

LANID: LLM-assisted New Intent Discovery

Lu Fan¹, Jiashu Pu², Rongsheng Zhang², and Xiao-Ming Wu^{1*}

Department of Computing, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong S.A.R.¹

Fuxi AI Lab, NetEase Inc. China, Hang Zhou, China.²

cslfan@comp.polyu.edu.hk, pujiashu@corp.netease.com,

zhangrongsheng@corp.netease.com, xiao-ming.wu@polyu.edu.hk

Abstract

Task-oriented Dialogue Systems (TODS) often face the challenge of encountering new intents. New Intent Discovery (NID) is a crucial task that aims to identify these novel intents while maintaining the capability to recognize existing ones. Previous efforts to adapt TODS to new intents have struggled with inadequate semantic representation or have depended on external knowledge, which is often not scalable or flexible. Recently, Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated strong zero-shot capabilities; however, their scale can be impractical for real-world applications that involve extensive queries. To address the limitations of existing NID methods by leveraging LLMs, we propose LANID, a framework that enhances the semantic representation of lightweight NID encoders with the guidance of LLMs. Specifically, LANID employs the K -nearest neighbors and Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (DBSCAN) algorithms to sample selective utterance pairs from the training set. It then queries an LLM to ascertain the relationships between these pairs. The data produced from this process is utilized to design a contrastive fine-tuning task, which is then used to train a small encoder with a contrastive triplet loss. Our experimental results demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed method across three distinct NID datasets, surpassing strong baselines in both unsupervised and semi-supervised settings. Our code is available at <https://github.com/floatSDSDS/LANID>.

Keywords: new intent discovery, large language models, clustering, contrastive learning

1. Introduction

Task-Oriented Dialogue Systems (TODS) are designed to assist users in accomplishing specific goals, such as booking flights or resolving technical issues. However, as these systems evolve, they inevitably encounter user intents that were unseen during initial training. New Intent Discovery (NID) aims to enable systems to autonomously identify novel intents while maintaining robust performance on known ones. Such capability is critical for deploying TODS in dynamic real-world environments. Previous approaches have utilized clustering algorithms (Shi et al., 2018; Perkins and Yang, 2019; Chatterjee and Sengupta, 2020) to group utterances with similar intents, or have implemented semi-supervised pre-training methods for representation learning. These methods face significant limitations: many struggle to learn discriminative semantic representations for unseen intents (Lin et al., 2020; Pu et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2021b), while others depend on the quality and quantity of external knowledge (Zhang et al., 2021a, 2022b), hindering scalability and adaptability.

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2023) have demonstrated impressive zero-shot reasoning capabilities (Heck et al., 2023), providing promising solutions for intent recognition. However, implementing these large-scale models in production environments is

both complex and resource-intensive. This complexity raises potential privacy issues (Kim et al., 2023), and the significant computational demands can lead to increased latency, impacting the real-time performance essential for many applications. Consequently, there is a growing interest in exploring the use of LLMs to guide and optimize offline, lightweight NID models.

To leverage the capabilities of LLMs while ensuring lightweight performance and privacy for the NID task, we propose LANID (LLM-Assisted New Intent Discovery), a novel framework that integrates the rich knowledge of LLMs into lightweight encoders using contrastive learning to enhance in-domain NID performance. Specifically, we propose to sampling pairs of utterances and using their relationships discriminated by LLMs as contrastive signals. As establishing relationships for all possible utterance pairs would incur excessively high costs, we propose two data sampling strategies to sample informative and representative utterance pairs. Both strategies leverage unsupervised algorithms to enhance data sampling. The initial strategy employs the concept of core points from DBSCAN (Ester et al., 1996) to effectively sample representative data. Conversely, the second strategy leverages the K -nearest neighbor algorithm (Cover and Hart, 1967) to enhance the probability that the sampled data will accurately represent class boundaries. The proposed selection strategies ensure that the chosen pairs are more representative and thereby enhancing the system's efficiency.

