

WARBERT: A Hierarchical BERT-based Model for Web API Recommendation

Zishuo Xu, Yuhong Gu, Dezhong Yao, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—With the emergence of Web 2.0 and microservices architecture, the number of Web APIs has increased dramatically, further intensifying the demand for efficient Web API recommendation. Existing solutions typically fall into two categories: recommendation-type methods, which treat each API as a label for classification, and match-type methods, which focus on matching mashups through API retrieval. However, three critical challenges persist: 1) the semantic ambiguities in comparing API and mashup descriptions, 2) the lack of detailed comparisons between the individual API and the mashup in recommendation-type methods, and 3) time inefficiencies for API retrieval in match-type methods. To address these challenges, we propose WARBERT, a hierarchical BERT-based model for Web API recommendation. WARBERT leverages dual-component feature fusion and attention comparison to extract precise semantic representations of API and mashup descriptions. WARBERT consists of two main components: WARBERT(R) for Recommendation and WARBERT(M) for Matching. Specifically, WARBERT(R) serves as an initial filter, narrowing down the candidate APIs, while WARBERT(M) refines the matching process by calculating the similarity between candidate APIs and mashup. The final likelihood of a mashup being matched with an API is determined by combining the predictions from WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M). Additionally, WARBERT(R) incorporates an auxiliary task of mashup category judgment, which enhances its effectiveness in candidate selection. Experimental results on the ProgrammableWeb dataset demonstrate that WARBERT outperforms most existing solutions and achieves improvements of up to 11.7% compared to the model MTFM (Multi-Task Fusion Model), delivering significant enhancements in accuracy and efficiency.

Index Terms—Web API recommendation, mashup, BERT, hierarchical architecture, dual-component feature fusion, attention comparison.

I. INTRODUCTION

WITH the emergence of Web 2.0 and microservice architecture, the number of APIs has increased dramatically [1]. Since 2022, there have been more than 24,000 APIs in ProgrammableWeb [2]. The benefits of Web APIs have led to the emergence of a novel method for developing applications, known as Mashup [3]. Mashup enables developers to integrate existing Web API resources to meet complex requirements without starting from scratch [4], [5]. However, selecting the appropriate API for mashup creation can be challenging, especially for those lacking expertise in APIs, due to the

Zishuo Xu is with the School of Software Engineering and Dezhong Yao is with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China (E-mail: ZishuoXuHUST@163.com, dyao@hust.edu.cn).

Yuhong Gu is with the SmartX, Beijing 100086, China (E-mail: yuhong.gu@smartx.com).

(Corresponding author: Dezhong Yao)




Figure 1. The Web API recommendation example.

vast number of available Web APIs. Consequently, Web API recommendations are crucial for effective data integration and have gained significant attention [6]–[8]. The goal of Web API recommendation is to help developers efficiently choose suitable Web APIs for their mashup applications [9], [10]. Figure 1 shows the Foodsta mashup and the interaction with multiple APIs. Web API recommendation supports the decision-making process by evaluating if the API functionality aligns with the mashup’s needs, based on factors like requirement descriptions, API descriptions, and API categories.

Many researchers have proposed Web API recommendation methods, including content-based, collaborative filtering (CF), factorization machine (FM), and hybrid methods. Content-based methods are divided into recommendation-type and match-type methods. Recommendation-type approaches treat the Web API recommendation as a multi-label classification task. They use Web APIs as labels to train the classifier and output the probability of candidate APIs. Match-type methods treat the Web API recommendation as a retrieval process, calculating the similarity between mashups and APIs [11], [12]. This paper uses both recommendation-type and match-type methods, proposing a new model combining them.

Despite the existing methods’ advancements, there are still three challenges: 1) natural language semantic ambiguities: There are synonymy and polysemy in natural languages, e.g. (twitter, tweet). Service users and service developers can have quite different descriptions of a mashup or an API even with the same meaning. Meanwhile, the same word in different descriptions may have different contextual information. For example, the word ‘cookie’ has different semantic meanings in the computer and food domains. These factors lead to the challenge of deriving accurate and unified semantic embed-

dings within the same semantic space from the descriptions of the mashup and the API. 2) Recommendation-type methods limit further enhancement, because of the lack of conducting a detailed comparison with mashups. In addition, it is inconvenient for service users who seek matching results for a mashup with a single API. 3) Match-type methods involve comparing mashups with each API, which can extend the time needed to produce recommendation outcomes. Furthermore, training certain models is a slow process that demands considerable memory resources, since the model must be trained on every pair of mashups and APIs.

To tackle the above challenges, we propose a hierarchical BERT-based model for Web API Recommendation, named WARBERT¹. This model includes two components that independently address the API recommendation problem: WARBERT for Recommendation (WARBERT(R)) and WARBERT for Matching (WARBERT(M)). WARBERT tackles the first challenge by leveraging a dual-component feature fusion strategy and an attention comparison mechanism. Specifically, WARBERT(R) improves the semantic precision of mashup descriptions through the dual-component feature fusion strategy, whereas WARBERT(M) concatenates mashup and API descriptions, employing the attention comparison mechanism to identify key discriminative words and generate aligned contextual embeddings. This method allows for a more accurate comparison of mashup requirements with API functions, effectively capturing the semantic differences.

To address the second and third challenges, we utilize a hierarchical network that integrates WARBERT(R) with WARBERT(M). WARBERT(R) acts as an initial filter, narrowing down the candidate API pool by dismissing unlikely matches, thereby optimizing the computation efficiency and safeguarding WARBERT(M) from inaccurate matches. Then, WARBERT(M) refines the matching process to identify the most relevant APIs for the mashup. The final match likelihood is determined by combining the outputs from WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M).

Moreover, we incorporate BERT-Tiny [13], a lightweight variant of BERT, into our model to mitigate issues related to extended computation times and memory constraints. Additionally, a category judgment task within WARBERT(R) endows the framework with multi-task learning capabilities. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that successfully integrates both matching and recommendation methodologies for the API recommendation task.

The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- We introduce WARBERT, a novel hierarchical framework for both matching and recommendation, pioneering the combination of these techniques within the API recommendation domain.
- WARBERT is the first to use a lightweight BERT model, enhancing language comprehension while maintaining a streamlined and efficient network structure.
- We propose WARBERT(R) as an effective filtering strategy that markedly reduces the pool of candidate APIs for

mashups.

- We demonstrate WARBERT’s superior performance over existing solutions in both Web API recommendation and mashup category judgment, supported by extensive experimental results.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II surveys related work. The definition of the problem is presented in Section III. Section IV introduces the proposed method. Section V provides the experiment results and analysis. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

II. RELATED WORK

API recommendation is a well-established problem that has been extensively explored over the years and continues to attract interest. Based on their approaches, we categorize the related work into four types: content-based methods, collaborative filtering (CF) methods, factorization machine (FM) methods, and hybrid methods.

A. Content based Methods

Content-based Web API recommendations are derived by analyzing the key features in the descriptions of mashups and APIs [14]. We categorize content-based methods into two groups: recommendation-type methods and match-type methods.

