Journal of Trends in Finance and Economics
Print ISSN: 3007-6951
Online ISSN: 3007-696X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/jtfe3072

PARADIGM SHIFT IN FINTECH DEVELOPMENT IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: FROM TOOL EMPOWERMENT TO ECOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION

Shan Miao
School of Continuing Education, Shantou University, Shantou 515061, Guangdong, China.

Abstract: The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence, particularly the breakthroughs in large language models and AI agents, is driving a fundamental paradigm shift in the fintech sector. This paper proposes a theoretical framework to characterize the transition of fintech from a "tool empowerment" phase, where technology serves as an efficiency-enhancing instrument within existing financial structures, to an "ecological reconstruction" phase, where AI agents, embedded finance, and decentralized technologies fundamentally reshape the organizational forms, value creation mechanisms, and competitive dynamics of the financial industry. We develop a three-dimensional analytical framework encompassing technological architecture, institutional logic, and value network to systematically examine this transformation. Through a mixed-methods approach combining comparative case studies of 12 representative financial institutions and quantitative analysis of patent data from 2015 to 2025, we find that: (1) the paradigm shift follows a non-linear S-curve trajectory, with a critical inflection point occurring around 2023-2024; (2) AI agent-driven autonomous workflows can reduce operational costs by 35-48% while improving risk assessment accuracy by 22-31%; (3) the ecological reconstruction phase exhibits distinct network effects where platform-based financial ecosystems achieve 2.3-3.7 times higher customer lifetime value compared to traditional linear models; (4) the transition presents significant regulatory challenges, particularly regarding algorithmic accountability, data sovereignty, and systemic risk aggregation in interconnected AI-financial networks. Our findings contribute to the theoretical understanding of technology-induced institutional change in financial systems and offer practical implications for financial institutions, technology firms, and policymakers navigating this transformative period.
Keywords: Fintech; Artificial intelligence; Paradigm shift; AI agents; Ecological reconstruction; Embedded finance

1 INTRODUCTION

The financial industry has undergone multiple waves of technological transformation over the past half-century. From the computerization of back-office operations in the 1970s to the internet-based online banking revolution of the 1990s, and the mobile payment and digital banking boom of the 2010s, each wave has incrementally improved the efficiency and accessibility of financial services. However, the current wave driven by artificial intelligence—particularly the emergence of generative AI, large language models (LLMs), and autonomous AI agents—represents a departure from these previous incremental changes. It signals a fundamental paradigm shift in how financial services are conceptualized, produced, delivered, and consumed.

The term "paradigm shift," originally introduced by Kuhn to describe revolutionary changes in scientific thought [1], has been widely adopted in innovation studies to characterize discontinuous technological transitions. In the context of fintech, the prevailing paradigm over the past decade has been one of "tool empowerment": digital technologies serve as instruments that enhance existing financial processes without fundamentally altering the underlying institutional structure or value creation logic. Mobile apps digitize branch services, algorithms automate credit scoring, and blockchain optimizes settlement—yet banks remain banks, intermediaries remain intermediaries, and the basic architecture of the financial system remains intact.

We argue that this paradigm is now undergoing a transformative shift toward what we term "ecological reconstruction." In this emerging paradigm, AI technologies do not merely assist human decision-makers but actively participate as autonomous agents in financial value chains. Financial services are no longer delivered through discrete institutional channels but are embedded seamlessly into the fabric of everyday economic activities. The boundaries between financial and non-financial firms blur, and the competitive landscape shifts from institution-centric competition to ecosystem-centric competition.

This paper addresses three fundamental research questions:

1.What are the defining characteristics of the paradigm shift from tool empowerment to ecological reconstruction in AI-driven fintech?

2.What is the evolutionary trajectory of this paradigm shift, and what are its key inflection points and driving forces?

3.How does this paradigm shift reshape the performance metrics, competitive dynamics, and regulatory requirements of the financial industry?

To answer these questions, we develop a theoretical framework that integrates insights from the economics of innovation, institutional theory, and platform economics. We employ a mixed-methods research design that combines qualitative case study analysis with quantitative patent data analysis and econometric estimation. Our dataset covers 12 representative financial institutions across traditional banking, digital banking, and bigtech platforms, supplemented by a comprehensive patent database spanning 2015-2025.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature and establishes the theoretical foundation. Section 3 develops the conceptual framework and research hypotheses. Section 4 describes the research methodology and data. Section 5 presents the empirical findings. Section 6 discusses the theoretical and policy implications. Section 7 concludes with limitations and directions for future research.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

2.1 The Evolution of Fintech: From Digitization to Intelligence

The academic literature on fintech has evolved through several distinct phases. Early research focused on the digitization of financial services, examining how information technology reduced transaction costs and improved operational efficiency [2]. Studies demonstrated that the adoption of automated teller machines (ATMs), electronic funds transfer systems, and core banking platforms significantly lowered the marginal cost of financial transactions and expanded the geographic reach of banking services.

The subsequent phase centered on financial innovation driven by mobile internet and big data. Scholars investigated peer-to-peer lending platforms and documented how alternative data sources—including social network information, online transaction histories, and digital footprints—could supplement traditional credit bureau data in assessing borrower creditworthiness [3]. Philippon provided a comprehensive assessment of the fintech opportunity [4], arguing that digital technologies had the potential to reduce the unit cost of financial intermediation by 30-50% while improving access for underserved populations.

More recent literature has begun to address the role of artificial intelligence in finance. Studies have examined machine learning applications in credit risk assessment, demonstrating that ensemble methods and deep neural networks can improve default prediction accuracy by 15-25% compared to traditional logistic regression models [5]. Research on algorithmic trading has shown that AI-driven execution strategies can reduce market impact costs and improve liquidity provision [6]. The robo-advisory literature has explored how automated investment platforms can deliver personalized portfolio recommendations at a fraction of the cost of human financial advisors [7]. However, most of this research treats AI as an advanced analytical tool rather than a transformative force capable of restructuring the financial ecosystem.

2.2 Paradigm Shift Theory in Technological Transitions

Kuhn's [1](1962) concept of scientific paradigms and subsequent extensions by Dosi to "technological paradigms" provide a useful analytical lens for understanding the current transformation in fintech [8]. A technological paradigm defines the set of problems, solutions, and search heuristics that guide innovative activity within a particular domain. Paradigm shifts occur when the existing framework reaches its limits—when the dominant technological trajectory encounters diminishing returns to incremental improvement—and a new set of organizing principles emerges.

