

Not There Yet: Evaluating Vision Language Models in Simulating the Visual Perception of People with Low Vision

Rosiana Natalie, Wenqian Xu, Ruei-Che Chang, Rada Mihalcea, Anhong Guo

University of Michigan
{rosianan, wtxu, rueiche, mihalcea, anhong}@umich.edu

Abstract

Advances in vision language models (VLMs) have enabled the simulation of general human behavior through their reasoning and problem solving capabilities. However, prior research has not investigated such simulation capabilities in the accessibility domain. In this paper, we evaluate the extent to which VLMs can simulate the vision perception of low vision individuals when interpreting images. We first compile a benchmark dataset through a survey study with 40 low vision participants, collecting their brief and detailed vision information and both open-ended and multiple-choice image perception and recognition responses to up to 25 images. Using these responses, we construct prompts for VLMs (GPT-4o) to create simulated agents of each participant, varying the included information on vision information and example image responses. We evaluate the agreement between VLM-generated responses and participants' original answers. Our results indicate that VLMs tend to infer beyond the specified vision ability when given minimal prompts, resulting in low agreement (0.59). The agreement between the agent' and participants' responses remains low when only either the vision information (0.59) or example image responses (0.59) are provided, whereas a combination of both significantly increase the agreement (0.70, $p < 0.0001$). Notably, a single example combining both open-ended and multiple-choice responses, offers significant performance improvements over either alone ($p < 0.0001$), while additional examples provided minimal benefits ($p > 0.05$).

1 Introduction

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have expanded opportunities for human-AI interaction, especially in role-playing scenarios (Park et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2024), driven by improved reasoning and problem-solving capabilities (Dasgupta et al. 2022; Orrù et al. 2023). LLMs have been used for role-play across domains like gaming (Wang et al. 2023; Xu et al. 2023), social networks (Park et al. 2022), education (Lu and Wang 2024), and content creation (Choi et al. 2024). They are particularly useful in resource-constrained settings for tasks such as data annotation (Salminen et al. 2023), survey generation (Hämäläinen, Tavast, and Kunnari 2023), and usability testing (Taeb et al. 2024).

Despite growing interest in LLM-driven role-play and simulation, their application in accessibility remains largely

unexplored. This presents a compelling opportunity: in situations where directly involving people with low vision is difficult due to logistical, privacy, or resource constraints, vision language models (VLMs) may serve as a promising alternative. These models could be used to conduct initial automated accessibility evaluation of visual media, simulate and pilot first-person accounts of technology use, perform low-cost prototyping of assistive technologies, among others, to support inclusive design processes. They also hold potential for powering adaptive and personalized technologies that respond to users' unique vision abilities. Thus, understanding how well VLMs can simulate visual perception is a critical step toward realizing this opportunity.

In this paper, we investigate the current capabilities and limitations of employing VLMs to simulate the vision abilities of people with low vision. Specifically, our study addresses: **What is the vision perception simulation performance of current VLMs? How do prompt, context, and example format affect simulation performance?**

We first collect a benchmark dataset with 40 low vision participants and gather self-reported vision information, and responses to image perception and recognition tasks using both open-ended descriptions and multiple-choice questions. From this survey, we collect 709 open-ended descriptions (avg. word count 27.2) and 4,170 multiple-choice responses. Low vision participants answer an average of 60.4% of the multiple-choice questions correctly, with individual scores ranging from 0% to 99%, reflecting a wide range of visual accessibility. Participants also complete the survey in approximately 70.2 minutes on average.

Next, we use this dataset to systematically evaluate a range of VLM prompt configurations for constructing simulated agents of low vision participants. Specifically, we examine:

- **RQ1:** What is the performance of simulated agents with little to no prompting?
- **RQ2:** How do vision information and example image responses affect simulation performance?
- **RQ3:** How do the format and number of open-ended descriptions and multiple-choice responses affect simulation performance?

Our results show that VLMs tend to infer beyond the specified visual perception abilities, thus resulting in low

agreement with human responses. Compared to the true answers for the images perceived by sighted people, the agent achieves an *accuracy* of 0.94 with no prompting, and 0.92 with minimal prompting. These result in a low *agreement* between the low vision participants and the agents, which are 0.59 (no prompting), and 0.59 (minimal prompting). On the other extreme, when prompted being blind, the agents achieve 0 accuracy (because it answers all questions with “I Can’t Tell”), resulting in a lower agreement of 0.35.

Furthermore, the agreement between the agents’ and participants’ responses remain low when only either the vision information (0.59) or example image responses (0.59) are provided, whereas a combination of both significantly increase the agreement (0.70, $p < 0.0001$). Notably, a single example combining both open-ended and multiple-choice responses offer significant performance improvements over either alone ($p < 0.0001$), while additional examples provided minimal benefits ($p > 0.05$). With these agreement scores (highest mean = 0.70), we believe that VLMs’ capabilities to simulate the visual perception of people with low vision is “Not There Yet.”

Overall, our study contributes:

1. A benchmark compiled from 40 people with low vision, consisting of vision information and image perception responses.
2. The design of various prompt configurations for creating VLM-based agents that simulate people with low vision’s vision perception.
3. Insights on agent performance across different prompt configurations and how different types, formats, and the number of examples provided during prompting impacted simulation performance.

1.1 Ethical and Societal Considerations

While simulations can offer benefits (e.g., supporting accessibility evaluation, and low-cost prototyping), they also raise important ethical concerns. Disability simulations have been critiqued for reinforcing stereotypes (Bennett and Rosner 2019), trivializing lived experiences (Cossovich et al. 2023), misrepresenting disability (Morris. 2019), and excluding disabled people from the design process (Nario-Redmond, Gospodinov, and Cobb 2017). We acknowledge these valid critiques and agree that simulating disabled experiences should be approached with caution (Andrew and Tigwell 2022). However, we argue that it is equally important to explore how emerging AI capabilities might be leveraged in ways that benefit the accessibility community, and actively involve people with disabilities in shaping future technologies. This work presents an initial evaluation of the strengths and limitations of VLM-based simulation agents – not to suggest they replace human participants, but to understand their potential to support early-stage design when direct involvement is not feasible.

2 Related Work

Our work is related to the body of literature on disability simulations, and the emerging capabilities of LLMs in simulating human behavior.

2.1 Simulating People with Disabilities

Disability simulation refers to methods that approximate the experiences of people with disabilities, typically to foster empathy, inform design, or evaluate accessibility (Bennett and Rosner 2019). Prior research has explored simulations in various disabilities, including mobility impairments (Ehibhationmhan et al. 2022), visual impairments (Juniat et al. 2019; Kim et al. 2018; Barbieri et al. 2023; Zhao et al. 2018), cognitive disabilities (Ehibhationmhan et al. 2022), and hearing loss (Nelson, Spence, and Gormley 2023).

Researchers and practitioners have explored many techniques to specifically simulate visual impairments for different purpose. For example, for direct and physical manipulation of the vision, prior studies explore the use of techniques including simple blindfolding (Colwell 2013), the use of the dedicated glasses or goggles that works as filters to mimic visual impairments experience (Juniat et al. 2019). Prior research also has explored methods of simulating visual impairments in digital and immersive technologies, such as the use of VR and AR technologies which are used to create a simulation environment in virtual environment (Häkikilä et al. 2018; Barbieri et al. 2023; Zhao et al. 2017, 2018) and displaying the outcome of image processing system. Furthermore, Kim et al. explored the use of mobile app to display the image filter on screen (Kim et al. 2018). Lastly, several studies in the game domain have explored interactive ways in simulating visual impairments through games (Leão et al. 2024; Melthis et al. 2015). These simulations serve a range of purposes, including raising awareness among non-disabled individuals (Juniat et al. 2019; Leão et al. 2024; Melthis et al. 2015), healthcare and professional training (Juniat et al. 2019), informing inclusive design (Kim et al. 2018), and evaluating assistive technologies (Hwang et al. 2018; Acevedo et al. 2022; Almutleb and Hassan 2020; Kim et al. 2018).

