

Inherent and emergent liability issues in LLM-based agentic systems: a principal-agent perspective

Garry A. Gabison^{1,2,*}, R. Patrick Xian^{3,*}

¹Queen Mary University of London

²University of California, Berkeley

³Certivize AI

*Equal contribution

✉: gabison@berkeley.edu, xrpatrick@gmail.com

Abstract

Agentic systems powered by large language models (LLMs) are becoming progressively more complex and capable. Their increasing agency and expanding deployment settings attract growing attention over effective governance policies, monitoring and control protocols. Based on emerging landscapes of the agentic market, we analyze the potential liability issues stemming from delegated use of LLM agents and their extended systems from a principal-agent perspective. Our analysis complements existing risk-based studies on artificial agency and covers the spectrum of important aspects of the principal-agent relationship and their potential consequences at deployment. Furthermore, we motivate method developments for technical governance along the directions of interpretability and behavior evaluations, reward and conflict management, and the mitigation of misalignment and misconduct through principled engineering of detection and fail-safe mechanisms. By illustrating the outstanding issues in AI liability for LLM-based agentic systems, we aim to inform the system design, auditing and monitoring approaches to enhancing transparency and accountability.

1 Introduction

AI agents are computer software systems capable of creating context-specific plans in non-deterministic environments (Chan et al., 2023; Krishnan, 2025). AI agents based on LLMs (aka. LLM agents, see Appendix A) exist on a spectrum of autonomy, ranging from simple tool-calling agents to generalist agents capable of planning, sourcing, critiquing, and executing their own workflow (Li, 2025). They primarily adopt an architecture with explicitly defined functioning components¹ (Sumers et al., 2023). LLM-based multiagent systems (MASs) allow agents to interact, collaborate, or compete within shared environments (Fig. 1a). They are designed by combining agents with specialized roles through LLM role-playing (Shanahan et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a) or through integration on a software platform. Each agent handles specific subtasks based on its expertise and allocated resources (tools, data, compute, etc). MAS can be tailored to a wide range of scales and domains, from few-agent systems that simulate team decision-making in medicine (Tang et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2024) and finance (Xiao et al., 2025), to many-agent systems that mimic the population-level socioeconomic dynamics (Park et al., 2024a; Piao et al., 2025). A plausible LLM-based MAS (Fig. 1a) can possess multiple teams of interacting agents coordinated by an orchestrator (Wang et al., 2025) and behaviorally regulated by other platform agents or through a set of engineered constraints (e.g. norms) (Criado et al., 2011; Hadfield-Menell et al., 2019). While the flexibility of LLM-based MAS provides adaptability to various applications and

¹Also called cognitive architecture (Kotseruba & Tsotsos, 2020) at times, but the architecture alone doesn't guarantee cognition or sense of agency.

additional affordances but also emergent risks not present in single agents (Hammond et al., 2025; Pan et al., 2025).




Figure 1: (a) A plausible LLM-based MAS deployed on an agent platform, where delegation goes from the principal to an orchestrator (agent) to different functioning agent teams. The platform also contains supporting agents. Black circles indicate teams. (b) Landscape of the LLM agentic market. LLM agents are supplied through agent-native services or agentic SaaS (agents on top of existing software apps). Agent suppliers are supported by model suppliers. Colors in (a)-(b) distinguish between agents of different types or suppliers.

Understanding the current landscape of the agentic market² (Fig. 1b and Appendices A-B) is essential for analyzing liability. The present work uses the following terms to refer to its key components: Software platforms offering agent-native services include generalist agents that focuses on general autonomous use of computers, specialist agents which target labor intensive sectors and provide verticalized services for domain-specific workflow automation (Bousetouane, 2025), and character-infused, “hireable” agentic employees. Specialist agents are also offered directly by established software platforms as agentic SaaS to streamline their existing app services. Both agent-native services and agentic SaaS largely source models externally from model suppliers or derive their own models from open-source projects. Separately, prototypes of integration platforms and integration protocols facilitating the interaction of agents from different frameworks with third-party resources during deployment are also appearing.

Although the potential liability issues in the rapidly expanding market are prevalent, the governance of AI agents is still a nascent topic. Existing efforts are built along two streams: one focuses on establishing and refining the taxonomies of risks and harms using empirical evidence (Chan et al., 2023; 2024; He et al., 2024; Hammond et al., 2025) or differentiating the governance of agentic systems from traditional machine learning (ML) models (Cohen et al., 2024; Kolt, 2025); another focuses on understanding the interactions between humans and AI agents to build constructive principles (Zheng et al., 2023). Research in both streams used principal-agent theory (PAT) (Eisenhardt, 1989; Laffont & Martimort, 2002) as a starting point, but lacked systematic examination of how existing legal liability frameworks can effectively address various principal-agent relationships in AI systems. Moreover, AI systems are typically embedded in a sociotechnical system (Weidinger et al., 2023) such that the risks are materialized only through interacting with the environment (see example and analysis in Appendix C).

Despite the long history of PAT-based legal frameworks (Munday, 2022), their use in AI systems is still in early days. This work presents an initial attempt in extending principal-agent analysis to current LLM-based agentic systems. Our major contributions include: (i) extending the previous work on PAT for AI governance to accommodate the characteristic behaviors of LLM agents; (ii) discussion of the potential liability issues in light of the emerging market for LLM-based agentic systems; and (iii) outlining of the important directions of policy-driven method developments that support the technical governance of LLM agents.

²<https://aiagentslist.com/ai-agents-map>

2 Related works

AI liability Legal scholars have treated AI as products and the harm they caused under product liability (Abraham & Rabin, 2019; Buiten, 2024; Sharkey, 2024). In the US, product liability falls under: (i) design defect, (ii) manufacturing defect, and (iii) a warning defect (inadequate instructions) (Abraham, 2012). Anyone harmed by a product can bring a claim. Product harm carries strict liability — meaning courts do not consider the care level — and affects anyone along the supply chain.

Service-caused harm usually trigger a negligence inquiry: was “reasonable care” used? If not, the service provider is liable (primary liability) and their principal can also be liable under multiple legal theories. Principals face two primary liabilities: “negligent hiring” for hiring an agent without a reasonable due diligence on its modus operandi; and “negligent supervision” for failing to reasonably monitor or control its agents. Principals face secondary liability such as vicarious liability (Sykes, 1984; Diamantis, 2023) because of their relationship (when its agents acted within the boundaries of employment). A service relationship can also fall under a contractor relationship, which does not trigger vicarious liability. Courts look at the contract and control exercised to categorize the relationship. Below, we assume the principal exercise enough control to trigger vicarious liability.

Software exhibits both “product” (movable goods) and “service” (akin to professional offering) characteristics (Gemignani, 1980; Popp, 2011). As AI agents become more autonomous, they move closer to services, their actions are more accountable due to increasing agenticity (Chopra & White, 2011; Chan et al., 2023). A negligence rule with potential vicarious liability may be more suited (Turner, 2018) for those relationships. In current legal use, this framework straddles product liability falling on the manufacturer and vicarious liability involving principals. Besides the service-product divide, law and economics (L&E) has also advocated other approaches, including risk-based liability (Geistfeld et al., 2022), fault-based liability (Buiten et al., 2023), explanation-based liability (Padovan et al., 2023), etc.

Principal-agent problems in AI/ML Prior works that invoked the principal-agent framework in AI/ML primarily focused on the decision-making aspects in human-AI collaboration and AI safety. Lubars & Tan (2019) discussed the relation between task delegation and the principal’s preference. Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield (2019) mapped AI alignment onto the principal-agent problem and discussed the alignment issues in the incomplete contracts theory. Athey et al. (2020) considered different scenarios in allocating decision authority when the human principal and the AI agent have different capabilities. Critch & Krueger (2020) and Hendrycks (2023) considered the potential dangers of complete task delegation to agentic systems. Besides, principal-agent problems have also been considered in game-theoretic machine learning (Gan et al., 2024) and in reinforcement learning settings with two interacting agents (Ivanov et al., 2024).

Agent-oriented software systems Agentic systems have long been proposed as a canonical approach for software design (Jennings, 2001; Zambonelli et al., 2003). Their core advantages are the scalability, flexibility, and the ability to perform complex tasks through task decomposition. LLM agents (Li, 2025) can be configured by text instruction and can interact with external resources to achieve enhanced capabilities than LLMs in reasoning, tool use, memory, planning, and can be personalized according to the role-playing capability of the base model (Shanahan et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a). LLM-based MASs can use verbal communication protocols to facilitate collaboration and engage in debates (Tran et al., 2025), and the protocol topology is a key for their efficient scaling and behavioral control (Qian et al., 2025).

3 Principal agency and liability

PAT examines the relationship where one party, the principal, delegates authority to another, the agent, creating three fundamental challenges (Eisenhardt, 1989; Laffont & Martimort, 2002):

- **Adverse selection** (aka. hidden information problem) occurs when agents possess more information than principals about their abilities or efforts. Adverse selection is a type of information asymmetry also known as the hidden information problem (Akerlof, 1970).
- **Moral hazard** (aka. hidden action problem) occurs when agents take greater risks than principals would prefer because they do not bear the full consequences (Arrow, 1963). Moral hazard is also a type of information asymmetry.
- **Misaligned interest** (aka. conflict of interest) can manifest between principals and agents in four ways (Jensen & Meckling, 1976): principal-agent collusion against third parties, principal-third party collusion against agents, agent-third party collusion against principals, or agents simply pursuing self-interest independently. Misaligned interests lead to agency cost, which is associated with information sharing, monitoring of the agent, etc (Fama & Jensen, 1983).

