International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 479-488

To cite this article: Mikhail Kobanenko (2025). EVALUATION OF AI TECHNOLOGIES FOR RISK MANAGEMENT IN ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENT FIRMS, International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies (IJRCMS) 7 (5): 479-488 Article No. 518 Sub Id 927

EVALUATION OF AI TECHNOLOGIES FOR RISK MANAGEMENT IN ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENT FIRMS

Mikhail Kobanenko

Master of Business Administration in Finance, Metropolitan College of New York
New York, USA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38193/IJRCMS.2025.7536

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the evaluation of artificial intelligence technologies for risk management in alternative investment firms. The relevance of the study is explained by the growing complexity of hedge funds, private equity, and private credit portfolios, where nonlinear risks and data scarcity challenge traditional models. The novelty of the research lies in a comparative analysis of supervised, unsupervised, natural language processing, and generative modeling approaches applied to financial risk forecasting and stress testing. The paper describes specific use cases of machine learning in value-at-risk estimation, default prediction, anomaly detection, and sentiment analysis. Particular emphasis is placed on the determining significance of explainable artificial intelligence in reinforcing transparency, regulatory adherence, and structured oversight, with the study aiming to illustrate how intelligent systems are capable of strengthening early detection mechanisms, minimizing anomaly incidence, and enhancing operational performance—while accounting for obstacles such as data integrity, model uncertainty, and integration barriers—by employing comparative and analytical frameworks applied to peer-reviewed academic literature and specialized industry documentation, and the concluding section identifies prerequisites for the responsible incorporation of AI solutions into alternative investment practices, offering practical value for scholars, supervisory bodies, market professionals, and policy developers seeking to align advanced technological instruments with reliable risk governance in the financial domain.

KEYWORDS: AI in risk management, alternative investments, supervised learning, unsupervised learning, NLP, generative models, stress testing, explainable AI

INTRODUCTION

Alternative investment firms (including hedge funds, private equity, and private credit firms) face distinctive risk characteristics – such as illiquidity, regime shifts, heavy-tailed returns, concentrated exposures, and complex operational processes – that challenge traditional risk models. Conventional approaches (e.g. parametric VaR/ES, stress tests) often under-capture nonlinearities and extreme

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 479-488

events. In response, many financial institutions have begun incorporating artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) into risk management: a recent survey found that over half of banks and insurers now apply AI/ML techniques in their model risk frameworks. This paper reviews predictive AI/ML technologies in the alternative investment context, linking specific risk tasks to suitable models, evaluation criteria, and governance practices. In particular, we examine supervised learning for value-at-risk (VaR)/expected shortfall (ES) forecasting and default prediction, unsupervised learning for anomaly and regime detection, natural language processing (NLP) for text-based risk signals, and generative modeling for stress scenarios. Emphasis is placed on rigorous validation (e.g. quantile loss and backtesting for market risk, discrimination and calibration metrics for credit risk) and explainability to support transparency and regulatory compliance. AI applications are illustrated in hedge funds (e.g. recurrent neural net VaR, regime monitoring) and private credit/PE (e.g. PD models with alternative data, text-based early warnings), and outline a governance checklist for human-in-the-loop deployment. The goal is to demonstrate how AI can enhance early warning capabilities, reduce exception rates, and improve operational efficiency in alternatives, while highlighting the data, model-risk, and integration challenges that must be addressed. Objectives:

1) To assess how AI models can improve early risk detection in alternative investments.
2) To compare the effectiveness of AI-based forecasting with traditional risk methods in reducing exception rates.
3) To analyze governance, data, and integration requirements for efficient and reliable AI adoption.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

