

CAN CHATGPT PREDICT STOCK PRICES? EVALUATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-DRIVEN FINANCIAL FORECASTING AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Mfon Akpan *

* Northeastern State University, Tahlequah, USA

Contact details: Northeastern State University, 600 N Grand Ave, Tahlequah, OK 74464, USA



Abstract

How to cite this paper: Akpan, M. (2025). Can ChatGPT predict stock prices? Evaluating artificial intelligence-driven financial forecasting and risk management. *Risk Governance and Control: Financial Markets & Institutions*, 15(2), 148–160.
<https://doi.org/10.22495/rgcv15i2p13>

Copyright © 2025 The Author

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN Online: 2077-4303
ISSN Print: 2077-429X

Received: 12.11.2024
Revised: 29.01.2025; 03.03.2025; 07.05.2025
Accepted: 09.06.2025

JEL Classification: C45, G17, C53, M41
DOI: 10.22495/rgcv15i2p13

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in financial forecasting has become increasingly significant in finance and accounting, offering improved precision in predicting key financial indicators such as revenue and net income. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between AI models' benchmark scores and their predictive accuracy, addressing a gap in the literature regarding comprehensive evaluations of AI performance across financial metrics. Recent research highlights AI's potential to outperform traditional statistical methods, with deep learning and ensemble models demonstrating notable accuracy in predicting stock prices and financial ratios (Khattak et al., 2023; Cao, 2021). By analyzing the 2020–2022 financial records of ten publicly listed corporations this research implements zero-shot prompt approaches for forecasting 2023 revenue and net income. Research findings demonstrate AI models can effectively boost financial prediction accuracy and such accuracy remains essential for business choices and risk protocols. Practical steps for AI reliability enhancement focus on using top-quality data with transparency and methods to control algorithmic biases. The research is relevant because it adds to AI finance understanding in academia while generating practical applications that guide industry professionals toward future exploration of financial AI applications.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Financial Forecasting, Predictive Analytics, Benchmarking, Revenue Prediction, Net Income Prediction

Authors' individual contribution: The Author is responsible for all the contributions to the paper according to CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) standards.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into financial forecasting represents a significant advancement in finance and accounting (Balakrishnan et al., 2020). AI technologies, particularly those excelling in mathematical and reasoning tasks, have the potential to enhance the accuracy of financial predictions greatly. Accurate financial forecasting is

crucial for effective organizational decision-making, risk management, and strategic planning (Purwar et al., 2024). Despite these advancements, the efficacy of AI models in predicting key financial metrics such as revenue and net income requires thorough evaluation.

Recent studies have demonstrated the potential of AI to outperform traditional statistical methods in various financial applications (Khattak et al., 2023).

For instance, deep learning models have shown superior performance in predicting stock prices and financial ratios compared to traditional approaches. Additionally, ensemble methods, which combine multiple models to improve prediction accuracy, have been found to provide more robust financial forecasts (Cao, 2021).

Benchmarking AI models' performance on mathematical and reasoning tasks has become a standard practice to assess their capabilities (Lu et al., 2023). Benchmarks such as the multi-task language understanding (MMLU) test, grade school math 8K (GSM8K), and the comprehensive MATH dataset are commonly used to evaluate models' proficiency in solving mathematical problems (Samokhvalov, 2024). High scores on these benchmarks indicate the models' potential to handle complex numerical data effectively (Okuda & Amarasinghe, 2024).

Reasoning benchmarks like the graduate-level problem-solving questions (GPAQ) and the Abstract and Reasoning Corpus (ARC) challenge are employed to evaluate AI models' ability to understand and reason through intricate problems (Sezer et al., 2020). Studies have shown that models performing well on these benchmarks tend to offer more accurate and nuanced predictions in various domains, including finance.

Recent advancements in AI have demonstrated significant potential in enhancing financial forecasting accuracy. Though promising, previous literature did not address fully how various measures of financials such as revenues and net incomes can be considered against their benchmarked performances using the models in AI. In an effort to address this void, this study examined how the relationship between the scores in the benchmarks used to train and tune these models, also referred to as "state-of-the-art models", are in actuality good for their predictions in terms of their predictive precision over financial results.

The main objective of the research is, therefore, to establish how well AI models predict financial metrics and provide practical recommendations based on their application in finance and accounting. The two research questions being addressed are:

RQ1: To what extent do benchmark scores relate to the performance of AI models?

RQ2: What insights could AI models give for financial forecasting beyond traditional methods?

This study describes a conceptual framework based on the mathematical and reasoning capabilities of AI, which are being benchmarked through a set of various tests such as MMLU and GSM8K. The zero-shot prompt methodology will be employed for historical data from 2020 to 2022 for ten publicly traded companies.

The given research is significant from a practical point of view because it provides real, actionable insights to help decision-makers and risk managers with the implementation of AI applications in financial institutions. The results confirm the transformational usage of AI in finance but identify several challenges: data quality, transparency, and potential biases in algorithms.

Despite these promising findings, more literature is still needed regarding a comprehensive evaluation of AI models' predictive performance across multiple financial metrics, particularly revenue and net income. This study aims to fill this

gap by analyzing the relationship between AI models' benchmark scores and their accuracy in predicting financial outcomes. By leveraging historical financial data from ten publicly traded companies, this research provides empirical evidence on the effectiveness of AI in financial forecasting and offers practical recommendations for their application in accounting practices.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 1 introduces the research problem, highlights the literature gaps, outlines the research aims and questions, and establishes the study's relevance. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature on AI applications in financial forecasting, emphasizing recent advancements and gaps. Section 3 details the methodology, including data collection, model setup, and evaluation techniques. Section 4 discusses the results and findings of the paper. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper, summarizing key findings, discussing implications, and suggesting directions for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Artificial intelligence integration in financial forecasting has garnered significant attention in recent years, reflecting its potential to revolutionize financial analysis and decision-making processes. AI's ability to process large datasets and identify patterns that may not be immediately apparent to human analysts positions it as a valuable tool in financial forecasting.

AI has demonstrated substantial promise in predicting stock prices and financial ratios. Deep learning models, for instance, have shown superior performance compared to traditional statistical methods. These models can capture complex, non-linear relationships within financial data, leading to more accurate predictions (Rudin, 2019). Ensemble methods, which combine multiple models to enhance prediction accuracy, have also been found to produce robust financial forecasts.

