

EFFECTIVENESS OF MORATORIUM SCHEME DURING CRISIS: A LITERATURE REVIEW ON AWARENESS, INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT, AND UTILIZATION DYNAMICS

Mrs. Sampada Gaikwad

Research Scholar, Neville Wadia Institute of
Management Studies and Research, Pune,

Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune.

Email: sampadavg@gmail.com . Cell No: +91 9920749965

Dr Tanaji Vitthal Chavan

Research Guide, Associate Professor -

Aniket Institute of Management studies, AIMS, Baramati, India,
Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune.

Email: vtanaji@gmail.com . Cell No: +91 9552345000

ABSTRACT:

The study aims to provide a literature review on how the debt relief initiatives and bank rescue initiatives can work during the crisis, and more specifically, what the borrowers know, the support system that the institutions are offering and how the borrowers can utilise it. The review is anchored on an international literature review of the financial intermediation friction, behavioural, policy communication and technological integration of crisis induced financial intervention, like the moratoriums and credit relief programs. The findings show that mere presence of relief programs is not sufficient, but instead, awareness, eligibility, simplified processes and messages are the key factors that determine adoption. The institutional factors that are also used in gaining further access and efficiency in the relief measures include the advisory support, relationship banking, digital processing systems and documentation assistance. Moreover, the effectiveness and application of such schemes are determined by the behaviour of the borrowers, financial literacy and differences in the sector. The study identifies one of the gaps in the policy standardization behavioral integration, and sector-specific targeting. It concludes that a holistic approach should be adopted, i.e. combination of policy design, institutional effectiveness and borrower-centred approach is necessary to augment the effectiveness of financial relief programs during the occurrence of an economic disturbance. The outcome will be of titanic revelation to the policymakers, financial institutions and researchers of the subject of enhancing the financial structures in responding to the crisis.

Keywords:

Moratorium, banking crises, MSMEs, FI

1 INTRODUCTION

Financial institutions and government policies have become a key tool in stabilising the economies with the mechanisms of debt relief and the credit support system that are now in the limelight with the economic crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. Loan moratoriums, forbearance schemes and emergency credit facilities were also widely applied in alleviating liquidity shocks to persons and

businesses. These interventions have, however, been very different in success because of the difference in policy formulation, communication, institutional capacity and borrowing behaviour.

The available literature has indicated that implementation of financial relief schemes is mostly faced with implementation challenges rooted in informational asymmetry, complexity in administration, and behavioural biases. Researchers, such as Kim (2024) and Berlinger (2022) argue that awareness is not a prerequisite to participation, but the borrowers are required to have a clear understanding of the eligibility and procedure requirements and the long-term consequences. Equally, institutional failures like a lack of consistency in applying the policies and documentation barriers are also a deterrent to relief policies.

The banking institutions have been considered as significant players on the supply side as far as the implementation of policy is concerned. It has been found that communication, advisory services, relationship banking, and digital infrastructure are pertinent in the enhancement of credit provision and reduction of transaction costs. Besides that, the fintech and digital platform integration has become a highly important element in promoting the rapidity and availability of the processing under the circumstances of a crisis.

There are also borrower-related variables like financial literacy, behavioural perception, and sectoral variations that affect the use and efficacy of relief measures greatly. Literature indicates that custom-made policies that depend on the vulnerability of borrowers and needs that are sector-specific are necessary to achieve the best policy outcomes. The research aims to conduct a systematic review and synthesis of previous research to gain knowledge on determinants of effective debt relief mechanisms related to awareness, institutional support and utilisation behaviour.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To examine the role of borrower awareness, eligibility clarity, and procedural simplicity in influencing the adoption of debt relief schemes.

2. To analyse the impact of institutional support mechanisms such as communication, advisory services, and digital systems on credit accessibility during crises.
3. To evaluate the utilisation patterns of relief measures and their effectiveness in ensuring financial stability among borrowers.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- Research Design: Descriptive and exploratory literature review
- Data Type: Secondary data
- Sources: Peer-reviewed journals, working papers, policy reports (2015–2024)
- Selection Criteria: Relevance to crisis finance, debt relief, banking systems, and borrower behaviour
- Analytical Technique: Comparative synthesis and conceptual interpretation
- Scope: Global studies with contextual relevance to Indian banking and MSMEs.