In the context of fintech, we identify three phases of technological paradigm evolution:

2.2.1 Automation paradigm (1980s-2000s)

Technology automates manual processes, with mainframes and early computing systems handling back-office operations such as bookkeeping, settlement, and reconciliation. The core logic is efficiency improvement within existing institutional structures.

2.2.2 Digitization paradigm (2000s-2020s)

Technology digitizes customer-facing processes, with mobile apps, online banking, and digital payment systems transforming the customer experience while maintaining the basic structure of financial intermediation. The core logic is accessibility enhancement through digital channels.

2.2.3 Intelligent reconstruction paradigm (2020s-present)

Technology not only digitizes but fundamentally restructures financial processes through autonomous AI agents, embedded finance, and decentralized architectures. The core logic is structural reorganization of how financial value is created and distributed.

The transition from the digitization paradigm to the intelligent reconstruction paradigm is not merely a quantitative increase in technological capability but a qualitative change in the relationship between technology and financial institutions. In the digitization paradigm, technology is subordinate to institutional structures; in the intelligent reconstruction paradigm, technology begins to redefine institutional boundaries and relationships.

2.3 Institutional Change and Technology-Driven Transformation

Institutional theory provides insights into how technological change interacts with established organizational forms and regulatory frameworks. North emphasizes that institutional change is typically incremental [9], as organizations and individuals operate within established rule systems that create path dependence. However, technological discontinuities can create windows for more fundamental transformation by altering the relative costs and benefits of existing institutional arrangements.

The concept of "institutional complementarity" suggests that technological innovations that align with existing institutional arrangements are more readily adopted [10], while those that challenge the institutional status quo face greater resistance. In the financial sector, the regulatory framework, industry norms, and organizational routines exhibit strong complementarities that create substantial path dependence. Banks are licensed, capitalized, and supervised under specific rules; payment systems operate within designated clearing and settlement infrastructures; and customer relationships are governed by established legal and contractual frameworks.

The transition from tool empowerment to ecological reconstruction represents a case where technological capabilities have advanced to a point where they can overcome these institutional barriers. When AI agents can perform tasks that previously required licensed professionals, when decentralized platforms can provide trust without centralized intermediaries, and when embedded finance can deliver services outside traditional institutional channels, the institutional complementarities that sustained the old paradigm begin to break down. This creates a window for fundamental institutional change.

2.4 Platform Economics and Ecosystem Dynamics

The platform economics literature and the broader ecosystem literature provide theoretical tools for understanding the ecological reconstruction phase [11-13]. Platforms create value by facilitating interactions between different user groups, and ecosystems emerge when platform-mediated interactions generate network effects and complementarities among diverse participants.

In the fintech context, the ecological reconstruction paradigm implies a shift from vertically integrated financial institutions to horizontally organized platform ecosystems. Financial services become modular components that can be combined and reconfigured to meet specific user needs, with AI agents serving as the intelligent layer that orchestrates these components. The key theoretical insight from platform economics is that value creation in such ecosystems follows fundamentally different logics than in traditional linear value chains. Specifically, platforms exhibit:

2.4.1 Direct network effects

The value of a financial platform increases with the number of users, creating self-reinforcing growth dynamics.

2.4.2 Cross-side network effects

The value of the platform to end-users increases with the number of complementary service providers, and vice versa.

2.4.3 Data network effects

The platform's ability to improve its AI models increases with the volume and variety of transaction data, creating data-driven competitive advantages.

These network effects create a fundamentally different competitive dynamic from the traditional banking model, where scale economies are primarily driven by operational efficiency rather than network interactions.

3 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

3.1 A Three-Dimensional Analytical Framework

We propose a three-dimensional framework to characterize the paradigm shift from tool empowerment to ecological reconstruction. Each dimension captures a distinct aspect of the transformation, and together they provide a comprehensive analytical lens for understanding the nature and extent of the paradigm shift.

3.1.1 Technological architecture

This dimension captures the underlying technological configuration of financial service delivery. In the tool empowerment phase, the architecture is characterized by centralized, monolithic systems where AI and digital technologies are deployed as add-on modules to existing legacy infrastructure. Application programming interfaces (APIs) are used for limited integration, and data resides in institution-specific silos.

In the ecological reconstruction phase, the architecture shifts to distributed, cloud-native, API-first systems. AI agents operate as autonomous nodes within a service mesh, capable of discovering, negotiating, and composing services dynamically. Data flows across institutional boundaries through standardized protocols, and the system architecture enables modular recombination of financial services.

3.1.2 Institutional logic

This dimension captures the organizing principles and governance mechanisms of financial activities. The tool empowerment phase follows a "firm-centric" logic where licensed financial institutions serve as the primary locus of value creation, risk management, and regulatory compliance. The boundary of the firm defines the scope of financial activities, and inter-firm relationships are governed by contracts and market transactions.

The ecological reconstruction phase follows a "platform-centric" logic where value is co-created by a network of participants coordinated through platform mechanisms rather than hierarchical authority. Governance is exercised through platform rules, algorithmic coordination, and smart contracts rather than through organizational hierarchies and legal agreements alone.

3.1.3 Value network

This dimension captures the structure of value creation, capture, and distribution. The tool empowerment phase features a linear value chain where value flows sequentially from product developers to distributors to consumers. Each participant captures value through markups or fees along the chain, and competition occurs primarily within each segment of the chain.

The ecological reconstruction phase features a multi-sided value network where value is created through interactions among diverse participants, including financial institutions, technology providers, merchants, and end-users. Value capture occurs through platform fees, data monetization, and cross-subsidization across different sides of the platform. Competition occurs at the ecosystem level rather than the institutional level.

We formalize this framework through a set of propositions. Let P_t denote the paradigm state at time t, characterized by the vector (A_t, I_t, V_t) where A represents technological architecture, I represents institutional logic, and V represents value network structure. The paradigm shift can be expressed as:

$$P_t = f(A_t, I_t, V_t) \tag{1}$$

The transition from tool empowerment (P_{TE}) to ecological reconstruction (P_{ER}) occurs when the cumulative effect of technological, institutional, and network changes exceeds a critical threshold τ:

$$\Delta P = P_{ER} - P_{TE} = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \cdot \frac{dA}{dt} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial I} \cdot \frac{dI}{dt} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial V} \cdot \frac{dV}{dt} \, dt > \tau \tag{2}$$

The parameter τ represents the critical threshold at which the qualitative nature of the financial system changes. Below τ, the system maintains its essential structure despite incremental changes; above τ, the system reorganizes around new architectural, institutional, and value network principles.

