The Evolution of Ethereum Scaling: A Comparative Analysis of Optimistic and Zero-Knowledge Rollup Infrastructure in 2026

Introduction to the Layer-2 Scaling Paradigm

The maturation of decentralized ledger technology has been perpetually constrained by the blockchain scalability trilemma—the proposition that a distributed network can only optimize for two of three properties: decentralization, security, and scalability. Because the base layer of the Ethereum network is structurally limited to processing approximately fifteen transactions per second, the network historically suffered from severe congestion, resulting in prohibitive transaction fees during periods of high demand that priced out retail participants[1].

To address this fundamental bottleneck, the Ethereum ecosystem pivoted toward a rollup-centric roadmap. This architectural shift offloads the bulk of computational execution and state storage to secondary networks known as Layer-2 rollups, which process transactions in high-volume batches off-chain before anchoring a compressed summary of the state back to the Ethereum base layer[4].

By the second quarter of 2026, this strategic pivot has proven unequivocally successful in migrating user activity. Layer-2 networks now account for over ninety percent of all Ethereum-related transaction execution, collectively securing tens of billions of dollars in capital and processing hundreds of transactions per second[6]. However, the infrastructure layer is not monolithic. It has bifurcated into two dominant and competing cryptographic architectures: Optimistic Rollups and Zero-Knowledge Rollups[6].

This report provides an exhaustive, comparative analysis of these two primary rollup architectures. It evaluates their underlying cryptographic mechanics, economic models altered by recent Ethereum protocol upgrades, and their relative market growth trajectories up to mid-2026. Furthermore, the analysis investigates the centralization vectors inherent in rollup sequencers and concludes by addressing the structural impediments to direct investment in this infrastructure layer, specifically the absence of traditional equity opportunities and the complex, often dilutive value accrual mechanics of governance tokens.

Architectural Frameworks and Cryptographic Foundations

The fundamental distinction between Optimistic and Zero-Knowledge rollups lies in their approach to state validation and dispute resolution. To utilize a jurisprudential analogy,

Optimistic rollups operate on the principle of "innocent until proven guilty," assuming all batched transactions are valid unless actively contested by network participants. Conversely, Zero-Knowledge rollups operate on a "guilty until proven innocent" paradigm, requiring immutable mathematical proof of validity before the base layer accepts any state transition[9].

Optimistic Rollups: Game Theory and Fraud Proofs

Optimistic rollups, which currently encompass market leaders such as Arbitrum, Base, and OP Mainnet, rely on cryptoeconomic incentives to maintain security[6]. A centralized node known as a sequencer collects, orders, and executes user transactions, subsequently posting the compressed transaction data alongside the new state root to the Ethereum Layer-1[1]. Because the system assumes the sequencer's state root is valid by default, it eliminates the need for intensive computational verification at the time of posting, allowing for high throughput and near-instant "soft finality" on the Layer-2 network[10].

To secure the network against malicious sequencers submitting invalid state transitions, Optimistic rollups employ a challenge mechanism utilizing "fraud proofs." When a batch is posted, a predefined dispute window—typically lasting seven days—opens[6]. During this period, any independent network observer running a validator node can cryptographically challenge the state root. If a challenge is initiated, the protocol executes the disputed transaction on the Ethereum base layer to determine the correct outcome[1]. If the sequencer is found to have acted maliciously or erroneously, their staked financial bond is slashed, and the challenger is rewarded, thereby aligning economic incentives with network vigilance[4].

Within the Optimistic rollup category, dispute resolution mechanisms diverge significantly between the leading protocols, primarily regarding how the fraud proof is executed:

The Arbitrum ecosystem utilizes a sophisticated multi-round interactive proving system, recently upgraded via a protocol called Bounded Liquidity Delay. Through this mechanism, the protocol forces the sequencer and the challenger to continuously dissect the disputed transaction off-chain until the disagreement is narrowed down to a single WebAssembly or Ethereum Virtual Machine instruction[3]. Only this microscopic piece of code is executed on the Ethereum Layer-1. This process is highly gas-efficient and protects the network from Sybil attacks, enabling an "all-vs-all" battle royale where a single honest party defending the correct state will always prevail against multiple malicious claims within a fixed upper bound of 6.4 days[16].

Conversely, Optimism originally relied on re-executing the entire transaction on the base layer, functioning as a single-round fault proof via its Cannon architecture[17]. While simpler to implement and maintaining strict parity with the Ethereum Virtual Machine, this approach incurs higher mainnet gas fees during dispute resolution[3].

The primary trade-off of the overall Optimistic architecture is the withdrawal latency. Because the system relies on the seven-day challenge window to guarantee absolute security, users withdrawing capital natively from an Optimistic rollup back to Ethereum must wait a full week for the transaction to achieve hard finality[6]. While third-party liquidity providers and cross-

chain bridges can circumvent this delay for a fee, the fundamental architecture prioritizes computational ease and developer compatibility over immediate settlement finality.

Zero-Knowledge Rollups: Cryptographic Validity

Zero-Knowledge rollups, including protocols such as zkSync Era, Starknet, Linea, and Polygon zkEVM, discard game-theoretic challenge windows in favor of absolute mathematical certainty[12]. Every time a sequencer batches transactions, a specialized computational node known as a prover generates a cryptographic validity proof. This proof mathematically demonstrates that the execution of the batch transitioning the network from one state to the next strictly followed the protocol's consensus rules[6].

