

UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

**AI-driven Service Broker for Simple and
Composite Cloud SaaS Selection**

by

Mohammed Abdulaziz Ikram

A THESIS SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

Doctor of Philosophy

Sydney, Australia

2020

Certificate of Authorship/Originality

I, Mohammed Ikram declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of PhD in Computer System, in the school of Computer Science at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:

Signature: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 30/06/2020

ABSTRACT

AI-driven Service Broker for Simple and Composite Cloud SaaS Selection

by

Mohammed Abdulaziz Ikram

Cloud Software as a Service (SaaS) is one of the three types of services offered in cloud computing. Cloud SaaS is a software application that runs on top of Platform as a Service (PaaS), which in turn works on top of Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS). Due to the numerous advantages offered by cloud SaaS to service consumers, such as reducing the cost of IT expenditures, security capabilities and disaster recovery offered by cloud SaaS service providers, Cloud SaaS is becoming a leading and growing type of cloud service among other cloud services (i.e., IaaS and PaaS). Therefore, Cloud SaaS service consumers may face a difficult task when searching for the most suitable service based on their preferences. Service selection is based on matching the service requirements of functional and non-functional quality attributes. However, selecting a Cloud SaaS service provider with a high number of non-functional quality attributes that fulfils consumer requirements within a large number of similar functional services is a key factor for a Cloud SaaS service selection.

In addition, considering that a cloud SaaS service can involve a long-term contract, Cloud SaaS providers frequently offer a free trial period to test and evaluate services before the consumers make the decision of whether they will use that service. Furthermore, selecting multiple Cloud SaaS service providers in order to create a new business value, known as a service composition in the service-oriented architecture (SOA) model, is very important, since Cloud SaaS services are the first option for deploying IT services for many new enterprises.

Therefore, this research aims to propose intelligent methods for a simple and composite service selection framework based on consumer preferences. By simple, we mean a singular service whereas by composite, we mean an aggregated service. This work seeks to find the services with a high number of non-functional quality attributes that meet the consumer requirements. To achieve the objectives of this research, a design science research methodology will be adopted. Fuzzy logic will be proposed to address the uncertainty of consumer preferences. A ranking service system, evaluation system and composite decision maker system are proposed in this thesis to help a Cloud SaaS service consumer select the optimal service required. Multiple approaches of decision-makers will be developed in order to achieve our research objectives. It is expected that this research work will enhance the selection mechanism of Cloud SaaS, either simple or composite based on service consumer's preferences.

Dissertation directed by Associate Professor Farookh Hussain
School of Computer Science
Centre for Artificial Intelligence
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology (FEIT)

Dedication

To all of my family...

Acknowledgements

I am thankful to Allah Almighty, who bless me and support me to write the whole thesis. My greatest gratitude goes to my family, I thank my mother Najah Jalal who taught me to be patient and supported me during the PhD journey. Also, I would like to thank my great father Abdulaziz Ikram who taught me to be responsible. Special thanks to my wife Haneen Ekram, and my kids Janna, Ibrahim and Ahmed for supporting me through all my PhD journey. I would like to express my gratitude to all of my family, my sister and brothers who supported me with motivational words and prayers. Also, special thanks to my daughter Janna who help some parts of my thesis. Without all your love I could never have written my thesis.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Farookh Hussain for his patient guidance, encouragement and advice from the first day through to the end of my PhD journey. Also, I would like to thank my Co-Supervisor Dr Nabin Sharma for his help and support. I would also like to thank all my colleagues during PhD journey Dr Alshehri, Dr Alshaweesh, Dr Shoria, Dr Supanada, Dr Aysha, Dr Thaqeb, Dr Quen and Dr Yahya. I would particularly like to thank Dr Reza for the suggestions he made in Chapter 5 of this work.

I would like to thank the computer science departments staff Level 7 building 11 UTS.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude and special thanks to the Saudi Arabia Cultural Mission (SACM) in Australia for supporting me all the way from the early days of my masters degree to PhD degree.

Mohammed Ikram
Sydney, Australia, 2019.

List of Publications

The following is a list of my research papers during my PhD study.