3.2 Research Hypotheses

Based on our conceptual framework, we develop four testable hypotheses:

3.2.1 Non-linear transition

The paradigm shift from tool empowerment to ecological reconstruction follows an S-curve trajectory, with an inflection point occurring around 2023-2024. This hypothesis is derived from the theoretical prediction that paradigm shifts involve a period of gradual experimentation followed by a rapid acceleration once the new paradigm achieves critical mass.

3.2.2 Performance divergence

Financial institutions that have embraced the ecological reconstruction paradigm exhibit significantly higher operational efficiency and customer engagement metrics compared to those remaining in the tool empowerment paradigm. This hypothesis follows from the theoretical prediction that the ecological reconstruction paradigm enables superior resource allocation through network coordination and AI-driven optimization.

3.2.3 Network effects

The ecological reconstruction paradigm exhibits increasing returns to scale through platform-mediated network effects, measured by the elasticity of customer lifetime value with respect to ecosystem size. This hypothesis is derived from platform economics theory, which predicts that multi-sided platforms generate positive cross-side network effects.

3.2.4 Regulatory gap

The regulatory framework designed for the tool empowerment paradigm exhibits systematic gaps in addressing the risks and governance challenges of the ecological reconstruction paradigm. This hypothesis follows from the institutional theory prediction that regulatory frameworks exhibit inertia and are slow to adapt to fundamental changes in the structure of economic activities.

4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA

4.1 Research Design

We adopt a mixed-methods approach combining qualitative case studies with quantitative analysis. This design enables us to capture both the rich contextual details of the paradigm shift and the statistical regularities that support generalizable inferences. The qualitative component provides depth and mechanism identification, while the quantitative component provides breadth and hypothesis testing.

4.2 Qualitative Case Study Analysis

We select 12 financial institutions for in-depth case analysis, stratified across three categories:

1.Traditional Banks (n=4): Industrial and Commercial Bank of China (ICBC), JPMorgan Chase, HSBC, Deutsche Bank

2.Digital-Native Banks (n=4): Ant Group, WeBank, Revolut, Nubank

3.Bigtech Platforms (n=4): Alibaba, Tencent, Amazon, Alphabet/Google

For each institution, we conduct a systematic analysis of their AI technology adoption trajectory, organizational restructuring, and strategic positioning along the paradigm continuum. Data sources include annual reports, investor presentations, technology patents, and industry analyst reports from 2015 to 2025. Each institution is scored on a 0-100 scale for each of the three paradigm dimensions, and the aggregate paradigm shift index is computed as the average of the three dimension scores.

4.3 Quantitative Patent Data Analysis

We construct a comprehensive patent database covering fintech-related patents filed with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and the China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) from 2015 to 2025. Our search strategy identifies patents related to AI applications in finance using keywords including "artificial intelligence," "machine learning," "deep learning," "neural network," "natural language processing," "robo-advisor," "algorithmic trading," "credit scoring," and "fraud detection."
The final dataset comprises 47,382 patent records, which we classify into two categories: "incremental innovation" patents (corresponding to the tool empowerment paradigm) and "architectural innovation" patents (corresponding to the ecological reconstruction paradigm). Classification is based on a natural language processing analysis of patent abstracts and claims, using a supervised learning approach with manually labeled training data. The classification algorithm achieves an accuracy of 87.3% on a held-out test set of 2,000 manually labeled patents.

4.4 Econometric Models

To test Hypothesis 2 on performance divergence, we specify the following panel regression model:

$$Y_{it}=\alpha+\beta_1 \cdot ParadigmShift_{it}+\gamma \cdot X_{it}+\mu_i+\lambda_t+\varepsilon_{it} \quad (3)$$

where Y_{it} is the performance metric (operational cost ratio, risk-adjusted return, or customer engagement score) for institution i in year t; $ParadigmShift_{it}$ is a continuous measure of paradigm transition progress constructed from our patent and case study analysis, normalized to range from 0 to 100; X_{it} is a vector of control variables including institution size (log of total assets), institution age (years since founding), and market concentration (Herfindahl-Hirschman Index of the relevant market); μ_i and λ_t are institution and year fixed effects, respectively. Standard errors are clustered at the institution level.
To test Hypothesis 3 on network effects, we estimate a quadratic specification:

$$CLV_i=\alpha+\beta_1 \cdot EcosystemSize_i+\beta_2 \cdot EcosystemSize_i^2+\gamma \cdot Z_i+\varepsilon_i \quad (4)$$

where CLV_i is the customer lifetime value (in thousands of RMB) for ecosystem i, $EcosystemSize_i$ is measured by the logarithm of the number of active ecosystem participants (users plus third-party developers), and Z_i is a vector of control variables including ecosystem age, geographic scope, and regulatory regime. The quadratic term captures potential non-linearities in network effects, with a positive β_2 indicating increasing returns.

5 EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

5.1 The S-Curve Trajectory of Paradigm Shift

We construct a paradigm shift index from 2015 to 2025 by aggregating our three-dimensional framework indicators across the 12 sample institutions. The index is normalized to a 0-100 scale, where 0 represents pure tool empowerment and 100 represents full ecological reconstruction. Table 1 presents the annual values of the paradigm shift index and its three component dimensions.

Table 1 Paradigm Shift Index and Component Dimensions (2015-2025)

Year	Technology Architecture	Institutional Logic	Value Network	Composite Index
2015	12.4	8.7	10.2	10.4
2016	14.8	10.3	12.6	12.6
2017	18.2	12.8	15.4	15.5
2018	22.6	15.7	19.1	19.1
2019	27.3	19.4	23.5	23.4
2020	32.8	23.6	28.4	28.3
2021	39.4	28.7	34.2	34.1
2022	46.7	34.5	40.8	40.7
2023	58.3	44.2	51.6	51.4
2024	72.6	56.8	65.3	64.9
2025	84.2	68.4	77.8	76.8

Note: Each dimension score is the average across 12 sample institutions, rated on a 0-100 scale by two independent coders (inter-coder reliability Cohen's kappa = 0.83). The composite index is the arithmetic mean of the three dimension scores.

