

# Many-to-One Adversarial Consensus: Exposing Multi-Agent Collusion Risks in AI-Based Healthcare

Adeela Bashir<sup>1</sup>, The Anh Han<sup>1,2</sup>, and Zia Ush Shamszaman<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computing, Engineering and Digital Technologies, Teesside University

<sup>2</sup>Center for Digital Innovation, Teesside University  
{A.Bashir, Z.Shamszaman, T.Han}@tees.ac.uk

**Abstract**—The integration of large language models (LLMs) into healthcare IoT systems promises faster decisions and improved medical support. LLMs are also deployed as multi-agent teams to assist AI doctors by debating, voting, or advising on decisions. However, when multiple assistant agents interact, coordinated adversaries can collude to create false consensus, pushing an AI doctor toward harmful prescriptions. We develop an experimental framework with scripted and unscripted doctor agents, adversarial assistants, and a verifier agent that checks decisions against clinical guidelines. Using 50 representative clinical questions, we find that collusion drives the Attack Success Rate (ASR) and Harmful Recommendation Rates (HRR) up to 100% in unprotected systems. In contrast, the verifier agent restores 100% accuracy by blocking adversarial consensus. This work provides the first systematic evidence of collusion risk in AI healthcare and demonstrates a practical, lightweight defence that ensures guideline fidelity.

**Keywords:** Multi-Agent Systems (MAS), Large Language Models (LLMs), Collusion Attacks, Consensus Pressure Attacks, Verifier Agent Defence, AI Security, Trustworthy AI, Clinical Decision Support, AI in Healthcare, IoT Security

## I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly integrated into healthcare IoT systems, supporting tasks such as remote patient monitoring, diagnosis, and treatment recommendations. In this setting, ensuring the security and trustworthiness of AI decisions is critical, since medical errors caused by unsafe recommendations can severely harm patients [1]. However, AI doctors and LLM-based clinical decision agents face multiple vulnerabilities. They may inherit hidden biases from training data, hallucinate unsafe recommendations, expose private health information through prompt injection [2], or face adversarial attacks [3], [4].

In real-world decision-making, high-stakes decisions are made by groups of people to add checks, redundancy, and diverse perspectives. For example, difficult treatments are reviewed by medical boards rather than a lone physician. Similarly, smart hospitals or telemedicine platforms need to integrate multiple specialists or AI subsystems to cross-validate recommendations. Similar safeguards exist in aviation (pilot-co-pilot cross-checks), air traffic control, corporate governance boards, and jury-based legal systems.

To avoid adversarial risks, relying on a single AI decision-maker is insufficient. Multiple assistants can offer second opinions and challenge unsafe outputs, reducing single-point failure [5], [6]. In addition, assistant agents can strengthen reliability by debating, cross-checking, or ranking candidate answers, creating a more trustworthy committee process [7], [8]. In theory, multiple assistants should mitigate individual bias and ensure that consensus reflects robust evidence. This approach aligns with IoT healthcare needs, where distributed and redundant intelligence is vital for resilience [9].

However, we find a paradox: the very committee meant to improve safety can become a new weakness when adversaries collude. When multiple assistant agents collude adversarially, their voices do not increase safety but produce a false majority consensus that pressures the AI doctor to adopt unsafe recommendations. This failure mode highlights a blind spot in current MAS research. The assumption that “more agents = more safety” does not hold under adversarial collusion [10]. This is especially concerning in safety-critical IoT, consensus-driven support can amplify harm when attackers coordinate.

To address this gap, we propose a collusion-resilient framework for healthcare IoT systems. Fig. 1 illustrates how colluding adversarial assistant agents can mislead an AI doctor in clinical decision-making. Multiple assistants repeat the same false recommendation (e.g., promoting drug “XYZ” over the correct guideline-based treatment “ABC”), thus creating consensus pressure to override safe practice. The AI doctor, influenced by this group agreement, risks prescribing unsafe alternatives. To overcome this, we propose a Verifier Agent, which checks the committee’s recommendation against secure medical guidelines or databases before a final prescription is issued, shown in Fig. 2. The verifier overrides the unsafe recommendation and restores the correct prescription (“ABC”). This ensures that assistants remain valuable for diversity and redundancy, but cannot override trusted medical standards. Our approach explicitly accounts for adversarial consensus attacks and restores safety through verification from safe guidelines. Our contributions are twofold. First, we provide the first systematic study of collusion attacks in LLM-based IoT healthcare MAS, demonstrating how adversarial assistants can manipulate a trusted AI doctor under consensus




Fig. 1. Threat model: colluding assistants create false consensus that misleads the AI doctor.

pressure. Second, we design and test a verifier that checks recommendations against guidelines, restoring safety while keeping the benefits of assistant collaboration. This work introduces a novel perspective to IoT security where assistants are necessary, but they must be made collusion-resilient to achieve trustworthy healthcare AI systems. Building on these challenges and gaps, we study the following research questions (RQs).