Recommendation-type methods treat each Web API as a label for classifier training. In contrast, match-type methods evaluate each API individually against a mashup to identify matches, which generally demands greater computational effort. The former approach yields a comprehensive matching result for a mashup against the entire API repository. However, when the API repository changes, such as the number of available APIs, the recommendation method often retrains its model. This is because it establishes a mapping between mashups and APIs, commonly using the number of APIs in its task layer to generate predictions. Conversely, after adequate initial training, the match-type method usually continues to perform effectively without additional training, even as the API repository evolves. This adaptability stems from its focus on the inherent characteristics of both mashups and APIs, allowing it to adjust more smoothly to API landscape updates.

Recently, BERT has been employed to encode mashup descriptions for recommendation-type methods, such as CME-CM [12] and BERT-CM [15]. Those methods utilize the “cls” vector to capture the semantic and contextual representation of the entire sentence. The final output is produced by a classifier composed of linear layers and activation functions.

Another group of content-based methods is match-type solutions including [15]–[22]. Xie *et al.* [16] develop a complex Heterogeneous Information Network (HIN) for tailored Web API recommendations for mashups. Other researchers have used clustering and knowledge graphs to enrich limited content information of Web APIs [17], including profiles, context, labels, and quality of service metrics [18]. Xu *et al.* [19] investigate a semantic-based service discovery framework involving the user model, context model, service model, and a service discovery process. Bao *et al.* [20] propose a fine-grained API

¹We have open source code at <https://github.com/ZsXu-enrico/WARBERT>

link prediction method for mashup recommendation. Chen *et al.* [21] introduce a keyword-driven service recommendation using deep reinforced Steiner tree search. FC-LSTM [22] implements an attention mechanism based on LSTM which enables the model to give higher weight to more important descriptions. ServiceBERT [15] employs pre-training and contrastive learning to extract the semantic embeddings of mashup descriptions and API descriptions via BERT. However, match-type solutions may require significant time to recommend APIs without an efficient filtering strategy.

B. CF based Methods

Collaborative filtering (CF) including memory-based CF and model-based CF has been widely utilized in Web service recommendation systems [23], [24]. Cao *et al.* [25] combine content similarity and collaborative filtering for Web API recommendation. Chen *et al.* [26] propose a collaborative filtering approach that integrates user-based CF with item-based CF to identify suitable APIs by evaluating QoS information. A geographic-aware CF strategy was proposed by Botangen *et al.* [27]. Matrix factorization paired with network maps is utilized by Tang *et al.* [24] to predict web service quality. Yao *et al.* [28] introduce a probabilistic matrix factorization (PMF) approach for mashup recommendation, focusing on the effects of explicit similarities and implicit API correlations on API co-invocation.

C. FM based Methods

The factorization machine (FM) is effective in capturing complex feature interactions and handling sparse data. Chen *et al.* [29] apply word embedding and topic modeling techniques to extract semantic features, which are utilized as inputs for the DeepFM model. Xie *et al.* [30] utilize similarity matrices from heterogeneous networks and meta-paths to extract features for Web services and Mashups. They employ a factorization machine for rating and recommending Web services. Anelli *et al.* [31] improve the interpretability of factorization machines in recommendation systems by initializing latent factors with semantic features from knowledge graphs. This approach preserves the original item information and enhances system performance. Both NAFM [32] and AMF [33] incorporate attention mechanisms to capture significant parts of the latent features. In addition, the FCN-NAFM model [8] further enhances recommendation performance by integrating content information with network structure information of Web services.

D. Hybrid Methods

Current hybrid methods for web service recommendation are showing significant potential by integrating various types of data effectively. For example, Xia *et al.* [34] propose a category-aware service clustering that combines with collaborative filtering to forecast the ranking of services within specific categories. Similarly, Ma *et al.* [10] develop the DLISR framework tailored for transient service selection, capitalizing on service interactions and utilizing an attention mechanism

to evaluate their importance. Building upon DLISR, the HISR framework is introduced, which incorporates content information along with interaction history to refine recommendations further. The MTFM model [35] explores both the semantics of mashups and the generation of latent interactions between mashups and APIs. Wang *et al.* [6] propose the FSFM model designed for Web API recommendation. This method extracts embedding vectors and generates requirement semantic vectors for Mashups and APIs, ultimately fuses all representation vectors to produce a list of recommended APIs. Zhang *et al.* [12] take advantage of a knowledge graph to improve the recommendation process. The CME-CF framework integrates the collaborative filtering method with the knowledge graph embedding to enhance recommendation accuracy.

III. PROBLEM DEFINITION

In this section, we first formally state the Web API recommendation task and then explain the role of WARBERT in the overall Web API recommendation workflow.

A. The Definition of Web API Recommendation

This paper focuses on the Web API recommendation task for mashup applications by providing suitable APIs within a cloud environment. Let a requirement description for mashup m_i provided by a user be denoted as T^{m_i} . Let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_L\}$ represent a repository of L Web APIs, where each Web API a_j is characterized by function description, category and meta-elements. Given T^{m_i} and A , the Web API recommendation task aims to generate a ranked subset $S^{m_i} \subseteq A$: $S^{m_i} = \{a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(N)}\}$, where σ is a permutation function that ranks APIs in A according to their match score with T^{m_i} , and N is the number of the selected APIs. Then the user can develop their mashup via APIs in S^{m_i} .

Definition 1 (Requirement description). T^{m_i} is an unstructured text to represent a user requirement for mashup creation.

Definition 2 (Web API). $a_j = \langle D^{a_j}, C^{a_j}, X \rangle \in A$ consists of: a textual description D^{a_j} to introduce its functions, a set of categories C^{a_j} to index it, a set of meta elements X , such as quality attributes, input ports, and output ports. Each API has at least either an input or an output port [12], [36].

Definition 3 (Web API Recommendation Task). Given the requirement description T^{m_i} and the API repository A , the Web API recommendation task is to compute a subset S^{m_i} with selected APIs. The objective of the task is to maximize the match score between T^{m_i} and the APIs in S^{m_i} :

$$S^{m_i} = \arg \max_{\substack{S \subseteq A, \\ |S|=N}} \sum_{a_j \in S} r_j^{m_i}, \quad (1)$$

where $r_j^{m_i} \in [0, 1]$ is the match score between requirement description T^{m_i} and the API a_j .

Definition 4 (Mashup). $m_i = \langle D^{m_i}, C^{m_i}, A^{m_i}, X \rangle \in M$ consists of: a textual description D^{m_i} to introduce its functions, a set of categories C^{m_i} to indicate its functions, a bundle




Figure 2. The Web API recommendation workflow.

of APIs A^{m_i} to participate in the mashup, a set of meta-elements X to prepare for composition [12], [36].

