Predictive Budgeting and Financial Performance Optimisation Using Enterprise Data Analytics in Saudi Arabia.

Abstract

Saudi companies increasingly draw on accounting systems, treasury records and operational data to look ahead rather than relying solely on last year's budget. More data and better forecasts, however, do not automatically produce stronger financial results. Decisions still depend on the quality of the underlying records, sound managerial judgement and the ability to respond to new information. This review examines how enterprise analytics can support predictive budgeting in Saudi Arabia. It brings together research published from 2020 to 2025 on financial forecasting, accounting analytics, organisational capability and Saudi business conditions. Five themes recur across the literature: dependable information, forecasting models tested against credible alternatives, attention to uncertainty, clear responsibility for decisions and evaluation of actual financial outcomes. Flexible statistical methods can reveal useful patterns that conventional forecasts miss, but their value differs across sectors and remains insufficiently tested in Saudi organisations. We propose an approach that links forecasts to approved budget actions, tracks the effects of those actions and uses the results to improve later decisions. The strongest case for predictive budgeting rests on financial value and accountability, not on the complexity of the software.

Keywords

Predictive budgeting; enterprise data analytics; financial performance; Saudi Arabia; financial planning and analysis; forecast governance.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1. Introduction

Budgets turn strategic priorities into spending plans and give managers a shared basis for accountability. Yet the assumptions behind an annual budget can quickly become outdated when demand, project timing, payroll costs or supplier prices change. This is especially relevant to

Saudi firms investing in new capacity and adapting to evolving markets. Predictive budgeting can complement the approved budget by using recent financial and operating information to revise expectations and examine possible responses. Its contribution should be assessed through the decisions it improves, not simply the precision of its forecasts (Wasserbacher and Spindler, 2022; Gao et al., 2024).

Enterprise data analytics encompasses the systematic preparation, integration, modelling and interpretation of information generated by operational and financial systems. Its budgeting applications include sales and cost forecasting, expense anomaly detection, scenario analysis, cash requirements, capital prioritisation and sensitivity assessment. Rather than treating these applications as a technology bundle, this review distinguishes descriptive measurement, predictive estimation and prescriptive decision support. The distinction matters because a low forecast error cannot guarantee sensible allocations when interventions alter customer behaviour, contractual timing or operating capacity. Research on financial planning cautions specifically against confusing predictive association with causal effects when choosing actions (Wasserbacher and Spindler, 2022).

focused on Saudi Arabia scholarship provides a pertinent but incomplete starting point. Boreik et al. (2023) associate big data analytics adoption with investment efficiency and financial performance among listed companies, while Masoud and Basahel (2023) examine performance mechanisms linked to digital transformation. Studies of finance automation and construction cash flow forecasting illuminate organisational controls and project information challenges (Arslan et al., 2024; Mahboob et al., 2024). Nevertheless, these findings do not show that a particular predictive budgeting model improves cash returns across sectors. A focused synthesis must therefore combine local evidence with methods that may be useful elsewhere, while stating clearly where direct Saudi validation is missing.

2. Aim, objectives and research questions

The aim is to critically evaluate the conditions under which enterprise data analytics can convert predictive budgeting into measurable financial performance improvements in Saudi organisations. Four objectives guide the review: first, to identify the enterprise information and analytical capabilities required for dependable budget prediction; second, to compare forecasting approaches for financial planning decisions rather than isolated predictive accuracy; third, to examine governance, human interpretation and organisational constraints shaping financial value; and fourth, to formulate an implementable evaluation framework and a focused on Saudi Arabia research agenda. The central research question asks how, when and for whom predictive budgeting improves financial performance. Supporting questions address relevant data architectures, selection of analytical methods, integration with resource allocation and mechanisms for demonstrating financial benefit.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

3. Review methodology

This paper uses a structured critical literature review rather than a primary survey, experiment or quantitative meta analysis. The review scope covers peer reviewed studies published between 2020 and 2025 on corporate forecasting, budgeting, analytics capabilities, accounting prediction, decision making and Saudi digitalisation. Search concepts were organised around combinations of “predictive budgeting”, “financial planning and analysis”, “machine learning forecasting”, “enterprise analytics”, “financial performance”, “data governance” and “Saudi Arabia”. Publisher databases and bibliographic discovery records were used to identify relevant literature; citation chaining connected accounting, forecasting and organisational studies. The approach is interpretive and thematic: no exhaustive retrieval count, pooled effect estimate or undocumented screening total is claimed.

