Show Me the Money: A Comprehensive Survey of Peer-to-Peer Lending Technologies

Gian Zignago
University of California, Los Angeles
grz@cs.ucla.edu

***Abstract*—Peer-to-peer (P2P) lending has emerged as a significant force in the financial sector, redefining access to credit and challenging traditional banking models. This survey paper delves into the intricacies of the P2P lending ecosystem, examining its origins, technological underpinnings, and its transformative impact on the financial landscape. Despite its rapid growth and potential for democratizing finance, the P2P lending industry is confronted with numerous challenges, including regulatory uncertainties, credit risk management issues, and a heightened vulnerability to fraud. Through an in-depth analysis, this paper critically evaluates the operational mechanisms of P2P lending platforms, the evolution of regulatory frameworks, and the persistent risks of fraudulent conduct that mar the industry. Highlighting key cases such as Hellum v. Prosper Marketplace, Inc., and the collapse of platforms like Ezubao, the paper underscores the complexities and regulatory gaps within the sector. The analysis extends to the implications of default rates and the absence of traditional safety nets, presenting a nuanced perspective on the sector's vulnerabilities. This survey aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of P2P lending's potential and pitfalls, offering insights into future directions and areas for improvement. The findings emphasize the need for enhanced regulatory oversight, robust risk assessment models, and greater transparency to ensure the long-term sustainability of P2P lending platforms.**

***Keywords*—P2P Lending, Financial Technology, Credit Risk, Regulatory Framework, Fraud Prevention, Default Rates, Financial Inclusion, Consumer Protection**

I. INTRODUCTION

Peer-to-peer (P2P) lending has ushered in a new era of democratized credit access, offering an alternative to traditional banking services. The P2P lending model directly connects borrowers with individual or institutional lenders through online platforms that serve as intermediaries. By circumventing conventional financial institutions, P2P lending streamlines the lending process, reducing operational costs and often providing more favorable terms for both borrowers and lenders [1].

The appeal of P2P lending lies in its ability to bridge the gap between those seeking credit and those willing to invest in loans. For borrowers, it offers accessible financing options for individuals or businesses that may have difficulty securing loans from traditional lenders due to stringent credit requirements or lack of collateral. Lenders are offered the prospect of higher returns on their investments compared to traditional fixed-income products, as well as the opportunity to diversify their portfolios.

The P2P lending market has experienced significant growth in recent years, with platforms operating in international markets and facilitating billions of dollars in loan originations annually [2]. This growth has been fueled by several factors, including advancements in financial technology, the increasing adoption of digital platforms, and the lingering effects of the global financial crisis, which led to tighter lending standards and a reduced appetite for risk among traditional lenders [3].

Despite its rapid expansion, the P2P lending industry faces significant challenges and scrutiny. Regulatory frameworks have struggled to keep pace with the evolving landscape, raising concerns about consumer protection, transparency, and the potential for systemic risk [4]. Additionally, the industry grapples with issues such as credit risk management, fraud prevention, and the need for robust risk assessment models to ensure the long-term sustainability of P2P lending platforms.

This comprehensive survey paper aims to provide an in-depth exploration of the P2P lending ecosystem, its opportunities, challenges, and future directions. By critically examining the industry's landscape, operational mechanisms, and emerging trends, this paper seeks to serve as a valuable resource for those wishing to learn more about the history and current trends in the sector.

II. BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF P2P LENDING

The implementation of P2P lending through online platforms is a recent development, enabled through technological advancements and the increasing accessibility of the internet, which have collectively enabled new financial services models. In this section, we review the background information and history pertaining to the development of the

P2P lending industry in its three oldest and largest markets – the United Kingdom, the United States, and China [5].

A. P2P Lending in the United Kingdom

The first P2P lending company was introduced in the United Kingdom in February 2005 with the launch of Zopa Bank Ltd. [6]. Founded in Buckinghamshire, Zopa introduced a novel model for credit access and investment that challenged traditional banking paradigms. This innovation was followed by the launch of Funding Circle in August 2010, pioneering the peer-to-business lending model and facilitating over £6.3 billion in loans to small businesses [7]. However, not all ventures were successful; Quakle, founded in 2010, ceased operations in 2011 due to a near-total default rate [8]. The UK government's investment of £60 million through P2P platforms to support small businesses, despite criticism, underscored a strategic shift towards alternative finance [9]. The sector's regulatory landscape transformed with FCA oversight from April 2014, fostering growth and enhancing consumer trust, albeit without FSCS protection. By 2015, P2P lending in the UK surpassed £3 billion, driven by innovations like the IFISA and a surge in platform numbers, reflecting a robust and maturing market [10].