Once this proof is submitted to and verified by a smart contract on Ethereum, the transactions are instantly finalized. There is no seven-day withdrawal delay, as fraud is mathematically impossible to commit if the zero-knowledge proof verifies correctly[9]. The attack surface is fundamentally narrower; security relies on the soundness of the cryptographic polynomial commitment scheme rather than the vigilance of third-party network monitors[20].

However, the generation of these proofs is computationally excruciating. It requires specialized hardware, typically advanced graphic processing units or application-specific integrated circuits, and incurs significant upfront computational costs. This historically throttled the transaction throughput and raised the baseline operational costs of Zero-Knowledge rollups compared to their Optimistic counterparts[7].

The Zero-Knowledge landscape is further subdivided by the specific type of cryptographic proof utilized, carrying distinct trade-offs regarding size, speed, and long-term security assumptions.

Cryptographic Feature	zk-SNARKs	zk-STARKs
Proof Size	Extremely Small (~0.6 KB)	Large (Up to 69 KB)
Verification Speed (Ethereum L1)	Fast (~1800 ms benchmark)	Very Fast (~470 ms benchmark)
Proof Generation Speed	Fast (~55 ms benchmark)	Slow (~3800 ms benchmark)
Trusted Setup Phase	Required (Though universal setups exist)	Not Required (Fully Transparent)

Cryptographic Foundation	Elliptic Curve Cryptography	Hash Functions
Quantum Threat Resistance	Vulnerable to Shor's Algorithm	Post-Quantum Secure

Data derived from independent CPU profiling and benchmarking of cryptographic systems in production environments[21].

The zk-SNARKs (Zero-Knowledge Succinct Non-Interactive Argument of Knowledge), utilized heavily by zkSync Era and Polygon zkEVM, generate highly compact proofs that can be verified on Ethereum rapidly and cheaply[21]. However, traditional SNARK constructions encode constraints over input variables and require an initial "trusted setup" ceremony to generate public parameters[21]. This introduces a theoretical vulnerability; if the setup participants conspire to retain the toxic waste generated during the ceremony, they could forge proofs[25]. Furthermore, SNARKs rely on elliptic curve cryptography, which is widely theorized to be vulnerable to future quantum computing decryption attacks[23]. Newer SNARK constructions, such as PLONK, utilize universal and updateable trusted setups that mitigate coordination risks, but the quantum vulnerability remains[25].

The zk-STARKs (Zero-Knowledge Scalable Transparent Argument of Knowledge), pioneered by StarkWare and utilized by the Starknet network, eliminate the trusted setup entirely. They utilize a transparent, hash-based cryptographic structure that relies on publicly verifiable randomness[22]. This makes STARKs highly scalable for massive enterprise computations and theoretically post-quantum secure[23]. The primary drawback of STARKs is the massive proof size; STARK proofs can be up to one hundred times larger than SNARK proofs, requiring significantly more storage bandwidth and inducing higher on-chain verification gas costs[21].

The zkEVM Compatibility Spectrum

A significant historical hurdle for Zero-Knowledge adoption has been the friction of adapting Ethereum's native programming language, Solidity, to zero-knowledge proving environments. The Ethereum Virtual Machine was not originally designed for zero-knowledge cryptography; certain standard operations and hash functions are exceptionally difficult and computationally expensive to prove mathematically[20].

To categorize the industry's solutions to this friction, Ethereum co-founder Vitalik Buterin established a standard taxonomy of zkEVM implementations, representing a sliding scale between strict Ethereum compatibility and proof-generation efficiency[20].

Type 1 systems strive for full Ethereum equivalence, maintaining perfect compatibility with all existing Ethereum infrastructure, hash functions, and state trees. No existing decentralized application code needs to change for deployment. The severe trade-off is prover time, which can take hours due to the sheer computational weight of proving legacy Ethereum operations

in a zero-knowledge circuit[27].

Type 2 systems aim for Ethereum Virtual Machine equivalence. They maintain total application-level compatibility but alter internal network structures, such as replacing the resource-heavy Keccak hash function with hash functions friendlier to zero-knowledge computation. Protocols like Scroll, Linea, and Polygon zkEVM target this architecture, resulting in faster proof generation while allowing developers to use familiar tooling unchanged[20].

Type 3 and Type 4 systems abandon strict compatibility to maximize performance. Type 4 systems, such as zkSync Era and Starknet, act as independent virtual machines. They compile legacy Solidity code into custom architectures optimized explicitly for zero-knowledge math, such as Starknet's Cairo language[20]. While they offer maximum network performance and near-instant proving speeds, they often require significant developer effort to rewrite or adjust existing applications migrating from the Ethereum mainnet[20].

The Economic Paradigm Shift: EIP-4844 and Data Availability Dynamics

The economic viability and operational cost structure of all Layer-2 networks were fundamentally and permanently altered on March 13, 2024, with the implementation of the Dencun upgrade and Ethereum Improvement Proposal 4844, colloquially known as Proto-Danksharding[1].

Prior to this upgrade, rollups were forced to post their compressed transaction batches to Ethereum using standard transaction data fields known as calldata. Because calldata is permanently stored on every Ethereum node in perpetuity, it was highly expensive, historically constituting over ninety percent of a rollup's operational cost[1].

