

# Discriminative Representation learning via Attention-Enhanced Contrastive Learning for Short Text Clustering

Zhihao Yao<sup>a,1</sup>, Bo Li<sup>a,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Harbin Engineering University, Harbin, 150001, China

## Abstract

Contrastive learning has gained significant attention in short text clustering, yet it has an inherent drawback of mistakenly identifying samples from the same category as negatives and then separating them in the feature space (false negative separation), which hinders the generation of superior representations. To generate more discriminative representations for efficient clustering, we propose a novel short text clustering method, called Discriminative Representation learning via Attention-Enhanced Contrastive Learning for Short Text Clustering (AECL). The AECL consists of two modules which are the pseudo-label generation module and the contrastive learning module. Both modules build a sample-level attention mechanism to capture similarity relationships between samples and aggregate cross-sample features to generate consistent representations. Then, the former module uses the more discriminative consistent representation to produce reliable supervision information for assist clustering, while the latter module explores similarity relationships and consistent representations optimize the construction of positive samples to perform similarity-guided contrastive learning, effectively addressing the false negative separation issue. Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed AECL outperforms state-of-the-art methods. The code is available at: <https://github.com/YZH0905/AECL-STC>.

**Keywords:** short text clustering, representation learning, contrastive learning, attention mechanism

## 1. Introduction

Text clustering plays a crucial role in various real-world applications, such as recommendation systems [1], information retrieval [2], etc. Its goal is to group text data into different clusters without supervised information so that intra-cluster data are similar and inter-cluster data are distinct. Short text clustering, a subfield of text clustering, has gained increasing importance due to the growing prevalence of short text communications on the internet. However, the short length of the texts results in insufficient discriminative information, leading to low-discriminative representations when extracting text features, which makes short text clustering a particularly challenging task. Therefore, extracting more distinctive representations is crucial in the study of short text clustering.

Over the past years, most short text clustering algorithms mainly focus on exploring different distance metric methods [3, 4]. However, due to the limited capability in feature extraction, these efforts often do not yield satisfactory results. Since deep learning excels in representation learning, methods based on deep learning [5]




Figure 1: Conventional contrastive learning only considers augmented views from one sample as positive pairs, which leads to false negative separation (as shown in the green samples). Our method optimizes the construction of positive samples by leveraging semantic similarity, effectively addressing the false negative separation problem.

employed a decoupled approach to perform representation learning and clustering processes. However, the two components of these methods are often decoupled, which may result in representations extracted by the former being unsuitable for the latter [6, 7]. Recently, contrastive learning greatly improved the quality of short text representations, enhancing short text clustering [8].

The basic idea of contrastive learning is to learn discriminative representations by pulling positive samples together and pushing negative samples apart in the feature space. In unsupervised field, previous studies identified positive and negative samples using data augmentation techniques[9]. Specifically, for a given sample, only its augmented views are identified as positives, while all other samples are considered negatives. However, this method mistakenly identified samples from the same class as negatives, and then increased the distance between same-class samples in feature space[10], as shown in Figure 1. This issue, referred to as false negative separation in this paper, hinders the generation of superior representations.

To generate more discriminative representations for efficient clustering, we propose an end-to-end short text clustering framework by incorporating an attention mechanism. Specifically, we design a sample-level attention network to capture semantic similarity relationships between samples. Leveraging this semantic similarity, we can optimize the construction of positive samples for contrastive learning by treating samples from the same category as positive pairs, rather than solely considering augmented views from one sample as positive pairs. This method is referred to as *similarity-guided contrastive learning*, and it can effectively address the false negative separation problem. Furthermore, the sample-level attention network can integrate information from similar samples and generate cross-sample representations (i.e., *consistency representations*). These consistent representations capture both the unique features of individual samples and the aggregated semantic information from all samples.

Solving false negative separation and generating consistency representations both promote the formation of the superior representations. Then, we proceed cluster-level contrastive learning and pseudo-label assisted learning for clustering. In the former, we enhance clustering performance by promoting intra-cluster cohesion and inter-cluster separation. In the latter, we use pseudo-labels to provide supervisory information to improve the stability of clustering.

The major contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We propose an end-to-end short text clustering framework that constructs a sample-level attention network to learn semantic similarity between samples and generate consistent representations. By integrating cross-sample features, these consistent representations exhibit notable discriminability, facilitating more effective clustering.

- We explore the semantic similarity and the consistent representations to perform similarity-guided contrastive learning, which effectively addresses the false negative separation problem, hence enhancing the clustering performance.
- We conduct extensive experiments on eight benchmark datasets, and the results demonstrate that the proposed **AECL** achieves state-of-the-art performance.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Contrastive Learning

Contrastive learning demonstrated effective representation learning in self-supervised and unsupervised learning [11, 12]. To define effective positive and negative samples in contrastive learning without supervision, the mainstream method is data augmentation strategies[13]. Specifically, this method first augmented the raw data with multiple views and then treated multiple views of the same sample as positive pairs while views of different samples as negative pairs. For example, SimCSE [14] passes raw data through an Encoder with two different dropouts to generate positive and negative pairs, which can lead to false negative separation. However, this method may consider other samples from the same category as negative examples. To address this issue, SWAV [15] and SELA [16] add uniformity constraints to eliminate the use of negative pairs, but this method does not apply to imbalanced datasets. TCL [10] and CCSSL [17] compare prediction confidence with a threshold to filter out false negative samples. However, this method cannot meet the filtering condition in the early training stages, false negatives are still separated initially, and only partially corrected in later stages.

In contrast, we propose utilizing a sample-level attention mechanism to learn similarities between samples and leverage these similarities to optimize the construction of positive samples, thereby addressing the false negative separation problem.

