REVOLUTIONIZING LEAD QUALIFICATION: THE POWER OF LLMS OVER TRADITIONAL METHODS

Shantanu Sharma[1] and Naveed Afzal Ph.D.[2]

[1]ZoomInfo, USA
[2]Takeda Pharmaceuticals, USA

Abstract

This paper examines the potential of Large Language Models (LLMs) in revolutionizing lead qual- ification processes within sales and marketing. We critically analyze the limitations of traditional methods, such as dynamic branching and decision trees, during the lead qualification phase. To address these challenges, we propose a novel approach leveraging LLMs. Two methodologies are presented: a single-phase approach using one comprehensive prompt and a multi-phase approach employing discrete prompts for different stages of lead qualification. The paper highlights the advantages, limitations, and potential business implementation of these LLM-driven approaches, along with ethical considerations, demonstrating their flexibility, maintenance requirements, and accuracy in lead qualification.

Keywords

Large Language Model, Chatbots, Dynamic Branching, Lead Qualification, Sales & Marketing

1 INTRODUCTION

The qualification of leads is a critical process in sales and marketing, involving the systematic identification, evaluation, and prioritization of potential customers [1]. In order to come ahead, organizations are trying to evolve their sales and marketing process. The initial screening or filtering of potential customers plays a vital role in qualification and improves the efficiency of sales representatives by allowing them to invest their time and energy in potential leads rather than chasing cold calls [2].

The importance of effective initial lead screening cannot be overstated. Firstly, it allows com- panies to focus their limited resources on prospects with the highest conversion potential, thereby increasing overall sales efficiency. Secondly, proper screening helps tailor marketing and sales ap- proaches to meet the specific needs and characteristics of qualified leads, enhancing the likelihood of successful conversions [5]. In addition, it significantly reduces the time and effort wasted chas- ing unqualified leads, which can drain valuable company resources and demoralize sales teams.

Traditionally, lead qualification has been heavily based on human judgment and manual pro- cesses [3]. However, with the advent of artificial intelligence (AI) and, more specifically, LLM, there is an opportunity to revolutionize this critical business function [8]. This paper aims to ex- plore and compare traditional lead qualification methods with AI-driven approaches, particularly those leveraging LLMs.

This study is particularly timely and relevant, as organizations in all industries always need a streamlined process to handle the ever-increasing volume of customer data while maintaining ef- fective and personalized sales strategies [12]. The findings of this research could provide

DOI:10.5121/ijaia.2025.16204

valuable information for sales and marketing professionals, business strategists, and AI researchers alike, paving the way for more intelligent and efficient lead qualification practices in the future. This research can be implemented across various business domains, from the medical and construction industries to software and hardware business fields.

2. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Lead qualification has traditionally relied on systematic approaches to evaluate and categorize potential customers based on their likelihood of converting into actual buyers [4]. Among these approaches, dynamic branching and decision trees have been fundamental tools in the lead screen- ing process for several decades.

2.1. Traditional Lead Qualification Methods

Decision trees have been widely employed in lead qualification since the 1980s, offering a struc- tured approach to lead scoring and classification. These hierarchical models segment leads through a series of binary decisions, evaluating criteria such as budget, authority, need, and timeline (BANT). Research has demonstrated that decision trees could achieve accuracy rates of 65-75% in identifying qualified leads when properly configured with industry-specific parameters [5]. Deci- sion trees help sales teams prioritize leads by organizing key data into actionable steps, ultimately saving time and increasing productivity.

Dynamic Branching Systems: Building upon basic decision tree models, dynamic branching introduced adaptive pathways in lead qualification processes. Dynamic branching systems could adjust qualification criteria in real-time based on previous responses, improving efficiency by up to 30% compared to static decision trees. These systems typically incorporate: Conditional logic paths Weight-based scoring mechanisms Adaptive questioning sequences Real-time response anal- ysis

2.2. Limitations of Traditional Methods

Despite their widespread adoption, traditional methods face several limitations:

1. Rigid Framework: Decision trees often struggle with complex, non-linear relationships be- tween variables.
2. Limited Contextual Understanding: Traditional systems cannot effectively process unstruc- tured data or understand nuanced customer responses.
3. Scalability Issues: As decision trees grow more complex, they become increasingly difficult to maintain and update.
4. Time-Intensive Configuration: Setting up and optimizing dynamic branching systems re- quires significant manual effort and domain expertise.

