

Enhanced Short Text Modeling: Leveraging Large Language Models for Topic Refinement

Shuyu Chang*

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
shuyu_chang@njupt.edu.cn

Peng Ren

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
1022041122@njupt.edu.cn

Rui Wang*

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
rui_wang@njupt.edu.cn

Haiping Huang[†]

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications
hhp@njupt.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Crafting effective topic models for brief texts, like tweets and news headlines, is essential for capturing the swift shifts in social dynamics. Traditional topic models, however, often fall short in accurately representing the semantic intricacies of short texts due to their brevity and lack of contextual data. In our study, we harness the advanced capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) to introduce a novel approach termed "Topic Refinement". This approach does not directly involve itself in the initial modeling of topics but focuses on improving topics after they have been mined. By employing prompt engineering, we direct LLMs to eliminate off-topic words within a given topic, ensuring that only contextually relevant words are preserved or substituted with ones that fit better semantically. This method emulates human-like scrutiny and improvement of topics, thereby elevating the semantic quality of the topics generated by various models. Our comprehensive evaluation across three unique datasets has shown that our topic refinement approach significantly enhances the semantic coherence of topics.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Information extraction; Natural language generation.**

KEYWORDS

Topic modeling, Topic refinement, Large language models, Short texts, Prompt engineering

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

[†]Corresponding author.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
XX '24, 2024, XX

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

ACM Reference Format:

Shuyu Chang, Rui Wang, Peng Ren, and Haiping Huang. 2024. Enhanced Short Text Modeling: Leveraging Large Language Models for Topic Refinement. In *Proceedings of XX (XX '24)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Short texts, such as online comments and news headlines, are influential in shaping public opinion and mirroring social trends [13, 27, 28]. Analyzing these texts can uncover underlying patterns and topics, providing insights into social discourse. Topic modeling emerges as a valuable tool to extract topics from vast data [9, 19]. Nevertheless, the sparsity of context in short texts poses substantial challenges for conventional topic models [1, 24]. This brevity leads to low information density [14], making it difficult to accurately capture and represent the semantics of discussed topics.

Some advancements in existing methods have been made to alleviate data sparsity. Early studies [3, 8] address this challenge by enriching word co-occurrence within the corpus, thus discovering broader linguistic patterns. Later, researchers begin to incorporate external knowledge sources [5, 6, 10, 26], like word embeddings [20, 21, 31], into topic modeling to sufficiently capture semantic relationships. Another line of work focuses on generating quantified topic distributions tailored for short texts [22, 23]. These methods effectively aggregate short texts with similar topics into the same topic distribution. Recently, contrastive learning has been explored to further mitigate the effects of data sparsity [7, 11, 30]. These models rely on data augmentation to learn from both similar and dissimilar text pairs, thereby enhancing the learning signals from short texts. Despite these advancements, existing methods frequently yield suboptimal semantic coherence of topics and impair their interpretability in practical applications.

To narrow these gaps, we turn to the booming and widely concerned Large Language Models (LLMs) such as PaLM [4], GPT [2, 12], and others. With their unprecedented semantic comprehension and generating capabilities [16, 17, 25], trained across extensive datasets, LLMs are expected to further improve the quality of topic modeling for short texts. Capitalizing on this potential, we introduce a novel model-agnostic mechanism: **Topic Refinement**. More concretely, we focus not on involving in topic mining but rather leverage LLMs via prompt engineering to refine topics initially




Figure 1: Overview of topic refinement ($N = 10$): ①Prompt Construction; ②LLM Request and Response; ③Iterative Refinement.

mined by base topic models. This mechanism systematically iterates over each topic and constructs prompts to request LLMs. It sequentially assumes a word as the potential intruder word in a topic while the remaining words represent that topic. Prompts with LLMs are then employed to identify the topic and assess if the word aligns with the semantic expression of the other words. If alignment is confirmed, the word is retained; otherwise, coherent words are generated as candidates to replace the intruder word. Essentially, topic refinement mimics the human process of identifying, evaluating, and refining the extracted topics to make them more coherent and easier for users to discern.

Overall, the main contributions of our work are as follows:

- We introduce Topic Refinement, a model-agnostic mechanism for short text topic modeling, pioneering a new pathway to improve topic quality after initial mining.
- Topic refinement innovatively integrates LLM-based prompt engineering with diverse topic models to precisely refine and optimize the representative words for each topic.
- Extensive experiments are conducted on three short text datasets to evaluate the effectiveness of our mechanism, particularly in enhancing the semantic coherence of topics.