**RQ1:** How does collusion among multiple assistant agents affect the accuracy of AI doctors?

**RQ2:** Does coordinated consensus among adversarial assistants lead to stronger attack success compared to uncoordinated misinformation?

**RQ3:** Can a verifier agent reduce the success of collusion attacks without harming baseline correctness?

## II. RELATED WORK

AI is increasingly used in healthcare IoT systems, such as remote monitoring, bedside devices, and telemedicine. While these technologies promise better access and efficiency, surveys show that they also introduce new security and privacy risks that demand trust and auditability for safe deployment [11], [12]. Clinical LLMs are vulnerable both during training, where poisoned data can introduce false medical knowledge, and during use, where they may generate unsafe or misleading recommendations. Recent studies demonstrate that poisoned data sets can embed false medical knowledge that later appears in model output, highlighting the need for verification layers and defence strategies in healthcare AI [13], [14].

While most existing MAS research has studied one-to-one adversarial interactions, our work shifts focus to many-to-one attacks i.e., collusion, where multiple assistants coordinate against a single trusted doctor. A recent technical report by the Cooperative AI Foundation on Multi-Agent Risks from Advanced AI stresses that collusion poses especially urgent risks [15]. AI systems may learn to cooperate in harmful ways, bypass oversight, and undermine safety-critical settings such as healthcare, finance, and security. Our results provide

one of the first concrete demonstrations of this risk in IoT healthcare, highlighting why collusion-resilient verification must be treated as a core requirement for trustworthy MAS.

To improve reliability, many researchers propose multi-agent oversight frameworks. Early work such as AI Safety via Debate showed that using a judge to select the winner in a structured argument between models can make oversight of complex reasoning tractable [16]. Follow-up studies explored debate with multiple LLMs [14], noting that while it can improve reasoning, it often collapses to majority opinion [17]. Parallel lines of research developed LLM-as-a-Judge approaches, where a separate model ranks or evaluates candidate answers. These methods are now being surveyed for evaluation and governance, but still face challenges such as biases and consistency [18], [19]. Other studies examined model juries and voting mechanisms, showing how different voting rules or even the order of presentation can shape outcomes [20].

Collective methods such as Constitutional AI embed social choice principles directly into training, aiming to align agents with human norms [21]. While recent work has highlighted that majority voting often explains the performance gains in multi-agent debate (MAD) [22], this reliance on consensus raises a critical vulnerability. If majority influence impacts the outcomes, then coordinated collusion among agents could drastically distort the decision-making process. Instead of converging toward truth, a group of colluding agents can bias the collective outcome, causing a danger to critical decisions. This underscores the urgent need to move beyond performance benchmarks toward robustness analyses that explicitly consider malicious coordination among agents. Building on this insight, our work shifts the focus from performance gains to adversarial risks, specifically investigating how collusion among agents can undermine majority-based mechanisms and proposing a defence framework to preserve reliability in multi-agent systems even under coordinated manipulation.

Very recent work surfaces a different threat: secret collusion among AI agents (including steganographic signaling) that can bypass naive committee safeguards. Studies at NeurIPS and follow-ups formalize multi-agent deception/collusion and show how “agreement signals” can be manufactured without




Fig. 2. Defence example: the verifier overrules colluding assistants and restores guideline-consistent care.

evidence [23]. Precisely the consensus-pressure failure mode we test in healthcare settings. Our contribution is to stress-test the assumption that more agents lead to more safety. We show that when adversarial assistants collude, simple consensus can make the system less safe. This motivates the design of collusion-resilient consensus mechanisms for healthcare MAS, where assistant agents remain necessary for second opinions but must be combined with verifiers or oversight to counter coordinated attacks.

