

Multi-modal Retrieval Augmented Multi-modal Generation: A Benchmark, Evaluate Metrics and Strong Baselines

Zi-Ao Ma¹, Tian Lan¹, Rong-Cheng Tu², Yong Hu³, Heyan Huang¹, Xian-Ling Mao^{1*}

¹School of Computer Science and Technology, Beijing Institute of Technology, China

²Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, ³WeChat AI, Tencent Inc., China

{maziaoylwt, lantiangmftby}@gmail.com, rongcheng.tu@ntu.edu.sg

rightyonghu@tencent.com, maoxl@bit.edu.cn

<https://github.com/maziao/M2RAG>




Figure 1: A typical comparison between naive RAG and our proposed M²RAG. GPT-4o is used in this case.

Abstract

This paper investigates an intriguing task of Multi-modal Retrieval Augmented Multi-modal Generation (M²RAG). This task requires foundation models to browse multi-modal web pages, with mixed text and images, and generate multi-modal responses for solving user queries, which exhibits better information density and readability. Given the early researching stage of M²RAG task, there is a lack of systematic studies and analysis. To fill this gap, we construct a benchmark for M²RAG task, equipped with a suite of text-modal metrics and multi-modal metrics to analyze the capabilities of existing foundation models. Besides, we also propose several effective methods for foundation models to accomplish this task, based on the comprehensive evaluation results on our benchmark. Extensive experimental results reveal several intriguing phenomena worth further research.

1 Introduction

Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) has been emerged as a promising technique to enhance the factual correctness of model-generated responses by grounding on facts in external knowledge databases (Lan et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024; Li et al., 2022). Except for textual knowledge, multi-modal data, like images and videos, also contain diverse information, and it is natural to leverage these knowledge to answer user queries more accurately, leading to a concept named Multi-modal RAG or MuRAG (Chen et al., 2022; Joshi et al., 2024; Ye et al., 2024). Numerous works (Riedler and Langer, 2024) have demonstrated that RAG with multi-modal inputs outperforms single-modal RAG. This paper studies MuRAG, but we primarily focus on how to use foundation models to generate multi-modal responses for solving user queries, which we named M²RAG task, given multi-modal inputs with mixed layout of text and images. Numerous previous works (Zhu et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2023b;

* Corresponding author




Figure 2: The overall framework of our proposed dataset construction and M²RAG pipeline. Step 1-3 represent the dataset construction pipeline and Step 4 demonstrates the generation process.

Li et al., 2024) have proven that multi-modal outputs effectively improve the information density and readability for users, embodying the principle—*A single image is worth a thousand words*. For example, Figure 1 compares plain text and multi-modal responses to the same user query about folding a paper airplane. While both responses provide similar textual explanations, the inclusion of instructional images in the multi-modal response significantly enhances readability. As a result, human readers can understand the instructions more quickly and efficiently, enabling them to successfully create a paper airplane with less effort.

Despite the emerging interest in the M²RAG task, there is a lack of systematic analysis and evaluation, given its early stage of research development. To address this gap, we propose a benchmark designed to evaluate the capabilities of existing generative models, including Large Language Models (LLMs) and Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs), in completing the M²RAG task. This benchmark evaluates the generated content from both text-modal and multi-modal perspectives, incorporating four metrics for each dimension, such as fluency, relevance, image coherence, and helpfulness. The benchmark dataset is constructed through a multi-step workflow, as illustrated in Steps 1-3 of Figure 2: (1) **Query Collection**: We gather a diverse set of user queries spanning ten distinct topics. For each query, the top- k relevant multi-modal web pages are retrieved using the Google Search API; (2) **Data Cleaning**: A rigorous data cleaning pipeline is applied to these web pages to extract and filter high-quality text and images, which are then used to build a reliable multi-modal database for retrieval; (3) **Retrieval**: A suite of

retrieval methods is developed to evaluate the relevance between multi-modal data elements and the user query. Each element is assigned a relevance score to guide its selection for further processing. Additionally, we propose two approaches for tackling this task, based on comprehensive studies using the constructed benchmark: (1) **Single-stage Approach**: This method generates a multi-modal response directly in a single turn, with images represented as placeholders within the response; (2) **Multi-stage Approach**: This method first generates a text response and then interleaves relevant images, finally refines the text response with retrieved images to ensure a more cohesive and enriched output.

Extensive experimental results uncover numerous intriguing phenomena, providing valuable insights for future researches. For example, the multi-stage approach integrates more relevant images into responses, significantly outperforming the single-stage approach. Moreover, existing MLLMs demonstrate notable limitations in handling M²RAG tasks, performing 8% and 13% worse than LLMs under the single-stage and multi-stage approaches, respectively, which underscores substantial room for improvement. Importantly, compared to separate modeling approaches employed in prior works such as MuRAR (Zhu et al., 2024), jointly modeling the relationships and interactions between images and text results in noticeable performance enhancements for the M²RAG task. These findings highlight the necessity of advancing joint modeling techniques to unlock the full potential of multi-modal generative models. Overall, our contributions are summarized as follows:

- **Task Formulation and Benchmark:** We introduce the M²RAG task and establish a comprehensive benchmark, alongside a suite of fine-grained text-modal and multi-modal metrics to evaluate the capabilities of existing models.
- **Proposed Baselines:** We propose several strong baseline methods for solving the M²RAG task, including single-stage and multi-stage approaches.
- **Experimental Insights:** Our experiments demonstrate that current LLMs outperform MLLMs significantly in M²RAG tasks. Additionally, decomposing this complex task into simpler sub-tasks further enhances performance. We also observe that relying solely on images in this task can result in poor performance for certain topics, suggesting that incorporating additional modalities could yield further improvements.

2 Related Work

2.1 Text-modal Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG)

RAG (Li et al., 2022) has been widely used to improve the generation quality of language models by incorporating external knowledge (Lan et al., 2023), which is usually retrieved by using BM25, dense retrieval model or search engine (Lee et al., 2021; Asai et al., 2023). Recently, given the increasing capabilities of LLMs to effectively process any text inputs, there is an emerging way to simply concatenate all retrieved data into the context of LLMs for generation (Sun et al., 2024).