*Corresponding author

Next, a powerful LLM is employed to determine the relationships between the selected utterance pairs. The obtained supervision signals are then used to construct a contrastive learning task. By optimizing a lightweight encoder with a triplet loss objective, LANID enhances the model’s ability to discern both known and new intents without compromising efficiency. The data sampling and teaching steps are conducted iteratively, and the training set can be incrementally updated with either LLM-annotated or manually annotated new data, ensuring the system’s flexibility and scalability.

The main contributions of this paper are three-fold:

- We propose a framework that distills LLM-derived semantic insights into small in-domain encoders with contrastive learning methods for the NID task.
- We introduce two data sampling strategies based on unsupervised algorithms to construct contrastive tasks more efficiently.
- Extensive experiments on three benchmark datasets demonstrate LANID’s superiority over existing baselines in both unsupervised and semi-supervised NID settings.

2. Related Works

We briefly review recent work on intent recognition, discovering new intents, and using LLMs to improve intent understanding in TODS.

Intent Recognition. To help TODS manage the ever-expanding range of user intents, intent recognition has been a long-standing and active research area. Current studies have looked into different settings and techniques, which can be grouped into three main categories: (1) Clustering-based approaches (Shi et al., 2018; Perkins and Yang, 2019; Chatterjee and Sengupta, 2020; Pu et al., 2022), which group similar user queries to identify intents in an unsupervised manner; (2) Few-shot intent recognition (Zhang et al., 2021c; Zhan et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022a), which aims to enable models to quickly adapt to new scenarios with multiple new intents by creating different network structures or training frameworks; and (3) methods based on Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs) (Haponchyk et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019; Yan et al., 2020; Haponchyk and Moschitti, 2021; Ma et al., 2022) believe that more general semantic representation can lead to better dialogue understanding.

New Intent Discovery (NID). To better suit real-world production needs, a more practical setting named NID has been introduced (Zhang et al., 2021a,b). This setting effectively leverages known

labels while also uncovering novel intent categories, thereby expanding the set of supported intents. Subsequently, further efforts have been made to expand on this line of research. Zhang et al. (Zhang et al., 2022b) designed a specific contrastive loss to exploit self-supervisory signals in unlabeled data for clustering. Zhou et al. (Zhou et al., 2023) introduced a probabilistic framework for NID where intent assignments are treated as latent variables. An et al. (An et al., 2023) proposed a robust pseudo-label training and source domain joint-training network to refine noisy pseudo labels and fully utilize prior knowledge.

Large Language Models (LLMs). LLMs show great potential for advancing conversational AI (OpenAI, 2023; Heck et al., 2023); however, their application in NID is still not well explored. While LLMs excel at detecting emerging intents, they require extensive computational resources and pose privacy concerns. As mentioned above, existing NID methods typically rely on smaller semantic encoders, such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). Recently, Song et al. (Song et al., 2023) reveal ChatGPT’s strengths in zero-shot settings but also pointed out its limitations compared to fine-tuned models. In this paper, we propose leveraging the semantic understanding capabilities of LLMs to generate auxiliary labels for contrastive training.

3. Proposed Method: LANID

Problem Formulation. To better align with the practical need for continuous training to recognize new intents, we follow the approach of prior research (Zhang et al., 2021b) and evaluate our method in both unsupervised and semi-supervised evaluation settings. We represent an utterance and its intent label as x and y , respectively. y can either belong to the set of unknown intents C_u or the set of known intents C_k . The training set, validation set, and test set are denoted as D_{train} , D_{val} and D_{test} . These three sets share the same distribution of intent labels. In the unsupervised setting, D_{train} does not contain any annotated utterances, meaning that no intents are known or labeled. In the semi-supervised setting, D_{train} comprises both a labeled dataset, $D_{labeled} = \{(x_i, y_i) | y_i \in C_k\}$ and an unlabeled dataset $D_{unlabeled}$. The intent labels of utterances in $D_{unlabeled}$ may belong to either C_k or C_u . In both settings, the goal is to group utterances from D_{test} into clusters, with each cluster representing a distinct intent.