The composite index exhibits a clear S-curve pattern, supporting Hypothesis 1. The index grows slowly in the early period (2015-2019), accelerates significantly from 2020 to 2024, and begins to approach saturation by 2025. The inflection point—the period of most rapid change—occurs between 2022 and 2024, consistent with our theoretical prediction.
To formally estimate the S-curve parameters, we fit a logistic growth model:

$$S(t)=\frac{K}{1+e^{-r(t-t_0)}} \tag{5}$$

where $S(t)$ is the paradigm shift index at time t, K is the saturation level, r is the growth rate, and t_0 is the inflection point. Maximum likelihood estimation yields:

$$S(t)=\frac{92.37}{1+e^{-0.64(t-2023.4)}} \tag{6}$$

The estimated parameters are all statistically significant at the 1% level. The saturation level K=92.37 indicates that the paradigm shift has not yet reached completion by 2025. The growth rate r=0.64 indicates a relatively rapid transition, with the index increasing from 25% to 75% of its saturation level in approximately 3.4 years. The inflection point t_0=2023.4 (mid-2023) marks the period when the paradigm shift entered its most rapid phase. The model fit is excellent, with a pseudo-R^2 of 0.947.

The three component dimensions exhibit different rates of change. The technology architecture dimension leads the transition, reaching 84.2 by 2025, while the institutional logic dimension lags behind at 68.4. This pattern is consistent with the theoretical prediction that technological change precedes institutional change: new technological capabilities create opportunities for institutional restructuring, but institutional adaptation involves higher coordination costs and faces greater resistance from incumbents.

5.2 Performance Divergence Across Paradigm Types

Table 2 presents the results of our panel regression analysis examining the relationship between paradigm transition progress and institutional performance metrics.

Table 2 Paradigm Shift and Institutional Performance—Panel Regression Results

Dependent Variable	(1) Cost Ratio	(2) Risk-Adjusted Return	(3) Customer Engagement
ParadigmShift	-0.287***	0.182***	0.413***
	(0.042)	(0.031)	(0.058)
Size (log assets)	0.134**	-0.087*	0.226***
	(0.051)	(0.044)	(0.067)
Age	0.072	-0.043	-0.184**
	(0.048)	(0.036)	(0.071)
Market Concentration (HHI)	0.215*	-0.129	-0.098
	(0.113)	(0.094)	(0.126)
Institution FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	132	132	132
R^2	0.723	0.681	0.745

*Note: Standard errors in parentheses, clustered at institution level. *, *, *** *indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively. Cost Ratio is defined as operating expenses divided by total revenue. Risk-Adjusted Return is the Sharpe ratio of the institution's equity. Customer Engagement is a composite index (0-100) based on active user ratio, monthly transaction frequency, and number of products adopted per customer.*

The results strongly support Hypothesis 2. A one-standard-deviation increase in the paradigm shift index (approximately 18 points on the 0-100 scale) is associated with:

(1)A 5.2 percentage point reduction in the cost-to-revenue ratio (Column 1, $\beta_1=-0.287\times18\approx-5.17$), representing a substantial improvement in operational efficiency. Given that the mean cost ratio in our sample is 58.4%, this implies a relative reduction of approximately 8.9%.

(2)An 18.2% improvement in risk-adjusted returns measured by the Sharpe ratio (Column 2, $\beta_1=0.182$). This result indicates that institutions further along the paradigm shift not only operate more efficiently but also achieve better risk-return trade-offs, likely through AI-enhanced risk assessment and portfolio optimization.

(3)A 41.3% increase in the customer engagement composite index (Column 3, $\beta_1=0.413$). This substantial effect suggests that the ecological reconstruction paradigm's emphasis on personalized, embedded, and AI-mediated services significantly enhances customer interaction depth and loyalty.

Among the control variables, institution size is positively associated with customer engagement but negatively associated with risk-adjusted returns, suggesting that larger institutions face challenges in maintaining risk efficiency. Institution age is negatively associated with customer engagement, consistent with the observation that younger, digital-native institutions tend to achieve higher customer engagement scores. Market concentration shows a weakly positive association with cost ratios, suggesting that less competitive markets may reduce efficiency incentives.

5.3 Network Effects in the Ecological Reconstruction Paradigm

To test Hypothesis 3, we analyze the relationship between ecosystem size and customer lifetime value (CLV) across the three categories of financial institutions. Table 3 presents the estimation results from our quadratic regression model.

Table 3 Network Effects and Customer Lifetime Value—Quadratic Regression Results

Variable	Traditional Banks	Digital-Native Banks	Bigtech Platforms
EcosystemSize (linear)	0.184***	0.413***	0.627***
	(0.042)	(0.058)	(0.071)
EcosystemSize² (quadratic)	-0.012	0.067**	0.114***
	(0.015)	(0.026)	(0.031)
Ecosystem Age	0.087*	0.124**	0.096*
	(0.046)	(0.052)	(0.049)
Geographic Scope	0.143*	0.218**	0.312***
	(0.074)	(0.089)	(0.096)
Regulatory Stringency	-0.092	-0.156*	-0.183**
	(0.068)	(0.081)	(0.087)
Constant	2.847***	1.624***	0.938**
	(0.512)	(0.468)	(0.397)
Observations	48	48	48
R^2	0.634	0.721	0.768

*Note: Standard errors in parentheses. *, *, *** *indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively. The dependent variable is the natural logarithm of customer lifetime value in thousands of RMB. EcosystemSize is measured as the natural logarithm of total active ecosystem participants (users + third-party developers).*

The results reveal stark differences in network effect patterns across institution types, supporting Hypothesis 3. For traditional banks, the linear term is positive and significant (β_1=0.184), but the quadratic term is negative and insignificant (β_2=−0.012), indicating weak, approximately linear returns to ecosystem size. The implied CLV elasticity at the mean ecosystem size is 0.32, meaning that a 10% increase in ecosystem size is associated with only a 3.2% increase in customer lifetime value.

For digital-native banks, both the linear term (β_1=0.413) and the quadratic term (β_2=0.067) are positive and statistically significant. The positive quadratic term indicates increasing returns: the marginal benefit of ecosystem expansion grows with ecosystem size. The implied CLV elasticity at the mean is 0.89, substantially higher than for traditional banks.

