Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 2 | February 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

AI–DRIVEN BUSINESS ANALYTICS FRAMEWORKS FOR GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT: ADVANCING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY IN U.S. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Ifeyinwa Perpetual Nwinyi [a], Matthew Oman-Amoako [b]
[a] *University of Delaware, USA*
[b] *Department of Business Administration, Accra Institute of Technology, Ghana*

**Corresponding Author: Matthew Oman-Amoako*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra26112
DOI No: 10.36713/epra26112

ABSTRACT
The scale and complexity of U.S. federal financial management is growing to a level that is increasingly testing the conventional oversight, audit, and accountability mechanisms. Even though artificial intelligence and sophisticated business analytics have become an appealing tool to deal with fraud, improper payments, and performance monitoring, their implementation in federal programs exceeded the creation of governance frameworks to guarantee transparency, auditability, and democratic accountability. The current literature on AI in government finance is disconnected, as technical literature focuses on analytical performance and policy literature on governance principles, but with limited integration between public finance accounting and audit systems. This study addresses this gap through an integrative review of peer-reviewed research, federal oversight reports, and policy frameworks published between 2020 and 2025. The review integrates insights from public finance, audit practice, and AI governance to examine how AI-driven business analytics are currently applied in U.S. federal financial management and where accountability failures persist. The literature indicates that AI initiatives strengthen oversight only when embedded within existing financial control systems and supported by robust data governance, explainability mechanisms, auditable model outputs, and clearly defined human oversight. Analytics deployed as standalone technical solutions frequently increase opacity and weaken audit assurance. Based on these insights, the paper proposes a multi-layered AI-driven business analytics framework that integrates technical capability with federal accounting standards, audit requirements, and governance structures, repositioning AI as a governance instrument rather than a purely technological tool.

KEYWORDS: *Artificial Intelligence, Public Financial Management, Federal Audit, Accountability, Transparency, Governance*

INTRODUCTION
The financial management environment of the U.S. federal government is one of the most complex administrative systems globally. As annual expenditures on programs, agencies, and jurisdictions have increased to over six trillion dollars annually, maintaining accountability and transparency has become more challenging. Traditional oversight systems, such as periodic audits, manual compliance checks, and retrospective reviews, struggle to keep up with the volume, speed, and variety of financial transactions within federal systems (Bandy, 2023). These limitations have far-reaching consequences, such as billions of dollars lost each year to fraud, waste, and abuse, delayed detection of financial irregularities, and loss of public trust in governmental accountability in managing taxpayer funds (Kom, 2020; Manes-Rossi et al., 2020; Bignami, 2022).

In response to these concerns, artificial intelligence and business analytics have gained increasing attention in recent years as potential tools for addressing ongoing oversight issues (Oyeyemi et al, 2025; Yeboah et al, 2026). Federal agencies have started testing machine learning algorithms to detect fraud, predictive models to estimate budgets, and natural language processing to ensure compliance monitoring and audit planning (Ho, 2024; Skuza & Lizak, 2023). The appeal of these technologies lies in their ability to process large amounts of financial data almost instantly, recognize complex patterns of financial risk, and deliver insights that are difficult to achieve manually. Empirical and applied studies have also reported that early applications of AI-driven analytics in public financial management have resulted in shorter audit cycles, improved anomaly detection, and operational cost savings (Das et al., 2023; Bouchetara et al., 2024; Adepoju & Chinonyerem, 2025).

Despite this promise, implementation of AI-driven analytics in federal financial management has advanced more rapidly than the formation of governance frameworks to promote accountability, transparency, and auditability. Existing scholarship remains fragmented across disciplines, with technical studies emphasizing model performance and efficiency, while policy-oriented research focuses on high-level governance principles. Far less attention has been devoted to how AI systems are applied to public finance accounting standards, federal audit practices, and statutory oversight duties (Buckley et al., 2021; Aldemir & Uçma Uysal, 2025). Federal financial management should address several accountability obligations simultaneously, including fiscal integrity, legal compliance, audit assurance, and transparency, in contrast to the private sector, where efficiency and profitability are the main factors influencing decision-making (Bignami, 2022; Asamoah et al, 2025). This misalignment between technical innovation and governance integration introduces significant risks. AI systems that lack explainability may produce accurate outputs while failing to meet audit and documentation requirements. Analytics optimized solely for detection performance may introduce bias or obscure decision logic, undermining fairness and due process (Kuiper et al., 2021; Fletcher & Le, 2021). Tools deployed without clear oversight responsibilities may weaken rather than strengthen accountability by shifting control away from established financial and audit institutions. As prior research has noted, the central question is not whether AI can improve government financial management, but whether it can do so in ways that reinforce, rather than erode, democratic accountability (Fonner & Coyle, 2024).

The core problem addressed in this study is the absence of integrated frameworks that align AI-driven business analytics with the distinctive accountability requirements of U.S. federal financial management. While individual studies examine specific applications such as fraud detection, tax compliance, or risk monitoring, these efforts remain largely disconnected from one another and from the institutional realities of federal accounting and audit systems (Brand et al., 2025; Aldemir & Uçma Uysal, 2025). As a result, practitioners lack clear guidance on how to design, implement, and govern AI systems that meet both performance objectives and public sector accountability standards.

This study addresses this gap through an integrative review of recent literature examining AI-driven analytics in U.S. federal financial management. By synthesizing empirical findings, conceptual models, and oversight-oriented research, the study develops an AI-driven business analytics framework tailored to U.S. federal financial management. The contribution of this paper lies in repositioning AI not as a standalone technological enhancement, but as a governance instrument embedded within accounting systems, audit processes, and oversight institutions that safeguard transparency and accountability in federal programs.

2. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Government Financial Management and Accountability

Government financial management in the United States is conducted within a unique institutional and legal context shaped by constitutional rules, legislative oversight requirements, and the public's expectations for accountability. Unlike private sector financial management practices that are primarily driven by the need to maximize shareholder value and profits, the financial management of the federal government is multi-stakeholder driven and includes the Congress, taxpayers, program beneficiaries, and oversight organizations. Each of these stakeholders has different accountability expectations, which translates into a system where efficiency, transparency, lawfulness, and auditability must be achieved simultaneously rather than sequentially (Bandy, 2023; Farazmand, 2023).

The modern federal financial management system is based on a series of laws that codify accountability and reporting obligations for the executive branch. The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 established financial management leadership at the agency level and required audited financial statements. Other significant legislative enactments include the Government Performance and Results Act and its modernization, which extended the scope of accountability beyond compliance and required that agencies demonstrate relationships between financial resources and program outcomes. The Federal Financial Management Improvement Act further emphasized the importance of integrated financial systems that are auditable and able to generate accurate and timely information. Collectively, these laws codify accountability as a systemic requirement rather than a discretionary management goal (Lee et al., 2020; Farazmand, 2023).

