

# Agentic AI for Cyber Resilience: A New Security Paradigm and Its System-Theoretic Foundations

Tao Li and Quanyan Zhu\*

## Abstract

Cybersecurity is being fundamentally reshaped by foundation-model-based artificial intelligence. Large language models now enable autonomous planning, tool orchestration, and strategic adaptation at scale, challenging security architectures built on static rules, perimeter defenses, and human-centered workflows. This chapter argues for a shift from prevention-centric security toward *agentic cyber resilience*. Rather than seeking perfect protection, resilient systems must anticipate disruption, maintain critical functions under attack, recover efficiently, and learn continuously. We situate this shift within the historical evolution of cybersecurity paradigms, culminating in an *AI-augmented paradigm* where autonomous agents participate directly in sensing, reasoning, action, and adaptation across cyber and cyber-physical systems. We then develop a system-level framework for designing agentic AI workflows. A general agentic architecture is introduced, and attacker and defender workflows are analyzed as coupled adaptive processes, and game-theoretic formulations are shown to provide a unifying design language for autonomy allocation, information flow, and temporal composition. Case studies in automated penetration testing, remediation, and cyber deception illustrate how equilibrium-based design enables system-level resiliency design.

## 1 Introduction

Cybersecurity is currently undergoing a new wave of disruptive changes. The rapid emergence of *foundation-model-based AI*, including large language models and multimodal reasoning systems, has altered not only the scale of cyber threats but their fundamental character. These models enable reasoning, planning, and tool orchestration at a level of generality and flexibility that was previously unavailable. Attackers can now automate reconnaissance, generate adaptive exploits, and coordinate campaigns using foundation models as cognitive engines, while defenders face increasing system complexity, compressed decision timelines, and the limits of static rule-driven security architectures. This shift exposes structural mismatches between traditional security models and an environment shaped by general-purpose agentic intelligence.

Responding to such a disruption requires more than incremental improvements to existing tools. It calls for reexamining the foundational assumptions that govern how security is designed, operated, and integrated into complex socio-technical systems [76,

---

\*T. Li is with the Department of Systems Engineering, City University of Hong Kong; E-mail: li.tao@cityu.edu.hk; Q. Zhu is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, New York University; E-mail: qz494@nyu.edu. Correspondence should be addressed to T. Li.

26]. By revisiting the historical evolution of cybersecurity paradigms, we can clarify why prior approaches struggle under foundation-model-driven threats and what conceptual shifts are required to accommodate autonomous reasoning, strategic adaptation, and continuous interaction between attackers and defenders. At the same time, this historical perspective provides a basis for envisioning future security architectures that are resilient by design rather than brittle under change.

The following subsection therefore traces the evolution of cybersecurity through a sequence of paradigms, from early *laissez-faire* protection to the emerging AI-augmented, agentic, and resilience-oriented model. This perspective situates today’s disruption, driven by the foundationmodel, within a broader conceptual trajectory and motivates the shift toward agentic cyber resilience that frames the remainder of this chapter.

## 1.1 From Laissez-faire to AI-Augmented Paradigms

The evolution of cybersecurity can be understood as a sequence of distinct *paradigms*, progressing from early ad hoc protection to the emerging *AI-augmented paradigm* [22]. Each paradigm reflects a fundamentally different worldview regarding how security is conceptualized, implemented, and governed within socio-technical systems. Transitions between paradigms have been driven by the co-evolution of computing infrastructure, threat sophistication, and the shifting allocation of decision-making authority between humans and machines.

Viewed through a historical lens, these paradigms follow a clear temporal trajectory:

- **1P (1970s–1990s):** Laissez-faire security for isolated systems
- **2P (1990s–early 2000s):** Perimeter-based defense for networked systems
- **3P (2000s–2010s):** Reactive detection and incident response
- **4P (2010s–early 2020s):** Proactive, intelligence-driven defense
- **5P (2020s–):** AI-augmented, agentic, and resilience-oriented security

Although these paradigms frequently coexist in practice, each represents a qualitative shift in how security is understood, operationalized, and valued.

The **first paradigm**, the *laissez-faire paradigm (1P)*, was characterized by minimal regulation and largely reactive postures. Computing systems were relatively isolated, threats were assumed to be rare, and security was treated as a secondary engineering concern. Incident response was manual, localized, and slow, and resilience was not an explicit design consideration.

The **second paradigm**, the *perimeter paradigm (2P)*, emerged as networks expanded and organizational boundaries became digitally porous. Security architectures focused on separating trusted internal systems from untrusted external networks through firewalls, access controls, and intrusion prevention mechanisms. While this approach improved scalability, it proved structurally fragile: once the perimeter was breached, internal systems were often insufficiently protected.

The **third paradigm**, the *reactive paradigm (3P)*, arose in response to the increasing frequency and sophistication of cyber attacks. Defenders shifted from static protection to continuous monitoring and detection, deploying intrusion detection systems, antivirus software, and SIEM platforms. Security operations centers became institutionalized as

hubs for incident response. However, this paradigm remained fundamentally reactive and human-centric, characterized by alert fatigue, delayed response, and a tendency to treat attacks as isolated events rather than sustained adversarial campaigns.

The **fourth paradigm**, the *proactive paradigm (4P)*, marked a transition from reaction toward anticipation. Threat intelligence, risk modeling, red–blue team exercises, and threat hunting were introduced to infer attacker intent and disrupt campaigns earlier in their lifecycle. Despite these advances, proactive defense continued to rely heavily on expert judgment, hand-crafted heuristics, and static models, limiting scalability and adaptivity in the presence of fast-moving and AI-enabled adversaries [44, 45, 15, 14, 27].

The **fifth paradigm**, the *AI-augmented paradigm (5P)*, constitutes a fundamental departure from prior approaches. Its defining innovation is not merely the use of AI for automation, but the shift from human-supervised workflows to *AI-orchestrated, agentic security ecosystems*. Artificial intelligence, machine learning, and large language models operate across the full security lifecycle—from sensing and detection to response, recovery, and post-incident learning [37, 40]. Security is no longer treated as a static configuration problem, but as a continuous *sense–reason–act* process executed by autonomous, learning-enabled systems.

## 1.2 AI-Augmented Security Paradigm

What distinguishes 5P most clearly is the emergence of *agentic autonomy and adaptivity*. Security functions evolve from rule-based execution toward goal-directed behavior, where learning agents dynamically adjust strategies in response to uncertainty, feedback, and adversarial adaptation. Decisions arise from closed-loop optimization rather than fixed policies. At the same time, AI enables deep integration across traditionally siloed domains, bridging detection, forensics, patching, access control, and cyber–physical operations within a shared cognitive architecture.

Beyond operational efficiency, the fifth paradigm introduces cognitive and strategic awareness into cybersecurity. AI-augmented systems reason about intent, simulate adversarial behavior, and anticipate escalation, deception, and long-term adaptation. Defense becomes predictive and game-aware, shaped by ongoing interaction among intelligent agents on both sides. Rather than a monolithic defender, the security ecosystem consists of distributed, communicating, and self-organizing *agentic entities* whose collective behavior produces defensive intelligence.

Equally important, 5P reorients cybersecurity toward resilience [66, 60]. Instead of striving for perfect prevention, systems are designed to anticipate disruption, absorb shocks, recover functionality, and learn from failure. Resilience becomes a first-class design objective, reflecting the reality that absolute security is neither achievable nor economically sustainable. Through embedded learning and self-healing mechanisms, AI-augmented systems sustain mission continuity under persistent and adaptive threats.

In this sense, the fifth paradigm integrates security and resilience into a single adaptive process [75]. Where earlier paradigms sought to minimize risk through static controls, 5P embraces uncertainty and operates within a co-evolutionary landscape of intelligent adversaries. Security becomes a dynamic game of reasoning and adaptation among autonomous agents. The AI-augmented paradigm thus serves as the conceptual bridge to *agentic cyber resilience*, where artificial intelligence functions not merely as a support tool, but as a strategic actor embedded in the ongoing defense, recovery, and evolution of complex socio-technical systems.




Figure 1: **A general agentic AI architecture.** The figure depicts a canonical agentic system composed of a reasoning core (LLMs), persistent memory, tool interfaces, human-in-the-loop interaction, and an external environment. User requests are processed through memory-aware reasoning; the agent invokes tools to perceive and act upon the environment, receives structured feedback, and updates its internal state through learning. This closed-loop architecture supports long-horizon reasoning, adaptive behavior, and embodied interaction across digital and physical domains.

### 1.3 Structure of the Chapter

This chapter builds on the vision of the AI-augmented paradigm by developing a *system-level theory for agentic cyber resilience*. We begin in Section 2 by introducing a general architectural model for agentic AI workflows, clarifying the roles of memory, reasoning, tool invocation, human interaction, and environmental embodiment. We then examine how these architectural elements are instantiated within cybersecurity settings, with particular attention to advanced persistent threats and adversarial learning dynamics. In Chapter 3, we present the cyber kill chain under agentic AI, showing how the attacker and defender workflows become tightly coupled through continuous feedback and adaptation. We conceptualize this interaction as a strategic game among learning agents, drawing on concepts from game theory and control to reason about stability, incentives, and long-term behavior. The chapter then shifts from security to resilience in Section 4, discussing the temporal facets of proactive, responsive, and retrospective resilience, and explaining in Section 5 the frameworks for the design of agentic AI workflows. Finally, in Section 6, we discuss integrated cyber-physical systems, where agentic AI and physical AI jointly govern both digital and embodied processes.

