

# LIT: Large Language Model Driven Intention Tracking for Proactive Human-Robot Collaboration - A Robot Sous-Chef Application

Zhe Huang, John Pohovey, Ananya Yammanuru, Katherine Driggs-Campbell  
 University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign  
 {zheh4, jpohov2, ananyay2, krdc}@illinois.edu

## Abstract

*Large Language Models (LLM) and Vision Language Models (VLM) enable robots to ground natural language prompts into control actions to achieve tasks in an open world. However, when applied to a long-horizon collaborative task, this formulation results in excessive prompting for initiating or clarifying robot actions at every step of the task. We propose Language-driven Intention Tracking (LIT), leveraging LLMs and VLMs to model the human user’s long-term behavior and to predict the next human intention to guide the robot for proactive collaboration. We demonstrate smooth coordination between a LIT-based collaborative robot and the human user in collaborative cooking tasks.*

## 1. Introduction

The groundbreaking advances in Large Language Models (LLM) and Vision Language Models (VLM) endow robots with exceptional cognition capabilities and reasoning skills to both understand the surrounding open world and follow natural language commands of human users [11, 20]. More recent works explore conversations between the human user and the robot to allow the robot to perform multi-step tasks or clarify ambiguity of the human command [30, 37].

When the philosophy of grounding natural language commands into robot control policies is applied to human-robot collaboration (HRC), the human user may have to have a conversation with the robot at each step of the long-horizon task [37]. This situation rarely happens in human-human collaboration, as a human is able to track the progress on the partner’s side based on their shared knowledge over the task. For examples, a worker rarely has to have a conversation with a co-worker in a collaborative assembly task on which they have collaborated many times, and a sous chef rarely has to have a conversation with the chef when creating a regular dish together.

To address this challenge in human-robot collaboration,

the robot needs to build an effective understanding of not only the environment, but also the human user. This work proposes Language-driven Intention Tracking (LIT) to model long-term behavior of the human user, and integrates LIT into an LLM-driven collaborative robot framework. LIT extends intention tracking [14] by applying an LLM to model measurement likelihood and transition probabilities in the probabilistic graphical model of human intentions, which is defined by grounding an overall task prompt (e.g., make a salad) with understanding of the scene using LLM and VLM models. Note this is the only prompt needed from the human user in LIT framework. LIT uses a VLM to generate text descriptions of the human user’s behavior in the frames as measurements to track the human user’s intention and filter out hallucinations. Intention prediction in the near-term allows the collaborative robot to proactively assist the human user. By harnessing the power of foundation models, we believe the LIT framework can be generalized to any collaborative tasks. We demonstrate the effectiveness of the LIT framework in a scenario where the collaborative robot acts as a sous-chef to assist a human user in cooking.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Language Models in Robotics

There has been an explosion of work in robotic planning tasks driven by LLM. LLMs have been shown to exhibit the ability to write multi-step control logic code based on natural language command [12, 20]. However, such methods typically do not understand whether such a command is feasible to execute *a priori*; though this can be corrected for with e.g., feasibility planners [1, 39], such as is done by Text2Motion [21]. VoxPoser [11], SayCan [15], and LATTE [5] ground robotic affordances into their LLM-driven planning and modification steps following a command provided via natural language. RT-2 [4] extends the PALM-E VLM [8] with action representations. Recent works [36, 40] explore LLM agent embodiment within video games for accomplishing goals using visual input




Figure 1. Language-driven Intention Tracking (LIT) based collaborative robot framework. The open scene understanding module detects objects in the scene and generate potential manipulation options, which in our case are top-down grasp poses. The task graph reasoning module takes the user’s prompt on the overall task and the detected objects as input to generate a list of task steps, which we define as intention in this work. As some steps of the overall task can switch order without impact on the outcome, the LLM checks on reversibility of sequences of task steps, and builds a task graph. The Language-driven Intention Tracking module uses the task graph to build the probabilistic graphical model for intention transition. The VLM is used to generate text descriptions from frames as measurements. We compute time-varying transition probabilities and make prediction steps, and use measurements to compute measurement likelihood and make update steps to track the human intention. The intention-grounded planning module make an additional prediction step on the current intention posterior, and manipulate the objects relevant to the predicted next intention to proactively collaborate with the human.

and/or high-level textual task description. Specifically Voyager [36] leverages Minecraft to build an LLM-driven agent intended to continually explore, and learn new skills and store them for future use. Instead of caching skills, we propose caching intentions for more effective collaborative autonomy.