B. P2P Lending in the United States

The peer-to-peer lending industry in the US began with the launch of Prosper Marketplace in February 2006, followed by the emergence of LendingClub. These early platforms were met with minimal borrower eligibility restrictions, leading to adverse selection issues and a spike in default rates [11]. The liquidity challenge for these loans, typically having a minimum three-year term, was also perceived negatively by some investors [12]. The 2008 financial crisis marked a pivotal moment for the global financial sector, significantly affecting the burgeoning P2P lending market. In the short term, the crisis led to heightened scrutiny from regulatory bodies such as the SEC, which demanded that P2P companies register their offerings as securities under the Securities Act of 1933 [13]. This registration process proved challenging, resulting in Prosper and LendingClub temporarily halting new loans, while others, like Zopa Ltd., exited the U.S. market [14]. However, both LendingClub and Prosper eventually secured SEC approval to offer notes backed by loan payments to investors, addressing earlier liquidity concerns.

The long-term ramifications of the financial crisis were paradoxically beneficial for the P2P lending industry. A significant erosion of trust in traditional banking institutions, alongside stricter lending standards, drove both borrowers and investors towards alternative financial services [15]. P2P lending platforms, by offering more accessible credit and higher investment returns, thrived in this environment, leveraging the increasing demand for non-traditional lending and investment avenues. The regulatory response, initially a hurdle, morphed into an opportunity for transparency and rebuilding investor confidence [16]. Prosper and LendingClub's strategic adaptations, including the development of secondary markets for notes through partnerships with FOLIOfn, were instrumental in this shift [17]. The detailed information available for each loan request enhanced due diligence capabilities for lenders and secondary buyers, distinguishing the P2P model from traditional securitization markets.

Following the financial turmoil of 2007–2008, the P2P lending market witnessed increased investor scrutiny as borrower defaults rose [18]. Nonetheless, the sector's resilience was underscored by the growing involvement of traditional financial institution executives, who joined P2P companies in various capacities. This trend signaled the burgeoning acceptance of P2P lending within the financial mainstream, establishing it as a credible alternative to conventional financing models. By 2013, LendingClub had ascended to become the largest P2P lender in the U.S. based on issued loan volume and revenue, further cementing the sector's role in the broader financial landscape [19]. The varied interest rates and default rates across borrower profiles demonstrated the platform's ability to cater to a wide spectrum of credit needs, marking a significant evolution from its early challenges to a position of industry leadership.

C. P2P Lending in China

The Chinese P2P lending industry experienced exponential growth early in its adoption, catalyzed by financial constraints on small businesses and consumers, and expanded under minimal regulatory oversight. The first P2P lending company in the country, PPdai, launched in 2007, marking the beginning of an era that would see the industry's loan volume soar from $3.3 billion in 2012 to $420 billion by 2017 [20]. This rapid expansion filled a critical financing gap but also brought to the forefront increasing risks and unsustainable business models. Regulatory actions in 2018 and 2019, aimed at registering P2P businesses and winding down the industry, highlight the Chinese government's response to the sector's escalating challenges [21]. These measures underscored the importance of robust credit risk assessment and operational risk management under experienced financial oversight.

The lax regulatory environment that enabled the rapid growth of P2P lending in China later led to significant reforms. In 2018, the government mandated registration for P2P lenders, followed by directives in 2019 that effectively signaled the end of the P2P lending era [22]. These reforms were responses to the industry's rampant issues, including fraudulent practices and the failure of numerous platforms, exacerbating investor fears and destabilizing the market. Amidst its explosive growth, the P2P lending industry in China faced operational challenges, primarily around credit risk assessment. Traditional credit models were ill-equipped to predict loan defaults due to inadequate data, prompting larger firms to develop innovative credit scoring systems based on alternative data sources, such as utility bill payment history and social media behavior [23]. These efforts marked

a significant shift towards more sophisticated risk assessment methodologies, setting a precedent for the financial technology sector.