## 2 Agentic AI for Security: Toward Agentic Defense Workflows

AI now plays a transformative role in complex decision-making systems by moving beyond narrow prediction and classification toward integrated cognition and action. On one hand, AI assists human operators in tasks such as monitoring, analysis, and decision support, for example, by summarizing large data streams, flagging anomalies, or recommending candidate actions. On the other hand, recent advances in learning, reasoning, and autonomy increasingly enable AI systems to *plan, decide, and act* with limited or intermittent human intervention across complex, multi-layered environments. This evolution marks a fundamental transition from tool-centric automation, where AI executes predefined functions, to *agentic AI*, in which AI systems are designed as goal-directed entities that continuously interact with humans, tools, and the external world.

Figure 1 presents a *general architectural template for agentic AI*, independent of specific application domains. The diagram organizes agentic intelligence into a small number of interacting blocks, each of which plays a distinct functional role.

**Reasoning Core (LLMs).** At the center of the architecture is a reasoning engine, instantiated here by large language models (LLMs). This component performs high-level interpretation, planning, and synthesis: it translates user requests and observations into internal representations, generates candidate plans, and reasons about multi-step courses of action. Unlike traditional pipelines that map inputs directly to outputs, the reasoning core supports deliberation, abstraction, and goal-conditioned behavior. Recent work on reasoning- and tool-augmented LLMs demonstrates that such models can decompose complex tasks, reason over intermediate states, and adapt plans based on feedback rather than executing static scripts (e.g., ReAct, Toolformer, and subsequent agent frameworks) [63, 51].

**Persistent Memory.** Above the reasoning core, the memory block provides a persistent state across interactions. This memory stores historical exchanges with users, prior tool results, contextual knowledge about the environment, and learned abstractions about the agent’s own behavior. Persistent memory enables temporal continuity: the agent can recognize recurring situations, accumulate experience, and reason over long horizons rather than reacting myopically to the current input. In practice, this memory may be implemented using vector databases for episodic retrieval, symbolic knowledge graphs for structured reasoning, or hybrid episodic-semantic memory systems [32, 30]. Such mechanisms are essential for situational awareness, personalization, and continual learning from past successes and failures.

**Tool Interfaces.** The lower block of the diagram represents the agent’s interface to external tools. Rather than directly manipulating the environment, the agent issues structured *tool calls* to sensing, analytics, simulation, optimization, or control modules, and receives structured *tool results* in return. Examples include querying monitoring dashboards, invoking data analysis pipelines, running simulations or digital twins, or triggering automated control actions. This paradigm, exemplified by modern agent frameworks, grounds the agent’s reasoning in real system state and measurable outcomes rather than purely symbolic inference [51, 55]. The feedback loop formed by tool invocation, result

interpretation, and memory update constitutes the computational substrate for adaptive, goal-directed behavior.

**Human-in-the-Loop.** A defining feature of the architecture is the explicit inclusion of human-in-the-loop interaction. Humans may issue high-level requests, refine objectives, provide corrective feedback, supervise tool execution, or intervene in critical decisions. Rather than remaining external supervisors, human operators are integrated as first-class components of the agentic loop. This integration supports alignment, accountability, and trust, particularly in high-stakes settings such as cybersecurity, healthcare, and critical infrastructure. Importantly, the architecture supports adjustable autonomy: agents may operate independently under routine conditions, while deferring to human judgment when uncertainty, risk, or ethical considerations exceed predefined thresholds, a principle emphasized in human–AI teaming and mixed-initiative control literature [3].

**Environment and Embodiment.** On the right side of the diagram, the environment represents the external world with which the agent interacts. This environment may include digital systems (e.g., software services, networks), physical systems (e.g., robots, industrial processes), organizational processes, and other agents. Actions taken by the agent, mediated through tools, alter the environment, while observations of those changes are fed back via sensing and analytics. This embodiment closes a continuous sense–reason–act–learn loop, distinguishing agentic AI from static automation or batch learning systems. By embedding cognition within ongoing interaction with the world, agentic AI supports adaptation under uncertainty and nonstationarity, aligning with foundational perspectives in embodied intelligence and adaptive control systems [8].

**Integration.** The components in Fig. 1 form a closed-loop architecture in which reasoning, memory, tools, human oversight, and environmental interaction are tightly coupled. The reasoning core generates plans and actions; tools ground those plans in operational reality; memory provides continuity and learning; humans ensure alignment and accountability; and the environment supplies feedback that drives adaptation. This architecture is intentionally domain-agnostic, serving as a general template for agentic systems across application areas, and providing the conceptual foundation for instantiating agentic AI in adversarial and resilience-critical domains such as cybersecurity.

Although Fig. 1 is domain-agnostic, it provides a powerful conceptual foundation for applying agentic AI to cybersecurity and defense. When instantiated in security settings, each architectural block acquires a concrete operational meaning grounded in adversarial environments, where intelligent attackers probe, adapt, and persist over time. In this context, the *environment* corresponds to enterprise networks, cloud infrastructures, endpoints, users, and cyber–physical systems such as industrial control systems or autonomous platforms [56, 28, 57, 80, 48, 79]. The state of this environment evolves continuously as legitimate users interact with systems, configurations change, and adversaries conduct reconnaissance, exploitation, and lateral movement. For example, in an advanced persistent threat (APT) intrusion [78, 71, 24, 25, 33, 18], early-stage reconnaissance may manifest as subtle shifts in network traffic distributions, anomalous authentication attempts against privileged accounts, or unusual process executions that individually appear benign but collectively signal adversarial intent. An agentic defense system treats these changes as part of a dynamic environment rather than isolated events, continuously updating its situational awareness as the intrusion unfolds.

The *tool interfaces* in Fig. 1 map naturally to the diverse ecosystem of cybersecurity instrumentation and control mechanisms. These include network- and host-based monitors, intrusion detection and prevention systems, log aggregation and analytics platforms, vulnerability scanners, sandboxing environments, and response mechanisms such as access-control reconfiguration or service isolation [52, 50]. Through structured tool calls, an agentic AI can query measurements, invoke simulations to assess the impact of potential actions, or execute containment measures. For instance, during an advanced persistent threat (APT) campaign, the agent may call a network flow analyzer to determine whether low-volume outbound traffic corresponds to covert data exfiltration, or invoke a sandbox to analyze a suspicious binary before deciding whether to isolate the affected host. Such tool-mediated interactions ground the agent’s reasoning in measurable system states and observable outcomes, a critical requirement for operating in adversarial environments [63, 51].

The *persistent memory* component plays a critical role in adversarial reasoning. In cybersecurity, memory encodes attack histories, indicators of compromise, system configurations, and learned threat models accumulated across incidents. By retaining contextual knowledge over time, the agent can recognize recurring attack patterns, correlate seemingly isolated alerts into coherent campaigns, and learn from past encounters [42]. In the APT setting, memory enables the agent to associate current activity, such as credential reuse or privilege escalation, with earlier reconnaissance phases observed weeks or months prior, thereby identifying persistence strategies that would evade short-term detection mechanisms. This form of temporal continuity is essential for defending against adversaries whose defining characteristics are patience, stealth, and iterative adaptation [2].

At the center of the architecture, the *reasoning core* synthesizes observations from tools and memory to form hypotheses about adversarial intent and to generate candidate defense strategies. Rather than merely classifying events as benign or malicious, an agentic AI reasons about sequences of actions, anticipates attacker responses, and evaluates tradeoffs among competing objectives such as containment speed, operational disruption, intelligence collection, and forensic value. For example, when an APT foothold is suspected, the agent may deliberate between immediately isolating a compromised host, which reduces risk but may reveal detection, and allowing limited interaction within a controlled environment to observe attacker behavior and infer objectives. As new evidence arrives, the reasoning core revises its hypotheses and adapts its strategy accordingly, reflecting principles studied in adversarial learning and sequential decision-making under uncertainty [5, 23].

Human-in-the-loop interaction remains essential in security-critical deployments. Analysts may provide high-level objectives, validate or override automated actions, or supply contextual knowledge that is difficult to infer from data alone, such as business criticality, regulatory constraints, or geopolitical considerations. An agentic defense system therefore operates with adjustable autonomy: it handles routine detection and response actions independently, while escalating ambiguous or high-impact situations, such as suspected compromise of mission-critical assets, to human operators. This mixed-initiative collaboration aligns with best practices in human–AI teaming and supports accountability and trust in high-stakes cyber operations [3, 35].

When these components are integrated, the general agentic architecture gives rise to *agentic defense workflows*. In such workflows, AI systems do not merely analyze security data post hoc, but actively participate in the cyber defense loop. They continuously sense the environment through tools, reason about evolving threats using memory and plan-

ning, act through response and deception mechanisms, and learn from the outcomes of those actions. In an APT scenario, this may involve autonomously detecting early reconnaissance, deploying adaptive deception to mislead the adversary, selectively containing exploitation attempts, and updating threat models to improve detection of future campaigns. Viewed through this lens, cyber defense becomes a closed-loop, learning-enabled, and adversarially aware process rather than a static monitoring function.