We acknowledge the risks associated with disability simulations, while also recognizing their potential value for early-stage ideation, testing, and understand the user profile as to support the effort for more personalized and adaptive experience with AI based applications. Our work aims to extend this body of simulation research and perform an initial evaluation of the performance of VLMs for vision perception simulation.

2.2 Role-Playing and Simulations with LLMs

LLMs have recently emerged as powerful tools for simulating human behavior across diverse domains. They have been studied in strategic gaming (Xu et al. 2023), social interaction (Park et al. 2022, 2023), education (Lu and Wang 2024), content creation (Choi et al. 2024), and the social sciences (Huang et al. 2024), where they are used to perform roles that involve reasoning, communication, and decision-making. Park et al.’s Generative Agents demonstrated how LLM-powered characters could simulate daily routines and social interactions in a virtual world (Park et al. 2023) and replicate answer for General Social Survey (Park et al. 2024). Similarly, Social Simulacra used LLMs to populate prototype social computing platforms with simulated

users, allowing designers to explore emergent social behaviors before deployment (Park et al. 2022). Other studies have leveraged LLMs to replicate empirical findings in social science research (Huang et al. 2024), and generate synthetic datasets for open-ended tasks (Hämäläinen, Tavast, and Kunnari 2023).

Recent studies further suggest that LLMs can simulate aspects of human behavior where involving real participants may be resource-constrained or logistically challenging (Liu et al. 2025; Hämäläinen, Tavast, and Kunnari 2023). Researchers have studied the potential of such agents to perform labor-intensive tasks, including survey response generation (Hämäläinen, Tavast, and Kunnari 2023), data annotation (Salminen et al. 2023), and early-stage user research exploration (Taeb et al. 2024; Lu et al. 2025; Liu et al. 2025). These applications demonstrate the growing utility of LLMs in modeling human behavior, especially when personas or prompts are carefully designed to reflect specific roles or contexts.

However, most LLM role-play applications have focused on cognitive, social, or task-based personas. There is a notable gap in exploring LLMs, particularly VLMs, as proxies for users with perceptual disabilities, such as visual impairments. Despite growing interests in applying AI to accessibility, little work has examined whether VLMs can meaningfully simulate the visual perception of people with visual impairments. Our work addresses this gap by investigating the capabilities and limitations of current VLMs in simulating visual perception, and examining how different input information in prompts influences the quality of simulations.

A key insight from prior research is that personas become more believable and useful when enriched with contextual and personality traits (Shanahan, McDonell, and Reynolds 2023). Building on this, we extend prior approaches by grounding our VLM-based agents prompts in real-world data from individuals with low vision. Inspired by works such as Proxona (Choi et al. 2024), Park et al. (Park et al. 2024), Shin et al. (Shin et al. 2024), and Hämäläinen et al. (Hämäläinen, Tavast, and Kunnari 2023), which use real participant data to build contextually rich personas, we embed actual survey-derived descriptions of visual conditions and examples of their image recognition and perception into the prompts.

3 Benchmark of Human Vision Information and Image Perception

Our benchmark consists of vision information as well as vision perception and recognition tasks from 40 low vision participants. We recruit participants through the National Federation of the Blind (NFB) research participant solicitation request form, university mailing lists, and word of mouth. To be eligible, individuals had to be at least 18 years old and self-identify as having low vision, with some degree of light perception and usable vision.

To compile a benchmark of vision information and image perception from low vision individuals, we develop a custom survey web interface, which is screen reader-compatible, and support image enlarging and minimizing). We log par-

ticipants’ change of responses and the duration participants spent on each question. The survey is designed to take approximately one hour to complete, and participants receive a \$20 incentive for participating. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at our university.

3.1 Survey Questions

The survey is structured into three main sections:

Brief Vision Information We ask participants about their vision-related background, including their level of vision (e.g., visual acuity, visual field, and color perception), the onset of their vision impairment (i.e., congenital or acquired), their vision progression over time, and medical diagnoses.

Detailed Vision Information We ask participants to provide more detailed descriptions of how they perceive their surroundings (e.g., shapes, colors, motion, and variations under different lighting conditions). We also ask them to describe any unique aspects of their visual experience that might differ from others with the same medical diagnosis. Capturing these individual differences helps move beyond stereotypical assumptions tied to specific diagnoses and gather more personalized understanding of vision information. We also include a subset of items from the Visual Functioning Questionnaire (VFQ-25) (Pawar et al. 2021), a widely used tool for assessing the impact of vision on daily living. Given VFQ-25’s breadth, we only select items that relate to participants’ ability to perceive actions, objects, and facial expressions.

Image Perception and Recognition To capture how participants use their vision to perceive images, we curate a list of 25 images. They are selected following the classification in Stangl et al. to represent a range of visual elements and contexts, drawing from the intersection of five content types, including (1) politician/people, (2) living room, (3) bazaar, (4) mountains, and (5) food; as well as five usage scenarios, including (i) news for learning, (ii) e-commerce for purchasing, (iii) social networking for information seeking, (iv) travel for planning, and (v) library for knowledge sharing.

We ask participants both open-ended and multiple-choice questions. Participants first respond to the open-ended question: *“Based on your visual perception, how would you describe this image? Please describe any shapes, colors, details, or other elements that you can perceive. If certain aspects are unclear or not visible to you, feel free to describe how you perceive the image in your own way.”*

Next, participants answer six multiple-choice questions (MCQs) intended to cover three visual skills suggested by prior work (Zeng et al. 2020): (i) object recognition (e.g., What is the person wearing?), (ii) color recognition (e.g., What is the color of the person’s hair?), and (iii) counting (e.g., What is the total count of people in the image?). An example image along with its corresponding MCQs is shown in Figure 1. These structured questions provide a consistent basis for assessing visual perception across participants and are later used as the ground truth of the VLM-based




Figure 1: Sample image and corresponding questions with the living room type and the e-commerce for purchasing scenario. The bolded answers indicate the correct ones.

agent’s performance. We iteratively refine the questions to be clear and answerable, and two sighted individuals both achieve 100% accuracy on the final set. See Appendix A for an overview of the survey interface, Appendix B for the task images, and Appendix C for the full list of survey questions.

3.2 Benchmark Statistics

We collect survey responses from 40 low vision participants (age: $M = 48$ years, $SD = 18.0$). Participants reported using various assistive technologies to complete the survey, including screen magnifiers ($N = 14$), screen readers ($N = 19$), magnifying lenses ($N = 8$), and braille readers ($N = 2$). On average, participants spent approximately 70.2 minutes ($SD = 32.3$) to complete the survey. Due to the diverse vision ability and assistive tool use that affected task completion time, we made the first 10 images mandatory. For those 10, participants took an average of 29.5 minutes ($SD = 21.3$). Within the one-hour mark, participants completed an average of 16 questions.

Among the participants, 9 complete all 25 images, while 8 complete only the 10 mandatory images. In total, we collect 4,170 MCQ responses and 709 open-ended descriptions from participants, with an average word count per description of 27.2 ($SD=31.6$). Breaking down the duration for each survey section, participants spend an average of 5.2 minutes ($SD = 5.6$) on the Brief Vision Information section, 8.8 minutes ($SD = 5.8$) on the Detailed Vision Information section, 1.8 minutes ($SD = 3.3$) on each open-ended image description, and 1.0 minute ($SD = 0.8$) on each group of MCQs.

