

One Stone, Four Birds: A Comprehensive Solution for QA System Using Supervised Contrastive Learning

BO WANG¹, TSUNENORI MINE², (Member, IEEE)

¹Graduate School of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, 8190395, JAPAN (e-mail: wangbo.rw@gmail.com)

²Faculty of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, 8190395, JAPAN (e-mail: mine@ait.kyushu-u.ac.jp)

Corresponding author: Bo Wang (e-mail: wangbo.rw@gmail.com).

arXiv:2407.09011v1 [cs.CL] 12 Jul 2024

ABSTRACT This paper presents a novel and comprehensive solution to enhance both the robustness and efficiency of question answering (QA) systems through supervised contrastive learning (SCL). Training a high-performance QA system has become straightforward with pre-trained language models, requiring only a small amount of data and simple fine-tuning. However, despite recent advances, existing QA systems still exhibit significant deficiencies in functionality and training efficiency. We address the functionality issue by defining four key tasks: user input intent classification, out-of-domain input detection, new intent discovery, and continual learning. We then leverage a unified SCL-based representation learning method to efficiently build an intra-class compact and inter-class scattered feature space, facilitating both known intent classification and unknown intent detection and discovery. Consequently, with minimal additional tuning on downstream tasks, our approach significantly improves model efficiency and achieves new state-of-the-art performance across all tasks.

INDEX TERMS Intent discovery, natural language processing, out-of-domain detection, question-answering system, supervised contrastive learning, text classification.

I. INTRODUCTION

QUESTION answering (QA) system is a well-established and important application widely used in areas such as healthcare [1], finance [2] and e-commerce [3]. Despite the world gradually moving into the era of large language models (LLMs), classic QA systems still maintain a strong presence due to their low cost, ease of deployment, and high accuracy in answering questions.

A typical QA system mainly comprises two components: user intent classification and answer retrieval. The efficiency of the former is crucial, as a correct response often depends on accurately determining the user's intent. To achieve robust classification, it is essential to efficiently extract features from user input, providing intent-specific and discriminative text representations for classification. Initially, text features were extracted manually using techniques like term frequency-inverse document frequency (TF-IDF [4]) or bag-of-words (BoW [5]). With the advent of neural networks, feature extraction became an automated process [6], [7]. Today, the power of pre-trained Transformers like BERT [8] has made it much easier to extract features and build classification models, requiring only a small amount of data with Cross-

Entropy (CE) loss fine-tuning [9], [10].

It seems that the current QA system building is simple and mature, with nearly nothing to be changed. However, from the perspective of building a comprehensive system, current QA systems still face unresolved issues at both internal and external levels, which have not been fully addressed yet:

- **Externally, or at the system level:** Current QA systems typically adopt a “training-as-complete” policy, meaning that once the model has finished training, its knowledge is not updated. This approach leaves the system vulnerable to unseen, unknown inputs (as out-of-domain, OOD inputs [11]). To maintain the robustness and security of the model, there should be mechanisms to handle these inputs. Furthermore, even when new data is collected to upgrade the system, the common practice is to re-train a new model from scratch, leading to a waste of labor and resources.
- **Internally, or in training efficiency:** Increasing studies indicate that the BERT+CE training combination still has efficiency problems. For BERT, the raw text feature distribution is anisotropic [12]. Additionally, when using CE as the fine-tuning loss, text features of different




FIGURE 1. Our proposed workflow to achieve a comprehensive and adaptive QA system. First, an initial model is trained using current known data (Pre). Then, during daily usage, an inquiry will first be judged to be an answerable input or not (T-2): if so, proceed to the intent detection (T-1) and retrieve the answer; if not, the unknown inquiry will be temporarily saved and be clustered later (T-3). Finally, the initial model is re-trained with newly discovered data to obtain the classification ability to new intents (T-4).

intents often remain mixed with unclear boundaries in the embedding space [13]. Both issues hinder training efficiency and model performance.

In this paper, aiming to build a more robust QA system, we propose a novel and comprehensive solution to address both issues. To tackle the systematic issue, including the basic intent classification function, we define four key tasks and design a workflow between them (as shown in Figure 1), enabling the system to be self-consistent and recurrently updatable. Specifically, the tasks are:

- T-1 **User input intent classification:** The fundamental task for a QA system.
- T-2 **OOD input detection:** Detect abnormal inputs to prevent misleading output. The detected OOD texts are saved as source data for Task 3.
- T-3 **New intent discovery:** Utilize detected OOD texts to discover new possible intents once they accumulate to a sufficient quantity.
- T-4 **Continual learning:** Use newly discovered and pseudo-labeled data to incrementally train the initial classification model, enhancing the system’s capability to handle the latest inquiries.

To address the training efficiency problem, we leverage supervised contrastive learning (SCL, [14]) to replace CE fine-tuning as the unified text representation optimization method, which requires minimal tuning to achieve all four task objectives. We choose SCL because, in our previous research on OOD detection [15], it demonstrated excellent capability in upstream feature optimization, allowing an accurate OOD text detection using only a simple distance-based algorithm in downstream.

More specifically, the advantage of SCL over CE fine-tuning lies in its ability to enhance both learning efficiency and feature separation. As shown in Figure 2-b), SCL employs a simple but clear optimization target: pulling same-label text features together and pushing different ones further apart, resulting in an intra-class compact and inter-class

scattered, well-organized embedding space. This clear separation between clusters facilitates easier in-domain (IND) intent classification and IND/OOD separation and detection (Figure 2, T-1/2). Additionally, this structure also supports the aggregation of currently unknown but semantically similar features, creating a conducive environment for new intent discovery and continual learning (Figure 2, T-3/4). Consequently, even with the simplest algorithms in downstream tuning, all task objectives can be achieved effortlessly and efficiently.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- 1) For the first time, we clearly identify the systematic and efficiency issues in current QA systems and propose a comprehensive solution involving four key tasks in a natural workflow to enhance the training process, resulting in a robust and comprehensive system.
- 2) To achieve the task objectives, we leverage SCL as the unified representation learning approach, which requires minimal tuning in downstream tasks.
- 3) Our experiments demonstrate that, despite its conciseness and simplicity, the proposed solution significantly improves global feature optimization efficiency and outperforms state-of-the-art methods across all tasks, complementing the deficiencies of current QA systems.

II. RELATED WORKS

A. REPRESENTATION LEARNING IN INTENT CLASSIFICATION MODEL BUILDING

Early history of representation learning

Representation learning (RepL), or feature learning, is a crucial process in building machine learning models. Good RepL methods capture the intrinsic patterns and structures of the data, thus providing a solid foundation for downstream tasks.

Initially, RepL research focused on manually extracting meaningful features from raw data, with preliminary methods including TF-IDF [4] and BoW [5]. Subsequently, the development of word embeddings extracted via neural net-




FIGURE 2. Diagrams of SCL's representation optimization procedure, and solutions for each task. Left: the training and optimization effect by SCL, which gathers same-intent text features together and pushes different features further apart, providing an underlying embedding space for following tasks. Right: the classification/detection processes of T-1 to T-4 after SCL. (Together with Figure 1 for better understanding)

works automated the feature extraction process [6], [7]. More recently, with the advent of large-scale encoders like BERT [8], pre-trained on extensive corpora, obtaining high-quality text embeddings has become much easier. The most common approach is to use BERT as the base encoder, with CE fine-tuning as the RepL method to refine the text embedding distribution.

Drawbacks of BERT+CE mode

The above BERT+CE approach is also widely adopted in QA systems [1], [10], [16], [17]. However, this method can be suboptimal for feature optimization from two main reasons. Firstly, from a global perspective, [12], [18] reported that the overall text embedding distribution generated by BERT is anisotropic. This means that most embeddings are spatially distributed in an elongated cone-like space rather than uniformly in a sphere, leading to high similarity between any two sentence representations and posing challenges for downstream tasks. Secondly, from a local perspective, CE fine-tuning results in a “loose” feature arrangement [13], [14], where the boundaries between different intent clusters are barely distinguishable. This not only reduces the performance of known, IND classification, but also makes the model prone to confusing IND inputs with unseen but similar OOD inputs.