## 2.2. Intention Modeling in HRC and NLP

Understanding human intention is essential for safe and seamless human-robot interaction (HRI) and human-robot collaboration (HRC). Human intentions have been extensively studied in various contexts, including a pedestrian’s desired destination for social navigation [13, 17, 35], a driver’s lane-changing intention for autonomous driving [19, 38], and a worker’s desired tool/part for collaborative manufacturing [28, 29]. However, such intention estimation methods that match the observations to these well-defined intentions are usually carefully crafted and are hard to generalize to novel scenarios. On the other hand, intent classification is a crucial task in NLP and has been comprehensively studied over decades [6, 9, 16, 27]. In particular, identification of unseen open intents has become an emerging area in the field of intent classification [41, 42]. Nevertheless, intent classification in NLP is typically formulated as a static recognition task, whereas HRC requires using

measurement sequences to perform online tracking of human intentions which can vary across time [14]. We apply the concept of open intent in NLP to the intention tracking method for HRC, so our language-driven intention tracking method can easily generalize to novel scenarios and tasks.

## 2.3. Robotic Cooking

There has long been interest in developing robots that can cook for and/or with people. Many works [2, 3, 10, 31, 32, 37] propose robotic systems which learn to autonomously perform cooking and baking tasks from various modalities. BakeBot [2, 3] and RoboCook [31] take as input the plain text recipe and target shapes for deformable manipulation respectively before determining its own step-by-step instructions for the long horizon planning task of baking cookies and making dumplings from scratch. However, while the latter is able to recover from human meddling of its planned tasks, it is not able to understand why the human has interrupted the task, and will instead simply resume from a prior step to reach the original goal. Other works propose teaching a robot to cook from human demonstration [10, 32]. However, these works seek only to imitate the human motion of a certain cooking action, with the latter’s Hidden Markov Model limited to inferring the corresponding recipe based on observations of the human skele-

tal motion, before subsequently continuing the recipe itself. More similar to our work, Wang *et al.* propose a collaborative framework for a robotic cooking assistant in MOSAIC [37], using an LLM as a task-planner and large vision models for determining locations of ingredients. However, this system requires the chef to give explicit natural language commands to incite action, and only forecasts human motion primarily as a means to provide safety for the human, such as by preventing collisions with the robot. Finally, it is specific to the cooking application.

### 3. Language-driven Intention Tracking

#### 3.1. Problem Formulation

A human user collaborates with a robot to perform a long-horizon multi-step task. The robot can understand the scene and reason about the task to formulate a directed task graph, where vertices are defined as steps of the task, and edges are defined as the feasible orders between the task steps. The reason we use a task graph instead of a task chain is the relationships between task steps may not always be causal and the order may be reversible, such as “cut tomatoes” and “cut cucumbers” for a salad making task. We define human intention  $G_t$  as the task step the human intends to work on at time  $t$ . The robot uses the measurement history of the human behavior  $X_{1:t}$  to track the human intention  $G_t$ .




Figure 2. The graphical model for intention tracking. We denote the measurement of human behavior as  $X_t$ , and the human intention as  $G_t$ .

#### 3.2. Language Probabilistic Graphical Model

We propose Language Probabilistic Graphical Model (LPGM) to describe the dynamics of human behavior in Fig. 2, where the value of each node is a natural language sentence. To calculate a conditional probability for example  $P(A = a|B = b, C = c)$  in an LPGM, we use an LLM, where the prompt has two parts: a conditional part and a query part. We formulate the conditional part of the prompt as “We observe  $\{B\}$  is  $\{b\}$ , and  $\{C\}$  is  $\{c\}$ ,”. We propose three different methods to compose the query part of the prompt and calculate the conditional probability accordingly.

The first method is to directly ask for  $P(a|b, c)$ . The query part of the prompt is formulated as “provide the probability of  $\{A\}$  being  $\{a\}$ .”. This is similar to Ren *et. al* [30],

where the LLM is treated as an expert in modeling the mathematical relationships between  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$ . However, the outputs from the LLM may not be trustworthy if corresponding materials are not covered much by the corpus used to train the LLM. We use this as a baseline in our work.