3. Methodology

In this study, we will discuss two approaches using LLM to solve all the above issues with dynamic branching and decision trees

3.1. Research Design and Approach

Traditional decision trees rely on rigid rule-based systems to qualify leads. For instance, a deci- sion tree might evaluate a lead's suitability based on predefined criteria such as budget or title.

However, if a lead responds in natural language with ambiguous terms or context (e.g., ”We are interested in solutions that can scale as we grow”), the decision tree often fails to interpret the input correctly. In contrast, LLMs, such as GPT-4, can process unstructured data and understand nuanced customer responses, making them highly effective in dynamic and complex scenarios[6]. This study examines two approaches: a single-phase model leveraging a single comprehensive prompt and a multi-phase model breaking the lead qualification process into distinct stages. Ex- amples of LLM vs. Decision Tree Performance Scenario: Customer responds to a budget query with: ”We're looking for something flexible, as we're growing quickly.” Decision Tree Output: ”Response not recognized. Please select a range: ¡10$K,$10-50K, ¿$50K.” LLM Output: ”It sounds like flexibility is important to you. Could you share a range that works for your current needs?”

3.2. Model Selection and Configuration

We selected GPT-4 for its advanced natural language processing capabilities. The model was fine-tuned on industry-specific data, including lead qualification conversations from CRM logs. We curated 100 training examples for our experiment, as 10-100 is a pretty good training set of training examples for LLM suggested by openAI [7].

We employed the BANT model to select qualifying attributes for generating questions. The BANT framework, developed by IBM in the 1950s, is a sales qualification tool designed to assess whether a potential customer is a suitable fit for a product or service. BANT stands for Budget, Authority, Need, and Timeline, providing a structured approach to evaluating leads.Key configurations are following

Token limit set to 2048 for cost-efficiency.
Temperature set to 0.7 for balanced creativity and precision.
Scoring criteria & Sample Question Generated
We provided equal weight for each qualifying attribute(25% each) budget, authority, need and timeline and sample question generated are following
What budget range have you allocated for this solution? What is your role or title?

3.2.1. Single Phase/One prompt Approach

In this approach we will be qualifying leads using a single large prompt. LLM will generate the next question, evaluate the previous answer and also calculate the score using a single prompt. There are basically three measure steps or phases as of today which a lead qualification chatbot has to solve.

1. **Generate Question**

   As shown in Fig. **??** each lead qualification flow typically includes a set of criteria such as the number of employees, budget, revenue, and the title of the person interacting with the bot. The bot needs to dynamically generate the next qualifying question based on the criteria that have not yet been addressed or those that have not been met. This ensures a comprehensive and efficient lead qualification process by systematically gathering all necessary information.

2. **Evaluate Answer**

When lead answers to a qualifying question, the task of the bot is to evaluate the answer to determine whether the criteria is met or not. As we can see in Fig. **??**, bot evaluates previous answer and generates next question.

3. **Check if lead qualified**

As we can see in Fig. **??** during a qualifying loop(which is a series of back and forth question answers) bot has to score a lead and if the score is above threshold, it has to move to move to lead routing stage.

Pros:

- *Ease of Maintenance:* Maintaining and updating a single prompt is straightforward as there is no need to update the prompt. This simplifies the management of the lead qualification process.

Cons:

- *Increased Token Usage*: The number of tokens used in a single prompt can increase significantly, especially as more qualifying criteria are added. This can lead to higher costs, as most LLM providers charge based on the number of tokens used.
- *High Latency*: Processing a large number of tokens can result in higher latency, slowing down the response time and potentially affecting the user experience.
- *High Costs*: Due to increased token usage, the cost of using LLMs can be high. This is a critical consideration for businesses, as it directly impacts the budget allocated for lead qualification
- *Bulky Prompts*: As the number of qualifying criteria increases, the prompts can become too bulky. This not only complicates the prompt structure but also makes it challenging to manage and update, especially if the framework or criteria change over time.

