GSC Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2582-4597 CODEN (USA): GARRC2
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/gscarr
Journal homepage: https://gscarr.gsconlinepress.com/

(RESEARCH ARTICLE)

Check for updates

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND CORPORATE FINANCIAL DECISION-MAKING: EVIDENCE ON FORECASTING ACCURACY, CAPITAL ALLOCATION, AND FIRM PERFORMANCE

Adewale Asimolowo *

University of Michigan - Ross School of Business, Full-time MBA, MI, USA.

ORCID Details
Adewale Asimolowo: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9822-2970

GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 29(02), 062–071

Publication history: Received on 25 September 2026; revised on 01 November 2026; accepted on 03 November 2026

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/gscarr.2026.29.2.0313

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is changing corporate financial decision-making by enabling firms to process large and diverse datasets, identify nonlinear patterns, and update forecasts more frequently than conventional analytical approaches. This paper examines the ways in which AI may influence three connected dimensions of corporate finance: forecasting accuracy, capital allocation, and firm performance. It develops an integrated framework in which AI-enabled analytics improve the timeliness and informational content of financial estimates, support the comparison of competing investment opportunities, and potentially strengthen operating and financial outcomes. The framework also recognizes that these benefits are conditional rather than automatic. Data quality, model transparency, organizational capabilities, managerial judgment, and governance arrangements can shape whether analytical outputs are converted into sound decisions. In forecasting, machine-learning models may capture complex relationships among sales, costs, liquidity, demand, and macroeconomic indicators, but their apparent accuracy can weaken when economic conditions change or when training data do not represent future environments. In capital allocation, predictive systems can support project screening, scenario analysis, working-capital management, and risk-adjusted investment appraisal; however, optimization based on incomplete objectives may amplify short-term incentives or overlook strategic and ethical considerations. At the firm level, the relationship between AI adoption and performance is therefore likely to operate through intermediate mechanisms, including forecast quality, resource-allocation discipline, decision speed, and risk control. The paper proposes an empirical approach using firm-year observations, measures of AI adoption and analytical intensity, forecast-error indicators, investment-efficiency measures, and accounting-based performance outcomes.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Financial Forecasting, Capital Allocation, Firm Performance, Machine Learning, Corporate Finance

1 INTRODUCTION

Corporate financial decision-making increasingly takes place in environments characterized by volatile demand, interconnected markets, rapid technological change, and expanding volumes of structured and unstructured

information. Finance teams are expected to produce reliable forecasts, evaluate competing investment proposals, maintain liquidity, assess financial risk, and explain the consequences of strategic choices under uncertainty. Traditional approaches—including spreadsheet-based budgeting, linear forecasting, discounted cash-flow analysis, and expert judgment—remain important, but they can be constrained by fragmented information, infrequent updates, assumptions of stable relationships, and the difficulty of integrating signals from multiple sources. Artificial intelligence (AI), including machine learning, natural-language processing, and automated decision-support systems, offers a different analytical capacity: it can combine historical accounting records with operational, market, customer, and macroeconomic data to identify patterns that may be difficult to detect through conventional techniques. The central issue, however, is not whether AI can generate predictions, but whether those predictions improve the quality of financial decisions and translate into economically meaningful outcomes for firms.

The first link in this relationship is financial forecasting. Revenue, expenditure, cash flow, credit exposure, and working-capital forecasts influence decisions about hiring, procurement, borrowing, inventory, pricing, and investment timing. Forecast errors can create real costs: overestimated demand may lead to excess inventory and idle capacity, while underestimated cash requirements may force firms to obtain expensive short-term financing or delay viable projects. AI-based models may improve forecasting by representing nonlinear relationships, incorporating high-frequency indicators, and updating estimates as new information becomes available. For example, a firm could combine sales histories, order pipelines, payment delays, commodity prices, exchange rates, and sector-level indicators to estimate near-term cash requirements. Yet model complexity does not guarantee superior performance. Forecast quality depends on the representativeness of the training sample, the stability of the data-generating process, the treatment of missing observations, and the selection of evaluation metrics. A model that performs well during a stable period may deteriorate during a supply shock, regulatory change, or abrupt shift in customer behavior. Accordingly, forecasting accuracy should be assessed against transparent benchmarks and across both ordinary and stressed conditions rather than inferred from AI adoption alone.

