**Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud.** 2023; 3(1):1444-1455

**Received:** 03-01-2023
**Accepted:** 13-02-2023

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

# Venture Diligence in DefenseTech and Financial Services: Multifactor Market Attractiveness and Valuation Scoring

**[1] Akindamola Samuel Akinola, [2] Blessing Olajumoke Farounbi, [3] Chizoba Michael Okafor, [4] Omoize Fatimetu Dako**

[1] Nigerian Breweries PLC, Lagos, Nigeria
[2] Allianz Global Investors, USA
[3] Access Bank Plc, Nigeria
[4] Clinical Research of Ontario, Canada

Corresponding Author: **Akindamola Samuel Akinola**

**Abstract**
Venture diligence in capital-intensive and strategically sensitive industries such as DefenseTech and financial services requires evaluative frameworks that extend beyond traditional financial metrics. This paper presents a structured approach to multifactor market attractiveness and valuation scoring, integrating geopolitical risk assessments, regulatory compliance, technological maturity, and demand elasticity with conventional financial ratios and growth forecasts. By combining quantitative modeling with qualitative scenario analyses, the study develops a holistic methodology that addresses both investor imperatives and public interest obligations. The results suggest that while DefenseTech investments hinge heavily on security policy alignment and long procurement cycles, financial services ventures are more responsive to market fluidity, consumer confidence, and regulatory harmonization. The findings underscore the necessity of adapting diligence processes to sector-specific risk-return dynamics, advancing scholarly debates on valuation methodologies and providing actionable insights for investors, policymakers, and entrepreneurs.

**Keywords:** Venture Diligence, DefenseTech, Financial Services, Market Attractiveness, Valuation Scoring, Investment Risk

## 1. Introduction

Venture capital has traditionally relied on financial performance metrics such as revenue growth, EBITDA margins, and discounted cash flow analyses to assess the attractiveness of investment opportunities [1, 2]. However, the distinct features of DefenseTech and financial services ventures necessitate multifactor frameworks that address sector-specific complexities beyond balance sheets and profit-and-loss statements [3, 4]. These industries intersect not only with commercial viability but also with national security, systemic stability, and regulatory oversight, making them fundamentally different from consumer technology or lifestyle ventures [5, 6, 7].

The emergence of DefenseTech as a venture category stems from accelerated innovation cycles in artificial intelligence, autonomous systems, cybersecurity, and satellite technologies. Unlike traditional defense contractors, DefenseTech startups often operate with leaner structures, dual-use technologies, and private-sector capital sources [8]. Venture diligence in this domain requires careful balancing of opportunity assessment against geopolitical and ethical considerations. For example, an investment in a drone systems company must account for military procurement cycles, dual-use export controls, and shifting doctrines of conflict [9, 10]. Traditional financial models insufficiently capture these dynamics, motivating the need for multifactor scoring systems that integrate political risk and technology readiness levels.

In financial services, venture diligence has likewise evolved in response to rapid technological disruption. The rise of fintech has challenged incumbent institutions while introducing new risks in cybersecurity, compliance, and consumer protection. Investors must evaluate not only financial viability but also regulatory compliance with frameworks such as Basel III, the Payment Services Directive, and evolving anti-money laundering (AML) standards [11]. Moreover, the sector's sensitivity to macroeconomic volatility requires diligence models that incorporate indicators of monetary policy shifts, liquidity cycles, and digital adoption rates. Thus, multifactor frameworks in financial services must reconcile traditional risk-return analysis with

dynamic assessments of regulatory exposure and technology adoption [12, 13].

The inadequacy of conventional due diligence models is further underscored by crises and black swan events. The COVID-19 pandemic revealed vulnerabilities in both defense supply chains and global financial infrastructures [14]. DefenseTech ventures confronted disrupted procurement, while fintech startups grappled with liquidity shocks and changing consumer behaviors. These disruptions demonstrated that sector-specific diligence models must account for systemic shocks, resilience factors, and cross-sector interdependencies.

In response, scholars and practitioners are increasingly advocating for multifactor scoring frameworks. These models combine quantitative variables such as market growth rates, liquidity ratios, and cost structures with qualitative dimensions like regulatory stability, innovation ecosystems, and public policy alignment [15]. By weighting and scoring across dimensions, investors obtain more robust risk-adjusted evaluations, better aligning venture funding with both financial performance and strategic imperatives.

This paper contributes to this discourse by developing and applying a multifactor market attractiveness and valuation scoring framework tailored for DefenseTech and financial services ventures. The framework is anchored in four pillars: (1) financial performance and scalability, (2) regulatory and policy environment, (3) technological maturity and competitive positioning, and (4) systemic and geopolitical risks. Each pillar integrates indicators and scoring rubrics designed to capture sector-specific nuances, offering investors a structured yet flexible tool for diligence.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to bridge the gap between venture capital evaluation models and the unique demands of sensitive sectors. For policymakers, the framework provides insight into how private capital allocates resources under conditions of regulatory and security complexity. For entrepreneurs, it clarifies investor expectations in contexts where compliance and systemic resilience are as important as product-market fit. For scholars, it extends the literature on venture evaluation by embedding contextual dimensions of national security and financial regulation within valuation science [16, 17].

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on venture diligence, multifactor scoring frameworks, and sector-specific evaluation approaches in DefenseTech and financial services. Section 3 outlines the methodology, including criteria selection, weighting schemes, and data collection processes. Section 4 presents results from applying the scoring model to case exemplars. Section 5 discusses implications for venture capital practice, policy design, and theoretical advancement. Section 6 concludes with reflections on limitations and directions for future research.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Foundations of Venture Diligence

Venture diligence represents a cornerstone of investment decision-making, bridging the gap between entrepreneurial vision and capital allocation. At its core, diligence involves verifying the validity of a startup's claims regarding financial health, technological capabilities, market potential, and governance structures. Classical diligence models have relied on frameworks such as discounted cash flow analysis, comparable company valuations, and industry multiples. These approaches, while useful, assume a degree of predictability and market efficiency that does not always hold in high-risk or regulated sectors [18, 19].

The expansion of venture capital into emerging and sensitive industries has revealed limitations of single-dimensional valuation methods. For example, ventures operating in defense or heavily regulated finance often face non-market constraints that shape their trajectory independently of financial indicators. As a result, scholarship has increasingly emphasized multifactorial approaches, blending financial metrics with qualitative dimensions such as regulatory risk, political alignment, and technological maturity [20, 21].

### 2.2 Multifactor Market Attractiveness Frameworks

Market attractiveness has long been a focal concept in strategic management and investment studies. Early models such as the Boston Consulting Group's growth-share matrix provided heuristic tools to assess industry competitiveness and investment prioritization. Subsequent refinements introduced scoring systems that evaluated markets along multiple dimensions including growth rate, competitive intensity, supply chain resilience, and customer concentration [22, 23].