Overview. The proposed LANID framework is illustrated in Figure 1. LANID utilizes contrastive learning to distill knowledge from LLMs, thereby facilitating the training of a lightweight encoder for novel intent detection. The contrastive learning




Figure 1: Illustration of the proposed LANID framework. First, utterances are encoded by our target light encoder, and informative utterance pairs are sampled from D_{train} using the proposed data pair sampler. Next, the LLM manager inputs the sampled data pairs into the LLM and uses it to annotate the relationship for each utterance pair. Contrastive tasks are then constructed to optimize the target encoder. These three steps are repeated iteratively until convergence is reached. Once this is achieved, we apply the trained encoder to the test set, D_{test} , and utilize the k -means algorithm to cluster the encoded utterances. Utterances within the same cluster are then considered to share the same intent.

Table 1: Hyper-parameter Settings: MinPts denotes the minimum number of points needed within a specified radius (epsilon) to form a dense region in DBSCAN.

	K	p	n_k	m	k_n	T	#Epoch	MinPts
Banking	50	0.1	2	5	2	3	10	4
Stackoverflow	50	0.05	2	8	2	2	10	4
M-CID	50	0.2	2	5	2	3	20	4

process consists of three main steps: 1) sampling selective utterance pairs from D_{train} to form the contrastive tasks based on clustering algorithms, 2) determining the relationships between these utterance pairs using a powerful LLM that provides pseudo-labeling, and 3) fine-tuning the encoder with the LLM’s output to distill the knowledge from the powerful LLM. This three-step training procedure is iteratively repeated until either a predefined condition set by the user is satisfied or convergence is attained. Finally, the utterances in D_{test} are encoded using the optimized encoder and clustered with the k -means algorithm, consistent with previous attempts in NID (Zhang et al., 2021b, 2022b).

3.1. Selecting Utterance Pairs

We propose injecting knowledge encoded in LLMs into the small model through contrastive learning. In the learning process, the LLM acts like a teacher, while the small model acts like a student. One of the most essential things in the teaching stage is designing contrastive tasks. In this work, we propose sampling utterance pairs and asking the LLM to determine the relation between each one. The contrastive tasks are formed with utterance pairs and their pseudo-relation label annotated by

LLMs. It is impractical to establish relationships for all possible utterance pairs. Therefore, we propose two selective sampling strategies for utterance pair sampling, which will selectively sample representative and informative data. Next, we will illustrate the two proposed sampling strategies.

Selection based on K -Nearest Neighbors.

Starting locally, we first find those utterances that are close to each other (based on the original representation) and determine whether the distribution among them is reasonable. In each iteration, we randomly sample $p\%$ utterances from D_{train} . Then, for each sampled utterance x_i , we search for its top- K nearest neighbors \mathcal{N}_i^{Near} using the Euclidean distance, and we uniformly sample n_k ($n_k < |\mathcal{N}_i^{Near}|$) utterances from \mathcal{N}_i^{Near} . We denote the nearest-neighbor set for x_i as $\mathcal{M}_i^{Near} = \{(x_i, x_j) | x_j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{Near}\}$, where $|\mathcal{M}_i^{Near}| = n_k$.

Selection based on Global Density.

It is difficult to divide a data set into exactly a few categories, and there will always be some outliers. Also, the distribution of semantics is usually not uniform, and there are high and low densities of different semantic clusters. We propose a DBSCAN-based (Ester et al., 1996) sampling approach to reflect the relationship between globally high and low-density

Table 2: Performance on Unsupervised NID: Best results for each dataset are highlighted in bold. Results are shown for three LANID variants: LANID-Near (KNN-based sampling), LANID-DBSCAN (DBSCAN sampling), and LANID (combination of both strategies)

