Executive Dashboards in Corporate Finance: A Systematized Review of Visual Analytic Design and Efficacy

BLESSING OLAJUMOKE FAROUNBI[1], AKINDAMOLA SAMUEL AKINOLA[2], OLAOLU SAMUEL ADESANYA[3], CHIZOBA MICHAEL OKAFOR[4]
[1]*Vetiva Capital, Nigeria*
[2]*Nigerian Breweries PLC, Lagos, Nigeria (A Heineken company)*
[3]*PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), Lagos, Nigeria*
[4]*Access Bank Plc, Nigeria*

Abstract- Executive dashboards have become central tools for financial decision-making, offering leaders consolidated, real-time insights through visual analytics. In the context of corporate finance, dashboards help reduce cognitive load, improve situational awareness, and support strategic alignment between operational metrics and financial goals. However, despite their increasing adoption, research reveals diverse design practices, variable efficacy, and challenges in implementation. This paper conducts a systematized review of scholarly and practitioner literature on dashboard use in corporate finance, focusing on three domains: visual analytic design, decision-making efficacy, and integration with financial management systems. Drawing on over 100 sources spanning business analytics, information visualization, finance, and decision science, the paper synthesizes key findings, identifies design principles, and evaluates efficacy evidence. A conceptual framework is proposed, integrating visualization theory with financial strategy execution, highlighting feedback loops and executive cognition. The review concludes with implications for practice, policy, and research, advocating for a new generation of adaptive, personalized, and AI-enabled executive dashboards to advance corporate finance governance in uncertain environments.

Keywords: Executive Dashboards, Corporate Finance Analytics, Visual Analytic Design, Decision-Making Efficacy, Data Visualization Systems, Financial Performance Management

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, executive dashboards have emerged as one of the most prominent tools for strategic management and financial decision-making in modern corporations [1], [2]. In the era of big data, enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems, and business intelligence (BI) platforms, executives are confronted with a constant inflow of complex, high-volume information [3], [4], [5]. Navigating this landscape requires mechanisms to filter, visualize, and interpret data in ways that facilitate quick, evidence-based decisions. In corporate finance, where misinformed judgments can have material consequences for capital allocation, liquidity management, and shareholder value, dashboards play an increasingly critical role [6], [7], [8]. They promise to reduce cognitive overload, consolidate heterogeneous datasets, and align operational insights with financial strategy.

The concept of dashboards is not entirely new. The earliest precursors can be traced to management control systems of the mid-20th century, when executives relied on static reports and key performance indicator (KPI) sheets to monitor performance [9], [10]. However, these tools were retrospective, often outdated, and lacking in interactivity. By the late 1990s and early 2000s, the convergence of relational databases, real-time analytics, and advances in data visualization gave rise to digital dashboards capable of integrating multi-source data and presenting it visually [11], [12]. This transformation was accelerated by the rise of balanced scorecards, Six Sigma reporting frameworks, and ERP systems that sought to link financial metrics to operational processes. Executive dashboards became positioned as the “single pane of glass” through which leaders could oversee performance, anticipate risks, and align business units with corporate objectives [13], [14].

In corporate finance specifically, dashboards have found broad applications [1], [15]. Executives use them to monitor liquidity ratios, revenue growth, cost efficiency, working capital cycles, debt servicing, risk exposures, and compliance indicators [16], [17]. The dashboard interface provides visual cues such as color-coded alerts, trend lines, heatmaps, and predictive graphs that highlight deviations from benchmarks or strategic plans [18], [19]. More advanced dashboards incorporate scenario modeling, simulation engines, and AI-driven predictive analytics to extend decision support beyond monitoring toward proactive management [20], [21]. Thus, dashboards evolve from being passive “mirrors” of performance to active decision-support ecosystems.

1.1 Rationale for Dashboards in Corporate Finance

Corporate finance involves decision-making under conditions of uncertainty, time pressure, and often conflicting stakeholder expectations [22], [23]. Executives must decide on capital budgeting, investment prioritization, debt issuance, dividend policy, risk hedging, and resource allocation [24], [25]. These decisions are complex because they rely on both quantitative data (financial statements, risk models, forecasts) and qualitative judgment (strategic positioning, market conditions, regulatory changes) [26], [27]. Traditional reporting systems are often inadequate: they present static, retrospective data and fail to integrate cross-functional insights.

Dashboards address these shortcomings by offering real-time visibility, integrated data sources, and intuitive visualization techniques that allow executives to quickly identify anomalies or opportunities. For instance, an executive may monitor a dashboard that simultaneously tracks:

- Daily cash flow movements,
- Variance from budgeted expenditures,
- Risk-adjusted return on capital employed (ROCE), and
- ESG-related financial exposures.

By consolidating these diverse metrics into a unified interface, dashboards support more holistic and timely decision-making. In this sense, dashboards act as a bridge between the information environment (vast, fragmented datasets) and the decision environment (executive cognition, bounded rationality, and strategic priorities).

1.2 Visual Analytics and Cognitive Load

The central strength of dashboards lies in their visual analytic design. Research from cognitive psychology demonstrates that the human brain processes visual information far more efficiently than textual or numerical information [28], [29]. Features such as color, shape, size, and spatial positioning act as pre-attentive attributes, enabling executives to perceive patterns, anomalies, or trends at a glance [30], [31]. In corporate finance, where even minor anomalies in cash flow or cost overruns can have material impacts, the ability to “see” risks before they escalate is invaluable [32], [33].

Yet, poor design can undermine this value. Dashboards cluttered with excessive metrics, inconsistent scales, or misleading graphics can exacerbate cognitive overload rather than alleviate it [34], [35]. Scholars emphasize principles of minimalism, contextualization, interactivity, and alignment with cognitive fit theory, which posits that visualization formats must match the type of decision problem [36], [37]. For instance, time-series data on revenue growth may best be visualized as a trend line, whereas risk exposures across regions may be better captured through heatmaps or treemaps [38], [39].

1.3 From Operational to Strategic Dashboards

Historically, dashboards were used primarily for operational monitoring tracking short-term metrics such as daily sales, costs, or production outputs [1], [40]. Over time, however, their role has expanded into strategic domains, particularly in corporate finance. Strategic dashboards align directly with long-term financial objectives and capital market expectations [41], [42]. They may include projections of earnings per share (EPS) under different macroeconomic scenarios, stress tests of liquidity under credit shocks, or visualizations of investment portfolio risk exposures [43], [44]. This shift mirrors the evolution of corporate finance itself, from an accounting-based, retrospective practice to a forward-looking, risk-sensitive, and strategic discipline.

Importantly, dashboards also support communication and governance. Executive committees, boards of directors, and external stakeholders increasingly expect transparent, concise representations of financial performance. Dashboards provide not only analytical clarity but also a language of visualization that facilitates dialogue between finance executives, operational managers, and investors. In this way, dashboards serve not just as tools of analysis but as instruments of governance and accountability.

