Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 6 Issue 1 (2026)

Augmenting Regulatory Intelligence: How Ai-Driven Behavioral Analytics Can Inform Sebi's Oversight Framework in the Age of Algorithmic Trading and Retail Investor Proliferation

Mr. Jeevan Thombare

Research Fellow, Ratan Tata Maharashtra State Skill University.

Email: jeevan.mplcon@gmail.com

Abstract

In a time when the number of retail investors is growing quickly, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and other organizations have a revolutionary opportunity to improve market oversight through the incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) into financial regulation. By combining computational power and human judgment, this study suggests a novel framework called Augmenting Regulatory Intelligence that uses AI-driven behavioral analytics to improve SEBI's supervisory capabilities. Capital markets are more susceptible to behavioral distortions like herding, overconfidence, and fear-of-missing-out (FOMO) dynamics as retail participation grows through digital brokerages and social media "influencers." These biases, which are well-documented in the literature on behavioral finance, have the potential to increase volatility and enable manipulative tactics like well-planned pump-and-dump schemes. Concurrently, market intermediaries' use of AI systems allows for high-frequency and data-intensive strategies that frequently surpass conventional regulatory monitoring tools, resulting in disparities in the technological capabilities of regulated entities and regulators. The study recommends the strategic use of machine learning and natural language processing (NLP)-driven regulatory technology (RegTech) solutions to rectify this imbalance. Large-scale transactional data and unstructured digital content can be analyzed by these tools to find early warning signs of coordinated manipulation or illogical investor behavior. SEBI can improve regulatory responsiveness while maintaining accountability by integrating AI-generated insights into human-led supervisory procedures. The study promotes a hybrid governance model in which artificial intelligence (AI) enhances rather than replaces human intelligence by drawing on interdisciplinary viewpoints from behavioral finance, regulatory governance, and public policy. The study adds to the current discussions on the moral application of AI in financial regulation and makes recommendations that are pertinent to policy for creating regulatory frameworks that are flexible, open, and behaviorally aware.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Behavioral Finance, Investor Psychology, Algorithmic Trading, Regulatory Technology (RegTech), SEBI, Market Surveillance, Cognitive Biases, Human-In-The-Loop Governance, Sentiment Analysis, Financial Regulation, Retail Investors.

Introduction

A significant change from administrative control to a disclosure-based framework with an emphasis on efficiency, transparency, and investor protection was brought about by SEBI's establishment in 1988 and its statutory authority under the SEBI Act, 1992. This change was in line with worldwide movements toward principles-based regulation, which prioritize information disclosure and market discipline over direct intervention (Black, 2001). The Capital Issues (Control) Act, 1947, which governed capital markets prior to this change, was marked by severe information asymmetries, limited market development, and inadequate investor protection. These factors highlighted the need for an independent regulator that could handle agency issues (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

As part of a tripartite governance model that balances stability, efficiency, and fairness, SEBI's mandate includes investor protection, market development, and regulatory oversight (Goodhart et al., 1998). In line with the efficient market hypothesis, regulatory changes since 1992, such as electronic trading, dematerialization, and improved disclosure standards, have greatly increased market participation, decreased transaction costs, and boosted investor confidence (Fama, 1970). Initiatives for complementary investor education also take into account behavioral finance insights about bias mitigation and informed participation (Shiller, 2003).
The regulatory development of SEBI serves as an example of an adaptive governance strategy that is sensitive to systemic risk and innovation (Baldwin et al., 2012). This flexibility is becoming more and more important as AI and ML change trading tactics, risk management procedures, and market microstructure.

As algorithmic decision-making becomes more prevalent, new regulatory issues pertaining to opacity, accountability, and systemic amplification arise, requiring anticipatory and technologically enabled supervision.

