Sarcouncil Journal of Applied Sciences

ISSN(Online): 2945-3437

Volume- 05| Issue- 08| 2025

Review Article

Received: 17-07-2025 | **Accepted:** 07-08-2025 | **Published:** 28-08-2025

Stablecoin Architecture and Price Stability: A Comprehensive Review of Peg Mechanisms and Collateral Frameworks in Digital Finance

Naveen Reddy Dendi

Independent Researcher, USA

Abstract: Stablecoins are a significant innovation in digital finance that aims to connect the stability of traditional fiat currencies with the programmability of blockchain-based financial technologies. Stablecoins create parity with their fiat counterparts in a variety of ways through either a combination or single mechanism of fiat-backed reserves, algorithmic feed supply changes, and crypto collateralization methods. With fiat-backed stablecoins like USDC, traditional currency reserves are maintained on a one-for-one basis. Algorithmic stablecoins buy and sell reserve digital assets to maintain a fixed currency price, i.e., maintaining equilibrium via automated feed-supply adjustments that cancel each other out and keep the price fixed. Crypto-backed stablecoins like DAI use overcollateralization principles and reserves to absorb the price fluctuations of the underlying crypto assets and prevent price deviation from parity. Hybrid stablecoin architectures that tokenize baskets of real-world collateral and diversified assets are also emerging in the blockchain space. The risks associated with these differing stablecoin mechanisms influence their ability to mitigate risk exposure while maintaining transparency, disclosure measures, and compliance with regulators. There are numerous possible applications of stablecoin mechanics, ranging from remittance services to digital savings products and decentralized finance protocols, where preserving stable value is critical. Having a good grasp of the technical architectures and economic theory that underpin the different stabilization mechanisms is essential for assessing systemic risk exposure as well as for achieving practical, pragmatic deployment scenarios in rapidly evolving financial ecosystems.

Keywords: Stablecoins, price stability mechanisms, collateral models, cryptocurrency pegs, decentralized finance.

INTRODUCTION

The Emergence of Stablecoins in Digital Finance & Core Characteristics and Functional Design

Stablecoins, which are fungible tokens built on blockchain, have a stable value compared to some collateralized asset, typically a fiat currency. Stablecoins are different from Bitcoin and Ethereum, which considerably change in price based on market sentiment. Stablecoins employ various technical measures to create lower volatility. Market participants use these tokens to hedge their positions, for transactions between different cryptocurrencies, and to hold value during shaky market conditions. The models supporting price stability, however, involve many different architectural components, including holding a bank account to back protocols that use algorithms to manage supply. As with anything related to stablecoins, the architecture that supports price stability reflects different philosophical approaches to stability while maintaining some of the same benefits of blockchain (Islam, M. R. *et al.*, 2018).

Bridging Traditional Finance with Distributed Ledgers

The intersection of conventional monetary stability and distributed ledger capabilities creates unique financial instruments serving multiple market needs. Blockchain infrastructure enables near-instantaneous value transfers across borders without correspondent banking relationships, while smart contract functionality allows automatic execution of complex financial agreements. Traditional payment rails often require multiple days for international settlements, whereas stablecoin transfers complete within minutes. This technological leap forward particularly benefits regions with limited banking infrastructure, where mobile phones provide easier access than physical bank branches. Cost reductions emerge from eliminating multiple intermediary institutions typically involved in cross-border transactions (Kukman, T., & Gričar, S. 2025).

Analytical Framework and Coverage Parameters

This examination dissects various stabilization techniques employed across major stablecoin implementations, evaluating their technical robustness and practical limitations. Analysis encompasses reserve-backed models maintaining dollar deposits in regulated financial institutions, mathematical algorithms attempting stability through automated supply management, and collateralized debt positions securing tokens against cryptocurrency deposits. Hybrid structures combining elements from multiple approaches receive attention for their attempts to balance competing priorities. Each model presents unique risk profiles affecting user confidence and regulatory acceptance across different jurisdictions.