### 3 Agentic AI in the Cyber Kill Chain

Despite the fact that earlier waves of AI-enabled cybersecurity already incorporated elements of reasoning, learning, and automation, these capabilities were typically expensive and tightly coupled to specialized expertise. Advanced reasoning engines, large-scale simulations, and expert-driven analytics were accessible only to well-resourced organizations and were often confined to isolated segments of the security workflow. As a result, intelligent decision-making remained centralized, slow to adapt, and limited in both scale and scope.

The emergence of agentic AI fundamentally alters this landscape. By significantly lowering the cost of reasoning, planning, and adaptation, and by reducing the dependence on scarce domain expertise, agentic AI makes sophisticated decision-making broadly accessible. Both attackers and defenders can now easily acquire and integrate agentic AI services into their workflows, often as modular components that interoperate with existing tools and infrastructure. This democratization of autonomy means that agentic reasoning is no longer the exclusive advantage of a single side; instead, it permeates the entire cyber-ecosystem, and it enables rapid adoption on both offense and defense.

#### 3.1 Cyber Kill and Defense Chains

The cyber kill chain describes a *linear* sequence of attacker actions, progressing from reconnaissance and weaponization to exploitation and the achievement of objectives. This abstraction is particularly well-suited for characterizing *advanced persistent threats* (APTs), which unfold over extended time horizons and adapt continuously in response to defensive measures. APTs are distinguished by stealthy reconnaissance, staged and selective exploitation, and iterative refinement of tactics based on observed system and defender behavior.

In recent years, APT campaigns have become markedly more sophisticated as they increasingly leverage artificial intelligence, large-scale automation, and substantial organizational resources. AI-enhanced reconnaissance, adaptive malware, and automated command-and-control have expanded the speed, scale, and persistence of such operations. At the level of nation-state actors, these capabilities blur the boundary between cyber operations and strategic conflict, elevating APT activity from isolated intrusions to sustained campaigns that resemble digital warfare in both intent and impact.

When agentic AI systems participate, it is not merely the linear structure of the kill chain that changes. Rather, the attacker’s kill chain becomes tightly *intertwined* with a corresponding defensive chain, reflecting the co-evolutionary nature of modern APT campaigns. Both attackers and defenders deploy autonomous agents that sense, reason, and act in continuous, coupled feedback loops. Reconnaissance is met with anticipatory monitoring, exploitation with adaptive containment, and long-term persistence with

automated recovery and dynamic reconfiguration. The kill chain thus evolves from a one-directional sequence into a coupled attacker–defender interaction, enabled and accelerated by agentic intelligence on both sides.

Table 1 illustrates this dual-use nature by showing how agentic AI can serve simultaneously as an enabler of offense and as an architect of defense across every stage of the cyber kill chain. The same underlying capabilities, including autonomous exploration, contextual reasoning, and adaptive learning, can be leveraged for exploit discovery and exploit mitigation, social engineering, and cognitive defense, as well as command-and-control (C2) and counter-C2 mechanisms.

On the offensive side, agentic AI enables large-scale reconnaissance, automated vulnerability discovery, adaptive malware generation, and resilient C2 coordination [4, 2, 16, 11]. On the defensive side, these same capabilities support anticipatory monitoring, threat hunting, adaptive containment, deception, and automated recovery, transforming defense from static protection into a continuous, learning-driven process [5, 42]. This symmetry underscores that agentic AI does not inherently favor offense or defense, but instead reshapes the cyber kill chain into a co-evolutionary arena in which intelligent agents on both sides learn, adapt, and counter-adapt over time.

### 3.2 Agentic AI Arms Race

This dual-use nature of agentic AI raises a central question: *if both sides employ agentic AI, who will win, and how?* The answer is nontrivial because cybersecurity is intrinsically asymmetric. Attackers need to succeed only once to achieve impact, while defenders must succeed continuously across time, assets, and attack vectors. A single overlooked vulnerability, misconfiguration, or delayed response can invalidate an otherwise robust defensive posture. Defenders, moreover, must operate under constraints imposed by usability, availability, regulatory compliance, and operational cost constraints that attackers do not share.

Agentic AI does not eliminate this asymmetry; in many cases, it *amplifies* it. Autonomous attack agents can probe vast attack surfaces, explore rare corner cases, and rapidly mutate tactics at machine speed. They can parallelize exploration, personalize attacks, and exploit distribution shifts faster than human-centered defense workflows can respond. Defensive agents, by contrast, must balance detection accuracy against false positives, manage limited response resources, and preserve mission continuity. Even as defensive models improve, the combinatorial space of possible attacks continues to expand, preserving a persistent advantage for offense.

An example of such adversarial dynamics is found in adaptive malware detection and evasion, a problem explicitly addressed in recent adversarial AI defense efforts such as DARPA’s *Guaranteed AI Robustness for Decision-Making (GARD)* program [10]. In this setting, defenders deploy machine-learning models trained on static and dynamic representations to detect malicious software at scale, while anticipating that attackers will actively probe and adapt to learned decision boundaries [5, 23].

Attackers respond by algorithmically generating obfuscated or polymorphic variants that preserve malicious functionality while shifting feature representations outside the detector’s training distribution, often optimizing evasion through automated search or reinforcement learning [4]. Defenders counter by retraining models, incorporating more semantically grounded features, or deploying ensemble detection pipelines, only for attackers to adapt again by exploiting structural blind spots such as delayed execution,

environmental triggers, or benign-behavior mimicry.

This detect–evade–retrain–counter-evade cycle is not an implementation flaw but a structural property of learning-based defense in adversarial environments [5]. It reflects a repeated interaction between intelligent agents with opposing objectives, underscoring that adversarial learning in cybersecurity must be understood as a *dynamic strategic game*, rather than a one-shot classification problem. Cyber conflict becomes an *arms race among learning agents*. Each side improves its models, tools, and strategies in response to the other. Progress on one side induces counter-progress on the other, resulting in a continuous race rather than a terminal victory. This race unfolds across multiple time scales: tactical adaptation during an incident, operational learning across campaigns, and strategic investment in capabilities over months or years [62, 61, 40].

### 3.3 Game-Theoretic Frameworks and Cyber Resilience

Game theory provides a natural and principled language for analyzing and designing such adversarial interactions [41, 77, 53, 46, 29, 47, 74]. In agentic cyber environments, attackers and defenders are not static entities but strategic decision makers whose actions influence one another over time. Game-theoretic models capture this interdependence by explicitly representing objectives, information structures, and strategic choices under uncertainty.

At the *tactical level*, games model real-time attacker–defender interactions during ongoing incidents. Here, game formulations help reason about optimal response actions, adaptive containment policies, and the strategic use of deception, such as honeypots or moving-target defenses [73, 7]. Uncertainty about attacker intent, system state, and future actions can be formalized through incomplete-information or stochastic games, enabling defenders to anticipate adversarial reactions rather than responding myopically to observed events.

At the *strategic level*, game-theoretic reasoning captures longer-term dynamics, including capability investment, information asymmetry, commitment strategies, and deterrence. Repeated and dynamic games provide a framework for understanding how learning agents adapt across campaigns, how credibility and reputation emerge, and how persistent advantages or stalemates can arise over time [65, 59, 39, 76, 36]. These models are particularly relevant in settings involving nation-state actors, where cyber operations are embedded within broader geopolitical and economic considerations.

By framing agentic cyber conflict as a game between adaptive, learning players, one can reason not only about immediate best responses, but also about equilibrium behavior, incentive alignment, and stability under continual adaptation. This perspective enables the design of defense strategies that are robust not just to current attacks, but to future adversarial learning and strategic evolution, which is an essential requirement for resilient cyber defense.

Beyond providing a lens for analyzing adversarial behavior, a game-theoretic framework also offers a principled pathway toward *resilience*. In adaptive attacker–defender settings, preventing every successful attack is neither realistic nor necessary. Instead, the objective shifts to sustaining acceptable system performance over time despite persistent and intelligent adversarial pressure. From this perspective, “winning” the cyber game means limiting attacker impact, preserving critical functionality, and enabling rapid recovery rather than achieving perfect prevention.

Game-theoretic reasoning naturally supports this shift by modeling repeated interac-

tion, strategic adaptation, and incentive alignment [72, 81, 75]. By explicitly accounting for how today’s defensive actions shape future attacker behavior, game-based approaches enable the design of strategies that stabilize long-term outcomes even as adversaries learn and evolve. Resilience thus emerges not as a static property, but as a strategic equilibrium of ongoing cyber conflict, an outcome that is both achievable and essential in agentic security environments.

## 4 Agentic AI for Cyber Resilience as the Next Frontier

As agentic AI accelerates defense, it also accelerates the threat landscape. Attackers can now leverage widely available AI tools to automate reconnaissance, exploitation, and campaign orchestration at scales and speeds that were previously impractical. This paradigm shift requires a move beyond cybersecurity as prevention alone toward *cyber resilience*: the ability to absorb disruption, maintain critical functions, recover rapidly, and learn from attacks.