The EIP-4844 upgrade introduced a novel data structure called "blobs" (Binary Large Objects). Blobs represent large chunks of data, fixed at 128 kilobytes each, with a maximum of six blobs permitted per Ethereum block[30]. Blobs are attached to transactions but are explicitly segregated from the Ethereum execution layer, meaning they cannot be accessed by smart contracts[30]. Most importantly, blobs are ephemeral. They are pruned from the network after 4096 epochs, which equates to approximately eighteen days. This duration provides ample time for Optimistic rollups to complete their seven-day fraud-proof challenge window while preventing permanent state bloat on the base layer[30]. Blobs are verified using Kate-Zaverucha-Goldberg polynomial commitments, a mathematical property that enables data availability sampling. This allows network nodes to confirm that the blockchain data is both available and correct without requiring every node to download the entire dataset[31].

Divergent Cost Structures Post-Dencun

The transition from calldata to blobs reduced the data posting costs for Layer-2 networks by over ninety percent, driving average Layer-2 transaction fees down to sub-cent levels and shifting the processing volume dynamics across the industry[1]. However, the introduction of a

multidimensional fee market affected Optimistic and Zero-Knowledge rollups distinctly.
The total fee for a blob-carrying transaction is calculated via a dual-market equation: the execution base fee multiplied by execution gas, plus the execution priority fee, plus the blob base fee multiplied by the blob gas used[33].
Because Optimistic rollups do not execute proofs on the base layer unless actively challenged, their execution gas requirement is minimal, often relying on the baseline 21,000 gas. Therefore, their cost structure became almost entirely dependent on the highly volatile blob base fee. High-volume Optimistic rollups tend to utilize all available space within their blobs efficiently, making their transactions highly optimized for the new market[33].
Conversely, Zero-Knowledge rollups require substantial execution gas, often exceeding 200,000 gas, to run the smart contracts that verify their cryptographic proofs on the base layer. Consequently, even with cheap blobs, the execution base fee remains a significant portion of a Zero-Knowledge rollup's operational cost[33]. Furthermore, because Zero-Knowledge rollups post less overall data due to cryptographic compression, they often fail to fill the fixed 128 kilobyte capacity of a single blob[30]. Due to the fixed size of blobs, users must pay gas fees corresponding to the entire 128 kilobytes even if they use significantly less data, leading to inefficient capital deployment. Recent research indicates that cooperative "blob sharing" between different rollup networks can alleviate this inefficiency, reducing overall data availability costs by eighty to ninety-nine percent[30].
While EIP-4844 successfully reduced costs, it introduced minor consensus stability concerns at the base layer. The propagation of large blobs increased the time required for nodes to validate slots and reach consensus. Empirical data indicates that the fork rate rose from 3.097 to 6.707 slots per 2,000 slots post-implementation, as extended slot synchronization times challenged network stability for validators with lesser computational resources[34].
Ultimately, EIP-4844 catalyzed massive margin expansion for Layer-2 sequencer operators. By reducing their settlement costs to fractions of a penny while maintaining slightly higher user-facing fees, sequencers began generating immense profit spreads, a dynamic that profoundly influences network tokenomics and centralized revenue generation models[35].

Market Dominance: Analyzing Ecosystem Growth Trajectories in 2026

The core objective of assessing Layer-2 networks requires evaluating which ecosystem is growing faster. Based on primary data snapshots spanning the first half of 2026, the empirical evidence demonstrates that the market has voted decisively in favor of Optimistic Rollup architectures regarding capital deployment, active users, and developer mindshare[4]. Zero-Knowledge rollups, while technologically superior in settlement finality and cryptographic guarantees, continue to severely trail in retail adoption metrics and Total Value Locked.

Capital Concentration: Total Value Secured and Decentralized Finance Activity

The most rigorous metric for Layer-2 capital analysis is Total Value Secured, compiled by data aggregators utilizing primary-source snapshots. Total Value Secured measures the sum of native assets minted on the network, canonical value bridged from Ethereum, and external value bridged from third-party networks, all secured by the protocol's underlying proofs[37]. As of mid-2026, the aggregate Total Value Secured across 118 tracked Ethereum Layer-2 networks stood at $48.78 billion[37].

Within this landscape, market concentration is extreme. The top two Optimistic rollups command a combined 66.4% of the entire ecosystem's secured value[37].

Network	Rollup Architecture	Total Value Secured (TVS)	DeFi TVL	L2BEAT Stage
Arbitrum One	Optimistic (Arbitrum Nitro)	$16.84B - $20.50B	$1.50B	Stage 1
Base Chain	Optimistic (OP Stack)	$10.72B - $11.90B	$4.41B	Stage 1
Polygon PoS	Custom Sidechain	$4.49B	$1.20B	N/A
OP Mainnet	Optimistic (OP Stack)	$1.50B - $1.91B	$325M	Stage 1
Starknet	ZK-STARK (CairoVM)	$525M - $617M	$197M	Stage 1
Linea	ZK-Rollup (EVM Stack)	$414M - $431M	$33.7M	Stage 0
zkSync Era	ZK-SNARK (ZK Stack)	$282M - $404M	$17.7M	Stage 0

