

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)
W1	DLiSA	3.135 (0.035)	
	DLiSA-I	3.132 (0.029)	0.549 ($p = 0.196$)
	DLiSA-II	3.152 (0.071)	0.508 ($p = 0.827$)
W2	DLiSA	0.030 (0.000)	
	DLiSA-I	0.030 (0.000)	0.500 ($p = 1.000$)
	DLiSA-II	0.030 (0.001)	0.505 ($p = 0.322$)
W3	DLiSA	3.305 (0.014)	
	DLiSA-I	3.310 (0.020)	0.586 ($p = 0.015$)
	DLiSA-II	3.312 (0.022)	0.611 ($p = 0.002$)
W4	DLiSA	7.159 (0.032)	
	DLiSA-I	7.191 (0.120)	0.572 ($p = 0.017$)
	DLiSA-II	7.189 (0.123)	0.579 ($p = 0.014$)
W5	DLiSA	33.421 (0.150)	
	DLiSA-I	33.401 (0.020)	0.502 ($p = 0.944$)
	DLiSA-II	33.420 (0.155)	0.520 ($p = 0.524$)
W6	DLiSA	0.971 (0.003)	
	DLiSA-I	0.973 (0.006)	0.542 ($p = 0.079$)
	DLiSA-II	0.973 (0.008)	0.548 ($p = 0.047$)
W7	DLiSA	0.192 (0.004)	
	DLiSA-I	0.194 (0.005)	0.570 ($p = 0.030$)
	DLiSA-II	0.194 (0.006)	0.598 ($p = 0.003$)
W8	DLiSA	10.907 (0.020)	
	DLiSA-I	10.917 (0.033)	0.574 ($p = 0.016$)
	DLiSA-II	10.927 (0.070)	0.581 ($p = 0.009$)
W9	DLiSA	9.197 (0.314)	
	DLiSA-I	9.232 (0.323)	0.529 ($p = 0.444$)
	DLiSA-II	9.304 (0.452)	0.543 ($p = 0.268$)
W10	DLiSA	5.358 (0.228)	
	DLiSA-I	5.459 (0.326)	0.589 ($p = 0.006$)
	DLiSA-II	5.480 (0.343)	0.595 ($p = 0.003$)
W11	DLiSA	2.089 (0.022)	
	DLiSA-I	2.095 (0.029)	0.512 ($p = 0.734$)
	DLiSA-II	2.104 (0.041)	0.565 ($p = 0.080$)
W12	DLiSA	3.477 (0.065)	
	DLiSA-I	3.484 (0.073)	0.509 ($p = 0.811$)
	DLiSA-II	3.483 (0.077)	0.515 ($p = 0.695$)
W13	DLiSA	2.530 (0.018)	
	DLiSA-I	2.530 (0.018)	0.513 ($p = 0.692$)
	DLiSA-II	2.532 (0.019)	0.538 ($p = 0.265$)