

Responsible Decision-Making in Algorithmic Distribution Networks: Reconciling Productivity with Justice

Camille Laurent

Department of Digital Economics and Ethics, European Research University, Paris, France

VOLUME 03 ISSUE 04 (2026)

Published Date: 10 April 2026 // Page no.: - 06-13

ABSTRACT

Algorithmic distribution networks have become foundational to modern financial systems, supply chains, and real-time decision infrastructures, where automated models increasingly determine resource allocation, pricing strategies, and risk distribution. While these systems significantly enhance productivity through speed, scalability, and predictive accuracy, they simultaneously raise critical concerns regarding fairness, transparency, and ethical accountability. This paper investigates the intersection of algorithmic efficiency and distributive justice, focusing on how responsible decision-making frameworks can be embedded within AI-driven network architectures.

Drawing upon machine learning, reinforcement learning, federated learning, and entropy-based optimization techniques, this research synthesizes findings from contemporary literature to evaluate both the technical capabilities and socio-ethical implications of algorithmic decision systems. Studies on reinforcement learning in trading environments demonstrate strong predictive and adaptive capabilities but also reveal instability under high-volatility conditions (Felizardo et al., 2022; Millea, 2021). Similarly, big data analytics and neural architectures have improved financial forecasting accuracy, yet often at the cost of interpretability and fairness (Harris & Harris, 2024; Wang et al., 2016).

The paper further explores ethical tensions in algorithmic optimization, particularly the trade-off between efficiency maximization and equitable outcomes. A key analytical lens is provided by recent work on AI ethics in optimization systems, emphasizing the need to balance fairness constraints with performance objectives (Raikar et al., 2026). This perspective is extended across algorithmic distribution networks where similar trade-offs emerge in financial trading, supply chains, and automated fraud detection systems (Mohammed et al., 2024; Oyeniyi et al., 2024).

Methodologically, this study employs a qualitative meta-synthesis of selected literature to construct an integrated conceptual framework. The findings suggest that responsible algorithmic governance requires hybrid models combining technical optimization with ethical constraint layers, including fairness-aware learning, federated governance structures, and entropy-regulated decision thresholds (Vrinceanu & Serban, 2025; Shanmugam et al., 2023).

The paper concludes that reconciling productivity with justice is not a purely technical challenge but a systemic governance issue requiring interdisciplinary coordination between machine learning design, regulatory oversight, and ethical computation principles.

Keywords: Algorithmic decision-making, distributive justice, reinforcement learning, federated learning, ethical AI, financial systems, supply chain optimization, fairness-aware algorithms, entropy-based optimization, responsible AI governance.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid proliferation of algorithmic systems in contemporary economic and industrial ecosystems has fundamentally restructured how decisions are made, evaluated, and executed. From financial trading platforms to global supply chain networks, algorithmic distribution systems now mediate complex resource allocation processes with minimal human intervention. These systems leverage advances in machine learning,

reinforcement learning, and large-scale data analytics to optimize performance metrics such as speed, cost-efficiency, and predictive accuracy (Harris & Harris, 2024; Felizardo et al., 2022).

However, the increasing reliance on algorithmic governance introduces a significant tension between productivity and justice. While algorithms are highly effective in identifying patterns and optimizing outcomes, they are inherently constrained by the quality of data, model design choices, and

embedded objective functions. As a result, optimization processes may unintentionally reinforce structural biases, amplify inequalities, or prioritize efficiency over fairness (Millea, 2021). This raises critical concerns about whether algorithmic systems can be considered neutral decision-makers or whether they inherently encode normative assumptions.

In financial systems, algorithmic trading models have demonstrated remarkable capability in executing high-frequency transactions, predicting market movements, and optimizing portfolio allocations. Yet, such systems often operate as opaque black boxes, limiting interpretability and accountability (Wang et al., 2016). Similarly, fraud detection systems based on machine learning demonstrate high accuracy but may disproportionately flag certain demographic or transactional patterns, leading to fairness concerns (Mohammed et al., 2024).

The problem becomes more complex in distributed algorithmic networks where decision-making is decentralized. Federated learning architectures attempt to address privacy and data fragmentation issues by enabling decentralized model training. However, these systems introduce additional governance challenges related to coordination, consistency, and fairness across nodes (Shanmugam et al., 2023). In such environments, ensuring equitable outcomes requires not only technical optimization but also ethical alignment across distributed agents.

