

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

Zi-Ao Ma<sup>1</sup>, Tian Lan<sup>1</sup>, Rong-Cheng Tu<sup>2</sup>, Yong Hu<sup>3</sup>, Heyan Huang<sup>1</sup>, Xian-Ling Mao<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science and Technology, Beijing Institute of Technology, China

<sup>2</sup>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, <sup>3</sup>WeChat AI, Tencent Inc., China

{maziao, ylw, lantiangm, ftb}@gmail.com, rongcheng.tu@ntu.edu.sg

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

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




Figure 1: A typical comparison between naive RAG and our proposed M<sup>2</sup>RAG. GPT-4o is used in this case.

## Abstract

This paper investigates an intriguing task of Multi-modal Retrieval Augmented Multi-modal Generation (M<sup>2</sup>RAG). 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG task, there is a lack of systematic studies and analysis. To fill this gap, we construct a benchmark for M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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.

\* Corresponding author

## 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG task, given multi-modal inputs with mixed layout of text and images. Numerous previous works (Zhu et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2023b;




Figure 2: The overall framework of our proposed dataset construction and M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG task, including single-stage and multi-stage approaches.
- **Experimental Insights:** Our experiments demonstrate that current LLMs outperform MLLMs significantly in M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 generation<sup>1</sup> 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)

<sup>1</sup>Most 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG task, which also emphasizes the integration of multi-modal content in the input.

## 3 Task Formulation

In M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 methods<sup>2</sup>. 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.

<sup>2</sup>Please 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 API<sup>3</sup> 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 Reader<sup>4</sup>. 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,

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

<sup>4</sup><https://jina.ai/reader/>

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 task<sup>5</sup>. 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG Task

Finishing Step 1-3 of Figure 2, we introduce three strong baselines for Step 4 to accomplish our proposed M<sup>2</sup>RAG task.

<sup>5</sup>Please 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 series<sup>6</sup>. 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG task.

<sup>6</sup>Please refer to Appendix E for more details.

Model Type	Approach	Model	Text-modal Metrics				Multi-modal Metrics				Overall
			Flu.	Rel.	CP.	Faith.	Coher.	Help.	Ref.	Recall	
LLMs	Separate	GPT-4o	0.80	0.82	0.69	0.89	0.53	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.63
	Single	GPT-4o	<b>0.79</b>	0.81	0.76	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.57</b>	0.31	0.57	<b>0.68</b>
		Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	0.75	0.79	0.75	0.85	0.57	0.47	0.18	0.22	0.57
		Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.77</b>	0.87	0.62	0.52	<b>0.35</b>	0.52	0.66
		Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	0.74	0.77	0.72	0.83	0.49	0.38	0.28	0.62	0.60
		Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	0.71	0.73	0.73	<b>0.91</b>	0.52	0.41	0.22	<b>0.63</b>	0.61
	Average	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.87</b>	0.56	0.45	0.27	0.51	0.62	
	Multi	GPT-4o	<b>0.78</b>	0.76	0.68	<b>0.87</b>	0.68	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.77</b>
		Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	0.73	0.75	0.72	0.84	0.68	0.55	0.77	<b>0.97</b>	0.75
		Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct	0.77	<b>0.77</b>	0.72	0.85	<b>0.69</b>	0.58	0.78	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.77</b>
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct		0.72	0.73	0.72	0.82	0.66	0.55	0.75	0.93	0.74	
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct		0.74	0.74	<b>0.74</b>	0.83	0.64	0.55	0.76	0.95	0.74	
Average	<b>0.75</b>	0.75	0.72	0.84	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.75</b>		
MLLMs	Single	GPT-4o	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.66</b>
		Llama-3.2-90B-V-Instruct	0.77	0.68	0.64	0.76	0.51	0.34	0.10	0.01	0.48
		Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct	0.77	0.78	0.72	0.88	0.43	0.32	0.15	0.16	0.53
		Llama-3.2-11B-V-Instruct	0.77	0.64	0.60	0.68	0.26	0.21	0.02	0.02	0.40
		Qwen2-VL-7B-Instruct	0.66	0.64	0.71	0.83	0.39	0.30	0.23	0.15	0.49
	Average	<b>0.75</b>	0.71	0.69	0.81	0.53	0.43	0.22	0.19	0.54	
	Multi	GPT-4o	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.78</b>	0.72	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.76</b>
		Llama-3.2-90B-V-Instruct	0.72	0.70	0.67	0.74	0.55	0.43	0.62	0.94	0.67
		Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct	0.75	0.74	0.71	0.80	0.63	0.52	0.73	0.94	0.73
		Llama-3.2-11B-V-Instruct	0.72	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.47	0.34	0.34	0.81	0.59
Qwen2-VL-7B-Instruct		0.70	0.75	<b>0.73</b>	0.77	0.54	0.42	0.51	0.94	0.67	
Average	0.73	0.73	0.70	0.77	0.57	0.46	0.62	0.92	0.69		