Contrastive learning as a RepL method

As discussed above, RepL research has gradually shifted focus from feature extraction to feature optimization, with one of the most popular method series being the contrastive learning (ConL). The earliest ConL can be traced back to supervised metric learning (MeL) [19] used in image classification tasks, which established the fundamental strategy of

“gathering similar examples together and pushing dissimilar ones further apart”. This strategy helps generate compact feature clusters efficiently. Subsequently, unsupervised ConL (UConL) [20], [21] was proposed, sharing the same strategy but aiming to improve the overall representation uniformity. Finally, SCL [14] incorporates the advantages of both MeL and UConL, thus having the potential to address both global and local feature optimization issues.

However, ConL has been mainly examined in computer vision (CV) field. In NLP field, there have been limited applications, primarily in natural language inference (NLI) tasks using UConL methods [22], [23]. A boarder exploration of SCL's learning effect across various tasks, including its application in QA systems, remains unaddressed.

B. METHODS REVIEW FOR SPECIFIC TASKS

OOD detection: As QA systems have evolved significantly in recent years, there is now a higher expectation for systems not only to answer known questions correctly but also to identify and reject unknown inputs, which constitutes the OOD detection task. Early OOD detection methods relied on the availability of numerous OOD data for binary classification [24]. However, the scope and variety of OOD data are theoretically infinite, making collection a burdensome task. Subsequently, more approaches have focused on training networks using only IND data to generate heterogeneous representations [25], [26]. Various downstream algorithms, such as local outlier factor (LOF) [27], Gaussian discriminant analysis (GDA) [28], energy score [29], [30], and Mahalanobis distance [31], [32], have been applied to distinguish

between IND and OOD text features. The latest advances in OOD detection fall into two broad categories: using ConL methods to optimize the representation space [15], [33], [34], and employing generative modeling approaches like training a GPT model [35] on IND data to achieve lower likelihoods for OOD text generation [36]–[38].

New intent discovery, NID: Initially, new intent discovery focused on identifying new categories directly from unlabeled data, with most methods applying unsupervised clustering [39], [40]. Later approaches commonly incorporated some labeled data to support the discovery of unknown intents [41], [42]. A typical workflow involves computing textual similarities between unlabeled and known data, assigning pseudo labels to unknown data based on the results, and then performing clustering. Recently, NID research has also emphasized the importance of representation learning, with many studies incorporating pre-training and contrastive learning methods to optimize feature space arrangements [43]–[45].

Continual learning: Continual learning denotes a re-training procedure to let the network learn new knowledge in stages, and finally reach a level to handle all tasks. For example, we may let the model learn the even five handwriting numbers and then the odd fives, finally let it recognize all ten numbers. The biggest challenge of continual learning is the forgetting problem [46], that is, the model’s ability to recognize old data may deteriorate significantly after learning new data. Current studies are also focusing on solving this issue, where the solutions mainly include weight regularization [47], [48] and knowledge distillation [49], [50]. In this paper, for simplicity, we apply a very straightforward method that re-trains the model with both a few new and old intent data, which can be regarded as the “replay” policy [51], [52], to mitigate forgetting. Experiments (Section VI-E) show that this policy is effective and exhibits minimal performance degradation for old data classification.

Despite the above significant progress in each task, there remains a gap in integrating these tasks into a comprehensive QA system building, which is the aim of this paper to realize using SCL.

III. PROBLEM AND TASK DEFINITION

As mentioned in Section I, we introduce four basic tasks to build a comprehensive and adaptive QA system (Figure 1). Here, before presenting the specific solutions, we formally define the problems and targets of each task.

A. PRELIMINARY

Data: Suppose we initially have a set of known data $S_{known} = \{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i | y_i \in \mathcal{C}_{kn}\}$, where \mathbf{x}_i is the i -th user inquiry text, y_i is the corresponding label, and \mathcal{C}_{kn} is the label set of **known** intents. This data serves as the pre-training data, which is also referred as the In-Domain, IND examples, i.e., $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i | y_i \in \mathcal{C}_{kn}\} \in \mathbb{D}_{IND}$.

We also have a set of label-unknown data $S_{unlabeled} = \{\mathbf{x}_j, y_j | y_j \in \{\mathcal{C}_{kn} + \mathcal{C}_{uk}\}\}$, which refers to the real, daily user inputs. Note that besides the known intents, there are also

some data belonging to \mathcal{C}_{uk} , which is the **unknown** intent set. Those data are the so-called Out-of-Domain, OOD examples, i.e., $\{\mathbf{x}_j, y_j | y_j \in \mathcal{C}_{uk}\} \in \mathbb{D}_{OOD}$.

Encoder: We have a language encoder ENC that encodes and transforms a discrete text \mathbf{x} into an m -dimension continuous representation: $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Since there are many text similarity calculations during SCL training, we adopt a simple but effective “mean-pooling” strategy to obtain the sentence representation. Specifically, the average of all word embeddings in the sentence is served as the sentence embedding:

$$\mathbf{h} = \frac{1}{len(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{i=1}^{len(\mathbf{x})} ENC(w_i) \quad (1)$$

where $len(\mathbf{x})$ is the length of input \mathbf{x} , $\{w_1, \dots, w_i, \dots, w_{len(\mathbf{x})}\}$ are the words in the sentence \mathbf{x} .

B. T-1: USER INTENT CLASSIFICATION

The target of this task is to find an accurate mapping:

$$f_{cls} : ENC(\mathbf{x}_i) \mapsto \hat{y}_i \quad \hat{y}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{kn} \quad (2)$$

For traditional methods like CE-fine-tuning, this is achieved by further adding a fully-connected layer to the end of ENC and training them together using CE loss. In the proposed method, the encoder is pre-trained using SCL (refer to Section IV-A for details) and the parameters are fixed in the following tasks T-1/2/3. f_{cls} is realized by a nearest neighbor algorithm (Section IV-B1).

C. T-2: OUT-OF-DOMAIN DETECTION

The target of this task is to determine whether an example \mathbf{x}_j from $S_{unlabeled}$ belongs to \mathbb{D}_{IND} or \mathbb{D}_{OOD} . This is usually realized by comparing the detection score sco given by a detection algorithm f_{det} with an empirically-set threshold λ :

$$sco_j = f_{det}(ENC(\mathbf{x}_j)) \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_j \in \begin{cases} \mathbb{D}_{OOD}, & \text{if } sco_j \geq \lambda \\ \mathbb{D}_{IND}, & \text{if } sco_j < \lambda \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Here, the detected \mathbf{x}_j^{ood} are saved for T-3 (new intent discovery), while the detected \mathbf{x}_j^{ind} will be classified normally in T-1 and also saved for the final task, T-4 (continual learning).

D. T-3: NEW INTENT DISCOVERY

Once the collected OOD texts \mathbf{x}_j^{ood} reach a sufficient quantity, an algorithm f_{nid} is used to cluster and assign pseudo labels \hat{y}_j to them, as the “new IND intents” in $\mathcal{C}_{kn'}$:

$$f_{nid} : ENC(\mathbf{x}_j^{ood}) \mapsto \hat{y}_j \quad \hat{y}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{kn'} \quad (5)$$

E. T-4: CONTINUAL LEARNING

Finally, using both the known IND data $\{\mathbf{x}_{j'}, \hat{y}_{j'} | \hat{y}_{j'} \in \mathcal{C}_{kn}\}$ and newly discovered ‘‘IND’’ data $\{\mathbf{x}_{j'}, \hat{y}_{j'} | \hat{y}_{j'} \in \mathcal{C}_{kn'}\}$, *ENC* is re-trained to obtain the ability of classifying both old and new intent inquires.

$$f_{cls-new} : ENC_{new}(\mathbf{x}_k) \mapsto \hat{y}_k \quad \hat{y}_k \in \{\mathcal{C}_{kn} + \mathcal{C}_{kn'}\} \quad (6)$$

IV. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we introduce the methodology of SCL as the RepL method in the pre-training stage, followed by the downstream solutions to each task.