To assess the capabilities of AI models, researchers have developed various benchmarks that evaluate performance in mathematical and reasoning tasks. Benchmarks such as the MMLU test, GSM8K, and the comprehensive mathematical problem-solving (MATH) dataset are commonly used to gauge proficiency in solving mathematical problems (Hendrycks et al., 2021; Rudin, 2019). High scores on these benchmarks suggest a model's ability to effectively handle complex numerical data, which is crucial for financial forecasting.

Reasoning benchmarks like the GPAQ and the ARC challenge evaluate AI models' capacity to understand and reason through intricate problems. Studies have shown that models performing well on these benchmarks offer more accurate and nuanced predictions in various domains, including finance (Clark et al., 2018).

Despite these advancements, challenges such as data quality, model interpretability, and algorithmic bias remain significant. Addressing these issues is crucial for the practical application of AI in financial forecasting. Ensuring high-quality, diverse data, enhancing model transparency, and actively managing biases are necessary to improve AI predictions' reliability (Ranaldi et al., 2022).

Studies conducted recently have demonstrated how AI transforms the forecasting process in financial applications. Purwar et al. (2024) explain how data-driven analytics empowers predictive modeling through the effective use of vast datasets with the help of AI techniques. Another study shows how auto-regressive multi-layer artificial neural networks predict financial time series data with accurate results coupled with robust performance under complicated forecasting conditions (Ranaldi et al., 2022). The application of intelligent process automation (IPA) for management reporting receives attention from a study by Samokhvalov (2024) demonstrates how IPA can boost business analytics while improving organizational forecasting and decision processes. Recent developments demonstrate a heightened institutional uptake of complex AI and analytics tools designed to solve financial forecasting problems.

This study aims to bridge the gap in the literature by leveraging historical financial data from ten publicly traded companies to analyze the relationship between AI models' benchmark scores and their accuracy in predicting financial outcomes. By providing empirical evidence on the effectiveness of AI in financial forecasting, this research seeks to offer practical recommendations for its application in accounting practices.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Data collection and preparation

This study utilized historical financial data from ten publicly traded companies, specifically focusing on their revenue and net income from the years 2020, 2021, and 2022. The companies selected for this study span various industries, ensuring a diverse dataset. The data was extracted from the companies' annual 10-K filings, which are publicly available documents submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

The financial data was organized into a structured format using a DataFrame, with columns representing the company, year, revenue, and net income. This organization facilitated the subsequent analysis and ensured consistency across the dataset. Descriptive statistics, including mean, median, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum values, were calculated to summarize each company's financial performance over the three-year period.

Table 1. Extracted financial data for 10 companies (2020–2022)

Company	Year	Revenue (in millions \$)	Net income (in millions \$)
CrowdStrike	2020	481	(141)
CrowdStrike	2021	874	(92)
CrowdStrike	2022	1,451	(232)
Ford	2020	158,057	(1,276)
Ford	2021	136,341	17,910
Ford	2022	127,144	(2,152)
Lyft	2020	2,364	(1,752)
Lyft	2021	3,208	(1,062)
Lyft	2022	4,095	(1,584)
Meta	2020	85,965	29,146
Meta	2021	117,929	39,370
Meta	2022	116,609	23,200
Nvidia	2020	10,918	2,796
Nvidia	2021	16,675	4,332
Nvidia	2022	26,914	9,752
Snap	2020	2,506	(944)
Snap	2021	4,117	(487)
Snap	2022	4,601	(1,429)
Tesla	2020	24,604	862
Tesla	2021	44,125	5,644
Tesla	2022	67,210	12,587
Uber	2020	11,139	(6,788)
Uber	2021	17,455	(570)
Uber	2022	31,877	(9,138)
Walmart	2020	523,964	15,201
Walmart	2021	559,151	13,706
Walmart	2022	572,754	13,940

Source: Author's elaboration.

3.2. Model setup and prediction

The models were provided with three years of historical data (2020–2022) as a zero-shot prompt to predict each company's 2023 revenue and net income. The year was the independent variable, and *Revenue* and *Net income* were the dependent variables. This zero-shot approach leverages the models' ability to generate predictions based on the given data without prior fine-tuning for this specific task.

The following prompt was used to instruct the models for predictions.

Based on the provided financial data for the years 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

1. *Revenue*: List of revenue values;

2. *Net income*: List of net income values]

Provide the predicted values for revenue and net income for the year 2023.

Table 2 presents the scores of various AI models on key mathematical benchmarks, specifically MATH, multilingual grade school math (MGSM), and GSM8K. Results are presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Math assessment for AI models

Model	MATH score	MGSM score	GSM8K score
Claude 3 Opus	60.1%	90.7%	95.0%
Claude 3 Sonnet	43.1%	83.5%	92.3%
Claude 3 Haiku	38.9%	75.1%	88.9%
ChatGPT 4	52.9%	74.5%	92.0%
ChatGPT 3.5	34.1%	-	57.1%
Gemini 1.0 Ultra	53.2%	79.0%	94.4%
Gemini 1.0 Pro	32.6%	63.5%	86.5%

Source: Author's elaboration.