Data compiled from L2BEAT and DefiLlama snapshots across February, April, and May 2026,

reflecting both bridge security value and active decentralized finance deployment[6].
Arbitrum remains the undisputed liquidity and composability hub of decentralized finance. Its highly optimized Nitro stack and developer-friendly Ethereum Virtual Machine compatibility required virtually no modification for major blue-chip protocols to deploy[6]. It consistently ranks as the default destination for institutional capital, complex derivatives, and high-frequency trading protocols, boasting deep liquidity that minimizes slippage on major asset pairs[11].
Base, incubated by the public cryptocurrency exchange Coinbase and built utilizing Optimism's modular OP Stack framework, has emerged as the fastest-growing consumer-facing Layer-2 network in the industry[11]. Leveraging Coinbase's distribution funnel of over 110 million verified users and seamless fiat-to-crypto onboarding rails, Base achieved over $13 billion in bridged Total Value Secured by May 2026[36]. It dominates in retail applications, social decentralized platforms, and AgentFi—a novel sector where autonomous artificial intelligence agents manage over $12.6 billion in on-chain liquidity[11].
Conversely, Zero-Knowledge rollups have experienced sustained capital outflow in the public retail sector. Despite reaching peaks in early 2024, networks like zkSync Era saw their Total Value Secured contract sharply by over sixty percent to approximately $282 million to $404 million by mid-2026[4]. This precipitous drop highlights that much of the initial liquidity in Zero-Knowledge networks was highly sensitive to short-term airdrop incentive farming rather than sticky, organic decentralized finance utility[40]. Furthermore, the official sunsetting of the Polygon zkEVM Mainnet Beta sequencer, scheduled for July 1, 2026, signals structural consolidation and retail capitulation within the broader Zero-Knowledge ecosystem, as Polygon pivots its technology toward other aggregation layers[42].

Network Activity, User Retention, and Throughput Capabilities

Throughput and active user metrics further underscore the dominance of Optimistic architectures. Following the implementation of EIP-4844, daily Layer-2 transactions surged past 226 transactions per second on average, massively eclipsing the execution capacity of the Ethereum base layer[7].
Base leads the activity metrics, processing roughly forty-six percent of all Layer-2 transactions[4]. On an average twenty-four-hour period in early 2026, Base consistently registered over 11.5 million transactions from 660,000 active addresses, driven by low-latency "Flashblocks" and micro-transaction fees averaging a fraction of a cent[36]. Arbitrum maintains a strong secondary position, processing over four million daily transactions from 130,000 active addresses, optimized heavily for high-value decentralized finance execution[38].
By contrast, leading Zero-Knowledge networks struggle to maintain comparable public usage. Starknet registers approximately 600,000 daily transactions from 42,000 active addresses, while zkSync Era reports under 20,000 daily transactions from fewer than 5,000 active retail addresses[38]. Organic user retention heavily favors Optimistic ecosystems with deep, composable liquidity loops, whereas networks reliant on theoretical future token incentives suffer extreme attrition once those incentives are distributed[41].

Developer Mindshare and the Institutional Pivot to Zero-Knowledge

Developer activity serves as a leading indicator of future ecosystem value, as deep developer pools generate superior tooling, which attracts applications, subsequently drawing users. According to Electric Capital's definitive 2026 developer report, the Ethereum ecosystem crossed a historic milestone of over one million lifetime developers, with roughly 232,000 active within the trailing twelve months[46]. Crucially, over fifty percent of Ethereum developers now work primarily on Layer-2 networks rather than the base layer[46]. Base alone accounted for forty-two percent of new Ethereum code commits in late 2025, indicating a massive migration of intellectual capital toward the OP Stack and Optimistic architectures for public deployment[46].

However, Zero-Knowledge technology is far from obsolete; rather, it is undergoing a profound pivot away from retail decentralized finance toward structural institutionalization. While Zero-Knowledge rollups lost the retail liquidity war to Arbitrum and Base, they are crossing the "production chasm" in enterprise contexts where absolute privacy, instant settlement finality, and regulatory compliance are mandatory[47].

For example, zkSync is heavily promoting its Elastic Chain vision, aiming to interoperate multiple custom zero-knowledge chains natively[48]. More critically, the underlying ZK Stack is being utilized to build "Prividiums"—private, permissioned Layer-2 networks secured by Ethereum[32]. Initiatives such as the Cari Network have successfully onboarded major United States regional banks with over $600 billion in deposits onto zero-knowledge infrastructure[50]. In these enterprise environments, Zero-Knowledge proofs allow banks to execute tokenized deposit transfers, cross-border payments, and intraday repo transactions with near-instant finality. The cryptography guarantees privacy, proving regulatory compliance and solvency to auditors without exposing sensitive commercial data or client identities to the public blockchain[50].

Thus, the growth trajectory of the Layer-2 market has bifurcated based on use-case utility. Optimistic rollups are capturing public retail liquidity and decentralized finance volume due to their robust Ethereum Virtual Machine compatibility and established network effects. Conversely, Zero-Knowledge rollups are becoming the covert infrastructure for traditional banking, compliant asset tokenization, and institutional privacy networks, where the lack of a seven-day withdrawal delay and the cryptographic guarantees of data protection are non-negotiable requirements.

Security Thresholds and the Centralized Sequencer Threat

Despite managing nearly fifty billion dollars in capital and processing the vast majority of Ethereum's economic activity, the Layer-2 ecosystem remains in a surprisingly immature security state. Analytics platforms utilize a standardized framework to grade network decentralization from Stage 0, denoting a network with full training wheels and centralized

operator control, to Stage 2, representing a fully decentralized network controlled exclusively by immutable smart contracts[10].

