

# Leveraging Artificial Intelligence for Automated Transaction Mapping to Accounting Standards

Linda William, Renyu Lu, Ester Goh and Woelly William

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

September 26, 2024

# Leveraging Artificial Intelligence for Automated Transaction Mapping to Accounting Standards

Linda William<sup>1</sup>, Renyu Lu<sup>1</sup>, Ester Goh<sup>1</sup>, and Woelly William<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>School of Informatics & IT, Temasek Polytechnic, Singapore <sup>2</sup>Edugame Analytics Pte Ltd., Singapore lwilliam@tp.edu.sg, 2202560E@student.tp.edu.sg, egohgh@tp.edu.sg, woellywilliam@ea-asia.com

#### Abstract

For companies, adhering to industry standards, regulations, and laws is essential. This includes the requirement to file annual financial statements using accounting standards issued by relevant government agencies. However, companies often document their transactions with various non-standard descriptions, leading to discrepancies between these transactions and the accounting standards. This project aims to address these discrepancies by proposing an automated tool that uses Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) models to align company transactions with accounting standards. Eleven AI/ML models, including Random Forest (RF) and Decision Tree Classifier (DTC), were developed and trained using historical transactions. The evaluation results indicate that while both RF and DTC models have identical training accuracies, RF performs slightly better on the test set. Consequently, RF was chosen for the automated tool.

### 1 Introduction

For companies, compliance with industry standards, regulations, and laws is crucial (Lanturn Pte Ltd., 2023). For example, Singapore companies must file annual financial statements to the Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority (ACRA) (Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority, 2023). The main purpose of compliance is to identify and avoid red flags that may appear in the companies. All companies, including small companies, must comply with these regulatory requirements. Violations of regulatory compliance often result in legal punishment, including governmental fines (Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority, 2023). For small companies with limited resources, these compliances, including preparing and filing the annual financial statement, can be challenging (Wolters Kluwer, 2021).

Available accounting software (such as Xero (Xero Limited, 2023), Sage (Sage Group, 2023), QuickBooks (Intuit Inc., 2023), KashFlow (KashFlow Software Ltd., 2023), and MYOB (Asian Business Software Solutions Pte Ltd., 2023)) have been used to assist the companies to prepare their financial statement. This software helps in documenting, managing, and tracking a company's transactions. However, companies may have a lot of variations in their transactions. When the companies document their transactions using accounting software or manually, they may use various descriptions (non-standard descriptions). The government agencies have standard guidelines and classification for these accounts. Hence, they would need to manually map their transactions with the accounting standards. These processes require significant time and manpower and would require accounting knowledge. Depending on the size of the company and the complexity of the transactions, it may take around 2 days to 3 weeks to complete it.

This work aims to solve this problem by developing an automated tool to map the company's transactions with accounting standards. Powered by Artificial intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) models, the proposed tool would get the input in terms of accounting transactions and automatically map the transactions with the standard accounts. For this purpose, eleven AI/ML models are developed and trained using historical transactions. These models include Random Forest (RF) (Breiman, 2001), Balanced Random Forest (Kobylinski & Przepiorkowski, 2008), Decision Tree Classifier (DTC) (Suthaharan, 2016), Gradient Boosting (Sarkar & Natarajan, 2019), Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) (Manaswi, 2018), Ridge Classifier (Hastie, Tibshirani, & Friedman, 2009), Linear Support Vector Classifier (Linear SVC) (Bonaccorso, 2017), K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) (Dangeti, 2017), Multiclass Logistic Regression (Li, Lin, & Zeng, 2023), Naive Bayes (NB) (Bonaccorso, 2017), and TensorFlow Keras Neural Network (NN) (Silaparasetty, 2020). The evaluation results show that RF and DTC models show identical training accuracies (0.74), but RF performs slightly better on the test set (0.60 vs. 0.54) at the cost of a longer runtime (136 seconds vs. 65 seconds). Based on these results, RF was selected to be used in the automated tool.

# 2 Data Pre-Processing

The proposed tool would get the input in terms of accounting transactions from the companies that have been prepared by using accounting software or manually prepared and map it to the accounting standards. The accounting standards are considered as a label for each transaction and AI/ML models would need to classify the transactions to the correct label. The accounting standards can have several levels as illustrated in Table 1. The maximum level of the accounting standards used in this work is 5 levels. However, not all transactions would have a complete 5 levels. For example, transaction #1 in Table 1 only has 4 levels, while transaction #5 has 5 levels.

