AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DATA SCIENCE AND MACHINE LEARNING (ISSN: 2692-5141)

Volume 05, Issue 02, 2025, pages 306-315
Published Date: - 30-11-2025

Artificial Intelligence and the Reinvention of Mergers & Acquisitions: Mechanisms, Risks, and Strategic Pathways

Arjun L. Bennett
Global Business School, University of Edinburgh

ABSTRACT

Background: The rapid infusion of artificial intelligence (AI) into corporate finance and transactional workflows is reshaping fundamental activities in mergers and acquisitions (M&A). This paper examines how AI alters pre-deal screening, due diligence, valuation, integration planning, and post-merger performance measurement, and it situates these changes within the broader M&A literature on efficiency, behavioral dynamics, and integration challenges. Methods: Drawing strictly on the provided scholarly and practitioner sources, the study constructs a conceptual framework that synthesizes empirical findings, theoretical models, and practitioner narratives to identify mechanisms by which AI affects M&A outcomes. The methodological approach is deductive and integrative: it dissects each stage of the M&A lifecycle, maps AI capabilities to stage-specific tasks, and evaluates anticipated benefits and risks across financial, organizational, and regulatory dimensions. Results: AI-driven tools reduce information asymmetries through automated document analysis, pattern detection, and structured prediction (Emmi, 2025; Fang et al., 2025; Fedyk et al., 2022). AI also shifts the locus of subjectivity in valuation towards algorithmic consistency while creating new sources of model risk and bias (Geertsema et al., 2025; Freire-González, 2025). For post-merger integration, AI enables more rapid cultural and operational mapping but does not eliminate human-leadership and governance challenges, and may create novel misalignment between automated recommendations and managerial incentives (Graebner, 2004; Graebner et al., 2017; Ellis et al., 2011). Discussion: AI's promise in M&A is substantial, but realization depends on governance, data quality, model validation, and integration of AI outputs into decision rights. The analysis reveals tensions between efficiency gains and risks of model opacity, regulatory scrutiny, and workforce displacement. The paper identifies a research agenda to empirically measure AI's causal impact on deal success and outlines policy-relevant safeguards that preserve managerial accountability and market stability. Conclusion: AI is not merely an efficiency tool in M&A; it is a structural technology that reframes valuation, due diligence, and integration processes. Successful adoption requires deliberate orchestration of technical, human, and governance systems to harness advantages while managing persistent and emergent risks.

KEYWORDS

artificial intelligence, mergers and acquisitions, due diligence, valuation, post-merger integration, governance, audit

INTRODUCTION

Mergers and acquisitions have long been focal mechanisms by which firms pursue growth, obtain strategic assets, and reconfigure industry structures (Eckbo, 2018; Haleblian et al., 2008). Traditional M&A scholarship emphasizes the complexity of transactions, highlighting pre-transaction uncertainty, heterogeneous motives, and the difficulty of achieving anticipated synergies (Ferreira et al., 2015; Gomes et al., 2013). Post-merger integration (PMI) remains a pivotal determinant of realized value, where leadership, culture, and systems must be aligned to capture expected gains (Graebner, 2004; Graebner et al., 2017). Historically, barriers to M&A efficiency have included information asymmetries, costly and time-consuming due diligence, and subjective valuation practices prone to behavioral biases and inconsistent methodologies (Erel et al., 2012; Haleblian et al., 2008). These frictions create a fertile context for technological intervention.

Artificial intelligence—broadly defined as computational methods that perform tasks associated with human intelligence, such as pattern recognition, natural language processing, and predictive modeling—has rapidly moved from a niche capability to a core component of financial and transactional services (Fang et al., 2025; Freire-González, 2025). Practitioners report that AI can accelerate document review, detect transaction risks earlier, and standardize aspects of relative valuation, thereby promising time and cost savings as well as improved decision quality (Emmi, 2025; Fedyk et al., 2022; Geertsema et al., 2025). Yet such claims coexist with concerns: algorithmic opacity can create new unknowns; biased training data can embed systematic errors; and overreliance on automated outputs can displace critical human judgment needed for integration and strategic fit assessments (Fedyk et al., 2022; Shounik, 2025). The literature on M&A provides a rich set of constructs—such as information asymmetry, integration capability, and managerial incentives—that must be reevaluated in light of AI's capabilities and constraints (Gomes et al., 2013; Ellis et al., 2011; Haleblian et al., 2008).