As of 2026, virtually no major general-purpose Layer-2 network has achieved Stage 2[10]. The leading Optimistic rollups, Arbitrum, Optimism, and Base, operate at Stage 1. This signifies that their fraud-proof systems are active and functional, but centralized Security Councils composed of elected multisignature wallet holders retain emergency override powers to intervene during catastrophic bugs[10]. Most Zero-Knowledge rollups, including zkSync Era, Linea, and Polygon zkEVM, linger at Stage 0, relying entirely on centralized provers and operator multisignatures without fully permissionless state validation[10].

The most systemic vulnerability inherent in the current Layer-2 architecture is the reliance on centralized sequencers. A single entity—such as Coinbase for Base, OP Labs for Optimism, or Offchain Labs for Arbitrum—operates the node responsible for ingesting, ordering, and executing user transactions[19]. This structural design presents two distinct vectors of existential risk.

First, centralized sequencers represent a massive single point of failure that induces operational fragility. Liveness failures can freeze entire multi-billion-dollar networks. For instance, the Base network experienced multiple chain halts within a forty-eight-hour period due to sequencer stalling[36]. When a sequencer fails, on-chain liquidation systems freeze. If the broader cryptocurrency market experiences sharp price volatility while the sequencer is offline, the mechanisms designed to protect decentralized lending protocols cannot execute, turning clean algorithmic solvency models into systemic insolvency risks very quickly[54]. While infrastructure providers like BlockSec are developing Threat Overwatch Programs to build intrinsic security at the sequencer level to block malicious transactions dynamically, the core liveness assumption remains dependent on a single operator[53].

Second, centralized sequencers attract severe regulatory scrutiny. The United States Securities and Exchange Commission has explicitly warned about the regulatory status of these network operators. SEC Commissioners have suggested that a centralized entity determining the order of transactions and controlling the flow of execution closely resembles a traditional "centralized matching engine"[55]. If a sequencer is legally classified as an unregistered securities exchange, it poses an existential threat to the Layer-2 operator. While developers argue that sequencers merely order transactions deterministically on a first-in, first-out basis and defer all actual trade logic to decentralized smart contracts at the application level, the regulatory overhang restricts how these networks distribute their capital and operate their businesses[55].

The Investment Conundrum: Capital Allocation in the Infrastructure Layer

For sophisticated market participants, institutional allocators, and retail investors seeking to capitalize on the exponential growth of blockchain scalability, gaining direct, productive

investment exposure to the Layer-2 infrastructure layer presents severe structural impediments. The distinct mechanics of digital asset venture capital, combined with the fundamentally broken tokenomics of Layer-2 governance models, have effectively walled off the massive revenue generated by these networks from the public market investor.

The Absence of Equity in Digital Asset Venture Capital

In traditional technology markets, venture capital firms and private equity groups invest capital in early-stage companies in exchange for equity—legal ownership shares representing a claim on the company's hard assets and future cash flows[56]. In the cryptocurrency sector, this traditional model has been largely abandoned at the protocol level.

Instead of issuing equity, early-stage cryptocurrency venture capitalists utilize financing mechanisms such as Simple Agreements for Future Tokens[56]. Network founders issue a digital token to bootstrap network effects, circumventing traditional equity rounds and heavily regulated public initial public offerings[56]. Consequently, when public market participants look to invest in the success of Arbitrum, Optimism, or zkSync, they cannot purchase shares in the software companies building them (Offchain Labs, OP Labs, or Matter Labs). They can only purchase the network's native digital token[19].

Token Value Accrual and the Regulatory "Fee Switch" Dilemma

The fundamental issue discouraging traditional investment is that Layer-2 native tokens generally lack a mechanism for value accrual. Tokens such as ARB, OP, STRK, and ZK are explicitly designed as "governance tokens." They grant the holder voting rights on Decentralized Autonomous Organization proposals, but confer zero legal or economic claim to the network's revenues[35].

Layer-2 networks generate immense, tangible cash flows. Sequencers collect transaction fees from users in Ethereum's native asset, pay a microscopic fraction of a cent to post the ephemeral blob data to the Ethereum base layer, and keep the massive arbitrage spread as absolute profit[35]. Base, for example, generates hundreds of millions in annualized revenue directly for its parent company, Coinbase[59]. However, for decentralized Layer-2 networks that have issued tokens, these immense operational profits flow directly into the project's treasury or the pockets of the founding development team[35].

For these governance tokens to become productive financial assets—often referred to as cashflow tokens—the network DAOs must activate what the industry terms the "fee switch." This is a protocol upgrade that would distribute a percentage of the sequencer profits to token holders who stake their assets to secure the network[35]. However, founding teams and legal counsels vehemently refuse to activate this switch. Distributing network revenues to passive token holders would almost certainly cause global financial regulators, particularly the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, to classify the token as an unregistered security under the Howey Test, subjecting the entire network to devastating legal enforcement actions[35].

