Is your RAG application performing as well as you expected? Learn to test it with Ragas and PyTest.

Abstract

RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) is a modern technique that enhances response generation by leveraging large language models (LLMs) with data retrieved from an authorized knowledge base. However, evaluating these responses can be challenging because a response may be valid even if it uses different wording each time, or it may simply be a hallucination. This study presents an approach to evaluating both the context used to generate the answers and the answers themselves using a tool called RAGAS. As a result of this research, I was able to build a local RAG system, consume a single data source, generate answers, and produce evaluation metrics using RAGAS and Pytest to assess various quality aspects of the system, such as context precision, context recall, response faithfulness, and response relevance. This research serves as a starting point for further exploration of how to evaluate RAG responses and agents in the future, which is the next objective.

11 Introduction to Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) is the process of optimizing the output of a large language model, so it references an authoritative knowledge base outside of its training data sources before generating a response. Large Language Models (LLMs) are trained on vast volumes of data and use billions of parameters to generate original output for tasks like answering questions, translating languages, and completing sentences. RAG extends the already-powerful capabilities of LLMs to specific domains or an organization's internal knowledge base, all without the need to retrain the model. It is a cost-effective approach to improving LLM output so it remains relevant, accurate, and useful in various contexts.

RAG is a useful technique because it leverages the existing capabilities of large LLMs, making it a cost-effective implementation. It also enhances user trust by using reliable data sources and provides greater control over the generated answers.

In simple terms, RAG transforms a dataset into chunks of information. Each chunk is stored in a vector database as embeddings. When a query is made, the system retrieves the most relevant chunks to answer the question, and a response is generated based on the retrieved information.



Fig. 1: Diagram explaining how a regular RAG application works

12 Challenges of testing RAG applications

The RAG process uses LLMs to generate responses from a valid knowledge base, but since it still relies on models, the risk of unexpected outputs remains. Additionally, the way users structure their questions can vary significantly from one person to another, making it virtually impossible to test all possible queries

One of the challenges is when the question does not return the required content, and it may be caused when the query is not well-formulated or phrased.

RAG generates responses based on relevant chunks of information using embeddings. However, this can lead to another challenge when some relevant information is not retrieved, resulting in essential content missing from the final response. This may occur if not all necessary chunks of information are retrieved to construct the best response, if the embeddings are not large enough, or if there is an issue with the vector search mechanism itself.

There may also be cases where information is repeated across multiple chunks, and RAG might struggle with retrieving redundant data. This can lead to the model generating responses with duplicated content incoherently.

A RAG app may generate answers based on a vague context. This could be caused by incorrect chunking strategies or the use of poor embedding models.

LLMs have a common problem called hallucinations, which RAG apps can inherit. A hallucination refers to text generation that is unsupported by the retrieved information. In some cases, the generative model may produce text that seems plausible but is not present in the retrieved context. This poses a risk that must be managed.

RAG can produce generic responses despite the good quality of the retrieved chunks of information. This can result in irrelevant text or text that does not fully address the user's needs.

This paper highlights only a few of the challenges, but many more exist. Identifying these challenges and developing effective strategies to manage them is crucial for improving the reliability of RAG applications.

13 Test RAG responses with Ragas and Pytest

RAGAS is a Python library used to generate scores based on different factors by analyzing all components of a RAG application. To generate a score, it uses various parameters depending on the aspect being evaluated. Some of these parameters include the question, the answers, the chunks of information used to generate the response (referred to as the retrieved documents), and, for certain metrics, a ground truth or reference is required.

PyTest is another Python library used as a test framework to write small, readable tests, and it can scale to support complex functional testing for applications and libraries.

3.11 RAGAS & metrics

A metric is a quantitative measure used to evaluate the performance of an AI application. Metrics help in assessing how well the application and individual components that makes up application is performing relative to the given test data. They provide a numerical basis for comparison, optimization, and decision-making throughout the application development and deployment process.

Metrics help identify which part of the application is causing errors or suboptimal performance, making it easier to debug and refine. Metrics enable the tracking of an AI application's performance over time, helping to detect and respond to issues such as data drift, model degradation, or changing user requirements.