This paper aims to integrate the practitioner observations and early empirical findings about AI in M&A with longstanding theoretical frameworks from finance, strategy, and organization studies. By systematically mapping AI functionalities to the lifecycle of M&A transactions, the paper identifies where AI can plausibly increase deal quality and where it introduces new failure modes. The central problem addressed is how AI alters the trade-offs that acquirers and targets face across three dimensions: information (accuracy and timeliness), valuation (objectivity versus model risk), and integration (speed versus sociocultural fit). The literature gap motivating this analysis is twofold. First, extant M&A reviews describe drivers of success and failure without integrating the disruptive role of AI tools that are increasingly embedded into transactional workflows (Ferreira et al., 2023; Haleblian et al., 2008). Second, practitioner reports and emerging academic work highlight specific AI applications but often lack a unified theoretical account that connects those applications to long-standing determinants of M&A success and failure (Emmi, 2025; Fang et al., 2025; Fedyk et al., 2022). This paper responds by offering a comprehensive conceptual synthesis and a research roadmap anchored in the referenced materials.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. The methodology section explains the integrative conceptual approach used to synthesize evidence and theory. The results section details how AI maps to discrete M&A stages—deal origination, screening, due diligence, valuation, negotiation, and integration. The discussion interprets these findings in light of governance, audit, human capital, and regulatory considerations, highlighting limitations and proposing avenues for future research. The conclusion distills the managerial and policy implications and the overarching argument: AI transforms M&A not merely by automating tasks but by changing the epistemic foundations of deal-making, thereby necessitating new governance and accountability mechanisms.

METHODOLOGY

The research design is conceptual and integrative rather than empirical. Given the instruction to base the article strictly on the provided references, the methodology involves systematic synthesis and deductive reasoning using the supplied practitioner articles, working papers, and canonical academic studies in M&A. The methodological steps are as follows.

Literature Anchoring and Scope Selection. The first step was to identify focal constructs from the provided materials: AI's capabilities in transaction processes (Emmi, 2025; Fang et al., 2025; Fedyk et al., 2022), changes to valuation practices and relative-valuation subjectivity (Geertsema et al., 2025), and organizational integration challenges traditionally associated with M&A (Graebner, 2004; Graebner et al., 2017; Gomes et al., 2013). Supplementary M&A foundational sources (Eckbo, 2018; Haleblian et al., 2008; Ellis et al., 2011; Erel et al., 2012) provided theoretical anchors concerning efficiency, governance, and cross-border determinants.

Stage-Based Analytical Framework. The approach segments the M&A lifecycle into discrete stages: deal origination and screening; diligence and risk discovery; valuation and price formation; negotiation and contracting; and post-merger integration and performance monitoring. For each stage, the analysis identifies (1) traditional challenges; (2) AI capabilities relevant to those challenges; (3) expected benefits; (4) emergent risks from AI adoption; and (5) governance and organizational adjustments necessary to capture benefits while managing risks. This stage-based method facilitates clear mapping from capabilities to outcomes and aligns with practitioner perspectives that similarly treat the M&A lifecycle as a series of coordinated activities (Gomes et al., 2013; Emmi, 2025).

Conceptual Synthesis and Mechanism Mapping. Drawing on the referenced materials, the study constructs logical causal chains—how a specific AI tool (e.g., NLP-based contract analytics) changes information availability, which in turn affects valuation precision and integration planning. Where the literature provided empirical or quasi-empirical claims (e.g., that AI improves audit processes or reduces time in due diligence), those claims are adopted as provisional premises (Fedyk et al., 2022). The conceptual synthesis pays special attention to countervailing mechanisms (e.g., reduced subjectivity versus increased model risk) and explicitly notes boundary conditions and assumptions under which benefits accrue (Geertsema et al., 2025; Fang et al., 2025).

Cross-Validation with M&A Theory. The assembled causal models are iteratively compared against key M&A theoretical constructs—information asymmetry and adverse selection (Eckbo, 2018), integration capability and managerial leadership (Graebner et al., 2017), and determinants of cross-border transactions (Erel et al., 2012). This step checks for theoretical consistency and surfaces gaps where AI introduces novel phenomena not fully anticipated by prior theory (Freire-González, 2025).

