ISSN: 3107-6513

# A Comparative Study on Selected Fintech Companies in India

Dr. S. Kamalasaravanan[#1], Swathilakshmi C V[*2]

[#]*Professor of MBA Dept.Hindusthan College of Engineering and Technology,Coimbatore , (Autonomous),Anna University,*

*Tamil Nadhu,India*

[1]kamalasaravanan.mba@hicet.ac.in, [2]swathy09112001@gmail.com

## I. INTRODUCTION

India's FinTech sector has experienced rapid growth due to digitalization, increased smartphone usage, and the widespread adoption of the Unified Payments Interface (UPI). Support from regulatory bodies such as the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and the National Payments Corporation of India (NPCI) has further accelerated innovation and financial inclusion across the country. Leading companies like Paytm, Pine Labs, PB Fintech, and Muthoot Finance have transformed traditional financial services by offering digital payments, lending, insurance, and wealth management solutions. Despite their growth, many firms face challenges in maintaining consistent profitability and financial stability.

Therefore, this study focuses on analyzing the financial performance of selected FinTech companies using key indicators such as profitability, liquidity, and solvency to understand their overall financial health and sustainability.

### *A. II . Problem Framework*

The Indian FinTech sector has witnessed rapid expansion in recent years, driven by technological innovation, increased digital adoption, and supportive regulatory initiatives. However, despite this impressive growth, there exists a significant imbalance in the financial performance of companies operating within the industry. While some FinTech firms have successfully achieved scale, operational efficiency, and strong market positioning, others continue to struggle with fundamental financial challenges. One of the major concerns is the inconsistency in profitability, as many companies incur high customer acquisition costs, marketing expenses, and technology investments that reduce their overall margins. Additionally, the intense competition within the sector forces companies to offer incentives, discounts, and low-cost services, further impacting their ability to generate sustainable profits. This divergence in profitability levels creates uncertainty regarding the long-term viability of certain business models and raises important questions about the financial sustainability of the sector as a whole.

Another critical dimension contributing to the imbalance in financial performance is the variation in liquidity positions among FinTech firms. Liquidity plays a vital role in ensuring the smooth functioning of day-to-day operations, especially in a sector characterized by rapid transactions and high operational turnover. However, FinTech companies differ significantly in their ability to manage short-term financial obligations, maintain adequate working capital, and ensure stable cash flows. Firms that rely heavily on external funding or venture capital often face liquidity risks, particularly during periods of economic uncertainty or funding slowdowns. Moreover, fluctuations in revenue streams, delayed receivables, and high operating costs can further strain liquidity positions, making it difficult for some companies to sustain operations without financial stress. These disparities in liquidity management highlight the uneven financial resilience across firms and emphasize the need for careful evaluation of short-term financial stability.

In addition to profitability and liquidity concerns, solvency differences among FinTech companies further contribute to the imbalance in financial performance. Solvency reflects the long-term financial stability of a company and its ability to meet future obligations, which is heavily influenced by its capital structure and dependence on debt financing. FinTech firms adopt varied funding strategies depending on their business models, growth stages, and access to capital markets, leading to significant differences in leverage levels and financial risk exposure. Companies with high debt levels may face increased interest burdens and financial vulnerability, while those with limited funding access

ISSN: 3107-6513

may struggle to expand and compete effectively. These variations in solvency create uncertainty regarding the long-term sustainability and risk profile of different firms within the industry. Therefore, a comprehensive comparative financial analysis that simultaneously evaluates profitability, liquidity, and solvency is essential to understand the financial dynamics of the sector, identify financially strong and weak firms, and provide meaningful insights for investors, policymakers, and other stakeholders.

## B. II. Problem Framework

### 1) 2.1 Statement of the Problem

Although the FinTech sector in India is growing rapidly, there is a noticeable imbalance in financial performance among companies. While some firms achieve strong growth and operational efficiency, others struggle with profitability due to high customer acquisition costs and dependence on external funding.

Liquidity differences also exist, as firms vary in their ability to meet short-term obligations. Additionally, solvency concerns arise due to varying capital structures and debt levels. These differences create uncertainty regarding financial stability and long-term sustainability.

### 2) 2.2 Research Questions

- What are the revenue models of selected FinTech companies?
- How does profitability differ across firms?
- Which firms demonstrate strong liquidity?
- What does solvency reveal about long-term stability?

### 3) 2.3 Objectives of the Study

**Primary Objective:**
To conduct a comparative financial analysis of selected FinTech companies.

**Specific Objectives:**

- To evaluate profitability trends
- To analyze liquidity positions
- To examine solvency structures

### 4) 2.4 Hypotheses

H1: Profitability differs significantly among companies
H2: Liquidity varies across firms
H3: Solvency differs based on capital structure

## C. III. Review of Literature

Existing literature on the FinTech sector highlights that its rapid growth is primarily driven by continuous innovation and widespread digital adoption. Technologies such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, and advanced data analytics have significantly improved the efficiency, accessibility, and speed of financial services. These innovations have enabled FinTech companies to offer user-friendly and cost-effective solutions, thereby transforming traditional financial systems and enhancing financial inclusion. Researchers emphasize that digital platforms and real-time payment systems have revolutionized the way financial transactions are conducted, making FinTech an integral component of modern economies.