The appeal of P2P lending in China was multifaceted. For borrowers, it offered access to finance that was otherwise unavailable through traditional banks, attracting many consumers and small businesses. For investors, P2P platforms promised higher returns, fueling the industry's rapid expansion. However, the sector's growth also attracted a slew of poorly managed platforms and fraudulent schemes, leading to increased regulatory scrutiny and the eventual crackdown on the industry [24]. Key lessons from the contraction of China's P2P lending market include the critical importance of effective credit risk management, the need for regulatory frameworks that evolve in tandem with industry growth, and the potential for innovations in the financial technology sector to significantly impact traditional financial ecosystems. Although the P2P lending model faces an uncertain future in China, the evolution of the industry underscores the enduring demand for inclusive finance and the ongoing need for innovation in addressing the financial needs of underserved populations.

III. Credit Worthiness Assessment in P2P Lending Systems

Traditional approaches to assessing creditworthiness, while effective in conventional banking settings, may not fully capture the complexities and nuances of borrower behavior in P2P lending environments. The emergence of such platforms introduces a paradigm where traditional financial intermediaries are bypassed, allowing for direct lending between private individuals and businesses. This model, however, presents heightened credit risk and systemic risks due to the high interconnectedness among borrowers facilitated by the platform.

A. Enhancing Credit Risk Models Through Network Analysis

In their paper *Network based scoring models to improve credit risk management in peer to peer lending platforms,* P. Giudici et al. propose enhancing the accuracy of credit risk models for P2P platforms by leveraging the topological information embedded in similarity networks derived from borrowers' financial data [25]. This approach involves constructing networks where nodes represent borrowers, and the edges denote the similarity in their financial information. The key hypothesis is that the network's structure—particularly its topological coefficients describing borrowers' importance and community structures—can significantly improve the predictive performance of credit scoring models [26].

B. Network-Based Scoring Models

By utilizing financial ratios and other relevant data from borrowers, L. Baals et al. develop a similarity network that captures the relationships among borrowers based on their financial health [27]. By applying the standardized Euclidean distance metric, researchers can quantify the similarities between borrowing companies, facilitating the construction of a Minimal Spanning Tree (MST) that highlights the most relevant connections.

By examining the MST and employing network measures such as degree and strength centrality, as well as community detection algorithms, Y. Wei et al. demonstrated the ability to identify key patterns and clusters within the borrower network [28]. These patterns are indicative of potential credit risk concentrations and can inform more nuanced risk assessment models.

As demonstrated by A. Abd Rabuh et al., the incorporation of network-derived variables into traditional credit scoring models (e.g., logistic regression, discriminant analysis, and support vector machines) leads to a marked improvement in predictive accuracy [29]. This suggests that understanding the network structure among borrowers provides valuable insights into credit risk that are not captured by individual financial metrics alone.

C. Practical Implications and Future Directions

Y. Liu et al. suggest that the application of network-based scoring models offers a promising avenue for improving credit risk management in P2P lending platforms [30]. By integrating topological information from borrower similarity networks, P2P platforms can develop more nuanced and effective credit scoring models that better capture the complex interdependencies among borrowers. This approach not only enhances the platform's ability to assess and manage credit risk but also contributes to the stability and sustainability of the P2P lending ecosystem.

D. Advanced Machine Learning Techniques in Credit Scoring

The evolving landscape of P2P lending necessitates advanced analytical approaches to assess and manage credit risk effectively. LightGBM (Light Gradient Boosting Machine) and dmlc XGBoost (Distributed Machine Learning Community eXtreme Gradient Boosting) are prominent technologies that have been proven to contribute significantly to the predictive modeling capabilities of credit scoring systems [31].

Developed by Microsoft, LightGBM is a gradient boosting framework designed for speed and efficiency [32]. It utilizes a novel tree learning algorithm that grows trees vertically (leaf-wise) rather than horizontally (level-wise), allowing it to achieve lower losses with fewer splits. Ke, G. et al. demonstrated this approach's ability to significantly reduce the amount of computation and memory resources required, making it highly suitable for processing the vast datasets typical in P2P lending platforms. By integrating LightGBM

into credit scoring models, P2P lending systems can efficiently handle large-scale data while enhancing the model's ability to identify complex non-linear patterns associated with borrower risk.

