ChatGPT

Cognitive and Emotional Biases in Retail Trading

Retail traders often **anchor their decisions to past prices**, such as the price they paid for a stock, instead of objectively assessing the present and future outlook. For example, many will *refuse to sell* a losing position until it "gets back to breakeven," letting the entry price cloud their judgment. This is essentially a **sunk cost fallacy** – treating the money already spent as if it were still relevant – and it leads to suboptimal choices. In reality, the market "doesn't care what price you think is 'fair'... it moves based on the collective actions of all participants" [1] . Rationally, any past cost is *irrecoverable*, so decisions should focus on current data and future expectations, not on *recouping* sunk costs.

Common cognitive and emotional biases that affect traders include:

- **Sunk Cost Fallacy:** The tendency to factor in *irrecoverable* past costs when making decisions. In trading, this manifests as *holding onto losers* simply because you paid a higher price originally. Traders feel reluctant to sell at a loss, effectively throwing good money after bad. A rational actor would treat the past purchase price as irrelevant now (it's "water under the bridge"), but many can't let go – they *integrate the sunk cost into decision-making*, leading to irrational choices [2] . For example, an investor might stick with a poorly performing stock because "I've already put so much into it," even if better opportunities exist.

- **Anchoring Bias:** The habit of **fixating on a reference point** (such as your buy price or a stock's all-time high) and basing decisions around that anchor rather than on fresh analysis. Traders often become *emotionally attached* to certain price levels – e.g. *"I won't sell below \$X because that's what I paid"* or *"This coin was \$1.00 before, so \$0.50 is a bargain"*. Such anchoring causes them to **cling to outdated price benchmarks** instead of adapting to new market conditions [3] [4] . It can also appear as **round-number anchoring** – giving undue importance to neat prices like \$100 or \$10. In fact, trading volume often **clusters around popular round numbers**, creating self-fulfilling support/resistance levels as many traders place stops or orders there [5] [6] .

- **Loss Aversion:** A well-documented bias where **losses hurt more than equivalent gains feel good**. Investors are naturally "hard-wired" to avoid losses [7] , which leads to behavior like *holding losing positions too long (to avoid locking in a loss)* and *selling winners too quickly (to lock in a sure gain)*. The pain of loss can cloud judgment – for instance, someone might reject a high-potential new trade because it requires selling another stock at a 20% loss, thus **missing better opportunities due to fear of realizing a loss** [8] . Loss aversion is central to the well-known **disposition effect**, where traders **sell winners faster than losers**, even when it's objectively illogical [9] .

- **Confirmation Bias:** The tendency to **seek out or overweight information that confirms your existing beliefs** while ignoring contradictory evidence. A trader who is bullish on a stock will, for example, read only positive news and dismiss any negative analysis as "FUD" (fear, uncertainty, doubt). This creates an *echo chamber* in the trader's mind. **Clinging to only convenient, confirming information can lead to stubbornly holding biased views** – e.g. remaining convinced a faltering trade will rebound because you only read optimistic forum posts about it [10] . This bias often causes traders to **hold losing positions longer** than they should, as they ignore warning signs and "filter" new data through their preconceived narrative.

- **Herd Mentality (Bandwagon Effect):** The bias toward **following the crowd**. Many investors find safety in numbers – if everyone on social media is raving about a particular crypto or stock, it feels reassuring to do the same. This leads to *copying others' trades without independent analysis*. Herd mentality and the related **fear of missing out (FOMO)** often drive **bubbles and frenzied rallies**, as seen in cases like the Dogecoin craze – people piled in "because everyone else was," only to get *"trapped when prices tumbled"* once the hype collapsed [11] . Following the herd can provide comfort, but it often means buying late into euphoria or panic-selling in crashes, rather than acting on sound fundamentals.

- **Overconfidence & Hindsight Bias:** Many traders **overestimate their knowledge or skill**, especially after a few wins. Hindsight bias feeds this – after a successful trade they think *"I knew it all along"*, attributing gains to skill rather than luck [12] . This false confidence can lead to taking unduly large risks or disregarding risk management. Overconfidence is reinforced by selective memory (remembering one's winners, forgetting the role of chance or the losers). Eventually the market humbles them, but in the meantime an overconfident trader may double down or trade too frequently, underestimating the possibility of error.