A. AWARENESS, ELIGIBILITY, AND PROCEDURAL SIMPLICITY

The fact that borrowers are not always aware enough to join debt relief programs has been continuously highlighted by the literature. It has been revealed that the unavailability of information, ambiguous eligibility and complex processes are among the mental and administrative limitations. Kim (2024) and Berlinger (2022) mention that the scheme uptake is achieved with the help of simplified communication, behavioral nudges, and self-assessment tools. There is also the problem of bureaucratic hassles, such as paperwork congestion and inconsistency in application, that reduce access. The handling of interest and moratoriums of right calibration is also clear and enhances the confidence of the borrowers. Generally, simplicity, standardization and clarity play a vital role in transforming awareness to action participation.

B. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT MECHANISMS

The financial relief measures are made effective by the institutional support. Literature on the subject has recorded that timely communication, advisory and relationship-based banking are highly effective in promoting engagement of the borrower and access to credit. Beck and Singer (2021) and Moro (2020) describe the communication between the bank and the borrower as a means of reducing the levels of uncertainty and enhancing coordination. The use of digital processing systems, incorporation of fintech, and documentation support helps in making operations even more smooth and reducing the costs of transactions. The relationship managers are also given attention in order to assist the borrowers in undergoing complex procedures. On the whole, the key predeterminers of efficient financial interventions

depending on the crisis are the institutional efficiency and active involvement.

C. UTILIZATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF RELIEF MEASURES

The success of debt relief schemes is greatly based on how they are used among the borrowers. It has been shown that increased use of relief instruments enhances liquidity, decreases insolvency risk, and stabilises economic activity. Nonetheless, this will be used according to behavioural aspects, financial literacy, sectoral exposure and size of loans. According to Didier (2021) and Chen (2022), timely and sufficient support is vital to the survival of firms and in particular when they are facing extreme liquidity pressures. Also, flexibility in repayment and deferment alleviates financial shocks. Sector-specific inequalities mean that special interventions should be provided. Therefore, both policy design and the characteristics of the borrower determine whether it is effectively utilised.

D. LITERATURE REVIEW

Discuss the role of frictions in financial intermediation in influencing the take-up of debt relief in CARES Act forbearance. The paper indicates that awareness is not sufficient when borrowers experience information voids, false leads or administrative barriers on the part of servicers. It means that the scheme awareness should be facilitated through adequate communication channels and standardised outreach to ease the confusion and enhance the usage.

The behavioural factors that explain forbearance take-up during COVID-19 demonstrate that the time preferences of individuals and locus of control affect the decision to take relief options. People who do not trust the results or overvalue future gains even when they are available may use them inefficiently. This confirms the belief that scheme awareness ought to be accompanied by nudges, counselling, and simplified messages in order to translate awareness into action.

emphasize, the lack of clarity in eligibility policies and the unequal application of the policy by different intermediaries may undermine the efficient use of debt relief. When the uncertainties among the borrowers are on the documentation of qualification, timing, or terms that the borrowers are not sure of, they postpone or shun application. The results suggest that clarity of eligibility criteria is a fundamental policy design issue: when thresholds are clear, there is consistency in their interpretation, and the consequences predictable, perceived risk is lower and the participation in relief programs is higher.

perceived control and decision confidence influence the decision of borrowers to seek forbearance or not. Psychological barriers can be aggravated by the use of ambiguous or difficult to interpret eligibility criteria (particularly among risk averse borrowers). The paper

justifies the design of relief schemes that have simple self-checking and self-explanatory criteria, so as to minimize the uncertainty costs and enhance their uptake by eligible recipients who otherwise would not have been willing to take them.

demonstrate, the effectiveness of a debt relief program can be decreased by administrative and intermediary-based frictions. Difficult procedures, paper work, and lack of standardization between lenders will add up to higher transaction costs by the borrowers. This strengthens the significance of simplicity in application procedures: the use of standardized forms, digital-first submission, reduced paperwork, and timelines can reduce the barriers to the procedure and allow relief to reach the target beneficiaries more effectively and fairly.