1.4 Challenges in Dashboard Adoption

Despite their promise, dashboards face significant challenges in design, implementation, and efficacy assessment. These challenges fall into several categories:

1. Data Integration: Corporate finance relies on data from ERP systems, treasury platforms, accounting modules, and external market feeds. Ensuring accurate, real-time integration remains technically complex [27], [45].
2. Governance and Reliability: Dashboards are only as reliable as the underlying data governance structures. Issues of data quality, latency, or manipulation can erode trust [46], [47].
3. User Adoption and Training: Executives vary in their familiarity with visual analytics, and without training, they may misinterpret dashboard cues or underutilize interactive features [48], [49].
4. Efficacy Measurement: While dashboards are intuitively appealing, rigorous empirical evidence of their causal impact on decision quality remains limited [50], [51].
5. Over-Simplification: There is a risk of oversimplifying complex financial dynamics into "traffic light" indicators, which may obscure nuance or mislead decision-makers [52].

1.5 Justification for a Systematized Review

Given the diversity of dashboard applications and the rapid evolution of visualization technologies, a comprehensive review of existing literature is warranted. While there have been numerous case studies and design papers, the field lacks a systematized synthesis that evaluates both design principles and efficacy evidence specifically within the domain of corporate finance. A systematized review strikes a balance between breadth and rigor, drawing on the systematic review tradition in information systems while accommodating the heterogeneity of sources (academic journals, conferences, practitioner reports).

This paper addresses this gap by conducting a systematized review of 110 scholarly and practitioner sources published between 2000 and 2018. It asks three central questions:

1. What are the prevailing design principles for executive dashboards in corporate finance?
2. What evidence exists regarding their efficacy in enhancing decision-making?
3. How can dashboards be conceptually framed as integrated tools for financial governance, strategy, and accountability?

1.6 Contribution of the Study

The contributions of this paper are threefold:

- Synthesis: It consolidates fragmented knowledge from multiple domains visual analytics, finance, decision science into a coherent review.
- Evaluation: It critically evaluates efficacy evidence, distinguishing between anecdotal claims and empirically validated outcomes.
- Framework Development: It proposes a conceptual framework that situates dashboards within the broader ecosystem of financial strategy execution, executive cognition, and performance governance.

1.7 Structure of the Paper

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows:

- Section 2 presents a comprehensive literature review synthesizing scholarship on dashboard design, efficacy, and financial applications.
- Section 3 outlines the methodology of the systematized review.
- Section 4 discusses the findings of the review, emphasizing design principles, efficacy evidence, and integration challenges.
- Section 5 proposes a conceptual framework for executive dashboards in corporate finance.
- Section 6 concludes with implications for practice, policy, and future research.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Executive dashboards have evolved from static reporting tools to highly interactive, data-driven systems that integrate visual analytics, performance monitoring, and decision-support functionalities. This section reviews existing literature on dashboard design, adoption, and efficacy with a focus on applications in corporate finance. The review synthesizes contributions from information systems, visual analytics, finance, and management science, offering a structured understanding of how dashboards contribute to decision-making under uncertainty.

2.1 Historical Evolution of Dashboards

The origins of executive dashboards can be traced to management information systems (MIS) in the 1960s and decision support systems (DSS) in the 1970s [40], [53]. Early systems relied heavily on tabular reports, with limited graphical capabilities. By the 1990s, the introduction of enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems facilitated the integration of financial and operational data [54]. Balanced scorecard frameworks, popularized by Kaplan and Norton [5], emphasized linking financial metrics to strategy, thereby laying a conceptual foundation for dashboards.

The early 2000s witnessed a surge in business intelligence (BI) platforms such as Cognos, SAP BusinessObjects, and Microsoft Power BI, which embedded dashboards as front-end visualization tools [55], [56]. These systems shifted dashboards from static reporting toward real-time, interactive decision-support tools [57], [58]. Scholars argue that this evolution was driven by three forces:

1. Explosion of corporate data from ERP, CRM, and supply chain systems [59], [60], [61].
2. Advances in visualization technologies leveraging interactive charts, heatmaps, and geospatial mapping [62], [63], [64].
3. Demand for strategic agility, requiring executives to process information quickly [65], [66], [67].

By the 2010s, dashboards became ubiquitous in corporate finance, supporting liquidity management, investment decision-making, and compliance monitoring [68], [69].

2.2 Visual Analytics Foundations

Visual analytics forms the backbone of dashboard functionality. Research shows that humans process visuals 60,000 times faster than text [16]. Effective dashboard design leverages preattentive attributes such as color, shape, and spatial positioning to enhance perception [17], [18]. Tufte [19] emphasized clarity, simplicity, and avoidance of "chartjunk," while Few [20] argued for dashboards as "data displays that monitor and communicate key information at a glance."

Cognitive fit theory posits that visualization formats must match the decision task [21], [22]. For instance, time-series trends in financial ratios are best conveyed through line charts, while comparative risk exposures may be more effectively displayed using bar charts or treemaps [23]. Overloaded dashboards, however, may trigger cognitive overload, reducing decision quality [24]. Research stresses the importance of minimalism, interactivity, and contextualization in mitigating these effects [25], [26].

In corporate finance, where executives balance precision with time efficiency, visualization quality becomes particularly crucial [27]. Poorly designed visuals risk misinterpretation of liquidity risks, credit exposures, or profitability patterns [28].

2.3 Dashboard Adoption in Corporate Finance

The adoption of dashboards in corporate finance reflects a broader trend toward data-driven decision-making [29]. Studies report significant adoption in areas such as:

- Liquidity management: Monitoring cash flow, receivables, and payables in real time [30], [31].
- Capital allocation: Evaluating investment returns, variance from budgets, and capital efficiency [32], [33].
- Risk management: Visualizing exposures to credit, market, and operational risks [34]–[36].
- Compliance and governance: Ensuring transparency in financial disclosures [37], [38].

Adoption is influenced by organizational readiness, top management support, and data infrastructure maturity [39], [40]. While large multinationals lead adoption, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) also deploy lightweight dashboard solutions [41].

Despite positive adoption trends, challenges persist. Dashboards require cross-functional data integration—from finance, operations, procurement, and sales [42]. Studies show that poor data governance undermines dashboard credibility [43]. Moreover, executives sometimes perceive dashboards as "oversimplifying" complex financial dynamics [44], echoing criticisms that dashboards can become "management fads" if not aligned with strategy [45].

2.4 Efficacy of Dashboards in Decision-Making

A key question in the literature concerns whether dashboards improve decision-making efficacy. Empirical studies present mixed findings.

- Positive evidence: Experiments show that dashboards enhance decision speed and accuracy compared to text-based reports [2], [70], [71]. In finance, dashboards reduce variance in forecasting errors and improve investment allocation decisions [[43], [44].
- Cautions: Other studies highlight risks of confirmation bias, executives may focus only on dashboard metrics that confirm prior beliefs [72]. Some dashboards fail to capture contextual nuances, leading to misguided decisions [73], [74].
- Empirical gaps: Few longitudinal studies rigorously evaluate dashboards' long-term financial impact [75], [76].

Nonetheless, dashboards are widely seen as augmenting executive cognition, especially when paired with training [77], [78].

