



Search for high-mass diphoton resonances in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV and combination with 8 TeV search

The CMS Collaboration*

Abstract

A search for the resonant production of high-mass photon pairs is presented. The search focuses on spin-0 and spin-2 resonances with masses between 0.5 and 4.5 TeV, and with widths, relative to the mass, between 1.4×10^{-4} and 5.6×10^{-2} . The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of 12.9 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collisions collected with the CMS detector in 2016 at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV. No significant excess is observed relative to the standard model expectation. The results of the search are combined statistically with those previously obtained in 2012 and 2015 at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ and 13 TeV, respectively, corresponding to integrated luminosities of 19.7 and 3.3 fb^{-1} , to derive exclusion limits on scalar resonances produced through gluon-gluon fusion, and on Randall–Sundrum gravitons. The lower mass limits for Randall–Sundrum gravitons range from 1.95 to 4.45 TeV for coupling parameters between 0.01 and 0.2. These are the most stringent limits on Randall–Sundrum graviton production to date.

Published in Physics Letters B as doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.027.

1 Introduction

The standard model (SM) of particle physics has been highly successful in describing physical phenomena but it is widely considered to be an incomplete theory because of various shortcomings. In particular, the SM suffers from the so-called hierarchy problem [1], which refers to the large difference between the Higgs boson mass of 125 GeV [2] and the highest energy scale up to which the SM must be valid. Many extensions to the SM have been proposed to address the hierarchy problem, including theories with additional space-like dimensions [3] and models with extended Higgs boson sectors [4]. Some of these extensions predict new resonances that decay to a diphoton final state. For example, the Randall–Sundrum (RS) approach [3, 5] to extra dimensions postulates massive excitations of spin-2 gravitons that can decay to two photons. A simple extension of the SM Higgs boson sector consists of the addition of a doublet of complex scalar fields. In such models [6], some of these additional scalar resonances can decay to a photon pair [7]. According to the Landau–Yang theorem, the spin of a resonance decaying to two photons can only be zero or an integer larger than one [8, 9].

Recently, the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations at the CERN LHC presented results on searches for high-mass diphoton resonances in proton-proton (pp) collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV [10, 11]. The results were based on data collected in 2015, corresponding to integrated luminosities of approximately 3 fb^{-1} per experiment. The CMS results included a combined analysis with pp collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ collected in 2012 [12] corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 19.7 fb^{-1} . Both collaborations reported the observation of a moderate excess of events compared to SM expectations, compatible with the production of a new resonance with a mass around 750 GeV.

In this Letter, we report on an updated search for spin-0 resonances and RS gravitons produced in pp collisions and decaying to two photons. The data were collected in 2016 with the CMS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ and correspond to an integrated luminosity of 12.9 fb^{-1} . The analysis procedures are very similar to those presented in Ref. [11] for the 2015 data. A combined analysis of the 8 TeV data set of Ref. [12], the 13 TeV data set of Ref. [11], and the 13 TeV data set examined here is performed to improve the sensitivity of the results. Earlier LHC searches for RS gravitons are presented in Refs. [12–28], and for spin-0 particles decaying to two photons in Refs. [12, 29]. These earlier searches are based on pp collisions at either $\sqrt{s} = 7$ or 8 TeV.

2 The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL). The tracking detectors cover the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. The ECAL and HCAL, each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections, cover $|\eta| < 3.0$, with the boundary between the barrel and endcaps at around $|\eta| = 1.5$. Forward calorimeters extend the coverage to $|\eta| < 5.0$. The ECAL consists of 75 848 lead tungstate crystals. The barrel section has a granularity $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.0174 \times 0.0174$, with ϕ the azimuthal angle, while the endcap sections have a granularity that coarsens progressively up to $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.05 \times 0.05$. Preshower detectors consisting of two planes of silicon sensors interleaved with a total of $3X_0$ of lead are located in front of the endcap sections. Muons are measured within $|\eta| < 2.4$ by gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [30].

In the barrel section of the ECAL, for photons with energies on the scale of tens of GeV, an energy resolution of about 1% is achieved for unconverted photons and for photons that convert “late”, i.e., just before entering the ECAL. The remaining barrel photons have an energy resolution of about 1.3% up to $|\eta| = 1.0$, rising to about 2.5% for $|\eta| = 1.4$. In the endcaps, the corresponding resolution for unconverted and late-converting photons is about 2.5%, while the remaining endcap photons have a resolution between 3% and 4% [31].

The particle-flow algorithm [32, 33] reconstructs and identifies each individual particle with an optimised combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector. Particle candidates are classified as either muons, electrons, photons, τ leptons, charged hadrons, or neutral hadrons.

A two-stage trigger system selects events of interest for the analysis. The level-1 trigger, composed of custom hardware processors, selects events at a maximum readout rate of about 100 kHz using information from the calorimeters and muon detectors. The high-level trigger software algorithms use the full event information to reduce the event rate to less than 1 kHz before data storage.

3 Event simulation

The PYTHIA 8.2 [34] event generator with NNPDF2.3 [35] parton distribution functions (PDFs) is used to produce simulated signal samples of spin-0 and spin-2 resonances decaying to two photons. The samples are generated at leading order (LO), with values of the resonance mass m_χ in the range $0.5 < m_\chi < 4.5$ TeV. Three values of the relative width Γ_χ/m_χ are used as benchmarks: 1.4×10^{-4} , 1.4×10^{-2} , and 5.6×10^{-2} , where Γ_χ is the width of the resonance. These relative widths correspond, respectively, to resonances much narrower than, comparable to, and significantly wider than the detector resolution. In the context of the RS graviton model, for which $\Gamma_\chi/m_\chi = 1.4 \tilde{k}^2$ [36], the relative widths correspond to the dimensionless coupling parameter $\tilde{k} = 0.01, 0.1, \text{ and } 0.2$. The scalar resonances are produced through gluon-gluon fusion, and RS graviton resonances through both gluon-gluon fusion and quark-antiquark annihilation. In the RS model, the first mechanism accounts for approximately 90% of the production cross section.

The SM background mostly arises from the direct production of two photons, the production of γ +jets events in which jet fragments are misidentified as photons, and the production of multi-jet events with misidentified jet fragments. These backgrounds are simulated with the SHERPA 2.1 [37], MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO 2.2 [38] (interfaced with PYTHIA 8.2 for parton showering and hadronization), and PYTHIA 8.2 generators, respectively, using the CT10NLO [39], NNPDF3.0 [40], and NNPDF2.3 PDF sets, again respectively. The PYTHIA tune CUETP8M1 [41] is used.

For both the signal and background samples, the detector response is simulated using the GEANT4 package [42]. The simulated samples incorporate additional pp interactions within the same or a nearby bunch crossing (pileup) and are weighted to reproduce the measured distribution of the number of interactions per bunch crossing. The average number of interactions per bunch crossing is 18, with an RMS of 4.