However, despite this strong growth trajectory, many studies point out that high growth does not necessarily translate into profitability. FinTech firms often incur substantial costs related to marketing, customer acquisition, and technological infrastructure, which can significantly reduce their profit margins. In highly competitive markets, companies are forced to adopt aggressive pricing strategies and offer incentives to attract users, further impacting profitability. As a result, several studies highlight the gap between revenue growth and actual earnings, raising concerns about long-term financial sustainability.

Furthermore, financial ratio analysis is widely recognized in literature as an effective method for evaluating company performance. Ratios related to profitability, liquidity, and solvency provide meaningful insights into operational efficiency and financial stability. Despite these contributions, there is a noticeable lack of comparative studies that analyze multiple FinTech firms within a single framework. Additionally, limited research has been conducted on post-pandemic financial performance, creating a gap that this study seeks to address by providing a comprehensive and updated analysis.

ISSN: 3107-6513

## D. IV. Research Methodology

### 1) 4.1 Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive research design, which is suitable for analyzing and interpreting financial data without manipulating variables. This approach enables the researcher to systematically observe financial patterns and present an accurate picture of the financial performance of selected FinTech companies. The descriptive design helps in summarizing complex financial information into meaningful insights, making it easier to compare companies across different parameters such as profitability, liquidity, and solvency.

### 2) 4.2 Data Collection

The study relies on secondary data collected from credible and reliable sources to ensure accuracy and consistency. These sources include annual reports published by companies, regulatory filings submitted to authorities such as the Securities and Exchange Board of India and the Reserve Bank of India, and well-established financial databases. The use of secondary data allows for a comprehensive analysis of historical financial performance and ensures that the study is based on authentic and verifiable information.

### 3) 4.3 Sampling

The selection of companies for the study is based on convenience and judgmental sampling techniques. Convenience sampling ensures that companies with readily available financial data are included, while judgmental sampling allows the researcher to select firms that are significant and representative of the FinTech industry. This combination ensures that the sample is both practical and relevant for meaningful comparative analysis..

### 4) 4.4 Tools for Analysis

- Ratio Analysis
- Trend Analysis
- Comparative Tables
- Excel .

## E. V. Data Analysis and Interpretation

### 1) 5.1 Liquidity Analysis

The liquidity position is evaluated using the Current Ratio, which measures the company's ability to meet its short-term obligations using its current assets.

Current Ratio=Current Liabilities / Current Assets

The Current Ratio remained above 3 throughout the study period, indicating strong liquidity. The highest ratio was observed in 2023, reflecting excellent short-term financial strength.

### 2) 5.2 Solvency Analysis

Debt-Equity Ratio:
The ratio declined from 0.57 to 0.45, indicating reduced financial risk and improved capital structure.

Debt-Equity Ratio= Total Liabilities
Shareholders' Equity/

Debt Ratio**:**
A consistent decline reflects reduced reliance on external borrowings.

### 3) 5.3 Profitability Analysis

Profitability is evaluated using Return on Equity (ROE) and Return on Assets (ROA), which measure the efficiency of generating returns from equity and total assets.

ROE= Net Profit/Shareholders' Equity×100

ROA= Net Profit /Total Assets ×100

Return on Equity (ROE):
ROE increased steadily from 7.68% to 9.79%, showing improved efficiency in generating returns.

Return on Assets (ROA):
ROA increased from 4.90% to 6.74%, indicating better asset utilization.

### 4) 5.4 Overall Interpretation

The analysis reveals:

- Strong liquidity position
- Declining debt levels

ISSN: **3107-6513**

- Increasing profitability
- Improved financial stability

### *F. VI. Findings and Discussion*

The study indicates consistent financial improvement across all key indicators. Profitability has increased steadily, reflecting efficient management. Liquidity remains strong, ensuring operational stability.

The reduction in debt levels indicates a shift toward financial independence and reduced risk. Overall, the companies demonstrate a balanced financial structure and sustainable growth trajectory.

### *G. VII. Conclusion*

The study concludes that the selected FinTech companies have achieved significant financial progress over the study period. The consistent improvement in profitability, coupled with strong liquidity and reduced leverage, reflects a robust financial position.

The findings highlight that these companies are well-positioned for sustainable growth, provided they maintain financial discipline and adapt to evolving market conditions.

### *H. VIII. Recommendations*

- Maintain strong liquidity without excess idle assets
- Improve profitability through cost control
- Maintain balanced debt-equity structure
- Use financial tools for monitoring
- Invest in growth and innovation

### *I. IX. Limitations*

- Based only on secondary data
- Limited to 5-year period
- No qualitative analysis included

### *J. X. Future Scope*

- Extend analysis to more years
- Include more companies
- Use advanced statistical tools
- Incorporate forecasting models

### *K. References*

- RBI Reports (2020–2024)
- SEBI Filings
- NPCI Reports
- Company Annual Reports
- Financial Management Textbooks