

FORENSIC ACCOUNTING PRACTICES IN DETECTING FINANCIAL STATEMENT FRAUD

Ir. Nida Garnida Fitrianti, MSI, Raden Roro Fatma Sari, SE., MSI

1 Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas

2 Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

NidaFitrianti@gmail.com, sarie801@yahoo.com

Abstract

Background: Financial statement fraud is difficult to detect because the people able to manipulate reporting often understand the control system. Forensic accounting adds value by combining accounting knowledge, investigative reasoning, digital evidence and a willingness to test explanations against alternative scenarios. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including IFRS Foundation (2023a); COSO (2013). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. Analytics alone does not discover intent. Unusual transactions can be legitimate, and fraudulent reporting can be designed to look ordinary, so detection depends on professional skepticism and evidence that connects numbers to business reality. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Forensic Accounting, Financial Statement Fraud, Fraud Detection, Data Analytics, Professional Skepticism, Governance*

Introduction

Financial statement fraud is difficult to detect because the people able to manipulate reporting often understand the control system. Forensic accounting adds value by combining accounting knowledge, investigative reasoning, digital evidence and a willingness to test explanations against alternative scenarios. This question is timely for organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems. Recent institutional and research sources such as OECD (2024b); IFRS Foundation (2023a) provide the broader context for the discussion.

Analytics alone does not discover intent. Unusual transactions can be legitimate, and fraudulent reporting can be designed to look ordinary, so detection depends on professional skepticism and evidence that connects numbers to business reality. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. Grant (1996); Edmondson & Lei (2014) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial

for one organization and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. Knudsen (2020); OECD (2024b); OECD (2021) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. OECD (2021); IFRS Foundation (2023a) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Fraud risk hypotheses	forensic work begins with plausible ways management could distort revenue, expenses, assets or disclosures	generic red-flag lists can produce noise without guiding evidence collection
Journal-entry and transaction analytics	large datasets can be screened for timing, unusual users, round amounts and rare account combinations	rules generate false positives when business context is ignored
Estimates and management judgment	impairment, provisions, fair values and useful lives create legitimate judgment that can be abused	bias is harder to identify than a false invoice because assumptions may remain within broad ranges
Revenue and cut-off	pressure to meet targets can encourage premature or fictitious recognition	complex contracts make simple cut-off rules insufficient
Digital evidence and chain of custody	emails, logs and system histories can explain who changed data and when	poor preservation can make evidence unreliable or inadmissible
Governance and response	investigations must be independent enough to follow evidence where it leads	management influence can narrow scope or delay escalation

Research Method

This article uses a structured narrative review. The purpose is interpretive rather than meta-analytic: sources are selected to clarify mechanisms, boundary conditions and practical implications, not to pool coefficients that were estimated from different populations and methods.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
ACFE (2024)	occupational fraud patterns and control implications	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
COSO (2013)	internal-control principles and components	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Knudsen (2020)	digitalization of accounting and information boundaries	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024b)	digital technology, policy, skills and trust	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
IFRS Foundation (2023a)	general sustainability-related financial disclosures	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2021)	public governance and institutional capacity	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Fraud risk hypotheses

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Forensic work begins with plausible ways management could distort revenue, expenses, assets or disclosures. That distinction matters because generic red-flag lists can produce noise without guiding evidence collection. In organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Edmondson & Lei (2014); Grant (1996), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the practical response is to build hypotheses from incentives, opportunities and the reporting process. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Forensic work begins with plausible ways management could distort revenue, expenses, assets or disclosures, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Generic red-flag lists can produce noise without guiding evidence collection. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the

issue. A more credible approach is therefore to build hypotheses from incentives, opportunities and the reporting process, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Forensic work begins with plausible ways management could distort revenue, expenses, assets or disclosures should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, generic red-flag lists can produce noise without guiding evidence collection. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by ACFE (2024); Grant (1996) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: build hypotheses from incentives, opportunities and the reporting process. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Journal-entry and transaction analytics

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Large datasets can be screened for timing, unusual users, round amounts and rare account combinations. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: rules generate false positives when business context is ignored. In organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IFRS Foundation (2023a); Knudsen (2020), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the practical response is to use analytics to prioritize investigation rather than substitute for it. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Large datasets can be screened for timing, unusual users, round amounts and rare account combinations, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Rules generate false positives when business context is ignored. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. COSO (2013) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use analytics to prioritize investigation rather than substitute for it, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Large datasets can be screened for timing, unusual users, round amounts and rare account combinations should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, rules generate false positives when business context is ignored. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2024b); ACFE (2024) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use analytics to prioritize investigation rather than substitute for it. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Estimates and management judgment

