

SceneScout: Towards AI Agent-driven Access to Street View Imagery for Blind Users

Gaurav Jain*
Columbia University
New York, NY, USA
gaurav@cs.columbia.edu

Leah Findlater
Apple
Seattle, WA, USA
lfindlater@apple.com

Cole Gleason
Apple
Seattle, WA, USA
cole_gleason@apple.com




Figure 1: The SceneScout prototype system. A blind user accessing street view imagery through textual descriptions provided by SceneScout to assess a new neighborhood for potential relocation. SceneScout generates these descriptions by virtually grounding an AI agent within the physical environment using maps APIs, enabling the agent to perceive real-world surroundings. This perceived visual and map information, along with BLV users' preferences (e.g. intention and accessibility needs), is processed by a multimodal large language model to extract meaningful information, which blind users access through textual descriptions displayed on SceneScout's web interface.

ABSTRACT

People who are blind or have low vision (BLV) may hesitate to travel independently in unfamiliar environments due to uncertainty about the physical landscape. While most tools focus on in-situ navigation, those exploring pre-travel assistance typically provide only landmarks and turn-by-turn instructions, lacking detailed visual context. Street view imagery, which contains rich visual information and has the potential to reveal numerous environmental details, remains inaccessible to BLV people. In this work, we introduce *SceneScout*, a multimodal large language model (MLLM)-driven AI agent that enables accessible interactions with street view imagery. SceneScout supports two modes: (1) Route Preview, enabling users to familiarize themselves with visual details along a route, and (2) Virtual Exploration, enabling free movement within street view imagery. Our user study ($N = 10$) demonstrates that SceneScout helps BLV users uncover visual information otherwise unavailable through existing means. A technical evaluation shows that most descriptions are accurate (72%) and describe stable visual elements

(95%) even in older imagery, though occasional subtle and plausible errors make them difficult to verify without sight. We discuss future opportunities and challenges of using street view imagery to enhance navigation experiences.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing → Accessibility systems and tools.

KEYWORDS

accessibility, navigation, screen readers, street view imagery

ACM Reference Format:

Gaurav Jain, Leah Findlater, and Cole Gleason. 2025. SceneScout: Towards AI Agent-driven Access to Street View Imagery for Blind Users. In *Proceedings of 2025 (arXiv)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 25 pages. <https://doi.org/xx.xxxx/xxxxxxx.xxxxxxx>

1 INTRODUCTION

Navigating outdoors is a major challenge for blind and low vision (BLV) people¹. Existing solutions assist BLV users with various aspects of navigation, including guiding them to destinations [3, 53, 54, 101], alerting them of nearby obstacles [37, 54, 66], highlighting points of interest (POIs) [51, 58, 82, 101], and facilitating street crossing [4, 6, 54, 81]. Despite advancements in in-situ navigation

¹Disability language is nuanced and shaped by regional, cultural, and individual preferences [103]. In this work, we use the term *blind and low vision (BLV) people* to refer to individuals who rely on screen readers to access visual content on computers.

*Work done during internship at Apple.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).
arXiv, April, 2025

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN xxx-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/xx/xx.
<https://doi.org/xx.xxxx/xxxxxxx.xxxxxxx>

assistance tools, BLV users may still hesitate to navigate unfamiliar environments independently. This hesitation stems in part from uncertainty about the built environment’s physical characteristics (e.g. sidewalks, curb ramps, crosswalks), which current tools do not fully address [20, 29, 55, 118, 119].

To complement in-situ navigation assistance tools, research has explored approaches for helping users acquire spatial and route knowledge before navigation [13, 35, 36, 84]. Approaches such as route previews [36] enable users to form mental maps of their routes before physically navigating the environment. However, they often focus on navigation instructions and POIs along the route, while overlooking critical details about the accessibility of the built environment. Features such as tactile paving, curb ramps, and audible pedestrian signals (APSSs) significantly influence BLV users’ willingness to navigate unfamiliar areas [55, 60, 97], yet this information is rarely included in existing solutions. Thus, there is a need to explore approaches that provide BLV users with a holistic understanding of the environment beforehand, ultimately improving their confidence during navigation [64, 91].

Street view imagery, a rich source of information about the outdoor environment, offers a potential solution. It consists of panoramic photographs captured at street level, providing a visual representation of streets, sidewalks, and surrounding infrastructure. Sighted people frequently use tools like Apple Maps [49] and Google Maps [33] to *visually inspect* street view imagery, allowing them to assess physical surroundings and contextualize the navigation instructions by themselves. However, this resource remains largely inaccessible to BLV users. Although prior research has shown the utility of street view imagery for identifying accessibility issues [42, 43, 97], there is still limited work to make street view imagery directly usable by BLV users.

Many questions arise before facilitating direct access to street view imagery for BLV users: What various types of information could be useful to BLV people from street view imagery? How do their preferences for information from street view imagery change by scenario? How might we design a system that can perceive and move within street view imagery to enable accessible interactions? To what extent can such a system address BLV people’s needs?

In this work, we address these questions by developing *SceneScout*, a prototype system that uses a multimodal large language model (MLLM)-driven AI agent to enable blind-accessible interactions with street view imagery. Based on a literature review and feedback from BLV colleagues, we designed SceneScout to support two primary interaction modes: (1) *Route Preview*, which familiarizes users with visual details along a specific route, and (2) *Virtual Exploration*, which enables free movement within street view imagery. Figure 1 illustrates how SceneScout grounds an AI agent within the physical world using maps APIs, allowing it to perceive the environment, reason about BLV users’ preferences, and generate personalized textual descriptions based on the users’ intentions. These descriptions are presented via SceneScout’s web interface.

We conducted a user study with $N = 10$ BLV participants using a mixed-methods, scenario-based design [93]. Participants first interacted with SceneScout’s two interaction modes and then answered questions in a semi-structured interview. Findings show that SceneScout’s AI agent effectively surfaces relevant information from street view imagery, enabling BLV users to uncover visual details

about the built environment that would otherwise remain inaccessible. Participants expressed a strong interest in integrating street view imagery into their navigation workflows, both pre-travel and in situ. However, certain aspects of SceneScout did not meet participants’ expectations. For example, the descriptions lacked spatial precision, occasionally made assumptions about users’ abilities and the environment, and did not offer the level of personalization desired. We discuss future opportunities for achieving personalization at scale in Section 7.

To assess SceneScout’s performance, we conducted a technical evaluation to quantify the dimensions highlighted in the user study. Specifically, we evaluated the generated descriptions based on information type, correctness, error type, consistency, redundancy, and relevance. We found that while most descriptions were accurate (72%), the errors were often plausible additions, textual errors, or spatial mix-ups (16%) that may be undetected by BLV users who cannot see the images. The descriptions did describe elements that were likely or mostly likely (95%) to remain consistent over time, meaning the street imagery can remain useful even if not updated on a very frequent basis. While the performance of models will certainly improve, this evaluation indicates we should take care in the design of responses to convey relevant information from street view images to BLV users.

In summary, this work contributes:

- SceneScout, a prototype that explores the use of MLLM-driven AI agents to make street view imagery accessible for BLV users. Its two interaction modes, Route Preview and Virtual Exploration, support users’ pre-travel planning.
- A user study investigating how BLV people use SceneScout to access street view imagery. We find that SceneScout helps users uncover relevant visual details, but limitations in spatial precision and unsupported assumptions about the environment led to hesitation in fully trusting it.
- A technical evaluation assessing the accuracy and reliability of MLLM-driven AI agents in surfacing relevant and accessible information to BLV users. We find that the conversational nature of these models can lead to some subjectivity in descriptions. Although most descriptions are correct, the errors that are present tend to be plausible and hard to discern without the ability to see the images.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 In Situ Navigation Assistance

Most navigation tools for BLV people focus on in situ real-time guidance, providing turn-by-turn directions [3, 53, 54, 101], alerting users of nearby obstacles and POIs [37, 51, 54, 58, 66, 82, 101], and helping users cross streets [4, 6, 54, 81]. Although helpful, these systems primarily provide localized navigation cues rather than broader spatial awareness. For example, StreetNav [54] helps users detect and bypass obstacles, but only within their immediate vicinity, leaving the overall structure of the environment unclear. This limitation highlights the need to provide BLV users with a comprehensive spatial understanding before entering unfamiliar areas [29, 119]. Our work addresses this gap by enabling BLV users to virtually explore environments via street view imagery, offering

a holistic view of what the environment looks like to proactively build stronger mental models and ultimately navigate confidently.

2.2 Pre-travel Navigation Assistance

BLV people often plan routes in advance to anticipate potential challenges and navigate with confidence in unfamiliar environments [14, 21, 64, 85, 91, 119]. Mainstream navigation apps like Google Maps [33] and Apple Maps [49] can help by offering textual, step-by-step directions (*e.g.* ‘Turn left onto Park Avenue’), but these route-focused previews provide limited details about the environment [60]. To offer richer spatial information, researchers have developed tactile maps and 3D-printed models that provide detailed information via touch [28, 44, 70, 109, 117]. Researchers have also proposed virtual navigation systems that convey spatial layouts through audio-haptic feedback. Some of these systems simulate real-world movement using virtual canes or walking-in-place techniques but often require additional hardware [25, 65, 79, 125]. Others leverage touchscreen displays with audio-haptic feedback, enabling virtual previews on widely available smartphones [15, 23, 25, 35, 36, 38, 61, 67, 68, 92, 100, 107]. However, many existing solutions have limited resolution or emphasize basic route information and POIs rather than detailed spatial context. Our work builds on these approaches by investigating how street view imagery, a high-fidelity visual representation of the actual physical environment, can enhance BLV users’ pre-travel navigation planning.

2.3 Street View Imagery for Accessibility

Street view imagery has been widely explored as a proxy for the built environment, particularly in identifying accessibility issues. Project Sidewalk [41, 95, 97, 98], for example, introduced the concept of crowdsourcing accessibility information like curb ramps and sidewalk issues from Google Street View images [34]. Some approaches have also combined machine learning with crowdsourcing to partially automate the annotation workflow [22, 43, 46, 73, 115]. Collectively, prior work has demonstrated the feasibility of using street view imagery as a data source for assessing the environment’s accessibility. However, current approaches typically generate curated outputs for applications such as accessibility maps or urban planning resources [72]. BLV people generally do not directly interact with street view imagery, relying instead on preprocessed information like accessible bus stop locations [42] or pedestrian route recommendations [77]. Our work differs by providing BLV users with direct access to street view imagery, empowering them to obtain meaningful information directly from the imagery itself. This approach moves away from access to predefined data from street view imagery towards an interactive experience with it.

2.4 Multimodal AI Agents for Navigation

Recent advances in vision-language models have led to the development of AI agents capable of real-world navigation. Benchmarks such as Touchdown [17] use Google Street View panoramas to assess how well these agents follow natural language instructions and visually locate destinations in a complex urban environment. Researchers have explored various methods to build agents that can independently navigate such settings. Schumann et al. [102] proposed an embodied agent that verbalizes its visual observations

at each step, thereby providing a dynamic natural language context for its navigation policy. Balata et al. [8] focused on spatially grounded instructions that automatically enrich route directions with salient landmarks and spatial cues to better align with the environment. Complementing these language-centric strategies, Yang et al. [122] leverage a simulated environment with street view imagery, effectively bridging the gap between virtual training and real-world complexity. Collectively, these advances demonstrate the feasibility of developing multimodal AI agents with enhanced vision-language reasoning for real-world tasks. Our work builds on these advancements by taking a human-centered approach, adapting multimodal AI agents to support BLV users. Rather than focusing on the computational understanding of virtual environments, we design interactions that enable BLV users to access and interpret street view imagery independently.

3 THE SCENESCOUT SYSTEM

SceneScout is a prototype system that leverages a MLLM-driven AI agent to support accessible interactions with street view imagery for BLV users. SceneScout offers two primary modes of interaction through its web interface, (1) *Route Preview*: helping users gain familiarity with the visual details along routes to a destination, and (2) *Virtual Exploration*: enabling users to freely move within street view imagery. In the following sections, we discuss the design goals for SceneScout (Section 3.1), the two interaction modes it enables (Section 3.2), and the implementation details (Section 3.3).

3.1 Design Goals

SceneScout’s interaction modes embody two design goals identified through a literature review on navigation assistance systems. To ensure we follow a human-centered design process, a critical part of accessibility design [105], we further refined our design goals through input and feedback from BLV colleagues. We formulate the design goals as follows:

DG1. Support gaining familiarity with routes and destinations. Prior work highlights the importance of pre-travel planning for BLV users, showing that access to detailed environmental information aids mental map formation [27, 87, 90, 110], helps anticipate challenges [9, 55, 60, 118, 119], and helps users feel more confident [1, 19, 35, 36]. While broad spatial and accessibility cues are useful for general navigation, last-few-meters wayfinding [96] requires finer-grained details such as entrances, storefronts, and nearby landmarks [31, 53, 54]. BLV users should be able to access this layered information through street view imagery to gain familiarity with the routes and prepare for both navigation along the route and precise arrival at the destination.

DG2. Promote exploratory freedom within street view imagery. While most tools focus on route-based navigation [3, 37, 101], recent work highlights exploration as a critical yet under-supported aspect of BLV navigation [55]. To support exploration with street view imagery, users should be able to freely move in any direction and tailor information to their goals and situational context. This flexibility enables more spontaneous navigation, such as discovering new amenities along less-traveled routes or in unfamiliar locations [55].



Figure 2: The Route Preview interaction mode in SceneScout, enabling BLV users to familiarize themselves with a route before traveling. On the left, an illustration shows the AI agent navigating the street view imagery along the route to a nearby bus stop, while on the right is SceneScout’s web interface. BLV users set a start and destination, which triggers the agent to automatically retrieve relevant street view imagery (A_1 – B_1) and generate step-by-step descriptions (A_2 – B_2) along the route. Finally, it provides a detailed visual description of the destination (C_2) based on the destination’s street view images (C_1), assisting users with last-few-meters wayfinding. Appendix B includes the web interface’s text in an accessible format.

3.2 Interaction Modes

To illustrate SceneScout’s two interaction modes, we follow a persona of a fictional user, Maya. She is an engineer based in a large US city who is congenitally blind and relies on screen readers to access computers. To navigate outdoors, Maya uses a white cane alongside assistive technology applications. We present example usage scenarios for SceneScout’s two interaction modes, Route Preview (addressing **DG1**) and Virtual Exploration (addressing **DG2**), from Maya’s perspective.