The second method is to ask the LLM to generate a value of  $A$ , and compare the similarity score such as BERTScore [43] of the generated text with respect to  $a$  to quantify  $P(a|b, c)$ . The query part of the prompt is formulated as “what do you think  $\{A\}$  would be?”. This method essentially uses the LLM to provide a maximum likelihood estimate  $\arg \max_a P(A = a|B = b, C = c)$ , and uses the distance between this point estimate and the value to compute the conditional probability.

The third method addresses the case where  $A$  is a discrete variable. We ask LLM to generate a list of values of  $A$  with a large length  $N$ , compare the values in the list to all possible values of  $A$ , aggregate the number of most similar generated values to each possible value, and form a statistical estimate of the  $P(a|b, c)$ . The query part of the prompt is formulated as “what do you think  $\{A\}$  would be? Provide  $N$  different examples.”. This is similar to a Monte Carlo method which approximates the distribution of  $P(A|B = b, C = c)$  by sampling from the LLM.

#### 3.3. Application in Intention Tracking

To perform language-driven intention tracking, we iterate prediction and update steps of Bayesian filtering as presented in Eq. 1.

$$P(g_{t+1}|x_{1:t}) = \sum_{g_t} P(g_{t+1}|g_t, x_{1:t})P(g_t|x_{1:t}) \quad (1)$$

$$P(g_{t+1}|x_{1:t+1}) \propto P(x_{t+1}|x_{1:t}, g_{t+1})P(g_{t+1}|x_{1:t})$$

We apply LPGM methods to compute the fixed time-window approximations of intention transition  $P(g_{t+1}|g_t, x_{t-T_w:t})$  and measurement likelihood  $P(x_{t+1}|x_{t-T_w:t}, g_{t+1})$ . We apply the third method to compute  $P(g_{t+1}|g_t, x_{t-T_w:t})$ , since the human intention  $G_t$  is a discrete variable. We apply the second method to compute  $P(x_{t+1}|x_{t-T_w:t}, g_{t+1})$ .

### 4. Robot Sous-Chef Application

We introduce Language-driven Intention Tracking based collaborative robot sous-chef framework as presented in Fig. 1.

#### 4.1. Collaborative Cooking Setup

The human user wants to make a dish, but all the required materials and tools are not reachable by the human – but are by the robot. The robot needs to act as a sous-chef to smoothly coordinate with the human by passing essential

materials and tools at appropriate times while not making the human’s cooking table overly occupied with unnecessary items at the moment. The robot is assumed to only receive the prompt at the beginning on what dish is going to be made, and will not receive prompts during collaboration.

We choose LLaVA [22–24] with a 13-billion parameter Vicuna backbone [7] (derived from Llama 2 [34]) as the VLM in the system, due to both its open source nature and competitiveness with commercial-grade models such as Gemini [33]. Note that we use the same model as the LLM for consistent performance by inputting the text prompt with a full-black image. The collaborative robot is a UR5e arm equipped with a Robotiq Hand-E Gripper. We use Intel RealSense RGBD Cameras to provide a top-down view of the robot table with objects on it, and to provide a front view of the human user’s behavior. We use Robot Operating System (ROS) to build the LIT framework.

## 4.2. Open Scene Understanding Module

The overhead camera provide a top-down view of the robot workspace with all object reachable by the robot. We prompt the VLM to name and describe the objects in the image frame from the overhead camera, and take these names as input to Grounding DINO [25] coupled with Segment Anything [18] to locate and segment all objects on the frame. Object names listed as present in the scene by the VLM that are detected with low confidence are thrown out. We perform Principal Component Analysis on object segmentations and compute object orientation and corresponding grasp poses. The detected object names and grasp poses are fed into the downstream modules.

## 4.3. Task Graph Reasoning Module

Given the available objects produced by the open scene understanding module and the general task prompt from the human user, we query the LLM to output a sequence of task steps in order to achieve the overall task. The LLM is also asked to provide the corresponding objects needed in each task step, which will be used to inform the downstream planning module. We initialize the task graph with the sequence of task steps, and query the LLM whether adjacent steps can be reversible to add new edges to the task graph.