2.2 Multi-modal RAG

Although typical RAG framework demonstrates great potential, it can only handle textual inputs and cannot utilize the rich information presented in multi-modal data such as images and videos (Su et al., 2023). While earlier efforts to incorporate multi-modal inputs for text generation¹ often relied on carefully designed frameworks (Xiao et al., 2024), a new paradigm has emerged that emphasizes pre-training MLLMs to accomplish this task more directly and efficiently (Chen et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024a; Yao et al., 2024; Shen et al., 2023; Riedler and Langer, 2024), with representative models including GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024)

¹Most existing multi-modal works mainly focus on the visual modality.

and Llama-3.2-Vision (Dubey et al., 2024). While these multi-modal models greatly expand the range of applications for LLMs, they remain limited to text-only outputs, restricting their ability to directly deliver rich, multi-modal information to users (Zhu et al., 2024).

2.3 Multi-modal Generation

In real-world scenarios, humans naturally interact with multi-modal data, such as browsing web pages that combine text, images, and videos in mixed layouts (Zhu et al., 2024). Consequently, it is crucial to develop foundation models that not only generate plain text responses to user queries but also incorporate relevant multi-modal data to enhance readability and user engagement. This approach embodies the principle—*A single image is worth a thousand words*, emphasizing the value of visual elements in effective communication. To the best of our knowledge, MExBERT (Singh et al., 2021) took the first step in this research direction, which retrieves one image given the user query and generated response. Beyond retrieving the images, recent works also focus on generating the corresponding images for model-generated responses, like Next-GPT (Wu et al., 2023b), TextBind (Li et al., 2024), Janus (Wu et al., 2024) and Emu3 (Wang et al., 2024b). Unlike these works, our study focuses on M²RAG task, which aims to dynamically select the multi-modal content from multiple multi-modal inputs (text or images) to construct final multi-modal responses without generating any visual elements. To the best of our knowledge, MuRAR (Zhu et al., 2024) is the most closely related work to our study. However, it falls short of modeling multi-modal content holistically. Specifically, it generates initial responses as plain text based solely on user queries and retrieved textual content, without incorporating the corresponding multi-modal data. This approach differs significantly from the setup of our proposed M²RAG task, which also emphasizes the integration of multi-modal content in the input.

3 Task Formulation

In M²RAG task, models answer each user query Q with a multi-modal response based on retrieved multi-modal web pages. Suggest that multi-modal data resource $R = \{D_1, \dots, D_n\}$ represents n retrieved multi-modal documents or web pages from the Internet. Each document D_i consists of m ordered elements $\{E_{i,1}, E_{i,2}, \dots, E_{i,m}\}$, where each

element $E_{i,j}$ can be either a textual or visual element. Elements are preserved in their original order within a document, ensuring that images are accompanied by their corresponding textual contexts. These contexts often provide rich descriptions or additional information that enhances the understanding and relevance of the images.

With the above inputs, the M²RAG task needs several steps to get the multi-modal response. Specifically, the following procedures are essential: (1) **In-Doc Retrieval**, (2) **Generation** and (3) **Multi-modal Element Incorporation**.

In-Doc Retrieval While previous studies have demonstrated the strong capabilities of LLMs to answer user queries grounded in retrieved documents, their inference time increases significantly as input sequences grow longer (Sun et al., 2024). This challenge is more severe in the M²RAG task, where models must process both textual content and corresponding images simultaneously.

To mitigate this issue, we first propose the In-Doc Retrieval process to collect relevant elements from R , which are used for next step multi-modal generation.

As illustrated in Step 3 of Figure 2, we employ a retrieval model, denoted as M_R , to assess the relevance of each element $E_{i,j}$ in the dataset R with respect to the user query Q , denoted as $M_R(Q, R)$. The top- k most relevant elements are selected to form a refined multi-modal data resource, $R_{\text{In-Doc}}$. The refined resources serve as the inputs for generative models. Importantly, when a visual element is selected, its associated textual context is also retrieved to ensure coherence and provide richer input data for the generation process.

Generation The refined multi-modal data resource $R_{\text{In-Doc}}$ is then processed by the generative model M_G alongside the user query Q to generate the final multi-modal response:

$$r = M_G(Q, R_{\text{In-Doc}}) \quad (1)$$

Here, r represents the final answer to the user query. Notably, if no visual elements are in $R_{\text{In-Doc}}$, the task defaults to the traditional RAG, since no multi-modal elements are utilized and generated.

Multi-modal Element Incorporation Different from previous works that retrieve multi-modal data after text generation (Zhu et al., 2024), we proposed a novel approach that can incorporate multi-modal data with text in a single-

turn conversation. Specifically, images in the input and output are presented as placeholders. Each placeholder follows the following format: ! [IMAGE_CONTENT] (PSEUDO_URL). The pseudo URL identifies which image the model intends to include (Wu et al., 2023a) in the output. For input images, the content is represented as tokenized image embeddings for MLLMs or as detailed image captions for LLMs. For output images, the image content is a concise caption based on the input image content which aids in the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) process (Wei et al., 2022), assisting the model in understanding the image content or caption and placing it appropriately.

4 Dataset Construction

As shown in Step 1-3 of Figure 2, we elaborate three detailed steps to construct the benchmark dataset for evaluating the capabilities of foundation models in M²RAG task: (1) Query Collection, (2) Data Preparation and (3) Element Evaluation.

4.1 Query Collection

The queries are sourced from the ELI5 (Fan et al., 2019) dataset and undergo a series of filtering and classification procedures, as outlined in Step 1 of Figure 2. Specifically, we first exclude queries that do not require rich references and then discard those that do not necessitate visual information for providing comprehensive answers. After filtering, the remaining queries are classified to ensure a balanced dataset and lay the groundwork for further studies on the topic sensitivity of the proposed methods². The classification process results in 11 distinct categories, as detailed in Table 1. 20 queries are sampled in each category (other than “Others”), resulting in a final benchmark dataset containing 200 queries.

