AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NETWORKS AND SECURITY (ISSN: 2693-387X)

Volume 05, Issue 02, 2025, pages 92-100
Published Date: - 30-11-2025

# Artificial Intelligence in Financial and Healthcare Systems: Integrative Architectures, Governance, and Practical Pathways for Resilient Digital Transformation

**Dr. Arunita V. Mendes**
Global Institute for Socio-Technical Studies, Lisbon University

## ABSTRACT

Background: Rapid advances in artificial intelligence (AI) have accelerated transformation across sectors—especially healthcare, retail supply chains, and financial services—producing both demonstrable operational gains and novel systemic risks (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Reynolds, 2024). The convergence of generative models, federated learning, and large-scale analytics requires new frameworks that integrate technical architectures, governance, and domain-specific constraints.

Objective: This article synthesizes multidisciplinary evidence from recent applied studies, industry reports, and methodological reviews to present a coherent conceptual and operational framework for deploying AI in high-stakes domains—healthcare and finance—while accounting for data governance, model robustness, and organizational adoption processes. The aim is to move beyond descriptive summaries to produce actionable methodological guidance suitable for researchers, practitioners, and policy makers.

Methods: We conduct a structured, theory-driven synthesis of the supplied literature, mapping empirical findings and conceptual contributions onto three layers: (1) data and infrastructure (including database management and federated learning), (2) algorithmic systems (including large language models and domain-adapted generative AI), and (3) governance and organizational pathways (including compliance, risk management, and human–AI collaboration). Each layer is examined for technical requirements, failure modes, mitigation strategies, and measurable outcomes, with claims tied to the provided sources.

Results: The synthesis highlights common enablers—scalable data architectures, domain-specific model fine-tuning, and federated approaches for privacy-preserving learning—and recurring challenges—data quality, distribution shift, regulatory complexity, and the skills gap among professionals (Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024; Shounik, 2025). Domain-specific vignettes illustrate how AI improves diagnostics and operational throughput in healthcare while simultaneously demanding robust validation and clinical governance (Cleveland Clinic, 2024; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024; Daley, 2024). In finance, generative AI and advanced analytics enable faster due diligence and anomaly detection but require layered controls to prevent model-induced fraud and systemic concentration risks (Sergiienko, 2024; Paleti et al., 2021).

Conclusions: Realizing AI's promise necessitates integrated architectures that combine scalable databases, privacy-preserving training (federated learning), domain-aligned model evaluation, and explicit human oversight. Implementation roadmaps must prioritize data hygiene, incremental validation, workforce reskilling, and governance protocols that reconcile business agility with safety and compliance. We offer a comprehensive operational checklist and research agenda to guide next-phase deployments and empirical evaluation.

**KEYWORDS**
Artificial intelligence, healthcare, finance, federated learning, governance, large language models, data architecture

## INTRODUCTION

The proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) across sectors has moved from proof-of-concept experiments to broad operational deployment in a handful of industries—most notably healthcare, retail supply chains, and financial services (Reynolds, 2024; David, 2024; Sifted Team, 2024). During the COVID-19 pandemic, AI tools were rapidly mobilized for diagnostics, resource allocation, and epidemiological modeling, demonstrating both the potential for positive impact and the speed at which immature systems may be adopted under crisis conditions (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021). This rapid uptake underscores the central tension that motivates this paper: AI systems provide new capabilities but also introduce complex technical, organizational, and ethical challenges that existing governance frameworks are often ill-equipped to manage (Reynolds, 2024; Appen, 2020).

This article proceeds from a position that rigorous, domain-informed architectures and governance mechanisms are necessary conditions for safe, effective, and equitable AI deployment. The provided reference set includes empirical and review literature, industry analyses, and technology-focused treatises spanning database management, federated learning, and sector-specific applications (Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024; Ghavami, 2019). Our task is to synthesize these materials into an integrated research and practice roadmap that is theoretically grounded yet operationally detailed.

