

When Experts Speak: Sequential LLM-Bayesian Learning for Startup Success Prediction*

Yidong Chai^a, Yanguang Liu^b, Xuan Tian^c, Jiaheng Xie^d, and Yonghang Zhou^e

Abstract

Evaluating startups is inherently challenging in entrepreneurial finance, where investors confront severe information asymmetry and limited quantitative data. Leveraging a novel expert network call data, we develop an LLM-Bayesian model that analyzes these conversations at the question-answer turn level, extracting semantic and evaluative signals via large language models (LLMs) and aggregating them in a sequential Bayesian architecture. The model dynamically updates beliefs as additional expert calls occur and attenuates contradictory assessments, which are absent from existing text-based screening tools. Our model outperforms state-of-the-art benchmarks by 6.69% in F1-score and increases portfolio-level Return on Investment by 15.26%. Attention and ablation analyses reveal that conversational cues are particularly informative for technologically complex startups, young firms, diverse founding teams, and firms with low public visibility. By converting expert dialogue into continually updated probabilities, our model advances research in entrepreneurial finance and information systems and offers policy implications for improving funding outcomes for informationally disadvantaged startups.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Finance; Large Language Models; Bayesian Learning; Expert Network Calls; Textual Analysis; Venture Capital.

JEL: G24, G32

* Tian acknowledges financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.72425002). We remain responsible for all remaining errors and omissions.

a Hefei University of Technology, chaiyd@hfut.edu.cn.

b Martin Tuchman School of Management, New Jersey Institute of Technology, yl224@njit.edu.

c PBC School of Finance, Tsinghua University, China, tianx@pbcfsf.tsinghua.edu.cn.

d Alfred Lerner College of Business and Economics, University of Delaware, jxie@udel.edu.

e Hefei University of Technology, 2014213676@mail.hfut.edu.cn.

When Experts Speak: Sequential LLM-Bayesian Learning for Startup Success Prediction^{*}

Abstract

Evaluating startups is inherently challenging in entrepreneurial finance, where investors confront severe information asymmetry and limited quantitative data. Leveraging a novel expert network call data, we develop an LLM-Bayesian model that analyzes these conversations at the question-answer turn level, extracting semantic and evaluative signals via large language models (LLMs) and aggregating them in a sequential Bayesian architecture. The model dynamically updates beliefs as additional expert calls occur and attenuates contradictory assessments, which are absent from existing text-based screening tools. Our model outperforms state-of-the-art benchmarks by 6.69% in F1-score and increases portfolio-level Return on Investment by 15.26%. Attention and ablation analyses reveal that conversational cues are particularly informative for technologically complex startups, young firms, diverse founding teams, and firms with low public visibility. By converting expert dialogue into continually updated probabilities, our model advances research in entrepreneurial finance and information systems and offers policy implications for improving funding outcomes for informationally disadvantaged startups.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Finance; Large Language Models; Bayesian Learning; Expert Network Calls; Textual Analysis; Venture Capital.

JEL: G24, G32

1. Introduction

Predicting which early-stage startups will succeed is a central challenge in entrepreneurial finance. Although a small subset of startups achieves rapid growth or liquidity events, most do not, generating highly skewed return distributions and magnifying misallocation risks (Kerr et al. 2014). Investors must screen under severe information asymmetry: private firms rarely disclose audited financials, frequently pivot business models, and offer limited operating histories (Gompers and Lerner 2001, Ewens and Marx 2018). Common platform data, such as funding rounds or product descriptions, provide narrow, backward-looking snapshots that reveal little about latent execution capability or competitive durability. As a result, startup screening depends heavily on qualitative assessment and sequential updating under uncertainty.

To alleviate information frictions, institutional investors increasingly rely on expert network platforms that facilitate compliance-monitored conversations with domain specialists (Solomon and Soltes 2015, Bernstein et al. 2017). These multi-turn, investor-directed dialogues elicit experiential insights on product adoption, customer churn, and competitive positioning, which are typically absent from static disclosures. Because experts are external to the focal firm, they face fewer incentives to spin narratives (Larcker and Zakolyukina 2012), allowing investors to triangulate perspectives across customers, competitors, and former executives. The resulting transcripts capture dynamic, interactive exchanges that reveal how investors probe, how experts qualify uncertainty, and how judgment evolves, distinguishing expert calls from scripted corporate communications. In our data, each call consists of a one-on-one conversation between an investor and an external expert, typically lasting 45–60 minutes and transcribed verbatim by the platform; we define each question–answer pair as an exchange, and the entire sequence as a conversation.

Despite its value, three key technical challenges arise in analyzing expert call data. First, expert calls produce lengthy and continuously generated textual data, making direct processing inefficient and less effective, as useful information is often sparse and accumulates over time. Therefore, a scalable approach is needed to efficiently analyze the data for improved predictive performance; yet, how to design such a method remains unclear. Second, capturing the underlying data characteristics is crucial for predictive performance. Expert call data have a hierarchical sequential structure (each company has a series of calls, and each call includes multiple question–answer pairs) and a paired structure (each pair includes a question and an answer). Modeling these complex dependencies across calls, conversations, questions, and answers is challenging. Third, expert calls take place at different times, and a company’s success rate may change accordingly. Since only the final binary outcome (i.e., success or not) is observed, it is required to infer the underlying success rate in real time. Since the success rate is dynamically inferred, it is necessary to quantify the uncertainty of such inference and update the beliefs sequentially.

To address the above three challenges, this study proposes an LLM–Bayesian network approach to

predict startup success. We employ an LLM to extract dense vector-based representations of the textual content, effectively capturing key information. Within each expert call, the questions and answers typically revolve around the company’s underlying status: the questions seek to uncover it, while the answers reflect the expert’s judgment of it. Hence, we further introduce a vector-based variable to represent each expert call. Meanwhile, given the Bayesian network’s strength in modeling complex dependencies, such as the dependencies among expert calls, conversations, questions, and answers in our context, we propose a Bayesian network to capture these dependencies. Additionally, we introduce latent variables that represent the company’s underlying success rate, both the one implied by the final observed binary outcome and those estimated immediately after each expert call. These latent variables are inferred jointly during the training process in a Bayesian manner, allowing us to predict a company’s success rate and update such beliefs sequentially after each expert call, when applied in practice. The company’s success rate is modeled as a distribution, allowing us to quantify the uncertainty.

To motivate our LLM–Bayesian network approach, we first analyze the semantic patterns in expert call data. Using a large language model (LLM), we convert unstructured conversations into interpretable, investment-relevant features that reveal systematic variation across expert types and industries: customers and consultants emphasize acquisition and competition, whereas competitors and former executives highlight strategic and regulatory concerns. Sentiment polarity further separates optimistic innovation narratives from cautious discussions of compliance or restructuring, indicating that expert calls embed heterogeneous private information. These regularities motivate a Bayesian framework that treats startup success as a latent state inferred from multiple conversational signals and refines this belief as new calls arrive. As additional evidence accumulates, both predictive (*F1-Score* and *Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC)*) and economic (*ROI (Return on Investment)* and *MOIC (Multiple on Invested Capital)*) performance improve, demonstrating that the model learns dynamically rather than relying on static assessments. Our model outperforms state-of-the-art benchmarks by 6.69% in F1-score and increases portfolio-level Return on Investment by 15.26%. By combining the semantic richness of LLM representations with Bayesian belief updating, our model transforms qualitative dialogue into a structured, continuously updated measure of success that mirrors investors’ iterative due-diligence cycles and links information flow directly to investment outcomes.

Beyond predictive accuracy, our model offers economically interpretable insights linking conversational patterns to realized startup outcomes. Attention analyses show that the LLM–Bayesian network prioritizes information dynamically: it assigns the greatest weight to customers and consultants, whose discussions of acquisition, competition, and regulation most strongly predict success. Credible optimism in technical or compliance-heavy domains carries higher predictive value than pessimism, mirroring investor intuition that informed confidence signals quality. As startups mature, the salience of

qualitative discussions declines, reflecting an information-substitution process, in which narrative and expert judgment dominate early assessments but give way to quantitative metrics. Overall, these attention patterns show that the model captures how investors update beliefs across diverse information sources as firms evolve.

Finally, we examine where the LLM–Bayesian network delivers the greatest marginal value. Gains are largest for technologically complex startups, where expert discourse captures implementation risk and differentiation overlooked by structured metrics; for diverse founder teams, where conversations surface leadership quality underweighted by traditional indicators; and for low-visibility firms, where expert insights substitute for missing public signals. Across these high-friction settings, the model attains markedly higher AUC and ROI, demonstrating that it adds the most value when information is sparse or biased. By complementing investor judgment where qualitative expertise is most critical, our model helps mitigate funding gaps for complex and under-documented firms, enhancing allocative efficiency and innovation equity.

Our contribution is threefold. First, we introduce expert network calls as a novel and economically meaningful data source for studying how investors acquire and process information about opaque startups. The venture capital literature identifies information asymmetry as a central friction in entrepreneurial finance (Gompers and Lerner 2004, Kaplan and Strömberg 2004). Prior work on soft information, such as managerial tone, founder narratives, and survey assessments (Drake et al. 2012), relies on sparse, episodic, and strategic disclosures. In contrast, expert calls provide high-frequency, third-party evaluations from customers, consultants, competitors, and former executives, reflecting diffuse private knowledge largely absent from traditional datasets. This analysis complements research on alternative information infrastructures in private markets (Hochberg et al. 2007, Solomon and Soltes 2015, Bernstein et al. 2017) by identifying the qualitative signals investors rely on when hard data are limited and by showing how they outsource fundamental discovery to domain specialists during due diligence.

Second, we develop an LLM–Bayesian network that captures the hierarchical and sequential nature of investor learning in expert calls. The model represents each conversation as linked question–answer exchanges and infers a latent, continuous measure of startup success that evolves as new information arrives. This design mirrors how investors update beliefs in real time, integrating conversational signals across experts, topics, and time. By combining the semantic power of LLMs with Bayesian belief updating, our model transforms unstructured dialogue into a dynamic, data-driven analogue of due diligence, overcoming the limitations of static text-based approaches. From a policy perspective, it can help reduce underinvestment in technologically complex, demographically diverse, and low-visibility startups, where informational frictions are greatest, thereby enhancing allocative efficiency and innovation equity.

Third, we contribute to the growing literature on machine learning in finance, demonstrating its applicability beyond expert call analysis. While prior studies largely use LLMs for classification or sentiment detection (Huang et al. 2023), our model shows how these models can serve as inputs to Bayesian systems that quantify belief dynamics and uncertainty, core elements of financial decision-making. By integrating advances in natural language processing with probabilistic inference, we extend recent work on artificial intelligence (AI)-based prediction (Ke et al. 2019, Giglio et al. 2021) toward a more interpretable and economically grounded paradigm, linking the methodological frontier of AI to classic finance questions on information processing and learning under uncertainty.

2. Related Literature

2.1 Entrepreneurial Finance and Startup Success Prediction

Evaluating early-stage startups is difficult due to severe information asymmetry and the challenge of assessing entrepreneurial quality. Unlike mature firms, startups lack audited financials, operating histories, and standardized disclosures, limiting the hard signals available for ex ante screening (Bernstein et al. 2017, Howell 2017). Prior research links observable attributes, such as founder experience, intellectual property, early traction, and investor networks, to startup success (Ewens and Marx 2018, Gompers et al. 2020), yet evidence remains fragmented, and many traits are only partially observable at investment. Recent work shows that qualitative information can mitigate these frictions when quantitative signals are scarce: Guzman and Li (2023) find that early strategic choices predict later growth; Maarouf et al. (2025) show that combining LLM representations with structured data enhances outcome prediction; and Katsafados et al. (2024) demonstrate that text-based models improve merger prediction in banking. Together, these studies indicate that unstructured narratives embed valuable information for screening and valuation under asymmetric information. To synthesize this evidence, we organize established determinants of startup performance into a structured framework, the Startup Success Ontology (SSO). An ontology is a formal specification of key concepts and their relationships (Gruber 1995), serving here as an integrative schema grounded in entrepreneurial finance research (Zhang et al. 2024). The SSO does not propose new theory but consolidates widely accepted factors into four coherent dimensions: startup characteristics (product–market fit, burn rate, intellectual property; (Gans et al. 2019, Guzman and Li 2023)); market and industry factors (total addressable market, regulation; (Gompers and Lerner 2001)); investor characteristics (venture capital reputation, governance, network strength; (Hochberg et al. 2007, Kaplan and Strömberg 2009)); and buyer characteristics (strategic fit, acquisition history; (Bowen et al. 2023)).

The SSO serves two key roles. First, it provides an economically grounded lens for interpreting heterogeneous qualitative information when assessing startup fundamentals. Second, it aligns narrative disclosures, such as expert network calls, with core constructs of entrepreneurial finance related to

screening, monitoring, and exit valuation. By structuring established determinants into a coherent framework, the SSO enhances interpretability while remaining anchored in the economic foundations of startup evaluation.

2.2. Expert Network Calls and Qualitative Signals

Expert network calls have become an important channel for institutional investors to obtain decision-relevant information on private and pre-IPO firms. Following regulatory reforms that curtailed selective disclosure, these intermediaries facilitate structured Q&A sessions between investors and domain specialists (Bushee et al. 2003). Through adaptive questioning, investors extract “soft information” on product positioning, competition, and execution risk that traditional filings rarely capture (Liberti and Petersen 2019). Expert calls provide diverse perspectives, customers discuss satisfaction and switching costs, competitors assess innovation, partners highlight operational challenges, and former employees reveal managerial quality, helping investors triangulate fundamentals and mitigate biases in managerial narratives (Drake et al. 2012). Unlike static disclosures, these multi-turn dialogues enable follow-up probing and scenario testing (Gompers and Lerner 2001, Kaplan and Strömberg 2004), with sequential tone, evasiveness, and specificity revealing latent startup quality otherwise unobservable.

Prior research finds that linguistic cues such as tone, uncertainty, and evasiveness convey information about firm fundamentals (Mayew and Venkatachalam 2012, Hobson et al. 2012, Larcker and Zakolyukina 2012). Expert calls share these properties but differ because (i) experts are external to the focal firm, and (ii) investors guide questioning in real time, revealing conviction or hesitation. The resulting transcripts offer detailed discussions of technology, customer churn, and unit economics, core elements of startup evaluation absent from standard datasets.

