Week 1, September 7 to 14:

I read the stuff given by Dr. Martin to get a clear understanding about research. Then I collected data from the internet about \LaTeX and began learning \LaTeX, went through few commands, and tried implementing them. I worked on learning how to implement Mathematical equations for documentation. I read latex manual and learnt how to write an article in Latex. Then I started working on my mathematical autobiography and made a rough draft of it. Then I finished my final draft. Finally I finished writing the autobiography, learnt more \LaTeX commands.

Week 2, September 15 to 21:

The work for this week was to prepare a plan for writing the algorithm. We had two meetings this week. In the first meeting (on Sunday) we figured out the exact problem. Then we prepared a rough plan for writing the algorithm. In the second meeting (on Wednesday) we clubbed the ideas of all team members and prepared the final algorithm. I made the final typesetting using \LaTeX.

Week 3, September 22 to 28:

We submitted our algorithm design plan to Dr. Martin and other team. I went through other team’s work. We were asked to make comments on the other team’s work and return them their work on Monday. We also got our work back with comments from Dr. Martin as well as from other team. We had a meeting on Wednesday and discussed about the comments on our work. Later we incorporated the necessary changes into our work and prepared the final algorithm. One significant change we did was to use one single file for maintaining the error value and the file name instead of two.

Week 4, September 29 to October 05:

This week the entire project was divided into different modules and I was assigned the modules #6 and #7 for which I am supposed to do the coding in
Python.

First in order to get familiar with python editor, I practised with few basic commands. And then I went through Python tutorials and tried to do the programming in Python. Then I wrote the code for both the modules and submitted to Dr.Martin. He corrected my mistakes and suggested some changes. Later again I incorporated the necessary changes and prepared the final code.

**Week 5, October 06 to 12:**

This week the entire program was ready. Dr.Martin discussed the entire program with us and asked for any suggestions and corrections. He gave back the mathematical autobiographies to us and with corrections and asked us to correct those changes.

I prepared the autobiography and journals once again and submitted a soft-copy to Dr.Martin in pdf format. I also submitted a hard copy to him.

**Week 6, October 13 to 19**

The main task for this week was to run the code, playing with the different modules. I went through the code, trying to understand each and every line and ran the code for each module individually. The program gave correct results and I was comfortable with the code.

The second task was to read the handout given by Dr.Martin. I read the content. The paper contained much physics and I could understand the Mathematics part of it.

**Week 7, October 20 to 26**

This week I searched for the journals, given by Dr. Martin, on the internet. It took two days for me to get these journals. One was on physics and other was on mathematics. I tried to read the paper on Multiconfiguration Self-Consistent-Field Theory but I could not understand it as there was too much physics in it. The other paper on Approximation of Higher Order Tensors too was tough to understand.

The task for next week will be to present one of these two papers.

**Week 8, October 27 to November 2**

The task for this week was to present the paper. I worked on the paper trying to understand it but it was too abstract to understand. Four people were selected to present the paper.
Week 9, November 3 to 9

Adrian and Tejaswi presented the papers. Their way of presentation was really good. We were asked to comment and there were some constructive comments.

I worked on my paper and I could understand only some part of it. I prepared powerpoint slides and I am ready to give my presentation.

Comments on my presentation:

My presentation was good and I got both positive and negative feedback. Dr. Martin pointed out that I was too fast and that at one point, I was explaining by pointing my finger to the monitor of the desktop rather than the screen. Also he advised me to use the laser pointer. Beningo pointed that I was too excited while giving my presentation. Also I changed the slides too fast that the listeners could not follow me. It was also nice listening to other presentations.

On the whole it was a good experience and I learnt many new things about giving a presentation.