Integration of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Indian Capital Markets

In Indian capital markets, AI and ML technologies are now integrated into trading, advisory, risk management, and compliance functions. Predictive analytics is used by algorithmic and high-frequency trading systems to execute trades quickly, improving liquidity and price discovery but raising issues with informational asymmetries and volatility amplification. Similar to this, AI-based stock recommendation systems are challenging conventional suitability and accountability frameworks while increasing accessibility by personalizing investment advice using financial data, sentiment analysis, and investor preferences.
In line with behavioral finance theories on narrative-driven price formation, sentiment analysis using ML and NLP makes it possible to extract behavioral signals from news, disclosures, and social media. A transition from reactive enforcement to proactive supervision is supported by RegTech applications and AI-driven risk management, which automate fraud detection, anomaly identification, and compliance monitoring.

These advancements increase access through robo-advisory platforms and result in cost savings, enhanced decision-making, and efficiency gains. But they also make regulations more complicated, especially in retail-dominated industries where behavioral biases can be magnified on a large scale.

Regulatory Challenges Posed by Artificial Intelligence and Behavioral Distortions in Capital Markets

The growing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) in capital markets creates a new paradigm of regulatory issues that go beyond the conventional agenda of market manipulation, insider trading, and compliance with disclosure requirements. Although AI-based systems improve efficiency and analytical power, their intersection with market behavior and systemic processes creates complex regulatory challenges. From a theoretical perspective on regulation, the source of these challenges is the growing opacity, speed, and autonomy of algorithmic processes, which strain the traditional rule-based approach to regulation.

Algorithmic Opacity and Explainability Constraints

One of the most significant regulatory difficulties linked with the implementation of artificial intelligence (AI) is the "black-box" problem, also known as algorithmic opacity. Complex machine learning (ML) models, such as deep learning models, function through complex, non-linear processes that are not easily interpretable, even for their designers. This makes it difficult for regulatory bodies to assess whether the outputs of algorithms conform to the relevant securities regulations, fiduciary obligations, or suitability requirements.

From the viewpoint of accountability theory, opacity undermines the ability to hold someone accountable for market turbulence or investor damage caused by decisions made by algorithms. Conventional tools of regulation rely on traceability and intention, which are undermined by the autonomous decision-making of systems based on probabilistic inference rather than rules. This creates difficulties for regulators in assigning responsibility to the designers, the companies, and the users of AI systems.

Behavioral Amplification and Market Distortions

Conversely, AI-powered trading and advisory platforms can inadvertently exacerbate behavioral biases, rather than correct them. The literature on behavioral finance has pointed to systematic departures from rational decision-making, including herding, overconfidence, and loss aversion, which influence market outcomes. If AI models are trained on past market data that exhibit these biases, they can learn and replicate these behavioral tendencies on a large scale.

In retail-dominant market segments, recommendation algorithms and robo-advisory platforms can perpetuate herding behavior by providing similar investment recommendations to a large number of investors at the same time. This collective decision-making process can increase the chances of correlated trading, which can, in turn, exacerbate price volatility, create asset bubbles, or hasten market meltdowns during times of stress. From a systemic risk management standpoint, this behavioral bias amplification can call into question the conventional wisdom that algorithmic trading helps to ensure market stability.

Speed, Feedback Loops, and Procyclicality

The fast pace and adaptive nature of AI-driven systems also raise new regulatory issues related to feedback effects and procyclicality. Learning algorithms that adapt to market feedback may change course in a manner that accentuates market trends, particularly in periods of high market volatility. Rapid, automatic responses to market feedback can create self-reinforcing cycles, where market prices trigger further algorithmic actions in the same market direction.

This dynamic is consistent with theories of financial instability that highlight endogenous risk and reflexivity in modern financial markets. Procyclicality driven by AI systems makes real-time regulation even more challenging, as market disturbances can occur on timescales that are beyond the capabilities of human regulators to respond to. As such, regulators need to review the sufficiency of circuit breakers, monitoring systems, and stress tests in the presence of intense AI usage in trading.

