20 December 2025 · CC-BY 4.0 Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Explaining the Unexplainable: A Systematic Review of Explainable AI in Finance"

Parisa Omidmand[1]

1. Department of Economics, Texas Tech University, United States

The paper addresses a timely and important area. The main weakness is in the screening logic. Starting from 6,086 items and then keeping only papers with at least 50 citations will strongly bias the sample toward older work and a small set of "hits," which is risky in a field that has moved quickly after 2019. That step needs a stronger justification, plus a sensitivity check such as repeating the analysis without the citation threshold or using a time-adjusted criterion so recent but influential work is not automatically excluded. Overall, this is a useful descriptive review with good structure, but it needs a more defensible selection strategy and clearer traceability from the 323 papers to the 30 final papers.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.