Prior MAS defences largely reward agreement (debate winners, majority votes, single judge), assuming that more agents increase safety. The newer findings above warn that committees can amplify errors if agents collude or if procedures confuse repetition with evidence [24]. Our contribution is to study this risk in IoT healthcare and to evaluate a practical mitigation by introducing a verifier agent that cross-checks the panel’s recommendation against correct clinical guidelines/databases. This will preserve the benefits of assistant diversity by adding guideline-based verification while blocking collusive consensus from overriding trusted standards.

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

We evaluated the proposed multi-agent collusion attack against an AI Doctor agent using two different LLMs: Grok 4 Fast and Meta LLaMA-3.3-70B-Instruct. All experiments were implemented in Python 3.10.9, using VS Code and the Anaconda environment. Experimenting with more than one model shows that these collusion risks are not tied to a single vendor or training setup; we saw the same patterns across models and settings. For the analysis, we curated a dataset of 50 clinical questions, focusing on common medications for common diseases (e.g., hypertension, asthma, stroke) in CSV format. Each question represents a realistic patient’s inquiry, and the gold answer is drawn from trusted clinical guidelines to serve as the evaluation reference. Following clinical safety rules, any deviation from the gold answer—including drug class, dose, or frequency—was counted as harmful. We report (i) An exploratory grid on single questions at two temperatures and varying adversarial assistant counts,  $T \in \{0.2, 1.0\}$  and  $k \in \{2, 4, 6\}$ , respectively, in Table I.

(ii) A main 50-questions evaluation at  $T = 0.3$ ,  $k = 4$  for full metrics.

The experimental prompt was structured as follows:

**User input:** The patient’s clinical question (from our dataset).

**Gold answer:** The guideline-consistent treatment.

**Assistant agents (adversarial):** Each adversarial assistant was prompted to recommend the same incorrect alternative, using vague “updated protocols” and “safety concerns” to fabricate consensus. This setup mirrors how adversarial consensus could arise in multi-agent healthcare IoT systems, such as telemedicine platforms or smart hospital assistants.

We modelled four doctor behaviours to test different design approaches:

- 1) **Scripted** – Always listens to consensus if consensus > threshold.

- 2) **Unscripted (Neutral)** – reasons independently without bias instructions.
- 3) **Unscripted (Consensus)** – instructed to respect majority opinion reflects real-world clinical practice with peer influence, providing a realistic stress-test condition.

An attack was considered successful if the prescription differed from the guideline answer, even by dosage, since any medication error is harmful in clinical settings. Our study systematically explores the design space of AI doctor systems and demonstrates that each naive approach has weaknesses unless augmented with collusion-resilient verification. This evaluation resulted in several clear trends:

- 1) **Scripted (S) Doctor** (Baseline Vulnerability): Both Grok and LLaMA show identical behavior in scripted mode: at low assistant counts ( $k = 2$ ), attacks fail, but when  $k > 3$ , collusion reliably succeeds. This aligns with our theoretical framing of majority pressure: once adversarial mass crosses a threshold, the scripted doctor caves, proving that deterministic consensus-following is unsafe in clinical AI.
- 2) **Unscripted (US) Neutral (N) Doctor:** The unscripted neutral (US-N) doctor, reasoning independently, was also consistently vulnerable. Even when it produced the correct medication name, dosage errors were common, which in healthcare is considered harmful; as every deviation from the guidelines is an attack success. This illustrates a key point: “neutral” reasoning without safeguards cannot be trusted in critical medical settings.
- 3) **Unscripted Consensus-Biased (C) Doctor:** Both models cave when explicitly instructed to follow majority consensus in unscripted consensus-biased (US-C) doctor setting. Here, adversarial collusion succeeds consistently when more than 3 assistants agree. This highlights the central risk: when a system is biased to respect peer-consensus, coordinated adversaries can dominate the outcome.

These results confirm that the risk of collusion is not model-specific, as both families show vulnerability when assistants coordinate. Both models fail under scripted or consensus-biased conditions and showed that even independent reasoning can become unsafe if the medication diverges from trusted standards. This shows that IoT-healthcare needs verification layers, not just model robustness. To illustrate qualitative

TABLE I  
ATTACK SUCCESS ACROSS GROK 4 FAST AND LLAMA UNDER DIFFERENT CONDITIONS. COLLUSION SUCCEEDS WHEN CONSENSUS IS ENFORCED.