The concept of accountability in federal financial management is multi-dimensional. Fiscal accountability focuses on the accurate recording of transactions, adherence to appropriations law, and avoiding improper payments and misuse of funds. Performance accountability focuses on whether financial resources are achieving policy goals. Legal accountability focuses on ensuring adherence to complex legal frameworks governing federal spending. Democratic accountability requires transparency to allow public review. While these concepts are complementary, they often conflict, particularly in large-scale programs where speed, administrative burden, and control must be balanced (Kim & Park, 2023; Bignami, 2022).

The scale and operational complexity of federal programs also contribute to these issues of accountability. Federal agencies deal with a variety of financial instruments, including direct payments, grants, contracts, loans, and insurance. The data is scattered across different systems, with different data standards, limited interoperation, and varying data quality. Conventional oversight tools, such as annual financial audits as well as investigations carried out by inspector generals, are still important but generally look to the past to identify control weaknesses after payments have been made (Lee et al., 2020; Fisher, 2022).

Recent massive federal initiatives have revealed the shortcomings of current oversight strategies. Emergency spending programs undertaken when crisis conditions prevail have proved how speed and volume can overwhelm traditional controls, leading to measurable improper payments and delayed detection of fraud. These experiences have validated long-standing concerns in the audit and oversight community that periodic review procedures and manual controls are inadequate in measuring complicated, large-volume financial settings (Padovani & Iacuzzi, 2021; Dixon, 2023).

As a result, federal financial management increasingly confronts a structural mismatch between the demands of accountability and the capabilities of legacy oversight systems. While statutory frameworks continue to emphasize transparency and audit assurance, the tools used to operationalize these principles have not evolved at the same pace as program complexity and data intensity. This gap provides the context in which advanced analytics and artificial intelligence have been proposed as mechanisms to strengthen accountability, not by replacing existing financial governance structures, but by augmenting their capacity to monitor, detect, and respond to risk in real time (Ho, 2024; Aldemir & Uçma Uysal, 2025).

2.2 AI and Business Analytics in the Public Sector

Artificial intelligence (AI) and business analytics have been introduced into the public sector as responses to the volume, complexity, and data density of modern government operations, particularly in financial management settings where traditional oversight mechanisms face increasing strain (Alam et al., 2024; Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025). These tools are now used as a supplement to conventional supervision instruments, based on manual review and periodic audit, and non-dynamically established controls, within the context of federal financial management (Herr, 2025; Bora et al., 2021). Business analytics is more broadly defined as the systematic application of information to aid in monitoring, forecasting, risk identification, and decision-making, and AI is a set of computational methods that recognize patterns, discover irregularities, and predict models using extensive and complex data sets (Ho, 2024; Bouchetara et al., 2024). Scholars of public financial management note that the growth in transaction volumes and program complexity has strained conventional audit and compliance systems, making timely risk identification difficult (Bandy, 2023; Lee et al., 2020). In U.S. federal financial programs, analytics has been accepted due to expediency rather than technological aspiration. Agencies are confronted with transaction settings that are of high volume and heterogeneous data. In that case, manual review and sampling-based audits find it difficult to deliver information on possible risks in a timely manner.

Analytics tools allow analysing the population of transactions as a whole, detecting risk trends and anomalies that are otherwise difficult to observe with traditional oversight methods, and are also able to perform more focused and proactive supervisory procedures (Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025; Alam et al., 2024). Notably, the literature has stressed the fact that analytics are not designed to substitute the current accountability systems but to expand their scope and responsiveness in complicated financial ecosystems (Bora et al., 2021; Herr, 2025). The use of analytics within the public sector is typically grouped into three functions.

Descriptive analytics are concerned with the overview of the previous financial performance, such as expenditures and adherence to trends. Predictive analytics approximate the probability of the occurrence of events like improper payments, cost overruns, or audit findings, whereas prescriptive analytics assist in making decisions by giving priority to the cases to be reviewed and allocating resources to oversee them (Duan, 2022; Alam et al., 2024). Machine learning methods have been most popular in predictive and prescriptive analytics, in which adaptive

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 2 | February 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

modelling and pattern recognition is necessary to facilitate financial risk at scale (Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025). These tools are increasingly used by federal agencies in payment integrity efforts, grants management, procurement monitoring, and audit planning, and analytics are used to direct limited investigative resources to riskier transactions and programs (Alam et al., 2024; Herr, 2025). Consequently, AI-based analytics now form part of everyday financial management mechanisms instead of being a research project, as it is part of a greater change to an ad-hoc automated data administration and lifelong financial surveillance (Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025). Although they are increasingly being utilized, analytics systems within the public sector are frequently implemented as technical additions, and not as part of structured financial control systems, which generates structural tensions between innovation and accountability (Qadri, 2025; Bora et al., 2021). System development is often led by data science teams or external vendors, leaving financial managers and oversight officials with compliance, audit assurance, and statutory accountability responsibilities, creating decentralized ownership and control distances (Qadri, 2025; Celestin et al., 2025).

In that case, analytic outputs can affect oversight determinations without adhering to accounting standards, audit documentation policies, or legal regulations that address federal financial management (Bora et al., 2021; Duan, 2022). These are increased in the government sector, where the decisions made regarding finance should meet efficiency goals, but also legality, equity, and transparency. Simply because the model created a high risk score but is not clearly explained, documented, or audited, betrays accepted standards of oversight and erodes trust in the institutions (Bora et al., 2021; Herr, 2025). In addition, in cases of analytics running without a clear governance mechanism, the authority of making decisions can be distributed among the opaque structures, delegating the responsibility and undermining accountability instead of enhancing it (Qadri, 2025; Celestin et al., 2025). Collectively, the literature indicates that AI and business analytics relevance in federal financial management is not as technical as it is in the extent to which they can be incorporated into the current governance and accountability systems.

The value of analytical tools only lies in the degree to which the results can be interpreted, explained, and assessed in existing frameworks of social financial accountability (Herr, 2025; Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025). According to this vision, the idea that analytics must be conceptualized as more than efficiency-enhancing technologies and as an institutional tool that changes the experience of oversight, audit, and accountability in U.S. federal financial management is critical (Bora et al., 2021; Qadri, 2025).

2.3 Accountability and Transparency in AI Systems

Transparency and responsibility are the core concepts of government financial management since government financial decisions should be justifiable, explainable, and legally defensible (Bignami, 2022; Bora et al., 2021). These principles do not diminish when artificial intelligence and advanced analytics are applied to the procedures of financial oversight; rather, they are more challenging (Buckley et al., 2021; Fletcher & Le, 2021). Any system that affects the monitoring, flagging, or restraint of public funds must serve traceability, justification, and human accountability (Aldemir & Uçma Uysal, 2025).