4.2 Data Preparation

All multi-modal data used for retrieval and generation are prepared during this step. Specifically, data for each query are processed through the following procedures: (1) Prepare Web Pages and Auxiliary Images, (2) Text Processing and (3) Image Processing.

²Please refer to Appendix A for more details.

ID	Category Name	Num. Samples
1	Society & Culture	14182
2	Science & Mathematics	14449
3	Health	10931
4	Education & Reference	776
5	Computers & Internet	6999
6	Sports	1974
7	Business & Finance	3821
8	Entertainment & Music	1946
9	Family & Relationships	820
10	Politics & Government	4638
11	Others	451

Table 1: Topics and volumes of the queries.

4.2.1 Prepare Web Pages and Auxiliary Images

For each collected query, we first employ Google Search API³ to get the URLs of web pages given the query, and then retrieve each web page containing a mix of text and images in markdown format using JINA AI Reader⁴. Our preliminary study reveals that the images within these web pages are sometimes inaccessible, low quality, or insufficient for effective multi-modal generation. Therefore, we supplement the dataset with auxiliary images sourced from Google Image Search, using the user queries as search input to ensure relevance and enrich the visual content.

Since the qualities of collected web pages and images are not guaranteed, we further propose Text Processing and Image Processing to post-process these multi-modal data to improve the quality of our dataset, as illustrated in Step 2 of Figure 2.

4.2.2 Text Processing

The raw web pages often contain a significant amount of irrelevant or redundant text, like the advertisements and web links, and it is essential to remove these data and produce concise and relevant content for generation. The text processing process is divided into three steps: (1) **Embedded Image Handling**: image URLs are extracted from the web pages for image collection, and placeholders are inserted in their place within the text; (2) **Text Cleaning**: text snippets matching pre-defined patterns, such as web links, are removed to ensure cleaner and more relevant content; (3) **Text Splitting**: the cleaned text content is segmented into smaller pieces using the LangChain (Chase,

2022) text splitter, facilitating further selection and processing.

4.2.3 Image Processing

We conduct following steps to process images, ensuring they are of high quality and relevant to the user query: (1) **Caching & Conversion**: we download all the images with their URLs, and convert them into widely accepted formats such as JPG, PNG, GIF, or WEBP. Images that fail to be downloaded or converted are discarded; (2) **Filtering**: images that fall below a certain size threshold or receive a low similarity score with CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) are removed. Such images are typically insufficiently informative, often consisting of icons, banners, or other non-representative visuals. (3) **Deduplication**: PHash algorithm-based deduplication (Zauner, 2010) is applied to remove duplicated or similar images, preventing redundant images for generation.

4.3 Element Evaluation

As described in Section 3, we need to perform In-Doc retrieval to select text and visual elements for efficient generation. To achieve this goal, the relevance between each element and the user query should be evaluated. Specifically, we utilized the DeepSeek-Chat (DeepSeek-AI, 2024) API for evaluating textual elements and MiniCPM-V-2.6 (Yao et al., 2024) for assessing visual elements. Our preliminary manual annotations revealed that these methods demonstrate a high degree of consistency with human evaluations in measuring correlation, making them suitable for this task⁵. This step results in a score from 0 to 10 for each element, where higher scores indicate better relevancy. This can be used to replace the traditional embedding-based similarity score for retrieval.

With the above procedures, a high-quality multi-modal RAG dataset with real-world user queries, retrieved web pages and images is constructed. Detailed statistical information of our constructed dataset can be found in Appendix C.

5 Strong Baselines for M²RAG Task

Finishing Step 1-3 of Figure 2, we introduce three strong baselines for Step 4 to accomplish our proposed M²RAG task.

³<https://developers.google.com/custom-search/v1>

⁴<https://jina.ai/reader/>

⁵Please refer to Appendix B for more details.

5.1 Separate Modeling

Previous studies have approached text generation and image integration as distinct processes, exemplified by the MuRAR method (Zhu et al., 2024). MuRAR operates in three sequential steps: (1) retrieving relevant plain text content and generating a text-based response; (2) identifying and incorporating appropriate visual elements into the text-based response; and (3) refining the text to seamlessly integrate the visual elements and their associated information.

In our implementation, pre-trained embedding model (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) is used to retrieve visual elements based on their surrounding text content or detailed image caption generated by GPT-4o. Since the separated method does not need to process multi-modal content, it is implemented by LLMs.

5.2 Joint Modeling

The separate approach overlooks the relationships between textual content and multi-modal data when generating text responses, leading to sub-optimal integration of multi-modal information. To address this limitation, we propose several baseline methods that jointly model text and images as a unified entity, capturing their rich relationships and interactive dynamics.

Specifically, our approach can be categorized into single-stage and multi-stage methods, leveraging LLMs or MLLMs as backbone models. This design allows for a more holistic representation of multi-modal content, as depicted in Step 4 of Figure 2.

Single- and Multi-stage Approaches Single-stage approach requires models to directly generate a multi-modal output with selected images in their corresponding placeholders, given all multi-modal content saved in a single prompt.

Although the single-stage approach is straightforward, current open-source foundation models struggle in generating accurate image placeholders. Besides, it is a well-known limitation that most MLLMs may struggle with handling a large number of images simultaneously. Therefore, we propose a multi-stage approach to address the complexity of the single-stage approach, which involves three stages: (1) **Text Response Generation**: generate a plain text answer given the multi-modal input; (2) **Image Interleaving**: divide the text into several segments, and LLMs or MLLMs are

prompted to determine which segment requires the inserted images for better readability; (3) **Text Refinement**: refine each segment by incorporating the information of selected images. Although multi-stage approach addresses the shortcomings of single-stage approach, their computational overhead for inference is much higher.

