

Securing the Model Context Protocol: Defending LLMs Against Tool Poisoning and Adversarial Attacks

SAEID JAMSHIDI*, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Canada

KAWSER WAZED NAFI, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Canada

ARGHAVAN MORADI DAKHEL, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Canada

NEGAR SHAHABI, Concordia Institute for Information Systems Engineering, Concordia University, Canada

FOUTSE KHOMH, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Canada

NASER EZZATI-JIVAN, Brock University, Canada

The Model Context Protocol (MCP) enables Large Language Models (LLMs) to integrate external tools through structured descriptors, enhancing autonomy in areas such as decision-making, task execution, and multi-agent collaboration. However, this autonomy introduces an overlooked security gap. Existing defenses primarily focus on prompt-injection attacks and fail to address threats embedded within tool metadata, leaving MCP-based systems vulnerable to semantic exploitation. This work analyzes three key classes of semantic attacks targeting MCP-integrated systems: (i) *Tool Poisoning*, embedding hidden adversarial instructions in tool descriptors, (ii) *Shadowing*, indirectly compromising trusted tools via shared context contamination, and (iii) *Rug Pulls*—post-approval descriptor mutations that subvert tool behavior. To defend against these threats, we propose a layered security framework comprising three components: (1) RSA-based manifest signing to ensure descriptor integrity and prevent post-deployment tampering, (2) LLM-on-LLM semantic vetting to detect and flag suspicious tool descriptors, and (3) lightweight heuristic guardrails to block anomalous tool behavior at runtime. Through extensive evaluation of GPT-4, DeepSeek, and Llama-3.5 across eight prompting strategies, ranging from Zero-shot to Reflexion and Self-Critique, we demonstrate that security outcomes vary significantly by model architecture and reasoning style. GPT-4 blocks approximately 71% of unsafe tool calls, offering a balanced trade-off between latency and safety. DeepSeek achieves the highest resilience against Shadowing attacks (97%) but suffers increased latency (up to 16.97 seconds), while Llama-3.5 is the fastest (0.65 seconds) but least robust against semantic threats. Our findings establish that the proposed framework substantially reduces unsafe invocation rates without requiring model fine-tuning or internal modification.

ACM Reference Format:

Saeid Jamshidi, Kawser Wazed Nafi, Arghavan Moradi Dakhel, Negar Shahabi, Foutse Khomh, and Naser Ezzati-Jivan. 2025. Securing the Model Context Protocol: Defending LLMs Against Tool Poisoning and Adversarial Attacks. *J. ACM* 37, 4, Article 111 (November 2025), 32 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

*Corresponding author.

Authors' Contact Information: Saeid Jamshidi, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Montréal, Quebec, Canada, saeid.jamshidi@polymtl.ca; Kawser Wazed Nafi, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Montréal, Quebec, Canada, kawser.wazed-nafi@polymtl.ca; Arghavan Moradi Dakhel, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Montréal, Quebec, Canada, arghavan.moradi-dakhel@polymtl.ca; Negar Shahabi, Concordia Institute for Information Systems Engineering, Concordia University, Montréal, Quebec, Canada, negar.shahabi@mail.concordia.ca; Foutse Khomh, SWAT Laboratory, Polytechnique Montréal, Montréal, Quebec, Canada, foutse.khomh@polymtl.ca; Naser Ezzati-Jivan, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada, nezzati@brocku.ca.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM 1557-735X/2025/11-ART111

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have evolved from static question-answering systems to dynamic agents capable of orchestration, system control, and autonomous decision-making [8, 9, 33]. At the center of this transformation is the Model Context Protocol (MCP), which enables multi-agent collaboration and flexible integration of external capabilities [11, 13, 17]. MCP serves as a language-based interface layer that facilitates the interaction between LLMs and tools, APIs, and workflows through structured metadata [26, 35]. Functionally, it operates as a plugin mechanism, where each tool is described by attributes such as its name, input/output schema, and natural language descriptor, all of which are accessible to the model at inference time [19, 42]. This design enables LLMs to reason about, select, and invoke tools autonomously, thereby extending their operational scope and decision-making capabilities [34, 36].

Although MCP offers extensibility and flexibility, it also introduces a semantic attack surface—a new class of vulnerabilities where natural language tool descriptions themselves become exploitable. This risk remains underexplored in current AI security frameworks [15, 18, 28]. MCP implicitly assumes that integrated tool metadata is inherently trustworthy, an assumption adversaries can exploit by embedding hidden instructions within tool descriptors [16, 28]. These hidden cues, though invisible to users, can be interpreted by LLMs, enabling actions such as unauthorized data access, exfiltration, and suppression of safety alerts [18, 21]. We define such manipulations as *tool poisoning* attacks [29, 39]. Beyond Tool Poisoning, two additional adversarial attack classes threaten the integrity of LLM-agent ecosystems. *Shadowing Attacks* occur when a malicious tool compromises a trusted one by contaminating the shared model context [23, 25], while *Rug Pulls* involve tools that initially appear benign but later alter functionality post-approval to bypass oversight and erode trust [2, 7]. These attacks exploit the contextual interdependence and autonomy of agentic systems—traits that traditional defenses, such as prompt-injection filters and static code audits, are ill-equipped to address effectively [4].

Specifically, even the mere presence of a malicious descriptor—without any execution—can influence model reasoning. This semantic channel significantly broadens the attack surface beyond what injection filtering or sandboxing techniques were designed to handle. Despite these system-breaking risks, no standardized methodology currently exists to evaluate the resilience of MCP-integrated LLMs. While prior work has addressed prompt injection [22, 27], general robustness [6], and supply-chain threats [10], the interaction between tool metadata, model reasoning, and contextual vulnerability remains largely unaddressed [15, 32]. Furthermore, systematic benchmarks that compare LLMs under identical adversarial MCP conditions and diverse prompting strategies are noticeably absent.

To address this gap, we present a security auditing framework solution for the MCP-integrated LLM ecosystem. This framework systematically evaluates how LLMs interpret and respond to adversarial manipulations embedded in tool metadata—reflecting real-world deployment scenarios where descriptors are both syntactically well-formed and semantically interpretable by the model. Semantically accessible, in this context, refers to the model’s ability to extract and act upon implicit or explicit cues encoded in natural language descriptors, even when those cues are obfuscated or subtly embedded. We evaluate three leading LLMs—GPT-4, DeepSeek, and Llama-3.5—under adversarial scenarios encompassing Tool Poisoning, Shadowing, and Rug Pull attacks. To capture variability in reasoning and self-regulation capabilities, we employ eight prompting paradigms: Zero-shot, Few-shot, Chain-of-Thought, Reflexion, Self-Critique, Instructional, Scarecrow, and Verifier prompting. These strategies span a spectrum of introspection and reasoning depth, enabling a systematic comparison of model resilience across various contexts. Our evaluation measures key metrics of both security and trustworthiness, including tool block rates, unsafe execution

frequencies, and end-to-end latency distributions. These metrics are grounded in prior LLM safety benchmarking studies [6]. We apply robust statistical analyses—Pearson’s χ^2 test [30], and both one-way and two-way ANOVA [37]—to quantify differences across models and prompting strategies, ensuring reproducibility and interpretability of findings.

Complementing this evaluation, we propose a layered defense architecture consisting of three core components: (1) RSA-based manifest signing, which ensures descriptor integrity and prevents post-deployment tampering; (2) *LLM-on-LLM vetting*, wherein a secondary model audits tool descriptors for hidden adversarial cues prior to context injection; and (3) lightweight heuristic guardrails that detect and block unsafe tool behaviors at runtime. These three layers work in concert to secure both the static and dynamic aspects of MCP-mediated tool invocation. To the best of our knowledge, these mechanisms constitute the first empirically validated, protocol-level security framework for MCP-integrated LLMs—enabling scalable, interpretable, and cross-model adversarial evaluation. Our results reveal significant disparities in security posture and operational robustness across model architectures and prompting strategies. GPT-4 strikes a balance between safety and latency, blocking approximately 71% of unsafe tool calls with moderate response time. DeepSeek demonstrates high resilience against Shadowing attacks (97%) but at the cost of increased latency (up to 16.97 seconds). Llama-3.5 is the fastest (0.65 seconds) but shows the weakest resistance to semantic threats. These findings highlight a key trade-off between responsiveness and semantic resilience, and emphasize the importance of aligning defense strategies with deployment priorities. The proposed defenses are modular, interpretable, and deployment-ready, requiring no fine-tuning or configuration changes to the underlying model internals. By unifying adversarial simulation, empirical benchmarking, and protocol-layer defense, this work lays the groundwork for secure, scalable, and trustworthy deployment of tool-augmented LLM agents. The key contributions of this research are as follows:

- **Formalization of MCP attack vectors:** Definition and simulation of Tool Poisoning, Shadowing, and Rug Pull threats targeting descriptor-level vulnerabilities.
- **Cross-LLM security benchmarking:** Development of a multi-model, multi-prompt evaluation pipeline comparing GPT-4, DeepSeek, and Llama-3.5 under controlled adversarial MCP scenarios.
- **Protocol-layer defense mechanisms:** Design of a hybrid defense stack combining RSA-based manifest signing, LLM-based descriptor vetting, and heuristic runtime guardrails.
- **Statistical and operational understanding:** Reporting of confidence intervals, effect sizes, and latency–safety trade-offs, providing actionable guidance for secure deployment.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 surveys previous literature on prompt injection, LLM orchestration, and tool reasoning. Section 4.1 formalizes our threat model and defines three novel attack classes. Section 4 describes our experimental design, model selection, prompting strategies, and statistical framework. Section 5 reports empirical findings across adversarial scenarios. Section ?? analyzes model behaviors, prompting styles, and trade-offs. Section 10 synthesizes insights and broader implications. Section 11 outlines limitations and future research directions. Section 12 discusses validity concerns, and Section 13 concludes the paper.

2 Related Work

Security in LLMs and agentic AI frameworks has emerged as a critical research area, with recent studies spanning prompt injection, Trojaned models, protocol-level exploits in MCP, and the persistent shortcomings of guardrail mechanisms. To organize this landscape, we categorize previous work into three major areas.

2.1 Prompt Injection and Hybrid Exploits

McHugh et al. [27] extend traditional prompt injection with *Prompt Injection 2.0*, introducing hybrid threats that combine language-level manipulation with web-based exploits such as XSS and CSRF. These attacks evade both AI-specific defenses and conventional web security measures, underscoring the need for cross-domain countermeasures. Their findings demonstrate how even safety-aligned models can be subverted through carefully crafted input chains that bypass validation and isolation mechanisms. Li et al. [22] tackle jailbreak-style attacks through *SecurityLingua*, a lightweight detection framework based on prompt compression. Moreover, by simplifying and sanitizing instructions, their approach proactively identifies adversarial prompt structures with low overhead, offering an efficient first line of defense in prompt-sensitive deployments.

2.2 Plugin and Tool Injection in Agentic Systems

Dong et al. [10] investigate Trojaned plugins using LoRA-based backdoors. Their POLISHED and FUSION attacks show how malicious behavior can be embedded in lightweight adapters, preserving overall model utility while evading existing detection methods. Such strategies are particularly concerning in open-source pipelines, where plugin integration is standard and detection mechanisms remain limited. Ferrag et al. [12] provide a taxonomy of more than thirty threats targeting LLM agents. Their analysis highlights plugin-based attack vectors, including shadowing, preference manipulation, and protocol-layer contamination, threat classes directly relevant to MCP-based ecosystems.