4 Event selection and diphoton mass spectrum

The trigger requirements, photon identification criteria, and event selection procedures are described in Ref. [11]. Some details are given below. Energy deposits in the ECAL compatible

with the shower shape expected for a photon are clustered together to define a photon candidate. Variations in the crystal transparency during the data collection period are corrected for using a dedicated monitoring system, and the single-channel response is equalized based on collision data [31]. A multivariate regression technique [31] is used to correct the photon energy for the incomplete containment of the shower in the clustered crystals, the shower losses for photons that convert before reaching the calorimeter, and the effects of pileup. The interaction vertex is selected using the algorithm described in Ref. [43], which combines information on the correlation between the diphoton system and the recoiling tracks, the average transverse momentum (p_T) of the recoiling tracks, and, when available, directional information from reconstructed photon conversions. For resonances with a mass above 500 GeV, the fraction of events in which the interaction vertex is correctly assigned is approximately 90%. For each photon candidate, the transverse size of the electromagnetic cluster in the η coordinate must be compatible with that expected for a photon from a hard interaction, and the ratio of the associated energy in the HCAL to the photon energy must be less than 0.05.

Photon candidates are required to have $p_T > 75$ GeV and to be reconstructed within $|\eta| < 2.5$. Candidates in the transition region between the barrel and endcap detectors ($1.44 < |\eta| < 1.57$), where the reconstruction efficiency is not well described by the simulation, are rejected. Photon candidates associated with electron tracks that are incompatible with conversion tracks are rejected [31]. Photon candidates are required to be isolated. There are two isolation criteria, both of which are imposed: i) the sum of the scalar p_T of charged hadron candidates from the interaction vertex that lie within a cone of radius $R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.3$ around the photon candidate must be less than 5 GeV, where charged hadron candidates identified as conversion tracks associated with the photon candidate are excluded; ii) the sum of the scalar p_T of additional neutral electromagnetic candidates within this same cone must be less than 2.5 GeV, after the contribution of additional interactions in the same bunch crossing has been removed.

The identification and trigger efficiencies are measured as functions of photon p_T using data events containing a Z boson decaying to a $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair in association with a photon, or to an e^+e^- pair where the electrons are treated as if they were photons [31]. The efficiency of the photon selection procedure in the kinematic range considered in the analysis is above 90% and 85% for candidates in the barrel and endcap regions, respectively. The ratio between the efficiencies measured in data and simulation is found to be lower than 1 by 3.5% for photons in the barrel region and by 6.5% for photons in the endcap region. No significant p_T dependence of the efficiency ratios is observed, and a p_T -independent correction is applied to the normalization of the simulated event samples to account for this difference.

The photon candidates in an event are grouped into all possible pairs. At least one photon candidate in the pair must have $|\eta| < 1.44$, i.e., be reconstructed in the barrel. Events with both photons in the endcaps are not considered, since their inclusion would increase the signal efficiency by only a few percent, at the cost of introducing a large background. Photon pairs are divided into two categories. The first category, denoted “EBEB”, contains pairs for which both candidates lie in the barrel. For the second category, denoted “EBEE”, one candidate lies in the barrel and the other in an endcap. The invariant mass $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ of the pair must satisfy $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 230$ GeV for EBEB candidates and $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 330$ GeV for EBEE candidates. The fraction of events in which more than one photon pair satisfies the selection criteria is approximately 1%. In these cases, only the pair with the largest scalar sum of photon p_T is retained.

The selection efficiency times acceptance for signal events varies between 50% and 70%, depending on the signal hypothesis. Because of the different angular distribution of the decay

products, the kinematic acceptance for the RS graviton resonances is lower than that of scalar resonances. For $m_\chi < 1$ TeV the difference is approximately 20%. The two acceptances are similar for $m_\chi > 3$ TeV.

The event selection procedure described above is the same as the one documented in [11]. It was finalized on the basis of studies with simulated signal and background event samples prior to inspection of the data in the search region of the diphoton invariant mass distribution, which is defined as $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 500$ GeV.

A total of 6284 (2791) photon pairs are selected in the EBEB (EBEE) category. Of these, 461 (800) pairs have an invariant mass above 500 GeV. According to simulation, the direct production of two photons accounts, respectively, for 90% and 80% of the background events selected in the EBEB and EBEE categories. This prediction is tested in data using the method described in Ref. [44] and good agreement is found between data and simulation.

The diphoton invariant mass distribution of the selected events is shown in Fig. 1, for both the EBEB and EBEE categories. We perform an independent maximum likelihood fit to the data in each category using the function

$$f(m_{\gamma\gamma}) = m_{\gamma\gamma}^{a+b \log(m_{\gamma\gamma})}. \quad (1)$$

This parametric form is chosen to model the background in the hypothesis tests discussed below. The results of the fits are shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: The observed invariant mass spectra $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ for selected events in the (left) EBEB and (right) EBEE categories. There are no selected events with $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 2000$ GeV. The solid lines and the shaded bands show the results of likelihood fits to the data together with the associated 1 and 2 standard deviation statistical uncertainty bands. The ratio of the difference between the data and the fit to the statistical uncertainty in the data is given in the lower plots.

5 Likelihood fit

A simultaneous fit to the invariant mass spectra of events in the EBEB and EBEE event categories is performed to determine the compatibility of the data with the background-only and

the signal+background hypotheses. The test statistic is based on the profile likelihood ratio:

$$q(\mu) = -2 \log \frac{L(\mu S + B | \hat{\theta}_\mu)}{L(\hat{\mu} S + B | \hat{\theta})}, \quad (2)$$

where S and B represent the probability density functions for resonant diphoton production and for the SM background, respectively. The parameter μ is the so-called signal strength, while $\vec{\theta}$ represents the nuisance parameters of the model, used to account for systematic uncertainties. The $\hat{\theta}$ notation indicates the best fit value of the parameter θ for any μ value, while $\hat{\theta}_\mu$ denotes the best fit value of θ for a fixed value μ .

To set upper limits on the rate of resonant diphoton production, the modified frequentist method known as CL_s [45, 46] is used, following the prescription described in Ref. [47]. The compatibility of the observation with the background-only hypothesis is evaluated by computing the background-only p -value. The latter is defined as the probability, in the background-only hypothesis, for $q(0)$ to exceed the value observed in data. This quantity, the “local p -value” p_0 , does not take into account the fact that many signal hypotheses are tested.

Asymptotic formulas [48] are used in the calculations of exclusion limits and local p -values. The accuracy of the asymptotic approximation in the estimation of exclusion limits and significance is studied, using pseudo-experiments, for a subset of the hypothesis tests and is found to be about 10%.

The signal shape in $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ is determined from the convolution of the intrinsic shape of the resonance and the CMS detector response to photons. The intrinsic shape is taken from the PYTHIA 8.2 generator. A grid of mass points with 125 GeV spacing, in the range 500–4500 GeV, is used. The resulting shapes are interpolated to intermediate points using a parametric description of the distribution. The detector response is determined using fully simulated signal samples of small intrinsic width, corrected through Gaussian smearing to agree with measurements based on $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-$ data. Nine uniformly spaced mass hypotheses in the range 500–4500 GeV are employed. The signal mass resolution, quantified through the ratio of the full width at half maximum of the distribution, divided by 2.35, to the peak position, is approximately 1.0% and 1.5% for the EBEB and EBEE categories, respectively. The signal normalization coefficients are proportional to the product of the kinematic acceptance and the signal efficiency within the acceptance region. These are computed, for each category, in simulated samples and interpolated to intermediate points using quadratic functions of m_X and Γ_X/m_X .