Risk and Governance Analysis. A discrete section of the methodological synthesis identifies regulatory, audit, and organizational governance implications using practitioner and audit-focused references (Fedyk et al., 2022; Emmi, 2025; Shounik, 2025). The audit literature, for instance, provides a basis for extrapolating how AI's application to diligence and controls requires new validation and oversight procedures.

Limitations of the Methodology. This study is deliberately constrained to the provided references and therefore does not incorporate broader empirical datasets, interviews, or real-world transaction data beyond what those sources report. The method is primarily analytical; it develops testable propositions and highlights variables that future empirical studies should measure. The absence of new empirical tests is recognized as a limitation but is consistent with the task of generating a theoretically rigorous and practically grounded synthesis anchored in the supplied literature.

Results

The results present the conceptual mapping of AI's effects on M&A stages, summarized as a sequence of mechanisms and their implications. Each subsection outlines the traditional challenge, AI capability, expected benefit, emergent risk, and governance countermeasure.

Deal Origination and Screening

Traditional Challenge. Deal origination historically depends on networks, sector expertise, and manual scanning of market signals, producing both selection bias and slow response times (Ferreira et al., 2015). Market signals may be noisy and dispersed, leading to missed opportunities or overconcentration on familiar targets.

AI Capability. AI systems can ingest large volumes of structured and unstructured data—financial filings, news articles, patent databases, job postings—and identify patterns indicating strategic fit or distress signals at scale (Fang et al., 2025; Geertsema et al., 2025). Natural language processing (NLP) and unsupervised learning can flag emergent competitors, technology shifts, or management churn that suggest attractive targets.

Expected Benefit. AI reduces search costs and expands the observable opportunity set, thereby improving match quality between acquirers' strategic criteria and potential targets (Fang et al., 2025). Automated screening can surface counterintuitive targets outside traditional networks, enabling more diverse portfolio strategies and potentially increasing the ex-ante probability of finding high-synergy targets.

Emergent Risk. Scalable screening amplifies base-rate concerns: if algorithms prioritize rare signals, they may produce false positives, leading to wasted diligence resources. Moreover, algorithmic screening could inadvertently homogenize deal pipelines if many firms adopt similar models trained on overlapping datasets, potentially increasing competitive bidding and valuation inflation.

Governance Countermeasure. Maintaining diversity in screening models and embedding human-in-the-loop validation are essential. Firms should implement periodic model audits and track false positive/negative rates to recalibrate thresholds. Strategic oversight should ensure that algorithmic suggestions are inputs to, not replacements for, strategic judgment (Emmi, 2025; Shounik, 2025).

Due Diligence and Risk Discovery

Traditional Challenge. Due diligence is time-consuming and costly, often involving review of voluminous contracts, financial records, employee agreements, and compliance documents. Human review is error-prone and may overlook latent patterns across documents that indicate contingent liabilities or regulatory exposure (Gomes et al., 2013).

AI Capability. AI tools excel at rapid document review, semantic extraction, anomaly detection, and clustering of clauses that relate to contingent liabilities or unusual contractual commitments (Fedyk et al., 2022; Emmi, 2025). Machine learning models can prioritize high-risk items and surface relationships across datasets that human reviewers might miss.

Expected Benefit. AI reduces time and cost for diligence by automating routine tasks and enabling deeper inspection of unstructured data. Faster identification of red flags improves bargaining positions and pricing accuracy. AI's ability to standardize the review process can also create more replicable diligence frameworks across deals, improving institutional learning (Fedyk et al., 2022).

Emergent Risk. AI-driven diligence creates systemic model risk: if training datasets lack examples of rare but consequential contract structures, models may fail to detect critical issues. Bias in historical data can cause AI to underweight emerging regulatory or technological risks. Additionally, reliance on AI outputs can lead to overconfidence—decision-makers might undervalue the need for targeted manual checks, particularly for reputational or cultural risks that are difficult to quantify algorithmically (Fedyk et al., 2022; Shounik, 2025).

Governance Countermeasure. Robust model governance frameworks are required, including validation datasets, scenario-based stress testing for rare events, and mandatory human review for categories where AI performance is known to be weaker. Audit trails and explainability mechanisms should be standard to allow legal and compliance teams to interrogate AI outputs (Fedyk et al., 2022).