- **Recency Bias:** A cognitive shortcut where **recent events weigh more heavily in decision-making than older historical data**. Traders suffering this bias might assume the current trend will continue, because the latest weeks or months have been consistently up (or down). For example, if a stock has rallied five days in a row, a recency-biased trader might ignore longer-term risks and assume it will keep rallying indefinitely. Conversely, after a sharp crash, they might become too bearish, forgetting that recoveries happened in the past. *Overweighting the most recent information* can cause traders to **ignore historical averages or cycles**, potentially buying into a peak or selling at a bottom because *"this time is different."* It's important to balance present signals with longer-term context [13] .

- **Other Biases: Availability bias** (relying on easily recalled information – e.g. a memorable news story – rather than thorough data) [14] ; **Narrative fallacy** (getting swayed by a compelling story or hype around an investment, instead of examining facts) [15] ; **Endowment Effect** (overvaluing what you already own – *"I can't sell this stock; I've held it for years, it's special"* – leading to attachment beyond rational value); **Status Quo Bias** (a preference for inaction – sticking with a poor investment because change is uncomfortable) [16] ; and **Blind Spot Bias** (recognizing others' biases while failing to see your own) are all factors that can cloud traders' judgment [17] . The key distinction is that a **bias is an *irrational* or emotional deviation from optimal decision-making**, whereas a *conscious choice* or strategy (such as intentionally taking a higher risk for a higher potential reward) isn't a bias if the trade-off is understood. In practice, however, human investors inevitably have biases – *"you are your own worst enemy"* in the markets [7] – so the goal is to be aware of these tendencies and mitigate their influence.

Notably, the **"entry price" fixation** mentioned (anchoring on the price you bought in at) combines several of the above biases. It's an anchor to a past reference, it plays into loss aversion (unwillingness to sell at a loss), and invokes sunk cost reasoning. A perfectly rational trader would evaluate the position *today* with fresh eyes – asking *"If I had no prior position, what would I do now?"* – and act accordingly [18] . In other words, *"If I were entering this trade right now with no prior involvement, what would I do?"* [18] . This mental reset helps counter anchoring by focusing on current conditions rather than past costs. Adopting such an approach can break the spell of biases like anchoring and sunk costs, enabling traders to cut losers or set new targets based on objective analysis rather than pride or pain. As one trading psychologist put it, *"The market doesn't care about your cost basis"* – the best you can do is optimize from **now** onward.

Manifestations of Biases in Trading Communities and Media

Bias-driven thinking is *contagious* in trading communities, social media, and even mainstream financial media. Retail traders often **reinforce each other's biases** through group discussions, popular memes, and influencer narratives. For instance, online forums like Reddit's WallStreetBets or crypto Twitter can become **echo chambers** that amplify confirmation bias [19]. In these environments, only the bullish (or bearish) viewpoint might be loudly endorsed while dissenting voices get drowned out or ridiculed. During the GameStop saga of 2021, such groupthink led many investors to *"disregard financial fundamentals and make emotional investment decisions"*, with some buying at peak prices simply because the community consensus was wildly optimistic [20]. The result was predictable: many latecomers faced *severe losses* when reality reasserted itself [20].

Social media influencers and "finfluencers" can unwittingly propagate biases. When a respected analyst or popular YouTuber makes a bold prediction – e.g. *"This stock is guaranteed to double"* or *"Bitcoin to \$500,000!"* – it can become a powerful **anchor** in the audience's mind [21]. Followers may latch onto that specific number or outlook and filter all market moves through that lens. This **authority bias** and anchoring to expert predictions often warps investors' perception, causing them to ignore evidence that contradicts the forecast [21]. We see this when people hold a losing asset because a guru promised a high price target – they dismiss negative news as *noise*, remaining fixated on the prophecy. Likewise, financial news headlines frequently emphasize reference points ("XYZ stock *plunges* 20% from its high" or "Tech index back to *last year's level*"), which can subtly anchor readers to those past levels as if they were intrinsically important.

