

## ABSTRACT

### OPTIMIZATION OF DERIVATION JOBS AND MODERNIZATION OF NIGHTLY CI BUILD I/O TESTS FOR THE ATLAS EXPERIMENT

Arthur C. Kraus, M.S.  
Department of Physics  
Northern Illinois University, 2025  
Dr. Jahred Adelman, Director

The ATLAS experiment's Software Performance Optimization Team has efforts in developing the Athena software framework that is scalable in performance and ready for widespread use during Run-3 and HL-LHC data ready to be used for Run-4. It's been shown that the storage bias for TTree's during derivation production jobs can be improved upon compression and stored to disk by about 4-5% by eliminating the basket capping, with a simultaneous increase in memory usage by about 11%. Additionally, job configuration allows opportunity to improve many facets of the ATLAS I/O framework.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
DE KALB, ILLINOIS

MAY 2025

OPTIMIZATION OF DERIVATION JOBS AND MODERNIZATION OF NIGHTLY CI  
BUILD I/O TESTS FOR THE ATLAS EXPERIMENT

BY

ARTHUR C. KRAUS  
© 2025 Arthur C. Kraus

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS

Dissertation Director:  
Dr. Jahred Adelman

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Here's where you acknowledge folks who helped. Here's where you acknowledge folks who helped. Here's where you acknowledge folks who helped. Here's where you acknowledge folks who helped. Here's where you acknowledge folks who helped.

## DEDICATION

To all of the fluffy kitties. To all of the fluffy kitties. To all of the fluffy kitties. To all of  
the fluffy kitties.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
1.1 Particle Physics and the Large Hadron Collider . . . . .	1
2 ATLAS I/O . . . . .	2
2.1 Athena and ROOT . . . . .	2
2.1.1 What is Athena . . . . .	2
2.1.2 What is ROOT. . . . .	2
2.1.3 How do they work together . . . . .	3
2.1.4 What is a derivation job . . . . .	3
2.2 xAOD Event Data Model. . . . .	3
2.2.1 What is an Event Data Model . . . . .	3
2.2.2 Why do we need an EDM . . . . .	3
3 TOY MODEL DERIVATION PRODUCTION . . . . .	4
3.1 Building the Toy Model. . . . .	4
3.2 Toy Model Derivation Production. . . . .	4
4 DATA AND MONTE CARLO DERIVATION PRODUCTION . . . . .	5
4.1 Current Derivation Framework. . . . .	5
4.2 Performance Metrics and Benchmarking . . . . .	5
4.3 Results. . . . .	6
4.3.1 Presence of basket-cap and presence of minimum number of entries. .	6

Chapter	Page
4.3.2 Comparing different basket sizes . . . . .	7
4.3.3 Monte Carlo PHYSLITE branch comparison . . . . .	8
4.3.4 Conclusion . . . . .	9
5 MODERNIZING I/O CI UNIT-TESTS . . . . .	10
APPENDIX: APPENDIX ONE . . . . .	12

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
4.1	Athena v22.0.16: Comparing the maximum proportional set size (PSS) and PHYS/PHYSLITE output file sizes (outFS) for data jobs over various Athena configurations for 160327 entries. . . . .	7
4.2	Athena v22.0.16: Comparing the maximum proportional set size (PSS) and PHYS/PHYSLITE output file sizes (outFS) for MC jobs over various Athena configurations for 140000 entries. . . . .	7
4.3	Athena v24.0.16: Comparing the maximum proportional set size (PSS) and PHYS/PHYSLITE output file sizes (outFS) for Data jobs over various Athena configurations for 160327 entries. . . . .	8

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Particle Physics and the Large Hadron Collider