## 4.4. Language-driven Intention Tracking Module

We use the task steps from the reasoned task graph as possible values of intention  $G_t$ . The task graph is used to initialize the uniform prior among the first steps the human can start on, and to inform which pairs of  $(g_t, g_{t+1})$  are required to compute the intention transition  $P(g_{t+1}|g_t, x_{t-T_w:t})$ . During collaboration, we use a front-view camera to collect frames of the human user, and feed the frames to VLM to generate text descriptions of human behavior as measure-

ments  $x_t$ ’s. We follow Eq. 1 to perform language-driven intention tracking.

## 4.5. Intention-grounded Planning Module

To collaborate with the human proactively, the robot predicts the human intention at the next time step by running one prediction step in LIT on the current posterior of the intentions, and outputting the maximum probability intention as the prediction. The intention-grounded planning module performs planning and control to manipulate the objects relevant to the predicted next intention. In our collaborative cooking scenario, the robot sous-chef would pass the objects needed for the next cooking step to the human chef in advance.

## 5. Preliminary Study

We collect a salad cooking demonstration and run language-driven intention tracking to compare how similarity metrics affect tracking performance as presented in Fig. 3. In addition to BERTScore [43], we introduce BERT-mean-cos and Word2Vec-mean-cos [26], which take the mean of word embeddings from the corresponding pre-trained model to generate candidate and reference sentence embeddings, and apply cosine similarity to generate similarity score. During evaluation, we isolate the effect of similarity metrics by computing measurement likelihood with the similarity metrics while using a fixed intention transition matrix based on the task graph [14]. Fig. 3 shows that BERT-mean-cos empirically outperforms BERTScore and Word2Vec-mean-cos for tracking human intentions.

## 6. Conclusions and Future Work

We propose Language-driven Intention Tracking (LIT) to model long-term behavior of the human user in an open scenario for proactive human-robot collaboration without repetitive prompting. We develop a LIT-based collaborative robot framework powered by LLMs and VLMs to understand the open scene, construct a task graph, track varying human intentions, and ground intention prediction to planning. We demonstrate the framework in a robot sous-chef application, where the robot seamlessly assist the human user in cooking.

In future, we will conduct human subject experiments with more comprehensive metrics to evaluate performance efficiency and user satisfaction compared to existing works. We will study the tradeoff between expressiveness and speed of the foundation models on performance of the LIT framework. We will show versatility of this framework by testing in different daily tasks such as collaborative furniture assembly. We will also work on generalization of the framework to multiple users.






Figure 3. Language-driven Intention Tracking with different similarity metrics. The ground truth order of the human intentions: slice tomatoes; slice cucumbers; put tomatoes and cucumbers in a bowl; put salad dressing on tomatoes and cucumbers; stir and mix the salad with a spoon. Snapshots show the moment when intention transition happens. (a) The human starts cutting a cucumber after finishing cutting a tomato. (b) The human starts putting vegetables into a bowl after cutting the cucumber.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 2143435.

## References

[1] Christopher Agia, Toki Migimatsu, Jiajun Wu, and Jeannette Bohg. Stap: Sequencing task-agnostic policies. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 7951–7958, 2023. 1

[2] Mario Bollini, Jennifer Barry, and Daniela Rus. Bakebot: Baking cookies with the pr2. In *The PR2 workshop: results, challenges and lessons learned in advancing robots with a common platform, IROS*. Citeseer, 2011. 2

[3] Mario Bollini, Stefanie Tellex, Tyler Thompson, Nicholas

Roy, and Daniela Rus. *Interpreting and Executing Recipes with a Cooking Robot*, pages 481–495. Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, 2013. 2

[4] Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Xi Chen, Krzysztof Choromanski, Tianli Ding, Danny Driess, Avinava Dubey, Chelsea Finn, Pete Florence, Chuyuan Fu, Montse Gonzalez Arenas, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Kehang Han, Karol Hausman, Alex Herzog, Jasmine Hsu, Brian Ichter, Alex Irpan, Nikhil Joshi, Ryan Julian, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Yuheng Kuang, Isabel Leal, Lisa Lee, Tsang-Wei Edward Lee, Sergey Levine, Yao Lu, Henryk Michalewski, Igor Mordatch, Karl Pertsch, Kanishka Rao, Krista Reymann, Michael Ryoo, Grecia Salazar, Pannag Sanketi, Pierre Sermanet, Jaspier Singh, Anikait Singh, Radu Soricut, Huang Tran, Vincent Vanhoucke, Quan Vuong, Ayzan Wahid, Stefan Welker, Paul Wohlhart, Jialin Wu, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Peng Xu, Sichun Xu, Tianhe Yu, and Brianna Zitkovich. Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15818*, 2023. 1

