ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

An Analysis of Option Trading Risk Control and Iterative System Construction From the Perspective of Implied Volatility

Jicheng Dou

School of Business, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macao, China

Abstract

Price fluctuation risk is the main type of risk in option trading, and the implied volatility is the core measurement indicator for quantifying option risks and dynamic risk management. Historical volatility is calculated based on the historical trading data of the underlying asset, but it can only reflect the past price fluctuation status and has obvious lag, lacking the ability to predict market trends, and is not suitable for the practical needs of real-time risk control in option trading. Unlike the static nature of historical volatility, the implied volatility can respond in real time to the secondary market prices and market sentiment changes, accurately reflecting the market's expectation of the future fluctuation range of the underlying asset, and is suitable for dynamic risk assessment of option positions. Currently, the trading and regulatory system of the domestic option market has been basically completed, but most traders' risk control methods are relatively traditional, generally relying on historical volatility and fixed risk parameters to assess risks, ignoring the time-varying characteristics of implied volatility. This static risk control method cannot adapt to the dynamic market conditions and is prone to cause imbalance in position exposure, misplacement of position allocation, and trading losses, etc. This paper, based on the operational characteristics of the domestic option market, explores the causes and transmission mechanism of volatility risk, constructs a dynamic hierarchical risk management framework, designs an intelligent iterative risk control optimization scheme, and provides practical reference for market participants to optimize risk control strategies, resist volatility risks, and stabilize investment returns.

Keywords

Implied volatility, Option trading, Risk control, Iterative system, Volatility risk.

1. Introduction

With the continuous improvement of domestic financial regulatory rules and the continuous upgrading of the market trading system, the operation of the stock index and commodity options markets has become increasingly standardized, and the industry development has become increasingly mature. Options are practical financial tools in the capital market, which can offset investment losses caused by fluctuations in spot prices, improve the market risk resistance system, and also provide investors with more asset allocation options. They have now been widely applied in the domestic derivatives trading market.

The trading models of options and spot trading are completely different, and the logic for obtaining returns has fundamental differences. They cannot be simply compared together. The profit-making methods for participating in spot trading are very simple, mainly relying on the unilateral rise and fall of the product price to earn the difference. The income situation of options is different. The changes in market expectations for volatility are the key factors affecting the income of options. Due to this unique income generation method, the risk composition of option trading is more complicated, and higher standards have been proposed

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

for the risk control level of traders. In actual trading, many investors who have just started with options will still use the risk control methods of spot trading, ignoring the differences in the underlying operating logic of the two products, which is also the key reason why novice investors are prone to losses [1].

In option trading analysis, the implied volatility is a very crucial reference indicator. Based on the real-time option trading prices in the market, this indicator can be inversely calculated. This indicator can truly reflect the overall judgment of all market traders on the price fluctuation amplitude and trend of the product, directly affecting the pricing result of the option contract, and also defining the overall risk fluctuation range of the investment portfolio. Currently, in the domestic option trading market, most investors still habitually use the traditional static risk control method, relying on fixed parameters and inherent trading rules to carry out risk prevention and control. This fixed operation method has obvious deficiencies, cannot keep up with the dynamic changes of implied volatility, and lacks effective countermeasures against common market fluctuations such as volatility smile and volatility skewness. A large number of past trading backtesting data can confirm that the sudden abnormal losses in option trading are not mainly caused by extreme fluctuations in the price of the underlying product. The inability to adapt to the dynamic changes of volatility is the core problem that the traditional static risk control model has, causing trading losses.

In the real option trading scenario, the drawbacks of the traditional static risk control model are very prominent, with obvious lag and insufficient adaptability. To address this real trading problem, this paper relies on the dynamic change rules of implied volatility, improves the traditional option risk management thinking, and builds a set of intelligent risk control system that is in line with actual trading, can adjust parameters dynamically, and can continuously update and optimize. The biggest improvement is that it changes the passive risk control mode after the loss occurs to an active prevention mode through pre-risk prediction and detailed control throughout the process, significantly improving the overall risk control effect of option trading and effectively compensating for the shortcomings of traditional risk control methods [2].

