

# agents\_design (Updated)

This document defines each agent with: (1) purpose, (2) inputs/outputs & topics, (3) algorithms/mathematics, and (4) how downstream components should interpret the output.

**Key addition:** PricePredictionAgent (LSTM) and ValueFundamentalsAgent, plus an expanded DebateOrchestratorAgent protocol.

## Agent Catalog (Updated)

Agent	Primary Outputs	Primary Consumers
IngestionAgent	data.market.quote, data.portfolio.state, raw text feeds	Most agents
RiskMetricsAgent	data.risk.snapshot	RiskEvent, UI, Explanation
RiskEventAgent	data.risk.event	MCDA, UI, Explanation, Debate gating
MCDAgent	data.risk.prioritized	DebateOrchestrator, Explanation
<b>PricePredictionAgent (LSTM)</b>	data.forecast.lstm	RiskEvent, MCDA, Debate, Explanation
<b>ValueFundamentalsAgent</b>	data.fundamentals.value	RiskEvent, MCDA, Debate, Explanation
EarningsCallSentimentAgent	data.earnings.sentiment	RiskEvent, Explanation, Debate
RegimeShiftDetector	data.market.regime	MCDA, Debate, Explanation
ExplanationAgent (RAG)	thought.risk.explanation	UI, Debate
<b>DebateOrchestratorAgent</b>	thought.debate.conclusion, proposals, critiques	ExecutionPlanner, UI

Agent	Primary Outputs	Primary Consumers
ExecutionPlannerAgent	data.execution.plan	UI approval, ExecutionEngine
ExecutionEngineAgent	data.execution.status, orders	Monitor, UI
ExecutionMonitorAgent	thought.execution.summary, feedback events	Risk loop, UI

## 1) PricePredictionAgent (LSTM Forecast)

### Purpose

Produce a **next-day predictive signal** per symbol (return or price), including confidence/uncertainty diagnostics. This is a forecast input to risk orchestration—not a direct trading command.

### Inputs

- data.market.quote: prices, volume, returns
- data.features.technical: precomputed feature vector (recommended), or the agent computes features internally
- Model artifacts: LSTM weights, scaler/normalizer parameters, training metadata

### Output topic + schema

data.forecast.lstm

```
{
  "schema_version": "1.0",
  "msg_id": "01J...",
  "produced_at": "2025-12-15T00:00:00Z",
  "symbol": "NVDA",
  "horizon": "1d",
  "target": "return",
  "yhat": 0.0123,
  "yhat_price": 152.40,
  "uncertainty": {
    "sigma": 0.018,
    "p10": -0.010,
    "p50": 0.012,
```

```

    "p90": 0.035,
    "method": "mc_dropout"
},
"feature_snapshot": {
    "return_1d": 0.004,
    "return_5d": 0.031,
    "return_20d": 0.082,
    "return_60d": 0.140,
    "return_120d": 0.220,
    "return_252d": 0.410,
    "volatility_5d": 0.55,
    "volatility_20d": 0.42,
    "volatility_60d": 0.38,
    "volume_ratio_5d": 1.4,
    "volume_ratio_20d": 1.1,
    "dollar_volume": 3.2e10,
    "market_beta": 1.6,
    "market_return": 0.002,
    "market_volatility": 0.18,
    "rsi_14": 62.0,
    "macd": 1.8,
    "sma_50_200_cross": 1,
    "bollinger_position": 0.72,
    "atr": 4.1
},
"diagnostics": {
    "data_freshness_sec": 45,
    "lookahead_checks_passed": true,
    "model_version": "lstm_v2.1",
    "train_window": "2016-01-01..2025-11-30",
    "last_retrain": "2025-12-01"
}
}

```

## Algorithm / mathematics

### Feature computation (typical definitions)

- Returns:  $\text{return\_kd} = (\text{P}_t / \text{P}_{\{t-k\}}) - 1$
- Volatility (rolling):  $\text{vol\_kd} = \text{std}(\text{r}_{\{t-k+1..t\}}) * \sqrt{\text{annualization\_factor}}$
- Volume ratio:  $\text{volume\_ratio\_kd} = \text{vol\_t} / \text{mean}(\text{vol}_{\{t-k+1..t\}})$
- RSI (14): standard Wilder RSI on returns

- MACD: EMA(12) - EMA(26) (optionally signal/ histogram)
- SMA cross: indicator 1 if SMA50 > SMA200 else 0
- Bollinger position: normalized position of price within bands (0..1)
- ATR: average true range (volatility-of-range measure)

## LSTM inference

The LSTM maps a sequence of feature vectors  $X_{\{t-L+1..t\}}$  to a next-day prediction:

$$\hat{y}_{\{t+1\}} = f_{\text{LSTM}}(X_{\{t-L+1\}}, \dots, X_t)$$

**Uncertainty (recommended):** provide confidence bounds rather than a single point estimate.  
Options:

- **MC Dropout:** run N stochastic forward passes with dropout enabled; use mean and std:

$$\hat{y} = \text{mean}(\hat{y}_i), \quad \text{sigma} = \text{std}(\hat{y}_i), \quad i=1..N$$

- **Quantile regression head:** predict p10/p50/p90 directly.
- **Ensemble:** multiple LSTMs with different seeds, average predictions, compute dispersion.