Table 2: The overall experiment results on M<sup>2</sup>RAG task. **Flu., Rel., CP. and Faith.** represent fluency, relevance, context precision and faithfulness, respectively. **Coher., Help., Ref., and Recall** represent image coherence, helpfulness, reference and recall, respectively. The highest scores for each group are highlighted in **bold**, and the highest average scores for 4 groups are highlighted in **red**.

**Scaling Phenomena** Significant scaling phenomena are observed in most experimental setups, with model performance improving as model size increases. However, a notable exception is found in the single-stage approach with LLMs. For instance, Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct slightly outperforms Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct (0.60 > 0.57) under this approach. Rigorous human annotation reveals that this issue arises because larger models tend to select fewer images in the single-stage approach. It should be noted that many of the excluded images are beneficial for the response, and their omission results in performance degradation. For example, the Image Recall scores of Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct and Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct are significantly lower than those of Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct and Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct (0.22 < 0.62 and 0.52 < 0.63, respectively). This phenomenon highlights a limitation in the image selection behavior of larger models, which warrants further investigation in future work.

**Joint Modeling versus Separate Modeling** It can be observed that the separate modeling method is much worse than all of our proposed approaches. Specifically, our worst approach, *i.e.*, single-stage

with MLLMs (GPT-4o) still outperforms it (0.66 > 0.63). This phenomenon demonstrates that jointly modeling the relationship and interactive information between multi-modal data is crucial for the M<sup>2</sup>RAG task.

**Comparison among Approaches** As shown in the ‘‘Average’’ rows in Table 2, it can be found that the multi-stage approach significantly outperforms the single-stage approaches for LLMs models (0.75 > 0.62) and MLLMs models (0.69 > 0.54). Besides, multi-stage approach introduce more relevant images, enhancing the information density and readability of the generated answers. Specifically, the Image Recall and Helpfulness fine-grained scores of multi-stage approaches are higher than the single-stage approach.

Moreover, the LLMs significantly outperforms the MLLMs in M<sup>2</sup>RAG tasks, no matter the single-stage or multi-stage is used. For example, the average overall score of LLMs are better than MLLMs (0.71 > 0.64). This observation demonstrates that the capabilities of existing MLLMs are not yet capable enough to accomplish the complex M<sup>2</sup>RAG tasks.



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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG, 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—M<sup>2</sup>RAG, 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG evaluation. For example, pairwise ranking is more appropriate for assessing overall performance than Likert scale in M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 Wenhu 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 Vasan 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, Zhihao 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, Qiyang 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, Zhihui 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 Feujio, Akash Maharaj, and Yunyao Li. 2024. Murar: A simple and effective multimodal 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 Topics<sup>7</sup>. 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-

<sup>7</sup>[https://huggingface.co/datasets/community-datasets/yahoo\\_answers\\_topics](https://huggingface.co/datasets/community-datasets/yahoo_answers_topics)

<p><b># Task Description</b> You are a useful question classification assistant. Your task is to classify the input question with the guidelines.</p> <p><b># Guidelines</b> 1. If inserting appropriate images in the answer to this question can provide a more comprehensive answer and make it easier for users to understand the content being discussed, then generate a single integer 1. 2. Otherwise, generate a single integer 0.</p> <p><b># Output Format</b> 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 integer 0 or 1. Do not generate any other information other than the analysis and category indices.</p> <p><b># Input Question</b> {question}</p> <p><b># Output</b></p>
---

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

didate elements provide substantial information relevant to the target question. Additionally, in real-time M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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 M<sup>2</sup>RAG 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).