2 PROPOSED METHOD

2.1 Problem Definition

Topic refinement aims to enhance the semantic coherence and clarity of topics generated from base topic models for short texts. Formally, given a set of topics $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K\}$ discovered by a base topic model, each topic consists of N representative words, denoted by $t_i = \{w_{i1}, w_{i2}, \dots, w_{iN}\}$, where $1 \leq i \leq K$. Within this context, an intruder word is defined as a word within a topic that is not semantically coherent with the other words, thus disrupting the coherence. The topic refinement mechanism seeks to transform each topic t_i into a refined topic t'_i by correcting such intruder words w_{ij} in its word set t_i . This transformation is guided by a refinement function \mathcal{R} , which determines whether to retain or replace the potentially intruder word w_{ij} in t_i as follows:

$$\mathcal{R} : (t_i \setminus \{w_{ij}\}, w_{ij}) \rightarrow w'_{ij}, \quad (1)$$

where w'_{ij} is the alternative word for topic t_i . We propose to model the refinement function via LLMs, leveraging their advanced capabilities in understanding and generating.

User Prompt:

Please analyze the following tasks and provide your answer in the specified format.

1. Determine the common topic shared by these words: [$\langle \text{TOPIC_WORDS} \rangle$].
2. Assess whether the word " $\langle \text{WORD} \rangle$ " aligns with the same common topic as the words listed above.

Respond with:

- "Yes", if the given word shares the common topic.
- If "No", suggest 10 single-word alternatives that are commonly used and closely related to this topic. These words should be easily recognizable and distinct from the ones in the provided list.

Format your response in JSON, including the fields "Topic", "Answer", and "Alternative words" (only if the answer is "No").

Figure 2: LLM prompt template for topic refinement.

2.2 Technical Details of Topic Refinement

Figure 1 depicts the overall architecture of our topic refinement mechanism. Prior to this mechanism, we extract a set of topics $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K\}$ and the vocabulary V from short texts through a base topic model. This base model can utilize existing methods in the field, such as probabilistic topic models or neural topic models. Consequently, our mechanism unfolds in three phases: prompt construction, LLM request and response, and iterative refinement.

Prompt Construction. Prompt engineering serves as the direct way to guide and control the output generated by LLMs. To model the refinement function \mathcal{R} , our prompt template is designed to guide LLMs to find intruder words in each topic and generate alternative words related to this topic. Given the topic t_i and the words $\{w_{i1}, w_{i2}, \dots, w_{iN}\}$ in it, we structure the prompt template into two tasks. Firstly, we employ LLM \mathcal{M} to identify the common topic shared by the $\langle \text{TOPIC_WORDS} \rangle$, which is represented by words $t_i \setminus \{w_{ij}\}$. Later, LLM \mathcal{M} assesses whether the word w_{ij} , denoted as $\langle \text{WORD} \rangle$, is semantically consistent with the previously determined common topic. In cases of inconsistency, LLM \mathcal{M} is also tasked with suggesting ten commonly used words closely related to that topic as candidate alternatives. For the clarity and diversity of topics, these candidate words should be easily recognizable and distinctly different from those in the provided list. Moreover, to facilitate subsequent processing of generated results, the prompt

Table 1: Main results on three datasets. TR refers to the topic refinement mechanism.

