



International Journal of Creative Research and Publications

Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal



Research Article

Evaluating Monetary Policy Effectiveness Under Economic Shocks: Evidence From COVID-19 Era Studies

Randeep Kaur

Assistant Professor, P.G. Department of Commerce, Mata Gujri College, Fatehgarh Sahi, Punjab, India

Corresponding Author: * Randeep Kaur

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22341788>

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic generated an unprecedented global economic shock, simultaneously disrupting supply, demand, financial markets, international trade, and employment. In response, central banks implemented extraordinary monetary policy measures, including policy-rate reductions, quantitative easing, liquidity provision, targeted refinancing, forward guidance, and credit-support facilities. However, evidence regarding the effectiveness of these interventions remains heterogeneous across countries, policy instruments, and economic outcomes. This study conducts a meta-analysis of empirical research published between 2020 and 2023 to quantitatively assess the effectiveness of monetary policy during the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent recovery period, interpreting the accumulated evidence from a 2026 perspective. The analysis synthesizes 42 empirical studies comprising 187 standardized effect sizes from advanced and emerging economies. A random-effects model is employed to estimate pooled effects, while heterogeneity, subgroup differences, and potential publication bias are examined. The findings indicate a statistically significant positive overall effect of monetary policy interventions, with a pooled Hedges' g of 0.28 (95% CI: 0.19–0.37; $p < 0.01$). Substantial heterogeneity is observed across studies ($I^2 = 76.8\%$), indicating that policy effectiveness varied according to economic and institutional conditions. Unconventional monetary policy instruments, including quantitative easing and liquidity measures, demonstrate a stronger effect ($g = 0.34$) than conventional rate cuts ($g = 0.19$). Monetary policy effects are also stronger in advanced economies ($g = 0.31$) than in emerging economies ($g = 0.22$). Egger's test indicates no statistically significant evidence of publication bias ($p = 0.14$). The findings suggest that monetary policy played an important stabilizing role during the pandemic, particularly through unconventional instruments, although its effectiveness was context-dependent. The study highlights the importance of flexible, credible, and appropriately calibrated monetary policy frameworks for managing future systemic economic shocks while balancing economic stabilisation, financial stability, and inflation control.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 3139-6313
- **Received:** 05-07-2026
- **Accepted:** 28-08-2026
- **Published:** 31-08-2026
- **IJCRP:** 1(4); 2026: 202-208
- **©2026, All Rights Reserved**
- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Kaur R. Evaluating Monetary Policy Effectiveness Under Economic Shocks: Evidence From COVID-19 Era Studies. Int. J. Creative Res. Publ. 2026;1(4):202-208.

Access this Article Online



www.jcrp.in

KEYWORDS: Monetary Policy Effectiveness; COVID-19 Pandemic; Economic Shocks; Meta-Analysis; Monetary Policy Responses; Unconventional Monetary Policy; Quantitative Easing; Central Bank Interventions; Economic Recovery; Inflation; Financial Stability.

1. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic, which emerged globally in early 2020, triggered one of the most severe and unprecedented economic shocks in modern history. Unlike conventional financial crises, the pandemic simultaneously disrupted both supply and demand across economies, resulting in sharp contractions in output, rising unemployment, disruptions in international trade and supply chains, heightened financial market volatility, and unprecedented uncertainty. The scale and speed of the economic disruption required central banks across the world to implement extraordinary monetary policy measures to preserve financial stability, sustain credit flows, support economic activity, and restore market confidence. These measures included rapid reductions in policy interest rates, large-scale asset purchase programmes, enhanced liquidity provision, targeted refinancing operations, forward guidance, credit support facilities, and other unconventional monetary policy interventions.

Monetary policy has traditionally played a central role in mitigating economic downturns through its influence on interest rates, credit availability, investment, consumption, asset prices, exchange rates, and inflation expectations. However, the exceptional nature of the COVID-19 shock raised fundamental questions regarding the effectiveness and transmission of monetary policy under conditions of extreme uncertainty and restricted economic activity. In many economies, policy interest rates rapidly approached the effective lower bound, limiting the scope for further conventional monetary easing and increasing reliance on unconventional instruments such as quantitative easing, targeted long-term refinancing operations, asset purchase programmes, yield curve interventions, and credit support mechanisms. Although these interventions were implemented on an unprecedented scale, empirical evidence has produced varying conclusions regarding their effects on economic growth, inflation, employment, credit conditions, financial markets, and financial stability.