LLM and MLLM Backbones Both of LLMs and MLLMs can be used to solve M²RAG task with single-stage or multi-stage approaches. Specifically, as introduced in Section 3, given the retrieved multi-modal data resource $R_{\text{In-Doc}}$, the prompt P for LLMs and MLLMs could be constructed using a structured template T :

$$P = T(G, Q, R_{\text{In-Doc}}) \quad (2)$$

where G, Q denotes the textual task guidelines and user query, respectively. Then LLMs and MLLMs could be prompted with P to solve M²RAG task: (1) **For MLLMs**, the encoded image tokens are placed at their original positions (Dubey et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024a), reserving the relative position in the multi-modal web pages. Since the additional images do not belong to any web pages, their image tokens are placed in a distinct section in the prompt; (2) **For LLMs**, since they could not process images directly, the detailed captions of images in $R_{\text{In-Doc}}$ are provided, allowing LLMs to access the semantical content of images.

6 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate the effectiveness of numerous models and methods, we design four text-modal metrics and four multi-modal metrics. Since the generated response are open-ended, these evaluation metrics are evaluated by prompting advanced GPT-4o model in a reference-free manner (Lan et al., 2024). To the best of our knowledge, prompting GPT-4o for automatic evaluation is the most reliable automatic evaluation methods for open-ended RAG and multi-modal evaluation scenarios (Es et al., 2023; Ku et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2023). The detailed prompts for our proposed text-only and multi-modal evaluation metrics can be found in Appendix D. The score ranges of all fine-grained text-only and multi-modal metrics are from 0 to 1, and scores close to 1 indicates better performance.

6.1 Text-modal Metrics

Following previous works (Zhu et al., 2024), we utilize both linguistic and RAG metrics (Es et al.,

2023) to assess the quality of the generated content in the M²RAG task. These metrics ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the generated textual content.

Fluency assesses the linguistic quality of model-generated text, ensuring the grammatical correctness, coherence, and readability (Su et al., 2022; Es et al., 2023).

Relevance assesses how pertinent the model-generated textual content is to the given user query (Lan et al., 2022; Es et al., 2023).

Context Precision evaluates the proportion of relevant chunks in the retrieved web pages by analyzing the overlap of their key concepts (Es et al., 2023).

Faithfulness measures the accuracy of the model-generated content in representing information from the original materials, focusing on factual alignment to avoid fabricated or misleading details (Es et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024).

6.2 Multi-modal Metrics

In addition to text-only metrics, we also focus on the quality of model-generated multi-modal content from following five perspectives.

Image Coherence examines the logical and coherent alignment of images with their surrounding text content, ensuring visual content enhances and complements the textual narrative (Zhu et al., 2024).

Image Helpfulness evaluates how effectively images contribute to the user’s comprehension of the text. This involves assessing whether visuals provide additional insights, clarify complex ideas, or support textual details (Zhu et al., 2024).

Image Reference verifies the appropriateness and alignment between images and their textual references. Inadequate or incorrect references of images lead to the confusion during reading.

Image Recall measures whether the generated content includes highly relevant, informative, and important images. As described in Section 4.3, images are evaluated and scored during pre-processing, with selection based on these scores prior to generation. Consequently, the images input to generative models are generally relevant to the user query. However, issues such as semantic overlap or quality variations among images may arise,

leading to the inclusion of sub-optimal images in the retrieved images. The goal of Image Recall is to ensure that no images other than the sub-optimal ones are excluded from the final answer. To achieve this, we prompt MLLMs to assess whether each image enhances human understanding of the content. To address potential semantic overlap, we include textual descriptions of images already present in the document and instruct the model to classify an image as negative if its content is significantly redundant compared to existing images. This process ensures that only diverse and meaningful images are retained.

6.3 Overall Score Computation

Except for these fine-grained evaluation dimensions, it is essential to summarize a final overall score reflecting the capabilities of foundation models in M²RAG task. Specifically, the average of four text-only metrics and five multi-modal metrics is computed as the overall score.

7 Experimental Results

Using the proposed baseline methods and evaluation metrics, we conduct comprehensive experiments on the benchmark dataset with a range of representative models, including GPT-4o, the Llama-3.1 series, Qwen2.5 series, Llama-3.2-Vision series, and Qwen2-VL series⁶. In this section, we analyze the experimental results presented in Table 2 from the following perspectives.

The Most Capable Models As shown in Table 2, it can be found that the most capable open-source and closed-source foundation models for the M²RAG task are Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct and GPT-4o (0.77), respectively, under the experimental setup of multi-stage approach with LLM backbones. Although the performance gap between these two models are negligible with single-stage approach, there is still a noticeable gap when it comes to single-stage approach(0.68 > 0.66). For MLLM backbones, GPT-4o significantly outperforms all closed-source models. For example, Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct is much worse than GPT-4o by using the single-stage approach (0.53 < 0.66). Besides, there is still significant room for improvement in the performance of the most capable GPT-4o model (0.77 < 1.0) in the M²RAG task.

⁶Please refer to Appendix E for more details.

Model	Approach	Prompt	Completion	Total
LLMs	Single	7797	767	8563
	Multi	16947	2252	19199
MLLMs	Single	11454	553	12007
	Multi	24078	1707	25785

Table 3: Average token usage for different approaches.

Furthermore, we also compute the average cost, *i.e.*, the average prompt and completion tokens of GPT-4o, in Table 3, and we could summarize two conclusions: (1) the cost multi-stage approach is over 2 times that of single-stage; (2) the cost of MLLMs is approximately 1.3-1.4 times that of LLMs. Therefore, considering that LLMs generally performs better than MLLMs in M²RAG, using single-stage with LLMs as backbone model is currently the most cost-effective approach.

8 Analysis

In this section, we answer the following three important questions about our proposed approaches.

8.1 Topic is a Key Factor Affecting Performance

The average overall scores of all evaluated models, as presented in Figure 3, reveal notable variations in performance across different topics. For instance, the most challenging topic is “Business & Finance”, which achieves the lowest overall score, whereas “Society & Culture” and “Sports” are significantly easier topics by comparison.




Figure 3: Average overall score across 10 topics.

We hypothesize that these performance differences stem from the varying demands for multi-modal information across topics. Specifically, images are more prevalent and useful in less technical




Figure 4: Comparison of performance with original and ablation settings.

fields, such as sports and culture. In contrast, fields like business and finance often require data from additional modalities, such as tables and charts, which are less readily integrated. Moreover, theoretical fields like politics may not rely heavily on multi-modal information for comprehensive responses.