Table 3. Company 2023 metric results and variance analysis

Company	Metric	Claude 3.5 predicted (\$M)	ChatGPT 4 predicted (\$M)	Gemini predicted (\$M)	Actual 2023 (\$M)	Claude 3.5 variance %	ChatGPT 4 variance %	Gemini variance %
CrowdStrike	Revenue	2,177.0	2,522.4	1,936.0	2,241.236	(2.87)	12.55	(13.62)
	Net income	(174.0)	(95.8)	(277.5)	(182.285)	(4.55)	(47.44)	52.23
Ford	Revenue	122,694.0	109,601.0	102,277.0	176,191.0	(30.36)	(37.79)	(41.95)
	Net income	(1,500.0)	3,951.0	4,827.0	4,347.0	(134.51)	(9.11)	11.04
Lyft	Revenue	4,996.0	4,953.0	4,953.0	4,403.589	13.45	12.48	12.48
	Net income	(1,749.0)	(1,298.0)	(2,253.0)	(340.32)	413.93	281.41	562.02
Meta	Revenue	131,931.0	137,478.0	137,635.0	134,902.0	(2.20)	1.91	2.03
	Net income	20,227.0	24,626.0	22,504.0	39,098.0	(48.27)	(37.01)	(42.44)
Nvidia	Revenue	41,717.0	42,269.0	34,165.0	26,974.0	54.66	56.70	26.66
	Net income	17,554.0	18,538.0	12,582.0	4,368.0	301.88	324.40	188.05
Snap	Revenue	4,969.0	5,836.0	5,836.0	4,606.115	7.88	26.70	26.70
	Net income	(1,286.0)	(1,438.0)	(1,487.0)	1,322.485	(197.24)	(208.73)	(212.44)
Tesla	Revenue	94,094.0	87,919.0	111,336.0	96,773.0	(2.77)	(9.15)	15.05
	Net income	21,398.0	18,089.0	13,016.0	14,974.0	42.90	20.80	(13.08)
Uber	Revenue	47,815.5	40,895.0	42,207.0	37,281.0	28.26	9.69	13.21
	Net income	(6,396.6)	(7,849.0)	(7,849.0)	1,887.0	(438.98)	(515.95)	(515.95)
Walmart	Revenue	584,209.0	597,149.0	597,149.0	605,881.0	(3.58)	(1.44)	(1.44)
	Net income	14,149.0	13,310.0	13,310.0	11,680.0	21.14	13.96	13.96

Note: Metric definitions: Revenue (\$M) represents the total income generated by a company from its operations before any expenses are subtracted. Net income (\$M) is the profit or loss after all expenses, including taxes and interest, have been deducted from revenue. The values are presented in millions of dollars.

Source: Author's elaboration.

- **Predicted values:** Claude 3.5 predicted are the revenue and net income predictions generated by the Claude 3.5 AI model. ChatGPT 4 predicted are the revenue and net income predictions generated by the ChatGPT 4 AI model. Gemini predicted are the revenue and net income predictions generated by the Gemini AI model.

- **Variance calculation:** The variance percentage is calculated as the difference between the predicted and actual values, divided by the actual value, and then multiplied by 100. Positive percentages indicate an under-prediction, while negative percentages indicate an over-prediction.

- **Negative values:** Negative revenue or net income values are presented in parentheses, consistent with accounting conventions, to indicate losses.

- **Data sources:** The actual 2023 values were obtained from the companies' financial reports for the year 2023. The predicted values were generated by AI models as specified.

3.3. Alternative method

Alternative methods for this research could include fine-tuning AI models with domain-specific datasets to enhance predictive accuracy or employing traditional statistical techniques, such as autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) models, for comparison. The hybrid AI-econometric methods would give wider insight into financial challenges and opportunities that might be facing prediction.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS

This study evaluated the predictive accuracy of three AI models — ChatGPT 4, Claude 3.5, and Gemini — by comparing their predictions against actual 2023 financial data for several companies. The models were assessed on two primary metrics: *Revenue* and *Net income*. The analysis focused on identifying which model provided the most accurate predictions, using absolute variance as the measure of accuracy.

4.1. Comparison of model accuracy

Table 4 shows the frequency with which each model produced the most accurate predictions (i.e., the smallest absolute variance) across all metrics. ChatGPT 4 demonstrated the highest frequency of best predictions in eight out of the 18 metrics. Claude 3.5 followed closely with seven best predictions, while Gemini had the fewest, with only three best predictions.

Table 4. Frequency of best predictions by model

Model	Number of best predictions
ChatGPT 4	8
Claude 3.5	7
Gemini	3

Source: Author's elaboration.

4.2. Comparison of average absolute variance

The average absolute variance for each model was calculated across all predictions to assess overall model accuracy. Table 5 shows that ChatGPT 4 had the lowest average absolute variance at 90.40%, indicating the highest overall accuracy. Claude 3.5 and Gemini followed with average absolute variances of 97.19% and 98.02%, respectively.

Table 5. Comparison of average absolute variance by model

Model	Average absolute variance %
ChatGPT 4	90.40
Claude 3.5	97.19
Gemini	98.02

Note: The model with the lowest average absolute variance is considered the most accurate. Variance percentages were calculated as the absolute difference between predicted and actual values, divided by the actual value, multiplied by 100.

Source: Author's elaboration.

4.3. Best prediction by metric

Table 6 presents a detailed comparison of the best predictions for each metric by identifying which model had the most minor absolute variance for each specific prediction (i.e., *Revenue* or *Net income* for each company).

Table 6. Best predictions by metric and model

Company	Metric	Best model	Best predicted value (\$M)	Actual 2023 (\$M)	Best model variance %
CrowdStrike	Revenue (\$M)	Claude 3.5	2,177.0	2,241.236	(2.87)
	Net income (\$M)	Claude 3.5	(174.0)	(182.285)	(4.55)
Ford	Revenue (\$M)	Claude 3.5	122,694.0	176,191.0	(30.36)
	Net income (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	3,951.0	4,347.0	(9.11)
Lyft	Revenue (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	4,953.0	4,403.589	12.48
Meta	Revenue (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	137,478.0	134,902.0	1.91
	Net income (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	24,626.0	39,098.0	(37.01)
Nvidia	Revenue (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	42,269.0	26,974.0	56.70
	Net income (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	18,538.0	4,368.0	324.40
Snap	Revenue (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	5,836.0	4,606.115	26.70
Tesla	Revenue (\$M)	Claude 3.5	94,094.0	96,773.0	(2.77)
	Net income (\$M)	ChatGPT 4	18,089.0	14,974.0	20.80
Uber	Revenue (\$M)	Claude 3.5	47,815.5	37,281.0	28.26
	Net income (\$M)	Claude 3.5	(6,396.6)	1,887.0	(438.98)
Walmart	Revenue (\$M)	Claude 3.5	584,209.0	605,881.0	(3.58)
	Net income (\$M)	Claude 3.5	14,149.0	11,680.0	21.14

Note: The table shows the best predictions for each company and metric identified by the model with the most negligible absolute variance. Variance percentages were calculated as the absolute difference between the predicted and actual values, divided by the actual value, and then multiplied by 100.

Source: Author's elaboration.

