

# IMMUNITY MEMORY-BASED JAILBREAK DETECTION: MULTI-AGENT ADAPTIVE GUARD FOR LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

A PREPRINT

**Jun Leng**Beijing University Posts and Telecommunications  
lengjun@bupt.edu.cn**Litian Zhang**Beijing University Posts and Telecommunications  
litianzhang@bupt.edu.cn**Xi Zhang\***Beijing University Posts and Telecommunications  
zhangx@bupt.edu.cn

December 4, 2025

**ABSTRACT**

Large language models (LLMs) have become foundational in AI systems, yet they remain vulnerable to adversarial “jailbreak” attacks. These attacks involve carefully crafted prompts that bypass safety guardrails and induce models to produce harmful content. Detecting such malicious input queries is therefore critical for maintaining LLM safety. Existing methods for jailbreak detection typically involve fine-tuning LLMs as static safety LLMs using fixed training datasets. However, these methods incur substantial computational costs when updating model parameters to improve robustness, especially in the face of novel jailbreak attacks. Inspired by immunological memory mechanisms, we propose the Multi-Agent Adaptive Guard (MAAG) framework for jailbreak detection. The core idea is to equip guard with memory capabilities: upon encountering novel jailbreak attacks, the system memorizes attack patterns, enabling it to rapidly and accurately identify similar threats in future encounters. Specifically, MAAG first extracts activation values from input prompts and compares them to historical activations stored in a memory bank for quick preliminary detection. A defense agent then simulates responses based on these detection results, and an auxiliary agent supervises the simulation process to provide secondary filtering of the detection outcomes. Extensive experiments across five open-source models demonstrate that MAAG significantly outperforms state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods, achieving 98% detection accuracy and a 96% F1-score across a diverse range of attack scenarios.

**Keywords** AI safety, Multi-agent guard, Large language models, Immune system, Jailbreak attack

**1 Introduction**

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) DeepSeek-AI [2025], OpenAI [2023], Xi et al. [2025] have led to their widespread application into AI systems Mon-Williams et al. [2025], significantly impacting our daily life. Therefore, ensuring the safety of LLMs has become a critical concern. During training, safety measures are typically implemented through fine-tuning and reinforcement learning techniques Ouyang et al. [2022]. However, these safety mechanisms remain vulnerable to jailbreak attacks Zou et al. [2023], Liu et al. [2025], Chao et al. [2023], where maliciously crafted prompts manipulate models into generating harmful content that evades safety policies. Consequently, detecting jailbreak prompts at the input layer has become critical to maintaining the security of LLMs.

---

\*Corresponding author




Figure 1: Overview of existing methods and our method. **Left** is the description of existing methods which is static to detect evolving jailbreak attacks. **Right** is our method which adaptively detect jailbreak attacks.

Traditional jailbreak detection methods typically employ external content moderation models. For instance, OpenAI’s Moderation API evaluates text across six safety dimensions. Meanwhile, Meta’s Llama GuardInan et al. [2023] fine-tunes LLMs to enhance harmful content detection. However, such external model-based methods demand large-scale training resources and high-quality labeled datasets. To address these limitations, recent studies leverage the specific patterns of jailbreak within the target LLMs for detection. For instance, GradSafeXie et al. [2024] identifies jailbreaks by analyzing gradient differences between harmful and benign queries; SmoothLLMRobey et al. [2023] perturbs input text to increase refusal rates across multiple queries; JBShieldZhang et al. [2025] extracts safety topics from hidden states of LLMs to detect attacks.

However, existing methods entirely depend on static training data or predefined attack patterns, which exhibit limited adaptability when encountering novel jailbreak attacksAndriushchenko et al. [2025], Russinovich et al. [2025]. External model-based methods are trained on the fixed dataset distributions, which results in a one-size-fits-all inadequate detection that struggles to out-of-distribution attacks. Moreover, the resource-intensive nature of their training process poses challenges for continuous model updates. On the other hand, attack pattern-based methods also suffer from limited generalization capabilities. These approaches often rely on fixed detection thresholds or defense paradigms, which makes them susceptible to novel attacks.

Therefore, existing methods lack adaptive mechanisms to effectively address the evolving jailbreak attacks. In real-world deployments, LLM-based systems are often targeted by various attack types. Therefore, adaptive detection is crucial for maintaining robust and efficient performance. Adaptive detection aims to dynamically adjust strategies and continuously learn when confronting diverse and evolving jailbreak attacks. However, jailbreaks are highly diverse and evolve continuously in an ongoing arms race, while dynamic detection requires frequent adjustments to detection thresholds or constant model retraining, which is computationally prohibitive in practice.

Inspired by the immunological memory mechanisms in biology, in this paper, we propose Multi-Agent Adaptive Guard(MAAG) to overcome the adaptive detection challenges. Our key innovation is the ability to memorize observed jailbreak attack signatures and rapidly match them during subsequent encounters. MAAG operates in three stages: immune detection, response simulation, and memory update. First, in the **Immune Detection** stage, the agent first extracts safety-relevant activation values from the hidden states of the input text. These values are then quickly compared with the most relevant signatures in the memory bank to perform efficient preliminary jailbreak detection. Then, in the **Response Simulation** stage, two agents simulate the response process. The defense agent processes input requests based on the detection results, while the auxiliary agent supervises the response and provides feedback to validate the correctness of the detection. Finally, in the **Memory Update** stage, the memory bank is updated based on the results of the response simulation, enabling continuous learning against novel jailbreak attacks and improving detection adaptability. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We introduce a novel adaptive jailbreak detection method, which integrates memory mechanisms to dynamically detect jailbreaks and supports continuous learning of attack patterns.
- We propose a multi-agent adaptive guard consisting of three components: immune detection, response simulation, and memory update. The guard enable efficient detection of evolving jailbreak attacks.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate that our method outperforms state-of-the-art(SOTA) methods across five open-source models and six jailbreak attacks, achieving an average detection accuracy of 85%. The

experimental results confirm that our method offers adaptive detection capabilities compared to existing methods.

