TABLE IX: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in system XZ. 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)
W1	DLiSA	3.813 (0.849)	
	DLiSA-I	5.871 (3.399)	**0.762** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	4.494 (1.316)	**0.674** (p **<0.001**)
W2	DLiSA	0.011 (0.003)	
	DLiSA-I	0.018 (0.008)	**0.746** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	0.012 (0.004)	0.535 (p = 0.149)
W3	DLiSA	3.835 (0.966)	
	DLiSA-I	5.976 (3.116)	**0.790** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	3.998 (1.023)	**0.588** (p **= 0.033**)
W4	DLiSA	11.102 (2.73)	
	DLiSA-I	21.186 (19.258)	**0.753** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	11.682 (3.294)	0.538 (p = 0.352)
W5	DLiSA	11.702 (3.297)	
	DLiSA-I	18.852 (11.245)	**0.782** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	12.161 (3.802)	0.522 (p = 0.583)
W6	DLiSA	1.638 (0.375)	
	DLiSA-I	2.622 (1.17)	**0.799** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	1.79 (0.492)	**0.586** (p **= 0.036**)
W7	DLiSA	0.196 (0.015)	
	DLiSA-I	0.235 (0.052)	**0.810** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	0.199 (0.016)	0.567 (p = 0.088)
W8	DLiSA	23.789 (5.998)	
	DLiSA-I	37.162 (19.153)	**0.787** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	26.167 (7.82)	0.569 (p = 0.094)
W9	DLiSA	21.324 (5.188)	
	DLiSA-I	41.339 (34.657)	**0.831** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	23.112 (6.467)	0.578 (p = 0.058)
W10	DLiSA	10.605 (2.606)	
	DLiSA-I	18.148 (12.152)	**0.816** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	11.607 (2.975)	**0.596** (p **= 0.019**)
W11	DLiSA	2.804 (0.775)	
	DLiSA-I	4.016 (1.902)	**0.751** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	3.051 (0.802)	**0.587** (p **= 0.033**)
W12	DLiSA	5.341 (1.318)	
	DLiSA-I	8.681 (5.194)	**0.771** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	5.809 (1.667)	0.570 (p = 0.085)
W13	DLiSA	2.939 (0.721)	
	DLiSA-I	4.274 (1.697)	**0.790** (p **<0.001**)
	DLiSA-II	3.163 (0.838)	0.573 (p = 0.073)