TABLE XI: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in system LRZIP. Statistically significant discrepancies are shown in bold ($\hat{A}_{12} > 0.56$ and p value < 0.05), where green cells indicate that DLiSA performs better; or red cells otherwise.

Workload	Algorithm	Mean (Std)	\hat{A}_{12} (p value)
	DLiSA	3.137 (0.041)	
W1	DLiSA-I	3.158 (0.077)	$0.616 \ (p = 0.003)$
	DLiSA-II	3.151 (0.064)	$0.626 \ (p = 0.001)$
	DLiSA	0.030 (0.000)	
W2	DLiSA-I	0.030 (0.000)	0.500 (p = 1.000)
	DLiSA-II	0.030 (0.001)	$0.505 \ (p = 0.322)$
	DLiSA	3.308 (0.015)	
W3	DLiSA-I	3.315 (0.023)	0.595 (p = 0.011)
	DLiSA-II	3.318 (0.030)	$0.579 \ (p = 0.035)$
	DLiSA	7.131 (0.062)	
W4	DLiSA-I	7.145 (0.107)	0.530 (p = 0.409)
	DLiSA-II	7.155 (0.083)	$0.582 \ (p = 0.026)$
	DLiSA	33.412 (0.109)	•
W5	DLiSA-I	33.507 (0.314)	0.560 (p = 0.088)
	DLiSA-II	33.496 (0.302)	$0.524 \ (p = 0.486)$
	DLiSA	0.973 (0.007)	4
W6	DLiSA-I	0.974 (0.006)	0.525 (p = 0.421)
	DLiSA-II	0.974 (0.008)	$0.512 \ (p = 0.706)$
	DLiSA	0.196 (0.005)	· ·
W7	DLiSA-I	0.197 (0.005)	0.532 (p = 0.350)
	DLiSA-II	0.196 (0.005)	$0.505 \ (p = 0.887)$
	DLiSA	10.919 (0.029)	
W8	DLiSA-I	10.921 (0.027)	0.541 (p = 0.269)
	DLiSA-II	10.918 (0.031)	$0.512 \ (p = 0.741)$
	DLiSA	9.152 (0.401)	
W9	DLiSA-I	9.250 (0.397)	$0.606 \ (p = 0.007)$
	DLiSA-II	9.215 (0.453)	$0.532 \ (p = 0.419)$
	DLiSA	5.321 (0.137)	<u> </u>
W10	DLiSA-I	5.333 (0.157)	0.525 (p = 0.461)
****	DLiSA-II	5.399 (0.271)	$0.546 \ (p = 0.170)$
	DLiSA	2.113 (0.043)	-
W11	DLiSA-I	2.122 (0.045)	0.572 (p = 0.072)
	DLiSA-II	2.120 (0.045)	$0.548 \ (p = 0.222)$
	DLiSA	3.495 (0.094)	
W12	DLiSA-I	3.515 (0.103)	0.536 (p = 0.307)
	DLiSA-II	3.529 (0.111)	$0.581 \ (p = 0.025)$
	DLiSA	2.532 (0.020)	4
W13	DLiSA-I	2.537 (0.023)	0.564 (p = 0.068)
	DLiSA-II	2.541 (0.027)	$0.582 \ (p = 0.020)$

TABLE VIII: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its

variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in

system z3. Statistically significant discrepancies are shown

in bold ($\hat{A}_{12}>0.56$ and p value < 0.05), where green cells

indicate that DLiSA performs better; or red cells otherwise.