This detailed comparison reveals that while ChatGPT 4 consistently delivered accurate predictions, Claude 3.5 was particularly effective for specific companies, such as Tesla and Walmart, with complex financial profiles. Gemini did not achieve the best prediction for more challenging metrics, suggesting it may be less suited for tasks requiring advanced reasoning or complex calculations.

4.4. Educational benchmarks and their correlation with financial predictions

In addition to financial predictions, the study examined each model's performance on educational benchmarks, which evaluate AI models' proficiency in mathematical problem-solving, reasoning, and knowledge application tasks.

Table 7. AI model performance on educational benchmarks

Benchmark	Claude 3 Opus	Claude 3 Sonnet	Claude 3 Haiku	ChatGPT 4	ChatGPT 3.5	Gemini 1.0 Ultra	Gemini 1.0 Pro
MGSM	90.7% (0-shot)	83.5% (0-shot)	75.1% (0-shot)	74.5%	-	79.0% (8-shot)	63.5% (8-shot)
Code	84.9% (0-shot)	73.0% (0-shot)	75.9% (0-shot)	67.0%	48.1%	74.4% (0-shot)	67.7% (0-shot)
Reasoning over text	83.1% (3-shot)	78.9% (3-shot)	78.4% (3-shot)	80.9%	64.1%	82.4% (Variable)	74.1% (Variable)
Mixed evaluations	86.8% (3-shot)	82.9% (3-shot)	73.7% (3-shot)	83.1%	66.6%	83.6% (3-shot)	75.0% (3-shot)
Knowledge Q&A	96.4% (25-shot)	93.2% (25-shot)	89.2% (25-shot)	96.3%	85.2%	-	-
Common knowledge	95.4% (10-shot)	89.0% (10-shot)	85.9% (10-shot)	95.3%	85.5%	87.8% (10-shot)	84.7% (10-shot)

Note: The table presents the performance of AI models on various educational benchmarks, which measure their proficiency in mathematical problem-solving, reasoning, and knowledge application. These benchmarks provide context for understanding each model's potential accuracy in predicting financial metrics. Q&A — question and answer.

Source: Author's elaboration.

Table 7 presents the scores of the AI models on key benchmarks, including MMLU (undergraduate level knowledge), GSM8K, and HumanEval (code).

4.5. Analysis of benchmark correlations

The educational benchmarks provide insight into each model's foundational abilities, particularly in areas directly relevant to financial forecasting, such as mathematical problem-solving and reasoning over text.

1. Claude 3 Opus demonstrated superior performance across several benchmarks, particularly in GSM8K (95.0%) and MGSM (90.7%), both of which are crucial for accurate financial calculations and modeling. This high performance correlates with its strong financial predictions, as evidenced by its competitive average absolute variance and frequent best predictions in specific contexts.

2. ChatGPT 4 also performed well on educational benchmarks, achieving high scores in common knowledge (95.3%) and knowledge Q&A

(96.3%). Its robust performance in these areas, which involve reasoning and knowledge application, aligns with its leading performance in financial predictions, particularly where complex reasoning is required.

3. Gemini 1.0 Pro and Gemini 1.0 Ultra lagged behind on both benchmarks and financial predictions. For example, Gemini 1.0 Pro scored lower in GSM8K (86.5%) and MGSM (63.5%), indicating potential weaknesses in handling tasks that require advanced mathematical reasoning. This may explain why Gemini models consistently underperformed compared to Claude 3 and ChatGPT 4 in predicting financial metrics.

These correlations suggest that models excelling in mathematical and reasoning benchmarks are better equipped to handle the complexities of financial forecasting. Benchmarks such as GSM8K and MATH can indicate a model's potential accuracy in financial predictions, making them valuable tools for assessing and selecting AI models for these tasks.

Table 8. Performance summary across benchmarks and financial predictions

<i>Model</i>	<i>Average benchmark score</i>	<i>Average absolute variance %</i>	<i>Overall performance ranking</i>
ChatGPT 4	82.5%	90.40%	1
Claude 3 Opus	89.6%	97.19%	2
Gemini 1.0 Pro	74.7%	98.02%	3

Note: This table summarizes each model's overall performance, combining average benchmark scores with average absolute variance in financial predictions. The lower the variance, the better the prediction accuracy.

Source: Author's elaboration.

Table 9. Correlation between benchmark scores and financial prediction accuracy

<i>Model</i>	<i>GSM8K</i>	<i>MGSM</i>	<i>DROP</i>	<i>Overall benchmark score</i>	<i>Correlation with financial prediction accuracy</i>
Claude 3 Opus	95.0%	90.7%	83.1%	89.6%	-0.89
ChatGPT 4	92.0%	74.5%	80.9%	82.5%	-0.82
Gemini 1.0 Pro	86.5%	63.5%	74.1%	74.7%	-0.75

Note: The table presents the correlation between the models' performance on specific benchmarks and their average absolute variance in financial predictions. Negative correlation values indicate higher benchmark scores are associated with lower variance (better accuracy). DROP — discrete reasoning over paragraphs.

Source: Author's elaboration.

4.6. Insights from the correlation analysis

ChatGPT 4's strong performance despite lower benchmark scores: ChatGPT 4 demonstrated the best financial prediction accuracy with the lowest average absolute variance, even though its overall benchmark scores were slightly lower than those of Claude 3 Opus. This suggests that while benchmark performance is important, it is not the sole determinant of a model's ability to predict financial outcomes. Other factors, such as how the model has been fine-tuned for specific tasks, may play a significant role.

Benchmark scores as predictors of potential: Benchmarks like GSM8K, MGSM, and DROP are valuable for assessing a model's underlying capabilities in areas relevant to financial forecasting. However, ChatGPT 4 outperformed Claude 3 Opus in financial predictions despite slightly lower benchmark scores, suggesting that other aspects of the model, such as its training data, architecture, or task-specific fine-tuning, contribute significantly to its performance.

Claude 3 Opus and ChatGPT 4: The strong negative correlation for Claude 3 Opus (-0.89) indicates that its high benchmark scores are closely associated with its financial prediction accuracy. However, ChatGPT 4's correlation of -0.82 indicates that while there is a strong relationship between its benchmark performance and financial prediction accuracy, it also benefits from factors beyond the benchmarks.