### 2.2. Short Text Clustering

Research in short text clustering can be divided into three class: vector space statistical methods, deep learning methods, and deep joint clustering methods. Vector space statistical methods use traditional methods like BOW to extract text features [18], these method cannot effectively capture semantic information of texts. Deep learning methods [5] combine deep neural network [19]




Figure 2: Overall structure of AECL. Our model contains two modules: (a) Pseudo-label Generation Module, and (b) Contrastive Learning Module.

with metric clustering algorithms. However, due to the decoupling of the two components, the representations extracted by the former are not necessarily suitable for the latter. Besides, since deep learning methods need to map the entire dataset before performing clustering, this approach cannot be used for online clustering and large-scale datasets. Deep joint clustering methods [20] integrate the representation learning and clustering into a single network, in which the representation learning is driven by the clustering objective.

Most short text clustering methods produce representations containing information from individual samples only. In contrast, we used a sample-level attention mechanism to extract consistent representations based on similarities among a batch of samples. This ensures that the consistent representations not only contain information from individual samples but also aggregate the cross-sample features from all samples.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1. Overall Structure of AECL

AECL consists of two modules, namely *Pseudo-label Generation Module* (PGM) and *Contrastive Learning Module* (CLM), as illustrated in Figure 2. Both modules are composed of an Encoder, a Projecting Network, an Attention Network, and a Clustering Network. The parameters of these networks are shared in both modules.

PGM generates reliable pseudo-labels to assist CLM in clustering, while CLM learns discriminative information from samples to enhance representation quality and enable efficient clustering. To achieve this, PGM employs a confidence-based filtering approach to produce

high-quality pseudo-labels that provide supervised information for CLM. Meanwhile, CLM leverages these pseudo-labels in combination with its own similarity-guided contrastive learning and cluster-level contrastive learning to optimize the model parameters.

#### 3.2. The Pseudo-label Generation Module

Pseudo-labels can provide supervised information to assist unsupervised model in training their parameters [21]. Inspired by this, we employ a confidence-based filtering approach to generate reliable pseudo-labels. An overview of the pseudo-label generation module is shown in Figure 2(a).

Specifically, given a batch of  $N$  text samples, i.e.  $X^{(0)} = [x_1^{(0)}, \dots, x_N^{(0)}]$ , the features extracted by the Encoder are  $V^{(0)} = \Phi(X^{(0)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D_1}$ , where  $D_1$  is the dimensionality of features. Then, we employ the Projecting Network  $G_z$  (fully connected neural networks) to further extract features from the representation as  $Z^{(0)} = G_z(V^{(0)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D_2}$ . The representation learned by this network only contains per-sample individual information, lacking cross-sample semantic information, which is crucial for making sample representations from the same category similar. Inspired by [22, 23], we construct a sample-level attention network to learn similarity relationships between samples and use these similarities to obtain consistent representations. Figure 3 shows the structure of the Attention Network. The input  $Z^{(0)}$  is mapped to different feature spaces by  $W_{K_1}$ ,  $W_{K_2}$  and  $W_T$ :

$$K_1^{(0)} = Z^{(0)}W_{K_1}, K_2^{(0)} = Z^{(0)}W_{K_2}, T^{(0)} = Z^{(0)}W_T, \quad (1)$$

where  $K_1^{(0)}$ ,  $K_2^{(0)}$  and  $T^{(0)}$  are all with dimensionality  $D_2$ .




Figure 3: The structure of Attention aggregation network.  $S^{(0)}$  denotes the similarity matrix among samples.

The similarity matrix  $S^{(0)}$  is:

$$S^{(0)} = \text{Softmax}\left(\frac{K_1^{(0)} K_2^{(0)T}}{\sqrt{D_2}}\right), \quad (2)$$

and the consistent representation  $H^{(0)}$  is as follows:

$$h_i^{(0)} = \sum_{j=1}^N S_{ij}^{(0)} t_j^{(0)}, \quad H^{(0)} = [h_1^{(0)}; h_2^{(0)}; \dots; h_N^{(0)}], \quad (3)$$

where  $t_j^{(0)}$  is the  $j$ th row in  $T^{(0)}$ , and  $S_{ij}^{(0)}$  is the element in  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column in  $S^{(0)}$ . The consistent representation  $H^{(0)}$  encourages samples from the same category have similar representations, which helps the clustering task.

After the Attention Network, we utilize a fully connected neural network  $G_p$  to predict the cluster probability assignments  $P^{(0)} = G_p(H^{(0)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ , where  $M$  is the number of clusters. Pseudo-labels can also be generated based on the probability assignments. Any sample whose maximum cluster probability is greater than a threshold is assigned a pseudo-label [24], which is shown as follows:

$$\hat{y}_i = \text{argmax}(\mathbf{p}_i^{(0)}) \quad \text{if } \max(\mathbf{p}_i^{(0)}) > \text{thres}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\text{thres}$  is set to be 0.95.

In the training process, we observed that the rows of  $P^{(0)}$  become one-hot vectors in a few epochs, which will produce unreliable pseudo-labels in E.q. (4). To address this issue, the entropy of  $P^{(0)}$  is used as a loss function:

$$L_{E1} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M P_{ij}^{(0)} \log P_{ij}^{(0)}. \quad (5)$$

After that, we can acquire reliable pseudo-labels, which can help us to train the CLM module.

### 3.3. Contrastive Learning Module

Data augmentation is essential in contrastive learning [10]. We utilize *EDA augmenter* [25] to generate augmented data  $X^{(1)}$  with the same settings as in [10]. By passing  $X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}$  through network  $G_z, G_h$  and  $G_p$ , one can obtain the representations  $\{Z^{(0)}, Z^{(1)}\}$ , the consistent representations  $\{H^{(0)}, H^{(1)}\}$ , the similarity matrices  $\{S^{(0)}, S^{(1)}\}$ , and the probability assignments  $\{P^{(0)}, P^{(1)}\}$ . Then, we conduct two types of contrastive learning along with pseudo-labels to train the model. The overview of the contrastive learning module is shown in Figure 2(b).