***Corresponding Author:** Naveen Reddy Dendi

DOI- https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16982562

Transformative Potential for Global Money Movement

The growing adoption of stablecoins is fundamentally transforming how individual actors and institutions facilitate transactions across borders, and threatening existing intermediaries and payment networks. Emerging markets often benefit as remittance costs are reduced, and settlement speeds are often much faster than with correspondent banking. The programmable nature of stablecoins creates financial products previously inconceivable with conventional currency, from sequencing automated escrow services to establishing conditional payments triggered by external data feeds (Kukman, T., & Gričar, S. 2025). Regulators around the world struggle to classify stablecoins and determine appropriate oversight regimes even as use cases quickly evolve from cryptocurrency trading to purchases for mainstream commerce and treasury operations for institutions.

ECONOMIC THEORY BEHIND STABLE VALUE DIGITAL CURRENCIES

Monetary Pegging Theory and Exchange Rate Dynamics

Exchange rate pegging involves connecting one currency's value to another through deliberate policy interventions and market operations. Governments employ foreign exchange reserves to purchase or sell their currency when market rates deviate from target levels. Such arrangements require substantial reserve holdings, disciplined fiscal management, and unwavering political commitment during speculative attacks. Interest rate adjustments and capital controls often supplement direct market interventions. Digital stable-value tokens apply comparable logic through automated protocols rather than discretionary central bank actions. Smart contracts execute predetermined rules for supply expansion or contraction based on price deviations, mimicking traditional monetary authority responses while removing human discretion from the process (Ramamurthy, B., & Madurai, S. 2022).

Evolution of Value-Stable Monetary Instruments Through History

Monetary systems have long sought mechanisms to preserve consistent purchasing power across time periods and geographic regions. Gold-backed currencies dominated international commerce until the twentieth century, providing natural supply constraints and universal acceptability. The Sterling Area and Franc Zone represented regional attempts at coordinated exchange rate stability through colonial and post-colonial arrangements. Private banks issued convertible notes before central banking monopolies emerged, creating competitive currencies backed by tangible assets. Modern currency boards in territories like Gibraltar and Bermuda demonstrate contemporary applications of rigid backing requirements. These precedents inform current digital token designs, particularly regarding reserve management, convertibility guarantees, and crisis response protocols (FasterCapital, 2025).

Extreme Price Movements in Cryptocurrency Markets

Digital asset markets have price fluctuations that exponentially exceed traditional financial instruments, and because of the concentrated ownership of digital assets, thin order books, and psychological factors that create herd mentality. Leading cryptocurrencies behave dramatically by moving twenty percent in a single trading session. Thus, the impossible commercial paradigm limits the commercial adoption of digital assets. Market manipulation occurs with unregulated exchanges and limited oversight. Public news events create knee-jerk trader reactions as they do not have models to assess fundamental value for a purely speculative asset class. Moreover, technical issues, such as exchange outages and blockchain congestion during stressful periods, add further volatility. Such extremes prompted developers to create price-stable alternatives to enjoy the benefits of decentralized blockchains while protecting participants from value risk (Ramamurthy, B., & Madurai, S. 2022).

Analytical Models for Stability Assessment

Comprehensive evaluation frameworks examine multiple dimensions when assessing stable-value token designs and their resilience under stress conditions. Critical factors include reserve adequacy relative to circulating supply, redemption mechanism reliability during bank runs, price feed accuracy from decentralized oracles, and governance token concentration among founding teams. Transparency metrics evaluate audit completeness, reserve attestations, and smart contract verifiability. Risk scoring incorporates both technical vulnerabilities and economic attack vectors specific to each stabilization approach (FasterCapital, 2025).