Eligibility prioritised dated journal articles with identifiable publication details and a DOI, clear relevance to financial prediction or organisational value, and sufficient methodological information for critical interpretation. Studies solely addressing speculative trading prices without a credible enterprise planning connection received lower priority. Empirical and review designs were included because the central question spans model evaluation, organisational implementation and financial outcomes. During synthesis, each study was assessed for unit of analysis, dataset, validation design, outcome construct, relevance to Saudi conditions and potential inference limitations. Forecasting competitions were used to examine comparative prediction principles, not as evidence of Saudi corporate performance. The resulting thirty references form a purposive analytical corpus rather than a statistically representative sample of all published work.

Evidence was grouped into five themes: information infrastructure, modelling, uncertainty and resource allocation, governance, and financial performance. Contradictory results were retained where differences in setting or measurement plausibly explained them. Cross sectional associations were not interpreted as proof that implementation caused superior profitability; results from international samples were treated as transferable hypotheses rather than verified Saudi effects. Quality appraisal attended to using unseen data testing, temporal leakage, control for confounding, organisational sampling and clarity of performance metrics. This procedure supports conceptual integration but does not establish numerical prevalence or causal magnitudes. The boundary of the review is therefore transparent: it develops a testable operating framework from existing evidence, not an independently estimated impact coefficient.

4.1. Enterprise information as the forecasting foundation

Predictive budgeting depends first on whether financial and operational facts share consistent meanings. Enterprise resource planning systems may record invoicing, payables, labour expense,

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

inventory, procurement commitments and project costs, yet different entities commonly use inconsistent account codes, recognition rules and calendars. Good analysis requires chart of accounts mapping, period alignment, entity identifiers, exchange rate conventions and consistent treatment of accruals versus cash movements. Its purpose is not simply to centralise information but to preserve the economic meaning of a measure across source systems. Literature on analytics capabilities emphasises that performance depends on complementary organisational assets, not just computing capacity (Yasmin et al., 2020; Ansari and Ghasemaghaei, 2023).

A financial forecast prepared from late or incomplete operational information can be precisely calculated but misleading in practice. Payment term changes, delayed purchase orders and project variation approvals may enter different systems at different times. The forecasting dataset must therefore record when information became available, not only the date to which it relates. Without this distinction, historical backtests may use information that a manager could not have observed at the decision point. In construction, the information management problem is visible in Saudi cash flow forecasting research, where integration of project and financial records is associated with better visibility but implementation barriers remain salient (Mahboob et al., 2024).

Data governance also determines whether forecast outputs can withstand audit or managerial challenge. Ownership of master data, approval of transformations, reconciliation to the general ledger and documented model versions should be explicit. Financial controls must distinguish a genuine adverse trend from a reclassification or timing adjustment. Organisational evidence links governance, analytics literacy and competent use of analytical information to decision quality (Fattah, 2024). Accordingly, an enterprise data platform should be evaluated by lineage, timeliness, reconciliation accuracy and accessibility to authorised people making decisions. A sophisticated model cannot compensate for unstable cost centre definitions or undisclosed changes to source data.

4.2. Predictive approaches and comparative performance

Conventional financial forecasts often rely on historical averages, growth assumptions, variance explanations and statistically parsimonious time series models. Their strengths include interpretability, limited data requirements and ease of reconciliation. Machine learning alternatives can capture nonlinear interactions between sales, seasonality, pricing, procurement schedules and financial statement components. Chen et al. (2022) demonstrate the predictive potential of detailed accounting information, while Jones (2023) reports improvements in predicting changes in profitability relative to conventional regressions. These studies support testing richer models, but neither supplies a universal corporate budgeting algorithm. Profit prediction and operational budget forecasting differ in horizon, granularity, information availability and economic loss.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Model choice should reflect the problem. For recurring overhead with stable seasonal patterns, a transparent time series baseline may perform adequately. For revenue influenced by many operational drivers, regularised regression and tree ensembles can capture nonlinearities while remaining accessible to explanation. Deep architectures may be defensible with longer histories and large aligned datasets, but their complexity increases maintenance costs and exposure to unstable relationships (Gao et al., 2024; Al-Karkhi and Rządkowski, 2025). Fischer et al. (2020) show the continuing relevance of specialised machine learning approaches for quarterly earnings; methodological value lies in rigorous comparison, not fashionable terminology.

