

Exploring the Limits of Natural Language Inference Based Setup for Few-Shot Intent Detection

Vijit Malik*
IIT Kanpur, India
vijitvm@iitk.ac.in

Ayush Kumar
Observe.AI, India
ayush@observe.ai

Jithendra Vepa
Observe.AI, India
jithendra@observe.ai

Abstract

One of the core components of goal-oriented dialog systems is the task of Intent Detection. Few-shot Learning upon Intent Detection is challenging due to the scarcity of available annotated utterances. Although recent works making use of metric-based and optimization-based methods have been proposed, the task is still challenging in large label spaces and much smaller number of shots. Generalized Few-shot learning is more difficult due to the presence of both novel and seen classes during the testing phase. In this work, we propose a simple and effective method based on Natural Language Inference that not only tackles the problem of few shot intent detection, but also proves useful in zero-shot and generalized few shot learning problems. Our extensive experiments on a number of Natural Language Understanding (NLU) and Spoken Language Understanding (SLU) datasets show the effectiveness of our approach. In addition, we highlight the settings in which our NLI based method outperforms the baselines by huge margins.

1 Introduction

Intent Detection (ID) is one of the core components in Natural Language Understanding when building goal-oriented dialog systems. The objective of Intent Detection is to extract underlying intents or the user’s goals behind the given utterances. The virtual assistants such as Amazon Alexa and Google Assistant allow users to perform a number of tasks through a natural language interface. Detecting the intent in natural language utterances is a crucial step in performing these tasks.

Intent Detection is a challenging problem due to the vast diversity in user utterances. Recent works have harnessed the capabilities of neural networks to approach the task and show promising results. However, they usually require a large number of labelled samples (on the order of hundreds) per

intent class to train upon. The requirement of more training data inhibits models’ capability in generalizing to newly emerging (novel) intents with no or limited annotations during inference. The scarcity of labelled samples renders the pre-training and fine-tuning objectives hardly applicable due to overfitting.

Few Shot Learning (FSL) is a paradigm adopted to tackle the scarcity problems of novel/emerging classes. The idea is motivated by the capability of humans in correctly categorizing new classes given a handful of samples (Gidaris and Komodakis, 2018). The FSL methods take advantage of a *support set* consisting of a small set of labelled examples from the novel classes and learn to discriminate the unlabeled *query* samples between classes which are not seen during training. In a more pragmatic setting of generalized few shot learning the task is to evaluate the model on both seen and unseen/novel class. Generalized FSL (or GFSID for Intent Detection) is a more challenging setting since the model has to generalize on both novel and seen classes. The challenge is further exacerbated by the absence of *support set* as well, which is referred to as Zero shot Learning or Generalized Zero shot learning depending upon the inference setup.

In recent works, Generalized FSL has seen little success. (Xia et al., 2020a), (Xia et al., 2020b), (Xia et al., 2021) uses BERT model as conditional variational autoencoder and pseudo siamese networks to generate more samples present in the support set. (Nguyen et al., 2020) uses dynamic semantic matching and aggregation that automatically extracts multiple semantic components from support and query sentences via multi-head self-attention. However, these methods do not show promising results upon GFSL or large label space settings. Natural Language Inference (NLI) (Bowman et al., 2015) can provide a potential solution since the task measures the truth value of the hy-

*Work done during internship at Observe.AI

pothesis given a premise. Hence, we focus our attention upon large pre-trained models like BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) which have shown promising results upon natural language understanding tasks like textual entailment. These models usually require a significant amount of data to be fine-tuned to downstream tasks due to which we make use of both seen class and novel classes data for fine-tuning.

In summary our contributions are three-fold:

- We propose a simple yet highly effective approach based on Natural Language Inference (NLI-FSL) for few shot and generalized few shot intent detection (and extend the approach to zero-shot settings as well).
- We perform extensive experimentation over multiple Intent Detection and Natural Language Understanding (NLU) datasets and show the effectiveness of our approach.
- We demonstrate the advantages of our approach in settings like (1) Huge label spaces, and robustness against (2) size of base class dataset and (3) number of shots in the support set.