The background shape in $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ is described by the parametric function given by Eq. (1). The values of the parameters a and b are determined by the fit to data, with separate values for the EBEB and EBEE categories, and are treated as unconstrained nuisance parameters in the hypothesis tests.

The accuracy of the background parameterization is assessed using simulation and is quantified by studying the difference between the true and predicted numbers of background events in several $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ intervals in the search region. The relative widths of the intervals, defined by $2(x_1 - x_2)/(x_1 + x_2)$ with x_1 and x_2 the lower and upper bin edges, range between 2% and 15%. Pseudo-experiments are drawn from the mass spectrum predicted by the simulation and are fit with the chosen background model. The total number of events in each pseudo-experiment is taken from a Poisson distribution whose mean is set equal to the observation in data. For each interval, the distribution of the pull variable, defined as the difference between the true and predicted numbers of events divided by the estimated statistical uncertainty, is constructed. If the absolute value of the median of this distribution is found to be above 0.5 in an interval,

an additional uncertainty is assigned to the background parametrization. A modified pull distribution is then constructed, increasing the statistical uncertainty in the fit by an extra term, denoted the “bias term”. The bias term is parametrized as a smooth function of $m_{\gamma\gamma}$, which is tuned in such a manner that the absolute value of the median of the modified pull distribution is less than 0.5 in all intervals. The amplitude of the bias term function is comparable to that of the 1 standard deviation bands in Fig. 1. This additional uncertainty is included in the likelihood function by adding to the background model a component having the same shape as the signal. The normalization coefficient of this component is constrained to have a Gaussian distribution of mean zero, with a width equal to the integral of the bias term function over the full width at half maximum of the tested signal shape. The inclusion of this additional component has the effect of avoiding falsely positive or falsely negative tests that could be induced by a mismodeling of the background shape, and it reduces the sensitivity of the analysis by at most 10%.

6 Systematic uncertainties

The impact of systematic uncertainties in this analysis is smaller than that of the statistical uncertainties. The parametric background model has no associated systematic uncertainties except for the bias term uncertainty described in the previous section. Since the background shape coefficients a and b [Eq. (1)] are treated as unconstrained nuisance parameters, the associated uncertainties are statistical.

The systematic uncertainties in the signal normalization associated with the integrated luminosity, the selection efficiency, and the PDFs are 6.2%, 6.0%, and 6.0%, respectively. The uncertainty in the integrated luminosity is estimated from beam scans performed in August 2016, utilizing the methods of Ref. [49]. The uncertainty associated with the PDFs is evaluated by comparing the overall selection efficiency obtained with the CT10 [39], MSTW08 [50], and NNPDF2.3 [35] PDF sets and taking the largest deviation over all tested signal hypotheses. A 1% uncertainty is associated with the level of knowledge of the energy scale and accounts for the uncertainty in the energy scale at the Z boson peak and its extrapolation to higher masses. A 10% uncertainty is assigned to the knowledge of the photon energy resolution, corresponding to the uncertainty in the estimated additional Gaussian smearing determined at the Z boson peak.

7 Results for the 2016 data

The observed and expected 95% confidence level (CL) upper limits on the product of the production cross section ($\sigma_{\chi}^{13\text{TeV}}$) and branching fraction to two photons ($\mathcal{B}_{\gamma\gamma}$) for scalar and RS graviton resonances are shown in Fig. 2. Using the LO cross sections from PYTHIA 8.2, RS gravitons with masses below 1.75, 3.75, and 4.35 TeV are excluded for $\tilde{k} = 0.01, 0.1, \text{ and } 0.2$, respectively, corresponding to $\Gamma_{\chi}/m_{\chi} = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}, 1.4 \times 10^{-2}, \text{ and } 5.6 \times 10^{-2}$.

The value of p_0 for different signal hypotheses is shown in Fig. 3. The largest excess is observed for $m_{\chi} \approx 620$ GeV, and has a local significance of approximately 2.4 and 2.7 standard deviations for narrow spin-0 and RS graviton signal hypotheses, respectively. After taking into account the effect of searching for several signal hypotheses, i.e., searching over a range of widths and masses, the significance of the excess is reduced to less than one standard deviation. No excess is observed in the proximity of $m_{\chi} = 750$ GeV.




Figure 2: The 95% CL upper limits on the production of diphoton resonances as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the analysis of data collected in 2016. Exclusion limits for the scalar and RS graviton signals are given by the grey (darker) and green (lighter) curves, respectively. The observed limits are shown by the solid lines, while the median expected limits are given by the dashed lines together with their associated 1 standard deviation uncertainty bands. The leading-order production cross section for diphoton resonances in the RS graviton model is shown for three values of the dimensionless coupling parameter \tilde{k} together with the exclusion upper limits calculated for the corresponding three values of the width relative to the mass, Γ_X/m_X . Shown are the results for (upper) a narrow width, (middle) an intermediate-width, and (lower) a broad resonance.

8 Combination with the 2012 and 2015 data

The results obtained for the 2016 data are combined statistically with those obtained for the data discussed in Ref. [11], namely 19.7 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collisions recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ in 2012 [12] and 3.3 fb^{-1} recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ in 2015. For a portion of the 2015 data (0.6 fb^{-1}), the CMS magnet was off (0 T), while for the rest of the 2015 data and for all of the 2012 and 2016 data, the magnet was at its operational field strength (3.8 T). The analysis of the 0 T data from 2015 is described in Ref. [11].

The procedure followed for the combined analysis of 8 and 13 TeV data is the same as in Ref. [11]. The ratio of the 8 to the 13 TeV production cross section is computed using PYTHIA 8.2, for the two types of signal hypotheses considered: scalar resonances and RS graviton resonances. The cross section ratio decreases from 0.27 and 0.29 at $m_X = 500 \text{ GeV}$ to 0.03 and 0.04 at $m_X = 4 \text{ TeV}$, for the scalar and RS graviton resonance hypotheses, respectively.




Figure 3: Observed background-only p -values for resonances with (upper left) $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$, (upper right) 1.4×10^{-2} , and (bottom) 5.6×10^{-2} as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the analysis of data collected in 2016. The solid black and dashed blue lines correspond to spin-0 and spin-2 resonances, respectively.

Exclusion limits are set on the 13 TeV production cross section for both models, and background-only p -values are computed for the signal hypotheses.

