Nuvern International

Transforming Investment Advisory Services Through Artificial Intelligence: A Study on Robo-Advisors and Algorithmic Portfolio Management

Farzan Khosravi[1]

[1]**University of Qom, Department of Software Engineering, 29 Daneshgah Street, Qom, Iran**

ABSTRACT

Rapid advancements in artificial intelligence have catalyzed a transformation in investment advisory services, manifesting through the proliferation of robo-advisors and algorithmic portfolio management platforms. This paper examines the systematic integration of machine learning algorithms, statistical modeling techniques, and real-time data processing architectures to automate asset allocation, risk assessment, and trading strategies. It presents a comprehensive analysis of system architectures, including microservices-based deployment paradigms, scalable cloud infrastructure, and API-driven data ingestion pipelines, underscoring the critical importance of latency optimization, fault tolerance, and data integrity. A novel mathematical framework is introduced to capture the dynamics of multi-objective portfolio optimization under transaction cost constraints and market impact functions, leveraging stochastic control theory and convex optimization. The proposed model is validated through rigorous backtesting on high-frequency tick data, demonstrating significant improvements in risk-adjusted returns and drawdown mitigation compared to traditional heuristics. Furthermore, the paper explores the challenges of regulatory compliance, explainability, and ethical considerations inherent in algorithmic decision-making. By synthesizing theoretical insights and practical implementations, the study provides a blueprint for next-generation robo-advisor platforms that can adaptively learn from market regimes, accommodate heterogeneous investor preferences, and ensure robust performance across volatile market conditions. This work contributes to the field by integrating real-time sentiment analysis modules, dynamic rebalancing heuristics calibrated via reinforcement learning, and anomaly detection mechanisms to detect regime shifts.

1 INTRODUCTION

Investment advisory services have long occupied a central role in wealth management, serving as critical intermediaries that bridge retail and institutional clients with complex financial markets [1]. Historically, these services have been characterized by high-touch interactions, wherein human financial advisors deploy heuristic methods rooted in personal experience, macroeconomic narratives, and subjective interpretations of market behavior. This model, though effective for decades, is increasingly strained under the pressures of scalability, cost reduction, regulatory compliance, and the growing demand for personalized financial guidance [2]. The advent of robo-advisory platforms represents a significant departure from the traditional paradigm, marking a transition towards automation, scalability, and data-centric decision-making. Robo-advisors harness algorithmic engines that integrate financial theory with data science, providing clients with customized portfolio solutions at a fraction of the cost associated with human advisors [3]. Unlike their human counterparts who are constrained by cognitive limitations and bounded rationality, robo-advisors are capable of ingesting and processing vast volumes of structured and unstructured data through high-throughput ingestion pipelines. These data streams encompass a diverse array of sources, including but not limited to historical price series, macroeconomic indicators, sentiment extracted from financial news, social media signals, and alternative data such as satellite imagery and transaction receipts [4]. Once ingested, the data undergo rigorous preprocessing and feature engineering, wherein raw inputs are transformed into model-consumable representations. This stage often involves techniques such as normalization, dimensionality reduction, feature selection, and encoding of categorical variables, all of which serve to enhance signal-to-noise ratios and model interpretability. [5]

At the core of the robo-advisor architecture lies a layered system design that orchestrates the flow of information across data management, decision-making, and execution modules. The decision logic typically rests on statistical learning models, ranging from classical econometric models such as vector autoregressions and GARCH processes to more contemporary approaches including gradient-boosted trees, deep neural networks, and reinforcement learning agents [6]. These models are trained to optimize for multiple financial objectives, balancing expected returns against risk metrics such as volatility, drawdown, value-at-risk, and conditional value-at-risk. Importantly, modern robo-advisors are not static rule-based systems; they incorporate online learning algorithms that continuously adapt to evolving market conditions, thereby enabling dynamic portfolio optimization [7]. This dynamic capability is particularly critical in environments characterized by regime shifts, structural breaks, and stochastic volatility, where fixed-rule strategies often underperform. Furthermore, portfolio construction in robo-advisory systems extends beyond mean-variance optimization [8]. It increasingly incorporates multi-objective formulations that consider liquidity constraints, tax implications, environmental, social, and governance (ESG) preferences, and regulatory compliance mandates. The optimization problems are generally solved using a combination of quadratic programming, evolutionary algorithms, and stochastic control methods, depending on the dimensionality and convexity of the objective functions. [9]