Valuation and Price Formation

Traditional Challenge. Valuation in M&A is not a purely mechanical exercise; practitioners rely on a mix of discounted cash flow models, relative valuation benchmarks, and strategic judgment. This mixture yields subjective variation—different analysts may produce divergent valuations for the same asset due to choice of comparables, terminal value assumptions, and adjustments for intangibles (Erel et al., 2012; Geertsema et al., 2025).

AI Capability. AI can bring consistency to relative valuation by systematically selecting comparables, adjusting for cross-sectional differences using high-dimensional feature sets, and revealing latent relationships between firm characteristics and transaction multiples (Geertsema et al., 2025; Fang et al., 2025). Predictive models can generate probabilistic distributions of outcomes rather than single-point estimates, explicitly capturing uncertainty.

Expected Benefit. AI reduces idiosyncratic subjectivity in valuation and can make relative-valuation processes more transparent and repeatable. Algorithmic selection of comparables may minimize cherry-picking and improve peer group construction. Probabilistic forecasts help negotiators understand downside scenarios and the distribution of possible returns, enabling more nuanced deal pricing.

Emergent Risk. Algorithmic standardization introduces model risk and the potential for "mechanistic herding" where multiple market participants rely on similar AI-driven valuations, compressing dispersion and increasing sensitivity to model misspecification (Geertsema et al., 2025). Furthermore, AI models may overweight historical patterns that are poor predictors in structural change contexts, such as technology shifts or regulatory disruption. Overreliance on models may also undermine entrepreneurial judgment about strategic fit and intangible synergies that are not well captured in datasets.

Governance Countermeasure. Firms should maintain hybrid valuation workflows: AI outputs should be treated as inputs that augment rather than replace human judgment. Sensitivity analysis and stress testing of valuation models are crucial. Transparency about model assumptions and explicit incorporation of scenario analysis for structural breaks should be institutionalized (Geertsema et al., 2025; Fang et al., 2025).

Negotiation and Contracting

Traditional Challenge. Negotiation in M&A balances financial terms and complex contractual protections, with parties often negotiating bespoke clauses to allocate post-closing risk. Negotiations are shaped by asymmetric information, time pressure, and strategic posturing.

AI Capability. AI-assisted negotiation tools can parse prior deal terms, suggest standard clauses, and model the likely acceptability of contract terms based on historical outcomes. NLP-based analytics can identify atypical clauses in counterparty drafts and recommend language adjustments consistent with precedent (Emmi, 2025; Fedyk et al., 2022).

Expected Benefit. Negotiators equipped with AI insights can benchmark terms rapidly and reduce drafting cycles. AI also helps counsel identify deviations from market norms, limiting exposure to obscure provisions. This efficiency can accelerate deal closings and reduce legal costs.

Emergent Risk. The standardization of contract language may reduce flexibility in addressing unique deal-specific risks. Further, model-driven negotiation makes parties susceptible to adversarial manipulation if one side intentionally crafts unusual clauses designed to exploit AI pattern recognition—an example of strategic behavior that emerges when one party anticipates the other’s automated processes.

Governance Countermeasure. Contract governance should include manual checkpoints for negotiation of bespoke protections and a two-track review process: an AI-driven normative review for market consistency and a human review for bespoke risk allocation. Legal teams must be trained to spot adversarial drafting targeted at algorithmic detection heuristics (Emmi, 2025).

Post-Merger Integration (PMI)

Traditional Challenge. PMI combines cultural, operational, and strategic alignment, with many acquirers failing to realize projected synergies due to people issues, incompatible systems, and poor attention to integration sequencing (Graebner et al., 2017; Gomes et al., 2013). Leadership turnover and misaligned incentives further complicate integration.

AI Capability. AI enables rapid mapping of organizational networks, skill inventories, and process interdependencies through analysis of HR systems, communications metadata, and operational logs. Predictive models can forecast where friction points are likely to emerge and recommend optimal integration sequences (Graebner et al., 2017; Emmi, 2025).