Metrics to be reviewed:

- 1. Context precision
- 2. Context recall
- 3. Response faithfulness
- 4. Response relevancy

3.12 Context precision

Context Precision is a metric that measures the proportion of relevant chunks in the retrieved contexts or relevant chunks of information returned based on the question.

```
\begin{aligned} \text{Context Precision@K} &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( \text{Precision@k} \times v_k \right)}{\text{Total number of relevant items in the top $K$ results}} \\ &\text{Precision@k} &= \frac{\text{true positives@k}}{\left( \text{true positives@k} + \text{false positives@k} \right)} \end{aligned}
```

Fig. 2: Formula to calculate the context precision score

3.13 Context recall

Context Recall measures how many of the relevant documents (or pieces of information) were successfully retrieved. It focuses on not missing important results. Higher recall means fewer relevant documents were left out. In short, recall is about not missing anything important. Since it is about not missing anything, calculating context recall always requires a reference to compare against.

Fig. 3: Formula to calculate the context recall score

3.14 Response Faithfulness

The Faithfulness metric measures how factually consistent a response is with the retrieved context. It ranges from 0 to 1, with higher scores indicating better consistency. A response is considered faithful if all its claims can be supported by the retrieved context.

```
\label{eq:score} \textbf{Faithfulness Score} = \frac{\textbf{Number of claims in the response supported by the retrieved contex}}{\textbf{Total number of claims in the response}}
```

Fig. 4: Formula to calculate the response faithfulness

3.15 Response Relevancy

The Response Relevancy metric measures how relevant a response is to the user input. Higher scores indicate better alignment with the user input, while lower scores are given if the response is incomplete or includes redundant information.

```
\label{eq:score} \textbf{Faithfulness Score} = \frac{\textbf{Number of claims in the response supported by the retrieved contex}}{\textbf{Total number of claims in the response}}
```

Fig. 5: Formula to calculate the response faithfulness

14 How to set up a local RAG system?

This research involved the development of a local RAG application, and the list of requirements is as follows:

```
pypdf
langchain
chromadb # Vector storage
pytest
pytest-asyncio
langchain-openai
langchain-community
langchain-chroma
python-dotenv
ragas
```

Fig. 6: List of requirements to create a local RAG using Python

Embeddings must be obtained from a provider. It is important to consider that a larger embedding model is recommended to improve response generation. For this research, the chosen provider was OpenAI.

```
#Used to get the embedding function.

from langchain_openai import OpenAIEmbeddings

def get_embedding_function():
    embeddings = OpenAIEmbeddings(model="text-embedding-3
large",openai_api_key=openai_api_key)
    return embeddings
```

Fig. 7: Function to use the embeddings from OpenAI and transform data to embeddings

The next step is to ingest data from a data source. For this research, PDF files will be stored in the 'data' folder. The database used to store the embeddings extracted from the PDFs is ChromaDB, a vector database optimized for this type of task. Each PDF and its content will be divided into multiple chunks, which will be saved in the database.

```
## 0 miles |

of the miles |

of cont. If the distance should be cleared (onling the "clear flog).

parame : amparam. deposentParame()

parame only parameters. Amparameters. action "store, trust", helps "Asset the database.")

parameters. The distance of the data store.

documents. The data store.

documents.
```

Fig. 8: Functions in charge of ingesting PDF files, splitting the documents into chunks, and then saving the embeddings in the database.

Once the embeddings are in the database, it is time to ask questions and get responses from the RAG system.

The RAG system receives the query, retrieves the embeddings from the database, and then sends the question along with the context to a model such as GPT-4o-mini. It then generates an answer based on the most relevant chunks of information retrieved from the database.

Fig. 9: Function to answer a question using the RAG application using the embeddings, with the power of an LLM such as GPT-4o-mini.