**Similarity-guided contrastive learning:** Previous research found that contrastive learning enhances the discriminability of individual sample representations [8], but the issue of false negative separation emerges. To tackle this issue, we redefine the positive samples, in which samples from the same cluster (with the same predicted results) are treated as positive.

We constructed three contrastive groups in similarity-guided contrastive learning, which are  $\{Z^{(0)}, Z^{(1)}\}$ ,  $\{Z^{(0)}, H^{(0)}\}$  and  $\{Z^{(1)}, H^{(1)}\}$ , respectively. In the first group, the sample pairs  $\{z_i^{(0)}, z_i^{(1)}\}$  are positive, while the other  $2N - 2$  pairs are negative. In the latter two groups, every sample still has  $2N - 2$  negative samples, but its positives consist of samples from the same predicted cluster. Specifically, for the  $i$ th sample, the set of its positive sample indices as:  $\Lambda_i = \{j | \text{argmax}(\mathbf{p}_j^{(0)}) = \text{argmax}(\mathbf{p}_i^{(0)}), j = 1, \dots, N\}$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_i^{(0)}$  represents the  $i$ th row in  $P^{(0)}$ . This method can re-identified false negatives as positives. Of course, this method may also introduce true negatives in  $\Lambda_i$  when  $P^{(0)}$  is inaccurate. Therefore, we weighted the re-identified positive samples using the semantic similarity matrices  $S^{(0)}$  and  $S^{(1)}$ . The training status of the similarity matrix is provided in Section 4.7. The experimental results show that after only a few training epochs, the element in the  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column of the similarity matrix is approximately 0 when the true label  $y_i \neq y_j$ . Thus, even if  $\Lambda_i$  contains true negatives, the impact will be minimized by the similarity matrix.

The loss function for a sample consists of two parts, namely  $l_{1,i}$  and  $l_{2,i}^v$ , where  $l_{1,i}$  is applied to the contrastive pair  $\{Z^{(0)}, Z^{(1)}\}$ , and  $l_{2,i}^v$  is applied to the contrastive pairs  $\{Z^{(0)}, H^{(0)}\}$  and  $\{Z^{(1)}, H^{(1)}\}$ . The specific definition is as



follows:

$$l_{1,i} = \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(0)}, \mathbf{z}_i^{(1)})/\tau_l)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^N [\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(0)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(0)})/\tau_l) + \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(0)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(1)})/\tau_l)]} + \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_i^{(0)})/\tau_l)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^N [\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(1)})/\tau_l) + \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(0)})/\tau_l)]}, \quad (6)$$

$$l_{2,i}^v = \frac{\sum_{j \in \Lambda_i} \mathbf{S}_{ij}^{(v)} \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(v)}, \mathbf{h}_j^{(v)})/\tau_l)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^N [\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(v)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(v)})/\tau_l) + \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(v)}, \mathbf{h}_k^{(v)})/\tau_l)]} + \frac{\sum_{j \in \Lambda_i} \mathbf{S}_{ij}^{(v)} \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i^{(v)}, \mathbf{z}_j^{(v)})/\tau_l)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^N [\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i^{(v)}, \mathbf{h}_k^{(v)})/\tau_l) + \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i^{(v)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(v)})/\tau_l)]}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\tau_l$  is the temperature parameter,  $v \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(0)}, \mathbf{z}_j^{(1)})$  is the cosine similarity between two samples defined as follows:

$$\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i^{(0)}, \mathbf{z}_j^{(1)}) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{z}_i^{(0)}, \mathbf{z}_j^{(1)} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{z}_i^{(0)}\| \|\mathbf{z}_j^{(1)}\|}. \quad (8)$$

The similarity-guided contrastive loss is computed across all samples in a batch as follows:

$$L_l = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{v \in \{0,1\}} -\log(l_{1,i} + l_{2,i}^v). \quad (9)$$

On the one hand, minimizing loss  $L_l$  will train the Attention Network to provide an accurate similarity matrices  $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{S}^{(1)}$ , which can address the issue of false negative separation. On the other hand, eliminating the false negative separation can enhance the model to produce discriminating representations, which improves the quality of similarity matrices  $\mathbf{S}^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{S}^{(1)}$  in the next iteration. These two steps mutually reinforce each other, gradually enhancing the model's performance.

The use of similarity-guided contrastive learning improves the discrimination of representations, laying a promising foundation for clustering. Subsequently, we perform cluster-level contrastive learning to proceed clustering.

**Cluster-level contrastive learning:** We first utilize the Clustering Network  $G_p$  to generate the probability assignments  $\mathbf{P}^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{P}^{(1)}$ . The  $i$ th column of either  $\mathbf{P}^{(0)}$  or  $\mathbf{P}^{(1)}$  can be regarded as a representation of the  $i$ th cluster center. Then, the corresponding columns in both  $\mathbf{P}^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{P}^{(1)}$  form positive pairs, while other columns

form negative pairs. The cluster-level contrastive learning loss function for the  $i$ th cluster is as follows:

$$l_{c,i} = -\log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(0)}, \mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(1)})/\tau_c)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^M [\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(0)}, \mathbf{P}_{:k}^{(0)})/\tau_c) + \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(0)}, \mathbf{P}_{:k}^{(1)})/\tau_c)]} - \log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(1)}, \mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(0)})/\tau_c)}{\sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^M [\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(1)}, \mathbf{P}_{:k}^{(1)})/\tau_c) + \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(1)}, \mathbf{P}_{:k}^{(0)})/\tau_c)], \quad (10)$$

where  $\tau_c$  is the cluster-level temperature parameter,  $\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{P}_{:i}^{(1)}$  are the  $i$ th columns in  $\mathbf{P}^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{P}^{(1)}$ , respectively. The cluster-level contrastive learning loss across all clusters is:

$$L_C = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^M l_{c,i}. \quad (11)$$

Minimizing cluster-level contrastive learning loss can make the columns of the probability assignments distinct from each other. Specific to an individual sample, this loss promotes the sample's probability assignment to each cluster to be more definitive, increasing the high probabilities while decreasing the low ones (sharpening the probability assignment) [10]. However, since the probability assignment is random at the initial stage of training, this sharpening process may introduce errors. To mitigate this issue, we use pseudo-labels generated by the PGM as supervision to guide the adjustment of the probability assignments.