Despite their richness, expert network calls remain underexplored because this industry is young and data access is limited. Their unstructured, conversational format also resists traditional text analysis. Each company has multiple calls across time, involving varied expert types and hundreds of conversational turns. These wide-ranging discussions make it difficult to isolate information relevant to startup success, as key cues are often buried in noise and sparsity. A few studies examine related channels: Solomon and Soltessshow (2015) that hedge funds gain informational advantages from private meetings, and Cao et al. (2023) find that expert call sentiment predicts returns and trading activity for public firms. In contrast, we analyze private startups and develop an LLM–Bayesian network that models both the sequential Q&A structure within each call and the temporal sequence of calls per firm. This design captures how investors update beliefs about startup quality dynamically, moving beyond tone analysis toward a structural representation of conversational information.

2.3. Financial Long-Text Data Analytics

The analysis of long financial texts, such as expert network call transcripts, poses significant challenges due to their length, noise, and complex structures. Traditional machine learning models, such as Support Vector Machines (SVM) (Zhang et al. 2024), Logistic Regression (LR) (Liu and Jia 2025), Naive Bayes (NB) (Popoola et al. 2024), and Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) (Borchert et al. 2023), typically rely on handcrafted textual representations including term frequency–inverse document frequency (TF–IDF) vectors or topic distributions derived from Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) (Zimmermann et al. 2024). These approaches offer the advantage of being insensitive to document length and are computationally tractable for long documents. However, they heavily depend on manual feature engineering, which is often ad hoc and lacks generalization across different domains or document types (Kadhim 2019).

With the advances of deep learning, neural architectures have demonstrated superior capability in capturing the semantic and contextual representations of textual data. In particular, Transformer-based models (Zhang and Shafiq 2024) have become the foundation of modern LLMs owing to their ability to model complex dependencies through the self-attention mechanism. Nevertheless, when applied to long sequences, Transformers suffer from a quadratic time and space complexity, i.e. $O(n^2)$, with respect to the sequence length n (Vaswani et al. 2017). This limitation hinders their direct use in financial applications involving lengthy, multi-turn dialogues or multi-document analyses. To address this computational bottleneck, a series of studies have introduced efficient attention mechanisms to approximate or sparsify the standard full attention. Representative models include Longformer (Beltagy et al. 2020) and BigBird (Zaheer et al. 2020), which adopt local and global sparse attention patterns to reduce computational complexity while preserving key contextual information. Another line of research decomposes long documents into smaller text segments and integrates local representations through hierarchical structures. Notable examples include the Hierarchical Attention Transformer (HAT) (Yang et al. 2016) and Hi-Transformer (Wu et al. 2021), which aggregate multi-level semantics via hierarchical attention layers. These architectures enhance the ability of neural networks to capture both local and global contextual dependencies in long textual data.

Although such models have improved the scalability and effectiveness of deep learning for long-text modeling, they still exhibit two major limitations. First, these models generally fail to quantify the uncertainty of predictions, which is crucial in financial decision-making where outcomes are inherently probabilistic. Second, they often adopt a purely data-driven perspective, directly fitting observed data without modeling the underlying generative process that gives rise to the text itself.

In contrast, Bayesian learning provides a principled framework for modeling uncertainty and updating beliefs when information arrives sequentially over time (Wang and Yeung 2021). In settings characterized by limited disclosures and evolving fundamentals, Bayesian approaches offer multiple advantages over

static predictive models: they incorporate prior knowledge, express uncertainty about latent states, and update posterior beliefs as new evidence accumulates (Carvalho and West 2007, Pastor and Veronesi 2009). These properties are especially salient in entrepreneurial finance, where investors must evaluate startups with sparse financial histories, uncertain growth trajectories, and heterogeneous expert assessments. Bayesian methods provide a principled framework to model both data generation processes and uncertainty (Wang and Yeung 2021). Classic models such as LDA (Blei et al. 2003) and its neural extensions (e.g., Neural Topic Models (Miao et al. 2016)) capture latent semantic structures and offer interpretable probabilistic representations. However, Bayesian approaches often suffer from limited predictive performance and intractable inference when applied to high-dimensional and long-sequence data, which constrains their practical adoption in financial long-text analytics domains.

This literature review suggests that, while advances in deep learning have significantly improved text modeling capabilities, three key challenges remain in the context of financial long-text analysis: (1) How to effectively identify and summarize salient signals about firm performance from lengthy, noisy, and information-sparse multi-turn dialogues? (2) How to capture the intricate dependencies across multiple levels of discourse structures in expert calls? and (3) How to represent and reason about the latent beliefs and subjective judgments expressed by experts during such communications.

3. The Proposed Method for Startup Success Prediction

3.1 Problem Formulation

For each company o , there are multiple expert calls. For simplicity, we omit the subscript o in the following, focusing on a single company as an example. We denote the l -th expert call of the company as c^l . Each expert call c^l consists of multiple conversations, where each conversation includes a question from the investor and an answer from the expert. We denote the k -th conversation as $(t_{\text{Que}}^{l,k}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,k})$, where $t_{\text{Que}}^{l,k}$ represents the textual content of the question and $t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,k}$ represents the textual content of the answer. Accordingly, $c^l = \left((t_{\text{Que}}^{l,1}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,1}), \dots, (t_{\text{Que}}^{l,k}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,k}), \dots, (t_{\text{Que}}^{l,K^l}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,K^l}) \right)$, where K^l denotes the number of conversations in c^l . Collectively, all expert calls of the company are represented as $c = (c^1, \dots, c^l, \dots, c^L)$, where L denotes the total number of expert calls for the company. We also denote external structural information, such as the company's profile, as e . The objective of our study is to build a machine learning model $\hat{y} = f_{\theta}([c, e])$, where $\hat{y} \in \{0,1\}$ represents the predicted label indicating whether the company is successful, and f_{θ} is the machine learning model parameterized by θ .

In our study, we predict startup success with regard to different events that are conventionally used as indicators of success (Nanda and Rhodes-Kropf 2013, Hegde and Tumlinson 2014). Specifically, a startup is classified as successful if it achieves at least one of the following events: an initial public offering, an

acquisition, or the attainment of external financing. Startups that experience none of these outcomes are considered unsuccessful. Unless otherwise indicated, these binary success indicators serve as the dependent variable for evaluating our machine learning predictions.

3.2 Technical Challenges

When constructing f_θ , three key technical challenges arise. First, expert calls are composed of lengthy textual data, making direct processing both time-consuming and inefficient, as useful information is often sparse. Moreover, since expert calls occur continuously, a scalable method is required to efficiently and effectively analyze the dynamically generated data to achieve better predictive performance. However, how to design a scalable method to achieve this goal remains challenging.

Second, capturing the underlying data characteristics is essential for better task modeling and improved performance. In our study, the data include both structured external information and textual expert calls. The expert call data features a hierarchical sequential structure (each company has a sequence of calls, and each call contains a sequence of question–answer pairs) and a paired structure (each pair consists of a question and an answer). Modeling such complex data remains non-trivial because the data involves complex dependencies among expert calls, questions, and answers.

Third, expert calls occur at different time points, and a company’s success rate may vary accordingly. However, since only the final binary outcome (i.e., success or not) is observed, we aim to infer the company’s underlying success rate, represented as a continuous value in the range $[0,1]$ with a higher value indicating a higher success rate. Meanwhile, in practice, predictions are required before whether a company will succeed is known. Moreover, since the success rate is inferred, it is essential to quantify the uncertainty associated with this inference to ensure reliable decision-making. Meanwhile, the model should also be able to sequentially update experts’ beliefs about the company’s success. However, it is nontrivial to design a model f_θ that can update experts’ beliefs to provide real-time success rate estimates while simultaneously quantifying uncertainty when applied in practice.

3.3 Description of Our Approach

We propose an LLM–Bayesian network approach to address the above three challenges. For the first challenge, we employ a large language model (LLM) to generate dense vector representations of the textual content, effectively capturing key information. For the second and third challenges, we design a novel Bayesian network that introduces latent distributed variables to represent a company’s underlying success rate after each expert call and captures the dependency relationships among expert calls, questions, and answers through a generative process. Next, we demonstrate each component.

3.3.1 Component 1: LLM-based Text Information Extraction

As mentioned above, although expert calls are valuable, the useful information they contain is often sparse. Therefore, it is necessary to extract the most informative content effectively. Given LLM’s advantage in summarizing textual content, we propose to adopt LLM for extraction. In each expert call, the questions and answers typically revolve around the company’s underlying status: the questions seek to uncover it, while the answers reflect the expert’s judgment of it. Since this status is unobserved, we introduce a vector-based latent variable to represent it for each call, providing an abstract yet informative representation that supports efficient and accurate prediction.

However, expert calls are typically lengthy, often containing thousands of words, and exhibit a complex structure. Directly feeding the entire text into an LLM would exceed its maximum input length and thus be infeasible. Conversely, splitting the text into smaller segments and processing each separately would neglect the structural dependencies inherent in the expert call data. To address this, we leverage an LLM (GPT 4) to extract key information from lengthy and noisy earnings conference call transcripts. Based on the literature review in Section 2.1, we use the Startup Success Ontology (SSO) to identify the key factors associated with successful private firm exits. These factors are then incorporated into domain-specific prompts designed to embed relevant expert knowledge (The detailed prompts are presented in Appendix A. III). Guided by these prompts, the LLM condenses each question–answer pair into a shorter, information-dense summary. Finally, following previous research (Zhu et al. 2025), we adopt MPNet, a variant of sentence transformer (Reimers and Gurevych 2019), to obtain dense, context-sensitive representations of the summarized questions and answers. Unlike static sentence embeddings, the LLM captures conversational semantics, such as the dependency between an investor’s probe and the expert’s justification, and retains both lexical and pragmatic nuances within each turn. These embeddings provide a richer latent structure for subsequent inference (to be detailed later). Denoting the extraction process as $\text{LLMExtract}(\cdot)$, and then we have

$$\mathbf{q}^{l,k} = \text{LLMExtract}(t_{\text{Que}}^{l,k}); \mathbf{a}^{l,k} = \text{LLMExtract}(t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,k}) \quad (1)$$

3.3.2 Component 2: Bayesian Network-based Dependency Modelling

Bayesian networks are well-suited for modeling dependency relationships through a generative process. Meanwhile, to address the third challenge, we introduce latent variables that represent the company’s underlying success rate, both the one implied by the observed binary outcome and those estimated immediately after each expert call. These latent variables are inferred jointly during the training process, allowing the trained model to dynamically estimate a company’s success rate after each expert call when deployed in practice. The Bayesian network is shown in Figure 1.

Formally, the company’s success rate at the time of the l -th expert call is denoted as $r^l \in [0,1]$. The

latent status at the same time is denoted as $\mathbf{s}^l \in \mathbb{R}^V$. For the latent status \mathbf{s}^l , when $l = 1$ (i.e., the first expert call), there is no prior information available to generate it. Since \mathbf{s}^l is a vector whose elements are continuous variables, we assume it follows a multivariate standard normal distribution $\mathbf{s}^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$. For subsequent expert calls ($l \geq 2$), the status from the previous time step provides useful prior information for determining the current status. Given the continuous nature of company operations, if a company's success rate was high at the previous time (e.g., $l - 1$), it is also likely to remain high at the current time (e.g., l), and vice versa. Therefore, we assume that the expected prior value of \mathbf{s}^l is \mathbf{s}^{l-1} , and model \mathbf{s}^l as following a multivariate normal distribution: $\mathbf{s}^l \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \mathbf{I})$.

For the latent company success rate at the time of the l -th expert call (i.e., r^l), three main factors influence its value. First, it depends on the company's current latent status \mathbf{s}^l , since a positive and promising current status naturally increases the likelihood of success. Second, it is affected by historical statuses prior to the l -th expert call, i.e., $\{\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}^1\}$. Specifically, when estimating the company's success rate, historical beliefs should be considered; for example, even if the current status is not favorable, a strong history of positive statuses can still yield a high success rate. Third, the success rate is also influenced by external factors such as company size, industry sector, and other environmental attributes, collectively denoted as \mathbf{e} . Hence, the success rate r^l should be determined by three factors: $\mathbf{s}^l, \{\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}^1\}$, and \mathbf{e} . However, the functional relationship that maps these factors to r^l is complex and nonlinear. This complexity arises because each latent status \mathbf{s}^l is a high-dimensional vector, and the number of such vectors varies dynamically with l . To flexibly capture this relationship, we employ a neural network model. Specifically, we adopt an attention mechanism to analyze the sequence of latent statuses, allowing the model to assign adaptive weights to different historical states. The resulting context vector is then concatenated with the environmental factor \mathbf{e} and passed through a multilayer perceptron (MLP) to generate r^l :

$$r^l = \text{MLP}(\text{Attention}(\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}^1); \mathbf{e}), \text{ if } l \geq 2 \quad (2)$$

At the first time, i.e., when $l = 1$, no historical status is available. Therefore, we estimate the success rate directly based on the current status and the environmental factors:

$$r^l = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{s}^1; \mathbf{e}), \text{ if } l = 1 \quad (3)$$

We denote the above neural network as NN_1^{Gen} for simplicity. Particularly, the final observed outcome y is generated based on the last success rate r^L , which is estimated by considering all historical statuses of the expert calls through an attention mechanism and the external factors: $\text{MLP}(\text{Attention}(\mathbf{s}^L, \dots, \mathbf{s}^1); \mathbf{e})$. Then, the success rate r^L is treated as the expectation of a Bernoulli distribution, which is then used to generate the success label:

$$y \sim \text{Bernolli}(r^L) \quad (4)$$

For each expert call, the dialogue proceeds in the form of “question 1” – “answer 1” – “question 2” – “answer 2,” and so on. Hence, we represent the conversation as a sequence of paired exchanges, where each exchange consists of a question and its corresponding answer. For a given answer $\mathbf{a}^{l,k}$, it is generated in response to its paired question $\mathbf{q}^{l,k}$. Meanwhile, from the expert’s behavioral perspective, neighboring answers are often dependent, as human communication exhibits continuity and memory. For example, if an expert feels that a previous answer was unclear, they may clarify it in the next response. Therefore, we need to model dependencies between the current answer and the previous answer $\mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}$. In addition, we model the dependency between the current answer and the previous question $\mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}$, since an expert may recall an unaddressed point from the prior question and incorporate it into the current answer. However, to balance model complexity and noise, we restrict the dependency to only the immediately preceding question and answer rather than modeling longer histories. Finally, each answer is also influenced by the company’s latent status \mathbf{s}^l as a promising status tends to elicit more positive responses from experts. In summary, the generation of each answer depends on four factors: $\mathbf{s}^l, \mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{l,k}$. Since $\mathbf{a}^{l,k}$ is a continuous vector, we assume it follows a multivariate Gaussian distribution whose mean is determined by these four factors:

$$\mu(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}) = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{s}^l, \mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{q}^{l,k}) \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{a}^{l,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}), \Sigma) \quad (6)$$

where Σ is a hyperparameter.