Definition 5 (Web API Recommendation Model). Web API recommendation Model is designed to handle the Web API recommendation task. It is defined as a parameterized function which outputs match score vector $R^{m_i}: f(\theta, T^{m_i}, A) \rightarrow R^{m_i} = [r_1^{m_i}, \dots, r_j^{m_i}, \dots, r_L^{m_i}]$. By applying the permutation function σ on R^{m_i} and selecting the top- N APIs, the subset S^{m_i} is obtained.

B. The Workflow of Web API Recommendation

In the actual scenario, the Web API recommendation process is divided into three steps. First, a recommendation model is designed. Second, the model is trained using data from the historical mashup API calls, with the mashup description D^{m_i} substituting for the requirement description T^{m_i} . Afterward, the developer submits the requirement description for a new mashup, the model will output a set of recommended APIs S^{m_i} from the API repository A that the developer can invoke.

In order to save the computational cost due to the large number of APIs, we add a step, called filtering. It will reduce the computational cost by removing APIs that are impossible to be called by the mashup. A complete end-to-end API recommendation framework consists of a filter and a matcher. The objective of the filter is to quickly fetch a set of candidate APIs $G^{m_i} = \{a_1', \dots, a_j', \dots, a_H'\}$ from A . Top- H candidate APIs with high relevance scores for a mashup are selected using the permutation function σ . The goal of the matcher is to determine exactly whether each candidate API is likely to be called. It generates the recommended APIs S^{m_i} after ranking and selection. In our implementation, WARBERT(R) serves as the filter and WARBERT(M) serves as the matcher.

Figure 2 illustrates the whole workflow. It is worth noting that the entire workflow does not require human intervention or additional expert knowledge.

IV. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we first outline the overall architecture of WARBERT and describe the implementation of WARBERT for both components, then analyze its training process.

A. WARBERT Architecture

Figure 3 shows the overall architecture of WARBERT. WARBERT consists of two main components, named WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M).

WARBERT(R) treats API recommendation as a multi-label classification problem. Each possible API is a label. WARBERT(M) treats API recommendation as a retrieval process, assuming that both the descriptions of the mashup and the descriptions of the candidate APIs are expressed in the same semantic space. The semantic feature vectors generated from the mashup descriptions or the API descriptions are input into a classifier. The classifier determines the probability of the mashup calling the API.

BERT computes word embeddings from all words of the sentence, it captures semantic and generate contextual embeddings. With dual-component feature fusion, WARBERT(R) grasps more semantic features. With attention comparison, WARBERT(M) gives greater attention to discriminative words in API descriptions considering the mashup description. For the hierarchical architecture, WARBERT(R) functions as a filter to generate potential API candidates based on its predictions, while WARBERT(M) matches these candidates with the mashup. The final matching result is a weighted average of the API relevance score vector predicted by WARBERT(R) and the mashup API similarity score vector predicted by WARBERT(M). Ultimately, we rank and choose the top- N APIs with the highest match scores and present them to the developer as a set of recommended APIs.

B. Implementation of WARBERT(R)

1) *Computing Contextual Embedding*: The mashup descriptions and API descriptions may contain noisy information. In this module, we can perform some pre-processing operations to reserve important information, such as abbreviation replacement and lemmatization [35]. The word sequence is then obtained through tokenization.

Given a description (API description or mashup description, in WARBERT(R) only mashup description is used), the word sequence of the mashup m_i description is denoted as $D^{m_i} = [d_1^{m_i}, \dots, d_{n_t}^{m_i}]$, while the word sequence of the API a_j description is denoted as $D^{a_j} = [d_1^{a_j}, \dots, d_{n_t}^{a_j}]$, where n_t is the number of words. The objective is to derive a representation for each word.

Traditional word embedding models are trained using a large corpus like Wiki. For each word, the model learns a global word embedding. However, the same word in different descriptions may have different contextual information. A single word embedding cannot distinguish between two meanings, making the semantics less accurate. This means that we need to generate different embeddings for the same word under different contexts.

Pre-trained language model BERT has demonstrated exceptional performance across various NLP tasks [37]. It leverages deep neural networks with multiple Transformer layers [38]. Transformer models excel at capturing long-range dependencies in input sequences and directly relate words with arbitrary spacing [39]. Under the Scaled Dot-Product Attention mechanism, the contextual information about words is obtained. BERT further encodes word position information as vectors to incorporate word order. This position-aware word embedding enables the network to capture word spacing semantics.




Figure 3. The architecture of WARBERT.

Based on the above characteristics, WARBERT uses BERT to generate contextual embedding \widehat{V} of dimension F . For the word sequence of the mashup m_i description, we use a special format for input to the model:

$$\widehat{V}_r = BERT([CLS], D^{m_i}, [SEP]), \quad (2)$$

where [SEP] is a special segmentation token and [CLS] is the classification token. Through BERT, the model learns to obtain the focus in the whole sequence.

2) *Classifier Utilizing Dual-Component Feature Fusion:* Once the contextual embedding \widehat{V}_r is obtained, we derive the semantic feature embeddings for the mashup by leveraging the pooler-output of the contextual embedding and applying Mean-Pooling to the contextual embedding. These two feature embeddings are then individually passed through two fully connected layers FC_p and FC_m .

$$U_p = W_p \cdot Pooler(\widehat{V}_r) + b_p, \quad (3)$$

$$U_m = W_m \cdot MeanPooling(\widehat{V}_r) + b_m, \quad (4)$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times F}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^L$ are learnable parameters, with L representing the number of APIs.

A fusion layer FC_f is then employed to generate the API relevance score vector v_r after concatenating U_p with U_m . The vector v_r is determined following the application of a sigmoid activation function.

$$v_r = \text{sigmoid}(W_f \cdot [U_p; U_m] + b_f), \quad (5)$$

where $W_f \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times 2L}$ and $b_f \in \mathbb{R}^L$ are learnable parameters. Furthermore, by substituting the number of APIs with the number of API categories in the fully connected layers FC_p , FC_m , and FC_f , WARBERT(R) can also judge the category of the API that the mashup may utilize.

C. Implementation of WARBERT(M)

1) *Attention Comparison:* In WARBERT(M), the same mashup description is matched against different API descrip-

tions with different weights for the words. For example, when Yelp is matched with the Social API like Twitter, the word "reviews" in the API function will be given higher weight.

The Transformer structure already uses the expressive attention mechanism. On this basis, for the word sequence of the input API a'_j description and mashup m_i description, we use a special format:

$$\widehat{V}_m = BERT([CLS], D^{m_i}, [SEP], D^{a'_j}, [SEP]). \quad (6)$$

In this configuration, the self-attention mechanism is applied not only within each individual word sequence but also across the compared word sequences. By utilizing a multi-layer Transformer, the model learns to identify focal points within both sequences. In the API task layer FC_t , we solely utilize the pooler-output of the embedding as the feature embedding to get the similarity score between m_i and a'_j :

$$r_{j'}^{m_i} = \text{sigmoid}(W_t \cdot \text{Pooler}(\widehat{V}_m) + b_t). \quad (7)$$

By applying this methodology on each candidate API in $G^{m_i} = \{a'_1, \dots, a'_j, \dots, a'_H\}$, we can obtain the mashup API similarity score vector v_m :

$$v_m = [r_{1'}^{m_i}, \dots, r_{j'}^{m_i}, \dots, r_{H'}^{m_i}]. \quad (8)$$

D. Hierarchical Architecture with WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M)

We utilize fine-tuned WARBERT(R) to generate H candidate APIs with high relevance scores and then employ fine-tuned WARBERT(M) to match these H candidate APIs with the mashup to identify the final matched APIs. The final likelihood of whether an API matches a mashup is determined by the match score vector v :

$$v = \lambda * v_m + (1 - \lambda) * v_r, \quad (9)$$

where v_r is the API relevance score vector predicted by WARBERT(R), v_m is the mashup API similarity score vector predicted by WARBERT(M) and λ is a weighting factor ranging from 0 to 1. To maintain dimensional consistency, only the relevance score vector of the H candidate APIs is utilized.

E. Training Process

For the task of Web API recommendation, WARBERT is trained with a training set where APIs called by the mashup are labeled. For the auxiliary task of mashup category judgment, WARBERT(R) is trained separately using the categories of the labeled mashups. WARBERT uses the binary cross entropy function to compute the classification loss in both tasks. During training WARBERT converges to a state where it fits the dataset well via backpropagation.

In Algorithm 1 we show the computation of the WARBERT model. WARBERT has both WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M) implementations and the training procedures are similar:

1) Computing contextual embeddings using pre-trained BERT models.

Algorithm 1: Computation of WARBERT

Input : The description D^{m_i} of the mashup m_i , API repository $A = [a_1, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_L]$, the number of APIs L , API descriptions $[D^{a_1}, \dots, D^{a_j}, \dots, D^{a_L}]$, and the BERT model

Output: a set of recommended APIs S^{m_i}

```

1 for mashup description  $D^{m_i}$  do
2   Apply WARBERT(R);
   // Compute Contextual Embedding
3    $\widehat{V}_r = BERT([CLS], D^{m_i}, [SEP]);$ 
   // Extract Feature Vectors
4    $U_p = W_p \cdot \text{Pooler}(\widehat{V}_r) + b_p;$ 
5    $U_m = W_m \cdot \text{MeanPooling}(\widehat{V}_r) + b_m;$ 
   // Get API Relevance Score Vector
6    $v_r = \text{sigmoid}(W_f \cdot [U_p; U_m] + b_f);$ 
7 rank and select the top- $H$  candidate APIs based on
   $v_r$ ;
8 fetch candidate APIs  $G^{m_i} = \{a'_1, \dots, a'_j, \dots, a'_H\};$ 
9 for each candidate API  $a'_j$  do
10  Apply WARBERT(M);
   // Compute Contextual Embedding
11   $\widehat{V}_m = BERT([CLS], D^{m_i}, [SEP], D^{a'_j}, [SEP]);$ 
   // Calculate Similarity Score
12   $r_{j'}^{m_i} = \text{sigmoid}(W_t \cdot \text{Pooler}(\widehat{V}_m) + b_t);$ 
   // Get Mashup API Similarity Score
   Vector
13  $v_m = [r_{1'}^{m_i}, \dots, r_{j'}^{m_i}, \dots, r_{H'}^{m_i}];$ 
   // Get the Final Match Score Vector
14  $v = \lambda \cdot v_m + (1 - \lambda) \cdot v_r;$ 
15 rank and select the top- $N$  APIs according to  $v$ ;
16 return  $S^{m_i} = \text{top-}N$  APIs;
```

2) Extracting feature vectors from the contextual embeddings.

3) The final matching results are obtained using the classifier that takes feature vectors as input and is trained on the training set.

The parameters of WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M) are initialized with the pre-trained BERT. They are fine-tuned by the training process described above.

V. EXPERIMENTS AND ANALYSIS

To evaluate the effectiveness of WARBERT, we need to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How effective is WARBERT in recommending accurate Web APIs when compared with the baseline models?

RQ2: How effective is WARBERT(R) in the auxiliary task mashup category judgment compared to the model MTFM and MTFM++?

RQ3: How effective is the hierarchical architecture of WARBERT?

RQ4: How effective is the dual-component feature fusion strategy employed by WARBERT?

Table I
STATISTICS OF THE DATASET

| Statistics | Value |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Number of APIs | 1647 |
| Number of Mashups | 8217 |
| Number of Categories | 499 |
| APIs per Mashup | 2.091 |
| Categories per Mashup | 2.447 |
| Categories per API | 2.271 |
| Words in description per Mashup | 17.019 |
| Words in description per API | 44.296 |

RQ5: How effective is the attention comparison strategy employed by WARBERT?

RQ6: What influence do the weighting factor λ and the candidate API number H have on WARBERT?

A. Benchmark Dataset

Following MTFM, we use the Mashup and API data crawled in ProgrammableWeb. Since the MTFM model requires data with three attributes: name, description and category. MTFM removes crawled data with missing attribute values. Finally, the dataset contains 8217 mashups and 1647 APIs. Detailed statistics of the dataset are presented in Table I.

To conduct performance evaluation, the dataset is split into the training, validation, and test sets using the ratios of 3:1:1. Note that we only split mashups and all the APIs are used as the API repository. Each mashup has at least one API call, and on average 2 APIs are called. So the ratio of positive pair (mashup called API) is 0.125%.

B. Baseline Models

There is no universal benchmark for the API recommendation problem. Therefore, we use some representative methods as benchmarks. These include the previous solution FC-LSTM, SPR, RWR, MTFM and its variant MTFM++. We summarize these methods in the following.

- **FC-LSTM**: FC-LSTM uses an additional attention mechanism based on the LSTM model. The attention mechanism is used to mine the function features in mashups and APIs. In addition, FC-LSTM also uses LDA models for text enhancement. To ensure fairness, we disable this strategy [22].
- **SPR**: The Service Profile Reconstruction Model (SPR) uses topic modeling to analyze the connection between mashup descriptions and APIs. It offers API recommendations based on the topic structure of the descriptions [18].
- **RWR**: The Random Walk with Restart (RWR) model encodes mashup-specific contexts in a knowledge graph and ranks Web APIs by relevance using a schema that models mashup requirements with category entities. The RWR algorithm prioritizes these entities to estimate API relevance [17].
- **MTFM**: MTFM² is the model based on CNN. It uses a multi-layer CNN network to extract the features of

the mashup and the API. It concatenates the mashup feature with all the API features to get the advantage of collaborative filtering. Furthermore, it combines multi-task learning, and uses mashup category judgment as an auxiliary task [35].

- **MTFM++**: MTFM++ is an extension of MTFM. It additionally uses the category attributes of the API and constructs quality features using Quality of Services (QoS) related attributes. Due to the additional use of attribute data, MTFM++ requires more demanding data formats.
- **WARBERT**: The WARBERT framework encompasses three implementations, namely WARBERT itself, along with its component WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M). All implementations are evaluated on their performance in the Web API recommendation task. Furthermore WARBERT(R) shows the model’s multi-task learning ability in the task of mashup category judgment.

To obtain embedding from text data, we follow the MTFM setting. Except for the implementation of WARBERT and RWR, all other models use the GloVe-6B pre-trained word embedding model. This model generates a 300-dimensional word embedding for each word. For WARBERT especially WARBERT(M), in order to mitigate extended consumption times and memory constraints, we use BERT-Tiny to fine-tune the entire model. BERT-Tiny consists of two layers of Transformer. In BERT-Tiny, each word is finally represented as a 128-dimensional embedding.

C. Experimental Settings

We refer to Sentence-BERT [40] to train our model, the learning rate is chosen from $1e^{-5}$ up to $1e^{-3}$. For WARBERT(R), we run about 15 epochs with the learning rate set to $1e^{-3}$ for the first six epochs and $1e^{-5}$ for the remaining epochs. For WARBERT(M), we run about 20 epochs with the learning rate starting at $1e^{-3}$ for the first 16 epochs and $1e^{-5}$ for the subsequent epochs. Each epoch is verified by the validation set to avoid over-fitting and Adam is used in the parameter optimizer. The model with the highest score in the validation set is used on the test data. In experiment we set the candidate number H to 45 and the weighting factor λ set to 0.6, which yielded the best results. For WARBERT, the maximum length of text sequence is limited to 256. An early stopping mechanism is also utilized.

D. Evaluation Metrics

As our experiment is to judge whether the mashup and API match, we pay more attention to the quality of the correct recommended APIs. We use Precision and Recall as the common evaluation metric. Usually, users pay more attention to APIs with high match scores in the recommendation list. To follow other methods, we also use Top- N results to evaluate the model. We use N as 1, 5 and 10.

Precision@ N refers to the ratio of the number of real hits in the recommended APIs to the number of recommended APIs.

$$Precision@N = \frac{|\text{APIs}_{\text{real}} \cap \text{APIs}_{\text{top-N}}|}{|\text{APIs}_{\text{top-N}}|}. \quad (10)$$

²The source code is at <https://github.com/whale-ynu/MTFM>

Table II
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF BASELINE MODELS ON THE TASK OF WEB API RECOMMENDATION

| Models | N = 1 | | | | N = 5 | | | | N = 10 | | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Prec | Rec | NDCG | MAP | Prec | Rec | NDCG | MAP | Prec | Rec | NDCG | MAP |
| FC-LSTM | 0.3087 | 0.2153 | 0.3087 | 0.3087 | 0.1328 | 0.3784 | 0.4272 | 0.3864 | 0.0842 | 0.4614 | 0.4524 | 0.3911 |
| SPR | 0.4187 | 0.2868 | 0.4187 | 0.4187 | 0.1744 | 0.4874 | 0.5568 | 0.5151 | 0.1114 | 0.5970 | 0.5784 | 0.5089 |
| RWR | 0.4291 | 0.3097 | 0.4291 | 0.4291 | 0.1876 | 0.5449 | 0.5997 | 0.5510 | 0.1153 | 0.6431 | 0.6200 | 0.5471 |
| MTFM | 0.5898 | 0.3939 | 0.5898 | 0.5898 | 0.1920 | 0.5535 | 0.6613 | 0.6324 | 0.1111 | 0.6066 | 0.6644 | 0.6174 |
| MTFM++ | 0.5861 | 0.3957 | 0.5861 | 0.5861 | 0.1940 | 0.5518 | 0.6595 | 0.6306 | 0.1136 | 0.6127 | 0.6637 | 0.6164 |
| WARBERT(M) | 0.6147 | 0.4170 | 0.6147 | 0.6147 | 0.1939 | 0.5575 | 0.6657 | 0.6460 | 0.1096 | 0.6000 | 0.6707 | 0.6372 |
| WARBERT(R) | 0.6379 | 0.4295 | 0.6379 | 0.6379 | 0.2100 | 0.6016 | 0.6995 | 0.6749 | 0.1180 | 0.6463 | 0.7021 | 0.6636 |
| WARBERT | 0.6616 | 0.4510 | 0.6616 | 0.6616 | 0.2167 | 0.6172 | 0.7173 | 0.6945 | 0.1215 | 0.6615 | 0.7189 | 0.6825 |

Table III
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF BASELINE MODELS ON THE TASK OF MASHUP CATEGORY JUDGMENT

| Models | N = 1 | | N = 5 | | N = 10 | |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Rec | NDCG | Rec | NDCG | Rec | NDCG |
| MTFM | 0.3276 | 0.6439 | 0.6000 | 0.7446 | 0.6934 | 0.7484 |
| MTFM++ | 0.3384 | 0.6598 | 0.6017 | 0.7553 | 0.6904 | 0.7571 |
| WARBERT(R) | 0.3621 | 0.6945 | 0.6335 | 0.7862 | 0.7219 | 0.7850 |

Recall@N refers to the ratio of the number of real hits in the recommended APIs to the number of all real APIs.

$$Recall@N = \frac{|API_{S_{real}} \cap API_{S_{top-N}}|}{|API_{S_{real}}|}. \quad (11)$$

Higher values for these metrics indicate greater accuracy and enhanced performance of the model. Also, since Precision@N and Recall@N do not take into account the order in the results. We used additional evaluation metrics: MAP@N and NDCG@N. The Mean Average Precision (MAP) and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) are commonly used evaluation metrics in information retrieval tasks, and they consider the order in the results. NDCG is calculated from DCG by normalizing IDCG. IDCG is the ideal DCG. DCG takes into account the ranking order, so that the top ranked items gain more and the bottom ranked items are discounted.

$$DCG@N = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{rel_i}{\log_2(i+1)}, \quad (12)$$

$$IDCG@N = \sum_{i=1}^{|realAPIs|} \frac{1}{\log_2(i+1)}, \quad (13)$$

$$NDCG@N = \frac{DCG@N}{IDCG@N}, \quad (14)$$

where $rel_i = 1/0$ represents whether the i -th API is truly relevant to the current mashup or not. AP calculates Precision at each position, and averages over all matching positions.

$$AP@N = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N rel_i * Precision@i}{\sum_{i=1}^N rel_i}. \quad (15)$$

MAP is obtained by averaging the Average Precision (AP) across all mashups M :

$$MAP@N = \frac{1}{|M|} \sum_{m \in M} AP_m@N. \quad (16)$$

E. Main Results

1) *RQ1: Performance of WARBERT on Web API recommendation and comparison with baseline models:* WARBERT achieves better performance than the other models in all metrics. Table II shows the results of the performance on the task of Web API recommendation. Since the average number of API calls for a mashup is 2, the upper limits of API recommendation Precision for Top-5 and Top-10 are 40% and 20% on average. WARBERT outperforms MTFM in all metrics. For Precision and Recall, WARBERT improves by up to 11.5% and 11.7%. For NDCG and MAP, WARBERT averages 9.6% and 10.8% improvements over MTFM.

FC-LSTM gives higher weight to the function information in the description to improve the effect. However, FC-LSTM considers the function information of the API to be composed of words that are semantically similar to the tag. So FC-LSTM needs additional tag information. Due to data heterogeneity, the tag information in the dataset may not be accurate. In WARBERT, the descriptions of the mashup and the API are compared directly. In the comparison process, WARBERT learns the key words, which leads to a performance improvement.

SPR outperforms FC-LSTM. Its hidden topic layer addresses the limitations of the bag-of-words model. It enables semantic connections between requirements and APIs even when documents are sparse. RWR surpasses SPR probably due to its more descriptive tag composition, which better captures developer requirements. However it also raises the operational complexity for users who must accurately and comprehensively articulate their needs.

For MTFM, it combines the advantages of collaborative filtering and multi-task learning. This makes its results better than RWR. However, also due to the requirement of multi-task learning, MTFM needs to contain labeled data in the dataset. This makes it more difficult for developers to operate. MTFM++ further imposes additional requirements on the data.

Table IV
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF ABLATION MODELS ON THE TASK OF WEB API RECOMMENDATION

| Models | N = 1 | | | | N = 5 | | | | N = 10 | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Prec | Rec | NDCG | MAP | Prec | Rec | NDCG | MAP | Prec | Rec | NDCG | MAP |
| WARBERT(RNM) | 0.3165 | 0.2179 | 0.3165 | 0.3165 | 0.1328 | 0.3167 | 0.4228 | 0.3864 | 0.0864 | 0.4524 | 0.4561 | 0.3949 |
| WARBERT(NM) | 0.5928 | 0.3965 | 0.5928 | 0.5928 | 0.1850 | 0.5116 | 0.6381 | 0.6198 | 0.1037 | 0.5496 | 0.6432 | 0.6133 |
| WARBERT(RNP) | 0.5898 | 0.3944 | 0.5898 | 0.5898 | 0.1914 | 0.5430 | 0.6494 | 0.6240 | 0.1086 | 0.5878 | 0.6532 | 0.6126 |
| WARBERT(NP) | 0.6281 | 0.4235 | 0.6281 | 0.6281 | 0.2050 | 0.5754 | 0.6829 | 0.6597 | 0.1155 | 0.6186 | 0.6856 | 0.6486 |
| WARBERT(MNA) | 0.3165 | 0.2179 | 0.3165 | 0.3165 | 0.1328 | 0.3617 | 0.4215 | 0.3846 | 0.0869 | 0.4585 | 0.4562 | 0.3959 |
| WARBERT(NA) | 0.6360 | 0.4316 | 0.6360 | 0.6360 | 0.2133 | 0.6094 | 0.7043 | 0.6786 | 0.1202 | 0.6541 | 0.7080 | 0.6683 |
| WARBERT(M) | 0.6147 | 0.4170 | 0.6147 | 0.6147 | 0.1939 | 0.5575 | 0.6657 | 0.6460 | 0.1096 | 0.6000 | 0.6707 | 0.6372 |
| WARBERT(R) | 0.6379 | 0.4295 | 0.6379 | 0.6379 | 0.2100 | 0.6016 | 0.6995 | 0.6749 | 0.1180 | 0.6463 | 0.7021 | 0.6636 |
| WARBERT | 0.6616 | 0.4510 | 0.6616 | 0.6616 | 0.2167 | 0.6172 | 0.7173 | 0.6945 | 0.1215 | 0.6615 | 0.7189 | 0.6825 |

The API is required with the corresponding QoS information to obtain the quality vector. Finally, in MTFM FIC (Feature Interaction Component), the mashup embedding and all API embeddings are concatenated together into a single embedding.

Compared to other baseline models, WARBERT has significant improvements in all evaluation metrics. WARBERT employs a lightweight variant of BERT for fine-tuning, implying that scaling the language model’s capacity could enhance its performance. Moreover, WARBERT does not require additional information to run, which makes it more general for use in actual scenarios. This also demonstrates the potential of WARBERT for further improvement by enriching information sources.

2) *RQ2: Performance of WARBERT on mashup category judgement and comparison with MTFM and MTFM++:* WARBERT(R) performs better than MTFM and MTFM++. Table III shows the results of the performance on the task of mashup category judgement. On average, WARBERT(R) demonstrates a performance improvement of approximately 5.6% in Recall and 4.4% in NDCG compared to MTFM++.

3) *RQ3: Effectiveness of the Hierarchical Architecture of WARBERT:* WARBERT demonstrates significant performance improvements over its individual components. Specifically, for Precision and Recall, WARBERT shows enhancements of up to 10.1% and 9.7% respectively compared to WARBERT(M). Additionally, for NDCG and MAP, WARBERT achieves average improvements of 7.5% and 7.4% over WARBERT(M). When compared to WARBERT(R), WARBERT’s Precision and Recall see improvements of up to 3.3% and 3.3%, with average enhancements for NDCG and MAP at 2.9% and 3.1%.

These results illustrate that the integrated workflow of WARBERT enhances the performance of each standalone model. WARBERT(R) plays a crucial role by filtering APIs that are less likely to be utilized, thereby saving time and safeguarding WARBERT(M) from inaccurate matches. Meanwhile, WARBERT(M) contributes by refining the matching process, ensuring that mashups are paired with the most relevant APIs.

F. Ablation Study

To answer RQ4-RQ6, we design the ablation models and conduct the ablation study.

1) *RQ4: Effectiveness of Dual-component Feature Fusion:* In WARBERT, the performance is significantly reduced when the dual-component feature fusion is replaced with utilizing a single feature. Specifically, by removing the feature vector from the pooler-output of the contextual embedding, we obtain WARBERT(RNP), and by removing the feature vector from the Mean-Pooling of the contextual embedding, we obtain WARBERT(RNM). Moreover, by substituting WARBERT(R) in the original WARBERT with WARBERT(RNP) or WARBERT(RNM), we obtain WARBERT(NP) and WARBERT(NM) respectively.

In the task of API recommendation, a comparison between WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(RNP) reveals a performance decrease ranging from 7.2% to 9.0% across all evaluation metrics. In contrast, when comparing WARBERT(R) with WARBERT(RNM), a more substantial performance decline is observed, ranging from 38.0% to 44.5%. Additionally, the comparison between WARBERT(NP) and WARBERT shows a reduction in performance of 4.6% to 6.5%, while comparing WARBERT(NM) with WARBERT results in a more significant decrease of 10.1% to 17.1%.

Similarly, in the task of mashup category judgment, WARBERT(RNP) experiences a reduction of 2.6% to 4.1%, while WARBERT(RNM) sees a more significant drop of 28.6% to 49.8%.

These results indicate that the dual-component feature fusion enhances model performance by providing more comprehensive semantics. Furthermore, they suggest that the feature vector from the Mean-pooling of the contextual embedding is more critical to the model’s performance than the feature vector from the pooler-output of the contextual embedding.

2) *RQ5: Effectiveness of Attention Comparison:* In WARBERT the performance is greatly reduced when the attention comparison is replaced with a simplified encoding concatenation approach. We use BERT-Tiny to encode mashup descriptions and API descriptions separately. We then concatenate their pooler-output and feed them into the API task layer to get the similarity score vector. The variant is denoted as WARBERT(MNA), and by substituting WARBERT(M) in the original WARBERT, we derive WARBERT(NA).

Relative to WARBERT(M), WARBERT(MNA) exhibits a performance reduction ranging from 20.7% to 48.5%, whereas WARBERT(NA) shows a decrease of between 1.1% and 4.3%

Table V
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF ABLATION MODELS ON THE TASK OF MASHUP CATEGORY JUDGMENT

| Models | N = 1 | | N = 5 | | N = 10 | |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Rec | NDCG | Rec | NDCG | Rec | NDCG |
| WARBERT(RNM) | 0.1819 | 0.3682 | 0.3850 | 0.5176 | 0.5154 | 0.5455 |
| WARBERT(RNP) | 0.3474 | 0.6701 | 0.6120 | 0.7638 | 0.6927 | 0.7644 |
| WARBERT(R) | 0.3621 | 0.6945 | 0.6335 | 0.7862 | 0.7219 | 0.7850 |




Figure 4. Performance of WARBERT with different candidate number H and weighting factor λ

compared to WARBERT.

These results demonstrate that the attention comparison mechanism enhances the encoding process by prioritizing key terms within API functions when jointly embedded with mashup descriptions. Furthermore, this approach reduces semantic discrepancies between user-oriented mashup descriptions and developer-provided API documentation. By aligning these textual representations, the pooler-output more effectively captures nuanced semantic relationships and functional correlations between the two descriptions.

3) RQ6: Influence of λ and the candidate number H :

The candidate API number H demonstrates an approximately linear positive correlation with WARBERT’s inference time, both H and the weighting factor λ influence the performance of WARBERT in all the metrics. The selection of H and λ is determined by the size of the API repository and depends on the accuracy of both WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M). In our experiment the best result is obtained when the candidate number H is set to 45 accounting for 2.7% of the whole API repository, and the weighting factor λ is set to 0.6. Figure 4 shows the result of Precision Recall NDCG and AP with H set to 20,30,45,100,200,500 and λ set to 0,0.2,0.4,0.5,0.6,0.8,1.0 when using the Top-5 results of WARBERT. The trend indicates that, with the exception of




Figure 5. Time consumption for WARBERT with different candidate number H

Precision, all other metrics attain their highest levels when the λ parameter is adjusted to 0.6. Furthermore, at this specific λ value of 0.6, the performance of all metrics, except for Precision, peaks with the candidate number set at 45. The results obtained when the λ parameter is set to 1 demonstrate the impact of the WARBERT architecture and the role of WARBERT(R) as a filter. Even when the final recommendation relies exclusively on the prediction from WARBERT(M), the integrated framework demonstrates superior performance compared to standalone WARBERT(M).

Figure 5 illustrates the time consumption for the fine-tuned WARBERT model when addressing the API recommendation problem on the test dataset across various candidate numbers. The data suggests a roughly linear correlation between time consumption and the candidate number H , as the candidate number increases, the time consumption increases accordingly.

G. Summary

WARBERT achieves the best performance in all metrics. WARBERT shows its superiority over the baseline models and also demonstrates the effect of the hierarchical architecture by showing improvements over its component WARBERT(R) and WARBERT(M). We verify the effectiveness of the components of the WARBERT by ablation study and it shows the effect of the dual-component feature fusion and attention comparison strategy. We further investigate the impact of the candidate number H and the weighting factor λ on the inference time and performance of the model.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The WARBERT framework, with its architecture of WARBERT(R) as an efficient filter and WARBERT(M) for precise

matching, has demonstrated exceptional effectiveness in the Web API recommendation task. It consistently outperforms existing methods by achieving superior metrics such as Precision, Recall, NDCG, and MAP, with enhancements exceeding 9.6% to 11.7% compared to MTFM. The proposed attention comparison mechanism and dual-component feature fusion enable a more profound understanding of API and mashup descriptions, which contribute to the framework's outstanding performance. Experimental results highlight the framework's advantage when combining both components, as opposed to using them individually. The ablation study illustrates the importance of the dual-component feature fusion and attention comparison and insights into the impact of the weighting factor λ and the candidate number H . Looking ahead, WARBERT holds substantial potential for future enhancements, including enriching information sources beyond mashup and API descriptions, and expanding the capacity of the underlying language model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.62072204, and the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant No.2022YFB4502001. The computation is completed in the HPC Platform of Huazhong University of Science and Technology.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Zhao, S. Deng, Z. Liu, J. Yin, and S. Dustdar, "Distributed redundant placement for microservice-based applications at the edge," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1732–1745, 2020.
- [2] W. Gong, X. Zhang, Y. Chen, Q. He, A. Beheshti, X. Xu, C. Yan, and L. Qi, "DAWAR: Diversity-aware web apis recommendation for mashup creation based on correlation graph," in *Proc. of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, Madrid, Spain, July 11 - 15, 2022, pp. 395–404.
- [3] J. Yu, B. Benatallah, F. Casati, and F. Daniel, "Understanding mashup development," *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 44–52, 2008.
- [4] C. Wei, Y. Fan, Z. Jia, and J. Zhang, "Cross-view graph alignment for mashup recommendation," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 2151–2164, 2024.
- [5] L. Ding, J. Liu, G. Kang, Y. Xiao, and B. Cao, "Joint QoS prediction for web services based on deep fusion of features," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, pp. 1–1, 2023.
- [6] X. Wang, M. Xi, and J. Yin, "Functional and structural fusion based web api recommendations in heterogeneous networks," in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, Chicago, IL, USA, July 2-8 2023, pp. 91–96.
- [7] X. Wang, M. Xi, Y. Li, X. Pan, Y. Wu, S. Deng, and J. Yin, "SEHGN: semantic-enhanced heterogeneous graph network for web API recommendation," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 2836–2849, 2024.
- [8] G. Kang, B. Liang, J. Liu, Y. Wen, Y. Xiao, and H. Nie, "Web API recommendation via leveraging content and network semantics," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [9] H. Alhosaini, S. Alharbi, X. Wang, and G. Xu, "API recommendation for mashup creation: A comprehensive survey," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 1920–1940, 2023.
- [10] Y. Ma, X. Geng, J. Wang, K. He, and D. Athanasopoulos, "Deep learning framework for multi-round service bundle recommendation in iterative mashup development," *CAAI Transactions on Intelligence Technology*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 914–930, 2023.
- [11] G. Kang, Y. Wang, H. Ren, B. Cao, J. Liu, and Y. Wen, "KS-GNN: keyword search via graph neural network for web API recommendation," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 5464–5474, 2024.
- [12] C. Zhang, S. Qin, H. Wu, and L. Zhang, "Cooperative mashup embedding leveraging knowledge graph for web API recommendation," *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 49 708–49 719, 2024.
- [13] P. Bhargava, A. Drozd, and A. Rogers, "Generalization in NLI: ways (not) to go beyond simple heuristics," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2110.01518, 2021.
- [14] B. Cao, M. Peng, L. Zhang, Y. Qing, B. Tang, G. Kang, and J. Liu, "Web service recommendation via integrating heterogeneous graph attention network representation and FiBiNET score prediction," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 3837–3850, 2023.
- [15] X. Wang, P. Zhou, Y. Wang, X. Liu, J. Liu, and H. Wu, "ServiceBERT: A pre-trained model for web service tagging and recommendation," in *Proc. of International Conference on Service-Oriented Computing (ICSOC)*, vol. 13121, 2021, pp. 464–478.
- [16] F. Xie, L. Chen, D. Lin, Z. Zheng, and X. Lin, "Personalized service recommendation with mashup group preference in heterogeneous information network," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 16 155–16 167, 2019.
- [17] X. Wang, H. Wu, and C.-H. Hsu, "Mashup-oriented API recommendation via random walk on knowledge graph," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 7651–7662, 2019.
- [18] Y. Zhong, Y. Fan, W. Tan, and J. Zhang, "Web service recommendation with reconstructed profile from mashup descriptions," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 468–478, 2018.
- [19] S. Xu and B. Raahemi, "A semantic-based service discovery framework for collaborative environments," *International Journal of Simulation Modelling*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 83–96, 2016.
- [20] Q. Bao, J. Zhang, X. Duan, R. Ramachandran, T. J. Lee, Y. Zhang, Y. Xu, S. Lee, L. Pan, P. Gatlin, and M. Maskey, "A fine-grained API link prediction approach supporting mashup recommendation," in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, Honolulu, HI, USA, June 25-30 2017, pp. 220–228.
- [21] H. Chen, H. Wu, J. Li, X. Wang, and L. Zhang, "Keyword-driven service recommendation via deep reinforced steiner tree search," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 2930–2941, 2023.
- [22] M. Shi, Y. Tang, and J. Liu, "Functional and contextual attention-based LSTM for service recommendation in mashup creation," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 1077–1090, 2019.
- [23] F. McCarey, M. O. Cinneide, and N. Kushmerick, "A recommender agent for software libraries: An evaluation of memory-based and model-based collaborative filtering," in *Proc. of the IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Intelligent Agent Technology*, Hong Kong, China, 18-22 December 2006, pp. 154–162.
- [24] M. Tang, Z. Zheng, G. Kang, J. Liu, Y. Yang, and T. Zhang, "Collaborative web service quality prediction via exploiting matrix factorization and network map," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 126–137, 2016.
- [25] C. Buqing, M. Tang, and X. Huang, "CSCF: A mashup service recommendation approach based on content similarity and collaborative filtering," *International Journal of Grid and Distributed Computing*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2014.
- [26] X. Chen, Z. Zheng, and M. R. Lyu, "QoS-Aware web service recommendation via collaborative filtering," *Web Services Foundations*, pp. 563–588, 2014.
- [27] K. A. Botangen, J. Yu, Q. Z. Sheng, Y. Han, and S. Yongchareon, "Geographic-aware collaborative filtering for web service recommendation," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 151, p. 113347, 2020.
- [28] L. Yao, X. Wang, Q. Z. Sheng, B. Benatallah, and C. Huang, "Mashup recommendation by regularizing matrix factorization with API co-invocations," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 502–515, 2021.
- [29] T. Chen, J. Liu, B. Cao, Z. Peng, Y. Wen, and R. Li, "Web service recommendation based on word embedding and topic model," in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Parallel & Distributed Processing with Applications, Ubiquitous Computing & Communications, Big Data & Cloud Computing, Social Computing & Networking, Sustainable Computing & Communications, (ISPA/IUCC/BDCloud/SocialCom/SustainCom)*, Melbourne, Australia, December 11-13 2018, pp. 903–910.
- [30] F. Xie, L. Chen, Y. Ye, Z. Zheng, and X. Lin, "Factorization machine based service recommendation on heterogeneous information networks," in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, San Francisco, CA, USA, July 2-7 2018, pp. 115–122.

- [31] V. W. Anelli, T. D. Noia, E. D. Sciascio, A. Ragone, and J. Trotta, "How to make latent factors interpretable by feeding factorization machines with knowledge graphs," in *Proc. of the 18th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC)*, vol. 11778, 2019, pp. 38–56.
- [32] G. Kang, J. Liu, B. Cao, and M. Cao, "NAFM: neural and attentional factorization machine for web API recommendation," in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, 2020, pp. 330–337.
- [33] M. Nguyen, J. Yu, T. Nguyen, and Y. Han, "Attentional matrix factorization with context and co-invocation for service recommendation," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 186, p. 115698, 2021.
- [34] B. Xia, Y. Fan, W. Tan, K. Huang, J. Zhang, and C. Wu, "Category-aware API clustering and distributed recommendation for automatic mashup creation," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 674–687, 2015.
- [35] H. Wu, Y. Duan, K. Yue, and L. Zhang, "Mashup-oriented web API recommendation via multi-model fusion and multi-task learning," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 3330–3343, 2021.
- [36] M. Imran, S. Soi, F. Kling, F. Daniel, F. Casati, and M. Marchese, "On the systematic development of domain-specific mashup tools for end users," in *Proc. of the 12th International Conference on Web Engineering: 12th International Conference (ICWE)*, Berlin, Germany, July 23–27 2012, pp. 291–298.
- [37] C. Papadopoulos, Y. Panagakis, M. Koubarakis, and M. Nicolaou, "Efficient learning of multiple NLP tasks via collective weight factorization on BERT," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: (NAACL)*, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10–15 2022, pp. 882–890.
- [38] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. u. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 5998–6008.
- [39] Q. Zhang, D. Ram, C. Hawkins, S. Zha, and T. Zhao, "Efficient long-range transformers: You need to attend more, but not necessarily at every layer," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EMNLP)*, Singapore, Dec. 2023, pp. 2775–2786.
- [40] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, "Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks," in *Proc. of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, Hong Kong, China, November 3–7 2019, pp. 3980–3990.



Zishuo Xu is working towards a B.S. degree in software engineering at the Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST), Wuhan, China. His research interests are machine learning and data mining.



Yuhong Gu received the B.S. degree from Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, China, in 2019, and the M.S. degree from Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST), Wuhan, China, in 2022. His main research interest is entity linking. He currently works for SmartX.



Dezhong Yao (Member, IEEE) received the PhD degree in computer science from the Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST), Wuhan, China, in 2016. He was a research fellow at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, between 2016 and 2019. He is currently an Associate Professor with the School of Computer Science and Tech-

nology, HUST. His research interests include edge intelligence, cloud native, distributed computing, and federated learning. He has published more than 40 papers in top-tier conferences and journals, such as SIGMOD, WWW, NeurIPS, AAAI, IJCAI, FSE, ICPP, ICDM, TC, TPDS, TACO, TKDD, TCC and TIST.