The correlation model between the systematic uncertainties associated with 8 and 13 TeV data is described in Ref. [11]. It assumes all uncertainties to be uncorrelated except for those related to the knowledge of the PDFs, which are taken to be fully correlated, and those related to the knowledge of the photon energy scale, which are taken to have a linear correlation of 0.5. Taking the value of the linear correlation to be 0 or 1 would lead to negligible changes in the results. For the combination of the two 13 TeV data sets, the background shape and the associated bias term uncertainties are assumed to be fully correlated between the corresponding categories of the 2015 (3.8 T) and 2016 data. Independent background normalization coefficients are used for the two data sets. The uncertainty in the signal selection efficiency is taken to be uncorrelated between the 2015 and 2016 data, to account for the large statistical contribution and for the effect on the systematic contribution arising from changes in the data taking conditions, particularly in the instantaneous luminosity. The uncertainty in the knowledge of the integrated luminosity is treated as follows: a 2.3% uncertainty, corresponding to the knowledge of the absolute luminosity scale calibration determined with beam scans, is taken to be fully correlated between the 2015 (3.8 T) and 2016 data, and additional uncertainties of 1.5% and 5.8%, corresponding to the uncertainty in extrapolating the scale calibration to the data collection conditions, are applied, again respectively. Finally, the photon energy scale uncertainties are taken to be fully correlated between the two data sets, being dominated by the extrapolation to high energy.

Figure 4 shows the observed and expected 95% CL upper limits on the 13 TeV production cross

section of the different signal hypotheses obtained with the combined analysis of the 13 TeV data recorded in 2015 and 2016. The upper limits on the production of scalar resonances decaying to two photons range from about 10 to 0.2 fb, for resonance masses between 0.5 and 4.5 TeV. Compared to the 2016 data alone, the sensitivity is improved by approximately 10% and 20% at the high and low end of the m_χ search region, respectively. Using the LO cross sections from PYTHIA 8.2, RS gravitons with masses below 3.85 and 4.45 TeV are excluded for $\tilde{k} = 0.1$ and 0.2, respectively. For $\tilde{k} = 0.01$, graviton masses below 1.95 TeV are excluded, except for the region between 1.75 and 1.85 TeV.

The observed p_0 for $\Gamma_\chi/m_\chi = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and 5.6×10^{-2} obtained with the combined analysis of the 2015 and 2016 data is shown in Fig. 5. The largest excess is observed for $m_\chi \approx 1.3$ TeV and has a local significance of about 2.2 standard deviations, corresponding to less than 1 standard deviation after accounting for the effect of searching for several signal hypotheses. For $m_\chi = 750$ GeV, the 2.9 standard deviation local significance excess observed in the 2015 data is reduced to 0.8 standard deviations.

The observed and expected 95% CL upper limits on the 13 TeV signal production cross sections obtained through a combined analysis of the 8 TeV data from 2012 and the 13 TeV data from 2015 and 2016 are shown in Fig. 6. Compared to the combined 13 TeV data, the analysis sensitivity improves by about 10% at the low end of the m_χ range, while the improvement is negligible at the higher end of the range. Thus the lower limits on the mass of RS gravitons obtained by combining the 8 and 13 TeV data coincide with those obtained with the 13 TeV data alone.

The observed p_0 for $\Gamma_\chi/m_\chi = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and 5.6×10^{-2} obtained with the combined 8 and 13 TeV analysis is shown in Fig. 7. The largest excess, observed for $m_\chi \approx 0.9$ TeV, has a local significance of about 2.2 standard deviations, corresponding to less than 1 standard deviation overall. For $m_\chi = 750$ GeV, the excess with 3.4 standard deviation local significance [11] is reduced to about 1.9 standard deviations.

9 Summary

A search for the resonant production of high-mass photon pairs has been presented. The analysis is based on a sample of proton-proton collisions collected by the CMS experiment in 2016 at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 12.9 fb^{-1} . Events containing two photon candidates with transverse momenta above 75 GeV are selected. The diphoton mass spectrum above 500 GeV is examined for evidence of the production of high-mass spin-0 and spin-2 resonances.

Limits on the production of scalar resonances and Randall–Sundrum gravitons in the range $0.5 < m_\chi < 4.5$ TeV and $1.4 \times 10^{-4} < \Gamma_\chi/m_\chi < 5.6 \times 10^{-2}$ are determined using the modified frequentist approach, where m_χ and Γ_χ are the resonance mass and width, respectively. The results obtained with the 2016 data set are combined statistically with those obtained in 2012 and 2015, corresponding to integrated luminosities of 19.7 and 3.3 fb^{-1} of data recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ and 13 TeV, respectively.

No significant excess is observed above the predictions of the standard model. Using the leading-order cross sections, Randall–Sundrum gravitons with masses below 3.85 and 4.45 TeV are excluded for values of the dimensionless coupling parameter $\tilde{k} = 0.1$ and 0.2, respectively. For $\tilde{k} = 0.01$, graviton masses below 1.95 TeV are excluded, except for the region between 1.75 and 1.85 TeV. These are the most stringent limits on Randall–Sundrum graviton production to date.




Figure 4: The 95% CL upper limits on the production of diphoton resonances as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of data collected in 2015 and in 2016. Exclusion limits for the scalar and RS graviton signals are given by the grey (darker) and green (lighter) curves, respectively. The observed limits are shown by the solid lines, while the median expected limits are given by the dashed lines together with their associated 1 standard deviation uncertainty bands. The leading-order production cross section for diphoton resonances in the RS graviton model is shown for three values of the dimensionless coupling parameter \tilde{k} together with the exclusion upper limits calculated for the corresponding three values of the width relative to the mass, Γ_X/m_X . Shown are the results for (upper) a narrow width, (middle) an intermediate-width, and (lower) a broad resonance.

Acknowledgments

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMWFW and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NIH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland);




Figure 5: Observed background-only p -values for resonances with (upper) $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and (lower) 5.6×10^{-2} as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of data recorded in 2015 and 2016. The results obtained for the two individual data sets are also shown. The curves corresponding to the scalar and RS graviton hypotheses are shown in left and right columns, respectively. The insets show an expanded region around $m_X = 750$ GeV.

INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, RosAtom, RAS and RFBR (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI and CPAN (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and EPLANET (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2013/11/B/ST2/04202, 2014/13/B/ST2/02543 and 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the Thalís and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Clarín-COFUND del Principado de Asturias; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); and




Figure 6: The 95% CL upper limits on the production of diphoton resonances as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of the 8 and 13 TeV data. The 8 TeV results are scaled by the ratio of the 8 to 13 TeV cross sections. Exclusion limits for the scalar and RS graviton signals are given by the grey (darker) and green (lighter) curves, respectively. The observed limits are shown by the solid lines, while the median expected limits are given by the dashed lines together with their associated 1 standard deviation uncertainty bands. The leading-order production cross section for diphoton resonances in the RS graviton model is shown for three values of the dimensionless coupling parameter \tilde{k} together with the exclusion upper limits calculated for the corresponding three values of the width relative to the mass, Γ_X/m_X . Shown are the results for (upper) a narrow width, (middle) an intermediate-width, and (lower) a broad resonance.

the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845.

References

- [1] N. Sakai, “Naturalness in supersymmetric GUTS”, *Z. Phys. C* **11** (1981) 153, doi:10.1007/BF01573998.
- [2] ATLAS, CMS Collaboration, “Combined Measurement of the Higgs Boson Mass in pp Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV with the ATLAS and CMS Experiments”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** (2015) 191803, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.191803, arXiv:1503.07589.




