Cuadernos de Economía (2024) Volume 47, Issue 133, 105-120

Asociación Cuadernos de economía

Cuadernos de economía

www.cude.es

ARTÍCULO

A Review of Network Financial Recovery and Its Regulatory Applications in Financial Systematic Risk Regulations

Kim Hieu Bui[1], Quynh Pham Thi Thai[2*], Van Phuoc Nguyen[3*], Ngoc Anh Dao Nguyen[4]

[1] Faculty of Laws, Ho Chi Minh City University of Foreign Languages and Information Technology, 828 Su Van Hanh, Ward 13, District 10, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.
[2] Department of Marketing, Economic Research Institute of Post and Telecommunication, Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology, Km 10 Nguyen Trai, Ha Dong, Ha Noi, Vietnam.
[3] Faculty of Business Administration, Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology, Km 10 Nguyen Trai, Ha Dong, Ha Noi, Vietnam.
[4] Faculty of Law and Economics, Ho Chi Minh University of Banking, 36 Ton That Dam Street, Nguyen Thai Binh ward, District 1, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

**Corresponding Author: quynhptt@ptit.edu.vn and phuocnv@ptit.edu.vn*

Jel Codes:
G10, G15, G20, G23, G38

Keywords:
Network Financials, Network Recovery, Stability of Financial Regulations, Systematic Risks.

Abstract: Ensuring the stability of financial regulations is crucial for protecting against various financial risks such as inflation, interest rates, war, recessions, currency fluctuations, market crashes, economic downturns, and other systemic threats. The interconnectedness and complexity of existing fiscal markets make the recovery of their network essential for assessing the financial system's ability to mitigate threats. This study aimed to evaluate the quality, reliability, and validity of the reviewed studies to ensure the credibility and robustness of the findings and conclusions derived from the literature. The study synthesised the literature review findings. A qualitative analysis was conducted to comprehensively review the regulatory applications of network financial recovery in mitigating systematic risks. A comparative analysis was conducted to evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, and effectiveness of different regulatory measures in addressing financial systemic risks. The study aimed to evaluate the literature, methodologies, and empirical studies on network financial recovery and its regulatory applications. This study provides a comprehensive analysis of network recovery in the financial industry, focusing on key research advancements in network recovery, finance networks, and regulatory frameworks. In addition, we look at the basic parts and uses of network financial (NetFin) resilience processes in fiscal policy. These include NetFin data, networks, recovery measurements, financial regulatory technology, and regulatory applications. Ultimately, we analyse current issues and propose potential research endeavours within the realm of recovery-based regulation of financial systematic risks.

Author Correspondence: quynhptt@ptit.edu.vn and phuocnv@ptit.edu.vn

https://doi.org/10.32826/cude.v47i133.1311

Introduction

The key objective of stabilising financial regulations is to concentrate on the risks that financial industries face in the realm of finance. It is a crucial element in safeguarding the nation's financial stability. Ever since the 2008 financial crisis, the world has been grappling with the challenge of safeguarding against systemic risks in the financial sector. Several countries have strengthened the oversight of their financial systems at both the macro and micro levels. Macroprudence primarily emphasises countercyclical management and the regulation of key financial sectors to prevent potential risks to the overall financial system. Microprudential supervision focuses on ensuring compliance and managing the risk exposure of specific financial industries. It pays close attention to individual risk management and behavioural standards (Lui, 2010). In addition, various financial regulatory standards have been implemented to manage risks within the financial system. The financial performance measures show an elevated level of risk insurance, which was emphasised by the Basel III supportive monetary system in 2010. This includes regulations on leverage ratios, countercyclical cash metrics, proposals for liquidity coverage ratios, the gross secure investment ratio, and other liquidity safety regulations. Several previous studies have utilised a similar approach to thoroughly analyse the financial recovery of networks and the resulting regulatory implications. Based on a study conducted by Ellis, Sharma, & Brzeszczyński (2022), this research delves into the concept of systemic risk in financial systems and examines the interconnectedness of financial organisations. As per the study conducted by (Caccioli, Barucca, & Kobayashi, 2018), network models are utilised to analyse the stability of financial systems, with a particular focus on the transmission of shocks and the resilience of networks. The study conducted by Poledna et al. (2021) utilises network analytic methodologies to gain insights into the structure and stability of financial systems, with a particular emphasis on systemic risk. Based on the research conducted by Roukny, Battiston, & Stiglitz (2018), this study seeks to examine the complex connections between financial institutions and the potential outcomes of systemic risk. The findings will provide valuable insights into the necessary regulatory measures needed to effectively reduce these risks (Xie et al., 2022). This research endeavour seeks to investigate the influence of network architecture on the emergence of systemic risk and analyse various models based on network theory to better understand the vulnerability of financial systems. This study provides a thorough analysis of existing academic research and explores the practical applications of regulations. It offers valuable insights into efforts to improve the stability of the financial system and reduce systemic risks. The study compiled the findings from the literature review. A qualitative analysis was conducted to offer a thorough examination of the different regulatory applications of network financial recovery in addressing systematic risks. A thorough analysis was conducted to evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, and effectiveness of different regulatory measures in addressing financial systematic risks. I conducted a thorough analysis of the current literature, methodologies, and empirical studies pertaining to network financial recovery and its regulatory applications.

Financial markets today are highly interconnected and complex networks. Due to the exponential expansion of the Internet and digital finance, different sectors of the financial industry have become interconnected through various financial exchanges. These sectors include property insurance, stock funds, and the ownership of financial derivative products. As regional financial convergence advanced, various associations of financial industries emerged, including Europe's banking unions and the United Kingdom's credit unions. Through financial exchanges, these unions have the potential to collectively reduce financial risks and strengthen the financial system's capacity to address uncertainties. However, they can also hide the potential for financial risks that could threaten local financial security. Thus, the main objective of financial regulations is to maintain the stability of network financials (NetFins) created by various financial industries through financial exchanges (Amini, Cont, & Minca, 2016).

This study emphasizes the importance of effective network financial recovery mechanisms in mitigating the risk of systemic failure. If one of the closely interconnected financial institutions fails, it can set off a chain reaction leading to a widespread crisis. This was evident during the global financial crisis, as the failure of several major banks triggered a series of collapses that had significant consequences for the global economy. This study aimed to tackle this issue by conducting a comprehensive review of the current literature and empirical studies on network financial recovery. The text identified regulatory applications implemented to enhance financial stability and mitigate systemic risks. The study aims to provide policymakers and regulators with insights and recommendations for enhancing the resilience and stability of financial systems by analysing the efficacy of these regulatory measures. Identifying and assessing systemic risks presents a significant challenge in the network financial recovery process. The complex relationships and intricate nature of financial institutions make it difficult to accurately measure and comprehend the potential ripple effects of their collapse. Conventional risk management methods frequently overlook these interconnected threats, leading to insufficient regulatory responses.

Network recovery refers to the ability of the affiliated entity network to recognise, react to, and resume regular business activities after network security events. Several studies have explored this topic (Acemoglu, Ozdaglar, & Tahbaz-Salehi, 2015; Almoghathawi & Barker, 2019; Chabot, Bertrand, & Thorez, 2019; Gao et al., 2015). The network recovery of regional financial systematic refers to the financial entity network's capacity to effectively address financial security crises. These crises are marked by systematic financial risks and require the network to possess the ability to identify and process these risks, absorb losses, maintain proper functioning safety measures, and continuously improve training and resilience. Enhancing financial reforms requires a strong and reliable NetFins system. The strong networking resilience of regions and the collaboration among small and medium-sized financial industries are closely interconnected and crucial in safeguarding against threats and maintaining the stability of the regional financial and securities sectors. Despite the potential recovery of international financial markets, the evolution pathways and structure of regional NetFins remain complex and diverse, posing a threat to the spread mechanics. As a result, regional NetFins face a variety of obstacles in assessing and controlling risks. Initially, various external factors can affect the process of network recovery. The COVID-19 pandemic influences the current financial market. The current market conditions are characterized by an economic downturn, unpredictability and instability, risks associated with liquidity and credit, and additional factors that intertwine or compound the aforementioned causes. Furthermore, we still lack a full understanding of the precise workings of the NetFins structure and its impact on network recovery. Usually, the structure of NetFins is irregular and unpredictable, and it is still unclear how network complexity impacts recovery. Furthermore, the existing monitoring technology for recovering NetFins is inadequate. NetFin's recovery fluctuates over time, necessitating regular monitoring at different stages of its development to assess its strength and capabilities.

Currently, monitoring relies primarily on micro- and macroprudential measures. From a technological standpoint, network power systems use deep learning techniques and advanced indicators to enhance their structural features. There is a need to explore and utilise other regulation technologies that have not been fully utilised. Additionally, it is crucial to continue developing smart automation techniques. Lately, the measurement and evaluation of financial stabilisation systems has gained significant attention in financial regulations due to a fresh perspective on recovery (Porter, 2010). The network structure, recovery characterization, and recovery assessment of financial industries can be utilised to evaluate the stability of the financial system (Amini et al., 2016). This study primarily examines the structural properties of NetFins, measurement of network recovery, characterization of financial recovery, and recovery-based regulatory strategies. Research on financial system recovery can reduce direct involvement in the financial market, as opposed to macro- and microprudential financial regulatory strategies. Thus, fostering and enhancing the NetFin recovery is essential for bolstering the efficacy of financial regulations.

This study investigates the origins of recovery literature review, the concepts and implications of financial recovery, the methodology employed by NetFins, and the utilisation of NetFins monitoring to gain a comprehensive understanding of the network recovery of NetFins. Subsequently, we examine the core principles of various recent studies to evaluate the main strategies and patterns in utilising NetFins recovery for financial monitoring. In addition, we provide recommendations for future research and highlight major challenges. Through the successful implementation of our methodology, we analyse significant papers from the Web of Science. The search keywords consist of three categories: "Internet recovery + finance," "finance + recovery," and "complex network analysis + recovery." We evaluate publications on financial regulations and finance risks. This strategy aims to generate new perspectives on the development of financial regulation and financial regulatory technologies, as well as a research focus on the ongoing stabilisation of NetFins.