Whereas security emphasizes *prevention and protection*, resilience focuses on *continuity and recovery*. It acknowledges that breaches are inevitable and that no system, regardless of defensive sophistication, can remain impenetrable indefinitely. A resilient system is therefore not defined by immunity to attack, but by its capacity to sustain mission-critical functions, degrade gracefully, and recover intelligently. Failure is treated not as a terminal condition, but as a source of information that drives adaptation and improvement.

The growing importance of resilience is driven by three converging realities. First, the expansion of the attack surface through ubiquitous connectivity and cyber–physical integration renders comprehensive protection infeasible. Second, adversaries increasingly exploit human and cognitive vulnerabilities, such as trust, bias, and attention, against which purely technical defenses offer limited protection. Third, autonomous and agentic AI systems capable of launching, coordinating, and adapting attacks at machine speed fundamentally alter the tempo and structure of cyber conflict. Under these conditions, resilience becomes the defining attribute of sustainable security: it enables systems to operate under uncertainty and persist through continuous disruption.

Resilience does not replace security; rather, the two are complementary [75]. Security mechanisms aim to prevent and detect intrusions, while resilience mechanisms ensure recovery, adaptation, and continuity once defenses are breached. Because defensive resources, including computation, time, human attention, and operational flexibility, are inherently finite, there exists a nontrivial tradeoff between investment in prevention and investment in recovery. Some vulnerabilities are best addressed through hardening, monitoring, and rapid patching; others are more effectively managed through resilience strategies that enable rapid reconfiguration or controlled degradation. Determining this balance is not a matter of intuition, but of formal reasoning.

### 4.1 Facets of Cyber Resilience

Cyber resilience is inherently temporal. It concerns not only whether a system can withstand a disruption at a given instant, but how it behaves across the full lifecycle of

adversarial interaction. A resilient cyber system must therefore operate coherently before, during, and after an incident, adapting its behavior as conditions evolve over time.

Before an incident occurs, the system must anticipate potential disruptions and prepare to mitigate their impact. During an incident, it must respond rapidly under uncertainty to preserve mission-critical functionality. After the incident, it must analyze what occurred, extract actionable insights, and update its models, policies, and configurations to improve future performance. These temporal phases are distinct but tightly coupled: preparation shapes response, response generates experience, and experience informs future anticipation.

To capture this structure, cyber resilience can be decomposed into three interdependent mechanisms: *proactive*, *responsive*, and *retrospective* resilience [66]. Together, these mechanisms form the temporal backbone of adaptive cyber defense, transforming resilience from a static property into a continuously evolving capability.

**Proactive resilience.** Proactive resilience captures the system’s anticipatory capacity to foresee potential disruptions and mitigate their impact before they occur. It manifests at design and planning stages through architectural diversification, redundancy, moving-target defenses, and strategic deception. By embedding heterogeneity into components and pathways, the system reduces its exposure to single points of failure and large-scale compromise. Agentic AI augments proactive resilience by simulating adversarial behavior, identifying high-risk attack surfaces, and autonomously deploying preemptive countermeasures. Through continuous monitoring and meta-learning, AI agents maintain a dynamic understanding of threat evolution, enabling defenses to adapt even in the absence of explicit attacks [43, 34].

**Responsive resilience.** Responsive resilience governs real-time adaptation once a disruption has occurred. It encompasses rapid diagnosis, containment, and reconfiguration to maintain essential operations under stress. Traditional reactive defenses rely heavily on predefined playbooks and human intervention; by contrast, agentic AI introduces adaptive, autonomous responses. Intelligent agents can localize breaches, isolate compromised components, reroute data flows, and reallocate computational resources in real time. Operating under partial observability, these agents employ learning- and control-based reasoning to balance containment speed against operational impact. By distributing responses across multiple agents, the system achieves faster reaction times and improved fault tolerance without centralized control.

**Retrospective resilience.** Retrospective resilience reflects the system’s capacity to learn and evolve after an incident. It includes forensic analysis, causal attribution, and post-event policy refinement. Agentic AI accelerates this process by reconstructing attack trajectories, correlating indicators of compromise, and generating structured representations (e.g., attack graphs or knowledge graphs) that encode causal dependencies. From these representations, agents identify recurring weaknesses and update defensive strategies accordingly. This process transforms operational experience into structural knowledge, closing the loop between failure and adaptation.

These three mechanisms form a continuous cycle of sensing, reasoning, and acting across time. Proactive anticipation informs real-time response, while the outcomes of the response feed back into future anticipation and learning. This recursive structure elevates resilience from a passive property to an active, self-reinforcing process. Agentic

AI provides the cognitive substrate for this process by automating perception, decision-making, and adaptation across temporal scales. Through distributed intelligence and game-aware coordination, it enables cyber systems to move beyond static defense toward dynamic resilience, which is an operating regime in which security is not merely preserved, but continuously renewed through interaction, learning, and strategic adaptation.

## 4.2 Agentic AI Workflows for Cyber Resilience

The notion of a *security workflow* has traditionally referred to a sequence of operations that detect, analyze, and respond to cyber incidents. In classical architectures, such workflows are implemented as static, rule-based control loops, for example, the canonical *detect-respond* cycle used in security operations centers (SOCs). While effective for routine events, these loops are fundamentally reactive and lack the capacity to generalize across dynamic and uncertain environments. They assume that threats evolve more slowly than the human decision cycle and that policy updates can be introduced manually. Such assumptions no longer hold in the era of autonomous, adaptive, and AI-generated attacks.

Agentic AI transforms these workflows from static pipelines into *dynamic, adaptive ecosystems*. Instead of a single feedback loop between detection and response, agentic workflows comprise multiple interlocking loops of sensing, reasoning, and acting that operate concurrently across spatial and temporal scales. Each loop is managed by one or more AI agents that perceive their local environment, share contextual knowledge, and execute coordinated decisions. This distributed structure mirrors the principles of cybernetic control but extends them through machine learning and cooperative reasoning. The result is an architecture capable of continuous adaptation, self-healing, and anticipatory defense.

At the core of these workflows are three defining properties: autonomy, contextual awareness, and adaptive decision-making. *High autonomy* refers to the ability of AI agents to function with minimal human supervision, executing end-to-end tasks that range from vulnerability discovery to remediation. Autonomy enables security systems to sustain operations under degraded conditions, respond faster than human analysts, and perform large-scale actions across distributed infrastructures. For example, an agentic patch management system can autonomously identify exploitable configurations, generate corrective code, and validate its impact using reinforcement signals derived from network performance metrics.

*Contextual awareness* denotes the ability of agents to maintain continuity of understanding across tasks and over time. Traditional automation treats each task in isolation, relying on static signatures or short-term inputs. Agentic AI, by contrast, constructs persistent cognitive states that integrate historical evidence, environmental cues, and multi-agent interactions. Through memory architectures and knowledge representations such as semantic graphs, agents preserve and share context across detection, response, and recovery cycles. This continuity allows them to reason about causal dependencies; e.g., linking an anomalous network flow to a misconfiguration pattern observed hours earlier, and to coordinate responses that account for systemwide implications rather than localized anomalies.

*Adaptive decision-making* encapsulates the ability to adjust strategies dynamically based on feedback and evolving objectives. Rather than relying on fixed response playbooks, agentic workflows employ learning algorithms that continuously refine their poli-

cies. Reinforcement learning, game-theoretic reasoning, and Bayesian inference allow agents to evaluate tradeoffs between competing goals such as containment speed, resource cost, and collateral impact [17]. As a result, decisions evolve as the environment changes: defensive agents can escalate or de-escalate their actions depending on adversarial behavior, confidence levels, and mission priorities. This adaptivity transforms cybersecurity from a rule-based discipline into a dynamic control process driven by feedback and optimization.

Agentic workflows can be organized hierarchically to support resilience at multiple levels of abstraction. At the *micro level*, operational agents handle immediate tasks such as packet inspection, anomaly scoring, and access verification. At the *meso level*, coordination agents synthesize inputs from lower tiers, allocate resources, and harmonize local actions with global objectives. At the *macro level*, strategic agents engage in meta-reasoning: they analyze long-term trends, evaluate performance metrics, and adjust the policies governing lower layers. This hierarchical composition produces a multi-scale control architecture analogous to those found in biological immune systems or distributed sensor networks, which are systems that achieve global robustness through the local intelligence of many autonomous entities.

These interwoven workflows embody the principles of *resilient autonomy*. They are not pre-programmed routines but evolving processes capable of reorganizing themselves in response to internal degradation or external pressure. For instance, when a subset of agents is compromised, neighboring agents can infer the disruption, quarantine the affected region, and reallocate responsibilities through consensus protocols. Similarly, when environmental uncertainty increases, agents can switch from deterministic policies to probabilistic exploration, ensuring coverage across the threat space. In both cases, resilience emerges as an emergent property of adaptive coordination rather than as a static defensive layer.