External forecasting competitions demonstrate why benchmarking must be rigorous. The M5 exercises compared diverse techniques at multiple aggregation levels and explicitly evaluated both point predictions and uncertainty distributions (Makridakis et al., 2022a, 2022b, 2022c). Corporate finance applications should similarly compare an incumbent budgeting method, a simple statistical benchmark and a candidate analytical model using genuinely later periods. Evaluation needs rolling origin testing, separation of model selection from final testing and checks for regime shifts. Randomly dividing observations can inflate apparent performance when temporal dependencies or revised source records leak information across periods. Gains should be reported by forecast horizon and financial line item rather than collapsed into one flattering percentage.

Corporate planning also imposes accounting identities: departmental expenses must reconcile to group totals, and projected financial statements must remain internally consistent. Hierarchical reconciliation methods offer a principled response when different teams produce forecasts for business units, projects and corporate accounts (Panagiotelis et al., 2021). Related machine learning work explores nonlinear reconciliation of hierarchical forecasts. For Saudi groups operating across divisions and geographies, this means model outputs should be coherent at cost centre, entity and consolidated levels. A standalone model that appears accurate locally but creates inconsistent aggregate totals may obstruct rather than improve management decisions.

4.3. Uncertainty, scenarios and budget decisions

Budgets allocate finite resources when outcomes are uncertain. A point forecast of annual revenue or operating cost is therefore an incomplete decision input. Managers also need plausible ranges, downside probabilities, cash timing sensitivity and the financial effects of exceeding a threshold. The M5 uncertainty findings illustrate why calibrated distributions are a separate forecasting task rather than a decorative confidence interval (Makridakis et al., 2022b). In corporate applications, predictive distributions can support working capital buffers, procurement commitments, hiring stages and contingency reserves. Calibration should be checked against observed outcomes, with special attention to tail risks and asymmetry: underestimating liquidity needs may be more costly than holding a modest buffer.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Scenario design must avoid treating every projected relationship as controllable. A sales forecast may depend on market demand, but a budget action such as discounting prices changes margins and possibly the driving sales process. Wasserbacher and Spindler (2022) emphasise the distinction between prediction and causal inference within financial planning. Accordingly, analytic budgeting should separate the baseline forecast, externally imposed scenarios and genuinely sensitive to management decisions simulations. The finance team can estimate likely outcomes under stated assumptions, yet should not attribute the full difference between scenarios to the proposed intervention without an appropriate causal design.

The value of a forecast ultimately depends on whether it changes a choice. A marginally more accurate sales projection may have limited economic effect when production capacity is fixed, whereas modest earlier warning about delayed customer receipts can prevent financing pressure. Decision weighted loss functions should therefore reflect the cost of shortages, idle capacity, excess inventories, contractual penalties and missed investment opportunities. Evaluation can compare simulated decisions made with existing forecasts against those informed by the candidate method, using identical information cutoff dates. This is more demanding than comparing prediction errors, but it better represents the business case for predictive budgeting.

4.4. Organisational adoption and governance

Transformation research identifies organisational redesign, skill development and across departments coordination as major conditions for realising digital benefits (Hanelt et al., 2021; Plekhanov et al., 2023). Budgeting is especially sensitive because forecasts influence negotiation, targets and managerial accountability. An analytically generated expense outlook may challenge incentives embedded in an approved annual plan; commercial managers may dispute assumptions or withhold information. A workable operating model gives finance responsibility for model assurance, operating teams responsibility for validating drivers, and executives responsibility for strategic tradeoffs. This separation maintains accountability while preventing algorithmic forecasts from becoming unchallengeable budget instructions.

Human oversight should be structured rather than informal. Each material forecast override ought to record its rationale, supporting evidence, approving role and subsequent accuracy. Monitoring should distinguish useful intervention from systematic optimism, especially when forecasts become performance targets. Business analytics research shows that decision making effectiveness depends on environmental scanning and use of information alongside analytical capability (Cao and Duan, 2024). Governance routines should therefore include scheduled forecast reviews, exception thresholds and documented escalation paths. The objective is disciplined learning, not removing professional judgement from budgeting.