Problem statement. Organizations face three interlocking problems when attempting to move from pilot AI projects to sustained, high-quality deployments. First, data architecture and governance are frequently inadequate: data silos, inconsistent schemas, and privacy constraints hinder robust model training and monitoring (Batra, 2018; Paleti et al., 2021). Second, model development and evaluation practices often prioritize short-term performance metrics without sufficient stress testing against distribution shift, adversarial behavior, or domain-specific failure modes (Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019). Third, organizational adoption falters when workforce skillsets, incentive structures, and compliance pathways are misaligned with the technical demands of maintaining and governing AI systems (Shounik, 2025; Bajulaiye et al., 2020). These problems are not isolated; they interact in ways that can amplify risks—e.g., a brittle model built on low-quality data may propagate errors that regulatory frameworks are unprepared to catch.

Literature gap. Existing literature tends to cluster in specialized silos: technical deep dives on federated learning and databases (Kaur et al., 2024; Batra, 2018), clinical overviews of AI in healthcare (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Cleveland Clinic, 2024), and industry case studies describing business outcomes for supply chains and retail (Sifted Team, 2024; David, 2024). There is a relative shortage of comprehensive frameworks that integrate these perspectives into actionable operational guidance tailored to sectors with high-stakes outcomes—healthcare and finance being prime examples (Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024; Sergiienko, 2024). This article fills that gap by synthesizing cross-disciplinary insights into a layered architecture for deployment, together with policy, governance, and workforce recommendations.

Scope and contribution. We focus on two high-impact domains—healthcare and financial services—using them as exemplars for cross-sectoral principles. The contributions are fourfold. First, we present a layered architecture linking data infrastructure, algorithmic systems, and governance processes. Second, we describe domain-specific implementation patterns and failure modes, illustrated with examples from the supplied literature. Third, we propose a set of measurement and validation practices informed by current best evidence. Fourth, we outline a research and policy agenda to guide future empirical work. Every major proposition is grounded in the supplied references, ensuring fidelity to the source material and relevance to contemporary practice (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Kaur et al., 2024; Paleti et al., 2021).

## METHODOLOGY

Our methodology is a structured synthesis that blends conceptual mapping with detailed, text-based methodological exposition. This section describes the approach to literature integration and the operationalization of themes into actionable recommendations.

Selection and scope of sources. The analysis is restricted to the references supplied by the user, which include peer-reviewed articles, industry reports, technology whitepapers, and practitioner-oriented analyses (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Appen, 2020; Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024; David, 2024; Sifted Team, 2024; Cleveland Clinic, 2024; Daley, 2024; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024; Sergiienko, 2024; Reynolds, 2024; Paleti et al., 2021; Bajulaiye et al., 2020; Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019; Wanless et al., 2022; Shaik et al., 2022). These sources were chosen because they collectively capture technical, organizational, and sectoral perspectives necessary to construct an integrative framework.

Analytical framework. We adopted a layered architecture model as the organizing principle: Data & Infrastructure, Algorithmic Systems, and Governance & Organizational Pathways. For each layer, we extracted claims, recommended practices, and evidence of outcomes from the supplied references. The layered approach permits modular treatment while preserving the interdependencies among layers—an important analytical advantage when recommending operational guardrails (Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024; Paleti et al., 2021).

Synthesis process. The synthesis proceeded in four steps:

1. Thematic extraction: Key themes were identified across sources using manual coding: data quality and management, privacy-preserving learning (federated learning), model development & validation, human oversight & workforce, and sector-specific governance (healthcare, finance, retail). Each theme was associated with supporting citations (Kaur et al., 2024; Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Sergiienko, 2024).

2. Mapping: Themes were mapped onto the layered architecture. For instance, federated learning and database design were mapped to Data & Infrastructure; LLMs and domain-adapted generative models were mapped to Algorithmic Systems; compliance, auditability, and change management were mapped to Governance & Organizational Pathways (Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024; David, 2024).

3. Operational elaboration: For each mapped theme we developed detailed, text-based operational guidance, including stepwise sequences for implementation, validation checks, and monitoring protocols. This included recommendations for test harnesses that emphasize out-of-distribution evaluation and continuous monitoring (Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019).

4. Cross-validation and consistency: Claims and operational recommendations were cross-checked against multiple references to avoid over-reliance on single-source claims and to ensure robustness to domain variation (Reynolds, 2024; Appen, 2020).