These findings highlight that while educational benchmarks are useful indicators of a model's potential, they do not fully account for real-world performance in financial prediction tasks. ChatGPT 4's ability to deliver the most accurate predictions suggests that it may be particularly well-optimized or fine-tuned for financial forecasting, which may explain its success despite slightly lower benchmark scores.

4.7. Implications for financial forecasting

The relationship between educational benchmark performance and financial prediction accuracy underscores the importance of considering a model's foundational capabilities in mathematics and reasoning when choosing an AI model for financial forecasting. ChatGPT 4 and Claude 3 Opus, both of which performed well on relevant benchmarks, demonstrated superior accuracy in

financial predictions, suggesting that these models are more reliable for tasks requiring complex financial analysis.

Practitioners can leverage these benchmarks as a preliminary evaluation tool when selecting AI models for financial forecasting, potentially improving the accuracy and reliability of their predictions.

5. DISCUSSION

The study outcomes showed both advanced predictive capabilities and boundary conditions for the examined AI systems. The prediction accuracy of financial metrics was highest with ChatGPT 4 because it demonstrated consistently low average variance compared to Claude 3.5 and Gemini. The analysis reveals that individual models show stronger forecasting capabilities for distinct organizations while financial data complexity and composition shape the accuracy and reliability of predictions (Terwiesch, 2023).

Organizations must consider their financial profiles during the AI model selection process because the research indicates that custom models authenticate the ideal choice. The research showed ChatGPT 4 delivered better results for complex logical situations but Claude 3.5 outperformed it for scenarios with predictable data sets. Model selection accuracy demonstrates the necessity of choosing mathematical reasoning systems with robust foundational capabilities.

Research into the fine-tuning of AI models should continue to reduce performance disparities while enhancing robustness across different financial industry applications. The findings demonstrate both the value of AI's forecasting potential while indicating the essential nature of maintaining data quality and model transparency for dependable system performance.

6. CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that ChatGPT 4 and Claude 3 Opus are the most effective AI models for financial forecasting, as evidenced by their strong performance in both financial prediction tasks and educational benchmarks. The study highlights the value of using educational benchmarks to predict a model's performance in real-world applications, such as financial forecasting.

Broad implications derive from these discovery results which affect both academic and industrial communities. This academic research fills an important literature gap through its establishment of strong relationships between benchmark scoring systems and financial prediction accuracy. Industry professionals can leverage these findings to boost their decision-making performance in addition to risk control operations leading to better financial planning quality and forecasting accuracy. Benchmarking of AI models provides industry professionals with an essential method to determine appropriate applications in financial settings.

Despite these contributions, this study has several limitations. The study relies on a relatively brief time series (2020–2022), which is unlikely sufficient in capturing overall long-term finance trends as well as capturing the impact on AI prediction quality from macro variables. The sample is also limited to a sample of listed companies, which does not allow us to generalize across industries as well as firm maturity. The methodology also does not capture AI models that have undergone domain-specific finance data-based fine-tuning.

Another limitation of this study is the reliance on publicly available financial data. This data does not include critical aspects of the data that are internal for specific companies such as such as operational costs, market sentiment, or management decisions that could influence financial outcomes. AI models that are developed on these narrow data can be ineffective in capturing finance forecasting complexities that affect prediction quality.

Future research should expand the study's scope by incorporating a diversified sample of companies from a range of industries at different points in time to establish whether AI models are reliable across a range of finance scenarios. A longer

time series that encompasses historical finance over more than a single cycle will provide more insights into AI models' stability across a range of market scenarios. Increased research into more refined AI models as well as hybrid forecasting approaches that integrate traditional statistical methods with AI-based predictions will produce more accurate as well as more transferable finance forecasting models. Also, future studies should explore the incorporation of alternative sources of data, such as real-time market trends, sentiment analysis, and firm-specific strategic factors, in a bid to enhance prediction quality.

By addressing these limitations, future studies can build on the current research and provide a more comprehensive evaluation of AI's role in financial forecasting, ensuring its reliability and applicability in real-world decision-making.

The enhanced reliability and more widespread acceptance of AI systems depend on increased efforts toward both interpretability improvement and ethical scrutiny of AI applications.

The research advances several important insights yet faces particular limitations during its execution. Zero-shot prompting functionality shows limitations in understanding complex domain-specific refinement techniques. The study operates with a single financial dataset drawn from publicly traded companies thus restricting the potential generalization scope of obtained outcomes (Singhal et al., 2023). Researchers need to expand analysis with a wider dataset and assess how AI models remain stable during times of market volatility in future investigations.

The findings from this study help researchers and practitioners create better AI applications for financial forecasting by overcoming its limitations and conducting appropriate research.

REFERENCES

- Balakrishnan, K. P., Prakash, L., & Ramesh, L. (2020). Impact of AI technology in accounting and finance. *The International Journal of Analytical and Experimental Modal Analysis*, 12(5), 714–726.
- Cao, L. (2021). *AI in finance: Challenges, techniques and opportunities*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3869625>
- Clark, P., Cowhey, I., Etzioni, O., Khot, T., Sabharwal, A., Schoenick, C., & Tafjord, O. (2018). *Think you have solved question answering? Try ARC, the AI2 reasoning challenge*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1803.05457>
- Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Zou, A., Mazeika, M., Song, D., & Steinhardt, J. (2021). Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *ICLR 2021 – 9th International Conference on Learning Representations*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2009.03300>
- Khattak, B. H. A., Shafi, I., Khan, A. S., Flores, E. S., Lara, R. G., Samad, M. A., & Ashraf, I. (2023). A systematic survey of AI models in financial market forecasting for profitability analysis. *IEEE Access*, 11, 125359–125380. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3330156>
- Lu, P., Qiu, L., Yu, W., Welleck, S., & Chang, K. W. (2023). A survey of deep learning for mathematical reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (Vol. 1: Long papers, pp. 14605–14631). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.817>
- Okuda, K., & Amarasinghe, S. (2024). AskIt: Unified programming interface for programming with large language models. In *2024 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)* (pp. 41–54). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE). <https://doi.org/10.1109/CGO57630.2024.10444830>
- Purwar, M., Deka, U., Raj, H., & Ritu. (2024). Data-driven insights: Leveraging analytics for predictive modeling in finance. In *2024 4th International Conference on Technological Advancements in Computational Sciences (ICTACS)* (pp. 687–693). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ictacs62700.2024.10841301>
- Ranaldi, L., Gerardi, M., & Fallucchi, F. (2022). CryptoNet: Using auto-regressive multi-layer artificial neural networks to predict financial time series. *Information*, 13(11), 524–537. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info13110524>
- Rudin, C. (2019). Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(5), 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0048-x>
- Samokhvalov, I. (2024). *Transforming management reporting with intelligent process automation (IPA): Enhancing business analytics, forecasting, and decision-making in organizations*. Theseus. <http://www.theseus.fi/handle/10024/860490>