A. STAGE 1: SUPERVISED CONTRASTIVE LEARNING-BASED PRE-TRAINING

1) Principle and optimizing effect of SCL

As discussed in Section II, BERT+CE fine-tuning exhibits issues with local loose borders and a global anisotropic distribution in RepL, while SCL has the potential to solve both of these problems.

Specifically, as illustrated in Figure 2, for the local aspect, compared with CE fine-tuning, SCL applies a more straightforward yet effective target: pulling the representations of similar examples (*positive examples*) together and pushing dissimilar ones (*negative examples*) further apart. To tackle the global distribution problem, SCL further generates ‘‘view’’ augmentations as additional positive examples before the contrasting process, optimizing features in a boarder scale. Together, these strategies provide a better supervision signal to arrange text representations to form compact and distinct clusters, enhancing both the alignment and uniformity of feature space, and thus sharpening the distinctions between texts from various intents.

This well-organized embedding space (Figure 2-b) provides a strong foundation that benefits all downstream tasks:

- T-1: The clear separations between each intent cluster facilitate easy and accurate classification.
- T-2: The compact and distinct IND clusters highlight the differences between them and OOD texts, which do not belong to any known intents.
- T-3: Although not trained directly with OOD data, the two optimization directions of SCL still drive the aggregation of semantically similar features. This creates an environment conducive to intent discovery algorithms, making it easier to identify the clustered gathered data.
- T-4: The accurately discovered new intent data, pre-organized feature space, and SCL-based re-training, together ensure the high-performance of the updated system.

2) Generation of text ‘‘views’’

As discussed in the last subsection, the effective optimization of SCL is attributed to both the supervised positive-negative movement and the unsupervised ‘‘view’’ augmentation. This augmentation also serves as a precaution against the

lack of positive examples in the mini-batch, especially when the data quantity is small compared with category numbers.

For images, view generation can be achieved by simple transformations such as rotating and cropping. However, these techniques are not easily applicable to text ‘‘view’’ generation, as hasty word swaps or deletions can distort the original meaning. In our previous study [15], we found that encoding a sentence twice with different drop-out masks (Figure 2-left) is an effective way to generate high-quality, slightly different but main meaning preserved text embeddings. By using this generation method, SCL gave the best OOD detection results compared to no-view-generation [33] or more complex techniques like embedding-attack [53] (refer to Tables 3-5 of [15] for detailed results). Considering these advantages, we continue to use this technique as the augmentation method in this paper.

3) Formal learning procedure definition

Here we give the formal definition of an SCL procedure:

Step 1: Text ‘‘View’’ generation

Before the learning process, two text embedding views are generated for each example in the known dataset $\mathcal{S}_{known} = \{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i | y_i \in \mathcal{C}_{kn}\}$. This is achieved by enabling the dropout option in network training settings and inputting the same sentence twice:

$$\mathbf{h}_{2i'} = ENC_{drop1}(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \mathbf{h}_{2i'+1} = ENC_{drop2}(\mathbf{x}_i) \quad (7)$$

Here, since the two view embeddings are derived from the same text, we assign them the same label as \mathbf{x}_i , that is: we get two views $\{(\mathbf{h}_{2i'}, y_{2i'}), (\mathbf{h}_{2i'+1}, y_{2i'+1})\}$, where $y_{2i'} = y_{2i'+1} = y_i, i' \in 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Step 2: Supervised contrastive learning

The SCL training loss is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{SCL} = \sum_{i'=1}^{2N} \frac{-1}{|Pos(i')|} \sum_{p \in Pos(i')} \log \frac{\exp(\mathbf{h}_{i'} \cdot \mathbf{h}_p / \tau)}{\sum_{q \in Neg(i')} \exp(\mathbf{h}_{i'} \cdot \mathbf{h}_q / \tau)} \quad (8)$$

where $i' \in 1, 2, \dots, 2N$ is the index of current sample (the *anchor* text). $Pos(i')$ is the index set of all *positive* examples to the *anchor* text in the mini-batch, i.e., $y_p = y_{i'}$, and $Neg(i')$ is the index set of all *negative* examples, i.e., $y_q \neq y_{i'}$. τ is the temperature factor to amplify the loss output. To calculate text similarity directly using dot product, we apply $L2$ normalization to all representations before training.

B. STAGE 2: SOLUTIONS FOR DOWNSTREAM TASKS

With a well-organized embedding space achieved through SCL, we can complete all the tasks with the least efforts.

1) Solution for T-1 intent classification

We apply a Mahalanobis distance (MDist) - nearest neighbor (NN)-based method for IND intent classification, which does not require any additional training. We use MDist because, compared to Euclidean distance, MDist considers the distribution of each feature component, providing a more accurate measurement of text similarity. Additionally, to further

accelerate the classification but avoid the instability of NN, we propose calculating MDist between the current test sample \mathbf{x}_{test} and only the centroids $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_c$ of each intent c . Finally, y_{test} is determined as the label of the nearest centroid. The whole process is divided into three steps:

a) Class centroid calculation

The class centroid is the average data point of all text embeddings belonging to this intent:

$$\bar{\mathbf{h}}_c = \frac{1}{num(c)} \sum_{i=1}^{num(c)} \mathbf{h}_{c,i} \quad (9)$$

where $num(c)$ is data quantity in category c , and $\mathbf{h}_{c,i}$ is the text representation of its i -th example.

b) MDist calculation

We calculate the covariance matrix S over all data (eq. 10) and then calculate MDist (eq. 11).

$$S = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{c \in C} (\mathbf{H}_c - \bar{\mathbf{H}}_c)(\mathbf{H}_c - \bar{\mathbf{H}}_c)^T \quad (10)$$

$$MDist(\mathbf{h}_{test}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c) = \sqrt{(\mathbf{h}_{test} - \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c)^T S^{-1} (\mathbf{h}_{test} - \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c)} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_c = [\mathbf{h}_{c,1}, \mathbf{h}_{c,2}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{c,num(c)}]^T$ is the sample matrix of category c , $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_c = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c$.

c) Label determination

Finally, the label is determined by the nearest centroid:

$$y_{test} = \arg \min_{c \in C} MDist(\mathbf{h}_{test}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c) \quad (12)$$

2) Solution for T-2 out-of-domain detection

The solution for T-2 is very simple: we still calculate MDist of \mathbf{x}_{test} to the nearest intent centroid as T-1, but the distance is used directly as the detection sco :

$$sco(\mathbf{x}_{test}) = \min_{c \in C} MDist(\mathbf{h}_{test}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c) \quad (13)$$

The distance itself can serve as the sco and be an effective detection indicator, since a larger value means that even taking the shortest distance, current example is still far from / has less similarity to any known, IND category centroids. As shown in Figure 2-T-2, this suggests that the current \mathbf{x}_{test} is more likely to be an unseen, i.e., OOD text.

In practical usage, as introduced in Section III-C, sco is further compared with a threshold λ , and texts with an exceeding distance will be judged as OOD examples.

3) Solution for T-3 new intent discovery

To conduct intent discovery, the first step is to obtain the OOD examples to be clustered. Here, we first find a threshold λ with a policy that when the model in T-2 gets a *true positive rate*, $TPR=90\%$ in T-2 on validation data (i.e., 90% OOD examples are correctly recognized), then we filter out OOD texts by comparing sco with this λ .