To achieve balanced performance across topics, a topic-sensitive approach should be developed to adaptively incorporate appropriate modalities for response synthesis, ensuring that the specific requirements of each topic are effectively addressed.

8.2 Caption Quality is Important for Image Integration

As described in Section 5.2, images are converted into captions for use by LLMs. To ensure a comparable level of information between LLMs and MLLMs, the captions are crafted to be as detailed as possible. Additionally, textual contexts associated with the images are included during the captioning process to enhance consistency. In this section, we investigate the impact of removing these elements.

As shown in Figure 4, performance declines noticeably with the removal of details and contextual information, particularly in the metrics of Image Coherence and Image Reference. The absence of contextual information in captions leads to a significant drop in Image Recall, highlighting the critical role of context in guiding the image selection process of LLMs. Beyond these key observations, the ablation settings show minor fluctuations in other

metrics. Overall, incorporating context during captioning is essential for achieving optimal image retrieval, while including detailed descriptions further enhances performance to a measurable extent.

8.3 Contributions of Auxiliary Images

Auxiliary images are collected for each query to address cases where highly relevant images are absent from the retrieved web pages. Removing these images leads to a significant decline in generative performance (Figure 4). For instance, Image Recall drops sharply without auxiliary images, suggesting that LLMs preferentially include auxiliary images over those sourced from web pages when constructing the generated document. Additionally, the decline in Image Coherence and Image Helpfulness metrics highlights the superior quality of auxiliary images compared to web-sourced images. Interestingly, the Image Reference metric shows a notable increase, likely due to stronger connections between each remaining image and its context. Overall, the inclusion of auxiliary images significantly enriches the visual content and enhances the quality of the generated document.

9 Conclusion

In this paper, we formulate a challenging task—M²RAG, requiring foundation models to process the mixed multi-modal web pages to generate a multi-modal answers for solving user queries. Besides, we construct a benchmark to comprehensively evaluate the capabilities of existing foundation models based on four text-only and five multi-modal fine-grained metrics. Furthermore, we also propose several strong baselines for existing models to solve this task. Extensive experimental results demonstrate several intriguing phenomena, facilitating the future research in this field.

10 Limitations

Although our proposed methods outperform some existing approaches for the M²RAG task, there are still several limitations.

Topic Restrictions Certain topics, such as “Business & Finance” or “Politics & Government”, are not well-suited for visual representation. For these domains, tables, charts, or other formats may be more appropriate than images. The absence of these modalities limits the applicability of our approach to these areas.

Content Availability The lack of extensive public discussion or data in certain specialized fields presents challenges for retrieving abundant multi-modal documents effectively. This limitation reduces the comprehensiveness of our analysis in underrepresented domains.

Evaluation Metrics The proposed evaluation metrics are limited and may fail to capture all aspects of M²RAG evaluation. For example, pairwise ranking is more appropriate for assessing overall performance than Likert scale in M²RAG task, which lacks a standard optimal answer. However, using the LLM-as-a-Judge (Zheng et al., 2023) approach, pairwise comparisons are resource-intensive, particularly for large-scale evaluations. Furthermore, their high cost and impracticality make them unsuitable for benchmarking, necessitating reliance on fixed scoring metrics that may not adequately address all edge cases.

References

- Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection](#).
- Harrison Chase. 2022. [LangChain](#).
- Wenhu Chen, Hexiang Hu, Xi Chen, Pat Verga, and William W Cohen. 2022. Murag: Multimodal retrieval-augmented generator for open question answering over images and text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02928*.
- Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Ping Luo, Tong Lu, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. 2024. [Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks](#).
- DeepSeek-AI. 2024. [Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model](#).
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#).
- Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa-Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2023. [Ragas: Automated evaluation of retrieval augmented generation](#).
- Angela Fan, Yacine Jernite, Ethan Perez, David Grangier, Jason Weston, and Michael Auli. 2019. Eli5: Long form question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.09190*.
- Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford,

- et al. 2024. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*.
- Pankaj Joshi, Aditya Gupta, Pankaj Kumar, and Manas Sisodia. 2024. Robust multi model rag pipeline for documents containing text, table & images. In *2024 3rd International Conference on Applied Artificial Intelligence and Computing (ICAAIC)*, pages 993–999. IEEE.
- Max Ku, Dongfu Jiang, Cong Wei, Xiang Yue, and Wenhui Chen. 2024. **VIEScore**: Towards explainable metrics for conditional image synthesis evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12268–12290, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- Tian Lan, Deng Cai, Yan Wang, Heyan Huang, and Xian-Ling Mao. 2023. **Copy is all you need**.
- Tian Lan, Yixuan Su, Shuhang Liu, Heyan Huang, and Xian-Ling Mao. 2022. **Momentum decoding: Open-ended text generation as graph exploration**.
- Tian Lan, Wenwei Zhang, Chen Xu, Heyan Huang, Dahua Lin, Kai Chen, and Xian ling Mao. 2024. **Criticeval: Evaluating large language model as critic**.
- Jinhyuk Lee, Mujeen Sung, Jaewoo Kang, and Danqi Chen. 2021. **Learning dense representations of phrases at scale**.
- Huayang Li, Siheng Li, Deng Cai, Longyue Wang, Lemao Liu, Taro Watanabe, Yujiu Yang, and Shuming Shi. 2024. **Textbind: Multi-turn interleaved multimodal instruction-following in the wild**.
- Huayang Li, Yixuan Su, Deng Cai, Yan Wang, and Lemao Liu. 2022. **A survey on retrieval-augmented text generation**.
- Yujie Lu, Xianjun Yang, Xiujun Li, Xin Eric Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2023. **Llmscore: Unveiling the power of large language models in text-to-image synthesis evaluation**.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. **Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Monica Riedler and Stefan Langer. 2024. **Beyond text: Optimizing rag with multimodal inputs for industrial applications**.
- Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. 2023. **Hugging-gpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in hugging face**.
- Hrituraj Singh, Anshul Nasery, Denil Mehta, Aishwarya Agarwal, Jatin Lamba, and Balaji Vasanth Srinivasan. 2021. **MIMOQA: Multimodal input multimodal output question answering**. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5317–5332, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Huayang Li, Jialu Xu, Yan Wang, and Deng Cai. 2023. **Pandagpt: One model to instruction-follow them all**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16355*.
- Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Yan Wang, Dani Yogatama, Lingpeng Kong, and Nigel Collier. 2022. **A contrastive framework for neural text generation**.
- East Sun, Yan Wang, and Lan Tian. 2024. **Block-attention for efficient rag**.
- Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhi-hao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Mengfei Du, Xuancheng Ren, Rui Men, Dayiheng Liu, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. 2024a. **Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*.
- Xinlong Wang, Xiaosong Zhang, Zhengxiong Luo, Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Jinsheng Wang, Fan Zhang, Yueze Wang, Zhen Li, Qiyi Yu, et al. 2024b. **Emu3: Next-token prediction is all you need**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18869*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. 2023a. **Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671*.
- Chengyue Wu, Xiaokang Chen, Zhiyu Wu, Yiyang Ma, Xingchao Liu, Zizheng Pan, Wen Liu, Zhenda Xie, Xingkai Yu, Chong Ruan, and Ping Luo. 2024. **Janus: Decoupling visual encoding for unified multimodal understanding and generation**.
- Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2023b. **Next-gpt: Any-to-any multimodal llm**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05519*.