**Pseudo-label assist learning:** We use pseudo-labels as supervised information to identify the category of the samples, and then optimize the probability assignments of the same category samples to converge toward a single one-hot vector, while samples from different categories move toward distinct one-hot vectors. The loss function is shown as follow:

$$L_P = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \text{OneHot}(\hat{y}_i), \log \mathbf{p}_i^{(1)} \rangle, \quad (12)$$

where  $\text{OneHot}(\cdot)$  is the one-hot encoding operator,  $\hat{y}_i$  is the pseudo-label of the  $i$ th sample  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(0)}$  generated by the PGM module, and  $\mathbf{p}_i^{(1)}$  is the probability assignment of the  $i$ th sample  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(1)}$  from the augmented data.

In addition, to avoid degenerating into a trivial solution, in which all samples are clustered into a single cluster, we use an entropy regularization loss function to regularize the mean sample probability in each cluster. The entropy loss function is as follows:

$$L_{E2} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^M (q_j^{(0)} \log q_j^{(0)} + q_j^{(1)} \log q_j^{(1)}), \quad (13)$$

where  $q_j^{(0)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{P}_{ij}^{(0)}$  and  $q_j^{(1)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{P}_{ij}^{(1)}$ . By adjusting the strength of this loss, the model can adapt to datasets with different imbalanced levels.

### 3.4. Putting Together

The overall learning procedure of AECL is shown in Algorithm 1, it contains three training stages. In the first stage, only similarity-guided contrastive learning loss  $L_I$  is used to train our model. After this stage, the Encoder ( $\Phi$ ), Projecting Network ( $G_z$ ), and Attention Network ( $G_h$ ) are trained, the Clustering Network ( $G_p$ ) is untrained.

In the second stage, to prevent the initial  $G_p$  generating incorrect pseudo-labels that could mislead the model through E.q. (12), we initialize the pseudo-labels by performing the K-means algorithm on the original text representations  $V^{(0)}$  and use them to update  $G_p$  through E.q. (12). The total loss function is defined as follow:

$$L = \lambda_1 L_I + \lambda_2 L_P, \quad (14)$$

In the third stage, we use PGM to generate pseudo-labels, and all the loss functions are applied. The total loss function is defined as follows:

$$L = L_C + \lambda_1 L_I + \lambda_2 L_P + \lambda_3 L_{E1} + \lambda_4 L_{E2}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$  and  $\lambda_4$  are weights for each loss.

After training, when input a text  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ , its clustering result is obtained through  $\text{argmax}(\mathbf{p}^{(0)})$ , where  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}$  is the output of the Clustering Network  $G_p$ .

## 4. Experiment

In this section, we conducted extensive experiments to validate our model performance. We also performed ablation studies to assess the importance of each component in our proposed model.

### 4.1. Datasets

We evaluate the performance of the proposed model on eight benchmark datasets, i.e., **AgNews**, **StackOverflow**, **Biomedical**, **SearchSnippets**, **GoogleNews-TS**, **GoogleNews-T**, **GoogleNews-S** and **Tweet**. Table 1 summarizes key information about these datasets. According to the imbalance level of these datasets, AgNews, StackOverflow and Biomedical are regarded as balanced datasets, SearchSnippets is a slightly imbalanced dataset, GoogleNews-TS, GoogleNews-T, GoogleNews-S and Tweet are heavy imbalanced datasets. Brief descriptions of these datasets are provided as follows:

---

### Algorithm 1 AECL

---

- 1: **Input:** Dataset  $\mathcal{X}^{(0)}$ ; number of epochs  $E_1, E_2$ , and  $E_3$ ; batch size  $N$ ; number of clusters  $M$ .
  - 2: **Output:** The trained model.
  - 3: Generate augmented dataset  $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}$  based on  $\mathcal{X}^{(0)}$ .
  - 4: Initialize parameters in network  $\Phi, G_z, G_h$ , and  $G_p$ .
  - 5: **for**  $epoch$  from 1 to  $E_1 + E_2 + E_3$  **do**
  - 6:     Sample a mini-batch  $\mathbf{X}^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{X}^{(1)}$ .
  - 7:     Compute representations  $\{\mathbf{Z}^{(0)}, \mathbf{Z}^{(1)}\}, \{\mathbf{H}^{(0)}, \mathbf{H}^{(1)}\}$ , and probability assignments  $\{\mathbf{P}^{(0)}, \mathbf{P}^{(1)}\}$ .
  - 8:     **if**  $epoch \leq E_1$  **then**
  - 9:         Compute the loss  $\mathcal{L}_I$  by E.q. (9).
  - 10:         Update parameters in  $\Phi, G_z$  and  $G_h$ .
  - 11:     **else if**  $epoch \leq E_1 + E_2$  **then**
  - 12:         Compute pseudo-labels by k-means.
  - 13:         Compute loss  $L = \lambda_1 L_I + \lambda_2 L_P$  by E.q. (14).
  - 14:         Update parameters in  $\Phi, G_z, G_h$ , and  $G_p$ .
  - 15:     **else**
  - 16:         Compute pseudo-labels by  $\hat{y}_i = \text{argmax} \mathbf{p}_i^0$ .
  - 17:         Compute loss  $L = L_C + \lambda_1 L_I + \lambda_2 L_P + \lambda_3 L_{E1} + \lambda_4 L_{E2}$  by E.q. (15).
  - 18:         Update parameters in  $\Phi, G_z, G_h$ , and  $G_p$ .
  - 19:     **end if**
  - 20: **end for**
- 