## How to interpret and use the output downstream

- **Do not treat as a trade signal by itself.** Treat as an evidence input with uncertainty.
- **RiskEventAgent:** can fire an event if forecast tail (p10) implies large downside beyond threshold (e.g., "Forecasted -3% with high confidence").
- **MCDAAgent:** incorporate forecast into "immediacy" / "severity" terms, but penalize low confidence.
- **DebateOrchestrator:** use forecast to trigger "hedge vs hold" debate when forecast conflicts with value fundamentals or regime.
- **UI:** display yhat + uncertainty band + diagnostics; highlight when confidence low or data stale.

## 2) ValueFundamentalsAgent (Value Investing Perspective)

### Purpose

Compute valuation and "business quality" signals that support **long-horizon decisions**: intrinsic value range, margin-of-safety, and quality/moat proxies from EDGAR fundamentals.

### Inputs

- SEC EDGAR filings (10-K/10-Q): revenue, operating income, FCF, shares, debt, etc.
- Optional: AlphaVantage fundamentals endpoints (if used as a convenience layer)
- Market price (data.market.quote) to compute margin-of-safety vs current price

## Output topic + schema

data.fundamentals.value

```
{
  "schema_version": "1.0",
  "msg_id": "01J...",
  "produced_at": "2025-12-15T00:05:00Z",
  "symbol": "NVDA",
  "valuation": {
    "method": "dcf_multi_stage",
    "intrinsic_value": {"p10": 120.0, "p50": 155.0, "p90": 210.0},
    "assumptions": {
      "fcf_growth_5y": {"p10": 0.08, "p50": 0.18, "p90": 0.30},
      "discount_rate": {"p50": 0.11},
      "terminal_growth": {"p50": 0.03}
    }
  },
  "margin_of_safety": {
    "price": 152.0,
    "mos_p50": 0.02,
    "mos_p10": -0.21,
    "classification": "FAIRLY_VALUED"
  },
  "quality": {
    "roic": 0.22,
    "gross_margin": 0.68,
    "operating_margin": 0.32,
    "fcf_margin": 0.25,
    "debt_to_fcf": 1.2,
    "interest_coverage": 18.0
  },
  "red_flags": ["NONE"],
  "diagnostics": {
    "filing_used": "10-K",
    "filing_date": "2025-02-21",
    "model_version": "value_v1.0"
  }
}
```

```

    }
}

```

## Algorithm / mathematics

### Core ratios

- ROIC (proxy):  $\text{ROIC} = \text{NOPAT} / \text{InvestedCapital}$
- FCF margin:  $\text{FCF} / \text{Revenue}$
- Debt-to-FCF:  $\text{TotalDebt} / \text{FCF}$
- Interest coverage:  $\text{EBIT} / \text{InterestExpense}$

### DCF (multi-stage) valuation

$$PV = \sum_{t=1..T} (\text{FCF}_t / (1+r)^t) + (TV / (1+r)^T)$$

$$TV = \text{FCF}_{T+1} / (r - g)$$

Use scenario/quantile assumptions for growth and discount rate to create an intrinsic value distribution (p10/p50/p90).

### Margin-of-safety

$$\text{MoS} = (\text{IntrinsicValue} - \text{Price}) / \text{Price}$$

Classification example: UNDERVALUED if  $\text{MoS}_{\text{p50}} > 0.20$ ; OVERVALUED if  $\text{MoS}_{\text{p50}} < -0.20$ ; else FAIR.

### How to interpret and use the output downstream

- **Debate is the primary consumer:** value signals define “thesis alignment” and provide a counterweight to short-term forecast/volatility.
- **MCDA:** value can reduce urgency of selling (if strongly undervalued) but cannot override hard risk constraints (margin, VaR breaches).
- **UI:** show intrinsic value band + MoS + quality metrics; explicitly label assumptions and filing date.