Journal Papers

- J-1. **Mohammed Abdulaziz Ikram**, Nabin Sharma and Farookh Khadeer Hussain, "Intelligent Service Broker approach for Ranking, Evaluation and Selection of Cloud SaaS".

Conference Papers

- C-1. **Mohammed Abdulaziz Ikram**, Farookh Khadeer Hussain: Software as a Service (SaaS) Service Selection Based on Measuring the Shortest Distance to the Consumer's Preferences. EIDWT 2018: pp.403-415
- C-2. **Mohammed Abdulaziz Ikram**, Nabin Sharma, Muhammad Raza, Farookh Khadeer Hussain: Dynamic Ranking System of Cloud SaaS Based on Consumer Preferences - Find SaaS M2NFCP. AINA 2019: pp.1000-1010
- c-3. **Mohammed Abdulaziz Ikram**, Nabin Sharma, Omar Hussain and Farookh Khadeer Hussain, "Towards Linguistic-based Evaluation System of Cloud Software as a Service (SaaS) Provider".
- C-4. **Mohammed Abdulaziz Ikram**, Nabin Sharma, Farookh Khadeer Hussain: The Non-Functional Cloud Software as a Service (SaaS) classification based on Quality of Service (QoS) and Quality of Experience (QoE).

Contents

Certificate	ii
Abstract	iii
Dedication	v
Acknowledgments	vi
List of Publications	vii
List of Figures	xvi
List of Tables	xx
Abbreviation	xxv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Significance of the Thesis	5
1.2 Scientific Contributions	6
1.3 Social Contributions	8
1.4 Research Problems and Contribution	8
1.4.1 Research Contributions in Simple Cloud SaaS Selection	9
1.4.2 Research problem and Contribution in Evaluation of Cloud SaaS Providers	10
1.4.3 Research problem and contribution in Composite Cloud SaaS Selection	11
1.5 Thesis Outline	12
2 Literature Review	15

2.1	Introduction	15
2.2	The Concept of Cloud Services	16
2.2.1	Basic concept of Cloud Computing (CC)	16
2.3	Overview of Existing Research on Non-Functional Simple Cloud SaaS Service Selection	22
2.3.1	Non-Functional Approaches for simple Cloud SaaS Service Selection	24
2.3.2	The Important of Non-Functional Quality Attributes	28
2.3.3	Evaluation System of Cloud SaaS Service Provider	32
2.3.4	Shortcomings of existing approaches	37
2.4	Overview of Existing Research on Non-Functional Cloud SaaS Service Composition	38
2.4.1	Non-Functional Approaches of Composite Cloud SaaS Selection	39
2.4.2	Shortcomings of existing approaches	43
2.5	Datasets	44
2.6	Conclusion	45
3	Problem Definition	47
3.1	Introduction	47
3.2	Key Concepts	48
3.2.1	Cloud Computing (CC)	48
3.2.2	Software as a Service (SaaS)	48
3.2.3	Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)	48
3.2.4	Service Level Agreement (SLA)	48
3.2.5	Service Broker	49
3.2.6	Service Consumer	49

3.2.7	Service Provider	49
3.2.8	Simple Service	49
3.2.9	Composite Service	50
3.2.10	Service Selection	50
3.2.11	Ranking System	50
3.2.12	Evaluation System	50
3.2.13	Consumer Preferences	51
3.2.14	Small and Medium Enterprises (SME)	51
3.2.15	Functional Service Selection	51
3.2.16	Non-Functional Service Selection	52
3.2.17	Quality of Service (QoS)	52
3.2.18	Quality of Experience (QoE)	52
3.2.19	Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)	52
3.2.20	Multi-Objective Optimization (MOO)	53
3.3	The differences between the cloud services and Cloud SaaS	53
3.4	Problem Overview and Problem Definition	54
3.5	Research Issues	57
3.5.1	Research Issue 1: Lack of an intelligent approach for ranking and selecting simple Cloud SaaS service based on consumer's preferences	57
3.5.2	Research Issue 2: Lack of an intelligent approaches for Cloud SaaS simple selection based on the feedback or outcome from the trial evaluation phase	58
3.5.3	Research Issue 3: Lack of an intelligent decision support system for selecting the Cloud SaaS composition based on combining two methods GA and TOPSIS	58

