THE COMPUTERTECH
(An International Peer Review Journal)
VOLUME 10; ISSUE 1 (JAN-JUNE); (2024)
WEBSITE: THE COMPUTERTECH

Intelligent Risk, Fraud, and Compliance Analytics in Modern Financial Services

Yang Li[1*]

[1]Harbin Engineering University, CHINA

Abstract

Financial organisations increasingly use artificial intelligence to detect fraud, assess creditworthiness, forecast investment conditions, monitor portfolios, and automate regulatory reporting. This critical narrative review examines the decision applications through which artificial intelligence creates operational value in banking, insurance, payments, capital markets, and financial technology. It compares machine learning, natural language processing, deep learning, expert systems, fuzzy logic, and hybrid approaches, while emphasising that application performance depends on data quality, governance, explainability, and continuous oversight. Evidence reported in the source systematic review shows particularly strong associations for machine learning, regulatory compliance, fraud detection, risk analytics, and credit scoring. The article discusses how artificial intelligence changes each stage of the financial decision process, from data ingestion and signal detection to recommendation, review, and reporting. It also evaluates common weaknesses, including false positives, concept drift, historical bias, fragmented datasets, opaque models, and over-automation. The review concludes that artificial intelligence can improve speed, coverage, and predictive precision, but institutions must match the model to the decision, maintain human accountability, and monitor performance across changing market and regulatory conditions.

Keywords: Financial Analytics; Fraud Detection; Credit Scoring; Risk Management; Investment Forecasting; Auditing; Machine Learning

Introduction

Financial decision-making has always depended on the ability to distinguish normal behaviour from risk, opportunity, error, or deliberate misuse. Traditional systems relied heavily on fixed rules, manual review, statistical scoring, and periodic reporting. These methods remain important, but they struggle when data arrives continuously, relationships are non-linear, and threats adapt quickly. Artificial intelligence extends the range of possible analysis by learning from historical patterns, processing unstructured information, and updating signals as new evidence becomes available.

The most visible applications are fraud detection, credit scoring, risk analytics, investment forecasting, portfolio management, auditing, and regulatory reporting. Each application has a different objective. Fraud systems search for rare and suspicious events. Credit models estimate the probability of repayment. Market systems evaluate uncertain future movements. Audit tools identify inconsistencies and missing evidence. Compliance systems test activities against changing obligations. A model that performs well in one setting may be unsuitable in another because the costs of false positives, false negatives, delay, and opacity differ.

This review reorganises the evidence from the uploaded systematic study around practical financial applications. The purpose is not to repeat the original search, but to provide a stand-alone account of how major artificial intelligence methods are used, what value they create, and which governance conditions support dependable performance.

Review Scope and Technology Landscape

The source review examined research published between 2015 and 2025 and reported a final sample of 1,155 studies. Banking represented the largest sector, followed by financial technology and investment services, then insurance. Machine learning was the most frequently reported artificial intelligence method, with natural language processing, expert systems, deep learning, artificial neural networks, fuzzy logic, and hybrid designs also represented.

Machine learning is widely used because it can classify customers, transactions, claims, and risk states using many variables. Natural language processing adds value when evidence appears in contracts, filings, emails, news, complaints, or policy documents. Deep learning can identify complex patterns in high-dimensional data but may be difficult to explain. Expert systems encode specialist rules and remain useful where regulations or decision criteria are explicit. Fuzzy logic can represent uncertainty in qualitative assessments, although the source review found weaker associations for fuzzy systems than for adaptive learning methods. Hybrid models combine statistical, rule-based, and learning approaches to balance predictive strength with control and interpretability.

Application	Typical AI methods	Primary value	Key control need
Fraud detection	Supervised learning, anomaly detection, graph analysis	Rapid identification of suspicious activity	False-positive management and investigator feedback
Credit scoring	Classification, ensembles, explainable models	Improved risk separation and broader data use	Fairness, reason codes, and appeal mechanisms
Risk analytics	Machine learning, stress models, hybrid systems	Earlier warning and wider risk coverage	Scenario testing and drift monitoring
Investment forecasting	Time-series learning, NLP, deep learning	Extraction of complex market signals	Out-of-sample validation and leakage control
Audit and compliance	NLP, rule engines, anomaly detection	Continuous monitoring and evidence prioritisation	Traceable decisions and professional review

Fraud Detection and Transaction Monitoring

Fraud detection is one of the strongest areas of artificial intelligence adoption because financial crime is dynamic, rare, and costly. Fixed rules can identify known behaviours, such as unusual transaction size or rapid movement between accounts, but criminals can learn to avoid predictable thresholds. Machine learning adds behavioural analysis by comparing a transaction with the customer's past activity, peer groups, device patterns, location, timing, merchant type, and network relationships.