3.2.1 Route Preview. Maya plans to take the bus after work to visit a friend. While she typically walks to a familiar stop to commute home, the bus to her friend’s house departs from a stop she has not used before. Uncertain about the accessibility of the route and hesitant to navigate an unfamiliar path, Maya turns to SceneScout to preview the journey. Figure 2 illustrates how the route preview interaction mode supports Maya in this scenario. Appendix C includes the figure’s text in an accessible format.

Descriptions along the route. Maya sets her office as the starting point and the bus stop as the destination, a three-minute walk away. SceneScout analyzes the route using street view imagery and map metadata (Figure 2 left), and presents the output through a screen reader-accessible web interface (Figure 2 right). Descriptions are organized in a table where each row corresponds to a 30 to 40 meter segment. This interval was selected to minimize visual overlap between consecutive panoramas. For each segment, SceneScout provides short, medium, and long descriptions based on nearby POIs and contextual details. Prior work highlights the value of customizable levels of detail in accessible image and video

content [47, 111]. This format supports quick skimming, with the option to explore specific segments in more detail as needed.

To generate these descriptions, SceneScout adaptively processes different fields of view from street view panoramas. At intersections, it uses a complete 360° view to provide a comprehensive understanding of traffic flow and controls, which are crucial for safe crossing. Figure 2A₁ shows this view, used to generate the description in Figure 2A₂. Along other segments, it processes a 180° forward-facing view, simulating a pedestrian’s perspective. Figure 2B₁ shows this view, used for the description in Figure 2B₂.

Detailed description near the destination. After reviewing the route, Maya receives a detailed description of the environment near the bus stop. This is organized into key categories: (i) the path leading to the stop, (ii) visual features such as a glass shelter with seating, (iii) suggested mobility cues like nearby trees or bins, (iv) sidewalk characteristics, and (v) textual signage, for example, a sign labeled “RapidRide.” These categories were informed by prior work [96] and feedback from BLV colleagues. This structure helps Maya identify essential visual and spatial cues for precise navigation. Figure 2C₁ shows the street view image used to generate the destination-focused description in Figure 2C₂.

3.2.2 Virtual Exploration. Maya, preparing to relocate to New York City for a new job, is considering moving to the Greenpoint neighborhood in Brooklyn. To evaluate whether this area is worth visiting and possibly living in, Maya wants to explore the neighborhood. Maya turns to SceneScout and uses it to virtually explore the neighborhood as part of her relocation planning. Figure 3 illustrates how the virtual exploration interaction mode supports Maya in




Figure 3: The *Virtual Exploration* interaction mode in SceneScout, enabling BLV users to freely explore street view. On the left, an illustration shows the AI agent’s (C) movement within street view, while on the right is SceneScout’s web interface. BLV users first specify their intent (A) and relevant keywords (B), which guide the descriptions generated from street view imagery. At intersections, users receive descriptions (D_2 – F_2) of each possible direction (D_1 – F_1) and select where to explore next. The agent then moves accordingly, generating step-by-step descriptions tailored to the user’s intent, creating an interactive and personalized exploration experience. Appendix C includes the web interface’s text in an accessible format.

this scenario. Appendix C includes the text from Figure 3’s web interface in an accessible format.

Defining exploration intent and keywords. To begin, Maya specifies her intention for exploration in natural language (Figure 3A) and provides keywords for SceneScout to emphasize in its descriptions of the street view imagery. Maya enters: “*I am buying a new house in this area and would like to see if this neighborhood is a quiet residential area with parks and good amenities.*” To further clarify her priorities, Maya can provide a set of keywords to guide the descriptions. SceneScout includes an initial set of keywords to which Maya adds: schools and public transport, as shown in Figure 3B. SceneScout then processes the street view imagery to generate descriptions of a block (Figure 3C), offering three verbosity levels similar to the route previews discussed in Section 3.2.1 but tailored to Maya’s intention and keywords.

Choosing directions for further exploration. As Maya explores the neighborhood virtually, she encounters intersections where decisions about the next direction to explore must be made. At these points, SceneScout first fetches the street view imagery for each possible direction, as shown in Figure 3 D_1 – F_1 . Then, it provides a summary of what lies in each direction, emphasizing features that align with Maya’s specified intention and keywords as shown in Figure 3 D_2 – F_2 . For example, since “*quiet streets*” is a priority for Maya, SceneScout might highlight directions with less traffic or appear more residential.

To assist in decision-making, SceneScout suggests a direction that best matches Maya’s goals. However, Maya retains full agency

and can override the suggestion to choose an alternative direction. By guiding Maya through iterative decision points at intersections, SceneScout fosters a dynamic exploration process that provides BLV users with an experience similar to how sighted users might navigate through street view imagery. This cycle repeats as SceneScout continues to generate block-by-block descriptions, prompting Maya to choose a direction at each intersection.

3.3 Implementation Details

SceneScout is powered by a MLLM-driven AI agent that perceives the environment through street view imagery, and reasons about BLV users’ preferences and context to facilitate accessible interactions with that imagery.

Figure 4 illustrates SceneScout’s system architecture. The agent positions itself by using geographic coordinates (i.e., longitude, latitude). With these coordinates, it leverages Apple Maps APIs [50] to retrieve street view imagery, determine valid movements within the street view, gather information about nearby POIs, and plan routes. These data, along with user preferences expressed in natural language, are processed by OpenAI’s GPT-4o multimodal LLM [89], which services prompt requests. To enhance the AI agent’s reasoning capabilities, user preferences and contextual information are encoded using few-shot prompting [16], chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning [114], and prompt-chaining techniques [121, 122]. Appendix A includes full prompt details.




Figure 4: System architecture of SceneScout, an MLLM-driven AI agent for accessible street view interactions. The agent grounds itself in the real world using geographic coordinates (i.e., geocodes) and retrieves street view imagery, routes, and POI data via Apple Maps APIs [50]. BLV users’ preferences—such as intent and accessibility needs—are processed alongside map data using GPT-4o, enabling SceneScout to generate textual descriptions. The web interface presents this information to BLV users.

SceneScout’s web interface is implemented using HTML, CSS, and JavaScript, with a Flask server managing back-end communication with the agent. We adhered to the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) accessibility guidelines [112] and tested compatibility with screen readers like VoiceOver [5]. Additionally, the interface incorporates W3C-recommended table structures, including two headers, to improve usability for screen reader users [113].

4 USER STUDY METHOD

Our user study is aimed at understanding BLV users’ experiences interacting with SceneScout to access street view imagery. To this end, we conducted a mixed-methods study with 10 BLV participants, answering the following research questions:

- RQ1.** How do BLV users perceive the relevance and utility of information surfaced from street view imagery by SceneScout?
- RQ2.** What are BLV users’ attitudes toward MLLM-generated descriptions of street view imagery, particularly regarding their trust and confidence in the descriptions?
- RQ3.** What are BLV users’ usage patterns with SceneScout and plans for incorporating it into their navigation workflows?
- RQ4.** What future interactions and use case scenarios could emerge for navigation systems that leverage street view imagery beyond the scope of SceneScout?

4.1 Participants

We recruited 10 screen-reader users (six males, three females, and one non-binary; aged 31–60) for the study. Participants worked at a large US technology company and were recruited by posting to internal communication channels and via snowball sampling [32].

Table 1 (Appendix D) summarizes our participants’ demographics, onset of vision impairment, use of mobility aids, and proficiency in using assistive technology (AT) for navigation. All participants, except P4, were totally blind and used mobility aids such as white canes (P1, P2, P8), guide dogs (P5, P6, P7, P9), or both (P3, P10). P4 reported having low vision due to severe central-vision distortion and did not use any mobility aids. All but one participant (P6)

reported themselves as being moderately–extremely proficient in using AT for navigation (3+ scores on a 5-point rating scale). Half of the participants were blind since birth, while the other half developed vision impairment later in life. Participants held a range of roles within the company, reflecting varying levels of experience with AI and MLLMs, although overall familiarity was likely higher than the general BLV population. Roles included software engineer (P1–P5, P8), business process analyst (P6), product manager (P7), data annotator (P9), and retail advisor (P10).

Study sessions were conducted remotely over video conferencing software and lasted for 90–120 minutes. Participants received \$12 meal vouchers as incentives for participation. We obtained informed consent from all participants.

4.2 Experimental Design

Our mixed-methods study followed a scenario-based design [93], where participants interacted with SceneScout’s two interaction modes. Each participant experienced two scenarios per mode based on use cases for street view imagery that our blind colleagues mentioned during design discussions (Section 3.1):

- **Route Preview:** Each scenario previewed a route, which began either at a POI or the corner of a street intersection and ended at another POI (e.g. transit stops, restaurants, stores). Start and end points were randomly selected to lie within a 5–10 minute walking distance.
- **Virtual Exploration:** Each scenario involved traversing through street view imagery with a specific randomized intent such as scoping out a new neighborhood for potential relocation, discovering new restaurants or activities, and identifying lively streets to explore on foot. The scenario began at a randomly selected intersection, and lasted for 10 minutes.

For both interaction modes, participants experienced two scenarios at different locations, one familiar and one unfamiliar. We intentionally started with a familiar location specified by the participant, typically a neighborhood where they had lived or worked.

This lets us naturally onboard participants while assessing SceneScout. Unfamiliar locations were randomly assigned from downtown areas in major US cities. We deliberately varied participants’ familiarity with the environment to gain insights into the perceived accuracy (RQ1), trust (RQ2), and utility of MLLM-generated street view descriptions (RQ3).

4.3 Procedure

We began each session by administering a *pre-study questionnaire* (Appendix E.1) to collect demographic information and details about participants’ level of vision, use of assistive technology for navigation, and familiarity with street view imagery. Participants then interacted with one of the two interaction modes in counterbalanced order to reduce potential ordering biases.

For each mode, we first gave participants a quick tutorial on how to navigate the web interface and interpret descriptions. Participants engaged with the first interaction mode in two scenarios, during which we asked them to think aloud [24]. After completing both scenarios, we administered a *post-prototype questionnaire* (Appendix E.2) designed to answer RQ1–3. For RQ1 (relevance and utility of descriptions), participants rated perceived relevance and utility of descriptions on a scale of 1–5. For RQ2 (attitudes toward MLLM-generated descriptions), they rated perceived trust and confidence in the descriptions (scale 1–5), and commented on the accuracy of descriptions for familiar locations. For RQ3 (usage patterns and integration into navigation workflows), participants ranked preferred verbosity levels, rated how location familiarity influenced their use (scale 1–5), and reflected on how SceneScout would fit into their current workflows. We followed up on participants’ ratings with additional questions to better understand their perspectives. The same questionnaire was administered after experiencing SceneScout’s second interaction mode.

Following their experience with SceneScout’s two interaction modes, we conducted a *semi-structured interview* (Appendix E.3) designed to answer RQ4 (future use cases for street view imagery-based navigation systems). The interview included open-ended questions that solicit suggestions for improving SceneScout’s two interaction modes and potential use cases for street view imagery beyond these modes. All questionnaires and interview questions are included in Appendix E.

4.4 Analysis

To analyze the interviews, we transcribed the study sessions in full and performed thematic analysis [12]. The first author led the analysis by reading the interview transcripts, taking notes, and synthesizing an initial set of codes which was shared with the other authors, who provided feedback on the initial set. From this feedback and continued iteration, the author refined codes to identify emerging themes grouped according to the research questions (RQ1–4).

5 USER STUDY RESULTS

In the following sections, we report themes that emerged for each of the research questions RQ1–4.




Figure 5: Participants’ average ratings ($N = 10$) for perceived relevance and usefulness of descriptions from SceneScout’s two interaction modes. While both modes received positive ratings, descriptions from Virtual Exploration were found to be slightly more relevant and useful compared to those from Route Previews. Error bars indicate standard error.

5.1 Relevance and Utility of Descriptions (RQ1)

Figure 5 shows participants’ average ratings for relevance and utility of descriptions across both interaction modes. The mean (\pm std. dev.) rating for participants’ perceived relevance of descriptions was 3.9 (± 1.2) for Route Preview and 4.4 (± 0.7) for Virtual Exploration. The mean (\pm std. dev.) rating for participants’ perceived utility of descriptions was 4.1 (± 0.7) for Route Preview and 4.2 (± 0.4) for Virtual Exploration. These positive ratings suggest that participants valued the information surfaced from street view imagery, instilling a sense of independence. P1 echoed this sentiment: “*these are details that a sighted person may not find useful to describe, but a blind person might not know how to ask.*” Follow-up discussions revealed the following key themes on relevance and utility of descriptions.

5.1.1 Useful categories of visual information. Participants found a variety of visual details useful for route previews, including landmarks like transit stops and businesses, accessibility-related features (e.g., curb cuts, tactile pavings, APSs), and traffic control elements (e.g., stop signs, lights, one-way vs. two-way streets). They also valued information about intersection types, infrastructure features (e.g., sidewalks, surface textures, pedestrian crossings), signboard text, mobility cues or obstacles (e.g., trash cans, benches, fire hydrants, bike racks, planters), and potential auditory cues like fountains. Some appreciated mentions of minute details, such as tripping hazards like tree roots or sidewalk cracks, which are difficult to detect otherwise. City-specific structures like Minnesota’s skywalks were especially useful, as shown in Figure 7. P7 noted, knowing about such features ahead of time “*shortens the learning curve significantly,*” reducing the need to rely on others when navigating new areas.

In virtual exploration, participants valued the richer descriptions, which helped them “*paint a fairly decent picture of what’s going on in the neighborhood*” (P3). As P4 described, “*glass facades sets all the buildings up around you.*” However, the subjective and sometimes vague language in these descriptions caused confusion. P1, for example, found non-specific terms frustrating, stating, “*Avoid terms like ‘landscaped area.’ It’s either grass, dirt, or a park... we should get it to avoid extremely vague things.*”




Figure 6: Participants’ average ratings ($N = 10$) for perceived trust in descriptions and confidence in navigation across SceneScout’s two interaction modes. Descriptions from Virtual Exploration were trusted slightly more than those from Route Preview. Both modes instilled a similar level of confidence in participants to navigate based on the information provided. Error bars indicate standard error.