Capability development matters for adoption at different organisational scales. Larger enterprises may deploy enterprise wide planning platforms but still struggle with fragmented subsidiary

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

data, while smaller firms face resource constraints and concentrated expertise. Reviews of digitalisation and smaller enterprise transformation emphasise phased adoption and organisational fit rather than driven mainly by technology implementation (Ben Slimane et al., 2022; Calderon-Monge and Ribeiro-Soriano, 2024). In Saudi Arabia, investment in analytics skills should combine finance domain knowledge, accounting controls, model validation and the ability to communicate uncertainty. Training a finance manager to question assumptions may be as consequential as training an engineer to tune an algorithm.

4.5. Financial performance and the Saudi setting

Financial performance must be measured more carefully than the frequency of updated dashboards. Relevant outcomes include operating margin, cash conversion, interest expense, forecast bias, working capital volatility, capital use and budget variance attributable to avoidable decisions. Meta analytic evidence connects analytics capabilities with firm performance, although the relationship varies by context and measurement (Ansari and Ghasemaghaei, 2023). Dynamic capabilities research suggests that analytics can enable organisational adaptation, but its effect is mediated by managerial processes and market conditions (Saeed et al., 2023). Consequently, an observed association between digital maturity and profitability may reflect selection, leadership quality or investment capacity rather than a direct effect of predictive budgeting.

Saudi evidence merits differentiated interpretation. Boreik et al. (2023) report positive links between big data analytics, investment efficiency and financial performance in a selected publicly listed company sample. This is relevant to organisational readiness but not direct evidence that budget forecasts cause greater returns. Masoud and Basahel (2023) examine how digital transformation relates to firm performance through innovation and customer experience; these mechanisms overlap with, but are distinct from, internal financial planning. Arslan et al. (2024) describe positive organisational associations involving automation, controls and business intelligence. Together, these studies support a plausible local research programme while underscoring the need for direct, longitudinal tests of budgeting interventions.

Sector differences are material. A manufacturer may gain from predicting raw material expenditure and capacity constraints; a construction contractor requires project based payment forecasts; a service provider may prioritise use and personnel expenses. The Saudi construction study by Mahboob et al. (2024) shows how integrated project information can help address cash flow forecasting challenges, but its surveyed population and technology context limit extrapolation to all enterprises. Similarly, international research examining the relationship between digital transformation, budgeting control and SME performance provides a mechanism for investigation, not an effect size transportable to Saudi organisations. Transferability depends on accounting practices, contractual structures, data maturity and decision rights.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

5. Proposed enterprise predictive budgeting framework

Figure 1 presents an iterative architecture connecting source information to outcomes through explicit governance gates. Source integration combines accounting actuals with procurement pipelines, customer orders, staffing plans, treasury positions and external drivers. Data controls establish a dated information snapshot and reconcile it to approved records. A modelling layer produces comparable baseline and candidate forecasts, retaining both point estimates and calibrated ranges. The decision layer translates forecasts into cash buffers, expenditure limits and resource allocation options. Finance leaders approve consequential actions, document overrides and review subsequent variances. Observed outcomes then update both models and organisational assumptions. Of particular importance, each stage creates an auditable link between evidence and decision.



Figure 1. Enterprise predictive budgeting information and decision cycle (conceptual synthesis).

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Table 1. Practical implementation and assurance requirements.

Stage	Minimum control	Evaluation evidence
Information readiness	Dated finance and operational snapshots	Ledger reconciliation and missingness
Model assurance	Incumbent comparator; rolling origin test	Bias, error and calibration by horizon
Decision governance	Authority and override register	Actions changed and approval record
Financial impact	Defined cost function and baseline	Working capital and adjusted for risk outcomes

Source: Authors' synthesis of the reviewed literature.

For implementation, organisations should begin with one financially consequential use case whose historical records are reasonably complete. A quarterly cash forecast for customer collections, for example, can be tested against the existing treasury process before it affects funding commitments. The pilot must specify an information cutoff, evaluation horizon, ownership of adjustments and an agreed economic loss metric. Only after prospective validation should the system expand to multiple lines or business units. Such sequencing reduces the risk of scaling unreliable estimates and creates an observable record of whether analytical advice changes actions and results. Table 1 translates this logic into controllable implementation requirements.