## 5 Toward a System Theory for Agentic AI Workflow Design

Achieving the resilience-oriented goals outlined in the previous sections requires more than isolated algorithmic advances. It calls for a *system theory* of agentic AI workflow design that clarifies how perception, reasoning, memory, tools, and human interaction should be structured, composed, and coordinated. Without such principles, agentic AI systems risk becoming ad hoc collections of components rather than coherent, robust decision-making architectures.

A central challenge is that agentic AI workflows can take fundamentally different forms, depending on how intelligence, control, and feedback are organized. Before addressing questions of optimality, it is therefore necessary to understand the *structural archetypes* of agentic workflows and the design tradeoffs they entail. Figures 2–5 illustrate four canonical workflow patterns that arise in practice.

### 5.1 Workflow Archetypes

**Simple agent-in-the-loop workflows.** Figure 2 depicts the simplest form of an agentic workflow, which closely resembles an enhanced chatbot interaction between a human user and an LLM. In this setting, the agent is primarily realized through *prompt engi-*

*neering*: user instructions, contextual prompts, and tool descriptions are composed to guide the model’s responses. The LLM interprets user intent, optionally invokes external tools, and returns generated outputs, but it does so within a single-turn or loosely coupled multi-turn interaction pattern.

Functionally, the agent acts as a conversational interface that mediates between the user and underlying computational resources. There is no explicit separation between reasoning, memory, and control, and any context required for decision-making must be reintroduced through prompts at each interaction. As a result, state persistence is shallow, implicit, and fragile, relying on prompt context rather than structured memory or internal state evolution.

Such workflows are effective for information retrieval, exploratory analysis, and lightweight decision support, where tasks can be completed within short interaction horizons. However, they lack persistent memory, long-horizon planning, and closed-loop feedback with the environment. Consequently, behavior remains largely reactive and myopic, with no principled mechanism for learning from outcomes, adapting strategies over time, or sustaining autonomous operation.

**Static multi-stage workflows.** Figure 3 illustrates a more structured class of agentic workflows, in which multiple agents or agentic components are composed into a pre-defined sequence of stages. Common examples include pipelines for query generation, external information retrieval, validation, and summarization, where each stage performs a specialized function and passes its output downstream. This decomposition improves modularity, interpretability, and task-level performance compared to single-agent workflows.

Despite these advantages, the defining characteristic of static multi-stage workflows is that their control flow and role assignment are fixed at design time. The workflow topology does not change in response to environmental feedback, unexpected outcomes, or adversarial manipulation. Agents execute prescribed roles without the ability to re-allocate authority, skip stages, revisit earlier decisions, or introduce new subtasks dynamically. If upstream assumptions are violated or downstream conditions change, the workflow lacks mechanisms for self-correction beyond human intervention. Consequently, static workflows remain effective for well-structured, predictable tasks, but struggle in domains such as cybersecurity, resilience engineering, or strategic planning, where uncertainty, deception, and adaptation are intrinsic. From a system-theoretic viewpoint, these workflows represent a transitional stage between scripted automation and fully dynamic agentic systems, offering structure without true autonomy.

**Decentralized sequential workflows.** Figure 4 depicts a decentralized sequential agentic workflow, in which multiple agents operate in a staged manner, each performing localized reasoning and invoking tools relevant to its assigned subtask. Information and intermediate results are passed sequentially from one agent to the next, forming a pipeline of agentic decision-making rather than a centrally orchestrated process. In this architecture, decision authority is distributed across agents, with each agent responsible for interpreting its inputs, interacting with tools, and producing outputs that condition subsequent stages. This decomposition improves modularity, scalability, and fault isolation, as individual agents can be modified or replaced without redesigning the entire workflow.




Figure 2: Simple agent-in-the-loop workflow, where an LLM-assisted agent mediates between a human user and external tools through prompt-driven interaction, without persistent memory or long-horizon adaptation.




Figure 3: Static multi-stage agentic workflow with predefined roles and fixed control flow, suitable for structured tasks but limited in adaptivity under changing or adversarial conditions.

**Dynamic, closed-loop agentic workflows.** Figure 5 illustrates fully dynamic agentic workflows in which control flow is not pre-specified, but instead emerges from continuous interaction among agents, tools, memory, and the environment. Agents repeatedly sense system state, reason over evolving context, invoke tools, and update internal memory, forming a closed-loop *sense-reason-act-learn* cycle. Rather than progressing through a fixed sequence of stages, the workflow adapts online, allowing agents to revise plans, switch roles, and reconfigure behavior in response to feedback, uncertainty, and adversarial actions.

A key enabler of such workflows is the availability of a shared, structured mechanism for managing and exchanging context across agents and tools. Recent efforts, such as the *Model Context Protocol (MCP)*, provide a unifying interface for representing task state, intermediate results, tool affordances, and environmental observations in a machine-interpretable form. By externalizing and standardizing context, MCP-like protocols allow agents to coordinate dynamically, invoke heterogeneous tools, and maintain coherent long-horizon reasoning without relying on rigid orchestration logic. This capability is essential for scaling agentic workflows beyond handcrafted pipelines toward adaptive, self-directed systems.

Dynamic closed-loop workflows are particularly well-suited for adversarial and resilience-critical settings. In cybersecurity, they enable defenders to continuously adapt to attacker behavior by revisiting hypotheses, re-prioritizing actions, and balancing competing ob-




Figure 4: Decentralized sequential agentic workflow, where multiple agents perform localized reasoning and tool interaction in a staged, handoff-driven sequence.




Figure 5: Dynamic closed-loop agentic workflow, in which agents interact with tools, memory, and the environment through continual feedback, enabling adaptive reasoning, action, and self-reconfiguration.

jectives such as containment, deception, and intelligence collection. More broadly, these workflows support long-horizon planning, adaptive role assignment, and autonomous recovery, making them a foundational architectural pattern for agentic AI systems operating in nonstationary and contested environments.

## 5.2 Toward Optimal System-Level Design

The value of a system-theoretic framework for agentic AI lies not only in its ability to analyze adversarial interactions, but in its capacity to *guide the design of workflows themselves*. In complex agentic systems, design choices, such as how many agents to deploy, what roles they assume, how information and memory are distributed, and when humans are engaged, fundamentally shape performance, robustness, and resilience. Absent a principled framework, these choices are often made in an ad hoc manner, hindering systematic comparison, optimization, and guarantees at the system level.

### 5.2.1 A Stackelberg Case Study for Optimal Agentic Workflow Design

One illustrative case study of system-level agentic workflow design arises in the context of *automated penetration testing and remediation*, where multiple agentic AI components must be coordinated to jointly optimize security and resilience objectives [20, 21]. In contrast to monolithic automation, this setting naturally lends itself to a *game-theoretic formulation*, in which agents operate under asymmetric information and sequential decision-

making. The *PenHeal* framework provides a concrete example of how such interactions can be structured and optimized using a Stackelberg game formulation.

PenHeal adopts a two-agent Stackelberg model in which decision-making unfolds sequentially. The first agent, the *pentest agent*, explores the target system by emulating attacker behavior and identifying exploitable vulnerabilities. The second agent, the *heal agent*, observes the pentest outcomes and subsequently determines an optimal remediation strategy subject to operational and cost constraints. In this hierarchy, the heal agent assumes the role of the Stackelberg leader, anticipating the information revealed by the pentest agent and selecting countermeasures that maximize overall system security and resilience. The pentest agent, in turn, functions as a follower whose exploration policy reveals latent weaknesses in the system.

This sequential structure is critical from a workflow design perspective. Rather than treating vulnerability discovery and remediation as loosely coupled tasks, the Stackelberg formulation explicitly captures their *strategic interdependence*. The exploration behavior of the pentest agent shapes the information available to the heal agent, while the remediation actions chosen by the heal agent alter the future attack surface and adversarial incentives. By modeling this interaction explicitly, the workflow can be optimized at the *system level*, rather than by locally optimizing each agent in isolation.

Several important outcomes emerge from this two-agent design. First, the coordinated Stackelberg workflow improves *vulnerability coverage*, as the pentest agent is incentivized to explore diverse attack paths instead of repeatedly exploiting the same weaknesses. Second, the heal agent’s optimization balances remediation effectiveness against cost and operational disruption, selecting actions that provide maximal security impact under resource constraints rather than defaulting to overly aggressive patching. Empirical results reported in the PenHeal study demonstrate that this strategic coordination yields higher remediation effectiveness and reduced operational overhead compared to non-strategic, decoupled baselines.

### 5.2.2 Gestalt Game-Theoretic Framework for Agentic Workflow Composition

The framework developed in our prior work [1] provides another foundational approach for the *system-level design of agentic AI workflows* by modeling them as a *coupled system of strategic decision processes*. Rather than treating agents or tasks as isolated optimization problems, the framework explicitly captures how local decision-making units are linked through shared state evolution, information dependencies, and adversarial responses. Each agent operates within a localized task environment under uncertainty and strategic pressure, while its actions reshape the conditions faced by the downstream agents and by the adversary itself. This gestalt perspective enables reasoning about agentic workflows as coherent *systems of systems*, rather than as loosely connected pipelines of automation.