XGBoost is regarded as a highly efficient and scalable implementation of gradient boosted decision trees, designed for both computational speed and model performance [33]. It offers a robust solution for supervised learning problems, including the critical task of creditworthiness assessment in P2P lending. XGBoost's ability to perform parallel tree boosting, its effective handling of missing data, and the incorporation of regularization to prevent overfitting, make it an indispensable tool for developing sophisticated credit risk models. XGBoost's versatility and power enable P2P platforms to improve their assessment accuracy, identifying high-risk borrowers more effectively while minimizing false negatives.

E. Implications of Integrating LightGBM and XGBoost

The incorporation of LightGBM and XGBoost into credit scoring models within P2P lending platforms marks a significant advancement in risk assessment methodologies. These machine learning algorithms offer the dual benefits of high computational efficiency and superior model performance, essential for processing extensive and complex data ecosystems to achieve more nuanced and accurate predictions of borrower creditworthiness.

IV. SHORTCOMINGS OF P2P LENDING

While P2P lending has democratized access to credit and offered alternative investment opportunities, it is not without its shortcomings. Two of the most significant challenges are associated with credit risk and the lack of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insurance, which pose considerable risks to both borrowers and investors within the P2P lending space.

A. Credit Risk

%	Expected annual default rate	Projected annual return after expected defaults
A*	0.0 - 1.0	2 - 4
A	0.5 - 2.5	2 - 5.5
B	2.5 - 4	4 - 6
C	4.5 - 6.5	5 - 7
D	9 - 11	7 - 9
E	10 - 12	10 - 14

Table 1. Projected default and return for Zopa investments, March 2016

Initially, P2P lending was seen as an avenue with appealingly low default rates. For example, Prosper's default rate was reported to be around 2.7% in 2007 [34]. However, actual default rates have often exceeded these early estimates [35]. For loans originated by Prosper in 2007, the realized default rate was significantly higher than anticipated, with an aggregate return on investments hitting negative figures for certain vintages [36]. From 2006 through October 2008, Prosper experienced a default rate of 36.1%, with 26.1% of the loaned amount being written off by investors [37]. Lending Club has shown a default rate range from 1.4% for top-rated three-year loans to 9.8% for its riskiest loans [38]. In contrast, the UK-based P2P lender Zopa reported a bad loan ratio of 0.84% over its first seven years, showcasing the effectiveness of modern credit models and risk management [39]. However, platforms like Bondora, which extend credit to less creditworthy customers, have seen default rates soar up to 70+% for certain borrower segments, indicating a wide variance in risk and return across platforms and borrower profiles [40].

Table 1 presents a detailed projection of default rates and expected annual returns for investments through Zopa from 2016 stratified across different credit grades [41]. The table shows a clear trend: as the risk level of the investment increases, the expected annual default rate also increases. This pattern illustrates the inherent trade-off between risk and return in investment decisions. Higher risk categories, denoted by lower credit grades, command higher expected returns to compensate for the increased likelihood of default. Conversely, investments in higher credit grades offer lower returns, reflecting their lower default risk.

B. Lack of FDIC Insurance

In the US, P2P lending is legally treated as an investment rather than a banking service. The FDIC protects bank depositors by guaranteeing the return of deposits up to a certain amount in the event of a bank failure, providing a significant layer of security for traditional banking customers. This classification means that, unlike bank depositors, P2P lenders do not benefit from the safety net of FDIC insurance [42]. The absence of FDIC insurance in P2P lending means that lenders face the full risk of borrower default without a governmental guarantee of recovery [43]. This risk is compounded by the fact that lenders can choose to lend their money to a wide spectrum of borrowers–from safer, lower-interest-rate loans to higher-risk, higher-return ones. While this model offers the potential for higher returns, it inherently comes with greater risk, especially in cases where borrowers default.

C. Case Study: Hellum v. Prosper Marketplace, Inc.

The complexities and potential vulnerabilities of the P2P lending regulatory framework were starkly illustrated by the class-action lawsuit, *Hellum v. Prosper Marketplace, Inc* [44]. This legal battle underscored the regulatory ambiguities and

investor risks inherent in the P2P lending space. In November 2008, Prosper Marketplace, Inc., along with some of its directors and officers, faced a class action lawsuit alleging violations of both California and federal securities laws. The lawsuit represented all loan note purchasers on Prosper's platform from January 2006 through October 2008, highlighting the platform's operational model. Central to the lawsuit was the contention that Prosper sold and offered unregistered and unqualified securities, operating as an uncertified broker-dealer. The suit was propelled further by a Cease-and-Desist Order from the SEC, which found that the loan notes offered by Prosper were indeed securities under the federal Securities Act of 1933 and were sold without an effective registration statement.