6. Comparative synthesis and critical discussion

Three conclusions emerge from the studies reviewed. First, detailed accounting and operating data can improve forecasts when the relationships in those records remain sufficiently stable. Research on predicting earnings from financial statement information illustrates this potential, but does not establish equivalent gains for every budget line or sector (Chen et al., 2022). Second, analytical capability is more likely to contribute to business performance when it is supported by clear responsibilities, strong data controls and managers who can interpret the results (Yasmin et al., 2020; Fattah, 2024). Third, even an accurate forecast can have little financial value if it arrives too late, cannot be acted upon or encourages a decision whose costs

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

exceed its benefits. Each conclusion needs to be tested against actual budgeting outcomes, particularly in Saudi organisations where direct evidence remains limited.



Figure 2. Why forecasting improvements do not automatically imply financial value (conceptual diagram).

One unresolved tension concerns the tradeoff between local accuracy and consolidated control. A cost centre model may detect operational patterns unavailable at group level but produce forecasts inconsistent with enterprise totals. Conversely, a centrally imposed corporate forecast can overlook specific to a project risks. Reconciliation offers technical coherence, while clear responsibility for local inputs protects relevance (Panagiotelis et al., 2021). Another tension concerns accuracy and explainability. Highly flexible models may reveal useful interactions yet be difficult for a finance committee to challenge. Explanation methods are valuable but must not be mistaken for causal evidence. Model acceptance should therefore depend on predictive validity, auditability and decisions supported, not explanatory graphics alone.

There is also a temporal mismatch between annual strategic commitments and frequently updated analytical updates. Updating every forecast daily may generate operational noise, managerial fatigue or opportunistic target adjustment. A more practical structure distinguishes stable strategic resource envelopes from rolling operational projections. Forecast revisions should trigger action only when changes exceed defined materiality or risk thresholds. Under this approach, the annual budget continues to communicate strategic priorities, while probabilistic forecasts inform tactical adaptation. Such separation prevents the incorrect conclusion that predictive budgeting requires the abolition of budgets and provides an institutional route for combining stability with responsiveness.

UNDER PEER REVIE

6.1. Measuring forecast value

A further measurement difficulty is the possibility that improvement in percentage error conceals a deteriorating economic outcome. Percentage metrics become unstable near zero and may give little weight to large absolute exposures. For liquidity planning, a forecast that misses one exceptional receivable can be more damaging than many minor inaccuracies. Researchers should therefore report absolute and scaled errors by materiality class and compare them with decision specific cost functions. Forecast bias deserves particular attention because systematically optimistic estimates can repeatedly postpone difficult financing decisions, even where aggregate error appears acceptable. The evaluation protocol must be agreed before teams see model comparisons, reducing the temptation to choose favourable metrics after the results are known.

6.2. Change and stability

Accounting measurement changes can resemble genuine economic shocks in a training dataset. A revised procurement policy may accelerate invoices without altering underlying consumption; a new legal entity may change which revenues appear in a group ledger. Models trained without event annotations may learn the wrong relationship and generate misleading forward estimates. Continuous monitoring should distinguish schema changes, operating changes and broader market changes through controlled tests and human confirmation. Model retraining should occur when there is evidence of performance deterioration or structural change, rather than automatically because computing resources permit it. This approach constrains complexity and supports reproducibility across successive budgeting cycles.

6.3. Incentives and overrides

Forecast ownership requires particular care where budget deviations affect compensation, departmental reputation or requests for additional resources. Managers may rationally prefer forecasts that preserve negotiating flexibility rather than forecasts that maximise statistical accuracy. An analytics programme cannot remove these incentives through interface design. A stronger control environment separates independently evaluated forecasts from agreed performance targets, records material human overrides and discloses uncertainty to people making decisions. Overrides should be encouraged when supported by new information, but their subsequent performance should be assessed symmetrically. This arrangement reduces arbitrary intervention while preserving the contextual expertise that central models cannot fully encode.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

6.4. Investment case and costs

The economics of predictive budgeting should incorporate ongoing costs not only the initial platform purchase. Data engineering, access controls, finance training, model monitoring, source system changes and periodic assurance create continuing obligations. A business case should compare these costs with avoided financing charges, more disciplined procurement, reduced inventory exposure and improved timing of capital commitments. Benefits need an observable counterfactual: a lower cost during a favourable market cycle cannot automatically be attributed to forecasting. Pilot results should distinguish implementation efficiency from the value of improved decisions and include scenarios in which model complexity adds cost without material performance improvement.