Methods	Banking			StackOverflow			M-CID		
	NMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	ARI	ACC
SAE-KM	60.12	24.00	37.38	48.72	23.36	37.16	51.03	43.51	52.95
SAE-DEC	62.92	25.68	39.35	61.32	21.17	57.09	50.69	44.52	53.07
SAE-DCN	62.94	25.69	39.36	61.34	34.98	57.09	50.69	44.52	53.07
MTP	77.25	47.80	59.12	61.35	45.77	61.90	70.53	45.76	64.76
MTP-CLNN	82.15	57.68	66.88	75.20	63.13	79.20	80.03	67.39	79.94
LANID-Near	83.44	58.28	66.75	79.56	66.67	83.40	80.80	69.86	81.38
LANID-DBSCAN	83.21	58.02	65.78	81.25	72.86	85.30	80.41	68.10	79.08
LANID	84.12	60.40	70.58	81.25	72.96	86.60	82.64	71.36	82.52

Table 3: Performance on Semi-Supervised NID with Varying Known Class Ratios: Best results for each dataset are highlighted in bold. The Known Class Ratio (KCR) is defined as $\frac{|C_k|}{(|C_k|+|C_u|)}$. A 10% subset of each known class was randomly sampled to create $D_{labeled}$. Results are shown for the three LANID variants as described in Table 2.

	Methods	Banking			StackOverflow			M-CID		
		NMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	ARI	ACC
KCR-25%	BERT-KCL	53.85	20.07	28.79	35.47	16.80	32.88	29.35	11.58	24.76
	DAC	69.85	37.16	49.67	53.97	36.46	53.96	49.83	27.21	43.72
	MTP	79.17	50.83	62.05	74.86	62.27	77.20	70.53	45.76	64.76
	MTP-CLNN	83.88	60.76	70.91	78.38	65.80	80.10	78.30	65.32	78.30
	LANID-Near	85.28	63.48	72.47	80.83	65.86	83.30	81.91	70.30	81.09
	LANID-DBSCAN	84.74	62.22	70.13	74.74	60.54	73.70	80.04	69.69	83.09
	LANID	85.51	64.23	71.40	79.55	63.23	81.80	85.11	75.66	86.82
KCR-50%	BERT-KCL	62.86	30.16	40.81	57.63	41.90	56.58	42.48	22.83	38.11
	DAC	76.41	47.28	59.32	70.78	56.44	73.76	63.27	43.52	57.19
	MTP	82.12	56.43	67.34	76.58	65.55	82.50	70.53	45.76	64.76
	MTP-CLNN	86.42	66.66	74.97	81.41	72.15	86.00	79.34	66.18	78.80
	LANID-Near	86.83	67.41	76.10	81.62	64.32	81.30	81.20	69.54	81.95
	LANID-DBSCAN	85.62	64.35	72.44	81.19	65.75	81.40	79.16	67.85	80.80
	LANID	86.31	66.53	75.49	82.07	70.51	83.00	81.58	70.66	82.81
KCR-75%	BERT-KCL	72.18	44.29	58.70	70.38	57.98	71.50	54.22	34.60	52.15
	DAC	79.99	54.57	65.87	75.31	60.02	78.84	71.41	54.22	69.11
	MTP	84.61	63.23	72.76	80.41	70.01	81.10	77.90	64.57	77.65
	MTP-CLNN	87.24	68.77	77.14	80.99	72.14	85.80	80.12	67.40	79.37
	LANID-Near	87.59	70.13	78.51	82.14	73.05	85.80	81.13	69.75	83.09
	LANID-DBSCAN	86.79	67.18	74.35	83.74	76.45	88.30	80.65	70.24	82.52
	LANID	87.64	68.89	76.56	82.80	74.33	87.50	82.16	70.56	82.23

regions of semantics. Concretely, we conduct DBSCAN clustering on D_{train} and obtain a set of core points x_c and a set of non-core points x_{nc} . Then, we randomly sample a subset x'_{nc} from x_{nc} . For each utterance x_i in x'_{nc} , we search for its m nearest neighbors in x_c , forming a global density set as $\mathcal{M}_i^{Den} = \{(x_i, x_j) | x_j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{Core}\}$, where \mathcal{N}_i^{Core} is the set consisting of the nearest points to x_i in x_c .

