

Does Firm-Level AI Adoption Improve Early-Warning of Corporate Financial Distress? Evidence from Chinese Non-Financial Firms

Frederik Rech

School of Economics, Beijing Institute of Technology,
Beijing, China
frederikrech@bit.edu.cn

Fanchen Meng*

Faculty of Economics, Shenzhen MSU-BIT University,
Shenzhen, China
612021000@smbu.edu.cn

Hussam Musa

Faculty of Economics, Matej Bel University,
Banská Bystrica, Slovakia
hussam.musa@umb.sk

Martin Šebeňa

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Hong Kong Baptist University,
Hong Kong SAR, China
sebena@hkbu.edu.hk

Siele Jean Tuo

Business School, Liaoning University,
Shenyang, China
tuosiele88@gmail.com

Does Firm-Level AI Adoption Improve Early-Warning of Corporate Financial Distress? Evidence from Chinese Non-Financial Firms

ABSTRACT

This study investigates whether firm-level artificial intelligence (AI) adoption improves the out-of-sample prediction of corporate financial distress models beyond traditional financial ratios. Using a sample of Chinese listed firms (2008-2023), we address sparse AI data with a novel pruned training window method, testing multiple machine learning models. We find that AI adoption consistently increases predictive accuracy, with the largest gains in recall rates for identifying distressed firms. Tree-based models and AI density metrics proved most effective. Crucially, models using longer histories outperformed those relying solely on recent "AI-rich" data. The analysis also identifies divergent adoption patterns, with healthy firms exhibiting earlier and higher AI uptake than distressed peers. These findings, while based on Chinese data, provide a framework for early-warning signals and demonstrate the broader potential of AI metrics as a stable, complementary risk indicator distinct from traditional accounting measures.

Keywords: Early Warning Model (EWM), Financial distress, Prediction models, Artificial intelligence, Machine Learning

1. Introduction

Corporate financial risk early-warning models have long been a central concern in finance, aimed at providing early warnings to stakeholders about the potential collapse of firms. Companies facing financial distress may default on credit obligations, enter debt restructuring processes, or even declare bankruptcy due to adverse financial conditions (Song et al., 2024). While the classical literature relies on accounting ratios and market-based indicators (Altman, 1968; Beaver, 1966; Ohlson, 1980), a growing body of work shows that modern machine-learning (ML) approaches extracting more signal from complex, high-dimensional data, improving early-warning models out-of-sample classification and calibration (Barboza et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2023). Building on these advances, recent work demonstrates that non-financial variables carry significant predictive weight alongside traditional financial metrics. Researchers incorporate macroeconomic conditions (Acosta-González et al., 2019; Sousa et al., 2022), industry structure (Sigrist & Leuenberger, 2023), regulatory environments (Fernández-Gámez et al., 2020), intellectual capital (Papíková & Papík, 2023), corporate governance (Meng et al., 2024) and ESG performance (Citterio & King, 2023). These variables carry additional

information about companies that is not captured in traditional financial data, and in many cases this information is inherently forward-looking.

In today's fast-paced markets, firms must innovate continuously or risk rapid erosion of their competitiveness. Yet standard accounting and market metrics understate innovation because internally generated intellectual property is weakly recognized, and investors often underreact to R&D and patent disclosures (Bai & Tian, 2020). Artificial intelligence (AI) serves as a salient case, as a general-purpose technology whose payoffs follow substantial complementary and mostly intangible investments in data, talent, processes, and organizational change, yielding a productivity J-curve in which costs and capital outlays rise before measured productivity improves (Brynjolfsson, Rock, & Syverson, 2021). China is an apt setting, as the 2017 New Generation AI Development Plan spurred rapid, policy-driven corporate adoption (Roberts et al., 2021), enabling analysis of early effects on financial health. Adoption has been shaped as much by policy incentives as by return on investment, with pronounced provincial heterogeneity and pilot zones in advanced regions like Guangdong and Zhejiang (Khanal et al., 2024); this top-down push can induce symbolic or compliance-driven uptake, including rebranding behavior, which may decouple observed AI activity from fundamentals even as authorities promote AI for financial risk monitoring and may channel support to adopters.

Conceptually, AI adoption can strengthen financial stability through three channels: (i) automation and predictive analytics that sharpen logistics, inventory, and demand forecasting, lowering cost volatility and improving working capital (Goldfarb et al., 2023); (ii) anomaly detection and AI-enabled controls that enhance reporting quality and curb governance-related distress (Chen et al., 2024; Habbal et al., 2024); and (iii) advanced analytics that raise decision quality and enable timely restructuring (Schrage et al., 2023). On the downside, the compute- and data-intensive nature of modern AI can raise a firm's carbon and resource footprint; opaque models and skewed data can entrench bias and harm; and surveillance-heavy applications may erode privacy and legitimacy, creating novel compliance and reputational exposures (Dwivedi et al., 2021). These risks are greatest when AI is treated as a plug-and-play substitute for labor; responsible adoption should emphasize human augmentation and robust governance.

The aim of this paper is to investigate whether firm-level AI adoption improves the predictive performance of corporate financial distress early-warning models beyond traditional accounting measures. Our contribution is fourfold. First, we add to the growing use of non-financial features by introducing AI adoption measures into

early-warning models (Papíková & Papík, 2023; Meng et al., 2024; Song et al., 2024). Second, we contribute to the literature on AI's economic impacts by extending it to the domain of corporate financial distress early-warning (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021; Goldfarb et al., 2023). Third, we introduce two AI variables, AI density full and AI density ChEn, which normalize AI term counts by full report length and by the Chinese and English narrative respectively. Fourth, we propose a pruned training window with a fixed test year that progressively drops the oldest training year, motivated by sparse AI disclosure in early years, to test whether focusing on later periods with more AI reporting improves early-warning models performance while preserving temporal validity. The remainder of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 details the data and methodology, Section 3 reports the empirical results, and Section 4 concludes.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Early-Warning of Corporate Financial Distress

Predicting corporate financial distress has moved from simple ratio-based discriminant models to dynamic market informed and machine learning systems. Early work showed that a few accounting ratios carry strong signals. Altman combined profitability, leverage, liquidity and activity ratios into the Z score to identify bankrupt firms (Altman, 1968) and related ratio models followed (Altman, 1983; Altman et al., 2017). Ohlson used logistic regression on ratios and firm size to relax discriminant analysis assumptions, but these static one period models often miss market signals and macro conditions (Ohlson, 1980).