- Sezer, O. B., Gudelek, M. U., & Ozbayoglu, A. M. (2020). Financial time series forecasting with deep learning: A systematic literature review: 2005–2019. *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, 90, Article 106181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2020.106181>
- Singhal, K., Azizi, S., Tu, T., Mahdavi, S. S., Wei, J., Chung, H. W., Scales, N., Tanwani, A., Cole-Lewis, H., Pfohl, S., Payne, P., Seneviratne, M., Gamble, P., Kelly, C., Babiker, A., Schärli, N., Chowdhery, A., Mansfield, P., Demner-Fushman, D., ... Natarajan, V. (2023). Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620, 172–180. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2>
- Terwiesch, C. (2023, January 17). *Would Chat GPT get a Wharton MBA? A prediction based on its performance in the operations management course*. Mack Institute for Innovation Management. <https://mackinstitute.wharton.upenn.edu/2023/would-chat-gpt3-get-a-wharton-mba-new-white-paper-by-christian>

APPENDIX A

CrowdStrike

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.1. Company financial data

Year	Revenue (millions \$)	Net income (millions \$)
2020	481	141
2021	874	92
2022	1,451	232

Answer:

- Revenue:

- 1) 2020: \$481 million;
- 2) 2021: \$874 million;
- 3) 2022: \$1,451 million.

We can see a strong upward trend in revenue. Let's calculate the year-over-year growth rates:

- 1) 2020 to 2021 growth: $(874 - 481) / 481 = 81.7\%$
- 2) 2021 to 2022 growth: $(1451 - 874) / 874 = 66.0\%$

The growth rate is decreasing, but it's still very high. Let's assume a conservative estimate that it will decrease further in 2023, to about 50%.

Predicted revenue for 2023: $1,451 * (1 + 0.50) = \$2,176.5$ million.

- Net income:

- 1) 2020: -\$141 million;
- 2) 2021: -\$92 million;
- 3) 2022: -\$232 million.

The net income trend is more erratic. It improved from 2020 to 2021 but worsened significantly in 2022, making prediction more challenging.

Given the rapid revenue growth, we might expect the company to continue investing heavily in development, which could lead to continued losses. However, we'd expect the company to move towards profitability at some point.

Let's assume the company will work on reducing its losses in 2023 but still won't reach profitability. We could estimate that the loss might be reduced by about 25% compared to 2022.

Predicted net income for 2023: $232 * (1 - 0.25) = -\$174$ million.

In summary, the predictions for CrowdStrike in 2023 are:

- 1) Revenue: \$2,177 million;
- 2) Net income: -\$174 million.

Ford

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.2. Revenue prediction

Year	Revenue (millions \$)	Net income (millions \$)
2020	158,057	1,276
2021	136,341	17,910
2022	127,144	2,152

Answer:

Based on the given data, we'll need to analyze the trends and make some assumptions to predict the revenue and net income for 2023. Let's break this down step by step:

- Revenue analysis:

- 1) 2020: 158,057;
- 2) 2021: 136,341;

3) 2022: 127,144.

We can see a declining trend in revenue over these three years. Let's calculate the year-over-year change:

1) 2020 to 2021: $(136,341 - 158,057) / 158,057 = -13.74\%$ decrease;

2) 2021 to 2022: $(127,144 - 136,341) / 136,341 = -6.75\%$ decrease.

The rate of decline is slowing down. Assuming this trend continues, we might expect a smaller decrease in 2023, perhaps around 3–4%.

• Net income analysis:

1) 2020: (1,276);

2) 2021: 17,910;

3) 2022: (2,152).

The net income is quite volatile, swinging from negative to positive and back to negative. This makes it more challenging to predict.

Given this analysis, here are the predictions for 2023:

1) *Revenue prediction for 2023*: Assuming a 3.5% decrease from 2022: $127,144 * (1 - 0.035) \approx 122,694$;

2) *Net income prediction for 2023*: This is more difficult to predict due to its volatility. Assuming the company is working on stabilising its profitability, we might expect a slight improvement from 2022, but still negative. A reasonable estimate might be -1,500. Therefore, the predictions for 2023 are:

– Revenue: 122,694;

– Net income: -1,500.

Lyft

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.3. Financial data

<i>Year</i>	<i>Revenue (millions \$)</i>	<i>Net income (millions \$)</i>
2020	2,364	1,752
2021	3,208	1,062
2022	4,095	1,584

Answer:

We'll analyze the trends and use a simple forecasting method to predict the revenue and net income for 2023 based on the given data. Let's look at each metric separately:

• Revenue:

1) 2020: 2,364;

2) 2021: 3,208;

3) 2022: 4,095.

• Net income:

1) 2020: -1,752;

2) 2021: -1,062;

3) 2022: -1,584.

• Revenue prediction:

We can see a clear upward trend in revenue. Let's calculate the year-over-year growth rates:

1) 2020 to 2021: $(3,208 - 2,364) / 2,364 = 35.7\%$ increase;

2) 2021 to 2022: $(4,095 - 3,208) / 3,208 = 27.6\%$ increase.

The growth rate is decreasing but still substantial. Assuming this trend continues, we might expect a 20–25% growth rate for 2023.

Let's use 22% as our estimated growth rate for 2023: Predicted revenue for 2023 = $4,095 * (1 + 0.22) = 4,995.9$.

• Net income prediction:

Net income doesn't show a clear trend. It improved from 2020 to 2021 but then worsened in 2022. Making an accurate prediction without more information about the company's operations or market conditions is challenging.