- **AgNews** is a subset of AG’s news corpus [26]. It comprises 8,000 news titles categorized into four topic areas [27].
- **SearchSnippets** [28] contains 12,340 snippets from eight different classes, extracted from the results of web search transactions.
- **StackOverflow** dataset consists of 20,000 question titles, each associated with one of 20 different tags [5]. These titles were randomly selected from a larger collection of challenge data made available on Kaggle.
- **Biomedical** consists of 20,000 paper titles from 20 different topics [5], selected from the challenge data available on BioASQ’s official website, covering a range of biomedical research areas.
- **GoogleNews** consists of the titles and snippets of 11,109 news articles related to 152 events [29], divided into three datasets: the full dataset **GoogleNews-TS**, only titles **GoogleNews-T**, and only snippets **GoogleNews-S**.
- **Tweet** [29] comprises 2,472 tweets related to 89 queries, originally sourced from the 2011 and 2012 microblog track at the Text Retrieval Conference.

Datasets	S	N	L	R
AgNews	8000	4	23	1
SearchSnippets	12340	8	18	7
StackOverflow	20000	20	8	1
Biomedical	20000	20	13	1
GoogleNews-TS	11109	152	8	143
GoogleNews-T	11109	152	6	143
GoogleNews-S	11109	152	22	143
Tweet	2472	89	22	249

Table 1: A summary of datasets. "S" represent the dataset size; "N" represent the number of categories; "L" represent the average number of words in each documents; "R" represents the size ratio of the largest to the smallest category.

#### 4.2. Experiment Settings

For model configuration, we adopt distilbert-base-nli-stsb-mean-tokens in the Sentence Transformers library [30] as the Encoder. The maximum sentence length of SBERT is 32. The output dimension of the Encoder is  $D_1 = 768$ , while the output dimension of the Projecting Network and Attention Network is  $D_2 = 128$ .

For learning setup, all parameters are optimized by using the Adam optimizer. The learning rate of the Encoder is  $5 \times 10^{-6}$ , while the learning rate of other networks is  $5 \times 10^{-4}$ . All datasets are trained for 70 epochs. The batch size is defined as  $N = 400$ . The similarity-guided temperature parameter and the cluster-level temperature parameter are set to be  $\tau_I = 1$  and  $\tau_C = 0.5$ , respectively.

For experimental status, we implemented our model using PyTorch [31], and conducted the experiments on a Linux system with NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090Ti GPU. The number of parameters in our model is 67.9M, and the training time for all datasets varies, ranging from 10 to 30 minutes.

#### 4.3. Evaluation Metrics

Like previous researches, we utilize two common evaluation metrics, which are accuracy (ACC) and normalized mutual information (NMI), respectively. Accuracy (ACC) is defined as:

$$ACC = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{y_i = \text{map}(\hat{y}_i)}}{N}, \quad (16)$$

where  $y_i$  represents the ground truth label and  $\hat{y}_i$  represents the predicted label for a given text  $x_i$ ,  $\text{map}(\cdot)$  function aligns each predicted label with the corresponding true label by using the Hungarian algorithm [32]. Normalized mutual information (NMI) is defined as:

$$NMI(Y, \hat{Y}) = \frac{I(Y, \hat{Y})}{\sqrt{H(Y)H(\hat{Y})}} \quad (17)$$

where  $Y$  denotes the ground truth labels and  $\hat{Y}$  denotes the predicted labels.

#### 4.4. Baselines

We compare our method with the following short text clustering methods. **BOW** [33] and **TF-IDF** [18] extract BOW and TF-IDF representations from text data, respectively, and implement clustering using the k-means. **STCC** [5] adopts a convolutional neural network to refine the initial representation obtained by word2vec and still uses k-means to obtain the final clustering results. **Self-Train** [34] learns representations using autoencoder and updates its parameters with cluster assignments as guidance. **SCCL** [8] introduces contrastive learning in short text clustering for the first time. It refines the output of the SBERT using contrastive learning. **RSTC** [35] constructs pseudo-labels by solving an optimal transport problem, and the pseudo-labels are utilized in clustering.

In addition to the aforementioned methods, we conducted another experiment called **SBERT**, which performs k-means clustering on the output of SBERT.

#### 4.5. Performance and Analysis

The results on benchmark datasets of various methods are shown in Table 2. From the results, we can conclude the following: (1) Conventional methods (**BOW** and **TF-IDF**) struggle to capture discriminative representations, leading to poor performance. (2) Deep neural network-based methods (**STCC** and **Self-Train**) can cluster more effectively than **BOW** and **TF-IDF** because they can learn efficient representations. (3) **SCCL** and **RSTC** achieve better performance by using contrastive learning to fine-tune pre-trained models. However, contrastive learning can cause false negative separation, which will affect achieve superior results. (4) **AECL** outperforms the previous best results across six datasets and matches the best results on the **Biomedical** and **GoogleNews-T** datasets. These results indicate that our proposed similarity-guided contrastive learning significantly improves clustering performance.

