Ensemble Learning Based Models and Deep Learning Model for Credit Prediction, Case Study: Taiwan, China

Mingyuan Han回a

College of Alameda, 555 Ralph Appezzato, Memorial Pkwy, Alameda, CA 94501, U.S.A.

Keywords: Credit Prediction, Data Imbalance Processing, Machine Learning Model.

Abstract: As time progresses, credit prediction has become increasingly critical for banks and financial institutions. It serves to optimize fund allocation and mitigate the risk of non-performing loans, thereby contributing to the stability of the financial system. This study specifically delves into the credit market of Taiwan. Given the inherent incompleteness of the dataset, preprocessing methods are imperative to address data imbalances. Techniques such as oversampling, undersampling, and ensemble methods are employed for this purpose.Six machine learning models are utilized to train the system for credit prediction: Logistic Regression (LR), Decision Tree (DT), Random Forest (RF), Gradient Boosting Decision Trees (GBDT), Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost), and Deep Neural Network (DNN). To assess the performance of these models, cross-validation and index evaluation methods are employed to ensure the robustness and reliability of the findings.Upon comparison of five performance metrics across the six models, XGBoost emerges as the most effective model for credit prediction in this context..

1 INTRODUCTION

After the coronavirus pandemic, much of the world's businesses and individuals are experiencing financial strain. In such circumstances, credit risk has escalated. Simultaneously, the world is entering an era characterized by the continuous development of information technologies (Ma, 2017), offering expanded opportunities for capital transactions. Consequently, banks and other financing institutions must ensure that borrowers do not default to safeguard their investments (Zhang, 2018). Overall, credit prediction is assuming heightened significance within the financial system.

Over the past decade, banks have dedicated substantial resources to developing internal risk models to more effectively assess the financial risks they encounter and allocate requisite economic capital (Kwon, 2019; Wang, 2019). These endeavors have garnered recognition and encouragement from banking regulators. Notably, the Market Risk Amendment (MRA) of the 1997 Basel Capital Accord formally integrated banks' internal market risk models into their regulatory capital computations (Zhang, 2020). Credit risk assessment plays a pivotal role in appropriately assisting financial institutions in crafting banking policies and business strategies.

In recent years, the proliferation of social lending platforms has disrupted traditional credit risk assessment services (Liu, 2020; Zhang, 2020; Chen, 2021). These platforms facilitate direct interaction between lenders and borrowers, bypassing financial intermediaries. They notably aid borrowers in fundraising, enabling participation from lenders of various numbers and sizes. However, the inexperience of lenders and the absence or ambiguity of information concerning borrowers' credit histories may heighten the risk associated with social lending platforms, underscoring the need for accurate credit risk scoring.

To overcome these problems, the credit risk assessment problem for financial operations is often modeled as a binary problem based on debt repayment, so appropriate machine learning techniques can be utilized (Xu, 2021;Chen,2021).

Han, M.

Ensemble Learning Based Models and Deep Learning Model for Credit Prediction, Case Study: Taiwan, China.

DOI: 10.5220/0012910900004508

Paper published under CC license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

In Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Engineering Management, Information Technology and Intelligence (EMITI 2024), pages 115-121 ISBN: 978-989-758-713-9

Proceedings Copyright © 2024 by SCITEPRESS - Science and Technology Publications, Lda.

^a https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0034-0068

2 METHODOLOGIES

This research followed a structured approach consisting of five main steps. Initially, a preliminary analysis and visualization of the dataset were conducted. The second step involved data preprocessing to address any inconsistencies or imbalances. Subsequently, the third step focused on feature engineering to enhance the dataset's predictive capabilities. The fourth step entailed selecting the appropriate machine learning model for training. This study employed six models: Logistic Regression (LR), Decision Tree (DT), Random Forest (RF), Gradient Boosting Decision Trees (GBDT), Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost), and Deep Neural Network (DNN).

The final step encompassed a comparative analysis of the model performance using five evaluation indicators, leading to the identification of the most suitable model. The workflow of the research is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

2.1 Data Set Exploration

In the first step of this research was look at the first few lines of the dataset to understand the basic structure, features, and samples of the data. And then use Python to find basic descriptive statistics of the statistics, such as mean, median, standard difference, etc., in order to get a preliminary understanding of the distribution of the data. At the same time, it is also necessary to draw some statistical charts and correlation heat maps of data characteristics. The specific content of chart analysis will be shown in the Experimental Setup and Results of the fourth part of the paper.