Similarly, each question is raised due to several factors. First, a question may arise because the previous question was unclear or because something mentioned in the previous exchange sparked the investor’s interest. Second, questions in an expert call typically progress gradually rather than being asked at random; hence, neighboring questions are often highly dependent. Third, questions usually center around the company’s current latent status, as the investor’s curiosity is shaped by the company’s situation at that time. Therefore, each question $\mathbf{q}^{l,k}$ is determined by three factors: the company’s latent status \mathbf{s}^l , the previous question $\mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}$, and the previous answer $\mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}$. Since each question is represented as a continuous vector, we assume it follows a multivariate Gaussian distribution whose mean is determined by these three factors:

$$\mu(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}) = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{s}^l, \mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}) \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{q}^{l,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}), \Sigma) \quad (8)$$

When $k = 1$, that is, for the first question and answer in the expert call, there are no previous questions or answers available. Therefore, Equations (5) and (7) are simplified as follows:

$$\mu(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}) = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{s}^l, \mathbf{q}^{l,k}) \quad (9)$$

$$\mu(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}) = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{s}^l) \quad (10)$$

We denote the MLPs in Equations (9) and (10) as NN_2^{Gen} , NN_3^{Gen} respectively. we also denote the MLPs

in Equations (5) and (7) as NN_4^{Gen} , NN_5^{Gen} respectively. The overall generative process is summarized as follows:

```

for  $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$ :
  if  $l = 1$ :
    generate  $\mathbf{s}^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ 
    generate  $r^1 = \text{NN}_1^{\text{Gen}}(\mathbf{s}^1, \mathbf{e})$ 
  else:
    generate  $\mathbf{s}^l \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \mathbf{I})$ 
    generate  $r^l = \text{NN}_1^{\text{Gen}}(\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}^1, \mathbf{e})$ 
  end if
  generate  $y = \text{Bernolli}(r^L)$ 
  for  $k = 1, \dots, K^l$ :
    if  $k = 1$ :
       $\mu(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}) = \text{NN}_2^{\text{Gen}}(\mathbf{s}^l)$ 
       $\mathbf{q}^{l,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}), \Sigma)$ 
       $\mu(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}) = \text{NN}_3^{\text{Gen}}(\mathbf{s}^l, \mathbf{q}^{l,k})$ 
       $\mathbf{a}^{l,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}), \Sigma)$ 
    else:
       $\mu(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}) = \text{NN}_4^{\text{Gen}}(\mathbf{s}^l, \mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{a}^{l,k-1})$ 
       $\mathbf{q}^{l,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}), \Sigma)$ 
       $\mu(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}) = \text{NN}_5^{\text{Gen}}(\mathbf{s}^l, \mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{q}^{l,k})$ 
       $\mathbf{a}^{l,k} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}), \Sigma)$ 
    end if
  end for
end for

```

3.4 The Learning Process of Our Method

3.4.1 Overview of the Learning Process

Our method involves two components. In the first component, no parameters need to be learned, as we utilize a pretrained LLM. Parameter learning occurs only in the second component, i.e., how to learn the parameters of NN_1^{Gen} to NN_5^{Gen} of the Bayesian network.

A key challenge in learning Bayesian networks arises from the presence of latent variables. Specifically, our Bayesian network involves latent variables r^l and \mathbf{s}^l for $l = 1, \dots, L$. We denote them as $r^{1:L}$ and $\mathbf{s}^{1:L}$. A straightforward way would be to infer their distributions, treat the latent variables as observed according to these inferred distributions to obtain the objective, and then learn the model parameters in the usual manner to maximize the obtained objective. In the generative process, we have specified assumptions about how r^l and \mathbf{s}^l are distributed, but these assumptions are made without considering the observed data and thus serve only as priors. We denote the prior distribution of the latent variable as $p^{\text{prior}}(r^{1:L}, \mathbf{s}^{1:L})$. The

actual distributions of r^l and s^l must be updated based on the observed data to obtain the posterior distributions, which is denoted as $p(r^{1:L}, s^{1:L} | A^{1:L}, Q^{1:L}, e, y)$. However, the true posterior of the latent variables is generally intractable. To address this, we adopt a variational inference approach, introducing a variational distribution to approximate the true posterior distribution of the latent variables. Note that r^l is deterministically determined given $s^{1:l}$ and the observed variable e . Therefore, we only need to introduce a variational distribution for $s^{1:l}$, denoted as $q(s^{1:L})$, to approximate the true posterior $p^{\text{post}}(s^{1:L})$, while taking into account the prior distribution $p^{\text{prior}}(s^{1:L})$. The variational distribution should have desirable properties to allow for tractable computation. Next, we introduce our variational distributions.

3.4.2 Variational Distribution and Inference Networks

Since we hope to infer the distribution of latent variables based on the observed data, the input to the variational distribution consists of the observed variables: the environmental factors e , all extracted answer vectors in the expert call (denoted as $A^{1:L}$), all extracted question vectors in the expert call (denoted as $Q^{1:L}$) and the final outcome y . Then, the variation distribution $q(s^{1:L})$ can be written as $q(s^{1:L} | A^{1:L}, Q^{1:L}, e, y)$.

Given the dependence relationships in the Bayesian network, we have

$$p^{\text{prior}}(s^{1:L}) = p^{\text{prior}}(s^1) \prod_{l=2}^L p^{\text{prior}}(s^l | s^{l-1}) \quad (11)$$

Hence, we also follow the same dependency structure to design our variational distribution q :

$$q(s^{1:L}) = q(s^1) \prod_{l=2}^L q(s^l | s^{l-1}) \quad (12)$$

We next introduce each factor of the variational distribution. First, for s^1 , it directly depends on Q^1 , A^1 and y . Hence, $q(s^1)$ should be determined by these three factors. However, during the testing phase, the inference network must estimate the latent status while y remains unobserved. Therefore, it is inappropriate to use y as an input to the variational distribution. To address this issue, we design a variational distribution $q(s^1)$ that takes Q^1 and A^1 as input, while being constrained by y during training. In this way, the determination of $q(s^1)$ considers y , while still allowing $q(s^1)$ to be inferred during the testing phase without requiring y .

Given that s^1 is a continuous vector, we assume it follows a Gaussian distribution, whose mean value $\mu_q(s^1)$ needs to be inferred. Leveraging the strength of neural networks in complex inference tasks, we use a neural network to estimate this mean. Furthermore, considering the structural characteristics of Q^1 and A^1 , the inference network must effectively capture their sequential dependencies for improved predictive accuracy. To this end, we employ an attention mechanism to analyze the sequence of question-answer pairs within the conversation. Formally,

$$\mu_q(\mathbf{s}^1) = \text{MLP} \left[\text{Attention} \left((\mathbf{a}^{1,1}, \mathbf{q}^{1,1}), (\mathbf{a}^{1,2}, \mathbf{q}^{1,2}), \dots, (\mathbf{a}^{1,K^1-1}, \mathbf{q}^{1,K^1-1}) \right) \right] \quad (13)$$

To enhance the nonlinearity of the inference network, we introduce an MLP following the attention mechanism. The overall inference network, comprising both the attention module and the MLP, is denoted as NN_1^{Inf} for simplicity. Accordingly, the variational distribution $q(\mathbf{s}^1)$ is defined as:

$$q(\mathbf{s}^1) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_q(\mathbf{s}^1), \Sigma_2) \quad (14)$$

where Σ_2 is a hyperparameter. A similar process is applied for \mathbf{s}^l with $l \geq 2$. However, for these later statuses, \mathbf{s}^l is also directly influenced by the previous status \mathbf{s}^{l-1} , whose variational distribution has already been inferred. To incorporate this information, we input the expectation of the previous distribution, $\mu_q(\mathbf{s}^{l-1})$, into the variational distribution for \mathbf{s}^l . The same attention mechanism is applied to capture the sequential dependencies:

$$\mu_q(\mathbf{s}^l) = \text{MLP} \left[\text{Attention} \left((\mathbf{a}^{1,1}, \mathbf{q}^{1,1}), (\mathbf{a}^{1,2}, \mathbf{q}^{1,2}), \dots, (\mathbf{a}^{1,K^1-1}, \mathbf{q}^{1,K^1-1}) \right), \mu_q(\mathbf{s}^{l-1}) \right] \quad (15)$$

$$q(\mathbf{s}^l) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_q(\mathbf{s}^l), \Sigma_2) \quad (16)$$

The network described above, which includes both the attention mechanism and the MLP, is denoted as NN_2^{Inf} for simplicity. Since the neural networks NN_1^{Inf} and NN_2^{Inf} are used for inference, they are called inference networks. The generation of r^l is a deterministic process conditioned on \mathbf{s}^l and \mathbf{e} . Therefore, once the distribution $q(\mathbf{s}^l)$ is obtained, the variational distribution $q(r^l)$ can be derived straightforwardly using NN_1^{Gen} . Specifically, we first sample a latent variable $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}^l$ from $q(\mathbf{s}^l)$ and then input $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}^l$ into NN_1^{Gen} to obtain \tilde{r}^l , which is an instance of $q(r^l)$. Meanwhile, during training, we require \tilde{r}^l to be close to the observed outcome y , thereby imposing a constraint on \mathbf{s}^l using y . Specifically, this constraint is stronger when the time gap between \tilde{r}^l and y is smaller. Let t^l denote the time gap from \tilde{r}^l to y . Then, the constraint can be formulated as:

$$C = \exp(-t^l) \cdot \text{CrossEntropy}(\tilde{r}^l, y) \quad (17)$$

This constraint is used to guide the training of $q(\mathbf{s}^l)$. In this way, $q(\mathbf{s}^l)$ is influenced by y during training, while still remaining inferable during the testing phase without requiring y as input.

3.4.3 Deriving the Learning Objective

Our goal is to maximize the model's fit to the observed variables, i.e., to maximize the likelihood of generating the observed data. The log-likelihood can be expressed as follows (details are provided in the appendix):

$$\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y) = \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}, \mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y) - \log q(\mathbf{s}^{1:L})] + KL(q||p^{\text{post}}) \quad (18)$$

where KL denotes the Kullback–Leibler divergence. The equation above can be further derived as:

$$\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y) - KL = \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}, \mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y) - \log q(\mathbf{s}^{1:L})] \quad (19)$$

Since the KL divergence measures the difference between the variational distribution and the true posterior, it should be minimized to ensure a high-quality approximation. For the likelihood of the observed variables, $\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y)$, the value is constant with respect to the model parameters and the variational distribution, as the observed variables are given. Therefore, minimizing the KL divergence is equivalent to maximizing the right-hand side of the equation. Moreover, since the KL divergence is non-negative, the right-hand side provides a lower bound on the log-likelihood of the observed variables. We denote this lower bound as \mathcal{L}^q , which can be further transformed as follows (details in the appendix):

$$\mathcal{L}^q = \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y|\mathbf{s}^{1:L})] - \text{KL}(q||p^{\text{prior}}) \quad (20)$$

The lower bound \mathcal{L}^q is our learning objective. It depends on the parameters of NN_1^{Gen} to NN_5^{Gen} as well as the introduced inference networks NN_1^{Inf} and NN_2^{Inf} . Hence, their parameters are updated to maximize \mathcal{L}^q .

3.4.4 Computation of the Learning Objective

For the term $\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y|\mathbf{s}^{1:L})$ on the right-hand side of \mathcal{L}^q , we can decompose it according to the dependency structure of the Bayesian network as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y|\mathbf{s}^{1:L}) &= \sum_{l=1}^L [\log p(\mathbf{q}^{l,1}|\mathbf{s}^l)] \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{k=2}^{K^l-1} [\log p(\mathbf{q}^{l,k}|\mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{s}^l) + \log p(\mathbf{a}^{l,k}|\mathbf{a}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{q}^{l,k-1}, \mathbf{q}^{l,k}, \mathbf{s}^l)] + \log p(\mathbf{e}) \\ &+ \log p(y|\mathbf{s}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

For the first two terms on the right-hand side in Equation (21), their values can be computed using the generation networks (i.e., NN_2^{Gen} to NN_5^{Gen}). The third term, $\log p(\mathbf{e})$ is constant with respect to our objective \mathcal{L}^q and can therefore be ignored. For the fourth term, $p(y|\mathbf{s}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e})$, we use the same neural network as the generation network (i.e., NN_1^{Gen}) to obtain r^L and then compute the probability of y based on Bernoulli distribution. In this way, Equation (21) can be computed. To estimate its expectation in Equation (20), we adopt the Monte Carlo method: we draw samples of the latent variables $\mathbf{s}^1, \dots, \mathbf{s}^L$ from the variational distribution q , and then compute the value of each sample to approximate the expectation.

Next, we focus on the second term on the right-hand side of Equation (20), i.e., $\text{KL}(q||p^{\text{prior}})$. Based on the factorizations in Equations (11) and (12), it can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{KL}(q||p^{\text{prior}}) = \sum_{l=1}^L \text{KL}(q(\mathbf{s}^l)||p^{\text{prior}}(\mathbf{s}^l)) \quad (22)$$

For each prior distribution $p^{\text{prior}}(\mathbf{s}^l)$, they are Gaussian distributions as mentioned before (i.e., $\mathbf{s}^l = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \mathbf{I})$ if $l \geq 2$; $\mathbf{s}^l = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$ if $l = 1$). Since the variational distributions $q(\mathbf{s}^l)$ are also Gaussian, the KL divergence between each prior and variational distribution can be computed in closed form using the standard formula for the KL divergence between two Gaussians. For instance, when $l \geq 2$, $\text{KL}(q(\mathbf{s}^l) \| p^{\text{prior}}(\mathbf{s}^l))$ can be computed as:

$$\text{KL}(q(\mathbf{s}^l) \| p^{\text{prior}}(\mathbf{s}^l)) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{tr}(\Sigma_2) + (\mu_q(\mathbf{s}^l) - \mathbf{s}^{l-1})^T (\mu_q(\mathbf{s}^l) - \mathbf{s}^{l-1}) - d + \log \frac{|\mathbf{I}|}{|\Sigma_2|} \right] \quad (23)$$

where d denotes the dimension of \mathbf{s}^l .

Since both components of the second term on the right-hand side of Equation (20) is computable, we can compute the value of \mathcal{L}^q to update parameters.

3.4.5 Iterative Training Process

The above computation of \mathcal{L}^q relies on instantiated samples of \mathbf{s}^l and r^l for all l . The quality of the variational distributions determines how well these samples approximate the true posterior, thereby affecting the KL divergence term. Meanwhile, the model parameters influence the first term of \mathcal{L}^q . Consequently, our optimization proceeds in two steps.

First, we fix the generative model parameters (i.e., the parameters of NN_1^{Gen} to NN_5^{Gen} , denoted as Φ collectively) and update only the parameters of the inference networks NN_1^{Inf} and NN_2^{Inf} (denoted as Θ collectively). Since a constraint was introduced in Equation (17) to train the inference network, it is incorporated into \mathcal{L}^q via a weighted sum. We optimize this objective using the Adam optimizer. Since the Adam optimizer is a gradient-based algorithm that updates the model parameters by minimizing the given objective, we take the negative of \mathcal{L}^q and combine it with the constraint term for optimization. We denote the parameters at the m -th round as Φ^m and Θ^m . Then,

$$\Phi^{m+1} \leftarrow \text{Adam}(-\mathcal{L}^q + wC, \Phi^m, \Theta^m)$$

where w is the relative weight of the constraint term. In this way, we reduce the gap between the variational distribution and the true posterior, yielding high-quality samples of the latent variables \mathbf{s}^l, r^l for all l , which allows us to compute \mathcal{L}^q .

Second, we freeze the inference networks (i.e., Θ^{m+1}) and update the generative model parameters to maximize \mathcal{L}^q , thereby improving the fit of the Bayesian network to the data. Formally,

$$\Theta^{m+1} \leftarrow \text{Adam}(-\mathcal{L}^q, \Phi^{m+1}, \Theta^m)$$

The above two-step training procedure corresponds to the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm, a classic algorithm for training Bayesian networks. We alternate between the two steps until convergence.

3.5 Predicting A New Sample

After the parameters have been learned, our LLM-Bayesian network method can be used to predict a

company’s success rate. At the first expert call, we first apply the LLM to analyze its conservation and extract the dense vector to represent the textual content. We then apply the trained NN_1^{Inf} to analyze the extracted vector to infer the latent status distribution $\mathbf{s}_{\text{test}}^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_q(\mathbf{s}_{\text{test}}^1), \Sigma_2)$. For stability, instead of sampling from the Gaussian, we use the mean $\mathcal{N}(\mu_q(\mathbf{s}_{\text{test}}^1), \Sigma_2)$ to compute the success rate via NN_1^{Gen} . The predicted success is determined by comparing r with a threshold. For subsequent expert calls (i.e., $l \geq 2$), given the inferred status $\mu_q(\mathbf{s}_{\text{test}}^{l-1})$, we use NN_2^{Inf} to infer the current status $\mu_q(\mathbf{s}_{\text{test}}^l)$. All inferred statuses up to l are then input to NN_2^{Gen} to compute r which is compared with the threshold to predict the company’s success. In this way, we can not only infer the company’s underlying success rate but also quantify the uncertainty and sequentially update the belief about the company’s success.

4. Data and Evaluation Method

4.1 Data and Exploratory Analysis

4.1.1 Expert Network Data

The expert network industry emerged in the early 2000s following major regulatory reforms, most notably Regulation Fair Disclosure and the Global Analyst Research Settlement, which curtailed traditional information channels and prompted investors to seek alternative sources of insight. This industry has since expanded to more than 100 firms, generating approximately \$1.9 billion in revenue by 2021.¹

Expert calls are client-initiated consultations in which investors engage domain specialists to obtain nuanced perspectives on companies, industries, or technologies. Experts commonly include customers, competitors, industry consultants, former executives of the focal firms, and partners. Following a series of insider-trading investigations, and consistent with Section 204A of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, which requires written policies to prevent the misuse of material non-public information, expert networks have instituted rigorous compliance protocols, including mandatory call recordings, transcript archiving, and the pre-vetting of participants to prevent the disclosure of confidential or material non-public information.

Table 2 summarizes key descriptive characteristics of the expert-call transcripts, expert composition, and underlying firms. The sample spans 2017–2024, where 2017 is the earliest year for which expert-call data are available. Variable definitions are reported in Table A.1. Table 2 Panel A documents that the average transcript contains approximately 5,880 words, consistent with a typical call duration of 39–49 minutes based on standard speaking rates. Conversations are dense, featuring an average of 74 question–answer exchanges, and condense to roughly 2,050 salient words after GPT-based summarization, suggesting that

¹ Bragg, S. (2021, November 8). Expert network industry nears \$2 billion. Integrity Research Associates. <https://www.integrity-research.com/expert-network-industry-nears-2-billion/>

discussions focus heavily on evaluative content rather than small talk. Panel B shows that clients rely on a diverse set of domain specialists: customers represent the largest share of experts (37.86%), followed by industry consultants (31.90%) and former executives (19.10%), while competitors (8.00%) and partners (3.16%) appear less frequently. This distribution highlights investors’ emphasis on market traction, technical implementation, and organizational capability.

4.1.2 LLM-Based Topic and Sentiment Modeling of Expert Network Data

To motivate the probabilistic dependencies formalized in our LLM–Bayesian network approach, we begin by examining the semantic and evaluative structures present in expert consultation transcripts. Using a large language model (LLM)–based topic and sentiment pipeline, we extract interpretable textual representations that reveal how expert discourse encodes signals about a company’s latent status and evolving success potential. These patterns provide the empirical foundation for the latent variables and conditional dependencies later modeled in our generative process (Section 3).

The exploratory procedure proceeds as follows: topic generation, refinement, and assignment, implemented through GPT-4 models (see Appendix A.I). The LLM first induces investment-relevant themes while avoiding firm-specific noise, consolidates semantically redundant clusters, and finally assigns each conversation to relevant topics and sentiment polarities (−2 to +2). Each transcript is thus transformed into a structured representation consisting of (i) topical relevance vectors and (ii) directional sentiment signals. These representations approximate the high-dimensional text embeddings ($t_{\text{Que}}^{l,k}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,k}$) used as observed inputs in our Bayesian network, serving as a conceptual bridge between the qualitative discourse and our latent-state modeling.

The ten most frequent topics summarized in Table 3 reveal the breadth and depth of information conveyed in expert consultations. Conversations are dominated by themes central to evaluating technological startups, such as AI and machine-learning platforms, data management, and industry-specific AI applications, reflecting investors’ emphasis on scalability, integration feasibility, and regulatory risk. The prominence of topics like Competitive Landscape in AI/ML and Customer Acquisition and Pricing further highlights the market-oriented perspective of expert dialogue, consistent with venture investors’ focus on commercialization potential. Overall, the distribution of topics underscores that expert network discussions capture the multidimensional due-diligence process, from technology assessment to strategic execution, providing a rich textual foundation for our LLM–Bayesian model to infer latent indicators of startup success.

Panel-level insights from Figures 2–5 illustrate the hierarchical and dynamic information structure motivating our method. Figure 2 maps topic attention across expert types, showing that customers and consultants emphasize customer acquisition and competitive landscape, whereas competitors and former

executives focus on strategic and regulatory concerns. These differentiated viewpoints imply distinct conditional priors, precisely the heterogeneity our model captures through expert-type-specific dependencies within each call’s latent status \mathbf{s}^l .

Figure 3 extends the analysis to industry-level specialization, revealing that expert discourse reflects economically meaningful sectoral structure: software and IT services concentrate on data and platform topics, financial services on market expansion and strategy, and healthcare on industry-specific AI applications and product safety and compliance. Such systematic variation justifies our conditioning of the success-rate function $r^l = \text{MLP}(\text{Attention}(\mathbf{s}^{l-1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}^1); \mathbf{e})$ on industry-related external factors \mathbf{e} , ensuring that our model’s latent inference aligns with real economic heterogeneity.

Figure 4 visualizes sentiment polarity across topics, demonstrating that innovation-oriented themes attract the most positive tone, while regulatory and restructuring discussions evoke caution. The sentiment scale is detailed in Table A.2. These tone gradients parallel our model’s assumption that the latent success rate evolves with directional expert assessments: optimistic discourse increases the updated beliefs in future success, whereas pessimistic tones attenuate it. Figure 5 further shows that this tone–topic interaction varies by expert type, with customers and consultants expressing greater optimism and competitors showing skepticism. This cross-dimensional structure mirrors the conditional dependencies our model encodes between topic-specific signals, expert type, and the latent success state.

4.1.3 Startup Data

We obtain startup fundamental data from Crunchbase, one of the most widely used databases in entrepreneurship and strategy research. Recent validation work highlights its strong coverage of innovative firms that receive institutional financing (Guzman and Li 2023). To focus on startups that have reached a commercially meaningful stage of development, we restrict our sample to firms with more than 50 employees. This threshold aligns with venture capital screening practices, as firms at or above this scale typically demonstrate product–market fit, organizational infrastructure, and measurable traction (Puri and Zarutskie 2012, Kerr et al. 2014). Excluding micro-firms reduces noise associated with pre-traction volatility and improves comparability in predicting subsequent growth and exit outcomes. Panel C of Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of the startups underlying our sample. On average, these firms have completed five investment rounds, are backed by approximately 14 institutional investors, and exhibit sizable technological footprints, operating roughly 31 active products and deploying an average of \$60.4 million in IT expenditures. To further characterize financing dynamics and exit events (e.g., IPO, acquisition, or failure), we supplement Crunchbase with data from Thomson Reuters’ VentureXpert (Kaplan and Schoar 2005), which provides detailed round-level investment histories and ultimate exit outcomes.

4.2 Evaluation Setting

In evaluating model performance, we consider both statistical accuracy and economic relevance. We adopt *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *F1-score*, *Weighted F1*, *Macro F1*, and Area Under the ROC Curve (*AUC*) as the evaluation metrics.

Furthermore, we calculate the Return on Investment (*ROI*) for the machine learning selected portfolios to evaluate the economic value of predictive performance. Each correctly identified successful startup generates a final investment value (FIV_{TP}), defined as the post-success valuation following major exit events such as acquisitions, IPOs, or late-stage funding rounds. Every selected startup, regardless of eventual outcome, incurs an investment cost (IC), approximated as the last pre-success valuation plus 10% to account for investor screening and monitoring costs (Gompers and Lerner 2004, Metrick and Yasuda 2021). To capture the cost of missed high-value opportunities, we introduce an opportunity cost (OC), defined as the difference between a top-decile post-success valuation benchmark and the average pre-success valuation, consistent with performance benchmarking in private equity and venture capital (Harris et al. 2014, Cambridge Associates 2018, Institutional Limited Partners Association 2019). Because startup-level data on valuations and costs of investment are not always publicly disclosed, we approximate these variables using constants based on historical benchmark values for startups listed in Crunchbase and VentureXpert.²

Let TP , FP , and FN denote the numbers of true positives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively.³ The net investment gain is calculated as the value of correctly predicted successful startups ($TP \times FIV_{TP}$) minus the total investment cost for all selected startups ($(TP + FP) \times IC$) and an additional penalty for missed successful startups ($FN \times OC$). For companies that were unsuccessful, we conservatively assign a final investment value of zero (FIV_{FP}). This *ROI* formulation explicitly penalizes both false positives and false negatives, aligning predictive accuracy with the asymmetric payoff structure of venture capital. Formally, *ROI* is defined as the ratio of net investment gain to total investment cost (Gompers and Lerner 2004, Metrick and Yasuda 2021, Maarouf et al. 2025):

$$ROI = \frac{TP \times FIV_{TP} + FP \times FIV_{FP} - (TP + FP) \times IC - FN \times OC}{(TP + FP) \times IC} \times 100 \quad (23)$$

As robustness checks, we report another complementary metric widely used in private equity and venture capital: the Multiple on Invested Capital (*MOIC*). *MOIC*, the ratio of total realized and unrealized value to invested capital, captures gross value creation without time adjustment (Cumming 2009, Korteweg

² In our dataset, the valuation of a startup after a success event (i. e., initial public offerings, funding, acquisitions) is, on average, \$248.44 million. The investment cost is, on average, \$10.24 million. The opportunity cost is, on average, \$198.81 million.

³ TP represents the number of correctly predicted successful startups, FP represents the number of startups incorrectly predicted as successful, and FN represents the number of missed successful startups.

and Sorensen 2023). Alongside *ROI*, this metric provides a comprehensive view of model-driven portfolio performance. *ROI* remains our primary measure, reflecting net economic gain while accounting for missed high-value opportunities, whereas *MOIC* offers time-agnostic and profitability-focused perspectives, respectively (Cumming 2009, Ljungqvist 2024). Together, these metrics ensure that our evaluation captures both statistical accuracy and the economic relevance of predictive performance for institutional investors (Harris et al. 2014, KPMG International 2016).

$$MOIC = \frac{TP \times FIV_{TP} + FP \times FIV_{FP} - FN \times OC}{(TP + FP) \times IC} \quad (24)$$

5 Prediction Performance and Economic Significance Evaluation

5.1 Comparison of Our Model against the Baselines

According to our literature review, we selected three groups of benchmarks. The first group is the commonly adopted machine learning (ML) methods in startup success predictions, including support vector machine (SVM), logistic regression (LR), Naïve Bayes (NB), and Multilayer Perceptron (MLP). We create three types of features as inputs for ML methods: topic distributions extracted from call transcripts by Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) algorithm (denoted as topic), the number of calls for the previous 24 months before the prediction date (denoted as #calls), and fundamental variables collected from the Crunchbase platform (denoted as fv). The second group is transformer-based methods for long text classification. We employ two types of long text classification methods, Hierarchical Models, including Hierarchical attention transformer HAT (Hu et al. 2021), Hi-Transformer (Wu et al. 2021), and Sparse Attention Transformers, including Longformer (Beltagy et al. 2020) and Bigbird (Zaheer et al. 2021). To ensure a fair comparison, we concatenate fundamental variables to hidden features extracted by these methods and then feed the concatenated feature into the classification layer. The third group is the text-based startup success prediction studies that are applicable to our study, including Maarouf et al. (2025), Katsafados et al. (2024), and Guzman and Li (2023). These studies and our study address a similar enterprise performance prediction with similar data (text). All the baselines and our model are fine-tuned via large-scale experiments to reflect their best performance capability in our context. The hyperparameters of our model are selected via grid search. The following performances are the mean of 10 random experimental runs. And all the experiment was conducted on the Ubuntu platform with Nvidia A800 GPU.

We first compare with ML methods in startup success prediction. As reported in Table 4, compared with ML methods, our proposed method outperforms all the baseline models, we outperform the best benchmark method (MLP) in *F1-score* by 7.078%⁴. Moreover, with the feature used in training ML

⁴ Our method's F1-score is 0.590. Best benchmark method (MLP)'s F1-score is 0.551. $(0.590/0.551-1) \times 100\% = 7.078\%$.

increased, all metrics improved significantly, demonstrating that the startup success prediction performance of ML methods heavily relies on the quality of feature engineering.

