

TABLE XIV: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in system H2. 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	26721.450 (705.601)	
	DLiSA-I	26489.732 (775.103)	0.641 ($p = 0.001$)
	DLiSA-II	26644.835 (654.267)	0.566 ($p = 0.104$)
W2	DLiSA	18972.982 (758.262)	
	DLiSA-I	18863.828 (809.835)	0.599 ($p = 0.015$)
	DLiSA-II	18931.037 (547.111)	0.559 ($p = 0.150$)
W3	DLiSA	948.344 (38.602)	
	DLiSA-I	943.536 (41.821)	0.541 ($p = 0.315$)
	DLiSA-II	938.459 (45.506)	0.567 ($p = 0.100$)
W4	DLiSA	1032.006 (45.261)	
	DLiSA-I	1013.514 (82.642)	0.578 ($p = 0.057$)
	DLiSA-II	1006.602 (88.074)	0.602 ($p = 0.013$)
W5	DLiSA	47835.194 (2491.758)	
	DLiSA-I	47999.853 (1876.084)	0.509 ($p = 0.830$)
	DLiSA-II	47763.929 (2437.681)	0.543 ($p = 0.290$)
W6	DLiSA	48335.083 (488.968)	
	DLiSA-I	48277.883 (559.910)	0.548 ($p = 0.239$)
	DLiSA-II	47866.219 (1882.315)	0.638 ($p = 0.001$)
W7	DLiSA	20037.040 (1584.735)	
	DLiSA-I	20103.313 (1244.099)	0.530 ($p = 0.457$)
	DLiSA-II	20124.243 (1258.559)	0.500 ($p = 0.993$)
W8	DLiSA	28129.890 (1669.565)	
	DLiSA-I	28033.752 (1665.729)	0.523 ($p = 0.572$)
	DLiSA-II	27691.456 (1923.862)	0.566 ($p = 0.108$)