

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Application of Machine Learning for the Higgs Boson Mass Reconstruction Using ATLAS Data.
Author's name:	Adam Herold
Type of thesis :	bachelor
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Cybernetics and Robotics
Thesis reviewer:	Babar Ali
Reviewer's department:	IEAP

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	challenging
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	
The task has been challenging as it involved a complex input data structure. Several data sets were provided which required a weighting to match the expectations in the real experiment. Furthermore, two different networks had to be applied, one for the best possible assignment of the elementary particles, and the other one for the reconstructing the Higgs boson mass. The neural network itself has not been particularly challenging.	

Fulfilment of assignment	fulfilled with minor objections
<i>How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.</i>	
The provided code for Higgs boson mass reconstruction was well studied and understood. The existing neural network code was further developed on the generated truth level, and also with simulated data of the ATLAS detector. The attribution of the reconstructed objects to the Higgs boson and top quark decays were studied and the correct attribution was quantified. The expected mass accuracy was determined and optimized with simulated data of the ATLAS detector. Finally, the developed algorithm was applied to the actual data recorded by the ATLAS experiment and determine the Higgs boson mass, however, not its uncertainty. A minor objection is that the ordering of the features was not performed. Also a scaling should have been applied such that the Higgs boson mass matched the known value. The code developed by the student is not well documented.	

Activity and independence when creating final thesis	B - very good.
<i>Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.</i>	
The student has been very active, approached the scientific work systematically. He also reported in internal meetings and demonstrated his progress. The student was well prepared for the consultations and clearly able to work independently.	

Technical level	B - very good.
<i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i>	
The contents of the thesis is sound and his expertise is employed. The student has explained clearly the research he has done.	

Formal level and language level, scope of thesis	B - very good.
---------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?

Overall the thesis is well written, and the English is very good. Minor format inconsistencies are in the citations, and also the application on real data could have been explained further and more conclusions drawn, also a list for future developments would have been useful.

Selection of sources, citation correctness

B - very good.

Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?

Adequate reference are given, and the student own contribution is well documented. The bibliographic citations meet the standard.

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

Overall the quality of the thesis is good, and has potential for further development, some aspects that the features were not order and their number reduced was missing, also for the real data the jet variables where not used and when it was identified there was not enough time to correct it before the submission date..

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading.

The thesis fulfills all tasks with minor objections, they could have been solved with more time before the submission date. The thesis describes very well the work done, it is original and the outcome useful. The usefulness would be higher with better description of the code. Scientifically, the scaling of the reconstructed masses and the estimate of the uncertainty would be useful. Also, the comparison with the missing mass calculator result is well done, however, a standard code was applied and not particularly adapted to the specific case. The use of two different input data production resulted in not using the jet information for the assignment and thus reduced the correct assignment probability significantly. These items should have been listed in the thesis for future research. Overall, the student show much motivation, addressed the tasks systematicalls and work independently while regularly reporting the progress.

The grade that I award for the thesis is B - very good.

Date: 20.1.2022

Signature: Andre Sopczak, Jan Kybic