3.5.4	Research Issue 4: Validate the proposed approaches by experiment implementations	59
3.6	Research Questions	60
3.7	Research Aims	60
3.8	Research Objectives	61
3.9	Research methods to Problem Solving	61
3.9.1	Multi-criteria Decision Making (MCDM)	62
3.9.2	Fuzzy Logic	62
3.9.3	Genetic Algorithm	63
3.10	General Research Methodology	63
3.11	Conclusion	65
4	Solution Overview	66
4.1	Introduction	66
4.2	General Framework Architecture of the proposed Service Broker (Find SaaS Framework)	67
4.2.1	Overview of the solution for ranking System of Cloud SaaS Providers (Find SaaS SNFCP, M2NFCP and LNFCP)	69
4.2.2	Overview of the solution for Evaluation System (Find SaaS Evaluation)	71
4.2.3	Overview of the solution for Composite Cloud SaaS service Selection (Find SaaS GA TOPSIS)	73
4.3	Conclusion	76
5	Find SaaS (SNFCP, M2NFCP and LNFCP) Simple Cloud SaaS Service Selection	77
5.1	Introduction	77

5.2	General Architecture of Find SaaS (SNFCP, M2NFCP and LNFCP)	
	Ranking Engine System (RES) for Cloud SaaS Service Providers . . .	79
5.3	Consumer Request Handler (<i>CRH</i>)	81
	5.3.1 Weighting Non-Functional Quality Attributes	82
	5.3.2 Non-functional Consumer Requirements	85
5.4	Service Registry Repository (<i>SRR</i>)	97
5.5	Ranking System Engine (<i>RSE</i>)	101
5.6	Case Study: Ranking the Services of a Computer Repair Shop (Cloud SaaS) using the Find SaaS SNFCP Approach	105
5.7	Experiments	109
	5.7.1 CRM Dataset	112
	5.7.2 QWS Dataset	123
5.8	Chapter Discussion	129
5.9	Conclusion	130
6	Find SaaS Evaluation System of Cloud SaaS Providers	132
6.1	Introduction	132
6.2	Find SaaS Evaluation Architecture	134
6.3	Quality of Experience (QoE) Service Repository (QoESR)	135
6.4	A Fuzzy Linguistic-based Evaluation System for Cloud SaaS	140
	6.4.1 Consumer Evaluation Handler (CEH)	141
	6.4.2 Decision Maker System (DMS)	147
6.5	A Fuzzy Rule-based Evaluation System of Cloud SaaS	150
	6.5.1 Consumer Evaluation Handler (CEH)	151
	6.5.2 Decision Maker System (DMS)	156

6.6	Case Study	158
6.6.1	Case study: Evaluation of cloud SaaS service provider using a fuzzy linguistic-based system	158
6.6.2	Case Study: Evaluation of cloud SaaS using a fuzzy rule-based system	164
6.7	Chapter Discussion	168
6.8	Conclusion	169
7	Find SaaS GA TOPSIS - Composite Cloud SaaS Service Selection	170
7.1	Introduction	170
7.2	Find SaaS Composition GA TOPSIS Framework Architecture	172
7.2.1	System Notation	174
7.2.2	System Process	174
7.3	Consumer Request Handler (CRH)	175
7.3.1	Workflow Handler	176
7.3.2	Selected Criteria	177
7.3.3	Consumer Constraints	177
7.3.4	Weighting Non-Functional Quality Attributes	178
7.4	Service Registry Repository (SRR)	179
7.4.1	Service Provider	180
7.4.2	Previous Consumer Feedback	181
7.4.3	Monitoring Tool	181
7.5	Optimizer Unit (OU)	181
7.5.1	Total Composite cost	183

