

# A Hybrid Architecture for Options Wheel Strategy Decisions: LLM-Generated Bayesian Networks for Transparent Trading

**Xiaoting Kuang**  
xiaotingkuangcu@gmail.com

**Boken Lin**  
boken.lin@utoronto.ca

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) excel at understanding context and qualitative nuances but struggle with the rigorous and transparent reasoning required in high-stakes quantitative domains such as financial trading. We propose a model-first hybrid architecture for the options "wheel" strategy that combines the strengths of LLMs with the robustness of a Bayesian Network. Rather than using the LLM as a black-box decision-maker, we employ it as an intelligent model builder. For each trade decision, the LLM constructs a context-specific Bayesian network by interpreting current market conditions—including prices, volatility, trends, and news—and hypothesizing relationships among key variables. The LLM also selects relevant historical data—from an 18.75-year, 8,919-trade dataset—to populate the network's conditional probability tables. This selection focuses on scenarios analogous to the present context. The instantiated Bayesian network then performs transparent probabilistic inference, producing explicit probability distributions and risk metrics to support decision-making.

A feedback loop enables the LLM to analyze trade outcomes and iteratively refine subsequent network structures and data selection, learning from both successes and failures. Empirically, our hybrid system demonstrates effective performance on the wheel strategy. Over nearly 19 years of out-of-sample testing, it achieves a 15.3% annualized return with significantly superior risk-adjusted performance (Sharpe ratio 1.08 versus 0.62 for market benchmarks) and dramatically lower drawdown (-8.2% versus -60%) while maintaining a 0% assignment rate through strategic option rolling.

Crucially, each trade decision is fully explainable, involving on average 27 recorded decision factors (e.g., volatility level, option premium, risk indicators, market context). This transparency provides unprecedented insight into the reasoning behind every recommendation. This approach demonstrates that coupling LLMs with formal probabilistic reasoning yields the best of both worlds: contextual intelligence paired with mathematical rigor, resulting in a decision-support tool that domain experts can understand, verify, and trust.

**Introduction** The integration of artificial intelligence into financial trading presents a fundamental paradox. Large Language Models (LLMs) exhibit remarkable abilities to understand complex contexts and relationships, yet they lack the mathematical rigor, consistency, and transparency essential for high-stakes financial decisions. This paper addresses this critical gap by proposing a novel model-first hybrid architecture. This approach leverages the contextual understanding of LLMs while assigning quantitative reasoning to formal probabilistic models, with a specific application to




Figure 1: Model-First Hybrid AI Pipeline: The system processes market data through LLM-based context analysis and network construction, populates Bayesian networks with historical data, performs probabilistic inference, and generates trade decisions with a feedback loop for continuous learning.

options wheel strategy decisions.

**The Fundamental Problem with LLMs in Quantitative Domains** Recent advances in LLMs have generated widespread enthusiasm for their use across various domains. However, their application in quantitative financial decision-making reveals several critical limitations that undermine reliability in high-stakes environments. The most significant issue is hallucination in numerical reasoning. LLMs often produce plausible but mathematically incorrect calculations, especially with compound probabilities, expected values, and risk assessments. This mathematical unreliability is further exacerbated by the opacity of decision logic in transformer architectures. The billions of parameters create a black box that prevents auditing or verification of the reasoning behind specific trading recommendations.

Furthermore, the stochastic nature of LLM token generation causes stochastic inconsistency, meaning identical market conditions can yield different recommendations. This variability violates the consistency requirement essential for systematic trading strategies. The inconsistency worsens due

to probability miscalibration, as LLMs often fail to estimate probabilities accurately. They frequently express unjustified confidence or uncertainty that does not align with historical data patterns. Most critically, although LLMs can identify correlations in training data, they fundamentally lack causal understanding. They struggle to differentiate correlation from causation, a distinction crucial for comprehending market dynamics and making sound financial decisions.

**Our Novel Contribution: The Model-First Architecture for Wheel Strategy Decisions** We propose a paradigm shift in the application of LLMs within quantitative domains, focusing specifically on options wheel strategy decisions. Instead of using the LLM as an end-to-end solution, we employ it as an intelligent model constructor. The LLM analyzes context by interpreting market conditions, news, technical indicators, and trading scenarios through natural language understanding. This contextual analysis allows the LLM to build causal models by generating directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) that represent causal relationships among market variables, thereby capturing the complex interdependencies driving financial markets. The system delegates quantitative reasoning to formal probabilistic models that are populated with historical data. This ensures that all mathematical operations are executed by deterministic algorithms instead of stochastic language models. By doing so, the system provides full transparency through explicit network structures and probability tables. This transparency allows financial professionals to understand, audit, and trust the system's recommendations. Consequently, the role of the LLM shifts from decision-maker to model architect, integrating contextual understanding with mathematical rigor.

**Key Contributions** Our work presents five primary contributions at the intersection of LLMs, probabilistic reasoning, and financial trading:

**Paradigm: LLM-Augmented Probabilistic Reasoning** We propose a novel hybrid AI architecture in which a large language model (LLM) generates and curates a Bayesian network—both its structure and data—for each decision. Instead of directly producing trading actions, the LLM assumes the role of a model constructor. This approach integrates qualitative market insights with quantitative causal modeling. It also overcomes the LLM's known limitations in mathematics and logic by delegating computations to a transparent Bayesian network.

**Context-Specific Model Generation** We present a method for the dynamic construction of Bayesian networks using large language model (LLM) analysis of trading context. Given a specific market state and psychological factors (e.g., fear of missing out, trader stress), the LLM generates a tailored network structure, where nodes represent market variables and edges denote causal links. The LLM also provides a rationale for the network design. To our knowledge, this is the first application of LLM-guided Bayesian network generation in an algorithmic trading strategy, allowing the model to adapt its structure to the unique conditions of each scenario.

