

# CPJ: Explainable Agricultural Pest Diagnosis via Caption-Prompt-Judge with LLM-Judged Refinement

Wentao Zhang\*, Tao Fang†, Lina Lu\*, Lifei Wang†, Weihe Zhong†

\*Business School, Shandong University of Technology, Shandong, China

†Institute of International Language Services Studies, Macau Millennium College, Macau SAR, China

**Abstract**—Accurate and interpretable crop disease diagnosis is essential for agricultural decision-making, yet existing methods often rely on costly supervised fine-tuning and perform poorly under domain shifts. We propose Caption-Prompt-Judge (CPJ), a training-free few-shot framework that enhances Agri-Pest VQA through structured, interpretable image captions. CPJ employs large vision-language models to generate multi-angle captions, refined iteratively via an LLM-as-Judge module, which then inform a dual-answer VQA process for both recognition and management responses. Evaluated on CDDMBench, CPJ significantly improves performance: using GPT-5-mini captions, GPT-5-Nano achieves +22.7 pp in disease classification and +19.5 points in QA score over no-caption baselines. The framework provides transparent, evidence-based reasoning, advancing robust and explainable agricultural diagnosis without fine-tuning. Our code and data are publicly available.<sup>1</sup>

**Index Terms**—Agricultural VQA, Crop Disease Diagnosis, Explainable AI, Vision-Language Models, LLM-as-a-Judge

## I. INTRODUCTION

Accurate and interpretable crop disease diagnosis is critical for agricultural decision-making. Conventional vision models (e.g., YOLO) only provide categorical labels without integrating essential context such as environment or crop variety, hindering practical utility as real-world diagnosis demands deeper reasoning combining visual evidence and expert knowledge. The opacity of such black-box systems undermines trust, emphasizing the need for explainable AI (XAI) [1].

Advanced large vision-language models (LVLMs), such as Qwen-VL and GPT-series, demonstrate strong performance in open-domain visual question answering (VQA) [2], [3]. Yet when applied to Agri-Pest VQA, these models often rely on raw image data alone, resulting in incomplete interpretations that miss critical diagnostic details distinguishing pathogen types. Domain-specific approaches like ITLMLP for cucumber disease recognition [4] and multimodal foundation models for agricultural applications [5] show promising directions but lack comprehensive explainability frameworks.

Existing works, including multimodal datasets like AgMMU and CDDM [6], [7], focus on fine-tuning [8], [9] for accuracy but neglect structured explainability, leading to unreliable

outputs under domain shifts [10]. Without intermediate representations, models cannot connect visual cues to causal explanations, reducing interpretability and robustness.

We propose enhancing Agri-Pest VQA with explicit, interpretable image captions as auxiliary inputs. We employ a larger LVLM to generate multi-angle descriptive captions detailing plant types, disease symptoms, severity, and uncertainties. These captions act as transparent intermediates, augmenting the model’s understanding like human experts verbalizing observations before diagnosis, thereby improving explainability through traceable, human-readable artifacts [11].

We propose the **Caption-Prompt-Judge (CPJ)** framework, a training-free pipeline leveraging LLM-as-a-Judge self-refined captions for debiased, evidence-grounded Agri-Pest VQA. As illustrated in Fig. 1, CPJ operates through: (i) generative interpretable captioning with iterative refinement via LLM-as-a-Judge, (ii) caption-informed VQA using task-specific prompts, and (iii) answer selection based on diagnostic validity and practical relevance.

Evaluated on CDDMBench [7] using lightweight LVLMs (Qwen-VL-Chat, GPT-5-Nano), CPJ achieves significant improvements via strict keyword matching for classification and LLM-based scoring for QA. GPT-5-Nano with GPT-5-mini captions achieves **+22.7** pp in disease classification and **+19.5** points in QA score over baselines, demonstrating enhanced accuracy and transparency without supervised fine-tuning.