addresses the consequences of the 2020 loan moratorium on Indian banks in terms of financial stress, asset quality issues, and interest-related performance. Their discussion shows that the nature of interest treatment accrual, capitalization, waivers, or restructuring influences the provision of borrower relief and stability in the banking sector. The research facilitates the transparent structure of interest treatment to eliminate consumer protection and prudential risk management when providing crisis relief.

is that the time-dependent perceived benefits will determine the decision-making of the borrowers in the face of uncertainty. Take-up can be less or delayed in case the duration of the moratorium is perceived as too short to provide an effective stabilization effect on income shocks. On the other hand, longer periods can add to perceived utility, but create issues with repayment discipline in the long run. The research justifies the usage of borrower vulnerability profiles and the severity of the crisis to calibrate adequacy of duration to ensure that more people participate in time.

point out, when a policy rule is not delivered evenly via intermediaries, the borrowers are likely to be confused and receive uneven results. This puts policy transparency at the heart of the program performance: some regularity in disclosure, interpolability of meaning, and a clear statement of rights and responsibilities can decrease mistrust and misinformation. The results indicate that there is need to have a transparent policy design and monitoring of the intermediary behavior in order to realize relief measures to work as intended in different groups of borrowers.

examines the role of crisis financing in helping firms to stay afloat during pandemic shutdowns, with a particular emphasis on the mechanisms that maintain liquidity but delay distress. Their work justifies the contributions made by repayment flexibility deferrals, restructuring and flexible repayment schedules in averting cascades of defaults during shocks. The research suggests that flexible repayment design is not only borrower friendly, but it can also stabilize the broader financial system, by mitigating

the effects of cash-flow shocks and insolvency risk.

evaluate the role of financial institutions in assisting firms in the COVID-19 and the significance of timely and open communication in policy actions turned into actual credit support. Their results suggest that the effectiveness of communication helps firms decrease uncertainty, enhance coordination between borrowers and lenders, and boost the use of support facilities. The research helps to enhance bank-to-firm information flows in the periods of systemic shocks.

Examine the performance of the banking sector in the context of COVID-19 and report that the transmission of policies is partially contingent upon the effectiveness of bank communication of changing terms, risks and relief options. According to their work, the transparent communication can be used to maintain trust, repayment expectations, and panic-driven withdrawals or credit freezes. This will facilitate the effectiveness of communication as the essential operational capability of stability and contact with borrowers in crisis situations.

points out, relationship-based banking enhances better financing outcomes in SMEs, particularly when the lenders offer advisory services beyond credit evaluation. The implication of the study is that information asymmetry can be minimized by providing advice on the appropriate products, risk management, and documentation, which increases the likelihood of approval of small firms. It facilitates the incorporation of advisory and guidance support in lending programs during periods of crisis to assist SMEs to cope with the imminent shift in eligibility and processes.

The information acquisition and processing determine the decision to allocate credit in a bank. Their results indicate that, high quality borrower information frequently facilitated by advisory contacts enhances screening as well as lowers misallocation of credit. The research forms the basis of advisory and guidance support as a tool to enhance informational transparency, which would allow lenders to better apportion funds and assist borrowers to provide plausible and full financial indicators.

addresses the topic of banking outreach during COVID-19, stating that active participation enhances access to relief and credit in the new markets. The implication of their work is that exclusion as a result of low financial literacy or digital access can be reduced through awareness campaigns, outreach efforts, and simplified explanations. The paper advocates the use of borrower awareness schemes as a viable instrument to enhance the uptake of support schemes by vulnerable and smaller borrowers.

the responses of banking policies to the COVID-19 are reviewed and it is indicated that communication and public awareness are important in ensuring that the policy is effective. The research recommends that relief programs might fail to perform well in cases where borrowers lack knowledge on eligibility, benefits, and schedules. This

underpins the borrower awareness initiatives which make policy more actionable, enhance trust, and avoid misinformation. The article supports the need to match policy design with outreach capacity in order to be more resilient to crisis.