To train AI/ML models, we use a historical dataset that contains past transactions from a local company in Singapore. The dataset is prepared manually, hence before applying the AI/ML models, the dataset undergoes data pre-processing to remove any data quality problems and transform the data input to fit the models. The steps in the data pre-processing are as follows:

**1. Replace missing values.** As mentioned earlier, each transaction may have different accounting levels. For a transaction that only has 1 level, 'Level 2' to 'Level 5' will be blank or missing. We replace this blank or missing in 'Level 1' to 'Level 5' with the value from the previous level. For example, transaction #1 in Table 1 only has 4 levels, 'Level 5' is blank. We replace 'Level 5' with 'Level 4' value. A sample of the dataset after the missing value replacement is in Table 2.

| No | Description                 | Level 1 | Level 2           | Level 3                     | Level 4                  | Level 5       |
|----|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| 1  | TRADE<br>DEBTORS            | Assets  | Current<br>assets | Trade and other receivables | Trade<br>Receivable<br>s | -             |
| 2  | DEPOSIT &<br>PREPAYME<br>NT | Assets  | Current<br>assets | Trade and other receivables | Other<br>receivable<br>s | Deposit       |
| 3  | TERM<br>LOAN                | Assets  | Current<br>assets | Trade and other receivables | Other<br>receivable<br>s | Related party |
| 4  | BANK (USD)                  | Assets  | Current<br>assets | Cash and bank balances      | -                        | -             |
| 5  | BANK (SGD)                  | Assets  | Current<br>assets | Cash and bank balances      | -                        | -             |

Table 1. Sample of the accounting standards for the company's transactions

Table 2. Sample of the dataset after the missing value replacement

| No | Description             | Level  | Level 2           | Level 3                     | Level 4                      | Level 5                      |
|----|-------------------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1  | TRADE<br>DEBTORS        | Assets | Current           | Trade and other receivables | Trade<br>Receivables         | Trade<br>Receivables         |
| 2  | DEPOSIT &<br>PREPAYMENT | Assets | Current<br>assets | Trade and other receivables | Other<br>receivables         | Deposit                      |
| 3  | TERM LOAN               | Assets | Current<br>assets | Trade and other receivables | Other<br>receivables         | Related party                |
| 4  | BANK (USD)              | Assets | Current<br>assets | Cash and bank balances      | Cash and<br>bank<br>balances | Cash and<br>bank<br>balances |
| 5  | BANK (SGD)              | Assets | Current<br>assets | Cash and bank balances      | Cash and<br>bank<br>balances | Cash and<br>bank<br>balances |

**2. Tag part-of-speech.** To enhance our text data, we utilized the spaCy library (Explosion AI, 2024) to perform part-of-speech (POS) tagging. This method is used to analyze and annotate each word in the text with its corresponding part-of-speech category, such as noun, verb, and adjective. The processes of this tagging involve loading the English language model and processing each level of text data. A sample of the dataset after the tagging is in Table 3.

**3. Lemmatizing the Text Data.** We utilize a pre-existing lemma dictionary (Vidhya, 2024) to lemmatize our text data. This method is used to reduce inflected words to their base or dictionary form, which helps in normalizing text for analysis. This step involves replacing each word with its lemma based on its POS tag in the previous step. Common terms used in accounting are also added manually to the lemma dictionary. A sample of the lemma dictionary is in Table 4.

**4. Feature engineering.** After lemmatizing, we combined levels 1-5 into one column with a semicolon separator. Joining the multiple levels into a single column helps capture relationships between these levels which is important for the model to learn and reduces run time by reducing the number of labels to predict. An example of the cleaned dataset after the data pre-processing is shown in Table 5.