6.5. Sectoral implications

Saudi manufacturers can connect production orders, maintenance schedules and input prices to expected margin and cash needs, but forecasting must accommodate procurement lead times and capacity restrictions. In project based businesses, milestone completion, certification and payment delays are often more informative than aggregate revenue trends. Service organisations may obtain greater value from linking workforce use and contract renewals to expense envelopes. These differences imply that firms should define the operational event that creates each financial exposure before selecting algorithms. A common enterprise governance framework can coexist with specialised models whose predictors, horizons and cost functions reflect actual business decisions.

6.6. Analytical transparency

A forecast governance record should identify the model version, training window, authorised data snapshot, transformations and responsible approver. Finance staff also need succinct explanations of which drivers changed since the previous cycle, alongside sensitivity ranges. Such documentation can reveal whether an apparent improvement derives from new information, a changed assumption or a revised algorithm. It also supports internal challenge when forecast outputs conflict with known contracts or cash restrictions. Transparency is therefore an operational control, not merely a visual preference, and it enables organisations to learn from mistakes without obscuring who made each consequential decision.

6.7. Coordination across departments coordination

Forecast processes often fail at the handoff between operational planning and financial interpretation. A sales pipeline can contain opportunities unlikely to become recognised revenue

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

within the budget period; purchase requisitions may be committed operationally but not yet booked as expenditure. A coordinated process translates such signals into financial timing using documented rules and reconciles material exceptions with accountable owners. This reduces disputes about whose numbers are correct and shifts attention toward the implications of discrepancies. A useful review meeting should spend less time reproducing spreadsheets and more time deciding what action is justified by the latest information.

6.8. Organisational learning

Retrospective review should differentiate forecasts that were wrong because of unforeseeable events from those that were wrong because information was already available but ignored. The former motivates resilience and scenario design; the latter points to data access, model selection or governance deficiencies. Organisations can categorise misses by source and quantify their decision consequences before deciding which capabilities to improve. Such a learning process provides a more stable basis for investment than repeated claims of increasing model accuracy. It also helps prevent a cycle in which each new forecasting system is abandoned whenever market conditions change.

7. Research gaps and future directions

Direct Saudi evidence on prospective accuracy, decision value and financial returns remains sparse. Future research should examine matched organisational units before and after analytic budgeting adoption, where feasible combining staggered implementation with credible comparison groups. Researchers should report both prediction metrics and budget decisions, making it possible to determine whether improvement stems from information timeliness, model flexibility or changed managerial behaviour. Cross sector samples would clarify whether requiring substantial cash flow construction firms, manufacturers and service enterprises benefit through different mechanisms. Longitudinal designs should identify implementation costs, skills requirements and unintended consequences such as biased overrides or excessive reliance on automated outputs.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Table 2. Research evidence, interpretation and outstanding validation needs.

Evidence stream	What the literature supports	Saudi validation needed
Financial statement prediction	Detailed accounting predictors can outperform benchmarks	Prospective budget line forecasting
Analytics capabilities	Association with organisational performance	Longitudinal causal mechanisms
Forecast reconciliation	Consistency across hierarchical totals	Multi entity enterprise pilots
Local finance digitalisation	Plausible adoption and performance links	Decision cost and implementation evidence

Source: Critical synthesis; studies and contexts are not causally equivalent.

Further work should develop relevant to Saudi Arabia benchmarks with harmonised accounting definitions and documented information cutoffs. Useful studies would compare deterministic and probabilistic methods, assess extreme event performance and test whether forecast reconciliation improves group level capital allocation. Organisational research should investigate who owns data quality, how finance committees interpret forecast uncertainty and why some accurate models remain unused. Privacy, commercial confidentiality and access restrictions also warrant practical study where enterprise records span multiple businesses. A common reporting standard covering samples, data availability, validation horizons, economic costs and implementation context would strengthen cumulative evidence and prevent misleading comparisons between incompatible forecasting settings.