The lawsuit detailed Prosper's transition in its operational model post-April 2008, where loans were initially made directly from Prosper's funds to borrowers, and then later through WebBank, with loans sold and assigned to lenders. Prosper retained the right to service these loans, managing both borrower and lender accounts and handling all aspects of loan servicing. The complaint underscored the insufficient information provided to prospective lenders, arguing that it did not meet the disclosures required for selling securities. The *Hellum* complaint culminated in a $10 million settlement by Prosper [45]. It not only brought to light the regulatory gaps and challenges faced by platforms operating in this nascent sector but also illustrated how opaque even large, reputable platforms were in conducting business.

V. POTENTIAL FOR FRAUD

In recent years, the P2P lending market has been marred by frequent reports of scams and fraudulent activities. The nature of P2P lending – and its existence as a new technology for which there is sparse publicly-available information – creates vulnerabilities that can be exploited by malicious actors. This, compounded by the industry's rapid growth that attracted less scrupulous actors, led to rampant abuse and questionable practices. Many platforms engaged in creating fictitious borrower information, extending credit without adequate risk assessment, and operating as shadow banks. These actions, along with the sale of wealth management products under the guise of P2P lending, culminated in a crisis of confidence. Among the most notable cases of such fraudulent practices within this sector is the Chinese P2P lender Ezubao.

A. Case Study: Ezubao

Ezubao (e租宝), once a prominent P2P lending platform in China, orchestrated one of the largest Ponzi schemes in the history of P2P lending. Established in July 2014, Ezubao promised investors unusually high returns, significantly surpassing those offered by traditional banks [46]. Attracting approximately 50 billion yuan ($7.6 billion) from around 900,000 investors, Ezubao showcased rapid growth, leveraging aggressive marketing strategies and exploiting the regulatory gray areas of the burgeoning P2P lending market.

However, beneath its veneer of legitimacy, Ezubao operated on a fraudulent model, with approximately 95% of its investment projects being fictitious [47]. The platform utilized incoming funds from new investors to pay off earlier investors [48]. The revelation of Ezubao's fraudulent operations in late 2015 led to public outcry, intense regulatory scrutiny, and the eventual arrest of 21 individuals involved in the scheme, including Zhang Min, the president of the parent company, Yucheng Global [49].

B. Implications and Regulatory Response for Chinese Market

The Ezubao scandal, coupled with ensuing public protests, led to stricter regulatory oversight within China's financial technology sector. Although the regulatory framework for P2P lending was conceptualized by the Chinese financial authorities in 2011, enforcement was lenient until this scandal highlighted the sector's vulnerabilities, which was followed by new regulations introduced to mitigate the risks associated with online lending [50]. These measures included prohibitions against P2P lending platforms accepting investor deposits, guaranteeing borrowers' loans, or engaging in asset securitization. Such directives sought to clarify the role of P2P platforms as intermediaries rather than financial guarantors or deposit-taking institutions.

Regulation of P2P lending in China began with a warning from the China Banking Regulatory Commission about the risks of P2P lending in 2011 [51]. This was followed by a 2014 joint statement from the Supreme People’s Court, the Supreme People’s Procuratorate, and the Ministry of Public Security on illegal fund-raising criminal cases, and the 2015 Guiding Opinions aimed at encouraging the positive development of internet finance. The pivotal moment came in August 2016 with the introduction of the Interim Measures for the Administration of the Business Activities of Online Lending Information Intermediary Institutions, which set forth comprehensive regulations to enhance transparency, accountability, and operational integrity for P2P platforms. These measures, emphasizing the platforms' role as intermediaries and setting clear operational guidelines, aimed to safeguard the sector against future frauds like Ezubao by delineating their operational boundaries and enforcing strict regulatory compliance. The establishment of the National Internet Finance Association (NIFA) and the collaborative efforts with credit rating agencies specializing in P2P lending later that year marked a further tightening of the regulatory environment [52].