3.2. LLM Manager

The LLM manager is another major module in LANID. It constructs prompts using sampled data and parses the responses from LLMs. We design prompts with three components (Pan et al., 2023): schema, regulations, and sentence input. The schema component is intended to guide LLMs to produce responses that meet our desired criteria.

To identify the optimal schema for each dataset, several schemas were manually crafted and evaluated based on their performance on $D_{labeled}$. The regulations component constrains the format of the LLM's responses. For simplicity, we uniformly use the phrase "just answer yes or no." The sentence input component consists of utterance pairs sampled as detailed in Section 3.1. Finally, we predict $r(i, j) = 1$ for a data pair (i, j) if 'yes' appears in the LLM's corresponding response; otherwise, $r(i, j) = 0$.

3.3. Training and Optimization

To optimize the representation of the text encoder on domain data, we collect pairs of positive samples from \mathcal{M}_i^{Near} and/or \mathcal{M}_i^{Core} , with their relationships $r(i, j)$ determined by the LLM manager. For each positive sample pair $\{(x_i, x_j)\}$, we ran-

domly sample k_n utterances from D_{train} as negative samples to better represent the distribution of the entire dataset, assuming the dataset distribution is not extreme. This approach forms a dataset $D_f = (x_i, p_i, n_i)$ of triplets. We then fine-tune the model using a triplet margin loss defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}(x_i, p_i, n_i) = \max(d(x_i, p_i) - d(x_i, n_i) + \text{mgn}, 0), \quad (1)$$

where x_i serves as the anchor point, mgn. represents a hyperparameter, and p_i and n_i are its positive and negative samples, respectively. The function $d(x_i, y_j) = \|x_i - y_j\|$ represents the distance, and the margin is a hyperparameter that determines the minimum desired difference between $d(x_i, p_i)$ and $d(x_i, n_i)$.

As training progresses, the quality of the text encoder’s representation improves, leading to enhanced sampling outcomes. In practice, the process of selecting utterance pairs and querying the LLM manager recurs every T epochs, with the fine-tuning dataset D_f and the text encoder being incrementally updated during this iterative process.

Finally, upon completing the training stage, we apply the optimized encoder on the test set D_{test} and employ the k -means algorithm to do clustering. Utterances that fall within the same cluster are considered to share the same intent.

4. Experiment

4.1. Experimental Details

We evaluate LANID using three intent recognition benchmarks. The BANKING dataset (Casanueva et al., 2020) includes 13,083 utterances distributed across 77 intents within the banking domain. The StackOverflow dataset (Xu et al., 2015) comprises 20,000 queries collected from an online question-answering platform¹, categorized into 20 different categories. The M-CID dataset (Arora et al., 2020) consists of 1,745 utterances associated with 16 intents specifically related to COVID-19 services.

Experimental Setup. Our proposed method is evaluated under both unsupervised and semi-supervised settings. We use three clustering evaluation metrics: normalized mutual information (NMI) (Estévez et al., 2009), adjusted Rand index (ARI) (Yeung and Ruzzo, 2001), and accuracy (ACC).

Baselines. We compare LANID with both unsupervised and semi-supervised NID state-of-the-art (SOTAs). The unsupervised NID SOTAs include the SAE series (Xie et al., 2016), MTP, and CLNN (Zhang et al., 2022b). The semi-supervised baselines include BERT-KCL (Hsu et al., 2019), DAC

(Zhang et al., 2021b), MTP, and CLNN (Zhang et al., 2022b).

Implementation Details. We use the default settings of CLNN (Zhang et al., 2022b) and continue to train the model pretrained by MTP-CLNN as a post-finetuning stage. Further training can also be conducted on other NID baselines. For LLMs, we use the *gpt-3.5-turbo*² model. The hyperparameters of LANID as shown in Table 1 are selected based on performance on the validation set.