[5] Arthur Buckler, Luis Figueredo, Sami Haddadin, Ashish Kapoor, Shuang Ma, Sai Vemprala, and Rogerio Bonatti. Latte: Language trajectory transformer. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 7287–7294, 2023. 1

[6] Iñigo Casanueva, Tadas Temčinas, Daniela Gerz, Matthew Henderson, and Ivan Vulić. Efficient intent detection with dual sentence encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04807*, 2020. 2

[7] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality, 2023. 4

[8] Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi S. M. Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, Wenlong Huang, Yevgen Chebotar, Pierre Sermanet, Daniel Duckworth, Sergey Levine, Vincent Vanhoucke, Karol Hausman, Marc Toussaint, Klaus Greff, Andy Zeng, Igor Mordatch, and Pete Florence. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03378*, 2023. 1

[9] Mauajama Firdaus, Asif Ekbil, and Erik Cambria. Multitask learning for multilingual intent detection and slot filling in dialogue systems. *Information Fusion*, 91:299–315, 2023. 2

[10] Zipeng Fu, Tony Z. Zhao, and Chelsea Finn. Mobile aloha: Learning bimanual mobile manipulation with low-cost whole-body teleoperation. In *arXiv*, 2024. 2

[11] Wenlong Huang, Chen Wang, Ruohan Zhang, Yunzhu Li, Jiajun Wu, and Li Fei-Fei. Voxposer: Composable 3d value maps for robotic manipulation with language models. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 540–562. PMLR, 2023. 1

[12] Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Harris Chan, Jacky Liang, Pete Florence, Andy Zeng, Jonathan Tompson, Igor Mordatch, Yevgen Chebotar, Pierre Sermanet, Tomas Jack-son, Noah Brown, Linda Luu, Sergey Levine, Karol Hausman, and brian ichter. Inner monologue: Embodied reason-