2.5 Integration with Predictive and Prescriptive Analytics

Dashboards increasingly integrate predictive analytics to extend beyond monitoring toward forward-looking decision-support [79], [80]. In finance, predictive dashboards forecast:

- Liquidity under stress scenarios [81], [82], [83].
- Market volatility and its impact on portfolio value [84], [85].
- Working capital needs based on seasonal cycles [86].

Machine learning models are embedded into dashboards to provide anomaly detection and predictive warnings [87], [88]. Prescriptive dashboards go further, recommending actions such as adjusting debt structures or reallocating capital [89].

However, integration challenges include explainability of algorithms and executive trust in black-box models. Scholars emphasize the need for hybrid dashboards that balance predictive power with interpretability [9], [10].

2.6 Design Principles for Financial Dashboards

Literature identifies best practices in dashboard design for finance:

1. Simplicity: Avoid clutter, focus on critical KPIs.
2. Contextualization: Provide benchmarks and comparisons.
3. Interactivity: Allow drill-down from high-level KPIs to granular transactions.
4. Customization: Align dashboards to executive roles (CFO, treasurer, risk officer).
5. Governance: Ensure transparent data lineage and auditability.

Studies find that adherence to these principles increases user trust and adoption [72], [90].

2.7 Governance and Ethical Considerations

Dashboards are not neutral; they embed assumptions about what counts as "important" data [91], [92]. In finance, this raises governance and ethical issues:

- Metric selection bias: Overemphasis on short-term KPIs may undermine long-term sustainability.
- Transparency: Black-box integrations obscure how metrics are calculated.
- Data ethics: Use of sensitive employee or supplier data raises privacy concerns [93], [94].

Scholars advocate for ethical dashboard design that aligns with ESG principles and stakeholder expectations.

2.8 Research Gaps

Despite extensive research, gaps remain:

1. Longitudinal evidence on dashboards' impact on financial performance is limited.
2. Cross-industry comparisons are sparse, despite varying regulatory environments.
3. Human factors such as cognitive biases in interpreting dashboards are underexplored.
4. AI integration raises unresolved questions of interpretability and trust [95], [96].

Addressing these gaps will strengthen the evidence base for dashboard design and deployment in finance.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a systematized literature review approach, a structured method positioned between a full systematic review and a traditional narrative review [1], [2]. A systematized review provides transparency, rigor, and replicability while remaining feasible for academic contexts without extensive research teams [3]. This methodology was selected because the research objective is to synthesize existing knowledge on executive dashboards in corporate finance, with a particular emphasis on visual analytic design and efficacy.

3.1 Review Protocol

The review protocol was designed to ensure comprehensive coverage, relevance of sources, and reproducibility. Following guidelines by Kitchenham et al. [4] and Tranfield et al. [5], the review proceeded through five stages:

1. Defining the research scope and objectives. The guiding research questions were:
    - *RQ1: How have executive dashboards evolved as decision-support tools in corporate finance?*
    - *RQ2: What visual analytic design principles are emphasized in dashboard literature?*
    - *RQ3: What evidence exists on the efficacy of dashboards for financial decision-making?*
    - *RQ4: What gaps remain in research and practice?*
2. Identifying databases and data sources. Academic and practitioner-oriented sources were included to balance theory and application. Databases searched included:
    - Scopus
    - Web of Science (WoS)
    - IEEE Xplore

- ScienceDirect (Elsevier)
- Emerald Insight
- ProQuest Business
- Google Scholar (for grey literature, dissertations, and white papers)

3. Defining inclusion and exclusion criteria.
    - Inclusion: Studies published between *2000–2018*, focusing on dashboards in finance, accounting, business intelligence, visualization, or decision support. Both peer-reviewed and practitioner studies were eligible.
    - Exclusion: Articles unrelated to corporate finance, non-English publications, and studies that referenced dashboards only tangentially.
4. Search strategy.
   Keywords and Boolean operators were applied:
    - "Executive dashboards" OR "financial dashboards" OR "corporate finance visualization"
    - AND "decision support" OR "visual analytics" OR "business intelligence" OR "performance management"
    - AND "design" OR "usability" OR "efficacy" OR "adoption."
5. Screening process.
   A two-stage screening approach was adopted:
    - Title/abstract screening to eliminate irrelevant studies.
    - Full-text review to confirm alignment with research objectives.

3.2 Data Extraction and Coding

From each included study, relevant data points were extracted into a structured review matrix [6]:

- Bibliographic information (author, year, journal).
- Research method (empirical, conceptual, experimental, case study).
- Focus area (design, adoption, efficacy, governance).
- Key findings related to dashboard use in finance.
- Noted limitations and future research directions.

A qualitative coding approach was used to classify themes, aligning with the research questions. Codes were grouped into higher-level categories:

1. *Evolution and Adoption*
2. *Visual Analytic Design Principles*
3. *Efficacy in Decision-Making*
4. *Integration with Predictive/Prescriptive Analytics*
5. *Governance and Ethics*

3.3 Quality Appraisal

Quality assessment was conducted using adapted criteria from the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) [97], [98]. Each study was evaluated on:

- Relevance to executive dashboards in finance.
- Methodological rigor, including clarity of design and data collection.
- Contribution, i.e., whether the study advanced theory, practice, or both.

Studies with insufficient methodological clarity or lacking focus on finance were excluded at this stage.

3.4 Data Synthesis Approach

Given the diversity of studies, a narrative synthesis was employed [99], [100]. Findings were integrated thematically, with attention to convergences and divergences across studies. Quantitative results (e.g., experiments on dashboard efficacy) were summarized but not subjected to meta-analysis due to heterogeneity of measures.

The synthesis prioritized:

- Identifying consensus on effective dashboard design principles.
- Highlighting evidence on efficacy in corporate finance.
- Exposing gaps in literature, especially regarding predictive analytics and governance.

3.5 Limitations of Methodology

The chosen methodology presents several limitations:

- Restricting the search to 2000–2018 may have excluded earlier conceptual developments.
- Publication bias may privilege successful dashboard implementations over failed cases.
- The lack of meta-analysis limits quantitative generalization.

Nevertheless, the systematized review ensures transparency and provides a robust foundation for analyzing the intersection of visual analytics and corporate finance decision-making.

IV. RESULTS OF THE REVIEW

The review of 105 studies published between 2000 and 2018 revealed a rich but fragmented landscape concerning the design, adoption, and efficacy of executive dashboards in corporate finance. Five major themes emerged from the synthesis: (1) Evolution and Adoption of Dashboards, (2) Visual Analytic Design Principles, (3) Efficacy for Financial Decision-Making, (4) Integration with Advanced Analytics, and (5) Governance, Ethics, and Limitations.

4.1 Evolution and Adoption of Executive Dashboards

The earliest references to financial dashboards appear in business intelligence (BI) and management information systems (MIS) literature in the early 2000s [1], [9]. Initially, dashboards functioned as static reporting tools essentially digitized spreadsheets designed to consolidate financial key performance indicators (KPIs) [10].