	DLiSA	2.254 (0.608)	
W2	DLiSA-I	2.120 (0.510)	$0.555 \ (p = 0.132)$
	DLiSA-II	1.998 (0.435)	0.619 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)
	DLiSA	0.364 (0.660)	
W3	DLiSA-I	0.302 (0.617)	0.506 (p = 0.861)
	DLiSA-II	0.354 (0.627)	$0.511 \ (p = 0.770)$
	DLiSA	2.324 (0.150)	
W4	DLiSA-I	2.313 (0.130)	$0.503 \ (p = 0.933)$
	DLiSA-II	2.303 (0.107)	$0.508 \ (p = 0.826)$
	DLiSA	3.150 (0.111)	
W5	DLiSA-I	3.173 (0.237)	$0.532 \ (p = 0.385)$
	DLiSA-II	3.170 (0.097)	0.629 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA	1.322 (0.130)	
W6	DLiSA-I	1.313 (0.085)	$0.513 \ (p = 0.618)$
	DLiSA-II	1.387 (0.245)	$0.585 \ (p = 0.006)$
	DLiSA	0.292 (0.458)	
W7	DLiSA-I	0.221 (0.004)	$0.532 \ (p = 0.102)$
	DLiSA-II	0.249 (0.152)	$0.522 \ (p = 0.365)$
	DLiSA	8.746 (0.005)	
W8	DLiSA-I	8.746 (0.005)	$0.508 \ (p = 0.823)$
	DLiSA-II	8.806 (0.590)	$0.520 \ (p = 0.570)$
	DLiSA	3.181 (0.003)	
W9	DLiSA-I	3.181 (0.003)	$0.515 \ (p = 0.491)$
	DLiSA-II	3.182 (0.004)	$0.530 \ (p = 0.237)$
	DLiSA	6.816 (0.236)	
W10	DLiSA-I	6.804 (0.222)	$0.502 \ (p = 0.953)$
	DLiSA-II	6.817 (0.246)	$0.513 \ (p = 0.746)$
	DLiSA	7.948 (0.654)	
W11	DLiSA-I	7.940 (0.499)	$0.504 \ (p = 0.919)$
	DLiSA-II	7.940 (0.506)	$0.517 \ (p = 0.677)$
	DLiSA	3.878 (0.009)	
W12	DLiSA-I	3.878 (0.008)	$0.507 \ (p = 0.846)$
	DLiSA-II	3.900 (0.148)	$0.595 \ (p = 0.014)$

DLiSA 0.907 (0.014) W1DLiSA-I 0.605 (p = 0.004)0.914 (0.029) $0.631 \ (p < 0.001)$ DLiSA-II 0.925 (0.043) DLiSA 1.338 (0.019) $0.581 \ (p = 0.023)$ W2 DLiSA-I 1.342 (0.021) DLiSA-II 1.348 (0.026) 0.617 (p = 0.001)4.196 (0.056) DLiSA W3 DLiSA-I 4.209 (0.071) **0.612** (p = 0.004)

Algorithm

its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100

run in system BATLIK. Statistically significant discrepancies

are shown in bold $(A_{12}>0.56$ and p value < 0.05), where

green cells indicate that DLiSA performs better; or red cells

Mean (Std)

 \hat{A}_{12} (p value)

otherwise.

Workload

	DLiSA-II	4.247 (0.123)	0.691 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA	1.193 (0.026)	
W4	DLiSA-I	1.197 (0.022)	$0.556 \ (p = 0.140)$
	DLiSA-II	1.204 (0.027)	$0.624 \ (p = 0.001)$
	DLiSA	2.404 (0.036)	
W5	DLiSA-I	2.411 (0.037)	$0.581 \ (p = 0.023)$
	DLiSA-II	2.432 (0.057)	$0.662 \ (p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA	3.152 (0.042)	
W6	DLiSA-I	3.160 (0.052)	$0.545 \ (p = 0.224)$
	DLiSA-II	3.182 (0.081)	$0.615 \ (p = 0.002)$
	DLiSA	1.137 (0.016)	
W7	DLiSA-I	1.139 (0.022)	$0.532 \ (p = 0.350)$
	DLiSA-II	1.146 (0.027)	$0.626 \ (p = 0.001)$
	DLiSA	7.076 (0.077)	
W8	DLiSA-I	7.090 (0.111)	$0.547 \ (p = 0.217)$
	DLiSA-II	7.151 (0.193)	$0.648 \ (p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA	1.051 (0.014)	
W9	DLiSA-I	1.050 (0.013)	$0.513 \ (p = 0.730)$
	DLiSA-II	1.057 (0.018)	$0.625 \ (p = 0.001)$
	DLiSA	1.117 (0.017)	
W10	DLiSA-I	1.117 (0.012)	$0.530 \ (p = 0.360)$
	DLiSA-II	1.120 (0.017)	$0.553 \ (p = 0.110)$
	DLiSA	1.628 (0.038)	
W11	DLiSA-I	1.640 (0.049)	$0.600 \ (p = 0.006)$
	DLiSA-II	1.650 (0.052)	0.632 $(p < 0.001)$
BLE X:	Performance	e comparison o	f DLiSA again s
			I) of over 100 ru
			screpancies are sho
old (\hat{A}_1	12 > 0.56 and	p value < 0.03	5), where green c
		•	r red cells other