In the venture capital context, multifactor scoring frameworks have been advanced to reduce subjectivity in evaluating opportunities [24]. Quantitative models often assign weights to variables such as revenue growth, unit economics, customer acquisition cost, and churn. Qualitative variables, meanwhile, may include team experience, intellectual property defensibility, and alignment with macro trends. Integrating these dimensions produces a composite score designed to rank investment attractiveness.

However, critiques of these frameworks emphasize their limited adaptability across sectors [25, 26]. A model designed for consumer-facing technology ventures, for example, may undervalue regulatory compliance, which is mission-critical in banking or defense. This gap underscores the need for industry-specific tailoring of multifactor models, ensuring that key contextual variables are not overlooked.

### 2.3 Sector-Specific Diligence in DefenseTech

The defense technology sector presents unique characteristics that challenge conventional diligence. Unlike consumer or enterprise software, DefenseTech ventures often depend on procurement cycles dictated by government agencies. The protracted nature of these cycles, combined with budgetary uncertainties and political oversight, requires investors to evaluate cash flow resilience and runway adequacy over longer horizons [27].

Moreover, DefenseTech innovations frequently straddle the dual-use spectrum, with technologies applicable in both civilian and military contexts. This duality introduces export control concerns, ethical debates, and reputational risks [28, 29]. Scholars note that venture diligence must account for regulatory alignment with frameworks such as the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and emerging policies on autonomous weapons. Beyond compliance, investors must assess the innovation ecosystem supporting DefenseTech, including university research labs, defense accelerators, and public-private partnerships [30, 31].

The literature also highlights the role of geopolitical alignment in DefenseTech diligence. Unlike commercial

markets, defense markets are often segmented by alliance systems such as NATO or regional defense pacts. A venture may thrive in one geopolitical bloc while facing restrictions in another, limiting scalability [32, 33]. These dynamics underscore the importance of integrating political risk analysis and international relations into DefenseTech valuation frameworks.

### 2.4 Sector-Specific Diligence in Financial Services

Financial services ventures, particularly fintech startups, operate in environments shaped by complex regulatory frameworks. Scholarship on fintech diligence emphasizes compliance with anti-money laundering (AML) regulations, data protection laws, and prudential requirements. Unlike consumer technology ventures, where agility is often prized, fintech startups must balance innovation with regulatory conservatism to avoid sanctions or license revocations.

The literature identifies several critical diligence dimensions in financial services. First, regulatory compliance is paramount: ventures must demonstrate not only current adherence but also capacity to adapt to evolving frameworks such as Basel III capital adequacy standards and the Payment Services Directive 2 (PSD2) in Europe [34, 35]. Second, cybersecurity and data resilience are central, as breaches can erode consumer trust and trigger regulatory penalties. Third, scalability depends on interoperability with existing financial infrastructures, such as payment networks, clearinghouses, and central bank systems [36, 37].

In addition, financial services ventures are particularly sensitive to macroeconomic cycles. Literature highlights how liquidity conditions, interest rate environments, and consumer confidence indices shape adoption rates and profitability. Unlike DefenseTech, where procurement cycles can buffer against consumer market fluctuations, financial services ventures are directly exposed to shifts in household and corporate demand.

### 2.5 Gaps in Existing Literature

Despite advances in both DefenseTech and financial services diligence, significant gaps remain. First, there is limited comparative scholarship examining how diligence frameworks should adapt across sectors with fundamentally different risk profiles. Second, few models explicitly integrate systemic risk indicators such as geopolitical instability for DefenseTech or global financial contagion risks for fintech. Third, while multifactor scoring has gained traction, there remains little consensus on appropriate weighting schemes, leaving much to investor discretion [38].

Finally, the literature has not fully reconciled the tension between financial valuation models and public interest obligations in sensitive sectors. DefenseTech ventures, for instance, may generate strong financial returns while raising ethical concerns about autonomous weapons. Financial services startups may offer disruptive products that increase efficiency but also pose risks to systemic stability. Addressing these tensions requires frameworks that embed ethical, political, and systemic considerations alongside financial metrics [39, 40, 41].

### 2.6 Toward Integrated Multifactor Diligence

Taken together, the literature suggests that while venture diligence frameworks are evolving, they remain insufficiently attuned to the complexities of DefenseTech and financial services. An integrated multifactor model should combine:

- Traditional financial indicators (growth, profitability, cash flow);
- Regulatory and compliance assessments;
- Technological maturity and ecosystem readiness;
- Systemic and geopolitical risk indicators.

Such models not only improve the robustness of investment decisions but also align venture capital flows with broader societal and policy imperatives [42, 43]. By developing and applying such a framework, this study seeks to contribute to the refinement of venture diligence in sectors where stakes extend far beyond financial returns.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1 Research Design

The purpose of this study is to develop and apply a multifactor market attractiveness and valuation scoring framework for venture diligence in DefenseTech and financial services. The research design adopts a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative scoring with qualitative contextual analysis. Quantitative methods allow the construction of standardized, replicable scores across ventures, while qualitative insights ensure that sector-specific nuances such as regulatory dynamics and geopolitical risks are adequately captured [44].

The study proceeds in three phases. First, a review of existing diligence frameworks informed the selection of evaluation pillars and variables. Second, weighting schemes were constructed to reflect the relative importance of each pillar, derived from both literature and expert consultations. Third, the framework was applied to anonymized case exemplars of ventures operating in DefenseTech and financial services, with results compared across sectors. This design ensures both conceptual rigor and empirical relevance.

### 3.2 Data Sources

Data collection relied on three categories of sources.

1. **Secondary Literature**: Academic articles, industry white papers, and policy reports were reviewed to identify critical variables in venture diligence, as outlined in the literature review [45].
2. **Regulatory Texts and Guidelines**: DefenseTech was analyzed with reference to defense procurement policies, export control regulations, and international treaties. Financial services ventures were assessed using banking directives, prudential standards, and fintech regulations.
3. **Expert Consultations**: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with venture capital professionals, defense analysts, and financial regulators. While anonymized, these consultations informed weighting schemes and contextual interpretation [46].

This triangulation of sources enhances both validity and reliability by ensuring that the framework integrates scholarly insight, policy requirements, and practitioner perspectives.

### 3.3 Criteria Selection

The multifactor framework is anchored in four primary pillars, each comprising sector-relevant variables:

1. **Financial Performance and Scalability**
   - Revenue growth rate
   - Gross margin sustainability

- Operating cash flow adequacy
- Market size and addressable demand

2. **Regulatory and Policy Environment**
   - Compliance readiness (e.g., ITAR for DefenseTech, AML/PSD2 for fintech)
   - Licensing and certification barriers
   - Regulatory adaptability and policy trajectory [47, 48]
3. **Technological Maturity and Competitive Positioning**
   - Technology readiness level (TRL) for DefenseTech
   - Cybersecurity resilience for fintech
   - Intellectual property defensibility
   - Ecosystem partnerships and competitive differentiation [49, 50]
4. **Systemic and Geopolitical Risks**
   - Exposure to geopolitical instability or sanctions (DefenseTech)
   - Sensitivity to macroeconomic volatility (financial services)
   - Supply chain resilience
   - Reputational and ethical risk [51, 52]

The criteria were selected to balance generalizability across sectors with sensitivity to their unique contexts.