2 Related Work

In Few-shot learning the classifiers are required to generalize to unseen (or novel) classes with only a few training examples per class (called the support set). Transfer learning and meta-learning are two conventional techniques that have been applied to address the challenge of data scarcity. The paradigm of transfer learning usually refers to pre-training initial models using mismatched domains with rich human annotations and then adapting the models with limited labels in targeted domains.

Previous works (Yang et al., 2017), (Chen et al., 2019) have shown promising results in applying transfer learning to FSL tasks. Meta-learning has gained growing interest among the machine learning fields for tackling the problems in few-shot learning and data scarcity. Metric-based meta-learning approaches, including prototypical networks (ProtoNets) (Snell et al., 2017) in which prototypes are not only represented by support samples but also matching information between support and query samples. Matching networks (Vinyals et al., 2016) aim to learn embedding or metric space which can be generalized to domains

unseen in the training set after adaptation with a small number of examples from the unseen domains. Another type of meta learning approach called Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) (Finn et al., 2017) focuses on learning parameter initialization from multiple subtasks, such that the initialization can be fine-tuned with few labels and yield good performance in targeted tasks. In this work we focus upon comparison of our NLI-FSL approach with metric-based meta-learning approaches.

Following the work of (Nguyen et al., 2020), we evaluate our method and baselines using the non-episodic setting since episodic setting lacks practicality. Episodic testing does not provide an end-to-end systematic evaluation and in practical applications, the requirement is to categorize unlabeled samples into one of the novel/joint classes, instead of a set of sampled classes.

Recently, many FSL works make use of multi-level matching and aggregation methods to improve FSL performance (Gao et al., 2019). These works integrate matching information between support and query samples on multiple levels. (Nguyen et al., 2020) extracted multiple semantic components from support and query sentences via multi-head self-attention with additional regularizations. (Ye and Ling, 2019) built local context representation for both support and query samples using a soft matching approach. (Sun et al., 2019) added word-level attention and used a more advanced multi-cross attention upon instance level.

Although there have been some works making use of Natural Language Inference (NLI) capabilities in the aspect of using utterance pairs in NLI setup (Zhang et al., 2020). (Xia et al., 2018) used a similar approach under the lens of incremental few shot learning. In our work we focus upon the approach’s ability under various different settings of NLU and SLU tasks.

3 Problem Statement

The task of intent detection is to determine the intent of the utterance x given the set of intent classes, \mathcal{Y} . Following the terminology of the (Nguyen et al., 2020), the goal of few-shot classification is to adapt a classifier f_ϕ to a set of novel classes $\mathcal{Y}_n = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n\}$ not seen during the training time, given a few labelled samples. In the traditional FSL task, a classifier performs a series of tasks during both training and inference, which

involves \mathcal{C} randomly chosen classes with only \mathcal{K} labeled samples from each class. This is called a \mathcal{C} -way \mathcal{K} -shot classification task. The set of $\mathcal{C}\cdot\mathcal{K}$ samples is called the support set. This series of tasks are repeated via episodes (Vinyals et al., 2016), where in each episode, the aim is to correctly classify unlabeled samples (query samples) by using only the support samples. However, in this work we perform non-episodic evaluation since episodic evaluation doesn't give a robust idea of model performance and loses practicality in realistic scenarios (Nguyen et al., 2020).

In addition to the set of novel classes \mathcal{Y}_n , we also have a set of seen classes $\mathcal{Y}_s = \{C'_1, C'_2, \dots, C'_s\}$. Note that the sets \mathcal{Y}_s and \mathcal{Y}_n are disjoint. We denote seen-class dataset as the set of examples $\mathcal{D}_s = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_{|\mathcal{D}_s|}, y_{|\mathcal{D}_s|})\}$, where $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_s$. Also, we denote the novel class dataset as the $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_{|\mathcal{D}_n|}, y_{|\mathcal{D}_n|})\}$ where $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_n$.

In Few-shot Intent Detection (FSID), the task is to maximize the probability of the correct prediction for an unlabeled utterance x in the novel label subspace, \mathcal{Y}_n as

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_n} p(y|x, \mathcal{D}_n, \mathcal{D}_s) \quad (1)$$

The corresponding Zero-shot Intent Detection (ZSID) is under the condition that the support data, \mathcal{D}_s is absent.