<p><b># Task Description</b> You are a useful question classification assistant. Your task is to classify the input question with the guidelines.</p> <p><b># Category List</b></p> <p><b>1. Society &amp; Culture:</b> This category encompasses questions about traditions, languages, customs, behaviors, and societal norms. Images can serve as a visual reference to cultural landmarks, traditional attire, or historical events that support the textual explanation. <b>Example:</b> What is the significance of the Day of the Dead celebration in Mexican culture?</p> <p><b>2. Science &amp; Mathematics:</b> Questions in this category often deal with complex concepts that can be enhanced with diagrams, charts, or images. These visual aids can help in understanding scientific phenomena or mathematical theories. <b>Example:</b> How does photosynthesis work in plants?</p> <p><b>3. Health:</b> Health-related questions often benefit from the use of images like anatomical diagrams, charts, or photos for better understanding of medical conditions, treatments, or fitness exercises. <b>Example:</b> What are the symptoms and treatment options for carpal tunnel syndrome?</p> <p><b>4. Education &amp; Reference:</b> This category includes academic topics and general knowledge where explanatory images, instructional graphics, and reference tables can provide clarity and enhance learning. <b>Example:</b> What are the main parts of a plant cell and their functions?</p> <p><b>5. Computers &amp; Internet:</b> Questions about technology, software, and internet usage can be more effectively answered with screenshots, infographics, and step-by-step visual guides. <b>Example:</b> How do I set up a Wi-Fi network at home?</p> <p><b>6. Sports:</b> Sports-related queries can be explained better with visual demonstrations, play diagrams, athlete photos, and equipment images to illustrate techniques, rules, or historical moments. <b>Example:</b> What are the basic rules of soccer?</p> <p><b>7. Business &amp; Finance:</b> Financial and business concepts often involve data, charts, and visualizations that can make complex information more digestible and insightful. <b>Example:</b> How does compound interest work and what impact can it have on investments?</p> <p><b>8. Entertainment &amp; Music:</b> This category includes questions about movies, TV shows, music, and celebrities where images of album covers, scene snapshots, or charts of music theory can enrich the content. <b>Example:</b> What was the cultural impact of the TV show 'Friends'?</p>	<p><b>9. Family &amp; Relationships:</b> Questions about family dynamics, parenting, and social relationships often benefit from illustrative images such as family diagrams, photos, and infographics about communication techniques or social scenarios. <b>Example:</b> What are some effective conflict resolution strategies for couples?</p> <p><b>10. Politics &amp; Government:</b> Political and governmental questions can be clarified with the help of charts, maps, and historical photographs that provide visual context to legislative processes, electoral maps, or political events. <b>Example:</b> How does the electoral college system work in the United States?</p> <p><b>11. Others</b></p> <p><b># Classification Guidelines</b> Select one or more categories from categories 1-10 that are most relevant to the content of the question as the category of the question. If the question does not belong to any of the categories 1-10, then classify it into category 11.</p> <p><b># Precautions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the input text is classified into category 11, it cannot be assigned any other category.</li> <li>Please first briefly analyze the content of the input text and find its association with the given category, and then output category indices based on the above analysis.</li> </ol> <p><b># Output Format</b> Your output should consist of two lines. - The first line is your brief analysis of the input text content and its relationship with the given category; - The second line consists of a list of integers separated by a space. Each integer represents the index of a category you assigned to the input question. Do not generate any other information other than the analysis and category indices.</p> <p><b># Input Question</b> {question}</p> <p><b># Output</b></p>
---	---

Figure 7: Prompt template for query classification.

LLM	MLLM
GPT-4o	GPT-4o
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	Llama-3.2-90B-Vision-Instruct
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	Llama-3.2-11B-Vision-Instruct
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	Qwen-2-VL-72B-Instruct
Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct	Qwen-2-VL-7B-Instruct

Table 5: LLMs and MLLMs used for M<sup>2</sup>RAG task.