2.2 Data Processing

Taking the data collected in questionnaire survey as an example, respondents often fill in some survey questions with blanks. This can also simply explain that data sets generally have certain problems of missing and inauthentic. In order to avoid the impact of numerical missing and data anomalies on the efficiency and performance of machine learning, it is necessary to preprocess the data set. In this study, oversampling synthesis, oversampling and undersampling were used to deal with data imbalance. The data set consists of 30,000 observations. Use 70% as the training set and 30% as the test set after the data preprocessing step.

2.3 Feature Engineering

Feature engineering is an important part of machine learning. This includes the selection of feature values and the labeling of features. In this research, the data set has 24 eigenvalues, such as age, sex, education and so on. Some of these features have little relevance to credit forecasting research, so it is necessary to do some feature selection in the research. The second is the feature tag coding. Some feature types in the data set represent high-dimensional information. Feature screening can reduce the noise generated by low correlation feature values in machine learning, so as to improve research efficiency and accuracy. High dimensional information needs to be reduced, which is simply to use different numbers to represent different features in the same feature type.

2.4 Model Selection and Construction

In this study, the feature types include both highdimensional information and continuous data such as credit card consumption amount and repayment amount. So the six machine learning models used in the study also include linear model. In order to make more comprehensive predictions of credit, the six models used in this survey include linear models, tree models (including three ensemble learning methods) and deep learning models. Ensemble learning is a machine learning model that combines multiple learners. The performance and generalization ability of the whole model can be improved by the prediction of multiple learners. By incorporating multi-level nonlinear learning, deep neural networks can autonomously acquire intricate feature representations. This model proves highly effective for credit forecasting, particularly when considering multiple criteria.

• Linear Regression

Linear regression is based on the basic assumption that there is a linear relationship between input features and output targets. This means that output targets can be predicted by linear combinations of



Figure 1: Research Workflow(Photo/Picture credit :Original).

input features. In this study, scikit-learn library was used to complete the training of regression models

• Decision Tree

A Decision Tree is a supervised learning algorithm for classification and regression problems. It divides the data recursively to generate a tree structure, with each leaf node representing a category or a value. Decision trees are a non-parametric learning method that makes no assumptions about the distribution of data and is suitable for all types of data. The main advantage of decision trees is that they are easy to understand and interpret, but also easy to overfit.

Random Forest

Random Forest is an ensemble learning method that improves prediction performance by building multiple decision trees and integrating them together. In the process of building each tree, the random forest will randomly sample the original data set with a return to generate different training data to increase the diversity of the model. Random forest performs well in dealing with high-dimensional data, largescale data and high complexity problems, and does not require too much tuning. It is a powerful machine learning model that is widely used for tasks such as classification, regression, and feature selection.

•Gradient Boosting Decision Tree

GBDT is a powerful machine learning algorithm based on ensemble learning. Its integrated learner is the same as RF, and it improves prediction performance by training multiple decision trees in serial. GBDT adopts a sequential training strategy, in which each decision tree is trained according to the residuals of the previous tree to gradually reduce the residuals of the model. The task of each decision tree is to learn the residual predicted by the previous tree (the difference between the actual value and the current model predicted value) in order to reduce the error of the overall model. As a result, GBDT can handle mixed data and is robust to missing values.

●XGBoost

XGBoost is a powerful gradient lift tree model, whose operation steps include initializing the base model, iteratively building a new decision tree to fit the residuals of the previous round of models, and gradually integrating multiple trees to improve performance. By controlling tree complexity through regularization techniques, XGBoost excels in handling structured data, large data sets, and challenging tasks, becoming one of the algorithms of choice in machine learning competitions and realworld applications.

•Deep Neural Network

Deep neural network is a flexible and powerful deep learning model, whose operation steps include defining the network structure, initializing the parameters, calculating the model output through forward propagation, updating the parameters through backpropagation, and continuously improving the model fitting ability through multiple iterations of training. DNN is suitable for processing high-dimensional, non-linear and large-scale data, and is widely used in image recognition, natural language processing and complex pattern recognition, with powerful feature learning and representation learning capabilities.