Data Bias, Model Risk, and Fairness Concerns

AI models are necessarily dependent on the quality and representativeness of the data. Biases in the data, arising from incomplete, biased, or historically specific datasets, can lead to systematically flawed results. In capital markets, biased training datasets can lead to discriminatory results, suboptimal risk analysis, or misleading investment advice, especially for retail investors.

The model risk management framework points to the risks of over-reliance on complex quantitative models without adequate validation and governance. AI models may work well in normal market conditions but break down unpredictably in structural breaks or extreme events. For regulators, this poses challenges in model validation standards, stress testing, and governance of third-party AI providers contracted by market intermediaries.

Regulatory Capacity and Supervisory Asymmetry

The quick spread of artificial intelligence among market participants has created a situation of regulatory asymmetry, where market participants often have better technological capabilities than regulatory authorities. This has created a situation where regulators are not in a position to effectively supervise and challenge the use of advanced algorithmic techniques. In terms of institutional capacity, the gap between regulators and market participants is likely to create a situation where the credibility and effectiveness of regulators are undermined. Supervisors also face challenges in dealing with cross-border issues, as AI-based trading algorithms can simultaneously operate in different jurisdictions. The absence of standardized global rules for AI regulation in financial markets has further added to the complexity of enforcement.

Analysis of the Current Regulatory Framework and SEBI's Response

The regulatory response to the increasing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) in the Indian capital markets must be assessed in the context of the overall SEBI institutional mandate and its responsiveness. SEBI, as the chief regulator of the securities market, is working within a largely principles-based regulatory framework that emphasizes disclosure, market integrity, and investor protection. While this framework was not designed with AI-driven market processes in mind, it has provided a degree of regulatory flexibility that has facilitated a gradual response to technological change.

Existing Regulatory Architecture and Its Relevance to AI-Driven Markets

In terms of regulation, the SEBI regulatory framework is currently devoid of any AI-specific legislation, and instead, AI-related activities are indirectly regulated by existing regulations that apply to market intermediaries, stock exchanges, investment advisers, and listed entities. The relevant regulations cover algorithmic trading, disclosure obligations, risk management systems, and internal controls. From a legal-institutional perspective, this regulatory framework reflects a technology-neutral regulatory approach, where the emphasis is on outcomes such as fairness, transparency, and stability, rather than on the tools and technologies used. In the context of algorithmic and high-frequency trading, the SEBI has put in place a number of safeguards, such as mandatory approvals of algorithms, risk controls at the exchange level, and periodic system audits. While these measures are intended to address issues of market abuse, volatility, and operational risks in the context of automated trading, they are more geared towards rule-based algorithms and are less effective in regulating self-learning AI systems that evolve dynamically over time.

SEBI's Supervisory Response to Behavioral and Systemic Risks

SEBI's regulatory actions are increasingly informed by a consideration of behavioral and systemic risks, even if these considerations are not explicitly stated in AI-specific language. For instance, best disclosure practices, suitability requirements for investment advice, and bans on deceptive communications are implicitly aimed at countering behavioral irregularities among retail investors. These practices align with the behavioral regulation theory, which recognizes that information asymmetry and cognitive biases can impair market efficiency and investor protection. However, AI-based personalization of investment advice and algorithmic recommendation systems present new challenges that put pressure on existing suitability and disclosure frameworks. Conventional regulatory tools implicitly assume a relatively straightforward distinction between human discretion and automated implementation, which becomes increasingly obscure in the context of AI-facilitated investment advice. As such, the challenge of accountability and informed consent in such a context remains an open question.

Surveillance, Enforcement, and the Use of Technology by SEBI

Notwithstanding the increasing complexity of markets, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has been strengthening its surveillance and enforcement capacities, including the use of data analytics to analyze trading patterns and detect anomalies. This trend is part of a larger shift towards technology-driven supervision, which is in line with the emerging SupTech agenda. By leveraging big data and real-time monitoring capabilities, SEBI aims to improve its capacity to detect market manipulation, insider trading, and group trading. The quick pace of development of AI-based trading systems, however, poses significant challenges to the effectiveness of market supervision. The rapid execution of market effects by high-speed and adaptive algorithms can outpace the response time of conventional investigation and enforcement actions. From the viewpoint of regulatory effectiveness, this trend poses challenges to the timeliness of intervention and the deterrent effect of ex post enforcement in AI-driven markets.