The preparation of this article required a comprehensive review of academic and industry sources, each contributing specific perspectives to the evaluation of artificial intelligence in risk management for alternative investment firms. J. Bowden, M. Cummins, D. Dao, and K. Jain [1] analyzed the importance of explainable AI in financial risk management and proposed practical frameworks for embedding transparency into risk systems. I. Chronopoulos, A. Raftapostolos, and G. Kapetanios [2] developed deep neural network quantile regression models for forecasting Value-at-Risk, demonstrating advantages of nonlinear methods over linear benchmarks. H. Daiya [3] investigated AI-driven strategies in financial technology, focusing on predictive analytics and portfolio stress testing in dynamic environments. Deloitte experts [4] presented the results of an industry survey, highlighting current challenges in model risk governance and identifying control practices for AI-driven models in Europe. P. Hernández de Cos [5] discussed the readiness of banking institutions to cooperate in AI adoption, emphasizing supervisory coordination and global regulatory harmonization. G. Leitner, J. Singh, A. van der Kraaij, and B. Zsámboki [6] reviewed benefits and risks of artificial intelligence for financial stability, underlining potential systemic vulnerabilities associated with opaque algorithms. Z. Liu and H. Liang [7] improved default prediction in alternative lending by

integrating machine learning models with credit bureau datasets, showing significant gains in accuracy metrics. A. Naidu [8] introduced generative adversarial networks as tools for scenario analysis and stress testing, expanding the range of risk events beyond historical data. A. Omoseebi, J. Owen, and Q. Loveth [9] applied natural language processing methods for sentiment analysis in financial markets, demonstrating how textual information can be converted into actionable risk signals. The European Parliament and Council [10] adopted the Artificial Intelligence Act, providing a legislative framework for AI deployment in financial domains, setting requirements for explainability and accountability.

The methodological basis of the study consisted of comparative analysis and synthesis of the above works, combined with source analysis and critical evaluation. Each contribution was examined in relation to supervised learning, unsupervised methods, natural language processing, and generative models. In addition, a regulatory dimension was integrated through the study of official documentation to ensure compliance-driven conclusions. In summary, the methodology combined source analysis, comparative evaluation, and synthesis of results from both academic research and regulatory publications, allowing the identification of the most effective approaches to the application of artificial intelligence in risk management for alternative investment firms.

RESULTS

Analysis identifies several notable findings. First, supervised ML methods improve risk forecasting. For example, deep learning quantile regression techniques have been shown to significantly enhance VaR predictions. Deep neural network quantile estimator outperforms linear quantile regression for VaR, delivering better finite-sample accuracy and showing gains in back testing tests [2]. Similarly, neural-network and ensemble approaches (e.g. LSTM or mixture density networks) have been found to adapt to changing market volatility better than static models. In credit risk, machine learning also adds value: in alternative lending, integrating rich credit bureau data with advanced ML (e.g. random forests) raises predictive power markedly. In one study, a random forest using credit scores, loan features, and 300+ selected bureau variables achieved an AUC of 0.854 in default classification – far above the AUC~0.60 using credit scores alone [7]. This underlines that nonlinear models, when fed comprehensive data, can sharply improve default-prediction accuracy in alt credit portfolios. A systematization of approaches is presented below (Table 1).

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 479-488

Table 1. Classification of machine learning methods for risk forecasting in alternative investments (compiled by the author based on [2, 3])

Approach	Risk application	Key advantages	Limitations
Supervised Learning	VaR/ES forecasting, default risk	High predictive accuracy, well-suited for labeled datasets	Requires large volumes of labeled data
Unsupervised Learning	Regime detection, anomaly discovery	Identifies hidden structures, effective with unlabeled data	Difficult interpretation, sensitive to parameters
NLP	Processing news, reports, documents	Early warning signals, access to unstructured data	Noise, language/cultural biases
Generative Models	Stress scenarios, simulations	Creates novel scenarios beyond history	Validation complexity, risk of unrealistic outputs

Second, unsupervised learning can reveal latent risk patterns. Clustering and anomaly detection help uncover market regimes and outlier behaviors not apparent to parametric models. For instance, recent work uses clustering of momentum and risk features to identify distinct market states (expansion, crisis, etc.) and builds a probabilistic state machine that captures regime transitions. This approach significantly outperforms traditional Gaussian scenarios in capturing the true skewness and kurtosis of returns. Such regime models allow scenario generation that reflects heavy tails and fat correlations, providing a more realistic stress-testing baseline [4]. The typology of market regimes and their characteristics is outlined below (Table 2).