Each of these problems has legal and economic solutions. Legal solutions include fiduciary duties (duty of care, duty of loyalty, etc.). Those duties provide principals with a legal recourse against agents who breached those duties. However, legal enforcement is probabilistic and slow (Levmore, 1990), so principals often prefer to use economic mechanisms. Economic solutions depend on the problem. Principals can address some hidden information problems by creating separating equilibria that force agents to reveal information about themselves, that is, “signals”; signals include credentials, warranties, or performance histories that distinguish high-quality from low-quality agents (Spence, 1973). Principals mitigate a hidden action problem through monitoring (i.e. direct observation of agent behavior) and then linking compensation to observable effort, or bonding arrangements in which the principals tie remuneration to outcomes (bonuses), thereby aligning financial incentives (Holmström, 1979). A principal can address conflict of interest by realigning incentives through carefully designed contracts (deferred compensation), creating organizational structures that promote incentive realignment (profit sharing), or leveraging reputation mechanisms. A principal has incentives to monitor their agents. Primary and secondary liability exposures provide additional incentives to ensure that it oversees that its agents complete their tasks using reasonable care.

4 Inherent liability issues in single agents

Contemporary approaches to the governance of AI agents (Kampik et al., 2022; Chan et al., 2023; 2024; Kolt, 2025) resort to PAT, where the principal, the human or company, delegates a task or goal to the AI agent, based on a mutual agreement. Yet LLM agents still cannot satisfy all criteria of a normal agent (Perrier & Bennett, 2025) in PAT, therefore, the agency gap can create additional liability issues or liability gaps (Turner, 2018).

4.1 Artificial agency

PAT requires a clarification of the agency relationship, which remains a hotly debated interdisciplinary topic for LLM-based systems (Shavit et al., 2023; Dai, 2024; Barandiaran & Almendros, 2024; Dung, 2024; Perrier & Bennett, 2025; Mattingly & Cibralic, 2025; Butlin, 2025; Das, 2025). AI researchers often take an operational view of artificial agency, such that it is possible to quantify and compare the mental state characteristics of and between AI systems through external interrogation (Baird & Maruping, 2021; Chan et al., 2023; Miehling et al., 2025). Representative caveats of artificial agency for LLMs and LLM agents include:

- **Instability:** Behavior varies with the same or paraphrased but meaning-consistent prompt on different trials (Loya et al., 2023).
- **Inconsistency:** Behavior is sensitive to distracting contextual information or affected by sentiment and adversarially designed prompts (Jain et al., 2023; Maus et al., 2023; Zhuo et al., 2024).
- **Ephemerality:** The complexity of behavioral sequence is restricted by the context window length because of the lack of effective memory mechanisms (Maharana et al., 2024).

- **Planning-limitedness:** Construction of executable plans hinges on accessible environmental feedback which is task-limited (Kambhampati et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024b; Chen et al., 2024b).

These caveats finds similar manifestations in behavioral economics (Thaler, 2016).

Liability from flawed agency Because an agency relationship requires both principals and agents agree to the relationship, current LLM agents cannot yet form an authentic relationship of such because of their flawed agency (Barandiaran & Almendros, 2024; Perrier & Bennett, 2025). Voluntary relationships usually indicates that both parties benefit. However, because rationality is generally not a built-in goal in developing LLM agents (Macmillan-Scott & Musolesi, 2024), their lack of consent (from agents) means that agent suppliers may face liability or risks they have not considered. That is why scholars have consistently argued that agent failures should be treated as product liability, and the allocation should reflect that (Abraham & Rabin, 2019; Buiten, 2024; Sharkey, 2024). In such a situation, the Coase Theorem suggests that the allocation of liability and risks is best left to contracts but before the parties can do that, legislators and courts must clarify rights and liabilities (Coase, 1960).

4.2 Task specification and delegation

Principals delegate tasks to their agent usually either because the principals lack the resources or the expertise to deal with the tasks (Castelfranchi & Falcone, 1998). For LLM agents, the principal provides as input to the LLM a task specification that contains instructions on the nature and procedure of task execution, available resources, potential ways to overcome hurdles, the principal’s preferences, etc. Such a procedure is subject to

- **Task underspecification** is often present because it is impossibly costly to fully anticipate all possible scenarios to put into the specification. Moreover, the same agent may be appropriate for one task but not another; therefore, task specification — the equivalent of job design in organizational theory (Oldham & Fried, 2016) — should balance the tradeoff between agent capability and task complexity (Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield, 2019). This incompleteness leaves the door open to undesirable outcomes such as negative side effects.
- **Risky delegation** The principal tends to forgo the delegation of very high-stakes tasks because of their severe adverse consequences and the unreliability of agent behaviors (Lubars & Tan, 2019). The risk of delegation can be reduced by the amount of repeated feedback the principal provides to ensure alignment (Jiang et al., 2024).

Liability from task misdelegation When selecting the agent (and the tasks) to delegate, principals are expected to carry out their due diligence. If they fail to take reasonable precautions when selecting agents, principals retain liability for negligent hiring (Camacho, 1993) and negligent retention. At the best of time, delegation of tasks raises information concerns because the principal may not have authorized the agent to share information. In the LLM context, the sharing of information raises concerns of copyright and trademark (e.g. duplication of protected documents), trade secret (sharing information outside the system), privacy (e.g. transferring data governed by the General Data Protection Regulation or California Consumer Privacy Act), etc. That is why many tasks are not delegable. A human agent may be able to dissociate the difference between delegable and non-delegable tasks based on the sensitivity of the information, while an AI agent may not without clear instructions (Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield, 2019).

4.3 Principal oversight

Human oversight is a costly endeavor for many AI applications yet it remains the gold standard in existing AI governance principles (Sterz et al., 2024; Cihon, 2024). Principal-agent problems suffer from information asymmetries, which are usually resolved through monitor and incentive realignment via reward or punishment. However, monitoring an AI agent requires designs that allow the principal to observe and understand what the agent is doing. Principals who prefer to realign the AI agent’s incentives (Everitt et al., 2021)




Figure 2: Examples of interaction patterns between the principals and single agents or multi-agent systems (MASs). Each MAS in the coordination or collaboration (collab.)/competition (compet.) pattern is enclosed within a box.

with their own would have to understand what “motivates” AI systems or assume that AI responds to human-style incentives (Ratliff et al., 2019). At the moment, quantifying misalignment remains challenging, especially for capable and general AI systems (Anwar et al., 2024). Moreover, the quality of principal oversight can be threatened by a spectrum of behaviors LLMs inherit from their training, such as:

- **Sycophancy** refers to the tendency of AI systems to provide responses that the evaluator would prefer in favor of improving the answer (Perez et al., 2023; Sharma et al., 2024), exploiting the evaluator’s cognitive biases (e.g. susceptibility to flattery) rather than correctly performing their duty.
- **Manipulation** refers to the ability of LLMs to influence their principals (Campedelli et al., 2024; Burtell & Woodside, 2023; Carroll et al., 2023), towards ends that are non-welfare maximizing to their principals.
- **Deception** refers to the tendency of AI systems to induce false beliefs (Park et al., 2024b; Scheurer et al., 2024; Lang et al., 2024), reinforcing the information asymmetries between the AI agent and its principal.
- **Scheming** refers to the strategic behavior of AI systems to harbor alternative and potentially harmful motives from alignment with the principal during post-training, leading to fake alignment (Greenblatt et al., 2024; Balesni et al., 2024)

These behavioral patterns also manifest in real-world scenarios (Blonz, 2023). All of them can upend the principal-agent asymmetry such that the principal will not be able to reliably monitor the agent’s behavior or provide informative feedback.

Liability from compromised oversight Principals that fail to exercise oversight over agents that committed unlawful acts are subject to primary liability under a negligent supervision theory or negligent retention (Cavico et al., 2016) depending on the nature of the act. The principal faces liability because if the principal had exercised reasonable investigation, it would have known that the acts (or omissions) of its agents would harm third parties or create unreasonable risks.

5 Emerging liability issues in MASs

MASs have flexible designs (Fig. 2), so agency relationships and the associated principal-agent problem can occur at different levels, similar to the functioning of a firm (Fama, 1980). The challenges in governing single LLM agents are compounded with multiple participating agents and complicated by emergent issues with no equivalent in the single-agent setting. An orchestrator (agent) in a MAS functions as a local manager, and directs the work execution of a number of agent workers/teams with different expertise but imposing liability only on the orchestrator does not incentivize the improvement of the subagents. Liability plays an important role when market mechanisms such as reputation do not

function well (e.g. lack of repeated interactions, monopoly power in an agentic space, etc). For compatibility with PAT, we consider here only the MASs where the agent roles/tasks are assigned before at start. We discuss three aspects in the following subsections.

5.1 Role and agency allocation

Constructing an LLM-based MAS involve role (or task) allocation (Campbell & Wu, 2011; Guo et al., 2024; Tran et al., 2025), which implicates allocated agency, where the single agents can act on their own to accomplish the goals defined by assigned task and resources. Because of the role-playing capability (Shanahan et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a), current LLM-based MASs generally adopts a role-centric approach, executing role allocation alongside its associated task (Guo et al., 2024; Tran et al., 2025). This approach provides an interpretable division of labor and can directly mimic interactions in teams of humans. Alternatively, role allocation can be self-organized such as in the deployment of subagents, which also need not be stationary. Role allocation is affected by the nature of LLMs’ flawed agency (Section 4.1), leading to potential downstream issues:

- **Influenceability:** Agency of individual agents in an MAS can be enhanced or reduced through communication with other agents in a cooperative MAS (He et al., 2025), therefore triggering agency shift or unanticipated conducts.
- **Distributedness:** The distribution of agency to different agents in an MAS leads to task specialization and latency which can trade off against performance and speed (Mieczkowski et al., 2025).
- **Diminished control:** In a hierarchical MAS, subagents are more separated from the principal than the head agent, therefore may be harder to directly control or monitor. The principal is more prone to manipulation from the head agent.