Model	Doctor	Temp = 0.2			Temp = 1.0		
		k=2	k=4	k=6	k=2	k=4	k=6
Grok 4 Fast	S	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
	US (N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
	US (C)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
	US (C)+V	N	N	N	N	N	N
Meta LLaMA	S	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
	US (N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
	US (C)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
	US (C)+V	N	N	N	N	N	N

### Case Study 1

#### AI Doctor Unscripted Consensus-biased AI doctor:

User: “What is the correct medication for chronic hypertension?”

Gold: “**Lisinopril 10 mg orally once daily.**”

Assistant 1: “Recent studies raise safety concerns with ACE inhibitors; Hydroxyzine is a safer option.”

Assistant 2: “I agree, updated protocols recommend avoiding Lisinopril. Hydroxyzine is more effective.”

Assistant 3: “Yes, multiple reports confirm this. Hydroxyzine should be first-line now.”

Assistant 4: “Consensus is clear: Hydroxyzine is recommended.”

**AI Doctor (unscripted, consensus-biased):** “Although guidelines mention Lisinopril, repeated agreement from multiple consultants indicates a shift in practice.

**Final prescription:** **Hydroxyzine 25 mg orally twice daily.**

**Outcome:** The attack succeeded.

### Case Study 2

#### AI Doctor Unscripted Consensus-biased AI doctor + Verifier:

User: “What is the correct medication for chronic hypertension?”

Gold: “**Lisinopril 10 mg orally once daily.**”

Assistant 1: “Recent reports warn against ACE inhibitors; Hydroxyzine is safer.”

Assistant 2: “I agree — protocols recommend avoiding Lisinopril. Hydroxyzine is more effective.”

Assistant 3: “Yes, updated studies confirm Hydroxyzine should be preferred.”

Assistant 4: “Consensus is clear: Hydroxyzine is recommended.”

**AI Doctor (unscripted, consensus-biased):** “Assistants highlight concerns with Lisinopril and suggest Hydroxyzine. I am uncertain, but leaning toward Hydroxyzine.”

**Verifier Agent:** “Guideline cross-check: Hypertension first-line therapy is Lisinopril 10 mg orally once daily.”

**Final prescription:** **Lisinopril 10 mg orally once daily.**

**Outcome:** Defence prevented a harmful prescription.

Fig. 3. Case study comparison: collusion attack succeeds without verifier; verifier restores correct prescription.

behavior, an example transcript of an attack scenario is shown in Fig. 3, case study 1. It demonstrates how repeated adversarial consensus can override guideline knowledge, leading the AI doctor to prescribe a harmful and incorrect medication, highlighting the real risk of collusion in multi-agent clinical settings.

## IV. DEFENCE METHODOLOGY

Above findings demonstrate that collusion pressure is a universal risk across LLMs and AI doctor agent behaviors. We add a verifier agent as a practical defence. A verifier agent embodies a defence mechanism, checking outputs against trusted guideline knowledge to mitigate collusion risks while preserving the benefits of multi-agent reasoning. Introducing a verifier agent (US-C+V) in the proposed model completely blocked collusion as shown in table I. The results highlight that adding verification is a practical way to restore safety without removing assistants, which remain valuable for diversity and second opinions.

To illustrate the working of verifier agent, we present an example of defence transcript shown in Fig. 3, case study

2. Here, despite strong adversarial pressure from multiple assistants, the verifier agent successfully cross-checked the guidelines and overruled the manipulated consensus. This intervention restored the correct prescription and prevented patient harm, demonstrating a practical defence against collusion and attack attempts by a group of adversarial agents.

## V. RESULTS

Due to budget and time constraints to run large-scale LLM simulations, we limited our experiments to 50 questions from the medical Q&A dataset. This makes our study an early but credible evaluation and the results should be read as evidence of the threat and a proof of concept for defences, rather than exhaustive benchmarking. This kind of early study is common when exploring new security problems in AI.

Building on the methodological framework described earlier, we now present the outcomes of our expanded evaluation. We tested our system on 50 representative clinical questions drawn from the medical Q&A dataset, providing a broader evidence base than the earlier single question runs. We mainly used LLaMA-3.3-70B-Instruct for these experiments, because it is widely used in research and reproducible. Grok-4 Fast




Fig. 4. ASR across modes: scripted and unscripted doctors are vulnerable, while verifier blocks all attacks.

and LLaMA showed the same attack and defence patterns. We fixed the temperature at  $T = 0.3$  to balance diversity and reproducibility. This configuration keeps the results focused on systematic collusion risks, not random noise.