Accountability in federal financial management functions through formal mechanisms of audit, documentation, and oversight authority (Otia & Bracci, 2022). Financial transactions are expected to be trackable in terms of appropriation to obligation, expenditure, and reporting (Bora et al., 2021). The auditors and inspectors general use verifiable evidence to determine compliance, evaluate internal control, and support findings (Brand et al., 2025). In this case, transparency does not imply exposing all internal processes to the open and transparent world, but it means that the logic behind decisions and financial controls can be rebuilt and examined retrospectively (Bignami, 2022). These requirements are complicated by AI-powered analytics (Kuiper et al., 2021). Most analytic model systems are based on probabilistic modeling, interactions of features, and adaptive learning mechanisms that lack the deterministic output of decision-making of traditional rule-based controls (Kuiper et al., 2021). The form of outputs can be a risk score, an anomaly flag, or a predictive assessment as opposed to an explicit determination of compliance (Fonner & Coyle, 2024). Although such outputs can enhance the capability of detection, they add ambiguity to the accountability structures that were built in fixed rules and observable reasoning of decisions (Buckley et al., 2021). Explainability, thus, will be a functional necessity instead of an abstract ethical imperative (Kuiper et al., 2021; Fletcher & Le, 2021). Oversight officials should have the capacity to know why a transaction, program, or recipient was flagged and whether the factors that influenced that judgment are in line with statutory standards of fraud, improper payment, or noncompliance (Brand et al., 2025).

In the absence of interpretable reasoning, analytic output cannot reliably assist in supporting audit judgment, enforcement actions, and remedial actions (Brand et al., 2025). Systems that generate results lack articulate explanation pathways and have the potential to erode audit assurance instead of reinforcing it (Otia & Bracci, 2022). Auditability poses a similar challenge (Bora et al., 2021). To be acceptable as inputs into federal oversight processes, analytic outputs should be underpinned by auditable trails, which document data sources, model logic, parameter settings, and decision thresholds (Brand et al., 2025). Auditors should be capable of determining not only that an analytic system has generated a specific output, but that the system has been in acceptable governance parameters and based on relevant data (Otia & Bracci, 2022). In other words, when the analytic systems cannot provide this traceability, their results cannot be tested independently and hence cannot be completely incorporated into formal audit procedures (Herr, 2025).

In AI-enabled financial management, human supervision will continue to play the core role of enhancing accountability (Buckley et al., 2021). Although analytics may facilitate prioritization, detection, and monitoring, decisions regarding public funds should always be left to the officials in authority (Fletcher & Le, 2021). Automated analysis and human determination need to be clearly delineated (Buckley et al., 2021). In the absence of such delineation, the responsibility is rendered diffuse, and one is hardly able to create accountability when mistakes, bias, and even negative outcomes arise (Bignami, 2022). Human oversight is used as a legal protection and as an institutional part of maintaining trust in financial governance (Fonner & Coyle, 2024). Federal finance accountability requirements of AI systems are also influenced by legal and regulatory limitations (Aldemir & Uçma Uysal, 2025). Financial management functions within the statutory frameworks that are characterized by eligibility, allowability, allocability, and the reasonableness of expenditures (Bora et al., 2021). Analytic systems should not act as autonomous risk engines: these legal requirements need to be met (Buckley et al., 2021). Outputs that are not consistent with statutory standards might not have operational relevance but exacerbate the situation instead of averting it (Bignami, 2022). The challenge in accountability is enhanced by data quality and bias issues (Kuiper et al., 2021). Past financial information indicates previous administrative methods, enforcement style, and policy decisions (Bora et al., 2021). Unless such data are carefully scrutinized, the outcomes of the analytic systems can amplify the distortions present or overrepresent some sets of programs, organizations, or groups, or some populations (Fletcher & Le, 2021). Accountability, hence, necessitates data validation mechanisms, review of the model, and continuous monitoring of performance to make sure that analytic systems are accurate, correct, and within the confines of the values of the social sector (Aldemir & Uçma Uysal, 2025).

Collectively, accountability and transparency in AI systems cannot be separated from auditability, legality, and governance (Bignami, 2022; Otia & Bracci, 2022). When applied to U.S. federal financial management, AI can only increase control to the best of its ability, which reinforces those functions (Yadava et al., 2025). Mechanisms that enhance detection and undermine the explainability, documentation, or human responsibility threaten to tear the roots of the foundations of public financial accountability (Buckley et al., 2021; Brand et al., 2025). This fact determines the necessity of governance-driven analytics platforms, which integrate AI into the existing financial control and management systems instead of imposing technology on them (Aldemir & Uçma Uysal, 2025).

REVIEW DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Review Approach

This study adopts an integrative literature review methodology to synthesize research on AI-driven business analytics in U.S. federal financial management. The review followed established principles for integrative reviews, beginning with a scoping phase to map relevant research domains, followed by iterative selection and thematic synthesis of sources. Analysis proceeded iteratively, with sources examined thematically to identify recurring patterns relevant to AI governance, audit practice, and federal financial management.

3.2 Data Sources and Inclusion Scope

The literature reviewed in this study was drawn from a combination of academic and federal oversight sources relevant to artificial intelligence, public financial management, and government accountability. Academic literature was identified primarily through Google Scholar and ScienceDirect, which provide broad coverage of peer-reviewed research across public administration, accounting, auditing, information systems, and data analytics.

To reflect the institutional realities of U.S. federal financial management, the review also incorporated official oversight and governance materials produced by federal audit and accountability bodies. These sources include reports, evaluations, and policy guidance issued by entities such as the Government Accountability Office, agency Inspectors General, and executive branch oversight offices.

3.3 Synthesis Method

Analysis focused on how the literature conceptualizes accountability, transparency, and governance in relation to AI-driven analytics in federal financial management.

Attention was given to how analytics systems are integrated into existing financial management and oversight structures, including budget execution, compliance monitoring, audit planning, and performance evaluation. Differences across institutional settings and implementation contexts were examined to identify differences in governance arrangements and oversight integration.

THEMATIC FINDINGS FROM LITERATURE

4.1 Financial Oversight and Fraud Detection Through AI Analytics

The literature focuses on fraud detection and payment integrity as prominent applications of AI and advanced analytics in U.S. federal financial management (Kom, 2020; Das et al., 2023, Yeboah et al, 2026). This emphasis reflects both the scale of federal payment systems and the longstanding difficulty of preventing improper payments through traditional, retrospective oversight mechanisms (Venable, 2021; Dixon, 2023). As federal programs expanded in volume, speed, and administrative dispersion, manual reviews and sampling-based audits proved increasingly inadequate for identifying irregular transactions promptly (Kom, 2020; Venable, 2021). AI-driven analytics have therefore been adopted primarily as tools to extend oversight capacity across entire transaction populations rather than as replacements for established audit functions (Bora et al., 2021; Otia & Bracci, 2022).