C. Ramifications of Chinese Regulations and Fraud

2018 marked a significant downturn in China's P2P lending industry, witnessing an unprecedented wave of platform closures and rising defaults. In the first half of the year alone, around 300 P2P platforms ceased operations amidst a broader financial tumult within the sector [53]. This

tumultuous period saw investor confidence wane as defaults surged, bringing to light the substantial risks attached to P2P lending investments. One notable platform failure was Niubanjin (牛板金), which left approximately 820,000 users facing losses from 3 billion RMB in investments [54]. The magnitude of these defaults prompted significant regulatory scrutiny, with listed companies in the sector – such as Yirendai (宜人贷) and Paipaidai (拍拍贷) – experiencing dramatic declines in stock value.

D. Broader Concerns in P2P Lending

The potential for scams in P2P lending extends beyond high-profile cases like Ezubao. The relatively new and rapidly evolving nature of P2P lending platforms can make it challenging for regulators to keep pace and for investors to fully understand the risks involved. Malicious actors can exploit these gaps by presenting themselves as legitimate entities, promising high returns with little to no risk, and using sophisticated marketing tactics to lure in unsuspecting investors. The collapse of the Chinese P2P lending market serves as a cautionary tale, highlighting the challenges of balancing innovation with risk management. The shakeout of the industry is expected to leave a smaller, more disciplined, and professionalized sector, with leaders like Lufax and Yirendai pivoting towards more sustainable business models [55].

VI. Conclusion

The exploration of P2P lending through this survey reveals a dynamic and rapidly evolving sector marked by significant growth, innovation, and inherent challenges. P2P lending, heralded for democratizing access to credit and disrupting traditional banking models, presents a compelling narrative of financial inclusion and technological advancement. However, beneath the surface of this revolution in financial technology lie critical vulnerabilities, regulatory ambiguities, and a pervasive risk of fraud that cannot be overlooked. The journey of P2P lending from its inception to its current state underscores a landscape fraught with challenges and operational pitfalls. High-profile cases such as *Hellum v. Prosper Marketplace, Inc.* exemplify the legal complexities and regulatory gaps within the sector. These instances not only highlight the risks faced by investors but also underscore the necessity for a more robust regulatory framework to safeguard participants and maintain market integrity.

Moreover, the pervasive issue of fraud within the P2P lending market, particularly exemplified by the downfall of platforms like Ezubao, casts a long shadow over the industry's potential. The rapid proliferation of P2P lending platforms, coupled with insufficient regulatory oversight, has created opportunity for fraudulent activities, undermining investor confidence and jeopardizing the sector's sustainability. The critical vulnerabilities of P2P lending, such as the risk of default and the absence of traditional safety nets like FDIC insurance, further compound the sector's challenges. Regulatory responses, while necessary, have often been reactive rather than proactive, highlighting the need for continuous regulatory adaptation and vigilance.

While P2P lending represents a significant innovation in financial services, offering new opportunities for credit access and investment, it remains a sector in need of careful scrutiny and enhanced regulatory oversight. The lessons drawn from the tumultuous experiences of P2P lending markets, particularly in China, serve as a cautionary tale for other markets worldwide. As the P2P lending industry continues to evolve, it must address its inherent vulnerabilities, mitigate the risks of fraud, and navigate the regulatory complexities to realize its full potential responsibly and sustainably.

References

[1] Zhao, H., Ge, Y., Liu, Q., Wang, G., Chen, E., & Zhang, H. (2017). P2P lending survey: Platforms, recent advances and prospects. ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST), 8(6), 1-28.

[2] Milne, A., & Parboteeah, P. (2016). The business models and economics of peer-to-peer lending.

[3] Lee, E., & Lee, B. (2012). Herding behavior in online P2P lending: An empirical investigation. Electronic commerce research and applications, 11(5), 495-503.

[4] De Roure, C., Pelizzon, L., & Tasca, P. (2016). How does P2P lending fit into the consumer credit market?.

[5] Chen, D., & Han, C. (2012). A comparative study of online P2P lending in the USA and China. Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce, 17(2), 1.

[6] Bholat, D., & Atz, U. (2016). Peer-to-peer lending and financial innovation in the United Kingdom.

[7] Hulme, M. K., & Wright, C. (2006). Internet based social lending: Past, present and future. Social Futures Observatory, 11, 1-115.

[8] Gonzalez, L., & McAleer, K. (2011). Determinants of success in online social lending: A peak at US prosper & UK Zopa.

[9] Fish, A., & McKnight, J. C. (2019). The financialization of peer-to-peer lending in the United Kingdom.

[10] Bavoso, V. (2020). The promise and perils of alternative market-based finance: the case of P2P lending in the UK. Journal of Banking Regulation, 21(4), 395-409.