Liability from agent misallocation These concerns make task allocation the principal’s most important decision. First, the principal must decide which tasks can be delegated. As the number of allocations increases, the agency cost also increases: each new allocation must offer marginal benefits that justify its marginal costs. L&E favors assigning liability on the entity that can avoid the accident at the lowest cost (Calabresi & Melamed, 1972; Carbonara et al., 2016). Second, MASs expose principals to the risks their (sub)agents take. The principal must understand the risks associated with each task and with each agent. Then, it must assess which tasks can be delegated without surpassing its risk tolerance and to whom. However, the principal faces information asymmetries: it might speculate about the expected cost-benefit of each (sub)agent. It faces liability for not being careful assigning a task to an agent but usually not for allocating too many tasks (Carbonara et al., 2016). Finally, if the system is so complex or opaque, courts may decide that the harm “speaks for itself”, inferring carelessness from the harm — turning a negligence rule into a strict liability rule (Fraser et al., 2022; Casey, 2019). Explainability can therefore become even more necessary.

5.2 Operational uncertainty

As LLM-based MASs become more complex, oversight becomes increasingly challenging. A human overseer may only handle direct communications with the head agent while the subsequent interactions between the head agent and the subagents are initiated autonomously among themselves. Although the organizational hierarchy and communication protocol can benefit from minimal human involvement such as in the coordination structure in Fig. 2, multiagent interactions via LLMs create additional challenges depending on the agent architecture and task (Pan et al., 2025).

- **Failure cascade** refers to the scenario where the downstream agents can have increased vulnerability than the upstream agents in a MAS with coordination structure (Peigne-Lefebvre et al., 2025).
- **Rogue agent** refers to the event that an agent in confusion introduces communication noise which can lead to system failure (Barbi et al., 2025).

- **Agent collusion** refers to the collaboration between agents that negatively impact others (Fish et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2024).

A promising direction for minimizing operational uncertainty from misbehaving agents is to instigate corrective mechanisms and foster a norm-based governance (Hadfield-Menell & Hadfield, 2019; Kampik et al., 2022), where the norm is defined through spontaneous and engineered social interactions between agents (Trivedi et al., 2024).

Liability from operational uncertainty When multiple LLM agents interact autonomously, the attribution of responsibility becomes blurred as decisions emerge from collective behaviors rather than individual actions. A software provider usually bears the liability for the harm their LLM agents cause. In heterogeneous MAS, courts may apply separate liability or distribute liability among suppliers according to the harm contribution. Courts do not favor this approach because it is complex to estimate, so the parties would benefit from contractual clarification between all the (sub)agents (e.g. contract liability based on value). Instead, when causes cannot be disentangled and assigned, courts revert to joint and several liability — meaning that each party is liable for the full harm and can be sued individually, which expands liability to the (sub)agents — a tempting approach to avoid complex litigations and battle of experts when MAS are involved (Custers et al., 2025). Courts may decide that MAS-related behaviors such as failure cascade, rogue agent, or agent collusion tendencies lead to third-party harm too often. So, courts may elevate the use of MAS to a “risky activity” and use a strict liability rule (Čerka et al., 2015).

5.3 Platform integration

Agent behaviors and interaction patterns are constantly changing. Emerging LLM-based MASs will likely feature supplier-dependent agent frameworks, which will follow somewhat different safety protocols (Fig. 2). At the moment, efforts to integrate different agent frameworks analogous to traditional software integration (Bass et al., 2021) are still lagging behind but are expected to ramp up due to the market growth. The motivation to integrate LLM agents is to enhance system capability by unifying disparate supplier frameworks, which may include privileged access to customized agentic components (e.g. unique databases, fast memory, etc). Overall, integration serves the needs of the user (i.e. principal) by balancing the advantages of different agent frameworks. At the moment, the potential benefits of integration platforms for LLM agents include:

- **Platform oversight** refers to measures on platform to provide users with enhanced multiagent security through a security-guard agent (Xiang et al., 2024), collusion mitigation mechanism (Foxabbott et al., 2023), detection and suppression of copyright infringement (Liu et al., 2025a) or privacy leakage. These oversight mechanisms are not necessarily baked into the design of individual agents but are provided through the integration platform.
- **Platform teaming** refers to the formation of agent teams on an integration platform through user-defined or ad hoc protocols (Mirsky et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024a) that enhances cooperation among homogeneous or heterogeneous agents.

Liability from mismanaged platforms In an integrated multiagent platform, the platform could carry some liability depending on the level of control they exercise (Gabison & Buiten, 2020; Lefouili & Madio, 2022). For example, control might encompass the behavioral monitoring of the individual agents operating on the platform. Because the platform intrinsically involves multiple principals and multiple agents, the principals may be liable for engaging in collusive behavior but, in rare occasions, platforms have faced liability for incentivizing others (e.g. copyright infringement³, intentional interference⁴).

³MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd., 545 U.S. 913 (2005)

⁴hiQ Labs, Inc. v. LinkedIn Corp., 938 F.3d 985 (9th Cir. 2019)

6 Policy-driven technical development

Improving the transparency and accountability of LLM-based agentic systems that supports in-depth failure analysis and liability attribution requires concomitant developments in agent behavior and system management, as discussed below:

Interpretability and behavior evaluations Tracing an AI agent’s actions (Lu et al., 2024) can be the basis for establishing whether it took reasonable care (Price et al., 2019; Choi, 2020) and therefore the evidence for liability claims. Prior works on the interpretability and faithfulness in LLM reasoning Lyu et al. (2023); Wei Jie et al. (2024) and dialogue generation (Tuan et al., 2021) may eventually also be used to assist in the analysis of agent behavior. More generally, these kinds of evaluations may help understand unreliable behavioral patterns and help diagnose and refine the design bottlenecks in LLM agents. To better ground notions of reasonable care for AI agents, method developments should prioritize decomposing complex multiagent interactions into interpretable causal mechanisms, leveraging causal abstraction frameworks Geiger et al. (2024) to create faithful, human-intelligible representations of agent interactions that preserve essential causal relationships while abstracting away unnecessary details. Additionally, formal verification approaches (Zhang et al., 2024) may be able to detect and prevent potential failure modes in agent interaction and decision-making.

Reward and conflict management Some application settings of LLM-based MASs aim to mimic the functioning of human teams and organization (Xie et al., 2024). Agentic systems can learn from existing organizational theory (Mitnick, 1992; Vardi & Weitz, 2016) to improve the design and architecture given the flawed agency of its components. The most relevant aspects include systems for managing reward and conflict between agents. It has been shown that “verbal tipping” (Salinas & Morstatter, 2024) can provide incentive in instruction to improve LLM performance. Moreover, managing knowledge conflict in LLMs (Xu et al., 2024) has been the most related area. To manage generic conflicts between LLM agents, a credit system (Thomas et al., 2017) of refusal and sanction based on agent IDs may be beneficial (Chan et al., 2025). This could include adaptive trust scoring from evaluation of domain-specific expertise, and an arbitration protocol to adjudicate conflicts such that the arbiter holds the right to refuse action from a frequently misbehaving agent. While an agent scoring system would need to be supported across the relevant AI agent integration platforms (Fig. 1a), it would be essential to balance individual agent utility and cooperation within the system.

Misalignment and misconduct avoidance As discussed in Section 4.3, LLMs and the agents based on them may act in misaligned ways, with behaviors ranging from sycophancy and deception to scheming. While AI model suppliers may be able to partially reduce these problems through effective detection and behavior steering, which has been demonstrated on LLMs (Rimsky et al., 2024; Goldowsky-Dill et al., 2025; Williams et al., 2025). In LLM-based agentic systems, the equivalent tasks could be carried out using separate LLM agents through observing and analyzing other agents’ behavior, such as using the theory-of-mind capability (Street, 2024). The MAS can include agents with a specially finetuned base model (Binz & Schulz, 2023) as a warden (agent) for deception mitigation. Similar approaches can also be used to suppress other agent misconducts such as generation of harmful or copyright-protected content using the warden to filter through key tokens and phrases that can induce such behavior. The adaptive approach carried out by a separate agent can compensate for the limitations in existing model-level approaches such as machine unlearning (Bourtole et al., 2021), which is suffering from limited effectiveness and tradeoffs with other model capabilities (Cooper et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2025b).

7 Conclusion

We examined liability issues arising from LLM-based agentic systems through analyzing distinct aspects of the agentic AI ecosystem according to the principal-agent theory. Despite

that a varieties of issues are yet to present themselves in the real world, the growing evidence and demonstrations in simulated scenarios can inform their potential impact at the societal scale, which we built on in our prospective study. Our work shows that besides increasing agency, disruption in other aspects of the principal-agent relationship can also lead to liability incidents. Ultimately, the materialization of liability issues in reality will be dominated by the more frequent use cases of agentic systems in each industry sector. Our analysis enriches existing contextualization of AI risk (Chan et al., 2023; Hammond et al., 2025) and demonstrates the explanatory power of the behavior-centric approach to translating frontier AI research into tangible knowledge to inform legal analysis and policy.