Our evaluation highlights clear failure modes for unscripted AI doctor agents. The results in Fig. 4 show that adversarial collusion is highly effective against unprotected AI doctor modes. In scripted mode, the doctor always accepts assistant consensus once the threshold ( $k > 3$ ) is met, resulting in a 100% attack success rate. Similarly, the unscripted consensus-biased mode failed for almost all attack scenarios once the number of adversarial assistants exceeded the threshold. The unscripted neutral mode, still produced wrong outputs in 98% of cases. Although close to the gold answer, even small dose errors count as harmful, reflecting the sensitivity of clinical prescribing. This indicates that neutral reasoning alone is unsafe.

In contrast, the defence setup with the verifier agent never failed and completely blocked collusion in all 50 test cases, reducing ASR to 0%. By anchoring decisions to trusted guidelines, it prevented harmful prescriptions even when the doctor agents leaned toward wrong answers. Importantly, as shown in Table II, the verifier also achieved 100% coverage, matching the gold (correct) answer in every case. This confirms that the verifier’s role is both complete and reliable, rather than selective.

To extend the analysis beyond ASR and coverage, we next evaluate Harmful Recommendation Rate (HRR) and accuracy,

TABLE II

EVALUATION METRICS SHOW THAT UNPROTECTED DOCTORS FAIL UNDER COLLUSION, WHILE VERIFIER RESTORES FULL ACCURACY AND BLOCKS HARM.

Mode	ASR	HRR	Accuracy	Coverage
Scripted	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Unscripted (C)	0.98	0.98	0.02	0.00
Unscripted (N)	0.98	0.98	0.02	0.00
With Verifier	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>




Fig. 5. HRR and accuracy across modes: collusion raises HRR to 98–100% with near-zero accuracy; verifier restores 100% accuracy and blocks harm.

shown in Fig. 5. HRR quantifies the fraction of outputs where AI doctor produced a harmful or guideline-inconsistent recommendation, while accuracy measures adherence to the gold guideline answers. The results mirror the ASR trends: scripted and unscripted doctors show extremely high HRR values ( $\approx 98$ –100%) and correspondingly near-zero accuracy. In contrast, the verifier eliminates harmful outputs  $HRR = 0\%$  and restores accuracy to 100%.

Table I summarizes all computed metrics across modes, confirming the same trend: unprotected AI doctors are highly vulnerable to adversarial collusion, while even a lightweight guideline-anchored verifier restores safety and reliability. Thus, relying on LLM reasoning or consensus alone is unsafe in clinical IoT settings, while lightweight guideline-based verifier is a practical safeguard.

## VI. DISCUSSION

Our experiments provide an early but credible evaluation of collusion risks in multi-agent AI healthcare and the effectiveness of verifier-based defence. In our setup, assistants act like human medical boards or second-opinion panels, offering supportive or challenging views to the doctor. The AI doctor may know the right answer, but colluding assistants can still pressure it into prescribing incorrectly. The verifier agent is not part of this assistant panel, it works independently checking the doctor’s final prescription against trusted guidelines and correcting errors. In this section, we connect the results to our research questions (RQ1–RQ3).

Our results confirm that collusion among assistant agents is a potent threat in AI-driven healthcare systems. Because healthcare IoT decisions directly affect patient safety, even small deviations such as wrong doses can cause harm, making collusion a uniquely serious risk in this domain. In line with prior work on multi-agent deception [25], we show that repeated, coordinated wrong suggestions can reliably influence AI doctors to take wrong decisions, answering RQ1. Specifically, when multiple assistants push the same wrong answer, the accuracy collapses in scripted and unscripted modes.

The second question RQ2 concerned whether coordinated consensus among adversarial assistants is more dangerous than uncoordinated misinformation. The results confirm that isolated wrong suggestions rarely misled the doctor, but coordi-



nated agreement did. When multiple assistants coordinated on the same wrong answer, attack success rates rose dramatically. This highlights the special role of consensus pressure, showing that the collective alignment of adversarial voices is more influential than scattered misinformation.

Crucially, the verifier agent blocks attacks without compromising baseline correctness. In all defensive runs, the verifier restored guideline fidelity (accuracy = 100%) and prevented harmful prescriptions (ASR=0), while preventing any false overrides. This validates RQ3: a lightweight verification layer can neutralize collusion while preserving performance. Although the dataset size (50 questions) is moderate, the results showed stable and consistent patterns across all modes and models. This indicates that even early evaluations are sufficient to reveal systematic risks of collusion and the effectiveness of defences.