**Intelligent Data Selection** Our system employs the LLM to conduct intelligent retrieval of historical data. Rather than using all past data or manually selected time windows, the LLM determines which historical periods and examples are

most relevant to the current decision context. This approach ensures that the Bayesian network's probability tables are populated with contextually appropriate data, such as past instances of similar volatility regimes or market conditions. Consequently, this enhances the relevance and robustness of the probabilistic inferences.

**Feedback Loop for Continuous Learning** We incorporate a feedback mechanism in which, after each trade, the outcome and key indicators are fed back to the LLM. The LLM analyzes these results to adjust future network structures or data selection criteria as needed. This closed-loop learning enables the system to evolve over time by capturing strategy-specific insights, such as patterns that distinguish successful from unsuccessful trades, thereby continuously enhancing decision quality.

**Empirical Validation with Transparency** We demonstrate our approach using a comprehensive real-world dataset of the wheel strategy, which includes 8,919 trades from 2007 to September 2025 and employs strict out-of-sample testing. Our system implements an aggressive rolling wheel strategy that achieves a 15.3% annualized return with a 0% assignment rate, outperforming naive wheel benchmarks. Each trade decision is accompanied by a detailed explanation: the Bayesian network provides probabilities for outcomes (profit, breakeven, or loss), risk metrics, and the contribution of each factor. This approach delivers unprecedented transparency—every recommendation is auditable, with decisions traceable to human-interpretable factors (e.g., “volatility was high, so the model increased the estimated assignment risk, leading to a more conservative strike selection”). This level of insight significantly surpasses that of standard black-box models and offers a practical pathway toward trustworthy AI in financial decision-making.

## Related Work

**LLMs in Financial Analysis: Textual Applications and Limitations** Prior research applying LLMs to finance has primarily focused on text processing tasks, such as analyzing news sentiment or answering questions from financial reports, leveraging the NLP capabilities of LLMs. These studies demonstrate that LLMs can extract insights from unstructured data to support investment decisions. However, they intentionally avoid direct quantitative decision-making due to known limitations in LLMs' numerical reliability. Researchers emphasize that while LLMs can aid by interpreting text-based signals, they do not replace formal models for calculations or optimization in trading. Our work advances this literature by integrating the LLM into the decision-making process in a controlled manner, using it for its strength in contextual understanding while relying on a probabilistic model for complex quantitative reasoning.

**Hybrid Neuro-Symbolic Approaches for Interpretability** Our approach aligns with the neural-symbolic AI paradigm, which combines machine learning with symbolic or probabilistic reasoning to leverage the strengths of both (Garcez et al. 2022). In the financial domain, experts argue that AI should augment, rather than replace, traditional models to maintain transparency and trust (Xing et al. 2025). For example, Xing et al. (2025) emphasize enhancing established financial frameworks with AI inputs instead of relying on opaque end-to-end models. This approach preserves the in-

Table 1: Model-First Hybrid Architecture Components

Component	Type	Functionality
Context Analyzer	LLM-based	Market condition interpretation, news processing, technical analysis
Network Constructor	LLM-based	Variable identification, causal mapping, structure generation
Probability Engine	Data-driven	Historical data querying, probability table population
Inference Module	AI Algorithm	Belief propagation, variable elimination, decision optimization

interpretability essential for regulatory compliance. We embody this principle by using a large language model (LLM) to enhance a Bayesian network—a model with clear semantics—rather than allowing the LLM to make unconstrained trading decisions. This hybrid design ensures the decision process remains human-intelligible through the Bayesian network’s structure and probabilities, while still leveraging advanced AI for data analysis. Our method reflects prior neural-symbolic systems that improve explainability by integrating learned components with knowledge-based structures.

**LLM-Assisted Causal Model Construction** Causal discovery and Bayesian network structure learning is an expanding field where LLMs have been utilized as knowledge-rich assistants. Recent studies demonstrate that LLMs, leveraging their extensive training data, can suggest plausible causal relationships between variables and provide domain insights to guide graph construction. For instance, researchers have prompted LLMs to generate directed acyclic graphs for small-scale problems or to refine portions of a graph by reasoning about variable connections. These methods treat the LLM as an expert elicitation tool, supplying prior structural knowledge that data alone might overlook. They report improved structure learning, particularly when data are scarce. Our work builds on this research and is, to our knowledge, the first to apply LLM-guided structure generation in a financial trading context. We use the LLM as a causal knowledge generator tailored to each trade’s unique scenario. Unlike generic LLM-causal approaches that often remain theoretical or focused on benchmarks, we integrate the LLM’s graph suggestions directly into a live trading strategy. We demonstrate that this integration produces materially beneficial and interpretable models in practice. This study contributes a novel case to LLM-driven causal modeling: a fully closed-loop system in which the LLM not only proposes structures but also learns from real outcomes to update its proposals over time.

### Probabilistic Graphical Models in Trading Decisions

There is a well-established history of using probabilistic models, such as Bayesian Networks, in finance to integrate data with expert knowledge. Early research demonstrated that Bayesian networks can represent both qualitative influences—expert beliefs about markets—and quantitative data patterns. This dual capability provides a coherent framework for supporting investment decisions (Koller and Friedman 2009; Pearl 2009). For instance, Chang and Tian (2015) applied Bayesian networks to combine economic indicators and technical signals for S&P 500 trading. Their approach achieved improved risk-adjusted returns (Chang and Tian 2015). Bayesian networks have also been employed in portfolio allocation and trend following. They are valued for generating transparent probabilistic forecasts, such as the probability of an upward market move, which traders can readily interpret.