Next, since SCL has provided a well-structured feature space, we apply KMeans, one of the simplest unsupervised clustering algorithms, to solve T-3. Taking the detected OOD samples $\mathbf{x}_{j'}^{ood}$, KMeans clusters and assigns pseudo-labels $\hat{y}_{j'}$

to them. The detailed procedure in algorithm is provided in Appendix A. The pseudo-labeled new intent examples $\{\mathbf{x}_{j'}^{ood}, \hat{y}_{j'}\}$ will serve as the training data for the final T-4.

4) Solution for T-4 continual learning

In the final task, the initial *ENC* will be re-trained with both detected IND examples $\{\mathbf{x}_{j'}^{ind}, \hat{y}_{j'} | \hat{y}_{j'} \in C_{kn}\}$ (labeled by the initial model) and detected OOD examples $\{\mathbf{x}_{j'}^{ood}, \hat{y}_{j'} | \hat{y}_{j'} \in C_{kn'}\}$ (pseudo-labeled in T-3) to prevent forgetting. The training method here is still SCL (same as in Stage-1, Section IV-A3) but with an expanded label set $\{C_{kn} + C_{kn'}\}$ without further modifications. After the training, the model gains the ability to handle inquiries from new intents.

V. EXPERIMENT

A. BASELINES

We apply the following latest and competitive methods as baselines for evaluation.

Fine-tuning, FT (All tasks): Despite being the most common training method, CE-based fine-tuning remains one of the most powerful methods actively used among all tasks [16], [31], [41]. Thus this time we applied it as a baseline of RepL, and tested the effects throughout all four tasks. The downstream detection and clustering method are all the same as SCL.

PTO-Sup [38] (T-2): This work proposed a Prefix Tuning-based OOD detection method, training a generative GPT-2 model on IND data and then using the likelihood as sco . It assumes that the unseen OOD text should let model output a lower likelihood. This method originally supports unsupervised learning, but for a fair comparison, we applied its supervised mode with IND labels available.

Layer-LOF [27] (T-2): This paper addressed that pre-trained language models like BERT may over-rationalize the input. That is, even it is an OOD input, the last-layer embedding may tend to be more like IND. Based on this observation, it proposed to consider a decision of multiple layers after fine-tuning, and finally used local outlier factor (LOF) with a voting mechanism for final decision. In this paper, we simply averaged its best-four layer results as the final result.

MTP-KNNCL [44] (T-3): The state-of-the-art NID method that first pre-trains the model with a Masked Language Modeling (MLM) target to obtain prior semantic knowledge, then performs KNN contrastive learning for better cluster aggregation. The downstream clustering method is KMeans.

DPN [45] (T-3): This Decoupled Prototypical Network first initializes some prototypes for known and unknown intents and aligns them as a bipartite matching problem. Unaligned prototypes represent new intents, and all embeddings are further optimized using semantic-aware prototypical learning. The downstream method is also KMeans.

B. DATASETS

We evaluate the methods using three popular intent classification datasets. To measure the performance of T-3 and T-4 quantitatively, we randomly select approximately 75% of

TABLE 1. Original data composition of each dataset

Dataset	num. of cate.	Train	Val	Test
CLINC	150	15,000	3,000	4,500
BANKING	77	9,003	1,000	3,080
SNIPS	7	13,000	700	700

TABLE 2. IND, OOD intent segmentation details

Dataset	original number of categories	num. of selected IND categories	num. of selected OOD categories
CLINC	150	112	38
BANKING	77	57	20
SNIPS	7	5	2

categories as the known IND intents, treating the remaining 25% as the unknown, OOD intents to discover new intents from them. Additionally, due to a shortage of test data for T-4, we split around 20% of the training data to create a second test set, Test II.

The original data composition is shown in Table 1, with examples from each dataset provided in Table 5. Details on IND/OOD intent segmentation and reorganized data composition are shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. To prevent confusion due to multiple data partitions and evaluation procedures, a quick reference for data usage is provided in Table 4, with a more detailed explanation in following Section V-D.

CLINC [54]: This is a widely-used dataset in OOD detection. It originally provides 150 intents of texts as the IND data and one OOD intent data (consisting of various abnormal inputs without specific labels). In this experiment, since we cannot calculate clustering metrics on this unlabeled OOD data, we discard it, and randomly select 112 IND intents as the new known IND intents and the remaining 38 intents as the new unknown OOD intents.

BANKING [55]: This intent classification dataset concerns online banking services with 77 intents. We randomly select 57 intents as the IND intents and 20 intents as the OOD intents.

SNIPS [56]: This is another intent classification dataset extracted from a voice assistant. Five out of seven intents are randomly selected to serve as the IND intents and remaining two intents are regarded as the OOD intents.

C. METRICS

We use the following metrics for model evaluation. Basic concepts are provided here, with detailed calculations in Appendix B.

1) For Task 1 and 4: F1 values

Since T-1 and T-4 are both classification problems, we use *Micro* and *Macro F1* scores for evaluation.

2) For Task 2: AUROC, AUPR, FPR90

As implied in Section III-C, the accuracy of IND/OOD detection is influenced by the comparison between *sco* and

TABLE 3. Re-organized data composition

Dataset	num. of cate.	Train	Val	Test I	Test II
CLINC	150	12,000	3,000	4,500	3,000
BANKING	77	7,463	1,000	3,080	1,540
SNIPS	7	12,300	700	700	700

TABLE 4. Data division usage in training/evaluations in this paper

	IND part	OOD part
Train	Pre-training	No usage
Val	Pre-, T-4 training	validation
Test I	T-1 test, T-2 test	T-2 test, T-3 test
Test II	T-4 test	

different λ . To ensure a fair and standard evaluation, we use three threshold-independent classification metrics.

AUROC/AUPR: AUROC, or *Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve*, measures the area under the curve of true positive rate (TPR) against false positive rate (FPR) at varying λ values. AUPR stands for *Area Under Precision-Recall curve*. Higher values in either metric indicate better OOD detection performance.

FPR90: A practical metric which shows the FPR value when TPR reaches 90%. Lower values indicate better performance.

3) For Task 3: NMI, ARI, ACC

For T-3, we use three common metrics in clustering and intent discovery: Normalized Mutual Information (*NMI*), Adjusted Rand Index (*ARI*) and Clustering Accuracy (*ACC*). Simply speaking, NMI and ARI measure the similarity between two clusters, while ACC evaluates the clustering accuracy after finding the best true - pseudo-clustering label mapping. Higher values in these metrics indicate a better performance.

D. DATA USAGE AND TRAINING/EVALUATION ORDER


In this paper, since there are many tasks and data divisions involved in our evaluations, we explain the training and evaluation order here with Figure 3. A complete procedure in algorithm form can also be founded in Appendix D.

As shown in Figure 3, in the **Pre-training** stage, the model was trained using SCL with Train - IND data. During training, Val - IND/OOD data were used to determine the stopping point, specifically when the OOD detection AUROC on Val set reached its peak.

After pre-training, the basic intent classification performance of the initial model (**T-1**) was tested on Test I - IND data, while the OOD detection ability (**T-2**) was tested on Test I - IND/OOD data. The filtered OOD texts (refer to Section IV-B3 for the filtering strategy) were saved and sent to **T-3** for new intent discovery. Finally, using the pseudo-labeled old IND data (labeled by initial model) and new "IND" data (labeled in T-3), the initial model was re-trained, and the classification performance was tested on Test II set (**T-4**).