In the Generalized Few-shot Intent Detection (GFSID), the task is to maximize the probability of the correct prediction for an unlabeled utterance x in the joint label subspace, \mathcal{Y}_j (where $\mathcal{Y}_j = \mathcal{Y}_n \cup \mathcal{Y}_s$) as

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_j} p(y|x, \mathcal{D}_n, \mathcal{D}_s) \quad (2)$$

Same as previous zero shot setting, the support data, \mathcal{D}_s is absent in the Generalized zero-shot Intent Detection (GZSID)

4 Methodology

Our proposed approach is a two step process where we utilize the large pre-trained language model, specifically BERT (Devlin et al., 2018). A default classification task using BERT is done by taking the utterance, $x = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{N_x}\}$ in the tokenized form as the input, in the $[CLS]x_1x_2\dots x_{N_x}[SEP]$ format and predicting the label $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where $[CLS]$ and $[SEP]$ denote the special tokens used by the BERT model for beginning and the end of the input respectively.

However, we make use of the Natural Language Understanding of the BERT model by modifying the input and reforming the task as a Natural Language Inference. For an utterance x with the true intent as y_t in the label space \mathcal{Y} , we make $|\mathcal{Y}|$ independent inputs corresponding to each label $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. We take the input sequence as the $[CLS]x_1x_2\dots x_{N_x}[SEP]y_1y_2\dots y_{N_y}[SEP]$ where $y_1y_2\dots y_{N_y}$ denotes the tokenized label name y . In other words, we take the utterance as the premise and the label name as the hypothesis in the Natural Language Inference task. The output space consists of only two labels, 0 for not-entailed and 1 for entailed. Note that for each utterance x , we end up with exactly 1 entailed pair (x, y_t) and $(|\mathcal{Y}| - 1)$ not-entailed pairs (x, y) where $y \in \{\mathcal{Y} \setminus \{y_t\}\}$. We denote the entailment label by ϵ .

In the first step of our methodology, we transform the seen class dataset, \mathcal{D}_s to the NLI format, \mathcal{D}'_s with $|\mathcal{D}_s| * (|\mathcal{Y}_s| - 1)$ non-entailment instances and $|\mathcal{D}_s|$ entailment instances. Similarly, we take the support set examples and obtain the set \mathcal{D}'_n . Due to the heavy class imbalance between entailment and non-entailment classes, we randomly sample some instances from \mathcal{D}'_s having the non-entailment label for further use. The size of the sample is kept comparable to the number of entailment instances in \mathcal{D}'_s (refer to Table).

In the next step, we fine-tune the BERT-base model on the combination of sampled \mathcal{D}'_s and \mathcal{D}'_n for the binary classification task of entailment and non-entailment.

In the final step of inference, we transform the query/test set into the NLI form, similar to the seen/support dataset. In other words, for each test utterance x , and the label space \mathcal{Y} , the predicted label is determined by the following equation

$$y_{pred} = \arg \max_{y_i \in \mathcal{Y}} p(\epsilon|y_i, x) \quad (3)$$

Note that in case of ZFSL and ZGFSL, we do not have a support set, hence, the data used for fine-tuning the BERT-base model does not contain \mathcal{D}'_n .

5 Datasets

We evaluate our proposed methodology over 5 different Intent Classification (ID) datasets for FSID/GFSID task: SNIPS-NLU (SNIPS), NLU-Evaluation dataset (NLUE), CLINC150, Airline Travel Information System (ATIS) dataset, BANKING77. All the datasets are benchmarks for the

Natural Language Understanding tasks. The support samples are sampled in advance before constructing the dataset splits for \mathcal{D}_n or \mathcal{D}_s .

SNIPS-NLU: (Xia et al., 2018) selected only two intents (RateBook and AddToPlaylist) as novel/ emerging intents and the other five intents as seen intents. However, to increase the complexity of the task we added one more intent (PlayMusic) to the novel set.

NLUE: Same as (Nguyen et al., 2020), we chose the 16 intents as unseen intents while the remaining 48 intents are considered as seen.