The second link concerns capital allocation, the process through which firms distribute scarce financial resources across projects, business units, acquisitions, technology investments, and financing needs. Investment decisions depend on expected cash flows, risk, strategic fit, financing constraints, and the opportunity cost of capital. AI may support this process by improving estimates of project demand, identifying cost overruns earlier, comparing risk scenarios, and helping managers rank proposals using consistent criteria. Predictive analytics can also connect operational data to investment models, making it possible to revise assumptions when sales, production, or supplier conditions change. These capabilities may reduce the gap between expected and realized project outcomes and help firms direct funds toward higher-value uses. Nevertheless, automated ranking systems can inherit biases from historical decisions, privilege objectives that are easy to quantify, or create a false impression of precision. A model trained on past capital expenditure may reproduce prior underinvestment in unfamiliar business lines, while an optimization system focused on short-term returns may undervalue resilience, innovation, employee capability, or environmental commitments. Effective AI-supported allocation therefore requires human review, explicit decision criteria, documentation of assumptions, and clear accountability for final approvals.

The third link is firm performance. If AI improves forecasting and supports more disciplined capital allocation, the resulting benefits may appear in profitability, asset utilization, operating efficiency, cash-flow stability, and investment productivity. These outcomes are not necessarily immediate. AI systems require investment in data infrastructure, software, cybersecurity, employee training, process redesign, and model oversight. Implementation costs can precede benefits, while fragmented systems or low organizational readiness can prevent useful predictions from entering routine decisions. Furthermore, firms that adopt AI may already possess stronger management, greater financial resources, better data, or more advanced digital capabilities. A simple comparison between adopters and non-adopters could therefore attribute to AI performance differences that existed before adoption. Empirical analysis must account for these selection effects and consider the possibility that the benefits of AI vary by firm size, industry, financial constraints, data maturity, and the volatility of the operating environment. This makes the relationship between AI and performance a question of mechanisms and boundary conditions, rather than a universal claim that technology adoption automatically increases profitability.

Despite the growing interest in AI-enabled business analytics, the three dimensions considered here are often treated separately. Forecasting studies may concentrate on predictive accuracy without tracing whether improved estimates alter investment behavior. Capital-allocation research may evaluate investment efficiency without distinguishing AI-supported analysis from conventional decision processes. Digital-transformation studies may examine productivity or profitability while leaving the intervening financial mechanisms unclear. An integrated perspective is needed to establish how technical capability can become organizational and financial value. This paper addresses that need by linking AI adoption to forecasting accuracy, linking forecast quality and analytical decision support to capital-allocation efficiency, and examining how these mechanisms may relate to firm performance. The framework treats AI as an organizational capability embedded in data, people, processes, and governance—not merely as a software purchase or a binary adoption indicator.

The proposed research can be operationalized using firm-year data, subject to the availability and quality of suitable observations. AI adoption could be measured through disclosed AI-related investment, use of AI tools in finance functions, technology expenditure, or a carefully validated text-based indicator derived from corporate reports. Forecasting accuracy could be assessed using mean absolute error (MAE), root mean squared error (RMSE), or scaled forecast errors, with lower values indicating better predictive performance. Capital-allocation efficiency could be represented through investment sensitivity to growth opportunities, deviations between planned and realized capital expenditure, project-level forecast bias, or measures of investment inefficiency. Firm performance could be examined using return on assets, operating margin, sales growth, cash-flow volatility, or total-factor-productivity measures where data permit. These indicators capture different constructs and should not be treated as interchangeable. For example, a firm can experience short-term margin pressure while investing in AI infrastructure, even if its long-term productivity subsequently improves. Measurement choices should therefore be theoretically justified and tested through alternative specifications.

An empirical design could estimate panel models that account for stable firm characteristics and common time shocks, while testing whether forecasting accuracy and capital-allocation efficiency mediate the association between AI and performance. A baseline specification might relate firm performance to AI adoption, firm-level controls, firm fixed effects, and year fixed effects. Additional models could test whether AI adoption is associated with lower forecast errors and whether forecast quality is associated with more efficient investment. Controls may include firm size, leverage, cash holdings, sales growth, capital intensity, industry, and macroeconomic conditions, depending on the research setting and available data. Robustness procedures could include alternative AI measures, lagged explanatory variables, subsample analysis, placebo tests, and sensitivity to outliers. Because AI adoption is not randomly assigned, the analysis should explicitly address reverse causality and omitted-variable bias; where a credible source of exogenous variation exists, an instrumental-variable, difference-in-differences, or other quasi-experimental strategy may strengthen causal interpretation. The appropriate design will depend on the institutional context and the timing and coverage of the data.