**Implementation Details** For the generation process, we deployed open-source LLMs and MLLMs using vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) on Nvidia A100-SXM4-80GB GPUs. Models with 7B-11B parameters operate on a single GPU, while those exceeding 70B parameters are distributed across 4 GPUs using tensor parallelism. The context length is configured at 64k for the Llama series and 32k for the Qwen series. During generation, we use a top- $k$  selection method with  $k$  set to 20 for filtering text elements from each webpage. The maximum number of auxiliary and web page specific images

is restricted to 5, with a total input image cap at 10. Images are resized to  $512 \times 512$  thumbnails for MLLMs processing. For evaluation, we implemented our customized metrics using the GPT-4o model to ensure the robust comprehensive assessment. Besides, the RAG metrics are implemented with RAGAS (Es et al., 2023) by using the GPT-4o-mini model.

## F Case Study

In this section, we provide some cases to demonstrate more details in the M<sup>2</sup>RAG task:

- Single-stage versus Multi-stage, as illustrated in Figure 23;
- Large Models versus Small Models, as illustrated in Figure 24;
- Separate Modeling versus Joint Modeling, as illustrated in Figure 25.

```

# Task Description
You are a useful text evaluation assistant. You will be provided with
a user query and a piece of text extracted from a relevant web page.
Please evaluate whether this text contains useful information to
address the user query.

# Input Data
1. User Query
2. Text from a Web Page

# Evaluation Guidelines
Assign a score from 0 to 10, where a higher score indicates better
alignment:
- 0: Entirely irrelevant to the query.
- 1-3: Minimal relevance; most content deviates from the query.
- 4-6: Moderately relevant; some content aligns with the query, but
includes notable digressions.
- 7-9: Highly relevant; most content relates directly to the query with
minor digressions.
- 10: Perfectly relevant; fully aligns with the query without any
digressions.

# User Query
{query}

# Web Page Text
```markdown
{webpage_piece}
```

# Precautions
If there is an <IMAGE_PLACEHOLDER> in the webpage text, ignore it
in your evaluation.

# Output Format
Your output should consist of two lines:
1. A brief analysis of the text's relevance to the query.
2. An integer score from 0 to 10.

# Output

```

Figure 8: Prompt template for the retrieval of text elements.

```

# Task Description
You are an assistant for evaluating the correlation between image
and text. You will be provided with an image and a question. The
image comes from a web page, so it may be a highly relevant image
to the provided text, a slightly relevant image, or a completely
unrelated image, or even an advertising image.

# Scoring Strategy
Score from 0 to 10 based on the correlation between the image
content and the problem, with higher scores indicating higher
correlation.
- 0 represents that the image is completely unrelated to the question,
or the image is an advertising image.
- 1-3 represents that the image is slightly related to the question, and
is dispensable for answering the question.
- 4-6 represents that the image is moderately related to the question,
and it is helpful for answering some of the content in the question.
- 7-9 represents that the image is highly related to the question, and
it is very helpful for answering the question.
- 10 represents that the image is the key to the question, and it is
essential for answering the question.

# Precautions
You are not expected to generate any other information other than
the score (an integer).

# Question
{question}

# Score

```

Figure 9: Prompt template for the retrieval of visual elements.




Figure 10: Non-empty web pages for each query




Figure 11: Valid pieces in Figure 12: Scores of web page pieces




Figure 13: Web page images for each query




Figure 15: Auxiliary images for each query

Figure 16: Score of auxiliary images

```

# 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 expla-
nation 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 expla-
nation 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 expla-
nation and score.

```

Figure 19: Prompt template for the image coherence 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 helpfulness of the image in enabling
human readers to comprehend the text (context above and below) it
accompanies.

# Context Above
```markdown
{context_above}
```

# Image
<IMAGE_PLACEHOLDER>

# Context Below
```markdown
{context_below}
```

# 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 comprehen-
sion.
- 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.

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 expla-
nation and score.

```

Figure 20: Prompt template for the image helpfulness evaluation.

```

# 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).

# Context Above
```markdown
{context_above}
```

# Image
<IMAGE_PLACEHOLDER>

# Context Below
```markdown
{context_below}
```

# 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.

Be rigorous and discerning when assigning your score.