Expected Benefit. Faster identification of critical roles, duplication, and integration hotspots permits targeted interventions. For example, AI can help prioritize retention of key personnel, align systems migration plans, and measure integration progress using real-time indicators rather than ex-post financial reporting. This accelerates capture of operational synergies and reduces wasteful parallel systems maintenance.

Emergent Risk. AI's focus on measurable signals may underweight cultural and symbolic aspects of integration that are vital for employee morale and long-term performance. Algorithmic recommendations for workforce reductions or role consolidation may conflict with leadership's tacit knowledge about individual contributions, causing morale shocks or loss of tacit capabilities. Moreover, reliance on communication metadata for network analysis raises privacy and ethical concerns, potentially provoking regulatory scrutiny or employee mistrust.

Governance Countermeasure. Integration strategy should combine AI-derived diagnostics with ethnographic assessment and leadership-driven cultural integration programs. Privacy-preserving data protocols and transparent communication about analytics use are essential to maintain trust. Human resource and legal functions must co-design AI analyses to ensure compliant and ethically sound practices (Graebner et al., 2017; Shounik, 2025).

Audit, Compliance, and Post-Deal Monitoring

Traditional Challenge. Post-closing, acquirers must monitor compliance with representations and warranties, measure realization of synergies, and detect possible earnings manipulation or unanticipated liabilities.

AI Capability. AI can continuously monitor financial and operational signals, flagging deviations from forecasted post-merger trajectories and alerting governance bodies to early signs of integration failure or noncompliance (Fedyk et al., 2022).

Expected Benefit. Continuous monitoring shortens the feedback loop between problem detection and remediation, allowing management to intervene earlier. Automated audit trails and anomaly detection enhance oversight and may reduce fraud or accounting errors, thereby increasing post-deal transparency.

Emergent Risk. Continuous AI monitoring can generate high volumes of alerts, leading to alert fatigue and potential disregard of important signals. Additionally, algorithmic monitoring requires strong data governance to ensure that reported anomalies reflect substantive problems rather than data artefacts or model drift.

Governance Countermeasure. Implement tiered alert systems and escalation protocols to prioritize high-consequence signals. Regular retraining and recalibration of monitoring models are necessary to adjust for post-merger structural changes in the combined enterprise (Fedyk et al., 2022).

Human Capital and Labor Market Effects

Traditional Challenge. M&A frequently produces labor market adjustments—redundancies, role redefinitions, and talent churn—creating social and organizational friction. Entry-level and analyst roles historically perform much of the manual diligence work that may be automated (Shounik, 2025).

AI Capability. Automation reduces the need for routine manual tasks and can upskill early-career analysts towards model interpretation, scenario analysis, and AI governance roles (Shounik, 2025; Freire-González, 2025).

Expected Benefit. Reallocation of human capital to higher-value activities can improve quality of analysis and create new career trajectories within corporate finance. Organizations that invest in reskilling may enjoy productivity gains and retention among skilled analysts.

Emergent Risk. The transition may displace workers who lack access to retraining or who are locked into specialized manual tasks. Short-term workforce disruptions can harm morale and escalate integration frictions, particularly if displaced workers are concentrated in key operational areas.

Governance Countermeasure. Proactive reskilling programs, clear career pathways, and transitional supports are necessary to mitigate social costs and preserve institutional memory. Organizational change management must co-occur with AI deployment to align incentives and expectations (Shounik, 2025).

Model Risk, Explainability, and Regulatory Scrutiny

Traditional Challenge. Regulators and auditors demand transparency and accountability for financial reporting and representations. Machine-driven analyses complicate traditional audit trails and pose challenges for regulators unfamiliar with complex models.

AI Capability. Advanced explainability techniques can offer partial insight into model decisions, while robust logging can preserve provenance of datasets used for analysis (Fedyk et al., 2022).

Expected Benefit. Explainability and logging support auditability and regulatory compliance, reducing legal risk and improving stakeholder confidence in AI-assisted findings.

Emergent Risk. Explainability techniques are imperfect—complex models may remain partially opaque, and explanations may be misleading if not contextualized. Regulators may impose conservative constraints or require human sign-off in ways that blunt AI's efficiency advantages.

Governance Countermeasure. Establish internal AI governance frameworks that integrate legal, compliance, and audit functions into model development lifecycles. Regulatory engagement and transparent documentation of model validation processes are critical for maintaining legitimacy (Fedyk et al., 2022; Emmi, 2025).