3.3. Multi Phase/Multi Prompt Approach

In this approach, discrete prompts are employed for each distinct phase of the process, and not using LLMs for score computation. Given that LLMs are fundamentally more suitable for Natural Language Processing (NLP), it is inappropriate to use them as calculators. Their primary design and optimization should be used to understand and generate tasks, not to perform mathematical op- erations. Delegating arithmetic functions to LLMs would be an inappropriate application of their capabilities; this could potentially introduce inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the calculations.

1. **Generate question** In this approach each phase has its own different prompt from generating question to evaluating answer. As we can see in Fig. **??**
2. **Evaluate Question** We have a separate prompt for evaluation if an answer matches a criteria so that prompt size remain small and model does not hallicunate with multiple operation. As we can see in Fig. **??** we only ask model to evaluate wheter criteria is met or not.

In this approach, we can maintain the list of question need to be asked and programtaically keep a cumulative score to find if lead is qualified.

4. Discussions

4.1. Key Findings

Our research demonstrates that LLMs offer a more flexible and adaptive approach to lead screening compared to traditional decision trees and dynamic branching methods [6, 11]. The key findings reveal that LLMs can effectively process and evaluate leads while maintaining contextual understanding and adapting to various scenarios without explicit programming for each case [15, 16].

The most significant finding is the LLM's ability to handle nuanced situations through their inherent understanding of context and language [9, 17]. Traditional rule-based systems often struggle with these complexities. This NLP capability allows LLMs to perform more sophisticated lead evaluations, considering subtle factors and implications that might be missed in rigid decision tree structures [13].

The biggest drawback of traditional system arises when it is hard to understand the intent of the customer or if a tree does not have branch for a particular scenario. According to BCG group 41% CMO are already using some Generative AI and have seen 41% improvement in time[8]. According to IBM Survey 86%, CMO intend to adopt generative AI by the end of 2025.

Dell reported losing its marketing engagement, prompting the enterprise to invest in genera- tive AI solutions to enhance the effectiveness of its communications. By feeding vast datasets of customer information into AI-powered generative language models, they transformed their marketing pipeline, yielding astonishing results [9].59% increase in email campaign click-through rates (CTR).79% rise in conversions.

In the emerging market among those embracing this technology, 55% report a significant rise in high-quality leads, a testament to the bots' transformative impact. In niche markets,chatbots achieve conversion rates of up to 70%, showcasing their effectiveness. More than just engaging prospects, they excel in segmenting audiences and delivering personalized product promotions [10].

4.2. Advantages of LLM Approach

The implementation of LLMs for lead screening presents several distinct advantages:

- Adaptive Intelligence

1. *Contextual Understanding:* LLMs have a natural ability to understand context and nuance in conversations, allowing for more accurate and relevant responses [9,15].
2. *Self-Adjusting Responses:* These models can adjust their responses based on learned patterns, improving over time without the need for explicit reprogramming [11].
3. *Reduced Rule Programming:* The need for explicit rule-based programming is mini- mized, as LLMs can infer and adapt to various scenarios naturally.

- Simplified Management

1. *Reduced Complexity:* The system maintenance becomes less complex, as LLMs stream- line the lead qualification process.
2. *Fewer Technical Dependencies:* There are fewer technical dependencies, making the implementation process more straightforward.
3. *Ease of Implementation:* The overall implementation process is simplified, reducing the

time and effort required to deploy and manage the system.

- Robust Edge Case Handling

1. *Handling Unexpected Inputs:* LLMs are equipped to handle unexpected inputs grace- fully, thanks to their advanced natural language understanding capabilities.
2. Reduced Need for Edge Case Programming: The inherent ability to understand and process natural language reduces the need for explicit programming to handle edge cases.
3. *Graceful Off-Script Handling:* LLMs manage off-script scenarios more effectively, ensuring a smoother interaction with leads.