3 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND RESULTS

3.1 Data Set Overview

This research uses the credit records of Taiwan as the data set. The selected dataset contains a total of 30,000 observations with 24 feature types (shown in Table 1).

| Feature abbreviation | Feature | data type | data range | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| LIMIT_BAL | Line of Credit | Discrete Type | Ten Thousand-A Million | | | | | |
| SEX | Gender | Discrete Type | 1,2 | | | | | |
| EDUCATION | Schooling | Discrete Type | 0,1,2,3,4,5,6 | | | | | |
| MARRIAGE | Marital Status | Discrete Type | 0,1,2,3 | | | | | |
| AGE | Age | Discrete Type | 2179 | | | | | |
| PAY_0-PAY_6 | Repayment Times | Discrete Type | -28 | | | | | |
| default payment next month | Default next month | Discrete Type | 0,1 | | | | | |

| Tabla | 1. | Deseri | ntion | of | faatura | tumor |
|-------|----|--------|-------|----|---------|--------|
| rable | 1: | Descri | puon | 01 | leature | types. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.0 |
|---------------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|---|------|
| LIMIT_BAL - | 1.00 | 0.02 | -0.22 | -0.11 | 0.14 | -0.27 | -0.30 | -0.28 | -0.27 | -0.25 | -0.23 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.34 | 0.36 | -0.15 | | 1.0 |
| SEX - | 0.02 | 1.00 | 0.01 | -0.03 | | | | | | | | -0.04 | -0.04 | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 | -0.04 | | |
| EDUCATION - | | 0.01 | 1.00 | -0.14 | 0.18 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | | | | | 0.03 | | |
| MARRIAGE - | -0.11 | -0.03 | -0.14 | 1.00 | -0.41 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | -0.00 | 0.00 | -0.00 | -0.00 | -0.00 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.02 | | 0.8 |
| AGE - | 0.14 | -0.09 | 0.18 | -0.41 | 1.00 | -0.04 | -0.05 | | | -0.06 | -0.05 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 | | |
| PAY_0 - | -0.27 | | 0.11 | 0.02 | | 1.00 | 0.67 | 0.57 | 0.54 | 0.50 | 0.47 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.27 | | | | | | | 0.32 | | |
| PAY_2 - | | | 0.12 | 0.02 | | | 1.00 | 0.77 | 0.66 | | 0.58 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.35 | -0.08 | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.00 | 0.26 | - | 0.6 |
| PAY_3 - | | | 0.11 | 0.03 | | 0.57 | 0.77 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.69 | | 0.37 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.10 | -0.07 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.24 | | |
| PAY_4 - | | | 0.11 | 0.03 | | 0.54 | | 0.78 | 1.00 | 0.82 | 0.72 | 0.36 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.07 | 0.11 | -0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.22 | | |
| PAY_5 - | | | 0.11 | 0.04 | | 0.50 | | | 0.82 | 1.00 | | 0.41 | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.17 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.16 | | |
| PAY_6 - | -0.23 | -0.04 | 0.09 | 0.04 | | 0.47 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 0.72 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.47 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.53 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.15 | | 0.4 |
| BILL_AMT1 - | 0.07 | -0.04 | 0.08 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.29 | 0.41 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 1.00 | | | | | | 0.45 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.37 | -0.03 | | |
| BILL_AMT2 - | 0.07 | -0.04 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.45 | 0.44 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 0.92 | | | | 0.57 | 0.43 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.38 | -0.02 | | |
| BILL_AMT3 - | 0.08 | -0.03 | 0.07 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.29 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.47 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 1.00 | | | | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.41 | -0.01 | - | 0.2 |
| BILL_AMT4 - | 0.10 | -0.02 | 0.05 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.28 | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.53 | 0.51 | 0.83 | | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.92 | | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.42 | -0.01 | | |
| BILL_AMT5 - | 0.11 | -0.01 | 0.04 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.28 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.41 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.80 | | | | 1.00 | | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.49 | 0.57 | 0.45 | 0.44 | -0.01 | | |
| BILL_AMT6 - | 0.11 | -0.01 | 0.04 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.35 | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.51 | 0.59 | 0.45 | 0.00 | | 0.0 |
| PAY_AMT1 - | 0.32 | -0.00 | | -0.01 | 0.03 | | | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.45 | 0.57 | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.45 | 0.43 | 1.00 | 0.52 | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 0.46 | -0.15 | | |
| PAY_AMT2 - | 0.33 | 0.01 | | -0.02 | 0.04 | | -0.03 | | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.41 | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 1.00 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.49 | 0.49 | -0.15 | | |
| PAY_AMT3 - | 0.34 | 0.02 | | -0.02 | 0.03 | | -0.02 | -0.01 | | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.56 | 0.49 | 0.46 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 1.00 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.50 | -0.13 | | |
| PAY_AMT4 - | 0.33 | 0.01 | | -0.02 | 0.04 | | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.57 | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 1.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 | -0.12 | - | -0.2 |
| PAY_AMT5 - | 0.34 | 0.01 | | -0.02 | 0.03 | | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.59 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 1.00 | 0.53 | -0.11 | | |
| PAY_AMT6 - | 0.36 | 0.03 | -0.07 | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.07 | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 1.00 | -0.12 | | |
| ayment next month - | -0.15 | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.02 | 0.01 | 0.32 | 0.26 | 0.24 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 0.15 | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.00 | -0.15 | -0.15 | -0.13 | -0.12 | -0.11 | -0.12 | 1.00 | - | -0.4 |
| | IT_BAL | SEX | CATION | RRIAGE | AGE | PAY_0 | PAY_2 | PAY_3 | PAY 4 | PAY_5 | PAY_6 | AMTI | _AMT2 | AMT3 | _AMT4 | AMT5 | AMT6 | AMTI | _AMT2 | _AMT3 | _AMT4 | AMT5 | _AMT6 | xt month | | |
| | TIM | | EDUG | MAF | | | | | | | | BILL | BILL | BILL | BILL | BILL | BILL | PAY | PAY | PAY | PAY | PAY | PAY | ult payment ne: | | |

