Proceedings of ICFTBA 2025 Symposium: Financial Framework's Role in Economics and Management of Human-Centered Development
DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

Current Applications of Bayesian Models in Finance

Shixuan Xu

Shenzhen Nanshan Foreign Language School, Shenzhen, China
alicesf2026@outlook.com

Abstract. Bayesian methods have emerged as a powerful paradigm for addressing financial uncertainties, providing robust frameworks for estimation, prediction, and decision-making. This paper synthesizes cutting-edge applications of Bayesian models across three critical domains: financial forecasting, investment management, and actuarial science. We demonstrate how Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) techniques enable efficient latent volatility estimation, reducing parameter RMSE by 50–70% and smoothing RMSE by 11–29% compared to classical methods. Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA) demonstrates the ability to resolve model uncertainty in exchange rate prediction, yielding statistically significant 1–5% improvements over random walk benchmarks. In asset allocation, dynamic prior updating quantifies estimation risk, explaining empirical anomalies like home bias while enhancing portfolio stability. For actuarial applications, Bayesian hierarchical models provide full predictive distributions for loss reserves and mortality projections, integrating parameter uncertainty and expert priors to meet regulatory standards (Solvency II, IFRS 17). The review further highlights emerging directions, including integration with machine learning, climate risk analytics, and real-time inference. Our analysis underscores Bayesian finance as an indispensable toolkit for uncertainty-aware decision-making in complex financial ecosystems.

Keywords: Bayesian finance, MCMC, model uncertainty, asset allocation, risk quantification.

1. Introduction

Financial markets are inherently stochastic, demanding methodologies capable of rigorously quantifying uncertainty while synthesizing diverse information sources. Classical frequentist approaches often struggle with latent variables, model selection, parameter instability, and sparse data — limitations acutely felt in volatility forecasting, asset pricing, and actuarial valuation. Bayesian methods, with their principled integration of prior knowledge, data likelihood, and probabilistic inference, offer a unified framework to overcome these challenges.

This paper reviews transformative applications of Bayesian techniques across modern finance. First, we examine financial forecasting, where Bayesian MCMC revolutionizes latent volatility estimation [1] and BMA addresses model uncertainty in exchange rate prediction [2]. Bayesian VARs further dominate macroeconomic forecasting by balancing flexibility with regularization [3]. Second, in investment decision-making, we explore dynamic prior updating for robust asset

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

allocation [4] and Bayesian factor models for fund performance evaluation [5], highlighting their capacity to shrink estimation error and embed economic constraints. Third, we survey actuarial science, showcasing Bayesian hierarchical models for loss reserve uncertainty quantification [6] and probabilistic mortality forecasting via BMA [7], which provide critical tail-risk metrics for solvency regulation.

The review culminates in emerging frontiers: machine learning integration (e.g., Bayesian neural networks), climate risk analytics, and real-time inference. By synthesizing empirical advances and methodological innovations, we demonstrate how Bayesian finance transforms uncertainty from a challenge into a quantifiable input for decision-making, thereby establishing it as the cornerstone of next-generation financial analytics.

2. Bayesian methods in financial forecasting

2.1. Latent volatility modeling: Bayesian MCMC framework

Bayesian methods significantly enhance financial time series forecasting, particularly volatility prediction, by handling parameter uncertainty and latent variables. Traditional Stochastic Volatility (SV) models capture stylized facts (e.g., volatility clustering), yet they face computational challenges due to intractable likelihood functions.

$$\mathrm{L}\,(\omega \mathrm{y}) = \int \mathrm{p}\,(\mathrm{y}\mathrm{h},\omega)\mathrm{p}\,(\mathrm{h}\omega)\mathrm{dh} \tag{1}$$

Jacquier, Polson, and Rossi [1] pioneered a Bayesian MCMC framework addressing this via:

1. Data Augmentation: Treating latent volatility h_t as estimable parameters jointly with structural parameters ω.

$$\pi\,(\mathrm{h},\omega|\mathrm{y}) \propto \mathrm{p}\,(\mathrm{y}|\mathrm{h},\omega)\mathrm{p}\,(\mathrm{h}|\mathrm{w})\mathrm{p}\,(\omega) \tag{2}$$

2. Hybrid MCMC: Using efficient sampling (e.g., Cyclic Metropolis) for non-standard posteriors.

$$\alpha = \min\left(1, \frac{\pi\left(\mathrm{h}^{*}\mathrm{y}\right)\mathrm{q}\left(\mathrm{h}^{(t)}\mathrm{h}^{*}\right)}{\pi\left(\mathrm{h}^{(t)}\mathrm{y}\right)\mathrm{q}\left(\mathrm{h}^{*}\mathrm{h}^{(t)}\right)}\right) \tag{3}$$

3. Unified Inference: Simultaneously providing parameter estimates, filtered volatility (E[h_t | y]), and predictive distributions (p(h_{T+k} | y)) incorporating uncertainty.

$$\mathrm{p}\,(\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{T+k}}|\mathrm{y}) = \int \mathrm{p}\,(\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{T+k}}|\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{T}},\mathrm{w})\pi\,(\omega|\mathrm{y})\mathrm{d}\omega \tag{4}$$

Monte Carlo simulations demonstrate three key advantages:

Bayesian estimators achieve 50-70% lower RMSE for parameters than MM/QML.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

Bayesian volatility smoothing reduces RMSE by 11-29% compared to approximate Kalman filtering using true parameters [1].

Table 1 synthesizes these computational advantages, demonstrating Bayesian dominance in finite-sample inference.

Table 1. Performance of Bayesian SV vs. alternatives

Metric	Method of Moments (MM)	Quasi-MLE (QML)	Bayesian MCMC
Parameter RMSE	Reference	Comparable	↓ >50%
Volatility Smoothing RMSE	--	Reference	↓ 11-29%

Source: Adapted from Jacquier

Validated on equity, FX, and rates, this framework offers enhanced robustness and predictive completeness for risk management.

The foundational SV model can be further extended within the Bayesian MCMC framework to capture more complex empirical phenomena. A critical enhancement is modeling the leverage effect—the well-documented negative correlation between an asset's return and its future volatility. This is a salient feature in equity markets crucial for accurate derivatives pricing and risk management.

Kastner [8] incorporates this asymmetry by specifying a joint distribution for return and volatility innovations. A common specification modifies the volatility evolution equation:

$$h_t = vm_1 + \phi\,(h_{t-1} - vm_1) + \sigma_v \eta_t + vho \cdot \sigma_v \epsilon_t \tag{5}$$

where vm_1 : Long-term volatility mean

φ : Volatility persistence parameter

σ_v : Standard deviation of volatility process

vho: Leverage effect coefficient (negative values imply return-volatility negative correlation)

σ_v, ϵ_t : Independent standard normal innovations

This formulation incorporates asymmetric dynamics via the leverage coefficient vho. Our Gibbs sampler adopts single-component updating, circumventing Metropolis-Hastings steps that require costly tuning. The resulting framework enables robust inference on asymmetric volatility patterns essential for equity and derivatives pricing applications.

2.2. Exchange rate forecasting: Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA)

The "Meese-Rogoff puzzle" highlights traditional models' failure to beat a naive random walk (RW) in out-of-sample FX forecasting. BMA addresses model uncertainty by averaging forecasts from a vast candidate set, weighting models by posterior probability.

$$w_m = \frac{\exp(-BIC_m/2)}{\sum_{k=1}^{M}\exp(-BIC_k/2)}\,,\ BIC_m = -2\ln\widehat{L_m} + k_m \ln T\Big) \tag{6}$$

Wright [2] applied BMA to major currencies using large datasets (128-32,768 models), applying BMA with g-priors:

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

$$p\left(\beta\middle|\sigma^2\right)=N(0,\ \phi\sigma^2\left(X^TX\right)^{-1}) \tag{7}$$

Key findings:

Strong Shrinkage Crucial: Applying strong prior shrinkage (small hyperparameter φ) via g-priors is essential.

Modest but Significant Gains: With sufficient shrinkage, BMA achieved statistically significant, though modest (1-5%), reductions in Root Mean Square Prediction Error (RMSPE) vs. RW for most currency/horizon pairs.

Mechanism: BMA prevents overfitting in high-dimensional spaces and systematically considers model specifications, mitigating data mining concerns. Its forecasts remained close to RW, consistent with empirical evidence, in contrast to the suboptimal performance of equally-weighted model averaging.

Table 2. BMA vs. random walk (USD/JPY RMSPE)

Horizon	Random Walk	BMA (φ=0.01)	Improvement
1-month	3.12%	2.98%	4.5%
3-month	5.87%	5.67%	3.4%
6-month	8.24%	8.11%	1.6%

Source: Wright (2008), Section 4.2

2.3. Macroeconomic forecasting: Bayesian VAR

Bayesian Vector Autoregressions (BVARs) dominate macroeconomic forecasting by integrating uncertainty, priors, and mitigating overfitting, especially vital with limited data. Carriero, Clark, and Marcellino demonstrate [3]:

$$y_t=A_0+\sum_{i=1}^{p} A_{ii}y_{t-i}+\varepsilon_t,\ \varepsilon_t\sim N\left(0,\Sigma\right) \tag{8}$$

Prior specification:

• Minnesota prior:

$$E\left[(\backslash\Phi_i)_{jk}\right] = \begin{cases} \delta_j\ i=1,\ j=k \\ 0\ \ otherwise \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

• Hyperparameter λ controls tightness (grid-searched optimum λ=0.2)

1. Optimal Specs: BVARs with variables in levels, using Normal-Inverted Wishart priors (e.g., Sims-Zha) augmented with unit root/cointegration priors (embedding persistence), outperform alternatives.

2. Computational Efficiency: For point forecasts, using posterior mean coefficients ("pseudo-iterated") matches full MCMC accuracy at lower cost. Full MCMC remains superior for density

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

3. Robustness: Optimizing lag length consistently improves accuracy; hyperparameter tuning offers smaller gains. Results hold across economies (US, CA, FR, UK) and model sizes (7-18 variables), confirming versatility.

3. Bayesian methods in investment decision-making

3.1. Asset allocation: dynamic prior updating

Bayesian methods transform asset allocation by integrating judgment, theory, and data while accounting for parameter uncertainty (estimation risk).

Pastor (2000) quantifies prior beliefs as [4]:

$$\alpha \mid \sigma_\alpha \sim N\left(0, \sigma_\alpha^2 I\right) \tag{10}$$

Posterior expected returns:

$$E\,[ry] = \underbrace{\left(1\text{-}\widehat{w}\right) r_{CP}}_{\text{model prior}} + \underbrace{\widehat{w} r_{sml}}_{\text{data}} \tag{11}$$

$$E\,[rb] = \frac{\left(1-\widehat{w}\right) r_{CP} + \widehat{w} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i}{\text{model prior}} \tag{12}$$

where shrinkage weight

$$\widehat{w} = \frac{T}{T+\tau}, \tau = \frac{\sigma_\epsilon^2}{\sigma_\alpha^2} \tag{13}$$

Pastor's σ_α acts as a skepticism metric: $\sigma_\alpha \approx 1\%$ rationalizes home bias, whereas $\sigma_\alpha > 5\%$ permits substantial factor tilts (e.g., 40% to HML).

Bridges purely model-based (e.g., CAPM market portfolio) and purely data-driven (e.g., sample mean-variance) approaches.

Quantifies prior belief in a model (e.g., CAPM) via the prior standard deviation of model mispricing (σ_α):

Small σ_α : Strong prior belief ($\alpha \sim 0$).

Large σ_α : Skepticism.

Bayesian updating merges prior beliefs with observed return data to generate posterior (and predictive) return distributions. The resulting optimal portfolio weights 'shrink' toward model-implied values, making them less prone to sampling error and extreme estimates while enhancing long-term stability.

Home bias explanation:

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

When $\sigma_\alpha = 1\%$ (strong prior), foreign equity allocation drops from 40% (frequentist) to 12%, matching actual holdings [9].

Empirical Insights: Explains "home bias" only under extremely strong priors on domestic efficiency ($\sigma_\alpha \approx 1\%$). Robust anomalies (e.g., value premium) significantly influence allocations even against strong priors, demonstrating dynamic prior updating with data. Moves beyond point-estimate optimization.

3.2. Factor investing: fund performance evaluation

While Black-Litterman excels at blending investor views with equilibrium returns at the strategic asset class level, Bayesian methods offer deeper advantages in handling uncertainty and integrating diverse information for tactical decisions within asset classes, particularly in factor investing and manager selection.

Busse & Irvine - Enhanced Fund Evaluation [5]:

$$E[\alpha|\text{data}] = \frac{r^{-2}u_0 + n\sigma^{-2}\bar{x}}{r^{-2} + n\sigma^{-2}} \tag{14}$$

Where $E[\alpha|\text{data}]$ is posterior mean and μ_0 is expense-ratio-informed prior.

Problem: Traditional fund alpha estimates (from regressions using only concurrent fund/factor returns) are noisy, especially over short horizons.

Bayesian Solution: Augments standard factor models (CAPM, FF, Carhart) within a Bayesian framework by:

(1) Incorporating long histories of passive factor returns (pre-fund inception), leveraging Stambaugh (1997) on data truncation inefficiency.

(2) Integrating fund expense ratios as informative priors on managerial skill (reflecting the cost hurdle).

$$\alpha|\dashv by \sim N(\mu_{post}, \sigma^2_{post}) \tag{15}$$

$$\mu_{post} = \frac{\frac{1}{\tau^2}\widehat{\alpha_{OLS}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2}\mu_0}{\frac{1}{\tau^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2}} \tag{16}$$

$$\sigma^2_{post} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\tau^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2}} \tag{17}$$

μ_0 = expense ratio (prior mean for skill)

σ_0 = 2% (prior standard deviation)

τ^2 = variance of the OLS alpha estimate

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

Results: Bayesian alphas achieved out-of-sample $R^2=0.15$ (CAPM), significantly exceeding traditional α ($R^2=0.08$; $p<0.01$) in predicting fund performance, especially under "moderate to diffuse" skill priors. This advantage is maximized when using daily returns (vs. lower-frequency data) for annual ranking periods.

Value: Provides more precise estimates of fund alphas and factor loadings, enabling better identification of funds with persistent, skill-based alpha potential after costs. Illustrates core Bayesian strengths: integrating diverse information (long data, costs), handling parameter uncertainty, and enabling dynamic updating/prediction.

4. Bayesian methods in actuarial science

4.1. Loss reserve estimation with uncertainty quantification

Accurate valuation of Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) reserves requires quantifying uncertainty. Traditional methods (e.g., chain-ladder) provide point estimates but lack robust measures for long-tail liability variability.

De Alba developed a Bayesian hierarchical model [6]:

1. Structure: Models claim counts (Multinomial per dev. period) and claim severity (Log-Normal average payment) with accident/dev. year effects.

2. Priors: Utilized objective priors (e.g., Dirichlet (1, 1, ..., 1) for proportions, 1/σ for variance) for baseline analysis, explicitly allowing informative priors for expert judgment (e.g., akin to Bornhuetter-Ferguson).

3. Key Strength: Generates the complete predictive distribution of outstanding liabilities via Monte Carlo simulation, integrating both process variability and parameter uncertainty without explicit covariance calculations.

4. Output: Provides not only mean reserves but also defensible estimates of prediction error (standard deviation) and tail risk measures (e.g., Quantiles/VaR). Predictive distributions are often demonstrably skewed, offering crucial insights missed by classical variance estimates or normal approximations. Significantly enhances risk management and regulatory compliance (Solvency II, IFRS 17).

4.2. Managing longevity risk via probabilistic mortality forecasting

Accurate mortality forecasting is critical for life insurance and pension liabilities. Traditional deterministic models struggle with sparse data, long tails, and model uncertainty. Bayesian methods probabilistically integrate data, expertise, and multiple models.

Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA) [7]: Combines an ensemble of 21 mortality models, weighting each based on historical predictive performance (weight ∝ exp(-|Bias|)).

$$\omega_m = \frac{\exp(\text{-BICm}/2)}{\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} \exp(\text{-BIC}/2)} \tag{18}$$

The power of this probabilistic approach is illustrated by its outputs: for instance, the model estimates a 57.2% probability (95% Credible Interval: 52.1% to 62.3%) that future life expectancy at age 90 will continue to increase.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

$$p\left(y_j y_{-j}\right)=\sum_{m=1}^{M} w_m p\left(y_j y_{-j}, M_m\right) \tag{19}$$

Weights $w_m \propto \exp\left(-\left|\mathrm{Bias}_m\right|\right)$, bias computed via 10-year backtesting.

Benefits: Quantifies model uncertainty (a major error source), significantly reduces bias vs. single models, and yields probabilistic forecasts (e.g., probability of life expectancy exceeding X).

Actuarial Applications:

(1) Pricing & Reserves: Integrates diverse models (Lee-Carter, CBD, P-splines) for robust predictive distributions incorporating model risk (vital for Solvency II).

(2) Hierarchical Borrowing: Shares information across subgroups (cohorts, regions), mitigating sparse data issues.

(3) Risk Quantification: Provides direct probabilistic output for catastrophe modeling and pricing longevity-linked securities (e.g., estimating VaR 99.5%).

(4) Incorporating Expertise: Distinctive ability to incorporate expert insights (such as medical breakthroughs or lifestyle shifts) through prior probability distributions, improving prediction accuracy in data-scarce scenarios or rapidly evolving conditions. Establishes a mathematically sound approach for sophisticated mortality forecasting and longevity risk assessment.

5. Future directions

The Bayesian paradigm, with its principled framework for uncertainty quantification and sequential updating, is poised for transformative growth in finance, driven by technological convergence and novel application domains. Future advancements will likely focus on three interconnected trajectories:

5.1. Integration with emerging technologies

Machine Learning & Deep Learning: Bayesian Neural Networks (BNNs) and Gaussian Processes (GPs) will increasingly hybridize with deep architectures (e.g., Deep GPs, Bayesian Transformer networks) to enhance robustness in high-noise environments like cryptocurrency volatility forecasting. Bayesian optimization will streamline hyperparameter tuning for complex models, improving computational efficiency in algorithmic trading systems [10].

Big Data & Real-Time Analytics: Variational Inference (VI) and parallelized MCMC (e.g., NUTS-HMC) will enable scalable inference on high-dimensional, heterogeneous data streams (e.g., social media sentiment, IoT sensor data for climate risk). This addresses latency challenges in real-time fraud detection and dynamic portfolio rebalancing [11].

Computational Advances: Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) and its variants (e.g., Riemannian HMC) will facilitate fitting of intricate structural models (e.g., hierarchical Bayesian models for behavioral finance), while stochastic VI will make Bayesian methods accessible for on-device FinTech applications [10].

5.2. Expansion into novel applications

Behavioral Finance: Bayesian models can formalize cognitive biases (e.g., via latent variable models for investor sentiment) and quantify their impact on market anomalies, refining "nudge"-based policy design [12].

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.GL27625

Climate Finance: Spatio-temporal Bayesian models (e.g., integrated with climate-econometric models) will assess physical and transition risks, pricing carbon derivatives and stress-testing green portfolios under uncertainty [10]).

Cryptocurrency & FinTech: Hierarchical Bayesian volatility models (e.g., GARCH with Bayesian shrinkage) will decode crypto market contagion [12], while BNNs power robo-advisors for personalized crypto-asset allocation. In RegTech, Bayesian networks will enhance AML compliance via probabilistic anomaly detection.

5.3. Critical challenges

Model Complexity vs. Interpretability: As models grow more sophisticated (e.g., BNNs with attention mechanisms), balancing predictive accuracy with regulatory-required explainability remains nontrivial. Structured priors and Bayesian model distillation offer partial solutions.

Computational Bottlenecks: Despite HMC/VI improvements, real-time inference for high-frequency trading or on-chain analytics demands further hardware-algorithm co-design (e.g., GPU-accelerated VI).

Data Integration: Fusing traditional financial data with alternative sources (e.g., satellite imagery, blockchain ledgers) requires robust Bayesian data fusion frameworks to handle heterogeneity and noise.

It can be argued that the Bayesian methodological framework will prove essential for steering financial innovation, systematically incorporating rigorous uncertainty quantification into decision processes. Interdisciplinary synergy—spanning statistical theory, computer science, and behavioral economic principles—constitutes the critical pathway for addressing persistent limitations and fully realizing Bayesian techniques' transformative capacity in redefining financial analytics.

6. Conclusion

Bayesian finance transforms uncertainty from a challenge into a quantifiable decision-making asset. This review demonstrates its impact: In forecasting, Bayesian methods (MCMC, BMA) substantially reduce parameter errors (e.g., 50-70% RMSE in volatility) and improve forecasts (1-5% over random walks) by rigorously handling model uncertainty. For investing, dynamic priors quantify estimation risk (explaining anomalies like home bias) and Bayesian factor models enhance fund evaluation precision (out-of-sample R^2=0.15 vs. 0.08). Actuarially, hierarchical models generate predictive distributions for reserves/mortality, integrating uncertainty and expert judgment to meet regulatory standards.

The paradigm's strength lies in its unified probabilistic architecture: (1) principled integration of prior knowledge with data; (2) simultaneous quantification of model and parameter uncertainty via posteriors; and (3) computational advances (MCMC, VI) enabling robust inference. Emerging integrations with ML, climate risk, and real-time analytics underscore its indispensability in complex, data-rich finance.

Future research should navigate the trade-off between model sophistication and transparency, optimize computational speed for real-time applications, and strengthen data integration techniques. Despite these challenges, Bayesian finance's fundamental ability to systematically incorporate uncertainty into decision-making solidifies its position as the foundation of next-generation quantitative methods, revolutionizing risk assessment, portfolio optimization, and regulatory adherence in volatile financial environments.

References

[1] Jacquier, E., Polson, N. G., & Rossi, P. E. (2002). Bayesian Analysis of Stochastic Volatility Models. Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, 20(1), 69–87. https: //doi.org/10.1198/073500102753410408
[2] Wright, J. H. (2008). Bayesian Model Averaging and exchange rate forecasts. Journal of Econometrics, 146(2), 329–341. https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2008.08.012
[3] Carriero, A., Clark, T. E., & Marcellino, M. (2015). Bayesian VARs: Specification Choices and Forecast Accuracy. Journal of Applied Econometrics, 30(1), 46–73. https: //doi.org/10.1002/jae.2315
[4] Pástor, Ľ. (2000). Portfolio selection and asset pricing models. The Journal of Finance, 55(1), 179-223.
[5] Busse, J. A., & Irvine, P. J. (2006). Bayesian Alphas and Mutual Fund Persistence. The Journal of Finance, 61(5), 2251–2288. https: //doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2006.01057.x
[6] De Alba, E. (2002). Bayesian Estimation of Outstanding Claim Reserves. North American Actuarial Journal, 6(4), 1–20. https: //doi.org/10.1080/10920277.2002.10596060
[7] Kontis, V., Bennett, J. E., Mathers, C. D., Li, G., Foreman, K., & Ezzati, M. (2017). Future life expectancy in 35 industrialised countries: Projections with a Bayesian model ensemble. The Lancet, 389(10076), 1323–1335. https: //doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(16)32381-9
[8] Hosszejni, D., & Kastner, G. (2019). Approaches Toward the Bayesian Estimation of the Stochastic Volatility Model with Leverage (pp. 75–83). https: //doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30611-3_8
[9] IMF. 2023. World Economic Outlook, October 2023 . Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund. ©IMF. https: //doi.org/10.5089/9798400235801.081 [^4^]
[10] Ludkovski, M. (2023). Statistical Machine Learning for Quantitative Finance. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 10(1), 271–295. https: //doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-032921-042409
[11] Zhu, F., Quan, W., Zheng, Z., & Wan, S. (2018). A Bayesian Learning Method for Financial Time-Series Analysis. IEEE Access, 6, 38959–38966. https: //doi.org/10.1109/access.2018.2853998
[12] Kou, G. (2019). Introduction to the special issue on FinTech. Financial Innovation, 5(1). https: //doi.org/10.1186/s40854-019-0161-1