W1**0.697** (p < 0.001)DLiSA-I 1.466 (1.755) 0.941 (0.219) DLiSA-II $0.532 \ (p = 0.427)$ 3.496 (0.501) DLiSA W2 5.120 (6.379) **0.702** (p < 0.001)DLiSA-I DLiSA-II 3.637 (0.640) $0.576 \ (p = 0.063)$ DLiSA 1.313 (0.313) W3 $0.616 \ (p = 0.004)$ DLiSA-I

Mean (Std)

0.933 (0.152)

 A_{12} (p value)

Algorithm

DLiSA

Workload

otherwise.

W4

W5

W6

$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	W 3	DLISA-I	2.131 (2.990)	$0.010 \ (p = 0.004)$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA-II		$0.552 \ (p = 0.206)$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA	1.613 (0.373)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	W4	DLiSA-I	2.277 (2.193)	0.699 $(p < 0.001)$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA-II	1.683 (0.389)	0.589 (p = 0.03)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA	3.185 (0.424)	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{DLiSA} & 0.100 \ (0.016) \\ \text{W6} & \begin{array}{c} \text{DLiSA-I} \\ \text{DLiSA-I} \\ \text{DLiSA-II} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0.130 \ (0.105) \\ \text{DLiSA-II} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0.102 \ (0.015) \\ \text{O.561} \ (p=0.124) \\ \text{DLISA-II} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0.589 \ (0.151) \\ \text{DLISA-II} \\ \text{DLISA-II} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0.589 \ (0.151) \\ \text{DLISA-II} \\ \text{O.589} \ (0.125) \\ \text{DLISA-II} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0.589 \ (0.125) \\ \text{O.528} \ (p=0.495) \\ \text{DLISA-II} \\ \text{O.137} \ (0.022) \\ \text{W8} & \begin{array}{c} \text{DLISA-I} \\ \text{DLISA-II} \\ \text{O.139} \ (0.024) \\ \text{DLISA-II} \\ \text{O.504} \ (p=0.922) \\ \text{DLISA-II} \\ \text{O.247} \ (0.034) \\ \text{W9} \\ \text{DLISA-II} \\ \text{O.283} \ (0.195) \\ \text{O.577} \ (p=0.056) \\ \end{array}$	W5	DLiSA-I	4.688 (5.025)	0.668 $(p < 0.001)$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA-II	3.256 (0.529)	$0.534 \ (p = 0.409)$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA	0.100 (0.016)	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	W6	DLiSA-I	0.130 (0.105)	0.678 $(p < 0.001)$
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA-II	0.102 (0.015)	$0.561 \ (p = 0.124)$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		DLiSA	0.589 (0.151)	
W8 DLiSA 0.137 (0.022) DLiSA-I 0.187 (0.188) DLiSA-II 0.139 (0.024) 0.504 ($p = 0.922$) DLiSA 0.247 (0.034) W9 DLiSA-I 0.283 (0.195) 0.577 ($p = 0.056$)	W7	DLiSA-I	0.917 (1.191)	$0.626 \ (p = 0.002)$
W8 DLiSA-I 0.187 (0.188) 0.656 ($p < 0.001$) DLiSA-II 0.139 (0.024) 0.504 ($p = 0.922$) DLiSA 0.247 (0.034) W9 DLiSA-I 0.283 (0.195) 0.577 ($p = 0.056$)		DLiSA-II	0.589 (0.125)	$0.528 \ (p = 0.495)$
DLiSA-II 0.139 (0.024) 0.504 (p = 0.922) DLiSA 0.247 (0.034) W9 DLiSA-I 0.283 (0.195) 0.577 (p = 0.056)		DLiSA	0.137 (0.022)	
DLiSA 0.247 (0.034) W9 DLiSA-I 0.283 (0.195) 0.577 (p = 0.056)	W8	DLiSA-I	0.187 (0.188)	0.656 $(p < 0.001)$
W9 DLiSA-I 0.283 (0.195) 0.577 ($p = 0.056$)		DLiSA-II	0.139 (0.024)	$0.504 \ (p = 0.922)$
		DLiSA	0.247 (0.034)	
DLiSA-II 0.251 (0.039) 0.514 $(p = 0.732)$	W9	DLiSA-I	0.283 (0.195)	$0.577 \ (p = 0.056)$
		DLiSA-II	0.251 (0.039)	$0.514 \ (p = 0.732)$
	BLE X	III: Performat	nce comparison	n of DLiSA agair
BLE XIII: Performance comparison of DidSA again			•	•
<u>.</u>				
variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 10	n in syst	em JUMP3R.	Statistically sig	gnificant discrepanci
ABLE XIII: Performance comparison of DLiSA again variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 10 n in system JUMP3R. Statistically significant discrepance				- I

