TABLE X: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in system x264. 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 | 0.890 (0.140) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 1.070 (0.963) | **0.648** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 0.954 (0.228) | 0.567 ($p$ = 0.100) |
| W2 | DLiSA | 3.590 (0.567) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 4.130 (1.004) | **0.660** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 3.731 (0.789) | 0.524 ($p$ = 0.562) |
| W3 | DLiSA | 1.286 (0.248) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 1.466 (0.365) | **0.656** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 1.344 (0.338) | 0.544 ($p$ = 0.278) |
| W4 | DLiSA | 1.586 (0.236) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 1.935 (1.281) | **0.666** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 1.649 (0.364) | 0.516 ($p$ = 0.702) |
| W5 | DLiSA | 3.222 (0.514) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 3.670 (0.939) | **0.659** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 3.442 (0.895) | 0.550 ($p$ = 0.218) |
| W6 | DLiSA | 0.100 (0.013) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 0.115 (0.049) | **0.687** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 0.104 (0.015) | 0.573 ($p$ = 0.065) |
| W7 | DLiSA | 0.572 (0.110) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 0.668 (0.201) | **0.656** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 0.583 (0.131) | 0.513 ($p$ = 0.75) |
| W8 | DLiSA | 0.133 (0.019) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 0.166 (0.133) | **0.658** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 0.138 (0.022) | 0.567 ($p$ = 0.091) |
| W9 | DLiSA | 0.240 (0.031) | |
| | DLiSA-I | 0.258 (0.042) | **0.657** (**$p$ <0.001**) |
| | DLiSA-II | 0.243 (0.030) | 0.535 ($p$ = 0.383) |