# ConQX: Semantic Expansion of Spoken Queries for Intent Detection based on Conditioned Text Generation

Anonymous ACL submission

#### Abstract

 Intent detection of spoken queries is a chal- lenging task due to their noisy structure and short length. To provide additional informa- tion regarding the query and enhance the per- formance of intent detection, we propose a method for conditional semantic expansion of spoken queries, called ConQX, which utilizes the text generation ability of an auto-regressive language model, GPT-2. To avoid off-topic text generation, we condition the input query to a structured context with prompt mining. We then apply zero-shot, one-shot, and few-shot learning. We lastly use the expanded queries to fine-tune BERT and RoBERTa for intent de- tection. The experimental results show that 016 the performance of intent detection can be im-proved by our semantic expansion method.

#### **018 1 Introduction**

 In human-to-machine conversational agents, such as Amazon Alexa and Google Home, *intent detec- tion* aims to identify user intents that determine the command to be executed. *Spoken query*, also called as *utterance*, can be classified into a set of pre-defined user intents [\(Tur et al.,](#page-4-0) [2010\)](#page-4-0).

 Intent detection is a challenging task due to the noisy, informal, and limited structure of spoken queries. Detection models may suffer from the problems of sparsity, ambiguity, and limited vo- cabulary. Recent state-of-the-art language mod- els, such as GPT-2 [\(Radford et al.,](#page-4-1) [2019\)](#page-4-1) and **GPT-3** [\(Brown et al.,](#page-4-2) [2020\)](#page-4-2) based on the Trans- former architecture [\(Vaswani et al.,](#page-4-3) [2017\)](#page-4-3), incorpo- rate domain-independent large corpora in training. They have the capability of coherent text genera- tion when the task is prompted in natural language. The clarification of short spoken queries can be done by generating coherent and semantically re- lated text. For instance, the given query "what is amzn worth" is expanded to "what is amzn worth *what is Amazon's stock worth*" that clarifies *stock worth*, as well as solving the ambiguity in *amzn*.

Transformer-based text generation does not al- **042** [w](#page-4-4)ays produce meaningful text segments [\(Shao](#page-4-4) **043** [et al.,](#page-4-4) [2017\)](#page-4-4). For instance, the given query without **044** conditioning "has my card application processed **045** yet?" is expanded to "has my card application pro- **046** cessed yet? *If you are not yet with us*" that gets **047** a trivial text segment given in italic. The reason **048** would be that the model does not know the context **049** of card application, such as banking or member- **050** ship card. However, the input can be conditioned **051** with a better prompt "[I am a bank customer], has  $052$ my card application processed yet?" that gets addi- **053** tional context as bank customer. The input would **054** then be expanded to a non-trivial text segment in **055** the context of bank cards. **056**

In order to solve the problems regarding the **057** noisy and limited structure of spoken queries, we **058** propose a novel method, called ConQX, for se- **059** mantic expansion of spoken queries with condi- **060** tioned text generation. The method name refers **061** to Conditioned spoken Query eXpansion. Specif- **062** ically, we employ a Transformer-based language **063** model, namely GPT-2, to generate semantically re- **064** lated text segments. We condition the input query **065** to set up a structured context for generating text **066** segments. For conditioning, we manually design **067** prompts, and mine useful ones that provide struc- **068** tured context, as we call *prompt mining*. We then **069** append the generated text segments to existing spo- **070** ken queries, and fine-tune state-of-the-art language **071** models, namely BERT [\(Devlin et al.,](#page-4-5) [2019\)](#page-4-5) and **072** RoBERTa [\(Liu et al.,](#page-4-6) [2019\)](#page-4-6), for the downstream **073** task of intent detection. **074**

Conditioned expansion aims to describe the task **075** to the model in natural language and provide a **076** number of ground truth demonstrations of the task **077** at inference time. To exploit conditioned expan- **078** sion, we examine zero-shot, one-shot, and few-shot **079** learning [\(Brown et al.,](#page-4-2) [2020\)](#page-4-2). **080**

Traditional semantic expansion methods rely on **081** keyword-based expansion, which utilizes proxim- **082**

 ity in a semantic space regardless of contextual coherence [\(Roy et al.,](#page-4-7) [2016\)](#page-4-7). However, the models using contextual word embeddings, such as BERT, are shown to benefit from natural language queries that keep the grammar structure and word rela- tions [\(Padaki et al.,](#page-4-8) [2020;](#page-4-8) [Dai and Callan,](#page-4-9) [2019\)](#page-4-9). 089 Transformer-based text generation can output more coherent natural language queries, compared to keyword-based expansion [\(Radford et al.,](#page-4-1) [2019\)](#page-4-1) that mostly adapts to improve the performance of retrieval algorithms [\(Claveau,](#page-4-10) [2020\)](#page-4-10).