Our contributions include:

- **Framework:** A training-free CPJ framework prioritizing interpretability through iteratively refined captions, enabling transparent diagnostic reasoning and addressing the gap between black-box predictions and explainable AI needs.
- **Methodology:** Integration of multi-angle descriptions with LLM-as-a-Judge refinement and dual-answer VQA generation, bridging visual-semantic gaps while maintaining objectivity through crop/disease name exclusion in caption prompts.
- **Empirical Validation:** Comprehensive evaluation on CDDMBench showing significant gains: GPT-5-Nano achieves +22.7pp in disease classification and +19.5 points in QA score with GPT-5-mini captions, with human expert validation (94.2% agreement, Cohen’s  $k = 0.88$ ) confirming LLM-as-a-Judge reliability.

Corresponding Author: Tao Fang; Email: taofang@mmc.edu.mo

Co-corresponding Author: Lina Lu; Email: 3050651@qq.com

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/CPJ-Agricultural/CPJ-Agricultural-Diagnosis>




Fig. 1. Overview of the “CPJ” pipeline for explainable Agri-Pest VQA, featuring three cohesive stages: (i) **Generative Explanational Captioning**: A large vision-language model analyzes input crop disease images to generate multi-angle descriptive captions detailing plant morphology, disease symptoms, severity levels, and diagnostic uncertainties. These captions undergo iterative refinement via LLM-as-a-Judge evaluation to ensure accuracy, completeness, and neutrality. (ii) **Task-Specific Prompt-Based VQA Generation**: Using the refined captions alongside original images and few-shot exemplars, the VQA model generates dual complementary answers addressing both disease recognition (crop type, disease identification, visual features) and actionable management guidance (treatment methods, prevention strategies). (iii) **LLM-as-a-Judge Answer Selection**: A stronger LLM evaluates both candidate answers against reference answers using multi-dimensional criteria (factual accuracy, completeness, specificity, practical relevance), selecting the superior response to deliver reliable, interpretable diagnostic recommendations.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Agricultural Vision-Language Models

Recent advancements in Vision-Language Models (VLMs) have enabled domain-specific adaptations for agricultural disease diagnosis. Traditional approaches to crop disease identification relied on handcrafted features and classical machine learning [12], but the advent of deep learning, particularly Vision Transformers (ViT) [13], has significantly improved classification accuracy. Pre-trained language models have also shown promise in agricultural text classification tasks [14]. Zhu et al. [15] comprehensively review VLM applications in agriculture, covering pest detection, weed identification, and seed quality assessment, while addressing challenges such as data scarcity, domain shift, and training efficiency. Specialized models like AgroGPT and AgriGPT-VL [16] demonstrate the efficacy of domain-specific training: Yang et al. train AgriGPT-VL on the large-scale Agri-3M-VL dataset via a progressive curriculum from text grounding to multimodal alignment, achieving state-of-the-art performance on agricultural benchmarks. Similarly, AgriVLM [17] integrates ViT and ChatGLM via Q-Former with LoRA fine-tuning, achieving over 90% accuracy in crop growth stage and disease recognition through parameter-efficient adaptation. Few-shot learning approaches [18] further enhance model adaptability in low-resource scenarios, while specialized agricultural tasks benefit from vision language model leveraging [19].

Benchmark evaluations reveal significant challenges in agricultural VQA [20]. Shinoda et al. [21] introduce AgroBench, an expert-annotated benchmark covering 203 crop and 682 disease categories across seven tasks, revealing that over 50% of errors stem from lack of domain-specific knowledge. Ra-

nario and Earles [22] benchmark 27 agricultural classification tasks, finding that zero-shot VLMs underperform supervised baselines and that multiple-choice prompting significantly outperforms open-ended generation. While large-scale datasets (e.g., MIRAGE [23], CDDMBench [7], AgMMU [6]) enable supervised fine-tuning (SFT) methods to achieve strong in-domain performance [24], these approaches tend to overfit narrow distributions and lack transparent reasoning. This limits their robustness to domain shifts (e.g., geography, season) and scalability in resource-limited agricultural settings [10].

### B. Explainable AI in Vision-Language Models

The opacity of VLMs necessitates explainability frameworks to enhance transparency and trustworthiness across diverse domains. Dinga et al. employ Shapley Values to interpret VLM-generated map descriptions, quantifying region-specific contributions to textual outputs and revealing how map labels and scale influence caption accuracy [25]. In medical imaging, Kamal et al. integrate U-Net, Vision Transformer, and Medical Language Graphs with LRP and LIME to interpret image captioning models, improving transparency in diagnostic report generation [26]. Masala and Leordeanu introduce GEST, a spatio-temporal event graph framework for explainable video description, converting structured graphs into natural language to enhance interpretability in vision-to-language tasks [27]. Natarajan and Nambiar’s VALE [28] combines SHAP, SAM, and VLMs to generate visual-textual rationales for image classification via prompt engineering. Saakyan et al. [29] investigate VLMs’ figurative meaning comprehension via the V-FLUTE dataset, framing it as explainable visual entailment. Park et al. [30] explore MLLMs for interface understanding, demonstrating cross-domain vision-language reasoning.

The LLM-as-a-Judge paradigm [31] has emerged as a powerful evaluation mechanism across diverse AI tasks, including code understanding and translation quality assessment. Our CPJ framework extends these XAI and evaluation principles to agricultural diagnosis, employing structured captions and LLM-based refinement to enhance interpretability without domain-specific annotations.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### A. Image Interpretability and Caption Enhancement

**Motivation.** Raw agricultural images often contain subtle visual cues that are difficult for models to interpret directly—such as early-stage lesions, minor discoloration, or texture variations indicative of nutrient deficiencies. Existing vision-language models, while powerful in open-domain tasks, may overlook these domain-specific details when processing images end-to-end. By explicitly generating detailed, structured captions as an intermediate step, we provide the model with a richer semantic context that highlights critical diagnostic features, thereby improving both accuracy and interpretability.

To achieve high-quality visual question answering (VQA) in agriculture, we enhance semantic descriptions of input crop images using multimodal large models without fine-tuning. Leveraging few-shot prompting, our method generates detailed captions including morphological traits (leaf shape, texture, size), symptom characteristics (lesion patterns, discoloration, necrosis), and developmental stages. These captions serve as rich, interpretable intermediate representations that bridge the semantic gap between raw pixel data and agricultural domain knowledge.

**Bias Mitigation.** To minimize bias in subsequent VQA, prompts explicitly exclude crop or disease names, focusing on objective morphological and symptomatic features. This prevents premature diagnostic conclusions and ensures captions remain neutral observations.

The initial caption, generated via a vision-language model (VLM) with few-shot prompting, is:

$$C_0 = \mathcal{M}_{\text{VLM}}(I, P_{\text{few}}), \quad (1)$$

where  $I$  is the image and  $P_{\text{few}}$  is the prompt template.

A large language model (LLM) evaluates caption quality  $s(C_0)$  based on **accuracy, completeness, and neutrality** [32]. Captions below the threshold  $\tau = 8.0$  are refined:

$$C^* = \begin{cases} C_0, & s(C_0) \geq \tau, \\ \mathcal{M}_{\text{VLM}}(I, \mathcal{R}(C_0)), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$  provides targeted refinement instructions. This iterative process ensures captions are interpretable and semantically dense, forming a robust foundation for VQA tasks.

#### B. Explanational caption-Optimized VQA

Using refined captions from stage one, we implement a multimodal VQA pipeline [33] for crop disease classification and knowledge answering. Given input  $X = (I, C^*, Q)$ , where

$Q$  is the query, the VQA model generates two complementary answers:

$$A = \{A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}\} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{VQA}}(X, P_{\text{task}}), \quad (3)$$

where  $P_{\text{task}}$  is the task-specific prompt template.

1) *Crop Disease Classification Task:* This task identifies crop species and disease type through joint analysis of visual and textual data. Two complementary outputs ensure comprehensive recognition: 1). Pest/disease identification: Symptoms, severity, and characteristic features of the plant and disease. 2). Crop identification: Specific crop type, variety, and distinctive morphological traits.

2) *Crop Disease Knowledge Question Answering Task:* This task generates actionable agricultural knowledge with expert-level prompts [6]. Outputs include: 1). Treatment, prevention, and control recommendations with specific methods. 2). Disease explanation: Symptoms, etiology, and lifecycle mechanisms.