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Impairment, provisions, fair values and useful lives create legitimate judgment that can be abused. The point is especially relevant where bias is harder to identify than a false invoice because assumptions may

remain within broad ranges. In organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); OECD (2021), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the practical response is to compare assumptions with external evidence and changes in operating conditions. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Impairment, provisions, fair values and useful lives create legitimate judgment that can be abused, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Bias is harder to identify than a false invoice because assumptions may remain within broad ranges. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. COSO (2013) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to compare assumptions with external evidence and changes in operating conditions, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Impairment, provisions, fair values and useful lives create legitimate judgment that can be abused should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, bias is harder to identify than a false invoice because assumptions may remain within broad ranges. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by COSO (2013); OECD (2021) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: compare assumptions with external evidence and changes in operating conditions. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Revenue and cut-off

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Pressure to meet targets can encourage premature or fictitious recognition. The reason is practical: complex contracts make simple cut-off rules insufficient. In organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); Knudsen (2020), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the practical response is to trace selected transactions through contract, delivery, billing and cash evidence. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Pressure to meet targets can encourage premature or fictitious recognition, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Complex contracts make simple cut-off rules insufficient. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Knudsen (2020) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to trace selected

transactions through contract, delivery, billing and cash evidence, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Pressure to meet targets can encourage premature or fictitious recognition should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, complex contracts make simple cut-off rules insufficient. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Edmondson & Lei (2014); Knudsen (2020) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: trace selected transactions through contract, delivery, billing and cash evidence. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Digital evidence and chain of custody

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Emails, logs and system histories can explain who changed data and when. For managers, the consequence is immediate: poor preservation can make evidence unreliable or inadmissible. In organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IFRS Foundation (2023a); ACFE (2024), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the practical response is to document acquisition, access and integrity of digital evidence. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Emails, logs and system histories can explain who changed data and when, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Poor preservation can make evidence unreliable or inadmissible. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. IFRS Foundation (2023a) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to document acquisition, access and integrity of digital evidence, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Emails, logs and system histories can explain who changed data and when should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, poor preservation can make evidence unreliable or inadmissible. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Knudsen (2020); OECD (2024b) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: document acquisition, access and integrity of digital evidence. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Governance and response

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Investigations must be independent enough to follow evidence where it leads. In operational terms, management influence can narrow scope or delay escalation. In organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems, this can change the economics and

timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Edmondson & Lei (2014); Knudsen (2020), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the practical response is to define reporting lines, legal coordination and remediation responsibility before major cases arise. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Investigations must be independent enough to follow evidence where it leads, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Management influence can narrow scope or delay escalation. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Grant (1996) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to define reporting lines, legal coordination and remediation responsibility before major cases arise, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Investigations must be independent enough to follow evidence where it leads should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, management influence can narrow scope or delay escalation. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by COSO (2013); ACFE (2024) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: define reporting lines, legal coordination and remediation responsibility before major cases arise. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that forensic accounting practices in detecting financial statement fraud cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by OECD (2021); Grant (1996); COSO (2013).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including Knudsen (2020); OECD (2021), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Build hypotheses from incentives, opportunities and the reporting process	Generic red-flag lists can produce noise without guiding evidence collection
2	Use analytics to prioritize investigation rather than substitute for it	Rules generate false positives when business context is ignored
3	Compare assumptions with external evidence and changes in operating conditions	Bias is harder to identify than a false invoice because assumptions may remain within broad ranges
4	Trace selected transactions through contract, delivery, billing and cash evidence	Complex contracts make simple cut-off rules insufficient
5	Document acquisition, access and integrity of digital evidence	Poor preservation can make evidence unreliable or inadmissible
6	Define reporting lines, legal coordination and remediation responsibility before major cases arise	Management influence can narrow scope or delay escalation

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to organizations where financial-statement manipulation may involve management override, complex estimates, related parties or deliberate concealment across multiple systems.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how

long capability building tool, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for forensic accounting practices in detecting financial statement fraud would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish fraud risk hypotheses from journal-entry and transaction analytics and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with estimates and management judgment may not transfer directly to settings dominated by revenue and cut-off, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of forensic accounting practices in detecting financial statement fraud, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of forensic accounting practices in detecting financial statement fraud should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined forensic accounting practices in detecting financial statement fraud through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: analytics alone does not discover intent. Unusual transactions can be legitimate, and fraudulent reporting can be designed to look ordinary, so detection depends on professional skepticism and evidence that connects numbers to business reality. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by forensic accountants, auditors and governance bodies.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes

the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2024). Occupational Fraud 2024: A Report to the Nations. Austin, TX: ACFE.
- Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). Internal Control - Integrated Framework. Durham, NC: COSO.
- 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>
- OECD. (2024). OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024 (Volume 1): Embracing the Technology Frontier. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a1689dc5-en>
- IFRS Foundation. (2023). IFRS S1 General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information. London: IFRS Foundation.
- OECD. (2021). Government at a Glance 2021. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23-43.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109-122.