CLINC150: We randomly sampled 50 classes from 150 classes as novel and take the remaining 100 classes as seen classes. We kept the representation of all classes in the base dataset with respect to number of samples as the same.

ATIS: We first removed the classes having less than 10 instances from consideration. This was done to create a robust inference setting even in 5-shot experiments where at least 5 samples are needed in the support set and using just 5 instances in testing setup might not provide a good inference. We selected 4 classes randomly ('flight airfare', 'quantity', 'abbreviation', 'meal') as the novel classes and the remaining classes as seen.

BANKING77: We randomly sample 27 classes from 77 classes as novel and take the remaining 50 classes as seen classes.

6 Baselines

We compare our methodology with several traditional FSL models over the 5 datasets.

- **Prototypical Network with BERT-base encoder (ProtoBERT):** (Snell et al., 2017) fine-tune the BERT-base model upon the base class dataset for supervised Intent Detection. Use the fine-tuned BERT model to obtain class prototypes and use Euclidean distance for classification.
- **Multi-level Matching and Aggregation Network (MLMAN):** (Ye and Ling, 2019) utilizes the multi-level matching approach and exploits both fusion and dot product similarity for better instance representation.
- **Hierarchical Prototypical Network (HAPN):** (Sun et al., 2019) uses the few-shot learning paradigm of extracting similarity on all levels (feature, word and instance).
- **Semantic Aggregation and Matching (SMAN):** (Nguyen et al., 2020) the semantic components are distilled from utterances via multi-head self-attention with additional dynamic regularization constraints.

For zero shot learning experiments, we compare our methodology with the following baselines:

- **Zero-shot DDN-USE:** (Kumar et al., 2017) Universal Sentence Encoder (USE) (Cer et al., 2018) is used to encode the label names and the input instance. The euclidean distance between the encodings is used to classify the input instance.
- **Zero-shot DDN-SBERT:** Zero-shot DDN with SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) encoder.

7 Experiments and Results

Implementation details: We use BERT-base-uncased model from the Huggingface¹ library. We fine-tune the model upon the NLI-format datasets for 3 epochs upon SNIPS and ATIS datasets and 4 epochs for BANKING77, NLUE and CLINC150 datasets. We downsample the not-entailed examples to be in the 2 : 1 ratio with the number of entailed examples. We use a batch size of 64 and a learning rate of $2e - 5$. We use AdamW optimizer with BinaryCrossentropy loss. We start the training with 1000 warmup steps.

We experiment under the 1 shot FSID/GFSID and 5 shot FSID/GFSID settings similar to (Nguyen et al., 2020) and report the F1 scores upon the test datasets. In the experiments, we compare our NLI-FSL method with ProtoBERT, MLMAN, HAPN and SMAN baselines. Upon SNIPS dataset, our NLI-FSL method outperforms in FSID settings by a significant margin (refer to Table 1), however in the GFSID setting, the results are close to results obtained using SMAN method. Similarly, for the ATIS dataset (Table 1), we can observe that the NLI-FSL results are closer to the best performing baseline results (most of the times being SMAN). Upon the CLINC150, BANKING77 and NLUE datasets, the NLI-FSL method especially outperforms the baselines by a huge margin. We can observe a difference of 47% F1 between the NLI-FSL and SMAN in the CLINC150 1-shot FSID results. From the BANKING77 experiments, we