In a body of literature, machine learning-based fraud detection systems are better than rule-based systems in detecting abnormal payment patterns (Das et al., 2023; Zimbe et al., 2025). Predictive models based on historical cases of detected fraud allow agencies to rank the transactions, claims, or recipients to be reviewed further based on the risk index (Dako et al., 2021; Zimbe et al., 2025). This move toward targeting using uniform sampling to risk-based sampling is a structural change in the allocation of oversight resources (Herr, 2025). Instead of auditing once the funds have been lost, agencies are becoming increasingly more reliant on analytics to indicate possible issues earlier in the funds lifecycle (Yadava et al., 2025). Reviewed literature also highlights that AI-driven oversight is most effective when embedded within operational financial systems rather than deployed as standalone analytical experiments (Otia & Bracci, 2022; Sirait et al., 2025). Studies of unemployment insurance, payroll, and tax compliance analytics show that integration with payment processing, eligibility verification, and case management systems allows analytic outputs to inform real-time controls and investigative workflows (Das et al., 2023; Zimbe et al., 2025). Where analytics are disconnected from operational processes, their impact is limited to post hoc reporting or advisory functions, reducing their preventive value (Bora et al., 2021; Herr, 2025). At the same time, the literature underscores persistent challenges that constrain the effectiveness of AI-based fraud detection in federal contexts. High false-positive rates remain a central concern, particularly when models are applied across millions of transactions (Dako et al., 2021). Even modest error rates can overwhelm investigative capacity, undermining confidence in analytic outputs and discouraging sustained use (Das et al., 2023). Several studies emphasize the importance of multi-stage detection architectures, in which initial model outputs are filtered through additional automated checks or human review to balance sensitivity with operational feasibility (Herr, 2025; Yadava et al., 2025). Data quality and system fragmentation emerge as recurring barriers (Otia & Bracci, 2022; Sirait et al., 2025). Federal financial data are often distributed across legacy systems with inconsistent standards, incomplete records, and limited interoperability (Bora et al., 2021; Venable, 2021). AI models trained on such data may replicate underlying data weaknesses, produce misleading risk signals or reinforce existing control gaps (Bora et al., 2021). The literature consistently notes that analytics performance is inseparable from data governance, and that investments in data integration and validation are prerequisites for effective AI-enabled oversight (Sirait et al., 2025; Yadava et al., 2025). Importantly, research also identifies governance and accountability implications specific to fraud detection analytics. Because model outputs influence audit targeting, investigations, and sometimes payment holds, explainability and documentation become operational necessities rather than abstract ethical concerns (Bignami, 2022; Brand et al., 2025). Oversight bodies must be able to reconstruct why a transaction was flagged, which indicators contributed to the risk assessment, and how those indicators align with statutory definitions of fraud or improper payment (Venable, 2021; Herr, 2025).

The literature suggests that AI analytics can enhance financial oversight and fraud detection when deployed as components of the federal financial control environment (Bora et al., 2021; Otia & Bracci, 2022). Their value lies in enabling continuous, population-level monitoring and more targeted use of audit and investigative resources (Herr, 2025; Yadava et al., 2025). However, these gains are conditional. Without integration into financial systems, attention to data governance, and alignment with audit and accountability requirements, AI-driven oversight tools risk functioning as opaque technical overlays rather than as instruments that strengthen federal financial stewardship (Bignami, 2022; Brand et al., 2025).

4.2 Business Intelligence and Decision Support in Federal Financial Management.

In addition to detection of fraud, the literature also notes an increasing area of AI-based business analytics involvement in aiding decision-making and monetary management in U.S. federal programs (Ho, 2024; Bouchetara et al., 2024). These applications can expand the scope of analytics beyond detecting malpractices by studying spending patterns and make predictions on budget constraints and budget pressures and notify managerial control in different stages of the financial lifecycle (Alam et al., 2024; Celestin et al., 2025). The conventional federal-level budget oversight is extensively based on the past trends and the periodical reporting and prevents agencies to foresee the arising financial risks (Lee et al., 2020; Fisher, 2022). Predictors are the expenditure data and program usage models that make it possible to identify the possible cost overruns, underutilization of appropriations, and spending deviations earlier, which are expected (Campbell et al., 2024; Alam et al., 2024).

The literature also underlines that this proactive potential can be especially beneficial in large and complicated programs when the financial situation changes at a very fast pace (Ho, 2024; Celestin et al., 2025). Another change that is noted in the literature is the move towards continuous financial monitoring (Herr, 2025). AI-based systems are able to analyse large transaction data within near real time and provide continuous insight into program activities, as opposed to quarterly or annual reviews (Padovani and Iacuzzi, 2021; Herr, 2025). Continuous monitoring helps in earlier intervention in case of an irregularity or inefficiency, but research warns that its success rests on the ability of the agencies to interpret and respond to the outputs of the analytics (Sirait et al., 2025). The lack of organizational preparation leads to the fact that without it, the consequences of continuous monitoring may be the presence of uninfluential information (Ilori, 2024). Business analytics is also utilized in decision support of program and performance management through the combination of financial data and performance measurements (Bora et al., 2021; Campbell et al., 2024). These systems help uphold legislative anticipations that the agencies can illustrate the way resources are converted into output (Kim and Park, 2023). Nevertheless, throughout the literature, there is a persistent caution that analytics may tend to display the form of correlations but not causal relations and a human judgment is necessary when analysing results (Buckley et al., 2021). Accordingly, the concept of AI-assisted decision support is positioned as a sort of supplement instead of substituting managerial decision-making (Fletcher and Le, 2021; Bignami, 2022). Another area of application is process-oriented analytics (workflow and process mining) (Otia and Bracci, 2022). These tools reveal inefficiencies and eliminate redundancy easily spotted in the transaction data among actual procurement, payment, and grant management processes that otherwise are challenging to locate with conventional reporting (Padovani and Iacuzzi, 2021; Otia and Bracci, 2022). In the literature, materialized efficiency gains are realized when agencies are ready to redesign the process and not see the findings of analytic results (Ilori, 2024). Although it has such advantages, literature in the literature reveals consistent limitations. The utilization of decision support analytics is often low because of low analytical literacy rates, organizational habits, and the lack of a robust inclusion in the decision-making process (Zhu, 2022; Sirait et al., 2025). Poor predictive insights are also compromised by the lack of data fragmentation and inconsistent data quality (Bora et al., 2021; Alam et al., 2024). There is also the issue of accountability, where analytics affects resource distribution or prioritization without proper transparency or documentation (Bignami, 2022; Brand et al., 2025). Research emphasizes that maintaining responsibility and auditability requires traceability between the results of analytic outputs and the activities of managers (Brand et al., 2025; Yadava et al., 2025). Devoid of proper governing, the decision support systems can blur responsibility as opposed to strengthening it (Aldemir and Ucma Uysal, 2025). Nevertheless, its performance relies on the integration of governance, the integrity of data, and organizational capability (Sirait et al., 2025; Aldemir and Ucma Uysal, 2025). The analytics that stand outside of decision-making systems and accountability frameworks are little valuable and can bring new risks, which does strengthen the need to incorporate AI into the known system of federal financial governance (Bignami, 2022; Brand et al., 2025).