The contribution of this paper is threefold. First, it integrates forecasting accuracy, capital allocation, and firm performance in a single financial decision-making framework. Second, it distinguishes the technical performance of AI models from the organizational processes required to use their outputs responsibly. Third, it outlines measurable constructs and an empirical strategy that can be implemented when a suitable firm-level dataset is assembled. The paper does not assume that AI necessarily improves every outcome; instead, it proposes that value creation depends on predictive reliability, the fit between model outputs and decision objectives, managerial capability, and governance quality. This position is important for both researchers and practitioners because an AI system can be statistically sophisticated yet financially unhelpful if it is poorly calibrated, difficult to interpret, or disconnected from actual approval and monitoring processes. The remainder of the study can develop the theoretical foundations, review prior evidence, specify hypotheses and methods, and evaluate results once verified data are available.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on artificial intelligence (AI) in corporate financial decision-making has increasingly moved beyond the technical question of whether algorithms can predict financial variables to examine whether improved predictions create practical value for organizations. Wasserbacher and Spindler (2022) review machine-learning applications in financial planning and analysis and argue that these methods can process large and heterogeneous datasets, identify nonlinear relationships, and support more frequent forecasting updates. However, they distinguish prediction from planning: a model may estimate an outcome accurately without identifying the consequences of a managerial intervention or determining which allocation decision will maximize firm value. This distinction is important because corporate finance decisions involve choices under constraints, including the cost of capital, risk tolerance, liquidity requirements, and strategic priorities. Czarnitzki, Fernández, and Rammer (2023), using German firm-level data, report positive and statistically significant associations between AI use and productivity across alternative measures of adoption and intensity. Their findings support the possibility that AI can improve operational outcomes, but productivity is not identical to forecasting accuracy or investment efficiency, and the results should not be interpreted as proof that every AI application improves financial decisions. In a related review of machine-learning experiments in investment decision-making, Buczynski, Cuzzolin, and Sahakian (2021) identify a gap between highly promising experimental results and uncertain real-world performance, emphasizing issues such as selective reporting, overfitting, and the difficulty of translating predictive success into durable economic gains. Taken together, these studies suggest that AI's value should be evaluated against conventional benchmarks using out-of-sample data and decision-relevant metrics, rather than inferred from model complexity or adoption claims alone. For corporate finance, this means assessing not only forecast error but also whether forecasts improve budgeting, cash planning, risk monitoring, and the timing of investment decisions.

A second strand of research connects AI adoption with investment efficiency and firm-level performance, while also highlighting the organizational conditions that determine whether technological capability becomes economic value.

Chen, Kim, and Peng (2026), in their study of corporate investment efficiency, report that greater AI adoption is associated with more efficient investment, more accurate management sales forecasts, improved financial reporting quality, and greater process and product innovation; they also find that exposure to data-privacy regulation weakens the relationship between AI adoption and investment efficiency. This evidence is directly relevant to the present study because it links forecasting quality to the allocation of capital rather than treating the two as separate outcomes. Nevertheless, AI adoption measures based on corporate disclosures may capture a combination of actual deployment, managerial attention, and strategic signaling, so measurement validity remains important. The broader evidence also cautions against assuming that stronger prediction automatically produces better decisions: an algorithm trained on historical data may reproduce past allocation patterns, underweight unfamiliar projects, or optimize measurable short-term returns at the expense of resilience and long-horizon innovation. The distinction between association and causation is equally important, because firms with stronger management, better data infrastructure, and greater financial resources may be more likely both to adopt AI and to perform well. Therefore, comparisons between adopters and non-adopters require controls for firm characteristics, time effects, and potential selection bias; where credible external variation exists, quasi-experimental approaches may strengthen causal interpretation. The present paper builds on these findings by examining three connected outcomes—forecasting accuracy, capital-allocation efficiency, and firm performance—and by treating organizational capabilities and governance as conditions that may strengthen or constrain the relationship. Its central research gap is the need for an integrated empirical framework that tests whether AI adoption is associated with better forecasts, whether forecast quality is reflected in more disciplined investment, and whether these mechanisms are related to measurable operating and financial outcomes. This integrated approach avoids presuming that AI necessarily improves performance and instead makes the proposed relationships testable with transparent variables and reproducible methods.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design and analytical approach

This study is designed as a quantitative, explanatory firm-level investigation of the relationship between artificial intelligence and corporate financial decision-making. The proposed unit of analysis is the firm-year, allowing changes in AI adoption and financial outcomes to be examined over time while controlling for persistent differences between firms and common annual shocks. The design tests a connected set of relationships: whether AI adoption is associated with lower financial forecast errors; whether AI adoption is associated with more efficient capital allocation; and whether forecasting accuracy and allocation efficiency help explain variation in firm performance. Because no verified firm-level dataset has been supplied for the present manuscript, this section specifies a reproducible empirical protocol rather than reporting completed estimates. Sample size, study period, coefficient estimates, confidence intervals, and statistical significance must be populated only after data collection and validation.

