Autoscaling Strategy Comparison - Absolute Metrics

Strategy I	nfrastructure Power (V	Workload Power (W)	Power per Replica (W)	Power per Node (WM)	ledian Response Time (95th Percentile (s)	Warm-up Avg (s)	Total Replicas	Unique Nodes Used	Avg Replicas/Node	Max Replicas/Node	Scale Up Actions	Scale Down Actions	Total Scaling Actions	Scheduling Events	Consolidation FactorS	cheduling Success Rat
Kubernetes	519.4	6577.5	3.22	4.36	1121.01	4485.887	10310.931	2040	39	52.3	228	401	1064	1465	1254	2.72	1.0
HPST	435.1	8885.9	3.64	3.66	1052.111	4909.099	4262.024	2443	119	20.5	66	558	311	869	2445	1.07	0.706
LPLT	544.8	2649.9	2.99	4.58	1180.832	4909.099	11809.096	885	46	19.2	193	175	482	657	576	1.0	1.0

Strategy Performance Comparisons (%)

Strategy Ir	nfrastructure Power Δ (🛭	Vorkload Efficiency Δ (%	Response Time Δ (%)	Cold Start Δ (%)
K8S vs HPST	-16.2	13.0	-6.1	-58.7
K8S vs LPLT	4.9	-7.1	5.3	14.5
HPST vs LPLT	-20.1	21.7	-10.9	-63.9

Performance Rankings by Category

```
☐ STRATEGY RANKINGS SUMMARY
Energy Efficiency (W/replica):
  1. LPLT (2.99) 2. K8S (3.22) 3. HPST (3.64)
Infrastructure Power:
  1. HPST (435.1W) 2. K8S (519.4W) 3. LPLT (544.8W)
Response Time:
  1. HPST (1052s) 2. K8S (1121s) 3. LPLT (1181s)
Cold Start Performance:
  1. HPST (4262s) 2. K8S (10311s) 3. LPLT (11809s)
Resource Utilization:
  1. K8S (52.3 rep/node) 2. LPLT (19.2) 3. HPST (20.5)
Scaling Stability:
  1. LPLT (657 actions) 2. HPST (869) 3. K8S (1465)
```