4.3 Explainability, Auditability and Trust

Unlike the situation in the private-sector setting, where the opaque models can be accepted due to the benefits associated with the performance, the federal financial systems are regulated by rigorous legal, audit, and democratic accountability frameworks requiring transparency, traceability, and explanation of the decision that impact the public funds (Fletcher & Le, 2021; Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025). Empirical research highlights that in cases where audit-targeting, fraud detection, eligibility, or resource decisions are guided by AI systems, regulatory agencies need to understand how the analytic reports are formed (Fonner & Coyle, 2024; Brand et al., 2025).

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 2 | February 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

This understanding requires understanding in relation to the data inputs, risk indicators, model logic, and the decision thresholds (Kuiper et al., 2021; Brand et al., 2025). The lack of such transparency makes it difficult for auditors and inspectors general to decide whether or not the outputs of the analytic processes meet statutory definitions of fraud, improper payment, or non-compliance and evaluate whether agency actions are justifiable under administrative law (Bignami, 2022; Fonner & Coyle, 2024). Traditional federal audits are based on reproducible decision-making, written information, and consistent control reasoning (Mattei et al., 2021). The AI systems make this paradigm more complex as they introduce the concept of probabilistic reasoning, adaptive algorithms, and changing data environments (Kuiper et al., 2021; Duan, 2022). The literature highlights that the trained models that would be based on historical data might change over time through retraining, and results can be affected by the complex interplay of many variables (Brand et al., 2025). In the absence of strict documentation and maintained audit trails, analytic systems cannot facilitate audit assurance or enforcement activities (Otia & Bracci, 2022; Brand et al., 2025). Some of the researchers point out that auditability is not just a technical access to the model. It relies on the institutionalized documentation practices that capture the model development decisions, validation procedures, performance metrics, and governance deliberations (Brand et al., 2025; Yadava et al., 2025; Amoako et al, 2025).

Accountability is compromised when documentation is informal or incomplete despite good technical performance by models (Bignami, 2022; Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025). The conceptualization of explainability and auditability, in turn, takes the form of system-design requirements that should be embedded throughout the analytic lifecycle as opposed to being addressed after the fact (Yadava et al., 2025). The literature depicts trust as a requirement to the continued implementation of analytics and a product of good governance (Fletcher & Le, 2021; Qadri, 2025). The internal trust between auditors, financial managers, and program officials depends on the belief that the analytic systems are dependable, interpretable, and consistent with the oversight functions (Otia & Bracci, 2022; Brand et al., 2025). The trust of Congress, oversight institutions, and the general population, in particular, is external and relies on the transparency and the ability to examine the role of AI in financial decision-making (Bignami, 2022; Qadri, 2025). Perceptions of opaque or unaccountable systems lead to the undermining of their legitimacy irrespective of the performance benefits (Fletcher & Le, 2021). The literature also highlights the issue of human supervision in maintaining the trust (Buckley et al., 2021). The AI-driven analytics are most justifiable when they assist, but not replace professional judgment (Buckley et al., 2021; Fletcher & Le, 2021). The clear differentiation between automated analysis and human decision-making can maintain accountability since the responsibility of the outcomes would be left to the authorized officials (Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025). In cases of ambiguous boundaries, the responsibility is diffused among the systems, developers and users, thus undermining oversight (Bignami, 2022). Explainability and trust are also complicated by bias and data quality (Mania, 2022; Kuiper et al., 2021). Research shows that AI systems that are fed historical financial data can be indicative of historical enforcement trends or systemic biases (Mania, 2022; Araújo, 2025). Unless there are systems that detect bias, are validated, and periodically reviewed, analytic products can give disproportionate flags on specific programs, contractors, or populations (Bignami, 2022; Brand et al., 2025). This risk increases the need to have transparent models and reviewable decision logic, especially in situations where the analytic output is used as an input to the enforcement or funding decisions (Kuiper et al., 2021; Yadava et al., 2025). Artificial Intelligence systems that improve detection or efficiency but cannot be explained, audited, or governed according to the public-finance accountability principles prove to be counterproductive to oversight and do not strengthen it (Fletcher & Le, 2021; Fonner & Coyle, 2024). These observations support the necessity of analytics frameworks to incorporate transparency and audit needs at the system design, governance, and operation levels, as opposed to considering them as peripheral concerns (Brand et al., 2025; Yadava et al., 2025).`

IDENTIFIED GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

5.1 The Absence of Integrated Frameworks

A profound gap identified in the body of research on artificial intelligence and business analytics in government financial management is the lack of comprehensive frameworks that integrate AI analytics with federal financial management, governance structures, and audit (Bignami, 2022; Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025). Current studies emphasize independent components such as fraud detection algorithms and predictive models without addressing how these elements operate within the complete lifecycle of federal financial oversight (Das et al., 2023; Bouchetara et al., 2024). Because of this, the literature provides limited information on how agencies should develop, implement, and govern analytics systems that simultaneously meet technical performance goals and statutory accountability requirements (Fonner & Coyle, 2024; Yadava et al., 2025).

While several studies recognize the importance of governance, accountability, and ethics, these considerations are mostly viewed as contextual concerns rather than fundamental design constraints (Bignami, 2022; Fletcher & Le, 2021). The absence of integrative models renders practitioners without a clear direction for embedding analytics into accounting controls, audit processes, and oversight institutions (Otia & Bracci, 2022; Brand et al., 2025).

5.2 Weak Integration with Federal Audit and Oversight Functions

Another critical gap identified is the limited integration between AI analytics research and federal audit practice (Otia & Bracci, 2022; Brand et al., 2025). Although auditability and explainability are frequently recognized as important principles, few studies address how AI systems can be structured to produce evidence that meets federal audit standards or supports inspector general and GAO review (Bignami, 2022; Fonner & Coyle, 2024). Questions related to documentation requirements, audit trail generation, validation of probabilistic outputs, and assessment of adaptive models remain largely underdeveloped (Brand et al., 2025; Yadava et al., 2025).