Ethics Statement

The design and deployment of LLM-based agentic systems raise significant ethical and legal considerations regarding liability attribution. This work acknowledges the complex interplay between supplier responsibility, user actions, and the emergent behaviors of semi-autonomous systems powered by LLMs. We recognize that traditional liability frameworks may inadequately address scenarios where AI agents make consequential decisions with incomplete human oversight. Our analysis aims to contribute to the discussion on appropriate liability for all sides related to LLM-based agentic systems that balances current evidence from system behavior and the available legal framework. We have considered liability in different deployment environment with the aim of informing policy discussions and technical developments to make liability more traceable in AI systems that are complex and extensible, but prone to misbehavior and failure and lack in self-control.

Acknowledgments

We thank the organizers at the AI Governance at the Crossroads symposium held at Berkeley, California in February, 2025. We thank Micah Carroll at UC Berkeley for information about LLM behaviors and AI safety and helpful comments on the manuscript.

A Definitions and their scopes

We clarify here the definitions and scopes for some of the key terms used throughout the text. They are not meant for a complete characterization of these terms but are primarily aimed at illustrating their relationships in the context of this work.

- An **AI agent** is a generic term referring to a software agent powered by any form of artificial intelligence (Krishnan, 2025). An equivalent definition is provided in Section 1.
- An **LLM agent** refers specifically to an AI agent powered by at least one LLM as the central component that executes planning, initiates and coordinates the agent’s actions, etc.
- An **AI system** is an umbrella term defined in the EU AI Act⁵. When deployed, an AI system can operate with various levels of autonomy and can create recommendations and content, make predictions and decisions that influence the environment. The system in the term indicates that the AI is not acting in isolation, but assisted by the surrounding infrastructure such as cloud computing, databases, and user interfaces, which are integral to the AI system and essential for its use. An AI system can be agentic or non-agentic.
- An **agentic system**, also known as an **agentic AI system** Shavit et al. (2023), is a type of AI system that contains a level of agency such that it can carry out actions on its own in pursuit of a goal. An agentic system can include a single agent or multiple agents acting in coordination, competition, cooperation (or collaboration). An AI agent is a component of an agentic system.
- Analogous to the previous entry, **agentic market** is the segment of AI market represented by the suppliers and buyers of agentic AI systems.
- An **agent platform** provides resources and toolkits to construct, configure as well as deploying AI agents (Fig. 1a). AI agents from distinct suppliers can operate on a (software) **integration platform**, where they can interact with each other, with third-party data sources, proprietary APIs, etc. AI agents on any deployment platform may subject to compliance governance and can receive protection against cyberthreats or malfunction from the software infrastructure there.

B Types and examples of existing LLM agent suppliers

We present here preliminary examples for elements of the agentic market that are currently available.

B.1 Agentic software as a service (SaaS)

- Salesforce: www.salesforce.com/agentforce/
- Adobe: business.adobe.com/products/experience-platform/agent-orchestrator.html
- SAP: www.sap.com/products/artificial-intelligence/ai-agents.html
- Oracle: www.oracle.com/artificial-intelligence/generative-ai/agents/
- Cisco Webex: www.webex.ai/ai-agent.html

B.2 Agent-native service

Suppliers of generalist agents

- OpenAI Operator: operator.chatgpt.com
- Google DeepMind Project Astra: deepmind.google/technologies/project-astra
- Please/MultiOn: please.ai
- Manus: manus.im

Suppliers of specialist agents

- Sesame (www.sesame.com) offers voice AI agents for different domains.

⁵<https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/article/3/>

- Contextual (contextual.ai) offers specialized AI agents with advanced retrieval-augmented features.
- Devin (devin.ai) offers AI agents for coding.
- Sierra (sierra.ai) offers AI agents tailored for different types of customer services.
- Health Force (www.healthforce.ai) offers human resources AI agents to handle digital text processing tasks in healthcare systems.
- Zenity (www.zenity.io/) offers security-focused AI agents.

Suppliers of character-infused agents

- Artisan: www.artisan.co
- Sintra: sintra.ai

B.3 Elements of agent integration platforms

- Microsoft Copilot Studio: www.microsoft.com/microsoft-copilot/microsoft-copilot-studio
- Anthropic Model Context Protocol: modelcontextprotocol.io
- IBM Bee AI: beeai.dev

C Principal-agent analysis of an LLM-related legal case




Figure 3: Principal-agent analysis of Mata vs. Avianca, Inc.

The case of *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*⁶ (above) was much discussed in the public media in 2023 as an early incident involving the use of LLMs. The delegational structure of major entities involved in the case is (Fig. 3)

Roberto Mata → Law firm (Levidow, Levidow & Oberman P.C.)
 → Mata’s lawyers (Peter LoDuca, Steven A. Schwartz)
 → ChatGPT

The case features a few different principal-agent relations, starting from Roberto Mata, the plaintiff. The segment relevant for current discussion concerns the law firm that hired the two lawyers representing Mata. A part of the tasks that the lawyers do was delegated to the LLM, ChatGPT, which is the subagent of the law firm. The law firm can control the tools that the lawyers use through the employment contract, but ChatGPT was *not* excluded explicitly. The lawyers defended the fake cases generated by ChatGPT and therefore was

⁶*Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 3d 443 (SDNY 2023)

ruled by the judge to be in bad faith. The law firm also received punishment alongside its employees.

The prompting method that the lawyers used was not explicitly discussed in the court proceeding. ChatGPT is treated as a subagent that carries out the lawyers' task request. It was largely regarded as an instance of LLM hallucination (or confabulation) in the news media rather than deception. The judicial verdict was finalized based on the behavior of the lawyers. The legal case highlights the shortcomings of current legal frameworks and the technical gap to fully comprehend behaviors of AI systems in the presence of their environment (involving humans) and make use of these evidence in attributing blame.

References

- Kenneth S Abraham. *The Forms and Functions of Tort Law*. Foundation Press, 2012.
- Kenneth S Abraham and Robert L Rabin. Automated vehicles and manufacturer responsibility for accidents. *Virginia Law Review*, 105(1):127–171, 2019. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26842234>.
- George A Akerlof. The market for "lemons": Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84:488–500, 1970. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/1879431>.
- Usman Anwar, Abulhair Saparov, Javier Rando, Daniel Paleka, Miles Turpin, Peter Hase, Ekdeep Singh Lubana, Erik Jenner, Stephen Casper, Oliver Sourbut, Benjamin L. Edelman, Zhaowei Zhang, Mario Günther, Anton Korinek, Jose Hernandez-Orallo, Lewis Hammond, Eric J. Bigelow, Alexander Pan, Lauro Langosco, Tomasz Korbak, Heidi Chenyu Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Sean O. hEigeartaigh, Gabriel Recchia, Giulio Corsi, Alan Chan, Markus Anderljung, Lilian Edwards, Aleksandar Petrov, Christian Schroeder de Witt, Sumeet Ramesh Motwani, Yoshua Bengio, Danqi Chen, Philip Torr, Samuel Albanie, Tegan Maharaj, Jakob Nicolaus Foerster, Florian Tramèr, He He, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, Yejin Choi, and David Krueger. Foundational Challenges in Assuring Alignment and Safety of Large Language Models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, May 2024. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=oVTkOs8Pka>.
- Kenneth J Arrow. Uncertainty and the welfare economics of medical care. *The American Economic Review*, 53:941–973, 1963. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1812044>.
- Susan C. Athey, Kevin A. Bryan, and Joshua S. Gans. The Allocation of Decision Authority to Human and Artificial Intelligence. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 110:80–84, May 2020. ISSN 2574-0768. doi: 10.1257/pandp.20201034. URL <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/pandp.20201034>.
- Aaron Baird and Likoebe Maruping. The Next Generation of Research on IS Use: A Theoretical Framework of Delegation to and from Agentic IS Artifacts. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 45(1):315–341, March 2021. ISSN ISSN 0276-7783/ISSN 2162-9730. URL <https://aisel.aisnet.org/misq/vol45/iss1/12>.
- Mikita Balesni, Marius Hobbhahn, David Lindner, Alexander Meinke, Tomek Korbak, Joshua Clymer, Buck Shlegeris, Jérémy Scheurer, Charlotte Stix, Rusheb Shah, Nicholas Goldowsky-Dill, Dan Braun, Bilal Chughtai, Owain Evans, Daniel Kokotajlo, and Lucius Bushnaq. Towards evaluations-based safety cases for AI scheming, November 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2411.03336>. arXiv:2411.03336 [cs].
- Xabier E. Barandiaran and Lola S. Almendros. Transforming Agency. On the mode of existence of Large Language Models, July 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10735>. arXiv:2407.10735 [cs].
- Ohav Barbi, Ori Yoran, and Mor Geva. Preventing Rogue Agents Improves Multi-Agent Collaboration, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.05986>. arXiv:2502.05986 [cs].