Emotional and cognitive biases also creep into the **language and norms of trading culture**. A few examples:

- **"You haven't lost until you sell."** This popular saying is a *rationalization of loss aversion*. It encourages people to hold onto losing positions on the premise that the loss isn't "real" until realized. In truth, a loss in market value *is* real wealth lost, whether or not you sell – but this phrase appeals to the bias of avoiding the pain of loss realization. It turns *inaction* into a comforting illusion of safety, when sometimes taking the loss and moving on is the wiser choice.

- **"Bagholders" and Breakevenitis:** In forums, traders who hold a coin or stock that has dropped heavily are derogatorily called *bagholders* – yet many wear it as a stubborn badge of honor, awaiting that breakeven point. Entire communities might rally around the hope of getting back to entry prices. This dynamic illustrates sunk cost and anchoring in action: people emotionally *need* to at least *break even*, so they collectively refuse to capitulate, often to their detriment. When prices approach those high-volume bagholding levels, you'll even see increased chatter and anxiety – a sign that many plan to sell as soon as they're made whole, often creating resistance at that very price level.

- **"Diamond hands" vs "paper hands":** These slang terms from the Reddit meme stock culture reflect herd-driven value judgments. "Diamond hands" (never selling, no matter the volatility) are praised, whereas "paper hands" (selling early or taking a loss) are shamed. This social pressure valorizes **extreme risk-taking and denial of loss** – essentially encouraging confirmation bias and status quo bias (staying in the trade no matter what) and discouraging prudent risk management. While meant to foster courage during volatility, it can trap traders in biased thinking: ignoring legitimate reasons to exit because the *group norm* is to **hold at all costs**.

- **Selective sharing and hindsight in media:** On platforms like Twitter and YouTube, traders often broadcast their big wins, reinforcing survivorship bias. Viewers get a skewed impression that "everyone is making money" except them, potentially inducing FOMO and overtrading. Meanwhile, analysts on TV may explain every market move after the fact with confident narratives (*hindsight bias*), implying it was obvious – which can mislead novices into thinking market outcomes are more predictable than they are. The reality – rarely admitted in media – is that **chance and uncertainty** play a big role. Recognizing that many social media success stories omit failures can help one remain objective and avoid the bias of overestimating one's own odds of success.

In summary, trading communities and media often **magnify biases through group reinforcement and sensationalism**. Herd behavior is validated when you see thousands of others doing the same thing, and confirmation bias feels natural when your news feed is curated to echo your views [22] [23]. To stay rational, traders should be vigilant about these patterns. **Spot the red flags:** hyperbolic predictions, one-sided narratives, peer pressure to follow the crowd, or personal attachment to a story or price. By consciously seeking *diverse perspectives and hard data*, you can counteract the skewed picture that social and mainstream media may paint. For example, deliberately following analysts who disagree with your stance, or checking actual financials rather than Reddit sentiment, can burst the bubble of an echo chamber [24] [25]. The key is to remain **skeptical of emotionally charged advice** and remember that popular consensus is not always correct – in fact, it's often a product of the very biases we want to avoid.

Cognitive Diversity in Trading: Rational Thinkers vs. Biased Majority

Humans are *not* universally irrational – there is significant cognitive diversity. Studies in behavioral finance and psychology have found that **some individuals are far less susceptible to common biases** than others. In particular, people with very analytical thinking styles – for example, those on the **autism spectrum or with exceptionally high systematic reasoning ability** – often exhibit what researchers call **"enhanced rationality."** They tend to make decisions more **logically consistent and objective**, with less emotional distortion [26]. In other words, while the *average* person might fall for framing effects, anchoring, or herd impulses, these more analytical minds **show greater immunity to such biases**.

Research supports this intriguing difference. One review notes that *"Autistic individuals are, on average, more consistent, less biased, and more rational than non-autistic individuals"* across various decision-making contexts [26]. For example, in experiments on the **framing effect** (where simply phrasing outcomes as gains vs losses shifts people's choices), autistic participants were **less swayed by emotional wording** and more driven by the raw numbers [27]. They made similar choices regardless of whether an outcome was described in positive or negative terms – essentially **focusing on the actual probabilities and payoffs rather than the emotional context** [27]. Likewise, studies found autistic individuals have a reduced **optimism bias** (they don't ignore bad news as much, integrating information – good or bad – more evenly) [28]. Perhaps most relevant, when confronted with **sunk cost dilemmas**, autistic decision-makers were **more likely to ignore the sunk cost** and choose based on current preferences and benefits. In a scenario where most people would irrationally favor the option they had spent more on (even when that money was already gone), autistic participants tended to make the objectively correct choice – picking the option they *truly preferred*, regardless of past cost [2]. This indicates an ability to *"let go"* of irrelevant past attachments and **stay rooted in present facts**, a crucial trait for rational trading.