The assessment of monetary policy effectiveness became even more complex as economies moved from the acute phase of the pandemic towards recovery. During 2021–2023, the reopening of economies was accompanied by supply-chain disruptions, labour-market imbalances, commodity-price increases, changing consumption patterns, and rising inflationary pressures. Central banks consequently shifted from highly accommodative monetary policies towards monetary tightening and normalization. This transition created an important analytical dimension for evaluating pandemic-era monetary policy: whether the measures that successfully stabilized financial markets and supported economic activity during the initial crisis also generated sustainable recovery without creating significant medium-term macroeconomic and financial imbalances. Consequently, the effectiveness of monetary policy during COVID-19 needs to be examined not only through its immediate crisis-management effects but also through its subsequent implications for inflation, economic recovery, credit conditions, financial stability, and monetary policy normalization.

A substantial body of empirical research has emerged since the beginning of the pandemic examining the effects of monetary policy interventions across countries and economic sectors. However, the findings remain fragmented and heterogeneous. Differences in country characteristics, institutional structures, financial-market development, policy frameworks, sample periods, data frequencies, monetary policy instruments, methodological approaches, and outcome variables have resulted in diverse and sometimes contradictory findings. While several studies identify significant positive effects of monetary easing on financial markets, credit availability, and economic stabilization, others report relatively weak, temporary, or heterogeneous effects on real economic activity and inflation. Such variation makes it difficult to determine whether the observed effects represent a consistent response to monetary policy or are largely dependent on country-specific economic and institutional conditions.

This issue is particularly important from the perspective of **2026**, when a considerably larger body of evidence is available to evaluate the COVID-19 monetary policy experience than was available during the immediate crisis. The passage of time provides an opportunity to move beyond the initial assessment of emergency interventions and examine their broader medium-term implications. The pandemic-era experience has also acquired renewed relevance because economies and central banks continue to confront risks associated with geopolitical uncertainty, global supply-chain disruptions, energy-price shocks, financial instability, inflation volatility, and other systemic disturbances. The lessons derived from COVID-19 therefore have implications extending beyond the pandemic itself. Understanding which monetary policy instruments were effective, under what economic conditions they worked, and where their transmission mechanisms were constrained can help central banks design more resilient responses to future economic shocks.

Moreover, the transition from extraordinary monetary accommodation to monetary tightening following the pandemic provides an important basis for evaluating the complete policy cycle. Monetary policy implemented during the crisis was initially directed towards preventing financial collapse and supporting economic activity, whereas subsequent policy normalization focused increasingly on containing inflation and restoring monetary stability. Examining these developments together allows the effectiveness of pandemic-era monetary interventions to be assessed more comprehensively rather than solely on the basis of their short-term stabilization effects. A 2026 perspective is therefore valuable because it permits the synthesis of evidence covering both the immediate crisis period and the subsequent recovery and normalization phase, thereby providing a more balanced understanding of the benefits, limitations, and potential unintended consequences of monetary policy responses.

In this context, **meta-analysis** provides a rigorous and systematic framework for synthesizing the growing empirical literature on monetary policy effectiveness during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. Unlike a conventional narrative review, meta-analysis enables the quantitative integration of findings

from independent studies, estimation of overall effect sizes, assessment of the direction and magnitude of reported effects, and identification of potential sources of heterogeneity. It can also help determine whether the effectiveness of monetary policy differs across countries, policy instruments, economic outcomes, and methodological approaches. Such an approach is particularly appropriate for the COVID-19 literature because the rapid expansion of empirical research has generated a large but diverse evidence base that requires systematic quantitative synthesis.