Next, we compare with transformer-based long text classifiers. As shown in Table 5, our proposed method outperforms all transformer-based long text classifiers. The hierarchical models perform better than sparse attention transformers. This is because the hierarchical models consist of hierarchical structures that are suitable for handling the data structure of multi-time calls with multiturn dialogs thus can capture key information from all transcripts. Sparse attention transformers perform even worse than MLP with all features. This is because sparse attention transformers can hardly capture the whole information from transcripts that have more than 4096 tokens with limited computing resources. Our method observes an improvement of 6.691% on *F1-score* and *ROI* by 95.74, equivalent to a 15.255% relative improvement, which demonstrates the superiority of our method.⁵

Lastly, we compare with text-based startup success prediction. As reported in Table 6, our method significantly outperforms the baselines. The best method of baselines is proposed by Katsafados et al. (2024), This is because the method can handle all tokens in transcripts while the others can't. Our proposed method outperforms the best baseline in *F1-score* by 11.742% and *ROI* by 65.159%.⁶

5.2 Sensitivity Analysis

To evaluate the robustness of the proposed model and to determine the optimal hyperparameter configuration, we conducted a comprehensive sensitivity analysis using a grid search strategy, and our results are reported in Table 7. Specifically, four key hyperparameters were systematically tuned: the learning rate (lr), the dropout rate (dr), the dimension of latent status s^l (ds), and the weight of the constraint term (w). The learning rate was varied to control the convergence speed and stability of training; the dropout rate was adjusted to balance model generalization and overfitting; the the dimension of latent status was optimized to ensure that the model attains a more accurate and discriminative representation of call dialogues; and the weight of the constraint term was tuned to ensure that the model appropriately balances the contributions of expert beliefs from different stages during the prediction process.

By analyzing performance variations across parameter settings, we identified the optimal configuration that yields the best validation performance (measured by *F1-score*). Specifically, model achieved the best

⁵ Our method achieves an F1-score of 0.590 and an ROI of 723.35, outperforming the strongest benchmark, HAT, which attains an F1-score of 0.553 and an ROI of 627.61. F1-score improvement is $(0.590/0.553-1) \times 100\% = 6.691\%$. ROI improvement is $723.35-627.61=95.74$, equivalent to $(723.35/627.61-1) \times 100\% = 15.255\%$.

⁶ Our method achieves an F1-score of 0.590 and an ROI of 723.35, outperforming the strongest benchmark, Katsafados et al. (2024)'s method, which attains an F1-score of 0.528 and an ROI of 437.97. F1-score improvement is $(0.590/0.528-1) \times 100\% = 11.742\%$. ROI improvement is $723.35-437.97=285.377$, equivalent to $(723.35/437.97-1) \times 100\% = 65.159\%$.

generalization performance and most stable convergence when the dropout rate was set to 0.15 and the learning rate to $1e-5$. These settings effectively prevented overfitting while maintaining smooth and efficient training process. Regarding the dimension of latent status s^l , we observed that smaller dimensions limited the representational capacity of the latent variables, making it difficult for the model to capture informative representations of expert calls. When the hidden size was set to 512, the latent space effectively encoded the semantic and structural characteristics of expert calls, leading to superior predictive performance. However, further increasing the hidden size resulted in a slight decline in performance, which may be attributed to the increased training difficulty associated with higher-dimensional parameterization. Additionally, when the weight of the constraint term w was set to 0.0001, the model appropriately balanced the contributions of expert beliefs from different stages, preventing dominance by any single phase of expert assessment. This process ensures that the proposed model can effectively learn and retain richer semantic and structural representations from expert call data, thereby enhancing its predictive capability and robustness.

5.3 Ablation Studies

Our model comprises several novel design components. We perform ablation studies by removing each design from the full model to examine its individual contribution. Each ablation corresponds to a specific methodological innovation. The first ablation eliminates the dependencies captured by the Bayesian network and includes three variants: (i) a variant that does not capture any dependencies (w/o dep), (ii) a variant that captures only temporal (sequential) dependencies (w/tmp dep), and (iii) a variant that captures only within-expert-call dependencies (w/cc dep). The second ablation removes the mechanism of sequentially updating experts' beliefs about the company's success (w/o yt), specifically, we remove all success rate latent variables. The third ablation removes the influence of the LLM-generated summaries (w/o GPT), concretely, we don't extract key information from dialogues by the knowledge-injected LLM.

As reported in Table 8, removing any design will significantly hamper the model's performance. The Bayesian network-based design, which models the complex dependencies among expert calls, questions, and answers, contributes the most to the model's predictive performance. Specifically, when no dependency relationships are modeled, the model performs the worst, achieving an *F1-score* of 0.402, an *ROI* of 171.360, and an *MOIC* of 2.714. When only partial dependencies are modeled, the model's performance improves slightly compared with the variant that does not model any dependencies. These results suggest that explicitly modeling the complex, sequential dependencies embedded in multi-round question-answer interactions during expert calls can substantially enhance the prediction accuracy of firm success.

Moreover, removing the sequential updating of experts' beliefs about firm success leads to a decline in performance. By capturing the progression of firm-specific latent success rates (rt) across multiple

consultation events, the model identifies not only the static informational content of individual calls but also the dynamic updating of expert belief. From a financial perspective, this temporal layer mirrors the way venture investors revise expectations as new qualitative information accumulates.

Similarly, excluding the knowledge-injected LLM-based summary design results in a substantial performance drop. This result indicates that the knowledge-injected LLM-based summarization design demonstrates a strong capability to distill critical signals associated with firm success from lengthy and information-sparse textual data, thereby enhancing the model’s ability to capture essential firm-level insights that are otherwise difficult to detect through conventional textual representations. Overall, these results demonstrate that each design component in our model makes a meaningful contribution to the accurate prediction of firm success.

5.4 Dynamic Updating and Sequential Learning

An advantage of the LLM-Bayesian framework lies in its capacity to dynamically update predictions as new information arrives, providing a continuous learning mechanism well suited to the opaque and fast-moving environment of private firms. Table 9 shows that both statistical and economic performance, measured by *F1-score*, *AUC*, *ROI*, and *MOIC*, improve steadily as additional expert calls are incorporated. *Accuracy* increases from 0.769 to 0.777, while *ROI* rises by more than 32.482%, demonstrating that the model progressively refines its posterior belief about a startup’s latent success trajectory as new conversational evidence accumulates.⁷ This sequential updating feature not only enhances predictive precision but also mirrors the iterative due-diligence process practiced by venture investors.

From a finance perspective, this design directly addresses one of the central challenges in entrepreneurial finance, severe information asymmetry and data sparsity surrounding private firms (Gompers and Lerner 2001, Kaplan and Strömberg 2004). Unlike public firms that disclose standardized financial statements and are continuously priced in capital markets, private ventures reveal information sporadically through funding announcements, patent filings, or media coverage. Widely used datasets such as VentureXpert and Crunchbase update only episodically, typically at funding or exit events, and therefore capture static, coarse-grained snapshots of firm activity. These lags constrain conventional machine-learning approaches, which rely on batch learning from fixed panels and cannot accommodate the evolving informational environment of early-stage investing.

Our model overcomes these limitations by embedding expert network calls into a sequential Bayesian learning process. Each new call, whether from a customer, consultant, or former executive, contributes incremental, high-frequency signals regarding product traction, competitive positioning, and managerial

⁷ 50% calls ROI=546 All calls ROI=723.35 $(723.35/546-1) \times 100\% = 32.482\%$.

credibility. The model fuses the semantic representation power of large language models with hierarchical Bayesian inference, enabling posterior beliefs about firm quality to update smoothly as new textual evidence arrives. In doing so, the system transforms expert conversations from isolated qualitative inputs into a real-time, information-updating mechanism that parallels investors’ belief-revision cycles (Ewens and Farre-Mensa 2022; Lerner and Nanda 2020).

From an information systems standpoint, this hybrid architecture advances prior text-analytics research that largely treats unstructured disclosures as static corpora. The LLM-Bayesian design operationalizes the principles of online and sequential learning, allowing the model to retain memory of prior interactions while re-weighting new evidence according to its relevance and source reliability. This yields a transparent mapping between information flow and decision updating, what Hevner et al. (2004) describe as design-science alignment between data dynamics and system adaptivity. Compared with recent LLM approaches to startup prediction, such as Maarouf et al. (2025), who develop a fused LLM combining textual self-descriptions from Crunchbase with structured venture data for one-time classification, our LLM-Bayesian framework extends the paradigm to a dynamic inference setting, enabling sequential belief updating as new expert-call evidence arrives and capturing the temporal evolution of startup success probabilities.

Taken together, these results highlight a methodological and practical contribution at the intersection of finance and information systems. The LLM-Bayesian model converts previously static, ex-post venture datasets into dynamic, interpretable information streams, capable of continuously revising success forecasts as evidence unfolds. This approach aligns model timing with the actual decision environment of venture capitalists and institutional investors, offering a data-efficient, transparent, and economically grounded framework for understanding how knowledge acquisition over time shapes investment performance in private markets.

5.5 Explainable Insights

To interpret the mechanisms behind the LLM-Bayesian’s predictive success, we combine qualitative case evidence and quantitative attention analysis, linking conversational patterns to model inference and investment outcomes.

5.5.1 Exemplary Transcript by Expert Type

Having established the model’s dynamic learning and sequential updating capabilities, we next examine how these mechanisms translate into interpretable decision patterns. Table 10 presents representative excerpts from expert-network consultation transcripts across five expert categories, customers, industry consultants, former executives, competitors, and partners, to illustrate how the LLM-Bayesian framework learns economically meaningful signals from dialogue. Each excerpt aligns the model-

identified sentiment with the startup’s realized outcome, allowing direct comparison between evaluative tone and ex-post success.

Customer discussions reveal that language centered on product functionality and user experience strongly differentiates outcomes. Successful ventures are described with confident and concrete expressions such as “unique integration” and “powerful dashboard,” whereas failed ones draw skeptical remarks like “flunky” or “would not recommend.” These contrasts mirror early indicators of product–market fit rarely captured in structured data.

Industry consultants highlight technological feasibility and scalability. Positive calls emphasize measurable improvements, “50 to 100 percent increase in energy density,” while negative ones stress limited adoption and execution challenges. Such statements resemble professional due-diligence assessments that directly inform investor expectations.

Former executives focus on organizational capability. Transcripts linked to failure reference hiring compromises and operational strain, whereas successful firms are portrayed as strategically differentiated. Competitors and partners, in turn, provide external validation: competitors discuss timing and market momentum, and partners emphasize trust and enthusiasm, “would absolutely buy them again.” These perspectives embed network-based and relational signals of startup quality.

Collectively, the transcripts show that expert discourse encodes multi-dimensional information, product design, technology, management, competition, and partnership, that conventional datasets such as VentureXpert or Crunchbase cannot capture in real time. By modeling such dialogues, the LLM-Bayesian framework translates qualitative judgments into structured latent signals that evolve with new interactions, offering an interpretable, investor-like mechanism for assessing startup success.

5.5.2 Exemplary Transcript by Attention Scores

Building on the qualitative insights from the exemplary transcripts, we next quantify how the LLM-Bayesian framework internally weighs different sources of information during prediction. Figures 6–8 visualize how the LLM-Bayesian framework allocates informational importance across expert types, topics, sentiment orientations, and firm characteristics. Similar to recent advances in explainable machine learning that use feature attribution to quantify topic importance in expert-call analysis, our attention-based approach provides a dynamic and interpretable lens through which the model’s decision process can be understood. While conventional interpretability methods identify which linguistic or topical features correlate most strongly with predicted outcomes, they operate on static models trained on fixed data snapshots. By contrast, our LLM-Bayesian assigns attention weights endogenously within a hierarchical and sequential structure, allowing predictive importance to evolve as new information arrives, an essential property in settings where information is sparse and continuously updated, as in startup financing.

Figure 6 reports the distribution of attention scores across expert types and discussion topics. Panel (a) shows that customers and industry consultants receive the largest weights, indicating that the model places greatest value on voices with firsthand operational and market knowledge. Former executives also contribute meaningfully, reflecting insights into managerial and organizational execution, while competitors and partners play more peripheral roles. Panel (b) highlights that discussions on regulatory challenges, customer acquisition, and industry-specific AI applications dominate the model’s learned focus, aligning closely with the uncertainty dimensions most salient in early-stage investment, compliance risk, scalability, and technological viability. The correspondence between model attention and investor intuition suggests that the LLM-Bayesian learns to extract information hierarchically, much like human analysts prioritize diverse yet economically material signals.

Figure 7 examines how attention varies with sentiment orientation. The model assigns the strongest weights to neutral and positive tones when discussing regulatory or technology-related topics, indicating that optimism in technically complex or compliance-heavy domains carries greater predictive value. Attention to customer acquisition intensifies when sentiment is positive, implying that expressions of confidence in market traction are particularly informative about future success. Conversely, negative tone in these same domains reduces attention weights, suggesting that the model learns to discount pessimistic views when uncertainty remains high. This pattern mirrors investor behavior during venture screening, where confident but credible optimism is often weighted more heavily in assessing long-term viability.

Figure 8 explores how attention evolves with firm maturity. The importance of regulatory, customer, and technology discussions declines as firms progress through successive funding rounds and investment sizes, indicating that qualitative assessments matter most in the formative stages of startup evaluation. As firms mature and quantitative performance indicators become available, these qualitative signals naturally lose marginal informational value. The model thus internalizes an information substitution process akin to that documented in venture finance, where early-stage decisions rely on narrative and expert insight, but later-stage assessments depend increasingly on observable outcomes.

Taken together, the attention patterns reveal that the LLM-Bayesian approach provides an economically interpretable decomposition of how investors learn from expert interactions over time. Rather than offering a static explanation of feature importance, the model dynamically tracks which information sources and tones are most predictive given the firm’s stage and conversational context. This dynamic interpretability bridges the gap between linguistic explainability and financial reasoning, capturing how investors update their beliefs in environments characterized by limited disclosure, evolving uncertainty, and high stakes.

5.6 Heterogeneity in Predictive and Economic Performance

To evaluate when the LLM-Bayesian model generates the greatest marginal value, we examine heterogeneity in predictive and economic performance across four firm dimensions that proxy for information frictions: industry complexity, firm age, public visibility, and founder diversity. These dimensions capture settings where the availability of hard information differs, shaping both investor uncertainty and the value of qualitative expert discourse.