15 How to set up Ragas and Pytest?

RAGAS requires different parameters depending on the evaluated metric to generate a score. The majority of metrics will require the following parameters:

- 1. Question
- 2. Response
- 3. Retrieved contexts

4. Reference

```
@pytest.mark.asyncio
async def test_context_precision(langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper, get_question, print_log):

# Get Question
question = get_question("context_precision", "simple")

# Get Response
response = query_rag(question)
parsed_response = json.loads(response)

# Initialize the LLM and Ragas Setup for Context Precision
context_precision = LLMContextPrecisionWithoutReference(llm=langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper)

# Feed Data
sample = SingleTurnSample(
    user_input=question,
    response=parsed_response["answer"],
    retrieved_contexts= [doc["page_content"] for doc in parsed_response["retrieved_docs"]],
)

# Score
score = await context_precision.single_turn_ascore(sample)
print_log(question, parsed_response["answer"], parsed_response["retrieved_docs"], score=score)
assert score >= 0.5
```

Fig. 10: Context precision test structure with its assertion

```
@pytest.mark.asyncio
async def test_context_recall(langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper, get_question, get_reference, print_log):

# Get Question
question = get_question("context_recall", "simple")

# Get Reference
reference = get_reference("context_recall", "simple_reference")

# Get Response
response = query_rag(question)
parsed_response = json.loads(response)

# Initialize the LLM and Ragas Setup for Context Precision
context_recall = LLMContextRecall(llm=langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper)

# Feed Data
sample = SingleTurnSample(
    user_input=question,
    retrieved_contexts= [doc["page_content"] for doc in parsed_response["retrieved_docs"]],
    reference=reference
}

# Score
score = await context_recall.single_turn_ascore(sample)
print_log(question, parsed_response["answer"], parsed_response["retrieved_docs"], reference, score)
assert score >= 0.5
```

Fig. 11: Context recall test structure with its assertion. Notice how it requires a reference to validate the relevance of the context retrieved.

```
@pytest.mark.asyncio
async def test_faithfulness(langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper, get_question, print_log):

# Get Question
question = get_question("faithfulness", "simple")

# Get Response
response = query_rag(question)
parsed_response = json.loads(response)

# Initialize the LLM and Ragas Setup for Context Precision
faithfulness = Faithfulness(llm=langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper)

# Feed Data
sample = SingleTurnSample(
    user_input=question,
    response=parsed_response["answer"],
    retrieved_contexts= [doc["page_content"] for doc in parsed_response["retrieved_docs"]],
)

# Score
score = await faithfulness.single_turn_ascore(sample)
print_log(question, parsed_response["answer"], parsed_response["retrieved_docs"], score=score)
assert score >= 0.5
```

Fig. 12: Response faithfulness test structure with its assertion.

```
@pytest.mark.asyncio
async def test_response_relevancy(langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper, get_embeddings, get_question,
print_log):

# Get Question
question = get_question("response_relevancy", "simple")

# Get Response
response = query_rag(question)
parsed_response = json.loads(response)

# Initialize the langchain wrapper and embeddings to be used for the response relevancy metric
response_relevancy = ResponseRelevancy(llm=langchain_llm_ragas_wrapper, embeddings=get_embeddings)

# Feed Data
sample = SingleTurnSample(
    user_input=question,
        response_response["answer"],
        retrieved_contexts= [doc["page_content"] for doc in parsed_response["retrieved_docs"]],
)

# Score
score = await response_relevancy.single_turn_ascore(sample)
print_log(question, parsed_response["answer"], parsed_response["retrieved_docs"], score=score)
assert score >= 0.5
```

Fig. 13: Response relevancy test structure with its assertion.

Each test receives different parameters to process the score, such as a LangChain wrapper, the embeddings to measure the quality of the response, an external JSON file where the questions are centralized, and a print log function to track what is happening behind the scenes.

16 Analyzing the scores and interpreting the results

For this project, I decided to use a simple dataset—a PDF file containing various information about cats. That's why you will see questions related to this topic. However, we can ingest any PDF for testing purposes.

Let's go through the different metrics, ask a simple question for each, check the score, and figure out why it got that result.

6.11 Context precision

For context precision, I asked the following question:

```
•••
#Question: What physical traits of domestic cats are unique compared to wild felines?
```

Fig. 14: Context precision question for demonstration.