Supervised models learn from labelled examples of legitimate and fraudulent activity. Their main limitation is that labels may be delayed, incomplete, or influenced by earlier detection systems. Unsupervised methods search for unusual clusters and outliers without requiring confirmed fraud labels. They are useful for emerging schemes but often produce more false alerts. Graph-based methods can reveal networks of connected accounts, devices, beneficiaries, or claims that appear ordinary when examined individually. Natural language processing can analyse case notes, complaints, and investigation records to enrich the risk signal.

The source review reported a high predictive weight for fraud detection, showing that this application is closely connected with artificial intelligence-supported financial outcomes. Yet high model accuracy does not guarantee operational success. Excessive false positives increase investigation cost and inconvenience legitimate customers. False negatives expose the institution to direct loss, regulatory action, and reputational harm. Effective systems therefore need threshold management, investigator feedback, clear escalation, and regular recalibration.

Credit Scoring and Lending Decisions

Credit scoring estimates the likelihood that a borrower will meet repayment obligations. Traditional scorecards use a limited set of variables and offer relatively clear explanations. Machine learning can incorporate a wider range of financial behaviours, transaction patterns, income signals, account stability, and relationship data. This may improve risk separation, particularly for applicants with limited conventional credit histories.

The benefits are accompanied by serious governance questions. Historical lending data reflects earlier policies and social inequalities. A model may therefore learn patterns that disadvantage particular groups even when protected characteristics are excluded. Proxy variables, such as location, occupation, purchasing behaviour, or device use, can reproduce similar effects. Complex models may also make it difficult to provide meaningful reasons for rejection or to challenge an error.

Responsible credit analytics requires documented feature selection, fairness testing, stability analysis, explainable outputs, and human review for unusual or high-impact cases. Institutions should monitor approval rates, default rates, overrides, complaints, and outcomes across relevant groups. Credit scoring achieved a strong reported weight in the source review, but its value depends on balancing predictive performance with equal treatment, transparency, and access to correction.

Risk Analytics and Portfolio Management

Risk analytics covers market, credit, liquidity, operational, cyber, and enterprise risk. Artificial intelligence can combine large numbers of internal and external indicators, identify non-linear interactions, and detect early signs of deterioration. In banking, models can support stress testing, exposure monitoring, and counterparty assessment. In insurance, they can assist underwriting, reserving, and claims risk. In investment management, they can estimate correlations, volatility, drawdown, and concentration.

The source review identified risk analytics as one of the strongest governance dimensions and portfolio risk management as a significant decision outcome. These results reflect the central role of risk in regulated finance. However, risk models are vulnerable to changing conditions. A model trained during stable markets may perform poorly during a crisis. Correlations can change rapidly, and rare events may be underrepresented in historical data. Continuous monitoring, challenger models, scenario analysis, and stress testing remain essential even when predictive accuracy is strong.

Human judgement is particularly important where the model faces conditions outside its training range. Decision-makers should know when a model is extrapolating, when confidence is low, and when manual review is required. Artificial intelligence should improve situational awareness rather than create the impression that uncertainty has disappeared.

Investment Forecasting and Capital-Market Decisions

Investment forecasting uses financial statements, price histories, macroeconomic indicators, market microstructure, news, analyst reports, and alternative data. Machine learning can identify relationships that linear models overlook, while natural language processing can convert text into sentiment, event, or risk signals. Deep learning may capture temporal and cross-sectional patterns in large datasets, and hybrid systems can combine quantitative indicators with rule-based constraints.

Forecasting remains difficult because markets respond to new information, strategic behaviour, regulation, and unexpected events. A model may perform well in back-testing but fail after deployment because the environment changes or because trading activity alters the pattern it was designed to exploit. Data leakage, overfitting, survivorship bias, and repeated testing can create unrealistic performance estimates.

Strong governance requires time-aware validation, transaction-cost analysis, independent testing, data lineage, and limits on automated execution. Portfolio managers should understand the economic logic behind the signal and avoid using statistical association as a substitute for causal understanding. The source review found a meaningful relationship between artificial intelligence and investment forecasting, but weaker than the relationships observed for fraud detection and credit scoring. This difference is consistent with the greater uncertainty and instability of market prediction.