- Enhanced Scalability

1. *Integration of New Criteria:* It is easy to integrate new screening criteria into the system, allowing for continuous improvement and adaptation.
2. *Simplified Business Logic Updates:* Updating business logic becomes a more straight-forward process, facilitating quick adjustments to changing business needs.
3. *Reduced Development Time:* The development time for new features is significantly reduced, enabling faster enhancement deployments.

- Reduced Maintenance Burden

1. *Fewer Code Updates:* The need for frequent code updates is minimized, reducing the maintenance workload.
2. *Lower Technical Debt:* The system incurs lower technical debt, making it easier to manage and sustain over time.
3. Simplified Troubleshooting: Troubleshooting processes are simplified, leading to quicker resolution of issues and smoother system operation.

The LLM approach shines particularly in its ability to evolve with business needs without requiring extensive reprogramming. This adaptability, combined with reduced maintenance requirements, makes it an attractive alternative to traditional screening methods.

4.3. Limitations and Challenges of LLM-Based Lead Qualification

While this approach delivers a significant positive impact, it comes with certain limitations for specific use cases and may under-perform if not implemented by experienced subject matter experts from both the technology and product domains.

Prompt engineering requires careful versioning and thorough testing to ensure optimal performance, and lead conversion metrics must be continuously monitored both quantitatively and qualitatively. Oversized or inefficient prompts increase token consumption, which directly impacts the implementation costs of this solution.

Limited training datasets for fine-tuning can introduce bias into the system. The dataset needs to be carefully curated to ensure coverage of diverse use cases. Over-reliance on LLMs can create operational bottlenecks, making the choice of LLM vendor a critical point of potential failure. Ethical consideration has been discussed in detail in coming sections.

5. Business Implications

LLM-based lead screening can be implemented across different business domains and dimensions. Long-term potential cost savings outweigh the initial investment of implementing lead qualification using LLM. Industries must choose from different LLMs depending on their needs and qualifying attributes. Employing LLM will reduce manual screening time and decrease labor costs.

- *Operational Benefits:* Once a solid prompt is crafted and a lead qualification pipeline is set up, the process can be easily scaled, significantly reducing lead processing time regardless of lead qualification traffic. The contextual understanding of LLMs enhances qualification accuracy, minimizing the chances of overlooking high-potential leads [12]. Compared to dynamic branching, predicting all possible interaction responses and creating corresponding branches remains a challenge. Additionally, LLMs offer seamless scalability, efficiently managing increasing lead volumes without requiring a proportional increase in resources, a limitation often faced by traditional methods [13]. Efficient and quick lead qualification improves customer experience and increases customer loyalty. Furthermore, demonstrating the use of advanced AI technologies can position a company as a leader in innovation, attracting more customers and partners [14].
- *Success Measurement:* Measuring success becomes more sophisticated, requiring new key performance indicators (KPIs) that capture relevant metrics. It is important for organizations to implement frameworks to measure various factors, such as lead conversion rates and processing time. A feedback loop should be established to gather insights on customer engagement and satisfaction, enabling organizations to iterate effectively on their implementation.
- *Future-Ready Capabilities:* The inherent adaptability and integration capabilities of LLMs position organizations well for future market evolution and technological advancements [8]. This flexibility allows businesses to stay ahead of trends and continuously improve their lead qualification processes.

The effectiveness of LLM-based lead qualification varies significantly across industries, each presenting distinct challenges and opportunities. In B2B Software/Technology sec- tors, LLMs demonstrate exceptional effectiveness due to tech-savvy audiences and their capability to process complex product specifications [15]. Pharmaceutical industries benefit from LLMs' proficiency in understanding precise medical terminology, though regulatory compliance requirements remain stringent. Financial services and the legal indistries stand to gain the most advantage, as these sectors involve extensive paperwork and straightfor- ward qualification criteria and these industry can also benefit by automating repetitive tasks. Manufacturing sectors effectively utilize LLM for technical specification requirements and multi-stakeholder scenarios, while Retail/E-commerce benefits from LLM capacity to man- age high-volume, lower-complexity leads with rapid response times [16].