3.2 Population, sample selection, and data sources

The target population is publicly listed non-financial firms for which annual financial statements, market or operating indicators, and a defensible measure of AI adoption can be observed for multiple years. Financial institutions may be excluded from the primary sample because their balance-sheet structures, regulatory capital requirements, and performance measures differ materially from those of non-financial firms; they may be studied separately as a robustness extension. Financial statement data may be obtained from audited annual reports and recognized financial databases, while AI-adoption information may be extracted from annual reports, sustainability reports, corporate disclosures, patent or technology records, and other documented sources. Text-based AI measures should be created using a pre-specified dictionary or validated classification procedure, with manual checks on a stratified subset to assess false positives and false negatives. The sample construction process should report the initial population, exclusions for missing or inconsistent data, treatment of mergers and delistings, and final number of firms and firm-year observations. All sources, extraction dates, and variable-construction rules should be documented to support replication.

3.3 Measurement of the principal constructs

The principal explanatory variable, AI adoption, may be operationalized as a binary indicator equal to one when a firm provides verifiable evidence of AI use in its business or finance processes and zero otherwise. Where disclosure coverage permits, a continuous adoption-intensity measure can be developed from the frequency and context of AI-related disclosures, AI-related investment, or the number of functions in which AI is deployed. Disclosure frequency alone should not be interpreted as actual operational intensity without validation. Forecasting accuracy should be measured using the absolute forecast error between a pre-period forecast and the subsequently realized outcome. For a forecast target Y, absolute error is $AE_{it} = |Y_{it} - \hat{Y}_{it}|$, while mean absolute error is $MAE = (1/N)\,\Sigma|Y_{it} - \hat{Y}_{it}|$. Root mean squared error (RMSE) can be calculated as $RMSE = \sqrt{[(1/N)\,\Sigma(Y_{it} - \hat{Y}_{it})^2]}$, giving greater weight to large misses. Forecasts should be recorded at the time they were originally produced to prevent look-ahead bias. If internal

budget forecasts are unavailable, the study must use a clearly defined public forecast proxy and acknowledge its limits rather than label it as a direct measure of management forecasting.

3.4 Capital allocation and firm performance variables

Capital-allocation efficiency is a multidimensional construct and should be assessed with more than one indicator where data allow. Candidate measures include the deviation between planned and realized capital expenditure, investment sensitivity to growth opportunities, and residual-based measures of overinvestment or underinvestment. A residual-based measure should be constructed from an explicitly specified expected-investment model using lagged growth opportunities, cash flow, leverage, and other theoretically justified predictors; the absolute residual can then serve as an investment-inefficiency proxy, subject to sensitivity analysis. Firm performance should be assessed through complementary accounting and operating outcomes, such as return on assets, operating margin, sales growth, and operating cash-flow volatility. Return on assets may be defined as net income divided by average total assets, while operating margin is operating income divided by sales. The analysis should avoid treating these measures as interchangeable: profitability, growth, and cash-flow stability capture distinct dimensions of performance and may respond to AI at different speeds.

3.5 Control variables and data preparation

The baseline models should include firm size, leverage, cash holdings, sales growth, capital intensity, firm age where available, and industry and year controls. Firm size can be measured as the natural logarithm of total assets; leverage as total debt divided by total assets; and cash holdings as cash and equivalents divided by total assets. Variable definitions should remain consistent across firms and years. Continuous variables may be winsorized at pre-specified tails to reduce the influence of extreme observations, with unmodified-data estimates reported as a robustness check. Missing data should be described transparently; imputation should not be used mechanically where missingness may itself reflect disclosure quality or AI adoption. Financial values should be adjusted for currency and inflation where cross-country comparisons require it. The timing of all explanatory variables should be specified so that AI adoption and controls precede the outcome period wherever possible.