|    | Table 3. Sample of the dataset after the part-of-speech tagging |                |                     |               |               |  |
|----|---|----------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| No | Level 1   | Level 2        | Level 3             | Level 4       | Level 5       |  |
| 1  | (assets,  | (current, ADJ) | (trade, NOUN) (and, | (trade, NOUN) | (trade, NOUN) |  |
|    | NOUN)   | (assets, NOUN) | CCONJ) (other, ADJ) | (receivables, | (receivables, |  |
|    |   |                | (receivables, NOUN) | NOUN)         | NOUN)         |  |
| 2  | (assets,  | (current, ADJ) | (trade, NOUN) (and, | (other, ADJ)  | (deposit,     |  |
|    | NOUN)   | (assets, NOUN) | CCONJ) (other, ADJ) | (receivables, | NOUN)         |  |
|    |   |                | (receivables, NOUN) | NOUN)         |               |  |
| 3  | (assets,  | (current, ADJ) | (trade, NOUN) (and, | (other, ADJ)  | (related,     |  |
|    | NOUN)   | (assets, NOUN) | CCONJ) (other, ADJ) | (receivables, | VERB) (party, |  |
|    |   |                | (receivables, NOUN) | NOUN)         | NOUN)         |  |
| 4  | (assets,  | (current, ADJ) | (trade, NOUN) (and, | (trade, NOUN) | (trade, NOUN) |  |
|    | NOUN)   | (assets, NOUN) | CCONJ) (other, ADJ) | (receivables, | (receivables, |  |
|    |   |                | (receivables, NOUN) | NOUN)         | NOUN)         |  |
| 5  | (assets,  | (current, ADJ) | (trade, NOUN) (and, | (other, ADJ)  | (deposit,     |  |
|    | NOUN)   | (assets, NOUN) | CCONJ) (other, ADJ) | (receivables, | NOUN)         |  |
|    |   |                | (receivables, NOUN) | NOUN)         |               |  |

Table 3. Sample of the dataset after the part-of-speech tagging

Table 4. Sample of the Lemma dictionary

| No | Word       | Dictionary   |  |  |  |
|----|------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1  | has        | NOUN: has; VERB: have; AUX: have                   |  |  |  |
| 2  | insight    | NOUN: insight                                      |  |  |  |
| 3  | the        | NOUN: the; PROPN: the; DET: the; PRON: the         |  |  |  |
| 4  | mechanisms | NOUN: mechanism                                    |  |  |  |
| 5  | learning   | NOUN: learning; VERB: learn                        |  |  |  |
| 6  | and        | NOUN: and; DET: a; CCONJ: and                      |  |  |  |
| 7  | processing | NOUN: processing; PROPN: Processing; VERB: process |  |  |  |

Table 5. Sample of the dataset after cleaning

| No | Description                    | Level<br>1 | Level 2           | Level 3                               | Level 4              | Level 5                  | Combined Level  |
|----|--------------------------------|------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1  | TRADE<br>DEBTORS               | Assets     | Current<br>assets | Trade<br>and other<br>receivabl<br>es | Trade<br>Receivables | Trade<br>Receivabl<br>es | asset;current<br>asset;trade and<br>other<br>receivable;trade<br>receivable;trade<br>receivable |
| 2  | DEPOSIT<br>&<br>PREPAY<br>MENT | Assets     | Current<br>assets | Trade<br>and other<br>receivabl<br>es | Other<br>receivables | Deposit                  | asset;current<br>asset;trade and<br>other<br>receivable;other<br>receivable;deposit             |
| 3  | TERM<br>LOAN                   | Assets     | Current<br>assets | Trade<br>and other<br>receivabl<br>es | Other<br>receivables | Related<br>party         | asset;current<br>asset;trade and<br>other<br>receivable;other<br>receivable;relate<br>party     |

# 3 AI/ML Models

After the data preprocessing, we train AI/ML models using the cleaned dataset. We develop and train eleven AI/ML models. A short description of these eleven models is in Table 6.