Why might some neurodivergent or high-IQ individuals be more rational? One explanation is **reduced emotional reactivity in decision-making**. Experiments show that people with certain autism-related traits have *lower emotional awareness of bodily signals* (like heart rate) during decisions, which correlates with being less influenced by fear or excitement [29] [30] . In trading terms, such a person is less likely to get caught up in *gut feelings* or the emotional contagion of a group. Instead, they rely on **logical analysis and factual information**. As Scientific American put it, *"Instead of using intuition and emotion… they viewed differently framed options more rationally than typical people,"* effectively **following their head and not their heart** [27] . This "cold" approach can be advantageous in the market, where excess emotionality leads to panic sells and euphoric buys. Indeed, *not* "following your heart" in trading – i.e. not letting emotions like greed or fear dictate actions – often results in more consistent, prudent choices [31] .

Of course, being human, no one is **completely free of bias**. But the example of autistic reasoning suggests that some minds come closer to the ideal of the "rational actor" in economic models. Such individuals (or anyone striving to emulate their approach) would base trading decisions on data, probabilities, and logic, rather than social cues or emotional comfort. They might be more likely to use **mathematical models or systematic rules**, since those appeal to logic and provide structure. In practical terms, this could mean relying on a **computer-like approach** – for instance, using a *computer algebra system or algorithmic strategy* to determine optimal trades, thereby stripping out emotional bias. Indeed, **algorithmic trading** is often cited as a way to remove the human pitfalls: *"Systematic trading removes emotional bias: unlike discretionary traders, an algorithm follows a plan. It doesn't get greedy or scared."* [32] . A well-designed trading algorithm has no ego to protect and no fear of regret – it will cut a loss when the rules say to, regardless of how painful, and it won't double down out of desperation.

It's telling that in a large-scale study, **fully automated algorithmic traders showed virtually none of the disposition effect** that human traders did. Humans consistently realized more gains than losses (sign of loss aversion), but algorithms *"realize gains and losses at nearly identical rates,"* implying they aren't biased by whether a trade is a winner or loser [33] . In fact, a simple chart of behavior over a trading day showed that *"whereas humans are swayed by the emotional pull of gains and losses, algorithms focus on execution without attachment."* [34] The algorithms just executed their strategy, taking losses as readily as profits if that was optimal, **treating outcomes purely on merit rather than emotion**. This is exactly the kind of **"autistic" absolute logic** the user's question envisions – an almost hyper-rational stance, grounded in math and rules.

However, the *paradox* is that even a super-rational trader **must account for the irrationality of others**. Markets are driven by the aggregate of participants, many of whom *do* have biases. A high-IQ or neurodivergent trader might personally be immune to, say, hype or panic, but if everyone else is panicking, the price *will* move irrationally – and that movement is real. Thus, the ideal "mathematically correct" trader should also practice a form of **Theory of Mind**: they remain objectively rational *themselves*, but they factor in the predictable irrational behaviors of the majority. In other words, *knowing* that most people anchor to certain prices or will rush in herd-like on certain news allows the rational minority to anticipate and even **capitalize on those patterns** (more on that shortly). The key is that the **rational trader doesn't *adopt* the majority's biases, but is keenly aware of them** externally. This is where a mix of psychology and math comes in – game theory, behavioral finance models, and quantitative tools can help the rational trader model the likely actions of biased agents in the market.