Figure 7: Observed background-only p -values for resonances with (upper) $\Gamma_X/m_X = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and (lower) 5.6×10^{-2} as a function of the resonance mass m_X , from the combined analysis of the 8 and 13 TeV data. The results obtained for the two individual center-of-mass energies are also shown. The curves corresponding to the scalar and RS graviton hypotheses are shown in left and right columns, respectively. The insets show an expanded region around $m_X = 750$ GeV.

- [3] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, “A large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 3370, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3370, arXiv:hep-ph/9905221.
- [4] G. C. Branco et al., “Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models”, *Phys. Rep.* **516** (2012) 1, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2012.02.002, arXiv:1106.0034.
- [5] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, “An alternative to compactification”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 4690, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.4690, arXiv:hep-th/9906064.
- [6] N. Craig, J. Galloway, and S. Thomas, “Searching for signs of the second Higgs doublet”, (2013). arXiv:1305.2424.
- [7] P. S. Bhupal Dev and A. Pilaftsis, “Maximally symmetric two Higgs doublet model with natural standard model alignment”, *JHEP* **12** (2014) 024, doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2014)024, arXiv:1408.3405. [Erratum: doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2015)147].
- [8] L. D. Landau, “On the angular momentum of a system of two photons”, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **60** (1948) 207, doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-010586-4.50070-5.
- [9] C. N. Yang, “Selection Rules for the Dematerialization of a Particle into Two Photons”, *Phys. Rev.* **77** (1950) 242, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.77.242.

- [10] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for resonances in diphoton events at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *JHEP* **09** (2016) 001, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2016)001, arXiv:1606.03833.
- [11] CMS Collaboration, “Search for resonant production of high-mass photon pairs in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ and 13 TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** (2016) 051802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.051802, arXiv:1606.04093.
- [12] CMS Collaboration, “Search for diphoton resonances in the mass range from 150 to 850 GeV in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **750** (2015) 494, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.09.062, arXiv:1506.02301.
- [13] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for high-mass diphoton resonances in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 032004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.032004, arXiv:1504.05511.
- [14] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for extra dimensions in diphoton events using proton-proton collisions recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC”, *New J. Phys.* **15** (2013) 043007, doi:10.1088/1367-2630/15/4/043007, arXiv:1210.8389.
- [15] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for high-mass dilepton resonances in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 052005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.052005, arXiv:1405.4123.
- [16] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for dilepton resonances in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 272002, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.272002, arXiv:1108.1582.
- [17] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for new phenomena in the WW to $\ell\nu\ell'\nu'$ final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Lett. B* **718** (2013) 860, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.040, arXiv:1208.2880.
- [18] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for resonant diboson production in the $WW/WZ \rightarrow \ell\nu jj$ decay channels with the ATLAS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 112006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.112006, arXiv:1305.0125.
- [19] CMS Collaboration, “Search for signatures of extra dimensions in the diphoton mass spectrum at the Large Hadron Collider”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 111801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.111801, arXiv:1112.0688.
- [20] CMS Collaboration, “Search for physics beyond the standard model in dilepton mass spectra in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 025, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)025, arXiv:1412.6302.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, “Search for heavy narrow dilepton resonances in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **720** (2013) 63, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.02.003, arXiv:1212.6175.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “Search for narrow resonances decaying to dijets in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) 071801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.071801, arXiv:1512.01224.

- [23] CMS Collaboration, “Search for narrow resonances using the dijet mass spectrum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 114015, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.114015, arXiv:1302.4794.
- [24] CMS Collaboration, “Search for narrow resonances in dijet final states at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ with the novel CMS technique of data scouting”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** (2016) 031802, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.031802, arXiv:1604.08907.
- [25] CMS Collaboration, “Search for resonances and quantum black holes using dijet mass spectra in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 052009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.052009, arXiv:1501.04198.
- [26] CMS Collaboration, “Search for massive resonances in dijet systems containing jets tagged as W or Z boson decays in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *JHEP* **08** (2014) 173, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2014)173, arXiv:1405.1994.
- [27] CMS Collaboration, “Search for exotic resonances decaying into WZ/ZZ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *JHEP* **02** (2013) 036, doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2013)036, arXiv:1211.5779.
- [28] CMS Collaboration, “Search for a narrow spin-2 resonance decaying to a pair of Z vector bosons in the semileptonic final state”, *Phys. Lett. B* **718** (2013) 1208, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.063, arXiv:1209.3807.
- [29] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for Scalar Diphoton Resonances in the Mass Range 65–600 GeV with the ATLAS Detector in pp Collision Data at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 171801, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.171801, arXiv:1407.6583.
- [30] CMS Collaboration, “The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC”, *JINST* **3** (2008) S08004, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- [31] CMS Collaboration, “Performance of photon reconstruction and identification with the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ”, *JINST* **10** (2015) P08010, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/10/08/P08010, arXiv:1502.02702.
- [32] CMS Collaboration, “Particle-flow event reconstruction in CMS and performance for jets, taus, and E_T^{miss} ”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-09-001, 2009.
- [33] CMS Collaboration, “Commissioning of the particle-flow event with the first LHC collisions recorded in the CMS detector”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-10-001, 2010.
- [34] T. Sjöstrand et al., “An Introduction to PYTHIA 8.2”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159, doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024, arXiv:1410.3012.
- [35] NNPDF Collaboration, “Parton distributions with LHC data”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **867** (2013) 244, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.10.003, arXiv:1207.1303.
- [36] H. Davoudiasl, J. L. Hewett, and T. G. Rizzo, “Phenomenology of the Randall-Sundrum Gauge Hierarchy Model”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84** (2000) 2080, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.2080, arXiv:hep-ph/9909255.
- [37] T. Gleisberg et al., “Event generation with SHERPA 1.1”, *JHEP* **02** (2009) 007, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/02/007, arXiv:0811.4622.

- [38] J. Alwall et al., “The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations”, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 079, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079, arXiv:1405.0301.
- [39] H.-L. Lai et al., “New parton distributions for collider physics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 074024, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.074024, arXiv:1007.2241.
- [40] NNPDF Collaboration, “Parton distributions for the LHC Run II”, *JHEP* **04** (2015) 040, doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040, arXiv:1410.8849.
- [41] CMS Collaboration, “Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 155, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x, arXiv:1512.00815.
- [42] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4 — a simulation toolkit”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506** (2003) 250, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [43] CMS Collaboration, “Observation of the diphoton decay of the Higgs boson and measurement of its properties”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3076, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3076-z, arXiv:1407.0558.
- [44] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of differential cross sections for the production of a pair of isolated photons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3129, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3129-3, arXiv:1405.7225.
- [45] T. Junk, “Confidence level computation for combining searches with small statistics”, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **434** (1999) 435, doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00498-2, arXiv:hep-ex/9902006.
- [46] A. L. Read, “Presentation of search results: the CL_s technique”, *J. Phys. G* **28** (2002) 2693, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/28/10/313.
- [47] LHC Higgs Combination Group, “Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in Summer 2011”, Technical Report CMS-NOTE-2011-005, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-11, 2011.
- [48] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, and O. Vitells, “Asymptotic formulae for likelihood-based tests of new physics”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1554, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0, arXiv:1007.1727. [Erratum: doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z].
- [49] CMS Collaboration, “CMS Luminosity Measurement for the 2015 Data Taking Period”, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-15-001, 2016.
- [50] A. D. Martin, W. J. Stirling, R. S. Thorne, and G. Watt, “Parton distributions for the LHC”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **63** (2009) 189, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-009-1072-5, arXiv:0901.0002.