Prompts ensure **two complementary answers** per query, addressing both recognition and explanation. Few-shot examples include images, explanatory captions, questions, and the two-answer structure to maintain contextual consistency. Prompt engineering supports zero- to five-shot settings, ensuring scalability and efficiency.

#### C. LLM-as-a-Judge Answer Selection

To enhance robustness and reduce uncertainty in VQA outputs, we introduce an LLM-as-a-Judge stage that evaluates and selects the most reliable answer from dual-answer candidates, addressing hallucination mitigation and completeness verification.

A stronger LLM (e.g., GPT-4) evaluates both VQA answers using multi-dimensional criteria  $\Omega$ . For the disease diagnosis task, criteria include: (i) *plant accuracy* (correct crop species identification), (ii) *disease accuracy* (correct disease/pest identification), (iii) *symptom accuracy* (precise symptom description), (iv) *format adherence* (both plant and disease information present), and (v) *completeness* (comprehensive and professional response). For the knowledge QA task, criteria encompass: (i) *accuracy* (scientifically correct information), (ii) *completeness* (covers all relevant aspects), (iii) *specificity* (precise details on rates, timings, methods), (iv) *practicality* (actionable for farmers), and (v) *scientific validity* (evidence-based with proper terminology). Each criterion is scored, and the total score guides selection:

$$\text{Score}(A) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} g_{\omega}(A, A_{\text{ref}}), \quad (4)$$

where  $g_{\omega}(\cdot)$  is the scoring function for criterion  $\omega$ , and  $A_{\text{ref}}$  is the reference answer.

The answer with the highest score is selected:

$$A^* = \arg \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Score}(A). \quad (5)$$

The LLM provides an evaluation report detailing strengths and weaknesses of each answer, key differences from the reference, and justifications for scoring decisions, ensuring diagnostic transparency. The system outputs  $A^*$  and the evaluation report, delivering reliable recommendations.

TABLE I  
 PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF QWEN-VL-CHAT AND GPT-5-NANO ACROSS TWO EXPLANATORY CAPTIONS GENERATED BY QWEN2.5-VL-72B-INSTRUCT AND GPT-5-MINI ON THE CDDMBENCH DATASET FOR TWO TASKS. STRATEGIES INCLUDE “EXPLANATIONAL CAPTION” (OPTIMIZED CAPTIONS), “EXPLANATIONAL CAPTION + FEW-SHOT” (WITH IN-CONTEXT EXAMPLES), AND “+LLM-AS-A-JUDGE” (SELECTING THE BEST OF TWO ANSWERS PER QUESTION). SCORES REPRESENT THE HIGHEST OF TWO CANDIDATES, WITH BEST RESULTS IN **BOLD** FOR EACH TYPE OF MODEL.

Model	Crop Disease Diagnosis		Crop Disease Knowledge QA
	Crop Classification	Disease Classification	
Generated Explanation Caption (Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct)			
Qwen-VL-Chat (Liu et al. (2024) Baseline)	28.40%	5.00%	41
Qwen-VL-Chat (Our Baseline)	28.55%	5.80%	41.5
Qwen-VL-Chat (Explanational Caption)	29.30%	12.10%	46.5
Qwen-VL-Chat (+few shot)	53.39%	24.49%	50
<b>Qwen-VL-Chat (+llm-as-a-judge)</b>	<b>54.90%</b>	<b>25.39%</b>	<b>51</b>
Gpt-5-Nano (Our Baseline)	47.00%	11.00%	65
Gpt-5-Nano (Explanational Caption)	51.20%	31.40%	75.5
Gpt-5-Nano (+few-shot)	50.10%	31.00%	74.5
<b>Gpt-5-Nano (+llm-as-a-judge)</b>	<b>53.20%</b>	<b>32.80%</b>	<b>76</b>
Generated Explanation Caption (GPT-5-mini)			
Qwen-VL-Chat (Explanational Caption)	28.99%	7.17%	44
Qwen-VL-Chat (+few-shot)	51.00%	14.50%	49
<b>Qwen-VL-Chat (+llm-as-a-judge)</b>	<b>51.60%</b>	<b>14.80%</b>	<b>49.5</b>
Gpt-5-Nano (Our Baseline)	47.00%	11.00%	65
Gpt-5-Nano (Explanational Caption)	60.30%	31.60%	84
Gpt-5-Nano (+few-shot)	58.90%	29.80%	76
<b>Gpt-5-Nano (+llm-as-a-judge)</b>	<b>63.38%</b>	<b>33.70%</b>	<b>84.5</b>