# 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.

Refrain from providing any additional information beyond
the explanation and score.

```

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 expla-
nation 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? |



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.



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.



How does Ballistic Missile Defense System work? |



## Anatomy of an Intercept

### Introduction

Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) systems seek to defend a given area from attack by locating and tracking an incoming ballistic missile and then launching an interceptor to destroy the missile before it can reach its target. All U.S. interceptors are made up of a booster rocket and a kill vehicle. While most interceptors are "hit-to-kill," meaning the kill vehicle crashes into the incoming missile to destroy it, others use a blast fragmentation warhead that detonates an explosive charge and sprays shrapnel in the hopes of detonating the payload in the incoming missile.

### Components of the U.S. BMD System

#### Satellite Sensors and Radars

- **Satellite Sensors:**
  - Satellites detect threat launches and track the threat cloud.
  - They provide infrared imaging and optical tracking of the incoming missile.
- **Ground-Based Radar:**
  - Radars track the threat cloud and attempt discrimination.
  - They monitor the missile's trajectory and provide early warning.

#### Interceptors

- **Interceptor Missiles:**
  - Interceptors are the missiles used to counter the threat.
  - They are launched from ground-based, air-based, or sea-based systems.
- **Kill Vehicles:**
  - Kill vehicles are the boosters that separate from the interceptors and attempt to destroy the threat.

#### Command and Control

- **Command and Control Centers:**
  - Centers are located around the world and involve several different U.S. military branches and commands working together.
  - They utilize fire control systems to coordinate the interception process.

#### Working Together



The United States currently has a Ballistic Missile Defense System that utilizes a combination of satellite sensors and interceptors to eliminate threats. As shown in the image, the system works as follows:

- **Satellite Sensors and Radars:** Monitor the threat launch and track the missile's trajectory.
- **Interceptor Missiles:** Intercept the threat missile during its boost, midcourse, or terminal phase.
- **Command and Control Centers:** Coordinate the interception process and provide the necessary information to the interceptors.

In addition to these components, the U.S. Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has developed and deployed a number of systems to defend the homeland, allies, and assets abroad.



## Introduction

The Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) is a complex network of sensors, interceptors, and command and control systems designed to protect the United States and its allies from ballistic missile attacks. The BMDS includes both homeland defense and regional defense capabilities, with interceptors deployed in Alaska, California, Romania, Poland, and other locations around the world. The system uses a combination of ground-based, sea-based, and space-based sensors to detect and track incoming missiles, and interceptors to destroy them before they can reach their targets. The BMDS is designed to be flexible and adaptable, allowing it to respond to a wide range of threats and changing conditions.




Locations of U.S. Missile Interceptors

### Components of the BMDS

The BMDS is composed of several key components, including:

- **Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) System:** This system is the primary defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). It consists of Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs) deployed in Alaska and California, and a command and control system based at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. The GBIs are designed to intercept and destroy incoming ICBMs during their midcourse phase, when they are traveling outside of the Earth's atmosphere.
- **Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) System:** This system is designed to defend against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. It uses Aegis cruisers, destroyers, and ashore sites armed with Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) Block IA, IB, and IIA interceptor missiles. The Aegis BMD system is deployed on 38 warships and at two operational Aegis Ashore sites, one in Romania and one in Poland.
- **Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) System:** This system is designed to defend against short- and medium-range missiles in their terminal phase of flight. It is air-transportable for rapid deployment in times of crisis and is currently deployed at seven active THAAD batteries, including one in Guam and one in the Republic of Korea.
- **Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) System:** This system is designed to provide point defense against short-range ballistic missiles. It is deployed worldwide and is an increasingly capable system.
- **Command and Control, Battle Management, and Communications (C2BMC) System:** This system links all elements of the BMDS together, providing a seamless, global picture that incorporates all aspects of the missile defense architecture. It allows for tailoring by each region's needs and is interoperable with systems developed with allies and partners.