Gaps and Limitations in the Current Framework

However, despite these incremental adjustments, there are still major gaps in SEBI's regulatory approach to AI-powered markets. The absence of clear guidelines on the explainability of algorithms, governance of models, and accountability of data limits the regulatory insight into sophisticated AI systems. Furthermore, existing audit and compliance obligations may not be effective in sufficiently identifying risks in AI models related to biased data, overfitting, or structural changes.

On the institutional front, SEBI faces challenges in its supervisory capabilities and technical know-how, particularly when compared to large market participants who have made significant investments in AI technology infrastructure. This creates a problem of regulatory gap and the possibility of innovation outpacing regulation. Furthermore, the international dimension of algorithmic trading and AI service delivery adds to the enforcement difficulties and underscores the need for improved international regulatory cooperation.

Towards an Adaptive Regulatory Strategy

In this regard, the SEBI approach to the AI-driven paradigm shift in capital markets can be seen as evolutionary rather than revolutionary. While the present regulatory framework offers a good foundation for addressing some risks, the increasing pervasiveness of artificial intelligence necessitates a more specific and proactive approach to regulation. This involves developing principles for algorithmic accountability, improving model governance standards, and a closer alignment of behavioral insights with the regulatory framework.

From a governance standpoint, the future-proofing of SEBI's regulatory approach will depend on its ability to strike a balance between flexibility and foresight, using technology as a supervisory tool while maintaining effective safeguards for market integrity and investor protection. In this regard, the incremental use of SupTech tools, combined with the process of regulatory learning, offers a sensible approach to managing the risks associated with AI-driven capital markets.

Recommendations and Future Outlook: Augmenting Regulatory Intelligence for SEBI

The need for a regulatory reset has arisen due to the fast-tracked integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) into the operations of the capital markets. For the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), the challenge goes beyond the regulation of AI-driven market activities and focuses on the need to improve regulatory intelligence through the use of AI-driven behavioral analytics and supervisory technologies. This section discusses the

policy interventions and presents a long-term vision for the regulation of AI-driven innovation that balances technology with trust, accountability, and resilience.

Institutionalizing AI-Driven Behavioral Analytics for Supervision

One of the key recommendations is the incorporation of AI-based behavioral analytics into the SEBI surveillance mechanism. With the increasing number of retail investors and the increasing use of algorithm-driven decision-making, behavioral irregularities such as herding, overconfidence, and panic selling pose a significant threat to market stability. The inclusion of behavioral analytics in the surveillance system will allow SEBI to detect warning signs of irrational exuberance, group behavior, or sentiment-driven market volatility. In terms of regulatory economics, this forward-looking surveillance approach is consistent with the shift from rule-based compliance to risk-based and outcome-based supervision. AI-based analytics can help SEBI in its efforts to shift from enforcement-based action to preventive action, such as investor advisories, market-wide action, or trading halts during periods of abnormal behavioral clustering.

Ethical AI, Data Governance, and Transparency Standards

In order to ensure responsible use of AI in capital markets, SEBI must develop clear ethical and governance norms for the use of AI by market intermediaries. The norms must cover issues of fairness, non-discrimination, proportionality, and robustness, with a focus on the impact of AI on retail investors. The development of a set of minimum standards for ethical use of AI would ensure regulatory clarity and consistency among market participants.

Data governance is another area of parallel importance. In view of the data-intensive nature of AI systems, data quality, privacy, and representativeness issues are at the heart of regulatory decisions. SEBI may choose to introduce stricter data protection and auditability norms for AI-based systems, to ensure that the training data sets are reviewed periodically for bias and relevance. Disclosure requirements, such as disclosure about the use of AI in trading, advisory, and portfolio management activities, would also help to ensure informed consent from investors.