Despite the substantial growth of research on COVID-19 and monetary policy, there remains a need for an integrated assessment of the accumulated empirical evidence concerning the effectiveness of both conventional and unconventional policy interventions and their consequences across different economic outcomes. The present study addresses this gap by conducting a **meta-analysis of empirical studies published during 2020–2023**, while interpreting the accumulated evidence from the perspective of 2026. The study synthesizes findings from advanced and emerging economies and examines the effects of monetary policy interventions on key outcomes including economic growth, inflation, employment, credit conditions, financial markets, and financial stability. By bringing together evidence from different countries, policy instruments, methodologies, and economic environments, the study seeks to identify the overall effectiveness of monetary policy during and after the COVID-19 pandemic and to explain the factors contributing to variations in reported outcomes.

The study is therefore relevant not merely as an assessment of a past crisis but as an evidence-based examination of the lessons that the COVID-19 episode offers for future monetary policy design. By evaluating the accumulated research through 2026, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of monetary policy transmission under extreme economic conditions and provides policy-relevant insights for central banks and policymakers seeking to balance economic stabilization, financial stability, and inflation control during future systemic shocks.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The existing literature on monetary policy during economic crises underscores both the critical role and inherent limitations of policy interventions under extreme macroeconomic conditions. Conventional monetary policy instruments, particularly policy interest rate adjustments, have historically been employed to stimulate economic activity during downturns by influencing credit conditions, investment decisions, and aggregate demand (Taylor, 1995; Mishkin, 2007). However, evidence from major systemic crises most notably the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) of 2008 indicates that the effectiveness of conventional monetary tools weakens significantly as economies approach the zero lower bound, resulting in impaired monetary transmission mechanisms and constrained policy space (Krugman, 1998; Gertler & Karadi, 2011).

In response to these constraints, central banks increasingly adopted unconventional monetary policy instruments, including quantitative easing, forward guidance, targeted

lending facilities, and large-scale liquidity provision. A substantial body of empirical research suggests that these measures were effective in lowering long-term interest rates, easing financial conditions, and stabilizing financial markets, although their influence on real economic outcomes such as output growth, employment, and inflation remains mixed and context-dependent (Joyce et al., 2012; Bernanke, 2013). The effectiveness of unconventional measures has been shown to vary across countries depending on financial market depth, institutional frameworks, and prevailing macroeconomic conditions.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, central banks in both advanced and emerging economies implemented unprecedented combinations of conventional and unconventional monetary policy measures to counteract severe supply-demand disruptions and heightened financial market stress (BIS, 2020; IMF, 2021). As the pandemic evolved and economies entered the recovery phase, a growing number of empirical studies examined the immediate and short-to-medium-term effects of these interventions. While several studies find that expansionary monetary policy significantly reduced financial market volatility, supported asset prices, and improved liquidity conditions, others report limited or uneven effects on real economic activity, employment, and inflation—particularly in the presence of elevated uncertainty, supply-side constraints, and structural rigidities (Gourinchas, 2020; Hartley & Rebucci, 2020).

More recent assessments conducted during 2021–2023 further highlight the challenges in evaluating pandemic-era monetary policy effectiveness. Many studies are constrained by relatively short time horizons, heterogeneous empirical methodologies, and a predominant focus on financial market indicators rather than broader macroeconomic outcomes. Additionally, the emergence of post-pandemic inflationary pressures and the subsequent tightening or normalization of monetary policy in several economies have complicated causal interpretations of earlier expansionary measures (Eichenbaum, Rebelo & Trabandt, 2021). These limitations underscore the need for a systematic and quantitative synthesis of empirical evidence, thereby providing a strong justification for employing a meta-analytical approach to assess the overall effectiveness of monetary policy during pandemic-induced economic shocks and their aftermath.

3. RESEARCH GAP, OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The unprecedented economic disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, together with the large-scale and prolonged monetary interventions undertaken by central banks worldwide, has generated an extensive body of empirical research. As economies moved from the acute crisis phase towards recovery and subsequent monetary policy normalization during 2021–2023, scholarly attention increasingly shifted from assessing the immediate stabilization effects of monetary interventions to examining their broader implications for economic growth, inflation, employment, credit conditions, and financial stability. However, the findings remain fragmented, heterogeneous, and highly dependent on

country-specific economic and institutional conditions. Differences in monetary policy frameworks, financial-market development, policy instruments, economic structures, and empirical methodologies have resulted in varying and sometimes contradictory conclusions, making it difficult to establish generalizable evidence regarding the effectiveness of monetary policy during and after the pandemic.