Later research incorporated time and market information. Shumway (2001) pioneered a hazard model framework that treats bankruptcy as a time-varying probability, using covariates like stock returns and volatility to capture early distress signals. Campbell et al. (2008) advanced this with a dynamic logit model combining accounting and market-based variables, which significantly improved predictive accuracy and provided a useful measure for asset pricing. Contemporary refinements include incorporating macroeconomic variables (Acosta-González et al., 2019; Sousa et al., 2022) and using Bayesian methods to update models with new information (Traczynski, 2017).

More recently, machine learning and AI methods ingest high dimensional financial and nonfinancial features and typically outperform traditional models out of sample (Barboza et al., 2017; Zhong & Wang, 2022). A key challenge with black-box machine learning models in finance is their lack of interpretability, which hinders trust

and regulatory adoption. To solve this, recent research emphasizes explainable AI (XAI) such as SHAP analysis to identify specific distress drivers (Deng et al., 2025; Ma et al., 2023).

2.2 Artificial Intelligence and financial distress

Firms adopt AI to enhance performance by automating processes, enabling data-driven decisions, and generating predictive insights. Researchers have employed diverse methodologies to capture firm-level AI adoption, each with distinct advantages and limitations. Common approaches include textual analysis of corporate disclosures (Li et al., 2025), employee skill indices derived from résumés (Babina et al., 2024), AI-related job postings (Han et al., 2025), and industry-level robot penetration (Liu et al., 2025). This section analyzes how these AI capabilities influence financial distress by enhancing operational efficiency, fostering innovation, and strengthening risk management. These functions represent key mechanisms through which AI may help firms anticipate or avoid financial distress.

AI adoption significantly influences firm performance and risk through several channels. AI drives product innovation and growth, with firms investing in AI experiencing higher sales, employment, and market value growth, primarily through new product development (Babina et al., 2024). However, evidence on operational efficiency is mixed. While AI is theorized to enhance operational efficiency through automation and optimized decision-making (Dwivedi et al., 2021), empirical evidence remains mixed. Some studies demonstrate significant productivity gains, such as a 14% increase in output from generative AI assistance (Brynjolfsson et al., 2023). However, these gains are not universal, as other research finds that efficiency improvements are heavily contingent on complementary factors like data infrastructure (Bessen et al., 2022). Furthermore, AI's impact manifests through complex changes in labor composition rather than simple automation (Acemoglu et al., 2022), suggesting that net efficiency gains may be muted in the short run as firms undergo this transition. This aligns with the 'productivity J-curve' (Brynjolfsson et al., 2019), where initial investment costs outweigh benefits before eventual gains are realized. On the other hand, Li et al. (2025) find that AI shows no association with improvements in gross operational efficiency and is actually negatively related to net operational efficiency in Chinese-listed firms.

Methodologically, researchers have employed various identification strategies to establish causality. Some studies exploit policy shocks or industry trends as instruments for AI investment, such as regional AI initiative rollouts, to isolate causal impacts on performance. A consistent finding across these studies is that firm heterogeneity mediates AI's benefits. Larger firms and those with complementary

intangibles tend to reap greater performance gains (Babina et al., 2024; Song et al., 2022), while smaller or resource-constrained firms often adopt AI superficially, yielding limited improvements. Many firms appear stuck in a "pilot trap" characterized by experimenting with AI in isolated processes but not achieving scale, which limits measurable performance impact. This underscores the need for complementary investments in training and reorganization to unlock AI's potential, consistent with the "productivity J-curve" theory (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021).

A growing body of literature also examines AI's role in enhancing corporate risk management and resilience. Firms with AI-skilled workers recovered nearly all market value after natural disasters, attributed to superior operational adaptability (Han et al., 2025). Liu et al. (2025) demonstrate that AI reduces financial risks by enhancing talent recruitment, alleviating financing constraints through a resource effect, and improving total factor productivity. Paradoxically, AI adoption may also encourage greater strategic risk-taking. Chen et al. (2024) document that firms deeply integrating AI show approximately 6.5% greater risk propensity in investments and financing decisions, possibly because AI's predictive capabilities enable firms to pursue opportunities more aggressively.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Data sources and samples

Our research constructs a 2007–2023 firm-year panel for Chinese A-share companies using annual reports from Sina Finance, AI-related patent data from Chinese Research Data Services (CNRDS) Platform, and financial-statement variables from CSMAR. Following the approach in financial distress prediction literature (Zhao et al., 2023), financial firms were excluded as they rarely face financial distress in the Chinese market, making their inclusion in a distress-related study unnecessary, and their financial statement structures differ significantly from non-financial firms. The merged sample comprises 32,593 firm-years, including 1,099 (3.26%) distressed observations. To address missing data, we applied multiple imputation by chained equations (mice) with five imputations, using CART-based conditional models.

Distress is identified via the China Securities Regulatory Commission's (CSRC) ST/*ST designation. Most ST/*ST cases arise from two consecutive years of losses (about 80%); other cited triggers include operating losses, investment risk, bankruptcy, shrinking assets or equity contraction, and temporary pauses in operations (Meng et al., 2024). Following common practice, we predict distress at year t using each firm's ST/*ST status measured at $t - 2$ (Song et al., 2024).

We define healthy firms as those never flagged ST or *ST at any time in our sample. For distressed outcomes, we drop cases where the base-year observation (t−2) is already ST/*ST, so the model does not simply project an existing distressed status two years forward.

3.2 Variable Selection

Table 1 summarizes the variables used in our predictive models. The feature set comprises the five Altman Z-score components (Altman, 1968) with a suite of proxies designed to capture a firm's engagement with AI technologies. All AI adoption variables are constructed as indirect proxies, as true AI integration is not directly observable in corporate disclosures.

Measuring firm-level AI adoption is challenging due to its diverse applications, rapid evolution, and integration into broader digital processes. While survey-based metrics are limited in scale, text-based indicators from corporate disclosures offer a scalable and a popular alternative (Han & Meng, 2025; Chen et al., 2025; Yang and Yang (2025)). Following this approach, we construct a composite measure based on a unified 72-term AI lexicon compiled from prior academic lists, national research reports, and the WIPO AI glossary, harmonize Chinese and English variants, and collapse synonym. Using natural language processing techniques, we identify and aggregate occurrences of AI-related keywords across both documents, including core terms such as “artificial intelligence”, “machine learning”, “natural language processing”, “Internet of Things”, “distributed computing”, and “big data analytics”. Our primary firm-year AI adoption metric is the natural logarithm of one plus the total count of these terms across all disclosures. Similarly, we identify AI patents by applying the same lexicon to patent titles and abstracts, creating analogous measures for AI invention, utility model, and design patents (Chen & Zhang, 2025).

Alongside the raw count, we introduce two normalized variables, AI density full and AI density ChEn, that scale AI mentions by text length. These measures control verbosity and report size, so a firm that mentions AI 100 times in 20,000 words scores higher than one with 100 mentions in 50,000 words, and the ChEn version further focuses on narrative content to reduce noise.

Table 1
Variables Definitions.

Variable	Calculation	Definition
Financial variables		
X01	WorkingCapital / TotalAssets	Short-term liquidity; higher values indicate stronger ability to meet current obligations

X02	$\text{RetainedEarnings} / \text{TotalAssets}$	Accumulated profitability; reflects internal financing capacity and loss-absorption cushion
X03	$\text{EBIT} / \text{TotalAssets}$	Operating performance efficiency; gauges how effectively assets generate operating profit
X04	$\text{MarketValueOfEquity} / \text{TotalLiabilities}$	Market-based leverage; higher values imply a larger equity buffer relative to debt
X05	$\text{OperatingRevenue} / \text{TotalAssets}$	Asset productivity; measures sales generated per unit of assets
AI variables		
AI patents total	$\text{LN}(1 + [\text{AI invention} + \text{AI utility} + \text{AI design}])$	Total independent AI patent applications (sum of invention, utility, and design).
AI invention	$\text{LN}(1 + \text{AI invention})$	Independent AI invention patent applications (novel technical solutions).
AI utility	$\text{LN}(1 + \text{AI utility})$	Independent AI utility model patent applications (functional improvements).
AI design	$\text{LN}(1 + \text{AI design})$	Independent AI design patent applications (aesthetic appearance)
AI level	$\text{Ln}(1 + \text{AI frequency in AR})$	Captures the frequency of AI-related terms in the entire annual report
AI level MD&A	$\text{Ln}(1 + \text{AI frequency in MD\&A})$	Captures the frequency of AI-related terms in the Management Discussion & Analysis (MD&A) section
AI density full	AI frequency in AR/Full text length of AR	Ratio of AI-related term to total length of the annual report
AI density ChEn	AI frequency in AR/Chinese & English text total length	Ratio of AI-related terms to the narrative part of the annual report

Figure 1 tracks how often each variable is nonzero over time for both healthy and distressed firms. In both panels the early years 2008–2014 are dominated by zeros. Almost no firms register activity on the AI measures or the innovation proxies, so usable observations are scarce. Coverage climbs from 2015, especially broad AI adoption, and by 2020–2021 only about half of companies show any AI activity.

Healthy firms generally show higher and earlier uptake. Their AI adoption rises smoothly year after year and ends the period a bit above the distressed sample. Distressed firms also catch up late in the horizon, but their levels are slightly lower, and the paths look bumpier (also see Fig. 2). Distressed firms catch up late but remain lower and bumpier (also see Fig. 2). Auxiliary innovation signals such as patents, invention, utility, or design filings stay sparse (single digits to low teens), with brief late 2010s spikes, especially among healthy firms.

China's State Council's 2017 New Generation AI Development Plan and provincial subsidies and targets created strong incentives for AI-related patenting, helping set up a visible rise in 2019–2020 (Roberts et al., 2021). The spike can be explained by the 18-month publication lag because a 2018 filing wave would appear in 2019–2020 and mechanically lift counts (Okada & Nagaoka, 2020). Moreover, the dominance of invention patents is to be expected because subsidy amounts for invention patents are significantly higher than for utility models or design patents, further reinforcing the observed pattern (Dang & Motohashi, 2015)..




Fig. 1. Prevalence of AI measures over time (% of firms).

In line with Figure 1, the cross-sectional means show healthy firms scoring higher on every measure, including AI adoption levels, AI term densities, and patent activity across invention, utility, and design classes. The gap suggests healthier firms are more active in AI adoption on average.




Fig. 2. Mean AI adoption and innovation intensity by financial health.

3.3. Model construction and evaluation

Prior studies often evaluate models in ways that can overstate out-of-sample

performance. Several rely mainly on in-sample assessments that do not enforce chronological separation, yielding optimistic fit statistics with little ex-ante content (Citterio & King, 2023; Geng et al., 2015; Song et al., 2024). Others do perform ex-ante model validation, but starve the models with low count of data, either because of the data sample or undersampling strategies (Geng et al., 2015; Ma et al., 2023; Meng et al., 2024). These issues are amplified in our setting as AI adoption is scarce in the early sample (Fig. 1), reflecting an emerging technology; in subsequent years adoption becomes more common, reducing the share of zeros and altering the underlying distribution.

We therefore implement a pruned training window with a fixed test year (Fig. 3). The test set is 2023 and remains untouched during training and tuning. For split $k = 1, \dots, 14$, we train on $[s_k, 2022]$ and evaluate once on 2023, where $s_k \in \{2009, \dots, 2021\}$. Thus, the shortest window uses one year (2022); the longest uses the whole sample (2009–2022). This produces 14 chronologically valid training samples that shrink in length:

$$T_k = [s_k, 2022], \quad S = \{2023\},$$

The design mimics real-time forecasting avoids look-ahead bias and lets us study how performance evolves as more data is available and enters the sample.




Fig. 3 Pruned training window with fixed test year.

Within each training window we winsorize each predictor at the 1st/99th percentiles computed from the training slice only, then apply those limits to the test set. With the same procedure we also apply Z-score standardization. Within split s , we compute:

$$x_{z-score}^s = \frac{x - \mu_{train}^s}{\sigma_{train}^s},$$

where μ_{train}^s and σ_{train}^s are the mean and standard deviations of the training samples.

We model two scenarios, one that augments financial variables with AI features and another that relies on financial variables alone. We estimate six classifiers, namely XGBoost, LightGBM, Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression, Neural Networks (NN), and radial basis function support vector machine (RBF-SVM). For each T_k , hyperparameters are selected by 10-fold stratified cross-validation inside the training window only; the 2023 test data are never used for preprocessing, fitting, tuning, or threshold selection.

Class imbalance is handled via inverse-frequency class weights. Let n_1 and n_0 be the counts of distressed and healthy firm-years in T_k . We preserve the event rate across folds (class-stratified) and optimize a class-weighted loss with inverse-frequency weights:

$$w_1 = \frac{n}{2n_1}, w_0 = \frac{n}{2n_0}, \quad L = \sum_i w_y \ell(y_i, \hat{p}_i),$$

so the minority (distress) cases receive increased loss weight without synthetic rebalancing. This keeps the $AI = 0$ distribution intact and avoids starving the model of majority-class information that is essential for calibration.

We evaluate on a held-out 2023 test set, reporting AUC, Accuracy, Recall, Specificity, Precision, F1, G-Mean, and confusion-matrix counts as both split averages and split-specific results. For interpretation, we use SHAP explanations alongside model-specific feature importance.

4. Empirical results

4.1. Main results

Table 2 presents the out-of-sample performance of our six machine learning models, evaluated with and without the augmentation of AI-derived features, while Table 3 provides a rigorous statistical analysis of the effect of adding these AI variables across multiple data splits. The numbers in bold in Table 2 indicate the superior model within each algorithm pair (with vs. without AI). The central finding is that AI augmentation does not uniformly dominate all performance metrics; rather, it induces a critical trade-off. Specifically, models incorporating AI augmentation consistently and significantly enhances model sensitivity at a measurable cost, with its efficacy being highly model-dependent.

Table 2
Model Performance Comparison (With vs. Without AI)

	AUC	Accuracy	Recall	Specificity	F1-Score	G-Mean	TP	TN	FP	FN
XGB — with AI	0.870	0.825	0.755	0.826	0.105	0.788	38.50	3253.21	683.79	12.50
XGB — without AI	0.861	0.844	0.707	0.846	0.105	0.772	36.07	3330.43	606.57	14.93
LightGBM— with AI	0.879	0.845	0.739	0.847	0.112	0.790	37.71	3333.57	603.43	13.29
LightGBM— without AI	0.874	0.865	0.697	0.867	0.124	0.773	35.57	3414.93	522.07	15.43
RF— with AI	0.872	0.851	0.744	0.852	0.113	0.796	37.93	3353.86	583.14	13.07
RF— without AI	0.868	0.852	0.704	0.854	0.110	0.774	35.93	3360.71	576.29	15.07
LR— with AI	0.891	0.867	0.761	0.869	0.129	0.812	38.79	3419.29	517.71	12.21
LR— without AI	0.887	0.869	0.732	0.871	0.128	0.798	37.36	3427.79	509.21	13.64
NN— with AI	0.859	0.845	0.741	0.846	0.111	0.791	37.79	3330.71	606.29	13.21
NN— without AI	0.873	0.851	0.756	0.852	0.117	0.802	38.57	3355.50	581.50	12.43
SVM— with AI	0.889	0.847	0.790	0.848	0.120	0.818	40.29	3338.21	598.79	10.71
SVM— without AI	0.869	0.855	0.753	0.857	0.122	0.803	38.43	3373.00	564.00	12.57

Notes: Metrics are averaged over 12 splits under a pruned training window. Split 1 trains on 2009–2022; in each subsequent split we drop the oldest training year (2009–2022 ... 2022–2022) while the test set remains 2023, preserving its class imbalance and isolating how performance responds to the evolving training history.

Across algorithms the marginal value of AI shows up on imbalance-sensitive metrics. Recall and G-Mean improve in five of six models and AUC generally edges higher, while accuracy and specificity ease lower. Random Forest exhibits the cleanest and most pervasive lift, XGBoost and LightGBM post smaller but steady gains, Logistic Regression improves modestly, Support Vector Machines deliver the sharpest move in AUC with a clear detection benefit, and the neural network is the outlier with weaker results when AI variables are added which is consistent with noise amplification in rare-event data. The confusion-matrix pattern aligns with this trade off since true positives rise and false negatives fall at the cost of more false positives. Because estimates pool pruned-window splits, the gains are not driven by a single training history and they persist as the window shortens. In practice, AI features help identify more at-risk firms when missing a failure is costly. We verify this with split-wise paired tests that mirror our code, computing within-split differences and using paired t tests and a paired bootstrap to obtain p values and 95 percent confidence intervals, which show consistent gains in recall and G-Mean with AI alongside small, expected dips in accuracy and specificity as reported in Table 3.

Table 3
Effect of AI Adoption Features Across Splits.

	Effect of adding AI variables		Inference			Direction
	Δ (With – Without)	95% CI	t statistic	p-value (t)	p-value (boot)	
AUC						
XGBoost	0.0093	[0.0035, 0.0144]	3.2317	0.0066***	0.0016***	↑ AI better
LightGBM	0.0055	[0.0007, 0.0106]	2.0615	0.0598*	0.0228**	↑ AI better
RF	0.0041	[-0.0002, 0.0087]	1.7155	0.1100	0.0604*	↑ AI better
Logit	0.0040	[0.0010, 0.0069]	2.4887	0.0272**	0.0072***	↑ AI better
NN	-0.0139	[-0.0267, -0.0021]	-2.1095	0.0549*	0.0232**	↓ AI worse
SVM	0.0200	[0.0166, 0.0239]	10.0586	0.0000***	0.0000***	↑ AI better
F1						
XGBoost	0.0009	[-0.0080, 0.0086]	0.1936	0.8495	0.8232	↑ AI better
LightGBM	-0.0121	[-0.0362, 0.0028]	-1.0646	0.3064	0.2528	↓ AI worse

RF	0.0040	[-0.0047, 0.0117]	0.8913	0.3890	0.3408	↑ AI better
Logit	0.0012	[-0.0105, 0.0095]	0.2211	0.8284	0.7532	↑ AI better
NN	-0.0057	[-0.0127, 0.0008]	-1.5876	0.1364	0.0900*	↓ AI worse
SVM	-0.0003	[-0.0035, 0.0026]	-0.2117	0.8356	0.8332	↓ AI worse
GMean						
XGBoost	0.0166	[0.0020, 0.0314]	2.1202	0.0538*	0.0332**	↑ AI better
LightGBM	0.0169	[-0.0034, 0.0473]	1.1913	0.2548	0.1684	↑ AI better
RF	0.0212	[0.0055, 0.0394]	2.3534	0.0350**	0.0020***	↑ AI better
Logit	0.0144	[0.0084, 0.0204]	4.4928	0.0006***	0.0000***	↑ AI better
NN	-0.0116	[-0.0291, 0.0043]	-1.2733	0.2252	0.1708	↓ AI worse
SVM	0.0147	[0.0071, 0.0225]	3.5573	0.0035***	0.0004***	↑ AI better
Type I error (FPR)						
XGBoost	-0.0196	[-0.0587, 0.0070]	-1.0961	0.2929	0.2428	↓ AI increases Type I
LightGBM	-0.0207	[-0.0640, 0.0050]	-1.0208	0.3260	0.2960	↓ AI increases Type I
RF	-0.0017	[-0.0195, 0.0132]	-0.2029	0.8424	0.8764	↓ AI increases Type I
Logit	-0.0022	[-0.0192, 0.0124]	-0.2660	0.7944	0.8100	↓ AI increases Type I
NN	-0.0063	[-0.0267, 0.0102]	-0.6382	0.5344	0.5336	↓ AI increases Type I
SVM	-0.0088	[-0.0174, 0.0009]	-2.0068	0.0660*	0.0304**	↓ AI increases Type I
Type II error (FNR)						
XGBoost	0.0476	[0.0098, 0.0924]	2.1630	0.0498**	0.0112***	↑ AI reduces Type II
LightGBM	0.0420	[-0.0084, 0.1232]	1.1238	0.2814	0.2024	↑ AI reduces Type II
RF	0.0392	[-0.0014, 0.0854]	1.7416	0.1052	0.0544*	↑ AI reduces Type II
Logit	0.0280	[0.0098, 0.0462]	2.8594	0.0134**	0.0012***	↑ AI reduces Type II
NN	-0.0154	[-0.0561, 0.0224]	-0.7274	0.4799	0.4724	↓ AI increases Type II
SVM	0.0364	[0.0154, 0.0588]	3.1388	0.0078***	0.0004***	↑ AI reduces Type II

Notes: Δ for AUC/F1/GMean = WithAI - WithoutAI (↑ means AI better). Δ for Type I/II = WithoutAI - WithAI (↑ means AI reduces error). Significant differences at the 90%, 95% and 99% levels are indicated by *, ** and ***, respectively.

Across the 14 pruned-window splits, AI features generally lift predictive performance, though the size of the gain varies by model and becomes more volatile as the training history shortens. Tree based models are the most consistent beneficiaries. When deciding whether to use the full history or focus on recent years, the picture favors breadth. Baseline models without AI perform best with the full sample, and AI-augmented models also generalize better when trained on the entire history. Restricting later AI rich years does not help despite denser disclosure. AUC is relatively stable across splits, while F1 and G-Mean deteriorate more quickly as the window narrows, indicating reduced ability to identify distressed firms. Notably, several models with AI cross the 90 percent AUC mark and they do so in several splits concentrated in the 10th to 13th splits where the window is shortest; the locally estimated scatterplot smoothing curve still trends down because the neural networks underperform and pull the curve. G-Mean shows a similar pattern, with earlier splits seeing AI models clearing the 82 percent threshold more often. The error panels show the tradeoff. Type I error drifts up for both versions in later splits, while Type II error is lowest for the AI versions and stays below the 20 percent line for the vast majority of models; most importantly, the Type II error curve with AI remains comparatively stable as the window shortens, whereas the curve without AI deteriorates. Overall, without AI the Type I error stays roughly flat even as the window shortens, while the

Type II error rises quickly. With AI the pattern flips, since Type I creeps up but Type II remains low and comparatively stable. For practice this means AI augmentation is preferred when missing a distressed firm is costly, while accounting-only models may be acceptable where false alarms are costly. In both cases use the longest feasible training history and calibrate thresholds or apply cost-sensitive learning to align the error mix with institutional objectives.






Fig. 4. Split wise model performance (2023 test).

Figure 5 shows that traditional ratios (x03, x02, x01) still dominate predictions,


pushing firms toward distress when fundamentals weaken. By contrast, AI-related features such as AI Density (FULL, CHEN) and AI Level consistently shift scores downward, toward the healthy class. Panels (b) and (c) illustrate this mechanism locally for two sample firms. Overall, financials remain the primary drivers, and AI features act as stabilizers that tilt classifications toward healthy firms and sharpen distressed-firm recall.



(a) The influence between features and results



(b) Local interpretation of sample 1



(c) Local interpretation of sample 2

Fig. 5 Global and local SHAP explanations (based on the first split).

Following Citterio and King (2023) we interpret feature stability using two cues, how often a variable appears in the top six across splits and its mean rank where lower is better. Overall, AI features add complementary signal, with AI density measures ranking close to financial predictors x01, x04, and x05 in mean importance, while the other AI measures carry roughly similar weight to these financial variables. Density measures beat simpler indicators by capturing AI-disclosure intensity and breadth, smoothing wording differences. AI Patent proxies LnInvention and LnDesign are seldom selected, indicating limited and unstable contribution.




Fig. 6. Feature Importance Stability (With AI)

Notes: Bubble size and color encode mean normalized importance (1-100)

Finally, while this study shows that AI-adoption signals add predictive power for forecasting financial distress in China's fast-evolving market, caution is warranted in generalizing the results. Part of the association may reflect that financially healthier firms are better able to fund the complementary intangible investments that AI enables and requires (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021). Yet such investment does not insulate firms from established failure drivers or macro-regulatory shocks (Fernández-Gómez et al., 2020; Sousa et al., 2022).

4.2 Robustness check

To ensure the validity and generalizability of our primary findings, we conduct robustness checks by replicating our methodology on alternative test years, 2021 and 2022, confirming that the incremental predictive value of AI-adoption metrics for early-warning signals persists across distinct economic and disclosure environments.

Table 4

Model Performance with AI Features on Alternative Test Years (2021 & 2022)

	2021				2022			
	AUC	F1-Score	G-Mean	Recall	AUC	F1-Score	G-Mean	Recall
XGB — with AI	0.878	0.239	0.806	0.733	0.826	0.127	0.756	0.661
XGB — without AI	0.872	0.236	0.802	0.723	0.832	0.121	0.742	0.644
LightGBM— with AI	0.890	0.262	0.820	0.745	0.831	0.137	0.748	0.635

LightGBM— without AI	0.888	0.256	0.808	0.723	0.835	0.128	0.736	0.620
RF— with AI	0.887	0.251	0.822	0.755	0.828	0.130	0.766	0.676
RF— without AI	0.891	0.235	0.825	0.772	0.818	0.119	0.766	0.692
LR— with AI	0.876	0.283	0.830	0.757	0.819	0.138	0.744	0.624
LR— without AI	0.871	0.260	0.830	0.767	0.829	0.136	0.752	0.640
NN— with AI	0.844	0.201	0.775	0.702	0.795	0.122	0.713	0.579
NN— without AI	0.871	0.253	0.812	0.733	0.819	0.121	0.737	0.629
SVM— with AI	0.881	0.253	0.793	0.694	0.789	0.117	0.710	0.584
SVM— without AI	0.887	0.253	0.826	0.763	0.840	0.126	0.768	0.686

Notes: This table employs the identical temporally-pruned window procedure described in Table 2, applied here to the 2021 and 2022 test years. The corresponding training windows are consequently shorter.

The out-of-sample performance for 2021 demonstrates high and stable predictive accuracy, with AUC consistently in the upper-80s for both specifications; models augmented with AI proxies, however, frequently achieve superior G-Mean and recall across most temporal splits (see Fig. 7). While the locally estimated scatterplot smoothing curve for the AI-enhanced model occasionally converges with or dips below the finance-only benchmark, the prevalence of individual AI data points above their counterparts within splits indicates recurrent, though moderated, split-level gains. This incremental value becomes critically apparent during the 2022 stress year, where all models deteriorate, evidenced by an approximate five percentage point decline in AUC and a drift in recall below 70 percent; however, the incorporation of AI features demonstrably cushions this drop. Notably, as the training window shortens, the finance-only model's G-Mean declines precipitously, while the AI-augmented model decays more gradually and maintains a higher position, particularly in the final splits reliant on recent, volatile data, signifying that AI variables provide a stabilizing signal when the accounting-to-distress mapping becomes unstable. Model heterogeneity reveals this robustness is not universal; architectures like NN and SVM can dampen the pooled AI performance, yet tree-based methods such as XGBoost, LightGBM, and Random Forest consistently outperform their finance-only equivalents on key metrics in both periods. Thus, the evidence substantiates that AI-adoption proxies deliver complementary information for distress identification.




Fig. 7 Split wise model performance (2021 & 2022 test).

4.3. Generalizability and the Chinese Institutional Setting

The findings of this study demonstrate that AI-adoption signals provide significant incremental power for forecasting financial distress within China's dynamic market. However, the generalizability of these results to other institutional contexts requires careful consideration. The Chinese setting is characterized by a distinct, policy-driven model of technological diffusion, heavily influenced by top-down initiatives. The 2017 "New Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan" is not merely a strategic document but a comprehensive national blueprint that set the explicit goal of making China the world leader in AI by 2030, monetizing it into a trillion-yuan industry, and shaping global ethical standards (Roberts et al., 2021). This stands in contrast to the more market-led adoption patterns often observed in liberal economies.

The implementation of this strategy creates a unique ecosystem. The central government provides a "stamp of approval" and incentivizes action, but the actual innovation and transformation are driven by local governments and a selected "national team" of private champions like Baidu, Alibaba, and Tencent, which receive

preferential treatment to focus on strategic AI sectors (Roberts et al., 2021). This state-guided, yet decentralized, execution model, combined with political incentives for local officials to fulfill central government initiatives, creates a powerful engine for policy-driven adoption that may differ fundamentally from corporate AI investment decisions in other countries (Khanal et al., 2024).

Consequently, the predictive relationship we identify may be shaped by these unique institutional factors, including the structure of state-firm relationships and specific disclosure incentives within China (Chen et al., 2024; Dang and Motohashi, 2015). The AI metrics captured in our study likely reflect not only genuine technological integration but also strategic responses to this distinct policy landscape. Therefore, the external validity of our specific coefficient estimates may be limited, as the observed relationship between AI disclosure and financial distress is embedded within China's particular socio-political and economic context.

5. Conclusion

We study whether firm AI disclosures add predictive value for financial distress in Chinese non-financials by combining accounting predictors with AI variables extracted from MD&A and full annual reports and by evaluating six machine learning models with and without these signals. We compare models on AUC, F1, G-Mean, accuracy, and Type I and Type II errors using a pruned training window that holds the 2023 test set fixed and we repeat key tests in alternative years to check stability.

Our main finding is that AI augmentation improves early-warning performance in ways that matter for supervision. Gains concentrate in recall and G-Mean and AUC is generally higher, while accuracy and specificity ease lower as models flag more cases. The effect is model dependent, with tree ensembles showing the most reliable improvements. Error profiles clarify the tradeoff, since without AI the Type I error stays roughly stable as the window shortens while the Type II error rises quickly, whereas with AI the Type II error stays low and comparatively stable and the Type I error drifts up, which matches the split-wise figures. Results hold across test years and split averaging and are confirmed by paired t tests and a paired bootstrap. The longest feasible history still generalizes best and restricting to recent AI-rich years does not beat the full history, so AI complements rather than replaces a broad training base. Feature importance and confusion-matrix patterns suggest that AI variables capture digital capability and process quality that financial ratios miss and that separation between adopters and non-adopters is sharper in stressed and shorter windows. We also document divergent adoption patterns, with healthy firms adopting AI earlier and at higher levels than distressed peers.

Our study contributes to research by documenting when and how disclosure-based AI measures add to traditional predictors of failure in a large emerging market. For practice the guidance is straightforward. Include AI variables when the cost of missing a distressed firm is high, keep long training histories, refresh models regularly to manage concept drift, and calibrate thresholds or apply cost-sensitive learning to control the extra alerts. For regulators the results indicate that AI-augmented models can improve identification of vulnerable firms without sacrificing transparency, especially when paired with explainability tools that support review and audit. Limitations remain. Our study focuses on Chinese listed non-financial firms in a policy driven setting, which may limit generalization to other countries, other policy regimes, and to private firms. The AI measures are disclosure based and may miss unreported deployments. Future work should link these proxies to direct measures of AI use, extend the analysis to unlisted firms and other markets, and test robustness outside China.

References

1. Acemoglu, D., Autor, D., Hazell, J., & Restrepo, P. (2022). Artificial Intelligence and Jobs: Evidence from Online Vacancies. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 40(S1). <https://doi.org/10.1086/718327>
2. Acosta-González, E., Fernández-Rodríguez, F., Ganga, H., 2019. Predicting corporate financial failure using macroeconomic variables and accounting data. *Computational Economics*, 53 (1), 227–257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-017-9737-x>
3. Altman, E.I., 1968. Financial ratios, discriminant analysis and the prediction of corporate bankruptcy. *The Journal of Finance*, 23 (4), 589–609. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2978933>
4. Altman, E. I. (1983). *Corporate Financial Distress: A Complete Guide to Predicting, Avoiding, and Dealing With Bankruptcy* (2nd ed.). Wiley Interscience, John Wiley and Sons.
5. Altman, E. I., Iwanicz-Drozdowska, M., Laitinen, E. K., & Suvas, A. (2017). Financial Distress Prediction in an International Context: A Review and Empirical Analysis of Altman's Z-Score Model. *Journal of International Financial Management & Accounting*, 28(2), 131–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/JIFM.12053>
6. Babina, T., Fedyk, A., He, A., & Hodson, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence, firm growth, and product innovation. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 151, 103745. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2023.103745>
7. Bai, Q., Tian, S., 2020. Innovate or die: Corporate innovation and bankruptcy

forecasts. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 59, 88–108.

8. Barboza, F., Kimura, H., Altman, E., 2017. Machine learning models and bankruptcy prediction. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 83, 405–417.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2017.04.006>
9. Beaver, W.H., 1966. Financial ratios as predictors of failure. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 4, 71–111. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2490171>
10. Bessen, J., Impink, S. M., Reichensperger, L., & Seamans, R. (2022). The role of data for AI startup growth. *Research Policy*, 51(5), 104513.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104513>
11. Brynjolfsson, E., Rock, D., Syverson, C., 2021. The productivity J-curve: How intangibles complement general purpose technologies. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 13 (1), 333–372.
<https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20180386>
12. Campbell, J. Y., Hilscher, J., & Szilagyi, J. (2008). In search of distress risk. *Journal of Finance*, 63(6). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2008.01416.x>
13. Chen, H., Zhang, M., Zeng, J., & Wang, W. (2024). Artificial intelligence and corporate risk-taking: Evidence from China. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, 17(3), 100372.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjar.2024.100372>
14. Chen, E., & Zhang, H. (2025). Research on the impact of artificial intelligence technology on urban public health resilience. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1506930>
15. Citterio, A., King, T., 2023. The role of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) in predicting bank financial distress. *Finance Research Letters*, 51, 103411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2022.103411>
16. Dang, J., Motohashi, K., 2015. Patent statistics: A good indicator for innovation in China? Patent subsidy program impacts on patent quality. *China Economic Review*, 35, 137–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2015.03.012>
17. Dwivedi, Y.K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., et al., 2021. Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, 101994.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.00>
18. Fernández-Gámez, M.Á., Soria, J.A.C., Santos, J.A.C., Alaminos, D., 2020. European country heterogeneity in financial distress prediction: An empirical analysis with macroeconomic and regulatory factors. *Economic Modelling*, 88, 398–407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2019.09.050>
19. Geng, R., Bose, I., Chen, X., 2015. Prediction of financial distress: An empirical

study of listed Chinese companies using data mining. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 241 (1), 236–247.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2014.08.016>

20. Goldfarb, A., Taska, B., Teodoridis, F., 2023. Could machine learning be a general purpose technology? A comparison of emerging technologies using data from online job postings. *Research Policy*, 52 (1), 104653.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104653>
21. Habbal, A., Ali, M.K., Abuzaraida, M.A., 2024. Artificial intelligence trust, risk and security management (AI TRiSM): Frameworks, applications, challenges and future research directions. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 240, 122442.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.122442>
22. Han, M., Shen, H., Wu, J., & Zhang, X. (Michael). (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Firm Resilience: Empirical Evidence from Natural Disaster Shocks. *Information Systems Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2022.0440>
23. Han, W.-Z., & Meng, W. (2025). Does AI contribute to systemic risk reduction in non-financial corporations? *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 100, 101973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.qref.2025.101973>
24. Khanal, S., Zhang, H., & Taeihagh, A. (2024). Development of New Generation of Artificial Intelligence in China: When Beijing's Global Ambitions Meet Local Realities. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 34(151), 19–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2024.2333492>
25. Li, Q., Zhang, Y., & Um, G. (2025). Intertwining artificial intelligence and efficiency: An empirical analysis of AI focus and operational efficacy in Chinese listed firms. *Finance Research Letters*, 80, 107451.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.107451>
26. Liu, S., Gao, L., & Chen, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence adoption and corporate financial risk. *Finance Research Letters*, 85, 107938.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.107938>
27. Ma, Y., Zhang, P., Duan, S., Zhang, T., 2023. Credit default prediction of Chinese real estate listed companies based on explainable machine learning. *Finance Research Letters*, 58, 104305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104305>
28. Meng, Q., Zheng, X., Wang, S., 2024. Corporate governance and financial distress in China: A multi-dimensional nonlinear study based on machine learning. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 88, 102549.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2024.102549>
29. Nguyen, H.H., Viviani, J.L., Ben Jabeur, S., 2023. Bankruptcy prediction using machine learning and Shapley additive explanations. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 65, 107–148.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11156-023-01192-x>

30. Ohlson, J.A., 1980. Financial ratios and the probabilistic prediction of bankruptcy. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 18(1), 109–131.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2490395>
31. Okada, Y., Nagaoka, S., 2020. Effects of early patent publication on knowledge dissemination: Evidence from U.S. patent law reform. *Information Economics and Policy*, 51, 100852. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoecopol.2020.100852>
32. Papíková, L., Papík, M., 2023. Application of intellectual capital in SME bankruptcy. *Applied Economics*, 56(55), 7317–7338.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2023.2281291>
33. Roberts, H., Cows, J., Morley, J., Taddeo, M., Wang, V., Floridi, L., 2021. The Chinese approach to artificial intelligence: An analysis of policy, ethics, and regulation. *AI & SOCIETY*, 36(1), 59–77.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00992-2>
34. Shumway, T. (2001). Forecasting bankruptcy more accurately: A simple hazard model. *Journal of Business*, 74(1), 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209665>
35. Schrage, M., Kiron, D., Candelon, F., Khodabandeh, S., Chu, M., 2023. AI is helping companies redefine, not just improve, performance. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 64(3).
36. Sigrist, F., Leuenberger, N., 2023. Machine learning for corporate default risk: Multi-period prediction, frailty correlation, loan portfolios, and tail probabilities. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 305(3), 1390–1406.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2022.06.035>
37. Song, Y., Li, R., Zhang, Z., Sahut, J.-M., 2024. ESG performance and financial distress prediction of energy enterprises. *Finance Research Letters*, 65, 105546.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2024.105546>
38. Sousa, A., Braga, A., Cunha, J., 2022. Impact of macroeconomic indicators on bankruptcy prediction models: Case of the Portuguese construction sector. *Quantitative Finance and Economics*, 6 (3), 405–432.
<https://doi.org/10.3934/QFE.2022018>
39. Traczynski, J. (2017). Firm Default Prediction: A Bayesian Model-Averaging Approach. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 52(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S002210901700031X>
40. Yang, G., & Yang, X. (2025). AI adoption and ESG performance: Evidence from China. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 104, 104659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.104659>
41. Zhao, Q., Xu, W., & Ji, Y. (2023). Predicting financial distress of Chinese listed companies using machine learning: To what extent does textual disclosure

matter? *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 89,
102770. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2023.102770>

42. Zhong, J., & Wang, Z. (2022). Artificial intelligence techniques for financial distress prediction. *AIMS Mathematics*, 7(12).
<https://doi.org/10.3934/math.20221145>