A critical dimension in this discourse is the emerging field of ethical AI optimization, which emphasizes the integration of fairness constraints into algorithmic decision-making processes. Recent research highlights the necessity of balancing efficiency with fairness in AI-based optimization systems, particularly in high-impact domains such as supply chains and financial markets (Raikar et al., 2026). This dual-objective framing challenges traditional optimization paradigms that prioritize singular objective maximization.

Another important consideration is the role of entropy-based decision-making models, which introduce probabilistic variability into algorithmic systems to avoid deterministic bias reinforcement. Entropy mechanisms, when integrated with reinforcement learning frameworks, can improve exploration capabilities while reducing overfitting to biased historical data (Vrinceanu & Serban, 2025). Such approaches represent a shift toward more adaptive and ethically aware algorithmic systems.

The primary objective of this paper is to critically analyze how algorithmic distribution networks can be designed to reconcile productivity with justice. Specifically, it aims to: (1) examine the technical foundations of algorithmic

decision systems, (2) evaluate ethical and fairness-related challenges, (3) synthesize existing literature into an integrated conceptual framework, and (4) propose governance-oriented design principles for responsible algorithmic systems.

The scope of this research spans financial systems, AI-driven supply chain networks, and distributed learning architectures. By focusing on these domains, the paper highlights both domain-specific challenges and cross-cutting ethical concerns. The significance of this study lies in its interdisciplinary approach, bridging computational intelligence, systems engineering, and ethical governance.

Literature Review

The literature on algorithmic decision-making systems spans multiple domains including machine learning, financial analytics, distributed AI architectures, and ethical optimization frameworks. A consistent theme across these studies is the tension between performance optimization and fairness preservation.

Reinforcement learning has been extensively applied to trading systems due to its ability to adapt to dynamic environments. Felizardo et al. (2022) provide a comprehensive survey of reinforcement learning applications in trading systems, highlighting their capacity for sequential decision optimization. However, they also emphasize limitations such as reward mis-specification and instability in non-stationary markets. Millea (2021) further critiques deep reinforcement learning approaches, arguing that while they improve predictive performance, they often lack interpretability and robustness under extreme market conditions.

In contrast, big data-driven financial models emphasize large-scale pattern recognition. Harris and Harris (2024) demonstrate that integrating big data analytics into portfolio optimization enhances predictive accuracy and risk diversification. However, such models are highly dependent on data quality and may amplify existing market biases.

Neural network-based approaches also contribute significantly to financial time series prediction. Wang et al. (2016) propose an Elman recurrent random neural network model for forecasting financial sequences, demonstrating improved accuracy in capturing temporal dependencies. Despite these advances, neural models often suffer from overfitting and lack transparency, making them difficult to deploy in regulated environments.

Beyond financial modeling, fraud detection systems illustrate another application of algorithmic decision-making. Mohammed et al. (2024) highlight the effectiveness of machine learning-based real-time fraud detection systems in identifying anomalous transactions. However, these systems may introduce fairness concerns when certain user groups are disproportionately flagged due to biased training data.

Federated learning introduces a decentralized paradigm for AI training. Shanmugam et al. (2023) discuss the architecture and challenges of federated learning systems, emphasizing privacy preservation and distributed computation. Nevertheless, issues such as model inconsistency and fairness across heterogeneous nodes remain unresolved.

Ethical considerations in AI optimization have gained increasing attention. Raikar et al. (2026) argue that AI-based optimization systems must balance efficiency with fairness to avoid reinforcing systemic inequalities. Their work provides a conceptual foundation for integrating ethical constraints into algorithmic decision-making frameworks, particularly in supply chain optimization systems. This perspective is highly relevant to algorithmic distribution networks, where similar efficiency–fairness trade-offs exist.

Entropy-based optimization methods offer an alternative approach to balancing exploration and exploitation in decision systems. Vrinceanu and Serban (2025) propose entropy-based decision-making frameworks for algorithmic trading, demonstrating that controlled randomness can improve robustness and reduce overfitting. Such approaches may also contribute to fairness by preventing deterministic bias reinforcement.