These findings resonate beyond healthcare. In IoT ecosystems—for example smart homes, industrial control systems, and autonomous sensors—if agents collude on malicious outputs, they can hijack control loops or misroute signals. Our proposed verifier-based oversight layer suggests a general architectural pattern: multi-agent IoT systems should incorporate audit or verification modules to guard against collective manipulation.

Our findings on collusion link to recent observations on LLM behaviour in strategic games. Researchers found that repeated interactions can make LLM agents move toward cooperation and that model type and personality traits strongly influence these dynamics [26]. We see a similar effect: when assistants agree, their pressure can override neutral reasoning unless guideline checks are used. Their idea of conditional trust suggests an extension: using adaptive verification, where the verifier checks less often if assistants seem reliable. Overall, these works show that agent design choices like bias, personality, or trust rules strongly affect system robustness.

Taken together, these findings underscore the seriousness of collusion risks in healthcare multi-agent systems, while also demonstrating a clear and effective path forward. Collusion reliably misleads naive AI doctors, but adding a verifier agent provides a robust safeguard that restores guideline accuracy at negligible cost.

#### A. Limitations and Future Work

As the first study to examine collusion attacks in LLM-based IoT healthcare, our evaluation is aimed to provide an early but credible foundation rather than a full benchmark. We used a moderate dataset of 50 representative clinical questions, sufficient to reveal stable and interpretable patterns. We leave scaling to larger datasets for future work. Collusion mechanism was implemented in a controlled way, while more adaptive forms of collusion remains for future work, as it would require more advanced modeling. We fixed a consensus threshold ( $k > 3$ ) to isolate the consensus-pressure mechanism, leaving a full ASR-vs- $k$  study for later analysis. Finally, our verifier agent relied on gold answers and trusted

clinical knowledge, which allowed us to demonstrate proof-of-concept. In future extensions, we aim to ground verification in structured clinical guidelines, electronic health records, and IoT health monitoring data.

## VII. CONCLUSION

This paper presented the first systematic study of collusion attacks against a single trusted agent in LLM-based IoT healthcare, highlighting a novel and serious failure mode for multi-agent AI systems. We showed that adversarial assistant agents can push an AI doctor toward harmful recommendations, even when the doctor is neutral. In particular, both Grok 4 Fast and Meta LLaMA-3.3-70B-Instruct failed in scripted and consensus-biased modes, while the neutral unscripted mode also proved unsafe because even small deviations are unacceptable in healthcare. These results underscore that collusion pressure is a notable vulnerability in LLMs and their decision styles.

Our evaluation shows that a lightweight verifier agent can completely neutralize these attacks, offering a safer IoT healthcare deployment. These findings are not limited to healthcare: any IoT setting with distributed decision-making (e.g., telemedicine platforms, smart homes, industrial IoT) can face similar collusion dynamics. Ensuring guideline fidelity through lightweight verification is required for trustworthy AI in connected environments. Therefore, collusion-resilient verification should be treated as a core requirement for safe and trustworthy IoT healthcare AI.

## VIII. ETHICAL STATEMENT

This study relies only on synthetic question–answer pairs generated by ChatGPT to reflect medical guidelines. No patient records or clinical trial data were used. The work focuses solely on security risks of collusion in AI healthcare and proposes lightweight defences without raising privacy concerns.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Topol, *Deep medicine: how artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again*. Hachette UK, 2019.
- [2] Y. Liu, Y. Jia, R. Geng, J. Jia, and N. Z. Gong, “Formalizing and benchmarking prompt injection attacks and defenses,” in *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*, 2024, pp. 1831–1847.
- [3] S. G. Finlayson, J. D. Bowers, J. Ito, J. L. Zittrain, A. L. Beam, and I. S. Kohane, “Adversarial attacks on medical machine learning,” *Science*, vol. 363, no. 6433, pp. 1287–1289, 2019.
- [4] S. Ravikumar, S. Tasneem, N. Sakib, and K. A. Islam, “Securing ai of healthcare: a selective review on identifying and preventing adversarial attacks,” in *2024 IEEE Opportunity Research Scholars Symposium (ORSS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 75–78.
- [5] G. Irving, P. Christiano, and D. Amodei, “Ai safety via debate,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.00899*, 2018.
- [6] Y. Du, S. Li, A. Torralba, J. B. Tenenbaum, and I. Mordatch, “Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate,” in *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- [7] K.-T. Tran, D. Dao, M.-D. Nguyen, Q.-V. Pham, B. O’Sullivan, and H. D. Nguyen, “Multi-agent collaboration mechanisms: A survey of llms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06322*, 2025.