¹<https://huggingface.co/>

Method	1-shot (FSID)	1-shot (GFSID)	5-shot (FSID)	5-shot (GFSID)
SNIPS				
ProtoBERT	64.74%	58.56%	85.79%	82.99%
MLMAN	67.55%	64.29%	87.54%	77.42%
HAPN	65.41%	60.79%	85.55%	83.85%
SMAN	68.57%	66.94%	89.39%	85.48%
NLI-FSL	93.04%	65.42%	96.26%	86.84%
NLUE				
ProtoBERT	35.50%	61.03%	64.00%	68.97%
MLMAN	40.07%	62.10%	64.01%	63.25%
HAPN	40.24%	59.47%	69.51%	71.21%
SMAN	40.60%	66.10%	69.60%	72.18%
NLI-FSL	78.95%	76.78%	84.72%	77.93%
ATIS				
ProtoBERT	76.10%	24.86%	77.82%	43.11%
MLMAN	74.88%	36.66%	79.11%	49.39%
HAPN	76.56	39.93%	79.87%	52.22%
SMAN	77.38%	41.14%	79.06%	54.03%
NLI-FSL	73.37%	59.39%	81.52%	71.00%
CLINC150				
ProtoBERT	29.19%	22.81%	63%	52.08%
MLMAN	34.29%	24.81%	62.37%	54.18%
HAPN	35.10%	27.19%	64.07%	55.53%
SMAN	37.48%	29.65%	67.90%	58.75%
NLI-FSL	84.00%	78.32%	90.55%	79.84%
BANKING77				
ProtoBERT	26.76%	16.38%	46.25%	34.57%
MLMAN	34.80%	22.46%	48.10%	37.29%
HAPN	37.45%	24.95%	49.82%	39.16%
SMAN	39.49%	25.07%	51.08%	40.40%
NLI-FSL	71.61%	66.96%	78.16%	70.51%

Table 1: Comparison of results by different methods upon SNIPS, NLUE, ATIS, CLINC150 and BANKING77 datasets.

can observe that the drop in the performance of NLI-FSL method from FSID to GFSID is not as much as the drops in the other baselines.

From the results provided in the tables, it is evident that our simpler NLI-FSL approach not only performs well upon the FSID tasks, but also provides a competitive results in GFSID setting as well.


7.1 Zero shot experiments

Our NLI-FSL method makes use of \mathcal{D}_n during fine-tuning of the BERT-base model. For zero-shot setting when there is no support set data available, we only make use of utterances from \mathcal{D}'_S to fine-tune. For both, generalized ZSL (GZSID) and traditional ZSL (ZSID), the evaluation setup is kept as the same.


We compare the performance of our method with two simpler zero shot intent detection methods, ZS-

Dataset	Method	ZSL	GZSL
SNIPS	NLI-FSL	80.55%	78.47%
	ZS-DDN-USE	83.07%	68.88%
	ZS-DDN-SBERT	45.32%	40.35%
NLUED	NLI-FSL	75.54%	71.95%
	ZS-DDN-USE	61.55%	39.26%
	ZS-DDN-SBERT	56.99%	31.60%
CLINC150	NLI-FSL	84.06%	74.62%
	ZS-DDN-USE	15.66%	13.93%
	ZS-DDN-SBERT	39.06%	30.03%
ATIS	NLI-FSL	47.06%	57.75%
	ZS-DDN-USE	52.37%	26.51%
	ZS-DDN-SBERT	46.58%	17.47%
BANKING77	NLI-FSL	84.06%	74.62%
	ZS-DDN-USE	15.66%	13.93%
	ZS-DDN-SBERT	39.06%	30.03%

Table 2: Results upon zero-shot experiments



(a) CLINC150



(b) BANKING77

Figure 1: Incremental Label Space Experiments

DDN-USE which makes use of USE (Universal Sentence Encoder) to encode the support set example. Inference is done by calculating the minimum euclidean distance between the encodings of set example and the label name. For ZS-DDN-SBERT, we make use of SBERT as the encoder instead of USE.


Refer to Table 2 for results upon all the datasets. Note that, our NLI-FSL method outperforms the baselines significantly over all the datasets in the generalized zero shot setting. Especially upon the CLINC150 dataset, NLI-FSL outperforms by 44%. In case of simple zero shot setting, the NLI-FSL method outperforms the baselines upon the CLINC150, NLUED and BANKING77 datasets.

7.2 Incremental label space


From our experiments in Section 7.1, we observed that our approach performs especially well upon the datasets having huge label spaces. This motivated us to study the performance of our method compared to the baselines upon the incrementation in label spaces. We consider CLINC150 and BANKING77 datasets since they have the highest number of labels (150 and 77 respectively) among the datasets we have chosen.