Human-in-the-Loop Governance and Accountability Mechanisms

Owing to the limitations of fully autonomous systems, one of the most important regulatory requirements is to ensure human oversight in AI regulation. This involves maintaining human control over decisions made by AI systems, particularly in high-risk domains such as providing investment advice, executing trades during stressful periods, and overriding risk management as and when required. From the viewpoint of accountability theory, human-in-the-loop systems help maintain the accountability chain and avoid the moral hazard of delegating control to algorithms.

SEBI can implement this guideline by mandating regulated entities to assign responsible officers for their AI systems, maintain decision logs, and establish escalation procedures for unusual or high-risk algorithmic activity.

Building Investor Trust through Regulatory Signaling

Trust between investors and the market is a public good that is central to the functioning of the securities market. As AI tools begin to influence the manner in which investors interact with the market, it is important that there be a clear regulatory message that innovation will not undermine the principles of fairness and protection. SEBI can help to instill confidence by issuing periodic guidance notes and best practices on AI-related risks and mitigation measures. Investor education must also keep pace with issues that are specific to AI, such as algorithmic suggestions and risks on digital platforms. Incorporating AI literacy into investor education initiatives will help retail investors interact with AI-enabled financial products in a more informed manner.

Comparative International Regulatory Approaches

Lessons from other major economies inform and influence SEBI's long-term strategy. In the European Union, security regulators are bound by a wide framework that focuses on explainability, accountability, and risk classification of AI systems. The EU's developing approach considers high-risk financial AI applications as falling under stricter compliance, reflecting a cautious and precautionary regulatory approach.

In the United States, the regulatory approach is more principles-based and enforcement-focused, relying on fiduciary obligations, disclosure requirements, and anti-fraud laws to address AI risks. There is a growing emphasis on AI governance, internal controls, and accountability rather than specific AI regulations, which provides flexibility while

maintaining enforcement discretion.Singapore and other leading Asian financial centers have adopted sandbox and joint regulatory approaches, allowing for the controlled testing of AI under regulatory oversight. These countries emphasize industry-regulator engagement, ethical guidelines for AI, and the use of supervisory technology (SupTech) to stay on top of innovation. In contrast, the Indian regulatory approach under SEBI is pragmatic and incrementally adaptive. While this flexibility is helpful in a rapidly evolving market, international experience indicates that articulating clear AI governance principles and supervisory expectations can enhance regulatory clarity without stifling innovation.

Long-Term Regulatory Vision for Indian Capital Markets

Looking forward, SEBI must construct a long-term regulatory strategy that feels highly adaptive, intelligent, and steady. The way ahead involves continuous learning for regulation, investment in supervisory technology, and further engagement with academic scholarship, market participants, and international regulators. If SEBI integrates AI into its own regulatory arsenal, it can fill knowledge gaps and enhance its capacity to regulate markets that are becoming increasingly complex.

The challenge is not to put the brakes on technological progress but to guide the trajectory of technology in a manner that ensures market integrity, investor protection, and confidence. A regulatory strategy that combines ethical AI practices, behavioral knowledge, human judgment, and superior technical capacity will enable SEBI to regulate an AI-driven capital market successfully and help realize India's own ambitions for financial stability and development.

Conclusion

This research examines the impact of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning on the capital markets of India, particularly in the context of SEBI, the market regulator. It traces the development of SEBI and its principles-based approach to regulation, illustrating how AI-based systems are transforming market efficiency, investor behavior, and risk accumulation in the market. AI and ML offer tremendous benefits—improved decision-making, increased inclusion, and simplified processes—but also pose complex challenges: lack of transparency in algorithms, enhanced behavioral biases, and inconsistent oversight. The current framework of SEBI seems pragmatic and responsive, but it still has challenges in understanding models, regulating models, and overseeing behavior. The paper proposes future directions in policy, emphasizing the enhancement of regulatory intelligence through AI-based behavioral analysis, ethical AI governance, human oversight, and technology-based oversight enhancement. Through the lens of what other countries have achieved, this research identifies how intelligence-led, adaptive regulation can keep up with innovation and ensure market integrity. Ultimately, the ability of SEBI to leverage technology capabilities and regulatory intelligence will be crucial to sustaining investor confidence and ensuring the stability and resilience of India's markets in the face of growing AI adoption.