Finally, it's worth noting that the **"majority neurotype" (neurotypical investors)** dominate popular discourse – many trading books, media pundits, and folk wisdom originate from typical human intuitions, which are often flawed. These sources may inadvertently promote biased thinking (like "never sell at a loss" or "stick to your first idea" or other one-size heuristics). In contrast, insights from the **minority of highly rational thinkers** – e.g. legendary quants, polymath analysts, or simply people who

think differently – can serve as a valuable counterweight. They might question the sacred cows of retail trading and debunk myths (for example, showing with data that averaging down endlessly is usually a poor strategy, even though many retail books encourage it as loyalty to a stock). By combining the **unemotional, systematic perspective** of these rational types with powerful analytical tools (from Monte Carlo simulations to symbolic algebra and beyond), traders can approach the ideal of objective, "autistic absolute" reasoning. In practice, this means cultivating habits such as *checking your biases at the door* of each trade, relying on evidence **over narratives**, and potentially letting algorithms or checklists enforce discipline where human psychology might waver [35] [36].

Exploiting Biases: How Rational Traders Use Market Data

A highly rational trader or institution not only avoids falling prey to biases, but actively **uses their knowledge of others' biases to gain an edge**. Markets are arenas of interacting humans (and machines programmed by humans), so irrational behaviors tend to leave **footprints in the data** – patterns that a savvy trader can detect and exploit. Professional and algorithmic traders routinely analyze tools like **volume profiles, order book heatmaps, and sentiment indicators** to understand where crowd biases are influencing prices.

Above: An illustration of "stop loss hunting." Many retail traders place their stop orders at obvious support levels (left, arrows). A large player (or algorithm) can drive the price down through that support, triggering a cascade of retail stop-loss orders. Those forced sales create a temporary liquidity surge (and price dip) that the large player then buys into at a bargain, before price recovers.

One classic example is **stop-loss hunting**. It's observed that retail traders often set their stop-loss orders at **predictable levels** – just below a recent swing low, or at a nice round number like 1.0000 in EUR/USD, etc. Large institutional players (the so-called "smart money") are well aware of this habit [37] [38]. Using *order book heatmaps* (which visualize pending orders at various prices) or simply their knowledge of common behavior, these players can identify **liquidity pockets** where a cluster of stop orders likely sits. With their deep capital, they can intentionally push the price toward these pockets – for instance, executing a big sell order to drive price downward *just far enough* to hit that cluster of stop-losses below support [39] [40]. When those stops trigger, they all convert into market sell orders, causing a swift, self-feeding drop… which the institutional trader then *reverses into*, buying up the now-cheaper shares that the retail traders *automatically sold in panic*. In essence, the "smart money" **creates a mini**

liquidity event by exploiting the knowledge that many others anchored their risk management to obvious levels. As a prop trading firm put it, *"Stop-loss hunting is a practice used by Smart Money to take advantage of the stop orders placed by retail traders."* [38] It's a direct exploitation of both **anchoring bias** (everyone clustering around the same notable price) and **loss aversion** (retail traders' use of tight stops to avoid big losses, which ironically makes them vulnerable).

Beyond stop hunts, **support and resistance levels** themselves often derive from collective bias. A **Volume Profile** analysis shows this clearly: it charts the volume of trading at each price level, revealing **high-volume nodes** (prices where many transactions occurred, indicating heavy position-taking or "value areas") and **low-volume nodes** (prices with little trading) [41] [42]. These high-volume nodes typically correspond to areas of **agreement** – many traders bought/sold there, so the price lingered – whereas low-volume areas are where price moved quickly (no consensus, just passing through). Rational traders use this because **past volume concentration can signal future support or resistance**. Why? Because if *thousands* of traders bought around \$50 (high volume node) and the price later falls below \$50, a lot of them are now sitting on losses – when price rallies back toward \$50, those anchored traders may rush to sell at breakeven (satisfying their loss aversion). This creates resistance at \$50. Conversely, if price rises above a high-volume area, those who sold there regret it and might try to buy back if it dips again, creating support. In essence, **volume-by-price analysis exposes where traders are likely** anchored **by past activity**, and thus where their **future biased actions (like panic selling or eager buying) might cluster. Institutions often combine this with** liquidity heatmaps **(visualizing order flow in real time) to anticipate moves. They know, for example, that** round numbers **and prior highs/lows attract orders: data shows trading activity jumps dramatically near major round figures (like +85% volume at \$100 marks, as noted earlier)** [6] **. This happens partly** *"as multiple traders react to the same round-number anchors,"* **turning those levels into self-fulfilling hurdles** [6] **. A rational strategy might be to** front-run *such levels – e.g. selling just before* a big round number is hit, expecting other traders' anchored behavior to cause a stall or reversal there.