[11] Reddy, S., & Gopalaraman, K. (2016). Peer to peer lending, default prediction-evidence from lending club. Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce, 21(3), 1.

[12] Nowak, A., Ross, A., & Yencha, C. (2018). Small business borrowing and peer‐to‐peer lending: Evidence from lending club. Contemporary Economic Policy, 36(2), 318-336.

[13] Pujun, B., Nick, C., & Max, L. (2016). Demystifying the workings of Lending Club. CS229 Stanford.

[14] Wang, R. (2015). Peer-to-Peer Lending Industry and Risk Control Measures.

[15] Havrylchyk, O., Mariotto, C., Rahim, T., & Verdier, M. (2021). The expansion of peer-to-peer lending. Review of Network Economics, 19(3), 145-187.

[16] Havrylchyk, O., & Verdier, M. (2018). The financial intermediation role of the P2P lending platforms. Comparative Economic Studies, 60, 115-130.

[17] Mandelbaum, R. (2015). How Lending Club is Shaping the Future of Small-Business Loans.

[18] Serrano-Cinca, C., Gutiérrez-Nieto, B., & López-Palacios, L. (2015). Determinants of default in P2P lending. PloS one, 10(10), e0139427.

[19] Toufani, P. (2017). A temporal analysis of peer-to-peer lending platforms: A case study of lending club (Master's thesis, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

[20] Feng, Y., Fan, X., & Yoon, Y. (2015). LENDERS AND BORROWERS'STRATEGIES IN ONLINE PEER-TO-PEER LENDING MARKET: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF PPDAI. COM. Journal of Electronic Commerce Research, 16(3), 242.

[21] He, Q., & Li, X. (2021). The failure of Chinese peer-to-peer lending platforms: Finance and politics. Journal of Corporate Finance, 66, 101852.

[22] Tsai, C. H. (2018). To regulate or not to regulate: A comparison of government responses to peer-to-peer lending among the United States, China, and Taiwan. U. Cin. L. Rev., 87, 1077.

[23] Zhang, Y., Jia, H., Diao, Y., Hai, M., & Li, H. (2016). Research on credit scoring by fusing social media information in online peer-to-peer lending. Procedia Computer Science, 91, 168-174.

[24] Chen, D., Kavuri, A. S., & Milne, A. (2020). The future of peer-to-peer lending in China. Available at SSRN 3524395.

[25] Giudici, P., Hadji-Misheva, B., & Spelta, A. (2019). Network based scoring models to improve credit risk management in peer to peer lending platforms. Frontiers in artificial intelligence, 2, 3.

[26] Katsamakas, E., & Sánchez-Cartas, J. M. (2022). Network formation and financial inclusion in P2P lending: A computational model. Systems, 10(5), 155.

[27] Baals, L. J., Liu, Y., Osterrieder, J., & Hadji Misheva, B. Leveraging Network Topology for Credit Risk Assessment in P2p Lending: A Comparative Study Under the Lens of Machine Learning. Available at SSRN 4550985.

[28] Wei, Y., Yildirim, P., Van den Bulte, C., & Dellarocas, C. (2016). Credit scoring with social network data. Marketing Science, 35(2), 234-258.

[29] Abd Rabuh, A. (2020). Developing a Credit Scoring Model Using Social Network Analysis (Doctoral dissertation, University of Portsmouth).

[30] Liu, Y., Baals, L. J., Osterrieder, J., & Hadji Misheva, B. (2024). Leveraging Network Topology for Credit Risk Assessment in P2P Lending: A Comparative Study under the Lens of Machine Learning. Expert Systems with Applications, Forthcoming.

[31] Al Daoud, E. (2019). Comparison between XGBoost, LightGBM and CatBoost using a home credit dataset. *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering*, *13*(1), 6-10.

[32] Ke, G., Meng, Q., Finley, T., Wang, T., Chen, W., Ma, W., … Liu, T.-Y. (2017). LightGBM: A Highly Efficient Gradient Boosting Decision Tree. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, & R. Garnett (Eds.), Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (Vol. 30).

[33] Chen, T., & Guestrin, C. (2016, August). Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining* (pp. 785-794).

[34] Song, Y., Wang, Y., Ye, X., Wang, D., Yin, Y., & Wang, Y. (2020). Multi-view ensemble learning based on distance-to-model and adaptive clustering for imbalanced credit risk assessment in P2P lending. Information Sciences, 525, 182-204.