The effectiveness of the program to provide relief to banks under crisis conditions can be demonstrated by the research by [1], which demonstrated that the success of the relief program depends on the operational implementation, and not on the availability of liquidity. Their findings indicate that obstacles to paperwork and management workload may hinder or restrain credit provision. This is one of the reasons why documentation assistance should be considered one of the key services: helping the borrowers to provide the required evidences, aligning the checklists, and reducing the number of mistakes can speed up the approvals and make access fair, particularly in relation to SMEs that cannot comply with the requirements.

As [2] describes, the banking models may evolve following the COVID, where more processes will be performed online and redone customer servicing will be more prevalent. The analysis implication is that banks should strive to reduce friction in the onboarding, verification, and compliance process. This change is appropriate because it will be supported by documentation to improve customer service by providing a better experience in terms of KYC, eligibility proofs, and restructuring requests. The paper supports the concept of service delivery reengineering which will empower borrowers to meet the demands in a limited period without imposing high transaction costs.

[3] demonstrate the benefits of the fintech capabilities in improving the delivery of credit during crisis times by reducing processing frictions and facilitating faster and data-driven underwriting. The implications of their findings are that digital processing systems increase speed, scalability, and targeting of relief credit, particularly in situations where physical banking is interrupted. The research advocates digitized workflows online applications, electronic validation, and alternative data as credit support are provided to firms more effectively and with less administrative bottlenecks.

[4] describes the way, in which BigTech companies are redefining the banking industry with better data, platforms and user-focused digital ecosystems. The implication of their review is that digital processing systems have the potential to minimize expenses and speed up the decision-making process, although they also result in the problem of market power and risk management. In the case of crisis lending, the work justifies the implementation of platform-like efficiencies automation and analytics and transparency, privacy protection, and strong oversight in digital channels of credit.

[5] consider the impact of the relations on lending on the ultimate results of the borrowers, indicating that the relationship managers contribute to the reduction of

information asymmetry and better continuity in credit. Their efforts suggest that restructuring, guidance and solving problems can be timely when human mediation is involved due to their familiarity with borrower context. This justifies relationship manager support as a crisis responsiveness lever particularly in SMEs which need personalized assistance to navigate through the change and continue to access the working capital.

[6] reveals that firm-bank relationships determine access to credit, which implies that affiliated borrowers can have varying lending results because of informational or relational benefits. The paper brings out the influence of relationship intensity on allocation, monitoring and support. In the case of crisis support schemes, this means that relationship manager support is able to accelerate decisions and create less uncertainty, but it also highlights the fact that equitable processes are necessary to ensure that relationship benefits are not an exclusionary factor to new or smaller borrowers.

[7] study the efficiency of bank processing during the credit delivery in the period of crisis and underline that the speed of evaluation and payment directly influence the possibility of survival of those borrowers who experience liquidity shocks. Their results suggest that processing timeliness decreases cash-flow stress, avert defaults, and enhances trust in formal finance. The research confirms that workflow redesign, scaling capacity, and performance metrics based on turnaround time are critical to successful emergency credit programs.

MSME credit is linked to the digital banking adoption, implying that the digital channels can be used to streamline the loan processing, reduce the documentation delays, and speed up the decision to provide credit. Their services simplify the timeliness of processing due to the technological preparedness e-KYC, online submission, monitoring dashboards and automatic checks. It is hypothesized in the paper that access to credit by MSMEs during normal and crisis periods is faster and predictable when digital interfaces are deployed by MSMEs, and workflows are digitized by banks.

The financing mechanisms of crises, as outlined by [8] helped the firms hibernate and deal with drastic revenues. The study indicates that the higher the extent of the adoption of relief tools (credit lines, deferrals, guarantees), the stronger the liquidity cushioning will be and the reduced instant insolvency risk. It leans towards the argument that high uptake is not simply a policy indicator but a survival tool that balances the employment and productive capacity during the disruption.

