

	Miniznc						Gecode			
	min		med				min		med	
n	time(ms)	fail	time(ms)	fail		n	time(ms)	fail	time(ms)	fail
10	1.438	9	1.065	0		10	0.536	9	0.494	1
20	3.698	33	4.759	21		20	2.463	33	1.307	7
30	9.754	29	7.869	81		30	3.33	29	3.722	32
40	15.626	19	13.87	44		40	5.164	19	4.878	12
50	30.45	512	20.924	2		50	13.428	512	8.796	16
60	44.704	406	32.498	3		60	13.422	406	9.352	1
70	84.039	1	40.47	14		70	12.292	1	13.985	0
80	61.839	21	54.518	0		80	16.268	21	18.798	41
90	75.415	341	72.88	96		90	30.982	341	22.32	1
100	150.475	22	91.316	60		100	30.889	22	30.99	1
110	215005.137	9679544	111.507	0		110	198918.503	9679544	56.512	466
120	168299.361	5889835	139.524	19		120	159707.583	5889835	42.742	1
130	*	*	181.473	26		130	*	*	58.861	3
140	422104.684	13898607	204.161	0		140	396132.248	13898607	61.005	19
150	6920.364	319289	240.22	4		150	6378.172	319289	136.209	6064
160	239.77	8	242.084	0		160	84.171	8	82.736	0
170	285.465	85	264.746	1		170	91.581	85	94.996	3
180	*	*	312.976	7		180	*	*	121.254	4
190	*	*	416.315	7900		190	*	*	137.576	168
200	3247.169	146838	415.341	8		200	3280.595	146838	151.075	4
*	No result within 10 mins					*	No result within 10 mins			

	Conclusions
	(1) Since we want to compare the performance difference of min and med, I tried to control all other factors, and deliberately discard the global constraint (all_different/distinct) for all four implementations above
	(2) "first-fail, median-domain-value" (short for med) search method is generally faster than the "first-fail, minimum-domain-value" (short for min) search method.
	(3) To find the first solution, the med search method is relatively stable. The run time of the med search method is relatively propotional to the boardsize.
	(4) To find the first solution, the min search method is relatively unstable. While $n = 130$, $n = 180$, $n = 190$ produces no result within 10 mins, we can find a solution for $n = 200$ within 3 seconds. The run time of the min search method is not propotional to the boardsize.