The GMD system involves a complex, global network of components. The launch of the threat missile (1) is detected by forward-based radars, if present, and satellite-infrared sensors (2). The threat missile releases its warhead and decoys (in this example the decoys are balloons, and a balloon contains a reflector) (3). The threat cloud, together with the warhead, are referred to as the "threat cloud" (4). Based on information from this radar, the GMD system launches one or more interceptors (5), each of which releases a kill vehicle (6). If a discrimination radar, such as the Sea Based X-Band Radar, is in place it will observe the threat cloud to try to determine which object is the warhead (7). It then steers itself into the path of the chosen object and passes to destroy it with the force of impact (8).

### How the BMDS Works

Referencing the intricate process depicted in the diagram, the BMDS initiates its function by detecting and tracking incoming missiles through a network of ground-based, sea-based, and space-based sensors. As illustrated in the image, the C2BMC system processes detected data to determine the optimal course of action. In the event of a required interception, the BMDS launches the appropriate interceptors and guides them to intercept and destroy the incoming missile. This defense mechanism operates in three phases corresponding to a missile's flight trajectory:

- **Boost Phase:** The BMDS employs early warning radars to detect and track the missile from the moment of launch until the propulsion system ceases operation.
- **Midcourse Phase:** Post-engine shutdown, the missile follows a ballistic trajectory, where ground-based and sea-based radars are utilized to track and distinguish between the missile and potential decoys.

### Testing and Evaluation

To ensure the BMDS's reliability, it undergoes rigorous testing and evaluation procedures, encompassing flight tests, ground tests, and simulations. Successful flight tests reinforce the confidence in the BMDS's operational capabilities. Moreover, the system undergoes regular assessments to guarantee it meets its established objectives and remains effective against the evolving threat landscape.

### Conclusion

The Ballistic Missile Defense System, as shown in the diagram, represents a sophisticated, multi-faceted network designed to safeguard the United States and its allies from ballistic missile threats. Its design emphasizes flexibility and adaptability, ensuring responsive capabilities against diverse and changing threats. Continuous testing and evaluation, along with ongoing updates and enhancements, keep the BMDS at the forefront of defense against emerging dangers.

### References

1. Topic: Ballistic missile defence - NATO - [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_49635.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49635.htm)
2. How Does Missile Defense Work? | Union of Concerned Scientists - <https://www.ucsusa.org/resources/how-does-missile-defense-work>
3. THE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM - <https://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Interactive/2018/11-2019-Missile-Defense-Review/MDR-BMDS-Factsheet-UPDATED.pdf>
4. Ballistic Missile Defense Review Report February 2010 - [https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/features/defenseReviews/BMDR/BMDR\\_as\\_of\\_26JAN10\\_0630\\_for\\_web.pdf](https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/features/defenseReviews/BMDR/BMDR_as_of_26JAN10_0630_for_web.pdf)
5. The Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System in Naval Support Facility ... - <https://www.cbf.navy.mil/Press-Room/News/News-Display/Article/3618612/the-aegis->

Figure 24: A case of comparison between small and large models (Qwen2-VL with 7B and 72B parameters).



Recycling does more harm than good because of the emissions during the recycling process. Is this statement accurate? |



### Does Recycling Do More Harm Than Good?

The commonly held belief is that recycling positively impacts the environment by reducing waste and conserving natural resources. However, doubts have surfaced regarding its effectiveness, particularly due to the emissions produced in recycling processes. Let's delve into whether recycling might truly be more detrimental than beneficial.

#### Chapter 1: Recycling Challenges

##### Global Mismanagement

The recycling industry faces numerous obstacles worldwide. A part of recyclable waste, especially plastics, frequently ends up in landfills or burning facilities because of contamination or inadequate processing capabilities. This is a prevalent issue in the U.S., where contamination—misplacing items in bins or discarding waste with food residue—hampers large-scale recycling efforts [3].

##### Export Difficulties

For years, countries like China were involved in processing a substantial share of global recyclables. However, policy changes such as China's 2018 National Sword policy have limited this trade. Consequently, countries like the U.S. have been offloading this responsibility onto other nations, many of which lack the infrastructure to manage waste properly, leading to increased pollution abroad [3].

##### Low Rates of Plastic Recycling

Another concern is the persistently low rates of plastic recycling. A minimal percentage of plastics, like PET bottles, end up being repurposed into new materials. The economic viability and quality standards required further constrain the recycling of plastics [3].

#### Chapter 2: Benefits of Recycling

##### Energy Saving

Despite these issues, recycling offers noteworthy environmental benefits. For instance, recycling aluminum conserves 95% of the energy needed to create it from raw sources. Recycling plastics and paper also leads to considerable energy savings compared to extracting and processing raw materials [5].