 The language model can be adapted to the downstream task with natural language prompts to achieve competitive performance. The design of an input prompt is important, since different writings of the task can affect the performance sig- nificantly [\(Jiang et al.,](#page-4-11) [2020;](#page-4-11) [Lester et al.,](#page-4-12) [2021\)](#page-4-12). Although there are some efforts for the automation [a](#page-4-11)nd standardization of prompt generation [\(Jiang](#page-4-11) [et al.,](#page-4-11) [2020;](#page-4-11) [Gao et al.,](#page-4-13) [2020\)](#page-4-13), they do not consider long text generation tasks, as in the case of seman- tic expansion. We employ prompt mining on a set of manually generated conditioning prompts and experiment with zero-shot, one-shot, and few-shot learning to further adapt the language model to the task of semantic expansion.

## **109 2 Conditioned Query Expansion**

 Given a set of spoken queries and input prompts, we use a pre-trained Transformer-based language model, GPT-2 [\(Radford et al.,](#page-4-1) [2019\)](#page-4-1), to generate coherent text. A spoken query is placed in manu- ally generated natural language prompts that are determined with prompt mining, and given as in- put to GPT-2 with zero/one/few-shot learning. The generated text segment is appended to the end of the original query to obtain the expanded query. **[B](#page-4-6)ERT** [\(Devlin et al.,](#page-4-5) [2019\)](#page-4-5) and RoBERTa [\(Liu](#page-4-6) [et al.,](#page-4-6) [2019\)](#page-4-6) are then fine-tuned for the task of in-tent detection.

#### **122** 2.1 Text Generation

 Our method for semantic expansion is based on lan- guage modeling [\(Bengio et al.,](#page-4-14) [2003\)](#page-4-14), formulated **in Equation [1,](#page-1-0) where q is a spoken query and**  $p(q)$  is the maximum likelihood probability of document estimation based on a sequence of tokens.

<span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
p(q) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p(s_i|s_1, ..., s_{i-1})
$$
 (1)

**129** ConQX employs the conditional probability of

estimating semantic expansion,  $q'$ , given the orig- $130$ inal query within the context of the input prompt, **131**  $p(q' | q) = p(s_{n+1}, ..., s_{n+k} | s_1, ..., s_n)$ , where q has 132 the length of *n* tokens, and  $q'$  has  $k$  tokens. The 133 likelihood is estimated by an auto-regressive lan- **134** guage model that considers the distributions of pre- **135** viously generated tokens for next token prediction. **136**

There are several methods to utilize auto- **137** regressive text generation. Greedy search predicts **138** the next token that has the highest probability of **139** occurrence. However, greedy search does not gen- **140** [e](#page-4-4)rate coherent text due to repetitive results [\(Shao](#page-4-4) **141** [et al.,](#page-4-4) [2017\)](#page-4-4). We apply top-*k* sampling that [\(Fan](#page-4-15) **142** [et al.,](#page-4-15) [2018\)](#page-4-15) predicts the next token from the most **143** likely *k* tokens to provide coherent and diverse text.