5.1.2 Inferring environment’s affordances. In addition to aiding navigation, participants stated the descriptions influenced their real-world decision-making by revealing aspects of the environment not apparent from navigational cues. For example, P7 appreciated the mention of an ‘Only Authorized Vehicles’ sign:

“If I didn’t know this area, I wouldn’t know that only buses and emergency vehicles are allowed on Nicollet Avenue. It’s interesting because if you were trying to get an Uber, you wouldn’t catch it there.” –P7

Participants also appreciated descriptions that conveyed contextual details about public infrastructure. For instance, learning that a bus shelter is transparent can be especially useful in bad weather, as it allows riders to remain sheltered while still being visible to the driver—unlike opaque shelters that may require stepping out to signal the bus. These kinds of details helped participants adapt their behavior and make more informed decisions, even if the information was not strictly related to navigation.

5.1.3 Specifying keywords enhances relevance. Participants appreciated the ability to specify keywords in virtual exploration, giving them control to steer the system to focus on details that mattered the most to them. P6 explained how this customization could align the descriptions better with her routine, shifting based on whether she was alone or with her partner: *“I know it said public transport, [but] I don’t love the subway system in New York. I’d rather focus on using buses... and I wanted to learn about the parking spaces there because my partner drives”* (P6). However, some participants desired to further refine the descriptions by not only adding but also modifying or removing suggested keywords, .

5.1.4 Route preview descriptions lacked spatial precision. Participants found descriptions slightly less relevant and useful for route previews than for virtual exploration (Figure 5) because route information required greater precision to support effective navigation. Participants emphasized the importance of describing object locations relative to their path. P1 noted that instead of just stating the presence of curb cuts, descriptions should clarify their layout: *“In [my city], some intersections have curb cuts that are at 90°*

angles, while the other side have them at 45°. A helpful description might be: You’re at a four-way intersection, and at the southeast corner are two curb cuts at 90°; the northwest corner is a single curb cut at 45°.” Exploration-focused descriptions could afford to be broader, providing a general sense of the environment rather than precise navigational details. As P3 noted: *“For exploration, the more verbose descriptions are useful since I don’t have a specific goal in mind. I’m trying to understand what I would experience there. For exploring, the descriptions are pretty darn good.”*

5.2 Attitudes Toward MLLM-generated Street View Descriptions (RQ2)

Figure 6 shows participants’ average ratings for their attitudes toward MLLM-generated descriptions for both interaction modes. The mean (\pm std. dev.) rating for perceived trust in the descriptions was 3.5 (± 1.2) for route previews and 3.5 (± 0.7) for virtual exploration. The mean (\pm std. dev.) rating for perceived confidence in knowing what to expect from the environment during navigation was 3.8 (± 0.6) for route previews and 3.5 (± 0.5) for virtual exploration. Although participants’ ratings leaned positive, they expressed hesitation in fully trusting the descriptions, acknowledging that *“AI can hallucinate, let’s be honest”* (P9). Figure 7 provides examples of both errors and useful information encountered by the participants during the study.

5.2.1 Trust through familiarity and physical verification.

Participants gauged the trustworthiness of MLLM-generated street view descriptions by evaluating their alignment with prior knowledge, real-world verification, and consistency over time. Descriptions that matched familiar environments were perceived as more reliable. For example, P5 felt reassured when a description of Central Avenue reflected their expectations: *“It mentions that going north, there’s gonna be some apartment buildings with ground-level shops, and that is exactly correct.”* However, participants emphasized that building trust required time and repeated interactions with the system. As P5 further explained: *“I would say a four [out of five], because they seem trustworthy for the areas I was familiar with, but my sample size isn’t big enough.”*

In addition to familiarity, participants stressed the importance of physical verification. P7 described SceneScout as *“a really useful tool in my toolbox, but it doesn’t feel like I can say exactly how the environment is going to be.”* P4 echoed this skepticism, stating: *“I don’t trust nothing until I touch that pedestrian signal. It could not be there. It could be there. It could be broken... but it gives you an expectation of what should be there.”*

As shown in Figure 7, inaccurate descriptions undermined participants’ confidence. P4, for instance, encountered a hallucinated street name and immediately questioned its validity: *“I don’t know if that’s actually true. [The] thing that is further north on 4th Street from Mission Bay Blvd., the next possible street is, oh wait a minute, that’s awkward because there is no Figueroa Ave. over there.”* Likewise, P3 expressed frustration when a description incorrectly stated that audio pedestrian signals were present: *“If the data is incorrect, I’m not going to trust it at all.”* Participants also highlighted the challenge of temporal inconsistencies, such as transient objects like vehicles and construction. More details are in Appendix F.2.




Street View Image	Description	User reaction
	There are cars parked in front of this building. Street signs indicate that this is Figueroa Avenue. To the right, you will find the Bank of America.	P3: "That's awkward because there is no Figueroa Avenue over there."
	The sidewalks are wide with trees and some commercial store fronts, and skywalks connecting buildings above the street level are visible.	P7: "Skywalks are a really big part of downtown Minneapolis. The fact that it's giving me skywalk information is great, because [when I first moved there] I just had to ask others."
	The sidewalk is wider here, allowing more ease of movement. A construction zone on the right side may affect accessibility due to orange barriers and construction equipment.	P10: "The construction can be so variable. It could have been under construction last year, or could be completed by now or not. We wouldn't have any way of knowing."

Figure 7: Examples of errors and useful information encountered by the participants during the study. The first highlights a misreading of a signboard, leading to incorrect location information. The second demonstrates the usefulness of describing skywalks, which are otherwise inaccessible details for BLV users. Third shows a temporally inconsistent description of a construction zone, illustrating challenges in conveying dynamic environmental changes.

5.2.2 Assumptions about people's abilities and actions can be offensive. Participants expressed dissatisfaction with the prescriptive nature of the descriptions, emphasizing the need for greater objectivity and avoidance of assumptions about users' abilities. Upon encountering the description: '...the sidewalks are wide, but caution is advised due to frequent obstructions, including parked vehicles,' P8 exclaimed, "That sentence doesn't need to be included. Don't tell me what I should do. Tell me the information." Similarly, participants highlighted the importance of refraining from making assumptions about users' actions:

"The fact is, we don't know how a user is going to cross the street. Are they gonna use another app to tell them the walk sign is on? Are they going to facetime a friend? We shouldn't make assumptions. I would be cautious about editorializing." –P1

Additionally, participants advised against explicitly naming disabilities in descriptions; for instance, referring to tactile pavings as meant for 'blind people' should be avoided.

5.2.3 Assumptions about places can be misleading. Participants pointed out that some descriptions made unwarranted assumptions about places without sufficient evidence. For instance, when exploring new neighborhoods for relocation, descriptions

sometimes inferred that an area was quiet without providing concrete facts. P4 felt that such assumptions should be avoided:

"How does it know that it's a quiet residential area? I almost think it's making that up. It can set somebody up for false expectations. Being objective is the best thing, and then allow the user to determine the implications."
–P4

5.3 Usage Patterns and Integration into Navigation Workflows (RQ3)

5.3.1 Usage of different verbosity levels. Participants preferred short and medium descriptions for Route Previews and medium and long descriptions for Virtual Exploration. Figure 10 (Appendix F.1) presents their ranking preferences for different verbosity levels, although all participants valued the ability to switch between verbosity levels as needed. For example, P8 said "all three [levels] have merits" (P8), while P6 explained, "I like [...] the medium, and then if I want more details, I'm going to the long." When in a hurry, short descriptions were preferred because "it gets straight to the point" (P9). Familiarity also played a role, as P4 noted, "If I'm in familiar [location], I would probably use the short. If I'm in unfamiliar, I would want the medium or the long to learn and understand the area." Visit purpose further shaped preferences, as P6 shared, "If I'm visiting for a week and I just need to get a smoothie, then I would use medium or short. I just want to get in, get my thing, and get going. I won't come back and don't need descriptions of anything around the area."

5.3.2 Effect of location familiarity on system usage. Prior research suggests that pre-travel navigation assistance is primarily useful in unfamiliar locations [35, 36, 60]. However, we found that the level of detail available in street view imagery makes it valuable even in familiar areas.

Figure 8 presents participants' average ratings for their likelihood of using the two interaction modes in both familiar and unfamiliar locations. The mean likelihood (\pm std. dev.) for Route Preview was 3.9 (± 1.2) in familiar locations and 4.5 (± 0.7) in unfamiliar locations. For Virtual Exploration, the ratings were 4.4 (± 0.7) and 4.5 (± 0.7), respectively. Participants expressed a strong likelihood of using both modes regardless of location familiarity, particularly for Virtual Exploration.

In unfamiliar locations, participants valued both modes for building confidence and setting expectations. As P5 noted: "This would be really useful for people who want more information about what to expect because blind people have varying degrees of travel skills and varying degrees of comfort with unfamiliar environments. Having a better idea of what's coming could be a really big help."

Contrary to expectations, participants also found Route Preview valuable in familiar locations. As P10 explained, they used it "to re-familiarize myself with [the area] to make sure that I'm not forgetting anything." P8 echoed this, acknowledging that even in well-known areas, one can still miss things or not know that something exists. P6 illustrated this with an example: "I'm not gonna lie, I know that sidewalk, but I didn't know the fence [behind] was wrought iron."

Similarly, Virtual Exploration in familiar locations offered context that was otherwise inaccessible. P1 highlighted this gap:




Figure 8: Participants’ average ratings ($N = 10$) for their likelihood of using SceneScout’s two modes in familiar and unfamiliar locations. While participants were equally likely to use Virtual Exploration regardless of location familiarity, they were slightly more likely to use Route Preview in unfamiliar locations. Error bars indicate standard error.

“Unless you have a very specific friend, there are pieces of your world that no one might tell you about. They may not tell you there’s a mural there. Maybe I’ve lived here for ten years and I happen to be with a friend from out of town, and they’re like, ‘oh, that’s a pretty mural.’ I’m like, what mural?” –P1

5.3.3 Incorporating SceneScout into navigation workflows. Participants identified several use cases for incorporating SceneScout into their navigation workflows. First, they wanted to establish a common visual ground with sighted people. Using visual references, for example, could enhance communication clarity:

“I love the description of color! I mean, you would never know that there’s a purple umbrella, but then if someone was looking for you, you could say: ‘Hey, I’m by the purple umbrella on 17th and Pearl Street,’ you know? These are really powerful descriptions for different use cases.” –P8

Additionally, participants emphasized that visual information enhances their ability to “ask a better question of somebody who’s around” (P7).

Second, participants highlighted how SceneScout could help to build mental maps, fostering confidence in navigating new areas:

“Some blind people find it a little difficult to explore and are focused on getting from point A to point B. They don’t necessarily know a lot about what is along the way. So, this [system] really helps with getting a more full picture of what’s there and engage more with your environment.” –P5

Another participant (P9) noted newfound confidence in exploring an area they had previously only traversed by bus: “I haven’t actually been here on foot because I didn’t know it has sidewalks that aren’t that bad. I think I could walk in.”

Third, participants expressed excitement about the Virtual Exploration mode. P8 said: “I would sit there and play with the [system] along Pearl Street as long as you would let me.” They identified various potential uses, including visiting their hometowns (P1, P6, P7,

P8, P9, P10), planning vacations (P1, P6, P10), following up on newsworthy locations or friends’ new homes (P1, P6, P10), exploring new neighborhoods or workplaces (P1, P6, P7, P8), and assessing locations for business meetings or outings with friends (P2, P4, P6).

5.4 Ideas for Improvement and New Interactions (RQ4)

5.4.1 Suggestions for improvement. Participants suggested several improvements to SceneScout. First, they wanted personalized descriptions that adapt over multiple sessions rather than relying solely on single-session keywords. P8 proposed “being able to mark certain elements of descriptions as favorites, so the model knows that [a user] likes to hear about these things.” Second, participants recommended shifting the point of view from a vehicle’s perspective to a pedestrian’s. P3 explained that interpreting car-centered imagery is challenging: “It has to be interpolated as if you were walking up the sidewalk rather than being in the middle of the street. People who are blind do not think about the street in a fully spatial way, so you can’t just say this is from the point of view of the center of the street.” Finally, they emphasized the need for better exploration capabilities so that users can move beyond the current window and retrace their steps. P8 pointed out that blind users often lack the same freedom to explore and may need to backtrack to find alternatives.

5.4.2 Integration into walking directions for in-situ assistance. Participants expressed a strong desire for real-time access to street view descriptions while walking. They envisioned applications that surface visual information through bone conduction headphones or transparency mode to provide relevant details as they move. As P9 put it, “Why can’t [maps] have a built-in ability to help [provide] detailed information about what you’re walking by.”

Participants suggested using even shorter, ‘mini’ (P1), descriptions while walking, highlighting only critical details such as landmarks or sidewalk conditions. More comprehensive descriptions, i.e. long descriptions, could be triggered on demand when users pause walking or reach intersections.

Another participant (P4) suggested a new form of interaction, in which users “could point the device in a certain direction” to receive on-demand descriptions, rather than having to physically align their phone camera to capture the surroundings. This would enable users to actively survey their environment in real time, making navigation more dynamic and responsive.

6 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

We evaluate SceneScout’s technical performance to determine how accurately and reliably the MLLM extracts information from street view imagery. Our user evaluations (Section 4–5), which captured BLV users’ subjective experiences with SceneScout, revealed instances of hallucinations, incorrect assumptions, and irrelevant details in street view descriptions. To further examine these issues, our technical evaluation provides an objective analysis of SceneScout’s performance. Specifically, we assess the generated descriptions for information type, correctness, error type, consistency, redundancy, and relevance.




Figure 9: Technical evaluation results for (a) information type, (b) correctness, (c) error type, (d) temporal consistency, (e) redundancy, and (f) relevance of descriptions. We report percentages comparing both of the interaction modes as well as description length. All of the metrics except relevance are analyzed on a per-sentence basis (i.e., results are normalized for description length). We find that while most descriptions are accurate and reliable, the errors are often subtle and plausible, making them difficult to detect without seeing the images.