##### Carbon Footprint Reduction

By reducing emissions from waste disposal and manufacturing processes, recycling initiatives help combat climate change. Companies focusing on incorporating recycled materials, such as those in the electronics and automotive industries, effectively trim their carbon footprints due to lower energy consumption [6].

#### Chapter 3: Path to Solutions

##### Enhancing Infrastructure and Policy

Boosting domestic recycling standards and enhancing technology are vital steps forward. The EPA's initiatives to improve recycling infrastructure and public education on proper waste management are critical efforts to reduce contamination [5].

##### Encouraging Consumer Participation



A massive pile of varied waste materials and litter covers the ground, with a bulldozer working atop the heap against a clear blue sky in the background.

Raising public awareness about effective recycling practices can improve recycling program performance. Community involvement, along with government and corporate actions toward sustainable production and waste management, is promising for enhancing the recycling landscape [3][7].

##### Corporate Innovations and Responsibility

Corporations play a significant role by developing sustainable products, incorporating recycled materials, and aiming for zero waste operations. Companies like Apple are prioritizing recycled content, which substantially reduces emissions from their production processes [8].

##### Conclusion

The skepticism that recycling may inflict more harm than good arises from existing inefficiencies and global management challenges. However, with advancements and potential benefits in recycling processes, proper policies, and active participation can likely lead to a sustainable future.

##### References

- Opinion | The Complicated Truth About Recycling - The New York Times - <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/29/opinion/recycling-plastic-paper-aluminum.html>
- Recycling in the U.S. is Broken. How Do We Fix It? - State of the ... - <https://news.climate.columbia.edu/2023/03/13/fix-recycling-america/>
- Frequent Questions on Recycling | US EPA - <https://www.epa.gov/recycle/frequent-questions-recycling>
- Environmental Progress Report - Apple - [https://www.apple.com/environment/pdf/Apple\\_Environmental\\_Progress\\_Report\\_2023.pdf](https://www.apple.com/environment/pdf/Apple_Environmental_Progress_Report_2023.pdf)
- Why Some Americans Do Not See Urgency on Climate Change ... - <https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2023/08/09/why-some-americans-do-not-see-urgency-on-climate-change/>



### Recycling and Its Environmental Impact: A Comprehensive Analysis

#### Introduction

Recycling has long been promoted as a key strategy for reducing landfill waste and conserving resources. However, questions have emerged about whether recycling does more harm than good, particularly due to emissions from the recycling process itself. This document aims to address these concerns by exploring various facets of recycling, including its effectiveness, challenges, benefits, and potential for improvement.



A recycling site illustrating inefficiencies and challenges in current processes.

#### The Current State of Recycling

In assessing the impact of recycling processes, it's essential to consider various factors, including the emissions produced. The image of a recycling site in Harbin, China, depicting large piles of plastic bottles and assorted waste alongside wooden and metal carts filled with materials, highlights the complexity of sorting and processing different recyclables. Such facilities often face challenges like inadequate infrastructure, as indicated by the dilapidated structures in the background, which can contribute to inefficiencies and increased emissions. While recycling centers aim to reduce environmental harm by reprocessing materials, the entire lifecycle of recycling—from collection and transportation to processing—can inadvertently result in emissions that may offset some environmental benefits. However, these emissions are generally still lower compared to producing new materials from raw resources. Thus, despite some negative impacts, recycling remains a crucial component of waste management strategies worldwide, striving to minimize overall environmental harm.



A depiction of landfill waste accumulation highlighting the challenges faced in effective recycling.

The recycling process is faced with several challenges, vividly illustrated by an image of a massive pile of varied waste materials with a bulldozer navigating the heap under a clear blue sky. This representation highlights the reality that a significant portion of recyclables, especially plastics, are not recycled as intended. Instead, they often end up incinerated, in landfills, or polluting oceans (Webpage 1). Contamination during recycling collection and sorting can be as chaotic as the scene, which further aggravates the problem by reducing the efficacy of recycling programs (Webpage 2).




Challenges in Plastic Recycling and Mismanagement

The image illustrates the complex journey of plastics, detailing their origins from extraction to consumption and highlighting mismanagement challenges at various stages, including recycling. This context is crucial for understanding the waste management crisis involving single-use plastics, which have a low recyclability rate and contribute significantly to environmental harm. Among plastics, only a select few, such as certain bottles, are recyclable under current systems, as reflected in the image's focus on low recyclability rates and subsequent environmental impacts like fugitive plastics affecting air, water, and soil quality (Webpage 2). The opacity of the global recycling system further complicates the assessment of true recycling rates.