3.6 Econometric specification

The first model estimates the association between AI adoption and forecast error: $FE_{it} = \alpha + \beta 1\ AI_{it-1} + \gamma' X_{it-1} + \mu_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it}$, where FE denotes a forecast-error measure, AI is the adoption indicator or intensity measure, X is the vector of controls, μ_i represents firm fixed effects, and λ_t represents year fixed effects. A negative $\beta 1$ is consistent with improved forecasting accuracy when the dependent variable is an error measure. The second model relates AI adoption to capital-allocation inefficiency: $CAI_{it} = \alpha + \beta 2\ AI_{it-1} + \gamma' X_{it-1} + \mu_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it}$, where lower CAI values indicate more efficient allocation under the chosen definition. The third model relates AI adoption and the proposed mechanisms to firm performance: $PERF_{it} = \alpha + \beta 3\ AI_{it-1} + \delta 1\ Accuracy_{it-1} + \delta 2\ Allocation_{it-1} + \gamma' X_{it-1} + \mu_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it}$. For clarity, the direction of the accuracy variable must be coded consistently: if it is forecast error, the expected association may be negative; if it is an accuracy score, the expected association may be positive. Standard errors should be clustered at the firm level to account for within-firm dependence over time, with alternative clustering considered when common industry shocks are material.

3.7 Identification, mediation, and robustness

Fixed-effects estimates help control for time-invariant firm characteristics but do not, by themselves, establish causality. Reverse causality may arise because firms with stronger performance can afford AI investment, while omitted management or technology capabilities may affect both adoption and outcomes. The analysis should therefore use lagged explanatory variables, alternative adoption measures, industry-by-year controls where feasible, and sensitivity checks for sample composition. If a credible policy change, staggered technology exposure, or other exogenous source of variation is available, a difference-in-differences or instrumental-variable design may be considered only after its identifying assumptions are defended and tested. Mediation analysis should be interpreted cautiously: evidence that AI adoption predicts forecast error and that forecast error predicts performance is consistent with a mechanism but does not alone prove causal mediation. Robustness checks should include alternative performance measures, alternative forecast-error metrics, alternative capital-allocation proxies, exclusion of extreme industry-years, placebo timing tests, and tests for differential effects by firm size, data maturity, and financial constraints. Model selection and validation must be performed without using the final test period to tune hyperparameters.

3.8 Predictive-model evaluation

If the study directly compares AI forecasting models with conventional methods, the comparison should use chronological training, validation, and test partitions rather than random splits that mix future and past observations. Candidate models may include a historical-mean or seasonal-naïve benchmark, linear regression, regularized regression, random forests, gradient-boosted trees, and—where sample size and time-series structure justify it—

recurrent neural networks. Hyperparameters should be selected using training and validation data only. Performance should be reported using MAE and RMSE, with scaled errors or directional metrics added where appropriate. The study should report the forecast horizon, target definition, data frequency, baseline model, missing-data handling, and whether predictions are generated recursively or one period ahead. A model should not be described as superior solely because it outperforms a weak baseline; comparisons with established forecasting practice and tests across economic regimes are required. For financial decisions, forecast uncertainty and calibration may also be relevant, since a decision-maker needs to know not only the central estimate but the plausible range of outcomes.

3.9 Reliability, validity, and research ethics

Construct validity should be strengthened by comparing alternative measures of AI use and financial outcomes and by validating text-derived adoption indicators against manually reviewed reports. Reliability checks should document coding rules, inter-coder agreement where human coding is used, and the reproducibility of the data-processing pipeline. The research should rely on lawfully obtained corporate disclosures and appropriately licensed datasets, respect database terms, and avoid publishing confidential firm-level information. Any proprietary or internal forecasts must be anonymized and used only with appropriate authorization. The final manuscript should disclose funding, conflicts of interest, data availability, code availability, and limitations in line with the target journal's requirements. These procedures are necessary because the credibility of an AI-finance study depends not only on statistical sophistication but also on transparent measurement, defensible identification, and reproducible analysis.

4 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

4.1 Data collection methods and sources

This study is designed as a quantitative longitudinal analysis of firm-year observations. The target population is publicly listed non-financial firms with repeated financial information and verifiable disclosures about artificial intelligence (AI) adoption. Data collection should follow a documented extraction protocol. Financial variables—including total assets, sales, operating income, net income, debt, cash holdings, capital expenditure, and fiscal year—should be collected from audited annual reports or recognized financial databases. AI-adoption evidence should be collected from annual reports, investor presentations, technology disclosures, and sustainability reports. A firm-year should be coded as AI-active only when the disclosure describes an implemented application; general statements of future intention should be coded separately. Forecast values should be collected from archived management budgets or a clearly defined public forecast proxy, with forecast dates stored separately from realized outcomes to prevent look-ahead bias. Records should be checked against original documents, duplicate observations removed, currencies and units standardized, and exclusions logged. If internal management forecasts are unavailable, the study must not claim to measure internal forecast accuracy and should explicitly discuss the limitations of any public proxy.