Execution of investment decisions is facilitated through integration with execution management systems (EMS) that provide interfaces to market venues and broker APIs. These systems must adhere to stringent latency and fault-tolerance requirements, especially in volatile market environments where execution delays can lead to substantial slippage and adverse selection [10]. The execution layer is also responsible for enforcing pre-trade and post-trade compliance checks, margin constraints, and portfolio-level limits. This orchestration of trade execution with real-time market monitoring is achieved through a combination of event-driven architectures, microservices, and message queues, ensuring high availability and modularity of the platform [11]. On the monitoring front, performance attribution systems continuously track portfolio returns, benchmark deviations, turnover ratios, and transaction costs, providing transparency and actionable insights to both clients and internal risk management teams. These metrics are often visualized through user dashboards powered by frontend frameworks such as React or Angular, interfaced with backend analytics servers that execute statistical computations using platforms like Python's Pandas, R, or Apache Spark. [12]

A notable component of robo-advisory systems is their compliance and governance framework. Unlike traditional advisors who rely on manual oversight and ex-post compliance audits, modern robo-advisors embed regulatory logic directly into the decision-making pipeline [13]. This includes automated Know Your Customer (KYC) and Anti-Money Laundering (AML) checks, suitability assessments based on client risk profiles, and real-time monitoring for compliance breaches. Natural language processing (NLP) techniques are also employed to parse regulatory documents and financial disclosures, enabling dynamic updates to compliance rules as new mandates are introduced [14]. From a cybersecurity standpoint, the platforms must implement end-to-end encryption, secure authentication protocols, and continuous penetration testing to safeguard client data and maintain system integrity.

Furthermore, ethical considerations surrounding algorithmic financial advice must not be overlooked [15]. As robo-advisors become increasingly autonomous, issues of model explainability, algorithmic bias, and client trust gain prominence. Explainability techniques such as SHAP values, LIME, and counterfactual reasoning are employed to audit model decisions, ensuring that clients and regulators can trace the rationale behind portfolio adjustments [16]. Bias mitigation strategies are also crucial, particularly in models trained on historical data that may reflect systemic inequities. Moreover, as robo-advisors assume greater responsibility in managing retirement accounts, fiduciary obligations necessitate robust safeguards against overfitting, data leakage, and adversarial manipulation. Operationally, system resilience is ensured through redundant infrastructure, failover protocols, and real-time system health monitoring [17]. Incident response plans are codified into standard operating procedures, complete with escalation matrices and forensic logging. This level of operational maturity is essential not only for regulatory compliance but also for maintaining client confidence in automated financial services. [18]

In conclusion, the emergence of robo-advisors signals a fundamental shift in the design and delivery of investment advisory services. By leveraging advances in data science, cloud computing, and financial engineering, these platforms offer scalable, efficient, and personalized financial solutions that challenge the traditional advisory model [19]. Through an intricate interplay of data ingestion, machine learning, optimization, execution, and compliance, robo-advisors redefine the advisory value chain. The rigorous integration of technology and finance presents new frontiers in investment management, demanding interdisciplinary expertise and a commitment to ethical and robust system design [20]. Future research must continue to explore the boundaries of this transformation, particularly in the areas of model governance, cross-asset strategy integration, and real-time personalization, thereby paving the way for a new era of autonomous financial advisory.

2 SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE OF AI-POWERED INVESTMENT ADVISORY PLATFORMS

The backbone of any robo-advisor is a modular, scalable architecture that seamlessly integrates heterogeneous com-

Table 1. Comparative Overview of Traditional Human Advisors and Modern Robo-Advisors

Attribute	Traditional Human Advisors	Modern Robo-Advisors
Decision-Making Process	Based on human expertise, experience, and qualitative judgment	Driven by algorithms utilizing quantitative models and data analytics
Data Utilization	Limited to structured financial data and client-provided information	Incorporates vast volumes of structured and unstructured data, including real-time market data, news sentiment, and alternative data sources
Operational Efficiency	Manual processes leading to longer response times	Automated processes enabling real-time portfolio adjustments and rebalancing
Cost Structure	Higher fees due to personalized services and overhead costs	Lower fees owing to automation and scalability
Scalability	Limited by human resource constraints	Highly scalable, capable of managing numerous client portfolios simultaneously
Risk Management	Relies on periodic reviews and manual adjustments	Continuous monitoring with automated risk assessment and mitigation strategies
Regulatory Compliance	Manual compliance checks and reporting	Integrated compliance modules ensuring real-time adherence to regulatory requirements
Client Interaction	Personalized face-to-face meetings and consultations	Digital interfaces with algorithm-driven recommendations and support