Consequently, Layer-2 tokens are viewed by the broader market as highly inflationary certificates of faith rather than productive investments[35]. The tokens suffer from structural dilution due to massive, persistent unlock schedules designed to compensate early venture capitalists and core team members[62]. For example, the Arbitrum token commands a Fully Diluted Valuation in the billions, yet trades at fractions of its all-time high due to the aggressive injection of over 90 million new tokens into the circulating supply every month[62]. Because the token supply expands perpetually while organic token demand remains virtually nonexistent—as users pay for network gas in ETH, not ARB or OP—the price action of the token trends structurally downward, completely decoupled from the actual adoption and success of the network it represents[35].

Strategic Avenues for Indirect Institutional Exposure

Given the uninvestable nature of highly dilutive Layer-2 governance tokens for strict fiduciary allocators like pension funds and traditional asset managers, capital is forced to seek indirect public equity exposure or proxy investment vehicles[64]. The transparency of public blockchains inherently complicates this, as compliance teams must utilize advanced on-chain surveillance to map multi-hop transactions and measure indirect exposure to sanctioned entities, a unique challenge when navigating the decentralized finance ecosystem[65].

To bypass the tokenomics dilemma, institutions allocate capital toward traditional, publicly traded equities that act as operational proxies for on-chain growth. The paramount example in 2026 is Coinbase Global Inc. Because Coinbase operates the sole centralized sequencer for the Base network, it captures one hundred percent of the Layer-2's sequencer margin[36]. This on-chain transaction revenue has become a critical, non-cyclical pillar of Coinbase's quarterly earnings, successfully diversifying its corporate revenue away from the volatility of retail spot trading[60]. By purchasing Coinbase stock, traditional asset managers gain direct, legally compliant exposure to the exponential growth of Layer-2 transaction volume and autonomous artificial intelligence agent activity without touching an unregulated governance token or managing complex cryptographic custody solutions[64].

Alternatively, institutional capital gains indirect exposure to the success of the Layer-2 ecosystem by holding Ethereum itself. Because all Layer-2 rollups, regardless of their architecture, must ultimately purchase blockspace on the Ethereum base layer to finalize their state, the explosive growth of both Optimistic and Zero-Knowledge ecosystems drives continuous, structural demand for ETH as the ultimate settlement currency and data availability commodity[35]. Through regulated spot Ethereum Exchange Traded Funds, or specialized European UCITS funds newly permitted to hold indirect crypto exposure up to ten percent of their Net Asset Value, institutional investors capitalize on Layer-2 infrastructure growth by holding the underlying foundational asset that powers the entire rollup-centric economy[64].

Conclusion

The Layer-2 infrastructure landscape of 2026 presents a clear bifurcation in both technological triumph and economic reality. Measured by Total Value Secured, daily transaction throughput, and decentralized finance liquidity, Optimistic rollups—specifically Arbitrum and Base—are growing substantially faster than their Zero-Knowledge counterparts. Their prioritization of strict Ethereum Virtual Machine compatibility, combined with the drastic cost reductions afforded by EIP-4844's blob data architecture, secured an insurmountable first-mover advantage in retail applications, social decentralized platforms, and public liquidity.
Conversely, Zero-Knowledge rollups have largely lost the public chain volume war. However, they are successfully transitioning into the enterprise sector, utilizing their superior cryptographic privacy, lack of withdrawal delays, and instant finality to build regulated, private infrastructure for the traditional banking system and compliant asset tokenization.
Despite this monumental technological success in scaling decentralized networks, the infrastructure layer remains highly adversarial for investors. The continued centralization of sequencers poses operational fragility and looming regulatory threats. More critically, the underlying tokenomics of Layer-2 networks effectively sever the public investor from the immense cash flows generated by the protocol. Until regulatory clarity permits the activation of revenue-sharing fee switches without triggering punitive securities classifications, direct investment in Layer-2 governance tokens will remain highly dilutive and speculative.
Consequently, prudent capital allocators are required to seek indirect exposure through base-layer assets or publicly traded corporate proxies that have successfully managed to legally monetize the on-chain economy.

Works cited

1. Rollups Explained: How Ethereum Layer 2s Work - Optimism, https://optimism.io/blog/rollups-explained-how-ethereum-layer-2s-work
2. Scaling DeFi with ZK Rollups: Design, Deployment, and Evaluation of a Real-Time Proof-of-Concept - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2506.00500v1
3. Optimism vs. Arbitrum - A Complete Comparison - TokenInsight, https://tokeninsight.com/en/research/market-analysis/optimism-vs.-arbitrum-a-complete-comparison
4. Layer 2 Solutions: Optimism vs Arbitrum vs zkSync for Ethereum Scaling - sanj.dev, https://sanj.dev/post/layer-2-solutions-optimism-vs-arbitrum-vs-zksync/
5. Analyzing and Benchmarking ZK-Rollups, https://d-nb.info/1367531551/34
6. Why Are Layer 2 Blockchains Important for Ethereum Scalability, and What Problems Do They Solve? - KuCoin, https://www.kucoin.com/blog/why-are-layer-2-blockchains-important-for-eth-scalability
7. Transaction Costs and Speed in the Ethereum Ecosystem: Scalability of the Mainnet and Layer 2s. - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2606.22206v1
8. Full-Year 2025 & Themes for 2026, https://public.bnbstatic.com/static/files/research/full-year-2025-and-themes-