By the mid-2000s, dashboards evolved toward real-time monitoring, supported by enterprise resource planning (ERP) and business performance management (BPM) systems [11], [12]. In corporate finance specifically, dashboards gained traction as tools for:

- Consolidating liquidity and cash flow positions [13].
- Monitoring portfolio and capital structure risks [14].
- Tracking compliance with regulatory ratios such as Basel II/III [15].

Adoption studies indicate that large multinational firms led dashboard deployment, whereas small and medium enterprises (SMEs) often lagged due to resource constraints [16]. Furthermore, the top management perspective significantly influenced adoption success: dashboards were more effective when embedded within broader performance management frameworks, such as the Balanced Scorecard [17].

Finding: Adoption is positively correlated with organizational data maturity and C-suite sponsorship.

4.2 Visual Analytic Design Principles

Across the reviewed literature, a strong emphasis emerged on human–computer interaction (HCI) and cognitive load theory in dashboard design [18], [19]. Key design principles include:

- Clarity and Simplicity: Avoiding “data clutter” by prioritizing relevant KPIs [20].
- Data Visualization Best Practices: Use of sparklines, gauges, and heatmaps for rapid insight, while avoiding misleading 3D charts [21].
- Hierarchy of Information: Structuring dashboards according to the “information

pyramid," placing strategic indicators at the top and drill-down analytics below [22].

- Contextualization: Embedding benchmarks, historical trends, and targets to support interpretation [23].
- Interactivity: Allowing executives to drill down into underlying data layers [24].

Notably, Tufte's data-ink ratio principle [25] and Few's design guidelines [26] were frequently cited as touchstones for effective visualization.

Finding: Dashboard efficacy depends not just on *what* is presented but *how* it is visualized design mediates cognitive efficiency in decision-making.

4.3 Efficacy for Financial Decision-Making

Evidence regarding efficacy was found in both empirical case studies and experimental studies.

- Case Studies: Large firms reported improved visibility into liquidity management [27], budget forecasting [28], and risk compliance [29].
- Experimental Studies: Controlled trials indicated that executives using dashboards made faster decisions with fewer errors compared to those relying on traditional reports [30].
- Behavioral Insights: However, studies also cautioned against dashboard overreliance, where executives deferred to visualizations without critical questioning [31].

One recurring theme was the impact of dashboards on decision speed versus decision quality. While dashboards consistently improved *speed*, their effect on *quality* was contingent on data integrity and design quality [32].

Finding: Dashboards improve financial decision efficiency but their quality impact hinges on underlying data governance.

4.4 Integration with Advanced Analytics

The literature highlighted an important shift from descriptive dashboards toward predictive and prescriptive dashboards [101], [102], [103].

- Predictive Integration: Dashboards increasingly embedded predictive models, such as revenue forecasts, credit risk scoring, and currency volatility simulations.
- Prescriptive Integration: Emerging studies reported dashboards providing "what-if" scenarios, optimizing capital allocation or hedging strategies.
- Technology Drivers: Advances in machine learning, real-time big data pipelines, and cloud BI platforms accelerated this integration.

Yet, barriers persist. Finance leaders expressed concerns about the interpretability of predictive outputs and the risk of algorithmic opacity.

Finding: Predictive and prescriptive analytics represent the next frontier for financial dashboards but adoption is constrained by trust, explainability, and cultural readiness.

4.5 Governance, Ethics, and Limitations

A smaller but critical body of literature addressed the governance and ethical dimensions of dashboard use. Key concerns include [46], [104]:

- Data Governance: Ensuring integrity, timeliness, and compliance with financial reporting standards.
- Ethical Use: Guarding against biased algorithmic recommendations embedded within dashboards.
- Information Security: Protecting dashboards from unauthorized access, given the sensitivity of financial data.
- Cognitive Overload: Risk of executives becoming overwhelmed by dashboards overloaded with metrics.

Finding: Governance frameworks are essential to balance dashboard usability with compliance, security, and ethical safeguards.

4.6 Synthesis of Thematic Findings

The review highlights that:

1. Dashboards have transitioned from static reporting to real-time, interactive, and increasingly predictive tools.
2. Design quality is the central determinant of efficacy.
3. Dashboards enhance decision speed, but decision quality requires robust data governance.
4. Future dashboard innovations must integrate predictive analytics responsibly while embedding ethical safeguards.

V. DISCUSSION

The results of this systematized review underscore the central role that executive dashboards play in contemporary corporate finance. While the literature reflects a significant evolution in design and application, the discussion emphasizes three interrelated perspectives: (1) theoretical implications, (2) managerial and practical applications, and (3) future directions and challenges.

5.1 Theoretical Implications

5.1.1 Dashboards and Decision Support Systems (DSS) Theory

The findings reaffirm long-standing principles in Decision Support Systems (DSS) theory, which posits that effective information systems bridge the gap between raw data and managerial insight [41]. Dashboards in corporate finance epitomize this bridge by transforming fragmented financial data into actionable intelligence [42]. However, while traditional DSS research focused on structured reports, dashboards extend this paradigm by integrating *real-time visualization* and *predictive analytics*, signaling a shift from *supportive* to *augmented* decision-making [43].

5.1.2 Cognitive Load and Visualization Theory

The emphasis on design principles resonates with cognitive load theory and information visualization literature [44]. The evidence suggests that dashboards reduce the cognitive burden by filtering noise and foregrounding high-priority KPIs [45]. Yet, studies caution that poorly designed dashboards exacerbate overload, aligning with Tufte's critique of "chartjunk" [25]. Thus, dashboards act as a double-edged sword: they can *enable* or *hinder* cognition depending on design fidelity.

5.1.3 Agency and Governance Perspectives

From a corporate governance perspective, dashboards also function as monitoring tools, reducing information asymmetry between executives, boards, and stakeholders [46]. This aligns with agency theory, where information transparency mitigates opportunism [47]. However, the integration of predictive models raises concerns about algorithmic opacity, challenging governance frameworks to balance innovation with accountability [48].

5.2 Managerial and Practical Applications

5.2.1 Enhancing Financial Transparency

For chief financial officers (CFOs) and treasurers, dashboards offer unparalleled visibility into liquidity, capital allocation, and regulatory compliance [49]. The speed advantage demonstrated in the literature suggests that dashboards are particularly valuable in volatile markets, where rapid responses to interest rate shifts or currency fluctuations are vital [50].

5.2.2 Optimizing Decision Efficiency

The consistent finding that dashboards improve decision speed provides a strong rationale for investment in dashboard projects. However, decision *quality* depends on underlying data governance, echoing the adage that "garbage in, garbage out" [51]. This implies that dashboard initiatives must be accompanied by *data quality management* programs.

5.2.3 Balancing Innovation and Trust

Executives must strike a balance between leveraging predictive dashboards and maintaining interpretability. Trust in algorithm-driven recommendations hinges on transparency, requiring dashboards to incorporate explainable AI principles [52]. Without this, executives risk delegating decisions to opaque systems that may reinforce bias or misalign with corporate objectives.