The response generated was:

```
# Answer: Domestic cats exhibit several physical traits that are unique compared to wild felines, including:

# 1. **Coloration**: Domestic cats have a wider range of colors and patterns due to less need for camouflage in captivity compared to their wild counterparts.

# 2. **Size**: Domestic cats tend to be smaller in size than many wild felines, which is attributed to changes in diet and habitat.

# 3. **Brain Size**: Domestic cats have a smaller brain size due to the gradual elimination of unnecessary survival instincts that are more critical in the wild.

# 4. **Physical Characteristics**: There is a greater variation in body shape and size among domestic cats, influenced by differing gene pools across countries.
```

Fig. 15: Response generated from the previous question

As explained earlier, this answer is based on relevant chunks of information retrieved by the RAG application. Take a look at the relevant chunks of information:

Fig. 16: Every chunk of information retrieved is used as context to generate the response.

Context precision measures how much of the retrieved context is relevant to answering the question. If the score is high, it means that most of the retrieved contexts are useful for answering the query. If the score is low, it means that many of the retrieved contexts are irrelevant or only partially relevant.

For this question, the context precision score was 0.75(75%), meaning that the retrieved context was highly relevant to the question. However, there's still room for improvement since some retrieved chunks weren't entirely relevant. For example, one passage discussed coat color diversity in domestic cats, which isn't related to what makes them unique compared to wild cats. Another passage focused on hybrid breeding with wild cats—interesting, but not directly answering the question.

Also, the response missed some key physical differences. For instance, domestic cats have shorter snouts and smaller teeth compared to wild felines. Their tails tend to be more upright when communicating, unlike wild cats. Their fur is also softer since they don't have to survive in harsh outdoor conditions.

6.12 Context recall

For context precision, I asked the following question:

```
.
# Question: What are the different types of cat coats, fur textures, and patterns,
and how do they affect a cat's appearance?
```

Fig. 17: Context recall question for demonstration.

The response generated was:

Fig. 18: Response generated from the previous question

As explained earlier, this answer is based on relevant chunks of information retrieved by the RAG application. Take a look at the relevant chunks of information:

Fig. 19: Every chunk of information retrieved is used as context to generate the response.

For context recall, a reference or ground truth is required to determine whether the retrieved chunks cover all the necessary details.

```
# Reference(truth): Cats have various coat types, fur textures, and patterns that
influence their appearance. Coat types include short-haired, long-haired, semi-
longhaired, curly (like Rex breeds), and hairless (like the Sphynx). Fur textures
vary from soft and silky (Persian) to coarse (Abyssinian) or wavy (Devon Rex)
Common fur patterns include solid (one color), tabby (striped or swirled), bicolor
(two colors), tortoiseshell (blended black and orange), calico (tortoiseshell with
white), pointed (darker face, ears, paws, and tail, like Siamese), and spotted
(like Bengals). These traits impact a cat's appearance by influencing color
distribution, texture feel, and overall distinctiveness, with genetics playing a
key role in determining variations
```

Fig. 20: Reference with all the necessary details to answer a question, it is going to help RAGAS to calculate the context recall metric.

Context recall measures how much of the total relevant information was retrieved. For this question, the context recall score was 0.4 (40%), which isn't great.

Analyzing the results, there are several reasons why the score is low. A lot of important details were left out. The system didn't mention all coat types, such as solid-colored cats, bicolor, pointed coats (like Siamese), or spotted coats (like Bengals). It also missed some fur textures, only discussing curly coats like those of Rex breeds but failing to mention silky Persians or coarse Abyssinians. Hairless cats were barely addressed, with the Sphynx being completely left out. Additionally, there was no real discussion on genetics, even though coat colors and patterns are largely genetic, and the system didn't retrieve enough information on this aspect.

It captured part of the answer but not the full picture, which is why the recall score is low.

6.13 **Response Faithfulness**

To evaluate faithfulness, I asked the following question:

Fig. 21: Faithfulness question for demonstration.

The response generated was:

```
# Answer: Some unique physical traits and abilities of cats include:
# 1. **Retractable Claws**: Cats have claws that are sheathed in skin and fur when relaxed, which helps keep them sharp.
# They can extend their claws involuntarily by stretching or swatting at prey.
# 2. **Superior Night Vision**: Cats possess a tapetum lucidum, which enhances their ability to see in low light conditions,
# although it may reduce visual acuity in bright light.
# 3. **Acute Sense of Balance**: Cats can reflexively twist their bodies during a fall to right themselves,
# thanks to their acute sense of balance and flexibility.
# 4. **Digitigrade Locomotion**: Cats walk on their toes, with the bones of their feet making up the lower part of their visible legs.
# This allows them to walk quietly and precisely, minimizing noise and visible tracks.
# 5. **Whiskers**: Cats have about a dozen whiskers in four rows on each upper lip, which are sensitive and help them navigate their environment.
# 6. **Strong Sense of Smell**: A cat's sense of smell is about 14 times stronger than that of humans,
# aided by having twice as many smell-sensitive cells in their noses.
# 7. **Vomeronasal Organ**: Cats have a specialized scent organ in the roof of their mouths that enhances their ability to detect scents,
# which they access through a behavior called gaping.
# These traits contribute to their effectiveness as predators and their adaptability in various environments.
```