## 3) DebateOrchestratorAgent (Expanded Flow + Coordination + Conclusion)

### Purpose

Coordinate a structured multi-agent debate to reconcile conflicting signals and produce an auditable, constrained recommendation.

## Inputs

- `data.risk.prioritized` (ranked events + regime)
- `data.risk.snapshot` (current exposure, VaR, drawdown, margin)
- `data.forecast.lstm` (forecast + uncertainty)
- `data.fundamentals.value` (intrinsic value + MoS + quality)
- `thought.risk.explanation` (RAG explanation + uncertainties)

## Outputs

- `thought.debate.context` (frozen packet)
- `thought.action.proposal` (per strategy agent)
- `thought.action.critique` (cross-exam)
- `thought.debate.conclusion` (final recommendation + runner-up + reasons + confidence)

## Protocol (how it coordinates)

### Step 0: Build frozen context packet

```
{
  "debate_id": "deb_01J...",
  "account_id": "acct_123",
  "top_events": [...],
  "risk_snapshot_id": "01J...",
  "forecast_summary": {"symbol": "NVDA", "p10": -0.01, "p50": 0.012, "p90": 0.035, "size": 155},
  "value_summary": {"symbol": "NVDA", "mos_p50": 0.02, "intrinsic_p50": 155},
  "hard_constraints": {"max_var_pct": 0.04, "max_concentration_pct": 0.25},
  "uncertainties": [...]
}
```



### Step 1: Proposal round (parallel)

Each strategy agent must output a *schema-valid* proposal:

```
{
  "debate_id": "deb_01J...",
  "agent": "HedgeAgent",
  "proposal": {
```

```
        "actions": [{"type": "HEDGE", "instrument": "QQQ_PUT_SPREAD", "notional": 250000},  
        "expected_impact": {"var_reduction_pct_points": 0.6, "net_exposure_reduction": 100000},  
        "estimated_cost": {"premium_usd": 4200, "fees_usd": 35},  
        "failure_modes": ["vol crush", "gap risk"],  
        "assumptions": ["liquidity ok", "spreads normal"]  
    }  
}
```

## **Step 2: Cross-exam (structured critiques)**

```
{  
  "debate_id": "deb_01J...",  
  "agent": "TrimAgent",  
  "critiques": [  
    {"target_agent": "HedgeAgent", "issue": "Cost too high for small VaR gain", "e  
    {"target_agent": "HoldAgent", "issue": "Violates concentration constraint und  
  ]  
}
```

### **Step 3: RiskOfficer validation (hard constraints + feasibility)**

RiskOfficer returns PASS/REVISE/REJECT with reasons. REVISE loops back to Step 1 for the affected proposals only.

#### **Step 4: Deterministic conclusion synthesis**

Orchestrator ranks proposals with a fixed scoring model (weights versioned):

```
score = 0.35*risk_reduction + 0.20*feasibility + 0.15*cost_efficiency  
+ 0.15*robustness + 0.15*thesis_alignment - 0.10*tail_risk
```

Conclusion payload:

```
{  
  "debate_id": "deb_01J...",  
  "recommendation": {  
    "winner": "HedgeAgent",  
    "runner_up": "TrimAgent",  
    "why": ["Var breach resolved with minimal thesis damage", "Feasible within ]
```

```
"confidence": 0.74
},
"required_user_action": "APPROVE_PLAN",
"next_steps": ["generate execution plan", "simulate slippage", "await approval"]
}
```

**Key governance rule:** Debate output cannot bypass “hard constraints” checks; RiskOfficer is the gatekeeper. The system can be advisory-only until you explicitly enable auto-execution.

## 4) Minimal updates needed in existing agents (to consume forecast + value)

- **RiskEventAgent:** add rule types:
  - FORECAST\_DOWNSIDE\_TAIL: if  $p10 < -X\%$  and uncertainty small
  - VALUE\_DISLOCATION: if  $MoS_{p50} > +Y\%$  (undervalued) or  $< -Y\%$  (overvalued)
  - SIGNAL\_CONFLICT: if LSTM bullish but regime bearish / risk breaches high
- **MCDAAgent:** incorporate forecast and value in criteria:
  - Severity/Immediacy boosted by forecast downside tail
  - Thesis alignment boosted by undervaluation + quality
  - Penalty for low confidence forecast (high sigma)
- **ExplanationAgent:** explicitly cite:
  - forecast band ( $p10/p50/p90$ ) and uncertainty method
  - intrinsic value band and key assumptions + filing date
  - why debate was triggered (conflicts, breaches)

**Critical correctness note:** Ensure your LSTM feature pipeline is strictly “t and earlier” (no lookahead leakage), and log `lookahead_checks_passed` in every forecast.