For CLINC150, We varied the number of novel classes from 5 to 50 (10% to 100% of novel classes) with strides of adding 5 classes. In our experimentation of varying the number of novel classes we also kept the ratio of seen classes in base dataset to the number of novel classes as the same. Therefore, we accordingly varied the number of seen classes from 10 to 100 with strides of 10 seen classes. Similarly for BANKING77, we varied the number of seen classes from 5 to 50 with strides of 5 classes.

We present the results of 5-shot FSID setting in Figure 1. Note that for CLINC150 dataset, the results show a bit smoother trend with the exception of ProtoBERT. As expected, the performance of all the methods decreases as the number of novel classes increases. However, we can see that our method not only outperforms SMAN and ProtoBERT in every increment but also is more robust upon addition to the number of classes. In Figure 1a, we can see that the results of SMAN method are much closer to the NLI-FSL method but decreases significantly after adding novel classes and reaches to a comparable performance with ProtoBERT. In Figure 1b, we can observe a similar trend, where ProtoBERT and SMAN both start very



(a) FSID



(b) GFSID

Figure 2: Incremental Label Space Experiments

close in performance with the NLI-FSL method but show drastic drops in performance as the novel classes increase. However, the results are slightly noisy due to the influence of having imbalanced classes. Since the base classes are added by random sampling, it is possible that the class added might have a low number of instances, hence affecting the fine-tuning of BERT model in our NLI-FSL method.

Overall, from our results, we can safely say that the performance of our NLI-FSL method is much more robust compared to the prototypical and semantic matching based baselines as more novel classes are added.

7.3 Incremental base class data

The base/seen class dataset contains sufficient examples to perform a supervised learning over these classes. However, to answer how much of base class dataset is enough for our approach to generalize better on the task of FSID or GFSID, we experimented with the CLINC150 dataset. We chose the dataset specifically since it has a large number of samples and target classes, allowing us to build a more robust experimental setup.

We worked with the initial split of the

Method	1-shot					5-shot				
	% seen class data					% seen class data				
	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
ProtoBERT	25.44%	25.06%	25.09%	27.97%	29.19%	53.18%	56.20%	56.38%	59.02%	63.00%
SMAN	33.11%	36.02%	35.89%	36.99%	37.48%	59.89%	60.03%	62.09%	64.17%	67.90%
NLI-FSL	80.36%	82.33%	83.15%	82.67%	84.00%	88.93%	87.34%	90.39%	89.70%	90.55%
	1-shot GFSID					5-shot GFSID				
	% seen class data					% seen class data				
	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
ProtoBERT	17.30%	17.36%	18.43%	21.36%	22.80%	42.53%	44.13%	44.93%	47.00%	52.18%
SMAN	26.85%	26.37%	28.98%	29.74%	29.65%	50.83%	54.36%	56.08%	57.17%	58.75%
NLI-FSL	64.52%	71.69%	75.38%	76.03%	78.32%	76.46%	77.85%	78.32%	79.09%	79.84%

Table 3: Experiments upon incremental base/seen class data.

CLINC150 dataset we used for the experiments in Table 1. We split the dataset into 5 equal parts (while keeping the base class data balanced with respect to number of instances within each class). We start with 20% of the base class data and in each iteration we add another 20% and fine-tune our NLI-FSL again. Note that we keep the support and query dataset fixed in our setup. In a similar way, we evaluate the performance of ProtoBERT and SMAN methods.

We can see (Table 3) that our method is very stable in 5-shot settings (both FSID and GFSID), with the worst performance of 87.34% and best performance of 90.55% in 5-shot setting. On the other hand, for ProtoBERT, the performance ranges from 59.89% to 67.9% and for SMAN, the performance ranges from 50.83% to 58.75%. The results indicate that our method is robust against the amount of base class data present in the 5-shot setting. Similar results can be observed in the GFSID 5-shot setting. However, the results are not so consistent in 1-shot setting. Although, the performance of the NLI-FSL method is better than the other baselines by a significant margin, a significant variance exists in the GFSID 1-shot setting. The variance might be attributed to the difficulty of the 1-shot GFSID task itself where the prediction needs to be performed on the combined label space. We believe that the scarcity of examples in both seen class dataset and support set affect the performance of our approach.