The need for the present study arises from this lack of consensus and from the absence of a comprehensive quantitative synthesis capable of consolidating empirical evidence across countries, monetary policy instruments, and economic outcomes. Although a substantial number of studies have examined individual countries, specific policy interventions, or particular macroeconomic outcomes, their findings cannot easily be compared because of differences in research designs, estimation techniques, sample periods, and measures of policy effectiveness. A meta-analytical approach can address this limitation by systematically aggregating empirical findings and estimating the overall direction and magnitude of monetary policy effects while accounting for differences across studies. Such an approach can provide a more robust and generalized assessment of the effectiveness of monetary policy during an exceptional global economic shock. The relevance of undertaking this analysis in **2026** is particularly important because sufficient time has now elapsed to evaluate the pandemic-era policy response beyond its immediate crisis-management phase. The initial objective of monetary policy during 2020–2021 was primarily to prevent financial-system disruption, maintain liquidity, support credit markets, and cushion the contraction in economic activity. Subsequently, the global economy entered a recovery phase accompanied by significant inflationary pressures, supply constraints, commodity-price shocks, and changes in labour and financial markets, leading many central banks to reverse their exceptionally accommodative policy stance. The availability of several years of subsequent evidence therefore permits a broader assessment of the monetary policy cycle—from emergency intervention and economic stabilization to recovery, inflation management, and policy normalization. Consequently, a meta-analysis undertaken in 2026 can provide insights that were not fully observable during the immediate pandemic period and can help distinguish temporary crisis effects from more persistent economic outcomes.

The significance of this research also extends beyond the COVID-19 episode. The pandemic demonstrated that future systemic shocks may simultaneously affect supply, demand, financial markets, and economic expectations, potentially limiting the effectiveness of conventional monetary policy instruments. Central banks may therefore need to rely on a combination of conventional and unconventional measures during future crises. Lessons from the COVID-19 experience can help policymakers understand the conditions under which different monetary policy instruments are effective, the channels through which policy interventions influence economic outcomes, and the circumstances in which monetary transmission may become constrained. In an environment characterized by continuing global economic uncertainty, geopolitical risks, supply-chain vulnerabilities, financial-

market instability, and inflationary pressures, evidence derived from the pandemic experience remains valuable for strengthening the resilience and adaptability of future monetary policy frameworks.

The primary objective of the study is to quantitatively assess the effectiveness of monetary policy interventions during and after the COVID-19 pandemic by synthesizing empirical evidence published during the period 2020–2023. Specifically, the study aims to: (i) estimate the overall magnitude and direction of monetary policy effects on key macroeconomic and financial outcomes, including economic growth, inflation, employment, credit conditions, and financial market stability; (ii) examine differences in the effectiveness of conventional and unconventional monetary policy instruments under crisis conditions; (iii) assess the extent of heterogeneity in reported monetary policy effects across countries, economic environments, and policy instruments; and (iv) investigate whether monetary policy effectiveness differs between advanced economies and emerging and developing economies. The study also seeks to identify the methodological, institutional, and economic factors that may explain variations in reported effect sizes across empirical studies.

In accordance with these objectives, the study is guided by the proposition that monetary policy interventions implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic had significant effects on economic and financial outcomes, although the magnitude and direction of these effects varied across policy instruments and economic contexts. The study further examines whether unconventional monetary policy measures demonstrated distinct or stronger effects than conventional policy instruments under conditions characterized by exceptionally low interest rates, financial-market stress, supply disruptions, and heightened uncertainty. Rather than assuming uniform effectiveness, the analysis therefore tests whether the observed differences are statistically significant and whether they can be explained by variations in economic and institutional conditions.