for-2026.pdf
9. Optimistic vs ZK Rollups: Which Scaling Tech Will Dominate? - Digitap app, https://digitap.app/news/guide/optimistic-vs-zk-rollups-which-scaling-tech-will-dominate
10. Scaling Ethereum: Is This the End of Layer 2s? | CryptoPress on Binance Square, https://www.binance.com/en-IN/square/post/288862145400722
11. Top 5 Layer 2 Solutions: Ethereum L2 Networks to Watch in 2026 - RZLT, https://www.rzlt.io/blog/top-5-layer-2-solutions-for-ethereum-in-2026
12. Layer 2 Crypto Exchange Integration Guide 2026 - Codono, https://codono.com/blog/layer-2-integration-crypto-exchange
13. The Sequencer and Censorship Resistance - Arbitrum Docs, https://docs.arbitrum.io/how-arbitrum-works/deep-dives/sequencer
14. (PDF) Blockchain Layer 2 Rollups, Optimistic vs zero knowledge - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382319087_Blockchain_Layer_2_Rollups_Optimistic_vs_zero_knowledge
15. Layer 2 Comparison: Arbitrum vs Base vs Optimism vs Lightning vs Spark, https://www.spark.money/tools/layer-2-comparison
16. BoLD: a technical deep dive - Arbitrum Docs, https://docs.arbitrum.io/how-arbitrum-works/bold/bold-technical-deep-dive
17. What is the difference between Arbitrum vs Optimism? - KuCoin, https://www.kucoin.com/knowledge-base/Review/what-is-the-difference-between-arbitrum-vs-optimism
18. Optimism vs Arbitrum: A Complete L2 Comparison Guide - Across Protocol, https://across.to/blog/optimism-vs-arbitrum
19. Arbitrum vs Optimism (2026): Fees, Speed & TVL Compared - Coinstancy, https://coinstancy.com/academy/compare/arbitrum-vs-optimism/
20. What Is a ZK Rollup? A 2026 Guide to Zero-Knowledge Scaling | Support - Eco, https://eco.com/support/en/articles/10080409-what-is-a-zk-rollup-a-2026-guide-to-zero-knowledge-scaling
21. A Comparative Analysis of zk-SNARKs and zk-STARKs: Theory and Practice - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2512.10020v1
22. A Comparative Analysis of zk-SNARKs and zk-STARKs: Theory and Practice - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2512.10020
23. Full Guide to Understanding zk-SNARKs and zk-STARKS - Cyfrin, https://www.cyfrin.io/blog/a-full-comparison-what-are-zk-snarks-and-zk-starks
24. ZK-SNARKs vs ZK-STARKs for Enterprise Blockchain Solutions - Relipa Global, https://relipa.global/zk-snarks-zk-starks-enterprise-blockchain-solutions/
25. zk-SNARKs and zk-STARKs Explained - Binance, https://www.binance.com/en/academy/articles/zk-snarks-and-zk-starks-explained
26. zk-SNARK vs zkSTARK - Explained Simple - Chainlink, https://chain.link/education-hub/zk-snarks-vs-zk-starks
27. What Is a zkEVM? - Chainlink, https://chain.link/education-hub/zkevm

28. What is zkEVM? - ForkLog, https://forklog.com/en/what-is-zkevm/
29. ZK Compression or ZK Rollups: A Comparative Analysis | by MrFrost - Medium, https://medium.com/@mrfrostplaysdefi/zk-compression-or-zk-rollups-a-comparative-analysis-20cb25be0dfc
30. 180 Days After EIP-4844: Will Blob Sharing Solve Dilemma for Small Rollups? - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2410.04111v2
31. Impact Of EIP-4844 On Ethereum: What You Need To Know - Hacken.io, https://hacken.io/discover/eip-4844-explained/
32. What Are Layer 2s (L2s)? Top L2 Networks Compared - CoinGecko, https://www.coingecko.com/learn/layer-2-l2
33. Blobsplaining Part 2: Lessons From The First EIP-4844 Congestion Event - Blocknative, https://www.blocknative.com/blog/blobsplaining-part-2-lessons-from-the-first-eip-4844-congestion-event
34. Impact of EIP-4844 on Ethereum: Consensus Security, Ethereum Usage, Rollup Transaction Dynamics, and Blob Gas Fee Markets - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2405.03183v1
35. Why Are L2 Tokens Often Considered Useless Governance Tokens? Layer 2 Economic Structure | Trading Insight_News on Binance Square, https://www.binance.com/en/square/post/33355762079057
36. What is Base Network? The L2 King and Why It Matters in 2026 - KuCoin, https://www.kucoin.com/blog/what-is-base-network-the-l2-king-and-why-it-matters-in-2026
37. Layer 2 Networks Adoption Statistics 2026: Surprising Growth Trends - CoinLaw, https://coinlaw.io/layer-2-networks-adoption-statistics/
38. Top Ethereum Layer 2 Projects: Networks Redefining Scaling in 2026 - Coin Bureau, https://coinbureau.com/analysis/what-is-the-best-layer-2
39. The Case for Base: An Open Stack for the Global Economy - DWF Labs, https://www.dwf-labs.com/research/the-case-for-base-an-open-stack-for-the-global-economy
40. How Ethereum Upgrades Affected L2s - CryptoRank, https://cryptorank.io/insights/analytics/how-eth-upgrades-affected-l2s
41. The fundamentals of zkSync | Token Terminal, https://tokenterminal.com/resources/crypto-research/zksync-era
42. Best Ethereum Layer 2 Networks in 2026: Speed, Fees, and TVL Compared - walllet, https://walllet.com/articles/best-ethereum-layer2-networks
43. Polygon zkEVM Sunset Deadline Nears as Users Urged to Withdraw Assets Before July 1, 2026 - Cryptonews.net, https://cryptonews.net/news/altcoins/33017031/
44. Polygon zkEVM | Scaling for the Ethereum Virtual Machine, https://polygon.technology/polygon-zkevm
45. Layer 2 Solutions: Optimism vs Arbitrum vs zkSync for Ethereum Scaling | sanj.dev, https://sanj.dev/post/layer-2-solutions-optimism-vs-arbitrum-vs-zksync