 \hat{A}_{12} (p value) Workload Algorithm Mean (Std) 2.573 (0.828) DLiSA 0.593 (p = 0.023)DLiSA-I 2.644 (0.629) 2.565 (0.624) $0.546 \ (p = 0.263)$ DLiSA-II DLiSA 0.846 (0.197) 0.927 (0.252) 0.606 (p = 0.009)W2 DLiSA-I 0.908 (0.226) $0.592 \ (p = 0.025)$ DLiSA-II 1.309 (0.368) DLiSA **0.611** (p = 0.007)W3 1.431 (0.384) DLiSA-I

1.380 (0.365)

0.642 (0.076)

0.678 (0.136)

0.691 (0.141)

1.045 (0.246)

1.127 (0.281)

1.174 (0.378) 0.298 (0.018)

0.307 (0.028)

0.305 (0.033)

 $0.573 \ (p = 0.075)$

 $\mathbf{0.582} \ (p = \mathbf{0.045})$

 $0.594 \ (p = 0.021)$

 $0.642 \ (p = 0.001)$ $0.631 \ (p = 0.001)$

 $0.622 \ (p = 0.002)$

0.565 (p = 0.099)

DLiSA-II

DLiSA-I DLiSA-II

DLiSA-I

DLiSA-II

DLiSA-I

DLiSA-II

DLiSA

DLiSA

DLiSA

are shown in bold ($A_{12}>0.56$ and p value < 0.05), where green cells indicate that DLiSA performs better; or red cells

TABLE IX:	Performanc	e comparison of	f DLiSA	against its
variants (i.e.	,DLiSA-I	and DLiSA-II	() of over	100 run in
		significant disc		
in bold (\hat{A}_{12}	> 0.56 and	p value < 0.05), where	green cells
indicate that	DLiSA pe	rforms better; or	red cells	otherwise.
			^	
Workload	Algorithm	Mean (Std)	\hat{A}_{12} (p va	alue)
	DI.iSA	3 693 (0 772)		