Figure 2: Attribute Correlation Matrix(Photo/Picture credit :Original).

This study also analyzes the relationship between each characteristic and default which is presented by Attribute Correlation Matrix (Figure 2).

Attribute Correlation Matrix is typically used to describe the degree of association between different attributes in a dataset. Specifically, the attribute correlation matrix is a square matrix whose elements represent the correlation coefficients between different attributes in the data set. The correlation coefficient measures the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. The figure can also analyze whether default has a high correlation with credit limit. The higher the credit limit, the lower the probability of default. (Figure 2)

research Additionally, the encompasses individual feature analyses, which are visually represented through mapping. These analyses visually elucidate the correlation between features and default occurrences, aiding in the identification of potential research focal points (Feature 3, Figure 4, Figure 5, Figure 6). From the ensuing charts, four key insights emerge: default probabilities are higher for males compared to females; a higher educational attainment correlates with a reduced default rate; unmarried individuals exhibit a higher default probability than their married counterparts; and individuals in their 30s manifest the lowest default rates.



Figure 3: The Relationship between Age and Default (Photo/Picture credit: Original).



Figure 4: The Relationship between Gender and Default (Photo/Picture credit: Original).



Figure 5: The Relationship between Education and Default(Photo/Picture credit :Original).



Figure 6: The Relationship between Marriage and Default (Picture credit: Original).

3.2 Experimental Settings

All models were implemented in Python 3.8.5 environment in this research. Then, this research had used seven packages: Use pandas for data processing and analysis. Numerical calculations were performed using numpy. Use matplotlib.pyplot and seaborn for visualization. Use the imblearn to handle class imbalances. Tensorflow was used to build and train deep learning models. Use the os for file and directory operations. The experimental hardware was configured with a 2.40GHz i7-13700H CPU, an RTX4060GPU, and 16GRAM.

3.3 Model Evaluation

The AUC is the area under the ROC curve, which describes the tradeoff between the true case rate and the false positive case rate at different classification thresholds. The closer the AUC value is to 1, the better the model performance and better classification ability. Of the six models in the figure 7, random forest has the highest AUC value. Second is GBDT, decision tree.



Figure 7: AUC Comparison Diagram (Photo/Picture credit: Original).

Accuracy is the proportion of the number of samples correctly predicted to the total number of samples. Accuracy is an important metric in many cases, but may not be comprehensive enough in cases where categories are unbalanced. As can be seen from the figure 8, except for linear regression, the other five models have higher accuracy and smaller gap between them. Among them, RF and DNN performed best.