Particle physics is the branch of physics that seeks out the origins of the universe by probing the smallest interactions at high energies. It has roots in electromagnetism, with the discovery of the electron and other particles, and quantum mechanics, that include descriptions of atoms, particles and their interactions both relativistic and non-relativistic speeds. There have been many efforts in experimentally probing for unique interactions, and the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) at CERN has been at the forefront in revealing new insights. The LHC is a 26.7-kilometer ring that crosses between the France-Switzerland border at a depth between 50 and 175 meters underground. [LHC FAQ the guide]



## CHAPTER 2

### ATLAS I/O

At any given time, code changes to Athena or the LCG stack could break various core I/O functionality. [1] A measure often taken to ensure stability and security of essential code functionality is the involvement of unit testing during continuous integration of new software. [Do I need to cite this ???] It's not always the case that new core I/O functionality is integrated into Athena with new unit tests.

#### 2.1 Athena and ROOT

##### 2.1.1 What is Athena

Athena is the open-source software framework for ATLAS. [Cite here] It relies on other software such as ROOT, Geant4 and other software as part of the LCG software stack. [cite here]

##### 2.1.2 What is ROOT

ROOT is an

### 2.1.3 How do they work together

### 2.1.4 What is a derivation job

## 2.2 xAOD Event Data Model

### 2.2.1 What is an Event Data Model

### 2.2.2 Why do we need an EDM

## CHAPTER 3

### TOY MODEL DERIVATION PRODUCTION

Building a toy model for derivation production jobs provides a schema by which it makes using real data and Monte Carlo simulated data much simpler. One general principle about both data and Monte Carlo is the branch data within both is made up a mixture of randomized floats and repeated integer-like data. If we test the ideas behind limiting basket sizes to see how it affects compression, effects should be evident.

#### 3.1 Building the Toy Model

#### 3.2 Toy Model Derivation Production

## CHAPTER 4

### DATA AND MONTE CARLO DERIVATION PRODUCTION

#### 4.1 Current Derivation Framework

Derivation production jobs suffer from high memory usage, and DAODs make up a bulk of disk-space usage. DAODs are used in physics analyses and ought to be optimized to alleviate stress on the GRID and to lower disk-space usage. Optimizing both disk-space and memory usage is a tricky balance as they are typically at odds with one another. For example, increasing memory output memory buffers results in lower disk-space usage due to better compression but the memory usage will increase since one will have to load a larger buffer into memory. The route we opted to take is by optimizing for disk-space and memory by testing various basket limits and viewing the effects of the branches on both data and Monte Carlo (MC) simulated analysis object data (AODs)

#### 4.2 Performance Metrics and Benchmarking

Our initial focus was on the inclusion of a minimum number of entries per buffer and the maximum basket buffer limit. As we'll see in the following section, we then opted to keep the minimum number of entries set to its default setting (10 entries per buffer).

For both the nightly and the release testing, the data derivation job comes from a 2022 dataset with four input files 160327 events. The MC job comes from a 2023  $t\bar{t}$  standard sample simulation job with six input files with 140k events. The specific datasets for both are noted in Appendix A.1.

The corresponding input files for both data and MC jobs were ran with various configurations of Athena (version 24.0.16) and its specified basket buffer limit. The four configurations tested all kept minimum 10 entries per basket and modified the basket limitation in the following ways:

1. “*default*” - Athena’s default setting, and basket limit of  $128 \times 1024$  bytes
2. “*no-lim*” - Removing the Athena basket limit, the ROOT imposed 1.3 MB limit still remains
3. “*256k*” - Limit basket buffer to  $256 \times 1024$  bytes
4. “*512k*” - Limit basket buffer to  $512 \times 1024$  bytes

Interesting results come from the comparison of “no-lim” and “default” configuration. The “256k” and “512k” configurations were included for completeness and provided to be a helpful sanity check throughout. Building and running these configurations of Athena are illustrated in a GitHub repository. [2]

## 4.3 Results

### 4.3.1 Presence of basket-cap and presence of minimum number of entries

First batch testing was for data and MC simulation derivation production jobs with and without presence of an upper limit to the basket size and presence of the minimum number of entries per branch. PHYSLITE MC derivation production, from Table 2, sees a 9.9% increase in output file size when compared to the default Athena configuration. Since this configuration only differs by the elimination of the “min-number-entries” we assume the

minimum number of entries per branch should be kept at 10 and left alone. Table 4.3 also shows the potential for a PHYSLITE MC DAOD output file size reduction by eliminating our upper basket buffer limit altogether.