Workload	Algorithm	Mean (Std)	\hat{A}_{12} (p value)
	DLiSA	3.693 (0.772)	
W1	DLiSA-I	5.958 (3.322)	$0.809 \ (p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	3.954 (1.016)	$0.615 \ (p = 0.005)$
	DLiSA	0.012 (0.004)	
W2	DLiSA-I	0.017 (0.007)	$0.688 \ (p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	0.012 (0.004)	$0.525 \ (p = 0.374)$
	DLiSA	3.582 (0.650)	
W3	DLiSA-I	5.619 (2.737)	0.776 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	3.786 (0.882)	$0.576 \ (p = 0.063)$
	DLiSA	11.001 (3.132)	
W4	DLiSA-I	18.954 (15.539)	0.785 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	11.113 (2.941)	$0.528 \ (p = 0.500)$
	DLiSA	10.406 (2.390)	
W5	DLiSA-I	16.746 (8.990)	0.809 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	11.480 (3.324)	$0.592 \ (p = 0.025)$
	DLiSA	1.552 (0.410)	
W6	DLiSA-I	2.749 (1.397)	0.850 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	1.750 (0.457)	0.646 $(p < 0.001)$
W7	DLiSA	0.193 (0.010)	
	DLiSA-I	0.230 (0.047)	$0.828 \ (p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	0.201 (0.018)	$0.620 \ (p = 0.002)$
W8	DLiSA	22.957 (5.456)	
	DLiSA-I	34.327 (14.209)	0.775 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	24.631 (7.130)	$0.556 \ (p = 0.174)$
	DLiSA	20.050 (4.127)	
W9	DLiSA-I	35.576 (29.394)	0.811 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	21.464 (5.679)	$0.572 \ (p = 0.079)$
W10	DLiSA	10.280 (2.502)	
	DLiSA-I	16.846 (10.210)	0.811 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	10.978 (3.135)	$0.566 \ (p = 0.109)$
	DLiSA	2.604 (0.539)	
W11	DLiSA-I	3.957 (1.900)	0.782 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	2.858 (0.832)	$0.586 \ (p = 0.035)$
	DLiSA	5.132 (1.234)	
W12	DLiSA-I	9.175 (6.526)	0.830 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	5.678 (1.753)	$0.588 \ (p = 0.032)$
	DLiSA	2.840 (0.573)	
W13	DLiSA-I	4.112 (1.645)	0.774 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	3.123 (0.856)	$0.586 \ (p = 0.036)$

Workload Mean (Std) Algorithm \hat{A}_{12} (p value) 1.849 (0.105) DLiSA W1 $0.638 \ (p = 0.001)$ 1.881 (0.130) DLiSA-I 1.881 (0.117) $0.646 \ (p < 0.001)$ DLiSA-II 1.115 (0.049) DLiSA DLiSA-I W2 1.128 (0.078) 0.524 (p = 0.552)DLiSA-II 1.132 (0.081) 0.544 (p = 0.280)0.375 (0.008) DLiSA 0.548 (p = 0.182)W3 DLiSA-I 0.376 (0.007) DLiSA-II 0.377 (0.008) 0.589 (p = 0.017)DLiSA 1.605 (0.067) DLiSA-I 1.611 (0.072) 0.549 (p = 0.223)DLiSA-II 1.618 (0.075) $0.576 \ (p = 0.059)$ DLiSA 0.503 (0.019) W5 DLiSA-I 0.505 (0.021) $0.541 \ (p = 0.304)$ 0.509 (0.020) $0.596 \ (p = 0.016)$ DLiSA-II 0.376 (0.011) DLiSA

TABLE XV: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its

variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run

in system DCONVERT. Statistically significant discrepancies

are shown in bold ($A_{12}>0.56$ and p value < 0.05), where

green cells indicate that DLiSA performs better; or red cells

otherwise.

otherwise.

W6 DLiSA-I 0.379 (0.011) $\mathbf{0.579} \ (p = \mathbf{0.041})$ DLiSA-II 0.383 (0.013) $0.641 \ (p < 0.001)$ 17.366 (2.734) DLiSA W7 DLiSA-I 17.582 (3.134) $0.566 \ (p = 0.103)$ DLiSA-II 17.754 (3.067) $0.565 \ (p = 0.109)$ DLiSA 1.032 (0.027) W8DLiSA-I 1.040 (0.032) 0.570~(p=0.081)DLiSA-II 1.044 (0.033) 0.617 (p = 0.004)DLiSA 0.473 (0.014) W9 DLiSA-I 0.476 (0.014) $0.566 \ (p = 0.098)$ DLiSA-II 0.475 (0.016) $0.555 \ (p = 0.170)$ DLiSA 1.438 (0.009) W10 DLiSA-I 1.440 (0.010) $0.554 \ (p = 0.165)$ DLiSA-II 1.440 (0.011) $0.532 \ (p = 0.403)$ 1.444 (0.019) DLiSA W11 DLiSA-I 1.447 (0.017) $0.555 \ (p = 0.171)$ DLiSA-II 1.447 (0.018) $0.533 \ (p = 0.415)$ DLiSA 0.487 (0.007) 0.522 (p = 0.561)W12 DLiSA-I 0.488(0.010)DLiSA-II 0.488 (0.008) $0.559 \ (p = 0.118)$ TABLE XII: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in system KANZI. Statistically significant discrepancies are shown in bold ($\hat{A}_{12}>0.56$ and p value < 0.05), where