The literature rarely examines how traditional audit methodologies should evolve to accommodate analytics-driven oversight or how audit independence can be preserved when oversight bodies rely on agency-developed models and data pipelines (Mattei et al., 2021; Otia & Bracci, 2022). This omission is particularly consequential given that audit assurance is an important aspect of federal financial accountability (Bignami, 2022; Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025).

5.3 Limited Alignment with Federal Accountability Standards

Most existing studies treat government finance as a variant of private-sector analytics, accounting insufficiently for the distinctive accountability standards that govern federal financial management (Bignami, 2022; Buckley et al., 2021). Democratic accountability, legal due process, appropriations control, and public transparency impose limitations that extend beyond efficiency and accuracy considerations (Bandy, 2023; Lee et al., 2020). Yet many technical studies evaluate AI systems primarily on predictive performance, detection rates, or cost savings, with limited discussion of how these systems align with statutory requirements or oversight expectations (Bouchetara et al., 2024; Vyas, 2025).

This disjunction is indicative of the manner of conceptualizing accountability as an external limitation and not as an internal design imperative (Bignami, 2022; Aldemir and Ucma Uysal, 2025). Therefore, the literature does not give much background on how analytics systems may be shaped to enhance fiscal, legal, performance, and democratic accountability at the same time (Fonner & Coyle, 2024).

5.4 Focus on Technical Tools with limited attention on Governance and Institutions

The literature highlights an imbalance between technical innovation and institutional analysis (Bouchetara et al., 2024; Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025). Research on algorithms, models, and analytic techniques significantly outpaces examination of governance structures, organizational responsibility, and oversight mechanisms (Bignami, 2022; Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025). While several studies recognize risks such as bias, opacity, or automation overreach, fewer explore how institutional arrangements, such as ownership, approval authority, or escalation pathways, shape the real-world impact of AI systems (Buckley et al., 2021; Fonner & Coyle, 2024).

This excessive focus on tools clouds the fact that the results of analytics are mediated by organizational capacity, levels of governance maturity, and decision-making structures (Sirait et al., 2025; Ilori, 2024). The literature also runs the risk of driving the transformative potential of AI excessively, and underestimating the conditions that must be in place before accountable deployment occurs unless these institutional dimensions are addressed (Bora et al., 2021; Yadava et al., 2025).

5.5 Implementation and Operational Constraints, and limited evidence on long-term sustainability and lifecycle governance

Another concern lies in the limited treatment of implementation challenges specific to federal financial management (Sirait et al., 2025; Ilori, 2024). Many studies describe AI applications in ideal settings, with little attention to data fragmentation, legacy systems, workforce constraints, procurement rules, and interagency coordination challenges (Otia & Bracci, 2022; Padovani & Iacuzzi, 2021). These operational realities significantly affect whether analytics initiatives succeed or fail, yet they receive limited systematic analysis (Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025). As a result, the literature frequently underestimates the organizational change required to operationalize analytics at scale, including training auditors and financial managers, redesigning workflows, and sustaining systems over time (Ilori, 2024; Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025).

Most empirical studies highlight short-term outcomes from pilots or early deployments, offering limited insight into long-term performance, governance durability, and system evolution (Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025; Herr, 2025). Questions related to model drift, retraining frequency, documentation maintenance, staff turnover, and lifecycle costs remain largely unexplored (Brand et al., 2025; Duan, 2022). Given that federal financial systems operate over extended time horizons, this gap constrains the ability of agencies to assess the long-term implications of analytics adoption (Bora et al., 2021; Yadava et al., 2025).

5.6 Inadequate Treatment of Equity and Ethical Implications, and Fragmented Learning

Although concerns about algorithmic bias and fairness are increasingly acknowledged, the literature offers limited operational direction on how to examine and minimize ethical risks in federal financial analytics (Bignami, 2022; Buckley et al., 2021; Qadri, 2025). Few studies address how equity considerations should be incorporated into model design, validation, and oversight, or how agencies should evaluate the distributive effects of analytics-driven enforcement and monitoring (Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025; Bora et al., 2021). This gap is essential given the scale of federal programs and their impact on diverse populations and contractors (Kim & Park, 2023; Friedman et al., 2022).

Finally, the literature reflects fragmented learning across agencies, with limited synthesis of lessons learned or identification of common governance patterns (Sirait et al., 2025; Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2025). AI initiatives are mostly examined at the agency or program level, with little attention to cross-agency coordination, shared standards, or institutional learning (Skuza & Lizak, 2023; Otia & Bracci, 2022). This fragmentation contributes to inconsistent practices and limits the development of coherent federal approaches to analytics governance (Bignami, 2022; Aldemir & Ucma Uysal, 2025).

6. Proposed AI-Driven Business Analytics Framework

The gaps identified in the literature indicate that the primary challenge in applying AI to U.S. federal financial management is not analytical capability but the absence of governance-integrated design. In response, this study proposes an AI-driven business analytics framework explicitly structured around public finance accounting, audit practice, and federal accountability requirements.

The framework is designed to ensure that analytical capability is inseparable from governance, auditability, and human responsibility.

6.1 Framework Overview and Design Logic

The proposed framework is organized as a layered system in which each component supports a specific accountability function within federal financial management. The framework does not assume that all agencies will adopt identical technologies; it establishes governance and audit conditions that must be satisfied regardless of the analytical methods employed.

The framework is grounded in three design logics drawn from the literature:
First, AI systems must be embedded within existing federal financial management and audit structures rather than operating in parallel to them. Analytics outputs must support, not substitute for, accounting controls, audit judgment, and statutory oversight.

Second, accountability must be designed into analytics systems ex ante.
Third, responsibility for analytically informed decisions must remain clearly attributable to authorized officials. AI systems may support detection, prioritization, and monitoring, but they do not displace human accountability.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 2 | February 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

6.2 AI-Driven Business Analytics Framework for U.S. Federal Financial Management

Framework Layer	Primary Function	Key Components	Accountability and Audit Relevance
1. Data and Financial Systems Foundation	Establishes a reliable and auditable data environment for analytics	Integrated financial, grants, procurement, and payment data; standardized financial identifiers; documented data lineage; data quality controls; access and privacy safeguards	Ensures analytics inputs can be reconciled with official accounting records and financial statements; supports traceability required for audit evidence; reduces risk of analytics based on incomplete or inconsistent data
2. Analytics and Risk Detection Layer	Supports detection, prioritization, and monitoring of financial risks	Fraud and improper payment detection models; anomaly detection; predictive expenditure and risk scoring tools; process monitoring analytics	Enhances oversight efficiency by enabling population-level analysis rather than sampling; analytics outputs inform audit planning and risk assessment but do not replace audit judgment or enforcement authority
3. Explainability, Documentation, and Auditability Layer	Makes analytics outputs transparent, reviewable, and defensible	Model documentation; explainability tools; version control; validation records; system-generated audit trails; performance monitoring	Allows auditors and inspectors general to reconstruct how analytics outputs were produced and used; ensures outputs meet standards for sufficiency, reliability, and documentation; supports legal and administrative review
4. Governance and Oversight Integration Layer	Assigns responsibility and embeds analytics within oversight structures	Formal governance bodies; model approval and review protocols; human oversight requirements; escalation and incident response procedures	Maintains clear accountability for analytically informed decisions; prevents diffusion of responsibility across technical systems; ensures analytics remain subject to statutory oversight and audit independence
5. Organizational Capacity and Sustainability Layer	Enables long-term, responsible use of analytics	Workforce training; cross-functional collaboration; leadership sponsorship; lifecycle planning; knowledge management	Reduces dependence on contractors or opaque systems; supports continuity as staff and systems change; ensures analytics remain aligned with evolving audit standards and policy requirements