Collectively, the literature reveals a fragmented but converging research landscape. While technical advancements in machine learning and distributed AI have significantly improved system performance, ethical and fairness considerations remain underdeveloped. This gap underscores the need for integrated frameworks that simultaneously address productivity and justice in algorithmic distribution networks.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Approach

This study adopts a qualitative meta-synthesis research design focused on integrating findings from existing scholarly work on algorithmic decision-making systems. The objective is not empirical experimentation but the construction of a unified conceptual and technical framework that explains how algorithmic distribution networks can simultaneously optimize productivity and ensure distributive justice.

A meta-synthesis approach is appropriate because the literature spans multiple domains—financial machine learning, reinforcement learning systems, federated learning architectures, and ethical AI optimization frameworks. Each domain independently addresses partial aspects of the problem, but lacks a unified governance model. Therefore, this methodology enables systematic integration of fragmented insights into a

coherent analytical structure.

The analytical process follows three phases:

1. Extraction of technical constructs (algorithms, architectures, models)
2. Extraction of ethical constraints (fairness, accountability, transparency)
3. Synthesis into a hybrid governance framework

This approach aligns with prior interdisciplinary AI research paradigms, particularly those emphasizing socio-technical system integration (Shanmugam et al., 2023).

Conceptual Framework: Algorithmic Distribution Network Model (ADNM)

The proposed conceptual framework, termed the Algorithmic Distribution Network Model (ADNM), represents distributed decision systems where autonomous or semi-autonomous agents allocate resources based on learned optimization policies.

Core Components of ADNM:

1. Decision Engine Layer
 - o Reinforcement learning or deep neural network-based policy models
 - o Responsible for sequential decision-making
 - o Example: trading agents optimizing portfolio allocation (Felizardo et al., 2022)
2. Data Aggregation Layer
 - o Big data pipelines collecting structured and unstructured inputs
 - o Includes financial signals, transaction logs, or supply chain telemetry (Harris & Harris, 2024)
3. Ethical Constraint Layer
 - o Implements fairness, bias mitigation, and equity constraints
 - o Inspired by ethical AI optimization frameworks (Raikar et al., 2026)
4. Distributed Coordination Layer
 - o Federated learning or decentralized optimization systems
 - o Ensures privacy-preserving model training

(Shanmugam et al., 2023)

5. Entropy Regulation Layer

o Controls randomness and exploration in decision policies

o Prevents overfitting and deterministic bias reinforcement (Vrinceanu & Serban, 2025)

Algorithmic Foundations

Reinforcement Learning Mechanisms

Reinforcement learning (RL) serves as the primary decision-making mechanism in ADN. The system is modeled as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), defined by:

- States (S): system conditions (market state, supply demand status)
- Actions (A): possible decisions (buy/sell, allocate resources)
- Rewards (R): performance feedback (profit, efficiency, fairness score)

The policy $\pi(a|s)$ is optimized to maximize expected cumulative reward.

However, traditional RL models prioritize efficiency, often neglecting fairness constraints. To address this, the reward function is extended:

$$R' = \alpha R_{\text{efficiency}} + \beta R_{\text{fairness}}$$

where:

- α controls productivity optimization
- β introduces distributive justice constraints

This modification aligns with fairness-aware reinforcement learning principles (Millea, 2021).

Deep Neural Decision Systems

Neural architectures, particularly recurrent neural networks such as Elman networks, are used for time-dependent forecasting tasks (Wang et al., 2016). These models capture temporal dependencies in financial and operational data streams.

In ADN, neural networks function as predictive engines for:

- Demand forecasting
- Risk estimation

- Price movement prediction

However, neural models introduce interpretability challenges. To mitigate this, the framework integrates explainability modules that compute feature attribution scores, enabling partial transparency in decision justification.

Federated Learning Architecture

Federated learning enables decentralized model training without centralizing raw data. This is critical for privacy-sensitive environments such as financial systems and global supply chains.

The federated process includes:

1. Local model training on distributed nodes
2. Parameter aggregation at central coordinator
3. Global model update dissemination

Mathematically:

$$\theta_{\text{global}} = \sum w_i \theta_i$$

Where:

- θ_i = local model parameters
- w_i = weighting factor based on data size or reliability

Despite its advantages, federated learning introduces fairness inconsistencies across nodes, particularly when data distributions are non-identical (Shanmugam et al., 2023).

Ethical Constraint Modeling

Fairness Definition in Algorithmic Systems

Fairness is operationalized through three dimensions:

1. Outcome Fairness – equitable distribution of benefits
2. Process Fairness – unbiased decision mechanisms
3. Representation Fairness – balanced data representation

These dimensions are embedded into optimization objectives.

Ethical Optimization Function

The system introduces a multi-objective optimization function:

Maximize:

$$F = \lambda_1(\text{Efficiency}) + \lambda_2(\text{Accuracy}) + \lambda_3(\text{Fairness})$$

Subject to:

- Risk constraints
- Resource constraints
- Distribution constraints

This formulation directly integrates ethical considerations into computational decision-making (Raikar et al., 2026).

Bias Mitigation Strategies

Bias mitigation is implemented through:

- Data reweighting techniques
- Adversarial debiasing networks
- Constraint-based learning
- Entropy regularization

These techniques ensure that model outputs do not disproportionately favor specific groups or system nodes.

Entropy-Based Decision Regulation

Entropy is introduced as a regulatory mechanism to prevent deterministic convergence of policies.

In reinforcement learning systems, excessive exploitation leads to biased outcomes. Entropy regularization modifies the policy objective:

$$J = E[R] + \eta H(\pi)$$

Where:

- $H(\pi)$ = entropy of policy distribution
- η = entropy coefficient

This encourages exploration and reduces over-concentration of decisions in narrow outcome spaces (Vrinceanu & Serban, 2025).

System Workflow Architecture

The ADNM operates in the following sequential workflow:

1. Data ingestion from distributed sources
2. Preprocessing and normalization
3. Local model training (federated nodes)
4. Policy generation via RL or neural networks
5. Ethical constraint evaluation
6. Entropy-based adjustment

7. Final decision execution
8. Feedback loop integration

This architecture ensures continuous adaptation while maintaining fairness constraints.

Real-World Application Scenarios

Financial Trading Networks

Algorithmic trading systems use ADNM to balance profit maximization with market fairness. For example, high-frequency trading strategies are regulated using entropy constraints to avoid market manipulation patterns (Millea, 2021).

Supply Chain Distribution Systems

In supply chains, ADNM ensures equitable resource allocation across regions while maintaining efficiency. Ethical optimization ensures that no node is systematically disadvantaged (Raikar et al., 2026).

Fraud Detection Systems

Machine learning models detect anomalies in financial transactions. However, fairness constraints prevent disproportionate targeting of specific demographic groups (Mohammed et al., 2024).

Methodological Limitations

Despite its integrative strength, the methodology has limitations:

- Dependence on secondary literature restricts empirical validation
- Ethical quantification of fairness remains context-dependent
- Computational complexity increases with multi-objective constraints
- Federated systems introduce communication overhead

RESULTS

The synthesis of algorithmic distribution network literature reveals a consistent structural pattern: while technical models achieve substantial gains in predictive accuracy and operational efficiency, their integration with fairness and justice constraints remains uneven and often underdeveloped. Across reinforcement learning, neural forecasting systems, federated learning architectures, and entropy-based optimization methods, three dominant findings emerge.

First, reinforcement learning-based systems demonstrate high adaptability in dynamic environments but exhibit instability when reward functions are not explicitly aligned with ethical constraints. Studies show that when optimization prioritizes purely economic or performance-based outcomes, the resulting policies tend to concentrate rewards among high-efficiency pathways, inadvertently marginalizing alternative but socially relevant outcomes (Felizardo et al., 2022; Millea, 2021). This indicates that productivity maximization without fairness constraints leads to skewed decision distributions.

Second, federated learning systems improve privacy and decentralization but introduce heterogeneity-induced fairness inconsistencies across distributed nodes. Variations in data quality, volume, and representativeness across nodes result in uneven model performance. Consequently, some participants benefit disproportionately from global model updates, while others experience degraded outcomes. This confirms that decentralization alone does not guarantee equitable system behavior and may, in fact, amplify structural imbalances if not governed by fairness-aware aggregation mechanisms (Shanmugam et al., 2023).

Third, entropy-based regulation mechanisms significantly enhance system robustness by preventing deterministic convergence of decision policies. By introducing controlled randomness, these systems avoid overfitting to historical patterns and reduce bias reinforcement cycles. However, excessive entropy can reduce system efficiency and increase variance in decision outcomes. Thus, entropy acts as a stabilizing but trade-off-dependent mechanism rather than a universal fairness solution (Vrinceanu & Serban, 2025).

Across financial and operational applications, algorithmic models consistently outperform traditional heuristic systems in efficiency metrics such as prediction accuracy, execution speed, and scalability. However, fairness evaluation reveals persistent disparities in outcome distribution, particularly in systems lacking explicit ethical constraint layers. Fraud detection models, for instance, demonstrate high accuracy but exhibit uneven false-positive rates across user segments, suggesting latent bias embedded in training data structures (Mohammed et al., 2024).

A key integrative finding is that fairness cannot be achieved as a byproduct of optimization; it must be explicitly encoded within system objectives. Multi-objective optimization frameworks that combine efficiency, accuracy, and fairness show improved balance but introduce computational complexity and convergence challenges. Overall, the results indicate that algorithmic distribution networks require hybrid governance structures that integrate technical optimization with

normative constraints to achieve balanced performance outcomes (Raikar et al., 2026).

DISCUSSION

The findings highlight a fundamental paradox in algorithmic distribution networks: systems designed to maximize efficiency inherently risk producing inequitable outcomes unless explicitly constrained by fairness-aware mechanisms. This tension reflects a deeper structural issue in computational optimization, where objective functions are traditionally defined in purely quantitative terms, excluding normative considerations such as justice or equity.

From a theoretical perspective, reinforcement learning systems illustrate how reward-driven optimization can unintentionally encode systemic bias. When reward functions prioritize financial returns or operational efficiency, agents converge toward strategies that maximize short-term gains, often at the expense of broader distributional fairness. This aligns with prior observations that deep reinforcement learning systems lack inherent interpretability and robustness in ethically sensitive environments (Millea, 2021).

Federated learning further complicates this landscape. While it decentralizes data processing and enhances privacy, it does not inherently solve fairness disparities. Instead, it redistributes computational responsibility across heterogeneous nodes, each with distinct data distributions. This leads to uneven model performance and raises questions about fairness across participants. Thus, decentralization must be paired with fairness-aware aggregation rules to ensure equitable outcomes (Shanmugam et al., 2023).

Entropy-based decision mechanisms introduce an important corrective dimension by preventing deterministic convergence. However, entropy alone cannot guarantee fairness; it merely introduces variability into decision-making. Excessive entropy can degrade system performance, highlighting a trade-off between exploration and stability. This reinforces the notion that fairness must be structurally embedded rather than probabilistically induced (Vrinceanu & Serban, 2025).

The integration of ethical AI principles provides a more robust solution. By embedding fairness constraints directly into optimization functions, systems can simultaneously evaluate efficiency and equity. This multi-objective formulation represents a significant shift from traditional single-objective optimization paradigms. However, balancing competing objectives introduces computational overhead and requires careful calibration of weighting parameters (Raikar et al., 2026).

Practically, the implications of these findings are significant for financial systems, supply chains, and automated decision infrastructures. In financial markets, fairness-aware models can reduce systemic bias in trading strategies and risk

allocation. In supply chains, they can ensure equitable resource distribution across regions. In fraud detection systems, they can minimize discriminatory false-positive rates across demographic groups (Mohammed et al., 2024).

Despite these advancements, several limitations remain. First, fairness metrics are often context-dependent and lack universal standardization. Second, multi-objective optimization introduces computational inefficiencies that may limit scalability. Third, the integration of ethical constraints into real-time systems remains technically challenging due to latency and resource constraints.

Overall, the discussion underscores that reconciling productivity with justice is not merely a technical optimization problem but a socio-technical governance challenge requiring interdisciplinary coordination between machine learning design, ethical theory, and system architecture.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the structural and ethical tensions inherent in algorithmic distribution networks, with a specific focus on reconciling productivity-driven optimization with distributive justice. Across financial systems, machine learning architectures, federated learning environments, and reinforcement learning frameworks, a consistent pattern emerges: algorithmic efficiency tends to improve operational performance, but without explicit ethical constraints, it can simultaneously generate uneven and potentially unjust outcomes.

The central contribution of this paper is the development of an integrated conceptual perspective in which algorithmic decision systems are understood as socio-technical constructs rather than purely computational tools. The proposed Algorithmic Distribution Network Model (ADNM) demonstrates that effective governance of such systems requires layered integration of decision engines, data pipelines, ethical constraint modules, distributed coordination mechanisms, and entropy-based regulation layers.

A key insight from the analysis is that fairness cannot emerge implicitly from optimization processes. Instead, it must be explicitly encoded through multi-objective functions that balance efficiency, accuracy, and justice. Reinforcement learning systems, while powerful in dynamic environments, require carefully designed reward structures to prevent biased convergence. Similarly, federated learning systems, despite their privacy-preserving advantages, must incorporate fairness-aware aggregation strategies to avoid unequal performance across distributed nodes.

Entropy-based regulation introduces an additional

stabilizing mechanism that enhances exploration and reduces deterministic bias reinforcement. However, it functions best as a complementary tool rather than a standalone solution. The findings collectively indicate that no single technique is sufficient to ensure responsible algorithmic decision-making.

From a broader perspective, the study emphasizes that algorithmic governance is fundamentally an ethical and institutional challenge. Technical improvements alone are insufficient unless accompanied by governance frameworks that define acceptable trade-offs between productivity and justice. In practical terms, this necessitates collaboration between data scientists, system architects, policymakers, and ethicists.

Future research should focus on developing standardized fairness metrics applicable across domains, improving computational efficiency of multi-objective optimization, and designing real-time ethical constraint enforcement mechanisms. Additionally, empirical validation of the proposed framework in real-world financial and supply chain systems would further strengthen its applicability.

In conclusion, achieving responsible decision-making in algorithmic distribution networks requires a paradigm shift from efficiency-centric optimization to fairness-integrated intelligence systems, where productivity and justice are treated as co-equal objectives rather than competing priorities.

REFERENCES

1. L. K. Felizardo, F. C. L. Paiva, A. H. R. Costa, and E. Del-Moral-Hernandez, "Reinforcement Learning Applied to Trading Systems: A Survey," Nov. 2022, [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.06064>
2. L. Harris and L. Harris, "Algorithmic Trading and Portfolio Optimization Using Big Data Analytics," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386076052>
3. Millea, "Deep reinforcement learning for trading—a critical survey," *Data*, vol. 6, no. 11. MDPI, Nov. 01, 2021. Doi: 10.3390/data6110119.
4. M. A. Mohammed, K. Rakesh, V. Kothapalli, R. Mohammed, and F. Mae, "Machine Learning-Based Real-Time Fraud Detection in Financial Transactions Prasanna Pasam." [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381146733>
5. K. Mullangi, V. K. Yarlagadda, N. Dhameliya, and M. Rodriguez, "Integrating AI and Reciprocal Symmetry in Financial Management: A Pathway to Enhanced Decision-Making," 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://upright.pub/index.php/ijrstp/OriginalContrib>

ution

6. Lawrence Damilare Oyeniyi, Chinonye Esther Ugochukwu, and Noluthando Zamanjomane Mhlongo, "Analyzing the impact of algorithmic trading on stock market behavior: A comprehensive review," *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 437 - 453, Apr. 2024, Doi: 10.30574/wjaets.2024.11.2.0136.

7. Raikar, T., Ezeugboaja, F., Bussa, S., Upadhyay, H., &Kalaru, P. (2026). Ethics of AI-based supply chain optimization: a better balance between efficiency and fairness . *Future Technology*, 5(2), 281–296. Retrieved from <https://fupubco.com/futech/article/view/831>

8. L. Shanmugam, R. Tillu, and M. Tomar, "Federated Learning Architecture: Design, Implementation, and Challenges in Distributed AI Systems," *Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology* ISSN: 2959-6386 (online), vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 371 - 384, Sep. 2023, Doi: 10.60087/jklst.vol2.n2.p384.

9. B. P. Vrinceanu and F. Serban, "Optimizing Algorithmic Trading with Machine Learning and Entropy-Based Decision Making." Mar. 31, 2025. Doi: 10.20944/preprints202502.1717.v2.

10. J. Wang, J. Wang, W. Fang, and H. Niu, " Financial Time Series Prediction Using Elman Recurrent Random Neural Networks," *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, vol. 2016, 2016, Doi: 10.1155/2016/4742515.