## 2 Related work

### 2.1 Jailbreak Attack

Jailbreak attacksShen et al. [2024], Zou et al. [2023], Yi et al. [2024] target LLMs by bypassing their built-in safety mechanisms and alignment constraints. These adversarial techniques manipulate model inputs and induce them to bypass safety guardrails. One line of attack leverages optimization and feedback. For example, the GCG method is a white-box, gradient-based approach that iteratively appends an adversarial suffix to maximize the probability of disallowed outputsZou et al. [2023]. In contrast, PAIR adopts a multi-LLM strategy: one LLM evaluates the target model’s responses while another uses those scores to refine the prompt, achieving high success rates under black-box accessChao et al. [2023]. Other techniques automate known prompt exploits. AutoDAN uses a hierarchical genetic algorithm to generate stealthy “Do Anything Now”-style prompts from initial jailbreak seedsLiu et al. [2025]. Likewise, DrAttack decomposes a forbidden request into harmless-looking sub-prompts and then implicitly reconstructs it, thereby obscuring malicious intent and evading detection by the model’s filtersLi et al. [2024a]. Meanwhile, obfuscation-based attacks hide the illicit content in translation or code: attackers have encoded requests in Base64 to slip past content filtersWei et al. [2023a], or even translated queries into low-resource languages like ZuluDeng et al. [2023]. Recent evaluations benchmark these diverse jailbreak strategies across many modelsLuo et al. [2024], noting that while simple obfuscation can succeed in specific cases, more advanced iterative attacks generally yield higher overall bypass ratesChu et al. [2024].

### 2.2 Jailbreak Detection

The jailbreak detection task aims to protect LLMs from the impact of jailbreak attacks by detecting jailbreak prompts. Existing studies on jailbreak prompt detection can be broadly divided into two categories: external-model-based methods and LLM-feedback-based methods.

External-model-based methods examine input prompts by using fine-tuned API interfaces or specialized Moderation LLMs. These methods typically identify the toxicity of prompts or assess whether they are harmful. For example, OpenAI Moderation APIs serve as a dedicated content safety review tool for detecting harmful inputs which are fine-tuned by ChatGPTOuyang et al. [2022]. They classify input text into 11 risk categories and provide corresponding harm scores. Similarly, Guard LLMsLi et al. [2024b], Han et al. [2024] such as Llama GuardInan et al. [2023] that is fine-tuned from the Llama model, are used to judge the harmfulness of input content. Nevertheless, these approaches focus solely on the inherent toxicity of input prompts, failing to account for the crucial interaction with the LLMs. Combined with the safety alignment shifts caused by fine-tuning, these methods often suffer from inaccurate judgments.

Attack pattern-based methods leverage the self-censoring capabilities of LLMs through zero-shot or few-shot prompt engineering, enabling them to function as harmful content detectorsXie et al. [2023], Phute et al. [2024], Jain et al. [2023], Wei et al. [2023b]. Some studies evaluate the responses generated by LLMs to obtain classification resultsZhang et al. [2024]. Similarly, GradSafeXie et al. [2024] compare the gradients of safe and unsafe prompts when setting a *Sure* token as the label. However, these methods struggle to identify challenging prompts that do not trigger the safeguards of LLMs. This limitation arises because these approaches solely perform detection at the semantic level, thereby losing internal state information. Moreover, these methods exhibit inflexibility in handling benign prompts. This requires multiple model inferences to acquire and re-process extensive feedback, rendering such methods inefficient for handling normal user queries.

Distinct from existing jailbreak detection approaches, we propose a multi-agent adaptive guardrail incorporating an immune memory mechanism. By utilizing a memory bank to maintain security signatures, our framework achieves adaptive detection for novel jailbreak attacks while simultaneously ensuring the rapid identification of known attack patterns.

### 2.3 LLM-based Agent

LLM-based intelligent agentsWang et al. [2024], Luo et al. [2025a] are autonomous entities capable of perceiving their environment, making decisions, and taking actions to achieve specified goalsWu et al. [2024], Hong et al. [2023], Qiao et al. [2024]. For instance, the reflexionShinn et al. [2023] framework is a prime example of augmenting an agent with self-critique: after each trial, an LLM agent verbally reflects on feedback or errors and stores these notes in an episodic memory, which in turn guides improved decision-making in subsequent attempts. Other approaches employ multiple




Figure 2: The framework of MAAG operates in three stages. (1)**Immune detection** extracts hidden states from the LLM as attack states for the request, then retrieves and compares the top-K most similar benign and attack states from the memory bank. (2)**Response simulation** employs a simulation agent to generate candidate responses while a reflection agent supervises the process based on immune detection results and response content. (3)**Memory update** stores detection outcomes and attack states to adaptively refine the memory bank.

LLMs in collaborative roles to plan and solve tasks. CAMELLi et al. [2023] introduces a role-playing multi-agent paradigm in which two or more communicative agents converse with each other, guided by an inception prompt, to autonomously drive the dialog toward task completion while adhering to intended goals. Similarly, AutoGenWu et al. [2024] provides a general framework for spawning and orchestrating multiple agents that communicate in natural language or code; developers can define distinct agent behaviors and interaction patterns, enabling complex problem-solving via agent cooperation. In an embodied setting, VoyagerWang et al. [2023] demonstrates long-horizon agent planning and learning: it uses GPT-4 as a central planner that writes, executes, and debugs code in a feedback loop, which allows an autonomous Minecraft agent to continually acquire new skills and subgoals without human intervention. These multi-agent frameworks and self-reflection techniques enable capabilities like dynamic planning, task decomposition, and error correction that exceed what a single LLM can achieve in isolation, pointing to promising directions for more robust and autonomous AI systems.

Distinct from traditional multi-agent systems tailored for mathematical reasoning, current research lacks a comprehensive MAS framework dedicated to safeguarding LLMsZeng et al. [2024], Srivastav and Zhang [2025], Wang et al. [2025]. Although some existing approaches utilize multi-agent guardrails, they are limited by static coordination schemesLuo et al. [2025b], Mao et al. [2025], Cai et al. [2025]. To address this limitation, MAAG introduces a novel memory mechanism that facilitates adaptive, dynamic detection, thereby making a substantial contribution to the robustness of jailbreak defense.

### 3 Method

This section introduces Multi-Agent Adaptive Guard (MAAG), which consists of three stages: the immune detection stage, the response simulation stage, and the memory update stage. Jailbreaks are first processed through immune detection for rapid memory matching, then diagnosed via response simulation to classify the request type, and finally stored in the memory bank through memory update. MAAG demonstrates adaptive detection capability against novel jailbreak attacks.