From a workflow design standpoint, this formulation yields a set of actionable system-level principles. First, it provides a principled basis for determining *where decision authority should reside* within a multi-agent workflow. Some decisions benefit from localized autonomy to enable fast reaction, scalability, and robustness to partial failure, while others require coordination or hierarchical oversight to maintain global consistency and strategic alignment. The framework characterizes these tradeoffs by linking the strategic influence of each decision point to its impact on overall system performance and adver-

serial outcomes.

Second, the framework elevates *information flow and memory placement* to first-class design variables. Rather than assuming uniform or unrestricted information sharing, it allows designers to reason explicitly about what information should be retained locally, aggregated across agents, or abstracted over time. This distinction is particularly important for cyber resilience, where excessive information propagation can enlarge attack surfaces or create single points of failure, while insufficient sharing can degrade coordination, situational awareness, and response quality.

Third, the framework supports the *temporal composition of agentic functions*. By modeling workflows as sequences of interdependent decision problems, it becomes possible to analyze how proactive anticipation, real-time response, and retrospective learning interact across time scales. Designers can thus evaluate tradeoffs between early investment in sensing and deception, rapid containment during incidents, and post-incident adaptation, optimizing workflows for long-term resilience rather than short-term task success.

Crucially, optimality within this framework is defined at the *system level*. An individual agent’s policy is evaluated not solely by its local effectiveness, but by how it contributes to the performance, stability, and resilience of the workflow as a whole. This naturally leads to equilibrium-based design criteria, in which workflows are constructed such that no agent, or adversarial counterpart, can improve global outcomes through unilateral deviation. Such equilibrium notions provide robustness guarantees even in the presence of adaptive and intelligent adversaries, aligning local decision-making with long-horizon system objectives.

### 5.2.3 Role of Game Theory in System-Level Agentic AI Design

Game theory plays a central role in system-level agentic AI design by providing a *unifying design language* that connects abstract workflow archetypes with formal principles of strategic interaction. As discussed earlier, agentic AI workflows can be organized into recurring archetypes, such as static pipelines, sequential decision chains, dynamic closed-loop workflows, and hierarchical or multi-agent compositions. Each archetype embodies implicit assumptions about temporal ordering, information availability, authority allocation, and adaptation [38]. Game-theoretic models make these assumptions explicit and analytically tractable.

In particular, different workflow archetypes naturally map to different classes of games. Static or feedforward workflows correspond to one-shot or simultaneous-move games, where agents act without observing downstream consequences. Sequential workflows align with *Stackelberg games*, in which leader–follower structures encode temporal ordering and information asymmetry. Dynamic, closed-loop workflows are naturally modeled as repeated or stochastic games, capturing continual interaction, feedback, and learning over time. Hierarchical and multi-agent workflows can be viewed as multi-level or nested games, where local decision problems are embedded within higher-level strategic objectives.

Within this framework, Stackelberg games are particularly important for agentic AI workflow design. They provide a principled mechanism for encoding who moves first, what information is revealed, and how downstream agents and adversaries are expected to respond. This enables designers to explicitly reason about the placement of autonomy, coordination, and human oversight within a workflow. For example, early-stage agents




Figure 6: Convergence of agentic AI and physical AI in an integrated cyber–physical system. Agentic AI mediates bidirectional interaction between cyber services and physical systems, enabling closed-loop cognition, control, and adaptation.

may act as leaders who shape the information and state space encountered by later agents, while downstream agents optimize responses conditioned on those decisions.

Beyond specific game forms, equilibrium concepts provide optimality criteria at the system-level that transcend individual agents [13, 6]. Rather than evaluating each agent individually, the game-theoretic design assesses how agent policies jointly contribute to global objectives such as security, resilience, and operational efficiency. Equilibrium-based workflows are constructed so that no agent, or adaptive adversary, can improve overall outcomes through unilateral deviation, conferring robustness under strategic uncertainty.

Crucially, this perspective elevates game theory from an analytical tool to an *architectural guide*. It informs how agentic functions should be decomposed, how information and memory should flow across workflow stages, and how the temporal and hierarchical structure should be imposed. By grounding agentic workflow archetypes in formal game-theoretic models, designers can move from intuitive architectures to principled, optimizable, and verifiable system-level designs [70, 69, 67, 68, 19].

## 6 Toward Agentic AI for Cyber-Physical Resilience

The trajectory of cyber defense and resilience is increasingly shaped by the convergence of *agentic AI* and *physical AI*. This integration unites high-level computational cognition, including planning, reasoning, and strategic adaptation, with embodied intelligence embedded in sensors, actuators, robots, and control systems. The result is a new class of *agentic cyber–physical systems*, in which intelligent agents operate simultaneously across digital and physical domains [81, 9]. In such systems, resilience is no longer confined to software or networks alone, but becomes a property of the tightly coupled cyber–physical whole.

Figure 6 illustrates this convergence, where agentic AI mediates bidirectional interaction between cyber services and physical systems. On the cyber side, agentic AI interfaces with data platforms, communication networks, and digital services. On the physical side, it interacts with robots, autonomous vehicles, industrial machines, and other embodied systems. Through continuous feedback, the agentic layer interprets observations, coordinates actions, and adapts control strategies, effectively becoming the cognitive nexus where cyber intelligence meets physical execution.

The integration of cyber and physical AI is not incidental but necessary. Modern critical systems, such as advanced manufacturing lines, autonomous aerial vehicles, and cyber–physical infrastructure, are controlled by software-defined logic while operating under physical constraints and safety requirements. Cyber attacks in these environments can have direct physical consequences, while physical disturbances or faults can propagate back into cyber layers. Agentic AI provides the unifying decision-making substrate re-

quired to reason across these domains, enabling coordinated responses that respect both digital security objectives and physical safety constraints.

Consider a smart manufacturing system controlled by agentic and physical AI. An adversarial cyber intrusion may attempt to manipulate sensor readings, control commands, or production schedules [58, 31, 49]. An integrated agentic system can correlate cyber anomalies with physical signals such as vibration patterns, energy consumption, or actuator behavior. Rather than treating cyber and physical incidents separately, the agent reasons about their joint impact, dynamically reconfiguring workflows, isolating compromised components, and adjusting control policies to preserve production quality and safety. Resilience here emerges from the ability to maintain operational continuity even as parts of the system are degraded or under attack.

A similar dynamic arises in autonomous UAV systems [54, 64, 12, 56]. Agentic AI oversees mission planning, coordination, and threat assessment, while physical AI governs flight control, navigation, and collision avoidance. Cyber attacks on communication links or onboard software can directly threaten mission success and physical safety. An integrated agentic cyber-physical architecture allows UAVs to adapt by replanning routes, switching control modes, or transitioning to decentralized coordination when connectivity is compromised. In this setting, resilience is inseparable from the ability to reason jointly about cyber threats, physical dynamics, and mission objectives.

At a systems level, resilience in integrated cyber-physical architectures arises from the interaction of three tightly coupled loops. The *control loop* governs real-time physical stability, ensuring safe and efficient operation of mechanical and electrical components. The *information loop* manages sensing, communication, and data integrity, maintaining situational awareness across distributed components. The *cognitive loop*, orchestrated by agentic AI, reasons about intent, anticipates adversarial strategies, and coordinates adaptive responses. Although these loops operate at different time scales, their hierarchical coupling enables the system to absorb disturbances, reconfigure under stress, and recover functionality.

Such architectures can be naturally modeled using multi-layer game-theoretic and hierarchical control frameworks [66]. At lower layers, physical controllers stabilize dynamics against disturbances. At higher layers, agentic decision-makers optimize strategies by anticipating both adversarial behavior and environmental uncertainty. Learning mechanisms continuously refine the coupling between perception, control, and cognition, allowing resilience to emerge not from rigidity, but from structured adaptivity.

The convergence of agentic AI and physical AI marks the point where cyber resilience meets physical resilience. It is at this interface that intelligent systems must defend not only data and networks, but also safety, mission integrity, and physical continuity. By embedding cognition into cyber-physical feedback loops, agentic AI enables a form of resilience that is embodied, distributed, and adaptive, capable of withstanding adversarial pressure in both digital and physical dimensions.

## 7 Concluding Remarks and Future Prospects

This chapter has argued that cybersecurity is entering a decisive transition driven by foundation-model-based and agentic AI. As autonomous reasoning, planning, and adaptation become accessible at scale, both attackers and defenders increasingly operate as intelligent, learning agents. Under these conditions, security can no longer be treated

as a static configuration problem or a purely preventative exercise. Instead, it must be understood as a dynamic, adversarial, and co-evolutionary process.

We introduced the *AI-augmented paradigm* as a conceptual lens for understanding this shift and positioned *agentic cyber resilience* as its organizing principle. Within this paradigm, resilience replaces absolute prevention as the primary objective: systems are designed to anticipate disruption, maintain critical functionality under attack, recover efficiently, and learn continuously. Agentic AI enables this transformation by embedding sensing, reasoning, action, and memory into closed-loop workflows that operate at machine speed while remaining strategically aware.