Publisher: SARC Publisher

VALUE STABILITY ARCHITECTURE IN DIGITAL TOKEN SYSTEMS

Traditional Currency Backing Through Reserve Holdings

Digital tokens maintaining dollar parity through physical currency reserves operate on straightforward principles where each token represents a claim against deposited funds. Issuers accumulate dollars in banking institutions before releasing equivalent blockchain tokens, establishing one-to-one correspondence between digital and traditional money forms. Accounting firms periodically examine these holdings, producing attestation reports confirming reserve sufficiency, though methodologies and disclosure standards differ markedly between operators. Redemption processes enable token-to-cash conversions, yet practical barriers, including minimum transaction sizes, verification procedures, and processing timeframes, restrict access primarily to institutional participants. Reserve composition raises ongoing debates, particularly when operators invest deposits in yield-generating instruments rather than maintaining pure cash positions (Cole, J. 2024).

Mathematical Protocols for Supply Elasticity

Supply-responsive protocols attempt price stability without external asset backing, instead relying on programmatic token creation and destruction based on market signals. Above-peg prices trigger new token generation distributed through liquidity pools or direct sales, expanding supply until prices normalize. The below-peg scenarios activate burning mechanisms or lock tokens in temporary vaults, contracting available supply to restore target valuations. Multi-token architectures frequently support these systems, with volatile tokens absorbing price pressures while stable tokens maintain consistent values. External price feeds from Oracle networks enable smart contracts to detect deviations and execute corrections, though data source reliability becomes critical for system integrity. Mathematical models alone struggle during confidence crises when participants doubt future stability, regardless of protocol actions (Wen, H. *et al*., 2025).

Blended Systems Balancing Multiple Objectives

Combination designs merge collateral backing with elastic supply features, attempting optimization across competing priorities of efficiency and security. Fractional reserves have lower capital requirements than full backing while retaining baseline value guarantees during market turbulence. Certain projects employ volatile cryptocurrency reserves supplemented by supply adjustments and trading stability assurance for operational independence from traditional finance. Alternative configurations maintain core fiat positions enhanced by controlled supply flexibility, providing fundamental value floors with upside elasticity. Decentralized governance coordinates these complex arrangements through token voting, though this introduces coordination problems and potential manipulation vectors. Increased sophistication brings heightened failure risks as interaction effects between components create emergent behaviors (Wen, H. *et al*., 2025).

Table 1: Comparison of Stablecoin Stabilization Mechanisms (Ramamurthy, B., & Madurai, S. 2022; Wen, H. *et al*., 2025; Cole, J. 2024)

Mechanism Type	Collateral Required	Decentralization Level	Capital Efficiency	Primary Risk Factors
Fiat-Backed	Full reserves	Low	Low	Custodial risk, regulatory compliance
Algorithmic	None	High	High	Death spiral, confidence crisis
Crypto-Backed	Overcollateralized	Medium-High	Medium	Liquidation cascades, oracle failures
Hybrid	Partial/Mixed	Medium	Medium-High	Complex interactions, governance risks

Terra Ecosystem Collapse: Algorithmic Design Limitations Exposed

The UST experiment demonstrated catastrophic consequences when purely mathematical stabilization confronts sustained selling pressure absent external value guarantees. Terra's mechanism burned LUNA tokens to mint UST during contractions and reversed this process during expansions, creating circular dependencies between paired assets. Anchor lending protocol offered unsustainably high yields, subsidizing artificial UST demand, masking underlying structural weaknesses until withdrawal cascades began. Once significant redemptions started,

Publisher: SARC Publisher

algorithmic responses proved insufficient as the LUNA supply explosion failed to maintain UST pricing, resulting in the simultaneous collapse of both tokens within days. This dramatic failure illuminated fundamental flaws in reflexive systems lacking independent value sources, especially when market psychology shifts from greed to fear (Cole, J. 2024).

BACKING MECHANISMS AND TRUST FRAMEWORK DESIGN

Cryptocurrency Collateral Protocols Using Excess Deposits

Blockchain lending platforms generate stable-value tokens by requiring borrowers to deposit cryptocurrency worth substantially more than borrowed amounts. Users place digital assets such as Ethereum or Bitcoin into automated vaults, receiving newly minted stable tokens valued at predetermined fractions of deposited collateral. Price volatility protection comes from maintaining large safety margins between loan and collateral values. When market downturns reduce collateral worth toward danger zones, software automatically sells deposits to close positions before losses occur. Independent operators called keepers scan blockchain data constantly, executing these forced sales for profit while protecting protocol integrity. Capital inefficiency represents the primary drawback, as users must lock up excessive value to borrow modest amounts (Feng, Z. *et al*., 2024).