2. Core Risk Characteristics of Option Trading from the Perspective of Implied Volatility

Various internal and external factors such as market policy adjustments, changes in investor sentiment, and abnormal short-term capital flows all continuously influence the trend of implied volatility, keeping it in a constantly changing state. This unstable fluctuation characteristic leads to a diverse and dynamic distribution pattern of option trading risks. Most existing domestic research mainly analyzes the overall impact of volatility risks from a macro perspective, and the targeted research based on actual trading scenarios is relatively limited. This article relies on a large amount of real option trading data and practical cases, and based on the causes of risk generation, the degree of concealment, and the market harm, classifies volatility risks into three categories. It then analyzes the operational characteristics and negative market impacts of different risks in combination with actual trading scenarios [3].

2.1. Volatility Mismatch Risk

Volatility misalignment risk is the most common type of risk in daily options trading, and it is highly concealed, making it easily overlooked by investors.

In the face of sudden changes in volatility, most investors who rely on historical volatility to set fixed risk control parameters failed to adjust their position structure and risk control standards in time, ultimately resulting in rapid decay of option time value and significant fluctuations in investment portfolio valuation. The losses caused by such risks are not high in a single instance,

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

but they cover all trading scenarios and occur very frequently [4]. Over the long term, they will continuously consume the overall returns of the portfolio, making them a risk type that needs to be particularly focused on in the daily risk control of options.

2.2. Volatility Surface Distortion Risk

Compared to the easily detectable volatility mismatch risk, the volatility surface distortion risk is more concealed. This type of risk mostly occurs during periods of stable and fluctuating market conditions, and it is difficult to be promptly identified through routine market observation. It is an important reason for the hidden loss of implicit returns in quantitative portfolios. Option contracts with different strike prices and different expiration times correspond to different implied volatility values. Various differentiated volatility data collectively form a complete volatility surface. The regular state of the surface structure can directly reflect the overall risk level of the option market.

Currently, many quantitative models and manual risk control methods all calculate the overall risk of the portfolio using a unified fixed parameter, ignoring the structural abnormal changes of the volatility surface. This leads to obvious loopholes in risk judgment [5]. Some investors have a cognitive misunderstanding, believing that when the market is stable and the fluctuation amplitude of the underlying asset is small, there is no trading risk. However, real trading data shows that in stable market conditions, forward contracts and out-of-the-money contracts are prone to local abnormal fluctuations in volatility, and risks will accumulate continuously over time without immediately being reflected in the rise and fall of the market. This type of risk will not cause a single large loss, but will gradually reduce the stability of the portfolio's returns, lead to the failure of hedging strategies, and decrease the accuracy of quantitative models, causing a continuous negative impact on investors' long-term trading returns.

2.3. Volatility Clustering Extreme Risk

Volatility clustering is the most prominent characteristic of implied volatility and is also an important trigger for extreme risks in the options market. The existing domestic literature on this market phenomenon has not conducted sufficient specialized research, but this characteristic has high reference value for real-time option decision-making and risk management. From the long-term market performance, the high and low fluctuation states of the market are not evenly alternating; instead, there is a clustering pattern where stable market conditions persist for a long time and high-fluctuation conditions occur in concentrated bursts.

After the market enters the high volatility clustering stage, the Vega risk of the option portfolio will continue to be exposed, and the fluctuating volatility will continuously expand the risk exposure of the position [6]. The traditional static risk control model of fixed stop-loss and fixed position size is difficult to cope with such continuous extreme market conditions. By analyzing various extreme trading cases, it can be found that the large losses suffered by investors are not caused by single market fluctuations, but rather due to the rigid risk control mechanism being unable to adapt to the dynamic changes of the market. Small losses accumulate and spread continuously, eventually evolving into large investment losses. Among the three types of volatility risks, the clustered extreme risk is the most difficult to predict and has the strongest market destructive power, and it is the core prevention focus for individual investors and quantitative institutions.