The study's most significant finding is the intricate relationship between financial institutions and markets. The study illustrates the interconnectivity of financial institutions through a complex network of relationships and transactions, highlighting their lack of independence. The interconnectedness of institutions can lead to the rapid propagation of failure or distress, potentially destabilising the entire financial system. Regulators can develop effective measures to identify and mitigate potential sources of systemic risk by recognising and mapping these interrelationships. The study also makes a significant contribution by analysing network financial recovery mechanisms. Network financial recovery refers to the ability of financial institutions to collectively recover from financial distress. The study examines the effectiveness of different recovery mechanisms in reducing systematic risk, including bailouts, mergers, and recapitalization. The importance of coordination and cooperation among regulators, central banks, and financial institutions in implementing recovery measures is emphasised.

The study examines the concept of network financial recovery, which pertains to the ability of financial institutions to endure losses and recover their financial position during periods of financial turmoil. The concept is crucial as it offers understanding of financial resilience and shock resistance. The studies investigate different network financial recovery mechanisms and tools, including capital reserves, stress testing, and resolution frameworks. The study's authors examine the involvement of central banks, regulators, and international organisations in promoting and monitoring network financial recovery. This study investigates the regulatory applications of network financial recovery in the context of financial systematic risk regulations. Systemic risk is the possibility of a single financial institution or market failing and causing a ripple effect throughout the entire financial system. The study investigates the integration of network financial recovery measures into regulatory frameworks to mitigate risks.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 presents an overview of the main concepts related to NetFins and the advancement of financial recovery. In Section 2, the relationship between the structural properties of NetFins and financial stability is discussed in detail. Section 3 outlines the technical procedures of network recovery and its applications to financial stability regulations. Section 4 of the paper discusses the governance recovery in NetFins. Section 5 of this study examines the legal framework for financial stability with a specific emphasis on network resilience. It also delves into the intricacies of complexity and discusses relevant initiatives. Section 6 provides the concluding remarks for the paper.

This study investigates the regulatory implications of network financial recovery, providing policymakers vital insights for developing efficient policies aimed at preventing and effectively managing financial crises. In general, this study enriches our comprehension of network-based financial recovery and its significance in regulations that mitigate systemic risk. Thus, it contributes to the advancement of financial systems that are more robust and secure.

Literature Review

Financial Recovery

The research on social organisations included recovery as a factor to assess the risks and opposition faced by communities or associations in response to external shocks (Gao et al., 2015; Tu et al., 2017). This includes crisis response, urgent disaster prevention, and socioeconomic governance. Recovery systems should minimise the likelihood of failure, the extent of damage, and the time required for recovery (Yazıcıoğlu, Roozbehani, & Dahleh, 2016). Additionally, they should exhibit reliability, data duplication, inventiveness, and speed. Ultimately, recovery refers to the ability of networks to maintain stability and quickly bounce back from economic shocks, while efficiently allocating and optimising system resources.

Social recovery is distinct from ecological and engineering recovery as it focuses on interorganizational disruptions and the capacity for learning and development (Kaiser-Bunbury et al., 2017; Lusardi, Hasler, & Yakoboski, 2021). The study of network information and recovery is popular in the heavily interconnected modern world. The 2013 report by the US President on national security decisions included the concept of "recovery" (Department of Homeland Security, 2013). Assessing the recovery of NetFins is an effective method for implementing financial regulations in the current ecosystem.

Financial recovery involves analysing external factors that affect processes (Adner & Helfat, 2003). Moreover, a coherent explanation for financial recovery is lacking. The concept of financial recovery is typically characterised by three main factors: financial stability, functionality, and growth. The durability of a NetFin varies between community and nation, exhibiting significant differences compared to purely physical networks. Several studies have explored the connection between personal financial recovery and financial accessibility in the microscopic aspects of the financial sector. Chabot et al. (2019) investigated the resilience of the UK's financial system by analysing a relationship network in the credit-default swap markets. Lusardi et al. (2021) provided a definition of financial recovery as the ability of an individual to recover from adverse financial circumstances. The researchers introduced a multidimensional financial recovery evaluation index and determined that the adult population is prone to substantial financial vulnerabilities. The financial recovery of individuals and families is linked to their level of financial literacy (Barbera et al., 2017; McCloughan & Lyons, 2006). A series of case studies were conducted to assess the financial recovery capacity of 12 EU countries, including the United Kingdom, Austria, and Italy. The study revealed a correlation between financial resilience and self-regulation, temperance, and responsive adaptation.

Thus, recovery is influenced by both internal and external factors. Financial recovery involves risk management, prevention, response, training, and evaluation as independent factors, and financial stability, service, and reform as dependent variables. Its purpose is to support the overall economy, mitigate financial threats, and promote financial changes. Financial resilience can be assessed based on four dimensions: security, resumption capability, flexibility, and transformation ability.

NetFins and Their Conceptualizations

The financial sector is known for its rigorous and secure methods of data and information preservation. The vast amount of intelligent data stored in NetFins should be utilised to generate government knowledge on financial regulations, user profiles, and knowledge management models.

Object Network and Threat Information Mining for Finance

Financial companies in the financial market establish extensive networks through financial exchanges. The connections between financial industries are established through equity networks, which include collaborative financial assets, loan holdings, venture capital, access to credit, and cooperative guarantees. Additionally, trading networks such as capital exchange-like derivatives, trading, bonds, and financial derivatives funding serve as the basis for these connections. Simultaneously, top managers in regional financial industries form a social network based on their practical and professional expertise. A network of informational links is generated from firms' financial reports, financials, news, and penalty cases. Aisaiti et al. (2019) argued that systematically significant industries pose systematic risks in NetFins. Emiliano, Raffaele, & Lopreite (2018) utilised network analysis methods to examine the hierarchical relationships between capital investments and firm outcomes from a broader perspective beyond individual companies. The application discussed here pertains to supply chain finance and is developed by NetFins.

NetFins, like natural ecosystems, are complex power systems with diverse steady-state transfer conditions. Interconnected entities play a significant role in the spread of NetFin threats, which can result in a crash of the monetary system (Correa et al., 2021). The structure of NetFins is linked to the systematic risks of the financial system (Aisaiti et al., 2019). The interrelationship between bank threats can mutually influence each other, leading to a substantial impact on the accuracy of bank risk assessment. The stability of the underlying architecture of interconnected financial systems presents a risk to the overall financial system. The stability of the financial system requires the identification of system turning points, breakage points, and thresholds (Haldane & May, 2011). Financial stabilisation systems can be achieved through strict financial regulations and the development of risk defence capabilities (Currie, Gozman, & Seddon, 2018; Tang et al., 2018).

NetFins is the main platform for conducting financial functions and services, as well as transferring regional finance risks. The credit decisions and organisational behaviour are influenced by mutual infection and impact in the context of digitalization and networking, resulting in a complex dynamic process known as NetFin recovery. To fully define NetFin recovery, one must comprehend the interaction between different influencing variables and the adaptability of NetFin recovery.

NetFins Construction

The integration and expansion of big data are necessary to establish cohesive and novel data structures. The financial sector encompasses diverse network architectures. Financial firms establish relationships to create NetFins, which are utilised for finance risk analysis. Network analysis can be used to analyse the overall importance of NetFins and their intra- and interorganizational significance. de la Concha, Martinez-Jaramillo, & Carmona (2018) utilised the monetary transactions between small and medium-sized firms to create NetFins, which was then applied to evaluate the creditworthiness of these enterprises. Isogai (2017) developed a financial network called NetFin, which connects loans, derivative currencies, and stock exchanges in the financial market. Gou, Xu, & Herrera (2018) proposed NetFins, a method based on cross-correlation matrices, which incorporates a threshold network and a minimum clustering tree. The threshold value in the threshold network is determined by calculating the standard deviation and average of the cross-correlation coefficient. Abramova & Böhme (2016) utilised blockchain technology to enhance the precision of financial reporting tools by striking a balance between open access and confidentiality.

NetFin Structures

NetFins possess significant information resources, and obtaining efficient information is a prerequisite for financial risk management. The financial system is a complex network. The exposure to shared or lent properties among financial industries increases the risk and reduces their ability to withstand financial shocks (Financial Stability Board, 2017). Bargigli et al. (2015) and Goodfellow et al. (2016) argue that the complex layered structure of NetFins is a consequence of the interconnections between financial firms, including credit and derivatives. The risks of the financial multi-layered network may be overestimated due to the frequent occurrence of nonlinear events. Bargigli et al. (2015) argue that the spatial relationships between the levels of a multilayer NetFin should be examined at an international level rather than individually. The interbank depositing networks were designed as flow networks by de la Concha et al. (2018) and Kaffash & Marra (2017). The study investigated the efficacy of three network architectures, namely star-shaped, complete, and incomplete, in facilitating liquidity transfer between banks. Banks are encouraged to maintain an interchange deposit at an optimal level in the star topology.

Developments ***in NetFins***

The initial risk resistance of NetFins aligns with a wetlands reserve concept, where threats are accumulated and mitigated until they surpass a certain threshold (de Almeida, Fazendeiro, & Inácio, 2018; Du Plessis & Smuts, 2021). According to Salminen, Ruohomaa, & Kantola (2017), there is a link between financial systematic risk contagion and increased vulnerability to NetFin risks. Kor & Mesko (2013) proposed a method for identifying primary sources of infection in networks by utilising a graph representation of the NetFin linkages across different countries. Unger et al. (2020) constructed the minimal clustering tree to showcase the contributions of the risk system and the dynamic development of NetFin structures. Korniyenko et al. (2018) examined the evolving financial sector networks from 1995 to 2016 and found evidence of increased connectivity between the Asian region and the rest of the world over the past two decades.

NetFins can detect risk elements by efficiently collecting and extracting financial sector sentiments and client opinions. Financial news, annual reports of publicly traded firms, and social media are key sources for extracting emotional variables (Garcia, 2013). Hall & Pesenti (2017) utilised text data from financial documents to predict financial risks in various industries. The results demonstrated a strong correlation between market sentiment and financial risks. Correa et al. (2021) examined the relationship between communicating sentiments and the financial cycle, using the terminology of the Central Bank's Stability of Financials Report. Mood indices were developed to assess the stability of financials and predict potential banking collapse.

The literature review assessment in Table 1 demonstrates the development of the study on NetFins and the emergence of a consensus on its significance in the financial system. The academic literature now contains various conclusions on the factors influencing the stability of the financial system and the ways in which risk is transmitted in NetFins. Currently, there is a lack of research on the network recovery and recovery structure of the financial system from a network perspective. The representation of NetFin recovery remains unknown. Furthermore, the absence of maturity, resilience, and development occurs when exposed to risks. Hence, additional research is necessary.

Table 1: NetFins and Their Conceptualizations.

Categories	References	Methodologies	Information and Databases	Study Results
Correlation coefficients between financial network and threat	(Choi, 2014; Gou et al., 2020; Henseler et al., 2015; Hill, Fishbein, & Ajzen, 1977; Huebner, 2017; Meyliana & Fernando, 2019)	Statistical interpretation, network models of coefficient of determination, complex theories, and so on.	The financial sector of the United States; the Bank of Settlements.	Finance networking spillage affects systemic risk; the sustainability of the finance network is affected by some nodes, resulting in the quick spread of threat. Complicated theory aids in the prediction and management of financial system risks, as it describes the risk routes in an interconnected finance network.
Establish a financial network	(Angeles et al., 2001; Caldarelli, 2020; Haldane & May, 2011; Henseler et al., 2015; Mazerolle, 2006; Ravichandran & Lertwongsatien, 2005)	Relationships among fund transactions; credits, derivatives, currency trading, and stock exchanges; cross-correlation matrices; cryptocurrency; block chain technologies.	China, Regional Financial Industry Association; daily data, stock markets for world indexes; Listing firm financial statements, and so on.	Through financial transactions, including creditor relations, investment exchanges, assurance interrelations, equity relations, and so on, the construction of a network connecting financial companies aims to provide diverse study topics and data accessibility.
Finance Network topologies	(Anand et al., 2018; Brown, Burns, & Arnell, 2018; Capponi et al., 2022; Cerchiello & Giudici, 2016; Giudici & Spelta, 2016; McCloughan & Lyons, 2006)	Models based on maximal sensitivity; threshold networks; star-shaped; fully completed connectivity; flowing network.	EU central bank deposit reports; monitoring reports sent to Banca d'Italia across all Italian institutions, and so on.	The finance network has a multi-layered and multiplexed topology, which is nonlinear, and different structural tiers offer different topology and features.
Establishing finance networks	(Barabasi, 2005; Cerchiello & Giudici, 2016; Huang et al., 2016; Huebner, 2017; Kumar et al., 2016)	Minimal spreading trees; textual analysis; sentiment analysis; graphical techniques.	Asia markets; Central Bank's Market Stability Report; securities and exchange headlines, documents, yearly documents, and so on.	With the alterations in external data, the development of financial network reveals several levels of risk tolerances and sustainability.

Methods and Materials

Research Design and Methods

This section presents an analysis of the research design and methodology employed in this study. This study aims to analyse the literature on network financial recovery and its regulatory implications in reducing financial systemic risk. The objectives of this study are to identify research gaps, evaluate the effectiveness of network financial recovery mechanisms, and suggest regulatory guidelines for managing financial systemic risk. This study seeks to investigate the following research questions: (a) What is the concept of network financial recovery? (b) What are the current regulatory frameworks for managing systemic financial risk? (c) This study examines the efficacy of network financial recovery strategies in mitigating systemic financial risks. (d) What are the prospective regulatory implications of utilizing network financial recovery as a means of mitigating systemic financial risk? The researchers started their study by conducting a thorough analysis of the existing literature to identify and examine the key concepts, theories, and prior research related to network financial recovery and the regulatory use of these strategies to manage systematic risks. The process involves searching academic databases, scholarly journals, conference proceedings, and relevant literature to gather relevant information. A conceptual framework has been developed to illustrate the theoretical foundations and relationships between network financial recovery, regulatory frameworks, and systemic risk management. This framework is based on insights obtained from a literature review. This framework serves as a valuable tool for collecting and analysing data. This study relied on secondary data sources. Secondary data sources encompass a range of materials, including published reports, official papers, financial accounts, and regulatory standards.

Network Recovery Under Regulatory Technology

The cultivation of NetFin recovery is a novel approach in the research on financial stabilization systems.

Network Recovery Analysis

Network recovery refers to the ability to quickly identify and resolve network security issues. Poledna et al. (2015) identified three main factors that contribute to the recovery of a network system: network structure, network dynamics, and malfunction mechanisms. The Financial Stability Board (2017) provides a definition of "cyber recovery" as the ability of an institution to effectively respond to and recover from cyber events by adapting to changes in the network environment and promptly containing and mitigating their impact. Recovery was defined by Yin et al. (2019) as the ability to reconstruct the network's connection architecture and exposure using detailed data for various NetFins.

This study examines a measurement model of NetFin recovery that integrates the evolutionary features of network recovery with multidimensional measurement indicators, in order to achieve a multilayer integrated NetFin.

$$\frac{ex_i}{et} = F(x_i) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij} C(x_i, x_j),$$

where x denotes the network nodes, $F(x_i)$ represents recovery dynamics functional, M_{ij} represents node incidence matrix, and $C(x_i, x_j)$ indicates node correlation dynamics function.

Furthermore, Additionally, this study examines the partial node interactions of the NetFins network and proposes a stabilisation assessment model to understand the dynamic nature of the network nodes. Hsu, Kraemer, & Dunkle (2006) proposed a method for adjusting controller parameters in a large-scale multidimensional system using interactive techniques. Their strategy isolates the dynamics of the mechanism nature from the core network in order to identify the perceptual mechanisms that underlie resilient actions. Hu, Wang, & Liu (2022) propose that the micro mechanism of the network system can be explained by a pairwise dynamics mechanism. Chowdhury et al. (2019) found that network recovery, when it maintains minimal capacity for both node streams, can become destabilised by external shocks, leading to network failure. The relationship between the disturbance structure of a network system and its recovery is important, and its recovery is influenced by a dynamic contemporary method (El Khatib, Ahmed, & Al-Nakeeb, 2019). Yang & Liu (2012) state that the recovery implosion of a system is influenced by its vibration characteristics and intrinsic interconnections. The evaluation and investigation of risk-avoidance capacity in networks across multiple industries is facilitated by system recovery. Hatzakis, Nair, & Pinedo (2010) asserted that the cost-sharing game is accountable for the formation of sub association groups in networks. Cai, Cui, & Stanley (2017) undertook a comprehensive statistics descriptive study of topology of the network and defined the characteristics of the link among the financial industries, thereby revealing its network's link dynamics. They employed a committee to assess the criticalness and impact factors of a bank's system to assist regulators and risk management in prioritizing areas of action.

The identification of network structures can enhance the applicability and effectiveness of financial risk prevention by establishing causal links between network structures of financial organisations and the presence of systematic risks. Huang et al. (2016) assessed the impact of system risk by employing a cointegration comparison multivariate GARCH approach. They established a measurable association between system risk contribution and the topology of NetFins. Barclay, Higgins, & Thompson (1995) proposed a framework to enhance the predictive accuracy of financial indicators using NetFins. The researchers concluded that networking could play a significant role in the substantial rise of uncertainty and fluctuations observed during periods of financial instability. Henseler, Ringle, & Sarstedt (2015) and Hu et al. (2022) proposed the use of heterostructure supreme filtration graphs and threshold-based techniques to enhance the stability of covariance connectivity during the early phases of financial crises. Capponi, Corell, & Stiglitz (2022) found that the persistence of public debt can exacerbate the "doom loop" and the problem of being "too interconnected to fail" in NetFins. Nie & Song (2018) developed NetFins, a financial model that incorporates both returns and risk using the Euclidean distance similarity criterion. This approach differs from the traditional method of linking underlying funds. The role and influence of core nations, such as Japan and the United States, in the transmission of volatile markets are primarily explained through correlation networks. Faul et al. (2009) assessed the vulnerability of a NetFin through linear optimisation and sensitivity analysis. Moulin & Sethuraman (2013) conducted a comprehensive hierarchical clustering analysis using Thomson Reuters Eikon databases from 2001 to 2016. Their study demonstrated that the global controlling network is primarily consolidated.

The recovery of a NetFin network is contingent upon the recovery of its individual nodes. The use of network analysis to manage critical risk nodes in NetFins is a crucial tool in financial regulation. Gomber et al. (2018) utilised network data to establish financial connections through syndicated loans. Therefore, loan banks with a larger network contribute to an increase in credit risk. However, strong relationships significantly reduce the debt threat for lending banks. Liu, Caporin, & Paterlini (2021) utilised a state space model to forecast the changing network of North American financing sectors between 2005 and May 2020. The researchers found that the spillover effect significantly increased during both the 2008 economic recession and the COVID-19 pandemic. Chao et al. (2021) employed network clustering to examine the coefficient of determination network of volatile capital asset returns. The correlation network of individual stock returns was transformed into a correlation network of portfolio returns based on groups. The researchers conducted cross comparisons of dynamic correlation networks by examining the differences among the three sub-period networks. Korniyenko et al. (2018) proposed a novel multi-layered network model to examine the relationship between equity and debt risk occurrences across nations. The authors argue that this network is highly susceptible to the central country and other nations with larger financial systems (including the United States and the United Kingdom). Bhattacharya, Inekwe, & Valenzuela (2020) investigated the impact of global financial integration on credit risk.

The study utilised online methods and financial institution records from 95 regions worldwide to determine that banking institutions in NetFins that have strong connections to major lenders are more vulnerable to risk than those with independent funding pathways. Giudici & Spelta (2016) developed a cross-regional finance risk interpolation system for the period 2009-2016. They used network analysis to assess the overall connectivity of the spatial correlation network for financial market threats. The study revealed that the China Regional Finance Risk Structure Affiliation System exhibits characteristics of a scale-free network, with partnerships in each region being unevenly distributed and displaying global characteristics. According to Emiliano et al. (2018), the diamond network is highly resistant to systematic risks.
The most extensively studied network at present is the multicollinearity network, which includes loan and equity networks as well as various financial activities (Table 2). The most common approach is complex network analysis. The majority of research focuses solely on the multilayer hierarchy and topographic network parameters of NetFins. The topic of broad technological recovery has been extensively examined (Tang et al., 2018). Moreover, the structural dynamics of networks generated by different NetFins are intricate. There is a lack of research on the financial system. Furthermore, there is a limited amount of research that has investigated the causal decoupling and intervention linkages of network recovery features. There is a limited amount of research on the recovery of direct and indirect properties of NetFin, as well as the extraction of useful information and incentive mechanisms.

Table 2. Research Methodologies of Network Recovery.

Categories	References	Methodologies	Information and Databases	Study Results
Correlation networks; network of dynamic correlation	(Blind, 2012; Chao & Peng, 2018; Csóka & Jean-Jacques Herings, 2018; Dehghanian, Aslan, & Dehghanian, 2018; Henseler et al., 2015; Liu, He, & Xu, 2019; Manyika et al., 2016)	Social economy network analyses; network sectors; model of optimization; conduct sensitivity analysis; heterostructure supremely filtration graph and technique based on thresholds; state space model (or a class of probabilistic graphical model); cointegration test comparison multivariate GARCH concept; changing coefficient of determination network.	Information and databases from Thomson Reuters Eikon; North American finance institutions; China Regional Financial Investment Sector Organization.	Dimension characteristic; "too interlinked to losses" issue in financial networks. The recovery is weakened by financial shocks. Resilience has a broad dynamic mechanism.
Multidimensional networks	(Appelbaum et al., 2017; Cai et al., 2017; Chao et al., 2021; Ishaya & Folarin, 2012; Kor & Mesko, 2013; Tu et al., 2017; Zha et al., 2020)	Analysis of heterogeneous networks; dynamical system.	95 nations/ regions; Asia and the remaining global markets.	This structure diminishes the capacity to resist financial risks as central nations gain an influential impact. The investment connection leads to the multi-layered structure of the financial network.
Network of topologies	(Hall & Pesenti, 2017; Leung & Cao, 2000; Tang et al., 2018)	Text classification; sensitive analysis.	Chinese and American finance industries.	The finance network contains numerous topological features.

Risk Contagion in NetFins

The primary challenge in mitigating current financial market risks is the systematic risk associated with NetFins (Aisaiti et al., 2019). The application of finance risk legislation in a network differs from conventional financial sectors. The diversity in the hierarchy and responsibilities of the major nodes in NetFins results in distinct features in the distribution of network risk. Caldarelli (2020) argued that the presence of large financial industries has a positive impact on NetFins. Promoting the growth of major industries can effectively contribute to maintaining a stable financial system. Giudici, Sarlin, & Spelta (2020) utilised an asymmetric network diagram to examine the cascade process and the subsequent spillover effects of NetFins. The determination of the minimum liquidity ratio for the industry in NetFins should be based on the level of infection exposure, as recommended. The network architecture significantly impacts the resilience of a system and influences the effectiveness of evacuation processes. Different types of events have different effects on the connection and recovery of a stock market cluster. According to Vial (2021), US enterprises are closely connected in production networks and are influenced by the internal transmission within these networks. Vial suggests that strategically important firms have the potential to prevent disruptions from spreading within these networks.
Further research indicates that the geographic dispersion of financial industries also contributes to systemic risks. Chu, Deng, & Xia (2020) and Kaffash & Marra (2017) found that having multiple banks with different geographical locations increases the probability of having similar asset portfolios. Therefore, the exposure of industries to similar threats increases systemic risks in the banking sector. Liu et al. (2021) utilised a simplified spillage indicator technique to analyse the financial organisation network of China in the aftermath of the global financial crisis. The study revealed significant impacts of non-bank financial industries. Major industry banks and other financial institutions often surpass the region's largest government banks in terms of transferring financial shocks. Commonly employed techniques in financial network risk analysis encompass the variance decomposition network method, tail risk contagion of multi-tier financial networks, co-high-order moments (e.g., co-skewness, co-volatility, and co-kurtosis), risk contagion determination method, opinion dynamics (Aickelin et al., 2018), fuzzy clustering theories (Gou et al., 2018), and financially aware spatiotemporal social

network analysis (De Tre, Hallez, & Bronselaer, 2014; Farivar & Yuan, 2014). Multi-objective decision-making approaches are commonly used for risk assessment (Chu et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021). Research on the assessment model of financial recovery from the perspective of a core network, cluster recovery computation technique, and the correlation between interference and reconfiguration with subnetwork coercion hierarchy and network recovery is currently limited.

Recovery Governance in NetFins

The complexity of the economic and financial environment poses challenges to the maintenance of financial stability and the implementation of financial regulations. The current network of financial institutions is becoming increasingly interconnected, with a growing level of pairing for both transactions and market entities. Furthermore, the wide variety of financial risks is increasingly concealed and fast-moving, posing greater challenges for regulatory measures.

Bankruptcy Reimbursement Mechanism in NetFins

The complexity of NetFins' asset repayment method and risk management has increased. It is important to take into account pairwise netting and network ownership association when dealing with bankruptcy disposal. The allocation of bankruptcy payments for NetFin corporations is a widely discussed subject that provides a theoretical basis for financial regulation. Yang & Liu (2012) and Kumar et al. (2016) examined the application of management science principles to the formulation of debt payment fractions in bankruptcy law within the context of NetFins. The authors emphasised the importance of considering the debt of associated agents and the net resolution of combined assertions when analysing debt connections in NetFins. Yang & Liu (2012) investigated the fair distribution of claims in situations where resources are insufficient and two-way rationing is implemented. Kumar et al. (2016) found that distributed equity divestiture, particularly under natural conditions, yields similar results to consolidated equity insolvency when using a small accounting unit. Furthermore, these were unique characteristics of the ambiguity overspill system structure in transnational sectors of the economy, as well as distinct patterns of contagion among economies. When addressing systematic threats in NetFins, it is important to carefully divide macroprudential regulations. Additionally, it is necessary to combine expansionary fiscal policy and macroprudential regulations in order to enhance and establish a robust macroprudential legislative framework. Lusardi et al. (2021) found that removing the label of systematically significant financial institutions can enhance company value.

Regulatory Technology for NetFin Recovery

In order to address current challenges, it is necessary to establish a comprehensive understanding of the interconnections between physical and virtual economic growth within the financial system. This includes addressing financial risks, ensuring reliability, fostering innovation, and implementing effective regulation. Additionally, it is important to develop an alternative risk management model. Regulatory technology (RegTech) is an effective approach to achieve financial regulation, ensuring compliance and stability through information systems. In 2014, Andy Haldane, the former chief economist of the Bank of England and a prominent economics expert, introduced this concept. New tech refers to technologies developed by the financial services sector to meet compliance standards and assess risk mitigation, often within a limited context and regulatory framework.

Table 3: Representative Recovery Governance Methods.

Categories	References	Methodologies	Information and Databases	Study Results
Financial distress indemnification	(Chin & Gopal, 1995; Csóka & Herings, 2021; Naubert & Tesar, 2019; Symonds &	Axioms technique; multiple regression; significance for the company; time-varying residual impact assessment.	Data from simulations, the Financial Stability Monitoring Council, MetLife, and so on.	Property disposition must incorporate the interaction between the financial network and investment network; resource identification must consider connectivity spilling impacts.
Regulation technologies	(Adner & Helfat, 2003; Butterworth, 2018; Currie et al., 2018; Goodfellow et al., 2016; Ilollari &	Regression analyses, statistical modeling, supervisory and unsupervised learning, and so on.	Global financial data; aggregated commercial bank statistics; mortgage supplies involving 17 advanced origin countries and 94 developed market targeted nations.	The currency network of foreign mortgages has a substantial effect on the magnitude, dispersion, and orientation of global monetary policy spillover effects.

Regulation technologies have enabled government regulators to use information and technology to improve the efficiency of their supervisory duties. Kim, Shin, & Lee (2009) have highlighted the development of new regulations and technological mechanisms in the field of finance. The utilisation of artificial intelligence, deep learning, and other technological tools for the surveillance and mitigation of financial risks has emerged as a recent focal point (Acemoglu et al., 2015). Chen (2018), Ding et al. (2015), and Hu et al. (2012) proposed a smart system for tracking and early detection of exchange financial fraud to aid decision-making. A standard fusion method was developed for large multidimensional datasets, incorporating data classification techniques, advanced information monitoring, and clustering algorithms for regulatory scenarios. In a study conducted by Chen (2018), the focus was on the use of smart monitoring to detect financial fraud in charitable operations. Some argue that technological legislation has negative implications. Currie et al. (2018) suggested the possibility of an anti-RegTech phenomenon. RegTech has achieved automation and efficiency gains, but these have been offset by increasing regulatory expenses. Battiston et al. (2016) provided a behavioural perspective on banking and regulatory concerns and proposed a more liberal and principled approach to financial regulation. Thus, choosing appropriate technological regulations is advantageous for the financial industry. Gou et al. (2020) propose an evolutionary algorithm approach to optimise a gradient-boosting decision tree for forecasting financial distress. They suggest incorporating network-based factors to enhance forecast accuracy and performance. de la Concha et al. (2018) found that interbank loan networks have a significant impact on fiscal policy externalities. This has a significant negative impact on the inflow of international capital into emerging markets. Barzel & Barabási (2013) proposed a framework to assess the impact of financial firms on systematic risks by considering the interconnectedness of corporate tail risk exposures. The tool can be utilised to monitor the systematic significance of financial industries, facilitating transparent macroprudential oversight.

The current risk regulations of NetFins are based on identifying "too big to fail" industries, implementing macroprudential regulations, and employing systematic mechanisms to address threats posed by NetFins (Table 3). However, the risk, opposition, and recovery of NetFins are dependent on the recovery of the network. Prior studies primarily examine the recovery nodes in small and medium-sized financial industries and networks, with a specific emphasis on the risk resistance and recovery assessment of the region's financial sector from a network recovery perspective. Nevertheless, the practical implementation of recovery regulations remains insufficient. The development of regulation technology networks recovery as a quantitative method for analysing regulatory policies is necessary.

Findings

To preserve the stability of financial networks, recovery enables the development of novel methods of financial regulations. Considering the present state of research and the most pressing concerns, we list the primary obstacles and potential future approaches for recovery-based stability of financial regulations.

Limitations

Financial resilience is intrinsically linked to the avoidance of financial threats. Existing approaches in information resource management and risk assessment of NetFins are mature, and they provide a solid theoretical foundation and methodological direction for future research on NetFin risk regulation from a recovery viewpoint. However, the existing research has some limitations.

First, there is a scarcity of research on the network recovery of financial systems. The theoretical foundations of NetFin risk regulation involve studies on the morphology and data assimilation of NetFins, characteristics of NetFin recovery, assessment of NetFin recovery, and the evolution and regulation of NetFin recovery in response to external disruptions.

Second, the current research primarily focuses on the mechanisms and determinants of financial recovery, as well as macroeconomic policy advocacy. Financial systems have reduced resilience to risk and recovery of growth.

Nevertheless, the study on systematic risk monitoring methodologies is nearing completion. The analysis reveals that the risk spread in NetFins is concentrated in large industries that are considered too big to fail. In addition, there is limited focus on the identification, control, and advanced detection of the recovery financial industry, and insufficient research has been conducted on the recovery of NetFins. Examining the management of regional financial sustainability, specifically the recovery management of NetFins, is essential for promoting financial reforms and safeguarding financial security in terms of network recovery.

Challenges

Current research on NetFins primarily examines risk transmission mechanisms and the impact of networks on various elements. The recovery of NetFins lacks sufficient research due to various obstacles that hinder the development of comprehensive studies.

The integration of financials and information networks: The financial market entities create a network called NetFin through their financial transactions. This network is prominent in the geographical financial sectors of the economy and includes non-bank financial industries such as metropolitan area banks, other financial institutions, and agricultural banks. It also encompasses community asset management firms, funding assurance industries, collaborative lending support, socioeconomic crowdfunding industries, and various local exchange facilities. Interactions exist among senior management in financial industries, especially in the context of local financial institution partnerships (Barbera et al., 2017). The annual reports on finances, news headlines, and revelations of scandals in the financial sector have resulted in the formation of multiple informational connections among financial firms. This study encounters challenges in establishing networks of financial firms that pair relevant information and data, determining the characterization and evolutionary mechanisms of NetFin recovery, and describing certain features. Accurate information, data assistance, and theoretical and empirical assessment are necessary for understanding the pairing connection between multisource heterogeneous networks. Texting, mining, and network analysis can be utilised to achieve this objective. In order to investigate the periodic nature of financial studies, numerous observations of economic cycles must be conducted.

Mechanisms for dynamic recovery in financial pairing networks. The drive mechanisms for recovering NetFins are influenced by the varying impacts of network nodes on network recovery. The processes within networks govern the recovery, collapse, restoration, and reactions to external shocks. The complexity of the financial-information coupling network connection hinders the validation of the significant relation and regulation between the information and data pairing, as well as the network relations and recovery growth. This study focuses on the intersection of information technology, complex networks, and financial risk management. The proper implementation of methodologies in different disciplines is a challenging issue.

The management of stabilisation for resilient NetFins primarily emphasises the regulation of "systemically important financial industries" (Agur, Peria, & Rochon, 2020; Haldane & May, 2011) in traditional financial stabilisation systems. The generation of risk in a networked financial system (NetFin) is influenced by latent trigger factors. In order to effectively respond to these risks, it is essential to have oversight and regulation of the financial industry (Anagnostopoulos, 2018). This supervision plays a critical role in the recovery and prevention of risks within the entire NetFin system. The relationship between recovery-important financial industries and systematically significant financial industries under recovery management remains unknown. A thorough investigation of the substitute and complementarity relations among various types of industries is necessary.

Discussion and Future Research Directions

Regional NetFins should possess the capability to endure threats and resume development. A NetFin is a financial institution that performs financial duties, offers financial services, and acts as the main channel for distributing regional finance risks. The impact of digitalization and networking on outcomes influences credit decisions and organisational behaviour. The establishment and expansion of NetFin recovery involve a complex and dynamic process. An in-depth analysis of the recovery of NetFins requires a comprehensive understanding of the interrelationships among various variables and the adaptability of NetFin recovery.

Unresolved Foundational Challenges

Summary of NetFin Recovery

The recovery of NetFin primarily involves its construction, evolutionary path, and legal aspects. The research investigates the variables and mechanisms that influence network recovery, including the communication relationships among network elements. It aims to identify and explain the attributes of the recovery's evolution. Several conceptual frameworks are used to evaluate the recovery of NetFins and assess the importance of financial institution recovery. The study areas are as follows:
(1) Construction of information coupling networks: Establish the necessary connections and relationships between different levels of networks and associations in order to create optimal and complementary NetFins.
(2) Extracting NetFin recovery's characteristics: Analysing the default status and evaluating network-related loss rates in different economic trends and associated risk events, while also taking into account the ever-changing nature of current and past states.
(3) Primary, internal, and external causes of recovery shock based on the recovery of regional NetFins: For example, the external environment consists of various factors that have a significant impact on the overall situation. These factors include foreign and domestic policy, economic geography, financial market culture, and the internal mechanisms that are affected. It is crucial to analyse how these external and internal components interact and intervene in the recovery process.
(4) Development of NetFin methodology: Explore the interaction mechanism and evolving characteristics of NetFin recovery across different systems and economic trends. Provide an overview of the process, development, and various routes to recovery. Therefore, a comprehensive analysis of the NetFins' recovery can be provided.

Measurement Methods for NetFin Recovery

In order to effectively monitor the recovery of NetFin, it is crucial to develop an evaluation model, identify the endpoint recovery, and conduct a thorough assessment. These components play a vital role in ensuring the successful recovery of NetFin. This study focuses on measuring the recovery of regional NetFins using network system dynamics theory and big data processing technologies. The key areas of focus include machine learning and data mining:

1 Constructing a recovery measuring methodology for NetFins: A model can be developed to measure network stabilisation based on the characterization of NetFin recovery. This model includes both the strength functional of the network node and the weighted network correlation functional. In addition, this text delves into the functions that describe the types of recovery losses.

2 Calculating the robustness of nodes in a NetFin: The recovery evaluation modeling establishes a method to assess the recovery crash of the node among dynamical NetFins in response to external shocks. Additionally, we can determine the connection of NetFins after some nodes have been destroyed, reconstruct the timing and intensity models of the repaired networks, list lower and upper limits for the traversal system, and conduct the NetFin recovery compressive strength test.

3 Improvement of the structure and resilience of subnets: NetFins do not comprise a scheme. The association between the intervention and alteration of subnetwork structure and recovery is explored, focusing on the subnetwork structure generated by related subgroups in the network. We may also monitor the structural aspects of the recovery-destroying subnetwork and acquire the law of structure's effect on the recovery of financial subnetworks.

Evaluation of NetFin Recovery

The loss of recovery signifies a reduction in the risk and defense capabilities of NetFins, which creates hidden threats in regional NetFins. To conduct early warning studies on the risk state of NetFins from the viewpoint of recovery, establishing science and recovery assessment methodologies is important to introduce a new approach to financial regulation. We require studies on embedded assessment techniques of NetFin recovery, recognition of network recovery at various phases of recovery evolutional, and identification of critical industries (nodes) in NetFins that influence recovery. In conclusion, the primary study areas include the following:

1 Development of a recovery evaluation index system: An extensive and rigorous index system for credit evaluation is established, incorporating recovery loss assessment and circuit relationship recovery.

2 Integrated examination of the recovery of NetFins: To develop an effective dynamics controlling technique that combines recovery and risk, it is crucial to incorporate risk identification and recovery prestige supervision, implement early detection techniques, construct a recommendation system, and recognise a capable operating, observable, expandable, and interpretable NetFin recovery assessment tool.

3 Identifying major financial industries that impact network recovery in a dynamically: By analysing the dynamic loss of nodes, industries in regional NetFins that have the highest influence on network recovery can be identified. This analysis targets the reaction, repair, and adaptation stages of the NetFin recovery evolution process. The key area of focus for early warning management in the recovery of regional NetFins is the group of financial industries that play a crucial role in the process.

Adaptive and Balance Governance of Recovery Regulation Resource

The detection of network recovery management features can be achieved through the use of pattern recognition and classification techniques. This involves integrating and embedding NetFin recovery managing and risk managing to create a compliance model for risk and recovery. Recovery, risks, effectiveness, frontiers, and performance metrics need to be defined using information and data networks, analyses, and other approaches, along with recovery expectation management techniques. The multisensory game technique is used to represent the node of network connection as interference among multiple observers. Objectives for managing various observers within the network are specified based on nodes and subnetwork recovery. The study employs a short route multi-interceptor gaming resolution approach to determine the optimal route considering various intercept tactics. This information is then used to develop a regulation resource adaptation and balanced monitoring plan, taking into account the asset level and other recovery aspect elements.

Future Research Directions

Clearly, the financial sector differs from the interorganizational one. It is important to investigate the primary drivers impacting the stable use of NetFins, the legislation of development of NetFins, the methodology for sophisticated financial sectors, and so on. This content primarily focuses primarily on the following:

Development of Recovery in The Substantial Financial Sector

Currently, the financial sector, while lacking in diversity of themes, is a substantial and complex system. Entities within the NetFin system display autonomous behaviour on a large scale. NetFin architectures may exhibit different evolutionary processes due to variations in market exchange methods, legal contexts, and risk and cultural characteristics of market participants, despite the endogenous structure of the system. The different evolutionary processes have an effect on price rules and trigger unique mechanisms for the propagation of financial risk. Further investigation is required to determine the change trend exhibited by the network's resistance in this dynamic development process. The simulation of environmental change recovery in significant financial sectors is crucial due to the increasing computer processing capacity and expanding modelling techniques. Integrating the intrinsic development of the financial sector into the recovery analysis framework could have important implications and warrant further investigation.

NetFin Recovery Under Multiagent and Heterogenous Multinetwork

NetFins is characterised by its diverse information dispersion techniques. The digital world and advanced financial industry have witnessed the rapid development and widespread adoption of innovative forms of communication, leading to an accelerated transfer of data among participants. This phenomenon highlights the existence of diverse transmitting legislation. The complexity of interaction among various NetFins has increased due to the spread of information. In the financial sector, the banking organization's funding networking involves the composition of mortgage lenders and the interaction of internet-based financial information. The future research extensively investigates the impact of legislation on the robustness of financial sectors with multiagent and multinetwork hierarchy. The recovery of supply chain networks and finance networks interact in industry chain financing networks. The impact of the two networks on the sustainability of the financial industry and the establishment of norms regarding risk absorption and intensification have been crucial for maintaining the stability of the financial system. Integrating various factors into a single model poses a significant challenge.

Updating Research Methods in the Literature Review of NetFin Recovery

In fact, regulation technologies involve identifying and controlling financial threats associated with different forms of intelligent technology. Unlike conventional supervision approaches (e.g., macro prudential development, ex-post monitoring, capital and liquidity adequate ratio regulations), supervising technologies may combine financial data from several sources to unearth useful monitoring information and data. Existing research indicates that NetFins and network recovery provide new research opportunities for regulatory technologies. However, the currently employed methodologies focus on complicated network analysis and derivative techniques. Further development of modern study methodologies is required. We investigate the viability of numerous techniques in network recovery research.

1 Financial adviser simulations (FAS): In addition to “experiment,” “empirical,” and “mathematical analysis,” FAS is an essential financial research approach. The financial system comprises a large range of adaptive and interdependent participants, and the hierarchy of the system is a “complex system” undergoing spontaneous development. FAS is intended to describe the features of self-adaptive and interacting individuals properly, micromodel the financial system from the bottom up, and investigate the complex and dynamic evolution and microformation mechanism of option pricing in NetFins. Individualized supervised learning, empirical mode deconstruction, and population evolutionary analyses are examples of its most common methodologies in ongoing studies.
2 Econophysics is a multidisciplinary field that integrates concepts and techniques from economics and physics. It utilises statistical physics, theoretical physics, complex systems theory, nonlinear sciences, and mathematical analysis to study the macro dynamics and complexity of self-organizing financial markets. This approach is characterised by its ability to simulate the subject's adaptation within a complex system, revealing the overall stabilisation and development of complex systems. The robustness of NetFins is a characteristic of this system. Examining the robustness of NetFins through the application of financial physics is both necessary and a growing trend. The primary strategies include multifractal features, a probabilistic model of microscopic topics, and a game model.
3 Neural information processing (NIS) refers to the application of theoretical and systematic concepts, methods, and tools in the study of data systems. This study explores and resolves multiple interconnected research topics in information systems from a unique perspective. This study primarily focuses on system conception and optimisation, counselling services and decision-making, and social media platforms and interactions. NIS stands for the utilisation of neuroscientific principles, methods, and instruments in the field of information systems research. The recovery of NetFin is closely linked to the design of system optimisation, information services, and network interactions within NetFins. The validation and development of network recovery, primarily through NIS, is a significant area of research. Pressure examination methodologies, such as financial analysis, risk assessment, scenario testing, and sector analysis, along with multitasking studies, can aid in the integration of recovery efforts.

Multimethod Calibration of NetFin Recovery

Similar to the study discussed in Section 2, the recovery of financial markets and the stability of financial oversight can be considered as forms of balancing governance. This study aims to explore the supervision of technology through the use of real information and data or simulated scenarios. The topic of several technique calibrations is intriguing. The process of calibration involves modelling configuration errors, model durability, actual information and data confirmation, linear systems, and complex-nonlinear errors. The primary methodology employed is multiscale geometric analysis. In the future, establishing settings and expanding the study on approaches for the sustained development of complex NetFins will pose challenges.

Conclusions

The modern financial market is characterised by complex relationships. The recovery management strategy implemented by NetFins is an innovative approach to ensuring the stability of financial regulation in the current environment. The study of NetFins and network recovery is a significant topic in the domains of financial regulations and information science. The overview and discussion of NetFins' network recovery are crucial for bridging past and future research in this sector. This study provides a summary of current research and identifies the main categories of research. We analyse and elaborate on important topics including recovery, specifically financial and network recovery, as well as recovery management. This study investigates significant scientific breakthroughs, the key obstacles encountered, and the limitations faced. The presentation also included challenging topics and potential research objectives.

The nature of NetFins varies based on financial exchanges in different nations and regions. The network configurations can be either dynamically interconnected or multi-layered. The following conclusions can be drawn from a variety of research methods, including network analysis, economic metric analysis, and pressure examination techniques applied to the illustrative fewest descendants trees.

1 NetFins structure significantly impacts the spread of finance threats and the rate of node recovery in various hierarchies. Additionally, the changes have distinct consequences on network resilience.

2 Countries like Japan and the United States, which have well-developed financial sectors, exert significant influence on the strength of the global NetFins and hold crucial positions in the network.

3 NetFin recovery permits a complete evaluation of the financial system's stabilization. The core nodes of a NetFin industry can be utilized to strengthen the stability of financial regulations.

4 The presence of NetFins is inevitable in the consolidation of the financial sector, and the complexity of network structures is raising significant regulatory concerns.

In addition to analyzing the limitations and constraints of the present research, we recommend the following future study directions: (1) the mechanism of connection between financials and information and data networks; (2) the assessment of network recovery in NetFins; (3) the assessment and implementation of recovery in NetFins. We are optimistic that continued research into the network recovery of NetFins will result in new opportunities for advancement in this industry.

List of Abbreviations

Network financial – NetFin
Regulatory technology – RegTech
Financial adviser simulations – FAS
Neural information processing – NIS

Declarations

Availability of Data and Materials

Not applicable.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work.

Authors' Contributions

HKB, PTTQ, VPN, and DNNA contributed to the design and execution of the research review, analysis of the results, and writing of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

Authors' Information

HKB is the Dean of the Faculty of Law at Ho Chi Minh City University of Foreign Languages and Information Technology, teaching courses in Economics and Law. His research includes articles on Artificial Intelligence, Fintech, and ICT legal and regulation research.

PTTQ is a lecturer at the Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology.

DNAN is a lecturer at Ho Chi Minh University of Banking, teaching courses in Composition, Copyright, and Intellectual Property Law. She received the 2020 award for Outstanding Classroom Instructor from Ho Chi Minh University of Banking for teaching undergraduate economics and laws courses. Her published works include several books on copyright and intellectual property law.

VPN is a lecturer at the Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology, teaching courses in E-Business Management and International Business. Nguyen's recent publications include articles on the challenges of artificial intelligence.

References

Abramova, S., & Böhme, R. (2016). Perceived benefit and risk as multidimensional determinants of bitcoin use: A quantitative exploratory study. *ICIS 2016 Proceedings*, 19. Retrieved from https://aisel.aisnet.org/icis2016/Crowdsourcing/Presentations/19

Acemoglu, D., Ozdaglar, A., & Tahbaz-Salehi, A. (2015). Systemic risk and stability in financial networks. *American Economic Review, 105*(2), 564-608. doi: https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20130456

Adner, R., & Helfat, C. E. (2003). Corporate effects and dynamic managerial capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal, 24*(10), 1011-1025. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.331

Agur, I., Peria, S. M., & Rochon, C. (2020). Digital financial services and the pandemic: Opportunities and risks for emerging and developing economies. *International Monetary Fund Special Series on COVID-19, Transactions, 52*(5), 1-13. Retrieved from https://www.imf.org/~/media/Files/Publications/covid19-special-notes/en-special-series-on-covid-19-digital-financial-services-and-the-pandemic.ashx

Aickelin, U., Reps, J. M., Siebers, P.-O., & Li, P. (2018). Using simulation to incorporate dynamic criteria into multiple criteria decision-making. *Journal of the Operational Research Society, 69*(7), 1021-1032. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01605682.2017.1410010

Aisaiti, G., Liu, L., Xie, J., & Yang, J. (2019). An empirical analysis of rural farmers' financing intention of inclusive finance in China: The moderating role of digital finance and social enterprise embeddedness. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 119*(7), 1535-1563. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-08-2018-0374

Almoghathawi, Y., & Barker, K. (2019). Component importance measures for interdependent infrastructure network resilience. *Computers & Industrial Engineering, 133*, 153-164. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2019.05.001

Amini, H., Cont, R., & Minca, A. (2016). Resilience to contagion in financial networks. *Mathematical Finance, 26*(2), 329-365. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/mafi.12051

Anagnostopoulos, I. (2018). Fintech and regtech: Impact on regulators and banks. *Journal of Economics and Business, 100*, 7-25. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconbus.2018.07.003

Anand, K., Van Lelyveld, I., Banai, Á., Friedrich, S., Garratt, R., Hałaj, G., et al. (2018). The missing links: A global study on uncovering financial network structures from partial data. *Journal of Financial Stability, 35*, 107-119. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2017.05.012

Angeles, R., Corritore, C. L., Basu, S. C., & Nath, R. (2001). Success factors for domestic and international electronic data interchange (EDI) implementation for US firms. *International Journal of Information Management, 21*(5), 329-347. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-4012(01)00028-7

Appelbaum, S. H., Calla, R., Desautels, D., & Hasan, L. N. (2017). The challenges of organizational agility: part 2. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 49*(2), 69-74. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-05-2016-0028

Barabasi, A.-L. (2005). The architecture of complexity: The structure and the dynamics of networks, from the web to the cell. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery in data mining* (pp. 1-3). ACM. doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/1081870.1081873

Barbera, C., Jones, M., Korac, S., Saliterer, I., & Steccolini, I. (2017). Governmental financial resilience under austerity in Austria, England and Italy: how do local governments cope with financial shocks? *Public Administration, 95*(3), 670-697. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12350

Barclay, D., Higgins, C., & Thompson, R. (1995). The partial least squares (PLS) approach to casual modeling: personal computer adoption ans use as an Illustration. *Technology Studies, Special Issue on Research Methodology, 2*(2), 285-309. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313137896

Bargigli, L., Di Iasio, G., Infante, L., Lillo, F., & Pierobon, F. (2015). The multiplex structure of interbank networks. *Quantitative Finance, 15*(4), 673-691. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14697688.2014.968356

Barzel, B., & Barabási, A.-L. (2013). Universality in network dynamics. *Nature Physics, 9*(10), 673-681. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys2741

Battiston, S., Farmer, J. D., Flache, A., Garlaschelli, D., Haldane, A. G., Heesterbeek, H., et al. (2016). Complexity theory and financial regulation. *Science, 351*(6275), 818-819. doi: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad0299

Bhattacharya, M., Inekwe, J. N., & Valenzuela, M. R. (2020). Credit risk and financial integration: An application of network analysis. *International Review of Financial Analysis, 72*, 101588. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2020.101588

Blind, K. (2012). The influence of regulations on innovation: A quantitative assessment for OECD countries. *Research Policy, 41*(2), 391-400. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.08.008

Brown, C., Burns, A., & Arnell, A. (2018). A Conceptual Framework for Integrated Ecosystem Assessment. *One Ecosystem, 3*, e25482. doi: https://doi.org/10.3897/oneeco.3.e25482

Butterworth, M. (2018). The ICO and artificial intelligence: The role of fairness in the GDPR framework. *Computer Law & Security Review, 34*(2), 257-268. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2018.01.004

Caccioli, F., Barucca, P., & Kobayashi, T. (2018). Network models of financial systemic risk: a review. *Journal of Computational Social Science, 1*, 81-114. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-017-0008-3

Cai, M., Cui, Y., & Stanley, H. E. (2017). Analysis and evaluation of the entropy indices of a static network structure. *Scientific Reports, 7*(1), 9340. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-09475-9

Caldarelli, G. (2020). A perspective on complexity and networks science. *Journal of Physics: Complexity, 1*(2), 021001. doi: https://doi.org/10.1088/2632-072X/ab9a24

Capponi, A., Corell, F., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2022). Optimal bailouts and the doom loop with a financial network. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 128*, 35-50. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2022.03.004

Cerchiello, P., & Giudici, P. (2016). Big data analysis for financial risk management. *Journal of Big Data, 3*, 1-12. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-016-0053-4

Chabot, M., Bertrand, J.-L., & Thorez, E. (2019). Resilience of United Kingdom financial institutions to major uncertainty: A network analysis related to the Credit Default Swaps market. *Journal of Business Research, 101*, 70-82. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.003

Chao, X., Kou, G., Peng, Y., & Viedma, E. H. (2021). Large-scale group decision-making with non-cooperative behaviors and heterogeneous preferences: an application in financial inclusion. *European Journal of Operational Research, 288*(1), 271-293. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2020.05.047

Chao, X., & Peng, Y. (2018). A cost-sensitive multi-criteria quadratic programming model for imbalanced data. *Journal of the Operational Research Society, 69*(4), 500-516. doi: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41274-017-0233-4

Chen, D. (2018). Application of artificial intelligence technology in the visual communication design of shopping platform. In J. Mizera-Pietraszko & P. Pichappan (Eds.), *Lecture Notes in Real-Time Intelligent Systems* (pp. 119-126). Springer. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60744-3_13

Chin, W. W., & Gopal, A. (1995). Adoption intention in GSS: Relative importance of beliefs. *ACM SIGMIS Database: the DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems, 26*(2-3), 42-64. doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/217278.217285

Choi, D. B. (2014). Heterogeneity and stability: Bolster the strong, not the weak. *The Review of Financial Studies, 27*(6), 1830-1867. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhu023

Chowdhury, B., Dungey, M., Kangogo, M., Sayeed, M. A., & Volkov, V. (2019). The changing network of financial market linkages: The Asian experience. *International Review of Financial Analysis, 64*, 71-92. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2019.05.003

Chu, Y., Deng, S., & Xia, C. (2020). Bank geographic diversification and systemic risk. *The Review of Financial Studies, 33*(10), 4811-4838. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz148

Correa, R., Garud, K., Londono, J. M., & Mislang, N. (2021). Sentiment in central banks' financial stability reports. *Review of Finance, 25*(1), 85-120. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfaa014

Csóka, P., & Herings, P. J.-J. (2021). An axiomatization of the proportional rule in financial networks. *Management Science, 67*(5), 2799-2812. doi: https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2020.3700

Csóka, P., & Jean-Jacques Herings, P. (2018). Decentralized clearing in financial networks. *Management Science, 64*(10), 4681-4699. doi: https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2847

Currie, W. L., Gozman, D. P., & Seddon, J. J. (2018). Dialectic tensions in the financial markets: A longitudinal study of pre-and post-crisis regulatory technology. *Journal of Information Technology, 33*(4), 304-325. doi: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41265-017-0047-5

de Almeida, P., Fazendeiro, P., & Inácio, P. R. (2018). Societal risks of the end of physical cash. *Futures, 104*, 47-60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2018.07.004

de la Concha, A., Martinez-Jaramillo, S., & Carmona, C. (2018). Multiplex financial networks: Revealing the level of interconnectedness in the banking system. In C. Cherifi, H. Cherifi, M. Karsai, & M. Musolesi (Eds.), *Complex Networks & Their Applications VI: Proceedings of Complex Networks 2017 (The Sixth International Conference on Complex Networks and Their Applications)* (pp. 1135-1148). Springer. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72150-7_92

De Tre, G., Hallez, A., & Bronselaer, A. (2014). Performance optimization of object comparison. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems, 29*(2), 495-524. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/int.20373

Dehghanian, P., Aslan, S., & Dehghanian, P. (2018). Maintaining electric system safety through an enhanced network resilience. *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications, 54*(5), 4927-4937. doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/TIA.2018.2828389

Department of Homeland Security. (2013). *Presidential policy directive – Critical infrastructure security and resilience*. The White House, Washington. Retrieved from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/12/presidential-policy-directive-critical-infrastructure-security-and-resil

Ding, S., Zhao, H., Zhang, Y., Xu, X., & Nie, R. (2015). Extreme learning machine: algorithm, theory and applications. *Artificial Intelligence Review, 44*, 103-115. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-013-9405-z

Du Plessis, G., & Smuts, H. (2021). The Diffusion of Innovation Experience: Leveraging the Human Factor to Improve Technological Adoption Within an Organisation. In D. Dennehy, A. Griva, N. Pouloudi, Y. K. Dwivedi, I. Pappas, & M. Mäntymäki (Eds.), *Responsible AI and Analytics for an Ethical and Inclusive Digitized Society: 20th IFIP WG 6.11 Conference on e-Business, e-Services and e-Society, I3E 2021, Galway, Ireland, September 1-3, 2021, Proceedings 20* (pp. 318-329). Springer. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85447-8_28

El Khatib, M. M., Ahmed, G., & Al-Nakeeb, A. (2019). Enterprise Cloud Computing Project for Connecting Higher Education Institutions: A Case Study of the UAE. *Modern Economy, 10*(1), 137-155. doi: https://doi.org/10.4236/me.2019.101010

Ellis, S., Sharma, S., & Brzeszczyński, J. (2022). Systemic risk measures and regulatory challenges. *Journal of Financial Stability, 61*, 100960. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2021.100960

Emiliano, B., Raffaele, G., & Lopreite, M. (2018). Centralization of capital and financial crisis: A global network analysis of corporate control. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, 45*, 94-104. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2018.03.001

Farivar, S., & Yuan, Y. (2014). The Dual Perspective of Social Commerce Adoption. *SIGHCI 2014 Proceedings*, 18. Retrieved from https://aisel.aisnet.org/sighci2014/18

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*(4), 1149-1160. doi: https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Financial Stability Board. (2017). *Financial stability implications from fintech*. Financial Stability Board. Retrieved from http://www.fsb.org/emailalert

Gao, J., Liu, X., Li, D., & Havlin, S. (2015). Recent progress on the resilience of complex networks. *Energies, 8*(10), 12187-12210. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/en81012187

Garcia, D. (2013). Sentiment during recessions. *The Journal of Finance, 68*(3), 1267-1300. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12027

Giudici, P., Sarlin, P., & Spelta, A. (2020). The interconnected nature of financial systems: Direct and common exposures. *Journal of Banking & Finance, 112*, 105149. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2017.05.010

Giudici, P., & Spelta, A. (2016). Graphical network models for international financial flows. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, 34*(1), 128-138. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/07350015.2015.1017643

Gomber, P., Kauffman, R. J., Parker, C., & Weber, B. W. (2018). On the fintech revolution: Interpreting the forces of innovation, disruption, and transformation in financial services. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 35*(1), 220-265. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1440766

Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2016). *Deep learning*. MIT Press. Retrieved from https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262035613/deep-learning

Gou, X., Liao, H., Wang, X., Xu, Z., & Herrera Triguero, F. (2020). Consensus based on multiplicative consistent double hierarchy linguistic preferences: Venture capital in real estate market. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management, 24*(1), 1-23. doi: https://doi.org/10.3846/ijspm.2019.10431

Gou, X., Xu, Z., & Herrera, F. (2018). Consensus reaching process for large-scale group decision making with double hierarchy hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relations. *Knowledge-Based Systems, 157*, 20-33. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2018.05.008

Haldane, A. G., & May, R. M. (2011). Systemic risk in banking ecosystems. *Nature, 469*(7330), 351-355. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09659

Hall, W., & Pesenti, J. (2017). *Growing the artificial intelligence industry in the UK*. Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (United Kingdom). Retrieved from https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2017-10/apo-nid114781.pdf

Hatzakis, E. D., Nair, S. K., & Pinedo, M. (2010). Operations in financial services—An overview. *Production and Operations Management, 19*(6), 633-664. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-5956.2010.01163.x

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*, 115-135. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Hill, R. J., Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1977). Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: an introduction to theory and research. *Contemporary Sociology, 6*(2), 244. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/2065853

Hsu, P.-F., Kraemer, K. L., & Dunkle, D. (2006). Determinants of e-business use in US firms. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 10*(4), 9-45. doi: https://doi.org/10.2753/JEC1086-4415100401

Hu, D., Zhao, J. L., Hua, Z., & Wong, M. C. S. (2012). Network-based modeling and analysis of systemic risk in banking systems. *MIS Quarterly, 36*(4), 1269-1291. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/41703507

Hu, X., Wang, Z., & Liu, J. (2022). The impact of digital finance on household insurance purchases: Evidence from micro data in China. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance-Issues and Practice, 47*(3), 538-568. doi: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41288-022-00267-5

Huang, W.-Q., Zhuang, X.-T., Yao, S., & Uryasev, S. (2016). A financial network perspective of financial institutions' systemic risk contributions. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 456*, 183-

196. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2016.03.034

Huebner, R. A. (2017). *A Quantitative Analysis of Organizational Factors that Relate to Data Mining Success* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/openview/a775818d196e59830e162c33ecc94699

Ilollari, O. F., & Gjino, G. (2013). Financial crisis. Implementation of macro-and micro-prudential regulation. *Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research, 5*(1), 83-91. Retrieved from http://reaser.eu/RePec/rse/wpaper/R5_9_Gjino_Illolari_p83_91.pdf

Ishaya, T., & Folarin, M. (2012). A service oriented approach to Business Intelligence in Telecoms industry. *Telematics and Informatics, 29*(3), 273-285. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2012.01.004

Isogai, T. (2017). Dynamic correlation network analysis of financial asset returns with network clustering. *Applied Network Science, 2*(1), 8. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-017-0031-6

Kaffash, S., & Marra, M. (2017). Data envelopment analysis in financial services: a citations network analysis of banks, insurance companies and money market funds. *Annals of Operations Research, 253*, 307-344. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-016-2294-1

Kaiser-Bunbury, C. N., Mougal, J., Whittington, A. E., Valentin, T., Gabriel, R., Olesen, J. M., & Blüthgen, N. (2017). Ecosystem restoration strengthens pollination network resilience and function. *Nature, 542*(7640), 223-227. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21071

Kim, G., Shin, B., & Lee, H. G. (2009). Understanding dynamics between initial trust and usage intentions of mobile banking. *Information Systems Journal, 19*(3), 283-311. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2575.2007.00269.x

Kor, Y. Y., & Mesko, A. (2013). Dynamic managerial capabilities: Configuration and orchestration of top executives' capabilities and the firm's dominant logic. *Strategic Management Journal, 34*(2), 233-244. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2000

Korniyenko, M. Y., Patnam, M., del Rio-Chanon, R. M., & Porter, M. A. (2018). *Evolution of the global financial network and contagion: A new approach*. International Monetary Fund. Retrieved from https://www.imf.org/~/media/Files/Publications/WP/2018/wp18113.ashx

Kumar, A., Irsoy, O., Ondruska, P., Iyyer, M., Bradbury, J., Gulrajani, I., et al. (2016). Ask me anything: Dynamic memory networks for natural language processing. In *International conference on machine learning* (pp. 1378-1387). PMLR. doi: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1506.07285

Leung, L. C., & Cao, D. (2000). On consistency and ranking of alternatives in fuzzy AHP. *European Journal of Operational Research, 124*(1), 102-113. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(99)00118-6

Liu, N., He, Y., & Xu, Z. (2019). Evaluate public-private-partnership's Advancement using double hierarchy hesitant fuzzy linguistic PROMETHEE with subjective and objective information from stakeholder perspective. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy, 25*(3), 386-420. doi: https://doi.org/10.3846/tede.2019.7588

Liu, S., Caporin, M., & Paterlini, S. (2021). Dynamic network analysis of North American financial institutions. *Finance Research Letters, 42*, 101921. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2021.101921

Lovely, M., & Popp, D. (2017). Trade, technology, and the environment: Does access to technology promote environmental regulation? In *International economic integration and domestic performance* (pp. 169-188). World Scientific. doi: https://doi.org/10.1142/9789813141094_0010

Lui, A. (2010). Macro and micro prudential regulatory failures amongst financial institutions in the United Kingdom: Lessons from Australia. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance, 21*(3), 241-258. doi: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1716264

Lusardi, A., Hasler, A., & Yakoboski, P. J. (2021). Building up financial literacy and financial resilience. *Mind & Society, 20*, 181-187. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11299-020-00246-0

Manyika, J., Lund, S., Singer, M., White, O., & Berry, C. (2016). *Digital finance for all: Powering inclusive growth in emerging economies*. McKinsey Global Institute. Retrieved from https://www.findevgateway.org/paper/2016/09/digital-finance-all-powering-inclusive-growth-emerging-economies

Mazerolle, M. (2006). Improving data analysis in herpetology: using Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) to assess the strength of biological hypotheses. *Amphibia-Reptilia, 27*(2), 169-180. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/156853806777239922

McCloughan, P., & Lyons, S. (2006). Accounting for ARPU: New evidence from international panel data. *Telecommunications Policy, 30*(10-11), 521-532. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2006.09.001

Meyliana, M., & Fernando, E. (2019). The influence of perceived risk and trust in adoption of fintech services in Indonesia. *CommIT (Communication and Information Technology) Journal, 13*(1), 31-37. doi: https://doi.org/10.21512/commit.v13i1.5708

Moulin, H., & Sethuraman, J. (2013). The bipartite rationing problem. *Operations Research, 61*(5), 1087-1100. doi: https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2013.1199

Naubert, C., & Tesar, L. L. (2019). The value of systemic unimportance: The case of MetLife. *Review of Finance, 23*(6), 1069-1078. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfy037

Nie, C.-X., & Song, F.-T. (2018). Constructing financial network based on PMFG and threshold method. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 495*, 104-113. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2017.12.037

Poledna, S., Martínez-Jaramillo, S., Caccioli, F., & Thurner, S. (2021). Quantification of systemic risk from overlapping portfolios in the financial system. *Journal of Financial Stability, 52*, 100808. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2020.100808

Poledna, S., Molina-Borboa, J. L., Martínez-Jaramillo, S., Van Der Leij, M., & Thurner, S. (2015). The multi-layer network nature of systemic risk and its implications for the costs of financial crises. *Journal of Financial Stability, 20*, 70-81. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2015.08.001

Porter, T. (2010). Financial stability board. In *Handbook of transnational economic governance regimes* (pp. 345-353). Brill Nijhoff. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004163300.i-1081.271

Ravichandran, T., & Lertwongsatien, C. (2005). Effect of information systems resources and capabilities on firm performance: A resource-based perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 21*(4), 237-276. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2005.11045820

Roukny, T., Battiston, S., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2018). Interconnectedness as a source of uncertainty in systemic risk. *Journal of Financial Stability, 35*, 93-

106. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2016.12.003

Salminen, V., Ruohomaa, H., & Kantola, J. (2017). Digitalization and big data supporting responsible business co-evolution. In J. Kantola, T. Barath, S. Nazir, & T. Andre (Eds.), *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management, Training and Education: Proceedings of the AHFE 2016 International Conference on Human Factors, Business Management and Society, July 27-31, 2016, Walt Disney World®, Florida, USA* (pp. 1055-1067). Springer. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42070-7_96

Symonds, M. R., & Moussalli, A. (2011). A brief guide to model selection, multimodel inference and model averaging in behavioural ecology using Akaike's information criterion. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 65*, 13-21. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1037-6

Tang, Y., Xiong, J. J., Jia, Z.-Y., & Zhang, Y.-C. (2018). Complexities in financial network topological dynamics: Modeling of emerging and developed stock markets. *Complexity, 2018*(1), 1-31. doi: https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/4680140

Tu, C., Grilli, J., Schuessler, F., & Suweis, S. (2017). Collapse of resilience patterns in generalized Lotka-Volterra dynamics and beyond. *Physical Review E, 95*(6), 062307. doi: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.95.062307

Unger, C., Murthy, D., Acker, A., Arora, I., & Chang, A. (2020). Examining the evolution of mobile social payments in Venmo. In *International Conference on Social Media and Society* (pp. 101-110). ACM. doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400819

Vial, G. (2021). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Managing Digital Transformation, 28*(2), 118-144. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

Wiwanto, F. (2020). *Three factors driving the rise of FinTech and what the banking industry can learn from them*. Forbes Media. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesfinancecouncil/2020/04/02

Xie, Y., Jiao, F., Li, S., Liu, Q., & Tse, Y. (2022). Systemic risk in financial institutions: A multiplex network approach. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 73*, 101752. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2022.101752

Yang, C., & Liu, H. M. (2012). Boosting firm performance via enterprise agility and network structure. *Management Decision, 50*(6), 1022-1044. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741211238319

Yazıcıoğlu, A. Y., Roozbehani, M., & Dahleh, M. A. (2016). Resilience of locally routed network flows: More capacity is not always better. In *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)* (pp. 111-116). IEEE. doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2016.7798255

Yin, Z., Yang, H., Wu, P., Wu, Y., & Ma, X. (2019). Reconstructing geostationary satellite land surface temperature imagery based on a multiscale feature connected convolutional neural network. *Remote Sensing, 11*(3), 300. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11030300

Zha, Q., Kou, G., Zhang, H., Liang, H., Chen, X., Li, C.-C., & Dong, Y. (2020). Opinion dynamics in finance and business: a literature review and research opportunities. *Financial Innovation, 6*, 1-22. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-020-00211-3