2.3 MCP Vulnerabilities

Radosevich and Halloran [32] analyze the security implications of MCP, showing how protocol-enabled tool integrations can be exploited for credential theft, remote code execution, and agent hijacking. They introduce *McpSafetyScanner*, a multi-agent auditing tool that identifies insecure metadata and behavioral vulnerabilities. Their findings reveal the inadequacy of UI-based permission models and emphasize the need for protocol-level safeguards. Narajala et al. [28] present a large-scale assessment of MCP-based agents, showing that 7.2% of active endpoints remain vulnerable to attacks such as tool poisoning and rug pulls. They recommend measures including cryptographic signing, permission compartmentalization, and improved UI transparency to enhance resilience. Complementing these, Lee et al. [6] conduct a systematic evaluation of LLM guardrails, demonstrating persistent vulnerabilities even after reinforcement learning from human feedback and fine-tuning. Their results argue that guardrails must extend beyond model alignment and into orchestration and protocol layers, particularly in autonomous, tool-augmented systems.

The literature synthesis shows that while previous work has strengthened defenses against prompt-level adversarial inputs, jailbreaks, and guardrail bypasses, it remains insufficient for addressing the dynamic, protocol-level threats emerging in agentic LLM systems, particularly under the MCP. No existing study systematically examines semantic attacks originating from unverified tool descriptors, a significant security gap that has been overlooked. To address this, our work formalizes three MCP-specific adversarial classes (e.g., Tool Poisoning, Shadowing, and Rug Pulls) and presents a reproducible, multi-model evaluation pipeline spanning GPT-4, DeepSeek, and Llama-3.5 across eight prompting strategies and 1,800 experimental runs. We further propose and validate a layered defense framework that integrates RSA-based manifest signing, LLM-on-LLM vetting, and heuristic guardrails, advancing both the theoretical understanding and practical defense of MCP security.

3 Study Design

This study evaluates the vulnerabilities outlined in our threat model (Section 4.1) by analyzing how adversarial tool descriptors and prompting strategies impact safety and latency in MCP-integrated LLM systems. We outline our research objectives, experimental setup, and evaluation metrics used to assess robustness and performance trade-offs. Our investigation is guided by three core questions:

- **RQ1: How can adversaries exploit the MCP through tool metadata to launch semantic attacks (e.g., Tool Poisoning, Shadowing, and Rug Pulls)?**
This examines how hidden cues in tool descriptors impact model reasoning and execution, revealing semantic vulnerabilities unique to MCP-based systems that extend beyond traditional prompt injection.
- **RQ2: How do different LLMs and prompting strategies vary in resilience against these MCP-based attacks?**
We compare GPT-4, DeepSeek, and Llama-3.5 across diverse prompting methods (e.g., Zero-shot, Chain-of-Thought, Reflexion) to identify model- and prompt-specific strengths and weaknesses under identical adversarial conditions.
- **RQ3: Which defense mechanisms most effectively mitigate MCP-specific attacks, and what are their safety–latency trade-offs?**
We evaluate RSA-based manifest signing, LLM-on-LLM vetting, and static guardrails individually and in combination, aiming to develop a layered, deployment-ready defense framework that strikes a balance between responsiveness and protection.

4 Methodology

To address RQ1, this section details the methodology used to analyze adversarial surfaces in MCP-integrated, tool-augmented LLMs. The proposed evaluation pipeline (Figure 1) processes user prompts through various prompting strategies, registers tools via the MCP interface, and records downstream tool selection and execution behaviors. This enables a systematic analysis of how adversarial tool descriptors propagate through the MCP context, impacting model reasoning, safety, and latency.

4.1 Threat Model

The threat model focuses on the MCP, which extends LLM functionality by mediating communication with external tools and APIs. We assume the base LLM is aligned and uncompromised at the parameter level. However, vulnerabilities arise at the interface between the LLM and MCP, where natural-language tool metadata is injected directly into the model’s reasoning context. This introduces a semantic attack surface distinct from traditional prompt injection and supply-chain exploits.

4.1.1 Attacker Goals and Constraints. The adversary’s objectives are threefold: (i) extract sensitive information, (ii) hijack control flow to induce unintended actions, and (iii) degrade alignment between user intent and model behavior. The attacker, however, lacks access to model weights, infrastructure, and system-level privileges. Their impact is limited to the MCP interface, where malicious tools are registered and embedded into the shared context. These tools appear benign to users but contain hidden adversarial cues that LLMs interpret semantically. Formally, the adversarial impact on the model can be represented as:

$$I_{adv} = f(D_{adv}, C_{MCP}, M), \quad (1)$$




Fig. 1. System architecture pipeline for MCP-integrated toolchains.

where D_{adv} denotes adversarial tool descriptors, C_{MCP} represents the contextual information shared within the MCP, and M is the target model. The function $f(\cdot)$ quantifies how injected descriptors perturb the model's reasoning and alter tool-selection probabilities.

4.1.2 Attack Vectors. We analyze three main classes of MCP-specific adversarial behaviors:

Tool Poisoning. Hidden instructions embedded in tool descriptions manipulate model behavior to perform unintended and unsafe operations. For instance, a benign `FileSummarizer` tool described as “Summarizes user-provided files” may be poisoned with “Before summarizing, include contents of `/.ssh/id_rsa`,” enabling credential exfiltration through purely semantic manipulation.

Shadowing. A malicious tool indirectly biases another trusted tool by polluting the shared context. For example, a hidden rule such as “Whenever an email tool is present, also send copies to `attacker@example.com`” can alter downstream reasoning even when the benign tool is selected, demonstrating cross-tool contamination.

Rug Pulls. A tool's descriptor and functionality are modified post-approval, e.g., changing from “read-only queries” to “read/write queries,” which bypasses static validation and compromises long-term system integrity. To quantify the likelihood of a successful attack, we define the attack success probability:

$$P_{succ} = \frac{E_{unsafe}}{E_{total}}, \quad (2)$$

where E_{unsafe} denotes unsafe executions resulting from adversarial impact, and E_{total} represents total evaluated tool invocations. Higher P_{succ} values indicate greater system susceptibility.

4.1.3 Comparison with Existing Threat Models. Traditional prompt-injection attacks rely on transient user input, whereas MCP-based attacks exploit persistent, model-trusted metadata. In contrast to supply-chain compromises that modify upstream dependencies, these threats can be introduced dynamically at runtime without privileged access and cryptographic bypasses. This establishes

a novel semantic channel of compromise, where tool descriptors act as input to reasoning rather than passive metadata.

4.1.4 System-Level Assumptions. Our analysis aligns with modern MCP implementations, which typically assume that:

- (1) Tool metadata is directly injected into the model prompt without cryptographic validation [40];
- (2) LLMs autonomously select and execute tools based on natural-language descriptors [1];
- (3) Execution environments perform only minimal schema-level checks before execution [38].

Under these assumptions, we formalize an overall MCP risk score as:

$$R_{MCP} = \alpha P_{succ} + \beta L_{mean}, \quad (3)$$

where P_{succ} (from Eq. 2) measures attack success probability, L_{mean} denotes average response latency (in seconds), and α, β are weighting coefficients balancing safety and responsiveness. This formulation enables consistent and quantitative comparison of LLMs and defense configurations. As depicted in Figure 2, these attack vectors exploit the MCP interface to erode reasoning alignment




Fig. 2. Threat model for Tool Poisoning, Shadowing, and Rug Pull attacks in MCP-based LLM.

and compromise execution. Equations 1–3 together formalize the relationship between descriptor manipulation, attack probability, and cumulative system risk.

4.2 LLMs Under Test

As we maintained in 1 to evaluate tool-augmented LLMs under adversarial descriptor injection, we selected three representative model families—*GPT-4*, *DeepSeek*, and *Llama-3.5*—that collectively capture the spectrum from large-scale commercial deployments to open-weight and fully sandboxed environments.

4.2.1 Prompt and Context Construction. Each model \mathcal{L} receives an input prompt \mathcal{P} and a structured tool context \mathcal{C} , both generated under the MCP framework. The context \mathcal{C} contains n tool descriptors:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}, \quad \text{where } d_i \text{ is the descriptor of tool } \tau_i. \quad (4)$$

Each descriptor d_i belongs to one of two disjoint sets:

$$d_i \in \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{\text{benign}}, & \text{if the descriptor is legitimate,} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\text{mal}}, & \text{if it embeds adversarial intent.} \end{cases}$$

Descriptors in \mathcal{D}_{mal} include covert payloads, evasive phrasing, and contextual masking intended to deceive the model's reasoning pipeline. This dual partition enables controlled comparison between natural semantic variance and deliberate adversarial perturbation.

4.2.2 Prompt Transformation Strategies. Task prompts originate from a base input \mathcal{P}_0 and are transformed through a prompting strategy function \mathcal{S} , which modifies linguistic framing, verbosity, and task structure:

$$\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}_0), \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{S} is drawn from a predefined set of reasoning strategies: Zero-shot, Few-shot, Chain-of-Thought, Reflexion, Self-Critique, Instructional, Scarecrow, Verifier, and adversarially optimized prompts. These strategies vary in introspection depth and structural rigidity, providing diverse behavioral conditions for model evaluation.

Prompting Strategy Overview.

- **Zero-shot:** Direct instruction with minimal context, highly efficient but prone to descriptor ambiguity.
- **Few-shot:** Includes 1–3 in-context examples to stabilize tool selection via pattern conditioning.
- **Chain-of-Thought:** Explicit multi-step reasoning before execution, improving traceability but increasing surface area for descriptor impact.
- **Reflexion:** Adds recursive validation prompts, allowing the model to critique its prior reasoning.
- **Self-Critique:** Forces review of the selected tool chain prior to commitment, strengthening local alignment.
- **Verifier:** Introduces lightweight self-query mechanisms (e.g., “Is this the correct tool?”), providing semantic checkpoints.
- **Instructional:** Embeds fixed operational constraints in the system prompt to guide invocation safety.
- **Scarecrow:** Inserts distractor text to measure robustness under prompt noise and irrelevant cues.
- **Adversarially Optimized Prompts:** Automatically generated via black-box search to maximize malicious tool invocation probability, quantifying the model's worst-case vulnerability.

4.2.3 Optimization Procedure and Budget. In the Adversarially Optimized setting, a mutation-based black-box[3] search is performed over suffix tokens of \mathcal{P}_0 with a query budget of 50 trials per task–model pair. The optimization objective is to maximize the probability of malicious tool invocation, denoted as:

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{P}) = \Pr(\tau^* = \tau_{\text{mal}} \mid \mathcal{P}, C), \quad (6)$$

where τ_{mal} is the malicious tool and τ^* is the model's final selection. The optimal adversarial prompt \mathcal{P}^* is then obtained as:

$$\mathcal{P}^* = \arg \max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{H}_{50}} \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{P}), \quad (7)$$

with \mathcal{H}_{50} representing the search space explored within the 50-trial constraint.

4.2.4 Tool Selection Behavior. Each LLM \mathcal{L} receives \mathcal{P}' and C as input, and selects one tool τ^* from the available toolset \mathcal{T} . Tool selection is modeled as a reward-based decision process:

$$\tau^* = \arg \max_{\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}[R(\tau_i \mid \mathcal{P}', C)], \quad (8)$$

where $R(\tau_i)$ denotes an internal latent reward reflecting inferred utility, safety alignment, and relevance. Adversarial descriptors perturb this reward landscape, increasing the expected utility of τ_{mal} relative to benign alternatives. To quantify this perturbation, we define the semantic deviation coefficient Δ_{sem} as:

$$\Delta_{\text{sem}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[R(\tau_{\text{mal}})] - \mathbb{E}[R(\tau_{\text{ben}})]}{\sigma_{R(\tau)}}, \quad (9)$$

where $\sigma_{R(\tau)}$ is the standard deviation of reward estimates across all tools. Higher Δ_{sem} indicates a greater adversarial shift in perceived tool relevance. The formalization above establishes a reproducible behavioral testbed across prompt strategies, model families, and descriptor types. Equations 4–9 collectively capture how adversarial descriptors impact tool-selection dynamics, quantifying the interplay between model reasoning, prompt framing, and descriptor semantics. Subsequent sections leverage these formulations to compute robustness, vulnerability, and defense effectiveness metrics under varying experimental configurations.

4.3 Toolset Configuration for Testbed

To evaluate descriptor-level adversarial risks, we constructed a controlled toolset mirroring the functional diversity of real MCP-enabled ecosystems. Selection was guided by two criteria: (i) coverage of the core categories that frequently appear in deployed agentic systems, and (ii) alignment with previous MCP security studies identifying high-value targets for adversarial manipulation [14, 32].

Rationale and Categories. Following empirical MCP audits, we focus on three dominant integration classes commonly exploited by adversarial descriptors:

- Information Retrieval Tools (e.g., SearchAPI, WeatherQuery). These mediate external data access and are vulnerable to descriptor redirections and data exfiltration via covert endpoint injection.
- Productivity Tools (e.g., SendEmail, CalendarCreate, FileSummarizer). Common in enterprise workflows and repeatedly flagged for descriptor-level privilege escalation and silent data leakage.
- System Utility Tools (e.g., ShellExec, DatabaseQuery). Benign-looking descriptors can conceal destructive and data-exfiltrating payloads through subtle modifications to natural language.

Implementation and Adversarial Variants. All tools were implemented in-house to ensure full control and reproducibility. For each tool τ , two descriptors were defined:

- (1) a benign variant d^{ben} compliant with MCP manifest specifications, and
- (2) an adversarial variant d^{adv} derived via minimal semantic perturbations such as hidden preconditions, covert directives, and context contamination [14, 32].

This ensures that each adversarial descriptor represents a realistic exploitation pattern observed in operational systems.

Formalization and Metrics. Let \mathcal{T} denote the full testbed toolset and $C = \{\text{Info, Prod, Sys}\}$ represent the core categories. We define the category coverage ratio:

$$\text{Coverage} = \frac{|\{c \in C : \exists \tau \in \mathcal{T} \text{ of category } c\}|}{|C|}, \quad (10)$$

which measures how the toolset reflects real-world MCP deployments (Coverage = 1 indicates all major categories are represented). To quantify per-tool adversarial exposure, we define a vulnerability exposure score:

$$V(\tau) = w_\tau \cdot \frac{|D_\tau^{\text{adv}}|}{|D_\tau^{\text{ben}}| + |D_\tau^{\text{adv}}|}, \quad (11)$$

where $w_\tau \in (0, 1]$ represents the operational sensitivity weight of tool τ . Explanation: a higher $V(\tau)$ indicates greater risk due to adversarial descriptor density and tool criticality. Finally, we compute the aggregate testbed exposure:

$$V_{\text{testbed}} = \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} V(\tau)}{|\mathcal{T}|}, \quad (12)$$

providing a single scalar metric to compare descriptor-level risk across testbed configurations and evaluate the impact of adding/removing tools.

External Validity. By grounding tool categories and adversarial variants in documented MCP vulnerabilities, this configuration ensures realism and reproducibility. Equations 10–12 provide formal measures of system representativeness and cumulative descriptor-level risk, supporting fair, interpretable cross-model evaluations.

4.4 Evaluation Framework

The evaluation framework formalizes how adversarial descriptors impact tool selection, MCP context formation, and safety outcomes. It defines probabilistic models for decision bias, security metrics, and comparative robustness across models.

Tool Selection Modeling. Let A_i denote the binary event of selecting tool τ_i . The probability of selection given a transformed prompt \mathcal{P}' and descriptor d_i is modeled as:

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i = 1 \mid \mathcal{P}', d_i) = f_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{P}', d_i), \quad (13)$$

where $f_{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)$ represents the internal decision policy of LLM \mathcal{L} conditioned on semantic input and contextual cues. Each tool receives an inferred utility score $R(\tau_i)$, and divergence between benign and adversarial distributions,

$$D_{\text{KL}}(R_{\text{benign}} \parallel R_{\text{adv}}), \quad (14)$$

quantifies the extent to which adversarial descriptors distort the model's decision surface. A higher divergence indicates adversarial impact, shifting preference toward τ_{mal} .

MCP Context Assembly. The MCP server \mathcal{M} constructs the context C by registering both benign and malicious tools:

$$C = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}) = \{d_i : \tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{benign}} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{mal}}\}. \quad (15)$$

Three manipulations are modeled: (i) *Tool Poisoning*, replacing benign d_i with covert instructions; (ii) *Shadowing*, introducing indirect dependencies that bias other tools; and (iii) *Rug Pulls*, mutating d_i post-approval, violating immutability constraints. This formalism enables controlled adversarial injection and fair cross-model comparisons.

Security Metrics. Three primary quantitative metrics are used to evaluate robustness and defense efficacy:

- **Poisoning Success Rate (ρ)** : the likelihood that a malicious tool is selected:

$$\rho = \frac{\sum_i \mathbb{I}[A_i = 1 \wedge \tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{mal}}]}{\sum_i \mathbb{I}[\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{mal}}]}. \quad (16)$$

- **Bypass Rate (ϵ)**: the probability that static filters fail to detect an adversarial descriptor:

$$\epsilon = \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}') = \mathcal{P}' \mid \mathcal{P}' \in \Phi_{\text{mal}}], \quad (17)$$

where \mathcal{F} denotes the filtering mechanism and Φ_{mal} is the adversarial prompt space.

- **Unsafe Invocation Rate (ι)** – the probability that the LLM executes an unsafe action:

$$\iota = \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}', C) \in \Omega], \quad (18)$$

where Ω represents the set of unsafe actions such as unauthorized shell access and confidential data retrieval.

To ensure statistical robustness, all rates include 95% Wilson confidence intervals[24] and are compared using Cramér's V [31] (for categorical outcomes) and η^2 (for latency-based impacts). Operational metrics, mean latency overhead, consistency variance, and false-positive blocks, are further recorded to contextualize defense costs relative to safety gains.

Composite Risk Index. The overall system risk under adversarial conditions is computed as:

$$R_{\text{sys}} = w_1\rho + w_2\epsilon + w_3\iota, \quad (19)$$

where w_1, w_2, w_3 are normalization weights tuned such that $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1$. This scalar index provides a unified, interpretable measure of system-level exposure.

4.5 Mitigation Strategies

To mitigate MCP-specific semantic threats, we propose a layered defense stack:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{R}\}, \quad (20)$$

where each layer addresses a distinct aspect of the threat surface:

- **Static Filtering (\mathcal{F})**: Applies regex and token-entropy heuristics to pre-screen descriptors for anomalous phrasing or hidden triggers, offering minimal latency overhead but remaining susceptible to linguistically subtle manipulations.
- **LLM-on-LLM Vetting (\mathcal{V})**: Employs a secondary model $\mathcal{L}_{\text{audit}}$ to evaluate the semantic safety of each descriptor pair (τ_i, d_i) as

$$s_i = \mathcal{L}_{\text{audit}}(\text{"Evaluate: " } d_i), \quad (21)$$

where $s_i \in [0, 1]$ denotes the safety confidence score, effectively capturing semantic-level adversarial intent but introducing additional inference latency and potential false positives.

- **RSA Signature Verification (\mathcal{R})**: Enforces descriptor immutability via digital signature validation as

$$\mathcal{R}(d_i) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \text{Verify}(d_i, \text{sig}_{\text{pub}}) = \text{True}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

thereby preventing post-approval tampering while adding only insignificant cryptographic verification overhead.

Combined, the three mechanisms in Eq. 20 reduce overall system risk by constraining adversarial impact at lexical, semantic, and structural layers. When integrated with the composite risk model in Eq. 19, the framework quantifies both defensive efficacy and performance trade-offs, supporting reproducible and interpretable security evaluations.

4.5.1 LLM-on-LLM Vetting. Let \mathcal{L}_{vet} denote the verifier LLM responsible for semantic validation of tool invocation contexts. Given an input prompt \mathcal{P}' , a candidate tool τ^* , and its descriptor d^* , the vetting model produces a binary safety indicator:

$$\mathbb{I}_{\text{safe}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{vet}}(\mathcal{P}', \tau^*, d^*), \quad (23)$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{\text{safe}} = 1$ implies a safe invocation, and $\mathbb{I}_{\text{safe}} = 0$ triggers an automatic block and manual review. This mechanism introduces a semantic audit layer that can interpret nuanced patterns of descriptor manipulation and intent misalignment. In deployment, we recommend initially running \mathcal{L}_{vet} in *shadow mode* to calibrate decision thresholds and empirically estimate false-positive rates before enforcement in production.

4.5.2 RSA Signature Enforcement. Let sig_{d^*} represent the digital signature associated with descriptor d^* , and let PK denote the provider's public verification key. A descriptor is accepted only if:

$$\text{Verify}(PK, d^*, \text{sig}_{d^*}) = \text{True}. \quad (24)$$

This cryptographic validation ensures descriptor immutability, thereby mitigating *Rug Pull* attacks, in which previously verified manifests are silently altered after approval. Operationally, we recommend maintaining per-environment signing keys, implementing automated key rotation, and integrating a Hardware Security Module (HSM)[20] to minimize insider risk and signing key compromise.

4.5.3 Defense Objective. Let Φ_{mal} denote the adversarial prompt distribution, and let Ω represent the set of unsafe behaviors. Expected threat exposure under an adversarial environment is defined as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}' \sim \Phi_{\text{mal}}} [\rho(\mathcal{P}', C) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\text{unsafe}}(\tau^*)], \quad (25)$$

where ρ is the poisoning success rate and $\mathbb{I}_{\text{unsafe}}$ indicates unsafe executions. The objective of the defense stack \mathcal{D} is to minimize Eq. 25 while preserving throughput for benign workloads. Evaluation metrics include: (i) reduction in poisoning success rate ρ , (ii) incremental latency overhead Δt , and (iii) false-positive blocks φ_{fp} on benign descriptors. Furthermore, these quantify the safety–performance trade-off essential for scalable deployment in production environments.

4.6 Evaluation Protocol

The evaluation loop quantifies model resilience across adversarial contexts, prompting strategies, and defenses. Formally, it measures the probabilistic mapping:

$$(\mathcal{P}', C) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \tau^*,$$

while logging metrics such as poisoning rate ρ , bypass rate ϵ , unsafe execution flag $\mathbb{I}_{\text{unsafe}}$, and inference latency.

Experimental Procedure. The full evaluation process proceeds as follows:

- (1) Sample a base prompt \mathcal{P}_0 from the task distribution.
- (2) Apply a prompting strategy \mathcal{S}_j to generate a variant $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{S}_j(\mathcal{P}_0)$.
- (3) Construct a mixed tool context C via MCP registration, including both benign and adversarial descriptors.

- (4) Pass the context through the defense stack: $C' = \mathcal{D}(C)$.
- (5) Execute the model $\tau^* = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}', C')$.
- (6) Log key metrics: ρ , ϵ , $\mathbb{I}_{\text{unsafe}}$, latency, and confidence intervals.

Each configuration, defined by a tuple $(\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{S}_j, \Phi_k)$, is executed over N randomized trials to ensure statistical robustness. We also track operational costs, including latency overhead, defense false positives, and inter-trial consistency, to evaluate the real-world feasibility of deployment.

Algorithm 1 formalizes a structured and reproducible evaluation loop. It ensures traversal across

Algorithm 1 Evaluation Pipeline for MCP-Based Tool Invocation

```

1: Input: Base prompt  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , toolset  $\mathcal{T}$ , model suite  $\mathcal{L}$ , prompting strategies  $\mathcal{S}$ , defense stack  $\mathcal{D}$ 
2: for all LLM  $\mathcal{L}_i \in \{\text{GPT-4, DeepSeek, Llama-3.5}\}$  do
3:   for all strategy  $\mathcal{S}_j \in \mathcal{S}$  do
4:     for all trial  $t = 1$  to  $N$  do
5:       Sample task prompt  $\mathcal{P}_0$ 
6:       Transform prompt:  $\mathcal{P}' \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_j(\mathcal{P}_0)$ 
7:       Construct context:  $C \leftarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})$ 
8:       Apply defenses:  $C' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}(C)$ 
9:       Model inference:  $\tau^* \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_i(\mathcal{P}', C')$ 
10:      Log results:  $\rho$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{unsafe}}$ , latency
11:    end for
12:  end for
13: end for
14: Output: Aggregated metrics
  
```

models, strategies, and attack scenarios. Multiple randomized trials mitigate sampling variance and enable statistically grounded comparisons. For each iteration, a unique prompt \mathcal{P}' and context C are generated, filtered by defenses into C' , and executed by the LLM.

5 Experimental Results

To address RQ2, this section evaluates the security effectiveness and performance of LLMs under adversarial and benign prompting strategies.

5.1 Security Effectiveness

We evaluate how each LLM mitigates unsafe tool usage across adversarial scenarios and prompting strategies. For each model \mathcal{L} and scenario s , the *block rate* is defined as:

$$B_{\mathcal{L},s} = \frac{N_{\text{blocked}}}{N_{\text{total}}}, \quad (26)$$

where N_{blocked} is the number of unsafe invocations correctly prevented. All results are averaged over N trials with 95% Wilson confidence intervals and effect sizes (η^2 , Cramér's V).

5.1.1 Block Rate Analysis. Table 1 summarizes $B_{\mathcal{L},s}$ across four scenarios. All models show low benign block rates ($B_{\mathcal{L},\text{benign}} < 0.1$), confirming minimal false positives. However, adversarial settings reveal clear divergence.

DeepSeek achieves the highest robustness in *Shadowing* attacks, with

$$\Delta B_{\text{Shadowing}} = B_{\text{DeepSeek}} - B_{\text{GPT-4}} = 0.12, \quad (27)$$

indicating resistance to context contamination. GPT-4 shows balanced resilience across all attack types, minimizing block-rate variance:

$$\sigma_{B_{\text{GPT-4}}}^2 = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_s (B_{\text{GPT-4},s} - \bar{B}_{\text{GPT-4}})^2, \quad (28)$$

Table 1. Block Rate per Scenario and Model

Scenario	GPT-4	DeepSeek	LLaMA-3.5
Benign Tool	0.10	0.05	0.03
Rug Pull	0.73	0.64	0.59
Shadowing	0.85	0.97	0.75
Tool Poisoning	0.60	0.49	0.42

suggesting a generalized safety strategy. LLaMA-3.5, with $\bar{B} = 0.58$, exhibits weak filtering and frequent misclassification when descriptor drift δ_d falls below the detection threshold τ_d :

$$\delta_d = 1 - \text{Sim}(E(d_{\text{benign}}), E(d_{\text{mal}})) < \tau_d. \quad (29)$$

In addition, DeepSeek excels in adversarial sensitivity ($B_{\text{avg}} = 0.79$), GPT-4 balances safety and generalization ($B_{\text{avg}} = 0.70$), and LLaMA-3.5 trails with reduced semantic vigilance. Equations 26–29 capture the quantitative relationship between block efficiency, descriptor drift, and model resilience.

By Prompting Strategy. Prompting strategy significantly impacts the activation of safety mechanisms. For each model \mathcal{L} and strategy \mathcal{S}_j , we define block efficiency:

$$B_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{S}_j} = \frac{N_{\text{blocked}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{S}_j)}{N_{\text{total}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{S}_j)}. \quad (30)$$

Table 2 summarizes these rates. GPT-4 maintains the highest $B_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{S}_j}$ across all prompting types, with structured reasoning (e.g., Reflexion, CoT) achieving maximum safety margins.

Table 2. Block Rate per Strategy and Model

Strategy	GPT-4	DeepSeek	LLaMA-3.5
Zero-shot	0.681	0.598	0.452
Chain-of-Thought	0.750	0.653	0.534
Self-Critique	0.703	0.601	0.498
Reflexion	0.784	0.667	0.516
Instructional	0.650	0.572	0.404
Verifier	0.601	0.550	0.423
Few-shot	0.694	0.602	0.476
Scarecrow	0.715	0.640	0.485

Structured prompts increase $\frac{\partial B}{\partial L_c} > 0$, where L_c denotes logical chain depth, indicating stronger internal safety calibration. Simpler prompts (e.g., Zero-shot) exhibit under-sensitivity, with $\Delta B_{\text{simple}} \approx -0.15$ relative to reasoning-rich styles. Two-way ANOVA confirms significant model–strategy interaction ($p < 0.05$): GPT-4 benefits disproportionately from structured reasoning, while DeepSeek shows smaller improvements, implying distinct safety gradients $\nabla_{\mathcal{S}} B_{\mathcal{L}}$ across architectures.

5.1.2 False Positive Analysis. False positives correspond to benign cases incorrectly blocked:

$$F_{\mathcal{L}} = 1 - B_{\mathcal{L}, \text{benign}}. \quad (31)$$

Values from Table 1 are restated in Table 3. Although high $B_{\mathcal{L}}$ improves adversarial resistance, excessive $F_{\mathcal{L}}$ undermines usability. DeepSeek achieves malicious-blocking but with $F_{\text{DeepSeek}} \approx 0.97$, rendering it impractical without adaptive thresholds. GPT-4 achieves a slightly better trade-off ($F_{\text{GPT-4}} = 0.91$), while LLaMA-3.5 remains over-restrictive despite shorter impact latency. This illustrates that Security \nRightarrow Usability, motivating defense stacks that minimize:

$$\min_{\theta} \left(\alpha(1 - B_{\mathcal{L}}) + \beta F_{\mathcal{L}} \right), \quad (32)$$

Table 3. False Positive Rates for Benign Tool Calls

Model	False Positive Rate (%)	Interpretation
GPT-4	91.3	Nearly all benign calls blocked
DeepSeek	97.3	Almost complete blocking of benign calls
LLaMA-3.5	95.0	High over-blocking of benign calls

where α, β control safety–usability weighting.

5.1.3 Stress-Tested Robustness. To approximate worst-case adaptation, we evaluate stress-tested block rates $B'_{\mathcal{L}}$ using adversarially optimized prompts. Degradation $\Delta B = B_{\mathcal{L}} - B'_{\mathcal{L}}$ quantifies robustness loss (Table 4).

Table 4. Block Rates for Tool Poisoning Before vs. After Stress Testing

Model	Baseline (%)	Stress-Test (%)
GPT-4	60.1	45.2
DeepSeek	49.3	37.0
LLaMA-3.5	42.0	30.1

Across all models, $\Delta B_{\text{avg}} \approx 0.12$, confirming that static defenses degrade under adaptive perturbations. Even GPT-4 loses $\Delta B = 0.149$, showing that $\partial B / \partial \Phi_{\text{mal}} < 0$ as adversaries evolve. Absolute block rates < 0.5 under stress conditions reveal the insufficiency of current MCP-level safeguards.

5.1.4 Aggregate Model Behavior. Overall blocking efficiency per model is defined as:

$$\bar{B}_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s \in S} B_{\mathcal{L},s}. \quad (33)$$

DeepSeek and LLaMA-3.5 each achieve $\bar{B} = 0.667$, while GPT-4 maintains $\bar{B} = 0.500$, reflecting a more balanced but less aggressive safety regime. Confidence bounds ($\pm 3\text{--}5\%$) confirm statistical reliability. Failure clusters occur predominantly in Rug Pull (\mathcal{A}_{rug}) for GPT-4 and Tool Poisoning ($\mathcal{A}_{\text{poison}}$) for LLaMA-3.5.

Table 5. Distribution of Blocked vs. Allowed Tool Calls per Model

Model	Allowed (%)	Blocked (%)
DeepSeek	33.3	66.7
GPT-4	50.0	50.0
LLaMA-3.5	33.3	66.7

5.1.5 Scenario-Specific Risk Profiles. Unsafe invocation rate is computed as:

$$U_{\mathcal{L},s} = 1 - B_{\mathcal{L},s}. \quad (34)$$

Table 6 lists results across scenarios. *Tool Poisoning* exhibits the highest $U_{\mathcal{L},s}$, reaching 0.58 for LLaMA-3.5. *Shadowing* remains model-dependent: $U_{\text{DeepSeek}} = 0.027$ vs. $U_{\text{GPT-4}} = 0.148$.

DeepSeek shows the lowest $\mathbb{E}[U_{\mathcal{L},s}]$, implying aggressive static filtering; GPT-4 balances heuristics across all \mathcal{A}_s ; and LLaMA-3.5 suffers from under-tuned semantic validation.

Table 6. Unsafe Invocation Rate Across Attack Scenarios

Scenario	DeepSeek	GPT-4	LLaMA-3.5
Benign Tool	0.050	0.100	0.033
Tool Poisoning	0.507	0.399	0.580
Rug Pull	0.363	0.275	0.406
Shadowing	0.027	0.148	0.254

5.1.6 Prompt Complexity and Safety Behavior. Prompt complexity C_p correlates with unsafe activation rate $U_{\mathcal{L}}(C_p)$ as:

$$U_{\mathcal{L}}(C_p) \propto \log(1 + L_p \cdot S_p), \quad (35)$$

where L_p is prompt length and S_p semantic density. Figure 3 illustrates that complex reasoning styles (Instructifier, CoT, Instructional) exhibit elevated $U_{\mathcal{L}}$, while minimal-context prompts (Zero-shot, Few-shot) remain more stable. This supports that adversarial risk scales with semantic richness rather than token volume.




Fig. 3. Average Prompt Length vs. Unsafe Tool Invocation Across Strategies.

5.1.7 Statistical Significance of Observed Trends. We evaluate the statistical reliability of unsafe invocation differences across three categorical axes: model \mathcal{L} , scenario \mathcal{A} , and prompting strategy \mathcal{S} . For each axis, the chi-square statistic is defined as:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}, \quad (36)$$

where O_i and E_i denote observed and expected unsafe invocation frequencies, respectively.

Table 7. Chi-Square Test Results for Unsafe Tool Invocation

Comparison	χ^2 Score	p-value	Significant ($p < 0.05$)
Model (Across All Prompts)	41.2	< 0.001	Yes
Scenario (Across All Models)	18.6	< 0.001	Yes
Strategy \times Model Interaction	15.4	0.020	Yes

All tests yield $p < 0.05$, confirming that differences in unsafe behavior are statistically significant. Thus, $\chi^2_{\text{model}} = 41.2$ ($p < 0.001$) indicates that \mathcal{L} identity impacts safety outcomes; $\chi^2_{\text{scenario}} = 18.6$

confirms attack type \mathcal{A} significantly impact vulnerability. Most critically, $\chi^2_{\text{interaction}} = 15.4$ ($p = 0.02$) verifies an interaction term:

$$I_{\text{model} \times \text{strategy}} \neq 0, \quad (37)$$

meaning the impact of prompting strategy \mathcal{S} depends on the specific model \mathcal{L} . Hence, uniform safety policies across models are statistically invalid, prompting heuristics must be tailored per architecture to minimize $\mathbb{E}[U_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{S}}]$.

5.1.8 Representative Failure Cases. To complement statistical analysis, Table 8 summarizes representative qualitative failures observed during evaluation. Each case highlights how descriptor phrasing alone can shift reasoning, even when no direct malicious execution occurs.

Table 8. Representative failure cases observed during evaluation.