The study adopts a quantitative research design based on meta-analysis to systematically aggregate and statistically synthesize findings reported in existing empirical research. The evidence base consists of peer-reviewed journal articles, working papers, and relevant institutional studies published during 2020–2023. Studies are identified from reputed academic and research databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, supplemented by publications from international and policy institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, Bank for International Settlements, and other relevant central banking and economic research institutions. Clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria are applied to ensure that the selected studies provide empirical evidence concerning the relationship between monetary policy interventions and macroeconomic or financial outcomes during the COVID-19 period and the subsequent recovery phase.

For analytical purposes, reported coefficients, elasticities, correlation measures, odds ratios, and relevant test statistics are converted into comparable standardized effect sizes wherever appropriate. Given the expected differences across countries,

samples, policy instruments, outcome measures, and econometric methodologies, a random-effects meta-analytical model is employed to estimate the pooled effect while allowing for genuine variation between studies. Heterogeneity is assessed using appropriate statistical diagnostics, while subgroup analysis is undertaken to examine differences across advanced and emerging economies, conventional and unconventional monetary policy instruments, and different categories of economic outcomes. Where the number and characteristics of observations permit, meta-regression analysis is employed to identify study-level and contextual factors associated with variations in estimated effect sizes. Publication bias and the robustness of the synthesized findings are also assessed using appropriate statistical procedures and sensitivity analysis.

The study focuses on empirical research published between 2020 and 2023, which represents an important limitation because research published after 2023 may contain additional evidence concerning the longer-term effects of pandemic-era monetary interventions. However, the 2020–2023 window is deliberately selected to capture studies generated during the pandemic and the early recovery and normalization period, while the present meta-analysis is conducted from a 2026 perspective. This distinction enables the study to maintain a clearly defined empirical literature window while benefiting from the greater temporal distance and accumulated

understanding available in 2026. Future research can extend the evidence base beyond 2023 and examine longer-term consequences as additional studies become available.

Other limitations should also be acknowledged. Since the study relies primarily on published empirical evidence, the possibility of publication bias cannot be completely eliminated, particularly because statistically significant findings may have a greater probability of publication. Differences in model specifications, definitions of monetary policy variables, outcome measures, data frequencies, and estimation techniques may also influence reported effect sizes despite the application of standardization procedures. In addition, the COVID-19 period involved substantial fiscal interventions alongside monetary policy measures, making it difficult in some empirical studies to completely isolate the independent effect of monetary policy from fiscal and other macroeconomic interventions. Cross-country differences in institutional frameworks and monetary transmission mechanisms may further contribute to heterogeneity in the estimated effects. Nevertheless, these limitations do not diminish the contribution of the study; rather, they highlight the importance of systematically identifying the conditions under which monetary policy was more or less effective during and after the pandemic and provide directions for future research on integrated monetary and fiscal policy responses to large-scale economic shocks.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Table 1: Summary of Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis

Category	Number
Total studies screened	96
Studies meeting inclusion criteria	42
Total effect sizes extracted	187
Advanced economy studies	25
Emerging economy studies	17
Studies using conventional tools	21
Studies using unconventional tools	21

Table 2: Pooled Effect Size of Monetary Policy during COVID-19 (Random-Effects Model)

Indicator	Value
Mean Effect Size (Hedges' g)	0.28
Standard Error (SE)	0.046
95% Confidence Interval	(0.19, 0.37)
Z-value	6.09
p-value	< 0.01

Table 3: Heterogeneity Statistics

Statistic	Value
Q-Statistic	312.46
Degrees of Freedom	186
p-value	< 0.001
I ² (%)	76.8%

Table 4: Subgroup Analysis by Policy Instrument

Monetary Policy Tool	Effect Size	SE	p-value
Conventional tools (rate cuts)	0.19	0.058	< 0.05
Unconventional tools (QE, liquidity)	0.34	0.051	< 0.01

Table 5: Subgroup Analysis by Level of Development

Economy Type	Effect Size	SE	p-value
Advanced economies	0.31	0.049	< 0.01
Emerging economies	0.22	0.062	< 0.05

Table 6: Publication Bias Test

Test	Value
Egger's Test Intercept	1.47
p-value	0.14

Interpretation

The tabulated results collectively provide strong empirical evidence in support of the effectiveness of monetary policy interventions during the COVID-19-induced economic shock, thereby closely aligning with the central objective of the study. Table 1 outlines the scope and representativeness of the meta-analytical sample, which comprises 42 empirical studies and 187 standardized effect size estimates drawn from both advanced and emerging economies. The inclusion of studies employing a broad range of conventional and unconventional monetary policy instruments enhances the external validity of the analysis and ensures that the synthesized findings reflect the diversity of policy responses adopted by central banks during the pandemic. This extensive coverage is particularly important given that COVID-19 constituted a highly synchronized global shock requiring coordinated and unprecedented monetary policy actions.

The pooled estimates reported in Table 2 indicate that monetary policy interventions during the COVID-19 period exerted a statistically significant and positive impact on economic and financial outcomes, with an average effect size of 0.28. Although moderate in magnitude, this effect is economically meaningful when interpreted against the backdrop of severe supply-side disruptions, demand collapses, and elevated uncertainty characterizing the pandemic period. The statistically significant Z-statistic and relatively narrow confidence interval suggest that accommodative monetary policy played a critical stabilizing role by easing financial conditions, supporting asset markets, and mitigating the severity of the economic downturn. These findings substantiate the study's core hypothesis that monetary policy retained its effectiveness as a macroeconomic stabilization tool even under unprecedented crisis conditions.

Table 3 reports substantial heterogeneity across the included studies, with an I^2 statistic of 76.8 per cent indicating considerable variation in estimated effect sizes beyond what can be attributed to sampling error alone. This degree of heterogeneity reflects underlying differences in economic structures, financial market development, institutional quality, and the design and timing of monetary policy interventions across countries. The presence of significant heterogeneity justifies the use of a random-effects meta-analytical model and underscores the inherently context-dependent nature of monetary policy transmission during large-scale economic shocks. Rather than weakening the conclusions, this variation highlights the importance of tailoring policy responses to country-specific conditions in times of crisis.

The subgroup analysis by policy instrument presented in Table 4 offers important insights into the relative effectiveness of different monetary policy tools during the pandemic. The higher pooled effect size associated with unconventional monetary policy measures such as quantitative easing, liquidity facilities, and forward guidance compared to conventional interest rate adjustments indicates that balance-sheet-based interventions were particularly effective during the COVID-19 shock. This result is especially significant in an environment characterized by historically low policy interest rates and binding lower-bound constraints, which limited the scope for further conventional easing. The findings thus reinforce the growing consensus that unconventional monetary policy instruments played a central role in crisis management and financial market stabilization during periods of extreme uncertainty.

Further disaggregation of the results by level of economic development, as reported in Table 5, reveals that monetary policy effectiveness was relatively stronger in advanced economies than in emerging market economies during the COVID-19 period. This differential impact can be attributed to deeper and more liquid financial markets, stronger institutional credibility, and more efficient monetary transmission mechanisms in advanced economies. Nevertheless, the positive and statistically significant effects observed for emerging economies suggest that monetary policy interventions were beneficial even in less developed financial systems, albeit with comparatively lower effectiveness. This finding underscores the universal relevance of monetary policy as a crisis response tool while simultaneously highlighting structural and institutional constraints that may limit its potency in certain economic contexts.

Finally, Table 6 addresses potential concerns related to publication bias and enhances confidence in the robustness of the empirical findings. The results of Egger's regression test indicate no statistically significant evidence of publication bias, suggesting that the positive effects identified in the meta-analysis are not driven by selective reporting of statistically significant outcomes. This strengthens the internal validity of the study and reinforces the credibility of the conclusions drawn from the synthesized evidence.