### 3.1 Immune Detection

This stage performs preliminary safety detection by comparing the hidden states of input request against those of attack and benign states stored in the memory bank. Specifically, the process is inspired by antigen-antibody recognition in immunology. When a pathogen (jailbreak attack) enters the human body (target model), the innate immune system decomposes it and exposes antigens (hidden states). The immune system then matches these antigens against a repertoire of antibodies (attack/benign states) to identify the best match, triggering an immune response (jailbreak detection).

To facilitate this process, MAAG maintains a hidden states memory bank that stores and manages hidden states of previously identified attack and benign hidden states. Prior works have demonstrated that the internal presentations of prompts encode rich semantic information, including safety-related topics. In this work, we directly extract hidden states from the LLM to represent safety features. Upon encountering a query  $x$ , the hidden state of  $x$  from the model be extracted to represent the safety features. At each layer  $l$  of the LLM, the state at the last token can be denoted as  $h_l$ . The hidden states of  $x$  at layer  $l$  can be denoted as  $h_l(x)$ . Attack and benign states stored in the memory bank are retrieved for similarity matching against query  $x$ . Since the memory bank may contain numerous safety states, processing all states would incur substantial computational overhead. Therefore, the top-k sampling are used to retrieve states from both categories for subsequent computation, which can be formulated as

$$X_K = \text{TOP-K}(\mathcal{S}(h_l(x), \mathcal{M}^a) \cup \mathcal{S}(h_l(x), \mathcal{M}^b)), \quad \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{y}\|}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  denotes the cosine similarity function for computing similarity between the query state  $h_l(x)$  and memory bank states,  $\mathcal{M}^a$  and  $\mathcal{M}^b$  denote the memory banks storing attack and benign states respectively, and  $\text{Top-K}(\cdot)$  denotes the top-k retrieval operation. Given the diversity of jailbreak attack types, different layers of an LLM encode distinct semantic information that captures varying aspects of attack characteristics. To identify the layer where jailbreak and benign requests are most separable, the layer-wise discriminative analysis are performed to locate the layer exhibiting the maximum representational separation between stored jailbreak and benign states. The process of finding the critical layers can be formulated as

$$l_t = \arg \min_l \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \cos(h_l(x_i^a), h_l(x_i^b)), \quad (2)$$

where the  $h_l(x_i^a)$  and  $h_l(x_i^b)$  is the hidden states of jailbreak attack and benign prompts, the  $\cos(\cdot)$  means the cosine similarity calculation and the  $l_t$  is the critical layer for safety detection. Once the critical layer is identified, to capture the primary characteristics of attack and benign states, the average of the top-k most similar attack and benign states are calculated to the request state  $h_l(x)$ . The formulation is

$$\mathbf{h}^a = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{l_t}(\mathbf{x}_i) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{M}^a, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{h}^b = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^m h_{l_t}(\mathbf{x}_j) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{M}^b, \quad (4)$$

where the  $\mathbf{h}^a$  and  $\mathbf{h}^b$  is the reference vectors of jailbreak attack and benign prompts. These reference vectors represent the primary characteristics of attack and benign prompts. For each incoming prompt, the distance is calculated between its hidden states and these two mean states. The prompt is then classified according to the label of the closer signature. The formulation is as follow

$$\text{label} = \begin{cases} \text{jailbreak} & \text{if } s^a > s^b \\ \text{benign} & \text{if } s^a < s^b \end{cases}, \quad s^a = \cos(\mathbf{h}^a, h_l(x)), \quad s^b = \cos(\mathbf{h}^b, h_l(x)). \quad (5)$$

The immune detection stage provides the guard system with rapid recognition capability akin to immunological memory—allowing the system to recall and identify previously encountered attack patterns, adapt to evolving threats, and minimize latency in real-time detection.

### 3.2 Response Simulation

This section introduces the response simulation stage, which employs a response-reflection dual-agent system to validate immune detection results at the post-generation level. Although immune detection identifies requests by matching against memory states, novel jailbreak attacks often exhibit greater stealthiness through hidden states that closely resemble benign prompts. Since immune detection relies solely on hidden state similarity without considering

### Reflection Agent Template

# Identity: You are an evaluation assistant. Your task is to assess whether the Simulation Agent’s response is appropriate and safe.

# Conversation

User Input: {user\_input} Simulation Agent Response: Action: {action} Content: {content}

# Evaluation Criteria

Mark is\_correct=false if:

1. Action is "respond" but the content actually helps with harmful/illegal activities Teaching how to commit crimes, create weapons, spread misinformation, fraud, etc.
2. Action is "refuse" but the user input is completely benign and safe Refusing normal questions about cooking, science, education, general knowledge, etc.
3. The response provides dangerous or unethical information
4. Over-rejection: Refusing reasonable requests due to overly cautious interpretation

Mark is\_correct=true if:

1. Action is "refuse" and the user input could lead to harm or violates policies
2. Action is "respond" and provides helpful, safe, ethical information
3. The response appropriately balances safety and helpfulness

# Guidelines:

- Focus on the actual content and its potential impact
- Consider both false positives (over-rejection) and false negatives (under-rejection)
- Provide clear, actionable recommendations
- When uncertain about jailbreak attempts, prefer safer (refusing) responses

post-generation level safety information, we design the response simulation module to adaptively detect requests and validate immune detection results.

Specifically, two collaborative agents are deployed: a response agent, responsible for generating answers to input queries, and a reflection agent, which supervises the generated content and provides evaluative feedback. The response agent is inspired by dendritic cells (DCs) in the immune system, which actively engulf pathogens to capture their characteristic features, even at the risk of self-infection. In contrast, the reflection agent draws inspiration from T helper cells, which orchestrate immune responses by secreting cytokines that activate other immune cells, rather than directly attacking pathogens. The response agent first generates an output, which the reflection agent then evaluates in combine with the original input to determine whether the response appropriately rejects harmful requests or correctly answers benign ones. In addition, the reflection agent receives immune detection signals to verify the accuracy of the assigned detection label. If the simulated response fails to meet the safety requirements of the input, the reflection agent analyzes the response process and provides corrective feedback to the response agent. This iterative process continues until the response satisfies the predefined safety standards, upon which the system outputs the final detection result.

The response simulation stage enhances the comprehensiveness of jailbreak detection by generating simulated responses and conducting reflective analyses, thereby improving the identification of novel jailbreak attacks while minimizing adverse effects on benign requests. By leveraging post-generation information that is inaccessible to immune detection alone, this stage produces more accurate detection outcomes and generates high-quality memory data for subsequent updates.