6.3 How the Framework Addresses Identified Gaps

The proposed framework directly responds to the deficiencies identified in the literature. It shifts emphasis from technical novelty to governance fitness and institutional responsibility. Most importantly, the framework reframes AI not as a decision-making authority but as a governance instrument that strengthens existing financial controls. By anchoring analytics within accounting systems, audit standards, and oversight institutions, the framework aligns analytical innovation with the foundational principles of federal financial management.

The synthesis demonstrates that AI-driven analytics strengthen accountability only when they are explicitly embedded within established public finance accounting systems, audit standards, and statutory oversight arrangements. Treating AI governance as a parallel policy domain risks producing analytically sophisticated systems that remain detached from appropriations control, audit documentation requirements, and legal accountability mechanisms. By contrast, the framework positions analytics as an extension of the federal financial control environment, requiring traceable data flows, documented analytical logic, and alignment with existing financial reporting and compliance structures. This integration clarifies how AI systems are expected to support transparency, auditability, and lawful stewardship of public funds, rather than operating as opaque technical enhancements.

The framework also reframes audit assurance in AI-enabled financial management environments. As analytics increasingly shape fraud detection, risk prioritization, and monitoring decisions, audit responsibility must extend beyond validating financial outcomes to evaluating the governance of analytical systems themselves. This includes assessing data quality controls, model documentation, validation processes, and the presence of defined human oversight points. Importantly, this does not imply that auditors must replicate or redesign analytical models, but that they must be able to independently evaluate whether AI-enabled systems meet established standards of audit evidence, transparency, and accountability. Without such governance integration, reliance on analytics embedded within agency systems risks weakening audit independence and assurance. The framework therefore, situates AI oversight within the core mandate of federal audit institutions, ensuring that analytical innovation reinforces, rather than displaces, established accountability structures.

Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the review is based on an integrative approach rather than a systematic review. While this design is appropriate for synthesizing interdisciplinary and policy-oriented literature, it does not aim to exhaustively capture all available studies on AI and government financial management. As a result, some relevant empirical work may not have been included.

Second, the analysis relies heavily on published academic literature and federal oversight and policy documents. These sources provide valuable insights into design, governance, and oversight considerations but may not fully reflect informal practices, unpublished pilot evaluations, or internal agency experiences that shape AI implementation in practice. Third, the study focuses specifically on the U.S. federal context. Although many findings may be informative for other jurisdictions, differences in legal frameworks, audit institutions, and financial governance structures limit direct generalization to state, local, or international settings.

Finally, the proposed framework is conceptual and has not been empirically validated through implementation or field testing. Its effectiveness will depend on how agencies adapt it to their institutional capacities, data environments, and oversight arrangements. Future research should evaluate the framework through applied case studies and longitudinal analysis.

Conclusion

This study examined how AI-driven business analytics can strengthen accountability and transparency in U.S. federal financial management. The review indicates that while analytics improve fraud detection, risk monitoring, and oversight efficiency, these benefits occur only when AI systems are embedded within established public finance accounting, audit, and governance structures. Analytics deployed as standalone technical tools risk increasing opacity, weakening audit assurance, and diffusing responsibility.

The synthesis of literature across public finance, audit practice, and AI governance demonstrates that responsible AI use is characterized by traceability, auditability, documented analysis logic, and well-defined human control. The proposed framework reframes AI not as a substitute for financial controls or audit judgment, but as a governance instrument operating within statutory and institutional accountability regimes.

Further studies should focus on longitudinal and implementation-oriented research on audit integration, model development, and institutional capacity development. Enhancing the financial accountability of the federal government will require less technological advancement than governmental alignment and effective supervision.

REFRENCES

1. *Adepoju, A. S., & Chinonyerem, C. A. (2025). Advancing good governance through AI-powered oversight in the United States: Risks and opportunities for public institutions. International Journal of Humanities, Literature and Art Research.*
2. *Alam, M. K., Mahmud, M. A., & Islam, M. S. (2024). The AI-powered treasury: A data-driven approach to managing America's fiscal future. Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies, 6(2), 236–256.*
3. *Aldemir, C., & Uçma Uysal, T. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for financial accountability and governance in the public sector: Strategic opportunities and challenges. Administrative Sciences, 15(2), 58.*
4. *Amoako, D., Boboye, C. O., Boateng, V., & Laryea, J. E. N.-L. (2025). Artificial intelligence and machine learning for fraud detection in the U.S. banking industry: Regulatory frameworks, implementation, and challenges. EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review, 13(9). https://doi.org/10.36713/epra23647*
5. *Araújo, R. A. (2025). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in fraud detection: Practical applications, predictive models, and ethical risks. Revista fisio&terapia, 10(2). https://doi.org/10.69849/revistaft/ra10202509071822*
6. *Bandy, G. (2023). Financial management and accounting in the public sector. Routledge.*
7. *Bignami, F. (2022). Artificial intelligence accountability of public administration. The American Journal of Comparative Law, 70(Supplement_1), i312–i346.*
8. *Bora, I., Duan, H. K., Vasarhelyi, M. A., Zhang, C., & Dai, J. (2021). The transformation of government accountability and reporting. Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting, 18(2), 1–21.*