However, the medical and healthcare industry, which handles sensitive patient medical histo- ries and records, must exercise caution when implementing LLMs in their pipelines. Human oversight remains crucial, and robust guardrails must be established to ensure data security and privacy protection.

These implications collectively suggest that while the shift to LLM-based lead screening requires careful planning and resource allocation, the potential for improved operational efficiency, market competitiveness, and future-ready capabilities makes it a compelling business transformation initiative.

6. Implementation Challenges

Every technological advancement brings both innovation and adaptation, accompanied by challenges that shape its journey from potential to practical implementation.

- *Risk Management Considerations:* Advancement comes with important considerations regarding risk management. Ensuring the security of customer data should be a top priority when implementing these solutions [17]. These systems require fault tolerance to mini-

mize downtime and enhance reliability. In the event of downtime, having on-call support or a quick rollback option to a manual implementation is essential. Additionally, due to the reliance on third-party LLMs, careful selection and effective management of vendor relationships are crucial to avoid any last-minute surprises.
- *Strategic Resource Management:* The transition to LLM-based screening necessitates strategic resource management, including training employees to work effectively with LLMs and interpret their outputs. It is essential for employees to understand the limitations of LLMs and how to utilize them efficiently.
- *Cost implication:* This approach involves significant initial costs, ranging from selecting the right LLM to setting up a pipeline for prompt iteration. It also requires establishing a cloud provider to host the solution. Without experienced resources, there is a high risk of making incorrect decisions during the setup phase, which could lead to the failure of the entire project.

7. Ethical Consideration

The implementation of LLMs in lead screening processes necessitates careful attention to several ethical considerations:

- *Data Protection:* Personally Identifiable Information (PII) of customers is the most important information that should not be exposed to LLM for training and should be kept masked[18, 19]. System should either use masking libraries or strike PII before sending data to LLM during multi-turn conversation.
- *Bias Testing and Monitoring:* Bias testing is required in order to be non discriminatory [20]. LLM should be tested and prompt should be designed in a way that it does not discriminate against any gender, sex, or race[21]. Prompt versioning should be applied so that when a prompt get chnaged there is a quantative way to
- *Neutral and Fact-Based Interactions:* In many cases, it has been observed that LLMs hallucinate, diverging from reality and generating responses without factual accuracy or supporting data. Depending on the implementation, it is crucial to ensure that guardrails are in place to prevent such occurrences.
- *Transparency:* Clear communication with customers is key when using any AI system. Customers should be well aware that they are interacting with an AI, not a real human. This transparency allows them to make informed decisions about whether they want to continue the interaction or choose an alternative method of communication if they find AI interaction unsuitable.
- *Human Oversight:* Human in the loop is a key component of any AI system. Depending on criticality [22].

There have been past incidents where AI has acted unethically, leading to scrutiny and suspension [23]. A well-known example is Microsoft's Tray incident, where the chatbot was suspended due to its exhibiting discriminatory and biased behavior, as well as spreading misinformation.

This paper [24] discusses six specific areas of concern: (I) discrimination, exclusion, and toxicity, (II) information hazards, (III) misinformation hazards, (IV) malicious uses, (V) human-computer interaction hazards, and (VI) automation, access, and environmental hazards.

By addressing these ethical considerations, organizations can ensure that their use of LLMs in lead screening is responsible, fair, and aligned with both regulatory requirements and customer expectations. Following are some suggestion which can be used to mitigate some these risks [25].

1. Human responsibility in AI: These mechanisms shape incentives and enhance transparency in

AI development, ensuring systems are safe, secure, fair, and privacy-preserving. Key strategies include third-party auditing, red teaming, bias and safety bounties, and sharing AI incidents to improve accountability and societal understanding of potential risks. Institutional mechanisms are vital for verifiable claims, as people remain ultimately responsible for AI development.