8. Managerial and policy implications

Chief financial officers should require investment proposals to state the budget decision being improved, the incumbent benchmark and the operational cost of prediction errors. Finance transformation programmes should prioritise master data reconciliation, model documentation and accountable ownership before complex automation. Controllers can introduce calibrated ranges alongside point forecasts, monitor override patterns and analyse whether forecasts reduce avoidable funding costs or expenditure shocks. Internal audit should verify the integrity of data transformations, permissions and version histories. Procurement, operations and treasury leaders should jointly validate drivers while avoiding incentives to alter inputs solely to achieve budget targets.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

For policymakers and professional bodies, targeted support for financial data literacy, interoperable reporting and applied validation could generate value beyond promotion of particular technologies. Small and medium sized enterprises may need modular approaches that work with modest data volumes and limited specialist staffing. Publicly available methodological benchmarks and specific to individual sectors training would lower experimentation costs without overstating likely returns. Based on evidence guidance should distinguish automation efficiency from the effects of improved financial decisions. These priorities align with wider digital transformation ambitions while preserving the principle that capital allocation remains an accountable managerial judgement.

9. Limitations

This is a thematic review, not an exhaustive survey of all published research, and it does not estimate a combined causal effect. The included studies differ in industry, geography, research design and the outcomes they measure. Some investigate overall business performance rather than budgeting, while forecasting competitions establish methodological lessons rather than evidence of financial returns. A DOI identifies a publication but does not, by itself, establish that its findings are reliable. Without original data from Saudi enterprises, the framework presented here remains a proposal for testing. These limitations should guide both the interpretation of the findings and the design of future research.

10. Conclusion

Predictive budgeting can be useful when finance teams combine reliable company records, forecasts that have been properly tested and clear responsibility for the decisions that follow. Research shows that richer accounting data and more flexible models can improve some predictions, but it offers much less direct evidence that forecast accuracy leads to better corporate financial results. The crucial step is deciding what action to take and measuring whether that action reduces costs, improves resource allocation or limits financial risk. Saudi organisations can begin with a focused use case, compare it with established budgeting practice and document any management adjustments. Researchers should then examine the results over time and across different sectors. That approach offers a stronger basis for investment than assuming that more advanced analytics must produce better budgets.

References

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAP

1. Wasserbacher, H., & Spindler, M. (2022). Machine learning for financial forecasting, planning and analysis: Recent developments and pitfalls. Digital Finance, 4, 63–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42521-021-00046-2
2. Gao, H., Kou, G., Liang, H., Zhang, H., Chao, X., Li, C.-C., et al. (2024). Machine learning in business and finance: A literature review and research opportunities. Financial Innovation, 10, 86. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-024-00629-z
3. Chen, X., Cho, Y. H., Dou, Y., & Lev, B. (2022). Predicting future earnings changes using machine learning and detailed financial data. Journal of Accounting Research, 60(2), 467–515. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679X.12429
4. Jones, S. (2023). Machine learning and the prediction of changes in profitability. Contemporary Accounting Research, 40(4), 2643–2672. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12888
5. Fischer, J. A., Pohl, P., & Ratz, D. (2020). A machine learning approach to univariate time series forecasting of quarterly earnings. Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting, 55, 1163–1179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11156-020-00871-3
6. Hunt, J. O. S. (2022). Improving earnings predictions and abnormal returns with machine learning. Accounting Horizons. https://doi.org/10.2308/HORIZONS-19-125
7. Makridakis, S., Spiliotis, E., &Assimakopoulos, V. (2022a). M5 accuracy competition: Results, findings, and conclusions. International Journal of Forecasting, 38(4), 1346–1364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2021.11.013
8. Makridakis, S., Spiliotis, E., Assimakopoulos, V., Chen, Z., Gaba, A., Tsetlin, I., & Winkler, R. L. (2022b). The M5 uncertainty competition: Results, findings and conclusions. International Journal of Forecasting, 38(4), 1365–1385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2021.10.009
9. Makridakis, S., Spiliotis, E., &Assimakopoulos, V. (2022c). The M5 competition: Background, organization, and implementation. International Journal of Forecasting, 38(4), 1325–1336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2021.07.007
10. Panagiotelis, A., Athanasopoulos, G., Gamakumara, P., & Hyndman, R. J. (2021). Forecast reconciliation: A geometric view with new insights on bias correction. International Journal of Forecasting, 37(1), 343–359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.06.004
11. Yasmin, M., Tatoglu, E., Kilic, H. S., Zaim, S., & Delen, D. (2020). Big data analytics capabilities and firm performance: An integrated MCDM approach. Journal of Business Research, 114, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.028
12. Ansari, K., &Ghasemaghaei, M. (2023). Big data analytics capability and firm performance: Meta-analysis. Journal of Computer Information Systems, 63(6), 1477–1494. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2023.2170300
13. Saeed, M., Adiguzel, Z., Shafique, I., Kalyar, M. N., & Abrudan, D. B. (2023). Big data analytics-enabled dynamic capabilities and firm performance: Examining the roles of