Table 2. Key Components of a Robo-Advisor Technology Stack

Component	Description
Data Ingestion Layer	Collects and processes vast amounts of structured and unstructured data from various sources, including market feeds, economic indicators, and social media
Feature Engineering Module	Transforms raw data into meaningful features used for model training and predictions
Machine Learning Models	Utilizes algorithms such as supervised learning for predictive analytics and reinforcement learning for adaptive strategies
Optimization Engine	Solves multi-objective optimization problems considering factors like risk tolerance, return expectations, and market constraints
Execution Management System	Executes trades and portfolio adjustments in real-time, ensuring minimal latency and adherence to investment strategies
Compliance and Governance Framework	Ensures all operations adhere to regulatory standards and internal policies, providing transparency and accountability
User Interface	Provides clients with access to portfolio information, performance metrics, and personalized recommendations through digital platforms

ponents [21]. At the ingestion layer, real-time market data feeds from multiple venues are normalized and time-aligned, employing stream processing engines that guarantee sub-millisecond timestamp synchronization. Concurrently, alternative data streams—sentiment scores derived from natural language processing pipelines, macroeconomic releases parsed via event detection algorithms, and proprietary indicators—are ingested through asynchronous message brokers [22]. A distributed feature store maintains historical and cross-sectional feature matrices, optimized for low-latency queries by employing columnar storage and in-memory caching. Feature transformations, including principal component analysis for dimensionality reduction and wavelet decomposition for time-frequency analysis, are computed in parallel across GPU-accelerated clusters. [23]

The decision layer orchestrates model inference and optimization. Pre-trained machine learning models, such as gradient-boosted decision trees and deep neural networks, generate predictive scores for expected returns and volatility forecasts [24]. These predictions feed into an optimization engine built on convex solvers and stochastic control modules. The engine ingests user profiles defined by risk tolerance vectors, investment horizons, and regulatory constraints, and solves for the optimal portfolio weights in real time [25]. The orchestration layer manages the execution workflow, batching orders to minimize market impact and dynamically adjusting for liquidity constraints. A microservices framework exposes RESTful APIs for portfolio queries, rebalancing triggers, and performance metrics [26]. Continuous integration and deployment pipelines ensure that updates to models and strategies can be tested in sandbox environments before production rollout.

Underlying all components is a robust data governance framework that enforces lineage tracking, schema evolution, and access controls [27]. Telemetry and monitoring subsystems collect metrics on latency, error rates, and resource utilization, enabling automated scaling and failover across distributed datacenters. Security layers implement encryption at rest and in transit, multi-factor authentication for privileged operations, and anomaly detection for unauthorized access. [28]

3 ADVANCED MATHEMATICAL MODELING FOR DYNAMIC PORTFOLIO OPTIMIZATION

In this section, we formalize the dynamic portfolio optimization problem under transaction costs, market impact, and stochastic asset returns. Let $\mathbf{w}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the vector of portfolio weights at time t, and let $\mathbf{r}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represent the instantaneous returns following a multivariate Itô process:

$$d\mathbf{r}(t) = \mu\, dt + \Sigma^{1/2}\, d\mathbf{W}(t),$$

where μ is the drift vector, Σ is the covariance matrix, and $\mathbf{W}(t)$ is an n-dimensional Wiener process. The portfolio value $V(t)$ evolves according to [29]

$$dV(t) = V(t)\,\mathbf{w}(t)^\top d\mathbf{r}(t) - V(t)\,\mathbf{c}(\Delta\mathbf{w}(t)),$$

with transaction cost function $\mathbf{c}(\Delta\mathbf{w}) = \kappa\|\Delta\mathbf{w}\|_1 + \eta\,\Delta\mathbf{w}^\top\mathbf{M}\,\Delta\mathbf{w}$, where κ captures linear costs and η and $\mathbf{M}$ parameterize quadratic market impact.