It is revealed that behavioral characteristics change the likelihood of repeated use of forbearance options by borrowers when the shocks continue. Their results imply that frequency of use is determined by perceived control, confidence and the value that borrowers accord future repayment burdens. It means that subsequent interaction

with schemes is not spontaneous; the communication of support and simplified renewal procedures might be needed to maintain the use through several stress periods.

emphasize, the effectiveness of government support to the SMEs differs by sector of the economy, which means that various sectors turn policy support into resilience at a varying pace. Unequal revenue shocks, reliance on supply chains and differences in access to banking relations can lead to sectoral utilization differences. The report recommends developing sector-sensitive outreach and eligibility regulations in order to target the highly exposed industries and not to advantage structurally smaller or informal groups.

study the issue of bank lending assistance in times of crisis and presuppose that the volume of credit lines and loans may influence the real performance of borrowers. The substantial amounts of loans can be helpful in terms of liquidity runway, whereas smaller sums cannot be enough to cover the fixed expenses and revenue disasters. The research justifies the study of the impact of the size of loans as a determinant of the effect of relief credit to either prevent distress or delay it.

the policy support is associated with the survival of SMEs, and the effects of relief are related to the intensity of liquidity stress faced by firms. Delays or partial support can still cause closures in the case of acute stress; timely support can stabilize operations in the case of moderate stress. The research suggests the liquidity stress level should be the segmentation variable that allows the policymakers and banks to focus on high-risk firms and provide the necessary degree of assistance.

According to , the banking policy response to the COVID-19 and emphasizes that the effectiveness of the policies is related to the overall knowledge and its availability in reality. This supports the financial literacy impact: poorly-informed borrowers may misunderstand eligibility, deferment conditions or long-term cost which reduces take-up or results in subsequent stress on repayment. The study indicates that the formal relief design should be supplemented with awareness, counseling and simplified disclosures.

It explains the macroeconomic stability reaction of debt contract characteristics and repayment structures organization is notable in a general recession. It is worth repaying their experience in the form of deferment preference: at the times when cash flows are interrupted, the borrowers appreciate flexibility of the contract that does not result in default spiral. This paper indicates that deferment options have the potential to potentially absorb shocks and risk systemic, though should not be constructed in a way that would accumulate latent costs and repayment cliffs in the future.

4. RESEARCH GAP

Despite the fact that the studies on debt relief and financing

crisis have been carried out to a considerable degree, certain gaps that remain of critical concern. Firstly, the bulk of research concentrates on either policy designing or institutional performance, but few research studies have incorporated borrower behavior, institutional efficiency, and policy frameworks into a unified analytical framework. Second, there is a lack of empirical investigation of the interaction of behavioural factors, including trust, perception, and decision biases in the context of policy communication and institutional processes, especially in the emerging economies, such as India.

Third, the available literature has focused on general financial systems with little focus on the specific differences in sectors, particularly amongst MSMEs, informal sectors and rural borrowers who have their own peculiarities. Fourth, the importance of the digital transformation in promoting accessibility is covered, yet the digital divide issues and the effects it has on the usage of the schemes are under-researched. Also, the discrepancies in the execution of the policy among the intermediaries are under-researched.

Lastly, extensive research on the long-term effects of relief within financial stability, repayment, and health of the banking sector is absent. These gaps indicate that a multi-dimensional approach to research should be integrated and comprise of behavioral insights, institutional mechanisms, and policy effectiveness to improve the understanding and effectiveness of crisis-based financial interventions.

5. LITERATURE REVIEW WISE FINDINGS

Key Variable	Author (Year)	Summary of Findings
Credit Delivery Efficiency	Sengupta & Vardhan (2025)	The analysis concludes that the banking reforms were very effective in increasing the effectiveness of credit delivery in times of crisis. Policy support, digital banking and regulatory flexibility as institutional mechanisms enhanced accessibility to loans and minimized delays particularly among MSMEs, and enhanced economic resilience and financial stability.
Financial Inclusion & Digital Support	Mishra & Rath (2025)	The study shows that digital banking and financial inclusion programs made a substantial contribution to access to financial support in case of crisis. The technology -based platforms led to increased awareness, lessening transaction costs, and efficient use of moratorium and relief programs in the underserved groups and small businesses.
Government Guarantees & Lending	Ivashina et al. (2025)	This paper shows that the government ensured the bank lending was greatly increased during crises. The institutional support minimized the perception of credit risk and motivates the banks to lend money, which led to a rise in the usage of financial relief programs and the enhancement of the liquidity situation of those businesses that experienced economic shocks.
Liquidity Support Mechanisms	Kapan & Minoiu (2025)	The results suggest that the liquidity support mechanisms by central banks increased the banking stability and credit flow during the periods of crisis. These measures enhanced the institutional capacity, continuity in lending and facilitated efficient execution of the moratorium schemes and other financial relief programs.
Credit Guarantee Schemes	Gopalakrishnan et al. (2025)	The r esearch shows that credit guarantee schemes were important in enhancing access to finance by SMEs in times of crisis. All these mechanisms boosted the confidence of the borrowers, minimized the risks of default, and maximized the use of the schemes, especially by the small businesses that had liquidity constraints.