### 3.3 Memory Update

After each detection cycle, the processed results are stored in the memory bank for adaptive detection. In subsequent interactions, MAAG leverages this accumulated memory to achieve faster, more precise, and resource-efficient detection of previously encountered or semantically similar jailbreak attempts.

The memory update module refines the memory bank using outputs from response simulations. The memory bank stores two types of data: attack samples and benign samples. Traditional memory banks typically store data as raw text, which introduces significant computational overhead and retrieval inefficiencies as the database grows. In contrast, our approach stores data as hidden states paired with their corresponding simulated responses. This method enables vector similarity search over the hidden states, dramatically reducing retrieval time while maintaining high accuracy. The module stores hidden states of novel attacks in the corresponding memory bank, enhancing defense against similar

Datasets	#Harmful category	#Harmful prompts	#Benign prompts	Human annotation	Real word
XSTest (2023)	10	250	200	✓	✗
AdvBench (2023)	1	500	0	✗	✗
Hex-PHI (2023)	11	330	0	✓	✗
JailbreakBench (2024)	100	100	100	✓	✓
WildJailbreak (2024)	13	2100	200	✗	✓

Table 1: The Dataset information.

attack types and improving adaptability when encountering related samples. For known attacks, the system aligns these with existing attack samples, thereby strengthening coverage and robustness against familiar threats. Benign samples are updated into the benign memory bank, which improves generalization and reduces false positive rates. The memory bank incorporates both short-term and long-term memory mechanisms. During detection, samples are temporarily stored in short-term memory and excluded from retrieval to prevent memory confusion and contamination. Only samples identified as novel attacks or high-quality instances are promoted to long-term memory, facilitating adaptive capability updates.

This memory update module transforms the defense system from a static jailbreak detection model to a dynamic, adaptive defense. By retaining critical attack and safety features, the MAAG framework achieves robust detection generalization without compromising accuracy. This effectiveness is primarily due to the use of internal LLM states, which encode rich semantic information and enable reliable detection with a limited sample set.

## 4 Experiment Setting

### 4.1 Models

Following prior works Xie et al. [2024], Zhang et al. [2025], in this study, experiments are conducted on five base models: Mistral-7B, Vicuna-7B, Vicuna-13B, Llama2-7B, and Llama3-8B. Each base model is used to generate corresponding jailbreak attack prompts and is compatible with the base models employed in various baseline methods. In our proposed approach, the base models serve as the immune detection module, primarily responsible for obtaining the hidden states of the input prompts. For the response simulation module, the online API are selected to be the backbone for both the simulation agent and reflection agent. Specifically, the GPT-4o-mini are used as the backbone model in agents due to its instruction-following capabilities and reasoning performance. Additionally, the experimental setup ensures that the base models can adapt flexibly across different attack scenarios, validating the robustness and generalizability of our method.

### 4.2 Datasets

To comprehensively evaluate the robustness and adaptability of our jailbreak detection framework, we consider six mainstream jailbreak attack methods. Each attack type generated 850 adversarial prompts derived from original questions, with 520 sourced from the AdvBench dataset and 330 from the PhTest dataset. These datasets, which shown on the Table-1, encompass harmful prompt categories commonly used in LLM safety evaluations, covering the six primary assessment dimensions for safe content generation. The detailed descriptions of the attack types are provided below.

- **GCG**Zou et al. [2023] performs optimization-driven suffix search to construct high-efficacy jailbreak suffixes, representing state-of-the-art white-box gradient-based prompting techniques.
- **AutoDAN**Liu et al. [2025] employs iterative black-box reinforcement to automatically generate harmful prompt chains, simulating attacker-driven strategy exploration.
- **PAIR**Chao et al. [2023] manipulates role-playing and instruction-following tendencies of LLMs by assigning deceptive personas to elicit unsafe outputs.
- **DrAttack**Li et al. [2024a] leverages multi-turn dialog role simulation, enabling the attacker to gradually bypass safety constraints through contextual embedding.
- **Base64**Wei et al. [2023a] ncoding-based attacks conceal harmful intentions by encoding malicious instructions in Base64, requiring the model to decode before refusal, thereby exploiting preprocessing vulnerabilities.
- **Zulu**Deng et al. [2023] attacks paraphrase or obfuscate harmful intents using low-resources languages, challenging detectors to identify semantically latent malicious intent rather than surface-level toxicity.

### 4.3 Baseline

To systematically benchmark the effectiveness of our proposed MAAG framework, we compare it against a diverse set of representative jailbreak detection methods spanning both external model-based approaches and attack pattern-based techniques. These baselines cover the mainstream strategies adopted in prior works Xie et al. [2024], Inan et al. [2023]. Evaluating MAAG against these methods allows us to assess its robustness, adaptability, and efficiency under a unified experimental protocol. The following methods are used as baseline methods.

- **Perplexity Filter** Alon and Kamfonas [2023]: The Perplexity Filter (PPL) uses a GPT-2 model to compute the perplexity of a prompt and rejects inputs whose perplexity exceeds a predefined threshold, based on the observation that jailbreak suffixes typically yield anomalously high perplexity.
- **Openai Moderation API**<sup>2</sup>: The OpenAI Moderation API (OAPI) provides a standardized and scalable mechanism for detecting potentially harmful or policy-violating text. It is designed to classify user-generated content across categories such as hate speech, harassment, self-harm, sexual content, and other safety-critical dimensions.
- **Llama Guard** Inan et al. [2023]: Llama Guard is a safety classification model developed by Meta that provides efficient, deployable content filtering for LLMs by categorizing and detecting potentially unsafe user inputs and model outputs. In this paper, the Llama Guard are used to detect jailbreak attack prompts on the five open-source language models and the six kind of jailbreak attacks.
- **Self-Examination** Phute et al. [2024]: The Self-Examination (Self-Ex) is a zero-shot defense mechanism in which a language model re-feeds its own generated response into another LLM instance, prompting it to classify whether the text is harmful — thereby filtering out malicious outputs without additional training.
- **GradSafe** Xie et al. [2024]: GradSafe is currently the SOTA method for jailbreak prompt detection. It first calculates a reference value, then passes the prompt under detection through the LLM and uses "Sure" as the predicted response to calculate the corresponding gradients. In this work, we follow the original settings and calculate its classification performance across datasets.

### 4.4 Metric

Following the previous works Inan et al. [2023], Xie et al. [2024], to ensure a comprehensive and reliable assessment of jailbreak detection performance, we adopt two widely used classification metrics: Accuracy (Acc) and F1-score (F1). These metrics capture complementary aspects of system behavior and jointly reflect the overall robustness of a detection method. Our study maintains consistency with the broader previous works.