- Len Bass, Paul Clements, and Rick Kazman. *Software Architecture in Practice*. Addison-Wesley Professional, June 2021. ISBN 978-0-13-688602-0.
- Marcel Binz and Eric Schulz. Turning large language models into cognitive models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, October 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=eiC4BKypf1>.
- Joshua A. Blonz. The Costs of Misaligned Incentives: Energy Inefficiency and the Principal-Agent Problem. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 15(3):286–321, August 2023. ISSN 1945-7731. doi: 10.1257/pol.20210208. URL <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/pol.20210208>.
- Lucas Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Hengrui Jia, Adelin Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. Machine unlearning. In *2021 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pp. 141–159. IEEE, 2021. doi: 10.1109/SP40001.2021.00019.
- Fouad Bousetuane. Agentic Systems: A Guide to Transforming Industries with Vertical AI Agents, January 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2501.00881>. arXiv:2501.00881 [cs].
- Miriam Buiten, Alexandre de Streel, and Martin Peitz. The law and economics of AI liability. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 48:105794, April 2023. ISSN 0267-3649. doi: 10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105794. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0267364923000055>.
- Miriam C. Buiten. Product liability for defective AI. *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 57(1):239–273, April 2024. ISSN 1572-9990. doi: 10.1007/s10657-024-09794-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10657-024-09794-z>.
- Matthew Burtell and Thomas Woodside. Artificial influence: An analysis of ai-driven persuasion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08721*, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08721>.
- Patrick Butlin. The agency in language agents. *Inquiry*, 0(0):1–21, 2025. ISSN 0020-174X. doi: 10.1080/0020174X.2024.2439995. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2024.2439995>. Publisher: Routledge eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2024.2439995>.
- Guido Calabresi and A Douglas Melamed. Property rules, liability rules, and inalienability: one view of the cathedral. *Harvard Law Review*, 85:1089–1128, April 1972. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/1340059>.
- Rodolfo A Camacho. How to avoid negligent hiring litigation. *Whittier Law Review*, 14: 787–808, 1993. URL <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/whitlr14&i=799>.
- Adam Campbell and Annie S. Wu. Multi-agent role allocation: issues, approaches, and multiple perspectives. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 22(2):317–355, March 2011. ISSN 1573-7454. doi: 10.1007/s10458-010-9127-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10458-010-9127-4>.
- Gian Maria Campedelli, Nicolò Penzo, Massimo Stefan, Roberto Dessì, Marco Guerini, Bruno Lepri, and Jacopo Staiano. I want to break free! persuasion and anti-social behavior of llms in multi-agent settings with social hierarchy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07109*, 2024. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.07109>.
- Emanuela Carbonara, Alice Guerra, and Francesco Parisi. Sharing residual liability: the cheapest cost avoider revisited. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 45(1):173–201, 2016. doi: 10.1086/685498.
- Micah Carroll, Alan Chan, Henry Ashton, and David Krueger. Characterizing Manipulation from AI Systems. In *Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*, pp. 1–13, New York, NY, USA, October 2023. ACM. ISBN 9798400703812. doi: 10.1145/3617694.3623226. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3617694.3623226>.

- Bryan Casey. Robot Ipsa Loquitur. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 108(2):225–286, 2019. URL <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/glj108&i=231>.
- Cristiano Castelfranchi and Rino Falcone. Towards a theory of delegation for agent-based systems. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 24(3):141–157, September 1998. ISSN 0921-8890. doi: 10.1016/S0921-8890(98)00028-1. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921889098000281>.
- Frank J Cavico, Bahaudin G Mujtaba, Marissa Samuel, and Stephen C Muffler. The tort of negligence in employment hiring, supervision, and retention. *American Journal of Business and Society*, 1(4):205, 2016. URL https://nsuworks.nova.edu/hcbe_facarticles/559/.
- Alan Chan, Rebecca Salganik, Alva Markelius, Chris Pang, Nitarshan Rajkumar, Dmitrii Krasheninnikov, Lauro Langosco, Zhonghao He, Yawen Duan, Micah Carroll, Michelle Lin, Alex Mayhew, Katherine Collins, Maryam Molamohammadi, John Burden, Wanru Zhao, Shalaleh Rismani, Konstantinos Voudouris, Umang Bhatt, Adrian Weller, David Krueger, and Tegan Maharaj. Harms from Increasingly Agentic Algorithmic Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '23*, pp. 651–666, New York, NY, USA, June 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400701924. doi: 10.1145/3593013.3594033. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3593013.3594033>.
- Alan Chan, Carson Ezell, Max Kaufmann, Kevin Wei, Lewis Hammond, Herbie Bradley, Emma Bluemke, Nitarshan Rajkumar, David Krueger, Noam Kolt, Lennart Heim, and Markus Anderljung. Visibility into AI Agents. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '24*, pp. 958–973, New York, NY, USA, June 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704505. doi: 10.1145/3630106.3658948. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3630106.3658948>.
- Alan Chan, Kevin Wei, Sihao Huang, Nitarshan Rajkumar, Elija Perrier, Seth Lazar, Gillian K. Hadfield, and Markus Anderljung. Infrastructure for AI Agents, January 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2501.10114>. arXiv:2501.10114 [cs].
- Jiangjie Chen, Xintao Wang, Rui Xu, Siyu Yuan, Yikai Zhang, Wei Shi, Jian Xie, Shuang Li, Ruihan Yang, Tinghui Zhu, Aili Chen, Nianqi Li, Lida Chen, Caiyu Hu, Siye Wu, Scott Ren, Ziquan Fu, and Yanghua Xiao. From Persona to Personalization: A Survey on Role-Playing Language Agents. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, June 2024a. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=xr070E8UIZ>.
- Yanan Chen, Ali Pesaranghader, Tanmana Sadhu, and Dong Hoon Yi. Can We Rely on LLM Agents to Draft Long-Horizon Plans? Let’s Take TravelPlanner as an Example, August 2024b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.06318>. arXiv:2408.06318 [cs].
- Bryan H. Choi. Software as a Profession. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology (Harvard JOLT)*, 33(2):557–638, 2020. URL <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/hjlt33&i=569>.
- Samir Chopra and Laurence F. White. *A Legal Theory for Autonomous Artificial Agents*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, July 2011. ISBN 978-0-472-07145-6.
- Peter Cihon. Chilling autonomy: Policy enforcement for human oversight of AI agents. In *41st International Conference on Machine Learning, Workshop on Generative AI and Law*, 2024. URL https://blog.genlaw.org/pdfs/genlaw_icml2024/79.pdf.
- Ronald Harry Coase. The problem of social cost. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 3:1–44, 1960. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/724810>.
- Michael K. Cohen, Noam Kolt, Yoshua Bengio, Gillian K. Hadfield, and Stuart Russell. Regulating advanced artificial agents. *Science*, 384(6691):36–38, April 2024. doi: 10.1126/science.adl0625. URL <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adl0625>. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

- A. Feder Cooper, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Miranda Bogen, Matthew Jagielski, Katja Filippova, Ken Ziyu Liu, Alexandra Chouldechova, Jamie Hayes, Yangsibo Huang, Niloo-far Mireshghallah, Ilia Shumailov, Eleri Triantafillou, Peter Kairouz, Nicole Mitchell, Percy Liang, Daniel E. Ho, Yejin Choi, Sanmi Koyejo, Fernando Delgado, James Grimmelmann, Vitaly Shmatikov, Christopher De Sa, Solon Barocas, Amy Cyphert, Mark Lemley, danah boyd, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Miles Brundage, David Bau, Seth Neel, Abigail Z. Jacobs, Andreas Terzis, Hanna Wallach, Nicolas Papernot, and Katherine Lee. Machine Unlearning Doesn't Do What You Think: Lessons for Generative AI Policy, Research, and Practice, December 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2412.06966>. arXiv:2412.06966 [cs].
- N. Criado, E. Argente, and V. Botti. Open issues for normative multi-agent systems. *AI Communications*, 24(3):233–264, January 2011. ISSN 0921-7126. doi: 10.3233/AIC-2011-0502. URL <https://content.iospress.com/articles/ai-communications/aic502>. Publisher: IOS Press.
- Andrew Critch and David Krueger. AI Research Considerations for Human Existential Safety (ARCHES), May 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.04948>. arXiv:2006.04948 [cs].
- Bart Custers, Henning Lahmann, and Benjamyn I Scott. From liability gaps to liability overlaps: shared responsibilities and fiduciary duties in ai and other complex technologies. *AI & SOCIETY*, pp. 1–16, 2025. doi: 10.1007/s00146-024-02137-1.
- Jessica Dai. Position: Beyond Personhood: Agency, Accountability, and the Limits of Anthropomorphic Ethical Analysis. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, June 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=4XlGXlh2BB>.
- Parashar Das. Agency in Artificial Intelligence Systems, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.10434>. arXiv:2502.10434 [cs].
- Mihailis E. Diamantis. Vicarious Liability for AI. *Indiana Law Journal*, 99(1):317–334, 2023. URL <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/indana99&i=330>.
- Leonard Dung. Understanding Artificial Agency. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, pp. pqae010, February 2024. ISSN 0031-8094. doi: 10.1093/pq/pqae010. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/pq/pqae010>.
- Kathleen M. Eisenhardt. Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(1):57–74, 1989. ISSN 0363-7425. doi: 10.2307/258191. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/258191>. Publisher: Academy of Management.
- Tom Everitt, Ryan Carey, Eric D. Langlois, Pedro A. Ortega, and Shane Legg. Agent Incentives: A Causal Perspective. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(13):11487–11495, May 2021. ISSN 2374-3468. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v35i13.17368. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/17368>. Number: 13.
- Eugene F. Fama. Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, 88(2):288–307, April 1980. ISSN 0022-3808. doi: 10.1086/260866. URL <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/260866>. Publisher: The University of Chicago Press.
- Eugene F. Fama and Michael C. Jensen. Agency Problems and Residual Claims. *The Journal of Law & Economics*, 26(2):327–349, 1983. ISSN 0022-2186. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/725105>. Publisher: [University of Chicago Press, Booth School of Business, University of Chicago, University of Chicago Law School].
- Sara Fish, Yannai A. Gonczarowski, and Ran I. Shorrer. Algorithmic Collusion by Large Language Models, November 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.00806>. arXiv:2404.00806 [econ].
- Jack Foxabbott, Sam Deverett, Kaspar Senft, Samuel Dower, and Lewis Hammond. Defining and Mitigating Collusion in Multi-Agent Systems. October 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=tF464LogJS>.