Athena v22.0.16 configurations (Data)	Max PSS (MB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)	PHYS outFS (GB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)	PHYSLITE outFS (GB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)
With basket-cap and min-num-entries (default)	27.109 ( + 0.00 %)	3.216 ( + 0.00 %)	1.034 ( + 0.00 %)
Without both basket-cap and min-num-entries	27.813 ( + 2.53 %)	3.222 ( + 0.20 %)	1.036 ( + 0.21 %)
Without basket-cap but with min-num-entries	27.814 ( + 2.53 %)	3.216 ( - 0.00 %)	1.030 ( - 0.39 %)
With basket-cap but without min-num-entries	27.298 ( + 0.69 %)	3.221 ( + 0.15 %)	1.042 ( + 0.71 %)

Table 4.1: Athena v22.0.16: Comparing the maximum proportional set size (PSS) and PHYS/PHYSLITE output file sizes (outFS) for data jobs over various Athena configurations for 160327 entries.

Athena v22.0.16 configurations (MC)	Max PSS (MB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)	PHYS outFS (GB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)	PHYSLITE outFS (GB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)
With basket-cap and min-num-entries (default)	14.13 ( + 0.00 %)	5.83 ( + 0.00 %)	2.59 ( + 0.00 %)
Without both basket-cap and min-num-entries	16.08 ( + 12.13 %)	6.00 ( + 2.93 %)	2.72 ( + 5.06 %)
Without basket-cap but with min-num-entries	15.97 ( + 11.51 %)	5.67 ( - 2.80 %)	2.45 ( - 5.58 %)
With basket-cap but without min-num-entries	14.19 ( + 0.42 %)	6.16 ( + 5.35 %)	2.87 ( + 9.90 %)

Table 4.2: Athena v22.0.16: Comparing the maximum proportional set size (PSS) and PHYS/PHYSLITE output file sizes (outFS) for MC jobs over various Athena configurations for 140000 entries.

### 4.3.2 Comparing different basket sizes

Pre-existing derivation jobs were ran for data and MC simulations to compare between configurations of differing basket sizes limits. The results for this set of testing are found from Table 3 through Table 10. The following tables are the DAOD output-file sizes of the various Athena configurations for PHYS/PHYSLITE over their respective data/MC AOD input files.

Athena v24.0.16 configurations (Data)	Max PSS (MB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)	PHYS outFS (GB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)	PHYSLITE outFS (GB) ( $\Delta\%$ default)
With basket-cap and min-num-entries (default)	27.8591 ( + 0.00 %)	3.2571 ( + 0.00 %)	1.0334 ( + 0.00 %)
Without both basket-cap and min-num-entries	28.6432 ( + 2.74 %)	3.2552 ( - 0.06 %)	1.0302 ( - 0.31 %)
Without basket-cap but with min-num-entries	28.2166 ( + 1.27 %)	3.2553 ( - 0.05 %)	1.0303 ( - 0.30 %)
With basket-cap but without min-num-entries	28.4852 ( + 2.20 %)	3.2571 ( + 0.00 %)	1.0307 ( - 0.26 %)

Table 4.3: Athena v24.0.16: Comparing the maximum proportional set size (PSS) and PHYS/PHYSLITE output file sizes (outFS) for Data jobs over various Athena configurations for 160327 entries.