Workload Algorithm Mean (Std) A_{12} (p value) DLiSA 0.986 (0.866) **0.682** (p < 0.001)W12.148 (3.514) DLiSA-I 1.227 (1.142) 0.587 (p = 0.034)DLiSA-II 0.131 (0.032) DLiSA $0.680 \ (p < 0.001)$ W2 DLiSA-I 0.158 (0.049) $0.618 \ (p = 0.003)$ 0.146 (0.039) DLiSA-II 0.308 (0.129) DLiSA 0.527 (0.94) W3 0.579 (p = 0.054)DLiSA-I

0.312 (0.208)

1.173 (0.697)

DLiSA-II DLiSA $0.529 \ (p = 0.470)$

green cells indicate that DLiSA performs better; or red cells

W4	DLiSA-I	2.601 (3.114)	0.702 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	1.603 (1.173)	0.619 $(p = 0.004)$
	DLiSA	0.938 (0.604)	
W5	DLiSA-I	1.589 (1.446)	0.708 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	1.194 (0.881)	$0.593 \ (p = 0.023)$
	DLiSA	0.433 (0.263)	
W6	DLiSA-I	0.647 (0.536)	0.644 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	0.514 (0.402)	$0.521 \ (p = 0.616)$
	DLiSA	0.177 (0.078)	
W7	DLiSA-I	0.234 (0.155)	$0.637 \ (p = 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	0.188 (0.075)	$0.568 \ (p = 0.093)$
	DLiSA	2.347 (2.228)	
W8	DLiSA-I	5.643 (9.41)	0.690 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	3.203 (3.692)	$0.593 \ (p = 0.024)$
	DLiSA	0.709 (0.585)	
W9	DLiSA-I	1.402 (2.631)	0.670 $(p < 0.001)$
	DLiSA-II	0.851 (0.621)	0.595 (p = 0.021)
	DEISA-II	0.631 (0.021)	0.335 (p = 0.021)
BLE XI	V: Performan	ce comparison	of DLiSA again

Workload Algorithm Mean (Std) \hat{A}_{12} (p value) DLiSA 26721.450 (705.601) W1DLiSA-I 26489.732 (775.103) **0.641** (p = 0.001)26644.835 (654.267) DLiSA-II $0.566 \ (p = 0.104)$ 18972.982 (758.262) DLiSA **0.599** (p = 0.015)W2 18863.828 (809.835) DLiSA-I DLiSA-II 18931.037 (547.111) $0.559 \ (p = 0.150)$ 948.344 (38.602) 943.536 (41.821) W3 $0.541\ (p=0.315)$

variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in

system H2. Statistically significant discrepancies are shown

in bold ($A_{12}>0.56$ and p value < 0.05), where green cells indicate that DLiSA performs better; or red cells otherwise.

		` /	4 /
	DLiSA-II	938.459 (45.506)	$0.567 \ (p = 0.100)$
	DLiSA	1032.006 (45.261)	
W4	DLiSA-I	1013.514 (82.642)	$0.578 \ (p = 0.057)$
	DLiSA-II	1006.602 (88.074)	$0.602 \ (p = 0.013)$
	DLiSA	47835.194 (2491.758)	
W5	DLiSA-I	47999.853 (1876.084)	0.509 (p = 0.830)
	DLiSA-II	47763.929 (2437.681)	$0.543 \ (p = 0.290)$
	DLiSA	48335.083 (488.968)	
W6	DLiSA-I	48277.883 (559.910)	$0.548 \ (p = 0.239)$
	DLiSA-II	47866.219 (1882.315)	$0.638 \ (p = 0.001)$
	DLiSA	20037.040 (1584.735)	
W7	DLiSA-I	20103.313 (1244.099)	$0.530 \ (p = 0.457)$
	DLiSA-II	20124.243 (1258.559)	$0.500 \ (p = 0.993)$
	DLiSA	28129.890 (1669.565)	
W8	DLiSA-I	28033.752 (1665.729)	$0.523 \ (p = 0.572)$
	DLiSA-II	27691.456 (1923.862)	$0.566 \ (p = 0.108)$
		,	