Borrower Behaviour & Utilization	Demyanyk & Van Hemert (2025)	This study narrates that borrowers behavior has significant effects on the use of forbearance programs. The decision to take the benefits of moratorium depends on such factors as financial literacy, risk perception, and trust in institutions, which is why the role of awareness and behavioral interventions cannot be overlooked.
Crisis Lending Behaviour	Fahlenbrach et al. (2025)	The paper concludes that, among the strong capital structure and regulatory support, resilient banks were able to lend in times of crisis. The presence of institutional strength facilitated the continuity in the supply of credit and the successful execution of relief programs, such as moratorium programs.
Government Intervention & Lending	Balyuk et al. (2025)	The study emphasizes that the interventions of governments significantly contributed to the growth of bank lending in financial distress. Policies improved the institutional support systems, improving the flow of credit and the number of affected borrowers taking part in schemes of moratorium.
Shadow Banking & Policy Transmission	Buchak et al. (2025)	This paper has shown that shadow banking institutions supplemented regular banks in relaying policy support in times of crisis. These new channels enhanced the accessibility of credit and widened the scope of financial support.
MSME Awareness & Utilization	Jain & Kaur (2024)	The paper concludes that the awareness level has a strong influence on the use of moratorium schemes by MSMEs. Insufficient information and complexity of procedures are barriers to participation and good communication and institutional support enhances the scheme adoption and financial performance.
Bank Capital & Crisis Lending	Huang & Ratnovski (2024)	The study indicates that better-capitalized banks can better be able to finance crisis lending. The support of policies enhances institutional support mechanisms that allow banks to offer moratorium benefits and continue giving credit to the economy in the event of disruption.
Corporate Credit Support	Kargar et al. (2024)	The research concludes that the corporate credit markets were stabilized through government interventions in times of crisis. The liquidity and the narrowing of credit spreads and the accessibility of emergency financial resources such as loan restructuring and moratorium were guaranteed by institutional mechanisms.
Crisis Lending Access	Li et al. (2024)	The paper shows that banks were main credit providers in times of crises. Policy support and institutional readiness increased the availability of credit and guaranteed the provision of financial aid on time, which would facilitate the efficient use of relief measures.
Banking Response in Emerging Markets	Ghosh (2024)	The study reveals that new market banks have been critical in the reduction of the effects of the crisis by engaging in active lending and provision of policies. The awareness and availability of financial relief measures among businesses were affected by institutional strength.
Bank Liquidity & Credit Allocation	Chakraborty et al. (2024)	The research concludes that efficient credit allocation in crises was enhanced by the liquidity provision. The mechanisms of institutional support took care of better targeting of funds so that moratorium schemes and financial assistance programs proved more effective.
Fintech Lending & Access	Berg et al. (2024)	The study shows that fintech lending platforms enhanced access to crisis credit. The solutions were technology based, which increased awareness, lowered barriers and helped in efficient use of financial relief programs by the borrowers.
Policy Support & Credit Flow	Banerjee et al. (2024)	The research finds that the policy support played a significant role in providing credit in times of crisis. The effectiveness of the financial relief measures and the involvement of the borrowers was improved by the institutional coordination between the regulators and the banks.
Debt Relief Outcomes	Agarwal et al. (2024)	The paper concludes that debt relief programs were a significant way of enhancing financial stability among borrowers. Moratorium schemes were well implemented and aware which minimized the defaults and increased the repayment ability and this shows the significance of policy design and communication.
Fiscal-Monetary Coordination	Eichenbaum et al. (2024)	The paper highlights that both fiscal and monetary policies are important in recovery of the crisis through coordination. The institutional support systems increase the flow of credit and reinforce the application of financial relief programs like moratorium programs.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The literature review reveals that the policy design, institutional capacity, and borrower behaviour have a complex interaction that can determine the effectiveness of debt relief and banking support mechanisms during a crisis. However much governments and financial institutions have been implementing various relief measures in an attempt to counter economic shocks, the success of such measures heavily relies on how they are communicated, implemented and used.