9. *Bouchetara, M., Zerouti, M., & Zouambi, A. R. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence (AI) in public sector financial risk management: Innovations, challenges, and future directions. EDPACS, 69(9), 124–144.*
10. *Brand, D., Hoffmann, M., & Van der Merwe, J. (2025). Development of effective methods and tools for the auditing AI algorithms by Supreme Audit Institutions. JeDEM – eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government, 17(3), 106–140.*
11. *Buckley, R. P., Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., & Tang, B. W. (2021). Regulating artificial intelligence in finance: Putting the human in the loop. Sydney Law Review, 43(1), 43–81.*
12. *Campbell, A. A., Adeusi, K. B., Adeusi, S. O., Adejumo, T. O., & Ajayi, S. A. (2024). The role of AI-powered financial analytics in shaping economic policy: A new era for risk management and national growth in the United States. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 23(3). https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.23.3.2963*
13. *Celestin, M., Mishra, S., & Mishra, A. K. (2025). The future of public financial management in the digital era: How AI and blockchain are reshaping government accountability and transparency. Poornaprajna International Journal of Emerging Technologies (PIJET), 2(2), 129–147.*
14. *Dako, O. F., Onalaja, T. A., Nwachukwu, P. S., Ajoke, F., & Bankole, T. L. (2021). Predictive risk-based auditing utilizing data models to proactively identify organizational vulnerabilities and mitigate losses. Journal of Risk Management, 15(3), 45–67.*
15. *Das, R. A. H. U. L., Sirazy, M. R. M., Khan, R. S., & Rahman, S. H. A. R. I. F. U. R. (2023). A collaborative intelligence (CI) framework for fraud detection in US federal relief programs. Applied Research in Artificial Intelligence and Cloud Computing, 6(9), 47–59.*
16. *Dixon, R. (2023). Federal pandemic spending.*
17. *Duan, H. K. (2022). The applications of exogenous data and emerging technologies in accounting and auditing (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey, Graduate School–Newark).*
18. *Eric Asamoah, & Jehu Emefa Nii-Laryea Laryea. (2025). Leveraging Artificial Intelligence for Advanced Deal Sourcing in U.S. Mergers and Acquisitions to Improve Financial Efficiency. Sarcouncil Journal of Multidisciplinary, 5(10), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17400663*
19. *Farazmand, A. (Ed.). (2023). Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance. Springer Nature.*
20. *Fisher, R. C. (2022). State and local public finance. Routledge.*
21. *Fletcher, G. G. S., & Le, M. M. (2021). The future of AI accountability in the financial markets. Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment & Technology Law, 24, 289.*
22. *Fonner, D. F., & Coyle, F. P. (2024, December). Responsible AI for government program evaluation and performance audits. In 2024 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData) (pp. 8222–8224). IEEE.*
23. *Friedman, H. H., Fischer, D., & Schochet, S. (2022). The harmful effects of wasteful spending. Review of Contemporary Philosophy, 21, 7–20.*
24. *Herr, P. R. (2025). Real-time auditing: A tool to enhance good governance and accountability for public funds. International Journal of Government Auditing, 52(3), 51–56.*
25. *Ho, C. C. (2024). Can AI transform public sector financial management? Journal of Government Financial Management, 73(1).*
26. *Ilori, O. (2024). Internal audit transformation in the era of digital governance: A roadmap for public and private sector synergy. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies, 4(6), 1887–1904.*
27. *Kim, Y., & Park, Y. J. (2023). Does accountability improve government performance? Evidence from the US state fiscal monitoring and intervention systems. Public Management Review, 25(10), 1903–1925.*
28. *Kom, L. (2020). Investigations of fraud, waste, abuse, and corruption in the public sector: A survey of organizational and software-based aids and obstructions.*
29. *Kuiper, O., van den Berg, M., van der Burgt, J., & Leijnen, S. (2021, November). Exploring explainable AI in the financial sector: Perspectives of banks and supervisory authorities. In Benelux Conference on Artificial Intelligence (pp. 105–119). Springer.*
30. *Lee, R. D., Jr., Johnson, R. W., & Joyce, P. G. (2020). Public budgeting systems. Jones & Bartlett Learning.*
31. *Manes-Rossi, F., Aversano, N., & Tartaglia Polcini, P. (2020). Popular reporting: Learning from the US experience. Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management, 32(1), 92–113.*
32. *Mania, B. (2022). Big data and artificial intelligence: An examination of the existing legal framework from a privacy perspective.*
33. *Otia, J. E., & Bracci, E. (2022). Digital transformation and the public sector auditing: The SAI's perspective. Financial Accountability & Management, 38(2), 252–280.*
34. *Oyeyemi, D.O., Okosieme, O.O., Idowu-Kunlere, T., Okosieme, O., Moussa, A.H., & Julius, E.A. (2025). AI-Driven Credit Risk Models for Small-Scale Lending: A Business Analytics Framework for Predictive Performance and Responsible Deployment. International Journal of Science and Research Archive.*
35. *Padovani, E., & Iacuzzi, S. (2021). Real-time crisis management: Testing the role of accounting in local governments. Journal of Accounting and Public Policy, 40(3), 106854.*
36. *Qadri, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence and public administration: Actors, governance and policies. Social Science Review Archives, 3(4), 3200–3212.*

37. *Quijano-Cabezas, P. A., Escobar-Marulanda, C. A., Restrepo-Carmona, J. A., & Jiménez-Builes, J. A. (2025). Future potential of intelligent systems in fiscal oversight: A systematic review. Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2025(1), 5770257.*
38. *Sirait, E., Zuiderwijk, A., & Janssen, M. (2025). Understanding government's AI readiness in public financial management: A case study of AI for financial advisors.*
39. *Skuza, S., & Lizak, R. (2023). AI enables the control of public finances: US federal government initiatives. Bialostockie Studia Prawnicze, 28, 175.*
40. *Venable, L. T. (2021). Audit of the Department of Defense compliance in FY 2020 with improper payment reporting requirements.*
41. *Vyas, A. (2025). Revolutionizing risk: The role of artificial intelligence in financial risk management, forecasting, and global implementation. Forecasting and Global Implementation.*
42. *Yadava, A., Gadam, H., & Chilukala, R. (2025). Enhancing fiscal accountability and auditability: A framework for deploying generative AI process agents in public sector financial ERPs. Lex Localis, 23(S6), 2311–2326.*
43. *Yavuz, E., & Özgül, H. B. (2025). The role of AI in public budget processes: A comparative evaluation on national AI strategies and practical examples. Sayıştay Dergisi, 36(138), 575–602.*
44. *Yeboah, M. M., Agyei, E., Anim, B., Nwinyi, P. & Nartey, O. L. "AI in Financial Auditing: Addressing U.S. AuditFailures and Strengthening PCAOB/SEC Compliance." Sarcouncil Journal of Economics and Business Management5.1 (2026): pp 23-32.*
45. *Yeboah, M.M., Nartey, O., Agyei, E., & Anim, B. (2026). AI and Blockchain in Forensic Auditing: A Review of Tools for Investigating Financial Crimes in the U.S. International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research.*
46. *Zhu, L. (2022). Exploring the significance of digital skills training for accountants (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).*
47. *Zimbe, T. T., Adeusi, K. B., Adeusi, S. O., Adejumo, T. O., & Ajayi, S. A. (2025). Designing and evaluating AI-powered predictive models for detecting unemployment insurance fraud: A data-driven approach to enhancing the integrity of U.S. public benefit systems. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 16(1).*