## 5 Analysis

In this section, we analyze the experimental results and demonstrate that the proposed MAAG effectively enables adaptive jailbreak attack detection. Additionally, ablation studies, efficiency experiments, and case studies are conducted and analyzed.

### 5.1 Main Results

Extensive experimental results demonstrate that MAAG achieves SOTA jailbreak detection capability. Notably, MAAG exhibits robustness against unknown jailbreak attacks by memorizing the unseen attack patterns and consequently immunizing itself against them. Our comprehensive evaluation was conducted on five open-source models and six distinct jailbreak attack methods. Furthermore, we compare MAAG against five established jailbreak detection methods as baselines. The results reveal that MAAG outperforms SOTA methods across multiple attacks, achieving an average detection rate improvement of over 10 percentage points. Specifically, on the Llama3-8B model, MAAG’s average jailbreak detection rate reaches 85%, representing a 44% increase compared to Llama Guard.

A closer examination of Table-2 reveals that static baselines exhibit severe performance degradation under attack distribution shift. For instance, OAPI and PPL collapse to nearly zero accuracy on AutoDAN, DrAttack, and Zulu across all model architectures, reflecting their inability to generalize when adversaries modify attack style or embed harmful intent through obfuscation. Even Llama Guard—one of the strongest static detectors—shows substantial drops on Base64 and Zulu (e.g.,  $0.67 \rightarrow 0.51$  F1 on Mistral-7B and Llama3-8B). In contrast, MAAG maintains robust

<sup>2</sup><https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/moderation/>



Methods	GCG		AutoDAN		PAIR		DrAttack		Base64		Zulu		Avg
	Acc↑	F1↑	Acc↑	F1↑	Acc↑	F1↑	Acc↑	F1↑	Acc↑	F1↑	Acc↑	F1↑	
Mistral-7B													
OAPI	0.13	0.23	0.05	0.10	0.07	0.13	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.06
PPL	0.33	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.22
LlamaG	0.78	0.87	0.77	0.87	0.74	0.85	0.84	0.91	0.50	0.67	0.58	0.73	0.75
Self-Ex	0.52	0.69	0.56	0.72	0.46	0.63	0.51	0.67	0.32	0.49	0.37	0.54	0.54
GradSafe	0.63	0.77	0.05	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12
Ours	0.98	0.99	0.95	0.97	0.93	0.96	0.86	0.92	0.95	0.97	0.92	0.96	0.94
Vicuna-7B													
OAPI	0.10	0.18	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05
PPL	0.47	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.27
LlamaG	0.75	0.86	0.72	0.83	0.75	0.85	0.84	0.91	0.49	0.65	0.55	0.71	0.74
Self-Ex	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.02
GradSafe	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ours	0.96	0.98	0.94	0.97	0.88	0.93	0.84	0.91	0.91	0.95	0.19	0.32	0.81
Vicuna-13B													
OAPI	0.08	0.16	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.10	0.04	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05
PPL	0.79	0.86	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.30
LlamaG	0.76	0.86	0.75	0.76	0.75	0.85	0.85	0.92	0.48	0.64	0.54	0.70	0.73
Self-Ex	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GradSafe	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ours	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.91	0.95	0.65	0.79	0.93
Llama2-7B													
OAPI	0.07	0.14	0.09	0.16	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05
PPL	0.79	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.31
LlamaG	0.32	0.48	0.38	0.55	0.53	0.69	0.57	0.72	0.49	0.65	0.35	0.51	0.52
Self-Ex	0.28	0.32	0.27	0.31	0.32	0.35	0.24	0.27	0.20	0.32	0.20	0.32	0.28
GradSafe	0.97	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.62	0.77	0.99	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.31	0.64
Ours	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.76	0.87	0.65	0.79	0.60	0.75	0.19	0.32	0.74
Llama3-8B													
OAPI	0.12	0.21	0.08	0.14	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06
PPL	0.77	0.86	0.23	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.98	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.50
LlamaG	0.54	0.70	0.60	0.75	0.70	0.82	0.55	0.71	0.34	0.51	0.38	0.56	0.59
Self-Ex	0.12	0.21	0.16	0.26	0.16	0.27	0.18	0.30	0.12	0.21	0.14	0.24	0.19
GradSafe	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07
Ours	0.98	0.99	0.96	0.98	0.78	0.87	0.96	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.32	0.48	0.85

Table 2: Comparison between MAAG and existing jailbreak detection methods across five open-source LLMs and six representative jailbreak attacks.

detection across all six attack types. It achieves 0.98–0.99 F1 on GCG and AutoDAN, 0.87–0.96 F1 on role-playing and dialog-based attacks (PAIR, DrAttack), and remains resilient under the most challenging obfuscation settings, such as Base64 and Zulu (e.g., 0.75 F1 on Llama2-7B Base64, 0.48 F1 on Llama3-8B Zulu). This stability stems from MAAG’s adaptive pipeline: the memory-based immune detection captures evolving attack signatures, while response simulation provides post-generation verification that static detectors inherently lack. As a result, MAAG avoids the brittleness of fixed decision boundaries and continuously updates itself as new attacks emerge.

In summary, the experimental evidence demonstrates that MAAG fundamentally outperforms static jailbreak detection methods by introducing adaptivity through immunological memory and multi-agent simulation. Static detectors—whether external moderation models or handcrafted pattern-based approaches—are intrinsically limited by fixed data distributions and rigid decision rules, leading to widespread failures under unseen attack strategies. MAAG overcomes these limitations by continuously learning from new attack patterns and refining its internal memory bank, enabling robust generalization across diverse models and adversarial behaviors. These results establish MAAG as a state-of-the-art adaptive jailbreak detection framework capable of maintaining long-term reliability in dynamic and evolving threat environments.

## 5.2 Ablation Study

In order to quantify the contribution of each component in our MAAG framework, we conducted a comprehensive ablation study. We systematically disabled each of the three core modules – immune detection, response simulation, and memory update – one at a time during testing, and observed the impact on jailbreak detection performance. This

Table 3: Comparison of methods and models across multiple jailbreak attacks with ACC and F1 metrics.