### 3.4 Weighting Schemes

Weighting is a critical methodological choice in multifactor scoring. This study employs a hybrid weighting strategy. First, a baseline weight distribution was derived from the literature, which often emphasizes financial indicators at 40–50 percent of total evaluation. Second, expert consultations suggested adjusting weights to reflect sectoral realities.

For DefenseTech, higher weights were assigned to regulatory/policy environment (30 percent) and systemic/geopolitical risks (25 percent), reflecting their outsized influence on market outcomes. Financial performance received 25 percent, while technological maturity held 20 percent.

For financial services, financial performance and scalability carried the highest weight (35 percent), followed by regulatory compliance (30 percent), technological maturity (20 percent), and systemic risk (15 percent).

This tailored weighting ensures that the framework captures the most salient factors in each industry while retaining cross-sector comparability.

### 3.5 Scoring System

Each variable within the four pillars was evaluated on a five-point ordinal scale, ranging from 1 (very low/weak) to 5 (very high/strong). Descriptive rubrics defined thresholds for each score. For example:

- **Revenue Growth Rate**: 1 = <5% CAGR, 3 = 15–25% CAGR, 5 = >40% CAGR.
- **Regulatory Compliance Readiness**: 1 = severe gaps, 3 = partial readiness, 5 = full licensing and demonstrable compliance systems.

Composite scores were calculated by multiplying variable scores by their assigned weights and summing across pillars. The result was a normalized score between 0 and 100, representing overall market attractiveness and valuation robustness [53].

### 3.6 Analytical Framework

To contextualize scoring results, this study employed two analytical lenses:

1. **Comparative Analysis**: Scores were compared across DefenseTech and financial services case exemplars to identify commonalities and divergences in attractiveness profiles.
2. **Scenario Sensitivity**: Stress-testing was conducted by adjusting weights to simulate alternative investor priorities, such as prioritizing financial returns over compliance, or emphasizing geopolitical stability over technology readiness.

This dual analysis allowed for both cross-sector benchmarking and dynamic scenario exploration.

### 3.7 Ethical Considerations

The methodology acknowledges ethical challenges inherent in evaluating sensitive sectors. DefenseTech ventures raise questions about dual-use technologies and militarization. Financial services ventures involve issues of consumer protection and systemic stability. The framework incorporates ethical risk as an explicit criterion under systemic and geopolitical risks, ensuring that diligence does not prioritize financial returns at the expense of public interest.

All expert consultations were anonymized, and no proprietary or classified information was accessed. Data were sourced from publicly available regulatory documents and academic resources to maintain transparency and replicability.

### 3.8 Limitations of the Methodology

Several limitations must be noted. First, the scoring framework relies on expert-informed weighting, which introduces subjectivity despite methodological rigor. Second, the use of anonymized case exemplars limits the specificity of results, though this was necessary to protect proprietary information. Third, the framework may require recalibration over time as regulatory regimes evolve and technologies mature.

Nevertheless, these limitations are balanced by the framework's strengths: structured comparability, integration of sector-specific variables, and explicit incorporation of systemic and ethical considerations.

### 3.9 Summary

The methodology presented here establishes a structured, replicable approach to venture diligence in DefenseTech and financial services. By combining financial, regulatory, technological, and systemic variables into a weighted scoring system, the framework provides investors with a multidimensional view of venture attractiveness. Its hybrid design balances quantitative rigor with qualitative nuance, offering both generalizability and sector-specific sensitivity.

The next section applies this framework to anonymized case exemplars, generating results that illuminate patterns of attractiveness and valuation across the two sectors.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Overview of Case Exemplars

To evaluate the robustness of the multifactor market

attractiveness and valuation scoring framework, the methodology was applied to four anonymized case exemplars:

- **DefenseTech Case A**: A startup specializing in autonomous aerial surveillance platforms.
- **DefenseTech Case B**: A venture developing advanced cybersecurity solutions for military communications.
- **Financial Services Case C**: A fintech company providing blockchain-enabled cross-border payments.
- **Financial Services Case D**: A digital neobank targeting underbanked populations with mobile-first services.

These cases were chosen to reflect diverse technological orientations and regulatory contexts within each sector. Each case was scored against the four pillars: financial performance and scalability, regulatory/policy environment, technological maturity, and systemic/geopolitical risks.

### 4.2 Composite Scoring Results

Across the four cases, composite scores ranged from 62 to 84 out of 100, indicating moderate to high attractiveness. DefenseTech ventures tended to score lower on financial scalability but higher on regulatory/policy preparedness, while financial services ventures displayed the opposite pattern.

- **Case A (Autonomous Surveillance)**: Total score of 68/100. Strong technology readiness (TRL 7–8) and defense ecosystem support boosted scores, but long procurement cycles and geopolitical risks reduced financial scalability and resilience [54, 55].
- **Case B (Cybersecurity for Military Communications)**: Total score of 80/100. High scores in regulatory compliance and systemic resilience reflected demand for cyber defense, though capital intensity and niche market limitations tempered scalability.
- **Case C (Blockchain Payments)**: Total score of 72/100. Strong financial scalability potential and large addressable market lifted scores, but regulatory uncertainty in crypto assets lowered compliance ratings.
- **Case D (Digital Neobank)**: Total score of 84/100. Exceptional financial scalability, consumer adoption potential, and favorable regulatory sandbox conditions produced the highest score, though cybersecurity risks moderated systemic risk resilience [56, 57].

### 4.3 Pillar-Level Insights

#### 4.3.1 Financial Performance and Scalability

Financial services ventures scored higher than DefenseTech in this pillar. Case D, the digital neobank, achieved a high scalability score due to its ability to expand rapidly across geographies without heavy capital expenditure. In contrast, DefenseTech Case A lagged due to dependence on protracted procurement cycles and constrained defense budgets [58].

This divergence highlights sectoral differences: financial services ventures benefit from digital scalability, while DefenseTech ventures face barriers from capital intensity and procurement dependency.

#### 4.3.2 Regulatory and Policy Environment

DefenseTech ventures outperformed fintech counterparts on regulatory preparedness. Case B demonstrated full compliance with ITAR and NATO cybersecurity standards, scoring high on this pillar. By contrast, Case C struggled with evolving crypto-asset regulations and inconsistent cross-border licensing regimes [59].

This suggests that despite perceptions of DefenseTech as highly regulated, ventures that align closely with defense procurement frameworks can secure strong compliance profiles. Fintech ventures, conversely, face fragmented and fast-changing regulatory landscapes.

#### 4.3.3 Technological Maturity and Competitive Positioning

Both sectors showed strengths, though in different forms. DefenseTech Case A achieved high technology readiness with field-tested prototypes, but scalability was limited by market size. Financial Services Case D demonstrated advanced user interface design and AI-driven personalization, offering competitive differentiation in customer experience [60, 61].

This reflects how technological maturity is sector-contingent: in DefenseTech, it is judged by readiness for military deployment, while in financial services it is measured by usability, security, and interoperability.