Assumptions and limitations of methodology. The synthesis assumes that the supplied literature is representative of mainstream thinking and practice as of the dates in the references. It does not incorporate external sources beyond the supplied list; therefore, it intentionally limits claims to the knowledge contained within these documents (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; David, 2024). This approach strengthens internal consistency but may omit subsequent developments not captured in the provided references. The deliberative, qualitative synthesis method is appropriate for theory-building and operational recommendations but does not substitute for empirical, data-driven meta-analysis.

Ethical and epistemic stance. Given the high-stakes nature of the domains addressed, the methodology privileges safety, auditability, and human-centered governance. Recommendations emphasize precautionary validation and the need for compliance with domain-specific regulatory standards (Cleveland Clinic, 2024; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024; Sergiienko, 2024).

## RESULTS

This section presents the outcomes of the synthesis as an integrated set of findings: a layered architecture, domain-specific vignettes, common enablers and barriers, and a consolidated operational checklist for practitioners.

Layered architecture: Components and relationships. The synthesis yields a three-layer architecture for AI deployment in high-stakes domains:

1. Data & Infrastructure: Encompasses data ingestion, schema harmonization, metadata management, secure storage, and privacy-preserving mechanisms such as federated learning. Scalable, consistent database management practices are foundational for reliable downstream modeling (Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024).

2. Algorithmic Systems: Includes model selection (e.g., discriminative models, generative models, LLMs), domain adaptation (fine-tuning, transfer learning), evaluation protocols (holdout validation, stress tests, adversarial checks), and runtime monitoring (drift detection, calibration). Emphasis is placed on model interpretability and measurable safety properties (Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019; David, 2024).

3. Governance & Organizational Pathways: Covers compliance frameworks, audit trails, incident response, workforce reskilling, and incentive structures for human–AI collaboration. Governance ties back to data and model layers through policies on access, consent, and auditability (Paleti et al., 2021; Bajulaiye et al., 2020).

These layers are interdependent: poor data governance undermines model robustness; inadequate model validation undermines governance; weak governance reduces trust and slows adoption. The architecture is visualized conceptually in our discussion (below) and operationalized via checklists and validation steps derived from the sources (Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024).

Domain-specific vignettes.

Healthcare vignette. AI in healthcare demonstrates clear operational advantages—improved diagnostic throughput, augmented decision support, and personalized care planning—when integrated with rigorous clinical governance (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Cleveland Clinic, 2024; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024; Daley, 2024). The literature indicates that successful healthcare deployments share several attributes: high-fidelity labeled datasets, multi-institutional validation, clinician-in-the-loop workflows, and explicit mechanisms for audit and patient consent (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Kaur et al., 2024). However, the risk of algorithmic bias, erroneous generalization across populations, and the regulatory complexity of clinical validation are recurring challenges necessitating conservative, staged rollout procedures (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024).

Finance vignette. Financial services leverage AI for faster due diligence, fraud detection, algorithmic advisory, and operational automation. Generative AI and LLMs are increasingly used for document summarization and synthesis during M&A diligence and client advisory, accelerating analysts' workflows (Shounik, 2025; Sergiienko, 2024; Paleti et al., 2021). Yet the literature emphasizes that the domain's regulatory constraints and adversarial risk profile (e.g., model manipulation, synthetic fraud) require rigorous internal controls, provenance tracking, and scenario-based stress-testing (Paleti et al., 2021; Sergiienko, 2024; Bajulaiye et al., 2020).

Retail and supply chain vignette. Retailers and logistics firms adopt AI to optimize inventory, demand forecasting, and routing; large firms like Amazon and Walmart deploy multiple nested models to scale supply chain responsiveness (Sifted Team, 2024; David, 2024). The operational lesson is that ensemble systems and modular model architectures, combined with robust data pipelines and close monitoring, enable high frequency decision-making under uncertainty. However, these same characteristics create dependencies that require careful change-control and rollback capabilities to manage systemic failures (David, 2024; Sifted Team, 2024).

Common enablers. Across domains, successful deployments share core enabling conditions:

• Scalable and well-governed data architectures that support versioning, lineage, and metadata management (Batra, 2018).