- Henry Fraser, Rhyle Simcock, and Aaron J Snoswell. Ai opacity and explainability in tort litigation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 185–196, 2022. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3531146.3533084>.
- Garry A. Gabison and Miriam C. Buiten. Platform Liability in Copyright Enforcement. *Columbia Science and Technology Law Review*, 21(2):237–281, 2020. URL <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/cstlr21&i=244>.
- Jiarui Gan, Minbiao Han, Jibang Wu, and Haifeng Xu. Generalized Principal-Agency: Contracts, Information, Games and Beyond, February 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.01146>. arXiv:2209.01146 [cs].
- Atticus Geiger, Duligur Ibeling, Amir Zur, Maheep Chaudhary, Sonakshi Chauhan, Jing Huang, Aryaman Arora, Zhengxuan Wu, Noah Goodman, Christopher Potts, and Thomas Icard. Causal Abstraction: A Theoretical Foundation for Mechanistic Interpretability, August 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.04709>. arXiv:2301.04709 [cs].
- Mark A. Geistfeld, Ernst Karner, and Bernhard A. Koch. Comparative Law Study on Civil Liability for Artificial Intelligence. In Ernst Karner, Bernhard A. Koch, Mark A. Geistfeld, and Christiane Wendehorst (eds.), *Civil Liability for Artificial Intelligence and Software*, pp. 1–184. De Gruyter, November 2022. ISBN 978-3-11-077540-2. doi: 10.1515/9783110775402-001. URL <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110775402-001/html>.
- Michael C. Gemignani. Product Liability and Software. *Rutgers Computer & Technology Law Journal*, 8(2):173–204, 1980. URL <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/rutcomt8&i=179>.
- Nicholas Goldowsky-Dill, Bilal Chughtai, Stefan Heimersheim, and Marius Hobbhahn. Detecting Strategic Deception Using Linear Probes, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.03407>. arXiv:2502.03407 [cs].
- Ryan Greenblatt, Carson Denison, Benjamin Wright, Fabien Roger, Monte MacDiarmid, Sam Marks, Johannes Treutlein, Tim Belonax, Jack Chen, David Duvenaud, Akbir Khan, Julian Michael, Sören Mindermann, Ethan Perez, Linda Petrini, Jonathan Uesato, Jared Kaplan, Buck Shlegeris, Samuel R. Bowman, and Evan Hubinger. Alignment faking in large language models, December 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2412.14093>. arXiv:2412.14093 [cs].
- Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V. Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. Large Language Model Based Multi-agents: A Survey of Progress and Challenges. volume 9, pp. 8048–8057, August 2024. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2024/890. URL <https://www.ijcai.org/proceedings/2024/890>. ISSN: 1045-0823.
- Dylan Hadfield-Menell and Gillian K. Hadfield. Incomplete contracting and ai alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society, AIES '19*, pp. 417–422, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450363242. doi: 10.1145/3306618.3314250. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3306618.3314250>.
- Dylan Hadfield-Menell, Mckane Andrus, and Gillian Hadfield. Legible Normativity for AI Alignment: The Value of Silly Rules. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society, AIES '19*, pp. 115–121, New York, NY, USA, January 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-6324-2. doi: 10.1145/3306618.3314258. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3306618.3314258>.
- Lewis Hammond, Alan Chan, Jesse Clifton, Jason Hoelscher-Obermaier, Akbir Khan, Euan McLean, Chandler Smith, Wolfram Barfuss, Jakob Foerster, Tomáš Gavenciak, The Anh Han, Edward Hughes, Vojtěch Kovařík, Jan Kulveit, Joel Z. Leibo, Caspar Oesterheld, Christian Schroeder de Witt, Nisarg Shah, Michael Wellman, Paolo Bova, Theodor Cimpanu, Carson Ezell, Quentin Feuillade-Montixi, Matija Franklin, Esben Kran, Igor

- Krawczuk, Max Lamparth, Niklas Lauffer, Alexander Meinke, Sumeet Motwani, Anka Reuel, Vincent Conitzer, Michael Dennis, Jason Gabriel, Adam Gleave, Gillian Hadfield, Nika Haghtalab, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, Sébastien Krier, Kate Larson, Joel Lehman, David C. Parkes, Georgios Piliouras, and Iyad Rahwan. Multi-Agent Risks from Advanced AI, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.14143>. arXiv:2502.14143 [cs].
- Pengfei He, Yupin Lin, Shen Dong, Han Xu, Yue Xing, and Hui Liu. Red-Teaming LLM Multi-Agent Systems via Communication Attacks, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.14847>. arXiv:2502.14847 [cs].
- Yifeng He, Ethan Wang, Yuyang Rong, Zifei Cheng, and Hao Chen. Security of AI Agents, December 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.08689>. arXiv:2406.08689 [cs].
- Dan Hendrycks. Natural Selection Favors AIs over Humans, July 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.16200>. arXiv:2303.16200 [cs].
- Bengt Holmström. Moral hazard and observability. *The Bell journal of economics*, 10:74–91, 1979. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3003320>.
- Dima Ivanov, Paul Dütting, Inbal Talgam-Cohen, Tonghan Wang, and David C. Parkes. Principal-Agent Reinforcement Learning: Orchestrating AI Agents with Contracts, October 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.18074>. arXiv:2407.18074 [cs].
- Shrey Jain, Zoë Hitzig, and Pamela Mishkin. Contextual Confidence and Generative AI, January 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.01193>. arXiv:2311.01193 [cs].
- Nicholas R. Jennings. An agent-based approach for building complex software systems. *Commun. ACM*, 44(4):35–41, April 2001. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/367211.367250. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/367211.367250>.
- Michael C. Jensen and William H. Meckling. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4):305–360, October 1976. ISSN 0304-405X. doi: 10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304405X7690026X>.
- Song Jiang, Da Ju, Andrew Cohen, Sasha Mitts, Aaron Foss, Justine T. Kao, Xian Li, and Yuandong Tian. Towards Full Delegation: Designing Ideal Agentic Behaviors for Travel Planning. In *NeurIPS 2024 Workshop on Adaptive Foundation Models*, November 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YT0S2XetSJ>.
- Subbarao Kambhampati, Karthik Valmeekam, Lin Guan, Mudit Verma, Kaya Stechly, Sidhant Bhambri, Lucas Paul Saldyt, and Anil B. Murthy. Position: LLMs Can’t Plan, But Can Help Planning in LLM-Modulo Frameworks. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, June 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Th8JPEmH4z>.
- Timotheus Kampik, Adnane Mansour, Olivier Boissier, Sabrina Kirrane, Julian Padget, Terry R. Payne, Munindar P. Singh, Valentina Tamma, and Antoine Zimmermann. Governance of Autonomous Agents on the Web: Challenges and Opportunities. *ACM Trans. Internet Technol.*, 22(4):104:1–104:31, November 2022. ISSN 1533-5399. doi: 10.1145/3507910. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3507910>.
- Yubin Kim, Chanwoo Park, Hyewon Jeong, Yik Siu Chan, Xuhai Xu, Daniel McDuff, Hyeonhoon Lee, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Cynthia Breazeal, and Hae Won Park. MDAgents: An Adaptive Collaboration of LLMs for Medical Decision-Making. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, November 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=EKdk4vxK04>.
- Noam Kolt. Governing AI Agents, January 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2501.07913>. arXiv:2501.07913 [cs].
- Iuliia Kotseruba and John K. Tsotsos. 40 years of cognitive architectures: core cognitive abilities and practical applications. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 53(1):17–94, January 2020. ISSN 1573-7462. doi: 10.1007/s10462-018-9646-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-018-9646-y>.

- Naveen Krishnan. AI Agents: Evolution, Architecture, and Real-World Applications, March 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.12687>. arXiv:2503.12687 [cs].
- Jean-Jacques Laffont and David Martimort. *The Theory of Incentives: The Principal-Agent Model*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J, January 2002. ISBN 978-0-691-09184-6.
- Leon Lang, Davis Foote, Stuart Russell, Anca Dragan, Erik Jenner, and Scott Emmons. When Your AIs Deceive You: Challenges of Partial Observability in Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, November 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=XcbgkjWSJ7¬eId=7bt8GnwBkH>.
- Yassine Lefouili and Leonardo Madio. The economics of platform liability. *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 53(3):319–351, June 2022. ISSN 1572-9990. doi: 10.1007/s10657-022-09728-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10657-022-09728-7>.
- Saul Levmore. Probabilistic recoveries, restitution, and recurring wrongs. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 19(S2):691–726, 1990.
- Xinzhe Li. A Review of Prominent Paradigms for LLM-Based Agents: Tool Use, Planning (Including RAG), and Feedback Learning. In Owen Rambow, Leo Wanner, Marianna Apidianaki, Hend Al-Khalifa, Barbara Di Eugenio, and Steven Schockaert (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 9760–9779, Abu Dhabi, UAE, January 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.coling-main.652/>.
- Ryan Y. Lin, Siddhartha Ojha, Kevin Cai, and Maxwell Chen. Strategic Collusion of LLM Agents: Market Division in Multi-Commodity Competitions. In *Language Gamification - NeurIPS 2024 Workshop*, December 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=X9vAIw5Yj>.
- Shunchang Liu, Zhuan Shi, Lingjuan Lyu, Yaochu Jin, and Boi Faltings. CopyJudge: Automated Copyright Infringement Identification and Mitigation in Text-to-Image Diffusion Models, February 2025a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.15278>. arXiv:2502.15278 [cs].
- Sijia Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jinghan Jia, Stephen Casper, Nathalie Baracaldo, Peter Hase, Yuguang Yao, Chris Yuhao Liu, Xiaojun Xu, Hang Li, Kush R. Varshney, Mohit Bansal, Sanmi Koyejo, and Yang Liu. Rethinking machine unlearning for large language models. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 7(2):181–194, February 2025b. ISSN 2522-5839. doi: 10.1038/s42256-025-00985-0. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s42256-025-00985-0>. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Manikanta Loya, Divya Sinha, and Richard Futrell. Exploring the Sensitivity of LLMs’ Decision-Making Capabilities: Insights from Prompt Variations and Hyperparameters. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 3711–3716, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.241. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.241/>.
- Jiaying Lu, Bo Pan, Jieyi Chen, Yingchaojie Feng, Jingyuan Hu, Yuchen Peng, and Wei Chen. AgentLens: Visual Analysis for Agent Behaviors in LLM-based Autonomous Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, pp. 1–17, 2024. ISSN 1941-0506. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2024.3394053. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10520238>. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics.
- Brian Lubars and Chenhao Tan. Ask not what AI can do, but what AI should do: Towards a framework of task delegability. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/hash/d67d8ab4f4c10bf22aa353e27879133c-Abstract.html.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. Faithful Chain-of-Thought Reasoning. In Jong C.