A central contribution of the chapter is the development of a system-level view of agentic AI workflow design. Rather than optimizing isolated components, we showed how workflows must be designed as coupled decision systems whose performance emerges from the interaction of agents, information flows, temporal structure, and adversarial responses. Game-theoretic frameworks provide a unifying design language for this task, allowing autonomy allocation, information disclosure, and temporal ordering to be treated as explicit design variables. Through case studies in cyber deception, penetration testing, and remediation, we demonstrated how equilibrium-based reasoning leads to workflows that are not only effective, but robust under strategic adaptation.

Looking forward, several open directions warrant further investigation. First, the integration of agentic AI with large-scale cyber-physical systems raises new challenges for resilience across digital, physical, and human layers. Manufacturing systems, autonomous vehicles, energy infrastructure, and robotic fleets increasingly rely on tightly coupled cyber and physical intelligence, making coordinated resilience a first-class concern. Second, the governance, verification, and assurance of autonomous agentic workflows remain largely unexplored. As decision authority shifts toward AI systems, new methods are required to ensure accountability, safety, and alignment under adversarial pressure.

Finally, human-AI collaboration remains an essential dimension. Designing workflows that balance autonomy with meaningful human oversight, especially in high-stakes security and safety contexts, is a key challenge for the next generation of resilient systems. Agentic AI should not be viewed merely as a more powerful automation tool, but as a strategic actor embedded within complex socio-technical systems. Cyber resilience in the era of AI-augmented reality will not be determined by eliminating risk, but by how effectively systems can adapt, recover, and learn under persistent adversarial pressure. By grounding agentic workflow design in system theory and game-theoretic principles, this chapter aims to provide a foundation for building security systems that remain robust, adaptive, and resilient in the face of continual change.

## References

- [1] M. A. Al Bari and Q. Zhu. A gestalt game-theoretic framework for designing agentic ai workflows in cyber deception. In *International Conference on Game Theory and AI for Security*, pages 228–248. Springer, 2025.
- [2] A. Alshamrani, S. Myneni, A. Chowdhary, and D. Huang. A survey on advanced persistent threats: Techniques, solutions, challenges, and research opportunities. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 21(2):1851–1877, 2019.

- [3] S. Amershi, D. Weld, M. Vorvoreanu, A. Fourney, B. Nushi, P. Collisson, J. Suh, S. Iqbal, P. N. Bennett, K. Inkpen, J. Teevan, R. Kikin-Gil, and E. Horvitz. Guidelines for human-ai interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, page 1–13, 2019.
- [4] H. S. Anderson, A. Kharkar, B. Filar, D. Evans, and P. Roth. Learning to evade static pe machine learning malware models via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.08917*, 2018.
- [5] M. Barreno, B. Nelson, R. Sears, A. D. Joseph, and J. D. Tygar. Can machine learning be secure? In *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM Symposium on Information, computer and communications security*, pages 16–25, 2006.
- [6] T. Başar and G. J. Olsder. *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, 1998.
- [7] N. Boumkheld, S. Panda, S. Rass, and E. Panaousis. Honeypot type selection games for smart grid networks. In *Decision and Game Theory for Security: 10th International Conference, GameSec 2019, Stockholm, Sweden, October 30–November 1, 2019, Proceedings 10*, pages 85–96. Springer, 2019.
- [8] R. A. Brooks. Intelligence without representation. *Artificial intelligence*, 47(1-3):139–159, 1991.
- [9] J. Chen and Q. Zhu. A cross-layer design approach to strategic cyber defense and robust switching control of cyber-physical wind energy systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 20(1):624–635, 2022.
- [10] DARPA. Guaranteed ai robustness for decision-making (gard). <https://www.darpa.mil/program/guaranteed-ai-robustness-for-decision-making>.
- [11] S. Datta, S. K. Nahin, A. Chhabra, and P. Mohapatra. Agentic ai security: Threats, defenses, evaluation, and open challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.23883*, 2025.
- [12] M. J. Farooq and Q. Zhu. A multi-layer feedback system approach to resilient connectivity of remotely deployed mobile internet of things. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, 4(2):422–432, 2018.
- [13] D. Fudenberg and J. Tirole. *Game theory*. MIT press, 1991.
- [14] Y. Ge, T. Li, and Q. Zhu. Scenario-agnostic zero-trust defense with explainable threshold policy: A meta-learning approach. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS 2023)*, Hoboken, NJ, USA, May 2023.
- [15] Y. Ge and Q. Zhu. Zero trust for cyber resilience. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02882*, 2023.
- [16] W. Guo, Y. Potter, T. Shi, Z. Wang, A. Zhang, and D. Song. SoK: Frontier AI’s impact on the cybersecurity landscape. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2504, 2025.
- [17] K. Hammar and T. Li. Online incident response planning under model misspecification through Bayesian learning and belief quantization. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security (AISec ’25)*, 2025.

- [18] K. Hammar, T. Li, R. Stadler, and Q. Zhu. Adaptive security response strategies through conjectural online learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 20:4055–4070, 2025.
- [19] Z. Han and Q. Zhu. A dynamic Stackelberg game framework for agentic AI defense against LLM jailbreaking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.08207*, 2025.
- [20] J. Huang and Q. Zhu. Penheal: A two-stage LLM framework for automated pen-testing and optimal remediation. In *Proceedings of the workshop on autonomous cybersecurity*, pages 11–22, 2023.
- [21] J. Huang and Q. Zhu. Penhealnet: An agent-based LLM framework for automated pentesting and optimal remediation. *Available at SSRN 4941478*, 2024.
- [22] L. Huang. *AI-Powered System-Scientific Defense for High-Confidence Cyber-Physical Systems: Modeling, Analysis, and Design*. PhD thesis, New York University Tandon School of Engineering, 2022.
- [23] L. Huang, A. D. Joseph, B. Nelson, B. I. Rubinstein, and J. D. Tygar. Adversarial machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM workshop on Security and artificial intelligence*, pages 43–58, 2011.
- [24] L. Huang and Q. Zhu. Dynamic Bayesian games for adversarial and defensive cyber deception. *Autonomous Cyber Deception: Reasoning, Adaptive Planning, and Evaluation of HoneyThings*, pages 75–97, 2019.
- [25] L. Huang and Q. Zhu. A dynamic games approach to proactive defense strategies against advanced persistent threats in cyber-physical systems. *Computers & Security*, 89:101660, 2020.
- [26] L. Huang and Q. Zhu. *Cognitive security: A system-scientific approach*. Springer Nature, 2023.
- [27] S. Jajodia, V. Subrahmanian, V. Swarup, and C. Wang. Cyber deception. *Cham, Switzerland: Springer*, 2016.
- [28] J. Jin, Z. Pang, J. Kua, Q. Zhu, K. H. Johansson, N. Marchenko, and D. Cavalcanti. Cloud-fog automation: The new paradigm towards autonomous industrial cyber-physical systems. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 2025.
- [29] C. A. Kamhoua, C. D. Kiekintveld, F. Fang, and Q. Zhu. *Game Theory and Machine Learning for Cyber Security*. John Wiley & Sons, 2021.
- [30] H. Kumar, R. Xiao, B. Lawson, I. Musabirov, J. Shi, X. Wang, H. Luo, J. J. Williams, A. N. Rafferty, J. Stamper, and M. Liut. Supporting self-reflection at scale with large language models: Insights from randomized field experiments in classrooms. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale, L@S '24*, page 86–97, 2024.
- [31] J. Lee, B. Bagheri, and H.-A. Kao. A cyber-physical systems architecture for industry 4.0-based manufacturing systems. *Manufacturing letters*, 3:18–23, 2015.

- [32] P. Lewis, E. Perez, A. Piktus, F. Petroni, V. Karpukhin, N. Goyal, H. Küttler, M. Lewis, W.-t. Yih, T. Rocktäschel, S. Riedel, and D. Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [33] T. Li, K. Hammar, R. Stadler, and Q. Zhu. Conjectural online learning with first-order beliefs in asymmetric information stochastic games. In *2024 IEEE 63rd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6780–6785, 2024.
- [34] T. Li, H. Li, Y. Pan, T. Xu, Z. Zheng, and Q. Zhu. Meta Stackelberg game: Robust federated learning against adaptive and mixed poisoning attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17431*, 2024. [Online] Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2410.17431>.
- [35] T. Li, Y. Pan, and Q. Zhu. Decision-dominant strategic defense against lateral movement for 5G zero-trust multi-domain networks. In *Network Security Empowered by Artificial Intelligence*, pages 25–76. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, Switzerland, 2024.
- [36] T. Li, G. Peng, Q. Zhu, and T. Başar. The confluence of networks, games, and learning a game-theoretic framework for multiagent decision making over networks. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 42(4):35–67, 2022.
- [37] T. Li, Y.-T. Yang, Y. Pan, and Q. Zhu. From texts to shields: Convergence of large language models and cybersecurity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.00841*, 2025.
- [38] T. Li, Y. Zhao, and Q. Zhu. The role of information structures in game-theoretic multi-agent learning. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 53:296–314, 2022.
- [39] T. Li and Q. Zhu. On the price of transparency: A comparison between overt persuasion and covert signaling. *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 00:4267–4272, 2023.
- [40] T. Li and Q. Zhu. Symbiotic game and foundation models for cyber deception operations in strategic cyber warfare. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10570*, 2024.
- [41] M. H. Manshaei, Q. Zhu, T. Alpcan, T. Başar, and J.-P. Hubaux. Game theory meets network security and privacy. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 45(3):1–39, 2013.
- [42] MITRE Corporation. MITRE ATT&CK: A knowledge base for adversary tactics and techniques. *MITRE Technical Report*, 2018. <https://attack.mitre.org>.
- [43] Y. Pan, T. Li, H. Li, T. Xu, Q. Zhu, and Z. Zheng. A first order meta stackelberg method for robust federated learning. In *The Second Workshop on New Frontiers in Adversarial Machine Learning, the Fortieth International Conference on Machine Learning*, 23–29 Jul 2023. [Online] Available at <https://openreview.net/forum?id=sHH1KS1Pcj>.
- [44] J. Pawlick and Q. Zhu. Proactive defense against physical denial of service attacks using poisson signaling games. In *International Conference on Decision and Game Theory for Security*, pages 336–356. Springer, 2017.

- [45] J. Pawlick and Q. Zhu. Strategic trust in cloud-enabled cyber-physical systems with an application to glucose control. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 12(12):2906–2919, 2017.
- [46] J. Pawlick and Q. Zhu. *Game theory for cyber deception*. Springer, 2021.
- [47] S. Rass and S. Schauer. Game theory for security and risk management. *Springer International Publishing*. doi, 10:978–3, 2018.
- [48] C. Rieger, I. Ray, Q. Zhu, and M. Haney. *Industrial control systems security and resiliency*. Springer, 2019.
- [49] S. Sahoo and C.-Y. Lo. Smart manufacturing powered by recent technological advancements: A review. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 64:236–250, 2022.
- [50] K. Scarfone and P. Mell. Guide to intrusion detection and prevention systems (idps). *NIST special publication*, 800(2007):94, 2007.
- [51] T. Schick, J. Dwivedi-Yu, R. Dessì, R. Raileanu, M. Lomeli, E. Hambro, L. Zettlemoyer, N. Cancedda, and T. Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:68539–68551, 2023.
- [52] P. W. Singer and A. Friedman. *Cybersecurity and cyberwar: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [53] M. Tambe. *Security and game theory: Algorithms, deployed systems, lessons learned*. Cambridge university press, 2011.
- [54] Y. Wang, X. Wu, J. Farooq, and J. Chen. Coordinated uav deployment and task offloading in uav-assisted leo satellite edge computing systems via proximal policy optimization. In *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC) Workshop on Emerging Technologies in Aerial and Space Networks*, Montreal, Canada, 2025.
- [55] Q. Wu, G. Bansal, J. Zhang, Y. Wu, B. Li, E. Zhu, L. Jiang, X. Zhang, S. Zhang, J. Liu, et al. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversations. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024.
- [56] Z. Xu and Q. Zhu. Secure and resilient control design for cloud enabled networked control systems. In *Proceedings of the first ACM workshop on cyber-physical systems-security and/or privacy*, pages 31–42, 2015.
- [57] Z. Xu and Q. Zhu. Cross-layer secure and resilient control of delay-sensitive networked robot operating systems. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*, pages 1712–1717. IEEE, 2018.
- [58] H. Yang, Z. Sun, G. Jiang, F. Zhao, X. Lu, and X. Mei. Cloud-manufacturing-based condition monitoring platform with 5G and standard information model. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(8):6940–6948, 2021.

- [59] Y.-T. Yang, T. Li, and Q. Zhu. Designing policies for truth: Combating misinformation with transparency and information design. In *2023 21st International Symposium on Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc, and Wireless Networks (WiOpt)*, pages 127–134, 2023.
- [60] Y.-T. Yang and Q. Zhu. Game-theoretic foundations for cyber resilience against deceptive information attacks in intelligent transportation systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04627*, 2024.
- [61] Y.-T. Yang and Q. Zhu. A multi-resolution dynamic game framework for cross-echelon decision-making in cyber warfare. In *International Conference on Game Theory and AI for Security*, pages 335–355. Springer, 2025.
- [62] Y.-T. Yang and Q. Zhu. Toward a multi-echelon cyber warfare theory: A meta-game-theoretic paradigm for defense and dominance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.08976*, 2025.
- [63] S. Yao, J. Zhao, D. Yu, N. Du, I. Shafran, K. R. Narasimhan, and Y. Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*, 2022.
- [64] T. Zhang and Q. Zhu. Strategic defense against deceptive civilian gps spoofing of unmanned aerial vehicles. In *International Conference on Decision and Game Theory for Security*, pages 213–233. Springer, 2017.
- [65] T. Zhang and Q. Zhu. Informational design of dynamic multi-agent system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03052*, 2021.
- [66] Q. Zhu. Foundations of cyber resilience: The confluence of game, control, and learning theories. In *Cyber Resilience: Applied Perspectives*, pages 27–58. Springer, 2025.
- [67] Q. Zhu. Game theory meets LLM and agentic AI: Reimagining cybersecurity for the age of intelligent threats. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.10621*, 2025.
- [68] Q. Zhu. Generative-conjectural LLM equilibrium for agentic AI deception with applications to spearphishing. In *International Conference on Game Theory and AI for Security*, pages 356–375. Springer, 2025.
- [69] Q. Zhu. LLM-Stackelberg games: Conjectural reasoning equilibria and their applications to spearphishing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09407*, 2025.
- [70] Q. Zhu. Reasoning and behavioral equilibria in LLM-Nash games: From mindsets to actions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.08208*, 2025.
- [71] Q. Zhu and T. Başar. Robust and resilient control design for cyber-physical systems with an application to power systems. In *2011 50th IEEE conference on decision and control and European control conference*, pages 4066–4071. IEEE, 2011.
- [72] Q. Zhu and T. Başar. A dynamic game-theoretic approach to resilient control system design for cascading failures. In *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on High Confidence Networked Systems*, pages 41–46, 2012.

- [73] Q. Zhu and T. Başar. Game-theoretic approach to feedback-driven multi-stage moving target defense. In *International conference on decision and game theory for security*, pages 246–263. Springer, 2013.
- [74] Q. Zhu and T. Basar. Game-theoretic methods for robustness, security, and resilience of cyberphysical control systems: Games-in-games principle for optimal cross-layer resilient control systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 35(1):46–65, 2015.
- [75] Q. Zhu and T. Başar. Disentangling resilience from robustness: Contextual dualism, interactionism, and game-theoretic paradigms. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 44(3):95–103, 2024.
- [76] Q. Zhu and T. Başar. Revisiting game-theoretic control in socio-technical networks: Emerging design frameworks and contemporary applications. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2025.
- [77] Q. Zhu and S. Rass. Game theory meets network security: A tutorial. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 2163–2165, 2018.
- [78] Q. Zhu and S. Rass. On multi-phase and multi-stage game-theoretic modeling of advanced persistent threats. *IEEE Access*, 6:13958–13971, 2018.
- [79] Q. Zhu, S. Rass, B. Dieber, and V. M. Vilches. Cybersecurity in robotics: Challenges, quantitative modeling, and practice. *Foundations and Trends in Robotics*, 9(1):1–129, 2021.
- [80] Q. Zhu, C. Rieger, and T. Başar. A hierarchical security architecture for cyber-physical systems. In *2011 4th international symposium on resilient control systems*, pages 15–20. IEEE, 2011.
- [81] Q. Zhu and Z. Xu. *Cross-layer design for secure and resilient cyber-physical systems*. Springer, 2020.

Table 1: Agentic AI Across the Cyber Kill Chain

Kill Stage	Chain	Agentic AI Role (Offense)	Agentic AI Role (Defense)
Reconnaissance		Autonomous scanning, system fingerprinting, and OSINT-driven intelligence collection via semantic query generation and large-scale crawling.	Continuous environment mapping, red-teaming simulation, and anticipatory reconnaissance to minimize exposure and reduce attack surfaces.
Weaponization		Automated exploit synthesis, malware generation, and payload optimization leveraging generative models and reinforcement learning.	Automated exploit reproduction, patch synthesis, and self-healing code generation to neutralize discovered vulnerabilities.
Delivery		Adaptive phishing and spearphishing campaigns with context-aware content personalization that exploit cognitive and situational vulnerabilities.	Intelligent content filtering, anomaly-based message vetting, and AI-driven deception channels that disrupt or absorb delivery vectors.
Exploitation		Real-time exploit chaining, privilege escalation, and lateral movement coordinated by multi-agent policies and adaptive learning.	Predictive isolation, sandboxing, and containment via behavioral modeling and dynamic privilege reduction.
Installation & Command-and-Control		Autonomous deployment, persistence establishment, and distributed command-and-control coordination.	Rapid infection localization, recovery orchestration, and decentralized counter-C2 mechanisms that sever attacker control.
Actions on Objectives		Coordinated data exfiltration, system sabotage, or integrity and availability manipulation across cyber-physical environments.	Continuity assurance through redundancy, mission migration, and adaptive failover enabled by predictive and resilient control.
Attacks Against Humans		Cognitive manipulation using synthetic media, voice spoofing, and persuasive dialogue systems targeting psychological biases.	Cognitive security enhancement via AI-mediated training, adversarial red-teaming, and human-AI trust calibration.