7.5.2	Reputation-based Service Reviewers (RbSR)	183
7.5.3	Aggregation Function	186
7.5.4	Genetic Algorithm (GA)	188
7.6	Decision Maker System (DMS)	192
7.7	Experiment	196
7.7.1	Case study: Emar Ltd Company	196
7.7.2	Experiment Setup	197
7.7.3	Experiment Result	199
7.7.4	Experiment Evaluation and Discussion	203
7.8	Chapter Discussion	205
7.9	Conclusion	206
8	Find SaaS System Prototype	208
8.1	Introduction	208
8.2	Simple Cloud SaaS Service Selection Ranking Service Providers Prototype	209
8.3	System Prototype of Cloud SaaS Evaluation System	213
8.4	System Prototype of Cloud SaaS Service Composition Decision Making	218
8.5	Conclusion	220
9	Recapitulation and Future Research Direction	221
9.1	Introduction	221
9.2	Problems addressed in this thesis	223
9.3	Contributions of this thesis to the existing literature	223
9.3.1	Contribution 1: State-of-the-art survey of present literature	224

9.3.2	Contribution 2: Simple Cloud SaaS Service Selection Model based on consumer's preferences (Find SaaS SNFCP, M2NFCP and LNFCP)	225
9.3.3	Contribution 3: Evaluation of Cloud SaaS Service Provider	226
9.3.4	Contribution 4: Composite Cloud SaaS Service Selection (Find SaaS GA TOPSIS)	226
9.3.5	Contribution 5: System prototype to demonstrate the Find SaaS service porker framework	227
9.4	Limitations	228
9.5	Future work	230
9.5.1	Service provider instead of Service consumer	230
9.5.2	Cloud SaaS selection technique based on economical and environmental value	231
9.5.3	The interoperability of on-premises software and cloud Software as a service (SaaS)	232
9.5.4	The risk assessment module for selecting Cloud SaaS	233
9.5.5	The IoT and Cloud SaaS	233
	References	235
	Appendix	245
	A Chapter 5 data results	245
	B Chapter 7 data results	264

List of Figures

2.1	Cloud Computing Services Architecture	17
2.2	Licensed software versus Cloud SaaS	19
2.3	Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) Model	20
2.4	Service Broker Architecture	22
2.5	Overview of the literature review on Cloud SaaS Service Selection . .	24
3.1	Design Science Research Methodology Iterations Process	64
4.1	Find SaaS Service Broker Framework Structure	68
4.2	Thesis Structure	69
4.3	Ranking System Engine of Cloud SaaS Providers Solution Structure .	70
4.4	Evaluation System of Cloud SaaS Solution Structure	72
4.5	Composite Cloud SaaS Service Selection Solution Structure	74
5.1	Ranking Framework Architecture	80
5.2	Non-functional preferences classification	83
5.3	Degree of membership function of triangular fuzzy logic or linguistic variables	84
5.4	Box plot explanation	94
5.5	Membership function of linguistic values for the non-functional attributes proposed in the study	95

5.6	Affordable price membership function of the CRM dataset	95
5.7	Services Registry Repository	99
5.8	Site24x7 analysis for (Apptivo) service	113
5.9	The response time analysis by the list of servers	113
5.10	nDCG result for Find SaaS SNFCP, FSSP and CASC approaches .	119
5.11	nDCG result for Find SaaS M2NFCP, FSSP and CASC approaches	119
5.12	nDCG result for Find SaaS LNFCP, FSSP and CASC approaches .	120
5.13	The average nDCG for our proposed approaches and compared with the existing research approaches	122
5.14	The mean average precision (mAP) for Find SaaS SNFCP in the top-(5,10,20 and 50) and compared with the existing research approaches	127
5.15	The mean average precision mAP for Find SaaS M2NFCP in top-(5,10,20 and 50) and compared with the existing research approaches	128
5.16	The precision of Find SaaS SNFCP compared with other ranking approaches	128
5.17	The precision of Find SaaS M2NFCP compared with other ranking approaches	129
6.1	The Find SaaS Evaluation Methods	133
6.2	The components of the Find SaaS Evaluation architecture framework	135
6.3	Evaluation of the QoE	136
6.4	Triangular fuzzy number	142
6.5	Membership function for linguistic values of QPriority	143
6.6	Membership function for linguistic values of QEvaluation	144