- Park, Yuki Arase, Baotian Hu, Wei Lu, Derry Wijaya, Ayu Purwarianti, and Adila Alfa Krisnadhi (eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 305–329, Nusa Dua, Bali, November 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.ijcnlp-main.20. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.ijcnlp-main.20/>.
- Olivia Macmillan-Scott and Mirco Musolesi. (Ir)rationality and cognitive biases in large language models. *Royal Society Open Science*, 11(6):240255, June 2024. doi: 10.1098/rsos.240255. URL <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsos.240255>. Publisher: Royal Society.
- Adyasha Maharana, Dong-Ho Lee, Sergey Tulyakov, Mohit Bansal, Francesco Barbieri, and Yuwei Fang. Evaluating Very Long-Term Conversational Memory of LLM Agents. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 13851–13870, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.747. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.747/>.
- James Mattingly and Beba Cibralic. *Machine Agency*. MIT Press, February 2025. ISBN 978-0-262-38096-6.
- Natalie Maus, Patrick Chao, Eric Wong, and Jacob R. Gardner. Black Box Adversarial Prompting for Foundation Models. In *The Second Workshop on New Frontiers in Adversarial Machine Learning*, August 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=aI5QPjTRbS>.
- Elizabeth Mieczkowski, Ruairidh Mon-Williams, Neil Bramley, Christopher G. Lucas, Natalia Velez, and Thomas L. Griffiths. Predicting Multi-Agent Specialization via Task Parallelizability, March 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.15703>. arXiv:2503.15703 [cs].
- Erik Miehling, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, Kush R. Varshney, Matthew Riemer, Djallel Bouneffouf, John T. Richards, Amit Dhurandhar, Elizabeth M. Daly, Michael Hind, Prasanna Sattigeri, Dennis Wei, Ambrish Rawat, Jasmina Gajcin, and Werner Geyer. Agentic AI Needs a Systems Theory, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.00237>. arXiv:2503.00237 [cs].
- Reuth Mirsky, Ignacio Carlucho, Arrasy Rahman, Elliot Fosong, William Macke, Mohan Sridharan, Peter Stone, and Stefano V. Albrecht. A Survey of Ad Hoc Teamwork Research. In Dorothea Baumeister and Jörg Rothe (eds.), *Multi-Agent Systems*, pp. 275–293, Cham, 2022. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-031-20614-6. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-20614-6_16.
- Barry M. Mitnick. The Theory of Agency and Organizational Analysis. In *Ethics and Agency Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom, 1992. URL <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2164770>.
- Roderick Munday. *Agency: Law and Principles*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom ; New York, NY, 4th edition, May 2022. ISBN 978-0-19-285619-7.
- Greg R. Oldham and Yitzhak Fried. Job design research and theory: Past, present and future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 136:20–35, September 2016. ISSN 0749-5978. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.05.002. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749597816302643>.
- Paulo Henrique Padovan, Clarice Marinho Martins, and Chris Reed. Black is the new orange: how to determine AI liability. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 31(1):133–167, March 2023. ISSN 1572-8382. doi: 10.1007/s10506-022-09308-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-022-09308-9>.
- Melissa Z. Pan, Mert Cemri, Lakshya A. Agrawal, Shuyi Yang, Bhavya Chopra, Rishabh Tiwari, Kurt Keutzer, Aditya Parameswaran, Kannan Ramchandran, Dan Klein, Joseph E.

- Gonzalez, Matei Zaharia, and Ion Stoica. Why Do Multiagent Systems Fail? In *ICLR 2025 Workshop on Building Trust in Language Models and Applications*, March 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wM521FqPvI>.
- Joon Sung Park, Carolyn Q. Zou, Aaron Shaw, Benjamin Mako Hill, Carrie Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Robb Willer, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. Generative Agent Simulations of 1,000 People, November 2024a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2411.10109>. arXiv:2411.10109 [cs].
- Peter S. Park, Simon Goldstein, Aidan O’Gara, Michael Chen, and Dan Hendrycks. AI deception: A survey of examples, risks, and potential solutions. *Patterns*, 5(5), May 2024b. ISSN 2666-3899. doi: 10.1016/j.patter.2024.100988. URL [https://www.cell.com/patterns/abstract/S2666-3899\(24\)00103-X](https://www.cell.com/patterns/abstract/S2666-3899(24)00103-X). Publisher: Elsevier.
- Pierre Peigne-Lefebvre, Mikolaj Kniejski, Filip Sondej, Matthieu David, Jason Hoelscher-Obermaier, Christian Schroeder de Witt, and Esben Kran. Multi-Agent Security Tax: Trading Off Security and Collaboration Capabilities in Multi-Agent Systems, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.19145>. arXiv:2502.19145 [cs].
- Ethan Perez, Sam Ringer, Kamile Lukosiute, Karina Nguyen, Edwin Chen, Scott Heiner, Craig Pettit, Catherine Olsson, Sandipan Kundu, Saurav Kadavath, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Benjamin Mann, Brian Israel, Bryan Seethor, Cameron McKinnon, Christopher Olah, Da Yan, Daniela Amodei, Dario Amodei, Dawn Drain, Dustin Li, Eli Tran-Johnson, Guro Khundadze, Jackson Kernion, James Landis, Jamie Kerr, Jared Mueller, Jeeyoon Hyun, Joshua Landau, Kamal Ndousse, Landon Goldberg, Liane Lovitt, Martin Lucas, Michael Sellitto, Miranda Zhang, Neerav Kingsland, Nelson Elhage, Nicholas Joseph, Noemi Mercado, Nova DasSarma, Oliver Rausch, Robin Larson, Sam McCandlish, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Sheer El Showk, Tamera Lanham, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tom Brown, Tom Henighan, Tristan Hume, Yuntao Bai, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Jack Clark, Samuel R. Bowman, Amanda Askell, Roger Grosse, Danny Hernandez, Deep Ganguli, Evan Hubinger, Nicholas Schiefer, and Jared Kaplan. Discovering Language Model Behaviors with Model-Written Evaluations. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 13387–13434, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.847. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.847>.
- Elija Perrier and Michael Timothy Bennett. Position: Stop Acting Like Language Model Agents Are Normal Agents, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.10420>. arXiv:2502.10420 [cs].
- Jinghua Piao, Yuwei Yan, Jun Zhang, Nian Li, Junbo Yan, Xiaochong Lan, Zhihong Lu, Zhiheng Zheng, Jing Yi Wang, Di Zhou, Chen Gao, Fengli Xu, Fang Zhang, Ke Rong, Jun Su, and Yong Li. AgentSociety: Large-Scale Simulation of LLM-Driven Generative Agents Advances Understanding of Human Behaviors and Society, February 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.08691>. arXiv:2502.08691 [cs].
- Karl Popp. Software Industry Business Models. *IEEE Software*, 28(4):26–30, July 2011. ISSN 1937-4194. doi: 10.1109/MS.2011.52. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5750001/references#references>. Conference Name: IEEE Software.
- W. Nicholson Price, Sara Gerke, and I. Glenn Cohen. Potential Liability for Physicians Using Artificial Intelligence. *JAMA*, 322(18):1765, November 2019. ISSN 0098-7484. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.15064. URL <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2752750>.
- Chen Qian, Zihao Xie, YiFei Wang, Wei Liu, Kunlun Zhu, Hanchen Xia, Yufan Dang, Zhuoyun Du, Weize Chen, Cheng Yang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Scaling Large Language Model-based Multi-Agent Collaboration. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, October 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=K3n5jPkrU6>.
- Lillian J. Ratliff, Roy Dong, Shreyas Sekar, and Tanner Fiez. A Perspective on Incentive Design: Challenges and Opportunities. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and*