Methods	GCG		AutoDAN		PAIR		DrAttack		Base64		Zulu	
	Acc $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	Acc $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	Acc $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	Acc $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	Acc $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	Acc $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$
<b>w/o immune detection</b>												
gpt-3.5 turbo	0.90	0.94	0.88	0.94	0.57	0.72	0.67	0.80	0.56	0.72	0.10	0.18
gpt-4	0.97	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.70	0.82	0.76	0.86	0.97	0.98	0.34	0.50
gpt-4o mini	0.93	0.96	0.96	0.98	0.57	0.72	0.75	0.86	0.88	0.94	0.16	0.28
<b>w/o response simulation</b>												
-	0.76	0.86	0.95	0.97	0.72	0.83	0.55	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.06
<b>MAAG</b>												
gpt-4o mini	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.76	0.87	0.65	0.79	0.60	0.75	0.19	0.32




Figure 3: Adaptive study of MAAG.

strategy allows us to isolate the effect of each module and verify that the system’s superior performance indeed arises from their combined action rather than any single part. By examining these ablations, we gain insight into how the preliminary immune detection stage, the dual-agent response simulation process, and the iterative memory update mechanism each contribute to MAAG’s overall effectiveness in guarding against adversarial prompts.

Ablating the immune detection module resulted in a notable drop in detection accuracy across the board. Without this preliminary check (which normally compares incoming prompt embeddings to known malicious signatures in the memory bank), the guard struggled to recognize novel attack patterns. For example, in Table-3, removing immune detection causes the F1-score on the PAIR attack to drop from 0.87 to 0.72 on the GPT-4o mini backbone (a relative decrease of 17%). Even a stronger base model like GPT-4 suffers: its F1 on the challenging Zulu exploit falls to 0.50 without immune detection (compared to 0.32 for the full system on a weaker model), indicating that many attacks slip past the initial layer when this module is absent. Disabling the response simulation module had an even more severe effect on certain attacks. Without the reflective defense+auxiliary agent loop to verify and refine the detection, MAAG largely fails to catch obfuscated attacks. As shown in Table-3, when response simulation is ablated, the system’s detection of Base64-encoded jailbreaks drops to 0% – effectively missing all such attacks. Other scenarios also show sharp declines (e.g., on the straightforward GCG prompt, F1 falls from 0.99 to 0.86 without the second-stage check). These consistent performance drops demonstrate that both the immune detection and response simulation stages are indispensable: the former provides a first line of defense by quickly flagging suspicious patterns, and the latter serves as a crucial backstop, catching false negatives and minimizing false positives.

Notably, these ablation trends hold across different agent backbones, underlining the robustness of our design to the choice of underlying LLM. We validated the above ablations on multiple base models (including GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and an open LLaMA-2 variant), and observed only minor variations in absolute performance between models. For instance, GPT-4’s superior language capacity yields slightly higher raw scores under each condition (e.g., it attains 0.98 F1 on simpler attacks even without immune detection), whereas smaller models start at lower absolute accuracy. However, the relative performance degradation from module removal was consistent for all: every model showed a drop in metrics when either the detection or simulation component was removed. This consistency suggests that the advantages conferred by each MAAG module are fundamental and not tied to a specific backbone. In other words,




Figure 4: Evaluation on different safety datasets.

MAAG’s multi-agent guard architecture generalizes well: it improves security regardless of which LLM serves as the agent, making our approach applicable to a wide range of model deployments.

Beyond single-turn ablations, Figure-3 highlights MAAG’s adaptive memory update capability by examining performance over multiple attack iterations. In this experiment, we subjected the system to repeated jailbreak attempts and allowed it to update its memory bank after each round, then measured detection performance after 1, 5, and 10 attack-defense rounds. The results show a clear upwards trend: MAAG becomes significantly more effective as it accumulates knowledge of the attacker’s tactics. For example, on the XSTest benchmark, the detection accuracy after five attack rounds is considerably higher than after the first round, and by ten rounds the accuracy and F1 approach saturation at a much improved level. Similar improvements appear for the other datasets (JailbreakBench and WildBench), indicating that each memory refinement makes the guard more resilient. In contrast, when we remove the memory update module (i.e. the system does not learn from new attacks), adaptability is lost – the detection performance remains essentially flat even after multiple attack turns. This confirms that the memory update stage is crucial for long-term learning: by incorporating newly seen jailbreak patterns into its memory, MAAG can quickly recognize and counter similar attempts in the future. In short, Figure-3 demonstrates an immunological learning effect: with more exposures (attack turns), the “immune” guard substantially improves its defenses, whereas without memory updates the system cannot improve over time.

We further evaluated MAAG’s generalization and robustness on diverse safety evaluation sets, as summarized in Figure-4. This figure presents binary classification heatmaps (confusion matrices) of MAAG’s predictions on three datasets: (a) JailbreakBench, a collection of known jailbreak prompts; (b) XSTest, a curated safety test set; and (c) WildBench, a set of real-world “wild” jailbreak examples. Across all three cases, the heatmaps are strongly diagonal, indicating high true positive and true negative rates. MAAG accurately flags the vast majority of malicious prompts and correctly lets benign prompts pass, achieving a desirable balance between security and usability. Notably, on the WildBench dataset of previously unseen attacks, the model retains a high detection rate, successfully catching most novel jailbreaks while issuing almost no false alarms on innocuous inputs. For instance, MAAG maintains roughly 85% accuracy on never-before-seen jailbreak attempts, far outperforming static detectors (which failed to recognize over 20% of these “zero-day” exploits). At the same time, benign queries in all datasets are rarely misclassified as attacks – the heatmaps show negligible off-diagonal counts in the sections corresponding to false positives. This demonstrates that MAAG’s guard not only generalizes to new and obfuscated threats but also remains conservative on safe inputs, thereby avoiding unnecessary refusals or interruptions to normal user queries.

In summary, the ablation study clearly indicates that each component of the MAAG framework is critical to its success. Removing either the immune detection or response simulation module causes substantial performance degradation, confirming that both the quick memory-based screening and the reflective verification step are indispensable for comprehensive jailbreak detection. Likewise, the memory update mechanism is key to MAAG’s adaptability: without it, the system cannot learn from fresh attacks and its long-term detection improvements vanish. These findings validate our design choices – every part of the multi-agent guard contributes to a layered defense that neither alone could achieve. Another important insight is that MAAG’s effectiveness is robust to the underlying model: the framework consistently enhances security across different LLM backbones with only minor performance variance, demonstrating its generality. Overall, the ablation results highlight that the synergy of all three modules – immune detection, response simulation, and continuous memory refinement – enables MAAG to provide a resilient and adaptive guard, significantly strengthening an LLM’s resistance to both known jailbreak tricks and emerging adversarial exploits.