#### 2.2 Zero/One/Few-shot Learning **145**

Pre-trained language models are trained over large 146 and domain-independent corpora. When used for **147** a downstream task, such as semantic expansion **148** in our case, they need conditioning to deduce the **149** task and generate contextually related text. Zero- **150** shot expansion aims to achieve this conditioning **151** by inserting spoken queries into input prompts that **152** contain natural language descriptions of the task **153** without any demonstrations of the desired output. **154** 

In one-shot expansion, the input prompt con- **155** tains a ground-truth demonstration of the semantic **156** expansion task. The language model is expected **157** to infer the semantic expansion task more easily, **158** compared to zero-shot expansion. Lastly, few-shot **159** learning provides a number of true demonstrations **160** to increase the performance of task inference. **161**

Figure [1](#page-2-0) shows an example spoken query for se- **162** mantic expansion with zero/one/few-shot learning. **163** The ability of task inference is known to be avail- **164** able in the large models in terms of the number of **165** parameters, such as GPT-3 [\(Brown et al.,](#page-4-2) [2020\)](#page-4-2); **166** but also observed in smaller models, such as GPT-2 **167** [\(Schick and Schütze,](#page-4-16) [2021\)](#page-4-16). **168**

#### **2.3 Prompt Mining 169 169**

Determination of the proper input prompt for con- **170** ditioning the language model can be achieved **171** through prompt mining. The prompts provide addi- **172** tional context for the task inference of the language **173** model. We manually generate a set of prompts that **174** differ in text length, formality of the language, syn- **175** tactic structure, and context. We apply empirical **176** evaluation on the prompts, such that the classifica- **177** tion performance is used to select a prompt after **178** 10-fold leave-one-out cross-validation. We give **179**



Figure 1: An example expansion process is illustrated for zero/one/few-shot learning. The input spoken query (labeled in yellow and italic) is inserted into quotations in a set of prompts. The generated text is then extracted to obtain the expanded query (labeled in red and bold). True demonstration(s) are also given in the prompts for one/few-shot learning.

**180** the details of our manually designed prompts in **181** Appendix.

 Prompt examples are given in Table [1.](#page-2-0) We pro- vide a short prompt (the first), as well as a longer one (the second) that aims to exploit the ability of Transformer to model long-term dependencies with the Attention mechanism. The third prompt introduces a syntactic structure to condition the model, imitating a dialog. The fourth prompt is written in a more formal language, while the others in a daily language. The last one has additional context information as banking. Note that some of the prompts end with a quotation mark that en- forces the language model to generate an example language; while the others generate expansions in the form of sentence completions.

<span id="page-2-0"></span>Table 1: Prompt mining examples from our experiments. [INP] is an input prompt, [EXP] is an expanded text segment.

<b>Input Prompt</b>
[INP]. I would like to [EXP]
Spoken queries are generally short and need to be 2
expanded. For example, [INP] is hard to process and
can lead to poor quality results. The query may be rewritten as "[EXP]
Voice Assistant: "How can I help you?" User: [INP]
Voice Assistant: "Sorry, I didn't understand." User:
" $[EXP]$
In conversational search, spoken queries are short and
need to be expanded. For example, [INP] is hard to
process. The query may be rewritten as "[EXP]
I am a bank customer and I need support, [INP]. My
intention is [EXP]

<span id="page-2-1"></span>Table 2: The details of the datasets used in this study.

<b>Details</b>	<b>Banking</b>	<b>CLINC</b>	<b>SNIPS</b>	
Train samples	10.003	18,000	13.084	
Test samples	3.080	4.500	700	
Number of intents	77	150		
Avg. length (tokens)	12.27	9.38	11 24	

#### 3 Experiments **<sup>196</sup>**

## 3.1 Datasets **197**

We use three publicly available datasets for intent **198** detection; namely Banking, CLINC, and SNIPS. **199** Banking [\(Casanueva et al.,](#page-4-17) [2020\)](#page-4-17) has 77 intents **200** about banking, which is challenging due to subtle **201** differences among classes. CLINC [\(Larson et al.,](#page-4-18) **202** [2019\)](#page-4-18) is a balanced dataset with 150 intents. SNIPS **203** [\(Coucke et al.,](#page-4-19) [2018\)](#page-4-19) is another balanced dataset **204** covering seven intents. The details of the datasets **205** are given in Table [2.](#page-2-1) We apply no preprocessing. **206**

#### 3.2 Experimental Design **207**

Query expansion is conducted on NVIDIA 2080Ti **208** PU with 12 GB memory; BERT fine-tuning uses 209 same infrastructure as well. Query expansion **210** the approximately an hour to complete in the **211** 10-fold setting. The methods are given as follows. **212**

