

FinAgent: An Agentic AI Framework Integrating Personal Finance and Nutrition Planning

Toqeer Ali Syed^{1,*}, Abdulaziz Alshahrani¹, Ali Ullah¹, Ali Akarma¹
Sohail Khan², Muhammad Nauman², Salman Jan³

¹Faculty of Computer and Information System, Islamic University of Madinah, Saudi Arabia

²Department of Computer Science, Effat College of Engineering, Effat University, Saudi Arabia

³Arab Open University, Bahrain

*Corresponding author: toqeer@iu.edu.sa

Abstract—The issue of limited household budgets and nutritional demands continues to be a challenge especially in the middle-income environment where food prices fluctuate. This paper introduces a price aware agentic AI system, which combines personal finance management with diet optimization. With household income and fixed expenditures, medical and well-being status, as well as real-time food costs, the system creates nutritionally sufficient meals plans at comparatively reasonable prices that automatically adjust to market changes. The framework is implemented in a modular multi-agent architecture, which has specific agents (budgeting, nutrition, price monitoring, and health personalization). These agents share the knowledge base and use the substitution graph to ensure that the nutritional quality is maintained at a minimum cost. Simulations with a representative Saudi household case study show a steady 12-18% reduction in costs relative to a static weekly menu, nutrient adequacy of over 95% and high performance with price changes of $\pm 20\text{-}30\%$. The findings indicate that the framework can locally combine affordability with nutritional adequacy and provide a viable avenue of capacity-building towards sustainable and fair diet planning in line with Sustainable Development Goals on Zero Hunger and Good Health.

Index Terms—Agentic AI, Household Budgeting, Diet Optimization, Nutritional Adequacy, Multi-Agent Systems, Price-Aware Meal Planning, Sustainable Development Goals

I. INTRODUCTION

Financial, healthcare, and digital services have also been transformed by artificial intelligence (AI) with generative AI being used to create content, reason, and support interactive decision-making [1], [2]. Nevertheless, the majority of systems are responsive and do not have long-term planning or goal-seeking independence. The

This paper was presented at the IEEE International Conference on Computing and Applications (ICCA 2025), Bahrain.

gaps are filled in agentic AI, which involves combining action loops based on planning, monitoring, memory and tools, and facilitating goal-directed behaviour [3], [4]. Gartner estimates that in 2028, agentic-AI will be present in one-third of applications [5].

With these developments, household decisionmaking, especially at the point of budgeting and nutritional requirements, is under-served. Current tools monitor expenses or suggest meals but do not combine financial constraints, nutritional needs and real-time prices [6]. Low quality of diet increases long term health risks [7], particularly among the low income families, which explains the applicability to SDG-2 and SDG-3.

This work presents a model of agentic-AI that integrates the real-time price monitoring, budgeting, nutritional maximization, and customized dietary restrictions. The system takes into account the market changes and health needs by using a multiagent architecture and cost-sensitive optimization with substitution graphs to adapt the household menus. Saudi household simulations reveal 12-18 % of cost reduction, and more than 95 % nutrient adequacy.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Healthy Diet Fundamentals

Healthy diets are not only preventive of chronic disease, but must contain balanced macronutrients, sufficient amounts of vitamins and minerals, and minimal amounts of sugars, saturated fats, and sodium [8], [9]. FAO focuses on different kinds of foods such as fruits, vegetables, legumes, whole grains, lean proteins, and dairy [10]. Iron, calcium and omega-3 fatty acid deficiencies are still common across the globe [11]. Cultural and religious considerations including halal rules and Ramadan fasting also influence the preferences of the

diet and promote flexible and individualized planning of meals [12].

B. Personal Finance for Households

Financial management is important to the stability of the household. Whilst guidelines like the 50/30/20 rule are helpful in providing a framework, they might not be suitable to low and middle-income families [13]. In most middle-income areas, the proportion of food to income is 15-25 % and increases with inflation [14]. By combining nutrition and budgeting, food resources, which are limited in number, can be allocated more effectively.

C. Agentic AI Concepts

Agents AI combine perception, memory, planning and self-monitoring in a loop [15]. It drives the retail, travel, and shopping agents that operate round the clock, but most of them are aimed at convenience, not health or financial welfare [15]. A household decision support is a new direction that can be achieved through integrating nutritional science, economic modeling, and dynamic pricing into an agentic architecture.

III. RELATED WORK

Literature on the relationship between household finance and optimal diets is scarce, encompassing FinTech, diet planners, and agentic AI.

A. Budgeting and Financial Technologies

FinTech apps (Mint, YNAB, PocketGuard) track revenues and sort expenditures but are reactive and hardly take nutrition or health into account [16]. Newer systems combine constrained health information with no dynamic adjustments of prices or supplies [17]–[19]. These are further extended by our framework to optimize budgets and nutrition jointly in the face of changing prices in real-time.

B. Diet Planners and Nutritional Optimization

The classical least-cost models [20] have developed to include nutrient databases and sustainability restrictions [21]–[24]. The majority of them disregard domestic realities, including shared budgets, multigenerational requirements, cultural inclinations, and variable prices, and do not offer personalization. These gaps are filled with our system with real-time, price-aware dietary optimization.




Fig. 1: Architecture of the agentic AI framework integrating budgeting, nutrition, cultural preferences, and price awareness

C. Agentic AI Systems in Consumer Domains

Agentic AI aids retail [25], travel [26], and consumer assistance [27], however there is little domestic finance or nutrition. Current diet applications are generic chatbots that do not have financial logic, personalization, or adaptive replanning [28]. Earlier-developed work is siloed: FinTech applications are used to handle budgets, nutrition applications handle intake, and agentic systems handle individual tasks. FinAgent incorporates autonomous replanning, cultural rules, family budgets, personalized nutrition, and real-time pricing.

IV. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

The system is an agentic-AI system that jointly optimizes food budgeting and nutritional adequacy in households and responds to supermarket prices, cultural restrictions, and health limitations. A multiagent system will be coordinated into a budgeting, nutrition, cultural knowledge, substitution strategies, and real-time price monitoring system to generate cost-effective weekly meal plans (Figure 1).

A. System Requirements and Assumptions

The household income and expenses, demographics, health conditions, nutrient references, cultural rules, and real-time supermarket prices are the inputs in (Table I). The weekly food budget B_w is calculated using the disposable income and it is overlaid on aggregate household nutrient needs.

B. Multi-Agent System Architecture

Agents coordinate via a shared knowledge base (Figure 2):

TABLE I: Core input requirements and data sources

Category	Examples / Source
Income & Expenses	Salary, rent, utilities, school fees
Family Profile	Age, gender, activity level, household size
Health Constraints	Deficiencies, allergies, sodium limits, diabetic diets
Price Feeds	Supermarket APIs, real-time scraping
Nutrition References	WHO, FAO, USDA dietary guidelines
Cultural Preferences	Halal rules, local cuisine, seasonal foods




Fig. 2: Multi-agent workflow illustrating inter-agent collaboration through the shared knowledge base

- **Budget Agent:** Computes B_w .
- **Price Monitor:** Detects price shocks and triggers re-planning.
- **Nutrition Agent:** Ensures macro- and micronutrient adequacy.
- **Health Personalizer:** Adjusts nutrient targets for medical needs.
- **Cultural & Preference Agent:** Enforces dietary rules.
- **Substitution Agent:** Suggests alternatives via a substitution graph.
- **Procurement Agent:** Converts plans to shopping lists.
- **Explainer Agent:** Provides transparent reasoning.

C. Data and Optimization Model

Agents share a knowledge base with food ontology, substitutions, household profiles, and prices. Meal planning is formulated as a linear program (LP):

Indices and Variables:

- $j \in J$: food items
- $n \in N$: nutrients
- $m \in H$: household members
- $x_j \geq 0$: quantity of food item j

Parameters:

- p_j : item price
- $c_{j,n}$: nutrient content
- $r_{m,n}$: recommended intake




Fig. 3: End-to-end workflow from data collection to adaptive re-planning

$$\bullet R_n = \sum_{m \in H} r_{m,n}: \text{household requirement}$$

$$\bullet B_w: \text{weekly budget}$$

LP Formulation:

$$Z = \sum_{j \in J} p_j x_j \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{j \in J} c_{j,n} x_j \geq R_n, \quad \forall n \in N \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{j \in J} p_j x_j \leq B_w \quad (3)$$

$$x_j \geq 0, \quad \forall j \in J \quad (4)$$

D. Price-Aware Adaptation

Price shocks are detected if

$$\frac{|p_{j,t} - p_{j,t-1}|}{p_{j,t-1}} > \tau, \quad \tau \approx 0.10$$

triggering substitutions and LP re-solving for cost-efficient meal continuity.

E. Health Personalization

The Health Personalizer calculates $r_{m,n}$ in real time, modifying R_n and constraints, to achieve personalized, adaptive plans.

F. System Workflow

Figure 3 shows the sequence:

- 1) **Data ingestion:** Populate knowledge base.
- 2) **Budget computation:** Estimate B_w .
- 3) **Nutrient profiling:** Compute R_n .
- 4) **LP optimization:** Generate baseline plan.
- 5) **Monitoring:** Detect price deviations.
- 6) **Substitution & re-optimization:** Update LP with alternatives.
- 7) **Plan generation:** Shopping list output.
- 8) **Explanation:** Justification for decisions.

TABLE II: Implementation summary of major system components

Category	Technology / Source
Optimization Engine	Python (PuLP, OR-Tools)
Agent Orchestration	Multi-agent LLM coordination with rule-based triggers
Database Layer	Household profiles, nutritional tables, health metadata
Frontend Interface	Lightweight API-driven web UI
Price Integration	Real-time supermarket APIs and verified scrapers
Cloud Infrastructure	Containerized deployment with caching and autoscaling

V. IMPLEMENTATION

Its implementation focuses on modularity, realtime responsiveness, privacy and transparency. The system has subsystems, the LP optimizer, multi-agent orchestration, data management, and price interfaces, which are independent and interact via API, allow scaling, fault isolation and efficient updates. Table II summarizes the main system components and the technologies used for each.

A. System Workflow and Integration

The LP engine provides real-time nutritional, cultural and budgetary constraints resulting in interpretable solutions. The orchestration layer deals with the communication between agents through event-based stimuli and common knowledge. Structured data are stored in relational databases; high frequency signals are stored in memory. The UI inputs are taken and weekly plans visualized; all the decision-making is made by autonomous agents. The concept of privacy-first is used.

B. Data Sources

Traceability and repeatability are guaranteed by three distinct data types:

1) *Real Supermarket Data*: Price feeds by Panda, Carrefour and Lulu are generated using authenticated API and vetted scrapers containing price history of individual items, availability indicators and category attributes. Updated daily.

2) *Authoritative Nutritional References*: Nutrient values of USDA, FAO, and WHO will be harmonized to GCC dietary standards. All items are mapped using a unified ontology.

3) *Synthetic Household Profiles*: Households having incomes between 5,000-15,000 SAR, 2-6 individuals, dietary habits (halal, vegetarian, lowsodium), and health conditions influencing nutrient requirement are created

TABLE III: Weekly Food Cost Comparison (SAR, 4-Person Household; mean \pm SD)

Method	Mean Cost	Savings	Nutrition Adequacy (%)
Fixed Menu	480 \pm 15	—	85
Static Optimization	440 \pm 12	8%	92
Manual Planning	455 \pm 18	5%	88
Agentic AI	415 \pm 14	13–18%	97

by means of stratified sampling using World Bank and CEIC distributions [29]. Simulation of market volatility is on price shocks of $\pm 10\%–\pm 30\%$. Fixed randomly selected seeds will yield reproducibility.

C. Evaluation Protocol

Two complementary assessments are done, synthetic simulations and a real Saudi household case study.

1) *Synthetic Experiments*: 100 synthetic households are experimented in 12 conditions of price-shocks, repeated 10 times. Metrics include:

- **Cost efficiency**: savings versus static baseline,
- **Nutritional adequacy**: proportion of R_n attained,
- **Adaptivity**: re-planning success rate.

Variance and confidence intervals are reported.

2) *Real Household Case Study*: A four-week comparison of an adaptive vs. static plans of reducing costs, covering nutrients, and practical feasibility is done through a Saudi household. Anonymized non-sensitive data is kept only.

This design facilitates the controlled quantitative analysis and validation in real-life.

VI. EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE METRICS

The three cases used are (i) synthetic simulations, (ii) ablation experiments and (iii) a real Saudi home case study. Measures were cost efficiency, nutritional adequacy and price shock adaptability. Synthetic experiments were done on 200 households (mean \pm SD). The case study was four weeks long; the experiment involved 312 food items.

A. Cost Efficiency

Cost efficiency was evaluated with respect to fixed weekly menus, fixed optimization, and manual planning. In 30 trials, the agentic system led to a consistent decrease in weekly costs but high nutrient adequacy. Table III shows savings of 13–18% relative to fixed menus.




Fig. 4: Nutritional adequacy across planning methods (mean over 30 runs).

TABLE IV: Adaptivity to Price Shocks (4-Person Household; mean cost over 30 runs)

Scenario	Static Plan	Agentic AI	Adequacy Maintained?
Chicken +20%	495	425	Yes
Fish -15%	465	410	Yes
Rice +30%	510	445	Yes
Mixed ±20%	500	430	Yes

B. Nutritional Adequacy

Sufficiency of Protein, Vitamin D, Iron and Calcium was compared with RDAs. The agentic AI attained $\geq 95\%$ in terms of nutrients, compared to static and manual plans, especially Iron and Vitamin D (Figure 4).

C. Adaptivity Under Price Shocks

Major food items were subjected to price shocks of $\pm 10\%$, $\pm 20\%$, $\pm 30\%$. Re-optimization was initiated at $\tau = 0.1$. Table IV and Figure 5 indicate that the plans of static surpassed the budgets, whereas agentic AI were affordable and sufficient.

D. Ablation Studies

Eliminating the Price Monitor would increase the weekly costs by 9 percent, disabling Health Personalizer dropped Vitamin D adequacy to 70 percent, and eliminating the Preference Agent led to duplicated menus and decreased user satisfaction (3.2 vs. 4.4). Each of the modules is necessary to the performance.

E. Case Study: Saudi Household

A four-week evaluation with a Saudi household (10,000 SAR/month) showed:

- **Average grocery cost:** 1,660 SAR (17% reduction),
- **Nutritional adequacy:** $\geq 95\%$ including Vitamin D,
- **Price shock handling:** 20% chicken increase mitigated via lentil/sardine substitution,
- **User feedback:** cost transparency 4.5/5, cultural relevance 4.2/5.

Figure 6 illustrates weekly plan adaptations under market changes.




Fig. 5: System adaptability under price shocks (SD over 30 runs).




Fig. 6: Weekly adaptation of meal plans during the four-week Saudi household case study.

VII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Synthetic simulations, ablation studies, and a four-week Saudi household case study show that the agentic AI framework delivers high nutritional adequacy, cost efficiency, and culturally appropriate meal plans. The actual implementation of the program resulted in a four-member family having $\geq 95\%$ nutrient coverage, adherence to halal and Ramadan diets, and a 17% decrease in grocery expenditure.

Robustness is confirmed by experiments with 200 homes over 30 runs: weekly spending decreased by 12–18% compared to fixed and static baselines, and the system remained stable against $\pm 30\%$ price shocks, automatically re-optimizing while maintaining dietary sufficiency.

Limitations and Ethics

Data. Price feeds that are semi-real-time and comprehensive nutrient tables are required; data that is sparse can be a performance problem. Imputation and region-specific datasets should be included in the future work.

Privacy. Household information is sensitive, and on-device calculation, differential protection, encryption, and retention under the user control reduce risks.

Bias. Recommendations can be skewed with databases or assumptions. They need auditing, constraints of fairness and culturally adaptive food ontologies.

Conclusion and Future Work

Multi-agent system will be used to harmonize budget modeling, nutritional optimization, and price-sensitive adaptation to provide affordable nutritional plans. The next steps involve the large scale deployment, long term compliance studies, as well as connection with loyalty programs, subsidies and school meals, with ethical governance that provides transparency, accountability, and user confidence.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah *et al.*, “Language models are few-shot learners,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [2] OpenAI, “Gpt-4 technical report,” Tech. Rep., 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- [3] J. Schneider, “Generative to agentic ai: Survey, conceptualization, and challenges,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.18875*, 2025.
- [4] J. S. Park, J. O’Brien, C. J. Cai, M. R. Morris, P. Liang, and M. S. Bernstein, “Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior,” in *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 2023, pp. 1–22.
- [5] Gartner, “Gartner predicts 2025: Agentic ai in enterprises,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gartner.com/en/articles/intelligent-agent-in-ai>
- [6] W. Khan, M. Idris, T. Ali, R. Ali, S. Hussain, M. Hussain, M. Amin, A. Khattak, Y. Weiwei, M. Afzal, and S. Lee, “Correlating health and wellness analytics for personalized decision making,” in *2015 17th International Conference on e-Health Networking, Application & Services (HealthCom)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 256–261.
- [7] G. Cannon and C. Leitzmann, “Food and nutrition science: the new paradigm,” *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2022.
- [8] W. H. Organization, “Healthy diet fact sheet,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/healthy-diet>
- [9] T. P. Lips, R. T. de Jongh, and N. M. van Schoor, “Trends in vitamin d status around the world,” *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research Plus*, vol. 5, no. 12, p. e10585, 2021.
- [10] FAO, “Fao nutrition and food systems report,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.fao.org/nutrition/en/>
- [11] L. H. Allen, “Interventions for micronutrient deficiency control in developing countries: past, present and future,” *The Journal of Nutrition*, vol. 133, no. 11, pp. 3875S–3878S, 2003.
- [12] H. Shatila, M. Baroudi, R. E. S. Ahmad, R. Chehab, M. R. Forman, N. Abbas, M. A. Faris, and F. Naja, “Impact of ramadan fasting on dietary intakes among healthy adults: a year-round comparative study,” *Frontiers in Nutrition*, vol. 8, p. 689788, 2021.
- [13] K. H. K. Yeo, W. M. Lim, and K.-J. Yii, “Financial planning behaviour: A systematic literature review and new theory development,” *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 979–1001, 2024.
- [14] W. Bank, “Food security update,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/agriculture/brief/food-security-update>
- [15] A. Bandi, B. Kongari, R. Naguru, S. Pasnoor, and S. Vilipala, “The rise of agentic ai: A review of definitions, frameworks, architectures, applications, evaluation metrics, and challenges,” *Future Internet*, vol. 17, no. 9, p. 404, 2025.
- [16] R. R. Suryono, I. Budi, and B. Purwandari, “Challenges and trends of financial technology (fintech): A systematic literature review,” *Information*, vol. 11, no. 12, p. 590, 2020.
- [17] Y. Kayikci, S. Demir, S. K. Mangla, N. Subramanian, and B. Koc, “Data-driven optimal dynamic pricing strategy for reducing perishable food waste at retailers,” *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 344, p. 131068, 2022.
- [18] C. R. Martell, “The impact of inflation on local government fiscal health,” *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 234–252, 2024.
- [19] V. Nalawade, B. S. Yunnus, M. G. Shankar, C. P. Balasaheb, and T. A. Aspan, “Exploring the role of reinforcement learning in personal finance management: A comprehensive literature survey,” *International Journal of Recent Advances in Engineering and Technology*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 21–26, 2024.
- [20] G. J. Stigler, “The cost of subsistence,” *Journal of Farm Economics*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 303–314, 1945.
- [21] A. E. Babalola, B. A. Ojokoh, and J. B. Odili, “Diet optimization techniques: A review,” in *2020 International Conference in Mathematics, Computer Engineering and Computer Science (ICMCECS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [22] E. Verly-Jr, A. M. de Carvalho, D. M. L. Marchioni, and N. Darmon, “The cost of eating more sustainable diets: A nutritional and environmental diet optimisation study,” *Global Public Health*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 1073–1086, 2022.
- [23] A. Rocabois, O. Tompa, F. Vieux, M. Maillot, and R. Gazan, “Diet optimization for sustainability: Indigoo, an innovative multilevel model combining individual and population objectives,” *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 19, p. 12667, 2022.
- [24] S. Acharya and S. Halder, “The price of nutrition: Can household food budgets support a healthy diet?” *Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 893–902, 2025.
- [25] S. Ben Saad and F. Choura, “Towards better interaction between salespeople and consumers: the role of virtual recommendation agent,” *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 858–903, 2023.
- [26] R. Yang, L. Liu, and G. Feng, “An overview of recent advances in distributed coordination of multi-agent systems,” *Unmanned Systems*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 307–325, 2022.
- [27] J. T. Tarigan, B. Wijaya, A. C. Salim, and S. M. Hardi, “An llm-based behavior agent with natural language personality control: Enabling trait-driven npc decision-making through prompt engineering,” *Engineering, Technology & Applied Science Research*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 26 827–26 832, 2025.
- [28] Y. J. Oh, J. Zhang, M.-L. Fang, and Y. Fukuoka, “A systematic review of artificial intelligence chatbots for promoting physical activity, healthy diet, and weight loss,” *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 160, 2021.
- [29] CEIC, “Global economic data, indicators, charts & forecasts,” 2025, accessed 28 September 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ceicdata.com/en>