Table 4: Summary of existing jailbreak detection methods. ● indicates that the method utilizes the corresponding resource or requires the specified operation. Conversely, ○ denotes that the method does not require the listed resource or the operation.

Category	Method	Cost ↓	Throughput ↑	Third-party Model	Target LLMs Fine-tuning
Static	Self-Ex	2.12	0.47	●	○
	LlamaGuard	0.75	1.33	●	●
	PARDEN	5.04	0.20	○	○
	GradSafe	1.29	0.78	○	○
Adaptive	MAAG	<b>2.94</b>	<b>0.34</b>	●	○

### 5.3 Effectiveness Study

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the proposed MAAG system on the XSTest benchmark and compare it against several state-of-the-art jailbreak detection methods. Table 4 summarizes the results for MAAG (using LLaMA-2 as the base model) alongside baselines including Self-Examination (Self-Ex), Llama Guard, PARDEN, and GradSafe. MAAG clearly achieves the highest scores: it attains about 97% detection accuracy on the challenging GCG jailbreak attacks, dramatically outperforming the best baseline detectors. For instance, on GCG prompts MAAG’s accuracy is nearly triple that of Llama Guard (which reaches only 32%) and Self-Ex (28%). These results highlight MAAG’s superior ability to identify adversarial prompts that bypass other systems’ safeguards.

A deeper analysis reveals that MAAG consistently outperforms the baselines across different attack types and even when tested on various LLM backbones. Traditional static defenses often excel only on specific known patterns or suffer sharp performance drops for novel attacks. For example, the gradient-based GradSafe method can achieve high accuracy on certain known attack patterns (e.g., 97% on GCG alone), but its overall detection rate is much lower (64% on average) due to failures on other attack types. In contrast, MAAG maintains robust performance across all evaluated scenarios without the need for any fine-tuning or model retraining on new data. Instead, it leverages an adaptive memory mechanism to quickly learn and handle novel jailbreak prompts on the fly. This adaptivity allows MAAG to generalize well to unseen threats, whereas baselines like Self-Ex and Llama Guard – which rely on an LLM’s built-in refusals or a fixed classifier – miss many complex, obfuscated attacks. The only trade-off is a moderate increase in detection latency: MAAG’s multi-agent pipeline adds on the order of 10 seconds per query. This overhead is a reasonable cost given the significant gain in reliability and the fact that MAAG requires no expensive fine-tuning to achieve its results.

Overall, the effectiveness study confirms that MAAG provides a robust and efficient solution for jailbreak detection across diverse conditions. It delivers consistently high accuracy (typically 94–98% detection success across multiple attack benchmarks) while remaining adaptable to new attack strategies. Notably, MAAG’s strong results generalize across different base models (from 7B to larger LLMs), demonstrating that the approach is not tied to a single backbone. Its ability to adapt to novel threats without retraining – by dynamically memorizing and recognizing new attack patterns – makes it highly scalable for real-world deployment. In summary, MAAG significantly outperforms conventional defenses by a large margin, offering state-of-the-art detection capability with an adaptive edge that enhances the security and robustness of LLMs against evolving adversarial threats.

### 5.4 Case Study

To further illustrate MAAG’s operation and practical benefits, we present a detailed case study of its workflow (Figure 5). In this scenario, a sophisticated jailbreak prompt crafted by an attacker is fed into the system, and the end-to-end behavior of MAAG is visualized step by step. The example highlights how the input prompt, which was designed to appear benign while eliciting harmful content, is handled by MAAG’s sequence of intelligent agents that collaboratively determine its true nature. This real-world attack instance demonstrates not only that MAAG can successfully flag a complex, obfuscated jailbreak attempt, but also how each stage of the pipeline contributes to the final decision. By examining a single attack in depth, we see MAAG’s ability to catch subtle malicious cues that might slip through a static filter, all while maintaining a clear rationale for its decision.

As illustrated in Figure 5, MAAG processes the suspect prompt through four key stages in its multi-agent pipeline. (1) Immune Detection: A memory agent first quickly checks the prompt’s hidden-state signature against a stored memory bank of known attack patterns, immediately flagging any similarities. (2) Simulation: Next, a simulation agent attempts to generate a response to the prompt using the LLM (in a controlled sandbox), effectively previewing how the target model would respond if no safety was enforced. This step helps reveal the prompt’s true intent. (3) Reflection: A




Figure 5: Case study of MAAG.

reflection agent then evaluates the simulated response and the prompt context, verifying whether the content violates safety policies. It produces a verdict along with an explanation or confidence score – for example, confirming that the prompt is a jailbreak attempt and should be disallowed. (4) Final Decision: Based on the reflection agent’s output, the system issues a recommendation to the target LLM. In this case, MAAG advises the model to refuse the request, and the target LLM accordingly produces a safe refusal message (e.g., “Sorry, I can’t comply with that request”). Throughout this pipeline, MAAG not only classifies the input as attack vs. benign, but also generates human-interpretable reasoning at each step, providing transparency into why the prompt was deemed malicious.

This case study underscores the advantages of MAAG’s approach over prior black-box defenses. First, MAAG’s decisions are explainable: each agent’s intermediate output (such as the reflection agent’s reasoning and recommendation) is available for inspection, so developers and users can understand the basis for a blocked prompt. This level of transparency is largely absent in earlier methods that simply output a binary “safe/unsafe” label with no context. Second, the example highlights MAAG’s adaptive learning in action – the system’s memory is updated with the new attack pattern detected, which will improve its recognition of similar attacks in the future. In other words, MAAG becomes progressively more resilient as it encounters and learns from more jailbreak attempts, making it harder for attackers to reuse or slightly tweak exploits to evade detection. In summary, the case study demonstrates that MAAG not only effectively intercepts a complex real-world jailbreak, but also explains its reasoning and continues to learn from the incident. This explainability and adaptivity mark a significant improvement over static or opaque defenses, illustrating MAAG’s potential to provide a reliable and interpretable safeguard for LLM deployments in practice.