The results in Table 11 reveal a consistent pattern: the LLM-Bayesian model adds the most value when traditional signals are weakest. In Panel A, performance gains are strongest for high-complexity industries such as AI, software, and biotechnology. In these technologically dense sectors, expert discussions reference interoperability challenges and technical risks that are difficult to quantify from structured data. Accordingly, the model achieves higher *Precision* (0.518 vs. 0.313) and larger ΔROI (+106.260 vs. +8.070), demonstrating its strength in extracting soft information from complex language.

This advantage extends to Panel B, where young firms, those less than six years old, show higher predictive and economic gains (*Precision* = 0.561; ΔROI = 268.300) than mature firms. Because early-stage startups lack long operating histories, expert commentary provides forward-looking assessments of scalability and execution risk, which the LLM-Bayesian framework converts into measurable predictive signals.

A similar pattern appears in Panel C, where low-visibility firms with younger web domains yield ΔROI = 336.920, more than twice that of high-visibility peers. When digital footprints are sparse, expert transcripts serve as the main source of credible information, allowing the model to outperform baseline approaches. Finally, Panel D shows stronger gains for firms led by diverse founding teams (*Precision* = 0.605; ΔROI = 203.120), suggesting that diversity produces richer, more informative discussions that the model effectively captures.

Overall, the LLM-Bayesian model’s advantage scales with information opacity. Across complex, young, low-visibility, and diverse firms, it enhances both predictive accuracy and portfolio returns by transforming unstructured expert discourse into actionable insight, thereby improving capital allocation efficiency and expanding access to innovation-driven opportunities.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

This paper shows that expert network call transcripts embed economically meaningful signals about startup success and introduces an LLM–Bayesian framework to extract and aggregate them. By modeling conversational dependencies and updating beliefs sequentially as new evidence arrives, the framework operationalizes Bayesian learning under severe information frictions, substantially improving predictive accuracy and investment performance over leading text and machine-learning baselines. Attention

mechanisms and probabilistic outputs enhance interpretability, clarifying why predictions evolve and addressing concerns about black-box screening in private markets.

Our findings have several implications. From a finance perspective, we provide direct evidence on how investors use third-party expertise to bridge information gaps and refine expectations in markets with power-law return distributions. From an information-systems perspective, we show how large language models combined with hierarchical Bayesian inference support sequential decision-making on unstructured text. Heterogeneity analyses reveal that conversational cues are most informative for technologically complex, young, diverse, and low-visibility startups, precisely where traditional signals are weakest.

From a policy perspective, such tools can help close systematic funding gaps by channeling capital to promising but informationally disadvantaged startups, enhancing allocative fairness and strengthening innovation pipelines. They also offer regulators and development agencies a scalable means to identify ventures with broad economic or social value.

This study opens avenues for future research. The expert-network setting serves as a natural laboratory for examining persuasion, belief updating, and expertise in real time. Extending the framework to other high-uncertainty contexts, such as emerging technologies, regulatory risk, or healthcare innovation, may yield further insight. In sum, by translating qualitative expert dialogue into sequential probabilistic beliefs, the LLM–Bayesian framework advances understanding of soft information acquisition in entrepreneurial finance and provides a transparent, scalable tool for screening where traditional data are sparse or biased.

References

- Beltagy I, Peters ME, Cohan A (2020) Longformer: The Long-Document Transformer. Preprint, submitted December 2, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.05150>.
- Bernstein S, Korteweg A, Laws K (2017) Attracting early-stage investors: evidence from a randomized field experiment. *J. Finance* 72(2):509–538.
- Blei DM, Ng AY, Jordan MI, Lafferty J (2003) Latent dirichlet allocation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 3(4/5):993.
- Borchert P, Coussement K, De Caigny A, De Weerd J (2023) Extending business failure prediction models with textual website content using deep learning. *European Journal of Operational Research* 306(1):348–357.
- Bowen DE, Frésard L, Hoberg G (2023) Rapidly evolving technologies and startup exits. *Manage. Sci.* 69(2):940–967.
- Bushee BJ, Matsumoto DA, Miller GS (2003) Open versus closed conference calls: the determinants and effects of broadening access to disclosure. *J. Account. Econ.* 34(1–3):149–180.
- Cambridge Associates (2018) *US Venture Capital Index and Selected Benchmark Statistics* (Cambridge Associates).
- Cao S, Green TC, Lei L (Gillian), Zhang S (2023) Expert network calls. Preprint, submitted May 15, <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4280865>.
- Carvalho CM, West M (2007) Dynamic matrix-variate graphical models. *Bayesian Anal.* 2(1):69–97.
- Cumming D (2009) *Private equity: fund types, risks and returns, and regulation* (John Wiley and Sons).
- Drake MS, Roulstone DT, Thornock JR (2012) Investor information demand: evidence from Google searches around earnings announcements. *J. Account. Res.* 50(4):1001–1040.
- Ewens M, Marx M (2018) Founder replacement and startup performance. *Rev. Financ. Stud.* 31(4):1532–1565.
- Ewens, M., and Farre-Mensa, J. (2022). Private or public equity? The evolving entrepreneurial finance landscape. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 14(1), 271–293.
- Gans JS, Stern S, Wu J (2019) Foundations of entrepreneurial strategy. *Strateg. Manag. J.* 40(5):736–756.
- Giglio S, Maggiori M, Stroebe J, Utkus S (2021) Five facts about beliefs and portfolios. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 111(5):1481–1522.
- Gompers P, Lerner J (2001) The venture capital revolution. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 15(2):145–168.
- Gompers PA, Gornall W, Kaplan SN, Strebulaev IA (2020) How do venture capitalists make decisions? *J. Financ. Econ.* 135(1):169–190.
- Gompers PA, Lerner J (2004) *The venture capital cycle* (MIT Press).
- Gruber TR (1995) Toward principles for the design of ontologies used for knowledge sharing? *Int. J. Hum.-Comput. Stud.* 43(5–6):907–928.
- Guzman J, Li A (2023) Measuring founding strategy. *Manage. Sci.* 69(1):101–118.
- Harris RS, Jenkinson T, Kaplan SN (2014) Private equity performance: what do we know? *J. Finance* 69(5):1851–1882.
- Hegde D, Tumlinson J (2014) Does social proximity enhance business partnerships? Theory and evidence from ethnicity’s role in U.S. venture capital. *Manage. Sci.* 60(9):2355–2380.
- Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., and Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. *MIS quarterly*, 75–105.
- Hobson JL, Mayew WJ, Venkatachalam M (2012) Analyzing speech to detect financial misreporting. *J. Account. Res.* 50(2):349–392.
- Hochberg YV, Ljungqvist A, Lu Y (2007) Whom you know matters: venture capital networks and investment performance. *J. Finance* 62(1):251–301.
- Howell ST (2017) Financing innovation: evidence from R&D grants. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 107(4):1136–1164.
- Hu Y, Chen P, Liu T, Gao J, Sun Y, Yin B (2021) Hierarchical Attention Transformer Networks for Long Document Classification. *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)* 1–7
- Huang AH, Wang H, Yang Y (2023) FinBERT: a large language model for extracting information from financial text. *Contemp. Account. Res.* 40(2):806–841.

- Institutional Limited Partners Association (2019) ILPA Principles 3.0: Fostering Transparency, Governance and Alignment of Interests for General and Limited Partners. *Institutional Limited Partners Association*.
- Kadhim AI (2019) Survey on supervised machine learning techniques for automatic text classification. *Artif Intell Rev* 52(1):273–292.
- Kaplan SN, Schoar A (2005) Private equity performance: returns, persistence, and capital flows. *J. Finance* 60(4):1791–1823.
- Kaplan SN, Strömberg P (2004) Characteristics, contracts, and actions: evidence from venture capitalist analyses. *J. Finance* 59(5):2177–2210.
- Kaplan SN, Strömberg P (2009) Leveraged buyouts and private equity. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 23(1):121–146.
- Katsafados AG, Leledakis GN, Pyrgiotakis EG, Androutsopoulos I, Fergadiotis M (2024) Machine learning in bank merger prediction: a text-based approach. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 312(2):783–797.
- Ke ZT, Kelly B, Xiu D (2019) Predicting returns with text data. Preprint, submitted August, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w26186.pdf>.
- Kerr WR, Nanda R, Rhodes-Kropf M (2014) Entrepreneurship as experimentation. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 28(3):25–48.
- Korteweg AG, Sorensen M (2023) Performance measures in private equity. Preprint, submitted October 7, <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4595553>.
- KPMG International (2016) *Evaluating private equity's performance*
- Larcker DF, Zakolyukina AA (2012) Detecting deceptive discussions in conference calls. *J. Account. Res.* 50(2):495–540.
- Lerner, J., and Nanda, R. (2020). Venture capital's role in financing innovation: What we know and how much we still need to learn. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(3), 237-261.
- Liberti JM, Petersen MA (2019) Information: hard and soft. *Rev. Corp. Finance Stud.* 8(1):1–41.
- Liu J, Jia M (2025) Financial distress prediction with annual reports-based deep textual feature extraction: A hybrid approach. *Information Sciences* 686:121318.
- Ljungqvist A (2024) The economics of private equity: a critical review. Preprint, submitted February 12, <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4723171>.
- Maarouf A, Feuerriegel S, Pröllochs N (2025) A fused large language model for predicting startup success. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 322(1):198–214.
- Mayew WJ, Venkatachalam M (2012) The power of voice: managerial affective states and future firm performance. *J. Finance* 67(1):1–43.
- Metrick A, Yasuda A (2021) *Venture capital and the finance of innovation* (John Wiley & Sons).
- Miao Y, Yu L, Blunsom P (2016) Neural variational inference for text processing. *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning* (PMLR), 1727–1736
- Nanda R, Rhodes-Kropf M (2013) Investment cycles and startup innovation. *J. Financ. Econ.* 110(2):403–418.
- Pastor L, Veronesi P (2009) Learning in financial markets. *Annu. Rev. Financ. Econ.* 1(1):361–381.
- Popoola G, Abdullah KK, Fuhnwi GS, Agbaje J (2024) Sentiment analysis of financial news data using TF-IDF and machine learning algorithms. *2024 IEEE 3rd International Conference on AI in Cybersecurity (ICAIC)* 1–6
- Puri M, Zarutskie R (2012) On the life cycle dynamics of venture-capital- and non-venture-capital-financed firms. *J. Finance* 67(6):2247–2293.
- Reimers N, Gurevych I (2019) Sentence-BERT: sentence embeddings using siamese BERT-networks. *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)* (Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China), 3980–3990
- Solomon D, Soltes E (2015) What Are We Meeting For? The Consequences of Private Meetings with Investors. *J. Law Econ.* 58(2):325–355.

- Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, Uszkoreit J, Jones L, Gomez AN, Kaiser Ł, Polosukhin I (2017) Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (Curran Associates, Inc.), 261–272
- Wang H, Yeung DY (2021) A survey on bayesian deep learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 53(5):1–37.
- Wu C, Wu F, Qi T, Huang Y (2021) Hi-transformer: hierarchical interactive transformer for efficient and effective long document modeling. *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)* (Association for Computational Linguistics, Online), 848–853
- Yang Z, Yang D, Dyer C, He X, Smola A, Hovy E (2016) Hierarchical attention networks for document classification. Knight K, Nenkova A, Rambow O, eds. *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies* (Association for Computational Linguistics, San Diego, California), 1480–1489
- Zaheer M, Guruganesh G, Dubey A, Ainslie J, Alberti C, Ontanon S, Pham P, et al. (2020) Big bird: transformers for longer sequences. *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems NIPS '20*. (Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA), 17283–17297
- Zaheer M, Guruganesh G, Dubey A, Ainslie J, Alberti C, Ontanon S, Pham P, et al. (2021) Big bird: transformers for longer sequences. Preprint, submitted January 8, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.14062>.
- Zhang H, Shafiq MO (2024) Survey of transformers and towards ensemble learning using transformers for natural language processing. *J Big Data* 11(1):25.
- Zhang Y, Liu T, Li W (2024) Corporate fraud detection based on linguistic readability vector: Application to financial companies in China. *Int. Rev. Financ. Anal.* 95:103405.
- Zhu Y, Liu X, Sheng ORL (2025) Post-earnings-announcement drift prediction: leveraging postevent investor responses with multitask learning. *Inf. Syst. Res.*:isre.2022.0358.
- Zimmermann J, Champagne LE, Dickens JM, Hazen BT (2024) Approaches to improve preprocessing for Latent Dirichlet Allocation topic modeling. *Decis. Support Syst.* 185:114310.

Figure 1: The Generation Process of Our Proposed Bayesian Network

This figure illustrates the sequential dependency structure of our Bayesian network, which models how conversational exchanges across expert calls inform latent estimates of a firm's success rate. Each call l produces question-answer pairs $(q^{l,k}, a^{l,k})$, summarized into a latent conversational state s^l . The state evolves through the sequence of calls, influencing the latent success variable r^l and updating the firm-level success belief y^{l+1} . This dynamic generative process enables the model to infer and update the underlying success probability after each new expert call.




Figure 2: Expert–Topic Knowledge Flows

This figure visualizes the distribution of discussion topics across expert types in the expert network call dataset. Each flow represents the proportion of calls linking a given expert type, *Competitor*, *Customer*, *Former executive*, *Industry consultant*, or *Partner*, to one of the top refined topics identified in the topic-model analysis. Flow width reflects the relative frequency of topic mentions within each expert group. The visualization highlights how different expert roles emphasize distinct domains, such as strategy, product development, regulation, and data analytics.




Figure 3: Topic Composition Across Industries

This figure shows the distribution of discussion topics across industries. T1–T10 correspond to the ten most salient discussion topics identified in Table 3, representing the dominant thematic categories extracted from expert network transcripts. Each horizontal bar represents one industry, with color segments indicating the proportion of transcripts devoted to each topic within that industry. The figure highlights industry-specific emphases—for instance, software and IT services exhibit stronger focus on technology-related topics, while investment and financial services concentrate on market and pricing discussions. The proportions are normalized within industries to sum to 100%, allowing comparison of related topic salience across sectors.




Figure 4: Sentiment by Topic

This figure plots the mean sentiment scores across discussion topics identified from expert–client consultation calls. Each point represents the average sentiment for a given topic, and horizontal lines indicate the variation across topics. Topics are ordered by their mean sentiment score, which ranges from –2 (strongly negative) to +2 (strongly positive). Higher values reflect more optimistic or favorable discussions, while lower values indicate concerns or negative outlooks.