3. Option Trading Risk Control Strategy Based on Implied Volatility

By analyzing the causes and market characteristics of the three types of volatility risks, it can be observed that the main problem with the traditional static risk control model lies in the fact that the fixed trading parameters and risk control rules cannot adapt to the dynamic changes of volatility. This is the fundamental reason for the repeated occurrence of volatility risks. The

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

core of option risk management lies in pre-event prevention and control. Relying solely on the passive handling method of post-event stop-loss can only compensate for the losses that have already occurred, but cannot fundamentally avoid risks and stabilize trading returns. Based on years of first-line real trading and practical experience, this article builds a set of refined risk control system that is suitable for dynamic markets and can be directly implemented from several perspectives: risk prediction and warning, dynamic adjustment of parameters, scenario-based hedging optimization, and refined position management [7].

3.1. Establish a Hierarchical Volatility Monitoring And Early Warning System

Pre-event risk warning is the foundation for achieving refined risk control in options. Post-event stop-loss measures can only recover some of the already incurred investment losses and cannot prevent the spread of risks at their source. A single volatility indicator has a relatively limited judgment dimension and is difficult to capture the subtle fluctuations in the market, which may lead to missed or incorrect risk judgments. By conducting a comprehensive judgment based on three core dimensions - the magnitude of volatility, the shape of the volatility curve, and the level of volatility premium - it is possible to comprehensively cover the market's fluctuation characteristics and effectively enhance the completeness and accuracy of risk identification [8].

3.2. Dynamic Calibration of Trading Risk Exposure Parameters

During the daily real trading process, investors can adjust the core risk control parameters of the portfolio based on the dynamic changes of the daily implied volatility, precisely correct the risk exposure scale of individual holding varieties and the overall portfolio, and achieve dynamic closed-loop management of risks. This optimization method can effectively solve the common problems of rigid traditional risk control parameters and lagging calculation, although it slightly increases the daily operation cost, it can significantly reduce unexpected losses caused by volatility mismatch and provide a reliable guarantee for long-term trading stability and continuous returns [9].

3.3. Implement Scenario-Based Adaptive Hedging Strategies

Hedging operations are a crucial method to mitigate the risk of option fluctuations and lock in the overall portfolio's returns. However, mechanized hedging operations with fixed frequencies and fixed proportions are difficult to adapt to the dynamic market environment. Such models not only have limited risk control effects but also continuously increase transaction costs, eroding the overall portfolio's returns. To balance risk control effects and trading returns, it is necessary to abandon template-based hedging operations and carry out differentiated operations based on different volatility ranges. Consider both trading security and return levels [10].

When the implied volatility is at a historically low level and the market trend is stable, the uncertainty risk of the market is relatively low. Excessive hedging will only result in unnecessary transaction fees and slippage losses. At this time, it is appropriate to reduce the hedging position and decrease the hedging frequency to save transaction costs. When volatility continues to rise, the volatility surface shows structural abnormalities, and market risks accumulate rapidly, the probability of trading losses significantly increases. It is necessary to strengthen Delta-neutral hedging and Vega hedging efforts to counteract the option valuation fluctuations caused by volatility changes and stabilize the overall portfolio's returns. This scenario-based hedging method is in line with real trading logic and can meet the risk control requirements of different market conditions [11].

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

3.4. Establish a Volatility-Adaptive Position Control Mechanism

Position management is the final line of defense for option risk control. The setting of position size and trading leverage needs to match the current risk level of the market, and the fluctuation range of implied volatility can directly reflect the level of market risk. By reviewing a large number of loss cases, it can be found that the large investment losses suffered by investors are mostly caused by heavy positions and high leverage trading under high volatility conditions. They ignored the risk escalation brought about by the dynamic changes in volatility.

Real-time trading data shows that when implied volatility is at a historical high and the market is releasing risks in a concentrated manner, the uncertainty of the market trend will significantly increase. At this time, reducing the position size, lowering the trading leverage, and strictly controlling the expansion of risk exposure are stable trading methods to deal with extreme market conditions. When volatility is long-term at a low level and the overall market risk is controllable, investors can reasonably allocate medium- and long-term positions, activate idle funds, and improve the efficiency of fund utilization. This differentiated dynamic position management model can adapt to the risk characteristics of different market conditions and achieve a dynamic balance between trading risks and investment returns, which is an important guarantee for long-term stable trading [12].