| No | Madal            | Table 6. AI/ML models used   | Example of use acce(a)   |
|----|------------------|--|--|
| No | Model            | Description  | Example of use case(s)   |
| 1  | Random           | RF is a supervised learning method based   | Credit scoring to predict the  |
|    | Forest (RF)      | on a combination of decision tree  | likelihood of a borrower   |
|    |                  | predictors. Each tree depends on an  | defaulting on a loan.  |
|    |                  | independent random vector with the same distribution for all the forest trees        | Predicting customer churn in a                                       |
|    |                  | (Breiman, 2001). It builds multiple  | telecom company by analyzing   |
|    |                  | decision trees using some component of   | customer behavior and usage  |
|    |                  | randomness and determines the  | patterns.  |
|    |                  | classification using most various trees.   | P  |
| 2  | Balanced         | Balanced Random Forest is an extension   | Medical diagnosis where the  |
|    | Random           | of the Random Forest algorithm designed  | prevalence of a disease is low but                                   |
|    | Forest           | to handle imbalanced datasets by under-  | critical to identify correctly.                                      |
|    |                  | sampling the majority class and over-  |  |
|    |                  | sampling the minority class during the   | Detecting fraudulent transactions                                    |
|    |                  | training process. Each tree will have  | in financial datasets where  |
|    |                  | bootstrapped sets of the same size, one  | fraudulent cases are much fewer                                      |
|    |                  | for the minority class and the other for the   | than legitimate ones.  |
|    |                  | majority class (Kobylinski &   |  |
| -  | Decision         | Przepiorkowski, 2008).   |  |
| 3  | Decision<br>Tree | A Decision Tree Classifier is a non-   | Customer churn prediction to   |
|    | Classifier       | parametric supervised learning method<br>used for classification. It splits the data | identify customers likely to leave<br>a service. Diagnosing diseases |
|    | (DTC)            | into subsets based on the value of input   | based on patient symptoms and  |
|    | (DIC)            | features, using a tree-like model of   | medical history.   |
|    |                  | decisions (Suthaharan, 2016).  | mearear motory.  |
| 4  | Gradient         | Gradient Boosting is an ensemble   | Fraud detection in financial   |
|    | Boosting         | technique that builds models sequentially,   | transactions. Predicting house                                       |
|    | _                | each correcting the errors of its  | prices by learning patterns from                                     |
|    |                  | predecessor (Sarkar & Natarajan, 2019).  | historical data.   |
| 5  | Multi-Layer      | A Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) is a  | Image classification tasks   |
|    | Perceptron       | class of feedforward artificial neural   | <b>TT 1 1 1 1 1</b>  |
|    | (MLP             | networks. It consists of at least three  | Handwritten digit recognition.                                       |
|    |                  | layers of nodes: an input layer, a hidden  |  |
|    |                  | layer, and an output layer. MLPs use   |  |
|    |                  | backpropagation for training the network (Manaswi, 2018).                            |  |
| 6  | Ridge            | A Ridge Classifier is a type of linear   | Sentiment analysis of textual  |
|    | Classifier       | classifier that applies L2 regularization  | data.  |
|    |                  | (Hastie, Tibshirani, & Friedman, 2009) to  |  |
|    |                  | prevent overfitting by penalizing large  | Text classification.   |
|    |                  | coefficients in the linear model.  |  |
|    |                  | coefficients in the inical model.  |  |

Table 6. AI/ML models used

| 7  | Linear      | Linear Support Vector Classifier (SVC) is   | Spam email detection.              |
|----|-------------|---|------------------------------------|
|    | Support     | a linear classification model that attempts |                                    |
|    | Vector      | to find the best hyperplane which           | Sentiment analysis to classify the |
|    | Classifier  | separates data points of different classes  | sentiment of user reviews as       |
|    | (Linear     | with a maximum margin (Bonaccorso,          | positive or negative.              |
|    | SVC)        | 2017).                                      |                                    |
| 8  | K-Nearest   | K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) is a non-         | Recommender systems for            |
|    | Neighbors   | parametric method used for classification   | suggesting products to users.      |
|    | (KNN)       | and regression. It classifies a sample      |                                    |
|    |             | based on the majority class among its k-    |                                    |
|    |             | nearest neighbors in the feature space      |                                    |
|    |             | (Dangeti, 2017).                            |                                    |
| 9  | Multiclass  | Multiclass Logistic Regression extends      | Image classification with multiple |
|    | Logistic    | binary logistic regression to handle        | categories.                        |
|    | Regression  | multiclass classification problems (Li,     |                                    |
|    |             | Lin, & Zeng, 2023). While binary logistic   | Classifying types of flowers       |
|    |             | regression is a conditional probability     | based on their petal and sepal     |
|    |             | distribution.                               | measurements.                      |
|    |             |   |                                    |
| 10 | Naive Bayes | Naive Bayes is a probabilistic classifier   | Document classification, such as   |
|    | (NB)        | based on Bayes' theorem with the            | classifying news articles.         |
|    |             | assumption of independence between          |                                    |
|    |             | features (Bonaccorso, Naive Bayes,          |                                    |
|    |             | 2017).                                      |                                    |
| 11 | TensorFlow  | TensorFlow Keras is an open-source          | Image recognition and              |
|    | Keras       | library for building neural networks. It    | classification in medical imaging. |
|    | Neural      | provides an easy-to-use API for creating    |                                    |
|    | Network     | and training models, allowing for easy      | Predicting stock prices using a    |
|    | (NN)        | and fast prototyping of neural networks     | time series of historical data.    |
|    |             | (Silaparasetty, 2020). The neural network   |                                    |
|    |             | finds underlying relationships in a dataset |                                    |
|    |             | by applying a number of techniques.         |                                    |