- ing through planning with language models. In *Proceedings of The 6th Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1769–1782. PMLR, 2023. 1
- [13] Zhe Huang, Aamir Hasan, Kazuki Shin, Ruohua Li, and Katherine Driggs-Campbell. Long-term pedestrian trajectory prediction using mutable intention filter and warp lstm. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(2):542–549, 2020. 2
- [14] Zhe Huang, Ye-Ji Mun, Xiang Li, Yiqing Xie, Ninghan Zhong, Weihang Liang, Junyi Geng, Tan Chen, and Katherine Driggs-Campbell. Hierarchical intention tracking for robust human-robot collaboration in industrial assembly tasks. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 9821–9828, 2023. 1, 2, 4
- [15] Alex Irpan, Alexander Herzog, Alexander Toshkov Toshev, Andy Zeng, Anthony Brohan, Brian Andrew Ichter, Byron David, Carolina Parada, Chelsea Finn, Clayton Tan, Diego Reyes, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Eric Victor Jang, Fei Xia, Jarek Liam Rettinghouse, Jasmine Chiehju Hsu, Jor-nell Lacañale Quiambao, Julian Ibarz, Kanishka Rao, Karol Hausman, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Kuang-Huei Lee, Kyle Alan Jeffrey, Linda Luu, Mengyuan Yan, Michael Soogil Ahn, Nicolas Sievers, Nikhil J Joshi, Noah Brown, Omar Eduardo Escareno Cortes, Peng Xu, Peter Pastor Sampedro, Pierre Sermanet, Rosario Jauregui Ruano, Ryan Christopher Julian, Sally Augusta Jesmonth, Sergey Levine, Steve Xu, Ted Xiao, Vincent Olivier Vanhoucke, Yao Lu, Yevgen Chebotar, and Yuheng Kuang. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. In *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL) 2022*, 2022. 1
- [16] Bernard J Jansen, Danielle L Booth, and Amanda Spink. Determining the informational, navigational, and transactional intent of web queries. *Information Processing & Management*, 44(3):1251–1266, 2008. 2
- [17] Kapil D Katyal, Gregory D Hager, and Chien-Ming Huang. Intent-aware pedestrian prediction for adaptive crowd navigation. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 3277–3283. IEEE, 2020. 2
- [18] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C. Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, Piotr Dollar, and Ross Girshick. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 4
- [19] Puneet Kumar, Mathias Perrollaz, Stéphanie Lefevre, and Christian Laugier. Learning-based approach for online lane change intention prediction. In *2013 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 797–802. IEEE, 2013. 2
- [20] Jacky Liang, Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Peng Xu, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Pete Florence, and Andy Zeng. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 9493–9500. IEEE, 2023. 1
- [21] Kevin Lin, Christopher Agia, Toki Migimatsu, Marco Pavone, and Jeannette Bohg. Text2motion: from natural language instructions to feasible plans. *Autonomous Robots*, 2023. 1
- [22] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023. 4
- [23] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [24] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, 2024. 4
- [25] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, and Lei Zhang. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection, 2023. 4
- [26] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013. 4
- [27] Shervin Minaee, Nal Kalchbrenner, Erik Cambria, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, and Jianfeng Gao. Deep learning-based text classification: a comprehensive review. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 54(3):1–40, 2021. 2
- [28] Davide Nicolis, Andrea Maria Zanchettin, and Paolo Rocco. Human intention estimation based on neural networks for enhanced collaboration with robots. In *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 1326–1333. IEEE, 2018. 2
- [29] Claudia Pérez-D’Arpino and Julie A Shah. Fast target prediction of human reaching motion for cooperative human-robot manipulation tasks using time series classification. In *2015 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pages 6175–6182. IEEE, 2015. 2
- [30] Allen Z Ren, Anushri Dixit, Alexandra Bodrova, Sumeet Singh, Stephen Tu, Noah Brown, Peng Xu, Leila Takayama, Fei Xia, Jake Varley, et al. Robots that ask for help: Uncertainty alignment for large language model planners. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 661–682. PMLR, 2023. 1, 3
- [31] Haochen Shi, Huazhe Xu, Samuel Clarke, Yunzhu Li, and Jijun Wu. Robocook: Long-horizon elasto-plastic object manipulation with diverse tools. In *Proceedings of The 7th Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 642–660. PMLR, 2023. 2
- [32] Grzegorz Sochacki, Arsen Abdulali, Narges Khadem Hosseini, and Fumiya Iida. Recognition of human chef’s intentions for incremental learning of cookbook by robotic salad chef. *IEEE Access*, 11:57006–57020, 2023. 2
- [33] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, and Sebastian Borgeaud et al. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models, 2024. 4
- [34] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning

- Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023. 4
- [35] Hung Tran, Vuong Le, and Truyen Tran. Goal-driven long-term trajectory prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 796–805, 2021. 2
- [36] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: Arxiv-2305.16291*, 2023. 1, 2
- [37] Huaxiaoyue Wang, Kushal Kedia, Juntao Ren, Rahma Abdullah, Atiksh Bhardwaj, Angela Chao, Kelly Y Chen, Nathaniel Chin, Prithwish Dan, Xinyi Fan, et al. Mosaic: A modular system for assistive and interactive cooking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18796*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [38] Yang Xing, Chen Lv, Huaji Wang, Hong Wang, Yunfeng Ai, Dongpu Cao, Efstathios Velenis, and Fei-Yue Wang. Driver lane change intention inference for intelligent vehicles: Framework, survey, and challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 68(5):4377–4390, 2019. 2
- [39] Danfei Xu, Ajay Mandlekar, Roberto Martín-Martín, Yuke Zhu, Silvio Savarese, and Li Fei-Fei. Deep affordance foresight: Planning through what can be done in the future. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, page 6206–6213. IEEE Press, 2021. 1
- [40] Jingkan Yang, Yuhao Dong, Shuai Liu, Bo Li, Ziyue Wang, Chencheng Jiang, Haoran Tan, Jiamu Kang, Yuanhan Zhang, Kaiyang Zhou, and Ziwei Liu. Octopus: Embodied vision-language programmer from environmental feedback, 2023. 1
- [41] Hanlei Zhang, Hua Xu, and Ting-En Lin. Deep open intent classification with adaptive decision boundary. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 14374–14382, 2021. 2
- [42] Hanlei Zhang, Hua Xu, Shaojie Zhao, and Qianrui Zhou. Learning discriminative representations and decision boundaries for open intent detection. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 2023. 2
- [43] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. 3, 4