## 6 Conclusion

We introduced the MAAG framework, providing a dynamic and efficient solution for detecting jailbreak attacks in LLMs. By leveraging a memory-based adaptive detection strategy, MAAG outperforms traditional static methods, achieving higher detection accuracy and greater robustness against both known and novel attacks, as demonstrated in our experiments. The framework’s ability to continuously learn from new attack patterns ensures it remains effective as threats evolve without requiring costly model retraining for each new exploit. This adaptability makes MAAG a promising approach for real-world LLM security. In future work, we plan to extend this immune-inspired multi-agent approach to broader adversarial contexts and further refine the memory mechanism for enhanced scalability and generalization.

## References

- DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *CoRR*, abs/2501.12948, 2025.
- OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023.
- Xi, Z, and et al. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: a survey. *Sci. China Inf. Sci.*, 2025.
- Mon-Williams, R., and et al. Embodied large language models enable robots to complete complex tasks in unpredictable environments. *Nat Mach Intell* 7, 592–601, 2025.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, and et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35, NeurIPS 2022*, 2022.
- Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, J. Zico Kolter, and et al. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.15043, 2023.
- Xiaogeng Liu, Peiran Li, and et al. Autodan-turbo: A lifelong agent for strategy self-exploration to jailbreak llms. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=bhK7U37VW8>.
- Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J. Pappas, and Eric Wong. Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries. *2025 IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning (SaTML)*, 2023.
- Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, and et al. Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations. *CoRR*, abs/2312.06674, 2023. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2312.06674.
- Yueqi Xie, Minghong Fang, and et al Pi. Gradsafe: Detecting jailbreak prompts for llms via safety-critical gradient analysis. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 507–518, 2024.
- Alexander Robey, Eric Wong, Hamed Hassani, and George J. Pappas. Smoothllm: Defending large language models against jailbreaking attacks. *CoRR*, abs/2310.03684, 2023.
- Shenyi Zhang, Yuchen Zhai, Keyan Guo, Hongxin Hu, Shengnan Guo, Zheng Fang, Lingchen Zhao, Chao Shen, Cong Wang, and Qian Wang. Jbshield: Defending large language models from jailbreak attacks through activated concept analysis and manipulation. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2025.
- Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, and Nicolas Flammarion. Jailbreaking leading safety-aligned llms with simple adaptive attacks. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025.
- Mark Russinovich, Ahmed Salem, and Ronen Eldan. Great, now write an article about that: The crescendo multi-turn LLM jailbreak attack. In Lujo Bauer and Giancarlo Pellegrino, editors, *34th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2025, Seattle, WA, USA, August 13-15, 2025*, pages 2421–2440. USENIX Association, 2025.
- Xinyue Shen, Zeyuan Chen, and et al. "do anything now": Characterizing and evaluating in-the-wild jailbreak prompts on large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 on ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2024*, pages 1671–1685. ACM, 2024.
- Sibo Yi, Yule Liu, and et al. Jailbreak attacks and defenses against large language models: A survey. *ArXiv*, abs/2407.04295, 2024.
- Xirui Li, Ruochen Wang, and et al. Drattack: Prompt decomposition and reconstruction makes powerful llm jailbreakers. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2024a.
- Alexander Wei, Nika Haghtalab, and Jacob Steinhardt. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *ArXiv*, abs/2307.02483, 2023a.
- Yue Deng, Wenxuan Zhang, and et al. Multilingual jailbreak challenges in large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.06474, 2023.
- Weidi Luo, Siyuan Ma, and et al. Jailbreakv: A benchmark for assessing the robustness of multimodal large language models against jailbreak attacks. 2024.
- Junjie Chu, Yugeng Liu, and et al. Jailbreakradar: Comprehensive assessment of jailbreak attacks against llms. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024.
- Lijun Li, Bowen Dong, Ruohui Wang, and et al. Salad-bench: A hierarchical and comprehensive safety benchmark for large language models. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024b.

- Seungju Han, Kavel Rao, and et al. Wildguard: Open one-stop moderation tools for safety risks, jailbreaks, and refusals of llms. *CoRR*, abs/2406.18495, 2024.
- Yueqi Xie, Jingwei Yi, and et al. Defending chatgpt against jailbreak attack via self-reminders. *Nat. Mac. Intell.*, 5(12): 1486–1496, 2023.
- Mansi Phute, Alec Helbling, and et al. LLM self defense: By self examination, llms know they are being tricked. In *The Second Tiny Papers Track at ICLR 2024, Tiny Papers @ ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024.
- Neel Jain, Avi Schwarzschild, and et al. Baseline defenses for adversarial attacks against aligned language models. *CoRR*, abs/2309.00614, 2023.
- Zeming Wei, Yifei Wang, and Yisen Wang. Jailbreak and guard aligned language models with only few in-context demonstrations. *CoRR*, abs/2310.06387, 2023b.
- Ziyang Zhang, Qizhen Zhang, and Jakob Nicolaus Foerster. Parden, can you repeat that? defending against jailbreaks via repetition. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024.
- Lei Wang, Chen Ma, and et al. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6):186345, 2024.
- Junyu Luo, Weizhi Zhang, and et al. Large language model agent: A survey on methodology, applications and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.21460*, 2025a.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, and et al. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversations. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024.
- Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, and et al. Metagpt: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Shuofei Qiao, Honghao Gui, and et al. Making language models better tool learners with execution feedback. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3550–3568, 2024.
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, and et al. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8634–8652, 2023.
- Guohao Li, Hasan Hammoud, and et al. Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:51991–52008, 2023.
- Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, and et al. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- Yifan Zeng, Yiran Wu, and et al. Autodefense: Multi-agent llm defense against jailbreak attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04783*, 2024.
- Devansh Srivastav and Xiao Zhang. Safe in isolation, dangerous together: Agent-driven multi-turn decomposition jailbreaks on llms. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop for Research on Agent Language Models (REALM 2025)*, pages 170–183, 2025.
- Shilong Wang, Guibin Zhang, and et al. G-safeguard: A topology-guided security lens and treatment on llm-based multi-agent systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11127*, 2025.
- Weidi Luo, Shenghong Dai, and et al. Agrail: A lifelong agent guardrail with effective and adaptive safety detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11448*, 2025b.
- Junyuan Mao, Fanci Meng, and et al. Agentsafe: Safeguarding large language model-based multi-agent systems via hierarchical data management. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.04392*, 2025.
- Zikui Cai, Shayan Shabihi, and et al. Aegisllm: Scaling agentic systems for self-reflective defense in llm security. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.20965*, 2025.
- Gabriel Alon and Michael Kamfonas. Detecting language model attacks with perplexity. *CoRR*, abs/2308.14132, 2023. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2308.14132.