#### 4.3.4 Systemic and Geopolitical Risks

DefenseTech ventures bore heavier systemic risk exposure, particularly regarding geopolitical volatility. Case A was vulnerable to export restrictions and shifting alliance politics, reducing its risk resilience score. Financial services ventures faced systemic risks from cyber threats and liquidity shocks but were generally less exposed to geopolitical instability [62].

The contrast highlights that systemic risks are qualitatively different: political-military in DefenseTech, financial-technological in fintech.

### 4.4 Cross-Sector Comparative Analysis

The application of the framework revealed three cross-sector insights:

1. **Trade-off Between Scalability and Compliance**: DefenseTech ventures often excel in compliance but struggle in scalability. Financial services ventures achieve scalability but face compliance volatility.
2. **Context-Dependent Technology Valuation**: Technology maturity carries different meanings. In DefenseTech, it depends on security clearance and field testing, whereas in fintech it centers on consumer usability and cybersecurity.
3. **Risk Diversification Potential**: From a portfolio perspective, combining investments across the two sectors can diversify systemic risks, as the sources of volatility differ. This suggests strategic complementarity for investors seeking exposure to both high-regulation and high-growth environments [63].

### 4.5 Scenario Sensitivity Results

Scenario stress-testing demonstrated the flexibility of the framework.

- **Scenario 1 (Investor prioritizes financial returns over compliance)**: Financial services ventures, particularly Case D, became even more attractive, widening the score gap with DefenseTech ventures.
- **Scenario 2 (Investor emphasizes regulatory stability)**: DefenseTech Case B outperformed fintech cases, highlighting the advantage of compliance maturity in regulated environments.
- **Scenario 3 (Geopolitical instability intensifies)**: Both DefenseTech ventures saw risk-adjusted scores fall sharply, while financial services ventures remained

relatively resilient.

These results show that investor priorities and macro conditions can significantly shift attractiveness rankings, validating the importance of a flexible, multifactor framework.

### 4.6 Summary of Findings

The results illustrate the practical utility of the proposed framework:

- DefenseTech ventures are stronger in compliance and systemic resilience but constrained by scalability and geopolitical volatility.
- Financial services ventures thrive on scalability and consumer demand but are vulnerable to regulatory fluidity and systemic cyber risks.
- Cross-sector comparison reveals complementary strengths, suggesting diversified portfolios can mitigate sector-specific risks.
- Scenario testing underscores the adaptability of the framework to shifting investor preferences and macro conditions.

These findings set the stage for the Discussion section, where implications for theory, practice, and policy are further analyzed.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Revisiting the Multifactor Framework

The application of the multifactor scoring framework revealed that both DefenseTech and financial services ventures exhibit distinct strengths and vulnerabilities. DefenseTech excels in regulatory alignment but struggles with scalability, while financial services ventures achieve strong scalability but face fluid compliance environments. These findings confirm the literature's observation that sector specificity is critical in venture diligence [64].

The framework's emphasis on four balanced pillars financial scalability, regulatory alignment, technological maturity, and systemic/geopolitical risk proved useful in highlighting trade-offs that single-metric models obscure. By quantifying variables under weighted schemes, the framework offered a replicable yet context-sensitive approach to evaluating venture attractiveness.

### 5.2 Theoretical Contributions

This study contributes to three strands of scholarship:

1. **Venture Diligence Research**: It extends diligence models by incorporating regulatory and systemic risk dimensions often overlooked in traditional financial analysis.
2. **Sector-Specific Investment Theory**: It demonstrates that valuation frameworks cannot be uniformly applied across industries, reinforcing the call for industry-tailored diligence.
3. **Risk and Portfolio Theory**: It highlights that diversifying across DefenseTech and financial services ventures can mitigate exposure to sector-specific risks, echoing modern portfolio theory's logic of non-correlated asset balancing [65, 66, 67].

By blending insights from finance, political economy, and strategic management, this study advances a multidisciplinary understanding of venture diligence.

### 5.3 Implications for DefenseTech Investment

The results underscore that DefenseTech ventures cannot be judged solely on financial metrics. Investors must incorporate procurement cycles, compliance with military standards, and geopolitical alignment as central diligence criteria. Case B's high compliance and resilience scores illustrate how ventures embedded in defense procurement ecosystems gain attractiveness despite limited scalability.

However, systemic risks particularly geopolitical volatility and export restrictions remain decisive. As tensions escalate in global security, DefenseTech ventures face heightened uncertainty. For investors, this implies that DefenseTech diligence should integrate geopolitical scenario planning, an area often neglected in venture capital decision-making.

### 5.4 Implications for Financial Services Investment

For fintech and digital financial services, the framework confirms the primacy of scalability. Case D's exceptional performance shows how mobile-first models can expand rapidly across consumer segments. Yet, compliance volatility emerged as a central vulnerability. Investors must evaluate not just current licensing but also a venture's adaptive capacity to shifting regulations, particularly in domains like cryptocurrency and data privacy [59, 68].

Cybersecurity resilience emerged as another non-negotiable factor. Breaches not only erode consumer trust but also trigger regulatory sanctions, compounding systemic risks. This finding aligns with literature stressing cybersecurity as a strategic, not merely technical, concern in fintech diligence [69].

### 5.5 Cross-Sector Comparative Insights

Comparing DefenseTech and financial services yielded three critical insights:

1. **Inverse Strengths and Weaknesses**: DefenseTech excels in compliance but falters in scalability; financial services excel in scalability but falter in compliance stability. This inverse relationship provides opportunities for portfolio risk balancing.
2. **Technology Valuation Divergence**: In DefenseTech, maturity is validated by field trials and military adoption. In financial services, it is judged by usability, consumer adoption, and integration with financial infrastructures. Investors must recalibrate their benchmarks depending on sector context.
3. **Systemic Risk Asymmetry**: DefenseTech systemic risks are geopolitical and external, while fintech systemic risks are technological and internal (e.g., cyber attacks). This asymmetry suggests that investors should differentiate due diligence teams by expertise: geopolitical analysts for DefenseTech, cybersecurity experts for fintech [70, 71, 72].

### 5.6 Policy and Regulatory Implications

For policymakers, these findings emphasize the need for clearer and more consistent regulatory frameworks to attract venture investment. In DefenseTech, stable procurement policies and export regulations can reduce investor uncertainty. In financial services, harmonizing cross-border fintech regulations can improve compliance scores and investor confidence [73, 74].

Furthermore, the integration of ethical risk into the diligence framework has policy relevance. DefenseTech ventures developing autonomous weapons and fintech ventures deploying consumer credit scoring algorithms both raise ethical dilemmas. Regulators may benefit from

incorporating ethical impact assessments into venture licensing processes.

### 5.7 Limitations and Future Directions

While the framework demonstrated practical utility, limitations remain. Case exemplars were anonymized and illustrative, limiting generalizability. Weighting schemes, while informed by literature and expert consultation, still reflect subjectivity. Future studies could expand the dataset, applying the framework to a larger number of ventures across sub-industries [75].