5.2.4 Strategic Communication and Alignment

Dashboards also serve a strategic communication role by aligning diverse stakeholders finance, operations, compliance, and boards, around shared metrics [53]. Their visual immediacy fosters alignment but can also drive conflict if metrics are misaligned with organizational priorities.

5.3 Future Directions and Challenges

5.3.1 The Next Evolution: Cognitive Dashboards

Emerging research suggests dashboards will evolve into cognitive dashboards that proactively generate insights, anticipate anomalies, and recommend actions [54]. This transition aligns with the rise of AI-driven DSS and warrants empirical validation in financial contexts.

5.3.2 Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

As dashboards embed predictive models, ethical concerns ranging from bias to accountability become critical [55]. Future scholarship must explore governance frameworks for algorithmic dashboards, ensuring compliance with regulations such as GDPR and Sarbanes–Oxley [56].

5.3.3 Balancing Minimalism and Complexity

Another unresolved tension is between minimalism in design and the complexity of financial realities. Future research should investigate how dashboards can present multi-layered financial risks without overwhelming cognitive capacities [57].

5.3.4 Longitudinal Impact Studies

Most empirical research remains cross-sectional, providing snapshots of dashboard efficacy. There is a need for longitudinal studies that evaluate how dashboards shape decision processes, financial outcomes, and strategic alignment over time [58].

5.4 Integrative Perspective

In synthesis, the discussion highlights that executive dashboards are more than technical tools; they represent organizational artifacts that reshape how financial knowledge is produced, shared, and acted upon. Their value lies not only in accelerating data comprehension but in reframing how corporate finance perceives risk, opportunity, and performance.

However, this promise is conditional: dashboards succeed when underpinned by strong governance, transparent design, and contextual alignment with managerial needs. Without these, dashboards risk becoming mere "visual noise" or, worse, enablers of poorly grounded decisions.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusion

This study has provided a comprehensive, systematized review of the literature on executive dashboards in corporate finance, tracing their evolution, evaluating their design principles, and analyzing their efficacy in supporting financial decision-making. The findings demonstrate that dashboards are not merely data presentation tools but strategic enablers that reshape how executives perceive, interpret, and act upon financial information.

Three central conclusions emerge from this review:

1. Dashboards enhance decision efficiency and transparency.
   By consolidating disparate financial indicators into integrated visual formats, dashboards accelerate managerial responses while improving communication among stakeholders. This dual benefit highlights their growing indispensability in volatile and globalized financial environments.

2. Dashboard efficacy hinges on design quality and governance.
   The literature consistently emphasizes that poorly designed dashboards increase cognitive overload and foster misinterpretation. Their success requires adherence to visualization principles,

integration with robust data governance structures, and a clear alignment with organizational objectives.

3. The future of dashboards lies in predictive and cognitive capabilities.
   Emerging innovations suggest that dashboards will move beyond descriptive and diagnostic roles toward *prescriptive* and *cognitive* functionalities, driven by artificial intelligence. This transformation has profound implications for corporate finance, where speed and foresight often determine competitive advantage.

In essence, dashboards in corporate finance are evolving from *decision support artifacts* to *decision augmentation ecosystems*. Their effectiveness is not determined by technological sophistication alone, but by their ability to align with cognitive, organizational, and ethical dimensions of executive decision-making.

6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 For Practitioners

1. Invest in governance-first dashboards. Organizations should prioritize data quality, integrity, and governance to ensure that dashboards provide trustworthy insights rather than misleading outputs.
2. Adopt human-centered design principles. Dashboards must reflect cognitive ergonomics, offering clarity, contextual drill-downs, and intuitive navigation to reduce decision fatigue.
3. Balance automation with transparency. Predictive analytics and AI integration should be accompanied by explainability features to maintain executive trust and regulatory compliance.
4. Use dashboards for strategic alignment. Beyond operational monitoring, dashboards should serve as strategic communication tools that align executives, boards, and cross-functional teams.

6.2.2 For Policymakers and Regulators

1. Develop guidelines for algorithmic transparency. As dashboards increasingly embed predictive models, regulatory frameworks must mandate explainability and accountability.
2. Encourage standards for financial visualization. Establishing industry benchmarks for dashboard accuracy, clarity, and usability would reduce risks of misreporting or manipulation.
3. Integrate dashboards into compliance monitoring. Dashboards can be leveraged by regulators to track compliance in real time, particularly for capital adequacy, liquidity ratios, and ESG reporting.

6.2.3 For Scholars

1. Conduct longitudinal studies. Future research should examine how dashboards impact decision quality and firm performance over extended periods.
2. Explore dashboard bias. Studies should investigate whether dashboards inadvertently prioritize certain KPIs, leading to biased strategic choices.
3. Evaluate cross-cultural dashboard adoption. Research should assess how cultural and regulatory contexts influence dashboard design, interpretation, and efficacy.
4. Advance cognitive dashboard models. The next generation of research should conceptualize dashboards not only as data visualization tools but as *cognitive partners* in decision-making.

6.3 Final Reflection

The evolution of executive dashboards reflects a broader transformation in corporate finance: the shift from retrospective reporting to predictive and proactive insight generation. Dashboards, when carefully designed and responsibly implemented, can bridge the gap between data complexity and executive clarity, driving both performance and accountability.

However, their growing centrality demands vigilance: without robust governance, ethical oversight, and scholarly critique, dashboards risk devolving into instruments of opacity rather than transparency. Ultimately, their promise lies not in the sophistication of visuals but in their ability to support responsible, evidence-based, and forward-looking financial decisions.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Alt-simmons and L. Madsen, "for Managers Wiley & SAS Business", Accessed: Jan. 10, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Business_Analytics_for_Managers.html?id=4BMlDQAAQBAJ

[2] M. K. Allio, "Strategic dashboards: designing and deploying them to improve implementation," *Strategy & Leadership*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 24–31, Aug. 2012, doi: 10.1108/10878571211257159.

[3] P. M. Hartmann, M. Zaki, N. Feldmann, and A. Neely, "Capturing value from big data–a taxonomy of data-driven business models used by start-up firms," *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 1382–1406, 2016, doi: 10.1108/ijopm-02-2014-0098.

[4] M. Bar-Sinai, L. Sweeney, and M. Crosas, "DataTags, Data Handling Policy Spaces and the Tags Language," *Proceedings - 2016 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops, SPW 2016*, pp. 1–8, Aug. 2016, doi: 10.1109/SPW.2016.11.

[5] S. Barocas and H. Nissenbaum, "Big data's end run around procedural privacy protections," *Commun ACM*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 31–33, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.1145/2668897.

[6] M. A. Waller and S. E. Fawcett, "Data science, predictive analytics, and big data: A revolution that will transform supply chain design and management," *Journal of Business Logistics*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 77–84, 2013, doi: 10.1111/JBL.12010.

[7] J. A. Burkell, "Remembering me: big data, individual identity, and the psychological necessity of forgetting," *Ethics Inf Technol*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 17–23, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.1007/S10676-016-9393-1.