- **Without expansion:** As a baseline method, we 213 fine-tune BERT-base [\(Devlin et al.,](#page-4-5) [2019\)](#page-4-5) and **214** RoBERTa-base [\(Liu et al.,](#page-4-6) [2019\)](#page-4-6) with default **215** parameters by Huggingface [\(Wolf et al.,](#page-4-20) [2019\)](#page-4-20), **216** but without expansion. **217**
- Bag-of-words (kNN): As a baseline expansion **218** method, we consider that the expanded words **219**

<span id="page-3-0"></span>Table 3: Comparison of ConQX with the baselines for intent detection in terms of the weighted F1 score. The means of 10-fold cross-validation are reported. The bold score is the highest. • indicates statistically significant improvement at a 95% interval in pairwise comparisons between the highest method and baselines marked with ◦.

<b>Expansion Method</b>	<b>Banking</b>		<b>CLINC</b>		<b>SNIPS</b>	
	<b>BERT</b>	<b>RoBERTa</b>	<b>BERT</b>	<b>RoBERTa</b>	<b>BERT</b>	<b>RoBERTa</b>
Without expansion	$0.908\circ$	0.923	0.959	0.964	0.974	0.979
Bag-of-words (kNN)	$0.909\circ$	0.922	$0.953\circ$	$0.957\circ$	$0.969\circ$	$0.972\circ$
Transformer (GPT-2)	0.912	0.923	0.954	0.964	0.976	0.981
$ConOX$ (zero-shot)	$0.920\bullet$	0.928	0.960	$0.965\bullet$	0.978	$0.983\bullet$
$ConOX$ (one-shot)	$0.920\bullet$	0.928	0.959	0.961	$0.983\bullet$	0.981
$ConOX$ (few-shot)	0.916	0.925	$0.962\bullet$	0.962	0.981	0.976

 are independent (bag-of-words), and use GloVe [\(Pennington et al.,](#page-4-21) [2014\)](#page-4-21) word embeddings. We sample *k*=1 nearest neighbor of each input token in the embedding space, and append them to the input, using scikit-learn [\(Pedregosa et al.,](#page-4-22) [2011\)](#page-4-22).

- **225** Transformer (GPT-2): As a baseline expansion **226** method, GPT2-large with 774M parameters by **227** Huggingface [\(Wolf et al.,](#page-4-20) [2019\)](#page-4-20) is used for text **228** generation, given the original query with no input **229** prompt [\(Radford et al.,](#page-4-1) [2019\)](#page-4-1). The number of **230** generated tokens is approximated to the number **231** of input tokens.
- **232** ConQX (zero-shot): Our semantic expansion **233** method with zero-shot learning. Both train and **234** test instances are expanded, and fine-tuning is **235** done using the expanded queries. For top-k sam-236 **pling in GPT-2, we experiment**  $k \in (10, 50, 100)$ , **237** and select empirically by F1 score on the test set.
- **238** ConQX (one-shot): Our method with one-shot **239** learning. A single true demonstration of semantic **240** expansion is provided.
- **241 ConQX** (few-shot): Our method with few-shot **242** learning. Multiple true demonstrations of seman-**243** tic expansion are provided (we use four demon-**244** strations for the sake of efficiency).

 We report the weighted average F1 score for intent detection with leave-one-out 10-fold cross validation. We use scikit-learn [\(Pedregosa et al.,](#page-4-22) [2011\)](#page-4-22) for evaluation metrics. Any improvements over the baselines are statistically validated by the two-tailed paired t-test at a 95% interval.

## **251** 3.3 Experimental Results

 We compare the effectiveness of baselines and our method for intent detection in Table [3.](#page-3-0) The re- sults show that ConQX improves the effectiveness of intent detection in all datasets, compared to all baselines. Although, the gap between baselines and ConQX is not too wide, we show that the differ-ences are statistically significant in some cases. We

show that conditioned text generation is a promis- **259** ing approach for semantic expansion of spoken **260** queries, and its performance can be improved by **261** additional *prompt mining*. ConQX with zero/one- **262** shot learning lead to better improvement in most **263** cases, showing that hand-crafted true demonstra- **264** tions could cause noise in few-shot learning, i.e. **265** prompt mining can generate better demonstrations. **266** GPT-2 without conditioned text generation does not **267** always improve effectiveness, showing the need of **268** conditioned text generation. kNN-based expansion **269** also deteriorates effectiveness in some cases, possi- **270** bly due to the fact that the neighbor words do not **271** clarify the context of short queries. **272**