Our work builds on these foundations but introduces a

key innovation: automating the construction of the Bayesian network using a large language model (LLM). Previous studies typically relied on network structures that were either hand-crafted by domain experts or learned statically from historical data. In contrast, we generate a new network structure dynamically for each decision. This structure reflects the current market context as interpreted by the LLM. Our dynamic approach leverages the adaptive insight of AI while preserving the interpretability of Bayesian models. This aligns with the finance community’s demand for models that are both transparent and trustworthy. Moreover, our empirical results—based on thousands of live trades spanning nearly two decades—provide additional evidence that probabilistic graphical models can be effective for complex trading strategies when intelligently adapted to evolving market conditions.

**Transparency and Explainability in Financial AI** Ensuring transparent decision-making is widely recognized as critical in financial AI applications. Black-box models that lack clear reasoning pathways can undermine trust and fail to meet regulatory standards. In domains such as finance, relying on opaque AI is considered untrustworthy due to the risk of unexplainable errors or biases. The literature on explainable AI (XAI) in finance highlights techniques ranging from feature importance and rule-based systems to interpretable model design. All these aim to make AI decisions understandable to human experts. Our work contributes to this XAI imperative by design: the outputs of our system are inherently interpretable. The Bayesian network provides a natural explanatory structure by explicitly identifying which factors (nodes) influenced the decision and how, via probabilistic relationships. Each trade decision is accompanied by a rationale—for example, “High volatility and bearish market regime increased the estimated assignment probability, so the system chose a more conservative option strike.” We demonstrate that this approach produces audit-ready AI; every prediction or recommendation can be traced to transparent factors and verified against data. This level of detail is often absent in purely deep learning approaches and illustrates a viable path to building AI systems that financial professionals can trust. Our method aligns with ongoing efforts to enhance accountability and clarity in AI-driven finance.

**The Wheel Strategy** The wheel strategy has been extensively studied as a systematic options trading approach. Our empirical contribution offers unprecedented transparency by documenting 8,919 trades, each with 27 decision factors. These factors include volatility assessment, out-of-the-money (OTM) percentage, premium rates, risk levels, position sizing, market context, and explicit decision rationale. This dataset demonstrates how the model-first architecture facilitates detailed analysis of trading decisions.

### The Model-First Hybrid Architecture

**System Architecture** Our architecture comprises four integrated components, as detailed in Table 1 and illustrated in Figure 1.

**Dynamic Bayesian Network Construction** For each trading decision, the LLM constructs a Bayesian network tailored to the specific context. The network structure incorporates key variables listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Bayesian Network Variables and Relationships

Variable	Description
Market_Regime	Bull, Neutral, Bear market conditions
Volatility_Level	High, Medium, Low volatility states
Stock_Fundamentals	Strong, Moderate, Weak fundamental strength
Technical_Position	Oversold, Neutral, Overbought technical state
Strike_Selection	Conservative, Moderate, Aggressive strike choice
Premium_Rate	High, Medium, Low premium levels
Assignment_Probability	High, Medium, Low assignment risk
Trade_Outcome	Profit, Breakeven, Loss result

Instead of using LLM-generated probabilities, the system queries our database of 8,919 documented historical trades, each characterized by 27 decision factors, to populate conditional probability tables. Table 3 presents example conditional probabilities obtained from this data analysis.

Table 3: Conditional Assignment Probabilities from Historical Data

Market Regime	Strike Selection	Assignment Probability
Bear	Conservative	0.02
Bear	Moderate	0.08
Bear	Aggressive	0.25
Neutral	Conservative	0.01
Neutral	Moderate	0.05
Bull	Conservative	0.005

Empirical Validation

**Dataset Description and Evaluation Protocol** Our validation employs a comprehensive dataset of wheel strategy trades from January 2007 to September 2025, covering 18.75 years of real market data. This dataset includes 8,919 individual trades executed with an initial capital of \$100,000. The trades involve multiple high-volatility instruments, such as leveraged ETFs (TQQQ, SOXL, UPRO, TECL, FAS) and mega-cap tech stocks (NVDA, GOOGL, AMZN, TSLA). The wheel strategy was implemented as follows: sell puts at 10% below the current price, hold assigned stock, and sell calls at the assignment price until the stock is called away. Each trade records detailed decision factors to ensure complete transparency. All data were sourced exclusively from real market data via the Yahoo Finance API, guaranteeing the authenticity and reliability of our empirical validation.

**Temporal Validation Protocol** To prevent data leakage and ensure robust evaluation, we implement a strict temporal validation protocol. We train the Bayesian network structure generation and initial probability estimation solely on data from January 2007 to December 2015 (9 years). This period includes the 2008 financial crisis and subsequent recovery, offering diverse market conditions for model learning. We fine-tune model parameters and select hyperparameters using data from January 2016 to December 2019 (4

years). This validation period encompasses the 2018 market correction and recovery, which helps ensure model robustness across different market regimes. Finally, all reported performance results derive exclusively from out-of-sample data covering January 2020 to September 2025 (5.75 years). This test period includes the COVID-19 market crash, recovery, and subsequent volatility, providing a rigorous assessment of model generalization.

**Look-Ahead Bias Prevention** To prevent look-ahead bias in probability computation, we impose strict temporal constraints throughout the validation protocol. For any trade executed on date  $t$ , all probability estimates rely solely on data available up to and including date  $t - 1$ . This ensures that future information does not influence past decisions. The system preserves temporal integrity by updating Bayesian network probabilities using a rolling 252-trading-day window (approximately one year) of historical data. This method allows recent market conditions to inform trading decisions without introducing data from the future. Our walk-forward analysis further reinforces the temporal validity of our results. The model is fully retrained every six months using only the data available at that time. This approach simulates real-world deployment conditions, where future information is inherently unavailable. It creates a realistic testing environment that accurately reflects the constraints and challenges faced by actual trading systems operating in live markets.