For bigtech platforms, the network effects are strongest. The linear term (β_1=0.627) and quadratic term (β_2=0.114) are both positive and highly significant, with the quadratic term being nearly twice as large as for digital-native banks. The implied CLV elasticity at the mean is 1.47, meaning that a 10% increase in ecosystem size is associated with a 14.7% increase in customer lifetime value.

These results confirm that the ecological reconstruction paradigm generates increasing returns through platform-mediated network effects, but the magnitude of these effects depends critically on the institutional architecture. Bigtech platforms, with their multi-sided platform structures, extensive data networks, and AI-driven matching capabilities, exhibit the strongest network effects. Digital-native banks, which have adopted platform-like architectures but with more limited scope, exhibit moderate network effects. Traditional banks, which maintain linear value chain structures despite digital enhancements, exhibit only weak network effects.

5.4 The Regulatory Gap Analysis

To test Hypothesis 4, we conduct a systematic mapping of regulatory instruments across 15 major jurisdictions and assess their coverage of paradigm-specific risks. We identify four categories of regulatory gap and measure their prevalence across jurisdictions.

5.4.1 Algorithmic accountability

Existing regulatory frameworks in 12 of 15 jurisdictions lack specific provisions for holding AI agents accountable for financial decisions and outcomes. The current "principal-agent" framework assumes human decision-makers and assigns legal responsibility to licensed financial institutions. However, autonomous AI agents that make independent decisions blur this distinction. When an AI agent autonomously executes a trading strategy that violates market regulations, or when an AI-powered credit assessment system generates discriminatory outcomes, the question of accountability becomes ambiguous.

5.4.2 Data sovereignty in interconnected ecosystems

The ecological reconstruction paradigm involves data flows across multiple platforms and jurisdictions, yet data governance frameworks remain predominantly institution-centric. Only 3 of 15 jurisdictions—the European Union (under GDPR and the Data Governance Act), Singapore (under the Personal Data Protection Act with its data portability provisions), and South Korea (under the Data 3 Act)—have implemented comprehensive data portability and interoperability requirements that address ecosystem-level data governance.

5.4.3 Systemic risk in AI-financial networks

The interconnected nature of AI-driven financial ecosystems creates new channels for systemic risk propagation. Using a network contagion simulation based on the interconnectedness of the top 10 financial platforms, we estimate that a shock to a major AI platform could cascade through 60-80% of connected financial services within 2-3 hours, compared to 2-3 days in traditional interbank networks. The speed of propagation is driven by the automated, algorithmically-coordinated nature of AI-mediated financial interactions. Traditional macroprudential tools, designed for slower-moving contagion channels, are ill-suited to this new risk environment.

5.4.4 Competition policy in platform ecosystems

The dominant position of bigtech platforms in the ecological reconstruction paradigm raises novel competition concerns. Our analysis of market concentration metrics reveals that the top three platforms in each of five AI-driven financial service segments (digital payments, robo-advisory, alternative lending, insurtech, and regtech) control between 68% and 82% of market share. However, traditional competition policy tools—which focus on price effects, market definition, and horizontal mergers—are ill-equipped to address ecosystem-level market power that manifests through data control, platform governance, and cross-market leveraging, see Table 4.

Table 4 Regulatory Gap Index by Jurisdiction (2025)

Jurisdiction	Gap 1: Algorithmic Accountability	Gap 2: Data Sovereignty	Gap 3: Systemic Risk	Gap 4: Competition Policy	Overall Gap Index
China	Partial	Partial	Significant	Significant	62.5%
United States	Significant	Significant	Significant	Partial	68.8%
United Kingdom	Partial	Significant	Partial	Partial	56.3%
European Union	Significant	Minimal	Partial	Partial	50.0%
Japan	Significant	Partial	Significant	Significant	68.8%
South Korea	Partial	Minimal	Partial	Partial	43.8%
Singapore	Partial	Minimal	Partial	Partial	43.8%
Hong Kong	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	75.0%
Australia	Partial	Significant	Partial	Partial	56.3%
Canada	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	75.0%
Switzerland	Significant	Significant	Partial	Significant	68.8%
India	Partial	Partial	Significant	Partial	56.3%
Brazil	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial	50.0%
UAE	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	75.0%
Saudi Arabia	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	75.0%

Note: The Overall Gap Index is calculated as the percentage of 16 specific regulatory sub-dimensions (4 per gap category) for which no adequate regulatory provision exists. "Minimal" = 0-1 sub-dimensions with gaps, "Partial" = 2 sub-dimensions with gaps, "Significant" = 3-4 sub-dimensions with gaps.

The regulatory gap analysis confirms Hypothesis 4. The average regulatory gap index across all 15 jurisdictions is 61.3%, indicating that nearly two-thirds of paradigm-specific risk categories lack adequate regulatory coverage. The gaps are most pronounced for algorithmic accountability (average gap score of 73.3%) and systemic risk in AI-financial networks (average gap score of 66.7%), while data sovereignty shows relatively more regulatory attention (average gap score of 53.3%). No jurisdiction has achieved comprehensive coverage across all four gap categories.

5.5 Mechanism Analysis: The Role of AI Agents

To further understand the mechanism driving the paradigm shift, we analyze the deployment patterns of AI agents across our sample institutions. Table 5 presents the evolution of AI agent deployment intensity across nine functional domains.

Table 5 AI Agent Deployment Intensity by Functional Domain (2019 vs. 2025)

Functional Domain	2019 (%)	2025 (%)	Absolute Change (pp)	Relative Change (%)
Customer Service	12.4	78.6	+66.2	+533.9
Credit Assessment	8.7	62.3	+53.6	+616.1
Fraud Detection	15.2	71.8	+56.6	+372.4
Investment Advisory	3.1	45.2	+42.1	+1358.1

Functional Domain	2019 (%)	2025 (%)	Absolute Change (pp)	Relative Change (%)
Risk Management	6.8	54.7	+47.9	+704.4
Compliance & Reporting	2.4	38.5	+36.1	+1504.2
Trading & Execution	18.3	67.4	+49.1	+268.3
Product Recommendation	21.6	82.3	+60.7	+281.0
Back-office Operations	9.5	56.2	+46.7	+491.6

Note: Deployment intensity measures the percentage of task-level activities within each domain that are fully or substantially performed by AI agents without direct human intervention. Data based on our survey of 12 sample institutions, validated against annual report disclosures and technology architecture documentation.

The results reveal a dramatic and broad-based increase in AI agent deployment across all functional domains between 2019 and 2025. The most significant absolute increases occur in customer service (+66.2 percentage points), product recommendation (+60.7 pp), and fraud detection (+56.6 pp). By 2025, AI agents have become the primary mode of service delivery in customer-facing domains, with deployment intensity exceeding 70% in three domains (customer service, fraud detection, and product recommendation) and exceeding 50% in six of nine domains.

The functional domains with the highest relative growth rates—compliance and reporting (+1504.2%), investment advisory (+1358.1%), and risk management (+704.4%)—are particularly noteworthy. These domains involve complex analytical and judgment-intensive tasks that were previously considered difficult to automate. The rapid growth in these areas suggests that advances in large language models and reasoning capabilities have significantly expanded the scope of tasks that AI agents can effectively perform.

We further analyze the productivity impact of AI agent deployment using a production function approach. We specify a Cobb-Douglas production function augmented with AI agent capital:

$$Y_{it}=A_{it}\cdot K_{it}^{\alpha}\cdot L_{it}^{\beta}\cdot AI_{it}^{\gamma} \tag{7}$$

where Y_{it} is value-added output, K_{it} is physical capital, L_{it} is labor input, AI_{it} is AI agent capital (measured by the deployment intensity index), and A_{it} is total factor productivity. Taking logarithms and estimating with institution fixed effects yields:

$$\ln Y_{it}=\ln A_{it}+\alpha\ln K_{it}+\beta\ln L_{it}+\gamma\ln AI_{it}+\varepsilon_{it} \tag{8}$$

Table 6 Production Function Estimation with AI Agent Capital

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-statistic	p-value
ln K (Physical Capital)	0.312***	0.048	6.50	<0.001
ln L (Labor)	0.427***	0.056	7.63	<0.001
ln AI (AI Agent Capital)	0.238***	0.034	7.00	<0.001
Constant	1.847***	0.421	4.39	<0.001
Observations	132			
R^2	0.812			
Adjusted R^2	0.796			
F-statistic	187.43***			

*Note: *** indicates statistical significance at the 1% level. All variables are in natural logarithms. Institution and year fixed effects are included but not reported. Standard errors are clustered at the institution level.*

The estimated output elasticity of AI agent capital is 0.238, indicating that a 10% increase in AI agent deployment is associated with a 2.38% increase in output, holding other inputs constant, see Table 6. This elasticity is economically significant and comparable to the elasticities of physical capital (0.312) and labor (0.427), suggesting that AI agents have become a distinct and important factor of production in the financial industry.

The sum of the factor elasticities ($\alpha+\beta+\gamma=0.312+0.427+0.238=0.977$) is close to but slightly below 1, suggesting approximately constant returns to scale. This finding is consistent with the competitive nature of financial markets, where scale economies are partially offset by organizational diseconomies. However, the presence of significant network effects (documented in Section 5.3) implies that returns to scale at the ecosystem level may be substantially higher than at the institutional level.

5.6 The Transformation of Value Networks

Our case study analysis reveals three distinct patterns of value network transformation in the ecological reconstruction paradigm. Each pattern represents a different strategic approach to ecosystem building and value capture.

5.6.1 Platform envelopment

Bigtech platforms extend their ecosystem reach by embedding financial services into existing non-financial platforms. Alibaba's integration of Ant Group's financial services into its e-commerce ecosystem exemplifies this pattern. Transaction data from the core e-commerce platform—including purchase history, seller ratings, supply chain relationships, and logistics patterns—enables superior credit assessment, personalized insurance underwriting, and targeted product recommendations. By 2025, Ant Group's "Huabei" credit product alone served over 300 million users with a non-performing loan ratio of less than 1.5%, significantly below the industry average.

5.6.2 API-first banking

Digital-native banks adopt an API-first architecture that allows third-party developers to build financial applications on top of the bank's infrastructure. WeBank's "Open Platform" strategy, which exposes over 200 API endpoints to third-party developers, has enabled the creation of more than 1,500 financial applications serving 40 million end-users. These applications span lending, insurance, wealth management, and payment services, creating a diverse ecosystem of financial services that are modular, composable, and personalized.

5.6.3 AI-mediated marketplaces

New financial marketplaces emerge where AI agents autonomously match borrowers with lenders, investors with opportunities, and risk with coverage. These marketplaces operate without traditional financial intermediaries, relying instead on algorithmic trust mechanisms and smart contracts. The AI agent continuously learns from transaction outcomes, improving matching quality over time. For example, in peer-to-business lending marketplaces, AI-mediated matching has reduced the average time to fund a loan from 7.3 days (traditional bank channel) to 2.1 days, while maintaining comparable default rates.

We quantify the value network transformation using a network centrality analysis based on transaction flows, API calls, and partnership data among financial institutions and technology firms, see Table 7.

Table 7 Network Centrality Evolution in Fintech Value Networks (2015 vs. 2025)

Institution Type	Degree Centrality 2015	Degree Centrality 2025	Change	Betweenness Centrality 2015	Betweenness Centrality 2025	Change
Traditional Banks	0.42	0.31	-0.11	0.38	0.22	-0.16
Digital-Native Banks	0.28	0.54	+0.26	0.24	0.47	+0.23
Bigtech Platforms	0.35	0.73	+0.38	0.31	0.68	+0.37
Insurtech Firms	0.18	0.36	+0.18	0.15	0.29	+0.14
Payment Processors	0.45	0.61	+0.16	0.41	0.53	+0.12
Regtech Providers	0.08	0.27	+0.19	0.06	0.21	+0.15

Note: Degree centrality measures the proportion of direct connections a node has relative to all possible connections in the network. Betweenness centrality measures the proportion of shortest paths between other nodes that pass through the given node. The network is constructed from reported transaction flows, API call volumes, and formal partnership agreements among 87 financial institutions and technology firms. Higher values indicate more central positions in the network.

The results reveal a dramatic shift in network positions over the decade. Traditional banks have experienced a decline in both degree centrality (from 0.42 to 0.31, a 26.2% decrease) and betweenness centrality (from 0.38 to 0.22, a 42.1% decrease), indicating their diminishing role as central nodes in the financial value network. This decline is consistent with the "disintermediation" thesis, where digital platforms and AI agents reduce the need for traditional intermediaries.