TABLE 5. Examples of each dataset

Intent name	Example
CLINC	
translate	what is the equivalent of, 'life is good' in french
distance	how many miles will it take to get to my destination
cancel_reservation	please cancel the table for two at burger king
BANKING	
verify_source_of_funds	Where can I check out the source of available funds in my account?
Refund_not_showing_up	I contacted the seller for a direct refund last week but he still hasn't give me my money. What should I do?
cash_withdrawal_not_recognised	Hello, Please look into this matter urgently. As i have lost my wallet and i can see one withdrawal, now i do not want to loose more money.
SNIPS	
BookRestaurant	book a restaurant at sixteen o'clock in sc
SearchScreeningEvent	find me showtimes for animated movies in the neighbourhood
AddToPlaylist	put this song in my funk playlist please

**FIGURE 3.** Diagrams of the evaluation workflow and data division used in each task

E. IMPLEMENTATION SETTINGS

We adopted *BERT-base* [8] and *MPNet-base* [57] as the base encoders for both our methods and baselines (except for *PTO-Sup* that used *GPT-2 small* [35]). These encoders were chosen because BERT is the most commonly used pre-trained encoder, while MPNet, a BERT-like variation, enhances context learning ability for better sentence encoding [58]. For SCL setting, we set dropout rate $p=0.1$, $n_{\text{views}}=2$ for “view” generation, and $\tau=0.1$ for calculating the loss. During the pre-training stage, we used the OOD detection AUROC on Val set to evaluate the training process for our *SCL* and *FT* methods, saving only the model with the highest $AUROC_{\text{val}}$. The training time reported in Table 6 also corresponds to the training time of the best model. All experiments were

conducted three times, and the results were averaged to obtain the final result. The experiments were run on a machine with an Ubuntu 18.04 operating system, an Nvidia A6000 GPU, an Intel i9-10980X CPU, and 128GB RAM.

VI. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

A. TRAINING TIME

We first show the model training time by *SCL* and CE fine-tuning in Table 6. It can be found that our model always reached the stop point earlier with higher Val AUROC scores, paving the way for a better performance in the following downstream tasks.

B. RESULT ON TASK 1: USER INTENT CLASSIFICATION

The initial classification results on Test I - IND data are shown in Table 7. Both *SCL* and *FT* achieved very high accuracy on CLINC and SNIPS datasets. However, on BANKING, our method showed its strength, achieving significantly better F1 scores on both metrics. This is because, compared with the other two datasets, examples in BANKING have a longer input length while the inquiry expressions are also more diverse (as shown in Table 5), which greatly increased classification difficulty. Despite this, our model maintained a high accuracy, demonstrating its robustness even with longer and noisier inputs.

C. RESULT ON TASK 2: OUT-OF-DOMAIN DETECTION

The results on T-2 are shown in Table 8. It can be observed that while *FT* provided solid results, our method performed better and achieved nearly all the best results. *Layer-LOF* that applied a layer-voting strategy also obtained slightly better results than *FT* on the first two datasets. However, the cost is a very long training time by the extensive computations required to measure information redundancy between layers. The random layer selection strategy also increased uncertainty, making it less practical.

On the other hand, *PTO-Sup*'s generative OOD detection method seemed work badly except on SNIPS. We speculate the reason as SNIPS exhibited more “background-shift” between IND/OOD examples. For instance, there are two intents belonging to IND and OOD parts shared the topic of “watching a movie”, although one was looking for movie information and another involved planning a cinema visit. Distinguishing this kind of OOD texts is a strong point of generative and textual perplexity-based methods but a weak point of CE fine-tune-based methods [36]. This is also evident from the performance drop of the other two fine-tuning-based baselines on SNIPS. Our method, however, still held strong across all situations, showing its superiority on OOD detection.

D. RESULT ON TASK 3: NEW INTENT DISCOVERY

Table 9 shows the results for Task 3 - new intent discovery. The feature optimization capabilities of *SCL* over CE fine-tuning are proven again by higher clustering scores on all datasets (We will provide the embedding space visualization

TABLE 6. Pre-training time and validation result comparison

Dataset	CLINC			BANKING			SNIPS		
Method	Stop epoch	Time	Val AUROC \uparrow	Stop epoch	Time	Val AUROC \uparrow	Stop epoch	Time	Val AUROC \uparrow
<i>FT</i>	18	4min10s	95.79	14	3min	93.81	15	3min15s	98.09
<i>SCL (Ours)</i>	7	1min10s	96.37	10	2min30s	94.97	12	2min40s	98.15

TABLE 7. T-1: intent classification result on Test I - IND set

Dataset	CLINC		BANKING		SNIPS	
Method/Metric	Micro F1 \uparrow	Macro F1 \uparrow	Micro F1 \uparrow	Macro F1 \uparrow	Micro F1 \uparrow	Macro F1 \uparrow
<i>FT-FullyConnect</i>	97.23	97.22	87.32	85.69	98.83	98.74
<i>SCL-NN (Ours)</i>	97.23	97.23	94.17	94.16	98.83	98.75

TABLE 8. T-2: IND/OOD detection result on Test I - IND/OOD set, the best result is in bold, the runner-up result is underlined

Dataset	CLINC				BANKING				SNIPS			
Method/Metric	AUROC \uparrow	AUPR \uparrow	FPR90 \downarrow	Time	AUROC \uparrow	AUPR \uparrow	FPR90 \downarrow	Time	AUROC \uparrow	AUPR \uparrow	FPR90 \downarrow	Time
<i>PTO-Sup</i>	81.67	55.01	44.3	40min	79.36	56.44	55.0	72min	97.53	93.87	6.4	3min20s
<i>Layer-CE</i>	<u>95.67</u>	<u>86.71</u>	10.7	78min	<u>92.89</u>	<u>81.67</u>	20.3	47min	93.47	87.34	15.6	18min
<i>FT-NDist</i>	95.64	85.96	<u>9.7</u>	<u>4min10s</u>	92.73	80.12	<u>18.9</u>	<u>3min</u>	96.56	90.43	9.2	<u>3min15s</u>
<i>SCL-NDist (Ours)</i>	96.15	88.41	8.5	1min10s	93.44	82.06	15.7	2min30s	<u>97.41</u>	94.36	4.3	2min40s

Note: All results are calculated under ‘OOD example as class 1 (positive) and IND example as class 0 (negative)’ condition.

TABLE 9. T-3: New intent discovery result on Test I - OOD set, the best result is in bold, the runner-up result is underlined

Dataset	CLINC				BANKING				SNIPS			
Method/Metric	NMI \uparrow	ARI \uparrow	ACC \uparrow	Time	NMI \uparrow	ARI \uparrow	ACC \uparrow	Time	NMI \uparrow	ARI \uparrow	ACC \uparrow	Time
<i>MTP-KNNCL</i>	92.36	79.70	83.60	6min10s	83.33	69.75	80.75	6min15s	78.04	85.50	96.26	6min40s
<i>DPN</i>	89.93	75.19	82.89	6min30s	82.51	69.04	76.50	6min	68.85	<u>77.72</u>	<u>94.12</u>	6min30s
<i>FT-KMeans</i>	86.81	67.71	76.27	4min10s	81.88	64.88	73.86	3min	66.16	70.29	91.98	3min15s
<i>SCL-KMeans (Ours)</i>	93.08	81.14	85.67	1min10s	84.44	70.64	81.16	2min30s	<u>70.94</u>	75.82	93.58	2min40s

evidence in following Section VI-F). As for the baselines, *MTP-KNNCL* also showed good clustering performance especially on SNIPS, where the other methods performed badly. We speculate that this is likely due to the existence of ‘‘background shift’’ discussed in T-2 result, where the unsupervised MLM target and semi-supervised KNN-ConL techniques used by *MTP-KNNCL* mitigated the risk of ‘‘over-training’’ common in supervised training settings. However, the cost is a slightly longer training time.

E. RESULT ON TASK 4: CONTINUAL LEARNING

Finally, we present the classification results of *ENC_{new}* after the incremental learning in Table 10. Overall, due to the excellent clustering performance on Task 3, this time our method further widened the accuracy gap with *FT* on all datasets. The concerning forgetting phenomenon also did not appear, as there was only a slight decrease on IND classification accuracy after the continual learning. This proves that our training strategy of using both pseudo-labeled IND and OOD texts is effective.