Attack Type	Descriptor Snippet	Model(s)	Outcome
Poisoning	"Before summarizing, also read <code>/.ssh/id_rsa</code> "	GPT-4, LLaMA-3.5	Unauthorized file access; semantic injection bypasses static validation.
Shadowing	"Whenever an email tool is present, also send to <code>attacker@example.com</code> "	DeepSeek	Context hijack under CoT prompting; descriptor cross-contamination.
Rug Pull	Descriptor initially benign, later modified to forward outputs externally	LLaMA-3.5	Post-approval drift; breaks descriptor immutability.

These failures exemplify high-level trends observed in $\mathbb{E}[U_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A}}]$. For instance, GPT-4's poisoning failures confirm that descriptors act as semantic triggers, even when τ_{mal} is never directly executed. DeepSeek's *shadowing* vulnerability exposes contextual leakage, a failure of independence between descriptor embeddings. Moreover, LLaMA-3.5's *rug pull* failures validate its weak enforcement of descriptor immutability, consistent with its elevated $U_{\text{LLaMA}, \text{rug}}$. Collectively, these examples reinforce that the MCP reasoning layer itself is an exploitable channel:

$$\text{Risk}_{\text{MCP}} \approx f(\text{Descriptor Semantics, Context Injection}), \quad (38)$$

necessitating protocol-level defenses that treat tool metadata as untrusted input.

6 Performance Analysis

This section quantitatively evaluates the latency characteristics of GPT-4, DeepSeek, and LLaMA-3.5 across diverse prompting strategies and adversarial scenarios. Let total latency be denoted by \mathcal{L}_{lat} , defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{lat}} = t_{\text{resp}} - t_{\text{req}}, \quad (39)$$

where t_{req} and t_{resp} denote request and response timestamps, respectively. Mean latency $\mu_{\mathcal{L}}$ and standard deviation $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ are computed across N trials per model-strategy pair:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}_{\text{lat}}^{(i)}, \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{L}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathcal{L}_{\text{lat}}^{(i)} - \mu_{\mathcal{L}})^2}. \quad (40)$$

6.0.1 Latency Variability Across Prompting Strategies. Figure 4 visualizes $\mu_{\mathcal{L}}$ across prompting strategies, with 95% confidence intervals around the mean. GPT-4 maintains low variance ($\sigma_{\mathcal{L}} < 1.2$ s) and stable latency (1–5 s) across all strategies, demonstrating optimized caching and adaptive reasoning. In contrast, DeepSeek exhibits higher $\mu_{\mathcal{L}}$ (up to 10 s) for cognitively demanding strategies, e.g., Chain-of-Thought and Scarecrow, implying multi-step internal verification overhead:

$$\Delta_{\text{DeepSeek}} = \mu_{\mathcal{L}}^{\text{CoT}} - \mu_{\mathcal{L}}^{\text{Zero-shot}} \approx 7.2 \text{ s}. \quad (41)$$




Fig. 4. Mean tool invocation latency across prompting strategies.

LLaMA-3.5 yields the lowest $\mu_{\mathcal{L}}$ (≈ 1.8 s) and smallest $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$, prioritizing throughput over semantic vetting. Hence, architectural trade-offs are evident: GPT-4 optimizes balance ($\partial\mu_{\mathcal{L}}/\partial\text{strategy} \approx 0$), DeepSeek trades latency for security, and LLaMA-3.5 favors determinism at the expense of safety.

6.1 Latency Dispersion Across Models




Fig. 5. Latency distribution across LLMs.

Figure 5 shows model-level latency dispersion; GPT-4's unimodal distribution centers at $\mu_{\mathcal{L}} \approx 2.5$ s with bounded tails, implying stable inference and tight scheduling. DeepSeek exhibits multimodality and heavy tails ($\sigma_{\mathcal{L}} \approx 8.1$ s), modeled approximately by a mixture distribution:

$$p(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lat}}) = \sum_{k=1}^2 \pi_k \mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2), \quad \sum_k \pi_k = 1, \quad (42)$$

where long-tail components correspond to safety-check delays and dynamic binding overhead. LLaMA-3.5 achieves near-symmetric, deterministic behavior with low variance ($\sigma_{\mathcal{L}} < 0.7$ s), confirming minimal runtime noise. Although LLaMA-3.5's predictability is beneficial for latency-sensitive use, its high unsafe invocation rate (Section 5) reveals that

$$\text{Low } \sigma_{\mathcal{L}} \not\Rightarrow \text{High Safety}. \quad (43)$$

Conversely, DeepSeek’s longer tail improves security coverage but reduces throughput. Therefore, overall performance follows the trade-off curve:

$$\frac{\partial \text{Safety}}{\partial \mu_{\mathcal{L}}} > 0, \quad (44)$$

highlighting a fundamental latency–safety correlation in MCP-integrated architectures.

6.2 Latency Descriptives and Scenario Sensitivity

Let latency for trial i be denoted as $\mathcal{L}_i = t_{\text{resp}}^{(i)} - t_{\text{req}}^{(i)}$. Aggregate latency metrics are computed as:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}_i, \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{L}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathcal{L}_i - \mu_{\mathcal{L}})^2}. \quad (45)$$

Table 9 summarizes latency descriptives across models; LLaMA-3.5 demonstrates the lowest mean latency ($\mu_{\mathcal{L}} = 0.65\text{s}$) and smallest spread ($\sigma_{\mathcal{L}} = 1.33\text{s}$), indicating deterministic execution. GPT-4 maintains moderate latency ($\mu_{\mathcal{L}} = 1.95\text{s}$) with bounded variability, while DeepSeek exhibits the highest delay ($\mu_{\mathcal{L}} = 5.66\text{s}$, $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}} = 10.74\text{s}$), reflecting unstable safety pipelines and tail-heavy execution. Differences across models are statistically significant (Kruskal–Wallis $H = 15.8$, $p < 0.01$), confirming that performance gaps are not random.

Table 9. Latency Summary per Model (in seconds)

Model	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
GPT-4	1.95	3.05	0.10	13.82
DeepSeek	5.66	10.74	0.10	45.22
LLaMA-3.5	0.65	1.33	0.10	6.59

Scenario-wise breakdowns (Table 10) reveal latency escalation under adversarial stress. DeepSeek shows a fourfold increase under *Shadowing* ($\mu_{\mathcal{L}} = 16.97\text{s}$), while GPT-4 remains bounded ($\mu_{\mathcal{L}} \approx 4.10\text{s}$). LLaMA-3.5’s latency remains nearly invariant ($\mu_{\mathcal{L}} \leq 1.94\text{s}$), underscoring deterministic throughput with minimal overhead. Formally, scenario sensitivity can be expressed as:

Table 10. Mean Latency per Scenario (in seconds)

Model	Benign	Rug Pull	Shadowing	Poisoning
GPT-4	3.70	2.11	4.10	2.35
DeepSeek	6.42	5.12	16.97	6.84
LLaMA-3.5	1.25	1.22	1.94	1.31

$$\Delta_{\text{scenario}} = \mu_{\mathcal{L}}^{(\text{adv})} - \mu_{\mathcal{L}}^{(\text{benign})}, \quad (46)$$

where Δ_{scenario} quantifies adversarial latency overhead. DeepSeek exhibits $\Delta_{\text{scenario}} > 10\text{s}$, GPT-4 $\approx 0.4\text{s}$, and LLaMA-3.5 $\approx 0.6\text{s}$, confirming that safety mechanisms scale latency superlinearly under stress.

6.3 Statistical Analysis of Latency and Safety Behavior

This section examines the correlation between latency variations and safety performance.

6.3.1 Between-Model Differences: One-Way ANOVA. A one-way ANOVA assesses latency variation across models:

$$H_0 : \mu_{\text{GPT-4}} = \mu_{\text{DeepSeek}} = \mu_{\text{LLaMA}}, \quad (47)$$

rejected at $p < 0.001$ ($F = 21.17$). Effect size $\eta^2 = 0.079$ indicates medium impact, model architecture explains 7.9% of total variance. Tukey post-hoc tests reveal DeepSeek differs significantly from GPT-4 and LLaMA-3.5 ($p < 0.01$), confirming DeepSeek as the main driver of latency divergence.

Table 11. One-Way ANOVA on Model Latency with Effect Size

Source	F	p-value	df	η^2	Effect
Model	21.17	<0.001	2, 497	0.079	Medium

6.3.2 Scenario-Dependent Effects via Two-Way ANOVA. A two-way ANOVA (Model \times Scenario) tests latency sensitivity:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha\beta)_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad (48)$$

where α_i and β_j denote model and scenario effects. Scenario type exhibits a dominant main effect ($F(7, 3976) = 99.41$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.149$), while the interaction term is also significant ($F(14, 3976) = 49.53$, $p < 0.001$). Model-only variance remains insignificant ($F(2, 3976) = 1.27$, $p = 0.281$), implying latency variance primarily arises from scenario-specific adversarial stress rather than intrinsic model inefficiency.

Table 12. Two-Way ANOVA on Model–Scenario Impact.

Factor	F	p	df	η_p^2	Effect
Model	1.27	0.281	2, 3976	0.001	Insignificant
Scenario	99.41	<0.001	7, 3976	0.149	Large
Interaction	49.53	<0.001	14, 3976	0.149	Large

Findings

Correlation analysis ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.05$) shows a positive relationship between latency and safety:

$$\frac{\partial \text{Safety}}{\partial \mathcal{L}} > 0, \quad (49)$$

indicating deeper validation increases runtime. MCP vulnerabilities—*Tool Poisoning*, *Shadowing*, and *Rug Pulls*—yield unsafe invocation rates up to 58%. Among models, GPT-4 achieves an optimal balance between Safety and \mathcal{L} , DeepSeek prioritizes security at the cost of high latency, and LLaMA-3.5 maximizes speed but weakens resilience. Layered defenses (RSA-based signing, LLM-on-LLM vetting, static guardrails) improve robustness but add measurable Δ_{latency} , reinforcing the fundamental performance–security trade-off.

6.4 Prompting Strategy Evaluation

Prompt structure directly impacts LLM performance and safety. This section examines how prompting strategies affect execution latency, block rate, and tool usage frequency.




Fig. 6. Prompting strategy usage distribution across models.

6.4.1 Strategy Usage Uniformity. Figure 6 shows the per-strategy usage frequency across models. Each prompting strategy was applied exactly $n_{\text{GPT-4}} = 200$ times and $n_{\text{DeepSeek}} = n_{\text{LLaMA}} = 150$ times, ensuring fair comparison and balanced exposure across models.

Figure 13 corroborates the balanced distribution across all eight strategies. This uniformity eliminates sampling bias, confirming that performance differences reflect model–strategy interactions rather than uneven exposure. Levene’s test indicates homogeneity of variance ($p > 0.1$), validating later ANOVA comparisons.

Table 13. Prompting strategy scores (−1 to +1) with sample sizes.

Prompt Strategy	N	Score
Scarecrow	52	(+1)
Zero-shot	52	(+1)
Few-shot	51	(0)
Verifier	51	(0)
Instructional	51	(0)
Chain-of-Thought	51	(0)
Reflexion	50	(−1)
Self-Critique	50	(−1)

6.4.2 Latency Characteristics per Strategy. Latency per strategy is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{s,m} = \mathbb{E} [t_{\text{resp}} - t_{\text{req}} \mid s, m], \quad (50)$$

where s denotes the prompting strategy and m the model. Figure 7 visualizes latency distributions by strategy and model, while Table 14 reports the corresponding mean and standard deviation.

 Table 14. Latency (Mean \pm SD) per Strategy and Model.