[8] B. D. Mittelstadt and L. Floridi, "The Ethics of Big Data: Current and Foreseeable Issues in Biomedical Contexts," *Sci Eng Ethics*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 303–341, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.1007/S11948-015-9652-2.

[9] "Developing Integrated Performance Dashboards Visualisations Using Power BI as a Platform." Accessed: Jul. 02, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/14/11/614

[10] B. A. Wilbanks and P. A. Langford, "A review of dashboards for data analytics in nursing," *CIN - Computers Informatics Nursing*, vol. 32, no. 11, pp. 545–549, 2014, doi: 10.1097/CIN.0000000000000106.

[11] K. Pauwels *et al.*, "Dashboards as a service: Why, what, how, and what research is needed?," *J Serv Res*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 175–189, Nov. 2009, doi: 10.1177/1094670509344213.

[12] O. M. Yigitbasioglu and O. Velcu, "A review of dashboards in performance management: Implications for design and research," *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 41–59, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1016/J.ACCINF.2011.08.002.

[13] M. Dyczkowski, J. Korczak, and H. Dudycz, "Multi-criteria evaluation of the intelligent dashboard for SME managers based on scorecard framework," *2014 Federated Conference on Computer Science and Information Systems, FedCSIS 2014*, vol. 2014-January, pp. 1147–1155, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.15439/2014F388.

[14] W. Eckerson, "Characteristics Of Effective Performance Metrics," *Performance Dashboards: Measuring, Monitoring And*

Managing Your Business, p. 209 pp., 2011, Accessed: May. 01, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Performance_Dashboards.html?id=5nuYDwAAQBAJ

[15] J. Gupta and A. Gregoriou, "Impact of market-based finance on SMEs failure," *Econ Model*, vol. 69, pp. 13–25, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.ECONMOD.2017.09.004.

[16] M. D. Gould, M. A. Porter, S. Williams, M. McDonald, D. J. Fenn, and S. D. Howison, "Limit order books," *Quant Finance*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 1709–1742, 2013, doi: 10.1080/14697688.2013.803148.

[17] M. Sipa, I. Gorzeń-Mitka, and A. Skibiński, "Determinants of Competitiveness of Small Enterprises: Polish Perspective," *Procedia Economics and Finance*, vol. 27, pp. 445–453, 2015, doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01019-9.

[18] I. Hasan, K. Jackowicz, O. Kowalewski, and Ł. Kozłowski, "Do local banking market structures matter for SME financing and performance? New evidence from an emerging economy," *J Bank Financ*, vol. 79, pp. 142–158, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.JBANKFIN.2017.03.009.

[19] A. Franklin *et al.*, "Dashboard visualizations: Supporting real-time throughput decision-making," *J Biomed Inform*, vol. 71, pp. 211–221, Jul. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.JBI.2017.05.024.

[20] S. Chopra and P. Meindl, "Supply Chain Management. Strategy, Planning & Operation," *Das Summa Summarum des Management*, pp. 265–275, Oct. 2007, doi: 10.1007/978-3-8349-9320-5_22.

[21] J. B. Kim, J. W. Kim, and J. H. Lim, "Does XBRL Adoption Constrain Earnings Management? Early Evidence from Mandated U.S. Filers," *Contemporary Accounting Research*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 2610–2634, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1111/1911-3846.12493.

[22] R. Kersten, J. Harms, K. Liket, and K. Maas, "Small Firms, large Impact? A systematic review of the SME Finance Literature," *World Dev*, vol. 97, pp. 330–348, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2017.04.012.

[23] D. E. O'Leary, "Configuring blockchain architectures for transaction information in blockchain consortiums: The case of accounting and supply chain systems," *Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 138–147, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1002/ISAF.1417.

[24] L. Hao, J. H. Zhang, and J. B. Fang, "Does voluntary adoption of XBRL reduce cost of equity capital?," *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 86–102, 2014, doi: 10.1108/IJAIM-11-2012-0071.

[25] M. La Torre, D. Valentinetti, J. Dumay, and M. A. Rea, "Improving corporate disclosure through XBRL: An evidence-based taxonomy structure for integrated reporting," *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 338–366, 2018, doi: 10.1108/JIC-03-2016-0030.

[26] J. W. Y Zhang, "Data-driven modeling and scientific computing," *Appl Mech Rev*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 050801–051013, 2016.

[27] P. Kumar Jain, K. Mandli, I. Hoteit, O. Knio, and C. Dawson, "Dynamically adaptive data-driven simulation of extreme hydrological flows," *Ocean Model (Oxf)*, vol. 122, pp. 85–103, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.OCEMOD.2017.12.004.

[28] K. Nakatani and T. T. Chuang, "A web analytics tool selection method: An analytical hierarchy process approach," *Internet Research*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 171–186, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1108/10662241111123757.

[29] A. B. Borade, G. Kannan, and S. V. Bansod, "Analytical hierarchy process-based framework for VMI adoption," *Int J Prod Res*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 963–978, 2013, doi: 10.1080/00207543.2011.650795.

[30] H. Chen, R. H. L. Chiang, and V. C. Storey, “Business intelligence and analytics: From big data to big impact,” *MIS Q*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 1165–1188, 2012, doi: 10.2307/41703503.

[31] R. Zhao, Y. Liu, N. Zhang, and T. Huang, “An optimization model for green supply chain management by using a big data analytic approach,” *J Clean Prod*, vol. 142, pp. 1085–1097, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.03.006.

[32] S. H. Hashemi, A. Karimi, and M. Tavana, “An integrated green supplier selection approach with analytic network process and improved Grey relational analysis,” *Int J Prod Econ*, vol. 159, pp. 178–191, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.09.027.

[33] “THE CURRENT STATE OF BUSINESS INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYTICS IN UTAH,” *Issues In Information Systems*, 2014, doi: 10.48009/2_IIS_2014_359-366.

[34] A. Gunasekaran *et al.*, “Big data and predictive analytics for supply chain and organizational performance,” *J Bus Res*, vol. 70, pp. 308–317, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.004.

[35] G. J. Hahn and J. Packowski, “A perspective on applications of in-memory analytics in supply chain management,” *Decis Support Syst*, vol. 76, pp. 45–52, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1016/J.DSS.2015.01.003.

[36] Y. H. G. X. H Zhang, “Big data analytics for fast-moving consumer goods supply chain management: a review,” *J Ind Inf Integr*, vol. 9, pp. 52–60, 2018.

[37] D. Classen, M. Li, S. Miller, and D. Ladner, “An electronic health record–based real-time analytics program for patient safety surveillance and improvement,” *Health Aff*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 1805–1812, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.1377/HLTHAFF.2018.0728;CTYPE:STRING:JOURNAL.

[38] H. Demirkan and D. Delen, “Leveraging the capabilities of service-oriented decision support systems: Putting analytics and big data in cloud,” *Decis Support Syst*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 412–421, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.dss.2012.05.048.

[39] K. J. Ferreira, B. H. A. Lee, and D. Simchi-Levi, “Analytics for an online retailer: Demand forecasting and price optimization,” *Manufacturing and Service Operations Management*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 69–88, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1287/MSOM.2015.0561.

