

TABLE XV: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in system DCONVERT. 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	1.849 (0.105)	
	DLiSA-I	1.881 (0.130)	<b>0.638</b> ( $p = 0.001$ )
	DLiSA-II	1.881 (0.117)	<b>0.646</b> ( $p < 0.001$ )
W2	DLiSA	1.115 (0.049)	
	DLiSA-I	1.128 (0.078)	0.524 ( $p = 0.552$ )
	DLiSA-II	1.132 (0.081)	0.544 ( $p = 0.280$ )
W3	DLiSA	0.375 (0.008)	
	DLiSA-I	0.376 (0.007)	0.548 ( $p = 0.182$ )
	DLiSA-II	0.377 (0.008)	<b>0.589</b> ( $p = 0.017$ )
W4	DLiSA	1.605 (0.067)	
	DLiSA-I	1.611 (0.072)	0.549 ( $p = 0.223$ )
	DLiSA-II	1.618 (0.075)	0.576 ( $p = 0.059$ )
W5	DLiSA	0.503 (0.019)	
	DLiSA-I	0.505 (0.021)	0.541 ( $p = 0.304$ )
	DLiSA-II	0.509 (0.020)	<b>0.596</b> ( $p = 0.016$ )
W6	DLiSA	0.376 (0.011)	
	DLiSA-I	0.379 (0.011)	<b>0.579</b> ( $p = 0.041$ )
	DLiSA-II	0.383 (0.013)	<b>0.641</b> ( $p < 0.001$ )
W7	DLiSA	17.366 (2.734)	
	DLiSA-I	17.582 (3.134)	0.566 ( $p = 0.103$ )
	DLiSA-II	17.754 (3.067)	0.565 ( $p = 0.109$ )
W8	DLiSA	1.032 (0.027)	
	DLiSA-I	1.040 (0.032)	0.570 ( $p = 0.081$ )
	DLiSA-II	1.044 (0.033)	<b>0.617</b> ( $p = 0.004$ )
W9	DLiSA	0.473 (0.014)	
	DLiSA-I	0.476 (0.014)	0.566 ( $p = 0.098$ )
	DLiSA-II	0.475 (0.016)	0.555 ( $p = 0.170$ )
W10	DLiSA	1.438 (0.009)	
	DLiSA-I	1.440 (0.010)	0.554 ( $p = 0.165$ )
	DLiSA-II	1.440 (0.011)	0.532 ( $p = 0.403$ )
W11	DLiSA	1.444 (0.019)	
	DLiSA-I	1.447 (0.017)	0.555 ( $p = 0.171$ )
	DLiSA-II	1.447 (0.018)	0.533 ( $p = 0.415$ )
W12	DLiSA	0.487 (0.007)	
	DLiSA-I	0.488 (0.010)	0.522 ( $p = 0.561$ )
	DLiSA-II	0.488 (0.008)	0.559 ( $p = 0.118$ )