References

1. Nikam, R. J. (2023). Legality of usage of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learnings by Share Market Intermediary. Passagens: Revista Internacional de História Política e Cultura Jurídica, 15(2), 319–339. https://doi.org/10.15175/1984-2503-202315207
2. L. A., & -, A. K. S. (2023). SEBI: As a Regulator of Capital Market. International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research, 5(4). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i04.5617
3. Sabarinathan, G. (2010). SEBI's Regulation of the Indian Securities Market: A Critical Review of the Major Developments. Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers, 35(4), 13–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/0256090920100402
4. Sabarinathan, G. (2004). Securities and Exchange Board of India and the Indian Capital Markets - A Survey of the Regulatory Provisions. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2152909
5. Rai, P., & Shekhar, C. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Financial Markets: Global Trends, Regulatory Challenges, and Comparative Analysis with India. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 6(3), 5503–5516. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0325.1261
6. Pierides, M., Mulligan, J., & Archer, C. (2022). AI in capital markets: Navigating legal and regulatory considerations. Journal of Securities Operations & Custody, 14(4), 299. https://doi.org/10.69554/mftj9209
7. Jain, K. (2020). AI and Capital Markets. In The AI Book (pp. 166–167). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119551966.ch45
8. Singh, G., Sagar, S., & Gupta, B. (2025). AI Adoption for Indian Stock Trader. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT, 09(04), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsrem44694

9. Koenig, A. C., & Riener, R. (2021). Regulating Artificial Intelligence in Finance: Putting the Human in the Loop. In SYDNEY LAW REVIEW.
10. Pamuk, M., Schumann, M., & Nickerson, R. C. (2024). What Do the Regulators Mean? A Taxonomy of Regulatory Principles for the Use of AI in Financial Services. Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction, 6(1), 143–155. https://doi.org/10.3390/make6010008
11. . P., Arifudin, N., & Sonaria, M. (2024). Development of Artificial Intelligence in Business Ethics and Regulatory Responsibilities in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. International Journal of Research and Review, 11(11), 26–32. https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20241104
12. Panda, P. (2023). Innovative Financial Instruments and Investors' Interest in Indian Securities Markets. Asia-Pacific Financial Markets. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10690-023-09403-0
13. 안수현. (2017). A Study on the Regulatory Challenges of Capital Market Act for the Evolution of Intelligent Artificial Intelligence(AI). The Korean Journal of Securities Law, 18(3), 137–176. https://doi.org/10.17785/KJSL.2017.18.3.137
14. Patnaik, I., & Shah, A. (2015). Fundamental Redesign of Financial Law: The Indian Approach. India Review, 14(1), 91–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/14736489.2015.1004257
15. Kofman, P. (2024). Scoring the Ethics of AI Robo-Advice: Why We Need Gateways and Ratings. Journal of Business Ethics, 198(1), 21–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05753-5
16. Sanghvi, N. S., Nkhil Shah, D., Joshi, R. J., Desai, K., & Loonkar, S. (2025). Emergence of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Equity Security Prediction: A Bibliometric Analysis. 2025 International Conference on Emerging Trends in Industry 4.0 Technologies (ICETI4T), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/iceti4t63625.2025.11132188
17. Araújo, A. de S. (2024). Principle of explicability: regulatory challenges on artificial intelligence. Concilium, 24(3), 273–296. https://doi.org/10.53660/clm-2722-24a22
18. Santiago Díaz, M. del C., Rubín Linares, G. T., & Sossa Azuela, J. H. (2024). Editorial: A Brief Current Overview of Artificial Intelligence and Risk Factors. International Journal of Combinatorial Optimization Problems and Informatics, 15(5), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.61467/2007.1558.2024.v15i5.553
19. Yeung, K. (2020). Response to European Commission White Paper on Artificial Intelligence. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3626915
20. Hupont, I., Micheli, M., Delipetrev, B., Gómez, E., & Garrido, J. S. (2023). Documenting High-Risk AI: A European Regulatory Perspective. Computer, 56(5), 18–27. https://doi.org/10.1109/mc.2023.3235712
21. Taran, K. K. (2023). Constituting a regulatory framework in the EU that regulates relations on the using artificial intelligence. Courier of Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL)), 2, 80–89. https://doi.org/10.17803/2311-5998.2023.102.2.080-089
22. Zhao, J. (2024). Promoting more accountable AI in the boardroom through smart regulation. Computer Law & Security Review, 52, 105939. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2024.105939
23. Katrak, M., & Parmar, J. (2016). Paralyzing Small Investors Under the Guise of Melioration: A Critical Evaluation of SEBI ICDR Fifth and Seventh Amendment Notifications. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3605779
24. Velagala, D. L., & D, S. (2025). Front running activity in Indian mutual fund sector and regulatory action by securities and exchange board of India. Journal of Financial Crime, 32(4), 878–895. https://doi.org/10.1108/jfc-08-2024-0271
25. Hu, G., & Liu, H. (2020). Development Strategy of Securities Investment Industry under the Background of Artificial Intelligence. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1533(3), 032057. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1533/3/032057
26. Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, M. (2012). *Understanding regulation: Theory, strategy, and practice* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
27. Black, J. (2001). Decentring regulation: Understanding the role of regulation and self-regulation in a "post-regulatory" world. *Current Legal Problems*, 54(1), 103–146. https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/54.1.103
28. BIS. (2018). *Sound practices: Implications of fintech developments for banks and bank supervisors*. Bank for International Settlements.
29. Brennan, M. J., & Subrahmanyam, A. (1996). Market microstructure and asset pricing: On the compensation for illiquidity in stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 41(3), 441–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(95)00870-K