Another angle is **sentiment analysis**. Modern quantitative funds ingest data from social media, forums, and news to gauge the market's emotional state. When sentiment indicators show *extreme optimism* in a particular asset (everyone is greedy, perhaps due to recent gains), a rational contrarian may prepare to sell or short, assuming that **crowd euphoria is a bias that often precedes a correction**. Likewise, extreme fear or pessimism (say, a spike in bearish posts or a high **fear index**) can indicate a potential bottoming – the point of **maximum loss aversion** where everyone is giving up, and a smart buyer can scoop up bargains. In fact, some **machine learning models** explicitly incorporate variables like Google Trends or Twitter sentiment as inputs, because they reflect *herding and availability bias* in real time. For example, a sudden surge in mentions of a stock alongside positive sentiment might mean a herd-driven rally that could overshoot intrinsic value; an algorithm might then look to fade that move (exploit the eventual mean reversion).

Crucially, **game theory** comes into play. Rational traders simulate how the "average" investor might react in various scenarios. If a company's earnings miss expectations, a purely logical trader would recalibrate price based on the new fundamentals. But knowing human nature, they might predict an *overreaction* sell-off (people panic, extrapolate worst-case scenarios – **availability and recency biases** at work). Thus, the rational actor can plan to buy into the overreaction and profit when prices mean-revert. A study by Norges Bank actually found that many algorithms engage in such contrarian strategies deliberately – *"while human traders' disposition effect reflects psychological biases, similar patterns observed among algorithms are the result of deliberate, rational behavior."* [43] Some algorithms systematically **buy stocks that are falling and sell stocks that are rising**, not out of panic, but to exploit the **predictable mean reversion** that occurs when emotional traders push prices too far from fair value [43] [44]. In other words, where humans see a frightening plunge, the algorithm sees

opportunity – it knows the plunge likely went *beyond* what was rational (due to fear), so a bounce back is probable once the fear-driven selling exhausts. This is a profit opportunity *created by bias*. Indeed, *"behavioral biases such as overreaction create inefficiencies, [but] they also generate opportunities for rational agents… to profit from stock price mean reversion,"* as one researcher observed [44]. The coexistence of **biased actors and rational arbitrageurs** arguably defines modern markets – the irrational crowd sets up situations that the calculating minority can exploit for gain [44].

To use another concrete tool: **liquidation heatmaps** in crypto markets show where a large number of leveraged positions will be forcibly closed (liquidated) if price hits certain levels. These levels often coincide with points that many traders thought "unlikely" (again reflecting biases like overconfidence or anchoring to recent ranges). When a cascade of liquidations is likely above/below a price, savvy traders know there could be a **swift move** if that line is crossed. They might push the price to *trigger* those liquidations, because it yields a quick flood of orders they can trade against (similar to stop hunting). This is effectively using knowledge of **other traders' risk management biases** (excess leverage, tight stops) to one's advantage.

Finally, a rational trader remains **adaptive**. While exploiting others' biases, they avoid growing complacent themselves. They know the crowd can stay irrational longer than one might expect. Thus, even as they bet against a bubble, for instance, they manage risk in case the bubble inflates further before bursting. They might also use **statistical arbitrage** to profit from mispricings caused by bias without taking outright directional bets – for example, if two similar stocks diverge too much because one is hyped in the media, a pair-trader could short the overhyped one and go long the underpriced one, assuming they'll converge once reality sets in.

In summary, **institutions and algorithmic traders leverage a deep understanding of human psychology as reflected in market data**. They examine where traders entered positions (volume at price), where they likely placed stops (chart patterns, round numbers), how they might react to news (sentiment analysis), and even external factors that sway mood (some studies found weather or time of day affects human trading – algorithms could factor that in, since humans trade worse on cold, gloomy days, for example [45] [46]). By **incorporating these behavioral factors into their models**, rational traders create strategies that *profit from* the collective biases. It's a form of **metagame**: not just playing the market, but playing the players. The ideal "autistic absolute" mathematical trader doesn't operate in a vacuum – they use math to decode the madness of the crowds. They remain unemotional in their own decisions, **but are keenly aware of the emotions driving everyone else**, and they adjust accordingly.

