© AUG 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 2 | ISSN: 2456-8880

Leveraging Big Data and AI for Liquidity Risk Management in Financial Services

CARLOS POSTIGO TOLEDO[1], JUDITH SAUNGWEME [2], NELISWA CLEMENTINE MATSEBULA[3], MABASA MASUNUNGURE[4], MUNASHE NAPHTALI MUPA[5]

[1,3,5]Hult International Business School

[2] Central Michigan University

[4]Suffolk University

Abstract- Liquidity risk management (LRM) has recently grown into a considerably more important role in promoting the operational and financial soundness of banking and financial institutions in the wake of the 2008 global financial crisis and the following economic upheavals caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The risk that an entity may not be in a position on to settle the financial obligations as they fall due, without loss that may be unacceptable or impacting its daily undertakings, is known as liquidity risk as far as the Baselessly Committee on Banking Supervision is concerned. In essence, it deals with the capacity of financial institutions to transform bank assets into to a form of readily available cash, especially in stressed market conditions. In a situation that was not well checked, liquidity risk may trigger dire effects, such as bank runs, failure of financial intermediaries,, and general systemic shocks, as witnessed during the bust of Lehman Brothers in 2008 (Shem and Mupa, 2024). The event confirmed the weakness of the classical liquidity management tools and models, which used to be based on stubborn indicators and the past without appropriate attention to the current market situation and potential future stressful scenarios.

I. INTRODUCTION

Liquidity risk management (LRM) has recently grown into a considerably more important role in promoting the operational and financial soundness of banking and financial institutions in the wake of the 2008 global financial crisis and the following economic upheavals caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The risk that an entity may not be in a position on to settle the financial obligations as they fall due, without loss that may be unacceptable or impacting its daily undertakings, is known as liquidity risk as far as the Baselessly Committee on Banking Supervision is concerned. In essence, it deals with the capacity of financial institutions to transform bank assets into to a form of readily available cash, especially in stressed market conditions. In a situation that was not well checked, liquidity risk may trigger dire effects, such as bank runs, failure of financial intermediaries,, and general systemic shocks, as witnessed during the bust of Lehman Brothers in 2008 (Shem and Mupa, 2024). The event confirmed the weakness of the classical liquidity management tools and models, which used to be based on stubborn indicators and the past without appropriate attention to the current market situation and potential future stressful scenarios.

In recent history, liquidity risk has been addressed by means of traditional methods,, including the liquidity coverage ratio (LCR), net stable funding ratio (NSFR),, and mismatch in maturity examinations (Alam et al., 2023). These measures, while giving basic insight, are necessarily retrospective and do not reflect the nonlinear interconnected, and rapid change that financial markets are undergoing in the digital age. The fact that financial instruments are becoming more complex, that information flow in the various markets is gaining momentum,, and that al events are becoming more and more unpredictable means that a more dynamic and intelligent approach in the management of risks is needed that should not be overlooked (Munashe Naphtali Mupa, 2025). He states that financial services valuation models now have to incorporate variables that were commonly ignored in past risk systems, including variables that define policy volatility, ESG exposure, intangible assets, and behavioral dynamics.

In this regard, Savchenko (2024) states that the meeting of big data analytics and artificial intelligence (AI) offers an improvement chance to the financial institutions to restructure their liquidity risk management models. Those technologies allow the realization of the gathering, processing, and analysis of huge amounts of structured and unstructured data in real-time. With machine learning (ML) and natural language processing (NLP), AI has the capability to make predictive models and early warning systems that preempt any liquidity stress event before it is realized (Onabowale, 2024). This paper critically evaluates the implication of using big data and AI in managing liquidity risk, basing the discussion on theoretical as well as empirical analysis,, including case research studies and best practices. It goes further to analyze the strategic, technical, and regulatory issues that come along with this transition and provides long-term advantages of a technology-y-based approach toward liquidity risk to uncial resilience.

II. THE CONCEPTUAL EVOLUTION OF LIQUIDITY RISK MANAGEMENT

Traditionally, liquidity risk management was dominated by the liquidity metricsi.e., maturity ladder analysis and the ratio-based assessment (e.g.,, liquidity coverage ratio and net stable funding ratio). These ratings are known through Basel III instructions,, which are based on the concept of high-quality liquid asset (HQLA) buffer and cash matching in a distressed situation. The main limitations of such models, however, include (1)being historical in nature and, therefore, being unable to provide actual risks, and (2) not being able to react in real-time to adjustments to what is happening in the markets. The 2008 financial crisis highlighted the inefficiency of traditional LRMIV. models, as metrics such as the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) and Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR) were implemented only after the crisis, not before.where such established institutions as the Lehman Brothers were brought to their knees by the liquidity crunches that could not be identified with the use of traditional tools (Bardaeva, 2021).

Shah et al. (2023) posits that the contemporary advances in data science and AI allow taking a more comprehensive and dynamic approach to risk management. Machine learning (ML) algorithms in particular have the capabilities to analyze large amounts of data in real-time, find latent relationships, and forecast liquidity stress conditions with unequaled precision (Behera et al., 2024). Integration of unstructured data with structured data on internal systems, outside market feeds, news, and social media enables an institution to pick up early warning signs of liquidity strain. According to Lion and Ekefre (2024), 82 percent of international banks have introduced an element of AI into their processes of risk management, and liquidity risk has been classified as a prime area of change.

III. BIG DATA ARCHITECTURE AND SOURCES IN LIQUIDITY RISK MODELING

Since the liquidity risk originated in the digitization of financial services and the globalization of financial markets, the application of big data in liquidity risk modeling has grown at an exponential pace. In finance, big data is more than the figures quantifying the raw amount of data being produced on a daily basis, but additionally the speed of its production (velocity), range of varied format and origin (variety), and validity or correctness problems (veracity),, and a combination of the three known as the four Vs. of big data (Nilashi et al., 2023). Such features render traditional data processing tools insufficient,, which is why elaborate big data architectures that are real-time, scalable,, and multiple-source analytics have to be created. With reference to liquidity risk, such evolution can launch the institutions into proactive and even predictive liquidity management approaches.

The sources of big data useful in modeling liquidity risks are found in either structured or unstructured areas. Internal records of structured data are intraday cash flow statements, treasury transaction logs, securities settlement, and real-time positions in accounts (Naphtali et al., 2024). They are commonly derived through core bank systems and trading systems, ell as treasury systems. In contrast, unstructured data covers market newsfeeds, regulatory filings, social media sentiment, geopolitical trends, and even alt data like satellite imagery (good at gauging either supply chain risk or macroeconomic problems that might impact liquidity sideways). Mupa (2025) explains that such multiplicity of the type of data necessitates the need to validate not only traditional financial indicators but also intangible, qualitative, and frequently real-time signals in the market n a bid to predict changes in the liquidity demand and availability.

Financial institutions leverage powerful big data frameworks in order to utilize these various sources of data (Mathrani and Lai, 2021). The true gems of this architecture are cloud-based storage systems, which extend and capabilities to far greater than terabytes of data at very high rates of scalability. Apache Hadoop and Apache Spark are examples of distributed computing,, which can process data in parallel,, therefore dramatically reducing the latency factor of real-time liquidity monitoring. Services such as Apache Kafka enable low-latency, high-throughput data ingestion systems that process transactional and event-driven streams of data in software. Data lakes serve as a hub storage container of different data and are able to store semi-structured, unstructured, and structured data in raw format with the flexibility to be used in deep learning and predictive analytics.

Additionally, Efuntade et al.. (2023) state that application programming interfaces (APIs) have also become paramount in operating disparate data systems with third-party market data vendors and internal compliance systems with the central liquidity monitoring systems. On the basis of these big data systems, in which it is possible to store, access, and analyze data gathered on thousands of nodes at the same time, these artificial intelligence tools can be applied to generate actionable insights into liquidity risks, and in many cases in near real-time. Consequently, implementation of such architecture no longer remains a choice a strategic question for the financial institutions in general to improve resiliency, satisfy the regulatory requirements, and ensure a competitive edge in the dynamic environment of risk management (Mupa, 2024).

In the context of liquidity risk, key data sources include

- Market data: Asset prices, volatility indices (e.g., VIX), interest rates, yield curves, and macroeconomic indicators.
- Customer behavioral data: withdrawal, redemption, loan utilizations, and payment delays.
- Alternative data: News sentiment analysis, social media trends, and geopolitical changes.

A proposition of these sources is that, when integrated, big data frameworks enable institutions to identify behavioral indicators of liquidity stress, including massive withdrawals and correlated asset devaluations, which might not appear in standard reports.

IV. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNIQUES IN LIQUIDITY RISK MANAGEMENT

Machine learning and artificial intelligence tools have emerged as the key in the analysis of high-dimensional financial data when treasury risk is at stake. Such methods are

1. Supervised Learning: Random Forests, Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM), and Support Vector Machines (SVM) models can be used to classify and imagine the liquidity stress events dependent on historical features.
2. Unsupervised Learning: To detect anomalies or new liquidity clusters without pre-labeled data, it is thus possible to use clustering algorithms (such as k-means and DBSCAN).
3. Natural Language Processing (NLP): Allows sentiment to be determined based on news and social media, such as the possible shocks (i.e.,, credit downgrades or regulatory crackdowns) that may affect the liquidity.
4. Deep Learning: Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) frames exemplify time series ties in liquidity metrics more successfully than customary models.
5. Reinforcement-based: This uses a scenario optimization and stress testing through simulation of several paths of decisions subject to various market conditions.

An example of the JPMorganrgan Chase case study proves how efficient AI is in LRM (Barua, 2024). The company employs a hybrid AI-based model that incorporates the market sentiment with the real-time transaction data to ensure managing its intraday liquidity needs, which results in the decrease in idle cash buffer by 10 percent with no violation of the Basel III LCR standards.

V. REAL-TIME LIQUIDITY MONITORING AND PREDICTIVE CAPABILITIES

The interface face of AI-based dashboards on liquidity risk management (LRM) has revolutionized how financial institutions track, predict, and manage liquidity displays. The more sophisticated tools show the treasury and risk management personnel the liquidity status of their position in any entity, any currency,, and any geographical region in real time. Aggregation of tremendous amounts of transactional data across multiple sources allows AI-powered systems to achieve a centralized perspective of cash flows, funding needs, and available liquidity, therefore boosting the decision-making process.

In addition to real-time monitoring, AICs have the ability to provide an outlook of liquidity situations by using machine learning and statistical modeling. These predictions are made by studying the past trend of transactions, up-to-date details of the balance sheet, the conduct of customers,, and the macroeconomics. These tools enable the estimation in normal market and stressed market conditions of the likely inflows and outflows,, therefore predicting well in advance the expected inflows and outflows through predictive analytics. Consequently, the treasury teams are given at least an insight into the events to occur before a shortage of liquidity occurs,, and thus mitigation measures can be instituted before regulatory thresholds are reached.

Notably, dynamic alerting features in AI systems are also true. These alerts are generated when the predicted liquidity positions are near some predetermined limits or there are abnormal trend patterns that can represent an increase in liquidity risk. This enables financial institutions to pursue proactive measures that could include initiating short-term interbank borrowings, redressing collateral, optimizing intra-day cash balances, or rebalancing portfolios of investments in order to meet regulatory requirements of liquidity coverage ratios (LCRs) or internal risk appetite models.

The efficiency of predictive LRM came out dramatically during the turbulence in the market that was occasioned by COVID-19 in March 2020. During the worst of the crisis, the financial markets around the world were under extreme pressure, and most banks were faced with a rush to withdraw accounts, repo markets ground to a halt, and there was a massive shrinking in their sources of funds. Liquidity that had the AI-based liquidity monitoring tools was in a better position to handle such challenges. Such tools could simulate different forms of stress, such as panicked withdrawals by customers, defaults of counterparties, and hoarding of liquidity. Through the real-time analysis of the results of these simulations, treasury teams could quickly reallocate funds, change funding strategies, and liquidity buffers.

The McKinsey report (2021) emphasized that banks that employed AI-powered LRM systems were 25 percent more successful than their counterparts in ensuring regulatory LCR reserves in the crisis (Hamzat, 2023). This highlights the importance of the implementation of AI in treasury operations—not only as a means of compliance but also as a strategic capability of resilience, agility, and competitive advantage in unstable markets. As the financial environment keeps changing, it is probable that the use of AI in liquidity forecasting will be one of the foundations of successful enterprise risk management.

VI. USE OF BIG DATA FOR STRESS TESTING AND SCENARIO ANALYSIS

The fact that it is becoming more and more difficult to predict the movements of global economies has created much havoc on the face of stress testing in the financial institutions, mainly through the increased demands of the prudential regulators. Stress testing as an aspect of the process of testing the capacity of a bank to handle some negative economic events has now become an essential part of the liquidity risk management process and legislative regulatory compliance. Despite being an essential framework on which stress testing is based, traditional stress testing models are prone to historic representations and deterministic modeling, which does not capture the non-linear, dynamic, and complex nature of the interdependence of market variables and behaviors of customers and economic climates. Big data and artificial intelligence (AI) have become the potent enablers in this context because the former can enrich and transform stress testing paradigms with real-time information and more granular data and relieve adaptability to scenarios (Rane et al., 2024).

The use of big data can help institutions to internalize and process huge bulks of real-time as well as existing caches of data from both internal and external sources. Such sources are transaction logs, intraday funding positions, and reports by central banks; trends in commodity as well as equity markets; geopolitical events; and customer behavioral patterns. Using distributed processing technologies like Spark and Hadoop, financial institutions can conduct thousands of forward-looking stress-testing simulations at the same time, thereby increasing the horizontal analysis space. Being, in general, probabilistic, Monte Carlo simulations acquire new powers when implemented together with machine learning (ML) algorithms. This hybrid method enables financial institutions to simulate thousands of possible routes through which liquidity may be reduced in a broad variety of macroeconomic scenarios, including the rapid rise in interest rates, a market freeze in credit markets, or geopolitical turmoil.

In addition, there is future work through applying the latest AI methods, such as generative adversarial networks (GANs), which further augment stress testing frameworks through the ability to generate synthetic, high-fidelity data samples that approximate rare or extreme events. It is especially useful when historical information is unlatching or inadequate (the days of black swan events). Such computer-generated data would enable the simulation of hypothetical situations that might not have happened but could happen with the changing world trends. The capacity to replicate controlled stress conditions like policy changes or ESG-driven shortages of liquidity in an AI-smart big data environment, as Munashe Naphtali Mupa (2025) claims, is very powerful in enhancing the preparedness and strategic response schemes of financial institutions.

Of much importance too is the development of reverse stress testing, which predicts the set of market and behavioral factors that can make an institution exceed its liquidity limits. Through unsupervised learning, AI models can identify the most sensitive and vulnerable aspects of an institution's liquidity structure on an automatic basis, and in this way, proactive risk mitigation is possible. Such methods have already been implemented by the leading Global Systemically Important Banks (G-SIBs) to improve their resilience evaluations and ensure compliance with the regulatory transparency requirements of Basel III and IV. Not only do these innovations suffice in enhancing decision-making, but they also instill the credibility of the institution among the stakeholders and supervisory organs.

VII. CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTATION

Dewasiri et al. (2024) state that although the use of big data, artificial intelligence (AI), and liquidity risk management (LRM) holds tremendous potential for changes, the difficulty lies in adopting their implementation into financial institutions with a collection of technical, regulatory, operational, and ethical issues. Unless dealt with properly, these issues may compromise reliability, acceptance, as well as scalability of AI-powered LRM frameworks. In this section, the four key areas of concern are discussed critically: data quality and integration, model interpretability, regulatory compliance, and ethical and operational risks.

1. Data Quality and Integration

Availability of high-quality, consistent, and well-integrated data may be defined as one of the underlying prerequisites of successful AI and big data analytics in LRM. Nonetheless, most financial institutions are still using fragmented IT infrastructures that support isolated business units. These silos result in data architectures that are inconsistent, formats that do not match, and redundancy, which makes data integration cumbersome and also prone to peculiarities (Mohammed, 2025). When it comes to LRM, the ability to make real-time decisions based on high-frequency data in internal transactional systems, external APIs (e.g., market feeds, sentiment analysis tools), and regulatory reporting systems is an important constraint to the non-existence of seamless data flow.

Moreover, AI models are extremely vulnerable to the quality and promptness of the input data. Weak or sporadic data may also add a lot of noise in the predictive models, leading to the high probability that liquidity positions may be forecasted incorrectly or the liquidity stress scenarios not being correctly identified. As an example, AI models could make liquidity errors when using incorrectly labeled, delayed data on customer transactions that remove a potential source of liquidity, resulting in incorrect liquidity warnings or understating liquidity risk.

2. Model Interpretability and Transparency
One of the key constraints of AI in LRM is the explainability of models applied. Some of the strongest AI algorithms are also the models that are the most "black box," especially deep learning, ensemble learning, and reinforcement learning. These models can find complicated structures and non-linear correlations in high-dimensional data and provide little explanation about the basis of some prediction or decision (Khan et al., 2023).

When there are high stakes in LRM, such as provision of liquidity buffers, funding strategies, and meeting regulatory standards, the stakeholders, senior management, risk committees, and regulators require knowing how decisions are drawn using model outputs. Lack of indication of how an AI model estimates a liquidity shortage or offers a specific interbank borrowing strategy makes it hard to trust and practically does not allow operational use of models beyond the pilot phase.

To overcome the problem, there has been the opening of the Explainable AI (XAI) field, which aims at coming up with tools and methods that enhance greater transparency of model behavior. Other methods, including SHAP (SHapley Additive explanations), LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations), and attention mechanisms, have been demonstrated to have the potential to help demystify complex AI models (Ahmed et al., 2024). Nevertheless, they still are at the early stages of their use in LRM settings, and the liquidity domain is the sphere where special challenges are posed. The amount of liquidity depends on changing and interdependent factors, such as the mood of the market, macroeconomic activities, funding positions within the company, etc. It is always hard to develop interpretable models that can be used in such a chaotic environment that have predictive power for a system as well.

3. Regulatory Compliance and Governance
The other very important issue is matching AI-facilitated LRM to regulatory looks. Stringent controls by the regulatory bodies impose strict compliance of transparency, auditability, and effectiveness of risk management models in financial institutions. The European Central Bank, in its Targeted Review of Internal Models (TRIM), Basel IV liquidity requirement (e.g., LCR and NSFR), and the European Banking Authority (EBA) on guidelines on machine learning in credit and liquidity risk require models to be explainable, validated, and governed comprehensively.

Among the factors that make regulators apprehensive about AI is its ability to create systemic risk by virtue of model obscurity and automation bias. Silent failures/false positives/negatives by a liquidity risk model can be devastating too: not only to the financial system but to the institution itself. To illustrate, an incorrect model can give the treasury operations a false impression of the cash inflow and outflow during a liquidity crisis, thus leading to default in the short term.

Further, regulating bodies are more and more expecting the firms implementing AI in risk management to preserve human oversight, develop sound model validation procedures, and record assumptions, constraints, and decision trees. A balance between achieving these requirements and upholding the characteristics of the AI models as adaptive and agile is thin. The existing model risk management structures might have to face a re-engineering process to suit the iterative aspect of the machine learning models, being constantly trained and updated in response to newer data feeds.

Such a contradiction of innovation and compliance tends to create a rhetorical or gradual involvement of AI in LRM. A significantly high number of companies use a hybrid method where AI-based insights are applied, but in a supplemental way, not in replacement of traditional ways of liquidity monitoring. But it may curtail the reaching of optimum potential of the AI and even result in overlapping of functions.

4. Ethical and Operational Risks
The moral and business matters also are of great concern. The quality of AI models depends on the data they get trained on. In case the underlying training data include historic biases, inaccuracies, or gaps, they can be reflected and reproduced as biases, errors, or gaps in the outputs. In the LRM scenario, this bias can show itself in an incorrect estimation of funds needed in certain areas or business lines, which translates to uneven allocation of resources and worse liquidity risk.

Another threat is operational risk. Implementation of AI systems, especially those combined with real-time dashboards and autonomous decision-making engines, generates new areas of failure. These factors embrace dangers of system deactivation, cyber-hacks, and data compromises. Since management of liquidity is extremely sensitive to time, any system failure can lead to dire implications such as regulatory violation and damage to reputation.

In addition, the risk of being over-reliant on automation exists. Unlike AI, which can recognize trends and provide measures based on statistics, the qualitative factors that tend to affect liquidity, including the appearance of new political instability, central bank statements, or the change of the counterparty behavior, cannot be completely incorporated by AI. Interpretation of these signals still requires human judgment. Institutions are thus forced to pay a delicate balance between automation and the oversight expert. The incorporation of human-in-the-loop (HITL) mechanisms will make the AI results verification and contextualization prior to important decisions.

VIII. STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS AND COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

The benefits of engaging in the use of AI and big data to practice LRM efficiently among banks are

- Capital Optimization: By improving the quality of liquidity forecasting, one can be able to manage buffers more efficiently, improving capital optimization and remaining compliant.
- Operational Efficiency: Automation minimizes manual counterbalances, improves decision-making velocity, and enables a shift of resources to value-added transcendences.
- Improved Customer Confidence: Once the institutions go on the offensive and address the liquidity issues through means that do not affect the service, they will develop reputation and faith among customers and regulatory agencies.
- Early warning systems: Real-time risk alerts allow proactive hedging or borrowing policies; thus, exposure to the liquidity gaps is minimized.

Innovation Leadership: The AI-driven LRM innovation leaders have a better chance to affect the industry norms and partner with the regulators on model creation.

As an example, using AI to track the intraday liquidity helped HSBC save its idle capital by more than 10 billion pounds in its international branches and streamline its compliance reporting schedules by 40%.

IX. THE FUTURE OF LIQUIDITY RISK MANAGEMENT

Moving forward, AI is likely to combine with the other emerging technologies, such as blockchain, quantum computing, and the Internet of Things (IoT), and can redesign the liquidity risk frameworks. Smart contracts using blockchain can automate the administration of collateral and the repo deal, thereby decreasing settlement delays. Complex liquidity simulations could be worked through at hitherto unreachable speeds by means of quantum computing, and IoT data (e.g., retail patterns of behavior) could be used in predictive cash flow models.

Moreover, open banking and API-sharing environments can provide cross-institutional and cross-jurisdictional standardized dashboards of liquidity. Those innovations would increase the transparency of systemic risk and enable central banks to conduct macroprudential supervision.

The move to an AI-first strategy that banks have recently made implies the transformation of risk professionals, who are currently seen as compliance specialists, into data-fluency analysts able to create and oversee intelligent systems. Regulatory systems will also have to change to include AI model auditing criteria, stress testing of algorithm biases, and digital infrastructure resilience indicators.

CONCLUSION

The liquidity risk management of big data and AI is a paradigm change in the sphere of financial services. Besides the higher predictive ability and the real-time response capability, such technologies can also facilitate the strategic agility within the volatile financial environment. Despite the remaining issues connected to data governance, interpretability of models, and regulatory concerns, the long-term value of AI-based LRM is high. Financial institutions that adapt to this change will have an opportunity to enjoy a competitive advantage, regulatory favor, and resilience in their operations. The modeling of cross-border liquidity utilizing the federated learning technique, inclusion of environmental stress factors (e.g., climate risk), and digital currencies (CBDC) as the means of shaping new liquidity paradigms should be considered in future studies.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmad, T., Katari, P., Pamidi Venkata, A.K., Ravi, C. and Shaik, M., 2024. Explainable AI: Interpreting Deep Learning Models for Decision Support. *Advances in Deep Learning Techniques*, *4*(1), pp.80-108.

[2] Alam, T., Hussain, I. and Saqib, A., 2023. Net Stable Funding and Liquidity Coverage Influence on Islamic Bank Financial Stability: Evidence from Malaysian Islamic Banking. *International Journal of Economics, Management and Accounting*, pp.153-176.

[3] Bardaeva, P., 2021. *Bank Asset Liability Management Best Practice: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

[4] Barua, T., 2024. Review of data analytics and information systems in enhancing efficiency in financial services: case studies from the industry.

[5] Behera, I., Nanda, P., Mitra, S. and Kumari, S., 2024. Machine Learning Approaches for Forecasting Financial Market Volatility. *Machine Learning Approaches in Financial Analytics*, pp.431-451.

[6] Dewasiri, N.J., Dharmarathna, D.G. and Choudhary, M., 2024. Leveraging artificial intelligence for enhanced risk management in banking: A systematic literature review. *Artificial intelligence enabled management: An emerging economy perspective*, pp.197-213.

[7] Efuntade, O.O., Efuntade, A.O. and FCIB, F., 2023. Application programming interface (API) and management of web-based accounting information system (AIS): security of transaction processing system, general ledger and financial reporting system. *Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*, *9*(6), pp.1-18.

[8] Hamzat, L., 2023. Real-Time Financial Resilience and Debt Optimization for Entrepreneurs: Tackling Debt Management as a Financial Health Pandemic and Empowering Small Business Growth through Early Detection of Financial Distress and Effortless Capital Management [online]

[9] Khan, N., Coleri, S., Abdallah, A., Celik, A. and Eltawil, A.M., 2023. Explainable and robust artificial intelligence for trustworthy resource management in 6G networks. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, *62*(4), pp.50-56.

[10] Lion, C.J. and Ekefre, A.E., 2024. Risk Control and Management in Banking Sector: Investigating the Work of Artificial Intelligence in Mitigating Risks. *International Journal of Advancement in Education, Management, Science and Technology*, *7*(1), pp.82-92.

[11] Mathrani, S. and Lai, X., 2021. Big data analytic framework for organizational leverage. *Applied Sciences*, *11*(5), p.2340.

[12] Mohammed, C.S.A., 2025. Integrated Financial Ecosystems: Leveraging FRDP to Bridge Risk, Compliance, and Product Innovation. *Indonasian Journal of Advanced Research & Technology*, *7*(7).

[13] MUPA, M.N., 2024. Corporate Governance and Firm Performance: A Study of Selected South African Energy Companies'. *IRE Journals*, *8*(2), pp.294-310.

[14] NETSHIFHEFHE, K., NETSHIFHEFHE, M.V., NAPHTALI, M. and MUPA, K.A.M., 2024. The Role of Forensic Audits in Strengthening Corporate Governance and Mitigating Compliance Risks.

[15] Nilashi, M., Keng Boon, O., Tan, G., Lin, B. and Abumalloh, R., 2023. Critical data challenges in measuring the performance of sustainable development goals: Solutions and the role of big-data analytics. *Harvard Data Science Review*, *5*(3), pp.1-36.

[16] Onabowale, O., 2024. Enhancing Financial Forecasting with AI and Machine Learning.

[17] Rane, N., Choudhary, S. and Rane, J., 2024. Artificial intelligence for enhancing resilience. *Journal of Applied Artificial Intelligence*, *5*(2), pp.1-33.

[18] Savchenko, M., 2024. The impact of artificial intelligence on risk management in the operational activities of financial institutions. *Development Management*, *4*(23), pp.45-54.

[19] Shah, H.M., Gardas, B.B., Narwane, V.S. and Mehta, H.S., 2023. The contemporary state of big data analytics and artificial intelligence towards intelligent supply chain risk management: a comprehensive review. *Kybernetes*, *52*(5), pp.1643-1697.

[20] SHEM, A.M. and MUPA, M.N., 2024. *Turnaround Financing: Legal and Financial Considerations for Distressed Companies* [online]

[21] SHIRAISHI, R. and MUPA, M.N., 2025. Cross-Border Tax Structuring and Valuation Optimization in Energy-Sector M&A: A US-Japan Perspective.