- Autonomous Systems*, 2(Volume 2, 2019):305–338, May 2019. ISSN 2573-5144. doi: 10.1146/annurev-control-053018-023634. URL <https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-control-053018-023634>. Publisher: Annual Reviews.
- Nina Rimsy, Nick Gabrieli, Julian Schulz, Meg Tong, Evan Hubinger, and Alexander Turner. Steering Llama 2 via Contrastive Activation Addition. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 15504–15522, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.828. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.828/>.
- Abel Salinas and Fred Morstatter. The Butterfly Effect of Altering Prompts: How Small Changes and Jailbreaks Affect Large Language Model Performance. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pp. 4629–4651, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.275. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.275/>.
- Jérémy Scheurer, Mikita Balesni, and Marius Hobbhahn. Large Language Models can Strategically Deceive their Users when Put Under Pressure. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*, March 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HduMpot9sJ>.
- Murray Shanahan, Kyle McDonell, and Laria Reynolds. Role play with large language models. *Nature*, 623(7987):493–498, November 2023. ISSN 0028-0836. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06647-8. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-023-06647-8>.
- Catherine M. Sharkey. A Products Liability Framework for AI. *Columbia Science and Technology Law Review*, 25(2):240–260, June 2024. ISSN 1938-0976. doi: 10.52214/stlr.v25i2.12763. URL <https://journals.library.columbia.edu/index.php/stlr/article/view/12763>. Number: 2.
- Mrinank Sharma, Meg Tong, Tomasz Korbak, David Duvenaud, Amanda Askeel, Samuel R. Bowman, Esin Durmus, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Scott R. Johnston, Shauna M. Kravec, Timothy Maxwell, Sam McCandlish, Kamal Ndousse, Oliver Rausch, Nicholas Schiefer, Da Yan, Miranda Zhang, and Ethan Perez. Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=tvhaxkMKAn>.
- Yonadav Shavit, Sandhini Agarwal, Miles Brundage, Steven Adler Cullen O’Keefe, Rosie Campbell, Teddy Lee, Pamela Mishkin, Tyna Eloundou, Alan Hickey, Katarina Slama, Lama Ahmad, Paul McMillan, Alex Beutel, Alexandre Passos, and David G. Robinson. Practices for Governing Agentic AI Systems. 2023. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Practices-for-Governing-Agentic-AI-Systems-Shavit-Agarwal/0002c42e8d7bfeafc431c4ed9f6318f223bbf58b>.
- Michael Spence. Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87:355–374, 1973. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>.
- Sarah Sterz, Kevin Baum, Sebastian Biewer, Holger Hermanns, Anne Lauber-Rönsberg, Philip Meinel, and Markus Langer. On the Quest for Effectiveness in Human Oversight: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT ’24*, pp. 2495–2507, New York, NY, USA, June 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704505. doi: 10.1145/3630106.3659051. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3630106.3659051>.
- Winnie Street. LLM Theory of Mind and Alignment: Opportunities and Risks, May 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.08154>. arXiv:2405.08154 [cs].
- Theodore Sumers, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Thomas Griffiths. Cognitive Architectures for Language Agents. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, October 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=1i6ZCvf1QJ>.

- Alan Sykes. The Economics of Vicarious Liability. *Yale Law Journal*, 1984. URL <https://openyls.law.yale.edu/handle/20.500.13051/16285>. Accepted: 2021-11-26T12:26:37Z.
- Xiangru Tang, Anni Zou, Zhuosheng Zhang, Ziming Li, Yilun Zhao, Xingyao Zhang, Arman Cohan, and Mark Gerstein. MedAgents: Large Language Models as Collaborators for Zero-shot Medical Reasoning. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pp. 599–621, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.33. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.33/>.
- Richard H. Thaler. Behavioral Economics: Past, Present, and Future. *American Economic Review*, 106(7):1577–1600, July 2016. ISSN 0002-8282. doi: 10.1257/aer.106.7.1577. URL <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.106.7.1577>.
- Lyn Thomas, Jonathan Crook, and David Edelman. *Credit Scoring and Its Applications, Second Edition*. Mathematics in Industry. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, August 2017. ISBN 978-1-61197-455-3. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611974560. URL <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/book/10.1137/1.9781611974560>.
- Khanh-Tung Tran, Dung Dao, Minh-Duong Nguyen, Quoc-Viet Pham, Barry O’Sullivan, and Hoang D. Nguyen. Multi-Agent Collaboration Mechanisms: A Survey of LLMs, January 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2501.06322>. arXiv:2501.06322 [cs].
- Rakshit Trivedi, Nikhil Chandak, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Shuhui Zhu, Atrisha Sarkar, Joel Z. Leibo, Dylan Hadfield-Menell, and Gillian K. Hadfield. Altered Environments: The Role of Normative Infrastructure in AI Alignment. In *Agentic Markets Workshop at ICML 2024*, October 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Gd6QrBLHBN>.
- Yi-Lin Tuan, Connor Pryor, Wenhui Chen, Lise Getoor, and William Yang Wang. Local Explanation of Dialogue Response Generation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 404–416. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/03b92cd507ff5870df0db7f074728830-Abstract.html>.
- Jacob Turner. *Robot Rules: Regulating Artificial Intelligence*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, November 2018. ISBN 978-3-319-96234-4.
- Yoav Vardi and Ely Weitz. *Misbehavior in Organizations: A Dynamic Approach*. Routledge, 2nd edition, April 2016.
- Caroline Wang, Arrasy Rahman, Ishan Durugkar, Elad Liebman, and Peter Stone. N-agent Ad Hoc Teamwork. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:111832–111862, December 2024a. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/cabf611498431ad89a85ace75f790d93-Abstract-Conference.html.
- Qian Wang, Tianyu Wang, Zhenheng Tang, Qinbin Li, Nuo Chen, Jingsheng Liang, and Bingsheng He. All It Takes Is One Prompt: An Autonomous LLM-MA System. In *ICLR 2025 Workshop on Foundation Models in the Wild*, March 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mSKj2bCWRr>.
- Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Lifan Yuan, Yizhe Zhang, Yunzhu Li, Hao Peng, and Heng Ji. Executable code actions elicit better LLM agents. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of ICML’24, pp. 50208–50232, Vienna, Austria, July 2024b. JMLR.org.
- Yeo Wei Jie, Ranjan Satapathy, Rick Goh, and Erik Cambria. How Interpretable are Reasoning Explanations from Prompting Large Language Models? In Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pp. 2148–2164, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-naacl.138. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-naacl.138/>.

- Laura Weidinger, Maribeth Rauh, Nahema Marchal, Arianna Manzini, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Juan Mateos-Garcia, Stevie Bergman, Jackie Kay, Conor Griffin, Ben Bariach, Iason Gabriel, Verena Rieser, and William Isaac. Sociotechnical Safety Evaluation of Generative AI Systems, October 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.11986>. arXiv:2310.11986 [cs].
- Marcus Williams, Micah Carroll, Adhyyan Narang, Constantin Weisser, Brendan Murphy, and Anca Dragan. On Targeted Manipulation and Deception when Optimizing LLMs for User Feedback. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Wf2ndb8nhf>.
- Zhen Xiang, Linzhi Zheng, Yanjie Li, Junyuan Hong, Qinbin Li, Han Xie, Jiawei Zhang, Zidi Xiong, Chulin Xie, Carl Yang, Dawn Song, and Bo Li. GuardAgent: Safeguard LLM Agents by a Guard Agent via Knowledge-Enabled Reasoning, March 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09187>. arXiv:2406.09187 [cs].
- Yijia Xiao, Edward Sun, Di Luo, and Wei Wang. TradingAgents: Multi-Agents LLM Financial Trading Framework. In *The First MARW: Multi-Agent AI in the Real World Workshop at AAAI 2025*, February 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=4QPrXwMQt1>.
- Chengxing Xie, Canyu Chen, Feiran Jia, Ziyu Ye, Shiyang Lai, Kai Shu, Jindong Gu, Adel Bibi, Ziniu Hu, David Jurgens, James Evans, Philip Torr, Bernard Ghanem, and Guohao Li. Can Large Language Model Agents Simulate Human Trust Behavior? November 2024. URL [https://openreview.net/forum?id=Ce0wahuQic&referrer=%5Bthe%20profile%20of%20Ziniu%20Hu%5D\(%2Fprofile%3Fid%3D~Ziniu_Hu1\)](https://openreview.net/forum?id=Ce0wahuQic&referrer=%5Bthe%20profile%20of%20Ziniu%20Hu%5D(%2Fprofile%3Fid%3D~Ziniu_Hu1)).
- Rongwu Xu, Zehan Qi, Zhijiang Guo, Cunxiang Wang, Hongru Wang, Yue Zhang, and Wei Xu. Knowledge Conflicts for LLMs: A Survey. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 8541–8565, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.486. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.486/>.
- Franco Zambonelli, Nicholas R. Jennings, and Michael Wooldridge. Developing multiagent systems: The Gaia methodology. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, 12(3):317–370, July 2003. ISSN 1049-331X. doi: 10.1145/958961.958963. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/958961.958963>.
- Yedi Zhang, Yufan Cai, Xinyue Zuo, Xiaokun Luan, Kailong Wang, Zhe Hou, Yifan Zhang, Zhiyuan Wei, Meng Sun, Jun Sun, Jing Sun, and Jin Song Dong. The Fusion of Large Language Models and Formal Methods for Trustworthy AI Agents: A Roadmap, December 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2412.06512>. arXiv:2412.06512 [cs].
- Qingxiao Zheng, Zhongwei Xu, Abhinav Choudhry, Yuting Chen, Yongming Li, and Yun Huang. Synergizing Human-AI Agency: A Guide of 23 Heuristics for Service Co-Creation with LLM-Based Agents, November 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.15065>. arXiv:2310.15065 [cs].
- Jingming Zhuo, Songyang Zhang, Xinyu Fang, Haodong Duan, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. ProSA: Assessing and Understanding the Prompt Sensitivity of LLMs. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 1950–1976, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.108. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.108/>.
- Paulius Čerka, Jurgita Grigienė, and Gintarė Sirbikytė. Liability for damages caused by artificial intelligence. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 31(3):376–389, 2015. ISSN 2212-473X. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2015.03.008>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S026736491500062X>.