4.2 Data preparation and analysis procedure

A data dictionary should define each variable, formula, source, unit, timing, and expected direction before estimation. Continuous variables should be checked for implausible values; winsorization at the 1st and 99th percentiles may be used as a sensitivity procedure, with unmodified estimates also reported. Missingness should be summarized by variable and year, and observations should not be silently removed. Descriptive statistics and correlation matrices should precede regression analysis. Forecasting models should use chronological training, validation, and test periods, rather than random splits that may leak future information into model training. MAE and RMSE should be computed on the held-out test period and compared with a transparent benchmark. Panel regressions may include firm and year fixed effects, with standard errors clustered at firm level. Alternative AI measures, outcome definitions, lags, and subsamples should be examined for robustness. Fixed effects alone do not establish causality; causal claims require a credible identification strategy and clearly defended assumptions.

4.3 Variable operationalization

AI adoption may be measured as a binary indicator or a validated intensity measure. Forecast error is the absolute difference between a forecast and the realized value, with lower values indicating better accuracy. Capital-allocation inefficiency may be measured by the absolute residual from a model of expected investment or by the gap between planned and realized capital expenditure where plan data are available. Firm performance may be assessed through return on assets (ROA), operating margin, and sales growth. Controls may include firm size, leverage, cash holdings, capital intensity, and prior sales growth. The definitions and timing of these variables should be fixed before analysis so the model is replicable and explanatory variables precede outcomes wherever possible.

5 RESULTS

Research integrity note: no verified firm-level dataset was provided. The numerical values in the following tables are simulated examples solely to demonstrate how results can be presented and interpreted. They are not real empirical findings and must be replaced with estimates computed from the collected data before journal submission.

5.1 Illustrative sample profile and descriptive statistics

For demonstration, assume a dataset of 600 firm-year observations from 120 non-financial firms over five years. In this simulated profile, 210 observations (35.0%) are classified as AI-active and 390 (65.0%) as not AI-active. Table 1 gives example summary statistics; these figures do not describe an actual sample.

Table 1: Illustrative descriptive statistics (simulated values).

Variable	Mean	SD	Median	N
AI adoption (0/1)	0.350	0.477	0.000	600
Forecast MAE (% of actual)	8.40	4.10	7.60	600
Capital-allocation inefficiency	0.126	0.084	0.103	600
Return on assets (%)	6.80	5.20	5.90	600
Operating margin (%)	11.40	8.60	9.70	600
Firm size (ln total assets)	14.20	1.60	14.10	600
Leverage (debt/assets)	0.340	0.190	0.320	600
Cash holdings (cash/assets)	0.120	0.090	0.095	600

The illustrative mean forecast MAE of 8.40% means that the absolute forecast error averages 8.40% of the realized target under the stated scaling convention. It does not establish that AI improves forecasting: that conclusion requires a comparable model benchmark and appropriate controls. Similarly, an illustrative average ROA of 6.80% describes profitability in the example sample but cannot be attributed to AI without further analysis.

5.2 Forecasting model comparison

Table 2 illustrates a chronological out-of-sample comparison between a conventional benchmark and two machine-learning approaches. Earlier observations are assumed to be used for model fitting, a later period for validation, and the final period for testing. MAE and RMSE are expressed as percentages of the realized target; lower values indicate smaller errors.

Table 2. Illustrative out-of-sample forecasting performance (simulated values).

Forecast model	Test MAE (%)	Test RMSE (%)	MAE reduction vs. benchmark
Historical/seasonal benchmark	9.20	13.10	Reference
Regularized linear regression	8.10	11.70	11.96%
Gradient-boosted trees	7.30	10.80	20.65%

In this example, gradient-boosted trees achieve a test MAE of 7.30%, compared with 9.20% for the benchmark. The relative reduction is (9.20 − 7.30) / 9.20 × 100 = 20.65%. If obtained from real data under identical forecast targets, horizons, and information sets, this would suggest better predictive accuracy. The comparison should also be tested across different periods and economic conditions, and uncertainty estimates or paired forecast-error tests should be reported where appropriate. RMSE is useful because it penalizes large errors more strongly than MAE.

5.3 Panel regression results

Table 3 demonstrates a reporting format for panel regressions with firm and year fixed effects and firm-clustered standard errors. The coefficients and p-values are hypothetical and are included only to explain how actual estimates should be interpreted.

Table 3: Illustrative fixed-effects estimates (simulated values; not empirical estimates).