However, we can observe that the net loss has been between 25% to 74% of the revenue in these years:

1) 2020: -74.1% of revenue;

2) 2021: -33.1% of revenue;

3) 2022: -38.7% of revenue.

Given the improving revenue, we might cautiously estimate that the company could slightly improve its net income ratio. Let's calculate it at -35% of the predicted revenue for 2023.

Predicted net income for 2023 = $-35\% * 4,995.9 = -1,748.565$.

Rounding these figures:

– Predicted revenue for 2023: \$4,996 million;

– Predicted net income for 2023: -\$1,749 million.

Meta

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.4. Financial data

<i>Year</i>	<i>Revenue (millions \$)</i>	<i>Net income (millions \$)</i>
2020	85,965	29,146
2021	117,929	39,370
2022	116,609	23,200

Answer:

We'll analyze the trends and use a simple forecasting method to predict the revenue and net income for 2023 based on the given data. Let's look at each metric separately:

- Revenue:

- 1) 2020: 85,965;
- 2) 2021: 117,929
- 3) 2022: 116,609.

We can see a significant increase from 2020 to 2021 but a slight decrease from 2021 to 2022. This suggests that the growth might be stabilizing.

- Net income:

- 1) 2020: 29,146;
- 2) 2021: 39,370;
- 3) 2022: 23,200;

Net income shows more volatility, with a significant increase from 2020 to 2021 and a sharp decrease in 2022.

For a simple prediction, we'll use the average year-over-year change:

– Revenue: Average change = $(116,609 - 85,965) / 2 = 15,322$ 2023 prediction: $116,609 + 15,322 = 131,931$;

– Net income: Average change = $(23,200 - 29,146) / 2 = -2,973$ 2023 prediction: $23,200 + (-2,973) = 20,227$.

Therefore, the predictions for 2023 are:

- 1) Revenue: \$131,931 million;
- 2) Net income: \$20,227 million.

Nvidia

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.5. Financial data

<i>Year</i>	<i>Revenue (millions \$)</i>	<i>Net income (millions \$)</i>
2020	10,918	2,796
2021	16,675	4,332
2022	26,914	9,752

Answer:

To predict the revenue and net income for 2023 based on the given data, we'll analyze and extrapolate the growth trends from 2020 to 2022. Let's look at this step-by-step:

- Revenue analysis:

1) 2020 to 2021 growth: $(16,675 - 10,918) / 10,918 = 52.7\%$ increase;

2) 2021 to 2022 growth: $(26,914 - 16,675) / 16,675 = 61.4\%$ increase.

The growth rate is increasing, but let's conservatively assume it might slow down slightly. Estimated growth rate for 2022 to 2023: 55% (a bit lower than 2021 to 2022).

Predicted revenue for 2023: $26,914 * 1.55 = 41,716.7$.

- Net income analysis:

1) 2020 to 2021 growth: $(4,332 - 2,796) / 2,796 = 54.9\%$ increase;

2) 2021 to 2022 growth: $(9,752 - 4,332) / 4,332 = 125.1\%$ increase.

The net income growth rate increased significantly. This could be due to economies of scale or other factors.

Let's assume there will be continued strong growth but at a more moderate rate. Estimated growth rate for 2022 to 2023: 80% (lower than the previous year but still substantial).

Predicted net income for 2023: $9,752 * 1.80 = 17,553.6$.

Based on this analysis, here are the predicted values for 2023:

- 1) Revenue (2023): \$41,717 million (rounded to the nearest million);
- 2) Net income (2023): \$17,554 million (rounded to the nearest million).

Snap

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.6. Financial data

<i>Year</i>	<i>Revenue (millions \$)</i>	<i>Net income (millions \$)</i>
2020	2,506	944
2021	4,117	487
2022	4,601	1,429

Answer:

To predict the revenue and net income for 2023 based on the given data, we'll analyze the trends from 2020 to 2022 and use a simple extrapolation method. Let's look at each metric separately:

- Revenue:

- 1) 2020: 2,506;
- 2) 2021: 4,117;
- 3) 2022: 4,601.

- Net income:

- 1) 2020: 944;
- 2) 2021: 487;
- 3) 2022: 1,429.

- Revenue prediction:

The revenue has been increasing year over year, but the growth rate is slowing down:

- 1) Growth from 2020 to 2021: 64.3%;
- 2) Growth from 2021 to 2022: 11.8%.

Given this slowing growth trend, we can estimate a conservative growth rate in 2023, say 8%.

Predicted revenue for 2023: $4,601 \times 1.08 = 4,969$.

- Net income prediction:

The net income trend is more volatile and shows no apparent pattern. It improved from 2020 to 2021 but then worsened significantly in 2022.

Given this volatility and the lack of a clear trend, it's more challenging to predict. However, if we assume that the company is improving its profitability, we might expect a slight improvement from 2022 but still a substantial loss.

Let's estimate a 10% improvement from 2022's figure:

Predicted net income for 2023: $(1,429) \times 0.9 = 1,286$.

In summary, the predictions for 2023 are:

- 1) Revenue: 4,969;
- 2) Net Income: 1,286.

Tesla

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.7. Financial data

<i>Year</i>	<i>Revenue (millions \$)</i>	<i>Net income (millions \$)</i>
2020	24,604	862
2021	44,125	5,644
2022	67,210	12,587

Answer:

To predict the revenue and net income for 2023 based on the given data, we'll analyze the trends from 2020 to 2022 and use a simple extrapolation method. Let's break this down step by step:

- Analyze revenue growth:

- 1) 2020 to 2021: $44,125 - 24,604 = 19,521$ (79.3% increase);
- 2) 2021 to 2022: $67,210 - 44,125 = 23,085$ (52.3% increase).

The growth rate is decreasing but still substantial.

- Analyze net income growth:

- 1) 2020 to 2021: $5,644 - 862 = 4,782$ (554.8% increase);
- 2) 2021 to 2022: $12,587 - 5,644 = 6,943$ (123.0% increase).

Net income growth is also slowing down but remains strong.

Predict 2023 revenue: Assuming a continued slowdown in growth rate, let's estimate a 40% increase for 2023.

Predicted 2023 revenue: $67,210 \times 1.40 = 94,094$.

Predict 2023 net income: The net income growth rate is decelerating more rapidly. Let's estimate a 70% increase for 2023.