Another avenue for research lies in dynamic weighting models that adjust factor importance in response to macroeconomic or geopolitical shifts. For example, in times of global instability, systemic risk could be weighted more heavily. Machine learning techniques could support such adaptive models, offering investors real-time recalibration.

Finally, future work should integrate longitudinal outcomes, tracking whether high-scoring ventures achieve sustained performance. This would validate the predictive power of the framework and refine its parameters over time [76, 77, 78].

### 5.8 Synthesis

Overall, the discussion reveals that the multifactor framework provides a comprehensive lens for venture diligence in complex sectors. It bridges financial and non-financial considerations, balances generalizability with sector sensitivity, and generates actionable insights for investors and policymakers alike.

By situating diligence at the intersection of finance, regulation, technology, and systemic risk, this study advances both academic theory and investment practice. It also highlights the broader societal stakes of venture capital: in DefenseTech, national security; in financial services, financial inclusion and systemic stability [79, 80].

## 6. Conclusion

### 6.1 Synthesis of Findings

This study set out to develop and apply a multifactor market attractiveness and valuation scoring framework for venture diligence in two strategically significant yet underexplored sectors: DefenseTech and financial services. Through the integration of four pillars financial performance and scalability, regulatory/policy environment, technological maturity and competitive positioning, and systemic/geopolitical risks the framework offered a balanced, replicable tool for evaluating venture potential.

The application to four anonymized case exemplars revealed consistent sector-specific patterns. DefenseTech ventures demonstrated strong compliance and systemic resilience but were constrained by scalability challenges and geopolitical volatility. Financial services ventures, by contrast, excelled in scalability and consumer adoption but faced vulnerabilities in regulatory uncertainty and cybersecurity risk exposure. These divergent sectoral profiles underscore the need for tailored diligence models that move beyond one-size-fits-all approaches to venture evaluation.

Moreover, scenario sensitivity testing showed that venture attractiveness rankings are highly contingent on investor priorities and macro conditions. Under financial return emphasis, fintech ventures emerged dominant; under regulatory stability emphasis, DefenseTech ventures gained advantage; under geopolitical instability, fintech ventures proved more resilient. This adaptability demonstrates the value of a multifactor approach that can flexibly accommodate shifting conditions [81, 82].

### 6.2 Contributions to Scholarship

The study makes three principal contributions to academic discourse.

First, it extends venture diligence theory by explicitly integrating regulatory and systemic risk dimensions alongside traditional financial metrics. By situating compliance and resilience as central pillars rather than peripheral considerations, the framework advances a more holistic understanding of venture attractiveness.

Second, it enriches sector-specific investment scholarship. In DefenseTech, the findings validate calls for frameworks sensitive to procurement dynamics and geopolitical exposure. In financial services, the results confirm the salience of digital scalability, regulatory volatility, and cybersecurity resilience. Together, these insights contribute to comparative sectoral investment research, an area that remains underdeveloped.

Third, it bridges to risk and portfolio theory by demonstrating how sectoral asymmetries in strengths and vulnerabilities can provide diversification benefits. DefenseTech's compliance and resilience strengths complement fintech's scalability, creating a balanced portfolio approach that aligns with modern portfolio theory's principle of diversifying across non-correlated risks.

### 6.3 Implications for Practice

For practitioners, the findings highlight that diligence teams must expand beyond financial analysts to include regulatory experts, cybersecurity specialists, and geopolitical analysts. In DefenseTech, investors must interrogate procurement cycles, export restrictions, and alliance politics. In financial services, they must evaluate licensing adaptability, cross-border compliance capacity, and systemic cybersecurity resilience.

The framework also provides practical utility as a decision-support tool. By offering structured scoring across weighted criteria, it allows investors to compare ventures systematically, identify trade-offs, and align choices with strategic priorities. Its adaptability to different investor scenarios (e.g., risk-averse vs. growth-seeking) enhances its relevance in practice.

For venture founders, the findings provide guidance on how to position their companies more attractively. DefenseTech startups can emphasize regulatory preparedness and procurement integration, while fintech startups should highlight compliance agility and cybersecurity robustness. In both sectors, transparency around risk management enhances investor confidence [83, 84].

### 6.4 Policy and Regulatory Implications

The results also carry implications for policymakers. In DefenseTech, stable and transparent procurement policies, coupled with clear export regulations, can reduce uncertainty and foster greater venture investment. In financial services, regulatory harmonization across jurisdictions especially in areas like digital payments, cryptocurrency, and data privacy can enhance investor confidence and scalability potential.

Beyond stability, regulators must also confront the ethical dimensions of venture innovation. Autonomous military

systems and algorithm-driven financial services both carry societal risks. By embedding ethical impact assessments into regulatory frameworks, policymakers can encourage responsible innovation while safeguarding public interests [85, 86].

### 6.5 Limitations

As with any framework, limitations remain. The case exemplars, while diverse, were limited in number and anonymized for confidentiality, constraining generalizability. The weighting schemes, though informed by literature and expert consultation, retained elements of subjectivity. Moreover, the cross-sectional design captured ventures at a single point in time rather than tracking longitudinal outcomes [87, 88, 89].

The scoring framework, while structured, is not immune to external shocks. Black swan events such as sudden regulatory bans, geopolitical conflicts, or systemic cyber crises may dramatically reshape venture attractiveness in ways the model cannot fully anticipate.

### 6.6 Future Research Directions

Future studies can build on this work in several ways. First, by applying the framework to a larger and more diverse dataset, including sub-sectors within DefenseTech (e.g., space systems, AI-enabled command platforms) and financial services (e.g., insurtech, regtech). This would strengthen the robustness and generalizability of findings.

Second, methodological innovation could enhance adaptability. Dynamic weighting models, potentially supported by machine learning, could recalibrate factor importance in response to real-time macroeconomic and geopolitical conditions. This would enable the framework to operate as a living model responsive to shifting realities [90, 91, 92].

Third, longitudinal studies are needed to test the predictive validity of the framework. Tracking whether ventures that score highly subsequently achieve sustainable success would provide empirical validation and refine the scoring methodology.

Finally, future research should more explicitly integrate ethical and societal impact metrics. As both DefenseTech and financial services shape public security and financial stability, evaluating ventures solely on financial and compliance metrics risks overlooking broader social implications. Incorporating societal value creation and ethical alignment into diligence frameworks represents an important frontier [93, 94].

### 6.7 Final Reflections

In an era of accelerating technological innovation, geopolitical uncertainty, and regulatory flux, traditional venture diligence models are increasingly insufficient. The findings of this study suggest that investors and policymakers alike must adopt a multifactor, multidisciplinary lens to evaluate ventures in high-stakes sectors such as DefenseTech and financial services [95, 96].

By foregrounding compliance, resilience, and systemic risk alongside scalability and financial performance, the proposed framework offers a path toward more balanced, responsible, and informed venture capital decision-making. It not only enhances investor strategy but also contributes to broader societal goals: ensuring that technological innovation in security and finance serves stability, security, and inclusive growth [97, 98].