30. European Securities and Markets Authority. (2023). *Artificial intelligence in EU securities markets*. ESMA.
31. Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383–417. https://doi.org/10.2307/2325486
32. Financial Stability Board. (2017). *Artificial intelligence and machine learning in financial services*. FSB.
33. Goodhart, C., Hartmann, P., Llewellyn, D., Rojas-Suarez, L., & Weisbrod, S. (1998). *Financial regulation: Why, how and where now?* Routledge.
34. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X
35. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185
36. Kirilenko, A., Kyle, A. S., Samadi, M., & Tuzun, T. (2017). The flash crash: High-frequency trading in an electronic market. *Journal of Finance*, 72(3), 967–998. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12498
37. Lodge, M., & Wegrich, K. (2012). Managing regulation: Regulatory analysis, politics and policy. *Palgrave Macmillan*.
38. OECD. (2021). *Artificial intelligence, machine learning and big data in finance*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/7b06c8ad-en
39. Shiller, R. J. (2003). From efficient markets theory to behavioral finance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(1), 83–104. https://doi.org/10.1257/089533003321164967
40. Securities and Exchange Board of India. (1992). *The Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992*. Government of India.
41. Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2019). *Framework for algorithmic trading*. SEBI.
42. Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2023). *Market surveillance and risk management systems*. SEBI.
43. Sunstein, C. R. (2014). *Why nudge? The politics of libertarian paternalism*. Yale University Press.
44. United States Securities and Exchange Commission. (2023). *Predictive data analytics and conflicts of interest*. SEC.
45. Varian, H. R. (2019). Artificial intelligence, economics, and industrial organization. *American Economic Review Papers & Proceedings*, 109, 399–405. https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20191003
46. Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., & Weber, R. H. (2020). The future of data-driven finance and RegTech: Lessons from EU and global AI regulation. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, 6(2), 172–203. https://doi.org/10.1093/jfr/fjaa017