Figure 8: Accuracy Comparison Diagram (Photo/Picture credit: Original).

Precision is the percentage of all samples that are predicted to be positive cases that are actually positive cases. Precision measures the accuracy of the model in positive case predictions and is suitable for situations where the focus is on reducing false positives. In the figure 9, XGboost performs best. RF and XGBT are similar. In the figure 9, DNN has the best effect, followed by RF and DT.

The recall rate refers to the proportion of actual positive cases that are correctly predicted as positive cases by the model, also known as the true case rate. The recall rate measures how well the model covers positive examples and applies to situations where the focus is on finding as many positive examples as possible. As can be seen from the figure 10, DNN has the highest recall rate. This was followed by DT, RF, GBDT and XGboost. The other chart shows the highest performance of XGBoost.



Figure 9: Precision Comparison Diagram (Photo/Picture credit:Original).



Figure 10: Recall Comparison Diagram (Photo/Picture credit: Original).

The F1 score serves as a harmonic average of accuracy and recall, offering a balanced perspective on their relationship. It proves particularly beneficial in scenarios characterized by imbalanced data, effectively weighing both accuracy and recall, thereby enhancing model evaluation. In the final performance metric, among the five models depicted on the left, all but LR exhibit comparable performance. Notably, XGBoost demonstrates superior performance in the right image, with RF, GBDT, and DNN following suit (see Figure 11).



4 CONCLUSION

This study employs six machine learning models to analyze and predict the Taiwan credit dataset, encompassing linear models, tree models, and deep neural network models. Specifically, these models include Linear Regression, Decision Trees, Random Forests, Gradient Boosting Decision Trees, Extreme Gradient Boosting, and Deep Neural Networks.

Through a comprehensive comparison of performance across five dimensions, it is evident that GBDT and XGBoost models exhibit superior performance, with Deep Neural Network ranking third. Both GBDT and XGBoost are renowned representatives of gradient boosting methods within the realm of machine learning. By amalgamating multiple weak learners, GBDT adeptly captures nonlinear relationships, thereby ensuring high prediction accuracy while also assessing feature importance.

XGBoost, built upon the foundation of GBDT, further enhances model efficiency through the incorporation of regularization terms, parallel computation, and automated handling of missing feature values. These enhancements significantly augment training and prediction efficiency while bolstering the model's generalization capabilities. Both models offer compelling advantages such as robust interpretation, the capacity to model intricate data patterns, and overall robustness. However, XGBoost's enhancements in speed, efficiency, and regularization render it particularly favored in practical applications.

Consequently, when confronted with diverse problem domains, it is advisable to leverage GBDT and XGBoost models due to their robust performance and suitability for practical deployment.

REFERENCES

- Chen, S., Liu, G., & Liao, S., 2021. Credit risk assessment using ensemble deep learning with interpretable features. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 167, 114183.
- Chen, X., Luo, Y., Guo, W., & Hu, X., 2021. Credit risk assessment using deep learning ensemble models with credit scorecard. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 223, 106983.
- Kwon, O., & Kang, S. , 2019. Credit risk prediction using ensemble deep learning. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 134, 330-342.
- Liu, Z., & Zheng, W., 2020. Credit risk evaluation using deep learning and ensemble learning. *Applied Soft Computing*, 90, 106208.
- Ma, Y., Liu, Y., Hu, X., & Zhang, H., 2017. Credit risk assessment with a deep ensemble-learning approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 83, 19-28.
- Wang, S., Ding, Y., Guo, W., & Hu, X., 2019. Credit risk assessment based on deep learning ensembles. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 118, 178-190.
- Xu, Y., Li, J., & Zhang, J. , 2021. Deep ensemble learning for credit risk prediction. *Applied Soft Computing*, 107, 107458.
- Zhang, Y., Ma, J., Zhou, L., & Liu, W., 2018. Credit risk assessment using ensemble learning: A systematic literature review. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 114, 19-34.
- Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., & Liu, W., 2020. A hybrid deep learning model for credit risk assessment. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 147, 113203.
- Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., & Liu, W., 2020. A novel hybrid credit scoring model based on deep learning and ensemble learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 197, 105975.