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS AND ANALYSIS

##### A. Dataset and Evaluation

We evaluate our framework on the CDDMBench dataset [7] across two tasks, following the original evaluation settings, metrics, and test splits.

For the **Crop Disease Diagnosis** task, the test set includes 3,000 images withheld from training. Each explanatory question pair assesses the model’s ability to identify crop and disease types, with performance measured by keyword matching in responses.

For the **Crop Disease Knowledge QA** task, the test set contains 20 questions spanning 10 crop disease types, paired with images. Responses are scored by GPT-4 on usefulness, relevance, and accuracy (1–10), with scores normalized to a 100-point scale. All evaluation protocols strictly adhere to [7].

##### B. Model Selection and Settings

To enhance interpretability, we employ two large vision-language models, Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct and GPT-5-mini, to generate explanatory descriptive captions for each input image. These captions describe plant type, disease symptoms, severity, and uncertainties. Each caption is evaluated by the same model acting as an LLM-as-a-Judge, and those scoring below 8 out of 10 are refined iteratively. For VQA, we use the 7B Qwen-VL-Chat model and GPT-5-Nano under few-shot settings, with key parameters set as: *Qwen-VL-Chat* (temperature: 0.5, max\_tokens: 400, top\_p: 0.8, max\_retries: 3) and *GPT-5-Nano* (reasoning\_effort: medium, verbosity: low, max\_retries: 3, timeout: 30). The final answer is selected by GPT-5 as LLM-as-a-Judge Answer Selection based on

accuracy and specificity without image access to avoid bias. Our framework is implemented using LangChain [34]–[36] for prompt management, model execution, and pipeline design. All models are accessed via API.

##### C. Main Results

Table I compares Qwen-VL-Chat and GPT-5-Nano on Crop Disease Diagnosis and Crop Disease Knowledge QA tasks across various caption strategies. The combination of Explanational Caption, few-shot prompting, and LLM-as-a-Judge delivered the best performance for both models.

**Overall Performance.** Using GPT-5-mini captions, GPT-5-Nano achieved best results at 63.38%, 33.70%, and 84.5, representing gains of +22.7pp in disease classification and +19.5 points in QA over baselines. With Qwen2.5-VL-72B captions, Qwen-VL-Chat scored 54.90%, 25.39%, and 51.0, while GPT-5-Nano scored 53.20%, 32.80%, and 76.0.

**Model-Specific Patterns.** GPT-5-Nano benefits more from caption quality while Qwen-VL-Chat exhibits stronger in-context learning from few-shot prompting. This suggests reasoning-focused models rely more on caption quality for grounding, while vision-centric models benefit more from example-based learning, with ablation results in Sec. IV-D.

**Cross-Caption Generator Analysis.** GPT-5-mini captions outperform Qwen2.5-VL-72B captions (+9.08pp crop, +2.10pp disease), indicating caption generation capability directly influences downstream performance. Few-shot prompting shows differential effects: Qwen-VL-Chat gains substantially (+24.10pp crop), while GPT-5-Nano shows minor decreases (-1.40pp crop), suggesting vision-centric models ben-




Fig. 2. Performance trends in the ablation study using Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct with Explanational Captions (EC). The abbreviations are as follows: EC for Explanational Caption, CC for Crop Classification, DC for Disease Classification, CDK for Crop Disease Knowledge, Qwen for Qwen-VL-Chat, and GPT for GPT-5-Nano.

efit more from visual patterns while reasoning models leverage captions effectively in zero-shot settings.

#### D. Ablation Study

This section examines component-wise contributions from Sec. IV-C. As shown in Fig. 2, both Qwen-VL-Chat and GPT-5-Nano steadily benefit from optimized captions, few-shot prompting, and LLM-as-a-Judge. We perform ablations under the *Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct* caption setting to quantify each module’s role.