7.4 Number of shots

We analyze the performance of our NLI-FSL based method under the condition of varying the number of shots as well. We experiment with 1, 5, 10 and 20 shots in the support set. We conduct these experiments upon CLINC150 dataset only since the dataset is huge in size, allowing us to have

sufficient examples in even 20 shot setting. We performed both FSID and GFSID tasks using the NLI-FSL, SMAN and ProtoBERT methods. Refer to Figure 2 for the results.

We can observe that the performance of NLI-FSL method outperforms every method in 1 shot setting by a huge margin but as the number of shots increase, the results of SMAN and ProtoBERT methods increase as well. However, the NLI-FSL method remains consistent when varying the number of shots. Similar trend can be observed in GFSID as well. As expected, increasing the number of shots in case of SMAN and ProtoBERT leads to saturation of their performance. From these results, we can infer that the NLI-FSL method works especially well in the setting where the number of support set examples is extremely low.

8 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a simple and effective method based on NLI techniques for the task of few/shot intent detection. We quantitatively demonstrate the settings in which our method prove applicable and provide significantly better results compared to the baselines. Our experimental results show that the method performs especially well under huge label spaces and is robust to less pre-train/base data and the number of shots in the support set. In the future, we would like to study our method’s performance upon designing label descriptions more carefully and utilizing the multilingual BERT for cross-lingual few shot intent detection as well.

References

Samuel R Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D Manning. 2015. A large anno-

- tated corpus for learning natural language inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.05326*.
- Daniel Cer, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St John, Noah Constant, Mario Guajardo-Céspedes, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, et al. 2018. Universal sentence encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.11175*.
- Qian Chen, Zhu Zhuo, and Wen Wang. 2019. Bert for joint intent classification and slot filling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.10909*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR.
- Tianyu Gao, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2019. Hybrid attention-based prototypical networks for noisy few-shot relation classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6407–6414.
- Spyros Gidaris and Nikos Komodakis. 2018. Dynamic few-shot visual learning without forgetting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4367–4375.
- Anjishnu Kumar, Pavankumar Reddy Muddireddy, Markus Dreyer, and Björn Hoffmeister. 2017. Zero-shot learning across heterogeneous overlapping domains. In *INTERSPEECH*, pages 2914–2918.
- Hoang Nguyen, Chenwei Zhang, Congying Xia, and Philip S Yu. 2020. Dynamic semantic matching and aggregation network for few-shot intent detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02481*.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentencebert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*.
- Jake Snell, Kevin Swersky, and Richard S Zemel. 2017. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.05175*.
- Shengli Sun, Qingfeng Sun, Kevin Zhou, and Tengchao Lv. 2019. Hierarchical attention prototypical networks for few-shot text 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 476–485.
- Oriol Vinyals, Charles Blundell, Timothy Lillicrap, Daan Wierstra, et al. 2016. Matching networks for one shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29:3630–3638.
- Congying Xia, Caiming Xiong, and Philip Yu. 2021. Pseudo siamese network for few-shot intent generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.00896*.
- Congying Xia, Caiming Xiong, Philip Yu, and Richard Socher. 2020a. Composed variational natural language generation for few-shot intents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10056*.
- Congying Xia, Chenwei Zhang, Hoang Nguyen, Jiawei Zhang, and Philip Yu. 2020b. Cg-bert: Conditional text generation with bert for generalized few-shot intent detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01881*.
- Congying Xia, Chenwei Zhang, Xiaohui Yan, Yi Chang, and Philip S Yu. 2018. Zero-shot user intent detection via capsule neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.00385*.
- Zhilin Yang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William W Cohen. 2017. Transfer learning for sequence tagging with hierarchical recurrent networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.06345*.
- Zhi-Xiu Ye and Zhen-Hua Ling. 2019. Multi-level matching and aggregation network for few-shot relation classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06678*.
- Jian-Guo Zhang, Kazuma Hashimoto, Wenhao Liu, Chien-Sheng Wu, Yao Wan, Philip S Yu, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. 2020. Discriminative nearest neighbor few-shot intent detection by transferring natural language inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.13009*.