#### Environmental Benefits of Recycling

Despite these challenges depicted in the image, recycling offers significant environmental benefits. By conserving energy and reducing the reliance on raw materials, recycling mitigates some of the negative impacts illustrated—particularly those associated with the extraction and production stages. For example, recycling aluminum and paper saves large amounts of energy, reducing emissions linked to the fresh production processes (Webpage 3). Recycled materials, notably aluminum, possess much lower carbon footprints compared to newly mined materials, a fact emphasized by companies prioritizing recycled content to minimize ecological impacts (Webpage 4). This aligns with the broader environmental health issues represented in the image, underscoring recycling's role in systemic sustainability efforts.



Graph of Earth spectra showing CO2 and H2O data points overlaid on temperature curves

Recycling's impact is a complex topic, and the notion that it causes more harm due to emissions during the process requires careful consideration. The image presents a graph titled "Earth spectra measured from space," illustrating a relationship between wavenumber and radiance, highlighting significant data on CO2 and H2O. This visual data underscores the broader context of emissions and atmospheric composition. While recycling processes do generate emissions, the overall environmental impact depends on various factors, including energy source, material type, and system efficiency. The highlighted data points of CO2 relate to greenhouse gas emissions which are a concern during recycling. However, recycling often saves more energy and reduces emissions when compared to producing new materials from raw resources. Thus, the statement that recycling does more harm than good is not fully accurate and depends heavily on the specifics of each recycling process.



Illustration depicting environmentally friendly technology, emphasizing green practices.

#### Emissions from Recycling Processes

In the context of recycling and its environmental impact, the image of plants with electrical plugs as blooms, labeled with "Green Tech," underscores the potential for technology to advance eco-friendly solutions. It highlights the juxtaposition of current perceptions: while recycling does manifest emissions, much like other industrial processes, innovations in technology aim to mitigate these environmental costs. Indeed, the illustration represents the ongoing efforts within the tech industry to develop methods that reduce the carbon footprint associated with recycling. Despite concerns over emissions, these green technologies are pivotal in ensuring that recycling processes align more closely with sustainability goals. Hence, it is important to recognize both the challenges and advancements in making recycling more environmentally harmonious.

#### Improving the Recycling System

To enhance recycling effectiveness and environmental benefits, several approaches are suggested:

- Improved Sorting and Collection:** Reducing contamination through better sorting at the source and more efficient collection systems can significantly increase material recoverability, similar to how precise technology reduces visual strain (Webpage 2).
- Incentivizing Recycled Content:** Encouraging product manufacturers to use recycled materials can drive demand and innovation in recycling technologies, paralleling the push for technological enhancements seen in the design of eco-friendly products (Webpage 5).
- Circular Economy Models:** Moving towards a circular economy, where products are designed for reuse and recycling, can help realize the full potential of recycling, much like how the computer setup focuses on sustainable viewing experiences (Webpage 4).



Cover of the publication "More than 30 Years of PVC Recycling in Europe - A Critical Inventory" published in "Sustainability" journal

#### Conclusion

While the image on the cover of a publication titled "More than 30 Years of PVC Recycling in Europe - A Critical Inventory" showcases the longevity and importance of recycling efforts, concerns about emissions during the recycling process do exist. However, the overarching benefits of recycling—such as resource conservation and energy savings—remain significant. The system, similar to what's examined in the journal "Sustainability," requires improvements to address inefficiencies, contamination, and inadequate infrastructure. By emphasizing not just recycling, but also reducing consumption and reusing materials, we address the root of the waste problem more comprehensively. With ongoing innovations and strategic investments, recycling can continue to play an essential role in sustainable waste management, as echoed by critical reviews in sustainability-focused publications with metrics like an Impact Factor of 3.9 and CiteScore of 5.8.

#### References

- Opinion | The Complicated Truth About Recycling - The New York Times - <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/29/opinion/recycling-plastic-paper-aluminum.html>
- Recycling in the U.S. is Broken. How Do We Fix It? - State of the ... - <https://news.climate.columbia.edu/2023/03/13/fix-recycling-america/>
- Frequent Questions on Recycling | US EPA - <https://www.epa.gov/recycle/frequent-questions-recycling>

Figure 25: A case of comparison between separated and jointly modeling approaches with GPT-4o.