4. Construction Path of the Option Trading Risk Control Iterative System

The dynamic risk control strategy established in the previous text can cover most volatility risk scenarios, but the manual implementation has obvious shortcomings. The manual monitoring of market conditions, manual adjustment of parameters, and manual hedging operation methods are inefficient, with lagging market response, and are prone to be influenced by traders' subjective emotions and mental states, making it difficult to adapt to the high-frequency fluctuation operation characteristics of the options market. Building an intelligent digital risk control system with autonomous upgrade capabilities is an inevitable trend to make up for the shortcomings of manual risk control and adapt to the professional development of the options market. Based on the practical operation experience of quantitative trading, this article has sorted out a set of intelligent risk control system construction plans with practical value and the potential for long-term optimization [13].

4.1. Construct an Intelligent Adaptive Risk Control Iterative Model

The standardized database provides a solid data foundation for the stable operation of the system. The adaptive iterative model is the key to solving the problem of rigid parameters and weak scene adaptability of traditional quantitative models. The commonly used quantitative models on the market have a wide range of applicable scenarios, but they are difficult to fit the local operation characteristics of the domestic options market. Therefore, the local intelligent risk control model needs to focus on incorporating common market abnormal situations such as volatility clustering, surface distortion, and extreme jumps, to further enhance the model's scene adaptability and risk judgment accuracy.

This iterative model conducts deep learning based on a large amount of real trading samples and can autonomously optimize the core parameters of the algorithm, update hedging rules and position management logic, and does not require frequent manual intervention. After long-term training and iteration with market data, the model can accurately adapt to the volatility change patterns of different market conditions and achieve autonomous upgrading and optimization of risk control strategies [14]. Compared with the traditional fixed-parameter model, the risk control accuracy and market adaptability of the adaptive iterative model are more in line with the domestic options trading scenarios.

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

4.2. Improve the Closed-Loop Iterative Optimization Mechanism for the Entire Process

The financial market is always in a state of dynamic change, and there is no fixed risk control strategy that can permanently fit the market. Even highly accurate intelligent risk control models will gradually encounter problems of adaptation failure if they are not updated and optimized over the long term. Establishing a full-process closed-loop iterative mechanism is a key condition for ensuring the long-term stable operation of the risk control system and its continuous adaptation to market changes [15].

Trading institutions can establish a closed-loop management model of "transaction execution - risk monitoring - effect review - parameter update", regularly summarizing the trading profits and losses and the implementation effect of hedging, accurately identifying system loopholes and strategy shortcomings. Based on the market fluctuation characteristics at different stages, the macro policy environment, and changes in trading structure, dynamically adjust core parameters such as warning thresholds, hedging frequency, and position upper limits to ensure that the system operation logic aligns with the latest market trends, and fundamentally avoid the rigid failure of the risk control strategy [16].

4.3. Add an Extreme Market Condition Risk Tolerance Protection Module

The conventional iterative optimization mechanism can cover most of the regular market conditions, but the financial market always has unpredictable sudden risks that are difficult to predict. The sudden and extreme jumps in volatility belong to low-probability and high-hazard risks, and are also the weak link of the conventional intelligent risk control system. Such risks erupt quickly and have strong market destructive power. Conventional risk control measures are difficult to respond quickly and are prone to causing large investment losses [17].

To make up for the deficiencies of the conventional risk control system, it is necessary to add an extreme market condition tolerance protection module. Through scientific data calculation to set the critical trigger standard for volatility, an automated emergency risk disposal system is established. When the market volatility exceeds the critical value and enters the extreme fluctuation range, the system will automatically execute stop-loss, position melting, batch reduction of positions, and other protective operations, quickly blocking the spread of risks, minimizing the investment loss range to the greatest extent, and enhancing the stability and safety margin of the trading system in extreme market conditions [18].