Auditing, Reporting, and Compliance Automation

Artificial intelligence is increasingly used to examine journal entries, reconcile records, identify unusual accounting patterns, review contracts, test control evidence, and prepare regulatory reports. Natural language processing can search large document collections for relevant clauses or obligations. Machine learning can prioritise transactions for audit based on risk rather than relying only on random samples. Automated reconciliation can identify differences between systems before reporting deadlines.

Compliance automation has particular value because financial regulation is extensive and frequently updated. Artificial intelligence can map obligations to policies, monitor activities, flag breaches, and organise supporting evidence. At advanced governance levels, the source review found compliance automation among the most influential factors. This suggests that mature institutions use artificial intelligence not merely to produce reports but to create continuous, preventive oversight.

Automation does not remove professional responsibility. Auditors and compliance officers must evaluate whether alerts are meaningful, whether evidence is complete, and whether the model itself introduces bias or blind spots. The audit trail should show data sources, model versions, changes, decisions, overrides, and final accountability.

Matching Models to Financial Decisions

Model selection should begin with the decision rather than the popularity of a technique. Supervised machine learning is suitable when reliable labels exist and the target is stable. Unsupervised learning is useful for novelty detection but requires careful interpretation. Natural language processing is valuable when text contains decision-relevant information. Deep learning may improve performance with large, complex datasets, yet it demands stronger validation and explanation. Expert systems are appropriate where rules are clear, legally defined, or safety-critical. Hybrid approaches can combine these strengths and were shown in the source review to become more influential in mature governance environments.

Institutions should evaluate accuracy, calibration, robustness, latency, interpretability, fairness, cost, maintainability, and regulatory acceptability. A slightly less accurate model may be preferable when it is easier to explain, monitor, and challenge. The decision threshold should also reflect consequences. Missing fraud has a different cost from delaying a legitimate payment, and rejecting a credit applicant has different social effects from ranking a transaction for review.

Implementation Challenges and Risk Controls

The most common implementation challenge is fragmented data. Financial institutions often operate legacy systems that use different customer identifiers, definitions, and update cycles. Artificial intelligence can expose these weaknesses but cannot solve them without organisational data management. Other challenges include limited labels, imbalanced classes, hidden proxies, privacy restrictions, model drift, cyber threats, and dependence on third-party platforms.

Control design should cover the full model lifecycle. Before development, organisations should define purpose, lawful data use, decision ownership, and acceptable risk. During development, they should document data preparation, compare models, test bias, and validate stability. Before deployment, independent reviewers should confirm suitability and establish thresholds, override rules, and incident procedures. After deployment, monitoring should track performance, drift, false alerts, customer impact, and changes in the operating environment.

A strong control environment also prevents over-automation. Human reviewers need adequate time, information, authority, and training to challenge the model. A nominal human-in-the-loop arrangement is ineffective when staff routinely accept recommendations without understanding them.

Future Research Directions

Research should move beyond one-time accuracy comparisons and evaluate systems over longer periods. More studies are needed on drift, operational cost, customer outcomes, investigation quality, override behaviour, and the effects of major market disruptions. Cross-country comparisons can show how regulation, data availability, and institutional capacity influence performance.

Future work should also test hybrid systems that combine rules, machine learning, causal reasoning, and expert judgement. Explainable artificial intelligence should be evaluated through the needs of actual decision-makers rather than technical measures alone. Field experiments and regulatory sandboxes could provide stronger evidence about whether artificial intelligence improves decisions in practice, not simply in historical datasets.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence has become a major component of fraud detection, credit scoring, risk management, investment analysis, auditing, and compliance. The source review indicates that machine learning, fraud detection, regulatory compliance, risk analytics, and credit scoring have particularly strong relationships with financial decision performance. Still, the best results arise when organisations match the method to the decision, maintain dependable data, provide clear explanations, and monitor models continuously. Artificial intelligence can extend the speed and reach of financial analysis, but it does not remove uncertainty or professional responsibility. Its sustainable value depends on disciplined governance, human accountability, and adaptation to changing financial conditions.

References

[1] Ehrlinger, L., & Wöß, W. (2022). A survey of data quality measurement and monitoring tools. *Frontiers in Big Data*, *5*, 850611.