**Baseline → Unoptimized Captions.** For Qwen-VL-Chat, unoptimized captions slightly improve Crop Classification (+0.05 pp) but significantly enhance Disease Classification (+6.20 pp) and QA (+4.0). GPT-5-Nano shows larger improvements (+1.90 pp / +19.20 pp / +7.5), indicating higher sensitivity to contextual information.

**Caption Optimization.** Iterative refinement boosts Qwen-VL-Chat by +0.70 pp / +0.10 pp / +1.0 and GPT-5-Nano by +2.30 pp / +1.20 pp / +3.0, demonstrating benefits from higher semantic density and reduced label leakage.

**Few-shot Prompting.** Qwen-VL-Chat achieves the largest boost at three-shot (+22.50 pp / +19.40 pp / +7.8), showing strong in-context learning capabilities. GPT-5-Nano shows smaller changes, suggesting robust baseline reasoning.

**Five-shot + LLM-as-a-Judge.** Best results: Qwen-VL-Chat reaches 54.90%, 25.39%, and 51.0; GPT-5-Nano achieves 52.40%, 32.50%, and 73.0. The LLM-as-a-Judge stage effectively filters hallucinations and selects factually complete answers, enhancing diagnostic reliability.

#### E. Qualitative Analysis and Error Patterns

To understand CPJ’s performance mechanisms, we analyze 150 sampled predictions. Table II categorizes behaviors into success cases and common error patterns.

**Success mechanisms.** Explanational Captions enable precise pathogen identification by translating visual symptoms into structured semantic features. For bacterial leaf spot, caption descriptions such as “necrotic lesions, yellow halos” directly map to pathogen-specific diagnostic criteria, enabling accurate treatment protocols. LLM-as-a-Judge shows strong factuality verification (73% vs. 51% correctness), effectively filtering hallucinations through multi-criteria scoring.

TABLE II  
ERROR PATTERN ANALYSIS WITH FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FROM 150 SAMPLED PREDICTIONS. THE TABLE PRESENTS SUCCESS CASES AND FOUR PRIMARY ERROR CATEGORIES: EARLY-STAGE AMBIGUOUS SYMPTOMS (18%), CO-INFECTION CONFUSION (12%), LOW CAPTION QUALITY (8%), AND JUDGE BIAS TOWARD VERBOSITY (5%).

Category	Description & Frequency
Success Case	Bacterial leaf spot: Caption “necrotic lesions, yellow halos” → correct diagnosis (9/10 QA)
Error:Ambiguous	Early-stage subtle symptoms (~18%)
Error:Co-infection	Mixed diseases confuse prediction (~12%)
Error:Caption quality	Low-quality captions degrade VQA (~8%)
Error:Judge bias	Favors verbose responses (~5%)

**Failure modes.** The dominant error (18%) stems from early disease stage ambiguity, where minimal visual symptoms provide insufficient diagnostic evidence even after caption enhancement. Co-infection scenarios (12%) require multi-label architectures. Caption quality issues (8%) correlate with image artifacts (blur, occlusion, lighting), suggesting adaptive preprocessing. Judge bias (5%) indicates need for length-normalized scoring.

#### V. CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS

We proposed a parameter-free, environment-adaptive generate–judge–select pipeline for agricultural VQA, coupling debiased, optimized captions with a two-answer VQA design and an LLM-as-a-Judge selector. On CDDMBench, the framework improves recognition and knowledge QA without SFT: GPT-5-mini captions help GPT-5-Nano achieve 63.38% (Crop), 33.70% (Disease), and 84.5 (QA); Qwen-VL-Chat attains 54.90%, 25.39%, and 51.0, outperforming caption-free baselines. The method is lightweight, reproducible, and enhances interpretability through structured evidence and rubric-based judgments. By decomposing the diagnostic process into explicit captioning, dual-answer generation, and meta-evaluation stages, CPJ provides practitioners with transparent reasoning chains that connect visual observations to actionable recommendations, fostering trust and enabling informed decision-making in AI-driven agricultural decision support systems across diverse farming contexts.