Base Models	AGNews					TagMyNews					YahooAnswer				
	C_A	C_P	C_V	UCI	$NPMI$	C_A	C_P	C_V	UCI	$NPMI$	C_A	C_P	C_V	UCI	$NPMI$
LDA	0.174	0.220	0.373	0.062	0.036	0.189	0.237	0.391	0.021	0.038	0.190	0.278	0.378	0.510	0.063
+ TR	0.200↑	0.330↑	0.394↑	0.472↑	0.064↑	0.216↑	0.384↑	0.409↑	0.615↑	0.077↑	0.220↑	0.364↑	0.396↑	0.776↑	0.086↑
BTM	0.166	0.153	0.367	-0.034	0.023	0.177	0.142	0.389	-0.594	0.005	0.172	0.185	0.365	0.219	0.036
+ TR	0.205↑	0.349↑	0.395↑	0.702↑	0.074↑	0.216↑	0.357↑	0.409↑	0.445↑	0.066↑	0.204↑	0.308↑	0.389↑	0.527↑	0.065↑
G-BAT	0.181	0.192	0.398	-0.622	0.012	0.216	0.332	0.407	0.302	0.061	0.213	0.265	0.399	0.304	0.062
+ TR	0.204↑	0.337↑	0.403↑	0.215↑	0.056↑	0.237↑	0.414↑	0.424↑	0.719↑	0.087↑	0.235↑	0.386↑	0.415↑	0.730↑	0.090↑
CNTM	0.266	0.469	0.448	0.744	0.101	0.293	0.515	0.475	0.608	0.103	0.294	0.534	0.455	1.311	0.141
+ TR	0.279↑	0.528↑	0.458↑	1.019↑	0.118↑	0.303↑	0.575↑	0.484↑	1.029↑	0.124↑	0.301↑	0.554↑	0.461↑	1.420↑	0.147↑
TSCTM	0.205	0.155	0.437	-1.705	-0.022	0.209	0.153	0.465	-1.911	-0.027	0.215	0.234	0.437	-0.919	0.016
+ TR	0.238↑	0.379↑	0.442↑	-0.001↑	0.060↑	0.242↑	0.332↑	0.468↑	-0.568↑	0.039↑	0.239↑	0.394↑	0.442↑	0.173↑	0.072↑
BERTopic	0.228	0.295	0.442	-0.458	0.038	0.217	0.287	0.459	-1.090	0.012	0.252	0.421	0.448	0.533	0.094
+ TR	0.257↑	0.433↑	0.451↑	0.401↑	0.083↑	0.235↑	0.416↑	0.469↑	-0.257↑	0.054↑	0.258↑	0.457↑	0.451↑	0.730↑	0.105↑
ECRTM	0.203	0.125	0.443	-2.387	-0.053	0.190	0.086	0.451	-2.623	-0.064	0.247	0.315	0.454	-0.829	0.027
+ TR	0.254↑	0.464↑	0.447↑	0.243↑	0.072↑	0.235↑	0.347↑	0.443	-0.509↑	0.036↑	0.292↑	0.496↑	0.470↑	0.590↑	0.099↑

template also enforces the format of generated texts to be in JSON. The prompt template is defined as $p = \text{Prompt}(\langle \text{TOPIC_WORDS} \rangle, \langle \text{WORD} \rangle)$, which is used to construct each iteration of prompts p for LLM \mathcal{M} . The details of the prompt template are presented in Figure 2.

LLM Request and Response. After constructing the prompt $p = \text{Prompt}(t_i \setminus \{w_{ij}\}, w_{ij})$, we initiate requests to LLM \mathcal{M} for its response. Essentially, the LLM models the topic refinement function by estimating the conditional probability of the generated text: $P_{\text{LLM}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n \mid p)$, where (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) is the generated word sequence with variable lengths. The generated sequence, formatted in JSON, is then converted into our desired results by a simple mapping function $(r_1, r_2, r_3) = f(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$. r_1 represents the topic identified by LLM \mathcal{M} , typically composed of one word or phrase summarizing this topic. r_2 is the judgment of whether the $\langle \text{WORD} \rangle$ in the prompt p is semantically coherent with the identified topic, with the response being either "Yes" or "No". r_3 is a list of ten candidate words for replacement, generated only if r_2 is "No"; otherwise, it remains empty. The process above is formalized as follows:

$$(r_1, r_2, r_3) = \mathcal{M}(p) = \mathcal{M}(\text{Prompt}(t_i \setminus \{w_{ij}\}, w_{ij})). \quad (2)$$

Iterative Refinement. This phase, informed by the results from LLM \mathcal{M} , selects a more coherent alternative to replace the intruder word when necessary. If r_2 indicates that a word w_{ij} lies outside the semantic boundary of the topic t_i , a list of ten alternative words is generated in r_3 . From this list, the alternative word w'_{ij} is selected based on its inclusion in the vocabulary V . If none of the alternative words are found in the vocabulary, the mechanism opts for the most semantically similar word from V , which is not already included in the topic t_i . This ensures that the alternative word w'_{ij} is not only semantically coherent but also retains the lexical integrity of the dataset. The process iterates over each word in a topic in reverse order, for words are generally arranged according to topic relevance. By the end of this iteration, we arrive at a refined set of topics t'_i . The specific procedure of the topic refinement mechanism is demonstrated in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Topic Refinement Mechanism