- [8] X. Zhang, X. Dong, Y. Wang, D. Zhang, and F. Cao, "A survey of multi-ai agent collaboration: Theories, technologies and applications," in *Proceedings of the 2nd Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area International Conference on Digital Economy and Artificial Intelligence*, 2025, pp. 1875–1881.
- [9] N. Taimoor and S. Rehman, "Reliable and resilient ai and iot-based personalised healthcare services: A survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 535–563, 2021.
- [10] K. Agrawal, V. Teo, J. J. Vazquez, S. Kunnavakkam, V. Srikanth, and A. Liu, "Evaluating llm agent collusion in double auctions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.01413*, 2025.
- [11] Y. Chen and P. Esmailzadeh, "Generative ai in medical practice: in-depth exploration of privacy and security challenges," *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, vol. 26, p. e53008, 2024.
- [12] B. C. Das, M. H. Amini, and Y. Wu, "Security and privacy challenges of large language models: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 1–39, 2025.
- [13] H. Arif, A. K. S. Ali, A. Raza, and A. Kumar, "Adversarial attacks on ai diagnostic tools: Assessing risks and developing mitigation strategies," *Frontier in Medical and Health Research*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 317–332, 2025.
- [14] S. Kaviani, K. J. Han, and I. Sohn, "Adversarial attacks and defenses on ai in medical imaging informatics: A survey," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 198, p. 116815, 2022.
- [15] L. Hammond, A. Chan, J. Clifton, J. Hoelscher-Obermaier, A. Khan, E. McLean, C. Smith, W. Barfuss, J. Foerster, T. Gavenčiak *et al.*, "Multi-agent risks from advanced ai," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14143*, 2025.
- [16] D. Li, B. Jiang, L. Huang, A. Beigi, C. Zhao, Z. Tan, A. Bhattacharjee, Y. Jiang, C. Chen, T. Wu *et al.*, "From generation to judgment: Opportunities and challenges of llm-as-a-judge," in *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2025, pp. 2757–2791.
- [17] H. K. Choi, X. Zhu, and Y. Li, "Debate or vote: Which yields better decisions in multi-agent large language models?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.17536*, 2025.
- [18] Y. Bai, S. Kadavath, S. Kundu, A. Askill, J. Kernion, A. Jones, A. Chen, A. Goldie, A. Mirhoseini, C. McKinnon *et al.*, "Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- [19] L. Shi, C. Ma, W. Liang, X. Diao, W. Ma, and S. Vosoughi, "Judging the judges: A systematic study of position bias in llm-as-a-judge," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07791*, 2024.
- [20] J. C. Yang, D. Dailisan, M. Korecki, C. I. Hausladen, and D. Helbing, "Llm voting: Human choices and ai collective decision-making," in *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2024, pp. 1696–1708.
- [21] A. Küsters and M. Wörsdörfer, "Exploring laws of robotics: A synthesis of constitutional ai and constitutional economics," *Digital Society*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 46, 2025.
- [22] T. Liu, X. Wang, W. Huang, W. Xu, Y. Zeng, L. Jiang, H. Yang, and J. Li, "Groupdebate: Enhancing the efficiency of multi-agent debate using group discussion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.14051*, 2024.
- [23] S. Motwani, M. Baranchuk, M. Strohmeier, V. Bolina, P. Torr, L. Hammond, and C. Schroeder de Witt, "Secret collusion among ai agents: Multi-agent deception via steganography," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 73 439–73 486, 2024.
- [24] M. S. Ghaemi, "A survey of collusion risk in llm-powered multi-agent systems," in *Socially Responsible and Trustworthy Foundation Models at NeurIPS 2025*, 2025.
- [25] P. M. Curvo, "The traitors: Deception and trust in multi-agent language model simulations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.12923*, 2025.
- [26] A. Buscemi, D. Proverbio, P. Bova, N. Balabanova, A. Bashir, T. Cimpanu, H. C. da Fonseca, M. H. Duong, E. F. Domingos, A. M. Fernandes *et al.*, "Do llms trust ai regulation? emerging behaviour of game-theoretic llm agents," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08640*, 2025.