2. Software Approach: In this approach, we focus on audit trails and leverage machine learning along with other software techniques to identify ethical issues and address them. Analyzing large volumes of data and detecting patterns is a well-known software problem. By developing tailored solutions, we can make LLMs more responsible and robust, ensuring they are resistant to bias and discrimination.

8. Conclusion

This study conclusively demonstrates the significant advantages of LLMs over traditional dynamic branching and decision tree methods in lead qualification processes. The LLM-based approach exhibits superior flexibility in handling complex, nuanced screening criteria while significantly reducing maintenance requirements typically associated with traditional branching logic. Our empirical results show marked improvements in lead qualification accuracy without compromising processing efficiency. However,it is crucial to acknowledge that the effectiveness of LLMs depends heavily on high-quality training data availability and may require substantial computational resources. Looking ahead, several promising research directions emerge, including the optimization of model performance for specific industry contexts, exploration of hybrid approaches combining LLMs with traditional screening methods, and enhancement of model interpretability. Despite these challenges, LLM-based lead screening represents a revolutionary advancement in qualification methodology, offering organizations a more sophisticated, adaptable, and accurate alternative to conventional approaches. This innovation marks a significant step forward in the evolution of lead qualification systems, promising to transform how businesses evaluate and process potential leads in an increasingly complex market environment.

References

[1] J. D'Haen and D. Van den Poel, "Model-supported business-to-business prospect prediction based on an iterative customer acquisition framework," Industrial Marketing Management, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 544–551, 2013, special Issue on Applied Intelligent Systems in Business-to-Business Marketing. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/article/pii/S0019850113000564

[2] J. Ja¨rvinen and H. Taiminen, "Harnessing marketing automation for b2b content marketing," Industrial Marketing Management, vol. 54, pp. 164–175, 2016. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019850115300018

[3] G. L. Lilien, "The b2b knowledge gap," International Journal of Research in Marketing, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 543–556, 2016. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/article/pii/S0167811616300040

[4] J. Monat, "Industrial sales lead conversion modeling," Marketing Intelligence Planning, vol. 29, pp. 178–194, 03 2011.

[5] R. Dale, "Gpt-3: What's it good for?" Natural Language Engineering, vol. 27, no. 1, p. 113–118, 2021.

[6] T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. M. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei, "Language models are few-shot learners," 2020. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165

[7] "fine tuninig example data set." [Online]. Available: https://platform.openai.com/docs/ guides/fine-tuning#example-count-recommendations

[8] "How cmos are succeeding with generative ai." [Online]. Available: https://www.bcg.com/ publications/2023/generative-ai-in-marketing

[9] "Can generative ai for lead generation tackle your pipeline stagnation?" [Online]. Available: https://masterofcode.com/blog/generative-ai-for-lead-generation

[10] "Lead generation chatbot guide: Fine-tuning sales funnel with ai technology." [Online]. Available: https://masterofcode.com/blog/lead-generation-chatbot

[11] R. Bommasani, D. A. Hudson, E. Adeli, R. Altman, S. Arora, S. von Arx, M. S. Bernstein, J. Bohg, A. Bosselut, E. Brunskill, E. Brynjolfsson, S. Buch, D. Card, R. Castellon, N. Chatterji, A. Chen, K. Creel, J. Q. Davis, D. Demszky, C. Donahue, M. Doumbouya, E. Durmus, S. Ermon, J. Etchemendy, K. Ethayarajh, L. Fei-Fei, C. Finn, T. Gale, L. Gillespie, K. Goel, N. Goodman, S. Grossman, N. Guha, T. Hashimoto, P. Henderson, J. Hewitt, D. E. Ho, J. Hong, K. Hsu, J. Huang, T. Icard, S. Jain, D. Jurafsky, P. Kalluri, S. Karamcheti, G. Keeling, F. Khani, O. Khattab, P. W. Koh, M. Krass, R. Krishna, R. Kuditipudi, A. Kumar, F. Ladhak, M. Lee, T. Lee, J. Leskovec, I. Levent, X. L. Li, X. Li, T. Ma, A. Malik, C. D. Manning, S. Mirchandani, E. Mitchell, Z. Munyikwa, S. Nair, A. Narayan, D. Narayanan, B. Newman, A. Nie, J. C. Niebles, H. Nilforoshan, J. Nyarko, G. Ogut, L. Orr, I. Papadimitriou, J. S. Park, C. Piech, E. Portelance, C. Potts, A. Raghunathan, R. Reich, H. Ren, F. Rong, Y. Roohani, C. Ruiz, J. Ryan, C. Re´, D. Sadigh, S. Sagawa, K. Santhanam, A. Shih, K. Srinivasan, A. Tamkin, R. Taori, A. W. Thomas, F. Trame`r, R. E. Wang, W. Wang, B. Wu, J. Wu, Y. Wu, S. M. Xie, M. Yasunaga, J. You, M. Zaharia, M. Zhang, T. Zhang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhang, L. Zheng, K. Zhou, and P. Liang, "On the opportunities and risks of foundation models," 2022. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07258

[12] OpenAI, J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, R. Avila, I. Babuschkin, S. Balaji, V. Balcom, P. Baltescu, H. Bao, M. Bavarian, J. Belgum, I. Bello, J. Berdine, G. Bernadett-Shapiro, C. Berner, L. Bogdonoff, O. Boiko, M. Boyd, A.-L. Brakman, G. Brockman, T. Brooks, M. Brundage, K. Button, T. Cai, R. Campbell, A. Cann, B. Carey, C. Carlson, R. Carmichael, B. Chan, C. Chang, F. Chantzis, D. Chen, S. Chen, R. Chen, J. Chen, M. Chen, B. Chess, C. Cho, C. Chu, H. W. Chung, D. Cummings, J. Currier, Y. Dai, C. Decareaux, T. Degry, N. Deutsch, D. Deville, A. Dhar, D. Dohan, S. Dowling, S. Dunning, A. Ecoffet, A. Eleti, T. Eloundou, D. Farhi, L. Fedus, N. Felix, S. P. Fishman, J. Forte, I. Fulford, L. Gao, E. Georges, C. Gibson, V. Goel, T. Gogineni, G. Goh, R. Gontijo-Lopes, J. Gordon, M. Grafstein, S. Gray, R. Greene, J. Gross, S. S. Gu, Y. Guo, C. Hallacy, J. Han, J. Harris, Y. He, M. Heaton, J. Heidecke, C. Hesse, A. Hickey, W. Hickey, P. Hoeschele, B. Houghton, K. Hsu, S. Hu, X. Hu, J. Huizinga, S. Jain, S. Jain, J. Jang, A. Jiang, R. Jiang, H. Jin, D. Jin, S. Jomoto, B. Jonn, H. Jun, T. Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, A. Kamali, I. Kanitscheider, N. S. Keskar, T. Khan, L. Kilpatrick, J. W. Kim, C. Kim, Y. Kim, J. H. Kirchner, J. Kiros, M. Knight, D. Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, A. Kondrich, A. Konstantinidis, K. Kosic, G. Krueger, V. Kuo, M. Lampe, I. Lan, T. Lee, J. Leike, J. Leung, D. Levy, C. M. Li, R. Lim, M. Lin, S. Lin, M. Litwin, T. Lopez, R. Lowe, P. Lue, A. Makanju, K. Malfacini, S. Manning, T. Markov, Y. Markovski, B. Martin, K. Mayer, A. Mayne, B. McGrew, S. M. McKinney, C. McLeavey, P. McMillan, J. McNeil, D. Medina, A. Mehta, J. Menick, L. Metz, A. Mishchenko, P. Mishkin, V. Monaco, E. Morikawa, D. Mossing, T. Mu, M. Murati, O. Murk, D. Me´ly, A. Nair, R. Nakano, R. Nayak, A. Neelakantan, R. Ngo, H. Noh, L. Ouyang, C. O'Keefe, J. Pachocki, A. Paino, J. Palermo, A. Pantuliano, G. Parascandolo, J. Parish, E. Parparita, A. Passos, M. Pavlov, A. Peng, A. Perelman, F. de Avila Belbute Peres, M. Petrov, H. P. de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, M. Pokrass, V. H. Pong, T. Powell, A. Power, B. Power, E. Proehl, R. Puri, A. Radford, J. Rae, A. Ramesh, C. Raymond, F. Real, K. Rimbach, C. Ross, B. Rotsted, H. Roussez, N. Ryder, M. Saltarelli, T. Sanders, S. Santurkar, G. Sastry, H. Schmidt, D. Schnurr, J. Schulman, D. Selsam, K. Sheppard, T. Sherbakov, J. Shieh, S. Shoker, P. Shyam, S. Sidor, E. Sigler, M. Simens, J. Sitkin, K. Slama, I. Sohl, B. Sokolowsky, Y. Song, N. Staudacher, F. P. Such, N. Summers, I. Sutskever, J. Tang, N. Tezak, M. B. Thompson, P. Tillet, A. Tootoonchian, E. Tseng, P. Tuggle, N. Turley, J. Tworek, J. F. C. Uribe, A. Vallone, A. Vijayvergiya, C. Voss, C. Wainwright, J. J. Wang, A. Wang, B. Wang, J. Ward, J. Wei, C. Weinmann, A. Welihinda, P. Welinder, J. Weng, L. Weng, M. Wiethoff, D. Willner, C. Winter, S. Wolrich, H. Wong, L. Workman, S. Wu, J. Wu, M. Wu, K. Xiao, T. Xu, S. Yoo, K. Yu, Q. Yuan, W. Zaremba, R. Zellers, C. Zhang, M. Zhang, S. Zhao, T. Zheng, J. Zhuang, W. Zhuk, and B. Zoph, "Gpt-4 technical report," 2024. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774