Min Xiao, Junnan Zhu, Feifei Zhai, Yu Zhou, and Chengqing Zong. 2024. Diusum: Dynamic image utilization for multimodal summarization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19297–19305.

Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zihui He, et al. 2024. Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01800*.

Jiabo Ye, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Anwen Hu, Ming Yan, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. mplug-owl3: Towards long image-sequence understanding in multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04840*.

Christoph Zauner. 2010. Implementation and benchmarking of perceptual image hash functions.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46595–46623.

Zhengyuan Zhu, Daniel Lee, Hong Zhang, Sai Sree Harsha, Loic Feujo, Akash Maharaj, and Yunyao Li. 2024. Murar: A simple and effective multi-modal retrieval and answer refinement framework for multimodal question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08521*.

A Query Collection

To simulate the real-world user query solving problem, we collect diverse and high-quality user queries from the ELI5 dataset (Fan et al., 2019). The ELI5 corpus is particularly suited for our task due to its comprehensive collection of long-form, open-ended questions that necessitate detailed, multi-sentence responses. The diversity of topics in ELI5 presents an opportunity to reflect the capabilities of language models in the real-world scenarios. Subsequently, we conduct two steps to collect diverse and high-quality queries that are suitable for using multi-modal information as responses: (1) Query Filtering; and (2) Query Classification.

Query Filtering conduct two steps to filter user queries that require detailed explanation and visual information for better understanding the content in the responses. The first step involves eliminating invalid or low-quality queries. Specifically, GPT-4o is prompted to remove queries that do not elicit detailed responses, such as those reducible to yes/no

Task Description

You are a useful text classification assistant. You will be provided with a piece of text to be recognized. Your task is to classify the text with the guidelines.

Guidelines

1. If the input text is not a question, the description is unclear, you are supposed to generate a single integer 0, which means it is an invalid question.
2. If there is no need to cite rich references to answer the question, i.e. the question can be fully addressed with a simple answer, you are supposed to generate a single integer 0, which means it is an invalid question.
3. If the question is not classified as invalid question according to the above two rules, then generate a single integer 1.

Output Format

Your output should consist of two lines.

- The first line is your brief analysis of the input question content and why or why not it meets the requirements;
- The second line is an single integer 0 or 1.

Do not generate any other information other than the analysis and category indices.

Input Text

{text}

Output

Figure 5: Prompt template for filtering queries which are not complex questions.

answers or simple sentences (as illustrated in Figure 5). This ensures that the dataset focuses on queries requiring more elaborate, informative responses. The second step filters out queries that can be fully addressed through textual content alone, as illustrated in Figure 6. Queries that lack the necessity for visual information do not align with the goal of evaluating multi-modal capabilities and are thus excluded.

Query Classification To effectively analyze the difference among user query topics, we also prompt GPT-4o model to automatically categorize these queries into eleven topics from Yahoo Answers Topics⁷. Table 1 demonstrates that our user queries covers common and diverse searching scenarios, which is beneficial to reflecting the performance of evaluated models in real-world scenarios. The prompt template for query classification is illustrated in Figure 7.

B Retrieval of Collected Elements

We replaced traditional embedding-based retrieval methods with LLM-based and MLLM-based approaches to enhance the retrieval process. Embedding-based methods typically prioritize semantic similarity but often overlook whether can-

⁷https://huggingface.co/datasets/community-datasets/yahoo_answers_topics




Figure 6: Prompt template for filtering queries which are not necessarily answered with images.

dicate elements provide substantial information relevant to the target question. Additionally, in real-time M²RAG tasks, where online documents cannot be pre-indexed, LLM-based and MLLM-based methods offer better performance without incurring significant additional time costs.

Using these methods, text and visual elements within the collected documents are evaluated based on their relevance to the user query. This evaluation is conducted by prompting LLMs and MLLMs for textual and visual content, respectively. The prompt templates used for these evaluations are illustrated in Figures 8 and 9.

C Dataset Statistics

C.1 Basic Statistics

The statistical information about our benchmark are shown in Table 4.

Item	Value
Queries	200
Web pages per query	6.4
Text elements per web page	7.2
Images per query	9.3
Auxiliary image per query	2.6
Average score of text elements	1.1
Average score of image elements	4.2
Average auxiliary image score	3.6

Table 4: Statistical information of our benchmark.

C.2 Data Distribution

We list the distributions of some key items:

- The number of non-empty web pages for each query, as illustrated in Figure 10;
- The number of valid text pieces in each web page, as illustrated in Figure 11;
- The score of each text piece, as illustrated in Figure 12;
- The number of images in web pages for each query, as illustrated in Figure 13;
- The score of each web page image, as illustrated in Figure 14;
- The number of auxiliary images for each query, as illustrated in Figure 15;
- The score of each auxiliary image, as illustrated in Figure 16.