To further analyze the effectiveness of our method, we performed T-SNE visualization of representations to compare prior works and our approach, as illustrated in Figure 4. The results reveal the following: (1) In **SBERT**, all clusters overlap each other, indicating poor separation. (2) **SCCL** shows partial improvement over SBERT with some clusters forming effectively. However, the sample points within the obtained clusters are dispersed, representing lower intra-cluster cohesion. (3) **RSTC** has better intra-cluster cohesion compared to

	AgNews		SearchSnippets		Stackoverflow		Biomedical	
	ACC	NMI	ACC	NMI	ACC	NMI	ACC	NMI
BOW	28.71	4.07	23.67	9.00	17.92	13.21	14.18	8.51
TF-IDF	34.39	12.19	30.85	18.67	58.52	59.02	29.13	25.12
STCC	-	-	76.98	62.56	51.14	49.10	43.37	38.02
Self-Train	-	-	72.69	56.74	59.38	52.81	40.06	34.46
SCCL	83.10	61.96	79.90	63.78	70.83	69.21	42.49	<b>39.16</b>
RSTC	85.99	64.14	79.83	68.76	80.07	72.28	<b>45.69</b>	38.57
SBERT	67.45	32.50	48.87	28.37	58.19	50.55	38.76	32.81
<b>AECL</b>	<b>86.21</b>	<b>64.91</b>	<b>80.58</b>	<b>69.27</b>	<b>83.22</b>	<b>73.12</b>	45.25	38.87
	GoogleNews-TS		GoogleNews-T		GoogleNews-S		Tweet	
	ACC	NMI	ACC	NMI	ACC	NMI	ACC	NMI
BOW	58.79	82.59	48.05	72.38	52.68	76.11	50.25	72.00
TF-IDF	69.00	87.78	58.36	79.14	62.30	83.00	54.34	78.47
SCCL	82.51	93.01	69.01	85.10	73.44	87.98	73.10	86.66
RSTC	83.30	92.62	73.10	<b>87.47</b>	78.11	89.01	77.75	86.07
SBERT	64.1	86.19	55.7	78.28	57.66	80.6	51.98	78.09
<b>AECL</b>	<b>85.45</b>	<b>93.71</b>	<b>74.25</b>	86.16	<b>80.41</b>	<b>89.44</b>	<b>80.46</b>	<b>87.60</b>

Table 2: Experimental results on eight short text datasets. Note that, the RSTC results were reproduced using the configuration provided by the authors, while the remaining baseline results are derived from the reported in the RSTC paper. Bold fonts represent the best results.




Figure 4: T-SNE visualization of the representations on Stackoverflow, each color indicates ground truth category.

SCCL. (4) Our proposed **AECL** achieves the most effectively clustering. The points within each cluster are tightly grouped, and the separation between clusters is highly distinct, indicating strong intra-cluster cohesion and inter-cluster separation. These visualizations confirm that our method learns highly discriminative representations and achieve superior clustering performance.

#### 4.6. Comparison of representation quality

To demonstrate that our model effectively addresses false negative separation, we conducted a comparative study with CCSSL[17] on Tweet dataset. CCSSL is the state-of-the-art method for solving false negative separation problem, which filters false negatives by comparing the prediction confidence with a threshold. This method is the current mainstream approach.

With the help of true labels, we use the cosine similarity between samples of the same class as an evaluation metric. The results are presented in Figure 5, which shows that: (1) The similarity for all three methods increases during the initial stages, resulting from the model’s generalization ability overcoming the issue of false negative separation. (2) CCSSL does not effectively address the false negative issue, resulting in a gradual decrease in similarity over time. (3) Our method effectively addresses false negative separation and significantly enhances the similarity among samples within the same class.

#### 4.7. Verification of the Attention Network aggregation process

As previously discussed, the similarity-guided contrastive learning loss function  $L_I$  can effectively train the




Figure 5: Performance comparison in dealing with false negative separation. The colored areas denote the variances.

similarity matrix of the Attention Network. To validate whether the  $L_I$  loss can achieve this objective, we conducted experiments by training the model using only the  $L_I$  loss on all datasets. Then, based on the true labels, we calculated the average similarity between samples of the different category in the  $S^{(0)}$  matrix as evaluation metric (called negative similarity,  $NS$ ). Specially, for given batch samples, the evaluation metric  $NS$  is calculated as follows:

$$NS = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{y_i \neq y_j} \times S_{ij}^{(0)}}{N}, \quad (18)$$

where  $y_i$  and  $y_j$  are the true labels of the  $i$ th and  $j$ th samples, respectively. The average similarity between samples of the same category (called positive similarity,  $PS$ ) is calculated as follows:

$$PS = 1 - NS. \quad (19)$$

Figure 6 shows the calculated  $NS$  results. For clarity, we divide the experimental results into three figures based on the size of the datasets. We can find that the  $NS \approx 0$  and the  $PS \approx 1$  after brief training, which demonstrates the  $L_I$  loss function can efficiently train the Attention Network. The satisfying similarity matrix  $S^{(0)}$  will help the model save false negative separation. Note that the tweet dataset contains only 2,472 samples, so it requires slightly more epochs.

#### 4.8. Ablation Studies

To verify the importance of each component in our model, we conducted ablation experiments on three themes using **StackOverflow** and **SearchSnippets** datasets.

##### 4.8.1. Effects of addressing false negative separation

To evaluate the impact of addressing false negative separation on the model’s performance, we conduct ablation studies by removing the loss in E.q. (7), this equation is the final implementation for solving false negative separation. The results presented in Table 3, demonstrate that resolving false negative separation significantly enhances the model’s performance.

Datasets	Method	ACC	NMI
SearchSnippets	AECL	<b>80.58</b>	<b>69.27</b>
	No IC	76.42	62.20
StackOverflow	AECL	<b>83.22</b>	<b>73.12</b>
	No IC	78.94	67.51

Table 3: Effect of addressing false negative separation.

##### 4.8.2. Significance of three-stage training

We conducted ablation studies by removing either the first stage (**No Stage 1**) or the second stage (**No Stage 2**) from the training procedure. The results are shown in Table 4, which highlight the critical role of both stages in achieving the strong performance of the **AECL** model.

Datasets	Method	ACC	NMI
SearchSnippets	AECL	<b>80.58</b>	<b>69.27</b>
	No Stage 1	63.01	47.44
	No Stage 2	54.05	46.51
StackOverflow	AECL	<b>83.22</b>	<b>73.12</b>
	No Stage 1	79.59	71.62
	No Stage 2	44.65	48.69

Table 4: Significance of the three-stage training.