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAP

marketing ambidexterity and environmental dynamism. Business Process Management Journal, 29(4), 1204–1226. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-01-2023-0015

14. Boreik, D. A. S., Melegy, M. M. A., & Ali Albaz, M. M. (2023). The impact of big data analytics on investment efficiency and financial performance: Evidence from Saudi stock market. Information Sciences Letters, 12(6), 2461–2473. https://doi.org/10.18576/isl/120645
15. Masoud, R., &Basahel, S. (2023). The effects of digital transformation on firm performance: The role of customer experience and IT innovation. Digital, 3(2), 109–126. https://doi.org/10.3390/digital3020008
16. Cao, G., & Duan, Y. (2024). Exploring the impact of business analytics on strategic decision-making in uncertain environments. Journal of Management Analytics, 11(4), 577–600. https://doi.org/10.1080/23270012.2024.2420365
17. Fattah, I. A. (2024). Decision making performance of business analytics capabilities: The role of big data literacy and analytics competency. Business Process Management Journal, 30(6), 2096–2126. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-11-2023-0894
18. Al-Karkhi, M. I., &Rządkowski, G. (2025). Innovative machine learning approaches for complexity in economic forecasting and SME growth: A comprehensive review. Journal of Economy and Technology, 3, 109–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ject.2025.01.001
19. Plekhanov, D., Franke, H., & Netland, T. H. (2023). Digital transformation: A review and research agenda. European Management Journal, 41(6), 821–844. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2022.09.007
20. Hanelt, A., Bohnsack, R., Marz, D., & Antunes Marante, C. (2021). A systematic review of the literature on digital transformation: Insights and implications for strategy and organizational change. Journal of Management Studies. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639
21. Calderon-Monge, E., & Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2024). The role of digitalization in business and management: A systematic literature review. Review of Managerial Science, 18, 449–491. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00647-8
22. Ben Slimane, S., Coeurderoy, R., &Mhenni, H. (2022). Digital transformation of small and medium enterprises: A systematic literature review and an integrative framework. International Studies of Management & Organization, 52(2), 96–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2022.2072067
23. Arslan, M., Hussain, S., & Amjad, M. (2024). The impact of financial automation, business intelligence, and internal controls on business performance in Saudi Arabia: A strategic financial approach. Journal of Humanities, Health and Social Sciences, 2(4), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.61503/jhhss.2.4.2024.52
24. Mahboob, A., Rathnasinghe, A., Ekanayake, A., & Tennakoon, P. (2024). Evaluating BIM's role in transforming cash flow forecasting among construction SMEs: A Saudi Arabian narrative. Sustainability, 16, 10221. https://doi.org/10.3390/su162310221

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAP

25. Kureljusic, M., & Karger, E. (2024). Forecasting in financial accounting with artificial intelligence: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. Journal of Applied Accounting Research, 25(1), 81–104. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-06-2022-0146
26. Ebhota, O. S., Hongxing, Y., &Sampene, A. K. (2024). Investigating the influence of digital transformation, budgeting and budgetary control on the financial performance of SMEs. (2024). Scientific African, 26, e02429. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2024.e02429
27. Alsufyani, N., & Gill, A. Q. (2022). Digitalisation performance assessment: A systematic review. (2022). Technology in Society, 68, 101894. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101894
28. Spiliotis, E., Abolghasemi, M., Hyndman, R. J., Petropoulos, F., &Assimakopoulos, V. (2021). Hierarchical forecast reconciliation with machine learning. (2021). Applied Soft Computing. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2021.107756
29. Reis, J., &Melão, N. (2023). Digital transformation: A meta-review and guidelines for future research. (2023). Heliyon, 9(1), e12834. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e12834
30. Mahboub, H., Sadok, H., Chehri, A., & Saadane, R. (2023). Measuring the digital transformation: A key performance indicators literature review. (2023). Procedia Computer Science, 225, 4570–4579. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.10.455

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAP