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Abstract: Web service discovery has always been a hot issue in the research field of Web services. In this study, services are grouped into functionally similar service clusters through calculating semantic similarity with WordNet. A Concept Position Vector model of service clusters is proposed, which can sharply cut in the number of services that do not completely match the service requests, thus can quickly build up the set of candidate services. Therefore, the time efficiency of the service discovery can be improved compared with the general cluster-based method of service discovery.
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INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, as SOA (Service-oriented Architecture) has been the main driving force for web application development, the types and number of web services grow rapidly. Thus, finding appropriate services quickly and accurately is considered as hard as searching a needle in the haystack (Garofalakis et al., 2004). Many efforts have been made to settle this problem and applying service clustering technique for service discovering is a mainstream idea in recent years. Generally speaking, the process of clustering services starts from parsing web service describing documents (such as WSDL) and extracting features and then groups web services into functionality-based clusters according to a particular methods for clustering (Elgazzar et al., 2010).

The main method for service clustering focuses on the similarity among services. Text mining methods are applied to extract features from WSDL in order to group services (Liu and Wong, 2009). And the frequency of keywords that appear in WSDL is used to measure the similarity (Nayak and Lee, 2007). To cluster services, scholars propose a method that combines the techniques of Hyperclique Patterns Discovery and LSI (Latent Semantic Indexing) (Pletani and Pernici, 2009). In order to improve the cohesiveness of the service cluster, someone considers not only the functions of services but also the process inside services. For a given service request, a service matchmaker compares the functionality and process consistency among the candidate services, which can improve the accuracy of matchmaking (Sun and Jiang, 2008). However, this study uses the method that comparing request with services in service clusters one by one, which ignores the similarity of services in a particular service cluster.

Overall, the present cluster-based works largely focus on the methods for clustering web services, but neglect a further study on the description and formalization of service clusters after clustering. In addition, these works do not specify clearly the process for service discovery.

Considering the similarity of services included in a service cluster, a model of Concept Position Vector (CPV) is provided to refine service clusters. It can largely improve the time efficiency of service discovery through clustering services and refine service clusters prior to matching services with a given service request. The overview of our study can be seen through Fig. 1.

This study firstly parsed the WSDL files and calculated the functional similarity of services with WordNet, then clustered services into functionally similar service clusters. And a CPV model was proposed to refine service clusters.

![Fig. 1: Schematic block diagram of cluster-based service discovery](image-url)
BASIC KNOWLEDGE OF WEB SERVICE

According to WSDL documents, a service contains more than one operation and each operation provides a function, about 75% WSDL documents contain more than two operations (Deng et al., 2009). Thus, these operations should be considered when we cluster services.

BASIC DEFINITION

Definition 1: Web service: A web service is a four-tuple:

$$S = \langle \text{SID}, \text{SName}, \text{SF}, \{\text{Op}_n\} \rangle$$

where, SID is the unique identifier of the service, SName is the service name which is often a compound word composed of several words with figures or identifiers (such as """, "") according to service producers’ naming conventions.

SF is the functional description in natural language provided by service provider when publishing services. \(\{\text{Op}_n\}\) is the set of operations in the service. In other words, it is the set of the functions that the service provides. Each operation can be described by S.Op in Definition2.

Definition 2: Service operation: An operation in a web service is a three-tuple:

$$\text{S.Op} = \langle \text{OpID}, \text{OpName}, \{\text{In}_n, \text{Out}_n\} \rangle$$

where, OpID is the unique identifier of the operation, OpName is the operation name, often a compound word that is similar to service names, \(\{\text{In}_n, \text{Out}_n\}\) present the interface of service functionality that is composed by the input parameters and output parameters of the operation. And each parameter can be described by:

- S.Op.In\_n: (ParaName, type) defines an input parameter with the name of the parameter and the type
- S.Op.Out: (ParaName, type) defines an output parameter in the same way

SEMANTIC SIMILARITY MEASUREMENT

In this study, we use WordNet (Miller, 1995) to calculate the semantic similarity between ontology concepts to group services into functionally similar clusters. Here, we apply the design of public ontologies such as WordNet instead of a domain-ontology for service annotation and similarity evaluation. This is because, on the one hand, different services may come from different domains; however, no public ontology is available now. On the other hand, WordNet, a natural language semantic database combined current psycholinguistic and human lexical items, has enough concepts for annotation. Although some efforts on ontology construction are increasing, such as Bootstrapping Ontologies for Web Services provided by (Segev and Sheng, 2012), we do not apply these methods due to the immaturity.

The factors that influence the semantic similarity between concepts mainly include: the shortest path and the depth. We prefer the methods proposed by (Li et al. (2003)) that consider both the two factors for semantic similarity computing. The similarity between two concepts \(C_i\) and \(C_j\) is calculated according to Eq. 1:

$$\text{Sim}(C_i, C_j) = e^{-\alpha \cdot \text{len}(C_i, C_j)} \times \frac{e^\beta - e^{-\beta}}{e^\beta + e^{-\beta}}$$

where, len \((C_i, C_j)\) presents the shortest path between the two concepts, \(h\) is the depth of the Least Common Ancestor in the ontology hierarchical structure and \(\alpha, \beta > 0\) are the regulating parameters of \(\text{len}(C_i, C_j)\) and \(h\). Particularly, Li et al. (2003) set \(\alpha = 0.2, \beta = 0.6\) in which case that can bring the perfect effect according to their research.

As shown in Fig. 2, for a fragment of the semantic hierarchy of WordNet, the similarity between two concepts (car, bicycle) (denoted by \(\text{Sim(car, bicycle)}\)) is considered, and the shortest path between them is car-transportation-bicycle. Thus \(\text{len(car, bicycle)} = 2\) and the Least Common Ancestor is Transportation whose depth in the actual hierarchical structure of WordNet is 11, and \(h = 11\). Therefore:

$$\text{Sim(car, bicycle)} = e^{-0.2 \times 2} \times \frac{e^{0.6} - e^{-0.6}}{e^{0.6} + e^{-0.6}} = 0.67$$

Fig. 2: A fragment of the semantic hierarchy of WordNet
WEB SERVICE CLUSTERING

Process for service clustering

Features mining from web service files: In this study, we use the tool of WSDL4J developed by IBM that provides standard WSDL parsing interfaces to parse WSDL files and mining four types of features, namely, the service name, the operation name, the input parameters and output parameters of the operation. These features represent the functions of the service.

Preprocess for clustering

Tokenization: Due to the naming conventions, the four types of features we extract from WSDL files mostly are composed by several words, for example, ShoppingmallMaxprice3digital-videoService, thus name similarity can be calculated only after a tokenization step which decomposes a given name into its terms. The set of terms will be actually compared to obtain the similarity among names. For this reason, we take the step of tokenization after feature mining and use blank spaces to segregate terms in the same set (Table 1).

Stemming: Stemming technology is often used in Information Retrieval (IR), as many English words are variations of the same lemma. For example, "wheel" is a lemma for "wheeled", "wheeling", "wheeler". We apply the Porter Stemmer to strip word endings and return lemmas. For example, "shopping" returns "shop". Through this step, inflections of nouns, conjugations of verbs, and adjectives are recognized, thus can reduce semantic ambiguity.

Stop list: It is also a common technology in the field of IR. Applying stop list, we do stop words removing, thus can filter out terms with less information value. For example, there is a parameter "Lecturer-in-academiaService", and after the step of tokenization, we should add the term "in" to stop list, and returns {lecturer academy service}.

Assignment in bipartite graphs of parameters: Generally speaking, the functional similarity of services relies on both the name of the services and all their operations; whereas the evaluation of similarity of operations should take into account both the operation name and all their parameters. As an operation has more than one input parameters and output parameters, so we should parse parameters to realize which is the maximum similarity between the elements included in the two sets we are comparing.

In this study, we want to obtain the global maximum similarity through pairing the elements in the two set, not the local maximum which relies on the order that the comparisons of elements from the two set occur. For example, when applying the method of local maximum, the result of parsing illustrated in Fig. 3 is \(<i1,i3>,<i2,i2>,<i3,i4>\). However, Sim(<i1,i3>) = 0.8, which is less than Sim(<i2,i2, i3>) = 1.0.

Many efforts have been made to solve the problem of parameter pairing by applying the algorithms of assignment in bipartite graphs. In this study, we design a method based on this idea for solving this problem.

Algorithm 1: Assignment in bipartite graphs of parameters

Input: a set of input parameters from one operation in a service \(SOP_{in}\) and another set of input parameters from one operation in another service \(SOP_{en}\), a given threshold.

Output: the set of parameter pairs

1. local a similarity values matrix \(a(SOP_{en}, SOP_{in})\).
2. For \(i \rightarrow SOP_{en}, j \rightarrow SOP_{in}\)
3. \(a[i][j] = Sim(<i,j>)\) // Sim(<i,j>) is calculated according to formula(1).
4. Picking up the maximum of each row in the matrix, \(a_{row}[i][j]\).
5. If \(a_{row}[i][j] = \in\), then add \(a_{row}[i][j]\) into MaxSim.
6. Else delete the row that \(a_{row}[i][j]\) lies in.
7. /*If there exists more than one elements in the MaxSim that come from the same column of the matrix, then change the value of the one of lower values into the value of 0, delete it from the MaxSim, then choose the maximum of the row in the matrix again*/
8. For each \(a_{row}[i][j]\) in MaxSim
9. If \(a_{row}[j][j] = \in\) then \(a_{row}[i][j]\) to a new set of \(a_{row}[n][j]\)
10. \(a_{row}[n][j] = 0\).
11. delete \(a_{row}[n][j]\) from MaxSim
12. picking up the maximum of the row \(a_{row}[n][j]\) lies in, repeat 5,6
13. Choose the elements that corresponding to rows and columns and pair them, then return the set of parameter pairs.
We can get the number of successfully paired parameters from Algorithm 1 through \( \text{MaxSim} \) (the length of \( \text{MaxSim} \)).

For example, in the matrix described above, if we set the value of \( v \) is 0.6, the maximums of each row in the matrix are \( a[0][2] = 0.8, a[1][2] = 1.0, a[2][3] = 0.9 \) but \( a[0][2], a[1][2] \) are from the same column \( i = 2 \), and \( a[0][2] < a[1][2] \), so we set \( a[0][2] = 0 \), and choose the maximum from the first row in the matrix again, that is \( a[0][1] = 0.6 \), equals to \( v \), so \( \text{MaxSim} = [0.6, 0.1, 0.0, 0.9] \). Then we get the set of parameter pairs \( \{<i1, i2>, <i2, i2>, <i3, i4>\} \).

**Functional similarity of web services**

**Similarity of the set of input/output parameters**: Given two operations (x and y) from different services, based on the parameter pairing, we can get the similarity of the set of inputs (or outputs), which is showed by Formula (2):

\[
\text{Sim}(<\text{In}_x, \text{In}_y>) = \frac{\text{num}(\text{In}_x \cap \text{In}_y)}{\text{num}(\text{In}_x) + \text{num}(\text{In}_y) - \text{num}(\text{In}_x \cap \text{In}_y)}
\]

where, \( \text{num} \) is the number of successfully paired parameters. In the previous example:

\[
\text{Sim}(<\text{In}_x, \text{In}_y>) = \frac{3}{3+4-3} = 0.75.
\]

And we deal with the outputs in the same way as with inputs.

**Operation similarity function**: Operational similarity relies on three functions: an operational name similarity \( \text{Sim}(<\text{Name}_{\text{op}_x}, \text{Name}_{\text{op}_y}>) \), the similarity of input parameters \( \text{Sim}(<\text{In}_{\text{op}_x}, \text{In}_{\text{op}_y}>) \) and the similarity of output parameters \( \text{Sim}(<\text{Out}_{\text{op}_x}, \text{Out}_{\text{op}_y}>) \), as Formula (3) shows:

\[
\text{OpSim}(<\text{S}_{\text{op}_x}, \text{S}_{\text{op}_y}>, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) = \omega_1 \times \text{Sim}(<\text{Name}_{\text{op}_x}, \text{Name}_{\text{op}_y}>) + \omega_2 \times \text{Sim}(<\text{In}_{\text{op}_x}, \text{In}_{\text{op}_y}>) + \omega_3 \times \text{Sim}(<\text{Out}_{\text{op}_x}, \text{Out}_{\text{op}_y}>)
\]

where, \( \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3 \in [0, 1] \), as weights for operation name, input parameters and output parameters, in addition, \( \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = 1 \). Generally, the selection of the weight coefficients, to some extent, is a key challenge for relevant research. It is somewhat subjective at present.

**Web service similarity function ssim(\( s_i, s_j \))**: As one service often contains more than one operation, so we consider the average of all operational similarity, which is Formula (4):

\[
\text{AvgOpSim}(S, S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum \text{Sim}(S, S)
\]

where, \( n = \min \{ |S|, |S| \} \).

The functional similarity of services relies on two main functions: a service name similarity function \( \text{Sim}(<\text{Name}_{\text{a}}, \text{Name}_{\text{b}}>) \) and the average operational similarity function \( \text{AvgOpSim}(<S, S>, S, S>) \). The weight for service name is the same as operation name, that is \( \omega_1 \). Web service similarity functional similarity, defined by \( \text{Ssim}(s_i, s_j) \), is evaluated by Formula (5):

\[
\text{Ssim}(s_i, s_j) = \omega_1 \times \text{Sim}(<\text{Name}_{\text{a}}, \text{Name}_{\text{b}}>) + (1-\omega_1) \times \text{AvgOpSim}(S, S)
\]

**Algorithm for service clustering**: A bottom-up algorithm of hierarchical clustering is applied to service clustering based on semantic similarity.

We firstly create a service cluster and randomly add one service \( S_u \) into it with viewing \( S_u \) as the center of this cluster. Then we scroll the rest set of services, and select the ones that satisfy a certain similarity condition through calculating the similarity with \( S_u \) and add them into the same cluster which \( S_u \) belongs to. If the similarity cannot satisfy the conditions, then we build up a new cluster and add this service in. The above steps repeat until each of the services can be mapped into a service cluster. The algorithm for service clustering is described in detail as Algorithm 2 shows.

**Algorithm 2: Service clustering**

\begin{enumerate}
\item \( \text{Input: All services in service register, the threshold for service functional similarity} \ (v) \).
\item \( \text{Output: The set of service clusters} \ S_{\text{con}} = \{S_{\text{c}1}, S_{\text{c}2}, ..., S_{\text{cn}}\} \)
\item \( \text{Local} S_{\text{con}} = 0; \)
\item \( \text{For each service} S, \text{that does not belong to any service cluster, build a new cluster} \ S \)
\item \( \text{Snew} = S_{\text{con}} \cup \{S\}; \text{add this cluster to} \ S_{\text{con}} \)
\item \( \text{For each service} S, \text{that do not belong to any service clusters} \)
\item \( \text{Ssim}(S, S) // \text{compare} S, \text{with all the other services that also do not belong to any clusters} \)
\item \( \text{If} (\text{Ssim}(S, S) > v) \text{then add} S, \text{to} \ S_{\text{con}} \)
\item \( \text{Repeat the steps of 2) and 3)} \)
\end{enumerate}

**SERVICE DISCOVERY BASED ON SERVICE CLUSTERS**

After clustering, the services in the service registry can be mapped into different clusters that are loosely-coupled and highly-cohesive. In order to improve the time efficiency in service discovery, we take advantage of the functional similarity of services in the same service cluster. Therefore we take a further step to refine service clusters. Then based on clusters, we improve the time efficiency of service discovery. The whole process of our study is depicted by Fig. 4.
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Fig. 4: the whole process of service discovery

**Service cluster refinement**

**Concept annotation:** To eliminate the semantic ambiguity of terms included in the service cluster, this study apply Concept annotation technology Plebun and Fornici (2009) that is annotating each term with a concept from a public ontology (in this study, we refer to WordNet as it is domain-independent and it has enough concepts to annotate terms parsed from various services).

After the step of concept annotation, the expended descriptions of services and operations can be got:

\[ S' = (S\text{ID}, S\text{Name}, \text{Concept}, SF, \{Op_y\}) \]

\[ S'.Op' = (OpID, OpName, \text{Concept}, \{In_x', Out_t\}) \]

\[ S'.Op'.In_x' = (\text{ParaName}, \text{Concept}, \text{type}) \]

\[ S'.Op'.Out_t = (\text{ParaName}, \text{Concept}, \text{type}) \]

**Refinement of service clusters**

**Definition 3: Service cluster:** A web service is a five-tuple \( SC = (SC\text{ID}, SC\text{F}, \{SC\text{InP}\}, \{SC\text{OutP}\}, \{S'.Op'\}) \):

- **SCID:** The unique identifier of the service cluster
- **SCF:** The functional description in natural language that is added by hand according to the functional description of the services included in the cluster
- **SCInP:** The concept set of input after concept annotation for each input
- **SCOutP:** The concept set of output after concept annotation for each output
- **S'.Op'** is the set of all operations which also takes the step of concept annotation included in the service cluster

**Definition 4: Concept position vector, CPV:** There is a set of concepts \( \{c_1, c_2, ..., c_i\} \), if \( c_{v_1}, c_{v_2}, ..., c_{v_n} \) is a rank of position number of elements in this concept set, then we call \( cV = (c_{v_1}, c_{v_2}, ..., c_{v_n}) \) as Concept Position Vector of this concept set.

We can get input/output CPV of service cluster that correspond to the concept sets of inputs/outputs:

\[ cV(SC\text{InP}) = (c_{v_1}, c_{v_2}, ..., c_{v_n}) \text{, } n > 0 \text{ and } n = |SC\text{InP}| \]

\[ cV(SC\text{OutP}) = (c_{v_1}, c_{v_2}, ..., c_{v_m}) \text{, } m > 0 \text{ and } m = |SC\text{OutP}| \]

As Input/Output concept set of service cluster is the union set from Input/Output concept set of all operations in the service cluster, thus:

\[ \forall S'.Op'.In_x' \in SC\text{InP}, \exists SC\text{InP} \in \{SC\text{InP}\} \text{ and } <S'.Op'.In_x', SC\text{InP} > \]

\[ \forall S'.Op'.Out_t \in SC\text{OutP}, \exists SC\text{OutP} \in \{SC\text{OutP}\} \text{ and } <S'.Op'.Out_t, SC\text{OutP} > \]

With Input/Output CPV of service cluster, we can get Input/Output CPV of each operation included in the service cluster:

\[ cV(S'.Op'.In_x') = k^*, \exists SC\text{InP} \in \{SC\text{InP}\} \text{ and } <S'.Op'.In_x', SC\text{InP} > \]

\[ cV(S'.Op'.Out_t) = 1^*, \exists SC\text{OutP} \in \{SC\text{OutP}\} \text{ and } <S'.Op'.Out_t, SC\text{OutP} > \]

Then we put the results of Input/Output CPV for each operation into the registry.

For example, there is an input concept set of a service cluster, expressed as \( (c_1, c_2, c_3) \), and \( cV(c_1) = 1, cV(c_2) = 2, cV(c_3) = 3 \); if there is an service operation \( (S'.Op') \) included in this service cluster that contains two concepts, \( c_2 \) and \( c_3 \). Then the Input CPV of \( S'.Op' \) is \( cV(S'.Op', In) = (1, 3) \).

**Service discovery process**

**Service request:** The goal of service discovery is finding the suitable services (or more precisely speaking, finding the suitable service operations) that meet users' requirements.

The formal description of service request is given by Definition 4.

**Definition 5: Service request:** A web service request is a three-tuple:

\[ R = (\{R\text{In}\}, \{R\text{Out}\}, \{R^*\}) \]
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where, \{Rin\} is the set of input parameters of service request, \{ROut\} is the set of output parameters of service request and \(r'\), an optional parameter, is the matching threshold of services comparing with the request, which is provided by user or a default value provided by the system.

In order to get optimal performance of cluster-based service discovery, concept annotation methods should be used to not only services of intra-cluster but the service request. Thus, we can get the formal semantic description for the enhanced request: \(R^r = (\{Rin\}, \{ROut\}, \{r'\})\), where \{Rin\} is the concept set of inputs; \{ROut\} is the outputs concept set.

**Algorithm for service discovery:** Once the service request is defined, the common method usually takes so much time in matching it with all of the services in the registry that it is often inefficient.

In this study, we do the service clustering and the refinement of service clusters off-line which does not increase the time spent on searching in runtime as Algorithm 3 shows.

**Algorithm 3: Service discovery**

Input: a service request \(R^r\) and the set of service clusters \(SC_1, SC_2, \ldots\)

Output: the set of candidate service-operations that potentially satisfy service request \(CandidateOp\)

1: Local CandidateOutOp \(= \emptyset\), CandidateOutOp \(= \emptyset\), and CandidateInOp \(= \emptyset\);
2: Randomly choose a service cluster \(SC_i\) from \(SC_1, SC_2, \ldots\);
3: /* whether the outputs concept of the request \(ROut\) all can be provided by the outputs concept set of the cluster \(SC_1,SC_2, \ldots\) */
4: if (\(Ce(ROut)\) and \(\alpha(\{SC_1,SC_2, \ldots\})\)) then go to 2;
5: else [ get CPV of request outputs \(c(ROut)\);
6: for each service \(SC_i\) in \(SC_1, SC_2, \ldots\):
7: if (\(c(VIS(\{SC_1,SC_2, \ldots\})\) = \(c(ROut)\))
8: CandidateOutOp \(\leftarrow\) CandidateOutOp \(\cup\)
9: \(SC_i\), Op; \)
10: if (CandidateOutOp \(\neq\emptyset\)) then go to 2;
11: /* whether the inputs concept of the request \(Rin\) all can be provided by the inputs concept set of service \(SC_1,SC_2, \ldots\) */
12: Get CPV of request inputs \(c(Rin)\);
13: for each service \(SC_i\) in \(SC_1, SC_2, \ldots\):
14: if (\(c(VIS(\{SC_1,SC_2, \ldots\})\) = \(c(Rin)\))
15: CandidateInOp \(\leftarrow\) CandidateInOp \(\cup\)
16: \(SC_i\), Op;
17: if (CandidateInOp \(\neq\emptyset\)) then go to 2;
18: CandidateOp \(\leftarrow\) CandidateOutOp \(\cup\)
19: CandidateInOp;

This algorithm begins with randomly choosing a service cluster \(SC_1\) from service clusters set \(SC_2, SC_3, \ldots\), and from 4 to 10, it matches outputs of this cluster with the given request and from 12 to 16, it matches the inputs with the request. Step 5 and 12 are proposed to get CPV of request outputs/inputs \(c(ROut)\), \(c(Rin)\)). From 6 to 8, it compares each service-operations in the cluster with \(c(ROut)\), if operations meet the conditions that the CPV of the operation outputs equals to that of request (in step 7), then it will add the operation to CandidateOutOp which means the candidate service-operations that can supply the outputs of the request (showed in step 8). From 13 to 16, it compares each service-operations in the cluster with \(c(Rin)\). If this cluster cannot meet the conditions, it will choose another cluster (as depicted in step 2). At last, it will return the set of candidate service-operations in this cluster that potentially match the request.

**EXPERIMENT AND EVALUATION**

**Data preparation:** OWL-TC (http://projects.semwebcentral.org/projects/owl-etc) is the OWL-S service retrieval test collection, and the newest version is OWL-TC4 which we adopt in our context. It provides 1083 Web services specified with OWL-S covering 9 application domains, such as food, economy, communication, travel, medical care, weaponry, education, geography and simulation, with 42 test queries. Since our method is based on parsing WSDL, the tool OWLS2WSDL is used to derive WSDL from OWL-S documents. After parsing all these WSDL files, we get 1075 services, 1075 operations, 1533 input parameters, 1606 output parameters.

The experiments run on a Windows XP PC with a 1.60 GHz processor, including Eclipse61, WordNet2.1, and My SQL 5.0.

**RESULTS**

**Threshold for similarity:** This phase aims at identifying for which value of threshold for similarity (defined by \(\nu\)) to cluster services that can obtain the best performances. For the sake of simplicity, we randomly select 115 services to do these experiments in this phase.

We set the similarity threshold to four kinds of cases: \(\nu = 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\). In the case of \(\nu = 0.5\), we divide the 115 services into 5 service clusters with the number of services in each cluster is respectively 7, 7, 21, 66, 13. In the case of \(\nu = 0.6\), we divide the 115 services into 10 service clusters with the number of services in each cluster is respectively 7, 3, 12, 13, 12, 10, 38, 11, 4, 4. In the case of \(\nu = 0.7\), there are 10 clusters with the respective number of services containing 2, 5, 3, 10, 7, 8, 39, 33, 26. In the case of \(\nu = 0.8\), there are 11 clusters with the respective number of services 1, 6, 2, 2, 3, 10, 8, 3, 35, 23, 22.

We test the time spending on service discovery for the same request in the four cases, and we do this for 20 times with recording results every time. After figuring up
the average response time of service discovery, we find that in the case of \( v = 0.7 \) that can get better performance than other cases, as Table 2 shows.

**Evaluating the efficiency of service discovery:** General methods for service discovery based on clustering often compare the request with all of the services in the registry without taking the functional similarity of service cluster into account, such as Sun and Jiang (2008) did. In contrast, our method for service discovery based on refining services clusters with Concept Position Vector after clustering.

In this experiment, we carry out 100 times test of service discovery with OWLS-TC. We specify the threshold value for similarity as \( v = 0.7 \) and the matching threshold in the request as \( r^* = 0.7 \). Figure 3 shows the results of our methods (defined by CPVCluster-SD) compared with the work of Sun and Jiang (2008) (defined by GeneralCluster-SD).

From Fig. 5, we can see that our method can reduce 30-60% respond time compared with the general method for service discovery based on clustering. And, with the number of service increasing, the respond time using the General Cluster-SD increases dramatically compared with using our method and the better stability of our method is illustrated. In other words, our method can effectively improve time efficiency of service discovery. In addition, considering the precision/recall, our method has the same performance with GeneralCluster-SD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold for similarity</th>
<th>Time of service discovery (msec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( v = 0.5 )</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v = 0.6 )</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v = 0.7 )</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v = 0.8 )</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSIONS**

In this study, we present an approach for service discovery based on service clustering and refining service clusters. All in all, we use WordNet to compute semantic similarity, and cluster services based on functional similarity, then refine service clusters with Concept Position Vector.

In the future, we will focus on service composition based on service clusters. However, many problems are needed to be resolved, such as, service quality problem which we do not considered in this study, the step of tokenization for combination-terms will need to optimize, and how to maintain the service clusters should also be taken into consideration in the future.
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