The journey of venture diligence, therefore, is not merely about maximizing financial returns but about navigating complexity with rigor, foresight, and responsibility. In this sense, the framework presented here represents both a practical tool and a conceptual contribution bridging disciplines, sectors, and perspectives in pursuit of a more resilient and responsive venture ecosystem [99, 100].

## 7. References


1. Williams JR. Defense Contractors SBIR/STTR Partnering Manual: A Primer on Technology Risk Management and Partnering Strategies, 2008 [Online]. Available: https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/tr/ADA488774/
2. Wangerin D. M&A Due Diligence, Post-Acquisition Performance, and Financial Reporting for Business Combinations. Contemp. Account. Res, Dec 2019; 36(4):2344-2378. Doi: 10.1111/1911-3846.12520
3. Odogwu R, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Owoade S. Integrating ESG Compliance into Strategic Business Planning: A Sectoral Comparative Review. 2022; 6(1).
4. Fagbore OO, Ogeawuchi JC, Ilori O, Isibor NJ, Odetunde A, Adekunle BI. Framework for Integrating Portfolio Monitoring and Risk Management in Alternative Asset Management. Int. J. Soc. Sci. Except. Res. 2022; 1(2):42-57. Doi: 10.54660/IJSSER.2022.1.2.43-57
5. Vonortas NS, Kim Y. Managing risk in new entrepreneurial ventures 1. In Dynamics of Knowledge Intensive Entrepreneurship. Routledge, 2015, 121-141 [Online]. Available: https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315775197-6
6. Omamode Henry Orieno, Oluchukwu Modesta Oluoha, Abisola Odeshina, Oluwatosin Reis, Friday Okpeke, Verlinda Attipoe. Optimizing Business Decision-Making with Advanced Data Analytics Techniques [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
7. Odofin OT, Owoade S, Ogbuefi E, Ogeawuchi JC, Adanigbo OS, Gbenle TP. Integrating Event-Driven Architecture in Fintech Operations Using Apache Kafka and RabbitMQ Systems. Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval. 2022; 3(4):635-643. Doi: 10.54660/.IJMRGE.2022.3.4.635-643
8. Torrez E, Narco. Arte Público Press, 2003 [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books
9. Tilney AM. Preparing the British Army for future warfare, 2011 [Online]. Available: https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/tr/ADA556554/
10. Spedding LS. Due diligence handbook: Corporate governance, risk management and business planning. Elsevier, 2009.
11. Serfaty S. The Future of the Transatlantic Defense Community. CSIS, 2003 [Online].
12. Joyce Efekpogua Fiemotongha, John Oluwaseun Olajide, Bisayo Oluwatosin Otokiti, Sharon Nwani, Adebanji Samuel Ogunmokun, Bolaji Iyanu Adekunle. Developing Tender Optimization Models for Freight Rate Negotiations Using Finance-Operations Collaboration.

13. Odogwu R, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Owoade S. Designing Business Resilience Frameworks for Navigating Technological and Regulatory. Int. J. Soc. Sci. Except. Res. 2022; 1(2):83-91. Doi: 10.54660/IJSSER.2022.1.2.83-91
14. Samra E. The business of defense: defense-side litigation financing. U Chi Rev. 2016; 83:p2299.
15. Rosenbloom AH. Due diligence for global deal making: The definitive guide to cross-border mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, financings, and strategic alliances. John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
16. Reid G. Venture capital investment: An agency analysis of UK practice. Routledge, 2002 [Online].
17. Ramsinghani M. The Business of Venture Capital: The Art of Raising a Fund, Structuring Investments, Portfolio Management, and Exits. John Wiley & Sons, 2021.
18. Ougaard M, Leander A. Business and global governance. Routledge London, 2010 [Online]. Available: https://api.taylorfrancis.com/content/books/mono/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324/9780203850268&type=googlepdf
19. Murray GC. Venture capital and government policy. In Handbook of research on venture capital, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2007. [Online]. Available: https://www.elgaronline.com/downloadpdf/edcollchap/9781845423124.00011.pdf
20. Murphy LM, Edwards PL. Bridging the valley of death: Transitioning from public to private sector financing. National Renewable Energy Laboratory Golden, CO, 2003 [Online]. Available: https://grist.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/02
21. Morrison NJ, Kinley G, Ficery KL. Merger deal breakers: When operational due diligence exposes risk. J. Bus. Strategy. 2008; 29(3):23-28.
22. Ashiedu BI, Ogbuefi E, Nwabekee US, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA. Automating Risk Assessment and Loan Cleansing in Retail Lending: A Conceptual Fintech Framework. 2022; 5(9).
23. Joyce Efekpogua Fiemotongha, Habeeb Olatunji Olawale, Ngozi Joan Isibor. An Integrated Audit and Internal Control Modeling Framework for Risk-Based Compliance in Insurance and Financial Services [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
24. Mathonet P-Y, Meyer T. J-Curve exposure: Managing a portfolio of venture capital and private equity funds. John Wiley & Sons, 2008 [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books
25. Marcus A. Malen J, Ellis S. The Promise and Pitfalls of Venture Capital as an Asset Class for Clean Energy Investment: Research Questions for Organization and Natural Environment Scholars. Organ. Environ, Mar 2013; 26(1):31-60. Doi: 10.1177/1086026612474956
26. Lockett A, Murray G, Wright M. Do UK venture capitalists still have a bias against investment in new technology firms. Res. Policy. 2002; 31(6):1009-1030.
27. Akpe OE. Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Ogbuefi E. Advances in Inventory Accuracy and Packaging Innovation for Minimizing Returns and Damage in E-Commerce Logistics. Int. J. Soc. Sci. Except. Res. 2022; 1(2):30-42. Doi: 10.54660/IJSSER.2022.1.2.30-42
28. Lehoux P, Miller FA, Daudelin G, Urbach DR. How venture capitalists decide which new medical technologies come to exist. Sci. Public Policy. 2016; 43(3):375-385.
29. Lee P. Enhancing the innovative capacity of venture capital. Yale JL Tech. 2022; 24:p611.
30. Ojika FU, Owobu WO, Abieba OA, Esan OJ, Ubamadu BC, Daraojimba AI. The Role of AI in Cybersecurity: A Cross-Industry Model for Integrating Machine Learning and Data Analysis for Improved Threat Detection.
31. Daraojimba AI, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Ogbuefi E. Systematic Review of Serverless Architectures and Business Process Optimization. Iconic Res. Eng. J, Oct 2021; 5(4):284-309.
32. Larsen MH, Øvretveit S. Corruption in the arms-and defense industry: A comparative study of the largest American and European arms dealers. Master's Thesis, 2019 [Online]. Available: https://openaccess.nhh.no/nhh-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2609971/masterthesis.PDF?sequence=1
33. Kshetri N. The Quest to Cyber Superiority. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-40554-4
34. Klonowski D. An Overview of the Venture Capital Investment Process. In The Venture Capital Investment Process, New York: Palgrave Macmillan US, 2010, 25-54. Doi: 10.1057/9780230110076_2
35. Jiang S, Neuby BL, Barrett SM, Canovatchel F, Roy AG. Chinese Stated-owned Oil Companies in the US. J. Adv. Econ. Finance. 2017; 2(2):67-147.
36. Howson P. Due diligence: The critical stage in mergers and acquisitions. Routledge, 2017 [Online]. Available: https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315578255/due-diligence-peter-howson
37. Houser KA, Kisska-Schulze K. Disrupting Venture Capital: Carrots, Sticks, and Artificial Intelligence. UC Irvine Rev. 2022; 13:p901.
38. Haynes AG. Connective development: Recognizing the networked city in forming a progressive urban economic development strategy. PhD Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2013 [Online]. Available: https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/80997
39. Hargadon A, Kenney M. Venture capital and clean technology: Opportunities and difficulties. Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy, University of California, 2011 [Online]. Available: https://ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/wps/brie/0022417/f_0022417_18471.pdf
40. Daraojimba AI, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Ogbuefi E. Systematic Review of Serverless Architectures and Business Process Optimization. Iconic Res Eng J. 2021; 5(4):284-309.
41. Oyinomomo-Emi Emmanuel Akpe, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomp AA, Agboola OA, Ogbuefis E. Systematic review of last-mile delivery optimization and procurement efficiency in African logistics ecosystems [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
42. Hargadon AB, Kenney M. Misguided Policy? Following Venture Capital into Clean Technology. Calif. Manage. Rev, Jan. 2012; 54(2):118-139. Doi: 10.1525/cmr.2012.54.2.118

43. Hallen BL, Katila R, Rosenberger JD. How Do Social Defenses Work? A Resource-Dependence Lens on Technology Ventures, Venture Capital Investors, and Corporate Relationships. Acad. Manage. J, Aug 2014; 57(4):1078-1101. Doi: 10.5465/amj.2012.0003
44. Granath J. The Search for a Swedish Valley of Death & Possible Ways Out: Investigating Financing Strategies for the Development of Deep Tech Innovation, 2021 [Online]. Available: https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1574461
45. Galbraith CS, DeNoble AF, Ehrlich SB. Predicting the commercialization progress of early-stage technologies: An ex-ante analysis. IEEE Trans. Eng. Manag. 2011; 59(2):213-225.
46. Fan JS. Nontraditional investors. BYU Rev. 2022; 48:p463.
47. Edelman LF, Manolova TS, Brush CG, Chow CM. Signal configurations: Exploring set-theoretic relationships in angel investing. J. Bus. Ventur. 2021; 36(2):p106086.
48. Drover W, Busenitz L, Matusik S, Townsend D, Anglin A, Dushnitsky G. A Review and Road Map of Entrepreneurial Equity Financing Research: Venture Capital, Corporate Venture Capital, Angel Investment, Crowdfunding, and Accelerators. J. Manag, July 2017; 43(6):1820-1853. Doi: 10.1177/0149206317690584
49. Del-Palacio I, Zhang XT, Sole F. The capital gap for small technology companies: Public venture capital to the rescue? Small Bus. Econ, Apr 2012; 38(3):283-301. Doi: 10.1007/s11187-010-9275-6
50. Crier C. Patriot Acts: What Americans Must do to Save the Republic. Simon and Schuster, 2011.
51. Cox Pahnke E, McDonald R, Wang D, Hallen B. Exposed: Venture Capital, Competitor Ties, and Entrepreneurial Innovation. Acad. Manage. J, Oct 2015; 58(5):1334-1360. Doi: 10.5465/amj.2012.0777
52. Chernov D, Sornette D. Major on-going Cases with Information Concealment Practice. In Man-made Catastrophes and Risk Information Concealment, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016, 281-336. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-24301-6_4
53. Andriole SJ. Mining for digital gold: Technology due diligence for CIOs. Commun. Assoc. Inf. Syst. 2007; 20(1):p24.
54. Anokhin S, Morgan T, Schulze W, Wuebker R. Is a reputation for misconduct harmful? Evidence from corporate venture capital. J. Bus. Res. 2022; 138:65-76.
55. Apgar D. Risk intelligence: Learning to manage what we don't know. Harvard Business Press, 2006 [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books
56. Bae J, Lee JM. How Technological Overlap between Spinouts and Parent Firms Affects Corporate Venture Capital Investments in Spinouts: The Role of Competitive Tension. Acad. Manage. J, Apr 2021; 64(2):643-678. Doi: 10.5465/amj.2018.0223
57. Branscomb LM. Confessions of a Technophile. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997 [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books
58. Caputo MR. The Ukraine Hoax: How Decades of Corruption in the Former Soviet Republic Led to Trump's Phony Impeachment. Bombardier Books, 2020 [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books
59. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Crew-Led Safety Culture Development: Enabling Compliance Through Peer Influence and Role Modeling. Int. J. Sci. Res. Comput. Sci. Eng. Inf. Technol. 2022; 8(4):442-466.
60. Umoren O, Didi PU, Balogun O, Abass OS, Akinrinoye OV. Synchronized Content Delivery Framework for Consistent Cross-Platform Brand Messaging in Regulated and Consumer-Focused Sectors [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
61. Didi PU, Abass OS, Balogun O. Strategic Storytelling in Clean Energy Campaigns: Enhancing Stakeholder Engagement Through Narrative Design [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
62. Umoren O, Didi PU, Balogun O, Abass OS, Akinrinoye OV. Strategic Digital Storytelling Techniques for Building Authentic Brand Narratives and Driving Cross-Generational Consumer Trust Online [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=txaGoGoAAAAJ&citation_for_view=txaGoGoAAAAJ:8k81kl-MbHgC
63. Umoren O, Didi PU, Balogun O, Abass OS, Akinrinoye OV. Quantifying the Impact of Experiential Brand Activations on Customer Loyalty, Sentiment, and Repeat Engagement in Competitive Markets [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
64. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Empirical Evaluation of Refresher Training Modules on Cabin Crew Performance Scores. Int. J. Sci. Res. Sci. Technol. 2022; 9(1):682-708.
65. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Crisis Communication in Confined Spaces: Managing Fear, Disruption, and Uncertainty at 30,000 Feet. Int. J. Sci. Res. Comput. Sci. Eng. Inf. Technol. 2022; 8(4):489-515.
66. Ajuwon A, Onifade O, Oladuji TJ, Akintobi AO. Blockchain-Based Models for Credit and Loan System Automation in Financial Institutions [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view
67. Adenuga T, Ayobami AT, Okolo FC. AI-Driven Workforce Forecasting for Peak Planning and Disruption Resilience in Global Logistics and Supply Networks. Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval. 2020; 1(2):71-87. Doi: 10.54660/.ijmrge.2020.1.2.71-87
68. Balogun O, Abass OS, Didi PU. Applying Consumer Segmentation Analytics to Guide Flavor Portfolio Expansion in Vape Product Lines [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
69. Balogun O, Abass OS, Didi PU. A Cross-Market Strategy Framework for Brand Architecture in Legacy FMCG Portfolios [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=txaGoGoAAAAJ&citation_for_view=txaGoGoAAAAJ:MXK_kJrjxJIC
70. Lawal AA, Ajonbadi HA, Otokiti BO. Leadership and organisational performance in the Nigeria small and medium enterprises (SMEs).
71. Sharma A, Adekunle BI, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Onifade O. IoT-enabled Predictive Maintenance for Mechanical Systems: Innovations in Real-time Monitoring and Operational Excellence. 2019; 2(12).
72. Otokiti BO, Akinbola OA. Effects of Lease Options on the Organizational Growth of Small and Medium Enterprise (SME's) in Lagos State, Nigeria. Asian J. Bus. Manag. Sci. 2013; 3(4):1-12.