In addition to the continued high accuracy, we would like to highlight another training advantage of *SCL* over CE fine-

tuning. In *FT* re-training, the last fully-connected layer had to be replaced and reinitialized to accommodate the new intents, requiring at least 4-5 epochs to obtain desirable results in our experiments. On the other hand, since *SCL* focuses on the feature optimization and label judgment is based on the nearest neighbor algorithm, it directly used the new data with extended labels for model training, offering straightforward scalability and efficiency.

In conclusion, our method demonstrated high standards of practicality and efficiency across all tasks, making it feasible to train and maintain a robust QA system quickly and easily.


F. EMBEDDING SPACE VISUALIZATION

Finally, to evaluate the representation optimization effect, we conducted a t-SNE embedding space visualization on BANKING Test I set. The results are shown in Figure 4. The top row displays the embedding arrangement over all intents (77 categories), while the bottom row focuses only on the newly discovered (previous OOD, 20 categories) data.

From the visualization result on overall data distribution, it can be observed that both *SCL* and *FT* performed reasonably well, although *FT* mixed embeddings from different intents

TABLE 10. T-4: Continual learning result on Test II set

Dataset	CLINC		BANKING		SNIPS	
Method/Metric	Micro F1↑	Macro F1↑	Micro F1↑	Macro F1↑	Micro F1↑	Macro F1↑
OVERALL						
<i>FT</i>	92.65	93.37	79.55	81.69	94.79	94.86
<i>SCL</i>	97.70	97.69	91.75	91.79	99.14	99.14
ON IND						
<i>FT</i>	97.53	97.48	86.29	84.33	98.80	98.80
<i>SCL</i>	98.14	98.10	93.53	93.55	99.30	99.29
Ref-Ori. <i>FT</i> model	98.30	98.31	87.11	85.93	99.40	99.40
Ref-Ori. <i>SCL</i> model	98.39	98.40	93.60	93.63	99.40	99.40
ON OOD						
<i>FT</i>	89.53	85.65	82.14	78.04	92.18	91.52
<i>SCL</i>	98.48	98.46	92.51	92.30	99.75	99.75

**FIGURE 4. T-SNE text feature space visualization result on BANKING test I - all data (top row) and only OOD data (bottom row)**

more frequently. On the other hand, *MTP-KNNCL* produced relatively larger clusters, with some clusters very close to each other, even starting to “stick” together. We consider this may be due to the training effect of *KNN-ConL* in *MTP-KNNCL*, which continuously pulled nearby similar embeddings together, resulting in a side effect on cluster aggregation.

The advantage of our proposed method is more obvious in the visualization on newly discovered intents. Without accessing OOD texts, our method still separated most of the OOD classes, with only two class clusters mixed. *MTP-KNNCL* also worked relatively well, but its dispersion effect of different intents was inferior to ours. Finally, *FT* produced a flatter embedding distribution with more severe confusion between intents, leading to the lowest clustering scores among the three methods.

To conclude, despite using less than half the time to the state-of-the-art method *MTP-KNNCL* and requiring fewer tuning steps, our method still produced a splendid underlying embedding space for clustering and other tasks, which is valuable in practical applications.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we addressed the functionality and efficiency problems of current QA system, and proposed our solution to solve them and build a comprehensive system. We first defined four key tasks to complement the system’s functionality shortcomings, and then applied *SCL* as the unified representation learning method with minimal additional tuning to achieve the task targets. The experiment results demonstrated that although being simple and straightforward, the proposed

method still achieved leading results in each task.

As this complete solution is first proposed and is still a prototype, there are still many situations needed to be considered for real deployment in the future. For example, there may also be some noisy inputs appearing, which are hard to be categorized into any intents. In such cases, developing a filtering algorithm before the intent discovery process might be necessary. In addition, to show efficiency, this time the downstream methods were all chosen to be as simple as possible, while more advanced methods could potentially yield even better results when combined with SCL.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. A. Alzubi, R. Jain, A. Singh, P. Parwekar, and M. Gupta, “Cobert: Covid-19 question answering system using bert,” *Arabian journal for science and engineering*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 11 003–11 013, 2023.
- [2] F. Zhu, W. Lei, Y. Huang, C. Wang, S. Zhang, J. Lv, F. Feng, and T.-S. Chua, “TAT-QA: A question answering benchmark on a hybrid of tabular and textual content in finance,” 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)*, C. Zong, F. Xia, W. Li, and R. Navigli, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021, pp. 3277–3287. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.254>
- [3] S. Gao, X. Chen, Z. Ren, D. Zhao, and R. Yan, “Meaningful answer generation of e-commerce question-answering,” *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 1–26, 2021.
- [4] S. Robertson, “Understanding inverse document frequency: on theoretical arguments for idf,” *Journal of documentation*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 503–520, 2004.
- [5] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, “Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- [6] J. Pennington, R. Socher, and C. Manning, “GloVe: Global vectors for word representation,” in *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, A. Moschitti, B. Pang, and W. Daelemans, Eds. Doha, Qatar: Association for Computational Linguistics, Oct. 2014, pp. 1532–1543. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/D14-1162>
- [7] P. Bojanowski, E. Grave, A. Joulin, and T. Mikolov, “Enriching word vectors with subword information,” *Transactions of the association for computational linguistics*, vol. 5, pp. 135–146, 2017.
- [8] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [9] C. Qu, L. Yang, M. Qiu, W. B. Croft, Y. Zhang, and M. Iyyer, “Bert with history answer embedding for conversational question answering,” in *Proceedings of the 42nd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, 2019, pp. 1133–1136.
- [10] P. Do and T. H. Phan, “Developing a bert based triple classification model using knowledge graph embedding for question answering system,” *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 636–651, 2022.
- [11] G. Fei and B. Liu, “Breaking the closed world assumption in text classification,” in *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, K. Knight, A. Nenkova, and O. Rambow, Eds. San Diego, California: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jun. 2016, pp. 506–514. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/N16-1061>
- [12] L. Wang, J. Huang, K. Huang, Z. Hu, G. Wang, and Q. Gu, “Improving neural language generation with spectrum control,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ByxY8CNtvr>
- [13] A. v. d. Oord, Y. Li, and O. Vinyals, “Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.
- [14] P. Khosla, P. Teterwak, C. Wang, A. Sarna, Y. Tian, P. Isola, A. Maschinot, C. Liu, and D. Krishnan, “Supervised contrastive learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 18 661–18 673, 2020.
- [15] B. Wang and T. Mine, “Optimizing upstream representations for out-of-domain detection with supervised contrastive learning,” in *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2023, pp. 2585–2595.
- [16] C. Wang and X. Luo, “A legal question answering system based on bert,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 5th International Conference on Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence*, 2021, pp. 278–283.
- [17] W. Zheng, S. Lu, Z. Cai, R. Wang, L. Wang, and L. Yin, “Pal-bert: An improved question answering model,” *CMES-Computer Modeling in Engineering & Sciences*, vol. 139, no. 3, 2024.
- [18] J. Gao, D. He, X. Tan, T. Qin, L. Wang, and T. Liu, “Representation degeneration problem in training natural language generation models,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [19] K. Sohn, “Improved deep metric learning with multi-class n-pair loss objective,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [20] T. Chen, S. Kornblith, M. Norouzi, and G. Hinton, “A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1597–1607.
- [21] K. He, H. Fan, Y. Wu, S. Xie, and R. Girshick, “Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 9729–9738.
- [22] T. Gao, X. Yao, and D. Chen, “SimCSE: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, M.-F. Moens, X. Huang, L. Specia, and S. W.-t. Yih, Eds. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021, pp. 6894–6910. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.552>
- [23] Y.-S. Chuang, R. Dangovski, H. Luo, Y. Zhang, S. Chang, M. Soljagic, S.-W. Li, S. Yih, Y. Kim, and J. Glass, “DiffCSE: Difference-based contrastive learning for sentence embeddings,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, M. Carpuat, M.-C. de Marneffe, and I. V. Meza Ruiz, Eds. Seattle, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2022, pp. 4207–4218. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.311>
- [24] D. Hendrycks, M. Mazeika, and T. Dietterich, “Deep anomaly detection with outlier exposure,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [25] Y. Shen, Y.-C. Hsu, A. Ray, and H. Jin, “Enhancing the generalization for intent classification and out-of-domain detection in SLU,” 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)*, C. Zong, F. Xia, W. Li, and R. Navigli, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021, pp. 2443–2453. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.190>
- [26] P. Colombo, E. D. Gomes, G. Staerman, N. Noiry, and P. Piantanida, “Beyond mahalanobis-based scores for textual ood detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13527*, 2022.
- [27] Y. Zhou, J. Yang, P. Wang, and X. Qiu, “Two birds one stone: Dynamic ensemble for OOD intent classification,” in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, A. Rogers, J. Boyd-Graber, and N. Okazaki, Eds. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 10 659–10 673. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.595>
- [28] H. Xu, K. He, Y. Yan, S. Liu, Z. Liu, and W. Xu, “A deep generative distance-based classifier for out-of-domain detection with mahalanobis space,” in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, D. Scott, N. Bel, and C. Zong, Eds. Barcelona, Spain (Online): International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2020, pp. 1452–1460. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.coling-main.125>
- [29] W. Liu, X. Wang, J. Owens, and Y. Li, “Energy-based out-of-distribution detection,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 21 464–21 475, 2020.
- [30] Y. Ouyang, J. Ye, Y. Chen, X. Dai, S. Huang, and J. Chen, “Energy-based unknown intent detection with data manipulation,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, C. Zong, F. Xia, W. Li, and R. Navigli, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021, pp. 2852–2861. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-acl.252>
- [31] A. Podolskiy, D. Lipin, A. Bout, E. Artemova, and I. Piontkovskaya, “Revisiting mahalanobis distance for transformer-based out-of-domain de-

