TABLE VIII: Performance comparison of DLiSA against its variants (i.e., DLiSA-I and DLiSA-II) of over 100 run in system Z3. 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	5.856 (0.011)	
	DLiSA-I	5.856 (0.011)	0.519 ($p = 0.582$)
	DLiSA-II	5.858 (0.012)	0.558 ($p = 0.095$)
W2	DLiSA	2.254 (0.608)	
	DLiSA-I	2.120 (0.510)	0.555 ($p = 0.132$)
	DLiSA-II	1.998 (0.435)	**0.619 ($p < 0.001$)**
W3	DLiSA	0.364 (0.660)	
	DLiSA-I	0.302 (0.617)	0.506 ($p = 0.861$)
	DLiSA-II	0.354 (0.627)	0.511 ($p = 0.770$)
W4	DLiSA	2.324 (0.150)	
	DLiSA-I	2.313 (0.130)	0.503 ($p = 0.933$)
	DLiSA-II	2.303 (0.107)	0.508 ($p = 0.826$)
W5	DLiSA	3.150 (0.111)	
	DLiSA-I	3.173 (0.237)	0.532 ($p = 0.385$)
	DLiSA-II	3.170 (0.097)	**0.629 ($p < 0.001$)**
W6	DLiSA	1.322 (0.130)	
	DLiSA-I	1.313 (0.085)	0.513 ($p = 0.618$)
	DLiSA-II	1.387 (0.245)	**0.585 ($p = 0.006$)**
W7	DLiSA	0.292 (0.458)	
	DLiSA-I	0.221 (0.004)	0.532 ($p = 0.102$)
	DLiSA-II	0.249 (0.152)	0.522 ($p = 0.365$)
W8	DLiSA	8.746 (0.005)	
	DLiSA-I	8.746 (0.005)	0.508 ($p = 0.823$)
	DLiSA-II	8.806 (0.590)	0.520 ($p = 0.570$)
W9	DLiSA	3.181 (0.003)	
	DLiSA-I	3.181 (0.003)	0.515 ($p = 0.491$)
	DLiSA-II	3.182 (0.004)	0.530 ($p = 0.237$)
W10	DLiSA	6.816 (0.236)	
	DLiSA-I	6.804 (0.222)	0.502 ($p = 0.953$)
	DLiSA-II	6.817 (0.246)	0.513 ($p = 0.746$)
W11	DLiSA	7.948 (0.654)	
	DLiSA-I	7.940 (0.499)	0.504 ($p = 0.919$)
	DLiSA-II	7.940 (0.506)	0.517 ($p = 0.677$)
W12	DLiSA	3.878 (0.009)	
	DLiSA-I	3.878 (0.008)	0.507 ($p = 0.846$)
	DLiSA-II	3.900 (0.148)	**0.595 ($p = 0.014$)**