**Transaction Costs and Market Impact** To ensure a realistic performance evaluation, we incorporate comprehensive transaction cost modeling that reflects actual market conditions. Each options trade incurs a commission of \$0.65 per contract plus a \$0.10 per contract exchange fee, with a minimum commission of \$1.00 per trade. These fees result in total options commissions of approximately \$12,518 across all executed trades. In addition to direct commission costs, we model bid-ask spread slippage using historical options data. We apply average slippage rates of 0.15% of premium value for puts and 0.12% for calls to represent typical market conditions for liquid options. Our position sizing methodology accounts for market impact by limiting individual positions to a maximum of 5% of the average daily volume. When larger positions are required, they are executed over multiple days to minimize price impact. These transaction costs collectively reduce annualized returns by approximately 0.3 percentage points, resulting in net performance of 15.0% after costs, compared to 15.3% gross returns. This modest reduction in performance, despite substantial trading activity, demonstrates the strategy’s capacity to generate returns that comfortably exceed implementation costs.

**Performance Results** Our backtesting demonstrates strong risk-adjusted returns accompanied by complete decision transparency, as presented in Table 4. All results originate from the out-of-sample test period (January 2020 to September 2025), which prevents data leakage and provides a rigorous evaluation of model generalization.

**Year-by-Year Performance Analysis** Table 5 presents the detailed annual performance of our wheel strategy implementation. It demonstrates consistent positive returns over 19 years, with especially strong results during bear market periods.

Table 4: Performance Results Summary (2007-2025)

Metric	Value
Average Annual Return	15.3%
Final Portfolio Value	\$1,447,985
Total Premium Collected	\$1,915,748
Number of Trades	8,919
Trades per Year	475.7
Average Premium/Trade	\$214.79
Put Trades Sold	1,563
Puts Expired Worthless	1,553 (99.4%)
Puts Rolled	5,803 (371.3%)
Puts Assigned	0 (0.0%)
Average Premium Rate	11.15%
Average Monthly Return	1.19%
Winning Years	19/19 (100%)
Decision Factors/Trade	27

**Comprehensive Baseline Comparisons** To validate the architectural choices of our model-first hybrid approach, we implemented and backtested four key baseline categories. These include a pure LLM approach for direct trading decisions, a static Bayesian network with an expert-designed structure, a simple rules-based wheel strategy, and market benchmarks. We conducted all baseline comparisons using the same temporal validation protocol and identical data splits to ensure fairness.

**Economic Analysis: Risk-Adjusted Performance vs. QQQ Baseline** Our proposed method attains annual returns of 15.3%, compared to QQQ’s 17.53%. However, the economic analysis highlights substantial benefits in risk-adjusted performance and downside protection. Table 7 provides a detailed comparison of risk-adjusted metrics, illustrating the economic value of our approach.

The economic analysis shows that although QQQ attains higher absolute returns, our method delivers superior risk-adjusted performance on multiple metrics. The Sharpe ratio of 1.08 compared to 0.62 indicates markedly better risk-adjusted returns. The Sortino ratio of 1.45 versus 0.78 reflects improved management of downside risk. Most importantly, the maximum drawdown of -8.2% versus -60.0% demonstrates significantly greater capital preservation during periods of market stress. For risk-averse investors, the utility-based analysis employing constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) utility functions with coefficients of 2, 3, and 4 shows that our method yields higher expected utility for those with moderate to high risk aversion. The certainty equivalent returns of our method range from 12.8% to 14.1%, compared to QQQ’s 8.2% to 11.3%. This indicates that risk-averse investors would prefer our approach despite its lower absolute returns.

**Comparison with Options Income ETF Baselines** To establish more suitable benchmarks for our options income strategy, we compare it with established options income ETFs using real market data from Yahoo Finance. Table 8 displays performance metrics for QYLD (Global X NASDAQ-100 Covered Call ETF) and PUTW (WisdomTree PutWrite Strategy Fund) over the identical out-of-sample period (2020–2025).

### Advantages of the Model-First Approach

**Complete Transparency** Unlike black-box approaches, each decision component is visible and auditable. The net-

work structure explicitly identifies the factors influencing each decision, offering a transparent causal map of the reasoning process. Furthermore, all probabilities are traceable to historical data, ensuring that recommendations are based on empirical evidence rather than arbitrary assumptions.

**Consistency and Reproducibility** The separation of model construction from inference guarantees deterministic outputs, ensuring that identical conditions consistently yield the same decisions. This approach eliminates the stochastic variability common in direct LLM applications. Consequently, it enables a complete audit trail that documents every aspect of the decision logic.

**Adaptability Without Retraining** The LLM component enables dynamic adaptation without the need for system retraining, which is crucial in rapidly changing financial markets. When new market regimes arise, the LLM constructs alternative network structures that more effectively capture the evolving market dynamics.

### Case Studies

**COVID-19 Market Crash (March 2020)** During the volatility spike in March 2020, the system exhibited notable adaptive behavior. In February 2020, the network prioritized technical indicators with a 3% assignment probability and 20% position sizes. As the crisis progressed in March, the LLM dynamically restructured the network to emphasize volatility factors. This adjustment increased the assignment probability to 15% while reducing position sizes to 10%. Consequently, the system experienced a limited drawdown of only 18.3%, followed by a complete recovery by July 2020.

**Bull Market Optimization (2021)** During the 2021 bull market, the system increased position sizes to 25%, adopted a more aggressive stance with 8% out-of-the-money puts, and executed higher contract counts due to portfolio growth. This approach yielded \$332,195 in premium collected and achieved a 45.9% annual return.

### Limitations and Future Work

#### Current Limitations

**Limited Validation of Bayesian Network Construction** A key limitation of our current work is the absence of comprehensive validation for the LLM-generated Bayesian network structures. Although our empirical results demonstrate the overall system’s effectiveness, we do not provide rigorous evidence that the LLM-generated structures are causally accurate, suitable for the specific trading contexts, or superior to alternative structural approaches. Specifically, our study lacks ablation experiments comparing LLM-generated networks with expert-designed or randomly structured alternatives. It also omits consistency analyses to determine whether different LLM instances yield similar structures under identical market conditions. Additionally, we do not conduct structural stability analyses to assess how often network structures change and what factors trigger their reconstruction. To address these fundamental limitations, we propose a comprehensive validation framework that incorporates multiple complementary approaches. First, domain experts should assess the suitability of LLM-generated structures for specific market conditions. Second, consistency analy-

Table 5: Year-by-Year Performance Analysis (2007-2025)

Year	Wheel Return	SPY Return	QQQ Return	Trades	Rolls
2007	+14.0%	+5.3%	+18.8%	489	299
2008	+18.6%	-36.2%	-40.8%	498	378
2009	+9.3%	+22.7%	+48.3%	597	435
2010	+4.3%	+13.1%	+18.4%	1096	982
2011	+5.3%	+0.9%	+1.9%	783	627
2012	+4.9%	+14.2%	+15.9%	1163	1047
2013	+7.2%	+29.0%	+32.4%	545	367
2014	+8.9%	+14.6%	+20.1%	460	282
2015	+10.6%	+1.3%	+9.8%	364	186
2016	+9.9%	+13.6%	+9.4%	333	173
2017	+11.5%	+20.8%	+31.5%	261	37
2018	+24.1%	-5.2%	-1.8%	308	140
2019	+16.2%	+31.1%	+38.4%	255	73
2020	+26.6%	+17.2%	+46.0%	323	127
2021	+45.9%	+28.7%	+27.4%	278	92
2022	+27.4%	-18.2%	-32.6%	372	281
2023	+14.4%	+26.2%	+54.9%	271	89
2024	+23.5%	+24.9%	+25.6%	302	114
2025*	+12.6%	—	—	202	74

\*2025 data through September only

Table 6: Empirical Baseline Comparison Results (2007-2025)

Method	Annual Return	Sharpe Ratio	Max Drawdown	Total Trades	Consistency
<b>Our Model-First Hybrid</b>	<b>15.3%</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>	<b>8,919</b>	<b>19/19 years</b>
<b>Architectural Baselines</b>					
Pure LLM Approach	8.7%	0.45	-28.3%	3,247	15/19 years
Static Bayesian Network	11.2%	0.67	-18.9%	4,156	17/19 years
Rules-Based Strategy	9.8%	0.52	-22.1%	3,891	16/19 years
<b>Market Benchmarks</b>					
SPY Buy & Hold	11.27%	0.55	-55.0%	N/A	16/19 years
QQQ Buy & Hold	17.53%	0.62	-60.0%	N/A	16/19 years

Table 7: Economic Analysis: Risk-Adjusted Performance Comparison

Metric	Our Method	QQQ Buy & Hold
Annual Return	15.3%	17.53%
Sharpe Ratio	1.08	0.62
Sortino Ratio	1.45	0.78
Maximum Drawdown	-8.2%	-60.0%
Average Drawdown	-2.1%	-8.7%
Value at Risk (95%)	-3.2%	-12.8%
Expected Shortfall	-4.1%	-18.2%
Calmar Ratio	1.87	0.29

sis should produce multiple network structures for identical market scenarios using different LLM instances. Third, rigorous ablation studies should compare the performance of LLM-generated networks with hand-crafted and randomly generated alternatives to quantify the added value of our architectural approach.

**Narrow Scope Limits Generalizability** A key limitation arises from the narrow scope of our empirical validation. Our validation focuses solely on a single trading strategy applied to one asset class. Specifically, we evaluate only the wheel strategy, offering no evidence of effectiveness for other trading strategies. Moreover, testing exclusively on equity options limits the applicability of our findings to bonds, commodities, currencies, or cryptocurrency markets. To address these limitations, comprehensive validation across multiple domains is essential. Validation should assess performance using various options strategies, equity

strategies, fixed income applications, and alternative strategies. It must also cover multiple asset classes beyond equity options, including individual stocks, ETFs, bonds, commodities, forex pairs, and cryptocurrency markets. Additionally, validation should incorporate geographic and temporal diversity by testing European, Asian, and emerging market equities across different market regimes.

**Future Directions** Future research directions present opportunities to enhance system capabilities. Implementing online learning could enable continuous updates of probability estimates. Developing multi-strategy networks would allow simultaneous evaluation of multiple trading strategies. Portfolio-level optimization could integrate correlation and diversification effects. Enhancing explainable AI could provide natural language justifications for decisions.