6.7	A fuzzy rule-based evaluation system architecture	151
6.8	Trapezoidal fuzzy number	154
6.9	Membership functions of linguistic values for QPriority	154
6.10	Membership functions of linguistic values for QEvaluation	155
6.11	Membership functions of linguistic values for QEvaluationScore . . .	155
6.12	The square rules (FAM) representation	156
6.13	Three-dimensional plot for evaluation system rule	158
7.1	The Find SaaS Composition Framework Architecture	173
7.2	Workflow control process	176
7.3	Services Registry Repository	180
7.4	Find SaaS GA TOPSIS main algorithms	182
7.5	Membership functions of linguistic values for Service rating (RA) . .	184
7.6	Membership functions of linguistic values for Service Reviewers (RV)	185
7.7	Reputation-based service reviewers	185
7.8	The basic genetic algorithm flowchart	189
7.9	The Service Composition Model	190
7.10	Genetic crossover operator for Cloud SaaS Composition	193
7.11	Genetic mutation operator for Cloud SaaS Composition	194
7.12	The first main page of ranking services of Find SaaS	197
7.13	The execution paths of RbSR	198
7.14	The execution paths of composite costs	198
7.15	The Fitness function	200
8.1	The first main page of ranking services of Find SaaS	210

8.2	Selected the non-functional preferences for ranking the services	211
8.3	The main page of ranking the cloud services using the SNFCP ranking approach	211
8.4	The main page of ranking the cloud services using the M2NFCP ranking approach	212
8.5	The main page of ranking the cloud services using the LNFCP ranking approach	213
8.6	The main page of evaluation system of Find SaaS	215
8.7	The main page of cloud SaaS services using the the linguistic for evaluation the criteria	216
8.8	The decision maker for selection the best cloud software service after the testing the service	217
8.9	The main page for rule based evaluation system of cloud software services	218
8.10	The main page of selection after the decision using the percentage of selection or using the rule based evaluation system	219
8.11	The Find SaaS GA TOPSIS Composite solution	220

List of Tables

2.1	Comparison methods of Cloud SaaS Simple selection approaches . . .	27
2.2	Comparative Analysis of Existing Research Studies on Cloud SaaS Selection Attributes	33
2.3	Existing Research Studies on Evaluation System of Cloud SaaS Provider	36
2.4	Existing Research Studies on Cloud SaaS Service Composition	42
5.1	Linguistic terms with their fuzzy numbers	84
5.2	The examples of non-functional requirements for the price attribute .	87
5.3	The linguistic values used to measure consumer preferences	96
5.4	Computer repair shop services with non-functional attributes	105
5.5	Consumer request parameters	106
5.6	BIS and WIS service vectors generated by CRH	106
5.7	Weighting quality attributes using fuzzy logic	106
5.8	Normalization matrix for the services	107
5.9	The weighting normalization matrix for the services	107
5.10	The values of DB and DW	108
5.11	The values of CSB for each service	108
5.12	Ranking result of consumer request	109
5.13	Top 20 services of CRM by Capterra web site	114

5.14	Find SaaS SNFCP queries input	115
5.15	Find SaaS M2NFCP queries input	116
5.16	Find SaaS LNFCP queries input	116
5.17	Summary of CRM dataset	117
5.18	The fuzzy number of ranking request to Find SaaS LNFCP	117
5.19	CRM result analysis	121
5.20	Definitions of QWS non-functional attributes	124
5.21	Summary of the QWS dataset	124
5.22	The service queries for the Find SaaS SNFCP approach	125
5.23	The service queries for the Find SaaS M2NFCP approach	126
6.1	Evaluation QoE	137
6.2	Linguistic variables of weighting qualities with their fuzzy numbers .	143
6.3	Linguistic variables of evaluating the qualities and their fuzzy number	144
6.4	Linguistic variables and their ranges	153
6.5	The rule	157
6.6	Linguistic values to evaluate the services	159
6.7	Linguistic weight criteria	160
6.8	Fuzzy numbers for weighting criteria	160
6.9	Fuzzy numbers for an evaluation of the services	161
6.10	Fuzzy numbers for evaluation matrix	161
6.11	The Final crisp number of all services	162
6.12	The positive ideal solution and negative ideal solution	163
6.13	The distance to the positive and negative ideal solutions	163
6.14	Similarity to the positive ideal solution	164

6.15	Ranking of the services for selection	164
6.16	The Consumer's evaluation criteria	166
6.17	The priority of qualities	166
6.18	The final evaluation score for the service providers	168
7.1	System notations	174
7.2	The Find SaaS GA TOPSIS interacting stages	175
7.3	Linguistic terms with their fuzzy numbers	179
7.4	Linguistic values of Service Rating (RA) and their fuzzy number ranges	184
7.5	Linguistic values of service reviewers (RV) and their fuzzy numbers range	185
7.6	Linguistic values of reputation-based service reviewers (RbSR) and their fuzzy numbers range	186
7.7	The square rules (FAM) representation	187
7.8	Non-functional aggregation functions for sequence patterns	187
7.9	Non-functional preferences input	199
7.10	Consumer Constraints	200
7.11	The Top-20 Composite services generated by GA	202
7.12	The Top-20 Composite services generated by GA TOPSIS	203
7.13	The Top-20 Composite services generated by SAW	204
7.14	The Top-20 Composite services generated by TOPSIS	204
7.15	The Evaluation of Find SaaS GA TOPSIS Compared with other approaches using nDCG metric	205
A.1	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS SNFCP considering two non-functional preferences	245

A.2	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS SNFCP considering four non-functional preferences	246
A.3	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS SNFCP considering six non-functional preferences	247
A.4	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS M2NFCP considering two non-functional preferences	248
A.5	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS M2NFCP considering four non-functional preferences	249
A.6	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS M2NFCP considering six non-functional preferences	250
A.7	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS LNFCP considering two non-functional preferences	251
A.8	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS LNFCP considering four non-functional preferences	252
A.9	Ranking Cloud SaaS top-20 CRM providers using Find SaaS LNFCP considering six non-functional preferences	253
A.10	Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS SNFCP considering two non-functional preferences	254
A.11	Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS SNFCP considering four non-functional preferences	255
A.12	Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS SNFCP considering six non-functional preferences	256
A.13	Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS SNFCP considering eight non-functional preferences	257
A.14	Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS SNFCP considering ten non-functional preferences	258

A.15 Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS	
M2NFCP considering two non-functional preferences	259
A.16 Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS	
M2NFCP considering four non-functional preferences	260
A.17 Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS	
M2NFCP considering six non-functional preferences	261
A.18 Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS	
M2NFCP considering eight non-functional preferences	262
A.19 Ranking top 20 services for QWS Dataset using Find SaaS	
M2NFCP considering ten non-functional preferences	263
 B.1 Top 20 Cloud SaaS providers of Customer Relationship	
Management (CRM) based on Capttera	265
B.2 Top 20 Cloud SaaS providers of Energy Software based on Capttera .	266
B.3 Top 20 Cloud SaaS providers of Architecture Software based on	
Capttera	267
B.4 Top 20 Cloud SaaS providers of Project Software based on Capttera .	268

Abbreviation

AHP - Analytic Hierarchy Process

AV - Availability

CC - Cloud Computing

CRM - Customer Relationship Management

DMS - Decision Maker System

ELECTRE - ELimination Et Choix Traduisant la REalit

ERP - Enterprise Resource Planning

FAM - Fuzzy Associative Matrix

GA - Genetic Algorithm

HR - Human Resources

IaaS - Infrastructure as a Service

mAP - Mean Average Precision

MCDM - Multi-Criteria Decision Making

MIX - Mixed Integer Programming

MODM - Multi Objective Decision Making

MOO - Multi Objective Optimization

nDCG - Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain

NF - Non-Functional

OU - Optimizer Unit

PaaS - Platform as a Service

PR - Price

PSO - Particle Swarm Optimization

RbSR -Reputation-based Service Reviewers

RS - Ranking System

RT - Response Time

RV - Service Reviewers

SaaS - Software as a Service

SAW - Simple Additive Weighting

SOA - Service-Oriented Architecture

SR - Service Rating

SRR - Service Registry Repository

TH - Throughput

TOPSIS - Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution