

Finance 5.0: Reimagining Financial Ecosystems in an Era of AI, Sustainability and Global Uncertainty: Transforming Equity Markets through Intelligent Finance

Aniket Suresh Ray

PGDM Student (2026-28 BATCH)
Indus Business Academy (IBA),
Bangalore – 560082
Mobile: 8108900185
WhatsApp: 8108900185
Emails: aniket07ray@gmail.com
Fpb2628.082.aniket@iba.ac.in

Roushan Kumar

PGDM Student (2026-28 BATCH)
Indus Business Academy (IBA)
Bangalore – 560082
Mobile: 8789670462
WhatsApp: 87896704629
Fpb2628.014.roushan@iba.ac.in

Bijay Krishna Bhattacharya

Professor - Finance
Indus Business Academy
Bangalore - 560082
Emails: bijay.kb@iba.ac.in
babunsampa@mail.com
Mobiles: 9831334839 and 7892216480

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI), algorithmic trading, big data, distributed-ledger applications, environmental, social and governance (ESG) information and recurring global shocks are changing how equity markets operate. This conceptual research article proposes for the first time the development of Finance 5.0 as an integrated framework of intelligent technologies, sustainability-oriented allocation, human judgement, and resilient market infrastructure that collectively affect market quality. This paper reviews the existing literature on price discovery, liquidity, volatility, valuation, investor access and systemic risk, based on the Efficient Market Hypothesis, behavioural finance, the resource-based view, stakeholder theory and resilience thinking. This analysis implies that algorithmic trading and AI might accelerate the absorption of information and alleviate some frictions in trade. In contrary, excessive automation, widespread use of models, data opacity and cyber dependence can exacerbate herding and instability. ESG disclosure may increase the information set and reallocate capital, however inconsistent measures, greenwashing and rating conflicts impede comparison. Blockchain can reduce friction in reconciliation and settlement, but governance, interoperability and legal finality will remain important. The study formulates six testable hypotheses and an empirical framework based on listed Indian firms and high-frequency market data for the period 2015-2026. Its key contribution is a conditional view: technical intensity is good for equity-market quality only if disclosure quality, governance, variety of market participants, and institutional safeguards are high enough. The article

concludes with policy implications for the exchanges, regulators, listed businesses, institutional investors and researchers, especially when addressing India's fast digitising capital market.

Keywords: *Finance 5.0; artificial intelligence; Efficient Market Hypothesis; ESG; algorithmic trading; resilient market infrastructure*

JEL Classification: *G14, G15, G23, O33, Q56*

Introduction

The architecture of equity markets is shifting from a predominantly human-intermediated system to a data-intensive, increasingly automated, and sustainability-sensitive ecosystem. Orders are generated and routed by algorithms; unstructured information is interpreted through natural-language processing; machine-learning models adjust portfolio weights; and corporate value is increasingly assessed against climate, social and governance risks. At the same time, inflation shocks, geopolitical fragmentation, supply-chain disruption, cyber threats and extreme weather expose the fragility of tightly connected markets. These developments are not independent. They interact through prices, liquidity, collateral, investor expectations and institutional trust.

This article uses the expression Finance 5.0 to describe a human-centred stage of financial transformation that combines intelligent automation with sustainability, ethical governance and resilience. The concept goes beyond digitising an existing process. It asks whether new technology improves the quality and inclusiveness of financial intermediation, whether capital allocation supports durable value creation, and whether market institutions remain reliable during stress. Equity markets provide the most visible testing ground because information is incorporated continuously and market quality can be observed through spreads, depth, volatility, price delay and firm-specific price informativeness.

The Indian setting is especially relevant. India has deep electronic exchanges, extensive retail participation, growing institutional investment and an evolving sustainability-disclosure regime. Its markets therefore offer an important emerging-economy laboratory for examining the benefits and limits of intelligent finance. However, claims that automation necessarily improves efficiency, or that better ESG performance automatically produces superior valuation, are too strong. Outcomes depend on data quality, model diversity, firm characteristics, market states and regulation. Accordingly, this paper develops an integrated, explicitly conditional framework rather than treating AI, ESG, and blockchain as isolated innovations.

Choice of the Study

The study is chosen for four reasons. First, the speed of technological adoption has exceeded the speed at which conventional market-efficiency models incorporate alternative data, adaptive algorithms and platform concentration. Second, sustainability information is becoming part of valuation and stewardship, but its measurement remains heterogeneous. Third, recent shocks show that liquidity, price discovery, and operational continuity must be evaluated together, not in normal periods alone. Fourth, most prior studies isolate one mechanism—for example, algorithmic trading or mandatory ESG disclosure—while practitioners make decisions in an ecosystem where these mechanisms operate jointly.

For India, an integrated perspective is useful to the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), stock exchanges, listed firms, asset managers and retail investors. It can connect technological capability with responsible disclosure and risk controls, and it can help distinguish genuine improvements in informational efficiency from merely faster trading. The topic also aligns with the wider conference concern of reimagining financial ecosystems under AI, sustainability and uncertainty.

Problem Statement

The principal research problem is that the combined effect of AI-enabled finance, ESG information and digital market infrastructure on equity-market quality is not well established. Faster information processing may narrow spreads and reduce price delay, but similar models and rapid feedback loops can also produce crowded trades, transient illiquidity and volatility. ESG disclosure may add material firm-specific information, yet inconsistent taxonomies, selective reporting and rating disagreement can generate noise. Distributed ledgers may simplify post-trade processes, but efficiency gains depend on interoperability, governance and enforceable settlement finality.

This creates a conceptual and empirical identification challenge. Market quality is multidimensional; technology adoption is endogenous; and firms with stronger governance or resources may be more likely both to adopt AI and to disclose ESG information. Global uncertainty may further alter the direction or magnitude of observed relationships. A framework is therefore required that specifies mechanisms, boundary conditions, measurable constructs and suitable empirical tests, particularly for an emerging equity market.

Objectives of the Study

- To conceptualise Finance 5.0 as the interweaving of intelligent technology, sustainable finance, oversight by humans, and market resilience;
- To explore the effect of AI, machine learning, big data and algorithmic trading on price discovery, liquidity, volatility and investor decision-making.
- To examine the impact of ESG disclosure and performance on the quality of information, valuation, cost of capital and the allocation of capital.
- To evaluate the potential and constraints of blockchain and digital post-trade infrastructure.
- To analyse how global uncertainty conditions the technology–market-quality relationship.
- To propose testable hypotheses, variables and an empirical methodology suitable for Indian equity markets.
- To recommend governance and regulatory measures that preserve innovation while limiting model, conduct, cyber and systemic risks.

Coverage of the Time Period

The proposed empirical window is 2015–2026. The starting point captures the acceleration of data-driven finance, digital investment platforms and algorithmic participation. In contrast, the end point accommodates the pandemic, subsequent inflation and interest-rate adjustment, geopolitical shocks, rapid generative-AI adoption and the maturation of sustainability reporting. For completed empirical work, researchers should use only observations available as of the extraction date and identify 2026 as a partial year where applicable. Sub-period tests—2015–2019, 2020–2022 and 2023–2026—can distinguish pre-pandemic conditions, crisis and recovery, and the recent AI-intensive phase.

Literature Survey and Review

Algorithms, big data and market efficiency

The Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) provides a suitable starting point: prices should reflect all available information, net of information and trade costs (Fama, 1970). In modern markets, however, a relevant question is not just whether information exists, but who can analyse it, how quickly it is translated into orders and whether the ensuing trades help price discovery. Behavioural finance adds that even when there is plenty of knowledge, bounded attention, overreaction and herding can persist

(Shiller, 2003) Artificial intelligence can minimise some cognitive and computational constraints, and at the same time open up new types of model-driven correlation.

Syamala and Wadhwa (2020) find evidence from India of intraday timing skills and liquidity provision by algorithmic traders, while algorithmic activity might also be linked to volatility and information asymmetry. Yuferova (2024) finds that an exogenous rise in algorithmic trading surrounding the NYSE Hybrid Market increased the information content of market and limit-order flows. Martin and Nagel (2022) show that it is difficult to evaluate predictability tests when investors analyse high dimensional information: apparent predictability coexists with sophisticated information processing. Together these findings make a case for a conditional rather than universal efficiency claim.

AI-driven investment and inclusivity

Machine learning widens the collection of useable signals by including financial statements, news, conference call text, web activity and other alternative data. Nonlinear relationships can be captured by neural networks and ensemble methods and portfolio rules can be learned to adjust to fluctuating states by reinforcement learning. Robo-advisory and digital broking lower the minimum investment limits and trading costs. However, model performance can decline following structural fractures, optimisation might overfit to historical data, and unequal access to proprietary data can compound informational advantages. Explainability, suitability and accountability are thus part of market quality, not peripheral compliance issues.

Valuation and ESG information

Stakeholder theory implies that corporations generate sustainable value by managing connections with employees, customers, communities, regulators and the environment (Freeman, 1984). Unique organisational competencies, including data governance and credible sustainability management, are also seen as possible sources of competitive advantage from a resource-based perspective (Barney, 1991). In capital markets, ESG information may affect predicted cash flows, transition costs, litigation exposure, discount rates, and investor clientele. Zhang et al. (2023) study 45 countries for the period 2000-2020 and conclude that mandated ESG disclosure enhances the timeliness of price discovery and boosts the inclusion of firm-specific information. The valuation effect, however, is not always positive: investment costs, sector exposure, disputed materiality, and discrepancies amongst rating providers can lead to varied results.

Blockchain and the market infrastructure

Distributed ledgers enable a shared record that can cut reconciliation, speed settlement processes and facilitate programmable assets. Tokenisation may unlock new issuance models and fractional ownership. These gains won't happen by themselves. Permissioning, interoperability, privacy, cyber resilience, oracle quality, asset custody and legal recognition of settlement influence whether a ledger eliminates or relocates risk. So, in typical equities markets, the relevant comparison is therefore entire lifecycle cost and risk and not simply transaction speed.

Uncertainty, resilience at governance

In stress, a resilient market continues price discovery, risk transfer and settlement and recovers without disorderly amplification. Artificial intelligence can enhance surveillance, scenario analysis and anomaly detection, but linked models can concurrently respond to the same signal. Risk containment strategies can include circuit breakers, kill switches, capacity controls, model validation, and human escalation mechanisms. Hence, global uncertainty is both a direct driver of volatility and a moderator of the repercussions of technology. Good governance should enable useful automation, while avoiding opaque or destabilising use.

Table 1. Synthesis of selected recent studies

Study	Setting and focus	Principal insight	Unresolved issue
Syamala & Wadhwa (2020).	Indian equity market; algorithmic traders	Timing ability and liquidity provision; effects are not uniformly benign	Does not integrate ESG, blockchain and systemic resilience.
Martin & Nagel (2022).	High-dimensional information and EMH	Big data changes the interpretation of return predictability	Limited treatment of sustainability and emerging-market institutions.
Zhang et al. (2023)	45 countries; mandatory ESG disclosure	More timely price discovery and firm-specific information incorporation	AI-ESG interaction remains untested.
Yuferova (2024)	NYSE Hybrid Market; order and limit-order flows	Algorithms accelerate incorporation of order-flow information	Institutional setting differs from emerging markets.
Polyzos et al. (2024).	Crypto-assets; social-media information	Alternative data help explain changing efficiency across regimes	Evidence may not transfer directly to listed equities.
Lahmiri (2024)	Crypto prices and volumes around COVID-19	Efficiency and randomness can change during crisis	Broader technology-governance architecture is outside scope.

Research Gap

Five gaps emerge. The integration gap is the most important: AI, ESG, algorithmic trading and digital infrastructure are commonly studied separately, although they jointly determine the information and execution environment. A second gap concerns conditionality. Positive average effects can conceal thresholds, nonlinearities or reversals when automation becomes excessive, or markets enter stress. Third, emerging-market evidence remains less extensive than evidence from mature markets, despite differences in liquidity, investor composition and enforcement. Fourth, measurement is fragmented: efficiency, liquidity, volatility, inclusion and resilience are rarely modelled as related dimensions of market quality. Fifth, endogenous adoption and common trends weaken causal interpretation. This paper addresses these gaps through a unified framework, moderation hypotheses and a staged empirical design for India.

Hypotheses and Conceptual Framework

The proposed framework treats equity-market quality (EMQ) as a multidimensional outcome influenced by AI intensity (AI), ESG information quality (ESG), digital-market infrastructure (DMI), global uncertainty (GU) and governance safeguards (GOV). Firm, industry, and time effects are included, with the firm as the unit of analysis. The core model is:

$$EMQ_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 AI_{it} + \beta_2 ESG_{it} + \beta_3 DMI_t + \beta_4 GU_t + \beta_5 (AI_{it} \times GU_t) + \beta_6 (AI_{it} \times GOV_{it}) + \gamma Controls_{it} + \mu_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Where EMQ may be represented by lower price delay, lower bid–ask spread, greater depth, higher firm-specific price informativeness or a standardised composite index. A positive coefficient means

improvement only after directionally adverse variables such as spreads, price delay and excess volatility are reverse-coded.

Table 2. Testable hypotheses

Code	Alternative hypothesis	Expected sign
H1	AI intensity is significantly associated with improved equity-market quality.	$\beta_1 > 0$
H2	ESG information quality is significantly associated with improved equity-market quality.	$\beta_2 > 0$
H3	Digital-market infrastructure is significantly associated with improved market efficiency and post-trade reliability.	$\beta_3 > 0$
H4	Global uncertainty is significantly associated with poorer equity-market quality.	$\beta_4 < 0$
H5	Global uncertainty weakens the favourable AI–market-quality relationship.	$\beta_5 < 0$
H6	Governance safeguards strengthen the favourable AI–market-quality relationship.	$\beta_6 > 0$

The corresponding null hypotheses state that the relevant coefficient has no favourable effect (for one-sided tests, $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ and $\beta_6 \leq 0$; β_4 and $\beta_5 \geq 0$). If theory or measurement does not justify a directional test, two-sided alternatives should be pre-specified instead.

Database and Methodology

Research design and sample

The paper adopts a structured conceptual-review design and proposes an empirical extension. The empirical sample may comprise firms continuously or intermittently listed on the National Stock Exchange of India and/or BSE between 2015 and 2026, subject to data availability. Survivorship bias should be avoided by retaining delisted firms where records exist. Financial firms may be analysed separately because their balance sheets, regulation and market microstructure differ from non-financial firms.

Data sources and measurement

Market data may be drawn from exchange order and trade files or an established market database; firm fundamentals from audited annual reports and recognised financial databases; ESG variables from Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reports, sustainability reports and consistent rating sources; AI measures from annual-report text, patents, technology expenditure, job postings or a validated AI-disclosure index; and uncertainty from recognised economic-policy, geopolitical-risk and volatility indices. Source regulatory-event dates from official circulars. Every constructed measure should have a documented dictionary and reproducible code.

Table 3. Indicative operationalisation of variables

Construct	Illustrative measures	Interpretation
Market efficiency	Price delay; return autocorrelation; stock-price non-synchronicity	Lower delay/autocorrelation or greater firm-specific information implies improvement.
Liquidity	Quoted/effective spread; Amihud illiquidity; depth; turnover	Lower spreads/illiquidity and greater depth imply improvement.
Stability/resilience	Excess volatility; downside beta; recovery time; trading halts	Lower amplification and quicker recovery imply stronger resilience.
AI intensity	AI textual score; patents; digital expenditure; AI-skilled hiring	Captures organisational or trading-related AI adoption.
ESG information	Disclosure score; assurance; materiality; rating; controversy indicator	Distinguishes information quality from ESG performance.
Governance protections	Board oversight, cyber controls, audit quality, model validation	Takes accountability for technology and disclosure.
Global uncertainty	Policy uncertainty, geopolitical risk, implied volatility.	It is a symbol of external stress and of information ambiguity.

Estimation approach

First step of the analysis should be descriptive statistics, missing data patterns, winsorised and unwinsorised distributions and pairwise correlations. The baseline panel estimates should include pooled ordinary least squares, firm fixed effects and random effects. The decision between fixed and random effects should be based on the Hausman test. Year effects absorb common shocks, while industry-by-year effects can absorb sector-specific cycles. Standard errors should be clustered at the firm level, or doubly clustered by firm and time, if appropriate.

Endogeneity must be handled explicitly. Lagged independent variables decrease simultaneity but do not prove causality. Plausible regulatory or infrastructure events can underpin difference-in-differences or event-study designs, as long as parallel trends and confounding events are taken into account. Instrumental variables must be both relevant and satisfy a believable exclusion criterion. The dynamic persistence can be simulated with system GMM for panels of adequate dimensions, including with serial-correlation and instrument-validity tests. Examine whether effects are nonlinear (threshold or spline models) with algorithmic intensity.

Robustness and decision rules

Robustness checks should include alternate proxies for each construct, varied winsorisation limits, elimination of crisis months, distinct large and small cap samples, placebo dates, variance-inflation factors and residual diagnostics. Statistical significance might be given at $p < .05$, but economic magnitude, confidence ranges, model validity and risk of multiple-testing must be mentioned. Results should be presented as associations unless a causal claim is supported by the identification approach. Data analysis and expected results

The material provided is conceptual, and does not include a full firm- or trade-level data set, hence this section is an interpretation of the evidence discussed. It demands disciplined expectations rather than manufactured empirical estimations. A positive β_1 would suggest that more AI intensity is related

with faster information assimilation or better liquidity, conditional on the development of EMQ. A coefficient near zero would show that adoption does not improve market quality. A negative coefficient could be an indication of overfitting, crowded tactics, unequal access to information or insufficient regulations.

A positive β_2 would be consistent with the concept that reliable ESG information decreases information asymmetry and helps pricing reflect firm-specific transition and stakeholder concerns. The conclusion should not be taken to mean that all high-ESG companies receive greater profits. The returns embody cash flow news and the price the investors are ready to pay. Rating dispute, disclosure quantity without materiality and greenwashing may reduce the coefficient.

A positive β_3 would imply that digital infrastructure enhances post-trade execution or reliability. Researchers should distinguish the benefits of shorter settlement cycles, platform updates or surveillance from blockchain-specific effects. A negative β_4 would be consistent with uncertainty expanding spreads, increasing volatility and delaying absorption of accurate firm-level information. The interaction β_5 is of special importance, since when it is negative, the net advantage of AI decreases as uncertainty increases. The marginal AI effect is $\beta_1 + \beta_5 GU$ and needs to be interpreted at low, median and high uncertainty with confidence intervals.

Finally, a positive β_6 would indicate that governance transfers technological capability into more reliable market outcomes. The marginal effect is $\beta_1 + \beta_5 GU + \beta_6 GOV$. This concept accounts for the fact that the same technology can have different effects in various enterprises or institutions. There can be strong validation, different models, escalation procedures and reliable disclosures that can hold speed while limiting destabilising feedback. These interpretations represent association, unless backed by a plausible quasi-experimental design.

Conclusion

The paper provides a technology, sustainability and resilience view on the concept of Finance 5.0. There is evidence that algorithms and big data can increase price discovery, ESG disclosure can improve firm-specific information, and digital infrastructure can eliminate chosen frictions. Each mechanism nevertheless has its own hazards. Common models and automation may magnify instability; ESG metrics may be noisy or purposefully exposed; and digital infrastructure may concentrate operational and cyber dependency. The bottom line, then, is the institutional context in which technology operates.

Conclusion

Finance 5.0 should not be construed as faster computation of Finance 4.0. It is a normative and practical move toward intelligent, sustainable, inclusive and shock-resilient finance. In the equity markets, success is measured by the quality of prices, the continuity of liquidity, the fairness of access, the reliability of settlement and the accountability of decision mechanisms. The integrated methodology described here predicts that AI, ESG information and digital infrastructure can improve market quality, but their impacts are dependant on governance and uncertainty regime.

This view is opportune for India. Electronic trading depth, greater digital involvement and a rise in sustainability disclosure are all significant prospects for better-informed capital allocation. They also increase the importance of model governance, data provenance, cyber resilience, investor protection and appropriate regulation. A carefully structured empirical program employing market microstructure data, corporate disclosures and regulatory events can test the suggested correlations without over asserting causality. The safest conclusion is a conditional one: intelligent finance provides durable benefit when speed is combined with transparency, responsibility and resilience.

Recommendations

Regulators and exchanges should require risk-tiered model governance, audit trails, pre-trade controls, kill switches, stress testing and timely reporting of material algorithmic incidents.

ESG disclosure should emphasise decision-useful, industry-material indicators, consistent boundaries, assurance and reconciliation with financial statements; disclosure volume alone should not be treated as quality.

Market-infrastructure projects should be assessed on end-to-end cost, legal finality, interoperability, cyber resilience and recovery capability before large-scale tokenisation or ledger migration.

Institutional investors should combine machine output with accountable human review, monitor data drift and model crowding, and disclose the governance of material AI-assisted investment processes.

Listed firms should integrate AI strategy, sustainability strategy and enterprise risk management under board oversight rather than place them in isolated organisational silos.

Investor-literacy initiatives should explain automated advice, suitability, data use, ESG-label limitations and the possibility that low-cost digital access does not eliminate investment risk.

Researchers should preregister directional hypotheses where feasible, publish variable dictionaries and code, test nonlinear and stress-regime effects, and distinguish correlation from causal evidence.

Appendix

Clarification of JEL Classification Codes

G14, G15, G23, O33 and Q56

Clarification of JEL Classification Codes

The Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) Classification System groups research papers by their principal subject areas. The selected codes locate this study at the intersection of market efficiency, international finance, institutional investment, technological change and sustainability.

JEL code	Subject area	Relevance to the study
G14	Information and Market Efficiency; Event Studies; Insider Trading	Equity-market quality, information asymmetry, price discovery, liquidity and regulatory-event analysis.
G15	International Financial Markets	Transmission of global economic-policy uncertainty, geopolitical risk, volatility and cross-border financial shocks to Indian markets.
G23	Non-bank Financial Institutions; Financial Instruments; Institutional Investors	Institutional ownership and trading, liquidity provision, price discovery and adoption of AI-enabled investment systems.
O33	Technological Change: Choices and Consequences; Diffusion Processes	Adoption and diffusion of AI, algorithmic systems and digital-market infrastructure, including their market consequences.
Q56	Environment and Development; Sustainability; Environmental Accounts and Accounting; Environmental Equity	ESG information quality, BRSR/BRSR Core reporting, environmental transparency and sustainable investment information.

G14: Information and Market Efficiency

G14 is the principal financial-economics classification for the paper. It directly reflects the study's focus on whether AI intensity and ESG information quality improve the processing of market information and thereby affect liquidity, volatility, spreads and price efficiency.

- Informational efficiency and price discovery.
- Information asymmetry and market reactions to new information.
- Event studies and abnormal returns.
- Speed with which public information enters security prices.
- Insider trading and informational advantages.

G15: International Financial Markets

G15 represents the international dimension. Although the securities may be Indian, the explanatory environment includes global uncertainty and cross-border financial transmission. It is appropriate when these international forces are substantively analysed rather than mentioned only as background.

- Global economic-policy uncertainty.
- Geopolitical-risk indices and international volatility.
- Global crises and cross-border capital movements.
- Transmission of external financial shocks to Indian equities.

G23: Institutional Investors

G23 is relevant when institutional ownership or trading is a meaningful explanatory, moderating or control dimension. Institutional investors often possess advanced AI, algorithmic-trading and risk-analytics capabilities that influence liquidity and price formation.

- Mutual funds, foreign portfolio investors and insurers.
- Pension funds, asset managers and other non-bank institutions.
- Institutional trading, liquidity and market depth.
- Institutional ownership and the pricing of ESG information.

O33: Technological Change and Diffusion

O33 captures the paper's technological foundation. It complements G14: G14 identifies the financial-market outcome, while O33 identifies AI and digital transformation as the technological drivers.

- AI, machine learning and algorithmic adoption.
- Digital transformation and diffusion of financial technologies.
- Automated trading, surveillance, clearing and settlement.
- Consequences and governance of technological innovation.

Q56: Sustainability and Environmental Information

Q56 represents the environmental and sustainability component. It is especially appropriate when ESG information quality is a central explanatory variable and environmental disclosure forms a substantial component of the index.

- ESG and sustainability reporting.

- BRSR and BRSR Core disclosures.
- Environmental transparency and accountability.
- Environmental-risk information and sustainable investment decisions.

Recommended Presentation in the Paper

Concise form: JEL Classification: G14, G15, G23, O33, Q56.

Expanded form: G14—Information and Market Efficiency; G15—International Financial Markets; G23—Institutional Investors; O33—Technological Change and Diffusion; Q56—Sustainability and Environmental Information.

Assessment of Appropriateness

Code	Degree of relevance	Recommendation
G14	Very high	Retain as the primary classification.
G15	High if global uncertainty is central	Retain when international transmission is substantively examined.
G23	Moderate to high	Retain when institutional investors are analysed beyond a minor control.
O33	Very high	Retain as a central classification.
Q56	High if ESG information quality is central	Retain when sustainability disclosure is a major variable.

Overall conclusion. G14, O33 and Q56 are the strongest classifications. The global-uncertainty dimension justifies G15, while G23 is justified when institutional ownership or institutional trading forms a substantive part of the empirical analysis.

Etiled Development of Testable Hypotheses

Detailed Development of the Hypotheses

The study examines how artificial intelligence (AI), ESG information quality, digital-market infrastructure, global uncertainty and governance safeguards influence equity-market quality. Equity-market quality may be represented by liquidity, price efficiency, price discovery, market depth, volatility, bid-ask spreads, trading costs, settlement efficiency and post-trade reliability.

General Empirical Model

$$EMQ_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 AI_{it} + \beta_2 ESG_{it} + \beta_3 DMI_{it} + \beta_4 GU_t + \beta_5 (AI_{it} \times GU_t) + \beta_6 (AI_{it} \times GOV_{it}) +$$

$$\Sigma \gamma_k Control_{kit} + \mu_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Where:

- **EMQ_{it}** = equity-market quality for entity i in period t.
- **AI_{it}** = AI intensity.
- **ESG_{it}** = ESG information quality.
- **DMI_{it}** = digital-market infrastructure.
- **GU_t** = global uncertainty.
- **GOV_{it}** = governance safeguards.
- **AI_{it} × GU_t** = interaction between AI intensity and global uncertainty.
- **AI_{it} × GOV_{it}** = interaction between AI intensity and governance safeguards.

- $\text{Control}_{\text{kit}}$ = relevant control variables.
- μ_i and λ_t = entity-specific and time-specific effects.
- ε_{it} = error term.

The coefficients β_5 and β_6 represent moderation effects. They must be interpreted jointly with the main AI coefficient, β_1 , rather than as independent direct effects.

Table 2. Testable Hypotheses

Cod e	Null hypothesis	Alternative hypothesis	Expected sign
H1	AI intensity has no favourable effect on equity-market quality.	AI intensity is significantly associated with improved equity-market quality.	$\beta_1 > 0$
H2	ESG information quality has no favourable effect on equity-market quality.	ESG information quality is significantly associated with improved equity-market quality.	$\beta_2 > 0$
H3	Digital-market infrastructure has no favourable effect on market efficiency and post-trade reliability.	Digital-market infrastructure is significantly associated with improved market efficiency and post-trade reliability.	$\beta_3 > 0$
H4	Global uncertainty does not adversely affect equity-market quality.	Global uncertainty is significantly associated with poorer equity-market quality.	$\beta_4 < 0$
H5	Global uncertainty does not weaken the favourable AI–market-quality relationship.	Global uncertainty significantly weakens the favourable AI–market-quality relationship.	$\beta_5 < 0$
H6	Governance safeguards do not strengthen the favourable AI–market-quality relationship.	Governance safeguards significantly strengthen the favourable AI–market-quality relationship.	$\beta_6 > 0$

Hypothesis 1: AI Intensity and Equity-Market Quality

Null hypothesis

H_{01} : $\beta_1 \leq 0$ AI intensity is not significantly and positively associated with equity-market quality.

Alternative hypothesis

H_{11} : $\beta_1 > 0$ AI intensity is significantly and positively associated with improved equity-market quality.

Theoretical reasoning

AI is increasingly used in algorithmic trading, market surveillance, risk measurement, fraud detection, investment analysis and transaction execution. Its capacity to process large volumes of structured and unstructured information rapidly can shorten the time required to incorporate new information into prices. The directional hypothesis assumes that, with adequate controls, these benefits dominate risks such as algorithmic herding, flash volatility and model error.

Principal transmission mechanisms include:

- Faster processing of financial and non-financial information.
- More accurate price discovery and lower information-processing costs.
- Improved trade execution, liquidity and market depth.
- Better detection of manipulation and abnormal transactions.
- Reduced operational and human errors through automated monitoring.

Empirical interpretation

- A positive and statistically significant β_1 supports H1.
- A non-positive or statistically insignificant β_1 does not support H1.
- If a higher dependent-variable value denotes deterioration—for example, a wider bid–ask spread—the expected sign must be reversed.

Hypothesis 2: ESG Information Quality and Equity-Market Quality

Null hypothesis

H₀₂: $\beta_2 \leq 0$ ESG information quality is not significantly and positively associated with equity-market quality.

Alternative hypothesis

H₁₂: $\beta_2 > 0$ ESG information quality is significantly and positively associated with improved equity-market quality.

Theoretical reasoning

High-quality ESG information helps investors assess environmental exposure, social practices, governance systems, sustainability risks and long-term resilience. Such information is most useful when relevant, comparable, timely, consistent, complete and externally assured. The hypothesis concerns the quality—not merely the quantity—of ESG disclosure.

Principal transmission mechanisms include:

- Reduced information asymmetry between firms and investors.
- Improved assessment and pricing of long-term risk.
- Greater disclosure credibility and investor confidence.
- Lower uncertainty concerning firm value.
- Less opportunity for selective disclosure and greenwashing.

Empirical interpretation

- A positive and statistically significant β_2 supports H2.
- A non-positive or insignificant β_2 does not support H2.
- Economic significance should accompany statistical significance, such as the liquidity change associated with a one-standard-deviation improvement in ESG information quality.

Hypothesis 3: Digital-Market Infrastructure, Efficiency and Post-Trade Reliability

Null hypothesis

H₀₃: $\beta_3 \leq 0$ Digital-market infrastructure has no significant favourable effect on market efficiency and post-trade reliability.

Alternative hypothesis

H₁₃: $\beta_3 > 0$ Digital-market infrastructure is significantly and positively associated with improved market efficiency and post-trade reliability.

Theoretical reasoning

Digital-market infrastructure includes electronic trading, automated clearing and settlement, depository systems, real-time surveillance, digital identification, straight-through processing, interoperable databases and cybersecurity arrangements. Reliable infrastructure can improve both trading and post-trade processes, although the benefits depend on operational resilience and regulatory oversight.

Principal transmission mechanisms include:

- Faster order matching and lower execution costs.
- Improved transparency, traceability and market surveillance.
- Reduced settlement delays, reconciliation errors and counterparty risk.
- Greater scalability and accessibility for market participants.
- More reliable business-continuity and post-trade processes.

Empirical interpretation

- A positive and statistically significant β_3 supports H3.
- A non-positive or insignificant β_3 does not support H3.
- If settlement failures or delays are dependent variables, improvement is a decrease and the expected coefficient becomes negative.

8.5 Hypothesis 4: Global Uncertainty and Equity-Market Quality

Null hypothesis

H₀₄: $\beta_4 \geq 0$ Global uncertainty is not significantly and negatively associated with equity-market quality.

Alternative hypothesis

H₁₄: $\beta_4 < 0$ Global uncertainty is significantly and negatively associated with equity-market quality.

Theoretical reasoning

Global uncertainty can arise from geopolitical conflict, economic-policy uncertainty, financial crises, pandemics, trade restrictions, exchange-rate volatility, interest-rate shocks and supply-chain disruptions. These conditions make future cash flows, discount rates and corporate risks more difficult to estimate, frequently impairing market liquidity and price discovery.

Principal transmission mechanisms include:

- Withdrawal of liquidity and wider bid–ask spreads.
- Higher volatility and disagreement among investors.
- Abrupt cross-border capital movements and higher risk premiums.
- Delayed investment decisions and reduced trading confidence.
- Weaker and noisier price-discovery processes.

Empirical interpretation

- A negative and statistically significant β_4 supports H4.
- A non-negative or insignificant β_4 does not support H4.
- If the dependent variable measures deterioration, such as volatility or spreads, the expected sign becomes positive.
- The finding remains associational unless the empirical design addresses endogeneity and establishes credible causal identification.

Hypothesis 5: Moderating Effect of Global Uncertainty

Null hypothesis

H₀₅: $\beta_5 \geq 0$ Global uncertainty does not significantly weaken the favourable relationship between AI intensity and equity-market quality.

Alternative hypothesis

H₁₅: $\beta_5 < 0$ Global uncertainty significantly weakens the favourable relationship between AI intensity and equity-market quality.

Theoretical reasoning

During unusually uncertain periods, historical relationships may become unstable and previously trained AI models may become less reliable. Sudden regime changes, extreme events and market-wide liquidity shocks may therefore weaken the market-quality benefits normally associated with AI.

Principal transmission mechanisms include:

- Structural breaks in historical data and declining predictive accuracy.
- Rapid changes in investor behaviour and correlations among securities.
- Algorithmic herding and amplified common trading signals.
- Incomplete or unreliable information during crises.
- Market-wide liquidity and operational shocks.

Moderation mechanism

H5 does not merely state that uncertainty lowers market quality. It proposes that uncertainty specifically reduces the marginal benefit of AI. Holding governance safeguards constant:

$$\partial EMQ / \partial AI = \beta_1 + \beta_5 GU$$

If $\beta_5 < 0$, the favourable effect of AI becomes smaller as global uncertainty rises. For example, if $\beta_1 = 0.40$ and $\beta_5 = -0.10$, the estimated AI effect equals 0.40 when $GU = 0$, 0.30 when $GU = 1$ and 0.20 when $GU = 2$.

Empirical interpretation

A negative and statistically significant β_5 supports H5.

A non-negative or insignificant β_5 does not support H5.

Marginal effects or predicted-value plots should show the AI effect at low, average and high levels of uncertainty.

8.7 Hypothesis 6: Moderating Effect of Governance Safeguards

Null hypothesis

H₀₆: $\beta_6 \leq 0$ Governance safeguards do not significantly strengthen the favourable relationship between AI intensity and equity-market quality.

Alternative hypothesis

H₁₆: $\beta_6 > 0$ Governance safeguards significantly strengthen the favourable relationship between AI intensity and equity-market quality.

Theoretical reasoning

Governance safeguards are institutional and control mechanisms that help AI systems operate transparently, securely, fairly and consistently with market regulation. They include human oversight, model validation, algorithmic audits, data-governance standards, cybersecurity controls, accountability mechanisms and business-continuity arrangements.

Principal transmission mechanisms include

- Lower model, operational and data-quality risks.
- Greater transparency, explainability and accountability.
- Prevention of manipulative or discriminatory algorithms.
- Stronger cybersecurity and system resilience.
- Higher investor and regulatory confidence in AI-supported processes.

Moderation mechanism

Holding global uncertainty constant, the marginal effect of AI is:

$$\partial EMQ / \partial AI = \beta_1 + \beta_6 GOV$$

If $\beta_6 > 0$, stronger governance safeguards increase the favourable marginal effect of AI. For example, if $\beta_1 = 0.30$ and $\beta_6 = 0.15$, the AI effect equals 0.30 when $GOV = 0$, 0.45 when $GOV = 1$ and 0.60 when $GOV = 2$.

Empirical interpretation

- A positive and statistically significant β_6 supports H₆.
- A non-positive or insignificant β_6 does not support H₆.
- Marginal-effect analysis should compare AI effects under weak, moderate and strong governance safeguards.

Statistical Decision Rule

For directional, one-sided tests at the 5 per cent significance level:

- Reject H₀₁, H₀₂, H₀₃ or H₀₆ when the estimated coefficient has the predicted positive sign and the one-sided p-value is below .05.
- Reject H₀₄ or H₀₅ when the estimated coefficient has the predicted negative sign and the one-sided p-value is below .05.
- Otherwise, fail to reject the corresponding null hypothesis.

Important qualification. Failing to reject a null hypothesis does not prove that no relationship exists. It means that the available sample does not provide sufficient evidence in favour of the pre-specified directional alternative.

Two-sided testing where direction is uncertain

If theory, measurement or prior evidence does not provide a sufficiently strong basis for a directional test, the researcher should pre-specify a two-sided test:

$$H_0: \beta_j = 0 \quad H_1: \beta_j \neq 0$$

The direction of every dependent variable must be checked before interpreting a coefficient. The stated expected signs assume that a higher equity-market-quality score represents better market quality. For deterioration measures such as volatility, bid–ask spreads, settlement failures or execution delays, the signs must be reversed.

Consolidated Interpretation Checklist

- Confirm that the market-quality measure is coded so that its direction is unambiguous.
- Report coefficient estimates, standard errors, p-values and confidence intervals.
- Evaluate economic magnitude in addition to statistical significance.
- Interpret β_5 and β_6 through marginal effects, not as stand-alone direct effects.
- Plot predicted AI effects at meaningful values of uncertainty and governance.
- Use robust or clustered standard errors where observations are dependent.
- Avoid causal language unless identification assumptions are adequately supported.

Data Sources and Measurement

The study should preferably construct a firm-month or firm-quarter panel of Indian listed companies. Daily or intraday market observations should first be used to calculate market-quality indicators and then aggregated to the selected panel frequency. Firm-level accounting, AI, ESG and governance variables may be measured annually and matched to market observations only after their public disclosure dates to avoid look-ahead bias.

Market data may be obtained from exchange order and trade files or an established market database; firm fundamentals from audited annual reports and recognised financial databases; ESG information from Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reports (BRSR), sustainability reports and a consistent rating source; AI measures from annual-report text, patents, technology expenditure, job postings or a validated disclosure index; and uncertainty from recognised economic-policy, geopolitical-risk and volatility indices. Regulatory-event dates must be taken from official circulars.

Table. Proposed Variables, Measurements and Sources

Variable	Code	Operational measurement	Frequency	Principal source
Equity-market quality	EMQ	Composite of liquidity, efficiency, depth, volatility and post-trade reliability	Firm-month/quarter	NSE/BSE order, trade and bhavcopy data
Relative bid-ask spread	BAS	(Ask - Bid) / Midpoint	Intraday/daily	Exchange order-book data
Amihud illiquidity	ILLIQ	Average Return / rupee trading volume	Daily to monthly	NSE/BSE price and turnover
Turnover ratio	TURN	Shares traded / shares outstanding	Daily/monthly	NSE/BSE and company filings
Market depth	DEPTH	Rupee value or shares at best bid and ask	Intraday to monthly	Order-book snapshots
Price efficiency	PEFF	Variance ratio, autocorrelation or price delay	Monthly/quarterly	Daily or intraday prices
Realised volatility	VOL	Standard deviation of daily returns	Monthly/quarterly	Adjusted closing prices
Post-trade reliability	PTR	Inverse of settlement failures, shortages or delays	Monthly/quarterly	Exchange/clearing reports
AI intensity	AI	Composite AI disclosure, patents, jobs and technology expenditure	Firm-year	Reports, patents, job postings
ESG information quality	ESG IQ	Completeness, comparability, quantification, consistency, assurance and timeliness	Firm-year	BRSR/BRSR Core and ESG source
Digital infrastructure	DMI	Index or event indicators for digital market reforms	Market-month/event	SEBI, exchanges, CCs, depositories

Variable	Code	Operational measurement	Frequency	Principal source
Global uncertainty	GU	Standardised EPU, GPR and/or India VIX	Daily/monthly	Policy Uncertainty database; NSE
Governance safeguards	GOV	AI oversight, validation, cyber/data governance and assurance index	Firm-year	Annual/corporate-governance reports
Firm size	SIZE	Natural logarithm of total assets or market capitalisation	Firm-year	Annual reports/database
Profitability	ROA	PAT / average total assets	Firm-year	Audited annual reports
Leverage	LEV	Total debt / total assets	Firm-year	Audited annual reports
Market-to-book	MTB	Market capitalisation/book equity	Firm-year	Prices and annual reports
Institutional ownership	INST	Institutional shares / total equity shares	Quarterly	Shareholding-pattern filings
Regulatory event	EVEN T	1 after implementation; 0 before	Event/day/month	Official circulars
Industry and time effects	IND, TIME	Industry and year/quarter/month indicators	Panel period	Constructed

Data-access note. Bhavcopy and selected historical reports are publicly available, whereas detailed order, trade and snapshot files may require an exchange subscription or licensed database.

Measurement of Equity-Market Quality

Equity-market quality is multidimensional. Separate component-level robustness tests should support a principal composite measure.

A. Relative bid-ask spread

$$BAS_{it}d = [(Ask_{it}d - Bid_{it}d) / ((Ask_{it}d + Bid_{it}d)/2)] \times 100$$

A lower spread indicates lower transaction costs and better market quality.

B. Amihud illiquidity ratio

$$ILLIQ_{it} = (1/D_{it}) \sum |R_{it}d| / TV_{it}d$$

R is the daily return, TV is the rupee trading volume, and D is the number of trading days. A higher value indicates poorer liquidity.

C. Turnover ratio

$$TURN_{it} = (Shares\ traded_{it} / Shares\ outstanding_{it}) \times 100$$

A higher value normally indicates greater trading activity and liquidity, although extreme turnover may reflect speculation.

D. Realised volatility

$$VOL_{it} = SD(R_{it}d) \times \sqrt{N}$$

Use N = 252 when daily volatility is annualised. Higher volatility generally denotes lower stability but is not, by itself, proof of inefficiency.

E. Return autocorrelation

$$R_{it}d = \alpha + \rho R_{i,t-d} + \varepsilon_{it}d$$

The absolute value of ρ may be used as an inverse efficiency measure; large predictable serial dependence implies weaker price efficiency.

F. Price-delay measure

$$R_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_{i0}R_{mt} + \sum_k \beta_{ik}R_{m,t-k} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

A larger contribution from lagged market returns indicates slower incorporation of market information.

G. Settlement-failure rate

$$\text{FailureRate}_t = (\text{Failed or short-delivery transactions}_t / \text{Total settled transactions}_t) \times 100$$

A positive reliability measure can be defined as PTR = 1 - FailureRate when both are expressed as proportions.

H. Composite equity-market-quality index

$$EMQ_{it} = [Z(-BAS_{it}) + Z(-ILLIQ_{it}) + Z(TURN_{it}) + Z(-VOL_{it}) + Z(-DELAY_{it}) + Z(PTR_{it})] / 6$$

All components are oriented so that higher values represent better market quality. Principal-component analysis may be used as a robustness alternative to equal weighting.

Measurement of AI Intensity

AI intensity is not directly observable and should, where possible, combine several independently measurable indicators.

A. AI-disclosure score

A pre-approved dictionary may include artificial intelligence, machine learning, deep learning, generative AI, large language model, natural-language processing, computer vision, predictive analytics, intelligent automation and algorithmic trading.

$$AIText_{it} = (\text{AI-related terms}_{it} / \text{Total words}_{it}) \times 10,000$$

Exclude boilerplate, definitions, and irrelevant uses. Contextual validation is necessary because term frequency cannot distinguish implementation from promotional language.

B. AI patent intensity

$$AIPatent_{it} = \text{AI-related patent applications}_{it} / (\text{Total patent applications}_{it} + 1)$$

Where possible, consolidate patent ownership across subsidiaries.

C. AI employment intensity

$$AIJobs_{it} = (\text{AI-related job advertisements}_{it} / \text{Total job advertisements}_{it}) \times 100$$

Relevant roles may include machine-learning engineers, data scientists, AI architects, NLP specialists and computer-vision specialists.

D. Technology-expenditure intensity

$$TechIntensity_{it} = (\text{Technology or digital expenditure}_{it} / \text{Revenue}_{it}) \times 100$$

This is an imperfect proxy because disclosures may combine AI, cloud, cybersecurity and ordinary IT expenditure.

E. Composite AI-intensity index

$$AI_{it} = [Z(AIText_{it}) + Z(AIPatent_{it}) + Z(AIJobs_{it}) + Z(TechIntensity_{it})] / 4$$

If some components are unavailable, use a documented reduced index and test alternative constructions for robustness.

Measurement of ESG Information Quality

ESG information quality must be distinguished from ESG performance. Extensive disclosure does not necessarily demonstrate favourable environmental or social outcomes. BRSR, BRSR Core and applicable assurance or assessment requirements provide a structured basis for evaluating completeness and credibility.

Dimension	Measurement rule	Score
Completeness	Required indicators fully reported	0-2
Quantification	Numerical values rather than narrative-only claims	0-2
Comparability	Consistent definitions and units across years	0-2
Consistency	Stable reporting boundary and methodology	0-2
Target specificity	Time-bound and measurable targets	0-2
Historical coverage	At least three years of comparable information	0-2
External assurance	Independent assurance or assessment	0-2
Timeliness	Released within the prescribed reporting period	0-2
Adverse-event disclosure	Incidents, penalties and non-compliance reported	0-2
BRSR Core alignment	Applicable core indicators reported	0-2

$$ESGIQ_{it} = (\text{Firm actual score}_{it} / \text{Maximum possible score}_{it}) \times 100$$

The resulting measure ranges from 0 to 100; a higher score indicates better ESG information quality.

Measurement of Digital-Market Infrastructure

Digital infrastructure is generally common to firms operating in the same market and period. It may be measured through a market-level index, separate components or official regulatory-event indicators.

Component	Operational indicator
Electronic trading	Share of transactions executed electronically
Settlement speed	Inverse of the number of settlement days
Straight-through processing	Transactions processed without manual intervention
Dematerialisation	Dematerialised securities / eligible securities
Surveillance capacity	Automated or AI-supported surveillance implementation

Component	Operational indicator
System reliability	Exchange and clearing-system uptime
Cyber resilience	Cybersecurity and continuity compliance
Settlement reliability	Inverse of settlement-failure rate
Interoperability	Clearing or infrastructure interoperability
Digital accessibility	Online investor and broker participation

$$DMI_t = (1/J) \sum_j Z(DMI_{jt})$$

For an event specification, set EVENT = 0 before implementation and EVENT = 1 after implementation. Record announcement, transition and effective dates separately; the official effective date should govern the principal test.

Measurement of Global Uncertainty

Measure	Code and interpretation	Frequency/source
Global EPU	GEPU: GDP-weighted combination of national policy-uncertainty indices	Monthly; Policy Uncertainty database
India EPU	IEPU: news-based Indian economic-policy uncertainty	Monthly; Policy Uncertainty database
Geopolitical risk	GPR: benchmark or India-specific geopolitical-risk index	Monthly; GPR database
India VIX	Market-implied near-term volatility	Daily; NSE

$$GU_t = [Z(\ln GEPU_t) + Z(\ln GPR_t) + Z(\ln IndiaVIX_t)] / 3$$

Log transformation can reduce skewness. Enter each index separately in robustness tests so results do not depend on an arbitrary composite.

Measurement of Governance Safeguards

Governance safeguards should capture general corporate controls and AI-specific oversight.

Governance element	Binary coding
Board-level technology or AI oversight	0 = absent; 1 = present
Board-level risk committee	0 = absent; 1 = present
Formal AI-use policy	0 = absent; 1 = present
Model-validation procedures	0 = absent; 1 = present
Human review of material AI decisions	0 = absent; 1 = present
Algorithmic audit or independent assurance	0 = absent; 1 = present
Data-governance policy	0 = absent; 1 = present

Governance element	Binary coding
Cybersecurity oversight	0 = absent; 1 = present
Responsible-AI principles	0 = absent; 1 = present
Incident reporting and remediation	0 = absent; 1 = present
Business-continuity testing	0 = absent; 1 = present
Disclosure of AI-related risks	0 = absent; 1 = present

$$GOV_{it} = [\sum_j GovernanceItem_{jit} / 12] \times 100$$

Where disclosure quality varies materially, use 0 = not disclosed, 1 = general disclosure, and 2 = specific policy, responsibility and evidence of implementation. At least two independent coders should assess qualitative items; report Cohen's kappa or Krippendorff's alpha.

Moderating Variables

Global uncertainty as moderator

$$AI_GU_{it} = AI_{it}^c \times GU_t^c$$

A negative coefficient indicates that global uncertainty weakens the favourable AI-market-quality relationship.

Governance safeguards as moderator

$$AI_GOV_{it} = AI_{it}^c \times GOV_{it}^c$$

A positive coefficient indicates that governance safeguards strengthen the favourable relationship.

Mean-centring

$$AI_{it}^c = AI_{it} - \text{mean}(AI); \quad GU_t^c = GU_t - \text{mean}(GU); \quad GOV_{it}^c = GOV_{it} - \text{mean}(GOV)$$

Mean-centring improves interpretation and reduces non-essential multicollinearity without changing the substantive interaction test.

Recommended Panel Structure

Data category	Original frequency	Recommended frequency	final
Trades, quotes and order book	Intraday	Firm-month	
Prices, returns, volume and turnover	Daily	Firm-month	
India VIX, EPU and GPR	Daily/monthly	Month	
Settlement statistics	Daily/monthly	Month	
Firm fundamentals	Quarterly/annual	Firm-quarter/year	

Data category	Original frequency	Recommended frequency	final
Shareholding pattern	Quarterly	Firm-quarter	
AI intensity	Annual	Firm-year	
ESG information quality	Annual	Firm-year	
Governance safeguards	Annual	Firm-year	
Regulatory events	Exact date	Event window/month	

A firm-month model supplies richer market variation, but annual AI, ESG and governance values repeat within the financial year. Statistical inference should reflect the effective frequency of slow-moving regressors; firm and time clustering may be appropriate.

Minimum Data Dictionary

Field	Description
firm_id	Permanent internal identifier
isin	International Securities Identification Number
exchange_symbol	NSE or BSE trading symbol
company_name	Standardised company name
industry_code	Consistent industry classification
observation_date	Trading, month-end or financial-year date
source_date	Date the information became public.
variable_code	Short variable name
variable_label	Full variable description
raw_value	Source value
adjusted_value	Cleaned or transformed value
unit	Rupees, percentage, ratio, index or count
frequency	Daily, monthly, quarterly or annual
source_name	Originating source
source_reference	Report, file, circular or database reference
transformation	Log, standardisation, winsorisation or aggregation.
missing_code	Reason for missing observation
verification_status	Unchecked, cross-checked or verified
coder_id	Researcher responsible for qualitative coding
notes	Restatement, corporate action or methodology comment

Official and Recognised Data Links

- NSE historical reports
- NSE historical-data specification
- BSE historical bhavcopy
- SEBI BRSR circular (2021)
- SEBI BRSR Core framework (2023)
- SEBI ESG disclosure circular (2025)
- SEBI circular repository
- Global Economic Policy Uncertainty data
- India Economic Policy Uncertainty data
- Geopolitical Risk Index data
- NSE reports, including historical India VIX

References and Bibliography

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>

Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *The Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383–417. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2325486>

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Lahmiri, S. (2024). Assessing efficiency in prices and trading volumes of cryptocurrencies before and during the COVID-19 pandemic with fractal, chaos, and randomness. *Financial Innovation*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-024-00628-0>

Martin, I. W. R., & Nagel, S. (2022). Market efficiency in the age of big data. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 145(1), 154–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2021.10.006>

Polyzos, E., Rubbaniy, G., & Mazur, M. (2024). Efficient market hypothesis on the blockchain: A social-media-based index for cryptocurrency efficiency. *Financial Review*, 59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fire.12387>

Shiller, R. J. (2003). From efficient markets theory to behavioural finance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(1), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1257/089533003321164967>

Syamala, S. R., & Wadhwa, K. (2020). Trading performance and market efficiency: Evidence from algorithmic trading. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 54, 101283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2020.101283>

Yuferova, D. (2024). Algorithmic trading and market efficiency around the introduction of the NYSE Hybrid Market. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 69, 100909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.finmar.2024.100909>

Zhang, Q., Ding, R., Chen, D., & Zhang, X. (2023). The effects of mandatory ESG disclosure on price discovery efficiency around the world. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 89, 102811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2023.102811>