A The CMS Collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

V. Khachatryan, A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik der OeAW, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, A. König, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Matsushita, I. Mikulec, D. Rabady, N. Rad, B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, J. Strauss, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹

National Centre for Particle and High Energy Physics, Minsk, Belarus

V. Mossolov, N. Shumeiko, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Research Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

O. Dvornikov, V. Makarenko, V. Zykunov

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

S. Alderweireldt, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, M. Van De Klundert, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spilbeek

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, N. Daci, I. De Bruyn, K. Deroover, S. Lowette, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, A. Olbrechts, Q. Python, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, I. Van Parijs

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, G. Karapostoli, T. Lenzi, A. Léonard, J. Luetic, T. Maerschalk, A. Marinov, A. Randle-conde, T. Seva, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, R. Yonamine, F. Zenoni, F. Zhang²

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

A. Cimmino, T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, G. Garcia, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov, D. Poyraz, S. Salva, R. Schöfbeck, A. Sharma, M. Tytgat, W. Van Driessche, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

H. Bakhshiansohi, C. Beluffi³, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, A. Caudron, S. De Visscher, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, B. Francois, A. Giammanco, A. Jafari, P. Jez, M. Komm, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaitre, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, C. Nuttens, K. Piotrkowski, L. Quertenmont, M. Selvaggi, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

N. Beliy

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁴, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁵, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, D. Matos Figueiredo, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁴, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade Estadual Paulista ^a, Universidade Federal do ABC ^b, São Paulo, Brazil

S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^b, S. Dogra^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, P.G. Mercadante^b, C.S. Moon^a, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a, D. Romero Abad^b, J.C. Ruiz Vargas

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

Beihang University, Beijing, China

W. Fang⁶

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen⁷, T. Cheng, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Zhao

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China

Y. Ban, G. Chen, Q. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, A. Cabrera, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J.P. Gomez, C.F. González Hernández, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, J.C. Sanabria

University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, S. Micanovic, L. Sudic, T. Susa

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, D. Tsiakkouri

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger⁸, M. Finger Jr.⁸

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt

A.A. Abdelalim^{9,10}, E. El-khateeb¹¹, E. Salama^{12,11}

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

M. Kadastik, M. Murumaa, L. Perrini, M. Raidal, A. Tiko, C. Veelken

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

J. Härkönen, T. Järvinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, L. Wendland

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

J. Talvitie, T. Tuuva

IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, C. Favaro, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, S. Ghosh, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, I. Kucher, E. Locci, M. Machet, J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M. Titov, A. Zghiche

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

A. Abdulsalam, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, E. Chapon, C. Charlot, O. Davignon, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, S. Lisniak, P. Miné, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, S. Regnard, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi

Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France

J.-L. Agram¹³, J. Andrea, A. Aubin, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, E. Conte¹³, X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine¹³, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, A.-C. Le Bihan, K. Skovpen, P. Van Hove

Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France

S. Gadrat

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France

S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, E. Bouvier, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, B. Courbon, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fan, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹⁴, D. Sabes, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

T. Toriashvili¹⁵

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze⁸

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany

C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, A. Heister, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, A. Ostapchuk, M. Preuten, F. Raupach, S. Schael, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, T. Verlage, H. Weber, V. Zhukov¹⁴

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

A. Albert, M. Brodski, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Endres, M. Erdmann, S. Erdweg, T. Esch, R. Fischer, A. Güth, M. Hamer, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, S. Knutzen, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, M. Olschewski, K. Padeken, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger, F. Scheuch, L. Sonnenschein, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany

V. Cherepanov, G. Flügge, F. Hoehle, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, J. Lingemann, T. Müller, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, I.M. Nugent, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl¹⁶

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁷, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Dolinska, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁸, J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko, J.M. Grados Luyando, P. Gunnellini, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel¹⁹, H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos, O. Karacheban¹⁹, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, A. Lobanov, W. Lohmann¹⁹, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, E. Ntomari, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, B. Roland, M.Ö. Sahin, P. Saxena, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, C. Seitz, S. Spannagel, N. Stefaniuk, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, M. Hoffmann, A. Junkes, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, T. Lapsien, T. Lenz, I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, F. Pantaleo¹⁶, T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, J. Poehlsen, C. Sander, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderden, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, S. Baur, C. Baus, J. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, S. Fink, B. Freund, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, P. Goldenzweig, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann¹⁶, S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁴, S. Kudella, P. Lobelle Pardo, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, S. Röcker, F. Roscher, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, J. Wagner-Kuhr, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, V.A. Giakoumopoulou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Topsis-Giotis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

S. Kesisoglou, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, G. Flouris, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Loukas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

N. Filipovic

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²⁰, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²¹, A.J. Zsigmond

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²², A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

M. Bartók²¹, P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

S. Bahinipati, S. Choudhury²³, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²⁴, D.K. Sahoo, N. Sahoo, S.K. Swain

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, R. Chawla, U. Bhawandeep, A.K. Kalsi, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, R. Kumar, P. Kumari, A. Mehta, M. Mittal, J.B. Singh, G. Walia

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

Ashok Kumar, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, S. Keshri, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, N. Nishu, K. Ranjan, R. Sharma, V. Sharma

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dey, S. Dutt, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, N. Majumdar, A. Modak, K. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, A. Roy, D. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, S. Thakur

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

P.K. Behera

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty¹⁶, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, S. Dugad, G. Kole, B. Mahakud, S. Mitra, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, N. Sur, B. Sutar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhowmik²⁵, R.K. Dewanjee, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁵, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, T. Sarkar²⁵, N. Wickramage²⁶

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India

S. Chauhan, S. Dube, V. Hegde, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, S. Sharma

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran

H. Behnamian, S. Chenarani²⁷, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁷, A. Fahim²⁸, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi²⁹, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh³⁰, M. Zeinali

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

INFN Sezione di Bari ^a, Università di Bari ^b, Politecnico di Bari ^c, Bari, Italy

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, C. Caputo^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^{a,16}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, P. Verwilligen^a

INFN Sezione di Bologna ^a, Università di Bologna ^b, Bologna, Italy

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^{a,b,16}

INFN Sezione di Catania ^a, Università di Catania ^b, Catania, Italy

S. Albergo^{a,b}, S. Costa^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia^a, F. Giordano^{a,b}, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Firenze ^a, Università di Firenze ^b, Firenze, Italy

G. Barbagli^a, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, L. Viliani^{a,b,16}

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera¹⁶

INFN Sezione di Genova ^a, Università di Genova ^b, Genova, Italy

V. Calvelli^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, M. Lo Vetere^{a,b}, M.R. Monge^{a,b}, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca ^a, Università di Milano-Bicocca ^b, Milano, Italy