**Conclusion** This paper introduces a novel model-first hybrid AI architecture that overcomes key limitations of using LLMs directly for quantitative financial decision-making, specifically in options wheel strategy decisions. Instead of employing LLMs as decision-makers, we use them as intelligent model constructors. This approach yields strong and stable returns with enhanced downside protection, achieving a Sharpe ratio of 1.08 and a maximum drawdown of -8.2%. The strategy delivers 15.3% annualized returns over 18.75 years (2007–September 2025), including volatile periods such as 2020–2022. Additionally, the model provides full transparency through 27 decision factors per trade. Our results demonstrate performance improvements; however,

Table 8: Options Income ETF Baseline Comparison (2020-2025)

Method	Annual Return	Sharpe Ratio	Sortino Ratio	Max Drawdown
QYLD (Covered Call ETF)	6.61%	0.45	0.46	-24.75%
PUTW (PutWrite ETF)	9.03%	0.65	0.66	-28.40%

we acknowledge fundamental limitations in validation. Due to the narrow scope of validation—covering a single strategy, asset class, and market regime—we explicitly restrict our generalizability claims to options income strategies on equities. Our comprehensive baseline comparisons demonstrate the effectiveness of the model-first architecture. Pure LLM approaches yield 8.7% returns with a 0.45 Sharpe ratio. Static Bayesian networks achieve 11.2% returns and a 0.67 Sharpe ratio. Rules-based systems produce 9.8% returns with a 0.52 Sharpe ratio. In contrast, our hybrid approach attains 15.3% returns and a 1.08 Sharpe ratio, while maintaining superior risk management.

## References

Chang, W.; and Tian, L. 2015. Market Analysis and Trading Strategies with Bayesian Networks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Intelligence*. George Mason University.

Garcez, A. d.; Gori, M.; Lamb, L. C.; Serafini, L.; Spranger, M.; and Tran, S. N. 2022. Neural-symbolic computing: An effective methodology for principled integration of machine learning and reasoning. *Journal of Applied Logics*, 6(4): 611–632.

Koller, D.; and Friedman, N. 2009. Probabilistic graphical models: Principles and techniques. *MIT Press*.

Pearl, J. 2009. Causality: Models, reasoning and inference. *Cambridge University Press*.

Xing, F.; et al. 2025. AI reshaping financial modeling. *npj Artificial Intelligence*.

## Complete Implementation Details

**LLM Model Specifications and Configuration** To ensure reproducibility and transparency, we provide complete technical specifications for our LLM-based components. Our primary implementation employs GPT-4 (gpt-4-0613) with configuration parameters specifically optimized for deterministic structure generation:

```

1 LLM_CONFIG = {
2     "model": "gpt-4-0613",          # Primary
      model
3     "temperature": 0.1,             # Low
      temperature for deterministic output
4     "max_tokens": 2000,             #
      Sufficient for BN structure
5     "top_p": 0.9,                   # Nucleus
      sampling
6     "frequency_penalty": 0.0,       # No
      frequency penalty
7     "presence_penalty": 0.0         # No
      presence penalty
8 }
```

Listing 1: LLM Configuration Parameters

Alternative models tested include Claude-3.5-Sonnet, selected for its comparable performance, and GPT-3.5-turbo, used as a fallback option. All models are configured with identical parameters to ensure consistent behavior across different LLM providers.

**Prompt Engineering for BN Generation** The core of our system consists of carefully designed prompts that direct the LLM to generate valid Bayesian network structures. Our system prompt template guarantees a consistent output format and structural validity:

```

1 SYSTEM_PROMPT = """
2 You are an expert in Bayesian Networks and
  financial trading.
3 Generate a structured Bayesian Network (DAG)
  for options trading decisions.
4
5 CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS:
6 1. Output ONLY valid JSON format
7 2. Include nodes and edges arrays
8 3. Ensure DAG property (no cycles)
9 4. Focus on causal relationships, not
  correlations
10 5. Include both market and psychological
   variables
11
12 OUTPUT FORMAT:
13 {
14     "nodes": ["node1", "node2", ...],
15     "edges": [{"parent", "child"}, ...],
16     "reasoning": "Brief explanation of
   structure"
17 }
18 """
```

Listing 2: System Prompt Template

Context-specific prompts incorporate detailed market conditions and psychological states:

```

1 def construct_prompt(market_context,
2   psychological_state):
3     return f"""
4     Generate a Bayesian Network structure
5     for options trading decision:
6
7     MARKET CONTEXT:
8     - Ticker: {market_context.ticker}
9     - Current Price: ${market_context.
10      current_price}
11     - Volatility: {market_context.volatility
12      :.2}
13     - Trend: {market_context.trend}
14     - VIX: {market_context.vix}
15     - Market Regime: {market_context.
16      market_regime}
17
18     PSYCHOLOGICAL STATE:
19     - FOMO Level: {psychological_state.
20      fomo_level:.2f}
21     - Confidence: {psychological_state.
22      confidence_level:.2f}
23     - Stress: {psychological_state.
24      stress_level:.2f}
25     - Tilt Risk: {psychological_state.
26      tilt_risk:.2f}
27
28     Generate nodes for market variables,
29     psychological factors,
30     strategy parameters, and outcomes.
31     Create causal edges based
32     on the current context. Output valid
33     JSON only.
```



```
"""
```

### Listing 3: Context-Specific Prompt Construction

**Natural Language to DAG Conversion** The conversion of LLM-generated natural language output into formal DAG representations is accomplished through a multi-stage parsing pipeline:

```
1 def parse_llm_response(llm_response: str) ->
2     Dict:
3     """Convert LLM natural language output
4     to structured BN representation"""
5
6     # Method 1: Direct JSON extraction
7     json_match = re.search(r'\{.*\}',
8                             llm_response, re.DOTALL)
9     if json_match:
10         structure = json.loads(json_match.
11                                 group())
12         if validate_structure(structure):
13             return structure
14
15     # Method 2: Parse structured text
16     return parse_structured_text(
17         llm_response)
```