[35] Byanjankar, A., Heikkilä, M., & Mezei, J. (2015, December). Predicting credit risk in peer-to-peer lending: A neural network approach. In 2015 IEEE symposium series on computational intelligence (pp. 719-725). IEEE.

[36] Ha, V. S., Lu, D. N., Choi, G. S., Nguyen, H. N., & Yoon, B. (2019, February). Improving credit risk prediction in online peer-to-peer (P2P) lending using feature selection with deep learning. In 2019 21st International Conference on Advanced Communication Technology (ICACT) (pp. 511-515). IEEE.

[37] Zhang, W., Wang, C., Zhang, Y., & Wang, J. (2020). Credit risk evaluation model with textual features from loan descriptions for P2P lending. Electronic commerce research and applications, 42, 100989.

[38] Guo, Y., Zhou, W., Luo, C., Liu, C., & Xiong, H. (2016). Instance-based credit risk assessment for investment decisions in P2P lending. European Journal of Operational Research, 249(2), 417-426.

[39] Kumar, V., Natarajan, S., Keerthana, S., Chinmayi, K. M., & Lakshmi, N. (2016, September). Credit risk analysis in peer-to-peer lending system. In 2016 IEEE international conference on knowledge engineering and applications (ICKEA) (pp. 193-196). IEEE.

[40] Emekter, R., Tu, Y., Jirasakuldech, B., & Lu, M. (2015). Evaluating credit risk and loan performance in online Peer-to-Peer (P2P) lending. Applied Economics, 47(1), 54-70.

[41] Wang, Z., Jiang, C., Zhao, H., & Ding, Y. (2020). Mining semantic soft factors for credit risk evaluation in peer-to-peer lending. Journal of Management Information Systems, 37(1), 282-308.

[42] Ryfe, D., & Saretto, A. (2023, November 28). Reciprocal deposit networks provide means to exceed FDIC's $250,000 account cap. Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.

[43] Bao, T., Ding, Y., Gopal, R. et al. Throwing Good Money After Bad: Risk Mitigation Strategies in the P2P Lending Platforms. Inf Syst Front (2023).

[44] Prosper Marketplace, Inc. v. Greenwich Ins. Co., No. A132967 (Cal. Ct. App. Jul. 16, 2012)

[45] Hedrick, R. (2008, December 1). Hellum v. Prosper Marketplace, Inc., No. CGC-08-482329. The Rosen Law Firm.

[46] Albrecht, C., Morales, V., Baldwin, J. K., & Scott, S. D. (2017). Ezubao: a Chinese Ponzi scheme with a twist. Journal of Financial Crime, 24(2), 256-259.

[47] McCann, D. P., & Pufpaff, M. (2021). China's Crackdown on Ponzi and Pyramid Schemes in Finance. In Doing Good Business In China: Case Studies In International Business Ethics (pp. 313-319).

[48] Cheng, W. G. (2019). Information contagion in P2P lending markets: empirical evidence from China (Doctoral dissertation).

[49] Chen, D., Deakin, S., Johnston, A., & Wang, B. (2021). Too much technology and too little regulation? The spectacular demise of P2P lending in China. Accounting, Economics, and Law: A Convivium, (0).

[50] Huang, L., Pontell, H.N. Crime and crisis in China's P2P online lending market: a comparative analysis of fraud. Crime Law Soc Change 79, 369–393 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-022-10053-y

[51] Yuan, Y. (2022, December). The Crisis Behind the Popularity of Internet Finance in Mainland China. In 2022 4th International Conference on Economic Management and Cultural Industry (ICEMCI 2022) (pp. 1548-1554). Atlantis Press.

[52] Huang, R. H. (2018). Online P2P lending and regulatory responses in China: Opportunities and challenges. European Business Organization Law Review, 19, 63-92.

[53] Cheng, W. G., de Oliveira Leite, R., & Caldieraro, F. (2022). Financial contagion in internet lending platforms: Who pays the price?. Finance Research Letters, 45, 102187.

[54] What today's shake-out in China's peer-to-peer lending market means for fintech. (2018, October 9). McKinsey & Company.

[55] Hsu, S., Li, J., & Bao, H. (2021). P2P lending in China: Role and prospects for the future. The Manchester School, 89(5), 526-540.