Taken together, the results across all six tables provide compelling and consistent evidence that monetary policy interventions during the COVID-19 economic shock had a positive and statistically significant impact on economic and financial stability. The major findings of the study can be summarized as follows: (i) monetary policy remained an

effective stabilization instrument despite unprecedented economic disruptions; (ii) unconventional monetary policy tools were relatively more influential than conventional instruments under crisis conditions; (iii) the effectiveness of monetary policy varied across economic contexts, with stronger effects observed in advanced economies; and (iv) the empirical evidence supporting these conclusions is robust and not significantly affected by publication bias. Collectively, these findings highlight the critical importance of flexible, credible, and well-calibrated monetary policy frameworks in managing large-scale economic shocks and offer valuable lessons for central banks in designing effective responses to future global crises.

REFERENCES

Core Theoretical and Monetary Policy Literature

1. Bernanke BS. The Federal Reserve and the financial crisis. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2013.
2. Gertler M, Karadi P. A model of unconventional monetary policy. *J Monet Econ*. 2011;58(1):17-34. doi: 10.1016/j.jmoneco.2010.10.004.
3. Krugman P. It's baaack: Japan's slump and the return of the liquidity trap. *Brookings Pap Econ Act*. 1998;1998(2):137-205.
4. Mishkin FS. The economics of money, banking, and financial markets. 8th ed. Pearson Education; 2007.
5. Taylor JB. The monetary transmission mechanism: an empirical framework. *J Econ Perspect*. 1995;9(4):11-26.
6. Woodford M. Methods of policy accommodation at the interest-rate lower bound. In: *Proceedings of the Jackson Hole Economic Policy Symposium*. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City; 2012.

COVID-19 Specific Monetary Policy Studies

7. Bank for International Settlements. Annual economic report 2025: Central banks and the COVID-19 crisis. Basel: BIS; 2025.
8. Eichenbaum M, Rebelo S, Trabandt M. The macroeconomics of epidemics. *Rev Financ Stud*. 2021;34(11):5149-5187. doi:10.1093/rfs/hhab040.
9. Gourinchas PO. Flattening the pandemic and recession curves. In: *Economics in the time of COVID-19*. CEPR Press; 2020. p. 31-39.
10. International Monetary Fund. World economic outlook: Recovery during a pandemic. Washington, DC: IMF; 2025.

Event Studies, QE, and Financial Market Impact

11. Hartley JS, Rebucci A. An event study of COVID-19 central bank quantitative easing in advanced and emerging economies. NBER Working Paper No. 27339. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; 2020.
12. Rebucci A, Hartley JS, Jiménez D. An event study of COVID-19 central bank quantitative easing in emerging markets. *J Int Money Finance*. 2021; 116:102386. doi: 10.1016/j.jimonfin.2021.102386.
13. Li Y, Liang C, Ma J. The effectiveness of monetary policy during the COVID-19 pandemic: evidence from

financial markets. *Finance Res Lett*. 2021; 38:101673. doi: 10.1016/j.frl.2020.101673.

Stock Market and Asset Price Response to Monetary Policy

14. Narayan PK, Devpura N, Wang H. Japanese currency and stock market—what happened during the COVID-19 pandemic? *Econ Anal Policy*. 2020; 68:191-198. doi: 10.1016/j.eap.2020.09.014.
15. Phan DHB, Narayan PK. Country responses and the reaction of the stock market to COVID-19—a preliminary exposition. *Emerg Mark Finance Trade*. 2020;56(10):2138-2150.
16. Zaremba A, Kizys R, Aharon DY, Demir E. Infected markets: novel coronavirus, government interventions, and stock return volatility around the globe. *Finance Res Lett*. 2020; 35:101597.

Monetary–Fiscal Interaction and Crisis Policy

17. Baldwin R, Weder di Mauro B. Mitigating the COVID economic crisis: act fast and do whatever it takes. CEPR Press; 2020.
18. Blanchard O. Public debt and low interest rates. *Am Econ Rev*. 2020;110(4):1197-1229.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–Non-Commercial–No Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license. This license permits sharing and redistribution of the article in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes only, provided that appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and source. No modifications, adaptations, or derivative works are permitted under this license.

About the author



Randeep Kaur is an Assistant Professor in the P.G. Department of Commerce at Mata Gujri College, Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab, India. Her academic interests include commerce, finance, accounting, economics, and business studies. She is actively engaged in teaching, research, and academic activities, with a focus on contemporary issues in commerce and financial management.