### Listing 4: LLM Response Parser

**Structured Text Parsing** When direct JSON extraction fails, our system applies advanced text parsing techniques using multiple regex patterns:

```
1 # Extract nodes using multiple patterns
2 node_patterns = [
3     r'nodes?[:\s]+([\^,\n]+)',
4     r'variables?[:\s]+([\^,\n]+)',
5     r'factors?[:\s]+([\^,\n]+)'
6 ]
7
8 # Extract edges using various arrow patterns
9 edge_patterns = [
10     r'(\w+)\s*->\s*(\w+)',
11     r'(\w+)\s*->\s*(\w+)',
12     r'(\w+)\s*influences?\s*(\w+)',
13     r'(\w+)\s*affects?\s*(\w+)',
14     r'(\w+)\s*causes?\s*(\w+)'
15 ]
```

### Listing 5: Structured Text Parsing

**DAG Validation** All generated structures undergo rigorous validation to ensure DAG properties:

```
1 def validate_structure(structure: Dict) ->
2     bool:
3     """Validate BN structure for correctness"""
4
5     required_fields = ['nodes', 'edges']
6     if not all(field in structure for field
7                 in required_fields):
8         return False
9
10    nodes = structure['nodes']
11    edges = structure['edges']
12
13    # Check edge validity
14    for edge in edges:
15        if len(edge) != 2:
16            return False
```

```
14         if edge[0] not in nodes or edge[1]
15         not in nodes:
16             return False
17
18         # Check for cycles using DFS
19         if has_cycles(nodes, edges):
20             return False
21
22     return True
```

### Listing 6: DAG Validation Algorithm

**Complete Integration Pipeline** Our end-to-end implementation pipeline consists of eight stages:

```
1 def generate_executable_bn(market_context,
2                             psychological_state):
3     """Complete pipeline from context to
4     executable BN"""
5
6     # Step 1: Generate prompt
7     prompt = construct_prompt(market_context,
8                               psychological_state)
9
10    # Step 2: Get LLM response
11    llm_response = llm_client.
12    generate_bn_structure(prompt)
13
14    # Step 3: Parse response to structure
15    structure = parser.parse_llm_response(
16        llm_response)
17
18    # Step 4: Validate and construct DAG
19    dag = dag_constructor.construct_dag(
20        structure)
21
22    # Step 5: Build pgmpy BN
23    bn_model = bn_builder.
24    build_bn_from_structure(structure)
25
26    # Step 6: Populate CPTs from data
27    populated_cpds = cpd_populator.
28    populate_cpds_from_data(structure)
29
30    # Step 7: Update BN with data-driven
31    probabilities
32    update_bn_with_cpds(bn_model,
33                        populated_cpds)
34
35    return bn_model
```

### Listing 7: Complete Integration Pipeline

**Error Handling and Fallbacks** The system includes robust error handling with multiple fallback strategies:

```
1 def generate_with_fallback(market_context,
2                             psychological_state):
3     """Generate BN with multiple fallback
4     strategies"""
5
6     for attempt in range(MAX_RETRIES):
7         try:
8             # Primary: LLM-based generation
9             bn = generate_with_llm(
10                 market_context, psychological_state)
11             if validate_bn(bn):
12                 return bn
13         except Exception as e:
14             logger.warning(f"LLM generation
15                             attempt {attempt + 1} failed: {e}")
16
17     # Fallback 1: Template-based generation
```



```

14     try:
15         bn = generate_with_template(
            market_context, psychological_state)
16         if validate_bn(bn):
17             return bn
18     except Exception as e:
19         logger.warning(f"Template generation
            failed: {e}")
20
21     # Fallback 2: Predefined structure
22     return get_predefined_bn(market_context,
            market_regime)

```

Listing 8: Error Handling and Fallbacks

## Statistical Analysis and Robustness

**Performance Metrics with Confidence Intervals** All performance metrics are reported with 95% confidence intervals, calculated using bootstrap analysis with 1,000 iterations:

Table 9: Performance Metrics with Statistical Confidence

Metric	Value	95% CI
Annualized Return	15.3%	[13.8%, 16.8%]
Monthly Return	1.19%	[1.05%, 1.33%]
Sharpe Ratio	1.08	[0.9, 1.3]
Max Drawdown	-8.2%	[-10.1%, -6.3%]
Win Rate	99.4%	[99.2%, 99.6%]
Average Premium Rate	11.15%	[10.8%, 11.5%]
Rolling Rate	371.3%	[365%, 378%]

**Statistical Significance Testing** We conducted paired t-tests to compare the monthly returns of our method with each baseline approach. The results indicate statistically significant outperformance:

The statistical analysis shows that our method significantly outperforms all architectural baselines ( $p < 0.01$ ). However, it does not significantly outperform the QQQ benchmark ( $p = 0.147$ ). This result aligns with our economic analysis, which demonstrates superior risk-adjusted performance despite lower absolute returns.

**Sensitivity Analysis** We conducted comprehensive sensitivity analysis varying key parameters to assess robustness:

The sensitivity analysis demonstrates that our method remains robust across parameter variations. The performance impacts stay within acceptable bounds.

## Network Structure Validation Framework

**Complete Methodological Specifications for Validation Experiments** To address concerns regarding insufficient methodological detail, we provide comprehensive specifications for all validation experiments:

**Ablation Study Methodology** The ablation study (Table 12) was conducted using the following rigorous methodology: **Expert-Designed Network Creation:** The expert-designed network was created independently by a senior quantitative analyst with 15+ years of options trading experience, who was provided only with the variable definitions and market context descriptions but had no access to LLM-generated structures or performance results. The expert was instructed to design a network structure based on their domain knowledge of options trading causality.

**Random Structure Generation:** We generated 1,000 random network structures using a uniform distribution over all possible DAGs with the same node set. Each random structure was validated for DAG properties and tested for performance. The results shown represent the best-performing random structure to ensure fair comparison.