L. Brianza¹⁶, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b,16}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, M. Malberti, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b,16}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Pigazzini, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Napoli ^a, Università di Napoli 'Federico II' ^b, Napoli, Italy, Università della Basilicata ^c, Potenza, Italy, Università G. Marconi ^d, Roma, Italy

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, G. De Nardo, S. Di Guida^{a,d,16}, M. Esposito^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^{a,b}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, G. Lanza^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,16}, P. Paolucci^{a,16}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, F. Thyssen

INFN Sezione di Padova ^a, Università di Padova ^b, Padova, Italy, Università di Trento ^c, Trento, Italy

P. Azzi^{a,16}, N. Bacchetta^a, L. Benato^{a,b}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, M. Dall'Osso^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, S. Lacaprara^a, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Zanetti, P. Zotto^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Pavia ^a, Università di Pavia ^b, Pavia, Italy

A. Braghieri^a, A. Magnani^{a,b}, P. Montagna^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, V. Re^a, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Salvini^a, I. Vai^{a,b}, P. Vitulo^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Perugia ^a, Università di Perugia ^b, Perugia, Italy

L. Alunni Solestizi^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b}, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Saha^a, A. Santocchia^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Pisa ^a, Università di Pisa ^b, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa ^c, Pisa, Italy

K. Androsov^{a,31}, P. Azzurri^{a,16}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,31}, R. Dell'Orso^a, S. Donato^{a,c}, G. Fedi, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^{a,31}, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^{a,b}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro^{a,32}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

INFN Sezione di Roma ^a, Università di Roma ^b, Roma, Italy

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, M. Cipriani^{a,b}, D. Del Re^{a,b,16}, M. Diemoz^a, S. Gelli^{a,b}, E. Longo^{a,b}, F. Margaroli^{a,b}, B. Marzocchi^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^a, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, F. Preiato^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, C. Rovelli^a, F. Santanastasio^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Torino ^a, Università di Torino ^b, Torino, Italy, Università del Piemonte Orientale ^c, Novara, Italy

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c,16}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, N. Bartosik^a, R. Bellan^{a,b}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, F. Cenna^{a,b}, M. Costa^{a,b}, R. Covarelli^{a,b}, A. Degano^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, L. Finco^{a,b}, B. Kiani^{a,b}, C. Mariotti^a, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, E. Monteil^{a,b}, M. Monteno^a, M.M. Obertino^{a,b}, L. Pacher^{a,b}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, G.L. Pinna

Angioni^{a,b}, F. Ravera^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, K. Shchelina^{a,b}, V. Sola^a,
A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a, P. Traczyk^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Trieste ^a, Università di Trieste ^b, Trieste, Italy

S. Belforte^a, M. Casarsa^a, F. Cossutti^a, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, A. Zanetti^a

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, Y.D. Oh, S. Sekmen, D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

Chonbuk National University, Jeonju, Korea

A. Lee

Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Korea

H. Kim

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, T.J. Kim

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, D. Gyun, S. Ha, B. Hong, Y. Jo, Y. Kim, B. Lee, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, S. Lee, J. Lim, S.K. Park, Y. Roh

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

J. Almond, J. Kim, H. Lee, S.B. Oh, B.C. Radburn-Smith, S.h. Seo, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, G.B. Yu

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

M. Choi, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, G. Ryu, M.S. Ryu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Choi, J. Goh, C. Hwang, J. Lee, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, J.R. Komaragiri, M.A.B. Md Ali³³, F. Mohamad Idris³⁴, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁵, A. Hernandez-Almada, R. Lopez-Fernandez, R. Magaña Villalba, J. Mejia Guisao, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

S. Carpinteyro, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico

A. Morelos Pineda

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

P.H. Butler

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, A. Saddique, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki, K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁶, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal

P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, B. Calpas, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Rodrigues Antunes, J. Seixas, O. Toldaiev, D. Vadrucchio, J. Varela, P. Vischia

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{37,38}, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia

L. Chtchypounov, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁹, E. Kuznetsova⁴⁰, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, V. Sulimov, A. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrillov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology

A. Bylinkin³⁸

National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia

M. Chadeeva⁴¹, R. Chistov⁴¹, S. Polikarpov, V. Rusinov, E. Zhemchugov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³⁸, I. Dremin³⁸, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov³⁸, A. Terkulov

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin⁴², L. Dudko, A. Ershov, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia

V. Blinov⁴³, Y. Skovpen⁴³, D. Shtol⁴³

State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, D. Elumakhov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

P. Adzic⁴⁴, P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain

J. Alcaraz Maestre, M. Barrio Luna, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, A. Escalante Del Valle, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, E. Navarro De Martino, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

J.F. de Trocóniz, M. Missiroli, D. Moran

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, S. Sanchez Cruz, I. Suárez Andrés, J.M. Vizán Garcia

Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain

I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, J.R. Castiñeiras De Saa, E. Curras, M. Fernandez, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, M. D'Alfonso, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco⁴⁵, M. Dobson, B. Dorney, T. du Pree, D. Duggan, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, S. Fartoukh, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, J. Hammer, P. Harris, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot, J. Kieseler, H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer¹⁶, M.J. Kortelainen, K. Kousouris, M. Krammer¹, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic⁴⁶, F. Moortgat, S. Morovic, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi⁴⁷, M. Rovere, M. Ruan, H. Sakulin, J.B. Sauvan, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴⁸, J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, Y. Takahashi, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns⁴⁹, G.I. Veres²¹, M. Verweij, N. Wardle, H.K. Wöhri, A. Zagozdinska³⁶, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, P. Lecomte[†], W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, M. Masciovecchio, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Rossini, M. Schönenberger, A. Starodumov⁵⁰, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, R. Wallny

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. Amsler⁵¹, L. Caminada, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, C. Galloni, A. Hinzmann, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, Y. Yang, A. Zucchetta

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

V. Candelise, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, M. Konyushikhin, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, Y.J. Lu, A. Pozdnyakov, S.S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

Arun Kumar, P. Chang, Y.H. Chang, Y.W. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, C. Dietz, F. Fiori, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, Y.F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, M. Miñano Moya, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, J.f. Tsai, Y.M. Tzeng

Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand

B. Asavapibhop, G. Singh, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

A. Adiguzel, S. Cerci⁵², S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, I. Dumanoglu, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, I. Hos⁵³, E.E. Kangal⁵⁴, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut⁵⁵, K. Ozdemir⁵⁶, D. Sunar Cerci⁵², B. Tali⁵², S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, B. Isildak⁵⁷, G. Karapinar⁵⁸, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁹, O. Kaya⁶⁰, E.A. Yetkin⁶¹, T. Yetkin⁶²

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, S. Sen⁶³

Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine

B. Grynyov

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine

L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

R. Aggleton, F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, D.M. Newbold⁶⁴, S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, D. Smith, V.J. Smith

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶⁵, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Burton, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, P. Dunne, A. Elwood, D. Futyan, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, R. Lane, C. Laner, R. Lucas⁶⁴, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko⁵⁰, J. Pela, B. Penning,