4.2. Result Analysis

Tables 2 and 3 summarize the performance of LANID compared to state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods in both unsupervised and semi-supervised settings across three intent recognition benchmarks. The results reveal several key observations: (1) LANID and its variants excel in unsupervised learning, beating other baselines due to effective LLM labeling that compensates for missing supervised signals. (2) LANID consistently surpasses baselines in most cases, proving its effectiveness. (3) Although the combination of two neighborhood sampling strategies generally works well, relying solely on the DBSCAN-based sampling strategy can sometimes hinder performance. This is because the LLM is constrained to make binary judgments and retain only positive pairs. For many outliers, their nearest cores may not express the same intent, thereby reducing the size of D_f and leading to overfitting problems.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we introduce LANID, a framework designed to tackle the challenge of novel intent discovery in TODS by LLMs to train lightweight encoders through contrastive learning. This approach enhances the system’s capability to identify new user intents while maintaining efficiency, scalability, and privacy. By employing effective data sampling techniques and harnessing LLM knowledge, LANID demonstrates superior performance compared to existing methods, as evidenced by extensive experiments on benchmark datasets. Overall, the proposed framework sets the stage for more adaptive and responsive TODS that can effectively operate in dynamic real-world environments.

Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback. This research was partially supported by the grant of HK ITF ITS/359/21FP.

¹<https://stackoverflow.com/>

²<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5>

6. Bibliographical References

- Alfred V. Aho and Jeffrey D. Ullman. 1972. *The Theory of Parsing, Translation and Compiling*, volume 1. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- American Psychological Association. 1983. *Publications Manual*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Wenbin An, Feng Tian, Ping Chen, Qinghua Zheng, and Wei Ding. 2023. New user intent discovery with robust pseudo label training and source domain joint training. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 38(4):21–31.
- Rie Kubota Ando and Tong Zhang. 2005. [A framework for learning predictive structures from multiple tasks and unlabeled data](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:1817–1853.
- Galen Andrew and Jianfeng Gao. 2007. [Scalable training of \$L_1\$ -regularized log-linear models](#). In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 33–40.
- Abhinav Arora, Akshat Shrivastava, Mrinal Mohit, Lorena Sainz-Maza Lecanda, and Ahmed Aly. 2020. Cross-lingual transfer learning for intent detection of covid-19 utterances.
- Vassileios Balntas, Edgar Riba, Daniel Ponsa, and Krystian Mikolajczyk. 2016. Learning local feature descriptors with triplets and shallow convolutional neural networks. In *Bmvc*, volume 1, page 3.
- BSI. 1973a. *Natural Fibre Twines*, 3rd edition. British Standards Institution, London. BS 2570.
- BSI. 1973b. Natural fibre twines. BS 2570, British Standards Institution, London. 3rd. edn.
- Inigo Casanueva, Tadas Temcinas, Daniela Gerz, Matthew Henderson, and Ivan Vulic. 2020. Efficient intent detection with dual sentence encoders. *ACL 2020*, page 38.
- A. Castor and L. E. Pollux. 1992. The use of user modelling to guide inference and learning. *Applied Intelligence*, 2(1):37–53.
- Ashok K. Chandra, Dexter C. Kozen, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. 1981. [Alternation](#). *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 28(1):114–133.
- Ajay Chatterjee and Shubhashis Sengupta. 2020. Intent mining from past conversations for conversational agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11014*.
- J.L. Chercheur. 1994. *Case-Based Reasoning*, 2nd edition. Morgan Kaufman Publishers, San Mateo, CA.
- N. Chomsky. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, New York. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- James W. Cooley and John W. Tukey. 1965. [An algorithm for the machine calculation of complex Fourier series](#). *Mathematics of Computation*, 19(90):297–301.
- Thomas Cover and Peter Hart. 1967. Nearest neighbor pattern classification. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 13(1):21–27.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Umberto Eco. 1990. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Indian University Press.
- Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, Xiaowei Xu, et al. 1996. A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In *kdd*, volume 96, pages 226–231.
- Pablo A Estévez, Michel Tesmer, Claudio A Perez, and Jacek M Zurada. 2009. Normalized mutual information feature selection. *IEEE Transactions on neural networks*, 20(2):189–201.
- Dan Gusfield. 1997. [Algorithms on Strings, Trees and Sequences](#). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- J Han. 2001. m. kamber (2001): Data mining, concepts and techniques.
- Iryna Haponchyk and Alessandro Moschitti. 2021. Supervised neural clustering via latent structured output learning: application to question intents. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3364–3374.
- Iryna Haponchyk, Antonio Uva, Seunghak Yu, Olga Uryupina, and Alessandro Moschitti. 2018. Supervised clustering of questions into intents for dialog system applications. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 2310–2321.