- tection,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 15, 2021, pp. 13 675–13 682.
- [32] H. Lin and Y. Gu, “FLatS: Principled out-of-distribution detection with feature-based likelihood ratio score,” in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, H. Bouamor, J. Pino, and K. Bali, Eds. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2023, pp. 8956–8963. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.554>
- [33] W. Zhou, F. Liu, and M. Chen, “Contrastive out-of-distribution detection for pretrained transformers,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, M.-F. Moens, X. Huang, L. Specia, and S. W.-t. Yih, Eds. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021, pp. 1100–1111. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.84>
- [34] Y. Zhou, P. Liu, and X. Qiu, “KNN-contrastive learning for out-of-domain intent classification,” in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, S. Muresan, P. Nakov, and A. Villavicencio, Eds. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 5129–5141. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.352>
- [35] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever et al., “Language models are unsupervised multitask learners,” *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, p. 9, 2019.
- [36] U. Arora, W. Huang, and H. He, “Types of out-of-distribution texts and how to detect them,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, M.-F. Moens, X. Huang, L. Specia, and S. W.-t. Yih, Eds. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021, pp. 10 687–10 701. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.835>
- [37] Q. Wu, H. Jiang, H. Yin, B. Karlsson, and C.-Y. Lin, “Multi-level knowledge distillation for out-of-distribution detection in text,” in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, A. Rogers, J. Boyd-Graber, and N. Okazaki, Eds. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 7317–7332. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.403>
- [38] Y. Ouyang, Y. Cao, Y. Gao, Z. Wu, J. Zhang, and X. Dai, “On prefix-tuning for lightweight out-of-distribution detection,” in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, A. Rogers, J. Boyd-Graber, and N. Okazaki, Eds. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 1533–1545. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.85>
- [39] A. Chatterjee and S. Sengupta, “Intent mining from past conversations for conversational agent,” in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, D. Scott, N. Bel, and C. Zong, Eds. Barcelona, Spain (Online): International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2020, pp. 4140–4152. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.coling-main.366>
- [40] W. An, F. Tian, W. Shi, Y. Chen, Q. Zheng, Q. Wang, and P. Chen, “DNA: Denoised neighborhood aggregation for fine-grained category discovery,” in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, H. Bouamor, J. Pino, and K. Bali, Eds. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2023, pp. 12 292–12 302. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.756>
- [41] T.-E. Lin, H. Xu, and H. Zhang, “Discovering new intents via constrained deep adaptive clustering with cluster refinement,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 05, 2020, pp. 8360–8367.
- [42] W. An, F. Tian, P. Chen, Q. Zheng, and W. Ding, “New user intent discovery with robust pseudo label training and source domain joint training,” *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 21–31, 2023.
- [43] H. Zhang, H. Xu, T.-E. Lin, and R. Lyu, “Discovering new intents with deep aligned clustering,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 16, 2021, pp. 14 365–14 373.
- [44] Y. Zhang, H. Zhang, L.-M. Zhan, X.-M. Wu, and A. Lam, “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)*, S. Muresan, P. Nakov, and A. Villavicencio, Eds. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 256–269. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.21>
- [45] W. An, F. Tian, Q. Zheng, W. Ding, Q. Wang, and P. Chen, “Generalized category discovery with decoupled prototypical network,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 11, 2023, pp. 12 527–12 535.
- [46] M. McCloskey and N. J. Cohen, “Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem,” in *Psychology of learning and motivation*. Elsevier, 1989, vol. 24, pp. 109–165.
- [47] I. Paik, S. Oh, T. Kwak, and I. Kim, “Overcoming catastrophic forgetting by neuron-level plasticity control,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 04, 2020, pp. 5339–5346.
- [48] G. Lin, H. Chu, and H. Lai, “Towards better plasticity-stability trade-off in incremental learning: A simple linear connector,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 89–98.
- [49] Z. Li and D. Hoiem, “Learning without forgetting,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2935–2947, 2017.
- [50] A. Iscen, J. Zhang, S. Lazebnik, and C. Schmid, “Memory-efficient incremental learning through feature adaptation,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XVI 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 699–715.
- [51] L. Bonicelli, M. Boschini, A. Porrello, C. Spampinato, and S. Calderara, “On the effectiveness of lipschitz-driven rehearsal in continual learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 31 886–31 901, 2022.
- [52] Z. Gong, K. Zhou, X. Zhao, J. Sha, S. Wang, and J.-R. Wen, “Continual pre-training of language models for math problem understanding with syntax-aware memory network,” in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, S. Muresan, P. Nakov, and A. Villavicencio, Eds. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 5923–5933. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.408>
- [53] Z. Zeng, K. He, Y. Yan, Z. Liu, Y. Wu, H. Xu, H. Jiang, and W. Xu, “Modeling discriminative representations for out-of-domain detection with supervised contrastive learning,” in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, C. Zong, F. Xia, W. Li, and R. Navigli, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021, pp. 870–878. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-short.110>
- [54] S. Larson, A. Mahendran, J. J. Peper, C. Clarke, A. Lee, P. Hill, J. K. Kummerfeld, K. Leach, M. A. Laurenzano, L. Tang, and J. Mars, “An evaluation dataset for intent classification and out-of-scope prediction,” 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)*, K. Inui, J. Jiang, V. Ng, and X. Wan, Eds. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2019, pp. 1311–1316. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1131>
- [55] I. Casanueva, T. Temčinas, D. Gerz, M. Henderson, and I. Vulić, “Efficient intent detection with dual sentence encoders,” in *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Conversational AI*, T.-H. Wen, A. Celikyilmaz, Z. Yu, A. Papangelis, M. Eric, A. Kumar, I. Casanueva, and R. Shah, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2020, pp. 38–45. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.nlp4convai-1.5>
- [56] A. Coucke, A. Saade, A. Ball, T. Bluche, A. Caulier, D. Leroy, C. Doumouro, T. Gisselbrecht, F. Caltagirone, T. Lavril, M. Primet, and J. Dureau, “Snips Voice Platform: An embedded Spoken Language Understanding system for private-by-design voice interfaces,” *arXiv*, 2018.
- [57] K. Song, X. Tan, T. Qin, J. Lu, and T.-Y. Liu, “Mpnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 16 857–16 867, 2020.
- [58] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, “Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, K. Inui, J. Jiang, V. Ng, and X. Wan, Eds. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2019, pp. 3982–3992. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1410>