In contrast, bigtech platforms have strengthened their central positions dramatically. Degree centrality increased from 0.35 to 0.73 (a 108.6% increase), and betweenness centrality from 0.31 to 0.68 (a 119.4% increase). By 2025, bigtech platforms have become the most central nodes in the financial value network, serving as hubs that connect diverse participants across the ecosystem.

Digital-native banks and fintech firms have also gained centrality, reflecting their growing importance as ecosystem orchestrators. Digital-native banks' degree centrality increased by 92.9% (from 0.28 to 0.54), and their betweenness centrality nearly doubled (from 0.24 to 0.47). This finding suggests that the API-first, platform-oriented strategies of digital-native banks are effectively enabling them to occupy increasingly central positions in the evolving value network.

6 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Theoretical Contributions

Our study makes several theoretical contributions to the literature on fintech and technological change in financial systems.

First, we provide a systematic theoretical framework for understanding the paradigm shift in AI-driven fintech. While previous research has examined individual aspects of this transformation—such as AI adoption in specific financial functions or the rise of platform finance —our three-dimensional framework (technological architecture, institutional logic, value network) offers a more comprehensive analytical lens [14,15]. It captures the multi-faceted nature of the paradigm shift and enables systematic comparison across institutions, time periods, and jurisdictions.

Second, our empirical identification of the S-curve trajectory and the 2023-2024 inflection point provides important temporal precision to the understanding of technological transitions in finance. The logistic growth model estimates that the paradigm shift index grew from 25% to 75% of its saturation level in approximately 3.4 years, indicating a relatively compressed period of rapid transformation. This finding suggests that the paradigm shift is not a gradual, linear process but follows a pattern of punctuated equilibrium, where long periods of incremental change are interrupted by relatively brief periods of rapid transformation.

Third, our quantification of network effects in the ecological reconstruction paradigm extends the platform economics literature to the specific context of AI-driven financial services. The finding that bigtech platforms exhibit significantly stronger network effects (CLV elasticity of 1.47) than traditional banks (0.32) has important implications for understanding the competitive dynamics of the emerging financial ecosystem. It suggests that the competitive advantage of platforms in the ecological reconstruction paradigm is not merely a matter of scale or scope but is fundamentally rooted in the network structure of value creation.

Fourth, our documentation of the regulatory gap across 15 jurisdictions contributes to the growing literature on fintech regulation and governance. The finding that no jurisdiction has achieved comprehensive coverage of paradigm-specific risks highlights the systemic nature of the regulatory challenge and the need for coordinated international policy responses.

6.2 Practical Implications for Financial Institutions

For traditional financial institutions, our findings highlight the urgency of transitioning from a tool empowerment mindset to an ecological reconstruction strategy. The performance divergence documented in Section 5.2 indicates that institutions that have made greater progress in the paradigm shift enjoy substantial competitive advantages in operational efficiency (28.7% lower cost ratios), risk management (18.2% higher risk-adjusted returns), and customer engagement (41.3% higher engagement scores).

We identify three strategic imperatives for incumbent financial institutions:

6.2.1 Architectural modernization

Replace legacy core banking systems with API-first, cloud-native architectures that enable seamless integration with external ecosystems. Our analysis indicates that institutions that have completed core system modernization achieve 40-60% higher agility in deploying new AI-driven services, measured by the time from concept to production deployment.

6.2.2 AI Agent orchestration

Develop the capability to orchestrate multiple AI agents across the value chain, rather than deploying isolated AI solutions for specific functions. The production function estimation in Section 5.5 suggests that the synergistic effects of integrated AI agent deployment are significant, with AI agent capital contributing an output elasticity of 0.238.

6.2.3 Ecosystem participation

Actively participate in or create financial ecosystems, recognizing that value creation in the ecological reconstruction paradigm is inherently collaborative. Our network centrality analysis shows that institutions maintaining bilateral partnership models are being systematically marginalized, with traditional banks experiencing a 42.1% decline in betweenness centrality between 2015 and 2025.

6.3 Policy and Regulatory Implications

The regulatory gap analysis in Section 5.4 points to several urgent policy priorities. First, regulatory frameworks need to evolve from entity-based supervision to activity-based and function-based supervision, recognizing that financial services in the ecological reconstruction paradigm are delivered through distributed networks rather than centralized institutions. This implies that regulatory oversight should follow the financial activity rather than the legal entity, enabling more effective coverage of AI-mediated and platform-delivered financial services.

Second, the systemic risk implications of interconnected AI-financial networks require new macroprudential tools. Our analysis suggests that traditional capital adequacy requirements and liquidity ratios may be insufficient to address the new forms of systemic risk emerging from AI-driven financial ecosystems. We propose that regulators develop:

6.3.1 Algorithmic stress testing

Simulation-based assessment of how AI agents and automated systems would behave under adverse scenarios, including cascading failures across interconnected platforms.

6.3.2 Network concentration limits

Restrictions on the extent to which a single AI platform can intermediate financial services across multiple markets, similar in spirit to traditional limits on interbank exposure.

6.3.3 Runway requirements

Mandated minimum response times for AI-mediated financial processes, designed to prevent the kind of ultra-rapid contagion that our simulation analysis identified.

Third, competition policy needs to adapt to ecosystem-level market power. The high concentration of AI-driven financial services among a small number of bigtech platforms raises concerns about data monopolies, algorithmic collusion, and barriers to entry. We suggest that competition authorities consider:

6.3.3.1 Data access mandates

Requirements for dominant platforms to provide non-discriminatory access to anonymized, aggregated data that is essential for competitive entry.

6.3.3.2 Interoperability standards

Mandated API standards that enable users and third-party developers to switch between platforms and combine services from multiple providers.

6.3.3.3 Algorithmic transparency

Requirements for dominant platforms to disclose the key parameters and logic of AI algorithms that significantly affect market outcomes, subject to legitimate trade secret protections.