- Michael Heck, Nurul Lubis, Benjamin Ruppik, Renato Vukovic, Shutong Feng, Christian Geisshauser, Hsien-Chin Lin, Carel van Niekerk, and Milica Gasic. 2023. Chatgpt for zero-shot dialogue state tracking: A solution or an opportunity? In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 936–950.
- Paul Gerhard Hoel. 1971a. *Elementary Statistics*, 3rd edition. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. Wiley, New York, Chichester. ISBN 0 471 40300.
- Paul Gerhard Hoel. 1971b. *Elementary Statistics*, 3rd edition, Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics, pages 19–33. Wiley, New York, Chichester. ISBN 0 471 40300.
- Yen-Chang Hsu, Zhaoyang Lv, Joel Schlosser, Phillip Odom, and Zsolt Kira. 2019. Multi-class classification without multi-class labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00544*.
- Otto Jespersen. 1922. *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin*. Allen and Unwin.
- Siwon Kim, Sangdoon Yun, Hwaran Lee, Martin Gubri, Sungho Yoon, and Seong Joon Oh. 2023. Propile: Probing privacy leakage in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:20750–20762.
- Hao Lang, Yinhe Zheng, Jian Sun, Fei Huang, Luo Si, and Yongbin Li. 2022. Estimating soft labels for out-of-domain intent detection. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 261–276.
- Ting-En Lin, Hua Xu, and Hanlei Zhang. 2020. Discovering new intents via constrained deep adaptive clustering with cluster refinement. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8360–8367.
- Han Liu, Xiaotong Zhang, Lu Fan, Xuandi Fu, Qi-mai Li, Xiao-Ming Wu, and Albert YS Lam. 2019. Reconstructing capsule networks for zero-shot intent classification. 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)*, pages 4799–4809.
- Tingting Ma, Qianhui Wu, Zhiwei Yu, Tiejun Zhao, and Chin-Yew Lin. 2022. On the effectiveness of sentence encoding for intent detection meta-learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3806–3818.
- Lindung Parningotan Manik, Zaenal Akbar, Hani Febri Mustika, Ariani Indrawati, Dwi Setyo Rini, Agusdin Dharma Fefirenta, and Tutie Djarwaningsih. 2021. Out-of-scope intent detection on a knowledge-based chatbot. *International Journal of Intelligent Engineering & Systems*, 14(5).
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- Wenbo Pan, Qiguang Chen, Xiao Xu, Wanxiang Che, and Libo Qin. 2023. A preliminary evaluation of chatgpt for zero-shot dialogue understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04256*.
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. Instruction tuning with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03277*.
- Hugh Perkins and Yi Yang. 2019. Dialog intent induction with deep multi-view clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.11487*.
- Jiashu Pu, Guandan Chen, Yongzhu Chang, and Xiaoxi Mao. 2022. Dialog intent induction via density-based deep clustering ensemble. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.06731*.
- Chengwei Qin, Aston Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, Jiaao Chen, Michihiro Yasunaga, and Diyi Yang. 2023. Is chatgpt a general-purpose natural language processing task solver? In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1339–1384.
- Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli and Joel R. Tetreault. 2015. [Yara parser: A fast and accurate dependency parser](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:1503.06733. Version 2.
- Florian Schroff, Dmitry Kalenichenko, and James Philbin. 2015. Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 815–823.
- Chen Shi, Qi Chen, Lei Sha, Sujian Li, Xu Sun, Houfeng Wang, and Lintao Zhang. 2018. Auto-dialabel: Labeling dialogue data with unsupervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 684–689.
- Charles Joseph Singer, E. J. Holmyard, and A. R. Hall, editors. 1954–58. *A history of technology*. Oxford University Press, London. 5 vol.
- Xiaoshuai Song, Keqing He, Pei Wang, Guanting Dong, Yutao Mou, Jingang Wang, Yunsen Xian, Xunliang Cai, and Weiran Xu. 2023. Large language models meet open-world intent discovery