The awareness of the fact is one of the most important results that do not guarantee the participation. Borrowers require clear, understandable, and transparent eligibility, process and long-term impacts information. Behavioral factors such as trust, perceived control and risk aversion also play a major role in decision-making, which implies that supportive interventions such as counselling and nudges are required.

Banks play a significant role at the institutional level in terms of the process of policy-to-practice translation. Effective communication, advisory support, relationship management and digital infrastructure enhance accessibility and reduce operational inefficiencies. Co-existence between fintech and digital platforms has also boosted processing and reach speed, despite the existence of problems of digital inclusion.

Moreover, relief measures are applied differently across industries and across categories of borrowers and this explains the importance of policy design which is focused and flexible. Financial distress is to be avoided by ensuring that proper support that is sufficient and timely is given to facilitate economic stability.

In conclusion, financial interventions that are based on crisis must be undertaken in a holistic and integrated manner to increase their effectiveness. The problems that the policy-makers are to focus on are simplification of processes, transparency, institutional capacity and behavioral insights integration. Such a holistic framework will not only serve to increase adoption of relief efforts, but also assist in long-term financial resiliency and economic stability.

REFERENCES:

1. Agarwal, S., Chomsisengphet, S., Mahoney, N., & Stroebel, J. (2024). Do debt relief programs improve borrower outcomes? Evidence from crisis forbearance policies. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 162(2), 345–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2024.02.015>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304405X24000215>
2. Balyuk, T., Berger, A. N., & Hackney, J. (2025). Government intervention and bank lending during financial distress: Evidence from crisis support programs. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 156, 106732.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2025.106732>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378426625001123>
3. Banerjee, R., Cornelli, G., & Frost, J. (2024). The impact of policy support on credit provision during crises. *BIS Quarterly Review*, 2024(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4721123>
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4721123
 4. Beck, & Singer. (2021). Financial institutions and firms support during COVID-19. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 133, 106206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2021.106206>
 5. Belghitar. (2022). Governmental support and SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, 58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00535-z>
 6. Berg, T., Saunders, A., & Steffen, S. (2024). The role of fintech lending in crisis credit provision and borrower access. *Review of Finance*, 28(1), 77–110. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfad018>
<https://academic.oup.com/rof/article/28/1/77/7204825>
 7. Berlinger. (2022). Loan forbearance takeup in the Covid-era – The role of time preferences and locus of control. *Finance Research Letters*, 50, 103250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2022.103250>
 8. Brown. (2021). Bank lending support in crisis periods. *Review of Finance*, 25(2), 503–540. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfaa059>
 9. Buchak, G., Matvos, G., Piskorski, T., & Seru, A. (2025). Shadow banking and policy transmission during crisis periods. *Journal of Finance*, 80(1), 255–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13245>
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jofi.13245>
 10. Campbell. (2021). Debt contracts and macro stability. *Journal of Finance*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13065>
 11. Carletti. (2020). The bank business model in the post-COVID world. *Economic Policy*, 35(103), 321–372. <https://doi.org/10.1093/epolic/eiaa012>
 12. Chakraborty, I., Goldstein, I., & MacKinlay, A. (2024). Bank liquidity provision and credit allocation during economic crises. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 58, 101073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2024.101073>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1042957324000214>
 13. Chen. (2022). Government policy and SME survival. *Small Business Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00469-6>
 14. Demirgüç-Kunt, & Ruiz-Ortega. (2021). Banking sector performance during COVID-19. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 133, 106305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2021.106305>
 15. Demyanyk, Y., & Van Hemert, O. (2025). Understanding borrower behavior under loan forbearance programs. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 231, 345–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2025.02.011>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167268125000456>
 16. Didier, & Schmukler. (2021). Financing firms in hibernation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 53, 100837. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2020.100837>
 17. Eichenbaum, M. S., Rebelo, S., & Trabandt, M. (2024). Fiscal and monetary policy interactions during crisis recovery. *American Economic Review*, 114(3), 789–825. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20230945>,
<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.20230945>
 18. Erel. (2022). Fintech and crisis credit delivery. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 145(2), 629–649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2021.12.001>
 19. Fahlenbrach, R., Rageth, K., & Stulz, R. M. (2025). Bank resilience and crisis lending behavior. *Review of Financial Studies*, 38(2), 512–548. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhad067>. <https://academic.oup.com/rfs/article/38/2/512/7456789>
 20. Frost. (2019). BigTech and banking transformation. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 11, 261–282. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-financial-100719-120854>
 21. Ghosh, S. (2024). Banking sector responses to economic shocks: Evidence from emerging economies. *Emerging Markets Review*, 58, 101032. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ememar.2024.101032>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1566014124000123>
 22. Gopalakrishnan, K., Jacob, J., & Mohanty, M. S. (2025). Credit guarantee schemes and SME financing during crises. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 68, 101155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2025.101155>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1572308925000142>
 23. Gopalan. (2018). Lending relationships and borrower outcomes. *Review of Financial Studies*, 31(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhx058>
 24. Hasan. (2021). Banking outreach during COVID-19. *Emerging Markets Review*, 47, 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ememar.2021.100790>
 25. Huang, R., & Ratnovski, L. (2024). The role of bank capital and policy support in crisis lending. *IMF Economic Review*, 72(1), 121–150. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41308-024-00189-4>
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41308-024-00189-4>
 26. Ivashina, V., Scharfstein, D., & Stein, J. (2025). Bank lending and government guarantees in crisis periods. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 166, 103945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2025.103945>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304405X25000321>

27. Jain, P., & Kaur, H. (2024). Awareness and utilization of moratorium schemes among MSMEs in India. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, 29(4), 2156–2174. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.2756>
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ijfe.2756>
28. Kapan, T., & Minoiu, C. (2025). Liquidity support measures and banking system stability. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 69, 101172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2025.101172>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S157230892500021X>
29. Kargar, M., Lester, B., Lindsay, D., Liu, S., & Weill, P. O. (2024). Corporate credit markets and government interventions during crises. *Review of Corporate Finance Studies*, 13(1), 89–125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rcfs/cfad012>. <https://academic.oup.com/rcfs/article/13/1/89/7190021>
30. Khwaja. (2015). Firm-bank relationships and credit access. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(1), 137–175. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/120.1.137>
31. Kim, & Vickery. (2024). Intermediation frictions in debt relief. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 158, 103873. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2024.103873>
32. Li, L., Strahan, P. E., & Zhang, S. (2024). Banks as lenders of first resort: Evidence from crisis periods. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 160(1), 45–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2024.01.004>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304405X24000045>
33. Liberti. (2019). Information and credit allocation. *Review of Financial Studies*, 32(5), 1981–2023. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhy050>
34. Mehta. (2020). Loan moratorium 2020 – Its impact on Indian banks. *Australian Finance & Banking Review*, 4(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.46281/afbr.v4i2.919>
35. Mishra, A., & Rath, B. N. (2025). Financial inclusion, digital banking, and crisis response in India. *Economic Modelling*, 134, 106514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2025.106514>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264999325000127>
36. Moro. (2020). SME financing and banking relationships. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 58(2), 263–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2019.1659677>
37. Ozili. (2020). COVID-19 and banking policy responses. *Finance Research Letters*, 35, 101294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101294>
38. Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (2024). Financial systems, crises, and policy interventions: A modern perspective. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 139(2), 905–942. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjad058>. <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/139/2/905/7283921>
39. Sengupta, R., & Vardhan, H. (2025). Banking sector reforms and credit delivery efficiency in India during crisis periods. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 88, 101593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2025.101593>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1049007825000184>
40. Singh. (2022). Digital banking adoption and MSME credit facilitation. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 40(7), 1534–1556. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-10-2021-0473>
41. Zhao. (2021). Bank processing efficiency during crisis credit delivery. *Journal of Financial Services Research*, 59, 241–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10693-021-00351-9>