D Details of Evaluation Metrics

Apart from Context Precision and Faithfulness which are implemented with RAGAS, other metrics are implemented by prompting GPT-4o with the following prompt templates:

- Fluency: as illustrated in Figure 17;
- Relevance: as illustrated in Figure 18;
- Image Coherence: as illustrated in Figure 19;
- Image Helpfulness: as illustrated in Figure 20;
- Image Reference: as illustrated in Figure 21;
- Image Recall: as illustrated in Figure 22.

E Experimental Setup

Evaluated Models We evaluate the capabilities of some advanced open-source and closed-source LLMs and MLLMs for M²RAG task. The involved models are listed in Table 5. Besides, we also implement a separate approach, *i.e.*, the MuRAR method with GPT-4o as the backbone model (Zhu et al., 2024).

Task Description
 You are a document evaluation assistant. Your task is to evaluate the fluency of the provided text written in markdown.

Input Text
 ```markdown  
 {text}  
 ```

Scoring Criteria
 Assign a score from 0 to 10 based on the fluency of the text:
 - **0:** The text is incoherent, lacks logical flow, and deviates significantly from correct markdown syntax.
 - **1-3:** The text has potential with partial fluency and logic but is plagued by multiple markdown errors, such as unhandled duplicate headings or incorrect formatting structures.
 - **4-6:** The text demonstrates general fluency with minor grammatical or logical inconsistencies, though the markdown structure lacks clarity or uniformity, like having redundant sections.
 - **7-9:** The text is well-written and logically coherent, with proper markdown usage, forming a mostly seamless document that maintains consistent quality.
 - **10:** The text is exemplary, demonstrating perfect fluency, logical progression, and impeccable markdown syntax, representing an ideal markdown document.

Be rigorous and discerning when assigning your score.

Output Instructions
 Your output should contain only 2 lines:
 1. A brief explanation justifying the assigned score.
 2. The score as an integer value.

Do not provide any additional information beyond the explanation and score.

Figure 17: Prompt template for the text fluency evaluation.

Task Description
 You are a document evaluation assistant. Your task is to evaluate the relevance between the query and provided text written in markdown.

Query
 {query}

Input Text
 ```markdown  
 {text}  
 ```

Scoring Criteria
 Assign a score from 0 to 10 based on the degree of relevance between the input text and the given query:
 - **0:** The text is entirely irrelevant to the given query.
 - **1-3:** The text has minimal relevance, with most content deviating from the intended query.
 - **4-6:** The text is moderately relevant, with some content aligned with the intended query, but contains noticeable digressions.
 - **7-9:** The text is highly relevant, with most content directly related to the intended query and only minor digressions.
 - **10:** The text is perfectly relevant, fully aligning with the intended query without any digressions.

Be rigorous and discerning when assigning your score.

Output Instructions
 Your output should contain only 2 lines:
 1. A brief explanation justifying the assigned score.
 2. The score as an integer value.

Do not provide any additional information beyond the explanation and score.

Figure 18: Prompt template for the text relevance evaluation.

Task Description
 You are a multi-modal document evaluation assistant. You will receive an image and its textual context written in markdown. Your task is to evaluate the coherence between the image and the text (context above and below) it accompanies.

Context Above
 ```markdown  
 {context\_above}  
 ```

Image
 <IMAGE_PLACEHOLDER>

Context Below
 ```markdown  
 {context\_below}  
 ```

Scoring Criteria
 Assess how coherent the image is in relation to its accompanying text, assigning a score from 0 to 10. A higher score indicates stronger coherence between the image and the text. Be precise when assigning the score.
 - A score from 0-3 means that the image is minimally or not at all coherent with the text.
 - A score from 4-6 indicates that the image shows some coherence with the text but may include unrelated elements.
 - A score from 7-9 indicates that the image is highly coherent with the text.
 - A score of 10 indicates perfect coherence, where the image completely corresponds with and enhances the text.

Be rigorous and discerning when assigning your score.

Output Instructions
 Your output should contain only 2 lines:
 1. A brief explanation justifying the assigned score.
 2. The score as an integer value.

Do not provide any additional information beyond the explanation and score.

Figure 19: Prompt template for the image coherence evaluation.

<p># Task Description You are a multi-modal document evaluation assistant. You will receive an image and its textual context written in markdown. Your task is to evaluate the helpfulness of the image in enabling human readers to comprehend the text (context above and below) it accompanies.</p> <p># Context Above <code>```markdown {context_above} ```</code></p> <p># Image <code><IMAGE_PLACEHOLDER></code></p> <p># Context Below <code>```markdown {context_below} ```</code></p> <p># Scoring Criteria Evaluate how well the image helps human readers understand the content of its accompanying text, assigning a score from 0 to 10. A higher score indicates that the image significantly enhances comprehension of the text. Be as precise as possible when assigning the score. - 0-3: The image is minimally or not at all helpful for comprehension. - 4-6: The image provides some helpful context or information but may contain extraneous or less relevant details. - 7-9: The image is highly helpful in enabling comprehension of the text. - 10: The image is perfectly helpful and greatly enhances and clarifies the information provided in the text.</p> <p>Be rigorous and discerning when assigning your score.</p> <p># Output Instructions Your output should consist of only two lines: 1. A brief explanation justifying the assigned score. 2. The score as an integer value.</p> <p>Do not provide any additional information beyond the explanation and score.</p>
--

Figure 20: Prompt template for the image helpfulness evaluation.

