

Dissecting the Ledger: Locating and Suppressing “Liar Circuits” in Financial Large Language Models

Soham Mirajkar

IIT Jodhpur

December 1, 2025

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly deployed in high-stakes financial domains, yet they suffer from specific, reproducible hallucinations when performing arithmetic operations. Current mitigation strategies often treat the model as a black box. In this work, we propose a **mechanistic** approach to intrinsic hallucination detection. By applying Causal Tracing to the GPT-2 XL architecture on the ConvFinQA benchmark, we identify a **dual-stage mechanism** for arithmetic reasoning: a distributed computational “scratchpad” in middle layers (L12-L30) and a decisive “aggregation” circuit in late layers (specifically **Layer 46**). We verify this mechanism via an ablation study, demonstrating that suppressing Layer 46 reduces the model’s confidence in hallucinatory outputs by **81.8%**. Furthermore, we demonstrate that a linear probe trained on this layer generalizes to unseen financial topics with **98% accuracy**, suggesting a universal geometry of arithmetic deception.

1 Introduction

The integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) into quantitative finance is hindered by the “Hallucination Problem.” While often framed as random noise, we hypothesize that hallucinations in arithmetic reasoning are **structural failures**. Specifically, when an LLM is asked to compute “Revenue growth from 50M to 30M,” and it answers “50%” (instead of -40%), it is not merely guessing; it is executing a flawed computational circuit.

While recent surveys, such as Lee et al. (2024), comprehensively categorize the landscape of Financial LLMs and identify hallucination as a primary barrier, they predominantly focus on behavioral evaluations [2]. Our work complements this by providing a **mechanistic** explanation for these failures, moving from symptom identification to root-cause analysis.

2 Methodology

2.1 Task Definition

We utilize the **ConvFinQA** dataset, filtering for numerical reasoning tasks involving arithmetic operations. We categorize model outputs into two sets: Y_{clean} (Factually Correct) and $Y_{hallucinated}$ (Arithmetic Errors).

2.2 Causal Tracing Setup

We adapt the Causal Tracing method (Meng et al., 2022). We iterate through every hidden state h_i^l (at token i , layer l) and intervene to measure its restorative potential:

$$\text{Impact}(h_i^l) = \mathbb{P}_{\text{patch}}(\text{Correct Answer}) - \mathbb{P}_{\text{corrupted}}(\text{Correct Answer}) \quad (1)$$

2.3 Implementation

We utilize the TransformerLens library to hook into internal activations.

```

1 def patching_hook(resid_pre, hook, pos, clean_cache):
2     # Overwrite the corrupted state with the clean state
3     resid_pre[:, pos, :] = clean_cache[hook.name][:, pos, :]
4     return resid_pre
5
6 patched_logits = model.run_with_hooks(
7     corrupted_tokens,
8     fwd_hooks=[(hook_name, partial(patching_hook, pos=position))]
9 )

```

Listing 1: Activation Patching Hook

3 Core Findings

3.1 The Dual-Stage Mechanism

Our analysis of GPT-2 XL (1.5B parameters) reveals that financial reasoning is not monolithic but split into two distinct sites.




Figure 1: **Causal Tracing Heatmap.** The x-axis represents tokens in the financial prompt. The y-axis represents Transformer layers (0-48). Note the distributed impact in the middle layers (L12-L30) at the operand tokens and the massive peak at Layer 46 at the final token.

Observation 1 (The Calculation Site): As visualized in Figure 1, we observe sustained, distributed causal impact in **Layers 12 through 30**, specifically localized at the operand tokens. *Interpretation:* These layers function as the “computational engine,” where the model attends to and processes the numerical values.

Observation 2 (The Late-Layer Gatekeeper): The single highest causal impact (**0.0073**) occurs at **Layer 46** on the final token position. *Interpretation:* This “Late Site” acts as an aggregator. It consolidates the upstream calculations before the final decoding.

3.2 Validation via Causal Suppression

To confirm the causal necessity of the identified mechanism, we performed an ablation study on the “Liar Layer” (L46). By suppressing the activation of this layer during inference (setting the residual contribution to zero), we observed an **81.8% reduction** in the model’s confidence for the hallucinatory output (from 0.0522 to 0.0095). This effectively “breaks” the hallucination circuit, proving that Layer 46 is the active bottleneck for the arithmetic decision.

3.3 Robustness Verification

To ensure these findings are not artifacts of a specific sentence structure, we averaged Causal Traces across $N = 5$ distinct financial scenarios.




Figure 2: **Robustness Analysis.** Averaged Causal Impact across 5 diverse financial prompts. The high-impact region at Layer 46 remains consistent, confirming it as a structural bottleneck for arithmetic output.

As shown in Figure 2, the **Late-Layer Gatekeeper at Layer 46** persists across all prompts. This confirms that the “Liar Circuit” mechanism is a universal feature of the model’s arithmetic processing.

4 Application: A Universal Hallucination Detector

To evaluate the practical utility of the identified “Liar Circuit” at Layer 46, we trained a linear probe (Logistic Regression) on the activation states of this layer.

Experiment: We constructed a dataset of synthetic financial queries divided into two distinct topics: *Corporate Finance* (Revenue/Cost) and *Stock Trading* (Open/Close). We trained the probe *only* on Corporate Finance data and tested its ability to detect hallucinations in the unseen Stock Trading domain.




Figure 3: **Geometry of Deception.** PCA projection of Layer 46 activations. Even on unseen topics (triangles), the model’s internal state separates clearly into “Truth” (Green) and “Hallucination” (Red) clusters along a shared linear direction.

Result: The probe achieved a generalization accuracy of **98%** on the held-out Stock topic. This suggests that arithmetic hallucination in GPT-2 XL is not task-specific but shares a universal topological signature in the residual stream of Layer 46. This finding paves the way for lightweight, topic-agnostic safety monitors that can flag numerical errors in real-time.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

Our findings explain the structural fragility of Financial LLMs. Unlike symbolic systems which process logic sequentially, LLMs rely on a **“Retrieval-then-Aggregation”** mechanism. The distributed retrieval in middle layers is prone to noise, and the singular bottleneck at Layer 46 acts as a single point of failure.

We successfully identified the “Liar Circuit” in GPT-2 XL, characterized by a late-stage bottleneck at Layer 46. We further demonstrated that this circuit has a consistent geometry that allows for **98% accurate zero-shot detection** of hallucinations across different financial domains. This work suggests that future financial AI safety should move beyond external verifiers and focus on monitoring internal state dynamics at the aggregation layers.

References

- [1] Meng, K., Bau, D., Andonian, A., & Belinkov, Y. (2022). Locating and Editing Factual Associations in GPT. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 35, 17359-17372.
- [2] Lee, J., Stevens, N., Han, S. C., & Song, M. (2024). A Survey of Large Language Models in Finance (FinLLMs). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02315*.

- [3] Chen, Z., Chen, W., Smiley, C., Shah, S., Borova, I., Langdon, D., ... & Wang, W. Y. (2021). FinQA: A Dataset of Numerical Reasoning over Financial Data. *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 3697-3711.