Figure 5: Sentiment by Topic and Expert Type

This heatmap reports the average sentiment score for each combination of discussion topic and expert type derived from expert–client consultation transcripts. Sentiment scores range from –2 (negative tone) to +2 (positive tone), with colors shifting from red (pessimistic outlook) to blue and green (optimistic outlook). Each cell reflects the mean sentiment expressed by a given expert group when discussing a specific topic.






Figure 6: Attention Score by Expert Type and Topics

This figure summarizes how attention is distributed across expert types and discussion topics. Panel (a) shows the average attention score by expert type, *Customers*, *Industry consultants*, *Former executives*, *Competitors*, and *Partners*. Panel (b) reports the distribution of attention across the most discussed topics, including *Regulatory and Security Challenges*, *Customer Acquisition and Pricing*, and *Industry-Specific AI Applications* as illustrative examples.



(a) Attention Score by Expert Type



(b) Attention Score by Topics

Figure 7: Attention Score by Topic and Sentiment

This figure visualizes how expert attention varies across major discussion topics and sentiment orientations. Each cell represents the average model-derived attention score for a given topic–sentiment pair, with warmer colors indicating higher emphasis.




Figure 8: Attention Scores for Each Topic versus Firm Characteristics

This figure shows attention scores to key topics, (a) *Regulatory and Security Challenges*, (b) *Customer Acquisition and Pricing*, and (c) *Industry-Specific AI Applications*, varies with firm characteristics. For each topic, attention scores are plotted against *Funding rounds*, *Funding amount*, and *Stages*. Firm stage is defined based on the most recent funding round, ranging from early-stage, expansion, later stage, exit. Blue lines are attention score. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.




Table 1: Notation

This table summarizes the notation used throughout the paper. Symbols describe key entities, model components, and data representations in the LLM-Bayesian framework

Notation	Description
o	The company under consideration o .
c^l	The l -th expert consultation call of company.
$(t_{\text{Que}}^{l,k}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,k})$	The k -th question–answer pair in call c^l , where $t_{\text{Que}}^{l,k}$ is the textual content of the question and $t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,k}$ is the textual content of the answer.
K^l	The total number of question–answer pairs in call c^l .
$c^l = \left((t_{\text{Que}}^{l,1}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,1}), \dots, (t_{\text{Que}}^{l,K^l}; t_{\text{Ans}}^{l,K^l}) \right)$	Representation of the full transcript of call c^l as a set of Q–A pairs.
e	External structured information (e.g., company profile, sector, or funding information).
$f_{\theta}(\cdot)$	The prediction model parameterized by θ .
y	The observed binary success outcome of company o .
\hat{y}	The predicted success outcome from the model.
r^l	Latent success rate of company o at the time of its l -th call.
\mathbf{s}^l	Latent status vector capturing the unobserved condition of company o at call l .
LLMExtract(\cdot)	Pretrained language model used to embed each Q–A text segment into vector space.
$\mathbf{A}^l; \mathbf{Q}^l$	Questions and Answers in the l -th expert consultation call respectively.

Table 2: Summary Statistics

This table presents descriptive statistics for the sample of expert network calls and firms included in the analysis. Panel A summarizes *Call Characteristics*, including *Number of words per transcript*, *Number of QA per transcript*, *Number of calls*, and *Number of words per transcript after gpt summary*. Panel B reports the *Expert Types Distribution* by their relationship to the target company. Panel C provides Firm Characteristics, including *Age*, *Founders count*, *Number of investment rounds*, *Raised funding*, *Investor count*, *Active products count*, and *IT spending*. All variable definitions are reported in Table A.1.

Panel A: Call Characteristics

Transcript	Min	p25	p50	p75	Max	Mean
Number of words per transcript	767	1330.323	1610.450	1730.935	16011	5879.730
Number of QA per transcript	2	31	59	111	333	73.726
Number of calls	1	1	2	5	5	2.769
Number of words per transcript after gpt summary	93	391.968	489.675	560.968	8808	2053.146

Panel B: Expert Types Distribution

Expert Type	Percent
Competitor	7.995
Customer	37.857
Former exec	19.095
Industry cons	31.899
Partner	3.155

Panel C: Firm Characteristics

Variables	N	Min	p25	p50	p75	Max	mean
Age (month)	4210	7.033	73.475	103.667	148.592	279.367	117.099
Founders count	4210	1	2	2	3	11	2.394
Number of investment rounds	4210	1	4	5	7	40	5.796
Raised funding (million)	4210	0.000	73	193.984	308.650	28500	435.384
Investor count	4210	1	7	11	18	124	14.138
Active products count	4210	2	21	27.365	37	139	30.979
IT spending (million)	4210	0.000	2.748	11.429	30.014	33912.320	60.432

Table 3: Top 10 Transcript Topics by ChatGPT (Ranked by Frequency)

This table summarizes the ten most frequently discussed thematic categories in expert network transcripts, with concise descriptions generated through a LLM-based topic modeling pipeline. Each topic represents a distinct area of focus within expert discussions

Rank	Topic	Description
1	AI and Machine Learning Platforms	Examination of AI/ML platforms for data preparation, model building, and deployment, including the impact of low-code solutions on reducing the need for skilled data scientists.
2	Data Management and Preparation	Challenges and solutions in data ingestion, normalization, and preparation, highlighting tools and platforms that facilitate these processes.
3	Industry-Specific AI Applications	Use cases of AI across various industries, focusing on applications like customer churn analysis and healthcare diagnostics.
4	Competitive Landscape in AI/ML	Analysis of the competitive dynamics among AI/ML vendors and the influence of major cloud providers on market dynamics.
5	Regulatory and Security Challenges	Discussion on regulatory and security considerations affecting the adoption of AI/ML tools, particularly in sensitive sectors.
6	Digital Advertising Strategies	Exploration of strategies and platforms used for digital advertising, including the impact of external factors like COVID-19 on budgets and platform-specific insights.
7	Corporate Culture and Management	Analysis of corporate culture and management styles across tech companies, focusing on leadership, execution speed, and strategic vision.
8	Product Development and Innovation	Insights into product development strategies, including the role of acquisitions and leadership in driving innovation and market positioning.
9	Market Expansion and Strategy	Discussion on strategies for market expansion, including international growth, competitive dynamics, and customer acquisition.
10	Customer Acquisition and Pricing	Analysis of customer acquisition channels and pricing strategies, emphasizing the importance of market-specific pricing models.

Table 4: Prediction Performance Comparison with Machine and Deep Learning Methods

This table compares the LLM-Bayesian framework with traditional machine learning and deep learning classifiers, Support Vector Machine (SVM), Logistic Regression (LR), Naïve Bayes (NB), and Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), using various combinations of engineered textual features (*topic*), call volume (*#call*), and structured firm variables (*fv*). Performance is evaluated using predictive metrics, *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *F1-score*, *Weighted F1*, *Macro F1*, and *AUC*. Economic metrics include *ROI* (Return on Investment) and *MOIC* (*Multiple on Invested Capital*), reflecting realized investor performance under model-guided portfolio allocation.

Baselines	Features	Accuracy	Precision	F1-score	Weighted F1	Macro F1	AUC	ROI	MOIC
SVM	topic	0.630	0.337	0.446	0.660	0.584	0.641	382.391	4.824
	#call	0.698	0.391	0.476	0.717	0.632	0.666	358.147	4.581
	fv	0.601	0.340	0.480	0.632	0.578	0.677	577.222	6.772
	topic + #call	0.716	0.411	0.487	0.732	0.645	0.674	358.040	4.580
	topic + fv	0.649	0.369	0.501	0.678	0.615	0.695	592.482	6.925
	topic + fv + #call	0.759	0.473	0.536	0.769	0.686	0.709	480.816	5.808
LR	topic	0.637	0.333	0.431	0.665	0.582	0.627	290.574	3.906
	#call	0.752	0.461	0.507	0.752	0.461	0.686	327.497	4.275
	fv	0.641	0.358	0.484	0.670	0.604	0.679	533.876	6.339
	topic + #call	0.749	0.455	0.504	0.758	0.668	0.684	321.945	4.219
	topic + fv	0.672	0.386	0.513	0.699	0.633	0.705	603.926	7.039
	topic + fv + #call	0.731	0.437	0.530	0.748	0.670	0.710	546.179	6.462
NB	topic	0.632	0.337	0.444	0.662	0.585	0.639	366.127	4.661
	#call	0.714	0.409	0.487	0.730	0.644	0.674	367.291	4.673
	fv	0.545	0.301	0.433	0.578	0.526	0.624	454.551	5.546
	topic + #call	0.651	0.347	0.443	0.706	0.622	0.638	352.885	4.529
	topic + fv	0.634	0.336	0.440	0.664	0.585	0.635	349.309	4.493
	topic + fv + #call	0.685	0.389	0.500	0.709	0.635	0.690	518.688	6.187
MLP	topic	0.618	0.325	0.432	0.649	0.572	0.627	341.661	4.417
	#call	0.688	0.388	0.489	0.711	0.632	0.679	455.437	5.554
	fv	0.677	0.381	0.490	0.702	0.627	0.681	489.012	5.890
	topic + #call	0.689	0.391	0.496	0.712	0.636	0.685	487.499	5.875
	topic + fv	0.686	0.393	0.508	0.710	0.639	0.697	533.264	6.333
	topic + fv + #call	0.737	0.448	0.551	0.754	0.682	0.729	639.874	7.399
Ours	crunch+text	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230

Table 5: Prediction Performance Comparison with Transformer-based Long Text Classifiers

This table compares the LLM-Bayesian framework’s predictive and economic performance with representative transformer-based long-text classification models applied to expert network transcripts combined with structured firm variables (*fv + text*). Benchmarked models include HAT, Hi-transformer, Longformer, and BigBirds, which differ in their hierarchical and sparse attention mechanisms. Performance is evaluated using predictive metrics, *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *F1-score*, *Weighted F1*, *Macro F1*, and *AUC*. Economic metrics include *ROI* (*Return on Investment*) and *MOIC* (*Multiple on Invested Capital*), reflecting realized investor performance under model-guided portfolio allocation.

Models	Features	Accuracy	Precision	F1-score	Weighted F1	Macro F1	AUC	ROI	MOIC
HAT	fv + text	0.745	0.458	0.553	0.761	0.688	0.729	627.610	7.280
Hi-transformer	fv + text	0.756	0.469	0.532	0.767	0.683	0.706	462.850	5.630
Longformer	fv + text	0.660	0.376	0.504	0.688	0.623	0.697	585.300	6.850
Bigbirds	fv + text	0.645	0.366	0.498	0.674	0.612	0.693	601.810	7.120
Ours	fv + text	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230

Table 6: Prediction Performance Comparison with Text-based Startup Success Prediction

This table compares the LLM-Bayesian model’s predictive and investment performance with recent text-based approaches to startup success prediction using comparable Crunchbase-derived inputs. Reported benchmarks include Maarouf et al. (2025), Katsafados et al. (2024), and Guzman and Li (2023), which combine textual and structured firm-level features (*fv+text*) or use text alone. Performance is evaluated using predictive metrics, *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *F1-score*, *Weighted F1*, *Macro F1*, and *AUC*. Economic metrics include *ROI* (*Return on Investment*) and *MOIC* (*Multiple on Invested Capital*), reflecting realized investor performance under model-guided portfolio allocation.

		Accuracy	Precision	F1-score	Weighted F1	Macro F1	AUC	ROI	MOIC
(Maarouf et al. 2025)	fv+text	0.746	0.452	0.511	0.757	0.670	0.690	376.917	4.769
(Katsafados et al. 2024)	fv+text	0.757	0.471	0.528	0.767	0.683	0.702	437.973	5.380
(Guzman and Li 2023)	text	0.598	0.318	0.434	0.631	0.561	0.628	385.065	4.851
Ours	fv+text	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230

Table 7: Sensitivity Analysis

This table evaluates the robustness of the LLM-Bayesian framework’s predictive and economic performance to alternative hyperparameter settings. Panels vary the *dropout* probability (Panel A), the learning rate (Panel B), the dimension of latent status (Panel C), and the weight of the constraint term (Panel D). Performance is evaluated using predictive metrics, *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *F1-score*, *Weighted F1*, *Macro F1*, and *AUC*. Economic metrics include *ROI* (*Return on Investment*) and *MOIC* (*Multiple on Invested Capital*), reflecting realized investor performance under model-guided portfolio allocation. Bolded values indicate optimal settings.

		Accuracy	Precision	F1-score	Weighted F1	Macro F1	AUC	ROI	MOIC
Panel A: Dropout rate									
	0.1	0.773	0.498	0.586	0.786	0.715	0.751	713.205	8.132
	0.15	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230
	0.2	0.771	0.495	0.581	0.783	0.712	0.747	696.989	7.970
	0.3	0.773	0.497	0.574	0.784	0.709	0.739	646.668	7.467
	0.35	0.780	0.510	0.569	0.788	0.711	0.732	592.047	6.921
Panel B: Learning rate									
	1.00E-04	0.771	0.494	0.573	0.782	0.708	0.739	650.493	7.505
	5.00E-05	0.776	0.503	0.578	0.787	0.713	0.742	657.987	7.580
<i>lr</i>	1.00E-05	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230
	5.00E-06	0.777	0.504	0.582	0.788	0.715	0.746	680.894	7.809
	1.00E-06	0.775	0.503	0.580	0.787	0.714	0.744	672.922	7.729
Panel C: Dimension of latent status s^l									
	128	0.769	0.492	0.571	0.781	0.707	0.738	642.907	7.429
	256	0.772	0.497	0.574	0.783	0.709	0.740	652.348	7.523
<i>dl</i>	512	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230
	768	0.779	0.508	0.583	0.789	0.716	0.745	675.129	7.751
	1024	0.777	0.505	0.583	0.788	0.715	0.746	682.630	7.826
Panel D: the weight of the constraint term w									
	1.00E-03	0.771	0.495	0.580	0.783	0.711	0.746	687.002	7.870
	5.00E-03	0.774	0.500	0.583	0.786	0.714	0.747	694.375	7.944
<i>w</i>	1.00E-04	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230
	5.00E-05	0.775	0.502	0.586	0.787	0.716	0.750	708.523	8.085
	1.00E-05	0.771	0.495	0.581	0.783	0.712	0.747	697.223	7.972

Table 8: Ablation Analysis of the Proposed Framework

This table compares the LLM-Bayesian model’s predictive and economic performance under alternative configurations to evaluate the contribution of the temporal Bayesian component. Each row reports results for models that remove our novel design. w/o dep refers variant that doesn’t capture any dependencies, w/tmp dep refers the variant that captures only temporal (sequential) dependencies, w/cc dep refers the variant that captures only within-conference-call dependencies, w/o yt refers the variant that removes all success rate latent variable, w/final yt refers the variant that retrain the success rate only for the final observed outcome, w/o gpt refers variant that removes knowledge-injected LLM summary, w/o s^l refers the variant that remove the latent variable s^l for each conference call. Predictive metrics include *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *F1-score*, *Weighted F1*, *Macro F1*, and *AUC*. Economic metrics include *ROI (Return on Investment)* and *MOIC (Multiple on Invested Capital)*, reflecting realized investor performance under model-guided portfolio allocation.