• Privacy-preserving training methodologies, particularly federated learning, which allow cross-institutional model improvement without raw data sharing (Kaur et al., 2024).

• Human–AI hybrid workflows where domain experts retain final authority, supported by model explanations and confidence metrics (Cleveland Clinic, 2024; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024).

• Continuous validation practices that include out-of-distribution testing, adversarial testing, and post-deployment monitoring for drift (Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019).

Common barriers. Recurring obstacles include:

• Data quality and heterogeneity: inconsistent schemas and noisy labels that produce brittle models (Batra, 2018; Appen, 2020).

• Regulatory and ethical complexity: unclear or evolving standards that complicate approval and compliance (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024).

• Skills and organizational mismatch: the need for cross-functional skills—data engineering, clinical domain knowledge, regulatory expertise—that are often scarce (Shounik, 2025; Bajulaiye et al., 2020).

• Adversarial and systemic risks: model manipulation and feedback loops that amplify errors across automated decision pipelines (Paleti et al., 2021; Ghavami, 2019).

Operational checklist. We distilled an actionable checklist for practitioners drawn from the synthesis:

Data & Infrastructure

• Inventory all data sources and map schemas; establish canonical schemas where possible (Batra, 2018).

• Implement lineage tracking and version control for datasets and features (Batra, 2018).

• Apply privacy-preserving techniques (encryption in transit and at rest, differential privacy where applicable, federated learning for cross-institutional collaboration). Monitor empirical privacy leakage metrics (Kaur et al., 2024).

Algorithmic Systems

• Adopt modular model architectures to isolate changes and enable targeted rollbacks (David, 2024).

• Use holdout and multi-institutional validation sets; perform rigorous stress testing including simulated adversarial scenarios (Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019).

• Prioritize interpretability and calibrated probability outputs to facilitate clinician or analyst oversight (Cleveland Clinic, 2024; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024).

Governance & Organizational Pathways

• Establish clear roles and responsibilities for model ownership, incident response, and audit (Paleti et al., 2021).

• Create incremental deployment pathways: shadow testing, limited clinical/operational pilots, phased rollouts with metrics-based gates (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024).

• Invest in workforce reskilling programs and cross-functional teams combining domain experts and technical staff (Shounik, 2025; Bajulaiye et al., 2020).

Metrics and monitoring. The literature suggests focusing on a set of measurable outcomes: predictive performance metrics (e.g., precision, recall, calibration), operational metrics (e.g., throughput, time-to-decision), safety metrics (e.g., false positives with high cost), and governance metrics (e.g., audit completeness, incident response time). Continuous monitoring for data drift and model degradation should feed into governance processes for model retraining or rollback (Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019).

**DISCUSSION**

This section interprets the results, situates them relative to theoretical concerns, outlines limitations, and proposes a forward-looking research and policy agenda.

Interpretation of layered architecture. The proposed three-layer architecture is not merely descriptive; it is prescriptive in emphasizing that technical and governance concerns must be engineered in tandem. Data architecture is foundational—without consistent databases and lineage control, any model's validity is fragile (Batra, 2018). Federated learning emerges as a particularly useful pattern to reconcile privacy constraints with the need for broader training data—especially in healthcare where patient privacy is paramount (Kaur et al., 2024). However, federated approaches introduce new engineering complexity: heterogeneity in local data distributions, system unreliability, and potential for poisoning attacks that must be mitigated by robust aggregation and verification protocols (Kaur et al., 2024; Ghavami, 2019).

Model design and evaluation complexities. The literature emphasizes that generative models and large language models (LLMs) are profoundly useful as information synthesis tools (David, 2024; Sergiienko, 2024). In finance, they shorten analyst cycles; in healthcare, they can assist with summarizing literature and patient notes (David, 2024; Cleveland Clinic, 2024). Yet LLMs are also prone to hallucination and overconfidence; thus, their output should be treated as a decision-support signal rather than an authoritative decision (Cleveland Clinic, 2024; Daley, 2024). Robust evaluation must therefore include calibration checks and human oversight mechanisms, as well as specific metrics for factuality when outputs are used for high-stakes decisions (Ghavami, 2019; Halper, 2017).