We analyze prompts differing in length, formal- **273** ity of language, and syntactic structure using punc- **274** tuation. Longer prompts tend to result in more **275** coherent and informative expansions. However, **276** depending on the dataset and classifier, shorter **277** prompts may be more suitable. The role of dif- **278** ferent prompts are application-dependent, formally **279** written prompts are favored by formal domains **280** such as banking. Syntactic structures, such as quo- **281** tation marks, make irrelevant text filtered out and **282** result in less noisy expansions. **283**

## 4 Conclusion and Future Work **<sup>284</sup>**

We propose conditioned query expansion (ConQX) **285** for intent detection. Our experimental results show **286** that the performance is increased in all datasets **287** from different domains, with proper selection of **288** parameters (prompt parameters and zero/one/few- **289** shot selection). ConQX is thereby a promising **290** method for similar tasks that can benefit from se- **291** mantic expansion. In future work, we plan to exam- **292** ine other models and sampling strategies, such as **293** beam search [\(Shao et al.,](#page-4-4) [2017\)](#page-4-4). We demonstrate **294** that the performance can be improved with hand- **295** crafted prompts, but *prompt mining* and *prompt* **296** *design* are emerging research topics. We plan to **297**

**298** focus on tuning parameters and systematic ways **299** for creating prompts [\(Lester et al.,](#page-4-12) [2021\)](#page-4-12).

#### **<sup>300</sup>** References

- <span id="page-4-14"></span>**301** Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, Pascal Vincent, and **302** Christian Janvin. 2003. A neural probabilistic lan-**303** guage model. *Journal of Machine Learning Re-***304** *search*, 3:1137–1155.
- <span id="page-4-2"></span>**305** Tom B Brown et al. 2020. Language models are few-**306** shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*.
- <span id="page-4-17"></span>307 **Iñigo Casanueva, Tadas Temčinas, Daniela Gerz, 308** Matthew Henderson, and Ivan Vulic. 2020. Efficient ´ **309** intent detection with dual sentence encoders. *arXiv* **310** *preprint arXiv:2003.04807*.
- <span id="page-4-10"></span>**311** Vincent Claveau. 2020. Query expansion with **312** artificially generated texts. *arXiv preprint* **313** *arXiv:2012.08787*.
- <span id="page-4-19"></span>**314** Alice Coucke et al. 2018. Snips voice platform: An **315** embedded spoken language understanding system **316** for private-by-design voice interfaces. *arXiv preprint* **317** *arXiv:1805.10190*.
- <span id="page-4-9"></span>**318** Zhuyun Dai and Jamie Callan. 2019. Deeper text un-**319** derstanding for ir with contextual neural language **320** modeling. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International* **321** *ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Develop-***322** *ment in Information Retrieval*, pages 985–988.
- <span id="page-4-5"></span>**323** Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and **324** Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of **325** deep bidirectional transformers for language under-**326** standing. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference* **327** *of the North American Chapter of the Association* **328** *for Computational Linguistics: Human Language* **329** *Technologies*, pages 4171–4186.
- <span id="page-4-15"></span>**330** Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. 2018. **331** Hierarchical neural story generation. In *Proceedings* **332** *of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for* **333** *Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, **334** pages 889–898.
- <span id="page-4-13"></span>**335** Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2020. **336** Making pre-trained language models better few-shot **337** learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723*.
- <span id="page-4-11"></span>**338** Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Jun Araki, and Graham **339** Neubig. 2020. How can we know what language **340** models know? *Transactions of the Association for* **341** *Computational Linguistics*, 8:423–438.
- <span id="page-4-18"></span>**342** Stefan Larson et al. 2019. An evaluation dataset for **343** intent classification and out-of-scope prediction. In **344** *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical* **345** *Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th* **346** *International Joint Conference on Natural Language* **347** *Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 1311–1316.
- <span id="page-4-12"></span>Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. **348** [The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.243) **349** [tuning.](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.243) In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on* **350** *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, **351** pages 3045–3059, Online and Punta Cana, Domini- **352** can Republic. Association for Computational Lin- **353** guistics. **354**
- <span id="page-4-6"></span>Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Man- **355** dar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, **356** Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. **357** Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining ap- **358** proach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*. **359**
- <span id="page-4-8"></span>Ramith Padaki, Zhuyun Dai, and Jamie Callan. 2020. **360** Rethinking query expansion for BERT reranking. In **361** *42nd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR*, **362** pages 297–304. **363**
- <span id="page-4-22"></span>F. Pedregosa et al. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning **364** in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **365** 12:2825–2830. **366**
- <span id="page-4-21"></span>Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D **367** Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word rep- **368** resentation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference* **369** *on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Process-* **370** *ing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543. **371**
- <span id="page-4-1"></span>Alec Radford et al. 2019. Language models are unsu- **372** pervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Blog*, 1(8):9. **373**
- <span id="page-4-7"></span>Dwaipayan Roy, Debjyoti Paul, Mandar Mitra, and **374** Utpal Garain. 2016. Using word embeddings **375** for automatic query expansion. *arXiv preprint* **376** *arXiv:1606.07608*. **377**
- <span id="page-4-16"></span>[T](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.185)imo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. [It's not just](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.185) **378** [size that matters: Small language models are also few-](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.185) **379** [shot learners.](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.185) In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference* **380** *of the North American Chapter of the Association* **381** *for Computational Linguistics: Human Language* **382** *Technologies*, pages 2339–2352, Online. Association **383** for Computational Linguistics. **384**
- <span id="page-4-4"></span>Yuanlong Shao et al. 2017. Generating high-quality and **385** informative conversation responses with sequence-to- **386** sequence models. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Con-* **387** *ference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language* **388** *Processing*, pages 2210–2219. **389**
- <span id="page-4-0"></span>G. Tur, D. Hakkani-Tür, and L. Heck. 2010. What is **390** left to be understood in ATIS? In *2010 IEEE Spoken* **391** *Language Technology Workshop*, pages 19–24. **392**
- <span id="page-4-3"></span>Ashish Vaswani et al. 2017. Attention is all you need. **393** In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference* **394** *on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages **395** 6000—-6010. **396**
- <span id="page-4-20"></span>Thomas Wolf et al. 2019. Huggingface's transformers: **397** State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv* **398** *preprint arXiv:1910.03771*. **399**