APPENDIX A KMEANS DETAILS

The KMeans learning process is shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 KMeans clustering

Input: Text embeddings $\{\mathbf{h}_{j'}\}_{j'=1}^{N_{ood}}$ of detected $\{\mathbf{x}_{j'}\}_{j'=1}^{N_{ood}}$ in T-2, number of clusters K

Output: Label assignments $\{\hat{y}_{j'}\}_{j'=1}^{N_{ood}}$

- 1: Initialize K cluster centroids $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ randomly.
- 2: **repeat**
- 3: **for** each data point $\mathbf{h}_{j'}$ **do**
- 4: Assign $\mathbf{h}_{j'}$ to the nearest cluster centroid:

$$\hat{y}_{j'} = \arg \min_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}} \|\mathbf{h}_{j'} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k\|^2 \quad (14)$$
- 5: **end for**
- 6: **for** each cluster k **do**
- 7: Update $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ as the mean of all points assigned to cluster k :

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_k = \frac{1}{|\text{num}(\text{cate } k)|} \sum \mathbf{h}_{j' \rightarrow k} \quad (15)$$
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **until** the cluster assignments $\{\hat{y}_{j'}\}$ do not change or the centroids $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_k\}$ converge
- 10: **return** Label assignments $\{\hat{y}_{j'}\}_{j'=1}^{N_{ood}}$

APPENDIX B METRIC CALCULATION DETAILS

Here we show the detailed calculation process of the used metrics.

A. FOR TASK 1 AND 4: F1 VALUES

The Micro and Macro F1 scores are calculated as follows: **Micro F1 score:** is calculated by summarizing the classification situations over all classes. It is the harmonic mean of micro-averaged precision (P) and recall (R):

$$\text{Micro F1} = \frac{2 \cdot PR}{P + R} \quad (16)$$

Macro F1 score: calculates the F1 score independently for each class and then takes the average, which treats all classes equally:

$$\text{Macro F1} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{F1-score}_c \quad (17)$$

where C is the number of categories.

B. FOR TASK 3: NMI, ARI, ACC

The NMI, ARI, ACC are calculated as follows:

Normalized Mutual Information (NMI): is a measure of the similarity between two sets of clusters:

$$\text{NMI}(U, V) = \frac{2 \cdot I(U; V)}{H(U) + H(V)} \quad (18)$$

where $I(U; V)$ is the mutual information between clusters U and V , and $H(U)$ and $H(V)$ are the entropies of U and V respectively. It ranges from 0 (no mutual information) to 1 (perfect correlation).

Adjusted Rand Index (ARI): measures the similarity between two data clusterings by considering all pairs of samples, and counting pairs that are assigned in the same or different clusters in the predicted and true clusterings:

$$\text{ARI} = \frac{\sum_{ij} \binom{n_{ij}}{2} - \left[\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2} \right] / \binom{n}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} + \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2} \right] - \left[\sum_i \binom{a_i}{2} \sum_j \binom{b_j}{2} \right] / \binom{n}{2}} \quad (19)$$

where n_{ij} is the number of elements in the intersection of clusters i and j , a_i is the sum over row i , and b_j is the sum over column j .

Clustering Accuracy (ACC): evaluates the clustering result after finding the best one-to-one mapping between cluster labels and true labels:

$$\text{ACC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta(y_i, \text{map}(\hat{y}_i))}{n} \quad (20)$$

where y_i is the true label, \hat{y}_i is the cluster label, $\text{map}()$ is the mapping function where we use the Hungary algorithm this time, and δ is the Kronecker delta function.

APPENDIX C ABBREVIATIONS

Table 11 shows the abbreviations that have appeared in this paper and their complete names.

TABLE 11. Abbreviations and full names

Abbreviations	Full name
QA	question answering (system)
RepL	representation learning (feature learning)
ConL	contrastive learning
MeL	metric learning
UConL	unsupervised contrastive learning
SCL	supervised contrastive learning
IND	in-domain (texts)
OOD	out-of-domain (texts)
GDA	Gaussian discriminant analysis
LOF	local outlier factor
GPT	Generative Pre-Trained Transformer
BERT	Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers
CE	cross-entropy (loss)
FT	fine-tuning
MLM	masked language modeling
NN	nearest neighbor

APPENDIX D LEARNING AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE (ALGORITHM FORM)

The learning and evaluation procedures of pre-training and each task are shown in Algorithm 2.

...

Algorithm 2 Overall process**Input:** Train data, Val data, Test I data, Test II data**Output:** Solutions for T-1 to T-4

- 1: **-Pre-training Stage-**
- 2: $Epoch \leftarrow 0, AUROC_{best-val} \leftarrow 0$
- 3: **while** $Epoch < 20$ **do**
- 4: Train *ENC* on \mathbf{x}_{train} using SCL loss object (eq. 8)
- 5: Calculate OOD detection $AUROC_{val}$ on this epoch
- 6: **if** $AUROC_{val} > AUROC_{best-val}$ **then**
- 7: Save model of this epoch, and record the threshold λ when TPR=90%
- 8: **end if**
- 9: **end while**
- 10: **-Task 1-**
- 11: Input $\mathbf{x}_{test I}$ (IND part) to *ENC* to obtain the representations:
- 12: $\mathbf{h}_{test I} = ENC(\mathbf{x}_{test-1})$
- 13: The label is determined as the label of the nearest IND cluster centroid:
- 14: $\hat{y}_{test I} = \arg \min_{c \in C} MDist(\mathbf{h}_{test I}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c)$
- 15: Calculate Micro, Macro F1 values
- 16: **-Task 2-**
- 17: Input \mathbf{x}_{test-1} (IND, OOD part) to *ENC* to obtain the representations and calculate the detection scores:
- 18: $sco(\mathbf{x}_{test I}) = \min_{c \in C} MDist(\mathbf{h}_{test I}, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_c)$
- 19: Calculate FPR, TPR results on various thresholds λ , and finally AUROC, AUPR, FPR90 values
- 20: **-Task 3 preparation-**
- 21: Determine λ_{filter} when TPR=90% on \mathbf{x}_{val}
- 22: Divide \mathbf{x}_{test-1} into $\mathbf{x}_{test-1, IND}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{test-1, OOD}$ two parts by comparing detection *sco* and λ_{filter}
- 23: **-Task 3-**
- 24: Apply KMeans on $\mathbf{x}_{test-1, OOD}$ and give new pseudo labels to $\mathbf{x}_{test-1, OOD}$ as $\hat{y}_{test-1, OOD} \in \mathcal{C}_{kn'}$
- 25: Calculate NMI, ARI, ACC metrics
- 26: **-Task 4-**
- 27: Give pseudo labels to $\mathbf{x}_{test-1, IND}$ using the initial *ENC* as $\hat{y}_{test-1, IND} \in \mathcal{C}_{kn}$
- 28: Train *ENC* on $\{\mathbf{x}_{test-1, \hat{y}_{test-1}}\}$, $\hat{y}_{test-1} \in \{\mathcal{C}_{kn} + \mathcal{C}_{kn'}\}$ using SCL loss (eq. 8)
- 29: Test on $\mathbf{x}_{test II}$ and calculate Micro, Macro F1 values
- 30: **END**