[2] Mallempati, A., & Jaladi, D. S. (2022). An API-Driven Master Data Management Framework for Distributed Enterprise Application Integration. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Engineering and Technology*, *3*(2), 151-160.

[3] Redman, T. C. (2020). The rise of AI in data quality management. *Harvard Business Review*.

[4] Batini, C., & Scannapieco, M. (2016). *Data and Information Quality: Dimensions, Principles and Techniques*. Springer.

[5] Loshin, D. (2011). *The Practitioner's Guide to Data Quality Improvement*. Morgan Kaufmann.

[6] Wang, R. Y., & Strong, D. M. (1996). Beyond accuracy: What data quality means to data consumers. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *12*(4), 5–33.

[7] Mallempati, A., & Jaladi, D. S. (2023). A Cloud-Native Master Data Management Architecture for Scalable Enterprise Data Platforms. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, *4*(1), 147-157.

[8] Pipino, L. L., Lee, Y. W., & Wang, R. Y. (2002). Data quality assessment. *Communications of the ACM*, *45*(4), 211–218.

[9] Kumar, M. S. (2023). A Scalable Architecture for Automated Data Classification and Sensitive Information Discovery Using Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Engineering and Technology*, *4*(2), 158-169.

[10] Strong, D. M., Lee, Y. W., & Wang, R. Y. (1997). Data quality in context. *Communications of the ACM*, *40*(5), 103–110.

[11] Haug, A., & Zachariassen, F. (2016). Data quality in CRM systems. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, *116*(9), 1896–1914.

[12] Miller, T. (2023). A hierarchical model for data quality terminology. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, *143*, 102087.

[13] Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., ... & Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, *3*, 160018.

[14] Kumar, M. S., & Yuvaraj, N. (2022). Preparing Enterprise Data for LLM-Assisted Customer Issue Analysis: A Governance-Centric Framework. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Data Science, and Machine Learning*, *3*(3), 181-192.

[15] Stall, S., Yarmey, L., Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J., Hanson, B., Lehnert, K., Nosek, B., ... & Wyborn, L. (2019). Make scientific data FAIR. *Nature*, *570*(7759), 27–29.

[16] Mallempati, A. (2023). Smart Data, Smart Decisions: The Future of MDM & Governance. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, *4*(2), 155-165.

[17] European Union. (2024). *Regulation 2024/1689 (EU AI Act)*. Official Journal of the European Union.

[18] Aluri, Y. S. (2022). Distributed Design Systems for Multi-Brand Enterprise Commerce Platforms. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Engineering and Technology*, *3*(3), 159-172.

[19] Olson, J. E. (2003). *Data Quality: The Accuracy Dimension*. Morgan Kaufmann.

[20] Yuvaraj, N. (2022). LLM-Augmented Conversational Intelligence for Customer Workflow Continuity. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Data Science, and Machine Learning*, *3*(4), 171-183.

[21] Herzog, T. N., Scheuren, F. J., & Winkler, W. E. (2007). *Data Quality and Record Linkage Techniques*. Springer.

[22] Lee, Y. W., Pipino, L. L., Funk, J. D., & Wang, R. Y. (2006). *Journey to Data Quality*. MIT Press.

[23] Aluri, Y. S. (2021). Federated Micro Frontend Governance in Enterprise Retail Ecosystems. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Data Science, and Machine Learning*, *2*(2), 114-125.

[24] Batini, C., Cappiello, C., Francalanci, C., & Maurino, A. (2009). Methodologies for data quality assessment and improvement. *ACM Computing Surveys*, *41*(3), 1–52.

[25] Aluri, Y. S. (2023). Context-Aware IDE Systems Using Large Language Models and Semantic Memory Architectures. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Computer Science and Information Technology*, *4*(2), 243-253.

[26] Redman, T. C. (2008). *Data Driven: Profiting from Your Most Important Business Asset*. Harvard Business Press.

[27] Mallempati, A. (2022). Data as a Strategic Asset: Unlocking Business Value through MDM and Governance. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, *3*(3), 137-146.

[28] Boeckhout, M., Zielhuis, G. A., & Bredenoord, A. L. (2018). The FAIR guiding principles for data stewardship: Fair enough? *European Journal of Human Genetics*, *26*(7), 931–936.

[29] Yuvaraj, N., & Kumar, M. S. (2023). Generative AI for Customer Workflow Continuity: Bridging Enterprise Data Governance with Intelligent Service Automation. *American International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, *5*(6), 38-53.