# 4 Results and Discussion

To evaluate the eleven AI/ML models, we use 5-fold cross-validation in the same environment and setup. The cutoff time to complete the training is 3 hours. The training accuracy and testing accuracy are calculated using the scikit-learn accuracy score (Scikit-learn , 2024). The result is shown in Table 7. The training accuracy, testing accuracy, and runtime shown in Table 7 are the average accuracy and runtime for each model.

From the result, several observations can be made. First, RF and DTC show identical training accuracies (0.74), but RF performs slightly better on the test set (0.60 vs. 0.54) at the cost of a longer runtime (136 seconds vs. 65 seconds). MLP achieves a high training accuracy (0.73) and testing accuracy (0.59), but it has a significantly longer runtime (2362 seconds). NB has the shortest runtime (2 seconds) but also the lowest performance (training accuracy 0.32, testing accuracy 0.31). Balanced RF significantly underperforms compared to the other models, with a training accuracy of 0.26 and a testing accuracy of 0.19. Gradient Boosting training is not completed after the cutoff time. Linear

SVC shows a balanced performance between accuracy (training accuracy 0.69, testing accuracy 0.56) and runtime (117 seconds). And TensorFlow Keras NN model performs comparably in testing accuracy (0.54) to DT (0.54) and RF (0.60) with a moderate runtime of 101 seconds. These observations indicate that RF is the best model for the mapping. Hence, RF was chosen for the automated tool.

| Model               | Training Accuracy | Testing Accuracy | Runtime (Sec) |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|
| RF                  | 0.74              | 0.60             | 136           |
| Balanced RF         | 0.26              | 0.19             | 47            |
| DTC                 | 0.74              | 0.54             | 65            |
| Gradient Boosting   | 0.66**            | 0.45**           | 10,842**      |
| MLP                 | 0.73              | 0.59             | 2,362         |
| Ridge Classifier    | 0.58              | 0.48             | 598           |
| Linear SVC          | 0.69              | 0.56             | 117           |
| KNN                 | 0.59              | 0.47             | 89            |
| Multiclass Logistic | 0.49              | 0.44             | 906           |
| NB                  | 0.32              | 0.31             | 2             |
| Tensorflow Keras NN | 0.53              | 0.54             | 101           |

Table 7. The performance of each model

\*\*: the training was not yet completed after the cutoff time

To further validate the mapping accuracy, we use the best model, RF, to map a new unlabeled dataset. The prediction result is then evaluated by two accounting experts. The experts confirm that the prediction is somewhat accurate with a minimum number of discrepancies between the predicted label and the accounting standard. Based on this result, we conclude that the model can map the transactions to the accounting standards.

## 5 Summary and Future Research

In this paper, we focus our study on developing an automated tool that uses Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) models to align company transactions with accounting standards. For this purpose, eleven AI/ML models, including Random Forest (RF), are developed and evaluated using historical transactions. The evaluation using 5-fold cross-validation indicates that RF has the best training and testing accuracy with relatively short runtime. We then further validate the model by predicting the accounting standards for unmapped transactions and manually evaluating the predictions. The manual evaluation confirms that the prediction is somewhat accurate with a minimum number of discrepancies between the predicted label and the accounting standard.

As this automated tool development is still ongoing, we would like to continue improving the accuracy of the models by further fine-tuning the model using Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) (Zhu, Jiao, & Jordan, 2023). We also would like to deploy and integrate the RF model with the web application to provide an easy interface for the users to upload the new data and map the transactions in the new data with the accounting standards.

