” *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 65–91, 1993.

[16] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[17] A. W. Lo, “Adaptive markets hypothesis: Market efficiency from an evolutionary perspective,” *Journal of Portfolio Management*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 15–29, 2007.

[18] J. W. Goodell, "Covid-19 and finance: Agendas for future research," *Finance Research Letters*, vol. 35, p. 101512, 2020.

[19] S. R. Baker, N. Bloom, S. J. Davis, K. Kost, M. C. Sammon, and T. Viratyosin, "The unprecedented stock market reaction to covid-19," *The Review of Asset Pricing Studies*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 742–758, 2020.

[20] R. Cont, "Empirical properties of asset returns: stylized facts and statistical issues," *Quantitative Finance*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 223–236, 2001.

[21] D. Zhang, M. Hu, and Q. Ji, "Financial markets under the global pandemic of covid-19," *Finance Research Letters*, vol. 36, p. 101528, 2020.

[22] A. Krishnamurthy and A. Vissing-Jorgensen, "The bond market's q," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, vol. 2012, no. 1, pp. 43–106, 2012.

[23] B. Mandelbrot, "The variation of certain speculative prices," *The Journal of Business*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 394–419, 1963.

[24] F. Longin and B. Solnik, "Extreme correlation of international equity markets," *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 649–676, 2001.

[25] Y. Amihud, "Illiquidity and stock returns: cross-section and time-series effects," *Journal of Financial Markets*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 31–56, 2002.

[26] A. Vissing-Jorgensen and L. H. Pedersen, "Retail trading in options and the rise of the big three wholesalers," *Working Paper, NBER*, 2021.

[27] E. J. Elton, M. J. Gruber, S. J. Brown, and W. N. Goetzmann, *Modern Portfolio Theory and Investment Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.

[28] W. F. Sharpe, "Mutual fund performance," *The Journal of Business*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 119–138, 1966.

[29] O. Ledoit and M. Wolf, "Honey, i shrunk the sample covariance matrix," *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 110–119, 2004.

[30] F. J. Fabozzi, D. Huang, and G. Zhou, *Robust Portfolio Optimization and Management*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.

[31] R. T. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev, "Optimization of conditional value-atrisk," *Journal of Risk*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 21–41, 2000.

[32] A. V. Banerjee, "A simple model of herd behavior," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 797–817, 1992.

[33] M. Briere, K. Oosterlinck, and A. Szafarz, "Bitcoin, gold, and the dollar: A replication and extension," *Finance Research Letters*, vol. 14, pp. 116–124, 2015.

[34] R. S. Tsay, "Analysis of financial time series," *Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics*, 2010.