##### 4.8.3. Importance of pseudo-label assisted learning

We remove the pseudo-label assisted learning to verify its benefit to our model (**No PG**). Additionally, we eliminate the  $L_{E1}$  loss function to examine the reliability of pseudo-label in the absence of entropy constraints (**No RC**). The results are shown in Table 5, which demonstrate that pseudo-labels play a crucial and positive role, this also proves that the pseudo-labels generated by our model are reliable. Moreover, the entropy constraint further enhances the reliability of the pseudo-labels.




Figure 6: Average similarity curve between samples of different categories on eight benchmark datasets.




Figure 7: The effects of  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$ ,  $\lambda_3$  and  $\lambda_4$  on model accuracy.

Datasets	Method	ACC	NMI
SearchSnippets	AECL	<b>80.58</b>	<b>69.27</b>
	No PG	56.61	47.01
	No RC	79.65	69.17
StackOverflow	AECL	<b>83.22</b>	<b>73.12</b>
	No PG	46.52	40.29
	No RC	82.67	71.33

Table 5: Importance of pseudo-label assisted learning.

#### 4.9. Hyperparameter Analysis of Loss Function

We conducted extensive experiments to verify the effects of  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$ ,  $\lambda_3$  and  $\lambda_4$  with sets of values  $\{0, 5, 10, 15, 20\}$ ,  $\{1, 5, 10, 15\}$ ,  $\{0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.1\}$  and  $\{0.09, 0.18, 0.5, 1, 10\}$ , respectively. The results are presented in Figure 7. Figure 7(a) shows that when  $\lambda_1$  is small, the model fails to learn robust representations, resulting in poor performance. Figure 7(b) demonstrates that the accuracy is not sensitive to  $\lambda_2$ , except for GoogleNews-TS. The reason is that when the assistance provided by pseudo-labels is weak, the parameters of the Clustering Network  $G_p$  in multi-categories tasks cannot be optimized effectively. Figure 7(c) illustrates that the accuracy is not sensitive to  $\lambda_3$ . Figure 7(d) emphasizes the importance of selecting this hyperparameter for datasets with varying imbalance levels.

Although our model has many hyperparameters, the experimental results demonstrate that the model is not sensitive to most of them, which allows the model to

be effectively extended to new datasets. Experimentally, we set  $\lambda_1 = 10$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 5$  and  $\lambda_3 = 0.01$  for all datasets;  $\lambda_4 = 0.09, 0.18$  and  $10$  for heavy imbalanced, slightly imbalanced and balanced datasets, respectively.

#### 4.10. Hyperparameter Analysis of Three Stage Training

In this section, we analyze the remaining hyperparameters  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ . Their values depend on the dataset characteristics:  $E_1$  is determined by the size of datasets, while  $E_2$  is influenced by the number of categories.

According to the size of the dataset, StackOverflow and Biomedical are considered as large datasets, AgNews, SearchSnippets, GoogleNews-TS, GoogleNews-T, and GoogleNews-S are medium datasets, the Tweet is small dataset. Then, we conducted extensive experiments to verify the effects of  $E_1$  on large, medium and small datasets with sets of values  $\{15, 17, 20, 23, 25\}$ ,  $\{2, 6, 10, 15, 20\}$  and  $\{2, 6, 10, 15, 20\}$ , respectively. We conducted experiments using representative datasets StackOverflow, GoogleNews-TS and Tweet datasets, the results are presented in Figure 8. Figure 8(a) and Figure 8(b) illustrate that the model’s performance is insensitive to  $E_1$  on large and medium datasets. Figure 8(c) shows that the ACC has some fluctuations, while the NMI remains relatively stable. The reason may be that the Tweet dataset contains only 2,472 samples, so minor prediction errors can lead to significant variations in ACC. Experimentally, we set  $E_1 = 2, 10$  and  $20$  for large, medium, and small datasets, respectively.






Figure 8: The effects of  $E_1$  on model performance




Figure 9: The effects of  $E_2$  on model performance

According to the number of categories in the dataset, AgNews, SearchSnippets, StackOverflow, and Biomedical are regarded as small-categories datasets, GoogleNews-TS, GoogleNews-T, GoogleNews-S, and Tweet are considered multi-categories datasets. We also conducted experiments using representative datasets StackOverflow, GoogleNews-TS and Tweet datasets. The results are presented in Figure 9. Figure 9(a) illustrates that the model’s performance is insensitive to  $E_2$ . Figure 9(b) and Figure 9(c) illustrate that the model’s performance decreases when the value of  $E_2$  is small. As the value of  $E_2$  increases to a certain level, the model’s performance becomes insensitive to further changes. The reason may be that multi-class datasets require more time to update the Clustering Network  $G_P$  because these datasets have more parameters in  $G_P$ . Experimentally, we set  $E_2 = 1$  for all small-categories datasets and set  $E_2 = 6$  for all multi-categories datasets except Tweet dataset, where we set  $E_2 = 10$ .

## 5. Conclusion

We propose a novel short text clustering model consisting of a pseudo-label generation module and a contrastive learning module. The former generates reliable pseudo-labels to assist the latter and the latter conducts

similarity-guided and cluster-level contrastive learning for clustering. We construct a sample-level attention network, which can learn similarities between samples and produce consistent representations. By leveraging similarities to optimize the construction of positive samples in contrastive learning, the issue of false negative separation is effectively addressed. Extensive experiments demonstrate that the proposed model exhibits superior performance in short text clustering.