6.1 Procedure

We selected a set of 40 usage logs from SceneScout for evaluation, evenly split between the two interaction modes (10 participants \times 2 scenarios \times 2 interaction modes). Overall, the dataset covered downtown areas in Austin, Chicago, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New York City, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Seattle, and Sunnyvale. We randomly sampled 20% of the descriptions from these logs for the technical evaluation, resulting in 126 descriptions. The analyzed descriptions had average lengths (\pm std. dev.) of 1.46 (\pm 0.7) sentences for short descriptions, 3.57 (\pm 1.3) sentences for medium descriptions, and 7.95 (\pm 1.8) sentences for long descriptions. In total, across the two interaction modes and three verbosity levels, we evaluated over 550 sentences.

Each sentence was evaluated across five metrics: *information type*, *correctness*, *consistency*, *redundancy*, and *relevance*. Note that we only rated *relevance* for Virtual Exploration descriptions, assessing how well they matched the user's intent. The definitions for these metrics follow prior work [26, 48, 71, 83]. We compared each sentence with the relevant street view imagery, contextual user data, and map information used as input to MLLM to generate descriptions. Annotation instructions for an example task are provided in Appendix G. Two researchers jointly evaluated a small subset of descriptions, subsequently discussing and resolving any differences. One of the researchers then evaluated the remaining data.

6.2 Results

Figure 9 summarizes the technical evaluation results and compares both of the interaction modes as well as description length. All of the metrics except relevance are presented on a per-sentence basis, meaning the results are normalized for description length.

6.2.1 Type of Information. Some participants in the user study desired SceneScout to refrain from making subjective statements. This evaluation showed that the majority (74%) of information in the sentences were objective descriptions of the visuals. An additional 25% of sentences contained both objective and subjective information, often using adjectives such as "busy", "crowded", "ample", "well-maintained", "well-kept", "quiet", or "bustling". There were substantially more examples of this in the Virtual Exploration interaction mode, primarily when the model attempted to answer the user's intent.

6.2.2 Correctness and Error Types. Of the sentences graded, 72% were rated correct and 14% partially correct, with 8% fully incorrect. Six percent were rated "I cannot tell" as the statement could not be verified with the images. In the Route Preview mode, short descriptions have more sentences containing errors, although this is often due to these sentences being more information-dense, meaning there is more potential for a mistake in a single sentence. Across interaction modes and description lengths, the errors tended to be a fairly consistent mix of plausible but not present visual details (40%, e.g. stating a crossing had pedestrian signals when it

did not), factual error (19%, e.g. incorrect text), spatial errors (16%, e.g. "left" instead of "right"), and outright hallucinations where the model invented whole objects (16%, e.g. a "Maintenance Yard" sign that was not present). Many of these errors are unlikely to be caught by BLV users unless they are familiar with the area, indicating caution must be taken when relying on MLLMs for future navigation.

6.2.3 Temporal Consistency. As noted by participants, the imagery (and therefore model responses) may be out of date either when the user views it or when the user visits the location. In the analysis, 79% of sentences were likely to remain consistent over time as they described elements of the built environment such as buildings, streets, or foliage. For 16% of sentences, some element made it only possible to remain consistent over time, usually because it described how busy an area was for people or vehicles, or described some seasonal element. Five percent of sentences were likely outdated because they described a temporary event (e.g. construction) or transient object (e.g., a specific person or vehicle).

6.2.4 Redundancy. As users experience the descriptions while moving down a street, elements such as lane configuration, sidewalk quality, and the presence of parking are likely to be similar between descriptions. We examined the sentences in the current description with the description presented to the user immediately prior, finding that 56% added new information not in the prior description, 31% repeated information already told to the user, and 13% updated information from the prior description. Redundancy was more common in Virtual Exploration as the model attempted to address the user’s intention at each location, even if not much changed. Additionally, we see less redundancy in short descriptions where there is less information to repeat.

6.2.5 Relevance. Overall, descriptions in the Virtual Exploration mode addressed the user’s intention, with 61% of descriptions being fully relevant and 35% of descriptions being partially relevant. Partially relevant descriptions tended to also describe non-relevant aspects of the imagery, which may be desirable. Four percent of descriptions did not address the user’s intention, which occurred when verbosity was limited and the model focused on what was visible in the image instead.

In summary, most descriptions were accurate (72%), objective (74%), likely to remain consistent over time (95%), and provided relevant information aligned with user’s intent (96%). However, the errors that did occur were often subtle and plausible, making them difficult to detect without the ability to see the images.

7 DISCUSSION

We reflect on SceneScout by discussing mechanisms to enhance user trust, strategies to achieve personalization at scale, the integration of map metadata with street view imagery, design considerations for street view imagery-based navigation systems, and implications for MLLMs applied to the accessibility of street view imagery.

Designing to Enhance User’s Trust. Our findings revealed insights into users’ trust in AI-generated street view descriptions (Section 5.2). Trust significantly influenced whether BLV people would use SceneScout-like systems, especially when they cannot

physically verify those details. Participants showed cautious optimism, but remained aware of potential inaccuracies inherent in LLM-based systems [48, 56, 59, 124]. Prior research explored how BLV users interpret AI-generated descriptions [2, 78], but trust becomes critical in navigation, where safety is paramount and verification is infeasible.

Two major concerns emerged: the accuracy of descriptions and the temporal consistency of imagery with real-world environments. Users need ways to verify descriptions on demand, particularly when uncertain. Existing approaches, such as touch-based interactions in ImageExplorer [69] and ImageAssist [88], enable users to explore objects and gather objective information. Similarly, visual question answering [11, 40, 62] provides a way to ask context-specific questions to clarify details. Beyond user-driven verification, recent techniques that proactively detect and correct inconsistencies could further enhance reliability [18, 39, 74, 80].

Uncertainty cues embedded within descriptions can also help, as communicating confidence levels helps users better assess reliability. Steyvers et al. [106] found that users overestimate AI accuracy, but uncertainty phrasing aligns their confidence more closely with actual performance. For example, if a signboard is obscured by trees, the model could highlight this to signal potential unreliability. Additionally, providing the capture date of street view imagery could further help users assess its trustworthiness.

Achieving Personalization at Scale. Our participants prioritized different information in street view imagery such as visual landmarks, pedestrian routes, or environmental details. They emphasized the need for personalized descriptions and greater customization, although achieving this poses challenges due to the high computational costs. Generating descriptions for each user using MLLMs is resource-intensive, making large-scale personalization with the current design of SceneScout economically infeasible. As personalization is crucial for accessibility [45, 57, 86, 116], the community must balance customization with scalability [63].

One promising approach for achieving scale is pre-processing descriptions, enabling fast retrieval without real-time inference. However, this method offers “one-size-fits-all” descriptions that may not meet individuals’ specific needs. A hybrid model could refine these descriptions pre-generated by larger MLLMs using a smaller, on-device model. These lightweight models could adjust descriptions in real-time based on each user’s unique history and needs, ensuring personalization without the computational demands of large models for every query.

The key challenge is balancing scalability with the highly personalized nature of assistive technologies. Future research should optimize this trade-off to ensure that personalization at scale is effective. Emerging advancements in machine learning provide promising directions for achieving this balance [63, 75, 99, 108].

Integrating Map Metadata with Street View Imagery. SceneScout’s AI agent combines structured map metadata from Apple Maps APIs [50] with MLLM-generated descriptions from street view imagery. Our evaluations revealed that map metadata is generally more accurate and up-to-date, but it lacks the nuanced details available in street view imagery. Metadata primarily covers POIs and driving directions, which may not always align with BLV users’

navigation needs. Additionally, walking route visuals are rarely conveyed in non-visual formats because navigation services assume users can interpret traditional map visuals, street view, or satellite images.

This gap presents an opportunity to enrich structured map metadata with the contextual information available from street view imagery [52]. Cross-referencing both sources could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the environment, making pedestrian routes more accessible. Conversely, map metadata—given its established, reliable workflows—could help validate and refine street view descriptions, improving their accuracy and consistency. Integrating street view images into search functions within map applications could enhance search results with visual context and improve navigation for all users. Future systems should explore ways for models to distinguish between reliable map metadata and the more variable street view descriptions, ensuring that users can trust the information presented, particularly in high-stakes navigation scenarios.

Design Considerations for Leveraging Street View Imagery.

Our evaluations found that street view imagery provides valuable information that BLV users would otherwise be unable to access. Currently, they often rely on friends, family, or orientation and mobility instructors for interpretation. Many participants expressed excitement about the prospect of independently accessing street view, with several echoing P7’s sentiment: *“I can’t express to you how thrilled I am that I [can access] street view imagery.”* However, fully leveraging street view for accessible navigation requires addressing key design considerations.

One concern is the age of street view imagery. Prior work shows strong agreement between virtual audits of pedestrian infrastructure and traditional methods [7, 42, 43, 94, 120], demonstrating that even older images can be reliable. However, the timeliness of imagery remains an issue. A 2013 study of 1k Google Street View panoramas and a 2019 analysis of 74k panoramas both found an average image age of two years [43, 97]. While public infrastructure changes slowly, future systems must account for delays between image capture and access.

Another challenge is the ephemeral nature of elements such as cars, people, and temporary road closures visible in the imagery. With SceneScout we used prompt engineering techniques [16] to mitigate this issue, but inaccuracies persisted. Future research should explore approaches to handling transient objects and preventing outdated information.

Finally, the vehicle-based point of view poses difficulties, as converting from a car to a pedestrian viewpoint adds cognitive load. Many participants emphasized the need for descriptions aligned with a pedestrian’s perspective to make street view imagery truly useful for navigation.

Implications for MLLMs. SceneScout’s AI agent, powered by MLLMs, provides BLV users with access to street view imagery. Our user evaluations show promise for this approach, emphasizing the value of access to real-world information. Our technical evaluations highlight areas of accuracy, but also key limitations with MLLMs.

A major concern was the lack of spatial precision. Participants emphasized that merely knowing an object’s presence is insufficient; precise information about its location is crucial for navigation

decisions. Our evaluations indicate that MLLMs fall short in reasoning about space with the precision required for blind navigation, where users rely entirely on environment descriptions. Additionally, MLLMs struggle to describe spatial relationships across multiple street view images, a vital component for facilitating real-world navigation. Future research should prioritize enhancing MLLMs’ spatial reasoning capabilities, especially in handling street view imagery, given its resemblance to real-world scenarios. Recent work has proposed benchmarks for evaluating visual-spatial intelligence [17, 76, 104, 122, 123].

While these models extracted useful information from street view imagery, they also sometimes made unwarranted assumptions about BLV users’ capabilities, leading to frustration among participants. This highlights the need for better understanding MLLMs’ biases, as accessibility-related data is often underrepresented in training sets [10, 30]. Future work should focus on adapting MLLMs for task-specific scenarios, ensuring that they can enable disability-aware interactions.

8 LIMITATIONS

Our work explores how AI agents can make street view imagery accessible to BLV users and provides key insights into their needs and preferences. However, our study has several limitations.

First, our participants were employees of a major technology company, likely with some familiarity with MLLMs. Their reactions may not reflect those of the broader BLV population, particularly those less familiar with AI advancements. Additionally, only one of our participants (P4) identified as low-vision, and therefore our user study does not reflect the full spectrum of visual ability. Future work should explore how a more diverse set of people with varying visual ability, technology familiarity, neurodiversity, and age range might perceive these systems. Second, due to time constraints, participants interacted with a limited set of examples. Long-term, real-world deployment is needed to understand how users adapt to the system’s limitations and discover new use cases. Additionally, our study focused on perceived usefulness rather than actual navigation outcomes, as participants did not physically navigate environments using the descriptions. Future research should assess how access to street view imagery impacts real-world navigation and explore in-situ, real-time street view integration. Last, our work explored two interaction modes: Route Preview and Virtual Exploration. Although these were most frequently mentioned in prior work and in feedback from BLV colleagues, other interaction methods may also be valuable. The scope of this work did not fully explore the design space for blind-accessible street view imagery and future research should develop a more comprehensive framework. Despite these limitations, our work serves as an initial step toward understanding how AI agents can provide BLV users access to street view imagery and identifies considerations for designing such systems.

9 CONCLUSION

We explored how AI-powered agents can make street view imagery accessible to BLV users, introducing opportunities for pre-travel navigation assistance. Our user study demonstrated that SceneScout effectively surfaces meaningful environmental details, enabling BLV

users to engage with street view imagery for both route previews and virtual exploration. Participants expressed strong interest in incorporating this information into their navigation workflows, but also highlighted challenges such as spatial imprecision and assumptions about user capabilities. Our technical evaluation further assessed the accuracy and reliability of MLLMs in extracting relevant information from street view imagery. We also discuss key insights from our findings and identify areas for improvement, including refining spatial reasoning, enhancing interaction design, and mitigating biases in AI-generated descriptions. While further research is needed, our work marks an initial step toward exploring how street view imagery can provide more information-rich and immersive navigation experiences for BLV users.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank our user study participants for their time and contributions. We greatly appreciate Amanda Swearngin, Griffin Dietz Smith, Jeffrey Bigham, Jessie Braden, Lilian de Greef, Ross Anderson, Samuel White, and Sarah Harling for their support and insightful feedback.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nazatul Naquiah Abd Hamid and Alistair D.N. Edwards. 2013. Facilitating route learning using interactive audio-tactile maps for blind and visually impaired people. In *CHI '13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems on - CHI EA '13*. ACM Press, Paris, France, 37.
- [2] Rudaiba Adnin and Maitraye Das. 2024. "I look at it as the king of knowledge": How Blind People Use and Understand Generative AI Tools. In *The 26th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, St. John's NL Canada, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663548.3675631>
- [3] Dragan Ahmetovic, Cole Gleason, Chengxiong Ruan, Kris Kitani, Hironobu Takagi, and Chieko Asakawa. 2016. NavCog: a navigational cognitive assistant for the blind. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services (MobileHCI '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 90–99.
- [4] Dragan Ahmetovic, Roberto Manduchi, James M. Coughlan, and Sergio Mascetti. 2015. Zebra Crossing Spotter: Automatic Population of Spatial Databases for Increased Safety of Blind Travelers. In *Proceedings of the 17th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers & Accessibility - ASSETS '15*. ACM Press, Lisbon, Portugal, 251–258.
- [5] Apple Inc. 2023. VoiceOver. <https://www.apple.com/accessibility/vision/>
- [6] AYES Inc. 2023. Oko: The AI-powered Navigation App for People with a Disability. <https://www.ayes.ai/>
- [7] Hannah M. Badland, Simon Opit, Karen Witten, Robin A. Kearns, and Suzanne Mavoa. 2010. Can Virtual Streetscape Audits Reliably Replace Physical Streetscape Audits? *Journal of Urban Health* 87, 6 (Dec. 2010), 1007–1016.
- [8] Jan Balata, Zdenek Mikovec, Petr Bures, and Eva Mulickova. 2016. Automatically Generated Landmark-enhanced Navigation Instructions for Blind Pedestrians. 1605–1612. <https://doi.org/10.15439/2016F135>
- [9] Nikola Banovic, Rachel L. Franz, Khai N. Truong, Jennifer Mankoff, and Anind K. Dey. 2013. Uncovering information needs for independent spatial learning for users who are visually impaired. In *Proceedings of the 15th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Bellevue Washington, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2513383.2513445>
- [10] Cynthia L. Bennett, Cole Gleason, Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, Jeffrey P. Bigham, Anhong Guo, and Alexandra To. 2021. "It's Complicated": Negotiating Accessibility and (Mis)Representation in Image Descriptions of Race, Gender, and Disability. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Yokohama Japan, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445498>
- [11] Jeffrey P. Bigham, Chandrika Jayant, Hanjie Ji, Greg Little, Andrew Miller, Robert C. Miller, Robin Miller, Aubrey Tatarowicz, Brandyn White, Samuel White, and Tom Yeh. 2010. VizWiz: nearly real-time answers to visual questions. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (New York, New York, USA) (*UIST '10*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 333–342. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1866029.1866080>
- [12] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, 2 (Jan. 2006), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- [13] Anke Brock. 2013. *Interactive Maps for Visually Impaired People: Design, Usability and Spatial Cognition*. phdthesis. Université Toulouse 3 Paul Sabatier.
- [14] Anke Brock. 2013. *Interactive Maps for Visually Impaired People: Design, Usability and Spatial Cognition*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Université Toulouse 3 Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France.
- [15] Anke M. Brock, Philippe Truillet, Bernard Oriola, Delphine Picard, and Christophe Jouffrais. 2015. Interactivity Improves Usability of Geographic Maps for Visually Impaired People. *Human-Computer Interaction* 30, 2 (2015), 156–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370024.2014.924412>
- [16] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (*NIPS '20*). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 159, 25 pages.
- [17] Howard Chen, Alane Suhr, Dipendra Misra, Noah Snively, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. TouchDown: Natural Language Navigation and Spatial Reasoning in Visual Street Environments. 12538–12547. https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_CVPR_2019/html/Chen_TOUCHDOWN_Natural_Language_Navigation_and_Spatial_Reasoning_in_Visual_Street_CVPR_2019_paper.html
- [18] Yuyan Chen, Qiang Fu, Yichen Yuan, Zhihao Wen, Ge Fan, Dayiheng Liu, Dongmei Zhang, Zhixu Li, and Yanghua Xiao. 2023. Hallucination Detection: Robustly Discerning Reliable Answers in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. ACM, Birmingham United Kingdom, 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3583780.3614905>
- [19] Gregory D. Clemenson, Antonella Maselli, Alexander J. Fiannaca, Amos Miller, and Mar Gonzalez-Franco. 2021. Rethinking GPS navigation: creating cognitive maps through auditory clues. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (Dec. 2021), 7764.
- [20] Laura Cushley, Neil Galway, and Tunde Peto. 2023. The unseen barriers of the built environment: navigation for people with visual impairment. *Town Planning Review* 94, 1 (2023), 11–35. <https://doi.org/10.3828/tp.2022.4> arXiv:<https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/doi/pdf/10.3828/tp.2022.4>
- [21] Michel Denis. 2017. *Space and spatial cognition: A multidisciplinary perspective*. Routledge.
- [22] Michael Duan, Sho Kiami, Logan Milandin, Johnson Kuang, Mikey Saugstad, Maryam Hosseini, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2022. Scaling Crowd+AI Sidewalk Accessibility Assessments: Initial Experiments Examining Label Quality and Cross-city Training on Performance. In *Proceedings of the 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (Athens, Greece), 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3517428.3550381>
- [23] Julie Ducasse, Anke M. Brock, and Christophe Jouffrais. 2018. *Accessible Interactive Maps for Visually Impaired Users*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 537–584.
- [24] KA Ericsson and HA Simon. 1980. Verbal Reports as Data. *Psychological Review* (1980). <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-295X.87.3.215>
- [25] L. Evett, D. Brown, S. Battersby, A. Ridley, and P. Smith. 2008. Accessible virtual environments for people who are blind – creating an intelligent virtual cane using the Nintendo Wii controller. (2008).
- [26] Rachel Gardner, Maya Varma, Clare Zhu, and Ranjay Krishna. 2020. Determining Question-Answer Plausibility in Crowdsourced Datasets Using Multi-Task Learning. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2011.04883> arXiv:2011.04883 [cs].
- [27] Reginald G. Golledge, R. Daniel Jacobson, Robert Kitchin, and Mark Blades. 2000. Cognitive Maps, Spatial Abilities, and Human Wayfinding. *Geographical review of Japan, Series B*. 73, 2 (2000), 93–104.
- [28] S. Giraud, A. M. Brock, M. J. Macé, and C. Jouffrais. 2017. Map Learning with a 3D Printed Interactive Small-Scale Model: Improvement of Space and Text Memorization in Visually Impaired Students. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8 (June 9 2017), 930. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00930>
- [29] Nicholas A. Giudice and Gordon E. Legge. 2008. Blind Navigation and the Role of Technology. In *The Engineering Handbook of Smart Technology for Aging, Disability, and Independence* (1 ed.), Abdelsalam (Sumi) Helal, Mounir Mokhtari, and Bessam Abdulrazak (Eds.). Wiley, 479–500.
- [30] Kate Glazko, Yusuf Mohammed, Ben Kosa, Venkatesh Potluri, and Jennifer Mankoff. 2024. Identifying and Improving Disability Bias in GPT-Based Resume Screening. In *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. ACM, Rio de Janeiro Brazil, 687–700. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658933>
- [31] Cole Gleason, Alexander J. Fiannaca, Melanie Kneisel, Edward Cutrell, and Meredith Ringel Morris. 2018. FootNotes: Geo-referenced Audio Annotations for Nonvisual Exploration. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 2, 3 (Sept. 2018), 1–24.
- [32] Leo A. Goodman. 1961. Snowball Sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 32, 1 (1961), 148–170. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2237615> Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.

- [33] Google. 2024. Google Maps. <https://www.google.com/maps>
- [34] Google. 2024. Google Street View. <https://www.google.com/streetview/>
- [35] João Guerreiro, Dragan Ahmetovic, Kris M. Kitani, and Chieko Asakawa. 2017. Virtual Navigation for Blind People: Building Sequential Representations of the Real-World. In *Proceedings of the 19th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Baltimore Maryland USA, 280–289.
- [36] João Guerreiro, Daisuke Sato, Dragan Ahmetovic, Eshed Ohn-Bar, Kris M. Kitani, and Chieko Asakawa. 2020. Virtual navigation for blind people: Transferring route knowledge to the real-world. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 135 (March 2020), 102369.
- [37] João Guerreiro, Daisuke Sato, Saki Asakawa, Huixu Dong, Kris M. Kitani, and Chieko Asakawa. 2019. CaBot: Designing and Evaluating an Autonomous Navigation Robot for Blind People. In *The 21st International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility (ASSETS '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 68–82. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3308561.3353771>
- [38] Tiago Guerreiro, Kyle Montague, João Guerreiro, Rafael Nunes, Hugo Nicolau, and Daniel J.V. Gonçalves. 2015. Blind People Interacting with Large Touch Surfaces: Strategies for One-handed and Two-handed Exploration. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Interactive Tabletops & Surfaces (Madeira, Portugal) (ITS '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 25–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2817721.2817743>
- [39] Anisha Gunjal, Jihan Yin, and Erhan Bas. 2024. Detecting and Preventing Hallucinations in Large Vision Language Models. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 38, 16 (March 2024), 18135–18143. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i16.29771> Number: 16.
- [40] Danna Gurari, Qing Li, Abigale J. Stangl, Anhong Guo, Chi Lin, Kristen Grauman, Jiebo Luo, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. 2018. VizWiz Grand Challenge: Answering Visual Questions From Blind People. 3608–3617. https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_cvpr_2018/html/Gurari_VizWiz_Grand_Challenge_CVPR_2018_paper.html
- [41] Kotaro Hara. 2016. Scalable Methods to Collect and Visualize Sidewalk Accessibility Data for People with Mobility Impairments. In *UMD CS PhD Dissertation* (College Park, MD), 284 pages. <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/18992>
- [42] Kotaro Hara, Shiri Azenkot, Megan Campbell, Cynthia L. Bennett, Vicki Le, Sean Pannella, Robert Moore, Kelly Minckler, Rochelle H. Ng, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2015. Improving Public Transit Accessibility for Blind Riders by Crowdsourcing Bus Stop Landmark Locations with Google Street View: An Extended Analysis. *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing* 6, 2 (March 2015), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2717513>
- [43] Kotaro Hara, Jin Sun, Robert Moore, David Jacobs, and Jon Froehlich. 2014. Tohme: detecting curb ramps in google street view using crowdsourcing, computer vision, and machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 27th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*. ACM, Honolulu Hawaii USA, 189–204.
- [44] J. F. Herman, T. G. Herman, and S. P. Chatman. 1983. Constructing Cognitive Maps from Partial Information: A Demonstration Study with Congenitally Blind Subjects. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness* 77, 5 (1983), 195–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X8307700502>
- [45] Jonggi Hong, Jaina Gandhi, Ernest Essuah Mensah, Farnaz Zamiri Zeraati, Ebrima Jarje, Kyungjun Lee, and Hernisa Kacorri. 2022. Blind Users Accessing Their Training Images in Teachable Object Recognizers. In *The 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Athens Greece, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3517428.3544824>
- [46] Maryam Hosseini, Mikey Saugstad, Fabio Miranda, Andres Sevtuk, Cláudio T. Silva, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2022. Towards Global-Scale Crowd+AI Techniques to Map and Assess Sidewalks for People with Disabilities. In *CVPR2022 Workshop: Accessibility, Vision, and Autonomy (AVA)* (New Orleans, LA), 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.13677>
- [47] Mina Huh, Yi-Hao Peng, and Amy Pavel. 2023. GenAssist: Making Image Generation Accessible. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (San Francisco, CA, USA) (UIST '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 38, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606735>
- [48] Mina Huh, Fangyuan Xu, Yi-Hao Peng, Chongyan Chen, Hansika Murugu, Danna Gurari, Eunso Choi, and Amy Pavel. 2024. Long-Form Answers to Visual Questions from Blind and Low Vision People. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.06303> arXiv:2408.06303 [cs].
- [49] Apple Inc. 2024. Apple Maps. <https://www.apple.com/maps/>
- [50] Apple Inc. 2024. Apple Maps Server API. <https://developer.apple.com/documentation/applemapsserverapi/>
- [51] Microsoft Inc. 2018. Microsoft Soundscape - Microsoft Research. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/product/soundscape/>
- [52] Koichi Ito, Yihan Zhu, Mahmoud Abdelrahman, Xiucheng Liang, Zicheng Fan, Yujun Hou, Tianhong Zhao, Rui Ma, Kunihiro Fujiwara, Jiani Ouyang, Matias Quintana, and Filip Biljecki. 2024. ZenSVI: An Open-Source Software for the Integrated Acquisition, Processing and Analysis of Street View Imagery Towards Scalable Urban Saugstad. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.18641> arXiv:2412.18641 [cs].
- [53] Gaurav Jain, Basel Hindi, Mingyu Xie, Zihao Zhang, Koushik Srinivasula, Mahshid Ghasemi, Daniel Weiner, Xin Yi Therese Xu, Sophie Ana Paris, Chloe Tedjo, Josh Bassin, Michael Malcolm, Mehmet Turkcan, Javad Ghaderi, Zoran Kostic, Gil Zussman, and Brian A. Smith. 2023. Towards Street Camera-based Outdoor Navigation for Blind Pedestrians. In *Proceedings of the 25th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (New York, NY, USA) (ASSETS '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 77, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597638.3614498>
- [54] Gaurav Jain, Basel Hindi, Zihao Zhang, Koushik Srinivasula, Mingyu Xie, Mahshid Ghasemi, Daniel Weiner, Sophie Ana Paris, Xin Yi Therese Xu, Michael Malcolm, Mehmet Kerem Turkcan, Javad Ghaderi, Zoran Kostic, Gil Zussman, and Brian A. Smith. 2024. StreetNav: Leveraging Street Cameras to Support Precise Outdoor Navigation for Blind Pedestrians. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (Pittsburgh, PA, USA) (UIST '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 139, 21 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3654777.3676333>
- [55] Gaurav Jain, Yuan Yang Teng, Dong Heon Cho, Yunhao Xing, Maryam Aziz, and Brian A. Smith. 2023. "I Want to Figure Things Out": Supporting Exploration in Navigation for People with Visual Impairments. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 7, CSCW1, Article 63 (April 2023), 28 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579496>
- [56] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 12 (March 2023), 248:1–248:38. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730>
- [57] Hernisa Kacorri, Kris M. Kitani, Jeffrey P. Bigham, and Chieko Asakawa. 2017. People with Visual Impairment Training Personal Object Recognizers: Feasibility and Challenges. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Denver Colorado USA, 5839–5849. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025899>
- [58] Hernisa Kacorri, Sergio Mascetti, Andrea Gerino, Dragan Ahmetovic, Hironobu Takagi, and Chieko Asakawa. 2016. Supporting Orientation of People with Visual Impairment: Analysis of Large Scale Usage Data. In *Proceedings of the 18th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Reno Nevada USA, 151–159.
- [59] Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. 2023. Challenges and Applications of Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.10169> arXiv:2307.10169 [cs].
- [60] Vaishnav Kameswaran, Alexander J. Fiannaca, Melanie Kneisel, Amy Karlson, Edward Cutrell, and Meredith Ringel Morris. 2020. Understanding In-Situ Use of Commonly Available Navigation Technologies by People with Visual Impairments. In *The 22nd International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Virtual Event Greece, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373625.3416995>
- [61] Shaun K. Kane, Meredith Ringel Morris, Annuska Z. Perkins, Daniel Wigdor, Richard E. Ladner, and Jacob O. Wobbrock. 2011. Access overlays: improving non-visual access to large touch screens for blind users. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (Santa Barbara, California, USA) (UIST '11). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 273–282. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2047196.2047232>
- [62] Yuka Kaniwa, Masaki Kuribayashi, Seita Kayukawa, Daisuke Sato, Hironobu Takagi, Chieko Asakawa, and Shigeo Morishima. 2024. ChitChatGuide: Conversational Interaction Using Large Language Models for Assisting People with Visual Impairments to Explore a Shopping Mall. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 8, MHCI (Sept. 2024), 247:1–247:25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3676492>
- [63] Hannah Rose Kirk, Bertie Vidgen, Paul Röttger, and Scott A. Hale. 2024. The benefits, risks and bounds of personalizing the alignment of large language models to individuals. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 6, 4 (April 2024), 383–392. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-024-00820-y>
- [64] R.M. Kitchin and R.D. Jacobson. 1997. Techniques to Collect and Analyze the Cognitive Map Knowledge of Persons with Visual Impairment Or Blindness: Issues of Validity. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness* 91, 4 (July 1997), 360–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X9709100405> Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- [65] Julian Kreimeier and Timo Götzelmann. 2019. First Steps Towards Walk-In-Place Locomotion and Haptic Feedback in Virtual Reality for Visually Impaired. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland UK) (CHI EA '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290607.3312944>
- [66] Masaki Kuribayashi, Seita Kayukawa, Jayakorn Vongkulbhisal, Chieko Asakawa, Daisuke Sato, Hironobu Takagi, and Shigeo Morishima. 2022. Corridor-Walker: Mobile Indoor Walking Assistance for Blind People to Avoid Obstacles and Recognize Intersections. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 6, MHCI, Article 179 (Sept. 2022), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3546714>
- [67] Orly Lahav, Hadas Gedalevitz, Steven Battersby, David Brown, Lindsay Evett, and Patrick Merritt. 2018. Virtual environment navigation with look-around mode to explore new real spaces by people who are blind. *Disability and*

- Rehabilitation* 40, 9 (2018), 1072–1084. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2017.1286391> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2017.1286391> PMID: 28637136.
- [68] O. Lahav and D. Mioduser. 2008. Haptic-feedback support for cognitive mapping of unknown spaces by people who are blind. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 66, 1 (2008), 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2007.08.001>
- [69] Jaewook Lee, Jaylin Herskovitz, Yi-Hao Peng, and Anhong Guo. 2022. ImageExplorer: Multi-Layered Touch Exploration to Encourage Skepticism Towards Imperfect AI-Generated Image Captions. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501966>
- [70] Fabrizio Leo, Elena Cocchi, and Luca Brayda. 2017. The Effect of Programmable Tactile Displays on Spatial Learning Skills in Children and Adolescents of Different Visual Disability. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* 25, 7 (2017), 861–872. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2016.2619742>
- [71] Tomer Levinboim, Ashish V. Thapliyal, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2021. Quality Estimation for Image Captions Based on Large-scale Human Evaluations. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1909.03396> arXiv:1909.03396 [cs].
- [72] Chu Li, Rock Pang, Delphine Labbé, Yochai Eisenberg, Maryam Hosseini, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2025. Accessibility for Whom? Perceptions of Mobility Barriers Across Disability Groups and Implications for Designing Personalized Maps. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan), 19 pages. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.19888>
- [73] Chu Li, Zhihan Zhang, Mikey Saugstad, Esteban Safranchik, Minchu Kulkarni, Xiaoyu Huang, Shwetak Patel, Vikram Iyer, Tim Althoff, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2024. LabelAid: Just-in-time AI Interventions for Improving Human Labeling Quality and Domain Knowledge in Crowdsourcing Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, Hawai'i), 21 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642089>
- [74] Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. HaluEval: A Large-Scale Hallucination Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.11747> arXiv:2305.11747 [cs].
- [75] Xinyu Li, Ruiyang Zhou, Zachary C. Lipton, and Liu Leqi. 2024. Personalized Language Modeling from Personalized Human Feedback. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.05133> arXiv:2402.05133 [cs].
- [76] Yuecheng Liu, Dafeng Chi, Shiguang Wu, Zhanqiang Zhang, Yaochen Hu, Lingfeng Zhang, Yingxue Zhang, Shuang Wu, Tongtong Cao, Guowei Huang, Helong Huang, Guangjian Tian, Weichao Qiu, Xingyue Quan, Jianye Hao, and Yuzheng Zhuang. 2025. SpatialCoT: Advancing Spatial Reasoning through Coordinate Alignment and Chain-of-Thought for Embodied Task Planning. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2501.10074> arXiv:2501.10074 [cs].
- [77] Claudia Loitsch, Karin Müller, Christin Engel, Gerhard Weber, and Rainer Stiefelhausen. 2020. AccessibleMaps: Addressing Gaps in Maps for People with Visual and Mobility Impairments. In *Computers Helping People with Special Needs*, Klaus Miesenberger, Roberto Manduchi, Mario Covarrubias Rodriguez, and Petr Peňáz (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 286–296. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58805-2_34
- [78] Haley MacLeod, Cynthia L. Bennett, Meredith Ringel Morris, and Edward Cutrell. 2017. Understanding Blind People’s Experiences with Computer-Generated Captions of Social Media Images. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Denver Colorado USA, 5988–5999. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025814>
- [79] Shachar Maidenbaum, Shelly Levy-Tzedek, Daniel-Robert Chebat, and Amir Amedi. 2013. Increasing Accessibility to the Blind of Virtual Environments, Using a Virtual Mobility Aid Based On the “EyeCane”: Feasibility Study. *PLOS ONE* 8, 8 (08 2013).
- [80] Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark J. F. Gales. 2023. SelfCheckGPT: Zero-Resource Black-Box Hallucination Detection for Generative Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08896> arXiv:2303.08896 [cs].
- [81] Sergio Mascetti, Dragan Ahmetovic, Andrea Gerino, and Cristian Bernareggi. 2016. ZebraRecognizer: Pedestrian crossing recognition for people with visual impairment or blindness. *Pattern Recognition* 60 (Dec. 2016), 405–419.
- [82] MIPsoft. 2016. BlindSquare. <https://www.blindsquare.com/>
- [83] Ananya Gubbi Mohanbabu and Amy Pavel. 2024. Context-Aware Image Descriptions for Web Accessibility. In *The 26th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663548.3675658> arXiv:2409.03054 [cs].
- [84] Daniel R. Montello. 2001. Spatial Cognition. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes (Eds.). Elsevier, 7–14771.
- [85] Daniel R. Montello. 2001. Spatial Cognition. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, N.J. Smelser and B. Baltes (Eds.). 7–14771.
- [86] Cecily Morrison, Martin Grayson, Rita Faia Marques, Daniela Massiceti, Camilla Longden, Linda Wen, and Edward Cutrell. 2023. Understanding Personalized Accessibility through Teachable AI: Designing and Evaluating Find My Things for People who are Blind or Low Vision. In *The 25th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, New York NY USA, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597638.3608395>
- [87] Lynn Nadel and Lloyd MacDonald. 1980. Hippocampus: cognitive map or working memory? *Behavioral and Neural Biology* 29, 3 (July 1980), 405–409.
- [88] Vishnu Nair, Hanxiu ‘Hazel’ Zhu, and Brian A. Smith. 2023. ImageAssist: Tools for Enhancing Touchscreen-Based Image Exploration Systems for Blind and Low Vision Users. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI ’23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 76, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581302>
- [89] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4o. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o>
- [90] Loes Ottink, Bram Van Raalte, Christian F. Doeller, Thea M. Van Der Geest, and Richard J. A. Van Wezel. 2022. Cognitive map formation through tactile map navigation in visually impaired and sighted persons. *Scientific Reports* 12, 1 (July 2022), 11567.
- [91] Konstantinos Papadopoulos, Eleni Koustriava, and Marialena Barouti. 2017. Cognitive maps of individuals with blindness for familiar and unfamiliar spaces: Construction through audio-tactile maps and walked experience. *Computers in Human Behavior* 75 (2017), 376–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.04.057>
- [92] Lorenzo Picinali, Amandine Afonso, Michel Denis, and Brian F.G. Katz. 2014. Exploration of architectural spaces by blind people using auditory virtual reality for the construction of spatial knowledge. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 72, 4 (2014), 393–407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2013.12.008>
- [93] Mary Beth Rosson and John M. Carroll. 2002. Scenario-Based Design. In *The Human-Computer Interaction Handbook: Fundamentals, Evolving Technologies and Emerging Applications*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, 1032–1050.
- [94] Andrew G. Rundle, Michael D. M. Bader, Catherine A. Richards, Kathryn M. Neckerman, and Julien O. Teitler. 2011. Using Google Street View to Audit Neighborhood Environments. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 40, 1 (Jan. 2011), 94–100.
- [95] Manaswi Saha. 2022. Designing Interactive Data-Driven Tools for Understanding Urban Accessibility at Scale. In *University of Washington PhD Dissertation* (Seattle, WA), 299 pages. https://orbiscascade-washington.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01ALLIANCE_UW/db578v/cdi_proquest_journals_2736667441
- [96] Manaswi Saha, Alexander J. Fiannaca, Melanie Kneisel, Edward Cutrell, and Meredith Ringel Morris. 2019. Closing the Gap: Designing for the Last-Few-Meters Wayfinding Problem for People with Visual Impairments. In *The 21st International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Pittsburgh PA USA, 222–235.
- [97] Manaswi Saha, Kotaro Hara, Jon Froehlich, Michael Saugstad, Hanuma Teja Maddali, Aileen Zeng, Ryan Holland, Steven Bower, Aditya Dash, Sage Chen, and Anthony Li. 2019. Project Sidewalk: A Web-based Crowdsourcing Tool for Collecting Sidewalk Accessibility Data At Scale. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI ’19*. ACM Press, Glasgow, Scotland UK, 1–14.
- [98] Manaswi Saha, Siddhant Patil, Emily Cho, Evie Yu-Yen Cheng, Chris Horng, Devanshi Chauhan, Rachel Kangas, Richard McGovern, Anthony Li, Jeffrey Heer, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2022. Visualizing Urban Accessibility: Investigating Multi-Stakeholder Perspectives through a Map-based Design Probe Study. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New Orleans, LA), 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517460>
- [99] Alireza Salemi, Sheshera Mysore, Michael Bendersky, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. LaMP: When Large Language Models Meet Personalization. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.11406> arXiv:2304.11406 [cs].
- [100] Jaime Sánchez and Angelo Tadres. 2010. Audio and haptic based virtual environments for orientation and mobility in people who are blind. In *Proceedings of the 12th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (Orlando, Florida, USA) (ASSETS ’10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 237–238. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1878803.1878849>
- [101] Daisuke Sato, Uran Oh, João Guerreiro, Dragan Ahmetovic, Kakuya Naito, Hironobu Takagi, Kris M. Kitani, and Chieko Asakawa. 2019. NavCog3 in the Wild: Large-scale Blind Indoor Navigation Assistant with Semantic Features. *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing* 12, 3 (Sept. 2019), 1–30.
- [102] Raphael Schumann, Wanrong Zhu, Weixi Feng, Tsu-Jui Fu, Stefan Riezler, and William Yang Wang. 2024. VELMA: Verbalization Embodiment of LLM Agents for Vision and Language Navigation in Street View. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 38, 17 (March 2024), 18924–18933. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i17.29858>
- [103] Ather Sharif, Aedan Liam McCall, and Kianna Rocas Bolante. 2022. Should I Say “Disabled People” or “People with Disabilities”? Language Preferences of Disabled People Between Identity- and Person-First Language. In *Proceedings of the 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (Athens, Greece) (ASSETS ’22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 10, 18 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3517428.3544813>
- [104] Fatemeh Shiri, Xiao-Yu Guo, Mona Golestan Far, Xin Yu, Gholamreza Haffari, and Yuan-Fang Li. 2024. An Empirical Analysis on Spatial Reasoning Capabilities of Large Multimodal Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.06048> arXiv:2411.06048 [cs].

- [105] Katta Spiel, Kathrin Gerling, Cynthia L. Bennett, Emeline Brulé, Rua M. Williams, Jennifer Rode, and Jennifer Mankoff. 2020. Nothing About Us Without Us: Investigating the Role of Critical Disability Studies in HCI. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI EA '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3375150>
- [106] Mark Steyvers, Heliodoro Tejeda, Aakriti Kumar, Catarina Belem, Sheer Karny, Xinyue Hu, Lukas Mayer, and Padhraic Smyth. 2025. What Large Language Models Know and What People Think They Know. *Nature Machine Intelligence* (Jan. 2025). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-024-00976-7> arXiv:2401.13835 [cs].
- [107] Jing Su, Alyssa Rosenzweig, Ashvin Goel, Eyal de Lara, and Khai N. Truong. 2010. Timbemap: enabling the visually-impaired to use maps on touch-enabled devices. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Human Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services* (Lisbon, Portugal) (MobileHCI '10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1851600.1851606>
- [108] Zhaoxuan Tan, Qingkai Zeng, Yijun Tian, Zheyuan Liu, Bing Yin, and Meng Jiang. 2025. Democratizing Large Language Models via Personalized Parameter-Efficient Fine-tuning. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.04401> arXiv:2402.04401 [cs].
- [109] Brandon Taylor, Anind Dey, Dan Siewiorek, and Asim Smailagic. 2016. Customizable 3D Printed Tactile Maps as Interactive Overlays. In *Proceedings of the 18th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (Reno, Nevada, USA) (ASSETS '16). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2982142.2982167>
- [110] Barbara Tversky. 1991. Spatial Mental Models. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. Vol. 27. Elsevier, 109–145.
- [111] Tess Van Daele, Akhil Iyer, Yuning Zhang, Jalyn C Derry, Mina Huh, and Amy Pavel. 2024. Making Short-Form Videos Accessible with Hierarchical Video Summaries. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 895, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642839>
- [112] W3C Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI). 2024. Introduction to Web Accessibility. <https://www.w3.org/WAI/fundamentals/accessibility-intro/>
- [113] W3C Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI). 2024. Tables with Two Headers. <https://www.w3.org/WAI/tutorials/tables/two-headers/>
- [114] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2024. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (NIPS '22). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 1800, 14 pages.
- [115] Galen Weld, Esther Jang, Anthony Li, Aileen Zeng, Kurtis Heimerl, and Jon E. Froehlich. 2019. Deep Learning for Automatically Detecting Sidewalk Accessibility Problems Using Streetscape Imagery. In *The 21st International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Pittsburgh PA USA, 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3308561.3353798>
- [116] Linda Yilin Wen, Cecily Morrison, Martin Grayson, Rita Faia Marques, Daniela Massiceti, Camilla Longden, and Edward Cutrell. 2024. Find My Things: Personalized Accessibility through Teachable AI for People who are Blind or Low Vision. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (CHI EA '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613905.3648641>
- [117] William R Wiener, Richard L Welsh, and Bruce B Blasch. 2010. *Foundations of orientation and mobility*. Vol. 1. American Foundation for the Blind.
- [118] Michele A. Williams, Caroline Galbraith, Shaun K. Kane, and Amy Hurst. 2014. "just let the cane hit it": how the blind and sighted see navigation differently. In *Proceedings of the 16th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on Computers & accessibility - ASSETS '14*. ACM Press, Rochester, New York, USA, 217–224. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2661334.2661380>
- [119] Michele A. Williams, Amy Hurst, and Shaun K. Kane. 2013. "Pray before you step out": describing personal and situational blind navigation behaviors. In *Proceedings of the 15th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. ACM, Bellevue Washington, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2513383.2513449>
- [120] Jeffrey S. Wilson, Cheryl M. Kelly, Mario Schootman, Elizabeth A. Baker, Anirudha Banerjee, Morgan Clennin, and Douglas K. Miller. 2012. Assessing the Built Environment Using Omnidirectional Imagery. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 42, 2 (Feb. 2012), 193–199.
- [121] Tongshuang Wu, Ellen Jiang, Aaron Donsbach, Jeff Gray, Alejandra Molina, Michael Terry, and Carrie J Cai. 2022. PromptChainer: Chaining Large Language Model Prompts through Visual Programming. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (CHI EA '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 359, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519729>
- [122] Jihan Yang, Runyu Ding, Ellis Brown, Xiaojuan Qi, and Saining Xie. 2024. V-IRL: Grounding Virtual Intelligence in Real Life. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03310> arXiv:2402.03310 [cs].
- [123] Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Anjali W. Gupta, Rilyn Han, Li Fei-Fei, and Saining Xie. 2024. Thinking in Space: How Multimodal Large Language Models See, Remember, and Recall Spaces. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.14171> arXiv:2412.14171 [cs].
- [124] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, Longyue Wang, Anh Tuan Luu, Wei Bi, Freda Shi, and Shuming Shi. 2023. Siren's Song in the AI Ocean: A Survey on Hallucination in Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.01219> arXiv:2309.01219 [cs].
- [125] Yuhang Zhao, Cynthia L. Bennett, Hrvoje Benko, Edward Cutrell, Christian Holz, Meredith Ringel Morris, and Mike Sinclair. 2018. Enabling People with Visual Impairments to Navigate Virtual Reality with a Haptic and Auditory Cane Simulation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Montreal QC Canada, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173690>

A PROMPTS

Here, we provide the main prompts used to facilitate SceneScout's two interaction modes.

A.1 Descriptions along the route

A.1.1 Prompt for describing non-intersection segments.

[Role]

You are StreetDescriberGPT, an expert in giving description from old street view images for current navigation.

[Task Description]

Given the previous description, nearby points of interest, and three images for the left, front, and right side of a street, describe the sidewalk with information that would be helpful for a blind individual walking on the path. Be sure to include any changes in the street view images compared to the previous description. Note that the images are from a time when the images were taken and may not reflect the current state of the place. Thus, it is important to provide information that is likely to remain consistent over time. For example, when you see construction, it is possible that it may already have been completed. Always include information about specific places that you see, referring to their names from the board that appears in the images. Also include information about the street signs. Keep descriptions concise and relevant to walking navigation given the context. Do not repeat information from previous descriptions, but highlight the changes. For example, if the previous description says there is a mural on the left, do not mention the mural again. Always mention the nearby places, their direction, and distance in meters (do not use contractions). Always include accessibility-related information for sidewalks like width, changes in texture, obstacles, and mobility cues. Be as specific as you can be. Do not make any explicit mentions that the descriptions will help a blind or visually impaired person. You must respond in the following JSON format:

```
{
  "long_description":  <longer description: super detailed>,
  "medium_description": <medium description: very concise
                        but includes all the important
                        information>,
  "short_description": <short description: includes only the
                        main information in one sentence>
}
```



```

"mobility_cues": "Describe landmarks that appear on the
                  route to this place that may help a
                  blind user who uses a white cane.",
"sidewalk": "Describe the sidewalk including its
            material, width, changes in surface, or
            anything noticeable that may be different
            from a usual sidewalk or help a blind
            person navigate."
"text": "Describe the text present on signages or boards
        near the place."
}}

```

[Example]

For the context "Is there a subway station here?", name of place as "subway station entrance", and with sequence of images to this place, the output might be:

```

{{
"path_summary": "A curved path with wide sidewalk. Potted
                plants on the right side and an open
                parking space on the left.",
"place_summary": "The subway station entrance has a set
                of stairs going down with no elevators
                at this entrance. It is relatively
                narrow and in the middle of the
                sidewalk. There is a trash can right
                next to it on your way. The pillars
                are metallic and the stairs appear to
                be wooded.",
"mobility_cues": "There is a bicycle rack near the
                street on the sidewalk and then a
                trash can very close to the entrance.
                Additionally, there are some potholes,
                poles, and traffic signs if you pass
                the entrance. There seems to be a
                parking lot right before the subway
                station entrance.",
"sidewalk": "The sidewalk has concrete surface and is
            medium sized, but gets wider as you
            continue walking towards the entrance. It
            also seems to curve a bit toward the street
            as you keep walking. There are some bushes
            close to the street on this sidewalk.",
"text": "The signage on the entrance reads: 1 train to
        96th St, 2 min"
}}

```

[Input]

```

Context: {context}
Place: {place_name}

```

[Output]

Your response in the required JSON format:

A.3 Choosing directions for further exploration

A.3.1 Prompt for describing what lies in a direction.

[Role]

You are PathDescriberGPT, an expert in describing what lies in a specific direction based on a user-specified intention and old street view images.

[Task Description]

Given a set intention, street name in a direction, street's heading, the user's current heading, and the place that user is finding, describe what is or might be on a road that could help make the decision on whether to go in that direction or not. Include information both in support or against the possibility of finding the intended place. Keep the description concise and informative -- 1-3 sentences only. Always start describing the road from the user's current heading on street name (\emph{e.g.} "Heading South on Adam Street: ...").

Your response should be in the following JSON format:

```

{{
"description": "Description of what is or is not in the
                direction (relevant to the place, both in
                support and against)"
}}

```

[Example]

For the intention "find a grocery store" street name "Adam St.", street heading "North", current heading "East", and and place type "grocery store", the output might be:

```

{{
"description": "Heading South on Adam Street: leads to a
                one-way residential street with houses and
                trees. No commercial buildings or transit
                stops in sight."
}}

```

[Input]

```

My Intention: {intention}
Street Name: {street_name}
Street heading: {new_heading}
Current heading: {curr_heading}
Place Type: {place_type}
Image: Refer to the given image.

```

[Output]

Your description in the required JSON format:

A.3.2 Prompt for suggestions on the most promising direction.

[Role]

You are PathSelectorGPT, an expert in choosing the optimal road from multiple candidates based on a user-specified intention and old street view images.

[Task Description]

Given a set intention, the road previously traveled, images of candidate roads and respective available candidate roads, select the best road from the crossroad. Always begin reason with heading and street name (\emph{e.g.} "Head South on Adam Street because..."). Your response should be in the following JSON format:

```

{{
"idx": "Selected road index (choose one from the range)",
"reason": "Justification for your selection"
}}

```

[Example]

For the intention "find a grocery store", the road previously traveled as "1", and with candidates "2: Leads to residential area, 3: Leads to a shopping district", the output might be:

```

{{
  "idx": "3",
  "reason": "Head South on Adam Street because a shopping
            mall is visible, making it more likely to have
            a grocery store."
}}

```

[Input]

My Intention: {intention}
 Road Descriptions: {road_descriptions}
 Previously Traveled Road: Road {from_road_idx}
 Images: Refer to given images.

[Output]

Your chosen road index and the reasoning behind your selection, in the required JSON format:

A.4 Descriptions along the block for exploration

[Role]

You are StreetDescriberGPT, an expert in giving description of old street view images.

[Task Description]

Given a specified intention, primary destination, list of secondary cared labels, nearby points of interest, images providing a 180-degree view of the street, and all previous descriptions, describe the street view images with information that would be helpful for exploring this new space. Be sure to include any changes in the street view images compared to the previous description. Note that the images are from a time when they were taken and may not reflect the current state of the place. Thus, it is important to provide information that is likely to remain consistent over time. For example, when you see construction, it is possible that it may already have been completed. Always include information about specific places that you see, referring to their names from the board that appears in the images. Also include information about the street signs. Keep descriptions concise and relevant to walking navigation given the context. Do not repeat information from the previous description; highlight the changes. Always highlight information that may affect the accessibility of the sidewalks, such as width, changes in texture, obstacles, and mobility cues for blind people. Never make any explicit mentions that it will help a blind or visually impaired person.

```

{{
  "long_description": <longer description: super detailed>,
  "medium_description": <medium description: very concise
                        but includes all the important
                        information>,
  "short_description": <short description: includes only the
                       main information in one sentence>
}}

```

[Example]

For intention, "reading a book," primary destination "bookstore," secondary labels "cafe, transit options, malls, crowds, parking", nearby points of interest, given set of images giving a 180-degree view of the street,

previous descriptions "..., sheltered bus stop on the left sidewalk, closer to the street than to the building, street parking on both sides... the sidewalk is wide, ...", the output might include descriptions like:

"A bookstore named Book Worm is on the left sidewalk and the Concordia cafe is on the right sidewalk. The sidewalk appears to get narrower. The sheltered bus stop reads C line to 96th St." Respond in three different levels of verbosity - long, medium, and short. The long description should be detailed, medium is a concise version of the long description, and the short description only includes essential information in a sentence. The new description should be coherent with the previous descriptions. Always include signs and board names in the description. Always mention the nearby places, their direction, and distance.

[Input]

Intention: {intention}
 Primary Place: {place_type}
 Secondary Labels: {cared_secondary_categories}
 Nearby Places: {nearby_places}
 Previous Description: {prev_description}
 Images: Images with a view of the street.

[Output]

Your description in the specified JSON format:

B ROUTE PREVIEW WEB INTERFACE EXAMPLE

Here, we include the text from Figure 2, which shows SceneScout’s web interface for the route preview interaction mode.

Descriptions en route to your destination along Westlake Avenue N going North

Instruction: Review the descriptions as you move North on Westlake Avenue N. Please feel free to select a short, medium, or long version of the description.

At the Westlake Avenue N and Thomas Street intersection.

Short: A four-way intersection with audible pedestrian signals, tactile pavings, wide sidewalks, and a nearby public transport stop 68 meters north. ‘California Closets’ is 59 meters north.

Medium: A busy four-way intersection with two-way streets, tactile pavings, and curb ramps at all corners. Sidewalks are wide and unobstructed. Overhead electrical tram lines cross the intersection. Street signs indicate loading bus lanes and no parking zones.

Long: The intersection has high-rise office buildings with audible pedestrian signals at all corners. Tactile pavings assist navigation. Traffic lights are positioned diagonally. Sidewalks are wide and unobstructed. Overhead electrical tram lines are present. Curb ramps are available. ‘Westlake & Thomas Stop’ is 68 meters north, and ‘California Closets’ is 59 meters left. Various street signs, a mural on a nearby building, and a for-lease sign are present.

43 meters further North, at 301 Westlake Avenue N.

Short: On the left, a building with food illustrations and wide sidewalks. On the right, ‘Salt & Pepper Deli Market’ with parked cars. ‘Westlake & Thomas Stop’ is 42 meters left.

Medium: On the left, a building with colorful illustrations. A large tree provides shade. The sidewalk remains wide. On the right, a red brick building with ‘Salt & Pepper Deli Market’ has a large tree and a reserved parking sign.

Long: A glass-walled building with food illustrations is on the left. A large tree provides shade. On the right, ‘Salt & Pepper Deli Market’ has a tree in front and a reserved parking sign limiting access. The sidewalk is wide with no obstructions.

Detailed Visual Description of the Area Near Westlake & Thomas Stop

Instruction: Check out the detailed description of the path and sidewalk near Westlake & Thomas Stop, including mobility cues and textual cues that appear in the street view imagery.

Description of Path Closer to Westlake & Thomas Stop. The path to the bus stop is straight along a bustling city street lined with modern buildings on both sides. The street has multiple lanes for cars and clearly marked crosswalks.

Visual Description of the Westlake & Thomas Stop. The bus stop is located along a wide sidewalk shaded by trees, with a glass canopy providing shelter. There is a metallic bench for seating and a sign displaying bus route and schedule information. The structure is primarily metallic with glass panels, featuring a ‘RapidRide’ sign above the schedule post. A ticket vending machine is beside the bus shelter.

Mobility Cues. Landmarks along the route include large office buildings with glass facades, intersection traffic lights, and clearly marked crosswalks. Trees are regularly spaced along the sidewalk, providing some shade.

Description of the Sidewalk Near Westlake & Thomas Stop. The sidewalk is made of concrete and is wide enough to easily navigate with a white cane. It appears to be in good condition, smooth, and without significant cracks or obstacles. There are marked pedestrian crosswalks with tactile paving at intersections.

Textual Cues Near Westlake & Thomas Stop. Signage near the bus stop includes the ‘RapidRide’ sign above the scheduled post and street address numbers on buildings such as ‘320’ near the entrance to the bus stop.

C VIRTUAL EXPLORATION WEB INTERFACE EXAMPLE

Here, we include the text from Figure 3, which shows SceneScout’s web interface for the virtual exploration interaction mode.

Status

Ready! Your intention is: I am buying a new house in this area and would like to see if this neighborhood is a quiet residential area with parks and good amenities. You are currently located at **Russell Street and Nassau Avenue intersection**. Go to the **"Description Keywords"** heading for next steps.

Description Keywords

Instruction: Before you begin exploring, review the following keywords that will be highlighted in your descriptions. Please enter any additional keywords and hit the **Continue** button. You can add multiple keywords separated by commas.

Following keywords will be highlighted in your descriptions of the street imagery as you explore:

- Parks
- Grocery stores
- Community centers
- Residential area

You can add multiple keywords separated by commas in the textbox below: schools, public transport (example input) [Continue]

Which Direction Would You Like to Explore Next?

Instruction: Review the description for what lies ahead in each direction and the suggested direction. Hit the button to select the direction you’d like to explore next.

Suggestion: Head north on Russell Street because of the residential buildings, ample on-street parking, well-maintained sidewalks, and presence of trees, indicating a quieter residential area.

Exploration Options: **1. Heading North on Russell Street:** Residential buildings line both sides with ample on-street parking and well-maintained sidewalks. The presence of trees indicates some greenery, contributing to a quieter, residential feel. No visible commercial areas or parks in this view, suggesting a strictly residential zone with limited immediate amenities. **(Suggested direction)**

2. Heading West on Norman Avenue: The street features residential buildings and parked cars on both sides, indicating a residential area. The presence of both mid-rise apartment complexes and houses suggests a mixed residential environment. Limited green space in sight, so parks might be located further along or on adjacent streets.

3. Heading East on Norman Avenue: This area appears to be a mix of residential and commercial buildings with parked cars and some industrial presence. It might not be the quietest residential neighborhood, but it does have good amenities and street activity.

D PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1 summarizes our user study participants’ demographics.

E QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

E.1 Pre-study Questionnaire

- Q1. What is your age?
- Q2. What is your gender?
- Q3. What is your occupation?
- Q4. Where do you live? (City, State)
- Q5. How often do you use screen readers (e.g. VoiceOver) to access computers?
 - 1: Never
 - 2: Sometimes
 - 3: About half the time

Table 1: Self-reported demographics of our user study participants. Gender information was collected as a free response. All participants, except P4, were totally blind. P4 reported having low vision due to severe central vision distortion. Participants rated their proficiency in using assistive technology (AT) for navigation on a scale of 1–5.

PID	Age	Gender	Onset	Mobility Aids	Assistive Technology (AT) for Navigation	AT Proficiency
P1	50	Male	Age 40	White cane	Apple/Google Maps, BlindSquare	(4/5) Very
P2	60	Male	At birth	White cane	Apple/Google Maps, BlindSquare, VoiceVista	(5/5) Extremely
P3	44	Male	Age 38	White cane, Guide dog	Apple Maps, BlindSquare, Oko, GoodMaps	(5/5) Extremely
P4	34	Male	Age 17	None	Apple/Google Maps, BlindSquare, Compass	(5/5) Extremely
P5	31	Non-binary	At birth	Guide dog	BlindSquare, VoiceVista, Oko	(3/5) Moderately
P6	39	Female	Age 16	Guide dog	Apple Maps, BlindSquare, GoodMaps	(2/5) Slightly
P7	34	Female	Age 15	Guide dog	Apple Maps, BlindSquare, Soundscape	(3/5) Moderately
P8	31	Female	At birth	White cane	BlindSquare, Soundscape	(4/5) Very
P9	32	Male	At birth	Guide dog	BlindSquare, VoiceVista, Soundscape	(5/5) Extremely
P10	51	Male	At birth	White cane, Guide dog	Apple/Google Maps, BlindSquare, Nearby Explorer	(5/5) Extremely

- 4: Most of the time

- 5: Always

Q6. Which screen reader do you generally use for accessing computers?

Q7. How would you rate your proficiency in using this screen reader?

- 1: Not at all proficient

- 2: Slightly proficient

- 3: Moderately proficient

- 4: Very proficient

- 5: Extremely proficient

Q8. What is your degree of vision loss?

Q9. Please describe your degree of vision loss.

Q10. At what age did your vision impairments develop?

Q11. Which mobility aids do you use?

Q12. Which navigation apps do you typically use for outdoor navigation?

Q13. How would you rate your proficiency in using assistive technology apps for outdoor navigation?

- 1: Not at all proficient

- 2: Slightly proficient

- 3: Moderately proficient

- 4: Very proficient

- 5: Extremely proficient

Q14. How would you rate your confidence navigating outdoors without any sighted help (i.e., with assistive technology and mobility aids only)?

- 1: Not at all confident

- 2: Slightly proficient

- 3: Moderately proficient

- 4: Very proficient

- 5: Extremely proficient

Q15. How would you rate your familiarity with street view imagery including how it is collected and what kind of information might be present in them?

- 1: Not at all familiar

- 2: Slightly familiar

- 3: Moderately familiar

- 4: Very familiar

- 5: Extremely familiar

Q16. Do you currently use street view imagery to help with your outdoor navigation in any way? If so, how do you access it and for what reasons do you use it for?

E.2 Post-prototype Questionnaire

Q1. What did you like about this prototype?

Q2. What did you dislike about this prototype?

Q3. How useful did you find the information surfaced in descriptions by this prototype?

- 1: Not at all useful

- 2: Slightly useful

- 3: Moderately useful

- 4: Very useful

- 5: Extremely useful

Q4. Elaborate on your rating. What specific types of information did you find useful and what additional pieces of information would you like the prototype to include?

Q5. How relevant were the descriptions? Elaborate on your rating.

(a) *For the route-based prototype*: How well were the descriptions tailored to include accessibility-related information?

(b) *For the exploration-based prototype*: How well did the descriptions match your intention to explore the areas? Did it surface the information that you have liked to know given that scenario?

- 1: Not at all relevant

- 2: Slightly relevant

- 3: Moderately relevant

- 4: Very relevant

- 5: Extremely relevant

Q6. Since street view images can be old, how well do you think the prototype surfaced information that is likely to stay consistent? Elaborate on your rating.

- 1: Not at all consistent

- 2: Slightly consistent

- 3: Moderately consistent

- 4: Very consistent

- 5: Extremely consistent

Q7. What level of detail in the descriptions between short, medium, long did you find the most useful? Rank them in order of usefulness.

Q8. Explain your ranking. In which scenario do you imagine using each of these different levels of verbosity?

Q9. How likely is it for you to use this prototype in environments that you're already familiar with?

- 1: Not at all likely

- 2: Slightly likely




Figure 10: Participants' ranking preferences ($N = 10$) for verbosity levels in (a) Route Preview and (b) Virtual Exploration. Preferences varied across participants: short and medium descriptions were more commonly preferred for Route Preview, while medium and long descriptions were favored for Virtual Exploration.

- 3: Moderately likely
- 4: Very likely
- 5: Extremely likely

Q10. How likely is it for you to use this prototype in environments that you're not at all familiar with?

- 1: Not at all likely
- 2: Slightly likely
- 3: Moderately likely
- 4: Very likely
- 5: Extremely likely

Q11. Elaborate on the rating? How does familiarity affect the potential use of this prototype?

Q12. How trustworthy would you say these descriptions are for you?

- 1: Not at all trustworthy
- 2: Slightly trustworthy
- 3: Moderately trustworthy
- 4: Very trustworthy
- 5: Extremely trustworthy

Q13. How confident do you feel about knowing what to expect from the physical environment after using this prototype?

- 1: Not at all confident
- 2: Slightly confident
- 3: Moderately confident
- 4: Very confident
- 5: Extremely confident

Q14. Elaborate on your rating.

Q15. Do you have any suggestions for improving this prototype?

Q16. If this prototype was made available to you right now, what would you use it for? Apart from the scenarios you experienced, what other scenarios can you imagine?

Q17. Anything else you would like to add before we wrap up this prototype?

E.3 Post-study Semi-structured Interview

Q1. Now that you have tried both prototypes, how would you compare the two?

- (a) In which scenarios do you imagine using the route-based prototype?
- (b) In which scenarios do you imagine using the exploration-based prototype?
- (c) What do you think about the level of control that each agent offers? Do you have a preference?

Q2. Apart from these two prototypes, what new use cases can you imagine using street view imagery for?

- (a) What information from street view imagery would you like to access?
- (b) How would you like to access that information? In other words, what type of interaction/interface can you imagine while accessing that information?

Q3. Anything else you would like to add before we wrap up the study?

F ADDITIONAL USER STUDY RESULTS

F.1 Ranking Preferences for Verbosity of Descriptions

Figure 10 presents participants' ranking preferences for verbosity levels across the two interaction modes. Short and medium descriptions were preferred for Route Previews, while medium and long descriptions were favored for Virtual Exploration. Participants valued the flexibility to adjust verbosity based on context, including time constraints, location familiarity, and visit purpose.

F.2 Perceived Temporal Consistency of Descriptions

Figure 11 average ratings for participants' perceived temporal consistency of descriptions across the two prototypes. The mean (\pm std. dev.) rating was 4.2 (± 0.9) for route previews and 3.7 (± 0.7) for virtual exploration. Participants noted that some of the descriptions lacked temporal consistency. For example, the presence of transient objects like 'Fedex' trucks and ongoing construction may be inaccurate when users eventually visit a location. While these inconsistencies sometimes caused confusion, participants recognized the inherent limitations of street view imagery. P6 noted: "I understand these are older images, so only major landmarks would be things I can 100% trust, but there's no reason why I feel like the descriptions wouldn't be trustworthy." Despite these concerns, participants generally found the descriptions reliable for stable features like major landmarks and infrastructure.

G ANNOTATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Figure 12 shows the context provided to annotators during the technical evaluation. This includes the previous description (for reference only), the user's heading, nearby POIs, street view images, and the full system-generated description. Based on this context, annotators assess each sentence in the description for information type, correctness, consistency, and redundancy. The following




Figure 11: Participants’ average ratings ($N = 10$) of the perceived temporal consistency of descriptions across SceneScout’s two interaction modes. While both received positive ratings, Route Preview was perceived to surface information more likely to remain consistent over time compared to Virtual Exploration. Error bars represent standard error.

evaluation form was used to rate each sentence according to these dimensions.

G.1 Evaluation Form

Rate Each Sentence

Now we will rate each sentence independently. Please read the sentence and answer each question based only on the information in that sentence.

Sentence 1: *The left sidewalk has residential buildings, including a beige multi-family house with stairs*

Q1. Type of information: How subjective or objective is the description?

- Subjective
(e.g. busy street, well-maintained park)
- Objective
(e.g. signage reading 'No entry, parked cars')
- Includes both subjective and objective information
(e.g. a busy street with 'one-way' signage)

Q2. If description includes objective information, what type of objective information is this? (Select all that apply).

- Points of Interest (POI) information
(a mention of nearby POI and possibly describing its relative location; e.g. 'Shark Fitness' is in west, 72 meters away.)
- Factual object information
(a mention of objects visible in the images; e.g. signage reading 'No entry, parked cars').
- Accessibility-related information
(a mention of objects or scene description that is focused on providing more information about accessibility for blind or low vision individual; e.g. sidewalk is wide and smooth, traffic signals are present, APS and curb cuts are visible)
- Other (Free response)

Q3. Accuracy: How accurate is the description?

- I cannot tell
(e.g. states that a sign board reads "4th St," but the signage is partially occluded and thus its accuracy cannot not be verified)

- Not correct
(e.g. states that a bus stop is present, but it is neither visible in the images, nor is it mentioned in the context)
- Partially correct
(e.g. states that a bus stop is on the right; the bus stop is visible in the images, but context states it is on the left)
- Correct
(e.g. states that a bus stop is present, which can be visible in the images or mentioned in the context information)

Q4. Error type: What type of error is in this sentence?

- Plausible but not present visual detail
(e.g. stating there is a factory near a parking lot of new cars, stating there is a small dog in a garden scene)
- Plausible but inaccurate visual adjectives
(e.g. describing a dark door as an open door, describing graffiti on building facade as a mural)
- Incorrect count / color / text or other factual information
(e.g. a building features 3 doors when it actually features 4 doors, reading "Freeway" signage as "Figuera Avenue")
- Incorrect spatial detail
(e.g. incorrectly stating a trash can is behind the bus stop, when it is in front of it)
- Complete hallucination
(e.g. nothing in the image or context indicates even a remote possibility of this statement being true)
- Other (Free response)

Q5. Consistency over time: Given that the image was taken at least a couple months ago, how likely is it for the information provided in this image to stay consistent when a user visits the area shown in the image at a later time?

- Not likely to remain consistent over time
(e.g. a blue car is parked next to Starbucks entrance, a FedEx truck is delivering packages)
- Possibly remain consistent over time
(e.g. busy street with cars parked along the street)
- Likely to remain consistent over time
(e.g. bus stop has a shelter with glass panels, Starbucks is on the right, sidewalk is wide and smooth, curb cuts and APS are visible)

Q6. Redundancy: Given the previous description, does this sentence add any new information or repeat what has already been mentioned in the previous description?

- No previous description provided
(Choose this if the previous description at the top of the task is blank)
- Repeats information from previous description
(e.g. both the previous description and this sentence state that the street is busy without adding any nuance or further information about the street)
- Adds new information
(e.g. states that a bus stop is now visible on the right, which wasn't mentioned in the previous description at all)
- Updates previously mentioned information
(e.g. states that a bus stop is now 10 meters away, which was 35 meters away as per the previous description)

Street Image Description Rating

In this task, a user who is blind or low vision has asked an automated agent to describe street images. You will rate the descriptions of the street images in detail.

First, please look at the context the automated agent was given below.

Context Passed to Model:

This is what the agent said just before the images and description in the current task:

Previous description (do not rate): The left sidewalk has residential buildings, including a beige multi-family house with stairs. The right side has a white house with large windows, a stop sign, and a yellow crosswalk sign. Both sides have street parking and greenery.

Note: Do not rate this previous description above in this task. Only judge the description in the questions below. This is only provided to help understand what the system said previously.

User is facing: West

Nearby Places:
None



Facing South



Facing North

The model described the street above with this description, which you will rate in this task.

Full Description: The left sidewalk has residential buildings, including a beige multi-family house with stairs. The right side has a white house with large windows, a stop sign, and a yellow crosswalk sign. Both sides have street parking and greenery.

Figure 12: Annotation interface showing the context provided to the model before generating a description. This includes the previous sentence (not to be rated), user heading, nearby places, and corresponding street view imagery. Annotators use this context to evaluate each sentence in the full description.