Limitations include sensitivity to caption quality, judge bias toward verbose responses, and lack of temporal/multi-view context. Caption refinement significantly mitigates quality issues, yet edge cases with severe image degradation remain challenging. The current framework operates on single images, limiting its ability to capture disease progression or environmental variations across time and spatial scales. Future work will explore knowledge-grounded verification, uncertainty calibration, multi-image and multilingual settings, cross-regional adaptation, and on-device deployment for field applications in resource-constrained environments.

## REFERENCES

[1] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Bennetot, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbado, Salvador Garcia, Sergio Gil-Lopez, Daniel Molina, Richard Benjamins, et al., “Explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible ai,” *Information fusion*, vol. 58, pp. 82–115, 2020.

[2] Kunpeng Zhang, Li Ma, Beibei Cui, Xin Li, Boqiang Zhang, and Na Xie, “Visual large language model for wheat disease diagnosis in the wild,” *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, vol. 227, pp. 109587, 2024.

[3] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi, “Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 19730–19742.

[4] Yiyi Cao, Lei Chen, Yuan Yuan, and Guangling Sun, “Cucumber disease recognition with small samples using image-text-label-based multi-modal language model,” *Computers and electronics in agriculture*, vol. 211, pp. 107993, 2023.

[5] Chenjiao Tan, Qian Cao, Yiwei Li, Jielu Zhang, Xiao Yang, Huaqin Zhao, Zihao Wu, Zhengliang Liu, Hao Yang, Nemin Wu, et al., “On the promises and challenges of multimodal foundation models for geographical, environmental, agricultural, and urban planning applications,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17016*, 2023.

[6] Aruna Gauba, Irene Pi, Yunze Man, Ziqi Pang, Vikram S Adve, and Yu-Xiong Wang, “Agmmu: A comprehensive agricultural multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10568*, 2025.

[7] Xiang Liu, Zhaoxiang Liu, Huan Hu, Zezhou Chen, Kohou Wang, Kai Wang, and Shiguo Lian, “A multimodal benchmark dataset and model for crop disease diagnosis,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 157–170.

[8] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al., “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.

[9] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al., “Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 23716–23736, 2022.

[10] Mojdeh Saadati, Aditya Balu, Shivani Chiranjeevi, Talukder Zaki Jubery, Asheesh K Singh, Soumik Sarkar, Arti Singh, and Baskar Ganapathysubramanian, “Out-of-distribution detection algorithms for robust insect classification,” *Plant Phenomics*, vol. 6, pp. 0170, 2024.

[11] Jianhua Wei, Qiang Li, Shuo Wang, and Hao Chen, “Lightweight vision-language models for agricultural disease diagnosis with explainable visual representations,” *Agricultural Systems*, vol. 223, pp. 103928, 2025.

[12] Surender Kumar and Rupinder Kaur, “Plant disease detection using image processing-a review,” *International Journal of Computer Applications*, vol. 124, no. 16, 2015.

[13] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al., “An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.

[14] Sargam Yadav and Abhishek Kaushik, “Comparative study of pre-trained language models for text classification in smart agriculture domain,” in *Advances in Data-driven Computing and Intelligent Systems: Selected Papers from ADCIS 2022, Volume 2*, pp. 267–279. Springer, 2023.

[15] Hongyan Zhu, Shuai Qin, Min Su, Chengzhi Lin, Anjie Li, and Junfeng Gao, “Harnessing large vision and language models in agriculture: A review,” 2024.

[16] Bo Yang, Yunkui Chen, Lanfei Feng, Yu Zhang, Xiao Xu, Jianyu Zhang, Nueraili Aierken, Runhe Huang, Hongjian Lin, Yibin Ying, and Shijian Li, “Agrigpt-vl: Agricultural vision-language understanding suite,” 2025.

[17] Piaofang Yu and Bo Lin, “A framework for agricultural intelligent analysis based on a visual language large model,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 18, pp. 8350, 2024.

[18] Yueyue Zhou, Hongping Yan, Kun Ding, Tingting Cai, and Yan Zhang, “Few-shot image classification of crop diseases based on vision-language models,” *Sensors*, vol. 24, no. 18, pp. 6109, 2024.