Conclusion: Trading is as much a **psychological game** as an analytical one. Retail traders commonly fall prey to biases like sunk costs, anchoring to entry price, loss aversion, confirmation bias, herd mentality, and more – all of which can lead to subpar results. These biases are reinforced by groupthink in communities and sensationalism in media, making it even harder for individuals to stay objective. However, by studying cognitive biases and even looking at how **different minds (neurotypical vs. highly analytical)** operate, we see that a more rational, less emotional approach is possible and beneficial. The most rational traders (or algorithms) treat trading as a **logical optimization problem – focusing on current and future risk/reward, unclouded by past attachments – while also accounting for the predictable irrational behaviors of others**. This dual awareness allows one to both avoid common pitfalls and exploit opportunities created by those pitfalls in others. In practical terms, staying rational means **"thinking about your thinking"** [47] : continually checking for bias, using data-driven methods, and sometimes trusting systematic rules over gut feelings. It also means keeping an eye on *where* and *how* others are biased – using tools like volume profiles, heatmaps, and sentiment gauges – to navigate the market effectively. By doing so, a trader can strive to be an "unbiased" operator in a biased world, using cold mathematics and sound reasoning as a compass, and ultimately

make better decisions that **maximize returns while minimizing the influence of fear, greed, and cognitive error**.

Sources:

- Behavioral finance analyses of common trading biases [8] [4] [3]
- Examples of bias in trading practice and media [48] [20]
- Research on rationality in autism vs. typical decision-making [26] [2] [27]
- Studies contrasting algorithmic (unbiased) trading with human biases [33] [34] [44]
- Trading strategy insights on exploiting biased behavior (stop hunting, volume profile) [38] [6] [42]

---

[1] [4] [18] [21] What Is Anchoring Bias and How Can It Work Against Forex Traders? - Babypips.com

https://www.babypips.com/trading/psychology-what-is-anchoring-bias-and-how-it-can-work-against-forex-traders-2025-04-09

[2] [26] [28] Autistic people challenge preconceived ideas about rationality | Psyche Ideas

https://psyche.co/ideas/autistic-people-challenge-preconceived-ideas-about-rationality

[3] [5] [6] Anchoring Bias in Trading: Break Free from Mental Price Traps - Trade with the Pros

https://tradewiththepros.com/anchoring-bias-in-trading/

[7] [8] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [35] [36] [47] [48] 11 Cognitive Bias That Can Affect Your Trading | AvaTrade

https://www.avatrade.com/education/trading-for-beginners/cognitive-bias

[9] [33] [34] [43] [44] [45] [46] When Machines Beat Bias: What Algorithmic Trading Teaches Us About Rationality

https://www.norges-bank.no/bankplassen/arkiv/2025/when-machines-beat-bias-what-algorithmic-trading-teaches-us-about-rationality/

[19] [20] [22] [23] [24] [25] From Tweets to Trades: The Risks of Social Media in Investing - CFA Institute Enterprising Investor

https://blogs.cfainstitute.org/investor/2024/10/29/from-tweets-to-trades-the-hidden-risks-of-social-media-in-investing/

[27] [29] [30] [31] People with Autism Make More Logical Decisions | Scientific American

https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/people-with-autism-make-more-logical-decisions/

[32] Is Algorithmic Trading for Retail Traders a Scam or the Real Deal?

https://medium.com/@trading.dude/is-algorithmic-trading-for-retail-traders-a-scam-or-the-real-deal-d4277a4f26aa

[37] [38] [39] [40] Stop Loss Hunting - Trade The Pool - Stock Trading Prop Firm

https://tradethepool.com/technical-skill/stop-loss-hunting/

[41] [42] The Institutional Edge: How We Boosted a Strategy's Return from 162% to 223% with One Indicator | by Richard Shu | CodeX | Medium

https://medium.com/codex/the-institutional-edge-how-we-boosted-a-strategys-return-from-162-to-223-with-one-indicator-eef74cadae91