<p># Task Description You are a multi-modal document quality assessment assistant. You will receive an image and its accompanying textual context, formatted in markdown. Your task is to determine whether the image is explicitly referenced or explained within the surrounding text (both above and below the image).</p> <p># Context Above <code>```markdown {context_above} ```</code></p> <p># Image <code><IMAGE_PLACEHOLDER></code></p> <p># Context Below <code>```markdown {context_below} ```</code></p> <p># Scoring Criteria Evaluate the extent to which the image is referenced or explained in the text: - 0: The image is not mentioned or referenced in the context. - 1-3: The image is referenced implicitly, and the reference is improper or incorrect. - 4-6: The image is referenced explicitly but in an improper manner, or it is referenced implicitly. - 7-9: The image is referenced explicitly, with the reference being generally proper and correct. - 10: The image is referenced explicitly, with the placement and explanation being completely proper and correct.</p> <p>Be rigorous and discerning when assigning your score.</p> <p># Output Instructions Your output should consist of only two lines: 1. A brief explanation justifying the assigned score. 2. The score as an integer value.</p> <p>Refrain from providing any additional information beyond the explanation and score.</p>

Figure 21: Prompt template for the image reference evaluation.

Task Description

You are a multi-modal document evaluation assistant. You will receive a single image and a multi-modal document written in markdown, where detailed captions serve as proxies for images. Your task is to evaluate whether the image should be inserted into the document to enhance understanding for human readers.

Images in the Document

The images in the document have been replaced with their detailed captions. Each image is represented by a single line starting with '<image>:'.

Document

```
```markdown  
{text}
```
```

Image

<IMAGE_PLACEHOLDER>

Scoring Criteria

Evaluate whether the provided image should be inserted into the document based on the following:

- If the image is irrelevant to the document's content or does not aid in comprehension, output a single integer 0, indicating the image should not be inserted.
- If the image content is too similar to or repetitive of images already represented in the document, output a single integer 0, indicating the image should not be inserted.
- Otherwise, output a single integer 1, indicating the image should be inserted.

Output Instructions

Your output should contain only two lines:

1. A brief explanation justifying the score of 0 or 1.
2. The score as an integer value.

Do not provide any additional information beyond the explanation and score.

Figure 22: Prompt template for the image recall evaluation.

If water is better at conducting electricity than air, why do static electricity shocks happen more often in dry air? |



M²RAG +

Static electricity is a common phenomenon that can cause shocks when a person touches a metal object. This occurs because the person's body has accumulated a static electric charge, which is then discharged when they touch the metal object.

There are several ways to prevent static electricity from building up and causing shocks. One way is to wear clothing made of natural fibers, such as cotton or wool, which are less likely to generate static electricity than synthetic fibers like polyester. Another way is to use an anti-static spray on carpets and upholstery, which can help to reduce the buildup of static electricity.


It's important to note that static electricity can be dangerous in certain situations, such as when working with flammable materials or in areas with high humidity. In these cases, it's important to take extra precautions to prevent static electricity from building up and causing a shock.

Overall, understanding how static electricity works and taking steps to prevent it from building up can help to reduce the risk of shocks and make everyday activities safer and more comfortable.



M²RAG +

Static electricity is a common phenomenon that occurs when two materials are in contact with each other and there is a transfer of electrons from one material to the other. This can happen when you walk on a carpet, rub against a balloon, or touch a metal object.

 Thunderstorm (cumulonimbus) cloud diagram.

Why do I get shocked by static electricity?

Static electricity shocks can occur more frequently in dry air due to the unique properties of water and air as conductors of electricity. Water is a better conductor of electricity than air because it contains ions that can move freely, allowing electrical charges to flow more easily. In contrast, dry air lacks these ions, making it a poorer conductor.

However, the presence of water in humid air can actually reduce the likelihood of static electricity shocks. When air is humid, the water molecules in the air can help to dissipate electrical charges, reducing the buildup of static electricity. This is why you may be less likely to experience static electricity shocks on a humid day.

On the other hand, dry air can lead to a buildup of static electricity, increasing the risk of shocks. This is because dry air lacks the ions needed to dissipate electrical charges, allowing them to build up and eventually discharge as a shock.

 Static electricity is more common in dry air because moisture in the air helps to dissipate static charges.

Static Electricity Shocks in Dry Air: Understanding the Connection

Static electricity shocks occur more frequently in dry air despite water being a better conductor of electricity. To understand this phenomenon, let's delve into the science behind static electricity and how it relates to the properties of air and water.

The Role of Moisture in Static Electricity

In the image above, you can see two atoms with electrons orbiting around their nuclei. When these atoms come into contact with each other, they can transfer electrons, leading to the buildup of static electricity. However, when there is moisture present in the air, such as in humid environments, the water molecules can absorb some of the excess electrons, reducing the amount of static electricity that builds up.

Why Dry Air Increases Static Electricity Shocks

On the other hand, when the air is dry, there are fewer water molecules available to absorb excess electrons. As a result, the electrons continue to accumulate on surfaces, leading to a greater buildup of static electricity. This increased static electricity can then discharge more easily, causing shocks when we touch objects or other people.

Conclusion

Static electricity is a common phenomenon that can cause shocks, but it is usually not serious. By understanding the causes of static electricity and taking steps to prevent it, you can reduce your risk of getting shocked. If you do get shocked, it is important to seek medical attention if you experience any severe symptoms.

Preventing Static Shocks

There are several ways to prevent static shocks:

- **Use a humidifier:** Adding moisture to the air can help to reduce static charges.
- **Wear natural fibers:** Clothing made from natural fibers such as cotton and wool is less likely to generate static electricity.
- **Touch a metal object:** Touching a metal object can help to discharge static charges from your body.
- **Use an anti-static spray:** There are specialized sprays available that can help to reduce static charges on clothing and other surfaces.
- **Avoid walking on carpeting:** If possible, try to avoid walking on carpeting, especially if you are wearing rubber-soled shoes.

Causes of Static Electricity

Static electricity is more common in dry air because moisture in the air helps to dissipate static charges. Clothing made from synthetic materials such as polyester and nylon can generate static electricity. Rubber-soled shoes can prevent static charges from being dissipated into the ground, allowing them to build up on your body. Walking on carpeting can generate static electricity, especially if you are wearing rubber-soled shoes. Low humidity levels can contribute to the buildup of static charges.

Figure 23: A case of comparison between single- and multi-stage approaches with Llama-3.2-Vision-90B-Instruct.