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 479-488

Table 2. Typology of market regimes and their implications for risk management (compiled by the author based on [1])

Market regime	Key characteristics	Detection methods	Potential risks
Expansion	High liquidity, stable returns	Clustering, return dynamics analysis	Illusion of stability, asset bubbles
Crisis	Sharp volatility, correlated downturns	Anomaly detection, state-transition models	Systemic losses, liquidity crunch
Transition	Unstable trends, rising correlations	Markov regime-switching models	Uncertainty of transitions, false signals
Stagnation	Low returns, reduced activity	Regression, cluster-based analysis	Long-term underestimation of risks

Likewise, clustering credit portfolios or client segments may uncover correlated default risk groupings. Although fewer academic studies focus on unsupervised AML/fraud in alternatives, anomaly detection techniques (e.g. autoencoders, isolation forests) are increasingly applied in transaction monitoring and operational-risk management to flag unusual patterns.

Third, NLP unlocks unstructured risk signals. Large language models and sentiment-analysis tools process earnings reports, news, social media, and regulatory filings to generate early-warning indicators. Researchers are studying the application of NLP in the financial sector, noting that as firms confront vast unstructured data, NLP is vital for risk prediction and compliance [9]. They highlight that integrating text-based features (e.g. sentiment scores, event counts) can help identify threats faster and more accurately. For example, NLP-derived sentiment or topic indices have been used to adjust VaR models in near real time, or to flag credit downgrades and covenant breaches. In private equity/credit, NLP on loan documents and market reports can pre-empt borrower distress signals. The key finding is that combining ML models with NLP-derived features enriches the risk-monitoring toolkit. A systematization of unstructured data sources and NLP methods is provided below (Table 3).

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 479-488

Table 3. Sources of unstructured data and NLP techniques for investment risk management (compiled by the author based on [4])

Data source	Risk-related information	NLP techniques applied	Limitations
News & Media	Sentiment, unexpected events	Sentiment analysis, topic modeling	High noise, short-lived signals
Company Reports	Financial metrics, forecasts	Entity extraction, tone analysis	Formalized language, heterogeneous formats
Social media	Mass sentiment, panic signals	Stream analysis, text clustering	Verification difficulty, manipulation risk
Regulatory Documents	New requirements, sanctions	Text mining, classification	Large volume, technical/legal style

Fourth, generative modeling enhances stress testing. Traditional stress tests rely on historical shocks or expert scenarios, which may miss unprecedented crises. Generative AI methods (e.g. GANs) have been proposed to create synthetic but realistic stress scenarios. A recent experiment applied generative adversarial networks to financial data, yielding diverse extreme scenarios that maintain internal coherence across variables. The GAN framework was able to replicate severe market conditions beyond the historical sample and provided more comprehensive risk coverage than standard distributional assumptions [8]. These AI-driven scenarios may help alt managers explore tail risks in complex portfolios (e.g. liquidity crunches or rapid shifts in correlations) that classical models overlook.

Fifth, evaluation and governance remain essential. Across all AI methods, rigorous backtesting and explainability are crucial. For market-risk models, this means using quantile regression loss, conditional coverage tests (Kupiec, Christoffersen), and ES backtests to ensure VaR/ES forecasts are reliable. For credit models, discrimination metrics (AUC/precision-recall) and calibration tests must be routinely applied. The literature emphasizes incorporating explainable AI (XAI) tools and clear governance. Recent work argues that explainability must receive the same attention as predictive performance [1]. Transparency is now explicitly required by regulators (e.g. EU AI Act mandates decision outcomes be explainable). In practice, this means deploying SHAP, LIME or surrogate trees

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 479-488

to interpret black-box ML outputs, establishing challenger models and documentation, and conducting regular re-validation.

Collectively, these results suggest that predictive AI can materially enhance early warning and efficiency in alternative investment risk management. As one example, the ML-driven alt-lending default model not only achieved higher accuracy, but also underscored key risk factors (loan size, duration, credit inquiries) that risk officers should monitor [7]. Similarly, NLP enhancements in risk signal processing promise to reduce false negatives in news-based warnings. The overall finding is that where sufficient data are available, AI techniques outperform legacy models in spotting nonlinearities and tail events. These findings are contingent, however, on addressing data quality and integration – issues we discuss below.

DISCUSSION

The above findings indicate that AI/ML holds significant promise for alt risk management, but also highlight several caveats. On the positive side, AI-driven risk models can improve early detection of distress. For instance, ML VaR models adapt to volatility spikes more quickly, reducing exception rates, and credit ML models flag at-risk borrowers earlier than static scoring alone. AI can also streamline operations: anomaly-detection algorithms can automate reconciliation and alert on settlement breaks, while NLP can auto-classify regulatory documents. These efficiencies free human analysts to focus on judgement-intensive tasks.

However, data limitations in alternatives temper this promise. Alternative assets are often illiquid and data-sparse; returns histories are shorter and less granular than for liquid markets. As the ECB notes, AI benefits depend critically on data quality – poor or insufficient data can yield faulty predictions that, if unchecked, could lead to severe losses or even market disruptions [6]. In practice, many alt managers must integrate proprietary and third-party data (e.g. NAV reporting, firmographics, alternative data feeds) to feed ML models. Ensuring consistent data pipelines and avoiding bias (sampling only “survivor” funds) are nontrivial tasks. Moreover, as pointed out in industry surveys, model complexity raises governance challenges: respondents to a 2023 Deloitte study warned that while AI models boost insight, their opacity demands stronger controls [4]. In other words, model risk management is critical. Institutions must calibrate models prudently and maintain “challenger” alternatives to guard against overfitting or structural breaks.

Another consideration is implementational disparity. The major benefits of AI are likely to accrue to firms with advanced infrastructure. ECB analysts observe that large institutions with established data science teams and robust data access are more readily able to adopt complex AI solutions, whereas smaller firms may “miss the transition” due to resource constraints. This could lead to competitive

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 7, No. 05 Sep-Oct; 2025 Page. No. 479-488

gaps within the industry. Hence, smaller alternative managers may need to rely on vendor platforms or consortium data solutions. In any case, deployment of AI must be phased with careful human oversight – a human-in-the-loop model where algorithmic signals inform but do not automatically execute decisions.

Regulatory and ethical factors further influence adoption. Explainable AI (XAI) methods are increasingly required: regulators (and fiduciaries) demand transparency in risk models, especially since AI can affect investment outcomes. Explainability also aids internal risk committees in understanding model drivers. Contemporary analytical overviews in the financial domain place considerable emphasis on embedding interpretable AI practices across all operational layers—ranging from the preliminary configuration of input variables to subsequent retrospective analysis—while simultaneously ensuring that algorithmic supervision remains structurally aligned with institutional mechanisms of enterprise risk oversight, which in applied terms necessitates meticulous registration of data origins, continuous observation of deviations in model behavior, and systematic production of comprehensive assessments related to algorithmic uncertainty, all against the backdrop of an evolving compliance landscape that includes regulatory innovations such as the anticipated legislative framework on artificial intelligence within the European Union.

CONCLUSION

This analysis demonstrates that the application of artificial intelligence and machine learning methodologies is capable of materially enhancing the structure of risk oversight in organizations engaged with alternative capital strategies through the identification of complex nonlinear patterns, the expansion of informational inputs used in decision processes, and the automation of mechanisms responsible for recognizing latent vulnerabilities within dynamic financial environments. In predictive tasks, supervised learning has yielded more accurate VaR/ES forecasts and default predictions than classical models, while unsupervised learning uncovers hidden market regimes and anomalies. NLP brings unstructured risk signals into quantitative models, and generative models expand stress-testing beyond historical crises. However, the analysis also highlights critical prerequisites: data quality and availability, rigorous model validation (e.g. backtesting metrics for VaR and PD), and explainability must not be neglected. The transition to AI-driven risk management should be accompanied by strengthened governance, as recommended by recent industry frameworks, to ensure transparency and accountability.

From a practical standpoint, the results indicate that alternative asset managers who allocate resources toward the development of data architecture and the cultivation of machine learning competencies are positioned to benefit from earlier threat detection and more stable operational continuity—illustrated, for instance, by the implementation of ensemble-based LSTM models for value-at-risk estimation in

hedge fund environments via live monitoring interfaces, or by the incorporation of financial language processing techniques into credit evaluation workflows in private lending contexts—while the scientific relevance of these findings consists in uniting foundational concepts from risk management theory with advanced algorithmic techniques and context-specific assessment metrics, ultimately leading to the conclusion that artificial intelligence, when deployed with deliberate attention to interpretability, model-related uncertainty, and technical integration hurdles, is capable of reinforcing both analytical clarity and functional efficiency within alternative investment structures, thereby offering actionable direction to financial practitioners seeking to embed AI into regulatory and strategic frameworks and to academic contributors focused on constructing specialized algorithmic tools for financial domains, with a view toward a governance paradigm in which robust oversight mechanisms and intelligent automation coexist as mutually reinforcing components.

REFERENCES

1. Bowden, J., Cummins, M., Dao, D., & Jain, K. (2024, March). *Explainable AI for financial risk management* (FRIL White Paper Series). University of Strathclyde. https://doi.org/10.17868/strath.00089573
2. Chronopoulos, I., Raftapostolos, A., & Kapetanios, G. (2023). Forecasting Value-at-Risk using deep neural network quantile regression. *Journal of Financial Econometrics, 2023*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1093/jjfinec/nbad014
3. Daiya, H. (2024). AI-driven risk management strategies in financial technology. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence General Science (JAIGS), 5*(1), 194–216. https://doi.org/10.60087/jaigs.v5i1.194
4. Deloitte. (2024). *EMEA model risk management survey 2023 – Deloitte Italy*. https://www.deloitte.com/it/it/Industries/financial-services/research/emea-model-risk-management-survey-2023--deloitte-italy.html
5. Hernández de Cos, P. (2024, April 17). *Managing AI in banking: Are we ready to cooperate?* Bank for International Settlements. https://www.bis.org/speeches/sp240417.htm
6. Leitner, G., Singh, J., van der Kraaij, A., & Zsámboki, B. (2024, May). The rise of artificial intelligence: Benefits and risks for financial stability. *Financial Stability Review*. European Central Bank. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/financial-stability-publications/fsr/special/html/ecb.fsrart202405_02~58c3ce5246.en.html
7. Liu, Z., & Liang, H. (2025). Enhancing default prediction in alternative lending: Leveraging credit bureau data and machine learning. *Journal of Risk Model Validation, 19*(1). https://doi.org/10.21314/JRMV.2025.003
8. Naidu, A. (2024). GANs for scenario analysis and stress testing in financial institutions. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR), 6*(3). https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/3/40681.pdf

9. Omoseebi, A., Owen, J., & Loveth, Q. (2023). Natural language processing (NLP) for sentiment analysis in financial markets. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR), 6*(3). https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/3/40681.pdf
10. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act). *Official Journal of the European Union, L, 2024/1689*, 1–XXX. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng