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Abstract In this paper, we will introduce the notion of cost associated to web sites, from the point of view of verification. We will determine, using an algorithm, some web pages in order to maximize the number of verified web pages so that the verification has a total cost less than or equal to a fixed cost. In order to do this, we use the notion of sink web pages which are determined using a relation between the web pages.
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1. Introduction

This paper presents a notion introduced by the authors in [8] and [15] together with a new application. The web sites used in this paper consist of web pages which contain only HTML tags.

We will define the verification cost associated to a tag with attributes, respectively associated to a web page and to a web site. A detailed example is presented in section 2, in order to understand the definition of the relation $R_{TG}$ and the method used to calculate the verification costs. Then, we will define the notion of sink web page, notion used as well in [8], [12] and [15] for different applications.

The relation used in section 2 is used through different methods in [6], [9], [11] and [13] and is dependent on a set of tags $TG$, chosen based on the web site, in order to have a larger or a smaller number of sink web pages.

In section 3, a method of selecting some web pages is being presented so that by verifying those web pages, others are being implicitly verified. Taking into consideration that a web site can contain a large number of web pages and that the process of verifying them is complex and expensive from the point of view of time, two aspects have been considered: maximizing the number of web pages which are being implicitly verified by the selected web pages and the cost of verifying those selected web pages that should not be higher than a fixed threshold. A web page $p$ is implicitly verified by a web page $q$ if all the tags in $p$, which are not members of a fixed set $TG$, can be found in $q$ in the same order.

The algorithm presented in section 3 determines the sink web pages necessary for verification, with the mentioned restrictions.

The effective verification of the web pages is not the target of this paper, taking into consideration the fact that several descriptions of this process have been presented in [2], [3], [4] and [8]. The novelty of this paper consists in the method of defining the cost for verifying a web site and selecting the sink web pages which are necessary in this process.

2. Sink Web Pages

Next, we will consider a web site with the set of web pages $P=\{p_1, p_2, ... , p_n\}$ and a set $TG$ of tags.

In [12] is defined a relation between two web pages, allowing us to say about a web page if its content can be found in the structure of another web page. Using this relation, we can select from a set $P$ of web pages, some of them that contain all the building tags of the web site. Those web pages are called sink web pages ([8], [12], [15]). Next, we briefly introduce these notions with an example that will be useful in section 3.

For any web page $p_i$ from $P$, we write $T_i$ the sequence of tags, without their arguments, from $p_i$ which are not members of $TG$.

Definition 1
Let $TG$ be a set of tags, $p_i$ and $p_j$ two web pages from $P$. We say that $T_i=(T_{i1}, T_{i2}, ..., T_{ia})$ is in relation $\leq TG$ with $T_j=(T_{j1}, T_{j2}, ..., T_{jb})$ and we write $T_i \leq TG T_j$, if $a \leq b$ and there is an index set $w=\{w[1], w[2], ..., w[a]\}$, with:

$1 \leq w[1] < w[2] < ... < w[a] \leq b$;

$T_{jw[1]} = T_{i1}$, $T_{jw[2]} = T_{i2}$, ..., $T_{jaw[a]} = T_{ia}$.

Definition 2
Let $TG$ be a set of tags, $p_i$ and $p_j$ two web pages from $P$. We say that $T_i=(T_{i1}, T_{i2}, ..., T_{ia})$ is in relation $\leq TG$ with $T_j=(T_{j1}, T_{j2}, ..., T_{jb})$ and we write $T_i \leq TG T_j$, if $a \leq b$ and there is an index set $w=\{w[1], w[2], ..., w[a]\}$, with:

$1 \leq w[1] < w[2] < ... < w[a] \leq b$;

$T_{jw[1]} = T_{i1}$, $T_{jw[2]} = T_{i2}$, ..., $T_{jaw[a]} = T_{ia}$.

Definition 1
Let $TG$ be a set of tags, $p_i$ and $p_j$ two web pages from $P$. We say that $T_i=(T_{i1}, T_{i2}, ..., T_{ia})$ is in relation $\leq TG$ with $T_j=(T_{j1}, T_{j2}, ..., T_{jb})$ and we write $T_i \leq TG T_j$, if:

i) $T_i \leq TG T_j$;

ii) For any tag $<T_g>$ from $T_j$ which appears in $T_i$ as well, if it has a closing tag $</T_g>$ in $T_j$, then $</T_g>$ is also in $T_i$.

Example 1
Let us consider a web site with seven web pages:
\( P = \{ p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5, p_6, p_7 \}. \) p can be found in the file pi.html, where \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 7\} \).

**p1.html**

```
<HTML>
<HEAD> </HEAD>
<BODY> Page 1
<a href="p1.html">Go Page 2</a>
</BODY>
</HTML>
```

**p2.html**

```
<HTML>
<HEAD> </HEAD>
<BODY> <FONT COLOR=red> <B> Page 2 </B> </FONT>
</BODY>
</HTML>
```

**p3.html**

```
<HTML>
<HEAD> </HEAD>
<BODY> <FONT COLOR=red> <B> Page 3 </B> <BR>
<FONT FACE="CURIER NEW" COLOR=yellow> Page 3 </FONT> </FONT>
</BODY>
</HTML>
```

**p4.html**

```
<HTML>
<HEAD> </HEAD>
<BODY> <FONT COLOR=red> <B> Page 2 </B> <FONT SIZE=7 FACE="ARIAL" COLOR=blue> Page 2 </FONT>
<IMG SRC="p.jpg" WIDTH=140 HEIGHT=200>
</BODY>
</HTML>
```

**p5.html**

```
<HTML>
<HEAD> </HEAD>
<BODY> Page 5 <IMG SRC="p.jpg" />
</BODY>
</HTML>
```

**p6.html**

```
<HTML>
<HEAD> </HEAD>
<BODY> <FONT SIZE=7 FACE="ARIAL" COLOR=blue> Page 6 </FONT>
<IMG SRC="p.jpg">
</BODY>
</HTML>
```

**p7.html**

```
<HTML>
<HEAD> </HEAD>
<BODY> <FONT SIZE=7 FACE="ARIAL" COLOR=red> Page 7 </FONT>
<a href="p1.html">Go Page 1</a>
</BODY>
</HTML>
```

Considering \( TG=\{<HTML>, <HEAD>, <HEAD>, <BODY>, <BODY>, <BODY>, <HTML>\} \) we obtain:

\[
T_1=(<a>, <a>)
\]

\[
T_2=(<FONT>, <B>, <B>, <FONT>)
\]

\[
T_3=(<FONT>, <B>, <B>, <BR>, <FONT>, <FONT>, <FONT>)
\]

\[
T_4=(<FONT>, <B>, <B>, <FONT>, <FONT>, <P>, <BR>, <BR>, <IMG>)
\]

\[
T_5=(<IMG>)
\]

\[
T_6=(<FONT>, <BR>, <FONT>, <IMG>)
\]

\[
T_7=(<FONT>, <BR>, <FONT>, <a>, <a>)
\]

According to previous definitions, we obtain the following pairs of pages which are in relation \( R_{TG} \) one with each other:

\[
p_1 R_{TG} p_7;
\]

\[
p_2 R_{TG} p_3; p_2 R_{TG} p_4;
\]

\[
p_5 R_{TG} p_4; p_5 R_{TG} p_6;
\]

\[
p_6 R_{TG} p_4.
\]

**Definition 3**

The web page \( p_i \) is called *sink web page*, if the following property is fulfilled:

There does not exist \( p_j \) in \( P \), with \( i \neq j \) and \( p_i R_{TG} p_j \).

Using the relation \( R_{TG} \), we can construct for the web site an oriented graph \( G=(X, U) \) as below:

\( X=\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) is the set of nodes. Each web page \( p_i \) from \( P \), where \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), has one and only one node in \( X \), associated to it. The relation between a node in \( X \) and its corresponding web page from \( P \) is the following: the web page \( p_i \) has associated the node \( i \).

\( U = \{ (i, j) | p_i R_{TG} p_j, i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq n \} \) is the set of edges. For any set \( A \) we denote by \( |A| \) the number of elements of the set \( A \).

Writing \( d_+(i) = |\{(i,j) | (i,j) \in U\}| \) as being the exterior degree of the graph \( G \), we obtain:

**Proposition 1**

If \( i, 1 \leq i \leq n \) is a node in the oriented graph \( G \) previously defined, with \( d_+(i) = 0 \), then \( p_i \) is a sink web page.

The proof is immediate, taking into consideration the definition of the sink web page.

**Figure 1.** The oriented graph \( G \) for a web site with 7 web pages and the relation \( R_{TG} \) given by the edges

For the web site with \( n=7 \) web pages, from example 1, we obtain the following sink web pages: \( p_3, p_4, p_7 \). (Figure 1).

Algorithms of determining the sink web pages from a web site are described in [9] and [11].
3. Defining the Cost of Verifying a Web Page

Similarly to previous sections, we will take a fixed set of tags TG. We will consider p being a web page which contains only HTML tags, with the sequence of tags that are not in TG, T, defined in section 2. For p, we will define the verification cost, C(p), as a function which depends on the cost of verifying the tags.

Let tg be an HTML tag. For tg, we write A_{tg} as being the set of attributes of tg.

Definition 4
Let the verification cost of tg be \( c(tg) = 1 + |A_{tg}| \).

Definition 5
Let the verification cost of a web page p as a function of TG be:

\[
C(p) = \sum_{tg \in T} c(tg)
\]

Definition 6
Let the verification cost of a web site WA, with the set of web pages \( P = \{p_1, p_2, ..., p_n\} \), as a function of TG be:

\[
C_{WA} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} C(p_i)
\]

For the example 1 from section 2, we have:

\[
C(p_1) = 2 + 1 = 3; \\
C(p_2) = 2 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 6; \\
C(p_3) = 2 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 9; \\
C(p_4) = 2 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 9; \\
C(p_5) = 2.
\]

Considering those costs, we obtain \( C_{WA} = 3 + 5 + 10 + 16 + 2 = 52 \).

The cost of verifying a web site can be diminished, if we use for verification only the sink web pages.

Definition 7
Let the cost of implicit verification of the web site WA, with the set of sink web pages \( S = \{s_1, s_2, ..., s_k\} \), be:

\[
C_{\text{Im}}(WA) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} C(s_i)
\]

For the above previous, we obtain: \( C_{\text{Im}}(WA) = C(p_3) + C(p_4) + C(p_5) = 10 + 16 + 8 = 34 \).

Definition 8
Let the cost of implicit verification of the web site WA, with the subset of sink web pages \( U \subseteq S \), where \( S = \{s_1, s_2, ..., s_k\} \) is the set of sink web pages, be:

\[
C_{\text{Im}}(WA(U)) = \sum_{p \in U} C(p)
\]

Remarks
1. \( C_{\text{Im}}(U) \leq C_{\text{Im}}(WA) \), for any \( U \subseteq S \);
2. \( C_{\text{Im}}(S) = C_{\text{Im}}(WA) \).

4. Algorithm of Determining the Sink

Web Pages for Verifying a Web Site with a Fixed Cost

We will consider a web site with the set web pages \( P = \{p_1, p_2, ..., p_n\} \), a set of tags TG and a fixed cost k, which is a natural number. Our target is to determine those web pages that maximize the number of implicitly verified web pages with the total cost of verification less than or equal to k.

In order to diminish the total cost of verification, certain web pages will be implicitly verified, through other web pages. A considerable improvement is obtained if we use the sink web pages.

For the example in section 2, if we fix \( k = 25 \), choosing the web pages 4 and 7, there can be verified directly or implicitly the web pages number 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 with a cost equal to \( 24 \leq 25 \).

The proposed algorithm has the following input data:
- the path of the folder with the web site to be verified
- the path of a text file which contains the TG set
- the fixed maximum cost k

The algorithm will return the following output data:
- the total number of web pages that can be verified within the fixed cost (directly or implicitly)
- the cost of verification
- the web pages that can be directly or implicitly verified with a cost less or equal than k

The algorithm consists of three parts:
- Using the previously defined relation (R_{TG}), the graph G associated to the web site is determined. It is memorized in an array \( (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \) with \( a_{ij} = 1 \) if \( p_i R_{TG} p_j \) and \( a_{ij} = 0 \) otherwise.
- The array \( s = (s_1, s_2, ..., s_n) \) is determined. For each \( i, 1 \leq i \leq n, s_i = 0 \) if \( p_i \) is a sink web page or \( s_i = j \) if \( p_i \) is not a sink web page and \( p_j \) is a sink web page which fulfils the condition \( p_i R_{TG} p_j \).
- Using dynamic programming (the knapsack problem), some sink web pages are selected so that their verification cost is less than or equal to k and the number of directly and implicitly verified web pages is maximum.

read the input data
read the tags from TG set
read the tags from each web page from the web site
//cost[i]= verification cost for web page i, i=1,n
for i=1,n do
    cost[i]=0;
    while (exist tag Tg in web page i) and (not(Tg in TG)) do
        cost[i]=cost[i]+(1+ number of attributes from tag Tg)
        read Tg from web page i
    endwhile
endfor
//create the graph
for i=1,n do
    for j=1,n do
        a[i][j]=0
        if i=j then
            if pi is in relation R_{TG} with pj then
                a[i][j]=1
            endif
        endif
    endfor
endfor

//s=(s[1],...,s[n]) with the meaning from the above description
for i=1,n do
s[i]=0
endfor
for i=1,n do
for j=1,n do
if s[j]=0 and a[i][j]=1 then
s[i]=j
endif
endfor
endfor
sw=1
while sw=1 do
sw=0
for i=1,n do
for j=1,nrsink do
if t!=0 and u!=0 and v=0 then
s[i]=u
sw=1
endif
endfor
endwhile
//p[1]-first sink web page, p[2]-second sink web page, ...
//nrp[i] the number of web pages verified through pi
for i=1,n do
nrp[i]=1
endfor
nrsink=0
for i=1,n do
if s[i]=0 then
nrsink=nrsink+1
else
nrp[s[i]]=nrp[s[i]]+1
endif
endfor
Implementing this algorithm using Java language has led to the results presented in Table 1. The tests were used for different values of the set TG, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TG</th>
<th>Cost of verification (cWS)</th>
<th>Number of sink web pages</th>
<th>Number of directly verified web pages (nWS)</th>
<th>Number of directly and indirectly verified web pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TG0</td>
<td>9976</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG1</td>
<td>9227</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG2</td>
<td>9227</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG3</td>
<td>9365</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG4</td>
<td>9317</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG5</td>
<td>9829</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG6</td>
<td>9799</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG7</td>
<td>9799</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG8</td>
<td>9799</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG9</td>
<td>9799</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. nWS, cWS and k for the journal web site WS

Table 1. nWS, cWS and k for the journal web site WS
TG0=Ø
TG1=\{<p>, <\p>, <B>, </B>\}
TG2=T1 \cup \{<i>, </i>, <u>, </u>\}
TG3=T2 \cup \{<meta>, <script>, </script>, <hr>\}
TG4=T3 \cup \{<pre>, </pre>, <center>, </center>, <hr>\}
TG5=T4 \cup \{<style>, </style>, <img>, <font>, </font>\}
TG6=T5 \cup \{<strong>, </strong>, <small>, </small>\}
TG7=T6 \cup \{<h1>, </h1>, <h2>, </h2>\}
TG8=T7 \cup \{<h3>, </h3>, <h4>, </h4>, <h5>, </h5>\}
TG9=T8 \cup \{<h6>, </h6>\}

We wrote nWS the number of web pages, respectively cWS the provided cost which does not exceed k as output data to Java program.

5. Conclusions

The algorithm described in section 3 has provided good results with the tested examples. Next, the authors intend to build a more complex application, which should use the notions and the presented algorithm, and test it on a larger set of web sites. Meanwhile, it is considered that the method of calculating the verification cost for a web page can be improved, by considering the possible values that the tag attributes can have, as well as the method of selecting web pages within the algorithm.
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