5. Conclusion

The dynamic changes of implied volatility clearly delineate the risk range and profit space of option trading, and are an important basis for conducting refined risk management of options. With the continuous development and maturation of the domestic option market, the market trading structure and investor structure have become increasingly complex, and the diversified and dynamic characteristics of risks have become more prominent. The traditional static and fixed risk control model has been unable to adapt to the current market environment and is difficult to effectively resist the impact of various volatility risks.

This article combines real trading cases and first-line practical experience to sort out the main characteristics and formation reasons of three types of volatility risks, builds a stratified volatility risk control strategy suitable for the dynamic market, and designs a set of implementable and long-term optimized intelligent risk control system construction plan. The entire risk control system can effectively prevent various option trading risks such as volatility mismatch, curved surfaces, and extreme clustering, and transform the traditional passive remedial mode of option risk control into a proactive and pre-emptive refined management mode. The dynamic risk control system built based on implied volatility is in line with the

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

operation rules of the domestic option market, which can help investors improve the risk control system and enhance trading stability, and also provide feasible theoretical and practical references for the construction and optimization of the intelligent risk control system of the domestic derivatives market.

References

[1] Vuletić, M., & Cont, R. (2025). VolGAN: A generative model for arbitrage-free implied volatility surfaces. Applied Mathematical Finance, 31(4), 203–238.

[2] François, P., Galarneau-Vincent, R., Gauthier, G., et al. (2025). Joint dynamics for the underlying asset and its implied volatility surface: A new methodology for option risk management. Journal of Futures Markets, 46(3), 545–561.

[3] Liu, J., & Tan, S. (2023). Implied volatility forecasting and option hedging risk with long short-term memory networks. Journal of Futures Markets, 43(8), 1180–1204.

[4] Chen, Y., & Lin, H. (2024). Volatility surface calibration and risk monitoring for Chinese equity index options. Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 88, 102582.

[5] Buehler, H., Gonon, L., Teichmann, J., et al. (2019). Deep hedging. Quantitative Finance, 19(11), 1719–1742.

[6] Jang, H., & Lee, S. (2022). Machine learning for real-time implied volatility surface updates in option trading systems. Finance Research Letters, 47, 102640.

[7] Andersen, T. G., Fusari, N., & Todorov, V. (2015). The risk premia embedded in index options. Journal of Financial Economics, 117(3), 558–584.

[8] Carr, P., & Wu, L. (2016). Analyzing volatility risk and risk premium in option contracts: A new theory. Journal of Financial Econometrics, 14(2), 279–320.

[9] Bégin, J. F., Boudreault, M., & Gauthier, G. (2020). Implied volatility surface forecasting for risk management: A comparison of parametric and machine learning approaches. Quantitative Finance, 20(10), 1647–1666.

[10] Cont, R., & Kokholm, T. (2013). A consistent pricing model for index options and volatility derivatives. Mathematical Finance, 23(2), 248–274.

[11] Glasserman, P., & Liu, X. (2018). Hedging under model uncertainty: The role of implied volatility. Mathematical Finance, 28(4), 1031–1067.

[12] Horvath, B., Cont, R., & Michaud, P. (2021). Deep hedging: Learning to hedge derivative portfolios with neural networks. Quantitative Finance, 21(10), 1607–1627.

[13] Jacquier, A., & Lorig, M. (2022). Risk management of option portfolios with stochastic implied volatility. Applied Mathematical Finance, 29(3), 221–251.

[14] Christoffersen, P., Fournier, M., & Jacobs, K. (2018). The factor structure in equity options. Review of Financial Studies, 31(4), 1594–1637.

[15] Martin, I., & Zou, Y. (2024). Pricing event risk: Evidence from concave implied volatility curves. Review of Finance, 29(4), 963–1007.

[16] François, P., Galarneau-Vincent, R., Gauthier, G., et al. (2022). Venturing into uncharted territory: An extensible implied volatility surface model. Journal of Futures Markets, 42(10), 1912–1940.

[17] Avellaneda, M., & Lee, J. H. (2012). Statistical arbitrage in the volatility surface. Quantitative Finance, 12(4), 565–579.

[18] De Marco, S., & Henry-Labordère, P. (2023). Robust option risk management under uncertain implied volatility. Mathematical Finance, 33(3), 974–1014.