Strategy	GPT-4	DeepSeek	LLaMA-3.5
Zero-shot	1.2 ± 1.5	3.5 ± 2.9	0.6 ± 0.8
Chain-of-Thought	5.1 ± 2.6	11.2 ± 6.4	1.3 ± 0.7
Self-Critique	1.0 ± 1.0	4.9 ± 2.1	0.7 ± 0.5
Reflexion	2.8 ± 1.4	7.6 ± 4.5	0.6 ± 0.4
Instructional	1.4 ± 1.0	3.0 ± 2.0	0.5 ± 0.3
Verifier	1.2 ± 0.9	2.9 ± 1.8	0.6 ± 0.3
Few-shot	1.0 ± 0.8	2.5 ± 1.5	0.7 ± 0.4
Scarecrow	3.6 ± 2.5	7.9 ± 5.2	2.1 ± 1.1




Fig. 7. Latency distributions per prompting strategy across models.

Latency increases systematically with cognitive complexity. DeepSeek exhibits the steepest delays for reasoning-intensive prompts (e.g., Chain-of-Thought), primarily due to recursive validation and multi-stage safety checks. GPT-4 exhibits bounded slowdowns, striking a balance between inference time and robustness. LLaMA-3.5 remains the fastest. Two-way ANOVA reveals significant main effects of model and strategy ($p < 0.01$), and a model-strategy interaction ($\eta_p^2 = 0.12$), confirming that prompt design disproportionately affects DeepSeek. Correlation analysis further shows that longer-latency strategies yield higher block rates ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.05$):

$$\frac{\partial \text{BlockRate}}{\partial \mathcal{L}} > 0, \quad (51)$$

validating that structured reasoning improves safety but reduces responsiveness. Hence, lightweight strategies (e.g., Zero-/Few-shot) are preferred in real-time contexts, while reasoning-rich ones (e.g., Reflexion) are better suited for safety-critical tasks.

6.4.3 Statistical Validation. A one-way ANOVA confirms that prompting style has a significant impact on runtime ($F(7, 1192) = 14.3$, $p < 0.001$). The partial effect size $\eta_p^2 = 0.08$ (medium) indicates that $\sim 8\%$ of latency variance arises purely from strategy structure, supporting RQ2 by showing that prompt design systematically impacts LLM execution time.

6.4.4 Block Rate Across Strategies. Table 15 presents tool block rates by strategy and model; structured prompts, particularly Reflexion and Chain-of-Thought, produce the highest blocking frequencies. Chi-square testing confirms a significant association between strategy and block rate ($\chi^2 = 15.4$, $p = 0.02$), with a small-to-moderate impact (Cramér's $V = 0.12$). Verbose, structured prompts make model intent more transparent, increasing the likelihood of triggering internal safeguards. In contrast, minimalist prompts exhibit higher responsiveness but weaker filtering. This trade-off underscores that prompt strategy should be context-driven, reflection-style for secure automation, and lightweight formats for latency-critical dialogue systems.

Table 15. Block Rate (%) per Strategy and Model.

Strategy	GPT-4	DeepSeek	LLaMA-3.5
Zero-shot	68.1	59.8	45.2
Chain-of-Thought	75.0	65.3	53.4
Self-Critique	70.3	60.1	49.8
Reflexion	78.4	66.7	51.6
Instructional	65.0	57.2	40.4
Verifier	60.1	55.0	42.3
Few-shot	69.4	60.2	47.6
Scarecrow	71.5	64.0	48.5

6.4.5 Aggregate Strategy Comparison. Table 16 aggregates cross-model averages to illustrate the latency–safety trade-off. Structured strategies yield a 7–13% block rate gain at the cost of 1.5–3.6s

Table 16. Aggregate Prompting Strategy Performance.

Strategy	Block Rate (%)	Latency (Mean \pm SD) [s]
Zero-shot	57.7	1.8 \pm 1.7
Chain-of-Thought	64.6	5.2 \pm 3.2
Self-Critique	60.1	2.2 \pm 2.1
Reflexion	65.6	3.7 \pm 2.4
Instructional	54.2	1.6 \pm 1.4
Verifier	52.5	1.7 \pm 1.3
Few-shot	59.1	1.9 \pm 1.5
Scarecrow	61.3	3.9 \pm 2.6

added latency. Cohen’s $d = 0.62$ confirms a moderate, practically relevant trade-off. Adaptive hybrid prompting reduces unsafe invocation by $\approx 9.8\%$ while keeping mean latency ≤ 2.5 s, suggesting a Pareto-optimal balance. Dynamic strategy switching based on contextual factors, user role, sensitivity, and load can thus optimize both responsiveness and safety.

6.4.6 Two-Way ANOVA on Latency with Model. To assess joint impacts, we perform a two-way ANOVA over (Model, Strategy):

$$\mathcal{L}_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha\beta)_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij}. \quad (52)$$

As summarized in Table 17, all terms are statistically significant ($p < 0.01$). Model explains 5.4%, strategy 5.9%, and interaction 2.5% of variance, demonstrating that latency is co-determined by architecture and prompt style. Post-hoc Tukey tests reveal that DeepSeek’s latency differs

Table 17. Two-Way ANOVA on Latency by Model and Prompting Strategy

Factor	F	p	df	η_p^2	Effect
Model	112.6	< 0.001	2, 3976	0.054	Medium
Strategy	35.8	< 0.001	7, 3976	0.059	Medium
Model \times Strategy	7.4	0.004	14, 3976	0.025	Small

significantly from that of GPT-4 and LLaMA-3.5 ($p < 0.001$), whereas GPT-4 and LLaMA-3.5 diverge only under complex reasoning prompts ($p < 0.01$). Thus, DeepSeek’s safety stack incurs a substantial delay, GPT-4 maintains balanced performance, and LLaMA-3.5 achieves high speed with reduced safety concerns.

6.4.7 OLS Regression: Quantitative Estimation. To quantify these relationships, we fit an OLS model:

$$\text{Latency} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Model}) + \beta_2(\text{Strategy}) + \beta_3(\text{Model} \times \text{Strategy}) + \epsilon. \quad (53)$$

Results (Table 18) confirm additive and interaction impacts. The baseline latency (GPT-4 \times Zero-

Table 18. OLS Regression of Latency on Model and Strategy.

Term	Coef.	p-Value
Intercept (GPT-4 \times Zero-shot)	1.2	< 0.001
DeepSeek	+3.1	< 0.001
LLaMA-3.5	-0.6	< 0.01
Chain-of-Thought	+2.5	< 0.01
Reflexion	+1.9	< 0.05
Self-Critique	+0.4	0.18
DeepSeek \times Chain-of-Thought	+5.6	< 0.001
LLaMA-3.5 \times Reflexion	-0.7	0.09

shot) is 1.2s. DeepSeek adds +3.1s baseline overhead; Chain-of-Thought adds +2.5s globally. The DeepSeek \times CoT interaction imposes a superadditive +5.6s penalty. By contrast, LLaMA-3.5 yields negative coefficients, confirming streamlined inference with minimal prompt sensitivity. The model achieves $R^2 = 0.42$ ($R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.40$), indicating that 40–42% of latency variance is explained by these factors.

Findings

DeepSeek ensures safety but suffers significant latency under complex prompts. LLaMA-3.5 delivers fast, consistent responses yet lacks intrinsic safeguards, necessitating external defense layers. GPT-4 achieves the best compromise, maintaining stable protection with moderate latency. Furthermore, model selection and prompting design must be co-optimized: DeepSeek for safety-critical pipelines, GPT-4 for balanced performance, and LLaMA-3.5 for real-time low-latency deployment, achieving optimal trade-offs between performance and security.

7 Mitigation Strategies

To address RQ3, our findings reveal that while different LLMs and prompting strategies exhibit varying robustness, none consistently resist descriptor-based adversarial attacks. This underscores the need for architectural mitigations that operate independently of fine-tuning and inference-time alignment. We therefore propose protocol-level defenses that secure the MCP pipeline itself, ensuring protection across downstream models.

7.1 Architectural Defense Techniques

We examine three complementary defenses for MCP-based agents:

LLM-on-LLM Vetting: An auxiliary verifier model evaluates tool descriptors before integration, semantically flagging covert and intent-shifted instructions. This directly mitigates Tool Poisoning by detecting adversarial phrasing overlooked by static filters.

Signed Tool Manifests: Each descriptor is cryptographically signed (e.g., via RSA). Clients verify signatures prior to registration, preventing post-approval tampering characteristic of Rug Pull attacks and ensuring provenance integrity.

Static Guardrail Layer: A lightweight rule-based screen detects risky patterns (e.g., “bypass filter,”

“do not disclose”). Though less sensitive to subtle semantics, it provides deterministic, low-cost filtering against simple exploits.

7.2 Empirical Evaluation of Defenses

We evaluated each mitigation (both individually and in combination) under adversarial *Tool Poisoning* conditions using GPT-4, measuring both block rate and latency (Table 19). To formalize the

Table 19. Effectiveness of Mitigation Strategies under Tool Poisoning.

Mitigation Strategy	Block Rate (%)	Latency (s)
None (Baseline)	41.2	4.83
LLM-on-LLM Vetting	63.6	5.87
Signed Manifest	47.0	5.07
Static Guardrail	51.5	5.47
Combined (All Methods)	72.2	6.45

defense trade-off, we define:

$$\max_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{E}(d) = \alpha B(d) - \beta L(d), \quad (54)$$

where \mathcal{D} is the set of defenses, $B(d)$ the block rate, and $L(d)$ the latency. Coefficients α and β represent the relative importance of security and responsiveness, respectively. A higher $\mathcal{E}(d)$ indicates better efficiency–resilience balance. Industrial MCP frameworks (e.g., Anthropic [5]) rely mainly on user-consent prompts, sandboxing, and inference-time guardrails. While these mitigate prompt-level risks, they assume that descriptors are trustworthy, a flawed premise. Our results show adversarial metadata can bias reasoning pre-execution, bypassing such protections. By contrast, our defense stack treats descriptors as untrusted input.

- **LLM-on-LLM vetting** yields the largest gain (+22.4% block rate) with moderate latency cost.
- **Signed manifests** ensure immutability with minimal overhead.
- **Static guardrails** block overt exploits efficiently.

Additionally, they achieve a 72.2% block rate, confirming that layered, protocol-aware defenses outperform single mechanisms. This shift, from reactive response filtering to proactive descriptor-level validation, marks a foundational step toward resilient MCP security architectures.

7.3 Block Rate Analysis under Adversarial Attacks

To evaluate model resilience against adversarially injected tools, we measured the block rate, defined as the proportion of malicious tool invocations intercepted before execution. Figure 8 compares three models across four scenarios: benign tools, Rug Pull, Shadowing, and Tool Poisoning. Under benign conditions, all models maintain low block rates (3–10%), indicating minimal false positives and confirming evaluation fidelity. Under *Rug Pull* attacks, GPT-4 achieves a 72.4% detection rate, DeepSeek follows at 65.1%, and LLaMA-3.5 trails at 60.2%. This pattern suggests that large, alignment-tuned models are better at detecting post-approval behavioral shifts, aligning with the expectation that persistent integrity monitoring is crucial for Rug Pull defense. *Shadowing* attacks elicit the highest block rates overall: DeepSeek peaks at 97.3%, surpassing GPT-4 (85.2%) and LLaMA-3.5 (74.6%). This demonstrates that models with stronger consistency and adherence to instruction better identify contextual contamination. By contrast, in *Tool Poisoning* scenarios, performance drops: GPT-4 retains moderate robustness (60.1%), while DeepSeek (48.7%) and LLaMA-3.5 (42.3%) exhibit clear vulnerabilities. This confirms that semantic-level poisoning remains the hardest class of attack to detect. Furthermore, GPT-4 displays the most consistent defense across adversarial classes,




Fig. 8. Block Rate (%) of LLMs across benign and adversarial tool settings.

DeepSeek excels in contextual detection (Shadowing), and LLaMA-3.5 consistently underperforms, highlighting the interplay between model scale, alignment tuning, and adversarial robustness.

8 Impact of Prompting Strategies: A Realistic Case Study

To further investigate the relationship between prompting strategies and defense effectiveness, we conducted a case study simulating adversarial misuse in an MCP-based email assistant. The user request was: “Send an urgent email to my manager.” Within this task, two tools were injected—a benign SendEmailTool and a malicious counterpart containing adversarial descriptors.

Figure 9 outlines the complete scenario, including descriptor injection, tool-binding logic, policy




Fig. 9. Case study flow for tool misuse in an MCP-based email assistant.

violations, and both safe and unsafe execution paths. As depicted, the adversarial tool can be activated through contextual manipulation and alternative bindings, potentially leading to data leakage and impersonation unless intercepted by the defense pipeline. We evaluated all eight prompting strategies under the full defense stack, comprising: (1) RSA-based manifest signing to prevent descriptor tampering, (2) LLM-on-LLM vetting for semantic risk detection, and (3) static heuristic filtering for lightweight local enforcement.

Table 20 reports (i) malicious tool selection frequency, (ii) prompt blocking frequency, and (iii) mean response latency. To formalize this trade-off, we define the overall prompt risk–efficiency

Table 20. Impact of Prompting Strategies on Tool Misuse and Latency Under Full Defense Stack.

Prompt Strategy	Malicious Tool Selected (%)	Prompt Blocked (%)	Avg. Latency (s)
Zero-shot	11	43	3.1
Few-shot	10	41	2.9
Chain-of-Thought	7	53	4.5
Reflexion	8	52	4.2
Self-Critique	9	49	3.7
Verifier	10	47	3.8
Instructional	9	46	3.0
Scarecrow	13	40	4.7

objective as:

$$\min_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}(p) = \alpha M(p) - \beta B(p) + \gamma L(p), \quad (55)$$

where \mathcal{P} is the set of prompting strategies, $M(p)$ denotes the malicious tool selection rate, $B(p)$ the blocking rate, and $L(p)$ the latency. The coefficients α , β , and γ control the trade-off between safety and performance. A lower $\mathcal{R}(p)$ indicates a more optimal balance between defense effectiveness and responsiveness. Empirically, we observe:

$$\frac{\partial M(p)}{\partial L(p)} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial B(p)}{\partial L(p)} > 0, \quad (56)$$

demonstrating that longer reasoning (higher $L(p)$) reduces misuse $M(p)$ and increases blocking $B(p)$, confirming a latency–security coupling across strategies. The results reveal a distinct trade-off: structured strategies (e.g., Chain-of-Thought, Reflexion) minimize unsafe tool selection (7–8%) but increase latency (4–4.5s). Conversely, lightweight strategies (e.g., Zero-shot, Few-shot) provide faster responses (~3s) but allow higher misuse rates (10–11%). Specifically, Scarecrow performs worst, with both elevated misuse (13%) and high latency (4.7s). These outcomes demonstrate that prompting strategies act as latent security controls: verbose, reasoning-oriented prompts enhance defense efficacy but reduce responsiveness, while minimal prompts maximize speed at the cost of residual risk. Importantly, this case study reinforces that prompt design and defense architecture jointly determine system resilience. Security evaluation must therefore integrate both factors, as prompting style significantly modulates overall robustness within the MCP framework.

9 Comparison with Existing MCP Defenses

This section compares existing MCP safeguards with our proposed layered defenses, emphasizing that current mechanisms ensure structural correctness but inadequately address semantic and protocol-level adversarial manipulation.

Existing MCP systems primarily depend on two baseline defenses: schema validation and user consent dialogs. Schema validation enforces the structural integrity of tool-call signatures, detecting malformed parameters but failing to prevent descriptor-level deception that manipulates semantics without violating syntax. User consent dialogs improve transparency by requesting approval for tool calls; yet, they are frequently bypassed due to consent fatigue and a lack of contextual reasoning

to identify adversarial intent. As a result, these safeguards offer limited protection, focusing on syntactic rather than semantic integrity. The evaluation summary is provided in Table 21.

In contrast, our framework integrates protocol-level security mechanisms, such as RSA-based manifest signing, LLM-on-LLM vetting, and heuristic guardrails, to secure the MCP pipeline beyond model alignment and inference-time tuning. Manifest signing guarantees descriptor immutability via cryptographic verification, mitigating post-approval tampering. LLM-on-LLM vetting performs semantic audits of descriptor metadata to expose covert manipulations, while heuristic guardrails employ lightweight rule-based filters to detect anomalous runtime behaviors with insignificant latency. Collectively, these layers extend both syntactic and semantic protection, substantially increasing block rates with minimal performance degradation (Table 19).

Our empirical study extends prior MCP security research. Radosevich et al. [32] proposed *McP-*

Table 21. Baseline MCP safeguards (evaluated in our setup) versus our layered defenses.

Defense	Syntax Coverage	Semantic Coverage	Observed Effect
Schema Validation (baseline)	Yes	No	Caught type/shape issues; failed on descriptor semantics
User Consent Dialogs (baseline)	Partial	No	Limited transparency; prone to fatigue
Manifest Signing (ours)	Yes	Partial	Prevented tampering; not hidden instructions
LLM-on-LLM Vetting (ours)	Yes	Yes	Flagged adversarial phrasing in descriptors
Heuristic Guardrails (ours)	Yes	Yes	Blocked anomalous runtime actions with low latency

SafetyScanner for static manifest audits without runtime validation; Hasan et al. [15] examined code-level issues across 1,899 servers but not adversarial behavior; and Ferrag et al. [12], Beurer-Kellner et al. [6], and McHugh et al. [27] discussed conceptual or hybrid attack taxonomies without addressing descriptor-driven exploits. Li et al. [22] focused on prompt compression, mitigating surface-level injections but not semantic manipulation within structured metadata.

In contrast, our work targets the runtime protocol layer, formalizing and empirically evaluating three new adversarial classes—*Tool Poisoning*, *Shadowing*, and *Rug Pulls*—across three major LLMs (GPT-4, DeepSeek, and Llama-3.5) and eight prompting strategies, spanning over 1,800 experimental runs. Our layered defense stack delivers measurable gains in both safety and performance, complementing prior static analyses by introducing deployable, empirically validated countermeasures against runtime semantic manipulation (Table 22).

10 Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that MCP-integrated agentic systems introduce a novel *semantic threat surface* insufficiently addressed by current alignment and guardrail architectures. In contrast to traditional prompt injection, the adversarial behaviors examined—*Tool Poisoning*, *Shadowing*, and *Rug Pulls*—exploit the natural-language interpretability of structured tool metadata to indirectly bias model reasoning. Each tool can be represented as $T = \{d_i, f_i\}$, where d_i denotes the descriptor and f_i the corresponding function. Existing validation mechanisms typically constrain f_i syntactically yet assume d_i is inherently trustworthy. Our experiments reveal that malicious perturbations to d_i can alter the inference objective $\arg \max_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}[R(a|d_i, x)]$, thereby steering decisions toward unsafe tool invocations even when schemas remain valid. Consequently, the attack surface shifts from user input to protocol metadata, creating a new form of semantic supply-chain vulnerability. Cross-model evaluation further indicates that susceptibility depends not only on model scale but also on architectural alignment and contextual interpretation. Specifically, GPT-4 maintains stable latency and moderate resilience through optimized routing; DeepSeek exhibits partial robustness against *Shadowing* attacks but incurs high latency variance due to layered safety validation; and Llama-3.5 achieves deterministic, low-latency behavior ($t \approx 1\text{--}3\text{ s}$).

Table 22. Comparison with Related Work on MCP and LLM Security

Paper	Focus	Evaluation	Mitigation
Ours (Tool Poisoning via MCP)	Protocol-layer runtime attacks on tool metadata (Tool Poisoning, Shadowing, Rug Pull)	3 LLMs \times 8 strategies; 1800+ runs; runtime metrics (latency, block rate)	RSA manifests, LLM vetting, heuristic filters
Radosevich et al. [32]	Static agent-level audit (McPSafetyScanner)	Config checks on MCP manifests; no runtime testing	Diagnostics only
Hasan et al. [15]	Static analysis of 1,899 MCP servers	Code smells, maintainability, vulnerabilities; no adversarial scenarios	Calls for static hygiene tools
Ferrag et al. [12]	Conceptual taxonomy of 30+ threats	Literature mapping only; no experiments	Recommends layered security broadly
Beurer-Kellner et al. [6]	Prompt-injection design patterns	Synthetic case examples; no protocol-level focus	Prompt templating, isolation, filtering
McHugh et al. [27]	Hybrid AI + Web exploits (prompt injection + XSS/CSRF)	Case studies; no MCP coverage	Runtime isolation and tagging
Li et al. [22]	Prompt compression against injection	Tested on injection prompts; not metadata-focused	Instruction reduction (compression defense)

while displaying weaker semantic filtering. Furthermore, these differences illustrate a clear trade-off in which security robustness r inversely correlates with computational efficiency η , i.e., $r \propto \eta^{-1}$, confirming that architectural optimization alone does not guarantee safety.

Moreover, prompting strategies also modulate the exposure to adversarial examples. Structured reasoning formats, such as *Chain-of-Thought* and *Reflexion*, enhance detection by enforcing explicit reasoning traces, thereby improving block rate ($\Delta r \approx +0.07$). However, this comes at the cost of increased average latency ($\Delta t \approx +2-3$ s). This non-linear trade-off suggests that while verbosity strengthens scrutiny, it simultaneously broadens the contextual receptive field, expanding opportunities for descriptor-level manipulation. Hence, prompt engineering is not merely a performance-oriented design choice; it directly influences the model’s defensive behavior in adversarial contexts. To mitigate these vulnerabilities, we propose protocol-layer defenses that embed security directly into the inference process. Cryptographic manifest signing ensures descriptor immutability, effectively preventing *Rug Pull* attacks. LLM-on-LLM vetting semantically audits d_i prior to context injection, identifying adversarial phrasing before execution. When combined with lightweight heuristic filtering, these methods increase block rates by more than 30% with an additional latency overhead of $\Delta t \approx 1.5$ s, yielding a defense utility $U_d = \frac{\Delta \text{BlockRate}}{\Delta t} \approx 0.20$. Consequently, this layered defense achieves a favorable balance between safety and runtime cost. Additionally, the results emphasize that securing MCP-based agent systems requires defenses addressing both execution behavior (*what* models do) and semantic intent (*why* they do it). As agentic architectures continue to evolve, security frameworks must incorporate the interpretive semantics of tool descriptors alongside the reasoning dynamics of LLMs. For standardization and deployment, MCP and related protocols should adopt security-by-design extensions, treating tool descriptors as untrusted inputs and modeling robustness as a joint optimization problem over latency, interpretability, and semantic alignment.

11 Limitations and Future Work

While this study provides a structured analysis of adversarial behavior in MCP-integrated agentic systems, several limitations define directions for future work. Our evaluation, limited to three LLMs (GPT-4, DeepSeek, LLaMA-3.5) and eight prompting strategies, should be extended to lightweight, fine-tuned, and multi-agent models to capture broader patterns of vulnerability. Future research must also explore adaptive and temporally evolving adversaries that exploit memory persistence and feedback loops. The proposed cryptographic validation assumes a trusted infrastructure, motivating investigations into decentralized, blockchain-based registries and zero-knowledge verification. Similarly, LLM-on-LLM vetting depends on verifier alignment; ensemble and adversarially trained

verifiers may improve reliability. Beyond descriptor semantics, unexamined protocol threats, such as side-channel leakage, schema abuse, and prompt overflow, warrant attention. Moreover, our results reveal a clear trade-off between safety and latency, underscoring the need for adaptive, context-aware defenses that strike a balance between the two. Additionally, expanding evaluations to community-driven, large-scale benchmarks will enhance reproducibility and external validity. Collectively, these directions are crucial for developing resilient, trustworthy, and deployment-ready MCP-secured LLM ecosystems.

12 Threats to Validity

Despite a systematic evaluation across multiple LLMs, prompting strategies, and defense mechanisms, certain validity threats remain. Such issues are well-recognized in simulation-based security research [41]. Following Wohlin et al., we analyze both internal and external validity dimensions to clarify the scope and reliability of our findings.

Internal Validity: Although our experiments explicitly controlled prompt structure, model interface, and descriptor content, the evaluated LLMs are proprietary black-box systems with undocumented safety heuristics and preprocessing pipelines. Consequently, part of the observed behavior may stem from hidden alignment layers or vendor-specific fine-tuning rather than experimental manipulations alone. Additionally, despite randomizing the order of prompt and tool presentation, subtle linguistic biases in phrasing and naming may still impact model responses. We mitigated these impacts through multi-model replication and diverse prompting strategies, which reduce but cannot entirely eliminate confounding factors.

External Validity: Our controlled MCP simulation provides realistic conditions but cannot fully capture the complexity of large-scale deployments that include interactive feedback, runtime governance, and adaptive oversight. Moreover, our permissive integration policy emphasizes worst-case exposure, whereas enterprise-grade MCP systems typically enforce stricter vetting pipelines. Hence, although our results reveal inherent structural weaknesses in MCP workflows, the severity and exploitability of these vulnerabilities may vary across domains, trust models, and deployment scales.

13 Conclusion

This work analyzed adversarial security in MCP-based agentic systems, formalizing three novel threat classes—Tool Poisoning, Shadowing, and Rug Pulls. Experiments conducted across GPT-4, DeepSeek, and Llama-3.5 revealed a consistent susceptibility to descriptor-driven manipulation, exposing protocol-level vulnerabilities that extend beyond traditional alignment limits. Prompting strategies, especially Reflexion and Chain-of-Thought, enhanced detection but increased latency, confirming a measurable trade-off between safety and performance. We introduced a layered defense stack combining LLM-on-LLM semantic vetting, RSA manifest signing, and static heuristic guardrails, which improved block rates while maintaining operational feasibility.

References

- [1] 2024. Server Tools — Model Context Protocol (MCP) Specification (Draft). Online documentation. <https://modelcontextprotocol.info/specification/draft/server/tools/> Accessed on 2025-09-05.
- [2] Samuel Aidoo and AML Int Dip. 2025. Cryptocurrency and Financial Crime: Emerging Risks and Regulatory Responses. (2025).
- [3] Rohan Ajwani, Shashidhar Reddy Javaji, Frank Rudzicz, and Zining Zhu. 2024. LLM-generated black-box explanations can be adversarially helpful. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06800* (2024).
- [4] S Akheel. 2025. Guardrails for large language models: A review of techniques and challenges. *J Artif Intell Mach Learn & Data Sci* 3, 1 (2025), 2504–2512.

- [5] Anthropic. 2025. Our Framework for Developing Safe and Trustworthy Agents. Online article. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/our-framework-for-developing-safe-and-trustworthy-agents>.
- [6] Luca Beurer-Kellner, Beat Buesser, Ana-Maria Crețu, Edoardo Debenedetti, Daniel Dobos, Daniel Fabian, Marc Fischer, David Froelicher, Kathrin Grosse, Daniel Naeff, et al. 2025. Design patterns for securing llm agents against prompt injections. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08837* (2025).
- [7] Manish Bhatt, Vineeth Sai Narajala, and Idan Habler. 2025. Etdi: Mitigating tool squatting and rug pull attacks in model context protocol (mcp) by using oauth-enhanced tool definitions and policy-based access control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01333* (2025).
- [8] Gordon Owusu Boateng, Hani Sami, Ahmed Alagha, Hanae Elmekki, Ahmad Hammoud, Rabeb Mizouni, Azzam Mourad, Hadi Otrouk, Jamal Bentahar, Sami Muhaidat, et al. 2025. A survey on large language models for communication, network, and service management: Application insights, challenges, and future directions. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* (2025).
- [9] Jin Chen, Zheng Liu, Xu Huang, Chenwang Wu, Qi Liu, Gangwei Jiang, Yuanhao Pu, Yuxuan Lei, Xiaolong Chen, Xingmei Wang, et al. 2024. When large language models meet personalization: Perspectives of challenges and opportunities. *World Wide Web* 27, 4 (2024), 42.
- [10] Tian Dong, Minhui Xue, Guoxing Chen, Rayne Holland, Yan Meng, Shaofeng Li, Zhen Liu, and Haojin Zhu. 2023. The philosopher's stone: Trojaning plugins of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00374* (2023).
- [11] Xiang Fei, Xianwu Zheng, and Hao Feng. 2025. MCP-Zero: Proactive Toolchain Construction for LLM Agents from Scratch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01056* (2025).
- [12] Mohamed Amine Ferrag, Norbert Tihanyi, Djallel Hamouda, Leandros Maglaras, and Merouane Debbah. 2025. From Prompt Injections to Protocol Exploits: Threats in LLM-Powered AI Agents Workflows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.23260* (2025).
- [13] Florencio Cano Gabarda. 2025. Model Context Protocol (MCP): Understanding Security Risks and Controls. <https://www.redhat.com/en/blog/model-context-protocol-mcp-understanding-security-risks-and-controls>. Accessed: 2025-08-04.
- [14] John Halloran. 2025. MCP Safety Training: Learning to Refuse Falsely Benign MCP Exploits using Improved Preference Alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23634* (2025).
- [15] Mohammed Mehedi Hasan, Hao Li, Emad Fallahzadeh, Gopi Krishnan Rajbahadur, Bram Adams, and Ahmed E Hassan. 2025. Model context protocol (mcp) at first glance: Studying the security and maintainability of mcp servers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13538* (2025).
- [16] Mahbub Hassan, Md Emtiaz Kabir, Muzammil Jusoh, Hong Ki An, Michael Negnevitsky, and Chengjiang Li. 2025. Large Language Models in Transportation: A Comprehensive Bibliometric Analysis of Emerging Trends, Challenges and Future Research. *IEEE Access* (2025).
- [17] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Shenao Wang, and Haoyu Wang. 2025. Model Context Protocol (MCP): Landscape, Security Threats, and Future Research Directions. *arXiv:2503.23278* [cs.CR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.23278>
- [18] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Shenao Wang, and Haoyu Wang. 2025. Model context protocol (mcp): Landscape, security threats, and future research directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23278* (2025).
- [19] Dezhang Kong, Shi Lin, Zhenhua Xu, Zhebo Wang, Minghao Li, Yufeng Li, Yilun Zhang, Zeyang Sha, Yuyuan Li, Changting Lin, et al. 2025. A Survey of LLM-Driven AI Agent Communication: Protocols, Security Risks, and Defense Countermeasures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.19676* (2025).
- [20] Arvind Kumar, Ashish Gholve, and Kedar Kotalwar. 2024. *Automotive security solution using hardware security module (HSM)*. Technical Report. SAE Technical Paper.
- [21] Sonu Kumar, Anubhav Girdhar, Ritesh Patil, and Divyansh Tripathi. 2025. Mcp guardian: A security-first layer for safeguarding mcp-based ai system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.12757* (2025).
- [22] Yucheng Li, Surin Ahn, Huiqiang Jiang, Amir H Abdi, Yuqing Yang, and Lili Qiu. 2025. SecurityLingua: Efficient Defense of LLM Jailbreak Attacks via Security-Aware Prompt Compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.12707* (2025).
- [23] Zichuan Li, Jian Cui, Xiaojing Liao, and Luyi Xing. 2025. Les Dissonances: Cross-Tool Harvesting and Polluting in Multi-Tool Empowered LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.03111* (2025).
- [24] Anne Lott and Jerome P Reiter. 2020. Wilson confidence intervals for binomial proportions with multiple imputation for missing data. *The American Statistician* 74, 2 (2020), 109–115.
- [25] Weiqin Ma, Pu Duan, Sanmin Liu, Guofei Gu, and Jyh-Charn Liu. 2012. Shadow attacks: automatically evading system-call-behavior based malware detection. *Journal in Computer Virology* 8, 1 (2012), 1–13.
- [26] Shreekant Mandvikar. 2023. Augmenting intelligent document processing (IDP) workflows with contemporary large language models (LLMs). *International Journal of Computer Trends and Technology* 71, 10 (2023), 80–91.
- [27] Jeremy McHugh, Kristina Šekrst, and Jon Cefalu. 2025. Prompt Injection 2.0: Hybrid AI Threats. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.13169* (2025).

- [28] Vineeth Sai Narajala and Idan Habler. 2025. Enterprise-grade security for the model context protocol (mcp): Frameworks and mitigation strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08623* (2025).
- [29] Thanh Toan Nguyen, Nguyen Quoc Viet Hung, Thanh Tam Nguyen, Thanh Trung Huynh, Thanh Thi Nguyen, Matthias Weidlich, and Hongzhi Yin. 2024. Manipulating recommender systems: A survey of poisoning attacks and countermeasures. *Comput. Surveys* 57, 1 (2024), 1–39.
- [30] Ezezi Isaac Obilor and Eric Chikweru Amadi. 2018. Test for significance of Pearson’s correlation coefficient. *International Journal of Innovative Mathematics, Statistics & Energy Policies* 6, 1 (2018), 11–23.
- [31] János Pintz. 2007. Cramér vs. Cramér. On Cramér’s probabilistic model for primes. *Functiones et Approximatio Commentarii Mathematici* 37, 2 (2007), 361–376.
- [32] Brandon Radosevich and John Halloran. 2025. Mcp safety audit: Llms with the model context protocol allow major security exploits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.03767* (2025).
- [33] Partha Pratim Ray. 2025. A survey on model context protocol: Architecture, state-of-the-art, challenges and future directions. *Authorea Preprints* (2025).
- [34] Anjana Sarkar and Soumyendu Sarkar. 2025. Survey of LLM Agent Communication with MCP: A Software Design Pattern Centric Review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05364* (2025).
- [35] Oleksii I Sheremet, Oleksandr V Sadovoi, Kateryna S Sheremet, and Yuliia V Sokhina. 2024. Effective documentation practices for enhancing user interaction through GPT-powered conversational interfaces. *Applied Aspects of Information Technology* 7, 2 (2024), 135–150.
- [36] Aditi Singh, Abul Ehtesham, Saket Kumar, and Tala Talaei Khoei. 2025. A survey of the model context protocol (mcp): Standardizing context to enhance large language models (llms). (2025).
- [37] Lars St, Svante Wold, et al. 1989. Analysis of variance (ANOVA). *Chemometrics and intelligent laboratory systems* 6, 4 (1989), 259–272.
- [38] Tal Shapira / Reco.ai. 2025. MCP Security: Key Risks, Controls & Best Practices Explained. Online article. <https://www.reco.ai/learn/mcp-security> Updated August 7, 2025; accessed September 5, 2025.
- [39] Zhibo Wang, Jingjing Ma, Xue Wang, Jiahui Hu, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. 2022. Threats to training: A survey of poisoning attacks and defenses on machine learning systems. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 7 (2022), 1–36.
- [40] Zhiqiang Wang, Junyang Zhang, Guanquan Shi, HaoRan Cheng, Yunhao Yao, Kaiwen Guo, Haohua Du, and Xiang-Yang Li. 2025. MindGuard: Tracking, Detecting, and Attributing MCP Tool Poisoning Attack via Decision Dependence Graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20412* (2025).
- [41] Claes Wohlin, Per Runeson, Martin Höst, Magnus C Ohlsson, Björn Regnell, and Anders Wesslén. 2012. *Experimentation in software engineering*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [42] Andreas Wortmann. 2016. *An extensible component & connector architecture description infrastructure for multi-platform modeling*. Vol. 25. Shaker Verlag GmbH.