## References

- [1] W. Liu, J. Su, C. Chen, X. Zheng, Leveraging distribution alignment via stein path for cross-domain cold-start recommendation, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021) 19223–19234.
- [2] G. Izacard, M. Caron, L. Hosseini, S. Riedel, P. Bojanowski, A. Joulin, E. Grave, Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09118* (2021).
- [3] S. Lloyd, Least squares quantization in pcm, *IEEE transactions on information theory* 28 (1982) 129–137.
- [4] G. Celeux, G. Govaert, Gaussian parsimonious clustering models, *Pattern recognition* 28 (1995) 781–793.
- [5] J. Xu, B. Xu, P. Wang, S. Zheng, G. Tian, J. Zhao, Self-taught convolutional neural networks for short text clustering, *Neural Networks* 88 (2017) 22–31.
- [6] Z. Chen, L. Li, X. Zhang, H. Wang, Deep graph clustering via aligning representation learning, *Neural Networks* 183 (2025) 106927.

- [7] Z. Dou, N. Peng, W. Hou, X. Xie, X. Ma, Learning multi-level topology representation for multi-view clustering with deep non-negative matrix factorization, *Neural Networks* 182 (2025) 106856.
- [8] D. Zhang, F. Nan, X. Wei, S.-W. Li, H. Zhu, K. McKeown, R. Nallapati, A. O. Arnold, B. Xiang, Supporting clustering with contrastive learning, in: North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:232335602>.
- [9] T. Chen, S. Kornblith, M. Norouzi, G. Hinton, A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations, in: International conference on machine learning, PMLR, 2020, pp. 1597–1607.
- [10] Y. Li, M. Yang, D. Peng, T. Li, J. Huang, X. Peng, Twin contrastive learning for online clustering, *International Journal of Computer Vision* 130 (2022) 2205–2221.
- [11] J. Zbontar, L. Jing, I. Misra, Y. LeCun, S. Deny, Barlow twins: Self-supervised learning via redundancy reduction, in: International conference on machine learning, PMLR, 2021, pp. 12310–12320.
- [12] Z. Wang, Y. Du, Y. Wang, R. Ning, L. Li, Deep incomplete multi-view clustering via multi-level imputation and contrastive alignment, *Neural Networks* 181 (2025) 106851.
- [13] C. Shorten, T. M. Khoshgoftaar, B. Furht, Text data augmentation for deep learning, *Journal of big Data* 8 (2021) 101.
- [14] T. Gao, X. Yao, D. Chen, SimCSE: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings, in: M.-F. Moens, X. Huang, L. Specia, S. W.-t. Yih (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 2021, pp. 6894–6910.
- [15] M. Caron, I. Misra, J. Mairal, P. Goyal, P. Bojanowski, A. Joulin, Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020) 9912–9924.
- [16] Y. M. Asano, C. Rupprecht, A. Vedaldi, Self-labelling via simultaneous clustering and representation learning, in: International Conference on Learning Representations, 2020.
- [17] F. Yang, K. Wu, S. Zhang, G. Jiang, Y. Liu, F. Zheng, W. Zhang, C. Wang, L. Zeng, Class-aware contrastive semi-supervised learning, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2022, pp. 14421–14430.
- [18] G. G. Chowdhury, Introduction to modern information retrieval, Facet publishing, 2010.
- [19] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. S. Corrado, J. Dean, Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [20] J. Xie, R. Girshick, A. Farhadi, Unsupervised deep embedding for clustering analysis, in: International conference on machine learning, PMLR, 2016, pp. 478–487.
- [21] W. Hu, C. Chen, F. Ye, Z. Zheng, Y. Du, Learning deep discriminative representations with pseudo supervision for image clustering, *Information Sciences* 568 (2021) 199–215.
- [22] S. Liu, J. Liu, H. Yuan, Q. Li, J. Geng, Z. Yuan, H. Han, Deep contrastive multi-view clustering under semantic feature guidance, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05768* (2024).
- [23] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, I. Polosukhin, Attention is all you need, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [24] S. Park, S. Han, S. Kim, D. Kim, S. Park, S. Hong, M. Cha, Improving unsupervised image clustering with robust learning, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2021, pp. 12278–12287.
- [25] J. Wei, K. Zou, EDA: Easy data augmentation techniques for boosting performance on text classification tasks, in: K. Inui, J. Jiang, V. Ng, X. Wan (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 2019, pp. 6382–6388.
- [26] X. Zhang, J. Zhao, Y. LeCun, Character-level convolutional networks for text classification, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [27] M. R. H. Rakib, N. Zeh, M. Jankowska, E. Milios, Enhancement of short text clustering by iterative classification, in: Natural Language Processing and Information Systems: 25th International Conference on Applications of Natural Language to Information Systems, NLDB 2020, Saarbrücken, Germany, June 24–26, 2020, Proceedings 25, Springer, 2020, pp. 105–117.
- [28] X.-H. Phan, L.-M. Nguyen, S. Horiguchi, Learning to classify short and sparse text & web with hidden topics from large-scale data collections, in: Proceedings of the 17th international conference on World Wide Web, 2008, pp. 91–100.
- [29] J. Yin, J. Wang, A model-based approach for text clustering with outlier detection, in: 2016 IEEE 32nd International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), IEEE, 2016, pp. 625–636.
- [30] N. Reimers, I. Gurevych, Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks, in: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), 2019.
- [31] A. Paszke, S. Gross, S. Chintala, G. Chanan, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, Z. Lin, A. Desmaison, L. Antiga, A. Lerer, Automatic differentiation in pytorch (2017).
- [32] C. H. Papadimitriou, K. Steiglitz, Combinatorial optimization: algorithms and complexity, Courier Corporation, 1998.
- [33] S. Scott, S. Matwin, Text classification using wordnet hypernyms, in: Usage of WordNet in natural language processing systems, 1998.
- [34] A. Hadifar, L. Sterckx, T. Demeester, C. Develder, A self-training approach for short text clustering, in: Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (Repl4NLP-2019), 2019, pp. 194–199.
- [35] X. Zheng, M. Hu, W. Liu, C. Chen, X. Liao, Robust representation learning with reliable pseudo-labels generation via self-adaptive optimal transport for short text clustering, in: A. Rogers, J. Boyd-Graber, N. Okazaki (Eds.), Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 2023, pp. 10493–10507.