Variants	Accuracy	Precision	F1-score	Weighted F1	Macro F1	AUC	ROI	MOIC
w/o dep	0.627	0.315	0.402	0.655	0.566	0.601	171.360	2.714
w/tmp dep	0.593	0.315	0.420	0.623	0.551	0.614	310.260	4.103
w/cc dep	0.601	0.307	0.408	0.633	0.553	0.604	262.820	3.628
w/o yt	0.768	0.490	0.580	0.781	0.710	0.747	699.249	7.993
w/o gpt	0.756	0.472	0.562	0.770	0.696	0.734	640.722	7.407
ours	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230

Table 9: Dynamic Updating of Predictive Performance with Successive Expert Calls

This table reports how the LLM-Bayesian model’s predictive and economic performance evolves as additional expert network calls are incorporated into the training sequence. Each row represents the model’s performance using transcripts from only the first call (*First call*), the first half of calls (*50% calls*), and all available calls (*All calls*) for each firm. Predictive metrics include *Accuracy*, *Precision*, *F1-score*, *Weighted F1*, *Macro F1*, and *AUC*. Economic metrics include *ROI* (*Return on Investment*) and *MOIC* (*Multiple on Invested Capital*), reflecting realized portfolio performance under model-guided investment.

	Accuracy	Precision	F1-score	Weighted F1	Macro F1	AUC	ROI	MOIC
First call	0.769	0.491	0.541	0.7772	0.695	0.710	461.568	5.616
50% calls	0.777	0.504	0.560	0.785	0.7051	0.724	546.000	6.46
All calls	0.777	0.505	0.590	0.789	0.718	0.753	723.350	8.230

Table 10: Exemplary Transcript by Expert Type

This table presents representative excerpts from expert network consultation transcripts illustrating how experts of different types discuss firms and their prospects. Each excerpt includes an anonymized question–answer exchange highlighting the expert’s evaluative tone and qualitative reasoning. Positive (blue) and negative (red) segments indicate the LLM-identified sentiment associated with each statement. To preserve confidentiality, firm names mentioned during the calls are replaced with the placeholder “ABC”.

Expert type	Textual self-description	Outcome
Customer	Q: So why would someone need ABC then? A:..The integration with the Tray was flunky and personally, I would not recommend them..	non-successful
Customer	Q: That makes sense. How is what they're doing unique? A: ABC, ... it has a lot of artificial intelligence built in, and it gives you the ability and a powerful dashboard to create rules and policies...	successful
Industry cons	Q: could you please give us a quick overview of your experience in this space? A:..it's money spent and screening people that ultimately don't enroll or even worse, enrolled and then drop out prematurely... ..That was a no for us really out of the gate ...	non-successful
Industry cons	Q: But how likely is it to actually be available at scale? A: ...this could get 50% to 100% improvement in energy density over state-of-the-art cells today... And that's an obviously huge marketing point for the technology in the startups...	successful
Former exec	Q: How does the engineering team compare with other companies you may have worked out ...? A: ... the pressure to get people in the absence of those professionals in the market forced the company to make some compromises in the sense that not always the best ones were hired. ..So maintaining them, it's very difficult.	non-successful
Former exec	Q: So from your experience at ABC, how did you guys frame yourself in the market? A: ABC goes one step beyond...	successful
Competitor	Q:..Were there any sort of real credible competitors or folks that you saw as being potential challengers in this segment? A:...But all of them are slower to the market...No one was effective.	non-successful
Competitor	Q: we are interested in the PIM space generally and are looking to get your perspective on some of the players. A: ...I mean this PIM business has definitely exploded...It's exciting...	successful
Partner	Q: is there any barrier to entry in entering the cloud cost optimization space? A:... Not necessarily...	non-successful
Partner	Q: And then maybe just turning to kind of your experience with ABC or ...how satisfied were you? A: ... Very pleased. I would absolutely buy them again for an organization that I'm with now or will be in the future...I absolutely love working with them...	successful

Table 11: Heterogeneity Analysis of Model Performance Across Firm Subgroups

This table evaluates whether the LLM-Bayesian model’s incremental predictive and economic performance varies across key firm subgroups. *Precision* measures the fraction of correctly predicted successful startups, while *ROI* (*Return on Investment*) and *MOIC* (*Multiple on Invested Capital*) reflect realized portfolio profitability under model-guided investment. ΔROI and $\Delta MOIC$ denote improvements relative to a baseline model. Panel A partitions firms by *Industry complexity*, classified through a two-stage text procedure combining keyword heuristics and LLM validation. Industries referencing advanced technologies (e.g., AI, software, biotech) are labeled *High*, while traditional sectors are labeled *Low*. Panel B partitions firms by *Firm age*, defining *Young* firms as those less than six years old, and *Mature* firms as those six years or older. Panel C partitions firms by *Public visibility*, proxied by domain age. Domains younger than six years are labeled *Low*, while older domains are labeled *High*. Panel D partitions firms by *Founder diversity*, capturing gender and ethnic minority representation.

		LLM-Bayesian				
		Precision	ROI	MOIC	ΔROI vs Baseline	$\Delta MOIC$ vs Baseline
Panel A: Industry complexity						
(1)	High	0.518	774.770	8.748	106.260	1.063
(2)	Low	0.313	29.220	1.290	8.070	0.079
Panel B: Firm age						
(3)	Young	0.561	976.710	10.767	268.300	2.683
(4)	Mature	0.495	678.320	7.783	105.430	1.054
Panel C: Public visibility						
(5)	Low	0.600	1085.790	11.858	336.920	3.369
(6)	High	0.504	703.660	8.037	152.420	1.524
Panel D: Founder diversity						
(7)	High	0.605	915.300	10.153	203.120	2.031
(8)	Low	0.497	579.060	6.791	32.320	0.323

Internet Appendix for “When Experts Speak: Sequential LLM-Bayesian Learning for Startup Success Prediction”

(Not to be published)

Appendix A. I: ChatGPT-Based Topic Modeling Pipeline for Expert Call Transcripts

In this appendix, we outline the technical details and prompt design underlying our three-step ChatGPT-based topic modeling framework applied to expert call transcripts. The process is designed to enable large language models (LLMs) to identify, refine, and evaluate thematic structures within each transcript while preserving conversational context and ensuring topic consistency across the corpus.

Step 1. Topic Generation

In the first step, ChatGPT is instructed to generate initial topics for each transcript individually. Each transcript is provided as input text, and the model outputs a list of concise thematic labels and corresponding summaries that capture the main discussion themes. The prompt is designed to balance interpretability and coverage by constraining the model to return no more than 8–10 core topics per transcript.

Prompt Example (Step 1: Topic Generation)

Task Description

As part of a research initiative in entrepreneurial finance, we examine how early-stage investors approach their decision-making. Our dataset consists of transcripts from consultation calls between prospective early-stage investors (hereafter referred to as “Clients”) and domain experts who possess deep knowledge of the companies under discussion. The transcripts will be analyzed individually to extract key thematic information.

Your Task

For the transcript below, identify the primary, top-level topics discussed. Focus on broadly relevant themes that capture the call’s main focus and the clients’ priorities.

Instructions

- Identify **ONLY** the primary, high-level topics central to this call.
- Avoid overly technical or company-specific topics.
- Keep labels concise and include a 1–2 sentence description for each topic.

This step yields an initial topic set for each transcript. The outputs are cached for subsequent refinement to ensure computational efficiency and reproducibility.

Step 2. Topic Refinement and Global Topic Alignment

In the second step, all transcript-level topics are aggregated to identify the global top-30 themes across the entire dataset. The purpose is to merge semantically overlapping or synonymous topics (e.g., “AI adoption in finance” and “AI-driven financial innovation”) and to construct a unified taxonomy of discussion categories.

ChatGPT is used to cluster, rename, and refine the topics for global consistency. The process ensures that topics assigned in later stages map to a stable and interpretable set of categories.

Prompt Example (Step 2: Topic Refinement)

Task Description

As part of an academic research project in entrepreneurial finance, we aim to better understand the key themes that shape how early-stage investors make decisions. To support this goal, we have compiled transcripts from consultation calls between investors and domain experts who are familiar with the companies. For each call, we have extracted a set of preliminary topic labels.

Your Task

Your job is to **clean and refine** these topic lists by identifying and merging topics that are duplicates, near-duplicates, or semantically overlapping. You should also adjust titles and descriptions for clarity and generality. If the provided topics are already clear and distinct, return "None" to indicate that no refinement is required.

This step represents the **topic refinement stage** in a multi-step topic modeling workflow.

Guidelines for merging topics:

- Merge topics that describe the same underlying idea or process, even if worded differently or from different industries.
- When one topic is more specific and another is broader, keep the broader one.
- Use concise, general titles (no company or product names).
- Avoid vague names like "Merged Topic."
- Write definitions that describe the general concept, not company-specific details.

Illustrative Merging Examples

- Customer Support Platforms + Customer Service Software →

Customer Service Infrastructure: Software systems for managing tickets, live chat, and client communication.

- Leadership Pipeline Development + Internal Talent Acceleration →

Leadership Development Programs: Strategies to identify, train, and promote internal talent.

- Nike Digital Campaigns + Adidas Online Marketing Strategy →

Digital Marketing Strategies: How firms use online platforms and partnerships to engage consumers.

This refinement step yields a stable taxonomy, which we use to assign consistent topic labels back to each transcript.

Step 3. Topic Assignment and Sentiment Evaluation

Finally, we re-evaluate each transcript and assign it to one or more of the refined topics identified in Step 2. ChatGPT receives both the transcript content and the refined topic list as context and determines which topics are most relevant to the discussion. The model also provides a sentiment evaluation (positive, neutral, or negative) for each topic occurrence within the transcript.

Prompt Example (Step 3: Topic Assignment and Sentiment Evaluation)

Task Description

Analyze the expert–client conversation to identify key discussion topics from the list below. Use only the exact topic names. For each relevant topic, assign a sentiment score (–2 to +2) and give short supporting evidence.

Sentiment Scale

+2 Strongly Positive — clear enthusiasm, major benefits

+1 Positive — favorable tone

0 Neutral — factual or balanced

–1 Negative — some concerns

–2 Strongly Negative — serious criticism or problems

Examples

(+2) “The Asia partnership doubled client volume.” → Strongly Positive (+2); rapid regional growth.

(–2) “System outages caused cancellations and refunds.” → Strongly Negative (–2); repeated failures, lost trust.

(0) “The firm publishes quarterly ESG updates.” → Neutral (0); factual reporting.

This step generates the final per-transcript topic-sentiment dataset used for downstream quantitative analysis, including topic frequency distribution, co-occurrence patterns, and sentiment correlation with firm outcomes.

Appendix A. II Tables

Table A.1: Variable descriptions.

Variable	Description
OUTCOME VARIABLE	
Success	True (= 1) if a startup had an initial public offering, received funding, or has been acquired. False(=0)otherwise
PREDICTORS	
<u>Fundamental variable (FV)</u>	
Age	Time since the startup has been founded (in months)
Founders count	Number of founders of the startup
Number of investment rounds	Number of investment rounds
Raised funding	Total raised funding (in million USD)
Investor count	Overall number of investors that invested in the startup
Active products count	Number of active products
IT spending	The approximate amount a company spends on IT
Trademark class	The class assigned to the trademark
Number of Calls in last 24 month	Number of Calls in last 24 month (24 dimension vector)
Head quarters location	Head quarters location (one-hot vector)
<u>Expert call transcript</u>	
Expert call embedding	Semantic representation of the expert–client conversation encoded via a large language model (MPNet)
<u>Expert types</u>	
Competitor	Competitors provide insights grounded in their direct rivalry with the focal firm.
Customer	Customers represent the demand side of the focal firm.
Former exec	Former executives and employees provide a rare insider’s view of the focal firm.
Industry cons	Industry consultants offer a broader vantage point of focal firm.
Partner	Partners, including distributors, suppliers, and strategic collaborators, illuminate the ecosystem dynamics that underpin a firm’s business model.

Table A.2: Sentiment Scale

This table presents the five-point sentiment scale used in the assignment prompt during our LLM-based topic modeling methodology. The scale ranges from -2 (Strongly Negative) to $+2$ (Strongly Positive), reflecting the tone and confidence expressed in expert–client discussions.

Score	Description
+2	Strongly Positive — clear enthusiasm, strong benefits, high confidence
+1	Positive — generally favorable, more pros than cons
0	Neutral — balanced, factual tone
−1	Negative — noticeable concerns or mild skepticism
−2	Strongly Negative — severe criticism or major problems

Appendix A. III Derivation of the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO) and Domain-Specific Prompt Design

The derivation of the ELBO in Equation (20):

$$\begin{aligned}
ELBO &= \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}, \mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y) - \log q(\mathbf{s}^{1:L})] \\
&= E_q[\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y | \mathbf{s}^{1:L}) p(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}) - \log q(\mathbf{s}^{1:L})] \\
&= E_q[\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y | \mathbf{s}^{1:L}) + \log p(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}) - \log q(\mathbf{s}^{1:L})] \\
&= E_q[\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y | \mathbf{s}^{1:L})] + E_q[\log p(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}) - \log q(\mathbf{s}^{1:L})] \\
&= E_q[\log p(\mathbf{A}^{1:L}, \mathbf{Q}^{1:L}, \mathbf{e}, y | \mathbf{s}^{1:L})] + KL(q(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}) || \log p(\mathbf{s}^{1:L}))
\end{aligned}$$

The detailed prompts with domain knowledge:

Assume you are an investment analysis expert. Please summarize the given private company's expert call content from the following perspectives in no more than 200 words: Startup Characteristics (Product, Financial Health, Founding Team, Leadership, Intellectual Property); Market and Industry Dynamics (Market Size, Competitive Landscape, Economic and Regulatory Environment); Investor Characteristics (VC Expertise, Investment Strategy, Governance Role); Buyer Characteristics (Strategic Fit, Buyer's reputation for successful cultural and operational integration); Relationships Between Factors. If there is no description associated with the above feature, output the None value.