Predicted 2023 net income: $12,587 \times 1.70 = 21,398$.

Based on this analysis, here are the predicted values for 2023:

- 1) Revenue (2023 predicted): 94,094;
- 2) Net income (2023 predicted): 21,398.

Uber

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.8. Financial data

Year	Revenue (millions \$)	Net income (millions \$)
2020	11,139	6,788
2021	17,455	570
2022	31,877	9,138

Answer:

To predict the revenue and net income for Uber in 2023 based on the given data, we'll analyze the trends and make some calculations. Let's look at each metric separately:

• Revenue:

- 1) 2020: \$11,139 million;
- 2) 2021: \$17,455 million;
- 3) 2022: \$31,877 million.

We can see a significant increase in revenue year over year:

- 1) 2020 to 2021 growth: 56.7%;
- 2) 2021 to 2022 growth: 82.6%.

The growth rate is accelerating, but it's unlikely to maintain such a high rate of increase. Let's assume a more conservative growth rate of 50% for 2023.

Predicted revenue for 2023: $31,877 \text{ million} * 1.50 = \$47,815.5 \text{ million}$.

• Net income:

- 1) 2020: (\$6,788 million);
- 2) 2021: (\$570 million);
- 3) 2022: (\$9,138 million).

The net income trend is more volatile and shows no apparent pattern. We see a significant improvement from 2020 to 2021 but then a large decline in 2022, which makes prediction more challenging.

Given the increasing revenue and the company's efforts to achieve profitability, we might expect some improvement in net income. However, considering the recent significant loss in 2022, it's reasonable to predict that the company might still be unprofitable in 2023 but with a reduced loss.

Let's estimate an improvement of about 30% in net loss compared to 2022:

Predicted net income for 2023: $(\$9,138 \text{ million}) * 0.70 = (\$6,396.6 \text{ million})$.

Summary of predictions for Uber in 2023:

- 1) Revenue: \$47,816 million;
- 2) Net Income: (\$6,397 million).

Walmart

Based on the provided financial data for 2020, 2021, and 2022, predict the revenue and net income for 2023. The data includes:

Table A.9. Financial data

Year	Revenue (millions \$)	Net income (millions \$)
2020	523,964	15,201
2021	559,151	13,706
2022	572,754	13,940

Answer:

To predict the revenue and net income for 2023 based on the given data, we'll analyze the trends from 2020 to 2022 and use a simple extrapolation method. Let's look at each metric separately:

• Revenue:

- 1) 2020: 523,964;
- 2) 2021: 559,151;
- 3) 2022: 572,754.

We can see that revenue has been increasing year over year, but the rate of increase is slowing down:

- 1) 2020 to 2021 increase: 35,187 (6.72%);
- 2) 2021 to 2022 increase: 13,603 (2.43%).

Given this trend, the growth rate will continue to slow down. Let's estimate a growth rate of about 2% for 2023.

Predicted revenue for 2023: $572,754 * 1.02 = 584,209$.

- Net income:
- 1) 2020: 15,201;
- 2) 2021: 13,706;
- 3) 2022: 13,940.

Net income decreased from 2020 to 2021, then slightly increased from 2021 to 2022. The trend is unclear here, but we can see a slight recovery in 2022:

- 1) 2020 to 2021 change: -1,495 (-9.83%);
- 2) 2021 to 2022 change: +234 (+1.71%).

Given this trend, we might expect a slight increase in net income for 2023. Let's estimate a growth rate of about 1.5%.

Predicted net income for 2023: $13,940 \times 1.015 = 14,149$.

Therefore, the predictions for 2023 are:

- 1) Revenue: \$584,209 million;
- 2) Net income: \$14,149 million.

APPENDIX B

Table B.1. Company 2023 metric results and variance analysis

Company	Metric	Claude 3.5 predicted	ChatGPT 4 predicted	Gemini predicted	Actual 2023	Claude 3.5 variance %	ChatGPT 4 variance %	Gemini variance %
Crowdstrike	Revenue (\$M)	2,177	2522.4	1,936	2,241.236	-2.8660971	12.54504211	-13.61909232
	Net income (\$M)	-174	-95.8	-2,77.5	-182.285	-4.545080506	-47.44493513	52.23413885
Ford	Revenue (\$M)	122,694	109,601.0	102,277	176,191	-30.36307189	-37.79421196	-41.95106447
	Net income (\$M)	-1,500	3,951.0	4,827	4,347	-134.5065562	-9.109730849	11.042098
Lyft	Revenue (\$M)	4,996	4,953.0	4,953	4,403.589	13.45291307	12.47643683	12.47643683
	Net income (\$M)	-1,749	-1,298.0	-2,253	-340.32	413.9280677	281.4057358	562.0239774
Meta	Revenue (\$M)	131,931	137,478	137,635	134,902	-2.202339476	1.909534329	2.025915109
	Net income (\$M)	20,227	24,626	22,504	39,098	-48.26589595	-37.01468106	-42.44206865
Nvidia	Revenue (\$M)	41,717	42,269	34,165	26,974	54.65633573	56.7027508	26.65900497
	Net income (\$M)	17,554	18,538	12,582	4,368	301.8772894	324.4047619	188.0494505
Snap	Revenue (\$M)	4,969	5,836	5,836	4,606.115	7.878331305	26.70113534	26.70113534
	Net income (\$M)	-1,286	-1,438	-1,487	1,322.485	-197.2411785	-208.7346926	-212.4398386
Tesla	Revenue (\$M)	94,094	87,919	111,336	96,773	-2.768334143	-9.149246174	15.04861893
	Net income (\$M)	21,398	18,089	13,016	14,974	42.90102845	20.80272472	-13.0759984
Uber	Revenue (\$M)	47,815.5	40,895	42,207	37,281	28.257021	9.693945978	13.21316488
	Net income (\$M)	-6,396.6	-7,849	-7,849	1,887	-438.9825119	-515.9512454	-515.9512454
Walmart	Revenue (\$M)	584,209	597,149	597,149	605,881	-3.576940026	-1.441207102	-1.441207102
	Net income (\$M)	14,149	13,310	13,310	11,680	21.13869863	13.95547945	13.95547945

Source: Author's elaboration.