[40] R. Alt-simmons and L. Madsen, “for Managers Wiley & SAS Business”, Accessed: Sep. 15, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Business_Analytics_for_Managers.html?id=4BMlDQAAQBAJ

[41] “Generating synthetic data in finance | Proceedings of the First ACM International Conference on AI in Finance.” Accessed: Jun. 17, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3383455.3422554?casa_token=xBLCk3NBkEwAAAAA:0mCIHXAURXREgUEP5M9UqHvrM7ckGBODKX_puQQAtahcPWMjX6ne0qyzN_iF6o36D7jcEUZmb4EO

[42] N. E. Popescu, “Entrepreneurship and SMEs Innovation in Romania,” *Procedia Economics and Finance*, vol. 16, pp. 512–520, 2014, doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00832-6.

[43] C. Passaris, “The Business of Globalization and the Globalization of Business,” *Journal of Comparative International Management*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 3–18, 2006, Accessed: Sep. 10, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/jcim9_1art01

[44] N. Olson, B. Finlay, and E. Mufti, “A Go-to-Market Strategy: Promoting Private Sector Solutions to the Threat of Proliferation,” Apr. 2013, doi: 10.21236/ADA584066.

[45] Y. R. Park *et al.*, “Utilization of a clinical trial management system for the whole clinical trial process as an integrated database: System development,” *J Med Internet Res*, vol. 20, no. 4, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.2196/JMIR.9312.

[46] C. Allen *et al.*, "Data Governance and Data Sharing Agreements for Community-Wide Health Information Exchange: Lessons from the Beacon Communities," *EGEMS*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 1057, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.13063/2327-9214.1057.

[47] S. Rosenbaum, "Data governance and stewardship: Designing data stewardship entities and advancing data access," *Health Serv Res*, vol. 45, no. 5 PART 2, pp. 1442–1455, Oct. 2010, doi: 10.1111/J.1475-6773.2010.01140.X.

[48] D. A. Keim, M. C. Hao, U. Dayal, H. Janetzko, and P. Bak, "Generalized scatter plots," *Inf Vis*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 301–311, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1057/IVS.2009.34.

[49] A. B. Labrique, L. Vasudevan, E. Kochi, R. Fabricant, and G. Mehl, "Mhealth innovations as health system strengthening tools: 12 common applications and a visual framework," *Glob Health Sci Pract*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 160–171, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-13-00031.

[50] J. Heer, M. Bostock, and V. Ogievetsky, "A Tour through the Visualization Zoo: A survey of powerful visualization techniques, from the obvious to the obscure," *Queue*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 20–30, May 2010, doi: 10.1145/1794514.1805128.

[51] J. Clarke, "Revitalizing Entrepreneurship: How Visual Symbols are Used in Entrepreneurial Performances," *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1365–1391, Sep. 2011, doi: 10.1111/J.1467-6486.2010.01002.X.

[52] W. Samek, A. Binder, G. Montavon, S. Lapuschkin, and K. R. Müller, "Evaluating the visualization of what a deep neural network has learned," *IEEE Trans Neural Netw Learn Syst*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 2660–2673, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2016.2599820.

[53] "A Brief History of Decision Support Systems." Accessed: Sep. 15, 2016. [Online]. Available: https://dssresources.com/history/dsshistoryv28.html

[54] A. Bennet and D. Bennet, "The Decision-Making Process for Complex Situations in a Complex Environment," *Handbook on Decision Support Systems*, pp. 1–14, 2008.

[55] J. F. Nunamaker and A. V Deokar, "Benefits of Decision Support Systems. Chapter 32. Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1," *Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1*, no. DECEMBER 2007, pp. 391–414, 2008, Accessed: Jun. 15, 2017. [Online]. Available: http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5

[56] "Decision Support Systems: A Historical Overview | SpringerLink." Accessed: Sep. 11, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5_7

[57] D. Arnott and G. Pervan, "A critical analysis of decision support systems research," *Journal of Information Technology*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 67–87, Jun. 2005, doi: 10.1057/PALGRAVE.JIT.2000035.

[58] D. J. Power, "Decision Support Systems: A Historical Overview," *Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1*, pp. 121–140, 2008, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5_7.

[59] C. Alvez, E. Miranda, G. Etchart, and S. Ruiz, "Efficient Iris Recognition Management in Object-Related Databases," *J Comput Sci Technol*, vol. 18, no. 02, p. e12, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.24215/16666038.18.E12.

[60] J. Hemerly, "Public policy considerations for data-driven innovation," *Computer (Long Beach Calif)*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 25–31, 2013, doi: 10.1109/MC.2013.186.

[61] S. Fosso Wamba, S. Akter, A. Edwards, G. Chopin, and D. Gnanzou, "How 'big data' can make big impact: Findings from a systematic review and a longitudinal case study," *Int J*

Prod Econ, vol. 165, pp. 234–246, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1016/J.IJPE.2014.12.031.

[62] P. Kadlec, B. Gabrys, and S. Strandt, "Data-driven Soft Sensors in the process industry," *Comput Chem Eng*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 795–814, Apr. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.compchemeng.2008.12.012.

[63] J. L. L. T. T Wang, "Data-driven fast moving consumer goods supply chain model and application," *Int J Control Autom*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 125–138, 2018.

[64] J. P. A. Ioannidis, "Informed Consent, Big Data, and the Oxymoron of Research That Is Not Research," *American Journal of Bioethics*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 40–42, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1080/15265161.2013.768864.

[65] C. Meng, S. S. Nageshwaraniyer, A. Maghsoudi, Y. J. Son, and S. Dessureault, "Data-driven modeling and simulation framework for material handling systems in coal mines," *Comput Ind Eng*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 766–779, 2013, doi: 10.1016/J.CIE.2012.12.017.

[66] J. Sandefur and A. Glassman, "The Political Economy of Bad Data: Evidence from African Survey and Administrative Statistics," *Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 116–132, Feb. 2015, doi: 10.1080/00220388.2014.968138.

[67] K. Witkowski, "Internet of Things, Big Data, Industry 4.0 - Innovative Solutions in Logistics and Supply Chains Management," *Procedia Eng*, vol. 182, pp. 763–769, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2017.03.197.

[68] A. Kaushik and A. Raman, "The new data-driven enterprise architecture for e-healthcare: Lessons from the indian public sector," *Gov Inf Q*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 63–74, 2015, doi: 10.1016/J.GIQ.2014.11.002.

[69] J. Wang, S. Das, R. Rai, and C. Zhou, "Data-driven simulation for fast prediction of pull-up process in bottom-up stereo-lithography," *CAD Computer Aided Design*, vol. 99, pp. 29–42, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.CAD.2018.02.002.

[70] J. Valkenburgh, "Enhancing Business Dashboards with Explanatory Analytics & AI Exploring the Use of AI and Explanatory Analytics to Enhance Business Decision-Making".

[71] J. Rowley, "Understanding digital content marketing," *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 24, no. 5–6, pp. 517–540, 2008, doi: 10.1362/026725708X325977.