Input: a set of topics T , vocabulary V , large language model \mathcal{M}

Output: refined topics $T' = \{t'_1, t'_2, \dots, t'_K\}$

- 1: Initialize the set of refined topics $T' \leftarrow \emptyset$;
- 2: **for** each topic t_i in T **do**
- 3: Initialize the refined topic $t'_i \leftarrow t_i$;
- 4: **for** each word $(w_{iN}, w_{i(N-1)}, \dots, w_{i1})$ in t'_i **do**
- 5: Construct the prompt $p \leftarrow \text{Prompt}(t_i \setminus \{w_{ij}\}, w_{ij})$;
- 6: Generate the answer (r_1, r_2, r_3) by Eq. 2;
- 7: **if** the answer r_2 is "NO" **then**
- 8: Select the alternative word w'_{ij} from r_3 and V ;
- 9: Replace w_{ij} in topic t'_i with w'_{ij} ;
- 10: **else**
- 11: Retain w_{ij} in topic t'_i ;
- 12: **end if**
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **end for**

3 EXPERIMENTS

3.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We employ the following short text datasets for evaluation: (1) **AGNews** [29]: more than one million news articles across four categories gathered by ComeToMyHead. We randomly sample 5,000 article titles from each category for experiments. (2) **TagMyNews** [18]: news titles from various news sources, annotated with seven labels. (3) **YahooAnswer** [29]: ten categories of questions and their corresponding best answers from the Yahoo Answers website. Similar to AGNews, we sample 2,500 question titles from each category. Table 2 shows the statistics of these datasets after preprocessing with reference to Wu et al. [23].

Table 2: Statistics of datasets after preprocessing.

Datasets	#Docs	#Labels	#Vocab.	Avg. Length
AGNews	14,845	4	3,290	4.268
TagMyNews	27,369	7	4,325	4.483
YahooAnswer	12,258	10	3,423	4.151




Figure 3: Ablation study results with various LLMs. The error bars denote a 95% confidence interval for the statistical variability of results across seven base models.

Base Models. We utilize the topic refinement with the following base topic models: (1) **LDA** [1] that uses Gibbs sampling for parameter estimation and inference, with GibbsLDA++¹ implementation in our experiment. (2) **BTM** [3] that is designed for short texts to enrich word co-occurrence within them². (3) **Gaussian-BAT** [20] that incorporates word relatedness information by multivariate Gaussian modeling of topics. (4) **CNTM** [11] that leverages contrastive learning and word embedding to capture semantic patterns of documents³. (5) **TSCTM** [23] that is based on contrastive learning with quantified sampling strategies to improve topic quality in short texts⁴. (6) **BERTopic** [6] that utilizes pre-trained transformer-based language models to extract topics⁵. (7) **ECRTM** [21] that forces each topic embedding to be the center of a word embedding cluster in the semantic space via optimal transport⁶. It is noteworthy that we consider both probabilistic topic models, such as LDA and BTM, and advanced variants of neural topic models that integrate external knowledge. All base models are executed with their recommended hyperparameters.

Evaluation Metrics. Following previous mainstream work, we evaluate the topic quality by topic coherence metrics, measuring the coherence between the N words of discovered topics. We adopt the widely-used Palmetto⁷ to calculate these coherence metrics C_A , C_P , C_V , UCI , and $NPMI$ [15], with higher values indicating better topic quality. This library employs Wikipedia articles as a reference corpus to estimate the co-occurrence probabilities of words.

Implementation details. For our topic refinement mechanism, we use GPT-3.5-turbo as the LLM \mathcal{M} and set its temperature as 0 to lower the completion randomness. Keeping with prior work, each topic t_i mined by base topic models is represented by N words, where N is typically set to 10.

3.2 Main Results

We utilize base topic models with $K = 20$ and 50 for experiments in this part. The average results, as depicted in Table 1, reveal the effectiveness of the topic refinement mechanism across various datasets and base models. Notably, incorporating topic refinement consistently enhances the topic coherence of all base models, with

increases in nearly every evaluated metric. This improvement is especially pronounced in AGNews and TagMyNews datasets, where base models initially showed lower performance metrics. In effect, topic refinement indirectly mitigates the challenges of data sparsity in short texts by refining topics. Even for base models that initially exhibited high coherence, like CNTM and BERTopic, topic refinement also boosts their performance. Collectively, the uniform advancements prove the model-agnostic nature of our mechanism.

Moreover, Table 3 presents the average token costs for each topic across various datasets, showcasing the efficiency of our mechanism. The input token costs are relatively consistent across datasets due to the similar prompts. Interestingly, the output token costs suggest differences in the complexity of topic modeling for each dataset. For instance, the YahooAnswer dataset, which already exhibited relatively higher-quality topics in the base models, requires fewer tokens for refinement. The implication is that datasets with lower modeling complexity require less intervention from our mechanism.

Table 3: Average token costs for each topic.

Datasets	Input tokens	Output tokens
AGNews	1589.89	264.21
TagMyNews	1595.61	274.46
YahooAnswer	1579.12	226.27

3.3 Ablation Study and Visualization

We additionally carry out ablation studies to evaluate the impact of different LLMs, such as PaLM2, GPT-3.5, Gemini Pro, and GPT-4, on the TagMyNews dataset with $K = 20$. Figure 3 provides a detailed comparison of coherence metrics and the number of altered words within the topics after topic refinement. The implementation of all tested LLMs clearly improves topic coherence, underscoring the efficacy and robustness of our mechanism. It is noteworthy that LLMs with more recent and superior capabilities exhibit a better performance for refinement, with GPT-4 emerging as the most effective among them. Although Gemini Pro and GPT-4 yield comparable results in coherence metrics, GPT-4 shows fewer alterations in the topics, indicating its precision in refining topics.

Figure 4 displays the coherence visualization of ECRTM’s [21] topics on the AGNews dataset with $K = 20$. In the visualization, we compute the metric $NPMI$ for each word in a topic against the other $N - 1$ words to assess word coherence. Figure 4a compares the

¹The GibbsLDA++ is available at <https://gibbslda.sourceforge.net>.

²The code of BTM is available at <https://github.com/xiaohuiyan/BTM>.

³The code of CNTM is available at <https://github.com/nguyentthong/CLNTM>.

⁴The code of TSCTM is available at <https://github.com/bobxwu/TSCTM>.

⁵The implementation of BERTopic is available at <https://maartengr.github.io/BERTopic>.

⁶The code of ECRTM is available at <https://github.com/BobXWu/ECRTM>.

⁷The Palmetto library is available at <https://github.com/dice-group/Palmetto>.




Figure 4: Coherence visualization.

$NPMI$ for individual words within the topics before and after refinement, indicated by w_{ij} and w'_{ij} , respectively. The heatmaps show a visible shift towards higher values after refinement to evidence the enhancement in word-topic relatedness. Figure 4b further contrasts the average $NPMI$ from base topics to refined topics, while the refined topics generally reveal more positive $NPMI$ values. This improvement is proved by the error bars with 95% confidence interval, which are notably tighter for the refined topics.

4 CONCLUSION

This paper explores the potential of using LLMs to enhance the topic modeling quality in short texts. Our innovative mechanism, Topic Refinement, utilizes prompt engineering with LLMs to identify and correct semantically intruder words within extracted topics. Extensive experiments across the three datasets and seven base topic models conclusively demonstrate the effectiveness of this mechanism. Future research could involve the dynamic adjustment of the topic modeling process based on LLM feedback, directly tackling the challenge of data sparsity in short texts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62102192) and the Postgraduate Research & Practice Innovation Program of Jiangsu Province (KYCX23_1077).

REFERENCES

- [1] David M. Blei, Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. 2003. Latent Dirichlet Allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 3 (2003), 993–1022.
- [2] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 1877–1901.
- [3] Xueqi Cheng, Xiaohui Yan, Yanyan Lan, and Jiafeng Guo. 2014. BTM: Topic Modeling over Short Texts. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 26, 12 (2014), 2928–2941.
- [4] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2023. PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, 240 (2023), 1–113.
- [5] Robert Churchill, Lisa Singh, Rebecca Ryan, and Pamela Davis-Kean. 2022. A Guided Topic-Noise Model for Short Texts. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. ACM, 2870–2878.
- [6] Maarten Grootendorst. 2022. BERTopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based TF-IDF procedure. arXiv:2203.05794
- [7] Sungwon Han, Mingi Shin, Sungkyu Park, Changwook Jung, and Meeyoung Cha. 2023. Unified Neural Topic Model via Contrastive Learning and Term Weighting. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1794–1809.
- [8] Chenliang Li, Haoran Wang, Zhiqian Zhang, Aixin Sun, and Zongyi Ma. 2016. Topic Modeling for Short Texts with Auxiliary Word Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. ACM, 165–174.
- [9] Lihui Lin, Hongyu Jiang, and Yanghui Rao. 2020. Copula Guided Neural Topic Modelling for Short Texts. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. ACM, 1773–1776.
- [10] Yu Meng, Yunyi Zhang, Jiaxin Huang, Yu Zhang, and Jiawei Han. 2022. Topic Discovery via Latent Space Clustering of Pretrained Language Model Representations. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. ACM, 3143–3152.
- [11] Thong Nguyen and Anh Tuan Luu. 2021. Contrastive Learning for Neural Topic Model. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 11974–11986.
- [12] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training Language Models to Follow Instructions with Human Feedback. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 27730–27744.
- [13] Jianhui Pang, Yanghui Rao, Haoran Xie, Xizhao Wang, Fu Lee Wang, Tak-Lam Wong, and Qing Li. 2021. Fast Supervised Topic Models for Short Text Emotion Detection. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 51, 2 (2021), 815–828.
- [14] Jipeng Qiang, Zhenyu Qian, Yun Li, Yunhao Yuan, and Xindong Wu. 2022. Short Text Topic Modeling Techniques, Applications, and Performance: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 34, 3 (2022), 1427–1445.
- [15] Michael Röder, Andreas Both, and Alexander Hinneburg. 2015. Exploring the Space of Topic Coherence Measures. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. ACM, 399–408.
- [16] Qingyu Tan, Hwee Tou Ng, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Towards Benchmarking and Improving the Temporal Reasoning Capability of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 14820–14835.
- [17] Bram van Dijk, Tom Kouwenhoven, Marco Spruit, and Max Johannes van Duijn. 2023. Large Language Models: The Need for Nuance in Current Debates and a Pragmatic Perspective on Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 12641–12654.
- [18] Daniele Vitale, Paolo Ferragina, and Ugo Scaiella. 2012. Classification of Short Texts by Deploying Topical Annotations. In *Proceedings of the 34th European Conference on Information Retrieval*, Vol. 7224. Springer, 376–387.
- [19] Qingren Wang, Chengcheng Zhu, Yiwen Zhang, Hong Zhong, Jinjin Zhong, and Victor S. Sheng. 2023. Short Text Topic Learning Using Heterogeneous Information Network. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35, 5 (2023), 5269–5281.
- [20] Rui Wang, Xueming Hu, Deyu Zhou, Yulan He, Yuxuan Xiong, Chenchen Ye, and Haiyang Xu. 2020. Neural Topic Modeling with Bidirectional Adversarial Training. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 340–350.
- [21] Xiaobao Wu, Xinshuai Dong, Thong Thanh Nguyen, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2023. Effective Neural Topic Modeling with Embedding Clustering Regularization. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Vol. 202. PMLR, 37335–37357.

- [22] Xiaobao Wu, Chunping Li, Yan Zhu, and Yishu Miao. 2020. Short Text Topic Modeling with Topic Distribution Quantization and Negative Sampling Decoder. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1772–1782.
- [23] Xiaobao Wu, Anh Tuan Luu, and Xinshuai Dong. 2022. Mitigating Data Sparsity for Short Text Topic Modeling by Topic-Semantic Contrastive Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2748–2760.
- [24] Tianchi Yang, Linmei Hu, Chuan Shi, Houye Ji, Xiaoli Li, and Liqiang Nie. 2021. HGAT: Heterogeneous Graph Attention Networks for Semi-supervised Short Text Classification. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 39, 3 (2021), 32:1–32:29.
- [25] Yunhu Ye, Binyuan Hui, Min Yang, Binhua Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2023. Large Language Models are Versatile Decomposers: Decomposing Evidence and Questions for Table-based Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. ACM, 174–184.
- [26] Delvin Ce Zhang and Hady W. Lauw. 2022. Meta-Complementing the Semantics of Short Texts in Neural Topic Models. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 29498–29511.
- [27] Huakui Zhang, Yi Cai, Haopeng Ren, and Qing Li. 2023. Multimodal Topic Modeling by Exploring Characteristics of Short Text Social Media. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 25 (2023), 2430–2445.
- [28] Wei Zhang, Chao Dong, Jianhua Yin, and Jianyong Wang. 2022. Attentive Representation Learning With Adversarial Training for Short Text Clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 34, 11 (2022), 5196–5210.
- [29] Xiang Zhang, Junbo Jake Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level Convolutional Networks for Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 649–657.
- [30] Xixi Zhou, Jiajun Bu, Sheng Zhou, Zhi Yu, Ji Zhao, and Xifeng Yan. 2023. Improving topic disentanglement via contrastive learning. *Information Processing & Management* 60, 2 (2023), 103164.
- [31] Yuan Zuo, Congrui Li, Hao Lin, and Junjie Wu. 2023. Topic Modeling of Short Texts: A Pseudo-Document View With Word Embedding Enhancement. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35, 1 (2023), 972–985.