### 4.3.3 Monte Carlo PHYSLITE branch comparison

Derivation production jobs work with initially large, memory-consuming branches, compressing them to a reduced size. These derivation jobs are memory intensive because they first have to load the uncompressed branches into readily-accessed memory. Once they're loaded, only then are they able to be compressed. The compression factor is the ratio of pre-derivation branch size (Total-file-size) to post-derivation branch size (Compressed-file-size). The compressed file size is the size of the branch that is permanently saved into the DAOD.

Branches with highly repetitive data are better compressed than non-repetitive data, leading to high compression factors—the initial size of the branch contains more data than it needs pre-derivation. If pre-derivation branches are larger than necessary, there should be an opportunity to save memory usage during the derivation job.

The following tables look into some highly compressible branches and might lead to areas where simulation might save some space. (AOD pre compression?)

[Table 5 from the int note]

An immediate observation: with the omission of the Athena basket limit (solely relying on ROOTs 1.3 MB basket limit), the compression factor increases. This is inline with the original expectation that an increased buffer size limit correlate to better compression. \*PrimaryVerticesAuxDyn.trackParticleLinks\* is a branch where, among each configuration of Athena MC derivation, has the highest compression factor of any branch in this dataset.

Some branches, like `*HLTNav Summary DAODSlimmedAuxDyn.linkColNames*` show highly compressible behavior and are consistent with the other job configurations (data, MC, PHYS, and PHYSLITE). Further work could investigate these branches for further optimization

#### 4.3.4 Conclusion

Initially, limiting the basket buffer size looked appealing; after 128kB basket buffer size the compression ratio would begin to plateau, increasing the memory-usage without saving much in disk-usage. The optimal balance could be the basket buffer limit of 128 kB.

Instead, by removing the upper limit of the basket size, a greater decrease in DAOD output file size is achieved. The largest decrease in file size came from the PHYSLITE MC derivation jobs without setting an upper limit to the basket buffer size. While similar decreases in file size appear for derivation jobs using data, it is not as apparent for data as it is for MC jobs. With the removal of an upper-limit to the basket size, ATLAS stands to gain a 5% decrease for PHYSLITE MC DAOD output file sizes, but an 11 - 12

By looking at the branches per configuration, specifically in MC PHYSLITE output DAOD, highly compressible branches emerge. The branches inside the MC PHYSLITE DAOD are suboptimal as they do not conserve disk space; instead, they consume memory inefficiently. As seen from (Table 5) through (Table 10), we have plenty of branches in MC PHYSLITE that are seemingly empty—as indicated by the compression factor being  $O(10)$ . Reviewing and optimizing the branch data could further reduce GRID load during DAOD production by reducing the increased memory-usage while keeping the effects of decreased disk-space.



CHAPTER 5

MODERNIZING I/O CI UNIT-TESTS

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration. *Software and computing for Run 3 of the ATLAS experiment at the LHC*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.06335 [hep-ex]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06335>.
- [2] A.C. Kraus. *GitHub Repository: building-athena*. <https://github.com/arthurkraus3/building-athena.git>. 2023.

APPENDIX  
APPENDIX ONE

## A.1 Derivation production datasets

For both the nightly and the release testing, the data derivation job, which comes from the dataset

`data22_13p6TeV: data22_13p6TeV.00428855.physics_Main.merge.AOD.r14190_p5449_ti`

was ran with the input files

`AOD.31407809._000894.pool.root.1`

`AOD.31407809._000895.pool.root.1`

`AOD.31407809._000896.pool.root.1`

`AOD.31407809._000898.pool.root.1`

Similarly, the MC derivation job, comes from the dataset

`mc23_13p6TeV: mc23_13p6TeV.601229.PhPy8EG_A14_ttbar_hdamp258p75_SingleLep.merge`

was ran with input files

`AOD.33799166._000303.pool.root.1`

`AOD.33799166._000304.pool.root.1`

`AOD.33799166._000305.pool.root.1`

`AOD.33799166._000306.pool.root.1`

`AOD.33799166._000307.pool.root.1`

`AOD.33799166._000308.pool.root.1`