46. Ethereum Crosses 1 Million Developers: What the Milestone Means for Builders, https://blog.thirdweb.com/ethereum-crosses-1-million-developers-what-the-milestone-means-for-builders/
47. Zero-Knowledge Proofs Crossed the Production Chasm in 2026 — Here's the Technical Evidence - DEV Community, https://dev.to/wilsonhoe/zero-knowledge-proofs-crossed-the-production-chasm-in-2026-heres-the-technical-evidence-11mf
48. Latest ZKsync News - (ZK) Future Outlook, Trends & Market Insights - CoinMarketCap, https://coinmarketcap.com/cmc-ai/zksync/latest-updates/
49. Why ZKsync Era's Role in Elastic Chains Might Be Bigger Than You Think?, https://gbaglobal.org/blog/2025/03/26/why-zksync-eras-role-in-elastic-chains-might-be-bigger-than-you-think/
50. Prividium - ZKsync.io, https://www.zksync.io/prividium
51. Why ZKPs Are Outperforming Bitcoin in 2026 | Privacy Tech Dominating DeFi, https://www.blockchainappsdeveloper.com/why-zkps-are-outperforming-bitcoin-in-2026
52. Zero-Knowledge Proof Platform Market Research Report 2034 - Market Intelo, https://marketintelo.com/report/zero-knowledge-proof-platform-market
53. Revolutionizing L2 Chains: Building Intrinsic Security from Sequencers - BlockSec Blog, https://blocksec.com/blog/revolutionizing-l2-chains-building-intrinsic-security-from-sequencers
54. A single bad block just froze Base twice in 48 hours and the sequencer problem is not going away - Startup Fortune, https://startupfortune.com/a-single-bad-block-just-froze-base-twice-in-48-hours-and-the-sequencer-problem-is-not-going-away/
55. Regulatory uncertainty clouds layer-2 sequencers as industry and SEC differ - CryptoSlate, https://cryptoslate.com/regulatory-uncertainty-clouds-layer-2-sequencers-as-industry-and-sec-differ/
56. What Is a Crypto VC (Venture Capital)?, https://crypto.com/en/university/what-is-a-crypto-vc
57. Crypto-asset investment structures: A primer | Collas Crill, https://www.collascrill.com/articles/crypto-asset-investment-structures-a-primer/
58. Initial Coin Offerings: Financing Growth with Cryptocurrency Token Sales - European Corporate Governance Institute, https://www.ecgi.global/sites/default/files/working_papers/documents/finalhowellniessneryermack_1.pdf
59. BIS Working Papers - No 1335 - Tokenomics and blockchain fragmentation - Bank for International Settlements, https://www.bis.org/publ/work1335.pdf
60. Coinbase Focused On Revenue Diversification As Crypto Market Conditions Deteriorated In Q1 : Analysis | Crowdfund Insider, https://www.crowdfundinsider.com/2026/05/278948-coinbase-focused-on-revenue-diversification-as-crypto-market-conditions-deteriorated-in-q1-

analysis/
61. Q4'25 Earnings Call - Transcript, https://s27.q4cdn.com/397450999/files/doc_financials/2025/q4/Q4-25-Earnings-Call-Transcript.pdf
62. Arbitrum (ARB) - Price Potential June 2026 | CoinStats AI, https://coinstats.app/ai/a/price-potential-arbitrum
63. Rethinking Token Value: From Subsidized Supply to Sustainable Accrual - FinTech Weekly, https://www.fintechweekly.com/magazine/articles/token-value-accrual-sustainable-crypto-economics-defi-2026
64. How Pension Funds Invest in Crypto - The Block, https://www.theblock.co/learn/406288/how-pension-funds-invest-in-crypto
65. Indirect Exposure: Why You Need to Look Beyond Direct Counterparties to Understand Cryptocurrency Address Risk - Chainalysis, https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/cryptocurrency-risk-blockchain-analysis-indirect-exposure/
66. The Multi-Hop Challenge: Understanding Indirect Blockchain Exposure in Compliance, https://thenextweb.com/news/the-multi-hop-challenge-understanding-indirect-blockchain-exposure-in-compliance
67. Why Crypto Whales Are Accumulating Ethereum Again in May 2026 - Bitcoin Foundation, https://bitcoinfoundation.org/news/ethereum/why-crypto-whales-are-accumulating-ethereum-again-in-may-2026/
68. CSSF opens the door to crypto exposure in UCIs - PwC Luxembourg, https://www.pwc.lu/en/newsletter/2026/cssf-opens-the-door-to-crypto-exposure-in-ucis.html

MAO SHUNQI