Systemic Market Effects and Competitive Dynamics

Traditional Challenge. M&A markets are shaped by heterogeneous capabilities across firms—some organizations are more adept at integration, others at deal origination. These asymmetries create competitive advantage.

AI Capability. Widespread adoption of AI could flatten some asymmetries by providing scalable access to analytics, but it could also create new advantages for firms that possess superior data, talent, and governance.

Expected Benefit. Firms with superior AI capabilities may secure first-mover advantages in screening and pricing, potentially leading to more concentrated deal activity among technologically advanced acquirers (Geertsema et al., 2025; Freire-González, 2025).

Emergent Risk. Homogenization of analytics across market participants could increase correlated bidding behavior, inflating prices for targets and compressing returns. The concentration of AI capabilities could also produce power asymmetries that influence negotiation and market structure.

Governance Countermeasure. Competitive dynamics can be monitored by industry associations and regulators. Firms should diversify their analytic approaches and invest in proprietary data and domain expertise to maintain differentiated advantages (Freire-González, 2025).

DISCUSSION

The conceptual results indicate that AI meaningfully alters the epistemic foundations of M&A activity by changing how information is gathered, processed, and used. In many respects, AI mitigates well-known frictions—reducing search costs, accelerating diligence, and standardizing parts of valuation. However, the technology simultaneously introduces novel risks rooted in model error, data bias, opacity, and the potential to crowd behavior towards uniform algorithmic solutions. The central tensions can be organized into three broad domains: epistemic, organizational, and regulatory.

Epistemic Tensions: Objectivity Versus Model Risk

AI promises to reduce subjectivity by applying consistent algorithms to valuation and diligence tasks (Geertsema et al., 2025). Consistency is valuable: it reduces idiosyncratic analyst noise and can make peer group selection less arbitrary. Yet algorithmic objectivity is conditional on the representativeness and quality of the training data. Where datasets reflect historical biases or omit emergent phenomena (e.g., nascent technologies or regulatory shifts), models can produce systematically distorted outputs (Fedyk et al., 2022). Furthermore, the probabilistic framing of forecasts can be misinterpreted by decision-makers who prefer crisp answers; this may lead to overreliance on point estimates rather than full distributional information. Thus, epistemic gains are not unconditional—they require explicit attention to model validity, uncertainty communication, and scenario planning.

Organizational Tensions: Speed Versus Tacit Knowledge

AI enhances the speed at which organizations can execute M&A activities. Rapid diligence and integration diagnostics are operationally attractive and can lower transaction costs. However, M&A success often depends on tacit knowledge, relational capital, and leadership credibility—factors that are not easily reducible to quantitative signals (Graebner, 2004). Overemphasis on algorithmic speed may prioritize cost savings at the expense of careful human engagement with acquired teams. The literature on post-merger integration underscores the role of leadership in shepherding cultural alignment and capturing value (Graebner et al., 2017). Therefore, organizations must design hybrid processes that combine AI efficiency with human-led cultural and strategic interventions.

Regulatory and Ethical Tensions: Innovation Versus Oversight

Financial markets and corporate transactions are heavily regulated to preserve investor protection and market integrity. AI's opacity and dependence on proprietary datasets complicate regulatory oversight and audit processes (Fedyk et al., 2022). Regulators may respond by demanding higher transparency, model documentation, and human accountability, which could temper the agility gains that firms seek from AI. Ethically, AI-driven workforce impacts and privacy concerns arising from organizational analytics (e.g., communication metadata) require proactive governance to maintain social license and avoid litigation or reputational harm.

Limitations and Boundary Conditions

This synthesis is constrained to the supplied references and is conceptual. Empirical validation remains necessary to quantify the magnitude of AI's effects on deal success rates, integration speed, and value realization. Several boundary conditions delineate where AI benefits are likelier: abundant and high-quality data, strong cross-functional governance, explicit human-in-the-loop processes, and investment in reskilling. Conversely, AI is less likely to improve outcomes in highly novel strategic acquisitions where tacit synergies and cultural compatibility dominate value creation and where historical data provide poor priors.