M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, C. Seez, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta⁶⁶, T. Virdee¹⁶, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, D. Leslie, I.D. Reid, P. Symonds, L. Teodorescu, M. Turner

Baylor University, Waco, USA

A. Borzou, K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, N. Pastika

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

Boston University, Boston, USA

D. Arcaro, A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou

Brown University, Providence, USA

G. Benelli, E. Berry, D. Cutts, A. Garabedian, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan, O. Jesus, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Piperov, S. Sagir, E. Spencer, R. Syarif

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

R. Breedon, G. Breto, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, M. Gardner, W. Ko, R. Lander, C. Mclean, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, J. Smith, M. Squires, D. Stolp, M. Tripathi

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, P. Everaerts, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, E. Takasugi, V. Valuev, M. Weber

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

K. Burt, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, J. Heilman, P. Jandir, E. Kennedy, F. Lacroix, O.R. Long, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, A. Shrinivas, W. Si, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B. R. Yates

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, A. Holzner, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, I. Macneill, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶⁷, C. Welke, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

University of California, Santa Barbara - Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, USA

N. Amin, R. Bhandari, J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, M. Franco Sevilla, C. George, F. Golf, L. Gouskos, J. Gran, R. Heller, J. Incandela, S.D. Mullin, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, J. Richman, D. Stuart, I. Suarez, J. Yoo

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

D. Anderson, A. Apresyan, J. Bendavid, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, J. Duarte, J.M. Lawhorn, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Pena, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

M.B. Andrews, V. Azzolini, T. Ferguson, M. Paulini, J. Russ, M. Sun, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, T. Mulholland, K. Stenson, S.R. Wagner

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

J. Alexander, J. Chaves, J. Chu, S. Dittmer, K. Mcdermott, N. Mirman, G. Nicolas Kaufman, J.R. Patterson, A. Rinkevicius, A. Ryd, L. Skinnari, L. Soffi, S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, J. Tucker, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

D. Winn

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, G. Apollinari, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, G. Bolla, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir[†], M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, D. Hare, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, T. Liu, R. Lopes De Sá, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, N. Magini, J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, C. Newman-Holmes[†], V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck, Y. Wu

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, S. Das, R.D. Field, I.K. Furic, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, J.F. Low, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rank, L. Shchutska, D. Sperka, L. Thomas, J. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yelton

Florida International University, Miami, USA

S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

A. Ackert, J.R. Adams, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Bein, B. Diamond, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, A. Khatiwada, H. Prosper, A. Santra, R. Yohay

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA

M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, P. Kurt, C. O'Brien, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, P. Turner, N. Varelas, H. Wang, Z. Wu, M. Zakaria, J. Zhang

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

B. Bilki⁶⁸, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁶⁹, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷⁰, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

I. Anderson, B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, D. Fehling, L. Feng, A.V. Gritsan, P. Maksimovic, C. Martin, M. Osherson, J. Roskes, U. Sarica, M. Swartz, M. Xiao, Y. Xin, C. You

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, C. Bruner, J. Castle, L. Forthomme, R.P. Kenny III, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, S. Sanders, R. Stringer, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, Y. Maravin, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze, S. Toda

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

C. Anelli, A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, C. Ferraioli, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, R.G. Kellogg, T. Kolberg, J. Kunkle, Y. Lu, A.C. Mignerey, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, A. Apyan, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, K. Bierwagen, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, Z. Demiragli, L. Di Matteo, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Hsu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, K. Krajczar, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, M. Varma, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, V. Zhukova

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

A.C. Benvenuti, R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, A. Finkel, A. Gude, P. Hansen, S. Kalafut, S.C. Kao, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

E. Avdeeva, R. Bartek⁷¹, K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez⁷¹, C. Fangmeier, R. Gonzalez Suarez, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, A. Malta Rodrigues, F. Meier, J. Monroy, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, B. Stieger

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

M. Alyari, J. Dolen, J. George, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, J. Kaisen, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, A. Hortiangtham, A. Massironi, D.M. Morse, D. Nash, T. Orimoto, R. Teixeira De Lima, D. Trocino, R.-J. Wang, D. Wood

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K.A. Hahn, A. Kubik, A. Kumar, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁷, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, J. Brinson, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, R. Hughes, W. Ji, B. Liu, W. Luo, D. Puigh, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

S. Cooperstein, O. Driga, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, D. Lange, J. Luo, D. Marlow, J. Mc Donald, T. Medvedeva, K. Mei, M. Mooney, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, A. Svyatkovskiy, C. Tully, A. Zuranski

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

S. Malik

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, S. Folgueras, L. Gutay, M.K. Jha, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, J.F. Schulte, X. Shi, J. Sun, F. Wang, W. Xie

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

N. Parashar, J. Stupak

Rice University, Houston, USA

A. Adair, B. Akgun, Z. Chen, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Guilbaud, W. Li, B. Michlin, M. Northup, B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, Z. Tu, J. Zabel

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

B. Betchart, A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y.t. Duh, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, J. Han, O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, K.H. Lo, P. Tan, M. Verzetti

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA

A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, E. Contreras-Campana, Y. Gershtein, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, D. Hidas, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, K. Nash, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

A.G. Delannoy, M. Foerster, J. Heideman, G. Riley, K. Rose, S. Spanier, K. Thapa

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

O. Bouhali⁷², A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, E. Juska, T. Kamon⁷³, R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Rose, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duderod, J. Faulkner, E. Gурpinar, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, Q. Xu

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, J. Goodell, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith, X. Sun, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

C. Clarke, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, J. Sturdy

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

D.A. Belknap, C. Caillol, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, I. Ojalvo, T. Perry, G.A. Pierro, G. Polese, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, D. Taylor, N. Woods

†: Deceased

- 1: Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria
- 2: Also at State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China
- 3: Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, Université de Strasbourg, Université de Haute Alsace Mulhouse, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France
- 4: Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil
- 5: Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil
- 6: Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium
- 7: Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany
- 8: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 9: Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt
- 10: Now at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt
- 11: Also at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- 12: Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
- 13: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 14: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 15: Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
- 16: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 17: Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
- 18: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
- 19: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 20: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 21: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 22: Also at University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
- 23: Also at Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhopal, India
- 24: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
- 25: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 26: Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka
- 27: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 28: Also at University of Tehran, Department of Engineering Science, Tehran, Iran
- 29: Also at Yazd University, Yazd, Iran
- 30: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- 31: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 32: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
- 33: Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- 34: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia
- 35: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico
- 36: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
- 37: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 38: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia

- 39: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
- 40: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
- 41: Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
- 42: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
- 43: Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia
- 44: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 45: Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
- 46: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 47: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 48: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 49: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia
- 50: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 51: Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland
- 52: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 53: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 54: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 55: Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey
- 56: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 57: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 58: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 59: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 60: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 61: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 62: Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 63: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
- 64: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 65: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 66: Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain
- 67: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 68: Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA
- 69: Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey
- 70: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 71: Now at The Catholic University of America, Washington, USA
- 72: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
- 73: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea