Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities

Ir. Nida Garnida Fitrianti, MSI (1) and Raden Roro Fatma Sari, SE., MSI (2) (1) Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas | (2) Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

NidaFitrianti@gmail.com ; sarie801@yahoo.com

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines forensic analytics and early detection of financial statement irregularities by asking how forensic analytics is connected to early detection of financial statement irregularities and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. Evidence associated with Knudsen, 2020 and Dechow et al., 2010 is read with the wider source set to distinguish formal adoption from effective use, short-term response from durable capability, and observed association from causal interpretation. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for data provenance and reconciliation, data quality, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: forensic, analytics, early, detection, financial, statement, irregularities, accounting, integrative review

Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities addresses a contemporary question in reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems. The title implies a relationship between forensic analytics and early detection of financial statement irregularities, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

A recurring issue in research on Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Forensic Analytics may be associated with early detection of financial statement irregularities, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when data quality is weak. The mechanism examined here is measurement discipline and disclosure consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in auditability. Sources such as Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and Kraus et al., 2022 are

therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Exception detection and escalation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on staff capability, organizational scale, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by IFRS Foundation, 2023 and OECD, 2023 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process

integrity with a lagging indicator of control effectiveness.

From a governance perspective, Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Governance oversight and professional judgment is most credible when supported by governance independence and staff capability. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

A recurring issue in research on Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Forensic Analytics may be associated with early detection of financial statement irregularities, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when system integration is weak. The mechanism examined here is technology-enabled traceability, which connects the focal practice to changes in compliance quality. Sources such as Verhoef et al., 2021 and Dechow et al., 2010 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

From a governance perspective, Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Data provenance and reconciliation is most credible when supported by regulatory clarity and organizational scale. The reviewed literature (Kraus et al., 2022; Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, forensic analytics can influence early detection of financial statement irregularities through exception detection and escalation. The pathway is conditional on data quality and regulatory clarity; these factors determine whether information becomes an

operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with IFRS Foundation, 2023 and Knudsen, 2020 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce control effectiveness.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, forensic analytics can influence early detection of financial statement irregularities through governance oversight and professional judgment. The pathway is conditional on staff capability and data quality; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce decision usefulness.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Technology-enabled traceability provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on governance independence, governance independence, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of compliance quality.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Data provenance and reconciliation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on system integration, regulatory clarity, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Kraus et al., 2022 and IFRS Foundation, 2023 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of information reliability.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Segregation of duties and authorization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on regulatory clarity, data quality, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reporting timeliness.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added

separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

The synthesis treats forensic analytics as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of early detection of financial statement irregularities. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, technology-enabled traceability changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while data quality shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The synthesis treats forensic analytics as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of early detection of financial statement irregularities. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, data provenance and reconciliation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while staff capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Kraus et al., 2022 and Verhoef et al., 2021 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Segregation of duties and authorization is most credible when supported by governance independence and regulatory clarity. The reviewed literature (OECD, 2023; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Measurement discipline and disclosure consistency is most credible when supported by system integration and data quality. The reviewed literature (Knudsen, 2020;

OECD, 2023) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and

periodic review.

A recurring issue in research on Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Forensic Analytics may be associated with early detection of financial statement irregularities, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when regulatory clarity is weak. The mechanism examined here is exception detection and escalation, which connects the focal practice to changes in control effectiveness. Sources such as Dechow et al., 2010 and Knudsen, 2020 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

From a governance perspective, Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Data provenance and reconciliation is most credible when supported by data quality and staff capability. The reviewed literature (Kraus et al., 2022; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Segregation of duties and authorization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on staff capability, system integration, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by OECD, 2023 and OECD, 2023 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reporting timeliness.

A recurring issue in research on Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Forensic Analytics may be associated with early detection of financial statement irregularities, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when governance independence is weak. The mechanism examined here is measurement discipline and disclosure consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in auditability. Sources such as Knudsen, 2020 and Knudsen, 2020 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

The synthesis treats forensic analytics as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of early detection of financial statement irregularities. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, exception detection and escalation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while system integration shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is

consistent with Dechow et al., 2010 and Dechow et al., 2010 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Governance oversight and professional judgment provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on regulatory clarity, system integration, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of decision usefulness.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Segregation of duties and authorization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on data quality, governance independence, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by OECD, 2023 and Knudsen, 2020 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reporting timeliness.

A recurring issue in research on Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Forensic Analytics may be associated with early detection of financial statement irregularities, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when staff capability is weak. The mechanism examined here is measurement discipline and disclosure consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in auditability. Sources such as Knudsen, 2020 and Dechow et al., 2010 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Exception detection and escalation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on governance independence, data quality, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Dechow et al., 2010 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging

indicator of control effectiveness.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, forensic analytics can influence early detection of financial statement irregularities through governance oversight and professional judgment. The pathway is conditional on system integration and governance independence; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and IFRS Foundation, 2023 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce decision usefulness.

From a governance perspective, Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Technology-enabled traceability is most credible when supported by regulatory clarity and regulatory clarity. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, forensic analytics can influence early detection of financial statement irregularities through measurement discipline and disclosure consistency. The pathway is conditional on data quality and system integration; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated

with Knudsen, 2020 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce auditability.

The synthesis treats forensic analytics as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of early detection of financial statement irregularities. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, exception detection and escalation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while staff capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Dechow et al., 2010 and IFRS Foundation, 2023 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Governance oversight and professional judgment provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on governance independence, staff capability, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of decision usefulness.

A recurring issue in research on Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Forensic Analytics may be associated with early detection of financial statement irregularities, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when system integration is weak. The mechanism examined here is technology-enabled traceability, which connects the focal practice to changes in compliance quality. Sources such as IFRS Foundation, 2023 and Verhoef et al., 2021 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

The synthesis treats forensic analytics as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of early detection of financial statement irregularities. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, data provenance and reconciliation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while regulatory clarity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Exception detection and escalation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on data quality, regulatory clarity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of control effectiveness.

The synthesis treats forensic analytics as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of early detection of financial statement irregularities. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, governance oversight and professional judgment changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while staff capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and Verhoef et al., 2021 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Forensic Analytics may be associated with early detection of financial statement irregularities, yet the relationship can be delayed,

mediated, or offset when governance independence is weak. The mechanism examined here is technology-enabled traceability, which connects the focal practice to changes in compliance quality. Sources such as IFRS Foundation, 2023

and Kraus et al., 2022 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Data provenance and reconciliation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on system integration, regulatory clarity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of information reliability.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Segregation of duties and authorization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on regulatory clarity, data quality, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Knudsen, 2020 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reporting timeliness.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, forensic analytics can influence early detection of financial statement irregularities through governance oversight and professional judgment. The pathway is conditional on data quality and organizational scale; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and Kraus et al., 2022 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce decision usefulness.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, forensic analytics can influence early detection of financial statement irregularities through technology-enabled traceability. The pathway is conditional on staff capability and staff capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with IFRS Foundation, 2023 and OECD, 2023 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation

rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce compliance quality.

For Forensic Analytics and Early Detection of Financial Statement Irregularities, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking forensic analytics with early detection of financial statement irregularities. Segregation of duties and authorization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on system integration, organizational scale, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Dechow et al., 2010 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reporting timeliness.

Historical source context and interpretation

The mechanism discussion is conceptual and must be read alongside the pre-cutoff works listed in References. Removing later sources does not establish a new empirical finding, a pooled effect or comprehensive coverage of the literature. Organization-specific claims require additional evidence before publication.

References

Knudsen, D.-R. (2020). Elusive boundaries, power relations, and knowledge production: A systematic review of the literature on digitalization in accounting. International Journal of Accounting Information Systems, 36, 100441. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2019.100441

Dechow, P., Ge, W., & Schrand, C. (2010). Understanding earnings quality: A review of the proxies, their determinants and their consequences. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 50(2-3), 344-401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2010.09.001

Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). Internal Control-Integrated Framework. Durham, NC: COSO.

IFRS Foundation. (2023). IFRS S1 General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information. London: IFRS Foundation.

Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. Journal of Business Research, 122, 889-901. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022

Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. International Journal of Information Management, 63, 102466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466

OECD. (2023). OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en