Banking Infrastructure Supporting Token Reserve Management

Companies issuing stable tokens against traditional money holdings establish relationships with licensed financial institutions for fund custody. Legal separation between corporate assets and customer deposits protects token holders during potential bankruptcy scenarios. Specialized trust entities often intermediate between token operators and banks, adding governance oversight and regulatory compliance layers. Professional auditors release periodic reports confirming that bank balances match outstanding token supplies, though delays between audits leave information gaps. Different countries mandate varying requirements for deposit insurance, operational procedures, and reporting standards. Traditional banking relationships introduce familiar regulatory protections while constraining innovation within existing financial frameworks (Hossain, T. *et al*., 2025).

Multi-Asset Pools and Cross-Network Collateral Strategies

Recent developments explore mixing different backing assets within single protocols, spreading risks while improving operational characteristics. Technology enabling asset transfers between separate blockchains allows collateral diversity beyond individual network constraints. Portfolio approaches aggregate multiple existing stable tokens, producing composite instruments with reduced concentration hazards. Community-funded insurance mechanisms absorb unexpected losses, distributing costs among all participants rather than individual position holders. Market-responsive parameters modify collateral demands based on volatility measurements, requiring higher deposits during unstable periods. Growing complexity accompanies these efficiency gains, introducing new failure possibilities through component interactions (Hossain, T. *et al*., 2025).

Bridging Physical Assets Into Digital Token Backing

Converting tangible property into blockchain representations opens new collateral categories beyond native digital assets. Government bonds entered stable token reserves successfully, generating modest returns while preserving high liquidity characteristics. Precious metal tokenization follows established patterns from exchange-traded funds, though physical delivery complications persist. Property markets attract tokenization interest despite regulatory uncertainty and limited trading volumes compared to traditional assets. Legal systems worldwide grapple with adapting ownership concepts across digital and physical boundaries. Information feeds connecting off-chain valuations to smart contracts become critical infrastructure, requiring trustworthy sources for pricing and verification data (Feng, Z. *et al*., 2024).

Table 2: Collateral Models and Implementation Characteristics (Feng, Z. *et al*., 2024; Hossain, T. *et al*., 2025)

Collateral Type	Examples	Liquidity Profile	Verification Method	Regulatory Complexity
Fiat Currency	USD, EUR	High	Bank attestations	Medium
Cryptocurrencies	ETH, BTC	High	On-chain verification	Low
Government Bonds	T-Bills	High	Custodian reports	Medium
Commodities	Gold, Silver	Medium	Vault audits	High

Publisher: SARC Publisher

Real Estate	Property tokens	Low	Title verification	Very High

OPERATIONAL HAZARDS AND REAL-WORLD IMPLEMENTATION

Disclosure Standards and Verification Processes

Token operators are under increasing pressure to prove asset backing via periodic third-party examinations and formal public reporting. Accountants review bank statements, custodial agreements, and blockchain transactions to compare the statement of reserves to the amount held in custody. However, banking technicalities do not allow for a real-time verification of the backing, leading to periodic snapshots, not constant verification. Code security reviews by specialized blockchain auditors identify potential exploit vectors prior to mainnet deployment, although review thoroughness depends heavily on auditor expertise. Centralized platforms typically release monthly attestations while decentralized alternatives enable direct blockchain inspection of collateral positions. Jurisdictional requirements increasingly dictate specific reporting formats, examination schedules, and legal accountability structures governing operational transparency (IEEE Blockchain and Distributed Ledgers Working Group (Chair: Chenhui Wang), 2025).

Hazard Analysis Methodologies Across Implementation Types

Comprehensive hazard identification requires examining technological weak points, economic manipulation possibilities, control structure vulnerabilities, and shutdown scenarios from authorities. Extreme condition modeling tests system resilience against mass withdrawals, backing asset collapses, price feed corruptions, and synchronized exit attempts, revealing failure thresholds. Numerical indicators monitor backing levels, trading volumes, withdrawal patterns, and price stability measurements throughout varying market environments. Non-quantitative elements include founding team backgrounds, corporate structuring choices, licensing positions, and participant involvement in decision-making processes. Evaluation frameworks assign different importance levels to factors depending on architectural choices and target applications. Adaptive tracking infrastructure modifies hazard ratings based on evolving market dynamics and newly identified attack strategies (Bluhm, M. *et al.*, 2024).

Table 3: Risk Assessment Framework Components (IEEE Blockchain and Distributed Ledgers Working Group (Chair: Chenhui Wang), 2025; Bluhm, M. *et al.*, 2024)

Risk Category	Key Metrics	Monitoring Frequency	Mitigation Strategies
Technical	Smart contract audits, bug bounties	Continuous	Code reviews, formal verification
Economic	Collateralization ratios, liquidity depth	Real-time	Dynamic parameters, circuit breakers
Governance	Token distribution, voting participation	Weekly	Timelock mechanisms, multi-sig controls
Regulatory	Compliance status, license coverage	Monthly	Legal counsel, proactive engagement
Market	Price deviation, redemption volumes	Real-time	Reserve buffers, liquidity incentives

Payment Corridors, Value Storage, and Blockchain Finance Integration

International money transfers use stable tokens to bypass variations in exchange rates associated with processing times and lower transfer costs. Foreign workers use token dosage to send wages home to family members and avoid more expensive stores through direct peer-to-peer transfers by sending a friend in one country the token equivalent value of their wages and then receiving it from a family member in the form of cash. Citizens in hyperinflationary nations are moving towards dollar-linked tokens as hedges against depreciating currency value. The loans on most blockchain lending platforms were in stable token-denominated loans that allow end-users to predict repayments without exposure to pricing fluctuations due to cryptocurrency. Users tend to exit exchange trading using stable token pairs, and exchanges often encourage users to park value between trades using stable tokens. Commercial users are also starting to adopt tokens to process

Publisher: SARC Publisher

payments as merchants see the appeal of predictable valuations with other ongoing benefits of blockchain payments (IEEE Blockchain and Distributed Ledgers Working Group (Chair: Chenhui Wang), 2025).

Table 4: Stablecoin Applications Across Financial Services (Islam, M. R. *et al*., 2018; Kukman, T., & Gričar, S. 2025; IEEE, Chenhui Wang. 2025)

Application	**Traditional Alternative**	**Key Advantages**	**Adoption Barriers**
Cross-border Payments	Wire transfers, SWIFT	Lower fees, faster settlement	Regulatory uncertainty
Inflation Hedging	Foreign currency accounts	Accessibility, divisibility	Technical knowledge required
DeFi Lending	Bank loans	Permissionless access, transparency	Smart contract risks
Trading Settlement	Fiat on/off ramps	Speed, availability	Exchange integration
Merchant Payments	Credit cards	Lower fees, programmability	Price volatility concerns

Legal Frameworks and Jurisdictional Complexities

National approaches toward stable token regulation vary dramatically, ranging from accommodative payment instrument classifications to restrictive banking-equivalent treatment. Customer identification requirements clash with blockchain pseudonymity preferences, necessitating uncomfortable trade-offs between legal compliance and user accessibility. Investment contract definitions potentially capture tokens offering returns from reserve deployments, triggering securities registration obligations. Taxation ambiguities surround conversion timing, yield accrual, and international movements crossing multiple legal systems. Limited international harmonization despite borderless token movements generates regulatory shopping incentives and multi-jurisdictional compliance burdens. Evolving legal structures attempt reasonable compromises between fostering technological advancement and ensuring user protections alongside systemic stability (Bluhm, M. *et al*., 2024).

CONCLUSION

Stablecoins mark an important advancement in digital finance that successfully combines the technological value of blockchain systems with the price stability requirements of real-world currency instruments. The different stabilization strategies—from fiat-denominated reserves to algorithmic protocols to crypto-collateralized systems—offer different trade-offs among decentralization, capital efficiency, and systemic resilience. The historical failures, mainly the Terra ecosystem bankruptcy, have stressed the importance of having a good backing mechanism and the risks posed by purely algorithmic designs under stress in a volatile marketplace. The market for stablecoins is growing and increasingly moving into non-cryptocurrency trading applications such as the provision of cross-border payments, inflation hedges, and decentralized lending markets (DeFi). Regulatory and legislating authorities worldwide are creating frameworks and facing competing priorities to protect consumers while still trying to create an environment conducive to innovation. The recent propensity to develop hybrid stablecoin types with different types of backing collateral and cross-chain functionality further indicates that there will be new developments related to stablecoins. In the future, there will likely be a demand for higher capital efficiency in exchange for some assurance of stability, greater transparency through real-time attestation, and a higher degree of regulatory certainty across jurisdictions. Ultimately, the broader prospect of stablecoins fully realizing their potential rests on sustained technological improvement, ongoing engagement with risk managers, and ongoing engagement with regulators to establish a sustainable ecosystem capable of providing space for stablecoins to flourish as a financial technology innovation.

REFERENCES

1. Islam, M. R., Nor, R. M., Al-Shaikhli, I. F., & Mohammad, K. S. "Cryptocurrency vs. fiat currency: architecture, algorithm, cashflow & ledger technology on emerging economy: the influential facts of cryptocurrency and fiat currency." *2018 International Conference on Information and Communication Technology for the Muslim World (ICT4M)*. IEEE, (2018).
2. Kukman, T., & Gričar, S. "Blockchain for quality: Advancing security, efficiency, and

Publisher: SARC Publisher

transparency in financial systems." *FinTech* 4.1 (2025): 7.
3. Ramamurthy, B., & Madurai, S. "The technology and potential of Stablecoin." (2022).
4. FasterCapital, "Mastering the Exchange Rate Mechanism: The Intricacies of Currency Pegs." *IEEE-affiliated economic policy archive*, (2025). https://fastercapital.com/content/Mastering-the-Exchange-Rate-Mechanism--The-Intricacies-of-Currency-Pegs.html
5. Wen, H., Li, S., & Zhang, J. "Hybrid Monetary Ecosystems: Integrating Stablecoins and Fiat in the Future of Currency Systems." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.10997* (2025).
6. Cole, J. "Understanding Fiat-Backed Stablecoin Reserves: Mechanisms, Risks, and Implications in Crypto." *BlockApps Technical Journal*, (2024). https://blockapps.net/blog/understanding-fiat-backed-stablecoin-reserves-mechanisms-risks-and-implications-in-crypto/
7. Feng, Z., Mohanty, H., & Krishnamachari, B. "Modeling and analysis of crypto-backed over-collateralized stable derivatives in DeFi." *Frontiers in Blockchain* 7 (2024): 1392812.
8. Hossain, T., Bappy, F. H., Zaman, T. S., & Islam, T. "CrossLink: A Decentralized Framework for Secure Cross-Chain Smart Contract Execution." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.09319* (2025).
9. IEEE, (Chair: Chenhui Wang), "Standard for Blockchain-Based Stablecoins Payment Service Requirements." *IEEE Standards Association (IEEE SA)*, (2025). https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/3272.01/11984/
10. Bluhm, M., Vasiljević, A. C., Derivaux, S., & Jessen, S. T. H. "Real-time risk metrics for programmatic stablecoin crypto asset-liability management (CALM)." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13399* (2024).

Source of support: Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:
Dendi, N. R. “Stablecoin Architecture and Price Stability: A Comprehensive Review of Peg Mechanisms and Collateral Frameworks in Digital Finance." *Sarcouncil Journal of Applied Sciences* 5.8 (2025): pp 67-73.

Publisher: SARC Publisher