Dependent variable	AI coefficient	Illustrative SE	Illustrative p-value	Direction
Forecast MAE (%)	−1.10	0.38	0.004	Lower forecast error
Capital-allocation inefficiency	−0.018	0.007	0.011	Lower inefficiency
ROA (percentage points)	0.620	0.270	0.022	Higher ROA

If the first coefficient were estimated from real data, −1.10 would indicate that AI-active firm-years are associated with a 1.10-percentage-point lower forecast MAE, conditional on the controls and fixed effects. The second coefficient would indicate a 0.018-unit reduction in the selected inefficiency index. The third would indicate a 0.62-percentage-point higher ROA, depending on the variable's scale. These are conditional associations, not necessarily causal effects. Statistical significance should be considered alongside confidence intervals, economic magnitude, measurement quality, and potential selection into AI adoption.

5.4 Robustness analysis

A full analysis should test whether findings depend on variable definitions, extreme observations, or timing assumptions. Table 4 presents an illustrative robustness summary. In the final paper, each row must correspond to a separately estimated model and include sample size, controls, fixed effects, and standard-error details.

Table 4: Illustrative robustness checks (simulated values).

Specification	AI coefficient on forecast MAE	Illustrative p-value	Example interpretation
Baseline fixed-effects model	−1.10	0.004	Negative association
Alternative AI-intensity measure	−0.86	0.018	Direction remains negative
Exclude extreme observations	−0.97	0.009	Direction remains negative
One-year lag of AI adoption	−0.72	0.041	Smaller negative association

The hypothetical signs remain negative across specifications, while the lagged estimate is smaller. In real data, this could be consistent with gradual implementation benefits, but it could also reflect measurement error or sample changes. Robustness requires more than stable signs: researchers should examine confidence intervals, influential observations, alternative clustering, placebo timing, and the credibility of the identification assumptions.

6 DISCUSSION

The proposed framework links AI to financial outcomes through forecasting accuracy and capital-allocation efficiency. If verified data showed lower out-of-sample errors for AI models, the result would be consistent with the proposition that machine learning can identify nonlinear relationships and combine heterogeneous signals to improve estimates of revenue, costs, cash flow, or investment needs. The finding would be more persuasive if it persisted across forecast horizons, benchmarks, and periods of economic volatility. Conversely, if improvements disappeared in a later test period, that would suggest that predictive performance may depend on the training environment or model selection. A rigorous study should therefore separate model development from final evaluation and report results on observations not used to tune the model.

Forecasting accuracy and capital allocation are connected, but they are not equivalent. More accurate forecasts may improve the information available for budgeting, project appraisal, and liquidity planning; they do not automatically ensure that managers select the best investment. Capital allocation also depends on the cost of capital, strategic priorities, risk tolerance, financing constraints, and managerial incentives. A firm may forecast demand accurately yet overinvest because of internal politics or short-term performance targets. Consequently, forecast-error measures should be considered alongside investment-efficiency indicators and evidence about how forecasts enter approval processes. If forecast quality statistically mediates the association between AI and investment efficiency, the result would be consistent with the proposed mechanism, but causal mediation requires stronger assumptions and clear temporal ordering.

The association between AI and firm performance must be interpreted in light of implementation costs and complementary capabilities. Data infrastructure, system integration, cybersecurity, employee training, and model oversight require resources, so costs may precede benefits. Firms with stronger management and better financial resources may be both more likely to adopt AI and more likely to perform well, creating selection bias. Firm and year fixed effects can control for some persistent differences and common shocks but cannot eliminate time-varying omitted variables or reverse causality. Lagged adoption, alternative definitions, placebo tests, and credible quasi-experimental designs can strengthen inference, provided their assumptions are explicitly justified.

The findings also have implications for governance. Financial models should be assessed for stability, calibration, and error concentration across business units and market regimes, not just average accuracy. A model that performs well overall may still generate costly errors during a liquidity shock or for a particular product line. Documentation, version control, access restrictions, monitoring thresholds, and clear responsibility for human overrides can help organizations detect model deterioration. Human oversight should involve evaluating assumptions and uncertainty rather than accepting or rejecting algorithmic outputs without scrutiny. Explainability is particularly important when recommendations affect material investment commitments or risk exposure.

Several limitations shape the proposed study. Public disclosures may measure communication strategy as well as operational AI use; public forecasts may not represent the information used by managers; and investment residuals can reflect unobserved opportunities rather than inefficiency. Effects may also differ by industry, firm size, data maturity, and regulatory environment. Future research should use verified longitudinal data, direct records of forecast revisions and realized outcomes, and qualitative evidence about how finance teams apply AI recommendations. These data would help distinguish improvements in prediction from improvements in decisions and, ultimately, from changes in financial performance.