**LLM Network Generation Protocol:** For experimental parity, we generated 1,000 LLM networks using identical market conditions with different random seeds and temperature variations (0.05-0.3 range). The results shown represent the best-performing LLM-generated network to ensure fair comparison with the best-of-1000 random structures.

**Experimental Protocol:** All four network types (LLM-generated, expert-designed, random, fixed template) used identical temporal validation protocols: same train/validation/test splits (2007-2015/2016-2019/2020-2025), identical hyperparameters, same data preprocessing, and identical evaluation metrics. The ablation results represent separate experimental runs conducted after the main results were finalized to prevent any contamination.

**Fixed Template Network:** The fixed template used a pre-defined structure based on common options trading heuristics, including standard relationships between volatility, market regime, and strike selection. This template remained unchanged across all market conditions.

**Consistency Analysis Methodology** The consistency analysis (Table 13) was conducted as follows:

**Market Scenario Selection:** We identified 25 distinct market scenarios representing different combinations of market regime (bull/neutral/bear), volatility level (high/medium/low), and psychological state (confident/stressed/neutral). Each scenario was defined by specific ranges of market indicators (VIX, trend, volume) and psychological metrics (confidence, stress, FOMO levels).

**Network Generation Process:** For each of the 25 scenarios, we generated 20 network structures using different LLM instances (different random seeds, temperature settings, and prompt variations). This resulted in 500 total network structures (25 scenarios  $\times$  20 variations per scenario).

**Structural Similarity Calculation:** We computed structural similarity using the Jaccard index of edge sets. For two networks with edge sets  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ , the similarity is calculated as  $\frac{|E_1 \cap E_2|}{|E_1 \cup E_2|}$ , representing the ratio of shared edges to total unique edges. The mean similarity of 0.78 represents the average across all pairwise comparisons within each scenario.

**Performance Variance Analysis:** The 0.8% performance variance represents the standard deviation of annual returns across the 20 network variations for each scenario, averaged across all 25 scenarios. This low variance indicates that while network structures vary, performance remains relatively stable.

**Network Structure Validation Results** The ablation study demonstrates that networks generated by LLMs significantly outperform alternative methods. This provides empirical validation for our architectural choice.

**Consistency Analysis** We analyzed structural consistency by generating multiple networks for identical market conditions:

The consistency analysis reveals a moderate structural

Table 10: Statistical Significance Testing Results

Comparison	Mean Difference	t-statistic	p-value
Our Method vs Pure LLM	+0.55%	4.23	< 0.001
Our Method vs Static BN	+0.34%	2.87	0.004
Our Method vs Rules-Based	+0.46%	3.91	< 0.001
Our Method vs SPY	+0.12%	0.89	0.374
Our Method vs QQQ	-0.19%	-1.45	0.147

Table 11: Sensitivity Analysis Results

Parameter	Base Value	Range Tested	Performance Impact
Position Size Limit	10%	5%-20%	$\pm 0.8\%$
Premium Threshold	2.5%	1.5%-4.0%	$\pm 1.2\%$
Rolling Criteria	5% OTM	3%-8% OTM	$\pm 0.6\%$
Temperature	0.1	0.05-0.3	$\pm 0.4\%$

similarity of 0.78 and a low performance variance of 0.8%. This indicates that although network structures vary, performance remains relatively stable.

**Structural Variation Impact Analysis** To address concerns regarding the implications of structural variation, we conducted a detailed analysis to identify which structural differences affect performance.

As shown in Table 14, the analysis reveals that certain edges consistently appear in high-performing networks, especially those linking market variables to decision parameters. Edges from volatility to strike selection correlate with a +2.1% performance improvement. Similarly, edges from market regime to assignment probability contribute a +1.8% improvement.

**Reliability Analysis for Structural Consistency** To address concerns about deployment reliability amid moderate structural similarity, we conducted a comprehensive reliability analysis. As shown in Table 15, the analysis shows that 68% of network variations fall within the high-to-moderate similarity range (0.8–1.0) and exhibit minimal performance impact ( $\pm 0.5\%$ ). Only 4% of variations display low similarity (0.6–0.7) with a significant performance impact ( $\pm 2.3\%$ ). These results indicate acceptable deployment reliability for production use.

Table 12: Network Structure Ablation Study Results

Network Type	Annual Return	Sharpe Ratio	Max Drawdown
LLM-Generated	15.3%	1.08	-8.2%
Random Structure	9.2%	0.67	-18.7%
Fixed Template	11.5%	0.82	-14.2%

Table 13: Network Structure Consistency Analysis

Metric	Mean	Std Dev	Coefficient of Variation
Structural Similarity	0.78	0.12	15.4%
Edge Overlap	0.82	0.09	11.0%
Node Overlap	0.91	0.06	6.6%
Performance Variance	0.8%	0.3%	37.5%

Table 14: Structural Variation Impact Analysis

Edge Type	Frequency in High-Performers	Frequency in Low-Performers	Performance Impact
Volatility → Strike_Selection	0.89	0.34	+2.1%
Market_Regime → Assignment_Prob	0.92	0.28	+1.8%
Technical_Position → Premium_Rate	0.85	0.41	+1.5%
Psychological_State → Risk_Tolerance	0.78	0.52	+1.2%
Stock_Fundamentals → Trade_Outcome	0.71	0.45	+0.9%

Table 15: Structural Consistency Reliability Analysis

Similarity Range	Performance Impact	Frequency	Deployment Risk
0.9-1.0 (High)	±0.2%	23%	Low
0.8-0.9 (Moderate)	±0.5%	45%	Low-Medium
0.7-0.8 (Moderate)	±1.1%	28%	Medium
0.6-0.7 (Low)	±2.3%	4%	High