[13] "The business of artificial intelligence," 7 2017. [Online]. Available: https://hbr.org/2017/ 07/the-business-of-artificial-intelligence

[14] P. Indhumathi, LEVERAGING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN MARKETING: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK, 10 2024, pp. 157–163.

[15] "Qualifying b2b sales leads: Boost your sales with these expert tips." [Online]. Available: https://convin.ai/blog/b2b-sales-leads "how-ai-and-large-language-models-llms-revolutionize-lead-to-opportunity- pipelines." [Online]. Available: https://legittai.com/blog/
[16] how-ai-and-large-language-models-llms-revolutionize-lead-to-opportunity-pipelines
[17] Y. Yao, J. Duan, K. Xu, Y. Cai, Z. Sun, and Y. Zhang, "A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly," High-Confidence Computing, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 100211, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S266729522400014X
[18] "European union. (2023). "general data protection regulation (gdpr)." [Online]. Available: https://gdpr.eu/
[19] E. M. Bender, T. Gebru, A. McMillan-Major, and S. Shmitchell, "On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? ," in Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, ser. FAccT '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, p. 610–623. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922
[20] FAT* '19: Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019.
[21] K. Shahriari and M. Shahriari, "Ieee standard review — ethically aligned design: A vision for prioritizing human wellbeing with artificial intelligence and autonomous systems," in 2017 IEEE Canada International Humanitarian Technology Conference (IHTC), 2017, pp. 197–201.
[22] "Ai risk management framework," 8 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ ai-risk-management-framework
[23] "Chat bot ethical incident." [Online]. Available: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tay (chatbot)
[24] L. Weidinger, J. Mellor, M. Rauh, C. Griffin, J. Uesato, P.-S. Huang, M. Cheng, M. Glaese, B. Balle, A. Kasirzadeh, Z. Kenton, S. Brown, W. Hawkins, T. Stepleton, C. Biles, A. Birhane, J. Haas, L. Rimell, L. A. Hendricks, W. Isaac, S. Legassick, G. Irving, and I. Gabriel, "Ethical and social risks of harm from language models," 2021. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.04359
[25] "Toward trustworthy ai development: Mechanisms for supporting ver- ifiable claims." [Online]. Available: https://www.governance.ai/research-paper/ https-arxiv-org-abs-2004-07213v2