Human–AI interaction and organizational change. The success stories in the literature consistently involve human–AI hybrids—workflows where AI accelerates tasks but humans retain final responsibility (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024). This hybrid approach reduces the risk of automation surprises and supports accountability. However, it also requires investment in workforce training and change management. The skillsets required are heterogeneous: engineers must understand domain constraints; clinicians and financial analysts must be trained to interpret AI outputs and understand limitations (Shounik, 2025; Bajulaiye et al., 2020).

Regulatory and ethical considerations. High-stakes domains are characterized by strict regulatory expectations; the literature calls for explicit governance mechanisms for model validation, auditability, and transparency (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024). The policy challenge is balancing innovation with safety: overly prescriptive regulation can stifle helpful experimentation, while lax oversight can permit harmful deployments. The recommended approach is adaptive regulation: outcome-focused standards, clear reporting requirements, and mechanisms for post-market surveillance aligned with domain-specific risk (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Paleti et al., 2021).

Counter-arguments and nuanced perspectives. Some commentators argue that AI will rapidly displace human roles and centralize power in large techno-corporate actors, raising concerns about market concentration and labor displacement (Reynolds, 2024; David, 2024). The literature indicates that such outcomes are possible but not inevitable. Outcomes depend on organizational choices: democratizing access to AI tools, investing in upskilling, and deploying models as augmentative tools rather than replacements can mitigate negative labor impacts (Bajulaiye et al., 2020; Shounik, 2025). Similarly, concerns about model opacity can be mitigated through engineering choices that prioritize interpretability and robust audit trails (Halper, 2017; Ghavami, 2019).

Limitations of the synthesis. The major limitation is that the analysis is constrained to the supplied references. While these sources are broad and informative, they may not capture the latest developments beyond their publication dates (e.g., post-2024 innovations). Furthermore, the methodology is synthesis-based rather than empirical; it prescribes mechanisms derived from multiple studies but does not present new experimental data. Future empirical validation of the proposed checklist and architecture is necessary.

Future research agenda. The synthesis points to several high-priority research directions:

• Empirical studies of federated learning in heterogeneous, multi-institutional healthcare datasets to quantify trade-offs between privacy and performance (Kaur et al., 2024).

• Longitudinal measurements of operational outcomes when LLM-based workflows are introduced in financial due diligence settings, including measures of accuracy, time saved, and error propagation (David, 2024; Shounik, 2025).

• Research on the measurement and mitigation of adversarial risks in supply-chain optimization and financial transaction monitoring (Paleti et al., 2021; Ghavami, 2019).

• Policy-focused empirical work assessing adaptive regulatory regimes and their effect on innovation and safety in clinical AI deployments (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024).

Policy and practice recommendations. Immediate recommendations for policy makers and practitioners include:

• Adopt outcome-based regulatory standards that prioritize system safety and transparency rather than prescribing specific technical architectures (Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021).

• Encourage public–private data collaboratives that use federated learning and strong privacy guarantees for cross-institutional model improvement (Kaur et al., 2024).

• Invest in workforce training programs emphasizing domain literacy for AI engineers and AI literacy for domain professionals (Shounik, 2025; Bajulaiye et al., 2020).

• Mandate post-deployment monitoring and incident reporting for high-risk AI systems, with clear metrics and timelines for remediation (Paleti et al., 2021; Mayo Clinic Press Editors, 2024).

## CONCLUSION

This article synthesizes a diverse set of references into an integrative framework for deploying AI safely and effectively in high-stakes domains. The central message is that technology alone is insufficient: success requires structural investments in data architecture, rigorous model validation, and governance that centers human expertise and accountability (Batra, 2018; Kaur et al., 2024; Khemasuwan & Colt, 2021). Federated learning, modular architectures, and interpretable model outputs are important technical vectors; concurrently, workforce reskilling and adaptive regulation are necessary organizational and policy complements (David, 2024; Sergiienko, 2024; Shounik, 2025).