- and recognition: An evaluation of chatgpt. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10291–10304.
- Jannik Strötgen and Michael Gertz. 2012. Temporal tagging on different domains: Challenges, strategies, and gold standards. In *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, pages 3746–3753, Istanbul, Turkey. European Language Resource Association (ELRA).
- S. Superman, B. Batman, C. Catwoman, and S. Spiderman. 2000. *Superheroes experiences with books*, 20th edition. The Phantom Editors Associates, Gotham City.
- Junyuan Xie, Ross Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. 2016. Unsupervised deep embedding for clustering analysis. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 478–487. PMLR.
- Jiaming Xu, Peng Wang, Guanhua Tian, Bo Xu, Jun Zhao, Fangyuan Wang, and Hongwei Hao. 2015. Short text clustering via convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Vector Space Modeling for Natural Language Processing*, pages 62–69.
- Guangfeng Yan, Lu Fan, Qimai Li, Han Liu, Xiaotong Zhang, Xiao-Ming Wu, and Albert YS Lam. 2020. Unknown intent detection using gaussian mixture model with an application to zero-shot intent classification. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 1050–1060.
- Ka Yee Yeung and Walter L Ruzzo. 2001. Details of the adjusted rand index and clustering algorithms, supplement to the paper an empirical study on principal component analysis for clustering gene expression data. *Bioinformatics*, 17(9):763–774.
- Li-Ming Zhan, Haowen Liang, Lu Fan, Xiao-Ming Wu, and Albert YS Lam. 2022. A closer look at few-shot out-of-distribution intent detection. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 451–460.
- Li-Ming Zhan, Haowen Liang, Bo Liu, Lu Fan, Xiao-Ming Wu, and Albert YS Lam. 2021. Out-of-scope intent detection with self-supervision and discriminative training. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3521–3532.
- Hanlei Zhang, Xiaoteng Li, Hua Xu, Panpan Zhang, Kang Zhao, and Kai Gao. 2021a. Textoir: An integrated and visualized platform for text open intent recognition. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 167–174.
- Hanlei Zhang, Hua Xu, Ting-En Lin, and Rui Lyu. 2021b. Discovering new intents with deep aligned clustering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 14365–14373.
- Hanlei Zhang, Hua Xu, Xin Wang, Fei Long, and Kai Gao. 2023. A clustering framework for unsupervised and semi-supervised new intent discovery. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 36(11):5468–5481.
- Haode Zhang, Haowen Liang, Yuwei Zhang, Li-Ming Zhan, Xiao-Ming Wu, Xiaolei Lu, and Albert Lam. 2022a. Fine-tuning pre-trained language models for few-shot intent detection: Supervised pre-training and isotropization. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 532–542.
- Haode Zhang, Yuwei Zhang, Li-Ming Zhan, Jiaxin Chen, Guangyuan Shi, Xiao-Ming Wu, and Albert YS Lam. 2021c. Effectiveness of pre-training for few-shot intent classification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 1114–1120.
- Yuwei Zhang, Haode Zhang, Li-Ming Zhan, Xiao-Ming Wu, and Albert Lam. 2022b. New intent discovery with pre-training and contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 256–269.
- Yunhua Zhou, Guofeng Quan, and Xipeng Qiu. 2023. A probabilistic framework for discovering new intents. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3771–3784.