# Acknowledgement

This research is supported by the Temasek Polytechnic, under its Temasek Polytechnic Research Fund (TPRF) (15th Call).

## References

- Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority. (2023, July 27). Singapore Financial Reporting Standard for Small Entities. Retrieved from Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority: https://www.acra.gov.sg/accountancy/accountingstandards/pronouncements/singapore-financial-reporting-standard-for-small-entities
- Asian Business Software Solutions Pte Ltd. (2023, August 28). MYOB. Retrieved from MYOB: https://sg.abssasia.com/free-

trial?gclid=Cj0KCQjw6KunBhDxARIsAKFUGs\_3kz5r6E3PbvwlQUL1hO6hdzxMkZXH-LvYTfRBN-XUoQY0x8RQr-EaArvjEALw wcB

- Bonaccorso, G. (2017). Naive Bayes. In Machine Learning Algorithms. UK: Packt Publishing.
- Bonaccorso, G. (2017). Support Vector Machines. UK: Packt Publishing.
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1), 5-32.
- Dangeti, P. (2017). K-Nearest Neighbors and Naive Bayes. In *Statistics for Machine Learning*. UK: Packt Publishing.
- Explosion AI. (2024, April 24). *Linguistic Features*. Retrieved from spaCy: https://spacy.io/usage/linguistic-features
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction.* New York: Springer New York.
- Intuit Inc. (2023, August 28). Accounting Software | Quickbooks Singapore. Retrieved from Quickbooks : https://quickbooks.intuit.com/sg/
- KashFlow Software Ltd. (2023, August 28). Kashflow Accounting Software. Retrieved from Kashflow Accounting Software: https://www.kashflow.com/
- Kobylinski, L., & Przepiorkowski, A. (2008). Definition Extraction with Balanced Random Forests. *Definition Extraction with Balanced Random Forests* (pp. 237–247). Berlin, Germany: ADVANCES IN NATURAL LANGUAGE PROCESSING.
- Lanturn Pte Ltd. (2023, June 30). *Introduction to Singapore Regulatory Compliance Requirements*. (Lanturn Pte Ltd.) Retrieved September 10, 2024, from https://www.lanturn.com/sg/blog/introduction-to-regulatory-compliance-in-singapore
- Li, H., Lin, L., & Zeng, H. (2023). Logistic Regression and Maximum Entropy Model. In *Machine Learning Methods* (pp. 103–125). Singapore: Springer.
- Manaswi, N. K. (2018). Multilayer Perceptron. In *Deep Learning with Applications Using Python* (pp. 45–56). United States: Apress L. P.
- Sage Group. (2023, August 28). Business Tools and Advice from Real Expert. Retrieved from Sage Group: https://www.sage.com/en-sg/
- Sarkar, D., & Natarajan, V. (2019). Boosting Model Performance with Boosting. In *Ensemble Machine Learning Cookbook*. United Kingdom: Packt Publishing.

Scikit-learn . (2024, April 15). Sklearn Metrics Accuracy Score. Retrieved from Scikit-learn https://scikit-

learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.metrics.accuracy\_score.html

- Silaparasetty, V. (2020). Neural Networks. In *Deep Learning Projects Using TensorFlow* (pp. 71–86). UK: Apress L.P.
- Suthaharan, S. (2016). Machine Learning Models and Algorithms for Big Data Classification. In *Thinking with Examples for Effective Learning* (pp. 237–269). Netherlands: Springer Nature.
- Vidhya, A. (2024, April 24). *How to Build a Lemmatizer*. Retrieved from Medium: https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/how-to-build-a-lemmatizer-7aeff7a1208c
- Wolters Kluwer. (2021, February 13). What is an LLC annual report and how to file one for your business. Retrieved from Wolters Kluwer: https://www.wolterskluwer.com/en/expert-insights/what-is-an-llc-annual-report-and-how-to-file-one-for-your-business
- Xero Limited. (2023, August 28). Accounting software to do your to-do. Retrieved from Xero Limited: https://www.xero.com/
- Zhu, B., Jiao, J., & Jordan, M. I. (2023). Principled Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback from Pairwise or K-wise Comparisons. arXiv.