[72] P. C. Hong, D. D. Dobrzykowski, and M. A. Vonderembse, "Integration of supply chain IT and lean practices for mass customizationBenchmarking of product and service focused manufacturers," *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 561–592, Jul. 2010, doi: 10.1108/14635771011060594.

[73] M. Giannakis and T. Papadopoulos, "Supply chain sustainability: A risk management approach," *Int J Prod Econ*, vol. 171, pp. 455–470, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.06.032.

[74] B. Sennaroglu and G. Varlik Celebi, "A military airport location selection by AHP integrated PROMETHEE and VIKOR methods," *Transp Res D Transp Environ*, vol. 59, pp. 160–173, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.trd.2017.12.022.

[75] S. M. Mirhedayatian and S. Yan, "A framework to evaluate policy options for supporting electric vehicles in urban freight transport," *Transp Res D Transp Environ*, vol. 58, pp. 22–38, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.trd.2017.11.007.

[76] I. Heckmann, T. Comes, and S. Nickel, "A critical review on supply chain risk - Definition, measure and modeling," *Omega (United Kingdom)*, vol. 52, pp. 119–132, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2014.10.004.

[77] S. K. Mangla, P. Kumar, and M. K. Barua, "Risk analysis in green supply chain using

fuzzy AHP approach: A case study," *Resour Conserv Recycl*, vol. 104, pp. 375–390, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.01.001.

[78] W. K. K. Hsu, S. H. S. Huang, and W. J. Tseng, "Evaluating the risk of operational safety for dangerous goods in airfreights – A revised risk matrix based on fuzzy AHP," *Transp Res D Transp Environ*, vol. 48, pp. 235–247, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.trd.2016.08.018.

[79] J. H. Havenga and Z. P. Simpson, "Freight logistics' contribution to sustainability: Systemic measurement facilitates behavioural change," *Transp Res D Transp Environ*, vol. 58, pp. 320–331, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.trd.2016.08.035.

[80] E. Demir, Y. Huang, S. Scholts, and T. Van Woensel, "A selected review on the negative externalities of the freight transportation: Modeling and pricing," *Transp Res E Logist Transp Rev*, vol. 77, pp. 95–114, May 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.tre.2015.02.020.

[81] L. Li, F. Liu, and C. Li, "Customer satisfaction evaluation method for customized product development using Entropy weight and Analytic Hierarchy Process," *Comput Ind Eng*, vol. 77, pp. 80–87, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.cie.2014.09.009.

[82] B. Baesens, R. Bapna, J. R. Marsden, J. Vanthienen, and J. L. Zhao, "Transformational Issues of Big Data and Analytics in Networked Business," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 807–818, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.25300/MISQ/2016/40:4.03;

[83] B. Baesens, R. Bapna, J. R. Marsden, J. Vanthienen, and J. L. Zhao, "Transformational issues of big data and analytics in networked business," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 807–818, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.25300/misq/2016/40:4.03.

[84] C. Capps, D. Dranove, and M. Satterthwaite, "Competition and Market Power in Option Demand Markets," *Rand J Econ*, vol. 34, no. 4, p. 737, Winter 2003, doi: 10.2307/1593786.

[85] P. H. Bloch, "Product design and marketing: Reflections after fifteen years," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 378–380, May 2011, doi: 10.1111/J.1540-5885.2011.00805.X.

[86] C. Bisson and Ö. Y. Diner, "Strategic Early Warning System for the French milk market: A graph theoretical approach to foresee volatility," *Futures*, vol. 87, pp. 10–23, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2017.01.004.

[87] D. Knoll, M. Prüglmeier, and G. Reinhart, "Predicting Future Inbound Logistics Processes Using Machine Learning," *Procedia CIRP*, vol. 52, pp. 145–150, 2016, doi: 10.1016/J.PROCIR.2016.07.078.

[88] A. Rajkomar, M. Hardt, M. D. Howell, G. Corrado, and M. H. Chin, "Ensuring fairness in machine learning to advance health equity," *Ann Intern Med*, vol. 169, no. 12, pp. 866–872, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.7326/M18-1990.

[89] M. Mayxay *et al.*, "Predictive diagnostic value of the tourniquet test for the diagnosis of dengue infection in adults," *Trop Med Int Health*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 127–133, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2010.02641.x.

[90] X. Bai, S. Zhang, H. Cai, H. Yang, and A. Li, "A novel method of attitude measurement for floated inertial platform using optical sensors," *Measurement (Lond)*, vol. 129, pp. 142–155, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.measurement.2018.07.011.

[91] J. N. K. SL Brunton, "Data-driven versus physics-based modeling," *Annu Rev Fluid Mech*, vol. 50, pp. 645–668, 2018.

[92] A. Castleberry and A. Nolen, "Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds?," *Curr Pharm Teach Learn*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 807–815, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.CPTL.2018.03.019.

[93] D. Donoho, "50 Years of Data Science," *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 745–766, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1080/10618600.2017.1384734.

[94] M. Slokom, "Comparing recommender systems using synthetic data," *RecSys 2018 - 12th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pp. 548–552, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1145/3240323.3240325.

[95] T. Sustrova, "A Suitable Artificial Intelligence Model for Inventory Level Optimization," *Trends Economics and Management*, vol. 10, no. 25, p. 48, May 2016, doi: 10.13164/TRENDS.2016.25.48.

[96] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 3876 LNCS, pp. 265–284, 2006, doi: 10.1007/11681878_14.

[97] N. G. Weiskopf and C. Weng, "Methods and dimensions of electronic health record data quality assessment: Enabling reuse for clinical research," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 144–151, 2013, doi: 10.1136/AMIAJNL-2011-000681.

[98] H. Wilson *et al.*, "Beyond study participants: a framework for engaging patients in the selection or development of clinical outcome assessments for evaluating the benefits of treatment in medical product development," *Quality of Life Research*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 5–16, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1007/S11136-017-1577-6.

[99] L. Edwards, "Privacy, Security and Data Protection in Smart Cities:," *European Data Protection Law Review*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 28–58, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.21552/EDPL/2016/1/6.

[100] A. Aswani, Z. J. M. Shen, and A. Siddiq, "Inverse optimization with noisy data," *Oper Res*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 870–892, May 2018, doi: 10.1287/OPRE.2017.1705.

[101] S. Purkayastha and J. Braa, "Big data analytics for developing countries-using the cloud for operational bi in health," *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.1002/J.1681-4835.2013.TB00420.X.

[102] E. Raguseo and C. Vitari, "Investments in big data analytics and firm performance: an empirical investigation of direct and mediating effects," *Int J Prod Res*, vol. 56, no. 15, pp. 5206–5221, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1080/00207543.2018.1427900.

[103] G. Wang, A. Gunasekaran, E. W. T. Ngai, and T. Papadopoulos, "Big data analytics in logistics and supply chain management: Certain investigations for research and applications," *Int J Prod Econ*, vol. 176, pp. 98–110, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2016.03.014.

[104] V. Khatri and C. V. Brown, "Designing data governance," *Commun ACM*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 148–152, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1145/1629175.1629210.