Fig. 22: Response generated from the previous question

As explained earlier, this answer is based on relevant chunks of information retrieved by the RAG application. Take a look at the relevant chunks of information:

Fig. 23: Every chunk of information retrieved is used as context to generate the response.

Faithfulness measures whether the response introduces external or incorrect information. It ensures that the response only rephrases and summarizes what is found in the retrieved context. A high score means the response is accurate and directly supported by the retrieved context. A low score indicates that the response includes information not supported by the retrieved context, potentially altering key facts and leading to a misleading or incorrect answer.

For this question, the faithfulness score was 0.86 (86%), meaning that most of the response is accurate and well supported by the retrieved context. However, there are some areas for improvement, such as slight rewording or extrapolation beyond the retrieved text and missed opportunities to expand on certain details.

6.14 Response relevancy

To evaluate response relevancy, I asked the following question:

```
•••
# Question: How do cats communicate with humans and other cats?
```

Fig. 24: Response relevancy question for demonstration.

The response generated was:

```
•••
```

Fig. 25: Response generated from the previous question

As explained earlier, this answer is based on relevant chunks of information retrieved by the RAG application. Take a look at the relevant chunks of information:

Fig. 26: Every chunk of information retrieved is used as context to generate the response.

Response relevancy measures how well the generated response answers the user's question based on the retrieved context. If the score is high, it means that the response fully answers the user's question with clear, direct, and specific information.

For this question, the context precision score was 0.99 (99%), meaning that the response aligns perfectly with the retrieved context. There are no fabrications or overgeneralizations, and it maintains good structure and readability.

17 Case study and conclusions

This research was applied to a simple dataset, but it serves as a good starting point for evaluating the scores and determining whether they make sense after analysis. Additionally, by using simple metrics, we validate different aspects of a response generated by an LLM without explicitly specifying a reference—except for context recall, where it is necessary.

After the scores are generated, it may be necessary to adjust various aspects to achieve higher scores. Possible solutions include refining the question using prompt techniques (depending on who will be using the RAG app—it is essential to understand the final user), making improvements to the RAG app itself, increasing the number of relevant information chunks, using a larger embedding model, or optimizing the ranking system that retrieves the chunks for better efficiency.

There is room for improvement in this research. A good next step could be to increase the number of data sources and explore the possibility of testing a conversation between a human and AI, as RAGAS can evaluate it. That will be the next step.

References

[RAG 24] RAGAS Documentation: Metrics Overview. Available at:

https://docs.ragas.io/en/stable/concepts/metrics/overview/ [Accessed March 2025].

[AWS 24] Amazon Web Services: What is Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)? Available at:

https://aws.amazon.com/what-is/retrieval-augmented-generation/?nc1=h_ls [Accessed March 2025]

[RAG 24] RAGAS Documentation: Context Precision - Available Metrics. Available at:

 $https: \cite{March 2025}, available_metrics/context_precision/\cite{March 2025}.$

[RAG 24] RAGAS Documentation: Context Recall - Available Metrics. Available at:

https://docs.ragas.io/en/stable/concepts/metrics/available_metrics/context_recall/ [Accessed March 2025].

[RAG 24] RAGAS Documentation: Faithfulness - Available Metrics. Available at:

https://docs.ragas.io/en/stable/concepts/metrics/available_metrics/faithfulness/ [Accessed March 2025].

[RAG 24] RAGAS Documentation: Answer Relevance - Available Metrics. Available at:

 $https://docs.ragas.io/en/stable/concepts/metrics/available_metrics/answer_relevance/\ [Accessed\ March\ 2025].$