We have offered a layered architecture, detailed operational checklists, domain-specific vignettes, and a research agenda grounded in the supplied literature. The path forward is one of cautious, evidence-driven experimentation: staged rollouts, transparent reporting, multi-institutional validation, and continual learning. By integrating technical rigor with organizational and policy safeguards, stakeholders can harness AI's potential to improve outcomes in healthcare, finance, and beyond while minimizing systemic risks.

## REFERENCES


1. Khemasuwan, D.; Colt, H.G. Applications and challenges of AI-based algorithms in the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Innov. 2021, 7, 387–398.
2. David, E. Walmart Bets on Multiple AI Models with New Wallaby LLM. 2024. Available online: https://venturebeat.com/ai/walmart-bets-on-multiple-ai-models-with-new-wallaby-llm/ (accessed on 12 October 2024).
3. Sifted Team. How Amazon Is Using AI To Become the Fastest Supply Chain in the World. 2024. Available online: https://sifted.com/resources/how-amazon-is-using-ai-to-become-the-fastest-supply-chain-in-the-world/ (accessed on 12 October 2024).
4. Cleveland Clinic. How AI Is Being Used to Benefit Your Healthcare. 2024. Available online: https://health.clevelandclinic.org/ai-in-healthcare (accessed on 12 October 2024).
5. Daley, S. AI in Healthcare: Uses, Examples and Benefits. 2024. Available online: https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/artificial-intelligence-healthcare (accessed on 12 October 2024).
6. Mayo Clinic Press Editors. AI in Healthcare: The Future of Patient Care and Health Management. 2024. Available online: https://mcpress.mayoclinic.org/healthy-aging/ai-in-healthcare-the-future-of-patient-care-and-health-management/ (accessed on 12 October 2024).
7. Sergiienko, B. Why Generative AI in Banking Is a Secret Weapon: Your Blueprint for Implementation. 2024. Available online: https://masterofcode.com/blog/generative-ai-in-banking (accessed on 12 October 2024).
8. Reynolds, K. COVID-19 Increased the Use of AI. Here's Why It's Here to Stay. 2024. Available online: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/02/covid-19-increased-use-of-ai-here-s-why-its-here-to-stay/ (accessed on 12 October 2024).

9. Appen. The 2020 State of AI and Machine Learning Report. 2020. Available online: https://www.appen.com/whitepapers/the-state-of-ai-and-machine-learning-report (accessed on 12 October 2024).
10. Batra, R. Database Management Systems and Tools. In SQL Primer; Apress: Berkeley, CA, USA, 2018.
11. Kaur, H.; Rani, V.; Kumar, M.; Sachdeva, M.; Mittal, A.; Kumar, K. Federated learning: A comprehensive review of recent advances and applications. Multimed. Tools Appl. 2024, 83, 54165–54188.
12. Paleti, S.; Singireddy, J.; Dodda, A.; Burugulla, J. K. R.; Challa, K. Strengthening Compliance, Secure Transactions, and Intelligent Advisory Systems Through AI-Driven Automation and Scalable Data Architectures, Secure Transactions, and Intelligent Advisory Systems Through AI-Driven Automation and Scalable Data Architectures, December 27, 2021.
13. Shounik, S. Redefining Entry-Level Analyst Roles in M&A: Essential Skillsets in the Age of AI-Powered Diligence. The American Journal of Applied Sciences, 2025, 7(07), 101–110. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajas/Volume07Issue07-11.
14. Bajulaiye, O.; Fenwick, M.; Skultetyova, I.; Vermeulen, E. P. Digital transformation in the hedge fund and private equity industry. Lex Research Topics in Corporate Law & Economics Working Paper, no. 2020-1, 2020.
15. Halper, F. Advanced analytics: Moving toward AI, machine learning, and natural language processing. TDWI Best Practices Report, 2017.
16. Ghavami, P. Big data analytics methods: analytics techniques in data mining, deep learning and natural language processing. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2019.
17. Wanless, L.; Seifried, C.; Bouchet, A.; Valeant, A.; Naraine, M. L. The diffusion of natural language processing in professional sport. Sport Management Review, 2022, 25(3), 522–545.
18. Shaik, T.; et al. A review of the trends and challenges in adopting natural language processing methods for education feedback analysis. IEEE Access, 2022, 10, 56720–56739.