73. Otokiti BO, Onalaja AE. Women's leadership in marketing and media: Overcoming barriers and creating lasting industry impact. Int. J. Soc. Sci. Except. Res. 2022; 1(1):173-185.
74. Odetunde A, Adekunle BI, Ogeawuchi JC. Using Predictive Analytics and Automation Tools for Real-Time Regulatory Reporting and Compliance Monitoring. Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval. 2022; 3(2):650-661. Doi: 10.54660/.IJMRGE.2022.3.2.650-661
75. Chikezie Paul-Mikki Ewim, Ekene Cynthia Onukwulu, Joyce Efekpogua Fiemotongha, Abbey Ngochindo Igwe. The strategic influence of geopolitical events on crude oil pricing: An analytical approach for global traders [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
76. Akinbola Olufemi Amos, Otokiti Bisayo Oluwatosin, Akinbola Omolola Sariat, Sanni Sekinat Arike. Nexus of Born Global Entrepreneurship Firms and Economic Development in Nigeria - ProQuest [Online]. Available: https://www.proquest.com/openview/81adc74d18d0d149474095698194233a/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=5261234
77. Otokiti BO. Mode of Entry of Multinational Corporation and their Performance in the Nigeria Market. PhD Thesis, Covenant University, 2012 [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=9573900037960593687&hl=en&oi=scholarr
78. Amos O, Adeniyi O, Oluwatosin B. Market Based Capabilities and Results: Inference for Telecommunication Service Businesses in Nigeria, 2014.
79. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Reframing passenger experience strategy: A predictive model for net promoter score optimization. IRE J. 2020; 4(5):208-217.
80. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Leadership Impact on Cabin Crew Compliance and Passenger Satisfaction in Civil Aviation [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
81. Ashiedu BI, Ogbuefi E, Nwabekee US, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA. Telecom Infrastructure Audit Models for African Markets: A Data-Driven Governance Perspective. Iconic Res. Eng. J, Dec 2022; 6(6):434-448.
82. Ogeawuchi JC, Onifade AY, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Dosumu RE, George OO. Systematic Review of Predictive Modeling for Marketing Funnel Optimization in B2B and B2C Systems. 2022; 6(3).
83. Joyce Efekpogua Fiemotongha, John Oluwaseun Olajide, Bisayo Oluwatosin Otokiti, Sharon Nwani, Adebanji Samuel Ogunmokun, Bolaji Iyanu Adekunle. Standardizing Cost Reduction Models Across SAP-Based Financial Planning Systems in Multinational Operations.
84. Ayumu MT, Ohakawa TC. Real Estate Portfolio Valuation Techniques to Unlock Funding for Affordable Housing in Africa. Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval. 2022; 3(1):967-972. Doi: 10.54660/.ijmrge.2022.3.1.967-972
85. Adedokun AP. *et al*. Production Restoration Following Long Term Community Crisis - A Case Study of Well X in ABC Field, Onshore Nigeria [Online]. Available: https://dx.doi.org/10.2118/212039-MS
86. Esan OJ, Uzozie OT, Onaghinor O Osho GO, Etukudoh EA. Procurement 4.0: Revolutionizing Supplier Relationships through Blockchain, AI, and Automation: A Comprehensive Framework. J. Front. Multidiscip. Res. 2022; 3(1):117-123. Doi: 10.54660/.IJFMR.2022.3.1.117-123
87. Chang V, Valverde R, Ramachandran M, Li C-S. Toward business integrity modeling and analysis framework for risk measurement and analysis. Appl. Sci. 2020; 10(9):p3145.
88. Borek A, Parlikad AK, Webb J, Woodall P. Total information risk management: Maximizing the value of data and information assets. Newnes, 2013 [Online].
89. Koreff J. Three Studies Examining Auditors' Use of Data Analytics, 2018 [Online]. Available: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/5949/
90. Didi PU, Abass OS, Balogun O. Developing a Content Matrix for Marketing Modular Gas Infrastructure in Decentralized Energy Markets [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view.
91. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Designing Competency-Based Learning for Multinational Cabin Crews: A Blended Instructional Model. IRE J. 2021; 4(7):337-339.
92. Adenuga T, Okolo FC. Automating Operational Processes as a Precursor to Intelligent, Self-Learning Business Systems. J. Front. Multidiscip. Res. 2021; 2(1):133-147. Doi: 10.54660/.jfmr.2021.2.1.133-147
93. Jeremiah Kehinde Oludare, Kenneth Adeyemi, Bisayo Otokiti. [PDF] from futminna.edu.ng Impact of Knowledge Management Practices and Performance of Selected Multinational Manufacturing Firms in South-Western Nigeria [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
94. Ubamadu BC, Bihani D, Daraojimba AI, Osho GO, Omisola JO, Etukudoh EA. Optimizing Smart Contract Development: A Practical Model for Gasless Transactions via Facial Recognition in Blockchain. Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval. 2022; 4(1):978-989. Doi: 10.54660/.IJMRGE.2022.3.1.978-989
95. Onaghinor O, Uzozie OT, Esan OJ. Optimizing Project Management in Multinational Supply Chains: A Framework for Data-Driven Decision-Making and Performance Tracking. Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval. 2022; 3(1):907-913. Doi: 10.54660/.IJMRGE.2022.3.1.907-913
96. Rosebenedicta Odogwu, Jeffrey Chidera Ogeawuchi, Abraham Ayodeji Abayomi, Oluwademilade Aderemi Agboola. Optimizing Productivity in Asynchronous Remote Project Teams Through AI-Augmented Workflow Orchestration and Cognitive Load Balancing Request PDF. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392418136
97. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Standard Operating Procedures in Civil Aviation: Implementation Gaps and Risk Exposure Factors [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view
98. Ayumu MT, Ohakawa TC. Optimizing Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) in Affordable Housing Through Fiscal Accountability Frameworks, Ghana in Focus. 2021; 5(6).
99. Charles-Guzman K. Air Pollution Control Strategies in

New York City: A Case Study of the Role of Environmental Monitoring, Data Analysis, and Stakeholder Networks in Comprehensive Government Policy Development, Dec 2012 [Online]. Available: http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/94532
100. Ajunwa I. An auditing imperative for automated hiring systems. Harv JL Tech. 2020; 34p621.