[19] Muhammad Arbab Arshad, Talukder Zaki Jubery, Tirtho Roy, Rim Nassiri, Asheesh K Singh, Arti Singh, Chinmay Hegde, Baskar Ganapathysubramanian, Aditya Balu, Adarsh Krishnamurthy, et al., “Leveraging vision language models for specialized agricultural tasks,” in *2025 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 6320–6329.

[20] Ke Su et al., “A survey on multimodal visual question answering: Datasets, methods and challenges,” *Pattern Recognition*, 2022.

[21] Risa Shinoda, Nakamasa Inoue, Hirokatsu Kataoka, Masaki Onishi, and Yoshitaka Ushiku, “Agrobench: Vision-language model benchmark in agriculture,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2025, pp. 7634–7644.

[22] Earl Ranario and Mason J Earles, “Are vision-language models ready to zero-shot replace supervised classification models in agriculture?,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.15977*, 2025.

[23] Vardhan Dongre, Chi Gui, Shubham Garg, Hooshang Nayyeri, Gokhan Tur, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, and Vikram S Adve, “Mirage: A benchmark for multimodal information-seeking and reasoning in agricultural expert-guided conversations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.20100*, 2025.

[24] Tian Yang, Yupeng Mei, Ling Xu, Huihui Yu, and Yingyi Chen, “Application of question answering systems for intelligent agriculture production and sustainable management: A review,” *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, vol. 204, pp. 107497, 2024.

[25] Güren Tan Dinga and Jochen Schiewe, “What do you see? an xai approach for vlm-generated map descriptions,” *Advances in Cartography and GIScience of the ICA*, vol. 5, pp. 12, 2025.

[26] Md Sarwar Kamal, Sonia Farhana Nimmy, Md Rafiqul Islam, and Usman Naseem, “Explainable medical image captioning,” in *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, 2025, pp. 2253–2261.

[27] Mihai Masala and Marius Leordeanu, “From vision to language through graph of events in space and time: An explainable self-supervised approach,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.04815*, 2025.

[28] Purushothaman Natarajan and Athira Nambiar, “Vale: A multimodal visual and language explanation framework for image classifiers using explainable ai and language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12808*, 2024.

[29] Arkadiy Saakyan, Shreyas Kulkarni, Tuhin Chakrabarty, and Smaranda Muresan, “Understanding figurative meaning through explainable visual entailment,” in *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2025, pp. 1–23.

[30] Seokhyeon Park, Yumin Song, Soohyun Lee, Jaeyoung Kim, and Jinwook Seo, “Leveraging multimodal llm for inspirational user interface search,” in *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2025, pp. 1–22.

[31] Haitao Li, Qian Dong, Junjie Chen, Huixue Su, Yujia Zhou, Qingyao Ai, Ziyi Ye, and Yiqun Liu, “Llms-as-judges: a comprehensive survey on llm-based evaluation methods,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05579*, 2024.

[32] Liannmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhang-hao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al., “Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 36, pp. 46595–46623, 2023.

[33] Liqiong Wang, Teng Jin, Jinyu Yang, Ales Leonardis, Fangyi Wang, and Feng Zheng, “Agri-llava: Knowledge-infused large multimodal assistant on agricultural pests and diseases,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.02158*, 2024.

[34] Sangeetha Annam, Merry Saxena, Ujjwal Kaushik, and Shikha Mittal, “Langchain: Simplifying development with language models,” *Textual Intelligence: Large Language Models and Their Real-World Applications*, pp. 287–304, 2025.

[35] Oguzhan Topsakal and Tahir Cetin Akinci, “Creating large language model applications utilizing langchain: A primer on developing llm apps fast,” in *International conference on applied engineering and natural sciences*, 2023, vol. 1, pp. 1050–1056.

[36] Dharin Dave, Yash Agarwal, Harshraj Chouhan, and Sakshi Jambhulkar, “Learning in langchain,” in *World Congress on Smart Computing: Proceedings of WCSC 2024*. Springer Nature, 2025, p. 29.