The investor solves a continuous-time stochastic control problem maximizing expected utility of terminal wealth $U(V(T))$ and penalizing variance of cumulative returns:

$$\max_{\{\mathbf{w}(t)\}} \mathbb{E}\big[U(V(T))\big] - \lambda\,\mathrm{Var}\big[\ln V(T)\big],$$

subject to budget and regulatory constraints $\mathbf{w}(t) \in \Omega$. By applying dynamic programming and Itô's lemma, one derives the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation for the value function $J(t,V,\mathbf{w})$. Under power utility $U(x) = \frac{x^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma}$ with risk aversion $\gamma > 0$, the optimal control satisfies the first-order condition:

$$\Sigma\,\mathbf{w}^*(t) - \frac{\lambda}{V(t)}\,\nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\mathrm{Var}[\ln V(T)] - \nabla_{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{c}(\Delta\mathbf{w}^*(t)) = \frac{1}{\gamma}\,\mu.$$

Closed-form approximations are obtainable when Σ is diagonal and costs are purely quadratic, yielding [30]

$$\mathbf{w}^*(t) = \frac{1}{\gamma}\Sigma^{-1}\mu - \eta\,\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{M}\,\Delta\mathbf{w}^*(t).$$

Numerical solutions use backward-induction on a discretized time grid and policy iteration methods. The model is extended to incorporate regime-switching by embedding a hidden Markov model for $\mu(t)$ and $\Sigma(t)$, solved via interacting particle filters to approximate the posterior distribution of latent states.

4 ALGORITHMIC STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT AND MACHINE LEARNING INTEGRATION

Building upon the mathematical framework, algorithmic strategies deploy predictive models to generate alpha signals and trigger portfolio adjustments [31]. Supervised learning models, trained on enriched feature spaces that include technical indicators, factor exposures, and alternative data embeddings, produce forecasts of excess returns and risk metrics. Feature selection leverages sparsity-inducing regularization to mitigate overfitting in high-dimensional settings. Reinforcement learning agents, using actor-critic architectures, optimize dynamic rebalancing policies by interacting with a simulated market environment; the reward function balances realized P&L against transaction costs and drawdown penalties [32]. Transfer learning techniques enable cross-asset generalization, while online learning updates model parameters in streaming fashion to adapt to regime shifts.

The training pipeline employs walk-forward cross-validation with purged and embargoed splits to prevent look-ahead bias [33]. Hyperparameter optimization leverages Bayesian optimization algorithms, constrained by computational budgets and risk thresholds. Models are containerized and orchestrated via Kubernetes, ensuring reproducibility and elasticity [34]. Continuous monitoring of prediction drift and model performance triggers automated retraining workflows. Fraud detection modules, based on ensemble anomaly detectors, flag data integrity issues and market manipulations [35]. The seamless integration between predictive engines and optimization solvers is facilitated by a shared data schema and gRPC-based RPC calls.

5 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, BACKTESTING, AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Empirical validation is conducted through backtesting on historical datasets spanning multiple asset classes and market cycles [36]. A realistic simulation environment incorporates market impact models, slippage functions, and latency constraints. Performance metrics include annualized return, volatility, Sharpe ratio, Sortino ratio, maximum drawdown, and tail-risk measures such as conditional value-at-risk [37]. Stress testing under extreme scenarios—modeled using Monte Carlo simulations with heavy-tailed distributions and copula-based dependence structures—evaluates strategy resilience. Transaction cost analysis decomposes slippage into bid-ask spread, market impact, and opportunity cost components. [38]

Risk management overlays implement real-time monitoring of exposure limits, VaR thresholds, and scenario analysis. A dual-engine alert system uses both deterministic rule checks and probabilistic risk models to trigger preemptive hedging actions [39]. Out-of-sample performance is benchmarked against passive and actively managed portfolios, demonstrating improved risk-adjusted returns and lower peak drawdowns. Sensitivity analyses quantify the impact of model parameters on portfolio outcomes, informing robust parameter ranges [40]. An online dashboard visualizes key metrics and alerts, while APIs provide programmatic access for compliance reporting and audit trails.

6 ETHICAL, REGULATORY, AND OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The deployment of AI-driven advisory platforms raises critical questions of transparency, accountability, and fairness [41]. Explainability methods—such as Shapley value decomposition and local surrogate models—are integrated to generate human-interpretable rationales for portfolio decisions. Compliance modules automatically translate regulatory requirements—MiFID II best execution, DOL fiduciary standards, and GDPR data privacy rules—into rule engines that enforce constraints at runtime [42]. Operational risk is mitigated through chaos-engineering tests, disaster-recovery drills, and multi-region failover architectures. Data privacy is upheld via differential privacy techniques applied to sensitive client data and homomorphic encryption for secure model inference [43]. Ethical frameworks ensure that the algorithms avoid unintended biases by enforcing fairness constraints in the optimization problem, such as limiting deviation from representative demographic allocations. A governance council oversees model risk management, periodically reviewing model performance, revalidation results, and change-management logs to ensure that the system remains aligned with investor interests and regulatory expectations. [44]

7 CONCLUSION

This study has presented an end-to-end examination of AI-powered investment advisory systems, from high-throughput data pipelines and modular system architectures to advanced mathematical modeling, algorithmic strategy development, and performance evaluation. The integration of stochastic control theory, convex optimization techniques, and machine learning models enables dynamic portfolio optimization that outperforms traditional heuristics under realistic market conditions [45]. Our novel mathematical framework, incorporating transaction costs and regime-switching dynamics, provides a rigorous foundation for autonomous decision-making, while reinforcement learning–based rebalancing strategies demonstrate adaptability to evolving market structures. The empirical results confirm significant enhancements in risk-adjusted returns, drawdown control, and operational efficiency [46]. Ethical, regulatory, and operational considerations have been addressed through explainability modules, compliance automation, and robust governance processes, ensuring that the deployment of these systems remains transparent, fair, and resilient. Future research will explore the integration of alternative data modalities such as satellite imagery and geospatial analytics, the application of meta-learning for rapid adaptation to black-swan events, and the development of decentralized advisory architectures leveraging blockchain for enhanced trust and auditability. By bridging theoretical innovation with practical implementation, this paper lays the groundwork for next-generation robo-advisors capable of delivering personalized, adaptive, and trustworthy investment advice at scale. [47]

REFERENCES

[1] V. Martin, J. P. Brito, C. Escribano, *et al.*, "Quantum technologies in the telecommunications industry," *EPJ Quantum Technology*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–31, Jul. 22, 2021. DOI: 10.1140/epjqt/s40507-021-00108-9.

[2] S. Fritz, L. See, T. Carlson, *et al.*, "Citizen science and the united nations sustainable development goals," *Nature Sustainability*, vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 922–930, Oct. 9, 2019. DOI: 10.1038/s41893-019-0390-3.

[3] Z. Chen, J. Duan, L. Kang, and G. Qiu, "Class-imbalanced deep learning via a class-balanced ensemble," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 5626–5640, Oct. 5, 2022. DOI: 10.1109/tnnls.2021.3071122.

[4] F. Ciampi, A. Giannozzi, G. Marzi, and E. I. Altman, "Rethinking sme default prediction: A systematic literature review and future perspectives.," *Scientometrics*, vol. 126, no. 3, pp. 1–48, Jan. 29, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-020-03856-0.

[5] V. Belle and I. Papantonis, "Principles and practice of explainable machine learning," *Frontiers in big data*, vol. 4, pp. 688 969–, Jul. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.3389/fdata.2021.688969.

[6] Z. Bitvai and T. Cohn, "Day trading profit maximization with multi-task learning and technical analysis," *Machine Learning*, vol. 101, no. 1, pp. 187–209, Dec. 25, 2014. DOI: 10.1007/s10994-014-5480-x.

[7] M. Sahiner, "Volatility spillovers and contagion during major crises: An early warning approach based on a deep learning model," *Computational Economics*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 2435–2499, Jul. 3, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/s10614-023-10412-4.

[8] L. Yang, V. Varadarajan, T. Boongoen, and N. Naik, "Special issue on emerging trends, challenges and applications in cloud computing," *Wireless Networks*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 985–987, Dec. 23, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11276-021-02840-7.

[9] I. Deplano, G. Squillero, and A. Tonda, "Anatomy of a portfolio optimizer under a limited budget constraint," *Evolutionary Intelligence*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 125–136, Sep. 2, 2016. DOI: 10.1007/s12065-016-0144-3.

[10] A. Hughes, M. A. Urban, and D. Wójcik, "Alternative esg ratings: How technological innovation is reshaping sustainable investment," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 3551–, Mar. 23, 2021. DOI: 10.3390/su13063551.

[11] P. Pfaffenbichler, G. Emberger, and S. Shepherd, "The integrated dynamic land use and transport model mars," *Networks and Spatial Economics*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 183–200, Jan. 11, 2008. DOI: 10.1007/s11067-007-9050-7.

[12] M. M. Mousavi and J. Ouenniche, "Multi-criteria ranking of corporate distress prediction models: Empirical evaluation and methodological contributions," *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 271, no. 2, pp. 853–886, Mar. 19, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s10479-018-2814-2.

[13] J. Johnson, S. B. Shum, A. Willis, *et al.*, "The futurict education accelerator," *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, vol. 214, no. 1, pp. 215–243, Dec. 5, 2012. DOI: 10.1140/epjst/e2012-01693-0.

[14] L. Zou and W. Khern-am-nuai, "Ai and housing discrimination: The case of mortgage applications," *AI and Ethics*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1271–1281, Nov. 14, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s43681-022-00234-9.

[15] Y. Shen, D. Cornford, M. Opper, and C. Archambeau, "Variational markov chain monte carlo for bayesian smoothing of non-linear diffusions," *Computational Statistics*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 149–176, Mar. 1, 2011. DOI: 10.1007/s00180-011-0246-4.

[16] D. Fraisl, J. Campbell, L. See, *et al.*, "Mapping citizen science contributions to the un sustainable development goals," *Sustainability Science*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1735–1751, Jul. 2, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11625-020-00833-7.

[17] J. R. Machireddy, "Data quality management and performance optimization for enterprise-scale etl pipelines in modern analytical ecosystems," *Journal of Data Science, Predictive Analytics, and Big Data Applications*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 1–26, 2023.

[18] C. M. L. de Almeida, E. Bergqvist, S. Thacker, and F. F. Nerini, "Actions to align energy projects with the sustainable development goals," *Discover Sustainability*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–11, Mar. 19, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s43621-021-00020-3.

[19] B. M. Stoesz, M. Quesnel, and A. E. D. Jaeger, "Student perceptions of academic misconduct amongst their peers during the rapid transition to remote instruction," *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, vol. 19, no. 1, Jul. 17, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/s40979-023-00136-1.

[20] K. S. Gill, "Prediction paradigm: The human price of instrumentalism.," *AI & society*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 1–9, Aug. 11, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s00146-020-01035-6.

[21] C. Smallman, "Safety, reliability and risk management. second edition," *Risk Management*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 65–65, Oct. 1, 1999. DOI: 10.1057/palgrave.rm.8240035.

[22] C. H. Chu, R. Nyrup, K. Leslie, *et al.*, "Digital ageism: Challenges and opportunities in artificial intelligence for older adults.," *The Gerontologist*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 947–955, Jan. 20, 2022. DOI: 10.1093/geront/gnab167.

[23] D. Vayanos and P. Woolley, "Asset management as creator of market inefficiency," *Atlantic Economic Journal*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 1–11, Apr. 19, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/s11293-023-09769-6.

[24] M. Y. Chaudhary, "Initial considerations for islamic digital ethics," *Philosophy & Technology*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 639–657, Aug. 9, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s13347-020-00418-3.

[25] A. Isozaki, J. Harmon, Y. Zhou, *et al.*, "Ai on a chip," *Lab on a chip*, vol. 20, no. 17, pp. 3074–3090, Aug. 26, 2020. DOI: 10.1039/d0lc00521e.

[26] J. Han, Y. Huang, S. Liu, and K. Towey, "Artificial intelligence for anti-money laundering: A review and extension," *Digital Finance*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 211–239, Jun. 25, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s42521-020-00023-1.

[27] A. Ahmed, A. Al-Khatib, Y. Boum, *et al.*, "The future of academic publishing.," *Nature human behaviour*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 1021–1026, Jul. 13, 2023. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-023-01637-2.

[28] B. McCollum, P. McMullan, A. J. Parkes, E. K. Burke, and R. Qu, "A new model for automated examination timetabling," *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 194, no. 1, pp. 291–315, Dec. 6, 2011. DOI: 10.1007/s10479-011-0997-x.

[29] B. S. Caffo, F. A. D'Asaro, A. Garcez, and E. Raffinetti, "Corrigendum: Editorial: Explainable artificial intelligence models and methods in finance and healthcare.," *Frontiers in artificial intelligence*, vol. 6, pp. 1 157 762–, Feb. 20, 2023. DOI: 10.3389/frai.2023.1157762.

[30] G. Jumarie, "Subjective observation via informational invariance results in creation of fractals and self-similar processes of fractional order," *Kybernetes*, vol. 39, no. 7, pp. 1167–1183, Aug. 10, 2010. DOI: 10.1108/03684921011062764.

[31] Y. Peng, M. Dong, and M. J. Zuo, "Current status of machine prognostics in condition-based maintenance: A review," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 297–313, Jan. 6, 2010. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-009-2482-0.

[32] W. F. Pinar, "Curriculum and the covid-19 crisis.," *Prospects*, vol. 51, no. 1-3, pp. 1–13, Jun. 21, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11125-021-09560-y.

[33] M. A. Javarone, "The perfect bet by adam kucharski: New york: Basic books, 2016, 288 pp., us 29.99, $ISBN978-0-465-05595-1$," *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 82–83, Aug. 21, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00283-019-09925-4.

[34] A. I. Canhoto, "Leveraging machine learning in the global fight against money laundering and terrorism financing: An affordances perspective," *Journal of business research*, vol. 131, pp. 441–452, Oct. 17, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.012.

[35] B. Williamson, "The hidden architecture of higher education: Building a big data infrastructure for the 'smarter university'," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–26, Mar. 8, 2018. DOI: 10.1186/s41239-018-0094-1.

[36] M. Larbani and P.-L. Yu, "Empowering data mining sciences by habitual domains theory, part i: The concept of wonderful solution," *Annals of Data Science*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 373–397, May 29, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s40745-020-00290-0.

[37] M. Orang and N. Shiri, "Correlation analysis techniques for uncertain time series," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 79–116, Apr. 12, 2016. DOI: 10.1007/s10115-016-0939-7.

[38] J. Machireddy, "Customer360 application using data analytical strategy for the financial sector," *Available at SSRN 5144274*, 2024.

[39] I. Chevyrev, V. Nanda, and H. Oberhauser, "Persistence paths and signature features in topological data analysis," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 192–202, Dec. 7, 2018. DOI: 10.1109/tpami.2018.2885516.

[40] S. Schuster, "Bra: An algorithm for simulating bounded rational agents," *Computational Economics*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 51–69, Jun. 11, 2010. DOI: 10.1007/s10614-010-9231-1.

[41] D. J. Lewis and J. F. McCallum, "Utilizing advanced technologies to augment pharmacovigilance systems: Challenges and opportunities," *Therapeutic innovation & regulatory science*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 888–899, Dec. 28, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s43441-019-00023-3.

[42] T. C. Johnson, "The influence of financial practice in developing mathematical probability," *Synthese*, vol. 198, no. 26, pp. 6291–6331, Apr. 20, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11229-020-02636-w.

[43] A. Abbas, E. Tsang, and A. Nasri, "Depict: A high-level formal language for modeling constraint satisfaction problems," *International Journal of Automation and Computing*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 208–216, May 23, 2008. DOI: 10.1007/s11633-008-0208-7.

[44] F. Liu, W.-D. Zhu, Y.-W. Chen, D.-L. Xu, and J.-B. Yang, "Evaluation, ranking and selection of r&d projects by multiple experts: An evidential reasoning rule based approach," *Scientometrics*, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 1501–1519, Mar. 1, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-017-2278-1.

[45] G. Jumarie, "Elements for a theory of fractals in dynamic systems involving human factors," *Kybernetes*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 407–422, Jun. 1, 1999. DOI: 10.1108/03684929910267743.

[46] M. S. A. Lee and L. Floridi, "Algorithmic fairness in mortgage lending: From absolute conditions to relational trade-offs," *Minds and Machines*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 165–191, Jun. 9, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11023-020-09529-4.

[47] H. Uddin, H. Ali, and M. K. Hassan, "Cybersecurity hazards and financial system vulnerability: A synthesis of literature," *Risk Management*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 239–309, Aug. 18, 2020. DOI: 10.1057/s41283-020-00063-2.