7 CONCLUSION

This paper develops an integrated framework for examining how artificial intelligence may influence corporate financial decision-making through forecasting accuracy, capital allocation, and firm performance. AI can potentially improve financial analysis by processing large and varied datasets, identifying nonlinear patterns, and updating forecasts as conditions change. More reliable forecasts may strengthen budgeting, liquidity planning, investment appraisal, and risk monitoring. However, prediction should not be confused with decision quality. Capital allocation remains dependent on strategic objectives, financing constraints, managerial judgment, and governance arrangements. The relationship between AI adoption and firm performance is therefore likely to depend on data quality, model suitability, and the organization's ability to integrate analytical outputs into established processes.

The proposed methodology explains how these relationships can be examined using firm-year observations, validated AI-adoption measures, out-of-sample forecasting metrics, investment-efficiency indicators, and accounting-based outcomes. Panel models with firm and year effects, clustered standard errors, alternative variable definitions, and robustness checks provide a structured approach, although fixed effects alone do not establish causality. Strong causal claims require a credible identification strategy and transparent assumptions. The numerical tables in this draft are simulated examples intended to demonstrate academic reporting conventions; they are not empirical findings and must be replaced with estimates from verified data before publication. The principal contribution is a testable research design connecting model performance to resource-allocation mechanisms and organizational outcomes. Future studies should prioritize longitudinal data, transparent model validation, and direct evidence of how finance professionals use AI recommendations. For practitioners, the key implication is to treat AI as a governed decision-support capability rather than a substitute for accountability. Sustainable value is more likely when predictive tools are combined with reliable data, skilled employees, clear investment criteria, independent monitoring, and informed managerial oversight.

STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The present research work does not contain any conflict of interest to be disclosed.

REFERENCES

[1] Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence. Harvard Business Review Press.

[2] Babina, T., Fedyk, A., He, A., & Hodson, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence, firm growth, and product innovation. Journal of Financial Economics, 151, Article 103745.

[3] Brynjolfsson, E., & McElheran, K. (2016). The rapid adoption of data-driven decision-making. American Economic Review, 106(5), 133–139.

[4] Buczynski, W., Cuzzolin, F., & Sahakian, B. (2021). A review of machine learning experiments in equity investment decision-making: Why most published research findings do not live up to their promise in real life. International Journal of Data Science and Analytics, 11, 221–242.

[5] Cai, X., Lin, P., Chen, L., & Wang, W. (2026). Making better analysts' forecast—An investigation of artificial intelligence applications in corporations. Applied Economics Letters, 33(13), 2406–2412.

[6] Chen, T., & Guestrin, C. (2016). XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 785–794.

[7] Czarnitzki, D., Fernández, G. P., & Rammer, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence and firm-level productivity. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 211, 188–205.

[8] Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. Harvard Business Review, 96(1), 108–116.

[9] Gogas, P., & Papadimitriou, T. (2021). Machine learning in economics and finance. Computational Economics, 57, 1–4.

[10] Gu, S., Kelly, B., & Xiu, D. (2020). Empirical asset pricing via machine learning. The Review of Financial Studies, 33(5), 2223–2273.

[11] Hyndman, R. J., & Athanasopoulos, G. (2021). Forecasting: Principles and practice (3rd ed.). OTexts.

[12] LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521, 436–444.

[13] Li, Y., Zhong, H., & Tong, Q. (2024). Artificial intelligence, dynamic capabilities, and corporate financial asset allocation. International Review of Financial Analysis, 96, Article 103773.

[14] Liu, Y., & Hu, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence, supply chain finance, and corporate investment efficiency. Finance Research Letters, 85, Article 107851.

[15] McKinsey Global Institute. (2018). Notes from the AI frontier: Modeling the impact of AI on the world economy. McKinsey & Company.

[16] Rane, N. L., Choudhary, S. P., & Rane, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence-driven corporate finance: Enhancing efficiency and decision-making through machine learning, natural language processing, and robotic process automation in corporate governance and sustainability. Studies in Economics and Business Relations, 5, 1–22.

[17] Schüßler, M., et al. (2024). Forecasting in financial accounting with artificial intelligence—A systematic literature review and future research agenda. Journal of Applied Accounting Research, 25(1), 81–104.

[18] Sezer, Ö. B., Gudelek, M. U., & Özbayoglu, A. M. (2020). Financial time series forecasting with deep learning: A systematic literature review: 2005–2019