We formalize the optimal regulatory design problem under the ecological reconstruction paradigm. Let R represent the regulatory regime, and let S(R) represent social welfare as a function of the regulatory framework. The regulator's optimization problem is:

$$max_R S(R)=\int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho t}[\pi(R,t)-C(R,t)-\lambda\cdot Risk(R,t)]dt \tag{9}$$

where $\pi(R,t)$ represents innovation benefits, $C(R,t)$ represents compliance costs, $Risk(R,t)$ represents systemic risk exposure, λ is a risk aversion parameter, and ρ is the discount rate. The first-order condition for optimal regulation implies:

$$\frac{\partial\pi}{\partial R}-\frac{\partial C}{\partial R}-\lambda\frac{\partial Risk}{\partial R}=0 \tag{10}$$

This condition suggests that optimal regulation balances the marginal innovation benefits against the marginal compliance costs and systemic risk reduction. In the ecological reconstruction paradigm, the shape of these functions differs from the tool empowerment paradigm. Specifically, the marginal compliance cost function is likely steeper due to the complexity of regulating distributed, AI-mediated systems, while the marginal risk reduction function may be shallower due to the difficulty of monitoring and enforcing compliance in such systems. This implies that the optimal regulatory framework should be qualitatively different—emphasizing principles-based regulation, real-time monitoring, and adaptive enforcement—rather than a marginal adjustment of existing rules.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper has documented and analyzed the paradigm shift in fintech development driven by artificial intelligence. We have proposed a three-dimensional framework to characterize the transition from tool empowerment to ecological reconstruction, and provided empirical evidence on the trajectory, driving forces, and consequences of this paradigm shift.

Our findings reveal that the paradigm shift follows an S-curve trajectory with a critical inflection point around 2023-2024, consistent with the theoretical prediction of punctuated equilibrium in technological transitions. Institutions that have embraced the ecological reconstruction paradigm achieve substantially higher operational efficiency (28.7% lower cost ratios), risk-adjusted returns (18.2% higher Sharpe ratios), and customer engagement (41.3% higher engagement scores). The shift is characterized by the emergence of strong network effects, particularly for bigtech platforms (CLV elasticity of 1.47), the centrality of AI agents as a distinct factor of production (output elasticity of 0.238), and the transformation of financial value networks from linear chains to multi-sided ecosystems, as evidenced by the 119.4% increase in bigtech platforms' betweenness centrality.

However, the paradigm shift also creates significant regulatory gaps. Our analysis across 15 major jurisdictions reveals an average regulatory gap index of 61.3%, with algorithmic accountability (73.3%) and systemic risk management (66.7%) being the most underserved areas. No jurisdiction has achieved comprehensive coverage of all paradigm-specific risks, highlighting the need for coordinated international policy responses.

Several limitations of this study suggest directions for future research. First, our empirical analysis is limited to the 2015-2025 period, and the ecological reconstruction paradigm is still in its early stages. As the paradigm matures, longer-term data will enable more robust testing of our hypotheses and the identification of additional patterns, including potential second-order effects such as market concentration dynamics and the evolution of consumer trust in AI-mediated financial services.

Second, our analysis focuses on the supply side of financial services—financial institutions and technology providers. Future research should examine the demand-side implications, including how the paradigm shift affects consumer welfare, financial inclusion, and household financial decision-making. Preliminary evidence from our case studies suggests that the ecological reconstruction paradigm may improve financial access for underserved populations, but the distributional consequences require systematic investigation.

Third, the cross-jurisdictional variation in regulatory responses to the paradigm shift presents a natural experiment for future research. As different jurisdictions adopt different regulatory approaches to AI-driven financial services, researchers can examine the causal effects of regulatory design on innovation, stability, and consumer protection outcomes. The regulatory gap index developed in this paper provides a baseline measurement that can be updated and refined as regulatory frameworks evolve.

Fourth, the implications of the paradigm shift for financial stability warrant deeper investigation. While our simulation analysis suggests new forms of systemic risk arising from interconnected AI-financial networks, a more comprehensive modeling framework that captures the complex interactions among AI agents, financial institutions, and regulatory responses would be valuable. Agent-based modeling approaches that can simulate emergent behaviors in AI-mediated financial ecosystems represent a particularly promising methodological direction.

Finally, the ethical implications of the ecological reconstruction paradigm—including algorithmic bias, data privacy, financial exclusion, and the concentration of economic power—require interdisciplinary research that bridges finance, computer science, law, and philosophy. As AI agents assume increasingly autonomous roles in financial decision-making, ensuring that these systems operate in alignment with societal values and ethical principles becomes not merely a regulatory concern but a fundamental design challenge.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

[1] Kuhn T S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press, 1962.
[2] Berger A N. The economic effects of technological progress: Evidence from the banking industry. Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 2003, 35(2): 141-176.
[3] Lin M, Prabhala N R, Viswanathan S. Judging borrowers by the company they keep: Friendship networks and information asymmetry in online peer-to-peer lending. Management Science, 2013, 59(1): 17-35.
[4] Philippon T. The fintech opportunity. NBER Working Paper, 2016: 22476.
[5] Khandani A E, Kim A J, Lo A W. Consumer credit-risk models via machine-learning algorithms. Journal of Banking and Finance, 2010, 34(11): 2767-2787.
[6] Hendershott T, Jones C M, Menkveld A J. Does algorithmic trading improve liquidity? Journal of Finance, 2011, 66(1): 1-33.
[7] D'Acunto F, Prabhala N, Rossi A G. The promises and pitfalls of robo-advising. Review of Financial Studies, 219, 32(5): 1983-2020.
[8] Dosi G. Technological paradigms and technological trajectories: A suggested interpretation of the determinants and directions of technical change. Research Policy, 1982, 11(3): 147-162.
[9] North D C. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
[10] Amable B. Institutional complementarity and diversity of social systems of innovation and production. Review of International Political Economy, 2000, 7(4): 645-687.
[11] Rochet J C, Tirole J. Platform competition in two-sided markets. Journal of the European Economic Association, 2003, 1(4): 990-1029.
[12] Armstrong M. Competition in two-sided markets. RAND Journal of Economics, 2006, 37(3): 668-691.
[13] Jacobides M G, Cennamo C, Gawer A. Towards a theory of ecosystems. Strategic Management Journal, 2018, 39(8): 2255-2276.
[14] Brynjolfsson E, McAfee A. The business of artificial intelligence. Harvard Business Review, 2017, 95(1): 3-11.
[15] Zhu F, Iansiti M. Why some platforms thrive and others don't. Harvard Business Journal, 2019, 97(1): 118-125.