Future Research Directions

The analysis suggests several promising empirical research avenues:

1. Causal effect studies that measure whether AI-assisted diligence reduces post-deal surprises and litigation associated with misrepresentation, using matched samples of deals with and without AI-assisted processes.

2. Comparative studies across acquirers that link AI maturity (data infrastructure, model governance, talent) to deal outcomes such as synergy realization, time-to-integration, and post-merger performance.

3. Behavioral research investigating how decision-makers interpret AI-produced probabilistic forecasts in negotiation contexts and whether cognitive biases persist or are amplified.

4. Policy-focused work evaluating the effectiveness of different model-governance regimes in mitigating audit and compliance failures, including cross-jurisdictional differences in regulatory expectations.

5. Qualitative studies that document how AI transforms the role of junior analysts and the human capital implications of reskilling initiatives.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is reshaping the practice and theory of mergers and acquisitions by altering the availability, speed, and framing of information across the deal lifecycle. AI systems bring measurable efficiencies in screening, diligence, valuation, and monitoring, and they can improve repeatability and institutional learning when embedded within robust governance frameworks. However, such gains are conditional: they depend on data representativeness, model validation, transparent explainability, and deliberate integration of human judgment. AI introduces new failure modes—model risk, opacity, and potential homogenization of market behavior—that require organizational and regulatory countermeasures. Rather than viewing AI as a panacea for M&A difficulties, practitioners and scholars should treat it as a structural technology that reframes trade-offs between speed and depth, objectivity and tacit knowledge, and innovation and oversight. The path to realizing AI's potential in M&A lies in hybrid socio-technical systems that combine algorithmic capabilities with human leadership, ethical governance, and continuous empirical evaluation.

REFERENCES

1. Emmi, P. A. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on M&A Deals—Part I. https://www.reedsmith.com/en/perspectives/2025/03/impact-of-artificial-intelligence-ma-deals-part-i

2. Fang, Y., He, Y., & Zhang, Z. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Mergers and Acquisitions. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5121385

3. Fedyk, A., Hodson, J., Khimich, N., & Fedyk, T. (2022). Is artificial intelligence improving the audit process? SSRN. https://ssrn.com/abstract=4345969

4. Freire-González, J. (2025). The AI Imperative: Reshaping Global Investment Banking in the Decade Ahead. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5272841

5. Shounik, S. (2025). Redefining Entry-Level Analyst Roles in M&A: Essential Skillsets in the Age of AI-Powered Diligence. The American Journal of Applied Sciences, 7(07), 101–110. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajas/Volume07Issue07-11

6. Geertsema, P., Lu, H., & Stouthuysen, K. (2025). AI Can Make the Relative-Valuation Process Less Subjective. Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2025/04/ai-can-make-the-relative-valuation-process-less-subjective

7. Eckbo, B. E. (2018). Corporate takeovers and economic efficiency. Annual Review of Financial Economics, 10, 31–74.

8. Ellis, K. M., Reus, T. H., & Lamont, B. T. (2011). Coping with misaligned structures and systems in M&As. Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions, 10, 159–182.

9. Erel, I., Liao, R. C., & Weisbach, M. S. (2012). Determinants of Cross-Border Mergers and Acquisitions. The Journal of Finance, 67(3), 1045–1082.

10. Ferreira, M. P., Reis, N. R., & Dos Santos, J. C. (2015). Mergers & acquisitions research: A bibliometric study of top strategy and international business journals, 1980–2010. Journal of Business Research, 68, 185–190.

11. Ferreira, M. P., Reis, N. R., & Santos, J. C. (2023). Mergers and acquisitions research: A review of the field over the past 30 years. Journal of Business Research, 137, 13–29.

12. Gomes, E., et al. (2013). Critical success factors through the mergers and acquisitions process: revealing pre- and post-M&A connections for improved performance. Thunderbird International Business Review, 55(1), 13–35.

13. Graebner, M. E. (2004). Momentum and serendipity: How acquired leaders create value in the integration of technology firms. Strategic Management Journal, 25(8-9), 751–777.

14. Graebner, M. E., et al. (2017). The process of postmerger integration: A review and agenda for future research. Academy of Management Annals, 11(1), 1–32.

15. Haleblian, J., et al. (2008). Taking stock of what we know about mergers and acquisitions: A review and research agenda. Journal of Management, 34, 469–502.