## **<sup>400</sup>** A Appendix for ConQX: Semantic **<sup>401</sup>** Expansion of Spoken Queries for **<sup>402</sup>** Intent Detection based on Conditioned **<sup>403</sup>** Text Generation

 We prepare a set of manually generated prompts, given in Table [4.](#page-5-0) Prompts focus on different aspects of conditioned text generation; such as text length, syntactic structure, and formality of the language **408** used.

> <span id="page-5-0"></span>Table 4: Manually generated input prompts used in prompt mining. Curly braces are replaced with spoken queries to be expanded.



 The prompts 6 to 9 have longer length, compared to the others. They aim to exploit Transformers' ability to model long-term dependencies with the attention mechanism. The prompt 7 is designed to introduce a syntactic structure to condition the model, imitating a dialog. The prompt 9 is written in a more formal language, while the others in a daily language.

**417** The prompts 6 to 9 end with a quotation mark **418** that enforces the language model to generate an ex-**419** ample language, and end it with another quotation

mark. The prompts 1 to 5 do not apply this *trick*, **420** and generate expansions in the form of sentence **421** completions. **422**

We examine the effect of specifying the domain **423** of the dataset in Table [5,](#page-5-1) which is given for the **424** Banking dataset. **425** 

<span id="page-5-1"></span>Table 5: Conditioning with domain label for Banking dataset. Curly braces are replaced with spoken queries to be expanded.



In Table [6,](#page-6-0) the few-shot setup for input prompt **426** "{} I would like to" is given. The prompt is selected **427** with prompt mining and adapted for the datasets. 428

<span id="page-6-0"></span>Table 6: Few-shot learning of an input prompt after prompt mining adapted for different datasets. The spoken query to be expanded is given in italic. Square brackets show the input prompt obtained from mining. The generated semantic expansion is given in bold.