We calculate the percentage of questions participants answer correctly, as a measure of task difficulty due to their vision abilities. Participants on average answer 60.4% ($Std = 36\%$, $Md = 74.5\%$) of the MCQs correctly, with individual percentages ranging from 0% to 99%, showing a wide range of visual abilities (Figure 2).

4 Evaluating VLM Simulation Performance

We evaluate VLM simulation performance by designing baseline prompts with no or minimal vision information and prompts that incorporate participants’ survey responses. Performance is measured using agreement scores between the agents’ responses and participants’ answers.




Figure 2: The accuracy distribution of participants’ answers compared to the true answers perceived by sighted people. The mean accuracy is 60.4% ($SD = 36\%$), shown in red vertical line, indicating a diverse range of vision abilities.

4.1 Prompt Design

We first design prompts to predict answers with no or minimal vision information about the participants the base-lines. Then, we constructed agents based on their survey responses, aiming to reflect participants’ unique visual abilities. We illustrated the prompt template in Appendix D.

For the baseline prompts, we used prompts with no or minimal vision information about the participants. We prompt VLMs to be one of three roles: an assistant with full vision (i.e., a sighted agent), an assistant with no visual perception (i.e., a blind agent), and an assistant with unspecified visual impairments (i.e., a minimally-prompted agent).

Then, we design agent prompt that include the responses from the participants. We design in total 16 prompts (Appendix E) that include either vision information, image perception and recognition responses (example), or both.

Vision Information We vary three levels of vision information detail:

- **Diagnosis-only (diagnosis):** The prompt includes a brief medical diagnostic statement reported by the participant in the Brief Vision Information survey section (e.g., Retinitis Pigmentosa, Glaucoma).
- **Brief Vision information (brief):** The prompt includes the participant’s response to the Brief Vision Information section of the survey.
- **Detailed Vision information (detailed):** The prompt incorporates the participant’s response from Detailed Vision Information Section.

Example Building on prior work that highlights the benefits of including explicit examples to guide model responses (Lu and Wang 2024; Brown et al. 2020), we prompt the VLM using only examples and combining vision information with examples. We vary the examples along three dimensions:

- **Number of examples:** single or multiple.
- **Type of single example:** examples drawn from (i) unrelated images, (ii) the same image type, or (iii) the same image scenario.
- **Type of example response:** open-ended responses, MCQ responses, or both.

For the single-example design, agents are given one example answer drawn from one of three types: (i) an image of the same type, (ii) an image from the same scenario, or (iii) an image unrelated in type or scenario. For each type, we also design prompts that include either only the open-ended responses, only the MCQ responses, or both.

For the multiple-example design, agents are given nine example answers corresponding to all mandatory images except the one being used for prediction (i.e., a leave-one-out setup). Similar to the single-example design, we designed prompts that included either only the open-ended response, only MCQ responses, or both.

Prediction For all prompt variations, the agent is instructed to predict open-ended and MCQ responses from the image perception and recognition task. For all prompts requiring examples, we fine-tune and predict using responses to the participant’s mandatory images (i.e., the ten images covering combinations of image types and scenarios).

4.2 Implementation

We use OpenAI’s GPT-4o (version: gpt-4o-2024-11-20), a large multimodal model capable of processing both text and image queries. For each API call, the model is prompted to generate a response to a single image-based perception or recognition question. We set the model’s temperature to 0.

4.3 Metrics

We evaluate the agent’s performance on the MCQ responses by calculating the *agreement* score, the proportion of questions where both the agent and the participant provided the same answer. The *agreement* ranges from 0 (no agreement) to 1 (perfect agreement).

We use a Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) with a binomial distribution and a logit link function. The response variable is agreement (i.e., a binary indicator of whether the agent agrees or disagrees with the participant). Prompt design is treated as a fixed effect, and both participant and questions are treated as random effects. This model estimate the probability of agreement between the agent and the participant under each prompt design. We then fit our GLMM models to assess the effects of different prompt designs and conduct pairwise comparisons using Estimated Marginal Means (EMMs) to test for differences between conditions.

5 Evaluation Results

5.1 RQ1: What is the performance of simulated agents with little to no prompting?

Our results indicate that VLMs tend to infer beyond the specified vision ability when given minimal prompts. Agents created with no to minimal prompt are achieving high accuracy against the ground truth in general, which are 0.94 for sighted and 0.92 for minimally-prompted agent. Blind agents answer all questions “*I can’t tell*”, which results in 0 accuracy. This is intuitive because we did not pass them any visual image, simulating that they have no vision perception.

This high accuracy of naive prompting compared to true answers perceived by sighted people results in low agreement between the agents and the participants (i.e., sighted agent: Mean = 0.59, SD = 0.33; minimally-prompted agent: Mean = 0.59, SD = 0.32). Moreover, the agreement is even lower between participants and the blind agent (Mean = 0.35, SD = 0.36).

Agent Agreement in Different Prompt Designs




Figure 3: The point plot shown for different performance for different prompt feedback. The prompts are either using vision profile only or with the example. The graph shows increasing trend between the visual profile and examples, and within the question types, open-ended, multi-choice questions, or both, also shows increasing trend. We present the mean and standard deviation value (in bracket).

5.2 RQ2: How do vision information and example image responses affect simulation performance?

Vision information. When prompting with more vision information, the agreement between the agent’s and participants’ responses remains low when only the vision information. The average agreement scores are 0.59 (SD = 0.30) for the prompt with diagnosis, 0.59 (SD = 0.27) for the prompt with brief vision description, and 0.59 (SD = 0.22) for the prompt brief and detailed description.

We find no significant difference in agreement across the vision information-only prompt designs. Pairwise comparisons reveal no statistically significant differences between the prompt designs, where all $p > 0.1$ (diagnosis vs. brief: $z = -1.01$, $p > 0.1$; diagnosis vs. detailed: $z = -1.66$, $p > 0.1$; brief vs. diagnosis: $z = -0.65$, $p > 0.1$).

Example. Agreement improves when examples are included in the prompts. Specifically, mean agreement scores increase to 0.65 (SD = 0.160) with an unrelated image example, 0.67 (SD = 0.15) with an image of the same type, 0.66 (SD = 0.16) with a same-scenario image, and 0.67 when multiple examples are provided. All example-based conditions show significantly higher agreement compared to the vision information-only prompts (vision information vs. unrelated: $z = 10.43$, $p < 0.0001$; vs. same type: $z = 12.71$, $p < 0.0001$; vs. same scenario: $z = 11.15$, $p < 0.0001$; vs. multiple examples: $z = 12.81$, $p < 0.0001$).

We also run additional analyses to evaluate the outcome of prompts where we provided only examples without any vision information. The mean agreement is 0.59 (SD = 0.25), which is significantly lower than the agreement achieved when both vision profiles and examples are combined (example only vs. example + vision information: $z = -8.525$, $p < 0.0001$).

Upon manual inspection of the agent responses for open-ended tasks, the agent often produce surprisingly de-

tailed and comprehensive image descriptions – even when prompted with information indicating vision impairment. While the agent occasionally acknowledges its visual limitations with statements such as, “*I’m unable to identify specific details or people in the image, but I can describe general elements*”, these acknowledgments are frequently followed by unexpectedly specific and confident responses. For example, one response states: “*It seems like a top-down view of a table setting. I can perceive round shapes that might be plates, and there are some contrasting colors that could be food items. The background has a pattern that might be tiles. There are also some elongated shapes that could be utensils or hands. The overall scene gives a sense of a meal or gathering.*”, which appears implausibly detailed for someone who could not identify specific details of objects or people.

In contrast, when the prompts include example answers from participants for other images, the agent’s responses displayed greater uncertainty and caution. Phrases such as “*vague...*”, “*possibly...*”, or “*it seems like...*” are more frequent. In some cases, the agent explicitly states its limitations, responding with phrases like “*I can’t tell*” or “*Unclear*”, particularly when the provided vision information described a high degree of visual impairment.

These findings suggest that vision information alone is insufficient to constrain the agent’s outputs in a way that reflected the intended perceptual abilities. In contrast, adding examples to the vision information in the prompts help guide the agent toward more appropriately accurate responses.

5.3 RQ3: How do the format and number of open-ended descriptions and multiple-choice responses affect simulation performance?

Example format. We investigate which types of example-based prompts lead to better agreement. Notably, examples that combine both open-ended and multiple-choice responses offer significant performance improvements over either format alone.

Across all prompts that incorporate examples, we find that including both open-ended description responses and MCQ responses in the examples results in the highest agreement scores. Specifically, the average agreement is 0.67 (SD = 0.17) for examples from unrelated images, 0.70 (SD = 0.14) for same-type images, 0.68 (SD = 0.16) for same-scenario images, and 0.70 (SD = 0.14) for prompts with multiple examples—all of which include both open-ended and MCQ responses.

These scores are significantly higher than those from prompts that included only open-ended response examples (unrelated: Mean = 0.64, SD = 0.13 ($z = 2.51, p < 0.05$); same type: Mean = 0.65, SD = 0.13 ($z = 4.27, p < 0.0001$); same scenario: Mean = 0.63, SD = 0.16 ($z = 4.01, p < 0.0001$); multiple: Mean = 0.67, SD = 0.14 ($z = 2.51, p < 0.05$)) or only MCQ response examples (unrelated: Mean = 0.64, SD = 0.18 ($z = 2.51, p < 0.01$); same type: Mean = 0.65, SD = 0.16 ($z = 4.73, p < 0.0001$); same scenario: Mean = 0.65, SD = 0.16 ($z = 2.90, p < 0.01$); multiple: Mean = 0.62, SD = 0.18 ($z = 3.04, p < 0.01$)).

Number of examples. Providing more examples offers minimal additional benefits compared to using only one example image response. Among all prompts that include examples, we find no statistically significant differences in pairwise comparison analyses between the prompt with different numbers of examples (single unrelated vs. multiple: $z = 2.33, p > 0.1$; single same type vs. multiple: $z = 0.07, p > 0.1$; single same scenario vs. multiple: $z = 1.60, p > 0.1$).

6 Discussion and Future Work

Previous studies have explored the ongoing challenges in using VLMs to simulate human behavior, such as the difficulty in making these models effectively “unlearn” previously acquired abilities (Lu and Wang 2024), including, in our case, visual sensory perception. For example, our observations indicate that the model struggle to authentically simulate the experience of low vision, even when explicitly instructed to role-play as an individual with a specific vision information (Section 5.1). However, we identify a promising direction: incorporating few-shot examples that demonstrate how a participant with low vision performs specific tasks (e.g., image perception and recognition) can significantly enhance the fidelity of VLM-based simulated agents.

In the following sections, we discuss simulation readiness, potential applications of simulated agents with low vision, and the need for vision information datasets supported by cost-effective and generalizable data collection pipelines.

6.1 Simulation Readiness: Limitations, Risks, and Responsible Use

This study investigates how well VLMs can simulate the visual perception of individuals with low vision. While our findings show approximately 70% agreement between simulated agents and actual user responses, VLM-based simulations may not yet be ready for standalone deployment and direct decision-making. Their use should be guided by caution, critical reflection, and human-in-the-loop validation. The divergence between agent outputs and human responses also amplifies a set of existing underlying deployment risks. Hallucinated or inaccurate descriptions (Chen et al. 2025; Bai et al. 2025), biases in training data, poor generalization across diverse environments exclusionary (Zhao et al. 2024; Project 2024) may produce stereotyped or culturally insensitive representations (Hali, Diagne, and Walker 2022). These risks may misinform how blind and low vision (BLV) users are represented and understood in design processes. Mistrust may emerge when users encounter unpredictable failures, especially if system limitations are not communicated clearly (Ahmadi and Lewis 2024). Together, these findings underscore that VLM-based simulation should not be treated as a substitute for direct user research, but as a complementary and contingent tool whose limitations must be made explicit. Future work should focus on defining acceptable fidelity thresholds – what level of agreement is “good enough” for various design contexts – and establishing those thresholds through collaboration with BLV individuals. Understanding how BLV users perceive and consent

to the simulation of their experiences is also important to ensure transparency, and trust throughout the design process.

6.2 Broader Applications of Simulated Agents with Low Vision

In this paper, we focus on the data collection and evaluation of a variety of prompting strategies to explore the effectiveness of simulated agents for low-vision individuals. Drawing from prior work in applying simulated agents to practical applications *e.g.*, (Hämäläinen, Tavast, and Kunnari 2023; Park et al. 2024), we also exemplify several potential use cases of our findings in this section. Firstly, commercial VLM-powered applications (*e.g.*, SeeingAI (SeeingAI 2025), Be My AI (BeMyAI 2025)) enable BLV users to access visual information by capturing photos and querying the application. However, the generalized, one-size-fits-all information typically produced by VLMs may not align with individual-specific needs, causing additional interaction such as multiple queries to obtain precise information (Stangl et al. 2021). To mitigate this challenge, application developers could adopt our prompt strategies to simulate diverse low-vision user experiences, ensuring that the generated descriptions align better with users’ existing comprehension. For instance, the agent could indicate what users can or cannot perceive from the images, which could be utilized to tailor the feedback and information provided by such applications.

Second, following an approach similar to (Taeb et al. 2024), web-based systems (*e.g.*, social media platforms) could use low-vision agents to run in the background to continuously evaluate image accessibility. These agents could automatically examine accessibility problems and apply corresponding visual filters in real time. For example, if an image includes color combinations that are challenging for users with color vision deficiencies (*e.g.*, red-green color-blindness), a filter such as Daltonization (Lillo et al. 2022) could dynamically adjust the colors specific to user needs, thus enhancing image accessibility.

Future research can expand on these use cases by creating detailed profiles of users’ vision capabilities to develop representative simulated agents by referring to our prompting strategies. These agents can then proactively identify and address accessibility issues, refining solutions before their deployment to actual users.

6.3 Cost-Effective and Generalizable Benchmark Data Collection Pipeline

This study introduces a novel, generalizable approach to collecting structured vision information for simulating agents representing diverse low-vision conditions. Our findings show that combining self-reported vision data with targeted image perception tasks and prompting strategies played a critical role in helping VLMs approximate the perception of individuals with low vision (Section 5.2). However, collecting accurate and diverse vision profiles remains challenging due to the absence of standardized, scalable methodologies. Traditional clinical tools like the Snellen Chart (Azzam and Ronquillo 2023) and Amsler Grid (Tripathy and Salini 2025), while valuable (Wang, Zhao, and Kim 2024), often lack accessibility and scalability.

To address this, we use an online survey paired with structured visual tasks to gather individual vision data. This method proves both efficient and accessible. For example, collecting the minimal data needed for simulation (*i.e.*, vision information and an image example response) takes only about 15 minutes, and within an hour, participants can respond to 16 image-based tasks—allowing for a broader range of image types to be included when needed. Importantly, participants report that the survey help them reflect on their own vision capabilities, suggesting that the data collection process itself can offer personal value.

Future work can develop end-to-end pipelines for collecting richer, longitudinal vision data, potentially through apps or in-situ studies, and by exploring ways to integrate simulation into real-world tools that support both user reflection and data-driven design feedback.

6.4 Potential for Improved Performance with Advanced Models

As language models continue to evolve, so does the potential to enhance the accuracy and reliability of the simulations. While our evaluation is currently limited to a non-reasoning model due to the high cost and restricted access to advanced reasoning models (*e.g.*, GPT-o3-pro), our initial results still suggest promising potential of VLM agents in simulating the visual perception of individuals with low vision.

Advances in model capabilities are likely to improve consistency in visual reasoning and enhance the reliability of simulated responses. As more powerful models become increasingly affordable and accessible, we anticipate continued improvements in simulation quality, paving the way for more effective, scalable tools for early-stage accessibility evaluation and personalized user experiences.

7 Conclusion

Our study investigates the use of VLMs to simulate the visual perception of individuals with low vision. By gathering a structured benchmarking dataset from 40 participants and conducting a series of prompting, we assesses the performance of the agent and how different types and amounts of input information influence simulation performance.

Our findings show that VLMs often infer beyond the intended visual constraints without sufficient prompting. However, providing a single example that includes both open-ended and MCQs responses significantly improves alignment, while additional examples offer minimal gains.


This study evaluates the readiness of VLMs to simulate visual perception of people with low vision, finding that while simulations show promise, fidelity gaps may add to ongoing risks (*e.g.*, hallucinations and bias). Such simulations should be used as complementary tools, supported by human-in-the-loop validation and clearly defined fidelity thresholds. Looking ahead, simulated agents may support broader applications, from personalized assistive technologies to automated accessibility auditing.

References

- Acevedo, V.; Colantoni, P.; Dinet, É.; and Trémeau, A. 2022. Real-time Low Vision Simulation in Mixed Reality. *2022 16th International Conference on Signal-Image Technology & Internet-Based Systems (SITIS)*, 354–361.
- Ahmadi, N.; and Lewis, J. 2024. Reporting Risks in AI-based Assistive Technology Research: A Systematic Review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12035*.
- Almutleb, E. S.; and Hassan, S. E. 2020. The Effect of Simulated Central Field Loss on Street-crossing Decision-Making in Young Adult Pedestrians. *Optometry and Vision Science*, 97: 229 – 238.
- Andrew, S.; and Tigwell, G. W. 2022. Accessible design is mediated by job support structures and knowledge gained through design career pathways. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 6(CSCW2): 1–24.
- Azzam, D.; and Ronquillo, Y. 2023. Snellen chart. In *StatPearls [Internet]*. StatPearls Publishing.
- Bai, Y.; Wang, X.; Zhao, M.; and Liu, Q. 2025. Hallucination of Multimodal Large Language Models: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.00029*.
- Barbieri, M.; Albanese, G. A.; Capris, E.; Canessa, A.; Sabatini, S. P.; and Sandini, G. 2023. Realter: An Immersive Simulator to Support Low-Vision Rehabilitation. In *XR*.
- BeMyAI. 2025. Introducing Be My AI (formerly Virtual Volunteer) for People who are Blind or Have Low Vision, Powered by OpenAI's GPT-4.
- Bennett, C. L.; and Rosner, D. K. 2019. The Promise of Empathy: Design, Disability, and Knowing the "Other". *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- Brown, T.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J. D.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877–1901.
- Chen, Z.; Yang, H.; Wu, L.; and Wang, Y. 2025. A Large Vision-Language Model Based Environment Perception System for Visually Impaired People. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.18027*.
- Choi, Y.; Kang, E. J.; Choi, S.; Lee, M. K.; and Kim, J. 2024. Proxona: Leveraging LLM-Driven Personas to Enhance Creators' Understanding of Their Audience. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10937*.
- Colwell, C. M. 2013. Simulating disabilities as a tool for altering individual perceptions of working with children with special needs. *International Journal of Music Education*, 31: 68 – 77.
- Cossovich, R.; Hodges, S.; Kang, J.; and Girouard, A. 2023. Co-designing new keyboard and mouse solutions with people living with motor impairments. *Proceedings of the 25th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*.
- Dasgupta, I.; Lampinen, A. K.; Chan, S. C.; Sheahan, H. R.; Creswell, A.; Kumaran, D.; McClelland, J. L.; and Hill, F. 2022. Language models show human-like content effects on reasoning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.07051*.
- Ehibhationmhan, R.; Foreman, E.; Barrott, L.; Shek, J.; and Nabhani-Gebara, S. 2022. 'A life in a day' simulation experience: perceptions of oncology nurses and pharmacy staff. *BMC Nursing*, 21.
- Häkikilä, J.; Colley, A.; Väyrynen, J.; and Yliharju, A.-J. 2018. Introducing Virtual Reality Technologies to Design Education. *Seminar.net*.
- Hali, M.; Diagne, B.; and Walker, J. 2022. Measuring Representational Harms in Image Captioning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT)*, 943–954.
- Hämäläinen, P.; Tavast, M.; and Kunnari, A. 2023. Evaluating large language models in generating synthetic hci research data: a case study. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–19.
- Huang, Y.; Yuan, Z.; Zhou, Y.; Guo, K.; Wang, X.; Zhuang, H.; Sun, W.; Sun, L.; Wang, J.; Ye, Y.; et al. 2024. Social Science Meets LLMs: How Reliable Are Large Language Models in Social Simulations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23426*.
- Hwang, A. D.; Tuccar-Burak, M.; Goldstein, R. B.; and Peli, E. 2018. Impact of Oncoming Headlight Glare With Cataracts: A Pilot Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9.
- Juniat, V.; Bourkiza, R.; Das, A.; Das-Bhaumik, R.; Founti, P.; Yeo, C.; Mathew, R.; and Okhravi, N. 2019. Understanding visual impairment and its impact on patients: a simulation-based training in undergraduate medical education. *Journal of medical education and curricular development*, 6: 2382120519843854.
- Kim, W.; Choo, K. T. W.; Lee, Y.; Misra, A.; and Balan, R. K. 2018. Empath-D: VR-based Empathetic App Design for Accessibility. *Proceedings of the 16th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*.
- Leão, L.; de Souza, D. C.; Souza, T.; Hauache, A.; Stival, E.; and Silla, C. N. 2024. Disability Racer: A Digital Game for Raising Awareness of Ophthalmological: Related Issues. In *International Conference on Computer Supported Education*.
- Lillo, J.; Moreira, H.; Abad, L.; and Álvaro, L. 2022. Daltonization or colour enhancement: potential uses and limitations. *Optics Express*, 30(25): 45156–45177.
- Liu, S.; Sabour, S.; Wang, X.; and Mihalcea, R. 2025. Free Lunch for User Experience: Crowdsourcing Agents for Scalable User Studies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22981*.
- Lu, X.; and Wang, X. 2024. Generative students: Using llm-simulated student profiles to support question item evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM Conference on Learning@ Scale*, 16–27.
- Lu, Y.; Yao, B.; Gu, H.; Huang, J.; Wang, J.; Li, L.; Gesi, J.; He, Q.; Li, T. J.-J.; and Wang, D. 2025. UXAgent: An LLM Agent-Based Usability Testing Framework for Web Design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12561*.

- Melthis, J.; Brown, A.; Tang, S.; and Hanneghan, M. 2015. Using Serious Games to Create Awareness on Visual Impairments. In *2015 International Conference on Developments of E-Systems Engineering (DeSE)*, 165–170.
- Morris., M. G. R. 2019. AI and accessibility. *Communications of the ACM*, 63: 35 – 37.
- Nario-Redmond, M. R.; Gospodinov, D.; and Cobb, A. 2017. Crip for a Day: The Unintended Negative Consequences of Disability Simulations. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 62: 324–333.
- Nelson, E. E. C.; Spence, A. D.; and Gormley, G. J. 2023. Stepping into the shoes of older people: a scoping review of simulating ageing experiences for healthcare professional students. *Age and Ageing*, 52.
- Orrù, G.; Piarulli, A.; Conversano, C.; and Gemignani, A. 2023. Human-like problem-solving abilities in large language models using ChatGPT. *Frontiers in artificial intelligence*, 6: 1199350.
- Park, J. S.; O’Brien, J.; Cai, C. J.; Morris, M. R.; Liang, P.; and Bernstein, M. S. 2023. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th annual acm symposium on user interface software and technology*, 1–22.
- Park, J. S.; Popowski, L.; Cai, C.; Morris, M. R.; Liang, P.; and Bernstein, M. S. 2022. Social Simulacra: Creating Populated Prototypes for Social Computing Systems. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450393201.
- Park, J. S.; Zou, C. Q.; Shaw, A.; Hill, B. M.; Cai, C.; Morris, M. R.; Willer, R.; Liang, P.; and Bernstein, M. S. 2024. Generative agent simulations of 1,000 people. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.10109*.
- Pawar, S.; Parkar, A.; Menon, S.; Desai, N.; Namrata, D.; and Dole, K. 2021. Assessment of quality of life of the patients with diabetic retinopathy using National Eye Institute Visual Functioning Questionnaire (VFQ-25). *Journal of Healthcare Quality Research*, 36(4): 225–230.
- Project, B. A. A. 2024. Multimodal LLM using Federated Visual Instruction Tuning. Technical report, University at Buffalo. Technical Report.
- Salminen, J.; Jung, S.-g.; Almerexhi, H.; Cambria, E.; and Jansen, B. 2023. How Can Natural Language Processing and Generative AI Address Grand Challenges of Quantitative User Personas? In *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*, 211–231. Springer.
- SeeingAI. 2025. Seeing AI.
- Shanahan, M.; McDonell, K.; and Reynolds, L. 2023. Role play with large language models. *Nature*, 623(7987): 493–498.
- Shin, J.; Hedderich, M. A.; Rey, B. J.; Lucero, A.; and Oulasvirta, A. 2024. Understanding human-AI workflows for generating personas. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, 757–781.
- Stangl, A.; Verma, N.; Fleischmann, K. R.; Morris, M. R.; and Gurari, D. 2021. Going beyond one-size-fits-all image descriptions to satisfy the information wants of people who are blind or have low vision. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international ACM SIGACCESS conference on computers and accessibility*, 1–15.
- Taeb, M.; Swearngin, A.; Schoop, E.; Cheng, R.; Jiang, Y.; and Nichols, J. 2024. Axnav: Replaying accessibility tests from natural language. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–16.
- Tripathy, K.; and Salini, B. 2025. *Amsler Grid*. StatPearls Publishing, Treasure Island (FL).
- Wang, G.; Xie, Y.; Jiang, Y.; Mandlekar, A.; Xiao, C.; Zhu, Y.; Fan, L.; and Anandkumar, A. 2023. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.16291>.
- Wang, L.; Ma, C.; Feng, X.; Zhang, Z.; Yang, H.; Zhang, J.; Chen, Z.; Tang, J.; Chen, X.; Lin, Y.; et al. 2024. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6): 186345.
- Wang, Y.; Zhao, Y.; and Kim, Y.-S. 2024. How Do Low-Vision Individuals Experience Information Visualization? In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–15.
- Xu, Y.; Wang, S.; Li, P.; Luo, F.; Wang, X.; Liu, W.; and Liu, Y. 2023. Exploring large language models for communication games: An empirical study on werewolf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04658*.
- Zeng, X.; Wang, Y.; Chiu, T.-Y.; Bhattacharya, N.; and Gurari, D. 2020. Vision skills needed to answer visual questions. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW2): 1–31.
- Zhao, L.; Mei, S.; Kumar, A.; and He, Y. 2024. VIALM: A Survey and Benchmark of Visually Impaired Assistance with Large Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01735*.
- Zhao, Y.; Bennett, C. L.; Benko, H.; Cutrell, E.; Holz, C.; Morris, M. R.; and Sinclair, M. 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*, 1–14.
- Zhao, Y.; Hu, M.; Hashash, S.; and Azenkot, S. 2017. Understanding low vision people’s visual perception on commercial augmented reality glasses. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, 4170–4181.

A Screenshots of Custom Interface for Benchmark of Human Vision Information and Image Perception



B Collection of Images used for the Benchmark Survey




Figure 5: Collections of images that are used for the question in the Image Perception and Recognition section in the survey. In total, there are 25 images that we prepared for the participants, ranging from five scenarios: (1) news + learn, (2) e-commerce + purchase, (3) SNS + find information, (4) travel + planning, and (5) library + sharing information and five types: (i) politician / human, (ii) living room, (iii) bazaar, (iv) mountains, and (v) food. These selections of images are inspired from the types and scenario used in Stangle et. al. In the survey, the participants had to complete the mandatory images before ending the survey that are 10 combinations of images, 2 from each scenario and type (i.e., news-politician, SNS-politician, e-commerce-living room, travel-living room, SNS-bazaar, library-bazaar, travel-mountain, library-mountain, news-food, and e-commerce-food). The mandatory images are highlighted in pink.

Due to the rarity of some combinations (e.g., a politician in an e-commerce setting), and in line with Stangle et. al.’s emphasis on people, their activities, and their surroundings, we substituted these combinations with thematically aligned images.

C Survey Questions

C.1 Demographic Information Section

1. First Name
2. Last Name
3. Birth Year
4. What device are you using currently to complete the survey?
 - (a) Laptop/PC
 - (b) Mobile Phone
 - (c) Tablet
5. What assistive technologies are you currently using to complete the survey?
e.g., Screen reader, Magnifier, etc.

C.2 Section 1 - Brief Vision Information

1. What is your level of vision?
e.g., visual acuity, visual and color perception
2. When did you lose your vision?
 - (a) Congenital (or since birth)
 - (b) Acquired (or later in life)
3. Can you provide more details about your vision onset and how it has progressed over time?
4. What is the cause of your visual impairment?
e.g., the medical diagnosis

C.3 Section 2 - Detailed Vision Information

1. Can you describe in detail how you perceive your surroundings?
2. How would you describe what you see in different lighting conditions (e.g., bright sunlight, dim indoor lighting, nighttime)?
3. Which of the following best describes your visual perception? (Select all that apply)
 - (a) I can see shapes but not details
 - (b) I can see colors but not fine details
 - (c) I rely more on contrast and movement
 - (d) I have light perception but no form vision
 - (e) I have no visual perception
4. In your experience, do you know if your vision or way of experiencing the world is unique compared to others with the same diagnosis? If so, in what ways?
5. How much difficulty do you have doing work or hobbies that require you to see well up close, such as cooking, sewing, fixing things around the house, or using hand tools?
 - (a) No difficulty at all
 - (b) A little difficulty
 - (c) Moderate difficulty
 - (d) Extreme difficulty
 - (e) Stopped doing this because of your eyesight
 - (f) Stopped doing this for other reasons or not interested in doing this
6. How much difficulty do you have finding something on a crowded shelf?
 - (a) No difficulty at all
 - (b) A little difficulty
 - (c) Moderate difficulty
 - (d) Extreme difficulty
 - (e) Stopped doing this because of your eyesight
 - (f) Stopped doing this for other reasons or not interested in doing this
7. How much difficulty do you have seeing how people react to things you say?

- (a) No difficulty at all
- (b) A little difficulty
- (c) Moderate difficulty
- (d) Extreme difficulty
- (e) Stopped doing this because of your eyesight
- (f) Stopped doing this for other reasons or not interested in doing this

C.4 Section 3 - Image Perception and Recognition Questions

Note: The bolded answers are the correct answers.

1. Bazaar - E-commerce + Purchase:

- (a) Q1: What vegetable is in the bottom left corner shelf? {I can't tell, **Cabbage**, Cucumber, Carrot}
- (b) Q2: Is there any tomato in this image? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (c) Q3: Is the place indoor or outdoor? {I can't tell, **Indoor**, Outdoor}
- (d) Q4: Are there any vegetables that are red in this image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people in this image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of boxes that contain banana? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

2. Food - E-commerce + Purchase:

- (a) Q1: Is there any tomato in the image? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (b) Q2: What cutlery the person is holding in the image? {I can't tell, Spoon, Fork, **Chopsticks**}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the bowl? {I can't tell, **Black**, Yellow, Green}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the meat? {I can't tell, White, **Brown**, Red}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of dogs in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of dishes in the image? {I can't tell, **1**, 2, 3}

3. Living Room - E-commerce + Purchase:

- (a) Q1: Is there bowl on the table? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (b) Q2: Is there any cat on in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the sofa? {I can't tell, **Grey**, Blue, Black}
- (d) Q4: What time of the day is it outside the window? {I can't tell, **Day**, Night}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of cushions are there on the sofa? {I can't tell, 2, 3, **5**}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of lamps are there in the image? {I can't tell, **2**, 3, 4}

4. Mountains - E-commerce + Purchase:

- (a) Q1: Are there any trees in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (b) Q2: Are there mountains in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (c) Q3: What time of the day is the image taken, day or night? {I can't tell, **Day**, Night}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the boat? {I can't tell, **Yellow**, Green, Blue}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of birds in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of fishes in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

5. Politician - E-commerce + Purchase:

- (a) Q1: Is there anyone wearing watch? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (b) Q2: What is the man who is looking up holding in his hand? {I can't tell, **Black jacket**, Black bag, Black book}
- (c) Q3: What is the weather like? {I can't tell, Foggy, Rainy, **Sunny**}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the girl's shirt? {I can't tell, Black, **Pink**, White}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people who are standing? {I can't tell, 2, **3**, 4}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of people who are squatting down? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}

6. Bazaar - Library + Share:

- (a) Q1: What is the material of the item(s) the man is holding? {I can't tell, Ceramic, **Wooden**, Plastic}
- (b) Q2: Does the man have any beard? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the man's shirt? {I can't tell, **Navy Blue**, Red, Yellow}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the item the man holding? {I can't tell, **Brown**, Red, Blue}

- (e) Q5: What is the total count of the boxes the man is holding on his hand? {I can't tell, **1**, 2, 3}
(f) Q6: What is the total count of cats in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

7. **Food - Library + Share:**

- (a) Q1: Is the person wearing glasses? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
(b) Q2: What is the person holding on her hand? {I can't tell, Spoon, **Fork**, Chopsticks}
(c) Q3: What is the color of her shirt? {I can't tell, Purple, Green, **White**}
(d) Q4: Is the person indoor or outdoor? {I can't tell, Indoor, **Outdoor**}
(e) Q5: What is the total count of the drinks in the image? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}
(f) Q6: What is the total count of cars in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

8. **Living Room - Library + Share:**

- (a) Q1: What is the cutlery the man is holding? {I can't tell, Spoon, **Fork**, Chopsticks}
(b) Q2: What is the shape of the coffee table? {I can't tell, **Round**, Square, Triangle}
(c) Q3: What is the color of the kid's pants? {I can't tell, Yellow, Green, **Orange**}
(d) Q4: Is the color of the wall different from the sofa? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
(e) Q5: What is the total count of laptops on the table? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}
(f) Q6: What is the total count of phones on the table? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}

9. **Mountains - Library + Share:**

- (a) Q1: What does the person carry on his back? {I can't tell, Fishing rod, Guitar, **Backpack**}
(b) Q2: What is the person doing? {I can't tell, Sitting down and playing musical instruments overlooking the ocean, **Standing up in the middle of the mountain and looking at the scenery**, Laying down sideways while reading a book}
(c) Q3: What is the weather like in the image? {I can't tell, Snowy, **Cloudy**, Sunny}
(d) Q4: What is the color of the man's puffer jacket? {I can't tell, Red, **Blue**, Yellow}
(e) Q5: What is the total count of dogs in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}
(f) Q6: What is the total count of trees in then image? {I can't tell, **0**, 2, Many trees}

10. **Politician - Library + Share:**

- (a) Q1: Is there any car in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
(b) Q2: Is there any plane in the image? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
(c) Q3: How is the weather shown in the image? {I can't tell, Snowy, Cloudy, **Sunny**}
(d) Q4: What is the hair color of the person on the most left? {I can't tell, **Black**, Red, Blonde}
(e) Q5: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, 2, 3, **4**}
(f) Q6: What is the total count of people in the image who is wearing glasses? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}

11. **Bazaar - News + Learn:**

- (a) Q1: Does the market sell any meat? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
(b) Q2: Is there any car in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
(c) Q3: Where is the market located? {I can't tell, Indoor, **Outdoor**}
(d) Q4: What is the weather like in the image? {I can't tell, **Sunny**, Rainy, Cloudy}
(e) Q5: What is the total count of women in this image? {I can't tell, 0, 1, **2**}
(f) Q6: What is the total count of women holding a bottle of water in this image? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}

12. **Food - News + Learn:**

- (a) Q1: Is there anyone have any phone on her/his lap? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
(b) Q2: Does everyone have a hamburger on their plate? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
(c) Q3: What is the color of the table? {I can't tell, **Black**, Yellow, Green}
(d) Q4: What is the color of the shirt of the person sitting on the left side of the cameraman? {I can't tell, Pink, Black, **Grey**}
(e) Q5: What is the total count of people who are sitting down around the table with visible hands? {I can't tell, 2, **3**, 4}
(f) Q6: What is the total count of cups with beer? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}

13. **Living Room - News + Learn:**

- (a) Q1: Is there any plant in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
(b) Q2: What is the item on the table? {I can't tell, **Block toys**, Books, Flowers}

- (c) Q3: What is the color of the big box on the sofa? {I can't tell, Red, **Black**, White}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the kid's shirt? {I can't tell, **Red**, Black, White}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, 2, **3**, 4}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of cups the man is holding? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}

14. **Mountains - News + Learn:**

- (a) Q1: Is there any snow on the ground? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (b) Q2: What are the people doing in the image? {I can't tell, **Walking towards the mountain.**, Laying down on the ground., Chatting while sitting down.}
- (c) Q3: What is the weather like in the image? {I can't tell, **Sunny**, Rainy, Cloudy}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the dog on the right? {I can't tell, **Black**, Brown, White}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of the dogs in the image? {I can't tell, 0, 1, **2**}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, **2**, 3, 4}

15. **Politician - News + Learn:**

- (a) Q1: Is this indoor or outdoor? {I can't tell, Indoor, **Outdoor**}
- (b) Q2: What is the weather like? {I can't tell, **Sunny**, Rainy, Stormy}
- (c) Q3: Are there any tree in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (d) Q4: Is the man standing on the podium wearing glasses? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, 1, 2, **3**}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of the microphones in the image? {I can't tell, **2**, 3, 4}

16. **Bazaar - SNS + Find Info:**

- (a) Q1: Is the person on the most left carrying a bag? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (b) Q2: Which direction the people is walking towards in the image? {I can't tell, Towards the camera, **Left**, Right}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the shirt of the person on the most right? {I can't tell, **White**, Yellow, Green}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the bag which the person on the most right holding? {I can't tell, **White**, Black, Orange}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of individuals with their hair tied? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, **2**, 3, 4}

17. **Food - SNS + Find Info:**

- (a) Q1: What kind of food is shown in the image? {I can't tell, Savory, **Dessert**}
- (b) Q2: Is there any cutlery in the image? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (c) Q3: What is the red fruit topping? {I can't tell, Cherry, **Strawberry**, Watermelon}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the container of the food? {I can't tell, Red, Black, **White**}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of the apples in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

18. **Living Room - SNS + Find Info:**

- (a) Q1: Are there any lamps in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (b) Q2: What is the pattern of the flooring? {I can't tell, **Wooden**, Stone, Concrete}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the armchair? {I can't tell, **Orange**, Black, White}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the wall? {I can't tell, **Beige**, Orange, Green}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of the armchairs in the image? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of mirrors in the image? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}

19. **Mountains- SNS + Find Info:**

- (a) Q1: What is the background scenery of the image? {I can't tell, Flower Park, Waterfall, **Mountain**}
- (b) Q2: Where is the person facing? {I can't tell, **Looking at the background**, Looking at the camera, Looking at the side of the image}
- (c) Q3: What is the weather like? {I can't tell, Foggy, Rainy, **Cloudy**}
- (d) Q4: What color is the girl's hoodies? {I can't tell, **Grey**, Black, Blue}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of dogs in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of birds in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

20. **Politician - SNS + Find Info:**

- (a) Q1: Is there anyone holding a phone? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (b) Q2: What is the mood of the people? {I can't tell, **Happy**, Sad}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the phone? {I can't tell, **Black**, Brown, Green}
- (d) Q4: What color is the suit of the man holding the phone? {I can't tell, Blue, **Black**, Red}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of individuals who are raising their hands? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of people who are sitting down? {I can't tell, 2, **3**, 4}

21. **Bazaar - Travel + Plan:**

- (a) Q1: What kind of stuff is sold in the place? {I can't tell, Clothes, **Food**, Vases}
- (b) Q2: What is the pattern of shirt of the man with glasses and holding a plate on his hand? {I can't tell, Floral, Stripes, **Checkered**}
- (c) Q3: Is there anyone in the image wearing a pink shirt? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the backpack the woman with headgear? {I can't tell, Red, **Black**, White}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people holding a plate in this image? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of cars in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

22. **Food - Travel + Plan:**

- (a) Q1: What is the food placed inside the center bowl? {I can't tell, Rice, **Meat**, Noodle}
- (b) Q2: Is there any nut in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the chili in the image? {I can't tell, **Red**, Green, Yellow}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the table? {I can't tell, **Brown**, Yellow, Red}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of bowls in the image? {I can't tell, 1, **4**, 5}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of chilies on the big bowl in the middle? {I can't tell, **1**, 4, 5}

23. **Living Room - Travel + Plan:**

- (a) Q1: Is there any painting on the wall in this image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (b) Q2: Is there any book on the table? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (c) Q3: What is the color of the sofa? {I can't tell, **White**, Yellow, Blue}
- (d) Q4: Is the light on? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 3, 5}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of cats in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

24. **Mountains - Travel + Plan:**

- (a) Q1: Is there any duck in the lake? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (b) Q2: Is there any lake in the image? {I can't tell, **Yes**, No}
- (c) Q3: What is the weather like? {I can't tell, Snowy, **Cloudy**, Raining}
- (d) Q4: What is the color of the roof of the most right house? {I can't tell, Green, **Dark Brown**, Yellow}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of houses with an aged or off-white appearance in the image? {I can't tell, 0, **1**, 2}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of people in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 1, 2}

25. **Politician - Travel + Plan:**

- (a) Q1: Is there any bird in the image? {I can't tell, Yes, **No**}
- (b) Q2: What are the facial expressions of the people sitting on the bench? {I can't tell, **Happy and engaged in conversation**, Serious and deep in thought, Bored and uninterested}
- (c) Q3: Is the image taken indoor or outdoor? {I can't tell, Indoor, **Outdoor**}
- (d) Q4: What is the hair color of the girl sitting at the most right of the bench? {I can't tell, Blond, **Black**, Red}
- (e) Q5: What is the total count of people who are sitting down on the bench and having conversation? {I can't tell, 2, **3**, 4}
- (f) Q6: What is the total count of balloons in the image? {I can't tell, **0**, 3, 5}

D Prompt Template

The figure illustrates the prompt template used in our analysis. The template is organized into three parts: (1) a system prompt that describes the vision context from participant information and the role the agent should adopt; (2) a user prompt that states the task instruction and may or may not include example responses for image perception and recognition tasks; and (3) a closing instruction that specifies the format and content expected from the VLMs. To assemble a complete prompt, the user selects one option from the dashed rectangles contained within each corresponding solid rectangle in the diagram.




Figure 6: The figure shows the prompt template used in our analysis. Overall, each prompt consists of two main components: a system prompt and a user prompt. The system prompt can include vision information at one of three levels of detail: (1) No or minimal vision information, which serves as a baseline with no vision-related content; (2) Diagnosis-only, which includes a brief diagnostic statement; and (3) Brief + Detailed vision information, which provides a full vision profile derived from the participant's response in the Detailed Vision Information section. The user prompt provides prediction instructions (with or without example inclusion) and prediction format. In the figure, dashed rectangles represent optional components within the solid rectangles components.

E Prompt Combinations used for Agent Evaluation

As discussed in Section 4.1, we design 16 prompts for our performance analysis. These prompts are created by combining different combinations of vision information, example, and type of responses. Below, we will present all the prompt combinations used our analysis, following the template shown:

Prompt X = {Vision Information}{Example}{Type of Responses}

The field Vision Information may include one or more items from diagnosis, brief, detailed. The Example field may contain one or more items from unrelated, type, scenario, multiple. The Type of Responses field may include either one or both of open-ended, multiple-choice. An empty set of curly brackets indicates that the prompt does not include any item for that specific field.

E.1 Prompt Combinations

```
Prompt 1 = {diagnosis}{}{}
Prompt 2 = {brief}{}{}
Prompt 3 = {brief, detailed}{}{}
Prompt 4 = {}{}{open-ended, multiple-choice}
Prompt 5 = {brief, detailed}{unrelated}{open-ended}
Prompt 6 = {brief, detailed}{unrelated}{multiple-choice}
Prompt 7 = {brief, detailed}{unrelated}{open-ended, multiple-choice}
Prompt 8 = {brief, detailed}{type}{open-ended}
Prompt 9 = {brief, detailed}{type}{multiple-choice}
Prompt 10 = {brief, detailed}{type}{open-ended, multiple-choice}
Prompt 11 = {brief, detailed}{scenario}{open-ended}
Prompt 12 = {brief, detailed}{scenario}{multiple-choice}
Prompt 13 = {brief, detailed}{scenario}{open-ended, multiple-choice}
Prompt 14 = {brief, detailed}{multiple}{open-ended}
Prompt 15 = {brief, detailed}{multiple}{multiple-choice}
Prompt 16 = {brief, detailed}{multiple}{open-ended, multiple-choice}
```